Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union

C 284

Ausgabe in deutscher Sprache

Mitteilungen und Bekanntmachungen

57. Jahrgang

26. August 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 284/01)

Inhalt Seite

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000210/14
do Komisji
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(10 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Obostrzenia w zakresie dopuszczalnej normy substancji smolistych w mięsie wędzonym i produktach mięsnych wędzonych

Rozporządzeniem Komisji nr 1881/2006 z dnia 19 grudnia 2006 r. ustalającym najwyższe dopuszczalne poziomy niektórych zanieczyszczeń w środkach spożywczych, zmienionym w sierpniu 2011 r., Komisja Europejska wprowadziła obostrzenia w zakresie dopuszczalnej normy substancji smolistych, między innymi benzo(a)pirenu, obniżając go z 5,0 do 2,0 µg/kg mięsa wędzonego i produktów mięsnych wędzonych, począwszy od 1 września 2014 r.

Otrzymuję jednak sygnały, że zaostrzenie wymogów dotyczących zawartości tej substancji w mięsie wędzonym i produktach mięsnych wędzonych jest zbyt restrykcyjne i może doprowadzić do upadku wielu małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw w branży wędliniarskiej w Polsce, produkujących tradycyjne wędzone wyroby wędliniarskie. Jednocześnie, doceniając działania Komisji mające na celu ochronę zdrowia konsumentów, zwraca się uwagę na to, że polscy konsumenci cenią sobie mięso i produkty mięsne od dziesięcioleci wędzone według tradycyjnych receptur, które – w wyniku wprowadzonych zmian – nie będą mogły być stosowane.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się do Komisji z następującymi pytaniami:

1. Czy Komisja badała, jakie skutki wywoła wprowadzenie niniejszego rozporządzenia na konkurencyjność branży wędliniarskiej w poszczególnych krajach członkowskich Unii?

2. Jakie środki Komisja wprowadziła lub planuje wprowadzić i kiedy, aby zapewnić pomoc przedsiębiorstwom objętym obostrzeniami?

3. Czy Komisja uważa, że środki w postaci obostrzeń w zakresie dopuszczalnych norm benzo(a)pirenu w mięsie i produktach mięsnych wędzonych, mogące doprowadzić do upadku wielu przedsiębiorstw i wzrostu bezrobocia są proporcjonalne do celu, jaki chce osiągnąć Komisja?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(27 lutego 2014 r.)

1. Przy zastosowaniu dobrych praktyk wędzarniczych osiągnięcie obniżonych dopuszczalnych poziomów wielopierścieniowych węglowodorów aromatycznych (WWA) w mięsie wędzonym i produktach mięsnych wędzonych jest również możliwe w przypadku tradycyjnego wędzenia drewnem. Wspomniane dobre praktyki zawarte są w kodeksie postępowania w zakresie redukcji zanieczyszczenia żywności wielopierścieniowymi węglowodorami aromatycznymi (WWA) w procesie wędzenia i suszenia bezpośredniego (CAC/RCP 68-2009) ([1]). Stosowanie tych dobrych praktyk jest wykonalne dla wszystkich przedsiębiorstw działających w sektorze mięsa wędzonego.

2. Na wniosek właściwych organów Komisja mogłaby bezzwłocznie służyć pomocą w zakresie stosowania dobrych praktyk wędzarniczych.

3. WWA są substancjami rakotwórczymi działającymi genotoksycznie, a ich obecność w żywności może stanowić zagrożenie dla zdrowia ([2]). Konieczne jest zatem ustanowienie najwyższych dopuszczalnych poziomów na najniższym, racjonalnie możliwym do osiągnięcia poziomie. W związku z powyższym Komisja jest zdania, że obniżenie najwyższych dopuszczalnych poziomów jest proporcjonalne w stosunku do celu.

([1]) http://www.codexalimentarius.org/download/standards/11257/CXP_068e.pdf
([2]) Opinia naukowa panelu ds. środków trujących w łańcuchu żywnościowym wydana na wniosek Komisji Europejskiej, dotycząca wielopierścieniowych węglowodorów aromatycznych w żywności. Dziennik EFSA (2008) 724, 1-114. Dostępna na stronie internetowej: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/724.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000210/14
to the Commission
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Reductions in the maximum permitted levels of tarry substances in smoked meat and smoked meat products

In Commission Regulation No 1881/2006 of 19 December 2006 setting maximum levels for certain contaminants in foodstuffs, amended in August 2011, the Commission reduced the maximum permitted levels of tarry substances, including benzo(a)pyrene, reducing it from 5.0 to 2.0 µg/kg in smoked meat and smoked meat products as of 1 September 2014.

It has been brought to my attention, however, that excessive restrictions on the levels of these substances in smoked meat and smoked meat products could result in the collapse of many Polish small and medium-sized enterprises in the smoked and processed meats industry which produce traditional smoked meats. While accepting that the Commission's action is aimed at protecting consumer health, it should be noted that Polish consumers are very fond of meat and meat products which for decades have been smoked according to traditional methods that will no longer be permissible if these changes are introduced.

1. Has the Commissioned assessed the potential consequences this regulation may have on competition in the smoked and processed meat industry in various EU Member States?

2. What measures has the Commission introduced, or is it planning to introduce, to provide assistance to enterprises subject to these restrictions, and when?

3. Is the Commission of the opinion that measures reducing the maximum permitted levels of benzo(a)pyrene in smoked meat and smoked meat products, which may cause the collapse of many enterprises and increased unemployment, are proportionate to the objective it wishes to achieve?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2014)

1. By applying good smoking practices, also with traditional wood-smoking, the lower maximum levels for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) in smoked meat and smoked meat products are achievable. These good practices are provided for in the Codex Code of Practice for the Reduction of Contamination of Food with Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) from Smoking and Direct Drying Processes (CAC/RCP 68-2009) ([1]). The application of these good practices is feasible for all companies active in the smoked meat industry.

2. The Commission is considering providing without delay assistance, if requested by the competent authority, for the application of the good smoking practices.

3. PAHs are genotoxic carcinogens and their presence in food is of health concern ([2]). Maximum levels have therefore to be established at a level as low as reasonably achievable. Therefore the Commission is of the opinion that the reduction of the maximum levels is proportionate to the objective.

([1]) http://www.codexalimentarius.org/download/standards/11257/CXP_068e.pdf
([2]) Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain on a request from the European Commission on Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Food. The EFSA Journal (2008) 724, 1-114. Available at: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/724.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000212/14
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Information provision and promotion measures for fish products

In 2011 the EU food and drink industry was found to be the largest manufacturing sector in the EU, generating a turnover of some EUR 1 017 billion. The potential to increase the EU's external trade in food and drink products in order to surpass the EUR 76.2 billion accrued in 2011 lies at the heart of the Commission's proposal for a regulation on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products in the internal market and in third countries.

Despite the laudable intentions behind the proposal, fishery and aquaculture products do not feature as they are not included in Annex 1 of the TFEU. For a number of Member States, as for my own constituency of Northern Ireland, the export of fish and sea food products is a very significant and growing means of income, as indicated by an increase in export figures of 14% across the EU between 2011 and 2012.

Given the importance of fish products to Member States, does the Commission believe that the exclusion of fish products from Annex 1 is still tenable? Furthermore, how does the Commission plan to promote the sale of fish products to third countries if these products are not included in the proposed regulation?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(10 March 2014)

The legislative proposal of the Commission (COM(2013)812) on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries considers as eligible products, among others, the agricultural products listed in Annex I to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, excluding the fishery and aquaculture products listed in Annex 1 to Regulation on the common organisation of the markets in fishery and aquaculture products ([1]) and tobacco;

The fishery and aquaculture products listed in Annex 1 to the regulation on the common organisation of the markets in fishery and aquaculture products, despite being listed in Annex I to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, are not considered eligible for information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries in order to avoid overlapping with other policy instruments.

The European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), which is the proposed new fund for the EU's maritime and fisheries policies for 2014-2020, foresees to include specific marketing measures for fishery and aquaculture products

Based on Council approved final compromise text of 10 February 2014 it shall aim at:

— finding new markets and improving the conditions for the placing on the market of fishery and aquaculture species

— promoting the quality and the value added

— conducting regional, national or transnational communication and promotional campaigns

Once the legislator has reached an agreement on the promotion scheme for agricultural products, the Commission will further explore possibilities for establishing an efficient and practical cooperation between the two instruments.

([1]) REG (EU) No 1379/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000213/14
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Resources for post-traumatic stress disorder

In response to Written Question E-012805/2013 concerning the way in which post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) had impacted post-conflict societies, particularly in my own constituency of Northern Ireland, I received the following answer from Mr Borg:

'The Commission has supported the project "The European Network for Traumatic Stress-Training & Practices (TENTS-TP)" 2009-2011 through the EU Health Programme. Its aim was to disseminate and implement evidence-based practice for those affected by traumatic events. No partners from Northern Ireland in the UK were involved in this project.

The Commission has no information available on whether there are strategies in place to address the needs of people who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorders in post-conflict areas in Europe'.

In light of this reply, has the Commission extended TENTS-TP post-2011 or replaced it with a similar project? If not, does the Commission have any prospective strategies for tackling the issues surrounding PTSD and promoting the involvement of Member State regions in these strategies?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2014)

The Commission has not extended the project 'The European Network for Traumatic Stress-Training & Practices' (2009-2011), which was co-funded from the EU Health Programme, nor has it replaced it with a similar project.

In the context of the Joint Action Mental Health and Well-being ([1]) Member States work together to develop a framework of action for the establishment of community-based services for people experiencing mental disorders in general.

The Commission currently has no plans to develop additional specific activities on post-traumatic stress disorders.

([1]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000214/14
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Web accessibility for blind and partially sighted people

The Digital Agenda for Europe set out clear objectives to be met by the Commission by 2015 in relation to the full accessibility of public websites and websites providing basic services. Nevertheless, the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council of December 2012 on the accessibility of public sector bodies' websites has been criticised by the European Blind Union (EBU) as being 'too little, too late'.

The proposal aims to make a large part of the public sector's websites easily navigable for the visually impaired. However, the directive excludes a number of areas in the public sector, including transport, banking and schools. Furthermore, the directive does not apply to other means of digital support such as tablets or mobile phones.

Although the estimated costs of making public sector websites and mobile devices across the EU fully compliant are undeniably high, how does the Commission plan to mitigate the lack of ease of access for blind and partially sighted people who use websites in the aforementioned public sector areas and on mobile devices?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2014)

The proposal for a directive on web-accessibility aims to approximate the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States related to the accessibility of public sector bodies' websites to all users, regardless of functional limitations, and not only visually impaired people.

The proposal aims to achieve this by harmonising the accessibility requirements at EU level for a set of public sector websites and thus ending the fragmentation and lack of confidence (from web-accessibility providers and procurers) in the internal market for web-accessibility.

The proposal targets only a subset of public sector bodies' websites in order to avoid undue implementation costs and market distortion. Public expenditure on web-accessibility for these websites alone can already create a secure and sizable market for web-developers. This subset of public sector bodies' websites is expected to be sufficient to trigger a 'spill-over' effect onto websites beyond those targeted by the proposal, beginning with other public sector websites.

In accordance with the findings of the Impact Assesment, the proposal is focused on tackling the fragmentation of the internal web-accessibility market. As a consequence it is focused on websites, without specifying the device from which they are accessed.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000215/14
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Minor use of plant protection products

Authorisation of the minor use of a plant production product (PPP) is covered by Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, with all minor crops combined representing some 22% of the EU's crop value. Authorisation is dependent on an evaluation of whether the applicant has extensive knowledge of the product, with the applicant bearing the considerable cost of the authorisation process. While industry can afford either not to apply for authorisation — on account of an expansive portfolio of PPPs — or indeed go through the authorisation process, small farmers find the costs of authorisation significantly more burdensome.

In light of the complexity of the process, what strategies does the Commission have in place to encourage small farmers to participate both at national and EU level in 'crop groups' that assist in the authorisation process? Furthermore, what resources are available to these groups given the role they play in assisting small farmers in complying with the aforementioned regulation?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2014)

According to Article 51(9) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([1]) on plant protection products, the Commission is required to submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council on the possible establishment of a minor uses fund.

The report is currently under adoption by the Commission and addresses issues on information sharing and coordination of minor use work between Member States and stakeholders.

In addition the Commission is considering supporting an ERANET ([2]) on Integrated Pest Management with specific reference to minor uses (IPM ERANET). One of the relevant expected outputs is the mobilisation of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs).

([1]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.
([2]) ERANETs are research coordination instruments whereby Member States can coordinate their National research activities and ultimately fund joint projects.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000216/14
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Best practice in EU organ donation

In 2008, the Commission adopted an 'Action Plan on organ donation and transplantation (2009-2015): Strengthened Cooperation between Member States' in order to help increase organ availability. The plan aims to facilitate the exchange of best practice via working groups and projects like FOEDUS and EFRETOS in the framework of the 2008-2013 Health Programme.

Moving forward, can the Commission provide more detail on how it will ensure that regions in the European Union with devolved responsibility for organ donation, such as my own constituency of Northern Ireland, can fully avail of best practice throughout Member States?

Furthermore, can the Commission provide an assessment of the extent to which Member States have adequately bought into the aforementioned projects and working groups, which appear to be crucial in the Commission's strategy of optimising organ donation?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to questions E-011096/2013, E-007300/2013, E-000513/2013, E-000780/2013, E-001680/2012 and E-010591/2011 ([1]).

The legal mandate of the Union in organ transplantation focuses on quality and safety aspects ([2]). To help increase organ availability and make transplantation systems more efficient, the Commission also adopted an Action Plan ([3]) that facilitates the exchange of best practices, via EU working groups and projects funded under the Health Programme.

The action plan is meant to 'strengthen cooperation between Member States'. It works on the basis of projects and exchanges of best practices, e.g. through projects such as ETPOD, European Training Course in Transplant Donor Coordination or ACCORD (Achieving Comprehensive Coordination in Organ Donation) ([4]).

To assess progress made under the action plan, a study ([5]) was carried out. On the basis of this study, the Commission intends to put forward a mid-term review of the action plan in the coming months.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) OJ L 207, 6.08.2010. Directive 2010/53/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on standards of quality and safety of human organs intended for transplantation.
([3]) Communication from the Commission 'Action Plan on organ donation and transplantation (2009-2015): Strengthened Cooperation between Member States', COM(2008) 819/3.
([4]) The list of projects is available at http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html
([5]) ACTOR study: http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organs/docs/organs_actor_study_2013_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000217/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(10 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Επίπεδο πληρωμών στις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2013

Μετά την έγκριση του σχεδίου διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού αριθ. 6/2012, η Επιτροπή, κατόπιν αιτήματος της αρμόδιας για τον προϋπολογισμό αρχής, παρουσίασε το σχέδιο διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού αριθ. 2/2013 για το ποσό των 11,2 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ, το οποίο θα επέτρεπε να καλυφθούν όλες οι νόμιμες υποχρεώσεις πληρωμών που εκκρεμούσαν στο τέλος του 2012, καθώς και εκείνες που προέκυψαν πριν τη λήξη του 2013, στο πλαίσιο του προϋπολογισμού του 2014.

Στη συνεδρίαση του Ecofin στις 14 Μαΐου 2013, επιτεύχθηκε πολιτική συμφωνία σχετικά με τη διάθεση της πρόσθετης χρηματοδότησης για τον προϋπολογισμό του 2013 σε δύο δόσεις, εκ των οποίων η πρώτη ανέρχεται στα 7,3 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ, με δέσμευση των υπουργών να επανεξετάσουν το ζήτημα αργότερα εντός του έτους. Εντούτοις, μέχρι τότε δεν υπήρξε επίσημη δέσμευση για το υπολειπόμενο ποσό των 3,9 δισεκατομμυρίων του σχεδίου διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού αριθ. 2/2013.

Μετά την επίτευξη πολιτικής συμφωνίας μεταξύ των ευρωπαϊκών θεσμικών οργάνων σχετικά με το πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο 2014-2020 στις 27 Ιουνίου 2013, το Συμβούλιο Ecofin ενέκρινε τη συμπληρωματική χρηματοδότηση ύψους 7,3 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ για τον προϋπολογισμό του 2013 στις 9 Ιουλίου 2013 και δεσμεύτηκε να λάβει κάθε απαραίτητο πρόσθετο μέτρο για να διασφαλιστεί η πλήρης τήρηση των υποχρεώσεων της ΕΕ για το 2013. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, βάσει πρότασης που πρόκειται να υποβάλει η Επιτροπή στις αρχές του φθινοπώρου του 2014, με βάση τις τελευταίες εκτιμήσεις όσον αφορά τις πιστώσεις πληρωμών, το Συμβούλιο δεσμεύτηκε να αποφασίσει σχετικά με πρόσθετο σχέδιο διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού χωρίς καθυστέρηση, προκειμένου να αποφευχθούν οποιεσδήποτε ελλείψεις όσον αφορά αιτιολογημένες πιστώσεις πληρωμών. Στις 26 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013, η Επιτροπή κατέθεσε το σχέδιο διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού αριθ. 8/2013 για τα υπόλοιπα 3,9 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Το σχέδιο διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού αριθ. 8/2013 και το σχέδιο διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού αριθ. 9/2013 (400,5 εκατομμύρια ευρώ για την κινητοποίηση του Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης της ΕΕ) εγκρίθηκαν στη συνεδρίαση της επιτροπής συνδιαλλαγής για τον προϋπολογισμό του 2014. Τα δύο αυτά σχέδια προϋπολογισμού και ο προϋπολογισμός του 2014 εγκρίθηκαν από το Κοινοβούλιο στη σύνοδο ολομέλειας του Νοεμβρίου 2013.

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, και δεδομένου ότι το επίπεδο πληρωμών για τον προϋπολογισμό του 2013 ήταν κατά 5 δισεκατομμύρια χαμηλότερο από τις ανάγκες πληρωμών της Επιτροπής, όπως εκτιμήθηκαν στο σχέδιο προϋπολογισμού της για το 2013, μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει αναλυτικές πληροφορίες σχετικά με το επίπεδο πληρωμών που καταβλήθηκαν έως την 31η Δεκεμβρίου 2013; Ειδικότερα, μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις πληρωμές που καταβλήθηκαν τους μήνες Ιανουάριο, Φεβρουάριο, Μάρτιο, Απρίλιο, Μάιο, Ιούνιο, Ιούλιο, Αύγουστο, Σεπτέμβριο, Οκτώβριο, Νοέμβριο και Δεκέμβριο 2013, ανά κράτος μέλος και ανά τομέα πολιτικής/πρόγραμμα;

Απάντηση του κ. Lewandowski εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Η αναλυτική κατανομή των έγκυρων αιτήσεων ([1]) πληρωμών που υποβλήθηκαν τον Ιούνιο για τα χρηματοδοτούμενα από το ΕΚΤ, το ΕΤΠΑ και το ΤΣ επιχειρησιακά προγράμματα της περιόδου 2007-2013 παρατίθεται στο παράρτημα I της παρούσας απάντησης, ενώ τα στοιχεία σχετικά με το ΕΤΑ παρατίθενται στο παράρτημα II. Τον Δεκέμβριο δεν υποβλήθηκαν αιτήσεις πληρωμών για το ΕΓΤΑΑ. Τα αριθμητικά στοιχεία του πίνακα προκύπτουν από τη σύγκριση των αιτήσεων πληρωμών που υποβλήθηκαν έως τα τέλη Δεκεμβρίου 2013 με εκείνα που υποβλήθηκαν έως τα τέλη Νοεμβρίου 2013. Η Επιτροπή μπορεί να αποφασίσει την αλλαγή χαρακτηρισμού μιας αίτησης πληρωμής από «Αποδεκτή» σε «Πλήρως απορριφθείσα» ή «Επιστραφείσα προς διόρθωση» και, συνεπώς, τα αριθμητικά στοιχεία των παραρτημάτων της παρούσας απάντησης ενδέχεται να αποτελέσουν αντικείμενο περαιτέρω προσαρμογών. Τα αρνητικά υπόλοιπα του ΕΤΑ για τη Σουηδία, για παράδειγμα, είναι αποτέλεσμα τέτοιας αλλαγής χαρακτηρισμού.

Ανάλογα στοιχεία για τους μήνες Ιανουάριο, Φεβρουάριο, Μάρτιο, Απρίλιο, Μάιο, Ιούνιο, Ιούλιο, Αύγουστο, Σεπτέμβριο και Οκτώβριο 2013 δόθηκαν από την Επιτροπή σε απάντηση των ερωτήσεων E-1090/2013, E-3237/2013, E-3928/2013, E-4903/2013, E-6405/2013, E-8097/2013, E-9846/2013, E-11168/2013 και E-12567/2013, αντίστοιχα ([2]).

([1]) Με εξαίρεση τα ποσά που έχουν απορριφθεί πλήρως.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/el/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000217/14
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Level of payments as of 31 December 2013

After Draft Amending Budget No 6/2012 was approved, the Commission, at the request of the budgetary authority, presented Draft Amending Budget No 2/2013 for an amount of EUR 11.2 billion, which would allow all the legal payment obligations pending at the end of 2012, as well as those arising before the end of 2013, to be covered in the 2014 budget.

At the Ecofin meeting of 14 May 2013, a political agreement was reached to provide the extra funding for the 2013 Budget in two tranches, with the first amounting to EUR 7.3 billion and with a commitment from Ministers to revisit the issue later in the year. However, as yet there has been no formal commitment on the remaining EUR 3.9 billion of Draft Amending Budget No 2/2013.

After the European institutions reached a political agreement on the multiannual financial framework 2014-2020 on 27 June 2013, the Ecofin Council approved the EUR 7.3 billion top-up for the 2013 EU budget on 9 July 2013 and committed to take all necessary additional steps to ensure that the EU's obligations for 2013 would be met. In this respect, on the basis of a proposal to be made by the Commission in early autumn 2014, which will draw on the latest estimates regarding payment appropriations, the Council has committed to decide on a further draft amending budget without delay to avoid any shortfall in justified payment appropriations. On 26 September 2013, the Commission issued Draft Amending Budget 8/2013 for the remaining EUR 3.9 billion. Draft Amending Budget 8/2013 and Draft Amending Budget 9/2013 (EUR 400.5 million for the mobilisation of the EU Solidarity Fund) were approved at the meeting of the conciliation committee on the 2014 Budget. Both of these draft budgets and the 2014 EU budget were adopted by Parliament in the November 2013 plenary session.

Taking all of the above into consideration, and given the fact that the level of payments for the 2013 EU budget was EUR 5 billion lower than the Commission's payment needs as estimated in its 2013 draft budget, could the Commission provide detailed information on the level of payments received up to 31 December 2013? More precisely, could the Commission provide information on the payments received in the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December 2013, broken down by Member State and policy area/programme?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(24 February 2014)

A detailed breakdown of the valid payment claims ([1]) received in December for the 2007-2013 ESF, ERDF and CF-funded operational programmes is provided in Annex I to this reply while for EFF the data is included in Annex II. No payment claims were submitted in December for EAFRD. The figures in the table result from comparing valid payment claims submitted until the end of December 2013 with those submitted until the end of November 2013. The Commission may decide to change the status of a payment claim from 'Accepted' to 'Fully rejected' or 'Returned for corrections' and therefore the figures presented in the annexes to this reply could still undergo further adjustments. A negative ERDF balance for Sweden, for instance, is the result of such changes in status.

Similar data for the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October and November 2013 were provided by the Commission in response to Questions E-1090/2013, E-3237/2013, E-3928/2013, E-4903/2013, E-6405/2013, E-8097/2013, E-9846/2013, E-11168/2013, E-12567/2013 and E-14160/2013, respectively ([2]).

([1]) Excluding fully rejected amounts.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000218/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(10 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Ruolo e influenza del club Bilderberg in Europa

Dal 1954 il club Bilderberg riunisce annualmente alcune tra le più influenti personalità europee e nordamericane nel campo della politica, dell'industria, della finanza e dei mezzi di comunicazione. Il fine del club parrebbe essere quello di ottenere un ampio scambio di informazioni, non soggetto ad alcun controllo pubblico, tra le élite di Europa e Nord America. Parrebbe trattarsi di un club privato molto influente, in grado di indirizzare importanti decisioni di natura politica ed economica. Diverse inchieste giornalistiche, prevalentemente veicolate attraverso Internet, avrebbero messo in luce il rapporto molto stretto tra le annuali riunioni del club Bilderberg e alcune importanti decisioni adottate dall'Unione europea, con particolare riferimento al Meccanismo europeo di stabilità (MES), nonché le fortunate carriere di alcuni esponenti politici che vi hanno partecipato. Infatti, sembrano essere diversi gli uomini politici ad aver partecipato, o a partecipare, agli incontri del club Bilderberg, avendo ricoperto in passato, o ricoprendo attualmente, ruoli di primo piano nell'Unione europea.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. ritiene che ci possano essere delle correlazioni tra le decisioni prese dal club Bilderberg e alcune delle decisioni adottate dall'Unione europea;

2. è in grado di verificare che gli obiettivi e le modalità operative del Meccanismo europeo di stabilità (MES) siano utili al perseguimento dei reali interessi dei cittadini dell'Unione europea, rispettandone la sovranità politica e il diritto a poter decidere democraticamente come utilizzare le risorse pubbliche;

3. ritiene che sia necessario, qualora partecipassero alle riunioni del club Bilderberg uomini politici che hanno ricoperto o ricoprono ruoli istituzionali all'interno dell'Unione europea, chiedere a questi ultimi un rapporto dettagliato dei contenuti delle sopra citate riunioni;

4. pensa di proporre un'inchiesta per verificare se vi siano pericoli per la trasparenza delle scelte democratiche dovuti alla partecipazione al club Bilderberg, passata e presente, di uomini politici europei?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(27 febbraio 2014)

1. No.

2. Sì, il Meccanismo europeo di stabilità (MSE) difende gli interessi dei cittadini dell'Unione europea conservando la stabilità finanziaria dell'UE e proteggendo l'euro. Il 2 febbraio 2012 gli Stati membri dell'area dell'euro hanno firmato il trattato che istituisce l'MSE, che è poi stato ratificato dai parlamenti nazionali ed è entrato in vigore l'8 ottobre 2012.

L'assistenza finanziaria dell'MSE deve essere richiesta da uno Stato membro al Consiglio dei governatori del meccanismo e viene erogata allo Stato membro in difficoltà, nel rispetto di determinate condizioni, evitando così qualsiasi rischio morale.

L'assistenza è collegata a un protocollo d'intesa che definisce le condizioni negoziate con la Commissione e la BCE in materia di sostegno finanziario e vigilanza. I programmi di assistenza vengono negoziati con governi sovrani, che rendono debitamente conto ai parlamenti nazionali. Le decisioni in materia di erogazione dei fondi dell'MSE sono adottate all'unanimità da parte del Consiglio dei governatori, che include i ministri delle Finanze dei paesi dell'area dell'euro.

Il direttore generale dell'MSE e il Vicepresidente degli Affari economici e monetari e per l'euro partecipano periodicamente al dialogo economico con la commissione ECON del Parlamento europeo. La nuova normativa «two pack» (maggio 2013) migliora in misura sostanziale la trasparenza e la legittimità democratica della Commissione sui paesi del programma e la Commissione è tenuta a riferire al Parlamento europeo.

3. No, cfr. il punto 1. Il sito ufficiale del gruppo Bilderberg elenca i temi trattati alle riunioni e illustra l'organizzazione del gruppo (cfr. http://www.bilderbergmeetings.org/meeting_2013.html). Talvolta alle riunioni hanno partecipato dei commissari europei a titolo personale e non in quanto rappresentanti della Commissione.

4. No (cfr. il punto 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000218/14
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Bilderberg Club's role and influence in Europe

Every year since 1954 the Bilderberg Club has brought together some of the most influential figures from North America and Europe in the fields of politics, industry, finance and the media. The purpose of the club would appear to be to enable the elite of Europe and North America to exchange information freely, away from public scrutiny. It would seem to be a highly influential private club that can address important political and economic issues. A number of investigative journalists writing mainly on the Internet have revealed very close connections between the annual Bilderberg meetings and certain important decisions taken by the European Union, particularly with regard to the European Stability Mechanism (ESM), as well as the successful careers of certain politicians who have attended them. Indeed, it seems that several politicians who have held or currently hold high office in the European Union have taken part in Bilderberg meetings in the past or very recently.

1. Does the Commission believe there may be correlations between the decisions reached by the Bilderberg Club and certain decisions taken by the European Union?

2. Can it confirm that the objectives and operational procedures of the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) serve the real interests of EU citizens whilst respecting the political sovereignty of individual countries and their right to decide democratically how public funds should be used?

3. Does it believe that politicians who hold or have held key positions in EU institutions and who attend meetings of the Bilderberg Club should be asked to provide a detailed account of their proceedings?

4. Does it intend to propose an inquiry to determine whether the transparency of democratic decision-making is threatened by the current or previous involvement of European politicians in the Bilderberg Club?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2014)

1. No.

2. Yes, the ESM serve the interest of the EU citizens by preserving the financial stability of the EU and safeguarding the euro. The euro area Member States signed a treaty establishing the ESM on 2 February 2012. It was approved by national Parliaments and the ESM was inaugurated on 8 October 2012.

Financial assistance from the ESM is activated on a request from a MS to the ESM's Board of Governors and will be provided to a MS in need, subject to appropriate conditionality, thereby avoiding moral hazard.

All assistance is linked to a MoU that sets the conditions negotiated with the Commission and the ECB for financial support as well as surveillance. Assistance programmes have been negotiated with sovereign Governments, fully accountable before their national Parliament. Decisions on ESM disbursements are taken by unanimity by the Board of Governors including the Ministers of Finance of the euro area.

The Managing Director of the ESM and the VP for economic and monetary affairs and for the Euro regularly participates in the Economic Dialogue with the ECON committee of the EP. The new two-pack legislation (May 2013) substantially increases the transparency and accountability of the COMon programme countries and foresees a reporting obligation for the Commission vis-à-vis the EP.

3. No, see also supra 1. The official site of the Bilderberg Group gives account of the themes discussed in its meetings and its organisation (see http://www.bilderbergmeetings.org/meeting_2013.html). European Commissioners occasionally participated to Bilderberg meetings in their personal capacity and not as representatives of the Commission.

4. No (see supra 1).

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000219/14
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(10 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Biodiversitate — Dunăre

Protecția mediului în strategia Uniunii Europene pentru dezvoltarea Dunării se concentrează pe trei zone prioritare: refacerea și menținerea calității apelor, gestionarea riscurilor de mediu și conservarea biodiversității, a peisajelor și a calității aerului și a solului. Pentru atingerea țintelor, aceste obiective trebuie integrate în alte politici.

De exemplu, turismul are un impact deosebit asupra creșterii și dezvoltării economice a regiunii, însa planificat în mod necorespunzător, ar putea avea un impact negativ asupra biodiversității și calității aerului și apei.

Potențialul turistic al Dunării în sectorul românesc este insuficient fructificat, iar dezvoltarea turismului va duce și la dezvoltarea activității IMM-urilor, atât prin acțiuni directe, cât și conexe.

Industria turismului poate profita foarte mult de pe urma Dunării, România având de-a lungul celor 1 000 de kilometri ai fluviului 13 porturi fluviale și trei fluvial maritime. Aceste porturi, însă sunt nevalorificate, până în prezent.

Având în vedere cele relatate mai sus, poate spune Comisia dacă ar găsi oportună finanțarea unei campanii de conștientizare în legătură cu rolul important al potențialului turistic al Dunării în menținerea biodiversității în toate statele membre pe care aceasta le traversează?

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(4 martie 2014)

Strategia UE pentru regiunea Dunării include domeniul prioritar „Promovarea culturii și a turismului, a contactelor directe între oameni”, coordonat de România și de Bulgaria. Această prioritate se bazează pe potențialul pe care îl are turismul de a contribui în mod semnificativ la creșterea economică în regiune, sustenabilitatea fiind un criteriu cheie care trebuie luat în considerare.

Comisia este conștientă de importanța pe care o prezintă creșterea nivelului de conștientizare cu privire la potențialul turistic în regiunea Dunării, în strânsă legătură cu protejarea și cu menținerea biodiversității. Acest lucru ar fi compatibil cu obiectivele Strategiei UE pentru regiunea Dunării, care prezintă o oportunitate integratoare pentru o creștere accelerată și sustenabilă prin intermediul turismului și care este legată în mod direct de domeniile prioritare referitoare la conectivitate și la asigurarea prosperității în regiune. Atât porturile românești, cât și oportunitățile oferite pentru IMM-urile din România fac parte din acest potențial.

Totuși, ideile de acest tip trebuie să fie promovate de țările participante, urmând apoi să fie coordonate de România și de Bulgaria prin acțiuni concrete care să fie puse în aplicare pe întregul teritoriu danubian.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000219/14
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Biodiversity — The Danube

In the European Union Strategy for the Danube Region, environmental protection focuses on three priority areas: restoring and maintaining water quality, managing environmental risks and preserving biodiversity, landscapes and quality of air and soil. To achieve the targets, these objectives have to be integrated into other policies.

For example, tourism has a particular impact on a region's economic growth and development but, when it is not properly planned, is liable to have a negative impact on biodiversity and air and water quality.

The tourism potential of the Danube is being insufficiently tapped along the Romanian stretch of that river, while the development of tourism would also lead, both directly and indirectly, to the development of SMEs' activities.

The tourism industry has a great deal to gain from the Danube, as Romania has 13 inland ports and three river/sea ports along its 1 000 km of that river. However, those ports have not been capitalised upon so far.

Considering the above, can the Commission state whether it would consider it appropriate to finance a campaign to raise awareness of the important role the Danube's tourism potential can play in maintaining biodiversity in all the Member States the river crosses?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The EU Strategy for the Danube region has a priority area 'To promote culture and tourism, people to people contacts', coordinated by Romania and Bulgaria. This priority is based on the potential that tourism has in making a significant contribution to growth in the region, with sustainability being a key criterion to take into account.

The Commission sees the value of raising awareness of the tourism potential in the Danube region, connected with protecting and maintaining the biodiversity. This would fit with the aims of the EU Strategy for the Danube Region, which presents a holistic opportunity for increased and sustainable growth through tourism, being directly linked to the priority areas related to connectivity and to building prosperity in the region. Romanian ports are part of this potential, as well as the opportunities offered for Romanian SMEs.

It is however for the participating countries to come forward with such an idea, which could then be coordinated by Romania and Bulgaria through concrete actions to be implemented in the entire Danube territory.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000220/14
adresată Comisiei
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(10 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Mobilitatea forței de muncă tinere în UE

Având în vedere că mobilitatea forței de muncă este un drept fundamental al cetățenilor europeni, deci și al tinerilor aflați în căutarea unui loc de muncă, găsirea unei cariere contribuind atât la propria lor dezvoltare, cât și la progresul UE;

Având în vedere că la nivelul UE se înregistrează tendințe diverse de mobilitate, mai ales a tinerilor europeni (mulți tineri din Europa de Est și Centrală se îndreaptă către țările din vestul Europei, în timp ce aceia din vestul Europei, mai ales cei din Irlanda, părăsesc spațiul european în căutare de locuri de muncă);

Având în vedere că unul dintre scopurile prioritare ale UE este crearea pieței unice europene,

Solicit Comisiei să răspundă la următoarele întrebări:

1. Consideră Comisia că forța de muncă, mai ales cea tânără, este o forță europeană primordială și un pilon al dezvoltării UE?

2. Nu consideră Comisia că se impune elaborarea unei strategii europene de gestionare adecvată a forței de muncă, în special a celei tinere, pentru folosirea optimă și evitarea risipirii acesteia?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(4 martie 2014)

Comisia consideră că forța de muncă, în special forța de muncă tânără, este un atu european esențial și un pilon fundamental al dezvoltării Uniunii. Tinerii de astăzi formează generația care a beneficiat de cea mai bună educație, iar UE ar trebui să valorifice acest lucru pe măsură ce progresează punerea în practică a Strategiei UE 2020.

În lupta împotriva șomajului, soluțiile politice la nivelul UE și la nivel național se completează reciproc în mod armonios. Politica în domeniul ocupării forței de muncă continuă să fie, în principal, responsabilitatea statelor membre, iar administrațiile naționale sunt cele mai în măsură să elaboreze și să pună în aplicare politici eficace de ocupare a forței de muncă care vizează tineretul. UE joacă un rol important de susținere și de stimulare, prin furnizarea de sprijin financiar și de orientări politice. UE reprezintă, de asemenea, o platformă utilă pentru încurajarea mobilității profesionale în rândul tinerilor.

În 2012, Comisia a adoptat pachetul privind ocuparea forței de muncă și pachetul privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor, care, printre altele, a propus o recomandare a Consiliului privind înființarea unei garanții pentru tineret (adoptată în aprilie 2013) și acțiuni menite să sporească mobilitatea tinerilor. Pentru a îmbunătăți funcționarea pieței muncii și a progresa în direcția creării unei adevărate piețe europene a muncii, au fost lansate mai multe inițiative, printre care se numără măsurile menite să elimine obstacolele juridice și practice din calea liberei circulații a lucrătorilor și să amelioreze corelarea ofertei cu cererea de locuri de muncă la nivel transfrontalier. În acest sens, propunerea de reglementare privind dezvoltarea EURES (serviciile europene pentru ocuparea forței de muncă) într-o veritabilă rețea paneuropeană de recrutare și de plasare a forței de muncă este, în prezent, inclusă în procesul legislativ. Între timp, în noiembrie 2012 a fost adoptată o nouă decizie EURES, care vizează optimizarea funcționării operaționale a EURES.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000220/14
to the Commission
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Youth labour mobility in the EU

Workforce mobility is a fundamental right of European citizens, and that includes young jobseekers, while their finding a career contributes not only to their own development, but also to the development of the EU.

Several mobility trends are apparent at EU level, especially as regards young Europeans (many young people from Eastern and Central Europe are heading for countries in Western Europe, while young people from Western Europe, especially from Ireland, are leaving the European continent to look for a job).

Since one of the priorities of the EU is to create a single European market, can the Commission state:

1. whether it considers the workforce, and especially the young workforce, to be a fundamental European strength and a pillar of EU development;

2. whether it does not consider it necessary to develop a European strategy for properly managing the workforce, and especially the young workforce, in order to ensure its optimum use and that it is not wasted?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The Commission considers the workforce, and especially the young workforce, to be a fundamental European strength and a pillar of EU development. Today's youth is the most educated generation ever, which the EU should capitalise on as it works towards the realisation of the EU2020 strategy.

In tackling unemployment, EU and national level policy solutions valuably complement each other. Employment policy remains principally the responsibility of Member States and national administrations are best placed to design and implement effective employment policies targeting youth. The EU plays an important supportive and simulating role by providing financial support and policy guidance. The EU also constitutes a valuable platform for encouraging youth labour mobility.

In 2012, the Commission adopted the Employment Package and the Youth Employment Package, which, among other things, proposed a Council Recommendation on establishing a Youth Guarantee (adopted in April 2013) and actions to enhance youth mobility. Several initiatives have been launched with the aim of improving the functioning of the labour market and taking steps towards the creation of a true European labour market, including measures to remove legal and practical obstacles to the free movement of workers and to enhance the matching of jobs-seekers across borders. In this regard, a regulatory proposal to develop EURES (European Employment Services) into a true pan-European job placement and recruitment network is currently in the legislative process. Meanwhile, a new EURES Decision was adopted in November 2012 to maximise the operational functioning of EURES.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000221/14
alla Commissione
Franco Bonanini (NI)
(10 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Coerenza del progetto integrato territoriale «Centro città» di La Spezia con gli obiettivi del POR regionale 2007-2013 — Asse 3: seguito

— Considerata l'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta presentata dal sottoscritto alla Commissione il 19 giugno 2013, avente per oggetto «Coerenza del progetto integrato territoriale "Centro città" di La Spezia con gli obiettivi del POR regionale 2007-2013 — Asse 3» (P-007162/2013);

— considerata la risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione del 10 luglio 2013, nella quale la Commissione affermava di essere in procinto di esaminare «una denuncia relativa al programma "Centro città" cofinanziato nell'ambito del Programma operativo regionale predisposto dalla Regione Liguria per il 2007-2013» e di aver chiesto «all'autorità di gestione di trasmettere le informazioni pertinenti, al fine di verificare eventuali violazioni della politica di coesione o di qualsiasi altra normativa europea applicabile»;

1. ciò considerato, ha la Commissione effettivamente esaminato le informazioni pertinenti richieste a suo tempo all'autorità di gestione e verificato l'esistenza di eventuali violazioni della politica di coesione o di qualsiasi altra normativa europea applicabile, come annunciato nella sua risposta?

2. Può la Commissione far conoscere i risultati di tale verifica?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(18 febbraio 2014)

Le autorità italiane non hanno ancora fornito le informazioni richieste in merito alle questioni sollevate nell'interrogazione dell'Onorevole deputato. La Commissione lo informerà direttamente non appena possibile.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000221/14
to the Commission
Franco Bonanini (NI)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Consistency of the integrated territorial project for La Spezia -'City Centre' — with the Regional Operational Programme objectives for 2007-2013, Priority Axis 3 — continued

On 19 June 2013, I tabled a written question to the Commission (P-007162/2013) concerning 'Consistency of the integrated territorial project for La Spezia -"City Centre" — with the Regional Operational Programme objectives for 2007-2013, Priority Axis 3'.

Johannes Hahn replied on behalf of the Commission on 10 July 2013, stating: 'The Commission is currently examining a complaint relating to the "City Centre" project co-financed within the framework of the 2007-2013 Liguria programme and has asked for relevant information from the managing authority in order to examine if there has been any infringement of cohesion policy, or any other applicable EU rules.'

1. Has the Commission indeed examined the relevant information requested from the managing authority and checked whether any infringements of cohesion policy or any other applicable EU rules have occurred, as announced in his reply?

2. Can the Commission communicate the results of this examination?

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

The Italian authorities have not provided yet with the required information on the complaint raised by the Honourable Member. The Commission will inform him directly as soon as possible.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-000222/14
upućeno Komisiji
Biljana Borzan (S&D)
(10. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Briga za novorođenčad

Više od pet milijuna žena rađa u EU-u svake godine. Dodatnih dva milijuna žena ima propale trudnoće. Više od 25 000 beba je mrtvorođeno i otprilike 90 000 beba ima velike prirođene poremećaje. Unatoč mnogim tehničkim naprecima, gotovo 30 000 beba umire unutar prvih 28 dana života (ne uključujući mrtvorođenčad).

Briga za novorođenčad počinje brigom za majke te se nastavlja pružanjem najbolje zdravstvene zaštite za novorođenčad, obrazovanjem zdravstvenih radnika, pružanjem financijske podrške za obitelji, razmjenom informacija itd.

Iako zdravlje majki, fetusa i novorođenčadi podliježe nacionalnim politikama, uznemirujuće statistike ukazuju na potrebu za pristupom na razini EU-a. Prema brojkama koje je objavila Europska zaklada za brigu o novorođenoj djeci, one zemlje koje su pristupile EU-u prije 2004. imaju srednju stopu smrtnosti novorođenčadi od 2,7 na 1 000 rođenja, dok one zemlje koje su mu pristupile nakon 2004. imaju srednju stopu od 4,4. Srednja stopa za Bugarsku i Rumunjsku viša je tri puta od stope „starih" država članica (8,5/1 000). Također se može uočiti značajna razlika u registriranim prekidima trudnoće i slučajevima smrti fetusa među državama članicama. Trenutno, zdravlje majki i perinatalno zdravlje čine jako mali dio programa istraživanja koje financiraju države članice ili EU.

S obzirom na deklaraciju usvojenu u Lisabonu u rujnu 2011. na 9. Konferenciji ministara zdravlja Vijeća Europe u kojoj stoji da su „zdrava djeca budućnost Europe i da se prava svakog djeteta na pravičan pristup zdravstvenoj skrbi koja je primjerena, usmjerena na djecu i dobre kvalitete moraju poštovati", poduzima li Komisija ikakve napore kako bi riješila ovaj problem na razini EU-a?

Odgovor g. Borga u ime Komisije
(5. ožujka 2014.)

Stopa smrtnosti djece u 2000. u EU-u varirala je između 3,4 i 18,6 mrtvorođene djece na 1 000 živorođene, što među državama članicama ([1]) čini razliku od 15,2 smrtna slučaja. Do 2012. stopa smrtnosti djece i razlika među državama članicama znatno se smanjila te iznosi između 1,6 i 9,0 smrtnih slučajeva na 1 000 živorođene djece u EU-u, što je razlika od 7,4 smrtna slučaja ([2]).

Komisija nastoji podržati aktivnosti smanjenja razlika brojnim inicijativama, uključujući aktivnost u okviru Komunikacije Komisije „Solidarnost u zdravstvu" ([3]) kojom se države članice podupiru u smanjenju nejednakosti u zdravstvu te u okviru Preporuke „Ulaganje u djecu: prekidanje ciklusa prikraćenosti" ([4]) kojom se države članice potiču na poboljšanje fleksibilnosti zdravstvenog sustava kako bi se udovoljilo potrebama prikraćene djece.

U okviru teme „Zdravlje" Sedmog okvirnog programa EU-a (FP7, 2007-2013) niz se projekata posebno usredotočio na determinante zdravlja i nejednakosti u zdravstvu kao što su GRADIENT ([5]), DRIVERS ([6]) i SOPHIE ([7]), kojima se naglašava potreba za cjeloživotnim pristupom radi smanjenja nejednakosti. Financiraju se i aktivnosti kao što su CHICOS ([8]), RICHE ([9]) i EPICE ([10]) kojima se određuju prioriteti u istraživanju dječjeg i perinatalnog zdravlja temeljeni na sveobuhvatnim potrebama u Europi.

Naposljetku, Komisija želi počasnim članovima skrenuti pozornost na članak 35. Povelje EU-a o temeljnim pravima u kojemu se navodi pravo pristupa preventivnoj zdravstvenoj skrbi i pravo na liječenje, u skladu s uvjetima utvrđenima u nacionalnom zakonodavstvu i praksi. Ova odredba služi kao temelj sveobuhvatnog načela da bi svaka osoba morala imati pristup zdravstvenoj zaštiti. Institucije Europske unije u svojim aktivnostima moraju djelovati u skladu s tim načelom.

([1]) Države članice EU-a.
([2]) Podaci su dostupni u internetskoj bazi podataka Eurostata. Vidi i http://ec.europa.eu/health/social_determinants/docs/healthinequalitiesineu_2013_en.pdf
([3]) COM(2009) 567.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en.
([5]) Vidi http://health-gradient.eu/other-research/gradient/.
([6]) Uzimanje u obzir strateških determinanata radi smanjenja nejednakosti u zdravstvu putem 1.) ranog razvoja djeteta, 2.) omogućivanja pravednog zapošljavanja i 3.) socijalne zaštite.
([7]) Procjena učinka strukturalnih politika na nejednakosti u zdravstvu i njihove socijalne determinante te poticanje promjena.
([8]) CHICOS — 241604 — Razvoj projekta „Child Cohort Research Strategy for Europe" www.chicosproject.eu.
([9]) RICHE — 242181 — Stvaranje platforme i popisa za istraživanje zdravlja djece u Europi www.childhealthresearch.eu.
([10]) EPICE — 259882 — Učinkovita perinatalna intenzivna skrb u Europi — prenošenje znanja u praksu temeljenu na dokazima http://www.epiceproject.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000222/14
to the Commission
Biljana Borzan (S&D)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Care for newborns

More than five million women give birth in the EU each year. A further two million women have failed pregnancies. More than 25 000 babies are stillborn and approximately 90 000 babies have major congenital anomalies. Despite many technological advances, almost 30 000 babies die within the first 28 days of life (not including stillbirths).

Caring for newborns starts by caring for mothers, and continues by providing the best healthcare for newborns, educating health workers, providing financial support for families, exchanging information, etc.

Although maternal, foetal and neonatal health is subject to national policies, disturbing statistics suggest that an EU-wide approach is required. According to figures released by the European foundation for the Care of Newborn Infants, those countries which joined the EU prior to 2004 have a median rate of neonatal mortality of 2.7 per 1 000 births, while those countries which joined in 2004 have a median rate of 4.4. The median rate for Bulgaria and Romania is three times higher than that of the 'old' Member States (8.5/1 000). A considerable difference in the registered termination of pregnancies and foetal deaths can also be seen among Member States. At present, maternal and perinatal health make up very few of the research programmes funded by the EU or the Member States.

In view of the declaration of the 9th Council of Europe Conference of Health Ministers adopted in Lisbon in September 2011 which states that 'healthy children are the future of Europe and the rights of every child to equitable access to healthcare which is appropriate, child-orientated and of good quality must be respected', are any efforts being made by the Commission to tackle this problem at EU level?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

In 2000, the infant mortality rate varied between 3.4 and 18.6 infant deaths per 1 000 live births in the EU, representing a gap of 15.2 deaths between MS ([1]). By 2012, both the infant mortality rates as such and the gap between MS had considerably lowered to between 1.6 and 9.0 per 1 000 live births in the EU, representing a gap of 7.4 ([2]).

The Commission seeks to support action to bridge inequalities through a number of initiatives including action under the Commission Communication 'Solidarity in Health' ([3]) to support MS to reduce health inequalities in general and under the recommendation 'Investing in Children: breaking the cycle of disadvantage' ([4]), which encourages MS to improve the responsiveness of health systems to address the needs of disadvantaged children.

Under the Health Theme of the EU Seventh Framework Programme (FP7, 2007-2013), a series of projects specifically focused on assessing determinants of health and health inequalities such as GRADIENT ([5]), DRIVERS ([6]) and SOPHIE ([7]), emphasising the need for a life course approach to reduce inequalities. Funding is also given for roadmap actions such as CHICOS ([8]), RICHE ([9]) and EPICE ([10]) for defining research priorities in child and perinatal health based on a comprehensive needs approach in Europe.

Finally, the Commission would like to draw the Honourable Member's attention to Article 35 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights which states the right to access preventive healthcare and the right to benefit from medical treatment, according to the conditions established by national laws and practices. This provision serves as a base to the overarching principle that everyone should have access to healthcare. The European Union institutions must comply with this principle in their actions.

([1]) Member States.
([2]) Data are available in Eurostat on line database; see also http://ec.europa.eu/health/social_determinants/docs/healthinequalitiesineu_2013_en.pdf
([3]) COM(2009) 567.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en
([5]) See http://health-gradient.eu/other-research/gradient/
([6]) Addressing the strategic Determinants to Reduce health Inequality Via 1) Early childhood development, 2) Realising fair employment, and 3) Social protection.
([7]) Evaluating the impact of Structural Policies on Health Inequalities and their Social Determinants and Fostering Change.
([8]) CHICOS — 241604 — Developing a Child Cohort Research Strategy for Europe www.chicosproject.eu
([9]) RICHE — 242181 — A platform and inventory for child health research in Europe www.childhealthresearch.eu
([10]) EPICE — 259882 — Effective Perinatal Intensive Care in Europe: Translating knowledge into evidence-based practice http://www.epiceproject.eu/

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys P-000224/14
komissiolle
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(10. tammikuuta 2014)

Aihe: Avaruusromun vähentäminen

Asiantuntijoiden mukaan maata kiertävällä radalla on tällä hetkellä noin 1–100 miljoonaa esinettä, jotka aiheutuvat ihmisen toiminnasta. Noin 20 000 näistä on kooltaan suurempia kuin 5–10 cm. Määrään sisältyy hajonneiden rakettien ja satelliittien kappaleita ja noin 1 200 toimivaa satelliittia. Avaruusromu saattaa törmätä toimiviin satelliitteihin ja aiheuttaa suurta tuhoa tai jopa vähentää eräiden kiertoratojen käyttökelpoisuutta. Joka vuosi lähetetään uusia satelliitteja maata kiertävälle radalle, mikä tuottaa lisää romua satelliitin törmättyä johonkin tai hajottua kappaleiksi.

Vastauksessaan avaruusromua koskevaan kirjalliseen kysymykseen E-007743/2011 komissaari Tajani vakuutti, että komissio tukisi neuvoston aloitetta ulkoavaruudessa tapahtuvan toiminnan vapaaehtoisista menettelysäännöistä. Sittemmin komissio on ollut mukana avaruusromun aktiivista poistamista käsittelevissä kansainvälisissä neuvotteluissa. Voisiko komissio kertoa missä vaiheessa nämä neuvottelut ovat, mitä tuloksia niiltä on lupa odottaa, onko todennäköistä että maata kiertävän avaruusromun siivoamisesta saadaan aikaan kansainvälinen yhteisymmärrys ja voisiko tai pitäisikö EU:n olla mukana vuonna 2018 laukaistavassa sveitsiläisessä CleanSpaceOne-satelliittihankkeessa tai yleensä muissa avaruuden siivoamista koskevissa hankkeissa?

Aikooko komissio ehdottaa säädöstä avaruusromun määrän kasvun hidastamiseksi niin, että kaikissa jäsenvaltioiden tai EU:n alueella sijaitsevien yritysten lähettämissä avaruusaluksissa ja satelliiteissa olisi oltava laitteet, jotka palauttavat sen turvallisesti takaisin maan pinnalle sen jälkeen, kun laitetta ei enää tarvita, mikä estäisi uuden avaruusromun syntymisen? Mitä mieltä komissio on mahdollisuudesta käyttää EU/FP7:n ESAIL-hankkeessa ja ehdotetussa SWEST-hankkeessa kehitettyjä sähköisiä purjeita avaruusalusten käyttövoimana ja satelliittien plasmajarruna? Onko tätä menetelmää tarkoitus testata lähitulevaisuudessa?

Antonio Tajanin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(18. helmikuuta 2014)

EU toimii avaruusromun leviämiseen liittyvissä kysymyksissä kolmella tasolla:

1. Komissio esitti helmikuussa 2013 avaruusesineiden valvonnan ja seurannan (SST) tukikehystä koskevan ehdotuksen. Yhdysvaltojen tarjoamia törmäyksenestopalveluja on tarkoitus täydentää toiminnallisilla SST-palveluilla Euroopan tasolla.

2. EU on mukana mm. maapallon kiertoradan puhdistamiseen tähtäävissä tutkimustoimissa. Jos tällainen teknologia ei ole täysin hallinnassa, avaruusromun määrä saattaa jopa lisääntyä. Tutkimuksen, teknologian kehittämisen ja demonstroinnin 7. puiteohjelmaan ja Horisontti 2020 -ohjelmaan kuuluu useita hankkeita, joilla pyritään ratkaisemaan tämä ongelma. Nämä hankkeet edellyttävät koordinointia ESAn, jäsenvaltioiden ja kansainvälisten kumppanien toimien välillä ja jättävät hakijoille paljon vapautta sekä ehdotuksen tekemisen että – valituksi tulleille hakijoille – tulosten hyödyntämisen suhteen.

3. EU on mukana kansainvälisissä keskusteluissa. Unionin ulkoasioiden ja turvallisuuspolitiikan korkea edustaja neuvottelee parhaillaan komission tuella EU:n ulkopuolisten maiden kanssa luonnoksesta ulkoavaruuden toimintaa koskeviksi kansainvälisiksi käytännesäännöiksi. Vuonna 2013 EU:n ulkosuhdehallinto vei tätä merkittävää EU:n aloitetta eteenpäin järjestämällä kaksi monenkeskistä avointa kuulemista, joihin osallistui yli 60 maata. Vuoden 2014 alkupuoliskolla pidettäväksi suunnitellun kolmannen kuulemiskierroksen jälkeen prosessin on tarkoitus edetä viimeiseen vaiheeseensa eli vaiheeseen, jossa kansainvälinen yhteisö hyväksyy aloitteen.

Mitä tulee ajatukseen säädöksen antamisesta EU:ssa avaruusromun määrän torjumiseksi ja vähentämiseksi, voidakseen ehdottaa mahdollisia ratkaisuja komissio on käynnistänyt tutkimuksen, jossa tarkastellaan edellä kuvattuja kehityskulkuja ja niiden mahdollisia vaikutuksia Euroopan avaruusteollisuuteen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000224/14
to the Commission
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Reducing space debris

Experts estimate that between 1 and 100 million small objects, including approximately 20 000 objects with a diameter of more than 5 to 10 cm, are currently orbiting the Earth as a result of human activity. They include disintegrated rockets and satellites and approximately 1 200 operational satellites. Space debris may collide with the operational satellites and cause severe damage, or even make certain orbital bands difficult to use. Each year several new satellites are sent to orbit the Earth, producing ever more debris after eventual collision or disintegration.

In the answer to Written Question E-007743/2011 on space debris, Mr Tajani gave assurances that the Commission would support the Council initiative for a voluntary code of conduct on outer space activities. The Commission has since been involved in international negotiations on the active removal of space debris. Could the Commission say what stage these negotiations are at, what outcomes are to be expected, whether it is likely that international consensus on how to clean up Earth's orbit will be reached in the next few years, and whether the EU could or should be involved in the Swiss satellite project CleanSpaceOne, which is due to launch in 2018, or indeed in any other space cleaning projects?

Does the Commission intend to propose a legislative act on debris growth mitigation so that all spacecraft and new satellites sent by Member States or by companies based in the EU would have to contain equipment which would bring the object safely back to Earth when it is no longer needed, in order that no new debris will be left in space? What is the Commission's view on the possibility of using electric sails for spacecraft propulsion as developed in the EU/FP7 project ESAIL and the proposed SWEST project, which may also be used as a plasma-brake on satellites? Are there any plans to trial this method in the near future?

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

The EU responses to the issues related to the proliferation of space debris is conducted at three levels.

1. The Commission put forward in February 2013 a proposal for a Space Surveillance and Tracking (SST) support programme. The aim is to complement the ongoing anti-collision services provided by the US with operational SST services at European level.

2. The EU is involved in research activities including those aiming at cleaning up Earth orbit. Indeed if not completely mastered, such technologies could end up increasing the population of space debris. Several projects in the Space Work Programs of FP7 and of Horizon 2020 address this issue. These projects require coordination with ESA's and Member States' activities and also with international partners and leave to the candidates autonomy both on the proposal and when selected on the exploitation of the results.

3. The EU is involved in international discussions. The High Representative of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, with the support of the Commission, is pursuing consultations with third countries on a draft International Code of conduct for Outer Space Activities. In 2013, the EEAS advanced this major EU initiative through two rounds of multilateral Open-ended Consultations bringing together more than 60 countries. Following a third round of Consultations, envisioned to take place in the first half of 2014, the process should move to the concluding phase towards adoption by the international community.

Regarding the idea of a legislative act to address the issue of debris growth and mitigation in the EU, the Commission has launched a study addressing the developments mentioned above and the possible impact on the European Space Industry to propose possible solutions.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000225/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(10 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Elecciones en Bangladés

La situación en Bangladés, donde se han producido innumerables conflictos sangrientos y consecuentes violaciones de los derechos humanos y democráticos de sus ciudadanos ([1]) a raíz de las elecciones estatales del 5 de enero, es extremadamente preocupante. La modificación de una ley relacionada con el proceso electoral, que lo convierte en un monopolio del Gobierno con dudosa transparencia, ha desencadenado un boicot de las elecciones por parte de la oposición que ha abierto la veda a revueltas, redadas e insurrecciones con desenlaces trágicos.

Dado este escenario antidemocrático y la negativa de ciertos actores internacionales, entre ellos la Unión Europea, de enviar observadores a las elecciones como prueba del desacuerdo con el rumbo caótico que ha tomado el proceso, ¿qué acciones prevé tomar la Alta Representante de ahora en adelante?

La legitimidad del resultado electoral está en duda ya que la participación es de un escaso 22 %, en gran parte por el boicot electoral de la oposición. Ni Gobierno ni oposición han demostrado una actitud pacificadora y democrática. La comunidad internacional siempre se ha conocido como un actor relevante en este tipo de conflictos. ¿Pretende la Alta Representante ejercer presión en nombre de la Unión Europea para resolver el problema y garantizar una democracia efectiva en Bangladés?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de marzo de 2014)

La situación política de Bangladés preocupa a la UE. La UE desempeñó un papel activo en los meses previos a las elecciones al instar a todas las Partes a acordar una fórmula que pudiera proporcionar una base sólida a una elecciones pacíficas, transparentes, integradoras y creíbles. La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta también se comunicó directamente con el Ministro de Asuntos Exteriores de Bangladés para promover el diálogo. Asimismo, manifestamos nuestra disponibilidad para enviar una misión de observación electoral de la UE, dependiendo de la situación en materia de seguridad y de las perspectivas de unas elecciones creíbles.

Lamentablemente, los principales partidos políticos no se pusieron de acuerdo sobre las condiciones que favorecen unas elecciones integradoras. El Partido Nacionalista de Bangladés decidió boicotear la votación, mientras que la Liga Awami decidió seguir adelante y presentarse a las elecciones en solitario. En estas circunstancias no habría estado justificado el envío de una misión de observación electoral de la UE. Las elecciones se caracterizaron por la violencia y una baja participación.

Tras las elecciones del 5 de enero, la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta hizo una declaración en nombre de la UE en la que se pedía el fin inmediato de la violencia y se instaba a los dirigentes de la Liga Awam y del Partido Nacionalista de Bangladés a alcanzar un acuerdo en torno a una solución mutuamente aceptable para celebrar unas elecciones creíbles, integradoras y transparentes, dando prioridad a los intereses del pueblo de Bangladés.

Los líderes políticos del país tendrán que asumir su responsabilidad de cara a una solución. La UE mantendrá su compromiso y seguirá estando muy atenta a la situación.

([1]) http://www.hrw.org/news/2014/01/03/bangladesh-crackdown-escalates-ahead-election

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000225/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Elections in Bangladesh

The situation in Bangladesh, where there have been countless bloody conflicts and consequent violations of the human and democratic rights of its citizens ([1]) following the state elections on 5 January, is extremely concerning. The amendment of a law on the electoral process, which created a government monopoly with questionable transparency, triggered a boycott of the elections by the opposition which declared open season for disturbances, police raids and insurrections, with tragic consequences.

In view of this anti-democratic scenario and the refusal of some international players, including the European Union, to send observers to the elections as a sign of their disapproval of the chaotic course of events, what actions does the High Representative intend to take now and in the future?

The legitimacy of the election result is in doubt, since the turnout was a mere 22%, largely because of the opposition's boycott. The government and the opposition have both failed to demonstrate peaceful and democratic intent. The international community has always been seen as having an important part to play in this type of conflict. Does the High Representative intend to apply pressure on behalf of the European Union to resolve the issue and to guarantee effective democracy in Bangladesh?

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

The political situation in Bangladesh is of concern for the EU. The EU played an active role in the months leading up to the elections, urging all parties to agree on a formula that would provide a sound basis for peaceful, transparent, inclusive and credible elections. The HR/VP also interacted directly with the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh to promote dialogue. We also expressed our readiness to send an EU Election Observation Mission, subject to the security situation and the prospects for credible elections.

Regrettably, the main political parties failed to agree on conditions conducive to inclusive elections. The Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) decided to boycott the vote, while the Awami League (AL) decided to go ahead and contest one-sided elections. In these circumstances, sending an EU Election Observation Mission would not have been warranted. The elections were marred by violence and turn-out was low.

Following the 5 January elections, the HR/VP issued a Declaration on behalf of the EU calling for an immediate end to the violence and urging the leaders of the AL and the BNP to agree on a mutually acceptable way forward to hold transparent inclusive and credible elections, putting the interests of the people of Bangladesh first.

Political leaders in Bangladesh will have to take their responsibility for finding a solution. The EU will stay engaged and continue to monitor the situation closely.

([1]) http://www.hrw.org/news/2014/01/03/bangladesh-crackdown-escalates-ahead-election

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000226/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(10 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Impulso del coworking

El *coworking* es una práctica laboral alternativa que se está extendiendo poco a poco en Europa y el mundo. Consiste en un espacio de trabajo donde diferentes empresas, normalmente *start-ups*, comparten, además de los gastos propios de una oficina, ideas, recursos, contactos y proyectos.

Este tipo de sinergia permite disminuir las barreras de entrada al mercado para los emprendedores al reducir costes y encontrar un valor añadido fruto de la retroalimentación interdisciplinaria entre empresas.

En Europa, ya contamos con unos 1 600 espacios de *coworking*, y sería necesario que, desde la Unión Europea, les diésemos más facilidades a través de financiación y apoyo. El resultado de este modo de trabajar conjuntamente tan práctico y flexible es notorio en términos de innovación, establecimiento de redes y empleo, acordes con las estrategias de Europa 2020.

¿Sería posible que la Comisión estudiase la posibilidad de incluir este tipo de proyectos en sus prioridades? ¿No cree la Comisión que resultaría altamente beneficioso potenciar estas prácticas entre las pymes mediante ventajas de inversión?

La duración media de los proyectos de algunos emprendedores que usan estas oficinas es de tres meses, con lo que difícilmente encuentran apoyo financiero desde fondos europeos. ¿Podría la Comisión revisar las condiciones de financiación aplicables a empresas que usan este método?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión está más comprometida que nunca en dar impulso a la competitividad, el crecimiento y el empleo, en particular mediante la transformación de la economía europea en una economía digital dinámica. Ello requiere la aplicación de la Agenda Digital, incluidas las medidas que favorecen el espíritu empresarial y el desarrollo de cualificaciones digitales (por ejemplo, las iniciativas «Startup Europe» y «Gran Coalición para el Empleo Digital»).

El uso de espacios de trabajo conjunto (co-working) beneficia, en efecto, a las empresas jóvenes, que ponen en común con otros emprendedores recursos, ideas y experiencias. Recibe nuestro apoyo mediante acciones específicas para las iniciativas de trabajo conjunto y dentro de los programas de viveros y de aceleradores de empresas.

A nivel de la UE ya se han puesto en marcha varios proyectos de TIC que apoyan tales actividades. El nuevo programa Horizonte 2020 contribuirá a su amplificación. A este respecto, cabe citar una acción específica para promover las actividades en espacios de trabajo conjunto en el ámbito de las TIC, que se iniciará en 2014.

No existe restricción alguna para que las empresas que utilizan espacios de trabajo conjunto participen en los programas de la UE. El instrumento para las PYME dentro de Horizonte 2020 brinda oportunidades a las PYME que trabajan en proyectos de innovación cortos. Les proporciona un apoyo gradual que abarca todo el ciclo de la innovación en tres fases, complementado con un servicio de tutoría y asesoramiento individual. Los proyectos pueden correr a cargo de un consorcio de PYME, pero también de una sola empresa, que puede así sustraerse a la obligación de negociar un consorcio para actividades cercanas al mercado en un entorno competitivo.

A pesar de ello, la naturaleza de los programas de la UE hace difícil asignar fondos en un plazo de tiempo muy breve. Es conveniente, por lo tanto, apoyar a dichas empresas a través de los intermediarios clave en el ecosistema, que pueden estar en mejores condiciones para asignar fondos en plazos inferiores a 3 meses. La Comisión continuará haciéndolo en el ámbito de las TIC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000226/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Promoting co-working

Co-working is an alternative working practice that is gradually becoming more widespread throughout Europe and the world. It consists of a work space in which, in addition to sharing office costs, different companies, usually start-ups, share ideas, resources, contacts and projects.

This kind of synergy enables barriers to market entry to be lowered for entrepreneurs by reducing costs and creating added value through an interdisciplinary feedback between companies.

In Europe, we already have around 1 600 co-working spaces and more opportunities need to be provided through European Union financing and support. The effects of this method of collaborative working, which is so practical and flexible, are clear in terms of innovation, networking and job creation, all of which are in line with the Europe 2020 strategy.

Would it be possible for the Commission to consider the possibility of including these kinds of projects among its priorities? Does the Commission not think it would be highly beneficial to promote these practices among SMEs by means of investment incentives?

The average duration of the projects of some entrepreneurs who use these offices is three months, which makes it difficult for them to obtain financial support from European funds. Could the Commission review the funding conditions applicable to companies using this method?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(3 March 2014)

The Commission is more than ever committed to boosting competitiveness, growth and employment, including through the transformation to a dynamic digital economy in Europe. This requires the implementation of Digital Agenda including actions for entrepreneurship and for development of digital skills (e.g. the 'Startup Europe' and 'Grand coalition for digital jobs' initiatives).

The use of co-working spaces indeed benefits young firms sharing resources, ideas and experiences with other entrepreneurs. We support it through actions targeting co-working practices and as part of incubators or accelerators programmes.

Several ICT projects supporting such activities have been already launched at EU level. This will be extended through the new programme — Horizon 2020. For instance, a specific action promoting co-working spaces activities in ICT will be launched in 2014.

There is no restriction for firms using co-working spaces to participate in EU programmes. The SME instrument within Horizon 2020 offers opportunities for SMEs working on short innovation projects. It provides staged support covering the whole innovation cycle in three phases complemented by a mentoring and coaching service. Projects can be run by a consortium of SMEs, but also by a single company avoiding the obligation to negotiate a consortium for close-to-market activities in a competitive environment.

Despites this, the nature of EU programmes makes it difficult to allocate funds in a very short timeframe. It is therefore appropriate to support such firms through key intermediaries within the ecosystem who may be in a better position to allocate funds in timeframes of less than 3 months. This is something the Commission will continue to do in ICT.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000227/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(10 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Restricción del acceso a Internet en Turquía

Turquía, país candidato a adherirse a la Unión Europea, está trabajando en un proyecto de ley que permitirá a las autoridades restringir el acceso a Internet y registrar las búsquedas de los usuarios y sus actividades durante un periodo de dos años, justificándolo como una medida de seguridad y protección para las familias, los jóvenes y los niños ([1]).

¿No es incompatible esta medida ultraproteccionista con los valores y estándares de libertad de la Unión? Si el Gobierno puede vetar el acceso a cierta información, ¿no se atenta contra la libertad de los ciudadanos/usuarios? ¿No quedan vulneradas indirectamente las libertades de prensa y de expresión?

Además, si el Gobierno puede registrar y guardar el historial de cada usuario y sus interacciones, ¿no entra en conflicto esta medida con la Directiva 2009/136/CE ([2]) del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo?

Respuesta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de febrero de 2014)

La Comisión está al corriente de la ley a que se refiere su Señoría, que fue adoptada por la Gran Asamblea Nacional de Turquía el 6 de febrero.

La Comisión ya había expresado su preocupación en numerosas ocasiones por los cierres desproporcionados de sitios web en Turquía, incluso en su informe de situación de 2013 ([3]), ya que la ley vigente sobre Internet es demasiado restrictiva. En cuanto a la ley propuesta, la Comisión ya ha manifestado su preocupación a las autoridades turcas en lo que se refiere a las restricciones de la libertad de expresión.

La Comisión reconoce que el texto contiene algunos elementos positivos, como la introducción del concepto de proporcionalidad y la eliminación de la pena de prisión para los prestadores de servicios de alojamiento de datos. No obstante, la ley ha de ajustarse a las normas europeas.

La Comisión mantiene una correspondencia al respecto con las autoridades turcas y espera nuevas aclaraciones sobre la manera en que las disposiciones fijadas en las enmiendas son conformes con el acervo y las normas europeas.

([1]) http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/Default.aspx?pageID=238&nID=60738&NewsCatID=341

([2]) Directiva 2009/136/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 25 de noviembre de 2009, por la que se modifican la Directiva 2002/22/CE relativa al servicio universal y los derechos de los usuarios en relación con las redes y los servicios de comunicaciones electrónicas, la Directiva 2002/58/CE relativa al tratamiento de los datos personales y a la protección de la intimidad en el sector de las comunicaciones electrónicas y el Reglamento (CE) n° 2006/2004 sobre la cooperación en materia de protección de los consumidores: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:337:0011:0036:ES:PDF

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000227/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Restriction of Internet access in Turkey

Turkey, a candidate for membership of the European Union, is working on a draft law which will allow the authorities to restrict access to the Internet and record users' searches and their activities for a period of two years. This is being justified as a measure providing security and protection for families, young people and children ([1]).

Is this ultra-protectionist measure not incompatible with the Union's values and standards of liberty? If the government can block access to certain information, is this not an attack on the liberty of citizens/users? Does this not indirectly harm the freedom of the press and freedom of expression?

Also, if the government can record and store the history of all users and their interactions, does this measure not conflict with Directive 2009/136/EC ([2]) of the European Parliament and of the Council?

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

The Commission is aware of the law the Honourable Member refers to, which was adopted by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on 6 February.

The Commission has previously expressed its concerns on numerous occasions over disproportionate website bans in Turkey, including in its 2013 Progress Report ([3]), as the existing Law on the Internet is too restrictive. With regard to the proposed law, the Commission has already conveyed its concern to the Turkish authorities, with regard to restrictions on the freedom of expression.

The Commission recognises that the text contains certain positive elements, such as introducing the concept of proportionality and eliminating prison sentence for hosting providers. However, the law needs to be in line with European standards.

The Commission is currently in correspondence with the Turkish authorities, and is expecting further clarification as to how provisions set out in the amendments align with the *acquis* and European Standards.

([1]) http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/Default.aspx?pageID=238&nID=60738&NewsCatID=341

([2]) Directive 2009/136/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009, amending Directive 2002/22/EC on universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services, Directive 2002/58/EC concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 on cooperation between national authorities responsible for the enforcement of consumer protection laws: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:337:0011:0036:ES:PDF

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000229/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(10 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Encallamiento del petrolero marroquí «Silver» y protocolos transfronterizos de control de riesgos petrolíferos

El pasado 23 de diciembre, el buque petrolero de bandera marroquí «Silver», cargado con unas 5 000 toneladas de fuel, encallaba en las proximidades del puerto marítimo de la ciudad de Tan-Tan, a unos 200 kilómetros de la isla canaria de Lanzarote, generando un grave riesgo medioambiental ante el posible derrame de dicho cargamento petrolífero.

Las autoridades marroquíes asumieron en solitario el vaciado y control de la carga del buque, que podría haberse convertido en un gravísimo vertido que habría llegado a las costas canarias. Este caso ha expuesto la problemática sobre la absoluta necesidad de control de riesgos transfronterizos ante un eventual vertido petrolífero en un tercer Estado, cuyo impacto podría devastar el medio ambiente marino tanto en el país del incidente como en las costas de un Estado miembro de la Unión Europea.

Durante el encallamiento del «Silver», las autoridades españolas no pusieron en marcha ningún dispositivo de control o alerta, más allá de calificar la crisis de «riesgo medio», demostrando la incapacidad de actuar ante un verdadero vertido. Pese a los altos riesgos que supone el elevado tránsito en las zonas marítimas transfronterizas de la Unión, este caso señala que, al menos en lo que respecta al Gobierno de España, no parece que se haya avanzado en los mecanismos ni protocolos en materia de control del riesgo de vertidos petrolíferos.

Ante un inicio de explotaciones petrolíferas en la zona, esta carencia de protocolos de seguridad ante posibles derrames de petróleo representa un doble riesgo para las costas canarias. El coste del control del riesgo a todos los niveles, incluido el transfronterizo, debe ser internalizado en los proyectos de explotación, puesto que es el Estado el que paga las consecuencias de los desastres petrolíferos.

¿Está enterada la Comisión del caso del encallamiento del «Silver»? ¿Está enterada de qué protocolos preventivos de seguridad y control del riesgo en accidentes petrolíferos de carácter transfronterizo se han empleado durante esta crisis? ¿Qué medios y recursos se han activado durante la crisis? ¿Considera que el despliegue habría resultado suficiente en caso de que el encallamiento hubiese llevado a un vertido?

Frente a la intención del Gobierno de España —a pesar del rechazo de la sociedad canaria y del propio Gobierno autonómico— de iniciar explotaciones petrolíferas en la zona, ¿qué dispositivos conjuntos entre la UE y Marruecos en materia de control de desastres petrolíferos se están considerando en la evaluación del impacto ambiental necesaria para la autorización de las explotaciones petrolíferas en aguas de las Islas Canarias?

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

La Comisión tiene conocimiento de este incidente. La Agencia Europea de Seguridad Marítima (AESM) dispone de un servicio de detección por satélite de buques y de vertidos de hidrocarburos —CleanSeaNet—, en el marco de la Directiva 2005/35/CE relativa a la contaminación procedente de buques y la introducción de sanciones para las infracciones ([1]). El 28 de diciembre de 2013, la AESM recordó al punto de contacto español la posibilidad de solicitar imágenes adicionales de CleanSeaNet, después de detectarse una mancha de petróleo en las proximidades del buque Silver (información comunicada por agencias de noticias y la televisión española). El 29 de diciembre de 2013 se activó el plan de emergencia de la AESM a raíz de la petición recibida de las autoridades españolas y se transmitieron a dichas autoridades imágenes de CleanSeaNet.

Debido a la ubicación de la encalladura y el vertido, y a las condiciones normales de vientos y corrientes, las posibilidades de contaminación de las costas o las aguas españolas eran desde el principio prácticamente nulas. El plan de emergencia se desactivó el 8 de enero de 2014. En las imágenes posteriores de la zona no se observó ningún vertido de petróleo. Si el incidente hubiese sido más grave, se habría podido recurrir al despliegue de los recursos de recuperación de petróleo de la AESM, con el fin de complementar la capacidad de lucha contra la contaminación de España, de conformidad con lo dispuesto en el Reglamento n° 100/2013/UE por el que se crea la Agencia Europea de Seguridad Marítima ([2]).

La Comisión ha investigado el proyecto de exploración de hidrocarburos en las aguas frente a las costas de las Islas Canarias. Como pone de manifiesto esa investigación, el procedimiento de evaluación de impacto ambiental para este proyecto está aún en curso y hasta la fecha no se ha concedido ninguna autorización. No obstante, la Comisión no tiene constancia de ningún dispositivo conjunto entre la UE y Marruecos para controlar los vertidos de hidrocarburos a los que podría dar lugar un proyecto de ese tipo.

([1]) DO L 255 de 30.9.2005.
([2]) DO L 39 de 9.2.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000229/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: The running aground of the Moroccan oil tanker 'Silver' and cross-border protocols for controlling oil risks

On 23 December 2013, the oil tanker 'Silver', which was flying the Moroccan flag and carrying 5 000 tonnes of fuel, ran aground near the Port of Tan-Tan, approximately 200 kilometres from Lanzarote in the Canary Islands, with the possibility of the oil cargo leaking out constituting a serious risk to the environment.

The Moroccan authorities took sole responsibility for emptying and controlling the tanker's cargo, which could have led to an extremely serious spillage that would have reached the coastline of the Canary Islands. This incident has highlighted the vital need to control cross-border risks in the event of an oil spill involving a Third State, which could have a devastating effect on the marine environment both in the country where the incident took place and on the coastline of an EU Member State.

While the 'Silver' was run aground, the Spanish authorities failed to implement any kind of control or warning measures, other than classing it as a 'medium-risk' crisis, thus demonstrating their inability to act when faced with an actual spillage. Despite the high levels of risk associated with heavy traffic in cross-border marine areas in the European Union, this incident shows that, at least as far as the Spanish Government is concerned, no progress has apparently been made in developing better mechanisms or protocols for controlling the risk of oil spills.

Given the proposals to construct new oil platforms in the area, this lack of security protocol in relation to potential oil leaks poses a dual risk to the coastline of the Canary Islands. The cost of controlling the risk at all levels, including at cross-border level, should be factored into exploitation projects, because when disaster strikes it is the State that suffers the consequences.

Is the Commission aware of the incident of the running aground of the 'Silver'? Does it know what preventive cross-border oil accident security and risk control protocols were employed during this crisis? What means and resources were called on during the crisis? Does it believe that they would have been deployed adequately if the running aground had led to a spillage?

In light of the Spanish Government's intention — despite the protests of the inhabitants and the autonomous regional government of the Canary Islands — to set up oil platforms in the area, what joint measures between the EU and Morocco for controlling oil disasters are being considered as part of the evaluation of the environmental impact, which is a prerequisite for authorising the construction of oil platforms in Canary Island waters?

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

The Commission is aware of the incident. The European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) operates a satellite-based oil spill and vessel detection service — CleanSeaNet -under Directive 2005/35/EC on ship source pollution and penalties for pollution offences ([1]). On 28 December 2013 EMSA reminded the Spanish point of contact of the possibility to request extra CleanSeaNet images, after a minor oil slick was detected nearby the ship SILVER (reported by newswires and the Spanish TV). EMSA's Contingency Plan was then activated on 29/12/2013 following a request received from the Spanish authorities and CleanSeaNet images were delivered to the Spanish authorities.

Because of the location of the grounding and the spill and the normal wind and current there was from the outset almost no chance of polluting the Spanish coast or waters. The Contingency Plan was closed on 08 January 2014. Subsequent images covering the area did not detect any oil spill. Had this incident been more serious, EMSA's oil recovery resources would have been available to be deployed in order to 'top-up' the pollution response capacities of Spain as provided for under Regulation 100/2013/EU establishing a European Maritime Safety Agency ([2]).

The Commission has investigated the project for hydrocarbon exploration in the waters off the Canary Islands. As shown by this investigation, the environmental impact assessment procedure for this project is still ongoing and no authorisation has been granted to date. The Commission is however not aware of any joint measures between the EU and Morocco for controlling oil spills that might result from any such project.

([1]) OJ L 255 du 30.9.2005.
([2]) OJ L 39 du 9.2.2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000230/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(10 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Colaboración entre UE y Marruecos durante el encallamiento del Silver Laayoune

El pasado 23 de diciembre el buque petrolero de bandera marroquí Silver, cargado con unas 5 000 toneladas de fuel, encallaba en las proximidades del puerto marítimo de la ciudad de Tan-Tan, a unos 200 kilómetros de la isla canaria de Lanzarote, generando un grave riesgo medioambiental ante el posible derrame de aquel cargamento petrolífero.

Las autoridades marroquíes asumieron en solitario el vaciado y control de la carga del buque, que podría haberse convertido en un gravísimo vertido que habría llegado a las costas canarias. Este caso ha expuesto la problemática sobre la absoluta necesidad de control de riesgos transfronterizos ante un eventual vertido petrolífero en un tercer Estado cuyo impacto podría devastar el medio ambiente marítimo tanto en el país del incidente como en las costas de un Estado miembro de la Unión Europea.

Durante el encallamiento del Silver las autoridades españolas no desencadenaron ningún dispositivo de control o alerta, más allá de calificar la crisis como de «riesgo medio», demostrando la incapacidad de actuar ante un verdadero vertido. Pese a los altos riesgos que supone el elevado tránsito en las zonas marítimas transfronterizas de la Unión, este caso señala que, al menos por lo que respecta al Gobierno de España, parece no haberse avanzado en los mecanismos ni protocolos de control del riesgo de vertidos petrolíferos.

Ante un inicio de explotaciones petrolíferas en la zona —a pesar del rechazo del mismo por parte de la sociedad canaria y del propio Gobierno autonómico—, esta carencia de protocolos de seguridad ante posibles derrames de petróleo representa un doble riesgo para las costas canarias. El coste del control del riesgo a todos los niveles, incluido el transfronterizo, debe ser internalizado en los proyectos de explotación, puesto que es el Estado el que paga las consecuencias de los desastres petrolíferos.

¿Considera la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante que Marruecos ha colaborado con la aportación de información detallada sobre el despliegue de medios por parte de las autoridades marroquíes durante el encallamiento del Silver?

En el ámbito de las relaciones políticas con Marruecos, ¿qué acuerdos existen en materia de prevención y control de desastres petrolíferos? ¿Se están negociando dichos acuerdos ante la posible autorización de una explotación petrolífera en la zona por parte de España?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de febrero de 2014)

El petrolero Silver encalló en aguas marroquíes, por lo que su puesta a flote y descarga incumbe a las autoridades marroquíes.

La gobernanza marítima se rige principalmente por acuerdos multilaterales en el marco de la Organización Marítima Internacional (OMI).

