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 218/01)

Treść Strona

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011597/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Visas délivrés aux ressortissants marocains

La Commission européenne a annoncé vendredi avoir proposé au Conseil l'ouverture de négociations entre l'Union européenne et le Maroc sur la conclusion d'un accord destiné à assouplir les procédures de délivrance des visas de court séjour.

Cette proposition s'inscrit, selon la Commission, dans le contexte du partenariat pour la mobilité entre l'Union européenne et le Maroc, signé en juin 2013, et dont la mise en œuvre est en cours.

Une partie des mesures d'assouplissement proposées sont généralisées à tous les demandeurs, tandis que d'autres ne profiteront qu'à certaines catégories de personnes, notamment les étudiants, les chercheurs et les hommes et femmes d'affaires, précise un communiqué de la Commission.

1. En quoi consiste cette série d'assouplissements proposés?

2. Selon des statistiques de la Commission, quelque 322 094 visas «Schengen» ont été délivrés en 2012 par les consulats des États de l'espace Schengen au Maroc. Quel est le top 10 des demandes de visas?

**Réponse donnée par M^me^ Malmström au nom de la Commission**
*(22 novembre 2013)*

Le 4 octobre 2013, la Commission européenne a présenté au Conseil une recommandation relative à des directives de négociation d'un accord avec le Maroc visant à faciliter la délivrance de visas. L'accord représente l'une des mesures figurant dans le partenariat pour la mobilité approuvé en juin 2013 par le Maroc, l'Union européenne et neuf de ses États membres.

La série d'assouplissements proposés comprend l'allègement pour certaines catégories de demandeurs des preuves documentaires relatives à l'objet du voyage à fournir à l'appui d'une demande de visa, la possibilité de délivrer des visas de long séjour à entrées multiples, l'exonération ou la réduction des droits de visas pour des catégories de voyageurs spécifiques, la fixation de délais pour le traitement des demandes et la possibilité d'exempter de l'obligation de visa les détenteurs d'un passeport diplomatique ou de service.

En 2012, les dix pays à l'origine de la plupart des demandes de visa Schengen étaient les suivants: la Russie (6 069 001), l'Ukraine (1 313 727), la Chine (1 242 507), la Biélorussie (698 404), la Turquie (668 835), l'Inde (506 162), l'Algérie (387 942), le Maroc (373 823), l'Arabie saoudite (255 083) et le Royaume-Uni (210 610). Ce dernier chiffre s'explique par le grand nombre de ressortissants de pays tiers résidant au Royaume-Uni qui ont besoin d'un visa pour entrer dans l'espace Schengen.

Au Maroc, en 2012, la plupart des demandes de visa ont été effectuées auprès des consulats de France (174 912 demandes, soit 46 % du total) et d'Espagne (139 134, soit 37 % du total).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011597/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Visas issued to Moroccan nationals

On Friday, the Commission announced that it had proposed to the Council to open negotiations between the European Union and Morocco on an agreement to facilitate the procedures for issuing short-stay visas.

According to the Commission, this proposal was made in the context of the Mobility Partnership between the EU and Morocco, signed in June 2013, and which is currently being implemented.

According to a Commission press release, some of the proposed facilitation measures will apply to all applicants, while others will only benefit certain groups of people, particularly students, researchers and business professionals.

1. What do these proposed facilitation measures consist of?

2. According to the Commission's figures, some 322 094 'Schengen' visas were issued to Morocco in 2012 by the consulates of Schengen States. Which countries make up the top 10 in terms of visa applications?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(22 November 2013)*

On 4 October 2013 the European Commission presented its recommendation to the Council for negotiating directives to negotiate a visa facilitation agreement with Morocco. This agreement is one of the measures included in the Mobility Partnership agreed in June 2013 by Morocco, the EU and 9 of its Member States.

The list of suggested visa facilitations includes the simplification of documentary evidence concerning the purpose of travel to be submitted in support of the visa application for certain categories of applicants, the possibility of issuing multiple-entry visas with a long period of validity, the waiving/reducing of the handling fees for specific categories of travellers, the setting of deadlines for processing visa applications, as well as a possible exemption from the visa obligation for holders of diplomatic and service passports.

In 2012 the 10 countries from which most Schengen visa applications were made were: Russia (6 069 001), Ukraine (1 313 727), China (1 242 507), Belarus (698 404), Turkey (668 835), India (506 162), Algeria (387 942), Morocco (373 823), Saudi Arabia (255 083), United Kingdom (210 610). The UK figures are explained by the large number of third-country nationals residing in the UK who require a visa to enter the Schengen area.

In Morocco in 2012, most visa applications were made at consulates of France (174 912 applications, i.e. 46% of the total) and Spain (139 134, i.e. 37%).

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011599/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), Verónica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Fabrizio Bertot (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Mario Borghezio (NI), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE) y Barbara Matera (PPE)**
*(10 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Solicitud de reintroducción del Reglamento (UE) n° 29/2012 — Normas de comercialización del aceite de oliva

En un restaurante de París una mujer italiana encontró un ratón vivo dentro de la aceitera. La noticia fue recogida en los principales periódicos italianos que protestaron por las malas condiciones sanitarias en las que se conserva el aceite que se sirve en las mesas de los restaurantes.

Desde hace meses, la mayoría de los países de Europa piden que se prohíba que los restaurantes y comedores sirvan aceite de oliva en aceiteras anónimas, sin etiqueta ni garantías anti-rellenado para los consumidores.

En mayo del año pasado el Comisario Ciolos bloqueó inexplicablemente el Reglamento (UE) n° 29/2012 sobre las normas de comercialización del aceite de oliva, por el que se establecía la obligación de utilizar botellas de aceite antifraude en los restaurantes, hospitales y comedores. Dicha propuesta podría ser muy útil para resolver el problema del rellenado de las aceiteras, lo que no garantiza la transparencia ni la seguridad del producto a los consumidores.

1. ¿Ha estudiado la Comisión el impacto de la falta de transparencia sobre el contenido real de los recipientes para los consumidores europeos, no sólo en términos económicos sino también en términos de protección de la salud, dado que el producto rellenado tiene menores propiedades organolépticas y pierde en calidad.

2. ¿Ha tenido en cuenta la Comisión el hecho de que la aplicación del Reglamento, en particular, de su artículo 2, también podría tener un papel para la promoción de los aceites de oliva extra virgen europeos, necesidad subrayada en múltiples ocasiones por la propia Comisión, transmitiendo así una información más completa sobre un producto genuino, y una opción de consumo más orientada hacia las marcas europeas?

3. ¿Tiene intención la Comisión, tras este último grave incidente y a la vista de lo que antecede, de volver a presentar el Reglamento con el fin de establecer la obligación de que los restaurantes y comedores sólo ofrezcan aceite de oliva en envases monodosis o botellas no rellenables, certificadas y etiquetadas, para garantizar a los consumidores el derecho elemental a conocer el producto que están utilizando?

**Respuesta del Sr. Cioloș en nombre de la Comisión**
*(3 de diciembre de 2013)*

La Comisión desea señalar que la responsabilidad del cumplimiento de las condiciones de higiene en el sector de la restauración recae en principio en el explotador de la empresa alimentaria y que el control al respecto, por razones de subsidiariedad, queda bajo la entera responsabilidad de los Estados miembros. Un incidente del tipo del mencionado en la pregunta parlamentaria también puede producirse con otros productos alimentarios, incluidos los productos envasados.

En lo que respecta a la comercialización del aceite de oliva por parte de los sectores de la hostelería y la restauración, compete a los Estados miembros evaluar las prácticas y garantizar que se protejan los intereses de los consumidores. La Comisión no tiene intención de presentar propuestas legislativas sobre esta materia. La normativa de la Unión Europea no se opone, *a priori*, a que un Estado miembro adopte una legislación nacional como la adoptada por Portugal en relación con la utilización de botellas de aceite de oliva no rellenables en los sectores de la hostelería y la restauración.

La Comisión seguirá trabajando en favor de la calidad del aceite de oliva y el control de la misma.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011599/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), Verónica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Fabrizio Bertot (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Mario Borghezio (NI), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE) e Barbara Matera (PPE)**
*(10 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Richiesta di reintrodurre il regolamento (UE) n. 29/2012 — Norme di commercializzazione dell'olio di oliva

In un ristorante di Parigi una donna italiana ha trovato all'interno dell'oliera un topo vivo. La notizia è stata riportata dai principali quotidiani italiani che hanno gridato allo scandalo per le scadenti condizioni sanitarie in cui era conservato l'olio servito sulle tavole del ristorante.

Da mesi la maggior parte dei paesi europei chiede il divieto per ristoranti e mense di somministrare olio di oliva in anonime oliere, prive di etichetta e di garanzie antirabbocco per i consumatori.

Nel maggio scorso è stato inspiegabilmente bloccato dal commissario Ciolos il regolamento n. 29/2012 relativo alle norme di commercializzazione dell'olio d'oliva, che avrebbe introdotto l'obbligo di utilizzare bottiglie di olio antifrode nei locali di ristorazione, negli ospedali e nelle mense. La proposta sarebbe stata invece molto utile per contrastare il fenomeno del *refilling* (rabbocco) delle oliere, che non garantisce ai consumatori né trasparenza né sicurezza in merito al prodotto.

Alla luce di quanto sopraesposto, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se ha valutato l'impatto sui consumatori europei della mancata trasparenza in merito al reale contenuto delle ampolle, non solo in termini economici ma anche sotto il profilo della tutela della salute, dal momento che il prodotto rabboccato, oltre a possedere generalmente proprietà organolettiche inferiori, è deteriorato nella sua qualità;

2. se ha tenuto conto del fatto che l'applicazione del regolamento, in particolare dell'articolo 2, avrebbe potuto avere anche una funzione di promozione degli oli extra vergine europei, ovvero un'esigenza più volte sottolineata dalla stessa Commissione, e quindi veicolare un'informazione più completa per un prodotto genuino nonché una scelta di consumo maggiormente orientata verso i marchi europei;

3. se, anche a seguito dell'ultimo gravissimo episodio citato e di quanto descritto, intende ripresentare il regolamento volto a introdurre l'obbligo per i ristoranti e le mense di somministrare olio di oliva soltanto in bottiglie monouso e antirabbocco, certificate ed etichettate, al fine di garantire ai consumatori il diritto elementare di conoscere il prodotto che stanno utilizzando.

**Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione**
*(3 dicembre 2013)*

La Commissione desidera sottolineare che spetta innanzitutto agli operatori della filiera alimentare garantire il rispetto delle condizioni igieniche nel settore della ristorazione e che il controllo, per ragioni di sussidiarietà, rientra interamente nella sfera di competenza degli Stati membri. Un incidente come quello citato nell'interrogazione parlamentare può verificarsi anche per altri prodotti alimentari, inclusi quelli confezionati.

Per quanto riguarda la commercializzazione di olio d'oliva da parte del settore alberghiero, della ristorazione e dei caffè, è compito degli Stati membri valutarne le pratiche e garantire la tutela degli interessi dei consumatori. La Commissione non intende legiferare in materia. La normativa dell'Unione europea non si oppone, a priori, all'adozione da parte di uno Stato membro di una legislazione nazionale come quella adottata dal Portogallo relativa all'utilizzo, nel settore alberghiero, della ristorazione e dei caffè, di bottiglie di olio d'oliva non riutilizzabili.

La Commissione continuerà a prodigarsi per tutelare e controllare la qualità dell'olio d'oliva.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011599/13**
**to the Commission**
**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), Verónica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Fabrizio Bertot (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Mario Borghezio (NI), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE) and Barbara Matera (PPE)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Request to reintroduce Regulation (EC) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil

An Italian woman recently found a live mouse in the oil cruet in a restaurant in Paris. The story was reported by the main Italian newspapers, which have branded the poor hygiene conditions in which the oil served in the restaurant was stored a disgrace.

For months now, most European countries have been calling for a ban on restaurants and canteens serving olive oil in unmarked oil cruets, with no label or guarantees for consumers that they are non-refillable.

In May 2013, Regulation (EC) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil, which would have introduced the obligation to use anti-fraud oil bottles in restaurants, hospitals and canteens, was inexplicably blocked by Commissioner Cioloş. The proposal would have been very useful for combating the phenomenon whereby oil bottles are refilled, which guarantees the consumer neither transparency nor safety with regard to the product.

1. Has the Commission assessed the impact on European consumers of the lack of transparency regarding the actual content of oil cruets, not only in financial terms, but also in terms of health protection, given that the refilled product, as well as generally having inferior organoleptic properties, is of lower quality?

2. Has the Commission considered that implementing the regulation, particularly Article 2 thereof, could have also served to promote European extra-virgin oils, something repeatedly stressed by the Commission as necessary, thus providing more complete information for a genuine product and guiding consumers more towards European brands?

3. Following the latest very serious incident mentioned above, does the Commission plan to resubmit the regulation intended to introduce the requirement for restaurants and canteens to serve olive oil only in certified and labelled non-refillable, single-use bottles, in order to guarantee consumers' basic right to know what they are consuming?

*(Version française)*

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

La Commission tient à souligner que la responsabilité du respect des conditions d'hygiène dans le secteur de la restauration incombe de prime abord à l'exploitant du secteur alimentaire et que le contrôle, pour des raisons de subsidiarité, est sous l'entière responsabilité des États membres. Un incident tel que celui mentionné dans la question parlementaire peut également survenir pour d'autres produits alimentaires y compris des produits conditionnés.

Pour ce qui concerne la commercialisation d'huile d'olive par le secteur de l'hôtellerie, de la restauration et des cafés, il est du ressort des États membres d'en évaluer les pratiques et de s'assurer que les intérêts des consommateurs sont protégés. La Commission n'a pas l'intention de légiférer en la matière. La réglementation de l'Union européenne ne s'oppose pas, à priori, à l'adoption par un État membre d'une législation nationale telle que celle adoptée par le Portugal concernant l'utilisation dans le secteur de l'hôtellerie, de la restauration et des cafés de bouteilles d'huile d'olive qui ne peuvent être remplies à nouveau.

La Commission continuera à œuvrer pour favoriser la qualité de l'huile d'olive et son contrôle.

*(Svensk version)*

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-011600/13**
**till kommissionen**
**Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)**
*(10 oktober 2013)*

*Angående:* Misstänkt obefogad brådska i målet om Googles sökneutralitet

Kommissionen har efter en utredning ([1]) kommit fram till att Google möjligen agerar på ett sätt som begränsar konkurrensen i Europeiska unionen ([2]). Dessutom har kommissionen välvilligt nog tilldelat Google tid att frivilligt åta sig att komma tillrätta med det konkurrensbegränsande agerande som kommissionen har påvisat. Dessa frivilliga åtaganden publicerades under våren 2013 efter personliga möten mellan kommissionär Almunia och Googles vd Eric Schmidt ([3]). De föreslagna åtagandena har varit föremål för minst ett starkt kritiskt uttalande från en europeisk konsumentgrupp ([4]), i vilket åtagandena beskrivs som otillräckliga på grund av tidigare kända konsumentbeteenden samt brist på objektiva skäl till det agerande som kommissionen påvisat.

Rykten har emellertid nått frågeställaren om att kommissionen kan komma att föredra att lägga ner ärendet innan kommissionär Almunia lämnar sin tjänst nästa år, hellre än att tillhandahålla den nödvändiga kritiska granskningen av åtagandena som Google har föreslagit.

Befinner sig kommissionen för närvarande i en position där den inte har tid att göra den nödvändiga granskningen av Googles föreslagna frivilliga åtaganden innan slutet av denna valperiod? Kan kommissionen bekräfta att det inte föreligger någon risk att Google kommer att genomgå mindre än den nödvändiga granskningen av kommissionen i antitrustmålet på grund av att kommissionären önskar lägga ner ärendet innan valperiodens slut?

**Svar från Joaquín Almunia på kommissionens vägnar**
*(5 december 2013)*

Kommissionen har ingen rättslig skyldighet att avsluta ett pågående antitrustärende före utgången av en valperiod.

Googles ursprungliga förslag till åtaganden var föremål för ett marknadstest som inleddes i april 2013. Kommissionen analyserade över hundra bidrag från tredje parter i samband med marknadstestet. Kommissionen vill för närvarande få marknadsfeedback på Googles reviderade förslag till åtaganden från september 2013 för att kunna bedöma om de är tillräckliga och om kommissionen under de närmaste månaderna kan göra dessa åtaganden bindande för Google. Kommissionen har avsatt betydande resurser för detta ärende och arbetar hårt med utredningen.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-10-1624_en.htm
([2]) Se http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-372_en.htm
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-967_en.htm
([4]) http://www.beuc.eu/BEUCNoFrame/Docs/1/GJIFKPJBLNJDDOBDBAIBCNlPPDW69DBYCD9DW3571KM/BEUC/docs/DLS/2013-00280-01-E.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011600/13**
**to the Commission**
**Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Suspected unwarranted rush in the Google search neutrality case

The Commission has found, after an investigation ([1]), that Google may be engaging in anti-competitive conduct in the European Union ([2]). It has also graciously awarded Google the time to make voluntary commitments to remedy the anti-competitive behaviour that the Commission has identified. The voluntary commitments were published in the spring of 2013 after personal meetings between Commissioner Almunia and Google CEO Eric Schmidt ([3]). These proposed commitments have been the subject of at least one strongly critical statement from a European group representing consumers ([4]), in which the measures are described as inadequate on grounds of known previous customer behaviour and the lack of objective justification for the behaviour identified by the Commission.

However, rumours have reached the author of this question that the Commission may prefer to close the case before Commissioner Almunia leaves his post next year, rather than providing the necessary critical scrutiny of the commitments Google has proposed.

Does the Commission currently find itself in a position whereby it will not have time to provide the necessary scrutiny of Google's proposed voluntary commitments before the legislature ends? Can the Commission reaffirm that there is no risk that Google will undergo less than the necessary scrutiny by the Commission's services in the anti-trust case because the Commissioner wishes to close the case before the end of the legislature?

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

There is no legal obligation on the Commission to close an ongoing antitrust case before the end of a legislature.

Google's initial commitments proposal was subject to a market test launched in April 2013. The Commission analysed over a hundred third party submissions in the context of this market test. The Commission is currently seeking market feedback on Google's revised commitment proposal of September 2013 with a view to assessing the adequacy of the commitments offered by Google and whether, in the coming months, the Commission may make those commitments binding on Google. The Commission has devoted significant resources to this case and is conducting its investigation diligently.

---

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-10-1624_en.htm
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-372_en.htm
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-967_en.htm
([4]) http://www.beuc.eu/BEUCNoFrame/Docs/1/GJIFKPJBLNJDDOBDBAIBCNlPPDW69DBYCD9DW3571KM/BEUC/docs/DLS/2013-00280-01-E.pdf

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-011602/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Alfredo Pallone (PPE)**
*(10 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Stabilimento FIAT di Cassino

Il comparto dell'Automotive è strategico per l'economia dell'Italia, e al suo sviluppo è legata buona parte delle strategie nel settore metalmeccanico, dal quale dipendono migliaia dei posti di lavoro attualmente in bilico nel Paese.

La strategia industriale di Fiat Group Automobiles, basata sullo sfruttamento delle economie di scala e l'ottimizzazione dei cicli produttivi, è utile nell'ottica di una maggiore integrazione col gruppo Chrysler e per il recupero di competitività e, dunque, ai fini della riconquista di un ruolo da protagonista del gruppo nel mercato mondiale dell'auto.

Tuttavia, questo riassetto solleva alcune preoccupazioni a causa della razionalizzazione messa in atto.

Finora, sul territorio di Cassino, nessuno è stato in grado di fornire un'indicazione precisa sulle intenzioni di Fiat relativamente allo stabilimento di Piedimonte San Germano, che è l'unico rimasto senza un progetto industriale. Ottenere da Fiat un messaggio chiaro sull'intenzione di investire anche in questo impianto rappresenterebbe una notizia molto attesa nella provincia di Frosinone.

La mancanza di chiarezza sul futuro dello stabilimento Fiat di Piedimonte San Germano sta inducendo molti imprenditori a non investire su un territorio nel quale l'UE ha impiegato tanto in termini di risorse finalizzate a migliorare la competitività in maniera strutturale.

È dunque necessario un messaggio da parte della Fiat che renda chiaro se Cassino rientra nei piani dell'azienda e con quali tempi, fatta salva la doverosa riservatezza su dettagli e tempi al fine di tutelare le strategie imprenditoriali.

Infine, sarebbe importante che Cassino lanciasse un progetto ambizioso e definito — ossia la valorizzazione del marchio Alfa Romeo e la sua collocazione su un target medio alto (per diventare competitor di altri marchi), con una maggiore attenzione alla qualità.

A tale proposito, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Come intende agire nei confronti di Fiat per fare chiarezza sui programmi industriali dell'azienda per quanto riguarda lo stabilimento di Piedimonte San Germano?

2. Quali misure intende adottare la Commissione per salvaguardare i posti di lavoro nello stabilimento in questione e le risorse già impiegate dall'UE nel migliorare la competitività nell'area di Cassino?

3. Quali iniziative intende intraprendere la Commissione affinché questa situazione d'incertezza sul futuro del comparto dell'Automotive possa essere risolta a breve, in modo da consentire il rilancio della produzione?

4. Inoltre, quali garanzie può fornire la Commissione per incentivare e rassicurare gli imprenditori in merito agli investimenti sul territorio?

**Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione**
*(5 dicembre 2013)*

1. La Commissione incontrerà i rappresentanti della FIAT per discutere la situazione dell'impianto Piedimonte San Germano, anche se la responsabilità è in ultima analisi nelle mani della regione Lazio e della FIAT.

2.-3. Conservare la base produttiva in Europa è uno degli obiettivi della politica industriale della Commissione. L'impianto Piedimonte San Germano è una importante unità produttiva per la FIAT, che ha dichiarato in più occasioni di non voler procedere alla chiusura di nessuno dei suoi impianti in Europa.

La Commissione ha già adottato il piano d'azione specifico CARS 2020 ([1]).

([1]) CARS 2020 sostiene il finanziamento di ricerca, sviluppo e innovazione (RDI) sostenibili, l'accesso ai mercati e alla finanza attraverso i programmi Horizon 2020 e COSME.

La Commissione verificherà anche la programmazione dei fondi strutturali, in modo tale da garantire che i fondi 2014-2020 siano spesi in modo efficiente nella regione Lazio. A partire dal 1° gennaio 2014, tali fondi strutturali possono essere utilizzati per finanziare la reindustrializzazione.

La certezza delle condizioni, un ambiente favorevole agli investimenti e le opportunità di crescita dipendono largamente dall'efficacia del dialogo tra le parti interessate. È quindi importante che i dipendenti dell'impianto di Piedimonte esercitino il loro diritto ad essere informati e consultati sui piani futuri della FIAT. Ciò dovrebbe consentire inoltre alle autorità competenti e ai fornitori di compiere i passi necessari per adeguarsi ai potenziali scenari futuri.

Ciò consentirebbe, tra l'altro, alla regione Lazio di preparare un programma operativo adeguato per il 2014-2020 e di anticipare aree di azione strategiche in linea con la Strategia di specializzazione intelligente, in modo tale da migliorare la competitività generale della regione.

4. La Commissione ha proposto un quadro finanziario pluriannuale dinamico per il 2014-2020. Rimane da vedere, tuttavia, come tale quadro di riferimento sarà attuato dagli Stati membri e dagli altri beneficiari, compresa l'industria automobilistica.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011602/13**
**to the Commission**
**Alfredo Pallone (PPE)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Fiat factory in Cassino

The automotive industry is strategically important for the Italian economy and its development together with the engineering sector on which thousands of jobs depend and are currently hanging in the balance.

Fiat Group Automobiles' industrial strategy, which is based on exploiting economies of scale and optimising productive cycles, is designed to better integrate the Chrysler group and to recover competitiveness with the aim of restoring its position as a leader in the world automotive market.

However, some concerns have been raised owing to the reasons behind the reorganisation.

Until now, in the Cassino area, there has been no precise indication of Fiat's intentions concerning the Piedimonte San Germano factory, which is the only plant without an industrial plan. The Frosinone Province has long awaited a clear message from Fiat as to whether it will invest in the factory.

Given the uncertainty surrounding the future of the Piedimonte San Germano factory, many business owners have stopped investing in the area where the EU has invested significant funding with a view to improving its competitiveness in a structured way.

Fiat needs to send out a message to clarify whether Cassino is part of the company's business plans and when they intend to take action, with the exception of guarding the details and timeframe to protect its business strategy.

Finally, it is important that Cassino develops an ambitious and well-defined project on enhancing the Alfa Romeo brand and its location (to become a competitor to other brands) with a greater focus on quality.

1. What action does the Commission intend to take to ensure that Fiat clarifies its business plans regarding the Piedimonte San Germano factory?

2. What measures does it intend to adopt to safeguard jobs at the factory and the funding allocated by the EU to improve competitiveness in the Cassino area?

3. What initiatives will it take in the short term to remove the uncertainty surrounding the future of the automotive sector so that production can take place once again?

4. What guarantees can the Commission provide to encourage and reassure business owners to invest in the area?

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

1. The Commission will meet with FIAT representatives to discuss the situation of the Piedimonte San Germano's plant, even if the ultimate responsibility lies essentially in the hands of the Lazio region and FIAT.

2 and 3. Maintaining the production base in Europe is one of the objectives of the Commission's industrial policy. The Piedimonte San Germano plant is an important production unit for FIAT, which has indicated in several occasions that they do not intend to shut down any of their plants in Europe.

The Commission already adopted a sector specific CARS 2020 Action Plan ([1]).

The Commission will also monitor the programming of structural funds ensuring that the 2014-2020 funds are efficiently spent in Lazio. As from 1 January 2014, the structural funds can be used to finance re-industrialisation purposes.

([1]) It supports the financing of sustainable RDI, access to markets and finance via the Horizon 2020 and COSME programmes.

Gearing towards certainty, investment conducive environment and growth opportunities is largely contingent on the effectiveness of a stakeholder dialogue. It is therefore important that Piedimonte employees exercise their right to be informed and consulted about FIAT's future plans. This should also permit the relevant authorities and suppliers to take the necessary steps adjusting to any potential future scenarios.

Amongst others, this would allow the Lazio region to prepare a fit-for-purpose operational programme for 2014-2020 and anticipate strategic areas of action, in line with the Smart Specialisation Strategy, leading to an improvement of the overall competitiveness of the region.

4. The Commission has proposed a dynamic multiannual financial framework for 2014-2020. However, it remains to be seen how it will be implemented by the Member States and other beneficiaries, including the automotive industry.

*(Suomenkielinen versio)*

**Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-011603/13**
**komissiolle**
**Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D)**
*(10. lokakuuta 2013)*

*Aihe:* Lakkorikkurien kouluttaminen

Työsopimusneuvottelut ovat usein hankalia ja vaativat joissain tapauksissa lakkoa viimeisimpänä keinona. Työnantajien alituiset säästötoimet eivät kuitenkaan voi yksinomaan tapahtua työntekijöiden kustannuksella.

Tietoomme on tullut suomalaisen lentoyhtiön Finnairin toimet, joilla he ovat ryhtyneet kouluttamaan lakkorikkureita Espanjassa rekrytointi- ja henkilöstövuokrausyrityksen kautta. Tämä seikka on pöyristyttänyt myös espanjalaiset lentohenkilökunnan edustajat. Lähtökohtaisesti rikkurien koulutuksen pitäisi olla laitonta paikasta riippumatta. Suomalaisiin työehtosopimuksiin kohdistuvaa tilannetta ja työtaistelua tarkastellaan Suomen lain ja työehtosopimusten mukaan, mutta näitä tulkitaan EU-sopimuksia vasten. Komission onkin välttämätöntä reagoida tähän seikkaan.

Mitä toimia Euroopan komissio on ottamassa, jotta tämänkaltainen ennalta ehkäisevä lakkorikkureiden kouluttaminen estettäisiin ja turvattaisiin työntekijöiden työtaisteluturva heidän tarvitsemallaan tavalla?

**László Andorin komission puolesta antama vastaus**
*(25. marraskuuta 2013)*

Lakkorikkurien koulutuksesta ei ole annettu EU-lainsäädäntöä. EU ei myöskään ole toimivaltainen sääntelemään lakko-oikeutta jäsenvaltioissa.

Direktiivissä 2008/104/EY ([1]) säädetään ([2]), että vuokratyön käyttöön liittyviä rajoituksia tai kieltoja koskevat direktiivin säännökset eivät estä sellaisten kansallisten lakien tai käytäntöjen soveltamista, joissa kielletään lakossa olevien työntekijöiden korvaaminen vuokratyöntekijöillä. Tietyt jäsenvaltiot nimenomaisesti kieltävät lakko-oikeuttaan käyttävien työntekijöiden korvaamisen vuokratyöntekijöillä.

([1]) Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiivi 2008/104/EY, annettu 19 päivänä marraskuuta 2008, vuokratyöstä, EUVL L 327, 5.12.2008.
([2]) Direktiivin johdanto-osan 20 kappale.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011603/13**
**to the Commission**
**Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Training of staff for use as strike-breakers

Collective bargaining negotiations are often tricky and in some cases require strike action as a last resort. However, the savings measures which employers are constantly taking cannot take place exclusively at the workers' expense.

It has come to our attention that the Finnish airline Finnair is proposing to train staff as strike-breakers through a recruitment and hiring agency in Spain. This fact has also shocked Spanish aircrew representatives. In principle the training of staff to break strikes ought to be illegal regardless of where it takes place. The situation as it relates to Finnish collective agreements, and the issue of labour disputes, are being examined from the point of view of Finnish law and collective agreements, but these are being interpreted in the light of the EU Treaties. It is essential that the Commission respond to this state of affairs.

What measures is the Commission taking to ensure that such training of strike-breakers, which is preventable, is in fact prevented, and that workers' rights in connection with labour disputes are protected in the way that they need?

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

There is no EC law related to training of strike-breakers. Moreover, the EU has no competence to regulate the right to strike in the Member States.

Directive 2008/104/EC ([1]) states ([2]) that its provisions on restrictions or prohibitions on temporary agency work are without prejudice to national legislation or practices that prohibit workers on strike being replaced by temporary agency workers. Certain Member States explicitly prohibit the recourse to temporary agency workers to replace workers exercising their right to strike.

([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]) Recital 20 of the directive.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011604/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Enseignement primaire universel

Le Parlement demande, dans sa résolution pour un enseignement primaire universel:

1. de s'engager au niveau international pour garantir que chaque enfant aille à l'école et reçoive une éducation de qualité;

2. de prendre des mesures urgentes pour combattre le décrochage scolaire dans l'Union européenne;

3. de plaider en faveur d'une amélioration du statut des enseignants aux niveaux national et international, et pour que les enseignants bénéficient de revenus décents et de conditions spécifiques en ce qui concerne leur formation professionnelle continue et leur évolution de carrière.

La Commission réagit-elle favorablement et que propose-t-elle?

**Réponse donnée par M^me^ Vassiliou au nom de la Commission**
*(3 décembre 2013)*

La Commission réagit favorablement à la résolution et reconnaît l'importance d'une éducation de qualité.

Dans le cadre des stratégies «Éducation et formation 2020» et «Europe 2020», les États membres poursuivent des objectifs communs, tels que l'amélioration de la qualité des professions enseignantes et la réduction du décrochage scolaire à moins de 10 %.

1. En mai 2013, l'UE a accueilli une conférence internationale relative à l'environnement stratégique à mettre en place pour faire progresser la réforme de l'éducation à l'échelle mondiale. La Commission a rappelé que l'UE restait déterminée à mener des actions en matière d'éducation.

L'UE soutient le Partenariat mondial pour l'éducation (qui a pour but d'aider les pays à faible revenu qui disposent de politiques saines, mais de ressources insuffisantes, à fournir un enseignement primaire de qualité) et l'Équipe spéciale internationale sur les enseignants pour l'éducation pour tous (qui vise à échanger les bonnes pratiques en matière de politiques relatives aux enseignants pour aider les pays partenaires à combler le manque d'enseignants et à améliorer la formation, la gestion et le déploiement de ces derniers).

2. Dans sa recommandation de 2011 concernant les politiques de réduction de l'abandon scolaire, le Conseil a invité les États membres à adopter des stratégies globales, comprenant des mesures de prévention, d'intervention et de compensation. Un groupe de travail sur ce thème a mis en place un apprentissage par les pairs et fournira des recommandations stratégiques. La Commission continuera de soutenir les activités visant à lutter contre le décrochage scolaire, notamment par l'intermédiaire du programme Erasmus +.

3. Dans un document de travail récent ([1]), la Commission a recensé les défis auxquels les États membres sont confrontés en matière de renforcement des professions enseignantes. Un groupe de travail sur le perfectionnement professionnel des enseignants a élaboré des orientations stratégiques [2].

([1]) «*Supporting the Teaching Professions for Better Learning Outcomes*» («Le soutien aux professions enseignantes pour l'amélioration des acquis de l'apprentissage»).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/school-education/teacher_fr.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011604/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Universal primary education

In its resolution on universal primary education, Parliament calls for:

1. action to be taken at international level to ensure that every child goes to school and receives a quality education;

2. urgent measures to be taken to combat school dropout in the European Union;

3. work to improve the status of teachers at national and international level and for teachers to receive decent pay and benefit from the specific conditions necessary for continued professional training and career development.

Does the Commission welcome this resolution and what does it propose?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

The Commission welcomes the resolution and recognises the importance of quality education.

Through the Education and Training 2020 and Europe 2020 strategies, Member States pursue common goals, such as improving the quality of teaching professions and reducing early school leaving (ESL) to below 10%.

1. In May 2013, the EU hosted an international conference on the strategic environment for advancing education reform globally. The Commission reiterated the EU's continued commitment to education efforts.

The EU supports the Global Partnership for Education (aims at helping low-income countries with sound policies but insufficient resources to achieve quality basic education) and International Task Force on Teachers for Education for All (aims at sharing best practices in teacher policies to help partner countries tackle teacher gaps and improve training, management and deployment).

2. The 2011 Council Recommendation on combatting ESL invites Member States to adopt comprehensive strategies, encompassing prevention, intervention and compensation measures. A Working Group on ESL has organised peer-learning and will deliver policy recommendations. The Commission will continue to support activities focused on ESL, notably through the programme Erasmus+.

