IV

(Informacje)

INFORMACJE INSTYTUCJI, ORGANÓW I JEDNOSTEK ORGANIZACYJNYCH UNII EUROPEJSKIEJ

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

PYTANIA PISEMNE Z ODPOWIEDZIĄ

Pytania pisemne skierowane przez posłów do Parlamentu Europejskiego i odpowiedzi na te pytania udzielone przez instytucję Unii Europejskiej

(2014/C 312/01)

Treść Strona

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001695/14
à la Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(14 février 2014)

Objet: Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif à la production et à la mise à disposition sur le marché de matériel de reproduction des végétaux

La proposition de règlement de la Commission relatif à la production et à la mise à disposition sur le marché de matériel de reproduction des végétaux a fait l'objet d'une vive controverse ces derniers mois. Conjointement avec le groupe des Verts/ALE, de nombreux citoyens de l'Union, militants écologistes et agriculteurs ont exprimé leur inquiétude au sujet de l'incidence restrictive de la proposition de règlement sur le marché des semences et sur la biodiversité locale.

J'ai récemment lancé une campagne en ligne visant à sensibiliser l'opinion publique à la proposition de la Commission. Sur mon site internet (www.claudeturmes.lu/seed), les citoyens peuvent obtenir des informations au sujet de la proposition de la Commission et envoyer facilement un message au commissaire à la santé, Tonio Borg (cab-borg-webpage@ec.europa.eu), ainsi qu'au commissaire chargé de la politique des consommateurs, Neven Mimica (cab-mimica-webpage@ec.europa.eu). Jusqu'à présent, quelques milliers de citoyens ont participé à cette campagne.

Le 10 février 2014, la commission de l'agriculture et du développement rural a rejeté la proposition de la Commission en raison du nombre important d'amendements déposés et d'inquiétudes exprimées concernant l'accès restrictif au marché des semences européen et les possibles effets néfastes sur la biodiversité locale.

La Commission présentera-t-elle une nouvelle proposition? Dans l'affirmative, prendra-t-elle en compte les objections soulevées par la commission de l'agriculture et du développement rural?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(27 mars 2014)

Contrairement à certaines déclarations et aux problèmes évoqués dans le cadre de plusieurs campagnes publiques, la proposition n'a pas d'effet restrictif sur le marché des semences et sur la biodiversité locale. Elle comporte des dispositions facilitant l'enregistrement des variétés traditionnelles et donne aux opérateurs non professionnels et aux microentreprises la possibilité de commercialiser des «variétés de niche» sans enregistrement. De plus, les microentreprises sont exemptées des redevances d'enregistrement des variétés.

Cependant, la Commission comprend tout à fait les préoccupations du Parlement en ce qui concerne la nature très technique de la proposition, le nombre important d'amendements déposés et le bref délai disponible pour l'examiner. La Commission examinera les inquiétudes exprimées dans les amendements déposés par la commission AGRI et envisage actuellement les prochaines étapes à suivre après le rejet de la proposition lors de la plénière de mars.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001695/14
to the Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the production and making available on the market of plant reproductive material

The Commission's proposal for a regulation on the production and making available on the market of plant reproductive material has been controversially discussed over the past few months. Together with the Greens/EFA, many EU citizens, environmental activists and farmers have raised serious concerns about the restrictive impact of the proposed regulation on the seed market and local biodiversity.

I recently started an online campaign to raise awareness of the Commission's proposal. Through my website (www.claudeturmes.lu/seed), people can find information about the Commission's proposal and send a message to the Commissioner for Health, Tonio Borg (cab-borg-webpage@ec.europa.eu), and the Commissioner for Consumer Policy, Neven Mimica (cab-mimica-webpage@ec.europa.eu). Several thousand people have participated so far.

On 10 February 2014, the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development rejected the Commission's proposal owing to the large number of amendments and concerns about the restrictive access to the European seed market and possible negative effects on local biodiversity.

Will the Commission present a new proposal? If so, will the Commission take into account the objections raised by the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development?

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

Contrary to some statements and the issues raised in several public campaigns, the proposal does not have a restrictive impact on the seed market and local biodiversity. The proposal includes provisions facilitating the registration of traditional varieties and gives non-professional operators and micro-enterprises the possibility to market so-called niche-market varieties without any registration. In addition, micro-enterprises are exempted from variety registration fees.

However, the Commission fully understands the Parliament's concerns regarding the highly technical nature of the proposal, the high number of tabled amendments and the short time available to examine the proposal. The Commission will study the concerns as expressed in the amendments tabled in the AGRI Committee and is, after the vote of rejection in plenary in March, considering the next steps to be taken.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001766/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Krise in der Zentralafrikanischen Republik

Aus einem politischen Motiv heraus, dem Putsch gegen die amtierende Regierung im Jahr 2013, haben sich offenbar schwerwiegende und beständig zunehmende Konflikte zwischen Christen und Muslimen entwickelt. Laut Medienberichten seien die Kontingente ausländischer Soldaten aus der Afrikanischen Union und Frankreich, die sich dort im UN-Einsatz befinden, mit der Situation überfordert.

1. Was gedenkt die Hohe Vertreterin zu tun, um den Konflikt möglichst auf politischer Ebene und friedlich zu lösen?

2. Inwiefern sieht die Hohe Vertreterin hier Verstöße gegen bestehende Abkommen mit der Zentralafrikanischen Republik, vor allem im Hinblick auf die Einhaltung der Menschenrechte, des Völkerrechts und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit?

3. In Medienberichten wird davon gesprochen, 500 EU-Soldaten in der Hauptstadt zum Schutz der Flüchtlinge am Flughafen zu stationieren. Ist die Hohe Vertreterin der Ansicht, dass diese Anzahl der Situation entsprechend ausreichend ist und dass auch keine außerordentliche Gefährdung besteht?

4. Welche humanitären Hilfsaktionen unterstützt die Europäische Union in diesem Krisengebiet, in dem von hunderttausenden Flüchtlingen die Rede ist?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(29. April 2014)

Die EU beteiligt sich aktiv an den Bemühungen der internationalen Gemeinschaft, die sicherheitspolitischen, politischen, humanitären und menschenrechtsbezogenen Aspekte der Krise anzugehen und den politischen Prozess wieder in Gang zu bringen. Am 10. Februar hat der Rat „Auswärtige Angelegenheiten“ gemäß einer Aufforderung des Europäischen Rates vom 19./20. Dezember 2013 die Einrichtung einer GSVP-Operation als Beitrag zu den Stabilisierungsbemühungen beschlossen. Die Operation EUFOR RCA ist integraler Bestandteil eines umfassenden Ansatzes.

EUFOR wird eng mit der von der Afrikanischen Union (AU) entsandten Mission MISCA, die zum Teil von der EU finanziert wird, und mit dem französischen Truppenverband Sangaris zusammenarbeiten. Beim Mandat der EUFOR liegt der Schwerpunkt auf der dringend notwendigen Sicherung von Bangui, dem Schutz der Zivilbevölkerung und der Schaffung der Voraussetzungenen für die Bereitstellung humanitärer Hilfe.

Im Rahmen des Instruments für Stabilität wird derzeit ein mit 12 Mio. EUR ausgestattetes Paket an Stabilisierungsmaßnahmen umgesetzt, um einige kurzfristige Prioritäten anzugehen. Dazu zählen u. a. Beendigung der Straflosigkeit durch teilweise Wiederaufnahme der Polizei- und Gendarmeriearbeit in Bangui, Unterstützung von Beobachtungsmissionen im Menschenrechtsbereich, Wiederherstellung unabhängiger Medien und Unterstützung des Dialogs zwischen den Gemeinschaften.

Die Europäische Union ist der wichtigste Partner der Zentralafrikanischen Republik im Bereich der humanitären Hilfe und der Entwicklungshilfe. Die EU bemüht sich weiterhin um Sensibilisierung für die Lage in der Zentralafrikanischen Republik (Teilnahme des für internationale Zusammenarbeit, humanitäre Hilfe und Krisenreaktion Kommissionsmitglieds an einem hochrangigen Treffen in Brüssel am 20. Januar und an einer Veranstaltung am Rande des Gipfeltreffens EU-Afrika am 3. April) und hat ihre Hilfe erheblich aufgestockt — von 8 Mio. EUR im Jahr 2012 auf 26,5 Mio. EUR im Jahr 2014, wovon 4 Mio. EUR für die Unterstützung der Nachbarländer vorgesehen sind, die Flüchtlinge aufgenommen haben.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001766/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Crisis in the Central African Republic

A politically motivated move — the rebellion against the incumbent government in 2013 — has given rise to what are clearly serious and constantly escalating conflicts between Christians and Muslims. According to media reports, the contingents of foreign soldiers from the African Union and France, who have been deployed there by the UN, are struggling to control the situation.

1. As far as is possible, what does the High Representative intend to do in order to resolve the conflict on a political level and in a peaceful manner?

2. To what extent does the High Representative believe that there have been breaches of existing agreements with the Central African Republic in this context, particularly with regard to respecting human rights, international law and the rule of law?

3. There is talk in media reports of 500 EU soldiers being stationed in the capital city in order to protect the refugees at the airport. Does the High Representative believe that this number is sufficient to respond to the situation and that there is not an exceptional level of risk involved?

4. What humanitarian aid programmes is the European Union supporting in this crisis zone in which mention can be made of hundreds of thousands of refugees?

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

The EU is actively involved in efforts undertaken by the international community to address the security, political, humanitarian and human rights dimension of the crisis, and to put the political process back on track. On 10 February, the Foreign Affairs Council decided to establish a CSDP operation to contribute to stabilisation efforts, as requested by the European Council on 19-20 December 2013. The EUFOR RCA operation is an integral part of a comprehensive approach.

EUFOR will work in close cooperation with the AU force MISCA, which the EU helps to fund, and the French force Sangaris. The mandate of EUFOR is focused on the urgent securization of Bangui, protection of civilians and creating the conditions for providing humanitarian aid.

Under the EU's Instrument for Stability, the implementation of a EUR 12 million stabilisation package is underway to address some immediate priorities, such as achieving a halt to impunity through the restoration of some police and gendarmerie activities in Bangui, as well as support for Human rights observation missions, the restoration of independent media and support to intercommunity dialogue.

The EU is the most important humanitarian and development partner of the CAR. The EU has been and will continue to be engaged in raising awareness about the situation in CAR (two missions of the Commissioner responsible for International Cooperation, Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Response ; a high level meeting organised in Brussels on 20 January and an event in the margins of the EU-Africa Summit on 3 April) and has significantly increased its assistance (from EUR 8 million in 2012 to EUR 26.5 million in 2014, out of which EUR 4 million are dedicated to the response in the neighbouring countries hosting refugees).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001767/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Das „Feuerland Italiens“ bei Neapel

Im Umland von Neapel kämpfen die Bewohner neben der starken Umweltverschmutzung auch gegen wirtschaftlich äußerst schlechte Verhältnisse. Medienberichten zufolge sollte in der Gegend von Orta di Atella ein Gewerbegebiet für Modebetriebe angesiedelt werden — unter anderem mit europäischen Fördergeldern. Bisher ist dort offenbar nur eine Teerstraße mit wilden Mülldeponien entstanden.

1. In welchem Zeitraum, mit welchen finanziellen Mitteln und mit wie viel Geld wurde oder wird diese Region gefördert?

2. Kann die Kommission erklären, warum in diesem Gebiet offenbar noch immer nicht der geplante Gewerbepark entstanden ist bzw. was die Probleme für deren Verwirklichung sind?

3. Was ist im Falle einer Nicht-Umsetzung der Projekte mit den europäischen Fördergeldern geschehen?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(9. April 2014)

1. Im Zeitraum 2007-2013 wurden der Region Kampanien Mittel in Höhe von 4 576 530 132 EUR zugewiesen; der Beitrag des EFRE belief sich auf 75 %. Die Frist für die Durchführung des Programms endet am 31. Dezember 2015. Die Höhe der Mittelzuweisung für den neuen Programmplanungszeitraum ist noch nicht bekannt, da die Region entsprechend den Ex-ante-Evaluierungen der Programme die Mittelzuweisung für jeden Fonds festlegen muss.

2. Laut der Verwaltungsbehörde wurde das Infrastrukturprojekt für den „Distretto della moda a Orta di Atella“ im Rahmen des öffentlichen Investitionsprogramms Aversa aus Mitteln der Zeiträume 2000-2006 und 2007-2013 finanziert. Das Projekt müsste bis spätestens 31. März 2019 abgeschlossen und betriebsbereit sein. Genaue Informationen hinsichtlich der Fertigstellung dieses Projekts im laufenden Programmplanungszeitraum können bei der Verwaltungsbehörde des Programms Kampanien erfragt werden, da gemäß dem Grundsatz der geteilten Verwaltung die nationalen Behörden für die Durchführung der Projekte im Rahmen der Programme zuständig sind.

3. Zum Zeitpunkt der Vorlage der Abschlussunterlagen am 31. März 2017 müssen die Mitgliedstaaten gewährleisten, dass alle in den Abschlussunterlagen enthaltenen Projekte abgeschlossen und betriebsbereit sind. Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen sich verpflichten, alle nicht betriebsbereiten Projekte spätestens zwei Jahre nach Ablauf der Frist für die Vorlage der Abschlussunterlagen fertigzustellen und den Kofinanzierungsbeitrag der Union zurückzuzahlen, falls diese Projekte nicht innerhalb von zwei Jahren fertiggestellt wurden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001767/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: 'Italy's triangle of death' near Naples

In the areas surrounding Naples the inhabitants are fighting not only against heavy environmental pollution but also against extremely poor economic conditions. According to media reports, a business park for the fashion industry is to be built in the area surrounding Orta di Atella — *inter alia* using European subsidies. Until now this area has apparently been nothing but a tarred road with illegal dumping.

1. Over which time periods, with which financial means and with how much money has this region been or will this region be funded?

2. Can the Commission explain why the planned business park has still not yet been built in this region and/or what are the problems for its realisation?

3. In the event of the non-implementation of the projects, what has happened to the European subsidies?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(9 avril 2014)

1. L'enveloppe financière allouée à la région Campania pour la période 2007-2013 s'élève à 4 576 530 132 avec une contribution de 75 % du FEDER. Le délai de mise en œuvre du programme est le 31 décembre 2015. L'allocation financière pour la nouvelle période n'est pas encore connue du fait que la région doit établir l'allocation financière pour chacun des Fonds selon les évaluations ex-ante des programmes.

2. D'après l'autorité de gestion, le projet concernant des infrastructures du «Distretto della moda a Orta di Atella» dans le cadre du PIP de Aversa était financé dans les programmations 2000-2006 et 2007-2013. Le projet devrait être achevé et opérationnel au plus tard le 31 mars 2019. Des renseignements précis quant à la conclusion dudit projet dans le cadre de cette période de programmation pourront être demandés à l'autorité de gestion du programme Campania vu que, conformément au principe de la gestion partagée, la mise en œuvre des projets dans le cadre des programmes incombe aux autorités nationales.

3. À la date de présentation des documents de clôture, le 31 mars 2017, les États membres devront garantir que tous les projets inclus dans la clôture du programme sont complets et opérationnels. L'État membre devra s'engager à achever tous les projets non opérationnels au plus tard deux ans après l'expiration du délai de présentation des documents de clôture, ainsi qu'à rembourser le cofinancement de l'Union alloué en cas de non-achèvement de ces projets dans le délai de deux ans.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001768/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Nachfrage zu „Giftmüll in Italien“ und die Antwort der Kommission

Neuesten Medienberichten zufolge ist die gesamte Region um Neapel mit unzähligen wilden Mülldeponien verseucht;., erste unbestätigte medizinische Datensammlungen zeigen sowohl einen enormen Anstieg der Krebsraten als auch eine mittlerweile sogar gesunkene Lebenserwartung der Bewohner der Region.

1. Hat die Kommission angesichts möglicher „fehlerhafter Anwendung der einschlägigen Richtlinien“, unter anderem der Richtlinie über nukleare Abfälle, in der Region um Neapel Untersuchungen eingeleitet?

2. Hinzu kommt, dass in der Region offenbar weit mehr Müll unter anderem aus dem italienischen Norden vergraben wurde, der allerlei massive Umweltschäden hervorruft und enormes gesundheitsgefährdendes Potenzial aufweist. Gedenkt die Kommission angesichts der Tatsache, dass offenbar auch Obst und Gemüse aus der Region in benachbarte EU-Länder exportiert werden, diesbezüglich im Gebiet zwischen Caserta und Neapel entsprechende Untersuchungen über die Einhaltung der europäischen Richtlinien zu veranlassen?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(10. April 2014)

Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-013777/2013.

Für die Überprüfung und Ermittlung der Gebiete, in denen Lücken bei der Umsetzung der EU-Rechtsvorschriften bestehen, sind die Mitgliedstaaten zuständig.

Alle Mitgliedstaaten waren verpflichtet, die Richtlinie 2011/70/Euratom bis zum 23. August 2013 in innerstaatliches Recht umzusetzen. Die Kommission verfolgt die Einhaltung dieser Verpflichtung durch die Mitgliedstaaten und wird die ordnungsgemäße Umsetzung überprüfen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001768/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Enquiry on 'toxic waste in Italy' and the answer of the Commission

According to the most recent media reports, the entire region surrounding Naples has been contaminated as a result of innumerable instances of illegal dumping; the first unconfirmed reviews of medical data show both an enormous increase in the rate of cancer and now even a decrease in life expectancy for the inhabitants of the region.

1. Has the Commission initiated investigations in the region surrounding Naples concerning a possible 'incorrect application of the applicable directives', including the directive on nuclear waste?

2. It should be added that much more waste has apparently been buried in the region, including from the north of Italy, which could cause all kinds of massive environmental damage and which has enormous potential for damage to health. In view of the fact that fruit and vegetables from the region are obviously being exported from the region to neighbouring EU countries, does the Commission think that corresponding investigations on this matter should be initiated in the region between Caserta and Naples concerning the observance of European directives?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written question 013777/2013.

Investigation and identification of those areas where there are gaps in implementing EC laws falls under the responsibility of Member States.

All Member States were obliged to transpose Directive 2011/70/Euratom into national legislation by 23 August 2013. The Commission is following up Member States' compliance with this obligation and will verify the conformity of the transposition.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001770/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Negative Konsequenzen der Stresstests

Die Stresstests und Restrukturierungen der europäischen Banken sind im Hinblick auf die Finanzkrise unverzichtbare Instrumente und im Grunde eine vorbildliche Vorgehensweise. Offenbar nutzen aber ausländische Investoren unter anderem die Anweisung zur Vergrößerung der Eigenkapitalbasis in verschiedenen Fällen, um vermehrt in das europäische Geschäft einzusteigen.

1. Erwartet die Kommission künftig eine relevante Zunahme der Zahl ausländischer Anteilseigner an europäischen Banken, der in direkter Folge auf Anweisungen hinsichtlich der Stresstests basiert?

2. Welche negativen Auswirkungen sind für die heimischen Banken gegenüber ihren Konkurrenten aus Drittstaaten zu erwarten, welche nicht an die strengen europäischen Vorgaben gebunden sind?

3. Welche Möglichkeiten gibt es, die Nachteile für heimische europäische Banken abzumildern?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(30. April 2014)

Im derzeitigen Stadium lässt sich nur schwer absehen, welche Ergebnisse die Stresstests bringen werden und in welchem Umfang Rekapitalisierungen über den Markt erforderlich werden könnten, um aufgedeckte oder prognostizierte Eigenkapitallücken zu schließen. Im Übrigen werden die Tests von den zuständigen Aufsichtsbehörden und nicht von der Kommission durchgeführt.

Die Stärkung der Eigenkapitalbasis ist nur eine von vielen Aufsichtsmaßnahmen, die Aufsichtsbehörden einer Bank auferlegen oder empfehlen können, um einem etwaigen Eigenkapitalmangel abzuhelfen. Es ist unmöglich, Voraussagen dazu zu machen, in welchem Ausmaß ausländische Anleger in naher Zukunft in EU-Banken investieren werden. Die Bereitschaft internationaler Anleger, europäischen Banken im Rahmen eines Rekapitalisierungsplans Kapital zur Verfügung zu stellen, könnte jedoch als positives Signal für das in den Sektor gesetzte Vertrauen gewertet werden. Zudem prüfen die Aufsichtsbehörden für jeden Erwerber bedeutender Beteiligungen an Kreditinstituten, ob er die Aufsichtsanforderungen erfüllt, die gemäß CRD IV ([1]) für Inhaber derartiger bedeutender Beteiligungen gelten.

Die Entscheidung, strenge, umfassende Prüfungen einschließlich Stresstests vorzunehmen, war eine bewusste, auf der Grundlage der SSM-Verordnung ([2]) getroffene politische Entscheidung: Zum einen sollte sichergestellt werden, dass der einheitliche Aufsichtsmechanismus sich ein vollständiges Bild von den zu beaufsichtigenden Banken machen kann, zum anderen sollte das in die europäischen Banken gesetzte Vertrauen durch Stärkung ihrer Widerstandsfähigkeit gegenüber makroökonomischen Schocks weiter gefördert werden.

Generell unterliegen alle europäischen Banken den weltweit geltenden Basel-III-Anforderungen, die in Europa mit der CRR ([3]) und der CRD IV ([4]) umgesetzt wurden. Andere Rechtsordnungen haben vergleichbare Maßnahmen zur Implementierung von Basel III in Bezug auf die in ihren jeweiligen Hoheitsgebieten tätigen Banken eingeführt.

([1]) ABl. L 176 vom 27.6.2013, S. 338.
([2]) ABl. L 287 vom 29.10.2013, S. 63.
([3]) ABl. L 176 vom 27.6.2013, S. 1.
([4]) ABl. L 176 vom 27.6.2013, S. 338.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001770/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Negative consequences of stress tests

In view of the financial crisis, the standards for the stress testing and restructuring of European banks represent vital instruments and in principle an exemplary method of procedure. However, among other factors foreign investors are apparently using the increase in the equity capital base in various cases in order to strengthen their access to European business.

1. Does the Commission expect in the future a relevant increase in the number of foreign shareholders in European banks based on the direct consequences of guidelines concerning stress tests?

2. Which negative consequences can be expected for domestic banks in comparison to their competitors from third countries that are not tied to the strict European standards?

3. Which possibilities are there of lessening the disadvantages for domestic European banks?

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

At this stage it is difficult to predict the results of stress tests and the extent to which market-sourced recapitalisation may be needed to address identified or projected capital shortfalls. Moreover, these tests are organised by the relevant supervisors and not by the Commission.

Strengthening the capital base is only one of many supervisory measures that the supervisor may require or recommend a bank to take to remedy a potential capital shortfall. To what extent foreign investors will invest in EU banks in the near future is impossible to predict. However, willingness of international investors to commit capital to European banks in the context of a recapitalisation plan could be a positive indication of confidence in the sector. At the same time any acquiror of significant holdings in credit institutions is subject to review by the supervisory authorities as to whether the acquiror in question meets the prudential criteria applying to owners of such significant holdings in accordance with CRD IV ([1]).

The decision to undertake rigorous comprehensive assessments including stress tests was a deliberate policy choice embedded in the SSM- Regulation ([2]) in order to ensure that the Single Supervisory Mechanism has a comprehensive view of the banks it is going to supervise, and to further boost the confidence in European banks by strengthening their resilience to future macroeconomic shocks.

More generally, all European banks are subject to worldwide Basel III requirements as transposed in Europe through the CRR ([3]) and CRD IV ([4])Other jurisdictions have adopted similar measures, transposing Basel III as regards the banks in their territorites.

([1]) OJ L 176, 27.6.2013, page 338.
([2]) OJ L 287, 29.10.2013, page 63.
([3]) OJ L 176, 27.6.2013, page 1.
([4]) OJ L 176, 27.6.2013, page 338.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001771/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Neue Finanzhilfen für Griechenland

Derzeit wird offenbar über ein weiteres — wenn auch bedeutend kleineres — Finanzpaket für Griechenland gesprochen.

1. Wie rechtfertigt die Kommission gegebenenfalls den möglichen Einsatz des ESM, obwohl Griechenland offenbar mit mehr als 150 der Reformmaßnahmen im Rückstand ist?

2. In welchen Bereichen verortet die Kommission zum gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt die größten Fortschritte Griechenlands bei der Sanierung der Staatsfinanzen?

3. Wo sieht die Kommission derzeit die größten Defizite bei der Umsetzung der Reformen in Griechenland?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(16. April 2014)

Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-012772/2013.

Griechenland hat in den letzten Jahren eine ehrgeizige Haushaltskonsolidierung verfolgt und es scheint, als habe Griechenland im Jahr 2013 einen Primärüberschuss erreicht (durch die VÜD-Daten nach Validierung durch ESTAT im April 2014 zu bestätigen). Die Haushaltskonsolidierung wird durch weitreichende Reformen der Renten-, Sozial- und Gesundheitssysteme sowie — auf der Einnahmenseite — durch die umfassende Reform der Steuerverwaltung und die Einführung weitreichender Steuerreformen gesichert. Der griechische Bankensektor wurde rekapitalisiert und die Finanzstabilität blieb gewahrt. Derzeit werden ehrgeizige Strukturreformen durchgeführt, die bereits erste Früchte tragen.

Allerdings bleibt noch viel zu tun und die Diskussionen zur vierten Überprüfung im Rahmen des zweiten Programms sind noch nicht abgeschlossen. Zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt ist es wichtig, dass Griechenland all seine Anstrengungen auf die fristgerechte Durchführung des Programms richtet. Die Mitgliedstaaten des Euro-Währungsgebiets werden weitere Maßnahmen und Unterstützungsmöglichkeiten für das Erreichen einer weiteren glaubwürdigen und nachhaltigen Senkung der Schuldenquote Griechenlands in Erwägung ziehen, wenn Griechenland einen jährlichen Primärüberschuss erreicht und sämtliche im Programm ([1]) aufgeführten Bedingungen vollständig erfüllt sind. Eine aktualisierte Bewertung der Programmdurchführung wird im Rahmen der laufenden Überprüfung erstellt und nach Abschluss der Überprüfung in den entsprechenden Programmdokumenten übermittelt.

([1]) http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/media/367646/eurogroup_statement_greece_27_november_2012.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001771/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: New financial aid for Greece

There currently seems to be talk of a further — albeit considerably smaller — financial package for Greece.

1. How would the Commission justify the potential involvement of the ESM even though Greece appears to be behind schedule with over 150 of the reform measures?

2. In what areas does the Commission see Greece making the most progress with regard to the consolidation of public finances at the present point in time?

3. What does the Commission consider to be the greatest shortcomings in the implementation of the reforms in Greece at the present time?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-012772/2013.

Greece has undertaken an ambitious fiscal consolidation in recent years and it seems that Greece has achieved the primary budget surplus in 2013 (to be confirmed by the EDP data validated by ESTAT in April 2014). Fiscal consolidation is being upderpinned by far-reaching reforms of the pension, welfare and health systems and, on the revenue side, the comprehensive reform of the revenue administration and the adoption of far-reaching tax reforms. The Greek banking sector has been recapitalised and financial stability preserved. Ambitious structural reforms are being implemented, and they are already starting to bear fruits.

However, a lot still remains to be done, and discussions in the context of the 4th review under the 2nd programme are still ongoing. At this stage, what is important is that Greece concentrates all its efforts on timely implementation of the programme. Euro area Member States will consider further measures and assistance for achieving a further credible and sustainable reduction of Greek debt-to-GDP ratio, when Greece reaches an annual primary surplus, conditional on full implementation of all conditions contained in the programme ([1]). An updated assessment of the implementation of the programme is being prepared in the context of the ongoing review and will be communicated in the related programme documents when the review is concluded.

([1]) http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/media/367646/eurogroup_statement_greece_27_november_2012.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001772/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Zwischen Mobilität und Migration

Mobilität ist in der Europäischen Union sehr erwünscht. Vor allem bei Studierenden und bei (jungen) gut ausgebildeten Fachkräften wird dies viel beworben. Daneben gibt es auch in erheblichem Umfang Aus- und Einwanderungsbewegungen in den verschiedenen europäischen Ländern. Am konkreten Beispiel wird in Deutschland gerade darüber diskutiert, welche Probleme Schulklassen mit sich bringen, deren Schüler oft nicht Deutsch als Muttersprache haben und dementsprechend nicht über genügend Sprachkompetenz verfügen. Dieses Problem betrifft allerdings wahrscheinlich nicht nur deutschsprachige Länder.

1. Aus welchen Ländern sind der Kommission ähnliche Entwicklungen bekannt?

2. Wie kann — analog zur Förderung der Mobilität und der steigenden Tendenz zur Migration — die Kompetenz der Lehrkräfte an den Schulen ausgebaut werden, und welche Empfehlungen kann die Kommission den Mitgliedstaaten diesbezüglich zukommen lassen?

3. Gibt es bereits Programme auf europäischer Ebene, die einen ganzheitlichen Ansatz — sowohl entsprechende Bildung der Schülerinnen und Schüler als auch entsprechende Qualifikation und Weiterbildung des Lehrpersonals — verfolgen und verbreiten?

3.1 Wenn ja, welche Beträge werden dafür zur Verfügung gestellt, und wie werden diese verteilt?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(8. April 2014)

Wie die Frau Abgeordnete sicher weiß, sind gemäß Artikel 165 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union allein die Mitgliedstaaten für die Lehrinhalte und die Gestaltung der Bildungssysteme einschließlich der Lehrpläne, der Lehrkräfteausbildung und der Qualifikationen verantwortlich. Im Rahmen der offenen Methode der Koordinierung unterstützt die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten bei der Verbesserung ihrer Bildungssysteme. Die Frage der schulischen Integration von Migrantenkindern ist in den vergangenen Jahren in vielen Mitgliedstaaten immer wichtiger geworden.

Nach dem Grünbuch der Kommission zur Migration aus dem Jahr 2009 hat der Rat Schlussfolgerungen angenommen, in denen eingeräumt wird, dass zwischen den schulischen Leistungen von Schülern mit Migrationshintergrund und einheimischen Schülern eine Kluft existiert. Dort heißt es, dass die Beherrschung der Landessprache des Gastlandes eine unabdingbare Voraussetzung für den schulischen Erfolg ist und für die gesellschaftliche und berufliche Integration eine entscheidende Rolle spielt. Weiter heißt es, dass die Entwicklung sprachlicher und interkultureller Kompetenzen gefördert werden sollte, um Schulbehörden, Schulleitungen, Lehrkräften und Verwaltungspersonal dabei zu helfen, sich an die Bedürfnisse von Schulen oder Klassen mit Schülern mit Migrationshintergrund anzupassen. Es sollte ferner überlegt werden, wie Lehrmethoden, Unterrichtsmaterialien und Lehrpläne so gestaltet werden können, dass sie für alle Schüler ungeachtet ihrer Herkunft geeignet sind, wie Schulen mit Schülern aus benachteiligten Gruppen auch künftig die besten Lehrer anziehen und halten können und wie die Anzahl der Lehrkräfte mit Migrationshintergrund erhöht werden kann.

Bildungsprojekte im Zusammenhang mit der schulischen Integration junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund können aus dem neuen Programm Erasmus+ finanziert werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001772/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Between mobility and migration

Mobility is desirable for many in the European Union. There are many applications submitted for this, especially by students and (young) well-educated, skilled employees. In addition there is also a considerable amount of emigration and immigration in the various European countries. In Germany for example there is currently much discussion on the specific issue of the problems found in school classes, in which schoolchildren are often not native speakers of German and accordingly do not have sufficient language skills available to them. This is indeed a problem that probably does not only affect German-speaking countries.

1. In which countries is the Commission aware of similar developments?

2. In keeping with the promotion of mobility and the increasing tendencies towards migration, how can the competence of teachers in schools be cultivated and which recommendations can the Commission give to the Member States with regard to this?

3. Are there already programmes at European level that pursue and propagate an integrated approach to this, i.e. both the corresponding education of schoolchildren and also corresponding qualification and further training for teaching staff?

3.1. If yes, which funds will be made available for this and how will these be distributed?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2014)

The Honourable Member will be aware that, in accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems, including curricula, teacher training, and qualifications, rests entirely with Member States. Through the Open Method of Coordination, the Commission supports Member States in their efforts to improve their education systems. Migrant education has become an increasingly important issue for many Member States over recent years.

Following the 2009 Commission Green Paper on migration, the Council adopted Conclusions which acknowledge the gap in educational attainment between pupils with a migrant background and natives. They state that proficiency in the official language of the host country is a prerequisite for educational success and key to both social and professional integration. They also say that the development of linguistic and intercultural competences should be encouraged in order to support school authorities, school leaders, teachers and administrative staff in adapting to the needs of schools or classes containing pupils with a migrant background. Consideration should also be given to issues such as how to make teaching methods, materials and curricula relevant to all pupils, irrespective of their origins, how to continue to attract and keep the best teachers in underperforming schools and how to increase the number of teachers with migrant background.

Education projects linked to the issue of education of young people from a migration background can be financed through the new Erasmus+ programme.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001773/14
an die Kommission
Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Flüchtlingskatastrophe vor Ceuta

Angesichts der Berichte vom 6. Februar 2014 über tote Flüchtlinge in der Nähe von Ceuta sowie der anderen Vorfällen an den Grenzen Europas (bspw. Farmakonisi) und in Erwägung der Augenzeugenberichte, wonach es Gewalteinwirkung durch europäische Einsatzkräfte gab, um die Flüchtlinge am Erreichen der Grenze zu hindern, stellen sich folgende Fragen:

1. Was erwägt die Kommission, um tödliche Vorfälle zukünftig zu verhindern?

2. Was erwägt die Kommission, um sicherzustellen, dass sich unter den Flüchtlingen, die an der Einreise gehindert werden, keine schutzbedürftigen Personen befinden?

3. Sind der Kommission Berichte bekannt, wonach durch Grenzschutzbehörden innerhalb der EU Gewalt angewendet wird, um Flüchtlinge an der Einreise in die EU zu hindern?

4. Welche Anstrengungen unternimmt die Kommission, um Verstöße gegen EU-Recht zu ermitteln, die im Zusammenhang mit dem Grenzschutz begangen werden?

5. Welche Möglichkeiten gibt es nach Ansicht der Kommission, um die Einhaltung europäischen Rechts bei Grenzschutzmaßnahmen durchzusetzen, und welche Anstrengungen unternimmt sie, um die Einhaltung zu gewährleisten?

6. Sind der Kommission Pläne bekannt, wonach Grenzschutzzäune erneut mit sogenanntem Nato-Draht ausgestattet werden sollen?

7. Wenn ja, welche Möglichkeiten nutzt die Kommission, um sicherzustellen, dass Mittel der Europäischen Union, die Drittländern für den Grenzschutz zur Verfügung gestellt werden, nicht für Maßnahmen eingesetzt werden, die das Leben von Flüchtlingen gefährden oder gegen EU-Recht verstoßen?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(4. April 2014)

Die Kommission bedauert den tragischen Verlust von Menschenleben bei diesen Vorfällen. Es werden weitere Maßnahmen gesetzt, um solche Tragödien in Zukunft zu verhindern, darunter auch stärkere Zusammenarbeit mit Drittländern, verstärkte Grenzüberwachung, z. B. mittels Eurosur, und wirksame Asyl-und Rückkehrverfahren. In Bezug auf den Vorfall bei Ceuta ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass Gewalt nicht als abschreckendes Mittel bei der Grenzüberwachung eingesetzt werden sollte. Jede Anwendung von Gewalt sollte verhältnismäßig sein und nur bei Gefahr für das Leben der Grenzschutzbeamten zur Anwendung kommen.

Gemischte Migrationsströme sind die Regel; die Grenzüberwachung muss dennoch unter Wahrung des Grundsatzes der Nichtzurückweisung erfolgen. Die besonderen Umstände jedes Einzelnen, auch die Frage, ob er internationalen Schutz beantragen möchte, können ab dem Zeitpunkt geklärt werden, zu dem die Person das Hoheitsgebiet der Mitgliedstaaten erreicht.

Der Kommission sind Berichte über angebliche Misshandlungen bei der Grenzkontrolle bekannt. In solchen Fällen fordert die Kommission Informationen von nationalen Behörden an, um die Vorwürfe zu untersuchen. Sie behält sich das Recht vor, geeignete Schritte zu unternehmen, wenn sich herausstellt, dass ein Mitgliedstaat gegen EU-Recht verstoßen hat.

Die Kommission ist über Pläne zur Verstärkung von Grenzinfrastrukturen/-ausrüstungen an den Außengrenzen bestimmter Mitgliedstaaten informiert.

Sie hat einigen Drittländern Unterstützung für die Grenzverwaltung über EU-Instrumente für die externe Zusammenarbeit gewährt. Die EU unterstützt ihre Partner bei der Anwendung des Konzepts der integrierten Grenzverwaltung, in dem der Grundsatz enthalten ist, dass alle Grenzverwaltungsaktivitäten unter vollkommener Wahrung der Menschenrechte durchzuführen sind. Eine EU-Unterstützung für Grenzschutzinfrastrukturen/-ausrüstungen in Drittländern ist immer mit weiter gehenden Reformen verbunden, einschließlich Maßnahmen zur angemessenen Behandlung von Migranten und Asylsuchenden an den Grenzen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001773/14
to the Commission
Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Refugee catastrophe off the coast of Ceuta

In light of the reports of 6 February 2014 concerning the death of refugees off the coast of Ceuta and other incidents on the borders of Europe (for example Farmakonisi) and in consideration of the eye witness reports stating that there were acts of violence committed by European action forces in order to prevent the refugees from reaching the border, the following questions must be raised:

1. What is the Commission considering in order to prevent such fatal episodes in the future?

2. What is the Commission considering in order to ensure that there are no persons in need of protection amongst those refugees whose entry is blocked?

3. Is the Commission aware of any reports of violence being used by border protection authorities within the EU in order to prevent refugees entering the EU?

4. Which efforts is the Commission making in order to investigate infringements against EC law committed in connection with border protection?

5. In the opinion of the Commission, which possibilities are there of enforcing the observance of European law during border protection actions and which efforts is it making in order to ensure observance?

6. Is the Commission aware of any plans to re-equip border protection fencing with razor wire?

7. If yes, which possibilities is the Commission using in order to ensure that European Union funds made available to third countries for border protection are not being used for measures that could endanger the lives of refugees or that infringe against EC law?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The Commission regrets the loss of life in these incidents. Measures to help prevent such tragedies are being pursued, including more cooperation with third countries, reinforced border surveillance, such as via Eurosur, and effective asylum and return procedures. On the incident near Ceuta, the Commission considers that force should not be used as a deterrent in border surveillance; any use of force should be proportionate and justified in safeguarding the lives of border guards.

Mixed migratory flows are common. Border surveillance must nevertheless be carried out in a way which respects the principle of non-refoulement. The circumstances of each individual, including whether they are seeking international protection, can be addressed when they reach the territory of Member States.

The Commission is aware of past reports alleging ill-treatment in border control. In such cases, the Commission requests information from national authorities to be able to carry out an assessment. The Commission reserves the right to take appropriate steps where there is evidence that a Member State has violated EC law.

The Commission is aware of plans to reinforce border infrastructure/equipment at certain areas of Member States' external borders.

The Commission has provided support to some third countries for border management via EU external cooperation instruments. The EU supports partners in applying the Integrated Border Management concept, which stresses that all border management activities must be conducted in full respect of human rights. EU support for border control infrastructure/equipment in third countries is always associated with wider reforms, including measures to ensure proper treatment of migrants and asylum-seekers at borders.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001776/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(17 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-faċilitazzjoni tal-libertà tal-moviment għaċ-ċittadini tal-UE

Wieħed mid-drittijiet li jgawdu minnhom iċ-ċittadini Ewropej huwa dak tal-libertà tal-moviment fl-Unjoni Ewropea.

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja minn xi differenzi fost l-Istati Membri fil-livell ta' ospitalità offrut lil ċittadini ta' Stati Membri oħra li jmorru jgħixu fi Stat Membru partikolari?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Hahn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(23 ta' April 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni ttenni l-importanza u l-benefiċċji tal-moviment liberu taċ-ċittadini tal-UE fil-Komunikazzjoni tagħha tal-25 ta' Novembru 2013 dwar "Il-moviment liberu taċ-ċittadini tal-UE u l-familji tagħhom: Ħames azzjonijiet li jagħmlu differenza" ([1]).

F'dan il-kuntest, hija ffukat b'mod partikolari fuq l-importanza li jiġi promoss l-għarfien tar-regoli tal-UE fil-livell lokali u jitħeġġeġ l-iskambju tal-aħjar prattiki żviluppati madwar l-Ewropa fl-implimentazzjoni ta' dawn ir-regoli u l-indirizzar tal-isfidi tal-inklużjoni soċjali.

Dan l-aħħar il-Kummissjoni kkummissjonat studju dwar l-impatt tal-moviment ħieles f'livell lokali ([2]) li eżamina l-politiki ta' lqugħ u ta' inklużjoni f'sitt ibliet Ewropej (Barċellona, Dublin, Hamburg, Lille, Praga u Turin). L-istudju kkonkluda li l-politiki lokali li jippromwovu ambjent inklużiv u kultura akkoljenti lejn il-moviment ħieles wasslu għal titjib progressiv ta' attitudni pożittiva tal-komunitajiet lokali lejn id-diversità u l-mobbiltà.

Dawn is-sejbiet kienu skont ir-riżultat ta' Konferenza dwar il-mobilità fl-UE fil-livell lokali li saret fil-11 ta' Far 2014, u li kienet koorganizzata mill-Kummissjoni u l-Kumitat tar-Reġjuni. Il-konferenza ġabret aktar minn 200 parteċipant mill-awtoritajiet lokali u reġjonali madwar l-UE u ppermettiet okkażjoni oħra biex jiġu skambjati l-aħjar prattiki dwar il-politiki ta' lqugħ.

([1]) COM(2013) 837 finali — http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/document/files/com_2013_837_free-movement_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/dg_just_eva_free_mov_final_report_27.01.14.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001776/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Facilitation of freedom of movement for EU citizens

One of the rights that European citizens enjoy is that of freedom of movement within the European Union.

Is the Commission aware of any differences between Member States in the degree of hospitality offered towards citizens of other Member States coming to live in the Member State concerned?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

The Commission reaffirmed the importance and the benefits of free movement of EU citizens in its communication of 25 November 2013 on 'Free movement of EU citizens and their families: Five actions to make a difference' ([1]).

In this context, it focused in particular on the importance of promoting the knowledge of EU rules at local level and fostering the exchange of best practices developed across Europe in implementing such rules and addressing social inclusion challenges.

The Commission also recently commissioned a study on the impact of free movement at local level ([2]) which examined welcoming and inclusion policies in six European cities (Barcelona, Dublin, Hamburg, Lille, Prague and Turin). The study concluded that local policies promoting an inclusive environment and a welcoming culture towards free movement resulted in a progressive improvement of a positive attitude of local communities towards diversity and mobility.

These findings were comforted by the outcome of a Conference co-organised by the Commission and the Committee of the Regions on EU mobility at local level on 11 February 2014, which gathered more than 200 participants from local and regional authorities around the EU and allowed for a further occasion to exchange best practices on welcoming policies.

([1]) COM(2013) 837 final — http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/document/files/com_2013_837_free-movement_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/dg_just_eva_free_mov_final_report_27.01.14.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001777/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(17 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Istituzzjonijiet li jgħinu l-moviment liberu

Il-Kummissjoni taf b'xi istituzzjonijiet fl-Istati Membri tat-tip "punt ta' kuntatt waħdeieni" li l-għan ewlieni tagħhom hu li jgħinu lil ċittadini tal-UE minn Stati Membri oħra jistabbilixxu ruħhom fl-Istat Membru ospitanti?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Hahn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(22 ta' April 2014)

Il-Europe Direct ([1]) tinforma liċ-ċittadini dwar kwistjonijiet tal-UE. Tinkludi "l fuq minn 500 Ċentru ta" Informazzjoni tal-Europe Direct fl-Istati Membri ([2]). L-Ewropa Tiegħek ([3]) tipprovdi informazzjoni onlajn dwar id-drittijiet tal-UE u aċċess għal servizzi ta' pariri u ta' soluzzjoni għall-problemi ([4]).

Il-Kummissjoni mhix konxja tat-tip ta' istituzzjonijet ta' "punt ta' kuntatt waħdieni" fl-Istati Membri stabbiliti speċifikament biex jipprovdu assistenza personalizzata liċ-ċittadini tal-UE li jmorru jgħixu hemm ([5]). Madankollu numru ta' portali nazzjonali jipprovdu informazzjoni għal ċittadini mobbli tal-UE ([6]). Xi portali joffru wkoll linji ta' għajnuna u aċċess għal servizzi ta' assistenza ([7]). Reċentement, il-Kummissjoni stiednet lill-Istati Membri biex jagħmlu l-informazzjoni disponibbli fuq il-portali tagħhom biex jippermettu liċ-ċittadini u n-negozji biex jagħmlu użu effettiv mid-drittijiet tagħhom tal-UE ([8]).

F'konsultazzjonijiet, iċ-ċittadini ssottolinjaw l-importanza ta' punti ta' kuntatt waħdanin fl-Istati Membri fejn ċittadini mobbli tal-UE jkunu jistgħu jiksbu għajnuna meta jmorru joqogħdu hemm ([9]). Dawn jeżistu pereżempju għal forniturі ta' servizzi ([10]) u riċerkaturi ([11]). Il-proposta tal-Kummissjoni ([12]) għal Direttiva li tiffaċilita t-tħaddim mill-ħaddiema tad-dritt tagħhom tal-moviment liberu li ladarba adottat u traspost jippermetti għal informazzjoni u assistenza aħjar fil-livell nazzjonali għal ħaddiema mobbli tal-UE. B'segwitu għar-Rapport tagħha tal-2013 dwar iċ-Ċittadinanza tal-UE ([13]) il-Kummissjoni qed tiżviluppa għodda ta' taħriġ onlajn għal persunal f'amministrazzjonijiet lokali biex jifhmu aħjar ir-regoli tal-moviment liberu, hekk kif jinsabu fuq quddiemnett biex jinfurmaw liċ-ċittadini mobbli tal-UE u jimplimentaw id-drittijiet tagħhom ta' moviment liberu.

([1]) http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_mt.htm
([2]) Kien hemm madwar 900 000 kuntatt personali fl-2013.
([3]) http://europa.eu/youreurope/.
([4]) bħalma huma Your Europe Advice (Pariri tal-Ewropa Tiegħek), SOLVIT, EURES (Servizzi Ewropej tal-Impjieg).
([5]) pereżempju dwar formalitajiet ta' reġistrazzjoni, akkomodazzjoni, saħħa, edukazzjoni, impjiegi, eċċ.
([6]) pereżempju l-Awstrija (https://www.help.gv.at/Portal.Node/hlpd/public/en), il-Belġju (http://www.belgium.be/en/).
([7]) pereżempju d-Danimarka (https://lifeindenmark.borger.dk/Pages/default.aspx), l-Isvezja (http://www.migrationsverket.se/4.123a9453141c5ece6112e.html), l-Irlanda (http://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/). Aktar informazzjoni dwar portali nazzjonali tista' tinsab fit-Tabella ta' Valutazzjoni tas-Suq Uniku: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/scoreboard/, ara taħt "Prestazzjoni minn Stat Membru", "L-Ewropa Tiegħek".
([8]) Il-komunikazzjoni "Tingħata aktar setgħa lin-negozji u ċ-ċittadini fis-suq uniku tal-Ewropa: Pjan ta' Azzjoni li jagħti spinta 'l quddiem lill-Ewropa Tiegħek f'kooperazzjoni mal-Istati Membri". COM(2013) 636 finali.
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/eu-citizen-brochure_en.pdf — ara notabbilment paġna 9 u 34.
([10]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/eu-go/index_mt.htm
([11]) http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/
([12]) COM(2013) 236 finali.
([13]) Ara azzjoni 10 — http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013eucitizenshipreport_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001777/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Institutions aiding freedom of movement

Is the Commission aware of any 'one-stop shop' type institutions in Member States the main purpose of which is to help EU citizens from other Member States establish themselves in the host Member State?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

Europe Direct ([1]) informs citizens on EU matters. It includes over 500 Europe Direct Information Centres in the Member States ([2]). Your Europe ([3]) provides online information on EU rights and access to advice and problem-solving services ([4]).

The Commission is not aware of 'one stop shop' type institutions in the Member States specifically set-up to provide personalised assistance to EU citizens who come to reside there ([5]). However a number of national portals provide information for mobile EU citizens ([6]). Some portals also offer helplines and access to assistance services ([7]). Recently, the Commission invited Member States to make information available on their portals to enable citizens and businesses to make effective use of their EU rights ([8]).

In consultations, citizens underlined the relevance of single contact points in the Member States where mobile EU citizens could get help when settling there ([9]). They for example exist for service providers ([10]) and researchers ([11]). The Commission proposal ([12]) for a directive to facilitate the exercise by workers of their right of free movement once adopted and transposed will allow for better information and assistance at national level for mobile EU workers. Following its 2013 EU Citizenship Report ([13]) the Commission is developing an e-training tool for staff in local administrations to better comprehend free movement rules, as they are in the forefront for informing mobile EU citizens and implementing their free movement rights.

([1]) http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm
([2]) There were around 900 000 personal contacts in 2013.
([3]) http://europa.eu/youreurope/.
([4]) Such as Your Europe Advice, Solvit, EURES.
([5]) For example on registration formalities, housing, health, education, jobs, etc.
([6]) For instance Austria (https://www.help.gv.at/Portal.Node/hlpd/public/en), Belgium (http://www.belgium.be/en/).
([7]) For instance Denmark (https://lifeindenmark.borger.dk/Pages/default.aspx), Sweden (http://www.migrationsverket.se/4.123a9453141c5ece6112e.html), Ireland (http://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/). More information about national portals can be found in the Single Market Scoreboard: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/scoreboard/ — see under 'Performance by Member State', 'Your Europe'.
([8]) Communication 'Empowering businesses and citizens in Europe's single market: An Action Plan for boosting Your Europe in cooperation with the Member States' COM(2013) 636 final.
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/eu-citizen-brochure_en.pdf — see notably page 9 and 34.
([10]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/eu-go/index_en.htm
([11]) http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/.
([12]) COM(2013) 236 final.
([13]) See action 10 — http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013eucitizenshipreport_en.pdf

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001780/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Borba protiv dobro umreženih transgraničnih kriminalnih skupina s područja bivše Jugoslavije

Rezolucijom od 23. listopada 2013. o organiziranom kriminalu, korupciji i pranju novca Parlament je ponovio svoj poziv Komisiji da predloži zajedničke pravosudne norme za jačanje integracije i suradnje među državama članicama.

Povezanost kriminalnih skupina iz Republike Hrvatske s onima iz ostalih bivših republika SFRJ-a predstavlja veliki problem. Ta je povezanost razvijena prije Domovinskog rata dok danas međunarodno priznate granice suverenih i neovisnih nacionalnih država još nisu postojale u takvoj formi, a rat je predstavljao idealnu priliku za produbljivanje kriminalne suradnje.

Unatoč ulasku Hrvatske i Slovenije u EU, prekogranična umreženost kriminalnih organizacija s prostora bivše Jugoslavije nije oslabila te danas predstavlja gorući problem u sferi organiziranog kriminala u ovim državama.

Željela bih ovim putem pitati Komisiju hoće li sukladno gore navedenoj Rezoluciji Europskog parlamenta predložiti pravosudne i druge norme kojima će se posebno adresirati problem umreženosti kriminalnih organizacija s prostora bivše Jugoslavije.

Podsjetit ću da se, osim Hrvatske i Slovenije koje su članice, radi o državama kandidatkinjama i potencijalnim kandidatkinjama te da bi ignoriranje ovog problema u procesu pristupnih pregovora vrlo izvjesno uzrokovalo veliku ugrozu za unutrašnju sigurnost Unije nakon pristupanja tih država ovoj zajednici.

Odgovor gđe Malmström u ime Komisije
(22. travnja 2014.)

Kako je naglašeno u Komunikaciji „Put ka ostvarenju otvorene i sigurne Europe” ([1]), Komisija smatra da je potrebno djelovanje u borbi protiv organiziranog kriminala unutar i izvan EU-a: direktiva o zamrzavanju i oduzimanju imovinske koristi ostvarene kaznenim djelima ([2]) mora biti provedena bez odgode te treba poboljšati sljedivost imovine.

Direktiva o trgovanju ljudima ([3]) mora biti u potpunosti provedena te je potrebno ispitati potrebu kriminalizacije svjesnog korištenja usluga žrtava trgovanja ljudima. Ulaganjem većih napora u provedbu zakona i revizijom relevantnog zakonodavstva EU-a može se pridonijeti rješavanju problema nezakonitog korištenja i trgovanja vatrenim oružjem.

Povećanom razmjenom informacija, korištenjem zajedničkih istražnih timova i zajedničkim operacijama poduprtim sredstvima i agencijama EU-a ojačala bi se operativna suradnja između nacionalnih tijela i međusobno povjerenje. Regionalna dimenzija organiziranog kriminala, primjerice u pogledu zapadnog Balkana, uzeta je u obzir u okviru ciklusa politike EU-a protiv teškog i organiziranog kriminala 2014. — 2017. To je vidljivo iz razvoja i provedbe mjera protiv trgovanja ljudima, organiziranog imovinskog kriminaliteta i trgovanja vatrenim oružjem.

Vladavina prava u samoj je srži pristupnog procesa. Od država pristupnica zahtijeva se temeljita reforma njihova sudskog sustava i sustava provedbe zakona kako bi se bolje nosile s kriminalom i korupcijom. Novi pristup za zemlje koje s Unijom vode pregovore o pristupanju usredotočen je na usklađivanje zakonodavstva, izgradnju institucija i konkretne rezultate u svim područjima koja obuhvaća vladavina prava radi znatnog poboljšanja rezultata borbe protiv kriminala i korupcije. Potpora u sklopu instrumenta pretpristupne pomoći (IPA) namijenjena je za reforme u tom području tijekom narednih sedam godina.

([1]) COM(2014) 154 završna verzija, 11. ožujka 2014.
([2]) Direktiva Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća o zamrzavanju i oduzimanju imovinske koristi ostvarene kaznenim djelima u Europskoj uniji, očekuje se potpis i objava akta.
([3]) Direktiva 2011/36/EU Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 5. travnja 2011. o sprečavanju i suzbijanju trgovanja ljudima i zaštiti njezinih žrtava te o zamjeni Okvirne odluke Vijeća 2002/629/PUP; SL L 101, 15.4.2011., str. 1. — 11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001780/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: The fight against interconnected, cross-border criminal groups from the former Yugoslavia

In its resolution of 23 October 2013 on organised crime, corruption and money laundering, the Parliament renewed its call to the Commission to propose common judicial standards to strengthen integration and cooperation between Member States.

The connections criminal groups from Croatia have with those from other former Yugoslav republics pose a great problem. These connections were developed before the Croatian War of Independence, when the internationally recognised borders of the sovereign and independent national states did not exist as they do today, and the war presented an ideal opportunity for deepening criminal cooperation.

Despite Croatia and Slovenia's accession to the EU, the cross-border ties of criminal organisations from the former Yugoslavia have not weakened, with these ties now constituting a burning issue in the context of organised crime in these countries.

I would like to ask the Commission whether it will propose, in accordance with the above Resolution of the European Parliament, judicial and other standards that will specifically address the problem of the close ties between criminal organisations from the former Yugoslavia.

I would like to remind you that, apart from the EU Member States of Croatia and Slovenia, the countries involved are EU candidates and potential candidates, and that ignoring this problem in the accession negotiation process will most likely pose a great threat to EU internal security after their accession to this Union.

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

As underlined in its communication 'An open and secure Europe: making it happen' ([1]), the Commission believes that actions are required to counter organised crime within the EU and beyond: the directive on the freezing and confiscation of proceeds of crime ([2]) needs to be implemented without delay and tracing of assets should be improved.

The directive on trafficking in human beings ([3]) must be fully implemented and the need to criminalise the intentional use of services of human trafficking victims should be examined. Illegal use and trafficking of firearms can be tackled through stronger law enforcement efforts and revising relevant EU legislation.

Increased information exchange, use of Joint Investigation Teams and joint operations supported by EU funds and agencies would strengthen operational cooperation between national authorities and mutual trust. The regional dimension of organised crime, for example regarding the western Balkans, is taken into account within the EU policy cycle against serious and organised crime 2014-2017. This is reflected in the development and implementation of steps against trafficking in human beings, organised property crime and the trafficking of firearms.

The rule of law is at the heart of the accession process. Enlargement countries are required to thoroughly reform their judicial and law enforcement systems to better tackle crime and corruption. The new approach for countries negotiating their accession focuses on legal alignment, institution building and concrete results in all areas falling under the rule of law with a view to substantially improving the track record of fighting crime and corruption. IPA support has been reserved to support reforms in this field in the next seven years.

([1]) COM(2014) 154 final, 11 March 2014.
([2]) Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the freezing and confiscation of proceeds of crime in the European Union, act awaiting signature and publication.
([3]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA; OJ L 101, 15.04.2011, p. 1-11.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001782/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Ovlasti i financiranje nacionalnih kontaktnih mjesta u borbi protiv zavaravajućih marketinških praksi

Rezolucija Europskog parlamenta od 22. listopada 2013. o zavaravajućim praksama oglašavanja poziva sve države članice da uspostave ili odrede nacionalno kontaktno mjesto na kojemu poslovni subjekti i druge žrtve zavaravajućih praksi mogu prijaviti te prakse i dobiti informacije o sudskim i izvansudskim pravnim lijekovima te pomoć i stručno znanje o sprječavanju i rješavanju problema različitih oblika prijevare.

Parlament pritom smatra da bi svako kontaktno mjesto trebalo imati bazu podataka u koju se bilježe sve vrste zavaravajućih marketinških praksi i koja sadrži lako razumljive primjere te poziva Komisiju da osigura koordinaciju neometane razmjene informacija iz nacionalnih baza podataka.

Željela bih ovim putem pitati Komisiju pod čijim bi pokroviteljstvom ta kontaktna mjesta trebala djelovati te predviđa li Komisija neke druge ovlasti osim kreiranja nacionalne baze podataka i informiranja prevarenih subjekata. Može li Komisija navesti najbolje prakse u osnivanju, funkcioniranju i koordinaciji takvih organa?

Odgovor gđe Reding u ime Komisije
(10. travnja 2014.)

Komisija razmatra reviziju Direktive 2006/114/EZ o zavaravajućem i komparativnom oglašavanju. Jedan od mogućih instrumenata koji se može uzeti u obzir jest jačanje suradnje među državama članicama u prekograničnim slučajevima zavaravajuće marketinške prakse među poduzećima.

Iako su podložni potpunoj procjeni učinka, nekoliko je mogućih instrumenata koji bi se mogli uzeti u obzir za provedbu ovog prijedloga, poput prekograničnog provedbenog postupka u okviru kojeg se koristi postojećim Informacijskim sustavom unutarnjeg tržišta utvrđenog Uredbom (EU) br. 1024/2012, a koji bi se mogao razmotriti za jačanje učinkovitosti i djelotvornosti u provedbi propisa EU-a u prekograničnim slučajevima. Ishod takve procjene učinka poslužit će Komisiji kao pokazatelj prilikom poduzimanja sljedećih koraka.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001782/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Powers and funding of national contact points in the fight against misleading marketing practices

Parliament's Resolution of 22 October 2013 on misleading advertisement practices calls on all Member States to establish or designate national contact points where businesses and other victims of misleading practices can report such practices and obtain information on judicial and non-judicial remedies, help and expertise on preventing and resolving problems related to various forms of fraud.

At the same time, Parliament feels that each of these contact points should have a database documenting all types of misleading marketing practices and setting out easily understood examples, and it calls on the Commission to ensure the coordination of the smooth exchange of information from national databases.

Could the Commission say under whose auspices these contact points would operate, and does it anticipate that they will have any powers other than creating national databases and informing victims of fraud? Can the Commission indicate the best practices for establishing, running and coordinating such agencies?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The Commission is exploring a revision of Directive 2006/114/EC on misleading and comparative advertising. One of the policy options that could be considered is to strengthen the cooperation of Member States in cross-border cases of business-to-business misleading marketing practices.

Subject to a full impact assessment, a number of policy options could be considered to implement this, such as a cross border enforcement procedure using the existing Internal Market Information (IMI) system laid down by Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012 that could be envisaged in order to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of enforcement of EU rules in cross-border cases. The outcome of such an impact assessment would guide the Commission as to further steps.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001783/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Razoružanje zapadnog Balkana u kontekstu sveobuhvatne strategije o oružju u EU-u

Europska se društva sve češće susreću s raznim manifestacijama organiziranog kriminala i međunarodnog terorizma pa je Europski parlament pozvao Komisiju da donese sveobuhvatnu strategiju o oružju, uključujući njegovu uporabu u svrhu nezakonite trgovine, organiziranog kriminala i terorizma.

Pristupanjem preostalih zemalja jugoistočne Europe Europskoj uniji otvorit ćemo svoje granice državama s neriješenim problemom velikih količina ilegalnog oružja zaostalog iz ratova koji su uslijedili raspadom bivše Jugoslavije.

S obzirom na to da se radi o državama kandidatkinjama i potencijalnim kandidatkinjama, planira li Komisija u skladu s budućom sveobuhvatnom strategijom o oružju ugraditi posebne kriterije i mjere u proces pristupnih pregovora kako bismo mogli jamčiti svojim građanima da daljnje širenje Unije neće predstavljati unutrašnji sigurnosni rizik?

Odgovor g. Fülea u ime Komisije
(11. travnja 2014.)

U području vanjskog djelovanja, strategija EU-a za suzbijanje nezakonitog prikupljanja i trgovanja malim i lakim oružjem i njihovim streljivom iz 2005. i dalje je bitna. Države kandidatkinje za pristupanje EU-u moraju uskladiti nacionalno zakonodavstvo s postojećim instrumentima o izvozu, posredovanju u trgovini, stjecanju, posjedovanju i nezakonitoj trgovini oružjem ([1]). Neširenje i kontrola malog i lakog oružja obuhvaćeni su pravnom stečevinom u poglavljima 30. (Vanjski odnosi) i 31. (Zajednička vanjska, sigurnosna i obrambena politika). U skladu s preporukama Konferencije o kontroli oružja EUSR-a/ UNDP-a koja se održala u Bosni i Hercegovini 18. i 19. lipnja 2013., države kandidatkinje morat će pripremiti i provesti strategiju o malom i lakom oružju, uključujući uništavanje i sigurnosne mjere za trgovinu oružjem te donošenje normi EU-a u području umanjivanja rizika povezanih s vatrenim oružjem ([2]).

Na forumu ministara pravosuđa i unutarnjih poslova EU-a i Zapadnog Balkana održanom od 19. do 20. prosinca 2013. obje su strane prepoznale potrebu za jačanjem napora u borbi protiv nezakonitog trgovanja i prikupljanja vatrenog oružja na Zapadnom Balkanu. Sve su se strane složile da bi u svrhu borbe protiv nezakonitog trgovanja vatrenim oružjem trebalo osnovati regionalnu mrežu stručnjaka u kojoj bi sudjelovali predstavnici policije, pravosudnih tijela i carinskih službi.

([1]) Komunikacija Komisije Vijeću i Europskom parlamentu o oružju i unutarnjoj sigurnosti EU-a: zaštita građana i suzbijanje nezakonite trgovine od 21. 10. 2013. COM(2013) 716, završna verzija, str. 10.

([2]) Komunikacija Komisije Vijeću i Europskom parlamentu o oružju i unutarnjoj sigurnosti EU-a: zaštita građana i suzbijanje nezakonite trgovine od 21. 10. 2013. COM(2013) 716, završna verzija, str. 14.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001783/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Disarming the western Balkans as part of a comprehensive strategy on weapons in the EU

European societies are increasingly faced with various signs of organised crime and international terrorism, and so the European Parliament has called upon the Commission to adopt a comprehensive strategy on weapons, including their use in illegal trade, organised crime and terrorism.

With the accession of the remaining countries of south-east Europe to the European Union, we will be opening our borders to countries with unresolved problems concerning the large quantities of illegal weapons left over from the wars that followed the breakup of the former Yugoslavia.

Considering that these are candidate and potential candidate countries, does the Commission plan as part of its future comprehensive strategy on weapons to incorporate special criteria and measures into their accession negotiations so that we can guarantee our citizens that further EU enlargement will not pose an internal security risk?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

In terms of external action, the 2005 EU strategy to combat the illicit accumulation and trafficking of small arms and light weapons and their ammunition continues to be relevant. Candidate countries for accession to the EU are required to align their national legislation with existing instruments concerning the export, brokering, acquisition, possession and trafficking of weapons ([1]). Non-proliferation, control of small arms and light weapons are covered by the *acquis* on chapters 30 (External relations) and 31 (Common Foreign, Security and Defence Policy). In line with recommendations from the EUSR/UNDP Conference on Arms Control which took place in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 18 and 19 June 2013, candidate countries are requested to devise and to implement a strategy on small arms and light weapons, including the destruction or securing of arms stores and the adoption of EU standards in firearm minimisation ([2]).

At the EU-Western Balkans Ministerial Forum on Justice and Home Affairs on 19-20 December 2013, parties acknowledged the need to enhance efforts to counter the illicit trafficking and accumulation of firearms in the western Balkans. All parties agreed that a regional experts' network should be set up to combat illicit trafficking in firearms, within which police, justice and customs services would be represented.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on firearms and the internal security of the EU: protecting citizens and disrupting illegal trafficking of 21.10.2013 COM(2013) 716 final, p. 10.

([2]) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on firearms and the internal security of the EU: protecting citizens and disrupting illegal trafficking of 21.10.2013 COM(2013) 716 final, p. 14.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001784/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Segregacija manjina u obrazovnom sustavu RH

U svojoj rezoluciji od 12. prosinca 2013. o napretku u provedbi nacionalnih strategija za integraciju Roma Europski je parlament pozvao države članice da iskorijene segregaciju na području obrazovanja i po potrebi nezakonitog smještanja romske djece u posebne škole te da stvore potrebnu infrastrukturu i nužne mehanizme za olakšavanje pristupa kvalitetnom obrazovanju svoj romskoj djeci.

Presuda Velikog vijeća Europskog suda za ljudska prava u slučaju Oršuš i drugi protiv Hrvatske iz 2010. našoj je državi bila jasna opomena kako odvojeni „romski razredi" nisu u skladu s civilizacijskim normama koje se danas primjenjuju u Europi.

Dok se s jedne strane s pravom inzistira na integraciji Roma u europska društva, pripadnicima drugih nacionalnih manjina u Republici Hrvatskoj se, navodno sukladno europskim praksama, dopušta da imaju odvojene razrede i škole, a u pojedinim se školskim predmetima tolerira i nastavni program koji nije u skladu s nacionalnim programom.

Željela bih pitati Komisiju smatra li da bi se i pripadnike ostalih nacionalnih manjina, a ne samo one romske, trebalo integrirati u zajedničke razrede i škole te uključiti u nacionalni nastavni program kako bi oni po završetku školovanja bili konkurentni na hrvatskom tržištu rada i bolje integrirani u hrvatsko društvo.

Odgovor g. Hahna u ime Komisije
(5. svibnja 2014.)

Poštovanje prava osoba koje pripadaju manjinama jedna je od temeljnih vrijednosti Europske unije (članak 2. UEU-a). Nadalje, člankom 21. Povelje o temeljnim pravima Europske unije zabranjuje se diskriminacija na temelju pripadnosti nacionalnoj manjini.

Direktivom 2000/43/EZ o rasnoj jednakosti zabranjuje se diskriminacija na temelju rasnog ili etničkog podrijetla u nekoliko područja, uključujući obrazovanje. Komisija nadzire usklađenost država članica s tom Direktivom te će u slučaju kršenja odredbi te Direktive poduzeti odgovarajuće mjere. Osim toga, Komisija je svojom komunikacijom o Okviru EU-a za nacionalne strategije integracije Roma, koja je donesena u 2011., pozvala sve države članice EU-a da osiguraju romskoj djeci pristup kvalitetnom obrazovanju te ih zaštite od diskriminacije ili segregacije. Preporukom Vijeća od 9. prosinca 2013. o učinkovitim mjerama integracije Roma u državama članicama (2013/C/378/01) poziva se države članice da iskorijene segregaciju u školama te spriječe neprimjereno smještanje romskih učenika u škole za učenike s posebnim potrebama te na taj način osiguraju jednako postupanje.

Također treba podsjetiti da Unija ima ograničene ovlasti u odnosu na obrazovanje (članci 165. i 166. UFEU-a) koje je uglavnom u nadležnosti država članica. U tom smislu, države članice imaju obvezu upotrijebiti sve odgovarajuće mjere kako bi osigurale da su temeljna prava osoba koje pripadaju manjinama i žive na njihovu državnom području učinkovito zaštićena u skladu s ustavnim poretkom i obvezama iz međunarodnog prava.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001784/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Segregation of minorities in the Croatian education system

In its resolution of 12 December 2013 on the progress made in the implementation of national Roma integration strategies, the European Parliament called on Member States to eliminate segregation in the field of education and the illicit placement of Roma children in special schools, where relevant, and to create the necessary infrastructure and mechanisms to facilitate access to quality education for all Roma children.

The judgment of the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights in the case Oršuš and Others v. Croatia of 2010 was a clear warning to Croatia that separate 'Roma classes' do not comply with the civil standards applied today in Europe.

While on the one hand the integration of Roma into European societies is rightly insisted on, members of other national minorities in Croatia are allowed, supposedly in accordance with European practices, to have separate classes and schools, and even a curriculum different to the national curriculum in certain school subjects is also tolerated.

I would like to ask the Commission whether it considers that members of other national minorities, and not just the Roma minority, should also be integrated into common classes and schools, and be part of the national curriculum, so that on completion of their schooling they will be competitive on the Croatian labour market and better integrated into Croatian society.

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 May 2014)

The respect for the rights of persons belonging to minorities is one of the founding values of the European Union (Article 2 TEU). Furthermore, Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union prohibits discrimination based on membership of a national minority.

Directive 2000/43/EC on Racial Equality prohibits discrimination on grounds of racial or ethnic origin in a number of fields, including education. The Commission monitors the Member States' compliance with the directive and will consider taking appropriate action whenever there is a breach. In addition, with its communication on the EU framework for National Roma Integration Strategies, adopted in 2011, the Commission invited all EU Member States to ensure that all Roma children have access to quality education and are not subject to discrimination or segregation. Furthermore, the Council Recommendation of 9 December 2013 on effective Roma integration measures in the Member States (2013/C 378/01) calls the Member States to ensure equal treatment by eliminating any school segregation and by putting an end to any inappropriate placement of Roma pupils in special needs schools.

Finally, it is to be recalled that the Union has limited powers regarding education (Articles 165 and 166 TFEU), which mainly falls under the competence of the Member States. In this respect, the Member States are bound to use all appropriate means to guarantee that the fundamental rights of persons belonging to minorities living on their territories are effectively protected in accordance with their constitutional order and obligations under international law.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001785/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Ustroj i ovlasti neformalne operativne mreže protiv mafije

Rezolucijom od 23. listopada 2013. o organiziranom kriminalu, korupciji i pranju novca Parlament traži od država članica da na nacionalnoj razini osnuju strukture za istrage i borbu protiv kriminalnih i mafijaških organizacija uz mogućnost razvoja, u koordinaciji Europola i uz potporu Komisije, neformalne „operativne mreže protiv mafije" za razmjenu informacija o strukturnim vidovima mafija koje su prisutne na određenim područjima, kriminalnim i financijskim planovima, lokaciji imovine te pokušajima infiltracije u postupke javne nabave.

Željela bih ovim putem zatražiti od Komisije podrobnije informacije o neformalnoj „operativnoj mreži protiv mafije" koja bi, uz njezinu potporu, trebala biti razvijena unutar Europske unije. Iako se u Rezoluciji navodi da bi bila neformalna, u kakvom bi obliku ta operativna mreža trebala postojati i koje bi ovlasti trebala imati? Pod čijim nadzorom bi trebala djelovati i odakle će se financirati njezin rad?

Odgovor gđe Malmström u ime Komisije
(2. travnja 2014.)

Komisija nije svjesna dosad poduzetih posebnih inicijativa za provedbu preporuke Europskog parlamenta kojom se poziva države članice na moguću uspostavu neformalne operativne mreže protiv mafije. Istom se preporukom države članice poziva i na uspostavu nacionalnih tijela za istragu i borbu protiv zločinačkih i mafijaških organizacija.

Primjer postojeće neformalne mreže je platforma o uredima EU-a za oduzimanje imovinske koristi (ARO) pod predsjedanjem Komisije i Europola. Njezin je cilj održavati redovne sastanke i tako olakšati operativnu suradnju i razmjenu najbolje prakse među uredima za oduzimanje imovinske koristi u praćenju nezakonito stečene imovine. Kao posljedica toga, operativne aktivnosti nacionalnih ureda za oduzimanje imovinske koristi u znatnom su porastu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001785/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Structure and powers of informal anti-mafia operational networks

In its resolution of 23 October 2013 on organised crime, corruption and money laundering, Parliament called on the Member States to set up national structures to investigate and combat criminal and mafia organisations capable of developing, with Europol coordination and Commission support, informal 'anti-mafia operational networks' to exchange information on the structural features of mafia groups operating in particular areas, criminal and financial plans, the locations of property and attempts to infiltrate public procurement procedures.

Can the Commission provide more detailed information on the informal 'anti-mafia operational network' that should be developed, with the Commission's support, within the European Union? The resolution states that such a network would be informal; however, what form should the operational network take and what powers should it have? Under whose supervision should it operate and from where will it draw funds for its operations?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission is not aware of specific initiatives undertaken so far to implement the European Parliament recommendation calling on Member States to possibly develop an informal anti-mafia operational network. The same recommendation also calls Member States to create national bodies for investigating and combating criminal and mafia-type organisations.

An example of existing informal network is the EU Asset Recovery Offices' (ARO) Platform, chaired by the Commission and Europol. It aims at facilitating, through regular meetings, operational cooperation and exchange of best practices between the AROs on the tracing of criminal assets. As a result, the operational activities of the national AROs have substantially increased.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001786/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Zloporaba modela oduzimanja imovinske koristi stečene kaznenim djelom bez presude

Rezolucijom od 23. listopada 2013. o organiziranom kriminalu, korupciji i pranju novca Parlament je pozvao države članice da na temelju najnaprednijih nacionalnih propisa uvedu modele oduzimanja imovinske koristi stečene kaznenim djelom bez presude u slučajevima kad je moguće utvrditi, na temelju dostupnih dokaza i odluke suda, da je predmetna imovinska korist stečena kaznenim djelom ili se koristi za počinjenje kaznenog djela.

Svjesna potrebe da se društvo oštećeno kriminalnim aktivnostima pojedinaca ili skupina na neki način obešteti i zaštiti, svejedno sam zabrinuta jer se bojim da će ovakav institut biti lako zlorabljen u državama članicama u kojima nije osigurana potpuna vladavina prava i u kojima politika još uvijek ima velik utjecaj na policiju i sudstvo.

Stoga bih željela pitati Komisiju kakve zaštitne mehanizme odnosno mjere preporučuje državama članicama pri provedbi ovog instituta koji predlaže Parlament, a u svrhu sprječavanja zloporabe u okviru politički montiranih ili motiviranih procesa.

Odgovor gđe Malmström u ime Komisije
(10. travnja 2014.)

Komisija se slaže s uvaženom zastupnicom da mjere oduzimanja imovine trebaju biti u ravnoteži s odgovarajućim zaštitnim mjerama kako bi se u potpunosti poštovala temeljna prava i spriječio rizik od zlouporabe. Europski sud za ljudska prava u nekoliko je presuda o specifičnim nacionalnim odredbama koje se tiču oduzimanja bez presude istaknuo da takve odredbe ne krše temeljna prava tako dugo dok su na snazi odgovarajuće zaštitne mjere.

Novom Direktivom o zamrzavanju i oduzimanju imovine i imovinske koristi ostvarene kaznenim djelom u EU-u ([1]) od država se članica zahtijeva uvođenje zaštitnih mjera kojima bi se osobama na koje mjere oduzimanja imovine utječu osiguralo pravo na učinkoviti pravni lijek i pravedno suđenje u svrhu očuvanja njihovih prava. Komisija će pomno pratiti provedbu ove odredbe u državama članicama.

([1]) Donijeli Europski parlament 25. veljače 2014. i Vijeće 14. ožujka 2014., još nije objavljena.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001786/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Abuse of the model for the confiscation of the proceeds of crime without a judgment

In its resolution of 23 October 2013 on organised crime, corruption and money laundering, Parliament called on the Member States to introduce, on the basis of the most advanced national legislation, models for the confiscation of the proceeds of crime without a judgment in cases where it can be asserted — on the basis of available evidence and a court decision — that a particular piece of property constitutes the proceeds of a crime or has been used to commit a crime.

Whilst I am aware of the need to defend and compensate society in some way for the harm caused by the criminal activities of individuals or groups, I am nonetheless concerned, as I fear that this practice could be easily abused in Member States where the rule of law is not fully functioning and where the police and the judiciary are subject to the influence of politicians.

In this connection, could the Commission say what safeguards it would recommend to the Member States as they implement this measure, which has been proposed by Parliament, with a view to preventing abuse as part of politically motivated or rigged trials?

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

The Commission agrees with Honourable Member that confiscation measures need to be balanced with adequate safeguards in order to fully respect fundamental rights and prevent the risk of abuse. The European Court of Human Rights has held, in several judgments related to specific national provisions on non-conviction based confiscation, that such provisions do not violate fundamental rights as long as adequate safeguards are in place.

The new Directive on the freezing and confiscation of instrumentalities and proceeds of crime in the European Union ([1]) requires Member States to introduce safeguards ensuring that the persons affected by confiscation measures have the right to an effective remedy and a fair trial in order to uphold their rights. The Commission will closely follow the implementation of this provision in the Member States.

([1]) Adopted by the European Parliament on 25 February 2014 and by the Council on 14 March 2014, not yet published.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001787/14
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Rispetto dei principi comunitari nell'attività amministrativa tributaria — riesame amministrativo

Se, in ambito amministrativo, in Italia ci si è avviati verso un lento ma significativo processo di trasformazione dell'apparato improntato in ottica privatistica e paritaria sul piano dei rapporti cittadino-amministrazione (a partire dalla legge n. 241/1990, di matrice dichiaratamente comunitaria), in ambito tributario permane invece la primazia «pro fisco» dell'amministrazione sul contribuente.

Si riscontra un orientamento giurisprudenziale della Corte di giustizia teso verso un ampliamento in concreto della tutela del contribuente quanto all'azione meramente amministrativa dell'autorità finanziaria.

Principi di diritto tributario consolidati *dall'acquis communautaire*, come quello di legittimo affidamento, e più generali quali quelli del contraddittorio, qui declinato nel senso di diritto alla difesa in sede amministrativa, dell'obbligo di motivazione, di proporzionalità, di precauzione nell'azione amministrativa (ex articolo 174 TFUE) vengono sistematicamente disattesi in sede di giudizio tributario in Italia, in quanto si esclude il primato del diritto europeo sulla materia.

La Corte ha inoltre sancito l'azionabilità dei suddetti principi, garantendo (fra le altre con sentenza CGUE Kuhne & Heitz del 2004, punti 25-26) l'obbligatorietà del riesame di una decisione amministrativa definitiva, se questa risulti in contrasto con un sopravvenuto pronunciamento di ambito europeo, per altro senza limiti temporali quanto alla facoltà di richiedere detto riesame (Kempeter 2006).

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

1. i principi, tra cui quelli sopra menzionati, possono trovare applicazione anche nell'ambito dell'attività dell'amministrazione tributaria nei confronti dei contribuenti?

2. In particolare, esiste il diritto al riesame di un atto amministrativo tributario laddove questo sia emanato in contrasto con i richiamati principi? Il giudicato è di per sé motivo sufficiente per denegare il riesame degli atti amministrativi?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(25 aprile 2014)

L'onorevole deputato fa riferimento ad alcuni principi dell'*acquis* dell'Unione avallati dalla Corte di giustizia, quali il principio di legalità dell'azione amministrativa, del contraddittorio, del diritto alla difesa, della proporzionalità e dell'obbligatorietà della revocazione di una decisione definitiva quando è fondata su un'interpretazione errata del diritto (sentenza Kuhne & Heitz).

Alla Commissione non risulta che l'azione dell'amministrazione tributaria italiana non rispetti detti principi in modo generalizzato e sistematico a scapito dei contribuenti nei casi in cui si applica il diritto europeo.

Gli Stati membri, comprese le rispettive amministrazioni tributarie, sono tenuti a conformare le loro azioni e procedimenti ai summenzionati principi, in particolare a quello della revocazione delle decisioni adottate in ultima istanza e in contrasto con il diritto europeo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001787/14
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Compliance with Community principles in tax administration — administrative reviews

Although, administratively speaking, Italy has embarked on a slow but significant process of transformation of the current mechanism in a direction more favourable to private enterprise and equality in terms of relationships between the citizen and tax administration (based on Law 241/1990, avowedly of Community origin), the primacy of the tax administration over the taxpayer persists in the taxation system.

We are witnessing a trend in the case law of the Court of Justice which inclines towards a concrete extension of taxpayer protection in purely administrative actions instigated by the tax authority.

The principles of tax law consolidated by the *acquis communautaire* [body of EC law], such as the principle of lawful reliance and, more generally, the adversarial principle, here enunciated as the right of defence in administrative actions, the obligation to adduce grounds, the principle of proportionality and caution in administrative actions (pursuant to Article 174 TFEU), are systematically disregarded in tax proceedings in Italy, given that the supremacy of European law on this matter is excluded.

The Court of Justice has furthermore sanctioned the invocability of the abovementioned principles, reiterating (*inter alia* in CJEU Judgment Kuhne & Heitz of 2004, paragraphs 25-26) the obligatory nature of the review of a final administrative decision which conflicts with a European pronouncement, although no time limits are imposed in terms of the right to request such a review (Kempeter 2006).

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

1. Can the principles in question, some of which are referred to above, be applied to action taken by the tax administration against taxpayers?

2. In specific terms, is there a right of review of an administrative tax decision which conflicts with the principles invoked above? Is the pronouncement of a final decision of itself sufficient grounds for refusing a review of an administrative decision?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(25 avril 2014)

L'honorable membre fait référence à certains principes de l'acquis européen entérinés par la Cour de Justice tels que le principe de la légalité de l'action administrative, celui du contradictoire, du droit de la défense, de proportionnalité et celui de l'obligation de révision des décisions de dernière instance lorsqu'elles sont basées sur une interprétation erronée du droit européen (arrêt Kuhne & Heitz).

La Commission n'a pas connaissance d'une pratique généralisée selon laquelle ces principes sont systématiquement méconnus par l'action de l'Administration fiscale italienne à l'égard des contribuables dans des situations qui relèvent du droit européen.

Les États membres, y compris leurs administrations fiscales, sont tenus de conformer leurs actions et procédures aux principes susmentionnés et, notamment, à celui de la révision des décisions prises en dernier ressort délivrées en violation du droit européen.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001788/14
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Rispetto dei principi comunitari — giudicato favorevole

In Italia l'obbligazione tributaria sorge dalla realizzazione di un presupposto e nel rapporto di lavoro dipendente tale presupposto è realizzato dal lavoratore, mentre il datore di lavoro è, dalla legge, coobbligato in solido all'adempimento dell'obbligazione tributaria di questi, in qualità di sostituto d'imposta.

L'inscindibilità della soggettività passiva tributaria (sancita dalla legge in capo tanto al sostituito, quanto al sostituto) discende dall'unitarietà dell'obbligazione che lega i due soggetti.

Considerato che:

— sono principi acquisiti del diritto dell'Unione europea l'effettività della tutela giudiziale (sentenza CGUE C-362/12, 2013) e il principio di assimilazione, la certezza del diritto (sentenze CGUE Kuhne & Heitz, 2004 e Kempter, 2008), il *ne bis in idem* (articolo 50 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea; sentenza CGUE Aklagaren, 2013);

— la giurisprudenza della Corte di giustizia ha più volte chiarito che la tutela di tali diritti si esplica sia nella fase del giudizio di merito che nell'ambito procedimentale;

— l'interpretazione *in bonam partem* è stata riconosciuta in vari settori del diritto europeo;

— esiste un vero e proprio obbligo degli Stati membri di sanzionare quelle violazioni del diritto europeo che compromettano il diritto del singolo a tutelarsi sia nel merito che nel procedimento;

si domanda pertanto alla Commissione quanto segue:

1. il giudicato favorevole al sostituto d'imposta, coobbligato in solido col sostituito, che assolve il primo sancendo l'inesistenza del presupposto, è estendibile al sostituito?

2. Il pronunciamento favorevole che statuisca l'inesistenza del presupposto e quindi della pretesa non garantisce il sostituito da ulteriori azioni? Il caso contrario non configurerebbe l'elusione del divieto di doppia imposizione interna?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(28 aprile 2014)

L'interrogazione, in sostanza, è volta a chiarire se il diritto europeo impone che gli effetti favorevoli dei pronunciamenti che statuiscono l'inesistenza del fatto generatore dell'imposta, emessi da un giudice nazionale nei confronti di un datore di lavoro (agente pagatore dell'imposta) debbano estendersi al suo dipendente, in quanto coobbligato in solido all'adempimento dell'obbligazione tributaria.

La Commissione osserva, a titolo preliminare, che nessuno degli elementi indicati nell'interrogazione permette di concludere che le circostanze dei fatti riguardino situazioni transfrontaliere a cui *a priori* potrebbe applicarsi il diritto europeo.

Allo stato attuale, poiché l'armonizzazione in materia di fiscalità diretta è ancora limitata, gli Stati membri restano competenti per definire i regimi fiscali nazionali, compresi gli aspetti procedurali e giudiziari. Tuttavia gli Stati membri sono tenuti a rispettare i principi derivanti dai trattati e dall'*acquis* nella misura in cui i fatti abbiano incidenze transfrontaliere. Nelle circostanze descritte gli effetti, nei confronti delle parti di un'obbligazione tributaria, dei pronunciamenti definitivi dei tribunali nazionali riguardanti situazioni interne allo Stato membro sono disciplinati unicamente dal diritto procedurale nazionale.

Ciò premesso, i principi giurisprudenziali menzionati dall'onorevole parlamentare non ostano a che la tutela giudiziale derivante da un giudicato favorevole a una delle parti dell'obbligazione tributaria venga estesa all'altra parte coobbligata in solido; tuttavia il principio del divieto della doppia imposizione, ammesso che esista in materia di fiscalità diretta, non è pertinente nella situazione descritta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001788/14
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Compliance with Community principles — favourable final judgment

In Italy, a tax obligation arises from the making of a chargeable gain and, in the employment relationship, that chargeable gain is made by the employee, whilst the employer is by law jointly and severally liable for the fulfilment of the employee's tax obligation, in its capacity as withholding agent.

The indivisibility of tax liability (ratified in law with regard to both the withholding agent and the taxpayer) derives from the unitary obligation binding the two parties.

Considering that:

— the settled principles of EC law include effective legal protection (CJEU judgment C-362/12, 2013) and the principle of equal treatment; the certainty of law (CJEU judgments Kuhne & Heitz, 2004, and Kempter, 2008); and the *ne bis in idem* principle (Article 50 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union; CJEU judgment Aklagaren, 2013);

— the case-law of the Court of Justice has clarified on several occasions that protection of those rights applies both to the substantive action and in procedural terms;

— the interpretation *in bonam partem* has been acknowledged in various sectors of European law;

— there is a genuine requirement for Member States to punish any breaches of European law that prejudice the right of individuals to protect themselves in both substantive and procedural terms;

the Commission is asked:

1. Can a final judgment favourable to the withholding agent, who is jointly and severally liable with the taxpayer, which absolves the former by ratifying the non-existence of the chargeable gain, be extended to the taxpayer?

2. Does not a favourable decision which declares the non-existence of the chargeable gain and therefore of the claim protect the taxpayer against further proceedings? Would the contrary not mean evading the ban on domestic double taxation?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(28 avril 2014)

En substance, la question vise à savoir si le droit européen impose que les effets favorables de jugements concluant quant à l'inexistence du fait générateur de l'impôt, délivrés par une juridiction nationale à l'égard d'un employeur (agent payeur de l'impôt) doivent s'étendre à son employé, en tant que contribuable solidairement responsable de ladite obligation fiscale.

À titre liminaire, la Commission observe qu'aucun des éléments évoqués dans la question ne permet de conclure que les circonstances de faits concernent des situations transfrontalières auxquelles le droit européen pourrait a priori s'appliquer.

En l'état actuel, l'harmonisation restant limitée en matière de fiscalité directe, les États membres demeurent compétents pour établir leurs propres régimes fiscaux, y compris les aspects procéduraux et judiciaires. Cependant, les États membres doivent respecter les principes découlant des Traités et de l'acquis dans la mesure où les faits ont des incidences transfrontalières. Dans les circonstances décrites, les effets de jugements finaux des cours nationales à l'égard des parties d'une obligation fiscale n'affectant que des situations domestiques ne sont régis que par le droit procédural national.

Cela étant, les principes jurisprudentiels évoqués par l'Honorable Parlementaire ne font pas obstacle à ce que la protection juridique découlant d'un arrêt favorable à l'une des parties de l'obligation fiscale soit étendue à l'autre partie solidairement responsable; le principe de l'interdiction de la double imposition — à supposer qu'il existe en matière de fiscalité directe — n'est toutefois pas relevant dans la situation décrite.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001790/14
aan de Commissie
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(17 februari 2014)

Betreft: Mogelijke staatssteun energie-intensieve industrie

In Nederland is recentelijk de Elektriciteitswet 1998 (volumecorrectie nettarieven voor de energie-intensieve industrie) gewijzigd ([1]). De wet heeft als doel een volumecorrectie toe te passen op de nettarieven voor energie-intensieve bedrijven. Op afnemers met „een relatief grote bijdrage aan de stabiliteit van het net" zal op de hun in rekening gebrachte nettarieven een procentuele volumecorrectie worden toegepast.

De Autoriteit Consument en Markt (ACM) is er echter niet zeker van dat deze wet verenigbaar is met het Europees recht: „De toelichting geeft evenwel geen nadere kwantitatieve onderbouwing van de relatie tussen het verbruiksprofiel van de energie-intensieve industrie en de mate waarin dat bijdraagt aan de beperking van de netkosten. Gelet hierop zijn de zorgen van ACM omtrent de verenigbaarheid met het Europees recht niet geheel weggenomen." ([2])

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze kortingsregeling?

2. Heeft de Nederlandse regering een oordeel gevraagd aan de Commissie over de wet (in het kader van mogelijke staatssteun)? Zo ja, wat is het oordeel van de Commissie? Zo niet, is de Commissie van mening dat de wet voorgelegd moet worden aan de Commissie voor een oordeel?