Los Estados miembros de la UE y Marruecos son Partes en el Convenio Internacional sobre Cooperación, Preparación y Lucha contra la Contaminación por Hidrocarburos de 1990 (OPRC 90). Este es el instrumento internacional que establece una normativa destinada a facilitar la cooperación internacional y la asistencia mutua a la hora de prepararse para siniestros graves con contaminación y de hacerles frente. También obliga a los Estados a crear sistemas nacionales de respuesta a la contaminación y a mantener una capacidad y recursos adecuados para abordar situaciones de emergencia relacionadas con la contaminación por hidrocarburos.

Marruecos también es parte en el Convenio internacional para prevenir la contaminación por los buques (Marpol).

En el marco del programa SafeMed, gestionado por la Agencia Europea de Seguridad Marítima, la UE coopera con Marruecos en materia de seguridad marítima, lo que incluye la formulación de medidas dirigidas a prevenir catástrofes marítimas y a hacer frente a sus consecuencias.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000230/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Cooperation between the EU and Morocco during the grounding of the Silver Laayoune

On 23 December last year, the oil tanker Silver, sailing under the Moroccan flag and carrying some 5 000 tonnes of fuel, ran aground outside the maritime port of Tan-Tan, approximately 200 kilometres from the Canary Island of Lanzarote, creating a serious environmental risk due to the possible spillage of this fuel.

The Moroccan authorities took sole responsibility for the control and removal of the ship's cargo, which could have resulted in a serious discharge reaching the Canary Islands' coastline. This case has raised the issue of the critical need for monitoring cross-border risks when there is the possibility of an oil spillage in a third country that could have a devastating impact on the marine environment of both that country and the coastline of a Member State of the European Union.

While the Silver was aground, no monitoring or warning mechanism was triggered by the Spanish authorities apart from characterising the crisis as 'medium risk', demonstrating an incapacity to act in the face of an actual spillage. Despite the significant risks created by heavy traffic in the Union's cross-border maritime areas, this case indicates that, for the Spanish Government at least, there seems to have been no progress in either mechanisms or protocols for controlling the risk of oil spills.

With the prospect of the commencement of oil exploitation in the area — despite this having been rejected by both the Canary Islanders and the autonomous Government itself — this lack of safety protocols for possible oil spills represents a double risk for the Canary Islands' coastline. The cost of risk control at all levels, including cross-border, must be internalised within exploitation projects given that it is the State that pays the consequences for oil disasters.

Does the Vice-President/High Representative consider that Morocco cooperated by providing detailed information on the deployment of resources by the Moroccan authorities during the grounding of the Silver?

In terms of political relations with Morocco, what agreements exist for the prevention and control of oil disasters? Are these agreements being negotiated given Spain's possible authorisation of oil exploitation in the area?

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

The tanker *Silver* ran aground in Moroccan waters; as a consequence, its re-floating and unloading was under the responsibility of the Moroccan authorities.

Maritime governance is mainly regulated by multilateral agreements under the International Maritime Organisation (IMO).

The EU Member States and Morocco are party to the IMO's 'International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation 1990' (OPRC 90). This is the international instrument that provides a framework designed to facilitate international cooperation and mutual assistance in preparing for and responding to major oil pollution incidents. It requires States to develop national systems for pollution response, and to maintain adequate capacity and resources to address oil pollution emergencies.

Morocco is also a party to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL).

In the framework of the Safemed programme, managed by the European Maritime Safety Agency, the EU cooperates with Morocco on maritime safety. This includes developing measures aiming to prevent maritime catastrophes and deal with their consequences.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000236/14
to the Commission
Mairead McGuinness (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Status of chartered architectural technologists in Ireland

On 1 March 2014 national legislation, the Building Control (Amendment) Regulations 2013, will come into force in Ireland. The new legislation precludes chartered architectural technologists ([1]) from providing their current professional services within the building environment.

In anticipation of the implementation of the regulations, chartered architectural technologists are reporting a number of difficulties, such as restrictions reducing the number of members of the Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologists (CIAT) who can bid for projects due to commence after March 2014. They say that this results in a loss of potential clients as well as economic loss.

Does the Commission interpret the Building Control (Amendment) Regulations 2013 as a breach of EC law, specifically legislation relating to competition and the free market? Does the Commission feel that the new legislation prevents chartered architectural technologists from earning a living in their field of training and expertise ([2])?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2014)

The Commission is aware of the introduction of a register for architects and building surveyors by the Building Control Act of 2007. On 1 March 2014 this regulation will be amended to circumscribe the profile of professionals who can design, inspect and certify for compliance all buildings greater than 40 square meters. Such regulatory protection, for a profession with not only significant safety but also environmental and urban impacts, is common across many Members States and as such Ireland is not a minority in seeking to reassure that standards are made, met and maintained.

The Commission has received a number of complaints raising concerns that the actions of the Irish government and the impact of the Building Control (Amendment) Regulation 2013 pose a breach of EC law in areas on the recognition of professional qualifications, freedom of movement and, with specific regard to its impact on Architectural Technologists.

Commission services are currently examining the issues raised to determine any possible contraventions of EC law and if any actions may be necessary in such cases.

([1]) Chartered architectural technologists provide architectural designs, negotiate construction projects and manage the development of projects from conception to completion and are listed in the Commission's database of professional qualifications.

([2]) This parliamentary question is linked to a number of complaints submitted to the Commission (reference numbers CHAP(2013)03587, and CHAP(2014)00026).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000237/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Conseguenze su milioni di utenti dell'abbandono di uno dei più diffusi sistemi operativi informatici

Uno dei maggiori colossi informatici ha comunicato che ad aprile saranno rilasciati gli ultimi aggiornamenti di uno dei suoi sistemi operativi più diffusi (risulta installato su un terzo dei computer del mondo).

Nell'ultimo anno, esperti ed analisti hanno più volte lanciato l'allarme, richiamando l'attenzione sulle conseguenze che tale decisione potrebbe avere su centinaia di milioni di utenti. Dal giorno in cui l'azienda informatica non fornirà più alcuna patch di correzione né assistenza tecnica e i computer continueranno a connettersi in rete saranno sempre esposti ad attacchi di virus, spyware e malware che potranno come minimo provocare notevoli problemi di funzionamento al PC, se non addirittura rubare informazioni private. Inoltre, gradualmente, anche i fornitori di software, hardware e accessori smetteranno di rilasciare aggiornamenti e driver, contribuendo a creare condizioni di lavoro sempre meno sicure. Per evitare tali conseguenze, oltre alla soluzione impraticabile di isolare il più possibile i computer evitando che si colleghino in rete, occorre effettuare un aggiornamento, scegliendo un sistema operativo di ultima generazione, più performante e sicuro. Un passaggio necessario per gli utenti privati, le aziende private e pubbliche che lavorano con tale strumento informatico, in quanto, per costoro, le conseguenze potrebbero essere la sottrazione di dati sensibili di clienti e dipendenti, la distruzione di documenti riservati, nonché gravi perdite economiche.

Considerato che:

— le autorità federali degli Stati Uniti hanno già avvertito gli istituti bancari che, in caso di furto delle informazioni dei correntisti a causa del mancato aggiornamento del sistema operativo, saranno chiamati a risponderne penalmente;

— in Italia è compito del Garante della privacy tracciare delle linee guida in tempo per affrontare l'emergenza;

— per alcune imprese, poiché esistono software gestionali, siti intranet e reti hardware aziendali che ancora funzionano solo con tale sistema operativo, cambiare l'intero parco informatico implicherebbe un notevole impegno economico;

si chiede alla Commissione se:

1. è a conoscenza delle conseguenze che la decisione di quest'azienda informatica avrà su milioni di utenti;

2. ritiene che occorra informare adeguatamente i privati e le imprese affinché possano assumere le decisioni più opportune;

3. considera che si possa seguire l'esempio degli Stati Uniti, incitando gli istituti bancari a porre in essere tutte le misure necessarie per evitare eventuali furti di informazioni?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che Microsoft non fornirà più assistenza per il sistema operativo Windows XP, rilasciato nel 2001, esponendo così gli utenti del sistema a rischi per la sicurezza. Nell'Unione europea sono in vigore, o sono stati proposti, diversi strumenti legislativi per proteggere i dati personali dei titolari di conti bancari e ridurre al minimo i furti di identità qualora tale circostanza dovesse avverarsi.

Informare gli utenti è fondamentale. A questo proposito, l'articolo 21, paragrafo 4, lettera b), della direttiva servizio universale stabilisce che le autorità nazionali possono richiedere alle imprese che forniscono reti pubbliche di comunicazione elettronica ([1]) di informare gli utenti circa «*i mezzi di protezione contro i rischi per la sicurezza personale, per la vita privata e per i dati personali nella fruizione di servizi di comunicazione elettronica*» ([2]). Inoltre, l'articolo 17 della direttiva sulla tutela dei dati ([3]) impone l'obbligo, alle entità che trattano dati personali come le banche, di mettere in atto misure tecniche volte a garantire la protezione dei dati. Il mancato aggiornamento di sistemi operativi obsoleti che comporta la violazione di dati personali può esporre a sanzioni amministrative e a responsabilità civili e penali. Fatte salve le competenze della Commissione in quanto custode del trattato, le autorità nazionali sono gli organi preposti a monitorare l'applicazione delle misure nazionali in recepimento della suddetta direttiva.

([1]) Ad esempio, i fornitori di servizi internet.
([2]) Articolo 21, paragrafo 4, lettera b), della direttiva 2002/22/CE (direttiva servizio universale), quale modificata dalla direttiva 2009/136/CE.
([3]) Articolo 17 della direttiva 95/46/CE.

Inoltre, la proposta di regolamento generale sulla protezione dei dati prevede di imporre ai responsabili del trattamento dei dati, come ad esempio le banche, l'obbligo di informare le persone fisiche di eventuali violazioni dei dati, ad esempio utilizzi non autorizzati delle informazioni sui titolari dei conti che potrebbero danneggiarli ([4]). Infine, la proposta di direttiva, presentata dalla Commissione, sulla sicurezza delle reti e dell'informazione ([5]) prevede che gli operatori del mercato, compresi gli istituti di credito, adottino misure volte a gestire i rischi per la sicurezza e segnalino gli incidenti più gravi alle competenti autorità nazionali.

([4]) COM(2012) 11 def.
([5]) COM(2013) 48 def.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000237/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Impact on millions of users of the abandonment of one of the most popular computer operating systems

One of the major computer giants has announced that in April it will release its last ever updates of one of its most popular operating systems (installed on one-third of the world's computers).

Over the past year, experts and analysts have repeatedly raised the alarm, drawing attention to the consequences that this decision could have on hundreds of millions of users. When the computer company stops providing corrective patches or technical assistance while computers continue to connect to each other online, they will constantly be exposed to attacks from viruses, spyware and malware that will, at the very least, be able to cause serious operational problems to PCs and maybe even steal private information. In addition, suppliers of software, hardware and accessories will gradually stop releasing updates and drivers, helping to create working conditions that are increasingly less secure. To avoid these consequences, besides the impractical solution of isolating computers as much as possible, by preventing them from connecting to each other online, an upgrade needs to be carried out by choosing a last-generation operating system that is more efficient and secure. This will be essential for private users and private and public companies that work with this computer tool, because otherwise, sensitive customer and employee data could be stolen, confidential documents destroyed and the companies/individuals concerned could suffer serious financial losses.

Given that:

— the US federal authorities have already warned banks that, in the event of any theft of account-holder information due to their failure to update their operating systems, they will be held criminally liable;

— in Italy it is the task of the supervisory authority for data protection ('Garante della Privacy') to set out guidelines in time to deal with the emergency;

— for some businesses, since some management software, intranet sites and company hardware networks still work only with that operating system, it would be extremely costly to have to change all the company computers;

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the impact that this computer company's decision will have on millions of users?

2. Does it not agree that private individuals and businesses need to be adequately informed so that they can take the most appropriate decisions?

3. Would it not be possible to follow the example of the United States and urge banks to put in place all necessary measures to prevent any theft of information?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The Commission is aware that Microsoft will discontinue supporting its operating system XP, first released in 2001. Users of the system may be vulnerable to security risks. If this occurs, in the EU, a number of legislative instruments are in force or have been proposed to protect personal data of account holders and minimise identity theft.

Informing users is vital. In this regard, Art 21.4.b of the Universal Service Directive provides that national authorities may require operators of public electronic communication networks ([1]) to inform users about 'the means of protection against risks to personal security, privacy and personal data when using the services' ([2]). Furthermore, Art 17 of the Data Protection Directive ([3]) requires entities processing personal data, such as banks, to implement appropriate technical measures to protect the data. Failure to update obsolete operating systems resulting in personal data breaches may lead to administrative sanctions and to civil and criminal liability. Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaty, national authorities are the competent bodies to monitor the application of the national measures implementing the above Directives.

([1]) (e.g., Internet access providers).
([2]) Article 21.4 (b) of the 2002/22/EC Universal Service Directive, as amended by Directive 2009/136/EC.
([3]) Article 17 of Directive 95/46/EC.

In addition, the proposed General Data Protection Regulation foresees that data controllers such as banks will have to inform individuals about data breaches, for example unauthorised usages of account holder information that could adversely affect them ([4]). Finally, the Commission proposal for a directive on network and information security ([5]) provides that market operators, including credit institutions, shall adopt measures to manage security risks and report the most significant incidents to the national competent authorities.

([4]) COM(2012) 11 final.
([5]) COM(2013) 48 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000238/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Mancata restituzione di fondi pensione transitori in Svizzera: quale tutela in applicazione del diritto UE sulla sicurezza sociale?

È stato recentemente scoperto dalle autorità nazionali svizzere che più di cinque miliardi di euro non reclamati sono rimasti su conti di fondi pensione svizzeri. Questi circa 855 000 conti sono stati trasferiti in un fondo speciale incaricato di ritrovare i loro beneficiari, ha rivelato una tv nazionale svizzera. In totale, si tratta di 6,3 miliardi di franchi svizzeri (5,12 miliardi di euro), che sono stati «dimenticati» in un periodo di circa poco più di due anni e trasferiti al fondo «Substitute Occupational Benefit».

I conti contengono in media 7 500 franchi svizzeri, ed alcuni superano anche il milione. Secondo il direttore del fondo, sono stati dimenticati perché i loro beneficiari hanno cambiato lavoro, sono partiti in congedo maternità o hanno lasciato il paese.

In questi casi, i titolari dovrebbero trasferire il loro conto al fondo pensione del loro nuovo datore di lavoro. Circa la metà di questi conti non reclamati appartengono a lavoratori stranieri che hanno lasciato il paese.

Nel 70 % dei casi, detti beneficiari non possono essere rintracciati. Queste persone tuttavia possono reclamare la loro pensione col sostegno delle istituzioni svizzere.

Considerato che:

— vi è un'alta probabilità che i titolari di tali fondi risultino essere cittadini degli Stati membri che hanno passato un breve periodo lavorativo in Svizzera e non erano perfettamente a conoscenza dei meccanismi contributivi di quel Paese;

— i lavoratori frontalieri residenti e occupati nell'Unione europea godono, come tutti i lavoratori migranti, del principio di non discriminazione e della parità di trattamento previsti per i lavoratori che si spostano nel territorio dell'Unione;

— i principi e il regime applicabili in materia di protezione sociale ai lavoratori frontalieri sono, salvo alcuni casi specifici, gli stessi che in generale sono validi per tutti i lavoratori migranti all'interno dell'UE;

si domanda alla Commissione, in applicazione del diritto europeo sulla sicurezza sociale:

1. quali azioni di coordinamento dei sistemi nazionali intende intraprendere, al fine di assicurare che i legittimi titolari di tali fondi possano reclamare le somme loro spettanti;

2. se ritiene opportuno attivare campagne di sensibilizzazione e informazione dei cittadini per agevolare le procedure di riconoscimento dei loro diritti pensionistici transfrontalieri e di liquidazione delle somme versate e non ancora reclamate.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

1. Le regole unionali sul coordinamento dei sistemi di sicurezza sociale ([1]), che interessano i sistemi pensionistici nazionali, si applicano anche alla Svizzera e coprono pertanto il regime obbligatorio svizzero di pensione da lavoro ([2]).

Per quanto concerne le pensioni ([3]), la posizione assicurativa di un assicurato è mantenuta fino a quando costui raggiunga l'età del pensionamento. In altri termini, i contributi versati non sono trasferiti in un altro paese ([4]) o pagati all'interessato se questi non è più assicurato in tale paese. Tutti i paesi in cui la persona è stata assicurata per almeno un anno devono versare a detta persona una pensione quando raggiunge l'età stabilita.

Anche se una persona ha lavorato in più di un paese (diciamo, in tre paesi), essa deve chiedere la pensione in un unico paese il quale chiederà agli altri di fornire informazioni su tutti i contributi pensionistici pagati da tale persona. Le verrà quindi versata una pensione composta di tre pensioni separate, indipendentemente dal luogo in cui la persona risiede.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 883/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, relativo al coordinamento dei sistemi di sicurezza sociale (GU L 166 del 30.4.2004) e regolamento (CE) n. 987/2009 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 settembre 2009, che stabilisce le modalità di applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 883/2004 relativo al coordinamento dei sistemi di sicurezza sociale (GU L 284 del 30.10.2009).
([2]) Cfr. la legge federale svizzera sul Fondo pensioni professionali per vecchiaia, superstiti e invalidità.
([3]) Capitolo 5 del regolamento (CE) n. 883/2004.
([4]) Nel caso di persone che hanno vissuto e lavorato in uno o più Stati membri o in Islanda, Liechtenstein, Norvegia o Svizzera.

Il sistema di scambio elettronico di informazioni della sicurezza sociale ([5]) attualmente in via di costituzione agevolerà lo scambio di tali informazioni.

Esistono pertanto misure adeguate per il coordinamento dei sistemi di sicurezza sociale nazionali, anche tra l'UE e la Svizzera.

2. Tutte le informazioni necessarie sulla normativa in campo pensionistico sono disponibili sul portale della Direzione generale «Occupazione, affari sociali e inclusione» ([6]) della Commissione. Un opuscolo intitolato «I vostri diritti a pensione se avete vissuto o lavorato in più di un paese dell'UE» fa un quadro dei diritti a pensione ed è disponibile in tutte le lingue ufficiali dell'UE ([7]).

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=869
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=860
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7693&langId=it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000238/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Failure to return transitory pension funds in Switzerland — what safeguards under EU social security law?

It has recently been discovered by the Swiss authorities that an unclaimed amount of more than five billion euro is lying dormant in Swiss pension fund accounts. These 855 000 accounts (approximately) have been transferred to a special fund which has been given the task of finding their beneficiaries, according to a Swiss national TV channel. In total, the sum amounts to 6.3 billion Swiss francs (EUR 5.12 billion) that have been 'forgotten' in just over two years and have now been transferred to the 'Substitute Occupational Benefit' fund.

The accounts contain an average of CHF 7 500, with some even exceeding CHF 1 million. According to the director of the fund, they have been forgotten because their beneficiaries have changed jobs, gone on maternity leave or left the country.

In these cases, the account holders are supposed to transfer their accounts to the pension fund of their new employer. About half of these unclaimed accounts belong to foreign workers who have left the country.

In 70% of cases, these beneficiaries cannot be traced. These people can, however, claim their pensions with the support of the Swiss institutions.

Given that:

— it is highly likely that the holders of these funds are EU citizens who have spent a short time working in Switzerland and were not fully aware of how the contribution system worked in that country;

— cross-border workers who are resident and employed in the European Union benefit, like all migrant workers, from the principle of non-discrimination and equal treatment for workers moving within EU territory;

— the principles and scheme applicable with regard to social protection for cross-border workers are, with certain limited exceptions, the same as those which, in general, apply to all migrant workers within the EU;

can the Commission, therefore, answer the following questions in relation to the application of EU social security law:

1. What measures to coordinate national systems does it intend to take in order to ensure that the rightful owners of these funds are able to reclaim the sums due to them?

2. Does it not agree that it might be advisable to launch awareness-raising and public information campaigns to facilitate the procedures for the recognition of cross-border pension rights and payment of the amounts not yet reclaimed?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

1. The EU rules on the coordination of social security systems ([1]), which cover national pension schemes, apply to Switzerland and therefore cover the Swiss compulsory occupational pension scheme ([2]).

As regards pensions ([3]), the insurance record of an insured person is kept until he or she reaches retirement age. In other words, contributions paid are not transferred to another country ([4]) or paid to the person concerned if he or she is no longer insured in that country. All countries in which the person has been insured for at least a year will have to pay that person a retirement pension when he or she reaches retirement age.

Even if a person has worked in more than one country (say, three), he or she should apply for a pension in one country only, which will request the others to provide information on all pension contributions paid by that person. A pension consisting of three separate old-age pensions will then be paid, regardless of where the person resides.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 166, 30.4.2004) and Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 284, 30.10.2009).
([2]) See the Swiss Federal Act on Occupational Old Age, Survivors and Invalidity Pension Fund.
([3]) Chapter 5 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004.
([4]) In the case of persons who lived and worked in one or more Member States or in Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway or Switzerland.

The Electronic Exchange of Social Security Information system ([5]) currently being established will facilitate the exchange of such information.

Suitable measures therefore exist for the coordination of national social security systems, including between the EU and Switzerland.

2. All the necessary information on pension rules is available on the portal of the Commission's Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion ([6]). A leaflet entitled 'Your pension rights if you have lived or worked in more than one EU country' gives an overview of pension rights and is available in all official EU languages ([7]).

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=869
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=860
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7693&langId=en

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000239/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuove disposizioni per l'implementazione di misure di sicurezza riguardo alla scarsa preparazione tecnologica dei piloti commerciali per le operazioni di volo

Un recente studio commissionato dalla Federal Aviation Administration statunitense ha decretato come la tecnologia e il ricorso ai sistemi di guida automatica stanno erodendo le competenze dei comandanti di volo. Si ritiene che siano poco reattivi e disabituati a impugnare la cloche e che non padroneggino le ultime novità dell'elettronica di bordo.

Lo studio descrive come la tecnologia abbia reso i piloti degli aerei poco reattivi: i capitani sembrano essere ormai dipendenti dagli stessi sistemi automatici di cui i nuovi velivoli sono ampiamente dotati e dei quali tuttavia faticano a padroneggiare i più recenti aggiornamenti, relegando i comandi manuali praticamente ai soli decollo e atterraggio. Questa rilevazione ha evidenziato che i piloti stanno gradualmente dimenticando come si conduce un aereo senza l'aiuto della tecnologia. Per esempio, spesso si affidano troppo ai sistemi automatici e possono essere riluttanti a intervenire o a disattivarli in circostanze rischiose o eccezionali, o non hanno conoscenze sufficienti e approfondite per tenere sotto controllo la traiettoria degli apparecchi. Fra i motivi principali di queste mancanze si trovano i metodi di addestramento e il poco tempo a essi dedicato.

Fra gli incidenti esaminati, in quasi due terzi dei casi i piloti hanno avuto problemi sia nel controllo manuale del velivolo sia nell'uso dei computer di bordo (come nel caso della tragedia dell'Airbus A330 Air France precipitato nell'oceano Atlantico il 9 giugno 2009) e l'eccessivo affidamento sui computer è stato da anni individuato dalla stessa industria aeronautica come un problema potenziale di portata molto ampia.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Intende acquisire i risultati di tale studio e intende promuoverne uno di rilevanza europea simile a quello citato?

2. Ritiene sia il caso di indicare di concerto con l'EASA nuovi standard minimi per implementare le misure di sicurezza per l'addestramento vigenti e l'aggiornamento dei piloti di linea commerciali?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(26 febbraio 2014)

1. Lo studio della US Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), al quale fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato, è ben noto sia alla Commissione che all'AESA. In effetti, negli ultimi anni l'AESA ha partecipato attivamente a diversi gruppi di lavoro internazionali che hanno prodotto risultati rilevanti per la FAA sulle questioni su cui si è concentrato lo studio in questione. L'AESA ha pubblicato diversi bollettini informativi sulla sicurezza («Safety Information Bulletins» (SIB)) sullo stesso argomento al fine di rendere consapevoli le parti interessate dell'UE dei problemi in gioco. Per il momento, la Commissione ritiene che quanto viene fatto attualmente in questo settore sia sufficiente sotto il profilo della sicurezza del trasporto aereo in Europa e che il tipo di studio a cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato non sia necessario.

2. In collaborazione con gli Stati membri e gli esperti del settore, l'AESA sta preparando nuove norme relative all'addestramento iniziale e di aggiornamento dei piloti che tengano conto delle conoscenze più recenti in questo settore. I progetti concreti per modificare le norme attuali saranno elaborati secondo le procedure abituali. La pubblicazione di questi progetti è prevista nel biennio 2014-2015, mentre l'adozione e l'entrata in vigore degli emendamenti potranno aver luogo entro la fine del 2015.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000239/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: New rules for the implementation of security measures with regard to poor technological training of commercial pilots for flight operations

A recent study commissioned by the US Federal Aviation Administration determined that technology and the use of automatic steering systems are undermining the skills of flight commanders. It was concluded that they are not very reactive and unused to holding the joystick. They have also failed to master the latest on-board electronics.

The study describes how technology has made aircraft pilots unresponsive: captains seem to have become dependent upon the automatic systems with which new aircraft are extensively equipped, but nonetheless struggle to master the latest updates of those systems, resorting to manual controls essentially only for take-off and landing. This survey showed that the pilots are gradually forgetting how to fly a plane without the aid of technology. For example, they are often over-reliant on automated systems and may be reluctant to intervene or over-ride them in hazardous or exceptional situations, or do not have sufficient in-depth knowledge to control the trajectory of the aircraft. Among the main reasons for these shortcomings are training methods and the short amount of time spent on training.

Among the incidents examined, in nearly two-thirds of cases, pilots had problems with both the manual control of the aircraft and the use of on-board computers (as in the case of the tragedy of the Air France Airbus A330, which crashed into the Atlantic Ocean on 9 June 2009) and for years the aviation industry itself has identified over-reliance on computers as a potential problem with very wide-ranging impact.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does it intend to examine the results of this study and does it intend to promote one of European relevance similar to the one discussed?

2. Does it believe it is appropriate to lay down new minimum standards in conjunction with EASA to implement current safety measures for training and retraining of commercial airline pilots?

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

1. The study by the US Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), to which the Honourable Member refers, is well known to both the Commission and EASA. In fact, over the past years EASA has actively participated in several international working groups that have provided results relevant to the FAA on the issues highlighted by the study. EASA has issued several 'Safety Information Bulletins' (SIB) on the same subject to make EU stakeholders aware of the issues at stake. For the moment, the Commission believes that the ongoing activities in this area are sufficient from the perspective of aviation safety in Europe and that there is no need for the kind of study referred to by the Honourable Member.

2. Together with Member States and industry experts, EASA is preparing new standards for intial and recurrent pilot training that will take into account the latest knowledge in this area. The concrete drafts for amending the current standards will be elaborated according to the normal procedures. The publication of these drafts is foreseen in the 2014-2015 framework, and the adoption and entry into force of the amendments may take place by late 2015.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000240/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Omocisteina alta e grassi nel sangue aumentano del 40 % il rischio di ictus: campagne di prevenzione e raccomandazioni

È universalmente riconosciuto come pressione alta, troppi grassi nel sangue e fumo di sigaretta predispongano all'ictus. Ma c'è un altro fattore di rischio ben noto agli specialisti: è l'omocisteina, un aminoacido derivato da un suo simile che si assume con i cibi: la metionina. Una sua eccessiva presenza nel sangue (iperomocisteinemia) può, di per sé, favorire la comparsa di attacchi cerebrali.

Un gruppo di ricercatori cinesi del Pla General Hospital di Pechino ha pubblicato recentemente uno studio il cui risultato, pubblicato dalla rivista Neural Regeneration Research, ha confermato l'ipotesi dell'effetto sinergico dei fattori di rischio. In altre parole: chi ha elevati livelli di omocisteina e di lipidi (colesterolo e trigliceridi) nel sangue, a parità di altri fattori di rischio, ha un quaranta per cento in più di probabilità di andare incontro a ictus rispetto a chi ha questi valori normali. La compresenza di iperomocisteinemia (troppa omocisteina nel sangue) e iperlipidemia (troppi grassi) ha dunque un effetto sinergico negativo. Lo studio ha anche rilevato però che i livelli di omocisteina nel sangue possono essere facilmente controllati con farmaci poco costosi e facilmente accessibili: l'acido folico e la vitamina B12.

Può la Commissione far sapere se intende acquisire e valutare i risultati di tale studio e raccomandare di attivare campagne di sensibilizzazione dell'opinione pubblica per la prevenzione dell'ictus in base alle evidenze disponibili sulla omocisteina?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(27 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei fattori di rischio quali la pressione sanguigna elevata, l'eccesso di grasso nel sangue e il fumo, che possono determinare un rischio di ictus. La Commissione è anche a conoscenza delle pubblicazioni in cui si discute la correlazione tra i livelli elevati di omocisteina nel sangue e l'aumento dei casi di ictus. I risultati del recente studio cinese menzionato sono in linea con tali constatazioni.

Livelli elevati di omocisteina nel sangue sono un indicatore di stili di vita non sani. La Commissione affronta il problema della malattie cardiovascolari, tra cui l'ictus, intervenendo sui fattori di rischio noti, come i problemi sanitari legati all'alimentazione, al sovrappeso e all'obesità, in cui rientrano anche la mancanza di attività fisica ([1]), ([2]), l'abuso di alcol ([3]), e di tabacco ([4]). La Commissione ha posto in atto ampie strategie per affrontare questi fattori di rischio. La Commissione non intende avviare campagne o azioni addizionali per sensibilizzare il pubblico sulla prevenzione dell'ictus imperniate sui rischi legati ad elevate concentrazioni di omocisteina nel sangue.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/policy/strategy_en.htm
([2]) Libro bianco: una strategia europea sugli aspetti sanitari connessi all'alimentazione, al sovrappeso e all'obesità, COM(2007) 279.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/alcohol/policy/index_it.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/tobacco/introduction/index_it.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000240/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: High homocysteine and fats in the blood increase the risk of stroke by 40%: prevention campaigns and recommendations

It is universally acknowledged that high blood pressure, too much fat in the blood and smoking are predisposing factors for stroke. Specialists are nevertheless well aware of another risk factor: homocysteine, an amino acid derived from a precursor taken with food: methionine. Its excessive presence in the blood (hyperhomocysteinemia) can single-handedly lead to the onset of cerebral attacks.

The results of a study recently published by a group of Chinese researchers from the PLA General Hospital in Beijing in the journal Neural Regeneration Research, confirmed the hypothesis that risk factors act synergistically. In other words: those who have high levels of homocysteine and lipids (cholesterol and triglycerides) in the blood, with the same additional risk factors, are forty percent more likely to have a stroke than those with normal levels of these substances. The combined presence of hyperhomocysteinemia (too much homocysteine in the blood) and hyperlipidemia (too much fat) thus has a negative synergistic effect. The study also found, however, that levels of homocysteine in the blood can easily be controlled with inexpensive and readily accessible drugs: folic acid and vitamin B12.

Can the Commission say whether it intends to acquire and evaluate the results of this study and recommend the implementation of campaigns to raise public awareness about stroke prevention based on the available evidence on homocysteine?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2014)

The Commission is aware of risk factors such as high blood pressure, too much fat in the blood and smoking, which ultimately can lead to stroke. The Commission is also aware of publications in which a correlation between elevated homocysteine blood levels and an increase in stroke rates is discussed. The results of the recent Chinese study referred to is in line with such findings.

Elevated homocysteine blood levels are an indicator for unhealthy lifestyles. Therefore, the Commission is addressing cardiovascular diseases, including stroke, by taking action on known risk factors such as nutrition, overweight and obesity-related health issues including lack of physical activity ([1]), ([2]), alcohol ([3]), and tobacco ([4]). The Commission has put in place comprehensive strategies to address these risk factors. The Commission does not intend to launch additional action or campaigns to raise public awareness about stroke prevention based on elevated homocysteine concentrations in the blood.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/policy/strategy_en.htm
([2]) White paper on a strategy for Europe on nutrition, overweight and obesity related health issues COM(2007)279.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/alcohol/policy/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/tobacco/introduction/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000241/14
alla Commissione
Franco Bonanini (NI)
(10 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Gestione dei danni arrecati dalla fauna selvatica, con particolare riferimento al cinghiale

La problematica dei danni arrecati all'agricoltura dalla fauna selvatica ha acquisito negli anni una dimensione notevole in termini di impatto negativo sulle attività economiche delle imprese nel comparto agricolo e zootecnico e sulla conservazione della biodiversità.

Si rilevi che le strategie impostate a livello nazionale si sono rilevate inefficaci e/o comunque non sufficientemente adeguate.

Occorre necessariamente ricondurre tale problematica nell'ambito di una strategia comune per la conservazione della biodiversità (interesse comunitario di cui agli artt. 2, 11, 14, 16 della direttiva 92/43/CEE, ribadito recentemente dal programma generale di azione dell'Unione in materia di ambiente fino al 2020) in grado di superare l'ambito degli strumenti nazionali e locali di programmazione in quanto gli impatti negativi subiti da un ecosistema si riversano inevitabilmente su quelli vicini.

Si tenga presente che, all'interno della fauna selvatica, l'impatto negativo della sovradiffusione del cinghiale (Sus Scrofa) rende questa specie la più pericolosa per gli equilibri ecosistemici e per le attività agricole e zootecniche, rendendo necessario un approccio tecnico scientifico specifico e la definizione di un accurato piano considerati gli impatti sul sistema agricolo e sulle biocenosi locali.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Quali provvedimenti intende adottare con urgenza al fine di provvedere all'accertamento dei danni riscontrati e quali aiuti possono essere disposti per essere di supporto alle istituzioni locali?

2. Intende promuovere uno strumento diretto a favore delle imprese agricole vista l'evidente sproporzione tra danni subiti e strumenti finanziari messi a disposizione dall'UE a loro protezione, tutela ed eventuale indennizzo?

3. Intende proporre uno strumento ad hoc per la prevenzione dei danni causati dal cinghiale?

4. Intende prevedere che la problematica dei danni all'agricoltura arrecati dalla fauna selvatica diventi una priorità nell'agenda politica UE?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(26 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-9973/2012 di Gaston Franco e Véronique Mathieu ([1]).

Il cinghiale non è una specie di interesse europeo protetta dalla direttiva Habitat e la sua gestione, di norma, non è legata ad obiettivi di tutela ambientale. Spetta pertanto agli Stati membri garantire che le popolazioni siano gestite in modo da evitare o ridurre al minimo gli impatti negativi sui terreni agricoli. L'orientamento delle politiche di sviluppo rurale, alla base della normativa vigente e di quella futura in materia, prevede soltanto un sostegno ad azioni di prevenzione volte a ridurre il rischio di danni causati dagli animali selvatici e contempla inoltre la possibilità di un sostegno agli investimenti destinati a proteggere dai danni causati dagli animali selvatici (ad esempio recinzioni). Tuttavia, le misure relative allo sviluppo rurale non comprendono indennizzi per danni già esistenti causati da animali selvatici (protetti o non protetti).

In numerose decisioni in materia di aiuti di Stato la Commissione ha autorizzato misure nazionali ([2]) intese a indennizzare i danni provocati dagli animali selvatici protetti, come previsto dal trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea («TFUE»).

Nel quadro dei nuovi orientamenti per gli aiuti di Stato nel settore agricolo e forestale e nelle zone rurali per il periodo 2014-2020, attualmente in fase di elaborazione, la Commissione sta valutando la possibilità di includere disposizioni specifiche in materia di aiuti di Stato per i danni causati dagli animali protetti dalla legislazione nazionale o unionale. In alternativa, gli Stati membri possono concedere agli agricoltori aiuti per i danni causati da animali selvatici, protetti o non protetti, fino a 15 000 EUR nell'arco di un triennio, in virtù del regolamento agricolo «de minimis» (UE) n. 1408/2013 di recente adozione ([3]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) N. 723/2009 — Indennizzi per danni causati dai carnivori(Sassonia); SA.34622 Compensazione finanziaria dai «Fondi di indennizzo per i grandi predatori» per danni causati da lupi, linci e orsi (Baviera); SA.33040 Compensazione per danni causati da lupi (Brandeburgo). Le decisioni sono disponibili al seguente indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/register/
([3]) GU L 352 del 24.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000241/14
to the Commission
Franco Bonanini (NI)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Managing damage caused by wildlife, with particular reference to wild boar

Over the years, the scale of damage caused to farming by wildlife has increased significantly in terms of negative impact on the economic activities of businesses in the farming and livestock sector and on the conservation of biodiversity.

It is noted that strategies adopted at national level have proved ineffective and/or in any event insufficiently effective.

This issue must necessarily be tackled within the framework of a common strategy for biodiversity conservation (Community interest pursuant to Articles 2, 11, 14 and 16 of Directive 92/43/EEC, recently reiterated in the EU's general environment action programme to 2020), capable of going beyond the scope of national and local planning instruments inasmuch as the negative impact suffered by one ecosystem will inevitably have repercussions on the neighbouring ecosystems.

It must be borne in mind, when speaking of wildlife, that the negative impact of the overpopulation of wild boar (*Sus Scrofa*) makes that species the most hazardous for ecosystem balance and farming and livestock activities, thus requiring a specific technical and scientific approach and the establishment of a careful plan that takes account of the impacts on the farming system and local biocenoses.

In the light of the foregoing, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What urgent measures does it intend to adopt in order to ascertain the extent of the damage and what assistance can be arranged to support local institutions?

2. Does it intend to promote a direct instrument to help farming businesses in view of the clear disproportion between the damage suffered and the financial instruments made available by the EU for their protection, defence and possible compensation?

3. Does it intend to propose an ad hoc instrument to prevent damage caused by wild boar?

4. Does it intend to make the issue of damage to farming caused by wildlife a priority on the EU's policy agenda?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-9973/2012 ([1]) by Gaston Franco and Véronique Mathieu.

The wild boar is not a species of European interest protected by the Habitats Directive and its management is normally not linked with environmental objectives. It is therefore a competence for the Member States to ensure that wild boar populations are managed so as to avoid or minimise negative impacts on agricultural land. The current as well as the future legislation guidance for the Rural Development Policy only provides support for preventive actions aimed at mitigating the risk of damages done by wild animals and it is possible to support investments intended to protect against damage from wild animals (e.g. fences). However, the Rural Development measures do not include payments to compensate damages already done by wild animals (protected or not).

In several State Aid decisions, the Commission has authorised national measures aiming at compensating for damages caused by protected wild animals, as provided for under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ('TFEU') ([2]).

In the new Guidelines for State Aid in the agricultural and forestry sector and in rural areas 2014-2020, which are being currently drafted, the Commission considers to include specific provisions on State Aid for damages caused by animals protected by EU or national legislation. Alternatively, Member States may grant to farmers aid in relation to damages caused by protected or non-protected wild animals up to EUR 15 000 over a three-year-period under the recently adopted agricultural *de minimis* Regulation No 1408/2013 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) N 723/2009-'Compensation for damages caused by carnivores' (Saxony); SA.34622 Financial compensation by the 'Compensation funds large predators' for damages caused by wolfs, lynxes and bears (Bavaria); SA.33040 Compensation for damages caused by wolves (Brandenburg). Decisions are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/register/
([3]) OJ L 352, 24.12.2013.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-000242/14
Komisijai
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(2014 m. sausio 10 d.)

Tema: ES paramos lėšų panaudojimas pavojingų atliekų deginimo gamyklai

Lietuvoje šiuo metu įrenginėjama vienintelė valstybėje UAB „Toksika“ Šiaulių filialui priklausanti pavojingų atliekų deginimo gamykla, bendrai finansuojama ir ES paramos lėšomis (objektui skirta apie 15 milijonų eurų). Ši gamykla – vienintelis objektas Lietuvoje, galintis šalinti pavojingas atliekas, todėl tokio objekto veikimas yra būtinas, norint pašalinti Lietuvoje susidarančias pavojingas atliekas. Minėta gamykla turėjo pradėti veikti dar 2010 metais, tačiau neveikia iki šiol. Yra kilę abejonių dėl to, ar šio objekto poveikio aplinkai vertinimas atitinka nacionalinius teisės aktus. Be to, yra pradėtas ikiteisminis tyrimas dėl pažeidimų projektuojant, statant ir paleidžiant gamyklą.

1. Ar Komisija yra susipažinusi su pavojingų atliekų deginimo gamyklos Lietuvoje problematika ir ar neplanuoja pradėti tyrimo dėl ES lėšų panaudojimo teisėtumo?

2. Ar, Komisijos nuomone, galėtų veikti pavojingų atliekų deginimo gamykla (jei ji yra vienintelis tokio tipo objektas valstybėje ir yra būtinas, valstybei siekiant pavojingų atliekų tvarkymo tikslų), net jei būtų pripažinta, kad jai įrengti skirtos ES paramos lėšos panaudotos pažeidžiant nacionalinius teisės aktus?

Komisijos nario J. Hahno atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2014 m. kovo 4 d.)

Vadovaujančioji institucija pateikė Komisijai stebėsenos ataskaitas, tad Komisija yra susipažinusi su sunkumais, patirtais statant pavojingų atliekų deginimo gamyklą. Tačiau Komisija iki šiol negavo viso programos baigimui reikalingų dokumentų rinkinio. Kai tik Komisija gaus šį dokumentų rinkinį, ji įvertins, ar projektas buvo atliktas atsižvelgiant į jo tikslus. Jei projekto įgyvendinimas nepateisins jam skirtos paramos ar jos dalies arba bus neatitikimų, susijusių su parama, ir valstybė narė nesiėmė būtinų taisomųjų veiksmų, Komisija darys būtinas finansines pataisas.

Komisija yra atsakinga už tai, kad būtų laikomasi ES teisės aktų, o nacionalinių institucijų atsakomybė – užtikrinti, kad būtų laikomasi nacionalinės teisės aktų. Klausime pateikta informacija neįrodo, kad ES teisės aktai buvo pažeisti. Bet kuriuo atveju, turi būti laikomasi visų atitinkamų ES teisės aktų reikalavimų, susijusių su šia gamykla.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000242/14
to the Commission
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Use of EU support funds for a hazardous waste incineration plant

Lithuania's only hazardous waste incineration plant, which is owned by UAB Toksika's subsidiary in Šiauliai, is currently being constructed; the project is being co-financed from EU support funds (about EUR 15 m is to be allocated to it). The plant is the only site in Lithuania capable of disposing of hazardous waste and its operation is therefore the essential for the disposal of the hazardous waste generated in the country. It should have started up in 2010, but it is still not operational. There is some uncertainty as to whether the assessment of the site's environmental impact is in line with national legislation. Moreover, a pre-trial investigation has begun into flaws in the design, construction and commissioning of the plant .

1. Is the Commission aware of the issues concerning the hazardous waste incineration plant in Lithuania and are there any plans to initiate an investigation into the legality of the use of EU funds?

2. In the Commission's opinion, would it be possible for the hazardous waste incineration plant to operate if it were confirmed that the EU support funds used for its construction were involved in breaches of national legislation, taking into account that the plant is the only one of its kind in Lithuania and essential in order to achieve management aims regarding hazardous waste?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The Commission was made aware of difficulties in the building of the hazardous waste incineration plant by monitoring reports presented by the managing authority. However, the Commission has not yet received the full set of documents required for the financial closure of the project. As soon as these are received, the Commission will proceed to assess whether the project has been carried out according to its objectives. If the implementation of a project does not justify either part or the whole of the assistance granted to it, or there is an irregularity with regard to assistance, and the Member State has not taken the necessary corrective measures, the Commission shall make the financial corrections required.

The competence of the Commission is limited to compliance with EU legislation, while it is for the national authorities to ensure compliance with national law. The information provided in the question is insufficient to indicate any breach of EC law. In any case, all relevant requirements of EU legislation have to be met in relation to this plant.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000243/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(10 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Derecho de acceso a documentos

El franquismo creó, durante la guerra civil, un organismo para realizar una requisa de documentos de entidades, organismos y personas republicanas con objeto de recopilar un gran fichero de «antecedentes políticos» como soporte a la represión política que llevó a cabo, siguiendo las experiencias de la policía fascista y del régimen nazi. Esta requisa supuso, en Cataluña, la confiscación de más de 100 toneladas de documentos. Con esta documentación se elaboraron más de tres millones de fichas policiales en la sede del organismo en Salamanca. Al ser restablecido el Gobierno de Cataluña en 1977, las personas y entidades de los documentos requisados por el franquismo empezaron a reclamar su devolución. A partir del año 2000, la entidad cívica «Comissió de la Dignitat» ([1]) empezó una gran campaña ciudadana para reivindicar la restitución de los archivos catalanes, consiguiéndose el 17 de noviembre de 2005 ([2]) la aprobación de una ley que reconocía este derecho. Una parte de los documentos ya se han transferido, aunque después de más de ocho años aún no se ha completado la restitución de la mayor parte de los documentos que ya están totalmente digitalizados a cargo del Gobierno catalán. El Gobierno español incumple la ley aprobada en 2005 y la ley de la memoria histórica 52/2007 ([3]) y el deber de restitución a favor de las víctimas de la dictadura fascista, dentro de las políticas de justicia transicional derivadas del Pacto Internacional de Derechos Civiles y Políticos que consta en los apartados 87, 2) y 8). La Comisión de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas, con sede en Ginebra, también lo ha denunciado, como consta en el informe del 94° periodo de sesiones ([4]).

¿Piensa la Comisión emitir una directiva sobre el derecho de acceso a los documentos basada en los estándares que la UE se aplica a sí misma?

Respuesta del Sr. Barroso en nombre de la Comisión
(19 de febrero de 2014)

La Unión Europea no tiene competencia general para regular el acceso a los documentos en los Estados miembros. El artículo 15, apartado 3, párrafo segundo, del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea establece una base jurídica específica para determinar los principios generales y los límites que regulan el derecho de acceso a los documentos de las instituciones, organismos, oficinas y agencias de la Unión.

([1]) http://www.comissiodeladignitat.cat
([2]) https://www.google.es/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CDEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.boe.es%2Fdiario_boe%2Ftxt.php%3Fid%3DBOE-A-2005-18934&ei=7d7PUs6VK4uY1AXQ0oDgAw&usg=AFQjCNGKwOlQQiMNBVSZbvaZlMnU6pjnBA&bvm=bv.59026428,d.d2k
([3]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2007/12/27/pdfs/A53410-53416.pdf
([4]) https://www.google.es/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CDEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fccprcentre.org%2Fdoc%2FICCPR%2FAR%2FA_64_40(Vol%2520I)_Esp.pdf&ei=Md7PUqDuCNGU0QW2loDgCg&usg=AFQjCNG6kcZmcrgXwJ4HU_H6EntPpPsq3Q&bvm=bv.59026428,d.d2k

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000243/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Right of access to documents

Under Franco, an organisation was created during the civil war to requisition documents from Republican bodies, organisations and individuals with the aim of compiling a large index of 'political history' as a means of supporting the political repression that it exercised, emulating the experience of the fascist police and the Nazi regime. In Catalonia, this requisitioning involved the confiscation of over 100 tonnes of documents, from which more than three million police files were created at the organisation's headquarters in Salamanca. When the Government of Catalonia was re-established in 1977, the individuals and bodies whose documents had been requisitioned under Franco started to demand their return. From the year 2000, the civil body Comissió de la Dignitat ([1]) [Dignity Commission] launched a major civic campaign to demand the return of the Catalan archives, resulting in the approval on 17 November 2005 ([2]) of a law recognising this right. Some of these documents have since been transferred, but even after more than eight years, the majority — which have now been fully digitised — have still not been returned to the Catalan Government. The Spanish Government has not complied with the law approved in 2005, with Law 52/2007 on historical memory ([3]) or with the duty of restoration to the victims of the fascist dictatorship under the transitional justice policies arising from the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as specified in sections 87.2 and 87.8. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights, based in Geneva, has also issued a denunciation, as shown in the report of the 94th session ([4]).

Does the Commission intend to issue a directive on the right of access to documents based on the standards that the EU applies to itself?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2014)

The European Union has no general competence to regulate access to documents in the Member States. Article 15(3), second subparagraph, of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union provides a specific legal basis to lay down the general principles and limits governing the right of access to documents of the Union's institutions, bodies, offices and agencies.

([1]) http://www.comissiodeladignitat.cat

([2]) https://www.google.es/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CDEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.boe.es%2Fdiario_boe%2Ftxt.php%3Fid%3DBOE-A-2005-18934&ei=7d7PUs6VK4uY1AXQ0oDgAw&usg=AFQjCNGKwOlQQiMNBVSZbvaZlMnU6pjnBA&bvm=bv.59026428,d.d2k

([3]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2007/12/27/pdfs/A53410-53416.pdf

([4]) https://www.google.es/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CDEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fccprcentre.org%2Fdoc%2FICCPR%2FAR%2FA_64_40(Vol%2520I)_Esp.pdf&ei=Md7PUqDuCNGU0QW2loDgCg&usg=AFQjCNG6kcZmcrgXwJ4HU_H6EntPpPsq3Q&bvm=bv.59026428,d.d2k

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000245/14
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος / Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(10 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Μεγάλος κίνδυνος για τη δημόσια υγεία και την οικονομία χωρών της ΕΕ από την καταστροφή και απόρριψη των χημικών όπλων της Συρίας στη Μεσόγειο

Σύμφωνα με ανακοίνωση του ΟΗΕ, απέπλευσε την Τρίτη από το συριακό λιμάνι της Λατάκειας, δανέζικο πλοίο που μεταφέρει το πρώτο φορτίο χημικών όπλων που εγκαταλείπει τη Συρία. Η απομάκρυνση των επικίνδυνων χημικών όπλων αποτελεί το πρώτο βήμα προς την εκπλήρωση της συμφωνίας για την εξάλειψη του χημικού οπλοστασίου στη Συρία. Η ίδια ανακοίνωση επισημαίνει ότι η καταστροφή των χημικών όπλων θα γίνει με τη μέθοδο της υδρόλυσης.

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα του διεθνούς τύπου, τα όπλα θα μεταφερθούν στην Ιταλία, όπου θα τα παραλάβει πλοίο του αμερικανικού Ναυτικού και θα τα μεταφέρει σε διεθνή χωρικά ύδατα στη Μεσόγειο μεταξύ Ελλάδας, Ιταλίας και Λιβύης για να καταστραφούν σε ειδική δεξαμενή από τιτάνιο που θα βρίσκεται στο πλοίο.

Ο κίνδυνος περιβαλλοντικής καταστροφής είναι ορατός δεδομένου ότι η συγκεκριμένη μέθοδος θεωρείται από επιστήμονες εξαιρετικά επικίνδυνη, καθώς μείγματα τοξικών ουσιών δεν είναι σε θέση να αδρανοποιηθούν μόνο με τη χρήση αυτής της μεθόδου και μάλιστα σε τέτοιο βαθμό, ώστε να καταστεί δυνατό να απορριφθούν στη θάλασσα χωρίς καταστρέψουν ζώντες οργανισμούς.

Η συγκεκριμένη περιοχή προστατεύεται από τη Σύμβαση της Βαρκελώνης για την προστασία της Μεσογείου, κείμενο νομικά δεσμευτικό για την ΕΕ και τις χώρες της Μεσογείου που την έχουν υπογράψει.

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος:

— Είναι ενήμερη σχετικά με την καταστροφή των χημικών όπλων της Συρίας σε θαλάσσια περιοχή μεταξύ Ελλάδας, Ιταλίας και Λιβύης που καλύπτεται από τη Σύμβαση της Βαρκελώνης;

— Μετά την τελευταία τροποποίηση της Σύμβασης, πρέπει να εφαρμόζεται στο χώρο εφαρμογής της Σύμβασης η αρχή «ο ρυπαίνων πληρώνει». Ωστόσο, η καταστροφή των χημικών όπλων στη συγκεκριμένη περιοχή παραβιάζει την αρχή αυτή. Τι συγκεκριμένα μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει για να αποτρέψει την επιχειρούμενη καταστροφή των χημικών όπλων και την απόρριψή τους στη θάλασσα που συνιστά παραβίαση της αρχής αυτής;

— Με βάση την ανακοίνωση του ΟΗΕ η καταστροφή θα γίνει με τη μέθοδο της υδρόλυσης. Είναι ενημερωμένη για το γεγονός ότι η μέθοδος αυτή θεωρείται ανεπαρκής για την αδρανοποίηση τοξικών ουσιών και πώς προτίθεται να αντιδράσει για την προστασία των χωρών μελών της ΕΕ από μία πιθανή καταστροφή που θα θέσει σε σημαντικό κίνδυνο τη δημόσια υγεία και θα οδηγήσει σε σοβαρή περιβαλλοντική υποβάθμιση και σε τεράστια ζημία στον τουρισμό και την αλιεία των περιοχών της ΕΕ;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000679/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(23 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Καταστροφή χημικού οπλοστασίου της Συρίας

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατα δημοσιεύματα τα χημικά όπλα της Συρίας θα καταστραφούν με τη μέθοδο της υδρόλυσης στη θαλάσσια περιοχή μεταξύ Μάλτας – Λιβύης – Κρήτης.

Δεδομένου ότι η καταστροφή του χημικού οπλοστασίου της Συρίας απειλεί την δημόσια υγεία, το περιβάλλον και την οικονομία της χωρών της ΕΕ (κυρίως της Ελλάδας και της Μάλτας) κι ολόκληρης της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου,

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Αληθεύουν αυτές οι πληροφορίες; Μπορεί να μας δώσει περαιτέρω πληροφορίες ως προς το θέμα αυτό;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000681/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(23 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Καταστροφή χημικών όπλων — Απειλή για την Μεσόγειο

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατα δημοσιεύματα, τα χημικά όπλα της Συρίας θα καταστραφούν με τη μέθοδο της υδρόλυσης στη θαλάσσια περιοχή μεταξύ Μάλτας – Λιβύης – Κρήτης.

Δεδομένου ότι, σύμφωνα με επιστήμονες, κάτι τέτοιο θα έχει σαν αποτέλεσμα την πλήρη νέκρωση του θαλάσσιου περιβάλλοντος και την μόλυνση σε ολόκληρο το Λιβυκό και Κρητικό πέλαγος.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Σε ποιες ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί για να προστατεύσει την Μεσόγειο, που αποτελεί μια κλειστή θαλάσσια λεκάνη, από αυτήν την οικολογική και οικονομική καταστροφή που απειλεί την περιοχή της Κρήτης και τις παράλιες μεσογειακές περιοχές;

Κοινή απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Μαρτίου 2014)

Η καταστροφή του χημικού οπλοστασίου της Συρίας συμφωνήθηκε και εποπτεύεται από το Εκτελεστικό Συμβούλιο του Οργανισμού για την απαγόρευση των χημικών όπλων (ΟΑΧΟ) και από το Συμβούλιο Ασφαλείας των Ηνωμένων Εθνών, τα οποία έχουν λάβει όλα τα κατάλληλα μέτρα για να εξασφαλίσουν την ασφαλή και περιβαλλοντικά ορθή καταστροφή όλων των κατηγοριών συριακών χημικών ουσιών. Το σχέδιο αυτό βρίσκεται σε μια σειρά δημοσίων εγγράφων του ΟΑΧΟ που περιέχουν σχετικές αποφάσεις του Εκτελεστικού Συμβουλίου του ΟΑΧΟ. Στον σχεδιασμό της ενέργειας αυτής συμμετείχαν ενεργά τόσο το πρόγραμμα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για το Περιβάλλον (UNEP) όσο και η Παγκόσμια Οργάνωση Υγείας (ΠΟΥ). Η μέθοδος υδρόλυσης για την προτεραιότητα 1 «πρόδρομες χημικές ουσίες» έχει επιλεγεί με βάση την μακρά επιτυχή εμπειρία στο πλαίσιο της καταστροφής χημικών όπλων σε άλλα κράτη που κατείχαν χημικά όπλα. Η ακριβής θέση εν πλω που προτείνεται από την κυβέρνηση των ΗΠΑ στα διεθνή χωρικά ύδατα δεν έχει ακόμη αποφασιστεί. Δεν υπάρχει πρόθεση απόρριψης χημικών ουσιών ή των λυμάτων τους μετά από υδρόλυση στη θάλασσα. Αντίθετα, οι ουσίες αυτές θα αποθηκευθούν στο αμερικανικό σκάφος και θα μεταφερθούν, μαζί με τις υπόλοιπες συριακές βιομηχανικές χημικές ουσίες σε επιλεγμένες εμπορικές υποδομές για τελική καταστροφή με αποτέφρωση. Η κοινή αποστολή οργάνωσε πρόσφατα συνεδρίαση με τις σημαντικότερες διεθνείς και εθνικές περιβαλλοντικές ΜΚΟ, για να εξηγήσει ότι η καταστροφή θα πραγματοποιηθεί σύμφωνα με τις διεθνείς και εθνικές νομοθετικές διατάξεις. Τέλος, πρέπει να υπογραμμιστεί ότι η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη της έχουν συνεισφέρει σε μεγάλο βαθμό τόσο χρηματοδοτικά όσο και σε είδος για την ενέργεια αυτή, προκειμένου να εξαλειφθεί μια κατηγορία θανατηφόρων όπλων μαζικής καταστροφής και να μην επαναληφθεί η χρήση τους κατά του συριακού λαού.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000245/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Serious threat to public health and the economies of EU Member States from the destruction and disposal of Syrian chemical weapons in the Mediterranean

According to a UN statement, a Danish ship carrying the first consignment of chemical weapons from Syria sailed from the Syrian port of Latakia on Tuesday. The removal of dangerous chemical weapons is the first step of the agreement on the destruction of Syria's chemical arsenal. The statement also notes that the chemical weapons are to be destroyed by hydrolysis.

According to articles in the international press, the weapons will be taken to Italy, where they will be loaded on to a US Navy ship and shipped to international waters in the Mediterranean between Greece, Italy and Libya for destruction in a special titanium tank on board the ship.

There is a clear risk of environmental damage; scientists consider this particular method to be extremely dangerous, since it cannot alone be used to deactivate mixtures of toxic substances, certainly not to the extent that they will disperse in the sea without destroying living organisms.

This particular area is protected by the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean, which is legally binding on the EU and the Mediterranean countries which have signed it.

In view of the above, will the High Representative say:

— Is she aware that Syrian chemical weapons are to be destroyed in the sea area between Greece, Italy and Libya, which is covered by the Barcelona Convention?

— Following the most recent amendment to the Convention, the 'polluter pays' principle applies to the area covered by the Convention. However, the destruction of chemical weapons in this particular area infringes that principle. What specific measures does she plan to take in order to prevent the attempted destruction and dispersal in the sea of chemical weapons, in breach of that principle?

— According to the UN statement, the weapons are to be destroyed by hydrolysis. Is she aware that this method is considered unsuitable for deactivating toxic substances? What action does she intend to take in order to protect the EU Member States from a potentially disastrous operation that will pose a significant risk to public health and cause serious damage to the environment and to tourism and fisheries in a number of areas of the EU?

Question for written answer E-000679/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Destruction of Syria's chemical arsenal

According to recent press reports, Syria's chemical weapons are to be destroyed by hydrolysis in the sea between Malta, Libya and Crete.

In view of the fact that the destruction of Syria's chemical arsenal poses a threat to public health, the environment and the economies of EU Member States (especially Greece and Malta) and of the entire Eastern Mediterranean.

Will the Commission say:

Are these reports true? Can it provide us with any further information on the matter?

Question for written answer E-000681/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Destruction of chemical weapons — The threat to the Mediterranean

According to recent press reports, Syria's chemical weapons are to be destroyed by hydrolysis in the sea between Malta, Libya and Crete.

In view of the fact that, according to scientists, this will result in complete necrosis of the marine environment and widespread contamination of the Libyan and Cretan Seas,

Will the Commission say:

What action does it intend to take to protect the Mediterranean, which is a closed marine basin, from this ecological and economic disaster, which poses a threat to the area off Crete and to Mediterranean coastal areas?

Joint answer given by High-Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

The destruction of the Syrian chemical weapons arsenal has been agreed and is supervised by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) Executive Council and the UN Security Council, who have taken all relevant measures in securing a safe and environmentally sound destruction of all the categories of the Syrian chemical weapons. This plan is contained in a series of public OPCW documents containing relevant decisions by the OPCW Executive Council. In the planning of the operation both United Nations Environment Programme and World Health Organisation (WHO) were actively involved. The method of hydrolysis for the Priority 1 chemical precursors has been chosen on the basis of long successful experience of application in the context of destroying the CW of the US and other possessor states. The exact location on board a ship provided by the US Government in the international waters has not been decided yet. There is no intention to discharge any chemicals or their effluent after hydrolysis into the sea. Instead, the effluents will be stored on the US vessel and transferred, together with the rest of the Syrian industrial chemicals to selected commercial facilities for final destruction by incineration. The Joint Mission has recently organised a meeting with leading international and national environmental NGOs, to explain that the destruction will take place in accordance with international and national legislation provisions. Finally, it should be underlined that the EU and its Member States have been heavily contributing financially and in kind to this operation, aiming at eliminating a category of lethal weapons of mass destruction and preventing a repetition of their use against the Syrian people.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-000246/14
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(10. tammikuuta 2014)

Aihe: Velallisten suojaaminen ja kaupallisissa toimissa tapahtuvien maksuviivästysten torjumisesta annetun direktiivin 2011/7/EY tarkistaminen

Kaupallisissa toimissa tapahtuvien maksuviivästysten torjumisesta 29 päivänä kesäkuuta 2000 annettu Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiivi 2011/7/EY koskee sisämarkkinoiden ytimeen kuuluvaa asiaa. Maksuviivästykset vaikuttavat sekä yksityiseen sektoriin että julkiseen sektoriin ja myös EU:n kansalaisten jokapäiväiseen elämään. Talouskriisin ja pikaluottojen yleistymisen vuoksi mutta myös siitä syystä, että nuorilla henkilöiltä puuttuu selkeä käsitys laista ja oikeudesta, oikeussuojasta sekä aggressiivisista perintäkäytännöistä, yhä useammille (enimmäkseen nuorille) henkilöille kertyy suuri velkataakka. Näin ollen on olennaisen tärkeää, että mainittua direktiiviä tarkistetaan, jotta voidaan varmistaa, että se vastaa kaupallisen liiketoiminnan nykytilannetta.

Mainitun direktiivin johdanto-osan 21 kohdan mukaan ”direktiivillä ei saisi rajoittaa jäsenvaltioiden oikeutta säätää perintäkulujen korvaamisesta kiinteillä summilla, jotka ovat korkeampia ja siten velkojalle edullisempia”. Edellä mainittu ja samaa asiaa koskeva johdanto-osan 28 kohta on velallisen kannalta hyvin epäedullinen, koska velalliset ovat monessa tapauksessa heikommassa asemassa kuin velkojat;

Kansalaiset, joita edustan, ovat erityisen huolestuneita tietynkaltaisesta kehityksestä. Ensiksikin monet velkojina toimivat yritykset ovat sisällyttäneet perintäyritykset omaan rakenteeseensa, mikä vähentää läpinäkyvyyttä velallisen kannalta. Toiseksi on perintäyrityksiä syytetään siitä, että ne lähettävät laskun vasta eräpäivän jälkeen, mikä johtaa korkokulujen ja viivästymismaksujen kertymiseen, sekä siitä, että ne lähettävät laskuja velallisen entiseen osoitteeseen, mikä on erityinen ongelma rajat ylittävissä tapauksissa. Lopuksi on todettava, että pikaluottoyritykset ovat harhaanjohtaneet asiakkaitaan myöntämällä vain yli 2 000 euron luottoja, vaikka asiakas haluaisi vain paljon pienemmän luoton. Edellä mainitun tuloksena asiakkaat joutuvat maksamaan suurempia korkokuluja yli 2 000 euron luotoista.

1. Onko komissio arvioinut säännöllisesti direktiivin täytäntöönpanoa ja soveltuvuutta ennen direktiivin 11 artiklassa määrättyä määräpäivää, mikä on 16. maaliskuuta 2016?

2. Onko komissio harkinnut direktiivin tarkistamista velallisia suosivampaan suuntaan? Jos on, millä tavoin?

3. Noudattavatko jäsenvaltiot mainittua direktiiviä? Mitkä ovat suurimmat puutteellisuudet jäsenvaltioissa?

4. Katsooko komissio, että direktiiviin olisi sisällytettävä uusia määräyksiä, jotka koskevat perintätoimistoja sekä pikaluottoalan oikeuksia ja velvollisuuksia?

Antonio Tajanin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(25. helmikuuta 2014)

1. Komissio seuraa tarkasti, että direktiivi 2011/7/EU saatetaan asianmukaisesti osaksi kansallista lainsäädäntöä ja pannaan täytäntöön kaikissa 28 jäsenvaltiossa. Komissio on ottanut yhteyttä jäsenvaltioihin, jos on näyttänyt siltä, että niiden toimenpiteet direktiivin saattamiseksi osaksi kansallista lainsäädäntöä eivät ole olleet täysin direktiivin mukaisia. Maksuviivästyksiä koskevan tiedotuskampanjan yhteydessä järjestettävissä tapahtumissa komissio niin ikään kiinnittää huomiota direktiivin täytäntöönpanoon liittyviin ongelmiin.

2. Direktiiviä sovelletaan yritysten tai viranomaisten ja yritysten välisiin kaupallisiin toimiin, jotka johtavat tavaroiden toimittamiseen tai palvelujen suorittamiseen korvausta vastaan. Näin ollen direktiivin soveltamisalaan eivät kuulu kuluttajien kanssa suoritettavat toimet tai tietyt rahoituspalvelut ([1]).

Tällä hetkellä direktiivin tarkistaminen ei ole suunnitelmissa. Jos komission tietoon kuitenkin saatetaan, että velallisen kannalta suotuisempia säännöksiä tarvitaan, se voi harkita asiaa koskevien ehdotusten antamista esittäessään 16. maaliskuuta 2016 mennessä Euroopan parlamentille kertomuksen direktiivin täytäntöönpanosta ([2]).

3. Tähän mennessä komissio on arvioinut direktiivin täytäntöönpanoa viidessä jäsenvaltiossa, eikä se löytänyt huomautettavaa. Jäljellä olevien jäsenvaltioiden lainsäädäntöä arvioidaan parhaillaan. Eräillä jäsenvaltioilla näyttää olevan ongelmia viranomaisten kanssa tehtävien sopimusten maksuaikojen soveltamisessa.

([1]) Direktiivin 1 artikla ja 2 artiklan 1 kohta ja direktiivin johdanto-osan 8 kappale.
([2]) Direktiivin 11 artikla.

4. Tällä hetkellä komission tiedossa ei ole, että perintätoimistoja ([3]) tai pikaluottoalaa koskevat uudet säännöt olisivat tarpeen. Mutta kuten edellä 2 kohdassa todetaan, komissio voi antaa tällaisia ehdotuksia, jos se tulevassa kertomuksessaan katsoo sen aiheelliseksi ([4]).

([3]) Direktiivin 6 artiklan 3 kohta.
([4]) Direktiivin 11 artikla.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000246/14
to the Commission
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Protection for debtors and the revision of Directive 2011/7/EU on combating late payment in commercial transactions

Directive 2011/7/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 on combating late payment in commercial transactions addresses an issue that is at the very core of our internal market. The issue of deferred payments affects both the private and the public sector, as well as the lives of EU citizens on a daily basis. On account of the financial crisis and the increased use of 'payday loans', but also because of a lack of legal clarity and protection and aggressive collection practices, more and more (mostly young) people are ending up with large-scale debt. It is essential, therefore, that the directive be revised so as to ensure that it reflects the current situation in the field of commercial transactions.

The aforementioned directive, according to Recital 21 thereof, is 'without prejudice to the right of Member States to provide for fixed sums for compensation of recovery costs which are higher and therefore more favourable to the creditor'. This, in combination with Recital 28, appears to be highly disadvantageous for debtors, who are often in a more vulnerable position than creditors.

The citizens whom I represent have also been particularly worried about certain developments. Firstly, many corporations that act as debtors have incorporated debt collection agencies into their structures, thereby reducing transparency for the debtor. Secondly, debt collection agencies have allegedly sent invoices after their expiry date, leading to the accumulation of interest and late payment fees, or have sent invoices to debtors' old addresses — a particular problem in cross-border cases. Lastly, 'payday loan' companies have misled customers by signing contracts only for loans above EUR 2 000, even though customers actually wanted much smaller loans. As a result, customers have ended up having to pay the interest on amounts higher than EUR 2 000.

1. Has the Commission been conducting regular reviews regarding the implementation and feasibility of the directive, in advance of the 16 March 2016 deadline laid down in its Article 11?

2. Has the Commission considered revising the directive to make it more debtor-friendly,, and if so, how?

3. Are the Member States acting in compliance with the directive? What are their biggest shortcomings?

4. Is there, in the Commission's opinion, a need for new provisions on debt collection agencies as well as on the payday lending industry's rights and responsibilities?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2014)

1. The Commission is strictly monitoring the correct transposition and implementation of Directive 2011/7/EU in all 28 Member States. Contacts are taken with the Member States whose transposition measures pose questions as to their full compliance with the directive. Also during the Late Payment Campaign events, the Commission takes note of any concerns as to the implementation of the directive.

2. The directive applies to commercial transactions between undertakings or between public authorities and undertakings which lead to the delivery of goods or the provision of services for remuneration. Hence, the directive's scope does not encompass transactions with consumers or the provision of certain financial services ([1]).

There are currently no plans to revise the directive. However, if the Commission is informed about the need for more debtor-friendly provisions, it may consider them when submitting its report on the implementation of the directive to the European Parliament due by 16 March 2016 ([2]).

3. So far the Commission has positively completed the assessment of the implementation of the directive in five Member States and it is currently reviewing the legislation in the remaining ones. Some Member States seem to have problems with the application of the payment deadlines in contracts with public authorities.

([1]) Articles 1 and 2 (1) and Recital 8 of the directive.
([2]) Article 11 of the directive.

4. At the moment, the Commission has no knowledge of any need to include further rules on debt collection agencies ([3]) and the payday lending industry. However, as mentioned under point 2, such proposals may be intitiated if considered appropriate by the Commission in its forthcoming report ([4]).

([3]) Article 6.3 of the directive.
([4]) Article 11 of the directive.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000247/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(10 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Βουλγαρία και Ρουμανία

Από την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2014, οι πολίτες της Βουλγαρίας και της Ρουμανίας είναι ελεύθεροι να εργάζονται σε οποιοδήποτε άλλο κράτος μέλος, χωρίς να χρειάζονται άδεια. Σύμφωνα με τον κ. László Andor, Επίτροπο Απασχόλησης, Κοινωνικών Υποθέσεων και Ένταξης, «η διευκόλυνση της εν λόγω ελεύθερης κυκλοφορίας μπορεί να διαδραματίσει ρόλο στην αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας και να συμβάλει στη γεφύρωση των ανισοτήτων μεταξύ των διαφόρων χωρών της ΕΕ». Ωστόσο, δεν πρέπει να ξεχνάμε ότι ορισμένοι Βούλγαροι και Ρουμάνοι θα τύχουν διαφορετικής αντιμετώπισης. Είναι ευρέως γνωστό ότι πολλοί Ρομά είναι πολίτες αυτών των δύο βαλκανικών κρατών και ότι θα προσπαθήσουν επίσης να κινηθούν προς τα πιο εύπορα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ.

Πώς σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να αντιμετωπίσει τις αναμενόμενες αντιδράσεις της Γερμανίας και της Γαλλίας όσον αφορά την ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των Βουλγάρων και Ρουμάνων και, ειδικότερα, των Ρομά που προέρχονται από αυτές τις χώρες;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Όπως τονίζει ο κύριος βουλευτής, από την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2014 οι βούλγαροι και ρουμάνοι πολίτες μπορούν να ασκούν πλήρως το δικαίωμά τους να εργάζονται σε όλες τις χώρες της ΕΕ χωρίς άδεια εργασίας. Η ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των εργαζομένων είναι θεμελιώδης αρχή της ΕΕ, την οποία εγγυάται η Συνθήκη, και η Επιτροπή είναι αποφασισμένη να προστατεύσει το δικαίωμα αυτό. Πρόκειται για θεμελιώδη ελευθερία που απολαύουν όλοι οι πολίτες της ΕΕ, ανεξάρτητα από την υπηκοότητα ή την εθνική καταγωγή.

Στις 25 Νοεμβρίου, η Επιτροπή παρουσίασε ανακοίνωση σχετικά με την ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των πολιτών και των οικογενειών τους, που επεξηγούσε τους κανόνες της ΕΕ για την ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία και περιέγραφε 5 συγκεκριμένες δράσεις με στόχο να βοηθήσει τα κράτη μέλη ώστε να εφαρμόσουν αποτελεσματικά τους κανόνες της ΕΕ σχετικά με την ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία.

Στην εν λόγω ανακοίνωση, η Επιτροπή υπενθύμισε ότι τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, όπως το ΕΚΤ, υποστηρίζουν τις ευκαιρίες απασχόλησης και την κοινωνική συνοχή στις χώρες υποδοχής και στις χώρες καταγωγής, όπως η Ρουμανία και η Βουλγαρία.

Επιπλέον, από το 2011, η ΕΕ διαθέτει ειδικό πλαίσιο πολιτικής για την υποστήριξη της ένταξης των Ρομά ([1]), με στόχο την ενίσχυση και την παρακολούθηση των εθνικών πολιτικών των κρατών μελών για την εξασφάλιση της πρόσβασης των Ρομά ιδίως στην απασχόληση, την εκπαίδευση, την υγεία και τη στέγαση, καθώς και την κινητοποίηση κονδυλίων της ΕΕ για στρατηγικές ένταξης των Ρομά επιτόπου.

Επιπλέον, τον Δεκέμβριο του 2013, το Συμβούλιο εξέδωσε σύσταση για μέτρα αποτελεσματικής ένταξης των Ρομά στα κράτη μέλη ([2]), η οποία ενισχύει το πλαίσιο της ΕΕ με ένα μη δεσμευτικό νομικό μέσο — το πρώτο που εκδόθηκε από το Συμβούλιο στον τομέα αυτόν — με στόχο να επιταχυνθεί η πρόοδος με την παροχή καθοδήγησης προς τα κράτη μέλη προκειμένου να λάβουν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα για την αποτελεσματικότερη εφαρμογή των στρατηγικών τους. Στο πλαίσιο του Ευρωπαϊκού Εξαμήνου, πέντε κράτη μέλη έλαβαν ορισμένες ειδικές ανά χώρα συστάσεις ([3]) σχετικά με την ένταξη των Ρομά.

([1]) Ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής «Πλαίσιο της ΕΕ για εθνικές στρατηγικές ένταξης των Ρομά μέχρι το 2020», COM(2011)173 τελικό.
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/139979.pdf
([3]) Το 2013 το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο ενέκρινε ειδικές ανά χώρα συστάσεις σχετικά με την ένταξη των Ρομά για τη Βουλγαρία, την Τσεχική Δημοκρατία, την Ουγγαρία, τη Σλοβακία και τη Ρουμανία. Οι εν λόγω συστάσεις αφορούν την εφαρμογή των εθνικών στρατηγικών ένταξης των Ρομά στο πλαίσιο των οριζόντιων πολιτικών καθώς και την ανάπτυξη ειδικών πολιτικών στους τομείς της εκπαίδευσης και της απασχόλησης για τους Ρομά.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000247/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Bulgaria and Romania

Since 1 January 2014, the citizens of Bulgaria and Romania have been free to work in any other Member State without requiring a permit. As the Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, László Andor, has said, 'facilitating such free movement can play a role in tackling unemployment and helping to bridge the disparities between different EU countries'. However, we must not forget that some Bulgarians and Romanians will be treated differently. It is common knowledge that many Roma people are citizens of these two Balkan states and that they will also try to move to the wealthier EU Member States.

How does the Commission intend to tackle the expected reactions of Germany and France towards the free movement of Bulgarians and Romanians and, more specifically, the Roma people coming from these countries?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2014)

As the Honourable Member notes, since January 1st 2014 Bulgarian and Romanian citizens can fully exercise their right to work in all EU countries without a work permit. The freedom of movement of workers is a fundamental principle of the EU, guaranteed by the Treaty, and the Commission is determined to protect this right. This fundamental freedom enjoyed by all EU citizens, regardless of nationality or ethnicity.

On 25 November, the Commission presented a communication on free movement of citizens and their families which explained the EU rules on free movement and outlined 5 concrete actions to help Member States effectively apply EU free movement rules.

In this communication, the Commission recalled that Structural funds like the ESF support employment opportunities and social cohesion in the receiving countries and the countries of origin, like Romania and Bulgaria.

Furthermore, since 2011, the EU has a specific policy framework for supporting the integration of Roma ([1]), which aims to enhance and monitor Member States' national policies for ensuring Roma's access in particular to employment, education, health and housing, as well as to mobilise EU funds for Roma integration strategies on the ground.

In addition to this, the Council adopted in December 2013 a recommendation on effective Roma integration measures in the Member States ([2]) which reinforces the EU Framework with a non-binding legal instrument — the first adopted by the Council in this domain — aiming to speed up progress by providing guidance to the Member States to carry out concrete measures for implementing their strategies more effectively. In the framework of the European Semester, five Member States received some country-specific recommendations ([3]) on Roma integration.

([1]) Commission Communication 'An EU Framework for national Roma integration strategies up to 2020', COM(2011) 173 final.
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/139979.pdf
([3]) In 2013 the European Council endorsed country specific recommendations relevant for Roma inclusion for Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Romania. These recommendations address the implementation of National Roma Integration Strategies in the framework of the horizontal policies as well as specific policy developments in the field of education and employment for Roma.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000249/14
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(10 januari 2014)

Betreft: Toegevoegde suikers in voeding

Ons voedsel bulkt van de toegevoegde suikers. Het is zo alomtegenwoordig dat consumenten zonder er zich van bewust te zijn veel te veel suikers binnenkrijgen. Een gemiddelde consument neemt zo per dag 12 eetlepels suiker op, terwijl de norm van de Wereldgezondheidsorganisatie momenteel op 10 ligt. Bovendien zal deze norm in de nabije toekomst teruggebracht worden tot 5. De Wereldgezondheidsorganisatie stelt bovendien dat het verband tussen suikeropname en ziekten als diabetes, obesitas en hart- en vaatziekten zeer duidelijk bewezen is.

Het is inmiddels gebleken dat oproepen aan de voedselindustrie om vrijwillig en via zelfregulering de hoeveelheid toegevoegde suikers in hun producten te verminderen, niet het gewenste resultaat hebben opgeleverd. Het is dan ook tijd om andere instrumenten in te zetten om het suikergehalte in onze voeding terug te dringen.

Is de Commissie zich bewust van deze problematiek?

Plant de Commissie initiatieven hieromtrent?

Plant de Commissie de onlangs gelanceerde campagne „Action on sugar", die tot doel heeft de hoeveelheid suiker in onze voeding met 30 % te verminderen, te steunen en mee te promoten?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(20 februari 2014)

De Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid treedt op als risicobeoordelaar en geeft onafhankelijk wetenschappelijk advies. Advies over suikeropname en de gevaren daarvan werd verstrekt in het wetenschappelijk advies over de voedingsreferentiewaarden voor koolhydraten en voedingsvezels ([1]).

De Commissie is van mening dat Verordening (EU) nr. 1169/2011 betreffende de verstrekking van voedselinformatie aan de consumenten ([2]), uit hoofde waarvan de vermelding van de voedingswaarde — suikergehalte inbegrepen — op de meeste verwerkte levensmiddelen verplicht is gesteld, de consument in staat stelt doordachte voedingskeuzes te maken en hierbij rekening te houden met de voedingsaanbevelingen die zij ontvangen.

De lidstaten zijn hoofdverantwoordelijk voor de voorlichting op het gebied van voeding en gezondheid. In dit verband hebben de lidstaten zich in het kader van de groep op hoog niveau voor voeding en lichaamsbeweging (GHN) samen met de Commissie over de reductie van de inname van in overdaad geconsumeerde nutriënten gebogen. In 2011 bereikte de GHN overeenstemming over een EU-kader voor nationale initiatieven betreffende bepaalde nutriënten, waaronder verzadigde vetten en toegevoegde suikers, waarbij verzadigde vetten de hoogste prioriteit voor actie door de lidstaten kregen. Op Europees niveau buigt men zich momenteel eerst over dit laatste nutriënt; in de toekomst kunnen ook de andere voedingselementen worden aangepakt. De HLG is nog niet begonnen met de uitwerking van specifieke acties betreffende suiker of concrete reductienormen zoals de reductiedoelstelling van 30 % die in de campagne „Action on Sugar" wordt vooropgesteld.

In het kader van het EU-actieplatform op het gebied van voeding, lichaamsbeweging en gezondheid moedigt de Commissie acties van belanghebbenden aan ([3]). De gegevensbank van het platform ([4]) bevat vier afgeronde en veertien lopende acties met betrekking tot de herformulering van levensmiddelen en suiker.

([1]) EFSA Journal 2010; 8(3):1462.
([2]) PB L 304 van 22.11.2011, blz. 18.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_nl.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/nutrition/platform/database/dsp_search.cfm?CFID=40314&CFTOKEN=43974211&jsessionid=08a8e79d74d660047f6f6ba313c6d6d7f2e3TR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000249/14
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(10 January 2014)

Subject: Added sugars in food

Our food is bursting with added sugars. They are so ubiquitous that, without realising it, consumers eat far too much sugar. The average consumer consumes 12 dessert-spoons of it per day, whereas the World Health Organisation's norm is currently 10. Moreover, this norm is to be reduced to 5 in the near future. In addition, the WHO states that the link between sugar consumption and such diseases and conditions as diabetes, obesity and cardiovascular diseases is very clearly proven.

It has become clear by now that calling on the food industry to reduce the quantity of sugar in its products voluntarily and by means of self-regulation has not produced the desired result. It is therefore time to resort to different instruments in order to reduce the sugar content of our food.

Is the Commission aware of this problem?

Is the Commission planning any initiatives in this regard?

Is the Commission planning to support and help to promote the campaign 'Action on Sugar', which was recently launched with the aim of reducing the quantity of sugar in our food by 30%?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2014)

The European Food Safety Authority acts as a risk assessor and provides independent scientific advice. Advice on sugar consumption and related risks was provided in the Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for carbohydrates and dietary fibre ([1]).

The Commission believes that regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([2]) introducing the mandatory nutrition declaration, including the sugar content, on the majority of processed foods will enable consumers to make informed dietary choices whilst taking into account the dietary advice they receive.

Member States have the key role in providing education on diet and health. In this respect, the Commission has worked with Member States in the High Level Group on Diet and Physical Activity (HLG) on the reduction of the intake of nutrients consumed in excess. In 2011, the HLG agreed on an EU Framework for National Initiatives on Selected Nutrients, referring to saturated fat, added sugars and other nutritional elements as saturated fat received the highest priority for action from Member States. At European level work has started first on this nutrient while the other nutritional elements may be addressed in the future. The HLG has so far neither started to work on specific actions on sugar nor on concrete benchmarks for reductions, such as the 30% reduction target by the campaign 'Action on Sugar'.

In the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([3]), the Commission encourages stakeholders' actions. The Platform's database ([4]) has 4 completed and 14 active commitments on food reformulation and sugar.