3. A recent Commission working document ([1]) identified challenges that Member States face in strengthening teaching professions. A Working Group on Teacher Professional Development has developed policy guidance. ([2])

([1]) 'Supporting the Teaching Professions for Better Learning Outcomes'.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/school-education/teacher_en.htm

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011605/13**
**à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* VP/HR — Situation au Soudan

La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante compte-t-elle:

1. condamner les meurtres, la violence exercée à l'encontre des manifestants, la censure des médias, les intimidations politiques, ainsi que le harcèlement et l'arrestation arbitraire de défenseurs des Droits de l'homme, de militants politiques et de journalistes;

2. demander au gouvernement du Soudan de mettre un terme à ces harcèlements et de libérer sans délai l'ensemble des manifestants pacifiques, des militants politiques, des membres de l'opposition, des défenseurs des Droits de l'homme, du personnel médical, des blogueurs et des journalistes arrêtés dans l'exercice de leur droit à la liberté d'expression et de réunion; souligner que tous les prisonniers doivent pouvoir bénéficier d'un procès équitable fondé sur une enquête crédible, sur le droit d'être défendu par un avocat et sur le respect de la présomption d'innocence, et que le gouvernement doit permettre aux détenus de voir leur famille et d'accéder aux soins médicaux;

3. déplorer l'utilisation de balles réelles contre les manifestants, ce qui s'est traduit par des meurtres, par le recours disproportionné à la force et par des allégations d'homicides volontaires commis par les forces de sécurité à l'encontre des manifestants;

4. inviter instamment le gouvernement soudanais à mettre immédiatement un terme à la répression et à l'impunité dont jouissent les agents du NISS; demander l'abolition de la loi implacable de 2010 sur la sécurité nationale;

5. demander aux forces de sécurité soudanaises de respecter les principes de base des Nations unies sur le recours à la force et l'utilisation des armes à feu par les responsables de l'application des lois, qui fixent les conditions dans lesquelles il est possible de faire légalement usage de la force sans pour autant violer les Droits de l'homme, notamment le droit à la vie;

6. demander aux autorités soudanaises de restaurer et de respecter les Droits de l'homme et les libertés fondamentales consacrés par le droit international, notamment la liberté d'expression, tant en ligne que hors ligne, la liberté de réunion, la liberté de religion, les droits de la femme ainsi que l'égalité des genres, et de mettre immédiatement un terme à l'ensemble des restrictions visant l'accès à l'information et aux technologies de communication;

7. inviter instamment le gouvernement soudanais à cesser toute forme de répression à l'égard des personnes exerçant leur droit à la liberté d'expression, que ce soit en ligne ou hors ligne, et de protéger les journalistes?

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

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a été profondément préoccupée par les informations faisant état d'actes de violence et de lourdes pertes de vies humaines au cours des manifestations organisées dans plusieurs villes du Soudan durant la deuxième moitié du mois de septembre 2013.

Le 30 septembre 2013, elle a fait publiquement part de ces préoccupations dans une déclaration de son porte-parole. Elle y condamnait les violences, qu'elles aient été perpétrées par les manifestants ou par les forces gouvernementales, et exhortait toutes les parties à faire preuve de la plus grande retenue. Elle appelait tout particulièrement les autorités soudanaises à s'abstenir de tout usage excessif de la force et à respecter la liberté d'expression, le pluralisme des médias et la liberté de réunion pacifique. Elle précisait aussi que les personnes arrêtées devaient bénéficier d'un procès équitable, que les médias devaient pouvoir travailler librement et que les incidents à l'origine des pertes humaines, des blessés et des dommages matériels devaient faire l'objet d'une enquête crédible.

Enfin, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante appelait les autorités soudanaises à honorer leur engagement d'entamer, avec toutes les parties, un dialogue national qui renforcerait l'unité nationale et encouragerait la gouvernance démocratique.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011605/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Situation in Sudan

1. Will the Vice-President/High Representative condemn the murders, the use of violence against demonstrators, the media censorship and the political intimidation in Sudan, as well as the harassment and arbitrary arrest of human rights campaigners, political activists and journalists?

2. Will she call on the Sudanese Government to stop such harassment and immediately free all of the peaceful protestors, political activists, opposition members, human rights campaigners, medical workers, bloggers and journalists who have been arrested while exercising their right of freedom of expression and assembly? Will she stress that all prisoners must be given a fair trial based on a credible investigation, the right to be defended by a lawyer and respect for the presumption of innocence, and that the Government must allow prisoners to see their families and have access to medical care?

3. Will she condemn the use of live bullets against protestors, which has resulted in people being killed, a disproportionate use of force and allegations of murder committed by the security forces against protestors?

4. Will she urge the Sudanese Government to bring an immediate end to the repression and to the impunity granted to agents of the National Intelligence and Security Services (NISS) and call for the merciless national security law of 2010 to be abolished?

5. Will she call on the Sudanese security forces to respect the United Nations' Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials, which lays down the conditions under which it is legally possible to use force without violating human rights, especially the right to life?

6. Will she call on the Sudanese authorities to restore and respect human rights and the fundamental freedoms laid down by international law, including the freedom of expression, whether online or otherwise, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, women's rights and gender equality, and to put an immediate end to all of the restrictions on access to information and communication technologies?

7. Will she urge the Sudanese Government to stop all forms of repression against persons exercising their right to freedom of expression, whether online or otherwise, and to protect journalists?

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

The HR/VP has been deeply concerned by reports of violence and significant loss of life during protests in cities across Sudan in the second half of September 2013.

On 30 September 2013, she publicly expressed this concern in a Statement by her Spokesperson, in which she condemned violence by either protestors or government forces and urged all parties to exercise maximum restraint. The HR/VP called especially on the Government of Sudan to refrain from excessive use of force and to respect the freedom of expression, media and peaceful assembly. Those detained should be given the opportunity for a fair trial, the media should be allowed to operate freely and a credible investigation should be conducted into incidents that have led to loss of life, injury and material damage.

Finally, the HR/VP called on the Government of Sudan to carry through its commitment to begin an inclusive national dialogue that will strengthen national unity and promote democratic governance.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011607/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Aegean Airlines et Olympic Air

La Commission a autorisé mercredi le rachat, par la compagnie aérienne grecque Aegean Airlines, de son concurrent Olympic Air en dépit de la création d'une situation de monopole sur certaines liaisons intérieures en Grèce.

Il est rare que la Commission, gardienne de la concurrence en Europe, prenne une telle décision. Elle a ainsi refusé cette année pour la deuxième fois la fusion des deux compagnies irlandaises Ryanair et Aer Lingus.

1. Qu'est ce qui a motivé ce feu vert de la Commission?

2. Quelle est la différence avec les autres fusions qui avaient été refusées?

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

Le 9 octobre 2013, la Commission a autorisé sans conditions le rachat d'Olympic Air par Aegean Airlines ([1]). Elle était parvenue à la conclusion qu'Olympic aurait de toute façon quitté le marché dans un avenir proche en raison de ses difficultés financières. Aegean aurait ainsi occupé une position dominante, voir monopolistique, sur toutes les liaisons problématiques où les activités des compagnies se chevauchent.

Une analyse des perspectives commerciales d'Olympic a montré qu'il était peu probable que la société devienne rentable dans un avenir proche, quel que soit le scénario envisagé. C'est pourquoi son actionnaire unique, Marfin Investment Group, a décidé de ne plus financer la compagnie dans l'hypothèse où elle ne serait pas vendue à Aegean. Ne pouvant trouver d'autre source de financement, Olympic aurait très probablement fait faillite rapidement. L'enquête menée sur le marché par la Commission a montré qu'il n'y avait pas d'autre acquéreur crédible, moins anticoncurrentiel, intéressé par le rachat d'Olympic et que tous ses actifs disparaîtraient complètement du marché si la compagnie devait cesser ses activités.

En d'autres termes, la Commission a retenu en l'espèce l'argument de «l'entreprise en sérieuse difficulté» puisqu'il a été démontré qu'Olympic allait bientôt disparaître en tant que concurrent d'Aegean et que ses actifs quitteraient le marché, que l'opération de concentration se réalise ou non. La Commission applique des critères très stricts à l'égard de ce type d'argument et l'accepte rarement. Aucun argument semblable n'a été invoqué dans l'affaire COMP/M.6663 — Ryanair/Aer Lingus III ([2]).

([1]) Affaire COMP/M.6796 — Aegean/Olympic II; le communiqué de presse est disponible à l'adresse suivante: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-927_fr.htm

([2]) De plus amples informations sont disponibles à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/elojade/isef/case_details.cfm?proc_code=2_M_6663

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011607/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Aegean Airlines and Olympic Air

On Wednesday, the Commission authorised the Greek airline Aegean Airlines to buy out its competitor Olympic Air, despite the fact that this would create a monopoly on certain domestic flights in Greece.

As guardian of competition in Europe, the Commission rarely decides to allow such moves. This year, the Commission blocked a merger between the two Irish airlines Ryanair and Aer Lingus for the second time.

1. What were the Commission's reasons for allowing this deal to go ahead?

2. What difference is there between this merger and others that have been blocked?

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

The Commission unconditionally approved the acquisition of Olympic Air by Aegean Airlines on 9 October 2013 ([1]). The Commission concluded that Olympic would have left the market soon in any event due to financial difficulties. As a result, Aegean would have become the dominant player, if not monopolist, on all problematic overlap routes anyway.

An analysis of Olympic's business prospects demonstrated that Olympic would probably not turn profitable under any business scenario in the near future. For this reason, Marfin Investment Group, Olympic's sole shareholder, decided to cease funding Olympic, should it not be sold to Aegean. Unable to secure financing from any other source, Olympic would most likely have gone bankrupt soon. The Commission's market investigation showed that there was no other credible, less anti-competitive, purchaser interested in Olympic and that all its assets would leave the market completely, should it go out of business.

In other words, the Commission accepted the so-called 'failing firm defence' in this case, as it was demonstrated that Olympic would soon disappear as a competitor to Aegean and its assets would leave the market, with or without the merger. The Commission applies very strict criteria to this type of defence and rarely accepts it. In case COMP/M.6663 — Ryanair/Aer Lingus III ([2]), no failing firm defence was raised.

([1]) Case COMPP/M.6796 — Aegean/Olympic II; the press release can be found at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-927_en.htm
([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/competition/elojade/isef/case_details.cfm?proc_code=2_M_6663 for further details.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011608/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Évolution du marché des céréales

Avec une récolte de céréales de 301,5 millions de tonnes (Mt) pour 2013-2014, l'Union européenne devrait voir ses stocks de fin de campagne se détendre, selon un document de la Commission européenne paru le 8 octobre 2013.

En effet, la production pour 2012-2013 était de 275,9 Mt amenant un ratio stock/utilisation à 9,1 % en fin de campagne, alors que celui pour la fin de 2013-2014 est attendu à 13,2 %.

En conséquence, les prix des céréales en Europe ont baissé de près d'un tiers entre décembre 2012 et août 2013.

1. La Commission prévoit-elle une détente sur les disponibilités en oléagineux avec 29,8 Mt estimées pour 2013-2014, contre 27,3 Mt il y a un an?

2. Quelles sont les perspectives de la Commission pour le marché pour un avenir à court et moyen terme?

**Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission**
*(14 novembre 2013)*

La fixation des prix sur le marché des céréales de l'Union dépend fortement de la situation sur le marché mondial. L'augmentation des stocks de fin de campagne de l'Union européenne n'est donc pas la seule cause de la baisse des prix des céréales de l'Union.

L'Union est importatrice nette de 14 à 15 millions de tonnes d'oléagineux. Ce volume représente un tiers de l'utilisation domestique. L'augmentation prévue de la production totale d'oléagineux dans l'Union (2,5 millions de tonnes) permettra donc de réduire ce déficit mais ne modifiera pas significativement notre statut d'importateur net. Par conséquent, l'Union restera un preneur de prix.

En ce qui concerne ses prévisions à court et à moyen termes, la Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire au document intitulé «Short-term outlook for arable crop, meat and dairy markets in the European Union» (perspectives à court terme pour les marchés des cultures arables, de la viande et des produits laitiers dans l'Union européenne), publié à l'automne 2013 et disponible à l'adresse suivante:
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets-and-prices/short-term-outlook/index_en.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011608/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Growth in the cereals market

According to a Commission document published on 8 October 2013, the EU should have better close-of-season cereal stocks this year, with a harvest of 301.5 million tonnes (Mt) in 2013-14.

Output in 2012-13 was 275.9 Mt, leading to a close-of-season stock-to-use ratio of 9.1%, whereas the ratio for the end of the 2013-14 season is expected to be 13.2%.

As a result, cereal prices in Europe fell by almost a third between December 2012 and August 2013.

1. Does the Commission anticipate an improvement in the availability of oilseed crops, with an estimated 29.8 Mt in the 2013-14 season, compared with 27.3 Mt a year ago?

2. How does the Commission think the market will progress both in the near future and in the medium term?

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

The price setting in the Union's cereals market highly depends on the world market situation. The decrease of the Union's cereals prices is therefore not solely a consequence of better ending stocks in the European Union.

The Union is a net importer of oilseeds of some 14 to 15 million tonnes. This represents one third of the domestic use. The forecasted increase (2.5 million tonnes) of the total Union's oilseeds production will therefore reduce the deficit but will not substantially change our net import status. The Union will therefore remain a price taker.

For the short and medium term forecast, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the autumn 2013 issue of the Short-term outlook for arable crop, meat and dairy markets which is available on the following webpage: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets-and-prices/short-term-outlook/index_en.htm

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011610/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Bisous interdits

Un couple d'adolescents a été arrêté par la police à Nador, dans le nord-est du Maroc, après avoir publié sur le réseau social Facebook une photo les montrant en train de s'embrasser.

Il s'agit d'un adolescent et de sa petite amie. Ils ont été arrêtés jeudi pour atteinte à la pudeur publique, après avoir posté une photo les montrant en train de s'embrasser.

La photo a été prise devant le lycée où ils étudient. Cette affaire a aussitôt enflammé les réseaux sociaux, plusieurs jeunes couples marocains publiant des photos similaires sur leurs comptes.

1. L'Europe compte-t-elle rester silencieuse sur ces sanctions d'un autre âge?

2. N'estime-t-elle pas qu'un couple d'adolescents a le droit de s'embrasser?

3. Ne s'agit-il pas d'une violation des Droits de l'homme?

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

La Commission a connaissance de l'affaire à laquelle l'Honorable Parlementaire se réfère.

Cette affaire a soulevé une vague de protestations et de réactions au sein de la société civile marocaine et parmi les utilisateurs des médias sociaux, vague qui, nous semble-t-il, a aussi contribué à la remise en liberté des adolescents, trois jours après leur arrestation.

L'UE surveille attentivement l'évolution de la situation des Droits de l'homme au Maroc et mène un dialogue actif avec les autorités marocaines compétentes sur tout ce qui touche à ces questions. Elle suivra également de près le procès programmé le 22 novembre et agira en conséquence, étant donné que la réaction des autorités locales à Nador semble effectivement disproportionnée.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011610/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Ban on kissing

A teenage couple have been arrested by police in Nador, north-eastern Morocco, after they published a photo of themselves kissing on the social network site Facebook.

The case involves a teenager and his girlfriend. They were arrested last Thursday for breach of public modesty, after they posted a photo of themselves kissing.

The photo was taken in front of the secondary school where they are both students. The social networks were immediately up in arms over the case and several young Moroccan couples published similar photographs on their accounts.

1. Will the EU remain silent over these outdated punishments?

2. Does the Commission not believe that a teenage couple have the right to kiss?

3. Is this not a breach of human rights?

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

The Commission is aware of the case referred to by the Honourable Member.

This case has caused a wave of protests and reactions from Moroccan civil society and social media users, which we believe also contributed to the release of the teenagers, three days after their arrest.

The EU follows closely Human Rights in Morocco and has an active dialogue with relevant Moroccan authorities on all its aspects. The EU will also follow closely the trial scheduled for 22 November and react accordingly, as the reaction of the local authorities in Nador seems indeed disproportionate.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011612/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Crise alimentaire à Madagascar

Quatre millions d'habitants des zones rurales de Madagascar sont en situation d'insécurité alimentaire en raison de la faible récolte de riz de cette année, ont mis en garde — mercredi — deux agences spécialisées de l'ONU.

La production de riz, l'aliment de base, et de maïs a souffert de conditions météorologiques capricieuses et d'une invasion de criquets. L'insécurité alimentaire risque de toucher 9,6 millions d'autres personnes. On peut attribuer la mauvaise campagne agricole à plusieurs facteurs: des conditions météorologiques irrégulières l'an dernier, des cyclones en début d'année, qui ont causé des inondations, suivis d'une période de faible pluviosité.

La production rizicole a fléchi de 21 % cette année, selon leurs chiffres, ce qui entraînera un déficit national de riz de 240 000 tonnes. Quant à la production de maïs de 2013, elle ne saura satisfaire les besoins intérieurs et on estime à 28 000 tonnes les besoins d'importation pour combler le déficit, ajoutent les deux agences, qui ont effectué une mission sur l'île.

La nourriture est la principale dépense d'environ un tiers des ménages, qui y consacrent jusqu'à 75 % de leur budget.

Les difficultés actuelles de Madagascar traduisent des années de déclin économique, l'aggravation de la pauvreté, des services publics limités et une série de catastrophes naturelles qui ont pesé sur les moyens d'existence et les stratégies d'adaptation des habitants, selon les deux agences.

1. Comment la Commission réagit-elle à cet alarmant constat?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle faire quelque chose politiquement mais aussi logistiquement pour fournir ou organiser une aide alimentaire aux catégories les plus vulnérables, ciblée sur les besoins particuliers des enfants et des femmes enceintes ou allaitantes?

**Réponse donnée par M^me^ Georgieva au nom de la Commission**
*(26 novembre 2013)*

La Commission suit de près la situation à Madagascar. En septembre 2013, une équipe d'experts de la Commission a effectué une mission en vue de déterminer s'il est nécessaire de fournir une aide alimentaire aux populations vulnérables de la région du sud de Madagascar. Les experts ont rapporté que la dégradation actuelle des conditions de sécurité, l'instabilité politique, la détérioration persistante des infrastructures et des services en raison d'un manque d'investissements, la grande pauvreté sous-jacente et les catastrophes naturelles récurrentes représentent une menace réelle pour la sécurité alimentaire, en particulier dans les régions du sud du pays. Ils ont recommandé que les acteurs de l'aide humanitaire mettent en place de systèmes d'alerte précoce solides permettant de suivre étroitement l'évolution de la situation en matière d'alimentation, de nutrition et de santé. La Commission envisage d'affecter une partie de son enveloppe pour la préparation aux catastrophes en Afrique australe et dans l'Océan Indien au financement d'un système de surveillance en collaboration avec les acteurs locaux.

Outre l'aide d'urgence évoquée plus haut, la Commission a mobilisé 4 millions d'euros pour financer la première campagne de lutte antiacridienne conduite par la FAO. De plus, plusieurs programmes d'un montant total de près de 60 millions d'euros sont actuellement mis en œuvre pour améliorer la sécurité alimentaire, les revenus et la nutrition. Une attention particulière est portée aux ménages vivant dans des zones exposées au risque d'invasion de criquets.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011612/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Food crisis in Madagascar

On Wednesday, two specialist UN agencies warned that four million people in rural areas of Madagascar are in a situation of food insecurity as a result of this year's poor rice harvest.

Rice is the country's staple food, and both rice and maize crops have suffered as a result of volatile weather conditions and a plague of locusts. A further 9.6 million people are also at risk of food insecurity. The poor crop season can be attributed to several factors: erratic weather last year and cyclones at the start of this year which led to flooding, followed by a period of low rainfall.

According to the agencies' figures, rice production dropped 21% this year, which will lead to a national rice shortage of 240 000 tonnes. The agencies visited the island and report that the 2013 maize crop will not meet domestic demand and an estimated 28 000 tonnes will need to be imported in order to meet the shortage.

Food is the main expenditure item in around one third of households, who spend up to 75% of their budget on it.

According to the two agencies, Madagascar's present problems are the result of years of economic decline, worsening poverty, limited public services and a series of natural disasters that have taken their toll on the inhabitants' livelihoods and adaptation strategies.

1. What is the Commission's reaction to these alarming facts?

2. Does the Commission plan to take any action both on the political front and also on the logistical front, in order to supply or organise food aid to the most vulnerable groups, targeted in particular at the special needs of children and pregnant or breastfeeding mothers?

**Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission**
*(26 November 2013)*

The Commission is closely following the current situation in Madagascar. A mission was conducted in September 2013 by a team of Commission experts aiming to ascertain the need of food assistance in the vulnerable southern region of Madagascar. The mission reported that the current deterioration in security, political instability, continued deterioration in infrastructure and services due to a lack of investment, underlying deep poverty and recurrent natural disasters represents a concrete threat to food security, especially in the southern regions. It was recommended that humanitarian actors establish robust early warning systems to monitor the food, nutrition and health situations closely. The Commission is planning to allocate part of its envelope for disaster preparedness in Southern Africa and Indian Ocean to support a monitoring system in collaboration with local actors.

In addition to the emergency assistance as highlighted above, the Commission has mobilised EUR 4 million to finance the first anti-locust campaign implemented by FAO. Furthermore, various programmes totalling nearly EUR 60 million are being implemented to improve food security, income and nutrition. A specific attention is paid on households located in areas exposed to the risk of locust.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011613/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Utilisation des fonds européens destinés à l'amélioration de la condition des Roms

Selon les données publiées par la Commission, 17,5 milliards d'euros auraient été affectés entre 2007 et 2013 aux Roms et «autres groupes vulnérables» dans les États membres.

Dans les deux États membres les plus concernés, en l'occurrence la Roumanie et la Bulgarie, le taux d'absorption des fonds européens est respectivement de 6 % et 12 %. Ainsi, la Roumanie ne consacrerait qu'une infime partie des 2,2 milliards par an prévus par la Commission pour améliorer le sort de ses deux millions de Roms.

Par ailleurs, selon les autorités roumaines et bulgares, ce sont les petits projets avec un financement associatif direct qui donnent les meilleurs résultats.

Compte tenu de ces éléments, de quelle façon la Commission pense-t-elle agir pour encourager les autorités roumaines et bulgares à faire un meilleur usage des fonds afin d'améliorer la condition des Roms?

La Commission ne pense-t-elle pas qu'il serait opportun d'encourager le développement des petits projets, seuls à avoir démontré leur valeur ajoutée jusqu'à présent?

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

L'intégration des Roms est une priorité horizontale dans le cadre des programmes opérationnels en matière de «développement des ressources humaines», cofinancés par le Fonds social européen (FSE) pour la période 2007-2013 en Bulgarie et en Roumanie. Il n'y a ainsi aucune dotation financière spécifique pour les Roms dans la mesure où ils bénéficient du FSE en raison de leur statut social et économique défavorisé et non de leur appartenance à un groupe ethnique. De même, dans le cadre du Fonds européen de développement régional (FEDER), la population Rom en Roumanie et en Bulgarie bénéficie d'investissements dans les logements sociaux et le développement urbain intégré, ciblant aussi d'autres communautés marginalisées.

Les taux d'absorption du FSE sont actuellement de 26 % en Roumanie et de 46 % en Bulgarie. Les services de la Commission sont en dialogue constant avec les autorités de gestion roumaine et bulgare sur les mécanismes de mise en œuvre des projets visant à améliorer l'intégration des Roms. Au cours de la période 2014-2020, les Fonds structurels et les fonds d'investissement ([1]) se concentreront sur les politiques de soutien aux populations marginalisées, telles que les Roms, et les mécanismes seront améliorés afin d'atteindre les plus démunis.

La Commission octroie aussi une aide financière, par l'intermédiaire du programme Progress, aux projets à petite échelle visant à tester la validité des politiques innovantes, y compris pour l'intégration des Roms ([2]). Il est prévu de poursuivre le soutien des projets de test à petite échelle au cours de la prochaine période de programmation financière ([3]). En outre, la Commission, en collaboration avec le Conseil de l'Europe, a lancé le projet Romact, destiné à améliorer la capacité des municipalités à élaborer et mettre en œuvre des plans et projets pour l'inclusion des Roms, y compris en Roumanie et en Bulgarie.

---

([1]) Fonds européen de développement régional (FEDER), Fonds social européen (FSE), Fonds de cohésion (FC), Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural (FEADER) et Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et la pêche (FEAMP).
([2]) Un appel à propositions est actuellement ouvert.
([3]) Programme de l'UE pour l'emploi et l'innovation sociale (EaSI).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011613/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Use of EU funds aimed at improving the situation of Roma people

According to figures published by the Commission, EUR 17.5 billion was reportedly allocated to Roma and 'other vulnerable groups' between 2007 and 2013 in the Member States.

In the two most affected Member States, which in this case are Romania and Bulgaria, the take-up rate of European funds stands at 6% and 12% respectively. Thus, Romania allocates only a very small part of the EUR 2.2 billion per year provided for by the Commission to improving the lives of its two million Roma.

Moreover, according to the Romanian and Bulgarian authorities, small projects with associative funding are the most effective.

In view of the above, what action does the Commission intend to take to encourage the Romanian and Bulgarian authorities to make better use of funds to improve the situation of Roma people?

Does the Commission not think that it would be appropriate to encourage the development of small projects, which are the only kind to have shown their added value up to now?

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

Roma integration is a horizontal priority under the European Social Fund (ESF) co-funded 'Human Resource Development' Operational Programmes (2007-2013) in Bulgaria and Romania. To this end, there is no specific financial allocation for Roma as they benefit from ESF based on their disadvantaged social and economic status and not on their ethnicity. Similarly, under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) the Roma population in Romania and Bulgaria benefits from investments in social housing and integrated urban development targeting also other marginalised communities.

The ESF absorption rates currently stand at 26% in Romania and 46% in Bulgaria. The Commission services are in a constant dialogue with Romanian and Bulgarian Managing Authorities about the delivery mechanisms for the projects aiming to improve Roma integration. In the 2014-2020 period, the European Structural and Investment Funds ([1]) will concentrate on supporting policies for marginalised people such as Roma and mechanisms will be improved so as to reach the most deprived.

The Commission is also providing financial support through the PROGRESS Programme to small scale projects to test the validity of innovative policies, including for Roma inclusion ([2]). Supporting of testing innovative small scale projects is foreseen to continue during the next financial programming period ([3]). Moreover, the Commission together with the Council of Europe has launched the ROMACT project aimed at improving the capacity of municipalities in developing and implementing plans and projects for the inclusion of Roma, including in Romania and Bulgaria.

---

([1]) the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF), the Cohesion Fund (CF), the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF).
([2]) A call for proposals is currently open.
([3]) EU Programme for Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI).

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011614/13**
**à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* VP/HR — Lynchage à Madagascar

La semaine passée a eu lieu le lynchage de trois personnes — un Français, un Franco-italien et un Malgache — à Madagascar; le profil de la victime française se précise. L'homme a été tué par une foule de plusieurs centaines de personnes, selon des témoins, qui l'accusait de faire partie d'un réseau de trafiquants d'organes, puis de pédophilie.

Sur un enregistrement audio effectué au moment d'un simulacre de procès et retranscrit par la presse, après sa capture par la foule, le Français apparaît terrorisé, essayant tant bien que mal de se défendre des actes dont il est accusé. «Je suis victime d'un complot», assure-t-il. «Je n'aime pas les enfants, surtout pas, et je n'aime pas les personnes qui ont des rapports avec les enfants», poursuit-il face à la foule. «Tu n'aimes pas les enfants?» s'entend-il répondre par un homme. «J'adore les enfants, si, j'ai une petite fille, je n'aimerais pas qu'on lui fasse ça», balbutie-t-il. En larmes, il assure aux Malgaches qui le menacent de lynchage: «Je ne raconte que la vérité, strictement que la vérité». L'homme est mort quelques instants plus tard.

1. Quelle est votre réaction officielle face à ce lynchage?

2. Quelles sont les actions entreprises avec le gouvernement malgache?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante, au nom de la Commission**
*(26 novembre 2013)*

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a connaissance de l'événement tragique et profondément regrettable auquel se réfère l'Honorable Parlementaire.

Le chef de la délégation de l'UE à Madagascar a déploré la perte de vies humaines et s'est dit vivement préoccupé par de tels actes de violence. Le sujet a été largement évoqué lors d'une réunion qui s'est tenue avec le Premier ministre.

La délégation de l'UE sur le terrain a suivi de près la situation et il est clair que cet événement n'a aucun lien avec le processus électoral en cours dans le pays. Il semble s'agir d'une éruption de violence extrême au cours de laquelle la population a décidé de se faire justice elle-même.

Les autorités malgaches ont réagi rapidement et elles ont déployé des forces de sécurité supplémentaires afin de rétablir l'ordre public, d'enquêter sur les circonstances des actes de violence et d'en arrêter les auteurs. Certaines personnes qui auraient participé à l'incident ont déjà été arrêtées.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011614/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Lynching in Madagascar

Last week, three people were lynched in Madagascar. They included a French man, a Franco-Italian man and a Malagasy man; clearer details regarding the French victim have emerged. According to witnesses, the man was killed by a mob of several hundred people who accused him of being part of a network for organ trafficking, then paedophilia.

In an audio recording made during a mock trial following the man's capture by the mob and transcribed by the press, the French man seemed terrified while he struggled to defend himself against the acts of which he was accused. 'I am the victim of a conspiracy', he said. 'I do not like children, absolutely not, and I don't like people who have sex with children', he explained to the mob. 'So you don't like children?' said a man to him in reply. 'I love children, yes, I have a little girl, I wouldn't want someone to do that to her', he stammered. In tears, he told the Malagasies who were threatening to lynch him: 'I'm telling the truth, strictly the truth.' The man died a few moments later.

1. What is your official reaction to this lynching?

2. What actions have been undertaken alongside the Malagasy Government?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President is aware of the tragic incident the Honourable Member of Parliament refers to, which is deeply regretful.

The EU's Head of Delegation in Madagascar has expressed regret for the loss of life and great concern about such violence. The issue was discussed at length at a meeting with the Prime Minister.

The EU Delegation on the ground has been following the situation closely and it is understood that this event has no connection with the ongoing electoral process in the country. It appears to be an eruption of extreme violence where the local population has taken law into its own hands.

The Malagasy authorities have reacted promptly by deploying additional security forces to re-establish law and order, to investigate the circumstances and to arrest the perpetrators. Some presumed participants of the incident have already been arrested.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011617/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Frontex et politique migratoire

1. L'agence de surveillance des frontières européennes peut-elle aider les pays membres à réguler les flux de migrants?

2. Si des outils communs de lutte contre l'immigration illégale ont été créés, le soutien de l'Union européenne aux États membres ne reste-t-il pas trop faible?

3. Créée en 2004, l'agence Frontex est chargée de soutenir la coopération opérationnelle entre les États membres en matière de gestion des frontières extérieures, de les assister pour la formation des garde-frontières nationaux, d'effectuer des analyses de risques, d'organiser des opérations conjointes de retour des clandestins dans leurs pays d'origine. Au cours des deux dernières années, Frontex a sauvé 16 000 vies en Méditerranée, mais de nombreux experts estiment que la baisse radicale du budget dédié à Frontex ne lui donne plus qu'un caractère symbolique. Comment réagit la Commission? N'estime-t-elle pas que cette chute des budgets des politiques migratoires explique aussi la catastrophe de Lampedusa?

**Réponse donnée par M^me^ Malmström au nom de la Commission**
*(12 décembre 2013)*

Depuis son lancement en octobre 2005, l'agence Frontex a apporté un soutien considérable aux États membres dans la gestion des flux migratoires.

Outre le soutien opérationnel fourni par l'intermédiaire de l'agence Frontex, permettant notamment de déployer des équipes européennes de gardes-frontières aux frontières des États membres, le soutien de l'UE provient de quatre fonds instaurés dans le cadre du programme général «Solidarité et gestion des flux migratoires» et dotés d'un budget combiné de près de 4 milliard d'euros pour la période 2007-2013.

La Commission a proposé une augmentation substantielle de l'aide financière aux États membres au titre du nouveau Fonds «Asile et migration» et du Fonds pour la sécurité intérieure. Les propositions législatives pour la création des deux fonds, y compris les montants finaux, sont encore en cours de négociation.

Le budget de l'agence Frontex n'a pas subi de diminutions drastiques. Le montant total du financement de l'UE était de 111 millions d'euros en 2011, mais ce montant comprenait 30 millions d'euros de financement supplémentaire en vue d'alléger la pression accrue aux frontières résultant du Printemps arabe. En 2012, ce montant était de 84 millions d'euros, dont 4,5 millions d'euros prélevés sur la réserve créée par l'autorité budgétaire. En 2013, il était de 79,5 milllions d'euros. En réponse aux tendances récentes, le budget de l'agence Frontex pour 2013 a été renforcé de 7,9 millions d'euros supplémentaires.

L'événement tragique qui a coûté la vie aux 300 migrants au large de Lampedusa ne peut être imputé au manque de ressources dont dispose l'agence Frontex. En effet, les actifs navals et aériens qui ont été déployés dans le cadre de l'opération conjointe Hermes de l'agence Frontex ont participé à l'opération de sauvetage et contribué à sauver la vie de 151 personnes.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011617/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Frontex and migration policy

1. Can the European borders monitoring agency help Member States to regulate migration?

2. While some common tools for combating illegal immigration have been established, is the European Union's support for Member States still not too weak?

3. Created in 2004, Frontex is the agency responsible for supporting operational cooperation between Member States in terms of the management of external borders, assisting them in the training of national border guards, undertaking risk analyses and organising joint operations to return illegal immigrants to their countries of origin. Over the last two years, Frontex has saved 16 000 lives in the Mediterranean, but many experts believe that the drastic cuts to the budget allocated to Frontex leaves it with a merely symbolic role. What is the Commission's reaction to this? Does it not think that such migration policy budget cuts are also to blame for the Lampedusa disaster?

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

Since Frontex became operational in October 2005, it has provided substantial support to the Member States in managing migration flows.

Apart from the operational support provided for through Frontex, including the possibility of deploying European Border Guard Teams at the borders of the Member States, EU support is provided through four Funds established as part of the General programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows' with the combined allocation of nearly 4 billion EUR for 2007-2013.

The Commission has proposed significant increases of financial support to Member States under the new Asylum and Migration Fund and the Internal Security Fund. The legislative proposals for the establishment of both Funds, including the final amounts, are still under negotiation.

The budget of Frontex has not been subject to any drastic cuts. The total amount of EU funding was EUR 111 million in 2011, but this included EUR 30 million of additional funding for addressing the increased pressure at the borders due to the Arab Spring. In 2012, it was EUR 84 million, including EUR 4.5 million released from the reserve established by the Budget Authority. In 2013, it was EUR 79.5 million. As a response to the latest trends, the 2013 budget of the Agency was reinforced with an additional EUR 7.9 million.

The tragic event that cost the lives of over 300 migrants nearby Lampedusa cannot be linked to a lack of financial resources for Frontex. Indeed, the naval and airborne assets which have been deployed in the ongoing Hermes Joint Operation of Frontex, participated in the rescue operation and contributed to saving of life of 151 people.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011618/13**
**to the Commission**
**Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* International governance

Increasingly, the EU is implementing legislation which is global in nature. Thus, the 'country of origin labelling' (COOL) rules come from the WTO and the UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation.

It was recently claimed in the UK press that the EU wishes to make it illegal for garden centres to sell popular plant varieties (such as Hidcote lavender), when the EU is merely amending its directives on plant varieties in line with rules agreed globally by bodies such as the UNECE and the OECD.

Regulation pertaining to food labelling, vehicle manufacture, banking, insurance, fisheries and many other areas clearly originates from a network of global government agencies which compel the EU to frame its rules as if it were the European regional branch of a global government to which the EU duly defers.

1. Does the Commission agree that governance is becoming increasingly remote from the electorates of the nation states and even from the electorates of the EU?

2. To what extent do those who work for the Commission (and the EU) participate in the development of 'global legislation' and sit on global committees, including agencies of the UN?

3. To whom do such staff owe their allegiance and on whose authority do they operate?

4. Does the Commission consider the EU to be subservient to international regulation of the nature described above, which is issued from unelected bodies?

5. Does the Commission agree that one of the aims of international regulation as described above is to facilitate international trade and global governance and to diminish the authority of the nation states and even supranational bodies like the EU?

6. Why does the Commission not seek to defend itself when it is criticised by the media for introducing new regulation by pointing to its global origin?