Antwoord van de heer Almunia namens de Commissie
(9 april 2014)

De lidstaten zijn verplicht de Commissie in kennis te stellen van elk voornemen tot invoering of wijziging van steunmaatregelen, zoals neergelegd in artikel 108 van het Verdrag.

De Commissie is niet op de hoogte gesteld van de wijziging van de Elektriciteitswet 1998 in Nederland en kan zich niet uitspreken over de mogelijke classificatie ervan als staatssteun en de eventuele verenigbaarheid van die wijziging met de regels inzake staatssteun. Het is in de eerste plaats aan de lidstaat om op het eerste gezicht te beoordelen of bepaalde maatregelen staatssteun vormen en bijgevolg aan de Europese Commissie moeten worden gemeld.

([1]) http://www.tweedekamer.nl/vergaderingen/commissievergaderingen/details/index.jsp?id=2013A05267
([2]) http://goo.gl/C2Wxrad

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001790/14
to the Commission
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Possible state aid for energy-intensive industry

In the Netherlands, the Electricity Law 1998 (volume correction to network tariffs for energy-intensive industry) has recently been amended ([1]). The aim of the Law is to apply a volume correction to network tariffs for energy-intensive businesses. Customers who make a 'relatively large contribution to network stability' have a percentage volume correction made to the network tariffs charged to them.

However, the Consumer and Markets Authority (ACM) is not sure that this law is compatible with European law: 'However, the Explanatory Memorandum does not provide any quantitative evidence of the relationship between the consumption profile of energy-intensive industry and the extent to which it helps to limit network costs. In view of this, the ACM's concerns about the issue of compatibility with European law have not been completely assuaged.' ([2])

1. Is the Commission aware of this discount scheme?

2. Has the Netherlands Government requested an opinion from the Commission concerning the law (in connection with possible state aid)? If so, what view does the Commission take? If not, does the Commission consider that the law ought to be submitted to the Commission for assessment?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

Member States are required to notify to the Commission any plans to grant or alter aid as set out in Article 108 of the Treaty.

The Commission has not been notified about the amendment to the Electricity Law 1998 in the Netherlands and is not in a position to pronounce itself on the state aid character and the possible compatibility of those amendments with the state aid rules. It is in the first place for the Member State to make a prima facie assessment of whether certain measures may constitute state aid which should consequently be notified to the European Commission.

([1]) http://www.tweedekamer.nl/vergaderingen/commissievergaderingen/details/index.jsp?id=2013A05267
([2]) http://goo.gl/C2Wxrad

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001791/14
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) oraz Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(17 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Przepisy dotyczące zawartości substancji smolistych w żywności

W ostatnim czasie otrzymaliśmy znaczną liczbę zapytań od zaniepokojonych producentów żywności. Od 2014 r. wejdą w życie unijne przepisy dotyczące składu substancji smolistych w żywności. W wyniku nowej dyrektywy znikną produkty regionalne, produkty od stuleci wytwarzane w Polsce. Co więcej, przepis ten uderzy w całą północno-europejską tradycję konserwacji żywności. Dyrektywa określa maksymalną zawartość benzo(a)pirenu. Obecnie w wyrobach wędzonych jest go do 5,0 mikrogramów na kilogram. Od września mają być to zaledwie 2,0 mikrogramy. Całkowicie uniemożliwi to przemysłowy wyrób tradycyjnych wędlin oraz serów na południu Polski. W ostatnich latach wiele firm zainwestowało, aby spełnić unijne wymogi produkcji. Dziś te same firmy będą musiały całkowicie wstrzymać swoją produkcję.

Czy Komisja może przedstawić raport wpływu na gospodarkę państw członkowskich zapisów zmniejszających ilość substancji smolistych w żywności? Które państwa członkowskie stracą najwięcej?

Co z produktami certyfikowanymi przez Unię, opatrzonymi specjalnym oznakowaniem. Są to rzeczy wędzone i wiele z nich, w Polsce, zostało przez Komisję wpisanych na listę unijnych produktów regionalnych i znajduje się w jej rejestrach jako produkty z oznaczeniem ChNP, ChOG i GTS. Czy jeśli przekroczą poziom substancji smolistych, to stracą rekomendację?

Czy Komisja zamierza jeszcze raz zbadać sprawę wpływu nowej dyrektywy na sektor spożywczy poszczególnych państw członkowskich?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(2 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Przed przyjęciem najwyższych dopuszczalnych poziomów przeprowadzono szeroko zakrojone konsultacje z państwami członkowskimi i zainteresowanymi organizacjami. W odniesieniu do tych konsultacji Komisja pragnie odesłać Szanownego Pana Posła do odpowiedzi na pytanie pisemne P-000082/2014 ([1]).

Przy zastosowaniu dobrych praktyk wędzarniczych osiągnięcie obniżonych dopuszczalnych poziomów wielopierścieniowych węglowodorów aromatycznych (WWA), w tym benzo(a)pirenu, w mięsie wędzonym i produktach mięsnych wędzonych jest również możliwe w przypadku tradycyjnego wędzenia drewnem.

Odnośnie do odpowiedzi na dwa ostatnie pytania Komisja pragnie odesłać Szanownego Pana Posła do odpowiedzi na pytanie pisemne E-000579/2014 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=PL
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=PL

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001791/14
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) and Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Legislation on tarry substances in food

We have recently received a significant number of questions from worried food producers. EU legislation regarding the composition of tarry substances in food comes into effect in 2014. As a result of the new Directive, certain regional products that have been produced in Poland for centuries will disappear. Furthermore, this legislation will impact upon the entire northern European tradition of food preservation. The directive lays down the maximum content of benzo(a)pyrene. This is currently 5.0 micrograms per kilogram for smoked products. As of September, the level will be merely 2.0 micrograms. This will entirely prevent the industrial production of traditional smoked meats and cheeses in southern Poland. In recent years, many businesses have made investments to meet EU production requirements. Today, the same businesses will be forced to cease production altogether.

Can the Commission present a report on the impact of the legislation reducing the level of tarry substances in food on the economy of Member States? Which Member States stand to lose the most?

How about products certified by the EU and branded with a special mark? This concerns smoked products, many of which, in Poland, have been registered by the Commission on the list of EU regional products and are included in its registers as products marked ChNP, ChOG and GTS. Will they lose their recommendation if they exceed the level for tarry substances?

Does the Commission intend to reassess the impact of the new Directive on the food sector of particular Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

Before adoption of the maximum levels, extensive consultations have taken place with Member States and relevant stakeholder organisations. As regards these consultations the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-000082/2014 ([1]).

By applying good smoking practices, also with traditional wood-smoking, the lower maximum levels for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) including benzo(a)pyrene in smoked meat and smoked meat products are achievable.

For a reply to the last two questions, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000579/2014 ([2]).

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001792/14
ao Conselho
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de fevereiro de 2014)

Assunto: Referendo na Suíça

Considerando que:

— A iniciativa da direita nacionalista do Partido do Povo Suíço «contra a imigração em massa» foi aprovada em referendo na maioria dos 26 cantões, com o apoio de 50,3 % dos eleitores suíços, anunciando assim uma mudança de sistema na política suíça de imigração;

— De acordo com o Ministro dos Negócios Estrangeiros suíço esta decisão põe em causa «o acordo com a União Europeia sobre a livre circulação de pessoas» e, de acordo com a Ministra da Justiça, o resultado do referendo implicará «uma mudança de sistema com grandes consequências para os suíços e para relações com a UE»;

Assim, pergunto ao Conselho:

Qual a posição institucional do Conselho relativamente aos resultados do referendo na Suíça?

Resposta
(14 de abril de 2014)

Convida-se o Senhor Deputado a consultar a resposta do Conselho às Perguntas Escritas E-001553/14 e P-002168/14.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001792/14
to the Council
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Referendum in Switzerland

The initiative 'against mass immigration' launched by the right-wing nationalist Swiss People's Party was approved in the referendum in the majority of the 26 cantons with the support of 50.3% of Swiss voters, marking a major change in Swiss immigration policy.

The Swiss Foreign Minister has said that this decision jeopardises the agreement with the European Union on the free movement of people, and the Swiss Justice Minister has said that the referendum result will bring about 'a change of system with far-reaching consequences for Switzerland and our relations with the EU'.

What is the position of the Council as an institution on the results of the referendum in Switzerland?

Reply
(14 April 2014)

The Honourable Member should refer to the Council's replies to Written Questions E-001553/14 and P-002168/14.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001793/14
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de fevereiro de 2014)

Assunto: Referendo na Suíça

Considerando que:

— A iniciativa da direita nacionalista do Partido do Povo Suíço «contra a imigração em massa» foi aprovada em referendo na maioria dos 26 cantões, com o apoio de 50,3 % dos eleitores suíços, anunciando assim uma mudança de sistema na política suíça de imigração;

— De acordo com o Ministro dos Negócios Estrangeiros suíço esta decisão põe em causa «o acordo com a União Europeia sobre a livre circulação de pessoas» e, de acordo com a Ministra da Justiça, o resultado do referendo implicará «uma mudança de sistema com grandes consequências para os suíços e para relações com a UE»;

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Qual a posição institucional da Comissão relativamente aos resultados do referendo na Suíça?

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

A Comissão Europeia respeita plenamente a tradição suíça de democracia direta. Considera, no entanto, que o resultado do referendo tem consequências potencialmente graves para as relações entre a União Europeia e a Suíça e está ciente de que as suas ramificações ultrapassam quer o domínio interno suíço, quer o âmbito da política externa da UE. A Comissão afirma que a livre circulação de pessoas é um princípio fundamental e não negociável, tanto para a UE como para as relações entre a UE e a Suíça.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001793/14
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Referendum in Switzerland

The initiative 'against mass immigration' launched by the right-wing nationalist Swiss People's Party was approved in the referendum in the majority of the 26 cantons with the support of 50.3% of Swiss voters, marking a major change in Swiss immigration policy.

The Swiss Foreign Minister has said that this decision jeopardises the agreement with the European Union on the free movement of people, and the Swiss Justice Minister has said that the referendum result will bring about 'a change of system with far-reaching consequences for Switzerland and our relations with the EU'.

What is the position of the Commission as an institution on the results of the referendum in Switzerland?

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

The European Commission fully respects the Swiss tradition of direct democracy. It believes, however, that the result of the vote has potentially serious consequences for European Union-Switzerland relations and is aware that its ramifications go beyond a Swiss domestic matter or a matter of EU foreign policy. It affirms that the free movement of persons is a fundamental, non-negotiable principle both for the EU and for the EU's relations with Switzerland.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001794/14
komissiolle
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(17. helmikuuta 2014)

Aihe: EU:n yhdyskuntajätevesidirektiivin ja vesipuitedirektiivin vaatimukset, meristrategia ja HELCOMin suositukset Itämeren osalta

EU:n meristrategian tavoitteena on saavuttaa meriemme hyvä tila vuoteen 2020 mennessä. On selvää, ettei tavoitteeseen päästä varsinkaan Itämeren osalta, ellei ravinnekuormitusta koskevia vaatimuksia tiukenneta.

Itämeren suojelukomissio HELCOM suosittaa, että isompien asutuskeskusten jätevesistä poistetaan vähintään 90 % fosforista. Uudella teknologialla on mahdollista päästä tätäkin parempiin tuloksiin – teknologia ei ole siis tiukempien säännösten esteenä. Kuitenkin EU-lainsäädännön määräykset ovat tätä höllemmät. Pelkona on, että jotkin EU-jäsenmaista ja Itämeren rannikkomaista seuraavat HELCOM-suositusten sijaan näitä direktiivin höllempiä vaatimuksia. On arvioitu, että yksin Puolan osalta siirtyminen HELCOMin suosituksista EU-lainsäädännön minimiin tarkoittaisi, että vuosittain noin 2 000–3 000 tonnia fosforia jäisi puhdistamatta niistä jätevesistä, jotka virtaavat Itämereen.

Onko komissio tietoinen HELCOMin tiukemmista suosituksista Itämeren suhteen? Miten komissio aikoo varmistaa, että Itämeren suojelutarve täyttyy myös EU-lainsäädännön nojalla? Aikooko komissio esittää uusia keinoja, jotta meristrategian tavoitteet täytetään?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(16. huhtikuuta 2014)

Komissio on tietoinen Itämeren suojelukomission suosituksista.

EU:n lainsäädännöllä edistetään Euroopan merialueiden, myös Itämeren, suojelua, jos lainsäädännön täytäntöönpano on jäsenvaltioissa tehokasta. Kyseinen lainsäädäntö sisältää muun muassa, muttei yksinomaan, yhdyskuntajätevesien käsittelystä annetun direktiivin ([1]) (UWWTD), vesipolitiikan puitedirektiivin ([2]) (WFD), nitraattidirektiivi ([3]) (NiD) ja ympäristön hyvää tilaa koskevan tavoitteen, joka on meristrategiadirektiivin ([4]) (MSFD) mukainen. Komissio työskentelee yhdessä jäsenvaltioiden kanssa parantaakseen mainittujen direktiivien noudattamista.

Meristrategiadirektiivin täytäntöönpanon ensimmäisestä vaiheesta hiljattain antamassaan kertomuksessa ([5]) komissio katsoo, että jäsenvaltiot eivät ole käsitelleet ympäristön hyvään tilaan liittyviä kuvaajia yhtenäisesti Itämeren alueella ja että niiden on ryhdyttävä tarmokkaisiin toimiin yhtenäisyyden parantamiseksi sekä erikseen että yhteistyössä koko merialueella vuoteen 2020 mennessä. Jäsenvaltioiden on muun muassa laadittava toimenpideohjelmat, joiden on oltava käytössä viimeistään vuonna 2016. Komissio aikoo arvioida sen jälkeen, onko yhteistyöhön perustuva lähestymistapa toteutunut ja tuottanut tuloksia, vai tarvitaanko lisätoimia meristrategiadirektiivin asianmukaisen täytäntöönpanon varmistamiseksi.

EU:n Itämeri-strategia (EUSBSR) on hyvin yhdenmukainen Itämeren suojelukomission sopimuspuolten antamien sitoumusten kanssa. Se muodostaa täytäntöönpanoalojen välisen yhteistyökehyksen, jonka avulla pyritään Itämeren suojelukomission asettamiin vähennystavoitteisiin. Näitä vähennystavoitteita on asetettu senkaltaisilla ensisijaisilla aloilla kuten NUTRI, AGRI ja HAZARDS, ja ne on viimeksi päivitetty lokakuussa 2013 Kööpenhaminassa järjestetyssä ministerikokouksessa.

([1]) Direktiivi 1991/271/ETY, EYVL L 135, 27.3.1998.
([2]) Direktiivi 2000/60/EY, EYVL 327/1, 16.12.2001.
([3]) Direktiivi 1991/676/ETY, EYVL L 375, 31.12.1991.
([4]) Direktiivi 2008/56/EY, EUVL L 164, 25.6.2008.
([5]) COM 2014/97 FINAL http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2014:0097:FIN:FI:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001794/14
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Requirements of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive and the Water Framework Directive; Marine Strategy and Helcom recommendations on the Baltic Sea

The EU's Marine Strategy aims to attain good status for our seas by 2020. It is clear that this objective cannot be attained, particularly in the case of the Baltic Sea, unless requirements relating to the nutrient burden are stepped up.

The Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission Helcom recommends that at least 90% of the phosphorus should be removed from effluent from larger conurbations. With the aid of new technology, it is even possible to achieve better results than this, so that technology is no obstacle to tighter regulation. However, the provisions of EC law are less stringent than this. It is feared that, rather than abiding by Helcom's recommendations, some EU Member States and Baltic coastal states will apply these less stringent requirements laid down in the directive. It has been estimated that if Poland alone were to apply the minimum requirements in the EU Directive instead of the Helcom recommendations, this would result in some 2 000-3 000 tonnes of phosphorus per annum not being removed from effluent discharged into the Baltic.

Is the Commission aware of the stricter recommendations by Helcom regarding the Baltic Sea? What will the Commission do to ensure that the need for protection of the Baltic Sea is also catered for on the basis of EU legislation? Will the Commission propose new means of attaining the objectives of the Marine Strategy?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

The Commission is aware of the Helcom recommendations.

EU legislation, if effectively implemented by Member States, will cater for the protection of European seas including the Baltic. This includes, but is not limited to, the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive ([1]) (UWWTD), the Water Framework Directive ([2]) (WFD), the Nitrates Directive ([3]) (NiD) and the pursuit of Good Environmental Status (GES) under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive ([4]) (MSFD). The Commission is working with Member States to improve compliance with these Directives.

The Commission, in its recent report on the first phase of implementation of the MSFD ([5]), concludes that coverage of the descriptors of GES is not uniform within the Baltic Sea area and Member States will have to significantly step up efforts to deliver it, both individually and in cooperation across the sea basin, by 2020. This includes establishing Programmes of Measures (PoMs) that Member States will have to put in place by 2016. The Commission intends to reassess thereafter whether the collaborative approach has been implemented and has delivered results or whether additional action is needed to ensure the proper implementation of the MSFD.

The EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR) is closely aligned to the commitments made by Contracting Parties to Helcom and is a framework for cooperation between implementing sectors to reach the reduction targets set by Helcom in priority areas such as 'NUTRI', 'AGRI' and 'Hazards', most recently updated at the Copenhagen Ministerial Conference in October 2013.

([1]) Directive 1991/271/EEC, OJ L 135, 27.3.1998.
([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ 327/1, 16.12.2001.
([3]) Directive 1991/676/EEC, OJ L 375, 31.12.1991.
([4]) Directive 2008/56/EC, OJ L 164, 25.6.2008.
([5]) COM 2014/97 FINAL http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2014:0097:FIN:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001795/14
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Legislation that applies to posted workers published by the Commission

The Commission's 'Practical Guide' outlines current EU legislation regarding posted workers. It sets forth the criteria for posted workers to be considered exempt from paying income tax and national insurance in the country in which they are working. There are several flaws in this legislation, including the fundamental principle underlying the legislation itself. Firstly, in order to illustrate a case where EC law is applicable, the guideline uses the example of a Spanish worker carrying out part of his activity in Spain and the other part in Portugal. This is a convenient example, in view of the fact that these two countries are comparable in terms of social security systems, taxes and wages. However, in the UK, as is the case in many Member States, basic tax rates are considerably higher than in many of its EU counterparts and the cost of healthcare is covered entirely by general taxation. This means that a posted worker from a country with lower average taxes as well as lower wages could benefit from a considerably higher wage in the UK whilst still paying their own country's lower tax rate.

Another major loophole in the Commission guidelines is the definition of temporary work as constituting a period of up to two years, which is far longer than temporary assignments. Moreover, when the two-year period comes to an end, the posted worker merely has to wait a further two months before becoming eligible to reapply for a new 'temporary' work post, leaving the system wide open to abuse.

1. The current definition of a self-employed worker is rather loose; for example, a sufficient criterion for proving self-employed status is the production of a 'business card'. Would the Commission consider giving a clearer definition of the criteria employed to ascertain the self-employed status of posted workers? Moreover, the Commission states that the justification for exempting these categories of workers is the need to reduce 'administrative difficulties and confusion'. Does the Commission not agree that the legislation is wide open to abuse and deliberate tax avoidance by posted workers?

2. Does the Commission have any figures as to the number of workers who are enjoying privileged access under this legislation by only paying taxes in their home posting state and what proportion of these take up permanent residence in the posted country?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Practical Guide mentioned by the Honourable Member is not a Commission document, but a guide that has been discussed thoroughly within the Administrative Commission for the Coordination of Social Security Systems ([1]) and approved by the delegations of all Member States. It was drafted to assist institutions, employers and EU citizens in determining which Member State's legislation should apply in given circumstances. It only provides guidance on the implementation of the regulations relating to the coordination of social security systems and does not stipulate where taxes are to be paid. The Member States are responsible for designing their own tax systems and for deciding when, what and at what rate to tax.

As for the definition of a self-employed person, Regulations (EC) No's 883/2004 and 987/2009 provide that a person 'who normally pursues an activity as a self-employed person' means someone who habitually carries out substantial activities in the territory of the Member State in which he is established ([2]). Point 8 of the Guide clarifies that definition and point 9 lays down criteria that could be applied to determine whether a person is habitually self-employed in the posting Member State ([3]).

According to the data collected by the Commission from among the members of the Administrative Commission, (the latest year for which data are available) there were around 1.2 million A1 portable documents issued for posting to other EU-EEA Member States in 2011. A report available on the Commission website gives details per posting/destination country and the sectors. The data give no indication of the place of residence of posted workers ([4]).

([1]) In accordance with Article 72(a) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004, the Administrative Commission for the Coordination of Social Security Systems, which comprises delegates from all 28 Member States and is chaired by the Presidency, is responsible for dealing with all administrative questions or questions of interpretation arising from Regulations (EC) No's 883/2004 and 987/2009.

([2]) Regulations (EC) No's 883/2004 and 987/2009 require that a self-employed person wishing to take advantage of the posting arrangements 'must have already pursued his activity for some time' before the date of posting. A period of two months can be regarded as satisfying this requirement, with shorter periods requiring a case-by-case evaluation.

([3]) This includes maintaining an office in the posting State, paying taxes in the posting State, maintaining a VAT number in the posting State, being registered with the chamber of commerce or a professional body in that posting State, and possessing a professional card of the posting State.

([4]) 'Posting of workers in the European Union and EFTA countries: Report on A1 portable documents issued in 2010 and 2011', Administrative Commission for the Coordination of Social Security Systems, at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=9675&langId=en

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001797/14
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(18 februarie 2014)

Subiect: VP/HR — Programul nuclear iranian

După alegerea noului Președinte al Iranului, relația dintre Uniunea Europeană și această țară pare a fi intrat într-o nouă etapă. Ajungerea la un acord interimar la 24 noiembrie 2013 referitor la viitorul programului nuclear iranian este o dovadă a acestui fapt.

Care sunt prioritățile UE în domeniu pentru perioada următoare pentru a asigura viabilitatea acestui acord interimar?

În cazul în care se va decide prelungirea acestui acord, ce măsuri de relaxare a sancțiunilor față de Iran are în vedere Uniunea?

Cum poate asigura Uniunea sustenabilitatea și durabilitatea angajamentelor luate de Iran în privința programului său nuclear?

Răspuns dat de Înaltul Reprezentant/doamna vicepreședinte Ashton în numele Comisiei
(15 aprilie 2014)

Acordul interimar (Planul comun de acțiune) încheiat la data de 24 noiembrie la Geneva între E3/EU+3 și Iran reprezintă doar un prim pas către identificarea unei soluții cuprinzătoare menite să asigure natura exclusiv pașnică a programului nuclear al Iranului. Planul comun de acțiune este un acord limitat în timp, cu o durată de șase luni, ce poate fi reînnoit de comun acord pentru o perioadă suplimentară de șase luni.

Înaltul Reprezentant al UE/vicepreședinte și grupul E3+3 își mențin angajamentul ferm să ajungă, până în iulie 2014, la un acord cuprinzător pe termen lung cu Iranul în ceea ce privește programul nuclear al acestuia. Negocierile privind identificarea unei soluții cuprinzătoare au început la jumătatea lunii februarie, la Viena, iar la mijlocul lunii martie a avut loc o nouă reuniune.

Agenția Internațională pentru Energie Atomică (AIEA) monitorizează și verifică punerea în aplicare a măsurilor legate de domeniul nuclear, convenite în cadrul Planului comun de acțiune. AIEA emite rapoarte lunare cu privire la punerea în aplicare a măsurilor. Corespunzător unei prime etape și proporțional cu măsurile adoptate de Iran în cadrul Planului comun de acțiune, UE a suspendat parțial sancțiunile, însă rămâne în vigoare arhitectura principalelor sancțiuni impuse în chestiuni financiare și petroliere. Pe baza dublei abordări (angajament și presiune), ridicarea finală a sancțiunilor poate avea loc numai după ce se ajunge la o soluție cuprinzătoare cu privire la programul nuclear al Iranului.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001797/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Iran's nuclear programme

Relations between the European Union and Iran seem to have entered a new phase following the election of Iran's new president. This was demonstrated by the signing of an interim agreement on the future of Iran's nuclear programme on 24 November 2013.

What are the EU's priorities in this field for the coming period, with a view to ensuring the viability of this interim agreement?

If a decision is taken to extend this agreement, what steps is the EU planning to take to relax the sanctions on Iran?

How can the EU guarantee the sustainability and durability of the commitments given by Iran with regard to its nuclear programme?

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

The interim agreement (Joint Plan of Action- JPoA) reached between the E3/EU+3 and Iran in Geneva on 24 November is only a first step towards reaching a comprehensive solution aimed at ensuring the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme. The JPoA is a time-bound agreement with duration of 6 months and can be renewed by mutual consent for an additional 6 months period.

The EU High Representative/Vice-President together with the E3+3 remains strongly committed to reach a comprehensive long-term agreement with Iran on its nuclear programme by July 2014. Talks on a comprehensive solution started mid-February in Vienna, with a new meeting in mid-March.

Implementation of the nuclear related measures agreed in the JPoA is monitored and verified by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The IAEA provides monthly reports about the implementation. Commensurate for a first step and proportionate to the measures taken by Iran under the JPoA, the EU partially suspended its sanctions, while the core sanctions architecture on financial and oil remains in place. Based on the dual track approach (engagement and pressure) the final lifting of sanctions may only occur once a comprehensive solution on Iran's nuclear programme is reached.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001799/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(18 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Declinul demografic în Uniunea Europeană

Îmbătrânirea populației creează o serie de provocări sociale și economice de o importanță sporită, în contextul în care politicile naționale și europene vor fi nevoite să asigure pe termen lung o sustenabilitate economică adaptată la condiții demografice în continuă schimbare.

Conform „Raportului de îmbătrânire 2012", rata de fertilitate la nivelul UE va înregistra o creștere modestă în viitor, de la 1,59 cât era în anul 2010, la 1,64 în anul 2030 și până la 1,71 în 2060.

De asemenea, se preconizează faptul că, în anul 2060, procentul persoanelor cu vârsta de 65 de ani sau peste va crește la 52,5% din totalul populației Uniunii Europene. Așadar, din cauza dinamicii fertilității, a speranței de viață și a migrației, structura vârstei populației în UE se va schimba dramatic în următorii ani.

Cu toate că politicile de sănătate sexuală și reproductivă sunt competențe exclusive ale statelor membre, intenționează Comisia să tragă un semnal de alarmă asupra problemei îmbătrânirii populației, prin realizarea unui plan de acțiune în acest sens?

De asemenea, are în vedere Comisia măsuri de aducere în atenția opiniei publice și a autorităților naționale a unor exemple de bune practici sau de politici naționale care au avut un impact pozitiv semnificativ asupra natalității în diverse state membre?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(2 aprilie 2014)

Comisia acordă o importanță deosebită provocărilor demografice, așa cum se arată în Comunicarea COM(*2006*) 571 final ([1]). În cadrul primului său domeniu de politică, „Promovarea reînnoirii demografice în Europa", aceasta s-a ocupat de problema ratelor natalității pe atunci în scădere — încă scăzute în prezent — și a solicitat crearea de condiții favorabile pentru persoanele care doresc să aibă copii. Răspunsul la întrebarea P-000568/14 prezintă politica și acțiunile întreprinse de Comisie pentru a aborda această provocare. Chiar dacă nu există niciun plan de acțiune specific în privința fertilității și a îmbătrânirii, aceste teme sunt abordate în detaliu în cadrul Semestrului european și prin intermediul recomandărilor specifice fiecărei țări, în special.

În plus, în conformitate cu Raportul privind îmbătrânirea populației, ipotezele privind ratele de fertilitate utilizate de Eurostat ([2]) pornind de la estimări demografice sunt parte a unui scenariu comun pe termen lung. Creșterea corespunzătoare a ratei fertilității poate fi obținută prin politicile adecvate menționate mai sus.

Colectarea și diseminarea bunelor practici este o altă cale prin care Comisia sprijină statele membre ale UE în eforturile lor de a face față îmbătrânirii populației. Se atrage în special atenția distinsului membru asupra Platformei europene pentru investiția în copii ([3]) care a urmat Pachetului din 2013 privind investițiile sociale ([4]).

Comisia a lansat, în 2011 ([5]), Parteneriatul european pentru inovare privind îmbătrânirea activă și în condiții bune de sănătate ([6]). În 2013, Parteneriatul a realizat o cartografiere și o colectare de bune practici, în scopul multiplicării și al reproducerii la scară mai mare a serviciilor inovatoare în domeniul îmbătrânirii active și în condiții bune de sănătate.

([1]) COM(2006) 571 final „Viitorul demografic al Europei — transformarea unei provocări în oportunitate".
([2]) Estimările privind structura de vârstă a populației sunt publicate o dată la trei ani de către Eurostat și se bazează pe o serie de ipoteze referitoare la evoluția fertilității și a mortalității în timp. Cele mai recente rezultate (EUROPOP2010) sunt disponibile în baza de date online a Eurostat; Eurostat elaborează în prezent o nouă serie de estimări demografice (EUROPOP2013).
([3]) http://europa.eu/epic/practices-that-work/index-en.html
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A52013DC0083
([5]) Concluziile Consiliului privind lucrările pregătitoare pentru proiectul-pilot de parteneriat european pentru inovare. „Îmbătrânirea activă și în condiții bune de sănătate" (martie 2011) & Concluziile Consiliului — Îmbătrânirea în condiții bune de sănătate pe întreaga durată a ciclului de viață (decembrie 2012).
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing&pg=home

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001799/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Demographic decline in the European Union

The ageing of the population is creating a set of social and economic challenges that are of growing importance in a context in which national and European policies will have to ensure long-term economic sustainability that is in keeping with ever-changing demographic circumstances.

According to the 2012 Ageing Report, the fertility rate in the EU will rise slightly from its 2010 level of 1.59% to 1.64% by 2030 and 1.71% by 2060.

It is also suggested that, by 2060, the percentage of the population aged 65 and over will have risen to over 52.5% of the total EU population. Hence, owing to fertility, life expectancy and migration trends, the age structure of the EU population will change drastically in the years to come.

Although sexual and reproductive health policies are the sole competence of the Member States, can the Commission state whether it plans to sound the alarm as regards the ageing of the population, by drawing up an action plan in this respect?

Can it also state whether it is considering measures to draw the attention of the public and the national authorities to examples of good practices, or national policies, which have had a markedly positive impact on birth rates in the various Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission attaches great importance to demographic challenges, as outlined in its communication COM(2006) 571 final ([1]). Under its first policy area, 'Promoting demographic renewal in Europe', it addressed the then falling — now still low — birth-rates and called for the creation of supportive conditions for people who wish to have children. The answer to P-000568/14 outlines the Commission's policy and work to address this challenge. While there is no specific action plan on fertility and ageing, these topics are well-covered in the European semester and through the country specific recommendations in particular.

In addition, according to the Ageing Report the fertility assumptions used by Eurostat ([2]) on population projections are part of a common long-term scenario. The corresponding rise in fertility can be achieved via the appropriate policies referred to above.

Collecting and disseminating good practices is a further way the Commission supports the EU Member States in their efforts to address ageing. The attention of the honourable member is drawn in particular to, the European Platform for Investing in Children ([3]) that followed the Social Investment Package in 2013 ([4]).

The Commission launched the European Innovation Partnership on Active & Healthy Ageing ([5]) in 2011 ([6]). In 2013 the Partnership has undertaken a mapping and collection of good practices to support the replication and scaling up of innovative services in active and healthy ageing.

([1]) COM(2006) 571 final 'The demographic future of Europe — from challenge to opportunity'.
([2]) Projections of the age structure of the population are published every three years by Eurostat, based on a set of assumptions on the evolution of fertility and mortality over time. The latest results (EUROPOP2010) are available in Eurostat online database; Eurostat is currently developing a new set of population projections (EUROPOP2013).
([3]) http://europa.eu/epic/practices-that-work/index-en.html
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52013DC0083:EN:NOT
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing&pg=home
([6]) Council Conclusions on preparatory work for the pilot European Innovation Partnership 'Active and Heatlhy Ageing' (March, 2011) & Council conclusions on Healthy Ageing across the Lifecycle (December2012).

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-001800/14
до Комисията
Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE) и Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(18 февруари 2014 г.)

Относно: Пенсии на български граждани, работили в Гърция

До нас, в качеството ни на евродепутати, бяха отправени сигнали от български граждани, които са работили в Гърция и са плащали редовно социалните си осигуровки. Към настоящия въпрос прилагаме имената и телефоните им. При пенсиониране те имат различни проблеми, изразяващи се най-често в неоснователно бавене на процедурата при пенсиониране или на документи за пенсиониране, които е необходимо да бъдат представени в България. Друг проблем е забавяне на изплащането на вече отпуснати пенсии с месеци и дори с години, без да бъде дадено разумно обяснение за това. Гражданите ни сезират и заради изискването към тях да пътуват лично до Гърция всяка година, за да удостоверяват, че са живи и имат право да получават пенсията си.

Имаме предвид, че системите за социална сигурност са национални системи и че всички страни определят сами законодателството си. ЕС, обаче, определя общи правила за защита на правата на социална сигурност, когато гражданите преминават от една европейска страна в друга. Те се основават на четири принципа и един от тях е принципът на равно третиране и недискриминация. Той изисква българските граждани да имат същите права и задължения като гражданите на страната, в която се осигуряват, в случая Гърция.

Счита ли Комисията, че описаните от българските граждани практики нарушават един от четирите основни принципа, а именно — принципа на равно третиране, и че те водят до тяхното дискриминиране? Какви мерки би могла да вземе Комисията, за да бъдат правилно прилагани общите правила за защита на социална сигурност, когато се преминава от една в друга страна членка?

Отговор, даден от Ласло Андор от името на Комисията
(2 април 2014 г.)

Законодателството на ЕС в областта на социалната сигурност предвижда не хармонизиране, а координиране на схемите за социална сигурност ([1]). Следователно правото на Съюза не ограничава правомощията на държавите членки да организират схемите си за социална сигурност. Същевременно при упражняването на това правомощие, държавите членки трябва да спазват правото на ЕС. С тези правила се гарантира, че в процеса на прилагане на различните национални законодателства се спазват основните принципи на равно третиране и недискриминация.

Службите на Комисията получиха голям брой жалби от страна на български граждани. Проблемът със забавянето при разглеждането на заявления за пенсия от страна на гръцките власти беше внимателно разгледан и отнесен до гръцката администрация. Гръцката администрация призна за съществуването на този проблем и се ангажира да подобри комуникацията си с пенсионерите.

Освен това гръцките власти уверих службите на Комисията, че заявленията от българските граждани се третират по същия начин като тези от гражданите на други държави и че няма разлика в третирането на чужденци, които подават заявления за пенсия. Гръцките власти също така предоставиха телефонен номер, на който гражданите на ЕС могат да изискат информация относно актуалното състояние на пенсионното си досие.

Като се има предвид казаното по-горе, въпросът не засяга прилагането на правото на ЕС, за което Комисията носи отговорност, а по-скоро ефективността на гръцката администрация. Поради това той следва да бъде решен пряко между съответните администрации, а не на равнище ЕС.

([1]) Регламент (ЕО) № 883/2004 за координация на системите за социална сигурност и Регламент (ЕО) № 987/2009 за установяване на процедурата за прилагане на Регламент (ЕО) № 883/2004 за координация на системите за социална сигурност.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001800/14
to the Commission
Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE) and Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Pension problems for Bulgarian citizens who worked in Greece

As MEPs, we have been approached by a number of Bulgarian citizens who worked in Greece and paid their social security contributions there in the normal way. The names and telephone numbers of the individuals concerned are appended to this question. On retirement, these people have experienced a range of problems: mostly commonly, undue procedural delays in confirming their pension entitlement or delays in issuing pension-related documents which have to be submitted to the authorities in Bulgaria. In other cases, where pension entitlements have been confirmed, the actual payment of the pensions has been delayed, without any proper explanation, for months or even years. A further problem about which people have contacted us is the requirement that pensioners present themselves in person in Greece once a year to confirm that they are still alive and eligible to receive their pensions.

We are aware that social security systems are national systems and that every country has its own relevant legislation. However, the EU lays down general rules for the protection of people's social security entitlements when they move from one EU country to another. The system of rules is underpinned by four principles, one of which is the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination. That principle requires that Bulgarian citizens have the same rights and obligations as the citizens of the country in which they paid their social security contributions — in this case, Greece.

In the Commission's view, do the practices that these Bulgarian citizens have described to us constitute a violation of the principle of equal treatment and amount to discrimination against them? What measures could the Commission take to ensure the correct application of the general rules protecting social security entitlements when people move from one EU country to another?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

EC law in the field of social security provides for the coordination and not the harmonisation of social security schemes ([1]). Hence, it does not limit the power of the Member States to organise their social security schemes. However, when exercising that power, Member States must comply with EC law. These rules ensure that the application of the different national legislations respects the basic principles of equality of treatment and non-discrimination.

The Commission services received a number of complaints from Bulgarian citizens. The problem of delays in dealing with pension claims by the Greek authorities was carefully examined and raised with the Greek administration. The Greek administration acknowledged the problem and pledged to improve the way they communicate with pensioners.

Moreover, the Greek authorities assured the Commission services that the claims of Bulgarians are being treated in the same way as those of other nationals; thus there is no difference in treatment for foreign nationals applying for pensions. The Greek authorities also provided a phone number where EU citizens can enquire about the state of play of their pension file.

Taking into account the above, this issue does not seem to involve the application of EC law for which the Commission is responsible, but rather the efficiency of the Greek administration. Hence, this problem should be solved directly between the administrations concerned, and not at EU level.

([1]) Regulation (EC) n. 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems and Regulation (EC) 987/2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001805/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Artisti espulsi dalle istituzioni culturali in Ungheria

In Ungheria si registra un altro allarme piuttosto preoccupante riguardo alle presunte «epurazioni» nelle principali istituzioni culturali. Il direttore dell'orchestra sinfonica di Miskolc è stato cacciato, a detta di una rivista tematica, perché «non allineato» con l'attuale governo. Un altro celebre compositore e direttore, fondatore del Festival di Budapest, parla di una «evoluzione orribile, di una corsa verso l'abisso» dell'Ungheria. Altri colleghi dei due avevano già lanciato l'allarme per le epurazioni nei teatri e nelle orchestre magiare, dove direttori, intendenti e musicisti vengono espulsi su due piedi e sostituiti.

Alla luce di questi fatti, può la Commissione chiarire come intende muoversi?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(2 maggio 2014)

Dalle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato non risulta che la fattispecie cui fa riferimento, ovverosia i presunti licenziamenti abusivi nelle istituzioni culturali in Ungheria, sia connessa all'applicazione del diritto dell'Unione europea.

Benché la Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea preveda, all'articolo 30, tutela in caso di licenziamento ingiustificato ([1]), ciò non si applica a tutte le situazioni di presunta violazione di tale diritto. Ai sensi dell'articolo 51, paragrafo 1, la Carta si applica agli Stati membri esclusivamente nell'attuazione del diritto dell'Unione europea: «Le disposizioni della presente Carta si applicano alle istituzioni, organi e organismi dell'Unione nel rispetto del principio di sussidiarietà, come pure agli Stati membri esclusivamente nell'attuazione del diritto dell'Unione».

Dalle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato non risulta che la fattispecie cui si fa riferimento sia connessa all'applicazione del diritto dell'Unione europea. In tali casi spetta quindi allo Stato membro, e alle sue autorità giudiziarie, garantire il rispetto dei diritti fondamentali in conformità degli accordi internazionali e della legislazione interna.

([1]) «Ogni lavoratore ha il diritto alla tutela contro ogni licenziamento ingiustificato, conformemente al diritto dell'Unione e alle legislazioni e prassi nazionali.» (articolo 30 della Carta).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001805/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Artists expelled from cultural institutions in Hungary

In Hungary, considerable alarm has been expressed concerning alleged 'purges' of leading cultural institutions. The conductor of the Miskolc Symphony Orchestra has been ousted, according to a specialist journal, for 'not being in line' with the current government. Another famous composer and conductor, founder of the Budapest Festival, has spoken of a 'terrible process, a race towards the abyss' in Hungary. Other colleagues of the two had previously expressed alarm due to purges of Hungarian theatres and orchestras, from which conductors, managers and musicians have been expelled without notice and replaced.

In the light of these facts, can the Commission clarify what action it intends to take?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2014)

On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, it does not appear that the matter referred to, namely alleged abusive dismissals in cultural institutions in Hungary, is related to the implementation of EC law.

While the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union provides in Article 30 for protection in the event of unjustified dismissal ([1]), it does not apply to every situation of an alleged violation of this right. According to its Article 51(1), the Charter applies to Member States only when they are implementing European Union law: 'The provisions of this Charter are addressed to the institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union with due regard for the principle of subsidiarity and to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law.'

On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, it does not appear that the matter referred to relates to the implementation of Union law. In such cases, it is thus for the concerned Member State, including its judicial authorities, to ensure that fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from internal legislation — are respected.

([1]) 'Every worker has the right to protection against unjustified dismissal, in accordance with Community law and national laws and practices' (Art. 30 Charter).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001806/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Attentato in Egitto

Lo scorso 14 febbraio una violenta esplosione ha investito un bus di turisti nel Sinai, sul versante egiziano del valico di Taba. Almeno 5 persone sono rimaste uccise nell'attentato, mentre altre 29 sono state ferite più o meno gravemente. Le forze di sicurezza egiziane affermano di aver ritrovato sull'autobus resti umani riconducibili ad un kamikaze e si segue quindi la pista dell'attacco terroristico.

Può la Commissione fornire ulteriori informazioni sull'incidente? Sono presenti cittadini europei tra le vittime?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

In base alle informazioni di cui dispone il SEAE, l'attacco è stato rivendicato dal gruppo terrorista Ansar Bait al-Maqdis e tra le vittime non figurano cittadini europei. L'Alta rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha fermamente condannato l'attacco terroristico auspicando che gli autori venissero consegnati alla giustizia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001806/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Attack in Egypt

On 14 February a bus carrying tourists in Sinai, on the Egyptian side of the Taba border crossing, suffered a violent explosion. At least 5 people were killed in the attack and another 29 sustained injuries of varying degrees. The Egyptian security forces say they found human remains ascribable to a suicide bomber on the bus and are therefore treating the incident as a terrorist attack.

Can the Commission provide further information on this incident? Were European citizens among the victims?

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

According to the information available to EEAS, the attack has been claimed by the terrorist group Ansar Bait al-Maqdis, and no European citizen figures among the victims. The HR/VP strongly condemned the terrorist attack and called the perpetrators to be brought to justice.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001807/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Corsi di danza per disabili

Nella città di Foggia è stato organizzato un corso di danze folk dedicato esclusivamente alle persone affette da disabilità. Organizzato da una associazione sportiva dilettantistica locale, il corso, chiamato «Folk ability — Ritmi e danze dal mondo», si terrà tra febbraio a marzo e sarà completamente gratuito.

Lo scopo del progetto è quello di riallacciare le relazioni con il proprio corpo e far scoprire l'espressività, la creatività e l'allegria anche a quelle persone che hanno perso la funzionalità di alcune parti del corpo. Una sorta di terapia psicologica per aiutare ad accettare ed apprezzare il proprio corpo.

Alla luce di quanto detto, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. è a conoscenza del progetto in questione;

2. è a conoscenza di progetti simili in altri Stati membri dell'UE;

3. esistono fondi europei dedicati al sostegno di questo genere di attività?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2014)

Come illustrato nella «Strategia europea sulla disabilità 2010-2020 ([1])», la Commissione sostiene l'impegno degli Stati membri a promuovere l'inclusione e la piena partecipazione dei disabili a tutti gli aspetti della vita, e quindi anche alle attività sportive ([2]).

La Commissione non è a conoscenza del progetto in questione, né ha mai sovvenzionato attività di associazioni sportive analoghe a quella di Foggia sulla base di domande individuali. Un finanziamento della Commissione per progetti specifici può essere ottenuto solo nel contesto di inviti a presentare proposte.

La Commissione ha sovvenzionato progetti volti a incrementare la partecipazione allo sport, per esempio nel 2009 nell'ambito dell'obiettivo prioritario «Promozione dei valori fondamentali dell'Europa favorendo lo sport per le persone disabili» e nel 2010 nell'ambito dell'obiettivo prioritario «Promozione dell'inclusione sociale nello sport e attraverso di esso». La Commissione continua a garantire un sostegno a questo tipo di progetti nel quadro del programma Erasmus+ ([3]).

Inooltre, il programma «Europa creativa», che ha sostituito i programmi «Cultura» e «MEDIA», sovvenziona progetti di cooperazione culturale ([4]), prestando particolare attenzione alle categorie svantaggiate, e quindi anche ai disabili. Condizione fondamentale è che partecipino a un progetto almeno tre operatori culturali provenienti da paesi europei diversi ([5]). Il programma «Cultura» ha finanziato progetti simili a «Folk ability — Rhythms and dances of the world». Per esempio, «Dali Muchi» è stato realizzato da organizzazioni del Regno Unito, di Romania e Italia nel periodo 2007-2009 ([6]). Per ottenere il finanziamento di un progetto nell'ambito di «Europa creativa» occorre presentare una domanda sulla base di un invito a presentare proposte; i migliori progetti saranno selezionati per il finanziamento. Per ulteriori ragguagli La preghiamo di mettersi in contatto con lo sportello «Europa creativa» nel Suo paese ([7]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/disability-strategy/index_en.htm
([2]) Si vedano: «Un rinnovato impegno per un'Europa senza barriere», COM(2010) 0636 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT e l'elenco delle azioni per il periodo 2010-2015 SEC(2010)1324 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/documents/erasmus-plus-programme-guide_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/calls/index_en.htm
([5]) Esempi di progetti precedentemente finanziati sono consultabili all'indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported_en.htm
([6]) Per informazioni più dettagliate sul progetto si consulti: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/documents/publications/cult_prog_2009_en.pdf, pag. 10).
([7]) Per i dati relativi agli sportelli di «Europa creativa» si consulti il sito: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/creative-europe-desks_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001807/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Dance courses for the disabled

In the town of Foggia, a folk dance course has been organised, dedicated exclusively to persons affected by disability. Organised by a local amateur sports association, the course, entitled 'Folk ability — Rhythms and dances of the world', will be held in February and March and will be completely free of charge.

The aim of the project is to enable persons who have lost functionality in certain parts of their bodies to rediscover a relationship with their bodies and inspire expressiveness, creativity and happiness. It can be viewed as a kind of psychological therapy to help the disabled accept and appreciate their bodies.

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

1. Is the Commission aware of the project in question?

2. Is the Commission aware of similar projects in other EU Member States?

3. Have European funds been set aside to support this kind of activity?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

As set out in the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]), the Commission supports national efforts to promote the inclusion and full participation of persons with disabilities in all aspects of life, including in sport activities ([2]).

The Commission is not aware of the project in question nor does it directly fund on the basis of individual requests the activities of sports associations like the one in Foggia. Commission funding for specific projects can only be obtained within the context of calls for proposals.

The Commission has supported projects to increase participation in sport, for example in 2009 under the priority 'Promoting European fundamental values by encouraging sport for persons with disabilities' and in 2010 under the priority 'Promoting social inclusion in and through sport'. The Commission continues to support this type of projects under the Erasmus+ programme ([3]).

Furthermore, the Creative Europe Programme, which has replaced the Culture and MEDIA programmes, supports cultural cooperation ([4]) projects, with frequent emphasis on disadvantaged groups, including people with disabilities. The basic condition is that at least three cultural operators from different European countries must be involved in a project ([5]). Projects similar to 'Folk ability — Rhythms and dances of the world' were funded by the Culture Programme. For example 'Dali Muchi' was realised by organisations from the UK, Romania and Italy in 2007-2009 ([6]). Funding opportunities for projects under Creative Europe are available on the basis of calls for proposals, further to which the best applications are selected for funding. For further information, please contact the Creative Europe Desk in your country ([7]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/disability-strategy/index_en.htm
([2]) 'A renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe', COM(2010) 0636 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT and the list of actions for 2010-2015 SEC(2010)1324 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/documents/erasmus-plus-programme-guide_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/calls/index_en.htm
([5]) Examples of previously funded projects are available via this link: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported_en.htm
([6]) More detailed information on the project: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/documents/publications/cult_prog_2009_en.pdf, p. 10).
([7]) Creative Europe Desk contact details: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/creative-europe-desks_en.htm).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001808/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Cromoterapia e livelli di attenzione

La spossatezza è divenuta ormai un'afflizione comune, quasi alla pari dello stress, rendendo le persone stanche sin dalle prime ore del mattino. In questi casi come rimedio è consigliata l'attività fisica, il consumo di alimenti naturali o integratori, ma talvolta queste terapie non sono sufficienti.

Una possibile soluzione potrebbe però essere stata scoperta da un'equipe di ricercatori, che ha notato come un'esposizione, anche di breve durata, alla luce blu sia in grado di migliorare, quasi con effetto immediato, la vigilanza e le prestazioni. Gli effetti dell'esposizione fino ad ora erano stati testati solo sull'attenzione durante le ore notturne, ma pare che in realtà questo effetto si estenda anche alle ore diurne. I risultati dei test confermano che le persone esposte alla luce blu avevano meno sonno, tempi di reazione più rapidi e un minor numero di problemi di attenzione. A livello cerebrale si è evidenziato un notevole cambio di attività che indicava uno stato più vigile.

La ricerca ha anche evidenziato come un'esposizione prolungata alla luce blu possa avere effetti eccessivi sugli individui. La scoperta potrebbe avere importanti ripercussioni sugli ambienti di lavoro, sulle scuole, aiutando a migliore le prestazioni e al tempo stesso tutelare la salute degli individui.

Alla luce di questo studio, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. era a conoscenza della ricerca in questione?

2. esistono studi simili negli Stati membri?

3. intende approfondire l'argomento per valutarne i risvolti positivi sulla società e i potenziali effetti negativi sugli individui?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio pubblicato dal dottor Shadab Rahman e collaboratori cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato ([1]).

2. Il Settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (2007-2013) ([2]) non ha sostenuto la ricerca sulla cromoterapia e i suoi possibili effetti sull'attenzione e la stanchezza. La Commissione non è in grado di fornire informazioni su studi analoghi eseguiti in università o in centri di ricerca in Europa.

3. Orizzonte 2020, il Programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione ([3]) (2014-2020), nell'ambito dell'obiettivo «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere» contenuto nella priorità «Sfide per la società», potrebbe offrire opportunità di sostegno alla ricerca in questo settore. Si possono ottenere informazioni sulle attuali possibilità di finanziamento dal portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione della Commissione europea ([4]).

([1]) Diurnal spectral sensitivity of the acute alerting effects of light, Rahman SA; Flynn-Evans EE; Aeschbach D; Brainard GC; Czeisler CA; Lockley SW. Diurnal spectral sensitivity of the acute alerting effects of light. SLEEP 2014;37(2):271-281.
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_it.html
([3]) COM(2011) 808 definitivo, COM(2011) 811 definitivo.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001808/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Chromotherapy and attentiveness levels

Fatigue is now a common affliction, almost on a par with stress, which means sufferers are exhausted from the early morning. In such cases, the remedies recommended are physical activity and the consumption of natural foods and food supplements, but sometimes these treatments are not enough.

However, a potential solution may have been discovered by a team of researchers who have noted that even brief exposure to blue light can improve alertness and performance with almost immediate effect. Until now, the effects of exposure to blue light have only been tested on attentiveness during night hours, but it appears that in fact the effect could extend to daytime hours. The findings of these tests confirm that persons exposed to blue light were less sleepy, had faster reaction times and fewer problems with attentiveness. A significant change in brain activity, indicative of greater alertness, was noted.

The research also revealed that prolonged exposure to blue light could have unwanted effects on individuals. This discovery could have major repercussions on work and educational environments, help to improve performance and at the same time safeguard the health of individuals.

In the light of this study, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is the Commission already aware of this research?

2. Have similar studies been undertaken in Member States?

3. Does the Commission intend to evaluate this discovery to assess the positive repercussions on society and the potential negative effects on individuals?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

1. The Commission is aware of the study published by Dr Shadab Rahman and collaborators referred to by the Honourable Member ([1]).

2. The Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (2007-2013) ([2]) has not supported research on chromotherapy and its possible effects on attentiveness and fatigue. The Commission is not in a position to provide information on similar studies being carried out in universities or research centres in Europe.

3. Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation ([3]) (2014-2020), through its 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge may provide opportunities to support research in this area. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained at the EC Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([4]).

([1]) Diurnal spectral sensitivity of the acute alerting effects of light, Rahman SA; Flynn-Evans EE; Aeschbach D; Brainard GC; Czeisler CA; Lockley SW. Diurnal spectral sensitivity of the acute alerting effects of light. SLEEP 2014;37(2):271-281.
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([3]) COM(2011) 808 final, COM(2011) 811 final.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001810/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nocività del bisfenolo A per l'essere umano

Uno studio scientifico dell'Università del Michigan ha messo in luce l'alto rischio di cancro quando si usano di frequente alimenti chiusi in confezioni contenenti il bisfenolo A, alias BPA, presente negli involucri plastificati. In particolare lo studio ha messo in relazione il BPA delle confezioni di cibi consumati da giovani donne e il rischio di tumore per i loro figli.

I dati confermano che il 27 per cento dei topi esposti a tre diverse dosi di BPA, attraverso la dieta della madre, è a rischio. Tale percentuale ha infatti inciso sullo sviluppo di tumori del fegato o lesioni pre-cancerose. La probabilità era direttamente proporzionale al rischio di sviluppare un tumore. Le madri che hanno ricevuto il dosaggio più elevato (50 milligrammi di BPA per ogni chilo di peso corporeo) si sono dimostrate sette volte più esposte al pericolo di sviluppare un tumore.

Alla luce dei risultati di questo studio, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. è a conoscenza di questo studio;

2. è al corrente delle potenziali problematiche per la salute umana legate alla presenza di bisfenolo A nei contenitori per alimenti;

3. ha già intrapreso studi in materia per verificare la nocività del BPA e la sua incidenza sullo sviluppo di patologie? In caso di risposta negativa, intende avviarli?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio, eseguito dalla School of Public Health dell'Università del Michigan, cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare.

2. A norma del regolamento n. 10/2011 ([1]) nell'UE è ammesso l'uso del bisfenolo A (BPA) nei materiali destinati a venire in contatto con i prodotti alimentari, con un limite di migrazione specifico di 0,6 mg/kg di alimento. Dal maggio 2011 è vietato l'uso di BPA nella fabbricazione di biberon di policarbonato per lattanti. La Commissione segue attentamente i lavori dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA). L'EFSA ha avviato un riesame completo dei rischi per la salute umana, non soltanto in ambito alimentare, dell'esposizione al BPA, riesame che comporta l'analisi di varie centinaia di studi scientifici ed ha lanciato una consultazione pubblica online (aperta fino al 13 marzo 2014) ([2]) al fine di elaborare un progetto di parere. Tale progetto non tiene ancora conto del nuovo studio dell'Università del Michigan, ma l'EFSA ne sta valutando la rilevanza. Il parere finale dovrebbe essere adottato entro la fine di maggio 2014. Recentemente, nell'ambito del quadro normativo UE sulle sostanze chimiche ([3]) ([4]), sono inoltre state prese ulteriori disposizioni in merito al BPA che sono attualmente all'esame del comitato per la valutazione dei rischi dell'Agenzia europea per le sostanze chimiche ([5]) ([6]).

3. La Commissione ha anche finanziato una serie di progetti di ricerca in questo settore. Nell'ambito del 6°PQ ([7]), la rete di eccellenza CASCADE ([8]) ha eseguito un esame completo degli inquinanti della catena alimentare. Nell'ambito del tema 2 «Prodotti alimentari, agricoltura e pesca, e biotecnologie» ([9]) del 7°PQ ([10]) si è fornito sostegno a numerosi progetti di ricerca riguardanti gli effetti sulla salute delle sostanze chimiche contenute nei prodotti alimentari e nei materiali a contatto con gli alimenti ([11]). Le future possibilità di finanziamento nel quadro di Orizzonte 2020 consentiranno di proseguire la ricerca e l'innovazione in materia di sicurezza alimentare ([12]).

([1]) GU L 12 del 15/01/2011.
([2]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/consultationsclosed/call/140117.htm
([3]) GU L 353 del 31.12.2008.
([4]) GU L 396 del 30.12.2006.
([5]) http://www.echa.europa.eu/web/guest/harmonised-classification-and-labelling-previous-consultations/-/substance/179/search/201-245-8/term
([6]) http://www.echa.europa.eu/web/guest/registry-of-submitted-restriction-proposal-intentions/-/substance/179/search/+/term
([7]) Sesto programma quadro di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (6° PQ, 2002-2006).
([8]) http://cascade.projectcoordinator.net/
([9]) Settimo programma quadro di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7° PQ, 2007-2013).
([10]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/kbbe/about-kbbe_en.html
([11]) http://www.theobelixproject.org/, http://www.perfood.eu/, http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/88451_it.html, http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/106798_it.html
([12]) Si possono ottenere informazioni sulle attuali possibilità di finanziamento dal portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione: http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001810/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Bisphenol A harmful to humans

A scientific study carried out by the University of Michigan has revealed a high cancer risk associated with the frequent consumption of food in packaging containing bisphenol A, also known as BPA, present in plastic-coated packaging. The study has established a specific link between BPA contained in the packaging of food consumed by young women and a risk of development of tumours in their children.

The data confirms that 27% of mice exposed to 3 different doses of BPA, through the mother's diet, are at risk. This percentage incidence in fact related to the development of tumours of the liver or precancerous lesions. The probability was directly proportionate to the risk of developing a tumour. The mothers who received the highest dose (50 milligrams of BPA for every kilogram of body weight) were found to be seven times more at risk of developing a tumour.

In the light of the findings of this study, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of this study?

2. Is the Commission aware of the potential adverse effects on human health of the presence of bisphenol A in food containers?

3. Has the Commission embarked on studies on this matter to ascertain the harmfulness of BPA and its incidence on the development of pathologies? If not, does it intend to do so?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

1. The Commission is aware of the study, carried out by the University of Michigan School of Public Health, referred to by the Honourable Member.

2. Bisphenol A (BPA) is permitted for use in food contact materials in the EU under Regulation No 10/2011 ([1]) with a specific migration limit of 0,6 mg/kg food. Since May 2011, the use of BPA for the manufacture of polycarbonate infant feeding bottles is prohibited. The Commission follows closely the work of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). EFSA has initiated a full re-evaluation of human health risks associated with exposure to both dietary and non-dietary BPA, which includes a review of several hundred scientific studies, and opened an online public consultation (which was open until 13 March 2014) ([2]) on the resulting draft opinion. This draft does not yet take into account the new study by the University of Michigan, but EFSA is evaluating its relevance. The final opinion is expected to be adopted by the end of May 2014. Further actions regarding BPA have also been initiated recently within the EU regulatory framework on chemicals ([3]), ([4]) and are currently under evaluation by the Committee for Risk Assessment of the European Chemicals Agency ([5]), ([6]).

3. The Commission has also funded a number of research projects in this area. Under FP6 ([7]), the CASCADE ([8]) Network of Excellence carried out a comprehensive review of food chain contaminants. Under FP7 ([9]), the 'Food, agriculture and fisheries, and biotechnology' ([10]) theme 2 has provided support to a number of research projects on the health effects of chemicals in food and food contact materials ([11]). Future funding opportunities under Horizon 2020 will allow the continuation of research and innovation in the area of food safety ([12]).

([1]) OJ L 12, 15.01.2011.
([2]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/consultations/call/140117.htm
([3]) OJ L 353, 31.12.2008.
([4]) OJ L 396, 30.12.2006.
([5]) http://www.echa.europa.eu/web/guest/harmonised-classification-and-labelling-previous-consultations/-/substance/179/search/201-245-8/term
([6]) http://www.echa.europa.eu/web/guest/registry-of-submitted-restriction-proposal-intentions/-/substance/179/search/+/term
([7]) Sixth Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP6, 2002-2006.
([8]) http://cascade.projectcoordinator.net/
([9]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).
([10]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/kbbe/about-kbbe_en.html
([11]) http://www.theobelixproject.org/ http://www.perfood.eu/ http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/88451_en.html http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/106798_en.html
([12]) Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal: http://ec.europa.eu/resarch/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001811/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuovi strumenti per la protezione dei minori on-line

Una nota azienda privata Italia del settore dei media e della comunicazione ha annunciato l'adozione di una serie di misure a protezione dei minori su tutti i portali internet del gruppo, compresi i servizi non lineari (on demand) attivi su tv connesse, pc, tablet e altri dispositivi mobili. L'annuncio è avvenuto nel contesto del Safer Internet Day, la giornata per un «Internet più sicuro» promossa dall'Unione europea, tenutasi lo scorso 11 febbraio.

Tra le novità annunciate vi sono degli strumenti di verifica dell'età previa registrazione per l'accesso a contenuti VM14 on-line, la classificazione a semaforo di contenuti catch-up (serie, fiction e film), il link diretto al «Comitato Media e Minori» dell'azienda per segnalare contenuti inappropriati.

L'azienda ha anche affermato di apprestarsi a lanciare un nuovo sistema tecnologico di classificazione dei contenuti generati dagli utenti, in un'ottica di protezione dei minori.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. quali sono i principali strumenti di tutela dei minori on line da parte delle principali aziende di media e comunicazione degli Stati membri dell'UE?

2. se ritiene che il sistema di classificazione dei contenuti generati dagli utenti sia uno strumento efficace? Esistono altre azioni di media e comunicazione che fanno uso? Intende promuoverlo a livello europeo, al fine di estenderne l'utilizzo da parte degli operatori?

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

La Commissione apprezza molto le iniziative portate avanti dalle imprese del settore lungo tutta la catena del valore; si tratta di un aspetto fondamentale dell'approccio delineato nella strategia intesa a fare di internet un luogo migliore per i bambini ([1]).

Dal 2011 la Commissione collabora con circa 30 imprese, nel contesto della coalizione CEO ([2]), per rendere internet un luogo migliore per i bambini, condividendo informazioni su varie misure e pratiche con imprese del settore e terze parti.

Le relazioni di attuazione ([3]) trasmesse alla Commissione nel gennaio 2014 riflettono tale interazione. Gli strumenti chiave devono essere identificati di volta in volta, in quanto le misure di buona pratica comportano l'adattamento dei servizi e dei prodotti offerti alle reali esigenze dei bambini. Tuttavia, la direttiva sui servizi di media audiovisivi (direttiva SMA) cita al considerando 60 esempi di misure tecniche che si potrebbero utilizzare per proteggere i minori dai contenuti dannosi: codici PIN, etichettatura dei contenuti e sistemi di filtraggio. I contenuti generati dagli utenti sono particolarmente difficili da classificare e YouRateIt ([4]), lo strumento pilota lanciato e gestito dagli organismi di classificazione nazionali BBFC ([5]) e NICAM ([6]), rappresenta un approccio interessante al problema.

Mediaset ha aderito a questa iniziativa ispirata dalle discussioni della coalizione CEO e proverà il nuovo strumento con il suo servizio 16mm ([7]). È troppo presto per giudicare l'efficacia dell'approccio, ma la Commissione in generale accoglie con favore le iniziative volte ad attenuare i problemi posti dalle nuove sfide, come l'assenza di informazioni sui contenuti generati dagli utenti.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/european-strategy-deliver-better-internet-our-children
([2]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/node/61973
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=14391
([4]) http://www.yourateit.eu/
([5]) http://www.bbfc.co.uk/
([6]) http://www.kijkwijzer.nl/english
([7]) http://www.16mm.it/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001811/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: New tools for the protection of children online

A well-known private Italian company in the media and communications sector has announced a series of measures to protect children on all Internet portals of the group, including nonlinear (on demand) services active on connected TVs, PCs, tablets and other mobile devices. The announcement has come in the context of Safer Internet Day, held on 11 February and promoted by the European Union.

The innovations announced include tools to check the ages of users subject to registration for access to online VM14 content, traffic-light classification of catch-up content (series, fiction and films) and a direct link to the company's 'Media and Children's Committee' for the reporting of inappropriate content.

The company has also announced that it is preparing to launch a new technological system for the classification of user-generated content in order to protect children.

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

1. Can the Commission identify the key tools to protect children online used by leading media and communications companies in EU Member States?

2. Does the Commission consider the system of classification of user-generated content to be an effective tool? Is this system used in initiatives taken by other media and communications companies? Does the Commission intend to promote this system throughout Europe to ensure that it is used by a greater number of operators?

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

The Commission highly values actions taken by industry across the value chain — this is a key part of the approach set out in the strategy to make the Internet a Better place for children ([1]).

The Commission has engaged with around 30 companies in the CEO coalition ([2]) to make the Internet a better place for children since 2011 where much information about various measures and practices has been shared among industry, 3rd parties and with the Commission.

The implementation reports ([3]) submitted to the Commission in January 2014 reflect this. What to consider as key tools varies, as good practice measures imply tailoring services and products offered according to the real needs of children. However, the AVMS Directive (see Recital 60) mentions examples of technical measures which may be used to protect minors from harmful content such as: the use of PIN codes, labelling of content and filtering systems. User-generated content is challenging in terms of classification and YouRateIt ([4]), the pilot initiated and led by BBFC ([5]) and NICAM ([6]), who are national classification bodies, is an interesting approach to this issue.

Mediaset has signed up to this spin-off action coming out of the CEO Coalition discussions and they will test it in practice on their 16mm service ([7]). It is not possible to say at this early stage if the approach is effective or not but the Commission would generally welcome such initiatives aiming to mitigate new challenges like the lack of information about user-generated content.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/european-strategy-deliver-better-Internet-our-children
([2]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/node/61973
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=14391
([4]) http://www.yourateit.eu/
([5]) http://www.bbfc.co.uk/
([6]) http://www.kijkwijzer.nl/english
([7]) http://www.16mm.it/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001812/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuovo composto contro le infezioni virali

Il virus del raffreddore è uno tra i più attivi e mutevoli, tanto da ripresentarsi durante ogni stagione fredda. Un team di ricercatori britannici dell'Università di Oxford ha però pubblicato su una nota rivista scientifica uno studio su un composto in grado di impedire la contrazione del virus. Il composto potrebbe essere usato contro diverse malattie, alcune anche potenzialmente fatali come la poliomielite e l'afta. Il composto agisce legandosi al virus, paralizzandolo e impedendogli il rilascio di materiale genetico infettivo.

Alla luce di questo studio, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. è a conoscenza dello studio?

2. lo studio ha beneficiato di finanziamenti europei?

3. è a conoscenza di studi simili in altri Stati membri dell'UE?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'articolo «More powerful virus inhibitors from structure based analysis of HEV71 capsid binding molecules» pubblicato sulla rivista Nature.

2. L'articolo riconosce il contributo apportato ai risultati della ricerca dal progetto SILVER ([1]), finanziato a titolo del Settimo programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7° PQ, 2007-2013) ([2]). SILVER si concentra sui seguenti aspetti: sviluppo concettuale e screening delle biblioteche, studi sui meccanismi d'azione, interazione tra proteine ed RNA, ottimizzazione molecolare e prova di concetto (Proof of Concept, PoC), tossicità dei farmaci in vitro e sviluppo di farmaci in vivo. Si tratta in tutti i casi di processi importanti per la scoperta di potenziali farmaci antivirali.

3. La Commissione non è a conoscenza di studi simili in altri Stati membri dell'UE, ma desidera sottolineare che lo studio in oggetto non coinvolge soltanto ricercatori dell'Università di Oxford, ma anche ricercatori di altri Stati membri dell'UE (come Austria, Francia, Belgio e Germania) e della Cina.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/96747_it.html — http://www.silver-europe.com/spip.php?article26
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001812/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: New compound to combat viral infections

The common cold virus is one of the most active and prone to mutate, to the extent that it reappears every winter. A team of British researchers from Oxford University, however, has published a study in a well-known scientific journal on a compound that is capable of preventing contraction of the virus. The compound could be used against a number of diseases, some of them potentially fatal, such as polio and foot and mouth disease. The compound works by binding to the virus, paralysing it and preventing it from releasing infectious genetic material.

In the light of this study, can the Commission clarify whether:

1. it is aware of this study;

2. the study has received EU funding;

3. it is aware of any similar studies in other EU Member States?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

1. The Commission is aware of the article on 'More powerful virus inhibitors from structure based analysis of HEV71 capsid binding molecules' published in Nature.

2. The article acknowledges the contribution of the research results from the SILVER ([1]) project that is funded under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) ([2]). SILVER focuses in particular on library screening and conceptual development, mode of action studies, protein — RNA interactions, molecular optimisation and proof of concept, drug toxicity *in vitro*, and *in vivo* drug development. These are all important processes in the discovery of potential antiviral drugs.

3. The Commission is not aware of similar studies in other EU Member States, but would like to underline that this study does not only involve researchers from Oxford University, but also from other EU Member States (e.g. Austria, France, Belgium, Germany, etc.) as well as from China.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/96747_en.html — http://www.silver-europe.com/spip.php?article26
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001816/14
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(18 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Rosja przesuwa granicę w głąb Gruzji

Jak podaje agencja Reuteurs, Rosja przesunęła granicę o 11 kilometrów w głąb terytorium Gruzji. Moskwa tłumaczy się, że jest to tymczasowe rozwiązanie na czas Igrzysk Olimpijskich w Soczi. NATO wyraziło swoje zaniepokojenie tym posunięciem. Szef organizacji Anders Fogh Rasmussen powiedział: „odnotowaliśmy ostatnią decyzję o przesunięciu tzw. strefy granicznej Abchazji na teren Gruzji bez zgody gruzińskiego rządu, jesteśmy tym bardzo zaniepokojeni". Z kolei Gruzja określiła ruch Moskwy jako „nielegalną akcję" naruszającą jej niezależność.

W związku z powyższym pragniemy zapytać:

1. Czy Wysoka Przedstawiciel Unii do spraw zagranicznych i polityki bezpieczeństwa Pani Catherine Ashton mogłaby udzielić informacji, jakie jest stanowisko Unii Europejskiej w tej sprawie?

2. Czy Pani Catherine Ashton wystosuje apel do władz rosyjskich w tej sprawie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(28 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Faktyczne władze Abchazji ustanowiły 11-kilometrową strefę bezpieczeństwa pomiędzy granicą Federacji Rosyjskiej i Gruzją w strefie kontrolowanej przez faktyczne władze Abchazji. Środek ten został wprowadzony w kontekście Igrzysk Olimpijskich w Soczi. Ograniczenia w tej strefie bezpieczeństwa zostały wprowadzone od dnia 20 stycznia do dnia 19 marca 2014 r.; w tym okresie wszystkie pojazdy zostały sprawdzone i tylko osoby zarejestrowane jako mieszkający w tej strefie mogły się do niej dostać. UE wydała oświadczenie w dniu 23 stycznia za pośrednictwem swojego przedstawicielstwa w OBWE, gdzie UE ponownie wyraziła swoje głębokie zaniepokojenie w sprawie poszanowania integralności terytorialnej Gruzji, a także podkreśliła, że jej stanowisko w odniesieniu do oddzielenia działań dotyczących rosyjskich i separatystycznych regionów utrudnia swobodę przemieszczania się dla społeczności lokalnych.

Usunięcie „wszelkich ograniczeń bezpieczeństwa" (w tym „11-kilometrowej strefy bezpieczeństwa") na granicy Federacji Rosyjskiej zostało potwierdzone przez abchazyjskich i rosyjskich uczestników 27. rundy międzynarodowych rozmów genewskich w dniach 25-26 marca. UE (EUMM Georgia) nie ma jednak środków służących weryfikacji tej kwestii na miejscu.

Podczas swoich spotkań z przedstawicielami Federacji Rosyjskiej Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca nadal przedstawia stanowisko UE w sprawie wszystkich tych kwestii.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001816/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Russia moves its border into Georgian territory

According to Reuters news agency, Russia has moved the border 11 kilometres into Georgian territory. Moscow has explained that this is a temporary measure during the Olympics in Sochi. NATO has expressed its concern at this move. The head of the organisation, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, has said: 'we are aware of the latest decision to move the so-called border area of Abkhazia into Georgia without the consent of the Georgian Government and we are very concerned about this'. On the other hand, Georgia has called Moscow's move 'an unlawful act' violating its independence.

In respect of the above, I wish to ask:

1. Can the EU's High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Catherine Ashton, provide information as to the European Union's position in this matter?

2. Has Catherine Ashton appealed to the Russian authorities in this matter?

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

The Abkhaz *de facto* authorities have established an 11km security zone between the Russian Federation Border and Georgia in an area controlled by Abkhaz *de facto* authorities; this measure was implemented in the context of the Sochi Olympic Games. Restrictions in this security zone were put in place from 20 January to 19 March 2014; in this period all vehicles were checked and only people registered as living in this area were able to enter the area. The EU issued a statement on 23 January via its Delegation to the OSCE, where the EU yet again expressed its profound concerns in relation to the respect of the Georgian territorial integrity and equally emphasised its position on the Russian and break away regions' fencing activities hindering freedom of movement for the local communities.

The removal of 'all security restrictions' (including the '11km security zone') at the RF border was confirmed by the Abkhazian and Russian participants at the 27th round of the Geneva international discussions on 25-26 March. The EU (EUMM Georgia) has however no means to verify this on the ground.

In her meetings with the Russian Federation representatives the HR/VP continues bringing forward the viewpoints of the EU on all these matters.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001818/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(18 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: W sprawie sprawozdania Komisji dla Rady i Parlamentu Europejskiego, Sprawozdanie o zwalczaniu korupcji w UE [COM(2014)0038]

Sprawozdanie o zwalczaniu korupcji analizuje problem w każdym państwie członkowskim. Pokazuje, jakie środki są podejmowane w celu zwalczania korupcji, czy są one wystarczająco skuteczne, co może być poprawione i w jaki sposób. Sprawozdanie wskazuje, że skala korupcji i jej natura są rożne w zależności od analizowanego państwa. Efektywność podjętych działań jest także zróżnicowana. Sprawozdanie podkreśla, że problem korupcji w Unii Europejskiej wymaga większej uwagi ze strony państw członkowskich.

Według sprawozdania, w niektórych krajach korupcja dotyczy szczególnie tylko wybranych sektorów. Jak wskazali respondenci na Węgrzech, w Słowacji i Polsce, największy problem z korupcją ma miejsce w opiece zdrowotnej. Jest to dowód, że problemy strukturalne w tym sektorze przyczyniają się do korupcji. Zgodnie z tym sprawozdaniem z problemem spotkała się następująca liczba ankietowanych: Węgry (13 %), Słowacja (14 %), Polska (15 %).

Komisja zauważa także zagrożenie upolitycznienia Centralnego Biura Antykorupcyjnego w Polsce. Proponuje Polsce wzmocnienie systemu zabezpieczającego przed upolitycznieniem tego organu, tj. bezstronną i przejrzystą procedurę mianowania szefa tej instytucji, a także dokonywanie analizy skuteczności CBA z naciskiem na liczbę oskarżeń i powagę spraw, którymi się zajmuje.

1. Czy Komisja zamierza pomóc państwom członkowskich, w których istnieje poważny problem strukturalny w opiece zdrowotnej, w tym Polsce? Poprawa sytuacji w opiece zdrowotnej mogłaby zmniejszyć skalę korupcji. Gdy pacjenci będą mieli wystarczający dostęp do usług medycznych na wysokim poziomie, skala korupcji może zostać zmniejszona do minimum.

2. Czy Komisja mogłaby sprecyzować propozycję zwiększenia przejrzystości Centralnego Biura Antykorupcyjnego w Polsce? Czy Komisja proponuje zrezygnowanie z nadzoru Prezesa Rady Ministrów nad szefem Centralnego Biura Antykorupcyjnego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(2 kwietnia 2014 r.)

1. Komisja planuje zaangażować państwa członkowskie w dialog na temat działań następczych w odniesieniu do wszystkich przyszłych działań zaproponowanych w sprawozdaniu o zwalczaniu korupcji w UE, w tym tych dotyczących sektora opieki zdrowotnej. Komisja rozpocznie również w tym roku program wymiany doświadczeń, który ułatwi państwom członkowskim, lokalnym organizacjom pozarządowym i innym zainteresowanym stronom wymianę dobrych praktyk i eliminowanie braków polityki antykorupcyjnej, prowadzenie działań następczych, podnoszenie świadomości oraz oferowanie stosownych szkoleń.

2. Jeżeli chodzi o niezależność polskiego Centralnego Biura Antykorupcyjnego, Komisja proponuje wprowadzenie bardziej przejrzystej i bezstronnej procedury mianowania szefa Biura. Szczegółową analizę obecnie występujących niedociągnięć przedstawiono na stronach 5-6 załącznika 21 do sprawozdania o zwalczaniu korupcji w UE ([1]).

([1]) Sprawozdanie jest dostępne pod adresem: http://ec.europa.eu/anti-corruption-report/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001818/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: The Commission's EU anti-corruption report for the Council and the European Parliament [COM(2014)0038]

The Anti-Corruption Report analyses the problem of corruption in each Member State. It indicates what measures are being taken to counteract corruption and whether they are sufficiently effective, what may be improved and in what way. The report indicates that the scale and nature of corruption differ from country to country. The effectiveness of measures taken also differs. The report stresses that the problem of corruption in the European Union requires greater attention from Member States.

According to the report, in certain countries corruption only particularly affects certain sectors. As respondents in Hungary, Slovakia and Poland indicated, the greatest problem with corruption arises in healthcare. This constitutes evidence that structural problems in this sector contribute to corruption. According to the report, the following number of respondents had experienced this problem: Hungary (13%), Slovakia (14%) and Poland (15%).

The Commission also noted the danger of the Central Anti-Corruption Agency [CBA] in Poland becoming politicised. It proposes that Poland strengthen the system safeguarding against the politicisation of this agency, i.e. an impartial and transparent procedure for appointing the head of this institution and analysing the effectiveness of the CBA, with an emphasis on the number of charges brought and the importance of the cases conducted.

1. Does the Commission intend to assist Member States in which there is a serious structural problem in healthcare, including Poland? An improvement in the situation in healthcare could reduce the scale of corruption. If patients have sufficient access to high-level medical services, the scale of corruption may be reduced to a minimum.

2. Can the Commission clarify its proposal to increase the transparency of the Central Anti-Corruption Agency in Poland? Does the Commission propose that the Prime Minister's supervision over the head of the Central Anti-Corruption Agency be abolished?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

1. The Commission plans to engage Member States in dialogue on the follow-up of all future steps suggested in the EU Anti-Corruption Report, including those concerning the healthcare sector. The Commission will also put in place this year an experience sharing programme to help Member States, local NGOs and other stakeholders exchange good practice and overcome shortcomings in anti-corruption policy, facilitate follow-up work, raise awareness, and provide training.

2. Concerning the independence of Poland's Central Anti-Corruption Bureau, the Commission suggests introducing a more transparent and impartial procedure for the appointment of the Bureau's Head. Vulnerabilities in the current setting are analysed in detail on pages 5-6 of Annex 21 to the EU Anti-Corruption Report ([1]).

([1]) Available at http://ec.europa.eu/anti-corruption-report/

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001821/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: La nueva reforma del sistema tarifario eléctrico del Gobierno español (I)

La nueva reforma del sistema tarifario eléctrico del Gobierno español entrará en vigor a partir del próximo 1 de abril. La factura experimentará cambios de precio cada hora según marque el mercado, lo cual hará casi imposible comprobar si la factura se ha hecho correctamente. La casuística es infinita: además de los 1 440 precios que se aplicarán a un solo usuario por su consumo de dos meses (24 horas al día, multiplicado por 60 días, para los que hayan pactado factura mensual), están los periodos de facturación que, para cada usuario, empiezan o terminan en días diferentes. Por otra parte, el precio a cobrar en cada caso dependerá de la potencia que tenga contratada cada uno ([1]). Además, todo el sistema eléctrico español deberá disponer de nuevos contadores de la luz *inteligentes* antes del 31 de diciembre de 2018, es decir, en tres años y diez meses, según indica el Plan de sustitución de equipos a medida ([2]), por el que los usuarios pagarán un 40 % más caro el alquiler del contador.

Por un lado, se ahorra el coste de los operarios, que ya no serán necesarios para realizar mediciones; se facilita el corte remoto de suministro; se agiliza y simplifica el área comercial de las compañías, que pueden ofrecer diferentes tipos de tarifas, como con la telefonía móvil; y también se controla mejor el fraude: si alguien manipula el contador, la compañía lo sabrá al instante.

¿Qué medidas cree la Comisión que debe adoptar el Estado español para luchar contra la pobreza energética?

¿Está satisfecha la Comisión con las recientes medidas del Gobierno español para reducir el déficit de tarifa? ¿Le preocupa que el contenido de estas medidas suponga un aumento de la carga financiera para los consumidores?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a las preguntas escritas E-000093/2014 ([3]) y E-001115/2014 ([4]).

([1]) http://www.economistas.org/Contenido/Consejo/ResumenPrensa/1_2014/11_FEBRERO/12-02-14/2_electric.pdf
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20140217/54400266536/nuevos-contadores-luz.html
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-000093&language=ES
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-001115&language=ES (respuesta aún no publicada).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001821/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: New reform of the electricity tariff system by the Spanish Government (I)

The new reform of the electricity tariff system by the Spanish Government is due to come into force as from 1 April this year. The prices in electricity bills will change every hour according to market fluctuations, which will make it almost impossible to verify if a bill has been calculated correctly. The variables are practically infinite: apart from the 1 440 prices charged to a customer for his/her consumption over two months (24 hours per day multiplied by 60 days for those who have opted for monthly bills), there will be billing periods that start or end on different days for each consumer. In addition, the price to be charged to each consumer will depend on the capacity contracted for ([1]). Furthermore, the whole electricity system in Spain will have to have new 'smart' electricity meters by 31 December 2018, i.e. within three years and ten months, according to the Plan for Replacement of Metering Equipment ([2]), which will mean that consumers will have to pay 40% more for leasing their meters.

On the one hand, employment costs will be reduced, since no staff will be needed to read meters; it will be easier for the utility companies to cut off consumers' supplies remotely; the companies' marketing sectors will be stimulated and simplified, as they will be able to offer different types of tariff, as in the mobile telephone sector; and, furthermore, there will be more control over fraud — the utility company will be notified instantly of any manipulation of a meter.

What measures does the Commission believe the Spanish Government should adopt in order to counter energy poverty?

Is the Commission satisfied with the recent measures of the Spanish Government to reduce the tariff deficit? Is it concerned that these measures might entail higher costs for consumers?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-000093/2014 ([3]) and E-001115/2014 ([4]).

([1]) http://www.economistas.org/Contenido/Consejo/ResumenPrensa/1_2014/11_FEBRERO/12-02-14/2_electric.pdf
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20140217/54400266536/nuevos-contadores-luz.html
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-000093&language=EN
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-001115&language=EN (answer not yet published)

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001822/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: La nueva reforma del sistema tarifario eléctrico del Gobierno español (II)

La nueva reforma del sistema tarifario eléctrico del Gobierno español entrará en vigor a partir del próximo 1 de abril. La factura experimentará cambios de precio cada hora según marque el mercado, lo cual hará casi imposible comprobar si la factura se ha hecho correctamente. La casuística es infinita: además de los 1 440 precios que se aplicarán a un solo usuario por su consumo de dos meses (24 horas al día, multiplicado por 60 días, para los que hayan pactado factura mensual), están los periodos de facturación que, para cada usuario, empiezan o terminan en días diferentes. Por otra parte, el precio a cobrar en cada caso dependerá de la potencia que tenga contratada cada uno ([1]). Además, todo el sistema eléctrico español deberá disponer de nuevos contadores de la luz *inteligentes* antes del 31 de diciembre de 2018, es decir, en tres años y diez meses, según indica el Plan de sustitución de equipos a medida ([2]), por el que los usuarios pagarán un 40 % más caro el alquiler del contador.

Según los expertos de la Organización de Consumidores y Usuarios, «al usuario ni le va a salir más barata la factura ni va a tener acceso a su consumo». Dicho en otros términos, con los nuevos contadores el consumidor va a seguir desconociendo qué consume hora a hora —que es como insta el Gobierno a los ciudadanos a que se tarife desde ahora—, aunque la compañía tendrá toda la información.

¿Cree la Comisión que se está perdiendo una buena oportunidad para informar al usuario para que este haga un consumo más eficiente?

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión hacer recomendaciones a los Estados miembros para que tomen medidas para el uso inteligente y eficiente de la energía eléctrica en los edificios?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de abril de 2014)

La Directiva sobre la eficiencia energética ([3]) (DEE) contiene disposiciones (cuya transposición al Derecho nacional debe efectuarse para el 5 de junio de este año) para permitir a los consumidores utilizar la energía de forma más eficiente. En virtud de esta Directiva, los consumidores finales reciben nuevos derechos en cuanto al acceso a la información sobre su propio consumo de energía, con inclusión del derecho de los consumidores finales que utilizan contadores inteligentes de electricidad a ser informados sobre el tiempo real de uso (consumo según tarifas en función del tiempo de uso). Esto será obligatorio en todos los Estados miembros en que se hayan introducido sistemas de medición inteligentes de acuerdo con la Directiva 2009/72/CE.

La Comisión ya ha adoptado recomendaciones relativas a medidas para fomentar el uso inteligente y eficiente de la electricidad en los edificios. En particular, en marzo de 2012 la Comisión adoptó una recomendación para preparar la provisión de sistemas de medición inteligentes, destinada a facilitar la aceptación de esta nueva tecnología. En ella se establece un conjunto de funcionalidades mínimas comunes para los sistemas de medición inteligentes y trata cuestiones de protección de datos y de seguridad.

Por otra parte, en noviembre de 2013 la Comisión publicó una Nota de orientación sobre las disposiciones de la DEE en relación con la medición, la información sobre la facturación y el coste del acceso a la información sobre medición y facturación ([4]).

Se espera que, con la adecuada aplicación de las Directivas 2012/27/UE y 2009/72/CE, los consumidores se vean incentivados para utilizar la información sobre su consumo a fin de controlar mejor el uso que hacen de la energía. Gracias a la combinación de servicios de respuesta de la demanda y tarifas diferenciadas, los consumidores podrán utilizar la electricidad cuando los precios de esta sean bajos (por ejemplo, debido a un excedente en la red) y reducir así sus facturas de energía.

([1]) http://www.economistas.org/Contenido/Consejo/ResumenPrensa/1_2014/11_FEBRERO/12-02-14/2_electric.pdf
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20140217/54400266536/nuevos-contadores-luz.html
([3]) Directiva 2012/27/UE.
([4]) Documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión [SWD(2013) 448], Nota de orientación sobre la Directiva 2012/27/UE relativa a la eficiencia energética. Artículos 9-11: Contadores; información sobre la facturación; coste de acceso a la información sobre medición y facturación.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001822/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: New reform of the electricity tariff system by the Spanish Government (II)

The new reform of the electricity tariff system by the Spanish Government is due to come into force as from 1 April this year. The prices in electricity bills will change every hour according to market fluctuations, which will make it almost impossible to verify if a bill has been calculated correctly. The variables are practically infinite: apart from the 1 440 prices charged to a customer for his/her consumption over two months (24 hours per day multiplied by 60 days for those who have opted for monthly bills), there will be billing periods that start or end on different days for each consumer. In addition, the price to be charged to each consumer will depend on the capacity contracted for ([1]). Furthermore, the whole electricity system in Spain will have to have new 'smart' electricity meters by 31 December 2018, i.e. within three years and ten months, according to the Plan for Replacement of Metering Equipment ([2]), which will mean that consumers will have to pay 40% more for leasing their meters.

According to experts at the Association of Consumers and Users, 'consumers are not going to have lower bills nor will they have access to details of their consumption'. In other words, with the new meters consumers will continue not knowing what their hourly consumption is — which is how the government is urging citizens to be invoiced from now on -, although the utility companies will have all the information.

Is the Commission of the view that a good opportunity is being lost for providing consumers with information so that they can achieve more efficient consumption?

Does the Commission intend to make any recommendations to Member States regarding the adoption of measures to promote the intelligent and efficient use of electricity in buildings?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The Energy Efficiency Directive ([3]) (EED) contains provisions (to be transposed into national legislation by 5 June this year) that will allow consumers to consume energy more efficiently. Under this directive, final customers receive new rights as regards access to information on their own energy consumption. This includes the right of final customers using smart electricity meters to be provided with information on actual time of use (consumption according to time of use tariffs). This will be required for all Member States where smart metering systems are introduced according to Directive 2009/72/EC.

The Commission has already adopted recommendations regarding measures to promote the intelligent and efficient use of electricity in buildings. In particular, in March 2012, the Commission adopted a recommendation to prepare the roll-out of smart-metering systems aimed at facilitating the take-up of this new technology. It sets common minimum functionalities of smart metering systems and addresses data protection and security issues.

Moreover, in November 2013 the Commission issued a Guidance note on the EED's provisions on metering, billing information and the cost of access to metering and billing information ([4]).

It is expected that with proper implementation of Directives 2012/27/EU and 2009/72/EC consumers will be incentivised to use information about their consumption to better control their energy use. Thanks to demand response services combined with differentiated tariffs, consumers will be able to use electricity when electricity prices are lower (e.g. due to surplus of electricity in the grid) and thus reduce their energy bills.

([1]) http://www.economistas.org/Contenido/Consejo/ResumenPrensa/1_2014/11_FEBRERO/12-02-14/2_electric.pdf
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20140217/54400266536/nuevos-contadores-luz.html
([3]) Directive 2012/27/EU.
([4]) Commission Staff Working Document (SWD(2013)448), Guidance note on Directive 2012/27/EU on energy efficiency Articles 9 — 11: Metering; billing information; cost of access to metering and billing information.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001823/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: La nueva reforma del sistema tarifario eléctrico del Gobierno español (III)

La nueva reforma del sistema tarifario eléctrico del Gobierno español entrará en vigor a partir del próximo 1 de abril. La factura experimentará cambios de precio cada hora según marque el mercado, lo cual hará casi imposible comprobar si la factura se ha hecho correctamente. La casuística es infinita: además de los 1 440 precios que se aplicarán a un solo usuario por su consumo de dos meses (24 horas al día, multiplicado por 60 días, para los que hayan pactado factura mensual), están los periodos de facturación que, para cada usuario, empiezan o terminan en días diferentes. Por otra parte, el precio a cobrar en cada caso dependerá de la potencia que tenga contratada cada uno ([1]). Además, todo el sistema eléctrico español deberá disponer de nuevos contadores de la luz *inteligentes* antes del 31 de diciembre de 2018, es decir, en tres años y diez meses, según indica el Plan de sustitución de equipos a medida ([2]), por el que los usuarios pagarán un 40 % más caro el alquiler del contador.