([1]) EFSA Journal 2010; 8(3):1462.
([2]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/nutrition/platform/database/dsp_search.cfm?CFID=40314&CFTOKEN=43974211&jsessionid=08a8e79d74d660047f6f6ba313c6d6d7f2e3TR

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000250/14
alla Commissione
Susy De Martini (ECR)
(13 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Omessi controlli disastro Costa Concordia

Avuto riguardo al tempo trascorso dalla data dell'incidente della Costa Concordia, che risale al gennaio 2012, si chiede se la Commissione europea abbia avviato le doverose procedure per verificare il rispetto — da parte delle autorità italiane, della compagnia di navigazione e degli organi di certificazione — sia delle norme di prevenzione, segnatamente quelle di cui alla direttiva 2009/45 del 6 giugno 2009 e alla SOLAS del 1974, in materia di tutela dell'equipaggio e dei passeggeri nonché dell'ambiente, sia delle misure urgenti, una volta avvenuto il sinistro, per evitare conseguenze così drammatiche a pochi metri dalla costa.

Il fatto che la nave fosse in stretto contatto prima, durante e dopo l'accadimento con la compagnia armatrice e con le autorità italiane (che in passato oltretutto hanno tollerato pratiche marittime rischiose come quella del cosiddetto «inchino»), e che fra la stessa compagnia armatrice e le autorità italiane vi sia stato un costante collegamento che avrebbe ben consentito ed imposto un efficace intervento, costituiscono elementi da valutare nella prospettiva del rispetto del diritto dell'Unione europea e segnatamente dell'attuazione dei diritti dell'equipaggio e dei passeggeri.

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(14 febbraio 2014)

In base alla direttiva 2009/18/EC ([1]), gli Stati membri provvedono ad effettuare un'inchiesta di sicurezza «quando un sinistro marittimo molto grave, a) si verifica con il coinvolgimento di una nave battente la bandiera nazionale, indipendentemente dal luogo del sinistro; b) si verifica nel suo mare territoriale e nelle sue acque interne…». Di conseguenza, spetta alle autorità italiane condurre inchieste di sicurezza sull'incidente della Costa Concordia.

A maggio 2013, la commissione centrale di indagine sui sinistri marittimi (CCISM) ha fornito alla Commissione e all'Organizzazione marittima internazionale (IMO) la relazione sulle inchieste di sicurezza relative al sinistro di cui trattasi. A giugno 2013, le raccomandazioni in materia di sicurezza erano state oggetto di discussione nel corso della 92ª sessione del comitato per la sicurezza marittima dell'IMO.

La Commissione ha avviato un procedimento d'infrazione (infrazione n. 2013/2122) nei riguardi dell'Italia per applicazione non corretta delle disposizioni in materia di inchieste sugli incidenti a norma della direttiva 2009/18/CE. Inoltre, la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alle risposte fornite dalla Commissione alle interrogazioni parlamentari relative all'incidente della Costa Concordia, E-466/2012, E-508/2012, E-572/2012, E-586/2012, E-615/2012 e P-1135/2012 ([2]).

([1]) Direttiva 2009/18/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 23 aprile 2009, che stabilisce i principi fondamentali in materia di inchieste sugli incidenti nel settore del trasporto marittimo e che modifica la direttiva 1999/35/CE del Consiglio e la direttiva 2002/59/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, GU L 131 del 28.5.2009.

([2]) Disponibili all'indirizzo http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000250/14
to the Commission
Susy De Martini (ECR)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Costa Concordia disaster — lack of checks

Given the time that has elapsed since the Costa Concordia accident in January 2012, can the Commission state whether it has launched the requisite procedures to check whether the Italian authorities, the shipping line and certification bodies complied not only with the safety standards applicable to crews, passengers and the environment — and notably those laid down in Directive 2009/45 of 6 June 2009 and in the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) of 1974 — but also with the emergency measures to be taken in the event of an accident that may have prevented this tragedy, which occurred just metres from the coast.

When assessing whether EC law — and notably the rights of the crew and the passengers — were respected, one should bear in mind that the ship was in close contact before, during and after the event with the shipping company and with the Italian authorities (which, moreover, have in the past tolerated risky navigational practices such as that of 'taking a bow'), and that the shipping company and Italian authorities were also in constant touch with one another, meaning that the necessary action could easily have been taken.

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

According to Directive 2009/18/EC ([1]), Member States shall ensure that a safety investigation is carried out 'after very serious marine casualties, (a) involving a ship flying its flag, irrespective of the location of the casualty; (b) occurring within its territorial sea and internal waters…'. Therefore the responsibility for the conduct of the safety investigation into the Costa Concordia incident lays with the Italian authorities.

The Italian Marine Casualties Investigative Body (MCIB) has made its safety investigation report on this case available to the Commission in May 2013. It has also been delivered to the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) and the safety recommendations were initially discussed at the 92nd session of the IMO Maritime Safety Committee in June 2013.

The Commission has initiated an infringement procedure (Infringement No 2013/2122) against Italy for incorrect implementation of the provisions on the accident investigation under Directive 2009/18/EC. In addition, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the Commission's replies to related parliamentary questions on the Costa Concordia accident, E-466/2012, E-508/2012, E-572/2012, E-586/2012, E-615/2012 and P-1135/2012 ([2]).

([1]) Directive 2009/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 establishing the fundamental principles governing the investigation of accidents in the maritime transport sector and amending Council Directive 1999/35/EC and Directive 2002/59/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 131, 28.5.2009.

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000251/14
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(13 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Bariere în calea tratamentului diabetului în Europa

Conform unui recent raport publicat de către Federația internațională de diabet, două dintre principalele bariere în calea tratamentului eficient al acestei boli îl reprezintă, la nivelul întregii Uniuni Europene, accesul inegal la informațiile privind diabetul și inaccesibilitatea medicamentelor ([1]).

1. Poate Comisia să întreprindă acțiuni pentru a îmbunătăți accesul la informațiile privind diabetul?

2. Intenționează Comisia să întreprindă vreo acțiune în ceea ce privește reglementarea prețurilor pentru a face posibil accesul tuturor la medicamente și la dispozitive medicale?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(4 martie 2014)

Comisia Europeană cofinanțează o acțiune comună referitoare la bolile cronice prin intermediul programului UE în domeniul sănătății. Un pachet de lucru din cadrul acestei acțiuni comune este dedicat studierii obstacolelor din calea prevenirii, depistării și tratării diabetului, astfel abordând și aspecte legate de responsabilizarea pacienților.

Totuși, Comisia nu poate să ia măsuri pentru a îmbunătăți accesul la educația privind diabetul în diferitele țări din UE, deoarece aceasta intră în domeniul de competență al statelor membre.

În plus, Comisia Europeană participă la procesul de reflecție cu privire la bolile cronice prin organizarea, în aprilie 2014, a unui summit UE pe tema bolilor cronice, care își propune să analizeze acțiunile întreprinse până în prezent, să continue discuțiile referitoare la bolile cronice, adăugând în mod clar valoare la nivelul UE, și să ofere recomandări privind viitoarele intervenții care vor aborda problema bolilor cronice, printre care se numără și diabetul.

([1]) http://www.idf.org/regions/EUR/accesstodiabetescare

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000251/14
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Barriers to diabetes care in Europe

A recent report published by the International Diabetes Federation identifies unequal access to diabetes education and unaffordable medicines as two of the major EU-wide barriers to the effective treatment of diabetes ([1]).

1. Can the Commission take any action to improve access to diabetes education?

2. Does the Commission envisage any action on price regulation to make medicines and medical devices affordable for all?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The European Commission is co-financing a joint action on chronic diseases through the EU health programme. One work package within this Joint Action is dedicated to studying the barriers to prevention, screening and treatment of diabetes thereby also addressing issues of patient empowerment.

The Commission cannot however take action to improve access to diabetes education within individual EU countries as this falls in the area of competence of the Member States.

In addition, the European Commission is following-up the reflection process on chronic diseases by organising an EU summit on chronic diseases in April 2014 to analyse action to date, to continue the discussion in the field of chronic diseases with clear EU added value, and to deliver recommendations on future interventions to tackle the burden of chronic diseases, including diabetes.

([1]) http://www.idf.org/regions/EUR/accesstodiabetescare

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-000252/14
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(13. tammikuuta 2014)

Aihe: VP/HR – Malia koskevan EU:n kattavan strategian puuttuminen

Malia pidetään elintärkeänä ja strategisesti merkittävänä maana EU:n kannalta. Unionia on kuitenkin kritisoitu Malin kriisiä koskevan yhteisen toimintasuunnitelman puuttumisesta. Vaikuttaa myös siltä, että EU:n toimet paikan päällä Malissa eivät vastaa Sahelin alueen turvallisuutta ja kehitystä koskevan EU:n strategian yleisempiä tavoitteita, vaikka tämän strategian julkaisemista viivytettiinkin alueen sekasorron vuoksi. Strategiaa on kritisoitu myöhästymisen lisäksi myös asetettujen tavoitteiden ja niiden saavuttamiseen käytettävissä olevien keinojen välisestä epäsuhdasta. Lisäksi on arvosteltu EU:n toimien ja Sahelin alueen maiden todellisten tarpeiden välistä ristiriitaa. Strategia ei ole ennalta ehkäisevä vaan reagoiva. Joidenkin mielestä syynä on se, että kehitysyhteistyö ja humanitaarinen apu kuuluvat komission alaisuuteen ja sitä kautta Euroopan ulkosuhdehallinnon, yhteisen turvallisuus- ja puolustuspolitiikan sekä Euroopan unionin Malin koulutusoperaation piiriin.

1. Onko EU:n koulutusoperaatio Malissa yhä aiheellinen, kun otetaan huomioon, että poliittinen ja sotilaallinen tilanne on muuttunut, ja mitkä ovat operaation sisäisen vaikutustenarvioinnin tulokset? Mikä on Malin asevoimien nykyinen operatiivinen tila? Saavuttiko asevoimien ensimmäinen pataljoona operatiivisen tilan heinäkuuhun 2013 mennessä? Miten kauan kestää, ennen kuin muut pataljoonat saavuttavat operatiivisen tilan?

2. Onko suunnitelmissa laatia Malia varten uusi EU:n strategia, jossa käytettäisiin täysimittaisesti EU:n käytössä olevia uusia välineitä ja jolla paremmin voitaisiin vastata hauraaseen tilanteeseen? Miten EU on käyttänyt sovittelua ja vuoropuhelua klaanien ja heimojen välisissä kahnauksissa ja sovinnon edistämiseksi Malissa?

3. EU kiitteli Malia vuolaasti vaalien järjestämisestä joulukuussa, mutta siirtymäkausi ei pääty vaaleihin. Millainen on ulkoasiainhallinnon ja komission toimintasuunnitelma vaalien jälkeiselle ajalle? Aikovatko ne auttaa siirtymäkauden juridisten menettelyjen kehittämisessä? Onko olemassa suunnitelmia siviilioperaation käynnistämiseksi intervention päättymisen jälkeen?

4. Tällä hetkellä Malin asevoimien aseistus ja kalusto on tasoltaan kehnoa, ja jotkut kansainvälisten toimijoiden toimittamat aseet ovat päätyneet vääriin käsiin. Miten tämä ongelma voidaan ratkaista? Aikooko EU laajentaa vaikutusvaltaansa turvallisuusalan uudistamiseen, aseiden riisuntaan, joukkojen kotiuttamiseen ja integroimiseen takaisin yhteiskuntaan ja rajavalvontaoperaatioihin?

5. Malin hallitus ja armeija ovat erityisen korruptoituneita, ja joskus korkea-arvoisten upseerien tilalle on lahjuksilla nimitetty siviilejä, joilla ei ole lainkaan sotilaskoulutusta. Onko EU:n Malin koulutusoperaatioon tarkoitus lisätä korruptiota koskevia opetusjaksoja siellä jo olevien humanitaarista oikeutta ja ihmisoikeuksia koskevien jaksojen lisäksi?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(27. helmikuuta 2014)

EU on toteuttanut Sahelin-strategiaansa vuodesta 2011, ja se on edelleen tärkein kehys EU:n toiminnalle alueella.

Malin tapauksessa EU on myöntänyt huomattavaa tukea vakautusprosessille ja perustuslaillisen järjestyksen palauttamiselle vapaiden ja rehellisten vaalien avulla. EU jatkaa maan tukemista samalla, kun se kannustaa osapuolia osallistaviin ja uskottaviin rauhanneuvotteluihin. Rauhasta koituvat hyödyt ovat kiistattomia, ja EU seuraakin tarkkaan Malin tilanteen johdosta Brysselissä 15. toukokuuta 2013 järjestetyssä avunantajien kokouksessa annettujen sitoumusten täytäntöönpanoa.

EU käynnisti helmikuussa 2013 Malissa sotilasoperaation (EUTM), jonka puitteissa annetaan turvallisuusalan koulutusta ja neuvontaa. Malin viranomaiset ovat jo kouluttaneet kolme pataljoonaa (yli 2 000 sotilasta) ja lähettänyt ne maan pohjoisosaan. Neljäs pataljoona on parhaillaan koulutettavana. Jatkamalla EUTM:n mandaattia 24 kuukaudella pitäisi voida kouluttaa vielä neljä pataljoonaa. EUTM:n neuvonantajatiimi tukee myös Malin puolustusministeriötä puolustuksen rakenneuudistuksen suunnittelussa ja alullepanossa osana laajempaa turvallisuusalan uudistusta. EU:n ulkoisten toimien oikeudellinen kehys ei ole riittävä perusta EU:n tuelle Malin asevoimien uudelleen varustamiseksi, mutta yksittäiset EU:n jäsenvaltiot koordinoivat siihen tähtääviä toimiaan EU:n sotilasesikunnan tuella.

Perustuslaillisen järjestyksen, rauhan ja vakauden palauttaminen Maliin edellyttää jatkuvaa kansainvälistä panosta. EU aikoo tukea tätä prosessia politiikan, turvallisuuden ja kehityksen näkökulmasta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000252/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Absence of a comprehensive EU strategy for Mali

Mali is considered a country of vital interest and strategic relevance to the EU. However, the EU has been criticised for its lack of a common operational plan to manage the crisis in Mali. It also seems that the EU's activities on the ground in Mali do not correspond to the wider objectives laid out in the EU Strategy for Security and Development in the Sahel, even though the publication of this strategy was delayed due to the turmoil in the region. The strategy has not only been criticised for this publication delay, but also for the discrepancies between its stated objectives and the means available to achieve them. Discrepancies between the EU's actions and the real needs of the Sahel countries have also been criticised. The strategy is reactive rather than preventative. Some say that this is because development cooperation and humanitarian aid remain under the control of the Commission, thereby coming under the framework of the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), and subsequently the European Union Training Mission (EUTM) in Mali.

1. Is EUTM Mali still relevant considering the changing political and military situation, and what are the results of internal impact assessments on the mission? What is the current operational status of the Malian Armed Forces (MAF)? Did its first battalion reach operational stage by July 2013? How long will it take for the other battalions to become operational?

2. Is a new EU strategy for Mali, which makes full use of the new EU tools available, in the pipeline in order to better respond to the fragile situation? How has the EU used mediation and dialogue to deal with clashes between clans and tribes and to promote reconciliation in Mali?

3. The fact that Mali held elections in December was widely praised by the EU, but the transition period will not end with the elections. What is the EEAS/Commission plan of action following the elections? Will they help create transitional justice mechanisms? Are there any plans for a post-intervention civilian mission?

4. At present, the MAF's equipment is of poor quality and some of the arms provided by international players have ended up in the wrong hands. How can this issue be resolved? Is the EU planning to extend its influence to security sector reform, disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration, and border-monitoring operations?

5. The Mali Government and army are extremely corrupt, and high-ranking officials in the army have been replaced by civilians who do not possess any relevant military training, sometimes because of bribes. Does the EUTM intend to add modules on corruption in addition to those currently in place on humanitarian law and human rights?

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

The EU has been implementing its Sahel Strategy since 2011 and it continues to be the key framework for EU action in the region.

In Mali specifically, the EU has provided considerable support to the stabilisation process and the return to full constitutional normalcy through free and fair elections. The EU will continue to support it while encouraging inclusive and credible peace talks. Peace dividends are crucial and the EU is actively following up on the Mali Donors' Conference hosted in Brussels on 15 May 2013.

In the field of security, a training and advisory mission EUTM was launched in February 2013. Three Battalions (more than 2,000 soldiers) have already been trained and deployed by Malian authorities in the north of Mali. A fourth one is currently being trained. The renewal of EUTM's mandate for another 24 months should enable the training of 4 additional battalions. EUTM advisory team is also supporting the Malian MOD to design and initiate a structural reform in the field of Defence as part of a broader reform of the security sector. While the legal framework of EU external action does not provide an adequate basis for EU support to the re-equipment of Malian armed forces, EU individual Member States are coordinating their endeavours to that effect with the support of the EU Military Staff.

The full return to constitutional normalcy, peace and stability in Mali will require sustained international engagement. The EU is determined to accompany this process at all levels, political, security and development.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-000254/14
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(13. tammikuuta 2014)

Aihe: VP/HR – EU:n ensisijaiset tavoitteet Libyassa konfliktin jälkeen: aseistariisunta ennen vaaleja ja perustuslain laatiminen

Useat niin kutsutut vapaustaistelijat ja vanhalle hallinnolle lojaalit henkilöt ovat jääneet ilman asemaa Libyan yhteiskunnassa sodan jälkeen. Sadattuhannet entiset taistelijat ovat rekisteröityneet virallisesti korvausten toivossa. Vaikka osa entisistä taistelijoista on löytänyt töitä turvallisuusalalta, monet entisistä taistelijoista kulkevat ympäriinsä ryöstellen ja sattumanvaraisia tappoja suorittaen. Tämän lisäksi uudelleensopeuttamisen yhteydessä ei ole suoritettu asianmukaista seulontaa tai valintamenettelyä. Osa kaarteista kieltäytyy myös aseistariisunnasta, koska se estäisi heitä vaikuttamasta poliittiseen prosessiin. Vaikuttaa siltä, että poliittinen ja turvallisuuspoliittinen tilanne on huonontunut entisestään viime kuukausien aikana. Huolimatta siitä, että EUBAM Libya (Euroopan unionin rajavalvonnan avustusoperaatio) on siviilioperaatio, sen keskeinen tehtävä on puolisotilaallisten rajavartija- ja rannikkovartijajoukkojen, joilla saattaa olla kyseenalaisia poliittisia suunnitelmia, toiminnallisten valmiuksien parantaminen. Tämä vaikuttaa aika vastuuttomalta, kun otetaan huomioon helposti saatavilla olevien laittomien aseiden runsas määrä, mikä vaarantaa sekä libyalaisten että EUBAMin henkilöstön hengen. Kansalaisyhteiskunnan aktivistit ovat sitä mieltä, että Libyan demokratiaan siirtyminen on epäonnistunut. He kritisoivat EU:ta erityisesti siitä, että siirtymätoimet Libyassa on toteutettu väärässä järjestyksessä. EU:n ensisijaisiin tavoitteisiin kuuluvat rauhanomaiset ja uskottavat vaalit ja perustuslain laatiminen, vaikka ensimmäisten tavoitteiden olisi oltava aseistariisunta ja asianmukaisten konfliktin jälkeisten olosuhteiden aikaansaaminen sovintomenettelyjen kautta.

1. Ulkoasioiden neuvosto totesi 18. marraskuuta 2013 antamassaan lausunnossa, että unioni kannustaa (…) vallankumouskaartien jäsenten asteittaiseen integroitumiseen toteuttamalla (…) aseistariisunta-, demobilisaatio- ja yhteiskuntaan sopeuttamisohjelmia (…). Mihin käytännön toimenpiteisiin EU on ryhtymässä riisuakseen aseista kyseiset ryhmät, jotka saattavat horjuttaa maan vakautta?

2. Eikö ole hyödytöntä varmistaa rajat ja kouluttaa puolisotilaallisia joukkoja, jos kyseisiin toimiin ei kuulu aseistariisuntaa? Onko suunnitelmissa EUBAMin toimeksiannon jatkaminen ja onko Libyan hallitus suostuvainen sen jatkamiseen?

3. Sovintomenettelyt edellyttävät myös sukupuolinäkökohtien ja nuorisoasioiden huomioon ottamista. Kansalaisyhteiskunnan aktivistien mukaan EU:n toimissa ei oteta kyseisiä asioita tarpeeksi huomioon. Mihin toimiin ollaan ryhtymässä tilanteen parantamiseksi?

4. *EU Observer*-julkaisussa ([1]) ilmestyneessä artikkelissa kerrottiin, että EU:n vastikään suorittamasta tutkimuksesta käy ilmi, että alle puolet libyalaisista tietää, mikä EU on. Minkälaisiin toimiin on ryhdytty tietämyksen lisäämiseksi EU:sta ja siten EU:n uskottavuuden lisäämiseksi Libyassa?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(28. helmikuuta 2014)

1. Aseistariisuntaa, demobilisaatiota ja yhteiskuntaan sopeuttamista koskevan prosessin tehokkuus edellyttää pääryhmittymien välistä poliittista ratkaisua. EU tukee kuulemisprosessia Yhdistyneiden kansakuntien Libyan-tukioperaation (UNSMIL) kautta. Tehokkaan integroitumisen valmistelemiseksi EU rahoittaa poliisivoimien ja oikeuslaitoksen uudistusohjelmaa (10 miljoonalla eurolla) ja teknisen ja ammatillisen koulutuksen ohjelmaa (6,5 miljoonalla eurolla), mistä on hyötyä myös entisille taistelijoille, jotka eivät halua integroitua turvallisuuspalveluihin.

2. EUBAM tukee hallitusta yhdennettyä rajaturvallisuutta koskevan suunnitelman laatimisessa ja täytäntöönpanossa ja antaa operatiivista koulutusta esimerkiksi rannikkovartioston etsintä- ja pelastustoiminnassa sekä lentoasemien turvaamisessa. Tämän katsotaan olevan hyödyllistä myös nykyisessä tilanteessa, jossa aseistariisuntaprosessia valmistellaan. EUBAMin toimeksiannon laajentamista ei suunnitella.

3. EU:n ohjelmat Libyassa ovat suuruudeltaan 26 miljoonaa euroa, joten se on Libyan kansalaisyhteiskunnan ehdottomasti suurin tukija. Nuorisoasiat ja sukupuolinäkökohdat sisältyvät näihin ohjelmiin. Yhdellä ohjelmalla esimerkiksi tuetaan naisjärjestöjä, jotka tähtäävät naisten oikeuksien sisällyttämiseen perustuslakiin. EU tunnustaa nuorison merkityksen ja harkitsee nuorison nimeämistä tukipakettinsa painopistealaksi ohjelmakaudella 2014–2015.

4. EU:n näkyvyys ja sitä koskeva tietoisuus on tosiaan tärkeää. Sekä unionin edustusto että EUBAM tiedottavat säännöllisesti toiminnastaan Libyassa ja pyrkivät kasvattamaan näkyvyyttään entisestään ottaen kuitenkin turvallisuusnäkökohdat huomioon.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/foreign/122134

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000254/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — the EU's priorities in post-conflict Libya: disarmament before elections and constitution drafting

Numerous so-called freedom fighters and old regime loyalists have been left without a role in post-war Libyan society. Hundreds of thousands of ex-fighters have officially registered in expectation of being rewarded. Whilst some ex-combatants have been reintegrated into the security sector, many are still going around looting and carrying out arbitrary killings. Moreover, no proper screening or selection procedure is being conducted upon their reintegration. Some brigades are also refusing to disarm, as this would prevent them from influencing the political process. The political and security situation appears to have further deteriorated in recent months. Despite the fact that EUBAM Libya (EU Border Assistance Mission) is a civilian mission, its primary task is to build up the operational capacity of the 'paramilitary' Border Guards and the Naval Coast Guard, which may have questionable political agendas. This seems rather irresponsible in view of the abundance of easily accessible illegal arms, as it puts the lives not only of Libyans, but also of EUBAM personnel, at risk. Civil society activists are of the opinion that the democratic transition in Libya has failed. They are particularly critical of the EU for tackling Libyan transition activities in the wrong order. The EU's immediate priorities include peaceful and credible elections and the drafting of a constitution, when it should be focusing on disarmament and the establishment of proper post-conflict conditions through reconciliation.

1. On 18 November 2013, the Foreign Affairs Council issued a statement saying that the Union 'encourages (…) the progressive integration of members of the revolutionary brigades through (…) disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration'. What practical steps is the EU taking towards disarming the groups in question, which may have a potentially destabilising effect on the country?

2. Is it not pointless to secure the borders and train paramilitaries unless these activities include a disarmament element? Are there any plans to extend the EUBAM mandate and would the Libyan government be open to such an extension?

3. Reconciliation also requires gender and youth mainstreaming. According to civil society activists, however, the EU's activities do not take this sufficiently into account. What steps are being taken to improve the situation?

4. An article in the EU *Observer* ([1]) reported that 'a recent survey carried out by the EU demonstrates that less than 50% of Libyans know what the EU is'. What efforts are being made to improve awareness of the EU, and thus to make the EU more credible, in Libya?

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

1. For an effective process of demobilisation, disarmament and reintegration (DDR) a political settlement is required between the main factions. Through the UN Special Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) the EU supports the consultation process. To prepare for effective integration, the EU is funding a police and justice reform programme (EUR 10 million) and a programme for Technical and Vocational Training (EUR 6.5 million) which will also benefit ex-fighters who do not wish to be integrated in the security services.

2. EUBAM supports the government in establishing a concept for Integrated Border Management and provides operational training in areas such as search and rescue for the coast guard, airport security etc. It is considered that this is also useful in the current situation while preparations are being made for a disarmament process. There are no plans to extend the mandate of EUBAM.

3. The EU is by far the largest supporter of Civil Soceity in Libya with programmes amounting to EUR 26 million. Youth and gender are part of these programmes. For example, one of the programmes is promoting women's organisations for the inclusion of women's rights in the Constitution. The EU recognises the importance of youth and is considering Youth as a focal sector for its assistance package under the 2014-2015 programming period.

4. EU visibility and awareness is indeed important. Both the Delegation and EUBAM regularly communicate about their acitivities in Libya and aim to further enhance their visibility while being mindful of the possible security implications.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/foreign/122134

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-000255/14
upućeno Komisiji
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(13. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Zaštita istarskog pršuta kao autohtonog hrvatskog proizvoda

Prema službenim izvorima iz hrvatskog ministarstva poljoprivrede Republika Slovenija uložila je prigovor na hrvatski zahtjev za registraciju istarskog pršuta. U skladu s europskim zakonodavnim pravilima na Europskoj komisiji je da ocijeni valjanost slovenskog prigovora.

Sam proces zaštite istarskog pršuta započeo je davno prije hrvatskog pristupanja Europskoj uniji na osnovi brojnih argumenata koji potvrđuju njegovu autohtonost kao što su sorta od koje se proizvodi (pasmine bijelih mesnatih svinja poput velikog jorkšira i švedskog landrasa, te njihovih križanaca) i činjenica da se u njegovoj proizvodnji ne koristi dimljenje.

Osim toga, proces proizvodnje točno je propisan i kontroliran. Da bi dobio status istarskog pršuta, svaki proizvod mora dobiti tri pečata: da je meso ugojeno i osušeno u Istri te da je spravljeno prema tradicionalnoj recepturi.

Uzimajući u obzir prethodno navedene argumente zanima me koji je stav Komisije spram prigovora koji je uložila Republika Slovenija vezano uz hrvatski prijedlog za registraciju istarskog pršuta?

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-000341/14
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(15. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Problem registracije istarskog pršuta

Prema pravilima Europske komisije svi proizvodi koji su već zaštićeni prema nacionalnim kriterijima moraju se uskladiti sa standardima EU-a najkasnije u roku od godinu dana nakon ulaska države u punopravno članstvo Unije. Istarski pršut je prvi autohtoni poljoprivredno-prehrambeni proizvod uopće u Hrvatskoj zaštićen oznakom izvornosti prema standardima Europske unije. Da bi dobio status istarskog pršuta, svaki proizvod mora dobiti tri pečata: da je meso uzgojeno u Istri, osušeno u Istri te da je spravljeno prema tradicionalnoj recepturi. Proizvodnja pršuta ne ovisi toliko o državi, već o teritoriju na kojem je proizveden, zbog čega je istarski pršut apsolutno jedinstven proizvod.

Važno je istaknuti da se 89% teritorija Istarskog poluotoka nalazi u RH pa je i to možda jedan argument koji ide u prilog Hrvatskoj.

Smatra li Komisija da je slovenski prigovor neutemeljen, s obzirom na to da je istarski pršut apsolutno autohtoni hrvatski proizvod i nigdje se u svijetu, pa ni u Sloveniji, ne proizvodi na način na koji se proizvodi u Istri?

Odgovor g. Cioloşa u ime Komisije
(28. veljače 2014.)

Zahtjev za registraciju „ISTARSKI PRŠUT" objavljen je u SL C 155, 1.6.2013. Dana 30. 8. 2013. nadležna slovenska tijela poslala su Komisiji prigovor unutar zadanog roka propisanog Uredbom (EU) br. 1151/2012 ([1]). Na prigovor je 29. 10. 2013., u zadanom roku od dva mjeseca, podnesena obrazložena izjava o prigovoru. Izjava se smatra prihvatljivom i proslijedit će se hrvatskim nadležnim tijelima uz zahtjev da se održe savjetovanja sa slovenskim nadležnim tijelima. Savjetovanja moraju započeti bez odlaganja i mogu trajati najviše tri mjeseca. U slučaju nepostizanja sporazuma obavješćuje se i Komisija. Na zahtjev podnositelja zahtjeva Komisija može produžiti rok za najviše tri mjeseca.

Komisija u ovoj fazi ne može zauzeti stajalište i mora pričekati ishod tih savjetovanja prije poduzimanja daljnjih koraka.

([1]) SL L 343, 14.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000255/14
to the Commission
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Protection of 'istarski pršut' as a native Croatian product

According to official sources in the Croatian Ministry of Agriculture, Slovenia has challenged Croatia's application for the registration of 'istarski pršut', that is to say, Istrian dry-cured ham. Under the rules laid down in European legislation the Commission has to assess the validity of the Slovenian objection.

The istarski pršut protection process, which started long before Croatia joined the EU, is based on numerous grounds testifying to the authentically Croatian character of this ham, including for example the types of pigs from which it is made (fleshy white breeds such as the Large White and the Swedish Landrace, and crosses between them) and the fact that it is produced without smoking.

The production process is, moreover, exactly regulated and supervised. In order to be classed as 'istarski pršut', each product has to bear three stamps showing that the meat has been obtained from pigs fattened in Istria and has been cured there and prepared according to the traditional recipe.

In the light of the foregoing, how does the Commission view Slovenia's objection to the Croatian proposal to register istarski pršut?

Question for written answer E-000341/14
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Registering Istrian pršut

Pursuant to rules laid down by the Commission, all products that are protected in accordance with national rules must be brought into line with EU standards one year after the date of that country's full accession to the European Union at the latest. Istrian pršut is the first native agricultural food product in Croatia to be protected by a designation of origin in line with EU standards. In order to be classified as Istrian pršut, all products must fulfil three criteria: the meat must have been raised in Istria, dried in Istria and prepared in accordance with traditional methods. The country in which pršut is produced is less crucial than the territory in which it is produced, which makes Istrian pršut an absolutely unique product.

It is important to stress that 89% of the territory of the Istrian peninsula is located within Croatia, which is perhaps an argument in favour of Croatia's cause.

Does the Commission consider Slovenia's objection to be groundless, given that Istrian pršut is an absolutely native Croatian product which is not produced in the same way anywhere else in the world — including in Slovenia?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2014)

The application for registration of 'ISTARSKI PRŠUT' was published in the OJ, C 155 on 1.6.2013. A notice of opposition was sent on 30.8.2013 by the Slovenian authorities to the Commission, within the required time provided by Regulation (EU) No1151/2012 ([1]). This notice was followed on the 29.10.2013, within the required two month deadline, by a reasoned statement of opposition. The reasoned statement was deemed admissible and will be forwarded, to the Croatian authorities accompanied by a request inviting them to hold consultations with the Slovenian authorities. These consultations shall start without undue delay and not exceed three months. If no agreement is reached, this information shall also be provided to the Commission. At the request of the applicant the Commission may extend the deadline by a maximum of three months.

The Commission cannot take a position at this stage and must await the outcome of these consultations before any further steps can be taken.

([1]) OJ L 343 du 14.12.2012.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-000256/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(13. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Registracija izvornosti istarskog pršuta

Slovenski prigovor na hrvatski zahtjev za registraciju izvornosti istarskog pršuta ne predstavlja prvi takav napad na hrvatske autohtone proizvode. Republika Hrvatska je kao najnovija članica Unije stavljena u neravnopravan položaj jer nije na taj način mogla zaštititi svoje poljoprivredne i prehrambene proizvode prije dana pristupanja Uniji. Prema poglavlju 11. pristupnog ugovora Hrvatskoj je odobrena mogućnost da u roku od 12 mjeseci od dana pristupanja preda zahtjeve za registraciju na razini EU-a za poljoprivredne i prehrambene proizvode koji su već registrirani i zaštićeni na nacionalnoj razini oznakama izvornosti, zemljopisnog podrijetla ili tradicionalnog ugleda na dan pristupanja EU-u.

S obzirom na to da je istarski pršut registriran i zaštićen na nacionalnoj razini od 2011. i da je način njegove proizvodnje strogo propisan pravilima jedinstvenima u svijetu, držim kako nema prepreke za registraciju njegove izvornosti na razini EU-a.

Stoga bih željela pitati Komisiju smatra li takve prigovore na zahtjev za registraciju izvornosti zloporabom tog instituta i drži li ih udarom na slobodu tržišta jer se, kao i u slučaju prošeka i terana, radi o pokušaju eliminacije konkurencije sa zajedničkog tržišta preko europskih institucija. Planira li Komisija poduzeti mjere kojima bi se spriječilo ponovno dovođenje Republike Hrvatske u neravnopravan položaj na taj način?

Odgovor g. Cioloşa u ime Komisije
(25. veljače 2014.)

Hrvatska je i prije pristupanja Uniji mogla podnositi zahtjeve za zaštitu naziva u Europskoj Uniji kao zaštićene oznake zemljopisnog podrijetla (ZOZP) i zaštićene oznake izvornosti (ZOI) u skladu s Uredbom Vijeća (EZ) br. 510/2006 o zaštiti oznaka zemljopisnog podrijetla i oznaka izvornosti poljoprivrednih i prehrambenih proizvoda ([1]) koja je zamijenjena Uredbom (EU) br. 1151/2012 o sustavima kvalitete za poljoprivredne i prehrambene proizvode ([2]).

Ti se zahtjevi podnose u skladu sa standardnim postupkom registracije previđenim Uredbom (EU) br. 1151/2012. Prigovor i obrazložena izjava o prigovoru Slovenije u pogledu zahtjeva Hrvatske za registraciju proizvoda „ISTARSKI PRŠUT" temelje se na pravima koja su u skladu s člankom 51. Uredbe (EU) br. 1151/2012 dana svim državama članicama ili trećoj zemlji, ili fizičkoj ili pravnoj osobi s legitimnim interesom koja ima boravište ili sjedište u trećoj zemlji. Izjava Slovenije smatra se prihvatljivom i proslijedit će se hrvatskim nadležnim tijelima uz zahtjev da se održi savjetovanje sa slovenskim nadležnim tijelima. Savjetovanje se ne smije nepotrebno odlagati i traje najviše tri mjeseca. Ako se ne postigne sporazum, o tome se obavješćuje i Komisiju. Na zahtjev podnositelja Komisija može produžiti rok za najviše tri mjeseca.

Komisija u ovoj fazi ne može zauzeti stajalište i mora čekati ishod tih savjetovanja prije poduzimanja daljnjih koraka.

([1]) SL L 93, 31.3.2006.
([2]) SL L 343, 14.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000256/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Registration of origin of Istrian pršut

Slovenia's objection to Croatia's calls for the registration of origin of Istrian pršut is not the first such attack on traditional Croatian products. As the EU's newest Member State, Croatia has been placed at a disadvantage by being unable to protect its agricultural and food products by registering them prior to its accession to the EU. Chapter 11 of Croatia's Accession Treaty gives the country a period of 12 months from the date of accession in which to submit applications for EU registration of agricultural and food products which are already registered and protected by designations of origin, geographical indications or traditional terms at national level on the date of EU accession.

Given that Istrian pršut has been registered and protected nationally since 2011, and that the method used in its production is strictly regulated by rules that are unique in the world, I believe that there are no obstacles to registering its origin at EU level.

Does the Commission consider such objections to applications for the registration of origin to be an abuse of the procedure and an attack on the free market, since — as was also the case with 'Prošek' and 'Teran' — they clearly constitute an attempt to use the European institutions to eliminate competition on the single market? Does the Commission intend to take steps to prevent Croatia from once again being put at a disadvantage in such a way?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2014)

Already before its accession to the Union, Croatia could submit applications for the protection of names in the European Union as geographical indications (PGI) and designations of origin (PDO) under Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs ([1]), now replaced by Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs ([2]).

Such applications follow the standard registration procedure provided for by Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012. Slovenia's notice of opposition and reasoned statement of opposition with respect to Croatia's application for registration of 'ISTARSKI PRŠUT' are based on the rights given to all Member States or of a third country, or a natural or legal person having legitimate interest and established in a third country by Article 51 of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012. Slovenia's statement was deemed admissible and will be forwarded, to the Croatian authorities accompanied by a request to hold consultations with the Slovenian authorities. These consultations shall start without undue delay and not exceed three months. If no agreement is reached, this information shall also be provided to the Commission. At the request of the applicant the Commission may extend the deadline by a maximum of three months.

The Commission cannot take a position at this stage and must await the outcome of these consultations before any further steps can be taken.

([1]) OJ L 93, 31.3.2006.
([2]) OJ L 343, 14.12.2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000257/14
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(13 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Istituti previdenziali

Premesso che:

— da recenti notizie apparse su organi d'informazione, risulta che lo Stato italiano dal 2010 al 2012 abbia trasferito all'Istituto nazionale per la previdenza sociale (INPS) 990 milioni di euro l'anno per il trattamento di quiescenza del personale dipendente di Poste italiane S.p.A., il cui capitale è detenuto al 100 % dal Ministero dell'Economia e delle Finanze;

— ad occuparsi del trattamento previdenziale del personale postale è stato, fino a maggio 2010, l'Istituto Postelegrafonici (Ipost), costituito con DPR n. 542/1953, che ha visto confermato il proprio ruolo anche in seguito alla trasformazione delle Poste italiane in ente pubblico economico nel 1994 e in società per azioni (Poste Italiane S.p.A.) nel 1997;

— il legislatore italiano, con decreto legge n. 78/2010, convertito in legge n. 122/2010, ha disposto la soppressione dell'Ipost, trasferendo tutte le sue funzioni all'INPS che ne ha ereditato i rapporti attivi e passivi, compresi i trasferimenti statali per il trattamento previdenziale del personale postale;

— per il 2013, i bilanci dell'INPS rilevano un aumento del 2 %, rispetto allo scorso anno, del personale di Poste italiane S.p.A. in quiescenza, con un conseguente esborso di risorse statali pari almeno alla somma trasferita nel 2012;

— in data 29 gennaio 2011 la Commissione europea ha avviato un procedimento contro il Regno Unito, contestando un pacchetto di aiuti alla Royal Mail che avrebbe portato lo Stato britannico a farsi carico di ben 9 miliardi di sterline di deficit accumulato dal colosso postale inglese;

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se sia a conoscenza dei fatti sopra esposti;

2. se, in considerazione del ruolo a essa spettante nella valutazione degli aiuti di Stato compatibili con il mercato interno ai sensi dell'articolo 107, intenda procedere al fine di acquisire ulteriori chiarimenti al riguardo.

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(26 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione prende atto delle notizie secondo le quali il governo italiano ha trasferito all'Istituto nazionale della previdenza sociale (INPS) i fondi per il trattamento previdenziale dei dipendenti delle Poste Italiane S.p.A.

I servizi della Commissione non erano stati precedentemente informati in merito a tale trasferimento. In questa fase, tuttavia, la Commissione non è in grado di valutare se il trasferimento costituisce un aiuto di Stato e, di conseguenza, se esso può essere dichiarato compatibile con il trattato.

A tal fine, risulta necessaria un'analisi approfondita della questione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000257/14
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Social security institutions

Whereas:

— according to recent news reports in the media, from 2010 to 2012 the Italian Government apparently transferred EUR 990 million each year to the National Social Security Institute (INPS) to cover severance pay for employees of Poste italiane S.p.A., which is wholly owned by the Ministry for the Economy and Finance;

— until the end of May 2010, the Istituto Postelegrafonici (Ipost), established by Presidential Decree No 542/1953, dealt with social security for postal staff, its role having been confirmed even following the transformation of Poste italiane into a public economic entity in 1994 and a joint stock company (Poste italiane S.p.A.) in 1997;

— the Italian legislator, by Decree Law No 78/2010 converted into Law No 122/2010, ordered the abolition of Ipost, transferring all its functions to the INPS which inherited all its assets and liabilities, including government transfers for social security in respect of postal staff;

— for 2013, the INPS accounts show an increase of 2% in the retired staff of Poste italiane S.p.A. compared to the previous year, with a consequent outflow of government resources at least equal to the sum transferred in 2012;

— on 29 January 2011, the European Commission brought proceedings against the United Kingdom, challenging an aid package for the Royal Mail that would have led the British Government to take over a full GBP 9 billion deficit accumulated by the English postal giant;

can the Commission state:

1. Whether it is aware of the abovementioned facts;

2. Whether, considering the role it plays in assessing state aid compatible with the internal market pursuant to Article 107, it intends to seek further clarification in this respect?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2014)

The Commission takes note of the reports that the Italian Government transferred social security funds for employees of Poste Italiane S.p.A. to the National Social Security Institute (INPS).

The Commission services had not been previously informed about such a transfer. At this stage, however, the Commission is not in a position to assess whether the transfer constitutes state aid and subsequently whether it could be declared compatible with the Treaty.

Further investigation of the matter will be necessary.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000258/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Emergenza rifiuti a Roma e nel Lazio — Sospetto ampliamento non autorizzato della discarica di Cupinoro

Nel Lazio e nella provincia di Roma permane una situazione di emergenza rifiuti rispetto alla quale non si intravede alcuna seria ipotesi di soluzione definitiva. Di fatto, dopo la chiusura della discarica di Malagrotta, non sono stati individuati siti idonei al conferimento dei rifiuti di Roma e si continua a gestire l'intera politica dei rifiuti senza una strategia adeguata e con politiche dettate dall'emergenza, attraverso la nomina di Commissari straordinari. Nel mese di dicembre scorso, in particolare, la situazione ha raggiunto livelli molto preoccupanti nella città di Roma, dove c'è stata una forte battuta d'arresto della raccolta differenziata.

Vale la pena ricordare che lo scorso 9 gennaio il Nucleo operativo ecologico dei Carabinieri di Roma ha eseguito 7 arresti e che altre persone risultano indagate per reati per truffa e associazione a delinquere finalizzata al traffico dei rifiuti.

Inoltre, relativamente alla discarica di Cupinoro molti comitati segnalano che sarebbe allo studio la possibilità di consentire il conferimento di rifiuti sul fianco Nord e/o sinistro del sito in questione. Ciò significherebbe la possibilità di abbancare su questo fianco ulteriori 54.000 metri cubi di rifiuti circa.

Considerando che anche una relazione di Confservizi Lazio dello scorso dicembre indica che la capacità della discarica di Cupinoro è «in esaurimento», può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è stata correttamente esperita la procedura di valutazione d'impatto ambientale preventiva e se esistono o meno le condizioni previste dalla direttiva 2011/92/CE?

2. Sono state chieste le autorizzazioni relative ai codici CER, che definiscono la tipologia di rifiuti che deve essere conferita in discarica?

3. È effettivamente previsto un ampliamento della discarica di Cupinoro che, nonostante la prevista dismissione nel 2011, è tuttora aperta in regime di proroga?

4. Sono state effettuate le procedure obbligatorie di pubblicità e informazione della cittadinanza (VIA e VAS)?

5. Sono state prese adeguatamente in considerazione da parte delle autorità italiane le disposizioni contenute nella direttiva 2008/98/CE e nella decisione 2003/33/CE del Consiglio che stabilisce criteri e procedure per l'ammissione dei rifiuti nelle discariche?

6. Quali garanzie ha fornito la Regione Lazio nell'ambito del procedimento d'infrazione 2011/4021, volto a garantire che le autorità locali italiane approntino sufficienti capacità per trattare tutti i rifiuti smaltiti nelle discariche della regione?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-011918/2013 ([1]). La procedura di infrazione 2011/4021 è ancora pendente dinanzi alla Corte di giustizia (causa C-323/13).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000258/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Waste emergency in Rome and Lazio — Suspected unauthorised extension of the Cupinoro landfill site

A waste emergency situation is on-going in Lazio and the province of Rome to which there does not appear to be any serious prospect of a final solution. In fact, following the closure of the Malagrotta landfill, no suitable sites have been identified to take waste from Rome and the entire waste issue is still being handled without any adequate strategy and with policies dictated by the emergency, including the appointment of Special Commissioners. Last December, in particular, the situation reached extremely worrying levels in the city of Rome, where there was a sharp slowdown in differentiated waste collection.

It is worth noting that, on 9 January, the ecological operational unit of the Rome Carabinieri made seven arrests and other people are under investigation for offences of fraud and conspiracy to engage in waste trafficking.

In addition, with regard to the Cupinoro landfill, many committees have reported that consideration is being given to the possibility of permitting landfill of waste on the northern and/or left-hand side of the site in question. This would mean potentially storing a further 54 000 m^3 or so of waste on that side.

Considering that a report issued last December by Confservizi Lazio states that the capacity of the Cupinoro landfill is 'exhausted', can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Was the procedure for prior environmental impact assessment carried out correctly and have the conditions laid down in Directive 2011/92/EC been met or not?

2. Were the relevant permits applied for in relation to the EWC codes, which determine the types of waste that should go to landfill?

3. Is an extension actually planned for the Cupinoro landfill which, despite the intended decommissioning in 2011, is still open under an extension?

4. Were the mandatory public notice and information procedures carried out (EIA and SEA)?

5. Did the Italian authorities give due consideration to the provisions of Directive 2008/98/EC and Council Decision 2003/33/EC establishing criteria and procedures for the acceptance of waste at landfills?

6. What guarantees has the Lazio regional government provided in the context of infringement proceeding No 2011/4021 aimed at ensuring that Italian local authorities develop enough capacity to process all the waste disposed of in the region's landfill sites?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to parliamentary Question E-011918/2013 ([1]). The infringement procedure 2011/4021 is still pending before the Court (Case C-323/13).

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000262/14
à la Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(13 janvier 2014)

Objet: Méthodologies de calcul de la consommation et des émissions de CO_2 des véhicules lourds en Europe

Les véhicules lourds (camions, bus, autocars) contribuent fortement aux émissions de CO_2 générées par le transport.

Or, contrairement aux voitures, aucune méthodologie n'est en vigueur en Europe pour mesurer la consommation ou les émissions des véhicules lourds par kilomètre parcouru. En effet, on caractérise aujourd'hui leur moteur thermique, seul au banc d'essai, sans prendre en considération l'efficacité de la transmission, le poids total du véhicule, son aérodynamique, la consommation des accessoires, etc.

Des méthodologies d'essai appropriées existent pourtant hors Europe.

En conséquence de cette situation:

— aucune pression n'est exercée sur les constructeurs pour qu'ils introduisent des véhicules moins énergivores, moins émetteurs de CO_2;

— les technologies nouvelles (motorisations électriques, hybrides, allègement, etc.) ne peuvent démontrer indiscutablement leur intérêt et sont donc invendables, alors même qu'elles se développent en Europe et pourraient représenter tant un gain pour l'environnement, qu'un gain économique pour les entreprises qui les développent;

— les utilisateurs finaux ne peuvent dès lors pas comparer diverses offres de véhicules, ni intégrer le coût de la consommation sur un cycle de vie;

— le potentiel important de réduction des émissions de CO_2 dans le secteur du transport, pourtant reconnu, reste inutilisé.

1. Est-il dans les plans de la Commission d'envisager une proposition législative afin de mettre en place un système de mesure permettant de comparer les performances des véhicules lourds, obligeant les constructeurs à publier ces informations pour que les clients puissent faire leur choix en toute connaissance de cause?

2. Si tel n'est pas le cas, la Commission pourrait-elle se pencher sur la question à court terme?

Réponse donnée par Mme Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(6 mars 2014)

Les véhicules utilitaires lourds contribuent à environ 5 % des émissions de gaz à effet de serre dans l'UE et à environ 25 % des émissions liées au transport routier. Il n'existe actuellement aucune méthode officielle dans l'UE visant à mesurer, enregistrer et communiquer la consommation de carburant des véhicules utilitaires lourds et leurs émissions de CO_2. Du fait de ce manque de transparence sur le marché des poids lourds, il est difficile pour les acheteurs potentiels de comparer les véhicules de constructeurs différents.

La Commission compte présenter, dans les mois à venir, une stratégie pour s'attaquer aux émissions de CO_2 imputables aux véhicules utilitaires lourds. L'objectif prioritaire sera de remédier à ce manque de transparence, une étape nécessaire avant de pouvoir envisager toute mesure complémentaire. C'est pourquoi la Commission est en train de mettre au point, en coopération avec le secteur, une méthode permettant de déterminer la part des émissions de CO_2 des véhicules lourds à l'aide d'un procédé de simulation informatique. Un rapport ([1]) publié par le Centre commun de recherche montre des similitudes prometteuses entre la consommation de carburant simulée et la consommation réelle des véhicules lourds, ainsi qu'entre les émissions de CO_2 simulées et réelles.

Ce procédé de simulation, s'il se révélait fructueux, permettrait à la Commission de mesurer et de rendre publique la quantité d'émissions de CO_2 produite par les véhicules utilitaires lourds.

([1]) http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/111111111/30495

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000262/14
to the Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Methods of calculating the fuel consumption and CO_2 emissions of heavy vehicles in Europe

Heavy vehicles (lorries, buses, coaches) contribute significantly to the volume of transport-related CO_2 emissions.

However, unlike for cars, there is no standard method in use in Europe for measuring the fuel consumption or emissions of heavy vehicles per kilometre travelled: at present only their engine is rated on the test bed, without taking into account transmission efficiency, the overall weight of the vehicle, aerodynamics, ancillary systems, etc.

Countries in other parts of the world have developed appropriate testing methods, however.

As a result:

— manufacturers are under no pressure to produce more energy-efficient vehicles which emit less CO_2;

— new technologies (electric motors, hybrids, lightweighting, etc.) do not sell, because consumers are not convinced of their advantages, even though they are being developed in Europe and could both reduce pollution and boost manufacturers' profits;

— end users do not have a wide enough range of vehicles to choose from and cannot calculate a vehicle's fuel costs over its lifetime;

— the acknowledged, and considerable, scope for reducing CO_2 emissions in the transport sector is not being exploited.

1. Does the Commission plan to propose legislation introducing a measurement system which can be used to compare the performance of heavy vehicles and require manufacturers to publish this information, so that vehicle buyers can make a fully informed choice?

2. If not, will the Commission address this issue in the near future?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

Heavy Duty Vehicles (HDVs) contribute some 5% of total EU greenhouse gas emissions, and about a quarter of road transport emissions. There is currently no official method in the EU for measuring, registering, and reporting HDV fuel consumption and CO_2 emissions, which leads to a lack of transparency in the market, and makes it difficult for prospective HDV purchasers to compare vehicles from different manufacturers.

The Commission intends to present, in the coming months, a strategy to address HDV CO_2 emissions. The key priority will be to reduce this lack of transparency which is a necessary step before any further action can be envisaged. In view of this, and in cooperation with industry, the Commission is developing a methodology to establish HDV CO_2 emissions using a computer based simulation methodology. A report ([1]) issued by the Joint Recent Centre shows promising similarities between the simulated and actual HDV fuel consumption and CO_2 figures.

A successful development of this simulation methodology would allow the Commission to measure and report HDV CO_2 emissions.

([1]) http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/111111111/30495

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000263/14
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(13 januari 2014)

Betreft: Erdoğan wil gemengde studentenhuizen verbieden (vervolgvraag)

De Turkse premier Erdoğan wil gemengde studentenhuizen verbieden, omdat zij „niet conform zijn conservatieve opvatting van democratie" zouden zijn. Erdoğan wil dergelijke huizen, maar ook privéwoningen waar studenten wonen, bovendien door de staat laten controleren. In Istanbul vonden reeds de eerste controles plaats. Op 5 november 2013 is een woning van een studente door dertig agenten doorzocht — zonder daarbij een huisdoorzoekingsbevel te laten zien ([1]).

Op 8 januari 2014 heeft de heer Füle namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-012984/2013 over voornoemde kwestie. Daarin schrijft hij: „De Commissie wijst op een cruciaal aspect van het recente democratiseringspakket dat eerste minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan aankondigde, namelijk de bescherming van de levenswijze en de persoonlijke keuzes van elke burger. De Commissie sluit zich van harte aan bij deze visie. In dit specifieke geval moeten de studenten en hun familie deze keuze zelf kunnen maken."

1. Is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte dat het door haar aangehaalde democratiseringspakket ([2]), waaraan zij in deze kwestie haar „hoop op verbetering" ontleent, stamt van 30 september 2013 en dat het verbod op gemengde studentenhuizen en de daarmee gepaard gaande controles door de staat daarná zijn doorgevoerd? Deelt de Commissie dientengevolge de mening dat zij haar standpunt in dezen niet op vermeend positieve gevolgen van genoemd democratiseringspakket kán baseren, respectievelijk dat dit pakket in werkelijkheid een grote farce is?

2. Hoe ervaart de Commissie het dat de dikwijls door haar geuite gewenste scenario's — zoals in dit geval de opvatting dat studenten en hun familie de keus voor een al dan niet gemengd studentenhuis zélf moeten kunnen maken — nooit, werkelijk nóóit realiteit worden, omdat Turkije hier simpelweg geen oren naar heeft? Hoe ervaart de Commissie het dat Turkije eenvoudigweg niet wíl, niet kán en niet zál hervormen? Wanneer komt de Commissie tot de conclusie dat Turkije nooit en te nimmer EU-lid moet worden?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(28 februari 2014)

De Commissie herinnert eraan dat in dit specifieke geval de keuze moet berusten bij de studenten en hun familie. Deze kwestie moet door de Turkse samenleving worden opgelost op basis van een inclusief overlegproces waarbij de opvattingen van alle betrokkenen aan bod komen.

De Commissie verwijst tevens naar de lopende toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije die ook de door het geachte Parlementslid opgeworpen kwesties bestrijken. Deze toetredingsonderhandelingen werden geopend na een unaniem advies van de EU-lidstaten in 2005 en worden gevoerd overeenkomstig het onderhandelingskader van 3 oktober 2005. De Commissie brengt jaarlijks in detail verslag uit bij de lidstaten en het Europees Parlement over de vooruitgang van Turkije met de invulling van de toetredingscriteria en over blijvende punten van zorg. Deze punten van zorg worden waar nodig regelmatig ter sprake gebracht in vergaderingen op alle niveaus met de Turkse autoriteiten.

([1]) http://www.welt.de/politik/ausland/article121738893/Erdogans-Angst-vor-dem-Sex-in-Studenten-WGs.html
([2]) http://www.akparti.org.tr/english/haberler/democratization-and-human-rights-package/52628.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000263/14
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Erdoğan wants to ban mixed student residences (follow-up question)

Prime Minister Erdoğan of Turkey wishes to prohibit mixed student residences because they 'do not conform to his conservative notion of democracy'. In addition, Erdoğan wants to have not only these residences but also private accommodation where students live monitored by the State. The first inspections have already taken place in Istanbul. On 5 November 2013, 30 police officers conducted a search of a female student's apartment without showing a search warrant ([1]).

On 8 January 2014, Mr Füle, on behalf of the Commission, answered Written Question E-012984/2013 concerning the above matter. In his reply, he wrote: 'The Commission recalls that a core element of the recent democratisation package announced by Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan was the protection of the lifestyles and private choices of every citizen, and this is a position which the Commission wholeheartedly welcomes. The choice in this particular case should be for the students and their families to exercise.'

1. Is the Commission aware that the democratisation package ([2]) to which it refers and from which it derives its 'hope for improvement' dates from 30 September 2013 and that the ban on mixed student residences and the associated State inspections postdate it? Does the Commission therefore agree that it cannot possibly base its position regarding the matter on the allegedly positive impact of that democratisation package, and/or that the package is in reality an enormous farce?

2. Would the Commission like to comment on the fact that the desirable scenarios which it often mentions — such as in this case the view that students and their families must themselves be free to decide for themselves whether or not a student should live in a mixed residence — never, but never, become reality because Turkey is simply not prepared to countenance them? What view does the Commission take of the fact that Turkey simply does not want to reform, cannot do so and never will? When will the Commission reach the conclusion that Turkey should never ever join the EU?

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

The Commission recalls that the choice in this particular case should be for the students and their families to exercise. This is an issue which Turkish society needs to solve on the basis of an inclusive consultation process integrating the views of all stakeholders concerned.

The Commission also refers to the ongoing accession negotiations with Turkey which also cover the subjects mentioned by the Honourable Member. These accession negotiations were opened upon unanimous decision of the EU Member States in 2005 and are carried out in line with the Negotiating Framework of 3 October 2005. The Commission reports yearly in detail to the Member States and the European Parliament on progress in Turkey's fulfilling of the criteria for accession and on persisting concerns. These concerns are brought up in regular meetings at all levels with the Turkish authorities as appropriate.

([1]) http://www.welt.de/politik/ausland/article121738893/Erdogans-Angst-vor-dem-Sex-in-Studenten-WGs.html
([2]) http://www.akparti.org.tr/english/haberler/democratization-and-human-rights-package/52628

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-000264/14
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(13. tammikuuta 2014)

Aihe: Villieläinten pannoittamiskäytännöt

Villieläinten pannoituksen avulla voidaan hankkia arvokasta tietoa niiden elintavoista ja käyttäytymisestä. Pannoittamiskäytännöista saatavilla oleva tieto on kuitenkin ristiriitaista ja puutteellista. Eri maitten noudattamat käytännöt myös poikkeavat toisistaan.

Onko olemassa kansainvälisiä sopimuksia, jotka määrittelevät villieläinten pannoittamisen hyväksyttävät tai suositeltavat käytännöt?

Onko villieläinten pantatutkimusten toteuttaminen kansallisten toimijoiden käsissä vai koordinoiko ja valvooko EU tätä toimintaa?

Onko komissiolla suunnitelmia villieläinten pannoittamista koskevan tiedon saatavuuden parantamiseksi?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(3. maaliskuuta 2014)

Komissio panee tyytyväisenä merkille villieläinten pannoittamista koskevat tieteelliset aloitteet, joilla tuetaan lajien suojeluohjelmia ja jotka vastaavat EU:n luonnonsuojelulainsäädännön vaatimuksia, mutta se ei itse osallistu kyseisten aloitteiden kehittämiseen tai toteuttamiseen.

Jäsenvaltioiden toimivaltaisten viranomaisten tehtävänä on varmistaa, että kaikki tällaiset ohjelmat ovat asiaa koskevan lainsäädännön mukaisia. Eri asiantuntijafoorumit ja -tahot, kuten Euroopan lintujen rengastusohjelmien koordinointijärjestö EURING ([1]), tukevat ja edistävät tietoisuutta erilaisista pannoittamiskäytännöistä.

Komissiolla ei ole suunnitelmia villieläinten pannoittamista koskevan tiedon saatavuuden parantamiseksi.

([1]) http://www.euring.org/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000264/14
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Tagging of wild animals

Tagging wild animals makes it possible to obtain valuable information about their habits and behaviour. However, the information available about tagging practices is contradictory and inadequate. The practices adhered to also differ between countries.

Are there any international agreements determining what practices are approved or recommended for tagging wild animals?

Is research by means of wild animal tracking collars controlled at national level or does the EU coordinate and supervise this activity?

Does the Commission have any plans for improving the availability of information concerning tagging of wild animals?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(3 March 2014)

The Commission welcomes scientific initiatives for the tagging of wild animals, that support species conservation programmes and are in line with the protection requirements of EU nature legislation, but it is not involved in their development or operation.

It is the responsibility of the competent authorities in the Member States to ensure that any such schemes are in accordance with applicable legislation. Different expert forums and bodies such as EURING ([1]), the coordinating organisation for European bird-ringing schemes, assist with and promote awareness about the different tagging schemes.

The Commission has no plans to improve availability of information on the tagging of wild animals.

([1]) http://www.euring.org/index.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000265/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(13 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Primer puesto de España en el ranking de desempleo juvenil de la UE en 2014

Según los datos estadísticos publicados por Eurostat el pasado 8 de enero, España vuelve a situarse a la cabeza en destrucción de empleo, y muy especialmente la juventud del país, que parece estar sufriendo de una manera focalizada los efectos de la crisis financiera.

La Comisión Europea ha alabado y felicitado, en repetidas ocasiones, el trabajo del Gobierno de España por la acelerada implementación de las reformas que les habían sido «recomendadas» desde Bruselas. Sin embargo, detrás de estas reformas llevadas a cabo por el ejecutivo de Rajoy se encuentra la evidencia de la dramática destrucción del empleo que se encarna en una tasa de desempleo juvenil que alcanza el 57,7 % de los jóvenes españoles, situando a España a la cabeza de la Unión Europea en este indicador. La Comisión Europea, a través de sus recomendaciones a España, es la institución que ha decidido cargar sobre los hombros de la población juvenil española el peso de la crisis que atraviesa el país. La elaboración de recomendaciones en materia de política económica implica la asunción de la responsabilidad por sus consecuencias sociales, que no han sido tenidas en cuenta a la hora de elaborarlas.

Esta situación de dramático desempleo juvenil está produciendo flujos de migración masiva de jóvenes españoles hacia otros Estados miembros de la Unión Europea. La tasa de desempleo juvenil media de la eurozona es del 12,1 %, y del 10,1 % para el total de la Unión. Esto refleja cómo el Gobierno de España, en plena connivencia con la Comisión Europea, está emprendiendo una ofensiva contra la población juvenil española para que se vea forzada a abandonar el país en busca de un empleo.

¿Conoce la Comisión los recientes datos del desempleo juvenil en España?

¿Considera que sus recomendaciones en materia de empleo, tales como las reformas laborales implementadas, pueden estar detrás del elevado crecimiento del desempleo juvenil? ¿Considera que las medidas aprobadas por la Unión Europea para el fomento del empleo en los países del sur de Europa son suficientes para atender las necesidades del 57,7 % de los jóvenes españoles?

¿Piensa retractarse de sus recomendaciones en materia de empleo y recomendar otro tipo de políticas al ejecutivo de Rajoy? ¿Está desarrollando algún tipo de política para la inclusión de los jóvenes españoles que están abandonando su país para encontrar trabajo en otros Estados miembros?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión sigue de cerca cada día la situación del mercado de trabajo español y es consciente de la tasa muy importante de desempleo juvenil. Sin embargo, también debe reconocerse la evolución positiva que reflejan las cifras del instituto español de estadística para el mes de diciembre ([1]) en relación con el desempleo juvenile.

Las recomendaciones específicas por país (REP) dirigidas a España por el Consejo en 2013 relativas al empleo señalaban un amplio conjunto de medidas que deben adoptarse. Las REP pedían específicamente que se reformaran las políticas activas del mercado de trabajo y que se reforzara la pertinencia de la educación y la formación para el mercado de trabajo.

En 2103, la Comisión adoptó varias iniciativas políticas, algunas de las cuales fueron aprobadas por el Consejo, para luchar contra el desempleo y especialmente contra el desempleo juvenil. Entre ellas, está la Recomendación del Consejo sobre el establecimiento de la Garantía Juvenil, la Comunicación «Trabajar juntos por los jóvenes europeos», la Alianza Europea para la Formación de Aprendices y el marco de calidad para los periodos de prácticas ([2]).

Además de estas iniciativas, el Consejo Europeo adoptó la Iniciativa sobre Empleo Juvenil con una financiación total de 6 000 millones EUR. En el marco de esta Iniciativa se han asignado a España 943 millones EUR a precios corrientes, que se completarán con la misma cantidad procedente del Fondo Social Europeo.

Por último, en el marco del procedimiento del Semestre Europeo 2014, la Comisión sigue de cerca las REP para España, incluida la mencionada anteriormente, y presentará su análisis en los próximos meses.

([1]) En el tercer trimestre de 2013, el desempleo juvenil (16-29) afectaba a 54 000 jóvenes menos que en el trimestre anterior: véase INE 2014, Encuesta de Población Activa, Cuarto trimestre, en: http://www.ine.es/daco/daco42/daco4211/epa0413.pdf

([2]) Véase http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1036

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000265/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Spain top of the EU youth unemployment table in 2014

Eurostat statistics published on 8 January 2014 once again place Spain, and especially her young people, at the top of the table for job losses. The effects of the financial crisis seem to be hitting Spain's youth in particular.

The Commission has praised and congratulated the Spanish Government on many occasions on its speedy implementation of the reforms 'recommended' by Brussels. However, behind these reforms brought in by Rajoy's government can be seen job losses of dramatic proportions which are personified by Spain's youth unemployment rate of 57.7%, the highest in the European Union. It was the Commission, through the recommendations it made to Spain, which decided to place the weight of the crisis the country is going through on the shoulders of Spain's young people. Drawing up recommendations on economic policy entails accepting responsibility for their social consequences, but the latter were not taken into account when these recommendations were drawn up.

These dire levels of youth unemployment are causing young Spaniards to migrate in huge numbers to other EU Member States. The average youth unemployment rate in the euro area stands at 12.1%, while the overall rate for the whole EU is 10.1%. This reflects how the Spanish Government, with the full connivance of the Commission, is embarking on an offensive to force Spain's young people to leave the country in search of work.

Is the Commission aware of the recent figures for youth unemployment in Spain?

Does it consider that its recommendations on employment, such as the labour reforms that have been implemented, may be behind the high rise in youth unemployment?

Does it believe that the measures approved by the European Union to boost employment in the southern EU countries are sufficient to meet the needs of this 57.7% of young Spaniards?

Is it thinking of withdrawing its recommendations on employment and recommending policies of another kind to the Rajoy government? Is it developing a policy to include young Spaniards who are leaving their country to find work in other Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The Commission is following the developments on the Spanish labour market on a daily basis and is aware of the very high youth unemployment rate there. Nonetheless, the positive developments highlighted by the Spanish statistical institute's December figures ([1]) for unemployment among young people also need acknowledging.

The Country-Specific Recommendations (CSR) addressed to Spain in 2013 by the Council related to employment indicated a comprehensive set of measures to be adopted. The CSR asked specifically for a reform in the Active Labour Market Policies and also to increase the labour market relevance of education and training.

In 2013 the Commission took various policy initiatives, some of which were endorsed by the Council, to fight against unemployment and especially youth unemployment. These include the Council Recommendation on establishing a Youth Guarantee, the communication 'Working together for Europe's young people', the European Alliance for Apprenticeships and the Quality Framework for Traineeships ([2]).

In addition to those initiatives, the European Council adopted the Youth Employment Initiative with total funding of EUR 6 billion. Under the latter Spain has an allocation of EUR 943 million at current prices, to be supplemented by at least the same amount from the European Social Fund.

Lastly, under the 2014 European Semester procedure the Commission is closely monitoring the implementation of Spain's CSR, including the one mentioned above, and will present its analysis in the coming months.

([1]) Youth unemployment (16-29) in the third quarter of 2013 was almost 54 000 down on the previous quarter: see INE 2014, Encuesta de Población Activa, Cuarto trimestre 2013, at: http://www.ine.es/daco/daco42/daco4211/epa0413.pdf

([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1036

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000267/14
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Zero per cent VAT on new community halls

It has been brought to my attention that the Commission's review of VAT treatment of public bodies and exemptions in the public interest contains a proposal to remove the 0% VAT on the construction of new community halls.

In my constituency, a community cooperative and a charity have spent several years making sure that a new community centre gets the go-ahead. To now have to raise an additional sum in the region of GBP 150 000 would render the project unfeasible.

The community hall is intended as a community building, owned by the community for the benefit of the community and staffed by volunteers. In light of this, does the Commission intend to proceed with the removal of the 0% VAT rate on the construction of new halls? If so, can the Commission confirm when this is likely to take place and whether any legislation will affect current projects which have already been started?

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

European VAT law does not generally provide for a zero rate for the construction of community halls unless a Member State was granting such a zero rate at 1 January 1991; in this case a Member State may continue to grant such a rate on the basis of Article 110 of the VAT Directive. The Commission's review of the VAT treatment of public bodies and the exemptions in the public interest which is currently being carried out does not focus on this provision.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000268/14
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(13 January 2014)

Subject: Monarch Airlines

It has come to my attention in a case involving one of my constituents that Monarch Airlines are not acting in compliance with Article 14(2) of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 or the ruling in the Wallentin-Hermann case (2009). I understand that airlines are relying on the 'exceptional circumstances' clause of the regulation, which states that 'obligations on operating air carriers should be limited or excluded in cases where an event has been caused by extraordinary circumstances which could not have been avoided even if all reasonable measures had been taken. Such circumstances may, in particular, occur in cases of political instability, meteorological conditions incompatible with the operation of the flight concerned, security risks, unexpected flight safety shortcomings and strikes that affect the operation of an operating air carrier.'

I understand that, in order to invoke this clause, airlines should, under Article 14(2), detail the exact nature of the mechanical problem in question. In the case in question, however, the airline did not comply with this requirement. This failure may constitute a breach of Section 3 of the Fraud Act 2006, on grounds of misrepresentation.

It has also come to my attention that the practice is employed by other airlines. In light of this, does the Commission have any plans to urge civil aviation authorities to put pressure on airlines to comply with all aspects of the above regulation?

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

Article 14(2) of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 obliges air carriers to provide passengers with a summary of their rights in case of denied boarding, cancellation or delay at departure. It does not impose a specific obligation on the airline to provide passengers with a written statement on the reasons for the flight disruption.However the burden of proof lies with the air carrier according to Article 5(3) of the regulation when extraordinary circumstances are invoked.

In a recent meeting held by the Commission with the national enforcement bodies (NEB), it was agreed that NEBs would request a substantiated statement each time carriers invoke extraordinary circumstances in order not to pay compensation.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-000270/14
a la Comisión
Carmen Romero López (S&D)
(14 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Desarrollo y fondos URBAN

¿Cuál es el grado de ejecución y financiación europea de los fondos URBAN para fomento de un desarrollo urbano más sostenible en cada uno de los municipios españoles de entre 20 000 y 50 000 habitantes de cada una de las comunidades autónomas que se acogieron a estas ayudas en el Marco Comunitario de Apoyo 2007-2013?

¿Cuál es la cuantía económica certificada por España y abonada por los fondos comunitarios a cada uno de los municipios españoles de entre 20 000 y 50 000 habitantes de cada una de las comunidades autónomas que se acogieron al programa URBAN II de los Fondos de Desarrollo Regional del Marco Comunitario de Apoyo 2007-2013?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de febrero de 2014)

Su Señoría encontrará en el anexo la información solicitada. Los datos están divididos por regiones y municipios de veinte mil a cincuenta mil habitantes y se refieren únicamente al Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER).

Por lo que se refiere a los fondos de la UE percibidos por cada municipio de veinte mil a cincuenta mil habitantes en el marco de URBAN II y conforme al FEDER 2007-2013, la Comisión desea aclarar que URBAN II pertenecía al período 2000-2006 y que los únicos municipios beneficiarios eran los de más de cincuenta mil habitantes.

La información ha sido facilitada por la autoridad de gestión, que es la única que dispone de datos de ejecución con este nivel de detalle.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000270/14
to the Commission
Carmen Romero López (S&D)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Development and the URBAN funds

Could the Commission provide figures for the implementation of EU funding to promote more sustainable urban development, in municipalities of between 20 000 and 50 000 inhabitants, granted by the URBAN funds to each of the autonomous communities in Spain which benefited from this assistance under the Community support framework 2007-2013?

What is the figure for funds certified by Spain and paid from EU funds to each municipality of between 20 000 and 50 000 inhabitants in each of the autonomous communities in Spain which benefited from the URBAN II Programme under the 2007-2013 Community support framework's Regional Development Fund?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(17 February 2014)

The Honourable Member will find in the annex the information requested. The data is divided by region and municipalities between 20 000 and 50 000 inhabitants and concerns the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) only.

Regarding EU funds paid to each municipality of between 20 000 and 50 000 inhabitants in the framework of URBAN II under 2007-2013 ERDF, the Commission would clarify that URBAN II belonged to the 2000-2006 period and the only beneficiary municipalities had more than 50 000 inhabitants.

The information has been provided by the managing authority, as only they hold this level of detail of implementation data.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000271/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(14 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Declaraciones de Catherine Ashton ante la muerte de Ariel Sharon

El pasado 11 de enero, la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante de la Unión Europea, Catherine Ashton, publicó un comunicado ante la muerte del antiguo Primer Ministro israelí Ariel Sharon. Dicho comunicado no contenía condena alguna a las masacres de Sabra y Chatila ni a las continuas ofensivas que el mismo realizó sobre la población palestina durante su vida, tanto en su carrera militar como en la política.

En 1982, durante la guerra del Líbano, se perpetró la masacre de Sabra y Chatila, que ha sido calificada como genocidio por las Naciones Unidas en su Resolución 37/123. Según una comisión de investigación del propio Estado israelí, las Fuerzas de Defensa de Israel fueron indirectamente responsables de dicho genocidio al no haber evitado las matanzas. Ariel Sharon, Ministro de Defensa de Israel durante el citado conflicto era el máximo responsable de las fuerzas israelíes y, por tanto, colaborador necesario en la masacre de Sabra y Chatila.

Según testimonios documentados, el propio Sharon incitó a las milicias falangistas a perpetrar el genocidio. Durante casi 48 horas, esta milicia, asesinó, torturó y violó. El ejército israelí permitió y colaboró, llegando a iluminar los campamentos durante la noche para facilitar que las milicias falangistas masacraran a las 2 500 víctimas registradas hasta el momento. Lamentar la muerte de Ariel Sharon supone emplear las instituciones europeas para enaltecer su figura, lo cual podría ser considerado como «apología pública» o «trivialización flagrante», según los estipulado en la Decisión Marco 2008/913/JAI.

¿Considera que tal declaración podría poner en entredicho el compromiso internacional de la UE con los derechos humanos?, ¿se retracta la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante de su declaración ante la muerte de Ariel Sharon?

¿Considera que dicha declaración podría suponer un acto de enaltecimiento del reconocido genocidio de Sabra y Chatila según lo dispuesto en la Decisión Marco 2008/913/JAI?

Ante la muerte de Ariel Sharon, ¿dirige alguna palabra a los familiares de las víctimas palestinas del genocidio de Sabra y Chatila, ocurrido bajo sus órdenes, que han visto cómo los verdugos siguen impunes?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de marzo de 2014)

Mediante una declaración hecha el 11 de enero de 2014, la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta dio el pésame a la familia, el pueblo y el Gobierno de Israel tras el fallecimiento de Ariel Sharon, antiguo Primer Ministro de Israel.

La UE reaccionó adecuadamente ante los terribles sucesos de Sabra y Shatila.

La citada declaración no puede considerarse una aprobación de esos terribles sucesos ni pone en entredicho el compromiso de la UE con los derechos humanos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000271/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Statement by Catherine Ashton on the death of Ariel Sharon

On 11 January 2014, the Vice-President of the European Commission/High Representative of the European Union, Catherine Ashton, published a press release on the death of the former Israeli Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon. This statement did not contain any condemnation whatsoever with regard to the Sabra and Shatila massacre or the continuous offensives that he carried out on the Palestinian people over the course of his life, during both his military and political career.

The Sabra and Shatila massacre was perpetrated in 1982, during the Lebanese Civil War, and was described as an act of genocide by the United Nations in Resolution No 37/123. A committee of enquiry set up by the Israeli government itself found that the Israel Defence Forces were indirectly responsible for this genocide as they did not prevent the slaughter. Ariel Sharon, who was Israel's Minister of Defence at the time of this conflict, held ultimate responsibility for the Israeli forces and, therefore, was necessarily a collaborator in the Sabra and Shatila massacre.

According to documented evidence, Sharon himself incited the Phalangist militias to perpetrate the genocide; for almost 48 hours, these militias murdered, tortured and raped their victims. The Israeli army allowed and colluded in this, by illuminating the night sky over the camps and thus helping the Phalangist militias to massacre the 2500 victims who are hitherto known to have died. To mourn the death of Ariel Sharon would be tantamount to using the European institutions to exalt him, which could be considered as 'publicly condoning' or 'grossly trivialising' the genocide, under the wording of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA.

Does the Commission consider that such a statement could call into question the EU's international commitment to human rights? Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to withdraw her statement on the death of Ariel Sharon?

Is the Commission of the opinion that this statement could imply an act of exalting the acknowledged Sabra and Shatila genocide under the provisions of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA?

On the death of Ariel Sharon, does the Commission have any comment for the relatives of the Palestinian victims of the Sabra and Shatila genocide, which occurred under Sharon's orders, as they have seen that the executioners continue to go unpunished?

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

The HR/VP issued a statement on 11 January 2014 on the death of Ariel Sharon conveying the HR/VP condolences to the family, the people and the government of Israel following the death of former Israel Prime Minister Ariel Sharon.

The EU reacted adequately to the terrible events of Sabra and Shatila.

The abovementioned statement cannot be regarded as condoning the terrible events in Sabra and Shatila or putting into question the EU's well known commitment to human rights.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000273/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Contaminación en el lago de Sanabria

Ante mi inquietud sobre diversos informes que aludían al riesgo de contaminación en un espacio singular y protegido como es el del lago de Sanabria a causa del defectuoso funcionamiento de una depuradora, en concreto la de Galende (E-012511/2013), me acaba de responder la Comisión que no ha recibido información alguna de las autoridades españolas.

Con anterioridad ya había trasladado a la Comisión mi preocupación por la calidad de las aguas en otro espacio protegido como es el de los Picos de Europa, donde también se investigó el correcto funcionamiento de las estaciones de depuración de aguas residuales (E-005334/2010).

1. ¿Preguntará la Comisión a las autoridades responsables sobre los datos que tienen del correcto funcionamiento de la depuradora de Galende que vierte al lago de Sanabria?

2. ¿Puede precisarme la Comisión qué información posee de la calidad de las aguas en los Picos de Europa y del funcionamiento de las depuradoras de esa zona, que fueron objeto de mi pregunta E-005334/2010?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de marzo de 2014)

La información presentada por España en el informe del último ejercicio acerca de la aplicación de la Directiva sobre el tratamiento de las aguas residuales urbanas ([1]) no alude específicamente al municipio de Galende ni al tratamiento que se da a las aguas residuales del mismo. Según el Instituto Nacional de Estadística, ese municipio tiene una población censada inferior a 1 500 habitantes. Si genera una carga de aguas residuales inferior a la de 2 000 equivalentes habitante, son pocas las obligaciones de la Directiva aplicables.

En cualquier caso, el Procurador del Común de Castilla y León está investigando este caso y, en vista de ello, la Comisión no considera apropiado intervenir en este momento.

En cuanto al tratamiento de las aguas residuales en los Picos de Europa, la Comisión investigó la situación nuevamente en 2011 y llegó a la conclusión de que no existían indicios de infracción de la legislación de la UE. El denunciante fue informado de los resultados de la evaluación de la Comisión y se archivó el expediente.

([1]) Directiva 91/271/CEE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000273/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Pollution in Sanabria Lake

In response to my concerns regarding various reports that touch on the risk of pollution in such an exceptional and protected natural area as Sanabria Lake due to the malfunctioning of a treatment system, specifically the Galende treatment plant (E-012511/2013), the Commission has stated that it has not received any information whatsoever from the Spanish authorities.

I have previously voiced my concerns to the Commission over the water quality in another protected area, Picos de Europa, where the proper functioning of the waste water treatment plants was also under investigation (E-005334/2010).

1. Will the Commission ask the Spanish authorities about the information they have on the proper functioning of the Galende water treatment plant that empties into the Sanabria Lake?

2. Could the Commission please clarify what information it has regarding the water quality in Picos de Europa and the functioning of the water treatment plants in the area, which were the subject of my Question E-005334/2010?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The information submitted by Spain within the last reporting exercise on the implementation of the directive concerning urban waste water treatment, ([1]) does not refer specifically to the agglomeration of Galende or the treatment provided to the waste water generated by this agglomeration. According to the Spanish Statistical Office, the population registered in this community is below 1500 inhabitants. If the agglomeration generates a waste water load of less than 2 000 person equivalent, few obligations laid down by the directive would be applicable.

In any case, it appears that an investigation concerning this particular case is currently being carried out by the regional Ombudsman. In light of the current investigations, the Commission does not deem it appropriate to act at this stage.

As regards the treatment of waste water in the area of Picos de Europa referred to by the Honourable Member, the Commission investigated the situation further in 2011 and concluded that there was no evidence of an infringement of the EU legislation. The complainer was informed of the results of the assessment carried out by the Commission and the file was closed.

([1]) Directive 91/271/EEC.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000275/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Repregunta sobre la discriminación lingüística en la contratación pública

La Comisión Europea me anunció la apertura de una investigación al hilo de varias preguntas que le había trasladado sobre las discriminaciones que se estaban produciendo en convocatorias de contratos públicos (preguntas E-009021/2012, E-011105/2012 y E-001045/2013). Dentro de unos días se cumplirá un año desde que la Comisión me contestó que «los hechos que relata su Señoría en las preguntas escritas que formula merecen ser examinados más en detalle a la luz de los objetivos de la mencionada disposición. En consecuencia, se propone iniciar una investigación con el fin de hacer una evaluación fáctica y jurídica de la práctica administrativa a que se refiere Su Señoría. Si fuera preciso, la Comisión Europea adoptará las medidas necesarias para lograr que las prácticas administrativas de los poderes adjudicadores se adecuen a la normativa de la UE sobre contratación pública».

Por ello, ¿puede indicar la Comisión si inició la investigación anunciada? ¿Qué trámites se han realizado? ¿Ha propuesto la Comisión alguna medida concreta para garantizar que no se quiebre una mínima igualdad de los empresarios en esos contratos públicos?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de febrero de 2014)

La Comisión comunicó a Su Señoría en la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-012296/2013, publicada el 7 de enero de 2014 ([1]), que se mantiene en contacto con las autoridades españolas a fin de aclarar la situación de hecho y de derecho en relación con la supuesta práctica de la Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa de excluir de los procedimientos de licitación de obras y servicios públicos a las empresas que no sean capaces de demostrar que sus empleados y su personal directivo tienen un excelente dominio de la lengua vasca. La investigación de los servicios de la Comisión sigue en curso.

Por lo tanto, la Comisión puede confirmar que se informará a su Señoría de cualquier novedad que se produzca en el primer semestre de 2014.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-012296&language=ES

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000275/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Follow-up question on linguistic discrimination in public procurement

The European Commission informed me that an investigation would be launched in the light of various questions I had put to it regarding cases of discrimination in tendering procedures for public contracts (questions E-009021/2012, E-011105/2012 and E-001045/2013). In a few days' time it will be a year since the Commission replied to me that 'The facts presented by the Honourable Member in his written questions need to be investigated further in the light of the objectives of the provision referred to. It is proposed, therefore, to launch an investigation to undertake a legal and factual assessment of the administrative practice to which the Honourable Member refers. If need be, the European Commission will take the necessary steps to ensure that the administrative practices of the contracting authorities comply with EU public procurement law'.

Could the Commission therefore say whether it has initiated the investigation that it announced? What steps have been taken? Has the Commission proposed any concrete measures to ensure that a minimum level of equality is maintained among the entrepreneurs taking part in these public procurement contracts?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(24 February 2014)

The Commission informed the Honourable Member in the context of the reply to the Written Question E-012296/2013 published on 7 January 2014 ([1]) that the Commission is currently in contact with the Spanish authorities to clarify the factual and legal situation related to the alleged practice of the Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa to exclude from tendering procedures for public works and services companies when they would be unable to provide evidence that their employees and/or their management staff have an excellent command of the Basque language. At this stage the investigation by the Commission services is still on-going.