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

In recent years there has been a rapid development of regional and global value chains: products are no longer made in one country from start to finish. Thus, the development of international standards can reduce costs for producers and contribute to more growth and employment.

This is why the Commission is supportive of international standardisation and play an active role in international bodies working in this field including in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) work on principles on international standardisation, which call for transparency, openness, impartiality and consensus in the creation of international standards.

It should however be recalled that international standards are not directly enforceable in the EU. When EU legislators consider that requirements need to be put in place in order to achieve a legitimate objective, this is achieved by the introduction of a mandatory legislative instrument such as a directive or Regulation that is enforceable in the EU.

That being said, the EU and its Member States — as all other members of the WTO — have an obligation, under the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade and the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures, to use international standards to the greatest extent possible as a basis for its regulations, unless such standards are deemed inappropriate or ineffective for the legitimate objectives pursued.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011619/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Claudio Morganti (EFD)**
*(10 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Finanziamenti europei per immigrazione

Negli scorsi giorni è avvenuta l'ennesima tragedia a largo di Lampedusa, costata la vita a centinaia di persone che sono morte nel vano tentativo di raggiungere (in maniera comunque irregolare) il suolo europeo, trasportate da mercanti di morte senza scrupoli.

Può la Commissione indicare quanti e quali finanziamenti europei siano stati dedicati per affrontare l'emergenza sbarchi a Lampedusa a partire dal 2007?

Può la Commissione precisare se sono state previste particolari modalità o vincoli per l'utilizzazione di questi fondi da parte delle autorità italiane?

**Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione**
*(18 novembre 2013)*

L'Italia è il principale beneficiario dei quattro fondi (EBF ([1]), EIF ([2]), ERF ([3]) e RF ([4])) istituiti nel quadro del programma generale SOLID ([5]) per il periodo 2007-2013. Durante tale periodo di programmazione, l'Italia ha ricevuto in totale 504 milioni di EUR nell'ambito di programmi nazionali, ripartiti nel modo seguente: 250 milioni di EUR nel quadro dell'EBF, 148 milioni di EUR nel quadro dell'EIF, 62 milioni di EUR nel quadro dell'ERF (compresi 26 milioni di EUR di misure di emergenza) e 44 milioni di EUR nel quadro dell'RF.

Lampedusa ha beneficiato in particolare delle misure di emergenza stanziate nel quadro dell'ERF: infatti, dal 2008 al 2013, l'Italia ha ricevuto 7 milioni di EUR nel 2008, 17 milioni di EUR tra il 2011 e il 2012, quando è iniziata l'emergenza legata alla primavera araba e 2 milioni di EUR nel 2013. La base giuridica dell'ERF prevede che questi fondi siano utilizzati entro sei mesi.

Riguardo ai 30 milioni di EUR specificamente annunciati per l'Italia, la ripartizione orientativa sarebbe di 8 milioni di EUR per le attività di Frontex, 10 milioni di EUR ~~per le misure di~~ emergenza ERF e rispettivamente 5 e 7 milioni di EUR per le attività di emergenza finanziate tramite azioni dell'Unione svolte nel quadro dell'EBF e dell'RF nel 2012 e 2013. Questa mobilitazione è stata ottenuta esclusivamente grazie a ridistribuzioni interne e a una riprogrammazione dei fondi esistenti (Bilancio Affari interni; «Sicurezza degli alimenti e dei mangimi» — Capitolo 17.04; assistenza tecnica per lo Sviluppo rurale — Capitolo 05.04; accordi internazionali in materia di agricoltura — Capitolo 05.06; e «Life+» — Capitolo 07.03) e non ha richiesto un bilancio rettificativo o l'uso di riserve di bilancio (margine).

([1]) Fondo per le frontiere esterne.
([2]) Fondo europeo per l'integrazione di cittadini di paesi terzi.
([3]) Fondo europeo per i rifugiati.
([4]) Fondo europeo per i rimpatri.
([5]) Solidarietà e gestione dei flussi migratori.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011619/13**
**to the Commission**
**Claudio Morganti (EFD)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* EU funding for immigration

Yet another tragedy has recently taken place off the coast of Lampedusa, in which hundreds of people transported by unscrupulous merchants of death lost their lives in a vain (and illicit) attempt to reach European soil.

How much EU funding has been allocated to dealing with the landings emergency at Lampedusa since 2007, and what is the source of this funding?

Have any special procedures or restrictions been established for the use of these funds by the Italian authorities?

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

Italy is the largest beneficiary of the four Funds under the General Programme SOLID ([1]) over 2007-2013, i.e. the EBF ([2]), the EIF ([3]), the ERF ([4]) and the RF ([5]). Over that programming period, Italy has received in total EUR 504 million under the national programmes, divided as follows: EUR 250 million under the EBF; EUR 148 million under the EIF; EUR 62 million under the ERF (including EUR 26 million of emergency measures); and EUR 44 million under the RF.

Lampedusa has particularly benefitted from the ERF emergency measures in that, over 2008-2013, Italy has received EUR 7 million in 2008, EUR 17 million over 2011 and 2012 when the pressure resulting from the Arab Spring started, and EUR 2 million in 2013. These funds must be used according to the ERF legal basis within a 6-month period.

Regarding the EUR 30 million specifically announced for Italy, the tentative allocation would be EUR 8 million for Frontex operations, EUR 10 million for ERF emergency measures, and respectively EUR 5 and 7 million for emergency activities to be funded under the EBF and RF Community actions 2012 and 2013. This mobilisation has been achieved exclusively through internal redeployments as well as the re-programming of existing funds (Home Affairs budget; 'Food and feed safety' — Chapter 17.04; technical assistance for Rural Development — Chapter 05.04; international agreements in agriculture — Chapter 05.06; and 'Life+' — Chapter 07.03); it did not require an amending budget or use of the budgetary reserve ('margin').

---

([1]) Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows.
([2]) External Borders Fund.
([3]) European Fund for the integration of third-country nationals.
([4]) European Refugees Fund.
([5]) European Return Fund.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011620/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Claudio Morganti (EFD)**
*(10 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Violazioni dei diritti delle persone con disabilità in Moldova

Un recente rapporto del *Mental Disability Advocacy Center* (MDAC) di Budapest in merito all'implementazione delle misure previste dalla Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sull'eliminazione di tutte le forme di discriminazione contro le donne, ha riscontrato come negli ospedali psichiatrici della Moldova siano costantemente violati alcuni diritti fondamentali.

Camere da 40 mq condivise da 15-20 donne, stanze da bagno e toilette prive di carta igienica e tamponi, iniezioni continue di sedativi e degenti costrette forzosamente al letto: queste sono soltanto alcune delle irregolarità riscontrate dopo una serie di visite condotte nelle principali strutture sanitarie del paese, alle quali si devono purtroppo aggiungere anche casi di violenza sessuale e aborti forzosi.

Attualmente negli istituti psichiatrici moldavi risiedono circa 2 200 persone con disturbi mentali, molte delle quali private dei minimi diritti solo in virtù della loro condizione di disabilità.

È la Commissione a conoscenza di questi fatti e delle condizioni delle persone con disabilità, donne in particolare, nella Repubblica di Moldova?

Ha la Commissione sollevato, o intende sollevare, la questione nel corso dei suoi dialoghi di partenariato con il paese dell'Europa orientale?

**Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione**
*(29 novembre 2013)*

La Commissione è a conoscenza di diverse relazioni sulla situazione dei pazienti negli ospedali psichiatrici nella Repubblica di Moldova, ad esempio quelle del comitato del Consiglio d'Europa per la prevenzione della tortura, che confermano in gran parte le informazioni fornite nell'interrogazione dell'onorevole parlamentare. In linea con la strategia europea sulla disabilità 2010-2020, basata sui principi della Convenzione dell'ONU sui diritti delle persone con disabilità, il problema è stato sollevato come questione prioritaria durante la riunione che si è tenuta ad aprile 2013 nell'ambito del dialogo UE-Repubblica moldova in materia di diritti umani e resterà all'ordine del giorno, in particolare nei dibattiti informali tra esperti sulle questioni relative ai diritti umani cui partecipano le autorità moldove, la società civile e le organizzazioni internazionali. Il più recente di questi dibattiti si è tenuto a Chisinau il 19 novembre 2013.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011620/13**
**to the Commission**
**Claudio Morganti (EFD)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Violations of the rights of people with disabilities in Moldova

A recent report by the Mental Disability Advocacy Center (MDAC) in Budapest regarding the implementation of measures provided for by the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, found that certain fundamental rights are being constantly violated in psychiatric hospitals in Moldova.

Rooms measuring 40 $m^2$ housing 15-20 women, bathrooms and toilets with no toilet paper and tampons, continuous injections of sedatives and patients forced to stay in bed: these are just some of the irregularities found following a series of visits to the main health facilities in the country. Unfortunately, cases of sexual violence and forced abortions must also be added to the list.

Moldovan psychiatric institutions are currently home to approximately 2 200 people with mental disorders, many of whom do not enjoy even minimum rights simply because they have a disability.

Is the Commission aware of these facts and the circumstances of people with disabilities, women in particular, in the Republic of Moldova?

Has the Commission raised this issue, or does it intend to do so, during partnership dialogues with this Eastern European country?

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

The Commission is aware of several reports (e.g. by the Council of Europe's Committee against the prevention of torture) about the situation of patients in psychiatric hospitals in the Republic of Moldova, which concur to a great extent with the information conveyed in the question of the Honourable Member. In line with the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020, and based on the principles of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, this issue was raised accordingly as a priority question during the April 2013 meeting of the EU-Moldova Human Rights Dialogue and will remain on the agenda, including in the framework of informal experts' discussions on human rights issues with the participation of the Moldovan authorities, civil society and international organisations. The next such meeting has taken place in Chisinau on 19 November 2013.

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011621/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Patricia van der Kammen (NI)**
*(10 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Vervolgvraag fraude met uitkeringen en toeslagen in Nederland

Op 17 juni heeft de heer Andor namens de Europese Commissie antwoord gegeven ([1]) op schriftelijke vragen over grootschalige fraude met uitkeringen en toeslagen in Nederland.

De vragen waren ingegeven door berichtgeving ([2]) waarin duidelijk werd dat Oost-Europese bendes op grote schaal fraude met toeslagen en uitkeringen plegen in Nederland. Staatssecretaris Weekers van Financiën noemde het schokkend dat er op grote schaal met toeslagen en uitkeringen wordt gefraudeerd ([3]).

Vraag 1 aan de Europese Commissie luidde of de Commissie bekend is met het bericht dat er grootschalige fraude plaatsvindt met toeslagen in Nederland door Oost-Europeanen, zoals ook bevestigd door de Nederlandse Staatssecretaris van Financiën?

Het antwoord van de Commissie d.d. 17 juni 2013 op deze vraag luidt: „De Commissie heeft over deze aantijgingen geen nadere informatie ontvangen."

In Volkskrant van 17 mei 2013 valt te lezen ([4]) dat eurocommissaris Reding op een persconferentie reageert op het onderwerp van de grootschalige fraude, en ook in een interview gaat zij er inhoudelijk op in ([5]).

Dit leidt tot de volgende vraag:

Hoe verhoudt zich de ontkenning van de Commissie in de beantwoording op 17 juni 2013 tot het artikel ([4]) en interview ([5]) op 17 mei 2013, waaruit onomstotelijk blijkt dat de Commissie wel degelijk op de hoogte was van de fraudezaken?

**Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie**
*(28 november 2013)*

De Commissie bevestigt geen nadere informatie te hebben ontvangen over de aantijgingen van fraude met uitkeringen en toeslagen waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst, buiten de informatie die in de Nederlandse pers beschikbaar was ten tijde van het bezoek van vicevoorzitter Reding aan Nederland op 16 mei 2013. Op grond van die informatie heeft vicevoorzitter Reding de toe te passen regels van de EU-wetgeving met betrekking tot het vrije verkeer van personen verduidelijkt.

In 2012 en 2013 heeft Nederland in zijn jaarlijkse verslag inzake fraude en onjuistheden, bij de Administratieve Commissie voor de coördinatie van socialezekerheidsstelsels ([6]), geen melding gemaakt van wijdverbreide grensoverschrijdende sociale fraude in de sociale zekerheid. Dit rapportagemechanisme is opgericht bij een besluit ([7]) van de Administratieve Commissie en heeft als doel doeltreffende samenwerking tussen lidstaten te vergroten in de strijd tegen grensoverschrijdende fraude in de sociale zekerheid, als onderdeel van de correcte uitvoering van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004. De Administratieve Commissie bestaat uit een regeringsvertegenwoordiger van elke lidstaat, en wordt geadviseerd door de Europese Commissie. De Administratieve Commissie bevordert samenwerking tussen de lidstaten op het gebied van coördinatie van de sociale zekerheidsstelsels.

---

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-004673&language=NL.
([2]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2013/04_april/21/binnenland/oost-europese-bendes-frauderen-met-toeslagen.xml.
([3]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2013/04_april/21/binnenland/Belastingdienst_als_pinautomaat_is_onacceptabel.xml.
([4]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3443116/2013/05/17/Bulgaren-fraude-is-geen-Europees-maar-Nederlands-probleem.dhtml.
([5]) http://nieuwsuur.nl/onderwerp/508042-bulgaarse-fraudezaak-zelf-oplossen.html
([6]) opgericht bij Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004.
([7]) Besluit Nr. H5 van 18 maart 2010. . http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:149:0005:0007:NL:PDF.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011621/13**
**to the Commission**
**Patricia van der Kammen (NI)**
*(10 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Follow-up question on benefit and allowance fraud in the Netherlands

On 17 June, Commissioner Andor responded ([1]) on behalf of the Commission to written questions concerning large-scale benefit and allowance fraud in the Netherlands.

The questions were prompted by reports ([2]) making clear that Eastern European gangs are committing large-scale benefit and allowance fraud in the Netherlands. The Dutch Secretary of State for Finance, Frans Weekers, is on record as saying that it is shocking that benefit and allowance fraud is taking place on a large scale ([3]).

The first question to the Commission asked whether the Commission was aware of the report that Eastern Europeans are committing large-scale allowance fraud in the Netherlands, as confirmed by the Dutch Secretary of State for Finance?

The Commission's response on 17 June 2013 was to state that it had 'not received any other information about these allegations'.

According to a report of 17 May 2013 in the Dutch newspaper *Volkskrant* ([4]), Commissioner Reding discussed the subject of large-scale fraud at a press conference, while she also went into the detail of the subject in an interview ([5]).

This raises the following question:

How does the Commission's denial of knowledge in its response of 17 June 2013 square with the article[4] and interview[5] on 17 May 2013, which irrefutably demonstrate that the Commission was indeed aware of the cases of fraud?

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

The Commission confirms that it did not receive any other information about the allegations of benefit and allowance fraud to which the Honourable Member refers, beyond the information available in the Dutch press at the time of the visit of Vice-president Reding to the Netherlands on 16 May 2013. It was on the basis of this information that Vice-president Reding provided clarification on the applicable rules of EC law on free movement.

The Netherlands did not refer to widespread cross-border social security fraud in its annual report on Fraud and Error to the Administrative Commission for the Coordination of Social Security Systems ([6]) in 2012 and 2013. The reporting mechanism, established by a decision ([7]) of the Administrative Commission, aims to increase effective cooperation between Member States in combatting cross-border social security fraud as part of the proper implementation of Regulation (EC) 883/2004. The Administrative Commission is composed of a government representative from each Member State and is advised by the Commission. It promotes cooperation between Member States on social-security coordination.

---

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-004673&language=NL
([2]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2013/04_april/21/binnenland/oost-europese-bendes-frauderen-met-toeslagen.xml
([3]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2013/04_april/21/binnenland/Belastingdienst_als_pinautomaat_is_onacceptabel.xml
([4]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3443116/2013/05/17/Bulgaren-fraude-is-geen-Europees-maar-Nederlands-probleem.dhtml
([5]) http://nieuwsuur.nl/onderwerp/508042-bulgaarse-fraudezaak-zelf-oplossen.html
([6]) Established by Regulation (EC) No 883/2004.
([7]) Decision H5 of 18 March 2010.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:149:0005:0007:EN:PDF

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011622/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)**
*(11 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Grado de ejecución de los fondos europeos

Distintos medios se hacen de eco estos días del bajo nivel de ejecución en España de los fondos europeos previstos para el período 2007-2013. Según estas informaciones, se trataría de algo más de 40 000 millones de euros, de los que se habrían ejecutado únicamente en torno al 60 % de lo previsto. ¿Podría la Comisión confirmar estar informaciones y detallar las cantidades percibidas y el grado de ejecución por comunidades autónomas en España en el actual período financiero?

Las informaciones parecen todavía más preocupantes en lo que se refiere al Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader). ¿Podría asimismo detallar la Comisión las cantidades y el grado de ejecución por comunidades autónomas?

**Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión**
*(13 de diciembre de 2013)*

En el anexo 1, Su Señoría encontrará un cuadro con los importes abonados a España en 2007-2013 por programa, por Fondo (Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional, Fondo de Cohesión y Fondo Social Europeo) y por objetivo. A 24 de octubre de 2013, las ayudas abonadas con cargo a los Fondos Estructurales y al Fondo de Cohesión ascendían a 21 300 millones de euros, lo que supone en torno al 62 % de la asignación concedida. Los pagos intermedios ascienden a 18 700 millones de euros, lo que supone un nivel de ejecución del 54 %, como se muestra en el anexo 1.

La contribución del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader) a los programas de desarrollo rural en España asciende a 8 000 millones de euros para el mismo período.

El importe abonado por el Feader a los programas de desarrollo rural en España figura en el anexo 2. A 15 de octubre de 2013, los pagos realizados por el Feader, adelantos incluidos, ascienden a 5 300 millones de euros. Estos pagos corresponden al 66,5 % de la contribución total del Feader a los programas vigentes.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011622/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Level of implementation of European funds

There have been reports in the media recently on the low level of implementation in Spain of European funds made available for the period 2007-2013. These reports claim that a little over EUR 40 billion has been used, which would be only around 60% of the expected figure. Could the Commission confirm this information and state the amounts received and the level of implementation in each of Spain's autonomous regions in the current financial period?

The figures seem even more worrying with regard to the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD). Could the Commission also specify for the EAFRD the amounts and the level of implementation in each autonomous region?

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

The Honourable Member will find in Annex 1 a table with the amounts paid to Spain in 2007-2013 by programme, by Fund (European Regional Development Fund, Cohesion Fund, European Social Fund) and by objective. As of 24 October 2013, assistance paid from the Structural and Cohesion Funds amounts to EUR 21.3 billion which represents around 62% of the decided allocation. The interim payments amount to EUR 18.7 billion which represents a level of implementation of 54% as shown in Annex 1.

The contribution of the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) to the rural development programmes (RDPs) in Spain amounts to EUR 8 billion for the same period.

The EAFRD amount paid to the Spanish RDPs is presented in Annex 2. As of 15 October 2013, the EAFRD payments made, including the advances, amount to EUR 5.3 billion. These payments represent 66.5% of the total EAFRD contribution to the current programmes.

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011623/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(11 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Nombramientos en la CNMC (Comisión Nacional de Mercados y Competencia)

La Comisión ha declarado repetidamente que es fundamental que el nuevo organismo regulador de los mercados, de la energía y de la competencia sea independiente. Por ello, el artículo 26.3 de la ley aprobada para su creación exige convocatoria pública para todo el personal directivo (esto es, los directores de instrucción, subdirectores, vicesecretarios, jefe de la asesoría jurídica, secretario general y jefe del departamento de control interno). De este modo se reduce al mínimo la discrecionalidad política, pues la convocatoria pública y por méritos permite que se presente todo el que quiera y que la CNMC (que goza, en todo caso de discrecionalidad en el nombramiento) tenga que justificar la selección final con bases objetivas.

En este sentido, es preocupante que la propia CNMC no esté cumpliendo con este precepto y que esta semana se haya sabido que se están efectuando nombramientos que no solo ponen en entredicho la futura independencia de este órgano por sus lazos familiares con el Gobierno, sino que además incumplen la legislación que la ampara ([1]).

Teniendo en cuenta la respuesta de la Comisión a la pregunta E-009835/2013, en la que afirma que «la Comisión continuará vigilando estrechamente la aplicación de la reforma de la CNMC con el fin de garantizar su compatibilidad con los requisitos pertinentes establecidos en virtud del Derecho de la UE»,

¿cree la Comisión que esta práctica de la CNMC es consistente con el principio de independencia del poder político que es tan necesario para que desarrolle correctamente sus funciones?

¿Piensa la Comisión actuar para asegurar que la CNMC efectúe los nombramientos por criterios de mérito?

**Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión**
*(25 de noviembre de 2013)*

La Comisión concede gran importancia a la independencia de las autoridades reguladoras nacionales y ha seguido muy de cerca la aprobación de la Ley 3/2013, de creación de la Comisión Nacional de los Mercados y la Competencia (CNMC) en España. Tras la aprobación de la Orden Ministerial ECC/1796/2013 ([2]), la nueva autoridad inició sus actividades el 7 de octubre de 2013.

Como se indica en nuestra respuesta a la pregunta E-009835/2013, el marco regulador de la UE en materia de comunicaciones electrónicas contiene una serie de requisitos a este respecto. En particular, la Directiva 2002/21/CE, modificada por la Directiva 2009/140/CE ([3]), dispone, entre otras cosas, que los Estados miembros deben velar por que estas autoridades sean jurídicamente distintas y funcionalmente independientes de todas las entidades del sector y actúen con independencia y no soliciten ni acepten instrucciones de ningún otro organismo en la realización de determinadas tareas en virtud de la legislación nacional por la que se aplica el Derecho de la UE. La misma Directiva prevé que los Estados miembros deben velar también por que las autoridades reguladoras nacionales cuenten con los recursos financieros y humanos necesarios para participar activamente en las actividades del Organismo de Reguladores Europeos de Comunicaciones Electrónicas (ORECE) y contribuir a las mismas.

No obstante, el procedimiento para el nombramiento del personal directivo es competencia de la autoridad reguladora nacional en virtud de la legislación nacional pertinente que establece, entre otras cosas, la competencia del Consejo de la CNMC a este respecto.

La Comisión continuará vigilando estrechamente la aplicación de la reforma de la CNMC, inclusive la adecuada asignación de recursos humanos a la nueva autoridad y la independencia de la misma, con el fin de garantizar su compatibilidad con los requisitos pertinentes establecidos en virtud del Derecho de la UE.

---

([1]) http://cincodias.com/cincodias/2013/10/01/empresas/1380652681_875746.html
([2]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/10/05/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-10371.pdf
([3]) DO L 337 de 18.12.2009, p. 37.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011623/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Appointments to the National Commission for Markets and Competition (CNMC)

The Commission has declared repeatedly that it is vital that the new regulatory authority for markets, energy and competition is independent. Article 26.3 of the law passed to create the authority therefore requires an open call to be made for all managerial appointments (i.e. investigation officers, deputy officers, deputy secretaries, head of the legal service, secretary-general and head of internal control). This minimises political discretion, as an open call, assessed on merit, allows anyone who so wishes to apply and forces the CNMC (which, in any case, can use discretion when making the appointment) to justify its final choice on objective grounds.

It is worrying, in this regard, that the CNMC itself is not complying with this rule and that, as came to light this week, appointments being made not only call into question the future independence of this authority, due to its close ties with the Government, but also violate the law applicable to it ([1]).

In answer to Question E-009835/2013, the Commission stated that 'the Commission will continue to monitor closely the implementation of the CNMC reform in order to guarantee its compatibility with the relevant requirements under EC law.'

Does the Commission believe that this practice by the CNMC is consistent with the principle of independence from political power, which is vital for it to carry out its functions properly?

Will the Commission take action to ensure that the CNMC makes its appointments on merit?

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

The Commission attaches great importance to the independence of national regulatory authorities and has been following closely the adoption of Law 3/2013 creating the National Commission for Markets and Competition (CNMC) in Spain. Following the adoption of Ministerial Order ECC/1796/2013 ([2]) the new authority began its activities on 7 October 2013.

As indicated in our reply to E-009835/2013, the EU regulatory framework for electronic communications contains a number of requirements in this regard. In particular, Directive 2002/21/EC, as amended by Directive 2009/140/EC ([3]), provides, amongst others, that Member States shall guarantee that these authorities are legally distinct from and functionally independent of all organisations in the sector and that they shall act independently and not seek or take instructions from any other body in the exercise of certain tasks under national law implementing EC law. The same Directive provides that Member States shall ensure that national regulatory authorities have adequate financial and human resources to enable them to actively participate in and contribute to the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC).

However, the procedure for the appointment of management positions is a competence of the national regulatory authority under the relevant national legislation which establishes, amongst others, the competence of the Board of the CNMC in this regard.

The Commission will continue to monitor closely the implementation of the CNMC reform, including the independence and adequate attribution of human resources to the new authority, in order to guarantee its compatibility with the relevant requirements under EC law.

---

([1]) http://cincodias.com/cincodias/2013/10/01/empresas/1380652681_875746.html
([2]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/10/05/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-10371.pdf
([3]) OJ L 337, 18.12.2009, p.37.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011625/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(11 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Πολιτικές συνέπειες του ναυαγίου της Λαμπεντούζας

Με το ναυάγιο της Λαμπεντούζας δεν χάθηκαν μόνο εκατοντάδες ανθρώπινες ζωές. Βούλιαξε ταυτόχρονα, χωρίς να αφήσει ίχνη, και η ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική για το πολιτικό άσυλο και τη μετανάστευση. Οι πολίτες της Ευρώπης και όλος ο πολιτισμένος κόσμος αισθάνονται ντροπή και αγανάκτηση γι' αυτό που συνέβη. Το χειρότερο είναι ότι τέτοια περιστατικά ήταν αναμενόμενα και ο καθένας ένοιωθε ότι κάτι πολύ τραγικό θα μπορούσε να συμβεί. Πολλά παρόμοια περιστατικά, μικρότερου όμως μεγέθους, συμβαίνουν εδώ και αρκετό καιρό σε μεσογειακές χώρες της Ένωσης χωρίς οι αρμόδιες υπηρεσίες της ΕΕ να δείχνουν την αναγκαία βούληση για αποτελεσματική αντιμετώπισή τους.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε να υπάρξει ενιαία και αποτελεσματική πανευρωπαϊκή πολιτική για το πολιτικό άσυλο και τη μετανάστευση;

2. Πώς μπορεί να βοηθήσει τις χώρες του Ευρωπαϊκού Νότου περιλαμβανομένης της Κύπρου, οι οποίες δέχονται τις μεγαλύτερες πιέσεις από τα μεταναστευτικά ρεύματα και τους αιτητές ασύλου, ώστε να αντεπεξέλθουν στο βάρος που συνεπάγεται η κατάσταση αυτή;

3. Τι πιστεύει ότι πρέπει να γίνει ώστε το οικονομικό, κοινωνικό και διοικητικό κόστος που προκύπτει να επιβαρύνει ισότιμα και δίκαια όλες τις χώρες της Ένωσης;

4. Τι μέτρα λαμβάνονται για δίκαιη γεωγραφική κατανομή αλλά και ομαλή κοινωνική ενσωμάτωση όλων των νόμιμων μεταναστών και αιτητών ασύλου στα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης;

**Απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(13 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η Επιτροπή συμμερίζεται τα αισθήματα της κυρίας βουλευτού σε σχέση με τον τραγικό θάνατο πολλών εκατοντάδων μεταναστών στη Μεσόγειο κατά τους τελευταίους μήνες. Σε άμεση συνάρτηση με το γεγονός αυτό, συγκροτήθηκε ειδική ομάδα δράσης για τη Μεσόγειο η οποία θα αναζητήσει τρόπους για να αποτρέπεται στο μέλλον η απώλεια ανθρώπινων ζωών στη θάλασσα και να αποφευχθεί η επανάληψη παρόμοιων ανθρώπινων τραγωδιών.

Η νομοθεσία που περιλαμβάνει τη δεύτερη φάση του Κοινού Ευρωπαϊκού Συστήματος Ασύλου εγκρίθηκε τον Ιούνιο του τρέχοντος έτους. Σκοπός των νέων κανόνων είναι να εξασφαλίσουν καλύτερη πρόσβαση στη διαδικασία ασύλου, να οδηγήσουν σε δικαιότερες αποφάσεις, να παράσχουν εγγυήσεις στους ανθρώπους που φοβούνται πιθανές διώξεις ότι δεν θα επιστρέψουν εκεί όπου θα κινδύνευαν, να εξασφαλίσουν αξιοπρεπείς συνθήκες και καλύτερη πρόσβαση σε μέτρα ένταξης. Το έργο που πρέπει να επιτελεστεί είναι η εξασφάλιση αποτελεσματικής και ομοιόμορφης εφαρμογής των κανόνων από όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Η ΕΕ έχει επίσης χαράξει μια ολοκληρωμένη πολιτική για τη νόμιμη και την παράνομη μετανάστευση.

Η ΕΕ έχει θέσει σε εφαρμογή πολλές δράσεις που αποσκοπούν στην παροχή βοήθειας στα κράτη μέλη που αντιμετωπίζουν πιέσεις στο σύστημα ασύλου, μεταξύ των οποίων η επανεγκατάσταση. Η οικονομική αλληλεγγύη σε θέματα ασύλου εξασφαλίζεται μέσω του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου για τους Πρόσφυγες (2008-13). Δεν υπάρχουν, ωστόσο, σχέδια για τη δημιουργία κλείδας κατανομής ή άλλου μηχανισμού για την κατανομή των αιτούντων άσυλο και των μεταναστών μεταξύ των κρατών μελών.

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι η Κύπρος, λόγω της γεωγραφικής της εγγύτητας με όσα διαδραματίζονται στη Συρία, είναι ιδιαίτερα εκτεθειμένη στον κίνδυνο μαζικής εισροής ατόμων που χρήζουν διεθνούς προστασίας. Η Επιτροπή εξετάζει το πρόσφατο αίτημα της Κύπρου για επείγουσα βοήθεια ύψους 2,7 εκατ. ευρώ με σκοπό να αυξηθεί η ικανότητα υποδοχής της χώρας. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η Επιτροπή μελετά επί του παρόντος από κοινού με τις κυπριακές αρχές τα κατάλληλα μέτρα στήριξης της Κύπρου, μεταξύ των οποίων και πρόσθετη χρηματοδότηση από μέρους της ΕΕ.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011625/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Political repercussions of the Lampedusa shipwreck

The shipwreck off Lampedusa did not only cause the loss of hundreds of human lives. It also caused European policy on political asylum and migration to sink without trace. The citizens of Europe and of the entire civilised world felt shame and indignation about this incident. The worst thing is that such incidents were expected and everyone felt that something much more tragic might happen. Numerous similar incidents, on a smaller scale, have been occurring for some time now off the Mediterranean countries of the Union, without the EU services demonstrating the necessary will to take effective action to prevent them.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. What does it intend to do to ensure a single, effective, pan-European policy on political asylum and migration?

2. How can it help the countries of southern Europe, including Cyprus, which are under the most pressure from migratory movements and asylum-seekers, to cope with the burden caused by this situation?

3. What does it believe must be done so that the resultant economic, social and administrative costs are borne equally and fairly by all the Member States of the Union?

4. What measures are being taken to ensure a fair geographical distribution and proper social integration of all legal migrants and asylum-seekers in the Member States of the Union?

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

The Commission shares the sentiment of the Honourable Member in relation to the tragic deaths of many hundreds of migrants in the Mediterranean in recent months. As a direct consequence, a Task Force for the Mediterranean has been set up that will look at ways to prevent the loss of lives at sea and to avoid that such human tragedies happen again.

The legislation comprising the second phase of the Common European Asylum System was adopted in June this year. The new rules are designed to provide better access to the asylum procedure; lead to fairer decisions; ensure that people in fear of persecution are not returned to danger; provide dignified conditions; and better access to integration measures. The task ahead will be to ensure effective and uniform implementation across Member States. The EU has also been developing a comprehensive policy on legal and irregular migration.

The EU has many actions in place to assist Member States facing pressures on their asylum system, including through relocation. Financial solidarity on asylum has been available through the European Refugee Fund (2008-13). However, there are no plans to create a distribution key or other mechanism to divide up asylum-seekers and migrants across Member States.

The Commission is aware that, due to its geographical proximity to the events in Syria, Cyprus is particularly exposed to the risk of a mass influx of persons in need of international protection. The Commission is considering Cyprus' recent request for EUR 2.7 million of emergency assistance to increase reception capacity. In this context, the Commission is currently discussing with the Cypriot authorities approriate measures to support Cyprus, including through additional EU funding.

*(Slovenska različica)*

**Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-011627/13**
**za Komisijo**
**Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)**
*(11. oktober 2013)*

*Zadeva:* Finančni instrumenti in kohezijska politika

Komisija se je že zavezala, da bo v naslednjem programskem obdobju 2014–2020 okrepila vlogo finančnih institucij v kohezijski politiki. Parlament je pobudo ob številnih priložnostih toplo pozdravil in v različnih besedilih poudaril, da sta potrebni takojšnja pravna varnost in večja preglednost pri uvajanju novih inovativnih oblik financiranja.

Ker so standardni finančni instrument vedno ena od možnosti, ki bi lahko spodbudila uporabo takšnih instrumentov tudi med regionalnimi in lokalnimi organi, ki jih še ne poznajo, je bilo izraženih več zahtev po pravni jasnosti in pravočasni uvedbi ustreznih pravil, ki se uporabljajo za standardne instrumente.

1. Ali je Komisija manj kot leto dni pred začetkom novega programskega obdobja 2014–2020 že pripravila kakšen standardni instrument?

2. Katere komunikacijske kanale je Komisija uporabila za obveščanje morebitnih uporabnikov o pravilih in tehničnih podrobnostih v ozadju takšnih standardnih instrumentov?

3. Kako bo Komisija promovirala in spodbujala uporabo vseh vrst inovativnih finančnih instrumentov v zadnjem letu pred začetkom novega programskega obdobja 2014–2020?

4. Ali lahko Komisija pove več o prihodnosti finančnih instrumentov, ki se izvajajo sedaj (Jessica, Jeremy, Jasper)? Ali bodo na enak način delovali tudi v novem programskem obdobju 2014–2020?

**Odgovor g. Hahna v imenu Komisije**
*(6. december 2013)*

1–3. Za standardizirane finančne instrumente, na katere se vprašanje nanaša, veljajo standardni pogoji za finančne instrumente v skladu s pravili za naslednji Evropski strukturni in investicijski sklad (ESIF), ki jih je treba še določiti v izvedbenem aktu.

Komisija je pripravila osnutek ključnih elementov standardiziranih finančnih instrumentov. Ta osnutek je bil v okviru procesa posvetovanja že predstavljen strokovni skupini držav članic in zainteresiranim stranem, ki so trenutno dejavne na področju finančnih instrumentov. Standardizirani finančni instrumenti so bili ob več priložnostih predstavljeni v različnih državah članicah, o njih pa se je razpravljalo v okviru seminarjev, konferenc in delavnic.

4. Organi upravljanja bodo odločali, kako bodo po obdobju upravičenosti v skladu s pravili delovali tisti instrumenti finančnega inženiringa, ki se že izvajajo. Ti instrumenti bi lahko delovali še naprej, če bi bila potreba po tem potrjena na podlagi predhodne presoje in bi bili del programa za državo članico. Ker so pravila za obdobje 2014–2020 podrobnejša od tistih za obdobje 2007–2013, bo treba te instrumente, pod pogojem da bodo podprti v okviru evropskih in strukturnih investicijskih skladov za obdobje 2014–2020, prilagoditi, da bodo usklajeni z novimi pravili.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011627/13**
**to the Commission**
**Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Financial instruments in cohesion policy

The Commission has already committed itself to strengthening the role of financial instruments within cohesion policy in the upcoming programming period (2014-2020). Parliament has warmly welcomed this initiative on a number of occasions and, in various texts, called for immediate legal clarity and increased transparency with regard to the introduction of new, innovative forms of financing.