Las eléctricas van a disponer de cuantiosa y valiosa información acerca de sus consumidores. Cada veinte segundos, el contador inteligente enviará información a la compañía acerca de las familias o de las empresas. Las compañías eléctricas, con el nuevo contador, sabrán a qué hora se acuesta una familia, a qué hora se levanta, quién come en casa, quién come fuera, qué electrodomésticos utiliza, quién ve el fútbol… El de la privacidad es un tema muy importante por el que parece que se está pasando por encima en el Estado español.

¿Cree la Comisión que se han tomado las medidas necesarias para el cumplimiento de la Directiva 95/46/CE, relativa a la protección de datos?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de abril de 2014)

Toda recogida de datos por parte de contadores inteligentes de electricidad o de gas, así como su tratamiento posterior, debe ajustarse al Derecho de la UE sobre la protección de datos personales, en particular a la Directiva 95/46/CE, relativa a la protección de las personas físicas en lo que respecta al tratamiento de datos personales y a la libre circulación de estos datos ([3]), y a la legislación de los distintos Estados miembros que transpone dicha Directiva, así como a otros actos legislativos de la UE ([4]). Por otra parte, la Comisión procura dar orientaciones a los Estados miembros en relación con la implantación de sistemas de medición inteligente, y sus recomendaciones ([5]) incluyen disposiciones específicas sobre la protección de datos, la intimidad y la seguridad. La Comisión está trabajando también en un modelo de evaluación del impacto sobre la protección de datos aplicable a las redes inteligentes y en las mejores técnicas disponibles para los sistemas de medición inteligente. En cualquier caso, los contadores inteligentes avalados por la legislación de la UE no permiten determinar las preferencias personales en cuanto a la forma de comer o los programas de televisión o las películas que se ven, y tampoco otros datos de hábitos y modelos de comportamiento implícitos en la pregunta.

La Comisión no puede por ahora hacer ningún comentario sobre la conformidad de las recientes medidas españolas respecto a todos los requisitos aplicables en virtud de la legislación de la UE. Sin perjuicio de las competencias de la Comisión Europea como guardiana de los Tratados, la supervisión y la ejecución de la legislación sobre protección de datos son competencia de las autoridades nacionales, en particular de las autoridades de control de la protección de los datos, y de los órganos jurisdiccionales. Los ciudadanos que crean que el nuevo sistema español de tarifas eléctricas no se ajusta a la legislación de la UE sobre protección de datos personales pueden presentar denuncias formales ante la Agencia Española de Protección de Datos.

([1]) http://www.economistas.org/Contenido/Consejo/ResumenPrensa/1_2014/11_FEBRERO/12-02-14/2_electric.pdf
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20140217/54400266536/nuevos-contadores-luz.html
([3]) Directiva 95/46/CE, de 24 de octubre de 1995, relativa a la protección de las personas físicas en lo que respecta al tratamiento de datos personales y a la libre circulación de estos datos, DO L 281 de 23.11.1995.
([4]) Directiva 2002/58/CE, de 12 de julio de 2012, relativa al tratamiento de los datos personales y a la protección de la intimidad en el sector de las comunicaciones electrónicas, DO L 201 de 31.7.2002; Directiva 2006/24/CE, de 15 de marzo de 2006, sobre la conservación de datos generados o tratados en relación con la prestación de servicios de comunicaciones electrónicas de acceso público o de redes públicas de comunicaciones y por la que se modifica la Directiva 2002/58/CE, DO L 105 de 13.4.2006.
([5]) Por ejemplo, la Recomendación de la Comisión, de 9 de marzo de 2012, relativa a los preparativos para el despliegue de los sistemas de contador inteligente (2012/148/UE).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001823/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: New reform of the electricity tariff system by the Spanish Government (III)

The new reform of the electricity tariff system by the Spanish Government is due to come into force as from 1 April this year. The prices in electricity bills will change every hour according to market fluctuations, which will make it almost impossible to verify if a bill has been calculated correctly. The variables are practically infinite: apart from the 1 440 prices charged to a customer for his/her consumption over two months (24 hours per day multiplied by 60 days for those who have opted for monthly bills), there will be billing periods that start or end on different days for each consumer. In addition, the price to be charged to each consumer will depend on the capacity contracted for ([1]). Furthermore, the whole electricity system in Spain will have to have new 'smart' electricity meters by 31 December 2018, i.e. within three years and ten months, according to the Plan for Replacement of Metering Equipment ([2]), which will mean that consumers will have to pay 40% more for leasing their meters.

The utility companies are going to have at their disposal a great deal of valuable information about consumers. Every twenty seconds these 'smart meters' will send data to the company concerned regarding their business or family customers. With these new meters the electricity companies will know at what time a given family goes to bed, when they get up, who eats at home and who eats out, what appliances they use, who likes to watch football, etc. Privacy is a very important matter, and it seems that in Spain it is being ignored.

Is the Commission of the view that the necessary measures have been adopted to comply with the directive 95/46/EC, on the protection of personal data?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(28 April 2014)

Any collection of data by electricity or gas smart meters and further processing must be done in accordance with EC law on the protection of personal data, in particular Directive 95/46/EC on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data ([3]) and the national legislations transposing it, as well as several other pieces of EU legislation ([4]). Furthermore, the Commission strives to provide guidance to Member States on smart metering rollout, and its recommendations ([5]) contain specific provisions on data protection, privacy and security. The Commission is also working on a Data Protection Impact Assessment template for smart grids and Best Available Techniques for smart metering. At any rate, smart meters promoted in EU legislation do not make it possible to determine individuals' TV/film watching or eating preferences, or other details of habits and patterns of behaviour implied in the question.

The Commission is currently not in the position to comment on the compliance of recent Spanish measures with all applicable requirements under EU legislation. Without prejudice to the powers of the European Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation falls under the competence of national authorities, in particular data protection supervisory authorities, and courts. Citizens who believe that the new Spanish electricity tariff system is not in conformity with EC law on the protection of personal data may lodge formal complaints with the Spanish Data Protection Agency.

([1]) http://www.economistas.org/Contenido/Consejo/ResumenPrensa/1_2014/11_FEBRERO/12-02-14/2_electric.pdf
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20140217/54400266536/nuevos-contadores-luz.html
([3]) Directive 95/46/EC 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995.
([4]) Directive 2002/58/EC of 12 July 2012 concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector, OJ L 201, 31.7.2002; Directive 2006/24/EC of 15 March 2006 on the retention of data generated or processed in connection with the provision of publicly available electronic communications services or of public communications networks and amending Directive 2002/58/EC, OJ L 105, 13.4.2006.
([5]) e.g. Commission Recommendation of 9 March 2012 on preparations for the roll-out of smart metering systems (2012/148/EU).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001825/14
to the Commission
Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: VAT rates for accession states

Upon the accession of a new state to the EU, can the Commission confirm whether it will seek harmonisation of the VAT rates and categories of that state with the prevailing systems in Member States?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2014)

There are strict conditions for EU accession to ensure that new members are admitted only when they are fully able to comply with the obligations of EU membership. Countries aiming to join the EU are required to align with all the EU's standards and rules (the *acquis*) and to reach full compliance upon accession. For the purpose of accession negotiations, these are divided into 35 different policy fields (chapters). Chapter 16 relates to taxation.

Concerning VAT rates, a new Member State's VAT rates have to comply upon joining the EU with the EU legislation which currently lays down the obligation of applying a standard VAT rate (currently of at least 15%), and the option to apply one or two reduced VAT rates set no lower than 5% for a certain limited list of supplies (Annex III to Council Directive 2006/112/EC ([1])).

Additional information is available on the Commission's website ([2]).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2006L0112:20130815:EN:HTML
([2]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/enlargement/ongoing_enlargement/l14536_en.htm and http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/policy/conditions-membership/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001826/14
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: CCTV on ferries

On 20 May 2013, one of my constituents, Richard Fearnside, died whilst on the P&O *Pride of Kent* ferry.

I understand that Richard went for a cigarette on deck but never returned. Both the ship and surrounding waters were searched, but he was not found. His parents and the authorities do not know what happened to Richard as there were no CCTV cameras installed on the deck of the ferry.

In light of this, will the Commission consider taking action to ensure that all ferries operating within the European Union are required to install CCTV cameras on open decks?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The Commission would like to express its deepest regret for the unfortunate loss of Mr Fearnside.

Currently there are no requirements both at the international (International Convention on Safety of Life at Sea) or at European level concerning the installation of CCTV systems on board ferries or passenger ships in general and their effectiveness to prevent persons going over board has yet to be evaluated.

Directive 2009/18/EC ([1]) establishes the fundamental principles governing the investigation of accidents in the maritime transport sector; 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'. Furthermore, Member States shall ensure that safety investigations are conducted under the responsibility of an impartial permanent investigative body, competent in matters relating to marine casualties and incidents.

The permanent cooperation framework (PCF) set up under Directive 2009/18/EC provides for a forum of experts from Member States' independent accident investigation bodies and the Commission services will suggest that the PCF discusses on the basis of existing accident data possible preventive measures which could be further demonstrated in the context of EU funded projects in the future.

([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.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001827/14
till kommissionen
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(18 februari 2014)

Angående: Det övergripande avtalet om ekonomi och handel mellan EU och Kanada: att skapa lika villkor inom biovetenskapsbranschen

Ett principavtal om de viktigaste delarna i det övergripande avtalet om ekonomi och handel mellan EU och Kanada nåddes den 18 oktober 2013. Detta avtal är det första som EU undertecknar med en G8-nation och innebär ett prejudikat för andra frihandelsavtal som EU förhandlar om.

Ett av målen med förhandlingarna från EU:s sida var att skapa lika villkor för EU och Kanada gällande immateriella rättigheter i den biovetenskapliga sektorn, inbegripet säkerställande av skyddet för patenträttigheter. Bristen på faktisk rätt att överklaga för innovatörer vad gäller talan om ogiltigförklarande av patent i Kanada medför att de inte har lika omfattande möjligheter att överklaga som företag som tillverkar generiska produkter. Detta innebär en betydande skillnad mellan de juridiska rättigheter som gäller innovatörer respektive tillverkare av generiska produkter i Kanada.

I sin tekniska sammanfattning om slutgiltiga framförhandlade resultat om det övergripande avtalet om ekonomi och handel som offentliggjordes den 29 oktober 2013 påpekade den kanadensiska regeringen offentligt att den hade gått med på att återställa rättvisan i detta förfarande genom att ge innovativa tillverkare möjlighet till en faktisk rätt att överklaga inom det kanadensiska regelverket. Den kanadensiska regeringen angav emellertid också att detta skulle ge Kanada möjligheter att sätta stopp för bruket av dubbla processer.

EU:s mål med att söka en faktisk rätt att överklaga för innovatörer var att utjämna den rådande diskrimineringen inom det kanadensiska systemet. Det hade inget att göra med att sätta stopp för dubbla processer, vilket skulle kunna innebära att den nuvarande obalansen vad gäller rättigheter förvärras genom avskaffande eller minskning av patentinnehavares befintliga juridiska rättigheter. Kanadas agerande i samband med dubbla processer kan faktiskt omintetgöra eller försvaga medgivandet gentemot EU med anknytning till rätten till överklagande.

1. Har kommissionen frågat om den kanadensiska regeringens planer vad gäller dess offentligt uttalade ambition att sätta stopp för bruket av dubbla processer? Hur har Kanada i så fall bemött detta?

2. Kanada kan visserligen hävda att avskaffandet av dubbla processer är en fråga för inhemsk lagstiftning och politik. Anser inte kommissionen trots detta att det påverkar resultaten för rätten till överklagande och därmed den mer omfattande överenskommelsen om lika villkor, vilken förhandlats fram av kommissionen i det övergripande avtalet om ekonomi och handel?

3. Söker kommissionen försäkringar från Kanada om att en faktisk rätt till överklagande för innovatörer kommer att genomföras utan att man tar bort eller minskar andra befintliga rättigheter för innovatörer att skydda sina patent mot intrång?

Svar från Karel De Gucht på kommissionens vägnar
(3 april 2014)

EU:s och Kanadas politiska avtal av den 18 oktober 2013 om de viktigaste inslagen i ett handelsavtal tillgodoser de tre huvudpunkter som EU fört fram när det gäller immateriella rättigheter för läkemedel. Avtalet innebär att även rättighetsinnehavare kommer att ges rätt att överklaga inom ramen för den kanadensiska lagstiftningen om patentskyddade läkemedel, när godkännandet för försäljning av ett läkemedel endast beviljas om ett liknande patentskyddat läkemedel redan har godkänts. Dessutom ingår bestämmelser om ersättning ifall förfarandet för godkännandet för försäljning drar ut på tiden och garantier för att data från kliniska prövningar som lämnats in i samband med förfarandet kommer att vara skyddade i åtta år.

Kommissionen är fast besluten att se till att Kanada respekterar sina åtaganden och skyldigheter enligt det övergripande avtalet om ekonomi och handel.

Hittills har den kanadensiska regeringen inte lagt fram något förslag som kommissionen skulle kunna ta ställning till när det gäller ”dubbla processer”. Kommissionen har dock begärt att hållas à jour.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001827/14
to the Commission
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: EU-Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement: levelling the playing field for the life sciences industry

An agreement in principle on the key elements of the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between the EU and Canada was reached on 18 October 2013. This agreement is the first that the EU will be signing with a G8 nation and marks a precedent for other free trade agreements that the EU is negotiating.

One of the objectives of the negotiations on the EU side was to level the playing field between the EU and Canada on intellectual property rights (IPRs) in the life sciences sector, including enforcement of patent rights. The lack of an effective right of appeal for innovators in Canadian patent invalidity proceedings means that they do not have the same level of recourse as generic companies. This amounts to a significant inequality between the legal rights applicable to innovators and generics in Canada.

In its 'Technical Summary of Final Negotiated Outcomes' on the CETA released on 29 October 2013, the Canadian Government publicly indicated that it had agreed to restore fairness to this procedure by granting innovative manufacturers an effective right of appeal within the Canadian regulatory framework. However, it further stated that this would provide 'scope for Canada to end the practice of dual litigation'.

The EU's objective in seeking an effective right of appeal for innovators was to rebalance the existing discrimination within the Canadian system. It had nothing to do with ending 'dual litigation', which could mean compounding the present imbalance in rights by removing or diminishing the existing legal rights of patent holders. Canada's actions in relation to 'dual litigation' could in fact nullify or weaken the concession made to the EU related to the right of appeal.

1. Has the Commission enquired about the plans of the Government of Canada regarding its publicly stated ambition to end the practice of 'dual litigation', and, if so, how has Canada responded?

2. Even if Canada may claim that ending 'dual litigation' is a matter of domestic law and policy, does the Commission not think that it affects the outcome on right of appeal, and thus the broader 'level playing field' negotiated by the Commission in CETA?

3. Is the Commission seeking assurances from Canada that an effective right of appeal for innovators will be implemented without removing or diminishing any other existing rights of innovators regarding the enforcement of their patents?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

The political agreement the EU and Canada reached on the key elements of a trade agreement on 18 October 2013 satisfactorily addressed the three key points on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) protection for pharmaceuticals the EU had put forward. This agreement foresees a right of appeal extended to intellectual property holders in the context of the Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations, where the granting of marketing approval (Notice of Compliance) for a drug, relies upon the earlier approval of a related drug that is patented. It also foresees compensation for delays in the marketing authorisation process and guarantees that clinical test data submitted during marketing authorisation will be protected for 8 years.

The Commission is committed to ensure that Canada respects its commitments and obligations taken under CETA.

To date, the Canadian Government has not tabled a proposal in relation to 'dual litigation' that the Commission could assess. The Commission has, however, asked to be kept informed.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001828/14
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(18 février 2014)

Objet: Réduire de moitié le gaspillage alimentaire d'ici 2025

Dans une résolution de janvier 2012, le Parlement européen a décidé de mettre en lumière la catastrophe mondiale que constitue le gaspillage alimentaire et a notamment appelé la Commission européenne à faire de 2014 l'année européenne pour la lutte contre le gaspillage alimentaire. L'objectif fixé était de réduire de moitié ce gaspillage d'ici 2025.

Le gaspillage alimentaire était alors évalué à 89 millions de tonnes par an dans l'Union européenne, soit 179 kilos par personne, avec des prévisions en hausse pour les années à venir. En outre, il était estimé que près de 50 % des denrées saines et comestibles étaient gâchées, alors que 79 millions de personnes vivent en dessous du seuil de pauvreté en Europe.

Dans sa résolution, le Parlement européen demandait alors des mesures urgentes pour faire face à ce gaspillage présent à tous les stades de la chaîne alimentaire. Diverses mesures ont été proposées, telles que des campagnes de sensibilisation ou des règles d'étiquetage et d'emballage plus adéquates.

Toutefois, ces requêtes ont reçu peu d'échos de la part de la Commission européenne, avec des mesures qui tardent à se mettre en place. Il serait insensé que l'Union européenne n'apporte pas de réponses efficaces à un tel phénomène de gâchis, alors que des centaines de millions de personnes souffrent de la faim dans le monde.

Ces démarches sont d'autant plus importantes que le gaspillage alimentaire ne constitue pas seulement un problème éthique mais également économique, social et environnemental.

La Commission européenne peut-elle nous informer de la manière dont elle compte atteindre cet objectif de réduire de moitié le gaspillage alimentaire d'ici 2025, tout en entreprenant des démarches pour encourager une meilleure répartition des denrées alimentaires en faveur des plus démunis?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(10 mai 2014)

La Commission invite l'auteur de la question à se reporter à ses réponses aux questions écrites E-013588/2013, E-014106/2013 et E -001391/2014.

Elle tient en outre à souligner que faciliter la redistribution aux personnes dans le besoin de denrées alimentaires excédentaires propres à la consommation est l'un des objectifs prioritaires de la promotion de l'alimentation durable et de la réduction du gaspillage alimentaire. Dans son dialogue avec les parties prenantes, la Commission s'emploie activement à recenser et à supprimer, chaque fois que cela est possible, les éventuelles entraves au don de denrées alimentaires aux personnes dans le besoin. Par exemple, dans le cadre de la révision du paquet «Hygiène», elle proposera de simplifier — sans transiger sur la sûreté alimentaire — les prescriptions qui s'appliquent à la fourniture de denrées aux banques alimentaires par des détaillants.

De plus, la Commission a l'intention d'inclure dans sa prochaine communication sur l'économie circulaire des mesures visant à donner suite à l'engagement pris dans le septième programme d'action pour l'environnement afin de réduire le gaspillage alimentaire.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001828/14
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Reducing food waste by half by 2025

In a resolution passed in January 2012, Parliament voted to highlight the global disaster that food wastage represents and called specifically on the Commission to make 2014 the European Year against Food Waste. A target of halving such waste by 2025 was set.

At the time, food wastage in the European Union was calculated at 89 million tonnes per year, or 179 kilos per person, and this was forecast to rise in years to come. Moreover, it was estimated that close to 50% of healthy, edible food went to waste, at a time when 79 million people in Europe were living below the poverty line.

In its resolution, Parliament demanded that urgent measures be taken to address this wastage, which occurs at every stage of the food supply chain. Various measures were proposed, such as awareness campaigns or improvements to labelling and packaging rules.

However, these requests have met with little response from the Commission, with measures being slow to be put in place. It would be insane for the European Union to fail to provide an efficient response to such phenomenal wastage when hundreds of millions of people go hungry around the world.

Such steps are all the more important as food wastage does not merely represent an ethical problem but an economic, social and environmental one too.

Can the Commission provide information on how it plans to achieve this target of halving food waste by 2025 while at the same time taking steps to encourage a fairer distribution of food so those who have least receive more?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 May 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to written questions E-013588/2013, E-014106/2013 and E-001391/2014.

The Commission would further wish to highlight that facilitating redistribution of surplus food, safe for human consumption, to those in need is one of the priority areas identified in promoting food sustainability and reducing food waste. In dialogue with stakeholders, the Commission is working actively to identify and remove wherever possible any barriers to donation of foods to those in need. For instance, in the context of the review of the food hygiene package, we will propose to simplify — without compromising on food safety — the requirements which apply when retailers provide food to food banks.

In addition, the Commission intends to include measures to address the commitment in the 7th Environment Action Programme to reduce food waste in the forthcoming Communication on the Circular Economy.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001829/14
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(18 février 2014)

Objet: Contrefaçon du vin en Chine: nous attendons des résultats concrets

Le montant annuel des exportations de vins et spiritueux européens vers la Chine est supérieur à un milliard d'euros. Certaines estimations affirment que la contrefaçon compte pour près de 40 % des vins importés dans ce pays. Cette pratique sape non seulement l'économie européenne — le secteur vinicole européen représente plus de 2 millions d'emplois directs — mais également son patrimoine. C'est enfin une grave atteinte à la propriété intellectuelle et donc au savoir-faire européen. L'Europe doit s'assurer que la Chine prend des mesures vigoureuses en matière de lutte contre la contrefaçon du vin et des spiritueux.

Ces chiffres sont d'autant plus inquiétants à l'heure où les exportations de vin vers la Chine sont en hausse croissante. La contrefaçon du vin et des spiritueux touche plus particulièrement les grands crus provenant de France. Ainsi, l'Institut national français des appellations d'origine (INAO) traite chaque année environ trois cents dossiers viticoles de contrefaçon, dont un peu plus d'un quart en provenance de Chine.

La coopération internationale fait pleinement partie de l'approche de l'Union en ce qui concerne le contrôle du respect des droits de propriété intellectuelle. Compte tenu de l'importance du secteur viticole européen, il paraît donc logique qu'elle se penche sur celui-ci dans le cadre de sa coopération avec la Chine.

L'Union et la Chine se sont engagées dans une lettre d'intention en juillet 2013 à renforcer leur coopération dans le cadre de la lutte contre la contrefaçon des boissons alcoolisées. Les engagements pris devaient notamment se traduire par le recensement des pratiques de la contrefaçon et l'amélioration de la formation aux méthodes de détection et d'authentification. L'Union et la Chine prévoyaient également de développer des systèmes efficaces de contrôle et de traçabilité. Six mois plus tard, les viticulteurs se plaignent du manque de résultats.

Face à la persistance de la contrefaçon du vin et des spiritueux en Chine, la Commission peut-elle nous renseigner sur la concrétisation de ces engagements bilatéraux pour lutter contre ces pratiques?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(2 avril 2014)

La Commission est consciente de l'intérêt économique que représentent pour les producteurs de l'Union les exportations de vins et spiritueux vers la Chine. La popularité croissante des vins et spiritueux européens en Chine a donné lieu à de plus en plus de problèmes avec les produits de contrefaçon et les infractions aux droits de propriété intellectuelle.

Un vaste plan de coopération dans le domaine de l'agriculture et du développement rural a été signé lors de la visite du commissaire Cioloş en Chine en juin 2012. Ce plan de coopération prévoit notamment une collaboration commune en matière de lutte contre la contrefaçon qui a été inscrite à l'ordre du jour comme une priorité. Le plan est mis en œuvre en coopération avec la General Administration of Quality, Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine (AQSIQ) (Administration générale du contrôle de la qualité, de l'inspection et de la quarantaine), afin de faciliter le recensement des pratiques liées à la contrefaçon par les autorités compétentes et trouver les solutions les mieux adaptées et les plus efficaces.

En complément de ces premières mesures, une lettre commune d'intention sur la lutte contre la contrefaçon dans le commerce des boissons alcoolisées a été signée avec le ministre de l'AQSIQ au cours de la troisième visite en Chine du commissaire Cioloş en juillet de l'année dernière, afin d'établir une plate-forme opérationnelle rassemblant à la fois les pouvoirs publics et le secteur privé, pour la coopération sur cette question importante. La lettre d'intention prévoit les mesures suivantes: recensement des problèmes, partage de l'information, formations, séminaires sur des thèmes tels que la traçabilité, les méthodes de détection des produits de contrefaçon et l'analyse en laboratoire. Le 25 mars 2014, une première initiative concrète aura lieu à Pékin, associant des laboratoires de l'UE et de Chine, les représentants du gouvernement et de l'industrie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001829/14
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Counterfeiting of wine in China: we expect concrete results

Europe exports over a billion Euros worth of wines and spirits to China each year. Some estimates claim that almost 40% of the wine imported by that country is counterfeit. This practice undermines not only the European economy — the European wine industry directly employs over two million people — but also its cultural heritage. Furthermore, it represents a serious assault on intellectual property rights and thus on European know-how. Europe must ensure that China takes vigorous action to combat the counterfeiting of wines and spirits.

The above figures are all the more worrying at a time when wine exports to China are experiencing substantial growth. Wine and spirits counterfeiting is a particular problem for fine wines produced in France. The French National Institute of Appellations of Origin (INAO) deals with around three hundred cases of counterfeit wine each year, over a quarter of which originate from China.

International cooperation is an essential part of the Union's approach to enforcing compliance with intellectual property rights. Bearing in mind the significance of the European wine industry, it thus appears logical that the scope of EU cooperation with China should include an examination of this sector.

In a letter of intent signed in July 2013, the Union and China undertook to extend cooperation in relation to the fight against the counterfeiting of alcoholic drinks. The undertakings that were made were meant to translate specifically into a survey of counterfeiting practices and improved training in detection and authentication methods. The Union and China also planned to develop effective control and traceability systems. Six months later, wine growers are unhappy with the lack of results.

Given the persistent counterfeiting of wines and spirits in China, can the Commission perhaps inform us as to what concrete action is being taken in respect of the bilateral undertakings to combat this practice?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission is very much aware of the economic interest of wine and spirits exports to China for EU producers. The increasing popularity of European wines and spirits in China has led to ever growing problems with counterfeit products and intellectual property rights infringements.

A comprehensive Cooperation Plan in Agricultural and Rural Development was signed at the occasion of Commissioner Cioloş' visit to China in June 2012. As part of this Cooperation Plan, joint collaboration against counterfeiting was put on the agenda as a priority. This is implemented in cooperation with AQSIQ (General Administration of Quality, Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine), so as to facilitate identification of counterfeiting practices by the competent Authorities and find most appropriate and effective solutions.

Further to these first steps, a Joint letter of Intent on fighting counterfeiting in the trade of alcoholic beverages was signed with the Minister of AQSIQ during Commissioner Cioloş third visit to China in July last year, to provide an operational platform for cooperation on this important issue, involving both Government authorities and the private sector. Planned actions under the Letter of Intent include: identification of problems, sharing of information, trainings, seminars on subjects such as traceability, detection methods for counterfeit products, and laboratory analysis. On March 25, 2014 a first concrete initiative will be held in Beijing, bringing together laboratories from the EU and China, government officials, and industry.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001832/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Medidas para la inclusión de las personas sordas en el uso del número único de emergencias

Según datos de la Unión Europea de Sordos (EUD), en los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea habitan aproximadamente un millón de personas sordas que son usuarias del lenguaje de signos. Teniendo en cuenta que este elevado número de personas aún encuentra numerosos obstáculos para ser tenidas en cuenta en los procesos comunicativos de las instituciones, las instituciones europeas deberían garantizar su acceso pleno a la información y la participación política.

Sin embargo, esto no se produce en una forma adecuada y, por tanto, se está violando la base de una sociedad democrática: la inclusión de todas las personas en los procesos de participación en las instituciones, así como la inclusión en el uso de los servicios e información pública. Existen numerosos servicios que ofrecen información pública que no implementan medidas de inclusión para este colectivo. Esto se produce pese a que la Unión Europea ha ratificado diferentes compromisos internacionales relativos a la inclusión de las personas con discapacidad, como la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los derechos de las personas con discapacidad en 2010.

La Unión Europea pretende implementar su compromiso con las personas discapacitadas a través de la Estrategia Europea en materia de discapacidad 2010-2020, que debería incluir acciones que permitan la plena integración de las personas sordas. Una de las discriminaciones más evidentes y que puede generar perjuicios más graves para las personas sordas es aquella que supone la atención a través del número único de emergencias de la UE, el 112. La UE debe garantizar medidas para que las personas sordas dispongan de algún medio alternativo que les permita contactar con los servicios nacionales de emergencia.

¿Dispone de una evaluación sobre las acciones necesarias para incluir a las personas sordas como plenas usuarias de los servicios de emergencia en todos los Estados miembros de la UE?

¿Qué acciones piensa llevar a cabo para que las personas sordas puedan acceder a los servicios de emergencia recogidos en el número único 112?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión está plenamente comprometida con la inclusión de las personas con discapacidad, tal como se refleja en la Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad 2010-2020 ([1]). En este contexto, el marco regulador de la UE sobre las comunicaciones electrónicas insta a los Estados miembros a velar por que el acceso de los usuarios con discapacidad a los servicios de emergencia sea equivalente al que disfrutan otros usuarios. No obstante, debe tenerse en cuenta que, de conformidad con el principio de subsidiariedad, es responsabilidad de los Estados miembros disponer de la tecnología y la organización necesarias para ofrecer a los usuarios con discapacidad un acceso equivalente al número único de llamadas de emergencia 112.

Los servicios de la Comisión supervisan estrechamente la ejecución de las medidas de accesibilidad al 112 a través del informe del COCOM sobre el acceso al 112. El último informe, publicado el 11 de febrero de 2014, muestra una mejora del acceso al 112 para los usuarios discapacitados. Veintiún Estados miembros han informado de la puesta en práctica de un acceso alternativo al 112, frente a los doce del año anterior. Por ejemplo, la posibilidad de enviar un mensaje de texto (SMS) al 112, considerado un acceso alternativo para personas con problemas de habla o de audición, pasó de nueve a dieciocho Estados miembros ([2]).

El 11 de febrero, día de la publicación del Informe COCOM sobre el 112, la Comisión invitó a las autoridades nacionales a presentar sus planes para aplicar eficazmente el 112, incluido el acceso para usuarios con discapacidad ([3]).

Sobre la base de la información remitida por los Estados miembros, la Comisión decidirá cómo proceder en el futuro para garantizar la aplicación del marco regulador de la UE, en particular, en el ámbito de la accesibilidad para todos al 112.

Además, la Comisión está llevando a cabo un proyecto piloto ([4]) sobre posibles soluciones tecnológicas para seguir facilitando la comunicación entre las personas sordas o con dificultades auditivas con las instituciones de la UE.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/disability-strategy/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/implementation-european-emergency-number-112-%E2%80%93-results-seventh-data-gathering-round
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-97_en.htm
([4]) http://www.eud.eu/Insign_Project-i-716.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001832/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Measures to include deaf people in the use of the single emergency number

According to data from the European Union of the Deaf (EUD) around one million deaf people who use sign language live in the Member States of the European Union. Bearing in mind that such a large number of people still come across many barriers to being included in institutions' communicative processes, European institutions ought to have a duty to guarantee full access for them to information and political participation.

However, this does not happen properly and as a result the basis of a democratic society, namely the inclusion of everyone in the processes of participation in institutions and in the use of public information and services, is being violated. There are numerous services offering public information that do not implement measures of inclusion for these people, and this occurs despite the fact that the European Union has ratified various international commitments relating to the inclusion of disabled people, such as the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2010.

The European Union proposes to implement its commitment to disabled people by means of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020, which should include measures to allow full integration of deaf people. One of the clearest forms of discrimination, which can also give rise to serious harm for deaf people, is the EU single emergency number (112) service. The European Union ought to guarantee measures so that deaf people can use some alternative method to contact national emergency services.

Has the Commission assessed what action may be necessary to include deaf people as full users of the emergency services in each Member State of the Union?

What measures is it planning to adopt to ensure that deaf people can access the emergency services served by the single number 112?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2014)

The Commission is fully committed to the inclusion of disabled people as it is mirrored in the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]). In this context, the EU regulatory framework on electronic communications requires Member States to ensure that access to emergency services for disabled end-users is equivalent to that enjoyed by other users. However, it should be borne in mind that it is the Member States that are responsible, under the principle of subsidiarity, for putting in place the technology and organisation to allow equivalent access to 112 calls for disabled end-users.

The Commission services closely monitor the implementation of accessibility measures for 112 through the 112 COCOM implementation report. The latest report published on 11 February 2014 shows an improvement of the access to 112 for disabled end-users. 21 Member States reported the implementation of an alternative access to 112 compared to 12 last year. For instance, the implementation of SMS to 112, which is considered an alternative access for people with speech and hearing impairment, jumped from 9 Member States to 18 ([2]).

On 11 February, the day of the publication of the 112 COCOM report, the Commission called on national authorities to submit their plans to effectively implement 112, including access for disabled end-users ([3]).

Based on the evidence received from Member States the Commission will decide how to proceed further in ensuring that the EU regulatory framework is implemented in particular in the area of accessibility for all to 112.

In addition, the Commission is implementing a Pilot Project ([4]) on potential technological solutions to further improve communication opportunities between deaf or hard of hearing persons with EU institutions.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/disability-strategy/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/implementation-european-emergency-number-112-%E2%80%93-results-seventh-data-gathering-round
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-97_en.htm
([4]) http://www.eud.eu/Insign_Project-i-716.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001833/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Protección del parque del Tamarguillo

El parque fluvial del arroyo Tamarguillo es un humedal y un espacio de uso público que supone un gran logro ciudadano y beneficia a la calidad de vida de la ciudad de Sevilla. En los últimos años se han mejorado la calidad ambiental y la salud de su cuenca con importantes inversiones, en parte procedentes de la UE. Actualmente, se encuentra gravemente amenazado por la construcción de un tramo de ronda urbana (SE-35) que lo atravesaría sobre un talud, sin viaducto alguno, cercenándolo en dos. A pesar de la polémica de la obra, el Ayuntamiento justifica su decisión haciendo referencia a un convenio con los propietarios de San Nicolás Oeste, en virtud del cual este suelo rústico, de interés agrícola, pasa a ser urbanizable y asegura la instalación de una tienda Ikea. Frente a estas pretensiones, en 2009 los afectados se dirigen a la Comisión de Peticiones para expresar la existencia de alternativas al trazado y denunciar que, de mantenerse el trazado actual, se atentaría contra un espacio único en la ciudad. En 2010 se obtiene una respuesta que reconoce la inversión en el marco del programa POMAL pero no tiene en cuenta el «Proyecto de restauración hidrológica del cauce del arroyo Ranillas y acondicionamiento ambiental del parque Tamarguillo» cofinanciado con fondos europeos FEDER. También se comunica la competencia de las autoridades locales en materia ambiental. El 11 de febrero de 2014 el periódico local ABC ([1]) se hace eco de la apertura de un expediente por el citado proyecto contra la Gerencia de Urbanismo del Ayuntamiento de Sevilla. Sin conocer el contenido del mismo, pues no ha recibido comunicación oficial, el peticionario quiere dejar constancia del valor cultural de los yacimientos arqueológicos que serían destruidos y ruega a este Parlamento que se ratifique en la salvaguarda del parque y el humedal frente a la amenaza de la autovía.

Considerando que la construcción de la SE-35 afecta a especies protegidas catalogadas en los anexos de la Directiva Europea Hábitats (2009/147/CE), que confirman la importancia del espacio como firme candidato a ser incluido en la Red de Espacios Naturales Protegidos de Andalucía;

Considerando que supondría la fragmentación y pérdida irreversible de conectividad, que afectaría a múltiples espacios verdes incluidos en la Red Natura 2000 y LIC;

Considerando que el proyecto no ha sido sometido a ninguna evaluación y que por lo tanto incumple la Directiva 2011/92/UE de evaluación de impacto ambiental;

Considerando la Directiva 2003/4/CE relativa al acceso a la información que dispone que ésta debe estar disponible y ser difundida entre el público;

1. ¿Podría hacer llegar la Comisión información sobre el expediente que se ha transmitido al Ayuntamiento de Sevilla en relación con el proyecto SE-35?

2. ¿Qué posición adopta la Comisión en este conflicto?

3. ¿Qué medidas pretende llevar a cabo la Comisión para asegurar el cumplimiento de la normativa europea citada anteriormente?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de abril de 2014)

De los contactos preliminares mantenidos con las autoridades españolas se deduce que el proyecto no ha sido objeto de un procedimiento de evaluación del impacto ambiental tal como exige la Directiva EIA ([2]). La Comisión decidirá ahora la forma más adecuada de proceder al respecto.

([1]) http://www.abcdesevilla.es/sevilla/20140211/sevi-europa-frena-ikea-201402102350.html
([2]) Directiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 13 de diciembre de 2011, relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente (texto codificado) (DO L 26/1 de 28.1.2012).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001833/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Protection of the Tamarguillo park

The Tamarguillo river waterway park is a wetland and public space that enhances the quality of life for the people of Seville and represents a great achievement by its citizens. Over the last few years, substantial investment, including EU funds, has brought an improvement in the environmental quality and health of its basin. However, it is now gravely threatened by the construction of a stretch of urban ring-road (the SE-35), which will cross it by way of raised earthworks rather than a viaduct, thus cutting it in two. Despite the controversy surrounding this project, the city council justifies its decision by referring to an agreement with the owners of San Nicolás Oeste, by virtue of which this rural land of agricultural interest will become development land and will ensure the construction of an Ikea store. In response to this project, in 2009 those affected by it contacted the Committee on Petitions to inform it of alternatives to the proposed route and to denounce the fact that, if the proposed route were maintained, a unique space in the city would be damaged. In 2010 a reply was received acknowledging investment within the framework of the POMAL programme but ignoring the 'Project for hydrological restoration of the Ranillas river basin and environmental rehabilitation of the Tamarguillo park', which is co-financed with European FEDER funds. They were also advised that the local authorities had jurisdiction in environmental matters. On 11 February 2014 a local newspaper, ABC ([1]), reported the institution of administrative proceedings against the planning department of Seville city council in respect of the aforementioned project. Without knowing the terms thereof, as no official communication has been received, the petitioner wishes to place on record the cultural value of the archaeological sites that would be destroyed and begs this Parliament to ratify the safeguarding of the park and wetlands against the threat of the motorway.

Considering that the construction of the SE-35 affects protected species catalogued in the annexes to the European Habitats Directive (2009/147/EC), which confirm the importance of the zone as a firm candidate to be included in the Network of Protected Natural Spaces of Andalusia;

Considering that the project would entail fragmentation and irreversible loss of connectivity affecting numerous green zones included in the Natura 2000 network and the SCI;

Considering that it has not been subjected to any environmental assessment and is therefore in breach of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (Directive 2011/92/EU);

Considering the terms of Directive 2003/4/EC on access to information, which provides that information should be available and distributed to the public;

1. Could the Commission provide information regarding the administrative proceedings instituted against Seville city council in relation to the SE-35 project?

2. What is the Commission's position with respect to this conflict?

3. What measures does the Commission propose to adopt in order to ensure compliance with the EU regulations referred to above?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

Following preliminary contacts with the Spanish authorities, it appears that this project has not been submitted to an Environmental Impact Assessment procedure as required by the EIA Directive ([2]). The Commission will now decide on the appropriate course of action.

([1]) http://www.abcdesevilla.es/sevilla/20140211/sevi-europa-frena-ikea-201402102350.html
([2]) Directive 2011/92/EU 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 (codification) — OJ L 26/1. 28.1.2012.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001834/14
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(18. februar 2014)

Om: Retningslinjer for fremme af anvendelsen af energi fra vedvarende energikilder

Direktiv 2009/28/EF indeholder retningslinjer for fremme af anvendelsen af energi fra vedvarende energikilder.

I Danmark er der udviklet et produkt, der udnytter kropsvarmen fra svin til opvarmningen af stalde. Det er dokumenteret, at denne udnyttelse af svins spildvarme sparer meget energi sammenlignet med de gængse energikilder til opvarmning af stalde (eksempelvis fyring med træpiller). Produktet kan dog ikke opnå EU-tilskud i Danmark gennem direktiv 2009/28/EF. Kan Kommissionen derfor oplyse, om den varme, der opstår, når husdyr omsætter foder til kød/mælk, er at opfatte som værende fossil eller vedvarende energi? Kan Kommissionen, såfremt varmen kan opfattes som vedvarende energi, bekræfte, at foder til husdyr hører ind under biomasse i henhold til definitionen i direktiv 2009/28/EF?

Der ligger et meget stort energibesparende potentiale i at udnytte spildvarmen fra svin. Kan Kommissionen derfor, hvis det vurderes, at dette innovative energibesparende tiltag ikke ligger inden for rammerne af det omtalte direktiv, klart begrunde denne vurdering?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Günther Oettinger
(10. april 2014)

I direktiv 2009/28/EF udpeges biomasse som en vedvarende energikilde. Dyr indtager biomasse og omsætter den til andre former af biomasse og varme. Det kan derfor hævdes, at den spildvarme, som dyr producerer, stammer fra en vedvarende energikilde og derfor bør anses for at være vedvarende energi.

Spørgsmålet er, om direktivet hjemler støtte til at fremme brugen af denne energi. I denne forbindelse er to bestemmelser særlig relevante, alt efter om energien forbruges på stedet (til at opvarme den bygning, hvor dyrene er opstaldet), eller om den anvendes som varmekilde for en varmepumpe. Det er fastsat i direktivets artikel 5, at aerotermisk varmeenergi genereret ved hjælp af varmepumper under visse omstændigheder tages i betragtning med henblik på stk. 1, litra b). Ifølge artikel 2 er »aerotermisk energi« dog defineret som energi, som lagres i form af varme i den omgivende luft, dvs. luften udenfor ([1]). Det er desuden fastlagt i artikel 5, at termisk energi genereret ved hjælp af passive energisystemer, hvor et lavere energiforbrug opnås passivt ved bygningers udformning, ikke skal medtages ved beregningen af andelen fra vedvarende energikilder.

Uden yderligere oplysninger om det produkt/den proces, der er udviklet i Danmark ([2]), kan Kommissionen ikke vurdere præcist, hvilke bestemmelser der er mest relevante. Spildvarmen fra dyr eller andre levende væsener, herunder personer, er dog ikke medregnet som del af de energistatistikker, der ligger til grund for EU's målsætninger og direktivet, så at tage hensyn til sådanne spildenergistrømme i målene for vedvarende energi ville ikke være i overensstemmelse med lovgivningens formål. Det betyder ikke, at udnyttelse/brug af denne form for energi ikke er værd at fremme som en energieffektivitetsforanstaltning ved hjælp af andre instrumenter.

([1]) Jf. EUT L 62 af 6.3.2013, s. 27.
([2]) F.eks. art og funktionsmåde.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001834/14
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Guidelines for promoting the use of energy from renewable sources

Directive 2009/28/EC contains guidelines for promoting the use of energy from renewable sources.

In Denmark, a product has been developed which uses pigs' body heat in order to heat stalls. It has been demonstrated that, by comparison with customary energy sources for heating stalls (e.g. wood pellets), using pigs' waste heat produces a considerable energy saving. However, EU subsidies cannot be granted for the product in Denmark under Directive 2009/28/EC. Can the Commission therefore say whether the heat generated when livestock convert feed into meat/milk should be regarded as fossil energy or renewable energy? If that heat can be regarded as renewable energy, can the Commission confirm that feed for livestock comes under biomass as defined in Directive 2009/28/EC?

There is very great energy-saving potential in exploiting waste heat from pigs. If this innovative energy-saving initiative is not considered to come within the scope of the directive referred to, can the Commission clearly state why that is the case?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

Directive 2009/28/EC identifies biomass as one source of energy from renewable sources. Animals consume biomass and convert it to other forms of biomass and heat. Therefore, the waste heat generated by livestock is of renewable origin and should be regarded as renewable energy.

The question remains whether the use of this energy can be promoted under the directive. In that context, two provisions are of particular relevance, depending whether the energy would be used in situ (to heat the building where the animals are housed), or it would be used as a heat source for a heat pump. Article 5 lays down that aerothermal heat energy captured by heat pumps under certain conditions shall be taken into account for the purposes of paragraph 1(b) of the directive. However, Article 2 defines 'aerothermal energy' as energy stored in the form of heat in the ambient air, i.e. only outdoor air ([1]). Moreover Article 5 provides that thermal energy generated by passive energy systems, under which lower energy consumption is achieved passively through building design shall not be considered for calculation of the share of energy from renewable sources.

Without further information about the product/process that has been developed in Denmark ([2]), the Commission cannot judge precisely what provisions are most relevant. However, the waste heat generated by livestock or other living beings, including people, was not counted as part of energy statistics that formed the basis for the EU targets and the directive, so taking into account such waste energy streams for the renewable energy targets would not be in line with the legislation's intention. This does not mean that recovery/use of such waste energy isn't worth promoting as an energy efficiency measure through other instruments.

([1]) Cf. OJ 6.3.2013 L62/27.
([2]) e.g. its nature and how it functions.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001837/14
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D) og Stephen Hughes (S&D)
(18. februar 2014)

Om: Det Forenede Kongeriges gennemførelse af direktivet om vikararbejde

Det Forenede Kongeriges gennemførelse af direktivet om vikararbejde (2008/104/EF) er blevet mødt med kritik fra mange sider. Det britiske fagforbund, Trade Union Congress (TUC), indgav en klage til Kommissionen i september 2013, hvori det understregede, at Det Forenede Kongeriges gennemførelse af direktivet indebærer en undtagelse for vikaransatte, når det gælder ligebehandling. Mere specifikt omhandler klagerne vikaransatte, der er ansat på »kontrakter i henhold til den svenske undtagelse«.

Det Forenede Kongeriges gennemførelse af direktivet medfører, at vikaransatte, der har været ansat på kontrakter i henhold til den svenske undtagelse i mindst 12 uger, underlægges følgende vilkår:

— de kan kun kræve 50 % af deres grundløn, men ikke mindre end mindstelønnen, i perioderne mellem jobanvisninger

— de har kun denne rettighed i fire uger i perioderne mellem jobanvisninger, hvorefter vikarbureauerne har mulighed for at afvise dem.

Kan Kommissionen i betragtning af, at direktivets vigtigste formål er at sikre ligebehandling af vikaransatte, forklare, hvordan Det Forenede Kongeriges gennemførelse af direktivet er i overensstemmelse med bestemmelserne heri om ligebehandling?

Kommissionen anmodes om i sit svar at overveje det forhold, at mange britiske vikaransatte som følge af denne gennemførelse udsættes for negativ forskelsbehandling sammenlignet med deres fastansatte kolleger — med hensyn til både sikkerhed og løn.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(9. april 2014)

Formålet med direktiv 2008/104/EF [1] om vikararbejde er at forbedre beskyttelsen af vikaransatte og kvaliteten af vikararbejde, navnlig ved at fastslå princippet om ligebehandling og samtidig bidrage til at udvikle vikararbejdesektoren som en fleksibel mulighed for virksomheder og arbejdstagere.

I overensstemmelse med direktivets artikel 5, stk. 2, kan medlemsstaterne efter høring af arbejdsmarkedets parter bestemme, at princippet om ligeløn kan fraviges, når den vikaransatte har en tidsubegrænset arbejdsaftale med et vikarbureau og aflønnes i perioderne mellem udsendelserne. Da der er tale om en undtagelse fra princippet om ligebehandling som fastsat i direktivet, skal bestemmelsen fortolkes restriktivt.

Kommissionen har gennemgået gennemførelsen af direktivet, herunder den måde hvorpå medlemsstaterne anvender undtagelser. Rapporten blev offentliggjort den 21. marts [2].

Kommissionen henleder de ærede medlemmers opmærksomhed på, at den i øjeblikket er ved at undersøge den klage, de henviser til, og som vedrører gennemførelsen af direktiv 2008/104/EF i Det Forenede Kongerige. Den meddeler resultatet til klageren på et senere tidspunkt.

---

[1] Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 2008/104/EF af 19. november 2008 om vikararbejde (EUT L 327 af 5.12.2008).
[2] COM(2014) 176 final og SWD(2014) 108 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001837/14
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D) and Stephen Hughes (S&D)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: UK implementation of the directive on temporary agency work

The UK's implementation of the directive on temporary agency work (2008/104/EC) has been met with criticism from many sides. The British Trade Union Congress (TUC) sent a complaint to the Commission in September 2013, emphasising that the UK's implementation of the directive allows for the exemption of agency workers from equal treatment. More specifically, the complaint relates to agency workers employed on 'Swedish derogation contracts'.

The UK's implementation of the directive allows agency workers who have been employed on Swedish derogation contracts for at least 12 weeks to be subject to the following conditions:

— they can only claim 50% of their basic pay, but not less than the minimum wage, in periods between assignments;

— they only have this right for four weeks in periods between assignments, after which employment agencies have the option of dismissing them.

Bearing in mind that a key purpose of the directive is to ensure equal treatment of agency workers, can the Commission explain how the UK's implementation of the directive is compatible with the latter's provisions on equal treatment?

In its answer, the Commission is asked to consider the fact that, as a consequence of this implementation, many British agency workers are being exposed to negative discrimination — compared with their permanently employed colleagues — in relation to both employment security and remuneration.

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

Directive 2008/104/EC ([1]) on temporary agency work aims to improve the protection of temporary agency workers and the quality of agency work, in particular by establishing the principle of equal treatment, while contributing to the development of the agency work sector as a flexible option for companies and workers.

In accordance with Article 5(2) of the directive, Member States may, after consulting the social partners, provide for an exemption from the principle of equal pay for temporary agency workers where the latter have a permanent contract of employment with a temporary-work agency and continue to be paid in the time between assignments. By way of a derogation from the principle of equal treatment laid down in the directive, that provision is to be interpreted restrictively.

The Commission has been reviewing the implementation of the directive, including the way the Member States apply derogations. The report was published on 21 March ([2]).

The Commission would draw the Honourable Members' attention to the fact that it is currently examining the complaint to which they refer and which relates to the implementation of Directive 2008/104/EC in the United Kingdom. It will communicate its findings to the complainant in due course.

([1]) Directive 2008/104/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on temporary agency work, OJ L 327, 5.12.2008.
([2]) COM(2014) 176 final and SWD(2014) 108 final.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-001838/14
до Комисията (зам.-председател/върховен представител)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), баронеса Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) и Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 февруари 2014 г.)

Относно: VP/HR — Правата на жените в Афганистан

На 4 февруари 2014 г. афганският парламент прибави към правния кодекс на Афганистан известното като Член 26. обезпокоително допълнение, забраняващо на родните на обвиняемо лице да свидетелстват срещу него. Тази промяна в правния кодекс прави много по-трудно за афганските жени да свидетелстват срещу лицата, които ги нападат и възпрепятства свидетели в рамките на семейството да се застъпват за тях.

Това отива отвъд стандартния закон, непозволяващ на съпрузите да свидетелстват един срещу друг, и прави всички форми на свидетелстване в рамките на семейството невъзможни. Това е особено обезпокоително предвид факта, че Афганистан има дълга и мъчителна история на домашно насилие, насилствени бракове и убийства на честта.

По данни на *Women for Women International* „над 87 % от афганските жени са били подложени на физическо, психическо и сексуално насилие или принудителен брак в някакъв момент от живота си“. Освен това, по данни на Amnesty International „повечето от случаите на насилие срещу жени и деца [включително домашно насилие, насилствени бракове или бракове на деца] са в рамките на семейството и след като често членовете на семейството са тези, които стават свидетели на случаите на насилие, разпоредбата би затруднила изключително много разследването и преследването при случаи на насилие срещу жени“.

Приветстваме изявлението на баронеса Аштън, в което тя изисква изменение на Член 26. В момента на оттегляне на чуждите войски от Афганистан е важно да заявим ясно, че ще продължим да се застъпваме за правата на афганските жени.

1. Какви политически действия се разглеждат с цел да се гарантира, че афганското правителство ще представи доклада, обещан през юли 2013 г. относно прилагането на закона за изкореняване на насилието срещу жени?

2. Това представлява още един пример към поредицата от пречки пред зачитането на правата на жените в Афганистан. В момента на оттегляне на чуждестранните войски от Афганистан как планира Европейската служба за външна дейност да продължи да гарантира достъпа на жените до образование и да ги защити от насочени срещу тях престъпления?

Отговор, даден от Върховния представител/заместник-председателя г-жа Аштън от името на Комисията
(28 април 2014 г.)

След интензивно взаимодействие на ЕС с Министерството по въпросите на жените последното неотдавна оповести пълния доклад относно премахването на насилието срещу жените. В момента ЕС анализира съдържанието на този изключително важен доклад.

Напредъкът по отношение на конституционните и законовите права на жените представлява едно от най-значимите подобрения Афганистан след падането на режима на талибаните през 2001 г. Подкрепата за укрепването на полицейската дейност и върховенството на закона, в това число съдебната реформа в по-широк план, които са от решаващо значение за защитата на правата на жените, е един от централните сектори за ЕС.

ЕС ще продължи да настоява пред афганистанските органи да спазват разпоредбите на Рамковото споразумение от Токио за взаимна отчетност и условията, установени на конференцията от Бон. Планираното споразумение за сътрудничество за партньорство и развитие ще съдържа като съществени елементи също разпоредби относно правата на човека.

ЕС ще продължи да утвърждава правата на жените по-специално чрез изграждане на капацитет, образование в областта на правата на човека, предоставяне на правна помощ, подслон, консултации и посредничество за жени и момичета, станали жертва на семейно насилие. Полицейската мисия на Европейския съюз в Афганистан подпомага звената по семейни въпроси на Министерството на вътрешните работи, като предоставя специализирано обучение в областта на наказателното разследване.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001838/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) y Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Derechos de las mujeres en Afganistán

El 4 de febrero de 2014, el Parlamento de Afganistán aprobó una nueva disposición preocupante del código procesal afgano conocida como «artículo 26», por la que se prohíbe a los familiares de una persona acusada de un delito testificar contra ella. Esta modificación del código procesal dificulta considerablemente que las mujeres afganas testifiquen contra los que las ataquen e impide que cualquier testigo dentro de la familia pueda intervenir.

Esta disposición va más allá de la legislación habitual que no permite a los cónyuges testificar en contra el uno del otro e imposibilita cualquier declaración como testigo de un familiar. Es especialmente preocupante porque Afganistán tiene una larga y dolorosa historia de violencia doméstica, matrimonios forzados y crímenes de honor.

Según Women for Women International, más del 87 % de las mujeres afganas han sufrido violencia física, psicológica o sexual o se han visto obligadas a contraer matrimonio forzado en algún momento de su vida. Por otro lado, Amnistía Internacional afirma que la mayor parte de los casos de violencia contra mujeres y niñas (incluida la doméstica y los matrimonios forzados o de menores) se produce en el seno familiar, y dado que la familia suele ser la que presencia los abusos, esta disposición dificulta enormemente la investigación y el enjuiciamiento de la violencia contra las mujeres.

Aplaudimos la declaración de la baronesa Ashton en la que solicita la modificación del artículo 26. Habida cuenta de que las tropas extranjeras empiezan a abandonar Afganistán, es importante que dejemos claro que seguiremos abogando por los derechos de las mujeres afganas.

1. ¿Qué acciones políticas se están barajando en lo que respecta a que el Gobierno afgano publique el informe que prometió en julio de 2013 sobre la aplicación de la Ley sobre la eliminación de la violencia contra las mujeres?

2. Este es otro ejemplo más de una serie de retrocesos de los derechos de la mujer en Afganistán. Puesto que las tropas extranjeras abandonan Afganistán, ¿qué planes tiene el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior para seguir salvaguardando el acceso de las mujeres a la educación y protegerlas de los delitos violentos?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de abril de 2014)

Tras un intenso diálogo de la UE con el Ministerio de Asuntos de la Mujer, se ha publicado recientemente el informe completo sobre la eliminación de la violencia contra la mujer. La UE está analizando ahora el contenido de este informe crucial.

El avance en los derechos constitucionales y jurídicos de las mujeres es una de las mejoras más importantes ocurridas en Afganistán desde la caída de los talibanes en 2001. Uno de los sectores prioritarios para la UE es el apoyo a la consolidación de la policía y del Estado de Derecho, incluida una reforma judicial más amplia, que son esenciales para la protección de los derechos de las mujeres.

La UE seguirá exhortando a las autoridades afganas a ajustarse a lo dispuesto en el marco de responsabilidad mutua de Tokio y a las condiciones establecidas en la Conferencia de Bonn. El acuerdo previsto de cooperación en materia de asociación y desarrollo también incorpora como elementos esenciales las disposiciones sobre derechos humanos.

La UE seguirá fomentando los derechos de la mujer, sobre todo mediante la capacitación, la educación en materia de derechos humanos y la prestación de asistencia jurídica, alojamiento, asesoramiento y mediación para las mujeres y niñas afectadas por la violencia familiar. La Misión de Policía EUPOL Afganistán respalda a las unidades de respuesta familiar del Ministerio del Interior aportando formación especializada en investigación penal.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-001838/14
Komisi (Místopředsedkyně Komise/Vysoká představitelka)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) a Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18. února 2014)

Předmět: VP/HR – práva žen v Afghánistánu

Dne 4. února 2014 afghánský parlament schválil znepokojivou změnu právního řádu v této zemi, tzv. článek 26, jenž příbuzným obviněné osoby zakazuje proti této osobě vypovídat. Tato novela zákona afghánským ženám výrazně ztěžuje vypovídat proti útočníkům a brání případným svědkům z rodinného kruhu, aby u soudu podávali svědectví.

Toto přesahuje rámec standardních právních předpisů, které manželům neukládají povinnost vypovídat proti sobě, a znemožňuje jakoukoliv formu svědecké výpovědi rodinných příslušníků. Tato skutečnost vzbuzuje velké obavy zejména proto, že Afghánistán má dlouhou a trpkou historii, pokud jde o domácí násilí, nucené sňatky a vraždy ze cti.

Podle organizace Women for Women International „přes 87 % afghánských žen v určitém okamžiku svého života zažilo fyzické, psychické nebo sexuální násilí, nebo bylo přinuceno k sňatku“. Kromě toho podle zprávy Amnesty International „k násilí na ženách a dívkách, včetně domácího násilí a nucených sňatků nebo sňatků dětí, dochází především v rodině, a jelikož jsou svědky tohoto násilí často rodinní příslušníci, uplatňování tohoto ustanovení by výkon vyšetřování a stíhání násilí páchaného na ženách mimořádně ztížilo“.

Z tohoto důvodu vítáme prohlášení baronky Ashtonové, v němž žádá, aby byl článek 26 změněn. Vzhledem k postupnému stahování zahraničních jednotek z Afghánistánu je důležité zřetelně ukázat, že se i nadále budeme o práva žen v této zemi zasazovat.

1. Jaká politická opatření se zvažují, aby se zajistilo, že afghánská vláda vydá zprávu o prosazování zákona o odstranění násilí páchaného na ženách přislíbenou v červenci 2013?

2. Jedná se o další příklad zhoršující se situace v oblasti práv žen v Afghánistánu. Jaké kroky tedy Evropská služba pro vnější činnost hodlá s ohledem na odchod zahraničních jednotek učinit, aby se i nadále zaručil přístup žen ke vzdělání a jejich ochrana proti násilným trestným činům?

Odpověď vysoké představitelky a místopředsedkyně Komise Ashtonové jménem Komise
(28. dubna 2014)

Nedávno vydalo Ministerstvo pro záležitosti žen v návaznosti na intenzivní působení EU podrobnou zprávu o Eliminaci násilí páchaného na ženách (Elimination of Violence Against Women, EVAW). V současné době EU obsah této klíčové zprávy analyzuje.

Pokrok, jehož bylo dosaženo na poli ústavních a zákonných práv žen, představuje jedno z nejzásadnějších zlepšení v Afghánistánu po pádu Tálibánu v roce 2001. Stěžejní oblasti pro ochranu práv žen, jakými jsou podpora udržování pořádku a právního státu a také dalekosáhlejší soudní reforma, patří mezi ohniska zájmu EU.

EU bude i nadále nabádat afghánské úřady k dodržování ustanovení Tokijského rámce vzájemné odpovědnosti a podmínek dohodnutých během Bonnské konference. Mimoto budou lidská práva tvořit nedílnou součást připravované dohody o spolupráci v oblasti partnerství a rozvoje.

Konkrétně bude EU pokračovat v podpoře práv žen skrze budování kapacit, vzdělávání s důrazem na lidská práva, poskytování právní podpory, přístřešků, poradenství a mediace pro ženy a dívky zasažené domácím násilím. Policejní mise EUPOL v Afghánistánu podporuje útvary pro práci s rodinami, které jsou součástí ministerstva vnitra, a to zprostředkováváním odborných školení na poli trestního vyšetřování.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001838/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) und Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Frauenrechte in Afghanistan

Am 4. Februar 2014 hat das afghanische Parlament eine beunruhigende neue Änderung des Strafgesetzbuchs des Landes (Paragraph 26) verabschiedet, wonach Familienangehörige von Angeklagten nicht gegen diese vor Gericht aussagen dürfen. Durch diese Gesetzesnovelle ist es nun sehr viel schwieriger für afghanische Frauen, Zeugenaussagen gegen Personen zu machen, die sie tätlich angegriffen haben, und dadurch wird gänzlich verhindert, dass sich innerhalb einer Familie jemand entscheidet, Angehörige zu belasten.

Dies geht weiter als die herkömmliche rechtliche Bestimmung, der gemäß Ehepartner nicht gegeneinander aussagen dürfen. Vielmehr ist jetzt jegliche Zeugenaussage gegen Familienangehörige nicht mehr möglich. Dies ist umso besorgniserregender, wenn man bedenkt, dass häusliche Gewalt, Zwangsheirat und sogenannte Ehrenmorde seit langem bestehende und schwerwiegende Probleme in Afghanistan sind.

Nach Angaben von Women for Women International sind „mehr als 87 % aller afghanischen Frauen in ihrem Leben mit körperlicher, seelischer oder sexueller Gewalt bzw. mit Zwangsheirat“ konfrontiert. Amnesty International weist außerdem darauf hin, dass es zu den meisten Fällen von „Gewalt gegen Frauen und Mädchen [darunter häusliche Gewalt, Zwangsheirat und Kinderheirat] innerhalb der Familie kommt, und da die Zeugen der Misshandlung oftmals Familienangehörige sind, würde diese Rechtsvorschrift die Untersuchung und Strafverfolgung von Gewalt gegen Frauen außerordentlich erschweren“.

Wir begrüßen es sehr, dass Baroness Ashton die Abänderung von Artikel 26 gefordert hat. Nun, da die ausländischen Truppen aus Afghanistan nach und nach abgezogen werden, ist es wichtig, dass wir deutlich machen, dass wir uns auch weiterhin für die Rechte der Frauen in Afghanistan einsetzen werden.

1. Welche politischen Maßnahmen werden erwogen, um dafür zu sorgen, dass die afghanische Regierung den im Juli 2013 zugesagten Bericht über die Durchsetzung des Gesetzes zur Beseitigung von Gewalt gegen Frauen veröffentlichen wird?

2. Dies ist nur ein weiteres Beispiel einer Reihe von Rückschlägen in Bezug auf die Frauenrechte in Afghanistan. Wie sehen die Pläne des Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienstes angesichts des Truppenabzugs aus Afghanistan aus, mit denen sichergestellt werden soll, dass Frauen dort auch in Zukunft Zugang zu Bildung haben und vor Gewalttaten geschützt werden?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(28. April 2014)

Nach intensiven Bemühungen der EU hat das Ministerium für Frauenangelegenheiten vor Kurzem den vollständigen Bericht über die Durchsetzung des Gesetzes zur Beseitigung von Gewalt gegen Frauen veröffentlicht. Die EU prüft derzeit den Inhalt dieses wichtigen Berichts.

Die Ausweitung der verfassungsmäßig und gesetzlich verankerten Frauenrechte ist eine der wichtigsten Verbesserungen in Afghanistan seit dem Sturz der Taliban im Jahr 2001. Die Förderung der Polizeiarbeit und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit, einschließlich der Justizreform, die für den Schutz der Frauenrechte von entscheidender Bedeutung sind, zählt zu den Schwerpunktbereichen der EU.

Die EU wird die afghanischen Behörden auch in Zukunft zur Einhaltung der Bestimmungen der Rahmenvereinbarung von Tokio über gegenseitige Rechenschaft und der auf der Bonner Konferenz festgelegten Bedingungen anhalten. Bestimmungen zu den Menschenrechten werden ein wesentliches Element des geplanten Kooperationsabkommens über Partnerschaft und Entwicklung sein.

Die EU wird die Frauenrechte auch in Zukunft fördern, insbesondere durch Kapazitätsaufbau, Menschenrechtserziehung, die Bereitstellung von Rechtsbeistand, Unterkünften sowie Beratungs- und Vermittlungsangeboten für Frauen und Mädchen, die Opfer von häuslicher Gewalt sind. Die Polizeimission EUPOL Afghanistan unterstützt die mit Problemen häuslicher Gewalt betrauten Stellen des Innenministeriums („Family Response Units“) durch spezielle Schulungen zum Vorgehen bei Ermittlungen in Strafsachen.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001838/14
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) και Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Δικαιώματα των γυναικών στο Αφγανιστάν

Στις 4 Φεβρουαρίου 2014 εγκρίθηκε από την κυβέρνηση του Αφγανιστάν μία νέα προβληματική προσθήκη στο νομικό κώδικα του Αφγανιστάν, γνωστή ως άρθρο 26, η οποία απαγορεύει στα συγγενικά πρόσωπα του κατηγορουμένου να καταθέσουν εναντίον του. Αυτή η τροποποίηση του νομικού κώδικα καθιστά πολύ πιο δυσχερή την κατάθεση των Αφγανών γυναικών εις βάρος αυτών που τους επιτίθενται και παρεμποδίζει οποιοδήποτε μάρτυρα της οικογενείας να προχωρήσει σε κατάθεση.

Η εν λόγω ρύθμιση βαίνει πέραν του βασικού νόμου, που δεν επιτρέπει στους συζύγους να καταθέτουν ο ένας εις βάρος του άλλου και καθιστά αδύνατη οποιαδήποτε μορφή μαρτυρικής κατάθεσης από μέλος της οικογενείας. Η ρύθμιση αυτή είναι ιδιαίτερα προβληματική, δεδομένου ότι το Αφγανιστάν έχει μία μακρά και επώδυνη ιστορία ενδοοικογενειακής βίας, καταναγκαστικών γάμων και εγκλημάτων τιμής.

Σύμφωνα με την οργάνωση Women for Women International, «πάνω από το 87% των Αφγανών γυναικών έχουν υποστεί σωματική, ψυχική ή σεξουαλική κακοποίηση, ή έχουν εξαναγκαστεί σε γάμο κάποια στιγμή της ζωής τους». Περαιτέρω, σύμφωνα με τη Διεθνή Αμνηστία, «τα περισσότερα κρούσματα βίας κατά γυναικών και κοριτσιών [συμπεριλαμβανομένης της ενδοοικογενειακής βίας και των καταναγκαστικών γάμων ή των γάμων παιδιών] εμφανίζονται εντός της οικογενείας και δεδομένου ότι συνήθως οι μάρτυρες της κακοποίησης είναι μέλη της οικογενείας, η ανωτέρω διάταξη δύναται να καταστήσει τη διερεύνηση και δίωξη των υποθέσεων βίας κατά γυναικών εξαιρετικά δυσχερή».

Επιδοκιμάζουμε τη δήλωση της Βαρόνης Ashton, με την οποία ζητείται η τροποποίηση του άρθρου 26. Καθώς οι ξένες στρατιωτικές δυνάμεις αρχίζουν να αποχωρούν από το Αφγανιστάν, είναι σημαντικό να διευκρινιστεί ότι θα εξακολουθήσουμε να είμαστε υποστηρικτές των δικαιωμάτων των Αφγανών γυναικών.

1. Τι είδους πολιτική δράση σκέφτεται να αναλάβει η Επιτροπή, προκειμένου να διασφαλίσει ότι η κυβέρνηση του Αφγανιστάν θα δημοσιεύσει την έκθεση σχετικά με την εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας για την εξάλειψη της βίας κατά των γυναικών, όπως υποσχέθηκε τον Ιούλιο του 2013,

2. Πρόκειται πραγματικά για ένα ακόμη εκ των πολυάριθμων εμποδίων που ορθώνονται στα δικαιώματα των γυναικών στο Αφγανιστάν. Δεδομένου ότι οι ξένες στρατιωτικές δυνάμεις αποχωρούν από το Αφγανιστάν, ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει η Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Εξωτερικής Δράσης, προκειμένου να συνεχίσει να διαφυλάσσει την πρόσβαση των γυναικών στην εκπαίδευση και να τις προστατεύσει από τα εγκλήματα βίας;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου κ. Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Απριλίου 2014)

Μετά από εντατική συνεργασία της ΕΕ με το Υπουργείο Γυναικείων Υποθέσεων, η Επιτροπή εξέδωσε πρόσφατα το σύνολο της έκθεσης για την εφαρμογή του νόμου για την εξάλειψη της βίας κατά των γυναικών (EVAW). Η ΕΕ εξετάζει το περιεχόμενο της εν λόγω ζωτικής σημασίας έκθεσης.

Η αναβάθμιση των συνταγματικών και νομικών δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών συνιστά ένα από τα σημαντικότερα βήματα προόδου στο Αφγανιστάν μετά την πτώση των Ταλιμπάν, το 2001. Η στήριξη της έντασης της αστυνόμευσης και της επιβολής του κράτους δικαίου, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της ευρύτερης μεταρρύθμισης του δικαστικού συστήματος — ζωτικής σημασίας προϋποθέσεις για την προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών — αποτελεί έναν από τους στρατηγικούς τομείς για την ΕΕ.

Η ΕΕ θα συνεχίσει να πιέζει τις αφγανικές αρχές ώστε να συμμορφωθούν με τις διατάξεις του Αμοιβαίου Πλαισίου Λογοδοσίας του Τόκιο και με τους όρους που καθορίστηκαν στη διάσκεψη της Βόννης. Βασικές συνιστώσες της προβλεπόμενης συμφωνίας συνεργασίας για εταιρική σχέση και ανάπτυξη θα είναι και διατάξεις για τα δικαιώματα του ανθρώπου.

Η ΕΕ θα εξακολουθήσει να προωθεί τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών, ιδίως μέσω της δημιουργίας ικανοτήτων, της εκπαίδευσης σε θέματα ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, την παροχή νομικής υποστήριξης, της στέγασης, παροχής συμβουλευτικών υπηρεσιών και διαμεσολάβησης για τις γυναίκες και τα κορίτσια — θύματα οικογενειακής βίας. Η αστυνομική αποστολή EUPOL-Αφγανιστάν στηρίζει τις μονάδες για την αρωγή στην οικογένεια, οι οποίες παρέχουν εξειδικευμένη κατάρτιση σε θέματα ερευνών που εντάσσονται στο ποινικό δίκαιο.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001838/14
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) et Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 février 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Droits de la femme en Afghanistan

Le 4 février 2014, le parlement afghan a adopté une nouvelle disposition inquiétante s'insérant dans le code de procédure pénale afghan, dite «article 26», qui interdit aux membres de la famille d'un accusé de témoigner contre lui. Cette modification du code de procédure pénale fait qu'il est beaucoup plus difficile pour les femmes afghanes de témoigner contre ceux qui les agressent et empêche les témoins appartenant à la famille de se manifester.

Cette modification va au-delà des dispositions habituelles interdisant aux conjoints de témoigner l'un contre l'autre, car elle rend impossibles toutes les formes de témoignage familial. Cette mesure est d'autant plus inquiétante que les violences conjugales, les mariages forcés et les crimes d'honneur sont depuis longtemps une douloureuse réalité en Afghanistan.

Selon l'organisation Women for Women International, plus de 87 % des femmes afghanes subissent des violences physiques, psychologiques ou sexuelles ou connaissent un mariage forcé à un moment de leur vie. En outre, selon Amnesty International, étant donné que la majeure partie des violences faites aux femmes et aux jeunes filles (violences familiales, mariages forcés, mariages d'enfants, etc.) ont lieu dans le cadre de la famille et que les membres de la famille en sont souvent les seuls témoins, les nouvelles dispositions rendent extrêmement difficile d'enquêter sur ces violences et d'en poursuivre les auteurs.

Nous saluons la déclaration de Mme Ashton dans laquelle elle demande la modification de l'article 26. Alors que le retrait des troupes étrangères d'Afghanistan a commencé, il importe que nous affichions clairement notre détermination à continuer à défendre les droits des femmes afghanes.

1. Quelles mesures politiques sont envisagées pour amener le gouvernement afghan à publier le rapport qu'il a promis en juillet 2013 sur l'application de la loi relative à l'élimination des violences faites aux femmes?

2. Cet épisode est un nouveau coup dur pour les droits de la femme en Afghanistan. Alors que les troupes étrangères se retirent d'Afghanistan, que compte faire le Service européen pour l'action extérieure pour continuer à garantir aux femmes l'accès à l'éducation et les protéger contre les violences?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(28 avril 2014)

À la suite d'un dialogue intense de l'UE avec le ministère de la condition féminine, celui-ci a récemment publié la totalité du rapport sur l'élimination de la violence à l'égard des femmes (rapport EVAW). L'UE examine actuellement le contenu de ce rapport crucial.

Les progrès en matière de droits constitutionnels et légaux des femmes constituent l'une des avancées les plus importantes en Afghanistan depuis la chute des Taliban en 2001. L'un des secteurs de concentration de l'UE consiste à appuyer le renforcement de l'État de droit et son respect, notamment la réforme de la justice au sens large, qui sont indispensables pour protéger les droits de la femme.

L'UE continuera à presser les autorités afghanes de respecter les dispositions de l'accord-cadre de responsabilité mutuelle de Tokyo et les conditions fixées à la conférence de Bonn. L'accord de coopération relatif au partenariat et au développement, qui est envisagé, comprendra aussi des dispositions sur les Droits de l'homme qui en formeront des éléments essentiels.

L'UE continuera à promouvoir les droits des femmes, en particulier par le renforcement des capacités, l'éducation aux Droits de l'homme, la fourniture d'un soutien juridique, d'abris, de conseils et de services de médiation pour les femmes et les jeunes filles touchées par la violence familiale. La mission de police en Afghanistan d'EUPOL soutient les unités d'intervention familiale du ministère de l'intérieur en dispensant une formation spécialisée en matière d'enquêtes pénales.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001838/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) e Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — I diritti delle donne in Afghanistan

Il 4 febbraio 2014 il parlamento afghano ha adottato una nuova preoccupante integrazione al codice giuridico dell'Afghanistan nota come articolo 26, secondo cui i congiunti di un imputato non possono testimoniare contro quest'ultimo. Con tale modifica del codice giuridico, per le donne è molto più difficile testimoniare contro gli individui che le aggrediscono e impedisce a qualsiasi testimone della famiglia di farsi avanti.

Ciò oltrepassa il diritto standard di non consentire ai coniugi di testimoniare uno contro l'altro e rende impossibile ogni forma di testimonianza all'interno della famiglia. Tale aspetto è particolarmente preoccupante in quanto l'Afghanistan ha una storia lunga e dolorosa di abusi domestici, matrimoni forzati e omicidi d'onore.

Stando a Women for Women International «oltre l'87 % delle donne afghane ha subito violenze fisiche, psicologiche o sessuali o il matrimonio forzato a un punto della loro vita». Secondo Amnesty International, inoltre, «gran parte delle violenze contro le donne e le ragazze [tra cui le violenze domestiche, i matrimoni forzati e infantili] avviene in ambito familiare e i membri della famiglia sono spesso quelli che sono testimoni degli abusi, facendo sì che il provvedimento renda estremamente difficile l'attività di indagine e il procedimento giudiziario riguardanti la violenza contro le donne».

Accogliamo con favore la dichiarazione della baronessa Ashton di modificare l'articolo 26. Dato che le truppe straniere stanno iniziando a uscire dall'Afghanistan è importante precisare che continueremo a difendere i diritti delle donne afghane.

1. Quali misure politiche sono in corso di valutazione nell'ottica di garantire che il governo afghano pubblichi la relazione promessa nel luglio 2013 e concernente l'applicazione della legge sull'eliminazione della violenza contro le donne?

2. Questo è un altro esempio di una serie di battute d'arresto per quanto concerne idiritti delle donne in Afghanistan. Con l'uscita delle truppe straniere dall'Afghanistan,quali sono i piani del Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna per continuare a salvaguardarel'accesso delle donne all'istruzione e proteggerle contro i crimini violenti?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(28 aprile 2014)

A seguito di intensi contatti dell'UE con il ministero degli Affari femminili è stata recentemente pubblicata la versione integrale della relazione sulla legge relativa all'eliminazione della violenza contro le donne (EVAW), di cui l'UE sta analizzando il contenuto.

Il progresso in materia di diritti costituzionali e giuridici delle donne è uno degli sviluppi più importanti in Afghanistan dalla caduta del regime talebano nel 2001. Uno dei settori prioritari per l'UE è il sostegno al rafforzamento della polizia e dello Stato di diritto (compresa una più ampia riforma del settore giudiziario), elementi fondamentali per la tutela dei diritti delle donne.

L'UE continuerà a sollecitare le autorità afghane a conformarsi alle disposizioni del quadro di Tokyo sulla responsabilità reciproca e alle condizioni stabilite in occasione della conferenza di Bonn. Fra gli elementi essenziali del previsto accordo di cooperazione sul partenariato e sullo sviluppo figureranno inoltre disposizioni sui diritti umani.

L'UE continuerà a promuovere i diritti della donna soprattutto attraverso il potenziamento delle capacità, l'educazione al rispetto dei diritti umani, la fornitura di assistenza legale, accoglienza, consulenza e mediazione alle donne e alle ragazze vittime di violenza domestica. La missione di polizia dell'Unione europea in Afghanistan (EUPOL) sostiene le unità di risposta familiare del ministero dell'Interno impartendo una formazione specifica sulle tecniche di indagine penale.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001838/14
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) u Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: VP/HR — Id-drittijiet tan-nisa fl-Afganistan

Fl-4 ta' Frar 2014 żieda preokkupanti fil-kodiċi legali tal-Afganistan, magħrufa bħala l-Artikolu 26, li tipprojbixxi lill-qraba ta' persuna akkużata milli tixhed kontriha, għaddiet mill-Parlament Afgan. Din it-tibdila fil-kodiċi legali tagħmilha iktar diffiċli għan-nisa Afgani li jixhdu kontra dawk li jattakkawhom u ma tħalli l-ebda xhud mill-familja jieħu passi f'dan is-sens.

Dan imur lil hinn mill-liġi standard li ma tħallix lill-koppji miżżewġin jixhdu kontra xulxin, u tagħmel kull tip ta' xhieda bejn il-qraba impossibbli. Hu partikolarment preokkupanti li l-Afganistan għandu storja twila u inkwetanti ta' abbuż domestiku, żwiġijiet furzati u qtil għall-unur.

Skont il-*Woman for Women International*, 'il fuq minn 87 % tan-nisa Afgani xi darba f'ħajjithom batew minn vjolenza fiżika, psikoloġika jew sesswali jew żwieġ furzat. Barra minn hekk, skont Amnesty International, il-parti l-kbira tal-vjolenza kontra n-nisa u l-bniet [inklużi l-vjolenza domestika, żwieġ furzat jew tat-tfal] issehħ fil-familja u, peress li l-membri tal-familja ħafna drabi huma dawk jinsabu xhieda tal-abbużi, din id-dispożizzjoni tagħmilha ferm diffiċli li ssir investigazzjoni u prosekuzzjoni ta' każijiet ta' vjolenza kontra n-nisa.

Aħna infaħħru d-dikjarazzjoni tal-Barunessa Ashton fejn titlob li l-Artikolu 26 ikun emendat. Hekk kif it-truppi jibdew iħallu l-Afganistan, hu importanti li nagħmluha ċara li se nibqgħu nagħmluha ta' difensuri għad-drittijiet tan-nisa Afgani.

1. X'azzjoni politika qiegħda tiġi kkunsidrata fir-rigward tal-iżgurar li l-Gvern Afgan jippubblika r-rapport li wieħed f'Lulju 2013 dwar l-infurzar tal-Liġi dwar l-Eliminazzjoni tal-Vjolenza kontra n-Nisa?

2. Dan hu eżempju ieħor minn għadd ta' ostakoli li jxekklu d-drittijiet tan-nisa fl-Afganistan. Hekk kif it-truppi barranin qed iħallu l-Afganistan, xi pjanijiet għandu s-Servizz Ewropew għall-Azzjoni Esterna biex ikompli jissalvagwardja l-aċċess tan-nisa għall-edukazzjoni u biex jipproteġihom kontra reati ta' vjolenza?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentanta Għolja/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' April 2014)

Wara l-impenn qawwi tal-UE mal-Ministeru tal-Affarijiet tan-Nisa, reċentament ħarġet ir-rapport EVAW sħiħ. L-UE bħalissa qed tanalizza l-kontenut ta' dan ir-rapport kruċjali.

L-avvanz fid-drittijiet kostituzzjonali u legali tan-nisa huwa wieħed mill-iktar elementi importanti ta' progress fl-Afganistan mill-waqgħa tat-Talibani fl-2001. Wieħed mis-setturi fokali għall-UE huwa li tappoġġja t-tisħiħ tal-pulizija u tal-istat tad-dritt, inkluż riforma ġudizzjarja usa', li huma ta' importanza kritika għall-ħarsien tad-drittijiet tan-nisa.

L-UE se tkompli tħeġġeġ lill-awtoritajiet Afgani biex jikkonformaw mad-dispożizzjonijiet tal-Qafas dwar ir-Responsabbiltà Reċiproka ta' Tokjo u l-kundizzjonijiet stabbiliti fil-Konferenza ta' Bonn. Il-Ftehim ta' Kooperazzjoni dwar is-Shubija u l-Iżvilupp previsti se jinkorpora wkoll dispożizzjonijiet tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem bħala elementi essenzjali.

L-UE ser tkompli tippromwovi d-drittijiet tan-nisa b'mod partikolari permezz tal-bini tal-kapaċità, l-edukazzjoni dwar id-drittijiet umani, il-forniment ta' appoġġ legali, kenn, konsulenza u medjazzjoni għan-nisa u l-bniet milquta mill-vjolenza fil-familja. Il-missjoni tal-pulizija EUPOL tal-Afganistan tappoġġja l-Unitajiet ta' Reazjoni fil-qasam tal-Familja tal-Ministeru tal-Intern li jipprovdu taħriġ speċjalizzat fl-investigazzjoni kriminali.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001838/14
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) oraz Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Prawa kobiet w Afganistanie

Dnia 4 lutego 2014 r. afgański parlament przyjął kontrowersyjną poprawkę do afgańskiego kodeksu prawnego, znaną jako art. 26, która zabrania krewnym osób oskarżonych zeznawać przeciwko nim. Taka zmiana w kodeksie prawnym bardzo utrudni afgańskim kobietom zeznawanie przeciwko tym, którzy je atakują, oraz uniemożliwi jakimkolwiek świadkom z grona rodziny poparcie kobiet w zeznaniach.

Zmiana ta wykracza poza standardowo stosowane rozwiązanie prawne, uniemożliwiające małżonkom składanie zeznań przeciwko sobie nawzajem, ponieważ uniemożliwia każdą formę zeznawania przeciwko członkom rodziny. Jest to szczególnie niepokojące ze względu na fakt, że w Afganistanie od pokoleń odnotowuje się bolesne przypadki nadużyć w rodzinie, przymusowych małżeństw i zabójstw honorowych.

Według organizacji Women for Women International „ponad 87 % afgańskich kobiet na którymś etapie życia doświadczyło przemocy fizycznej, psychicznej lub seksualnej bądź przymusowego małżeństwa". Dodatkowo według organizacji Amnesty International „większość przypadków przemocy wobec kobiet i dziewcząt [co obejmuje przemoc domową, przymusowe małżeństwo lub zawarcie małżeństwa w wieku dziecięcym] ma miejsce w rodzinie, a ponieważ to członkowie rodziny są najczęściej świadkami nadużyć, przepis ten ogromnie utrudni dochodzenie i egzekwowanie sprawiedliwości w przypadku przemocy wobec kobiet".

Popieramy oświadczenie wysokiej przedstawiciel Catherine Ashton, w którym zwróciła się ona o zmianę artykułu 26. Zważywszy na fakt, że zagraniczne siły zaczęły wycofywać się z Afganistanu, bardzo istotne jest jasne postawienie sprawy, że nadal będziemy odpowiadać się za prawami afgańskich kobiet.

1. Jakie działania polityczne rozważa się w kontekście zadbania o to, by afgański rząd opublikował sprawozdanie obiecane w lipcu 2013 r. i dotyczące egzekwowania prawa służącego likwidacji przemocy wobec kobiet?

2. Omawiana zmiana prawna to kolejny z wielu przykładów ograniczania praw kobiet w Afganistanie. Mając na uwadze fakt, że zagraniczne siły zaczęły wycofywać się z Afganistanu, jakie działania planuje Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych, by nadal chronić dostęp kobiet do edukacji i chronić je przed przestępstwami z użyciem przemocy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(28 kwietnia 2014 r.)

W wyniku intensywnych działań UE doszło do opublikowania przez afgańskie Ministerstwo Spraw Kobiet pełnego sprawozdania EVAW (End Violence Against Women). UE analizuje obecnie zawartość tego istotnego sprawozdania.

Zmiana w konstytucyjnych i podmiotowych prawach kobiet to jedno z najważniejszych ulepszeń w Afganistanie od upadku reżimu talibów w 2001 r. UE koncentruje swoje działania między innymi na wspieraniu sprawniejszego nadzoru i rządów prawa, w tym szerzej zakrojonej reformy sądownictwa, które mają podstawowe znaczenie dla ochrony praw kobiet.

UE będzie w dalszym ciągu wzywać władze Afganistanu do przestrzegania postanowień tokijskich ram wzajemnej odpowiedzialności i warunków ustalonych na konferencji w Bonn. Istotnymi elementami przewidywanej umowy o współpracy na rzecz partnerstwa i rozwoju będą również postanowienia dotyczące praw człowieka.

UE będzie w dalszym ciągu propagować prawa kobiet zwłaszcza poprzez budowanie zdolności, edukację w zakresie praw człowieka, zapewnianie wsparcia prawnego, schronienia, doradztwa i mediacji dla kobiet i dziewcząt dotkniętych przemocą w rodzinie. Misja policyjna EU AFGANISTAN wspiera jednostki ds. pomocy rodzinie działające w ramach ministerstwa spraw wewnętrznych w prowadzeniu specjalistycznych szkoleń w dochodzeniach karnych.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001838/14
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) e Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 de fevereiro de 2014)

Assunto: VR/HR — Os direitos das mulheres no Afeganistão

Em 4 de fevereiro de 2014, o Parlamento afegão aprovou um preocupante novo aditamento ao código jurídico do Afeganistão, o denominado «artigo 26.°», que proíbe os familiares de uma pessoa acusada de testemunharem contra ela. Esta alteração ao código jurídico dificulta consideravelmente o testemunho das mulheres afegãs contra aqueles que as atacam e impede eventuais testemunhas no seio da família de intercederem.

Esta disposição vai além da norma habitual que não permite que os cônjuges testemunhem um contra o outro e impossibilita qualquer forma de testemunho familiar. Esta situação é particularmente preocupante uma vez que o Afeganistão tem um longo e doloroso historial de violência doméstica, casamentos forçados e crimes de honra.

De acordo com a organização *Women for Women International*, mais de 87 % das mulheres afegãs sofreram violência física, psicológica ou sexual ou foram confrontadas com uma situação de casamento forçado em alguma fase da sua vida. Além disso, segundo a Amnistia Internacional, grande parte da violência contra as mulheres e as raparigas [incluindo a violência doméstica e o casamento forçado ou de crianças] ocorre no seio da família e, dado que os familiares são frequentemente aqueles que testemunham os abusos, esta disposição torna a investigação e a perseguição judicial de casos de violência contra as mulheres extremamente desafiante.

Aplaudimos a declaração da Baronesa Ashton, solicitando a alteração do artigo 26.°. À medida que as tropas estrangeiras começam a abandonar o Afeganistão, é importante deixar claro que iremos continuar a defender os direitos das mulheres afegãs.

1. Que ações políticas estão a ser analisadas no que respeita à garantia de que o Governo afegão publicará o relatório prometido em julho de 2013 relativo à aplicação da Lei sobre a Eliminação da Violência Contra as Mulheres?

2. Este é outro exemplo de vários recuos em matéria de direitos das mulheres no Afeganistão. À medida que as tropas estrangeiras abandonam o Afeganistão, quais os planos do Serviço Europeu para a Ação Externa com vista a continuar a assegurar o acesso das mulheres à educação e a protegê-las contra crimes violentos?

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

Na sequência da pressão efetuada pela UE junto do Ministério dos Assuntos da Mulher do Afeganistão, foi recentemente publicada a versão integral do relatório sobre a lei relativa à eliminação da violência contra as mulheres. A UE está atualmente a analisar o teor desse documento crucial.

O progresso em matéria de direitos jurídicos e constitucionais das mulheres é um dos principais desenvolvimentos ocorridos no Afeganistão desde a queda do regime talibã em 2001. Um dos setores prioritários para a UE é o apoio ao reforço do policiamento e do Estado de direito, incluindo uma reforma judicial mais vasta, que é essencial para a proteção dos direitos das mulheres.

A UE continuará a insistir junto das autoridades afegãs para que respeitem as disposições do Quadro de Responsabilidade Mútua de Tóquio e as condições acordadas na Conferência de Bona. Entre os elementos essenciais do acordo de cooperação em matéria de parceria e desenvolvimento que se prevê celebrar figurarão igualmente disposições em matéria de direitos humanos.

A UE continuará a promover os direitos das mulheres no Afeganistão, nomeadamente através do reforço das capacidades, da educação para os direitos humanos, da prestação de apoio jurídico, da criação de centros de acolhimento e serviços de aconselhamento e mediação para as mulheres e as jovens vítimas de violência doméstica. A Missão de Polícia da UE no Afeganistão (EUPOL) tem prestado apoio às unidades de resposta familiar do Ministério do Interior, ministrando formação especializada em matéria de técnicas de investigação criminal.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001838/14
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) şi Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 februarie 2014)

Subiect: VP/HR — Drepturile femeilor în Afganistan

La 4 octombrie 2014, în parlamentul afgan a fost votat un nou articol problematic, articolul 26, prin care se interzice rudelor unei persoane acuzate să depună mărturie împotriva acestora. Această schimbare legislativă face mult mai dificil pentru femeile afgane să depună mărturie împotriva celor care le atacă și împiedică intervenția oricărui martor din familie.

Această prevedere merge mult mai departe decât dispoziția standard prin care nu li se permite soților/soțiilor să depună mărturie unii împotriva altora și face imposibilă orice formă de mărturie în familie. Problema este cu atât mai gravă cu cât Afganistanul are o istorie îndelungată încărcată de abuzuri domestice, căsătorii forțate și crime de onoare.