The Commission can therefore confirm that the Honourable Member will be provided with an update of the latest developments in the first half of 2014.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-012296&language=EN

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000280/14
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Dienstfahrzeuge der Kommission

Wie viele Dienstfahrzeuge wurden in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils von der Kommission angeschafft, und wie hoch lagen die diesbezüglichen Kosten?

Über wie viele Dienstfahrzeuge (letzter verfügbarer Stand) verfügt die Kommission, und wie hoch waren die damit verbundenen Aufwendungen jeweils in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 und 2013?

Wie viele Chauffeure beschäftigt die Kommission, und wie hoch waren die Aufwendungen insgesamt für geleistete Chauffeurdienste jeweils in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 und 2013?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(24. Februar 2014)

Die Kommission hat seit 2009 keine Fahrzeuge gekauft.

Sie besitzt kein einziges Dienstfahrzeug. Sie nutzt Dienstfahrzeuge auf der Grundlage langfristiger Leasing-Verträge.

Sie beschäftigt 80 Chauffeure, die in der Regel als Vertragsbedienstete der Funktionsgruppe I eingestellt werden und deren Gehalt in Artikel 93 der Beschäftigungsbedingungen für die sonstigen Bediensteten der Europäischen Union ([1]) festgelegt ist.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1962R0031:20140101:DE:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000280/14
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Official cars of the Commission

How many official cars were purchased by the Commission in each of the years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 and what were the costs associated with these purchases?

How many official cars (most recent available figure) does the Commission have in its possession and what was the expenditure associated with these vehicles in each of the years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013?

How many chauffeurs are employed by the Commission and what was the total expenditure for chauffeur services rendered during each of the years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(24 February 2014)

The Commission has not purchased any vehicles since 2009.

The Commission has no car in its possession. It uses cars on the basis of long term leases.

The Commission has 80 chauffeurs. They are in principle recruited as contract staff Function Group I with salaries as provided for in Art 93 of the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the EU ([1]).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1962R0031:20140101:EN:PDF

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000281/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Dienstfahrzeuge des Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienstes (EAD)

Wie viele Dienstfahrzeuge wurden in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils vom EAD angeschafft, und wie hoch waren die diesbezüglichen Kosten?

Über wie viele Dienstfahrzeuge (letzter verfügbarer Stand) verfügt der EAD, und wie hoch waren die damit verbundenen Aufwendungen jeweils in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013?

Wie viele Chauffeure beschäftigt der EAD, und wie hoch waren die Aufwendungen insgesamt für geleistete Chauffeurdienste jeweils in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(7. März 2014)

1) Im Jahr 2011 hat der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst 41 Fahrzeuge erworben, im Jahr 2012 waren es 47 und im Jahr 2013 57. Die Kosten hierfür beliefen sich 2011 auf 1 141 600 EUR, 2012 auf 1 265 698 EUR und 2013 auf 1 487 860 EUR. Die Fahrzeuge werden in der Regel alle 7 Jahre ersetzt.

2) In Brüssel gibt es keinen EAD-eigenen Fuhrpark. Im Rahmen einer Leistungsvereinbarung (SLA) stellt die Kommission (OIB — Amt für Gebäude, Anlagen und Logistik) leitenden Mitarbeitern des EAD in begrenztem Umfang Fahrzeuge zur Verfügung. In den Delegationen umfasste der Fahrzeugbestand 2013 etwa 717 Fahrzeuge (ohne gepanzerte Fahrzeuge). Die Kosten hierfür beliefen sich 2011 auf 2 533 082 EUR, 2012 auf 2 523 750 EUR und 2013 auf 2 545 379 EUR.

3) Der EAD beschäftigte in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 im Durchschnitt 222 Fahrer. Das Gesamtvolumen der Bruttoaufwendungen für diese Fahrer beläuft sich schätzungsweise auf 4 715 000 EUR im Jahr 2011, 4 678 000 EUR im Jahr 2012 und 4 831 000 EUR im Jahr 2013. Diese Beträge umfassen die Nettolöhne zuzüglich Sozialversicherungsbeiträge.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000281/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Official cars of the European External Action Service (EEAS)

How many official cars were purchased by the European External Action Service in each of the years 2011, 2012 and 2013, and what were the costs associated with these purchases?

How many official cars (most recent available figure) does the EEAS have in its possession and what was the expenditure associated with these vehicles in each of the years 2011, 2012 and 2013?

How many chauffeurs are employed by the EEAS and what was the total expenditure for chauffeur services rendered during each of the years 2011, 2012 and 2013?

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

1) In 2011, 41 cars were purchased by the European External Action Service, 47 in 2012 and 57 in 2013. The associated costs with these purchases amounted to EUR 1 141 600 in 2011; EUR 1,265,698 in 2012 and EUR 1 487 860 in 2013. In principle, cars are replaced every 7 years.

2) In Brussels, there is no EEAS vehicle fleet. Through a Service Level Agreement, the Commission (Office des Infrastructures de Bruxelles) makes vehicles available to senior EEAS staff on a limited basis. In Delegations, the size of the vehicle fleet is about 717 cars (excluding armoured cars) in 2013. The expenditure associated with these vehicles amounted to EUR 2 533 082 in 2011; EUR 2 523 750 in 2012; EUR 2 545 379 in 2013.

3) The EEAS employed on average 222 drivers in 2011, 2012 and 2013. We have estimated the total gross expenditure for those drivers at EUR 4 715 000 for 2011, EUR 4 678 000 for 2012 and EUR 4 831 000 for 2013. These amounts include net salary plus social contributions.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000286/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Krankenstände der EU-Beamten im Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst (EAD)

1. Wie viele Beamte des EAD gingen in den Jahren 2010, 2011, 2012 und 2013 in den Krankenstand? Wie hoch war jeweils der prozentuale Anteil gemessen an der Gesamtanzahl der Beamten im EAD?

2. Wie hoch waren die Gesamtkosten, die durch den Krankenstand der Beamten des EAD in den Jahren 2010, 2011, 2012 und 2013 entstanden? Wie hoch waren die Durchschnittskosten pro erkranktem Beamten im EAD in diesen Jahren?

3. Wie viele Tage befand sich ein Beamter des EAD durchschnittlich in den Jahren 2010, 2011, 2012 und 2013 im Krankenstand? Wie viele Beamte fehlten wegen Krankheit jeweils a) null bis fünf Tage, b) fünf bis 20 Tage und c) mehr als 20 Tage?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(27. Februar 2014)

Im Jahr 2010 existierte der EAD noch nicht. Die Angaben für die Jahre 2011-2013 finden Sie nachstehend.

1. 2011: 1638 Meldungen

2012: 1458 Meldungen

2013: 1294 Meldungen

Abwesenheitsrate:

2011: 3,01 %

2012: 3,51 %

2013: 3,73 %

Es ist zu beachten, dass das System lediglich ermöglicht, die Anzahl der Anträge zu berechnen; ein Beamter kann in einem gegebenen Jahr mehr als einen Antrag gestellt haben.

2. Die Kosten werden aus dem Gemeinsamen Krankenfürsorgesystem bestritten, das aus den Beitragszahlungen des gesamten Personals finanziert wird. Der EAD verfügt über einige „Springer“, die unter anderem bei langfristigen krankheitsbedingten Abwesenheiten in Anspruch genommen werden können, wenngleich sie in der Praxis meist eingesetzt werden, um Mutterschafts- und Elternurlaube abzudecken.

3. Durchschnittliche Krankentage:

2011: 7,9

2012: 9,2

2013: 9,8

a) 0-4 Tage (Meldungen)

2011: 1194

2012: 1016

2013: 957

b) 5-19 Tage (Meldungen)

2011: 341

2012: 328

2013: 402

c) mehr als 20 Tage (Meldungen)

2011: 103

2012: 114

2013: 141

Es ist zu beachten, dass Wochenenden in die Berechnung der Krankentage einbezogen werden. Ein Krankheitsurlaub von Freitag bis Montag zählt als 4 Tage.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000286/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Number of absences due to illness among EU officials within the European External Action Service (EEAS)

1. How many officials of the EEAS reported sick during the years 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013? What was the percentage rate in each year measured against the total number of officials in the EEAS?

2. What were the total costs incurred as a result of the absence of officials of EEAS due to illness during the years 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013? What were the average costs within the EEAS per official who was absent due to illness during these years?

3. For how many days, on average, was an official of EEAS absent due to illness during theyears 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013? How many officials were absent due to illness for a)zero to five days, b) five to twenty days and c) more than twenty days respectively?

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

The EEAS did not exist in 2010. For the years 2011 — 2013, please find the answers below.

1. 2011: 1638 notifications
2012: 1458 notifications
2013: 1294 notifications

Absence rate:
2011: 3.01%
2012: 3.51%
2013: 3.73%

Please note that the system only allows us to calculate the number of staff requests, a single official might have more than one request in a given year.

2. The costs of illness are financed from the Joint Sickness Insurance Scheme, which are financed from the salary contributions of all staff. The EEAS has a few floaters, which can *inter alia* be used to cover long-term absences due to illness, although in practice they are mostly used to cover maternity and parental leave.

3. Average days for sickleave:
2011: 7.9
2012: 9.2
2013: 9.8

a) 0-4 days (notifications)
2011: 1194
2012: 1016
2013: 957

b) 5-19 days (notifications)
2011: 341
2012: 328
2013: 402

c) more than 20 days (notifications)
2011: 103
2012: 114
2013: 141

Please note that Sick leaves include weekends. A sick leave from Friday to Monday is calculated as 4 days.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000288/14
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Anzahl der und Kosten für die der gemäß Artikel 50 des Beamtenstatuts ihrer Stelle enthobenen EU-Beamten

Wie viele EU-Beamte sind nach Artikel 50 des Statuts der EU-Beamten in den Jahren 2010, 2011, 2012 und 2013 ihrer Stelle enthoben worden?

Wie hoch ist die durchschnittliche Vergütung der nach Artikel 50 des Statuts der EU-Beamten ihrer Stelle enthobenen EU-Beamten?

In wie vielen Fällen hat die EU-Kommission bei einer vorzeitigen Versetzung eines EU-Beamten in den Ruhestand von der Möglichkeit nach Anhang VIII Artikel 9 Absatz 2 des Statuts der EU-Beamten Gebrauch gemacht und auf eine Kürzung des Ruhegehalts ganz oder teilweise verzichtet?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(4. März 2014)

Gemäß Artikel 50 des Beamtenstatuts können Beamte auf Generaldirektoren- und Direktorenebene ihrer Stelle enthoben werden; entsprechende Regelungen gibt es auch im öffentlichen Dienst einiger Mitgliedstaaten. Im Jahr 2010 hat die Kommission diesen Artikel in sechs Fällen angewandt. In den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 ist kein derartiger Beschluss ergangen. Der Kommission liegen keine Angaben zur Anwendung des Artikels durch andere Organe vor.

Die Anwendung von Artikel 50 des Beamtenstatuts führt nicht zur Gewährung eines Ruhegehalts. Wird der betreffende Beamte nicht in einer anderen Planstelle verwendet, erhält er nach Maßgabe des Anhangs IV des Beamtenstatuts für den darin festgelegten Zeitraum eine monatliche Vergütung. Die Einkünfte des Beamten aus seiner neuen Tätigkeit während dieser Zeit werden von der Vergütung in Abzug gebracht, wenn die Summe dieser Einkünfte und der Vergütung die letzten Gesamtdienstbezüge des Beamten übersteigt.

Die Anwendung von Artikel 50 des Beamtenstatuts ist von dem vorgezogenen Ruhestand gemäß Artikel 9 Anhang VIII des Beamtenstatuts zu unterscheiden. Die Kommission möchte dem Herrn Abgeordneten zur Kenntnis bringen, dass nach den neuen Statutsbestimmungen, die am 1. Januar 2014 in Kraft getreten sind, ein vorzeitiger Eintritt in den Ruhestand ohne Kürzung der Ruhegehaltsansprüche nicht mehr möglich ist.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000288/14
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Number of EU officials retired from their posts in accordance with Article 50 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities and the costs associated with these

How many EU officials were retired in accordance with Article 50 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities during the years 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013?

How much is the average allowance of EU officials who have been retired from their posts in accordance with Article 50 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities?

In how many cases of the early retirement of an EU official has the European Commission made use of the facility in accordance with Annex VIII, Article 9, Section 2 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities and foregone the option to reduce the retirement pension in whole or in part?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

Like in certain national civil services, Article 50 of the Staff Regulations allows withdrawing officials at Director-General and Director level from their posts. In 2010, the Commission decided in six cases to apply this Article. No such decisions were taken by the Commission in 2011, 2012 and 2013. The Commission does not have any information on the application of this Article by other Institutions.

The application of Article 50 of the Staff Regulations does not lead to the granting of a retirement pension. The official concerned receives, if he or she is not assigned to another post and under the conditions and for the period set out in Annex IV to the Staff Regulations, a monthly allowance. Income received by the official from any new employment during this period is deducted from the allowance if that income and the allowance together exceed his last total remuneration.

The application of Article 50 of the Staff Regulations is to be distinguished from early retirement under Article 9 of Annex VIII to the Staff Regulations. The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that, under the revised Staff Regulations which entered into force on 1 January 2014, early retirement without reduction of pension rights is no longer possible.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000290/14
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Gesamtausgaben für Pauschalen für Reisen zum Herkunftsort von Kommissions-Beamten

Der Beamte hat für sich und, soweit er Anspruch auf die Haushaltszulage hat, für seinen Ehegatten und die unterhaltsberechtigten Personen einmal jährlich Anspruch auf eine Pauschalvergütung der Reisekosten vom Ort der dienstlichen Verwendung zum Herkunftsort (Anhang VII Abschnitt 3 C Artikel 8 des Statuts der Beamten der Europäischen Gemeinschaften vom 1.5.2004).

1. Wie viele a) Beamte und b) Vertragsbedienstete der Kommission erhielten im Jahr 2013 den automatischen Heimreise-Pauschalbetrag?

2. Wie hoch waren im Jahr 2013 die Ausgaben der Kommission für die Erstattung dieser im Statut vorgesehenen Ausgaben?

3. Wie hoch war der Pauschalbetrag im Durchschnitt? Wie hoch war der niedrigste gezahlte Pauschalbetrag; wie hoch war der höchste gezahlte Pauschalbetrag?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(24. Februar 2014)

Im Jahr 2013 erhielten 16 926 Beamte und 3 015 Vertragsbedienstete die jährliche Pauschalvergütung der Reisekosten.

Einzelheiten zu dem insgesamt für den jährlichen Reisekostenzuschuss für Mitarbeiter der Kommission gezahlten Betrag sind der Arbeitsunterlage Teil VI des Entwurfs des Gesamthaushaltsplans der Europäischen Kommission für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zu entnehmen ([1]).

Im Durchschnitt wurden 1 750 EUR gezahlt.

Mit der Annahme der Änderungen des Beamtenstatuts hat sich die Zulage am 1.1.2014 geändert. Dies wird zu einem Rückgang der Zahl der Begünstigten führen.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/2013/DB2013/DB2013-WDVI-FINSTATH5.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000290/14
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Total expenditure for fixed-rate payments for travel to the place of origin of Officials of the Commission

Officials are entitled to receive a fixed-rate payment once a year equivalent to the costs of travel from the place of employment to their place of origin for themselves and, in so far as they are entitled to the household allowance, for their spouses and dependents (Annex VII, Section 3 C, Article 8 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities of 1 May 2004).

1. How many a) officials and b) contract staff members of the Commission received the automatic fixed-rate payment for travel to their place of origin in 2013?

2. What was the Commission's expenditure for refunding these expenses provided for in the Staff Regulations during 2013?

3. How much was the average fixed-rate payment? How much was the smallest fixed-ratepayment that was made; how much was the largest fixed-rate payment that was made?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(24 February 2014)

In 2013, the annual flat rate travel allowance was paid to 16 926 officials and 3 015 contract agents.

Details on the overall sum paid for annual travel allowance for Commission staff members can be in the Working Document Part VI of Draft General Budget of the European Commission for the financial year 2013 ([1]).

The average amount paid was EUR 1 750.

As of 1.1.2014 the allowance has been changed with the adoption of the changes to the Staff Regulations. This will result in a decrease in the number of beneficiaries.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/2013/DB2013/DB2013-WDVI-FINSTATH5.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000291/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Gesamtausgaben für Pauschalen für Reisen zum Herkunftsort von EAD-Beamten

Der Beamte hat für sich und, soweit er Anspruch auf die Haushaltszulage hat, für seinen Ehegatten und die unterhaltsberechtigten Personen einmal jährlich Anspruch auf eine Pauschalvergütung der Reisekosten vom Ort der dienstlichen Verwendung zum Herkunftsort (Anhang VII Abschnitt 3 C Artikel 8 des Statuts der Beamten der Europäischen Gemeinschaften vom 1.5.2004).

1. Wie viele a) Beamte und b) Vertragsbedienstete des EAD erhielten im Jahr 2013 den automatischen Heimreise-Pauschalbetrag?

2. Wie hoch waren im Jahr 2013 — soweit dies für den EAD getrennt erhoben werden kann — die Kosten für Heimreise-Pauschalbeträge?

3. Wie hoch war der Pauschalbetrag im Durchschnitt? Wie hoch war der niedrigste gezahlte Pauschalbetrag; wie hoch war der höchste gezahlte Pauschalbetrag?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(7. März 2014)

1. Im Jahr 2013 erhielten 1 466 Beamte des EAD (einschließlich Bediensteten auf Zeit) und 269 Vertragsbedienstete des EAD die automatische Pauschalvergütung für die Reise zu ihrem Herkunftsort.

2. Die Gesamtkosten der automatischen Pauschalvergütungen für Reisen zum Herkunftsort beliefen sich für die Bediensteten des EAD auf 12 939 095 EUR.

3. Die durchschnittliche Pauschalvergütung betrug für die Bediensteten der EAD-Zentrale 1 778 EUR und für die Bediensteten der Delegationen 6 680 EUR. Der niedrigste Betrag belief sich auf 30 EUR, der höchste auf 86 648,63 EUR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000291/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Total expenditure for fixed-rate payments for travel to the place of origin of EEAS officials

Officials are entitled to receive a fixed-rate payment once a year equivalent to the costs of travel from the place of employment to their place of origin for themselves and, in so far as they are entitled to the household allowance, for their spouses and dependents (Annex VII, Section 3 C, Article 8 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities of 1 May 2004).

1. How many a) officials and b) contract staff members of the European External Action Service received the automatic fixed-rate payment for travel to their place of origin in 2013?

2. What were the costs of automatic fixed-rate payments for travel to places of origin during 2013, in so far as this information can be obtained as a separate figure in relation to the EEAS?

3. How much was the average fixed-rate payment? How much was the smallest fixed-ratepayment that was made; how much was the largest fixed-rate payment that was made?

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

1. In 2013, 1 466 EEAS officials (including temporary agents) and 269 EEAS contract agents received the automatic fixed-rate payment for travel to their place of origin.

2. The total costs of automatic fixed-rate payments for travel to places of origin for EEAS staff amounted to EUR 12 939 095.

3. For EEAS staff in HQ, the average fixed-rate payment was EUR 1 778, while the average fixed-rate payment for Delegations was EUR 6 680. The smallest payment was EUR 30, the largest was EUR 86 648.63.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000292/14
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Zahl der EU-Beamten, die in den Ruhestand gehen

Wie viele Beamte sind im Jahr 2013 nach Anhang XIII Artikel 23 des Statuts der Beamten der Europäischen Gemeinschaften mit 50 Jahren, 51 Jahren, 52 Jahren, 53 Jahren, 54 Jahren und wie viele mit 55 Jahren in den Ruhestand getreten?

Wie viele österreichische und wie viele deutsche Beamte sind nach Anhang XIII Artikel 23 des Statuts der Beamten der Europäischen Gemeinschaften 2013 in den Ruhestand getreten?

Wie viele deutsche und wie viele österreichische Beamte sind im Jahr 2013 nach Anhang XIII Artikel 23 des Statuts der Beamten der Europäischen Gemeinschaften mit 50 Jahren, 51 Jahren, 52 Jahren, 53 Jahren, 54 Jahren und wie viele mit 55 Jahren in den Ruhestand getreten?

Wie viele EU-Beamte sind im Jahr 2013 im Alter zwischen 50 und 55 Jahren, 56 und 60 Jahren, 61 und 65 Jahren bzw. im Alter von über 65 Jahren in den Ruhestand getreten?

Wie hoch war im Jahr 2013 das durchschnittliche Pensionsalter aller Beamten, die nach Anhang XIII Artikel 23 des Statuts der Beamten der Europäischen Gemeinschaften vorzeitig in den Ruhestand getreten sind?

Wie hoch war im Jahr 2013 das durchschnittliche Pensionsalter aller EU-Beamten?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(6. März 2014)

Im Jahr 2013 sind 35 Beamte, darunter zwei Deutsche und ein Österreicher, nach Anhang XIII Artikel 23 des Statuts in den Ruhestand getreten.

Im gleichen Zeitraum sind 257 Beamte im Alter zwischen 55 und 60 Jahren, 791 Beamte im Alter zwischen 60 und 65 Jahren sowie 40 Beamte im Alter über 65 Jahren in den Ruhestand getreten.

2013 lag das Durchschnittsalter der Beamten, die nach Anhang XIII Artikel 23 ausgeschieden sind, bei 53 Jahren. Das Durchschnittsalter aller Beamten, die 2013 in den Ruhestand getreten sind, betrug 61 Jahre.

Im Oktober 2013 verabschiedeten das Europäische Parlament und der Rat Änderungen zum Beamtenstatut ([1]); danach beträgt das reguläre Ruhestandsalter für Beamte, die ab 2014 bei den EU-Organen eingestellt werden, 66 Jahre. Bereits im Dienst befindliche Beamte können nunmehr erst ab 58 Jahren und nur mit Kürzung der Ruhegehaltsansprüche vorzeitig in den Ruhestand treten.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1962R0031:20140101:DE:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000292/14
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Number of EU officials retiring

How many officials retired in accordance with Annex XIII Article 23 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities at 50 years of age, 51 years of age, 52 years of age, 53 years of age, 54 years of age and 55 years of age in 2013?

How many Austrian and how many German officials retired in accordance with Annex XIII Article 23 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities in 2013?

How many German and how many Austrian officials retired in accordance with Annex XIII Article 23 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities at 50 years of age, 51 years of age, 52 years of age, 53 years of age, 54 years of age and 55 years of age in 2013?

How many EU officials between 50 and 55 years of age, 56 and 60 years of age, 61 and 65 years of age and over 65 years of age retired in 2013?

What was the average retirement age in 2013 of all officials who retired early in accordance with Annex XIII Article 23 of the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities?

What was the average retirement age of all EU officials in 2013?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

In 2013, 35 staff members retired in accordance with Article 23 of Annex XIII of the Staff Regulations. Two of them were German and one was Austrian.

Over the same period, 257 staff members retired between the ages of 55 and 60, 791 between 60 and 65 and 40 staff members were over 65.

In 2013, the average age of staff members using the provisions of Article 23 of Annex XIII was 53. The average retirement age of all officials who retired in 2013 was 61.

In October 2013, the Parliament and the Council adopted amendments to the Staff Regulations ([1]) changing *inter alia* the normal retirement age for officials joining the EU institutions as of 2014 to 66 years. In addition, for staff already in place, early retirement is now only possible at 58 years of age and only with reduction of pension rights.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1962R0031:20140101:EN:PDF

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000293/14
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Pensionierung von EU-Beamten aufgrund von Dienstunfähigkeit

Wie viele Beamte sind im Jahr 2013 wegen Dienstunfähigkeit vorzeitig in den Ruhestand versetzt worden?

Wie haben sich die Versorgungskosten für die wegen Dienstunfähigkeit vorzeitig pensionierten EU-Beamten im Jahr 2013 entwickelt?

Wie hat sich das Durchschnittsalter der wegen Dienstunfähigkeit vorzeitig pensionierten EU-Beamten im Jahr 2013 entwickelt?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(6. März 2014)

139 Bediensteten aus allen Organen wurde 2013 ein Invalidengeld gewährt.

Die Kosten für Invalidengelder betrugen 2013 insgesamt 39,9 Millionen EUR, das heißt weniger als 3 % der Gesamtmittel für das EU-Versorgungssystem.

Das Durchschnittsalter der Bediensteten zum Zeitpunkt der Gewährung des Invalidengeldes lag 2013 bei 52 Jahren.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000293/14
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Retirement of EU officials due to disability

How many officials retired early due to disability in 2013?

How have the care costs changed in 2013 for EU officials who retired early due to disability?

How has the average age of EU officials who retired early due to disability changed in 2013?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

The honourable member is informed that term 'disability' used by him is understood as 'invalidity', as invalidity involves a medical incapacity which prevents the staff member carrying out his/her functions in his/her function group.

139 staff members in all the institutions were granted invalidity allowance in 2013.

The total cost for invalidity allowances was EUR 39.9 million in 2013. This represents less than 3% of the total expenses related to the EU Pension Scheme.

The average age of staff members at the moment when they were granted the disability allowance was 52 in 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000295/14
alla Commissione
Carlo Casini (PPE)
(14 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Finanziamento del settimo programma quadro di ricerca — cellule staminali embrionali

La Commissione ha già comunicato che in attuazione del settimo programma quadro di ricerca, fino al 2012, sono stati erogati 121,5 milioni di euro per 21 progetti che coinvolgono cellule staminali embrionali.

Può la Commissione fornire nomi e indirizzi degli enti che hanno effettuato i 21 progetti, la loro precisa denominazione e i risultati raggiunti da ciascun progetto?

Può essa fornire le medesime informazioni per i progetti finanziati nel 2013?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(4 febbraio 2014)

È possibile trovare in allegato un elenco dei 21 progetti, inclusi i sei avviati successivamente nel 2013. Digitando l'acronimo del progetto nella pagina di ricerca del sito di CORDIS ([1]) è possibile reperire i nomi e gli indirizzi degli enti (più di 250) che hanno effettuato tali progetti, nonché un breve riepilogo del lavoro svolto, le relazioni e le pubblicazioni.

Va osservato che la cifra indicata rappresenta il totale del finanziamento erogato dall'UE all'intero progetto e non alle attività di ricerca sulle cellule staminali embrionali umane, che ne costituiscono solo una parte. Bisogna dunque considerare che tali finanziamenti non si rivolgono esclusivamente ai progetti in materia di cellule staminali embrionali umane, per i quali è utilizzato circa un quarto dell'importo erogato.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/projects_it.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000295/14
to the Commission
Carlo Casini (PPE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Financing of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research — embryonic stem cells

The Commission has already announced that, in implementation of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, up to 2012, EUR 121.5 million had been paid out for 21 projects involving embryonic stem cells.

Can the Commission provide the specific names and addresses of the organisations that carried out the 21 projects, together with the results achieved by each project?

Can it provide the same information for the projects funded in 2013?

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

A list of the 21 projects, including a further six that were launched in 2013, is provided in annex. The names and addresses of the organisations carrying out the work (of which there are over 250), summary of the work, reports and publications can be found by typing the project acronym into the search page of the CORDIS site ([1]).

It should be noted that the figure for the EU contribution represents the amount contributed to the whole of the project and not to human embryonic stem cells which represent only a part of the project. The figures cannot be construed as devoted exclusively to human embryonic stem cells. Approximately one quarter of the sum is used on the human embryonic stem cell part of the projects.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/projects_en.html

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-000296/14
до Комисията
Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Peter Liese (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Françoise Grossetête (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE) и Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(14 януари 2014 г.)

Относно: Ролята на Комисията в полагането на усилия за осигуряване на всеобщ достъп до висококачествени здравни услуги, ориентирани към гражданите

След конференцията на тема „Устойчиви здравни системи за приобщаващ растеж в Европа“, проведена по време на литовското председателство на Съвета, и подписаната в резултат от нея Декларация от Вилнюс, в която се призовава за всеобщ достъп до висококачествени здравни услуги, ориентирани към гражданите, и за партньорски подход в намирането на ефективни решения за подобряване на равния достъп, каква роля може да изиграе Комисията в напредъка по работата в тази насока, по-точно що се отнася до измерването, оценяването, сравняването и подобряването на равния достъп между и в рамките на държавите — членки на ЕС?

Отговор, даден от г-н Борг от името на Комисията
(5 март 2014 г.)

Равният достъп до качествено медицинско обслужване е основен принцип на системите за здравеопазване на Европейския съюз ([1]). Всеобщият принцип, че всеки трябва да има достъп до здравеопазване — профилактика, диагностика и лечение, независимо от финансовото положение, пола или националната принадлежност, се основава на член 35 от Хартата на основните права на ЕС.

Институциите на ЕС трябва да спазват този принцип при своите действия. С цел да допринесе за намаляване на различията в достъпа до здравно обслужване, гарантиране на равен достъп в рамките на всяка държава членка и равен достъп в различните държави членки и да се справи с неравнопоставеността, която засяга най-уязвимите групи от населението, ЕС подкрепя държавите членки по въпроси като оценката на резултатите от работата на системата за здравеопазването, здравните работници и оценката на здравните технологии.

Освен това измерването или сравняването на достъпа до грижи между държавите членки ще бъде от значение, за да се оцени например дали се спазва принципът от Хартата в Директива 2011/24 за упражняване на правата на пациентите при трансгранично здравно обслужване.

Измерването на достъпа до здравеопазване, обаче, отбелязва значителни трудности. Наличните показатели дават възможност за измерване на самооценката за неудовлетворени потребности от здравни грижи, но не и за измерване на достъпа. Показателите за обхвата, времето за чакане и достъпността не съществуват или не са достатъчни.

Понастоящем Комисията разглежда въпроса за достъпа до здравеопазване, с цел определяне на възможни области за бъдеща работа. Комисията приканва заинтересованите страни да изпратят коментари относно инструментите за измерване на достъпа.

([1]) Това се посочва и в заключенията на Съвета относно общите ценности и принципи на системите за здравеопазване в Европейския съюз (ОВ C 146, 22.6.2006 г., стр. 1).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000296/14
an die Kommission
Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Peter Liese (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Françoise Grossetête (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE) und Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Rolle der Kommission bei der Förderung der Bemühungen, den allgemeinen Zugang zu hochwertigen Gesundheitsdiensten für Patienten zu gewährleisten, bei denen der Mensch im Mittelpunkt steht

Während des litauischen Ratsvorsitzes fand eine Konferenz über nachhaltige Gesundheitssysteme für inklusives Wachstum in Europa statt, auf die die Erklärung von Vilnius folgte, in der ein allgemeiner Zugang zu hochwertigen Gesundheitsdiensten, bei denen der Mensch im Mittelpunkt steht, und ein partnerschaftlicher Ansatz zur Ermittlung wirksamer Lösungen zur Verbesserung des gleichberechtigten Zugangs gefordert werden. Wie kann die Kommission diese Arbeit fördern, insbesondere was die Messung, die Bewertung, den Vergleich und die Verbesserung dieses Zugangs zwischen und in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten betrifft?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(5. März 2014)

Einer der Grundwerte der Gesundheitssysteme der Europäischen Union ist der gleichberechtigte Zugang zu einer hochwertigen Gesundheitsversorgung ([1]). Artikel 35 der EU-Charta der Grundrechte bildet die Grundlage des Leitgrundsatzes, dass jeder Mensch Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung, also Prophylaxe, Diagnostik und Therapie, haben sollte, ungeachtet der finanziellen Mittel, des Geschlechts oder der Staatsangehörigkeit.

Die EU-Organe müssen diesen Grundsatz bei ihren Maßnahmen beachten. Um dazu beizutragen, die Unterschiede bei der Zugänglichkeit der Gesundheitssysteme abzubauen, den gleichen Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung innerhalb der Mitgliedstaaten und länderübergreifend sicherzustellen und Ungleichheiten, von denen besonders schutzbedürftige Bevölkerungsgruppen betroffen sind, zu bekämpfen, unterstützt die EU die Mitgliedstaaten in Fragen wie Leistungsbewertung des Gesundheitssystems, Qualifikation der Arbeitskräfte des Gesundheitswesens oder Technologiefolgenabschätzung im Gesundheitswesen.

Auch wäre es wichtig, den Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung zu messen oder diesbezügliche Unterschiede zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten zu ermitteln, um zum Beispiel zu prüfen, ob der Grundsatz der Charta bei der Umsetzung der Richtlinie 2011/24 über die Ausübung der Patientenrechte in der grenzüberschreitenden Gesundheitsversorgung eingehalten wird.

Allerdings ist die Messung des Zugangs zur Gesundheitsversorgung mit erheblichen Schwierigkeiten verbunden. Die zur Verfügung stehenden Indikatoren ermöglichen es, den nicht erfüllten Bedarf an medizinischer Versorgung nach eigener Einschätzung zu ermitteln, liefern jedoch kein objektives Bild über den Zugang. Indikatoren für den Umfang der Versorgung, die Wartezeiten und die Erschwinglichkeit sind entweder überhaupt nicht vorhanden oder ungeeignet.

Die Kommission befasst sich derzeit mit der Problematik des Zugangs zur Gesundheitsversorgung, um mögliche Handlungsbereiche für die Zukunft zu identifizieren. Beiträge von Interessenträgern zu Instrumenten für die Messung des Zugangs wären in diesem Zusammenhang wünschenswert.

([1]) Vgl. Schlussfolgerungen des Rates zum Thema „Gemeinsame Werte und Prinzipien in den Gesundheitssystemen der Europäischen Union“ (2006/C 146/01).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000296/14
à la Commission
Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Peter Liese (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Françoise Grossetête (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE) et Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(14 janvier 2014)

Objet: Rôle de la Commission dans les initiatives visant à assurer aux patients un accès universel à des services de santé de qualité axés sur la personne

À la suite de la conférence sur les systèmes de santé viables pour une croissance inclusive en Europe, organisée durant la présidence lituanienne du Conseil, et dans le prolongement de la déclaration de Vilnius qui en est issue, déclaration qui préconise l'accès universel à des services de santé de qualité axés sur la personne, ainsi qu'une logique de partenariat pour dégager des solutions efficaces permettant d'améliorer l'égalité d'accès, quel rôle peut jouer la Commission pour faire progresser ces travaux, et en particulier la mesure, l'évaluation, la comparaison et l'amélioration de cet accès entre les États membres de l'Union européenne et au sein de ceux-ci?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(5 mars 2014)

L'égalité d'accès à des soins de santé de qualité est une valeur essentielle des systèmes de santé de l'UE ([1]). L'article 35 de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne sert de base au principe primordial que toute personne doit pouvoir accéder aux soins de santé — préventifs, diagnostiques et curatifs — indépendamment de ses moyens financiers, de son sexe ou de sa nationalité.

Les institutions de l'Union doivent respecter ce principe dans leurs actions. Afin de contribuer à réduire les écarts dans l'accessibilité aux soins de santé, de garantir un accès équitable à ces soins tant au sein de chaque État membre que d'un État membre à l'autre, et de lutter contre les inégalités affectant les catégories de population les plus vulnérables, l'UE soutient les États membres dans des domaines tels que l'évaluation de l'efficacité des systèmes de santé, les qualifications du personnel de santé ou l'évaluation des technologies de santé.

De plus, il serait important d'examiner ou de comparer les conditions d'accès aux soins de santé entre les États membres pour évaluer, par exemple, si le principe primordial de la Charte est respecté dans la mise en œuvre de la directive 2011/24 relative à l'application des droits des patients en matière de soins de santé.

Cependant, la mesure du niveau d'accès aux soins de santé présente des difficultés importantes. Les indicateurs disponibles permettent d'évaluer la perception par les intéressés de leurs besoins de soins non satisfaits mais ne fournissent pas une mesure objective de l'accès aux soins; les indicateurs de la couverture, des temps d'attente et de l'accessibilité financière soit n'existent pas, soit ne sont pas appropriés.

La Commission examine actuellement le problème de l'accès aux soins de santé en vue d'identifier des domaines éventuels de travail futur. Les contributions des parties prenantes sur des outils permettant de mesurer l'accès aux soins seraient appréciées dans ce contexte.

([1]) Comme indiqué dans les Conclusions du Conseil sur les valeurs et principes communs aux systèmes de santé de l'Union européenne (2006/C 146/01).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000296/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Peter Liese (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Françoise Grossetête (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE) u Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(14 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Rwol tal-Kummissjoni fl-avvanz ta' sforzi sabiex ikun żgurat aċċess universali għal servizzi tas-saħħa għall-pazjenti li jkunu ta' kwalità għolja u li jikkonċentraw fuq in-nies

Wara l-konferenza li saret waqt il-Presidenza Litwana tal-Kunsill fuq is-Sistemi tas-Saħħa Sostenibbli għal Tkabbir Inklussiv fl-Ewropa, u d-"Dikjarazzjoni ta' Vilnius" li rriżultat minnha, li titlob għal aċċess universali għal servizzi tas-saħħa ta' kwalità għolja u li jikkonċentraw fuq in-nies u għal approċċ ta' sħubija biex ikunu identifikati soluzzjonijiet effettivi biex tittejjeb l-ekwita tal-aċċess, xi rwol jista' jkollha l-Kummissjoni fl-avvanz ta' dan ix-xogħol, b'mod partikolari rigward il-kejl, l-evalwazzjoni, it-tqabbil u t-titjib ta' tali aċċess madwar u fi ħdan l-Istati Membri tal-UE?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(5 ta' Marzu 2014)

L-ekwità fl-aċċess għall-kura tas-saħħa ta' kwalità hija valur globali tas-sistemi tas-saħħa tal-Unjoni Ewropea ([1]). L-Artikolu 35 tal-Karta tad-Drittijiet Fundamentali tal-UE jservi bħala bażi għall-prinċipju globali li kulħadd għandu jkollu aċċess għall-kura tas-saħħa — trattament preventiv, dijanjostiku u ta' kura — irrispettivament mill-mezzi finanzjarji, mill-ġeneru jew min-nazzjonalità.

L-istituzzjonijiet tal-UE għandhom jikkonformaw ma' dan il-prinċipju fl-azzjonijiet tagħhom. Sabiex tikkontribwixxi għat-tnaqqis tad-differenzi fl-aċċessibbiltà għall-kura tas-saħħa, filwaqt li tiżgura aċċess ekwu fl-Istati Membri u bejniethom u tindirizza l-inugwaljanzi li jaffettwaw il-gruppi ta' popolazzjoni l-aktar vulnerabbli, l-UE qiegħda tappoġġa l-Istati Membri fi kwistjonijiet bħall-valutazzjoni tal-prestazzjoni tas-sistema tas-saħħa, is-saħħa tal-ħaddiema jew il-valutazzjoni tat-teknoloġija tas-saħħa.

Barra minn hekk, il-kejl jew il-paragun tal-aċċess għall-kura bejn l-Istati Membri jkun importanti biex jivvaluta pereżempju jekk il-konformità mal-prinċipju tal-Karta tinkisibx fid-Direttiva 2011/24 dwar id-drittijiet tal-pazjenti fir-rigward tal-kura tas-saħħa transkonfinali.

Madankollu, il-kejl tal-aċċess għall-kura tas-saħħa jinkludi diffikultajiet sinifikanti. L-indikaturi disponibbli jippermettu l-kejl tal-awtoperċezzjoni tal-ħtiġijiet mhux sodisfatti għall-kura iżda mhux il-kejl oġġettiv tal-aċċess; l-indikaturi għall-kopertura, il-ħinijiet ta' stennija u l-affordabbiltà huma jew ineżistenti jew inadegwati.

Il-Kummissjoni bħalissa qed tanalizza l-kwistjoni ta' aċċess għall-kura tas-saħħa bil-ħsieb li jiġu identifikati l-oqsma possibbli li jeħtieġu aktar xogħol fil-ġejjieni. Kontribuzzjonijiet minn partijiet interessati dwar l-għodod li jkejlu l-aċċess ikunu apprezzati f'dak il-kuntest.

([1]) Kif iddikjarat fil-Konklużjonijiet tal-Kunsill dwar valuri u prinċipji Komuni fis-Sistemi tas-Saħħa tal-Unjoni Ewropea (2006/C 146/01).

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000296/14
adresată Comisiei
Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Peter Liese (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Françoise Grossetête (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE) şi Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(14 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Rolul Comisiei în sporirea eforturilor pentru asigurarea accesului universal la servicii de sănătate de înaltă calitate orientate asupra pacienților

În urma conferinței cu privire la sisteme de sănătate durabile pentru o creștere favorabilă incluziunii în Europa, organizate în timpul Președinției lituaniene a Consiliului, și a „Declarației de la Vilnius" rezultate, care solicită acces universal la servicii de sănătate de înaltă calitate orientate asupra pacienților și o abordare de tip parteneriat pentru identificarea unor soluții eficiente pentru îmbunătățirea posibilităților de acces egal, ce rol poate avea Comisia în continuarea eforturilor în acest sens, îndeosebi cu privire la analizarea, evaluarea, compararea și îmbunătățirea accesului la servicii de sănătate între statele membre ale UE și în interiorul acestora?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(5 martie 2014)

Echitatea în ceea ce privește accesul la servicii de sănătate de calitate este o valoare fundamentală a sistemelor de sănătate din Uniunea Europeană ([1]). Articolul 35 din Carta drepturilor fundamentale a UE servește ca bază pentru principiul fundamental potrivit căruia orice persoană ar trebui să aibă acces la serviciile de asistență medicală — prevenire, diagnosticare și tratament curativ — indiferent de venituri financiare, sex sau naționalitate.

Instituțiile UE trebuie să respecte acest principiu în acțiunile lor. Pentru a contribui la reducerea diferențelor de accesibilitate la asistența medicală, la asigurarea unui acces echitabil în și între statele membre, precum și la combaterea inegalităților care afectează cele mai vulnerabile segmente ale populației, UE oferă sprijin statelor membre în domenii precum evaluarea performanțelor sistemului de sănătate, a personalului sanitar sau a tehnologiilor medicale.

În plus, măsurarea sau compararea accesului la îngrijiri medicale între statele membre ar fi importantă pentru a se evalua, de exemplu, dacă conformitatea cu principiul Cartei este realizată prin Directiva 2011/24 privind drepturile pacienților în materie de asistență medicală transfrontalieră.

Cu toate acestea, măsurarea accesului la asistență medicală prezintă dificultăți importante. Indicatorii disponibili permit evaluarea percepției individuale a nevoilor nesatisfăcute de îngrijire, dar nu și măsurarea obiectivă a accesului; indicatorii pentru serviciile asigurate, pentru perioadele de așteptare și pentru accesibilitatea din punct de vedere financiar sunt fie inexistenți, fie neadecvați.

În prezent, Comisia analizează problema accesului la asistență medicală în vederea identificării posibilelor direcții viitoare de activitate. Contribuțiile părților interesate cu privire la instrumentele de măsurare a accesului ar fi apreciate în acest context.

([1]) După cum se afirmă în Concluziile Consiliului privind valorile și principiile comune în sistemele de sănătate ale Uniunii Europene (2006/C 146/01).

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-000296/14
za Komisijo
Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Peter Liese (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Françoise Grossetête (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE) in Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(14. januar 2014)

Zadeva: Vloga Komisije pri prizadevanjih za zagotavljanje univerzalnega dostopa do visoko kakovostnih zdravstvenih storitev, osredotočenih na bolnike

Ob upoštevanju konference o trajnostnih zdravstvenih sistemih za vključujočo rast v Evropi, ki je potekala med litovskim predsedovanjem Svetu in na kateri je bila sprejeta Vilenska deklaracija, ki poziva k univerzalnemu dostopu do visoko kakovostnih, na bolnike osredotočenih zdravstvenih storitev, in k partnerskemu pristopu za opredelitev učinkovitih rešitev za izboljšanje enakopravnega dostopa, kakšno vlogo ima lahko Komisija pri nadaljevanju dela na tem področju, zlasti pri merjenju, ocenjevanju, primerjanju in izboljšanju tega dostopa v vseh državah članicah EU?

Odgovor komisarja Tonia Borga v imenu Komisije
(5. marec 2014)

Enakost pri dostopu do kakovostnega zdravstvenega varstva je poglavitna vrednota zdravstvenih sistemov Evropske unije ([1]). Člen 35 Listine Evropske unije o temeljnih pravicah je osnova za poglavitno načelo, po katerem bi morali vsi imeti dostop do zdravstvenega varstva, in sicer do preventivnega, diagnostičnega in kurativnega zdravstvenega varstva, ne glede na finančna sredstva, spol ali državljanstvo.

Institucije EU morajo upoštevati to načelo v svojih ukrepih. Da bi zmanjšali razlike v dostopnosti do zdravstvenega varstva, zagotovili enak dostop znotraj držav članic in med njimi ter odpravili neenakosti, ki vplivajo na najranljivejše skupine prebivalstva, EU podpira države članice na področjih, kot je ocenjevanje uspešnosti zdravstvenih sistemov, zdravstvenih delavcev ali zdravstvene tehnologije.

Poleg tega bi bilo pomembno meriti ali primerjati dostop do zdravstvenega varstva med državami članicami, da se na primer oceni, ali je z Direktivo 2011/24 o pravicah pacientov dosežena skladnost z načeli Listine v zvezi s čezmejnim zdravstvenim varstvom.

Vendar merjenje dostopa do zdravstvenega varstva prinaša znatne težave. Razpoložljivi kazalniki sicer omogočajo merjenje, kako prebivalstvo dojema neizpolnjene potrebe po zdravstvenem varstvu, vendar ne omogoča objektivnega merjenja dostopa. Kazalniki za geografsko pokritost, čakalne dobe in cenovno dostopnost bodisi ne obstajajo bodisi niso zadostni.

Komisija trenutno preučuje vprašanje dostopa do zdravstvenega varstva, da bi lahko opredelila morebitna področja za prihodnje delo. Prispevki deležnikov v zvezi z orodji za merjenje dostopa bi v tem okviru bili dobrodošli.

([1]) Kot je navedeno v Sklepih Sveta o skupnih vrednotah in načelih zdravstvenih sistemov Evropske unije (2006/C 146/01).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000296/14
to the Commission
Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Peter Liese (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Françoise Grossetête (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE) and Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Role of the Commission in advancing efforts to ensure universal access to high- quality, people-centred health services for patients

Following the conference held during the Lithuanian Presidency of the Council on Sustainable Health Systems for Inclusive Growth in Europe, and the resulting 'Vilnius Declaration', which calls for universal access to high-quality, people-centred health services and a partnership approach to identify effective solutions to improve equity of access, what role can the Commission play in advancing this work, in particular as regards measuring, evaluating, comparing and improving such access across and within EU Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

Equity in access to quality healthcare is an overarching value of the health systems of the European Union ([1]). Article 35 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights serves as a basis to the overarching principle that everyone should have access to healthcare — preventive, diagnostic and curative treatment — regardless of financial means, gender or nationality.

The EU institutions must comply with this principle in their actions. To contribute to reducing variation in accessibility to healthcare, ensuring equitable access within and across Member States and tackling inequalities affecting the most vulnerable population groups, the EU is supporting Member States on issues such as health system performance assessment, health workforce or health technology assessment.

In addition, measuring or comparing access to care between Member States would be important to assess for instance whether compliance with the principle of the Charter is achieved in Directive 2011/24 on patients' rights in relation to cross-border healthcare.

However measuring access to healthcare encompasses significant difficulties. Available indicators allow for the measurement of self-perception of unmet needs for care but not for objective measurement of access; indicators for coverage, waiting times and affordability are either non-existent or inadequate.

The Commission is currently looking into the issue of access to healthcare with a view to identifying possible areas for future work. Contributions from stakeholders on tools to measure access would in that context be appreciated.

([1]) As stated in the Council Conclusions on Common values and principles in European Union Health Systems (2006/C 146/01).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000299/14
a la Comisión
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(14 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Acuerdo de asociación Mercosur-UE: valoración y voluntad política

Durante la reunión ministerial UE-Mercosur de enero de 2013 en Santiago de Chile, ambos bloques de países acordaron fijar el último trimestre de 2013 como plazo para presentar un intercambio de ofertas concretas.

Contrariamente a lo pactado, tal intercambio no ha tenido lugar.

Por ello, pregunto a la Comisión:

¿Qué valoración hace la Comisión sobre la posposición de este intercambio de ofertas?

¿Sigue existiendo voluntad política por ambas partes para concluir este acuerdo?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(19 de febrero de 2014)

El intercambio de ofertas de acceso a los mercados acordado con Mercosur en enero del año pasado será un paso significativo en las negociaciones, ya que se trata del primer intercambio de ofertas desde 2004, antes de que se suspendieran las negociaciones. Este intercambio será importante para alcanzar el término del proceso de negociación. Sin embargo, para que el intercambio sea un éxito ambas partes deben garantizar que el contenido y las condiciones son adecuadas.

Durante 2013, tanto la UE como Mercosur han hecho preparativos para llevar a cabo un intercambio de ofertas y han realizado consultas internas. En la actualidad, ambas partes están trabajando para ultimar las ofertas. La UE y Mercosur siguen en estrecho contacto y se comprometen a llevar a cabo el intercambio de ofertas a principios del presente año. La fecha concreta del intercambio se fijará según el avance del trabajo de ambas partes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000299/14
to the Commission
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: EU-Mercosur Association Agreement: opinion and political will

During the EU-Mercosur Ministerial Meeting held in January 2013 in Santiago de Chile, both blocs of countries agreed on the last quarter of 2013 as the deadline for presenting an exchange of specific offers.

In spite of this agreement, the exchange never took place.

Therefore, I ask the Commission:

What is the Commission's opinion on the postponement of this exchange of offers?

Do both parties still have the political will to conclude this agreement?

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

The exchange of market access offers agreed with Mercosur in January last year will be a significant step in the negotiations, being the first exchange of offers since 2004, before the suspension of the negotiations. This exchange will be important to drive the negotiaton process forward towards it conclusion. However, both sides need to ensure that the substance is right and that conditions are there for a successful exchange.

During 2013, both the EU and Mercosur have prepared for an exchange of offers and consulted internally. Currently, both sides are in the process of finalising the offers. The EU and Mercosur remain in close contact and are committed to proceed with the exchange of offers early this year. A concrete date for the exchange of offers will be fixed in accordance with the state of finalisation of work on both sides.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000301/14
a la Comisión
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(14 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Acuerdo de Asociación Mercosur-UE: fechas de intercambio de ofertas

Durante la última reunión ministerial UE-Mercosur, celebrada el 26 de enero de 2013 en Santiago de Chile, se acordó que el intercambio de ofertas de acceso al mercado de bienes, servicios y contratos públicos se llevaría a cabo «a más tardar en el último trimestre de 2013».

Así lo recordó el Comisario De Gucht en su respuesta del pasado 25 de octubre a una pregunta parlamentaria presentada por mí mismo el 6 de septiembre de 2013.

Dado que nos encontramos en enero de 2014 y que el intercambio no ha tenido lugar, ¿puede indicar la Comisión cuál es la razón por la que este intercambio de ofertas no se ha producido?

¿Cuándo prevé la Comisión que ocurra dicho intercambio?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de marzo de 2014)

El intercambio de ofertas de acceso al mercado acordado con el Mercosur en enero de 2013 constituirá un paso importante en las negociaciones del Acuerdo de Asociación entre la UE y el Mercosur y, por consiguiente, es preciso que nos aseguremos de que se dan las condiciones para llevarlo a buen término. Este sería el primer intercambio de ofertas de acceso al mercado desde que se reanudaron las negociaciones en 2010. Ambas partes mantienen su compromiso de llevar adelante el intercambio tan pronto como sea factible.

A lo largo de 2013, la UE y el Mercosur han estado preparando sus respectivas ofertas y realizando consultas internas. Actualmente ambas partes están terminando de elaborar las ofertas. La fecha exacta para el intercambio de ofertas a principios del corriente año se fijará de común acuerdo y dependerá de cuándo finalicen ambas partes su labor.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000301/14
to the Commission
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: EU-Mercosur Association Agreement: dates for the exchange of offers

During the latest EU-Mercosur Ministerial Meeting, held on 26 January 2013 in Santiago de Chile, it was agreed that the exchange of offers for access to the goods, services and public procurement contracts market would take place 'during the last quarter of 2013 at the latest'.

This was pointed out by Commissioner De Gucht in the answer he gave on 25 October last year to a Parliamentary Question that I submitted on 6 September 2013.

Given that we are now in January 2014 and this exchange has still not taken place, could the Commission please explain why this exchange of offers has not taken place?

When does the Commission think that this exchange will happen?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

The exchange of market access offers agreed with Mercosur in January 2013 will be an important step in the negotiations of the Association Agreement between the EU and Mercosur and therefore requires us to ensure that the conditions are there to make it successful. This would be the first exchange of market access offers since the resumption of negotiations in 2010. Both sides remain committed to proceed with the exchange as soon as feasible.

During 2013, the EU and Mercosur have been preparing their respective offers and consulting internally. Currently, both sides are in the process of finalising the offers. A precise date for the exchange of offers early this year will be fixed by common agreement, depending on the finalisation of work on both sides.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000351/14
do Komisji
Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)
(15 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Rosja – dodatkowe opłaty nakładane na pojazdy ciężarowe pochodzące z UE (system TIR)

Pragnę powrócić do tematu mojego pytania pisemnego P-012431/2013, (na które Komisja udzieliła odpowiedzi 2 grudnia 2013 r.).

Władze rosyjskie odroczyły plany obciążenia dodatkowymi opłatami pojazdów ciężarowych z Unii Europejskiej wjeżdżających na teren Rosji, ale ich nie wycofały.

Jak obecnie wygląda sytuacja?

Jeśli Rosja rzeczywiście nałoży dodatkowe opłaty, jakie środki podejmie w związku z tym Komisja?

Czy bez słowa zaakceptujemy działania Rosji?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Algirdasa Šemetę w imieniu Komisji
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Komisja jest poważnie zaniepokojona sytuacją dotyczącą stosowania systemu TIR w Rosji i zareagowała bezzwłocznie, gdy została poinformowana o jej zamiarach.

Bieżącą sytuację w tej kwestii oraz działania Komisji przedstawiono w odpowiedzi na pytanie pisemne E-013566/2013 ([1]).

Obecnie Rosja odroczyła wypowiedzenie umowy z ASMAP, krajowym zrzeszeniem poręczającym w systemie TIR, do dnia 1 lipca 2014 r., ale wymaga dodatkowych gwarancji tranzytowych we wszystkich okręgach celnych, z wyjątkiem tych znajdujących się na granicy z Finlandią.

Komisja uważa, że ten stan rzeczy stanowi naruszenie Konwencji TIR i ma negatywne skutki dla unijnych operatorów transportowych, także pod względem braku jasności co do przyszłej sytuacji. Komisja będzie w dalszym ciągu podnosić tę kwestię na odpowiednich wielostronnych (tj. przed organami konwencji TIR w ramach EKG ONZ) oraz dwustronnych forach, aby zagwarantować, że wprowadzone przez Rosję środki będą miały możliwie ograniczony wpływ na podmioty gospodarcze w UE, a także aby doprowadzić do ich zniesienia.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000351/14
to the Commission
Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Russia — additional levies on EU heavy goods vehicles (TIR system)

I should like to come back to the subject of my Written Question P-012431/2013 (which the Commission answered on 2 December 2013).

The Russian authorities have postponed but not withdrawn their plans to impose additional levies on EU heavy goods vehicles entering Russia.

What is the current state of play on this matter?

If Russia does impose additional levies, what measures is the Commission likely to take in response?

Are we going to accept possible Russian activities in this area in silence?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2014)

The Commission is seriously concerned about the situation regarding the application of the TIR system in Russia and acted promptly when it was informed of Russia's intentions.

The latest state of play on the situation and the Commission's actions can be found in the reply to Written Question E-013566/2013 ([1]).

Currently, Russia has postponed the termination of the contract with the national TIR guaranteeing association ASMAP to 1 July 2014, but is charging additional transit guarantees in all customs districts, except for those situated at the border with Finland.

The Commission considers this situation is in breach of the TIR Convention and has negative effects on EU transport operators and in terms of lack of clarity for the future. The Commission will continue to raise this issue in the appropriate multilateral (i.e. the UNECE based TIR bodies) and bilateral fora with a view to ensuring that the impact of these measures for EU operators remains as limited as possible and with the objective to put an end to them.

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

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000352/14
do Komisji
Andrzej Grzyb (PPE)
(15 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Ograniczenia dla wolnego przepływu osób w Wielkiej Brytanii

Premier Wielkiej Brytanii David Cameron zapowiada wprowadzenie ograniczeń w prawach do zasiłków dla osób niebędących obywatelami Zjednoczonego Królestwa utrzymując równocześnie obecny poziom zabezpieczeń socjalnych dla jego obywateli. Obywatele innych krajów UE mają nabierać praw do zasiłku dla bezrobotnych po trzech miesiącach od przybycia na Wyspy Brytyjskie, dzieci obywateli państw członkowskich UE płacących w Wielkiej Brytanii podatki mają być objęte dodatkami tylko, jeśli przebywają na Wyspach Brytyjskich. Ograniczenia te nie mają dotyczyć obywateli Wielkiej Brytanii.

Takie postępowanie jest jawnie niezgodne z Traktatami a w szczególności wolnym przepływem osób w UE.

Jakie działania Komisja zamierza podjąć w przypadku wprowadzenia tego typu rozwiązań?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(5 lutego 2014 r.)

W komunikacie Komisji z dnia 25.11.2013 r. przywołuje się prawo obywateli UE do swobodnego przemieszczania się i pobytu w innych państwach członkowskich ([1]). We wspomnianym komunikacie przedstawiono również pięć konkretnych działań, które Komisja zamierza podjąć, aby wesprzeć państwa członkowskie w skutecznym stosowaniu unijnych zasad dotyczących swobodnego przepływu osób.

Rząd Wielkiej Brytanii wprowadził nowe ograniczenia dotyczące prawa do zasiłku dla poszukujących pracy, obowiązujące od dnia 1 stycznia 2014 r. Zasiłek dla osób poszukujących pracy to uzależnione od wysokości dochodu i przeznaczone dla osób poszukujących pracy specjalne świadczenie pieniężne o charakterze nieskładkowym w rozumieniu art. 70 rozporządzenia (WE) nr 883/2004 w sprawie koordynacji systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego. Ponadto jest to świadczenie „pieniężne, mające na celu ułatwienie dostępu do zatrudnienia", które – na podstawie orzecznictwa Trybunału Sprawiedliwości – powinno być wypłacane obywatelom UE poszukującym pracy, którzy ustanowili rzeczywisty związek z brytyjskim rynkiem pracy ([2]). Zmiany wprowadzone w prawie brytyjskim są złożone. Komisja, której zadaniem jest zapewnienie zgodności krajowych przepisów z dorobkiem prawnym UE, prowadzi obecnie analizę przedmiotowych zmian.

Komisja odnotowała debatę prowadzoną w Wielkiej Brytanii dotyczącą zmian w zakresie uprawnień obywateli UE do otrzymywania świadczeń na dzieci. Jak dotąd jednak nic nie wskazuje, by Zjednoczone Królestwo nie zamierzało przestrzegać obowiązujących zasad dotyczących wypłacania świadczeń rodzinnych.

([1]) Swobodny przepływ obywateli UE i ich rodzin: pięć skutecznych działań, COM(2013) 837 final.
([2]) Sprawa C-138/02 Collins; sprawy połączone C-22/08 oraz C-23/08 Vatsouras.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000352/14
to the Commission
Andrzej Grzyb (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Restrictions on the free movement of persons in the United Kingdom

The UK Prime Minister, David Cameron, has said that restrictions are to be introduced on non-UK nationals' benefit entitlements, while the level of social security for UK nationals is to remain unchanged. Nationals of other EU countries would be entitled to unemployment benefit after being in the UK for three months, while nationals of other EU countries who pay tax in the UK would only be entitled to claim child allowance for children who actually reside in the UK. These restrictions would not apply to UK nationals.

These measures are clearly in violation of the Treaties, particularly as regards the free movement of persons.

What steps does the Commission intend to take if such measures are introduced?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(5 February 2014)

The rights of EU citizens to move and reside freely in other Member States are recalled in the Commission's Communication of 25.11.2013. ([1]) In this communication the Commission also puts forward five concrete actions it will take to help Member States effectively apply EU free movement rules.

The UK Government introduced new restrictions on entitlement to Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) as from 1 January 2014. JSA — an income-based allowance aimed at jobseekers — is listed as a special non-contributory cash benefit within the meaning of Article 70 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems. Moreover, it is a benefit 'of a financial nature intended to facilitate access to employment' which should, on the basis of case-law of the Court of Justice, be paid to EU jobseekers who have established a real link with the UK labour market. ([2]) The changes introduced in UK law are complex. The Commission, whose task it is to ensure national legislation complies with the EU acquis, is currently analysing the compatibility of the changes made.

The Commission has noted the discussion in the UK on changes to entitlement of EU nationals to UK child benefits. However, so far there is no suggestion that the UK will not comply with the existing rules on the payment of family benefits.

([1]) Free Movement of EU Citizens and their Families: Five Actions to Make a Difference, COM(2013) 837 final.
([2]) Case C-138/02 Collins; Joined Cases C-22/08 and C-23/08 Vatsouras.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-000353/14
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(15 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: VP/HR — Abuzurile așa-numitelor autorități de la Tiraspol asupra școlilor și liceelor cu predare în limba română din regiunea transnistreană

În data de 13 ianuarie, directorului Liceului „Lucian Blaga” din Tiraspol, Republica Moldova, a anunțat că așa-numitele autorități din regiunea transnistreană au blocat conturile acestei instituții de învățământ, obiectivul nedeclarat al acestei măsuri fiind închiderea definitivă a liceului.

Nu este prima formă de presiune asupra acestui liceu, dar și asupra celorlalte instituții de învățământ cu predare în limba română din regiunea transnistreană, căci la începutul lunii decembrie miliția separatistă a descins în cadrul aceluiași liceu, percheziționând instituția și interogând conducerea acesteia. Pe lângă caracterul ilegal și discriminatoriu al acestor demersuri, ele se constituie într-un abuz și o încălcare a unor drepturi fundamentale, precum cel al educației în limba maternă.

Dacă luăm în considerare și declarația liderului regiunii separatiste, Evgheni Șevciuk, făcută la finalul lunii decembrie 2013, conform căreia școlile cu predare în limba română din zona de conflict din stânga Nistrului vor fi închise dacă vor refuza să intre sub jurisdicția administrației nerecunoscute de la Tiraspol, atunci avem o imagine clară asupra amplorii abuzurilor. Toate aceste acțiuni de intimidare asupra unor școli sau licee aflate sub jurisdicția administrației de la Chișinău au un impact negativ asupra reglementării conflictului transnistrean și asupra negocierilor în format 5+2, care momentan nu avansează.

De asemenea, în contextul parafării Acordului de Asociere și a celui de liber schimb de către Republica Moldova și Uniunea Europeană, evenimentele recente de la Tiraspol pot să aibă efecte negative asupra parcursului european al Republicii Moldova și să cauzeze instabilitate în regiune.

În contextul în care Uniunea Europeană este parte la negocierile în format 5+2 privind reglementarea conflictului transnistrean, cum apreciază Înaltul Reprezentant ultimele acțiuni de intimidare ale așa-numitelor autorități de la Tiraspol?

Care sunt măsurile și demersurile avute în vedere de Înaltul Reprezentant pentru a stopa abuzurile la care sunt supuși românii din regiunea transnistreană?

Nu în ultimul rând, cum intenționează Înaltul Reprezentant să se implice pentru avansarea discuțiilor în format 5+2 și pentru evitarea unor astfel de situații pe viitor? Există un plan de acțiune al Uniunii Europene în acest sens?

Răspuns dat de Înaltul Reprezentant/doamna vicepreședinte Ashton în numele Comisiei
(25 februarie 2014)

Comisia este într-un dialog permanent cu Chișinăul și cu Tiraspolul cu privire la școlile cu predare în limba română, cu Tiraspolul acest dialog purtându-se prin intermediul forurilor multilaterale instituite în acest sens.

Situația celor opt școli cu predare în limba română din regiunea Transnistria este de mult timp vulnerabilă, iar OSCE, în calitate de coordonator al procesului „5 + 2”, a publicat anul trecut recomandări în vederea consolidării acestui proces. Comisia a delegat un participant permanent în cadrul Grupului de lucru pe probleme de educație și știință, care a fost înființat în 2007 de Chișinău și Tiraspol cu medierea OSCE. Ultima reuniune a acestui grup de lucru a evidențiat faptul că mai pot fi luate încă măsuri pentru a pune în aplicare recomandările OSCE. UE sprijină această abordare, considerând-o o soluție pragmatică și durabilă, chiar dacă, evident, nu și una finală, de pe urma căreia vor avea de câștigat în primul rând elevii, studenții și părinții lor.

În urma incidentului îngrijorător de la Liceul Lucian Blaga, Comisia a solicitat, de asemenea, Delegației UE la Chișinău să elaboreze un raport specific privind situația școlilor cu grafie latină, în vederea unei dezbateri pe această temă în cadrul Consiliului.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000353/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Abuses by the so-called authorities in Tiraspol targeting Romanian-language schools in the Transnistrian region

On 13 January 2014, the head of the Lucian Blaga high school in Tiraspol, Republic of Moldova, announced that the so-called authorities in the Transnistrian region had blocked the school's accounts with the unstated aim of forcing the school to close permanently.

This is not the first time that pressure has been put on this high school, along with the remaining Romanian-language schools in the Transnistrian region. At the beginning of December 2013 the separatist militia entered the high school, searched it and questioned its head teacher. As well as being illegal and discriminatory, these measures constitute abuse and a violation of fundamental rights such as the right to mother-tongue education.

The leader of the separatist region, Yevgeny Shevchuk, made a statement at the end of December 2013 to the effect that Romanian-language schools in the disputed zone on the left bank of the Dniester river would be closed if they refused to come under the jurisdiction of the unrecognised authorities in Tiraspol. This gives some indication of the scale of these abuses. All these attempts to intimidate schools presently under the jurisdiction of the Chisinau authorities are having a negative impact on efforts to settle the Transnistrian conflict and the 5+2 format negotiations, which are currently stalled.

Moreover, bearing in mind that the Republic of Moldova and the European Union have now initialled the Association Agreement and Free-Trade Agreement, the recent events in Tiraspol could also harm the Republic of Moldova's course towards the EU and cause instability in the region.

Given that the European Union is a party in the 5+2 format negotiations aimed at settling the Transnistrian conflict, how does the High Representative assess the above intimidation on the part of the so-called authorities in Tiraspol?

What measures and initiatives does the High Representative have in mind to halt the abuses targeting Romanians in the Transnistrian region?

Not least, what action will the High Representative take with a view to advancing the 5+2 format discussions and preventing similar situations in the future? Is there a European Union action plan to this effect?

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

The Commission maintains a permanent dialogue on the issue of Romanian-language schools with Chisinau and Tiraspol — in the latter case, through the established multilateral fora.

The situation of the eight Romanian-language schools in the Transnistrian region has long been vulnerable, and the OSCE, as coordinator of the '5+2' process, issued last year recommendations aiming at strengthening it. The Commission delegated a permanent participant to the Working Group on education and science established in 2007 by Chisinau and Tiraspol under OSCE mediation. The latest meeting of this Working Group showed that there was still room for implementing the OSCE recommendations. The EU supports this approach as a pragmatic and lasting, though certainly not final, solution, which will first benefit the pupils, the students and their parents.

Following the worrying incident with the Lucian Blaga gymnasium, the Commission also requested the EU Delegation in Chisinau to prepare a specific report on the situation of the Latin-script schools, in view of a Council discussion on this issue.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000355/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(15 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Promoción del uso de productos de proximidad

El año pasado, el escándalo de la carne de caballo puso de relieve un problema de trazabilidad de los productos en el mercado interior de la Unión, y llevó a señalar con el dedo al Estado francés, al que el reciente informe de la Comisión sobre el etiquetado de la carne ([1]) critica particularmente. Recientemente, el Gobierno de Hollande ha impulsado un plan que consiste en promover el uso de productos de proximidad.

Nos parece que iniciativas de este tipo constituyen una solución sostenible que permitiría resolver el problema de la trazabilidad de los productos y, al mismo tiempo, consolidar los sectores primarios locales. El problema es que la mayoría de las administraciones no impulsa iniciativas en esta materia por falta de voluntad política. Es el caso del Gobierno de la Comunidad Autónoma del País Vasco, por ejemplo. Por lo tanto, nos parece menester impulsar medidas para la promoción del uso de productos de proximidad, y pensamos que la UE también tiene un papel importante para dar ese impulso.

Precisamente en este momento, el Parlamento Europeo está debatiendo sobre la nueva reforma de la contratación pública. Las Directivas 2004/17/CE y 2004/18/CE que regulan esta materia promueven el uso de circuitos cortos en la cadena de abastecimiento agrícola; pero no se trata de normas vinculantes, sino que dependen de la voluntad política de cada poder adjudicador.

¿Piensa la Comisión dar algunos pasos para promover el uso de productos de proximidad en el sector primario?

Más concretamente, ¿piensa la Comisión tomar alguna iniciativa para que la nueva reforma de la contratación pública fije normas más vinculantes respecto a los circuitos cortos?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de marzo de 2014)

En el informe de la Comisión publicado en diciembre de 2013 sobre la justificación de un sistema de etiquetado relativo a la agricultura local y la venta directa ([2]) y en el documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión sobre los diversos aspectos de las cadenas cortas de suministro de alimentos se examinaron la agricultura local y las cadenas cortas de suministro de alimentos, sus problemas y perspectivas y los instrumentos existentes a escala de la UE para apoyar su desarrollo.

Uno de estos instrumentos es el apoyo, en el marco de la política de desarrollo rural, a la cooperación a efectos de la creación y el fomento de las cadenas cortas de suministro y los mercados locales, lo que se complementa con ayudas a las actividades de promoción en un contexto local en relación con su fomento ([3]).

En dicho informe, la Comisión instó al Parlamento Europeo y al Consejo, a los Estados miembros y a las regiones a reflexionar sobre si las medidas e instrumentos políticos existentes son los adecuados. Basándose en las conclusiones de estas reflexiones, la Comisión decidirá sobre la conveniencia de adoptar nuevas medidas en este ámbito.

Las nuevas Directivas sobre contratación pública, que sustituirán a las Directivas 2004/17/CE y 2004/18/CE y que persiguen fomentar el mercado interior no contemplan disposiciones específicas sobre los productos locales.

Las autoridades públicas pueden apoyar el desarrollo de las cadenas de suministro de alimentos sostenibles mediante sus compras. A este respecto, las nuevas Directivas incluyen disposiciones, por ejemplo, sobre el uso de criterios de adjudicación relacionados con la calidad y el medio ambiente, fijándose los costes según los costes del ciclo de vida, así como la posible integración de las externalidades en los costes y un régimen más simple y específico para los servicios sociales, sanitarios y educativos, entre otros.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/foodlabelling/docs/com_2013-755_es.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/local-farming-direct-sales/index_en.htm
([3]) Artículo 35 del Reglamento (UE) n° 1305/2013, relativo a la ayuda al desarrollo rural (DO L 347 de 20.12.2013, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000355/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Encouraging the use of local produce

Last year's horsemeat scandal highlighted the problem of the traceability of goods in the European Union internal market, and France was singled out for specific criticism in the Commission's recent report on meat labelling ([1]). The Dutch government recently launched a plan aiming to encourage the use of local produce.

In our opinion, this type of initiative is a sustainable solution that would make it possible to solve the problem of the traceability of goods and, at the same time, reinforce the local primary sector. The problem is that most governments do not promote these kinds of initiatives due to a lack of political will. Such is the case for the government of the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country, for example. We therefore consider it to be necessary to promote measures to encourage the use of local produce, and we believe that the EU also has an important role to play in this promotion drive.

At this very moment, the European Parliament is debating the new reform on public procurement. Directives 2004/17/EC and 2004/18/EC regulating this matter encourage the use of short circuits in the agricultural supply chain; however, these are not binding regulations, but depend on the political will of each individual judiciary power.

Is the Commission thinking about taking steps to encourage the use of local produce in the primary sector?

More specifically, is the Commission thinking about creating an initiative to make the new reform on public procurement more binding in relation to short circuits?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

The Commission Report published in December 2013, on the case for a local farming and direct sales labelling scheme ([2]) and the Commission Staff Working Document on various aspects of short food supply chains, examined local farming and short food supply chains, their challenges and tools that exist at EU level to support their development.

One of these tools is the support in the framework of rural development policy for cooperation in establishing and developing short supply chains and local markets, complemented by support for promotion activities in a local context related to their development ([3]).

In the report the Commission called on the Parliament and the Council, Member States and regions to reflect whether existing policy tools and measures are appropriate. Based on the conclusions of these reflections, the Commission will decide on whether further action is appropriate in this area.

The new public procurement Directives which will replace Directives 2004/17/EC and 2004/18/EC and should foster the internal market do not foresee specific provisions on local produce.

Public authorities can support the development of sustainable food supply chains with their purchases. In this respect, the new Directives include provisions on, for example, the use of quality and environmental award criteria, costs being established on the basis of life-cycle costing as well as possible inclusion of externalities into the costs and a specific and simpler regime for services like social, health and education services.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/foodlabelling/docs/com_2013-755_es.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/local-farming-direct-sales/index_en.htm
([3]) Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 on support for rural development; OJ L 347 of 20.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000358/14
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR), Julie Girling (ECR) and Giles Chichester (ECR)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Monitoring of border crossings at the Gibraltarian/Spanish frontier

On15 November 2013, the Commission presented the conclusions of its investigation into the events at the Spain/Gibraltar border. The Commission commented in its letter to the Spanish Government that the actions by the Spanish authorities had created a bottle-neck effect, as six queues of traffic waiting to pass through the border were funnelled into one single lane. The Spanish Government was asked to streamline its border-crossing procedures, improve the infrastructure available to do so, increase the number of lanes available and adopt a more intelligence-driven investigative method in combating cross-border smuggling. Spain was even offered funds to help meet the costs of improving its border facilities.

We are now two months on from these conclusions and residents in Gibraltar are still suffering from unnecessary queues and random harassment. There seems to be little activity or desire to improve matters on the Spanish side of the border. By contrast, the Gibraltarian authorities have already announced that they will carry out outbound tobacco checks in an effort to implement the Commission's recommendations. I would therefore like to know the following:

1. What steps is the Commission taking to monitor the ongoing situation?

2. Has the Spanish Government submitted any proposals to improve its border-crossing activities?

3. How much money has been made available to the Spanish Government to improve its facilities?

4. Will the Commission be sending a follow-up investigative team to the frontier to monitor progress? If so, when is the team due to be sent or will this be carried out in secret?

5. By what date would the Commission expect progress to be made concerning its recommendations?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answers to written questions E-013941/2013 ([1]) and E-013389/13 ([2]).

In the meantime the Spanish authorities committed to improve the management of vehicle and pedestrian traffic, the infrastructure and the equipment at the crossing point of La Línea de la Concepción. These investments could be supported with EU Funds. Under the Internal Security Fund (Border and Visa Instrument), Spain was allocated with 195 million euros for the period of 2014-2020. The Spanish authorities can include the relevant actions improving border-crossing activities at the Spanish/Gibraltar border in its Internal Security Fund multi-annual programme. So far, Spain has not submitted its draft ISF programme. At the same time, Spain can also foresee the revision of the ongoing 2013 annual programme of the External Borders Fund. However, the Commission has not received so far any request in this respect.

As already announced, after the expiration of the six month deadline, the Commission will assess the situation again. It will pay particular attention on how its recommendations have been taken into consideration by the authorities of Spain and of the United Kingdom. The Commission reserves the right to pay another visit to the border if appropriate.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-013941%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-013389%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000359/14
to the Commission
Phil Bennion (ALDE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Protection of Unesco biosphere reserve in Paraguay

A constituent from Worcestershire (England) has expressed her concern about the news that Paraguay has granted cattle ranchers a licence to bulldoze a Unesco biosphere reserve, which is also the last refuge of un-contacted Ayoreo Indians. My constituent is particularly alarmed by this because she thinks it is highly likely that beef produced illegally on the tribe's land will be on supermarket shelves in the EU in the near future.

Is the Commission aware of this? Has the matter been raised with the Paraguayan authorities?

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

The EU pays great attention to the situation of indigenous peoples in Latin America. The EU is aware of the situation of the Ayoreo community, and the dispute concerning the management of the forests on part of the land claimed by the tribe. According to recent information, the issue is under examination by the Paraguayan judicial system.

The EU addresses government policies to promote sustainable development, poverty reduction and the rights of indigenous people in its dialogue with Paraguay.

No imports of beef from Paraguay into the EU are currently authorised, because of animal health concerns due to the outbreaks of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) which occurred in the country in 2011 and 2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000360/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Azioni integrate per lo sviluppo urbano sostenibile in Italia

Il rilancio economico e lo sviluppo delle aree urbane sono un fattore chiave per la crescita e l'occupazione nell'ambito della revisione della politica di coesione dell'UE, che mira a un miglioramento della qualità della vita e a una maggiore integrazione sociale e territoriale.

Infatti, per il periodo di programmazione 2014-2020, il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale, obiettivo «Investimenti a favore della crescita e dell'occupazione», prevede che almeno il 5 % delle risorse del FESR assegnate a livello nazionale nel quadro dell'obiettivo «Investimenti a favore della crescita e dell'occupazione» siano destinate ad azioni integrate per lo sviluppo urbano sostenibile.

1. Relativamente all'Italia, può la Commissione chiarire quali saranno i criteri di selezione delle città e aree urbane che potranno beneficiare di tali misure, da chi saranno selezionate e in quali tempi?

2. Come saranno decisi gli importi da destinare alle singole città?

3. Quali tipologie di interventi potranno essere finanziate?

4. Come si integreranno tali risorse con i finanziamenti provenienti da altri fondi e programmi?

5. Quale sarà il ruolo delle amministrazioni locali?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(6 marzo 2014)

Per il periodo 2014-2020 ciascuno Stato membro deve stabilire i principi per la selezione delle aree urbane nel proprio accordo di partenariato. I programmi devono indicare se lo sviluppo urbano sostenibile verrà implementato tramite una priorità urbana o mediante investimenti territoriali integrati (ITI) sulla base delle priorità dei programmi. I criteri specifici di selezione per le aree urbane interessate saranno definiti nei programmi.

Gli importi da assegnare a ciascuna città saranno determinati dalle autorità di gestione dei programmi. Per massimizzare l'impatto dei fondi unionali è necessario concentrare le risorse disponibili per lo sviluppo urbano sostenibile su un numero limitato di aree urbane.

Il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) può sostenere azioni integrate volte ad affrontare le sfide d'ordine economico, ambientale, climatico, demografico e sociale che interessano le aree urbane, tenendo conto anche della promozione dei collegamenti urbano-rurali. Le azioni da cofinanziare dipenderanno dai bisogni e dalle potenzialità specifiche delle aree urbane selezionate.

Spetta alle autorità di gestione assicurare che il cofinanziamento del FESR sia integrato, se del caso, da altri fondi strutturali e di investimento europei, in particolare dal Fondo sociale europeo. La complementarità sarà assicurata a livello dei programmi.

La delega delle mansioni alle autorità locali non è obbligatoria e il livello di delega può variare. Tuttavia, se l'autorità di gestione decide di costituire ITI per l'attuazione delle azioni finalizzate allo sviluppo urbano sostenibile, è prescritta la delega alle autorità urbane delle mansioni legate alla selezione delle operazioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000360/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Integrated actions for sustainable urban development in Italy

Economic recovery and the development of urban areas are key factors for growth and employment in the context of the review of the European Union's cohesion policy, which seeks to improve quality of life and strengthen social and territorial integration.

For the 2014-2020 programming period, the 'Investment for growth and jobs' goal of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) requires that at least 5% of ERDF resources allocated at national level under the 'Investment for growth and jobs goal' be set aside for integrated actions for sustainable urban development.

1. In relation to Italy, can the Commission clarify what the criteria will be for selecting the cities and urban areas that can benefit from such measures, who will select them and at what times?

2. How will the amounts to be allocated to each particular city be determined?

3. What kinds of work can be funded?

4. How will these resources be integrated with money coming from other funds and programmes?

5. What role will there be for local authorities?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

For 2014-2020, each Member State shall establish the principles for the selection of urban areas in its Partnership Agreement. The programmes shall indicate whether sustainable urban development shall be implemented through an urban priority or through Integrated Territorial Investments (ITIs) drawing from the priorities of the programmes. The specific selection criteria for the urban areas concerned will be set in the programmes.

The amounts to be allocated to each city will be determined by the managing authorities of the programmes. In order to maximise the impact of EU funds, it is necessary to concentrate the resources available for sustainable urban development on a limited number of urban areas.

The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) can support integrated actions that tackle the economic, environmental, climate, demographic and social challenges affecting urban areas, while taking into account the link to promoting urban-rural linkages. The actions to be co-financed will depend on the specific needs and potentials of the selected urban areas.

It is the responsibility of the managing authorities to ensure that ERDF co-financing is integrated, when appropriate, with other European Structural and Investment Funds, in particular with the European Social Fund. Complementarity shall be ensured at the level of programmes.

The delegation of tasks to local authorities is not mandatory and the level of delegation may vary. However, where the managing authority decides to set up ITIs for the implementation of sustainable urban development actions, the delegation of tasks related to the selection of operations to urban authorities is required.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000361/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Elezioni in Egitto

Nei giorni 14 e 15 gennaio 2014, il popolo egiziano si è recato alle urne per votare la nuova Costituzione proposta dal regime militare ad interim che ha deposto il governo dei Fratelli Musulmani. In occasione delle elezioni sono ricominciati scontri di piazza, in particolare tra la falange islamista dell'ex Presidente Morsi e le forze di polizia. È certo che vi siano delle vittime, ma il loro numero non è ancora stato accertato, così come quello dei feriti.

1. In occasione di questi eventi, può la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante chiarire se dispone di dati precisi e ufficiali sulle vittime e i feriti tra i civili e le forze dell'ordine?

2. Può verificare se le elezioni si sono svolte in maniera corretta e legale?

3. Può inoltre far sapere se intende esprimersi o adottare misure a nome dell'UE per arginare le violenze e favorire lo sviluppo pacifico del processo democratico in Egitto?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(6 marzo 2014)

L'Unione europea è a conoscenza degli scontri violenti, degli arresti e delle perdite di vite umane verificatesi in Egitto in occasione del referendum costituzionale del 14-15 gennaio. Secondo le informazioni del Ministero della salute egiziano, nel corso di queste due giornate 11 persone sono state uccise e 42 ferite e, in base alle informazioni della polizia, sono state arrestate 444 persone.

Un gruppo di esperti di alto livello dell'UE (missione di esperti elettorali) era presente sul campo per valutare il referendum, ma non è in grado di effettuare una valutazione approfondita del suo svolgimento o di verificarne le irregolarità. In ogni caso non sembrerebbe che queste ultime ne abbiamo significativamente influenzato l'esito. La votazione è stata organizzata in maniera prevalentemente ordinata. Tuttavia, l'UE deplora l'assenza di un processo pienamente inclusivo e la mancanza di condizioni di parità, prima e durante il referendum.

In numerose occasioni l'UE ha espresso preoccupazione in merito ai recenti scontri violenti e ha condannato gli attentati terroristici, ad esempio mediante le dichiarazioni dell'AR/VP dell'11 e del 19 gennaio. Allo stesso modo, nel corso dei loro contatti sul campo, anche i rappresentanti speciali dell'UE e la delegazione dell'UE hanno preso posizione contro la violenza e hanno auspicato una maggiore inclusività.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000361/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Elections in Egypt

On 14 and 15 January 2014, the Egyptian population voted on the new constitution proposed by the interim military regime that had deposed the government of the Muslim Brotherhood. The elections were once again marred by violent street clashes, in particular between the Islamist supporters of the ousted President Morsi and the police. There will certainly have been fatalities, but the exact number, together with the number of people injured, has not yet been established.