As one option has always been off-the-shelf financial instruments which regional and local authorities still unfamiliar with such instruments would find easier to use, there have been repeated calls for legal clarity and the timely introduction of appropriate rules applicable to such off-the-shelf instruments.

1. With less than a year to go before the start of the 2014-2020 programming period, has the Commission prepared any such off-the-shelf instruments yet?

2. What channels has the Commission been using to communicate the rules and technicalities associated with such off-the-shelf instruments to potential users?

3. How will the Commission promote and incentivise the use of all forms of innovative financial instrument in the final year before the start of the 2014-2020 programming period?

4. Can the Commission elaborate on the future of those financial instruments already in operation (Jessica, Jeremy and Jasper)? Will they continue to operate in the same way throughout the next programming period (2014-2020)?

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

1 - 3. The off-the-shelf financial instruments mentioned in the question are the standard terms and conditions for financial instruments in line with the future European Structural and Investment Fund (ESIF) regulations, to be set out in an implementing act.

The Commission has prepared a draft of the key elements of the off-the-shelf instruments. This draft has already been shared, through a consultation process with the Member States expert group and stakeholders active in financial instruments in the current period. The off-the-shelf instruments have also been presented and discussed on multiple occasions during seminars, conferences and workshops in different Member States.

4. Concerning those financial engineering instruments under implementation, managing authorities will have to decide how to continue these after the end of the eligibility period within the limit of the regulations. These instruments could be continued if the need is confirmed by an *ex-ante* assessment and if they are part of the programme for the Member State. Since the 2014-2020 rules are more detailed than those of the 2007-2013 period, these instruments, if supported by the 2014-2020 ESIF Funds, will have to be adapted in order to comply with the new regulations.

*(Slovenska različica)*

**Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-011628/13**
**za Komisijo**
**Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)**
*(11. oktober 2013)*

*Zadeva:* Platforma za dobro davčno upravljanje

Komisija je kot del akcijskega načrta za boj proti davčnim goljufijam in utajam ter agresivnemu davčnemu načrtovanju jeseni leta 2013 ustanovila platformo za dobro davčno upravljanje.

Platforma ima nalogo, da pozorno spremlja, kako se izvajata priporočili, ki ju je Komisija pred poletjem leta 2013 izdala v zvezi z davčnimi goljufijami in davčnimi oazami v vseh državah članicah, in da se pri tem posvetuje s številnimi zainteresiranimi stranmi, med drugimi nacionalnimi davčnimi organi, socialnimi partnerji in sindikati, zato se porajajo sledeča vprašanja:

1. Ali platforma že deluje in kdo pri njej sodeluje?

2. Kdaj lahko pričakujemo njeno prvo poročilo?

3. Ali bo glede na zaveze, ki so jih države članice letos poleti dale v zvezi z direktivo o prihrankih in mehanizmom za hiter odziv v primerih goljufij na področju DDV, platforma nadzorovala tudi izvajanje teh dveh zakonodajnih aktov?

**Odgovor Algirdasa Šemete v imenu Komisije**
*(29. november 2013)*

1. Da, platforma že deluje. Vzpostavljena je bila 23. aprila 2013. Prvo srečanje članov platforme je potekalo 10. junija 2013, drugo pa 16. oktobra 2013. Člani platforme so bili izbrani na podlagi razpisa. Seznam članov in druge informacije o platformi so objavljene na spletišču platforme:
http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/gen_info/good_governance_matters/platform/index_en.htm

2. Povzetki zapisnikov s srečanj članov platforme se objavijo na spletišču, ko jih potrdijo člani. Komisija bo poročilo o izvajanju svojih priporočil z dne 6. decembra 2012 pripravila do konca decembra 2015 v sodelovanju s platformo.

3. Delovni program platforme je dostopen na spletišču. Izvajanje direktive o prihrankih in mehanizma za hiter odziv v primerih goljufij na področju DDV ne bo ena izmed prednostnih nalog platforme.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011628/13**
**to the Commission**
**Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Platform for Tax Good Governance

As part of the Commission's action plan to combat tax fraud, tax evasion and aggressive tax planning, a 'Platform for Tax Good Governance' was established in autumn 2013.

As its mission is to monitor closely the implementation of the two Commission recommendations issued before summer 2013 regarding tax fraud and tax havens in all Member States, and to consult during this monitoring process with a number of different stakeholders, including national tax workforces, social partners and trade unions, the following questions seem relevant:

1. Is the Platform already operational and who is participating in it?

2. When can we expect its first report?

3. In view of the commitments given by Member States this summer regarding the implementation of the Savings Directive and the quick reaction mechanism against VAT fraud, will the Platform also be overseeing and monitoring the implementation of these two legislative acts?

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

1. Yes, the Platform is already operational. It was established on 23 April 2013. The first meeting took place on 10 June 2013 and a second meeting was held on 16 October 2013. The members of the Platform have been selected following a Call for Applications. Its members and other information on the Platform have been published on the Platform's website:
http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/gen_info/good_governance_matters/platform/index_en.htm

2. A summary record of the Platform's meetings is published on the website once approved by the members. The Commission will report on the implementation of its 6 December 2012 Recommendations by the end of 2015, the Platform will assist the Commission in preparing this report.

3. The Platform's Work programme can be consulted on the website. The implementation of the Savings Directive and the quick reaction mechanism against VAT fraud will not be amongst the Platform's priorities.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011629/13**
**to the Commission**
**Julie Girling (ECR)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Food and Veterinary Office inspections on horses

When will the Food and Veterinary Office publish its programme of inspections for 2014? How many of its inspections will cover equine-related issues in Member States and third countries? Of these, how many are likely to be unannounced?

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

The Food and Veterinary Office will publish its work programme 2014, including its programme of audits for 2014, in November. Equine-related issues will be included in the scope of fifteen audits in Member States, three audits in Candidate Countries and five audits in third countries. All audits will be announced to the competent authorities of the countries concerned.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011630/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(11 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Allarme carestia in Madagascar

Il Madagascar è la quarta isola più grande del mondo, con una superficie di 587 000 km$^2$. Nonostante le sue risorse naturali abbondanti, il paese resta uno dei meno sviluppati del pianeta. La strategia internazionale per lo sviluppo del paese si focalizza sulla riduzione della povertà attraverso il raggiungimento degli obiettivi di sviluppo del Millennio entro il 2015. Nel 2007, il nuovo piano d'azione per il Madagascar (Madagascar Action Plan, MAP) ha rimpiazzato il documento strategico per la riduzione della povertà entro il 2012 (Strategic Document on Poverty Reduction until 2012). Il 10° Fondo europeo di sviluppo (FES) si inserisce in questo contesto. Esso è strutturato intorno allo sviluppo delle infrastrutture, allo sviluppo rurale e alla pianificazione, mentre enfatizza la promozione del buongoverno e rinforza l'integrazione regionale.

Tredici milioni di persone — quasi il 60 % della popolazione — rischiano oggi la fame a causa dell'infestazione delle locuste malgasce, che minacciano la sicurezza alimentare e i mezzi di sussistenza.

Il flagello delle locuste è iniziato nell'aprile del 2012. Vasti sciami di questi insetti molto mobili hanno danneggiato ampie aree di terra coltivata e di pascoli. Sebbene le locuste abbiano principalmente colpito il sud del paese, secondo una missione di valutazione della FAO condotta nell'aprile/maggio di quest'anno, si prevede che verso la fine del 2013 e l'inizio del 2014 alcuni sciami raggiungeranno le più produttive regioni settentrionali. In alcune regioni si stima sia stato danneggiato il 70 % delle colture di cereali, tra cui quelle di riso — il principale alimento di base — e di mais.

Considerato che:

— la campagna contro le locuste è di vitale importanza per cercare di limitare altri danni alle colture dei contadini poveri;

— finora la FAO ha ricevuto solo 23 milioni di dollari per il programma (che avrà un costo previsto di 41,5 milioni di dollari per i tre anni di operazioni);

può la Commissione far sapere:

se, alla luce degli eventi, intende rivedere le stime per i fondi destinati alla cooperazione internazionale, ed in particolare al Madagascar?

**Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione**
*(2 dicembre 2013)*

La prima campagna contro le locuste, che ha avuto inizio nel settembre 2013, è una risposta iniziale per arrestarne l'invasione. Gli sforzi compiuti dalla comunità internazionale, compresa l'Unione europea (UE) che ha mobilitato rapidamente 4 milioni di EUR assegnandoli alla FAO, hanno contribuito a far sì che questa prima campagna fosse avviata senza indugio e attuata integralmente per avere un impatto decisivo. Le prossime campagne contro le locuste (che saranno condotte nel 2014/2015 e nel 2015/2016) dovrebbero assicurare il ritorno alla normalità.

L'UE, oltre al suddetto stanziamento di 4 milioni di EUR, continua a sostenere la popolazione colpita dall'invasione di locuste attraverso vari programmi per un importo complessivo di quasi 60 milioni di EUR. Questi programmi hanno l'obiettivo di migliorare la sicurezza alimentare, il reddito e l'alimentazione delle famiglie che vivono in zone a rischio di invasione di locuste e comprendono attività di formazione e sostegno agli agricoltori per rafforzarne la resilienza ai vari rischi.

La delegazione dell'UE in Madagascar continua le consultazioni e la collaborazione con altri partner per lo sviluppo attivi nel paese, nonché con le autorità malgasce, al fine di creare le condizioni necessarie per eliminare permanentemente la minaccia delle locuste. Particolare attenzione viene prestata al rafforzamento delle capacità di sorveglianza e controllo preventivo.

Il sostegno dell'UE a favore delle campagne contro le locuste è stato finanziato mediante fondi inutilizzati del 10° FES che erano stati assegnati al Madagascar prima della crisi politica.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011630/13**
**to the Commission**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Famine alert in Madagascar

Madagascar is the fourth-largest island in the world, with an area of 587 000 km$^2$. Despite its abundant natural resources, it is one of the least-developed countries on the planet. The international development strategy for the country focuses on poverty reduction through achievement of the Millennium Development Goals by 2015. In 2007, the new Madagascar Action Plan (MAP) replaced the Strategic Document on Poverty Reduction until 2012. The 10th European Development Fund (EDF) fits into this context. It is structured around the development of infrastructure, rural development and planning, and emphasises the promotion of good governance and the strengthening of regional integration.

Thirteen million people — nearly 60% of the population — are currently at risk of hunger due to infestations of the Malagasy locust, which threaten food security and means of subsistence.

The locust plague began in April 2012. Vast, highly mobile swarms have damaged huge areas of cultivated land and pastures. Although they have largely struck the south of the country, a UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) assessment mission conducted in April and May of this year estimates that some swarms may reach the more productive northern regions by the end of 2013 or beginning of 2014. In some regions, 70% of cereal crops are estimated to have been damaged, including rice — the primary staple food — and maize.

The campaign against the locust is vitally important to limit further damage to poor farmers' crops. To date, the FAO has received only USD 23 million for the programme (which is expected to cost USD 41.5 million over its three years of operation).

In light of this situation, does the Commission intend to review the estimates for funds allocated to international cooperation, particularly for Madagascar?

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

The first anti-locust campaign, started in September 2013, provides the initial response to halt the locust invasion. The efforts made by the international community, including the European Union (EU) which quickly mobilised EUR 4 million and allocated these funds to the FAO, helped to ensure that this first campaign was launched on time and carried out in its entirety to have a decisive impact. The future anti-locust campaigns (in 2014/2015 and 2015/2016) should ensure the effective return to a situation of remission.

The EU, in addition to the abovementioned allocation of EUR 4 million, is continuing its support to people affected by the locust invasion through various programmes totalling nearly EUR 60 million. These programmes aim at improving the food security, income and nutrition of households located in areas at risk of exposure to locusts. They include activities coaching and supporting farmers to strengthen their resilience to various hazards.

The EU Delegation in Madagascar is continuing its consultation and coordination with other development partners active in Madagascar as well as with the Malagasy authorities to ensure that the conditions are met to permanently halt the locust threat. Particular attention is being paid to strengthening surveillance and preventive control capabilities.

The EU's support to the anti-locust invasion has been funded through available unused 10$^{th}$ EDF funds that had been allocated to Madagascar before the political crisis.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011631/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(11 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Fenomeno del land grabbing nei paesi in via di sviluppo

Un recente studio di un'importante organizzazione internazionale ha evidenziato che per la coltivazione dello zucchero numerose imprese acquisiscono vaste porzioni di terreni dei paesi in via di sviluppo, sradicando le popolazioni indigene, senza il consenso né il risarcimento delle comunità che abitano su quella terra. Si tratta di una pratica nota come «land grabbing».

Nello studio si citano casi specifici, come ad esempio la situazione dello Stato di Pernambuco (Brasile), dove nel 1998 una comunità di pescatori è stata cacciata con la violenza per far posto a uno zuccherificio. Oppure il caso del distretto di Sre Ambel (Cambogia), in cui 200 famiglie stanno ricorrendo in giudizio per riavere la terra da cui sono state sfrattate nel 2006 per far posto a una piantagione. In aggiunta sono anche illustrati i gravi conflitti per la terra scatenatisi in paesi come Mali, Zambia e Malawi.

Considerato che:

— sono coinvolte nel land grabbing delle multinazionali operanti in tutto il mondo;

— con tale pratica si impoverisce il suolo, si provocano tensioni sociali e gravi conflitti per la terra, si affamano le popolazioni che sussistono grazie a agricoltura e allevamento;

— la terra destinata alla coltivazione della sola canna di zucchero è pari a 31 milioni di ettari, una superficie pari all'Italia, per cui si tratta di un fenomeno molto diffuso;

si chiede alla Commissione se:

1. ritenga sia necessario adottare una politica di «tolleranza zero» invitando tutte le imprese a rivelare in modo trasparente i paesi e i produttori dai quali si riforniscono di materie prime;

2. sia opportuno effettuare valutazioni sulle conseguenze che la produzione dello zucchero ha sulle comunità locali in tali paesi;

3. abbia intenzione di mobilitare attivamente l'industria alimentare affinché si rispettino i diritti sulla terra.

**Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione**
*(27 novembre 2013)*

La normativa dell'UE per quanto riguarda la fornitura di informazioni sui prodotti alimentari ai consumatori si applica a tutti gli alimenti destinati al consumatore finale o alle collettività. Per quanto riguarda l'etichettatura di origine obbligatoria si stabilisce che la Commissione presenti relazioni al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio esaminando la possibilità di estendere a determinati prodotti alimentari l'etichettatura di origine obbligatoria. A seconda delle conclusioni di tali relazioni la Commissione può presentare proposte di modifica delle disposizioni pertinenti dell'Unione o, ove opportuno, adottare nuove iniziative per settori. Pertanto in questa fase la Commissione non può adottare una posizione in merito alla questione sollevata.

La Commissione esegue valutazioni nei paesi terzi per quanto riguarda le sue attività e sono disponibili relazioni sulla sua partecipazione nel settore dello zucchero a favore del Malawi. La Commissione sostiene, tra l'altro, organizzazioni indipendenti quali l'«International Land Coalition», la principale fonte in loco delle informazioni utilizzate da OXFAM nella sua urgente campagna sullo zucchero.

La Commissione sostiene attivamente i processi per assicurare l'impegno e la responsabilizzazione delle industrie agroalimentari per quanto riguarda il rispetto dei diritti fondiari consuetudinari. Essa ha partecipato e ha sostenuto la negoziazione degli orientamenti volontari per una governance responsabile in materia di proprietà fondiaria, pesca e foreste (Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests) e si impegna attivamente per la loro applicazione a livello nazionale attraverso la recente approvazione di un programma da 33 milioni di EUR per l'Africa e la Land Transparency Initiative del G8. I negoziati in corso sugli investimenti agricoli responsabili affronteranno in modo specifico gli obblighi del settore privato per l'acquisto di terreni.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011631/13**
**to the Commission**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Land grabbing in developing countries

A recent study by a major international organisation shows that many companies purchase vast swathes of land in developing countries for sugar cultivation, uprooting the indigenous population without consent from or reimbursement to the communities occupying the land. This is a practice known as 'land grabbing'.

The study mentions specific cases, such as the situation in the State of Pernambuco (Brazil), where a fishing community was violently expelled in 1998 to make room for a sugar refinery, and the case of the Sre Ambel district (Cambodia), where 200 families turned to the courts to recover the land they were evicted from in 2006 to make room for a plantation. The study also illustrates serious conflicts over land in countries like Mali, Zambia, and Malawi.

Multinationals operating throughout the world are involved in land grabbing. This practice depletes the soil, creates social tensions and serious conflicts over land, and starves populations that subsist on agriculture and raising livestock. Some 31 million hectares of land is used to cultivate sugar cane alone — an area equal to the size of Italy — which means it is an extremely widespread problem.

Does the Commission believe it necessary to adopt a 'zero tolerance' policy, requiring all companies to be transparent and reveal the countries and producers from which they obtain their raw materials?

Does the Commission believe it opportune to perform assessments on the consequences of sugar production on local communities in these countries?

Does it intend to actively mobilise the food industry to respect land rights?

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

The EU Regulation on the provision of food information to consumers applies to all foods delivered to the final consumer or to mass caterers. Regarding mandatory origin labelling, it requires the Commission to submit reports to Parliament and the Council exploring the possibility to extend mandatory origin labelling with respect to certain foods. Depending on the outcome of the reports, the Commission may submit proposals to modify the relevant Union provisions or take new initiatives, where appropriate, on a sectoral basis. As such, the Commission cannot at this stage take a position on the issue raised at hand.

The Commission performs assessments in third countries in relation to its activities, and reports are available on its involvement in the sugar sector for Malawi. The Commission, *inter alia*, supports independent organisations, such as the International Land Coalition, the main provider of the information from the ground used by OXFAM in its sugar rush campaign.

The Commission actively supports processes to ensure the agro-food industries are committed to and held responsible for respect for customary land rights. It participated in and supported the negotiation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests and is actively engaged in their application at country level, with a recently approved EUR 33 million programme for Africa, as well as the G8 Land Transparency Initiative. The current negotiations on responsible agricultural investments will specifically tackle the obligations of the private sector in land acquisition.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011633/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(11 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Rendicontazione dei finanziamenti dell'Unione europea diretti a Haiti

Haiti è il paese più povero del continente americano: il 70 % della popolazione è disoccupato e la maggior parte vive con meno di 2 dollari al giorno.

Il 12 gennaio 2010 un terremoto di magnitudine 7.0 ha devastato il Paese, provocando 230 000 morti, 300 000 feriti e 1 300 000 senza tetto. Lo stesso anno, in ottobre, si è registrata una delle più violenti epidemie di colera al mondo, con 651 339 casi di cui 8 053 mortali. Nel 2012 il Paese è stato colpito dalla tempesta tropicale Isaac e poi dall'uragano Sandy.

Per quanto riguarda gli aiuti dagli altri Paesi, sono arrivati circa 7,5 miliardi di dollari, ma risulta che solo l'1 % dei fondi raccolti per l'emergenza sanitaria e il 10 % di quelli per la ricostruzione sono arrivati allo Stato. La maggior parte dei soldi è stata versata sui conti di ONG internazionali, Banca Mondiale, Nazioni Unite, *Inter-America Development Bank* e società di consulenza, e imprese di costruzioni occidentali. Solamente queste organizzazioni sanno come sono stati spesi i soldi e non devono renderne conto a nessuno. Oltre a ciò, un ulteriore problema è rappresentato dal fatto che i flussi di aiuti internazionali rientrano in Europa o negli Usa, in quanto le società che si aggiudicano i bandi per la ricostruzione sono quasi sempre straniere. Inoltre, si sottolinea che c'è stato molto lavoro nella fase di emergenza, ma che successivamente la maggior parte delle ONG ha lasciato il paese.

Considerato che:

— Haiti è un paese martoriato da instabilità, violenza, povertà, analfabetismo e deforestazione, e che quattro anni dopo il terremoto la ricostruzione sembra appena cominciata;

— dal 2010 ad aprile 2013 l'UE ha stanziato 213 milioni di EUR di finanziamenti per l'assistenza umanitaria diretta a tale Paese;

— non è stato tuttavia possibile reperire informazioni precise sul rendiconto dei programmi realizzati ad Haiti,

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Quali azioni di monitoraggio sono state effettuate sui finanziamenti ad Haiti?

2. Quali sono stati i risultati raggiunti?

3. È possibile ottenere un rendiconto dettagliato di tutte le attività poste in essere dall'UE in tale Paese?

**Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione**
*(27 novembre 2013)*

I finanziamenti dell'UE ad Haiti comprendono sia assistenza umanitaria che aiuti allo sviluppo. La delegazione dell'UE e l'ufficio ECHO ad Haiti controllano l'attuazione dei progetti dell'Unione. Ogni anno vengono eseguite missioni di verifica esterne, come anche missioni di audit e valutazione di ciascun programma di sviluppo al suo completamento.

Le schede d'azione di tutti i programmi di cooperazione allo sviluppo dell'UE sono pubblicate sul sito web di EuropeAid ([1]) e informazioni sulle attività dell'UE e sul loro impatto sono disponibili sul sito della delegazione dell'UE ([2]). Attualmente è in corso una valutazione globale della sostenibilità, dell'impatto, della pertinenza, dell'efficienza e dell'efficacia della cooperazione allo sviluppo dell'Unione europea ad Haiti dal 2008 al 2012; la relazione di valutazione sarà pubblicata sul sito web di EuropeAid nel secondo trimestre del 2014.

La realizzazione delle operazioni finanziate dalla DG Aiuti umanitari prevede diversi livelli di verifica e controllo lungo tutto il ciclo del progetto, tra cui: un'accurata selezione dei partner; l'identificazione delle azioni da finanziare in base al grado di necessità; il monitoraggio di progetti sul campo e a livello della sede centrale; valutazioni esterne; audit finanziario sul campo e a livello della sede centrale.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/country-cooperation/haiti/haiti_en.htm
([2]) http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/haiti/index_fr.htm

Una valutazione delle azioni umanitarie sostenute dall'UE nel periodo 2009-2011 è stata effettuata nel 2011. Ulteriori dettagli sulle attività finanziate sono disponibili nelle relazioni annuali della Direzione generale per gli Aiuti umanitari e la protezione civile ([3]).

Informazioni in generale sui finanziamenti dei donatori e sui pagamenti sono disponibili anche sul sito web dell'Inviato Speciale delle Nazioni Unite ad Haiti ([4]).

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/echo/aid/caribbean_pacific/haiti_en.htm
([4]) http://www.lessonsfromhaiti.org

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011633/13**
**to the Commission**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Reporting of EU funding for Haiti

Haiti is the poorest country in the Americas: 70% of the population is unemployed and most people live on less than USD 2 a day.

On 12 January 2010, a magnitude 7.0 earthquake devastated the country, leaving 230 000 dead, 300 000 injured and 1.3 million homeless. October of the same year saw an outbreak of one of the most virulent epidemics of cholera in the world, with 651 339 cases, 8 053 of which were fatal. In 2012, the country was hit by Tropical Storm Isaac and subsequently by Hurricane Sandy.

Other countries have given approximately USD 7.5 billion in aid, but only 1% of funds collected for the health emergency and 10% of those for reconstruction have reached the State. Most of the money was paid into the accounts of international NGOs, the World Bank, the United Nations, the Inter-American Development Bank, consultancy firms and Western construction companies. Only these organisations know how the money was spent, and they are accountable to no one. Furthermore, there is an additional problem insofar as international aid flows come back to Europe or the US since the companies which are awarded the reconstruction contracts are almost always foreign. Moreover, it should be stressed that there was a great deal of work during the emergency, but subsequently, most NGOs left the country.

— Haiti is a country beset by instability, violence, poverty, illiteracy and deforestation, and four years after the earthquake, reconstruction appears to have only just begun.

— Between 2010 and April 2013, the EU allocated EUR 213 million to fund direct humanitarian assistance in this country.

— It has not, however, been possible to find precise information on the reporting of programmes carried out in Haiti.

1. How has funding to Haiti been monitored?

2. What were the results?

3. Is it possible to obtain a detailed report of all the activities carried out by the EU in this country?

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

EU funding to Haiti includes both humanitarian and development assistance. The EU Delegation and ECHO office in Haiti monitor the implementation of EU projects. External monitoring missions are carried out annually, including the audit and evaluation of each development programme after completion.

The action fiches for all EU development cooperation programmes are published on EuropeAid's website ([1]) and information on the EU's activities and their impact is to be found on the EU Delegation's website ([2]). A comprehensive evaluation is currently being carried out on the sustainability, impact, relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of EU development cooperation to Haiti from 2008-2012. The evaluation report is expected to be published on EuropeAid's website in the 2nd quarter of 2014.

The implementation of Humanitarian Aid funded operations is ensured through several layers of checks and controls throughout the project cycle. This includes: strict selection of partners; needs-based criteria for the identification of actions to be funded; monitoring of projects at field and HQ levels; external evaluations; financial audits at field and HQ levels.

An evaluation of EU supported humanitarian actions in 2009-2011 was carried out in 2011. Further details on activities funded can be found in the annual Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection reports ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/country-cooperation/haiti/haiti_en.htm
([2]) http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/haiti/index_fr.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/echo/aid/caribbean_pacific/haiti_en.htm

Information on overall donor funding and disbursement is also available on the website of the UN Special Envoy to Haiti ([4]).

([4]) http://www.lessonsfromhaiti.org/

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011634/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(11 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Rigassificatori e strategia energetica comune

L'Italia punta a diventare il più importante polo sud-europeo del gas naturale, attraverso il suo piano di Strategia energetica nazionale (SEN). Le previsioni per il 2020 delineano un aumento dei consumi di gas naturale in Europa da 528 a 575 $Sgm^3$/anno e una riduzione della produzione da 21 a 13 $Sgm^3$/anno.

Per poter raggiungere tale obiettivo, indispensabile per l'Italia come per l'Europa, sono in costruzione diversi rigassificatori al largo delle coste italiane, che per entrare in funzione a costi competitivi di mercato devono accedere al regime regolato dell'energia e beneficiare di un fattore di garanzia.

Questo perché il costo dell'infrastruttura stessa viene determinato da una stima nei piani di infrastrutture dello Stato, ma per i benefici il calcolo è più complesso: per verificare se l'investimento è giustificabile si effettua una stima dell'abbassamento del prezzo di mercato della materia prima all'iniezione di nuova liquidità.

Considerato che:

— queste stime necessarie per le valutazioni infrastrutturali diventano sempre più volatili ed arbitrarie e le ultime analisi hanno rilevato come il costo di arbitraggio fisico dato dal costo di trasporto del gas scambiato col Nord Europa si sia ridotto fino ad annullarsi (come rilevato nella relazione europea sui mercati del gas della DG Energia), rendendo alcuni rigassificatori in costruzione economicamente non sostenibili;

— i costi dell'energia, influenzati in maniera consistente dal mercato del gas, incidono in misura oltremodo rilevante sui costi che le industrie devono sostenere per produrre nei paesi europei (fino a 4 volte tanto che negli USA);

può la Commissione far sapere:

se ritiene necessario rivedere la priorità ed urgenza dei programmi sulla super rete intelligente (Super Smart Grid) che, oltre ad abbattere i costi di produzione ed al consumo, allevierebbero le centrali attuali di carichi degradanti?

**Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione**
*(6 dicembre 2013)*

Contrariamente a quanto accade nel settore dell'energia elettrica, le reti intelligenti suscitano un debole interesse nel settore del gas, in particolare a causa dell'incertezza dei costi e dei benefici. Uno studio realizzato dall'industria del gas e dai gestori delle reti nell'ambito della task force per le reti intelligenti è giunto alla conclusione che le reti intelligenti del gas non possono essere sviluppate isolatamente, ma devono essere collegate alle reti intelligenti dell'energia elettrica di prossima costruzione e favorire un uso accorto dell'energia, ad esempio nella cogenerazione (PCCE), nel riscaldamento e nel raffreddamento. Perché gli investimenti nelle reti intelligenti generino pieni benefici pare tuttavia necessario che il settore evolva ulteriormente.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011634/13**
**to the Commission**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Regasification plants and the common energy strategy

Italy aims to become the most important southern European hub for natural gas, through its National Energy Strategy (NES). Forecasts predict an increase in natural gas consumption in Europe from 528 to 575 $Gm^3$/year by 2020, and a reduction in production from 21 to 13 $Gm^3$/year.

To meet this objective, essential both for Italy and for Europe, various regasification plants are being built off Italy's coasts. In order to become operational with competitive market costs, they must operate under the regulated energy system and benefit from an 'income guarantee'.

This is because the cost of the actual infrastructure is decided by an estimate in the State's infrastructure plans, but it is more complicated to calculate the benefits: to check whether the investment is justifiable, an estimate is made of the reduction in the market price of the raw material when new capital is injected.

Given that:

— these estimates, necessary to make valuations of the infrastructure, are becoming increasingly more volatile and arbitrary, and the latest analyses show that the cost of arbitrage, determined by the cost of transporting gas traded with northern Europe, has fallen to zero (as established by the Directorate-General for Energy's Report on European Gas Markets), meaning that certain regasification plants under construction are not economically sustainable;

— energy costs, significantly influenced by the gas market, have a huge impact on the costs that industry has to bear in order to manufacture in European countries (up to four times as much as in the US);

does the Commission believe it necessary to review the priority and urgency of Super Smart Grid programmes which, in addition to cutting production and consumption costs, would relieve current plants of harmful materials?

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

Contrary to the high support given by the power sector to the electricity smart grids, the interest of the gas industry in smart gas grids seems to be much lower, especially due to cost and benefits uncertainties. A study conducted by the gas industry and network operators under the Smart Grid Task Force concluded that smart gas grids cannot be developed in isolation but should be linked to future electricity smart grids and should facilitate smart energy utilisation, e.g. in cogeneration(CHP), heating and cooling. However, further development seems to be necessary to ensure fully exploitation of the requested smart grids investments.

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011635/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(11 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Denegación de visados a médicos de Kosovo para asistir a un congreso internacional de anestesiología en España — Régimen de visados en la EU

Veinte médicos de Kosovo no pudieron asistir en el mes de junio a un congreso internacional de anestesiología en Barcelona. La diplomacia española no se lo permitió porque eran ciudadanos de un Estado que España no reconocía.

El Gobierno español ha explicado en el Congreso de los Diputados las razones por las que se denegaba la entrada de estos anestesistas diciendo que los consulados españoles ni siquiera tramitan las demandas de visado porque son ciudadanos de un Estado que para España no existe ([1]).

En el documento de respuesta entregado a un diputado en el Congreso español, el Gobierno dice que solo concede «visados de validez territorial limitada» en casos excepcionales, como cuando existe una razón humanitaria, una razón de interés nacional o alguna similar.

El Parlamento Europeo aprobó el de 18 de abril de 2013 una Resolución sobre el proceso de integración europea de Kosovo ([2]).

En las conclusiones de las reuniones del Consejo de Asuntos Generales de 7 de diciembre de 2009, de 14 de diciembre de 2010 y de 5 de diciembre de 2011 se subraya y reafirma que Kosovo, sin perjuicio de la posición de los Estados miembros sobre su estatuto, debe también beneficiarse de la perspectiva de la posible liberalización del régimen de visados cuando se cumplan todas las condiciones, y se celebra el inicio de un diálogo sobre visados en enero de 2012 y la presentación de una hoja de ruta para la liberalización de visados en junio de 2012.

98 de los 193 Estados miembros de las Naciones Unidas, incluidos 22 de los 27 Estados miembros de la UE, reconocen la independencia de Kosovo.

¿Piensa la Comisión que es normal que los ciudadanos de Kosovo puedan obtener visados a través de la UE pero no en España, teniendo en cuenta las próximas negociaciones de adhesión a la UE?

¿Es la Comisión consciente de esta situación? ¿Qué medidas va a tomar la Comisión para resolver esta situación?

**Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión**
*(4 de diciembre de 2013)*

La Comisión es consciente de la situación a la que se enfrentan los ciudadanos de Kosovo que desean viajar a España. La Comisión está estudiando actualmente la interpretación y aplicación que las autoridades españolas hacen de la política común de visados, para comprobar si están en consonancia con las disposiciones legales.

([1]) http://www.vilaweb.cat/noticia/4148843/20131010/lestat-espanyol-considera-kossovesos-ciutadans-normals.html
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2013-0187+0+DOC+XML+V0//ES

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011635/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Refusal of visas to doctors from Kosovo to attend an international anaesthesiology conference in Spain — Visa system in the EU

Twenty doctors from Kosovo were unable to attend an international anaesthesiology conference held in Barcelona in June. Spanish diplomats did not allow it because they were nationals of a state not recognised by Spain.

The Spanish Government explained in the Congress of Deputies the reasons for these anaesthetists being denied entry, saying that Spanish consulates do not even process such visa applications because they are for nationals of a state that, as far as Spain is concerned, does not exist ([1]).

In the answer given to a member of the Spanish Congress, the Government says that it only grants 'visas with limited territorial validity' in exceptional cases, such as for humanitarian reasons, reasons of national interest, or similar.

On 18 April 2013, Parliament adopted a resolution on the European integration process of Kosovo ([2]).

The conclusions of meetings of the General Affairs Council on 7 December 2009, 14 December 2010 and 5 December 2011 highlight and reaffirm that Kosovo, without prejudice to the position taken by Member States on its statute, should also benefit from the prospect of possible liberalisation of the visa system when all conditions are met. Talks on visas were begun in January 2012 and a roadmap for visa liberalisation was presented in June 2012.

Ninety-eight of the 193 Member States of the United Nations, including 22 of the 27 EU Member States, recognise Kosovo's independence.

Does the Commission find it normal that Kosovar citizens can obtain visas through the EU but not in Spain, in view of the forthcoming negotiations on accession to the EU?

Is the Commission aware of this situation? What steps will the Commission take to resolve this situation?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation which Kosovar nationals wishing to travel to Spain face. The Commission is currently examining the Spanish authorities' interpretation and implementation of the common visa policy to verify whether they are in line with the legal provisions.

([1]) http://www.vilaweb.cat/noticia/4148843/20131010/lestat-espanyol-considera-kossovesos-ciutadans-normals.html
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2013-0187+0+DOC+XML+V0//ES

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011636/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**
*(11. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Pferdesteuer in Höhe von 20 % pro Monat ab 1.1.2014

Medienberichten zufolge ist ab 1.1.2014 eine Änderung der Besteuerung von Betrieben mit Reitpferden oder Vermietung von Pferdeeinstellplätzen vorgesehen. Die Begründung der Kommission lautet: Die Pferdehaltung rein zum Reiten sowie das Vermieten von Pferdeboxen würden nicht unter die Tätigkeiten der Land- und Forstwirtschaft fallen. Für kleine Betriebe, die bis zu fünf eigene bzw. vermietete Reitpferde haben, wird es keine steuerlichen Änderungen geben — „größere" Betriebe müssten hingegen in Zukunft mit einer Erhöhung der Besteuerung um 20 % pro Monat rechnen.