Conform organizației Women for Women International, „peste 87% dintre femeile afgane au suferit violențe fizice, psihologice sau sexuale sau căsătorii forțate în decursul vieții lor”. De asemenea, Amnesty International susține că „majoritatea actelor de violență împotriva femeilor și fetelor — inclusiv violența domestică, căsătoria forțată sau căsătoria copiilor — au loc în familie, membrii familiei fiind cel mai adesea martori ai abuzurilor, ceea ce face ca această prevedere să facă foarte dificilă anchetarea sau urmărirea în justiție a violențelor împotriva femeilor”.

Aplaudăm declarația Baronesei Ashton prin care cere modificarea articolului 26. Odată cu plecarea trupelor străine din Afganistan, e important să subliniem că vom continua să susținem drepturilor femeilor afgane.

1. Ce acțiuni politice sunt avute în vedere pentru a se garanta că guvernul afgan va da publicității raportul promis în iulie 2013 referitor la aplicarea legii privind eliminarea violențelor împotriva femeilor?

2. Acesta este încă un exemplu dintr-o serie de regrese ale drepturilor femeilor în Afganistan. Odată cu plecarea trupelor străine din Afganistan, ce planuri are Serviciul European de Acțiune Externă pentru a apăra dreptul femeilor la educație și pentru a le proteja împotriva infracțiunilor violente?

Răspuns dat de Înaltul Reprezentant/doamna vicepreședinte Ashton în numele Comisiei
(28 aprilie 2014)

După o implicare intensă a UE cu Ministerul pentru problemele femeilor, acesta a publicat recent întregul raport referitor la eliminarea violențelor împotriva femeilor. UE analizează în prezent conținutul acestui raport esențial.

Progresele înregistrate în ceea ce privește drepturile constituționale și legale ale femeilor constituie una dintre cele mai importante îmbunătățiri din Afganistan, de la căderea regimului taliban în 2001. Sprijinirea consolidării activității forțelor de poliție și a statului de drept, inclusiv a reformei sistemului judiciar, care reprezintă aspecte esențiale pentru protejarea drepturilor femeilor, este unul dintre sectoarele prioritare pentru UE.

UE va continua să îndemne autoritățile afgane să respecte dispozițiile din Cadrul de la Tokyo privind responsabilitatea reciprocă și condițiile stabilite la Conferința de la Bonn. Viitorul acord de cooperare privind parteneriatul și dezvoltarea va cuprinde, de asemenea, dispoziții privind drepturile omului ca elemente esențiale.

UE va continua promovarea drepturilor femeilor, în special prin consolidarea capacităților, educația privind drepturile omului, acordarea de asistență juridică, adăpost, consiliere și mediere pentru femeile și fetele afectate de violența domestică. Misiunea de poliție EUPOL Afganistan sprijină demersurile prin care unitățile de reacție în domeniul familiei din cadrul Ministerului de Interne oferă formare de specialitate în ceea ce privește cercetările penale.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001838/14
komissiolle (Varapuheenjohtajalle/Korkealle edustajalle)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) ja Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18. helmikuuta 2014)

Aihe: VP/HR – naisten oikeudet Afganistanissa

Afganistanin parlamentti hyväksyi 4. helmikuuta 2014 huolestuttavan lisäyksen Afganistanin lakiin, niin kutsutun 26 artiklan, joka kieltää syytetyn henkilön sukulaisia todistamasta syytettyä vastaan. Kyseinen lakimuutos vaikeuttaa entisestään afganistanilaisten naisten mahdollisuuksia todistaa heidän päälleen karanneita henkilöitä vastaan, ja se estää perheeseen kuuluvia todistajia ilmoittautumasta todistajiksi.

Lakimuutos ylittää tavallisen lainsäädännön, joka estää puolisoita todistamasta toisiaan vastaan, ja tekee kaikenlaisen perheenjäsenten todistamisen mahdottomaksi. Tämä on erityisen huolestuttavaa, kun otetaan huomioon Afganistanin pitkä ja kipeä kotiväkivallan, pakkoavioliittojen ja kunniamurhien leimaama menneisyys.

Women for Women International -järjestön mukaan yli 87 prosenttia afganistanilaisista naisista on kokenut fyysistä, psykologista tai seksuaalista väkivaltaa tai pakkoavioliiton jossain vaiheessa elämäänsä. Lisäksi Amnesty International -järjestön mukaan suurin osa naisiin ja tyttöihin kohdistuvasta väkivallasta [mukaan luettuina kotiväkivalta, pakko- tai lapsiavioliitot] tapahtuu perhepiirissä, ja koska perheenjäsenet joutuvat usein todistamaan hyväksikäyttöä, säännös tekisi naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan tutkimisen ja siihen liittyvän oikeudenkäynnin erittäin haasteelliseksi.

Pidämme positiivisena Catherine Ashtonin lausuntoa, jossa hän vaatii 26 artiklan muuttamista. Ulkomaisten joukkojen valmistautuessa lähtemään Afganistanista on tärkeää, että teemme selväksi aikeemme jatkaa afganistanilaisten naisten oikeuksien puolustamista.

1. Mitä poliittisia toimia on suunnitteilla sen varmistamiseksi, että Afganistanin hallitus julkaisee heinäkuussa 2013 lupaamansa raportin naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan poistamista koskevan lain täytäntöönpanosta?

2. Kyseessä on jälleen yksi esimerkki naisten oikeuksien rajoittamisesta Afganistanissa. Mitä suunnitelmia Euroopan ulkosuhdehallinnolla on naisten koulutusmahdollisuuksien turvaamisen jatkamiseksi ja naisten suojelemiseksi väkivaltarikoksilta ulkomaisten joukkojen valmistautuessa lähtemään Afganistanista?

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

EU:n käytyä intensiivistä vuoropuhelua naisasiainministeriön kanssa, ministeriö on äskettäin julkistanut naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan poistamisesta laaditun raportin kokonaisuudessaan. EU analysoi parhaillaan tämän keskeisen raportin sisältöä.

Naisten perustuslaillisissa ja muissa oikeuksissa tapahtunut edistys on yksi tärkeimmistä parannuksista Afganistanissa sen jälkeen, kun Taleban kukistui vuonna 2001. Yksi EU:n painopistealoista on poliisitoiminnan ja oikeusvaltioperiaatteen tukeminen ja vahvistaminen, mukaan lukien oikeuslaitoksen laajempi uudistaminen. Nämä ovat olennaisen tärkeitä naisten oikeuksien suojelemiseksi.

EU kehottaa jatkossakin Afganistanin viranomaisia noudattamaan Tokiossa hyväksytyssä keskinäisen vastuuvelvollisuuden kehyksessä sovittuja säännöksiä sekä Bonnin konferenssissa asetettuja ehtoja. Suunniteltuun kumppanuutta ja kehitystä koskevaan yhteistyösopimukseen sisältyy myös olennaisina osina ihmisoikeussäännöksiä.

EU edistää jatkossakin naisten oikeuksia erityisesti kehittämällä valmiuksia, antamalla ihmisoikeuskoulutusta, oikeudellista tukea, suojaa, neuvontaa ja sovittelua perheväkivallan kohteiksi joutuneille naisille ja tytöille. Euroopan unionin poliisioperaatio Afganistanissa tukee sisäasiainministeriön perheasiainyksikköä antamalla rikostutkinnan erityiskoulutusta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001838/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Susy De Martini (ECR), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), James Elles (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR), Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), Philippe Juvin (PPE), Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE) and Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Women's rights in Afghanistan

On 4 February 2014 a troubling new addition to the Afghanistan legal code known as Article 26, which bans relatives of an accused person from testifying against them, was passed by the Afghan Parliament. This change in the legal code makes it much more difficult for Afghan women to testify against those who attack them and prevents any witnesses within the family from stepping forward.

This goes beyond the standard law of not allowing spouses to testify against each other and makes all forms of familial testimony impossible. It is particularly troubling given that Afghanistan has a long and painful history of domestic abuse, forced marriages and honour killings.

According to Women for Women International, 'over 87% of Afghan women have experienced physical, psychological or sexual violence or forced marriage at some point in their life'. Furthermore, according to Amnesty International, 'most violence against women and girls [including domestic violence, forced or child marriage] occurs within the family and as family members are often the ones who witness abuses, the provision would make the investigation and prosecution of violence against women extremely challenging'.

We applaud Baroness Ashton's statement asking for Article 26 to be amended. As foreign troops begin to leave Afghanistan it is important that we make it clear that we will continue to be advocates for the rights of Afghan women.

1. What political action is being considered with regard to ensuring that the Afghan Government releases the report they promised in July 2013 on the enforcement of the Law on Elimination of Violence against Women?

2. This is yet another example of a series of setbacks for women's rights in Afghanistan. As foreign troops leave Afghanistan, what plans does the European External Action Service have to continue to safeguard women's access to education and to protect them against violent crimes?

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

Following intense engagement of the EU with the Ministry of Women's Affairs, it has recently released the full EVAW report. The EU is currently analysing the contents of this crucial report.

The advance in the constitutional and legal rights of women is one of the most important improvements in Afghanistan since the fall of the Taliban in 2001. Supporting the strengthening of policing and the rule of law, including wider judicial reform, which are critical for protecting the rights of women, is one of the focal sectors for EU.

The EU will continue urging Afghan authorities to comply with the provisions of the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework and the conditions laid down at the Bonn conference. The envisaged Cooperation Agreement on Partnership and Development will also incorporate human rights provisions as essential elements.

The EU will continue promoting women's rights in particular through capacity building, human rights education, the provision of legal support, shelter, counselling and mediation for women and girls affected by family violence. The EUPOL Afghanistan police mission supports the Ministry of the Interior's Family Response Units providing specialized training in criminal investigation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001840/14
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Ampliamento di un impianto per rifiuti speciali a Noale (Venezia) e possibile rischio di emissioni e di omessa valutazione dell'impatto cumulativo con un impianto a biogas

Nel 2013 la Regione Veneto ha autorizzato l'adeguamento tecnologico di un impianto di stoccaggio e trattamento di rifiuti speciali, ubicato nel comune di Noale ([1]); la struttura sorge in una zona a rischio idrogeologico, in prossimità di alcune aree tutelate quali SIC (Siti di importanza comunitaria) e ZPS (Zone di protezione speciale) della rete «Natura 2000» ([2]). L'adeguamento approvato, che secondo il Consiglio provinciale di Venezia rischia di comportare pericolose emissioni nell'atmosfera e lo sversamento di acque meteoriche nel vicino fiume Marzenego ([3]), comprenderebbe lo stoccaggio e il trattamento di 21 500 tonnellate di rifiuti, quasi metà delle quali composta da rifiuti speciali pericolosi. Secondo quanto riferito dai comitati cittadini di Noale e Salzano (provincia di Venezia), inoltre, l'autorizzazione sembrerebbe essere stata concessa senza tenere conto del fatto che, nello stesso sito, la medesima azienda aveva attivato nel 2011 un impianto di cogenerazione a biomasse da 995 kilowatt; non sembrerebbe essere stato considerato, pertanto, il futuro impatto cumulativo dei due impianti in termini di inquinamento. Va ancora aggiunto che l'ARPAV (Agenzia Regionale per la Prevenzione e Protezione Ambientale del Veneto) ha rilevato nel semestre freddo del 2012 a ridosso dell'impianto una concentrazione media giornaliera di PM10 pari a 73 µg/m^3 (microgrammi per metro cubo) e di benzo(a)pirene pari a 3,2 ng/m^3 (nanogrammi per metro cubo), a fronte dei noti limiti pari rispettivamente a 50 µg/m^3 e 1 ng/m^3 [(4)]. Preoccupato per l'impatto del progetto sulla salute pubblica, il Consiglio regionale del Veneto ha votato una mozione (la n. 188 del 19.9.2013) per chiedere alla Giunta di sospendere l'autorizzazione e di adoperarsi per delocalizzare l'attività. Si ricorda che, in data 19.12.2012, l'Italia è stata condannata dalla Corte di giustizia dell'UE (causa C-68/11) per le continue violazioni della direttiva Aria (2008/50/CE).

Tutto ciò premesso, l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito esposti.

1. Quali iniziative intende intraprendere per far fronte alla situazione di rischio ambientale e sanitario descritta, in particolare al fine di verificare il rispetto della normativa ambientale dell'Unione europea?

2. Non ritiene che la concessione dell'autorizzazione di cui sopra, in un'area caratterizzata da continui sforamenti dei limiti imposti dalla direttiva Aria, possa risultare in contrasto con l'esigenza di evitare ulteriori violazioni a seguito della succitata condanna?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

Spetta alle autorità competenti degli Stati membri garantire il rispetto della normativa dell'Unione europea. A seguito della sentenza della Corte di giustizia dell'UE nella causa C-68/11, la Commissione sta monitorando da vicino l'attuazione da parte dell'Italia delle misure necessarie a far rientrare le concentrazioni di PM_{10} nell'aria ambiente all'interno dei valori limite stabiliti dalla legislazione dell'UE.

È compito degli Stati membri determinare se un'autorizzazione può essere concessa a un determinato progetto situato in una zona caratterizzata da un'insufficiente qualità dell'aria, alla luce delle misure esistenti e previste intese a ridurre l'inquinamento atmosferico, come richiesto dalla direttiva 2008/50/CE ([5]) relativa alla qualità dell'aria ambiente. Così facendo gli Stati membri devono anche garantire il rispetto di tutta la normativa UE pertinente, compresa la direttiva 2010/75/UE relativa alle emissioni industriali ([6]), il cui articolo 18 specifica che le condizioni dell'autorizzazione possono essere rese più rigorose di quelle ottenibili con le migliori tecniche disponibili, se il rispetto di una norma di qualità ambientale lo richiede.

([1]) Deliberazione della Giunta regionale n. 213 del 26 febbraio 2013.
([2]) SIC/ZPS IT3250008 «Ex cave di Villetta di Salzano»; IT3250017 «Cave di Noale»; IT3250021 «Ex cave di Martellago.»
([3]) http://goo.gl/vCPIzp
([4]) http://goo.gl/nks4Xq
([5]) GU L 152 dell'11.6.2008.
([6]) GU L 334 del 17.12.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001840/14
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Expansion of a special waste plant at Noale (Venice) and possible risk of emissions and lack of cumulative impact assessment with a biogas plant

In 2013 the Veneto Region authorised the technological modification of a plant for the storage and treatment of special waste, located in the municipality of Noale ([1]); the structure is built in a hydrogeological risk area, close to certain areas protected as SCIs (Sites of Community Importance) and SPZs (Special Protection Zones) under the network 'Natura 2000' ([2]). The approved modification, which according to the Venice Provincial Council, threatens to discharge hazardous emissions into the atmosphere and rainwater into the nearby Marzenego River ([3]), would involve the storage and treatment of 21 500 tonnes of waste, almost half of which would be made up of special hazardous waste. In addition, according to comments made by the citizens committees of Noale and Salzano (Province of Venice), the authorisation appears to have been granted without taking account of the fact that, on the same site, the same company set up a 995 kilowatt biomass cogeneration plant in 2011; therefore, little consideration would appear to have been given to the future cumulative impact of the two plants in terms of pollution. It is also added that in the cold season of 2012 the Veneto Regional Agency for the Prevention and Protection of the Environment (ARPAV) reported an average daily concentration of PM10 of 73 μg/m^3 (micrograms per cubic metre) and of benzo(a)pyrene of 3.2 ng/m^3 (nanograms per cubic metre) in the surroundings of the plant, compared with the well-known limits of 50 μg/m^3 and 1 ng/m^3 respectively ([4]). Concerned about the impact of the project on public health, the Veneto Regional Council has passed a resolution (No 188 of 19.9.2013) requesting the Executive Committee to suspend the authorisation and to take action to relocate the activity. It is recalled that on 19.12.2012 Italy was found guilty by the Court of Justice of the European Union (Case C-68/11) of continuous breaches of the Air Directive (2008/50/EC).

In view of all the above,

1. What initiatives does the Commission intend to take to deal with the situation of environmental and health risk described, in particular, in order to verify observance of EU environmental legislation?

2. Does the Commission consider that the granting of the authorisation referred to, in an area characterised by continuous breaches of the limits imposed by the Air Directive, may conflict with the need to avoid any further infringements, following the said judgment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

It is for the competent authorities of Member States to ensure compliance with EU legislation. Following the ruling of the Court of Justice of the EU in Case C-68/11, the Commission is monitoring closely the implementation by Italy of the measures necessary to bring concentrations of PM_{10} in ambient air within the limit values set in EU legislation.

Member States are responsible for defining whether a permit can be granted to a given project located in an area affected by insufficient air quality, in the light of the existing and planned measures aiming at reducing air pollution such as required under Directive 2008/50/EC ([5]) on ambient air quality. In doing so, they must also ensure that all relevant applicable EU legislation is complied with, including Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions ([6]) whose Article 18 specifies that permit conditions may have to be made stricter than those achievable by the use of the best available techniques if the achievement of an environmental quality standard so requires.

([1]) Resolution of Regional Executive Committee No 213 of 26 February 2013.
([2]) SCI/SPZ IT3250008 'Old quarries at Villetta di Salzano'; IT3250017 'Quarries at Noale'; IT3250021 'Old quarries at Martellago'
([3]) http://goo.gl/vCPIzp
([4]) http://goo.gl/nks4Xq
([5]) OJ L 152, 11.6.2008.
([6]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001841/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(18 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Lotnisko w Obicach

Komisja Europejska nie da pieniędzy na nowe lotniska w Polsce do 2020 r. W obecnej unijnej perspektywie budżetowej nowe porty lotnicze nie mogą liczyć na wspólnotowe dofinansowanie. Pieniądze z Brukseli trafią jedynie do istniejących lotnisk wpisanych do Transeuropejskiej Sieci Transportowej TEN-T.

Brak finansowania z Unii może oznaczać problemy m.in. dla samorządu w Kielcach, który planuje budowę nowego lotniska. Warto zwrócić uwagę na to, że grunty pod tę inwestycję zostały już wykupione, jak i na samą gotowość samorządów do jego budowy(zarząd województwa świętokrzyskiego + miasto Kielce). Lotnisko miałoby być nie tylko stricte pasażerskie, ale posłużyć również w przyszłości jako cargo.

Stwarzałoby to wyjątkową okazję do zbudowania centrum logistycznego, jakim ten region Europy obecnie nie dysponuje. Trudno przecenić znaczenie takiego ośrodka dla gospodarki nie tylko regionu, ale też całego kraju

Ponadto dotychczas mieszkańcy województwa świętokrzyskiego musieli podróżować z Kielc do Krakowa-Balice 130 km, do Katowic-Pyrzowice 150 km. W obu przypadkach drogi do tych lotnisk od strony Kielc są w bardzo złym stanie, a w najbliższym czasie nie ma planów na poprawę infrastruktury drogowej (np. droga krajowa E-7 w woj. małopolskim).

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać:

1. Obecnie województwo świętokrzyskie, jako jedne z niewielu, nie posiada portu lotniczego. Jak Komisja zamierza wytłumaczyć zasadność budowy lotniska w Radomiu, kiedy to mieszkańcy Radomia mają do Warszawy-Okęcie tylko 80 km, natomiast mieszkańcy Kielc 160 km?

2. Dlaczego pieniądze z Brukseli trafią jedynie do istniejących lotnisk wpisanych do Transeuropejskiej Sieci Transportowej TEN-T, a nie wspiera się nowych kluczowych inwestycji dla rozwoju regionu?

3. W jaki sposób Komisja ocenia rentowność lotniska, jeżeli jest ono częścią infrastruktury, której nie da się przełożyć wprost na bilans zysków i strat?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji
(9 kwietnia 2014 r.)

W odniesieniu do portów lotniczych inwestycje finansowane w ramach instrumentów polityki spójności mają na celu skupienie się na portach lotniczych należące do sieci bazowej, ponieważ taki priorytet określono w wytycznych dotyczących TEN-T przyjętych przez Radę i Parlament Europejski ([1]). We wszystkich przypadkach inwestycjom w porty lotnicze powinny towarzyszyć inwestycje niezbędne do łagodzenia oddziaływania lotnictwa na środowisko. Ogólna zasada zakłada, że państwa członkowskie powinny zagwarantować realizację projektów zgodnie ze stosownymi przepisami unijnymi, tzn z unijnymi aktami prawnymi dotyczącymi pomocy państwa.

Do budowy portu lotniczego w Radomiu, tak samo jak w przypadku portu lotniczego w Kielcach, nie wykorzystano żadnego z unijnych funduszy strukturalnych lub funduszy spójności. W związku z powyższym Komisja nie może wypowiedzieć się bardziej szczegółowo w sprawie inwestycji podejmowanych przez władze regionalne lub prywatnych inwestorów, w przypadku gdy takie inwestycje nie korzystają ze środków instrumentów polityki spójności. Jednocześnie władze polskie powiadomiły w projekcie planu rozwoju transportu o zamiarze inwestowania w modernizację linii kolejowych w regionie kieleckim w celu zapewnienia lepszej jakości usług dla pasażerów.

Komisja wykorzystuje analizę kosztów i korzyści jako narzędzie pomagające państwom członkowskim w ocenie jakości i wykonalności inwestycji infrastrukturalnych wspieranych w ramach instrumentów polityki spójności. Koszt infrastruktury jest brany pod uwagę przy analizie korzyści i wykonalności inwestycji.

([1]) Motyw 13 i art. 6 ust. 3 rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (UE) nr 1315/2013 z dnia 11 grudnia 2013 r. w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dotyczących rozwoju transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej i uchylające decyzję nr 661/2010/UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001841/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Airport in Obice

The European Commission will not provide funds for new airports in Poland before 2020. New airports cannot hope to receive any EC co-financing under the current EU budget. Only existing airports included in the Trans-European Transport Network TEN-T will receive funds from Brussels.

The absence of EU financing may cause problems e.g. for the local authority in Kielce, which is planning to construct a new airport. It should be noted that the land for this investment has already been purchased and the local authorities are ready to commence construction (the board of the Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship + the city of Kielce). The airport is not only intended to be a passenger airport but also to handle cargo in future.

This would constitute an excellent opportunity to create the first logistics centre in this region of Europe. The importance of this centre for the economy, not just of this region but the entire country, cannot be overestimated.

Furthermore, the residents of the Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship currently have to travel 130 km from Kielce to Krakow-Balice airport or 150 km to Katowice-Pyrzowice airport. In both cases, the roads to these airports from Kielce are in very poor condition and there are no plans to improve the road infrastructure in the near future (e.g. national road E-7 in the Małopolskie Voivodeship).

In respect of the above, I wish to pose the following questions:

1. The Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship is one of the few that does not currently have an airport. How does the Commission intend to explain the legitimacy of building an airport in Radom, when the residents of that city live just 80 km from Warsaw-Okęcie airport, as compared to 160 km in the case of Kielce residents?

2. Why are funds from Brussels only being spent on airports included in the Trans-European Transport Network TEN-T, rather than being used to support new, key investments for the development of the region?

3. How does the Commission assess the profitability of an airport if it is an element of infrastructure, which cannot directly be converted into a balance sheet?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

As regards the airports, the investments to be supported by the Cohesion policy instruments aim to concentrate on the TEN-T core network airports as this is set out to be the priority of the TEN-T Guidelines adopted by the Council and the European Parliament ([1]). In all cases, airport investments should be accompanied by investments necessary to mitigate the environmental impact of aviation. As a general rule, Member States should ensure that the projects are carried out in compliance with relevant Union law, namely with Union legal acts on state aid.

Concerning the construction of the Radom airport, no EU structural or cohesion funds were used, as it was in the case of the Kielce airport. Hence, the Commission cannot comment in detail the investments undertaken by regional authorities and/or private investors when these investments are not supported by the Cohesion policy instruments. At the same time, Polish authorities have indicated in the draft Transport Development Plan the intent to invest in upgrading the railway lines around Kielce to provide better service for passengers.

The Commission uses a cost benefit analysis as a tool to help the Member States to judge the quality and feasibility of the infrastructure investments supported by the Cohesion policy instruments. Cost of the infrastructure is taken into account when analysing the benefits and the feasibility of the investment.

([1]) Recital 13 and Article 6.3 of the 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.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande P-001842/14
till kommissionen
Olle Schmidt (ALDE)
(18 februari 2014)

Angående: FRA:s strykning av arbetsdefinitionen av antisemitism

Jag har uppmärksammats på att Europeiska unionens byrå för grundläggande rättigheter (FRA) har strukit sin arbetsdefinition av antisemitism från 2005 från sin webbplats. Denna arbetsdefinition omfattade inte bara klassiskt antisemitiskt beteende, utan betraktade även förtal av israeler eller av Israel som antisemitiskt beteende. Eftersom antisemitismen ökar kraftigt i Europa i den finansiella krisens spår framstår denna avsaknad av en specifik definition som mycket oroväckande. FRA säger att dess uppgifter inkluderar att fastställa definitioner av verksamhetsområden, men trots detta hävdar Blanca Tapia på FRA att organisationen inte har något mandat att ta fram sina egna definitioner.

Vid en tidpunkt då FRA:s egna rapporter visar på helt nya nivåer av upplevd och faktisk antisemitism är bristen på en ny definition för att ersätta den gamla i bästa fall dåligt timad och i värsta fall skadlig för bekämpningen av antisemitism. Utan en fastställd definition blir det svårt att ta fram rapporter och genomföra undersökningar med koncisa och exakta resultat. Dessutom anser många att strykningen av arbetsdefinitionen ytterligare har förvärrat judarnas situation i Europa, eftersom det inte längre är möjligt att kategorisera och klassificera de händelser som offren för antisemitism har varit med om. Det är i dagsläget av största betydelse att utveckla en fungerande och heltäckande definition, som eventuellt skulle kunna bygga på den arbetsdefinition som tagits fram av European Forum on Antisemitism.

Är kommissionen medveten om att FRA har strukit sin arbetsdefinition från 2005?

Finns det någon anledning till denna plötsliga strykning och kommer det att tas fram en ny definition för att ersätta den gamla?

Anser kommissionen att avsaknaden av en definition negativt kommer att påverka kampen mot antisemitism i Europeiska unionen?

Svar från Viviane Reding på kommissionens vägnar
(25 mars 2014)

Kommissionen vill påpeka att FRA ([1]) är en oberoende byrå. Byrån samlar in uppgifter och information om antisemitism som har kartlagts av officiella organ (exempelvis jämställdhetsorgan som finns i varje medlemsstat enligt direktiv 2000/43/EG), av polis och rättsliga myndigheter och av icke-statliga organisationer. I detta hänseende tillämpar byrån inte någon egen särskild definition.

FRA bestämde helt självständigt att låta det dokument som parlamentsledamoten hänvisade till ligga kvar på nätet fram tills nyligen då det togs bort tillsammans med andra icke-officiella dokument.

([1]) Europeiska unionens byrå för grundläggande rättigheter.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001842/14
to the Commission
Olle Schmidt (ALDE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Question regarding the removal of the working definition of antisemitism by the FRA

It has come to my attention that the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) has removed its 2005 working definition of antisemitism from its website. This working definition not only included classic antisemitic behaviour but also considered vilification of Israelis or Israel as antisemitic behaviour. As antisemitic sentiments are growing increasingly strong in Europe in the wake of the financial crisis, we find this lack of a specific definition highly alarming. Although the FRA states that its tasks include drawing up definitions of areas of work, Blanca Tapia of the FRA has claimed that the organisation 'has no mandate to develop its own definitions'.

At a point in time where the FRA's own reports show unprecedented new levels of perceived and actual antisemitism, the lack of a replacement definition appears ill-timed at best, and damaging to the fight against antisemitism at worst. Without a set definition, it would be difficult to produce reports and investigations that are concise and exact in their findings. Furthermore, many people consider that the removal of the working definition has made the situation of Jews in Europe even worse, as it is no longer possible to categorise and classify the experiences of victims of antisemitism. At this time, it seems of the highest importance to develop a functioning and all-encompassing definition, which could perhaps take inspiration from the working definition of the European Forum on Antisemitism.

Therefore, I would like to ask if the Commission is aware of the removal of the 2005 FRA working definition.

Is there a reason for the sudden removal of the working definition and will there be a replacement definition?

Does the Commission think that the lack of a definition will adversely affect the fight against antisemitism in the European Union?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission would like to point out that the FRA ([1]) is an independent agency. Furthermore, the FRA collects data and information on anti-Semitism that has been identified by official bodies (e.g. equality bodies that exist in each EU Member State according to Directive 2000/43/EC), by police and judicial authorities and by non-governmental organisations. In this sense, the FRA does not itself apply any one particular definition.

In all autonomy, the FRA retained the document the Honourable Member referred to online until recently when it was removed together with other non-official documents.

([1]) European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001844/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(18 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Ir-rati tal-kanċer fl-irġiel

Dejta ppubblikata minn Cancer Research UK fl-14 ta' Frar 2014 turi li l-irġiel għandhom probabbiltà ta' 50 % aktar min-nisa li jmutu bil-kanċer. Madwar id-dinja jmutu aktar minn 46 miljun raġel fis-sena bil-kanċer, ekwivalenti għall-126 raġel għal kull 100 000. Dawn il-figuri juru wkoll li r-rati ta' mortalità mill-kanċer fost l-irġiel huma għola fl-Ewropa Ċentrali u tal-Lvant. Fir-Renju Unit, irġiel iddjanjostikati bil-kanċer għandhom probbabiltà ta' 30 % aktar min-nisa li jmutu.

1. Il-Kummissjoni xi strateġija qed tadotta sabiex iżżid l-għarfien dwar il-kanċer fl-irġiel fl-Istati Membri?

2. Ir-riċerka turi li t-tendenzi tal-kanċer fl-irġiel qed jinbidlu, il-kanċer tal-pulmun qed jonqos u l-kanċer tal-prostata qed jiżdied. Il-Kummissjoni x'azzjoni qed tieħu biex tiżgura li l-Istati Membri kollha joffru programmi nazzjonali tal-iskrinjar għall-irġiel li jippromwovu dijanjosi bikrija ta' din il-marda?

3. Dieta ħażina, konsum għoli ta' alkoħol u t-tabakk huma fost dawk il-fatturi li l-aktar jikkontribwixxu għall-kanċer fl-irġiel. Il-Kummissjoni x'azzjoni qed tieħu biex tippromwovi stil ta' ħajja għall-irġiel li hu tajjeb għas-saħħa?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' April 2004)

Il-Kummissjoni tippromwovi għadd ta' inizjattivi biex titqajjem kuxjenza u tinkoraġġixxi għażliet f'isem stil ta' ħajja tajjeb għas-saħħa, inkluż dwar fatturi ta' riskju ewlenin, bħat-tabakk, il-ħsara marbuta mal-alkoħol, dieta ħażina u n-nuqqas ta' attività fiżika. Dawn l-inizjattivi jindirizzaw kemm l-irġiel kif ukoll in-nisa.

Barra minn hekk, speċifikament fil-qasam tal-kanċer, il-Kummissjoni tappoġġja l-Kodiċi Ewropew kontra l-Kanċer ([1]), għodda ewlenija ta' prevenzjoni abbażi ta' evidenza xjentifika.

Ir-Rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kunsill dwar l-iskrining tal-kanċer ([2]) li tistieden lill-Istati Membri kollha biex jieħdu azzjoni u jimplimentaw programmi ta' skrining imsejsa fuq il-popolazzjoni nazzjonali, tkopri l-kanċer kolorettali, ċervikali u tas-sider. Biex tassisti lill-Istati Membri bl-iskrining tal-kanċer għal dawn it-tipi ta' kanċer, il-Kummissjoni pproduċiet linji gwida Ewropej għall-assigurazzjoni tal-kwalità fl-iskrining u d-dijanjosi tal-kanċer kolorettali, ċervikali u tas-sider. S'issa ma nħarġet l-ebda rakkomandazzjoni dwar l-iskrining tal-popolazzjoni għall-kanċer tal-pulmun u tal-prostata, u dan minħabba n-nuqqas ta' kunsens xjentifiku dwar din il-kwistjoni.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/diseases/cancer/index_en.htm#fragment2
([2]) 2003/878/KE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001844/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Male cancer rates

Data published by Cancer Research UK on 14 February 2014 show that men are 50% more likely to die from cancer than women. More than 46 million men die from cancer every year across the globe, the equivalent of 126 men in every 100 000. These figures also show that cancer death rates among men are highest in central and eastern Europe. In the UK, men diagnosed with cancer are 30% more likely to die than women.

1. What strategy is being adopted by the Commission to increase awareness of male cancer in the Member States?

2. Research shows that male cancer patterns are changing, with lung cancer declining and prostate cancer on the increase. What action is being taken by the Commission to ensure that all the Member States offer national screening programmes aimed at men which promote early diagnosis of this disease?

3. Unhealthy diet, high alcohol consumption and tobacco use are among the major factors that contribute to cancer in men. What action is being taken to promote a healthy lifestyle for men?

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

The Commission promotes a number of initiatives to raise awareness and encourage healthy lifestyle choices, including on major risk factors, such as tobacco, alcohol related harm, unhealthy diet and lack of physical activity. These initiatives address both men and women.

Furthermore, specifically in the area of cancer, the Commission supports the European Code against Cancer ([1]), a key prevention tool, based on scientific evidence.

The Council Recommendation on cancer screening ([2]) which invites all Member States to take action to implement national population-based screening programmes, covers breast, cervical and colorectal cancer. To assist the Member States with cancer screening for these types of cancer, the Commission has produced European guidelines for quality assurance in cervical, breast and colorectal cancer screening and diagnosis. So far, no recommendation on population screening for lung and prostate cancer has been issued, due to the lack of scientific consensus on this issue.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/diseases/cancer/index_en.htm#fragment2
([2]) 2003/878/EC.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001846/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Lotta alla contraffazione

Nel 2008, se non erro, è stato istituito l'Osservatorio europeo sulle violazioni dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale.

1. Possiamo conoscere i risultati raggiunti fino ad ora da detto Osservatorio?

2. Lavorano italiani in questo organismo?

3. Qual è il rapporto tra l'Osservatorio e i governi degli Stati membri?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

Nel 2009 la Commissione ha istituito l'Osservatorio europeo sulla contraffazione e la pirateria sotto forma di rete informale di esperti delle autorità nazionali e di parti interessate del settore privato. Obiettivo dell'Osservatorio era sostenere la tutela dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale e contribuire a contrastare la crescente minaccia di violazioni in questo settore. Nel giugno 2012 l'Osservatorio è stato assegnato all'Ufficio per l'armonizzazione nel mercato interno (UAMI) allo scopo di garantire un'infrastruttura adeguata e sostenibile per lo svolgimento dei suoi compiti ([1]). Le attività svolte e i risultati conseguiti dall'Osservatorio sono descritti nelle relazioni annuali sulle attività dell'UAMI ([2]). Le attività in corso e quelle programmate sono descritte anche nel programma di lavoro annuale dell'Osservatorio e nel suo piano pluriennale per il periodo 2014-2018 ([3]).

La Commissione può confermare che cittadini italiani lavorano presso l'UAMI e che alcuni di essi partecipano ai lavori dell'Osservatorio. Le parti interessate italiane pubbliche e private ([4]) partecipano attivamente ai lavori dell'Osservatorio e membri del Parlamento europeo ([5]) sono invitati alle sue riunioni.

Tutti gli Stati membri sono rappresentati nel consiglio di amministrazione dell'UAMI e possono altresì inviare almeno un rappresentante della loro pubblica amministrazione alle riunioni dell'Osservatorio. Gli Stati membri informano regolarmente l'UAMI in merito alle politiche e alle strategie che adottano a tutela dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale e forniscono dati statistici sulle violazioni di tali diritti.

([1]) Il regolamento (UE) n. 386/2012 definisce i compiti e il mandato dell'Osservatorio e ne ha cambiato il nome nell'attuale designazione di «Osservatorio europeo sulle violazioni dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale».

([2]) La relazione 2012 è disponibile sul seguente sito internet: https://oami.europa.eu/tunnel-web/secure/webdav/guest/document_library/observatory/resources/about/AnnualReport_2012_en.pdf; la relazione 2013 sarà pubblicata nei prossimi mesi.

([3]) https://oami.europa.eu/tunnel-web/secure/webdav/guest/document_library/observatory/documents/about_us/observatory_work_programme_2014_en.pdf e https://oami.europa.eu/tunnel-web/secure/webdav/guest/document_library/observatory/documents/about_us/observatory_multiannual_plan_en.pdf

([4]) In particolare: il Ministero dello sviluppo economico; http://www.mise.gov.it/index.php (autorità nazionale) e Indicam: http://www.indicam.it/ (organizzazione privata)

([5]) I nomi dei partecipanti, l'ordine del giorno e il verbale delle riunioni sono pubblicati sul sito internet dell'Osservatorio: https://oami.europa.eu/ohimportal/it/web/observatory/home

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001846/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Combating counterfeiting

In 2008, if I am not mistaken, the European Observatory on Counterfeiting and Piracy was set up.

1. May we know the results obtained up to now by the Observatory?

2. Do any Italians work for this body?

3. What is the relationship between the Observatory and the governments of Member States?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The European Observatory on Counterfeiting and Piracy was established by the Commission in 2009 as an informal network of experts from national authorities and private stakeholders to support the protection of intellectual property (IP) rights and help combat the growing threat of IP infringements. The Observatory was entrusted to the Office for Harmonisation in the internal market (OHIM) in June 2012 to ensure an adequate and sustainable infrastructure for the fulfilment of its tasks ([1]). The activities and the results obtained by the Observatory are described in OHIM's annual reports on its activities ([2]). On-going and planned activities are also described in the Observatory's annual work programme and in its Multiannual Plan for 2014-2018 ([3]).

The Commission can confirm that there are Italian nationals employed by the OHIM and that some of them are involved in the work of the Observatory. Italian public and private stakeholders ([4]) take active part in the work of the Observatory and Members of the European Parliament ([5]) are invited to meetings of the Observatory.

All Member States are represented at the Administrative Board of the OHIM and they also send at least one representative from their public administration to the meetings of the Observatory. Member States inform the OHIM on a regular basis of their policies and strategies on the enforcement of IP rights and also provide statistical data on infringements of IP rights.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 386/2012 sets out its tasks and mandate and changed the name of the Observatory to 'the European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights'.

([2]) The 2012 report is available on: https://oami.europa.eu/tunnel-web/secure/webdav/guest/document_library/observatory/resources/about/AnnualReport_2012_en.pdf and the 2013 report will be published later this spring.

([3]) https://oami.europa.eu/tunnel-web/secure/webdav/guest/document_library/observatory/documents/about_us/observatory_work_programme_2014_en.pdf and https://oami.europa.eu/tunnel-web/secure/webdav/guest/document_library/observatory/documents/about_us/observatory_multiannual_plan_en.pdf

([4]) In particular, the Ministero dello sviluppo economico; http://www.mise.gov.it/index.php (national authority) and Indicam: http://www.indicam.it/ (private organisation).

([5]) The names of the representatives attending, the agenda and the minutes of the meetings are published on the Observatory's website: https://oami.europa.eu/ohimportal/en/web/observatory/home

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001847/14
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Fuochi d'artificio e incendio di Ferragosto nella «Laguna del Mort» a Eraclea Mare in Provincia di Venezia

Lungo il litorale di Eraclea Mare, località balneare in provincia di Venezia, si svolge annualmente uno spettacolo pirotecnico in occasione della festività di Ferragosto. L'area nella quale ha luogo la manifestazione è tutelata all'interno del progetto «Rete Natura 2000» quale SIC (Sito di Importanza Comunitaria) IT 3250013 denominato «Laguna del Mort e Pinete di Eraclea», ai sensi della direttiva «Habitat» 92/43/CEE. La Laguna del Mort, infatti, consiste in un sistema lagunare litoraneo isolato originatosi da una derivazione del fiume Piave che, nonostante sia sottoposto a un notevole impatto antropico, presenta un significativo valore naturalistico ed è ancora relativamente incontaminato. Tra le specie floristiche ivi presenti troviamo la Salicornia veneta (Salicornia veneta), specie prioritaria. Quanto alla fauna, la peculiarità del bacino acqueo protetto fa sì che l'area sia di primario interesse per l'avifauna perché segna una zona di contatto tra gli areali di nidificazione di specie a distribuzione mediterranea e quelli di specie a distribuzione prevalentemente centro-nord europea (1). In applicazione dell'articolo 6, paragrafo 3, della direttiva «Habitat», pertanto, le Autorità locali eseguivano nel 2009 uno screening V.Inc.A. (Valutazione di Incidenza Ambientale) (2) in merito allo spettacolo pirotecnico annuale, che escludeva la possibilità che si verificassero significative conseguenze negative per il sito. Ciononostante, in occasione della manifestazione pirotecnica di ferragosto del 2013 si è verificato un incendio: parte delle sterpaglie ivi presenti sembrerebbe essere venuta in contatto con una miccia dei fuochi d'artificio ed essersi incendiata. Le fiamme sono state domate velocemente, ma avrebbero potuto esservi conseguenze disastrose tanto sulla fauna e flora del SIC quanto sull'incolumità di residenti e turisti qualora l'incendio si fosse propagato, stante la presenza di moltissima vegetazione secca a causa della calura estiva.

Tutto ciò premesso, la Commissione:

1) non ritiene che lo screening V.Inc.A. possa non essere stato eseguito correttamente, stante la mancata previsione del rischio di incendio poi verificatosi?

2) Quali iniziative intende pertanto intraprendere al fine di controllare il rispetto di quanto prescritto dalla direttiva «Habitat» a tutela delle aree «Rete Natura 2000»?

3) Può inoltre chiarire se, nel caso di spettacoli come quello in esame a cadenza annuale/periodica, la V.Inc.A. debba essere ripetuta ogni anno/ogni volta o se sia possibile attenersi a quella svolta in anni precedenti/le volte precedenti, nell'ottica di una corretta applicazione di quanto previsto dall'articolo 6, paragrafo 3, della direttiva «Habitat»?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2014)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza del caso specifico segnalato dall'onorevole deputato e non le è pervenuta alcuna documentazione relativa alla valutazione effettuata a titolo dell'articolo 6, paragrafo 3, della direttiva Habitat ([1]) da parte delle autorità italiane. Non può pertanto esprimere un giudizio sulla qualità o sull'adeguatezza di tale valutazione.

La responsabilità di attuare e far rispettare la normativa ambientale dell'UE incombe in primo luogo agli Stati membri e alle loro autorità amministrative e giudiziarie. Ai sensi del trattato, la Commissione non ha il potere di intervenire nelle attività di pianificazione e nelle decisioni delle autorità degli Stati membri. A norma della direttiva Habitat, le autorità nazionali competenti devono garantire che qualsiasi piano o progetto che possa avere incidenze significative sui siti designati Natura 2000 sia oggetto di un'opportuna valutazione. Nel caso in esame la Commissione non rileva alcuna potenziale infrazione delle disposizioni sopra menzionate che giustificherebbe un'inchiesta.

La valutazione di cui all'articolo 6, paragrafo 3, non deve necessariamente essere ripetuta se un evento/un'attività si svolgono periodicamente alle stesse condizioni. Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti garantire che le condizioni alle quali l'attività è stata autorizzata siano rispettate ogni volta che essa ha luogo.

([1]) Direttiva 92/43/CEE, GU L 206 del 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001847/14
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Fireworks and Ferragosto fire at 'Laguna del Mort' at Eraclea Mare, Province of Venice

On the coastline at Eraclea Mare, a seaside resort in the Province of Venice, an annual firework display takes place on the occasion of the August festival of Ferragosto. The area where the display takes place is protected under the 'Rete Natura 2000' project as SCI (site of Community importance) IT 3250013, known as 'Laguna del Mort e Pinete di Eraclea', under the 'Habitat' Directive 92/43/EEC. The Laguna del Mort actually consists of an isolated system of coastal lakes, originating from a derivation of the River Piave which, despite being subjected to a considerable human impact, is of significant natural value and still relatively uncontaminated. Among the species of flora present can be found the Venice salicorne (Salicornia veneta), a priority species. As far as fauna are concerned, the special nature of the protected water basin makes the area of primary interest for bird life as it marks an area of contact between the nesting areas of Mediterranean species and those of prevalently Central and Northern European distribution (1). In application of Article 6(3) of the 'Habitat' Directive, therefore, the local authorities conducted an assessment of environmental implications in 2009 (2) in relation to the annual firework display, which ruled out the possibility of significant negative consequences for the site. Nevertheless, during the Ferragosto 2013 firework display a fire broke out; it seems that some of the brushwood there came into contact with one of the fuses of the fireworks and caught light. The flames were quickly extinguished, but there could have been disastrous consequences for both the flora and fauna of the SCI and for the safety of residents and tourists if the fire had spread, in view of the existence of a large amount of dry vegetation due to the summer heat.

In view of all the foregoing:

1. Does the Commission consider that the assessment of environmental implications may not have been carried out correctly, in view of the failure to foresee the risk of a fire, which subsequently occurred?

2. What initiatives does the Commission therefore intend to take in order to monitor the observance of the provisions of the 'Habitat' Directive in order to protect 'Rete Natura 2000' areas?

3. Can the Commission further clarify whether, in the case of annual/periodic displays such as the one in question, the assessment of environmental implications should be repeated every year/every time or whether it is possible to rely on the results obtained in previous years/on previous occasions, with a view to the proper application of the provisions of Article 6(3) of the 'Habitat' Directive?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

The Commission is not aware of the specific case mentioned by the Honourable Member and has not received any documentation related to the assessment carried out under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive ([1]) by Italian authorities. It cannot therefore make a judgment on the quality or adequacy of such an assessment.

Responsibility for implementing and enforcing EU environmental legislation lies primarily with Member States and their administrative and judicial authorities. Under the Treaty, the Commission has no power to intervene in the planning activities and decisions of Member States' authorities. The Habitats Directive requires the relevant national authorities to ensure that any plan or project which is likely to have significant effects on designated Natura 2000 sites is subject to an appropriate assessment. In this case the Commission cannot identify any potential breach of the abovementioned provisions which would warrant an investigation.

The article 6(3) assessment does not necessarily need to be repeated if an event/activity takes place regularly under the same conditions. It is up to the competent national authorities to ensure that the terms under which the activity was authorised are respected every time it takes place.

([1]) Directive 92/43/EEC, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001848/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Calidad de las aguas fluviales en Catalunya

Diferentes organizaciones ecologistas (Ecologistes en Acció, Grup de Defensa del Ter, Martorell Viu, Salvem el Gaià, Prou Sal, Xarxa per una Nova Cultura de l'Aigua y Aigua es Vida) han presentado el informe titulado «Los conflictos hídricos más importantes en las Cuencas Internas de Catalunya» ([1]). La Directiva marco sobre el agua (Directiva 2000/60/CE) tiene como objetivo alcanzar el buen estado ecológico de todas las masas de agua para 2015. Esta Directiva exige la aprobación de planes de gestión y programas de medidas para todas las cuencas hidrográficas en noviembre de 2009. En noviembre de 2010 se aprobó el Plan Hidrológico de Gestión del Distrito de Cuenca Fluvial de las Cuencas Internas de Catalunya, que tenía como objetivo conseguir el máximo de masas de agua en buen estado ecológico para 2015 o, como mínimo, que se pusieran en marcha el máximo de medidas para conseguir el buen estado en las siguientes revisiones. El Programa de Seguimiento y Control que permitiría conocer la evolución a lo largo del tiempo de las diversas masas de agua en Catalunya ha sido aprobado recientemente y, en consecuencia, en este momento aún no se tienen datos contrastados de cuál es el estado actual de las masas de agua ni de cuál ha sido su evolución. Sin embargo, aunque las actividades industriales, agrícolas y ganaderas han disminuido por los efectos de la crisis, se sabe que, debido a la no implantación de medidas programadas en el plan de medidas, la nula actividad de inspección del medio y la gran permisividad, el estado general de las masas de agua, en vez de mejorar y acercarse al 53 % planificado en el citado Plan Hidrológico, actualmente se encuentra por debajo de la diagnosis inicial (48 %). Las políticas del Gobierno de la Generalitat basadas en considerar la preservación del medio como una gran barrera para el desarrollo económico y la competitividad han supuesto el ahogo económico y la desactivación de la Agencia Catalana del Agua (ACA) y, por tanto, su inoperancia de cara a la imprescindible buena gestión del medio fluvial.

1. ¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre el no cumplimiento de los objetivos de la Directiva marco sobre el agua en las cuencas fluviales de Catalunya?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión que, a día de hoy, ya se deberían tener datos contrastados sobre el estado actual de las masas de agua?

3. ¿Piensa actuar la Comisión para asegurar el cumplimiento de la normativa de la Unión citada anteriormente?

4. ¿Considera la Comisión que el medio ambiente y el buen estado ecológico de las masas de agua son elementos de menor prioridad que los objetivos de déficit o la recuperación de los mercados?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de abril de 2014)

A la Comisión no consta en la actualidad que exista incumplimiento de las disposiciones de la Directiva marco del agua ([2]) en las cuencas fluviales de Cataluña. El Plan Hidrológico de Gestión del Distrito de Cuenca Fluvial de las Cuencas internas de Catalunya fue transmitido por las autoridades competentes el 14 de octubre de 2010. La evaluación de los planes de gestión de cuencas hidrológicas de los Estados miembros, así como las recomendaciones correspondientes, se encuentran disponibles por Internet ([3]).

La Directiva dispone que los Estados miembros comuniquen sus planes de gestión hidrológica actualizados para el 22 de marzo de 2016. Los proyectos de los planes deben estar disponibles para consulta pública durante seis meses a más tardar el 22 de diciembre de 2014. Los planes deben contener los resultados de los programas de seguimiento, que permitirán hacer una evaluación de los logros alcanzados por la Directiva en lo relativo al buen estado de las aguas.

La Directiva marco del agua contiene los mecanismos necesarios para compaginar el desarrollo económico y la protección medioambiental con el objetivo de lograr una gestión sostenible del agua a largo plazo. Es cometido de los Estados miembros velar por que se cumplan adecuadamente los principios y obligaciones de la Directiva.

([1]) http://www.ecologistasenaccion.org/IMG/pdf/cuencas_internas_catalunya.pdf
([2]) Directiva 2000/60/CE, DO L 327 de 22.12.2000.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/pdf/CWD-2012-379_EN-Vol3_ES.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001848/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: River water quality in Catalonia

Various ecological organisations (Ecologistes en Acció, Grup de Defensa del Ter, Martorell Viu, Salvem el Gaià, Prou Sal, Xarxa per una Nova Cultura de l'Aigua and Aigua es Vida) have submitted the report entitled 'The Most Significant Hydric Conflicts in the Internal Basins of Catalonia' ([1]). The objective of the Water Framework Directive (Directive 2000/60/EC) is to achieve the good ecological status of all bodies of water by 2015. This directive required the approval of management plans and resources programmes for all hydrographic basins in November 2009. In November 2010 approval was given to the Hydrological Management Plan for the River Basin District of the Internal Basins of Catalonia, whose objective was to raise as many bodies of water as possible to good ecological status by 2015 or, at the very least, to set in motion as many measures as possible to achieve good status on subsequent inspections. The Monitoring and Control Programme which would enable changes in the various bodies of water in Catalonia to be monitored over time has recently been approved and, therefore, we do not yet currently have any contrast data on the current state of bodies of water, nor on how they have changed. Nevertheless, whilst industrial, agricultural and cattle-rearing activities have reduced as a result of the crisis, it is known that due to the failure to implement the measures set out in the plan, the absence of inspections and the extremely liberal policies, instead of improving and getting close to 53% of what was planned in the said Hydrological Plan, the general status of bodies of water is currently below the initial diagnosis (48%). The policies of the Generalitat government based on viewing the retention of the measure as a major barrier to economic development and competitiveness have led to financial difficulties and the shelving of the Catalan Water Agency (CWA) and, therefore, to its ineffectiveness with regard to the vital good management of river environments.

1. What is the Commission's opinion on the non-compliance with the objectives of the framework Water Directive in the river basins of Catalonia?

2. Does the Commission consider that there should today be contrast data in respect of the current status of the bodies of water?

3. Does the Commission intend to take action to ensure compliance with the Union legislation referred to above?

4. Does the Commission consider the environment and the good ecological status of bodies of water to be matters of lesser priority than the objectives of the lack or recovery of markets?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The Commission currently has no evidence of a possible non-compliance with the provisions of the Water Framework Directive ([2]) in the river basins of Catalonia. The River Basin Management Plan of Distrito Fluvial de Catalonia was provided by the competent authorities on 14 October 2010. The Commission's assessment of the River Basin Management Plans of Member States, as well as the ensuing recommendations, are available online ([3]).

The directive requires Member States to report their updated river basin management plans by 22 March 2016. Draft plans should be available for public consultation during six months as of 22 December 2014 at the latest. The plans should contain the results of the monitoring programmes which will enable an assessment of the fulfilment of the directive's objectives of good status.

The Water Framework Directive includes the appropriate mechanisms to balance economic development with environmental protection, with the aim of achieving long term sustainable water management. It is for the Member States to ensure that the principles and obligations of the directive are adequately implemented.

([1]) http://www.ecologistasenaccion.org/IMG/pdf/cuencas_internas_catalunya.pdf
([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/pdf/CWD-2012-379_EN-Vol3_ES.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001849/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Contaminación por purines en la cuenca del río Ter

Según se señala en el informe «Los conflictos hídricos más importantes en las Cuencas internas de Catalunya», presentado por diferentes organizaciones ecologistas (Grupo de defensa del Ter y otros) ([1]), en la cuenca del Ter (Catalunya) se ha substituido en los últimos años el modelo tradicional de ganadería porcina por un sistema industrial que ha multiplicado la producción de carne de cerdo. Esta actividad ha generado la producción de grandes cantidades de residuos de las deyecciones ganaderas (purines); estos residuos son vertidos al campo como abono y han contaminado con nitratos gran parte de las aguas subterráneas de estas zonas. Además, los purines contienen restos de antibióticos y algunos metales pesados que pueden acabar contaminando los acuíferos.

Como consecuencia, muchos municipios han abandonado los abastecimientos de agua potable y para poder abastecerlos ha sido necesaria la construcción de potabilizadoras y redes de distribución, hecho que ha supuesto una elevada inversión pública. La Generalitat de Catalunya ha tolerado esta situación durante años y parece que no tiene voluntad de hacer cumplir muchas de las previsiones del Plan de Gestión del Agua de Catalunya ni tampoco exigir el cumplimiento de los planes de fertilización.

Teniendo en cuenta que la Directiva Marco del Agua (2000/60/CE) tiene como objetivo alcanzar el buen estado ecológico de todas las masas de agua para 2015 y que la Directiva de nitratos (91/676/CEE) tiene por objeto proteger las aguas contra la contaminación producida por nitratos,

¿Tenía conocimiento la Comisión de los hechos citados anteriormente? ¿Considera la Comisión que esta situación infringe la normativa comunitaria citada anteriormente relativa a la calidad de las aguas y los límites de nitratos permitidos? ¿Se debería obligar a la industria del cerdo a internalizar todos los costes de su actividad incluyendo los daños causados al medio ambiente y a pagar las infraestructuras que su actividad ha obligado a construir? ¿Se debería incluir en las futuras disposiciones la limitación de la densidad de cabañas ganaderas para preservar el medio ambiente? ¿Se deberían dictar normas sobre la aplicación preventiva de antibióticos en la ganadería teniendo en cuenta el subsiguiente vertido en el medio natural?

Respuesta del Sr Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de abril de 2014)

En el marco de las obligaciones de información que le incumben en virtud de la normativa de la UE sobre el agua, España ha informado de la contaminación con nitratos de varias masas de agua en la cuenca del río Ter. De conformidad con la Directiva marco del agua ([2]) y la Directiva sobre nitratos ([3]), los Estados miembros deben combatir la contaminación del agua con medidas que permitan tener en cuenta cualquier intensificación de la producción ganadera.

Además, la cría intensiva de cerdos (más de 2 000 plazas para cerdos o más de 750 para cerdas) está sujeta a la Directiva sobre emisiones industriales ([4]). Las actividades propias de esa cría tienen que efectuarse en el marco de un permiso que exija la aplicación de las mejores técnicas disponibles para prevenir o, si esto no fuere posible, reducir al mínimo la contaminación y las emisiones al medio ambiente.

Los Estados miembros están obligados a aplicar una política de fijación de precios para el agua en la que rija el principio de que quien contamina paga. Esto no significa que esté permitido contaminar el agua si se paga por ello. La Directiva marco del agua obliga a evitar el deterioro del estado de las aguas de superficie y subterráneas y de alcanzar en ellas un «buen estado» de aquí a 2015.

Como parte de la estrategia adoptada por la Unión en 2001 para combatir el peligro que representa la resistencia a los antimicrobianos, la normativa de la UE prohíbe desde 2006 utilizar antibióticos en los piensos animales con el fin de promover el crecimiento. La Comisión ha iniciado así desde entonces un «Plan de acción contra la amenaza creciente de las resistencias bacterianas» ([5]) del que forman parte medidas para reducir la contaminación medioambiental por antibióticos.

La Comisión mantiene contactos con las autoridades competentes españolas para tratar estos problemas.

([1]) http://www.ecologistasenaccion.org/IMG/pdf/cuencas_internas_catalunya.pdf
([2]) Directiva 2000/60/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 23 de octubre de 2000, por la que se establece un marco comunitario de actuación en el ámbito de la política de aguas (DO L 327 de 22.12.2000).
([3]) Directiva 91/676/CEE del Consejo, de 12 de diciembre de 1991, relativa a la protección de las aguas contra la contaminación producida por nitratos procedentes de fuentes agrarias (DO L 375 de 31.12.1991).
([4]) Directiva 2010/75/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 24 de noviembre de 2010, sobre las emisiones industriales (DO L 334 de 17.12.2010).
([5]) COM(2011) 748 (http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/docs/communication_amr_2011_748_en.pdf).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001849/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Contamination from slurry in the basin of the river Ter

According to the report 'The Most Significant Hydric Conflicts in the Internal Basins of Catalonia', submitted by various ecological organisations (Group for the Defence of Ter and others) ([1]), in recent years the traditional pig farming model in the Ter basin (Catalonia) has been replaced by an industrial system which has greatly increased pork production. This activity has generated the production of large quantities of livestock excrement (slurry); this excrement is spread on the fields as fertiliser and has contaminated a large part of the groundwater in these areas with nitrates. In addition, the slurry contains the residue of antibiotics and certain heavy metals which can end up contaminating the aquifers.

As a result, many local authorities have abandoned these aquifers as drinking water storage and it has been necessary to construct purification plants and distribution networks in order to store it, which has given rise to considerable public investment. The Generalitat of Catalonia has tolerated this situation for years and apparently has no intention of ensuring compliance with many of the provisions of the Water Management Plan of Catalonia nor of requiring compliance with the fertilisation plans.

Given that the object of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) is to achieve the good ecological status of all bodies of water by 2015 and that the object of the nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC) is to protect waters against pollution caused by nitrates,

Was the Commission aware of the above facts? Does the Commission believe that this situation breaches the Community legislation referred to above on water quality and permitted nitrate limits? Should the pig farming industry be forced to bear all the costs of its activities including the damage caused to the environment and to pay for the construction of the infrastructure which its activities have necessitated? Should future provisions include a limit on the density of livestock in order to preserve the environment? Should legislation be issued on the preventive use of antibiotics in livestock taking into account that they are subsequently released into the natural environment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

Spain has reported the pollution of water bodies by nitrates in the Ter basin in the context of its reporting obligations under EU water legislation.

Pursuant to the Water Framework Directive ([2]) and to the Nitrates directive ([3]), Member States should put in place appropriate measures to address water pollution, which should take account of any intensification of livestock production.

Moreover, intensive pig rearing (more than 2 000 places for pigs or more than 750 places for sows) is subject to the Industrial Emissions Directive ([4]). These activities should operate in accordance with a permit requiring the application of the best available techniques to prevent or, if not possible, to minimise pollution and emissions to the environment.

Member States are required to establish water pricing policies in accordance with the polluter pays principle. This does not mean that polluting water is allowed if it is paid for. The Water Framework Directive establishes the obligation to prevent deterioration of the status of surface and groundwater bodies and to achieve good status by 2015.

The use in animal feed of antibiotics for growth promotion is banned by EU legislation since 2006 as part of the 2001 Union strategy to combat the threat of antimicrobial resistance. The Commission has since initiated an Action Plan against the rising threats from antimicrobial resistance ([5]), including actions to reduce environmental pollution by antibiotics.

The Commission is in discussions with the competent authorities in Spain to address these issues.

([1]) http://www.ecologistasenaccion.org/IMG/pdf/cuencas_internas_catalunya.pdf
([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([3]) Council Directive 91/676/EEC of 12 December 1991 concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources.
([4]) Directive 2010/75/EU of the Parliament and the Council on industrial emissions.
([5]) COM(2011) 748 (http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/docs/communication_amr_2011_748_en.pdf).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001850/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Incumplimiento del caudal de mantenimiento en el Alto Ter (minicentrales hidroeléctricas)

Según el informe «Los conflictos hídricos más importantes en las Cuencas Internas de Catalunya» presentado por diferentes organizaciones ecologistas (Grupo de Defensa del Ter y otros) ([1]), en los años 70 la Generalitat promocionó antiguos aprovechamientos hidráulicos en la cuenca del río Ter (Catalunya) renovando concesiones y subvencionado las reformas necesarias. Algunos inversores se apropiaron de las pequeñas centrales y, con la complicidad de la Administración, aprovecharon tanto caudal como fue posible. Esto tuvo un gran impacto sobre los ríos que, a cambio de la baja producción eléctrica de las minicentrales hidroeléctricas (inferior al 2 % de la producción eléctrica), vieron reducidos en gran medida sus caudales, lo que destruyó el buen estado ecológico de los ecosistemas fluviales.

Actualmente, la falta de caudal del río Ter es el principal problema para su ecosistema. Gracias a la aprobación de la Directiva Marco del Agua (2000/60/CE) (DMA), científicos expertos definieron los «caudales de mantenimiento» variables a lo largo del año y a lo largo del río y que deben circular por su curso antes de cualquier uso o detracción de agua para permitir un buen funcionamiento de los ecosistemas vinculados al medio hídrico y se aprobó el «Plan Sectorial de Caudales de Mantenimiento». Posteriormente, se aprobó asimismo el «Pla de l'aigua de Catalunya», que prevé la aplicación de los caudales de mantenimiento a los ríos de las cuencas internas con un calendario concreto y la elaboración de «Planes Zonales de Implantación de Caudales de Mantenimiento» que concreten las medidas que han de adoptarse en todos los aprovechamientos. El Gobierno actual de la Generalitat de Catalunya ha frenado la elaboración de los planes zonales y eliminado los previstos Consejos de Cuenca que tenían que velar por su implantación. En consecuencia, los caudales de mantenimiento no se han implantado y las perspectivas de futuro no son nada optimistas. Así, la situación actual nos hace pensar que difícilmente se cumplirán los objetivos previstos en la DMA de recuperación del buen estado ecológico de los ríos.

¿Tenía conocimiento la Comisión de los hechos citados anteriormente? ¿Considera la Comisión que esta situación infringe la normativa comunitaria relativa a los caudales de mantenimiento necesarios para asegurar la buena calidad de las aguas? ¿Considera la Comisión que es necesario definir una forma de calcular los caudales de mantenimiento de obligado cumplimiento para los Estados miembros? ¿Está de acuerdo la Comisión con que la titularidad de las explotaciones hidroeléctricas tiene que ser pública, ya que el agua es un bien público?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočniken en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de abril de 2014)

Las autoridades competentes todavía no han informado acerca de sus progresos en la aplicación de sus programas de medidas en la demarcación hidrográfica de Cataluña, como exige el artículo 15, apartado 3, de la Directiva marco sobre el agua ([2]). La Comisión no puede pronunciarse en esta fase sobre la situación específica del río Ter.

Por lo que se refiere a los caudales de mantenimiento, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a las preguntas escritas E-14175/2013 y E-14177/2013 ([3]).

Por lo que se refiere a la titularidad pública de las centrales hidroeléctricas, se trata de una cuestión que compete a los Estados miembros de conformidad con el principio de neutralidad recogido en el artículo 345 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea.

([1]) http://www.ecologistasenaccion.org/IMG/pdf/cuencas_internas_catalunya.pdf
([2]) Directiva 2000/60/CE (DO L 327 de 22.12.2000).
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001850/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Failure to maintain flow in the Upper Ter (mini hydroelectric power stations)

According to the report 'The Most Significant Hydric Conflicts in the Internal Basins of Catalonia' submitted by various ecological organisations (Group for the Defence of Ter and others) ([1]), in the 70s the Generalitat promoted old water uses in the basin of the river Ter (Catalonia) renewing concessions and subsidising the necessary reforms. Some investors acquired the small power stations and, with the Administration's complicity, used as much flow as possible. This had a major impact on the rivers which, in return for the low electricity production from the mini hydroelectric power stations (less than 2% of electricity production), saw their flows greatly reduced, which destroyed the good ecological status of the ecosystems in the rivers.

At the present time, the lack of flow in the river Ter is the main problem for its ecosystem. Thanks to approval of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) (WFD), scientific experts defined the variable 'maintenance flows' throughout the year and along the river which had to flow along their course before any water could be used or extracted in order to ensure the proper functioning of the water-related ecosystems and the 'Sectorial Plan for Flow Maintenance' was approved. Subsequently, approval was also given to the 'Pla de l'aigua de Catalunya', which sets out the application of maintenance flows to the rivers in internal basins with a specific calendar and the drawing up of 'Zone Plans for the Implementation of Maintenance Flows' which specify the measures to be taken in all uses. The current government of the Generalitat of Catalonia has stopped the drawing up of the zone plans and done away with the proposed Basin Councils which were to have overseen the implementation of these plans. As a result of this, the maintenance flows have not been implemented and the prospects for the future are far from optimistic. Therefore, the current situation leads us to believe that it is unlikely that the objectives stated in the WFD of recovering the good ecological status of the rivers, will be met.

Was the Commission aware of these facts? Does the Commission believe that this situation breaches Community legislation on the maintenance flows required to ensure good water quality? Does the Commission consider it necessary to define a method for calculating maintenance flows which is binding on Member States? Does the Commission agree that hydroelectric power stations should be in public ownership, given that water is a public asset?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(1 April 2014)

Competent authorities have not yet reported on their progress in implementing their programmes of measures in the Catalonian river basin district, as required by Article 15(3) of the Water Framework Directive ([2]). The Commission cannot comment at this stage on the specific situation of the river Ter.

As regards maintenance flows, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to the written questions E-14175/2013 and E-14177/2013 ([3]).

As regards the public ownership of hydropower stations, this is a matter for the Member States to decide in accordance with the neutrality principle enshrined in the article 345 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU.

([1]) http://www.ecologistasenaccion.org/IMG/pdf/cuencas_internas_catalunya.pdf
([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001851/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Lobbies y protección de datos

La regulación de la protección de datos de la ciudadanía de la UE es uno de los grandes retos a los que se enfrenta en la actualidad el Parlamento Europeo. Mientras numerosos agentes sociales son ignorados por la Comisión, tal y como han denunciado varios movimientos sociales especializados en derechos digitales, como EDRi, Acces Now o La Quadrature du Net, diferentes empresas y grupos de interés de los Estados Unidos y Europa buscan influenciar las nuevas normas europeas para rebajar el nivel de protección de la ciudadanía y tratar impunemente los datos que manejan sobre ella. Esto pone en peligro los derechos de la ciudadanía sin garantizar ningún beneficio económico ni social agregado.

Estos *lobbies* económicos utilizan inmensas cantidades de recursos para influenciar la política de la UE a todos los niveles, entablando contacto con diputados al Parlamento Europeo, miembros y altos cargos de la Comisión. Nuevamente, la ciudadanía se ve relegada a un nivel menor de influencia al no poder competir con los recursos económicos que las grandes corporaciones invierten anualmente en actividades de representación de intereses.

¿Qué opina la Comisión de esta situación? ¿Van a establecerse mecanismos para garantizar la participación de la ciudadanía? ¿Cree la Comisión que, de ser vinculantes jurídicamente las normas de conducta en la relación con los grupos de interés, podrían solventarse situaciones como esta? ¿Qué acciones propone para salvaguardar la libre capacidad de actuación y el libre ejercicio de las funciones de los miembros de las instituciones europeas? ¿Sería favorable a que todas estas actividades de representación de intereses fueran de dominio público?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de mayo de 2014)

En el marco de su reforma de la protección de datos ([1]), la Comisión observó efectivamente que su propuesta y el debate preparatorio suscitaron un gran interés por parte de los ciudadanos, las partes interesadas y los representantes del sector.

Para preparar la reforma del marco jurídico de protección de datos de la UE de manera transparente, la Comisión ha organizado, desde 2009, varias rondas de consultas públicas sobre la protección de datos ([2]) y ha entablado un intenso diálogo con los interesados ([3]). Las contribuciones a la consulta pública se han publicado en el sitio web de la Comisión y se han tenido en cuenta en la evaluación de impacto ([4]).

Estas conversaciones dejaron claro que tanto los ciudadanos como las empresas deseaban que la Comisión Europea procediese a una reforma general de las normas de protección de datos de la UE. Por lo tanto, la Comisión está comprometida con una normativa sólida y coherente que abarque todas las políticas de la Unión, que refuerce los derechos de los ciudadanos de conformidad con los Tratados de la UE y la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales, así como la dimensión del mercado único en cuanto a la protección de datos, y que disminuya el papeleo para las empresas.

([1]) COM(2012) 11 y COM(2012) 12.

([2]) Se han puesto en marcha dos consultas públicas sobre la reforma de la protección de datos, una entre julio y diciembre de 2009 (http://ec.europa.eu/justice/news/consulting_public/news_consulting_0003_en.htm) y otra entre noviembre de 2010 y enero de 2011 (http://ec.europa.eu/justice/news/consulting_public/news_consulting_0006_en.htm).

([3]) En 2010 se llevaron a cabo consultas específicas con las autoridades y los interesados del sector privado de los Estados miembros. En noviembre de 2010, la Comisaria de Justicia Viviane Reding organizó una mesa redonda sobre la reforma de la protección de datos. A lo largo de 2011 se celebraron otros talleres y seminarios sobre aspectos específicos (por ejemplo, notificaciones de las violaciones de datos).

([4]) Véase la evaluación de impacto SEC(2012) 72.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001851/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Lobbies and data protection

The regulation of data protection of EU residents is one of the biggest challenges that the European Parliament currently faces. While numerous social stakeholders are ignored by the Commission, as denounced by various digital rights social movements such as EDRi, Access Now and La Quadrature du Net, different companies and interest groups in the United States and Europe are seeking to influence new European standards in order to lower the level of protection afforded to the public, enabling them to process information that they handle concerning the public with impunity. This is jeopardising the rights of citizens, without guaranteeing any economic or social benefit.

These economic lobbyists use huge amounts of resources to influence EU policy at all levels through contact with MEPs, and members and officials of the Commission. Once again, the public is relegated to having a lower level of influence as they cannot compete with the financial resources that large corporations invest every year in interest representation activities.

What does the Commission think of this situation? Will it put measures in place to ensure the participation of citizens? Does the Commission believe that, with legally binding rules of conduct in relation to interest groups, situations like this could be resolved? What actions does it propose to safeguard freedom of action and the freedom of members of the European institutions to perform their duties? Would it be in favour of all of these interest representation activities being conducted within the public domain?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2014)

In the context of its data protection reform ([1]), the Commission indeed observed that its proposal and the preparatory discussion raised considerable interest from individuals, stakeholders and industry representatives.

To prepare the reform of the EU's data protection framework in a transparent manner, the Commission has, since 2009, launched public consultations on data protection ([2]) and engaged in intensive dialogues with stakeholders ([3]). The contributions to the public consultation have been published on the Commission website and taken into account in the impact assessment ([4]).

These discussions made clear that both citizens and businesses wanted the European Commission to reform EU data protection rules in a comprehensive manner. The Commission is therefore committed to a strong and consistent legislative framework across Union policies, enhancing individuals' rights in line with the EU Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Single Market dimension of data protection and cutting red tape for businesses.

([1]) COM(2012) 11 and COM(2012) 12.

([2]) Two public consultations have been launched on the data protection reform: one from July to December 2009 (http://ec.europa.eu/justice/news/consulting_public/news_consulting_0003_en.htm) and a second one from November 2010 till January 2011 (http://ec.europa.eu/justice/news/consulting_public/news_consulting_0006_en.htm).

([3]) Targeted consultations were organised in 2010 with Member State authorities and private stakeholders. In November 2010, EU Justice Commissioner Viviane Reding organised a roundtable on the data protection reform. Additional dedicated workshops and seminars on specific issues (e.g. data breach notifications) were also held throughout 2011.

([4]) See the impact assessment SEC(2012) 72.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001852/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Eurodac y criminalización de las personas migradas

El sistema Eurodac permite a los países de la Unión Europea (UE) ayudar a identificar a los solicitantes de asilo y a las personas interceptadas al cruzar de manera irregular las fronteras exteriores de la Unión. Comparando sus huellas dactilares, los países de la UE pueden comprobar si un solicitante de asilo o un extranjero presente ilegalmente en su territorio ya ha solicitado asilo en otro país de la UE, o si un solicitante de asilo ha entrado irregularmente en el territorio de la Unión.

La propuesta para la introducción de un sistema de registro de entradas y salidas (EES) busca registrar los datos de entrada y salida de los nacionales de terceros países que cruzan las fronteras exteriores de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea y, además, se presenta conjuntamente con otra por la que se pretende implantar un Programa de Registro de Viajeros.

Todos estos instrumentos realizan un seguimiento y un control de los nacionales de terceros países, especialmente de aquellos en situación de irregularidad o en busca de asilo. Dicho control vulnera los derechos fundamentales de estas personas, ya que sus datos pasan a formar parte de un sistema de control y ello podría suponer la caracterización de determinados colectivos «potencialmente criminales».

¿Considera la Comisión que estos mecanismos de control de fronteras criminalizan a las personas migradas? ¿Cree que se viola el derecho fundamental a la presunción de inocencia y a la privacidad de los nacionales de terceros países? ¿Cómo garantizará la destrucción de los datos de las personas inocentes y la no utilización de los mismos con otros fines?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de abril de 2014)

Ni el sistema Eurodac, ni el sistema de registro de entradas y salidas propuesto, ni el Programa de Registro de Viajeros incriminan a los migrantes ni a los solicitantes de asilo.

En lo que se refiere a Eurodac, los datos se guardan a efectos de facilitar el Reglamento de Dublín ([1]), es decir, para determinar qué Estado miembro puede ser responsable del examen de una solicitud de asilo. La refundición del Reglamento Eurodac ([2]) permite el acceso de las autoridades policiales a la base de datos Eurodac, pero solo en circunstancias muy limitadas y con sujeción a importantes salvaguardias. Pueden hacerse pesquisas en Eurodac cuando las fuerzas del orden intenten prevenir, detectar o investigar terrorismo y casos de delitos muy graves. La presencia de los datos de una persona en Eurodac no puede considerarse de ningún modo que suponga por sí misma culpabilidad o sospecha de que haya cometido un delito. Por lo tanto, solo podría incoarse una investigación contra un individuo cuyos datos se guarden en Eurodac si se diera una coincidencia entre los datos tomados en el lugar de un delito y la información conservada en Eurodac.

Con arreglo a la refundición del Reglamento Eurodac, los datos se borran automáticamente transcurrido un período de tiempo determinado (10 años en el caso de los solicitantes de asilo; 18 meses en el de las personas detenidas al cruzar una frontera). Los datos recogidos a efectos policiales que no se utilicen en una investigación deben borrarse al cabo de un mes.

En lo que se respecta a las propuesta de un sistema de entrada y salida y de un Programa de Registro de Viajeros, la Comisión concede gran importancia a los derechos fundamentales y a los principios de protección de datos tales como la limitación de una finalidad específica y la proporcionalidad. Asimismo, no cejará en la defensa del pleno respeto de estos principios en procedimientos ulteriores en los que participen ambos poderes colegisladores.

([1]) Reglamento (UE) nº 604/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 26 de junio de 2013, por el que se establecen los criterios y mecanismos de determinación del Estado miembro responsable del examen de una solicitud de protección internacional presentada en uno de los Estados miembros por un nacional de un tercer país o un apátrida (DO L 180 de 29.6.2013, p. 31).

([2]) Reglamento (UE) nº 603/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 26 de junio de 2013, relativo a la creación del sistema «Eurodac» para la comparación de las impresiones dactilares para la aplicación efectiva del Reglamento (UE) nº 604/2013, por el que se establecen los criterios y mecanismos de determinación del Estado miembro responsable del examen de una solicitud de protección internacional presentada en uno de los Estados miembros por un nacional de un tercer país o un apátrida, y a las solicitudes de comparación con los datos de Eurodac presentadas por los servicios de seguridad de los Estados miembros y Europol a efectos de aplicación de la ley, y por el que se modifica el Reglamento (UE) nº 1077/2011, por el que se crea una Agencia europea para la gestión operativa de sistemas informáticos de gran magnitud en el espacio de libertad, seguridad y justicia (DO L 180 de 29.6.2013, pp. 1-30).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001852/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Eurodac and criminalisation of migrants

The Eurodac system enables European Union (EU) countries to help identify asylum applicants and persons who have been apprehended in connection with an irregular crossing of an external border of the Union. By comparing fingerprints, EU countries can determine whether an asylum applicant or a foreign national found illegally present within an EU country has previously claimed asylum in another EU country or whether an asylum applicant entered the Union territory unlawfully.

The proposed introduction of an entry/exit registration system (EES) aims to register entry and exit data of third-country nationals who cross an external border of a Member State of the European Union and is coupled with another proposal that seeks to implement a Registered Traveller Programme.

All of these instruments serve to monitor and regulate nationals of third countries, especially those who find themselves in an irregular situation or who are seeking asylum. Such measures infringe the fundamental rights of these people, as their data becomes part of a control system and this could involve characterising certain 'potentially criminal' groups.

Does the Commission believe that these border control mechanisms criminalise migrants? Does it believe that they violate the fundamental right to the presumption of innocence and privacy of third-country nationals? How will it ensure that the data of innocent people will be destroyed and not used for other purposes?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

Neither the Eurodac system nor the proposed Entry Exit System or Registered Traveller Programme criminalise migrants or asylum-seekers.

As regards Eurodac, the data are stored for the purpose of facilitating the Dublin Regulation ([1]) i.e. to determine which Member State may be responsible for an asylum application. The recast Eurodac Regulation ([2]) allows for law enforcement access to the Eurodac database, but only under very limited circumstances and subject to significant safeguards. Eurodac may be searched in cases where law enforcement authorities are seeking to prevent, detect or investigate the most serious crimes and terrorism. The presence of a person's data in Eurodac can in no way be considered of itself as implying guilt or suspicion of any crime. An investigation against an individual whose data are stored in Eurodac could therefore only commence if there were a hit against the data compared between a crime scene and that stored in Eurodac.

Under the recast Eurodac Regulation, data are subject to automatic erasure after a certain period of time (10 years for asylum-seekers; 18 months for persons apprehended crossing a border). Data collected for law enforcement purposes that are not used in an investigation must be deleted after one month.

As regards the Entry Exit System and Registered Traveller Programme proposals, the Commission attaches great importance to fundamental rights and data protection principles such as purpose limitation and proportionality. It will persist in advocating that the above principles are fully respected in further proceedings involving both co-legislators.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 604/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person; OJ L 180, 29.6.2013, p. 31-59.

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 603/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on the establishment of 'Eurodac' for the comparison of fingerprints for the effective application of Regulation (EU) No 604/2013 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person and on requests for the comparison with Eurodac data by Member States' law enforcement authorities and Europol for law enforcement purposes, and amending Regulation (EU) No 1077/2011 establishing a European Agency for the operational management of large-scale IT systems in the area of freedom, security and justice; OJ L 180, 29.6.2013, p. 1-30.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001853/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Puertas giratorias

De forma habitual, el personal laboral y los miembros de las instituciones europeas pasan a trabajar en el sector privado o dejan el sector privado para trabajar en las instituciones, sin ningún control y poniendo en riesgo la imparcialidad e independencia de las instituciones.

Esta conducta favorece los intereses de los sectores que pueden permitirse una importante inversión en actividades de *lobby* y pone en duda la legitimidad democrática de la Unión Europea. Un buen ejemplo de ello es el caso de Michel Petit, un conocido miembro de un grupo de presión que, tras trabajar durante más de diez años para las instituciones europeas, especialmente para la Comisión Europea, comenzó a trabajar para el despacho de abogados Clifford Chance LLP y que, como parte de este despacho, es asesor principal de Philip Morris International.

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión de esta situación? ¿Qué acciones propone para luchar contra las puertas giratorias? ¿Estaría a favor de impedir que los empleados de las instituciones europeas puedan pasar a trabajar para el sector privado en materias relacionadas con las funciones que desempeñan en la EU hasta que no hayan transcurrido dos años desde el cese de la relación contractual?

Respuesta del Sr. Šefčovič en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de abril de 2014)

El Estatuto de los funcionarios y sus disposiciones de aplicación incluyen normas estrictas en materia de conflictos de intereses y de actividades posteriores al ejercicio de las funciones. Pueden imponerse restricciones y periodos de incompatibilidad si procede y en el momento oportuno. Desde el 1 de enero de 2014, se aplican a los altos funcionarios normas adicionales que les prohíben ejercer actividades de representación de intereses y promoción ante el personal de su antigua institución durante un período de doce meses después de dejar de ejercer sus funciones en la institución.

La Comisión no comparte la opinión de Su Señoría. El antiguo funcionario mencionado en la pregunta había notificado oportunamente su intención de llevar a cabo una nueva actividad tras dejar de ejercer sus funciones en la institución y recibió la autorización para ello, sujetándose a condiciones estrictas, a fin de evitar riesgo alguno de conflicto de intereses. Las restricciones impuestas se han respetado.

En cuanto a la sugerencia hecha en la pregunta, la Comisión recuerda que el marco jurídico proporciona todas las herramientas necesarias para proteger el interés público. El Estatuto de los funcionarios contempla un planteamiento caso por caso basado en un análisis de los riesgos para los intereses de la institución. Pueden imponerse restricciones e incluso una prohibición temporal de la actividad en caso necesario, pero respetando el principio de proporcionalidad. Solo cuando exista un riesgo para los intereses de una institución podrán adoptarse las medidas adecuadas. No se prevé una prohibición general de realizar actividades en sectores relacionados con la actividad anterior, porque sería desproporcionada e incompatible con el derecho de cada persona a ejercer una profesión elegida o aceptada libremente, tal como se contempla en el artículo 15 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001853/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Revolving doors

Often, employees and members of European institutions move on to working in the private sector, or leave the private sector to work in institutions, with no checks carried out, which jeopardises the impartial and independent nature of the institutions.

This conduct benefits the interests of sectors that can afford to invest significantly in lobbying activities and casts doubt over the democratic legitimacy of the European Union. A prime example of this is the case of Michel Petit, a well-known member of a pressure group who, after working for European institutions for more than 10 years, in particular the European Commission, began to work for the law firm Clifford Chance LLP and, as part of this role, is a principal consultant for Phillip Morris International.

What is the Commission's view of this situation? What actions does it intend to take against revolving door activity? Would it be in favour of banning employees of European institutions from moving into areas of the private sector that are related to roles that they perform in the EU for two years after their contractual relationship has ended?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Staff Regulations and implementing provisions contain strict rules as regards conflicts of interest and post service activities. Restrictions and 'cooling off periods' may be imposed if and when appropriate. Since 1 January 2014, in the case of senior officials, additional rules apply prohibiting them in principle in the 12 months after leaving the service from engaging in lobbying and advocacy vis-à-vis staff of their former institution.

The Commission does not share the opinion expressed by the Honourable Member. The former staff member mentioned in the question notified his intention to engage in a post service activity in due time. He was authorised to carry out this activity, subject to strict conditions, in order to rule out any risk of conflict of interest. The restrictions imposed have been respected.

As for the suggestion made in the question, the Commission recalls that the legal framework provides all the necessary tools to protect public interest. The Staff Regulations require a case-by-case approach based on an analysis of the risks for the interests of the Institution. Restrictions and even a temporary prohibition of the activity may be imposed if necessary, but with due regard for the principle of proportionality. It is only when there is a risk for the interest of an institution that appropriate measures can be taken. A general ban to move into areas related to the previous occupation is not envisaged as it would be disproportionate and incompatible with the right of every individual to pursue a freely chosen or accepted occupation as enshrined in Article 15 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001854/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Anillo ferroviario

El anillo ferroviario es un circuito para efectuar pruebas y homologaciones de material ferroviario. Es una instalación al servicio de la industria ferroviaria y de ninguna manera está relacionada con la Red de Ferrocarriles Españoles, el servicio público ni los intereses generales del país. Es un anexo al Centro de Investigaciones Ferroviarias de Málaga. Esta comarca está considerada entre las siete u ocho más fértiles y productivas de España, con tierra mayoritariamente de regadío, mucha inversión acumulada y una alta densidad de población. El trazado del circuito afecta a siete municipios y a nueve núcleos urbanos; pone en peligro los acuíferos de cuatro municipios; perjudica seriamente la ecología de la zona; la fauna propia y las importantes colonias de aves migratorias instaladas en las lagunas de esta comarca; limitará gravemente la movilidad de personas y animales y dificultará la distribución de las aguas pluviales, en una comarca que mayoritariamente está declarada zona inundable; supone molestias de impacto visual a los vecinos, pues la vía discurre a una altura media de casi 3 metros. El impacto sobre la economía de la comarca será desastroso, puesto que las 800 ha destruidas por el anillo, canteras y vertederos, representan unos 30 000 jornales agrícolas anuales y una gran parte de las 700 fincas a expropiar son pequeñas y medianas explotaciones que dan de comer a varias decenas de familias. También afectará al turismo en la zona. La previsión de empleo está en torno a los 40 trabajadores, lo que supone un balance final de incremento considerable del paro. A 250 km en torno a Antequera existen lugares aptos para la instalación de este anillo, que cumplen con la normativa europea, no poseen riqueza ecológica, apenas tienen población y la agricultura es mayoritariamente de secano. Se ha actuado con total oscurantismo y opacidad, no aportándose estudio de viabilidad, proyección de futuro, plan de negocio, plan de amortización, balance de beneficios/perjuicios para esta comarca; no se han presentado alternativas de ubicación como es preceptivo y ni siquiera se ha presentado el proyecto completo a los ayuntamientos como mandan los convenios europeos. Este proyecto tiene asignado una financiación vía fondos FEDER de 180 millones de euros.

¿Qué acciones va a tomar la Comisión? ¿Retirará los fondos asociados a este proyecto?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de abril de 2014)

Las autoridades españolas presentaron a la Comisión el proyecto de «Centro de Ensayos de Alta Tecnología Ferroviaria de Antequera (Málaga)» que menciona Su Señoría en octubre de 2013. La principal propuesta relativa al proyecto contenía los resultados de estudios de viabilidad (incluidos emplazamientos alternativos), un análisis coste/beneficio, que incluía una evaluación de riesgos y el impacto previsible en el sector en cuestión y en la situación socioeconómica del Estado miembro y de la región, una justificación de la contribución pública y un análisis del impacto medioambiental.

La Comisión está evaluando actualmente la solicitud relativa al proyecto y, por consiguiente, aún no ha decidido si lo cofinanciará a través del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001854/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Railway test circuit in Antequera

Railway test circuits are used to carry out the trials required so that railway equipment can be granted type-approval. The circuit in the Antequera area of southern Spain, which is part of the Malaga Centre for Railway Research, is a facility serving the railway industry. It is not connected in any way with the Spanish railway network, and has no public service or national interest function. Substantial investment over time, high population density and the fact that most of the land is irrigated have made Antequera the seventh or eighth most fertile and productive area of Spain. The test circuit, once completed, will cross seven municipalities and nine urban areas, pose a risk to the aquifers in four municipalities, prove very damaging to local fauna and flora, including the large flocks of migrating birds which congregate on the area's lakes, make it much more difficult for people and animals to move around, cause problems when it rains, given that most of the land in the area is prone to flooding, and, lastly, be an eyesore for local residents, as the line will run along an embankment on average almost three metres high. The economic impact of the circuit will be disastrous, as the work of building the line, and the associated earthworks and dump sites, will destroy 800 hectares of land, the equivalent of some 30 000 lost farming days a year. What is more, most of the 700 farmers to be expropriated run small and medium-sized holdings that feed dozens of families. The project will also affect tourism in the area. The circuit is expected to provide employment for around 40 people, which will not be enough to prevent a significant increase in local unemployment. There are more suitable locations within a 250-km radius of Antequera that meet EU requirements, have no special environmental features and are very sparsely populated and where farming is mainly dry. People have been left completely in the dark about this project, as no feasibility study, future projections, business or amortisation plan or cost-benefit analysis have been drawn up or carried out. No alternative locations were proposed, as is supposed to happen, and the final project was not submitted to the local authorities, as required under EC law. ERDF funding to the tune of EUR 180 million has been allocated to the project.

What action does the Commission intend to take? Will it withdraw the funding for the project?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The project mentioned by the Honourable Member, 'Centro de Ensayos de Alta Tecnológia Ferroviaria de Antequera (Málaga)' was submitted by the Spanish authorities to the Commission in October 2013. The major project proposal contained the results of feasibility studies (including alternative locations), a cost-benefit analysis, including a risk assessment and the foreseeable impact on the sector concerned and on the socioeconomic situation of the Member State and the region, a justification for the public contribution, and an analysis of the environmental impact.

The Commission is currently evaluating the project application and has therefore not yet decided if it will co-fund this project with the European Regional Development Fund.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001855/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Decisión «Prüm»

La Decisión 2008/615/JAI del Consejo de 23 de junio de 2008, o Decisión «Prüm» tiene el objetivo de intensificar la cooperación policial y judicial transfronteriza entre los países de la Unión Europea en materia penal. Pretende mejorar los intercambios de información entre las autoridades encargadas de prevenir e investigar los delitos. Establece disposiciones sobre acceso a ficheros automatizados de análisis de ADN, sistemas automatizados de identificación dactiloscópica y datos de los registros de matriculación de vehículos nacionales; suministro de datos referentes a grandes acontecimientos; suministro de información destinada a evitar actos terroristas; así como otras medidas para reforzar la cooperación policial transfronteriza.

En este sistema de cooperación policial y especialmente en relación a la identificación de personas, no se prevé un control democrático por parte del Parlamento Europeo. No tener ningún mecanismo de control en esta materia supone un déficit democrático en lo que a garantía y protección de derechos humanos se refiere, ya que como han denunciado muchos eurodiputados y eurodiputadas, esta materia es altamente susceptible de inducir a vulneraciones de los mismos.