1. In connection with these events, can the Vice-President/High Representative clarify if precise and official data is available concerning how many civilians and members of the security forces were either killed or injured?

2. Can it confirm whether the elections were carried out in a fair and legal manner?

3. Can it state whether it intends to speak out or take action on behalf of the EU to stem the violence and foster the peaceful advancement of democracy in Egypt?

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

The European Union is aware of the violent events, arrests and losses of life during the constitutional referendum on 14-15 January in Egypt. According to information from the Egyptian Health Ministry, 11 people were killed and 42 wounded during these days. According to police information, 444 people were arrested during these two days.

The EU had a team of senior experts (Election Expert Mission) on the ground to assess the referendum, but is not in a position to make a thorough assessment of the conduct of the referendum or verify irregularities; still, these do not appear to have fundamentally affected the outcome. The vote had been organised in a largely orderly manner. However, the EU deplores the absence of a fully inclusive process and the lack of a level playing field before and during the referendum.

The EU has on numerous occasions, e.g. by statements of the HR/VP of 11 and 19 January, expressed concern at the recent violent events and condemned terrorist attacks. Also the EU Special representatives and the EU Delegation speak out against violence and call for inclusiveness in their contacts on the ground.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000362/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Esecuzioni in Iran

Nelle prime due settimane di quest'anno in Iran è proseguita la serie di esecuzioni di civili. Al 12 gennaio è stata confermata la morte di 19 civili nelle città di Urumiyah, Salmas, Mashhad, Qazvin, Gachsaran e Tabriz. Tra le vittime vi è anche un minore.

Questo genere di esecuzioni, così come la diffusa pratica di amputare le mani e i piedi dei condannati, rappresentano una lampante violazione dei diritti umani da parte dell'Iran.

1. In seguito a questi eventi, può la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante fornire, qualora ne sia in possesso, dati aggiornati e completi sulle esecuzioni e le torture contro i prigionieri e, più in generale, sulla situazione del rispetto dei diritti umani in Iran?

2. Può inoltre chiarire quali siano le azioni intraprese dall'Unione in materia di promozione dei diritti umani nel dialogo con Teheran?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(18 febbraio 2014)

Il numero elevato di esecuzioni in Iran rimane una fonte di seria preoccupazione per l'UE. Nel solo 2013 sono state giustiziate più di 500 persone. Questa cifra si basa sulle esecuzioni confermate dalle autorità iraniane e registrate dall'UE. I primi dati sulle esecuzioni avvenute dall'inizio del 2014 non sono incoraggianti.

L'UE ha esortato ripetutamente l'Iran a sospendere tutte le esecuzioni e ad applicare una moratoria sulla pena di morte. Analogamente, in una serie di dichiarazioni pubbliche l'AR/VP ha invitato l'Iran a sospendere le esecuzioni imminenti e a rispettare standard minimi. Un certo numero di iraniani figura inoltre sull'elenco delle persone oggetto di sanzioni dell'UE per gravi violazioni dei diritti umani sotto forma di torture, maltrattamenti ed esecuzioni.

L'UE continuerà ad esortare l'Iran a sospendere le esecuzioni sia nei contatti bilaterali diretti con le controparti iraniane che in pubblico e nei diversi consessi delle Nazioni Unite che si occupano di diritti umani.

Per quanto riguarda il dialogo sui diritti umani con l'Iran, l'UE è disponibile ad avere contatti con il paese su tali questioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000362/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Executions in Iran

The number of civilians being executed in Iran has shown no signs of abating over the first two weeks of the new year; on 12 January, the deaths of 19 civilians in the cities of Urumiyah, Salmas, Mashhad, Qazvin, Gachsaran and Tabriz were confirmed, with one of the victims being a minor.

These kinds of executions, alongside the widespread practice of amputating the hands and feet of convicted criminals, represent a glaring violation of human rights on the part of Iran.

1. In the wake of these events, does the Vice-President/High Representative have any up-to-date and comprehensive data that she could provide regarding the executions and torture perpetrated against prisoners and, more generally, the extent to which human rights are being respected in Iran?

2. Can she further clarify what actions have been taken by the Union to promote human rights in dialogue with Tehran?

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

The high number of executions in Iran continues to be a serious concern for the EU. In 2013 alone, more than 500 persons were executed. This number is based on executions confirmed by the Iranian authorities and registered by the EU. First figures on executions since the beginning of 2014 are not encouraging.

The EU has on numerous occasions called on Iran to halt all pending executions and to apply a moratorium on the death penalty. Likewise, in a number of public statements, HR/VP has called on Iran to stop imminent executions and to respect minimum standards. Furthermore, a number of Iranians are on the EU's sanctions list for grave human rights abuses related to torture, mistreatment and executions.

The EU will continue to call on Iran to halt executions, both in bilateral, direct contacts with Iranian counterparts as well as in public, and within the United Nations various fora for human rights.

As far as human rights dialogue with Iran is concerned, the EU is open for contacts with Iran on the human rights issues.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000364/14
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(15 januari 2014)

Betreft: Compensatie voor de slachtoffers van de textielfabrieken in Bangladesh

Onlangs werden de onderhandelingen over de financiële tegemoetkoming voor de gewonden en de families van de slachtoffers van de fabriek in Rana Plaza, Bangladesh, afgerond.

Heeft de Commissie weet van Europese kledingbedrijven die ondanks het feit dat ze kleding afnamen van de fabriek, toch niet deelnemen aan deze onderhandelingen? Om welke kledingbedrijven gaat het?

Welke initiatieven neemt de Commissie opdat alle betrokken Europese kledingbedrijven de compensatieregeling onderschrijven?

Zal de Commissie ook initiatieven nemen om Europese afnemers van kleding uit de Tazreen fabriek, die eerder een zelfde lot onderging, aan de onderhandelingstafel te brengen om een gelijkaardig compensatiekader uit te werken?

Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie
(20 februari 2014)

De Commissie volgt de compensatie van de slachtoffers in Bangladesh via de EU-delegatie in Dhaka. Bij de compensatie moet rekening worden gehouden met de complexe juridische aspecten van de identificatie van de slachtoffers, het vaststellen van wie aanspraak kan maken op compensatie alsook de mate van verantwoordelijkheid en het delen van de kosten.

Naar aanleiding van instructies van een gerechtshof in Bangladesh heeft een deskundigenpanel een protocol opgesteld voor de compensatie van slachtoffers van industriële rampen, en in het bijzonder van Rana Plaza. Het compensatiepakket voorziet in verschillende maten van compensatie. De families van slachtoffers die zijn overleden, vermist of permanent invalide zijn geraakt zullen de hoogste compensatie ontvangen.

Drie Europese bedrijven hebben een memorandum van overeenstemming ondertekend inzake „Rana Plaza compensatieregeling" onder een global trust fund van 40 miljoen dollar. Het memorandum is ook ondertekend door het ministerie van Arbeid en Werkgelegenheid van Bangladesh, Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BGMEA), Bangladesh Knitwear Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BKMEA), Bangladesh Employers' Federation (BEF), National Coordination Committee for Workers' Education (NCCWE), International Business Cooperation (IBC) and IndustryALL (internationale vakbond). Iedereen kan bijdragen aan het global trust fund en meer bedrijven worden aangemoedigd om het memorandum te ondertekenen.

De regering van Bangladesh heeft voorzien in compensatie uit het Prime Minister's Fund voor slachtoffers van de brand in Tazreen, tot 9 000 dollar per slachtoffer. Enkele buitenlandse bedrijven zijn overeengekomen om een concreet voorstel uit te werken, gebruikmakend van hetzelfde model dat voor de Rana Plaza-compensatie is gepland. Om ervoor te zorgen dat dit voorstel wordt voltooid, is de medewerking van andere bedrijven nog steeds nodig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000364/14
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Compensation for the victims of the Bangladeshi textile factories

Negotiations regarding financial compensation for the injured and for the families of the victims of the Rana Plaza factory disaster in Bangladesh have recently been concluded.

Is the Commission aware of any European clothing companies who, despite having purchased clothing from the factory, did not take part in these negotiations? If so, which companies are these?

What is the Commission doing to ensure that all the European clothing companies involved support the compensatory scheme?

Does the Commission also intend to take the initiative in bringing to the negotiating table European purchasers of clothing from the Tazreen factory, which had previously suffered a similar fate, in order to draw up a similar compensation framework?

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

The Commission is following the issue of compensation of Bangladeshi victims through the EU Delegation in Dhaka The issue is linked to complex legal aspects of identifying victims, determining eligibility, as well as the levels of responsibility and cost-sharing.

Following instruction from a court in Bangladesh, a panel of experts has formulated a protocol for compensation of victims of industrial disasters, especially Rana Plaza. The compensation package varies in ranges. The families of deceased, missing and permanently disabled workers are to receive the highest compensation.

Three European companies have signed a memorandum of understanding on the 'Rana Plaza Arrangement' for compensation under a USD 40 million Global Trust Fund. Other signatories include Bangladesh's Ministry of Labour and Employment, Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BGMEA), Bangladesh Knitwear Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BKMEA), Bangladesh Employers' Federation (BEF), National Coordination Committee for Workers' Education (NCCWE), International Business Cooperation (IBC) and IndustryALL (international trade union). The Global Trust Fund is open for contributions from anyone and more companies are encouraged to sign up.

The government has provided compensation from the Prime Minister's Fund for Tazreen fire victims of up to USD 9 000 per victim. Some foreign companies have agreed to work out a concrete proposal, using the same model as is planned for Rana Plaza compensation. Commitment is still needed from other companies to ensure that this is brought to completion.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000368/14
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(15 januari 2014)

Betreft: VP/HR — Algemene staking in de VN- vluchtelingenkampen in de Westbank

UNRWA voorziet in scholing van en gezondheidszorg aan de Palestijnse vluchtelingen in de Gazastrook, de Westbank, Syrië, Libanon en Jordanië. Jammer genoeg ligt de werking in de Westbank sinds 2 december 2013 stil door een algemene staking van de UNRWA medewerkers. De VN-organisatie ligt overhoop met de vakbond over het werk- en salarisbeleid. De Palestijnse kinderen zijn hiervan het slachtoffer en kunnen sinds 2 december 2013 niet meer naar school.

Andere NGO's zoals Karama proberen in hun gemeenschapshuizen deze kinderen op te vangen en toch les te geven. Hiervoor hebben ze niet de juiste materialen noch de juiste hoeveelheid materiaal in huis om alle kinderen onderricht te geven. Meer dan 52 200 kinderen uit de 19 vluchtelingenkampen in de Westbank zitten zonder school. Maar ook andere VN- diensten zoals de gezondheidscentra en de distributiekantoren zijn gesloten. Deze kinderen lopen hierdoor enorme leerachterstand op en door het gemis aan structuur die de school hen bood, lopen ze nu meer kans op sociale gedragsproblemen.

Daarom de volgende vragen aan Hoge Vertegenwoordiger Catherine Ashton:

1. Heeft u weet van deze aanhoudende staking bij de UNRWA? Beperkt deze staking zich enkel tot de 19 vluchtelingenkampen in de Westbank of zijn er ook spanningen en/of stakingen in de andere vluchtelingenkampen in de Gazastrook, Syrië, Libanon en Jordanië? Is er in enige mate toch crisisopvang voorzien voor deze 52.200 Palestijnse kinderen in de Westbank?

2. Welke acties onderneemt u om het onderwijs in deze vluchtelingenkampen te stimuleren? Welke acties onderneemt u om de staking snel tot een einde te brengen?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(4 maart 2014)

De Europese Unie is op de hoogte van de staking van de werknemers van UNRWA, die van de vluchtelingenkampen op de Westelijke Jordaanoever uitbreiding genomen heeft naar de Gazastrook.

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter en afscheidnemend commissaris-generaal Grandi van UNRWA hebben op 27 januari 2014 in een bilaterale vergadering de recente ontwikkelingen in verband met de staking besproken. Commissaris-generaal Grandi verwees ook naar de staking in zijn toespraak voor de commissie Buitenlandse Zaken diezelfde dag. De EU zal zich tot het uiterste blijven inspannen om UNRWA te helpen deze crisis spoedig te overwinnen zodat de vluchtelingen en met name kinderen niet meer onder de situatie te lijden hebben en UNRWA zijn essentiële dienstverlening zonder verwijl weer kan opnemen. De Unie verleent op jaarbasis significatieve steun aan UNRWA met een totale bijdrage van meer dan 150 miljoen euro in 2013.

De EU waardeert bijzonder het werk van UNRWA in zeer moeilijke omstandigheden en zal het VN-agentschap verder volledig blijven steunen, dat in de regio de rol heeft van een stabiliteitsfactor.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000368/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — General strike at UN refugee camps in the West Bank

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) provides schooling and healthcare to Palestinian refugees in the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan. Unfortunately, operations in the West Bank have been suspended since 2 December 2013 owing to a general strike by UNRWA employees. The UN agency is embroiled in a dispute on work and pay policy with the trade union. The Palestinian children are the victims of this strike, as they have not been able to attend school since 2 December 2013.

Other NGOs such as Karama are attempting to give lessons to these children in their community centres. These centres have neither the correct materials nor enough materials to be able to teach all of these children. More than 52 200 children in the 19 refugee camps in the West Bank are without a school, and other UN services such as the health centres and distribution centres have also closed. These children are therefore at a huge learning disadvantage and also run a greater risk of experiencing social behavioural problems due to the lack of structure which school provides.

I therefore have the following questions for High Representative Catherine Ashton:

1. Are you aware of this ongoing strike at the UNRWA? Does this strike only affect the 19 refugee camps in the West Bank or are there also tensions and/or strikes in the other refugee camps in the Gaza Strip, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan? Has any form of crisis relief been provided for these 52 200 Palestinian children in the West Bank?

2. What action are you taking to promote education in these refugee camps? What action are you taking to end the strike quickly?

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

The European Union is aware of the strike by UNRWA workers, which has spread from the West Bank refugee camps and is now affecting the Gaza Strip.

The HR/VP and UNRWA's outgoing Commissioner-General Grandi discussed the latest developments regarding the strike in a recent bilateral meeting on 27 January 2014. It was also referred to by Grandi when he addressed the Foreign Affairs Committee on the same day. The EU will continue to do its utmost to help UNRWA in its efforts to find a swift solution to the crisis, so that refugees, and indeed children in particular are no longer adversely affected and so that UNRWA can resume the delivery of essential services without further delay. The Union provides significant support to UNRWA on an annual basis with the total contribution to UNRWA reaching more than EUR 150 million in 2013.

The EU is greatly appreciative for UNRWA's work in very difficult circumstances and will continue to fully support the UN agency, which is a force for stability in the region.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000370/14
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Prórroga de explotación de la central de Garoña

El Ministerio de Industria español anunció ayer que va a modificar la orden ministerial (IET/1453/2012) mediante la que puede prorrogarse la licencia de explotación de la central nuclear de Garoña. De acuerdo con la respuesta a la pregunta E-005942/2013, si se volviera a introducir combustible en el reactor, el Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear español exigiría «que se efectuaran las modificaciones de diseño previstas en la Orden Ministerial relativa a la explotación de la central nuclear de Garoña actualmente vigente y que se prosiguiera la aplicación del programa de mejoras técnicas posterior a Fukushima».

Tras dicha catástrofe se comprobó que Garoña no resiste terremotos, presenta un riesgo de inundación muy alto en caso de rotura de las presas cercanas y tiene deficiencias en la custodia y la protección del combustible gastado en caso de pérdida de los sistemas de refrigeración. También faltan medidas para reducir las concentraciones de hidrógeno, con riesgo de explosión en la contención del reactor. Finalmente, se detectaron deficiencias en los planes de emergencia ante una catástrofe nuclear en la zona. En consecuencia, las inversiones que requiere dicho programa de mejoras técnicas no parecen coherentes con una prórroga de explotación breve, con los 40 años de funcionamiento de una instalación abierta para 25, ni con las capacidades que puede aportar esta instalación al parque español de generación eléctrica. En consecuencia:

1. ¿Ha sido informada la Comisión del proceso emprendido para permitir la reapertura de Garoña?

2. ¿Dispone la Comisión de los planes de inversión establecidos para adaptar esta instalación a las exigencias técnicas establecidas tras la catástrofe de Fukushima?

3. ¿Considera la Comisión prudente, a la vista de los datos disponibles y las repercusiones no locales de un posible accidente, la reapertura de esta central?

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

1. La Comisión ha sido informada de que el Ministerio de Industria, Energía y Turismo español está tramitando una modificación de la legislación nacional pertinente ([1]) que propone que, en caso de que el cese de la actividad de una instalación nuclear no se deba a motivos de seguridad nuclear, el titular de la licencia de explotación pueda solicitar una renovación de la misma en el plazo de un año tras la declaración de cese de actividad. De conformidad con la Directiva 2009/71/Euratom del Consejo, de 25 de junio de 2009 ([2]), los Estados miembros deben comunicar a la Comisión el texto de las disposiciones básicas de Derecho interno que adopten en el ámbito regulado por esta Directiva, así como de cualquier modificación posterior de las mismas.

2. La Comisión no ha recibido ningún plan de inversión con arreglo al artículo 41 del Tratado Euratom relativo a una modificación en la central nuclear de Santa María de Garoña.

3. Las decisiones sobre la posible prórroga de la licencia de explotación de una central nuclear y sobre su reapertura son de competencia nacional. Es responsabilidad de los Estados miembros garantizar que la central nuclear se explote de forma segura, de conformidad con la Directiva 2009/71/Euratom del Consejo. Esto incluye la obligación por parte de los Estados miembros de garantizar que su marco nacional exija que los titulares de una licencia, bajo la supervisión de la autoridad reguladora nacional competente, evalúen y verifiquen periódicamente y mejoren continuamente, en la medida de lo razonablemente posible, la seguridad nuclear de sus instalaciones nucleares.

([1]) El Reglamento sobre instalaciones nucleares y radiactivas.
([2]) Directiva 2009/71/Euratom del Consejo, de 25 de junio de 2009, por la que se establece un marco comunitario para la seguridad nuclear de las instalaciones nucleares.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000370/14
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Extension of the operating licence of the Garoña power plant

The Spanish Ministry of Industry announced yesterday that it is going to modify the Ministerial Order (IET/1453/2012) by means of which the operating licence of the Garoña nuclear power plant can be extended. According to the answer to Question E-005942/2013, should fuel be introduced again into the reactor, Spain's Nuclear Safety Council 'will require design modifications provided for in the Ministerial Order in force relating to the operation of the Garoña nuclear power plant and continue the post-Fukushima programme for technical improvements. '

Following the Fukushima disaster it was confirmed that Garoña is not earthquake-resistant, presents a very high risk of flooding in the event of the nearby dams being breached and has deficiencies in terms of the safe-keeping and protection of the spent fuel in the event of loss of the refrigeration systems. There are also inadequate means to reduce hydrogen concentrations, with a risk of explosion within the reactor container. Finally, deficiencies were found in the emergency plans for a nuclear disaster in the area. Therefore the investment required for this programme of technical improvements would appear to be inconsistent with a short extension of operation, with the 40 years' operation of a facility that was originally opened for 25, as well as with the capacity which this facility can provide to Spain's power generation capability.

1. Has the Commission been informed about the process which has been undertaken to enable Garoña to reopen?

2. Does the Commission have the investment plans drawn up to adapt this facility to the technical requirements drawn up following the Fukushima disaster?

3. Does the Commission consider it wise to reopen this plant, given the available data and the far-reaching repercussions of a possible accident?

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

1. The Commission has been informed that Spain's Ministry of Industry, Energy and Tourism is processing an amendment to the relevant national legislation ([1]) that proposes that, in the event that the cessation of operation of a nuclear facility is not due to reasons of nuclear safety, the licence holder may request a renewal of the operating licence within one year of the cessation of operation declaration. Under Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 ([2]), Member States must communicate to the Commission the text of the main provisions of national law which they adopt in the field covered by this directive and of any subsequent amendments to those provisions.

2. The Commission has not received any investment plans under Article 41 of the Euratom Treaty regarding any modifications to the Santa Maria de Garoña nuclear power plant.

3. Decisions on the possible extension of the operating licence for a nuclear power plant and its reopening are matters of national competence. It is the responsibility of the Member States to ensure that the nuclear power plant is operated safely, in line with Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom. This includes an obligation of the Member States to ensure that their national framework requires licence holders, under the supervision of the national competent regulatory authority, to regularly assess and verify, and continuously improve, as far as reasonably achievable, the nuclear safety of their nuclear installations.

([1]) The regulation on Nuclear and Radioactive Facilities.
([2]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installation.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000371/14
an die Kommission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(15. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Bleioxid, Bleitetroxid, Tetrableidioxidsulfat und Pentableitetraoxidsulfat unter der REACH-Verordnung

Im Zuge der Umsetzung der REACH-Verordnung wurden Bleioxid, Bleitetroxid, Tetrableidioxidsulfat und Pentableitetraoxidsulfat in die Kandidatenliste gemäß Anhang XV aufgenommen. Diese vier Stoffe wurden als CMR-Stoffe klassifiziert. Damit werden sie als SVHC eingestuft.

Nun könnten diese Stoffe prioritär in den Anhang XIV aufgenommen werden, was eine besondere Zulassung jeder Anwendung bedeuten würde.

1. Ist der Kommission bekannt, dass diese vier Stoffe unabdingbar für die Herstellung von Bleibatterien sind und dass es zurzeit keine Substitutionsmöglichkeiten gibt, aber andererseits Bleibatterien für Start-Stopp-Lösungen oder Hybridtechnologien im Auto notwendig sind? Wie bewertet die Kommission diese Sachlage?

2. Die Verwendung dieser vier Stoffe in Batterien wird durch klare Regeln bei der Produktion und einem Recycling der Batterien zu 100 % so gestaltet, dass keine Gefährdung und keine Freisetzung erfolgen. Ist es angesichts dieser Sachlage nicht geboten, für die Verwendung der vier Stoffe in Bleibatterien eine Ausnahme in Anhang XIV zu verankern, um diese Stoffe in dieser Verwendung von einer Zulassung freizustellen?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(7. März 2014)

Die Kommission ist sich darüber im Klaren, dass die vier in die Kandidatenliste aufgenommenen Bleioxide bei der Herstellung von Batterien verwendet werden, und ihr ist auch bekannt, dass es derzeit für einige Anwendungen keine Substitutionsmöglichkeiten gibt. Die Zulassungsanforderung im Rahmen von REACH ([1]) ist so konzipiert, dass unter bestimmten Umständen Verwendungen in den Fällen weiter gestattet weden können, in denen es keine technisch oder wirtschaftlich realisierbaren Alternativen gibt. Der sozioökonomische Nutzen bestimmter Verwendungen (z. B. bei der Herstellung von Batterien für Hybridfahrzeuge) kann ebenfalls ein wichtiger Faktor zugunsten der Erteilung einer Zulassung sein.

In Artikel 58 Absatz 2 der REACH-Verordnung ist die Möglichkeit vorgesehen, Verwendungen von der Zulassungspflicht auszunehmen, sofern — auf der Grundlage bestehender spezifischer Rechtsvorschriften der Union mit Mindestanforderungen an den Schutz der menschlichen Gesundheit und der Umwelt bei der Verwendung des Stoffes — das Risiko ausreichend beherrscht wird. Die Anwendbarkeit dieser Ausnahme auf einige Verwendungen der vier von dem Herrn Abgeordneten genannten Stoffe wird die Kommission prüfen, wenn die Europäische Chemikalienagentur gemäß Artikel 58 Absatz 3 die Aufnahme dieser Stoffe in Anhang XIV der REACH-Verordnung empfiehlt.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1907/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 18. Dezember 2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000371/14
to the Commission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Lead oxide, lead tetraoxide, tetralead dioxide sulfate and pentalead tetraoxide sulfate under the REACH Regulation

In the course of implementing the REACH Regulation, lead oxide, lead tetraoxide, tetralead dioxide sulfate and pentalead tetraoxide sulfate have been added to the candidates list in accordance with Annex XV. These four substances have been classified as CMR substances. Hence they are regarded as SVHCs.

These substances may now be included in Annex XIV as priority substances, which would mean that specific authorisation would have to be obtained for every application.

1. Is the Commission aware that these four substances are indispensible in the manufacturing of lead-acid batteries, that there are currently no possible substitutes, and that lead-acid batteries are essential for start-stop systems and hybrid technologies in cars? How does the Commission view this situation?

2. Thanks to clear production rules and the 100% recycling of used batteries, the use of these four substances in batteries is non-hazardous and creates no discharge into the environment. Given this situation, would it not be appropriate to specify an exception in Annex XIV, so as to exempt the use of these substances in lead-acid batteries from the need for authorisation?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the use of the four lead oxides included in the candidate list in the manufacturing of batteries and is also aware of the current lack of substitutes for some of the applications. The authorisation requirement under REACH ([1]) is conceived for allowing, under certain conditions, the continuation of the uses in those cases for which there are no technically or economically feasible alternatives. The socioeconomic benefits of some specific uses (for example, in the production of batteries for hybrid vehicles) can also be an important factor supporting the granting of an authorisation.

Article 58(2) of REACH foresees the possibility to grant an exemption from authorisation to uses for which the risk is properly controlled, on the basis of existing specific Union legislation imposing minimum requirements relating to the protection of human health and the environment for the use of the substance. The applicability of this exemption to some of the uses of the four substances referred to by the Honourable Member will be assessed by the Commission once those substances are recommended for inclusion in Annex XIV to REACH by the European Chemicals Agency in accordance with the provisions in Article 58(3).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000372/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(15 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Derechos de la mujer en Maldivas

El Majlis de Maldivas, órgano legislativo unicameral de Maldivas, ha aprobado recientemente una ley por la que se establece la enseñanza obligatoria del Corán en los colegios. También en Maldivas, una chica de 15 años que había sido violada habría sido flagelada públicamente de acuerdo con la sharia si no hubiese sido por el clamor de la comunidad internacional.

¿Está vigilando la UE el impacto social que esta enseñanza podría tener en los derechos de la mujer? ¿Se destina financiación de la UE a la promoción de los derechos de la mujer en Maldivas?

Asimismo, ¿está la UE pendiente del impacto que la enseñanza del Corán podría tener en la democracia?

Por último, ¿pueden el SEAE y la AR/VP garantizar que no se utilicen fondos de la UE para patrocinar o promover ideologías fundamentalistas en Maldivas?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de febrero de 2014)

La UE es muy consciente del incremento de las convicciones islamistas en las Maldivas. La alianza del Gobierno con un movimiento político que interpreta la ley islámica de forma más restrictiva puede tener efectos negativos en los derechos de las mujeres y las niñas. A pesar de la ratificación por el Gobierno de la Convención sobre la eliminación de todas las formas de discriminación contra la mujer (CEDAW), los temas relacionados con los derechos de las mujeres siguen siendo controvertidos.

La UE está dispuesta a apoyar las intervenciones en el ámbito de los derechos de la mujer sobre la base de convocatorias de propuestas competitivas sobre las líneas presupuestarias temáticas organizadas en la sede central, aunque no hay ninguna dotación específica para las Maldivas al amparo del Instrumento Europeo para la Democracia y los Derechos Humanos (IEDDH).

La UE ha adoptado un Marco estratégico de la UE sobre derechos humanos y democracia y un plan de acción para la puesta en práctica del mismo. En este contexto, las Maldivas han participado como uno de los países piloto con democracias de primera generación de la UE, con el objetivo de un análisis y actuación coherentes en apoyo del proceso democrático en el país, dando como resultado un perfil de democracia, una cartografía de las partes interesadas y un análisis de carencias en el ámbito de la democratización. La UE plantea cuestiones de derechos humanos activamente en sus contactos con los interlocutores de la política y la sociedad civil maldivas. La Delegación de la UE en Colombo se encarga del seguimiento.

En la actualidad, la UE ofrece ayuda al desarrollo a las Maldivas para ayudar al país a luchar contra el cambio climático. Al ser un país de renta media-alta, las Maldivas no forman parte de la lista de los países beneficiarios del Instrumento de Cooperación al Desarrollo (ICD) para el período 2014-2020.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000372/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Women's rights in the Maldives

The People's Majlis, the unicameral legislative body of the Maldives, recently passed legislation making the teachings of the Koran a compulsory subject on the school curriculum. Also in the Maldives, a 15-year-old girl who had been raped would have received a public flogging under Sharia law had there not been an outcry from the international community,

Is the EU monitoring the potential impact of these teachings on women's rights in society? Are any EU funds being allocated for the promotion of women's rights in the Maldives?

Similarly, is the EU monitoring the impact on democracy of the teachings of the Koran?

Furthermore, can the EEAS and the VP/HR provide assurances that EU funds are not being used to sponsor or promote fundamentalist ideology in the Maldives?

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

The EU is well aware of the growth of Islamist sentiments in the Maldives. The government's alliance with a political movement that is seen to have a more strict interpretation of the Islamic Sharia, has potentially negative effects on the rights of women and girls. Despite the government's ratification of the Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) issues relating to the rights of women remain controversial.

The EU stands ready to support interventions in the field of women's rights on the basis of competitive calls for proposals on thematic budget lines organised at HQ, although there is no country-specific envelope for the Maldives under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR).

The EU has adopted a Strategic Framework on Human Rights and Democracy and an Action Plan for putting it into practice. In this context the Maldives has participated as one of the EU's first generation democracy pilot countries aiming for a coherent analysis and action in support of democratic processes in the country resulting in a demoracy profile, mapping of stakeholders and gap-analysis in the area of democratisation. The EU raises human rights issues actively in its interactions with Maldivian political and civil society actors. Monitoring is ensured through the EU Delegation in Colombo.

The EU currently provides development assistance to the Maldives to help the country counter climate change. Being an upper middle-income country, the Maldives will not be included in the list of countries benefitting from the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) in 2014-2020.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000373/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Fecondazione assistita e complicazioni neonatali

Uno studio condotto in Australia sembra dimostrare che le coppie che optano per la fecondazione assistita incorrano in un maggiore rischio di gravi complicazioni alla nascita, tra cui i parto prematuro, basso peso alla nascita fino alla morte neonatale. Lo studio è stato condotto su un ampissimo numero di nascite (oltre 300mila) lungo un lasso di tempo di oltre 15 anni, includendo diverse tecniche di fecondazione assistita come la fecondazione in vitro, l'iniezione intracitoplasmatica di sperma, l'induzione dell'ovulazione e la crioconservazione degli embrioni.

Il professore di una nota università australiana che è a capo del progetto sostiene che la fecondazione assistita ha registrato un tasso doppio di conseguenze negative rispetto alle coppie con nessun record di infertilità, anche se questi dati possono variare a seconda del tipo di fecondazione assistita.

Alla luce di questa ricerca, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Può chiarire se dispone di dati relativi alla diffusione dei diversi tipi di fecondazione assistita nei diversi Stati membri?

2. Può confermare se negli Stati membri dell'Unione sono state condotte ricerche che dimostrino un collegamento tra i casi di fecondazione assistita e le complicazioni alla nascita del bambino e quali siano eventualmente i risultati di tali ricerche?

3. Può indicare se intende approfondire la ricerca summenzionata al fine di migliorare le informazioni a disposizione dei cittadini europei affinché possano compiere scelte pienamente consapevoli su un tema così delicato?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(19 febbraio 2014)

1. La Commissione non effettua una raccolta sistematica dei dati sui vari tipi di fecondazione assistita negli Stati membri. Nel 2010, tuttavia, ha pubblicato un rapporto elaborato dalla Società europea per la riproduzione umana e l'embriologia (ESHRE) ([1]), dal quale risulta che il numero totale di cicli di fecondazione assistita nell'UE è pari a mezzo milione all'anno. I dati si riferiscono però al 2006 e, pur con l'ausilio di questa società specializzata, è stato difficile raccoglierli e validarli.

2. La Commissione non dispone di un quadro generale dell'attività di ricerca condotta in questo campo nei singoli Stati membri dell'UE, ma sa che parte di essa si avvale dei finanziamenti erogati attraverso il Settimo programma quadro ([2]). Ad esempio, il progetto SARM ([3]) sta investigando i fattori di rischio legati al mancato impianto embrionale e al ridotto tasso di gravidanza dopo la fecondazione in vitro, con l'obiettivo di proporre nuovi biomarcatori embrionali ed endometriali utili per selezionare gli embrioni più adatti ad essere trapiantati o per identificare le cause dell'infertilità femminile di origine endometriale. Il progetto MACE ([4]) è incentrato sullo studio dell'interattoma embrionale-materno e intende mettere a punto nuovi metodi volti a migliorare l'efficienza e la sicurezza delle tecniche di fecondazione assistita.

Altri fondi sono inoltre erogati ad azioni che rientrano nel programma quadro, come CHICOS ([5]), RICHE ([6]) ed EPICE ([7]), finalizzate a definire, in una prospettiva generale europea, le priorità della ricerca nel campo della salute infantile e perinatale.

3. I risultati che si otterranno dai progetti summenzionati saranno poi presi in considerazione per definire le priorità della ricerca nell'ambito di Orizzonte 2020.

([1]) Comparative Analysis of Medically Assisted Reproduction (MAR) in the EU: Regulation and Technologies http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organs/docs/study_eshre_en.pdf
([2]) Settimo programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (2007-2013).
([3]) SARM — 324509 — Endometrial and embryonic genomics, searching for biomarkers in assisted reproduction http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/106680_it.html
([4]) MACE — 236708 — Maternal Communication with embryo http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/93450_it.html
([5]) CHICOS — 241604 — Developing a Child Cohort Research Strategy for Europe www.chicosproject.eu
([6]) RICHE — 242181 — A platform and inventory for child health research in Europe www.childhealthresearch.eu
([7]) EPICE — 259882 — Effective Perinatal Intensive Care in Europe: Translating knowledge into evidence-based practice http://www.epiceproject.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000373/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Assisted reproduction and neonatal complications

A study carried out in Australia seems to show that couples who choose assisted reproductive therapy run a greater risk of serious birth complications, including premature birth, low birth weight and even stillbirth. The study was conducted on a very large number of births (more than 300 000) over a period of more than 15 years and included various assisted reproduction techniques, such as *in-vitro* fertilisation, intracytoplasmic sperm injection, induced ovulation and cryopreservation of embryos.

The professor at a well-known Australian university who is leading the project claims that assisted reproduction has double the rate of negative outcomes compared with couples who have no record of infertility, although these data can vary with the kind of assisted reproductive therapy used.

1. Does the Commission have figures on the prevalence of the various kinds of assisted reproductive therapy in the individual Member States?

2. Can it confirm whether research has been carried out in EU Member States showing a connection between assisted reproduction and birth complications in infants, and what the results of such research may have been?

3. Does it intend to take the abovementioned research further in order to provide Europeans with better information so that they can make fully informed choices on such a sensitive matter?

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

1. The Commission does not systematically collect data on the various kinds of assisted reproductive therapy in the Member States. However, in 2010, the Commission published a report produced by the European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology (ESHRE), ([1]) which mentioned a total of 0.5 million medically assisted reproduction cycles per year in the EU. However, data referred back to 2006 and, even with this professional society involved, data collection and validation proved difficult.

2. The Commission is not aware of a comprehensive overview of research in this area performed in EU member states. However, a number of research projects in this area are being funded through FP7. ([2]) The project SARM ([3]) is researching risk factors for implantation failure and decreased pregnancy rate after *in vitro* fertilisation. It will propose novel embryonic and endometrial biomarkers useful for selecting the most appropriate embryos for transfer or identifying the causes of female infertility of endometrial origin. The project MACE ([4]) seeks to gain knowledge of the embryo-maternal interactome to facilitate novel approaches for improving the efficiency and safety of assisted reproduction techniques.

In addition, funding support is also provided for roadmap actions such as CHICOS, ([5]) RICHE, ([6]) and EPICE ([7]) for defining research priorities in child and perinatal health based on a comprehensive needs approach in Europe.

3. Among other aspects, the research outcomes of the abovementioned projects will be taken into consideration for research priority setting under Horizon 2020.

([1]) 'Comparative Analysis of Medically Assisted Reproduction (MAR) in the EU: Regulation and Technologies' http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organs/docs/study_eshre_en.pdf
([2]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (2007-2013).
([3]) SARM — 324509 — Endometrial and embryonic genomics, searching for biomarkers in assisted reproduction http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/106680_en.html
([4]) MACE — 236708 — Maternal Communication with embryo http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/93450_en.html
([5]) CHICOS — 241604 — Developing a Child Cohort Research Strategy for Europe www.chicosproject.eu
([6]) RICHE — 242181 — A platform and inventory for child health research in Europe www.childhealthresearch.eu
([7]) EPICE — 259882 — Effective Perinatal Intensive Care in Europe: Translating knowledge into evidence-based practice http://www.epiceproject.eu/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000374/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Musicoterapia

Un recente articolo pubblicato su una nota rivista medico-scientifica che si occupa di medicina complementare e alternativa ha reso noto uno studio condotto da un'università di Taiwan sulla musicoterapia applicata all'epilessia. In particolare, sono stati tratti ottimi benefici dall'ascolto del concerto numero 23 — K488 di Mozart in termini di riduzione del rischio di recidiva in seguito alla prima crisi epilettica convulsiva non provocata. Dallo studio, condotto su 46 bambini che avevano già subìto almeno una crisi epilettica con scariche epilettiformi, è emerso che il tasso di recidive è stato significativamente inferiore alla media nel gruppo «mozartiano» rispetto a quello di controllo, in particolare dopo un mese di terapia.

Alla luce di questi eventi, può la Commissione comunicare:

1. se studi simili sono stati condotti anche da università o altri centri di ricerca in Europa;

2. se l'UE prevede voci dedicate alla musicoterapia nel contesto del VII Programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo (2007-2013) della DG Ricerca o in altri programmi complementari di altre DG della Commissione;

3. se la Commissione prevede di inserire una voce dedicata alla musicoterapia nel futuro Programma quadro?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(26 febbraio 2014)

1. La Commissione non è in grado di fornire informazioni su studi analoghi in fase di realizzazione in università o centri di ricerca in Europa.

2. Sebbene non affronti il tema specifico della musicoterapia applicata all'epilessia, il Settimo programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7° PQ, 2007-2013), ha stanziato circa 10 milioni di euro per la ricerca dei potenziali effetti della musica su cognizione, riabilitazione e risultati scolastici ([1]).

Il progetto EBRAMUS ([2]) si è concentrato sulla riabilitazione delle funzioni auditive e dei deficit di linguaggio mediante la musica in diversi gruppi di pazienti e negli anziani. Il progetto ADAM ([3]) sta esaminando l'interazione tra processi sensoriali, quali l'ascolto e la cognizione diretta al raggiungimento di un obiettivo. Infine, il progetto UMSIC ([4]) si è concentrato sullo sviluppo di applicazioni basate sulle TIC che utilizzano musica per ridurre il rischio di marginalizzazione dei bambini con scarso rendimento scolastico.

3. Orizzonte 2020, il nuovo programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020) ([5]), attraverso l'obiettivo «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere», contenuto nella priorità «Sfide per la società» può offrire ulteriori opportunità per il sostegno alla ricerca in questo settore. Le informazioni sulle attuali possibilità di finanziamento possono essere reperite mediante il portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione ([6]).

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([2]) http://leadserv.u-bourgogne.fr/ebramus/, EBRAMUS — Europe Brain and music.
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/105015_en.html, ADAM —The Adaptive Auditory Mind.
([4]) http://www2.it.lut.fi/project/umsic/, UMSIC — Usability of Music for Social Inclusion of Children.
([5]) COM(2011) 808 definitivo, COM(2011) 811 definitivo.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000374/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Music therapy

A recent article in a well-known medical-scientific journal that deals with complementary and alternative medicine described a study carried out by a Taiwanese university into music therapy applied to epilepsy. In particular, listening to Mozart's Concerto No 23, K488, had a highly beneficial effect in terms of reducing the risk of relapse following the first unprovoked convulsive epileptic seizure. The study was conducted on 46 children who had already had at least one epileptic seizure with epileptiform discharges, and it emerged that the relapse rate was significantly below average in the 'Mozart' group compared with the control group, particularly after one month's therapy.

1. Can the Commission say whether similar studies have also been carried out in universities or other research centres in Europe?

2. Does the EU include items for music therapy in DG Research's Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Development (2007-2013) or in other complementary programmes run by other Commission DGs?

3. Does the Commission plan to include an item for music therapy in the forthcoming Framework Programme?

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

1. The Commission is not in a position to provide information on similar studies being carried out in universities or research centres in Europe.

2. Although the specific subject of music therapy applied to epilepsy has not been addressed, the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) ([1]), has allocated some EUR 10 million to researching the potential effects of music on cognition, rehabilitation and school performance.

The EBRAMUS ([2]) project has focused on the rehabilitation of auditory functions and language deficits through music in various patient populations and the elderly. The ADAM ([3]) project is investigating the interplay between sensory processes such as hearing and goal-directed cognition. Finally, the UMSIC ([4]) project has focused on the development of ICT-based applications involving music for reducing the risk of marginalisation of children with low school performance.

3. Horizon 2020, the new Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([5]), may through its 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge provide further opportunities to support research in this area. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([6]).

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([2]) http://leadserv.u-bourgogne.fr/ebramus/ EBRAMUS — Europe Brain and music.
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/105015_en.html ADAM — The Adaptive Auditory Mind.
([4]) http://www2.it.lut.fi/project/umsic/ UMSIC — Usability of Music for Social Inclusion of Children.
([5]) COM(2011) 808 final, COM(2011) 811 final.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000375/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Traghetto affondato in Sud Sudan

Lo scorso 14 gennaio un barcone con a bordo tra le duecento e le trecento persone è affondato nelle acque del Nilo, provocando la morte di quasi tutte le persone a bordo, incluse donne e bambini. I passeggeri erano profughi in fuga dalla guerra e dalla povertà che ancora attanagliano il Sud Sudan che si sono accalcati sul barcone, provocandone l'affondamento. Si tratta di persone disperate che, in fuga da un destino infausto, hanno tristemente trovato la morte mentre erano alla ricerca di una vita migliore.

Al momento il Sud Sudan è uno dei punti più caldi del sistema internazionale e si inquadra nel contesto geografico del Corno d'Africa, ritenuto dall'UE un teatro strategico per la propria sicurezza e la sicurezza internazionale. L'UE già dispone di una missione civile in Sud Sudan, EUAVSEC, per garantire la sicurezza dell'aeroporto internazionale di Giuba, ma non ha disposto alcuna missione di protezione dei civili.

A tal proposito, può il Vice-presidente/Alto Rappresentante rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. L'UE intende avviare una nuova missione, nel quadro della politica di sicurezza e difesa comune, al fine di garantire la protezione della popolazione civile del Sud Sudan?

2. Intende includere il Sud Sudan nel contesto dell'approccio onnicomprensivo adottato per il Corno d'Africa di partecipare attivamente alla pacificazione e democratizzazione della regione?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(28 febbraio 2014)

L'UE ha appreso con grande tristezza la notizia dell'affondamento del barcone in cui, secondo le notizie, hanno perso la vita oltre 200 civili in fuga dalle violenze scoppiate a Malakal, nello Stato dell'Alto Nilo. Questo tragico incidente aggrava il bilancio di perdite umane che i combattimenti in corso hanno già inflitto al popolo del Sud Sudan. L'UE teme che la crisi attuale possa propagarsi all'intera regione — già colpita da instabilità, conflitti e povertà — per la quale, nel 2011, l'UE ha adottato un approccio politico «globale» che includeva già il Sud Sudan.

La protezione della popolazione è uno degli obiettivi centrali delle iniziative dell'UE relative al Sud Sudan e a tal fine, essa si avvale di numerosi strumenti. Di concerto con la comunità internazionale, l'UE sta cercando di impedire che la crisi degeneri in una guerra civile su base etnica che provocherebbe ulteriore instabilità nella regione. Alex Rondos, rappresentante speciale dell'UE, è attualmente in viaggio nella regione e partecipa ai colloqui di Addis Abeba, patrocinati dall'Unione africana (UA) e dall'Autorità intergovernativa per lo sviluppo (IGAD). L'UE ha accolto con favore la notizia della firma di un accordo di cessate il fuoco e ha insistito affinché, grazie alla buona fede delle parti in causa, tale accordo si traduca concretamente in realtà. L'UE è convinta che l'accordo rappresenti un primo passo verso la conclusione dei combattimenti e l'instaurazione di una pace duratura nel Sud Sudan.

L'UE garantisce il proprio sostegno all'IGAD per la gestione del processo negoziale e dei suoi risultati, finanziando anche il meccanismo di controllo del cessate il fuoco. Essa sostiene inoltre il rafforzamento in corso dell'UNMISS, che permetterà alla missione di svolgere il proprio mandato e proteggere la popolazione civile. Infine, l'UE ha accolto con favore l'impegno dell'Unione africana a istituire una commissione d'inchiesta e ne sollecita la rapida istituzione ed operatività.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000375/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Ferry disaster in South Sudan

On 14 January this year a barge carrying between 200 and 300 people sank in the Nile with the loss of nearly everybody on board, including women and children. The passengers were refugees fleeing the fighting and poverty that still have a grip on South Sudan. So many had crowded onto the barge that it sank. These were desperate people trying to escape from a hopeless situation who sadly died while in pursuit of a better life.

South Sudan is currently one of the most troubled spots on the international scene and falls within the geographical context of the Horn of Africa, which the European Union considers a strategic theatre for its own security and that of the international community. The EU already has a civilian mission in South Sudan, EUAVSEC, to ensure security at Juba's international airport, but it has not deployed any missions to protect civilians.

1. Can the Vice-President/High Representative please say whether the EU intends to launch a new mission under the common security and defence policy to protect South Sudan's civilian population?

2. Does it intend to include South Sudan in the comprehensive approach it has adopted for the Horn of Africa to play an active role in bringing peace and democracy to the region?

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

The EU is very saddened by the ferry accident in South Sudan in which over 200 civilians, reportedly lost their lives while fleeing violence in Malakal in Upper Nile State. This tragic incident adds to the human toll that the current conflict has already inflicted on the South Sudanese people. The EU is concerned that the on-going crisis risks affecting the much wider region that is already prone to instability, conflict and poverty and for which the EU, in 2011, has adopted a 'comprehensive approach'. This new combined political approach already included South Sudan.

The protection of the South Sudanese people is at the heart of the EU's efforts in the country. To this effect, the EU is deploying a range of its instruments. Together with the international community, the EU is active in trying to prevent the crisis descending into an ethnic-based civil war and avoid further instability in the region. EU Special Representative Alex Rondos is travelling the region and attending the talks in Addis Ababa, facilitated by the African Union (AU) and Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). The EU welcomed the signing of a ceasefire agreement and insisted on turning it into reality by implementing it in good faith. The EU is confident that the agreement is a first step to stop the fighting and to find lasting peace within South Sudan.

The EU is providing support to IGAD for the negotiation process and its eventual outcomes, including support to the ceasefire monitoring mechanism. The EU also supports the on-going strengthening of UNMISS so that it can fulfil its mandate of protection of civilian. The EU also welcomed the AU's commitment to establish a Commission of Enquiry and urges for its swift setup and operationalization.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000376/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Telefoni italiani e roaming sloveno

Alcuni cittadini residenti in Friuli Venezia-Giulia denunciano una situazione problematica per la telefonia mobile: infatti, nelle zone di confine con la Slovenia, i cellulari italiani finiscono per andare in «roaming involontario», ovvero si allacciano alla rete dei gestori telefonici sloveni, causando spese pazze e impossibilità di utilizzo per gli utenti friulani. Questo accade perché in Slovenia le antenne telefoniche sono più potenti di quelle italiane, avendo limiti di potenza inferiori e di conseguenza segnali più potenti che arrivano facilmente oltre confine a coprire la rete telefonica italiana, il che porta ad aumenti di bolletta esagerati per gli utenti in questione.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. cosa aspetta ad eliminare il roaming all'interno dell'Unione europea, come da tempo auspicato dal Commissario Kroes?

2. Non ritiene che la potenza eccessiva dei ripetitori sloveni possa causare rischi per la salute dei cittadini sloveni e degli Stati confinanti?

3. Quali soluzioni propone per ovviare a questo e ad altri problemi di chi risiede lungo i confini degli Stati membri?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(5 marzo 2014)

Le spese di roaming costituiscono un chiaro esempio dell'assenza di un mercato unico nel settore delle comunicazioni elettroniche e per questo motivo la proposta della Commissione di regolamento che stabilisce misure riguardanti il mercato unico europeo delle comunicazioni elettroniche e per realizzare un continente connesso (COM(2013) 627) affronta la questione del roaming per eliminarne gradualmente i sovrapprezzi nell'Unione europea. Il vigente regolamento (UE) n. 531/2012 sul roaming contiene inoltre obblighi specifici di monitoraggio e di informazione dei consumatori sui modi per evitare il roaming involontario nelle zone frontaliere. In particolare, i fornitori di roaming sono tenuti ad adottare misure ragionevoli per proteggere i propri clienti dai costi di roaming per accesso involontario a servizi di roaming mentre si trovano nello Stato membro in cui risiedono.

Spetta alle autorità nazionali di regolamentazione vigilare sul roaming involontario che non è stato tuttavia considerato un problema significativo in una recente relazione dell'associazione delle autorità nazionali di regolamentazione, BEREC ([1]). Secondo tale relazione, i fornitori di comunicazioni elettroniche hanno adottato diversi meccanismi volti a risolvere la questione del roaming involontario. Oltre alle informazioni in linea, essi di norma adottano misure volte a garantire che i consumatori siano informati circa eventuali problemi specifici: in alcuni casi gli operatori offrono tariffe specifiche per i paesi limitrofi, in altri casi gli operatori hanno invece migliorato la copertura di rete proprio per evitare il roaming involontario.

Va infine osservato che i limiti sloveni di esposizione della popolazione ai campi elettromagnetici sembrano conformi a quanto prescritto nella raccomandazione del Consiglio 1999/519/CE relativa alla limitazione dell'esposizione della popolazione ai campi elettromagnetici; la Commissione non è a conoscenza di violazioni a tali limiti nazionali sulle frontiere.

([1]) BEREC International Roaming Compliance Report (Relazione del BEREC sulla conformità in tema di roaming internazionale) — BoR (13) 126.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000376/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Italian telephones and Slovenian roaming charges

Some people who live in Friuli Venezia-Giulia are reporting a problem with the mobile telephone service. In areas along the border with Slovenia, Italian mobiles end up switching to 'spontaneous roaming' mode; in other words they connect to the Slovenian mobile network, resulting in absurd costs and making it impossible for Friuli customers to use them. This happens because the telephone masts in Slovenia are more powerful than the Italian ones. They have lower power limits and therefore emit more powerful signals, which easily carry over the border and smother the Italian telephone network. That leads to hugely inflated bills for the users in question.

1. What is the Commission waiting for to end roaming charges within the European Union, as Commissioner Kroes has been hoping for some time?

2. Does it not believe that the excessive power of the Slovenian repeater masts may be a health risk for people in Slovenia and neighbouring countries?

3. What solutions is it putting forward to this and other problems experienced by people who live along the borders of Member States?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

Roaming charges are a manifest example of lack of single market in the electronic communications sector and for this reason the Commission proposal for a regulation laying down measures concerning the European single market for electronic communications and to achieve a Connected Continent COM(2013)627 addresses roaming, with a view to gradually phasing out roaming surcharges in the European Union. Moreover, the current Roaming Regulation no 531/2012 contains specific obligations to monitor and to inform customers on how to avoid inadvertent roaming in border regions. Roaming providers shall in particular take reasonable steps to protect their customers from paying roaming charges for inadvertently accessed roaming services while situated in their home Member State.

Monitoring of inadvertent roaming lies with National Regulatory Authorities (NRA) which however did not identify it as a significant problem in the recent BEREC report ([1]). According to it, electronic communications providers have put in place a number of mechanisms to deal with this issue. Apart from online information, they generally take steps to ensure consumers are aware of any specific problem; in some cases operators offer specific tariffs for neighbouring countries; yet in other cases, operators have improved network coverage to avoid inadvertent roaming in the first place.

Finally, it should be noted that the Slovene limits of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields appear to be in line with the Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields and the Commission is not aware of breaches to these national limits on the borders.

([1]) BEREC International Roaming Compliance Report — BoR (13) 126.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000377/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Iperburocrazia sulle aspirapolveri

La nuova direttiva sugli elettrodomestici proposta dalla Commissione rappresenta l'ennesimo eccesso di burocrazia di un'Unione europea che pretende di entrare nelle case e nelle scelte di consumo dei propri cittadini, salvo poi dimenticare il suo ruolo in altri ambiti. La suddetta direttiva impone, entro fine anno, la vendita e la produzione di apparecchi con motori non superiori alla potenza di 1.600 watt, con il limite che verrà ulteriormente abbassato a 900 watt entro il 2017. Il tutto in nome di una sacrosanta politica di risparmio energetico, che passa anche dalle regolamentazioni sugli sciacquoni, che però nega libertà di produzione alle aziende e di scelta ai consumatori, che non potranno scegliere la potenza delle proprie aspirapolveri in base alla propria necessità. Tuttavia, tutto questo non coincide con politiche di difesa e investimento sulle energie rinnovabili, come dimostra il caso del dumping cinese nel settore fotovoltaico, in cui le aziende dell'Unione europea sono state completamente abbandonate dalla Commissione.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se non ritiene con questo provvedimento di andare contro la libertà di scelta dei consumatori?

2. Ha considerato che tale misura porterà a due conseguenze, vale a dire la minore efficienza delle aspirapolveri che verranno utilizzate per più tempo, con evidente dispendio dell'energia «risparmiata», da un lato, e l'aumento dei prezzi delle aspirapolveri in caso di un aumento dell'efficienza corrispondente a una diminuzione dell'energia utilizzata, dall'altro?

3. Quali altri limiti energetici impone all'interno della direttiva sugli elettrodomestici?

4. Come intende ovviare all'imminente diminuzione delle risorse energetiche dell'UE in termini di approvvigionamento?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(28 febbraio 2014)

1.-3. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla risposta congiunta alle interrogazioni scritte 12250/2013 e 12338/2013 ([1]).

4. La Commissione non prevede un'imminente diminuzione delle risorse energetiche dell'UE in termini di approvvigionamento, ma riconosce l'importanza della sicurezza dell'approvvigionamento energetico a lungo termine. Nella sua comunicazione su un «Quadro per le politiche dell'energia e del clima per il periodo dal 2020 al 2030», la Commissione ha presentato una strategia articolata su tre livelli sulla quale si baseranno le politiche dirette a migliorare la sicurezza dell'Unione in materia di approvvigionamento ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Punto 2.7 del documento COM(2014) 15 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000377/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Hyper-bureaucracy concerning vacuum cleaners

The new directive on household electrical goods proposed by the Commission is the latest in a long list of bureaucratic excesses by the European Union, which is trying to interfere in consumers' homes and in the choices they make, only to forget what it should be doing in other areas. By the end of the year, the new directive will require household goods to be produced and sold with motors not exceeding 1 600 watts in power, to be reduced to 900 watts by 2017. All this is for the sake of its sacrosanct energy savings policy, which also led to the toilet flush regulations, but it denies businesses their freedom of production and consumers their freedom of choice, as they will not be able to choose the power of their vacuum cleaners based on their actual needs. However, alongside all of this there are no policies to protect and invest in renewable forms of energy, as is shown by the case of Chinese dumping in the solar panel industry, in which EU businesses have been completely abandoned by the Commission.

1. In view of the above, does the Commission not believe that it is going against consumers' freedom of choice with this legislation?

2. Has it considered that this measure will have two outcomes: first, these less effective vacuum cleaners will be used for longer, thereby obviously using up the energy 'saved'; and, second, prices of vacuum cleaners will go up if they are made more efficient while using less energy?

3. What other energy restrictions is it introducing in the household goods directive?

4. How does it intend to tackle the imminent reduction in EU energy resources in supply terms?

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

1-3. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its joint answer to questions 12250/2013 and 12338/2013 ([1]).

4. The Commission does not foresee an imminent reduction in supply of EU energy sources, but recognises the importance of long-term security of energy supply. It has set out a three-pronged approach for policies to improve the Union's security of supply in its communication on a policy framework for climate and energy in the period from 2020 to 2030 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Section 2.7 of COM(2014) 15.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000381/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(16. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Ende der 2020-Ziele in der Energiepolitik

Bisher war die Europäische Union ein weltweites Vorbild, was entsprechende Pläne und oft auch die Umsetzung einer neuen, umweltgerechten Energiepolitik betraf. Neuesten Medienberichten zufolge ist die neue Vorgehensweise für die Zeit nach 2020 nicht stringent, sondern bedeutet wahrscheinlich einen Verlust dieser Vorreiterrolle.

1. Welche konkreten Gründe hat die Kommission, für die Zeit nach 2020 keine ähnlich ehrgeizigen Klimaziele mehr zu formulieren?

2. Sieht die Kommission in dieser Vorgehensweise nicht eher eine Schwächung der europäischen Position für die Verhandlungen über ein neues Klimaschutzabkommen 2015? Falls nein, warum nicht?

3. Wie begründet die Kommission die Tendenz, die bisher erreichte Integration der Mitgliedstaaten in der Energiepolitik aufzugeben und die Vorgehensweise, gemeinsame europäische Ziele zu verfolgen, somit zu ändern?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(28. Februar 2014)

1. Die Kommission hat für 2030 einen Rahmen vorgegeben, in dem Ziele sowohl für die Reduktion der THG-Emissionen (40 %) als auch für den Ausbau der erneuerbaren Energien (mindestens 27 %) festgelegt werden. Die Rolle der Energieeffizienz soll anhand einer für Mitte 2014 geplanten Überprüfung der Energieeffizienz-Richtlinie bestimmt werden. Dadurch wird sichergestellt, dass die EU den im Fahrplan der Kommission für eine CO_2-arme Wirtschaft beschriebenen kostengünstigsten Weg einschlägt, um das für 2050 angestrebte Ziel einer Senkung der Emissionen um 80-95 % zu erreichen.

2. Ebenso wichtig ist es, sich im Hinblick auf gute internationale Klimaschutzverhandlungen darauf zu verständigen, wie ehrgeizig das EU-THG-Reduktionsziel sein soll. Wir müssen rechtzeitig eine Einigung über den Rahmen bis 2030 erzielen, damit die EU Impulse für die internationalen Verhandlungen setzen und in den internationalen Verhandlungen, auch auf dem von Ban Ki-moon organisierten Klimagipfel im September 2014, mit einer Stimme sprechen kann. Das von der EU vorgeschlagene 40 %-Ziel wäre ein starkes Signal an die internationale Gemeinschaft, genauso ehrgeizige Beiträge zu dem internationalen Übereinkommen zu liefern.

3. Die Kommission gibt in keiner Weise die bisher erreichte Integration der Energiemärkte auf; mit einer Stärkung der EU-Maßnahmen im Energiebereich will sie die Ziele für das Jahr 2030 parallel weiterverfolgen. Die Kommission schlägt für die erneuerbaren Energien ein auf EU-Ebene zu erreichendes Ziel vor. Dadurch soll sichergestellt werden, dass die Mitgliedstaaten auf ein gemeinsames Ziel hinarbeiten; gleichzeitig wird ihnen eine größere Flexibilität dabei gewährt, sich für die Maßnahmen zu entscheiden, die am besten zur ihrem nationalen Energiemix passen. Diese Flexibilität muss mit einer weiter gehenden Marktintegration und mit mehr Wettbewerb vereinbar sein, für die ein klarer Governance-Rahmen gilt, der für die allgemeine Kohärenz und Übereinstimmung mit den umfassenderen Zielen der europäischen Energiepolitik sorgt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000381/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: End of the 2020 goals in energy policy

Until now the European Union has been a worldwide role model with regard to appropriate planning for and often also the implementation of a new, environmentally friendly energy policy. According to the latest media reports, the new approach for the period after 2020 is not stringent, but instead probably means a loss of this pioneering role.

1. What exact reasons does the Commission have for not formulating any more similarly ambitious climate objectives for the period after 2020?

2. Does the Commission not see a weakening of the European position for the negotiations on a new agreement on climate protection in 2015 in this approach? If not, why not?

3. How does the Commission justify the tendency to abandon the previously achieved integration of Member States in the energy policy, thus changing the approach of pursuing common European goals?

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

1. The Commission has set out a framework for 2030 that defines targets both for GHG reductions (40%) and for the development of renewable energy (at least 27%). The role of energy efficiency will be determined through a review of the Energy Efficiency Directive foreseen for mid-2014. This will ensure that the EU is on the cost-effective pathway set out in the Commission's low-carbon roadmap towards meeting the 2050 objective of an 80-95% emissions reduction.

2. It is equally important to agree on the EU's ambition level for GHG reductions in view of the good international climate negotiations. We must reach agreement on the 2030 framework, in good time in order to enable the EU to provide impetus to the international negotiations and speak with one voice in international negotiations, including the Climate Summit organised by Ban Ki-moon in September 2014. The 40% target put forward by the EU would constitute a strong signal to the international community to come forward with equally ambitious contributions to the international agreement.

3. The Commission is in no way abandoning achieved integration of energy markets, with strengthened EU policies in the energy field to continue in parallel to achieving the 2030 targets. The Commission proposes a target for renewable energy to be met at EU level, ensuring that Member States are working towards a common objective, but allowing them greater flexibility to choose policies best matched to national energy mixes. This flexibility must be compatible with further market integration and increased competition, overseen by a clear governance framework, which will ensure overall consistency and coherence with the wider objectives of European energy policy.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000382/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(16 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Επιβολή φόρου στα ακίνητα στην Ελλάδα

Ο Επίτροπος, κ. OETTINGER, απάντησε στην ερώτησή μου E-012579/2013 σχετικά με το έκτακτο τέλος που επεβλήθη στα ακίνητα στην Ελλάδα, μέσω των λογαριασμών ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος της ΔΕΗ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Το ερωτηματολόγιο που έστειλε η Επιτροπή στο ελληνικό Υπουργείο Οικονομικών και οι απαντήσεις που δόθηκαν είναι απόρρητα έγγραφα; Μπορούν να μού αποσταλούν; Η Επιτροπή είχε προειδοποιήσει δημοσίως ότι «θα ελάμβανε τα ενδεικνυόμενα μέτρα» αν οι απαντήσεις δεν ήταν ικανοποιητικές. Τι ακριβώς την ανησυχούσε εν σχέσει με την επιβολή έκτακτου τέλους ακινήτων μέσω των λογαριασμών της ΔΕΗ;

2. Είχε δικαίωμα η ΔΕΗ να κόβει το ρεύμα σε όσους καταναλωτές πλήρωναν κανονικά την κατανάλωση ρεύματος αλλά όχι το έκτακτο τέλος ακινήτων, το οποίο στελνόταν μέσω των λογαριασμών ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος από το 2011;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Μαρτίου 2014)

1. Η Επιτροπή ζήτησε διευκρινίσεις από τις ελληνικές αρχές όσον αφορά τη συμβατότητα του έκτακτου τέλους ακινήτων με το άρθρο 3 της οδηγίας για την ηλεκτρική ενέργεια ([1]), ειδικότερα δε με τις διατάξεις για την καθολική υπηρεσία, την αλλαγή φορέα παροχής και την εν γένει προστασία του καταναλωτή. Οποιοδήποτε επίσημο αίτημα πρόσβασης στο εμπιστευτικό αυτό έγγραφο υποβληθεί από κοινοβουλευτικό όργανο που αναφέρεται στο άρθρο 1 παράγραφος 4 του Παραρτήματος II της συμφωνίας πλαισίου για τις σχέσεις μεταξύ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και της Επιτροπής, θα εξεταστεί σύμφωνα με τις διατάξεις της εν λόγω συμφωνίας. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει επίσης τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντηση που είχε δώσει στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-012579/2013 ([2]). Με βάση τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία και τις πληροφορίες που έδωσαν οι ελληνικές αρχές, οι υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής έθεσαν το θέμα στο αρχείο.

2. Η κατάσταση στην οποία αναφέρεται ο κ. βουλευτής δεν καλύπτεται από τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ. Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία που διαθέτει η Επιτροπή, η τροποποίηση του ελληνικού νομοθετικού πλαισίου (Νόμος 4110/2013) ρυθμίζει το εν λόγω θέμα.

([1]) Οδηγία 2009/72/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 13ης Ιουλίου 2009, σχετικά με τους κοινούς κανόνες για την εσωτερική αγορά ηλεκτρικής ενεργείας και για την κατάργηση της οδηγίας 2003/54/ΕΚ (ΕΕ L 211 της 14.8.2009).
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/el/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000382/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Imposition of real estate levy in Greece

Commissioner Oettinger has answered my Question E-012579/2013 on the temporary levy imposed on property in Greece through Hellenic Public Power Corporation (HPPC) electricity bills.

Will the Commission say:

1. Are the questionnaire sent by the Commission to the Greek Ministry of Finance and the answers provided confidential documents? Can they be forwarded to me? The Commission had warned publicly that it would take appropriate measures if the answers were not satisfactory. What exactly troubled it in connection with the imposition of a special property levy via HPPC electricity bills?

2. Is the HPPC entitled to cut off power to consumers who have paid for their power consumption in the normal way, but have not paid the temporary real estate levy sent via electricity bills since 2011?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

1. The Commission sought clarification from Greek authorities in relation to the compatibility of the special property tax regime with Article 3 of the Electricity Directive ([1]), and specifically the provisions on universal service, change of supplier and general customer protection. Any request for access to this confidential document formally made by one of the parliamentary bodies referred to in Article 1(4) of Annex II of the framework Agreement on relations between Parliament and the Commission will be dealt with in accordance with that agreement. The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-012579/2013 ([2]). Based on available data and information provided by the Greek authorities, the Commission services decided to take no further action.

2. The situation invoked by the Honourable Member is not covered in EU legislation. According to the information available to the Commission, the amendment of the Greek legislative framework (under Law 4110/201 of the Hellenic Republic) addresses the issue.

([1]) Directive 2009/72/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity and repealing Directive 2003/54/EC, OJ L 211, 14.8.2009.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000385/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(16 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Incarico di amministratore delegato e presidente di AMA a persona con indagini in corso da parte della magistratura italiana per traffico illecito di rifiuti

Recentemente l'Italia è stata deferita alla Corte di giustizia europea per la cattiva gestione dei rifiuti di Roma e del Lazio. Inoltre in questi mesi nella città di Roma si è registrata una battuta d'arresto nella raccolta dei rifiuti differenziati.

Dopo mesi di stallo, ad aggravare la situazione, il Sindaco di Roma ha nominato amministratore delegato e presidente dell'AMA (azienda municipalizzata del comune di Roma che si occupa della raccolta dei rifiuti urbani) una persona che ha indagini in corso avviate dalla magistratura per traffico illecito di rifiuti, inadempimento di contratti e frode in pubbliche forniture.

Premesso ciò, può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. se è al corrente di questa nuova nomina da parte del Sindaco di Roma?

2. Una nomina corredata da tali caratteristiche è in linea con quanto si aspettano le istituzioni europee dalla governance della gestione dei rifiuti a Roma?

3. Un quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(25 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione non si esprime su questioni che sono di stretta competenza nazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000385/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Appointment as CEO and Chairman of the AMA of someone who is currently under investigation by the Italian courts for illegal trafficking of waste

Italy has recently been reported to the European Court of Justice due to its poor waste management in Rome and in Lazio. There have also been delays in differentiated refuse collection in the city of Rome in recent months.

After months of stalemate, the situation has been exacerbated by the appointment by the Mayor of Rome to the position of CEO and Chairman of the AMA (city-owned company in the municipality of Rome which is responsible for refuse collection in the city) of someone who is currently under investigation by the Italian courts for illegal trafficking of waste, breach of contract and public procurement fraud.

In light of the above, can the Commission clarify the following points?

1. Is it aware of this new appointment by the Mayor of Rome?

2. Is such an appointment in line with what the European institutions expect of the waste management governance in Rome?

3. Can it provide a general outline of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2014)

The Commission does not comment on matters that are strictly of national competence.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000387/14
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(16 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Istituzione di un sistema unico europeo di allerta per i minori scomparsi

Ogni anno, all'interno dell'Unione europea, si riscontrano all'incirca un milione di segnalazioni inerenti alla scomparsa di minori (come evidenziato dalla fondazione AMBER ALERT EUROPE e confermato dalla testata giornalistica Euronews).

Benché molti Stati membri abbiano adottato protocolli efficienti per garantire una reazione tempestiva da parte delle forze dell'ordine, non esiste ad oggi un protocollo univoco che permetta di estendere la segnalazione di scomparsa, in tempi brevissimi, agli Stati membri confinanti e, più in generale, a tutti i paesi UE.

Considerato che l'abolizione dei controlli sistematici alle frontiere tra gli Stati membri ha reso estremamente facile muoversi all'interno dell'Unione eludendo ogni controllo, parrebbe auspicabile l'implementazione di un sistema unico di allerta a livello europeo che consenta agli organi preposti di condividere istantaneamente informazioni riguardo a minori scomparsi, superando confini di Stato e barriere linguistiche.

Può la Commissione precisare quali iniziative intende eventualmente adottare per sollecitare l'adesione degli Stati membri a sistemi di allerta già operanti in alcuni degli Stati Membri (a titolo esemplificativo, il già citato sistema AMBER ALERT) e/o per favorire la stipula di nuovi accordi e/o protocolli?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(3 marzo 2014)

Il numero di segnalazioni inerenti alla scomparsa di minori nell'UE è effettivamente allarmante. Le cifre riportate dall'onorevole deputato, tuttavia, sono superiori a quelle indicate dallo studio della Commissione europea Missing Children in the European Union (Minori scomparsi nell'Unione europea) ([1]), che utilizza le cifre ufficiali comunicate dagli Stati membri.

Al fine di promuovere la cooperazione tra gli Stati membri nei casi di sottrazione di minori, la Commissione ha pubblicato nel 2008 il documento *Best practices for launching a cross-border child abduction alert* (Migliori pratiche per lanciare un meccanismo d'allarme transfrontaliero per sottrazione di minori) ([2]) e ha continuato a sostenere la cooperazione tra gli Stati membri in questo campo. Inoltre, dal 2010 l'UE stanzia finanziamenti in modo continuo allo scopo di istituire sistemi nazionali di allarme per i casi di sottrazione di minori e per rafforzare la cooperazione nei casi transfrontalieri.

Quando un minore scompare ed esistono elementi che indicano la possibilità di attraversamento delle frontiere nazionali, le autorità dello Stato membro preposte all'applicazione della legge possono attualmente collaborare mediante il sistema d'informazione Schengen e gli uffici SIRENE nazionali, lanciando allarmi e scambiandosi informazioni dettagliate. L'aggiornamento del sistema (SIS II) del 9 aprile 2013 ([3]) ha apportato miglioramenti includendo tra le informazioni che possono essere trasmesse le segnalazioni specifiche di persone scomparse — in particolare minori — al fine di garantire una cooperazione più efficace per trovare i minori scomparsi.

In aggiunta a quanto precede, la rete di 116 000 linee europee di assistenza telefonica diretta per minori scomparsi è attualmente operativa in 27 dei 28 Stati membri ([4]). Le linee dirette sono spesso le prime a ricevere la segnalazione di un minore scomparso o informazioni relative alla scomparsa e operano in stretta collaborazione con i servizi di polizia. Inoltre, la rete europea coordinata da *Missing Children Europe* assicura l'assistenza e lo scambio di informazioni nei casi transfrontalieri, a sostegno delle autorità preposte all'applicazione della legge.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/missing_children_study_2013_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/funding/rights/call_10014/ramc_ag_annex_5_2008_en.pdf
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-309_it.htm?locale=en
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/rights-child/hotline/implementation/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000387/14
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Setting up a single European alert system for missing children

Around one million reports are recorded every year in the European Union concerning missing children (evidence supplied by the foundation AMBER ALERT EUROPE and confirmed by the current affairs channel Euronews).

Although many Member States have produced efficient guidelines guaranteeing a prompt response by the forces of law and order, so far there is no single protocol for relaying reports of disappearances very quickly to neighbouring Member States, more generally, the entire EU.

The abolition of systematic border checks between the Member States has made it extremely easy to move within the European Union unchecked. It would therefore appear desirable to set up a single alert system at European level which would enable the competent bodies to share information on missing children immediately, across national frontiers and linguistic barriers.

Can the Commission explain what initiatives it possibly intends to adopt to encourage Member States to join the alert systems which already operate in some Member States (e.g. the AMBER ALERT system already mentioned) and/or to foster the conclusion of new agreements and/or protocols?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 March 2014)

The number of children reported as missing in the EU is indeed alarming, however, the figures the Honourable Member is referring to exceed the findings of the European Commission's study on Missing Children in the European Union ([1]) which is using official figures from the Member States.

To promote cooperation between Member States in cases of child abductions, the Commission published 'Best practices for launching a cross-border child abduction alert' ([2]) in 2008, and has continued supporting cooperation among Member States in this field. Furthermore, EU funding has been provided continuously since 2010, to set up national abduction alert systems and to enhance cooperation in cross-border cases.

When a child goes missing and there are indications that the child may cross national borders, the Member State law enforcement authorities can currently cooperate through the Schengen Information System and the national SIRENE bureaus, by posting alerts and exchanging detailed information. With the update of the system (SIS II) on 9 April 2013 ([3]), improvements have been made by expanding the information that can be transmitted with specific alerts on missing persons — in particular children — now included to ensure more effective cooperation to find missing children.

In addition to this, the network of 116 000 hotlines for missing children is now operational in 27 of the 28 Member States ([4]). The hotlines are often the first to receive a report of a child going missing or information related to a child's disappearance and work in close cooperation with the police services. Furthermore, the European network coordinated by Missing Children Europe ensures support and information exchange in cross-border cases in support of law enforcement authorities.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/missing_children_study_2013_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/funding/rights/call_10014/ramc_ag_annex_5_2008_en.pdf
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-309_en.htm?locale=en
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/rights-child/hotline/implementation/index_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000388/14
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(16 januari 2014)

Betreft: Vooruitzichten voor de EU handelspreferenties voor Bangladesh

Onlangs liet Commissaris De Gucht in de marge van de WTO onderhandelingen in Bali, doorschemeren dat het opschorten van de handelspreferenties voor Bangladesh nog steeds tot de mogelijkheden behoort.

Wanneer plant de Commissie een evaluatie van de afspraken uit het Sustainability Compact?

Kan de Commissie alvast laten weten of de overheid van Bangladesh de engagementen die tegen eind 2013 moesten nagekomen worden (zoals de erkenning en het verzekeren van het stakingsrecht, het aanwerven van 200 extra inspecteurs en het doorlichten van het systeem van arbeidsinspecties) ook daadwerkelijk is nagekomen?

Hoever staat het met het opstellen van een publiek toegankelijke databank waarin informatie over de textielfabrieken, de incidenten die er plaats vinden en de genomen maatregelen worden opgenomen?

Antwoord van commissaris De Gucht namens de Commissie
(21 februari 2014)

De Europese Commissie volgt nauwlettend de uitvoering van het duurzaamheidspact voor Bangladesh, dat de toezeggingen van de regering van Bangladesh om de arbeidsvoorwaarden en -omstandigheden in het land te verbeteren, consolideert. In overeenstemming met de rapportageprocedures van de Internationale arbeidsorganisatie (IAO) heeft Bangladesh afgelopen najaar zijn verslag ingediend over de feitelijke en juridische naleving van de IAO-verdragen. De directeur-generaal van de IAO zal een rapport uitbrengen over Bangladesh dat het in maart door de raad van beheer van de IAO te bespreken rapport van het comité van deskundigen van de IAO zal aanvullen.

Wat de verdere toezeggingen in het kader van het pact betreft, kan worden opgemerkt dat de opleiding en aanwerving van extra inspecteurs in de pijplijn zitten. Er is begonnen met inspecties van regeringswege van fabrieken en tot dusver zijn er 120 fabrieken voorlopig beoordeeld als onderdeel van een doorlopend proces. Inspecties in het kader van de *Overeenkomst inzake brandveiligheid en de veiligheid van gebouwen* (die werd ondertekend door meer dan 120, hoofdzakelijk Europese detailhandelaars/merkhouders en internationale vakbonden) en de *Alliantie voor de veiligheid van werknemers in Bangladesh* (Noord-Amerikaanse detailhandelaren) staan ook op stapel en zijn in overeenstemming met de gemeenschappelijke normen waarmee door de regering en in het kader van de Overeenkomst en de Alliantie is ingestemd.

De IAO heeft een project gelanceerd dat onder meer de ontwikkeling en invoering van een databank inhoudt met betrekking tot handhavingskwesties ten behoeve van het departement voor de inspectie van fabrieken en inrichtingen van Bangladesh. Het project heeft ook betrekking op kwesties als de versterking van arbeidsinspecties, een voorlichtingsprogramma over veiligheid en gezondheid op het werk, re-integratie van gewonde werknemers en het programma „Beter werken".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000388/14
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Prospects for the EU's trade preferences for Bangladesh

Recently, in the margins of the WTO negotiations in Bali, Commissioner De Gucht hinted that it was still possible that Bangladesh's trade preferences might be suspended.

When does the Commission plan to evaluate [compliance with] the agreements in the Sustainability Compact?

Can the Commission meanwhile indicate whether the Government of Bangladesh has in fact complied with the commitments which it was required to honour by the end of 2013 (such as recognition and guaranteeing of the right to strike, the recruitment of 200 extra inspectors and a review of the system of labour inspectorates)?

What progress has been made towards the establishment of a publicly accessible database containing information about textile factories, incidents which occur there and the measures taken?

Answer given by Commissioner De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2014)

The European Commission is closely following the implementation of the Sustainability Compact for Bangladesh, which consolidates commitments by Bangladesh's Government to improve labour standards and working conditions in the country. In accordance with International Labour Organisation (ILO) reporting procedures, Bangladesh submitted in autumn last year its report on compliance in law and in practice with ILO conventions. The ILO Director General will issue a report on Bangladesh which will complement the ILO Committee of Exports' report to be discussed by the ILO Governing Body in March.

As to further commitments under the Compact, the training and recruitment of additional inspectors are underway. Government inspections of factories have been launched and 120 factories have so far undergone a preliminary assessment as part of a continuous process. Inspections by the *Accord on Fire and Building Safety* (signed by over 120 mainly European retailers/brands and international trade unions) and the *Alliance for Bangladesh Worker Safety* (North American retailers) are also underway and follow common standards agreed by the government, the Accord and the Alliance.

The ILO has launched a project that includes the development and establishment of a database for compliance issues for the Department of Inspection of Factories and Establishments of Bangladesh. The project also covers issues such as strengthening labour inspections, an occupational health and safety awareness programme, rehabilitation of injured workers, and the Better Work Programme.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000389/14
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(16 januari 2014)

Betreft: Recente inbreukprocedures m.b.t. kansspelen

Bij de lancering van het Groenboek Online gokken in Europa in het voorjaar van 2011 verklaarde de Commissie: „Het doel van deze raadpleging is niet de markt vrij te maken, maar wel te zorgen voor een markt voor onlinegokdiensten in de EU die voor iedereen goed gereguleerd is."

Recente ontwikkelingen plaatsen hierbij toch wel enkele vraagtekens. Er is immers op EU niveau erg weinig vooruitgang geboekt met betrekking tot het „goed reguleren van de online gokdiensten". Daarentegen is de Commissie verder gegaan met inbreukdossiers tegen lidstaten die met nieuwe nationale wetgeving deze doelstelling voor ogen hebben.

Operatoren die in verschillende lidstaten illegaal opereren wenden zich al jarenlang tot de Commissie met klachten over de interne markt. In het verleden gaven vertegenwoordigers van de Commissie aan dat alle klachten samen bekeken en beoordeeld worden.

Kan de Commissie toelichten:

1. of alle onlangs opgestarte inbreukprocedures gebaseerd zijn op een klacht?

2. tegen welke lidstaten klachten lopen op het vlak van gokregulering en de mogelijke strijdigheid met het VWEU?

3. hoeveel klachten de Commissie tegen deze lidstaten ontvangen heeft en wanneer deze klachten werden ingediend?

4. of deze klachten voornamelijk afkomstig zijn van private operatoren die actief zijn in de lidstaten waartegen ze klacht indienen zonder de nodige vergunning te hebben?

5. of er nog onderzoeken tegen andere lidstaten lopen die voor het einde van 2014 mogelijk tot een nieuw inbreukdossier kunnen leiden?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(5 maart 2014)

Zowel de Commissie als de lidstaten moeten ervoor zorgen dat de nationale reguleringskaders in overeenstemming zijn met het EU-recht. Tegelijkertijd werkt de Commissie nauw en constructief samen met de lidstaten voor de uitvoering van een breed Europees kader voor onlinegokken ([1]). In de deskundigengroep voor gokdiensten ontwikkelt de Commissie thans samen met de lidstaten aanbevelingen over gemeenschappelijke beginselen voor de bescherming van consumenten en spelers en voor verantwoorde commerciële mededelingen over kansspelen. Voorts zoekt de Commissie manieren om de administratieve samenwerking tussen reguleringsinstanties te verbeteren.

1. Alle thans ingeleide inbreukprocedures op het gebied van kansspelen zijn gebaseerd op klachten.

2. Alle thans geregistreerde klachten over de toepassing van artikel 49 of 56 VWEU op het gebied van kansspelen hebben betrekking op 18 lidstaten. Aangezien het onderzoek van de klachten vertrouwelijkheid vereist, kan de Commissie niet alle betrokken lidstaten openbaar maken ([2]).

3. Tussen 2002 en januari 2014 werden 112 actieve klachten ontvangen.

4. Er werden klachten ingediend door operatoren, tussenpersonen, handelsverenigingen en individuele personen die ongerechtvaardigde beperkingen aanklagen op de uitoefening van de rechten die hun krachtens het Verdrag zijn gewaarborgd en met name de fundamentele vrijheden van de interne markt.

5. In november 2013 heeft de Commissie, ook na een verzoek van het EP om inbreukprocedures te starten tegen lidstaten die het EU-recht lijken te schenden ([3]), onderzoeken tegen een aantal lidstaten gevoerd of afgesloten ([4]). De in november 2013 genomen besluiten hebben betrekking op een eerste reeks behandelde zaken. Onderzoeken tegen andere lidstaten zijn minder ver gevorderd en worden voortgezet. In die zaken zullen te gepasten tijde besluiten worden genomen.

([1]) Mededeling „Een breed Europees kader voor onlinegokken", COM(2012) 596 final.
([2]) Op basis van actieve klachten heeft de Commissie inbreukprocedures ingeleid tegen België, Cyprus, Tsjechië, Duitsland, Griekenland, Hongarije, Litouwen, Nederland, Polen, Roemenië en Zweden.
([3]) Resolutie van het Europees Parlement van 10 september 2013 over onlinegokken op de interne markt (2012/2322(INI)), zie met name punt 30.
([4]) Commissie eist van lidstaten naleving EU-regels bij regulering kansspelen — IP/13/1101.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000389/14
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Recent infringement procedures relating to gambling

When launching the Green Paper on online gambling in Europe in early 2011, the Commission stated: 'This consultation is not about liberalisation of the market, it is about ensuring that the market for online gambling services within the EU is well-regulated for all.'

However, recent developments raise certain questions about this. Very little progress has been made at EU level with regard to 'proper regulation of online gambling services'. On the other hand, the Commission has continued with infringement proceedings against Member States which seek to attain this aim by means of new national legislation.

Operators operating illegally in various Member States have for years been complaining to the Commission about the internal market. In the past, representatives of the Commission have indicated that all the complaints would be examined and assessed as a single package.