1. Entspricht der oben dargestellte Sachverhalt der Realität? Wenn ja, seit wann besitzt die Kommission die Zuständigkeit, eine solche Steuer einzuführen? Liegt die Steuerhoheit nicht mehr weiterhin bei den Mitgliedstaaten?

2. Wann und wie würden die Betriebe von der Änderung der Besteuerung konkret erfahren?

3. Welche Betriebe würden genau unter die neue Besteuerung fallen? Woher kommt die willkürliche Grenze von 5 Pferden? Ist ein Reitstall mit 10 Pferden nicht auch noch ein kleiner Reitstall?

4. Wie begründet die Kommission die Gefährdung der Existenzgrundlage vieler dieser kleinen Betriebe?

5. Sind auch Vereine von der Besteuerung betroffen?

6. Reitsportbegeisterte sind zu 75 % unter 21 Jahre alt. Der Pferdereitsport ermöglicht Jugendlichen Bewegung in der Natur und Kontakt zu Tieren. Die anfallenden Mehrkosten würden vermutlich auf die Verbraucher abgewälzt, Reiten würde damit teurer. Konterkariert dies nicht die Pläne der Kommission, Jugendlichen Bewegung im Freien näher zu bringen?

**Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission**
*(22. November 2013)*

Mangels genauerer Angaben, anhand deren sie die erforderlichen Nachforschungen zu dem angesprochenen Problem vornehmen könnte, kann die Kommission die Frage zurzeit nicht beantworten. Es wäre hilfreich, genaue Angaben darüber zu erhalten, um welche Art von Steuer (Ertragssteuer, Mehrwertsteuer oder eine andere indirekte Steuer, Gewerbesteuer, Kommunalsteuer …) und um welchen Mitgliedstaat es sich handelt. Die Kommission bittet den Herrn Abgeordneten um nähere Erläuterungen zu der Anfrage.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011636/13**
**to the Commission**
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Horse tax of 20%/month from 1 January 2014

According to media reports, from 1 January 2014 there is to be a change in the taxation of companies that own horses for riding or rent accommodation for horses. The Commission's justification is that the activities of renting out horseboxes and keeping horses purely for riding will not come within the activities of agriculture and forestry. For small businesses that have up to five of their own or rented horses for riding, there are to be no tax changes — 'larger' companies, on the other hand, will face a tax rise of 20% per month.

1. Does the description above match the reality? If so, since when has the Commission had the competence to introduce such a tax? Is the raising of taxes no longer a competence of the Member States?

2. When and how will these businesses know for certain about the changes in taxation?

3. Exactly which companies will be subject to the new taxation? What is the reasoning behind the random threshold of five horses? Is it not the case that a 10-horse riding stable is still a small one?

4. How does the Commission justify the existential threat posed to many of these small businesses?

5. Will clubs also be subject to this tax?

6. Seventy-five per cent of riding enthusiasts are aged under 21. Horse-riding allows young people the chance to be active in the natural environment and provides contact with animals. It is to be expected that the additional costs incurred would be passed on to customers, thereby pushing up the cost of riding. Does this not run counter to the Commission's plans to promote outdoor exercise by young people?

*(Version française)*

**Réponse donnée par M Šemeta au nom de la Commission**
*(22 novembre 2013)*

En l'absence de précisions qui permettent à la Commission d'effectuer les recherches nécessaires sur le problème évoqué, la Commission regrette de ne pas pouvoir répondre pour le moment à la question. En effet, il serait utile de préciser le type de taxe en cause (taxe sur le résultat, TVA ou autre taxe indirecte, taxe locale...) ainsi que l'État membre concerné. La Commission prie dès lors l'Honorable Parlementaire de bien vouloir en préciser davantage le libellé.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011637/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**
*(11. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Safe-Harbor-Verfahren — Konzerne täuschen EU-Bürger beim Datenschutz

Eine Studie der Datenschutz-Beratungsfirma Galexia, welche im September 2013 veröffentlicht wurde, warnt europäische Kunden vor der Unsicherheit des Safe-Habor-Abkommens. Eigentlich sollte das sogenannte Safe-Harbor-Abkommen Datenschutzstandards bei der Verwendung personenbezogener Daten von EU-Bürgern durch amerikanische IT-Unternehmen sicherstellen. Bedauerlicherweise sieht die Realität aber offenbar anders aus: Bei knapp 3 000 untersuchten US-Firmen, welche sich dem Safe-Harbor-Abkommen unterworfen haben, wurden 427 Verstöße dagegen gefunden. Ungefähr 30 % der untersuchten Firmen teilen ihren Kunden zudem nicht mit, wie das Verfahren bei Verstößen abläuft oder an wen man sich wenden muss. Andere wiederum verweisen ihre EU-Kunden in den Nutzungsbedingungen an Organisationen, die gegen Entgelt (!) Beschwerden entgegennehmen.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Ist der Kommission die oben erwähnte Untersuchung bekannt? Hat die Kommission selbst ähnliche Untersuchungen zur tatsächlichen Umsetzung des Safe-Harbor Abkommens durchgeführt oder in Auftrag gegeben? Wenn ja, mit welchen Ergebnissen? Wenn nein, warum nicht?

2. Wie steht die Kommission zu den aufgezeigten Missständen?

3. Wie kann eine effektive Umsetzung und Kontrolle der Einhaltung der Safe-Harbor-Datenschutzregeln sichergestellt werden?

4. Gibt es Bestrebungen seitens der Kommission, das gegenständliche Abkommen angesichts der groben Verstöße amerikanischer IT-Unternehmen neu zu verhandeln?

5. Sieht die Kommission angesichts dieser Missstände die Notwendigkeit, wirklich abschreckende finanzielle Sanktionen für IT-Unternehmen in die Datenschutzgrundverordnung aufzunehmen? (Umso mehr vor dem Hintergrund des NSA-Skandals) Wenn ja, in welcher Höhe?

**Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission**
*(28. November 2013)*

Die Studie Galexia ist der Kommission bekannt. Die Kommission arbeitet derzeit ihre Bewertung der Safe Harbor Vereinbarung aus und wird sie vor Ende 2013 vorlegen.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011637/13**
**to the Commission**
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Safe Harbor procedure — companies mislead EU citizens on data protection

A study by the data protection consultants Galexia published in September 2013 warns European customers of the unreliability of the Safe Harbor Agreement. The Safe Harbor Agreement is actually intended to guarantee data protection standards when US IT firms use the personal data of EU citizens. Unfortunately, the reality is manifestly somewhat different: among the almost 3 000 US firms studied that had signed up to the Safe Harbor Agreement, 427 infringements of the agreement were uncovered. What is more, roughly 30% of the companies in the study do not inform their customers of what happens under the procedure in the event of infringements or to whom to report such infringements. Others, meanwhile, direct their EU customers, in their terms of use, to organisations that handle complaints for a fee(!).

1. Is the Commission familiar with the study referred to above? Has the Commission itself carried out or commissioned similar studies into the implementation of the Safe Harbor Agreement in practice? If so, what were the results? If not, why not?

2. What is the Commission's view of the shortcomings that have been identified?

3. How can effective implementation and monitoring of compliance with the Safe Harbor data protection rules be ensured?

4. Is the Commission taking steps to re-negotiate the current agreement in light of the major breaches by US IT firms?

5. In light of these shortcomings, does it see the need to adopt truly deterrent financial sanctions for IT firms in the General Data Protection Regulation (all the more so given the NSA scandal)? If so, at what level should they be set?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**
*(28 November 2013)*

The Commission is aware of the Galexia study. The Commission is currently preparing its assessment of the Safe Harbour arrangement and will present it before the end of 2013.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011638/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**
*(11. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Schutz europäischer Zugvögel in Ägypten — Tierquälerei und Bedrohung der Vogelpopulation

Ein deutsches Filmteam des Bayrischen Rundfunks veröffentlichte im September 2013 einen erschreckenden Bericht über ein millionenfaches Töten von europäischen Zugvögeln in Ägypten ([1]).

Mehr als 700 Kilometer lange Vogelfangnetze sind entlang der ägyptischen Mittelmeerküste aufgespannt. Mindestens zehn Millionen Zugvögel werden hier jeden Herbst gefangen gehalten. Die gefangenen Vögel werden eingesammelt und anschließend deren Flügel gebrochen, damit sie nicht mehr fliegen können — umgebracht werden sie erst später. Dabei hat auch Ägypten die Bonner Konvention (CMS), welche den Schutz von wandernden Tieren gewährleisten sollte, unterzeichnet.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Ist der Kommission die oben dargestellte Praxis bekannt? Wenn ja, gibt es eine diesbezügliche Stellungnahme?

2. Das politische Chaos in Ägypten erleichtert die illegale Jagd. Gedenkt die Kommission, Druck auf die ägyptische Regierung auszuüben, um die illegale Jagd einzudämmen und eine nachhaltige Jagd, die den Bestand der Populationen sichert, einzuführen bzw. zu gewährleisten? Wenn ja, wie?

3. Wie kann die ägyptische Regierung zur Einhaltung der Bonner Konvention zum Schutz wandernder Tierarten bewegt werden? Welche Möglichkeiten gibt es auf internationaler Ebene?

4. Wird sich die Kommission dafür einsetzen, dass die ägyptische Regierung den neuen Aktionsplan zum Schutz Eurasisch-Afrikanischer ziehender Landvögel (AEMLAP) unterzeichnet und umsetzt?

**Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission**
*(29. November 2013)*

1. Der Kommission ist das Problem des Tötens von Vögeln in Ägypten bekannt. Sie hat für den Umgang mit derartigen Fragen in Drittstaaten aber keinerlei rechtliche Befugnisse.

2. Aufgrund der aktuellen politischen Lage in Ägypten verzögern sich die normalen Abläufe der bilateralen Kontakte zu Umweltbelangen und damit zusammenhängenden Fragen. Die Kommission wird dieses Thema jedoch in der nächsten Sitzung zur Sprache bringen und in der Zwischenzeit die EU-Delegation auffordern, einen ersten Kontakt mit der ägyptischen Regierung herzustellen.

3./4. Ägypten ist Vertragspartei des Übereinkommens zur Erhaltung der wandernden wildlebenden Tierarten (CMS) und des Abkommens zur Erhaltung der afrikanisch-eurasischen wandernden Wasservögel (AEWA). Als Vertragspartei ist es rechtlich verpflichtet, für die Einhaltung von CMS und AEWA zu sorgen, die u. a. die Erhaltung wandernder Tierarten in ihrem gesamten Lebensraum auf dem Land, im Wasser und in der Luft zum Ziel haben. Es liegt im alleinigen Ermessen der ägyptischen Regierung, den Aktionsplan zum Schutz eurasisch-afrikanischer ziehender Landvögel (AEMLAP) zu unterzeichnen.

([1]) http://og-bayern.de/?page_id=3116

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011638/13**
**to the Commission**
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Protection of European migratory birds in Egypt — animal cruelty and threat to the bird population

In September 2013, a German film crew from the Bavarian public broadcaster *Bayrischer Rundfunk* released a shocking report on the killing of millions of European migratory birds in Egypt ([1]).

Over 700 km of bird nets are hung along Egypt's Mediterranean coast. At least 10 million migrating birds are caught in these nets each autumn. The birds caught are collected and then have their wings broken so that they cannot fly away — they are not killed until later. In this connection, Egypt, too, has signed the Bonn Convention (The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, or CMS), which is supposed to protect migratory creatures.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the practice described above? If so, has it issued an opinion in this regard?

2. The political chaos in Egypt facilitates illegal hunting. Does the Commission plan to apply pressure to the Egyptian Government to contain illegal hunting and introduce and safeguard a sustainable form of hunting that ensures the survival of bird populations? If so, how?

3. How can the Egyptian Government be pushed to comply with the Bonn Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals? What options are there at international level?

4. Will the Commission take steps to ensure that the Egyptian Government signs and implements the new African-Eurasia Migratory Landbird Action Plan (AEMLAP)?

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

1. The Commission is aware of the issue of the killing of birds in Egypt. The Commission has no legal competence to deal with such issues in a non-Member State.

2. Due to the current political situation in the country the normal cycle of bilateral contacts with Egypt on environmental and related issues has been delayed. The Commission will however take up this issue in the next meeting and in the meantime will request that the EU Delegation makes a first contact with the Egyptian Government.

3 and 4. Egypt is Party to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) and the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA). As a Party it is legally obliged to ensure compliance with CMS and AEWA, *inter alia*, aiming at conservation of terrestrial, aquatic and avian migratory species throughout their range. It remains the sole discretion of the Egyptian Government to sign the African-Eurasia Migratory Action Plan (AEMLAP).

([1]) http://og-bayern.de/?page_id=3116

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011639/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**
*(11 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Introduzione della nuova tassa «Rifiuti e servizi» in Italia: imprese a rischio

La legge n. 2014 del 22 dicembre 2011 ha introdotto in Italia la TARES (tassa rifiuti e servizi), in sostituzione della tariffa di igiene ambientale (TIA) e della tassa per lo smaltimento dei rifiuti solidi urbani (TARSU).

Secondo l'analisi svolta da Rete Imprese Italia, la nuova imposta colpirà fortemente il tessuto economico del paese e, soprattutto, le attività del commercio e dell'artigianato. Dallo studio dei dati risulta che la tariffa è aumentata del 4,9 % rispetto al marzo 2012, del 22,1 % nel periodo 2008-2013 e, se raffrontati gli ultimi 10 anni, del 56,6 %.

Gli aumenti maggiori, per come è strutturata ora tale imposta, ricadranno sulle attività artigianali: i produttori di pasta +93 %, i panificatori +93,6 %, le pizzerie al taglio +301 %, i laboratori di pasticceria +181,7 %.

La Commissione:

1. è al corrente dei fatti sopra esposti?

2. Può fornire dati in merito all'aumento delle tariffe rifiuti nella zona euro e negli Stati membri, negli ultimi 10 anni?

3. Alla luce della crisi economica che investe l'Italia e del fatto che, nel primo quadrimestre del 2013, 4.218 imprese hanno dovuto chiudere in Italia, cioè il 13 % in più rispetto allo stesso periodo nel 2012, la Commissione non ritiene che un'imposta di questo tipo sia, di fatto, contraria agli obiettivi di aumento dell'occupazione e di uscita dalla crisi delineati nella strategia Europa 2020?

**Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione**
*(3 dicembre 2013)*

Il controllo sulle decisioni nazionali relative alla spesa e alle entrate è di competenza delle autorità nazionali. La Commissione sorveglia la conformità agli obiettivi di bilancio stabiliti nel trattato e nel diritto derivato, in particolare il patto di stabilità e crescita.

La Commissione sorveglia inoltre la conformità alle raccomandazioni formulate dal Consiglio nel contesto del semestre europeo. Nel luglio 2013 il Consiglio ha tra l'altro raccomandato all'Italia di trasferire il carico fiscale dal lavoro e dal capitale ai consumi, ai beni immobili e all'ambiente assicurando la neutralità di bilancio.

La raccomandazione si è basata sulla valutazione che, mentre a breve e medio termine ridurre l'onere fiscale complessivo non è possibile a causa delle attuali ristrettezze di bilancio, il trasferimento del carico fiscale contribuirebbe a ridurre gli effetti distorsivi della tassazione, dato che le imposte sull'ambiente, sui beni immobili e sui consumi sono considerate meno dannose per la crescita. Questo approccio e le relative raccomandazioni sono stati approvati dal Consiglio, come indicato sopra.

La relazione della Commissione *Taxation Trends in the European Union* (edizione 2013, http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/gen_info/economic_analysis/tax_structures/2013/report.pdf) comprende i dati relativi alle imposte sull'inquinamento/risorse, tra cui imposte sulle emissioni misurate o stimate nell'aria e nell'acqua, gestione dei rifiuti solidi e dell'inquinamento acustico, nonché ogni altra imposta legata all'estrazione o all'uso di risorse naturali. In Italia nel 2011 questa categoria corrispondeva a meno dello 0,1 % delle entrate fiscali complessive, e rappresentava la 7ª quota più bassa tra gli Stati membri dell'UE e meno di 1/3 della media UE. Nel decennio precedente la quota è rimasta sostanzialmente stabile in Italia mentre è aumentata di 0,1 punti percentuali nell'UE.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011639/13**
**to the Commission**
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Introduction of the new 'Waste and Services' tax in Italy: businesses at risk

In Italy, Law No 2014 of 22 December 2011 introduced the waste and services tax (TARES), replacing the environmental hygiene tax (TIA) and the municipal solid waste disposal tax (TARSU).

According to the analysis performed by Rete Imprese Italia, the new tax will heavily impact the economic fabric of the country, especially the business and crafts sectors. Study data show that the tax has increased by 4.9% since March 2012, 22.1% over the period 2008-2013, and 56.6% over the last 10 years.

As this tax is currently structured, the largest increases will hit the crafts sector: pasta makers +93%, bakers +93.6%, pizzerias +301%, and pastry shops +181.7%.

Is the Commission aware of these facts?

Can it provide data on the increase of waste taxes in the euro area and the Member States over the past 10 years?

In light of the economic crisis affecting Italy and the fact that 4 218 companies were forced to close in Italy during the first quarter of 2013 — 13% more than the same period in 2012 — does the Commission believe that a tax of this kind is actually contrary to the objectives of increased employment and recovery from the crisis, as outlined in the Europe 2020 strategy?

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

Control over national expenditure and revenue decisions is the competence of national authorities. The Commission monitors compliance with the budgetary targets set out in the Treaty and secondary legislation, in particular the Stability and Growth Pact.

The Commission also monitors compliance with the recommendations issued by the Council in the context of the European semester. In July 2013 the Council recommended Italy — among others — to shift the tax burden from labour and capital to consumption, property and the environment in a budgetary neutral manner.

The recommendation was based on the assessment that, while in the short to medium term reducing the overall tax burden is not an option under the current budgetary constraints the tax shift would help reducing the distortionary effects of taxation, as taxes on the environment, property and consumption are considered to be less detrimental to growth. This approach and the recommendation were endorsed by the Council, as written above.

The Commission report 'Taxation Trends in the European Union' (2013 edition, http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/gen_info/economic_analysis/tax_structures/2013/report.pdf) includes data for pollution/resource taxes, including taxes on measured or estimated emissions to air and water, management of solid waste and noise, as well as any tax linked to extraction or use of a natural resource. In Italy, this category amounted to less than 0.1% of total taxation revenues in 2011, the 7th lowest shares among EU member states and less than 1/3 of the EU average. In Italy the share remained broadly stable over the previous 10 years while it increased by 0.1 pp in the EU as a whole.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011640/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(11 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Misure comunitarie di contrasto alle conseguenze dell'utilizzo dell'amianto

L'amianto (o asbesto) è un materiale molto utilizzato nel settore manifatturiero. Il suo impiego, tuttavia, è andato incontro a una serie di limitazioni normative, quantomeno nei paesi avanzati, dalla fine del XX secolo a causa delle gravi patologie che l'esposizione all'amianto può provocare. Il legame diretto tra le malattie correlate all'amianto e l'utilizzo di tale minerale è, però, stato scoperto con notevole ritardo, se si considera che il materiale era già adoperato nelle antiche civiltà romane e greche in virtù della sua abbondanza nel territorio e delle sue proprietà. L'amianto, infatti, annovera tra le sue caratteristiche una marcata resistenza alla corrosione, agli sforzi di trazione e all'usura, stabilità agli agenti chimici e fisici, isolamento sonoro e, in particolare, isolamento termico e resistenza al calore. Queste qualità hanno fatto sì che l'amianto sia stato molto utilizzato, soprattutto negli anni di boom economico successivi alla fine della seconda guerra mondiale, nella costruzione, ad esempio, di palestre, scuole, tubazioni, impianti di riscaldamento e condizionamento, abbigliamento ignifugo, autobus, treni, impianti frenanti.

Considerata la portata dell'utilizzo dell'amianto nei decenni passati nelle più disparate attività manifatturiere e che la popolazione di tutti i paesi può essere ritenuta potenzialmente esposta e, conseguentemente, suscettibile di contrarre patologie correlate all'amianto, tra cui il mesotelioma maligno, caratterizzato da un elevato periodo di latenza e un altissimo indice di mortalità,

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se ritiene opportuno predisporre un piano di intervento coordinato a livello dell'Unione per contrastare efficacemente le problematiche derivanti dall'utilizzo per lungo tempo dell'amianto?

2. Su quali fronti intende intervenire in priorità, giacché il problema dell'amianto ha ripercussioni sul piano sanitario, ambientale ed economico?

**Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione**
*(9 dicembre 2013)*

Sono stati effettuati soltanto pochi tentativi di quantificare l'incidenza globale del mesotelioma (provocato dall'amianto), principalmente a causa del fatto che si tratta di una tipologia di tumore relativamente rara e in molti paesi del mondo non riscontrata.

In conseguenza di ciò, il mesotelioma non è presente nella banca dati sull'incidenza del cancro e sulla mortalità mondiale pubblicata dall'Agenzia internazionale per la ricerca sul cancro (IARC). Tuttavia, secondo una stima del progetto RARECARE ([1]) (mirato alla sorveglianza dei tumori rari in Europa), che si avvale del sostegno del programma europeo per la salute, nell'Unione europea vi sarebbero ogni anno 8 009 nuovi casi di mesotelioma pleurico e pericardico e 7 912 decessi. La stima si basa su dati raccolti da RARECARE dai registri dei tumori relativamente a pazienti che hanno ricevuto la diagnosi fra il 1978 e il 2002; le informazioni sullo stato in vita sono aggiornate fino al dicembre 2003 ed oltre.

La Commissione ha inoltre lanciato, nel quadro del programma per la salute, l'iniziativa «Support to an information network on lung mesothelioma», volta a fornire sostegno a una rete di informazione sul mesotelioma polmonare. L'obiettivo è quello di sostenere la nascita di una rete di informazione incentrata sulle migliori pratiche per il trattamento del mesotelioma polmonare.

([1]) http://www.rarecare.eu/aims/aims.asp

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011640/13**
**to the Commission**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* EU measures to tackle the consequences of asbestos use

Asbestos is a commonly used material in manufacturing. However, since the late 20th century, a series of regulatory limitations has been put upon its use (at least in advanced countries) due to the serious illnesses that asbestos exposure can cause. The direct link between asbestos-related illness and the use of this mineral was only discovered rather recently, considering that it was used in ancient Rome and Greece because of its regional abundance and its properties. In fact, asbestos is strongly resistant to corrosion, tensile stress, and wear; it is chemically and physically stable, provides sound insulation and particularly thermal insulation, and is heat-resistant. These qualities led to the widespread use of asbestos in construction, especially during the post-World War II economic boom, for example in gyms, schools, piping, heating and air conditioning systems, fire retardant clothing, buses, trains and brake systems.

Given the widespread use of asbestos in many different manufacturing activities over the past decades, the populations of all countries can be considered to have been potentially exposed and consequently susceptible to contracting asbestos-related diseases, including malignant mesothelioma, which is characterised by a long latency period and a very high mortality rate.

Does the Commission consider it appropriate to prepare an action plan coordinated at EU level to effectively deal with problems arising from the long-term use of asbestos?

Since the asbestos problem has repercussions in the areas of health, the environment and the economy, what are the Commission's priority action areas?

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

Only few attempts have been made to quantify the global incidence of mesothelioma (caused by asbestos), mainly on the grounds that it is a comparatively rare cancer and is not reported in many countries worldwide.

Consequently, mesothelioma is not included in the cancer incidence and mortality worldwide database published by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). However the RARECARE (Surveillance of Rare Cancers in Europe) Project ([1]), supported by the EU Health Programme, has estimated that for the Mesothelioma of the pleura and pericardium, an estimated number of 8 009 new cases per year and an estimated of 7 912 deaths per year could be expected in the European Union. RARECARE gathered Cancer Registries data on patients diagnosed from 1978 up to 2002, with vital status information available up to December 2003 or later.

In addition, the Commission has launched, under the Health Programme, an action to provide 'Support to an information network on lung mesothelioma'. The aim is to support the creation of an information network focusing on best practices for treatment of lung mesothelioma.

([1]) http://www.rarecare.eu/aims/aims.asp

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011642/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)**
*(11 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Măsuri privind reducerea consumului de sare

Potrivit unei comunicări publicate în data de 26 Septembrie 2013 pe site-ul Direcției Generale Sănătate și Consumatori din cadrul Comisiei Europene, consumul zilnic de sare în statele europene variază între 8 g si 12 g pe zi, valoare care depășește cu mult pragul de 5 g pe zi recomandat de către Organizația Mondială a Sănătății.

Cercetările medicale în acest domeniu au demonstrat că un consum ridicat de sare pe termen lung crește riscul de infarct sau alte afecțiuni ale inimii, atac cerebral și de cancer la stomac și poate cauza afecțiuni cronice ale rinichilor.

În concluziile sale din 8 iunie 2010 privind „Acțiunile de reducere a aportului de sare în rândul populației în vederea îmbunătățirii stării de sănătate", Consiliul Uniunii Europene a invitat Comisia să continue abordarea sistematică de soluționare a consumului ridicat de sare la nivel european, prin punerea în aplicare a cadrului UE privind reducerea consumului de sare și să identifice în mod periodic, împreună cu statele membre, concentrațiile de sare cele mai scăzute care pot fi atinse în prezent la nivel european în diversele categorii și subcategorii de produse alimentare.

Având în vedere cele menționate mai sus, poate Comisia să ne informeze ce acțiuni a întreprins in acest domeniu în ultimele luni și care sunt măsurile pe care intenționează să le ia în viitorul apropiat?

**Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei**
*(26 noiembrie 2013)*

În urma mandatului din partea Consiliului ([1]), serviciile Comisiei au pregătit un raport ([2]) în care este prezentată o analiză a situației și a acțiunilor întreprinse în UE și în statele membre în 2012, pentru perioada începând de la mijlocul anului 2008 până la jumătatea anului 2012. Acest raport a fost publicat pe pagina de internet a DG Sănătate și Consumatori (SANCO) în decembrie 2012. Activitatea Grupului la nivel înalt pentru alimentație și activitate fizică (HLG) și a Platformei de acțiune a UE privind alimentația, activitatea fizică și sănătatea (Platforma) în ceea ce privește reducerea consumului de sare a continuat în 2013 și va continua în 2014. Acțiunile lor vor aborda, de asemenea, reducerea utilizării altor substanțe nutritive selectate, cu un accent special pe grăsimile saturate. De exemplu, reuniunea Platformei din data de 28 februarie 2013 s-a axat pe reformulare și a abordat problema reducerii aportului de sare. Tema reuniunii grupului la nivel înalt din 7 februarie 2013 a fost reformularea, inclusiv în ceea ce privește sarea, iar obiectivul acestui eveniment fiind grăsimile saturate.

Activitățile viitoare vor include un studiu realizat de Centrul Comun de Cercetare referitor la standardele privind alimentația din școli în statele membre, inclusiv în ceea ce privește cantitățile de sare. Rezultatele urmează a fi dezbătute în cadrul grupului la nivel înalt. Cu toate acestea, în prezent, ar fi prematur să se prevadă eventuale acțiuni.

([1]) La 8 iunie 2010, Consiliul Ocuparea Forței de Muncă, Politică Socială, Sănătate și Consumatori a adoptat concluzii cu privire la măsuri menite să reducă consumul de sare al populației, pentru o sănătate mai bună — JO (2010/C 305/04).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/salt_report1_en.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011642/13**
**to the Commission**
**Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Measures aimed at reducing salt consumption

According to a communication published on 26 September 2013 on the website of the Commission's Directorate-General Health and Consumers, daily salt consumption in European states varies between 8 g and 12 g a day, a figure far exceeding the 5 g daily limit recommended by the World Health Organisation.

Medical research conducted in this area has highlighted that high, long-term consumption of salt increases the risk of heart attacks or other heart disorders, as well as of strokes and stomach cancer, and can cause chronic kidney disorders.

In its conclusions of 8 June 2010 on 'Action to reduce population salt intake for better health', the Council called on the Commission to continue its systematic approach to tackling high salt consumption at European level by implementing the EU framework on salt reduction and to regularly identify with Member States the lowest salt levels currently being achieved at EU level in the different food categories and sub-categories.

In view of the above, can the Commission tell us what actions it has taken in this area in recent months and what measures it intends to take in the near future?

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

Following the mandate of the Council ([1]), the Commission services compiled a report ([2]) providing an analysis of the situation and actions taken in the EU and its Member States in 2012, covering the period from mid-2008 until mid-2012. This report was published on the webpages of DG Health and Consumers (SANCO) in December 2012. The work on salt reduction in the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity (HLG) as well as in the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health (Platform) continued in 2013 and will continue in 2014. The work will also address the reduction of other selected nutrients, with a special focus on saturated fat. For example, the Platform meeting on 28 February 2013 focused on reformulation and included issues of salt reduction. The topic of the HLG meeting on 7 February 2013 was reformulation, including salt, while the focus of this meeting was on saturated fat.

Future work will include a study carried out by the Joint Research Centre that will look into school meal standards in Member States, including standards in relation to salt levels. It is planned to discuss the findings in the HLG. However, it would be premature to predict any actions that may follow in the future at this point in time.

([1]) On 8 June 2010, the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council adopted conclusions on action to reduce population salt intake for better health, OJ (2010/C 305/04).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/salt_report1_en.pdf

*(Suomenkielinen versio)*

**Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-011643/13**
**komissiolle**
**Sari Essayah (PPE)**
*(11. lokakuuta 2013)*

*Aihe:* Latvian juutalaisten omaisuuden takaisinlunastus

Euroopan unioni pitää ihmisoikeuksia yleismaailmallisina ja jakamattomina. Se edistää ja puolustaa ihmisoikeuksia aktiivisesti sekä rajojensa sisällä että suhteissaan ulkopuolisiin maihin. Euroopan unionin perusoikeuskirjan 17 artiklassa säädetään omaisuusoikeudesta. Sen mukaan jokaisella on oikeus nauttia laillisesti hankkimastaan omaisuudesta sekä käyttää, luovuttaa ja testamentata sitä. Keneltäkään ei saa riistää hänen omaisuuttaan paitsi yleisen edun sitä vaatiessa laissa säädetyissä tapauksissa ja laissa säädettyjen ehtojen mukaisesti ja siten, että hänelle suoritetaan kohtuullisessa ajassa oikeudenmukainen korvaus omaisuuden menetyksestä. Omaisuuden käyttöä voidaan säännellä lailla siinä määrin kuin se on yleisen edun mukaan välttämätöntä. Samoin myös Euroopan ihmisoikeussopimuksen ensimmäisen lisäpöytäkirjan 1 artiklassa säädetään omaisuudensuojasta.

Neuvostoliitto valtasi Latvian kesäkuussa vuonna 1940. Myöhemmin Natsi-Saksan miehittämänä tapettiin vuosina 1941–1942 noin 80 000 Latvian juutalaista. Latvian saatua itsenäisyytensä takaisin vuonna 1991 yksilöillä, mukaan lukien juutalaisilla, oli oikeus lunastaa takaisin omaisuutta, joka heillä oli ollut ennen Neuvostoliiton valtaamista. Osa juutalaisyhteisölle kuuluvista omistusoikeuksista jäi tuolloin luovutusprosessin ulkopuolelle, eikä näitä omistusoikeuksia ole vieläkään palautettu tai korvattu. Latvian juutalaisneuvoston laskelmien mukaan yhteisöllä oli ollut omistusoikeus noin 270 kohteeseen ennen kuin Neuvostoliitto valtasi Latvian vuonna 1940. Omistusoikeuksien palauttaminen tai korvaaminen ei ole ratkennut Latvian valtion taholta eikä maassa ole säädettynä lakia pidätetyn omaisuuden edunpalautuksesta tilanteissa, joissa perijä ei ole tiedossa.

Minkälaisiin toimenpiteisiin komissio aikoo ryhtyä, että Euroopan unionin perusoikeuskirjan omaisuusoikeutta sekä Euroopan ihmisoikeussopimuksen omaisuudensuojaa kunnioittaen Latvian juutalaisyhteisölle palautetaan tai korvataan sille kuuluvat omistusoikeudet niihin kohteisiin, joiden omistusoikeudet se menetti Neuvostoliiton hyökättyä vuonna 1940?

**Viviane Redingin komission puolesta antama vastaus**
*(4. joulukuuta 2013)*

Euroopan unionin perussopimusten nojalla komissiolla ei ole yleisiä valtuuksia puuttua jäsenvaltioiden toimintaan. Komissio voi toimia vain, jos asia liittyy Euroopan unionin oikeuteen. Euroopan unionin perusoikeuskirjaa ei sovelleta kaikkiin tilanteisiin, joissa perusoikeuksia väitetään loukatun. Perusoikeuskirjaa sovelletaan sen 51 artiklan mukaan jäsenvaltioihin ainoastaan niiden soveltaessa unionin oikeutta. Lisäksi Euroopan unionista tehdyn sopimuksen 6 artiklan 1 kohdassa todetaan, että ”perusoikeuskirjan määräykset eivät millään tavoin laajenna perussopimuksissa määriteltyä unionin toimivaltaa”.

Arvoisan parlamentin jäsenen toimittamien tietojen perusteella ei vaikuta siltä, että kyseessä oleva jäsenvaltio olisi toiminut unionin lain soveltamisen aikana. Euroopan unionin toiminnasta tehdyn sopimuksen 345 artiklan mukaan perussopimuksen säännöksillä ei puututa jäsenvaltioiden omistusoikeusjärjestelmiin. Lisäksi ennen Euroopan unioniin liittymistä pakkolunastetun omaisuuden palauttaminen on kansalliseen toimivaltaan kuuluva asia.

Arvoisan parlamentin jäsenen esille nostamassa asiassa on siksi kyseisen jäsenvaltion vastuulla määrittää omaisuuden takaisinlunastuksen soveltamisala ja ehdot aikaisempien omistajien omistusoikeuksien palauttamiseksi kansallista ja kansainvälistä lakia sekä Euroopan ihmisoikeussopimusta noudattaen.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011643/13**
**to the Commission**
**Sari Essayah (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Restitution of property to Latvian Jews

The European Union regards human rights as universal and indivisible. It promotes and supports human rights actively both within its own borders and in its relations with third countries. Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union enshrines the right to private property. It states that 'Everyone has the right to own, use, dispose of and bequeath his or her lawfully acquired possessions. No one may be deprived of his or her possessions, except in the public interest and in the cases and under the conditions provided for by law, subject to fair compensation being paid in good time for their loss. The use of property may be regulated by law in so far as is necessary for the general interest'. In the same way Protocol No 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights governs the protection of property.

The Soviet Union occupied Latvia in June 1940. Later, in 1941-42, when the country was occupied by Nazi Germany, some 80 000 Latvian Jews were killed. When Latvia regained its independence in 1991 individuals, including Jews, had the right to redeem property which had been taken from them by the Soviet Union. At that time the property rights of some of the Jewish community were excluded from this relinquishment process, and these rights have still not been restored or any compensation paid. According to the calculations of the Council of the Jewish Communities of Latvia, the community had held ownership rights in some 270 properties before the Soviet occupation of Latvia in 1940. The return of, or compensation for, ownership rights has not been settled by the Latvian state and no law has been enacted in Latvia concerning the restitution of seized property in situations where the owner is unknown.

What measures does the Commission propose to take to ensure that, in compliance with the right to property under the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and with the European Convention on Human Rights, the ownership rights of the Latvian Jewish community are restored or compensated for in respect of properties to which it lost ownership rights following the Soviet invasion in 1940?