¿Sería favorable la Comisión a que se estableciese un mecanismo de control por parte del Parlamento Europeo en relación a esta materia? ¿Y a la realización de informes preceptivos y regulares sobre su desarrollo?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de abril de 2014)

La Decisión 2008/615/JAI del Consejo ([1]) («Decisión Prüm») contiene salvaguardias para la protección de los derechos fundamentales. Su capítulo 6 establece normas generales a este respecto. Entre ellas cabe destacar la disposición en virtud de la cual la transmisión de datos de carácter personal solo podrá iniciarse cuando en el territorio de los Estados miembros que participen en dicha transmisión se hayan incorporado al Derecho interno las disposiciones del capítulo 6 (artículo 25, apartado 2). Ello garantiza la participación de los legisladores nacionales. Con arreglo al artículo 30, apartado 5, el control jurídico de la transmisión o recepción de datos de carácter personal corresponde, en el marco de esta Decisión, a las autoridades de protección de datos independientes.

En cuanto a la notificación a nivel de la UE, los Estados miembros tienen la obligación legal de notificar a la Secretaría General del Consejo estas autoridades independientes de protección de datos. El cumplimiento de las disposiciones en materia de protección de datos constituye un elemento importante de los procedimientos de evaluación de conformidad con el capítulo 4 del anexo de la Decisión 2008/616/JAI del Consejo ([2]) («Decisión de Ejecución Prüm»).

En diciembre de 2012, la Comisión publicó un informe dirigido al Parlamento Europeo y al Consejo sobre la aplicación y el uso de la Decisión Prüm ([3]). Tal como la comisaria Malmström informó al Parlamento en el debate de 9 de octubre de 2013, la modificación de la Decisión Prüm solo debe plantearse una vez que se haya aplicado plenamente el instrumento actual ([4]). Cualquier modificación futura también deberá tener en cuenta la futura directiva sobre protección de las personas en relación con el tratamiento de los datos personales por las autoridades competentes con fines de prevención, investigación, detección o persecución de delitos penales o de ejecución de sanciones penales, y la libre circulación de dichos datos, que actualmente está siendo debatida por los colegisladores.

([1]) Decisión 2008/615/JAI del Consejo, de 23 de junio de 2008, sobre la profundización de la cooperación transfronteriza, en particular en materia de lucha contra el terrorismo y la delincuencia transfronteriza, DO L 210 de 6.8.2008, pp. 1-11.

([2]) Decisión 2008/616/JAI del Consejo, de 23 de junio de 2008, relativa a la ejecución de la Decisión 2008/615/JAI sobre la profundización de la cooperación transfronteriza, en particular en materia de lucha contra el terrorismo y la delincuencia transfronteriza, DO L 210 de 6.8.2008, pp. 12-72.

([3]) COM(2012) 732 final.

([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20131009+ITEM-020+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001855/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: The 'Prüm' Decision

Council Decision 2008/615/JHA of 23 June 2008, otherwise known as the 'Prüm' Decision, has as its objective the stepping up of cross-border police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters among EU countries. In particular, it aims to improve exchanges of information between the authorities responsible for the prevention and investigation of criminal offences. The decision sets out provisions with regard to automated access to DNA profiles, automated systems for identification of dactyloscopic data and certain national vehicle registration data, supply of data in relation to major events, supply of information with a view to preventing terrorist attacks, and other measures for reinforcing cross-border police cooperation.

In relation to this system of police cooperation, and particularly with respect to the identification of individuals, no democratic control is envisaged on the part of the European Parliament. The complete lack of a control mechanism in this area constitutes a democratic deficit as regards the protection and guarantee of human rights, since, as many MEPs have denounced, this issue is highly susceptible of giving rise to infringements of such rights.

Would the Commission be in favour of the creation of a control mechanism on the part of the European Parliament in relation to this issue? And of regular, binding reports being drawn up with respect to its operation?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2014)

Safeguards regarding the protection of fundamental rights are built in to Council Decision 2008/615/JHA ([1]) (the 'Prüm Decision'). Chapter 6 lays down comprehensive rules in this respect. These include the provision that the supply of personal data may not take place until the provisions of Chapter 6 have been implemented in the national law of the Member States involved in such supply (Art 25-2). This ensures the involvement of national legislators. Art 30-5 stipulates that independent national data protection authorities are responsible for legal checks on the supply or receipt of personal data under this decision.

As regards reporting at EU level, Member States are legally required to notify the General Secretariat of the Council of these independent data protection authorities. The compliance with data protection provisions is an important element of the evaluation procedures according to Chapter 4 of the annex of Council Decision 2008/616/JHA ([2]) ('Prüm Implementing Decision')

The Commission published a report to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation and the use of the Prüm Decision in December 2012 ([3]). As Commissioner Malmström informed Parliament in the debate on 9 October 2013, amendment of the Prüm Decision should only be considered once the current instrument is fully implemented ([4]). Any future amendment would also have to take into account the future directive on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data, which is currently being discussed by the co-legislators.

([1]) Council Decision 2008/615/JHA of 23 June 2008 on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime; OJ L 210, 6.8.2008, p. 1-11.
([2]) Council Decision 2008/616/JHA of 23 June 2008 on the implementation of Decision 2008/615/JHA on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime; OJ L 210, 6.8.2008, p. 12-72.
([3]) COM(2012) 732 final.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20131009+ITEM-020+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001856/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(18 février 2014)

Objet: Camp de réfugiés palestiniens de Yarmouk, en Syrie

Depuis plus de sept mois, l'armée syrienne encercle le grand camp de réfugiés palestiniens de Yarmouk, dans le sud de Damas. Les combats l'ont en partie détruit. La majorité des habitants ont fui ce camp, où il ne resterait plus qu'environ 18 000 personnes.

La famine a fait des ravages à Yarmouk. 63 personnes, dont des femmes et des enfants, sont décédées à cause de la pénurie de nourriture et d'un manque de soins médicaux. Depuis le 8 février, aucune aide alimentaire n'a pu être distribuée.

L'Office de secours et de travaux des Nations unies pour les réfugiés de Palestine dans le Proche-Orient (UNRWA) a réclamé un accès à ce camp afin de faire entrer l'aide alimentaire dans le secteur et de permettre l'évacuation des civils qui le souhaitent.

1. La Commission est-elle au courant du drame humanitaire qui se joue dans le camp de réfugiés de Yarmouk?

2. Quelles actions urgentes peut-elle entreprendre afin d'aider les réfugiés palestiniens assiégés à Yarmouk?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Georgieva au nom de la Commission
(4 avril 2014)

La Commission suit de près la situation du camp de Yarmouk. Elle a rencontré des représentants de l'UNRWA (*Office de secours et de travaux des Nations unies pour les réfugiés de Palestine dans le Proche-Orient*) à Bruxelles, à Beyrouth et à Damas pour voir quelles actions pouvaient être entreprises afin d'améliorer l'accès humanitaire à ce camp.

Le 18 janvier 2014, pour la première fois depuis juillet 2013, l'accès humanitaire au camp de Yarmouk camp a été rendu possible. Depuis lors, 7 000 colis alimentaires et 10 000 vaccins antipoliomyélitiques ainsi qu'une série d'autres dispositifs médicaux ont pu y être acheminés. Cet acheminement a certes amélioré la situation, mais les besoins humanitaires sont toujours loin d'être couverts. Au début de mars 2014, l'acheminement de l'aide humanitaire au camp de Yarmouk a été à nouveau stoppé par de nouveaux affrontements.

La Commission continuera à œuvrer dans toutes les enceintes possibles, y compris avec le gouvernement syrien, pour améliorer l'accès au camp de Yarmouk ainsi qu'à toutes les régions assiégées du pays, où les Nations unies estiment à 240 000 le nombre de personnes qui y sont bloquées. Elle demande à toutes les parties au conflit de garantir un accès sûr et sans entrave aux équipes humanitaires qui acheminent de l'aide.

Depuis le début de la crise, la Commission a engagé plus de 70 millions d'euros en faveur de l'UNRWA, afin de fournir une aide complémentaire aux réfugiés palestiniens restés en Syrie ou ayant fui le pays pour le Liban et la Jordanie. L'aide humanitaire acheminée par l'entremise de l'UNRWA s'élève actuellement à 14 millions d'euros. L'instrument contribuant à la paix et à la stabilité ainsi que l'instrument de voisinage européen épaulent l'UNRWA dans les efforts que ce dernier déploie pour répondre aux besoins spécifiques des réfugiés palestiniens touchés par le conflit. L'aide fournie à ce titre s'élève respectivement à 12,5 millions d'euros et 46,4 millions d'euros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001856/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Palestinian refugee camp at Yarmouk in Syria

The Syrian army has surrounded the large Palestinian refugee camp at Yarmouk, in the south of Damas, for more than seven months. The camp has been partially destroyed in the fighting and most of its inhabitants have fled, with only around 18 000 remaining.

Yarmouk has been ravaged by famine. Sixty-three people, including women and children, have died because of malnutrition and a lack of medical care. It has not been possible to distribute any food aid since 8 February.

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) has demanded access to this camp in order to let food aid in and to evacuate those civilians who wish to leave.

1. Is the Commission aware of the humanitarian tragedy which is unfolding in the Yarmouk refugee camp?

2. What urgent actions can it take to help the Palestinian refugees besieged at Yarmouk?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The Commission is closely following the situation of Yarmouk camp and has met with UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East) representatives in Brussels, Beirut and Damascus to discuss what actions could be undertaken to allow for greater humanitarian access to Yarmouk.

On 18 January 2014, for the first time since July 2013, humanitarian access to theYarmouk camp was made possible. Since then 7 000 food parcels as well as 10 000 polio vaccines and a range of other medical supplements could be delivered to the camp. While this constituted an improvement of the situation, the humanitarian needs were still far from being met. At the beginning of March 2014, aid deliveries to Yarmouk were once again halted as new clashes errupted.

The Commission will continue to advocate in all possible fora, including with the Syrian government, for increased access to Yarmouk and to all the other besieged areas of the country, where according to the United Nations estimate a total of 240 000 people are trapped. The Commission calls on all parties to the conflict to ensure safe and unhindered access for humanitarian teams delivering aid in the country.

Since the beginning of the crisis, the Commission has committed more than EUR 70 million to UNRWA in additional support of the Palestinian refugees in Syria, both for those remaining in the country as well as for those that left for Lebanon and Jordan. Specific humanitarian support through UNRWA currently amounts to EUR 14 million. The Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace and the European Neighbourhood Instrument are assisting UNRWA's efforts to address the specific needs of conflict affected Palestinian refugees with EUR 12.5 million and EUR 46.4 million respectively.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001857/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(18 février 2014)

Objet: Droit au retour de réfugiés palestiniens

Le droit international établit que sont considérés comme des réfugiés les Palestiniens et leurs descendants dont la Palestine était le lieu de résidence entre juin 1946 et mai 1948, et à qui on a interdit de retourner chez eux après la création de l'État d'Israël.

La résolution 194 du 11 décembre 1948, adoptée par le Conseil de sécurité des Nations-Unies, reconnaît le droit au retour ou à la compensation aux réfugiés palestiniens.

Selon l'UNRWA, au 31 décembre 2012, le nombre des réfugiés approchait les 4,92 millions, répartis entre la Palestine historique et les pays avoisinants: plus de 2 millions en Jordanie (10 camps), 1,2 million dans la bande de Gaza (67 % de la population, 8 camps), 750 000 en Cisjordanie (30 % de la population, 19 camps), 500 000 en Syrie (9 camps) et 450 000 au Liban (15 camps).

1. La Commission a-t-elle demandé à Israël l'application de la résolution 194? Dans la négative, compte-t-elle le faire rapidement? Et par quels moyens politiques ou diplomatiques compte-t-elle faire appliquer cette résolution?

2. Quels sont les fonds alloués par la Commission pour venir en aide aux camps de réfugiés palestiniens? Comment est-répartie cette aide, et qui se charge de la distribuer? Existe-t-il des rapports concernant le fonctionnement de la distribution des aides?

Réponse donnée par la M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(15 avril 2014)

L'UE n'a cessé de rappeler son engagement vis-à-vis de la solution fondée sur la coexistence de deux États et a salué sans réserve la reprise des négociations en 2013 car il s'agit d'une étape décisive vers la mise en place d'une résolution durable du conflit. L'UE s'est engagée à maintenir son soutien aux réfugiés palestiniens par l'entremise de l'UNRWA jusqu'à ce qu'une solution concertée, juste, équitable et réaliste à la question des réfugiés soit trouvée, ce qui constitue l'une des questions du statut final.

L'aide de l'UE à l'UNRWA s'est élevée à plus de 150 millions d'euros en 2013, soit le montant le plus élevé depuis l'envoi de l'aide d'urgence en réponse à «l'opération Plomb durci» lancée à Gaza en 2009. La part du lion revient au budget général de l'agence de l'Unwra qui fournit des services de santé et d'éducation essentiels à des millions de réfugiés vivant dans cinq régions. L'UE fournit des fonds supplémentaires par l'intermédiaire d'autres instruments, tels que le soutien d'ECHO aux réfugiés palestiniens vivant à l'intérieur de la Palestine, qui a atteint 7 millions d'euros en 2013, afin d'aider à subvenir aux besoins humanitaires en Cisjordanie et dans la bande de Gaza.

Depuis le début de la crise syrienne, la Commission s'est déjà engagée à verser plus de 70 millions d'euros à l'UNRWA afin de fournir un appui supplémentaire aux réfugiés palestiniens, surtout à ceux de Syrie mais aussi à ceux qui ont quitté le Liban et la Jordanie. ECHO a soutenu l'UNRWA par une aide d'urgence spécifique (14 millions d'euros), l'instrument de stabilité (12,5 millions d'euros) et DEVCO et elle a fourni une aide supplémentaire (46,4 millions d'euros) pour couvrir les besoins spécifiques de réfugiés palestiniens touchés par le conflit.

La commission consultative, au sein de laquelle l'UE a le statut d'observateur, se réunit deux fois par an pour traiter de questions visant à conseiller et assister le Commissaire général de l'UNRWA dans l'exécution de la mission de l'agence.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001857/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Right to return of Palestinian refugees

International law grants refugee status to Palestinians and their descendants whose place of residence was Palestine between June 1946 and May 1948 and who were barred from returning to their homes after the creation of the State of Israel.

Resolution 194 of 11 December 1948, adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations, recognises the right of return or the right to compensation of Palestinian refugees.

According to the UNRWA, the number of refugees on 31 December 2012 was almost 4.92 million, split between historical Palestine and neighbouring countries: over 2 million in Jordan (10 camps), 1.2 million in the Gaza Strip (67% of the population, 8 camps), 750 000 in the West Bank (30% of the population, 19 camps), 500 000 in Syria (9 camps) and 450 000 in Lebanon (15 camps).

1. Has the Commission demanded that Israel apply Resolution 194? If not, does it intend to do so soon? And by what political or diplomatic means does it intend to see this resolution applied?

2. What funds have been allocated by the Commission to come to the aid of the Palestinian refugee camps? How is this aid apportioned and who is responsible for its distribution? Are there any reports on how aid distribution works?

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

The EU has consistently reiterated its commitment to the two- state solution and has fully welcomed the resumption of negotiations in 2013 as a crucial step towards achieving a lasting resolution to the conflict. The EU is committed to continuing its support to Palestine refugees through UNRWA until an agreed, just, fair and realistic solution is found to the refugee question, which is one of the final status issues.

The EU's total funding to UNRWA amounted to over EUR 150 million in 2013, the highest figure since the emergency aid provided in response to the Cast Lead operation in Gaza in 2009. The lionshare of the EU's funding to UNRWA is a contribution to the Agency's General Fund which allows the Agency to deliver essential health and education services to millions of refugees across five fields of operation. Additional funds are provided from other instruments, such as, ECHO's support to the Palestinian refugees inside Palestine, which amounted to EUR 7 million in 2013, responding to humanitarian needs in both the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

Since the beginning of the Syria crisis, the Commission has already committed more than EUR 70 million to UNRWA in additional support of the Palestinian refugees, mainly for those in Syria but also for those who left to Lebanon and Jordan. ECHO supported UNRWA with specific Emergency relief for EUR 14 million, Instrument for Stability with EUR 12.5 million and DEVCO and provided EUR 46.4 million additional support to address specific needs of conflict affected Palestinian refugees.

The Advisory Commission, where the EU is an observer, meets twice a year to discuss issues relating to advising and assisting the Commissioner-General of UNRWA in carrying out the Agency's mandate.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001858/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(18 février 2014)

Objet: Privatisation de l'eau dans l'Union européenne

Dans l'Union européenne, environ un million de citoyens n'a pas accès à l'eau potable et près de huit millions n'ont pas accès à une eau de qualité.

L'initiative citoyenne européenne «L'eau: un droit humain» a recueilli 1 880 000 signatures dans treize pays de l'Union et vient d'être présentée au Parlement européen. L'initiative demande que «l'approvisionnement en eau et la gestion des ressources hydriques ne soient pas soumis aux règles du marché intérieur» et que «les services des eaux soient exclus de la libéralisation».

L'initiative «L'eau: un droit humain» s'inscrit dans la bataille qui oppose les grandes entreprises privées du secteur de l'eau, comme les françaises Veolia et Suez, qui souhaitent exporter leur modèle public-privé, aux régies publiques qui gèrent la distribution de l'eau en Allemagne, mais aussi aux Pays-Bas et dans les pays scandinaves.

1. La Commission peut-elle fournir une estimation par pays de l'accès des citoyens de l'Union à l'eau potable?

2. Compte-t-elle proscrire toute libéralisation de l'approvisionnement en eau et de la gestion des ressources hydriques?

3. Est-elle consciente que l'accès à l'eau est un droit fondamental des citoyens?

4. A-t-elle tenté de promouvoir délibérément, par l'intermédiaire de la troïka, bailleurs de fonds internationaux (UE-FMI-BCE), la privatisation des services des eaux dans les pays sous assistance financière comme la Grèce ou le Portugal?

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(15 avril 2014)

Le 19 mars 2014, la Commission européenne a adopté une communication exposant sa réponse à l'initiative citoyenne intitulée *«l'eau et l'assainissement sont un droit humain! l'eau est un bien public, pas une marchandise!»* [COM(2014)177]. La communication est disponible à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/initiatives/finalised/answered?lg=fr

La communication aborde plusieurs des questions soulevées lors de l'audition publique organisée par le Parlement européen le 17 février 2014, notamment au sujet de la libéralisation et de la privatisation des services d'approvisionnement en eau. La Commission invite par conséquent l'Honorable Parlementaire à se référer aux informations et aux réponses fournies dans la communication susmentionnée.

En ce qui concerne la dernière question, la Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se reporter à la réponse qu'elle a donnée à la question E-011399/2013 du Parlement européen, dans laquelle elle déclare que l'Union européenne n'a pas de politique générale encourageant la privatisation et que les pays qui sont confrontés à des difficultés budgétaires et économiques peuvent envisager la privatisation d'entreprises publiques dans le secteur des services collectifs d'intérêt public (…) comme l'une des options stratégiques auxquelles peuvent recourir les États membres, parmi un large éventail d'autres options.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001858/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Water privatisation in the European Union

Around one million citizens in the European Union do not have access to drinking water and almost eight million do not have access to good quality water.

The European citizens' initiative 'Water: a human right' collected 1 880 000 signatures in 13 countries of the Union and has just been presented to the European Parliament. The initiative demands that 'the supply of water and the management of water resources should not be subject to the laws of the internal market' and that 'water services should be excluded from liberalisation'.

The 'Water: a human right' initiative forms part of the struggle which sets the large private companies in the water sector, such as the French companies Veolia and Suez, which would like to establish their public-private model abroad, against the public bodies which manage water distribution in Germany, the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries.

1. Can the Commission supply an estimate by country of what access the citizens of the Union have to drinking water?

2. Does it intend to rule out any liberalisation of water supply and management of water resources?

3. Is it aware that access to water is a fundamental right of citizens?

4. Has it deliberately attempted to promote privatisation of water services through the troika of international donors (EU-IMF-ECB) in countries receiving financial assistance, such as Greece and Portugal?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2014)

On 19 March 2014, the European Commission adopted a communication setting out its response to the citizens' initiative 'Water and Sanitation are a human right! Water is a public good not a commodity!' COM(2014) 177. The communication is available at the following address: http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/initiatives/finalised/answered.

The communication addresses many of the issues which were raised during the public hearing organised by the European Parliament on 17 February 2014, including on liberalisation and privatisation of water services. The Commission therefore invites the honourable Member to refer to the information and answers provided in the abovementioned Communication.

As regards the last question, the Commission would like to refer to its reply to EP Question E-011399/2013, which states that 'the EU does not have a general policy favouring privatisation' and that 'countries facing economic and budgetary difficulties may consider privatisation of state-owned-enterprises (SOEs) in the public utility sector (…) [as] one out of an array of policy options Member States can choose from'.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001859/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(18 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Bonus occulti ai banker della City di Londra

Nonostante il divieto, imposto alle banche dall'Unione europea, di corrispondere ai *banker* bonus annuali superiori al doppio dello stipendio mensile, risulta all'interrogante che i maggiori istituti di credito della City di Londra abbiano adottato un provvedimento atto a compensare ulteriormente i manager attraverso il meccanismo del pagamento di rimborsi variabili, versati settimanalmente o mensilmente; il limite sopra indicato è così ampiamente superato.

È la Commissione al corrente di tale palese violazione del tetto imposto per i bonus annuali versati dalle banche ai propri manager?

Quali interventi urgenti intende porre in essere per impedire una simile violazione delle norme, particolarmente inaccettabile in un momento in cui lo stato dell'economia mondiale impone a tutti una pesante politica di austerità?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(25 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che, in risposta ai nuovi requisiti in materia di remunerazione dei soggetti che assumono il rischio sostanziale contenuti nella direttiva sui requisiti patrimoniali (CRD IV) ([1]), in almeno uno Stato membro vari enti hanno dichiarato di essere pronti a usare le cosiddette indennità con l'intenzione di aumentare la componente fissa della remunerazione di taluni membri del personale.

La Commissione, in collaborazione con l'Autorità bancaria europea (ABE), sta seguendo questi sviluppi con grande attenzione. Alla fine di febbraio 2014, in virtù delle competenze conferitele dal regolamento istitutivo, l'ABE ha infatti presentato alle autorità competenti degli Stati membri una richiesta formale di informazioni su questo aspetto specifico. Una volta pervenute, le informazioni saranno analizzate attentamente al fine di stabilire se risulta che vi sia stata una violazione del diritto dell'Unione. Si ricorda che, ai sensi del regolamento istitutivo ([2]), l'ABE ha la responsabilità di garantire l'applicazione uniforme, efficiente ed efficace della direttiva CRD IV e una vigilanza efficace e coerente sugli istituti finanziari. A tal fine, l'ABE dispone di poteri specifici per chiedere informazioni, effettuare indagini sulla possibile violazione o mancata applicazione del diritto dell'Unione ([3]) e adottare misure, se del caso, in collaborazione con la Commissione, la quale può altresì avviare un procedimento di infrazione in parallelo al procedimento per violazione di cui all'articolo 17 del regolamento ABE.

([1]) Direttiva 2013/36/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 26 giugno 2013, sull'accesso all'attività degli enti creditizi e sulla vigilanza prudenziale sugli enti creditizi e sulle imprese di investimento, che modifica la direttiva 2002/87/CE e abroga le direttive 2006/48/CE e 2006/49/CE (GU L 176 del 27.6.2013, pag. 338).

([2]) Cfr. in particolare l'articolo 8, paragrafo 1, e l'articolo 35 del regolamento (UE) n. 1093/2010, del 24 novembre 2010, che istituisce l'Autorità europea di vigilanza (Autorità bancaria europea) (GU L 331 del 15.12.2010, pag. 12).

([3]) Si veda l'articolo 17 del regolamento (UE) n. 1093/2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001859/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Secret bonuses for the bankers of the City of London

Despite the European Union ban on banks paying bankers annual bonuses that are more than twice their monthly salary, it would appear that the major banks in the City of London have adopted a measure to further compensate managers through a system of variable refunds, which are paid on a weekly or monthly basis; the abovementioned limit is thus being amply exceeded.

Is the Commission aware of this blatant violation of the cap on annual bonuses paid by banks to their managers?

What urgent measures will it take to prevent such breaches of the rules, which are particularly unacceptable at a time when the state of the world economy calls for firm austerity policies for all?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2014)

The Commission is aware that at least in one Member State a number of institutions have indicated that they would use so-called allowances with the intention to increase the fixed component of the remuneration paid to certain staff members, in response to the new requirements regarding the remuneration of material risk takers contained in the Capital Requirements Directive (CRD IV) ([1]).

The Commission is following these developments very closely in cooperation with the European Banking Authority (EBA). Indeed, at the end of February 2014 the EBA issued a formal request for information to the competent authorities of the Member States on this specific issue pursuant to its powers under the EBA Regulation. Once the information requested has been submitted, the information will be carefully analysed in order to establish whether or not there appears to be a breach of Union law. It is recalled that, under the EBA Regulation ([2]), EBA has the responsibility to ensure the consistent, effective and efficient application of CRD IV, and the effective and consistent supervision of financial institutions. To this end the EBA has specific powers to request information, to investigate potential breaches or non-application of Union law ([3]) and to take action, where necessary, in cooperation with the Commission, which may as well introduce infringement proceedings in parallel to the breach of law procedure of Art. 17 EBA Regulation.

([1]) Directive 2013/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on access to the activity of credit institutions and the prudential supervision of credit institutions and investment firms, amending Directive 2002/87/EC and repealing Directives 2006/48/EC and 2006/49/EC, OJ L 176, 27.6.2013, p. 338.

([2]) See in particular Articles 8(1) and 35 of Regulation 1093/2010 of 24 November 2010 establishing a European Supervisory Authority (European Banking Authority), OJ L 331, 15.12.2010, p. 12.

([3]) See Article 17 of Regulation 1093/2010.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001860/14
a Bizottság számára
Bánki Erik (PPE)
(2014. február 18.)

Tárgy: Az állampolgári jogok figyelemmel kísérése Szlovákiában

Mint ismeretes, Viviane Reding biztos asszony tavaly élesen bírált egy magyar újságírót, amikor az egy cigányok által elkövetett bűncselekmény nyomán cikket írt. Akkor az Európai Bizottság alelnöke kijelentette, hogy az Európai Unióban nincs helye a rasszizmusnak, a gyűlöletbeszédnek vagy az intolerancia bármely formájának.

1. A fentiek fényében mi a véleménye Robert Fico, szlovák kormányfő közelmúltbeli nyilatkozatáról, melyben információim szerint sértő megjegyzést tett a cigányok életmódjára?

2. A Biztos Asszony szerint hogyan egyeztethető ez össze az Európában egyetemesen alkalmazandó alapvető emberi jogok tiszteletben tartásával, és tervezi-e, hogy az eset kapcsán is határozottan fellép a rasszizmus és a gyűlöletbeszéd ellen?

3. Tekintve, hogy a közelgő európai választási kampányban az előrejelzések szerint a szélsőséges nézetek előretörésére lehet számítani, milyen intézkedéseket tervez a Bizottság, hogy a rasszista megnyilvánulásokat és az emberi jogokat sértő magatartásokat visszaszorítsa az Unióban?

Johannes Hahn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. április 22.)

A Bizottság alelnöke és egyben a jogérvényesülésért, az alapvető jogokért és az uniós polgárságért felelős biztos több ízben is elítélte a rasszizmus és az idegengyűlölet valamennyi formáját és megnyilvánulását, függetlenül attól, hogy kitől erednek, hiszen ezek a jelenségek összeegyeztethetetlenek az Európai Unió alapját képező értékekkel és elvekkel. A Bizottság elkötelezett aziránt, hogy a Szerződések alapján rendelkezésére álló valamennyi eszközzel küzdjön az ilyen jelenségek ellen.

A Bizottság a 2008/913/IB kerethatározat révén fellép a rasszista és idegengyűlölő gyűlöletbeszéd ellen. Ez a jogszabály arra kötelezi a tagállamokat, hogy szankcionálják a faji, bőrszín szerinti, vallási, származás szerinti vagy nemzeti, illetve etnikai hovatartozásuk alapján meghatározott személyek csoportjával vagy e csoport valamely tagjával szembeni erőszakra vagy gyűlöletre való szándékos és nyilvános uszítást. A 2008/913/IB kerethatározat végrehajtásáról szóló bizottsági jelentést 2014. január 27-én fogadták el ([1]). A Bizottság 2014. december 1-jéig nem jogosult kerethatározatokra hivatkozva kötelezettségszegési eljárást indítani. A vélelmezett gyűlöletbeszédek konkrét tagállami eseteit illetően a nemzeti bíróságok feladata, hogy az egyes helyzetek sajátos körülményeit és összefüggéseit figyelembe véve megállapítsák, hogy az adott helyzetben fennáll-e a rasszista vagy idegengyűlölő erőszakra vagy gyűlöletre való uszítás.

([1]) A jelentés elérhetősége: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/com_2014_27_en.pdf és http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/swd_2014_27_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001860/14
to the Commission
Erik Bánki (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Monitoring of civil rights in Slovakia

As is well known, last year Commissioner Viviane Reding strongly condemned a Hungarian journalist for writing an article about a crime committed by gypsies. The Commission Vice-President stated that in the European Union there was no place for any form of racism, hate speech or intolerance.

1. In the light of the above, what is the Commission's view of the recent statement by Robert Fico, head of the Slovak Government, in which, if my information is correct, he made an offensive remark about the way of life of gypsies?

2. According to Mrs Reding, how can this be reconciled with respect for universally applicable fundamental human rights in Europe, and will she also take decisive action against racism and hate speech in this case?

3. As there is every indication that during the forthcoming European election campaign there is likely to be an upsurge of extremist views, what measures will the Commission take to combat expressions of racism and conduct which breaches human rights in the Union?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

The Vice-President and Member of the Commission responsible for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship has repeatedly condemned all forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia, irrespective of who they come from, as these phenomena are incompatible with the values and principles on which the European Union is founded. The Commission is committed to fight against these phenomena by all means available under the Treaties.

The Commission combats racist and xenophobic hate speech through Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, which obliges the Member States to penalise the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred against groups or individuals defined by reference to their race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin. The Commission report on the implementation of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA was adopted on 27 January 2014 ([1]). The Commission is not authorised to launch infringement proceedings on the basis of Framework Decisions until 1 December 2014. When it comes to concrete cases of alleged hate speech in the Member States, it is for the national courts to determine, according to the circumstances and context of each individual situation, whether such situation represents an incitement to racist or xenophobic violence or hatred.

([1]) The report is available at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/com_2014_27_en.pdf and http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/swd_2014_27_en.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001861/14
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(18 februari 2014)

Betreft: Deelname van Commissievoorzitter Barroso aan congres over „extreem-rechts"

Op 17 maart organiseert de Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung een congres met als thema: „Europa auf der Kippe? Rechtspopulismus und Rechtsextremismus im Vorfeld der Europawahlen". Commissievoorzitter Barroso staat aangekondigd als spreker. Hij zou de „keynote speech" houden, hoewel dit op 14 februari blijkbaar nog moest worden bevestigd.

Is de Commissievoorzitter van plan naar het congres te gaan en daar een toespraak te houden?

Wordt van een voorzitter van de Commissie niet een zekere terughoudendheid verwacht wat de deelname betreft aan activiteiten gericht tegen één welbepaalde politieke strekking?

Aangezien de Commissievoorzitter de tijd heeft om aan zulke evenementen deel te nemen: staat hij ook ter beschikking om deel te nemen aan congressen over bijvoorbeeld links-extremisme, eurofederalistisch-extremisme, islamitisch-extremisme, klimaatopwarmingsextremisme? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Verleent de Commissie financiële of andere steun aan dit congres? Zo ja, hoeveel bedraagt deze steun?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-002076/14
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(21 februari 2014)

Betreft: Congres in Duitsland over „rechtspopulisme"

Maandag 17 maart a.s. wordt in Keulen een congres gehouden over de „dreiging van rechtspopulisme en rechtsextremisme in het kader van de Europese verkiezingen". De organisator is de „Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung/bpb" in samenwerking met de regionale vertegenwoordiging van de Europese Commissie in Bonn ([1]). Sprekers zijn o.a. de heer Barroso, voorzitter van de Europese Commissie, en de heer Koppelberg, hoofd van de regionale vertegenwoordiging van de Europese Commissie in Bonn. De kosten voor het congres worden op 100 000 euro geschat, aldus de organisatie. In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven of dit congres uit een EU-begrotingspost wordt gefinancierd en zo ja, vanuit welke post?

2. Wordt ook een congres door de Commissie georganiseerd over de „dreiging van linkspopulisme en linksextremisme in het kader van de Europese verkiezingen"? Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat zij een strikt neutrale houding aan zou moeten nemen in het verkiezingsdebat? Kan de Commissie verder aangeven hoe zij hierna nog kan verdedigen dat de heer Barroso geheel onbevooroordeeld en onpartijdig de verkiezingscampage ingaat?

4. Hoeveel medewerkers van de Commissie zijn belast met het voorbereiden van dit congres, mede op kosten en rekening van de dagelijks toenemende groep „rechtspopulistische" belastingbetalers in Nederland?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(11 april 2014)

Voorzitter Barroso heeft niet deelgenomen aan het congres dat door het geachte Parlementslid wordt genoemd.

De Commissie heeft financieel bijgedragen aan dit congres uit begrotingslijn: 09.02.02 REP — andere Europese evenementen (16.030201), waarmee pan-Europese discussies worden ondersteund.

([1]) http://www.bpb.de/veranstaltungen/format/kongress-tagung/173300/europa-auf-der-kippe-rechtspopulismus-und-rechtsextremismus-im-vorfeld-der-europawahlen?programm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001861/14
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Participation by Commission President Barroso in conference on the 'extreme right'

On 17 March, the Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung (Federal Agency for Civic Education) is organising a conference on the theme 'Europa auf der Kippe? Rechtspopulismus und Rechtsextremismus im Vorfeld der Europawahlen' (Europe hanging in the balance? Right-wing populism and right-wing extremism in the run-up to the European elections). It has been announced that Commission President Barroso will be among the speakers. He is apparently expected to give the keynote speech, although on 14 February this had evidently yet to be confirmed.

Does the Commission President intend to go to the conference and give a speech there?

Is not a Commission President expected to exercise a certain restraint when it comes to participating in activities directed against a particular political ideology?

As the Commission President has time to take part in such events, is he also available to attend conferences, for example, on left-wing extremism, Euro-federalist extremism, Islamist extremism and climate change extremism? If not, why not?

Is the Commission supporting this conference financially or in any other way? If so, how much support is it providing?

Question for written answer P-002076/14
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Conference in Germany on 'right-wing populism'

On Monday, 17 March 2014, a conference is to be held in Cologne on 'the threat of right-wing populism and right-wing extremism in the context of the European elections'. It is being organised by the Federal Agency for Civic Education (BPB) in cooperation with the regional representation of the European Commission in Bonn ([1]). Speakers include Mr Barroso, the President of the Commission, and Mr Koppelberg, head of the regional representation of the European Commission in Bonn. The costs of the conference are estimated at EUR 100 000, according to the organisation.

1. Can the Commission indicate whether this conference is being financed from a heading in the EU budget and if so, which?

2. Is the Commission also organising a conference on 'the threat of left-wing populism and left-wing extremism in the context of the European elections'? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it ought to adopt a strictly neutral stance in the election debate? Can the Commission also indicate how, after this, it can claim that Mr Barroso is going into the election campaign in a completely unprejudiced and impartial manner?

4. How many Commission staff are working on preparations for this conference, partly at the expense of the daily growing group of 'right-wing populist' tax-payers in the Netherlands?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

President Barroso did not participate in the conference mentioned by the Honourable Member.

The Commission contributed financially to this conference under the budget line: 09.02.02 REP — Autres manifestations européennes (16.030201), that supports pan-European discussions.

([1]) http://www.bpb.de/veranstaltungen/format/kongress-tagung/173300/europa-auf-der-kippe-rechtspopulismus-und-rechtsextremismus-im-vorfeld-der-europawahlen?programm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001863/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: La Junta de Andalucía y el Gobierno dejan sin uso 77 km de AVE ya construidos entre Antequera y Marchena que han costado 280 millones de euros

En la línea de alta velocidad ferroviaria (AVE) que une Antequera (Málaga) con Marchena (Sevilla) existen 77 kilómetros ya construidos cuya utilización está en el aire, muy en el aire. Casi 280 millones de euros que pueden tener un retorno 0. Un nuevo ejemplo de infraestructuras modelo que terminan sin uso y sin beneficiarios ([1]).

En el año 2007 el ex presidente andaluz Manuel Chaves presentó el Plan de Infraestructuras para la Sostenibilidad del Transporte en Andalucía 2007-2013. El objetivo era que para el 2013 el 90 % de la población andaluza viviera a menos de una hora de una estación de AVE. Y el primer objetivo de la Junta era unir Sevilla con Granada, a través de Antequera, para posteriormente enlazar con el corredor del Mediterráneo. El tramo Sevilla-Antequera se extendía a lo largo de 129 kilómetros y el presupuesto rondaba los 1 100 millones de euros.

Las obras se iniciaron ese mismo año pero casi de inmediato la crisis empezó a pasar factura. En el 2009 la Junta suscribió un préstamo de 200 millones con los que se construyeron medio centenar de puentes y viaductos y la plataforma de 77 kilómetros entre Antequera y Marchena sobre la cual se tenderían las vías y se levantarían las catenarias. Pero hasta ahí llegó el dinero. Las obras en el tramo entre Marchena y Sevilla, 51 kilómetros, están congeladas y sin fecha de reanudación. Ya en el 2011 la Junta de Andalucía pidió al Gobierno que echara una mano para seguir con el proyecto pero desde entonces todo quedó en vía muerta.

En su respuesta E-012932/2013 el Sr. Kallas «reconoce que la red de alta velocidad actual en España es muy amplia y ambiciosa, aunque los costes unitarios en ella están bastante por debajo de la media de la UE».

¿Le preocupa a la Comisión que se sigan construyendo más kilómetros de ferrocarril de alta velocidad en el Estado español sin que se realice un profundo análisis de coste-beneficio?

Teniendo en cuenta los costes de construcción de las líneas de AVE y su bajo uso, ¿cree la Comisión que la construcción de líneas de AVE adicionales puede aumentar el déficit y, por lo tanto, contradecir las recomendaciones específicas para el Estado español?

¿Le preocupa a la Comisión que en un presupuesto con una partida de inversión decreciente y una gran inversión en líneas de AVE haya financiación suficiente para invertir en la red TEN-T de ferrocarriles?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

Por lo que se refiere a nuevas inversiones, la Comisión seguirá de cerca la implementación real y la eficacia del observatorio independiente mencionado en el documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión [SWD(2013) 359 final] ([2]) para evaluar la viabilidad de los proyectos. Se requiere un análisis de costes y beneficios tanto para la política de cohesión como para el Mecanismo «Conectar Europa» ([3]).

En cuanto a la concentración y la disponibilidad de recursos, el reglamento sobre disposiciones comunes ([4]) (relativo, en particular, a la intervención del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional para España) exige el cumplimiento de condiciones específicas *ex-ante* por parte de los Estados miembros. Así pues, antes de presentar las solicitudes de pago intermedias en materia de transporte, España debe presentar un «plan de transporte o marco global», que será evaluado por la Comisión para examinar su coherencia con las prioridades europeas y la planificación (es decir, la política común de transportes y, en particular, la política de RTE-T ([5]) y la complementariedad y las sinergias con el Mecanismo «Conectar Europa»), así como con la dotación de recursos.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/sevilla/20140218/54401391849/junta-gobierno-dejan-sin-uso-77-km-ave-construidos-antequera-marchena.html
([2]) Evaluación del Programa Nacional de Reforma 2013 y el Programa de Estabilidad de España http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/swd2013_spain_en.pdf
([3]) Reglamento (UE) nº 1316/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 11 de diciembre de 2013, por el que se crea el Mecanismo «Conectar Europa», por el que se modifica el Reglamento (UE) no 913/2010 y por el que se derogan los Reglamentos (CE) nº 680/2007 y (CE) nº 67/2010 (DO L 348 de 20.12.2013, p. 129).
([4]) Reglamento (UE) nº 1303/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 17 de diciembre de 2013 , por el que se establecen disposiciones comunes relativas al Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional, al Fondo Social Europeo, al Fondo de Cohesión, al Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural y al Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de la Pesca, y por el que se establecen disposiciones generales relativas al Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional, al Fondo Social Europeo, al Fondo de Cohesión y al Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de la Pesca, y se deroga el Reglamento (CE) nº 1083/2006 del Consejo.
([5]) Reglamento (UE) nº 1315/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 11 de diciembre de 2013, sobre las orientaciones de la Unión para el desarrollo de la Red Transeuropea de Transporte, y por el que se deroga la Decisión nº 661/2010/UE (DO L 348 de 20.12.2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001863/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: EUR 280 million high-speed train project abandoned by Regional Government of Andalusia and the Spanish Government

With some 77 km of the AVE high-speed rail line linking Antequera (Malaga) with Marchena (Seville) already constructed, the project has been put on hold with no completion date in sight. Almost EUR 280 million has been invested for a total return of EUR 0. This is yet another infrastructure project which has reached a dead end ([1]).

In 2007 the former President of Andalusia, Manuel Chaves, introduced the Infrastructure Plan for Sustainable Transport in Andalusia 2007-2013. The aim of this plan was to have 90% of Andalusia's population living less than one hour from an AVE station by 2013. The Regional Government hoped to create a link between Seville and Granada passing through Antequera, which could then be joined on to the Mediterranean Railway Corridor. The stretch between Seville and Antequera would cover a distance of 129 kilometres and the budget for the project was around EUR 1.1 billion.

Construction began that same year but the financial crisis struck shortly afterwards. In 2009, the Regional Government took out a EUR 200 million loan which was used to construct around 50 bridges and viaducts and the 77 kilometre platform between Antequera and Marchena where the rail track would be laid and the overhead power cables would be installed. At this point the money ran out. Work on the 51 km section between Marchen and Seville has been abandoned indefinitely. Lacking the resources required to go on with the project, in 2011 the Regional Government of Andalusia asked the Spanish Government for help. Since then nothing has happened.

In his answer E-012932/2013 Mr Kallas 'acknowledges that the current high-speed network in Spain is very wide and ambitious, although unit costs in Spain are considerably lower than the EU average'.

Is the Commission concerned by the fact that high-speed rail projects are still going ahead in Spain without a full cost-benefit analysis?

Since these high-speed rail lines are very expensive to construct and are hardly used, does the Commission agree that funding more of these projects could increase Spain's deficit, in direct contradiction to the specific recommendations issued to Spain by the EU?

At a time when the general investment budget is shrinking and large sums of money are being spent on high-speed rail lines, is the Commission concerned that there may not be sufficient funding to invest in the TEN-T railway network?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

With regard to new investments, the Commission will closely monitor the actual implementation and effectiveness of the independent observatory mentioned in the Staff Working Document {SWD(2013) 359 final} ([2]) to assess the viability of projects. A Cost-Benefit Analysis is required for both the Cohesion Policy and the Connecting Europe Facility ([3]).

With regards to concentration and availability of resources, the Common provisions regulation (CPR) ([4]) (concerning, more specifically, the intervention by the European Regional Development Fund for Spain) requires the fulfilment of specific *Ex Ante* Conditionalities by the Member States. Accordingly, prior to submitting interim payment claims related to transport, Spain has to submit a 'comprehensive transport plan or framework' that will be assessed by the Commission for its consistency with the European priorities and planning (i.e. the Common Transport Policy, and notably the TEN-T Policy ([5]) as well as the complementarity and synergies with the Connecting Europe Facility), as well as with the endowment in resources.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/sevilla/20140218/54401391849/junta-gobierno-dejan-sin-uso-77-km-ave-construidos-antequera-marchena.html
([2]) Assessment of the 2013 national reform programme and stability programme for SPAIN http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/swd2013_spain_en.pdf
([3]) 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.
([4]) (Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006).
([5]) 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.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001864/14
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(18 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Estrogeny a diagnostyka onkologiczna

W latach 80. wielką sławę zyskały kosmetyki zawierające estrogeny. Badania pokazują jednak, że stosowanie preparatów (leków bądź kosmetyków) zawierających pełnowartościowe hormony zwierzęce lub syntetyczne oraz inne aktywne biologicznie związki (estrogeny, glikokortykosteroidy, retinoidy) jest związane z działaniami niepożądanymi, które mogą wpłynąć na rozwój chorób nowotworowych (tak zwanych nowotworów hormonozależnych).

Powszechna ekspozycja na związki o działaniu estrogennym lub antyandrogennym w pożywieniu, kosmetykach czy wodzie naraża na nieświadome używanie tych artykułów, które według najnowszych badań mogą przyspieszać rozwój komórek nowotworowych w guzach pierwotnych czy ogniskach przerzutowych.

Jak wiadomo, wczesna profilaktyka umożliwia uniknięcie choroby lub jej wykrycie we wczesnym stadium. U zdecydowanej większości chorych rozwój nowotworu wynika ze sporadycznych mutacji w komórkach somatycznych, a ryzyko zachorowania zależy od rodzaju zmutowanego genu, typu mutacji, genów modyfikujących, a także od innych czynników środowiskowych. Istnieje badanie pozwalające na wykrycie mutacji w genach kodujących białka naprawcze (BRCA1 oraz CHEK2), odpowiedzialnych za nadwrażliwość na estrogeny, co również daje możliwość określenia ryzyka zapadnięcia na nowotwory wskutek działania hormonów płciowych. Działając profilaktycznie i leczniczo, chorzy pacjenci poddawani są terapii o działaniu antyestrogenowym.

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

W jaki sposób Komisja kontroluje artykuły spożywcze i kosmetyki, które zawierają estrogeny lub substancje pobudzające receptory estrogenowe?

Czy firmy produkujące kosmetyki i artykuły zawierające estrogeny lub substancje pobudzające receptory estrogenowe mają obowiązek umieszczania tych informacji na etykietach? Jak wygląda ta kwestia w krajach Unii Europejskiej i na świecie?

Czy Komisja monitoruje badania, które by potwierdzały negatywny wpływ egzogennych estrogenów w diagnostyce onkologicznej, zwłaszcza w grupie nowotworów hormonozależnych?

W jaki sposób Komisja monitoruje badania, w których stosowana jest terapia lekami antyestrogenowymi w leczeniu pacjentów chorych na nowotwory?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Nevena Mimicę w imieniu Komisji
(3 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Zgodnie z prawodawstwem unijnym istnieją surowe zasady stosowania estrogenów lub substancji pobudzających receptory estrogenowe, które spełniają różną funkcję w zależności od danego produktu.

Jeżeli substancja chemiczna stwarza ryzyko dla zdrowia ludzkiego lub środowiska naturalnego, jej stosowanie w wyrobach jest regulowane unijnymi przepisami w zakresie chemikaliów REACH ([1]). Tak jest również w przypadku określonych substancji zaburzających funkcjonowanie układu hormonalnego oraz substancji sklasyfikowanych jako rakotwórcze, mutagenne lub działające toksycznie na rozrodczość. Te kategorie substancji mogą być również uznane za substancje wzbudzające szczególnie duże obawy, a ich stosowanie może podlegać wymogowi uzyskania zezwolenia zgodnie z rozporządzeniem REACH.

W przypadku produktów kosmetycznych rozporządzenie (WE) nr 1223/2009 ([2]) zakazuje stosowania estrogenów w kosmetykach ([3]) i wymaga podania wszystkich składników w wykazie składników ([4]).

([1]) Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 1907/2006 Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 18 grudnia 2006 r. w sprawie rejestracji, oceny, udzielania zezwoleń i stosowanych ograniczeń w zakresie chemikaliów (REACH).
([2]) Dz.U. L 342 z 22.12.2009, s. 59.
([3]) Zob. pozycję 260 w załączniku II do rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1223/2009.
([4]) Artykuł 19 ust. 1 lit. g) rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1223/2009.

W przypadku produktów leczniczych prawodawstwo farmaceutyczne UE przewiduje nadzór po wprowadzeniu do obrotu w trakcie całego cyklu życia produktów. Posiadacze pozwolenia na dopuszczenie do obrotu muszą przedstawiać regularnie aktualizowane sprawozdania dotyczące bezpieczeństwa leków, jak również wszelkie nowe informacje, które mogą mieć wpływ na ocenę stosunku korzyści do ryzyka. Informacje te obejmują zarówno pozytywne, jak i negatywne wyniki badań klinicznych lub innych badań. W przypadku problemu w zakresie bezpieczeństwa w stosunku do danego produktu leczniczego podejmowane jest działanie regulacyjne.

W odniesieniu do monitorowania badań należy podkreślić, że w obrębie odpowiednich ram prawnych główna odpowiedzialność spoczywa na producentach i importerach wprowadzających produkty do obrotu. Za zapewnienie zgodności z przepisami odpowiedzialne są państwa członkowskie, podczas gdy Komisja oczywiście uważnie śledzi rozwój sytuacji w celu oceny potrzeby podjęcia dalszych działań.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001864/14
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Oestrogens and oncological diagnostics

In the 1980s, cosmetics containing oestrogens started to become very popular. However, studies show that the use of substances (medicines or cosmetics) containing high levels of animal or synthetic hormones or of other biologically active compounds (e.g. oestrogens, glycocorticosteroids or retinoids) is associated with adverse effects that can influence the development of cancers, such as hormone-dependent cancers.

Widespread exposure to compounds with oestrogenic or antiandrogenic effects in food, cosmetics and water can potentially give rise to the unconscious use of such substances, which — as the latest studies show — can accelerate the generation of cancerous cells in primary tumours and metastatic foci.

It is known that early prophylaxis makes it possible to prevent the disease or to uncover it at an earlier stage. In the overwhelming majority of cancer sufferers, tumours arise through the sporadic mutation of somatic cells, and the risk of illness depends on the type of mutated gene, the kind of mutation, modifying genes and other environmental factors. A test exists that can uncover mutations in the genes that encode for the repair proteins (BRCA1 and CHEK2) which are responsible for oversensitivity to oestrogens. This also makes it possible to define the risk of developing tumours as the result of the effects of sex hormones. As a preventive measure and as a form of treatment, cancer patients are subjected to anti-oestrogen therapy.

In this connection:

How is the Commission monitoring consumer goods and cosmetics that contain oestrogens or substances that stimulate oestrogen receptors?

Are companies that produce cosmetics and articles containing oestrogens or substances that stimulate oestrogen receptors obliged to include that information on their labels? How is this issue dealt with in the Member States and in the rest of the world?

Is the Commission monitoring studies that would be able to confirm the adverse effects of exogenous oestrogens in oncological diagnoses, with particular reference to the group of hormone-dependent cancers?

How is the Commission monitoring studies that use anti-oestrogen medicines to treat cancer patients?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

Under EU legislation, there are strict rules on the use of oestrogens or substances that stimulate oestrogen receptors which differ in function of the specific product.

If a chemical poses a risk to human health or to the environment, its use in articles is restricted under the EU's chemicals legislation REACH ([1]). This is the case e.g. for certain endocrine disruptors and substances classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic and toxic for reproduction. These categories of substances can also be identified as substances of very high concern and their uses made subject to the authorisation requirement under REACH.

For cosmetic products, Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 ([2]) prohibits the use of oestrogens in cosmetics ([3]) and requires the labelling of all the ingredients in the ingredients' list ([4]).

For medicinal products, the EU's pharmaceutical legislation foresees a post-marketing surveillance during the life-cycle of the products. Marketing authorisation holders must submit periodic safety update reports about their medicines, as well as any new information which might influence the evaluation of the benefits and risks. The information shall include both positive and negative results of clinical trials and other studies. In case of a safety issue, regulatory action on a medicinal product is taken as appropriate.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of chemicals.
([2]) OJ L 342, 22.12.2009, p. 59.
([3]) See entry 260 of Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009.
([4]) Article 19, 1. (g) of Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009.

As regards the monitoring of studies, it should be pointed out that under the respective legal frameworks, the primary responsibility rests with the manufacturers and importers placing the products on the market. It is the responsibility of Member States to ensure compliance with the legislation, while of course the Commission follows attentively new developments in order to assess the need for further action.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001865/14
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(18 février 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Construction d'une route à Beit Safafa (Jérusalem-Est)

La municipalité israélienne de Jérusalem et le ministère des transports effectuent des travaux de construction à grande échelle à Beit Safafa (Jérusalem-Est occupée) afin de compléter une autoroute («Begin Highway») qui servira à l'expansion des colonies illégales d'Israël dans et autour de la partie sud de Jérusalem-Est occupée et accélérera l'annexion de facto de colonies de Gush Etzion.

La population palestinienne occupée de Beit Safafa ne bénéficie pas de cette route qui est imposée contre sa volonté. Bien que la route soit construite sur des terres confisquées dans le passé aux membres de la communauté et passe par son centre, aucune route d'accès à l'autoroute ne sera disponible pour les habitants palestiniens. En outre, la route est à l'origine de graves pertes et dommages pour les personnes de la communauté de Beit Safafa. La route, si elle est achevée, couperait en deux la communauté de Beit Safafa et ruinerait les moyens de subsistance des 9 300 résidents palestiniens.

Selon le droit international, la route actuellement en construction à Beit Safafa est illégale. Entre autres, Israël viole ses obligations en vertu de la Quatrième Convention de Genève par la construction d'une autoroute dans les territoires palestiniens occupés, qui sert l'installation permanente des citoyens israéliens dans les territoires occupés, et qui ne bénéficie pas à la population palestinienne occupée, mais sert plutôt les intérêts de ses propres citoyens, y compris ceux des colonies illégales.

1. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est-elle au courant de la construction de cette route?

2. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante va-t-elle demander aux autorités israéliennes de cesser immédiatement les travaux de construction de cette route dans les territoires occupés par Israël en vertu du droit international?

3. Y a-t-il des investissements européens dans la construction de cette route?

4. Compte tenu de la persistance de l'expansion de la colonisation israélienne, quelles mesures comptent prendre la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante et l'UE pour faire pression sur le gouvernement israélien afin qu'il respecte ses obligations internationales?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(7 mai 2014)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a parfaitement connaissance du projet d'autoroute mentionné par l'Honorable Parlementaire. La délégation de l'UE à Tel Aviv s'intéresse de près à ce dossier.

L'UE ne participe pas au financement de l'extension de cette route. Elle reste fermement opposée aux colonies israéliennes et aux activités qui en découlent en Palestine et fait passer ce message auprès de ses homologues israéliens à tous les niveaux ainsi qu'au sein de diverses enceintes internationales ([1]).

(1) http://www.eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140111_02_fr.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001865/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — building a highway through Beit Safafa (East Jerusalem)

Large-scale construction work on a section of the Begin Highway is under way in Beit Safafa (occupied East Jerusalem) under the direction of the (Israeli) Municipality of Jerusalem and the Ministry of Transport. This will lead to the expansion of the illegal Israeli settlements around the southern part of East Jerusalem and speed up the de facto annexation of the Gush Etzion settlement bloc.

The highway will do nothing to improve the lives of the Palestinian inhabitants of occupied Beit Safafa and was approved against their will. Although it is being built on land seized from local Palestinian residents and passes right through the centre of the town, it will not be directly accessible from Beit Safafa itself. What is more, the project will be an economic and social disaster for the Beit Safafa community: should the highway be completed, the community would be split in two and the livelihoods of Beit Safafa's 9 300 Palestinian residents would be destroyed.

Building a section of the highway through Beit Safafa violates international law. Apart from anything else, by building the highway on Palestinian occupied territory, Israel is in breach of its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention. The highway only serves the interests of Israeli citizens, including those in illegal settlements in the occupied territories, by putting those settlements on a more permanent footing, and does not benefit the Palestinian residents of the occupied territories in any way.

1. Is the VP/HR aware of the highway project?

2. Does she intend to urge the Israeli authorities to halt construction work in the occupied territories immediately, in accordance with international law?

3. Is the highway being built with European funding?

4. Given Israel's insistence on expanding its settlements, how do the VP/HR and the EU intend to put pressure on the Israeli Government to honour its international obligations?

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

The HR/VP is fully aware of the highway project mentioned by the Honourable Member. The EU Delegation in Tel Aviv is closely following this issue.

The EU is not involved in the funding of the road extension. It remains firmly opposed to Israeli settlement and activities that derive from it in Palestine, and is conveying this message to its Israeli counterparts at all levels as well as in various International fora ([1]).

([1]) http://www.eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140111_02_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001866/14
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 février 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — le Qatar peut perdre la Coupe du monde

L'ambassade d'Inde au Qatar vient de nous confirmer la mort de 450 travailleurs sur les chantiers ces deux dernières années, les autorités népalaises pour leur part estiment à 400 le nombre de décès de leurs ressortissants. Combien de morts faudra-t-il pour que le Qatar puisse organiser cette Coupe du monde de football?

1. Il faut que changent du tout au tout les conditions de travail sur place afin de faire cesser cette tuerie. Que pense la Commission de la proposition d'un accompagnement international soutenu du respect des engagements des autorités en la matière ainsi que de l'envoi d'observateurs qui pourront constater de manière régulière si les règles de sécurité, d'hygiène et de logement sont bien respectées?

2. Comment la Commission se positionne-t-elle face à la «kafala», le code du travail qatarien, très restrictif et contraignant? Pour rappel, il interdit à tous les employés étrangers de rompre leur contrat sans l'aval d'un tuteur qui se trouve être la plupart du temps leur patron. L'ouvrier qui veut changer d'emploi sera considéré comme fugueur; il sera arrêté par la police et incarcéré.

3. La Commission trouve-t-elle normal que les syndicats et le droit de grève soient interdits aux travailleurs immigrés?

4. La Commission estime-t-elle approprié de discuter avec les autorités sportives internationales afin d'attribuer le Mondial à un autre pays si les statistiques qatariennes restent aussi meurtrières? Il y a encore bien assez de temps pour le faire. Ce ne serait d'ailleurs pas la première fois que l'on réattribue une Coupe du monde. En 1986, la Coupe du monde devait au départ se jouer en Colombie mais, pour des raisons économiques, le pays désigné avait dû céder sa place au Mexique.

Nous attendons à présent des autorités européennes, mais aussi des autorités sportives internationales, une position plus précise et plus vigoureuse. C'est une question d'éthique assurément, mais aussi et surtout de vie ou de mort pour des milliers de travailleurs.

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Asthon, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(1^er^ avril 2014)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a pleinement conscience du problème des droits des travailleurs migrants au Qatar. La délégation de l'UE à Riyad (accréditée auprès du Qatar) et les missions diplomatiques de l'Union à Doha suivent de près la situation des Droits de l'homme dans le pays.

L'UE surveille ces problèmes, notamment dans le cadre de l'Organisation internationale du travail (OIT). Elle soutient le programme pour un travail décent ainsi que la ratification et la mise en œuvre effective des conventions de l'OIT, notamment en ce qui concerne les normes fondamentales du travail. Elle est d'avis que ces questions doivent être traitées prioritairement au moyen du système de surveillance des normes du travail de l'OIT.

M^me^ Ashton se félicite de l'initiative des autorités qatariennes de mener une enquête approfondie au sujet des allégations de mauvais traitement et attend avec impatience ses conclusions qui devraient aider les autorités à remédier aux manquements constatés. Alors que les travaux de constructions directement liés à la Coupe du monde de la FIFA n'ont pas encore été entamés, l'UE a l'intention de suivre de près l'exécution de l'engagement contracté par le comité qatarien d'organisation de la Coupe du monde 2022 de garantir un traitement approprié pour les travailleurs, en particulier au regard de la «Charte des travailleurs» récemment publiée.

L'Union européenne continuera à plaider résolument en faveur d'une large révision du système actuel de parrainage, à l'origine d'abus et qui porte atteinte à certains Droits de l'homme fondamentaux.

L'UE considère qu'à ce stade, la Coupe du monde de la FIFA pourrait représenter une occasion à ne pas manquer de renforcer les droits des travailleurs migrants au Qatar, et restera en contact avec les autorités locales, ainsi qu'avec la FIFA et les autres autorités sportives concernées au sujet de la mise en œuvre des engagements récemment contractés dans ce domaine.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001866/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — should the World Cup be taken away from Qatar?

The Indian Embassy in Qatar recently announced that 450 Indian construction workers had died in Qatar over the past two years, whilst the Nepalese authorities put the corresponding figure for their nationals at 400. How many people need to perish so that Qatar can host the Football World Cup?

1. A complete overhaul of working conditions is essential in order to put an end to this senseless loss of life. What view does the Commission take of the proposals that there should be ongoing international monitoring to ensure that the Qatari authorities meet their obligations in this area, and that observers should regularly be sent to the country to confirm that regulations on safety, sanitation and housing are being adhered to?

2. What is the Commission's stance on the 'kafala', the harsh Qatari employment code which prevents foreign workers from ending their contracts without the agreement of their sponsor, who in most cases is their employer? Any worker who tries to change jobs is deemed to be a runaway and may be arrested and imprisoned.

3. Does the Commission regard it as acceptable that foreign workers in Qatar should be banned from joining trade unions or from going on strike?

4. Will the Commission consider discussing these matters with international sporting bodies, with a view to the World Cup being awarded to another country if the death rates for foreign workers in Qatar remain so high? There is still plenty of time to do this. In fact, it would not be the first time that it has happened: Colombia was originally chosen to host the World Cup in 1986, but the country's economic problems led to the tournament being moved to Mexico.

We are now looking to the European authorities and international sporting bodies to take a clearer, more robust stance on the issue. Not only is it a matter of ethics, it is also a real matter of life and death for thousands of workers.

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

The HR/VP is well aware of the issue of migrant workers' rights in Qatar. The EU Delegation in Riyadh (accredited to Qatar) and EU diplomatic missions in Doha are closely following the human rights situation in the country.

The EU monitors these issues notably under the framework of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The EU supports the Decent Work Agenda and the ratification and effective implementation of ILO Conventions, in particular with regard to core labour standards, and is of the opinion that these issues are to be tackled through the ILO's supervisory system of labour standards as a matter of priority.

The HR/VP welcomes the initiative of Qatari authorities to conduct a thorough investigation into allegations of mistreatment and look forward to its conclusions, which should help the authorities to address shortcomings. While construction directly related to the FIFA World Cup has yet to begin, the EU intends to closely follow the implementation of the commitment of the Qatar 2022 Supreme Committee to providing proper treatment for workers, in particular with respect to the recently released 'Workers' Charter'.

The EU will continue to consistently advocate for a broad review of the current sponsorship system, which has been at the origin of abuses and which infringes on some basic human rights.

The EU considers that at this juncture, the FIFA World Cup could represent an opportunity not to be missed for the enhancement of the rights of migrant workers in Qatar, and will continue to liaise with local authorities as well as FIFA and other relevant sport stakeholders on the implementation of recent commitments in this field.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001867/14
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 février 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Coupe du monde 2018 et Droits de l'homme

Chaque grand événement sportif est devenu le prétexte à trop d'excès. L'ambassade d'Inde au Qatar vient de nous confirmer la mort de 450 travailleurs sur les chantiers ces deux dernières années, les autorités népalaises pour leur part estiment à 400 le nombre de décès de leurs ressortissants.

Le droit des travailleurs est complètement nié et les Droits de l'homme une fois encore ternis.

Comment réagissez-vous à la décision de la Douma, le Parlement russe, de Poutine qui a déjà voté une loi restreignant les droits des travailleurs affectés aux chantiers de la Coupe du monde 2018?

Trouvez-vous cela acceptable?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(15 avril 2014)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a connaissance de l'entrée en vigueur, en juillet 2013, de la loi «sur la préparation et l'organisation de la Coupe du monde FIFA 2018 et la Coupe des Confédérations FIFA 2017 dans la Fédération de Russie et la modification de certains actes législatifs fédéraux russes n° 108-FZ».

L'UE est consciente qu'il lui incombe d'exhorter la Russie, en tant qu'organisatrice d'événements sportifs majeurs, à respecter ses engagements internationaux en matière de Droits de l'homme avant, pendant et après de telles manifestations. Cela inclut le respect des droits économiques, sociaux et culturels, ainsi que le respect des libertés fondamentales d'association, de réunion et d'expression. L'UE a systématiquement adopté cette approche envers la Russie avant et pendant les Jeux olympiques d'hiver de Sochi.

L'UE suivra de près l'impact de la loi fédérale n° 108 sur les Droits de l'homme, notamment par l'intermédiaire de sa délégation en Russie.

L'UE usera de toutes les voies disponibles, y compris des consultations semestrielles sur les Droits de l'homme qu'elle mène avec la Fédération de Russie, pour porter les préoccupations exprimées par l'Honorable Parlementaire ainsi que par la société civile et les syndicats, en Russie et en Europe, à la connaissance de la Fédération de Russie, et demandera des éclaircissements.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001867/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — 2018 Football World Cup and human rights

The organisers of major sporting events seem determined to outdo one another in flouting workers' rights. The Indian Embassy in Qatar recently announced that 450 Indian construction workers had died in Qatar over the last two years, whilst the Nepalese authorities put the corresponding figure for their nationals at 400.

Workers' rights are being completely disregarded and human rights are once again being violated.

What view does the VP/HR take of the fact that the Duma, Putin's tame Parliament, has passed a law restricting the rights of people employed on World Cup building sites in Russia?

Does she find this acceptable?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the entry into force in July 2013 of the law 'On the Preparation and Staging of the 2018 FIFA World Cup and 2017 FIFA Confederations Cup in Russian Federation and the Amendment of Certain Russian Federal Legislative Acts № 108-FZ'.

The EU is mindful of the responsibility it has in calling on Russia, as the organiser of major sports events, to respect its international human rights commitments before, during and after such events. This includes the respect for economic, social and cultural rights, as much as the respect for the fundamental freedoms of association, assembly and expression. This is the approach the EU has taken consistently with Russia in the run-up of and during the Sochi winter Olympic games.

The EU will pay a close attention to the impact of the Federal Law № 108 on human rights, notably through the EU Delegation in Russia.

The EU will use all avenues, including the bi-annual human rights consultations it holds with the Russian Federation, to bring the concerns expressed by the Honourable Member as well as by civil society and trade unions, in Russia and in Europe, to the attention of the Russian Federation, and will seek clarifications.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001871/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Vulneración de la Directiva 2009/28/CE de la reforma energética española

Considerando que la Directiva 2009/28/CE sobre energías renovables prevé un objetivo de cuota de energía producida de fuentes renovables del 20 % en 2020.

Considerando que la nueva Ley 24/2013 del sector eléctrico español (conocida como reforma energética) pone seriamente en peligro este objetivo puesto que el cambio de régimen retributivo a las renovables puede comportar el cierre de instalaciones existentes y la falta de cualquier tipo de incentivo y la imposición de impuestos (Ley 15/2012) y peajes (peajes de respaldo) impiden seriamente el desarrollo de nuevas instalaciones.

1. ¿Conocía la Comisión la infracción por parte del Gobierno español de dicha Directiva?

2. ¿Qué mecanismos tiene la Comisión para garantizar que, por parte de los órganos competentes y responsables, se exige el cumplimiento de la normativa comunitaria citada anteriormente?

3. ¿Qué acciones piensa emprender la Comisión para asegurar el cumplimiento de la normativa europea?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión tiene conocimiento de que no se han adoptado finalmente todos los instrumentos jurídicos de la reforma del sector eléctrico, incluido el nuevo régimen de ayuda para los proyectos de energías renovables ya existentes. Por lo tanto, la Comisión sigue evaluando la compatibilidad de la reforma del sector eléctrico (Ley 24/2013) con la legislación de la UE, incluida la Directiva 2009/28/CE, con vistas a estudiar nuevas acciones legales de la UE, si es necesario.

Según los datos de Eurostat, en España la cuota de energía procedente de fuentes renovables fue del 14,3 % en 2012, situándose por encima del objetivo intermedio del 11 % para el período 2011-2012. En caso de que un Estado miembro se sitúe por debajo de su trayectoria vinculante ([1]) hacia el objetivo de 2020, la Comisión puede tomar medidas jurídicas para subsanar esta deficiencia.

([1]) Tal como figura en el anexo I, parte B, de la Directiva 2009/28/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001871/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Infringement of Directive 2009/28/EC by Spain's energy reform

On of the objectives of Directive 2009/28/EC on energy from renewable sources (the Renewables Directive) is to ensure that 20% of energy is produced from renewable sources by 2020.

The new Spanish Law 24/2013 on the electricity sector (known as the energy reform) poses a serious threat to this objective, as the change in the tax regime applied to renewables may lead to the closure of existing facilities, and the lack of incentives of any type, new taxation (Law 15/2012) and charges (the so-called 'backup charges') are all serious obstacles to the development of new installations.

1. Is the Commission aware of this infringement of the Renewables Directive by the Spanish Government?

2. What mechanisms does the Commission have at its disposal to ensure that the relevant authorities comply with the abovementioned EC law?

3. What action does the Commission intend to take to ensure that the European rules are complied with?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission understands that not all legal instruments of the electricity sector reform have yet been finally adopted, including the new support scheme for existing renewable energy projects. Therefore the Commission is still assessing the legal compatibility of the electricity sector reform (Act 24/2013) with EU legislation, including Directive 2009/28/EC, with a view to consider further EU legal action if necessary.

According to Eurostat data, Spain renewable energy share was 14.3% in 2012, above the interim target for 2011-2012 of 11%. Should a Member State fall below its binding trajectory ([1]) towards 2020 target, the Commission can take legal measures to address this deficiency.

([1]) As set out in Annex I, Part B of Directive 2009/28/EC.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001873/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Νεόπτωχοι και μικρομεσαίοι επιχειρηματίες

Από την αρχή της κρίσης η φτώχεια έχει αυξηθεί σε μεγάλο βαθμό στην Ελλάδα και στην ΕΕ. Η ανεργία μαζί με την μείωση των μισθών και των κοινωνικών παροχών είχαν ως αποτέλεσμα να βρεθούν κάτω από το όριο της φτώχειας άνθρωποι που είχαν, μέχρι πρότινος, ασφάλεια εργασίας και μισθού, διευρύνοντας έτσι τη κατηγορία των νεόπτωχων. Πρόσφατες εκτιμήσεις της ΓΣΕΒΕΕ αναφέρουν πως το ένα τρίτο (1/3) αυτών προέρχονται από τους μικρομεσαίους επιχειρηματίες, όπως επίσης αναφέρουν πως ένα εκατομμύριο επιχειρηματίες έχουν μείνει χωρίς ιατρική και φαρμακευτική περίθαλψη.

Συγχρόνως βλέπουμε στην Ελλάδα υπέρμετρη φορολόγηση των ΜΜΕ, ενώ τα πρόστιμα που προβλέπονται από τον φορολογικό κώδικα έχουν σημειώσει άλμα της τάξης των 46 έως 364 ποσοστιαίων μονάδων.

Παράλληλα η παραλαβή δανείων για τις ΜΜΕ έχει δυσκολέψει σε μεγάλο βαθμό αφήνοντας πολλούς επιχειρηματίες χωρίς δυνατότητα χρηματοδότησης ή αναχρηματοδότησης.

Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Υπάρχει στατιστική που να αφορά τον αριθμό των νεόπτωχων στην Ευρώπη και τον επαγγελματικό κλάδο από τον οποίο προέρχονται;

2. Ποιο το εκπαιδευτικό και μορφωτικό προφίλ των νέων πτωχών στην ΕΕ;

3. Σε ποιες δράσεις πρόκειται να προβεί η Επιτροπή για να εξασφαλίσει ένα υγιές ευρωπαϊκό επιχειρηματικό περιβάλλον; Πιστεύει πως υψηλές φορολογίες, όπως αυτές που ισχύουν στην Ελλάδα, συνάδουν με την ενίσχυση της επιχειρηματικότητας;

4. Προτίθεται να δράσει για τη στήριξη των ΜΜΕ με συγκεκριμένα μέτρα που θα έχουν στόχο την πρόσβαση στη χρηματοδότηση;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Απριλίου 2014)

1. Σε όλη την ΕΕ η ηλικιακή ομάδα που έχει πληγεί περισσότερο από την κρίση είναι οι ενήλικες σε ηλικία εργασίας. Το ποσοστό ατόμων της ομάδας αυτής που αντιμετωπίζουν τον κίνδυνο της φτώχειας αυξήθηκε κατά 1,8 ποσοστιαίες μονάδες από το 2008 έως το 2012 ([1]). Η βιομηχανία και οι κατασκευές είναι οι τομείς που πλήττονται περισσότερο.

2. Η φτώχεια έχει αυξηθεί στις ηλικίες εργασίας, ιδίως μεταξύ αυτών με το χαμηλότερο μορφωτικό επίπεδο ([2]).

3. Η στρατηγική «Ευρώπη 2020» παρουσιάζει έναν χάρτη πορείας για την ανάπτυξη με τη δημιουργία ενός επιχειρηματικού περιβάλλοντος για περισσότερες και καλύτερες θέσεις εργασίας. Λόγω των σημερινών μέτρων δημοσιονομικής λιτότητας και των περιορισμένων περιθωρίων για μείωση των φόρων, θα πρέπει να δοθεί προτεραιότητα σε διαρθρωτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις που θα έχουν θετικό αντίκτυπο στην ανάπτυξη και την ανταγωνιστικότητα. Στην Ελλάδα, το πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής περιέχει μέτρα για την απλοποίηση των κανονισμών, τη μείωση του διοικητικού κόστους, την ενίσχυση του ανταγωνισμού στις υπηρεσίες δικτύων, και τη διευκόλυνση των εξαγωγών. Τα μέτρα αυτά αποφέρουν καρπούς. Η Ελλάδα σημείωσε θεαματική πρόοδο και κατατάχθηκε 36η από 147η στο πεδίο σύστασης επιχείρησης στην «Έκθεση σχετικά με τη διευκόλυνση της επιχειρηματικής δραστηριότητας 2013» («Doing Business 2013») ([3]). Επιπλέον, η φορολογία αναμορφώθηκε, μέσω της νέας νομοθεσίας για τον φόρο εισοδήματος φυσικών προσώπων και του φόρου ακίνητης περιουσίας, ενώ η φορολογική διαδικασία και οι κώδικες φορολογικής απεικόνισης έχουν αντικατασταθεί, οδηγώντας σε ένα απλούστερο, αποτελεσματικότερο και λιγότερο στρεβλωτικό σύστημα φορολογίας, το οποίο θα ενισχύσει επίσης τις επενδύσεις. Η επικείμενη ανακοίνωση σχετικά με την μακροπρόθεσμη χρηματοδότηση θα εστιάζεται στην πρόσβαση των ΜΜΕ στη χρηματοδότηση, περιλαμβανόμενης και της πρόσβασής τους σε μη τραπεζικές πηγές χρηματοδότησης.

([1]) Δηλαδή παρουσιάζει αύξηση κατά σχεδόν 6 εκατ. άτομα.
([2]) Από 16,5% το 2008 σε 18,1% το 2012.
([3]) «Doing Business 2013: Smarter Regulations for Small and Medium-Size Enterprises», International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank (2013), στη διεύθυνση:
http://www.doingbusiness.org/~/media/giawb/doing%20business/documents/annual-reports/english/db13-full-report.pdf

4. Τα Ευρωπαϊκά Διαρθρωτικά και Επενδυτικά Ταμεία (ΕΔΕΤ) ([4]), τονίζουν τη σημασία των ΜΜΕ και τα στηρίζουν στην πράξη. Κατά την περίοδο προγραμματισμού 2014-20, τα ΕΔΕΤ έχουν στόχο τις ΜΜΕ επενδύοντας στη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας, σε ένα ευπροσάρμοστο εργατικό δυναμικό, στην καινοτομία και την προσαρμοστικότητα όσον αφορά την οργάνωση της εργασίας. Το πρόγραμμα της ΕΕ για την ανταγωνιστικότητα των επιχειρήσεων και τις ΜΜΕ ([5]) παρέχει επίσης κεφάλαια που μπορούν να χρησιμοποιηθούν από όλες τις ΜΜΕ.

([4]) Ευρωπαϊκά Διαρθρωτικά και Επενδυτικά Ταμεία.
([5]) COSME http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/initiatives/cosme/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001873/14
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: The 'new poor' and SMEs

Since the onset of the crisis, poverty has affected many more people in Greece and in the rest of the EU. Unemployment and a reduction in wages and social benefits mean that people who had, until recently, enjoyed job security and a secure income have fallen below the poverty line, thereby joining the ranks of the new poor. Recent estimates by the GSEBEE (General Confederation of Greek Small Businesses and Trades) indicate that one third (1/3) of these are employees of small and medium-sized businesses and that one million self-employed people have been left without medical and pharmaceutical care.

At the same time, we are witnessing in Greece the excessive taxation of SMEs, while the fines provided for in the tax code have leaped from approximately 46 to 364 percentage points.

Similarly, it has become much more difficult for SMEs to borrow money, which has left many entrepreneurs without any possibility of securing funding or re-financing.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Are there any statistics about the number of the 'new poor' in Europe and the sector of employment from which they come?

2. What is the educational profile of the 'new poor' in the EU?

3. What action will the Commission take to ensure a healthy European business environment? Does it believe that high taxes, such as those in Greece, are consistent with efforts to boost entrepreneurship?

4. Does it intend to support SMEs by taking specific measures aimed at helping them to secure access to funding?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

1. Across the EU the age group most affected by the crisis are working-age adults. Their at-risk-of-poverty rate rose 1.8 pp from 2008 to 2012 ([1]) . Industry and construction are the sectors most affected.

2. Working-age poverty has increased in particular among those with the lowest level of education ([2]).

3. The Europe 2020 strategy sets out a roadmap for growth by creating a business environment for more and better jobs. Given the current fiscal austerity measures and the limited latitude for reducing tax, priority should be given to structural reforms that will have a positive impact on growth and competitiveness. In Greece, the Economic Adjustment Programme contains measures to streamline regulations, lower administrative costs, enhance competition in network services and facilitate export. These measures are bearing fruit. Greece has jumped from 147th to 36th in the starting a business field of the 'Doing Business 2013' report ([3]). In addition, taxation has been reshaped, through the new legislation on personal income tax and on property tax, while the tax procedure and the tax recording codes have been replaced, leading to a simpler, more effective and less distortive taxation system which will also foster investment. The upcoming Communication on long term finance will have a focus on SMEs access to finance including their access to non-bank sources of finance.

4. The ESIF ([4]) emphasise the importance of SMEs and support them practically. In the 2014-20 programming period, the ESIF targets SMEs by investing in job creation, an adaptable workforce, innovation and adaptability in work organisation. The EU programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs ([5]) also provides funds that can be used by all SMEs.

([1]) An increase of nearly 6 million.
([2]) From 16.5% in 2008 to 18.1% in 2012.
([3]) 'Doing Business 2013: Smarter Regulations for Small and Medium-Size Enterprises', International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank (2013), at: http://www.doingbusiness.org/~/media/giawb/doing%20business/documents/annual-reports/english/db13-full-report.pdf
([4]) European Structural and Investment Funds.
([5]) COSME http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/initiatives/cosme/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001874/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ισότιμη πρόσβαση στην υγειονομική περίθαλψη για τους ευρωπαίους πολίτες — έκθεση FRA

Μια έκθεση που δημοσιεύθηκε από τον Οργανισμό Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ (FRA) ([1]) προσδιορίζει τους συγκεκριμένους φραγμούς και μορφές άνισης μεταχείρισης που μπορεί να αντιμετωπίσουν τα άτομα κατά την πρόσβαση στην υγειονομική περίθαλψη, λόγω του συνδυασμού της προσωπικής τους κατάστασης, και χαρακτηριστικών όπως η εθνοτική καταγωγή, το φύλο, η ηλικία και η αναπηρία. Είναι προφανές ότι η κατάσταση αυτή παραβιάζει την αρχή της ίσης μεταχείρισης για όλους τους ευρωπαίους πολίτες.

1. Έχει η Επιτροπή πλήρη επίγνωση αυτής της κατάστασης και των υφισταμένων ακόμη ανισοτήτων; Συμφωνεί με τα συμπεράσματα της έκθεσης του FRA;

2. Ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει για να βελτιώσει την κατάσταση αυτή και για να εξασφαλίσει ότι όλοι οι ευρωπαίοι πολίτες έχουν ίση μεταχείριση όσον αφορά το βασικό ανθρώπινο δικαίωμα τους να έχουν πρόσβαση στην υγειονομική περίθαλψη;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Απριλίου 2014)

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή γνωρίζει την έκθεση του Οργανισμού Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ, στην οποία αναφέρεται το αξιότιμο μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου, η οποία επισημαίνει σημαντικά θέματα σχετικά με την ίση μεταχείριση στον τομέα της υγειονομικής περίθαλψης.

Το πρόγραμμα της ΕΕ για την υγεία παρέχει υποστήριξη στα κράτη μέλη για την ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών και ορθών πρακτικών για τη βελτίωση της πρόσβασης σε υγειονομική περίθαλψη υψηλής ποιότητας για μετανάστες και εθνοτικές μειονότητες, για άτομα με αναπηρία και άλλα άτομα σε επισφαλή κατάσταση. Ως συνέχεια στην ανακοίνωση της ΕΕ «Αλληλεγγύη στον τομέα της υγείας», του Οκτωβρίου 2009 ([2]), διοργανώθηκαν δύο διασκέψεις στις Βρυξέλλες τον Ιανουάριο και τον Μάρτιο του 2014 για να εξετασθεί το ενδεχόμενο για περαιτέρω δράσεις επί του εν λόγω θέματος.

Επιπλέον η οδηγία 2011/24 ([3]) υποχρεώνει τα κράτη μέλη να παρέχουν πληροφορίες, μεταξύ άλλων, σχετικά με τις δυνατότητες θεραπείας και τα πρότυπα ποιότητας και ασφάλειας. Οι διατάξεις αυτές βοηθούν τους ασθενείς — ανεξαρτήτως προελεύσεως — να ενημερώνονται για τα δικαιώματά τους. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή διενεργεί ελέγχους ως προς την μεταφορά, προκειμένου να εξασφαλιστεί η ορθή εφαρμογή των διατάξεων αυτών στην εθνική νομοθεσία.

Η νομοθεσία της ΕΕ απαγορεύει τις διακρίσεις στην παροχή υπηρεσιών υγειονομικής περίθαλψης όταν αυτές βασίζονται στη φυλετική ή εθνοτική καταγωγή ([4]) και στο φύλο ([5]). Το 2008, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε μια νέα οδηγία για την απαγόρευση των διακρίσεων κατά την παροχή υπηρεσιών υγειονομικής περίθαλψης λόγω θρησκείας ή πεποιθήσεων, ηλικίας, αναπηρίας και γενετήσιου προσανατολισμού ([6]). Το εν λόγω νομοσχέδιο είναι ακόμα υπό συζήτηση στο Συμβούλιο.

([1]) http://fra.europa.eu/en/press-release/2013/more-protection-against-unequal-treatment-healthcare-needed
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/social_determinants/policy/index_en.htm
([3]) Οδηγία 2011/24/ΕΕ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου της 9ης Μαρτίου 2011 περί εφαρμογής των δικαιωμάτων των ασθενών στο πλαίσιο της διασυνοριακής υγειονομικής περίθαλψης.
([4]) Οδηγία 2000/43/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 29ης Ιουνίου 2000, περί εφαρμογής της αρχής της ίσης μεταχείρισης προσώπων ασχέτως φυλετικής ή εθνοτικής τους καταγωγής (ΕΕ L 180 της 19.7.2000, σ. 22).
([5]) Οδηγία 2004/113/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 13 Δεκεμβρίου 2004, περί εφαρμογής της αρχής της ίσης μεταχείρισης ανδρών και γυναικών στην πρόσβαση σε αγαθά και υπηρεσίες και την παροχή αυτών, ΕΕ L 373 της 21.12.2004, σ. 37.
([6]) Πρόταση οδηγίας του Συμβουλίου για την εφαρμογή της αρχής της ίσης μεταχείρισης των προσώπων ανεξαρτήτως θρησκείας ή πεποιθήσεων, αναπηρίας, ηλικίας ή γενετήσιου προσανατολισμού, Βρυξέλλες, COM(2008)426 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001874/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Equal access to healthcare for European citizens — FRA report

A report published by the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) ([1]) identifies specific barriers and forms of unequal treatment that people may face when accessing healthcare because of a combination of their personal circumstances and characteristics such as ethnic origin, gender, age and disability. It is obvious that this situation violates the principle of equal treatment for all European citizens.

1. Is the Commission fully aware of this situation and of persisting inequalities? Does it agree with the findings of the FRA report?

2. What action does it intend to take to improve this situation and to make sure that all European citizens are treated equally as regards their basic human right of access to healthcare?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The European Commission is aware of the report by the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights referred to by the Honourable Member, which highlights important issues concerning equal treatment in healthcare.

The EU Health Programme is providing support to Member States to exchange information and good practice to improve access to high quality healthcare for migrants and ethnic minorities, people with disabilities and other people in vulnerable situations. As a follow-up of the EU Communication 'Solidarity in Health' of October 2009 ([2]) two conferences have been organised in Brussels in January and March 2014 to consider possible further actions on that matter.

Furthermore Directive 2011/24 ([3]) requires Member States to provide information, amongst other things, on treatment options and quality and safety standards in place. These provisions help patients — regardless of their background — to be informed of their rights. The European Commission is currently carrying out transposition checks in order to ensure correct implementation of these provisions in national legislation.

EC law prohibits discrimination in the provision of healthcare services when it is based on racial or ethnic origin ([4]) and on gender ([5]). In 2008, the Commission proposed a new Directive to prohibit discrimination in the provision of healthcare services based on religion or belief, age, disability and sexual orientation ([6]). This draft legislation is still being discussed in the Council.

([1]) http://fra.europa.eu/en/press-release/2013/more-protection-against-unequal-treatment-healthcare-needed
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/social_determinants/policy/index_en.htm
([3]) Directive 2011/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2011 on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare.
([4]) Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, OJ L 180, 19.7.2000, p. 22.
([5]) Council Directive 2004/113/EC of 13 December 2004 implementing the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services, OJ L 373, 21.12.2004, p. 37.
([6]) Proposal for a Council Directive on implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation Brussels, COM(2008) 426 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001875/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Η κατάσταση της δημόσιας υγείας στην Κύπρο

Λόγω της εφαρμογής του μνημονίου και των απαιτήσεων της Τρόικας εφαρμόζονται σοβαρές περικοπές στις δαπάνες για την υγεία στην Κύπρο. Πολλοί πολίτες βρίσκουν όλο και δυσκολότερη την πρόσβαση σε επαρκείς ιατρικές υπηρεσίες. Την ίδια στιγμή, λόγω της σοβαρής οικονομικής κατάστασης στο νησί, το προγραμματισμένο εθνικό σύστημα υγειονομικής περίθαλψης εξακολουθεί να καθυστερεί.

1. Έχει η Επιτροπή επίγνωση της επιδεινούμενης κατάστασης της δημόσιας υγείας στηνΚύπρο;

2. Υπάρχουν ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα που θα βοηθήσουν την Κύπρο να αντιμετωπίσει τις δυσκολίες της στον τομέα της υγείας;

3. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να επιμείνει στην πλήρη εφαρμογή των πολιτικών της Τρόικας παρά το γεγονός ότι τούτο θα επιφέρει σοβαρές κοινωνικές επιπτώσεις;

4. Πώς μπορεί η ΕΕ να βοηθήσει την Κύπρο να θέσει σε λειτουργία ένα εθνικό σύστημα υγειονομικής περίθαλψης το συντομότερο δυνατόν;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Η συστηματική επιδείνωση της κατάστασης της υγείας του κυπριακού πληθυσμού δεν φαίνεται από τα διαθέσιμα δεδομένα. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει συγκεκριμένα περιστατικά και έχει καλέσει τις κυπριακές αρχές να μειώσουν τον χρόνο αναμονής για υπηρεσίες περίθαλψης στον δημόσιο τομέα.

Οι αρχές συμφώνησαν να βελτιώσουν την πρόσβαση στην περίθαλψη με την παροχή καθολικής κάλυψης στο πλαίσιο ενός εθνικού συστήματος υγείας (ΕΣΥ). Εν συντομία, για να εξασφαλιστεί η πρόσβαση για όσους έχουν ανάγκη πρέπει να επανεξεταστούν τα κριτήρια παροχής δωρεάν δημόσιας υγειονομικής περίθαλψης και να εξασφαλιστεί ότι η ίδια συμμετοχή του ασφαλισμένου για τη δημόσια υγειονομική περίθαλψη αποσκοπεί στην αποτελεσματική προστασία από καταστροφικές δαπάνες για την υγεία.

Τα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά ταμεία μπορούν να χρησιμοποιηθούν για τη βελτίωση της υποδομής της υγειονομικής περίθαλψης αλλά δεν μπορούν να χρησιμοποιηθούν άμεσα για τη χρηματοδότηση της αγοράς υπηρεσιών υγειονομικής περίθαλψης.

Δεδομένων των σημαντικών επικείμενων κινδύνων, η πλήρης και έγκαιρη εφαρμογή του προγράμματος παραμένει κεφαλαιώδους σημασίας. Η Επιτροπή κατανοεί τις κοινωνικές επιπτώσεις της κρίσης. Έχει λάβει ειδικά μέτρα εν προκειμένω, για παράδειγμα με τη σύσταση ομάδας στήριξης που έχει εντολή να συμβάλει στον μετριασμό των επιπτώσεων αυτών. Ειδικότερα, η ομάδα στήριξης συντονίζει και κινητοποιεί κονδύλια για την τεχνική βοήθεια που ζήτησαν οι κυπριακές αρχές. Στον τομέα της υγείας, συμβάλει στην εφαρμογή μιας φιλόδοξης μεταρρύθμισης για τον εκσυγχρονισμό και τη βελτίωση της ποιότητας και της αποτελεσματικότητας της παροχής υπηρεσιών υγειονομικής περίθαλψης στη χώρα και παρέχει καθολική κάλυψη στο πλαίσιο του ΕΣΥ.

Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει την υλοποίηση του ΕΣΥ μέσω διαφόρων έργων τεχνικής βοήθειας, τα οποία, μεταξύ άλλων, αφορούν τον σχεδιασμό της υποδομής ΤΠ που είναι αναγκαία για την εφαρμογή του ΕΣΥ, την ανάπτυξη κλινικών κατευθυντήριων γραμμών και τον έλεγχο της εφαρμογής τους, καθώς και τη δημιουργία ενός συστήματος για την αξιολόγηση της τεχνολογίας υγείας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001875/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Health situation in Cyprus

As a result of the application of the memorandum and demands of the Troika, severe cuts in public health expenditure are being implemented in Cyprus. Many citizens are finding it increasingly difficult to access adequate medical services. At the same time, due to the serious economic situation of the island, the planned national healthcare scheme has been further delayed.

1. Is the Commission aware of the worsening health situation in Cyprus?

2. Are there any European programmes to help Cyprus cope with its current healthcare difficulties?

3. Will the Commission insist on full implementation of the Troika policies, despite the fact that this will have serious social consequences?