1. Are all the infringement proceedings which have been initiated recently based on a complaint?

2. Against which Member States are complaints pending with regard to the regulation of gambling and possible breaches of the TFEU?

3. How many complaints about these Member States has the Commission received, and when were they lodged?

4. Did these complaints mainly emanate from private operators who are operating in the Member States of which they are complaining and yet who do not have the requisite licence?

5. Are investigations into other Member States in progress which could lead to fresh infringement proceedings before the end of 2014?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

Ensuring compliance of national regulatory frameworks with EC law is an obligation for the Commission and for Member States (MSs). At the same time, the Commission is working in close and constructive cooperation with MSs on the implementation of a comprehensive European framework for online gambling ([1]). In the expert group on gambling services, the Commission, together with MSs, is currently developing recommendations on common principles for consumer and player protection and for responsible commercial communication of gambling services. Furthemore, the Commission is seeking ways to enhance administrative cooperation between regulators.

1. To date, all infringement proceedings in the field of gambling services have been based on complaints.

2. The complaints currently registered on the application of Article 49 or 56 TFEU in the field of gambling services concern 18 MSs. As the investigation of complaints requires confidentiality the Commission cannot disclose all MSs concerned ([2]).

3. 112 active complaints have been received between 2002 and January 2014.

4. Complaints have been submitted by operators, intermediaries, trade associations and individuals claiming unjustifiable restrictions to the exercise of the rights guaranteed to them under the Treaty and in particular by the fundamental freedoms of the internal market.

5. In November 2013, also following a call from the EP to launch infringement procedures against MSs that appear to breach EC law ([3]), the Commission pursued or closed investigations against a number of MSs ([4]). The decisions taken in November 2013 concern a first series of pending cases. Investigations against other MSs are less advanced and are being pursued. Decisions on these cases will be taken in due course.

([1]) Communication 'Towards a comprehensive European framework for online gambling' (COM(2012) 0596 final).
([2]) On the basis of active complaints the Commission has launched infringement proceedings against Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania and Sweden.
([3]) European Parliament resolution of 10 September 2013 on online gambling in the internal market (2012/2322(INI)), see in particular point 30.
([4]) Commission requests Member States to comply with EC law when regulating gambling services — IP/13/1101.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000390/14
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(16 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: W sprawie śledztwa dotyczącego umów licencyjnych na emisje filmów

Komisja Europejska prowadzi postępowanie w sprawie łamania prawa przy umowach licencyjnych na emitowanie filmów. Śledztwo obejmuje największe europejskie platformy telewizyjne, w tym operujący w Polsce Canal Plus, i dotyczy głownie klauzuli „absolutnej terytorialnej ekskluzywności".

Zgadzam się, że tego typu zapisy w umowach mogą naruszać prawo wspólnotowe, a przede wszystkim są niezgodne z interesem europejskich konsumentów, w tym przypadku abonentów platform cyfrowych. Zwracam się zatem z prośbą o dodatkowe informacje:

1. Jakie środki ze strony Komisji zostaną zastosowane w przypadku potwierdzenia nieprawidłowości w przedmiotowej sprawie?

2. Podobne problemy występują także podczas korzystania ze stron internetowych, gdzie częstokroć udostępnianie niektórych aplikacji, czy fragmentów portali zdywersyfikowane jest w zależności od lokalizacji odbiorcy. Czy również w takich przypadkach jest to naruszenie regulacji europejskich i czy Komisja zajmuje, bądź planuje zająć się także tą problematyką?

3. Czy w zgodzie z prawem europejskim pozostaje obecna możliwość zawarcia umowy przez konsumenta z platformą cyfrową jedynie w kraju zamieszkania? Czy zasięg usług danego operatora nie powinien obejmować całej Wspólnoty?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Joaquina Almunię w imieniu Komisji
(5 marca 2014 r.)

W dniu 13 stycznia 2014 r. Komisja wszczęła formalne postępowanie w celu zbadania zgodności z unijnym prawem konkurencji niektórych ograniczeń umownych w porozumieniach licencyjnych między kilkoma głównymi amerykańskimi wytwórniami filmowymi i nadawcami telewizji płatnej w pięciu największych państwach członkowskich UE.

Jeżeli dochodzenie potwierdzi, że powyższe ograniczenia naruszają prawo konkurencji UE, Komisja może przyjąć decyzję stwierdzającą naruszenie i żądać od zainteresowanych przedsiębiorstw zmiany swoich porozumień i praktyk. Ponadto Komisja może nakładać grzywny na podstawie rozporządzenia Rady nr 1/2003.

W niniejszym postępowaniu Komisja zbada przepisy w zakresie porozumień licencyjnych w zakresie nadawania drogą satelitarną lub rozpowszechniania w sieci między wytwórniami filmowymi i głównymi nadawcami europejskimi. Transgraniczny dostęp do takich usług online jest często blokowany w zależności od lokalizacji abonentów, np. w przypadku przemieszczania się przez granice.

W kontekście swojej strategii „Europejska agenda cyfrowa" oraz „Komunikatu w sprawie treści na jednolitym rynku cyfrowym" z 2012 r., Komisja nadzorowała w 2013 r. dialog z zainteresowanymi stronami – „Licencje dla Europy" – w celu zajęcia się w szczególności problemem braku transgranicznej dostępności do działalności twórczej. Jednym ze skutków tego dialogu było zobowiązanie zainteresowanych stron do dalszego poszukiwania sposobów poprawy możliwości transgranicznego przenoszenia treści audiowizualnych.

Ponadto Komisja rozpoczęła pod koniec 2013 r. konsultacje społeczne w sprawie przeglądu unijnych przepisów dotyczących praw autorskich, który zawiera pytania w sprawie dostępności usług w zakresie twórczych treści w Internecie na jednolitym rynku. Komisja rozpoczęła także szereg prawnych i ekonomicznych badań, które dotyczą (m.in.) tej kwestii.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000390/14
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Investigation of licensing agreements for film broadcasts

The Commission is investigating whether licensing agreements for broadcasting films are in breach of EC law. The investigation covers the biggest European television broadcasters, including Canal Plus, which also operates in Poland. It relates mainly to the 'absolute territorial exclusivity' clause.

I share the view that such contractual provisions may be in violation of EC law, and above all that they are inconsistent with the interests of European consumers, in this case digital television subscribers. Could the Commission therefore please provide further information?

1. What measures will the Commission take if irregularities are confirmed in this case?

2. Similar problems exist with the Internet, where access to some applications, or parts of a website, differs depending on the location of the user. Is this also a breach of EU regulations, and is the Commission addressing, or does it intend to address, this problem as well?

3. Is it still the case at present that under EC law consumers may only conclude contracts with a digital platform in their country of residence? Should the service coverage of a given operator not extend to the entire EU?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

On 13 January 2014, the Commission initiated formal proceedings to examine compatibility with the EU competition law of certain contractual restrictions in licensing agreements between several major US film studios and pay-TV broadcasters in the five largest EU Member States.

If the investigation confirms that the above restrictions violate EU competition law, the Commission may adopt a decision finding an infringement and requiring the companies concerned to modify their agreements and practices. In addition, the Commission may impose fines on the basis of Council Regulation No 1/2003.

In these proceedings the Commission will examine provisions of licensing arrangements for broadcasting by satellite or through online streaming between US film studios and major European broadcasters. Cross-border access to such online services is frequently blocked depending on the location of subscribers, e.g. when they move across borders.

In the context of the Commission's 'Digital Agenda for Europe' strategy and the 2012 'Communication on content in the Digital Single Market', the Commission oversaw in 2013 a stakeholder dialogue — 'Licences for Europe' — to address, in particular, the lack of cross-border availability of creative works. One of the results was the pledge of stakeholders to continue looking for ways to improve cross-border portability of audiovisual content.

In addition, the Commission launched at the end of 2013 a public consultation on the review of the EU copyright rules, which contains questions on the availability of online creative content services within the Single Market. The Commission also launched a number of legal and economic studies which relate (among other subjects) to this matter.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000391/14
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(16 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Relansarea industriei europene

Agenția Standard & Poor's a anunțat, în urmă cu două zile, că societățile comerciale europene au acumulat 346 miliarde de euro în numerar între 2007 și 2013, în timp ce statisticile europene arată că sectorul industrial european a pierdut 3,8 milioane de locuri de muncă în acest interval.

Companiile europene au pus deoparte banii, ei se regăsesc în diverse instrumente financiare — cesiuni de active, dividende și emisiuni de obligațiuni cu rate scăzute ale dobânzilor și nu în investițiile necesare relansării producției și a economiei, care ar duce la creștere economică.

În același timp, Parlamentul a adoptat la Strasbourg raportul privind reindustrializarea Europei pentru promovarea competitivității și a durabilității, în care se arată clar că una dintre slăbiciunile structurale ale economiei UE o reprezintă investițiile insuficiente în cercetare și în capitalul uman, ceea ce împiedică tranziția către o economie bazată pe inovare. Raportul propune o utilizare mai bună a fondurilor publice, mobilizarea fondurilor provenite din sectorul privat pentru activități de cercetare și inovare, încurajarea cooperării transnaționale și transregionale, prin intermediul grupurilor de întreprinderi inovatoare, al mediului academic și al organizațiilor de cercetare.

Cum vede Comisia corelarea acestor aspecte pentru folosirea adecvată a fondurilor menționate de către companiile europene în interesul economiei Uniunii prin investiții în scopul realizării de proiecte creative noi necesare relansării industriei europene, pentru reducerea șomajului, mai ales cel în rândul tinerilor, dar și pentru ca UE să rămână competitivă la nivel mondial?

Răspuns dat de dl Tajani în numele Comisiei
(25 februarie 2014)

UE depune eforturi pentru a crea un mediu economic adecvat, care să încurajeze investițiile. În climatul de nesiguranță creat de criză, investitorii și-au amânat proiectele în economia reală. Comisia și-a arătat îngrijorarea în legătură cu această tendință — a se vedea recentele comunicări cu privire la politica industrială [COM(2012)582 și COM(2014)14].

Majoritatea acțiunilor incluse în aceste comunicări sunt menite să stimuleze investițiile în inovare, în proiecte de cercetare și dezvoltare și în dezvoltarea sectoarelor industriale, a infrastructurilor și a competențelor. Acesta este unul din principalele aspecte incluse în noua noastră politică industrială integrată.

Comisia este convinsă că aceste eforturi pot relansa investițiile, activitatea industrială și crearea de locuri de muncă. În acest sens, contribuția statelor membre și a părților interesate din sectorul privat va fi de o importanță crucială.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000391/14
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Relaunching European industry

Two days ago, Standard & Poor's announced that European companies accumulated 346 billion Euros in cash from 2007 to 2013, while European statistics show that the European industrial sector lost 3.8 million jobs during the same period.

European companies have put the money aside; it is found in various financial instruments — assignments of assets, dividends and issues of bonds with low interest rates, rather than in the investments needed for relaunching production and the economy, which would result in economic growth.

At the same time, at its part-session in Strasbourg Parliament adopted the report 'Reindustrialising Europe to promote competitiveness and sustainability', which clearly shows that one of the structural weaknesses of the EU economy is insufficient investment in research and human capital, which hinders the transition to an innovation-based economy. The report proposes a better use of public funds, the mobilisation of funds from the private sector for research and innovation activities, encouraging cross-national and cross-regional cooperation through groups of innovative companies, universities and research organisations.

How does the Commission envisage linking these aspects together in order to allow the proper use of the aforementioned funds by European companies in the interest of the EU economy, by means of investments aimed at conducting new, creative projects necessary for relaunching European industry, in order to cut unemployment, especially among young people, as well as in order to enable the EU to remain competitive worldwide?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2014)

The EU is working to create the right economic environment to foster investment in Europe. In the climate of uncertainty created by the crisis, investors have delayed projects in the real economy. This has been a matter of great concern for the Commission as outlined in the recent industrial policy communications (COM(2012) 582 and COM(2014) 14).

Most of the actions included in these communications are aimed at fostering the recovery of investment. This includes investments in innovation, industrial sectors, infrastructures as well as R&D and skills. This latter is one of the main new developments in our new and integrated industrial policy.

The Commission is confident that these efforts can relaunch investment, industrial activity and job creation. In this sense, the contribution of Member States and the private sector stakeholders will be crucial.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-000392/14
à la Commission
Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Modification de la méthode de calcul de la surcharge carburant dans le transport aérien du fret

Courant août 2013, plusieurs compagnies aériennes ont signifié à leurs clients que les surcharges dites «carburant et sûreté» n'allaient désormais plus s'appliquer sur le poids brut ou réel des expéditions mais sur leur poids volumique.

En modifiant le mode de calcul de ces surcharges pour l'indexer sur le volume des marchandises, les compagnies aériennes vont augmenter le coût du transport aérien de fret de 15 % (en France) à 60 % (en Italie) selon les estimations des chargeurs aériens.

La modification du mode de calcul a été annoncée dans un laps de temps très court (entre septembre et novembre 2013) par plusieurs compagnies aériennes, dont notamment Air France/KLM, Emirates et Lufthansa.

Ce changement du mode de calcul de la surcharge carburant pour le fret aérien soulève trois problèmes majeurs:

— le bien-fondé du changement de mode de calcul. Le choix de l'indexation sur le volume du fret est contestable puisque le volume n'a aucune incidence sur la sûreté et aucun impact sur la consommation de kérosène qui dépend du poids réel du fret.

— Le calendrier des annonces par les compagnies aériennes. La concomitance des décisions prises par les différentes compagnies aériennes dans un laps de temps très court laisse entrevoir la possibilité d'une entente anti-trust.

— Les conséquences économiques du changement de mode de calcul. L'absence totale de concertation et l'impact sur la compétitivité de l'économie européenne, alors que ses performances restent fragiles, apparaissent plus que problématiques.

Pour rappel, la Commission européenne avait déjà condamné, le 18 septembre 2012, onze compagnies aériennes (dont Air France/KLM) à une amende totale de 800 millions d'euros pour une entente sur la surcharge imposée à ses clients par kilo et la surcharge dite de sécurité.

Parallèlement, le 20 décembre 2012, le Conseil des chargeurs européens avait demandé, par un communiqué, à la DG COMP d'ouvrir une enquête spéciale sur le comportement des armateurs en matière de surcharges pour le transport du fret maritime.

La Commission est-elle au courant de la résurgence de ces pratiques? Quelles solutions entend-elle proposer afin de remédier à la situation?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(10 février 2014)

La situation décrite dans la question a été portée à la connaissance de la Commission par certaines parties prenantes en septembre 2013. Les informations communiquées par ces parties n'ont toutefois pas suscité de préoccupations suffisantes pour justifier l'ouverture d'une enquête.

Selon la jurisprudence des juridictions européennes, les concurrents ne sont pas autorisés à coordonner entre eux leur comportement sur le marché d'une manière susceptible d'interférer avec les conditions normales de concurrence. En revanche, ils ont le droit de s'adapter intelligemment au comportement constaté ou à escompter de leurs concurrents. Par conséquent, le simple fait que les compagnies aériennes aient pris leurs décisions l'une à la suite de l'autre dans un laps de temps relativement court n'indique pas en soi que les règles de concurrence de l'UE ont été enfreintes, notamment parce que l'utilisation du «poids taxable» pour le calcul des tarifs de base constituait déjà une norme bien définie dans ce secteur.

La Commission continue de suivre l'évolution du marché du fret aérien et apprécierait toute information complémentaire à ce sujet.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000392/14
to the Commission
Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Alteration of the method of calculation of the fuel surcharge in air freight transport

In August 2013, several airlines informed their customers that in future their surcharges for fuel, safety and security would no longer be levied on the gross or actual weight of consignments but on their volumetric weight.

By changing the method of calculation of these surcharges so as to index them to the volume of goods, airlines will raise the cost of air freight transport by between 15% (in France) and 60% (in Italy), according to estimates by air consignors.

The change to the calculation method was announced within a very short period (between September and November 2013) by several airlines, notably including Air France/KLM, Emirates and Lufthansa.

This change in the method of calculation of the air freight fuel surcharge gives rise to three major problems:

— the issue of whether the change in the method of calculation is valid. The decision to link the charge to the volume of freight is questionable because the volume of goods does not affect either safety or the consumption of kerosene, which depends on the actual weight of the freight;

— the timing of the announcements by the airlines. The fact that the various airlines took similar decisions within a very short period of time suggests the possibility of an agreement among them tantamount to the formation of a cartel;

— the economic impact of the change in the method of calculation. The complete absence of coordination and the impact on the competitiveness of the European economy, while its performance remains fragile, seem more than problematic.

It may be recalled that on 18 September 2012 the Commission already imposed fines totalling EUR 800 million on 11 airlines (including Air France/KLM) for price-fixing in relation to the surcharge levied from their customers per kilo and the safety/security surcharge.

In parallel, on 20 December 2012, the European Shippers' Council issued a communiqué asking DG COMP to initiate a special inquiry into the conduct of ship-owners with regard to surcharges for maritime freight.

Is the Commission aware of the resurgence of these practices? What solutions will it propose in order to remedy the situation?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(10 February 2014)

The circumstances described in the question were brought to the attention of the Commission by some stakeholders in September 2013. However, the information provided by these stakeholders did not raise concerns sufficient to justify an investigation.

According to the case law of the European courts, competitors are not allowed to coordinate among them their conduct on the market in a way that might interfere with the normal condition of competition. They have however the right to adapt themselves intelligently to the existing or anticipated conduct of their competitors. Therefore, the mere fact that airlines took their decisions one after another in a relatively short space of time does not suggest in itself a violation of EU competition rules, notably since the use of 'chargeable weight' for the calculation of the base rates was already an industry standard which is well defined.

The Commission continues to follow developments in the air freight market and would welcome any additional information on the issue.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000393/14
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(16 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Libertad de circulación y residencia de las personas con discapacidad

La libre circulación de personas constituye una de las libertades fundamentales del mercado interior, que implica un espacio sin fronteras interiores en el que esta libertad estará garantizada con arreglo a las disposiciones del Tratado.

Las personas con discapacidad, en particular los estudiantes, que quieren estudiar en otro Estado miembro cuentan con determinadas prestaciones y/o ayudas sociales de su Estado que, sin embargo, no tienen garantizadas por el Estado receptor.

Esta situación se agrava cuando, por motivo de la crisis económica, una familia con un hijo con discapacidad se ve obligada a irse a otro Estado miembro. No obstante, no siempre es posible por la falta de atención que recibirían, o porque no les está garantizado un mínimo indispensable, lo que se convierte en un problema y, sin duda, no pueden disfrutar de la movilidad en la EU como los demás ciudadanos.

Considerando la prohibición de discriminación cualquiera que sea el motivo, incluyendo la nacionalidad o discapacidad; el artículo 45 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea y la Directiva 2004/38/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 29 de abril de 2004:

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que las disposiciones relativas a la limitación de las ayudas de que disponen las personas con discapacidad una vez salen de su Estado de origen son conformes a los Tratados, el Derecho derivado y la jurisprudencia de la UE?

2. En caso negativo, ¿piensa la Comisión adoptar alguna medida que limite esta discriminación al derecho de libre circulación y residencia?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de marzo de 2014)

La libre circulación es un derecho fundamental de los ciudadanos de la UE. Sin embargo, lo que hace el Derecho de la UE ([1]) en materia de seguridad social es coordinar los sistemas de seguridad social de los Estados miembros, no armonizarlos. En el Derecho de la UE se determina qué legislación es aplicable a los ciudadanos de la UE que ejercen la movilidad, pero es el Derecho nacional el que establece las prestaciones, así como las condiciones para tener derecho a ellas.

De conformidad con las normas de la UE sobre coordinación, las prestaciones en especie para cuidados de larga duración se ofrecen fuera del Estado miembro competente a aquellas personas que tengan derecho a ellas y residan en otro Estado miembro, de conformidad con la legislación aplicada por este último. Esto supone que, de acuerdo con las normas de coordinación de la UE, tales prestaciones en especie pueden ser diferentes de las disponibles en el país de origen y el Estado miembro competente no está obligado a exportarlas a sus nacionales residentes en otro Estado miembro, a diferencia de lo que ocurre con las prestaciones en metálico.

No es ello contrario a la legislación de la UE, la cual no garantiza que la decisión de una persona de establecer su residencia en otro Estado miembro sea necesariamente indiferente en cuanto a prestaciones de seguridad social. Es el ciudadano el que tiene que sopesar los pros y los contras de la decisión de trasladarse a otro Estado miembro. El Tribunal de Justicia ha confirmado que el traslado de un Estado miembro a otro puede resultar más o menos ventajoso para la persona asegurada, habida cuenta de las disparidades existentes entre las disposiciones de los Estados miembros en materia de seguridad social, disparidades que las normas de coordinación no compensan.

([1]) Artículo 48 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea y Reglamento (CE) n° 883/2004 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 29 de abril de 2004, sobre la coordinación de los sistemas de seguridad social (DO L 166 de 30.4.2004, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000393/14
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Freedom of movement and residence of persons with disabilities

The free movement of persons is one of the fundamental liberties of the internal market, which comprises an area without internal frontiers in which this liberty is ensured in accordance with the Treaty.

Persons with disabilities, in particular students who wish to study in another Member State, receive certain benefits and/or social assistance from their own State which are not however guaranteed by the receiving State.

This situation becomes more serious when a family with a disabled child finds itself obliged to move to another Member State because of the economic crisis. However, they are not always able to do so because of the lack of care they would receive, or because they are not guaranteed the minimum care that is essential. This presents a problem and without doubt they are not able to enjoy the same mobility within the EU as other citizens.

Taking into account the prohibition of discrimination for whatever reason, including nationality or disability; Article 45 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004:

1. Does the Commission consider the provisions regarding the limitation of the assistance available to persons with disabilities once they leave their State of origin to be in accordance with the Treaties, derived law and EU case-law?

2. If not, is the Commission thinking of adopting any measure to limit this discrimination of the right to free movement and residence?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

Freedom of movement is a fundamental right of EU citizens. However, EC law ([1]) applicable to social security coordinates the Member States' social security systems rather than harmonising them. It determines which legislation is applicable to EU mobile citizens, but the benefits and the conditions for entitlement to them are set out in national law.

In accordance with the EU rules on coordination, long-term care benefits in kind are provided outside the competent Member State to persons entitled thereto and residing in another Member State in accordance with the legislation applied by the latter. This means that, under the EU coordination rules, such benefits in kind may be different from the benefits available in the home country and the competent Member State is under no obligation to export them, unlike cash benefits, to its nationals who reside in another Member State.

This is in accordance with EC law, which does not guarantee that a decision to take up residence in another Member State is necessarily neutral in terms of social security benefits. It is for the citizen to weigh the pros and cons of a decision to move to another Member State. The Court of Justice has confirmed that, given the disparities between the Member States' social security provisions which are not offset by the rules on coordination, moving from one Member State to another may be more advantageous or less so to the insured person.

([1]) Article 48 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU and Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 166, 30.4.2004, p. 1).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000394/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Registre européen de la fraude alimentaire

La Commission pourrait-elle, comme le lui demande avec insistance le Parlement européen, collecter systématiquement des données sur les cas de fraude et échanger les bonnes pratiques en vue de détecter et de combattre la fraude alimentaire?

La Commission pourrait-elle publier le résultat de ces échanges?

Enfin et surtout, la Commission partage-t-elle l'avis du Parlement sur la volonté de créer un registre européen reprenant les différentes entreprises condamnées pour fraude alimentaire et de le rendre plus accessible au public?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(27 février 2014)

La Commission travaille actuellement au développement d'un système informatique dédié, qui vise à renforcer la coopération entre États membres et à assurer un échange efficace d'informations sur les cas potentiels d'infraction transfrontalière à la législation relative à la chaîne alimentaire. Ce système informatique viendra en appoint d'un réseau nouvellement créé d'autorités compétentes traitant les cas de fraude potentielle dans les États membres.

Le système en question permettra d'échanger rapidement des informations entre États membres dans les affaires transfrontalières et de procéder à la collecte structurée de données sur les cas de fraude potentielle et sur les meilleures pratiques permettant de les combattre, informations qui seront partagées avec l'ensemble des acteurs concernés.

À l'heure actuelle, la Commission n'a pas prévu de créer de registre européen des entreprises condamnées en matière de fraude alimentaire. Il appartient aux États membre de décider comment traiter les affaires de fraude alimentaire et quelle dimension publique leur accorder.

Le commissaire compétent a toutefois l'intention de lancer prochainement une étude sur l'application du cadre législatif existant, en vue de déterminer dans quelle mesure les dispositions en vigueur permettent d'atteindre l'objectif visé, à savoir prévenir les pratiques frauduleuses ou trompeuses, conformément à l'article 8 du règlement (CE) n° 178/2002 ([1]).

([1]) JO L 31 du 1.2.2002, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000394/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: European Food Fraud Register

Could the Commission, as repeatedly called for by the European Parliament, systematically gather data on cases of fraud and exchange good practices with a view to detecting and combatting food fraud?

Could the Commission publish the results of these exchanges?

Finally, and above all, does the Commission share Parliament's opinion on the need to create a European register listing the different companies convicted of food fraud and to make it more accessible to the public?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2014)

The Commission is currently working on the development of a dedicated IT system to strengthen Member States cooperation and ensure an efficient exchange of information on potential cross-border cases of economically motivated violations of food chain law. Such IT system will support the work of a recently created network of competent authorities dealing with potential fraud matters in the Member States.

The IT system in question will enable the rapid exchange of information between Member States in cross-border cases and will also allow the gathering of structured information on potential frauds and on best practices to combat them, to be shared with all concerned actors.

The Commission has no current plans to create an European register of companies convicted of food fraud. It is up to the Member States to decide how to handle and publish cases of fraudulent behavior in the food sector.

However the Commissioner intends to launch soon a study on the application of the existing legal framework, with the aim of assessing how existing rules deliver on the objective of preventing fraudulent or deceptive practices in accordance with Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 ([1]).

([1]) OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000395/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Fonds européen d'investissement pour l'innovation industrielle

La Commission pourrait-elle, comme l'y exhorte le Parlement, étudier la création d'un fonds européen d'investissement pour l'innovation industrielle afin de financer le développement de technologies innovantes favorables au climat, dont des projets phares sur le captage et le stockage du dioxyde de carbone, d'autres technologies innovantes à faibles émissions de CO_2, et des mesures visant à réduire les émissions de CO_2 des industries énergivores et de leurs processus?

Cela pourrait-il être financé par la vente de quotas dans le cadre du système communautaire d'échange de quotas d'émissions?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(28 février 2014)

Dans sa récente communication intitulée: «Un cadre d'action en matière de climat et d'énergie pour la période comprise entre 2020 et 2030 ([1])», la Commission européenne admet que l'accent devrait être mis en particulier sur l'accélération des réductions de coûts et la pénétration des technologies à faible intensité de carbone sur le marché (énergies renouvelables, efficacité énergétique et procédés industriels à faibles émissions de carbone dans divers secteurs). Pour ce faire, il conviendrait, entre autres, d'augmenter les investissements dans des projets de démonstration à grande échelle. En accord avec la politique d'innovation et la politique industrielle de l'Union, le principe d'un système NER 300 étendu sera donc examiné par la Commission en tant que moyen d'orienter les recettes du SEQE vers la démonstration de technologies innovantes à faible intensité de carbone dans les secteurs industriels et de la production d'électricité.

([1]) COM(2014) 15 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000395/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: European investment fund for industrial innovation

Could the Commission, as Parliament has urged it to do, look into the establishment of a European industrial innovation investment fund to finance the development of innovative climate-friendly technologies, including flagship projects on carbon capture and storage, other innovative technologies with low CO_2 emissions and measures designed to reduce the CO_2 emissions of energy-hungry industries and their processes?

Could this be funded through the sale of quotas as part of the Community emission quota exchange system?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2014)

In its recent Communication 'A policy framework for climate and energy in the period from 2020 to 2030 ([1])' the European Commission recognises that particular emphasis should be put on accelerating cost reductions and market uptake of low carbon technologies (renewables, energy efficiency, and low carbon industrial processes across a range of sectors). This should focus, among others, on scaling up investments in large scale demonstrators. In line with the Union's innovation and industrial policies, the concept of an expanded NER300 system will, therefore, be explored by the Commission as a means of directing revenues from the ETS towards the demonstration of innovative low carbon technologies in the industry and power generation sectors.

([1]) COM(2014) 15 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000401/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Santé en ligne

Comment la Commission compte-t-elle mettre au point de nouveaux outils de santé en ligne qui soient accessibles et facilement utilisables, notamment par les personnes âgées et les personnes handicapées?

Comment la Commission va-t-elle encourager les solutions de santé en ligne pour les femmes isolées, non seulement celles qui vivent dans des zones reculées, mais aussi celles qui sont confinées à leur domicile par manque de mobilité et/ou de réseau d'aide (sociale) qui leur permettraient de préserver leur santé et leur bien-être?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(3 mars 2014)

La stratégie numérique pour l'Europe vise à «mettre le numérique à la portée de tous» ([1]) et comporte, au titre de son 6^e^ pilier (Favoriser la culture, les compétences et l'intégration numériques) et de son 7^e^ pilier (Des avantages dus aux TIC pour la société de l'UE), des actions destinées à lever les obstacles empêchant les personnes âgées d'utiliser Internet.

En 2012, la Commission a soumis une proposition de directive relative à l'accessibilité des sites Web d'organismes du secteur public, qui prévoit notamment que les «services en rapport avec la santé: conseils interactifs sur la disponibilité de services, services en ligne pour les patients, prise de rendez-vous» soient également accessibles aux personnes souffrant de limitations fonctionnelles ou de handicaps. Le projet WAI-AGE (2010), financé par l'UE, a ainsi pour objectif d'accroître l'accessibilité du Web pour les personnes âgées et handicapées.

Le partenariat européen d'innovation pour un vieillissement actif et en bonne santé vise à fournir aux personnes âgées en Europe une large gamme de moyens numériques permettant de remédier à des problèmes essentiels comme l'amélioration de l'observance des traitements, la prévention des chutes et la prévention du déclin fonctionnel et de la fragilité.

La Commission a pris plusieurs initiatives, non spécifiques aux femmes isolées, en vue de l'élaboration et de la diffusion de solutions de santé en ligne faisant activement participer la population à la gestion de sa santé. Le plan d'action pour la santé en ligne ([2]) a pour objet de promouvoir la responsabilisation du patient et des activités visant à permettre à la population de mieux maîtriser les outils numériques de santé. Le défi de société 1 ([3]) du programme-cadre pour la recherche et l'innovation Horizon 2020 ([4]) porte sur l'intégration des personnes ayant des problèmes de mobilité, liés à l'âge ou autres. Le programme pour la compétitivité et l'innovation a permis de financer des projets pilotes à grande échelle afin de déployer plus largement la télémédecine et de réduire ainsi les inégalités d'accès aux services de santé.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/scoreboard
([2]) COM(2012) 736 final, plan d'action pour la santé en ligne 2012-2020 — Des soins de santé innovants pour le XXI^e^ siècle.
([3]) Santé, évolution démographique et bien-être.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/health-demographic-change-and-wellbeing

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000401/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Health online

How does the Commission intend to develop new online health resources that are accessible and easy to use, in particular for the elderly and persons with disabilities?

How is the Commission going to promote online health solutions for isolated women, not only those who live in remote areas but also those who are house-bound due to mobility problems and/or the lack of a (social) support network, which would enable them to maintain their health and well-being?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(3 March 2014)

The Digital Agenda for Europe aims to get 'every European digital' ([1]) and includes under its pillar 6 (Enhancing digital literacy, skills and inclusion) and 7 (ICT-enabled benefits for EU society) actions which aim to tackle barriers to Internet use by the elderly.

In 2012 the Commission launched a proposal for a directive on the accessibility of public sector websites, which requires amongst others that websites providing 'health-related services: interactive advice on the availability of services, online services for patients, appointments' are accessible also to people with functional limitations or disabilities. EU-funded project WAI-AGE (2010) has aimed to increase the accessibility of the Web for older people and people with disabilities.

The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing is bringing a wide range of digitally supported resources to older people across Europe in key areas including better adherence to medical treatments, prevention of falls and the prevention of functional decline and frailty.

The Commission has taken several initiatives, not specifically for isolated women, for the development and dissemination of online health solutions, actively involving the citizens in the management of their health. The eHealth Action Plan ([2]) promotes patient empowerment and activities aiming at increasing citizens' digital health literacy. Societal Challenge 1 ([3]) of the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation framework Programme ([4])addresses the inclusion of citizens with impaired mobility, age-related or otherwise. The Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP) has funded large scale pilots to wider deploy Telemedicine, thus reducing unequal access to health services.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/scoreboard
([2]) COM(2012) 736 final, eHealth Action Plan 2012-2020 — Innovative healthcare for the 21st century.
([3]) Health, demographic change and wellbeing.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/health-demographic-change-and-wellbeing

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000417/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(16 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Problematiche relative a un impianto per il trattamento di rifiuti speciali

In Lombardia, nello specifico nell'area di San Damiano tra Monza e Brugherio, è stato costruito un impianto finalizzato alla messa in riserva, recupero e deposito preliminare di rifiuti speciali. L'area è a ridosso delle case del quartiere San Damiano, in prossimità di case comunali del comune di Monza e vicino al canale Villoresi. La procedura amministrativa che ne ha permesso la costruzione risulta poco trasparente. Nel giugno 2010 un'azienda privata ha avanzato l'istanza al comune di Monza, successivamente la provincia di Monza ha convocato nel febbraio 2011 una conferenza di Servizi alla quale hanno partecipato i due enti, l'Arpa, l'Asl e l'azienda in questione: già in questa data il comune di Monza ha concluso la conferenza di servizi dando parere favorevole, mentre il comune di Brugherio, pur essendo interessato in quanto confinante, non era stato invitato alla predetta conferenza. Nell'aprile 2011 il Comune, tramite una delibera di giunta, ha concesso l'affitto dell'area. Nella successiva conferenza dei servizi l'Asl non è stata invitata, in precedenza essa aveva spedito una comunicazione al direttore del servizio ambiente in provincia con la quale si specificava il parere negativo in merito all'istanza e si chiedeva di integrare la richiesta di autorizzazione. A maggio 2011 il privato ha fatto pervenire la documentazione richiesta all'amministrazione provinciale — in seguito alle indicazioni dell'Asl — ma non risulta chiaro se sia stata inviata anche la certificazione in merito ai punti di captazione. A ottobre 2011 è arrivata l'autorizzazione della provincia di Monza a seguito della quale si è proceduto con la stipula del contratto di affitto che concede al privato per 9 anni la gestione dell'impianto di rifiuti speciali su quest'area.

L'impianto è stato realizzato, in deroga al Pgt vigente, su un'area comunale a destinazione agricola e da ricerche effettuate, è stato riscontrato un pozzo di captazione proprio accanto a quest'area e si teme che l'acqua che arriva nelle case dei residenti dei quartieri limitrofi possa essere inquinata dalla presenza di questo impianto.

Inoltre i residenti dei quartieri limitrofi ipotizzano che le polveri provocate dalla frantumazione di pezzi di autovetture siano tossiche.

Può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. può indicare quali azioni intende intraprendere affinché in Italia vengano rispettate le normative sulla tutela della salute e della falda acquifera?

2. Ritiene che la costruzione dell'impianto suddetto in prossimità di abitazioni sia conforme alla normativa UE?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(25 febbraio 2014)

Attualmente, la Commissione non è in grado di riscontrare alcuna prova di una violazione delle disposizioni legislative connesse alla tutela della salute e delle falde acquifere.

La direttiva quadro sui rifiuti ([1]) non prescrive distanze specifiche dalle abitazioni residenziali per la costruzione di impianti per il trattamento dei rifiuti o di discariche, prevedendo solo un obbligo di diligenza nella gestione dei rifiuti al fine di proteggere la salute umana e l'ambiente (articolo 13).

La direttiva 2011/92/UE (direttiva VIA) ([2]) impone una valutazione adeguata da parte delle autorità competenti dei possibili impatti sulle acque sotterranee e sull'aria, considerando contemporaneamente l'interesse pubblico di costruire l'impianto. La direttiva non specifica quali autorità debbano essere consultate nel corso della procedura, ma impone agli Stati membri di designare tali autorità nella richiesta di autorizzazione.

Infine, la direttiva 2001/42/CE (direttiva VAS) ([3]) non si applica necessariamente a tutte le variazioni sui piani esistenti, ad esempio il piano di governo del territorio. La valutazione ambientale deve essere effettuata soltanto se gli Stati membri ritengono che i loro progetti possano avere effetti significativi sull'ambiente.

([1]) Direttiva 2008/98/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 19 novembre 2008, relativa ai rifiuti e che abroga alcune direttive, GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.
([2]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.
([3]) Direttiva 2001/42/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 27 giugno 2001, concernente la valutazione degli effetti di determinati piani e programmi sull'ambiente, GU L 197 del 21.7.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000417/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Problems with a plant for processing special waste

In Lombardy, specifically in the San Damiano area between Monza and Brugherio, a plant has been built for the stockpiling, recycling and preliminary dumping of special waste. The site lies behind the residential district of San Damiano, close to Monza council houses and to the Villoresi Canal. There was little transparency about the administrative procedure which permitted the construction. In June 2010 a private company filed an application to Monza City Council. Then, in February 2011, the Province of Monza convened a special conference of local authorities, attended by the Regional Environmental Protection Agency (ARPA), the Local Healthcare Trust (ASL) and the applicant company. Monza City Council wound up the conference on the same day, delivering a favourable opinion. Brugherio, which had an interest as a neighbouring municipality, was not invited to this conference. In April 2011 the Council passed an executive board resolution leasing the site. This was followed by another special planning conference to which ASL was not invited. ASL had previously sent a notice to the Head of the Regional Environmental Agency stating its opposition to the application and calling for further documents to supplement it. In May 2011 the private company forwarded the required documentation to the provincial authority, as ASL had requested, but it is not clear whether certification relating to water catchment points was also sent. In October 2011, the Province of Monza issued the authorisation, after which the lease was concluded, allowing the private company to operate the special waste plant on this site for nine years.

The plant has been built, notwithstanding the Territorial Government Plan, (PGT), on municipal farmland. According to surveys carried out, there is a catchment well just beside this area and it is feared that the water supply to homes in neighbouring districts may be contaminated due to the plant's presence.

Furthermore, the residents of neighbouring districts believe the dust generated by crushing car parts is toxic.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Can it say what action it intends to take to ensure that Italy complies with the legislation regarding the protection of health and the water table?

2. Does it consider the construction of the abovementioned plant near houses to be in compliance with EU legislation?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2014)

At this stage, the Commission cannot identify any evidence of a breach of the legislation related to the protection of health and the water table.

The Waste Framework Directive ([1]) does not prescribe specific distances for the construction of waste treatment plants or landfill sites from residential houses, but only a duty of care when managing waste, in order to protect human health and the environment (Art. 13).

The EIA Directive 2011/92/EU ([2]) requires that possible impacts on groundwater and air be duly assessed by the competent authorities, in balance with the public interest in building the plant. It does not specify which authorities should be consulted during this procedure but requires Member States to designate these authorities in the authorisation request.

Lastly, the SEA Directive 2001/42/EC ([3]) does not necessarily apply to all changes to existing plans, such as the Territorial Government Plan. An environmental assessment must be carried out only where the Member States determine that their plans are likely to have significant environmental effects.

([1]) Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([2]) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([3]) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000422/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) y Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(17 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Crisis y Ley de Extranjería en España

El 15 de enero, la policía detuvo a Aziz Tarzout, activista de la «Plataforma de Afectados por la Hipoteca», que lleva nueve años en Girona, para expulsarlo de España de forma inmediata.

La orden de expulsión fue emitida porque había caducado su permiso de residencia. Es decir, a consecuencia de la crisis, Aziz no pudo encontrar trabajo y cayó en un vacío legal que lo convirtió en persona irregular después de 9 años viviendo en España. Independientemente del arraigo social y cultural, Aziz fue detenido para su deportación ([1]).

La Ley de Extranjería, que traspone la Directiva de Retorno, criminaliza así a las personas migradas pobres, víctimas de la recesión económica, que sí fueron bienvenidas cuando en Europa se necesitaba de mayor mano de obra barata.

¿Considera que la Ley de Extranjería española traspone correctamente el objetivo de la Directiva de Retorno? ¿Considera que las políticas de migración de la UE deberían ser abiertas, independientemente de la nacionalidad, el patrimonio o los ingresos, y que toda persona debe tener la posibilidad de solicitar un permiso de residencia y la nacionalidad? ¿Considera que, una vez otorgado dicho permiso, no puede retirarse exclusivamente por falta de un contrato laboral o de recursos económicos, hecho que discrimina a las personas migradas y las califica exclusivamente como mano de obra y no como personas con arraigo social y derechos humanos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de marzo de 2014)

Los inmigrantes que hayan residido legalmente y de forma continuada en el territorio de un Estado miembro de la UE durante un período de al menos cinco años pueden presentar una solicitud para obtener el estatuto de residente de larga duración, de conformidad con la Directiva sobre residencia de larga duración ([2]). Los beneficiarios de este estatuto gozan de protección reforzada contra la expulsión de conformidad con el artículo 12 de la Directiva. Los Estados miembros únicamente podrán tomar una decisión de expulsión contra un residente de larga duración cuando este represente una amenaza real y suficientemente grave para la seguridad o el orden públicos. Deben tenerse en cuenta la edad de la persona y la duración de la residencia en el territorio y la expulsión no podrá justificarse por motivos económicos.

Los inmigrantes que no posean el estatuto de residentes de larga duración (porque no lo hayan solicitado o porque no cumplan aún las condiciones) pueden perder su derecho a permanecer en el momento de la expiración de su permiso y pueden convertirse en consecuencia en inmigrantes irregulares que entren en el ámbito de aplicación de la Directiva de retorno ([3]), incluidas sus garantías procesales, tanto en lo referido al derecho de recurso como al derecho a un trato humano y digno durante todo el procedimiento. La Directiva de retorno también impone límites al uso del internamiento.

Aunque la duración de la estancia y la existencia de vínculos sociales acreditados son algunos de los temas que las autoridades nacionales deben tener en cuenta a la hora de tomar decisiones sobre la terminación de un período de estancia legal de los trabajadores, especialmente en lo que se refiere a la jurisprudencia del Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos, a fin de evitar situaciones como la que plantean Sus Señorías, se recomienda a los inmigrantes que soliciten el estatuto de residente de larga duración, de conformidad con la Directiva sobre la residencia de larga duración, tan pronto como cumplan los criterios.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/20140116/54399172995/el-incierto-futuro-de-aziz-en-girona.html
([2]) Directiva 2003/109/CE del Consejo, de 25 de noviembre de 2003, relativa al estatuto de los nacionales de terceros países residentes de larga duración (DO L 16 de 23.1.2004, pp. 44-53).
([3]) Directiva 2008/115/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 16 de diciembre de 2008, relativa a normas y procedimientos comunes en los Estados miembros para el retorno de los nacionales de terceros países en situación irregular (DO L 348 de 24.12.2008, pp. 98-53).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000422/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) and Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: The Crisis and the Immigration Act in Spain

On 15 January, the police detained Aziz Tarzout, an activist from the 'Mortgage Victims Platform', who has lived in Girona for nine years, in order to deport him immediately from Spain.

The deportation order was issued because his residency permit had expired. Namely, because of the crisis, Aziz could not find a job and fell into a legal vacuum which made him an irregular migrant after nine years in Spain. Regardless of his social and cultural ties, Aziz was detained for deportation ([1]).

This is how the Immigration Act, which transposes the Return Directive, criminalises poor migrants who are victims of the recession, who were welcomed when more cheap labour was needed in Europe.

Do you believe that the Spanish Immigration Act correctly transposes the aims of the Return Directive? Do you believe that EU migration policies should be open, regardless of nationality, wealth and income, and that all people should be able to request a residency permit and nationality? Do you believe that once a permit is granted, it cannot be withdrawn exclusively due to not having an employment contract or economic resources, as this discriminates migrants and qualifies them exclusively as labour and not as people with social ties and human rights?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

Migrants who have legally and continuously stayed in the territory of an EU Member State for a period of at least five years are eligible to apply for long-term EU resident status in accordance with long term residence directive ([2]). Beneficiaries of this status enjoy enhanced protection against expulsion under Article 12 of the directive: Member States may take a decision to expel a long-term resident solely where he/she constitutes an actual and sufficiently serious threat to public policy or public security. The age of the person and the duration of residence in the territory must be taken into account and the expulsion must not be founded on economic considerations.

Migrants who do not enjoy long-term resident status (either because they did not apply for it or because they do not yet fulfil the conditions) may lose their right to stay upon expiry of their permit and may become — as a consequence — irregular migrants covered by the scope of the Return Directive ([3]), including its procedural safeguards, both on a right to appeal and on human and dignified treatment throughout the process. The Return Directive also places limitations on the use of detention

While the length of stay and established social links are among the issues which national authorities should take into account when taking decisions on ending a period of legal stay, notably in respect of the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, in order to avoid situations such as the one raised by the Honourable Members, migrants would be best advised to apply for long-term resident status in accordance with the long term residence directive as soon as they fulfil its criteria.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/20140116/54399172995/el-incierto-futuro-de-aziz-en-girona.html
([2]) Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents; OJ L 16, 23.1.2004, p. 44-53.
([3]) Directive 2008/115/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals; OJ L 348, 24.12.2008, p. 98-107.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000423/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Carne sintetica

Di recente un gruppo di scienziati inglesi è stato in grado di produrre in laboratorio un hamburger di carne sintetica ottenuta in vitro tramite la riproduzione di cellule estratte da carne bovina. A detta del responsabile del gruppo, il prossimo passo sarà quello di produrre carne senza l'impiego di alcun animale.

Secondo il gruppo di scienziati, l'esperimento potrebbe avere ottimi risultati in termini di impatto ambientale, dal momento che oltre a ridurre i costi energetici e le emissioni inquinanti del processo produttivo, da un chilo di carne sintetica sarebbe possibile produrre tanti hamburger quanti se ne potrebbero produrre da 440 mila capi di bestiame.

Alla luce di questo esperimento, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. se è a conoscenza dell'esperimento in questione;

2. se i dati forniti dal gruppo sono verificabili;

3. se esistono studi sugli effetti di questo tipo di prodotto alimentare sintetico sulla salute umana;

4. se è in grado di valutare quali saranno gli effetti economici sul settore dell'allevamento nel caso in cui tali tipi di prodotto dovessero raggiungere ampia diffusione sul mercato?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(27 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza di un progetto di ricerca in materia di «carne sintetica» condotto dall'Università di Maastricht e presentato a Londra nel 2013. La Commissione non ha ricevuto i risultati specifici del progetto e non può quindi verificarli. La Commissione non è inoltre a conoscenza di nessuno studio sull'eventuale accettazione della «carne sintetica» da parte dei consumatori. Per quanto concerne l'impatto potenziale sul settore dell'allevamento, sarà necessario disporre di maggiori elementi per esaminare la questione e, in proposito, la risposta fornita all'interrogazione E-008228/2011 ([1]) indica il primo passo che si deve superare prima di poter sviluppare ulteriormente la tecnica su scala commerciale. Attualmente, la Commissione ritiene che sia troppo presto per valutare l'impatto potenziale sui prodotti carnei convenzionali.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000423/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: Synthetic meat

A group of English scientists has recently managed to produce in the laboratory a hamburger of synthetic meat obtained *in vitro* by means of the reproduction of cells taken from beef. According to the head of the group, the next step will be to produce meat without the use of any animal.

According to the group of scientists, the experiment could have excellent results in terms of environmental impact, since apart from reducing the energy costs and polluting emissions of the production process, it would be possible to produce from one kilo of synthetic meat the same number of hamburgers as it would be possible to produce from 440 thousand head of livestock.

In view of this experiment, can the Commission clarify:

1. whether it is aware of the experiment in question;

2. whether the data supplied by the group can be verified;

3. whether any studies exist on the effects of this type of synthetic food product on human health;

4. whether it is able to assess what the economic effects on the livestock sector will be if these types of product become widespread on the market?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2014)

The Commission is aware of a research project on 'synthetic meat' at Maastricht University presented in London in 2013. The Commission has not been provided with the detailed results of the project and can thus not verify them. The Commission is moreover not aware of any studies assessing possible consumer acceptance of 'synthetic meat'. As regards the potential impact for the livestock industry, more elements shall be made available to consider the issue and in this respect the answer given to Question E-008228/2011 ([1]) illustrates a first step that need to be considered for any further development of the technique on commercial scale. Currently the Commission considers that it is too early to assess the potential impact on conventional meat production.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000424/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Giornalista americano espulso dalla Russia

Un giornalista americano è stato recentemente espulso dalla Russia senza che gli venisse fornita una chiara motivazione. Al rientro dall'Ucraina, con in tasca una ricevuta del ministero degli Esteri russo che confermava l'emissione del nuovo visto, è stato invece fermato con la scusa che in novembre un tribunale russo ne aveva già decretato l'espulsione in seguito alla violazione di alcune norme sull'immigrazione, per essere restato in Russia con un visto scaduto. Tutto questo senza che il giornalista fosse messo al corrente del procedimento nei suoi confronti.

La carriera del giornalista è stata a lungo legata alla Russia. A partire dagli anni Sessanta egli è stato infatti corrispondente per diverse testate statunitensi, mentre a partire dallo scorso anno lavora come free lance e consulente per una nota emittente radio. Inoltre, tra gli anni Novanta e l'inizio del 2000 il suddetto giornalista ha pubblicato una serie di libri ispirati a una teoria che collega una serie di attentati a Mosca nel 1999 alle attività dei servizi segreti russi.

Alla luce di questi eventi, può il Vice-presidente/Alto Rappresentante far sapere:

1. se l'UE ha avviato un dialogo con il governo russo che includa anche la promozione e la difesa della libertà di informazione e di espressione ispirandosi al proposito di promuovere i valori fondamentali dell'UE nel mondo;

2. se intende rivolgersi alla diplomazia russa per ricevere delucidazioni sulla questione

3. se è a conoscenza di eventi simili accaduti in Russia che coinvolgano giornalisti europei e, se del caso, quale è stato il comportamento dell'UE e/o dello Stato membro di cittadinanza di questi giornalisti?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(28 febbraio 2014)

1. L'UE tiene dal 2005 consultazioni bilaterali semestrali con il governo russo in materia di diritti umani. La libertà di informazione e di espressione è uno dei temi che figurano regolarmente all'ordine del giorno di queste consultazioni, il cui ultimo ciclo si è svolto a Bruxelles il 28 novembre 2013. Le questioni problematiche in materia di diritti umani vengono discusse a tutti i livelli delle relazioni UE-Russia, conformemente al quadro strategico e al piano d'azione dell'UE sui diritti umani adottati nel giugno 2012.

2. A questo stadio, l'UE non intende sollevare la questione con la Russia. Sono stati forniti pubblicamente chiarimenti in merito sia dal ministero degli Esteri russo che dal giornalista, il cui caso è seguito dalle autorità del suo paese.

3. L'UE non è al corrente di incidenti analoghi in cui siano stati recentemente coinvolti giornalisti europei. La libertà dei media rimane tuttavia una delle questioni più importanti nelle relazioni tra l'Unione europea e la Federazione russa e l'UE seguirà gli sviluppi con la massima attenzione, specie per quanto riguarda il corretto svolgimento delle indagini su crimini e attacchi a danno di giornalisti nella Federazione russa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000424/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — American journalist expelled from Russia

An American journalist has recently been expelled from Russia without being given a clear reason. On his return from the Ukraine, with a receipt in his pocket from the Russian Foreign Affairs Ministry confirming the issue of a new visa, he was stopped on the pretext that a Russian Court had, in November, ordered his expulsion following a breach of immigration rules on the grounds that he had remained in Russia with an expired visa. Despite all this, the journalist had not been made aware of the proceedings against him.

The career of this journalist has long been associated with Russia. Since the 1960s he has in fact been a correspondent for a number of US papers and since last year has worked as a freelance journalist and adviser for a well-known radio station. Additionally, in the 1990s up to the year 2000 he published a series of books based on a theory linking a series of bomb attacks in Moscow in 1999 to the activities of the Russian secret services.

In the light of these events, can the Vice-President/High Representative tell us:

1. whether the EU has instigated a dialogue with the Russian Government which includes the promotion and defence of freedom of information and expression based on the intention to promote the fundamental values of the EU throughout the world;

2. whether the EU intends to approach the Russian diplomatic service for clarification on this question;

3. whether the EU is aware of similar incidents in Russia involving European journalists and, if so, what action has been taken by the EU and/or citizenship Member State of such journalists?

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

1. The EU holds since 2005 bi-annual bilateral human rights consultations with the Russian Government. The last round of these consultations was held on 28 November 2013 in Brussels. The issues of freedom of information and freedom of expression feature regularly, among others, on the agenda of these consultations. Human rights issues of concern are discussed at all levels of the EU-Russia relationship, in accordance with the EU strategic framework and action plan on human rights adopted in June 2012.

2. At this stage, the EU does not intend to approach Russia on this question. Clarifications have been brought publicly by the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and by the journalist, whose case is pursued by his national authorities.

3. The EU is not aware of similar incidents involving European journalists in the recent past. Freedom of the media nevertheless remains one of the most crucial issues of concern for the European Union in the Russian Federation, and the EU will follow closely developments in this area, notably the proper investigation of crimes and attacks which have affected journalists in the Russian Federation.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-000427/14
a Bizottság számára
Herczog Edit (S&D)
(2014. január 17.)

Tárgy: Uniós forrásokból épülő beruházások

Az 1731/2013. (X. 11.) Kormányhatározat leszögezi, hogy a magyar „kormány elkötelezett abban, hogy a 2014–2020-as programozási időszakban az uniós források felhasználásához kapcsolódó feladatok ellátása során felszámolja a korábban kiszervezett tevékenységeket. Ezen feladatokat a jövőben az állam a meglévő belső erőforrásaira építve, azokat *kibővítve* kívánja megvalósítani annak érdekében, hogy elősegítse a befolyásmentes, szakmai szempontú, gyors döntéshozatalt és végrehajtást" ([1]).

A Kormányhatározat értelmében tehát a jövőben az uniós forrásokból épülő beruházásoknál kizárják a magyar és más uniós vállalkozásokat az előkészítési, tervezési, szakértési és lebonyolítási tevékenységek elvégzéséből.

A következményeket mérlegelve a tervezési, szakértési és lebonyolítási tevékenységek „államosítása" számtalan kérdést vet fel az újonnan bevezetett rendszer hatékonyságát, működtethetőségét és eredményességét illetően. Így például: miként fogja az állam biztosítani a szükséges szakértői kapacitást és a kellő szakmai színvonalat e tevékenységek ellátásához, hiszen a közigazgatás eddig nem végzett széles körűen ilyen feladatot? Miként biztosítható a befolyásmentesség és a felelősségre vonhatóság, ha a pályázati felhívások kiírása, a pályázati anyagok elkészítése, valamint a pályázatok elfogadására vonatkozó döntések egy kézben összpontosulnak? Az uniós értékeket szem előtt tartva felmerül továbbá az a kérdés is, hogy vajon nem csorbítja-e a kormányhatározat a vállalkozás szabadságát, a szabad piaci versenyt, s nem jelent-e gátat az unión belüli szabad szolgáltatásáramlás számára a projektek tervezési, szakértési és lebonyolítási tevékenységeinek területén? A legaggasztóbb kérdés azonban a demokratikus értékek szintjén jelenik meg. A Bizottság miként értékeli, és miként tudja ellenőrzi a pályázók egyenlő esélyét, valamint az új pályázatkészítési eljárás társadalmi hatékonyságát és az átláthatóságot? Kirekesztve az említett tevékenységek elvégzéséből nemcsak a magyar, hanem más uniós vállalkozásokat, illetve az EU más tagállamaiból érkezett munkavállalókat, miként bizonyosodhat meg az Európai Bizottság arról, hogy burkoltan nem valósul meg idegenellenes diszkrimináció?

Bízom a Bizottság körültekintő hozzáállásában, és előre is köszönöm, hogy megvizsgálják a kérdést.

Johannes Hahn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. február 19.)

A Bizottság tisztában van azzal, hogy az 1731/2013. (X. 11.) sz. Kormányhatározat részletes rendelkezéseket tartalmaz a 2014–2020 programozási időszakra vonatkozó, az európai strukturális és befektetési alapok felhasználásával kapcsolatos egyes lebonyolítási kérdések vonatkozásában. Úgy tűnik, hogy az alkalmazási szabályok részletes kidolgozását (például a tervezést, a pályázati anyagok dokumentációját stb.), a közszférabeli kedvezményezettek esetében pedig a projektek előkészítésének, kiválasztásának és irányításának támogatását, valamint az egyéb lebonyolítási feladatokat többé nem lehet kiszervezni; ezeket a tevékenységeket az állam a jövőben belső erőforrásaira építve kívánja ellátni (a közigazgatási kapacitások szükséges kiépítését követően). Az említett döntés meghozatala teljes mértékben a magyar hatóságok hatáskörébe tartozik, és nem áll ellentmondásban az európai strukturális és befektetési alapokra vonatkozó uniós szabályozással.

Noha ésszerű és támogatandó, hogy a közszférabeli kedvezményezettek esetében a projektek előkészítése, tervezése és irányítása céljára, valamint az európai strukturális és befektetési alapok magyarországi irányítási rendszerére vonatkozólag belső adminisztratív kapacitásokat építsenek ki, az erre vonatkozó részletes intézkedéseket és határidőket Magyarország egyelőre nem közölte a Bizottsággal. A belső erőforrások kiépítésével kapcsolatos költségszempontok sem kerültek ismertetésre, továbbá az sem, hogy ezeket a kiadásokat milyen – uniós vagy nemzeti – forrásból kívánják fedezni.

A Bizottság arra számít, hogy az európai strukturális és befektetési alapok felhasználásának lebonyolítása vonatkozásában benyújtott partnerségi megállapodás tartalmazza a részletes szabályokat és a 2014–2020-as programozási időszakon belüli lebonyolítás ütemtervét. A magyar hatóságoknak mindenféleképpen biztosítaniuk kell, hogy a projektek kiválasztása, elfogadása és lebonyolítása során tiszteletben tartsák az uniós szabályokat, különös tekintettel az átláthatóságra és az egyenlő bánásmódra.

([1]) http://www.evosz.hu/hirek/c796.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000427/14
to the Commission
Edit Herczog (S&D)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: EU-funded programmes

Government Decree 1731/2013 (X. 11.) stipulates that in the 2014-2020 programming period, the Hungarian Government shall, when undertaking tasks connected to the take-up of EU funds, be committed to eliminating the outsourcing of activities hitherto contracted out. In future it intends to complete such tasks *to a greater extent* on the basis of its *existing* internal resources with the aim of promoting swift, uninfluenced specialist decision-making and implementation. ([1])

This means that, pursuant to the decree, firms from Hungary and other Member States will in future be excluded from carrying out preparatory, planning, advisory and implementation tasks for projects undertaken with EU funding.

Given the possible consequences, this 'nationalising' of planning, advisory and implementation tasks raises a great many questions with regard to the effectiveness, operability and efficiency of the newly adopted system. For example, how will the government ensure that there is sufficient specialist capacity and the requisite expertise to undertake these tasks, given that they have never yet been carried out on a large scale by public administration bodies? How can freedom from influence and accountability be ensured if the decisions on launching calls for proposals, preparing application files and awarding tenders are monopolised? In view of the values of the EU, the question also arises as to whether the decree undermines the freedom to conduct business and free market competition, and whether it hinders the free movement of services within the EU in terms of planning, advisory and implementation activities. The most alarming question, however, arises at the level of democratic values. How will the Commission evaluate — and how will it be able to monitor — equal treatment of applicants for tenders and the social effectiveness and the transparency of the new system for preparing proposals? With the exclusion from conducting these tasks of not only Hungarian firms but also those from other Member States, as well as employees from the rest of the EU, how will the Commission ensure that there is no implicit discrimination against foreigners?

I am confident that the Commission will take a prudent stance, and I thank them for investigating this matter.

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2014)

The Commission is aware that Government decree 1731/2013 (X.11.) contains detailed arrangements for certain implementation issues regarding the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) in the 2014-2020 period. Apparently, the elaboration of application rules (e.g. design, documentation of the application form etc.), in case of public beneficiaries the support for project preparation, project selection, project management and other implementation tasks cannot be outsourced anymore and should be provided through in-house capacities (after the necessary administrative capacity building). This decision falls within the full responsibility of the Hungarian authorities and is not in contradiction with EU ruling on the use of ESIF,

While it is reasonable and supported to build up internal administrative capacity for project preparation, development and management purposes for public beneficiaries as well as for the ESIF management structure in Hungary, the detailed steps and timeline of how this will be carried out have not yet been communicated to the Commission. Also the cost aspects of building up the required in-house administrative capacity have not been explained including how these cost will be covered, e.g. by EU or national resources.

The Commission expects that the submitted Partnership Agreement for the implementation of the ESIF will contain the necessary information on the detailed arrangements and time horizon for implementation during the 2014-2020 period. In any case, the Hungarian authorities will need to ensure that as regards project selection, awarding or implementation, EU rules and specifically the principles of transparency and equal treatment shall be respected.

([1]) http://www.evosz.hu/hirek/c796.pdf (Official Journal of Hungary, in Hungarian).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000430/14
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: Importance of maintaining support for the surveillance of Clostridium difficile infection at European level

Clostridium difficile infection (CDI) is one of the main healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) in Europe. Studies suggest that CDI is currently two to four times more common than HAIs caused by methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA). Since 2003, new variants of CDI with greater virulence have been emerging and spreading, causing higher patient morbidity and mortality. Experts convened by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) have estimated the cost of managing CDI in the EU at approximately EUR 3 billion per year, and this figure is expected to rise as the elderly proportion of the population increases across Europe.

In response to this threat, the Commission is currently funding, via the ECDC, the European CDI Surveillance Network (ECDIS-Net). Does the Commission recognise the importance of maintaining support for the surveillance of CDI at European level when the current funding for ECDIS-Net ends in 2014, in particular with regard to monitoring the emergence of new virulent strains of the infection? Furthermore, would the Commission consider developing European guidelines to encourage the use of CDI infection rates as a standard indicator of patient care quality and patient safety across Europe?

Question for written answer E-000431/14
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: Addressing the under-diagnosis of Clostridium difficile infection in hospitals

Clostridium difficile infection (CDI) is one of the main healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) in Europe. Studies suggest that CDI is currently two to four times more common than HAIs caused by methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA). Since 2003, new variants of CDI with greater virulence have been emerging and spreading, causing higher patient morbidity and mortality. Experts convened by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control have estimated the cost of managing CDI in the EU at approximately EUR 3 billion per year, and this figure is expected to rise as the elderly proportion of the population increases across Europe.

According to the recent pan-European point prevalence study EUCLID, over half of hospitals only test for CDI when requested to do so by doctors, which is a major reason why infections go undetected. In view of the Commission's forthcoming follow-up report on the implementation of the European Council recommendations on patient safety and HAIs, would the Commission consider actions to support the implementation by Member States of specific measures to address the under-diagnosis of CDI?

Question for written answer E-000432/14
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: Sharing of best practice to encourage education for hospital staff on Clostridium difficile infection and to raise awareness among patients

Clostridium difficile infection (CDI) is one of the main healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) in Europe. Studies suggest that CDI is currently two to four times more common than HAIs caused by methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA). Since 2003, new variants of CDI with greater virulence have been emerging and spreading, causing higher patient morbidity and mortality. Experts convened by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control have estimated the cost of managing CDI in the EU at approximately EUR 3 billion per year, and this figure is expected to rise as the elderly proportion of the population increases across Europe.

In response to this threat, the Commission has established that the training of specialised hospital staff and the provision of information to patients are areas in need of improvement in the fight against HAIs. Would the Commission consider sharing best practice to encourage the routine provision of CDI-specific education to these groups across Europe?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

The Commission recognises the importance to better monitor healthcare-associated infections in the EU, including Clostridium difficile infection. The Commission implementing decision amending Decision 2002/253/EC laying down case definitions for reporting communicable diseases to the Community network under Decision No 2119/98/EC includes Clostridium difficile infection under a general case definition of healthcare-associated infection ([1]).

Based on the evidence provided by the ECDC, the Commission does not believe that the use of Clostridium difficile infection rates as standard indicator of patient care quality and patient safety would represent any value added at this stage.

In support of the Council Recommendation (2009/C 15/101) on patient safety, including the prevention and control of healthcare-associated infections ([2]) and as follow-up on the conclusions of the related implementation report ([3]), the Commission intends to support specific measures to address healthcare-associated infections via the health programme. Furthermore, the Commission intends to make best practices available to encourage routine provision of education in the area of healthcare associated infections.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:262:0001:0057:EN:PDF
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/patient_safety/docs/council_2009_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/patient_safety/docs/council_2009_report_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000433/14
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(17 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Procedimento di approvazione degli impianti a biogas/biomassa: problematiche ambientali e sanitarie e possibili violazioni della direttiva 2011/92/UE

In Italia sta emergendo grande apprensione nell'opinione pubblica in merito alle problematiche ambientali e sanitarie connesse all'attività degli impianti per la produzione di energia a biogas/biomassa. Molti di questi progetti, infatti, sembrerebbero essere stati autorizzati senza i necessari approfondimenti istruttori e le necessarie prescrizioni a tutela dell'ambiente e della salute pubblica. Più nello specifico, nell'ordinamento italiano la quasi totalità dei procedimenti di autorizzazione di tali impianti sono disciplinati dall'articolo 12 del decreto legislativo n. 387/2003, che ha dato attuazione alla direttiva 2001/77/CE (ora 2009/28/CE). L'articolo in esame stabilisce al comma I che le opere necessarie e connesse alla realizzazione dei noti impianti vengano approvate mediante «autorizzazione unica», conferita all'esito di una «conferenza di servizi», che costituisce, ove occorra, variante allo strumento urbanistico. Malgrado a tale conferenza siano chiamate a partecipare le autorità competenti in materia di tutela dell'ambiente, del paesaggio e del patrimonio storico-artistico, la stessa conferenza delibera sulla base delle «previsioni prevalenti» espresse in tale sede, cosicché non sempre tutte le prescrizioni richieste vengono imposte in sede autorizzatoria. Inoltre le amministrazioni competenti escludono pressoché sistematicamente la necessità di effettuare sui progetti in esame la VIA di cui alla direttiva 2011/92/UE, essendo previsto il preventivo screening di VIA soltanto per gli impianti con potenza termica complessiva superiore a 50 MW ([1]), meramente sulla base della dimensione dell'opera ed escludendo invece completamente di prendere in considerazione tutti gli ulteriori criteri obbligatori di cui all'allegato III della nota direttiva attinenti alle «caratteristiche dei progetti» (tra cui il profilo assai rilevante degli «impatti cumulativi»), nonché alla «localizzazione» dell'opera e alle «caratteristiche dell'impatto potenziale» dei progetti ([2]). A causa di tali autorizzazioni «frettolose», molti impianti sono stati realizzati in luoghi non opportuni come a esempio nei pressi di corsi acqua o in aree protette/vincolate ovvero già compromesse sotto il profilo della qualità dell'aria, e sono fonti di emissioni maleodoranti, sversamenti di digestato ([3]) e/o di sostanze cariche di nitrati che possono giungere sino ai mari.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è a conoscenza delle suesposte problematiche ambientali e sanitarie e dei possibili profili di violazione della direttiva 2011/92/UE da parte delle autorità italiane in merito all'approvazione di tali impianti?

2. Quali iniziative intende intraprendere a riguardo?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

Ai sensi della direttiva 2011/92/UE (direttiva VIA) ([4]) i progetti elencati all'allegato I della stessa devono essere oggetto di una valutazione d'impatto ambientale (VIA), mentre i progetti dell'allegato II sono soggetti a una verifica preliminare (screening) intesa a stabilire se sia necessario lo svolgimento di una VIA. Nello svolgimento di tali verifiche, si tiene conto dei pertinenti criteri stabiliti all'allegato III.

Gli impianti che producono energia a partire da biogas o biomassa, con una potenza termica non superiore a 50 MW, rientrano nell'allegato II della direttiva VIA. Per questo tipo di impianti è obbligatorio effettuare uno screening.

Nell'ambito del procedimento di infrazione 2009/2086 in corso la Commissione sta già esaminando la questione dell'uso esclusivo delle soglie basate sulle dimensioni previsto dalla legislazione italiana per escludere dallo screening i progetti elencati all'allegato II della suddetta direttiva nonché il problema della mancata considerazione di tutti i criteri pertinenti stabiliti nell'allegato III in merito allo svolgimento di questi esami.

Nel dicembre 2013 la Commissione, nell'ambito del pacchetto Aria pulita, ha adottato una proposta di direttiva sugli impianti di combustione medi ([5]). Tale direttiva mira a disciplinare le emissioni di particolato, di diossido di zolfo e di ossidi di azoto provenienti dalla combustione di combustibili fossili e biomassa presso impianti aventi una potenza termica nominale compresa fra 1 e 50 MW.

([1]) Così dispone il decreto legislativo n. 152/2006 all'allegato IV della Parte II, punto 2, lettera a.
([2]) Come peraltro rilevato dalla recentissima sentenza della Corte costituzionale italiana n. 93/2013, con riferimento a una legge regionale della Regione Marche.
([3]) Si ricorda alla Commissione che lo scrivente deputato è autore delle interrogazioni nn. E-009475/2013 e E-010830/2013 sulle problematiche connesse al digestato prodotto da questo tipo di impianti.
([4]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.
([5]) COM(2013) 919 def.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000433/14
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: Procedure for approval of biogas/biomass plants: environmental and health issues and possible breaches of Directive 2011/92/EU

The Italian public is becoming increasingly apprehensive about environmental and health issues associated with the activities of plants engaged in the production of biogas/biomass energy. Many such projects in fact appear to have been authorised without the necessary preliminary in-depth studies and environmental and public health protection safeguards. In more specific terms, under the Italian system, virtually all procedures for the authorisation of such plants are governed by Article 12 of Legislative Decree No 387/2003, implementing Directive 2001/77/EC (now 2009/28/EC). Sub-section I of the said Article stipulates that works necessary to and associated with the construction of such plants must be approved on the basis of a 'one-stop authorisation' issued following a special conference of local authorities, which, when appropriate is considered to be a variant form of planning instrument. Although the authorities with responsibility for protection of the environment, landscape and historical/artistic heritage are invited to take part in this conference, the conference deliberates on the basis of the 'predominant assessments' expressed, with the result that all the requirements are not always imposed in the authorisation issued. In addition, the responsible authorities almost systematically exclude the need for an EIA on projects under consideration, as required under Directive 2011/92/EU, given that preliminary EIA screening is imposed solely in relation to plants whose overall thermal input exceeds 50 MW ([1]), purely on the basis of the scale of the work and hence entirely excluding consideration of all the additional mandatory criteria provided for in Annex III of the said Directive pertaining to the 'characteristics of the projects' (including the substantial weight given to 'cumulative impacts'), the 'localisation' of the work and 'characteristics of the potential impact' of the projects ([2]). As a result of such rushed authorisations, a number of plants have been constructed on inappropriate sites, for example near water-courses, in protected/restricted areas or areas already compromised in terms of air quality, and are the source of malodorous emissions, the dumping of digestate ([3]) and/or nitrate-laden substances liable to reach the seas.

Taking full account of the above, would the Commission answer the following questions?

1. Is the Commission aware of the environmental and health issues described above and possible breaches of Directive 2011/92/EU by the Italian authorities with regard to the approval of such plants?

2. What action does the Commission intend to take in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

Under Directive 2011/92/EU (EIA Directive) ([4]) projects listed in Annex I to the directive must be subjected to an environmental impact assessment (EIA), whereas projects listed in Annex II must be subjected to an examination (so-called screening) aimed at determining whether it is necessary to carry out an EIA. When doing screenings, the relevant criteria set out in Annex III shall be taken into account.

Plants producing energy from biogas/biomass with a thermal input not exceeding 50 MW are covered by Annex II to the EIA Directive. For such plants, a screening must be carried out.

Within the on-going infringement procedure 2009/2086, the Commission is already addressing the exclusive use of dimension-based thresholds in the Italian legislation to exclude the screening for projects listed in Annex II of the EIA Directive and the failure to take into account all the relevant criteria set by Annex III when carrying out such screenings.

Furthermore, in December 2013 the Commission adopted a proposal for a directive on medium combustion plants ([5]), as part of its Clean Air Policy Package. This directive would regulate emissions of particulate matter, sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides from combustion of fossil fuels and biomass in plants with a rated thermal input between 1 and 50 MW.

([1]) As provided for in Legislative Decree No 152/2006, Annex IV, Part II, paragraph 2, section a.
([2]) As moreover observed in the recent judgment by the Italian Constitutional Court No 93/2013, with reference to a Regional Law of the Marche Region.
([3]) The Commission is reminded that the author of this question is also the author of Questions E-009475/2013 and E-010830/2013 on issues associated with the digestate produced by this type of plant.
([4]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (OJ L 026, 28.1.2012).
([5]) COM(2013) 919 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000434/14
alla Commissione
Francesca Barracciu (S&D)
(17 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Tonnare fisse in Europa: Sardegna

Secondo i dati dell'ICCAT, l'anno scorso si è registrato un aumento del numero e del peso delle catture di tonno nell'Atlantico e nel Mediterraneo. Ciò nonostante, i metodi tradizionali di pesca del tonno rosso (tonnara), utilizzati in Italia, Portogallo e Spagna, continuano a essere, per via delle decisioni assunte dagli Stati membri, pesantemente trascurati e, quindi, danneggiati nella ripartizione delle quote di pesca. Tale ripartizione sta prefigurando la grave e imminente scomparsa delle tonnare fisse poiché ne determina l'insostenibilità economica e induce i già pochi pescatori rimasti a vendere le proprie quote di pesca. Eppure questi metodi sono comparativamente i più sostenibili a livello economico, sociale e ambientale, nonché quelli che generano più lavoro e le imprese che li praticano sono localizzate nelle zone dell'Europa meridionale che, al momento, sono afflitte da un alto tasso di disoccupazione.

Infatti, i territori in cui le tonnare fisse continuano a resistere sono già provati da profonda sofferenza economica — in Sardegna, Carloforte (Sulcis) — e le tonnare sono diventate il fulcro di un nuovo modello di sviluppo che punta nel medio-lungo periodo sulla cultura, sul recupero e sulla valorizzazione delle tradizioni produttive, gastronomiche e culturali per incrementare l'industria di trasformazione agro-alimentare e il turismo e liberarsi dalla dipendenza economica e occupazionale dell'industria pesante che, come noto, è interessata da una crisi profonda. Già oggi le tonnare fisse rappresentano una fonte importante di sostentamento economico e la loro scomparsa potrebbe segnare in maniera irrimediabile le prospettive di interi nuclei familiari, di piccole comunità locali e delle loro tradizioni.

Inoltre, poiché forniscono altri servizi che non riguardano strettamente la pesca del tonno, tali metodi di pesca sono marcatamente multifunzionali. Essi fungono, in alcuni Stati membri, da osservatorio dei tonni e la stessa ICCAT li considera essenziali per l'elaborazione delle proprie statistiche.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ritiene che la ripartizione delle quote di tonno da parte degli Stati membri debba, se non avvantaggiare, almeno riequilibrare le attribuzioni per i metodi tradizionali di pesca, vista anche l'importanza della loro multifunzionalità;

2. quali iniziative intende assumere in tal senso;

3. se ritiene opportuno sostenere in tutti gli Stati membri l'assegnazione strutturata della funzione di osservatorio alle tonnare fisse considerato che anche l'ICCAT lo ritiene essenziale?

Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(14 febbraio 2014)

Come ricorda giustamente l'onorevole parlamentare, l'assegnazione delle quote di tonno rosso a un particolare tipo di attrezzo o attività di pesca nell'Unione europea spetta agli Stati membri nella misura in cui è conforme alle norme che regolano la capacità di pesca delle flotte e degli attrezzi in questione e al totale ammissibile di catture (TAC) assegnato a ciascuno Stato membro.

Le attività di pesca del tonno rosso nell'Atlantico e nel Mar Mediterraneo sono gestite dalla Commissione internazionale per la conservazione dei tonnidi dell'Atlantico (ICCAT), di cui l'Unione europea è parte contraente. La Commissione europea funge da rappresentante dei suoi Stati membri all'interno dell'ICCAT e coordina la loro azione, ma non dispone di un mandato per imporre loro norme di gestione che influenzino l'assegnazione del TAC all'interno di uno Stato membro. La prerogativa degli Stati membri nell'assegnazione delle possibilità di pesca è sancita dall'articolo 16, paragrafo 6, e dall'articolo 17 del regolamento (UE) n. 1380/2013 relativo alla politica comune della pesca.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000434/14
to the Commission
Francesca Barracciu (S&D)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: Fixed tuna traps in Europe: Sardinia

According to ICCAT data, last year there was an increase in the number and weight of tuna catches in the Atlantic and Mediterranean. However, traditional methods of bluefin tuna fishing (by tuna traps), used in Italy, Portugal and Spain, continue to be substantially neglected because of the decisions taken by the Member States; these methods are thus being damaged by the allocation of fishing quotas. The way the quotas are being allocated is likely to lead to the serious and imminent disappearance of these fixed traps, because it is causing them to be economically unsustainable and is prompting the few remaining fishermen to sell their fishing quotas. Yet these methods are, comparatively speaking, the most sustainable in economic, social and environmental terms; they are also methods that create more jobs, and the companies that use these methods are located in parts of southern Europe which, at present, are plagued by high unemployment rates.

Indeed, the areas where the traps continue to resist are already suffering from deep economic pain — in Carloforte, Sardinia (Sulcis), for example. The tuna traps in these areas have become the centrepiece of a new development model that, in the medium- to long-term, seeks to gear itself to culture and to the recovery and showcasing of culinary, cultural and production traditions, with a view to developing the agri-food processing industry and tourism; this would enable the areas concerned to free themselves from their dependence, in economic and employment terms, on heavy industry, which, as we all know, is undergoing a severe crisis. Today, the tuna traps are still a major source of economic subsistence and their disappearance could irreparably damage the prospects of entire families, small local communities and their traditions.

Furthermore, since they provide other services which are not strictly related to tuna fishing, these fishing methods are markedly multifunctional. They act, in some Member States, as a sort of monitoring centre for tuna, and ICCAT itself considers them to be vital for the drawing up of its statistics.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. Does it not agree that the distribution of tuna quotas by the Member States should, if not benefit, at least restore the balance with regard to traditional fishing methods, given also the importance of their multifunctional nature?

2. What measures will it take to achieve this?

3. Would it not be advisable to promote, in all Member States, the granting of a kind of official status for fixed tuna traps as monitoring centres, given that even the ICCAT considers this to be essential?

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

As the Honourable Member rightly mentions the allocation of bluefin tuna quota to a particular type of gear or fishery within the European Union is the responsibility of the Member States, as long as it complies with the rules regulating the fishing capacity of the fleets or gears in question and with the overall total allowable catch (TAC) allocated to each Member State.

The bluefin tuna fisheries in the Atlantic and Mediterannean Sea are managed by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), to which the European Union is a Contracting Party. The European Commission acts as representative of its Member States in ICCAT and coordinates their action, but the Commission does not have a mandate to impose on them management rules affecting the internal allocation of TAC within a Member State. The prerogative of the member states in allocating fishing opportunities is enshrined in Articles 16(6) and 17 of EU Regulation 1380/2013 on the common fisheries policy.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000435/14
alla Commissione
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(17 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Alta velocità ferroviaria — Prolungamento del corridoio dell'asse baltico-adriatico

Il progetto BATCO, messo in atto per incrementare l'interconnettività dei Paesi dell'Europa centrale lungo l'asse baltico-adriatico, rappresenta una delle più importanti e strategiche reti di collegamento ferroviario tra nord e sud dell' Europa, connettendo potenzialmente 40 milioni di cittadini europei.

È indubbio che tale progetto porterà innumerevoli vantaggi alle regioni coinvolte lungo il tratto fino ad ora definito. Esso ha l'obiettivo di coniugare aree economiche emergenti e agevolare notevolmente il sistema dei trasporti e dei servizi, producendo effetti vitali per il commercio, collegando Paesi che tradizionalmente non hanno avuto grandi opportunità di sinergia in passato e potendo contare su una rete infrastrutturale a basso impatto ambientale.

Nell'ambito della revisione delle reti europee TEN-T e dello sviluppo del progetto per ampliare la rete di trasporto ferroviario transeuropeo, ritengo che l'UE non possa non considerare la necessità di estendere il progetto anche al Sud Italia lungo la dorsale adriatica. Tale parte della dorsale, infatti, non dispone di collegamenti adeguati, essendo priva di tratti ad alta velocità ed avendo apparati tecnologici obsoleti, rotaie usurate e addirittura tratti a binario unico in zone con elevati rischi idrogeologici. Con queste evidenti mancanze infrastrutturali, il mercato del Sud dell'Italia rimane paralizzato e non ha possibilità di ripresa.

L'intera regione rischia di uscire dalle dinamiche competitive, e la mancanza di efficienza dell'attuale linea ferroviaria spinge i cittadini ad utilizzare altri mezzi di trasporto, producendo disagi ed impatti negativi sull'ambiente. Il prolungamento del corridoio baltico-adriatico fino al sud dell'Italia avrebbe una rilevanza certamente positiva per le regioni interessate. Sarebbe utile per lo sviluppo delle strategie economiche, turistiche ed ambientali sia del Paese membro che dell'UE, la quale potrebbe sfruttare pienamente la posizione dell'Italia, piattaforma europea sul Mediterraneo.

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza delle mancanze infrastrutturali che riguardano il sud dell'Italia sulla dorsale adriatica e delle problematiche che esse comportano quotidianamente per milioni di cittadini europei?

2. Sarebbe disposta a valutare il prolungamento del corridoio baltico-adriatico fino al Sud dell'Italia, al fine di garantire, attraverso l'alta velocità, il diritto alla mobilità per migliaia di cittadini europei e di rimuovere questo ostacolo allo sviluppo economico?

3. In alternativa, quali altre misure la Commissione adotterebbe a medio termine per risolvere tale problematica, che evidenzia una distinzione in cittadini europei di prima e di seconda fascia?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(19 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione è effettivamente a conoscenza della situazione dell'infrastruttura nell'Italia meridionale. La nuova politica infrastrutturale dell'UE ([1]), ([2]) è stata istituita nel dicembre 2013 per affrontare questo problema e promuovere la crescita e la competitività.

Tutte le linee ferroviarie lungo la costa adriatica, da Rimini a Lecce e Taranto, fanno parte della rete ferroviaria TEN-T, le tratte Bologna-Rimini-Ancona e Foggia-Bari-Taranto sono incluse nella rete principale.

La pianificazione dettagliata, i tempi e lo sviluppo di meccanismi di finanziamento per collegare città e regioni alla rete TEN-T competono allo Stato membro.

Il programma TEN-T ha recentemente contribuito al miglioramento dell'infrastruttura ferroviaria lungo la linea adriatica, eliminando l'ultimo ostacolo che impediva il transito di container a grande capacità.

([1]) REGOLAMENTO (UE) N. 1315/2013 DEL PARLAMENTO EUROPEO E DEL CONSIGLIO, dell'11 dicembre 2013, sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti e che abroga la decisione n. 661/2010/UE (GU L 348 del 20.12.2013).

([2]) REGOLAMENTO (UE) N. 1316/2013 DEL PARLAMENTO EUROPEO E DEL CONSIGLIO, dell'11 dicembre 2013, che istituisce il meccanismo per collegare l'Europa, che modifica il regolamento (UE) n. 913/2010 e che abroga i regolamenti (CE) n. 680/2007 e (CE) n. 67/2010 (GU L 348 del 20.12.2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000435/14
to the Commission
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: High speed rail — Extension of the corridor of the Baltic-Adriatic axis

The BATCO project, set up to enhance interconnectivity between Central European countries along the Baltic-Adriatic axis, represents one of the most important and strategic rail networks between Northern and Southern Europe, potentially connecting 40 million European citizens.