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

Under the Treaties on which the European Union is based, the Commission has no general powers to intervene. It can do so only if an issue of European Union law is involved. The Charter of Fundamental Rights does not apply to every situation of an alleged violation of fundamental rights. According to its Article 51, the Charter applies to Member States only when they are implementing European Union law. Moreover, Article 6(1) of the Treaty of the European Union states that 'the provisions of the Charter shall not extend in any way the competences of the Union as defined in the Treaties'.

On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, it does not appear that the Member State concerned did act in the course of implementation of Union law. According to Article 345 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the provisions of the Treaty shall in no way prejudice the rules in Member States governing the system of property ownership. Furthermore, restitution of properties expropriated prior to the accession to the European Union is a matter which falls in principle under national competence.

In the matter referred to by the Honourable Member, it is therefore for the Member State concerned to determine the scope of property restitution and the choice of the conditions to restore the property rights of former owners, in conformity with relevant national and international law, including the European Convention on Human Rights.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011645/13**
**à la Commission**
**Gaston Franco (PPE)**
*(11 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Lutte contre la revente spéculative et le marché noir des billets de spectacle

La revente spéculative de billets pour des manifestations sportives ou culturelles s'est développée ces dernières années avec l'apparition de nombreuses plateformes illicites de revente sur internet, qui proposent des billets contrefaits ou inexistants et vendent des billets nettement plus chers que leur prix d'origine ou dans une catégorie ne correspondant pas à celle commandée. Ces sites Internet de revente pratiquent l'assèchement des billetteries dès la mise sur le marché des billets de spectacle et en font un véritable commerce, portant ainsi préjudice aux spectateurs mais aussi aux artistes et aux producteurs de spectacles. C'est ce que l'on appelle «le second marché». À cela s'ajoute la revente à la sauvette devant les salles de concert. En France, les différentes condamnations de revendeurs et la mobilisation des artistes et producteurs ont abouti à la promulgation de la loi du 12 mars 2012, qui sanctionne la revente de billets sans autorisation de l'exploitant. Désormais, «le fait de vendre, d'offrir à la vente ou d'exposer en vue de la vente […] des titres d'accès à une manifestation sportive, culturelle ou commerciale ou à un spectacle vivant, de manière habituelle et afin d'en tirer un bénéfice, sans autorisation du producteur, de l'organisateur ou du propriétaire des droits d'exploitation» sera passible d'une amende de 15 000 euros, qui pourra être doublée en cas de récidive. En outre, en juillet 2012, une campagne de communication contre le marché noir des billets de spectacle a été lancée et diffusée dans les festivals à l'initiative du syndicat Prodiss (Union du spectacle musical et de variété). Plus récemment, en octobre 2013, le site www.levraibillet.fr a été créé pour permettre aux spectateurs de connaître le «vrai» prix d'un billet, mais également de prendre conscience des enjeux et des risques liés à l'existence d'un marché noir.

1. En France, le «second marché» représentait, en 2012, 60 millions d'euros annuels, selon les professionnels. La Commission a-t-elle estimé le montant de ce marché pour toute l'Union européenne?

2. La France a été le premier pays à adopter une telle législation au sein de l'Union européenne. La Commission compte-t-elle proposer une législation au niveau européen pour lutter contre le marché noir des billets de spectacle?

3. La Commission pourrait-elle envisager de lancer une campagne de communication européenne sur le «vrai» prix des billets?

**Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission**
*(9 janvier 2014)*

1. Même si elle est consciente du problème évoqué par l'Honorable Parlementaire, la Commission ne dispose pas encore, à ce stade, d'informations sur le volume potentiel du marché secondaire de la revente de billets de spectacle qui couvriraient l'ensemble de l'UE.

En juin 2010, 414 sites de vente de billets ont été contrôlés par les autorités nationales chargées de l'application de la législation dans le cadre d'une opération «EU sweeps» (enquête sur des marchés en ligne spécifiques coordonnée par la Commission sur la base du règlement (CE) no 2006/2004 et suivie par des actions des autorités nationales visant à assurer cette application). Les principaux problèmes relevés avaient été les clauses contractuelles déloyales et l'information incomplète ou trompeuse sur les prix ou les coordonnées de l'opérateur. Le 29 septembre 2011, la Commission a annoncé qu'après les actions de mise en application, 88 % des sites contrôlés aux fin de détection des infractions aux règles UE de protection des consommateurs étaient dorénavant conformes, contre seulement 40 % en juin 2010. Ce secteur avait notamment été ciblé en raison des nombreuses plaintes sur les pratiques de vente de billets à l'international reçues par le réseau des centres européens des consommateurs (réseau des CEC). Les informations et conseils qui ont été fournis aux consommateurs sur ces questions sont consultables en ligne ([1]).

2. La Commission n'envisage pas de présenter une proposition de législation de l'UE qui traiterait spécifiquement de la revente de billets.

Elle tient néanmoins à souligner que la législation de l'UE en vigueur impose déjà aux entreprises des obligations précises dans leurs relations commerciales avec les consommateurs. La directive 2005/29/CE ([2]) sur les pratiques commerciales déloyales, en particulier, prohibe les actions trompeuses qui contiendraient des informations fausses, sur le prix notamment.

3. Eu égard à la multiplicité des questions en jeu, la Commission n'envisage pas de lancer une campagne sur le «vrai» prix des billets.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/sweep/online_ticket_sales/index_fr.htm
([2]) JO L 149 du 11.6.2005.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011645/13**
**to the Commission**
**Gaston Franco (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Combating the speculative resale of and the black market in event tickets

The speculative resale of tickets for sporting or cultural events has taken off in recent years with the appearance of numerous illegal resale platforms on the Internet. These platforms offer counterfeit or non-existent tickets and sell them at a significantly marked-up price or in a category that does not match that which was ordered. These Internet resale sites empty the ticket offices as soon as the event tickets are placed on sale and do a roaring trade out of it, thus harming audiences and spectators as well as the performers and producers of the shows. It is what is known as 'the second market'. In addition to this, there is ticket touting outside concert venues. In France, various convictions of resellers and the mobilisation of performers and producers led to the passing of the law of 12 March 2012, which punishes the resale of tickets without the authorisation of the operator. From now on, the fact of selling, offering for sale or setting out to sell tickets affording access to a sporting, cultural or commercial event or a live show, on a regular basis and for economic benefit, without the authorisation of the producer, organiser or owner of the operating rights, shall be punishable by a fine of EUR 15 000, which may be doubled for a repeat offence. Moreover, in July 2012, a communications campaign against the selling of event tickets on the black market was launched and promoted at festivals by the trade union Prodiss (trade union for musical and variety shows). More recently, in October 2013, the website www.levraibillet.fr was created to enable spectators to find out the 'true' price of a ticket, but also to make them aware of the stakes and risks associated with the existence of a black market.

1. In France, the 'second market' was valued at EUR 60 million a year in 2012, according to the professionals. Has the Commission put a figure on the value of this market for the entire European Union?

2. France was the first country in the European Union to adopt such legislation. Is the Commission intending to propose legislation at EU level to combat the black market in event tickets?

3. Does the Commission plan to launch a European communications campaign on the 'true' price of tickets?

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

1. The Commission is aware of the issue raised by the Honourable Member. However, at this stage the Commission has no information as to the possible value of the secondary market in ticket resale for the whole EU.

In June 2010, 414 ticketing sites were checked by national enforcement authorities as part of an 'EU sweeps' (a screening of specific online markets coordinated by the Commission under the regulation 2006/2004/EC, followed by enforcement actions by national authorities). The main issues identified were unfair contract terms and conditions, missing or misleading price information and trader details. On 29 September 2011, the Commission announced that 88% of the websites checked for breach of EU consumer rules were in line after enforcement actions compared to only 40% in June 2010. This sector was chosen, notably because European Consumer Centers Network (ECC-Net) received numerous complaints on international ticketing practices. Information and tips were provided to consumers on the issues found and are available online ([1]).

2. The Commission does not intend to propose EU legislation specifically dealing with ticket resale.

However, the Commission would like to stress that existing EC law already provides for specific obligations for businesses in their commercial relations with consumers. Specifically, Directive 2005/29/EC ([2]) on unfair commercial practices prohibits misleading actions that may contain false information, including on the price.

3. Giving the number of issues at stake, the Commission is not planning to launch an EU-wide campaign on the 'true' price of tickets.

---

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/sweep/online_ticket_sales/index_en.htm
([2]) OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011647/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)**
*(11 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Actual situación del tercer sector social

Una de las principales recomendaciones para España fijadas por la Comisión dentro de la Estrategia Europa 2020 es el establecimiento de unas finanzas públicas sostenibles con la finalidad de frenar el aumento de la deuda pública. Sin embargo, una de las consecuencias de esta medida es la paralización o la demora del pago por parte de las administraciones públicas a organismos o entidades que suministran servicios básicos en nuestra sociedad, como es el tercer sector social. El estado de bienestar social es un derecho que debe de garantizarse sobre todo en aquellos sectores de la sociedad que corren el riesgo de verse gravemente vulnerados.

En el caso de Cataluña, los recortes presupuestarios derivados de la crisis afectan, en el tercer sector social, especialmente a las personas de la tercera edad que viven en residencias de ancianos. La reducción de personal contratado para atenderles y la falta de liquidez para atender a pagos hacen que el estado de bienestar peligre, sin olvidar que también afecta directamente a otros factores como el desempleo, la pobreza y la exclusión social (solo en Cataluña se atiende a más de 55 000 ancianos en residencias de la tercera edad y se generan 33 000 puestos de trabajo)

Teniendo en cuenta estas circunstancias,

1. ¿Qué medidas considera la Comisión que deberían llevarse a cabo para garantizar el estado de bienestar social, cuando, por otro lado, se exige que se adopten políticas tendentes a reducir el gasto público?

2. ¿No cree la Comisión que deberían promoverse e impulsarse determinados sectores como el comentado, para evitar situaciones de desempleo o exclusión social, que son a su vez objetivos de la Estrategia Europa 2020?

**Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión**
*(25 de noviembre de 2013)*

1. Mediante su conjunto de medidas de inversión social ([1]), la Comisión solicita a los Estados miembros que utilicen sus presupuestos sociales con mayor eficiencia y eficacia a fin de garantizar una protección social adecuada y sostenible. Preconiza paquetes integrados de prestaciones y servicios que puedan estimular la participación en la sociedad y en el mercado laboral, haciendo hincapié en que es mejor prevenir que curar, reduciendo así la necesidad de prestaciones. También invita a utilizar financiación nacional y de la UE para fomentar el acceso a servicios de calidad en salud, educación y vivienda, entre otros, aumentando el potencial de las nuevas oportunidades de empleo en esos sectores (incluida la asistencia a las personas de edad avanzada). A este respecto, el FSE puede ser una valiosa fuente de financiación para unir los imperativos de saneamiento presupuestario y la necesidad de liberar el crecimiento, crear empleo y mitigar el impacto social de la crisis. Por consiguiente, es importante hacer el mejor uso posible de los Fondos Estructurales.

2. Promover la inclusión social y luchar contra la pobreza son prioridades del recientemente adoptado Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento de 2014. La Recomendación del Consejo dirigida específicamente a España para 2013 ([2]) y, en particular, su punto 6, insta a España a adoptar y aplicar las medidas necesarias para reducir el número de personas en riesgo de pobreza o exclusión social reforzando las políticas activas dirigidas al mercado de trabajo, con el fin de aumentar la empleabilidad de las personas con menor acceso al mercado de trabajo y mejorando el objetivo, la eficiencia y la eficacia de las medidas de apoyo, incluidos servicios de ayuda de calidad a las familias.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/es/13/st10/st10656-re01.es13.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011647/13**
**to the Commission**
**Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Current status of the third social sector

One of the main recommendations for Spain set out by the Commission as part of the Europe 2020 strategy is the establishment of sustainable public finances in order to halt rising public debt. One of the consequences of this measure, however, is the freezing of or delay in payments from the Government to bodies or institutions that provide basic services in our society, such as the third social sector. The social welfare state is a right that must be guaranteed above all others in those sectors of society that are at risk of serious harm.

In the case of Catalonia, the budget cuts resulting from the crisis particularly affect senior citizens residing in care homes, in terms of the third social sector. The reduction in the numbers of staff hired to care for them and the lack of cash to make payments puts the welfare state in danger, not to mention that it also has a direct effect on other factors such as unemployment, poverty and social exclusion (in Catalonia alone over 55 000 elderly people are being looked after in care homes, generating 33 000 jobs).

1. What action is the Commission thinking of taking to safeguard the social welfare state when, on the other hand, it is being required to adopt policies to reduce public spending?

2. Does the Commission not think it should promote and encourage certain sectors such as the one mentioned above, to prevent unemployment and social exclusion, which are in turn objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy?

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

1. Through its Social Investment Package ([1]), the Commission is asking Member States to use their social budgets more efficiently and effectively to ensure adequate and sustainable social protection. It advocates for integrated packages of benefits and services that can help people to participate in society and the labour market, stressing prevention rather than cure, and thus reducing the need for benefits. It also invites to use both national and EU funding to support access to high quality health, education and housing services amongst others, bringing potential for new job opportunities in those sectors (including elderly care). To this respect, the ESF can be a useful source of financing to build the bridge between the urge for fiscal consolidation and the need to unblock growth, create jobs and mitigate the social impact of the crisis. It is therefore important to make the best possible use of Structural Funds.

2. Promoting social inclusion and tackling poverty is a priority in the recently adopted 2014 Annual Growth Survey. The Council Country Specific Recommendations to Spain for 2013 ([2]), and particularly Recommendation 6 already invites Spain to adopt and implement the necessary measures to reduce the number of people at risk of poverty and/or social exclusion, by reinforcing active labour market policies to improve employability of people further away from the labour market, and by improving the targeting and increasing efficiency and effectiveness of support measures, including quality family support services.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st10/st10656-re01.en13.pdf

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011651/13**
**à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)**
**Christine De Veyrac (PPE)**
*(11 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* VP/HR — Lynchage d'Européens à Madagascar

Ce jeudi 3 octobre à Madagascar, deux Européens soupçonnés de trafic d'organes ont été tués puis brûlés par une foule d'émeutiers sur l'île de Nosy Be. L'événement déclencheur de cette chasse à l'homme fut la disparation d'un enfant de 8 ans, retrouvé le lendemain mort sans sa langue ni ses organes génitaux. Les deux Européens soupçonnés d'être à l'origine de ce crime furent alors torturés, battus, puis brûlés par les émeutiers.

Suite à cet événement, le consulat de France à Madagascar a fortement déconseillé à ses ressortissants tout déplacement sur cette île.

De plus, il est rappelé aux ressortissants européens que la période électorale, qui sera marquée, le 25 octobre, par le premier tour des élections présidentielles et, le 20 décembre, par le second tour des élections présidentielles et les élections législatives, est susceptible d'avoir une incidence sur le niveau d'insécurité.

Il apparaît que les lynchages publics ne sont pas rares à Madagascar, où des voleurs présumés ou des conducteurs impliqués dans des accidents mortels ont récemment été brûlés vifs.

En conséquence, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante entend-elle condamner ces actes de barbarie perpétrés à Madagascar à l'encontre de ressortissants européens et a-t-elle l'intention d'entreprendre des démarches pour établir des mesures de prévention afin d'assurer la sécurité des expatriés européens en vue de la probable instabilité du pays à l'approche des élections présidentielles et législatives?

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

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a connaissance de l'événement tragique et profondément regrettable auquel se réfère l'Honorable Parlementaire.

Le chef de la délégation de l'UE à Madagascar a déploré la perte de vies humaines et s'est dit vivement préoccupé par de tels actes de violence. Le sujet a été largement évoqué lors d'une réunion qui s'est tenue avec le Premier ministre.

Les autorités malgaches ont réagi rapidement et elles ont déployé des forces de sécurité supplémentaires afin de rétablir l'ordre public, d'enquêter sur les circonstances des actes de violences et d'en arrêter les auteurs. Certaines personnes qui auraient participé à l'incident ont déjà été arrêtées.

La délégation de l'UE sur le terrain a suivi de près la situation et il est clair que cet événement n'a aucun lien avec le processus électoral en cours dans le pays. Il semble s'agir d'une éruption de violence extrême au cours de laquelle la population a décidé de se faire justice elle-même.

L'UE n'est pas compétente en ce qui concerne l'adoption de mesures préventives visant à assurer la sécurité des expatriés européens. Il appartient à chaque État membre de proposer et d'adopter, le cas échéant, des mesures concrètes pour leurs ressortissants résidant ou séjournant à Madagascar. Dans ce contexte, le consulat de France à Antananarivo a organisé, avec le soutien de la délégation de l'UE, une réunion avec les consuls des États membres à Madagascar afin d'échanger des informations et d'harmoniser toute réponse concernant la protection des citoyens européens dans le pays.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011651/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Christine De Veyrac (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Lynching of Europeans in Madagascar

On Thursday 3 October 2013, in Madagascar, two Europeans suspected of organ trafficking were killed and their bodies burnt by a crowd of rioters on the island of Nosy Be. What sparked this manhunt was the disappearance of an eight-year-old boy, found dead the following day, missing his tongue and genitals. The two Europeans suspected of being responsible for this crime were subsequently tortured, beaten and then burnt by the rioters.

Following the incident, the French consulate in Madagascar strongly advised its nationals not to travel to the island.

Furthermore, European nationals are reminded that the election season, which will begin on 25 October with the first round of presidential elections, follow by the second round of presidential elections and legislative elections on 20 December, is likely to adversely affect security levels.

It appears that public lynchings are not uncommon in Madagascar, where suspected thieves or drivers involved in fatal accidents have recently been burnt alive.

Consequently, will the High Representative condemn these barbaric acts perpetrated against European nationals in Madagascar? Furthermore, does she intend to take steps to establish preventative measures in order to ensure the safety of European expatriates in view of the likely instability in the country in the run up to the presidential and legislative elections?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President is aware of the tragic event the Honourable Member refers to, which is deeply regretful.

The EU's Head of Delegation in Madagascar has expressed regret for the loss of life and high concern about such violence and the issue was discussed at length during a meeting that was held with the Prime Minister.

The Malagasy authorities have reacted promptly and have deployed additional security forces to re-establish law and order, to investigate the circumstances and to arrest the perpetrators. Some presumed participants of the incident have already been arrested.

The EU Delegation on the ground has been following the situation closely and it is understood that this event has no connection with the ongoing electoral process in the country. It appears to be an eruption of extreme violence where local population has taken law into its own hands.

The EU has no responsibility in adopting preventive measures to ensure the safety of European expatriates. It is up to each Member State to recommend and adopt, if necessary, specific measures for their nationals living or visiting Madagascar. In this context, the French Consulate in Antananarivo has organised, with the support of the EU Delegation, a meeting with the Member States' consuls in Madagascar to exchange information and harmonise any response dealing with the protection of European citizens in the country.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011653/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**
*(11 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Comunicarea privind consolidarea dimensiunii sociale a uniunii economice și monetare

Comisia Europeană a lansat la data de 2 octombrie 2013 Comunicarea privind consolidarea dimensiunii sociale a uniunii economice și monetare (UEM).

Printre propunerile Comisiei se numără consolidarea monitorizării evoluției ocupării forței de muncă și a situației sociale ca parte a supravegherii macroeconomice, elaborarea unui tablou de bord cu principalii indicatori sociali și de ocupare a forței de muncă și consolidarea coordonării politicilor în aceste domenii, precum și o coordonare mai bună a politicilor sociale și privind ocuparea forței de muncă în cadrul semestrului european.

Însă Comisia propune și măsuri de natură structurală care să conducă la aprofundarea UEM, precum „instituirea unei autorități autonome pentru bugetul zonei euro, dotată cu capacitatea bugetară necesară pentru a sprijini statele membre în absorbirea șocurilor". Practic, o astfel de măsură ar institui un buget autonom al zonei euro în materie de politici cu caracter social (spre exemplu, în domeniul asigurărilor de șomaj).

Este de acord Comisia că o astfel de măsură ar certifica, pe fond, crearea unei Europe cu două viteze, lăsând, în practică, statele care nu au adoptat încă moneda euro fără o asemenea plasă de siguranță? Nu consideră Comisia că o astfel de măsură ar fi foarte dificil de pus în practică din cauza condițiilor economice eterogene din statele membre, dar și a faptului că sistemele de asigurări sociale din statele zonei euro sunt deosebit de variate, fiind fondate pe principii diferite?

**Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei**
*(3 decembrie 2013)*

Comunicarea Comisiei privind consolidarea dimensiunii sociale a Uniunii economice și monetare (UEM) ([1]) face referire la Proiectul pentru o UEM profundă și veritabilă ([2]) pentru detalierea aspectelor pe termen lung ale reformei UEM, care sunt deosebit de importante pentru dimensiunea socială a UEM. Acest proiect include o examinare a posibilității de a stabili, pe termen lung, un buget autonom al zonei euro care să confere zonei euro capacitatea bugetară de a sprijini statele membre să absoarbă șocurile. Un posibil instrument de stabilizare identificat în acest context a fost reprezentat de un sistem de asigurări de șomaj la nivelul UEM. Cu toate acestea, astfel de măsuri ar presupune, în orice caz, o modificare substanțială a tratatului, deoarece, în prezent, UE nu are competența de a le adopta.

Comisia nu consideră că un instrument de stabilizare la nivelul UEM, cum ar fi, de exemplu, un sistem de asigurări de șomaj pentru zona euro, ar crea în mod necesar o Europă cu două viteze, fie și numai pentru faptul că instrumentul respectiv ar putea fi proiectat astfel încât să fie deschis pentru viitoarele țări din zona euro.

Analiza tehnică preliminară realizată de serviciile Comisiei a arătat că punerea în aplicare a unui sistem de compensare a șomajului la nivelul UEM ar constitui o provocare, dar că ar putea exista soluții — bazate și pe experiența altor sisteme federale — pentru ca un sistem supranațional să devină compatibil cu sistemele naționale. O analiză mai detaliată în acest sens este, cu siguranță, necesară.

([1]) COM(2013) 690.
([2]) COM(2012) 777.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011653/13**
**to the Commission**
**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**
*(11 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Communication on the social dimension of the Economic and Monetary Union

On 2 October 2013, the Commission released the communication on the social dimension of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU).

The Commission's proposals include the following: improving the monitoring of employment trends and the social situation as part of macroeconomic supervision, creating a scoreboard of the key social and employment indicators and strengthening policy coordination in these areas, as well as improving the coordination of social and employment policies under the European Semester.

However, the Commission is also proposing structural measures resulting in deeper EMU, such as establishing 'an autonomous euro area budget providing the euro area with a fiscal capacity to support Member States absorb shocks'. In practical terms, such a measure would establish an autonomous euro area budget for policies of a social nature (for example, in the area of unemployment insurance).

Does the Commission agree that such a measure would essentially endorse the creation of a two-speed Europe, leaving, in practice, Member States which have not yet adopted the euro without this safety net? Does the Commission not think that it would be extremely difficult to implement such a measure, not only due to the varied economic conditions in Member States, but also to the fact that the social insurance systems operating in the euro area countries are particularly diverse, given that they are based on different principles?

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

The Commission's Communication on strengthening the social dimension of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) ([1]) refers to the Blueprint for a deep and genuine EMU ([2]) when elaborating on longer-term aspects of EMU reform that are particularly important for the EMU's social dimension. This includes a consideration of the longer-term possibility of an autonomous euro area budget providing the euro area with a fiscal capacity to support Member States to absorb shocks. One possible stabilisation tool identified in such a context has been an EMU-level unemployment insurance scheme. However, such measures would in any event require a substantial Treaty change, as the EU currently does not have the competence to adopt them.

The Commission does not consider that an EMU-wide automatic stabiliser like a euro area unemployment insurance scheme would necessarily create a two-speed Europe, if only because it could be designed to be open to future euro area countries.

Preliminary technical analysis of Commission services has shown that implementation of an EMU unemployment compensation scheme would be challenging but that there could be solutions — building also on lessons from other federal systems — to make a supranational system compatible with the national ones. Further analysis in this respect is certainly required.

([1]) COM(2013) 690.
([2]) COM(2012) 777.

*(българска версия)*

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-011654/13**
**до Комисията**
**Preslav Borissov (PPE)**
*(14 октомври 2013 г.)*

*Относно:* Ескалиращите проблеми, които срещат предприятията за автомобилен транспорт, извършващи превози между ЕС и Република Турция

В последните години компетентните контролни органи на Република Турция все по-често задържат български товарни автомобили на граничните пунктове, ограничавайки достъпа им до турския пазар на товарни превози. През 2009 г. турската страна едностранно въведе минимално времетраене на превозите по различните релации в Европа, извършвани от превозвачите от България, Чехия, Румъния, Македония и Молдова с ЕКМТ/CEMT разрешителни. Реално необходимото време за извършване на тези превози е по-кратко и превозвачите са принудени да чакат на турските гранични пунктове, за да изтече произволно определеното от турските власти време.

От 1 септември 2013 г. турското правителство въведе такса от 3000 евро при превози с „несъответстващи“ разрешителни. Всеки ден турските митнически органи задържат български товарни автомобили под претекст, че разрешителните им са „несъответстващи“. Определят се за „несъответстващи“ двустранни разрешителни при превози между товарен и разтоварен пункт съответно в Турция и България, като се изисква разрешително за превоз за/от трета страна или транзитно разрешително. Турските контролни органи не зачитат транспортните документи и определят вида на превоза въз основа на произхода, собствеността на стоката и други, посочени в търговската фактура или незасягащи превоза, документи. Тези безпрецедентни дискриминационни действия от страна на турските контролни органи са в нарушение на международните договорености и възприетите практики в автомобилния транспорт, възпрепятстват търговията между Турция и ЕС и водят до тежки загуби за автомобилните превозвачи от ЕС и особено от България, които са активни на този пазар.

1. Запозната ли е Комисията с гореизложената ситуация и следи ли развитието ѝ?

2. Изисквала ли е Комисията информация по този въпрос от Република Турция?

3. Каква информация е изискана от Република Турция и предоставена ли е тя?

4. Какви мерки възнамерява да предприеме Комисията за решаване на ескалиращите проблеми, които срещат автомобилните превозвачи при превозите между ЕС и Турция?

**Отговор, даден от г-н Калас от името на Комисията**
*(19 ноември 2013 г.)*

Правилното прилагане на разпоредбите на Европейската конференция на министрите на транспорта и на договореностите на Международния форум за транспорта (ITF) е отговорност на подписващите страни (държавите членки и трети държави). В очакване на евентуално бъдещо сключване на споразумения на ЕС в областта на автомобилния транспорт, настоящите отношения между държавите членки и трети държави в областта на международните автомобилни превози се уреждат чрез двустранни или многостранни споразумения между държавите членки и съответните трети държави.

Тъй като е вероятно мерките, взети от Турция, да доведат до смущения не само в транспорта, но и в търговията, Комисията ще потърси информация по този въпрос от турските власти, за да се гарантира, че разпоредбите на митническия съюз между ЕС и Турция са спазени.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011654/13**
**to the Commission**
**Preslav Borissov (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Escalating problems for road hauliers operating between the EU and Turkey

Over the past few years, the Turkish customs authority has been stopping Bulgarian lorries at border crossing points with increasing frequency, thus restricting their access to the Turkish road haulage market. In 2009, Turkey unilaterally introduced minimum journey times for various European routes served by hauliers from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Moldova operating with European Conference of Ministers of Transport (CEMT) permits. The actual times required for the journeys are shorter than the periods stipulated, and the hauliers are thus forced to wait at the border crossings into Turkey until the times arbitrarily set by the Turkish authorities have expired.

On 1 September 2013, the Turkish Government introduced a EUR 3 000 charge for hauliers whose transport permits were 'not in order'. The Turkish customs authority is stopping Bulgarian lorries on a daily basis on the pretext that the hauliers' permits are 'not in order'. The customs officers refuse to accept bilateral permits for carriage between loading and unloading points in Turkey and Bulgaria respectively, and ask for third-country or transit permits. The Turkish authorities do not recognise the hauliers' transportation documents, and they categorise the freight on the basis of the origin and ownership of the goods and other data included on the commercial invoice or in documents unrelated to the shipment. This unprecedented and discriminatory action by the Turkish authorities is in breach of international agreements and accepted practice in the road haulage sector, it impedes trade between Turkey and the EU and it is causing heavy losses for EU, and especially Bulgarian, hauliers operating in this market.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation and is it monitoring it?

2. Has the Commission requested information from Turkey about this matter?

3. What information has been requested from Turkey and has it been provided?

4. What measures does the Commission intend to take to resolve the escalating problems faced by road hauliers operating between the EU and Turkey?

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

The correct application of the provisions of the European Conference of Ministers of Transport and the International transport Forum (ITF) arrangements is the responsibility of the signatories (Member States and third countries). Pending the possible future conclusion of EU agreements covering the area of road transport, the current international road transport relations between Member States and third countries are governed by bilateral or multilateral agreements between the Member States and the third countries concerned.

As the measures taken by Turkey are susceptible of producing disruption not only to transport, but also to trade, the Commission will inquire on this issue with the Turkish authorities to ensure that the provisions of the Customs Union between the EU and Turkey are respected.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-011655/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**
*(14. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* US-Schulden-Blockade

Den USA geht das Geld aus. Am 17. Oktober wird die gesetzliche Höchstschwelle für die Staatsverschuldung erreicht. Einigen sich Demokraten und Republikaner nicht auf die Anhebung der Schuldenobergrenze, kann die Regierung nicht mehr alle Verbindlichkeiten erfüllen — und wird damit zumindest teilweise zahlungsunfähig. Dies kann wiederum weltweit zu wirtschaftlichen Schwierigkeiten führen. Die Schulden der USA belaufen sich mit 16 Billionen Dollar auf über 30 Mal so viel wie der Marktwert, den Lehman kurz vor der Pleite erreicht hatte. Und diese Pleite hatte immense weltweite Auswirkungen. Etwa die Hälfte der Schulden der USA wird von ausländischen Regierungen und Zentralbanken gehalten; denn bisher dato gelten US-Bonds als eine der sichersten Investitionen weltweit. Ein Zahlungsausfall würde diese Bestände und den Dollar als Weltwährung massiv infrage stellen.

Auch hätte die US-Regierung im Falle einer Pleite wohl nicht einmal das Geld, um die Banken in Folge der Turbulenzen an den Finanzmärkten zu stützen. Doch selbst wenn die US-Regierung es schafft, ihren Verpflichtungen nachzukommen und Staatsanleihen zu bedienen, kann es zu schweren Erschütterungen an den Finanzmärkten kommen. Sollte die Schuldengrenze nicht angehoben werden, wäre die US-Regierung gezwungen, massive Streichungen bei den Ausgaben vorzunehmen. Experten sprechen davon, dass die USA damit in eine tiefe Rezession stürzen würden — und als größter Konsument viele andere Volkswirtschaften mit herunterziehen.

In der Euro-Krise genügten den Rating-Agenturen oft deutlich kleinere Anlässe, um Länder herabzustufen. Obwohl mit jedem Tag des Haushaltsstreits die Gefahr steigt, dass die USA ihre Schulden nicht mehr bedienen können, bleiben die US-Rating-Agenturen erstaunlich gelassen. Dabei steigt die US-Staatsverschuldung durch die zusätzlichen Kosten der Krise weiter an.

1. Gibt es in der EU Notfallpläne für das bevorstehende Chaos, das selbst dann droht, wenn die USA kurzfristig doch noch eine Einigung erzielen können?

2. Wie reagiert die Kommission darauf, dass beispielsweise Frankreich bei einem Schuldenstand von knapp 90 % seitens der US-Ratingagenturen die Bestnote aberkannt wurde, die USA-Schuldenquote von gut 103 % indes nach wie vor Höchstnoten genießt?

**Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission**
*(15. November 2013)*

Am 16. Oktober 2013 hat der US-Kongress ein Gesetz verabschiedet, mit dem die Schuldengrenze angehoben und nach einem 16-tägigen Stillstand die Regierungsgeschäfte wieder aufgenommen wurden. Wichtige Entscheidungen zu beiden Themen sind nicht ergangen, sondern wurden nur vertagt: Die Schuldengrenze wurde bis zum 7. Februar 2014 ausgesetzt, und es wurde ein Übergangshaushalt bis zum 15. Januar 2014 beschlossen.

1. Seit Ausbruch der weltweiten Finanzkrise hat die EU ihre wirtschafts- und finanzpolitische Steuerung erheblich gestärkt und ist somit besser gegen externe wirtschaftliche und finanzielle Schocks gewappnet.

2. Die Kommission kommentiert keine individuellen Bewertungen durch Rating-Agenturen.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011655/13**
**to the Commission**
**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* US debt crisis

The USA is running out of money. On 17 October it will reach the maximum legal limit for national debt. If the Democrats and Republicans do not come to an agreement about raising the debt ceiling, the government will no longer be able to fulfil all its obligations — and will be at least partially insolvent. This could in turn lead to economic difficulties worldwide. At 16 trillion dollars, the USA's debt amounts to more than 30 times the market value of Lehman Brothers shortly before its collapse. And this collapse had enormous repercussions worldwide. Around half of US debt is owned by foreign governments and central banks, US bonds being considered to be one of the safest investments in the world today. A default would cast serious doubt on these stocks and the dollar as a global currency.

Furthermore, in the eventuality of a collapse, the US government would not even have enough money to support the banks following the financial market upheaval. But even if the US government manages to fulfil its obligations and service its bonds, it could lead to severe financial market shocks. If the debt ceiling is not raised, the US government will be forced to drastically cut spending. Experts say that the USA would plunge into a deep recession — and, as the largest consumer, would bring down many other countries' economies.

During the euro crisis, credit ratings agencies often downgraded countries for far slighter reasons. With every day of the budget dispute there is an increasing danger that USA may no longer be able to service its debt, and yet the US credit ratings agencies remain surprisingly calm. Meanwhile the US national debt is rising because of the additional costs of the crisis.

1. Does the EU have any contingency plans for the impending chaos which threatens even if the USA can once more reach another agreement in the short term?

2. What is Commission's reaction to the fact that France, for example, which has a national debt of barely 90% of GDP, was stripped of the top rating by US ratings agencies while the USA still enjoys the maximum rating with a debt ratio of more than 103%?

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

On 16 October 2013 the US Congress passed a bill raising the debt ceiling and reopening the federal government following a 16-day-long shutdown. Crucial decisions related to both issues were postponed rather than resolved: the debt limit was suspended until 7 February 2014, while the funding for the federal government was extended through 15 January 2014.

1. Since the global financial crisis, the EU has significantly strengthened its economic and financial governance. As a result, it is in a better position to withstand external economic and financial shocks.

2. The Commission does not comment individual rating decisions of rating agencies.

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-011656/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)**
*(14 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Mogelijk Russisch importverbod op Nederlandse tulpen en zuivelproducten

Tegen de achtergrond van de gespannen betrekkingen tussen Nederland en Rusland naar aanleiding van de arrestatie van Greenpeace-activisten die protesteerden tegen olieboringen in de poolcirkel, en een incident met een Russische diplomaat in Nederland, hebben Russische ambtenaren op 9 oktober 2013 gesuggereerd dat Rusland een verbod op de invoer van Nederlandse tulpen en zuivelproducten overweegt.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van Russische aankondigingen over een mogelijk importverbod op Nederlandse producten?