4. How can the EU help Cyprus to put in place a national healthcare system as soon as possible?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(31 March 2014)

A systematic decline in the health status of the Cypriot population cannot be seen from available data. However, the Commission is aware of specific incidents and has urged the Cypriot authorities to reduce the waiting time for care services in the public sector.

The authorities have agreed to improve access to care by providing universal coverage under a National Health System (NHS). Shortly, access for those in need should be secured by reviewing criteria for free public healthcare, and ensuring that co-payments to public healthcare are set to protect effectively against catastrophic health expenditures.

European structural funds can be used to improve healthcare infrastructure but can't be used to finance directly the purchasing of healthcare services.

Given significant risks ahead, full and timely implementation of the programme remains essential. The Commission is sensitive to the social consequences of the crisis. It has taken specific measures in this regard, for example by setting up a Support Group mandated to help mitigate these consequences. In particular, the Support Group coordinates and mobilises funding for technical assistance requested by the Cypriot authorities. In the area of health, it helps to implement an ambitious reform to modernise and enhance the quality and efficiency of the provision of healthcare services in the country and provide universal coverage under a NHS.

The Commission is supporting the implementation of the NHS via several technical assistance projects, which, *inter alia*, concern the design of the IT infrastructure necessary for implementing the NHS, the development of clinical guidelines and the auditing of their implementation, and the establishment of a system for health technology assessment.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001876/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Μη καταγγελλόμενη βία κατά των γυναικών

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατη έρευνα του Οργανισμού Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ (FRA) ([1]), περίπου τα δύο τρίτα των γυναικών που πέφτουν θύματα σωματικής και/ή σεξουαλικής κακοποίησης δεν έρχονται σε επαφή με την αστυνομία ή οποιαδήποτε άλλη υπηρεσία μετά την αντιμετώπιση πολύ σοβαρών περιστατικών βίας. Το μέγεθος του προβλήματος, επομένως, συχνά παραμένει αόρατο στις επίσημες στατιστικές, γεγονός που τονίζει την ανάγκη να βελτιωθεί η ενημέρωση και η συλλογή στοιχείων σχετικά με αυτό το ζήτημα.

Η Επιτροπή καλείται να απαντήσει στις εξής ερωτήσεις:

1. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει συγκριτικά στοιχεία σχετικά με το μέγεθος του προβλήματος στα κράτη μέλη και σε ποιο βαθμό το πρόβλημα αυτό δεν γίνεται αντιληπτό ή υποτιμάται από τις επίσημες στατιστικές;

2. Έχει στη διάθεσή της η Επιτροπή στοιχεία που υποδεικνύουν ότι η οικονομική και κοινωνική κρίση που αντιμετωπίζει η Ευρώπη έχει συμβάλει στην αύξηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών;

3. Ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει προκειμένου να αντιμετωπίσει το πρόβλημα της αυξανόμενης βίας κατά των γυναικών τα τελευταία χρόνια;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Μαρτίου 2014)

Η πλήρης δέσμευση της Επιτροπής για τη στήριξη των κρατών μελών όσον αφορά την εξάλειψη της βίας κατά των γυναικών αποτυπώνεται ιδίως στον Χάρτη για τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών, τη Στρατηγική για την ισότητα μεταξύ γυναικών και ανδρών (2010-2015) ([2]), τη «δέσμη μέτρων για τα θύματα», το έργο της σχετικά με την ευρωπαϊκή εντολή προστασίας και τη σθεναρή της στάση στο ζήτημα της εξάλειψης του ακρωτηριασμού των γυναικείων γεννητικών οργάνων.

Στην προσπάθεια απόκτησης περισσότερων γνώσεων σχετικά με την εξάπλωση της βίας κατά των γυναικών και τις τάσεις του φαινομένου αυτού, η Επιτροπή διερευνά νέες δυνατότητες διεύρυνσης των συλλογών δεδομένων της Eurostat, ενώ συμμετέχει στις εργασίες του Οργανισμού Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων (FRA) και του Ευρωπαϊκού Ινστιτούτου για την Ισότητα των Φύλων (EIGE).

Το EIGE στηρίζει τα θεσμικά όργανα της ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη στις προσπάθειές τους για την καταπολέμηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών, με τη συγκέντρωση και παροχή συγκρίσιμων και αξιόπιστων δεδομένων και πόρων όσον αφορά τη βία κατά των γυναικών ([3]).

Η θέσπιση νομοθετικών μέτρων, κατά περίπτωση, η καταπολέμηση των διακρίσεων και η χειραφέτηση των γυναικών, η ανταλλαγή ορθών πρακτικών, καθώς και η ευαισθητοποίηση και η παροχή χρηματοδότησης θα παραμείνουν στο επίκεντρο των δράσεων της Επιτροπής στον τομέα αυτό.

([1]) http://fra.europa.eu/en/press-release/2014/unreported-violence-against-women-masks-true-extent-problem
([2]) COM(2010)491 τελικό, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0491:FIN:EL:PDF
([3]) Οι μελέτες του EIGE είναι διαθέσιμες στην εξής ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση: http://www.eige.europa.eu/content/activities/Gender-based-violence

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001876/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Unreported violence against women

According to a recent survey by the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) ([1]), about two thirds of female victims of physical and/or sexual violence do not contact the police or any other service after experiencing very serious incidents of violence. The magnitude of the problem therefore often remains invisible in official statistics, highlighting the need to improve awareness and data collection on the issue.

The Commission is requested to answer the following questions:

1. Can the Commission provide comparative data regarding the magnitude of the problem in Member States and showing the extent to which this remains invisible or is underestimated in official statistics?

2. Does the Commission have any data suggesting that the economic and social crisis that Europe is faced with has contributed to increased violence against women?

3. What measures does it intend to take to tackle the problem of increasing violence against women in recent years?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission's full commitment to support Member States in eliminating violence against women is seen particularly in the Women's Charter, the strategy for equality between women and men (2010-2015) ([2]), the 'victims' package', its work on the European Protection Order and its firm stance on eliminating female genital mutilation.

In order to increase knowledge about the prevalence of violence against women and the trends of this phenomenon, the Commission is exploring new possibilities to extend Eurostat data collections and is participating in the work of the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) and the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE).

EIGE supports the EU institutions and the Member States in their efforts to combat violence against women, by collecting and providing them with comparable and reliable data and resources on violence against women ([3]).

Adoption of legislative measures when appropriate, fighting against discrimination and empowering women, exchanging good practices, as well as raising awareness and providing funds will remain key actions for the Commission in this field.

([1]) http://fra.europa.eu/en/press-release/2014/unreported-violence-against-women-masks-true-extent-problem
([2]) COM(2010) 491 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0491:FIN:EN:PDF
([3]) The EIGE studies are available at: http://www.eige.europa.eu/content/activities/Gender-based-violence.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001877/14
an die Kommission
Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)
(18. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Waldüberwachung in der EU

Die EU hat das Übereinkommen über weiträumige grenzüberschreitende Luftverunreinigung (CLRTAP) unterzeichnet und ratifiziert. In der Vergangenheit wurden die Wälder über das Internationale Programm über die Zusammenarbeit bei der Messung und Bewertung der Auswirkungen der Luftverunreinigung auf die Wälder (ICP Forests) überwacht, das im Rahmen des CLRTAP der Wirtschaftskommission der Vereinten Nationen für Europa betrieben wurde. Die Finanzierung des ICP Forests ist jedoch zu einem bloßen Vorhaben verkommen, und die Mittelausstattung des Programms fällt derzeit minimal aus.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission den Bedarf an einer langfristigen Waldüberwachung im Allgemeinen und an einer ganzheitlich ausgelegten Waldüberwachung (bei der etwa die Luftverunreinigung und andere mit den Waldökosystemen zusammenhängende Probleme berücksichtigt werden) im Besonderen?

2. Wie will die Kommission ein solches Programm oder Projekt zur Waldüberwachung finanzieren?

3. Was spricht nach Auffassung der Kommission für ein Waldüberwachungsprogramm? Was spricht nach Ansicht der Kommission dafür, aus der Waldüberwachung ein Projekt zu machen?

4. Welches sind nach Auffassung der Kommission die Vor- und Nachteile einer ganzheitlichen Überwachung des Ökosystems Wald?

5. Wie will die Kommission in Bezug auf das von der EU ratifizierte CLRTAP handeln? Wie können nach Ansicht der Kommission die Ziele aus dem CLRTAP erreicht werden?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(11. April 2014)

Die Überwachung von Wäldern und Ökosystemen zur Bewertung der Auswirkungen der Luftverschmutzung spielt bei der Gesunderhaltung der Wälder eine wichtige Rolle. Jede Fortführung der langfristigen Überwachung auf internationaler Ebene, etwa im Rahmen des Übereinkommens zur weiträumigen grenzüberschreitenden Luftverschmutzung (CLRTAP), ist zu begrüßen. Die Kommission führt derzeit eine vorbereitende Maßnahme für die Waldüberwachung durch, um die Daten aus Waldinventaren zu harmonisieren. Außerdem ist sie im Begriff, ein Waldinformationssystem für Europa einzuführen, bei dem der Schwerpunkt auf Waldstörungen und Ökosystemleistungen, Klimawandel und EU-Bio-Ökonomie liegt.

Eine Finanzierung zusätzlicher Waldüberwachungsaktivitäten über die bestehenden Instrumente hinaus wird von der Kommission zurzeit nicht geplant. Im Rahmen der neuen LIFE-Verordnung ([1]) können Projekte vorrangig berücksichtigt werden, wenn sie auf Informationen aus nationalen Waldinformationsnetzen aufbauen und neue Methoden der Datenerhebung und der Berichterstattung hinsichtlich der Kriterien und Indikatoren für die nachhaltige Waldbewirtschaftung entwickeln und anwenden.

Ein Mindestmaß an langfristiger integrierter Waldüberwachung sollte durch die Mitgliedstaaten im Rahmen ihrer Verpflichtungen aus den EU-Rechtsvorschriften und dem CLRTAP sichergestellt werden. Die Kommission hat vor kurzem einen Vorschlag für einen Rechtsakt ([2]) vorgelegt, mit dem diese Überwachung für die Mitgliedstaaten verbindlich vorgeschrieben werden soll.

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1293/2013 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 11. Dezember 2013 zur Aufstellung des Programms für die Umwelt und Klimapolitik (LIFE) und zur Aufhebung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 614/2007.

([2]) Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über die Verringerung der nationalen Emissionen bestimmter Luftschadstoffe und zur Änderung der Richtlinie 2003/35/EG, KOM(2013)920 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001877/14
to the Commission
Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Forest monitoring in the EU

The EU has signed and ratified the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP). In the past, monitoring of forests was carried out via the International Cooperative Programme (ICP) on Assessment and Monitoring of Air Pollution Effects on Forests, operating under the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe CLRTAP. Recently, the financing of ICP forests became merely a project and now receives only minimal funding.

1. How does the Commission assess the need for long-term forest monitoring in general, and in particular forest monitoring that has an integral approach (e.g. one that includes air pollution and other issues related to forest ecosystems)?

2. How does the Commission plan to finance such a programme or project for the monitoring of forests?

3. In the Commission's opinion, what are the arguments in favour of a programme for forest monitoring? What are the Commission's arguments for making forest monitoring a project?

4. In the Commission's opinion, what are the pros and cons of integral forest environment monitoring?

5. How does the Commission plan to act with respect to the EU-ratified CLRTAP? In the Commission's opinion, how can the CLRTAP aims be achieved?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

Monitoring of forests and ecosystems for assessing the effects of air pollution is an important element in securing healthy forests. Any continuation of long-term forest monitoring at international level, such as the one under the LRTAP Convention, is welcome. The Commission is currently implementing a Preparatory Action on forest monitoring to harmonise data from forest inventories. It is also establishing a Forest Information System for Europe with emphasis on forest disturbances and ecosystem services, climate change and the EU bio-economy.

The Commission has currently no plans to finance additional forest monitoring beyond existing instruments. Under the new LIFE Regulation ([1]), priority may be given to projects that build on information collected by national forest information networks, and develop and implement new methods for data collection and reporting of sustainable forest management criteria and indicators.

A minimum level of long-term integrated monitoring of forests should be secured by Member States as part of their commitments under EU legislation and the LRTAP Convention. The Commission has recently proposed legislation to make such monitoring mandatory for the Member States ([2]).

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1293/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on the establishment of a Programme for the Environment and Climate Action (LIFE) and repealing Regulation (EC) No 614/2007.

([2]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the reduction of national emissions of certain atmospheric pollutants and amending Directive 2003/35/EC, COM(2013) 920 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001878/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(18 februari 2014)

Betreft: Europees Openbaar Ministerie weggestemd (follow-up)

In haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-013914/2013 verwees de Commissie naar de mogelijkheid dat voor het Europees Openbaar Ministerie (European Public Prosecutor's Office, EPPO) een procedure wordt opgestart van nauwere samenwerking.

1. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat oprichting van het EPPO via nauwere samenwerking een geheel andere procedure zou zijn, zodat een nieuw voorstel moet worden ingediend?

2. Is de Commissie het eens met de zienswijze dat, zelfs als de bepalingen inzake nauwere samenwerking worden nageleefd, het subsidiariteitsbeginsel nog steeds wordt geschonden?

3. Hoe zou de Commissie in het nieuwe voorstel rekening houden met de bezwaren die de nationale parlementen hebben geformuleerd in hun met redenen omklede adviezen?

4. Welke argumenten die de lidstaten in deze adviezen hebben aangevoerd zouden in het nieuwe voorstel worden opgenomen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(14 april 2014)

Zoals beschreven in de mededeling van 27 november 2013 is de Commissie van oordeel dat het voorstel van 17 juli 2013 in overeenstemming is met het subsidiariteitsbeginsel. De Commissie is van mening dat een eventuele nauwere samenwerking geen afbreuk zou doen aan haar analyse inzake subsidiariteit.

De standpunten van nationale parlementen komen aan bod in het kader van de lopende onderhandelingen in de Raad op grond van het voorstel van de Commissie van 17 juli 2013. Op dit moment kan de Commissie niet voorzien in welke mate de wetgever rekening zal houden met de bezwaren die door de nationale parlementen zijn geformuleerd in hun met redenen omklede adviezen, noch in welke mate die van invloed zullen zijn op de onderhandelingen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001878/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: European Public Prosecutor's Office voted down (follow-up)

In its answer to Written Question E-013914/2013, the Commission referred to the possible establishment of an enhanced cooperation procedure for the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO).

1. Does the Commission agree that establishing the EPPO through an enhanced cooperation procedure would be an entirely different process and would thus require a new proposal?

2. Does the Commission share the view that, even if the provisions on enhanced cooperation were complied with, the principle of subsidiarity would still be breached?

3. How would the Commission, in this new proposal, take into consideration the objections raised by national parliaments in their reasoned opinions?

4. Can the Commission specify which of the arguments set out in the Member States' reasoned opinions would actually be incorporated into the new proposal?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

As set out in the communication of 27 November 2013, it is the Commission's view that the proposal dated 17 July 2013 complies with the principle of subsidiarity. The Commission considers that the eventuality of enhanced cooperation would not affect its subsidiarity analysis.

The positions of national Parliaments are being considered in the framework of the ongoing Council negotiations on the basis of the Commission proposal of 17 July 2013. At this point in time, the Commission cannot anticipate how the objections raised by national parliaments in their reasoned opinions will be taken into account by the legislature and to what extent they will affect those negotiations.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-001879/14
a la Comisión
Carmen Romero López (S&D)
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Tragedia en la playa del Tarajal: Actuación del Gobierno de España y presión migratoria

El 6 de febrero se producía en Ceuta un nuevo intento de asalto a la frontera que acabó cobrándose la vida de 15 inmigrantes, ahogados en la playa del Tarajal.

Tras la comparecencia en el congreso del Ministro del Interior en España el pasado jueves quedan confirmadas:

— la utilización de pelotas de goma contra los inmigrantes y

— la práctica de la «devolución en caliente» sin respeto alguno de los derechos humanos ni del ordenamiento jurídico español, comunitario e internacional.

La propia Comisaria de Interior, Cecilia Malmström, ha manifestado su preocupación por estos hechos.

¿En qué acciones concretas va a traducirse esta preocupación por parte de la Comisión respecto a la actuación del gobierno español?

¿No piensa la Comisión que ante esta gravísima violación de los derechos humanos y del propio acervo comunitario en materia de inmigración y asilo en un país miembro de la UE deben depurarse responsabilidades y actuar para que esto no vuelva a suceder?

Las ciudades de Ceuta y Melilla se enfrentan desde hace meses al aumento de una fuerte presión migratoria que mantiene en alerta constante a las fuerzas y cuerpos de seguridad del Estado. Ayer mismo se produjo una nueva avalancha en Melilla con la entrada de 150 subsaharianos.

¿Qué medidas piensa adoptar la Comisión para apoyar y resolver esta fuerte presión migratoria en la frontera sur de Europa y evitar que una tragedia como la de Ceuta vuelva a suceder?

¿Está satisfecha la Comisión de los resultados de las medidas adoptadas a lo largo de esta legislatura para responder a los movimientos migratorios resultantes, entre otros, de la llamada primavera árabe?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de marzo de 2014)

En respuesta a la solicitud de explicaciones sobre el incidente de Ceuta por parte de la Comisión, las autoridades españolas confirmaron que habían puesto en marcha una investigación completa. La Comisión seguirá atentamente la evolución del asunto.

Por lo que se refiere a la devolución inmediata de emigrantes, España decidió, de conformidad con el artículo 2, apartado 2, letra a), de la Directiva de retorno ([1]), no aplicar esta Directiva a los nacionales de terceros países que hubieran cruzado la frontera ilegalmente. No obstante, España debe seguir garantizando un nivel mínimo de protección y respetar el principio de no devolución (artículo 4, apartado 4, de la Directiva). La Comisión se reserva el derecho de tomar las medidas adecuadas en el caso de que haya pruebas de que un Estado miembro ha infringido el Derecho de la UE.

La presión migratoria en Ceuta es parte de un fenómeno más amplio provocado por la inestabilidad en los países vecinos de la UE. La UE aborda esta situación aplicando el plan de acción de la UE frente a las presiones migratorias, así como las 37 acciones operativas derivadas de la labor del Grupo Especial para el Mediterráneo. La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su Comunicación de 4 de diciembre de 2013 sobre la labor del Grupo Especial para el Mediterráneo ([2]).

Las medidas adoptadas durante la presente legislatura reflejan el compromiso de la Comisión de abordar los retos que representa el aumento de los flujos migratorios. En el ámbito de la gestión de fronteras, cabe citar entr dichas medidas el Sistema Europeo de Vigilancia de Fronteras (Eurosur), que empezó a funcionar el 2 de diciembre de 2013, y las normas sobre operaciones marinas coordinadas por Frontex, que se adoptarán próximamente. A este respecto, se establecerán normas vinculantes sobre las operaciones de Frontex en lo que se refiere a la interceptación, la búsqueda y rescate y el desembarque. El próximo informe anual sobre el asilo y la migración presentará un panorama general de las medidas adoptadas en esos ámbitos a fin de hacer frente a los retos mencionados.

([1]) 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. 98-107).
([2]) COM(2013) 869 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001879/14
to the Commission
Carmen Romero López (S&D)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Tragedy on El Tarajal beach: response of the Spanish Government and migratory pressure

On 6 February 2014 a new mass attempt to breach the frontier took place in Ceuta, in which 15 immigrants drowned off the beach of El Tarajal.

During the subsequent address by the Interior Minister to the Spanish Congress on 13 February, it was confirmed that:

— rubber bullets were used against the immigrants;

— they were returned on the spot, without any respect for their human rights or provisions under Spanish, Community or international law.

The Commissioner for Home Affairs, Cecilia Malmström, has expressed her concern at these facts.

How will this concern be translated into concrete action on the part of the Commission in response to Spain's behaviour?

Does the Commission not feel that, in light of this extremely serious violation of human rights and the Community *acquis* with respect to immigration and asylum in EU Member States, responsibility should be determined and action taken to ensure that such events do not recur?

For months, the cities of Ceuta and Melilla have been experiencing a strong surge in migratory pressure, keeping the state's security forces and bodies on permanent alert. Only yesterday, 150 sub-Saharan immigrants managed to cross the border as part of another human avalanche.

What measures does the Commission intend to take to support and find a solution to this heavy migratory pressure on Europe's southern borders and to prevent further tragedies like the one in Ceuta taking place?

Is the Commission satisfied with the results of the measures adopted throughout this legislature in response to these migratory flows which have, in part, resulted from the Arab Spring?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

In response to the Commission's request for explanations about the incident in Ceuta, the Spanish authorities confirmed that they have launched a full inquiry. The Commission will closely monitor further developments.

As regards the summary return of migrants, Spain decided, in compliance with Article 2(2)(a) of the Return Directive ([1]), not to apply this directive to third-country nationals having crossed the borders illegally. However, Spain must still ensure a minimum level of protection and respect the principle of *non-refoulement* (Article 4(4) of the directive). The Commission reserves the right to take appropriate steps where there is evidence that a Member State has violated EC law.

The migratory pressure in Ceuta is part of a wider phenomenon generated by instability in the EU neighbourhood. The EU addresses this by implementing the EU Action Plan on Migratory Pressure, as well as the 37 operational actions emerging from the work of the Task Force Mediterranean. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its communication of 4 December 2013 on the work of the Task Force Mediterranean ([2]).

The measures adopted during this legislature reflect the Commission's commitment to address the challenges of growing migratory flows. In the area of border management, this includes the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur), which became operational on 2 December 2013, and the rules for sea operations coordinated by Frontex which are to be adopted shortly. This measure will establish binding rules for Frontex operations as regards interception, search and rescue and disembarkation. The next Annual report on Asylum and Migration will provide an overview of measures adopted in the area of migration and asylum to address the above challenges.

([1]) 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.
([2]) COM(2013) 869 final.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-001880/14
do Komisji
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(18 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Skuteczność całkowitego zakaz uboju rytualnego na terenie Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej

W nawiązaniu do odpowiedzi Komisji Europejskiej na poprzednie pytanie dotyczące skuteczności całkowitego zakazu uboju rytualnego na terenie Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej, pragnę sprecyzować stan faktyczny i zważyć, co następuje:

— art. 34 ust. 1 Ustawy z dn. 21 sierpnia 1997 r. o ochronie zwierząt (Dz.U. z 2013 r. poz. 856 – tekst jednolity) stanowi, iż „zwierzę kręgowe w ubojni może zostać uśmiercone tylko po uprzednim pozbawieniu świadomości przez osoby posiadające odpowiednie kwalifikacje". Ustawa nie przewiduje wyjątków od ww. przepisu, jednoznacznie zakazując uboju rytualnego na terenie RP;

— co więcej, art. 35 ust. 1 ustawy o ochronie zwierząt przewiduje sankcje karne za nieprzestrzeganie powyższej normy w postaci grzywny, kary ograniczenia wolności albo pozbawienia wolności do lat 2;

— skutkiem wspomnianych regulacji jest niemożność praktykowania istotnych obrzędów religijnych przez mniejszości religijne w Polsce, w szczególności:

  — muzułmanów, spożywającej mięso halal,

  — osób wyznania mojżeszowego, spożywających mięso koszerne;

— według różnych danych statystycznych zakaz uboju rytualnego uniemożliwia praktyki religijne na terenie RP kilku-kilkunastu tysiącom obywateli Polski i Unii Europejskiej wyznających islam i judaizm;

— w kwestii powiadomienia Komisji Europejskiej przez władze RP o niedopuszczalności uboju rytualnego na terenie Polski wskazać należy, iż uznanie aktu notyfikacyjnego Ministra jako aktu normatywnego jest w oczywisty sposób niedopuszczalne, jako łamiące szereg podstawowych zasad obowiązujących w każdym współczesnym państwie prawa, jako akt normatywny nie ujęty w zamkniętym katalogu powszechnie obowiązujących aktów normatywnych z art. 87 Konstytucji RP;

— wobec braku podjęcia działań przez ustawodawcę, działanie Ministra Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi, który samym aktem notyfikacji, jakim było pismo z dnia 27 grudnia 2012 r., mógłby zmieniać, ustanawiać i uchylać obowiązujące przepisy, należy uznać za naruszenie konstytucyjnych podstaw ustroju państwa, jakim jest zasada trójpodziału władzy, a zatem nie można go uznać za prawnie skuteczne;

Mając na uwadze powyższe, ponawiam następujące pytania:

1. Czy całkowity zakaz uboju rytualnego bez uprzedniego ogłuszenia może być uznany za regulację służącą zapewnieniu „dalej idącej ochrony zwierząt" w rozumieniu art. 26 ust. 1 Rozporządzenia?

2. Czy całkowity zakaz uboju rytualnego pozostaje w zgodzie z art. 10 Karty praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej?

3. Czy pismo Ministra Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi z dnia 27 grudnia 2012 r. spełnia warunki wynikające z art. 26 ust. 1 Rozporządzenia i umożliwia Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej powołanie się na całkowity zakaz uboju rytualnego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(24 marca 2014 r.)

Komisja pragnie podziękować Panu Posłowi za dodatkowe informacje w odniesieniu do poprzedniego zapytania nr P-13797/2013.

Komisja nie może jednak udzielić bardziej szczegółowej odpowiedzi. Komisja otrzymała skargę przeciwko władzom Polski w związku z wprowadzonym przez nie zakazem dokonywania uboju bez ogłuszania. Służby Komisji analizują obecnie tę skargę. Do czasu zakończenia tej pracy Komisja nie zajmie ostatecznego stanowiska.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001880/14
to the Commission
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Validity of outright ban on ritual slaughter in Poland

Further to the Commission's answer to my earlier question on the validity of an outright ban on ritual slaughter in Poland, I would like to clarify the situation by adding the following:

— Article 34(1) of the Act of 21 August 1997 on the protection of animals (consolidated text, Polish Official Journal 2103, item 856, as amended) provides that 'vertebrate animals may only be killed in a slaughterhouse after being rendered unconscious by a person with the relevant qualifications'. The Act does not provide for exceptions to the above rule explicitly prohibiting ritual slaughter in Poland;

— moreover, Article 35(1) of the Act on the protection of animals lays down criminal penalties for non-compliance in the form of a fine, restricted freedom or up to two years imprisonment;

— the effect of these rules is to make it impossible for religious minorities in Poland to observe their religious rites, in particular for:

  — Muslims who eat halal meat,

  — people of the Jewish faith who eat kosher meat,

— according to statistics, this ban on ritual slaughter makes the observance of religious practice in Poland impossible for several thousand Polish and EU citizens of Islamic or Jewish faith;

— on the question of the Polish authorities notifying the Commission about the illegality of ritual slaughter in Poland, it should be pointed out that the Minister's act of notification clearly cannot be deemed a normative act since it infringes a number of binding fundamental principles of any modern state based on the rule of law, as a normative act is not included in the exhaustive list of universally binding law under Article 87 of the Polish Constitution;

— in the absence of action by the legislator, the action taken by the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, which could have the effect of amending or abolishing existing provisions or of laying down new provisions, by means of an act of notification, which is what the letter dated 27 December 2012 was, should be regarded as a violation of the constitutional basis of the political system, which is the principle of separation of powers, and therefore it cannot be regarded as legally enforceable.

In light of the above:

1. Can an outright ban on ritual slaughter without prior stunning be considered a measure 'aimed at ensuring more extensive protection of animals' within the meaning of Article 26(1) of the above regulation?

2. Is such a ban in keeping with Article 10 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union?

3. Did the letter of 27 December 2012 from the Polish Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development meet the requirements laid down in Article 26(1) of the regulation, thus enabling Poland to maintain the outright ban on ritual slaughter?

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

The Commission would like to thank the Honourable Member for this additional information further to his previous question No P-13797/2013.

However, the Commission cannot be more specific. The Commission has received a complaint against the Polish authorities regarding their ban on slaughter without stunning. The Commission services are currently assessing this complaint. Until this work is completed, the Commission will not take any final position.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001881/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Comité Ético ad hoc

El Comité Ético tiene que velar por que las políticas de la Unión Europea se ajusten a la ética y la buena gobernanza. Sus miembros tienen que ser personas independientes y con una impecable carrera profesional que les acredite para poder cumplir con solidez e integridad sus funciones dentro de dicho comité.

Sin embargo, la Comisión ha renovado a reconocidos «lobbistas» que se cuentan entre los afectados por la llamada «puerta giratoria», como es el caso de Michel Petite, que tras trabajar durante más de diez años para las instituciones europeas, especialmente para la Comisión Europea, pasó a trabajar para la firma de abogados Clifford Chance LLP, y como parte de esta es asesor principal de Philip Morris International, tal y como denuncia la ONG Alter-EU ([1]).

La falta de respeto por parte de la Comisión de la ética y la buena gobernanza agudizan la falta de legitimidad democrática de la UE y suponen otro golpe a la confianza de la ciudadanía en las instituciones. La falta de rigor en el nombramiento de los miembros del comité daña y debilita la imagen y la función del mismo y ponen en riesgo la credibilidad de la ética institucional de la UE. A la par, la falta de transparencia supone un elemento más de falta de legitimidad democrática.

¿Se plantea la Comisión rectificar y renovar a todos los miembros del comité que sean susceptibles de no ser independientes e imparciales? ¿Participará de ahora en adelante el Parlamento Europeo en la elección y renovación de los miembros? ¿Se publicarán la agenda, los órdenes del día y todas las deliberaciones, acuerdos y trabajos del comité?

Respuesta del Sr. Barroso en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de marzo de 2014)

Las acusaciones de falta de respeto de las normas éticas y de buena gobernanza no tienen fundamento. El mandato del Comité de Ética se especifica en los puntos 1.2 y 2.3 del Código de Conducta de los Comisarios ([2]). Se refiere a la compatibilidad de las actividades de los antiguos Comisarios después de finalizar su mandato y a cuestiones generales relacionadas con el Código de Conducta de los Comisarios.

Los miembros del Comité de Ética *ad hoc* de la Comisión se eligen en función de sus competencias, experiencia y cualidades profesionales. Los nombra la Comisión por su integridad, independencia e imparcialidad ([3]). Este Comité no está implicado en la definición de las políticas e iniciativas de la Comisión y tampoco se le consulta sobre las mismas.

([1]) http://www.alter-eu.org/documents/2013/01/14/transparency-campaigners-challenge-the-decision-to-renew-the-mandate-of-the
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/pdf/code_conduct_en.pdf — C(2011)26904.
([3]) C (2003) 3750.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001881/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Ad hoc ethics committee

The task of the ethics committee is to ensure that EU policies are ethical and conform to standards of good governance. Its members must be individuals with an impeccable career record demonstrating their ability to perform their duties within the committee reliably and with integrity.

However, the Commission has reappointed known lobbyists, who are among those benefiting from the 'revolving door', as in the case of Michel Petite, who worked for more than 10 years in the European institutions, notably the Commission, before going to work for the law firm Clifford Chance, where he is now the principal consultant for Philip Morris International, according to the NGO Alter-EU ([1]).

The Commission's lack of respect for ethics and good governance is exacerbating the lack of democratic legitimacy of the EU and is another blow to public confidence in the institutions. The lack of transparency in the appointment of the committee members is damaging and weakening the image and purpose of the committee and jeopardising the credibility of the EU's institutional ethics. This lack of transparency only serves to emphasise the lack of democratic legitimacy.

Will the Commission consider removing and replacing all the committee members who are not likely to be independent and impartial? Will the European Parliament be involved in future in the election and replacement of members? Will the schedule, agendas and all the deliberations, agreements and work of the committee be published?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(28 mars 2014)

Les accusations de manque de respect des règles éthiques et de bonne gouvernance ne sont pas fondées. Le mandat du Comité Ethique est précisé aux points 1.2 et 2.3 du Code de conduite des Commissaires ([2]). Il porte sur la compatibilité des activités post mandat des anciens Commissaires et sur des questions générales liées au Code de conduite des Commissaires.

Les membres du Comité éthique ad Hoc de la Commission sont choisis en fonction de leur compétence, expérience et qualités professionnelles. Ils sont nommés par la Commission en raison de leur intégrité, leur indépendance et leur impartialité ([3]). Ce comité n'est pas impliqué, ni consulté dans la définition des politiques et initiatives de la Commission.

([1]) http://www.alter-eu.org/documents/2013/01/14/transparency-campaigners-challenge-the-decision-to-renew-the-mandate-of-the
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/pdf/code_conduct_en.pdf — C(2011)26904.
([3]) C(2003) 3750.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001882/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Registro de grupos de interés

En 2008 se creó un registro de grupos de interés voluntario para «mantener la calidad de la democracia» y para que estos grupos lleven a cabo su actividad con transparencia y cumpliendo los principios éticos, evitando presiones indebidas a los responsables de las decisiones y accesos ilegítimos a la información ([1]).

Asimismo existe un código de buenas prácticas que tan solo presenta como sanción de incumplimiento la expulsión del registro voluntario o la no publicidad en el mismo, así como perder el derecho de acceso al Parlamento Europeo ([2]).

Los grupos de presión y de interés tienen una presencia e influencia muy importante en la Unión Europea, pero existen importantes diferencias en la influencia dispar que puede ejercer la ciudadanía frente a, por ejemplo, grandes corporaciones o empresas. Esta falta de equidad en las relaciones con las instituciones europeas es lo que lleva al desequilibrio que relega a una posición menor a la mayor parte de la sociedad. Sin igualdad en la manera en que la institución se dirige a la ciudadanía, no se puede hablar de democracia.

En la actualidad asistimos a importantes movimientos de presión en normativas como la relativa a la protección de datos, la Directiva del tabaco o la política energética.

¿Qué opina la Comisión de esta situación? ¿Estaría a favor de convertir en obligatorio el registro de los grupos de interés? En caso negativo ¿cómo lo justifica, especialmente cuando países como los Estados Unidos sí tienen un registro obligatorio? ¿Se establecerían para el registro mecanismos de seguimiento, información e identificación de los grupos de interés?

Respuesta del Sr. Šefčovič en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión se compromete a mantener un elevado nivel de transparencia. El Parlamento Europeo y la Comisión dirigen conjuntamente un registro de grupos de interés («Registro de transparencia») y representantes de ambas instituciones componen un grupo de trabajo de alto nivel que elaboró en diciembre de 2013 una versión revisada del acuerdo interinstitucional correspondiente cuya aprobación oficial está en curso. En este contexto, las instituciones acordaron mantener el carácter voluntario del registro en esta fase, con el fin de mantenerse abiertas al diálogo con todos los interesados, independientemente de su estatus o su participación en el registro. El nuevo acuerdo permite reforzar los incentivos para adherirse al registro e implica también la mejora de los controles de calidad de la información proporcionada por los solicitantes de registro.

El Registro de transparencia incluye ya más de 6 300 entidades y su extenso ámbito de aplicación abarca todo tipo de representantes de intereses. Este es un reflejo de la realidad de los grupos de presión a escala de la UE, un caso único en el mundo. Puede encontrar más información sobre el funcionamiento del registro en su sitio web ([3]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/transparency-register/about-register/transparency-register/index_es.htm
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=RULES-EP&reference=20070903&secondRef=ANN-09&language=ES
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/info/homePage.do?locale=es#es

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001882/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Register of interest groups

In 2008 a voluntary register of interest groups was set up in order to 'maintain the quality of democracy' and so that these lobbies should carry out their activities transparently, with due respect for ethical principles and avoiding undue pressure on decision-makers or illegitimate access to information ([1]).

There is also a code of good practice, whose only punishment for non-compliance is expulsion from, or non-inclusion in, the voluntary register and loss of the right of access to the European Parliament ([2]).

Pressure groups and lobbies have a very significant presence and influence in the European Union, but there are important differences between the unequal influence a citizen can exert and that of the large corporations and businesses, for instance. This lack of equity in relations with European institutions gives rise to an imbalance that relegates most of society to an inferior position. Without equality in the manner in which the institutions deal with citizens there cannot be true democracy.

We are currently experiencing important movements of pressure in relation to legislation on such issues as data protection, the directive on tobacco and energy policy.

What is the Commission's opinion on this situation? Would it be in favour of making the registration of interest groups compulsory? If not, why not, particularly when there are countries such as the USA that do have compulsory registration? Would mechanisms of information, identification and monitoring of interest groups be set up for the register?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

The Commission is committed to a high level of transparency. The European Parliament and the Commission run jointly a register of interest groups ('Transparency Register'). A high level working group (consisting of representatives of both institutions) prepared a revised version of the related interinstitutional agreement in December 2013. Formal approval of the revised agreement is currently ongoing. In this context the institutions agreed to maintain the voluntary nature of the Register at this stage in order to remain open to dialogue with all stakeholders, regardless of their status or participation in the Register. The new agreement will allow to strengthen further the incentives to join the register. It will also entail enhanced quality checks of the information provided by registrants.

Already today, the Transparency Register includes over 6 300 entities and its wide scope covers all types of interest representatives. This is a reflection of the lobbying reality at EU level and makes it unique in the world. Ample information about the functioning of the register is provided at a dedicated website ([3]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/transparency-register/about-register/transparency-register/index_es.htm
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=RULES-EP&reference=20070903&secondRef=ANN-09&language=ES
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/info/homePage.do

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001883/14
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Exposición de la banca alemana, francesa y holandesa a la deuda griega

Según informaciones de distintos medios de comunicación sobre de las actas de las reuniones del Fondo Monetario Internacional celebradas en mayo de 2010, los Gobiernos de Alemania, Francia y los Países Bajos se comprometieron a asegurar que sus bancos mantendrían la exposición a la deuda griega.

Se calcula que, en el primer trimestre de 2010, antes del primer rescate a Grecia, los bancos de los tres países habían acumulado más de 122 000 millones de dólares en exposición a la deuda helena. Sin embargo, comenzaron a reducir en 2010 su exposición a la deuda helena a un ritmo veloz; se estima que a finales del año pasado esta cifra se habría reducido en un 72 %, no superando los 34 000 millones.

¿Puede la Comisión confirmar esta información? ¿Ha evaluado el impacto que estos compromisos, así como su ruptura, tuvieron en el desarrollo de los acontecimientos en relación a la crisis de deuda soberana en la zona del euro? ¿No cree que la reducción drástica de la exposición a la deuda helena por parte de los bancos de los Estados miembros citados contribuyó a exacerbar la crisis? ¿Considera la Comisión que, a la luz de los datos, se produjo un reparto justo de la carga entre acreedores y contribuyentes?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión no hace comentarios sobre documentos difundidos a raíz de supuestas filtraciones.

La información detallada acerca de la aplicación del programa de ajuste macroeconómico en Grecia, incluida la participación del sector privado, figura en los informes publicados periódicamente en:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001883/14
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Exposure of German, French and Dutch banks to Greek debt

According to various media reports regarding the minutes of meetings of the International Monetary Fund held in May 2010, the governments of Germany, France and the Netherlands undertook to guarantee that their banks would maintain their exposure to Greek debt.

It has been calculated that in the first quarter of 2010, before the first Greek bailout, these three countries' banks had accumulated over 122 000 million dollars in exposure to Greek debt. However, that same year they then began to reduce their exposure at a vertiginous rate, and it is estimated that by the end of last year the amount of their debt had been reduced by 72%, to no more than 34 000 million.

Can the Commission confirm this information? Has it evaluated the impact that such undertakings and/or breach thereof caused in the evolution of events in relation to the eurozone sovereign debt crisis? Is it not of the view that the drastic reduction of exposure to Greek debt by the banks of the aforesaid Member States contributed to exacerbating the crisis? Does the Commission consider that, in the light of the above data, there was a fair distribution of the burden between creditors and taxpayers?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

The Commission does not comment on allegedly leaked documents.

Detailed information regarding the implementation of the macroeconomic adjustment programme in Greece, including on private sector involvement, can be found in reports published regularly at:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001884/14
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D), Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D) y Alejandro Cercas (S&D)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Ámbito de aplicación del impuesto sobre las transacciones financieras

Según diversas informaciones, el Gobierno de España planteará ante el Ecofin limitar el alcance del impuesto sobre transacciones financieras, cuyo establecimiento se discute en un procedimiento de cooperación reforzada. Se trataría de limitarlo a transacciones de acciones de grandes empresas, apartándose de la propuesta inicial de la Comisión que contemplaba el gravamen de transacciones de todas las acciones, bonos y derivados. Esta posición pretende justificarse en que un ámbito más amplio del impuesto podría tener un impacto negativo sobre las posiciones de la deuda española y podría distorsionar el funcionamiento del mercado.

¿Comparte la Comisión estas apreciaciones? ¿Considera que su propuesta compromete las posiciones de deuda pública de los Estados miembros y puede distorsionar el funcionamiento de los mercados financieros? ¿Valora positivamente este sustancial recorte en el ámbito de aplicación de la tasa sobre las transacciones financieras? ¿Apoya que este tipo de operaciones siga contando con un privilegio fiscal y que la carga no soportada por la industria y los usuarios financieros deba trasladarse al resto de la industria y usuarios no financieros y, en general, al resto de los contribuyentes? ¿Teme que un privilegio de esta naturaleza constituya un incentivo para la hipertrofia del sector financiero y las operaciones especulativas a corto plazo? ¿Le parece justo que la industria financiera no asuma contribuir al sostenimiento de las cargas fiscales ocasionadas por la crisis financiera?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión recomienda a Sus Señorías que se remitan a la evaluación de impacto publicada junto con la propuesta de Directiva del Consejo por la que se intensifica la cooperación en relación con el impuesto sobre las transacciones financieras ([1]), en la que se analizan también las ventajas e inconvenientes de las distintas opciones de actuación, incluidas las indicadas por Sus Señorías.

([1]) SWD (2013) 28 final de 16 de febrero de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001884/14
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D), Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D) and Alejandro Cercas (S&D)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Scope of application of the financial transaction tax

According to various reports, the Spanish Government plans to propose to the Ecofin that the scope of application of the financial transaction tax, the establishment of which is being discussed in the ambit of an enhanced cooperation process, should be restricted. Its proposal would be to limit the tax to transactions involving the shares of large corporations, in contrast with the Commission's original proposal to tax all transactions involving shares, bonds and derivatives. The government seeks to justify this position with the argument that a wider scope of application of the tax might have a negative impact on Spanish debt levels and distort the functioning of the market.

Does the Commission share this view? Does it consider that its proposal compromises the public debt levels of Member States and may distort the functioning of financial markets? Does it view as positive such a substantial diminishment of the scope of application of the financial transaction tax? Does it support the fact that this kind of operation continues to enjoy fiscal privileges and that the burden not borne by this industry and financial users has to be transposed to the rest of industry and non-financial users and, in general, to other tax-payers? Is it concerned that a privilege of this nature represents an incentive for the financial sector and short-term speculative operations to hypertrophy? Does it consider fair the fact that the financial industry does not assume any contribution towards bearing the fiscal burdens caused by the financial crisis?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(1 April 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Members to the impact assessment published alongside the proposal for a Council Directive implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of financial transaction tax ([1]) that also analyses the pros and cons of different policy options, including those referred to by the Honourable Members.

([1]) SWD (2013) 28 final of 16 February 2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001885/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Directiva 2011/24/UE en el Estado español

En referencia a la pregunta E-012379/2013 el Sr. Borg respondió en nombre de la Comisión: «El plazo para la transposición de la Directiva 2011/24/UE, relativa a la aplicación de los derechos de los pacientes en la asistencia sanitaria transfronteriza ([1]), al ordenamiento jurídico nacional expiró el 25 de octubre de 2013. La Comisión no recibió dentro del plazo las notificaciones de transposición de los veintiocho Estados miembros».

Pasados dos meses de la respuesta de la Comisión, ¿ha transpuesto el Estado español esta Directiva?

En caso negativo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto tomar la Comisión para que este Estado miembro cumpla con la normativa europea?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de marzo de 2014)

España ha notificado a la Comisión sus medidas nacionales por las que se transpone la Directiva 2011/24/UE, relativa a la aplicación de los derechos de los pacientes en la asistencia sanitaria transfronteriza ([2]).

La Comisión está realizando actualmente un análisis detallado de si dichas medidas transponen plena y adecuadamente las de la Directiva. Si la Comisión considera que las medidas nacionales notificadas no transponen adecuadamente la Directiva, recurrirá a los procedimientos previstos en el Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea por lo que respecta a la no transposición de la legislación de la UE.

([1]) DO L 88 de 4.4.2011.
([2]) DO L 88 de 4.4.2011, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001885/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Directive 2011/24/EU in Spain

With reference to Question E-012379/2013 Mr Borg replied on behalf of the Commission as follows: 'Directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare ([1]) was due to be transposed into national law by 25 October 2013. The Commission did not receive transposition notifications from all 28 Member States by the deadline.'

Two months have now passed since the Commission's answer. Has the Spanish Government transposed this directive?

If not, what measures does the Commission intend to adopt to ensure that this Member State complies with EU legislation?

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

Spain has notified to the Commission its national measures transposing Directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare ([2]).

The Commission is currently carrying out a detailed assessment of whether these measures fully and adequately transpose the measures contained within the directive. Where the Commission believes that the notified national measures do not adequately transpose the directive, it will have recourse to the procedures laid down in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union with regard to failure to transpose EU legislation.

([1]) DO L 88 of 4.4.2011.
([2]) OJ L 88, 4.4.2011.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001886/14
an die Kommission
Othmar Karas (PPE) und Paul Rübig (PPE)
(19. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Strategieplan für die pharmazeutische Industrie und Preisgestaltung im Binnenmarkt

Kommissionspräsident Barroso hat in seiner Rede zur Lage der Europäischen Union 2012 die Wichtigkeit der pharmazeutischen Industrie für Europas Wirtschaftswachstum betont und eine neue Industriepolitik in Aussicht gestellt.

Weiterhin hat sich die Europäische Kommission in ihrer Kommunikation Industriepolitik vom Oktober 2012 dazu verpflichtet, einen Strategieplan spezifisch für den pharmazeutischen Sektor zu entwickeln, in dem wichtige Themen unserer Zeit, wie Wettbewerbsfähigkeit, Anpassung der Gesetzgebung an pharmazeutische Neuentwicklungen sowie Verzerrungen im Binnenmarkt bei der Preisgestaltung, die Ungleichheiten im Zugang zu innovativen Medikamenten nach sich ziehen, angesprochen werden sollen.

1. Wird die Kommission diesen wichtigen Strategieplan, wie angekündigt, vor Ende der Amtszeit veröffentlichen, so dass diese Themen von der neuen Kommission prioritär und zügig behandelt und mit dem Europäischen Parlament verhandelt werden können?

Nach Aussage des EU Industrial R & D Scoreboard von 2013 investiert der pharmazeutische Sektor (inklusive Biotechnologie) am meisten in Forschung und Entwicklung. Gleichzeitig wird das wirtschaftliche Umfeld für pharmazeutische Unternehmen durch zur Kostenbegrenzung eingeführte Praktiken wie die internationale Preisreferenzierung zunehmend unberechenbarer. Das wirkt sich abträglich auf den Forschungsstandort Europa aus und hat außerdem negative Konsequenzen für den Zugang zu Medikamenten in manchen Mitgliedstaaten.

2. Wird sich die Kommission angesichts der oben beschriebenen Situation dieser Problematik in ihrem Strategieplan annehmen und Lösungswege aufzeigen?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(7. April 2014)

1. Die Kommission hat die Bedeutung der pharmazeutischen Industrie für die europäische Wirtschaft stets anerkannt. Der Erhalt der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der pharmazeutischen Industrie ist grundlegend für die Verwirklichung der Ziele von Europa 2020.

Mit der angekündigten Initiative soll ein Prozess in Gang gesetzt werden, der zur langfristigen Wirtschaftsfähigkeit der pharmazeutischen Industrie in der EU beiträgt und einen besseren Zugang zu Arzneimitteln für die europäischen Bürger gewährleistet.

Die Kommission arbeitet derzeit an einem Dokument, in dem die wichtigsten Herausforderungen des Wirtschaftszweigs und die Bereiche ermittelt werden, auf die künftig eingegangen werden sollte.

Der Prozess zum Thema Verantwortung der Unternehmen im Bereich Arzneimittel, der im Oktober 2013 abgeschlossen wurde, hat mit den Boden für die Identifizierung von Themen von besonderem Interesse bereitet, wie Biosimilars, Vereinbarungen über den kontrollierten Markteintritt, Arzneimittel für seltene Leiden oder Ethik und Transparenz in diesem strategischen Wirtschaftsbereich.

2. Die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der europäischen pharmazeutischen Industrie wird auf vielfältige Weise politisch bestimmt. Eine wichtige Rolle spielen dabei die Preisfestsetzung und die Kostenerstattung. Zudem sei daran erinnert, dass die Festlegung der Gesundheitspolitik und die Organisation und Bereitstellung von Gesundheitsdiensten und medizinischer Versorgung in die nationale Zuständigkeit fallen.

Da jedoch Maßnahmen von Mitgliedstaaten extraterritoriale Auswirkungen haben, wird ein umfassender Ansatz für notwendig erachtet, um relevante politische Maßnahmen, auch Fragen der Preisfestsetzung und der Kostenerstattung, in Angriff nehmen zu können. Hinzu kommt, dass die Mitgliedstaaten aufgrund der sogenannten Transparenzrichtlinie (Richtlinie 89/105/EWG des Rates) verpflichtet sind, verfahrenstechnische Mindestanforderungen bei der Beschlussfassung einzuhalten. Diese Richtlinie wird derzeit im Rahmen interinstitutioneller Verhandlungen überarbeitet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001886/14
to the Commission
Othmar Karas (PPE) and Paul Rübig (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Strategy for the pharmaceutical industry and pricing in the internal market

In his address on the state of the European Union in 2012, Commission President Barroso stressed the importance of the pharmaceutical industry for economic growth in Europe and held out the prospect of a new industrial policy.

The Commission also undertook, in its communication on industrial policy of October 2012, to draw up a strategy specifically for the pharmaceutical industry which would address such important current issues as competitiveness, adaptation of legislation to the latest pharmaceutical developments and distortions in the internal market with regard to pricing, which result in inequalities in access to innovative drugs.

1. Will the Commission, as promised, publish this important strategy before the end of its term of office, so that the new Commission can deal with these subjects as a priority and promptly and can negotiate on them with the European Parliament?

According to the 2013 EU Industrial R&D Scoreboard, it is the pharmaceutical industry (including biotechnology) that invests most in research and development. At the same time, the economic context in which pharmaceutical undertakings operate is becoming increasingly unpredictable on account of practices introduced to control costs, such as international price referencing. This harms Europe's status as a research location and also has an adverse impact on access to drugs in many Member States.

2. In view of the above situation, will the Commission devote attention to these problems in its strategy and indicate possible solutions?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

1. The Commission has always acknowledged the importance of the pharmaceutical industry for the European economy. Maintaining the competitiveness of the pharmaceutical industry is quintessential in achieving the goals of Europe 2020.

The announced initiative aims at establishing a process contributing to the long-term viability of the EU pharmaceutical industry and ensuring better access to medicinal products for European citizens.

The Commission is currently working on a document which identifies the main challenges of the sector and the areas which may be worth addressing in future.

The Process of Corporate Responsibility in the field of pharmaceuticals, concluded in October 2013, has helped to prepare the ground by pinpointing some subject matters of particular interest, such as biosimilars, managed entry agreements, orphan drugs or ethics and transparency in this strategic economic sector.

2. The competitiveness of the European pharmaceutical industry is determined by multiple policy fields; one very important element is related to pricing and reimbursement. It is also worth recalling that the definition of health policies and the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care are national competences.

However, as measures taken by Member States have extraterritorial effects, a comprehensive approach is deemed appropriate to address relevant policies including issues related to pricing and reimbursement. Additionally, the so-called 'Transparency Directive' (Council Directive 89/105/EEC) requires Member States to respect minimum procedural requirements in the decision making process. This directive is currently being reviewed in an interinstitutional negotiation process.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001887/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(19 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Τιμές των φαρμάκων στην Κύπρο

Από συγκριτικά στοιχεία που παρουσιάζονται σε διάφορα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ διαπιστώνεται ότι παρατηρούνται σημαντικές αποκλίσεις στις τιμές των φαρμάκων. Από προσωπική εμπειρία έχω διαπιστώσει ότι οι τιμές σημαντικών φαρμάκων στην Κύπρο είναι υπερδιπλάσιες από τις τιμές παρόμοιων σκευασμάτων στην Ελλάδα και άλλα κράτη μέλη.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί να με προμηθεύσει με συγκριτικά στοιχεία για τις τιμές των φαρμάκων στα κράτη μέλη;

2. Με ποιες διαδικασίες διαμορφώνονται οι τιμές των φαρμάκων στα κράτη μέλη;

3. Θεωρεί ότι οι συνθήκες ανταγωνισμού στην ευρωπαϊκή αγορά φαρμάκων λειτουργούν ικανοποιητικά, διασφαλίζοντας στους πολίτες όλων των κρατών μελών δίκαιες και λογικές τιμές;

4. Πού αποδίδεται το πολύ υψηλό επίπεδο των τιμών των φαρμάκων στην Κύπρο;

5. Τι μπορεί να πράξει και τι εισηγείται στις κυπριακές αρχές η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή για τη διασφάλιση λογικών τιμών των φαρμάκων στην Κύπρο, μια χώρα της οποίας οι πολίτες δοκιμάζονται πολλαπλώς από τις συνέπειες της οικονομικής κρίσης;

Απάντηση του κ. Tajani εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Η φαρμακευτική νομοθεσία της ΕΕ παρέχει ένα σταθερό πλαίσιο που εξασφαλίζει ότι οι πολίτες της ΕΕ λαμβάνουν ασφαλή και αποτελεσματικά φάρμακα. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 168 παράγραφος 7 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης ([1]), η Ένωση πρέπει να σέβεται τις ευθύνες των κρατών μελών όσον αφορά τη διαμόρφωση της πολιτικής τους στον τομέα της υγείας, καθώς και την οργάνωση και την παροχή υγειονομικών υπηρεσιών και ιατρικής περίθαλψης.

1. Η Επιτροπή δεν παρακολουθεί το επίπεδο των τιμών των φαρμάκων στην ΕΕ και, ως εκ τούτου, δεν μπορεί να παράσχει συγκριτικά στοιχεία όσον αφορά την κατάσταση που επικρατεί στα κράτη μέλη.

2 & 4. Οι τιμές των φαρμάκων στα κράτη μέλη καθορίζονται αποκλειστικά από τις πολιτικές που αποφασίζονται από την αρμόδια εθνική αρχή.

3. Η Επιτροπή ανέκαθεν ενίσχυε τη συνεργασία και την ανταλλαγή γνώσεων μεταξύ των ενδιαφερομένων μερών, με στόχο τη βελτίωση της ανταγωνιστικότητας της φαρμακευτικής βιομηχανίας. Κατά συνέπεια, η διαδικασία για την εταιρική ευθύνη στον φαρμακευτικό κλάδο ([2]) ενίσχυσε τη συνεργασία των κρατών μελών και των αρμόδιων ενδιαφερόμενων μερών με σκοπό την επίτευξη κοινών, μη κανονιστικών μεθόδων για έγκαιρη και ισότιμη πρόσβαση στα φάρμακα μετά την έκδοση της άδειας κυκλοφορίας τους.

5. Τα κράτη μέλη είναι υπεύθυνα για τη διαχείριση των υπηρεσιών υγείας και την κατανομή των αντίστοιχων πόρων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των αποφάσεων για την τιμολόγηση και την επιστροφή δαπανών για την αγορά φαρμάκων. Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει το δίκτυο των αρμοδίων αρχών για την τιμολόγηση και την επιστροφή δαπανών, το οποίο αποσκοπεί στην ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών και βέλτιστων πρακτικών σχετικά με τις μεθόδους καθορισμού των τιμών και επιστροφής δαπανών όσον αφορά την αγορά φαρμακευτικών προϊόντων στα κράτη μέλη. Μέσω του δικτύου, τα κράτη μέλη, μεταξύ των οποίων και η Κύπρος, εργάζονται για μια πιο δίκαιη και ταχύτερη πρόσβαση σε φάρμακα για όλους τους πολίτες.

([1]) Συνθήκη για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/_getdocument.cfm?doc_id=7870

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001887/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Prices of medicines in Cyprus

Comparative data from various EU Member States show that there are significant differences in the prices of medicines from one Member State to another. From personal experience, I know that important medicines in Cyprus are more than twice as expensive as similar products in Greece and other Member States.

Will the Commission say:

1. Can it provide comparative figures on the prices of medicines in the Member States?

2. What determines the price of medicines in the Member States?

3. Does it consider that the conditions of competition in the European pharmaceuticals market are satisfactory, ensuring fair and reasonable prices for the citizens of all Member States?

4. What is the reason for the very high price of medicines in Cyprus?

5. What can it do, and what does it recommend that the Cypriot authorities do, to ensure reasonable prices for medicines in Cyprus, a country whose citizens are confronted with many problems as a result of the economic crisis?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(31 March 2014)

The EU pharmaceutical legislation provides a solid framework guaranteeing that EU citizens are provided with safe and efficacious medicines. According to Article 168(7) of the TFEU ([1]), the Union must respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care.

1. The Commission does not monitor the level of prices of medicines in the EU, therefore cannot provide comparative figures regarding the situation in Member States.

2 and 4. The prices of medicines in Member States are exclusively determined by the policies decided by the national competent authority.

3. The Commission has always fostered the cooperation and exchange of knowledge between stakeholders, with the objective of enhancing the competitiveness of the pharmaceutical industry. Notably the Process on corporate responsibility in the field of pharmaceuticals ([2]) fostered collaboration among Member States and relevant stakeholders in order to find common, non-regulatory approaches to timely and equitable access to medicines after their marketing authorisation.

5. Member States are responsible for the management of health services and the allocation of related resources, including decisions on pricing and reimbursement of medicinal products. The Commission is supporting the Network of Competent Authorities in Pricing and Reimbursement, which aims at exchanging information and best practice on methods for pricing and reimbursing pharmaceuticals in Member States. Through the Network, Member States, including Cyprus, work towards fairer and quicker access to medicinal products for all citizens.

([1]) Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/_getdocument.cfm?doc_id=7870

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001888/14
komissiolle
Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE) ja Petri Sarvamaa (PPE)
(19. helmikuuta 2014)

Aihe: Valtiontukia koskevien uusien suuntaviivojen seuraukset alueellisille lentokentille Ruotsissa ja Suomessa

Komissio julkaisi vastikään lentokentille ja lentoyhtiöille maksettavia valtiontukia koskevat tarkistetut suuntaviivaluonnokset. Uudessa ehdotuksessa lentoasemainfrastruktuureihin tehtäviin investointeihin myönnettävä valtiontuki sallitaan, mikäli julkisia tukitoimenpiteitä tarvitaan alueen kulkuyhteyksien varmistamiseksi. Tuen enimmäismäärä riippuu kuitenkin lentoaseman koosta. Lisäksi toimintatuet lentoasemille sallitaan ainoastaan kymmenen vuoden siirtymäaikana tietyin edellytyksin.

Uusien suuntaviivojen avulla on tarkoitus saavuttaa asianmukainen tasapaino terveen kilpailun ja luotettavien kulkuyhteyksien välille koko EU:n alueella. Ehdotettu vuotuinen 200 000 matkustajan raja, minkä ylittävän määrän saavuttaneelle, yleisiin taloudellisiin tarkoituksiin liittyväksi palveluksi luokitellulle lentoasemalle myönnetyn tuen komission on erikseen hyväksyttävä, synnyttää kuitenkin epävarmuutta ja riskejä, joilla on kielteisiä vaikutuksia.

On olemassa vaara, että ehdotetuissa suuntaviivoissa ei oteta huomioon Ruotsin ja Suomen alueellisten lentokenttien erityistä tilannetta, ja se voi jopa johtaa joidenkin lentokenttien sulkemiseen. Maissa, joissa etäisyydet ovat pitkiä, alueet ovat harvaan asuttuja ja joissakin tapauksissa muita vaihtoehtoisia liikennemuotoja ei ole lentoliikennepalvelujen ohella, alueelliset lentoasemat ovat tärkeitä kulkuyhteyksien, työllisyyden ja kasvun edistämiseksi maan kaikissa osissa. Ne myös usein tukevat sairaankuljetuspalveluita varmistamalla hoitopalveluihin pääsyn.

Voiko komissio edellä sanotun perusteella selventää, kuinka uudet suuntaviivat vaikuttavat alueellisiin lentoasemiin Ruotsissa ja Suomessa? Mitä perusteita komissio aikoo soveltaa hyväksyessään sellaisten alueellisten lentoasemien valtiontuet, joilla käy yli 200 000 matkustajaa vuodessa? Voivatko Ruotsi ja Suomi jatkaa valtiontukien maksamista alueellisille lentokentille, mikä on erittäin tärkeää alueilla asuville ja työskenteleville ihmisille? Pyydämme komissiota ottamaan huomioon Ruotsin ja Suomen alueellisten lentokenttien erityisen tilanteen ja antamaan avoimuuden ja oikeusvarmuuden varmistamiseksi selkeämmät säännöt ja määritelmät lopullisissa suuntaviivoissa, joiden odotetaan valmistuvan vuoden 2014 ensimmäisellä neljänneksellä.

Joaquín Almunian komission puolesta antama vastaus
(28. huhtikuuta 2014)

Komissio on samaa mieltä siitä, että alueellisten lentoasemien kehittäminen on tärkeää talouskasvun ja alueellisen yhteenkuuluvuuden kannalta. Sen vuoksi uusissa suuntaviivoissa ([1]) määrätään alueellisten lentoasemien toimintatuen soveltuvuusedellytyksistä 10 vuoden siirtymäkauden ajan. Siirtymäkaudella kyseisille lentoasemille annetaan aikaa mukautua uuteen markkinatilanteeseen. Hyvin pienet lentoasemat, joiden vuotuinen matkustajamäärä on vähemmän kuin 700 000 matkustajaa, voivat kohdata erityisiä vaikeuksia, minkä vuoksi ne voivat saada tappioidensa kattamiseksi toimintatukea ilman siirtymäkautta. Komissio arvioi niiden tilanteen uudelleen neljän vuoden kuluttua.

Lisäksi jäsenvaltiot voivat perustelluissa tapauksissa antaa lentoaseman pitäjien tehtäväksi yleishyödyllisten taloudellisten palveluiden ([2]) tuottamisen. Antaessaan lentoaseman pitäjälle tällaisen tehtävän jäsenvaltiot ottavat yleensä huomioon tiettyjen lentoasemien merkityksen alueellisten yhteyksien kannalta EU:n syrjäisillä alueilla tai reuna-alueilla, kuten saarilla tai Suomen ja Ruotsin kaltaisten maiden harvaan asutuilla alueilla. Jäsenvaltiot voivat määritellä varsin vapaasti tietyn palvelun yleishyödylliseksi taloudelliseksi palveluksi ([3]).

Alueelliset lentoasemat voivat lisäksi saada investointitukea tietyin edellytyksin etenkin, jos ne sijaitsevat eristyksissä olevalla alueella, jonka lähellä ei ole toista lentoasemaa. Investointituen intensiteetti on suurempi pienillä lentoasemilla, koska niiden on vaikeampi hankkia pääomaa investointisuunnitelmiensa rahoittamiseen. Uusien sääntöjen tavoitteena on ottaa huomioon erityistilanteet Suomen ja Ruotsin kaltaisissa maissa, joilla on maantieteellisiä erityispiirteitä.

Jäsenvaltiot voivat myös asettaa julkisen palvelun velvoitteita tiettyjä reittejä lentäville yhtiöille ja määrätä asianmukaisesta korvauksesta asetuksen (EY) N:o 1008/2008 mukaisesti.

([1]) EU:n suuntaviivat valtiontuesta lentoasemille ja lentoyhtiöille, http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/modernisation/index_en.html

([2]) Lentoasemille, joiden tehtäväksi on annettu yleishyödyllisen taloudellisen palvelun tuottaminen tai joille on asetettu jokin muu erityinen julkisen palvelun velvoite, voidaan myöntää valtiontukea yleisiin taloudellisiin tarkoituksiin liittyviä palveluja koskevan päätöksen tai yleisiin taloudellisiin tarkoituksiin liittyviä palveluja koskevien puitteiden mukaisesti vielä siirtymäkauden päätyttyäkin.

([3]) Komission tehtävänä on tässä yhteydessä estää ilmeiset virheet.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001888/14
till kommissionen
Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE) och Petri Sarvamaa (PPE)
(19 februari 2014)

Angående: Hur Sverige och Finland påverkas av de nya riktlinjerna om statligt stöd till regionala flygplatser

Kommissionen offentliggjorde nyligen ett förslag till ändrande riktlinjer för statligt stöd till flygplatser och flygbolag. I det nya förslaget är statligt stöd till investeringar i flygplatsinfrastruktur tillåtet om det statliga stödet är nödvändigt för att säkerställa en regions tillgänglighet. De högsta stödnivåerna är dock avhängiga av flygplatsens storlek. Dessutom kommer driftstöd till flygplatserna endast att vara tillåtet under en övergångsperiod på tio år och på vissa villkor.

Syftet med de nya riktlinjerna är att uppnå en jämn balans mellan sund konkurrens och tillförlitlig tillgänglighet i hela EU. Det föreslagna taket på 200 000 passagerare per år, över vilket en flygplats som klassificeras som tjänst av allmänt ekonomiskt intresse måste få ett särskilt godkännande av kommissionen, leder dock till osäkerhet och riskerar att få motsatt effekt.

Faktum är att det finns en oro för att de föreslagna riktlinjerna inte tar hänsyn till den särskilda situation som regionala flygplatser i Sverige och Finland befinner sig i, och till och med skulle kunna leda till att några av dem tvingas stänga. I länder med långa avstånd, glesbefolkade områden, och, i vissa fall, brist på alternativa transportmedel utöver flygtjänster, spelar de regionala flygplatserna en central roll för tillgängligheten, sysselsättningen och tillväxten i alla delar av landet. De utgör också ofta ett stöd för akuttransporter för att säkerställa tillgång till allmän sjukvård.

Mot bakgrund av detta, skulle kommissionen kunna klargöra hur de nya riktlinjerna kommer att påverka de regionala flygplatserna i Sverige och Finland? Vilka kriterier kommer kommissionen att titta på när den godkänner statligt stöd till regionala flygplatser med över 200 000 passagerare per år? Kommer Sverige och Finland att kunna fortsätta ge statligt stöd till regionala flygplatser – som är väsentliga för de människor som bor och arbetar där? Vi uppmanar kommissionen att ta hänsyn till den särskilda situation som de regionala flygplatserna i Sverige och Finland befinner sig i, och att fastställa tydligare regler och definitioner i de slutliga riktlinjerna som väntas komma under första kvartalet 2014, i syfte att säkerställa insyn och klarhet angående rättsläget.

Svar från Joaquín Almunia på kommissionens vägnar
(28 april 2014)

Kommissionen håller med om att regionala flygplatsers utveckling är viktig för ekonomisk tillväxt och territoriell sammanhållning. De nya riktlinjerna ([1]) anger villkor för förenlighet för driftstöd till regionala flygplatser under en övergångsperiod på 10 år. Under denna period ges flygplatserna tid att anpassa sig till den nya marknadssituationen. Eftersom mycket små flygplatser med en årlig trafik på mindre än 700 000 passagerare kan ha särskilda problem, kan de få driftstöd för att täcka förluster utan någon övergångsperiod. Kommissionen kommer att göra en ny bedömning av situationen efter fyra år.

Medlemsstaterna kan om det är motiverat anförtro flygplatsoperatörer tjänster av allmänt ekonomiskt intresse ([2]). När en flygplatsoperatör anförtros en tjänst av allmänt ekonomiskt intresse beaktar medlemsstaterna normalt sett den viktiga roll som vissa flygplatser har för regionala förbindelser i avlägsna eller perifera regioner inom EU, t.ex. öar eller glest befolkade områden i länder som Sverige och Finland. Medlemsstaterna har stor handlingsfrihet när det gäller att definiera en viss tjänst som en tjänst av allmänt ekonomiskt intresse ([3]).

Regionala flygplatser kan också få investeringsstöd om vissa villkor är uppfyllda, särskilt om de ligger i isolerade områden utan någon annan flygplats i närheten. Nivån för investeringsstöd är högre för mindre flygplatser, eftersom dessa flygplatser har svårare att få fram det kapital som behövs för att finansiera sina investeringsplaner. De nya reglerna syftar till att ta hänsyn till den särskilda situationen i länder med geografiska särdrag, exempelvis Sverige och Finland.

Slutligen kan medlemsstaterna införa allmän trafikplikt för flygbolag som flyger vissa rutter och föreskriva lämplig ersättning i enlighet med förordning (EG) nr 1008/2008.

([1]) Riktlinjer för statligt stöd till flygplatser och flygbolag, http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/modernisation/index_en.html

([2]) Flygplatser som anförtrotts tjänster av allmänt ekonomiskt intresse eller andra särskilda skyldigheter att tillhandahålla allmännyttiga tjänster kan beviljas statligt stöd i enlighet med beslutet eller rambestämmelserna om tjänster av allmänt ekonomiskt intresse även efter övergångsperiodens slut.

([3]) I detta avseende är kommissionens roll att förhindra uppenbara fel.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001888/14
to the Commission
Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE) and Petri Sarvamaa (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Effects of new guidelines on state aid for regional airports in Sweden and Finland

The Commission recently published draft revised guidelines on state aid for airports and airlines. In the new proposal, state aid for investment in airport infrastructure is allowed if public support is necessary to ensure the accessibility of a region. However, maximum levels of aid depend on the size of the airport. In addition, operating aid for airports will only be allowed for a transitional period of 10 years under certain conditions.

The purpose of these new guidelines is to achieve a proper balance between sound competition and reliable accessibility throughout the EU. However, the proposed ceiling of 200 000 passengers per year, above which an airport classified as a SGEI (service of general economic interest) has to be specifically approved by the Commission, creates uncertainty and risks having adverse effects.

There is in fact concern that the proposed guidelines do not take into account the particular situation of regional airports in Sweden and Finland, and could even result in some of them having to shut down. In countries with long distances, sparsely populated areas and, in some cases, a lack of alternative transport other than air services, regional airports play an essential role in accessibility, employment and growth in all parts of the country. They also often support emergency transport to ensure access to public health.

In light of this, could the Commission clarify how the new guidelines will affect regional airports in Sweden and Finland? What criteria will the Commission examine to approve state aid for regional airports with more than 200 000 passengers per year? Will Sweden and Finland be able to continue to provide state aid to regional airports, which are essential for people living and working there? We call on the Commission to take into account the specific situation of regional airports in Sweden and Finland and to provide clearer rules and definitions in the final guidelines expected in the first quarter of 2014, in order to ensure transparency and legal certainty.

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(28 April 2014)

The Commission agrees that the development of regional airports is important for economic growth and territorial cohesion. Thus the new Guidelines ([1]) provide compatibility conditions for operating aid to regional airports for a transitional period of 10 years. During this period these airports will be given time to adjust to the new market situation. Since very small airports with annual traffic of less than 700 000 passengers may face specific difficulties, they may benefit from operating aid to cover losses without a transitional period; the Commission will reassess their situation after four years.

Furthermore, where justified, Member States can entrust airport operators with Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI) ([2]). In entrusting an airport operator with an SGEI, Member States will normally take into account the important role of certain airports in terms of regional connectivity of remote or peripheral regions of the EU, such as islands or sparsely populated areas in countries like Sweden and Finland. Member States have a wide margin of discretion in defining a given service as an SGEI ([3]).

Moreover, regional airports can also benefit of investment aid if certain conditions are met, all the more so if they are located in isolated areas with no other airport in the proximity. The intensity of investment aid is greater for smaller airports, given that those airports face greater difficulties to find the capital necessary to finance their investments plans. The new rules aim to take account of the particular situation in countries with geographical specificities, such as Sweden and Finland.

Finally, Member States can impose Public Service Obligations (PSOs) on airlines flying certain routes and provide for appropriate compensation in line with Regulation 1008/2008.

([1]) Guidelines for State to airports and airlines, http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/modernisation/index_en.html
([2]) State aid for airports entrusted with SGEI or other specific public service obligations can be granted in compliance with the SGEI Decision or the SGEI Framework even after the expiry of the transition period.
([3]) In this respect the Commission's role is to prevent manifest errors.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001889/14
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Report by the Algeria Solidarity Campaign

I have been contacted by a constituent who tells me that the *Guardian* newspaper recently mentioned a report entitled 'Reinforcing Dictatorships: Britain's Gas Grab and Human Rights Abuses in Algeria', written by the Algeria Solidarity Campaign.

He tells me that a statement appears on the first page of the twenty-seven page report which claims that the document was produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. He is concerned that tax payers' money has been used for this purpose, particularly as Algeria is receiving help from a number of countries, notably the UK, to remain stable in a very difficult environment.

Could the Commission confirm whether or not the EU has contributed financially to this report and, if so, how much was spent?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2014)

The publication referred to was issued by Platform with Algeria Solidarity, one of five partners of CEE Bankwatch, who are together implementing the project 'Democratising energy for development: mobilising public support for fair energy relations and democratising the process regarding the EU Common External Energy Policy to develop a coherent, just and sustainable European policy'.

This project was selected further to a call for Proposals in the context of the Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR) programme, which is a programme aiming to developing citizens' awareness and critical understanding of the interdependent world, of roles and responsibilities in relation to development issues. It is part of the Non State Actors and Local Authorities thematic programme under the DCI.

This specific report will be part of the next interim report by CEE Bankwatch. Once the activity report has been submitted by the beneficiary, the Commission will carefully assess the cost claim and take the measures needed to make sure that EU support is used appropriately. The amount foreseen for this report is approximately EUR 1 700 as support only for the publication costs.

It should be noted that one of the guiding principles of NSA/LA thematic programme, approved by the European Parliament, is the recognition of Civil Society Organisation's right of initiative. The content of the reports remains of course the sole responsibility of the beneficiary and should in no way be taken to reflect the views of the EU, as is stated in the standard disclaimer, which was included as required.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001890/14
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Homosexual community in Georgia

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned about the safety of the homosexual community in Georgia.

My constituent tells me that the Georgian Orthodox Patriarch has recently said that he welcomes the news that the recognition of gay marriage will not be a pre-condition for EU membership. My constituent is also concerned that Georgian clerics incite violence against homosexuals and that it is dangerous for members of the gay and bisexual community to be out in public in the country.

Given that my constituent believes that homosexuals are under threat of violence in Georgia, could the Commission confirm whether it will insist on the promotion of human rights for the members of the homosexual and bisexual community as a precondition for Georgia joining the EU?

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

Recognition of gay marriage is not a pre-condition for Georgia's political association and economic integration with the EU, nor is it a requirement for applicants to join the EU nor indeed for existing EU member states. This remains a matter of national competence.

However, strict protection of the human rights of persons belonging to minorities, including members of the LGBTI community, is an essential part of EU cooperation with Georgia and an important requirement under the Visa Liberalisation Action Plan (VLAP). Georgia is in the process of adopting an Anti-Discrimination Bill (a benchmark under VLAP). The law will introduce a comprehensive legislative framework to fight discrimination and promote equal treatment of all persons living in Georgia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001891/14
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Fraudulent practices by Landsbanki Bank

I have been contacted by a constituent who represents a group of individuals who were subject to fraudulent practices by Landsbanki Bank.

Although in France the courts have recently indicted three former executives of the bank, and although a criminal complaint has been deemed admissible by the Spanish courts, the Luxembourg magistrates refuse to admit a complaint submitted to them in a similar way.

Could the Commission respond to the following:

1. What steps, if any, is it taking to ensure that there is a coherent approach at EU level to the indictment of Landsbanki Bank?

2. What European legislation, if any, is in place to ensure that there will be justice for this group of victims?

3. What European legislation, if any, is in place to ensure that such examples of fraud, malpractice and poor corporate governance are rooted out?

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

The European Commission is not directly supervising banks as regards prudential requirements and market conduct. This is a matter for the competent national authorities or for the ECB in the framework of the new supervisory rules for banks in the Eurozone.

The European banking prudential legislation (i.e. the Capital Requirements Directive and Regulation) requires banks to implement robust governance arrangements and internal control mechanisms to identify, manage and monitor all risks, including risks of fraud. Supervisory authorities should review these arrangements and take action, as necessary.

It is expected that the ECB will assume as of November 2014 the supervisory tasks conferred on it by the SSM Regulation and will directly supervise the significant credit institutions authorised in the participating Member States.

The investigation and prosecution of criminal offences in individual cases falls within the competence of Member States. The European Commission has no competence to intervene in the day-to-day running of the criminal justice system of any individual Member State.

To improve the cooperation of police and judicial authorities in crimes with a cross-border dimension, the Commission will ensure that the relevant EU legislation is correctly applied and propose new legislation, where necessary. Eurojust can coordinate the efforts of national authorities in cross-border cases.

EU legislation on victims' rights considerably strengthens the rights of victims across the EU in criminal proceedings, including the right to be heard, to receive information about a case and to get a decision on compensation from the offender. Member States have to implement these rights into their national laws by 16 November 2015.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002382/14
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(3 mars 2014)

Objet: Loi irlandaise et conformité au droit européen

La république d'Irlande a publié une série de lois thématique ces dernières années qui remettent en cause l'acquis communautaire dans le domaine de la concurrence et de la liberté de circulation.

Le «*Building Control Act 2007*» a par exemple été reconnu par le médiateur européen comme allant à l'encontre de la législation européenne en matière de concurrence, de liberté d'établissement et de liberté de mouvement des travailleurs européens.

Une nouvelle loi, le «*Building Control Regulation 2013*» sera d'application en Irlande à compter de mars 2014. Cette législation semble, dans les mêmes termes que le «*Building Control Act 2007*», enfreindre la liberté de mouvement des Européens. Elle prévoit que seuls trois groupes de professionnels soient autorisés à certifier la conformité des règles de construction en Irlande.

La Commission songe-t-elle à engager une réflexion plus globale sur la préférence communautaire?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(9 avril 2014)

La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à la réponse qu'elle a donnée à la question écrite E-000236/2014 de M. Gerard Batten ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001892/14
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Chartered architectural technologists and the Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologists in Ireland

Is the Commission aware of the new Irish Building Control Amendment Regulations (ROI BC(A)2014 — S.I. No.9 of 2014) to be enforced on 1 March 2014, which will prevent chartered architectural technologists from providing architectural services in the Republic of Ireland, many of whom have been doing so successfully for decades?

Irish chartered architectural technologists are members of the Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologists (CIAT), which is listed in the Commission's database of distinct professional qualifications. It is a leading member of the Association d'Experts Européennes du Bâtiment et de la Construction and is the UK's competent authority for architectural technology. This new regulation will deny CIAT members the ability to practise in Ireland. Other European countries, such as the Netherlands, have recently updated their building control systems whilst continuing to allow certified CIAT members to practise safely.

Does the Commission believe that disallowing CIAT members to work in Ireland unduly undermines competition in the EU and prevents long-term professionals from practising in an area in which they are competent?

Question for written answer E-002382/14
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(3 March 2014)

Subject: Irish law and compliance with European law

The Republic of Ireland has published a thematic series of laws in recent years which call into question the accepted Community position on competition and freedom of movement.

The Building Control Act 2007 has for example been recognised by the European ombudsman as being contrary to European law on competition, freedom of establishment and freedom of movement of European workers.

A new law, the Building Control Regulation 2013, will come into force in Ireland from March 2014. In the same way as the Building Control Act 2007, this law appears to infringe the freedom of movement of Europeans, as it provides for only three groups of professionals to be authorised to certify compliance with building regulations in Ireland.

Is the Commission thinking of giving broader consideration to community preference?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000236/2014 by Mr Gerard Batten ([1]).

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001893/14
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(19 février 2014)

Objet: Formation professionnelle en Europe

Le 11 septembre 2012, le Parlement européen a adopté une résolution intitulée «Éducation, formation et Europe 2020» en réponse à la communication de la Commission intitulée «Éducation et formation dans une Europe intelligente, durable et inclusive».

Le Parlement a souligné qu'en dépit d'améliorations dans le domaine de l'éducation et de la formation, l'éducation et la formation tout au long de la vie ne sont toujours pas une réalité pour la majorité des citoyens européens.

Plus précisément, les effets néfastes des programmes d'austérité en matière de chômage des jeunes dans certains États membres, en particulier dans les États du Sud, conduisent à une «fuite de cerveaux» importante vers d'autres pays, y compris des pays tiers.

1. Quelles mesures la Commission envisage-t-elle de mettre en œuvre en faveur des jeunes Européens, plus ciblées et adaptées, pour faciliter leur insertion dans le marché de l'emploi afin qu'ils contribuent à la relance économique de l'Union européenne?

Un élève européen sur sept quitte le système éducatif en ne possédant qu'un niveau d'enseignement secondaire inférieur et ne suit aucun autre enseignement ni aucune formation complémentaire.

2. La Commission compte-t-elle mettre en place des mesures en faveur des jeunes susceptibles de quitter l'école pour leur garantir un apprentissage de qualité? Une modernisation des programmes scolaires pourrait-elle être envisagée? Quel est le montant de l'aide versée au titre du Fonds social européen aux États membres dans le cadre du programme «écoles de la deuxième chance»?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(9 avril 2014)

1. Améliorer l'accès des jeunes au marché du travail est une priorité absolue de l'UE. Le Conseil a adopté une recommandation ([1]) par laquelle les États membres se sont engagés à concevoir des dispositifs de garantie pour la jeunesse prévoyant que chaque jeune de moins de 25 ans reçoit une offre d'emploi de qualité et bénéficie d'un enseignement continu, d'un apprentissage ou d'un stage dans les quatre mois suivant la sortie de l'enseignement formel ou après quatre mois de chômage. La Commission fournit un appui technique à l'élaboration de dispositifs complets de garantie pour la jeunesse. À ce jour, 22 États membres ont présenté des plans de mise en œuvre. Des initiatives telles que l'alliance européenne pour l'apprentissage et la recommandation du Conseil relative à un cadre de qualité pour les stages apportent une contribution à des aspects essentiels. Le déploiement des mesures est soutenu par l'initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes, dotée d'une enveloppe de 6,4 milliards d'euros (prix courants).

2. La réduction et la prévention du décrochage scolaire figurent parmi les objectifs de la stratégie Europe 2020: le nouveau règlement relatif au Fonds social européen (FSE) en a fait une priorité d'investissement et le programme Erasmus+ s'y attelle concrètement. Des initiatives visant à améliorer la qualité de l'éducation pour tous, y compris le cas échéant en modernisant les programmes scolaires, seront soutenues au titre des deux programmes. Le FSE a permis de soutenir avec succès des «programmes de la deuxième chance» pour la réintégration des jeunes dans le système scolaire; cela se poursuivra au cours de la nouvelle période de programmation, y compris dans le cadre de l'initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes. C'est aux États membres qu'il revient de décider des montants alloués; aucune information n'est donc disponible à l'échelon de l'UE à ce sujet.

Le FSE — par le biais de priorités d'investissement portant sur le décrochage scolaire et l'enseignement scolaire, l'enseignement supérieur, l'apprentissage tout au long de la vie, ainsi que l'enseignement et la formation professionnels — et le programme Erasmus+ offrent de nombreuses possibilités de financement pour soutenir les États membres dans leurs efforts pour assurer un enseignement de qualité aux jeunes.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001893/14
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Professional training in Europe

On 11 September 2012 Parliament adopted a resolution on education, training and Europe 2020 in response to the communication from the Commission entitled 'Education and training in smart, sustainable and inclusive Europe'.

The resolution notes that, despite some improvements in the area of education and training, lifelong learning is still not a reality for the majority of the EU population.

More specifically, the resolution draws attention to the way in which austerity programmes are having a detrimental impact as regards youth unemployment in certain Member States, especially those in southern Europe, which is leading to a significant brain drain towards other countries, including countries outside the EU.

1. Does the Commission intend to take more targeted and adapted measures to facilitate access for young Europeans to the job market so that they can contribute to Europe's economic recovery? If so, what are these measures?

According to Parliament's resolution, one out of every seven European pupils leaves the education system with no more than a lower-secondary-level education and does not participate in any further education or training.

2. Does the Commission plan to take measures to ensure that young people who are more likely to leave school early receive a high-quality education? Is there any scope for updating school curriculums? How much European Social Fund aid do the Member States receive under the 'second-chance-schools' programme?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

1. Improving young people's labour market access is a top EU priority. By a Council Recommendation ([1]) Member States (MS) committed to developing Youth Guarantee (YG) schemes whereby all young people up to 25 receive a quality offer of employment, continued education, an apprenticeship or a traineeship within four months of leaving formal education or becoming unemployed. The Commission is providing technical support to preparations of comprehensive YG schemes. To date, 22 MS have submitted Implementation Plans. Initiatives such as the European Alliance for Apprenticeships and the Council Recommendation on a Quality Framework for Traineeships contribute on key aspects. The EUR 6.4 billion (in current prices) Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) is supporting delivery.

2. Reducing and preventing early school-leaving (ESL) is a Europe2020 target — translated into an investment priority in the new regulation for the European Social Fund (ESF) and addressed through the Erasmus+ programme. Under both programmes initiatives aimed at improving quality of education for all will be supported, which might include updating school curricula. The ESF has successfully supported 'second chance schemes' to re-integrate young people in education; this will continue in the new programming round, including as part of the YEI. It is up to MS to decide on the amounts allocated and such information is not available at EU level.

The ESF — through its investment priorities on ESL and school education; higher education; lifelong learning; and vocational education and training — and Erasmus+ offer Member States many funding opportunities in attempts to offer high quality education to young people.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001894/14
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(19 février 2014)

Objet: Exportation de grumes vers l'Asie

Selon la Fédération nationale du bois, entre 370 000 et 400 000 m^3 de résineux et entre 350 000 et 370 000 m^3 de feuillus ont été exportés de France vers la Chine en 2013. Cette exportation importante de grumes entraîne une perte de valeur ajoutée pour les scieries françaises, nuisible à l'emploi dans ce secteur, et une fuite de la ressource forestière hors des frontières de l'Union européenne.

1. Dans la mesure où tous les grands acteurs forestiers mondiaux régulent leurs ressources, la Commission compte-t-elle œuvrer en faveur d'une régulation des exportations de grumes issues de l'Union européenne?

2. S'agissant du principe régulateur, jugerait-elle opportun d'opter pour une politique de quotas par pays et par essence, comme c'est déjà le cas pour d'autres domaines au niveau communautaire?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(15 avril 2014)

1. À ce jour, la Commission n'a pas l'intention de proposer une régulation des exportations de grumes de l'Union européenne. Elle est consciente de la récente augmentation des exportations de grumes de conifères et de feuillus vers des pays tiers et, notamment, vers la Chine. D'après nos informations, ces exportations massives à destination de la Chine proviennent non seulement de France, mais d'autres États membres. La Commission continuera de suivre la question de près.

2. Comme indiqué plus haut, elle n'envisage pas, pour le moment, de réguler les exportations de grumes en provenance de l'Union; elle n'est donc pas en mesure d'indiquer la forme que prendrait une telle régulation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001894/14
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Log exports to Asia

According to the French National Wood Federation (FNB), between 370 000 and 400 000 m^3 of timber from conifers and 350 000 to 370 000 m^3 from broad-leaved species was exported from France to China in 2013. The export of logs in such large volumes means a loss of value-added for sawmills in France, depresses employment in the sector and deprives the European Union of part of the yield of its forest resources.

1. Given that all the major players in the forestry sector at global level regulate their resources, does the Commission intend to push for the regulation of log exports from the EU?

2. Would it consider a policy of quotas by country and by species, similar to systems already in place at EU level in other sectors, to be a sound basis in principle for such regulation?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2014)

1. The Commission currently has no intention to propose the regulation of log exports from the EU. The Commission is aware of the recent increase of EU exports of logs of coniferous and deciduous timber to third countries, and to China in particular. According to our information, such logs are not only exported from France to China in significant volumes, but also from other EU Member States. The Commission will continue to monitor closely log exports from the EU.

2. As mentioned above, the Commission is currently not considering the regulation of EU wood log exports to third countries, hence it is not in a position to speculate on what form such regulation could take.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-001896/14
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(19. februar 2014)

Om: Fiskeriforhandlinger mellem EU og Norge

Forhandlingerne om fiskekvoter mellem EU og Norge er endnu engang brudt sammen, og der er endnu ikke fundet en ny dato for nye forhandlinger.

Normalt ville man fiske efter den eksisterende aftale, indtil en ny er på plads, men nordmændene har valgt at lukke de norske farvande for europæiske fiskere. Derfor har danske fiskere ingen adgang til de norske farvande i øjeblikket. Det rammer den nordeuropæiske fiskeindustri, og bl.a. det nordlige Danmark er særlig hårdt ramt som følge af tabte arbejdspladser og tabt indtjening. F.eks. er landingerne fra danske fiskere på fiskeauktionen i Hanstholm gået ned med hele 33 % i år ([1]).

Kan Kommissionen oplyse, om den finder, at det er i overensstemmelse med normal praksis og den eksisterende fiskeriaftale mellem EU og Norge, at de norske myndigheder lukker de norske farvande for europæiske fiskere, indtil en ny aftale er på plads?

Kan Kommissionen endvidere oplyse, hvad den agter at gøre for at få Norge tilbage til forhandlingsbordet, og om den agter at indføre restriktioner over for Norge, hvis ikke fartøjer fra EU-lande får adgang til norske farvande, indtil en ny aftale er på plads, eller hvis ikke der indgås en aftale snarest muligt?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Maria Damanaki
(28. marts 2014)

Bestemmelserne i aftalen mellem EU og Norge ([2]) fastsætter, at hver part skal give den anden parts fiskefartøjer adgang til i overensstemmelse med visse bestemmelser at drive fiskeri. Det omfatter blandt andet, at hver part, efter passende konsultationer, fastsætter fangstmængderne for den anden parts fiskefartøjer i overensstemmelse med målsætningen om at tilvejebringe en tilfredsstillende ligevægt i deres indbyrdes forhold på fiskeriområdet.

Konsultationerne med Norge er nu afsluttet, og dermed har det været muligt at fastsætte ovennævnte fangstmængder. Det betyder, at begrænsningerne i EU-fartøjers adgang til Norges farvande og omvendt er blevet ophævet.

([1]) http://nyhederne.tv2.dk/samfund/2014-02-18-eu-og-norge-i-kvotestrid-jyske-fiskere-frygter-job.

([2]) Rådets forordning (EØF) nr. 2214/80 af 27. juni 1980 om indgåelse af fiskeriaftalen mellem Det europæiske økonomiske Fællesskab og kongeriget Norge (EFT L 226 af 29.8.1980).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001896/14
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Fishery negotiations between the EU and Norway

Negotiations on fishing quotas between the EU and Norway have again broken down, and a date for fresh negotiations has not yet been set.