This project will undoubtedly bring countless advantages to the regions involved along the section so far defined. It has the objective of uniting emerging economic areas and significantly facilitating the transport and service system, producing vital effects for commerce, linking countries which traditionally have not had great opportunities for synergy in the past and providing them with an infrastructure network with low environmental impact.

Within the scope of the review of the TEN-T European networks and the development of the project to extend the trans-European rail network, it is my view that the EU has to consider the need to extend the project to southern Italy along the Adriatic ridge. This part in the ridge, indeed, is not served by adequate connections, as it is without any high-speed sections and has outdated technological equipment, worn rails and even single-track sections in areas with increased hydrogeological risk. With this evident lack of infrastructure, the southern Italian market is paralysed and has no possibility of recovery.

The entire region is in danger of withdrawing from the competitive dynamics, and the inefficiency of the existing rail line forces citizens to use other means of transport, causing inconvenience and negative impacts on the environment. The extension of the Baltic-Adriatic corridor to southern Italy would certainly have a positive effect on the regions involved. It would contribute to the development of economic, touristic and environmental strategies, both of the Member State and of the EU, which would be able fully to benefit from the position of Italy as the European platform on the Mediterranean.

1. Is the Commission aware of the lack of infrastructure in southern Italy along the Adriatic ridge and of the problems which this creates on a daily basis for millions of European citizens?

2. Would it be prepared to assess the extension of the Baltic-Adriatic corridor to southern Italy, in order to ensure, by means of high-speed transport, the right to mobility for thousands of European citizens and to remove this obstacle to economic development?

3. In the alternative, what other measures would the Commission adopt in the medium term to resolve this problem, which highlights a division of European citizens into first and second class?

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

Yes, the Commission is aware of the situation as regards infrastructure in southern Italy. The new EU infrastructure policy [1], [2] was put in place in December 2013 to address this and to promote growth and competitiveness.

The rail lines along the Adriatic coast from Rimini to Lecce and Taranto are all part of the TEN-T rail network, the sections Bologna-Rimini-Ancona and Foggia-Bari-Taranto are included in the Core Network.

The detailed planning, the timing and the development of financing schemes to connect cities and regions to the TEN-T network are the responsibilities of the Member State.

The TEN-T programme has recently contributed to the improvement of the rail infrastructure along the Adriatic line by removing the last bottleneck which prevented high cube container flows along it.

---

[1] REGULATION (EU) No 1315/2013 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 11 December 2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and repealing Decision No 661/2010/EU, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

[2] REGULATION (EU) No 1316/2013 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 11 December 2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility, amending Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 680/2007 and (EC) No 67/2010, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000438/14
à la Commission
Françoise Castex (S&D)
(17 janvier 2014)

Objet: Fonds européens et sous-traitance

L'article 30 du règlement (UE, Euratom) nº 966/2012 relatif aux règles financières applicables au budget général de l'Union prévoit que les crédits doivent être utilisés conformément au principe de bonne gestion financière. Cela comprend notamment les principes d'économie, d'efficience et d'efficacité, ce qui sous-entend une utilisation conforme à un bon rapport coût-efficacité.

Ces principes doivent être appliqués également par les États membres dans le domaine des fonds à gestion partagée, notamment les Fonds structurels et Fonds de cohésion.

Pour la période de programmation 2000-2006, le règlement (CE) nº 1685/2000 de la Commission prévoyait l'inéligibilité des «contrats de sous-traitance qui donnent lieu à une augmentation du coût d'exécution de l'opération sans y apporter une valeur ajoutée en proportion». Cette disposition n'est plus présente dans la réglementation applicable à la période de programmation 2007-2013.

1. La Commission peut-elle détailler de manière exhaustive et précise les dispositions du droit européen qui règlementent, limitent ou empêchent le recours abusif à la sous-traitance pour les périodes de programmation 2007-2013 et pour la période 2014-2020?

2. La sous-traitance en cascade par l'entrepreneur principal qui a signé le contrat avec le bénéficiaire est-elle autorisée dans le cadre d'un projet cofinancé par les Fonds structurels ou les Fonds de cohésion?

3. La sous-traitance à une entreprise qui n'apporte aucune valeur ajoutée, mais qui va sous-traiter à son tour 100 % des tâches est-elle autorisée dans le cadre d'un projet cofinancé par les Fonds structurels ou les Fonds de cohésion?

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(6 mars 2014)

À la différence du règlement (CE) nº 1685/2000 de la Commission, qui contient la règle nº 1, le règlement (CE) nº 1083/2006 et le règlement (UE) nº 1303/2013 ne fixent aucune règle spécifique en matière de sous-traitance.

Conformément à l'article 56, paragraphe 4, du règlement (CE) nº 1083/2006 et à l'article 65, paragraphe 1, du règlement (UE) nº 1303/2013, les règles d'éligibilité des dépenses sont établies au niveau national sous réserve des exceptions figurant dans les règlements spécifiques. La sous-traitance, même lorsqu'elle correspond à 100 % des activités, peut être éligible si la réglementation nationale l'autorise.

Lors des vérifications effectuées par les États membres ([1]), il convient de s'assurer de la réalité des dépenses déclarées, de la fourniture des produits et/ou services concernés conformément à la décision d'approbation, de l'exactitude des demandes de remboursement présentées par le bénéficiaire et de la conformité des dépenses avec les règles de l'Union et les règles nationales. Cette clause s'applique également aux activités de sous-traitance.

Comme la note d'information du COCOF ([2]) sur les indicateurs de fraude pour le Fonds européen de développement régional, le Fonds social européen et le Fonds de cohésion considère spécifiquement les contrats de sous-traitance en cascade et les paiements versés à des sociétés offshore comme des indicateurs de fraude, les États membres doivent être particulièrement attentifs à cet aspect et procéder aux vérifications adéquates de la gestion avant d'autoriser et de vérifier les dépenses des bénéficiaires.

([1]) Voir les articles 70 et 58 à 62 du règlement (CE) nº 1083/2006 ainsi que l'article 13 du règlement (CE) nº 1828/2006 de la Commission et les articles 122 à 127 du règlement (UE) nº 1303/2013.
([2]) COCOF 09/0003/00-EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000438/14
to the Commission
Françoise Castex (S&D)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: European funds and subcontracting

Article 30 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union provides that appropriations shall be used in accordance with the principle of sound financial management. This includes, in particular, the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness, implying that the budget should be used in a cost-effective manner.

These principles also have to be applied by Member States in the context of funds that are under shared management, in particular the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund.

For the 2000-2006 programming period, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1685/2000 provided for the ineligibility of 'subcontracting which adds to the cost of execution of the operation, without adding proportionate value to it'. This provision is no longer included in the rules applicable to the 2007-2013 programming period.

1. Can the Commission provide full and exact details of the provisions of European law which regulate, limit or prevent improper use of subcontracting for the 2007-2013 programming period and for the 2014-2020 period?

2. Is cascade subcontracting by the main contractor that signed the agreement with the beneficiary permitted within the context of a project which is co-financed by the Structural Funds or the Cohesion Fund?

3. Is subcontracting to a business that does not add any value but is, in turn, going to subcontract 100% of the work, permitted within the context of a project which is co-financed by the Structural Funds or the Cohesion Fund?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

Unlike rule 1 of the Commission regulation (EC) No 1685/2000, regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 and regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 do not set out specific rules on sub-contracting.

As provided in Article 56(4) of regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 and in Article 65(1) of regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 the rules on the eligibility of expenditure shall be laid down at national level subject to the exceptions provided for in the specific rules. Sub-contracting, including of 100% of the activities, may be eligible, if allowed under relevant national rules.

Verifications by the Member States ([1]) should ensure that the expenditure declared is real, that the products or services have been delivered in accordance with the approval decision, that the applications for reimbursement by the beneficiary are correct and that the operations and expenditure comply with Union and national rules. This also applies to sub-contracting.

As, COCOF Information Note on Fraud Indicators for European Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund and Cohesion Fund ([2]) specifically identifies sub-contracts in cascade and payments to off-shore companies as one of the fraud indicators, Member States, need to pay particular attention and carry out adequate management verifications in this respect, before authorising and verifying the expenditure of the beneficiaries.

([1]) see Article 70, Article 58-62 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 and Article 13 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006, Article 122-127 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013.
([2]) COCOF 09/0003/00-EN.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000439/14
aan de Commissie
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE)
(17 januari 2014)

Betreft: Uitbanning dementie tegen 2025

Op 11 december 2013 besloot de groep van acht grootste industrielanden ter wereld, de G8, om vóór 2025 een medicijn te gaan ontwikkelen waarmee dementie genezen, of beter onder controle gehouden kan worden. Een belangrijk initiatief, omdat in 2050 naar schatting 135 miljoen mensen wereldwijd aan dementie zullen lijden als er geen actie ondernomen wordt. In 2010 bedroegen de wereldwijde kosten van dementie 604 miljard US dollar, volgens de VN-Wereldgezondheidsorganisatie.

In het licht van het bovenstaande:

1. Heeft de Commissie zich aan dit G8-besluit verbonden?

2. Welke middelen in het Horizon 2020-programma voor onderzoek en innovatie maakt de Commissie vrij voor verouderingsziekten (zowel voor fundamenteel onderzoek naar de oorzaken als voor de behandelvormen in de diverse stadia ervan)?

3. Zal de Commissie direct of indirect financieel extra gaan bijdragen aan het G8-initiatief?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(4 maart 2014)

Op 11 december 2013 heb ik aan de G8-top over dementie deelgenomen en daar de steun van de Europese Commissie uitgesproken voor het doel ervan, namelijk een krachtigere wereldwijde aanpak van dementie, door voort te bouwen op initiatieven op EU-niveau, waaronder de gezamenlijke actie „Alzheimer Cooperative Valuation in Europe" (2011-2013) ([1]) en de activiteiten van het Europees innovatiepartnerschap voor actief en gezond ouder worden ([2]).

In hun verklaring van december 2013 hebben de G8-landen toegezegd om in 2014 een aantal fora van hoog niveau te organiseren. Dit gebeurt in partnerschap met de Commissie en het gezamenlijke programma van de EU voor onderzoek naar neurodegeneratieve aandoeningen, een initiatief van de lidstaten voor de ontwikkeling van een gemeenschappelijke onderzoeksstrategie door onderlinge afstemming van nationale programma's en met ondersteuning van de door de EU gefinancierde gemeenschappelijke actie Jumpahead ([3]) (2 miljoen EUR).

De maatschappelijke uitdaging „Gezondheid, demografische verandering en welzijn" van het nieuwe kaderprogramma voor onderzoek en innovatie Horizon 2020 ([4]) (2014-2020) zal mogelijkheden bieden om het onderzoek op dit gebied te ondersteunen. Zo wordt met de oproepen tot het indienen van voorstellen die op 11 december 2013 in het kader van Horizon 2020 zijn gepubliceerd, beoogd een beter inzicht te verkrijgen in de mechanismen die aan onze gezondheid, gezond ouder worden en ziekte ten grondslag liggen, en ouderen te helpen om actief en gezond te blijven. Dit omvat onder andere geestelijke aftakeling. Op het portaal voor onderzoeks- en innovatie-actoren van de Europese Commissie ([5]) is informatie beschikbaar over de onderwerpen waarvoor momenteel aanvragen kunnen worden ingediend.

Daarnaast bevat het programma voor actief en ondersteund wonen onderzoeks- en innovatie-initiatieven voor op ICT gebaseerde producten en -diensten voor ouderen die aan geestelijke aftakeling lijden.

([1]) http://www.alcove-project.eu/.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing.
([3]) http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/home/?no_cache=1.
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:NL:PDF.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000439/14
to the Commission
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: Eradicating dementia by 2025

On 11 December 2013 the group of the eight largest industrialised countries in the world, the G8, made a commitment to develop a medicine to cure dementia, or control it more effectively, by 2025. This is an important initiative as it is estimated that 135 million people worldwide will suffer from dementia in 2050 if no action is taken. According to the World Health Organisation, the global cost of dementia in 2010 was USD 604 billion.

In the light of the above:

1. Has the Commission pledged its support for the G8 commitment?

2. What research and innovation resources under the Horizon 2020 programme is the Commission making available for age-related diseases (both for fundamental research into the causes and for treatments for the various stages of these diseases)?

3. Will the Commission make an additional financial contribution to the G8 initiative, either directly or indirectly?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

I participated in the G8 Summit on Dementia on 11 December 2013 and have expressed, on this occasion, the European Commission's support for the aim of the Summit to strengthen global action on dementia, building on EU level initiatives, including the Joint Action on 'Alzheimer Cooperative Valuation in Europa' (2011-2013) ([1]) and the activities under the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing ([2]).

The G8 countries have committed themselves, in their December 2013 Declaration, to hold a series of high-level fora throughout 2014, in partnership with the Commission and the EU Joint Programme on Neurodegenerative Disease, a Member States-led initiative aimed at developing a common research strategy aligning national programmes, supported by the EU-funded Coordinated Action JUMPAHEAD ([3]) (EUR 2 Million).

Horizon 2020, the new Framework Programme for Research and Innovation ([4]) (2014-2020), through its 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge will provide opportunities to support research in this area. The Horizon 2020 'personalising health and care' calls for proposals, launched 11 December 2013, aim to improve our understanding of the mechanisms underlying health, healthy ageing and disease and support older persons to remain active and healthy. Cognitive decline is a part of that. The EC Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([5]) provides information on the current subjects open for applications.

In addition, the Active and Assisted Living Programme contains research and innovation for ICT-enabled products and services that support older people suffering from cognitive decline.

([1]) http://www.alcove-project.eu/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing
([3]) http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/home/?no_cache=1
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:EN:PDF
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000442/14
au Conseil (Président du Conseil Européen)
Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE)
(17 janvier 2014)

Objet: PCE/PEC — Audition du Conseil européen par le Parlement européen — application de l'article 230, paragraphe 3, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne

L'article 230, paragraphe 3, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne (TFUE) prévoit que «[l]e Conseil européen et le Conseil sont entendus par le Parlement européen dans les conditions prévues par le règlement intérieur du Conseil européen et par celui du Conseil».

Or, ni le règlement intérieur du Conseil européen, ni, d'ailleurs, celui du Conseil, ne semblent prévoir de dispositions en application de cet article 230 du TFUE.

C'est dans ce contexte que le député européen soussigné a l'honneur de saisir le Président du Conseil européen à l'effet de lui demander la position du Conseil européen à l'égard de l'application de l'article 230, paragraphe 3, du TFUE.

Réponse
(17 février 2014)

L'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à lire l'article 5 du règlement intérieur du Conseil européen.

Le président du Conseil européen a toujours présenté en personne au Parlement européen le compte rendu des résultats de chacune des réunions du Conseil européen, y compris des réunions informelles, à la première proche occasion utile, excepté dans un cas où, à la demande du Parlement, il a transmis un rapport écrit. Le Parlement a choisi de désigner certaines des réunions qu'il organise à cet effet sous la dénomination de «Conférence des présidents ouverte à tous les députés» et non de séance du Parlement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000442/14
to the Council (President of the European Council)
Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: PCE/PEC — Hearing of the European Council by the European Parliament — application of Article 230, paragraph 3, of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

Article 230, paragraph 3, of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) provides that '[T]he European Council and the Council shall be heard by the European Parliament in accordance with the conditions laid down in the Rules of Procedure of the European Council and those of the Council'.

And yet neither the Rules of Procedure of the European Council nor, moreover, those of the Council seem to contain provisions in application of Article 230 TFEU.

Against this background, I would respectfully ask the President of the European Council what is the position of the European Council with regard to the application of Article 230, paragraph 3, TFEU?

Reply
(17 February 2014)

The Honourable Member is invited to read Article 5 of the Rules of Procedure of the European Council.

The President of the European Council has reported in person on the results of each European Council meeting, including its informal meetings, to the European Parliament at the earliest convenient opportunity, with one exception, at Parliament's request, when he forwarded a written report. Parliament chose to designate some of its meetings organised for this purpose as a 'Conference of Presidents open to all Members' rather than as a sitting of Parliament.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000443/14
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος / Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Antonello Antinoro (PPE), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Gino Trematerra (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Fabrizio Bertot (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Sylvana Rapti (S&D), Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D), Dimitrios Droutsas (S&D), Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D), Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D), Anni Podimata (S&D), Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D), Joseph Cuschieri (S&D) και Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(17 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Διάθεση των χημικών όπλων της Συρίας

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη:

— ότι με τελευταία προσχωρήσασα τη Γερμανία, εγκρίθηκε το σχέδιο διάθεσης των χημικών όπλων της Συρίας που στην προκαταρκτική του φάση ξεκίνησε με τη μεταφορά του πρώτου φορτίου από το λιμάνι της Λαοδίκειας στη Συρία στις 7 Ιανουαρίου·

— ότι το σχέδιο αυτό προβλέπει 4 φάσεις και συγκεκριμένα:

1. τη μεταφορά στο λιμάνι της Λαοδίκειας των τοξικών ουσιών που προέρχονται από 12 συριακές εγκαταστάσεις υπό τον έλεγχο ρωσικού προσωπικού και με τη χρήση αμερικανικών εμπορευματοκιβωτίων·

2. την αποθήκευση των ουσιών σε δανικά και νορβηγικά φορτηγά πλοία, με αμερικανική επιμελητειακή υποστήριξη ενώ η Ρωσία θα είναι υπεύθυνη για την ασφάλεια·

3. τη μεταφορά σε ένα ιταλικό λιμάνι με δανικά (Ark Futura) και νορβηγικά πλοία·

4. τη μεταφορά των επικίνδυνων χημικών ουσιών σε ένα αμερικανικό πολεμικό σκάφος (MV Cape Ray), με τη διάλυση στη συνέχεια των ουσιών αυτών, χρησιμοποιώντας τη μέθοδο της υδρόλυσης και την πόντιση κατόπιν του φορτίου στα διεθνή ύδατα και συγκεκριμένα στο κέντρο του Ιονίου Πελάγους, μεταξύ Κρήτης, Λιβύης και Μάλτας στα τέλη του Ιανουαρίου,

Ερωτάται η Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος:

1. βάσει ποιών κριτηρίων και αξιολογήσεων επελέγη ο χώρος διάθεσης;

2. ποιοί άλλοι χώροι εκτός Μεσογείου εξετάστηκαν ενδεχομένως για την εν λόγω διάθεση;

3. δεν θεωρεί δυνατόν να υπάρξουν καταστρεπτικές επιπτώσεις στο όλο οικοσύστημα των θαλασσών και των χωρικών υδάτων, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι η Μεσόγειος, αν και περιλαμβάνει διεθνή ύδατα, είναι εν πάση περιπτώσει μια κλειστή θάλασσα;

4. δεν θα ήταν δυνατόν να τροποποιηθεί η επιλογή του χώρου διάθεσης προκειμένου να προστατευθεί όχι μόνο το οικοσύστημα αυτό καθ' εαυτό, αλλά και η υγεία όλων των ευρωπαίων πολιτών της περιοχής της Μεσογείου και όχι μόνο, δεδομένων των βαρύτατων συνεπειών της απόφασης;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Μαρτίου 2014)

Η καταστροφή του συριακού χημικού οπλοστασίου έχει ήδη εγκριθεί και εποπτεύεται από το εκτελεστικό συμβούλιο του οργανισμού για την απαγόρευση των χημικών όπλων (ΟΑΧΟ) και το Συμβούλιο Ασφαλείας των Ηνωμένων Εθνών, τα οποία έχουν λάβει όλα τα κατάλληλα μέτρα για να εξασφαλίσουν τα υψηλότερα πρότυπα περιβαλλοντικής ασφάλειας κατά την καταστροφή όλων των κατηγοριών συριακών χημικών ουσιών. Το σχέδιο αυτό βρίσκεται σε μια σειρά δημοσίων εγγράφων του ΟΑΧΟ που περιέχουν σχετικές αποφάσεις του εκτελεστικού συμβουλίου του ΟΑΧΟ. Στον σχεδιασμό της ενέργειας αυτής συμμετείχαν ενεργά τόσο το πρόγραμμα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για το Περιβάλλον (UNEP) όσο και η Παγκόσμια Οργάνωση Υγείας (ΠΟΥ). Η μέθοδος υδρόλυσης για την προτεραιότητα 1 «πρόδρομες χημικές ουσίες» βασίζεται σε μακρά επιτυχή εμπειρία σε παρόμοιες καταστάσεις. Η ακριβής θέση εν πλω που προτείνεται από την κυβέρνηση των ΗΠΑ στα διεθνή χωρικά ύδατα δεν έχει ακόμη αποφασιστεί. Δεν θα πραγματοποιηθεί καμία απόρριψη χημικών ουσιών ή των λυμάτων τους μετά από υδρόλυση στη θάλασσα. Αντίθετα, οι ουσίες αυτές θα αποθηκευθούν στο αμερικανικό σκάφος και θα μεταφερθούν, μαζί με τις υπόλοιπες συριακές βιομηχανικές χημικές ουσίες σε επιλεγμένες εμπορικές υποδομές για τελική καταστροφή με αποτέφρωση. Η κοινή αποστολή οργάνωσε πρόσφατα συνεδρίαση με τις σημαντικότερες διεθνείς και εθνικές περιβαλλοντικές ΜΚΟ, για να εξηγηθεί ότι η καταστροφή θα πραγματοποιηθεί σύμφωνα με τις διεθνείς και εθνικές νομοθετικές διατάξεις. Τέλος, πρέπει να υπογραμμιστεί ότι η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη της έχουν συνεισφέρει σε μεγάλο βαθμό τόσο χρηματοδοτικά όσο και σε είδος για την ενέργεια αυτή, προκειμένου να εξαλειφθεί μια κατηγορία θανατηφόρων όπλων μαζικής καταστροφής και να μην επαναληφθεί η χρήση τους κατά του συριακού λαού.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000443/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Antonello Antinoro (PPE), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Gino Trematerra (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Fabrizio Bertot (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Sylvana Rapti (S&D), Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D), Dimitrios Droutsas (S&D), Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D), Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D), Anni Podimata (S&D), Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D), Joseph Cuschieri (S&D) e Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(17 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Smaltimento armi chimiche siriane

Considerato:

— che è stato approvato, con l'adesione da ultimo della Germania, il piano di smaltimento delle armi chimiche siriane, che ha avuto inizio, nella sua fase preliminare, con il trasferimento del primo cargo dal porto siriano di Latakia lo scorso 7 gennaio;

— che questo piano prevede quattro fasi:

1. trasporto al porto di Latakia delle sostanze tossiche, provenienti da dodici siti siriani, sotto controllo di personale russo con container americani;

2. stoccaggio delle sostanze su cargo danesi e norvegesi, con supporto logistico da parte degli americani e con la Russia responsabile della sicurezza;

3. trasporto verso un porto italiano ad opera delle navi danesi (Ark Futura) e norvegesi;

4. trasferimento degli agenti chimici pericolosi su una nave militare americana (MV Cape Ray), con successivo smantellamento, attraverso idrolisi, delle sostanze chimiche, che saranno poi inabissate dal cargo in acque internazionali, al centro del Mar Ionio, tra Creta, Libia, Sicilia e Malta, il che dovrebbe avvenire a fine gennaio,

si chiede al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. quali criteri e valutazioni sono stati utilizzati per scegliere il sito per lo smaltimento;

2. quali altri siti, oltre al Mar Mediterraneo, sono stati considerati quali possibili candidati per il suddetto smaltimento;

3. se non ritiene possibile il verificarsi di un forte impatto disastroso sull'intero ecosistema dei mari e acque territoriali, considerato che il Mar Mediterraneo, pur comprendendo acque internazionali, è comunque un mare chiuso;

4. se non sia possibile modificare la scelta del sito per lo smantellamento, in modo da preservare non soltanto l'ecosistema in sé ma anche la salute di tutti i cittadini europei, dell'aerea del Mediterraneo e non solo, viste le possibili gravi conseguenze della decisione.

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

La distruzione dell'arsenale siriano di armi chimiche è stata concordata e gestita dal consiglio esecutivo dell'OPCW e dal Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU, che hanno adottato tutte le misure necessarie per garantire i massimi standard di sicurezza ambientale durante l'eliminazione di tutte le categorie di armi chimiche siriane. Il piano è contenuto in una serie di documenti pubblici dell'OPCW comprendenti le decisioni pertinenti adottate dal consiglio esecutivo. Alla fase di progettazione dell'operazione hanno contribuito attivamente sia il programma delle Nazioni Unite per l'ambiente (UNEP) che l'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità (OMS). Il metodo di idrolisi utilizzato per i precursori chimici di priorità 1 si basa su una lunga serie di risultati positivi ottenuti in altre circostanze. La posizione esatta a bordo di una nave messa a disposizione dal governo degli Stati Uniti nelle acque internazionali non è ancora stata definita. Le sostanze chimiche e i loro effluenti non saranno scaricati in mare dopo l'idrolisi. Saranno invece stoccati a bordo della nave statunitense e trasferiti, insieme al resto delle sostanze chimiche siriane industriali, verso impianti commerciali selezionati per le distruzione definitiva tramite incenerimento. La missione comune ha recentemente organizzato una riunione con ONG ambientali nazionali e internazionali di rilievo per spiegare che la distruzione avverrà secondo le disposizioni legislative nazionali e internazionali. Infine, occorre sottolineare che l'UE e gli Stati membri hanno contribuito in misura sostanziale, dal punto di vista finanziario e pratico, a questa operazione, con l'obiettivo di eliminare una categoria di armi letali di distruzione di massa ed evitare che vengano riutilizzate contro il popolo siriano.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000443/14
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President / Rappreżentant Għoli)
Antonello Antinoro (PPE), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Gino Trematerra (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Fabrizio Bertot (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Sylvana Rapti (S&D), Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D), Dimitrios Droutsas (S&D), Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D), Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D), Anni Podimata (S&D), Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D), Joseph Cuschieri (S&D) u Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(17 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: VP/HR — Rimi tal-armi kimiċi Sirjani

Minħabba:

— li ġie approvat, bl-aħħar adeżjoni tal-Ġermanja, il-pjan ta' rimi tal-armi kimiċi Sirjani, li ngħata bidu, fil-fażi preliminari tiegħu, bit-trasferiment tal-ewwel tagħbija fuq bastiment mill-port Sirjan ta' Latakia fis-7 ta' Jannar li għadda;

— li dan il-pjan jipprevedi erba' fażijiet:

1. it-trasport tas-sustanzi tossiċi li ġejjin minn 12-il sit Sirjan, lejn il-port ta' Latakia, taħt il-kontroll ta' persunal Russu b'kontejners Amerikani;

2. il-ħżin tas-sustanzi fuq bastimenti ta' tagħbija Daniżi u Norveġiżi, b'appoġġ loġistiku mill-Amerikani u bir-Russja li tkun responsabbli mis-sigurtà;

3. it-trasport lejn port Taljan mill-vapuri Daniżi (Ark Futura) u Norveġiżi;

4. it-trasferiment tal-aġenti kimiċi perikoluži fuq vapur militari Amerikan (MV Cape Ray), bir-rimi suċċessiv, permezz ta' idroliżi, tas-sustanzi kimiċi, li mbagħad se jkunu mgħarrqa mill-bastiment f'ibħra internazzjonali, fiċ-ċentru tal-Baħar Jonju, bejn Kreta, il-Libja, Sqallija u Malta, fejn kollox mistenni li jseħħ fl-aħħar ta' Jannar,

qed jiġi mistoqsi lill-Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli:

1. liema kriterji u valutazzjonijiet ittieħdu biex jintagħżel is-sit fejn isir ir-rimi;

2. liema siti oħra, minbarra l-Baħar Mediterran, ġew ikkunsidrati bħala siti possibbli fejn jista' jsir it-tali rimi;

3. jekk hux qed tiġi kkunsidrata l-possibilità li dan iħalli impatt diżastruż qawwi fuq l-ekosistema kollu tal-ibħra territorjali, meta jitqies li l-Baħar Mediterran, għalkemm jinkludi fih l-ibħra internazzjonali, xorta waħda hu baħar magħluq.

4. jekk huwiex possibbli li titbiddel l-għażla tas-sit fejn isir ir-rimi, b'mod li jkun ippreservat mhux biss l-ekosistema nnifsu imma anke s-saħħa taċ-ċittadini kollha Ewropej fiż-żona tal-Mediterran u lil hinn minnha, minħabba l-konsegwenzi gravi eventwali ta' din id-deċiżjoni.

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-qerda tal-ħażna tal-armi kimiċi Sirjana kienet miftehma u qed tiġi ssorveljata mill-Kunsill Eżekuttiv tal-OPCW u lill-Kunsill tas-Sigurtà tan-NU, li ħadu l-miżuri relevanti kollha biex jiżguraw l-ogħla standards ta' sigurtà ambjentali filwaqt li tkompli bil-qerda tal-kategoriji kollha tal-kimiċi Sirjani. Dan il-pjan jinsab f'serje ta' dokumenti pubbliċi tal-OPCW li fihom deċiżjonijiet rilevanti meħuda mill-Kunsill Eżekuttiv tal-OPCW. Fl-ippjanar tal-operazzjoni kemm il-UNEP kif ukoll il-WHO kienu involuti b'mod attiv. Il-metodu ta' idrolisi għall-prekursuri kimiċi ta' Prijorità 1 ġie bbażat fuq esperjenza twila u ta' suċċess f'sitwazzjonijiet simili. Il-post eżatt abbord vapur ipprovdut mill-Gvern tal-Istati Uniti f'ibħra internazzjonali għadu ma ġiex deċiż. Ma hemm l-ebda intenzjoni li s-sustanzi kimiċi jew id-dranaġġ tagħhom wara l-idroliżi jiġu rilaxxati fil-baħar. Minflok, se jinħażnu fuq bastiment tal-Istati Uniti u trasferiti, flimkien mal-bqija tal-kimiċi industrijali tas-Sirja lejn faċilitajiet kummerċjali magħżula għall-qerda finali permezz ta' inċinerazzjoni. Il-Missjoni Konġunta reċentement organizzat laqgħa ma' NGOs ambjentali internazzjonali u nazzjonali ewlenin, biex tispjega li l-qerda se ssir skont id-dispożizzjonijiet tal-leġiżlazzjoni internazzjonali u nazzjonali stabbiliti. Fl-aħħar nett, għandu jiġi enfasizzat li l-UE u l-Istati Membri tagħha kienu qed jikkontribwixxu sew finanzjarjament u sew in natura ta' din l-operazzjoni, bil-mira li tiġi eliminata kategorija ta' armi letali tal-qerda tal-massa u li tiġi evitata repetizzjoni tal-użu tagħhom kontra l-poplu Sirjan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000443/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Antonello Antinoro (PPE), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Gino Trematerra (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Fabrizio Bertot (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Sylvana Rapti (S&D), Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D), Dimitrios Droutsas (S&D), Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D), Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D), Anni Podimata (S&D), Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D), Joseph Cuschieri (S&D) and Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(17 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Disposal of Syrian chemical weapons

Whereas:

— with the recent adoption by Germany, the plan for disposal of Syrian chemical weapons has finally been approved, and its initial stage began with the transfer of the first load from the Syrian port of Latakia on 7 January last;

— this plan provides for four stages:

1. transport of the toxic substances to the port of Latakia from 12 Syrian production sites, under the control of Russian personnel in US containers;

2. storage of the substances on Danish and Norwegian cargo boats, with logistical support from the Americans and with Russia responsible for security;

3. transport to an Italian port by Danish (Ark Futura) and Norwegian vessels;

4. transfer of the hazardous chemical agents to a US military vessel (MV Cape Ray), and subsequent removal by hydrolysis of the chemical substances, which will be subsequently dumped by the cargo vessel in international waters, in the centre of the Ionian Sea, between Crete, Libya, Sicily and Malta, which is to take place by the end of January,

the Vice-President/High Representative is asked:

1. what criteria and assessments have been used to select the disposal site;

2. which other sites, apart from the Mediterranean Sea, have been considered as possible candidates for the said disposal;

3. whether she does not consider it possible that a disastrously strong impact could be caused to the entire ecosystem of the seas and territorial waters, considering that the Mediterranean Sea, although it contains international waters, is a closed sea;

4. whether it is not possible to amend the choice of the decommissioning site, so as to preserve not only the ecosystem itself but also the health of all European citizens, in the area of the Mediterranean and elsewhere, in view of the possible serious consequences of the decision.

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

The destruction of the Syrian chemical weapon arsenal has been agreed and is supervised by the OPCW Executive Council and the UN Security Council, who have taken all necessary measures to ensure the highest standards of environmental safety while proceeding with the destruction of all the categories of the Syrian chemicals. This plan is contained in a series of public OPCW documents containing relevant decisions by the OPCW Executive Council. In the planning of the operation both UNEP and WHO were actively involved. The method of hydrolysis for the Priority 1 chemical precursors has been based on a long successful experience in similar situations. The exact location on board a ship provided by the US Government in the international waters has not been decided yet. There will be no discharge of chemicals or their effluent after hydrolysis into the sea. Instead, they will be stored on the US vessel and transferred, together with the rest of the Syrian industrial chemicals to selected commercial facilities for final destruction by incineration. The Joint Mission has recently organised a meeting with leading international and national environmental NGOs, to explain that the destruction will take place in accordance with international and national legislation provisions. Finally, it should be underlined that the EU and its Member States have been heavily contributing financially and in kind to this operation, aiming at eliminating a category of lethal weapons of mass destruction and preventing a repetition of their use against the Syrian people.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-000446/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 janvier 2014)

Objet: Traçabilité de la viande

La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis que certaines règles valables pour la viande bovine (information sur le lieu de naissance, d'élevage et d'abattage) devraient aussi s'appliquer à toutes les autres viandes?

La Commission compte-t-elle faire une étude d'incidence sur cette proposition?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(25 février 2014)

Le règlement (UE) nº 1169/2011 relatif à l'information des consommateurs sur les denrées alimentaires ([1]) prévoit que la Commission adopte, avant le 13 décembre 2013 et après la réalisation d'une étude d'incidence, un acte d'exécution concernant la mention obligatoire du pays d'origine ou du lieu de provenance des viandes fraîches, réfrigérées et congelées des animaux des espèces porcine, ovine, caprine et des volailles. Il exige également de la Commission qu'elle présente un rapport concernant la mention obligatoire du pays d'origine ou du lieu de provenance pour les viandes autres que les viandes bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine et de volaille. L'étude d'incidence ([2]) et son rapport examinent les différentes options quant aux modalités possibles pour indiquer le pays d'origine ou le lieu de provenance par rapport à chaque stade déterminant dans la vie de l'animal, à savoir: la naissance, l'élevage et l'abattage.

S'appuyant sur l'étude d'incidence, le règlement d'exécution (UE) nº 1337/2013 ([3]) de la Commission, adopté le 13 décembre 2013, prévoit que les viandes provenant des animaux des espèces porcine, ovine, caprine et des volailles doivent porter la mention de l'État membre ou du pays tiers dans lequel l'animal a été élevé et de l'État membre ou du pays tiers dans lequel il a été abattu. Cette mention obligatoire peut être remplacée par: «origine (État membre ou pays tiers)», à condition que la viande provienne d'animaux nés, élevés et abattus dans un seul État membre ou pays tiers et que l'opérateur concerné puisse en apporter la preuve.

En fait, le règlement (UE) nº 1169/2011 n'exige pas de la Commission qu'elle applique une option en particulier, mais il lui confère la compétence de la mettre en œuvre après avoir réalisé une étude d'incidence sur les différentes options.

De plus, le rapport précité relatif à d'autres viandes est en cours d'élaboration et sera présenté par la Commission au Parlement européen et au Conseil au plus tard le 13 décembre 2014. La Commission peut accompagner ce rapport d'une proposition.

([1]) JO L 304 du 22.11.2011, p. 1.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2013/ia_meat_origin_labelling.pdf
([3]) JO L 335 du 14.12.2013, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000446/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Traceability of meat

Does the Commission agree that the rules on origin labelling for beef and veal, which make the provision of information about the place of birth, rearing and slaughter mandatory, should also be applied to all other kinds of meat?

Does the Commission plan to carry out an assessment of the impact of this proposal?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2014)

Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on food information to consumers ([1]) requests the Commission to adopt by 13 December 2013, following an impact assessment, an implementing act concerning the compulsory indication of the country of origin or place of provenance of fresh, chilled or frozen meats of swine, sheep, goats and poultry. This regulation instructs also the Commission to submit, a report regarding the mandatory indication of the country of origin or place of provenance for meats other than beef, swine, sheep, goat and poultry. The impact assessment ([2]) as well as the report examines different options for expressing the country of origin or place of provenance with respect to each of the stages of the live of the animals: birth, rearing and slaughter.

Building on the impact assessment, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1337/2013 ([3]), adopted on 13 December 2013, provides that meats of swine, sheep, goat and poultry must bear an indication of the Member State or third country where the animal was reared and of the Member State or third country where the animal was slaughtered. This mandatory indication may be replaced by 'origin (Member State or third country)' if the meat is obtained from animals born, reared and slaughtered in one single Member State or third country and the concerned operator can prove it.

In fact Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 does not instruct the Commission to apply a particular option but empowers the Commission to implement it after assessment of impacts for different options.

Moreover, the referred report regarding other meats is under preparation and will be submitted by the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council by 13 December 2014. The Commission may accompany this report with proposals.

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2013/ia_meat_origin_labelling.pdf
([3]) OJ L 335, 14.12.2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000451/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Pläne zum Bau des Serengeti-Highways

Die Serengeti in Tansania ist ein berühmtes Naturreservat, und die Hälfte der Fläche ist Teil des regionalen Nationalparks. Bereits im Jahr 2010 wurde in den Medien über den Plan zur Entwicklung einer Schnellstraße ([1]), die quer durch die Serengeti und mitten durch den Nationalpark führen soll, berichtet. Die geplante Straße solle die Stadt Arusha mit Musoma im Westen Tansanias verbinden und die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung des Landes unterstützen. Obwohl verschiedene Schutzzonen festgelegt und Natur- sowie Artenschutzmaßnahmen vorgesehen waren, wurden diese jedoch nicht von der tansanischen Regierung unterzeichnet. Es besteht die Befürchtung, dass durch den vorgesehenen Straßenbau etwa 2 Millionen freilebende Tiere gänzlich vom angrenzenden Naturschutzgebiet Masai Masai abgeschnitten werden, in welchem sie in der Trockenzeit Wasser finden können. Die Straße würde diese Wanderung in erheblichem Maße stören und könnte einen Rückgang des Grundbestands von 1,3 Milliarden Tieren auf nur mehr 200 000 verursachen; auf diese Tatsache will die tansanische Regierung eingehen.

1. Wie gedenkt die Kommission zu überprüfen, ob die gewählte Route für den Serengeti-Straßenbau nicht anders gelegt werden kann, um die Tierwanderung so wenig wie möglich zu stören und so für den Schutz der regional freilebenden Tiere einzustehen?

2. Der Straßenbau wird unter dem Namen der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung vorangetrieben. Wie gedenkt die Kommission sicherzustellen, dass auch die verarmte Bevölkerung aus den wirtschaftlichen Vorteilen, die der Straßenbau mit sich bringen soll, Nutzen zieht und nicht nur die politische Elite Tansanias und der angrenzenden Länder Kenia, Uganda, Burundi und Ruanda?

3. Wie gedenkt die Kommission zu kontrollieren, dass die neuen Verkehrsaufkommen, die durch den Straßenbau herbeigeführt werden würden, nicht zu signifikanten Umweltschäden durch erhöhte CO_2-Emissionen führen werden?

Antwort von Herrn Piebalgs im Namen der Kommission
(4. März 2014)

1. Die Regierung Tansanias hat sich gegenüber der Unesco verpflichtet, das Straßenentwicklungsprojekt von Arusha nach Musoma ohne eine Asphaltstraße im Serengeti-Nationalpark durchzuführen. Der bestehende, 53 km lange Abschnitt durch den Serengeti-Nationalpark bleibt eine unbefestigte Straße und wird weiterhin von der Nationalparkbehörde Tansanias verwaltet. In jüngsten Gesprächen mit Regierungsvertretern wurde deutlich, dass momentan nicht beabsichtigt wird, diese Straße für den Transitverkehr auszubauen, und sie weiterhin weitgehend als Verbindungsstraße für den Tourismus genutzt werden soll.

Mit finanzieller und technischer Hilfe mehrerer Entwicklungspartner — darunter die EU — werden stattdessen alternative Möglichkeiten für eine Regionalstraße mit Streckenführung südlich des Serengeti-Nationalparks geprüft. Im Jahr 2013 beauftragte Tansania Deutschland offiziell mit einer Durchführbarkeitsstudie für die *Serengeti Southern Routes*. Die EU-Delegation hat ihr Interesse an und ihre Unterstützung für das Vorhaben ausgedrückt und wird auf Grundlage der Ergebnisse der Studie das weitere Vorgehen abwägen.

2. Die Europäische Union engagiert sich seit langem für die Unterstützung des gemeinschaftsbasierten Managements natürlicher Ressourcen im Ökosystem Serengeti und für die Verbesserung des Wildtiermanagements bei gleichzeitiger Förderung von Erwerbsmöglichkeiten wie Bienenzucht und umweltfreundlicher Tourismus, die mit dem Naturschutz in Einklang stehen.

3. Da es keine Pläne gibt, die Straße im nördlichen Teil des Serengeti-Nationalparks für den Transitverkehr auszubauen, wird keine Zunahme des Verkehrsaufkommens erwartet, die zu einem erheblichen Anstieg an CO_2-Emissionen und dadurch bedingten Umweltschäden führen würde.

([1]) http://www.zeit.de/wissen/umwelt/2010-07/serengeti-afrika-tierwelt

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000451/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Plans to build the Serengeti Highway

The Serengeti is a renowned nature reserve in Tanzania, and half its area forms part of the regional national park. In 2010, the media reported on plans to develop a highway ([1]) that would cut through the Serengeti and run straight across the national park. The planned road is intended to link the city of Arusha to Musoma in western Tanzania and assist with the nation's economic development. Although a number of protected areas have been designated and nature and species preservation measures have been provided for, none of these have been signed off by the Tanzanian Government. The fear exists that if the road is built as planned, some two million wild animals will be completely cut off from the adjoining Masai Mara nature reserve, where they can find water during the dry season. The road will seriously disrupt this migration and could cause a reduction in the wildlife population from 1.3 billion animals to just 200 000. The Tanzanian Government intends to look into this matter.

1. How does the Commission intend to examine whether the selected route for the Serengeti highway might be adjusted so as to minimise disruption to animal migration and thereby stand up for the protection of the region's wildlife?

2. Construction of the road is being promoted in the name of economic development. How does the Commission intend to ensure that the economic gains that construction is supposed to yield benefit the impoverished population and not just the political elite of Tanzania and the neighbouring countries of Kenya, Uganda, Burundi and Rwanda?

3. How does the Commission intend to ensure that the increase in traffic that construction of the road will bring will not lead to significant environmental damage due to increased CO_2 emissions?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

1. The Government of Tanzania has given a commitment to Unesco that the road development project from Arusha to Musoma will not involve a tarmac road inside the Serengeti National Park (SNP). The existing 53 km section traversing the SNP will remain gravel road and continue to be managed by Tanzania National Parks. Recent exchanges with government representatives indicate that there is currently no intention to develop this road as a transit facility and that the road will remain a local facility for tourism purposes mainly.

Instead, alternative options for a regional road bypassing the SNP from the South will be studied with the financial and technical support of several Development Partners, including the EU. In 2013, the Government of Tanzania officially requested Germany to assist with a feasibility study for the Serengeti Southern Routes. The EU Delegation has expressed its interest and support for the initiative and will consider further steps based on the outcome of the study.

2. The European Union has a long standing commitment to supporting community-based natural resources management in the Greater Serengeti Ecosystem and to enhancing wildlife management while increasing opportunities for conservation-compatible income generation such as beekeeping and eco-tourism.

3. As there are no plans to develop the road traversing the northern part of the SNP to a transit route standard, no traffic increase is expected that would lead to a significant increase in CO_2 emissions and consequent environmental damage.

([1]) http://www.zeit.de/wissen/umwelt/2010-07/serengeti-afrika-tierwelt

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000452/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Alkoholausschank an junge Menschen

Alkoholausschank an junge Menschen, die unter die gesetzlich vorgegebene Altersgrenze fallen, wird nach wie vor als Kavaliersdelikt gesehen und hat nur minimale Folgen für Konzessionsinhaber. Jedoch ist bekannt, dass früh beginnender Alkoholkonsum schwerwiegende Folgen haben kann, da Alkohol eine sogenannte „gateway drug" (Einstiegsdroge) ist und die Hemmschwelle senkt, härtere Suchtmittel zu testen.

1. Welche konkreten Bemühungen hat die Kommission unternommen, um die Prävention von verfrühtem Alkoholkonsum auf europäischer Ebene zu unterstützen?

2. Wie erfolgreich schätzt die Kommission ihre bisherigen Bemühungen ein? Gibt es Statistiken, die den Erfolg der Präventionsmaßnahmen widerspiegeln?

3. Gedenkt die Kommission, entsprechende Empfehlungen an die Mitgliedstaaten zu richten, die Sanktionen gegen Konzessionsinhaber zu verschärfen, falls sie nachweislich jungen Menschen, die unter die vorgegebene Altersgrenze fallen, Alkohol ausgeschenkt haben? Werden in diesem Fall höhere Geldstrafen in Erwägung gezogen?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(5. März 2014)

Die EU-Strategie zur Unterstützung der Mitgliedstaaten bei der Verringerung alkoholbedingter Schäden ([1]) weist den Schutz von Kindern und Jugendlichen als Schwerpunktbereich aus. In der Strategie wird festgehalten, dass die Zuständigkeit für die einzelstaatliche Alkoholpolitik hauptsächlich bei den Mitgliedstaaten liegt; gleichwohl werden Beispiele bewährter Verfahren genannt, wie bessere Durchsetzung von Beschränkungen des Verkaufs, eingeschränkte Verfügbarkeit für Jugendliche und weitreichende kommunale Aktionen, die Eltern, Stakeholder und die Jugendlichen selbst einbeziehen.

Aufgabe der Kommission ist es, die nationalen Maßnahmen zu unterstützen und zu koordinieren, insbesondere durch Ermittlung und Verbreitung bewährter Verfahren. Im Jahr 2007 setzte die Kommission den Ausschuss „Nationale Alkoholpolitik und -maßnahmen" ein, um den Austausch von Meinungen und bewährten Verfahren zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten zu erleichtern. Im Rahmen des Europäischen Forums für Alkohol und Gesundheit ermutigt die Kommission außerdem ein breites Spektrum von Stakeholdern, u. a. die Alkoholindustrie und die mit der öffentlichen Gesundheit befassten NRO, Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung alkoholbedingter Schäden zu ergreifen.

Was die Sammlung von Beispielen bewährter Vorgehensweisen zur Durchsetzung der in den Mitgliedstaaten geltenden gesetzlichen Altersgrenzen für den Alkoholverkauf und -ausschank betrifft, so wurde im Jahr 2013 ein durch das Gesundheitsprogramm finanzierter Bericht mit dem Titel „Eyes on Ages" veröffentlicht.

([1]) Mitteilung vom 24. Oktober 2006 „Eine EU-Strategie zur Unterstützung der Mitgliedstaaten bei der Verringerung alkoholbedingter Schäden" (KOM(2006)625 endg.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000452/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Serving alcohol to young people

The serving of alcohol to young people below the legal age limit continues to be regarded as a trivial offence and has only minimal consequences for licensees. Yet it is well known that consuming alcohol from an early age can have serious consequences, as alcohol is a 'gateway drug' and lowers inhibitions against trying out harder addictive substances.

1. What specific steps has the Commission taken to support the prevention of underage drinking at the European level?

2. How successful does the Commission consider its efforts to date to have been? Are there any statistics that reflect the success of prevention measures?

3. Does the Commission intend to issue recommendations to the Member States concerning the tightening of sanctions against licensees who have provably served alcohol to underage young people? Are increased fines being contemplated in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

The protection of children and young people is identified as a priority theme in the EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm ([1]). Whilst recognising that Member States have the main responsibility for national alcohol policy, the strategy highlights examples of good practices such as better enforcement of regulations on sales, reduced availability to young people, and broad community-based actions involving parents, stakeholders and young people themselves.

The Commission's role is to support and help coordinate national actions, in particular by identifying and disseminating good practice. In 2007, the Commission set up the Committee on National Alcohol Policy and Action, to facilitate the exchange of views and good practices between Member States. The Commission is also encouraging a broad range of stakeholders — including the alcohol industry and public health NGOs — to take action to address alcohol related harm, through the European Alcohol and Health Forum.

As regards the collection of good practice on the enforcement of national legal age limits for selling and serving alcohol, a report 'Eyes on Ages', funded by the Health Programme, was published in 2013.

([1]) Communication of 24 October 2006, An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm (COM(2006) 625 final).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000454/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Verharmlosung von Schmerzmitteln/Schmerztabletten

Pharmazeutische Produkte, insbesondere Schmerzmittel, werden von Bürgerinnen und Bürgern viel zu oft eingenommen, da sie von Ärzten in großen Mengen verschrieben werden bzw. die Verpackungsmengen in manchen Fällen sehr groß sind. Aus diesem Umstand erklärt sich die Tatsache, dass viele Menschen bei Schmerzen oder Unwohlsein zu pharmazeutischen Produkten, meist Schmerzmitteln, greifen, um den Ansprüchen und Anforderungen des stressigen Alltags gewachsen zu sein. Bedauerlicherweise wird die Einnahme jedoch verharmlost, und nur wenige Bürger sind sich darüber bewusst, wie schädlich Schmerzmittel tatsächlich sind und welche gesundheitsschädlichen Folgen sie in Verbindung mit Genussmitteln wie Alkohol haben.

1. Wie gedenkt die Kommission, die europäischen Bürger über die tatsächliche Schädlichkeit der vermehrten Einnahme von Schmerzmitteln aufzuklären? Welche Informationskampagnen sind diesbezüglich geplant?

2. Wie gedenkt die Kommission die teilweise sehr großen Verpackungsmengen zu verringern, so dass nur noch kleinere Packungen verfügbar sind?

3. Wie gedenkt die Kommission einzugreifen, damit Schmerzmittel mit den Inhaltsstoffen Paracetamol und Ibuprofen, welche sich laut jüngsten Medienberichten besonders bei Kindern und Jugendlichen als schädlicher als gedacht herausstellen ([1]), nicht mehr ohne ärztliche Verschreibung verfügbar sind?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(5. März 2014)

Patienten erhalten durch die Packungsbeilage Informationen über die Verwendung eines Arzneimittels. Diese ist ebenso wie die zugelassenen Packungsgrößen Teil der Zulassung für das Produkt, die entweder von der Kommission für die gesamte EU oder von einem Mitgliedstaat für sein eigenes Hoheitsgebiet erteilt wird ([2]). Die Bewertung eines Zulassungsantrags schließt auch die Bewertung ein, ob die Packungsgrößen im Hinblick auf eine korrekte und sichere Verwendung angemessen sind. Das Spektrum der Packungsgrößen sollte je nach Dauer der Behandlung und je nach Dosierung gewählt werden ([3]).

Bei Erteilung einer Zulassung entscheidet jeder Mitgliedstaat selber darüber, ob das Arzneimittel verschreibungspflichtig abgegeben wird oder nicht.

Schmerzmittel, die Paracetamol bzw. Ibuprofen enthalten, werden von den Mitgliedstaaten zugelassen; diese Zulassungen sind daher EU-weit nicht vollständig harmonisiert.

Im Arzneimittelrecht ([1]) sind Instrumente vorgesehen, mit denen ein Tätigwerden auf EU-Ebene sichergestellt wird, wenn es ernsthafte Sicherheitsbedenken im Zusammenhang mit einem Arzneimittel gibt. Mehrere Schmerzmittel wurden bereits einer solchen Bewertung auf EU-Ebene unterzogen, infolge derer z. B. die zugelassene Verwendung beschränkt wurde. Die entsprechenden Kommissionsbeschlüsse und -entscheidungen, die für alle Mitgliedstaaten verbindlich sind, sind öffentlich zugänglich ([4]). Derzeit sind auf EU-Ebene zwei Verfahren zur Bewertung von Signalen im Zusammenhang mit der Sicherheit von Paracetamol anhängig ([5]), in deren Rahmen festgestellt werden soll, ob weitere Schritte erforderlich sind.

Die Kommission plant derzeit keine weiteren Maßnahmen bezüglich der Sicherheit von Schmerzmitteln.

([1]) http://www.hna.de/magazin/gesundheit-und-pflege/schmerzen-bei-kindern-erkennen-und-behandeln-mz-3311544.html

([2]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 726/2004 zur Festlegung von Gemeinschaftsverfahren für die Genehmigung und Überwachung von Human- und Tierarzneimitteln und zur Errichtung einer Europäischen Arzneimittel-Agentur (ABl. L 136 vom 30.4.2004) in ihrer aktuellen Fassung und Richtlinie 2001/83/EG zur Schaffung eines Gemeinschaftskodexes für Humanarzneimittel (ABl. L 311 vom 28.11.2001) in ihrer aktuellen Fassung.

([3]) Guideline on the packaging information of medicinal products for Human use authorised by the Union (Juli 2013)
http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/eudralex/vol-2/c/bluebox_06_2013_en.pdf

([4]) Nimesulid und Diclofenac: Arzneimittelregister der Gemeinschaft, EU-Befassungen
http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/refh_others.htm
Nicht steroidale entzündungshemmende Mittel (Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs — NSAID; zu diesen gehört auch Ibuprofen) und kardiovaskuläres Risiko
http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Medicine_QA/2012/10/WC500134095.pdf

([5]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Agenda/2014/02/WC500160761pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000454/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Trivialisation of painkillers / pain tablets

Pharmaceutical products, especially painkillers, are taken far too frequently by members of the public, because they are prescribed in large quantities by doctors or in some cases because the packaging quantities are very large. This explains why many people, when in pain or unwell, turn to pharmaceutical products, mostly painkillers, to help them cope with the claims and demands of stressful everyday lives. Regrettably, the consumption of such products is regarded as a trivial matter — few people realise how harmful painkillers really are, or understand the effects on health of taking them in conjunction with substances such as alcohol.

1. How does the Commission intend to make the European public aware of the real harm arising from the increased consumption of painkillers? What information campaigns are planned in this regard?

2. How does the Commission intend to reduce the — often very large — packaging quantities so that only smaller packs are available in future?

3. How does the Commission intend to take action to ensure that painkillers containing paracetamol and ibuprofen, which recent media reports suggest to be more harmful than previously thought, especially to children and young people ([1]), can no longer be obtained without a doctor's prescription?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

Information to patients about use of a medicinal product is provided in the package leaflet. This is, together with the approved package sizes, part of the marketing authorisation of the product, which is granted by the Commission for the entire EU or by a Member State for its own territory ([2]). The evaluation of a marketing authorisation application includes assessment of the appropriateness of pack sizes in the view of the correct and safe use. The range of pack sizes should be chosen in accordance with the duration of treatment and in accordance with the dosing ([3]).

A decision on supply of the medicinal product, with or without a prescription, is taken individually by each Member State, when the marketing authorisation is granted.

Paracetamol- and ibuprofen- containing products for use as painkillers are authorised by the Member States, therefore their marketing authorisations are not fully harmonised in the EU.

However, the pharmaceutical legislation[1] provides for instruments ensuring, that serious safety concerns over medicinal products are addressed at the EU level. Several painkillers have been subject to such evaluation, resulting e.g. in the restriction of the approved use. Relevant Commission Decisions, binding to all MSs, are publicly available ([4]). Currently there is ongoing EU evaluation of two safety signals for paracetamol ([5]), to determine the need for further action.

The Commission at present does not plan any additional activity regarding the safe use of painkillers.

([1]) http://www.hna.de/magazin/gesundheit-und-pflege/schmerzen-bei-kindern-erkennen-und-behandeln-mz-3311544.html
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency, OJ L 136, 30.4.2004, as amended, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.
([3]) Guideline on the packaging information of medicinal products for Human use authorised by the Union (July 2013), http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/eudralex/vol-2/c/bluebox_06_2013_en.pdf
([4]) E.g. nimesulide, diclofenac: Community register, EU Referrals, http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/refh_others.htm; Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs, including ibuprofen) and cardiovascular risk, http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Medicine_QA/2012/10/WC500134095.pdf
([5]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Agenda/2014/02/WC500160761.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000456/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Wissen über EU und Wirtschaft in Schulen

Für viele Schüler/innen in den Mitgliedstaaten sind die Begriffe EU und Wirtschaft noch immer abstrakte Wörter, welche keine Relevanz für ihr Leben haben. Das bedeutet, dass die Schüler/innen nicht ausreichend über diese Themen informiert sind.

1. Die Jugendlichen der Mitgliedstaaten sind die (wirtschaftliche) Zukunft der EU; aus diesem Grund sollten sie bestens über die Institution der EU und die Konzepte und Abläufe der Wirtschaft informiert sein. Wie gedenkt die Kommission gegen diese Informationslücke vorzugehen? Gibt es spezifische Programme der EU, um diese Themen fest in die Lehrpläne zu integrieren? Wenn ja, welche?

2. Nicht nur SchülerInnen aus höheren Schulstufen sollten mit den beiden genannten Bereichen vertraut sein; auch Schüler/innen, die nach der Pflichtschule eine Ausbildung beginnen, müssen dieses Wissen zur Verfügung gestellt bekommen. Wie will die Kommission gewährleisten, dass dieses Wissen allen Jugendlichen in den Mitgliedstaaten zur Verfügung steht?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(4. März 2014)

Die Kommission teilt nicht die Auffassung der Frau Abgeordneten, dass junge Menschen unzureichend über die Wirtschaft oder die EU Bescheid wüssten. Eine kürzlich durchgeführte Eurobarometer-Umfrage zeigt, dass junge Menschen recht gut über die Europäische Union informiert sind ([1]).

Für die Lehrinhalte und die Gestaltung des Bildungssystems sind ausschließlich die Mitgliedstaaten verantwortlich ([2]). Im Europäischen Rahmen für Schlüsselkompetenzen, auf den sich das Parlament und der Rat im Jahr 2006 geeinigt haben und der in viele nationale Lehrpläne aufgenommen wurde, ist davon die Rede, dass alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger ein „umfassendes Verständnis der Funktionsweise der Wirtschaft“ und der „verschiedenen Institutionen auf lokaler, regionaler, nationaler, europäischer und internationaler Ebene“ haben sollten.

Nachdem dies im Jahr 2011 vom Parlament gefordert wurde, umfassen die Jean-Monnet-Aktivitäten (JMA) mittlerweile auch die Unterstützung von Projekten im Rahmen der Initiative „Learning Europe at School“, die es ermöglicht, dass Hochschullehrer ihr Wissen über die EU an Schüler von Pflichtschulen weitergeben. Im Rahmen der JMA finanziert die Kommission außerdem Forschungsprojekte ([3]), bei denen untersucht wird, welche Rolle die EU derzeit in den Lehrplänen spielt und welche Verbesserungen möglich sind.

Auf dem Europa-Server finden sich auf der Seite „Die EU für Lehrer/innen“ speziell für Schüler/innen konzipierte Informationen über die EU ([4]), und die „Kinderecke“ bietet Lernspiele über Europa an. Beide Seiten verzeichneten im vergangenen Jahr um die 13 Millionen Aufrufe. Darüber hinaus kehren alljährlich Kommissionsbeamte in ihre Schulen zurück, um dort aus erster Hand über Europa zu berichten. Voriges Jahr wurden so 65 400 Schüler/innen in 886 Schulen erreicht. Die 500 Europe-Direct-Informationszentren organisieren ebenfalls Veranstaltungen für Schüler/innen und halten Workshops zum Thema EU ab.

Zudem bietet das Programm Erasmus+ Schulen und Lehrern/innen die Möglichkeit der Zusammenarbeit in Projekten zu den Themen Wirtschaft und EU.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb79/eb79_publ_de.pdf – S. 115.
([2]) Artikel 165 AEUV.
([3]) „Learning Europe at School“.
([4]) http://europa.eu/teachers-corner/index_de.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000456/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Knowledge about the EU and the economy in schools

For many schoolchildren in the Member States, the terms 'EU' and 'the economy' are still abstract words that have no relevance to their real lives. This means that the schoolchildren are not sufficiently informed about these topics.

1. Young people in the Member States are the (economic) future of the EU. For this reason, they should be as well-informed as possible about the institution of the EU and about economic concepts and processes. How does the Commission intend to combat this information gap? Do any specific EU programmes exist to embed these topics firmly into school curriculums? If so, what are they?

2. These areas should not only be familiar to schoolchildren in higher year groups — this knowledge should also be made available to children who enter vocational training at the end of their compulsory schooling. How will the Commission guarantee that this knowledge is available to all young people in the Member States?

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

The Commission does not share the Honourable Member's view that young people are not familiar with the economy or the information on the EU. The recent Eurobarometer report indicates that young people are quite well informed about the European Union ([1]).

The responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems rests entirely with Member States ([2]). The European Framework of Key Competences, agreed by the Parliament and Council in 2006 and integrated into many national curricula, states that all citizens should have a 'broad understanding' of 'the workings of the economy' and 'various institutions at the local, regional, national, European and international levels'.

Following a 2011 Parliament request, the Jean Monnet activities (JMA) provide support to projects under the initiative 'Learning Europe at School' which enables the transfer of EU knowledge from university professors to pupils in compulsory education. Under JMA, the Commission has also funded research ([3]) on how the EU currently figures in curricula and how this could be improved.

The Europa server's 'Teachers' Corner' provides information about the EU specifically designed for teaching young people ([4]); and the 'Kids' Corner' offers educational games about Europe. Both sites received some 13 million visits over the last year. Also, every year Commission officials return to their schools to tell first-hand what Europe is about. Last year, 65 400 pupils were reached in 886 schools. The 500 Europe Direct Information Centres also organise events for pupils and hold school workshops on the EU.

Finally, the Erasmus+ programme provides opportunities for schools and teachers to cooperate on projects relating to both the economy and the EU.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb79/eb79_publ_en.pdf — p.115.
([2]) Article 165 TFEU.
([3]) 'Learning Europe at School'.
([4]) http://europa.eu/teachers-corner/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000459/14
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: National parliaments and the defence of the subsidiarity principle

Article 7 of the Lisbon Treaty's protocol on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality requires the Commission to review draft legislative acts if objections are received from national parliaments representing at least one third of all the votes allocated to them.

Since the treaty entered into force, on how many occasions have national parliaments had the opportunity to object to proposed EU legislation on the grounds of subsidiarity or proportionality?

On how many occasions have national parliaments representing at least one third of all the votes registered an objection?

What proposals for legislation were subsequently reviewed following these objections, and what changes, if any, were made as a result?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(17 February 2014)

The Commission's annual reports on subsidiarity and proportionality ([1]) and on relations between the Commission and national Parliaments ([2]) give a comprehensive account of how the subsidiarity control mechanism is being implemented. Since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, national Parliaments have had the opportunity to submit reasoned opinions on all Commission proposals. In practice, the Commission received 252 reasoned opinions (34 in 2010, 64 in 2011, 70 in 2012, and 84 in 2013).

At this stage, there has been no 'orange card' ([3]) procedure and only two 'yellow card' ([4]) procedures. The first, in 2012, concerned the proposal for a Council Regulation on the exercise of the right to take collective action within the context of the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services ([5]). After an in-depth assessment of the arguments raised by national Parliaments, the Commission found that the principle of subsidiarity had not been breached. However, taking into account the views expressed by national Parliaments as well as the state of play of the discussions among stakeholders, and recognising that its proposal was unlikely to gather the necessary political support within the Parliament and the Council, the Commission withdrew it ([6]).

In 2013, a 'yellow card' procedure was triggered with regard to the proposal for a Council Regulation on the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office ([7]). After a detailed analysis of the arguments presented, the Commission found that the principle of subsidiarity had not been breached and decided to maintain its proposal ([8]). Negotiations on the proposal are on-going.

The reasoned opinions concerning other proposals did not reach the necessary thresholds to trigger a 'yellow card' procedure.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/relations/relations_other/npo/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/better_regulation/reports_en.htm
([3]) Protocol (No 2) to the TFEU, Art. 7(3).
([4]) Protocol (No 2) to the TFEU, Art. 7(2).
([5]) COM(2012) 130.
([6]) See Chapter 'Key Cases' in the Annual Report 2012 on Subsidiarity and Proportionality http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/better_regulation/documents/2012_subsidiarity_report_en.pdf
([7]) COM(2013) 534 .
The threshold to trigger a 'yellow card' is a quarter of all the votes allocated to the national Parliaments in the case of a draft legislative act submitted on the basis of Article 76 TFEU.
([8]) COM(2013) 851.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000460/14
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (NI)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Implementation status of national plans for rare diseases

Patients with rare diseases, including primary immunodeficiencies, live with life-threatening or chronically debilitating diseases with a low prevalence and a high level of complexity. In the case of primary immunodeficiencies, it is of paramount importance that national plans or strategies for rare diseases provide both for the establishment of and financial support for patient registries and information centres in view of the benefits these can bring to patients' lives, and for screening measures for newborn babies to speed up diagnosis and provide access to care for infants.

In the Council recommendation of 8 June 2009 on an action in the field of rare diseases, Member States committed themselves to 'elaborate and adopt a plan or strategy as soon as possible, preferably by the end of 2013 at the latest' (Article 1(1)(a)). According to the 2013 report on the state of the art of rare diseases activities in Europe, in May 2013 (7 months before the deadline), only 12 out of 28 Member States had developed their national plans or strategies.

According to the Council recommendation, the Commission was invited to produce, by the end of 2013, an implementation report. So far, no report has been published. When does the Commission intend to publish such a report?

What does the Commission intend to do in the case of Member States which have not developed and implemented such plans. in light of their importance in improving the lives of patients affected by rare diseases and those of their families?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 March 2014)

According to the information collected from Member States, currently sixteen countries have adopted a national plan/strategy on rare diseases. Several other countries are at an advanced stage of preparation.

The Commission is currently analysing information received from Member States and intends to publish an 'Implementation report on the Commission Communication on Rare Diseases: Europe's challenges and Council Recommendation of 8 June 2009 on an action in the field of rare diseases'.

Moreover, the Commission continues to co-fund a 'Joint Action: working for rare diseases' in order to support Member States in the process of development of plans/strategies on rare diseases.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000461/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Stupri di gruppo in India

È di poche settimane fa l'ennesima scioccante notizia proveniente dall'India: nello stato del Bihar una ragazza di soli dodici anni è stata brutalmente violentata da un «branco» composto da sei uomini. Ancora più sconcertante è il fatto che la ragazza era stata violentata dalle stesse persone il giorno precedente ed è stata poi intercettata il giorno seguente dopo essersi recata, insieme al padre, presso il commissariato di polizia per denunciare il fatto. Circa tre settimane fa la ragazza è stata aggredita per una terza volta da due dei sei uomini coinvolti, che l'hanno arsa viva. La ragazza è deceduta pochi giorni fa in seguito alle gravissime ustioni riportate. Con lei è morto anche il feto che portava in grembo, frutto della violenza subita.

Il fenomeno degli stupri in «branco» ha assunto ormai dimensioni preoccupanti in India ed è indice chiaro della violazione dei diritti inalienabili dell'individuo e del rispetto della donna.

Alla luce di quanto esposto e dal momento che l'India è un importante partner per l'Unione, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se dispone di dati completi e aggiornati su questo genere di fenomeno in India;

2. cosa stia facendo l'UE al fine di difendere e promuovere il rispetto dei diritti umani in India, in conformità con l'articolo 21, primo comma, del TUE.

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(6 marzo 2014)

Secondo le statistiche fornite dall'Ufficio nazionale del casellario giudiziale indiano, nel 2012 sono stati registrati 24 923 casi di stupro. Solo in un caso su quattro gli autori di questi crimini sono stati puniti, come si evince dal tasso delle condanne pronunciate, pari al 24 %. Non sono disponibili dati distinti per gli stupri di gruppo.

L'UE segue attentamente la situazione dei diritti umani in India e già da tempo coinvolge le autorità italiane e la società civile nel dibattito sulla violenza e la discriminazione nei confronti delle donne e sulle questioni di genere. L'approccio dell'UE si basa su tre principi: la promozione dell'uguaglianza di genere e dell'emancipazione femminile; la lotta alle discriminazioni di genere e la violenza contro le donne e le bambine; la protezione e la promozione dei diritti dei minori, in particolare delle bambine. A questi temi viene dato ampio spazio, tra l'altro, nelle riunioni che si svolgono nel quadro del dialogo regolare tra UE e India sui diritti umani, l'ultima delle quali ha avuto luogo il 27 novembre 2013.

Le questioni legate alle donne sono parte integrante anche delle attività di cooperazione allo sviluppo dell'UE: il benessere delle donne e delle bambine è al centro dei programmi in materia di istruzione e di sanità, mentre numerosi progetti hanno aiutato le organizzazioni della società civile ad affrontare questioni come la violenza contro le donne, compresi fenomeni quali la tratta di minori, i matrimoni infantili, la violenza domestica e l'HIV/AIDS.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000461/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Gang rape in India

A few weeks ago we heard yet another shocking news item from India: in the State of Bihar, a girl of only twelve years old was brutally raped by a 'gang' of six men. Still more disconcerting is the fact that the girl had been raped by the same men on the previous day and was intercepted the next day after visiting the police station with her father to report the attack. Some three weeks ago the girl was attacked for a third time by two of the six men involved, who burnt her alive. The girl died a few days ago as result of the severe burns she sustained. The foetus she was carrying died with her as a result of the attacks.

The phenomenon of 'gang' rape has now assumed worrying dimensions in India and is a clear indication of violation of the inalienable rights of the individual and of respect for women.

In the light of the above and given that India is an important partner for the Union, can the Commission clarify:

1. whether it has comprehensive and up-to-date figures for this type of phenomenon in India?

2. what the EU is doing to defend and promote respect for human rights in India in accordance with Article 21(1) of the Treaty on European Union?

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

According to the statistics provided by the National Crime Records Bureau of India, 24 923 cases of rape were reported in 2012; the conviction rate was 24%, which means that only in one case out of four the authors of these crimes were punished. There are no separate data concerning the cases of so-called 'gang rapes'.

The EU pays great attention to the situation of human rights in India and has engaged the Indian authorities and civil society for some time already on violence, discrimination against women and gender issues. The EU approach is based on three principles: promoting gender equality and women's empowerment, combating gender-based discrimination and violence against women and girls, and protecting and promoting the rights of children, especially girls. These topics feature prominently, *inter alia*, in the meetings of the regular Human Rights Dialogue between the EU and India. The latest such meeting took place on 27 November 2013.

Women's issues are also mainstreamed into EU's development cooperation activities: education and health-related programmes have a strong focus on women and girls' welfare, while numerous projects have helped civil society organisations to address issues such as violence against women, including trafficking and child marriage, domestic violence and HIV/AIDS.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000462/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Dieta mediterranea

Uno studio condotto da ricercatori spagnoli conferma la salubrità della dieta mediterranea, suggerendo che questo regime alimentare può ridurre il rischio di sviluppare il diabete di tipo 2 di circa il 30 %.

Lo studio ha coinvolto 3 541 soggetti di età compresa tra i 55 e gli 80 anni, ad aumentato rischio di malattie cardiache e di sviluppare il diabete, che sono stati seguiti per quattro anni. Divisi in due gruppi, sono stati sottoposti l'uno a una dieta povera di grassi, l'altro a una dieta mediterranea, ricca di grassi insaturi, ad esempio contenuti nell'olio extravergine di oliva.

I risultati ottenuti stabiliscono che la dieta che prevede in misura maggiore l'apporto di olio extravergine di oliva, e dunque di grassi insaturi, ha registrato un numero molto inferiore di casi di sviluppo del diabete.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione specificare se:

1. è a conoscenza dello studio in questione;

2. dispone di dati che confermino la tesi avanzata dallo studio;

3. intende svolgere campagne di promozione per un'alimentazione sana, includendo la dieta mediterranea tra gli esempi positivi di regime alimentare.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(5 marzo 2014)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza di questo studio. Tuttavia, i vantaggi della dieta mediterranea per quanto concerne la protezione dalle patologie cardiovascolari sono stati descritti in diversi studi che hanno messo in luce i vantaggi derivanti dall'assunzione di grassi non saturi. Diverse raccomandazioni relative a un'alimentazione sana si basano su tali informazioni.

La strategia del 2007 sugli aspetti sanitari connessi all'alimentazione, al sovrappeso e all'obesità ([1]) promuove una dieta equilibrata e stili di vita attivi per tutti. La strategia incoraggia partenariati attivi coinvolgenti i 28 Stati membri dell'UE (Gruppo ad alto livello sulla nutrizione e l'attività fisica ([2])) e la società civile (Piattaforma d'azione europea per l'alimentazione, l'attività fisica e la salute ([3])).

La Commissione europea incoraggia gli approcci comuni a promozione dell'alimentazione sana e dell'aumento del consumo di frutta e verdura. Anche se accoglie con favore e sostiene le iniziative degli Stati membri per un'alimentazione equilibrata e stili di vita attivi, la Commissione non prevede di organizzare una campagna specifica a promozione della dieta mediterranea in quanto tale.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_it.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_it.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000462/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Mediterranean diet

A study carried out by Spanish researchers has confirmed the healthy nature of the Mediterranean diet, suggesting that this dietary regime could reduce the risk of developing type 2 diabetes by around 30%.

The study involved 3 541 subjects aged between 55 and 80 and at increased risk of developing cardiac diseases or diabetes, who were monitored for four years. They were divided into two groups: one group was subjected to a low-fat diet and the other to a Mediterranean diet rich in unsaturated fats, for example contained in extra virgin olive oil.

The findings establish that the diet providing the highest input of extra virgin olive oil, and hence unsaturated fats, resulted in a far smaller number of cases where diabetes developed.

In the light of the above, can the Commission specify whether:

1. it is aware of the study in question;

2. it is in possession of data which confirms the theory put forward as a result of the study;

3. it intends to launch campaigns to promote healthy nutrition, including the Mediterranean diet as one of the positive examples of a nutritional regime.

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

The Commission is not aware of this study. However, the benefits of a Mediterranean diet with regards to protection from cardiovascular diseases have been described in a number of studies, which highlight the benefits of the intake of unsaturated fat. Many recommendations regarding healthy diets are based on this information.

The 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([1]) promotes a balanced diet and active lifestyles for all. The strategy encourages action-oriented partnerships involving the 28 EU Member States (High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity ([2])) and civil society (EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([3])).

The European Commission supports common approaches to promote healthy eating and to increase fruit and vegetables consumption. While the Commission further welcomes and supports Member States' initiatives promoting balanced diets and active lifestyles, the Commission is not planning to organise a specific campaign to promote the Mediterranean diet as such.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000470/14
alla Commissione
Susy De Martini (ECR)
(20 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Situazione ferroviaria sulla tratta Genova-Milano e rete ferroviaria ligure

Grazie all'alta velocità ferroviaria è possibile collegare Roma e Milano in poco meno di tre ore. Lo stesso tempo che occorre a un pendolare di Genova per recarsi a Ventimiglia con un treno regionale. Ma mentre Roma e Milano distano circa 600 km, la distanza tra il capoluogo ligure e la città di confine è di 147 km. Questo significa che i convogli (sia regionali che Intercity) viaggiano sulla linea ferroviaria della riviera di ponente a una velocità molto bassa, complice la presenza di un binario unico per circa 50 km. La presenza di un binario unico non è più tollerabile perché spesso causa l'interruzione dell'unica linea di collegamento con la Francia, come del resto avvenuto il giorno 17 gennaio 2014 a causa di una frana. Ciò rappresenta un ostacolo per lo sviluppo di una regione a forte vocazione turistica come la Liguria, oltre a creare disagi alle migliaia di cittadini che ogni giorno si spostano tra Genova, Ventimiglia e la Francia.

Analogo discorso vale per la tratta che collega Genova a Milano, sede dell'Expo 2015, per percorrere la quale si impiegano circa 2 ore. Un tempo eccessivo (10 minuti in più rispetto a 100 anni fa), se si considera che la distanza che separa le due città è di 150 km, a cui corrisponde ogni anno un ingiustificato aumento del prezzo del biglietto.

La tariffa, infatti, è per tutta la rete nazionale di 11 centesimi al chilometro, indipendentemente dalla velocità e dalla tipologia di linea ferroviaria.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se tale disparità di trattamento, a parità di costi gravanti sui passeggeri, non violi la legislazione europea in materia di diritti dei passeggeri del trasporto ferroviario, e in particolare il diritto a non essere discriminati nell'accesso al trasporto in base al regolamento (CE) n. 1371/2007;

2. se le arretrate condizioni infrastrutturali del comparto ligure non siano in contrasto con i principi ispiratori della comunicazione della Commissione, del 17 settembre 2010, relativa allo sviluppo di uno Spazio unico ferroviario europeo [COM(2010)0474];

3. se è a conoscenza delle forti disparità all'interno del comparto Nord Italia e sul versante tirrenico in particolar modo e se prevede perciò di prendere provvedimenti al fine di appianare questa situazione d'ineguaglianza, anche nell'ambito del VII programma quadro nel caso in cui fossero reperibili finanziamenti per l'ammodernamento di tale rete ferroviaria?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

Il principio di non discriminazione sancito nel regolamento (CE) n. 1371/2007 relativo ai diritti e agli obblighi dei passeggeri nel trasporto ferroviario ([1]) si riferisce al diritto delle persone con disabilità e/o a mobilità ridotta di poter avere accesso senza discriminazioni al trasporto ferroviario ([2]). Inoltre, ai sensi dell'articolo 18 del TFUE «è vietata ogni discriminazione effettuata in base alla nazionalità». Poiché la situazione descritta dall'onorevole deputato non comporta pratiche discriminatorie di questo tipo, la Commissione non può individuare in questa fase alcuna violazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1371/2007.

La direttiva 2012/34/UE che istituisce uno spazio ferroviario unico europeo ([3]) è volta a migliorare la situazione finanziaria del gestore dell'infrastruttura creando un quadro normativo solido per la pianificazione degli investimenti a lungo termine e degli aiuti di Stato. Tuttavia, gli Stati membri sono liberi di decidere in quali parti dell'infrastruttura investire.

Le tratte ferroviarie Genova-Ventimiglia e Genova-Milano fanno parte della rete centrale della rete transeuropea di trasporto (TEN-T), come prevede il regolamento (UE) n. 1315/2013 sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della TEN-T ([4]). Per le suddette tratte è previsto un ammodernamento diretto a permettere la prestazione di servizi ferroviari ad alta velocità, come indicato nella mappa ferroviaria TEN-T relativa all'Italia allegata al suddetto regolamento. Una volta completato tale ammodernamento, dovrebbero ridursi le disparità evidenziate dall'onorevole deputato.

([1]) GU L 315 del 3.12.2007.
([2]) Capo V del regolamento.
([3]) GU L 343 del 14.12.2012, pag. 1.
([4]) GU L 348 del 20.12.2013, pag. 1.

Sulla base del regolamento (UE) n. 1316/2013 che istituisce il meccanismo per collegare l'Europa ([5]), la Commissione potrebbe mettere a disposizione un sostegno finanziario dell'Unione europea per l'ammodernamento delle due tratte in questione. Spetta alle autorità italiane presentare progetti rivolti a questo fine. Per poter beneficiare dei finanziamenti dell'UE, tutti i progetti devono soddisfare i requisiti stabiliti nel summenzionato regolamento.

([5]) GU L 348 del 20.12.2013, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000470/14
to the Commission
Susy De Martini (ECR)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: The Genoa-Milan railway line and the Ligurian rail network

Thanks to high-speed rail, it is now possible to travel from Rome to Milan in just under three hours — the same time it takes a commuter to travel from Genoa to Ventimiglia on a local train. However, whereas Rome and Milan lie roughly 600 kilometres from each other, the distance between the Ligurian capital and the city on the French border is just 147 kilometres. This shows that trains (both local and Intercity services) travel at very low speeds on the line running across Italy's Western Riviera, and the situation is made even worse by the fact that there is only a single track for around 50 kilometres of this line. The presence of a single track can no longer be tolerated, since it often results in delays on the only line that connects the region with France (with the disruption caused by a landslide on 17 January 2014 being the most recent example). This is making it extremely difficult for Liguria — a region that is highly dependent on tourism — to develop, and is also creating misery for thousands of local people who commute between Genoa, Ventimiglia and France on a daily basis.

It's a similar story for the line running from Genoa to Milan (where Expo 2015 will be held). The journey time between these cities is currently around two hours (ten minutes more than it was a century ago!), which is simply unacceptable given that they are only 150 kilometres apart, and every year ticket prices are unjustly increased.

Indeed, the price of 11 cents per kilometre applies to the whole national network, regardless of the speed of the service or of the type of railway line travelled on.

In light of the above, can the Commission clarify:

1. whether such unequal treatment, for which passengers are forced to bear the brunt, breaches the European legislation on rail passengers' rights, and in particular the right to not be discriminated against in terms of access to transport on the basis of Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007;

2. whether Liguria's underdeveloped railway infrastructure goes against the inspiring principles set out in the communication from the Commission of 17 September 2010 concerning the development of a Single European Railway Area [COM(2010)0474];

3. whether it is aware of the major disparities that exist in northern Italy and especially along the Tyrrhenian Coast, and whether it plans, as a result, to take any measures in order to level out these disparities, and whether such measures could be incorporated within the scope of the Seventh Framework Programme in the event that funds are available for modernising this rail network?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The principle of non-discrimination enshrined in the regulation (EC) No 1371/2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations ([1]) relates to the right of persons with disabilities and/or reduced mobility to equal access to rail transport ([2]). In addition, under Article 18 of the TFEU 'any discrimination on grounds of nationality shall be prohibited'. Since the situation described by the Honorable Member does not entail such discriminatory practices, the Commission cannot detect at this stage any breach of Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007.

Directive 2012/34/EU establishing a single European railway area ([3]) aims at improving the financial situation of the infrastructure manager by creating a sound framework for the long-term investment planning and the state subsidies. However, Member States' remain free to decide in which parts of the infrastructure to invest.

The railway sections Genova-Ventimiglia and Genova-Milano are part of the core network of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T), as provided for in Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the TEN-T ([4]). These sections have been slated to be upgraded in order to support high-speed rail services, as indicated on the TEN-T rail map for Italy annexed to this regulation. Once this upgrade is completed, it should contribute to reducing the disparities the Honourable Member has highlighted.

([1]) OJ L 315, 3.12.2007.
([2]) Chapter V of the regulation.
([3]) OJ L 343, 14.12.2012.
([4]) OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

On the basis of Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility ([5]), the Commission could make available EU financial support for the upgrading of these two sections. It is up to the Italian authorities to submit projects to this end. To benefit from EU funding, all projects need to fulfill the requirements specified in the abovementioned Regulation.

([5]) OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000473/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(20 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Directiva privind introducerea pe piață a alimentelor provenite de la animale rezultate din clonare

La data de 18 decembrie, Comisia Europeană a adoptat propunerea de directivă privind introducerea pe piață a alimentelor provenite de la animale rezultate din clonare. Propunerea interzice ca produsele alimentare provenite de la animalele rezultate din clonare să fie introduse pe piață.

Totuși, propunerea nu vizează și descendenții animalelor rezultate din clonare. De asemenea, propunerea nu vizează etichetarea corespunzătoare a alimentelor provenite din descendenți ai animalelor clonate, în special în contextul în care există o reticență la nivelul cetățenilor din multe state ale Uniunii Europene în privința consumului unor astfel de alimente.