2. Wat is volgens de Commissie, gezien de geldende bilaterale akkoorden tussen de EU en Rusland en de verantwoordelijkheden van Rusland die voortvloeien uit de toetreding tot de WTO, de rechtsgrond voor een mogelijk invoerverbod op Nederlandse tulpen en zuivelproducten?

3. Wat vindt de Commissie van de bewering dat een mogelijk importverbod op Nederlandse producten in de huidige omstandigheden in wezen een politiek drukmiddel is ter bestraffing van een lidstaat?

4. Welke maatregelen zal de Commissie nemen om Nederlandse exporteurs te beschermen tegen de nadelige gevolgen van een mogelijk verbod op hun producten?

**Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie**
*(15 november 2013)*

De Commissie is op de hoogte van berichten in de media dat Rusland een invoerverbod op sommige Nederlandse producten zoals tulpen en zuivelproducten overweegt. Tot dusverre is echter geen informatie van de zijde van de Russische of de Nederlandse autoriteiten ontvangen.

Net als voor alle andere Russische handelsbeperkingen geldt ook hier dat, mocht Rusland maatregelen ten aanzien van de betrokken producten nemen, de Commissie de kwestie eerst bilateraal met Rusland zal opnemen. Als er geen oplossing wordt gevonden, zullen die maatregelen aan een verder grondig onderzoek worden onderworpen en zal de Commissie niet aarzelen de kwestie aan te kaarten bij de Wereldhandelsorganisatie.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011656/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Possible Russian import ban on Dutch tulips and dairy products

Against the background of strained relations between the Netherlands and Russia, sparked by the arrest of Greenpeace activists protesting against Arctic oil drilling and an incident with a Russian diplomat in the Netherlands, Russian officials hinted on 9 October 2013 that Russia may ban the import of Dutch tulips and dairy products.

1. Is the Commission aware of Russian announcements about a possible import ban on Dutch products?

2. In light of the bilateral agreements in force between the EU and Russia, and Russia's responsibilities stemming from its accession to the WTO, how would the Commission assess the legal basis for a possible import ban on Dutch tulips and dairy products?

3. How would the Commission assess the claim that, in the current circumstances, a possible import ban on Dutch products would, in essence, be a political pressure tool with which to punish a Member State?

4. What steps will the Commission take to protect Dutch exporters from the negative consequences of a possible ban on their products?

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

The Commission is aware of media reports that Russia was considering banning some Dutch products, such as tulips and dairy products. However, no information has so far been received from the Russian or the Dutch authorities.

Like with all the other Russian trade restrictive measures, should Russia take any measures against the products in question, the Commission will first raise the issue bilaterally with Russia. If no solution can be found, a further in-depth analysis will be conducted of any such measure and the Commission will not hesitate to raise the matter in the World Trade Organisation.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011657/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Presidential elections in the Maldives

The 2008 Maldivian Presidential Elections saw the end of Maumoon Gayoom's thirty-year presidency with the election of Moahmed Nasheed — a result that was hailed as a triumph of democracy at the time. Just four years later President Nasheed was removed from office by his Vice-President, Mohammed Waheed Hassan, in what has been widely described and accepted as a coup.

In response to the political turmoil, elections were held last month — elections which were declared by international observers, including the UN, to have been 'fair' and 'democratic'. Mohammed Nasheed of the Maldivian Democratic Party was a clear winner, with 45.5% of the vote. The main opposition candidate (and brother of former President Maumoon Gayoom), Abdullah Yameen, came second with 25.3%, closely followed by Gasim Ibrahim with 24.1%.

The necessity for a candidate to receive 50% of the popular vote prompted plans for a run-off between the two leading candidates — elections which constitutionally should have occurred by 28 September 2013. This process was derailed, however, by accusations from Gasim Ibrahim that there were voting irregularities, claims which the Supreme Court agreed to investigate.

It is alleged that these claims are false and are being used as a means to undermine the democratic process in the Maldives, with a view to establishing a more autocratic, controlleddemocracy, reminiscent of Gayoom's tenure. The claims have gained greater currency since the Supreme Court announcement of 7 October 2013 that the September elections are to be annulled, with new elections to be held on 20 October 2013. The possibility for elections to be held so soon has been questioned by many observers and commentators, sparking suggestions that the Maldives may once again lapse into turmoil, as previously happened in 2011/2012.

1. What action is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to take to ensure that the elections scheduled for 20 October 2013 are free and fair?

2. Will the VP/HR suspend, in total or in part, the financial aid provided by the EU to the Maldivian Government, in the event of that government failing to uphold proper and legitimate democratic processes?

3. What discussions has the VP/HR held with the Maldivian Government with regard to the current situation?

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

The HR/VP is following closely developments regarding the election process in the Maldives. She issued statements on 8 October and on 20 October in response to the Supreme Court's recent ruling to annul the first round of presidential elections (7 September) and the intervention of the police to halt the re-vote scheduled for 19 October:
http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2013/131008_04_en.pdf
http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2013/131020_02_en.pdf

The EU's assistance to the Maldives has already been reduced, and what remains (EUR 4 million) is targeted on the effects of climate change. As of 31 December the Maldives will, as an upper middle income country, no longer be eligible for trade preferences.

The HR/VP has not discussed the matter with the outgoing government. But the EU Delegation in Colombo, together with representatives of the Member States, is closely liaising with all stakeholders in the Maldives. The EU has also sent to Maldives a mission of two experts in electoral issues who have been following the elections since 13 August and preparing an independent assessment of the process.

The EU will consider what action should be taken in the event of any further delay of the new dates announced by the Elections Commission (9 November for a first round and 16 November for any second round) or if it is considered that the elections are not credible, transparent and inclusive.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011659/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**
*(14. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Weitergabe niedriger Strompreise an Privatkunden

Nachdem sie den Preisverfall an der Börse drei Jahre lang ausschließlich an Industriekunden weitergereicht hatten, haben die österreichischen Energiekonzerne Anfang Herbst endlich — auf massives Drängen der Regulierungsbehörde hin — auch einmal für die Privatkunden die Tarife minimal gesenkt. Dabei ist der Börsenpreis für Strom seit Mitte 2008 um über 40 % gefallen. Weil sich die Versorger zudem seit zwei Jahren weigern, ihre Kalkulationen offenzulegen, kann die E-Control die Gewinnmargen nur schätzen. Sie geht davon aus, dass die Energieunternehmen ihre Margen zuletzt auf bis zu 50 % verdoppeln konnten.

1. Wie ist die Situation EU-weit?

2. Wo konnten mit der Stromliberalisierung die meisten Fortschritte erzielt werden?

3. Wo gibt es noch Probleme?

4. Sind auf EU-Ebene in diesem Zusammenhang weitere Schritte geplant?

**Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission**
*(13. Dezember 2013)*

In mehreren Mitgliedstaaten war trotz der in den vergangenen Jahren sinkenden Großhandelspreise ein Anstieg der Endenergiekosten vieler Haushalte zu verzeichnen. Dies ist u. a. darauf zurückzuführen, dass die Stromrechnung privater Haushalte aus mehr als nur der Komponente Strom besteht, der auf dem Großhandelsmarkt gehandelt und dessen Preis durch den Wettbewerb auf dem Markt in Grenzen gehalten wird. Die Übertragungs- und Verteilernetzentgelte machen einen erheblichen Teil des Gesamtbetrags aus ebenso wie Steuern und Abgaben, die alle auf Ebene der Mitgliedstaaten festgesetzt werden. Die Kommission bereitet eine detaillierte Vergleichsanalyse der Energiepreise und ihrer treibenden Faktoren in der EU vor und kommt damit einer Forderung des Europäischen Rates nach. Der für Februar 2014 geplante Bericht wird Informationen über die Weitergabe von Großhandelspreisen an die Endkunden enthalten.

Die Kommission hat im November 2012 ([1]) die Defizite bei der Vollendung des EU-Energiebinnenmarktes aufgezeigt. Die Mitteilung der Kommission vom November 2012 wird von detaillierten Länderberichten über die Fortschritte bei der Integration und Liberalisierung des Energiemarkts in einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten flankiert und enthält auch einen umfassenden 22-Punkte-Aktionsplan mit weiteren Maßnahmen, die in der EU benötigt werden, um zu einem integrierten, vernetzten und wettbewerbsgeprägten Energiebinnenmarkt zu gelangen, der der Wirtschaft und den Verbrauchern in der EU zugute kommt.

([1]) Weitere umfassende Informationen zu den Maßnahmen sind dem Aktionsplan im Anhang der Mitteilung „Ein funktionierender Energiebinnenmarkt“, KOM(2012)663, zu entnehmen.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011659/13**
**to the Commission**
**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Passing on lower electricity prices to private customers

Having passed on the fall in prices on the stock exchange to industrial customers only for three years, at the beginning of the autumn Austrian energy companies finally — after a great deal of pressure from the regulatory authority — marginally reduced the tariffs for private customers, too. The stock exchange price for electricity has fallen by more than 40% since the middle of 2008. On account of the fact that suppliers have also been refusing to disclose their calculations for the last two years, E-Control can only estimate the profit margins. It believes that the energy companies could ultimately have doubled their margins to up to 50%.

1. What is the situation like throughout the EU?

2. Where has it been possible for most progress be made through the liberalisation of the electricity market?

3. Where are there still problems?

4. Are any further steps planned at EU level in this regard?

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

Increases in the final energy bill paid by many households notwithstanding the decrease in wholesale prices in the past years have been observed in a number of Member States. These are among others due to the fact that the household bill consists of more than just its energy component traded on the wholesale market and kept in check by the competition in the market. Transmission and distribution networks charges make up a substantial part of the total bill, as do taxes and levies, which are all determined at Member States level. The Commission is preparing a detailed comparative analysis of energy prices and their drivers in the EU in response to the request by the European Council. The report in preparation for February 2014 will include information on the pass-through of wholesale to retail prices.

The Commission identified in November 2012 ([1]) the shortcomings in the completion of the internal energy market in the EU. The November 2012 Commission document is accompanied by a set of detailed country reports showing the progress of energy market integration and liberalisation in individual Member States, and also includes a comprehensive 22-point action plan of further steps needed in the EU in order to achieve an integrated, interconnected and competitive internal market benefitting EU economy and consumers.

([1]) For more comprehensive information of the measures: See Action plan annexed to the communication on Making the internal energy market work, COM(2012) 663.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011660/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)**
*(14 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Το δημόσιο χρέος μετά το τέλος του Μνημονίου

Σύμφωνα με την έκθεση «Το δημόσιο χρέος μετά το τέλος του Μνημονίου» του Γραφείου Προϋπολογισμού του Κράτους ([1]) που έχει συσταθεί στην Ελληνική Βουλή, η οποία δόθηκε στη δημοσιότητα στις 9 Οκτωβρίου, μία μέρα πριν από την έναρξη της συζήτησης επί του Σχεδίου του Προϋπολογισμού 2014 στην αρμόδια Επιτροπή Οικονομικών Υποθέσεων:

— Μια νέα δανειακή σύμβαση για το κλείσιμο του δημοσιονομικού κενού δίνει μόνο προσωρινή λύση για ένα ή δύο χρόνια.

— Το χρέος δεν πρόκειται να τεθεί σε τροχιά μείωσης και να γίνει βιώσιμο έως το 2022 αποκλειστικά με εθνικές προσπάθειες αποταμίευσης.

— Είναι ψευδαίσθηση να αναμένουμε ότι η χώρα θα επιστρέψει στις αγορές μετά το 2014 για να καλύψει με λογικούς όρους τις ανάγκες αναχρηματοδότησης του χρέους, συν τυχόν έκτακτες ανάγκες. Η αριθμητική του χρέους είναι εναντίον μας.

Με δεδομένο ότι όπως διαπιστώνει η προαναφερθείσα έκθεση αλλά και άλλες εκθέσεις ειδικών, «η χώρα είναι σε χειρότερη θέση να αντιμετωπίσει το πρόβλημα του δημοσίου χρέους της, αφού έχει καταρρεύσει η παραγωγική της βάση» και αφού αυξάνεται για άλλη μια χρονιά η αδυναμία των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων αλλά και των πολιτών να ανταποκριθούν στην βαριά φορολογία αλλά και στην πληρωμή των ασφαλιστικών εισφορών που οδηγεί σε αύξηση των ελλειμμάτων των ασφαλιστικών ταμείων πάνω από 1,5 δις ευρώ. Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς απαντάει στην έκθεση του Γραφείου Προϋπολογισμού του Κράτους που διαπιστώνει επί της ουσίας ότι η ακολουθούμενη πολιτική δεν οδηγεί σε αντιμετώπιση των δημοσιονομικών προβλημάτων και θεωρεί ότι δεν θα επιτευχθεί μόνο με ελληνικές προσπάθειες η βιωσιμότητα του ελληνικού χρέους μέχρι το 2022;

2. Σκοπεύει να συζητήσει με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση, τους επαγγελματικούς και κοινωνικούς φορείς ένα ολοκληρωμένο εναλλακτικό σχέδιο για την ανασυγκρότηση της παραγωγικής βάσης της χώρας και τη δημιουργία βιώσιμων θέσεων απασχόλησης, που θα χρηματοδοτηθεί με επιπλέον πόρους την περίοδο 2014-2020, αφού οι πόροι από τα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά και επενδυτικά ταμεία, αν και σημαντικοί, δεν προβλέπεται να βγάλουν τη χώρα από τη βαθιά κρίση;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(4 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

1. Ο ελληνικός δείκτης του χρέους προς το ΑΕΠ προβλέπεται να ακολουθήσει και πάλι πτωτική τροχιά το 2014 και να μειωθεί σε επίπεδα χαμηλότερα του 120% το 2021, με την παραδοχή ότι το πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής εξακολουθεί να υλοποιείται στο ακέραιο. Για λεπτομερή ανάλυση της δημοσιονομικής κατάστασης της Ελλάδας και ανάλυση της βιωσιμότητας του χρέους της, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στην έκθεση συμμόρφωσης ([2]) η οποία δημοσιεύτηκε μετά το πέρας της προηγούμενης επανεξέτασης.

2. Ο στόχος των διαρθρωτικών μεταρρυθμίσεων που υλοποιούνται στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος είναι ακριβώς να δημιουργηθεί η βάση για βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη, καθώς και νέες θέσεις απασχόλησης στην Ελλάδα. Η χώρα αναμένεται να λάβει σημαντική χρηματοδότηση από τα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά και επενδυτικά ταμεία την επόμενη περίοδο προγραμματισμού, η οποία, εφόσον επενδυθεί σωστά, θα συμβάλει σημαντικά στην επίτευξη ευημερίας στο μέλλον για την Ελλάδα.

Οι πόροι που χορηγούνται στην Ελλάδα από τα διαρθρωτικά και επενδυτικά ταμεία για την περίοδο 2014-2020 πρέπει να διοχετευτούν σε μικρό αριθμό επενδυτικών προτεραιοτήτων ώστε να μεγιστοποιηθούν τα αποτελέσματά τους στην έξυπνη και βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη και τη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας. Έχουν καθοριστεί ορισμένες προϋποθέσεις ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί η αποτελεσματική και αποδοτική αξιοποίηση των εν λόγω πόρων. Μία εξ αυτών είναι η ενεργός συμμετοχή όλων των σχετικών φορέων στη χάραξη της αναπτυξιακής πολιτικής της χώρας.

([1]) http://www.naftemporiki.gr/cmsutils/downloadpdf.aspx?id=713049
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_/publications/occasional_paper/2013/pdf/ocp159_el.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011660/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Public debt after the Memorandum

According to the report by the Hellenic Parliament State Budget Office entitled 'Public debt after the Memorandum' ([1]) published on 9 October, one day before the start of the debate on the 2014 draft budget in the Committee on Economic Affairs:

— A new loan agreement to plug the fiscal gap will only provide a temporary solution, for one or two years.

— The debt is unlikely to decline and become sustainable by 2022 solely as a result of national efforts to make cutbacks.

— It is unrealistic to expect that the country will be able to return to the markets after 2014 in order to meet its debt refinancing requirements plus any emergency requirements on reasonable terms. The figures for this debt do not add up.

According to the aforementioned report and other specialist reports, the country is now in a worse position in terms of addressing the problem of its public debt, as its productive base has collapsed, and, once again, small and medium-sized enterprises and private individuals are unable to service their heavy tax liability and pay their social security contributions, as a result of which the social security funds have a deficit of over EUR 1.5 billion. In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What is its response to the report by the State Budget Office, which basically concludes that the policy being applied is not addressing the fiscal problems and considers that the public debt will not become sustainable by 2022 through national efforts alone?

2. Does it intend to discuss with the Greek Government and professional and social agencies an alternative plan to restructure the country's productive base and create sustainable jobs financed with additional resources between 2014 and 2020, as resources from the European structural and investment funds, although considerable, are not expected to get the country out of its deep recession?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**
*(4 December 2013)*

1. The Greek debt-to-GDP ratio is forecast to resume a declining path in 2014 and should become lower than 120% by 2021, assuming that the economic adjustment programme continues to be fully implemented. For a detailed analysis of Greece's fiscal situation and debt sustainability analysis the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the compliance report ([2]) published at the end of the previous review.

2. The objective of the structural reforms which are being implemented under the programme is precisely to create the basis for sustainable growth and employment creation in Greece. The country is set to receive substantial funding from European structural and investment funds in the upcoming programming period which, if adequately invested, will strongly contribute to a prosperous future for Greece.

The allocations of the Structural and Investment funds for Greece for the 2014-2020 period should be focused on few investment priorities in order to maximise their impact for smart and sustainable growth and jobs. Some preconditions are set to ensure such effective and efficient implementation of these resources. Active involvement of all relevant stakeholders in designing the growth policy for the country is one of these preconditions.

([1]) http://www.naftemporiki.gr/cmsutils/downloadpdf.aspx?id=713049
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/pdf/ocp159_en.pdf

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011661/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)**
*(14 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Απορρόφηση του Προγράμματος Διανομής Τροφίμων σε Απόρους

Το πρόγραμμα διανομής τροφίμων στους απόρους (ΠΔΤΑ) ([1]) αποτελεί, από το 1987, σημαντική πηγή εφοδίων για οργανώσεις που εργάζονται σε άμεση επαφή με τα αναξιοπαθούντα μέλη της κοινωνίας, παρέχοντάς τους τρόφιμα. Σήμερα διανέμει περίπου 500 000 τόνους τροφίμων ετησίως για τους απόρους. Δημιουργήθηκε με σκοπό την επωφελή χρησιμοποίηση των τότε γεωργικών αποθεμάτων. Λόγω της αναμενόμενης εξάντλησης και του υψηλού βαθμού αβεβαιότητας των αποθεμάτων παρέμβασης την περίοδο 2011-2020, ως αποτέλεσμα των αλλεπάλληλων μεταρρυθμίσεων της Κοινής Γεωργικής Πολιτικής, το ΠΔΤΑ θα διακοπεί στο τέλος του 2013. Το Ταμείο Ευρωπαϊκής Βοήθειας προς τους Απόρους θα αντικαταστήσει και θα βελτιώσει το ΠΔΤΑ. Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Πόσους πόρους του ΠΔΤΑ αξιοποίησαν τα έτη 2009, 2010, 2011 και 2012 κάθε ένα από τα κράτη μέλη;

2. Πόσοι πολίτες επωφελήθηκαν από τη βοήθεια του ΠΔΤΑ σε κάθε ένα από τα κράτη μέλη αντιστοίχως τις χρονιές αυτές;

3. Υπήρξε ιδιαίτερη μέριμνα για τα κράτη μέλη που βιώνουν πιο έντονα τη δημοσιοοικονομική κρίση (π.χ. Ελλάδα, Πορτογαλία και Ισπανία); Αυτά τα κράτη μέλη αξιοποίησαν στο μέγιστο βαθμό τα διαθέσιμα κονδύλια του ΠΔΤΑ;

4. Ποιες είναι οι κυριότερες αιτίες για την δυσκολία ορισμένων κρατών μελών να αξιοποιήσουν πλήρως τους διαθέσιμους πόρους παρά την αύξηση της φτώχειας και τις ανάγκες των πολιτών σε αρκετά κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ;

**Απάντηση του κ. Cioloş εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(25 Νοεμβρίου 2013)*

Η Επιτροπή θα αποστείλει στον κ. βουλευτή και στη γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου τα απαιτούμενα στοιχεία για την αξιοποίηση των πόρων, καθώς και τον αριθμό των δικαιούχων του προγράμματος για τους απόρους της ΕΕ.

Η κατανομή των διαθέσιμων πόρων μεταξύ των δικαιούχων κρατών μελών βασίζεται σε αντικειμενικά κριτήρια, δηλαδή στον αριθμό των πολιτών της ΕΕ που ζουν κάτω από το όριο της φτώχειας και στο κατά κεφαλήν ΑΕΕ μετά τις κοινωνικές μεταβιβάσεις, σύμφωνα με τα τελευταία στατιστικά δεδομένα που έχει δημοσιεύσει η Eurostat. Ως εκ τούτου, τα κράτη μέλη που πλήττονται εντονότερα από την οικονομική κρίση λαμβάνουν μεγαλύτερα μερίδια από τους διαθέσιμους πόρους, κατ' αναλογία προς την επιδείνωση, σε σύγκριση με τα υπόλοιπα δικαιούχα κράτη μέλη.

Οι δυσχέρειες αξιοποίησης των διαθέσιμων πόρων είναι πολύ σπάνιες και, κατά τα περισσότερα έτη, το ποσοστό απορρόφησης των πόρων αυτών σε ενωσιακό επίπεδο προσέγγιζε το 100%. Αναφέρθηκαν ορισμένες δυσχέρειες, όταν ορισμένα κράτη μέλη δεν κατόρθωσαν να ολοκληρώσουν ορισμένες διαδικασίες σύναψης δημοσίων συμβάσεων εντός των 11-12 περίπου μηνών που προβλέπονται για τον σκοπό αυτό. Έχει συμβεί επίσης, τα δικαιούχα κράτη μέλη να έχουν υπερεκτιμήσει τις ικανότητες διανομής των τοπικών φιλανθρωπικών οργανώσεων και, κατά τη διάρκεια της υλοποίησης του εθνικού προγράμματος, οι απροσδόκητα περιορισμένες ικανότητες τα εμπόδισαν να αξιοποιήσουν όλους τους διαθέσιμους πόρους.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/most-deprived-persons/index_en.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011661/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Take-up of food distribution programme for deprived persons

Since 1987, the food distribution programme for the most deprived persons ([1]) has been an important source of provisions for organisations working in direct contact with and distributing food to the least fortunate people of society. Today it distributes approximately 500 000 tonnes of food a year to deprived persons. It was set up with the aim of making good use of the agricultural stocks that existed at the time. As these are expected to run out and, as a result of successive reforms of the common agricultural policy, there is a great deal of uncertainty surrounding intervention stocks for 2011 to 2020, the food distribution programme will be cut at the end of 2013. The Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived will replace it and will improve the food distribution programme. In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What food distribution programme resources were taken up in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 by each of the Member States?

2. How many citizens benefitted from the food distribution programme in each of the Member States in each of those years?

3. Was particular attention paid to Member States experiencing the worst of the financial crisis (such as Greece, Portugal and Spain)? Did those Member States take up most of the programme's available resources?

4. What were the main reasons why certain Member States had difficulty taking up all the available resources, despite the increase in poverty and the needs of the citizens in numerous EU Member States?

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

The Commission will send the Honourable Member and the Parliament secretariat the requested details on the use of resources as well as the number of beneficiaries of the Most Deprived Programme of the EU.

The allocation of the available resources between the beneficiary Member States is based upon objective criteria, i.e. the number of EU citizens living below poverty threshold and the GNI per capita after social transfers, according to the latest Member State statistics published by Eurostat. Therefore, Member States experiencing the worst of the economic crisis receive higher shares from the available resources, in proportion to the deterioration compared to the other beneficiary Member States.

Difficulties to use the available resources are very rare, in most years the take up ratio was near to 100% at EU level. Some difficulties were reported, where Member States failed to close some of their public procurement tenders within the approximatelly 11-12 months available for this purpose. It also happened that the distribution capacities of local charitable organisations were overestimated by the beneficiary Member States and, during the implementation of the national programme, the unexpectedly scarce capacities prevented them to use all allocated resources.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/most-deprived-persons/index_en.htm

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011662/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Carmen Romero López (S&D)**
*(14 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Fondos de Cohesión

España quiso establecer en el Programa Operativo del Fondo de Cohesión 2007-2013 una red ferroviaria de altas prestaciones, conforme con la Directiva 96/48/CE relativa a la interoperabilidad del sistema ferroviario transeuropeo de alta velocidad, traspuesta a la normativa nacional por el Real Decreto 1191/2000. La Comisión fijó sus prioridades en las actuaciones en materia de transporte y en las ayudas destinadas a las redes transeuropeas de transporte (RTE-T), en particular los proyectos prioritarios de interés europeo. En este contexto las metas estratégicas del Marco Estratégico Nacional de Referencia de España 2007-2013 (MENR) fijaron intervenciones en alta velocidad ferroviaria con diversas actuaciones. Asimismo, el 7 de diciembre de 2007 la Comisión aprobó un Programa Operativo del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER) con arreglo al objetivo de convergencia en las comunidades autónomas de Andalucía, Castilla-La Mancha, Extremadura y Galicia, y al amparo del Fondo de Cohesión, en todo el territorio español.

Estando muy cercano (31de diciembre de 2013) el final del periodo acordado para la completa planificación de los grandes proyectos de alta velocidad ferroviaria aprobados y siendo obligatoria la finalización de su construcción al 31 de diciembre de 2015 y su puesta en funcionamiento en marzo de 2017, resulta de gran interés conocer el grado de ejecución de los grandes proyectos presentados por España y los fondos económicos utilizados, así como los proyectos que, por no cumplir los plazos acordados en la reglamentación correspondiente, deben replantearse o han supuesto la pérdida de las ayudas comunitarias acordadas.

¿En qué estado de planificación, de ejecución y de cumplimiento financiero se encuentran todos y cada uno de los grandes proyectos de alta velocidad ferroviaria que se presentaron por España y cuya inclusión en el Marco Comunitario de Apoyo 2007-2013 acordó la Unión Europea? ¿Cuáles de ellos se encuentran en riesgo evidente de incumplimiento de los plazos acordados en la normativa europea?

**Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión**
*(13 de diciembre de 2013)*

El sector del transporte es destinatario de aproximadamente la mitad de las ayudas aprobadas para España con cargo al Fondo de Cohesión. A fin de mejorar el equilibrio entre los diferentes modos de transporte, cerca de tres cuartas partes del presupuesto asignado al transporte se ha destinado a los proyectos del sector ferroviario, en consonancia con las directrices sobre redes transeuropeas de transporte de la Comisión. La ejecución de los proyectos ferroviarios, según la información enviada a la Comisión por las autoridades españolas, se adjunta en anexo.

El Estado miembro puede certificar los gastos relativos a estos proyectos antes de su aprobación. Si tales proyectos no se aprobaran, debería retirarse la certificación de los gastos.

De cualquier forma, los gastos para el período 2007-2013 son subvencionables hasta el 31 de diciembre de 2015.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011662/13**
**to the Commission**
**Carmen Romero López (S&D)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Cohesion Funds

As part of the operational programme of the Cohesion Fund 2007-2013, Spain wished to create a high-capacity rail network, in accordance with Directive 96/48/EC on the interoperability of the trans-European high-speed rail system, transposed into national law by Royal Decree No 1191/2000. The Commission established its priorities for action regarding transport and aid for the trans-European transport networks (TEN-T), and in particular the priority projects in terms of European interest. Against this background, the strategic goals of Spain's National Strategic Reference Framework 2007-2013 (NSRF) set out various actions for high-speed rail interventions. On 7 December 2007, the Commission also approved an operational programme of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in accordance with the convergence objective in the autonomous communities of Andalusia, Castile-La Mancha, Extremadura and Galicia, and under the Cohesion Fund for the entire territory of Spain.

Being very close to the end of the agreed period for finalising the complete plan for approved major high-speed rail projects, 31 December 2013, and with its construction having to be completed by 31 December 2015 and the service put into operation in March 2017, it is very important to find out what stage has been reached in the implementation of the major projects submitted by Spain and the funds used, as well as which projects, having failed to meet the deadlines agreed in the corresponding regulation, have to be reconsidered or have lost the Community aid agreed.

What is the state play with regard to the planning, implementation and financial compliance of each and every one of the high-speed rail major projects that were submitted by Spain and whose inclusion in the Community support framework 2007-2013 was agreed by the European Union? Which of these are blatantly at risk of failing to meet the deadlines agreed in European regulations?

*(Version française)*

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

Le secteur des transports constitue environ la moitié du total de l'aide approuvée du Fonds de Cohésion pour l'Espagne. Afin d'améliorer l'équilibre modal, près de ¾ du budget consacré aux transports a été destiné aux projets du secteur ferroviaire, en ligne avec les orientations en matière de réseaux transeuropéens de transport de la Commission. D'après les informations transmises à la Commission par les autorités espagnoles l'exécution des projets ferroviaires est jointe en annexe.

L'État membre peut certifier des dépenses relatives à ces projets avant leur approbation. Au cas où ces projets ne seraient pas approuvés, la certification de dépenses devra être retirée.

En tout état de cause, les dépenses, pour la période 2007-2013, sont éligibles jusqu'au 31 décembre 2015.

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011663/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Carmen Romero López (S&D)**
*(14 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* AVE Antequera-Granada

La Comisión Europea, por decisión de 24.3.2011, aprobó el gran proyecto «Línea de Alta Velocidad Antequera-Granada. Plataforma. Fase I», que forma parte, en el marco del objetivo de convergencia, del programa operativo de intervención estructural del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional para las comunidades autónomas de Andalucía, Castilla la Mancha, Extremadura y Galicia, y del Fondo de Cohesión en todo el territorio, en España.

La Comisión, según respuesta E-005706/2013 del Comisario Hahn, no ha recibido la solicitud de ayuda para la fase II del gran proyecto Antequera-Granada, aunque ya se ha certificado el 42 % de los gastos totales. El periodo de programación finaliza el 31 de diciembre de 2013 y es sabido que si la Comisión determina que el proyecto no es subvencionable, habría que retirar la certificación a dichos gastos.

Esta respuesta del Comisario de Política Regional sobre la situación de la fase II de este gran proyecto Antequera-Granada nos alarma sobremanera por la cercanía del plazo tope para presentar la planificación y por haber dado a conocer el Ministerio de Fomento del Gobierno de España su intención de cambiar esencialmente las características del trazado y la plataforma de esta línea de alta velocidad a su paso por Loja (Granada) en un tramo de 18 km y a su llegada a la ciudad de Granada, donde estaba previsto el soterramiento y la llegada a la ciudad en los terrenos de la actual estación de ferrocarriles.

¿Ha remitido España la planificación de la Fase II del Gran Proyecto de alta velocidad Antequera-Granada a la Comisión Europea para poderse acoger a la cofinanciación prevista en el Marco Comunitario de Apoyo 2007-2013?

**Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión**
*(10 de diciembre de 2013)*

La Comisión no ha recibido aún ninguna solicitud de ayuda relativa a la fase II de ese gran proyecto.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011663/13**
**to the Commission**
**Carmen Romero López (S&D)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* AVE Antequera-Granada High-Speed Line

The Commission, by means of a decision of 24 March 2011, approved the major project 'Antequera-Granada High-Speed Line. Platform. Phase I', which, within the framework of the convergence objective, forms part of the operational programme for structural intervention of the European Regional Development Fund for the autonomous communities of Andalusia, Castile-La Mancha, Extremadura and Galicia, and of the Cohesion Fund for the entire territory of Spain.

According to Commissioner Hahn's answer to Question E-005706/2013, the Commission has not received the aid application for phase II of the Antequera-Granada major project, even though 42% of the total expenditure has already been certified. The programming period ends on 31 December 2013 and it is understood that if the Commission decides that the project cannot be subsidised, the certification for this expenditure would have to be withdrawn.

This answer from the European Commissioner for Regional Policy regarding the status of phase II of the Antequera-Granada major project is exceedingly alarming given how close the deadline is for submitting the plans and considering that the Spanish Ministry of Development has announced its intention to make significant changes to this high-speed line's route and platform over an 18 km stretch passing through Loja (Granada) and to its terminus in the city of Granada, where underground works and the route's arrival into the site of the current railway station were planned.

Has Spain submitted the plans for Phase II of the Antequera-Granada high-speed line major project to the European Commission, so that it can receive the co-financing provided for in the Community support framework 2007-2013?

*(Version française)*

**Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission**
*(10 décembre 2013)*

La Commission n'a toujours pas reçu de demande d'aide concernant la phase II de ce grand projet.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011664/13**
**to the Commission**
**David Martin (S&D)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Tar sands and the Fuel Quality Directive

Can the Commission advise me as to the present situation regarding the greenhouse gas emission value of tar sands in relation to the Fuel Quality Directive?

**Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission**
*(22 November 2013)*

The Commission has established, during the course of its consultation process, an average life cycle greenhouse gas intensity of oil sands in the context of Article 7a of Directive 98/70/EC. This value is based on a Commission study ([1]) which concluded that fuels derived from oil sands are, on average, more greenhouse gas intensive than fuels derived from conventional crude oil. However the Commission has not yet adopted legislation in respect of the article 7a fossil fuel greenhouse gas calculation methodology.

([1]) https://circabc.europa.eu/w/browse/9e51b066-9394-4821-a1e2-ff611ab22a2d

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011666/13**
**to the Commission**
**Phil Bennion (ALDE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Female genital mutilation

The British Arab Federation is running a campaign to bring an end to female genital mutilation (FGM) in the UK and will be hosting a conference in my constituency.

Further to the response given to Written Question E-005613-13, can the Commission outline in more detail what action is being taken to help Member States combat FGM?

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

As the Honourable Member has suggested, Member States face the challenge of combating female genital mutilation (FGM), an unacceptable violation of fundamental rights which affects thousands of women and girls living in Europe. Fighting all forms of violence against women, including harmful practices such as FGM, has long been a priority of the European Commission, as illustrated in the action plan implementing the Stockholm Programme, the Women's Charter and the strategy for Equality between Women and Men 2010-2015.

The Commission has implemented a series of activities focusing on FGM over the last year. On 6 March 2013, the Commission hosted a high-level Round-Table on FGM in which a number of MEPs were involved. The results of a public consultation launched the same day have contributed to the Commission's policy development on FGM.

Through the Progress programme, the Commission is also supporting Member States' information and communication activities aimed at ending violence against women including FGM. Under the Daphne programme, the Commission is funding projects led by grass-roots organisations addressing FGM and other harmful practices.

The Commission intends to continue developing effective initiatives to support Member States in this area, making full use of EU competences and has adopted a Commission Communication on FGM on 25 November ([1]).

---

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/gender_based_violence/131125_fgm_communication_en.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011667/13**
**to the Commission**
**Phil Bennion (ALDE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Property in Cyprus

Further to the Commission's response to Written Question E-011456-2012, I am still receiving correspondence from constituents who face difficulties with property in Cyprus. In light of its answer to the abovementioned question, could the Commission provide an update as to what, if any, recent action it has taken to ensure that the national authorities in Cyprus investigate any potential misleading practices by banks, developers or agents operating on the island?

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

Following a number of complaints and also drawing on information obtained from the Cypriot authorities through a structured dialogue engaged in 2011, the Commission has recently opened infringement proceedings against Cyprus under Article 258 TFEU with regard to certain aspects of the transposition and application of EU consumer law.