Normally, fishing would continue under the existing agreement until a new agreement was in place, but Norway has opted to close its waters to EU vessels. Accordingly, Danish fishing vessels have no access at present to Norwegian waters. This has hit the North European fishing industry, with North Denmark, among other areas, being particularly hard-hit as a result of a loss of jobs and earnings. For instance, Danish vessels' landings for the fish auction at Hanstholm have fallen by as much as 33% this year ([1]).

Can the Commission say whether in its view, it is standard practice (and in accordance with the existing fishing agreement between the EU and Norway) that the Norwegian authorities should close Norway's waters to EU fishing vessels until a new agreement is in place?

Can the Commission furthermore say what it intends to do to bring Norway back to the negotiating table and whether it intends to introduce restrictions on Norway if EU countries' vessels are not given access to Norwegian waters, until a new agreement is in place, or if an agreement is not entered into as soon as possible?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

The terms of the Agreement between the EU and Norway ([2]) establish that each party should grant access to fishing vessels of the other Party to fish, in accordance with certain provisions. These include the adoption by each Party of the fishing opportunities available, after appropriate consultations of allotments for fishing vessels of the other Party in accordance with the objective of establishing a mutually satisfactory balance in their reciprocal fisheries relations.

Consultations with Norway have now been concluded and hence permitted the fixation of the abovementioned allotments. This means that restrictions of access by EU vessels to Norwegian waters and vice versa have been lifted.

([1]) http://nyhederne.tv2.dk/samfund/2014-02-18-eu-og-norge-i-kvotestrid-jyske-fiskere-frygter-job
([2]) Council Regulation (EEC) No 2214/80 of 27 June 1980 on the conclusion of the Agreement on fisheries between the European Economic Community and the Kingdom of Norway. OJ L 226 , 29.8.1980.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-001897/14
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(19. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Projekt Lake Karla

1. Was ist der Stand des Projekts Lake Karla?

2. In der Liste der Kommission über Projekte in Griechenland wird das Lake Karla Projekt als „project at risk" qualifiziert. Warum?

3. Das Projekt wurde von der DG Regi vier Mal geprüft. Beanstandungen wurden keine gemeldet. Warum kommt es in der Kommissionsliste zur Einstufung als „project at risk"?

4. Wurden die 4 Prüfungen von Prüfern der Kommission durchgeführt? Wann? Mit wie viel Personal?

5. Wegen Schwierigkeiten bei der Umsetzung des Projekts wurde es verlängert, steht aber seit 2 Jahren ganz still. Der See wurde geflutet, obwohl Filter und Kanäle nicht fertiggestellt sind. Studien besagen, dass Lake Karla niemals als Wasserreservoir dienen kann. Regelmäßige Fischsterben zeugen von Umweltproblemen. Wie reagiert die Kommission auf diese Probleme?

6. Wie viel Geld wurde bislang eingesetzt? Was sind die Ergebnisse?

7. Wann rechnet die Kommission mit der Fertigstellung?

8. Wie viele EU-Mittel werden dafür benötigt?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(27. März 2014)

1./2. Ziel des Projekts ist es, den See von Karla in Thessaly wiederherzustellen. Die Projektarbeiten wurden bereits zur Hälfte ausgeführt. Das Projekt hinkt derzeit hinter der zeitlichen Planung hinterher. Als Gründe hierfür führen die griechischen Behörden u. a. Folgendes an:

— archäologische Ausgrabungen

— notwendiger Bau von Bewässerungsnetzwerken (durch den nationalen Fonds für ländliche Entwicklung), damit um den See herum nicht mehr gebohrt werden muss

— Verzögerungen bei der Benennung der Behörde für die Verwaltung der Wasserressourcen (Problem im Dezember 2013 gelöst: Zuständig ist jetzt die Region Thessaly).

Ein ausführlicher Bericht über den Stand der Arbeiten am Projekt kann im Internet abgerufen werden ([1]).

3./4. Die Kommission hat kein Audit des Projekts durchgeführt. Es wurde ein Audit vonseiten der griechischen Behörden und des Europäischen Rechnungshofes vorgenommen. Dabei stellten die griechischen Behörden einige Mängel fest, die aber die Projektdurchführung nicht beeinträchtigen. Diese Probleme werden derzeit behoben. Der Rechnungshof konnte keine besonderen Probleme feststellen.

5./7. Die Kommission weiß um die mit dem Projekt verbundenen Probleme und arbeitet in enger Zusammenarbeit mit den griechischen Behörden an deren Lösung. Sie ist davon überzeugt, dass die Schwierigkeiten überwunden werden können und dass das Projekt vor Ende 2015 fertiggestellt werden kann.

6./8. Die EU hat bisher 13,8 Mio. EUR für das Projekt aufgewendet. Für die Fertigstellung des Projekts sollen weitere 18,2 Mio. EUR an EU-Mitteln bereitgestellt werden. Zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt wurde der natürliche Zustand des Sees wiederhergestellt und es wurden Maßnahmen zur Sicherstellung der Wasserversorgung der Bevölkerung vor Ort geplant.

([1]) http://www.anaptyxi.gov.gr/Default.aspx?tabid=41&language=en-US

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001897/14
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Lake Karla project

1. What is the state of play with the Lake Karla project?

2. In the Commission list of projects in Greece, the Lake Karla project appears as a 'project at risk'. Why?

3. DG REGIO has audited the project four times. No criticisms were reported. Why is it classified as a 'project at risk' in the Commission list?

4. Did Commission auditors perform the four audits? When? How many staff were involved?

5. Because of difficulties in the implementation of the project, it was extended, but has seen absolutely no progress in the past two years. The lake site has been flooded even though filters and channels were not ready. According to studies, it will never be possible for Lake Karla to serve as a water reservoir. Regular fish deaths indicate that there are environmental problems. What is the Commission's response to these problems?

6. How much money has been spent so far? What are the results?

7. When does the Commission expect the project to be completed?

8. How much EU funding will be required for its completion?

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

1 and 2. The objective of the project is the rehabilitation of the lake Karla in Thessaly. The project is half-way through its implementation. It is currently behind schedule due a number of problems identified by the Greek authorities, including:

— archaeological excavations;

— irrigation networks which should be built (through the national rural fund) in order to stop drilling in the surroundings of the lake;

— delays in the appointment of the authority for water resources management (resolved in December 2013 with responsibility now with the region of Thessaly).

A detailed description of the project's progress is available online ([1]).

3 and 4. The Commission has not audited this project. The Greek authorities and the European Court of Auditors have audited the project. The former have identified a number of issues which are not affecting implementation and are being followed up. The latter did not identify any particular problems.

5 and 7. The Commission is aware of the difficulties that the project has faced and is following these closely with the Greek authorities. The Commission is confident that the difficulties will be overcome and that the project will be completed before the end of 2015.

6 and 8. The EU has paid EUR 13.8 million for this project so far. A further EUR 18.2 million of EU funding is planned to enable completion. So far, the project has seen the recreation of the lake and planning measures for water provision for the local population.

([1]) http://www.anaptyxi.gov.gr/

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-001898/14
aan de Commissie
Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(19 februari 2014)

Betreft: Verduistering van EU-subsidies in Roemenië

De EU heeft programma's voor de uitroeiing en de monitoring van hondsdolheid in Roemenië.

1. Welke EU-programma's bestaan er betreffende de uitroeiing en de monitoring van hondsdolheid in Roemenië en hoe worden deze gefinancierd?

2. Hoeveel geld ging er in 2011, 2012 en 2013 naar deze programma's?

3. Hoeveel is er begroot in de periode 2014-2021 voor deze programma's en hoe wordt de implementatie gecontroleerd?

4. Volgens de website Deutsche Wirtschafts Nachrichten ([1]) worden deze EU-subsidies gebruikt om straathonden in Roemenië te doden. Klopt dit?

5. De website suggereert dat EU-subsidies terechtkomen bij private hondenvangers. Bevestigt de Commissie dit?

6. De website suggereert ook dat verantwoordelijke Roemeense autoriteiten, als opdrachtgevers, EU-subsidies tegen hondsdolheid gebruiken om hondenvangers te betalen en daarbij zelf winst maken. Bevestigt de Commissie dit?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(17 maart 2014)

1. De EU steunt momenteel een programma voor de uitroeiing van hondsdolheid in 13 lidstaten, waarbij soms ook activiteiten worden georganiseerd in aangrenzende derde landen, waar hondsdolheid als risicovol wordt beschouwd. Roemenië is een van die lidstaten.

De medegefinancierde maatregelen voor dit programma omvatten naast de aankoop van aaspakketjes met vaccin en de verspreiding ervan vanuit de lucht, om zo vossen tegen hondsdolheid te vaccineren, ook het onderzoek van monsters die zijn genomen bij wilde dieren, om zo de immunisatie van vossen te controleren.

2. Voor deze programma's in Roemenië is voor de periode 2011- 2013 een totaal bedrag van 6,5 miljoen euro uitgetrokken.

3. De Commissie heeft voor het jaar 2014 een budget van 5,5 miljoen euro uitgetrokken voor het bestrijden van hondsdolheid bij vossen via orale vaccinatie. Het programma voor 2014 voorziet 2 vaccinatiecampagnes — een in het voorjaar en een in het najaar. Het budget voor de volgende jaren zal afhangen van de programma's die Roemenië zal indienen, en van de goede uitvoering van de programma's van 2013 en 2014.

Het Voedsel- en Veterinair Bureau van het directoraat-generaal Gezondheid en Consumenten waakt over de controle van de technische implementatie van zulke programma's. Bovendien worden financiële controles ter plaatse uitgevoerd.

4. De EU-bijdrage aan het programma voor de uitroeiing van hondsdolheid beperkt zich tot de terugbetaling van de kosten om het vaccin dat in de campagnes wordt gebruikt aan te kopen en vanuit de lucht te verspreiden, op basis van facturen.

5 en 6. Een bijdrage van de EU wordt enkel uitbetaald op basis van de facturen van de aankoop en de verspreiding vanuit de lucht van het vaccin tegen hondsdolheid.

([1]) http://deutsche-wirtschafts-nachrichten.de/2014/02/15/eu-zahlt-kopfgeld-fuer-rumaenische-strassenhunde/.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001898/14
to the Commission
Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Embezzlement of EU subsidies in Romania

The EU has programmes for the eradication and monitoring of rabies in Romania.

1. What EU programmes exist for the eradication and monitoring of rabies in Romania, and how are they funded?

2. How much money was earmarked for these programmes in 2011, 2012 and 2013?

3. What is the budget for these programmes in 2014-2021, and how is implementation monitored?

4. According to the website Deutsche Wirtschafts Nachrichten ([1]), these EU subsidies are used to kill stray dogs in Romania. Is this true?

5. That website suggests that EU subsidies find their way to private dog catchers. Can the Commission confirm this?

6. The website also suggests that Romanian authorities, acting as contracting authorities, use EU anti-rabies subsidies to pay dog catchers and that they themselves profit in the process. Can the Commission confirm this?

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

1. The EU is currently funding an eradication programme against rabies in 13 Member States, some of them covering also activities in neighbouring third countries, where rabies is considered a high risk. Romania is one of those Member States.

The co-funded measures approving this programme are the purchase of oral vaccine baits and their aerial distribution in order to vaccinate foxes against rabies and the testing of samples taken from wild animals collected on the field in order to monitor the immunisation of foxes.

2. The total amount earmarked for these programmes in Romania for the period 2011 — 2013 is 6.5 million euro.

3. A budget of 5.5 million euro has been earmarked by the Commission for the implementation of an oral vaccination campaign against rabies in foxes for the year 2014. The programme for 2014 foresees 2 vaccination campaigns — one in spring and one in autumn. The budget for the subsequent years will depend on the programmes that will be submitted by Romania and on the proper implementation of the 2013 and 2014 programmes.

The Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General ensures the control of the technical implementation of such programmes. In addition, financial on-the-spot controls are carried out.

4. The EU contribution for the rabies eradication programme is limited to the reimbursement of costs for the purchase and aerial distribution of the vaccine used in the campaigns, based on invoices.

5 and 6. EU contribution is paid only on the basis of the invoices for the purchase and aerial distribution of the vaccines against rabies.

([1]) http://deutsche-wirtschafts-nachrichten.de/2014/02/15/eu-zahlt-kopfgeld-fuer-rumaenische-strassenhunde/

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-001899/14
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Kosten für externe Beratungsfirmen in den Jahren 2012 und 2013

1. Wie hoch waren die Gesamtkosten der Europäischen Kommission für die Beratung durch externe Firmen in den Jahren 2012 und 2013?

2. Wie hoch waren die Gesamtkosten der Europäischen Kommission für die Beratung durch externe Firmen je Generaldirektion in den Jahren 2012 und 2013?

3. Wie heißen jeweils diejenigen zehn Beratungsfirmen, die in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 die höchsten Beratungshonorare von der Europäischen Kommission erhalten haben?

4. Wie hoch waren die Gesamtkosten der Europäischen Kommission für die Beratung durch externe Firmen je Unternehmen im Jahr 2012 und 2013?

Antwort von Herrn Lewandowski im Namen der Kommission
(27. März 2014)

Die Kommission führt derzeit eine eingehende interne Untersuchung zur Beschaffung der gewünschten Informationen durch. Nach Abschluss der Untersuchung wird die Kommission den Herrn Abgeordneten sobald wie möglich über das Ergebnis informieren.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001899/14
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Cost of employing external consultancies in 2012 and 2013

1. How much did the Commission pay for the provision of consultancy services by external firms in 2012 and 2013?

2. How much did the Commission pay per directorate-general for the provision of consultancy services by external firms in 2012 and 2013?

3. What are the names of the 10 firms which received the highest consultancy fees from the Commission in 2012 and 2013 respectively?

4. How much did the Commission pay per firm for the provision of consultancy services by external firms in 2012 and 2013?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

The Commission is conducting a detailed internal investigation to obtain the information requested. Once the Commission has concluded the exercise, it will inform the Honourable Member as soon as possible about the result.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001900/14
to the Commission
Gerard Batten (EFD)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: The Scottish referendum, the EU budget and the United Kingdom

Mr Barroso recently said that if the Scottish people vote for Scotland to leave the UK in their referendum later this year, it would very 'difficult if not impossible' for Scotland to join the EU in its own right.

If Scotland does vote to the leave the UK, when that separation is formally completed, it will raise certain questions.

1. The UK joined the EEC in 1973, but that political entity will no longer exist. What would be the membership status of England, Wales and Northern Ireland?

2. If it would be 'difficult' or 'impossible' for Scotland to rejoin in its own right, would it be equally difficult or impossible for the remainder of the UK to join in its own right?

3. Alternatively, would the EU allow the remainder of the UK to remain a member without any need to formally renegotiate its terms of membership?

4. If Scotland was no longer to be a member of the EU, but England, Wales and Northern Ireland were to remain a member, would the UK contributions to the EU budget be reduced to reflect the corresponding loss in population and economic resources?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the first two paragraphs of its reply to parliamentary Question E-008133/2012 ([1]).

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-001901/14
à la Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE)
(19 février 2014)

Objet: Contrôles vétérinaires à l'importation de sulfate de chondroïtine en provenance de Chine

Les produits d'origine animale mentionnés à l'annexe I de la décision 2007/275/CE importés dans l'Union européenne doivent être soumis à un contrôle vétérinaire avant toute déclaration en douane.

Il s'avère que des difficultés apparaissent pour l'importation de chondroïtine en provenance de Chine. Cette molécule, utilisée pour soulager et réparer les articulations, est produite à partir de cartilage de poisson et de carapaces de crustacés; elle est donc à 100 % d'origine animale. La réglementation européenne impose aux sociétés importatrices d'informer les propriétaires de cette marchandise des mesures dont elles font l'objet, en réclamant un certificat sanitaire.

Or, les autorités chinoises ne délivrent aux entreprises qui en sont productrices ni certificat, ni agrément attestant du caractère alimentaire de la chondroïtine. Une entreprise française s'est ainsi vu refouler un conteneur de sulfate de chondroïtine faute d'avoir pu produire un certificat conforme, alors que des sociétés européennes concurrentes faisaient entrer au même moment le même produit en Grande-Bretagne et en Allemagne.

La Commission peut-elle indiquer si elle a eu connaissance d'un souci de cohérence relatif à la législation européenne concernant ce produit? Si oui, quelles démarches doit entreprendre l'entreprise française mentionnée plus haut?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(6 juin 2014)

Dans la législation de l'Union, le sulfate de chondroïtine qui est produit à partir de cartilage de poisson et de carapaces de crustacés et qui est à 100 % d'origine animale est considéré comme un produit de la pêche. Il doit provenir d'un pays tiers à partir duquel les importations de produits de la pêche sont autorisées et dans lequel ces produits sont fabriqués au sein d'un établissement agréé par l'UE. Il doit s'accompagner du certificat sanitaire relatif aux produits de la pêche prévu par la législation de l'UE.

Le sulfate de chondroïtine figure à l'annexe I de la décision 2007/275/CE ([1]) et doit, à ce titre, être soumis à des contrôles vétérinaires aux postes d'inspection frontaliers de l'UE avant d'être autorisé à l'importation dans l'Union.

Étant donné que les exigences applicables aux importations de sulfate de chondroïtine sont harmonisées dans la législation de l'UE, elles doivent être appliquées par tous les États membres. À la suite des demandes de clarification présentées par certains États membres, les informations ci-dessus ont été portées à l'attention de tous les États membres lors de réunions du groupe d'experts sur les contrôles vétérinaires à l'importation, et notamment au cours de la réunion du 21 novembre 2012.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/fr/oj/2007/l_116/l_11620070504fr00090033.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001901/14
to the Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Veterinary checks on imported chondroitin sulphate from China

Animal products listed in Annex I of Decision 2007/275/EC must be subject to veterinary checks prior to any customs declaration formalities for import into the EU.

It appears that difficulties are arising regarding imports of chondroitin from China. This molecule, which is used to relieve and cure joint diseases, is produced from fish cartilage and crustacean shells and is therefore 100% of animal origin. Under European rules, importing companies are required to provide information regarding the requisite formalities and obtain a health certificate.

However, the Chinese authorities do not issue producers with certification or documentation to the effect that chondroitin is an authorised food product. As a result, a consignment of chondroitin sulphate intended for a French company was turned back, since it was unable to produce the requisite certification, while competing European companies were at the same time importing this product in the United Kingdom and Germany.

Is the Commission aware of any inconsistencies in European legislation regarding this product? If so, what formalities should be completed by the French company referred to above?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

Chondroitin sulphate produced from fish cartilage and crustacean shells and being 100% of animal origin is classified according to the EU legislation as a fishery product. It shall origin from a third country from which imports of fishery products are authorised and produced in an EU approved establishment. It shall be accompanied by the health certificate for fishery products provided in the EU legislation.

Since Chondroitin sulphate is listed in Annex I to Decision 2007/275/EC ([1]) it shall be subjected to veterinary checks at the EU border inspection posts before the import into the EU could be authorised.

As the import requirements for chondroitin sulphate are harmonised in the EU legislation, they must be applied by all the Member States. Due to requests for clarification raised by some Member States, the above information has been brought to the attention of all Member States during meetings of the Expert Group on Veterinary import checks, in particular during the meeting of 21 November 2012.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2007/l_116/l_11620070504en00090033.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-001902/14
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Reparto de los Fondos estructurales en España

La Comisión ha hecho públicas las asignaciones financieras 2014-2020 de la política regional a precios corrientes. La nueva política de cohesión, dotada con 325 000 millones de euros (un 9 % menos que en la actualidad), destinará a España 28 559 millones de euros.

Pese a que la Comisión ha insistido en la importancia de mejorar la cooperación entre las autoridades responsables de utilizar los fondos de la UE y los socios de los proyectos mediante la mejora de los procesos de consulta, la transparencia, la participación y el diálogo con los socios durante todo el proceso (planificación, ejecución, seguimiento y evaluación) de los proyectos financiados por los Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión europeos, el Gobierno de España ha decidido no hacer público, hasta la fecha, el reparto por Comunidades Autónomas.

¿No cree la Comisión que la posición del Gobierno va en contra de los principios que defiende el código de conducta y, además, es irresponsable, al dificultar la labor de las autoridades regionales y locales?

¿No cree la Comisión que, en aras de respetar el principio de buena gobernanza, deberían ser públicas las informaciones sobre la distribución de los fondos entre las regiones?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de marzo de 2014)

De conformidad con el Reglamento por el que se establecen disposiciones comunes relativas a los Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión Europeos (EIE) ([1]), el acuerdo de asociación que ha de aprobar la Comisión deberá contener la asignación indicativa de ayuda de la Unión, por objetivo temático y a nivel nacional, correspondiente a cada uno de los Fondos EIE, así como la lista de los programas financiados por los Fondos EIE con las respectivas asignaciones indicativas por Fondo EIE y por año. Sin embargo, no existe ninguna obligación legal de proporcionar información detallada sobre la distribución regional de los Fondos EIE.

Según la información recibida por las autoridades nacionales en el marco de la preparación del acuerdo de asociación, se consultará a un importante número de organismos públicos y privados, nacionales y regionales, así como a representantes de organizaciones de la sociedad civil, y, además, también está prevista una consulta pública de los documentos de programación.

Una vez presentado, el acuerdo de asociación será evaluado por la Comisión siguiendo los criterios indicados en el artículo 5 del Reglamento (UE) n° 1303/2013, incluido el relativo a la aplicación del principio de asociación de conformidad con el Código de Conducta Europeo sobre las Asociaciones en el marco de los Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión Europeos adoptado por la Comisión ([2]).

([1]) Reglamento (UE) n° 1303/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 17 de diciembre de 2013 (DO L 347 de 20.12.2013, p. 320).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/esf/BlobServlet?docId=438&langId=es

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001902/14
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Distribution of structural funds in Spain

The Commission has published the financial allocations for regional policy for the 2014-2020 period at current prices. Under the new cohesion policy, which has a budget of EUR 325 million (9% down from present figures), Spain has been allocated EUR 28 559 million.

Although the Commission has stressed the importance of improving cooperation among the authorities responsible for using EU funds and the project partners, by improving consultation processes, transparency, participation and dialogue with partners throughout the whole process (planning, implementation, follow-up and assessment) of carrying out projects financed by the European Structural and Investment Funds, the Spanish Government has so far decided not to publish the distribution among the autonomous communities.

Does the Commission not think that the government's stance contradicts the principles upheld in the code of conduct, in addition to being irresponsible, since it impedes the work of local and regional authorities?

Does the Commission not think that the information detailing the regional distribution of funding should be made public, in order to respect the principle of good governance?

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

According to the Common Provisions Regulation of the Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds ([1]), the Partnership Agreement to be approved by the Commission must contain the indicative allocation of support by the Union by thematic objective at national level for each of the ESI Funds and the list of programmes financed by the ESI Funds with the respective indicative allocations by ESI Fund and by year. However, there is no legal obligation to provide detailed information on the regional distribution of the ESI Funds.

Following the information received by the national authorities in the framework of the preparation of the Partnership Agreement a relevant number of national and regional public and private bodies as well as representatives of the civil society organisations will be consulted and in addition, a public consultation of the programming documents is also foreseen.

Once submitted, the Partnership Agreement will be assessed by the Commission following the criteria indicated in Article 5 of the regulation (EU) 1303/2013, including the one related with the application of the partnership principle in accordance with the adopted by the Commission European code of conduct on partnership in the framework ESI Funds ([2]).

([1]) Regulation (EU) num. 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 OJ L 347/320.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/esf/BlobServlet?docId=438&langId=en

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001903/14
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(19. februar 2014)

Om: Islandske kapitalrestriktioner og EØS-aftalen

Jeg er blevet bekendt med, at Island stadig opretholder sine restriktioner for kapital. I denne forbindelse bedes Kommissionen besvare følgende spørgsmål:

Overholder Kommissionen sine forpligtelser i Det Blandede EØS-Udvalg til at sikre, at EØS-aftalen fungerer effektivt (artikel 43, 45 og 92 EØS) ved kun at »bemærke« Islands kontrol med kapital (indført i 2008) uden at reagere herpå og dermed de facto godkende kontrollerne?

Agter Kommissionen i betragtning af sine forpligtelser til at sikre den fri bevægelighed for kapital i hele EØS (jf. artikel 92 EØS) og i betragtning af kravet om, at kapitalrestriktionerne finder anvendelse i kortest mulig tid (artikel 45), fortsat at godkende Islands kapitalkontroller?

Opfylder Kommissionen sin forpligtelse til at sikre, at EØS-aftalen fungerer effektivt, og sin forpligtelse til at sikre og håndhæve TEUF (artikel 17 TEU) i lyset af, at EU-baserede virksomheder, der har investeret i Island, nu oplever, at deres investeringer reelt er blevet blokeret i mere end fem år, og at de ikke kan investere denne kapital andre steder og dermed udøve deres rettigheder i medfør af TEUF (artikel 63)?

Mener Kommissionen i betragtning af, at EØS-staterne ikke kan vedtage en à la carte-tilgang til grundlæggende rettigheder, at Islands restriktioner overholder reglerne om fri bevægelighed for kapital?

Overvejer Kommissionen at genforhandle EØS-aftalen i lyset af, at Island har foretaget kapitalkontroller i over fem år og dermed begrænset den fri bevægelighed for kapital mellem EU og de andre EFTA-stater?

Vil Kommissionen venligst give et svar, som tager hensyn til det forhold, at Schweiz for nylig begrænsede den fri bevægelighed for personer og derved brød sin aftale med EU?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Catherine Ashton, højtstående repræsentant og næstformand for Kommissionenș
(14. april 2014)

Kapitalens frie bevægelighed er en grundlæggende rettighed i medfør af det indre marked og fremgår i EØS-reglerne. Der kan dog indføres restriktioner vedrørende kapitalens frie bevægelighed mellem EU's medlemsstater og EFTA-staterne på baggrund af bestemmelserne i artikel 43 i EØS-aftalen.

Efter finanskrisen I 2008 indførte Islands regering midlertidig kontrol med kapitalbevægelserne som et led i IMF's stabiliseringsprogram. Restriktionernes gyldighed er blevet bekræftet af EFTA-domstolen ([1]) herunder det forhold, at Island fuldt ud har respekteret alle de specielle procedurer, der fremgår af artikel 43, 44 og 45, i EØS-aftalen hvad angår høring og varsling af EFTA-staternes stående udvalg og det blandede EØS-udvalg. Som følge heraf havde Kommissionen, der på det tidspunkt var formand for det blandede EØS-udvalg, ikke nogen indvendinger mod indførelsen af restriktioner vedrørende kapitalens frie bevægelighed i Island.

Det er dog stadig en kompliceret proces at ophæve kontrollen, som det fremgår af den betingelsesbaserede strategi, der blev godkendt af Islands regering i marts 2011. De oplysninger, der for øjeblikket er til rådighed, gør det ikke muligt at konkludere hvorvidt og hvornår strategien bliver en succes. Europa-Kommissionen anvendte sine juridiske kompetencer inden for rammerne af EØS-aftalen og opfordrede de islandske myndigheder til at forelægge regelmæssige opdateringer om de fremskridt, man har gjort, som ville gøre det muligt at genemføre en passende vurdering af de fortsatte behov for kontrol. Det endelige mål er stadig gradvist at ophæve denne midlertidige kontrol med kapitalbevægelserne.

Endelig er der ikke noget belæg for at overveje genforhandling af EØS-aftalen, idet kontrollen med kapitalbevægelserne i Island blev indført i overensstemmelse med EØS-aftalen og fordi Island fortsat gør fremskridt hvad angår ophævelse af denne kontrol.

([1]) Dom af f 14. december 2011 i sag E-3/11, Pálmi Sigmarsson v Seðlabanki Íslands.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001903/14
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Icelandic capital restrictions and the EEA Agreement

It has come to my attention that Iceland is still upholding its restrictions on capital. In light of this, I would like to ask the following questions.

In only 'taking note' of Iceland's capital controls (introduced in 2008) without giving a response and therefore, de facto, approving the controls, is the Commission fulfilling its obligations in the Joint Committee of ensuring the effective operation of the EEA Agreement (Articles 43, 45 and 92 EEA)?

In view of the Commission's obligations to safeguard the free movement of capital throughout the EEA (cf. Article 92 EEA), and in view of the requirement that capital restrictions remain in place only for the shortest period of time (Article 45), does the Commission intend to continue to approve of Iceland's capital controls?

Is the Commission fulfilling its duty to ensure the effective operation of the EEA Agreement and its duty to safeguard and enforce the TFEU (Article 17 TEU), bearing in mind that EU businesses, having invested in Iceland, now find that their investments have effectively been barred for more than five years and that they are unable to invest such capital elsewhere and thereby exercise their rights under the TFEU (Article 63)?

Given that EEA states cannot adopt an à la carte approach to fundamental freedoms, does the Commission believe that Iceland's restrictions satisfy the rules on the free movement of capital?

In light of the fact that Iceland has had capital controls in place for over five years, thereby limiting the free movement of capital between the EU and its fellow EFTA states, is the Commission considering renegotiating the EEA Agreement?

Please provide an answer which takes into account the fact that Switzerland has recently limited the free movement of people, thereby breaching its agreement with the EU.

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

Free movement of capital is a fundamental internal market freedom and is integral part of the EEA *acquis*. However, restrictions of free movement of capital between EU Member States and EFTA States can be implemented on the basis of the provisions of Article 43 of the EEA Agreement.

Following the 2008 financial crisis, the Government of Iceland introduced temporary capital controls as part of the IMF stabilisation program. The legality of these restrictions has been confirmed by the EFTA Court ([1]), including the fact that Iceland has fully respected all the special procedures provided by the article 43, 44 and 45 of the EEA Agreement with regard to consultation and notification of the EFTA Standing Committee and the EEA Joint Committee. As a consequence, the Commission, as alternative chair of the EEA Joint Committee, had no objections to the introduction of capital restrictions in Iceland.

The removal of these controls remains a complex process as confirmed by the conditions-based strategy approved by the the Icelandic Government in March 2011. Currently available information does not make possible to conclude whether and by when the strategy will be successful. In the framework of the EEA Joint Committee, the European Commission is using its legal competences and invited Icelandic authorities to provide regular updates as to the progress achieved that would render possible an appropriate assessment of the continuous needs of controls. The final goal remains the gradual removal of these temporary capital controls.

Finally, as the capital restrictions in Iceland were introduced in respect of the EEA Agreement and given the ongoing progress in lifting them, there are no grounds for considering a renegotiation of the Agreement.

([1]) Judgment of 14 December 2011 in case E-3/11, Pálmi Sigmarsson v Seðlabanki Íslands.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001904/14
a la Comisión
Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Tragedia en la playa de Tarajal: actuación del Gobierno de España y presión migratoria

Según fuentes policiales, alrededor de 30 000 subsaharianos están asentados en Marruecos a la espera de poder entrar clandestinamente en Europa, en la mayoría de los casos a través de Ceuta y Melilla. Estas dos ciudades se enfrentan desde hace meses a un aumento de la presión migratoria que mantiene en alerta constante a las fuerzas y cuerpos de seguridad del Estado.

Ayer mismo se produjo una nueva avalancha de inmigrantes en Melilla, con la entrada de 150 subsaharianos, y hace unos días, el 6 de febrero, tuvo lugar un intento de entrada en Ceuta que acabó cobrándose la vida de quince inmigrantes, ahogados en la playa de Tarajal.

Tras la comparecencia en el Congreso del ministro del Interior en España queda confirmada la utilización de pelotas de goma contra los inmigrantes y la práctica de la «devolución en caliente», sin respeto alguno de los derechos humanos ni del ordenamiento jurídico español, de la Unión e internacional.

La propia comisaria de Asuntos de Interior, Cecilia Malmström, ha manifestado su preocupación por estos hechos.

¿En qué acciones concretas va a traducirse la preocupación manifestada por la Comisión respecto de la actuación del Gobierno español?

¿No piensa la Comisión que, ante esta gravísima violación de los derechos humanos y del propio acervo de la Unión en materia de inmigración y asilo en un país miembro de la UE, deben depurarse responsabilidades y actuar para que esto no vuelva a suceder?

¿Qué medidas piensa adoptar la Comisión para apoyar a la frontera sur de Europa, aminorar la fuerte presión migratoria, y evitar que una tragedia así vuelva a suceder?

¿Está satisfecha la Comisión de los resultados de las medidas adoptadas a lo largo de esta legislatura para responder a los movimientos migratorios resultantes, entre otras causas, de la llamada Primavera Árabe?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de marzo de 2014)

En relación con las preguntas primera, tercera y cuarta, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita P-001879/2014 ([1]).

En cuanto a la segunda pregunta, la Comisión considera fundamental una investigación a fondo por parte de las autoridades nacionales, a quienes corresponde examinar y determinar si es necesario adoptar medidas disciplinarias adecuadas.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bP-2014-001879%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fES&language=ES

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001904/14
to the Commission
Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Tragedy at the Tarajal beach: actions of the Spanish Government and migratory pressure

According to police sources, there are around 30 000 Sub-Saharan people waiting in Morocco to enter Europe clandestinely, generally via Ceuta and Melilla. For some months now these two cities have been facing increasing migratory pressure, which obliges the national law enforcement agencies to stay on constant alert.

Yesterday there was another avalanche of immigrants, with 150 Sub-Saharans entering Melilla, while only a few days ago, on 6 February, there was a mass attempt to gain entrance to Ceuta, which cost the lives of fifteen immigrants, who were drowned off the Tarajal beach.

Following the appearance of the Spanish Minister of the Interior in parliament, it has been confirmed that rubber bullets were used against the immigrants and also that the practice of 'hot repatriation' was employed, with no respect shown either for human rights or for Spanish, EU or international legislation.

Even the Commissioner for Home Affairs, Cecilia Malmström, has expressed her concern about these events.

In the light of the concern expressed by the Commission regarding the actions of the Spanish Government, what specific measures does it intend to adopt?

Does the Commission not think that, as a result of this very serious violation in an EU Member State of human rights and of the very heritage of the Union in matters of immigration and asylum, those responsible should be held to account and action should be taken to prevent this situation from occurring again?

What measures does the Commission intend to adopt in order to back up Europe's southern border, reduce the intensity of migratory pressure and prevent a tragedy like this one from happening again?

Is the Commission satisfied with the results of the measures adopted in the course of this legislative session in response to the migratory movements that have arisen as a result *inter alia* of the so-called Arab Spring?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

As regards the first, third and fourth question, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question P-001879/2014 ([1]).

As regards the second question, the Commission considers it essential for a full inquiry to be carried out by national authorities; it is for the latter to examine and determine whether appropriate disciplinary measures are necessary.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bP-2014-001879%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001906/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Medidas urgentes para defender los derechos humanos en Corea del Norte

El Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas acaba de publicar un informe en el que documenta los múltiples crímenes contra la humanidad perpetrados en la República Popular Democrática de Corea. Una extensa documentación sobre «exterminación, asesinato, esclavitud, tortura, encarcelamiento, violación, aborto forzado y otros tipos de violencia sexual, así como persecución por razones políticas, religiosas, raciales y de sexo, trasferencia forzada de poblaciones, desaparición forzada de personas y el acto inhumano de causar intencionalmente hambre prolongada […]». En sus conclusiones aboga por la necesidad de adoptar medidas urgentes, así como de acudir a la Corte Penal Internacional.
(http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/CoIDPRK/Pages/ReportoftheCommissionofInquiryDPRK.aspx).

Ya he dejado constancia en ocasiones anteriores de mi preocupación ante los campos de concentración, los presos políticos y las violaciones de los derechos humanos en Corea del Norte (preguntas E-323/2012 y E-13090/13). Y sé que la Vicepresidenta de la Comisión y Alta Representante, en su declaración del 20 de diciembre de 2011, manifestó «su esperanza de que los nuevos dirigentes trabajen para mejorar la situación de los derechos humanos en la República Popular Democrática de Corea», y subrayó la disposición de la UE a ayudar al país en la consecución de dicho objetivo. También desde el Parlamento Europeo se han denunciado las violaciones de los derechos humanos, así como la grave situación alimentaria en Corea del Norte, lo que ha llevado a solicitar a la Comisión que garantice que «la ayuda [humanitaria] llegue de forma segura a la población a la que va dirigida» (Resolución de 14 de marzo de 2013).

Por todo ello, pregunto de nuevo a la Comisión:

1. ¿Ha analizado qué «medidas urgentes» de presión pueden adoptarse para conseguir el desmantelamiento de los campos de concentración, detener las ejecuciones y, en definitiva, paralizar tan graves violaciones de los derechos humanos?

2. ¿A cuánto asciende la ayuda humanitaria que facilita la Unión Europea a la República Popular Democrática de Corea? ¿Qué instrumentos garantizan que esa ayuda sea recibida por la población tan necesitada?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de abril de 2014)

1. La UE coinició la Resolución del Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas por la que se creó, en marzo de 2013, la Comisión de Investigación de las Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos Humanos en la República Popular Democrática de Corea (RPDC), a cuyo informe se refiere Su Señoría. La UE ha planteado sistemáticamente el tema de las violaciones de los derechos humanos en la RPDC, tanto ante las autoridades de ese país como fuera de este, especialmente en las Naciones Unidas. La UE trabajará con todos sus socios y, en especial, las Naciones Unidas, para garantizar un seguimiento adecuado de las conclusiones y recomendaciones de la Comisión de Investigación.

2. La UE proporciona ayuda humanitaria a la RPDC desde 1995. Entre 2000 y 2013, la ayuda de la UE a este país (ayuda humanitaria, ayuda alimentaria y de seguridad alimentaria, salud y saneamiento) superó los 230 millones de euros en desembolsos. Existen mecanismos de supervisión para garantizar que la ayuda llega a sus beneficiarios previstos, normalmente las personas más vulnerables de la República Popular Democrática de Corea, por ejemplo, los niños de centros asistenciales. Estos mecanismos incluyen visitas a los lugares de ejecución del proyecto y encuestas de referencia para comparar la situación anterior y posterior a la intervención. Algunos de los mecanismos de control todavía están sometidos a restricciones por parte de las autoridades de la RPDC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001906/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Urgent measures to protect human rights in North Korea

The United Nations Human Rights Council has recently published a report recording numerous crimes against humanity committed in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The report extensively documents 'extermination, murder, enslavement, torture, imprisonment, rape, forced abortions and other sexual violence, persecution on political, religious, racial and gender grounds, forcible transfer of persons, enforced disappearance of persons and the inhumane act of knowingly causing prolonged starvation […].' In its conclusions the report advocates the necessary adoption of urgent measures and referral to the International Criminal Court. (http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/CoIDPRK/Pages/ReportoftheCommissionofInquiryDPRK.aspx).

I have already on previous occasions placed on record my concern about the concentration camps, political prisoners and violations of human rights in North Korea (questions E-323/2012 and E-13090/13). I am aware that in her statement of 20 December 2011 the Vice-President and High Representative of the Commission expressed her 'hope that the new leadership will work to improve the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea' and underlined the EU's willingness to help the country in the pursuit of that goal. The European Parliament has also denounced both the violations of human rights and the serious food situation in North Korea, and it has asked the Commission to ensure 'the safe delivery of [humanitarian] aid to the targeted parts of the population' (Resolution of 14 March 2013).

In light of the foregoing I would like to ask the Commission again:

1. Has it studied what 'urgent measures' might be adopted to exert pressure so as to achieve the dismantling of the concentration camps, stop executions and, in short, put an end to such serious violations of human rights?

2. What is the amount of the humanitarian aid provided by the European Union to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea? What instruments are in place to ensure that this aid reaches the people who so desperately need it?

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

1. The EU co-initiated the UN Human Rights Council resolution that, in March 2013, established the UN Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), the report of which the Honourable Member has referred to. The EU has been consistently raising the issue of human rights abuses in DPRK both with DPRK authorities and beyond, especially in the United Nations. The EU will work with all its partners, and especially the UN, to ensure an appropriate follow-up to the Commission of Inquiry's findings and recommendations.

2. The EU has been providing humanitarian support to the DPRK since 1995. From 2000 to 2013 the level of EU assistance to this country (humanitarian aid, food assistance/food security, health and sanitation) was in the range of over EUR 230 million in terms of disbursements. Monitoring mechanisms are in place to ensure that this assistance reaches the intended beneficiaries, usually the most vulnerable elements in the population of DPRK, for example children in care institutions. These mechanisms include visits to project implementation sites and baseline surveys to compare the situation before and after the intervention. Some of the monitoring mechanisms still face restrictions by the authorities of DPRK.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001907/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: La columbita-tantalita y la violencia en la República Democrática del Congo

El foro que reúne a parlamentarios de África, el Caribe y el Pacífico con diputados del Parlamento europeo viene insistiendo desde hace años en la necesidad de promover una normativa sobre la utilización de los minerales óxidos. De manera especial se cita la columbita-tantalita, comúnmente denominada coltán, porque la extracción de este mineral tan preciado para la elaboración de instrumentos tecnológicos se realiza en unas condiciones funestas en la República Democrática del Congo. Es cierto que algunas empresas ya se han comprometido a reducir su utilización o a adquirirlo en minas que satisfagan unas mínimas reglas de humanidad, pero las noticias que nos llegan siguen siendo muy trágicas.

Junto a informes de las Naciones Unidas o Human Rights Watch, recientemente se han publicado preocupantes reportajes gracias a la financiación facilitada por el European Journalism Centre o la Fundación Bill & Melinda Gates. También en la ciudad de Madrid, en el Círculo de Bellas Artes, se puede visitar en estos momentos una exposición de fotografía titulada «Un cruel banquete. PourQuoi?» que denuncia la violencia contra las mujeres en las guerras que están asolando el África central.

De ahí que pregunte a la Comisión:

1. ¿Ha elaborado algún estudio sobre el tráfico de estos minerales óxidos en la Unión Europea?

2. ¿No considera que se podrían incluir «declaraciones responsables» o «protocolos básicos» de las empresas, así como cláusulas en los contratos para garantizar la reducción del uso de estos minerales o que, en todo caso, la extracción se realice atendiendo a unas condiciones sociales mínimas?

3. ¿Puede facilitar los datos de la ayuda humanitaria que la Unión Europea destina a la República Democrática del Congo y a las organizaciones no gubernamentales que actúan en ese territorio?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de abril de 2014)

1. El 5 de marzo de 2014, la Comisión aprobó una propuesta legislativa con un enfoque integrado de la UE a fin de impedir que los beneficios procedentes del comercio de minerales se utilicen para financiar conflictos armados como el de la República Democrática del Congo. Para elaborar la propuesta se contó con la información contenida en una evaluación de impacto que analiza la participación de las empresas de la UE en el comercio de estos minerales ([1]).

2. La Comisión ha propuesto un proyecto de Reglamento por el que se crea un sistema de autocertificación de la UE para las empresas que desean importar de forma responsable estaño, tantalio, wolframio y oro en la Unión. Esto implica que los importadores de la UE de estos metales y sus minerales están obligados a ejercer la «debida diligencia» mediante el control y la gestión de sus compras y ventas de acuerdo con la Guía de Debida Diligencia de la OCDE ([2]). Además, la Alta Representante y la Comisión han propuesto en una Comunicación conjunta ([3]) establecer una serie de medidas de acompañamiento que incluyan: incentivos en el marco de la contratación pública, ayuda financiera para las pequeñas y medianas empresas, diálogos políticos con los gobiernos de los países de extracción, transformación y consumo, ayuda específica al desarrollo, y apoyo paralelo de los Estados miembros de la UE a través de sus políticas e instrumentos propios.

3. En el período 2008-2013, la UE destinó más de 300 millones de euros en ayuda humanitaria a la República Democrática del Congo y 175 millones de euros a organizaciones de la sociedad civil.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/march/tradoc_152229.pdf
([2]) http://www.oecd.org/daf/inv/mne/GuidanceEdition2.pdf
([3]) JOIN (2014) 8.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001907/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Columbite-tantalite and violence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

The forum where members of parliament from Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific meet with Members of the European Parliament has been insisting for years on the need to promote regulations on the use of oxide minerals. Particular reference is made to columbite-tantalite, commonly known as coltan, because the mining of this valuable mineral for the manufacture of technological devices is carried out in terrible conditions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is true that some companies have already undertaken to reduce its use or to extract it from mines that meet certain minimum humane standards, but the news that reaches us is still tragic.

Along with reports from the United Nations and Human Rights Watch, worrying reports have also been published recently thanks to funding from the European Journalism Centre and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. In the city of Madrid there is currently a photographic exhibition on show at the Círculo de Bellas Artes cultural centre entitled '*Un cruel banquete. PourQuoi?*', which denounces the violence committed against women in the wars that are devastating central Africa.

I would therefore like to ask the Commission:

1. Has it carried out any investigation on the traffic of such oxide minerals in the European Union?

2. Does it not consider that 'declarations of responsibility' or 'basic protocols' might be included in contracts with these companies, along with clauses to guarantee a reduction of the use of these minerals, or at least to ensure that mining is carried out under minimum humane conditions?

3. Can it provide the data on the humanitarian aid that the European Union dedicates to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and to the non-governmental organisations that operate there?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

1. On 5 March 2014, the Commission approved a legislative proposal with an integrated EU approach to stop profits from trade in minerals being used to finance armed conflicts such as in the Democratic Republic of Congo. This proposal was informed by an impact assessment which analyses the involvement of EU companies in the trade of these minerals ([1]).

2. The Commission has proposed a draft Regulation setting up an EU system of self-certification for companies which choose to import tin, tantalum, tungsten and gold responsibly into the Union. This requires interested EU importers of these metals and their ores to exercise 'due diligence' by monitoring and administering their purchases and sales in line with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance ([2]). In addition, the High Representative and the Commission proposed in a joint Communication ([3]) to introduce a number of accompanying measures including: public procurement incentives, financial support for small and medium-sized enterprises, policy dialogues with governments in extraction, processing and consuming countries, dedicated development assistance and parallel support through EU Member State own policies and instruments.

3. In the period 2008-2013, the EU allocated more than EUR 300 million in humanitarian aid to the Democratic Republic of Congo and EUR 175 million to civil society organisations.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/march/tradoc_152229.pdf
([2]) http://www.oecd.org/daf/inv/mne/GuidanceEdition2.pdf
([3]) JOIN(2014) 8.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001908/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: El mercado de las monedas virtuales

En numerosas ocasiones he trasladado a la Comisión Europea mi preocupación por el incremento del uso de las monedas virtuales, y los peligros que puede conllevar para los consumidores por su escasa información y transparencia (E-013401/2013 y E-004459/2013).

Como conoce la Comisión Europea, recientemente la Autoridad Bancaria Europea ha emitido una advertencia formal destinada a incrementar la sensibilización de los consumidores.

La opinión señala la falta de protección existente que sufren los consumidores que deciden interactuar en los mercados a través de las denominadas monedas virtuales. Por ejemplo, se podría destacar la poca regularización que tienen las plataformas de intercambio donde los consumidores acuden para adquirir las monedas virtuales. Es decir, en caso de que una plataforma de intercambio desaparezca, no existe ninguna protección legal específica para el consumidor.

Informaciones recientes han desvelado que EE.UU. pretende ampliar la información disponible sobre las muchas monedas virtuales, con el objetivo de aumentar la transparencia, y por lo tanto la protección al consumidor. En una reciente comparecencia, el Superintendente de Servicios Financieros de Nueva York, Benjamin Lawsky, ha revelado la intención de proceder a una regulación de la moneda. La idea es que los profesionales del sector deban poseer una «Licencia Bit» para poder interactuar en el mercado de las monedas virtuales. Según explica el Sr. Lawsky, esta medida alejaría a consumidores con poca experiencia y evitaría que organizaciones criminales aprovechen la opacidad de estas monedas para desarrollar sus actividades.

Ante la información expuesta, este diputado pregunta:

1. ¿Es consciente la Comisión de la poca información de la que disponen los consumidores y, por lo tanto, de la falta de protección existente en este mercado?

2. ¿Ha considerado la Comisión legislar en pro de que las plataformas de intercambio posean un sistema de garantía de depósitos?

3. ¿Ha considerado la Comisión emitir un informe que aporte información y transparencia en las negociaciones de las monedas virtuales?

4. ¿Qué opinión le merece a la Comisión la «Licencia Bit»?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión desea confirmar a Su Señoría que, en el contexto de un grupo de trabajo específico creado por la Autoridad Bancaria Europea (EBA) y en el que participan la Autoridad Europea de Valores y Mercados (AEVM), el Banco Central Europeo (BCE), los servicios de la Comisión y varios representantes de los Estados miembros, se está analizando conjuntamente si las monedas virtuales pueden y deben regularse.

Se prevé que el informe del grupo de trabajo esté listo antes de mayo de 2014.

En estas circunstancias, todavía no se ha adoptado una posición final a escala de la UE sobre este importante asunto. En esta fase no se excluye ninguna opción, incluida la intervención reguladora.

Habida cuenta de los riesgos identificados para los consumidores, la Comisión quiere, en primer lugar, confirmar su pleno apoyo al aviso formal de la EBA que tiene como objetivo advertir a los consumidores de los posibles riesgos de comprar, poseer o realizar transacciones comerciales con monedas virtuales como, por ejemplo, la *bitcoin*.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001908/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: The virtual currency market

I have on numerous occasions expressed my concern to the European Commission regarding the growing use of virtual currency and the dangers that this may entail for consumers due to the lack of transparency and scarcity of information involved (E-013401/2013 and E-004459/2013).

As the Commission knows, the European Banking Authority recently issued a formal warning to raise consumer awareness.

The opinion highlights the current lack of protection for consumers who decide to interact in markets using so-called virtual currencies. For example, it might be pointed out that exchange platforms, which consumers access to trade in virtual currencies, tend to be unregulated. In other words, if an exchange platform goes out of business, there are no specific regulatory protections in place for consumers.

According to recent reports, the USA intends to broaden the information available on the numerous virtual currencies that exist, with the aim of increasing transparency and thus consumer protection. In a recent appearance Benjamin Lawsky, the New York Financial Services Superintendent, said that the city intended to take steps to regulate virtual currency. The idea is that traders in this sector should hold a 'BitLicense' before being permitted to interact in the virtual currency market. As Mr Lawsky explained, this measure would keep away consumers with little or no experience and would prevent criminal organisations from taking advantage of the opacity of these currencies for the purposes of their activities.

In light of the above I would like to ask:

1. Is the Commission aware of the scarcity of information available to consumers and therefore the lack of protection for them in this market?

2. Has the Commission considered legislating to ensure that exchange platforms have a system to guarantee deposits?

3. Has the Commission considered issuing a report to provide information and transparency in virtual currency trading?

4. What is the Commission's view on the proposed 'BitLicense'?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission would like to confirm to the Honorable Member that a joint examination aiming to assess whether virtual currencies ought and can be regulated is currently ongoing in the context of a dedicated task force set up by the European Banking Authority (EBA) and involving the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA), the European Central Bank (ECB), the Commission's services as well as several Member States' representatives.

The task force is expected to report by May 2014.

In these circumstances, a final position on this important matter has not yet been taken at EU level. At this stage no option is excluded, including regulatory intervention.

As a first step, giving the risks identified for consumers, the Commission would like to confirm its full support for the EBA's formal warning aiming to highlight to consumers possible risks from buying, trading or holding virtual currencies such as Bitcoins.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001909/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Política de inmigración — graves hechos en Ceuta I

En referencia a los graves hechos sucedidos el pasado 6 de febrero en la frontera española que limita el paso ceutí con el Tarajal, creo que es importante que la Comisión aclare bien lo sucedido para evitar que se repita en el futuro, teniendo en cuenta que la frontera de Ceuta se trata también de una frontera entre Europa y África.

¿Con qué protocolo se llevó a cabo la actuación de los agentes de la Guardia Civil en el intento de entrada masiva de inmigrantes a Ceuta por la Playa el Tarajal?

Aún no queda clara la actuación de la Guardia Civil. De todas las versiones que ha dado la Delegación del Gobierno en Ceuta, ¿tiene conocimiento la Comisión de cuál es la correcta?

¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión de si se utilizó material antidisturbios como lanzamiento de balas de goma y gases lacrimógenos a los inmigrantes que se encontraban dentro del agua?

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión abrir una investigación pertinente para esclarecer los hechos y depurar las responsabilidades de todo tipo que pudieran derivarse?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de marzo de 2014)

En respuesta a la solicitud de explicaciones sobre el incidente de Ceuta del 6 de febrero de 2014 presentada por la Comisión, las autoridades españolas confirmaron que han puesto en marcha una investigación a fondo y reconocieron que se usaron balas de goma en esa ocasión.

La Comisión considera que es esencial que las autoridades nacionales investiguen a fondo lo ocurrido y examinen y determinen si es necesario adoptar medidas disciplinarias adecuadas. La Comisión solicitó a las autoridades españolas ser informada de los resultados de su investigación. La Comisión se reserva el derecho a adoptar las medidas adecuadas en el caso de que haya pruebas de que un Estado miembro ha infringido el Derecho de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001909/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Immigration policy — serious incidents in Ceuta (I)

In relation to the serious incidents that took place on 6 February last at the Spanish border between Ceuta and the Tarajal, I believe it is important for the Commission to clarify exactly what happened so that it does not occur again, bearing in mind that this border is also a frontier between Europe and Africa.

What protocol did the Civil Guard agents follow in dealing with the mass attempt by immigrants to enter Ceuta by way of the Tarajal beach?

It is not yet clear precisely how the Civil Guard acted. Among all the different versions given by the Office of the Government Delegate in Ceuta, does the Commission know which is the correct one?

Does the Commission know whether riot control material was employed, such as the firing of rubber bullets and tear gas at the immigrants in the water?

Does the Commission intend to open an investigation to clarify what happened and ensure that those responsible are brought to account, whatever their position?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

In response to the Commission's request for explanations about the incident in Ceuta on 6 February 2014, the Spanish authorities confirmed that they have launched a full inquiry. They have also confirmed the use of rubber bullets on that occasion.

The Commission considers it essential for a full inquiry to be carried out by national authorities and it is for the latter to examine and determine whether appropriate disciplinary measures are necessary. The Commission invited the Spanish authorities to inform it of the outcome of their inquiry. The Commission reserves the right to take appropriate steps where there is evidence that a Member State has violated EC law.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001910/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Política de inmigración — graves hechos en Ceuta II

En referencia a los graves hechos sucedidos el pasado 6 de febrero en la frontera española que limita el paso ceutí con el Tarajal, creo que es importante que la Comisión aclare bien lo sucedido para evitar que se repita en el futuro ([1]), teniendo en cuenta que la frontera de Ceuta se trata también de una frontera entre Europa y Africa.

El presidente del Parlamento Europeo declaró, después de la tragedia de Lampedusa, que la UE tendría que afrontar definitivamente el problema de la inmigración ilegal ([2]).

¿Tiene establecido la Comisión algún protocolo europeo de actuación para la policía en las fronteras de la UE?

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión elaborar un protocolo de actuación de este tipo?

¿Cómo debe afrontar la UE la inmigración ilegal?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión no ha establecido un protocolo europeo sobre la actuación policial en las fronteras de la UE ni tiene previsto hacerlo.

La Comisión está colaborando con los Estados miembros de cara a un planteamiento global para reducir los flujos migratorios irregulares, garantizando al mismo tiempo el derecho a la protección internacional para las personas que la necesiten. El intercambio de información sobre las rutas migratorias entre los Estados miembros y con las agencias de la UE (a través de Frontex ([3])) es central en este planteamiento. Se ha intensificado la cooperación con los terceros países clave mediante asociaciones de movilidad y acuerdos de readmisión de la UE. Los Estados miembros están tomando medidas, en cooperación con Europol ([4]), para luchar contra el tráfico de seres humanos, la facilitación de la migración irregular y la falsificación de documentos. La gestión de las fronteras exteriores de la UE se ha reforzado mediante la aplicación del Reglamento Eurosur ([5]), así como mediante el pleno despliegue del Sistema de Información de Visados y el Sistema de Información de Schengen de segunda generación. Se ha aplicado una política de retorno de la UE justa y eficaz mediante la Directiva sobre el retorno ([6]).

([1]) http://www.elmundo.es/espana/2014/02/14/52fd5ae7e2704e702e8b4584.html
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/internacional/20131020/54391412679/martin-schulz-europa-necesita-inmigracion-legal.html
([3]) Agencia Europea para la Gestión de la Cooperación Operativa en las Fronteras Exteriores.
([4]) Oficina Europea de Policía.
([5]) Reglamento (UE) nº 1052/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 22 de octubre de 2013, por el que se crea un Sistema Europeo de Vigilancia de Fronteras (Eurosur); DO L 295 de 6.11.2013, pp. 11-26.
([6]) 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. 98-107.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001910/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Immigration policy — serious incidents in Ceuta (II)

In relation to the serious incidents that took place on 6 February last at the Spanish border between Ceuta and the Tarajal, I believe it is important for the Commission to clarify exactly what happened so that it does not occur again ([1]), bearing in mind that this border is also a frontier between Europe and Africa.

After the tragedy of Lampedusa, the President of the European Parliament declared that the EU would have to definitively face up to the problem of illegal immigration ([2]).

Has the Commission established any European protocol to regulate police action at EU borders?

Does the Commission plan to draw up a protocol of action of this kind?

How should the EU deal with illegal immigration?

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

The Commission has not established a European protocol on police action at EU borders and has no plans to do so.

The Commission is working together with Member States towards a comprehensive approach for reducing irregular migratory flows, while ensuring the right to international protection for those in need of it. Intelligence sharing on migratory routes between Member States and with EU agencies (via Frontex ([3])) is at the heart of this approach. Cooperation has been strengthened with key third countries through Mobility Partnerships and EU Readmission Agreements. Action is being taken by Member States, in cooperation with Europol ([4]), to tackle trafficking in human beings, the facilitation of irregular migration and document fraud. The management of the EU's external borders has been enhanced through the implementation of the Eurosur Regulation ([5]), and the full roll out of the Visa Information System and the second generation Schengen Information System. A fair and effective EU return policy has been implemented by the Return Directive ([6]).

([1]) http://www.elmundo.es/espana/2014/02/14/52fd5ae7e2704e702e8b4584.html
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/internacional/20131020/54391412679/martin-schulz-europa-necesita-inmigracion-legal.html
([3]) European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders.
([4]) European Police Office.
([5]) Regulation (EU) No 1052/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur); OJ L 295, 6.11.2013, p. 11-26.
([6]) 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.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001911/14
til Kommissionen
Claus Larsen-Jensen (S&D)
(19. februar 2014)

Om: Pillepas for pendlere og andre hyppigt transitrejsende

Jævnfør Schengenreglernes artikel 75, stk. 1 om forpligtelse til at kunne fremvise attest (et såkaldt »pillepas«) på, at medbragt medicin indeholdende psykotrope og/eller narkotiske stoffer, der anvendes som led i medicinsk behandling, vil jeg hermed henlede Kommissionens opmærksomhed på de vanskeligheder, som den nuværende implementering medfører for pendlende transitrejsende med kroniske eller længerevarende lidelser, der måtte kræve behandling med medicin, der er omfattet af disse bestemmelser.

Da disse attester maksimalt udstedes for en periode på 30 dage med nøjagtig angivelse af ud- og hjemrejsedato, besværliggøres pendleres og andre hyppigt rejsende transitrejsende unødigt, når de må ansøge om attester til hver rejse. Særligt for rejsende, der har start- og slutdestination i samme land, men som må rejse igennem et andet Schengenland, udgør dette en unødig tids- og ressourcemæssig byrde.

1. Vil det efter Kommissionens juridiske vurdering være muligt i henhold til Schengenreglerne at udstede Artikel 75-attester for perioder ud over 30 dage, samt til brug for flere transitrejser uden angivelse af specifikke ind- og udrejsedatoer?

2. Vurderer Kommissionen, at man for rejsende der har start- og slutdestination i samme land, men som af geografiske eller transportinfrastrukturelle årsager må transportere sig gennem et andet Schengenland, vil kunne give dispensation for kravet om Artikel 75-attester, subsidiært udarbejde særlige attester for denne gruppe rejsende, jf. punkt 1 ovenfor?

3. Såfremt Kommissionen vurderer, at udstedelse af sådanne attester, jf. ovenstående, ikke er muligt, vil den da påtage sig at udarbejde løsningsforslag, der kan lette de administrative byrder for de berørte rejsende?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Johannes Hahn
(6. maj 2014)

Bestemmelserne for udstedelse af den attest, der er omtalt i artikel 75 i konventionen om gennemførelse af Schengenaftalen af 14. juni 1985, er indeholdt i Eksekutivkomitéens afgørelse af 22. december 1994 om den i artikel 75 omhandlede attest for medbringelse af narkotika og psykotrope stoffer (SCH/Com-ex (94) 28 rev.) ([1]).

Af denne afgørelse fremgår det, at Schengenstaternes kompetente myndigheder skal udstede denne attest til personer, der har bopæl på deres område, og som ønsker at rejse til en anden Schengenstat, og som efter lægeordination skal indtage narkotika og/eller psykotrope stoffer i dette tidsrum. Ifølge afgørelsen er »attesten gyldig i højst 30 dage«. I de to bilag til afgørelsen findes den standardformular, der skal anvendes ved udstedelse af en sådan attest, samt en fortegnelse over de centrale myndigheder, der skal kontaktes i forbindelse med problemer.

([1]) EFT L 239 af 22.9.2000, s. 463-468.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001911/14
to the Commission
Claus Larsen-Jensen (S&D)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Certificates for medicines for cross-border commuters and other frequent transit travellers

In connection with Article 75(1) of the Schengen Convention, which requires travellers carrying medicines, for medical treatment purposes, that contain psychotropic and/or narcotic substances to produce a certificate, the Commission's attention is drawn to the difficulties now faced by cross-border commuters and transit travellers with chronic or long-term illnesses requiring treatment with medicines covered by that provision.

The certificates issued are valid for no more than 30 days and the precise outward and return journey dates must be specified, needlessly causing difficulties for cross-border commuters and other frequent transit travellers, given that they have to apply for a certificate for each journey. In particular for travellers whose journeys start and end in the same country, but who have to transit another Schengen country, this is an unnecessary time-consuming and bureaucratic burden.

1. In the Commission's opinion, would it be legally possible to issue Article 75 certificates which were valid for more than 30 days and could be used for a number of transit journeys without specifying precise entry and departure dates?

2. Does the Commission consider that travellers whose journeys start and end in the same country but who, for reasons to do with geography or transport infrastructure, have to travel through another Schengen country could be exempted from the requirement to produce Article 75 certificates or, alternatively, that special certificates could be issued for the category of travellers referred to in the first paragraph?

3. If the Commission considers that issuing such certificates is not possible, will it undertake to propose solutions easing the administrative burden for the travellers concerned?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2014)

The decision of the Executive Committee of 22 December 1994 on the certificate provided for in Article 75 to carry narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances (SCH/Com-ex (94) 28 rev.) ([1]) lays down the conditions under which the certificate referred to in Article 75 of the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 can be issued.

The decision stipulates that the competent authorities of any Schengen State shall issue this certificate to persons resident on their territory who want to travel to another Schengen State and who, owing to a medical prescription, need to take narcotic drugs and/or psychotropic substances during this period. According to this decision, the 'certificate shall be valid for a maximum period of 30 days'. The two annexes to this decision include the standard form to be used when issuing such a certificate as well as the list of Central Authorities to be contacted in case of problems.

([1]) OJ L 239 of 22 September 2000, p. 463-468.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001912/14
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(19. februar 2014)

Om: Industrielle kemikalier

Forskerne Phillippe Grandjean og Philip Landrigan har i The Lancet netop offentliggjort konklusionerne af en ny undersøgelse med titlen »Neurobehaviorial effects of developmental toxicity«. Forskerne slår fast, at den udbredte brug og eksistens af kemikalier bidrager væsentligt til en global pandemi af neuro-toksicitet. Det betyder med andre ord, at brugen af industrielle kemikalier fører til skader på menneskehjernens udvikling. Det er særligt fostre og små børn, der er udsatte. Forskerne vurderer, at kemikalierne er skyld i stigningen i antallet af børn med sygdomme som ADHD, samt at stofferne i øvrigt bevirker et fald i intelligens hos udsatte børn.

Det er dybt bekymrende resultater. Forskerne foreslår politisk handling og etablering af et internationalt »clearinghouse«, der skal udføre og koordinere studier samt fremme en global forebyggelsesindsats. Forskerne foreslår ligeledes lovkrav om, at alle stoffer testes — såvel kemikalier som pesticider og både gamle og nye stoffer. De understreger også, at yderligere evalueringer af stofferne er påkrævet, inden de sættes på markedet.

Mit spørgsmål til EU-Kommissionen er derfor:

Vil EU-Kommissionen tage initiativ til at etablere et internationalt »clearinghouse«, og vil Kommissionen uden yderligere forsinkelser tage initiativ til at stramme reglerne på EU-niveau? Det vil både sige en hurtigere og mere effektiv implementering af REACH, fremsættelsen af en definition på hormonforstyrrende stoffer samt en handlingsplan for at reducere EU-borgernes eksponering for de hormonforstyrrende stoffer.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potočnik
(30. april 2014)

REACH-direktivet har til formål at sikre et højt beskyttelsesniveau for menneskers sundhed mod skadelige stoffer, dvs. stoffer, der har toksisk indvirkning på udviklingen af nervesystemet, som f.eks. visse hormonforstyrrende stoffer.

I 2013 forpligtede Kommissionen sig til at opstille en liste over alle relevante kendte særligt problematiske stoffer, herunder hormonforstyrrende stoffer, og indarbejde den i kandidatlisten under REACH ([1]) 2020.

For at støtte gennemførelsen af disse forpligtelser har Det Europæiske Kemikalieagentur nedsat en ekspertgruppe om hormonforstyrrende stoffer, der giver videnskabelig rådgivning om identificering af hormonforstyrrende stoffer.

Desuden er Kommissionen for øjeblikket i gang med at færdiggøre en køreplan, der gør rede for det planlagte konsekvensanalysearbejde vedrørende kriterier for hormonforstyrrende stoffer med henblik på at kunne træffe en afgørelse om videnskabelige kriterier for identificering af hormonforstyrrende stoffer. Det er planen, at dette dokument skal offentliggøres i første halvår af 2014.

Det 7. miljøhandlingsprogram omfatter aktioner vedrørende hormonforstyrrende stoffer og foreskriver udvikling af harmoniserede farebaserede kriterier til identificering af hormonforstyrrende stoffer og metoder, der minimerer risikoen for, at mennesker udsættes for dem. Desuden bliver der fortsat gjort en indsats for at forny fællesskabsstrategien om hormonforstyrrende stoffer fra 1999 ([2]).

På den internationale konference om kemikalieforvaltning (ICCM), hvor EU deltager, opfordrede man i september 2012 IOCM-organisationerne ([3]) til at lede og fremme de koordinerede aktioner, der omfatter udveksling af videnskabeligt baserede oplysninger, udbredelse og netværksvirksomhed om hormonforstyrrende kemikalier, dvs. ved hjælp af den strategiske tilgang med en clearingscentral.

([1]) http://echa.europa.eu/web/guest/candidate-list-table.
([2]) KOM(1999) 706.
([3]) IOCM er et program for organisationer vedrørende god forvaltning af kemikalier.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001912/14
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Industrial chemicals

In 'The Lancet', researchers Phillippe Grandjean and Philip Landrigan recently published the conclusions of a new study entitled 'Neurobehavioral effects of developmental toxicity'. They demonstrate that the widespread use and existence of chemicals are a major factor in a global pandemic of neurotoxicity. In other words, the use of industrial chemicals is harmful to human brain development. Foetuses and young children are most at risk. The researchers consider that industrial chemicals are responsible for the rise in the number of children with disorders such as ADHD and that the substances also lower the intelligence of children exposed to them.

These are deeply worrying findings. The researchers propose political action and the establishment of an international clearinghouse to carry out and coordinate studies and promote global prevention efforts. They also propose statutory mandatory testing of all substances — both chemicals and pesticides, and both existing and new substances. In addition, they stress that there must be further evaluations of the substances before they are placed on the market.

Therefore:

Will the Commission act to establish an international clearinghouse and, without further delay, tighten up the relevant EU rules? This will mean faster and more effective implementation of REACH, formulating a definition of hormone disruptor and an action plan to reduce EU citizens' exposure to hormone disruptors.

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2014)

The REACH Directive aims to ensure a high level of protection of human health against harmful substances, *inter alia* those showing neurodevelopmental toxicity, such as certain endocrine disrupting substances.

In 2013, the Commission committed itself to list all relevant currently known substances of very high concern, including endocrine disruptors (EDs) in the Candidate List under REACH ([1]) by 2020.

To support implementation of this commitment, the European Chemicals Agency has established an expert group on EDs providing scientific advice related to the identification of endocrine disruptors.

Furthermore, the Commission is currently finalising a roadmap document, which sets out the planned impact assessment work on ED criteria, in order to enable a decision on scientific criteria for the identification of EDs. This document is planned to be published in the first semester of 2014.

The 7th Environmental Action Programme includes actions on EDs stipulating the development of harmonised hazard-based criteria for the identification of EDs and minimisation of exposure to them. Furthermore efforts to renew the 1999 ([2]) Community Strategy on EDs are on-going.

The International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), in which the EU participates, invited in September 2012 the IOCM ([3]) organisations to lead and facilitate the cooperative action to facilitate science-based information exchange, dissemination and networking on endocrine-disrupting chemicals through, *inter alia*, the use of the Strategic Approach clearing house.

([1]) http://echa.europa.eu/web/guest/candidate-list-table
([2]) COM(1999) 706.
([3]) IOCM = Inter-Organisation Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001913/14
an die Kommission
Albert Deß (PPE)
(19. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Düngeverordnung

Die von der Kommission geforderte Verschärfung der Nitratrichtlinie ist die Folge eines „Meldefehlers" der Bundesregierung. Es wurden nicht die Werte eines möglichst repräsentativen Messnetzes weitergegeben, sondern die Werte jener etwa 160 Meldestellen, bei denen schon Probleme bekannt waren. Dadurch sind die Werte von Deutschland nicht mit denen anderer Länder vergleichbar.

Insgesamt sind bei über 90 % des Grundwassers und 95 % des Trinkwassers die Nitratgrenzwerte von 50 Milligramm pro Liter eingehalten, wenn man das repräsentative Messnetz mit über 700 Messstellen in Betracht zieht.

Werden für die Messung unterschiedlich repräsentative Messnetze herangezogen? Plant die Kommission, die unterschiedlich repräsentativen Messergebnisse anzugleichen?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(8. April 2014)

Gewässer, die von Verunreinigung betroffen sind, und Gewässer, die von Verunreinigung betroffen werden könnten, müssen nach der Nitrat-Richtlinie (Richtlinie 91/676/EWG ([1])) von den Mitgliedstaaten bestimmt werden. Die Mitgliedstaaten können frei entscheiden, wie und wo die notwendigen Messnetze eingerichtet werden. Den aus der Nitrat-Richtlinie resultierenden Berichterstattungspflichten wird durch die Übermittlung der Daten seitens der Mitgliedstaaten nachgekommen.

Der Kommission ist bekannt, dass die Mitgliedstaaten Messnetze eingerichtet haben, denen unterschiedliche Kriterien zugrunde liegen. Dies ging auch aus dem letzten Bericht über die Durchführung der Nitrat-Richtlinie ([2]) hervor, der auf den Berichten der Mitgliedstaaten für den Zeitraum 2008-2011 beruhte.

Die Merkmale der Messnetze und die damit verbundenen Fragen der Repräsentativität und Vergleichbarkeit werden von der Kommission bei ihren Bemühungen zur Durchsetzung der Anwendung der Nitrat-Richtlinie in vollem Umfang berücksichtigt.

([1]) ABl. L 375 vom 31.12.1991.
([2]) KOM(2013)683 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001913/14
to the Commission
Albert Deß (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Provisions governing fertilisers

The measures being called for by the Commission to tighten up the Nitrates Directive are the result of a 'reporting error' by the German Government. The readings submitted were obtained not from a measuring network yielding the most representative results but from around 160 registration points where problems were already known to be arising. As a result, the readings for Germany are not comparable with those for other countries.

Readings from a representative measuring network encompassing over 700 registration points show compliance with the maximum nitrate content of 50 mg per litre in 90% of groundwater and 95% of drinking water.

Are readings being taken from measuring networks that are not equally representative? Will the Commission take steps to align the readings in such cases?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2014)

The Nitrates Directive (Directive 91/676/EEC ([1])) requires Member States to identify water affected by pollution and waters which could be affected by pollution. Members States are free to choose how and where to establish the necessary monitoring networks. The reporting obligations of the Nitrates Directive are fulfilled on the basis of data submitted by Member States.

The Commission is aware that Member States have established monitoring networks based on different criteria, as reflected in the latest report on the implementation of the Nitrates Directive ([2]), which is based on Member State reports for the period 2008-2011.

The characteristics of the monitoring networks, as well as the related issues of representativeness and comparability are fully taken into account by the Commission in its efforts to enforce the implementation of the Nitrates Directive.

([1]) OJ L 375, 31.12.1991.
([2]) COM/2013/0683 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001914/14
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(19. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Kennzeichnung von allergenen Stoffen

In ihrer Beantwortung auf die Anfrage E-013844/13 zum Thema „Kennzeichnungspflicht von allergenen Stoffen bei unverpackten Lebensmitteln" erläutert Kommissar Borg: „Die Erfahrungen deuten darauf hin, dass die meisten Zwischenfälle im Zusammenhang mit Lebensmittelallergien und -unverträglichkeiten auf unverpackte Lebensmittel zurückgeführt werden können, die häufig in Gaststätten oder Schnellimbissen verwendet werden. Gemäß der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel(2) ist die Information über Stoffe, die Allergien oder Unverträglichkeiten hervorrufen, ab 13. Dezember 2014 auch für unverpackte Lebensmittel verpflichtend. Die Mitgliedstaaten können durch nationale Maßnahmen festlegen, in welcher Form die Information über Allergene erfolgen soll. In der Zwischenzeit sind die für verpackte Lebensmittel geltenden Vorschriften der Verordnung in Bezug auf die Kennzeichnung von Stoffen oder Produkten, die Allergien oder Unverträglichkeiten auslösen, ebenfalls auf unverpackte Lebensmittel anwendbar. Dies bedeutet, dass die Information in Schriftform zur Verfügung gestellt wird, solange die Mitgliedstaaten noch keine eigenen nationalen Maßnahmen verabschiedet haben. Die Kommission beabsichtigt nicht, die obengenannten Vorschriften zu ändern".

1. Bedeutet dies, dass die Kennzeichnung in der Zwischenzeit, etwa in Gaststätten, in schriftlicher Form zu erfolgen hat, also z. B. konkret in der Speisekarte oder in einem zusätzlichen Informationsblatt?

2. Können die Mitgliedstaaten festlegen, dass die Information über unverpackte Lebensmittel in Gaststätten, Imbissen oder Bäckereien und Konditoreien mündlich erfolgen kann? Wenn ja, müsste diese mündliche Information in jedem Falle erfolgen oder nur auf Anfrage des Gastes?

3. Mit welchen Konsequenzen hätte ein Wirt/Bäcker zu rechnen, wenn er nach dem 13.12.2014 die Informationen gemäß der VO Nr. 1169/2011 nicht erbringt? Wird die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten anhalten, hier Stichproben durchzuführen und ein Fehlverhalten zu sanktionieren? Legt die Kommission einen Rahmen fest, in welchem die Mitliedstaaten die Höhe von Bußgeldern festlegen können? Wenn ja, wie wird dieser Rahmen aussehen?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(27. März 2014)

1. Ab dem 13. Dezember 2014 müssen die Informationen über Allergene in Restaurants schriftlich (z. B. auf der Speisekarte) zur Verfügung gestellt werden, sofern die Mitgliedstaaten nicht anders entscheiden.

2. Gemäß der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel ([1]) können die Mitgliedstaaten durch nationale Vorschriften festlegen, in welcher Form die Informationen über Stoffe oder Produkte, die Allergien oder Unverträglichkeiten auslösen, erfolgen soll. Wie unter Nummer 2.5.3 des Kommissionspapiers „Fragen und Antworten zur Anwendung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011" ([2]) erläutert, kann in den nationalen Maßnahmen etwa festgelegt sein, dass ausführliche Informationen zu Allergenen hinsichtlich Herstellung oder Zubereitung eines unverpackten Lebensmittels auf Nachfrage durch die Verbraucher erteilt werden, sofern der Lebensmittelunternehmer an gut sichtbarer Stelle leicht erkennbar, deutlich lesbar und gegebenenfalls unverwischbar angibt, dass diese Informationen auf Nachfrage erteilt werden.

3. Die Durchsetzung des Unionsrechts obliegt den Mitgliedstaaten; sie müssen durch amtliche Kontrollen überprüfen, ob die Unternehmer die Vorschriften einhalten. Ferner sind die Mitgliedstaaten befugt, Höhe und Art abschreckender und wirksamer Sanktionen für Verstöße gegen das Lebensmittelrecht festzulegen.

([1]) ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011, S. 18.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/foodlabelling/docs/qanda_application_reg1169-2011_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001914/14
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Labelling to show that foods contain allergenic substances

In the answer to Written Question E-013844/2013, the subject of which was 'Requirement to indicate allergenic substances on the labels of non-prepacked food', Commissioner Borg states the following: 'Evidence suggests that most food allergy and intolerance incidents can be traced back to non-prepacked food, often served in restaurants or at catering counters. (…) Under Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, as of 13 December 2014 the information on the presence of substances causing allergies or intolerances will also be mandatory for non-packed foodstuffs. Member States may adopt national measures concerning the means through which information on allergens will be made available. In their absence, the provisions of the regulation concerning pre-packed foodstuffs will be applicable to non-prepacked foods as regards the labelling of substances or products causing allergies or intolerances. This means that such information will be provided in a written form as long as Member States have not adopted specific national measures. The Commission is not planning to modify the abovementioned provisions.'

1. Does this mean that in the intervening period the information must be provided in written form, e.g. on the menu itself or on a separate sheet distributed with the menu?

2. Can the Member States stipulate that information about non-prepacked foods served in restaurants, at catering counters or in bakeries may be provided orally? If so, would this oral information have to be provided automatically, or only at the customer's request?

3. What action would be taken against restaurant owners or bakers who, after 13 December 2014, fail to provide the information required under Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011? Will the Commission urge the Member States to carry out spot checks and impose penalties should breaches of the rules be brought to light? Will the Commission draw up a framework within which Member States can set fines as they see fit? If so, what form will this framework take?

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

1. From 13 December 2014, the information on allergens must be provided in restaurants in written form (e.g. on the menu), unless the Member States decide differently.

2. According to Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([1]), Member States may adopt national rules concerning the means through which information on substances or products causing allergies or intolerances is to be made available. As explained in point 2.5.3 of the Commission document 'Questions and Answers on the application of the regulation (EU) No 1169/2011' ([2]), indicatively, national measures may stipulate that detailed allergen information regarding the manufacture or preparation of a non-prepacked food may be given upon request by the consumer, provided that the food business operator indicates in a conspicuous place and in such a way as to be easily visible, clearly legible and, where appropriate, indelible, that such information can be obtained upon request.

3. Member States are responsible for the enforcement of Union law and shall verify, through official controls, compliance by the operators. The Member States are also entitled to determine the level and type of dissuasive and effective penalties to be imposed for infringements of food legislation.

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/foodlabelling/docs/qanda_application_reg1169-2011_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001915/14
to the Commission
Marian Harkin (ALDE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Preservation of certain bat species

What measures would a local authority need to take to ensure compliance with EU legislation and the preservation of certain bat species (brown long-eared bat, common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Leisler's bat and Daubenton's bat) present in woodland where there is a proposal to build a roadway through this woodland?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

All bat species in Europe are strictly protected under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC ([1]). According to Art. 12 of the directive, Member States are required to prohibit the deliberate killing, capture or disturbance of those species, as well as the deterioration or destruction of their breeding or resting places. In the case of potentially damaging projects the Member State competent authorities will therefore need, in the context of the relevant planning and authorisation procedures, to provide for the necessary mitigation measures in order to meet the aforementioned requirements. Derogations from those requirements are allowed in accordance with the provisions of Art. 16 of the directive. These issues are further clarified in a guidance document issued by the Commission services ([2]).

Furthermore, the Commission, together with Member States and in cooperation with the Agreement on the Conservation of the Populations of European Bats UNEP/Eurobats is currently developing an action plan for all bat species in Europe. It will help Member States learn from each other's experience and will provide case studies and successful mitigation measures, including in relation to road infrastructure.

([1]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora Official Journal L 206, 22.7.1992.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/species/guidance/pdf/guidance_en.pdf

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001916/14
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(19 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Impactul subvențiilor din agricultură asupra sănătății

Un document recent publicat de OCDE cercetează efectul subvențiilor la produsele de bază asupra sănătății ([1]). El citează o serie de studii, inclusiv unul care arată o legătură între prețurile mai mici la fructe și legume și o greutate corporală normală ([2]) și altul care sugerează că reducerile de prețuri la anumite produse, precum uleiurile vegetale hidrogenate trag în jos prețurile alimentelor procesate ([3]).

Cu toate acestea, documentul OCDE trage concluzia că „în mare parte dovezile efectelor politicilor agricole asupra nutriției și sănătății lipsesc".

În ciuda succesului programului Fructe la școală, care a avut un efect pozitiv asupra alimentației copiilor de școală, se face foarte puțin uz de subvențiile agricole pentru îmbunătățirea stării de sănătate în UE.

Are Comisia în vedere alte programe prin care subvențiile agricole să poată fi folosite în vederea unor efecte benefice asupra sănătății?

Va lansa sau va sprijini Comisia alte cercetări privind legăturile dintre subvenții, prețurile la alimente și sănătate?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(14 aprilie 2014)

Politica agricolă comună a UE (PAC) vizează îmbunătățirea productivității în cadrul lanțului alimentar, asigurând astfel un standard de viață echitabil pentru comunitatea agricolă, stabilizarea piețelor și disponibilitatea aprovizionării cu alimente la prețuri accesibile pentru consumatorii din UE. Există standarde europene stricte care reglementează practicile de management agricol pentru a răspunde așteptărilor consumatorilor europeni în vederea unei aprovizionări adecvate cu alimente sigure, sănătoase și la prețuri accesibile.

Comisia a adoptat, la 30 ianuarie 2014 ([4]), o propunere pentru crearea unui cadru comun pentru cele două programe existente, programul de încurajare a consumului de fructe în școli și programul de distribuire a laptelui în școli. Aceasta ar trebui să ducă la creșterea eficienței sistemelor, să abordeze mai eficient problema alimentației necorespunzătoare, să consolideze elementele educaționale ale programelor și să contribuie la combaterea obezității. Aceasta prezintă o importanță deosebită ca urmare a scăderii consumului acestor produse de către copii și a creșterii consumului de către aceștia de produse alimentare cu grad înalt de prelucrare și cu un conținut ridicat de zaharuri adăugate, sare și grăsimi.

Orizont 2020 ([5]) ar putea oferi oportunități de finanțare suplimentare în cadrul provocării societale 2 „Securitatea alimentară și bioeconomia" ([6]), pentru a contribui la o mai bună înțelegere a legăturii dintre subvențiile agricole, prețurile la alimente și sănătate.

([1]) Sassi, F., A. Belloni and C. Capobianco (2013), „The Role of Fiscal Policies in Health Promotion" („Rolul politicilor fiscale în promovarea sănătății"), OECD Health Working Papers, No. 66, OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k3twr94kvzx-en.

([2]) Powell, L. M. et al (2013), „Assessing the potential effectiveness of food and beverage taxes and subsidies for improving public health: a systematic review of prices, demand and body weight outcomes" („Evaluarea rolului potențial al taxelor și subvențiilor la alimente și băuturi în îmbunătățirea sănătății publice, o analiză sistematică a prețurilor, cererii și efectelor asupra greutății corporale"), Obesity Reviews, No. 14, pp. 110-128.

([3]) Wallinga, D., H. Schoonover and M. Muller (2009), „Considering the contribution of US Agricultural policy to the obesity epidemic: overview and opportunities" („Aprecierea contribuției politicii agricole a SUA la epidemia obezității: aspecte generale și oportunități"), Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition, No. 4:1, pp. 3-19.

([4]) COM(2014) 32.

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

([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/h2020/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001916/14
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: The impact of agricultural subsidies on health

A recent paper published by the OECD examines the effect of commodity subsidies on health ([1]). It cites a number of studies, including one which shows a link between lower fruit and vegetable prices and reduced body weight ([2]), and another suggesting that price reductions on certain commodities such as hydrogenated vegetable oils lower the price of processed foods ([3]).

However, the OECD paper concludes that 'evidence of the effects on nutrition and health of agricultural policies is largely lacking'.

Despite the success of the School Fruits Scheme, which has had a positive effect on the diet of school children, there is only a limited use of agricultural subsidies to improve health in the EU.

Does the Commission envisage any further programmes through which agricultural funds may be used to achieve health benefits?

Will the Commission initiate or support further research into the links between agricultural subsidies, food prices and health?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

The EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) aims at improving productivity within the food chain productivity, thereby ensuring a fair standard of living for the agricultural community, market stabilisation and the availability of affordable food supplies for EU consumers. Strict European standards are in place to regulate agricultural management practices in order to meet European consumers' expectations of adequate supplies of safe, healthy and affordable food.

The Commission adopted a proposal on 30 January 2014 ([4]) to bring the current school fruit scheme and the school milk scheme under a joint framework. This should increase the effectiveness of the schemes, address poor nutrition more effectively, reinforce the educational elements of the programmes and contribute to the fight against obesity. This is in particular relevant because of the decreasing consumption of these products by children and their increasing consumption of highly processed foods which are high in added sugars, salt and fat.

Horizon2020 ([5]) might provide further funding opportunities under the societal challenge 2 'Food security and the Bioeconomy' ([6]) to help increase our understanding of the link between agricultural subsidies, food prices and health.

([1]) Sassi, F., A. Belloni and C. Capobianco (2013), 'The Role of Fiscal Policies in Health Promotion', OECD Health Working Papers, No 66, OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k3twr94kvzx-en.

([2]) Powell, L. M. et al (2013), 'Assessing the potential effectiveness of food and beverage taxes and subsidies for improving public health: a systematic review of prices, demand and body weight outcomes', Obesity Reviews, No 14, pp. 110-128.

([3]) Wallinga, D., H. Schoonover and M. Muller (2009), 'Considering the contribution of US Agricultural policy to the obesity epidemic: overview and opportunities', Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition, No 4:1, pp. 3-19.

([4]) COM(2014) 32.

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

([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/h2020/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001918/14
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Tackling social inequalities

In April 2012, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) published a working paper on income inequality in the EU. The working paper finds that income inequality has risen substantially in Europe since the mid-1980s, with income distribution more unequal than the average OECD country.

By focusing on social priorities in the 'Europe 2020' strategy, the social investment package and regional policy, the Commission has clearly attempted to rectify growing social inequalities. Nevertheless, the OECD working paper argues that the only way to build greater social convergence is to focus less on directives at EU level, but instead to implement a country-by-country EU framework.

With growing social inequality a pressing concern, does the Commission plan to adopt the OECD's recommendations for a more Member State-centric approach in its future efforts to tackle social inequalities?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Europe 2020 strategy, adopted by the European Council in March 2010, aims for smart and sustainable as well as inclusive growth, in which the 'benefits of growth and jobs are widely shared'. This reflects a determination to fight socioeconomic inequalities.

The European Semester is the EU's main framework for monitoring and steering reforms to implement the Europe 2020 strategy in a coordinated way. Specifically Member States are required to detail their planned reforms to make progress towards the 2020 objectives in their National Reform Programmes, and the Commission also provides country-specific recommendations (CSRs) to address the particular challenges facing each Member State.

Last year, several country-specific recommendations were issued to address various drivers of income inequality, such as by combating in-work poverty and labour market segmentation, alleviating poverty and ensuring the effectiveness of social transfers, reducing the effective tax burden on low-income earners, and increasing tax compliance. Member States are required to identify the necessary measures and incorporate them in their National Reform Programmes.

The inclusion of an income inequality indicator (S80/S20) in the scoreboard of key social and employment indicators, announced in the Commission communication 'Strengthening the social dimension of the Economic and Monetary Union' ([1]), implies improved monitoring at EU level of income inequality. The new scoreboard, which has been included in the 2014 Joint Employment Report (JER), has been adapted by the Council ([2]). It allows for better and earlier identification of major employment and social problems within the European Semester, already in 2014.

([1]) COM(2013) 690 final of 2 October 2013.
([2]) Council of the European Union, 7/476/14.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001919/14
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Corruption in the EU

On 3 February 2014, the Commission published a report into corruption within the EU entitled the 'EU Anti-Corruption Report.' The report places the cost of corruption at a shocking EUR 120 billion per year in Member States. Three-quarters of respondents to Eurobarometer surveys believed that corruption was widespread in their country, with 56% believing levels of corruption had increased in the last three years. In the UK, 64% said that they believed corruption was pervasive despite less than 1% of respondents having been asked for a bribe in the previous year.

Although there may be a gap in the public conscious between perception and reality, the report clearly identifies a significant 'culture of corruption' problem in Member States. The Commissioner for Home Affairs, Cecilia Malmström said in response to the report that the political will to tackle corruption was missing, stating that 'we are simply not doing enough.'

In light of the report's findings, does the Commission plan to bring forward new proposals to tackle corruption, or will the Commission issue renewed guidelines in an attempt to improve the enforcement of existing anti-corruption laws?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

The Commission does not have immediate plans to adopt legislation on fighting corruption. Its focus is on addressing, together with Member States and other stakeholders, the many issues identified in the Anti-Corruption Report. This does not necessarily imply proposing new legislation, but rather building cooperation in order to achieve proper implementation of the existing framework.

As the report calls for improvements in a number of different areas, it is not possible to provide uniform guidelines to solve the problems enumerated. Instead, each Member State has a number of individualised future steps by which the Commission indicated its views on the most important measures to be taken. The Commission will therefore engage Member States in dialogue on follow-up of the steps suggested in the report.

The Commission will also put in place this year an experience sharing programme to help Member States, local NGOs and other stakeholders exchange good practice and overcome shortcomings in anti-corruption policy, facilitate follow-up work, raise awareness, and provide training.

Public procurement is a stand-alone topic on which the EU Anti-Corruption Report already contains future guidelines (see the General chapter, p. 35-36 ([1])).

([1]) Available here: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/organised-crime-and-human-trafficking/corruption/docs/acr_2014_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001920/14
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Ecological focus areas and CAP reform

Delegated acts relating to the reform of the common agricultural policy (CAP) have become one of the most contentious aspects of the entire CAP negotiation process. The role of ecological focus areas (EFAs) in particular seems to divide opinion, with some MEPs calling on the Commission to ban the use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides on land designated as wildlife zones. Additionally, a group of Member States has called on the Commission to reduce the proposed fines for failure to respect greening measures on arable land, and to adapt the weighting matrix to better reflect the value of landscape features that count towards EFAs, such as the cultivation of protein crops.