Poate Comisia să explice dacă decizia de a nu introduce descendenții animalelor clonate în obiectul propunerii de Directivă este bazată pe studii științifice care atestă că nu există nicio diferență, din punct de vedere al siguranței alimentare, între alimentele obținute din animale clonate și cele obținute din descendenți ai animalelor clonate? Dacă aceste studii există și dovedesc faptul că nu există această diferență invocată mai sus, atunci care este motivul pentru care Comisia a decis să excludă din domeniul de aplicare descendenții animalelor clonate?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(27 februarie 2014)

După cum se arată în expunerea de motive a propunerii de Directivă privind introducerea pe piață a alimentelor provenite de la animale rezultate din clonare ([1]), Comisia a ținut cont, în faza de elaborare a propunerii, de avizul privind clonarea emis de Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară (EFSA) în 2008, precum și de cele trei declarații subsecvente emise în 2009, 2010 și 2012 ([2]). EFSA a analizat toate studiile științifice disponibile cu privire la animalele clonate, descendenții acestora și produsele obținute de la aceste animale.

Potrivit avizului EFSA, nu există niciun indiciu privind existența vreunei diferențe între siguranța alimentară a produselor provenite de la bovine și porcine rezultate din clonare și de la descendenții acestora și siguranța produselor provenite de la bovine și porcine reproduse prin mijloace convenționale. EFSA nu a avut la dispoziție date relevante pentru alte specii (ecvidee, ovine și caprine), dar a presupus că rezultatele pentru aceste specii ar fi similare. Așadar, clonarea nu ridică probleme legate de siguranța alimentară.

Considerentele 4-6 din propunerea de Directivă privind introducerea pe piață a alimentelor provenite de la animale rezultate din clonare explică faptul că propunerea răspunde percepțiilor consumatorilor privind clonarea, legate de preocupările privind bunăstarea animalelor. Produsele alimentare provenite de la descendenții animalelor clonate nu fac obiectul preocupărilor privind bunăstarea animalelor, întrucât descendenții sunt reproduși prin mijloace convenționale. Prin urmare, domeniul de aplicare al directivei propuse nu acoperă produsele alimentare provenind de la descendenții animalelor clonate.

Etichetarea produselor alimentare provenite de la descendenții animalelor clonate a făcut obiectul unor consultări intense în cadrul Comisiei. Comisia a decis că opțiunea de etichetare a cărnii proaspete provenind de la descendenții bovinelor clonate este foarte complexă și necesită mai mult timp, astfel încât să se poată efectua o analiză a impactului și un studiu de fezabilitate amplu, fără a aduce atingere rezultatului acestei analize sau deciziei finale care urmează a fi adoptată.

([1]) COM(2013) 893 final [nepublicată încă în Jurnalul Oficial => a se actualiza ulterior].
([2]) Aviz și declarații privind siguranța alimentelor, sănătatea și bunăstarea animalelor și impactul asupra mediului determinat de animalele rezultate din clonare prin transfer al nucleului celulelor somatice, de descendenții lor și de produsele obținute de la aceste animale:
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/767.pdf
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/319.pdf
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/1784.pdf
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/2794.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000473/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Directive on the placing on the market of food from animal clones

On 18 December 2013, the Commission adopted its proposal for a directive on the placing on the market of food from animal clones. Under the proposal, the marketing of food from animal clones is prohibited.

However, the proposal does not cover the offspring of animal clones and makes no provision for the corresponding labelling of food from the offspring of animal clones, even though citizens in many European Union countries are reluctant to eat such food.

Can the Commission explain whether the decision not to include the offspring of animal clones in the scope of the proposal for a directive was based on scientific studies demonstrating that, from the point of view of food safety, there is no difference between food from animal clones and food from the offspring of animal clones? If such studies exist and it has been demonstrated that there is no difference between these types of food in terms of food safety, why did the Commission decide to exclude the offspring of animal clones from the scope of the proposed directive?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2014)

As indicated in the explanatory memorandum to the proposal for a directive on the placing on the market of food from animal clones ([1]) the Commission considered the opinions delivered by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) on cloning in 2008 and updated by three statements in 2009, 2010 and 2012 ([2]) in the drafting of the proposal. EFSA assessed all available scientific studies on animal clones, their progeny and the products obtained from those animals.

According to EFSA's opinion there is no indication that differences exist in terms of food safety between food products from healthy cattle and pig clones and their offspring, compared with those from healthy conventionally-bred animals. No relevant data was available for other species, i.e. horses, sheep and goats. Yet EFSA presumed that the results for these species would be similar. Thus cloning does not raise food safety concerns.

Recitals 4 to 6 of the proposal for a directive on the placing on the market of food from animal clones explain that the proposal addresses consumer perceptions on cloning linked to animal welfare concerns. Food from offspring and descendants of clones carries no animal welfare concern as such animals are conceived via conventional methods. Therefore the scope of the proposed directive does not cover food from the offspring and descendants.

The labelling of food from offspring was subject to intensive consultations within the Commission. The Commission decided that the very complex option of labelling fresh bovine meet from offspring of cloned animals requires more time so that a comprehensive impact analysis and feasibility study can be carried out, without prejudging the outcome of this analysis or the final decision to be adopted.

([1]) COM(2013) 893 final [Not yet published in the Official Journal => to be updated later].

([2]) Opinion and statements on food safety, animal health and welfare and environmental impact of animals, derived from cloning by SCNT and their offspring and products obtained from those animals:
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/767.pdf
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/319.pdf
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/1784.pdf
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/2794.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000478/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(20 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Posible incumplimiento de la Directiva 1999/22/CE sobre mantenimiento de animales salvajes en un entorno zoológico en Galicia

Durante los últimos años las denuncias alrededor del incumplimiento de la normativa de la UE y de la legislación española sobre conservación de fauna silvestre en parques zoológicos y acuarios en Galicia han sido constantes y fundadas. En este sentido, la Xunta de Galicia no parece haber tomado las medidas necesarias para garantizar que las instalaciones abiertas al público desarrollen verdaderos programas de conservación, limitándose a permitir investigaciones o trabajos que en nada apoyan la conservación real de las especies verdaderamente amenazadas en algún grado por la extinción.

Resulta paradójico que existan parques zoológicos en Galicia que albergan en su colección de fauna especies extintas en estado silvestre sin que ello parezca importar para desarrollar programas de conservación. Sorprende también que algún parque libere animales considerados peligrosos para que los visitantes puedan tocarlos, y que esto se ofrezca como reclamo de cara a potenciales clientes de las instalaciones.

Entidades como la Asociación Animalista Libera y la Fondation Franz Weber (esta última administradora de dos parques nacionales en Togo y Camerún donde se protegen especies de especial interés para la biodiversidad como los elefantes) han evidenciado la necesidad de que los parques se impliquen en la conservación «ex situ», fomentando iniciativas para luchar contra el furtivismo y contra la perdida de la riqueza natural del planeta.

1. ¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión del incumplimiento de la Directiva 1999/22/CE en Galicia?

2. ¿Conoce la Comisión las denuncias al respecto del reclamo de animales para tocar en parques zoológicos de Galicia? En este caso, ¿piensa la Comisión iniciar algún procedimiento teniendo en cuenta la gravedad de esta situación?

3. ¿Piensa la Comisión emprender alguna medida para actualizar el marco normativo de la UE sobre parques zoológicos?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión tiene conocimiento de que, ante las denuncias presentadas, el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea declaró, en diciembre de 2010, que España había incumplido en varias regiones, entre ellas Galicia, las obligaciones que en materia de autorizaciones e inspecciones establece la Directiva sobre parques zoológicos ([1]). No obstante, las autoridades españolas han adoptado desde entonces todas las medidas necesarias con respecto a este tipo de parques, incluidos los de Galicia. La Comisión no tiene prueba alguna de que se esté infringiendo actualmente esta Directiva en Galicia.

Está previsto realizar una evaluación de la Directiva sobre zoológicos en el marco del programa de la Comisión denominado Adecuación y eficacia de la normativa (REFIT) ([2]). Mientras tanto, la Comisión no tiene la intención de tomar nuevas medidas para adaptar la Directiva.

([1]) Directiva 1999/22/CE del Consejo, relativa al mantenimiento de animales salvajes en parques zoológicos (DO L 94 de 9.4.1999).
([2]) COM(2013) 685 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000478/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Possible breach of Directive 1999/22/EC relating to the keeping of wild animals in zoos in Galicia

In the course of the past few years there has been a continual stream of well-founded complaints in Galicia regarding non-compliance with both EU and Spanish law on the conservation of wildlife in zoos and aquariums. In this regard, the Galician Government does not appear to have adopted the necessary measures to ensure that the sites open to the public pursue proper conservation programmes instead of merely allowing research or other types of studies that fail to support actual conservation of species that are really threatened to some degree with extinction.

It does seem paradoxical that there are zoos in Galicia containing, among their collections of fauna, species that are extinct in the wild, although this situation apparently does not matter enough for them to develop conservation programmes. It is also surprising that a zoo can set free animals considered to be dangerous so that the public can touch them, and that this should be offered as an attraction for potential customers.

Animal rights organisations such as Libera and the Fondation Franz Weber (which manages two national parks in Togo and Cameroon, where species are protected that are of particular importance for biodiversity, such as elephants) have highlighted the need for zoos to get involved in *ex situ* conservation, with the promotion of initiatives to fight against poachers and the loss of the planet's natural resources.

1. Is the Commission aware of the non-compliance with Directive 1999/22/EC in Galicia?

2. Is the Commission aware of the complaints lodged in this regard with respect to the attraction of animals that can be touched in Galician zoos? If so, and bearing in mind the gravity of this situation, is the Commission planning to take any action?

3. Is the Commission considering adopting any measures to update EU regulations on zoos?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of past complaints which led the European Union Court of Justice to declare, in December 2010, that Spain had failed to fulfil its obligations on licencing and inspections under the Zoos Directive ([1]) in several regions, including Galicia. However, the Spanish authorities have since adopted all the necessary measures in relation to all the concerned zoological establishments, including those in Galicia. The Commission has no evidence of a current infringement of the Zoos Directive in Galicia.

An evaluation of the Zoos Directive is foreseen under the Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme ([2]) (REFIT) of the Commission. Until this is completed the Commission is not considering any measures to update the directive.

([1]) Council Directive 1999/22/EC relating to the keeping of wild animals in zoos, OJ L 94, 9.4.1999.
([2]) COM(2013) 685 final.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-000479/14
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE) és Gyürk András (PPE)
(2014. január 20.)

Tárgy: Az állampolgárok biztonságos és megfizethető energiaellátáshoz való joga

A gázfogyasztók érdekeinek védelme és az energiaszegénység kezelése érdekében a rendszerhasználati díjak meghatározásának magyarországi keretrendszere eltérő díjakat alkalmaz az egyetemes szolgáltatásra jogosult és az arra nem jogosult szolgáltatók esetében.

A 2009/73/EK irányelv értelmében „a tagállamok a földgázágazatban működő vállalkozások számára általános gazdasági érdekből előírhatnak olyan közszolgáltatási kötelezettségeket, amelyek a biztonságra, az ellátás biztonságát is beleértve, az ellátás folyamatosságára, minőségére és árára, valamint a környezetvédelemre, beleértve az energiahatékonyságot és az éghajlat védelmét, vonatkoznak".

A harmadik energiaügyi csomag tartalma, más tagállamok jelenlegi gyakorlata és a szubszidiaritás elve ellenére a Bizottság ún. „pilot" eljárást indított Magyarország ellen a differenciált rendszerhasználati díjakat és a hálózatüzemeltetők költségeinek megtérülését érintően.

Tudomása van-e arról a Bizottságnak, hogy az egyetemes szolgáltatás megszüntetése tovább növelheti Magyarországon a végfelhasználói energiaárakat, amelyek a vásárlóerőt tekintve eleve a legmagasabbak között vannak az Unióban?

Mit tesz a Bizottság az állampolgárok biztonságos és megfizethető energiaellátáshoz való jogának védelme érdekében?

Günther Oettinger válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. március 7.)

A Bizottság nem tett javaslatot az egyetemes szolgáltatás megszüntetésére. Csupán biztosítani kívánja, hogy azokban az esetekben, amikor a tagállamok közszolgáltatási kötelezettségek útján egyetemes szolgáltatás nyújtásáról gondoskodnak, erre a hatályos uniós jogszabályokkal összhangban és hosszú távon gazdaságilag fenntartható módon, vagyis többek között a teljes költségek tükrözésével kerüljön sor.

A Bizottság továbbra is úgy véli, hogy a polgárok biztonságos és megfizethető energiával való ellátásának leghatékonyabb és gazdasági szempontból fenntartható módja az átlátható és integrált belső energiapiacon folytatott nyílt verseny, amint azt a kiszolgáltatott fogyasztók védelmére megfelelő biztosítékokat nyújtó európai jogszabályok is előirányozzák. Ennek jegyében a Bizottság nagy jelentőséget tulajdonít a harmadik energiaügyi csomagot alkotó jogszabályok végrehajtásának: e csomag egyértelmű rendelkezéseket tartalmaz a fogyasztói jogokra, az energiaszegénység elleni küzdelemre és a kiszolgáltatott fogyasztók védelmére vonatkozóan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000479/14
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE) and András Gyürk (PPE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Right of citizens to a secure energy supply at affordable prices

In order to protect gas consumers' interests and tackle energy poverty, the Hungarian framework for setting network tariffs applies different tariffs to consumers who are eligible for universal services and to non-eligible consumers.

In accordance with Directive 2009/73/EC, 'Member States may impose on undertakings operating in the gas sector, in the general economic interest, public service obligations which may relate to security, including security of supply, regularity, quality and price of supplies, and environmental protection, including energy efficiency, energy from renewable sources and climate protection'.

In spite of the content of the Third Energy Package, the existing practices of other Member States and the subsidiarity principle, the Commission has initiated a Pilot Procedure against Hungary concerning the differentiated network tariffs and the cost recovery of network operators.

Is the Commission aware of the fact that the abolition of universal services might further increase end-consumer energy prices in Hungary, which are one of the highest in the EU taking into consideration purchasing power?

What is the Commission doing to safeguard citizens' right to a secure energy supply at affordable prices?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

The Commission has not proposed the abolition of universal services. It is merely striving to ensure that where Member States ensure universal service by way of public service obligations, these are set up in compliance with applicable EU legislation and are delivered in a manner that is economically sustainable over time, *inter alia* by reflecting full costs.

The Commission continues to believe that the most efficient and economically sustainable way of providing citizens with secure and affordable energy supplies is through open competition in a transparent and integrated internal energy market as foreseen in European legislation with appropriate safeguards for vulnerable customers. The Commission therefore attaches high importance to the enforcement of the legislation of the Third Energy Package which includes clear provisions on consumer rights, fighting energy poverty and protection of vulnerable consumers.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000483/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Susy De Martini (ECR), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE) e Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(20 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Alta velocità sulla linea adriatica

In Italia la rete dei servizi ferroviari è di proprietà del gruppo Ferrovie dello Stato Spa, società controllata al 100 % dal ministero dell'Economia e delle finanze. L'infrastruttura pubblica, però, è di due tipi: sul versante tirrenico è presente l'alta velocità, sulla dorsale adriatica sono presenti le vecchie linee. Ad esempio, per attraversare gli 846 chilometri da Napoli a Milano ci vogliono 4 ore e 40 minuti per un costo del biglietto di 95 euro, mentre per i 650 chilometri da Bari a Bologna servono 5 ore e 35 minuti per una tariffa di 71,50 euro.

La tariffa, infatti, è per tutta le rete nazionale di 11 centesimi al chilometro, indipendentemente dalla velocità e dalla tipologia di linea ferroviaria. Questa scandalosa situazione, che divide in due l'Italia e che penalizza gli abitanti delle regioni che si affacciano sull'Adriatico, è stata denunciata dalla Gazzetta del Mezzogiorno e ha trovato l'adesione dell'opinione pubblica (raccolte oltre 15mila firme) e di tutti i sindaci e i presidenti di Regione del territorio adriatico. Anche le associazioni dei consumatori sono sul piede di guerra e stanno preparando una class action.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. tale disparità di trattamento, a parità di costi gravanti sui passeggeri, non violi la legislazione europea in materia di diritti dei passeggeri del trasporto ferroviario, in particolare il diritto a non essere discriminati nell'accesso al trasporto in base al regolamento (CE) n. 1371/2007;

2. le arretrate condizioni infrastrutturali del corridoio ferroviario adriatico non siano in contrasto con i principi ispiratori della comunicazione della Commissione, del 17 settembre 2010, relativa allo sviluppo di uno Spazio unico ferroviario europeo [COM(2010)0474];

3. è a conoscenza delle forti disparità che distinguono le reti ferroviarie sulla dorsale adriatica rispetto al Nord Italia e al versante tirrenico e prevede perciò di prendere provvedimenti al fine di parificare questa situazione d'ineguaglianza, anche nell'ambito del VII programma quadro nel caso in cui fossero reperibili finanziamenti per l'ammodernamento di tale rete ferroviaria?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(7 marzo 2014)

Il principio di non discriminazione sancito nel regolamento (CE) n. 1371/2007 relativo ai diritti e agli obblighi dei passeggeri nel trasporto ferroviario ([1]) si riferisce al diritto delle persone con disabilità e/o a mobilità ridotta di poter avere accesso senza discriminazioni al trasporto ferroviario ([2]). L'articolo 18 del TFUE stabilisce che «è vietata ogni discriminazione effettuata in base alla nazionalità». Poiché la situazione descritta dall'onorevole deputato non comporta pratiche discriminatorie di questo tipo, la Commissione non può individuare in questa fase alcuna violazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1371/2007.

La direttiva 2012/34/UE che istituisce lo spazio ferroviario unico europeo ([3]) è volta a migliorare la situazione finanziaria attraverso la creazione di un quadro normativo per la pianificazione degli investimenti a lungo termine e degli aiuti di Stato. Gli Stati membri restano liberi di decidere in quali parti dell'infrastruttura effettuare gli investimenti.

Il tratto ferroviario Bari-Napoli fa parte della rete centrale TEN-T, come prevede il regolamento (UE) n. 1315/2013 sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti ([4]). Per questo tratto è previsto un ammodernamento diretto a permettere la prestazione di servizi ferroviari ad alta velocità. In seguito a tale ammodernamento la città di Bari sarà collegata alla rete ferroviaria italiana ad alta velocità. Quanto indicato dovrebbe contribuire a ridurre le disparità esistenti che sono state evidenziate.

Sulla base del regolamento (UE) n. 1316/2013 che istituisce il meccanismo per collegare l'Europa ([5]), la Commissione potrebbe mettere a disposizione un sostegno finanziario dell'UE per l'ammodernamento della suddetta tratta. Spetta alle autorità italiane presentare progetti rivolti a questo fine.

([1]) GU L 315 del 3.12.2014.
([2]) Capo V del regolamento.
([3]) GU L 343 del 14.12.2012.
([4]) GU L 348 del 20.12.2013.
([5]) GU L 348 del 20.12.2013.

Sulla linea ferroviaria della dorsale adriatica sono state realizzate iniziative dirette a migliorare la sagoma limite. Per quanto riguarda il tratto residuo ancora a binario unico, il meccanismo per collegare l'Europa e i fondi strutturali e di investimento europei possono contribuire, sotto il profilo finanziario, al suo ulteriore miglioramento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000483/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Susy De Martini (ECR), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE) and Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: High-speed on the Adriatic rail line

In Italy the rail network is owned by the Group Ferrovie dello Stato Spa, a company 100% controlled by the Ministry of Economy and Finance. However, the public infrastructure falls into two parts: the Tyrrhenian side has high-speed rail and the Adriatic side only has outdated lines. For example, it takes 4 hours 40 minutes to travel the 846 km from Naples to Milan at a ticket cost of 95 euro, whereas it takes 5 hours 35 minutes to cover the 650 kilometres from Bari to Bologna at a ticket cost of 71.50 euro.

In fact the standard tariff across the entire nationwide network is 11 cents per kilometre, irrespective of the speed or type of rail line. This scandalous situation, which divides Italy into two and penalises the inhabitants of the regions facing the Adriatic, has been denounced by the Gazzetta del Mezzogiorno and attracted opposition from the public (over 15 000 signatures have been obtained) and mayors and presidents of the Adriatic Region across the board. Consumer associations are also up in arms and preparing for a class action.

In the light of the above, can the Commission clarify whether:

1. given the parity of cost to the passenger, this disparity of treatment breaches European legislation on the rights of rail passengers, in particular the right not to be discriminated against in access to transport under Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007;

2. the obsolete infrastructure of the Adriatic rail corridor conflicts with the principles which inspired the Commission's communication of 17 September 2010 relating to the development of a Single European Railway Area [COM(2010)0474];

3. the Commission is aware of the marked disparity between rail networks on the Adriatic side and rail networks in Northern Italy and the Tyrrhenian side and is therefore proposing to take action to remedy this situation of inequality, possibly under the VII Framework Programme should funding be available to modernise this rail network?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

The principle of non-discrimination enshrined in the regulation (EC) No 1371/2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations ([1]) relates to the right of persons with disabilities and/or reduced mobility to equal access to rail transport ([2]). Article 18 of the TFEU states that 'any discrimination on grounds of nationality shall be prohibited'. Since the situation described by the Honorable Member does not entail such discriminatory practices, the Commission cannot detect at this stage any breach of Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007.

Directive 2012/34/EU establishing the single European railway area ([3]) aims at improving the financial situation by creating a framework for the long-term investment planning and the state subsidies. Member States remain free to decide in which parts of the infrastructure to invest.

The railway section Bari-Napoli is part of the TEN-T core network, as provided for in Regulation (EU) 1315/2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network ([4]). This section is slated for an upgrading in order to support the high-speed rail services. After this upgrade Bari will be linked to the Italian high-speed rail network. This should contribute to the reduction of the disparities highlighted.

On the basis of Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility ([5]), the Commission could make available EU financial support for the upgrading of this section. It is up to the Italian authorities to submit projects to this end.

Some actions have been deployed on the Adriatic coast rail line to improve the loading gauge. Regarding the remaining section that is still a single track, the Connecting Europe Facility and the European Structural and Investment Funds can support the further improvement.

([1]) OJ L 315, 3.12.2014.
([2]) Chapter V of the regulation.
([3]) OJ L 343, 14.12.2012.
([4]) OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.
([5]) OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub P-000484/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Protezzjoni tas-sorsi ġurnalistiċi

Ġie rrapportat li f'Malta, il-Pulizija talbet lill-waħda mill-gazzetti nazzjonali tal-pajjiż tiżvela s-sors kunfidenzjali ta' informazzjoni dwar ġrajja għaddejja bħalissa li qed tiġi segwita mill-gazzetta.

X'leġiżlazzjoni jew ġurisprudenza teżisti fil-livell tal-UE rigward il-protezzjoni tas-sorsi ġurnalistiċi? Il-Kummissjoni tikkunsidra l-protezzjoni tas-sorsi ġurnalistiċibħala fundamentali għall-protezzjoni ta' stampa libera u ġusta fi Stat Membru?

X'inhi s-sitwazzjoni fl-Istati Membri l-oħra f'dak li għandu x'jaqsam mal-protezzjoni tas-sorsi ġurnalistiċi?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Kroes f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(14 ta' Frar 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni timmira li tiżgura r-rispett tad-drittijiet u l-prinċipji minquxa fil-Karta tad-Drittijiet Fundamentali tal-UE, inkluż l-Artikolu 11 dwar il-libertà tal-espressjoni u tal-informazzjoni (li tħaddan ukoll il-libertà u l-pluraliżmu tal-midja). Skont l-Artikolu 51(1), il-Karta tapplika għall-Istati Membri biss meta jkunu qegħdin jimplimentaw il-liġi tal-UE. Ma hemm l-ebda leġiżlazzjoni Ewropea li tirrigwarda l-protezzjoni tas-sorsi.

Dan is-suġġett ġie indirizzat fir-rapport lill-Kummissjoni tal-Grupp ta' Livell Għoli ([1]) indipendenti dwar il-libertà u l-pluraliżmu tal-midja, ta' Jannar 2013. Il-Grupp ta' Livell Għoli jirrakkomanda li l-pajjiżi kollha tal-UE jonqxu fil-leġiżlazzjoni tagħhom il-prinċipju tal-protezzjoni tas-sorsi ġurnalistiċi, u li r-restrizzjonijiet għal dan il-prinċipju jkunu aċċettabbli biss abbażi ta' inġunzjoni kompatibbli mal-kostituzzjoni tal-pajjiż rispettiv. It-30 rakkomandazzjoni fir-rapport mhumiex vinkolanti għall-Kummissjoni, iżda l-Kummissjoni fittxet kummenti dwarhom f'konsultazzjonijiet pubbliċi. Fil-konklużjonijiet tiegħu ta' Novembru 2013, il-Kunsill tal-UE stieden lill-Istati Membri jieħu miżuri xierqa biex jissalvagwardjaw id-dritt tal-ġurnalisti li jipproteġu s-sorsi tagħhom, u biex iħarsu lill-ġurnalisti minn influwenza mhix f'lokha ([2]). Il-konsultazzjoni u l-konklużjonijiet se jipprovdu ideat fid-diskussjoni sussegwenti dwar il-libertà u l-pluraliżmu tal-midja.

Il-liġi dwar il-protezzjoni tas-sorsi ġurnalistiċi tvarja minn Stat Membru għal ieħor. Hemm diversi rapporti minn għaqdiet u NGOs ([3]) rilevanti li jipprovdu ħarsa ġenerali. L-informazzjoni dwar il-protezzjoni tas-sorsi ġurnalistiċi hija wieħed mill-indikaturi tal-Osservatorju tal-Pluraliżmu tal-Midja (MPM). L-Istitut Universitarju Ewropew bħalissa għaddej jittestja u jimplimenta l-MPM, biex jivvaluta r-riskji għall-pluraliżmu tal-midja fl-Istat Membri wara proġett pilota previst fil-baġit tal-UE.

([1]) Il-Grupp ta' Livell Għoli.
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/139725.pdf
([3]) Pereżempju: Il-Federazzjoni Ewropea tal-Ġurnalisti (EFJ): http://europe.ifj.org/assets/docs/056/152/eaea138-f017a98.pdf
Artikolu 19: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1706688
Ara wkoll il-folju ta' tagħrif tal-ġurisprudenza tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropea dwar id-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem fir-rigward ta' soluzzjonijiet differenti għall-protezzjoni tas-sorsi ġurnalistiċi: http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/FS_Journalistic_sources_ENG.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000484/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Protection of journalistic sources

It has been reported that one of Malta's national newspapers has been asked by the country's police authorities to reveal the confidential source of information behind an ongoing story that the newspaper is following up.

What legislation and case law exist at EU level on the protection of journalistic sources? Does the Commission believe that the protection of journalistic sources is fundamental to the protection of a free and fair press in a Member State?

What is the situation in other Member States with regard to the protection of journalistic sources?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2014)

The Commission aims to ensure the respect of rights and principles enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, including Article 11 on freedom of expression and information (encompassing media freedom and pluralism). According to Article 51(1), the Charter applies to Member States only when they are implementing EC law. There is no European legislation regarding protection of sources.

This topic was addressed in the report to the Commission of the independent HLG ([1]) on Media Freedom and Pluralism of January 2013. The HLG recommends that all EU countries should have enshrined in their legislation the principle of protection of journalistic sources, restrictions to this principle only being acceptable on the basis of a court order, compatible with the constitution of that country. The 30 recommendations in the report are not binding on the Commission, but the Commission sought feedback on them in public consultations. In its conclusions of November 2013 the Council of the EU invited Member States to take appropriate measures to safeguard the right of journalists to protect their sources and to protect journalists from undue influence ([2]). The consultation and conclusions will feed into further discussion on media freedom and pluralism.

The law on the protection of journalistic sources varies among different Member States. Various reports of relevant associations/NGOs ([3]) provide an overview. Information about the protection of journalistic sources constitutes one of the indicators of the Media Pluralism Monitor tool (MPM). The MPM is currently being tested and implemented by the European University Institute to assess risks for media pluralism in the Member States following a pilot project foreseen in the budget of the EU.

([1]) High Level Group.
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/139725.pdf
([3]) For instance: EFJ: http://europe.ifj.org/assets/docs/056/152/eaea138-f017a98.pdf
Article 19: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1706688
See also the fact sheet of the ACHR case law related to different solutions for protection of journalist sources:
http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/FS_Journalistic_sources_ENG.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000486/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(20. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Bonitätsentscheidung von Ratingagenturen

Theoretisch sollte die Kombination aus Wettbewerb zwischen den Agenturen und drohender Reputationsverlust infolge der Vergabe „falscher" Ratings dazu führen, dass Agenturen akkurate Ratings erstellen. Immer wieder kommt Kritik auf, dass nicht allein die ökonomischen und politischen Fundamentaldaten eines Staates für sein Rating herangezogen werden, sondern das Herkunftsland der Agenturen bei Ratingentscheidungen eine Rolle spielt.

Von den drei US-Agenturen geben Fitch und Moody's den USA nach wie vor die Bestnote „AAA". Standard & Poor's (S&P) hat ihr Heimatland im August 2011 auf die zweitbeste Note „AA+" herabgestuft und soll sich infolgedessen juristischen Repressalien der US-Regierung ausgesetzt sehen haben. Einzig die aufstrebende chinesische Agentur Dagong hat die Bonität der USA zum wiederholten Male abgewertet und mit einem Rating von nur noch „A" versehen. Nach dieser Einstufung sind die Vereinigten Staaten 5 Stufen von der Bestnote „AAA" entfernt.

1. Teilt die Kommission die Ansicht, dass das Herkunftsland der Ratingagentur mit ausschlaggebend für die Bonitätseinstufung ist?

2. Wie kommt der Aufbau europäischer Ratingagenturen voran?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(5. März 2014)

In Anbetracht der Bedeutung von Länderratings ist es entscheidend, dass sie zeitgerecht erstellt werden und transparent sind. Daher beinhaltet der überarbeitete Rechtsrahmen für Ratingagenturen ([1]), der am 20. Juni 2013 in Kraft trat, neue Bestimmungen für Länderratings, durch die ihre Transparenz und Qualität erhöht werden sollen. Unter anderem sind Ratingagenturen zur Vorlage eines Zeitplans ihrer Länderratings sowie eines ausführlichen Prüfungsberichts aufgefordert, in dem alle Faktoren und Annahmen, die dem Rating zugrunde liegen, erläutert werden. Die aktualisierten Bestimmungen enthalten auch Maßnahmen zur Verringerung von Interessenkonflikten und zur zivilrechtlichen Haftung von Ratingagenturen.

Die Kommission hat im Rahmen der Folgenabschätzung ([2]) bei der letzten Überarbeitung der Verordnung über Ratingagenturen den Bedarf an einer Europäischen Ratingagentur geprüft. Damals ergab die Bewertung, dass die Schaffung einer solchen Ratingagentur mit öffentlichen Geldern Bedenken in Bezug auf ihre Glaubwürdigkeit gegenüber Anlegern und ihre Unabhängigkeit auslösen könnte. Die Kommission wird bis Ende 2016 erneut prüfen, ob es sinnvoll und durchführbar wäre, auf eine Europäische Ratingagentur für die Bewertung der Staatsanleihen von Mitgliedstaaten oder eine Europäischen Ratingstiftung für alle anderen Arten von Ratings hinzuarbeiten, und einen Bericht dazu vorlegen.

Seit dem 1. Juli 2013 sind zudem 22 Ratingagenturen in der Europäischen Union registriert und werden von der Europäischen Wertpapier- und Marktaufsichtsbehörde (ESMA) überwacht. Die Kommission wird in einem Anfang 2016 fälligen Bericht bewerten, ob zusätzliche Maßnahmen zur Wettbewerbsförderung auf dem Ratingmarkt notwendig sind.

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 462/2013 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 21. Mai 2013 zur Änderung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1060/2009 über Ratingagenturen (ABl. L 146 vom 31.05.2013).

([2]) Folgeabschätzung zum Vorschlag für eine Verordnung zur Änderung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1060/2009 über Ratingagenturen und zum Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie zur Änderung der Richtlinie 2009/65/EG zur Koordinierung der Rechts- und Verwaltungsvorschriften betreffend bestimmte Organismen für gemeinsame Anlagen in Wertpapieren (OGAW) und der Richtlinie 2011/61/EU über die Verwalter alternativer Investmentfonds, SEK(2011)1354.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000486/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Credit rating decision by rating agencies

Theoretically the combination of competition between the agencies and the threatened loss of reputation as a result of assigning 'incorrect' ratings should cause agencies to provide accurate ratings. Again and again the criticism is made that a country's economic and political data are not the only factors taken into consideration when creating its rating, but that the country of origin of the rating agencies also plays a role in rating decisions.

Of the three American agencies, Fitch and Moody's continue to give the United States the highest rating, 'AAA'. In August 2011 Standard & Poor's (S&P) lowered the rating of its home country to the second best rating, 'AA+', and as a result it is said to be have been subject to legal reprisals from the American Government. Only the rising Chinese agency Dagong lowered the credit rating of the United States again, giving it a rating of only 'A'. According to this classification, the United States is 5 stages removed from the highest rating of 'AAA'.

1. Does the Commission share the view that the rating agency's country of origin is a factor in the credit rating?

2. How is the development of European rating agencies proceeding?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

Given the importance of sovereign ratings, it is essential that these ratings are both timely and transparent. To that end, the revised legal framework for credit ratings agencies (CRAs) ([1]) which entered into force on 20 June 2013 includes new rules on sovereign ratings aimed at increasing transparency and the quality of these ratings, such as the requirement for CRAs to publish a calendar for sovereign ratings and a detailed research report explaining all factors and underlying assumptions taken into account. The revised rules also include measures to reduce conflicts of interest and on civil liability of CRAs.

Regarding a European CRA, during the last revision of the CRA Regulation, the Commission assessed the need for establishing such a body as part of the impact assessment ([2]). This analysis showed at that time, that the setting up of such a CRA could raise concerns regarding the CRA's credibility towards investors and independence if funded with public money. The appropriateness and feasibility of supporting a European CRA dedicated to assessing the creditworthiness of Member States' sovereign debt or a European Credit Rating Foundation for all other credit ratings will be re-assessed by the Commission, in a report by the end of 2016.

Moreover, regarding European credit rating agencies, since 1 July 2013, 22 credit rating agencies are registered in the European Union and supervised by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA). The Commission will, in a report due at the start of 2016, assess whether there is a need to implement additional measures to foster competition in the credit rating market.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 462/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2013 amending Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 on credit rating agencies, OJ L 146, 31.5.2013.

([2]) Impact Assessment, accompanying the proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 on credit rating agencies and a Proposal for a directive amending Directive 2009/65/EC on coordination on laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS) and Directive 2011/61/EU on Alternative Investment Fund Managers, SEC(2011) 1354.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000488/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(20. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Neue Vorschriften für Bio-Produkte

Medienberichten zufolge will die Europäische Kommission die Regeln für die Erzeugung und Weiterverarbeitung landwirtschaftlicher Bioprodukte verschärfen. Anscheinend sehen die neuen Vorschriften vor, dass Bauernhöfe nicht mehr konventionelle Landwirtschaft und Bio-Anbau gleichzeitig betreiben dürfen. Auch sollen die Kontrollen auf Groß- und Einzelhändler sowie Subunternehmer ausgeweitet werden. Waren bisher Rückstände von Pestiziden nicht auszuschließen, müssten Produzenten künftig garantieren, dass der Pestizidanteil nicht höher ist als in Babynahrungsmitteln.

Welche Regelungen sind in diesem Zusammenhang geplant:

1. hinsichtlich gentechnisch veränderter Organismen,

2. bezüglich der Verwendung von Tiermehl als Futter,

3. bezüglich der Verwendung von Stickstoffdünger,

4. hinsichtlich artgerechter Tierhaltung,

5. hinsichtlich der Verwendung von Wachstumshormonen?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(6. März 2014)

Die Kommission bereitet derzeit Vorschläge für die Überarbeitung des politischen und legislativen Rahmens für den ökologischen Landbau vor. Geplant ist, dass diese Vorschläge im März 2014 angenommen werden. Die Kommission kann derzeit keine Einzelheiten der Vorschläge bekanntgeben, da sie sich diese Vorschläge noch in der Vorbereitungsphase befinden. Nach ihrer Annahme wird die Kommission sie dem Europäischen Parlament vorlegen und diesbezügliche Anfragen beantworten, sobald die Vorschläge vom Kollegium verabschiedet wurden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000488/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: New regulations for organic products

According to media reports, the European Commission wants to tighten the rules for the production and processing of organic agricultural products. Apparently the new regulations stipulate that farms may no longer practice conventional agriculture and organic cultivation simultaneously. The controls on wholesalers and retailers as well as subcontractors are also to be expanded. While until now residues of pesticides were not excluded, in the future producers would be required to guarantee that the percentage of pesticides is no higher than in baby food.

Which regulations are planned in this connection:

1. regarding genetically modified organisms,

2. regarding the use of meat-and-bone meal as feed,

3. regarding the use of nitrogen fertiliser,

4. regarding species-appropriate animal husbandry,

5. regarding the use of growth hormones?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

The Commission is currently preparing proposals for the revision of the political and legislative framework for organic farming. These proposals are scheduled to be adopted by the Commission in March 2014. The Commission is not able to provide information at this stage on any aspect of these proposals, since these proposals are still in preparation. The Commission will present them to the EP after adoption and reply to any query in relation to these proposals after their adoption by the College.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-000490/14
til Kommissionen
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(20. januar 2014)

Om: Diskrimination og social dumping på danske skibe

Er Kommissionen enig i, at det er et brud på artikel 45, stk. 2, i traktaten om Den Europæiske Unions funktionsmåde (TEUF), når EU-borgere, der er forhyret som sømænd på skibe registeret i Dansk Internationalt Skibsregister (DIS), ikke må være omfattet af danske løn- og arbejdsforhold?

Det fremgår af DIS-lovens § 10, at søfarende uden bopæl i Danmark ikke kan omfattes af kollektive overenskomster, der er indgået med danske faglige organisationer.

Heraf følger det i praksis, at EU-søfarende uden bopæl i Danmark diskrimineres og overvejene ikke har løn- og arbejdsforhold, der gælder for indenlandske søfarendes beskæftigelse.

Ifølge EU-Domstolen er søfart omfattet af reglerne om ikke-diskrimination, og bopæl er ikke er et objektivt kriterium for at fravige denne ret.

Der er pr. 29. november 2013 1 217 EU/EØS-borgere forhyret på skibe, der er registeret i DIS.

I forbindelse med bortskaffelse af kemiske våben fra Syrien er denne praksis aktualiseret, idet den danske stat har påtaget sig transporten til destruktion med skibet ARK FUTURA, som er registeret i DIS. Danmark har betinget sig, at transporten foregår med et dansk skib og en dansk kaptajn, men officerer og mandskab kan herudover være fra EU/EØS- eller NATO-lande.

Det fremgår af en besvarelse til et dansk medlem af Folketinget, at polske søfarendes løn- og arbejdsforhold på ARK FUTURA er dårligere end dem, som gælder for indenlandske søfarendes beskæftigelse.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(13. februar 2014)

Kommissionen erindrer om, at den indledte en traktatbrudsprocedure på grundlag af EF-traktatens artikel 226 (nu artikel 258 i TEUF) i forbindelse med bopælskriteriet, der er fastsat i gældende dansk lov (§ 10, stk. 2, i lov om Dansk Internationalt Skibsregister (DIS)). Efter åbningsskrivelsen af 13. oktober 2004 vedtog Danmark lov nr. 214 af 24. marts 2009 om ændring af DIS-loven. Kommissionen var af den opfattelse, at de nye lovbestemmelser sammen med begrundelsen imødekom Kommissionens betænkeligheder, hvorfor den afsluttede traktatbrudsproceduren.

Kommissionen har ingen oplysninger om, at de danske domstole fortolker DIS-loven (som ændret ved lov nr. 214) på en måde, der er i strid med EU-retten.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000490/14
to the Commission
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Discrimination and social dumping on Danish vessels

Does the Commission agree that it is a breach of Article 45(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) that EU citizens who are employed as seafarers on vessels registered on the Danish International Ship Register (DIS) may not be covered by Danish rules on pay and working conditions?

It is clear from Section 10 of the DIS Act that seafarers who are not resident in Denmark cannot be covered by collective agreements concluded with Danish trade union organisations.

As a result, seafarers from other EU countries who do not have a residence in Denmark are discriminated against in practice and in most cases do not benefit from the pay and working conditions that apply to the employment of Danish seafarers.

According to the European Court of Justice, maritime transport is covered by the rules on non-discrimination, and residence is not an objective criterion for derogating from that right.

As at 29 November 2013, 1 217 EU/EEA citizens were employed on vessels registered on the DIS.

This practice has become of topical interest in connection with the disposal of chemical weapons from Syria, as the Danish state has undertaken to transport these weapons to their place of destruction on the vessel *Ark Futura*, which is registered on the DIS. Denmark has stipulated that the weapons will be transported on a Danish vessel with a Danish captain, but that officers and crew can be from EU/EEA or NATO countries.

It appears from a complaint to a Member of the Danish Parliament (Folketing) that the pay and working conditions of Polish seafarers on the *Ark Futura* are worse than those which apply to the employment of Danish crew.

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2014)

The Commission would point out that it initiated an infringement procedure on the basis of Article 226 EC (now Article 258 TFEU) in relation to the residence criterion set by the Danish legislation in force (Section 10(2) of the Act on the Danish International Shipping (DIS)). Following the letter of formal notice issued on 13 October 2004, Denmark adopted Act No 214 of 24 March 2009 amending the Act on the DIS. The Commission took the view that the new legislation, together with the explanatory memorandum, met the Commission concerns and accordingly terminated the infringement procedure.

The Commission has no information to the effect that the Danish courts are interpreting the Act on the DIS (as amended by Act No 214) in a manner contrary to EC law.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-000491/14
an die Kommission
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE)
(20. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Kosten für die Zulassung von Pflanzenschutzmitteln für den Parallelhandel

Die Zulassung für den Parallelhandel von neuen Pflanzenschutzmitteln, die in anderen EU-Mitgliedstaaten bereits geprüft wurden, erfolgt in Italien über das Gesundheitsministerium und ist verbindlich bevor ein Mittel auf den Markt gebracht werden darf.

In Italien kostet die Zulassung für den Parallelimport eines Substituts, das in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat bereits anerkannt wurde, 4 000 EUR. In anderen EU-Staaten kostet dieselbe Zulassung für einen Parallelimport deutlich weniger: in Deutschland zwischen 210 EUR und 2 125 EUR, in Frankreich 800 EUR , in Österreich zwischen 275 EUR und 916,33 EUR.

Dieser Unterschied in der Höhe der Antragskosten stellt eine Ungleichheit dar und verstößt damit auch gegen die Grundsätze des freien und gleichen Marktes innerhalb der EU. Der Import solcher Produkte nach Italien gestaltet sich schwieriger als in anderen Mitgliedstaaten und stellt somit für die Betroffenen eine deutliche Erschwerung des Marktzugangs dar.

1. Wie steht das kostenintensive Zulassungsverfahren in Italien (Dekret vom 28. September 2012, veröffentlicht in: G.U. Serie Generale, n. 274 vom 23. November 2012) im Verhältnis zu der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 21. Oktober 2009 über das Inverkehrbringen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinien 79/117/EWG und 91/414/EWG des Rates? In dieser Verordnung wird ein vereinfachtes Verfahren für die Erteilung einer Genehmigung für den Parallelhandel vorgesehen, um den Handel mit solchen Produkten zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten zu erleichtern.

2. Wie sind die großen Unterschiede bei der Höhe der Zulassungskosten für den Parallelhandel in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten gerechtfertigt?

3. Was gedenkt die Kommission zu tun, um die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit für den Import nach Italien im Vergleich zum Import in andere EU-Staaten auf diesem Gebiet zu gewährleisten?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(19. Februar 2014)

Es obliegt den Mitgliedstaaten, die Höhe der Gebühren und Abgaben für die Arbeiten festzusetzen, die sie im Rahmen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 ([1]) über Pflanzenschutzmittel durchführen. Gemäß Artikel 74 dieser Verordnung müssen diese Gebühren und Abgaben auf transparente Weise festgesetzt werden und den tatsächlichen Kosten der angefallenen Arbeit entsprechen, ausgenommen in Fällen, in denen eine Senkung der Gebühren oder Abgaben im öffentlichen Interesse ist.

Der Kommission ist bekannt, dass die von den Mitgliedstaaten erhobenen Gebühren und Abgaben für Zulassungen bzw. Genehmigungen für den Parallelhandel sehr unterschiedlich ausfallen — dies steht den Bestimmungen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 jedoch nicht entgegen.

Diese Unterschiede lassen sich dadurch rechtfertigen, dass in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten möglicherweise unterschiedlich hohe Kosten anfallen und dass bestimmte Mitgliedstaaten die Gebühren für bestimmte Arten von Zulassungen im öffentlichen Interesse gesenkt haben.

Die Kommission unterstützt die Mitgliedstaaten bei der Anwendung des Systems des Parallelhandels; so hat sie insbesondere Leitlinien für den Parallelhandel mit Pflanzenschutzmitteln ([2]) herausgegeben.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:309:0001:0050:DE:PDF
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/pesticides/approval_active_substances/docs/wrkdoc18_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000491/14
to the Commission
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE)
(20 January 2014)

Subject: Costs of obtaining authorisation of plant protection products for parallel trade

In Italy, the Health Ministry is responsible for authorising, for purposes of parallel trade, new plant protection products which have already been vetted in other EU Member States, and such authorisation is required before a product can be placed on the market.

In Italy, it costs EUR 4 000 to obtain authorisation for the parallel import of a substitute which has already been approved in another Member State. In other EU States, the same authorisation for purposes of parallel importation costs significantly less: in Germany between EUR 210 and EUR 2 125, in France EUR 800 and in Austria between EUR 275 and EUR 916.33.

This disparity in the level of charges for applications constitutes unequal treatment and thus breaches the principles of the free and equal market within the EU. It is more difficult to import such products into Italy than into other Member States, so that this significantly impedes market access for the operators concerned.

1. Is the costly authorisation procedure which applies in Italy (Decree of 28 September 2012, published in: G.U. Serie Generale No 274 of 23 November 2012) compatible with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC? This regulation provides for a simplified procedure for authorising products for parallel trade in order to facilitate trade in such products between Member States.

2. How are the major disparities in the level of authorisation charges for parallel trade in the various Member States justified?

3. What will the Commission do to ensure competitiveness for imports into Italy in comparison with imports into other EU States in this field?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2014)

It is a prerogative of Member States to decide on fees and charges associated with the work they carry out in the frame of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([1]) on plant protection products. Article 74 of that regulation requires that such costs are established in a transparent manner and correspond to actual cost of the work involved, unless it is in the public interest to lower the fees.

The Commission is aware that there are important differences in the fees and charges for authorisations and for parallel trade permits imposed by Member States but this is not in conflict with the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009.

The differences can be justified by the fact that costs incurred by Member States may differ and that certain Member States have decided for certain types of authorisations to lower the fees in the public interest.

The Commission is supporting the implementation by Member States of the parallel trade system and in particular it has published a guidance document on parallel trade of plant protection products ([2]).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:309:0001:0050:EN:PDF
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/pesticides/approval_active_substances/docs/wrkdoc18_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000500/14
a la Comisión
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Apoyo al turismo social en los programas de la UE

En una consulta anterior realizada en 2011 (H-000235/2011 ([1])), cuando se acercaba el fin de la acción preparatoria Calypso, pregunté a la Comisión sobre la continuidad del apoyo al turismo social en el marco de la UE.

Reconociendo los beneficios de Calypso para fortalecer el turismo social en Europa, la Comisión respondió que, tras el fin de la acción preparatoria a finales de 2011, se buscarían sinergias positivas dentro del Programa Marco para la Competitividad y la Innovación (CIP). Así pues, el apoyo al turismo social se canalizaría a través del apoyo a la competitividad de la industria turística europea.

Una vez que, en la programación actual para el período 2014-2020, las actividades del CIP han sido redirigidas para ver englobadas en el nuevo Horizonte 2020 y en el Programa para la Competitividad de las Empresas y para las Pequeñas y Medianas Empresas (COSME), estamos ante un buen momento para hacer balance.

¿Cómo se ha materializado esta búsqueda de sinergias con el CIP durante estos últimos años tras el fin del Calypso? ¿Han encontrado continuidad las actividades de Calypso dentro del CIP?

¿Ofrece el nuevo programa COSME nuevas oportunidades para la consolidación del turismo social en Europa durante el período entre 2014 y 2020? ¿Se prevén otras vías para apoyar este tipo de turismo durante este período?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de marzo de 2014)

La iniciativa Calypso se puso en marcha en 2009 para facilitar intercambios turísticos transnacionales durante la temporada baja de determinados grupos desfavorecidos (personas de edad avanzada, jóvenes, personas con discapacidad, familias con bajos ingresos), fomentando la creación de oportunidades de empleo más perennes en el sector al permitir que estos puestos de trabajo pudieran extenderse más allá de la temporada alta. En tres años como acción preparatoria, la Comisión cofinanció varios proyectos ([2]) y un estudio, y apoyó la creación de una plataforma web ([3]) que facilitase la correspondencia entre la demanda y la oferta en el turismo social.

La Comisión ha seguido apoyando a Calypso con el Programa para la Iniciativa Empresarial y la Innovación ([4]) mediante una convocatoria de propuestas en 2012 con la que se han cofinanciado dos nuevos proyectos ([5]).

Desde 2012, la Comisión se centra más en las personas de edad avanzada, que son las que han mostrado tener mayor potencial en cuanto al desarrollo futuro ([6]). La iniciativa se rebautizó «Calypso+» y se publicó una convocatoria específica de propuestas para permitir cofinanciar proyectos destinados a crear o reforzar asociaciones públicas y privadas, a nivel europeo, nacional o regional, con miras a facilitar los intercambios turísticos transnacionales de personas de edad avanzada durante la temporada baja en Europa ([7]).

Durante el periodo 2014-2020, en el marco del Programa para la Competitividad de las Empresas y para las PYME (COSME), la Comisión seguirá apoyando acciones dirigidas a facilitar los flujos turísticos en las temporadas baja y media; entre ellas, las dirigidas a turistas de edad avanzada y jóvenes, tanto dentro de Europa como en terceros países.

([1]) Respuesta escrita de 5.7.2011.
([2]) Más información sobre la acción preparatoria y todos los proyectos de Calypso cofinanciados: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/CALYPSO/index_es.htm
([3]) www.ecalypso.eu
([4]) El Programa para la Iniciativa Empresarial y la Innovación es uno de los programas específicos del Programa para la Innovación y la Competitividad.
([5]) Los proyectos se llevaron a cabo durante doce meses (hasta noviembre de 2013). El proyecto «OFF2013» se dirigía a personas de edad avanzada y familias en Hungría y en Polonia, recurriendo a la financiación social a través de enfoques financieros innovadores (como pagos no salariales, vales, etcétera), mientras que el proyecto «Holiday4all» se centraba en promover productos del turismo social regional en la zona del Danubio.
([6]) Este segmento de población incluye a personas que gozan de tiempo libre, buena salud y mayor esperanza de vida y poder adquisitivo que las generaciones anteriores; así pues, representan un importante mercado potencial.
([7]) Cincuenta y ocho propuestas de proyecto respondieron a la convocatoria de propuestas, que abarcaba a todos los Estados miembros de la UE. Cuatro o cinco de ellas recibirán cofinanciación de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000500/14
to the Commission
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Supporting social tourism in EU programmes

In a previous question put forward in 2011 (H-000235/2011 ([1])), when the end of the CALYPSO preparatory action was drawing near, I asked the Commission about the continuation of support for social tourism within the framework of the EU.

Recognising the benefits of CALYPSO for boosting social tourism in Europe, the Commission replied that, following the end of the preparatory action in late 2011, positive synergies would be sought under the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP). Support for social tourism would thus be channelled through support for competitiveness in the European tourism industry.

Since the activities of CIP have been re-directed to be encompassed in the new Horizon 2020 and in the programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (COSME) in the current programming for the period 2014-2020, this is a good time for us to take stock.

How has this search for synergies with CIP taken shape over the past couple of years following the end of CALYPSO? Have the activities of CALYPSO found continuity within CIP?

Does the new COSME programme offer new opportunities for the consolidation of social tourism in Europe during the period 2014-2020? Are other ways foreseen for supporting this kind of tourism during this period?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(10 March 2014)

The Calypso initiative was launched in 2009 to facilitate transnational exchanges in the tourist low season for specific disadvantaged target groups (seniors, youths, people with disabilities, families with low income) thereby encouraging the creation of longer-lasting employment opportunities in the tourism sector by making it possible to extend such jobs beyond the respective peak season. During its three-year period as a preparatory action, the Commission co-financed a number of projects ([2]), a study, and supported the creation of a web platform ([3]) which facilitates the match of demand and supply for social tourism.

The Commission continued supporting Calypso under the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme ([4]) through a dedicated call for proposals in 2012, thereby co-financing two new projects ([5]).

Since 2012, the Commission has focused more extensively on the senior group, which demonstrated to have the greatest potential in terms of further development ([6]). The initiative was reshaped as 'Calypso+' and a dedicated call for proposals was published to allow the co-funding of projects setting up and/or strengthening public and private partnerships at European, national and/or regional levels, with a view to facilitating transnational tourism exchanges for seniors in the low season within Europe ([7]).

For the period 2014-2020, under the Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME), the Commission will continue to support actions aimed at facilitating low/medium season tourism flows, amongst others for senior and young tourists, both within Europe and from third countries.

([1]) Written answer of 5.7.2011.
([2]) More information on Preparatory Action and all the Calypso co-financed projects can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/CALYPSO/index_en.htm
([3]) www.ecalypso.eu
([4]) The Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme (EIP) is one of the specific programmes under the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP).
([5]) The projects were carried out for 12 months (until November 2013). The project 'OFF2013' addressed seniors and families in Hungary and Poland, by placing social funding through innovative financial approaches (e.g. off-payrolls, vouchers, etc.), whereas the project 'Holiday4all' focused on the promotion of regional social tourism products in the Danube macro-region.
([6]) This segment of the population includes individuals who have leisure time, enjoy a better health, have a higher life expectancy and possess a greater spending power than previous generations; therefore they represent a significant market potential.
([7]) 58 project proposals were received in the context of the call for proposals, covering all the EU Member States. Four or five of these project proposals will receive EU co-funding.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000501/14
a la Comisión
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Banda de 800 MHz del espectro radioeléctrico

Muchos Estados miembros, entre ellos España, solicitaron en su día a la Comisión posponer la liberalización del espectro radioeléctrico en la banda de 800 MHz para su uso por los servicios de banda ancha móvil. La aceptación por parte de la Comisión de la mayoría de dichas solicitudes de aplazamiento ha hecho que algunos Estados miembros incumplan el plazo acordado para poner la banda de 800 MHz a disposición de la banda ancha móvil, que terminaba el 1 de enero de 2013.

La Comisión viene resaltando el retraso que sufrimos en Europa en relación con la disponibilidad de conexiones 4G y LTE. Es cierto que en su nueva propuesta para crear un continente conectado la Comisión intenta revertir esta situación a través de nuevas propuestas que afectan a la asignación del espectro.

Sin embargo, y volviendo a las prórrogas concedidas, ¿no cree la Comisión que éstas son en gran medida culpables del retraso europeo en cuanto a conexiones de última generación? ¿Cuál es la perspectiva a corto plazo? ¿Están solucionando los Estados miembros los problemas que les obligaron a solicitar las prórrogas? ¿Qué medidas están previstas y puede tomar la Comisión si al final de las prórrogas concedidas los Estados miembros no han sentado aún las condiciones para poner la banda de 800 MHz a disposición de la banda ancha móvil?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión recibió catorce solicitudes de excepción de los Estados miembros en virtud de la Decisión (243/2012/UE) por la que se establece un programa plurianual de política del espectro radioeléctrico (PPER). La Comisión rechazó dos solicitudes por no cumplir las condiciones del PPER y concedió doce excepciones motivadas por «*las circunstancias excepcionales de índole local o nacional o problemas de coordinación transfronteriza de frecuencias*». La Comisión adoptó dichas decisiones individuales una vez mantenidos los debates con los respectivos Estados miembros a fin de garantizar un impacto menor en términos de retrasos o extensión geográfica. Dos excepciones se concedieron solo parcialmente y otras cuatro se concedieron por una duración inferior a la solicitada. Todos los Estados miembros que solicitaron prórrogas deben presentar informes y la Comisión sigue de cerca los avances registrados.

En seis países, las excepciones expiraron a finales de 2013. También hay que tener en cuenta que tres Estados miembros han invocado la utilización continuada total o parcial de la banda de 800 MHz para fines de seguridad pública y defensa, de conformidad con el artículo 1, apartado 3, de la Decisión 243/2012/UE. Aunque el avance ha sido evidente en una serie de países, la Comisión considerará la posibilidad de utilizar sus poderes de ejecución, si procede. La Comisión también tomó medidas para garantizar que los Estados miembros que no solicitaron una excepción apliquen las disposiciones del PPER lo más rápidamente posible. En la actualidad, siete Estados miembros aún no han autorizado la utilización de la banda de 800 MHz.

Las propuestas de la Comisión para crear un continente conectado no afectan a la atribución de la banda de 800 MHz.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000501/14
to the Commission
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: 800 MHz digital dividend spectrum

Many Member States, including Spain, previously requested that the Commission postpone the release of the 800 MHz digital dividend spectrum for use by wireless broadband services. The Commission's acceptance of most of these deferral requests has meant that some Member States have breached the deadline agreed for making the 800 MHz band available for wireless broadband, which was set at 1 January 2013.

The Commission has been underlining the delay that we are suffering in Europe in connection with the availability of 4G and LTE connections. It is true that the Commission, in its new proposal to create a connected continent, is trying to reverse this situation through new proposals which affect the frequency band's allocation.

However, going back to the deferrals granted, does the Commission believe that these are largely responsible for the delay in Europe in terms of next generation connections? What is the short term outlook? Are the Member States resolving the problems which led them to request the extra time? What measures are foreseen and can the Commission take if the Member States have not yet established the conditions to make the 800 MHz band available for wireless broadband at the end of the extra time granted?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The Commission received fourteen derogation requests from Member States under Decision (243/2012/EU) establishing a multiannual radio spectrum policy programme (RSPP). The Commission rejected two requests for not fulfilling the RSPP conditions, and granted twelve derogations justified by 'the exceptional national or local circumstances or cross-border frequency coordination problems' at stake. The Commission took those individual decisions only after discussions with the respective Member States to ensure a lower impact in terms of time delay or geographical extent. Two derogations were only partially granted and four others were granted for a shorter duration than requested. Reports are required from all Member States that asked for deferrals, and the Commission is closely monitoring progress.

In six countries, the derogations expired by the end of 2013. It should also be noted that three Member States have invoked the continued partial or total use of the 800 MHz band for public security and defence purposes, pursuant to Article 1(3) of Decision No 243/2012/EU. While progress has been evident in a number of countries, the Commission will consider using its enforcement powers if appropriate. The Commission also took action in order to ensure that those Member States who did not request a derogation, implement the RSPP provisions as quickly as possible. Currently seven Member States have not yet authorised the use of the 800 MHz band.

The Commission proposals to create a connected continent do not impact the allocation of the 800 MHz band.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000512/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2011/97/UE

En referencia a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier respondió en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2011/97/UE que modifica la Directiva 1999/31/CE por lo que respecta a los criterios específicos para el almacenamiento de mercurio metálico considerado residuo?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla la legislación europea?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000513/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2011/36/UE

En referencia a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier respondió en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2011/36/UE relativa a la prevención y lucha contra la trata de seres humanos y a la protección de las víctimas y por la que se sustituye la Decisión marco 2002/629/JAI del Consejo?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla la legislación europea?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000514/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2010/75/UE

En respuesta a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier declaró en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2010/75/UE sobre las emisiones industriales (prevención y control integrados de la contaminación)?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000515/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2012/14/UE

En respuesta a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier declaró en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2012/14/UE, de forma que la metilnonilcetona quede incluida como sustancia activa en el anexo I?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000516/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2011/62/UE

En respuesta a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier declaró en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2011/62/UE, por la que se establece un código comunitario sobre medicamentos de uso humano, en lo relativo a la prevención de la entrada de medicamentos falsificados en la cadena de suministro legal?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000517/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2010/84/UE

En referencia a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier respondió en nombre de la Comisión lo siguiente: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2010/84/UE, por la que se establece un código comunitario sobre medicamentos para uso humano?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000520/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2012/15/UE

En referencia a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier respondió en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2012/15/UE, por la que se modifica la Directiva 98/8/CE de forma que incluya el extracto de margosa como sustancia activa en su anexo I?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000522/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2012/21/UE

En respuesta a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier declaró en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2012/21/UE, por la que se modifican los anexos II y III de la Directiva 76/768/CEE del Consejo, relativa a la aproximación de las legislaciones de los Estados miembros en materia de productos cosméticos, para adaptarlos al progreso técnico?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000523/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2012/22/UE

En respuesta a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier declaró, en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2012/22/UE, por la que se modifica la Directiva 98/8/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de forma que incluya el carbonato de didecildimetilamonio como sustancia activa en su anexo I?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000524/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2012/43/UE

En respuesta a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier declaró, en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2012/43/UE de la Comisión, por la que se modifican determinados epígrafes del anexo I de la Directiva 98/8/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000525/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2012/47/UE

En referencia a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier respondió en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2012/47/UE de la Comisión por la que se modifica la Directiva 2009/43/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo en lo que se refiere a la lista de productos relacionados con la defensa?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla la legislación europea?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000529/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2012/40/UE

En respuesta a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier declaró en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses, ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2012/40/UE de la Comisión por la que se corrige el anexo I de la Directiva 98/8/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo relativa a la comercialización de biocidas?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de marzo de 2014)

La información solicitada por Su Señoría acerca de la situación en lo relativo a la incorporación al ordenamiento jurídico del Reino de España figura en el cuadro adjunto en anexo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000512/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2011/97/EU

With reference to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier replied, on behalf of the Commission: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Commission Directive 2011/97/EU amending Directive 1999/31/EC as regards specific criteria for the storage of metallic mercury considered as waste?

If not, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000513/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2011/36/EU

With reference to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier replied, on behalf of the Commission: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA?

If not, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000514/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2010/75/EU

In reply to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier, on behalf of the Commission, stated: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control)?

If not, what measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000515/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2012/14/EU

In reply to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier, on behalf of the Commission, stated: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2012/14/EU to include methyl nonyl ketone as an active substance in Annex I?

If not, what measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000516/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2011/62/EU

In reply to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier, on behalf of the Commission, stated: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2011/62/EU on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, as regards the prevention of the entry into the legal supply chain of falsified medicinal products?

If not, what measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000517/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2010/84/EU

With reference to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier replied, on behalf of the Commission: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2010/84/EU on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use?

If not, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000520/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2012/15/EU

With reference to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier replied, on behalf of the Commission: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2012/15/EU amending Directive 98/8/EC to include margosa extract as an active substance in Annex I thereto?

If not, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000522/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2012/21/EU

In reply to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier, on behalf of the Commission, stated: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2012/21/EU amending, for the purpose of adaptation to technical progress, Annexes II and III to Council Directive 76/768/EEC relating to cosmetic products?

If not, what measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000523/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2012/22/EU

In reply to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier, on behalf of the Commission, stated: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2012/22/EU amending Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council to include DDACarbonate as an active substance in Annex I thereto?

If not, what measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000524/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2012/43/EU

In reply to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier, on behalf of the Commission, stated: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2012/43/EU amending certain headings of Annex I to Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council?

If not, what measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000525/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2012/47/EU

With reference to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier replied, on behalf of the Commission: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Commission Directive 2012/47/EU amending Directive 2009/43/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the list of defence-related products?

If not, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Question for written answer E-000529/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2012/40/EU

With reference to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier replied, on behalf of the Commission: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Commission Directive 2012/40/EU correcting Annex I to Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market?

If not, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

The information required by the Honourable Member concerning the state of transposition by the Kingdom of Spain is in the attached table.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000521/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2012/16/UE

En referencia a la pregunta E-003482/2013, el Sr. Barnier respondió en nombre de la Comisión: «A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas».

Pasados nueve meses ¿puede decir la Comisión si el Estado español ha comunicado las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2012/16/UE, por la que se modifica la Directiva 98/8/CE de forma que se incluya el ácido clorhídrico como sustancia activa en su anexo I?

En caso negativo ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla las leyes europeas?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de marzo de 2014)

España ha incorporado a su ordenamiento jurídico la Directiva 2012/16/UE mediante la Orden PRE/675/2013, de 22 de abril, por la que se incluyen las sustancias activas metilnonilcetona, extracto de margosa y ácido clorhídrico en el anexo I del Real Decreto 1054/2002, de 11 de octubre, por el que se regula el proceso de evaluación para el registro, autorización y comercialización de biocidas ([1]).

Esas medidas nacionales de transposición fueron comunicadas a la Comisión el 25 de abril de 2013.

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/04/25/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-4362.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000521/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Directive 2012/16/EU

With reference to Written Question E-003482/2013, Mr Barnier replied, on behalf of the Commission: 'As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives'.

After nine months, can the Commission say whether the Spanish Government has notified its measures transposing Directive 2012/16/EU amending Directive 98/8/EC to include hydrochloric acid as an active substance in Annex I thereto?

If not, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 March 2014)

Spain has transposed Directive 2012/16/EU into its legal system by 'Orden PRE/675/2013, de 22 de abril, por la que se incluyen las sustancias activas metilnonilcetona, extracto de margosa y ácido clorhídrico en el anexo I del Real Decreto 1054/2002, de 11 de octubre, por el que se regula el proceso de evaluación para el registro, autorización y comercialización de biocidas' ([1]).

These national measures of transposition were communicated to the Commission on 25 April 2013.

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/04/25/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-4362.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000526/14
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(21 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Sostenibilità del sostegno finanziario diretto dell'UE a favore dell'Autorità palestinese

L'11 dicembre 2013 la Corte dei conti europea ha pubblicato un comunicato stampa (ECA/13/44) contenente una serie di raccomandazioni indirizzate alla Commissione e al SEAE e concernenti la sostenibilità del sostegno finanziario diretto (SFD) PEGASE dell'UE destinato all'Autorità palestinese (AP). Hans Gustaf Wessberg, responsabile della relazione, ha sottolineato la necessità di adottare misure per incoraggiare l'AP a riformare la funzione pubblica. Dal 2008 al 2012 il SFD PEGASE è stato il programma di aiuti di maggior rilievo nei territori palestinesi, erogando finanziamenti per 1 miliardo di euro.

Nella relazione si sostiene che il programma ha contribuito in modo rilevante alla copertura della spesa per stipendi dell'AP. Tuttavia, in considerazione del numero crescente di beneficiari e della riduzione del numero di donatori, nel 2012 alcuni pagamenti degli stipendi hanno subito ritardi, causando disordini nei territori. Nel contempo i dipendenti pubblici della Striscia di Gaza sono stati retribuiti senza recarsi al lavoro o fornire un servizio.

In sintesi, la Corte dei conti sostiene che occorerebbe ricorrere in misura maggiore a procedure di appalto competitive e che è necessario semplificare i sistemi di gestione per evitare inutili costi amministrativi. Inoltre, la Corte dei conti afferma che la Commissione e il SEAE dovrebbero mettere a punto degli indicatori di prestazione per valutare il modo in cui vengono soddisfatti gli obiettivi fissati, che è necessario definire precisi criteri di condizionalità per le future attività del SFD PEGASE al fine di garantire la realizzazione di progressi reali, e che occorre pervenire ad un accordo con l'AP per interrompere il finanziamento da parte dell'SFD PEGASE degli stipendi dei dipendenti pubblici e delle pensioni di Gaza per trasferirlo alla Cisgiordania.

In considerazione di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È disposta ad adottare misure nel 2014 per ridurre gradualmente il pagamento degli stipendi dei dipendenti pubblici palestinesi che non stanno svolgendo una funzione di governo rilevante onde evitare abusi sui fondi del SFD PEGASE? In caso affermativo, in che modo?

2. Per quanto concerne la definizione delle condizionalità per il finanziamento, quali sono gli attuali parametri di riferimento dell'UE per monitorare i progressi e le riforme intraprese dall'AP?

3. Quali sono gli aspetti chiave del SFD PEGASE che la Commissione si impegna fermamente a modificare per garantire una maggiore efficacia prima di continuare a erogare finanziamenti?

Risposta di Stefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

Per quanto riguarda le singole raccomandazioni della Corte, la Commissione e il SEAE hanno deciso di comune accordo di introdurre alcuni cambiamenti e di riesaminare il meccanismo PEGASE. Tutti i punti sollevati dall'onorevole deputato sono contemplati nella risposta data dalla Commissione e dal SEAE alla relazione (ECA SP 14/2013), che è riportata alla fine della relazione stessa.

La Commissione invita l'onorevole deputato a consultare le sue risposte alle interrogazioni scritte E-13394/13, P-14034/13, E-14195/13, E-14347/13 e E-14320/13 ([1]) sullo stesso argomento.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000526/14
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Sustainability of EU Direct Financial Support to the Palestinian Authority

On 11 December 2013, the European Court of Auditors issued a press release (ECA/13/44) with a list of recommendations for both the Commission and the EEAS regarding the sustainability of the EU PEGASE Direct Financial Support (DFS) to the Palestinian Authority (PA). Mr Hans Gustaf Wessberg, who was responsible for the report, stressed that steps needed to be taken to encourage the PA to reform the civil service. From 2008 to 2012, the PEGASE DFS was the largest aid programme to the Palestinian territories, providing EUR 1 billion in funding.

The report stated that the programme made an important contribution to covering the PA's expenditure on salaries. However, given the growing number of beneficiaries and the drop in the number of donors, some salary payments were delayed in 2012, which caused unrest in the territories. At the same time, civil servants in the Gaza Strip were being paid despite not going to work or providing a service.

In short, the Court of Auditors has said that there should be greater use of competitive tendering and that the management system needs to be simplified in order to avoid unnecessary administrative costs. It also said that the Commission and the EEAS should develop performance indicators to assess how set objectives are met, that clear conditionality for future PEGASE DFS activities is required to ensure that real progress is made, and that an agreement with the PA is needed so that funding for the salaries and pensions of civil servants in Gaza is discontinued and redirected to the West Bank.

In view of the above, can the Commission clarify the following:

1. Is the Commission prepared to take steps in 2014 to gradually cut back on salary payments to Palestinian civil servants who are not currently performing a relevant government function in order to avoid abuse of PEGASE DFS funds? If so, how?

2. As regards the application of conditionality for funding, what benchmarks are currently in place for the EU to monitor progress and reforms undertaken by the PA?

3. What key aspects of PEGASE DFS is the Commission firmly committed to amending so as to ensure greater effectiveness before continuing its funding?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

Concerning individual recommendations by the Court, the Commission and the EEAS have agreed to introduce some changes and to review the PEGASE mechanism. All the points raised by the Honourable Member are covered in the reply by the Commission and EEAS to the report (ECA SP 14/2013), which can be found at the end of the report itself.

The Commission also refers the Honourable Member to its replies to written questions E-13394/13, P-14034/13, E-14195/13;E-14347/13 and E-14320/13 ([1]) on the same subject.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000527/14
alla Commissione
Clemente Mastella (PPE)
(21 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Tasse automobilistiche in Italia

In Italia le competenze in materia di tasse automobilistiche, dal 1° gennaio 1999, sono state trasferite alle Regioni: la tassa automobilistica, o bollo auto (in precedenza denominata anche «tassa di circolazione»), è un tributo locale che grava sugli autoveicoli e i motoveicoli immatricolati in Italia, il cui versamento è a favore della Regione di residenza. I maggiori beneficiari dell'aumento delle tasse automobilistiche sono stati, negli ultimi anni, proprio gli enti locali, che hanno visto una crescita rapida e ampia di questa voce di bilancio.

Essendo di competenza regionale, si sono registrate enormi discrepanze per i cittadini italiani: ad esempio, nelle regioni del Sud Italia le aliquote applicate sono significativamente più alte rispetto a quelle applicate al Nord.

Le associazioni dei consumatori stimano che solo negli ultimi dieci anni il costo delle tasse automobilistiche, associato a quello per assicurare l'auto, sia in pratica raddoppiato e che solo nell'ultimo biennio l'aumento sia stato del 30 %, senza contare che molte Province hanno alzato anche le imposte per le iscrizioni e le annotazioni sul PRA, il Pubblico registro automobilistico.

Per gli abitanti del Mezzogiorno, poi, la beffa è in molti casi doppia. Quasi ovunque subiscono il prelievo massimo da parte della Provincia e per di più l'aliquota si calcola su premi sensibilmente più alti rispetto al Centro-Nord. Secondo il portale Supermoney che consente di confrontare le offerte di diversi operatori, il costo medio di una polizza per chi non ha fatto incidenti negli ultimi 5 anni è di 1 456 euro al Sud contro i 920 euro del Nord. Questo sebbene il tasso di incidentalità del Mezzogiorno sia ormai più basso rispetto a quello delle altre aree del paese.

Condivide la Commissione l'opinione che tali differenze nelle tasse automobilistiche hanno un impatto negativo sul commercio di automobili in generale e, in particolare, che configurano una grave situazione di concorrenza sleale nei confronti dei cittadini italiani delle regioni meridionali?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(17 febbraio 2014)

La legislazione europea in materia di tassazione delle autovetture è piuttosto limitata, così come l'armonizzazione della normativa fiscale nazionale applicata dagli Stati in tale ambito. Di conseguenza, è compito di ogni Stato membro adottare disposizioni nazionali in materia nel quadro generale dei trattati UE. In assenza di armonizzazione delle tasse automobilistiche a livello dell'UE ([1]), l'Italia è libera di imporre la tassa di circolazione, che dovrebbe ad ogni modo conformarsi ai principi generali del diritto dell'UE. Sulla base delle informazioni ricevute, la Commissione non è in grado di fornire una valutazione complessiva delle misure in questione.

([1]) La Commissione aveva proposto di adottare una struttura uniforme in materia di tassazione delle autovetture (Proposta di direttiva (COM(2005) 261); tuttavia, tale proposta non ha mai ottenuto il necessario consenso unanime degli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000527/14
to the Commission
Clemente Mastella (PPE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Vehicle tax in Italy

In Italy, vehicle tax has been the remit of the regional governments since 1 January 1999. That vehicle tax or car tax ('*bollo auto*'), which also used to be called '*tassa di circolazione*' (road tax), is a local tax imposed on cars and other motor vehicles registered in Italy and is payable in the region of residence. The main beneficiaries of the increase in vehicle tax have in recent years been the local authorities themselves, which have seen the amounts under this heading in their budgets rise swiftly and significantly.

The fact that vehicle taxation is a regional government remit has created huge disparities for individual Italians. For example, in the southern Italian regions the rates applied are significantly higher than those in northern Italy.

Consumer organisations estimate that in the last decade alone, the combined cost of vehicle tax and vehicle insurance has effectively doubled, and that in the last two years alone it has risen by 30%, while many provincial governments have also increased the charges for registering a vehicle or amending an entry in the public register of motor vehicles.

This frequently makes for a 'double whammy' for people living in the south of Italy. They almost all have to pay the maximum amount chargeable by provincial governments, on top of which vehicle tax rates are calculated on the basis of insurance premiums markedly higher than those in the centre and north of Italy. According to the Supermoney website, on which the amounts charged by various insurance companies can be compared, the average cost of a policy for someone with five years' no-claims is EUR 1 456 in the south of Italy, as opposed to EUR 920 in the north, despite the fact that the accident rate in the south is now lower than elsewhere in the country.

Does the Commission not agree that these differences in vehicle tax rates have an adverse effect on the automobile market in general and, in particular, engender a situation that is grossly unfair, in competitive terms, for Italians living in the south of Italy?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(17 February 2014)

There is little EU legislation or harmonisation of national fiscal provisions applied by the Member States in the area of passenger car taxation. Therefore, within the general framework of the EU Treaties, it is for each Member State to lay down national provisions in this area. In the absence of harmonisation of car taxes at the EU level ([1]), Italy is free to impose the circulation tax, which should however be in line with general principles of EC law. The Commission is not in a position to give a comprehensive assessment of the measure based on the information provided.

([1]) The Commission proposed to establish a uniform structure for passenger cars taxation at the EU level (Proposal for a directive (COM(2005) 261), however, this proposal never obtained the required unanimous support from the Member States.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000528/14
do Komisji
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(21 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Import jaj z Ukrainy do UE

W kontekście obrotu towarami rolno-spożywczymi między Unią Europejską a krajami trzecimi (w szczególności Ukrainą) proszę o udzielenie odpowiedzi na następujące pytania:

1. Czy podmiot ukraiński, zajmujący się produkcją jaj może swobodnie sprzedawać je na rynku UE? Czy UE ma oczekiwania wobec krajów trzecich, a w szczególności Ukrainy, i czy posiada narzędzia egzekucyjne (np. w postaci akredytacji zakładów produkcyjnych przez przedstawicieli KE do sprzedaży produktów do UE) w obszarach:

— zakazu skarmiania mączek mięsno-kostnych,

— programów zwalczania salmonelli,

— dobrostanu drobiu w pełnym zakresie określonym w unijnych dyrektywach, np. nowoczesne klatki,

— monitoringu pozostałości niedozwolonych substancji (takich jak antybiotyki, hormony).

2. Czy jajka importowane z Ukrainy do UE (import hurtowy luzem) muszą być oznaczone nadrukiem kraju pochodzenia/wyprodukowania? Czy jeżeli produkowane są na Ukrainie, importowane do UE, a następnie pakowane w opakowania detaliczne i wprowadzane do obrotu konsumenckiego w kraju UE, wystarczy nadruk kraju pakowania?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(18 lutego 2014 r.)

1. Przyznane Ukrainie pozwolenie na wywóz jaj (z wyjątkiem jaj spożywczych) i produktów jajecznych do UE ([1]) opiera się na zharmonizowanych przepisach dotyczących przywozu produktów pochodzenia zwierzęcego. Kontrolą prawidłowego wdrażania tych wymogów w państwach trzecich, takich jak Ukraina, zajmuje się Biuro ds. Żywności i Weterynarii przy Dyrekcji Generalnej ds. Zdrowia i Konsumentów Komisji Europejskiej.

Zalecenia Światowej Organizacji Zdrowia Zwierząt (OIE) dotyczące zakazu stosowania określonych pasz odnoszą się wyłącznie do przeżuwaczy. Z kolei unijne przepisy dotyczące zakazu stosowania określonych pasz w hodowli zwierząt należących do gatunków innych niż przeżuwacze mają zastosowanie wyłącznie do państw członkowskich UE. Z podobnych względów wymogi UE w zakresie dobrostanu zwierząt dotyczące klatek dla kur niosek nie mają zastosowania do Ukrainy.

Zgodnie z obecnymi przepisami UE ([2]) w krajach trzecich prowadzących wywóz niektórych rodzajów żywności pochodzenia zwierzęcego do UE musi działać system monitorowania niedozwolonych substancji zgodny z wymogami UE. Ukraina spełnia te wymogi.

Zgodnie z obecnymi przepisami UE ([3]) państwa trzecie mogą prowadzić wywóz jaj spożywczych do UE pod warunkiem wdrożenia zatwierdzonego przez Komisję programu zwalczania salmonelli w stadach kur niosek. Dla Ukrainy nie zatwierdzono takiego programu zwalczania.

2. Jeżeli założenia programu zwalczania salmonelli są przestrzegane, wszystkie przywożone jaja, które mają być wprowadzone do obrotu na terytorium UE, są zgodne ze standardami UE. Zgodnie z jednym z tych standardów sortować i pakować jaja mogą tylko upoważnione zakłady pakowania. Działań tych nie można zatem przeprowadzać na poziomie handlu detalicznego.

([1]) Decyzja Komisji 2011/163/UE, Dz.U. L 70 z 17.3.2011, s. 40-46.

([2]) Dyrektywa Rady 96/23/WE z dnia 29 kwietnia 1996 r. w sprawie środków monitorowania niektórych substancji i ich pozostałości u żywych zwierząt i w produktach pochodzenia zwierzęcego oraz uchylająca dyrektywy 85/358/EWG i 86/469/EWG oraz decyzje 89/187/EWG i 91/664/EWG, Dz.U. L 125 z 23.5.1996, s. 10-32.

([3]) Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 2160/2003 Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 17 listopada 2003 r. w sprawie zwalczania salmonelli i innych określonych odzwierzęcych czynników chorobotwórczych przenoszonych przez żywność, Dz.U. L 325 z 12.12.2003, s. 1-15.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000528/14
to the Commission
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Importation of eggs into EU from Ukraine

In the context of the trade in agri-food products between the European Union and third countries (particularly Ukraine), please provide answers to the following questions:

1. Could a Ukrainian business involved in egg production sell its eggs freely on the EU market? Does the EU have any expectations with regard to third countries, particularly Ukraine, and does it have enforcement tools at its disposal (e.g. in the form of having Commission representatives grant accreditation to production plants to sell their products in the EU) in the following areas:

— banning the use of meat and bone meal in feed;

— Salmonella control programmes;

— welfare of poultry, as comprehensively defined in EU directives, e.g. regarding modern cages;

— monitoring the remaining unauthorised substances, such as antibiotics and hormones?

2. Do eggs imported into the EU from Ukraine (wholesale bulk import) need to be labelled with the country of origin/production? If the eggs are produced in Ukraine, imported into the EU, then packaged in retail packaging and placed on the consumer market in an EU Member State, would a label detailing the country of packaging not be sufficient?

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

1. The authorisation granted to Ukraine to export eggs (excluding table eggs) and egg products to the EU ([1]) is based on the harmonised legislation in place for imports of products of animal origin. The Commission's Food and Veterinary Office of DG Health and Consumers carries out audits to verify the correct fulfilment of those requirements by third countries, such as Ukraine.

The feed-ban recommendations of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) pertain only to the feeding of ruminants. However, the EU feed-ban provisions regarding non-ruminant species apply only to EU Member States. In a similar manner, EU animal welfare requirements on cages for laying hens do not apply to Ukraine.

According to the current EU legislation ([2]), a system in compliance with EU requirements for monitoring of unauthorised substances must be in place in the third countries exporting certain food of animal origin to the EU. Ukraine fulfils these requirements.

According to the current EU legislation ([3]), third countries are allowed to export table eggs to the EU if a Salmonella control programme for laying hens has been approved by the Commission. Such a control programme has not been approved for Ukraine.

2. As far as the Salmonella control programme is respected, all imported eggs shall conform to the EU standards to be marketed on the EU territory. One of these standards establishes that only authorised Packing Centres can grade and pack eggs. Therefore this practice cannot be executed at retail level.

([1]) Commission Decision 2011/163/EU, OJ L 70, 17.3.2011, p. 40-46.
([2]) Council Directive 96/23/EC of 29 April 1996 on measures to monitor certain substances and residues thereof in live animals and animal products and repealing Directives 85/358/EEC and 86/469/EEC and Decisions 89/187/EEC and 91/664/EEC, OJ L 125, 23.5.1996, p. 10-32.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 November 2003 on the control of salmonella and other specified food-borne zoonotic agents, OJ L 325, 12.12.2003, p.1-15.

ISSN 1977-088X (elektronische Ausgabe)
ISSN 1725-2407 (Papierausgabe)

Amt für Veröffentlichungen der Europäischen Union
2985 Luxemburg
LUXEMBURG

DE