While negotiations are ongoing to find common ground between these positions, what assurances can the Commission give that the principle of subsidiarity will remain paramount throughout the delegated act negotiations? In other words, will there be enough flexibility for Member States to decide the precise rules for the production for EFAs, with the caveat that Member States must prove that their chosen practices enhance soil production and biodiversity?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The principle of subsidiarity has been a key point in the discussions on the Delegated Act for Direct Payments. Experts of the European Parliament and the Member States were consulted in 13 days of expert group meetings between 25 September and 4 December 2013, and many of their suggestions and comments were taken on board.

The Delegated Acts were adopted on 11 March 2014.

As regards types of Ecological Focus Areas (EFA) from which Member States may choose, different possibilities for agricultural production exist. While the general objective to enhance biodiversity needs to be respected, the Delegated Act gives Member States the room to lay down additional conditions, in particular for buffer strips, strips along forest edges, catch crops, green cover and nitrogen fixing crops.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001921/14
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Underage drinking

On 24 October 2006, the Commission published a communication entitled 'An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm'. One of the five priority areas of the report was to protect young people and children, with the aim being 'to curb underage drinking and reduce hazardous drinking among young people'.

On 6 February 2014, a 'major incident' was declared by emergency services in my own constituency when nearly 50 people, the majority of whom were under 18 years old, were treated for excessive alcohol consumption outside a concert in Belfast. While the scale of the incident was particularly newsworthy, underage drinking is nevertheless troublingly prevalent across Member States.

Can the Commission provide a detailed summary of what progress has been made in achieving the aims stated in the 2006 communication and, moreover, whether the proposed EU alcohol strategy will include targets and reviews in order to measure how Member States are coping with the devastating impact of underage drinking?

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

The Commission is aware of the harm caused by heavy episodic drinking (binge drinking) in particular for youth. The protection of young people is a priority theme of the EU alcohol strategy ([1]).

In the context of the implementation of the strategy, the Commission has established the European Alcohol and Health Forum to mobilise voluntary action by stakeholders. Many of the about 250 initiatives launched by Forum members are targeted towards young people.

In addition, the second EU Health Programme ([2]) has supported several projects to raise awareness and reduce alcohol related harm among young people.

The Committee on National Alcohol Policy and Action, bringing together Member States Authorities, is currently working on an action plan specifically targeting binge drinking and youth, which is due to be endorsed by the Committee in summer this year.

([1]) Communication of 24 October 2006, An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm (COM(2006) 625 final).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001922/14
to the Commission
Malcolm Harbour (ECR), Emma McClarkin (ECR), Ashley Fox (ECR) and Julie Girling (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: French decision to implement the Triman mark

The French Government is pressing ahead with the implementation of the Triman mark, following the agreement reached at the 2007 'Grenelle for the environment', despite protests from numerous industrial stakeholders. The logo will apply to all consumer goods covered by an extended producer responsibility recovery scheme in France (including packaging but excluding glass), and will necessitate either separate production for France or the use of the logo on all products destined for the European market. Given the differences between waste management practices in other Member States, particularly those adjacent to France, the instructions could be misleading to consumers or even not apply at all. Finally, there has been no comprehensive impact assessment conducted by the French authorities or by the Commission, despite the cross-border effect of these measures.

1. Does the Commission view the Triman mark as an obstacle to the free movement of goods within the European Union and/or Member State obligations under WTO trade agreements?

2. Is the Commission planning to take any action with regard to this measure?

3. Does the Commission consider the proposed derogation for glass packaging materials discriminatory to other sectors?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to the reply given to Question E-2308/2014.

Within the framework laid down by Directive 98/34/EC, the French authorities notified this draft Decree to the Commission on 2 April 2012. In light of the information available to the Commission this measure, which will require most products to be labelled in a specific way for the French market, has not been adopted yet.

In the Commission's view, the envisaged measure might constitute a barrier to the free movement of goods within the internal market.

A national rule imposing legal barriers to the free movement of goods which are not subject to Union harmonisation is not necessarily contrary to EC law if justified on one of the public interest grounds set out in Article 36 TFEU or by one of the overriding requirements laid down by the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union. Such rules, however, must be necessary in order to attain legitimate objectives, and in conformity with the principle of proportionality, whereby the least restrictive measure is to be used.

In addition, this measure has also been notified to the WTO Secretariat under Article 2.9.2 of the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBTA) in November 2013 (G/TBT/N/FRA/153). Other WTO Members have therefore had a possibility to submit their comments on the draft decree which will be replied to in accordance with the EU obligations under the TBTA.

The possible derogation for glass packaging materials will also be examined by the Commission in the light of the applicable Union rules when the measure is formally adopted.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001924/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Realizzazione di un sistema di «videosorveglianza e di telesoccorso» nella città di Orvieto: possibili finanziamenti

Il comune di Orvieto ha manifestato l'interesse a realizzare un sistema tecnologicamente avanzato di «videosorveglianza e di telesoccorso», che ha lo scopo di potenziare, nel pieno rispetto delle normative vigenti e della riservatezza dei cittadini, la sicurezza urbana e la tutela dell'ordine pubblico, migliorando e rafforzando la qualità della vita delle persone che vivono e lavorano nel comune di Orvieto. Inoltre esso mira a garantire la serenità e la tranquillità a tutte quelle attività correlate al turismo. Gli obiettivi collegati alla realizzazione del progetto sono molteplici: in particolare, si sottolinea l'importanza della sua realizzazione ai fini della prevenzione, della sicurezza pubblica, della viabilità e della tutela del patrimonio pubblico e di quello privato.

Il progetto prevede inoltre il monitoraggio delle principali strade del comune, il controllo degli ingressi stradali al centro storico attraverso sistemi per la lettura delle targhe e la rilevazione di infrazioni del codice della strada.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione:

1. far sapere se esistono finanziamenti diretti a sostenere tale progetto;

2. far sapere se, nella programmazione 2014-2020, sono previsti finanziamenti diretti alla realizzazione di sistemi di videosorveglianza;

3. indicare se ci sono esempi e buone pratiche realizzati da altre città europee con le medesime finalità.

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(23 aprile 2014)

1. I progetti di «videosorveglianza e telesoccorso», come quello descritto dall'onorevole parlamentare, non possono beneficiare di finanziamenti diretti.

2. Nel periodo 2014-2020 il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) sosterrà lo sviluppo urbano sostenibile tramite strategie che contemplano azioni integrate per affrontare i problemi economici, ambientali, climatici, demografici e sociali delle aree urbane. I progetti di videosorveglianza non sono esclusi. Tuttavia, in questa fase, questo tipo di intervento non è stato identificato dalle autorità italiane come una priorità per lo sviluppo urbano, in particolare nelle regioni più sviluppate.

3. Questo tipo di intervento non è stato identificato separatamente nel quadro dei programmi finanziati dal FESR. URBACT ([1]) e l'RFSC ([2]) possono aiutare ad individuare le città che hanno esperienza in questo ambito. Il progetto PLUS ([3]) di INTERREG IV C potrebbe essere usato come esempio. Riguarda una tecnica per rendere le aree urbane più sicure e indica quali tipi di costi potrebbero essere ammissibili. Il progetto si basa sulle migliori pratiche di illuminazione urbana esistenti nelle città europee e mira ad aiutare le città a sviluppare le proprie politiche e strategie di illuminazione al fine di attuare soluzioni di illuminazione efficienti dal punto di vista energetico.

L'uso di sistemi di videosorveglianza nelle aree pubbliche da parte delle autorità deve avvenire nel pieno rispetto delle norme sulla protezione dei dati, di cui alla direttiva 95/46/CE sulla protezione dei dati personali, e delle misure nazionali di attuazione.

([1]) www.urbact.eu
([2]) www.rfsc.eu
([3]) Strategie di illuminazione pubblica per spazi urbani sostenibili.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001924/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Provision of a system of 'video surveillance and remote assistance' in the city of Orvieto: possible funding

Orvieto City Council has expressed an interest in constructing a hi-tech 'video surveillance and remote assistance' system with the aim of making the city safer and preserving public order, while fully respecting the rules in force and personal privacy. It would seek to improve and consolidate the quality of life of the people who live and work in the municipality of Orvieto and guarantee peace and quiet for all tourist-related activities. The project would be implemented with multiple objectives, but the importance of the following is especially emphasised: prevention, public safety, right of thoroughfare and the protection of public and private property.

The project would also monitor the municipality's main roads. It would control the roads into the city centre by means of number plate readers and record road traffic offences.

In view of all this, can the Commission state:

1. whether direct funding exists in support of such a project?

2. whether the 2014-2020 planning provides for funding to construct video surveillance systems?

3. and whether there are examples and good practices achieved by other European towns and cities with the same objectives?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

1. Projects aiming at 'video surveillance and remote assistance', such as the one described by the Honourable Member, cannot benefit from direct funding.

2. In the 2014-2020 period, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) shall support sustainable urban development through strategies that set out integrated actions to tackle the economic, environmental, climate, demographic and social challenges affecting urban areas. Video surveillance projects are not excluded. However, in the most developed regions especially, this type of intervention has not been identified at this stage as a priority for the urban development by the Italian authorities.

3. This type of intervention has not been separately identified within ERDF funded programmes. Urbact ([1]) and the RFSC ([2]) can assist in finding cities which have experience with this topic. The Interreg IVC project PLUS ([3]) could be used as an example. It deals with a technique to make urban areas safer and show what kind of costs could be eligible. The project capitalises on best practices in existing urban lighting in European cities. The project aims to help cities develop their lighting policies and strategies in order to implement energy efficient lighting solutions.

Any use of video surveillance systems in a public area by public authorities has to be carried out in full compliance with the data protection requirements laid down in Directive 95/46/EC on the protection of personal data and the national implementing measures.

([1]) www.urbact.eu
([2]) www.rfsc.eu
([3]) Public Lighting Strategies for Sustainable Urban Spaces.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001925/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Realizzazione del progetto «Orvieto Film Commission»: possibili finanziamenti

La creazione di una «Film Commission» è lo strumento per eccellenza attraverso il quale una città o una regione cerca di attrarre produzioni cinematografiche e televisive nel proprio territorio, sostenendo e sviluppando nel contempo anche le potenzialità locali, creando opportunità di lavoro per chi nella regione opera, o vorrebbe operare, nel campo cinematografico e televisivo.

In particolare, la Regione Umbria e la Città di Orvieto, in collaborazione con partner privati, hanno manifestato l'intenzione di investire nella realizzazione di una «Film Commission». La realizzazione di un tale progetto potrebbe avere un ruolo importantissimo nella promozione della Città di Orvieto, da un punto di vista sia culturale che imprenditoriale, sfruttando anche le eccellenze di questo territorio in diversi settori, quali l'enogastronomia, il turismo e la formazione. Il piano mira alla creazione di corsi di formazione diretti alla realizzazione di progetti cinematografici in ambito scolastico e alla costituzione di una «scuola di arti e mestieri del cinema», al fine di provvedere alla formazione di tutte le figure professionali di cui necessita l'industria cinematografica e al fine di promuovere l'occupazione sul territorio.

Premesso tutto ciò, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Quali programmi o finanziamenti sono previsti per la realizzazione di tale progetto?

2. Quali sono, nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020, i finanziamenti previsti per la realizzazione di progetti nell'industria cinematografica?

3. Il programma Europa Creativa 2014-2010 prevede finanziamenti diretti a sostenere la costituzione di tale progetto?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(28 marzo 2014)

Il finanziamento delle Film Commission non rientra nelle iniziative di MEDIA, il sottoprogramma del nuovo programma Europa creativa (2014-2020). MEDIA finanzia progetti europei del settore audiovisivo che rientrino nei seguenti ambiti:

a) formazione di professionisti provenienti dal settore in questione;

b) realizzazione di film, progetti televisivi e videogiochi;

c) progetti televisivi di ampia distribuzione;

d) sostegno commerciale e alle attività promozionali;

e) festival del cinema;

f) distribuzione di film europei nei cinema e sulle piattaforme digitali;

g) allargamento e diversificazione del pubblico nonché educazione cinematografica;

h) coproduzioni internazionali.

I progetti sostenuti dal programma Europa creativa devono presentare una cospicua dimensione europea, coinvolgendo partner da vari paesi dell'Europa.

Le Film Commission in quanto tali non possono richiedere finanziamenti, determinate attività di queste organizzazioni possono peraltro godere del sostegno di Europa creativa. Una Film Commission può ad esempio presentare domanda di finanziamento per un'attività formativa, purché questa sia rivolta a tutti i professionisti europei e comporti livelli elevati di valore aggiunto sul piano dell'Unione.

Per ulteriori informazioni: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001925/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Implementation of the Orvieto Film Commission project: possible funding

Forming a film commission is the ideal way for a city or region to try to attract film and television productions to its area. At the same time, it supports and develops local potential, by creating job opportunities for people in the region who are engaged, or would like to be engaged, in the field of cinema or television.

In particular the Region of Umbria and the City of Orvieto, in partnership with the private sector, have announced their intention of investing to set up a film commission. Carrying out such a project might play a very important role in promoting the city of Orvieto, in terms both of culture and business. It would also exploit this area's excellence in various sectors, such as wine and food, tourism and education. The plan aims to set up training courses with a view to implementing film projects in schools and founding a school of cinematographic arts and professions. This will provide training in all the professional roles required by the film industry and promote employment in the area.

In view of all this, the questions to the Commission are:

1. What programmes or funding are planned to carry out this project?

2. What funding does the new 2014-2020 programme allow for implementing projects in the film industry?

3. Does the Creative Europe Programme 2014-2010 provide for funding in support of the creation of such a project?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

The MEDIA sub-programme of the new Creative Europe programme (2014-2020) does not cover the funding of Film Commissions. It funds European audiovisual projects in the following areas:

(a) Training for audiovisual professionals;

(b) Development of films, TV projects and video games;

(c) TV projects with a wide distribution;

(d) Market and promotion support;

(e) Film festivals;

(f) Distribution of European films in the cinemas and on digital platforms;

(g) Audience development and film literacy;

(h) Funds for international co-productions.

Projects supported by Creative Europe must have a substantial European dimension by involving partners from various European countries.

While film commissions as such cannot apply for funding, Creative Europe can support certain activities of such organisations. For example, a film commission may be eligible to apply for funding of a training activity, provided that the training is open to all European professionals and that it has a strong European added value.

For more information, please see: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001926/14
al Consiglio
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Necessità di avviare rapidamente i negoziati per la direttiva sull'accessibilità dei siti web

La Presidenza greca del Consiglio sa bene che la prossima settimana il Parlamento europeo voterà le sue modifiche al testo della proposta legislativa della Commissione europea relativa all'accessibilità dei siti web degli enti pubblici (COM(2012) 0721 — C7-0394/2012 — 2012/0340(COD)).

Questa proposta di direttiva ha un valore sociale e pratico molto importante perché si prefigge lo scopo di migliorare l'accesso di persone con disabilità diverse ai servizi che, sempre più frequentemente, sono forniti ai cittadini anche attraverso la rete internet.

L'organizzazione denominata «European Blind Union», che comprende le organizzazioni nazionali che si occupano di rappresentare gli interessi morali e materiali dei cittadini non vedenti di 43 Stati, tra cui l'italiana «Unione italiana dei ciechi e degli ipovedenti», nei giorni scorsi ha manifestato il proprio disappunto per l'assoluta mancanza di progressi da parte del Consiglio.

A questa protesta aderiscono con convinzione anche i parlamentari europei di ogni gruppo politico.

È consapevole la Presidenza del Consiglio dell'importanza di questa proposta legislativa e del buon risultato raggiunto con sostegno trasversale nei lavori della commissione per il mercato interno del Parlamento europeo?

A che punto sono i lavori del Consiglio su questa proposta legislativa?

Dal momento che da diversi mesi la commissione per il mercato interno del Parlamento europeo ha già svolto il suo lavoro, per quali ragioni il Consiglio, nel suo ruolo di colegislatore, non ha ancora inserito questa relazione tra le priorità dell'attuale semestre?

È possibile conoscere le ragioni del mancato avvio dei negoziati con il Parlamento? Alcuni governi hanno manifestato perplessità nei confronti di questa proposta legislativa? Qualora ciò sia avvenuto, quali Stati membri essi rappresentano nel Consiglio? È possibile conoscere la posizione dei rappresentanti italiani?

Dal momento che molto raramente il Consiglio risponde alle interrogazioni dei parlamentari europei, ritiene la Presidenza greca opportuno invertire questa tendenza inaugurando una stagione di rapporti più trasparenti con le altre istituzioni europee?

Risposta
(13 maggio 2014)

Il Consiglio riconosce l'importanza della questione ed ha ricevuto la posizione del Parlamento europeo in prima lettura sulla proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa all'accessibilità dei siti web degli enti pubblici ([1]).

La proposta è ancora all'esame dei competenti organi preparatori del Consiglio. A questo proposito il Consiglio richiama l'attenzione dell'onorevole parlamentare sulla relazione della presidenza del 28 maggio 2013 ([2]) sull'andamento dei lavori concernenti la proposta.

([1]) 17344/12.
([2]) 10089/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001926/14
to the Council
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Need to launch negotiations quickly for the website accessibility directive

The Greek Presidency of the Council is well aware that the European Parliament votes next week on its amendments to the text of the European Commission's proposal for legislation on the accessibility of public-sector websites (COM(2012)0721 — C7-0394/2012 — 2012/0340(COD)).

This proposal for a directive is of great social and practical importance. Its set objective is to improve access for people with various disabilities to services which are increasingly also provided to the public via the Internet.

The European Blind Union comprises national organisations which represent the moral and material interests of non-sighted citizens of 43 countries. One is Italy's Unione Italiana dei Ciechi e degli Ipovedenti [Italian Union for the Blind and Part-Sighted]. In recent days, the European Blind Union has expressed its disappointment at the Council's total lack of progress.

European parliamentarians of every political grouping are joining this protest with conviction.

Is the Presidency of the Council aware of the importance of this proposed legislation and of the good result achieved, with cross-party support, in the proceedings of the European Parliament's Committee on the internal market?

What point has the Council's work on this proposed legislation reached?

As the European Parliament's Committee on the internal market completed its work some months ago, why has the Council, as co-legislator, not included this report among the priorities for the current six-month term?

Is it possible to know the reasons for not opening the negotiations with the Parliament? Have any governments expressed uncertainties about this proposed legislation? If so, which Member States do these represent on the Council? Is it possible to know the position of the Italian representatives?

Since the Council hardly ever answers questions from Members of the European Parliament, does the Greek Presidency consider it time to reverse this trend, by beginning a period of more transparent relations with the other European institutions?

Reply
(13 May 2014)

The Council acknowledges the importance of this issue and has received the European Parliament's first-reading position on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the accessibility of public sector bodies' websites ([1]).

The proposal is still under examination in the competent Council's preparatory bodies. In this regard, the Council draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the Presidency's progress report on the proposal of 28 May 2013 ([2]).

([1]) 17344/12.
([2]) 10089/13.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001927/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Wine kit — Frode commerciale ancora presente sui mercati europei

Nel novembre 2012, con l'interrogazione E-010826-12 si chiedeva alla Commissione di prendere provvedimenti contro la commercializzazione di vino in busta liofilizzato, un danno per le imprese produttrici europee e per i consumatori, contraffatto da diciture DOP/IGP prive di autorizzazione. La Commissione, nella risposta fornita da Dacian Cioloş, commissario per l'Agricoltura, si impegnava a prendere contatti con le autorità competenti degli Stati membri, in special modo con l'Italia, per vietare la commercializzazione di tale prodotto. La situazione però non è cambiata e il giro d'affari è addirittura aumentato.

Grazie a mesi di indagini è stata ricostruita parte della catena della produzione dei vini liofilizzati, da cui è emerso il coinvolgimento di note industrie italiane emiliane, che erano dietro alla produzione e alla distribuzione delle «bustine» di vino. Inoltre, altri prodotti simili provenienti da aziende spagnole — che come quelle italiane inviano cisterne in Canada dove la maggior parte del mosto viene liofilizzato e commercializzato attraverso wine kit — hanno fatto la loro comparsa sul mercato in molti paesi europei, tra i quali Danimarca, Svezia e Inghilterra, attraverso siti di vendita online conosciuti globalmente.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione:

1. riferire in merito ai risultati dei contatti avuti con le autorità degli Stati membri coinvolti nelle pratiche di commercializzazione del wine kit?

2. indicare se non ritiene necessario bloccare la vendita di tali prodotti per garantire la massima protezione delle DOP/IGP europee? E in tal caso, quali misure sono state adottate in proposito?

3. indicare se non considera indispensabile avviare un procedimento di indagine commerciale per pratiche sleali per quanto concerne la vendita di tali prodotti?

4. indicare se non ritiene doveroso promuovere una campagna di sensibilizzazione per proteggere la salute dei cittadini europei che acquistano, privi di informazione, tali prodotti?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(11 aprile 2014)

Da quando ha ricevuto la Sua interrogazione E-010826/2012 ([1]) la Commissione è stata informata dagli Stati membri (in particolare Regno Unito, Lussemburgo e Svezia) che sono state adottate misure contro le imprese che rivendono tali prodotti sul mercato nazionale, tra cui a siti di vendita al dettaglio su Internet, per prevenire l'uso illecito di prodotti recanti marchi DOP/IGP non autorizzati e che i prodotti in questione sono stati ritirati dal mercato.

La Commissione non è a conoscenza di casi recenti di uso illecito di marchi DOP/IGP; tuttavia gli Stati membri devono continuare ad adottare le misure necessarie per prevenire l'uso illecito di tali prodotti e ritirarli dal mercato.

Spetta agli Stati membri avviare indagini per rintracciare tali pratiche sleali onde garantire che i prodotti non presentino rischi per la salute.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001927/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Wine kits — Commercial fraud still prevalent in European markets

In my earlier Question E-010826/2012 of November 2012, I asked the Commission to take action against the marketing of freeze-dried wine in packets, since these products not only harm European wine producers and consumers but are also counterfeit as they bear unauthorised PDO/PGI labels. In its answer, which was given by the Commissioner for Agriculture Dacian Cioloş, the Commission vowed to contact the relevant authorities in the Member States, and especially in Italy, in order to prohibit the marketing of these products. However, the situation has still not changed for the better; indeed, the turnover generated by these products has actually gone up!

The lid on the chain of production of freeze-dried wines has been partially lifted following months of investigations, which have implicated a number of well-known Italian businesses based in the Emilia-Romagna region, who were behind the production and distribution of so-called wine 'packets'. However, other similar products originating from Spanish companies — which, like their Italian counterparts, send containers to Canada where most of the grape must is freeze-dried and sold in wine kits — have started to appear on the market in many European countries, including Denmark, Sweden and the United Kingdom, and are being sold on world-famous online retailing websites.

1. In light of the above, can the Commission indicate what progress has been made after it contacted the authorities in the Member States in which wine kits are marketed?

2. Does the Commission consider it necessary to block the sale of these products in order to ensure the greatest possible protection for European PDO/PGI labels, and if so, what measures have already been taken in this respect?

3. Does the Commission deem it vital to launch a commercial investigation owing to the unfair practices involved in the sale of these products?

4. Does the Commission feel that it would be wise to launch an awareness campaign in order to protect the health of the European citizens who buy these products without knowing what they really are?

Answer given by Mr.Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

Since your Question E-010826/2012 ([1]), the Commission was informed by the Member States that measures (in particular UK, Luxembourg and Sweden) have been taken against companies making the resale of these products on the domestic market, including to retail sites on the Internet, to prevent the illicit use of products bearing unauthorised PDO/PGI labels and that the concerned products were withdrawn from the market.

While the Commission is not aware of recent cases of illicit use of PDO/PGI labels Member States must continue to take the necessary measures to prevent the illicit use of these products and to withdraw them from the market.

It is the responsibility of the Member States to launch investigations for tracking these unfair practices and to ensure that products do not pose health risks.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001928/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Blocco di vendita online di giocattoli in Iran

Le autorità iraniane hanno lanciato una nuova campagna di tolleranza zero contro lo shopping online di giocattoli e videogiochi, ritenuto una sorta di cavallo di Troia per l'«inquinamento culturale» da parte dell'Occidente. L'ufficio anti-contrabbando di Teheran avrebbe incaricato la polizia di intraprendere i passi legali necessari per controllare Internet «in merito a qualsiasi acquisto o pubblicità di giocattoli e videogiochi», mentre il Ministero dell'industria e quello delle poste si dovrebbero dividere l'incarico di bloccare le vendite e impedire la consegna di «giocattoli stranieri non dotati di documenti legali».

Le autorità denunciano in particolare una famosa bambola di un noto brand statunitense, presente sul mercato iraniano sia nella sua versione ad hoc con il velo, sia nelle versioni distribuite nel resto del mondo. L'accusa si estende però a diversi prodotti e scaturisce dal fatto che questo genere di giocattoli possano avere effetti culturali e sociali nocivi sui bambini.

1. Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione europea chiarire se è a conoscenza del fatto in questione?

2. Dispone di dati che confermino che i produttori europei di giocattoli possano subire danni economici da questa operazione?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(7 maggio 2014)

La Commissione europea non è a conoscenza della questione sollevata dall'onorevole deputato. L'approccio iraniano nei confronti di internet rimane nel complesso molto diverso da quello caldeggiato dall'Unione europea, la quale ritiene che internet debba restare una rete di reti unica, aperta, libera e non frammentata, come sottolineato nella comunicazione «Governance e politica di internet» del febbraio 2014 (COM(2014) 72/4).

Non è stata intrapresa alcuna valutazione delle perdite economiche che i produttori europei potrebbero subire a causa delle misure in oggetto. Nel 2010, nel 2011 e nel 2012 le esportazioni di giocattoli in Iran sono ammontate, rispettivamente, a circa 800, 1 200 e 600 milioni di EUR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001928/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Block on online sales of toys in Iran

The Iranian authorities have launched a new campaign of zero tolerance with regard to online sales of toys and videogames, regarded as a 'Trojan horse' for 'cultural pollution' by the West. The anti-contraband office in Tehran has instructed the police to take the necessary legal steps to apply Internet controls 'on any kind of purchase or advertising of toys and videogames' and the Industry and Postal Services Ministries are to share the task of blocking sales and preventing the delivery of 'foreign toys not accompanied by the necessary legal documents'.

The authorities in particular denounce a well-known American brand of doll, present on the Iranian market in a locally adapted veiled version and versions distributed elsewhere in the world. However, the objection extends to a number of different products and arises from the assertion that this type of toy could have harmful cultural and social effects on children.

1. In the light of the above, can the European Commission clarify whether it is aware of this campaign?

2. Does the Commission have figures to demonstrate that European toy manufacturers could suffer economic loss as a result of this measure?

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

The issue raised by the Honourable Member has not been brought to the attention of the European Commission. Generally, Iran's approach to the Internet remains very different to the one advocated in the EU — which considers that the Internet should remain a single, open, free and unfragmented network of networks, as outlined in the February 2014 Communication on Internet Policy and Governance (COM(2014)72/4).

No assessment has been undertaken on potential economic loss for European manufacturers caused by the measures at issue. EU Exports of toys to Iran amounted to ca EUR 800 million, EUR 1200 million and EUR 600 million in 2010, 2011, and 2012 respectively.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001929/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Dirottamento di un aereo civile etiope

Lo scorso 17 gennaio un aereo civile in viaggio da Addis Abeba a Milano è stato dirottato dal co-pilota che, dopo essersi asserragliato da solo nella cabina di pilotaggio, ha preso il controllo del velivolo. Il primo allarme è stato dato dalle autorità del Cairo e l'aereo è stato intercettato nei cieli della Sicilia da alcuni caccia militari italiani, poi da caccia francesi, prima di atterrare in sicurezza a Ginevra.

Il giovane co-pilota è stato arrestato dalle autorità svizzere, alle quali ha detto di voler semplicemente fuggire da un paese in cui si sente costantemente minacciato.

Poco dopo le teste di cuoio svizzere sono salite a bordo, chiedendo a tutti di non muoversi e di mettere le mani sulla testa. I passeggeri sono quindi scesi uno alla volta, sempre con le mani sulla testa e senza bagaglio a mano. Accolti dalle autorità dell'aeroporto ginevrino, hanno ricevuto assistenza immediata per poi essere accompagnati, chi a Milano in autobus, chi con altro volo a Fiumicino.

Alla luce di questo evento, può la Commissione chiarire quali sono le misure in vigore nell'UE in materia di sicurezza dello spazio aereo?

Risposta congiunta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(25 aprile 2014)

Per quanto concerne le questioni attinenti alla sicurezza e alla difesa, la decisione relativa a se e quando avviare un'azione di intercettazione nel caso di un aeromobile oggetto di atti di interferenza illecita è presa dalle autorità nazionali (militari). Le istituzioni dell'Unione europea non hanno alcun potere in questo ambito.

Tale decisione riguarda anche le risorse da mettere a disposizione per l'azione in questione e quindi l'opportunità di poter disporre di capacità di intercettazione nel giro di 24 ore.

Per quanto riguarda la sicurezza dell'aeromobile che viene intercettato, il regolamento di esecuzione (UE) n. 923/2012 della Commissione, del 26 settembre 2012, che stabilisce regole dell'aria comuni e disposizioni operative concernenti servizi e procedure nella navigazione aerea, prevede norme specifiche relative ai segnali di intercettazione e ai metodi utilizzati per intercettare aeromobili civili (cfr. la sezione 11 dell'allegato). Tali norme sono dirette a ridurre al minimo il rischio di malintesi tra l'aeromobile intercettore (di solito un aeromobile militare, della guardia di frontiera o della polizia) e l'aeromobile civile che viene intercettato. Il suddetto regolamento verrà probabilmente inserito nell'accordo UE-Svizzera sul trasporto aereo del 2014 e diventerà legalmente vincolante per la Svizzera a decorrere dal 2015.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002484/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(4 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Spazju tal-ajru Svizzeru

Il-ġimgħa li għaddiet ajruplan tal-passiġġieri fi triqtu lejn Ruma nħataf mill-assistent bdot. Anki jekk l-ajruplan kien qiegħed itir fl-ispazju tal-ajru Svizzeru, kien neċessarju li jiġu skjerati fighter jets Taljani u Franċiżi biex jiskortaw lill-ajruplan lejn inżul sikur f'Ġinevra. Minkejja kienu jafu bis-sitwazzjoni, l-awtoritajiet Svizzeri ma rrispondewx għall-inċident minħabba li ġara barra mis-sigħat normali tax-xogħol ([1]).

Il-Kummissjoni taf b'xi ftehim konġunt ta' protezzjoni fl-ispazju tal-ajru bejn l-Isvizzera u l-Unjoni Ewropea li jista' jispjega n-nuqqas ta' risposta min-naħa tal-awtoritajiet Svizzeri fil-konfront ta' dan l-inċident?

Tweġiba konġunta mogħtija mis-Sur Kallas f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(25 ta' April 2014)

Fir-rigward ta' kwistjonijiet li jikkonċernaw is-sigurtà u d-difiża, id-deċiżjoni dwar jekk u meta għandha tinbeda azzjoni ta' interċezzjoni fil-każ ta' inġenju tal-ajru li jkun qed jiġi suġġett għal interferenza illegali, tittieħed mill-awtoritajiet nazzjonali (militari). L-istituzzjonijiet tal-UE ma għandhomx setgħat f'dan il-qasam.

Dik id-deċiżjoni tkopri wkoll ir-riżorsi li għandhom isiru disponibbli għal dik l-azzjoni u għalhekk l-opportunità li jkun hemm il-prontezza għal interċezzjoni pprovduta fuq bażi ta' 24 siegħa.

Fir-rigward tas-sikurezza tal-inġenju tal-ajru li jkun qed jiġi interċettat, ir-Regolament ta' Implimentazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni (UE) Nru 923/2012 tas-26 ta' Settembru 2012 li jistabbilixxi regoli komuni tal-ajru u dispożizzjonijiet operattivi dwar is-servizzi u l-proċeduri fin-navigazzjoni bl-ajru, jipprovdi għal regoli speċifiċi dwar is-sinjali u l-metodi ta' interċezzjoni li jintużaw biex jinterċettaw inġenji tal-ajru ċivili (irreferi għat-taqsima 11 tal-anness). Dawn ir-regoli huma fis-seħħ biex jimminimizzaw ir-riskju ta' nuqqas ta' ftehim bejn l-inġenju tal-ajru li jkun qed jinterċetta (normalment inġenju tal-ajru tal-puliżija, gwardja tal-fruntiera jew militari) u l-inġenju tal-ajru ċivili li jkun qed jiġi interċettat. Huwa mistenni li r-Regolament imsemmi jiġi inkorporat fil-Ftehim tat-Trasport bl-Ajru ta' bejn l-UE u l-Isvizzera fl-2014 u li jsir legalment vinkolanti fuq l-Isvizzera sa mill-2015.

([1]) http://www.businessweek.com/news/2014-02-17/swiss-clock-punching-air-force-relies-on-france-for-hijacked-jet

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001929/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Hijacking of an Ethiopian civil aircraft

On 17 January 2014 a civil aircraft flying from Addis Ababa to Milan was hijacked by the co-pilot who, after locking himself in the cockpit alone, took control of the aircraft. The alarm was first raised by the authorities in Cairo and the plane was intercepted in the skies over Sicily by Italian military fighter jets, then by French fighter jets, before landing safely in Geneva.

The young co-pilot was arrested by the Swiss authorities and told them that he simply wished to escape from a country where he felt constantly threatened.

Shortly afterwards, the Swiss special forces boarded the aircraft, telling everyone not to move and to put their hands on their heads. The passengers were then disembarked one by one, still with their hands on their heads and without their hand luggage. On being received by the Geneva airport authorities, they received immediate assistance; some were taken to Milan by coach, others took another flight to Fiumicino.

In view of this event, can the Commission clarify what measures are in place in the EU in relation to aviation safety?

Question for written answer E-002484/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(4 March 2014)

Subject: Swiss airspace

Last week a passenger aircraft en route to Rome was hijacked by the co-pilot. Even though the aircraft was flying in Swiss airspace, it was necessary to deploy Italian and French fighter jets to escort the plane to a safe landing in Geneva. Despite being aware of the situation, the Swiss authorities did not respond to the incident because it occurred outside of normal office hours ([1]).

Is the Commission aware of any joint airspace protection agreement between Switzerland and the EU that could explain the Swiss authorities' lack of response to this incident?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2014)

With regard to security and defence matters, the decision on if and when to start an action of interception in the event of an aircraft which is being subjected to unlawful interference, is taken by national (military) authorities. The EU institutions have no powers in this area.

That decision also covers the resources to be made available for that action and therefore the opportunity to have interception readiness provided on a 24 hour basis.

With regard to the safety of the aircraft being intercepted, the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 923/2012 of 26 September 2012, laying down common rules of the air and operational provisions regarding services and procedures in air navigation, provides for specific rules concerning interception signals and methods used to intercept civilian aircraft (refer to Section 11 of the annex). These rules are in place to minimise the risk of misunderstandings between the intercepting aircraft (usually a police, border guard or military aircraft) and the civilian aircraft being intercepted. It is expected that the said Regulation will be incorporated into the EU-Switzerland Air Transport Agreement in 2014 and will become legally binding on Switzerland as from 2015.

([1]) http://www.businessweek.com/news/2014-02-17/swiss-clock-punching-air-force-relies-on-france-for-hijacked-jet

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001930/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Mercato illegale dei tartufi dal Medio Oriente

La regione del Golfo, in Medio Oriente, ha visto, negli ultimi tempi, l'arresto di oltre quattromila trafficanti di tartufi ai confini fra Arabia Saudita e Iraq. La regione di Arar, stretta fra i due Stati, è infatti conosciuta per offrire ottimi tartufi, attirando trafficanti illegali che, soprattutto dal lato iracheno del confine, attraversano illegalmente la frontiera. È una realtà che si ripete ogni anno, ma in questa stagione il numero di trafficanti è insolitamente alto.

Nonostante gli arresti e le multe, i tartufi «illegali» sono stati restituiti a chi li aveva raccolti, previo l'impegno di non commettere più il reato.

Si calcola oggi che sul mercato di Kuwait City un chilo del prezioso vegetale costa circa 50 dollari americani, ma i tartufi vengono poi esportati in grandi quantità anche verso Egitto, Libano, Iran e Nord Africa alimentando un mercato parallelo a quello europeo.

1. Alla luce di questi eventi, può la Commissione chiarire in che misura il mercato europeo risente della competitività di questo traffico illegale?

2. Può indicare in che misura i tartufi raccolti illegalmente nella regione del Golfo sono immessi sul mercato europeo?

3. Intende adottare delle misure in difesa dei produttori europei e della qualità del prodotto europeo?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è consapevole dell'importanza della produzione di tartufi per l'economia di alcune regioni dell'UE. Finora, tuttavia, essa non ha ricevuto da Stati membri dell'UE o da produttori e/o commercianti europei di tartufi segnalazioni in merito allo sviluppo di un mercato illegale dei tartufi in Medio Oriente. Inoltre, le statistiche commerciali indicano che negli ultimi dieci anni le importazioni ufficiali nell'UE di funghi e tartufi provenienti da questa regione sono state pressoché nulle e la situazione risulta immutata.

In mancanza di una denuncia circostanziata, o di un'impennata delle importazioni, la Commissione non dispone al momento di informazioni sufficienti per valutare in quale misura i tartufi raccolti illegalmente nella regione del Golfo vengano immessi sul mercato dell'UE. La Commissione è ovviamente disposta a esaminare la questione in maniera più approfondita qualora la situazione dovesse cambiare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001930/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Illegal market in Middle Eastern truffles

The Gulf region of the Middle East has recently seen the arrest of over four thousand truffle smugglers on the border between Saudi Arabia and Iraq. The Arar region, enclosed between the two States, is in fact well known for producing excellent truffles, attracting smugglers who cross the border illegally, particularly from the Iraqi side. This is a situation which is repeated year after year, but this season the number of smugglers is unusually high.

Despite the arrests and fines, the 'illegal' truffles have been returned to those who picked them, on giving an undertaking not to repeat the offence.

Today, it is estimated that a kilo of the precious vegetable costs around 50 US dollars on the Kuwait City market, but the truffles are then exported in large quantities to Egypt, Lebanon, Iran and North Africa, feeding a parallel market to the European one.

1. In view of these events, can the Commission clarify to what extent the European market is affected by competition from this illegal trade?

2. Is it able to say to what extent the truffles illegally harvested in the Gulf region are introduced into the European market?

3. Does it intend to take measures to defend European producers and the quality of the European product?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Commission is aware of the importance of the production of truffles in the economy of certain regions of the EU. So far the Commission has not been alerted by any EU Member State, or by European producers and/or traders of truffles about an illegal market of truffles developing in the Middle East. Moreover, trade statistics show that official imports of mushrooms and truffles from this region into the EU have been almost inexistent for the last 10 years and this has not changed.

Absent a substantiated complaint, or indeed a surge in imports, the Commission does not have at this time sufficient information to evaluate to what extent the truffles illegally harvested in the Gulf region are introduced into the EU market. The Commission of course remains available to look into the matter in greater detail should the situation change.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001931/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuovo governo di unità nazionale in Libano e rischio di «contagio siriano»

Il Libano ha finalmente un nuovo governo di unità nazionale. Il nuovo esecutivo, guidato da un sunnita, conta tra i suoi 24 ministri due esponenti di Hezbollah, quattro del movimento Futuro e una donna al ministero degli Sfollati. Siedono insieme nell'esecutivo le due forze contrapposte della coalizione «14 marzo», il blocco anti-Damasco, e la coalizione «8 marzo», capitanata da Hezbollah.

Il gabinetto è stato definito dal nuovo premier come «la migliore formula possibile per ripristinare la sicurezza e sfidare la difficile fase corrente», soprattutto in relazione al possibile «contagio siriano».

Alla luce dei recenti eventi descritti l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito esposti.

1. Ha già una tabella di marcia per intavolare relazioni con la nuova formazione governativa libanese?

2. Quali provvedimenti intende intraprendere per sostenere la pacificazione del paese ed evitare il tanto temuto contagio siriano, tra l'altro già argomento dell'ultimo incontro tra i presidenti francese e americano?

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vice presidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(11 aprile 2014)

1. L'Unione europea è stata costantemente in contatto con il primo ministro designato Tammam SALAM già prima della formazione del nuovo governo, per il tramite della delegazione dell'UE in Libano e di alti funzionari del servizio europeo per l'azione esterna. L'UE è stata inoltre in contatto con i ministri attuali che erano membri dei governi precedenti. A livello ufficiale, subito dopo la formazione del nuovo governo l'Alta Rappresentante ha rilasciato una dichiarazione pubblica per congratularsi con il primo ministro SALAM e il presidente Barroso gli ha inviato una lettera.

2. L'Unione europea constata con grande preoccupazione che il Libano si trova ad affrontare una serie di problemi molto importanti riguardanti la sicurezza, nonché problemi di ordine economico, sociale e politico. L'Unione europea è il principale fornitore di aiuti umanitari e assistenza allo sviluppo a favore del Libano e intende proseguire e rafforzare il proprio impegno nei confronti del paese. L'assistenza attuale dell'UE a favore del Libano ammonta a 500 milioni di EUR; finora l'UE ha stanziato più di 300 milioni di EUR nel contesto della crisi, in particolare fornendo assistenza ai rifugiati siriani e alle comunità che li accolgono, fornendo assistenza umanitaria alle persone più vulnerabili e sviluppando le capacità del governo libanese di far fronte a questa crisi senza precedenti. L'UE ritiene inoltre che sia fondamentale giungere a un allentamento delle tensioni e intende quindi potenziare il sostegno alle forze armate libanesi, che sono un soggetto chiave per mantenere l'ordine e la stabilità.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001931/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: New Lebanese government of national unity and the risk of a spillover of violence from the Syrian conflict

At long last, a new government of national unity has been formed in Lebanon. The 24-minister cabinet is led by a Sunni prime minister and includes two members of Hezbollah, four members of the Future Movement and one woman as Minister of Displaced People. The new cabinet brings together Lebanon's two main opposing factions: the March 14 anti-Syria coalition and the Hezbollah-led March 8 Alliance.

The new prime minister described the government as the best possible way of restoring security to Lebanon and confronting the difficult challenges ahead, in particular in the context of the potential spillover of violence from the Syrian conflict.

In the light of the above, can the Commission say:

1. if there is a timeframe already in place for establishing diplomatic relations with the new Lebanese Government?

2. how it intends to support the country's return to peace and allay any fears of a spillover of violence from the Syrian conflict, as discussed by the French and American presidents at their recent meeting?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

1. The EU was in regular contact with Prime Minister-Designate Tammam SALAM already before the formation of the new government, through the EU Delegation to Lebanon and senior officials from the European External Action Service. The EU was also in contact with the current ministers who were members of previous governments. Officially, immediately after the formation of the new government, the High Representative released a public statement to congratulate Prime Minister SALAM and President Barroso sent a letter to him.

2. The EU notes with great concern that Lebanon is facing a set of extraordinary security, economic, social and political challenges. The EU is the major provider of humanitarian and development assistance to Lebanon and intends to continue and strengthen its engagement with the country. The on-going EU assistance to Lebanon amounts to EUR 500 million and so far the EU allocated more than EUR 300 million in the context of the crisis, notably by assisting the Syrian refugees and their host communities, delivering humanitarian assistance to the most vulnerable as well as building the capacities of the Lebanese Government to deal with this unprecedented crisis. The EU also believes that de-escalating tensions is a priority and thus intends to increase support to the Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF), a key factor in maintaining order and stability.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001932/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Progetto «10 000 orti entro il 2016»

Ieri a Milano è stato presentato il progetto «10 000 orti entro il 2016», il cui scopo è appunto la creazione di 10 000 orti in Africa entro il 2016. A promuovere il progetto è un'associazione attiva nel settore dello slow food, che mira in tal modo ad avviare un processo virtuoso, motore di cambiamento e di riscatto per tante piccole comunità africane.

La nascita del progetto è legata al fatto che la creazione di orti porterebbe alla formazione di contadini, agronomi e reti agricole, promuovendo così un'economia sostenibile. Alla presentazione erano presenti anche giovani agronomi ugandesi e contadini senegalesi, che hanno già avviato attività nelle proprie terre d'origine e confidano nel buon esito del progetto.

Il progetto prevede anche l'«adozione di un orto», con una donazione libera e volontaria, con garanzie di trasparenza per quanto riguarda le spese.

Alla luce del progetto descritto l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito esposti.

1. È a conoscenza del progetto?

2. Ritiene che possa essere sostenuto tramite finanziamenti europei?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione europea è favorevole all'iniziativa: l'agricoltura familiare e, più in generale, la piccola agricoltura sono al centro del quadro politico dell'Unione sulla sicurezza alimentare e nutrizionale; aumenta inoltre la pertinenza degli approcci innovativi volti a collegare i piccoli agricoltori con i mercati nel nostro portafoglio di assistenza esterna. Cercheremo di tenerci regolarmente informati in merito all'attuazione e ai risultati dell'iniziativa.

2. L'UE è la principale fonte di aiuti a favore dell'agricoltura sostenibile e della sicurezza alimentare e nutrizionale, per le quali impegna ogni anno più di 1 miliardo di EUR. Nell'ambito della nostra attuale programmazione per il periodo 2014-2020, più di 45 paesi hanno scelto l'agricoltura sostenibile e la sicurezza alimentare e nutrizionale quale settore prioritario per i programmi di cooperazione bilaterale dell'UE. In considerazione di quanto precede, e purché siano soddisfatti i criteri di ammissibilità, la promozione degli orti potrebbe probabilmente rientrare negli inviti a presentare proposte pubblicati dalla direzione generale dello Sviluppo e della cooperazione nel campo della sicurezza alimentare e nutrizionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001932/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Project '10 000 Market Gardens By 2016'

The project '10 000 Market Gardens By 2016' was introduced yesterday in Milan. As its title suggests, the project aims to create 10 000 market gardens in Africa by 2016. An association engaged in the slow food sector is promoting the project with a view to starting a virtuous cycle, driving change and take-off for many small African communities.

The idea behind the project is that creating market gardens would lead to the training of peasant farmers, agronomists and farming networks, thereby promoting a sustainable economy. Among the audience at the presentation were young Ugandan agronomists and Senegalese peasant farmers, who have already started up businesses in their home countries and are confident that this project will prove a success.

Another feature of the project is 'Adopt a Garden,' inviting voluntary donations with guaranteed transparency of spending.

In the light of this project described, the questioner asks the Commission to answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the project?

2. Does it consider that it might be eligible for the support of European funding?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

1. The European Commission welcomes this initiative: on the one hand family farming, and smallholder farming more generally, are at the heart of our policy framework on Food and Nutrition Security; on the other hand, innovative approaches linking smallholders with markets are of increasing relevance to our external assistance portfolio; we shall aim at being regularly informed about the implementation and the outcomes of this initiative.

2. The EU is the biggest donor in sustainable agriculture and food and nutrition security, committing more than EUR 1 billion to it every year. In our current programming exercise for the period 2014-2020, more than 45 countries have chosen sustainable agriculture and food and nutrition as a focal sector for our bilateral cooperation programmes. Based on the above considerations, and provided eligibility criteria are met, the promotion of market gardens would be likely to qualify in response to Calls for Proposals whenever issued by the Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation in the food and nutrition security field.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001934/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Solitudine come fattore di rischio per gli anziani

La solitudine può essere una e vera e propria malattia per gli anziani, con conseguenze potenzialmente letali: ben due volte di più dell'obesità e quasi quanto la «miseria nera». Sono questi i risultati di uno studio di un'università di Chicago, che mette in luce gli effetti devastanti del sentirsi isolati sulla salute degli over 50. Nei sei anni dello studio è stato osservato che chi si sente più solo ha il doppio delle probabilità di morire rispetto a chi si sente meno solo.

Paragonati alla persona media dello studio, i solitari avevano il 14 per cento di rischio in più di morte prematura, due volte la percentuale degli obesi, e poco meno dei poverissimi.

Diversi studi passati hanno messo in evidenza il legame tra solitudine e una serie di problemi di salute, che spaziano dall'ipertensione all'abbassamento delle difese immunitarie, nonché un più alto rischio di depressione, ictus e infarto. Secondo un noto psicologo americano occorre prestare particolare attenzione al momento del pensionamento, evitando uno sradicamento totale dell'anziano dal proprio ambiente di vita consueto, sul modello americano, favorendo piuttosto il proseguimento di un'interazione continua con amici ed ex-colleghi.

Alla luce di questi dati, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. dispone la Commissione di dati relativi ai cittadini europei pensionati che decidono di trasferirsi in un'altra regione o altro Stato membro dell'UE dopo il ritiro dalla vita lavorativa?

2. dispone di dati che confermino il rischio per la salute dell'anziano che soffre di solitudine?

3. quali sono i risultati delle politiche di invecchiamento attivo in termini di miglioramento della qualità della vita e di allungamento della speranza di vita degli anziani?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(31 marzo 2014)

In relazione all'invecchiamento attivo la Commissione sostiene gli Stati membri nei loro sforzi per migliorare le condizioni degli anziani nell'UE. Ai fini dell'invecchiamento attivo occorrono interventi politici in diversi ambiti riguardanti l'occupazione, le pensioni, l'istruzione, la salute, l'innovazione, la ricerca, i trasporti, le TIC e gli alloggi. I principi guida per l'invecchiamento attivo ([1]) offrono una lista di controllo all'indirizzo delle autorità nazionali e degli stakeholder in merito agli ambiti su cui concentrare le attività esecutive.

Inoltre, la Commissione continua a sostenere questi sforzi attraverso iniziative come il Partenariato europeo per l'innovazione per un invecchiamento attivo e in buona salute ([2]) che si prefigge di migliorare la qualità della vita degli anziani. Il suo obiettivo generale è di aumentare di due anni, entro il 2020, la speranza di vita in buone condizioni di salute per i cittadini dell'UE. Quanto al monitoraggio dei risultati di questa iniziativa unionale, le prime risultanze del Partenariato saranno presentate nell'autunno 2014. Il Partenariato ha anche pubblicato nel novembre 2013 una serie di buone pratiche in tema di invecchiamento attivo e in buona salute ([3]). Inoltre, l'Indice di invecchiamento attivo varato dalla Commissione europea e dalla Commissione economica per l'Europa delle Nazioni Unite (UNECE) offre ai decisori nazionali ed europei il modo per misurare le potenzialità non valorizzate degli anziani nei 27 Stati membri dell'UE e fuori di essi ([4]).

([1]) Cfr. l'allegato alla dichiarazione del Consiglio sull'Anno europeo dell'invecchiamento attivo e della solidarietà tra le generazioni (2012): prospettive per il futuro, all'indirizzo: http://europa.eu/ey2012/ey2012main.jsp?langId=it&catId=970&newsId=1743&

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing&pg=home

([3]) https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/eipaha/

([4]) http://www1.unece.org/stat/platform/display/AAI/Active+Ageing+Index+Home

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001934/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Loneliness as a risk factor for the elderly

Loneliness really can be an illness in elderly people, with potentially lethal consequences. In fact it is twice as lethal as obesity and nearly as lethal as dire poverty. These are the findings of a University of Chicago study which highlights the devastating effects of feeling isolated on the health of the over-50s. The six-year study observed that those who feel more lonely are twice as likely to die as those who feel less lonely.

Compared with the average person in the study, lonely people had a 14% greater risk of premature death: twice the percentage of the obese, and just below that of the very poorest.

A number of studies have revealed the link between loneliness and a series of health problems ranging from hypertension to reduced immune defences and higher risk of depression, stroke and heart attack. According to a well-known American psychologist, special attention must be paid to the moment of retirement, to avoid completely uprooting elderly people from their usual living environment, as is the pattern in the USA. Instead, continued interaction with friends and former colleagues should be encouraged.

In the light of these figures, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission hold figures on retired European citizens who decide to move to another region or EU Member State after retirement?

2. Does it have figures confirming the health risk to elderly people suffering from loneliness?

3. What are the results of policies for active ageing, in terms of improved quality of life and increased life expectancy for the elderly?

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

In the context of active ageing, the Commission supports the Member States in their efforts to improve conditions for older people in the EU. Active ageing calls for policy interventions in many different areas such as employment, pensions, education, health, innovation, research, transport, ICT and housing. The Guiding Principles for Active Ageing ([1]) provide a checklist for national authorities and stakeholders on areas to focus implementation.

Moreover, the Commission keeps supporting these efforts through initiatives such as the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing ([2]), which seeks to improve the quality of life of older people. Its overarching target is to increase by two years the average healthy life expectancy of an EU citizen by 2020. In terms of monitoring the results of this EU initiative, the first results of the Partnership will be presented in Autumn 2014. The Partnership has also published set of good practices on active and healthy ageing in November 2013 ([3]). In addition, an Active Ageing Index launched by the European Commission and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) offers national and European policy-makers a way to measure the untapped potential of seniors across the 27 EU Member States and beyond ([4]).

([1]) See Annex to the Council Declaration on the European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity between Generations (2012): The Way Forward, at: http://europa.eu/ey2012/ey2012main.jsp?langId=en&catId=970&newsId=1743&
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing&pg=home
([3]) https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/eipaha/
([4]) http://www1.unece.org/stat/platform/display/AAI/Active+Ageing+Index+Home

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001935/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Spaccio on line di «droghe legali» — aggiornamento

In merito a una mia precedente interrogazione (E-011001/2011), si invita la Commissione a fornire dati aggiornati in merito all'immissione di nuove sostanze psicoattive vendute come «droghe legali» e ai decessi ad esse collegati.

Può inoltre la Commissione far sapere quali siano state le misure presentate ad oggi allo scopo di arrestare l'immissione di nuove droghe sul mercato attraverso i negozi on line che aggirano le normative esistenti?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(2 maggio 2014)

Negli ultimi anni il numero delle nuove sostanze psicoattive presenti sul mercato europeo è costantemente aumentato. Dal 2005 gli Stati membri hanno segnalato 317 nuove sostanze all'Osservatorio europeo delle droghe e delle tossicodipendenze e a Europol attraverso il meccanismo per lo scambio di informazioni previsto dalla decisione 2005/387/GAI del Consiglio sulle nuove sostanze psicoattive ([1]). Tra il 2009 e il 2013 il numero di notifiche effettuate ogni anno è più che triplicato, passando da 24 a 81.

Anche se non sono disponibili dati completi e affidabili sulle morti legate all'uso di nuove sostanze in Europa, poiché tali dati non sono raccolti sistematicamente, i decessi sono stati associati all'uso di un certo numero di nuove sostanze psicoattive, più recentemente 4-MA, 5-IT, MDPV e metoxetamina.

Dal 1997 dieci nuove sostanze psicoattive sono state oggetto di misure restrittive accompagnate da norme di diritto penale in tutta l'UE ([2]). La vendita di tali sostanze è pertanto vietata, anche attraverso Internet. In base all'esito delle valutazioni dei rischi in corso su quattro nuove sostanze ([3]) e alle informazioni raccolte sul para-metil-4-metilaminorex, l'UE potrebbe adottare altre misure. Molte altre nuove sostanze psicoattive sono sottoposte a diverse restrizioni in ogni Stato membro dell'UE.

A settembre 2013 la Commissione ha presentato proposte legislative ([4]) per la revisione della decisione 2005/387/GAI del Consiglio. L'intento è di rendere più incisiva la risposta dell'Unione estendendo il monitoraggio e la valutazione del rischio delle sostanze e favorendo un'azione più rapida e proporzionata per ritirare dal mercato le sostanze pericolose. Le proposte sono attualmente oggetto di negoziato tra il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio.

([1]) Decisione 2005/387/GAI del Consiglio, del 10 maggio 2005, relativa allo scambio di informazioni, alla valutazione dei rischi e al controllo delle nuove sostanze psicoattive (GU L 127 del 20.5.2005, pag. 32).
([2]) 4-MTA (1999); PMMA (2002); 2C-I, 2C-T-2, 2C-T-7, TMA-2 (2003); BZP (2008); mefedrone (2010); 4-metilamfetamina, 5-(2-amminopropil)indolo (2013).
([3]) MDPV, metoxetamina, AH-7921, 25I-NBOMe.
([4]) COM(2013) 618 final e COM(2013) 619 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001935/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Online selling of 'legal highs' — update

Further to my previous question (E-011001/2011), please would the Commission supply updated figures on the release onto the market of new psychoactive substances, sold as 'legal highs' and the deaths connected with them?

Can the Commission also state what measures have so far been introduced to halt the release of new drugs onto the market via online shops which evade the existing regulations?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2014)

During the past years, the number of new psychoactive substances present on the European market has constantly increased. Since 2005, Member States have notified 317 such substances to the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction and Europol, through the mechanism for information exchange set up by the Council Decision 2005/387/JHA on new psychoactive substances ([1]). The number of yearly notifications more than tripled between 2009 and 2013, from 24 to 81.

No complete and reliable figures are available on the deaths related to the use of new substances in Europe, because such data is not systematically collected. But fatalities have been associated with the use of a number of new psychoactive substances — most recently 4-MA, 5-IT, MDPV, methoxetamine.

Since 1997, 10 new psychoactive substances ([2]) have been submitted to restriction measures backed by criminal law across the EU. Their sale is therefore forbidden, included through the Internet. The risk assessments of four new substances ([3]) and the collection of information on para-methyl-4-methylaminorex are ongoing and may lead to EU measures. Many more new psychoactive substances are subject to various restrictions of each EU Member State.

In September 2013, the Commission presented legislative proposals ([4]) to revise Council Decision 2005/387/JHA. The proposals aim at strengthening the EU response by enhancing the monitoring and risk assessment of substances, and by enabling swifter and more proportionate action to withdraw from the market those substances that pose risks. The proposals are currently being negotiated by the European Parliament and the Council.

([1]) Council Decision 2005/387/JHA of 10 May 2005 on the information exchange, risk-assessment and control of new psychoactive substances, OJ L 127, 20.5.2005, p. 32.
([2]) 4-MTA (1999); PMMA (2002); 2C-I, 2C-T-2, 2C-T-7, TMA-2 (2003); BZP (2008); mephedrone (2010); 4-methylamphetamine, 5-(2-aminopropyl)indole (2013).
([3]) MDPV, methoxetamine, AH-7921, 25I-NBOMe.
([4]) COM(2013) 618 final and COM(2013) 619 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001936/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Usura e ludopatia

Nel 2013 ben 500 le famiglie pugliesi si sono rivolte a una nota fondazione antiusura di Bari, per chiedere aiuto. Questo dato purtroppo è in crescita, per lo meno dal 1994, anno di avvio della fondazione: 290 nel 2010, 300 nel 2011, 350 nel 2012. La fondazione ha fino ad oggi aiutato 748 famiglie, erogando, tramite l'apposito fondo antiusura dello Stato, 42 milioni di euro sotto forma di finanziamenti.

Tra le cause principali del sovraindebitamento che spinge le famiglie pugliesi a rivolgersi agli usurai c'è senz'altro il gioco d'azzardo, per il quale nella provincia di Bari la spesa pro capite è di 1 022 euro, a Taranto di 1 066, a Lecce di 848 euro, a Foggia di 748 e a Brindisi, la più alta, di 1 089 euro. Un allarme particolarmente grave è quello dell'usuraio «di quartiere», anello che si inserisce tra le sale da gioco e i compro-oro.

Alla luce di queste osservazioni, può la Commissione:

1. chiarire se dispone di dati che colleghino senza dubbio l'usura alla ludopatia;

2. presentare dei dati relativi ai tassi di usura negli altri Stati membri;

3. presentare dei dati relativi al gioco d'azzardo negli Stati membri, in particolare in merito al numero di giocatori, la somma spesa in media, le potenziali vittime di ludopatia?

4. specificare quali misure intende adottare per contrastare l'usura?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(14 aprile 2014)

La Commissione prende atto delle informazioni trasmesse dall'onorevole deputato. Quanto alle domande da lui poste:

1. La Commissione non dispone di dati che consentano di individuare una correlazione tra usura e ludopatia.

2. La Commissione non dispone nemmeno di dati relativi ai tassi di usura (compravendita di oro) negli Stati membri.

3. Sebbene i dati comparabili sul gioco d'azzardo siano attualmente esigui, la Commissione riconosce che è utile disporre di dati su tali questioni. Al riguardo, la Commissione sta considerando la stesura di una raccomandazione con l'obiettivo di fornire un elevato livello di protezione dei consumatori dei servizi di gioco d'azzardo. Gli Stati membri saranno invitati ad applicare tale raccomandazione. Sebbene sia incentrata sul gioco d'azzardo on-line, la raccomandazione può essere pertinente anche per i servizi di gioco d'azzardo off-line.

4. La Commissione non prevede interventi volti a regolamentare l'usura (compravendita di oro) e desidera far riferimento in tale contesto alla risposta fornita all'interrogazione scritta E-008391/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001936/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Money-lending and compulsive gambling disorder

In 2013, some 500 families in Apulia turned to a well-known anti-money-lending foundation in Bari for help. However, the numbers are rising, and have been doing so since at least 1994, when the foundation was set up: 290 in 2010, 300 in 2011, and 350 in 2012. The foundation has so far helped 748 families, handing out EUR 42 million in loans through the State's special anti-money-lending fund.

One of the main causes of excess indebtedness that is leading families in Apulia to turn to money-lenders is gambling, with per capita spending on gambling of EUR 1 022 in Bari, EUR 1 066 in Taranto, EUR 848 in Lecce, EUR 748 in Foggia, and EUR 1 089, the highest figure, in Brindisi. Particularly alarming is the use of 'neighbourhood' money-lenders — a link in the chain between gambling establishments and gold-buyers.

In the light of these observations, can the Commission:

1. clarify whether it has any data that identify a clear link between money-lending and compulsive gambling disorder?

2. provide figures on the levels of money-lending in other Member States?

3. provide figures on gambling in the Member States, particularly in terms of the number of gamblers, their average spending on gambling, and potential victims of compulsive gambling disorder?

4. say what steps it intends to take to combat money-lending?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

The Commission takes note of the information provided by the Honourable Member. As to the questions asked by the Honourable Member:

1. The Commission does not have data that would identify a link between money-lending and gambling disorders.

2. The Commission also does not have data on the level of money lending (in the sense of cash-for-gold) in the Member States.

3. Although comparable data on gambling is limited at the moment, the Commission recognises that data on such issues is useful. In this respect, the Commission is considering a recommendation with the aim of providing a high level of protection of consumers of gambling services. Member States will be invited to implement the recommendation. While the focus of the recommendation is on online gambling, it may also be relevant for offline gambling services.

4. The Commission does not have projects to regulate money lending (in the sense of cash-for-gold) and would like to refer in this context to the reply to Written Question E-008391/2013 ([1]).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001937/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Violazione del diritto alla vita e alla libertà d'espressione in Iran

Un giovane poeta iraniano è stato giustiziato insieme a 14 attivisti dei diritti umani, dopo essere stato obbligato a confessare di attentare alla sicurezza nazionale utilizzando i suoi versi per «diffondere la corruzione sulla terra». Così le autorità iraniane hanno condannato il 34enne alla pena capitale.

Nonostante le aspettative per l'apertura del nuovo premier iraniano, in Iran continuano le violazioni sistematiche dei diritti umani, tra pene capitali, arresti ingiustificati, incarcerazioni o arresti domiciliari.

I negoziati per il nucleare non possono essere l'unico argomento di discussione con Teheran. Alla luce di questa ennesima palese violazione del diritto alla vita e alla libertà di espressione, può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. come intende comportarsi e quale strategia intende attuare per evitare che queste violazioni sistematiche continuino a ripetersi?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

L'UE ha esortato in diverse occasioni l'Iran a rispettare i propri impegni internazionali in materia di diritti umani e continuerà a farlo, sia nell'ambito di dichiarazioni pubbliche che nei contatti diretti con i rappresentanti di questo paese. L'UE si augura che il nuovo governo iraniano rispetti gli impegni assunti in termini di miglioramento della situazione e segue con attenzione gli sviluppi nel paese.

L'Unione è inoltre favorevole alla proroga del mandato del relatore ONU sui diritti umani in Iran e a una sua visita nel paese, conformemente a tale mandato.

Rimane infine valido il «duplice approccio» dell'UE per quanto riguarda i diritti umani in Iran che prevede, da un lato, la possibilità di imporre sanzioni ai responsabili di gravi violazioni dei diritti umani e, dall'altro, la disponibilità dell'Unione a discutere direttamente con le controparti iraniane delle questioni connesse ai diritti umani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001937/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Violation of right to life and freedom of expression in Iran

A young Iranian poet has been tried with 14 human rights activists, after a forced confession to undermining national security by using his poems to 'spread corruption on earth.' On these grounds, the Iranian authorities have sentenced the 34-year-old to the death penalty.

Despite expectations that Iran's new prime minister would be open, systematic violations of human rights continue in Iran, including capital punishment, wrongful arrests, imprisonments and house arrests.

The nuclear negotiations cannot be the only subject of discussion with Tehran. In the light of this umpteenth flagrant violation of the right to life and freedom of expression, can the Commission explain:

1. how it intends to behave and what strategy it plans to adopt to prevent continued repetitions of these systematic violations?

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

The EU has, on several occasions, called on Iran to respect its international human rights obligations, and will continue to do so, be it in public statements as well as in direct contacts with Iranian representatives. The EU hopes that the commitments made by the new Iranian Government as to an improvement of the situation will be implemented and is following closely developments in Iran.

In addition, the EU supports the extension of the mandate of the UN Rapporteur on Human Rights in Iran and is in favour of a visit by the Rapporteur to Iran, as prescribed by his UN mandate.

Finally, the EU 'double track approach' on Human Rights in Iran remains valid, including on the one hand the possibility of imposing sanctions on grave human rights offenders, and on the other hand the EU's readiness to discuss human rights matters directly with Iranian counterparts.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001938/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Violenze contro cristiani in Nigeria

Durante la notte tra il 15 e il 16 febbraio scorsi, la Nigeria ha assistito a una strage terrificante: oltre cento cristiani sono stati uccisi nel villaggio di Izghe, nel nord-est della Nigeria, ad opera degli estremisti islamici di Boko Haram.

I sopravvissuti hanno testimoniato che i miliziani sono arrivati di sera, a bordo di camion e moto, travestiti da soldati. Hanno costretto gli uomini a radunarsi in un'area del villaggio e li hanno massacrati a colpi d'arma da fuoco e con coltelli e machete, al grido di «Allah è grande». Non soddisfatti, hanno setacciato le abitazioni alla ricerca di chi si era nascosto, saccheggiato magazzini e depositi, dato fuoco alle case. Si calcola che almeno 106 persone siano state trucidate, tra le quali anche alcuni musulmani moderati.

Nonostante la «guerra» dichiarata dal presidente cristiano a Boko Haram e la costituzione di milizie armate di autodifesa, questi massacri continuano in Nigeria, a volte come ritorsioni contro attacchi agli estremisti islamici, a volte come attacchi diretti.

Massacri come quello di Izghe si ripetono ormai con una frequenza preoccupante e lo stato sembra non in grado di adottare misure adeguate.

Alla luce di quanto detto, può la Commissione riferire:

1. se è a conoscenza del fatto;

2. se esistono già misure europee per sostenere la sicurezza della Nigeria e la protezione dei diritti umani;

3. se è allo studio l'utilizzo di strumenti, tra tutti quelli a disposizione dell'UE, per promuovere la pacificazione del paese?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è seriamente preoccupata per i recenti attacchi perpetrati a Izghe e in altri villaggi della Nigeria nord-orientale. Il portavoce dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha condannato gli attacchi il 17 febbraio scorso.

L'UE collabora con il governo della Nigeria per contribuire ad arginare la spirale di violenza attraverso progetti volti ad affrontarne le cause di fondo.

Il 10° FES sostiene interventi a livello di democratizzazione, Stato di diritto, risorse idriche, impianti igienico-sanitari e salute materna. Lo strumento inteso a contribuire alla stabilità e alla pace (IcSP) finanzia diversi programmi di pacificazione e mediazione nonché progetti volti a riformare la giustizia penale e a potenziare l'ufficio del consulente nazionale per la sicurezza. Lo strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani finanzia diverse azioni a tutela dei diritti umani, in particolare con le ONG. Con l'11° FES gli aiuti dell'UE saranno concentrati maggiormente nella parte settentrionale del paese, nella misura consentita dalle condizioni di sicurezza.

Nel suo dialogo regolare con le autorità nigeriane l'UE affronta inoltre le questioni relative ai diritti umani legate agli attacchi terroristici e alla risposta delle autorità.

La Commissione fornisce altresì aiuti umanitari alle vittime della violenza negli Stati di Borno, Yobo e Adamawa, dove vige lo stato di emergenza. La protezione è un aspetto di fondamentale importanza, in quanto gran parte degli sfollati è costituita da donne e bambini. Viene fornita assistenza nutrizionale e sanitaria alle persone (nigeriani e rimpatriati) che hanno cercato rifugio nel vicino Niger.

Attraverso la direzione generale per gli Aiuti umanitari e la protezione civile, quest'anno la Commissione ha stanziato 7,5 milioni di EUR per aiutare le persone più bisognose in Nigeria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001938/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Violence against Christians in Nigeria

During the night between 15 and 16 February, Nigeria witnessed a terrifying massacre: more than a hundred Christians were killed in the village of Izghe in north-eastern Nigeria — the work of Boko Haram Islamic extremists.

Survivors said that the militants arrived in the evening in trucks and on motorbikes, disguised as soldiers. They rounded up the men of the village and massacred them using guns, knives and machetes, while shouting 'Allah is great'. Not satisfied with their work, they searched people's homes for anyone who might be hiding, ransacked shops and warehouses, and set fire to houses. It is estimated that at least 106 people were slaughtered, including moderate Muslims.

Despite the 'war' declared on Boko Haram by Nigeria's Christian President and the formation of armed self-defence militias, the massacres continue, sometimes as reprisals for attacks on Islamic extremists, sometimes as direct attacks.

Massacres like the one in Izghe are happening with alarming frequency now and the State seems unable to take appropriate measures.

In the light of all this, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. is it aware of the situation?

2. are European measures already in place to support security in Nigeria and protect human rights?

3. is it considering the use of instruments — among the many available to the EU — to promote peace in Nigeria?

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

The Commission is aware of and deeply concerned by the attacks perpetrated recently on Izghe and other villages in the North East of Nigeria. The Spokesperson of the High Representative condemned the attacks on 17 February.

The EU is working with the government of Nigeria to help end the cycle of violence through projects focusing on the root causes of violence.

The 10th EDF supports actions in the field of democratisation, rule of law, water, sanitation and maternal health. The IcSP (Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace) is supporting several peace and mediation programmes and projects to reform criminal justice and strengthen the Office of the National Security Advisor. The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights funds several actions to protect human rights, particularly with NGOs. The 11th EDF will shift the focus of EU aid more to the North, to the extent that security conditions allow.

In its regular dialogue with the Nigerian authorities, the EU also addresses human rights issues resulting from both terrorist attacks and the authorities' response.

Moreover, the Commission, in the humanitarian assistance side, also supports assistance to victims of violence in the Borno, Yobo and Adamawa states where a state of emergency is in force. Protection is a key component as the vast majority of the displaced are women and children. Assistance in terms of nutrition and healthcare is being provided to people, both Nigerians and returnees, who have sought refuge across the border in Niger.

This year, the Commission though its department of Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection, has allocated EUR 7.5 million to help those most in need in Nigeria.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001939/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Violenze e scontri politici in Venezuela

La scorsa settimana gli scontri in Venezuela hanno causato tre morti e oltre 60 feriti. Il presidente ha ordinato l'espulsione dal Paese di tre rappresentanti diplomatici statunitensi, accusati di cospirare contro il suo governo, per poi accusare gli Stati Uniti di «sostenere e legittimare i tentativi di destabilizzazione della democrazia venezuelana».

Oggi il leader del partito di opposizione, ricercato dalla giustizia venezuelana per l'organizzazione della violenza di piazza, ha invitato i propri sostenitori a unirsi in un corteo che lo accompagnerà fino alla sede del ministero degli interni, dove si consegnerà.

Nei prossimi giorni dovrebbe inoltre essere organizzata una manifestazione a livello nazionale «contro i gruppi paramilitari e armati», organizzata da un altro leader dell'opposizione, che accusa il governo di essere a capo delle violenze dei giorni scorsi, il cui obiettivo reale sarebbe quello di distrarre la popolazione dai gravi problemi economici e sociali del paese.

Alla luce di questi eventi, può la Commissione chiarire quanto segue:

1. quale è la posizione nei confronti del governo venezuelano e appoggia le proteste dell'opposizione?

2. Intende intervenire affinché il diritto alla giustizia e all'equo processo siano in ogni caso garantiti in Venezuela?

3. Cosa pensa al riguardo dei diplomatici statunitensi espulsi dal paese? Ritiene che l'incolumità dei diplomatici europei in Venezuela sia a rischio?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla dichiarazione sui disordini in Venezuela rilasciata il 21 febbraio 2014 dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente dell'UE e alla dichiarazione rilasciata a nome dall'Alta Rappresentante dell'UE durante il dibattito in plenaria sul Venezuela svoltosi il 27 febbraio 2014 al Parlamento europeo.

La Commissione non si esprime sulle relazioni diplomatiche fra due paesi terzi, ma rileva che l'UE è rappresentata in Venezuela da una delegazione che svolge le funzioni assegnate all'Unione dal trattato di Lisbona. La delegazione dell'UE a Caracas coordina periodicamente le proprie posizioni con le ambasciate dei dodici Stati membri rappresentati in Venezuela.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001939/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Violence and political clashes in Venezuela

Last week clashes in Venezuela caused three deaths and injured more than 60. The President has ordered the expulsion from the country of three US diplomats, accused of conspiracy against his government. He went on to accuse the USA of 'supporting and legitimising attempts to destabilise Venezuelan democracy.'

Today the leader of the opposition party, who is wanted by the Venezuelan judiciary for orchestrating street violence, called on his supporters to join him in a procession to the Ministry of the Interior building, where he will hand himself in.

In the next few days a national demonstration is also to be organised 'against the paramilitary and armed groups.' It will be organised by another opposition leader, who accuses the government of fomenting the violence of recent days, with the true purpose of distracting public attention from the country's serious economic and social problems.

In the light of these events, can the Commission clarify:

1. what position it holds towards the Venezuelan Government, and whether it supports the opposition protests?

2. whether it intends to intervene to ensure that the rights to justice and fair trial are guaranteed in every case in Venezuela?

3. what it thinks about the US diplomats expelled from the country, and whether it believes that the physical safety of European diplomats is at risk in Venezuela?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the 21 February 2014 Statement by the EU High Representative/Vice-President on unrest in Venezuela as well as to the Statement on behalf of the EU High Representative during the European Parliament plenary debate on Venezuela on 27 February 2014.

The Commission does not comment on the diplomatic relations between two third countries, but notes that the EU is represented in Venezuela by a Delegation which assures the function assigned to the EU under the Lisbon Treaty. The EU Delegation in Caracas regularly coordinates positions with the twelve EU Member State embassies in Venezuela.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001940/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Energie rinnovabili e nuovi impegni relativi al protocollo di Kyoto

Nuovi dati relativi alle emissioni di gas serra nell'atmosfera evidenziano maggiore impegno, da parte dei paesi occidentali nel perseguire gli obiettivi di Kyoto.

Il caso italiano farebbe parte di tale nuova tendenza, a fronte di un importante impulso reso al settore delle rinnovabili.

Nonostante tale quadro confortante, i quantitativi di CO_2 emessi nell'atmosfera tenderebbero a crescere: le attività produttive dei cosiddetti paesi in via di sviluppo sarebbero svincolate dal rispetto dei parametri di Kyoto e andrebbero ad incrementare i livelli di inquinamento su scala sovranazionale.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, appare evidente la necessità di una nuova adesione al protocollo da parte dei paesi di nuova industrializzazione, al fine di conseguire un obiettivo che può concretizzarsi solo globalmente.

In merito a quanto illustrato, può la Commissione informare in merito a:

1. interventi pregressi, posti in essere dall'UE al fine di favorire il discorso relativo alle nuove fonti energetiche e alla riduzione dei gas serra presso attori istituzionali ed economici dei PVS?

2. Lo stato dell'arte del dibattito odierno?

Risposta di Connie Hedegaard a nome della Commissione
(2 maggio 2014)

Sebbene i paesi in via di sviluppo non abbiano obiettivi vincolanti nell'ambito del protocollo di Kyoto, sono comunque impegnati a ridurre le loro emissioni ai sensi della convenzione quadro delle Nazioni Unite sui cambiamenti climatici.

Alla conferenza di Doha del 2012 l'UE e i suoi Stati membri hanno adottato una decisione per stabilire un secondo periodo d'impegno, previsto dal protocollo di Kyoto, per il 2013-2020. La decisione è stata presa nell'ambito di un più ampio pacchetto di misure, all'interno del quale sia i paesi industrializzati sia i paesi in via di sviluppo hanno concordato di dare un ulteriore contributo alla riduzione delle emissioni globali. 38 parti, costituite da paesi sviluppati, hanno accettato impegni giuridicamente vincolanti nell'ambito del protocollo di Kyoto fino al 2020, e più di 60 ulteriori parti si sono impegnate su base volontaria in sforzi di mitigazione. Ciò porta la quota di emissioni globali oggetto di azioni di mitigazione a più dell'80 %.

Un ulteriore elemento essenziale è la disponibilità delle parti della convenzione ad adottare entro il 2015 un protocollo, un altro strumento giuridico o un risultato convenuto giuridicamente vincolante nell'ambito della convenzione, nonché ad aumentare gli sforzi di mitigazione prima del 2020. Alla conferenza di Varsavia del 2013 tutte le parti hanno convenuto di redigere i loro contributi per il periodo successivo al 2020. L'UE ha costantemente affermato che tutte le parti devono contribuire agli sforzi globali di mitigazione sottolineando l'importanza delle fonti di energia rinnovabili, ad esempio attraverso l'iniziativa «Energia sostenibile per tutti».

L'Unione europea intrattiene un dialogo regolare con i paesi terzi e le parti interessate e fornisce un sostegno significativo anche nel settore delle politiche climatiche e dell'energia volte a ridurre le emissioni di gas serra, all'aumento delle energie rinnovabili e dell'efficienza energetica. Più di recente l'UE si è impegnata in riunioni di esperti tecnici sulle fonti rinnovabili di energia e sull'efficienza energetica, tenutesi a Bonn nel marzo 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001940/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Renewable energy sources and new commitments under the Kyoto Protocol

New data on atmospheric emissions of greenhouse gases provide evidence of western countries' increased commitment to pursuing the Kyoto targets.

The case of Italy fits the new trend, with a significant boost being given to the renewables sector.

Despite this reassuring picture, the quantities of CO_2 emitted into the atmosphere are on an upward trend. Productive activities in the 'developing' countries are exempt from compliance with the Kyoto parameters and are tending to increase supra-national pollution levels.

In the light of the above, there seems to be an obvious need for new ratification of the protocol by newly industrialised countries, in order to achieve an objective which is only practically feasible on a global scale.

Given what is outlined above, can the Commission supply information on:

1. previous interventions launched by the EU to encourage discussion of new energy sources and the reduction of greenhouse gases among institutions and businesses in the developing countries?

2. the present state of the debate?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2014)

While developing countries do not have binding targets under the Kyoto Protocol, they are committed to reducing their emissions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

At the Doha Conference in 2012, the EU and its Member States agreed to a decision to establish a second commitment period for 2013-2020 under the Kyoto Protocol. This decision came as part of a larger package in which both developed and developing countries agreed to further contribute to global emission reductions. 38 developed country Parties accepted legally-binding commitments under the Kyoto Protocol until 2020, and more than 60 further Parties have pledged voluntary mitigation efforts. This brings the share of global emissions covered by mitigation action to more than 80%.

A further essential element is the consensus of Parties to 'adopt a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties' by 2015, and to raise mitigation ambition pre-2020. At the Warsaw Conference in 2013, all Parties agreed to prepare their post-2020 contributions. The EU has consistently stated that all Parties must contribute to the global mitigation efforts, and emphasised the importance of renewable energy sources, for example through the Sustainable Energy for All Initiative.

The EU conducts regular dialogue with third countries and stakeholders, and provides significant support including in the fields of climate and energy policies aiming at greenhouse gas emission reductions, increase of renewable energy sources and energy efficiency. Most recently, the EU engaged in Technical Expert Meetings on renewable energy sources and energy efficiency in Bonn in March 2014.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001941/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Sul caporalato

La piaga del caporalato si ripropone frequentemente alla nostra attenzione attestandosi come fenomeno che non tende a scemare.

Notizie degli ultimi giorni sottolineano nuove modalità che declinano le pratiche di reclutamento vigenti fra «procacciatori» di manodopera. In particolare, le risorse offerte dalla rete permettono metodi veloci ed efficienti per i nuovi «cyber-caporali».

Inoltre, si afferma sempre di più la tendenza al reclutamento fra connazionali: i nuovi caporali sono, non poche volte, essi stessi migranti.

Tale fenomeno investe diverse dimensioni: principalmente, quella dei diritti, delle politiche migratorie e dell'occupazione in agricoltura.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione:

1. considerare nuovi strumenti nella lotta a tale triste realtà?

2. Favorire azioni di sensibilizzazione ed informazione per la società civile, nonché per gli attori economici ed istituzionali dei diversi Stati membri?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(23 aprile 2014)

Il 26 febbraio il Parlamento e il Consiglio hanno completato l'adozione di una nuova direttiva che rafforza i diritti dei lavoratori provenienti da paesi terzi per impieghi stagionali in settori come l'agricoltura ([1]). Per garantire la corretta attuazione della direttiva, in particolare delle disposizioni relative ai diritti, alle condizioni di lavoro e all'alloggio, gli Stati membri dovranno provvedere affinché siano posti in essere meccanismi appropriati per il controllo dei datori di lavoro e, se del caso, siano effettuate ispezioni efficaci e adeguate. La selezione dei datori di lavoro da controllare dovrebbe basarsi principalmente su una valutazione dei rischi, tenendo conto di fattori come il settore in cui opera un'azienda ed eventuali precedenti violazioni. La direttiva dovrà essere recepita nella legislazione nazionale entro settembre 2016.

Anche la direttiva sulle sanzioni ai datori di lavoro ([2]) dovrebbe contribuire a contrastare il fenomeno. Essa vieta l'impiego di cittadini di paesi terzi in soggiorno irregolare nell'UE e prevede sanzioni per coloro che forniscono loro un impiego. I datori di lavoro che impiegano migranti in soggiorno irregolare sono passibili di sanzioni sotto forma di ammende o sanzioni amministrative, nonché di sanzioni penali nei casi più gravi (quali ripetute violazioni, condizioni di lavoro di particolare sfruttamento o se il datore di lavoro è a conoscenza del fatto che il lavoratore è vittima della tratta di esseri umani).

La Commissione sta inoltre preparando un'iniziativa per migliorare la cooperazione tra gli Stati membri a livello dell'Unione europea per contrastare più efficacemente il lavoro sommerso. Essa raggrupperà i diversi organi esecutivi degli Stati membri, quali gli ispettorati del lavoro e le autorità competenti in materia di sicurezza sociale, fiscalità e migrazione. In particolare, l'iniziativa avrà lo scopo di contribuire a una migliore applicazione del diritto nazionale e dell'UE.

([1]) Non ancora pubblicata nella Gazzetta ufficiale, cfr. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=EN&reference=P7-TA-2014-0072 per il testo adottato dal Parlamento.

([2]) Direttiva 2009/52/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 18 giugno 2009, che introduce norme minime relative a sanzioni e a provvedimenti nei confronti di datori di lavoro che impiegano cittadini di paesi terzi il cui soggiorno è irregolare (GU L 168 del 30.6.2009, pag. 24).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001941/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: The gangmaster system

The issue of the gangmaster system repeatedly comes to our attention, confirming that the phenomenon is not on the wane.

News in the past few days has spotlighted new methods for recruitment of labour, practised among these operators. Internet resources, in particular, facilitate quick and efficient methods for the new 'cyber gangmasters.'

There is also a growing trend to recruit fellow citizens. The new gangmasters are not infrequently migrants themselves.

It is a phenomenon with many facets, the main ones being rights, migration policies and employment in agriculture.

In the light of this information, can the Commission:

1. consider new methods of combating this sad reality?

2. encourage awareness-raising and information initiatives in civil society and for the businesses and institutions of the various Member States?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

On 26 February, Parliament and the Council completed adoption of a new Directive strengthening the rights of workers coming from third countries for seasonal employment in sectors such as agriculture ([1]). To ensure the proper enforcement of this directive, and in particular the provisions regarding rights, working conditions and accommodation, Member States will have to ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place for the monitoring of employers and that, where appropriate, effective inspections are carried out. The selection of employers to be inspected should be based primarily on a risk assessment taking into account factors such as the sector in which a company operates and any past record of infringement. This directive will have to be transposed into national law by September 2016.

The Employer Sanctions Directive ([2]) should also help tackle the phenomenon. It prohibits the employment of irregularly staying third-country nationals across the EU and provides for sanctions for those who do employ irregularly staying workers. Employers of irregularly staying migrants are liable to sanctions in the form of fines or administrative sanctions, as well as criminal penalties in the most serious cases (such as repeated infringements, particularly exploitative working conditions or where the employer knows that the worker is a victim of human trafficking).

The Commission is also preparing an initiative to improve Member States' cooperation at EU level to tackle undeclared work more efficiently. It will bring together Member States different enforcement bodies, such as the labour inspectorates and the social security, tax and migration authorities. Its aim would be in particular to contribute to better enforcement of EU and national law.

([1]) Not yet published in the Official Journal, see http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=EN&reference=P7-TA-2014-0072 for the text adopted by Parliament.

([2]) Directive 2009/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 providing for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals; OJ L 168, 30.6.2009, p. 24-32.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001942/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Tecnologia e accesso alla cultura

Alla luce di una recente applicazione informatica, che va a promuovere l'accesso alla cultura per categorie cosiddette «svantaggiate» — nel caso specifico, persone non vedenti — si considera come determinate soluzioni tecnologiche contribuiscano a concretizzare politiche e misure relative alle pari opportunità.

Allo stesso tempo, tali dispositivi elettronici contribuiscono a valorizzare beni di natura storico-artistica interpretandoli nella veste di risorse culturali atte a costituirsi quale volano di sviluppo.

In relazione al singolo caso cui qui si fa riferimento, si menziona l'iniziativa promossa nella città di Pisa (che ha adottato un nuovo app per ipod) per una migliore fruizione dei beni architettonici della Piazza dei Miracoli; in particolar modo, a vantaggio dei cittadini videolesi.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione:

1. dar particolare impulso ad iniziative che mirino al supporto tecnologico per persone diversamente abili, relativamente all'accesso alla cultura?

2. Dar contezza di ulteriori e similari progetti implementati negli altri Stati membri?

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

La Commissione accoglie con favore gli sforzi del comune di Pisa per consentire alle persone con disabilità visiva una maggiore fruizione del patrimonio architettonico della Piazza dei Miracoli.

La Commissione, attraverso i programmi quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione, ha favorito lo sviluppo di nuove metodologie di progettazione e di tecnologie assistive per le persone con disabilità, compresi i non vedenti e gli ipovedenti. Il 7° PQ ha destinato complessivamente circa 80 milioni di EUR alla ricerca in questo settore. Il sostegno prosegue con il nuovo programma quadro Orizzonte 2020. È attualmente aperto un invito a presentare proposte ([1]) per migliorare le tecnologie di interazione uomo-macchina in modo da consentire la piena partecipazione delle persone disabili alla vita sociale ([2]).

Inoltre, nel 2011 la Commissione ha raccomandato agli Stati membri una serie di norme aggiornate per la digitalizzazione e la messa in rete del patrimonio culturale. La digitalizzazione rappresenta un importante mezzo per garantire un più ampio accesso ai beni culturali e una maggiore fruizione degli stessi, anche da parte di persone con disabilità visiva, grazie alla conversione al formato appropriato. Il materiale digitalizzato può essere riutilizzato a vari fini, quali lo sviluppo di contenuti didattici, documentari, animazioni e applicazioni turistiche o l'impiego su tecnologie informatiche innovative e piattaforme web mobili, che a loro volta consentono nuove interazioni con la ricchezza del nostro patrimonio culturale, a vantaggio delle imprese e di tutti i cittadini. Progetti finanziati dall'UE come CHESS e V-City mostrano in che modo queste nuove interazioni con il patrimonio culturale o urbano possono contribuire ad arricchire il bagaglio di esperienze degli utenti.

([1]) ICT-22.b-2014.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/91-ict-22-2014.html
http://www.chessexperience.eu/
http://vcity.diginext.fr/EN/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001942/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Technology and access to culture

A recent computer application seeks to improve access to culture for groups of people dubbed 'disadvantaged' — in this specific case, people who cannot see. This shows how certain technological solutions help to put policies and measures into practice in the field of equal opportunities.

At the same time, such electronic devices contribute to the exploitation of historical and artistic assets, by treating them as cultural resources which can be used as drivers of development.

Further to the specific case referred to above, mention can be made of the initiative promoted in the city of Pisa (a new app for iPods), which will enhance enjoyment of the architectural heritage of Piazza dei Miracoli, the cathedral square. This will be of special benefit to members of the public who are visually impaired.

In the light of this information, can the Commission:

1. specifically boost initiatives which aim to offer technological support in access to culture for people who are differently abled?

2. report on further, similar projects implemented in other Member States?

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

The Commission welcomes the efforts of the municipality of Pisa to allow visually impaired persons to increase their experience of enjoying the architectural heritage of Piazza dei Miracoli.

The Commission, through its framework programmes for research and innovation has been fostering the development of new methodologies for design as well as assistive technologies for people with disabilities, including blind and visually impaired persons. The total contribution to the FP7 research in this area amounted to approx. EUR 80 million. This support continues with the new framework programme Horizon 2020. A call for proposals ([1]) is currently open soliciting proposals on advancing human-machine interaction technologies to enable disabled people to fully participate in society ([2]).

Moreover, in 2011, the Commission recommended to Member States an updated set of measures for digitising and bringing cultural heritage online. Digitisation is an important means for ensuring greater access to and use of cultural material, including for visual-impaired persons, through format-shifting to the appropriate format. The digitised material can be re-used for various content such as educational content, documentaries, animations, tourism applications, on innovative ICT and mobile web platforms, which themselves enable new interactions with the richness of our cultural assets, to the benefit of businesses and all citizens . EU-funded projects like CHESS and V-City show how these new interactions with cultural or urban heritage can contribute to enriching the users' experiences.

([1]) ICT-22.b-2014.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/91-ict-22-2014.html
http://www.chessexperience.eu/
http://vcity.diginext.fr/EN/index.html