In its letter of formal notice, the Commission raises different concerns related to the application of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive and the Unfair Contract Terms Directive.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011668/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Patrizia Toia (S&D), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(14 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Lo Jugendamt tedesco e la Beistandschaft

Nella risposta all'interrogazione E-007711/2013 la Commissione afferma che «L'esercizio di tali competenze non rientra nell'applicazione del diritto dell'Unione europea e la Commissione non è pertanto in grado di valutarne la compatibilità», ma, com'è noto, esistono strumenti comunitari — quali lo stesso regolamento (CE) n. 4/2009 del Consiglio del 18 dicembre 2008 — che si occupano proprio di queste tematiche rendendo evidente una relativa competenza. L'affermazione pone in luce un inammissibile paradosso. Potrebbe chiarire definitivamente la Commissione se, a suo avviso, la competenza delle istituzioni comunitarie nelle menzionate materie davvero non sussista, soprattutto in presenza di violazione di diritti fondamentali riconosciuti invece negli altri Paesi dell'Unione?

Poiché la Commissione nella citata risposta afferma ammesso che possa [lo Jugendamt] prendere «decisioni unilaterali», desideriamo precisare che l'articolo di legge relativo al provvedimento di Beistandschaft prevede che detto provvedimento venga emesso solo su richiesta del genitore che si trova con il minore (in mancanza, in accordo o in violazione di una sentenza di affido) in territorio tedesco e senza nessun tipo di consultazione dell'altro genitore (non di raro vittima della sottrazione di suo figlio) e ne prevede inoltre l'immediata esecutività. Chiediamo pertanto il consenso della Commissione nel definire il provvedimento di Beistandschaft una «decisone unilaterale».

Poiché la Commissione nella citata risposta afferma: «lo Jugendamt non è assimilato a una giurisdizione ai sensi del suddetto regolamento; pertanto, ammesso che possa prendere "decisioni unilaterali", queste non fruirebbero delle norme previste dal regolamento sulle obbligazioni alimentari in materia di riconoscimento e di esecuzione, in particolare dell'abolizione dell'exequatur (articolo 17) e della procedura di riesame (articolo 19)», potrebbe chiarire se è corretto quanto inteso, che le decisioni dello Jugendamt denominate Beistandschaft, nonché i provvedimenti del Tribunale familiare che pedissequamente le recepiscono nella sostanza, non vanno sottoposti all'applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 4/2009 del Consiglio del 18 dicembre 2008 e quindi in particolare non beneficiano dell'abolizione dell'exequatur e dell'abolizione della procedura di riesame, di cui agli articoli 17 e 19, e di conseguenza devono e possono essere riesaminati nel merito dalle Autorità giudiziarie nazionali?

**Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione**
*(11 dicembre 2013)*

In merito alle competenze in materia di consulenza giuridica («Beistandschaft») concessa allo «Jugendamt» (l'Ufficio di assistenza dei minori tedesco), la Commissione rimanda gli onorevoli deputati alle risposte fornite alle interrogazioni scritte E-007539/2012 ed E-003342/2013.

La Commissione desidera inoltre precisare che il regolamento (CE) n. 4/2009 ([1]) e le sue disposizioni che aboliscono l'exequatur e prevedono la procedura di ricorso si applicano solo a decisioni giurisdizionali, transazioni giudiziarie e atti pubblici in materia di obbligazioni alimentari. Il regolamento (CE) n. 4/2009 non riguarda misure che concedono allo «Jugendamt» competenze in materia di consulenza giuridica.

Nel caso delle obbligazioni alimentari, la Commissione desidera sottolineare che in generale, una decisione giurisdizionale, una transazione giudiziaria o un atto pubblico, compreso un accordo sugli alimenti, concluso con le autorità amministrative o da queste autenticato, che soddisfi le condizioni di cui al regolamento (CE) n. 4/2009, godono, in un altro Stato membro, dell'abolizione dell'exequatur prevista dal regolamento.

È altresì importante informare gli onorevoli deputati che, come regola generale, un ente pubblico di uno Stato membro, che in virtù del diritto nazionale ha il diritto di agire per conto di una persona cui siano dovuti alimenti o di chiedere il rimborso di prestazioni erogate al creditore in luogo degli alimenti, può chiedere l'esecuzione in un altro Stato membro, senza una previa procedura di exequatur, di una decisione giudiziaria emessa nei confronti del debitore su domanda di un ente pubblico o di una decisione giudiziaria emessa tra il creditore e il debitore a concorrenza delle prestazioni erogate al creditore in luogo degli alimenti.

La Commissione rinvia infine gli onorevoli deputati anche alla risposta fornita all'interrogazione scritta E-011669/2013.

([1]) GU L 7 del 10.1.2009, pag. 1.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011668/13**
**to the Commission**
**Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Patrizia Toia (S&D), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The German 'Jugendamt' (child welfare office) and the 'Beistandschaft'

In its answer to Question E-007711/2013, the Commission states that '[t]he exercise of these powers does not form part of the application of European Union law and the Commission is therefore not able to assess its compatibility with EC law', but it is common knowledge that there are EU instruments, such as Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 of 18 December 2008, that are concerned with precisely these issues, so there clearly is competence in this sphere. The Commission's statement highlights an unacceptable paradox. Could the Commission provide definitive clarification on whether, in its view, the EU institutions do not in fact have any jurisdiction on the said subjects, particularly where fundamental rights are being infringed, and where these are protected in other EU countries?

In its answer, the Commission says 'assuming that it [the Jugendamt] may take unilateral decisions'. We would therefore like to make it clear that the article of law concerning Beistandschaft provisions stipulates that such a provision shall be issued only at the request of the parent who is with the child (whether in the absence of, in accordance with or in contravention of a custody ruling) on German territory and without any kind of consultation with the other parent (from whom, not infrequently, the child has been abducted) and, in addition, provides that the provision shall be immediately enforceable. We therefore ask for the Commission to confirm that Beistandschaft provisions may be characterised as unilateral decisions.

In its answer, the Commission also states that 'the Jugendamt is not equivalent to a court within the meaning of the said regulation; therefore, since it may take unilateral decisions, these decisions are not covered by the rules laid down in the regulation on maintenance obligations regarding recognition or enforcement, and in particular the abolition of exequatur (Article 17) and the review procedure (Article 19)'. In view of this, could the Commission explain whether I have correctly understood that the decisions of the Jugendamt referred to as Beistandschaft provisions, and the orders issued by the family court which transpose them to the letter, are not subject to the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 of 18 December 2008 and thus, specifically, do not benefit from the abolition of exequatur or the abolition of the review procedure, referred to in Articles 17 and 19 of the regulation, and therefore must and can be reviewed by the national courts?

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

With regard to the legal advisership (Beistandschaft) granted to the German Youth Welfare (Jugendamt), the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Members to its replies to the written questions E-007539/2012 and E-003342/2013.

In addition, the Commission would like to specify that the regulation (EC) No 4/2009 ([1]) and its rules abolishing the exequatur and providing for a review procedure apply only to court decisions, courts settlements or authentic instruments, relating to maintenance obligations. Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 does not concern measures granting the Jugendamt powers of Beistandschaft.

As far as maintenance matters are concerned, the Commission would like to emphasise that in general, a court decision, a court settlement or an authentic instrument, including a maintenance arrangement concluded with administrative authorities or authenticated by them, which meets the conditions set forth under the regulation (EC) No 4/2009 shall benefit, in another Member State, from the abolition of exequatur provided by that regulation.

It is also important to inform the Honourable Members that as a general rule, a public body of a Member State, which under its national law has the right to act in place of an individual to whom maintenance is owed or to seek reimbursement of benefits provided to the creditor in place of maintenance, may claim enforcement in another Member State, without prior exequatur, of a court decision given against a debtor on the application of the public body or of a court decision given between a creditor and a debtor to the extent of the benefits provided to the creditor in place of maintenance.

Finally, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Members to its reply to the Written Question E-011669/2013.

([1]) OJ, L 7, 10.1.2009, p.1.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011669/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Patrizia Toia (S&D), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(14 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* La Beistandschaft dello Jugendamt

Nella risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-007711/2013 del 20 agosto 2013, la Commissione ha fatto riferimento ad «informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione».

Potrebbe indicare specificamente in cosa consistono le informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione? Si tratta di informazioni provenienti esclusivamente dalla Germania, Paese del quale si contestano i provvedimenti?

Ha la Commissione verificato gli articoli del Codice tedesco citati nella Petizione Beistandschaft, dichiarata ricevibile nel novembre 2012 ed alla quale è stato attribuito il numero 0979-2012?

Nella citata risposta, la Commissione ha affermato che lo Jugendamt opera «in veste di consigliere giuridico del minore».

Potrebbe chiarire cosa si deve intendere con detta qualifica di «consigliere giuridico» e in che misura viene «giuridicamente consigliato» un minore ad agire contro il suo proprio genitore per ricevere dei soldi?

E come si spiega che detto «consigliere giuridico» ottenga il pagamento degli anticipi sugli alimenti attraverso il Bundesland, prima ancora che il giudice competente abbia sentenziato sull'affido?

Come si concilia questo ruolo con il divieto di esercitare il ruolo di consigliere giuridico per chi giurista non è, e tantomeno lo sono gli impiegati dello Jugendamt?

**Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione**
*(11 dicembre 2013)*

La Commissione assicura agli onorevoli deputati di aver attentamente verificato tutti gli atti legislativi correlati all'interrogazione scritta E-007711/2013 e alla petizione 00979/2012 citate nell'interrogazione.

Al riguardo, la Commissione coglie l'occasione per precisare che i compiti dello «Jugendamt» (l'Ufficio di assistenza dei minori tedesco), in quanto consigliere giuridico («Beistand») del minore in materia di obbligazioni alimentari, devono essere definiti ai sensi del diritto nazionale tedesco, in particolare della sezione 1712 del codice civile tedesco (BGB).

Inoltre, la Commissione desidera sottolineare che il suo principale obiettivo nel campo delle obbligazioni alimentari nei confronti del minore è promuoverne il rapido recupero nei casi transfrontalieri all'interno dell'Unione europea. È tuttavia responsabilità degli Stati membri sviluppare regimi specifici per fornire assistenza finanziaria o giuridica in materia di obbligazioni alimentari ai minori che ne hanno bisogno. La messa a punto di questi regimi è una questione di competenza del diritto nazionale. In particolare, il diritto di un ente pubblico di agire per conto di una persona cui siano dovuti alimenti o di chiedere il rimborso di prestazioni erogate al creditore in luogo degli alimenti è disciplinato dalla legislazione cui l'ente è soggetto.

Per ragioni di completezza, la Commissione desidera infine segnalare che, secondo le informazioni a sua disposizione, in caso di contenzioso relativo a un credito alimentare secondo il diritto tedesco è competente il giudice e non lo «Jugendamt».

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011669/13**
**to the Commission**
**Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Patrizia Toia (S&D), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The 'Beistandschaft' of the 'Jugendamt' (child welfare office)

In its answer to Written Question E-007711/2013 dated 20 August 2013, the Commission referred to 'information available to the Commission'.

Could it state exactly what the information available to the Commission consists of? Is this information solely from Germany, the country whose provisions are being challenged?

Has the Commission checked the articles of the German Code quoted in the Beistandschaft petition, which was declared admissible in November 2012 and given reference number 0979-2012?

In the abovementioned answer, the Commission stated that the Jugendamt acts 'as legal adviser to the minor'.

Could it clarify how this description of 'legal adviser' should be understood, and to what extent a minor is 'legally advised' to act against his or her own parent to receive money?

What is the explanation for the 'legal adviser' obtaining advances of maintenance payments through the Federal State, even before the relevant court has ruled on custody?

How can this role be reconciled with the prohibition on those who are not legal experts exercising the role of legal adviser, and particularly when they are employees of the Jugendamt?

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

The Commission would like to assure the Honourable Members that it has carefully examined the relevant pieces of legislation related to the Written Question E-007711/2013 and the petition 00979/2012, referred to in the question.

In this regard, the Commission takes this opportunity to specify that the tasks of the German Youth Welfare Office (Jugendamt) as legal adviser (Beistand) of a child in maintenance matters are to be understood within the meaning of the German national law i.e. Section 1712 of the German Civil Code (BGB).

In addition, the Commission would like to emphasise that in the area of child maintenance, its main objective is to promote the swift recovery of child maintenance in cross-border cases within the European Union. However, it remains the responsibility of Member States to develop specific schemes so as to provide children in need with financial or legal assistance in maintenance matters. That internal organisation remains a matter of national law. In particular, the right of a public body to act in place of an individual to whom maintenance is owed or to seek reimbursement of benefits provided to the creditor in place of maintenance is governed by the law to which the body is subject.

Finally, for the sake of completeness, the Commission would signal that, according to the information available, German law provides that in case of disputes relating to maintenance matters, the maintenance issue is to be determined by a court and not by the Jugendamt.

*(Slovenska različica)*

**Vprašanje za pisni odgovor P-011670/13**
**za Komisijo**
**Tanja Fajon (S&D)**
*(14. oktober 2013)*

*Zadeva:* Privatizacija v Albaniji po zakonu iz leta 1995 ter za ta namen izdani privatizacijski boni (vavčerji)

Po zakonu o privatizaciji državnega premoženja je Albanija leta 1995 med svoje državljane po določeni formuli razdelila privatizacijske bone. Namen njihove uporabe je bil jasen: sodelovanje državljanov pri privatizaciji državnega premoženja po zgledu večine držav, ki so konec dvajsetega stoletja izšle iz komunistične ureditve, torej za njihovo zamenjavo za delnice in deleže v podjetjih v državni lasti ter ostalo državno premoženje. Republika Albanija je tako izdala prenosljive materializirane vrednostne papirje, katerih skupna nominalna vrednost je znašala okoli 74 milijard albanskih lekov (ALL). Od tega naj bi jih bilo med državljane po nekaterih podatkih razdeljenih okoli 68,3 %, dejansko uporabljenih pa zgolj 17,6 %. Glede na te podatke bi današnja nominalna obveznost Republike Albanije (brez faktorja revalorizacije za obdobje 18 let) do imetnikov privatizacijskih bonov znašala okoli 266 milijonov EUR. V tem zakonu iz leta 1995 naj bi Albanija določila metodologijo izvedbe v treh fazah, česar žal nikoli ni v celoti uresničila, do sedaj pa sta bili izvedeni zgolj dve. Veljavnost kuponov je vlada že trikrat podaljšala – nazadnje do 31. 12. 2014 – iz tega izhaja, da se Vlada Republike Albanije sicer zaveda svojih obveznosti, ne najde pa prave volje in motiva, da bi obljubljeno in v zakonu zapisano tudi uresničila. Z dopolnitvijo zakona o privatizaciji je bila podana zakonska možnost, da privatizacijske bone kupijo tudi tuji državljani, vendar niso bili nikoli uvrščeni na kakršenkoli organizirani trg (npr. borza) ampak potisnjeni v območje „sivega trga“. V procesu nakupov privatizacijskih bonov so sodelovali številni državljani EU v želji po sodelovanju v privatizaciji albanskega premoženja – glede na s tem povezano pozitivno zakonodajo in dejstvo, da za obveznosti iz izdaje privatizacijskih bonov jamči Republika Albanija, pa so bili razumljeni kot atraktivna naložbena priložnost, vendar so številni ob tem utrpeli ogromne izgube. Privatizacijski boni ostajajo obveznost Republike Albanije. Vlada Republike Albanije bi morala nemudoma pristopiti k temu, da se omogoči njihova ustrezna uporaba bodisi za delnice uspešnih državnih podjetij bodisi za ostalo premoženje po vrednostih iz časa izdaje.

Zanima me, ali je bila o tem obveščena tudi Komisija ter ali zadevo spremlja, zlasti glede na mednarodnopravne obveznosti Republike Albanije do tujih državljanov v tej zadevi, zlasti tistih iz EU?

Ali Komisija sodeluje z Vlado Republike Albanije glede razrešitve vprašanja privatizacije, saj je Albanija v procesu pridobivanja statusa kandidatke za članstvo Evropske unije, ter kakšne ukrepe je Komisija sprejela v tej smeri?

**Odgovor Štefana Füleja v imenu Komisije**
*(22. november 2013)*

Evropska komisija tesno spremlja gospodarski razvoj v Albaniji. Poročilo o napredku Albanije iz leta 2013 ([1]) obravnava dosedanji napredek Albanije na področju gospodarskih meril. Vanj sta vključeni vprašanji javnega dolga in privatizacije.

Pomembno je, da vlada izpolnjuje svoje obveznosti in obvladuje dolgove. To je jasno opredeljeno v programu nove albanske vlade, ki je nastopila mandat septembra 2013. Kar zadeva vprašanje uporabe privatizacijskih kuponov za privatizacijo državnega premoženja, Komisija na tej stopnji ni seznanjena s kakršnimi koli vladnimi instrumenti ali načrti. V okviru namenjanja večje pozornosti ekonomskemu upravljanju in dialogu z albanskimi organi namerava Evropska komisija to vprašanje še naprej spremljati.

Učinkovita in pregledna politika privatizacije ter obvladovanje javnega dolga sta bistvenega pomena za ohranitev zaupanja vlagateljev in utrditev albanskega gospodarstva.

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

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011670/13**
**to the Commission**
**Tanja Fajon (S&D)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Privatisation in Albania under the 1995 law and privatisation vouchers issued for that purpose

Under its 1995 law on the privatisation of state-owned property, the Albanian government distributed privatisation vouchers to its citizens according to an agreed formula. Their purpose was clear: to involve citizens in the privatisation of state-owned assets along the lines of the model applied by most of the countries which emerged from Communism at the end of the 20th century, i.e. by exchanging vouchers for shares and stakes in state-owned companies and other state-owned assets. For this purpose the Albanian government issued transferable 'materialised' (i.e. physical) securities with a total nominal value of around 74 billion Albanian lek. Some 68.3% of the vouchers should have been distributed to the country's citizens, but just 17.6% were actually used. Based on these figures, the Albanian state's current nominal liability to holders of privatisation vouchers (excluding the impact of revaluation over a period of 18 years) should be around EUR 266 million. In the 1995 law Albania set out a three-phase implementation method, which unfortunately it has never fully carried out, as so far only two phases have been implemented. The government has extended the validity of the vouchers three times already (most recently to 31 December 2014), indicating that it recognises its obligations. However, it has found neither the genuine will nor the motivation actually to carry out what it promised and what is stipulated in the law. An amendment to the privatisation law made it legal for foreign citizens to buy the privatisation vouchers, but they have never been listed on any organised market (such as a stock exchange) and have been pushed instead into a 'grey market'. Many EU citizens, wanting to take part in the privatisation of Albanian assets, subsequently bought privatisation vouchers, encouraged by the positive legislation and the fact that the liabilities stemming from the issue of the vouchers were guaranteed by the Albanian state. They were seen as an attractive investment opportunity. However, many investors suffered huge losses. The privatisation vouchers remain a liability of the Republic of Albania. The government should immediately set about making it possible to actually use them, either for shares in successful state-owned companies or for other assets at the values pertaining at the time of issue.

Has the Commission been informed of this matter? If so, is it monitoring the situation, particularly in view of Albania's obligations under international law to the foreign nationals concerned, especially those from the EU?

Is the Commission working together with the Albanian government to resolve the privatisation issues, given that Albania is in the process of obtaining EU candidate country status? What measures has the Commission adopted in this respect?

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

The European Commission follows closely the economic developments in Albania. The 2013 Progress Report on Albania ([1]) addresses Albania's progress made so far in the field of economic criteria. Issues of government's debts and privatisation were included.

It is important that the government is meeting its own obligations and debts. This point is clearly addressed in the programme of the new Albanian government which took office in September 2013. Regarding the issue of the use of privatisation vouchers for the privatisation of state owned assets, the Commission is not aware of any relevant government instrument or plan at this stage. In the context of its increased focus on economic governance and its dialogue with the Albanian authorities, the European Commission intends to further monitor this issue.

An effective and transparent policy on privatisation and addressing government's debts is essential to sustain investors' confidence and to consolidate Albanian economy.

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

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011671/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**
*(14 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Aumento de la pobreza energética en España

Entendemos como pobreza energética la incapacidad por parte de la población de pagar la cantidad mínima de los servicios energéticos para cubrir las necesidades básicas. En Europa afecta a más de 50 millones de personas (Proyecto europeo *European Fuel Poverty and Energy Efficiency*, 2009) y en España, actualmente, un 15 % de los hogares se encuentran en situación de pobreza energética.

La Directiva 2009/72/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 13 de julio de 2009, sobre normas comunes para el mercado interior de la electricidad reconoce la existencia de la pobreza energética y obliga a los Estados miembros afectados que todavía no hayan tomado medidas al respecto a desarrollar planes de acción nacionales u otros marcos adecuados para luchar contra la pobreza energética, con el fin de reducir el número de personas que padecen dicha situación. En cualquier caso, esta Directiva obliga a los Estados miembros a garantizar el suministro de energía necesario y una protección adecuada de los clientes vulnerables.

Los precios de la electricidad en España han subido un 80 % desde el año 2004, siendo actualmente el tercer país de la UE con la electricidad más cara por detrás de Chipre y Malta. La Directiva 2009/72/CE contempla la prohibición de la desconexión de la electricidad a los clientes vulnerables en «períodos críticos», y la situación actual del Estado español, con 4 724 355 millones de parados, puede considerarse un «periodo crítico»; al mismo tiempo, la reforma energética aprobada por el Gobierno de España el pasado mes de julio permite a las eléctricas cortar la luz por impago a usuarios y a servicios públicos considerados esenciales como los hospitales.

Considerando todo lo anterior:

1. ¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre el aumento de la pobreza energética en España y sobre la erradicación de este grave problema?

2. ¿Qué mecanismos tiene la Comisión para garantizar que, por parte de los órganos competentes y responsables, se exija el cumplimiento de la normativa comunitaria en relación al abastecimiento energético?

3. ¿Cree la Comisión que la UE debería definir el término «pobreza energética» y disponer de una política y de unas obligaciones europeas a los Estados sobre este problema para solucionarlo?

4. ¿Considera la Comisión Europea la propuesta del Comité Económico y Social Europeo por una acción europea coordinada para prevenir y combatir la pobreza energética (septiembre de 2013) y la elaboración de un Compromiso Europeo de Seguridad y Solidaridad Energéticas?

**Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión**
*(6 de diciembre de 2013)*

1. La pobreza energética constituye un motivo de seria preocupación que los Estados miembros deberían abordar tomando en consideración las disposiciones pertinentes de la legislación europea en materia energética ([1]), tal y como se indica en la respuesta de la Comisión a la pregunta escrita E-4799/13 de la Sra. Dodds.

2. La Comisión está llevando a cabo controles del cumplimiento de las directivas ([2]) a fin de comprobar la exhaustividad y la calidad de la transposición en los Estados miembros. Cuando la Comisión detecta una inconformidad de la legislación de los Estados miembros con el acervo de la UE, se incoa un procedimiento de infracción, en los casos en que esté justificado.

([1]) En particular el artículo 3, apartados 7 y 8, de la Directiva 2009/72/CE; el artículo 3, apartados 3 y 4, de la Directiva 2009/73/CE; y el artículo 7, apartado 7, letra a), de la Directiva 2012/27/UE.
([2]) Directivas 2009//72/CE y 2009/73/CE.

3. La Comisión ha analizado, en colaboración con las partes interesadas, la posibilidad práctica y la conveniencia de establecer una definición común del término «pobreza energética». En un futuro informe, se presentarán los resultados del trabajo realizado por un grupo de expertos constituido en el marco del Foro de los Ciudadanos y la Energía ([3]), y estos se integrarán en el proceso de reflexión sobre nuevas formas de proteger a los clientes vulnerables frente a la pobreza energética.

4. En efecto, la Comisión está considerando esta propuesta y su posible incidencia presupuestaria. Además, algunas de sus acciones ya se han aplicado en la legislación adoptada recientemente ([4]).

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/forum_citizen_energy_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/eed/eed_en.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011671/13**
**to the Commission**
**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Rise in energy poverty in Spain

Energy poverty means people being unable to afford the bare minimum to cover their basic energy needs. This is an issue that affects over 50 million people in Europe (European Fuel Poverty and Energy Efficiency Project, 2009) and 15% of Spanish households are currently in energy poverty.

Directive 2009/72/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity recognises that energy poverty is an issue and requires the Member States to develop national action plans or other appropriate frameworks to tackle energy poverty, with the aim of reducing the number of people in that situation. In any event, this directive requires Member States to ensure the necessary energy supply and adequate safeguards to protect vulnerable customers.

Electricity prices in Spain have gone up by 80% since 2004, and Spain now has the third most expensive electricity in the EU behind Cyprus and Malta. Directive 2009/72/EC prohibits disconnecting the electricity of vulnerable customers in 'critical times', and the current situation in Spain, with 4 724 355 out of work, can be regarded as a 'critical time'. At the same time, the energy reform adopted by the Spanish Government in July 2013 allows electricity companies to cut off users and essential public services, such as hospitals, for not paying their bills.

1. What does the Commission think about the rise in energy poverty in Spain and the eradication of this serious problem?

2. What action can the Commission take in order to determine whether the competent bodies insist on compliance with EC law on energy supply?

3. Does the Commission think that the EU should define the term 'energy poverty' and come up with a policy and European obligations for Member States with regard to this problem, in order to resolve it?

4. Is the Commission considering the proposal of the European Economic and Social Committee for coordinated European measures to prevent and combat energy poverty (September 2013) and a European energy security and solidarity commitment?

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

1. Energy poverty is a serious concern that Member States should address taking into account the relevant provisions in European energy legislation ([1]) as described in Commissions answer to Written Question E-4799/13 by Ms Dodds.

2. The Commission is conducting compliance checks of the directives ([2]) to verify the completeness and quality of transposition in the Member States. Where the Commission identifies non-conformity of the Member States' legislation with EU *acquis*, infringement proceedings are launched when justified.

3. The Commission has analysed, in cooperation with stakeholders, the practical possibility and opportunity for a common definition of energy poverty. The results of the work undertaken by an expert group set up under the Citizens' Energy Forum ([3]) will be presented in a forthcoming report and will feed in the reflection on further ways to protect vulnerable consumers against energy poverty.

4. Yes, the Commission is considering this proposal and its potential budgetary effects. Moreover, some of its actions have already been implemented in recent legislation ([4]).

---

([1]) particularly Articles 3.7 and 3.8 of Directive 2009/72/EC; Articles 3.3 and 3.4 of Directive 2009/73/EC; Article 7.7(a) of Directive 2012/27/EU.
([2]) Directives 2009/72/EC and 2009/73/EC.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/forum_citizen_energy_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/eed/eed_en.htm

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011672/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Esther Herranz García (PPE)**
*(14 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Carne de pollo

Desde hace algunos meses, los productores españoles de carne de pollo se vienen quejando de la situación insostenible a la que se enfrentan debido a supuestas prácticas desleales realizadas por grandes superficies comerciales, que podrían estar pactando precios a la baja para mantener esta carne como producto reclamo. Muchos productores apenas pueden cubrir sus costes de producción debido al hundimiento de los precios, lo que dificulta enormemente su actividad empresarial.

— ¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento de la situación que afronta el sector avícola español?

—¿Conoce la Comisión otros casos similares en otros Estados miembros?

— Dado que es una cuestión que afecta a las normas de la competencia, ¿qué medidas piensa adoptar la Comisión para ayudar a este sector?

**Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión**
*(17 de diciembre de 2013)*

La Comisión está al corriente de las denuncias sobre prácticas comerciales desleales (PCD) en la cadena de suministro de alimentos de varios Estados miembros. No obstante, es importante distinguir entre PCD y prácticas que infringen las normas sobre competencia. Un acuerdo entre los supermercados para fijar precios plantearía un problema de competencia y tendría que ser investigado por las autoridades con responsabilidades en materia de competencia.

Las PCD son comportamientos que se desvían de la buena conducta comercial, contrarios a la buena fe y lealtad en las transacciones y que unos socios comerciales imponen a otros. Las PCD no constituyen un problema de competencia si no perjudican a los consumidores. Varias autoridades nacionales de competencia (ANC) han efectuado controles sobre las PCD en los últimos años ([1]) y han llegado a la conclusión de que, a corto plazo, esas prácticas no parecen ir en detrimento de los consumidores. Dicho esto, un informe de la autoridad nacional de competencia española advierte de los riesgos de determinadas prácticas comerciales que, a corto plazo, podrían no suponer un problema de competencia, pero que pueden incidir negativamente a largo plazo en el bienestar de los consumidores debido a la disminución de las inversiones y la innovación o a la reducción de sus posibilidades de elección. Para abordar la existencia de las PCD, España adoptó en agosto de 2013 una disposición legislativa (Ley 12/2013).

La UE también se ha ocupado de las PCD. Las organizaciones empresariales han aprobado recientemente una iniciativa voluntaria contra las PCD. La Comisión ha publicado un Libro Verde sobre las prácticas comerciales desleales en la cadena de suministro alimentario y está realizando una evaluación de impacto de las diferentes opciones para hacerles frente.

([1]) Puede encontrarse más información sobre estas investigaciones y medidas en la Red Europea de Competencia (REC): «ECN Activities in the Food Sector» (Actividades de la REC en el sector alimentario), mayo de 2012, especialmente los apartado 253-e54, que se puede consultar en http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011672/13**
**to the Commission**
**Esther Herranz García (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Poultrymeat

For several months, Spanish poultrymeat producers have been complaining about the unsustainable situation they are in as a result of alleged unfair practices by supermarkets, which may be agreeing to reduce prices so this meat remains a loss-leader product. Many producers can barely cover their production costs because prices have collapsed, making it very hard to stay in business.

— Is the Commission aware of the situation facing the Spanish poultry sector?

— Is it aware of similar situations in other Member States?

— Given that this is an issue concerning competition rules, what steps will the Commission take to help this sector?

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

The Commission is aware of complaints about Unfair Trading Practices (UTPs) in the food supply chain in different Member States. However, it is important to distinguish between UTPs and practices breaching competition law. An agreement between supermarkets to fix prices would raise a competition concern and would have to be investigated by the relevant Competition Authorities.

UTPs are behaviours that deviate from good commercial conduct, are contrary to good faith and fair dealing and are unilaterally imposed by trading partners on others. UTPs are not a competition issue unless they harm consumers. A number of National Competition Authorities (NCAs) have carried out monitoring actions of UTPs in recent years ([1]) and have found that in the short run UTPs do not seem to result in consumers' harm. This said, a report from the Spanish NCA alerted against the risks of certain commercial practices that in the short term may not suppose a competition concern but which may however in the long term entail negative effects on consumer welfare by decreasing investment and innovation or reducing consumer choice. To tackle the existence of UTPs, Spain adopted in August 2013 a legislative measure (Act 12/2013).

UTPs have also been the focus of action at EU level. Business organisations have just adopted a voluntary initiative against UTPs. The Commission launched a Green Paper on UTPs in the food supply chain and is currently undertaking an Impact Assessment of different options to address UTPs.

([1]) More information on these investigations and actions can be found in a recent report from the European Competition Network: 'ECN Activities in the Food Sector' (May 2012), in particular paragraphs 253-54, available at http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011673/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Aldo Patriciello (PPE)**
*(14 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Prospezioni petrolifere off-shore nel Mar Jonio

— Considerato che, per il tratto di mare denominato Mar Jonio, sono state presentate in Italia presso il Ministero dell'Ambiente numerose istanze di autorizzazione per attività di esplorazione di idrocarburi e che, nonostante tali richieste siano state rigettate nel 2010 dal MISE, con l'art. 35 del decreto «Cresci Italia» 83/2012 il governo italiano sanava il provvedimento, autorizzando de facto le richieste stesse;

— considerato che le istanze menzionate sono state presentate da numerose compagnie petrolifere omettendo di informare il pubblico interessato e impedendo la partecipazione dello stesso allo studio di pre-fattibilità;

— considerato che, a causa della peculiare conformazione del Mar Jonio, che rende tale specchio d'acqua un mare semichiuso, un incidente paragonabile a quello verificatosi nel Golfo del Messico nel 2010 potrebbe avere gravi conseguenze ambientali transfrontaliere sui fragili ecosistemi marini e costieri del Mediterraneo;

— considerato inoltre che attività di ricerche petrolifere e di eventuale estrazione di idrocarburi potrebbero trasformare il Golfo di Taranto da oasi turistica ricca di siti di interesse ambientali, quali l'Area marina protetta di Porto Cesareo e la Secca di Amendolara, in una discarica marina;

— considerata la decisione 2013/5/UE sulla protezione del Mar Mediterraneo dall'inquinamento;

— considerato che, in base a evidenze scientifiche emerse in studi condotti dal WWF, le tecniche di prospezione che si intendono utilizzare, basate sul sistema «air-guns», generano un inquinamento acustico che provoca seri danni agli ambienti marini, con conseguente diminuzione delle catture di pescato fino al 50 %;

— considerati, inoltre, i rischi di sversamento non solo durante le attività di estrazione, ma anche durante le mere attività di ricerca, come verificatosi durante la fase esplorativa del Progetto Ombrina Mare in Abruzzo;

— considerato che la ricerca di idrocarburi nel Golfo di Taranto renderebbe vani gli ingenti finanziamenti erogati dall'UE nell'ambito dei fondi regionali per la valorizzazione delle regioni interessate;

— considerati il principio di precauzione (art. 191 TUE) e le disposizioni in materia di sicurezza ambientale delle attività di perforazione per gas e petrolio approvate dal Parlamento europeo lo scorso maggio;

non ritiene la Commissione che le attività di ricerca e di estrazione di idrocarburi nel Mar Mediterraneo e i conseguenti rischi ambientali in un mare semichiuso come il «Mare Nostrum» appaiano in contrasto con le disposizioni elencate? Non ritiene che l'art. 35 del decreto legislativo 83/2012 disattenda il principio di precauzione?

**Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**
*(29 novembre 2013)*

Le attività di esplorazione o sfruttamento di idrocarburi in particolari condizioni o aree geografiche non sono vietate né dalla decisione 2013/5/UE del Consiglio, relativa all'adesione dell'UE al protocollo offshore della convenzione di Barcellona, né dalla direttiva recentemente approvata sulla sicurezza delle operazioni in mare nel settore degli idrocarburi (direttiva sulla sicurezza delle operazioni in mare) ([1]). Spetta agli Stati membri decidere se sfruttare o meno le risorse naturali di cui dispongono, ma garantendo il rispetto delle pertinenti normative UE in materia di ambiente e sicurezza.

In particolare, la direttiva sulla sicurezza delle operazioni in mare stabilisce norme chiare su come prevenire incidenti gravi e rispondervi in modo efficace, al contempo migliorando e rendendo più chiare le disposizioni dell'UE in materia di responsabilità. L'approccio seguito dalla direttiva sulla sicurezza delle operazioni in mare si basa sul principio della precauzione e sui principi dell'azione preventiva e della correzione, in via prioritaria alla fonte, dei danni causati all'ambiente nonché sul principio «chi inquina paga».

([1]) Direttiva 2013/30/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 12 giugno 2013, sulla sicurezza delle operazioni in mare nel settore degli idrocarburi e che modifica la direttiva 2004/35/CE.

La direttiva prevede inoltre che sia assicurata una tempestiva ed effettiva partecipazione del pubblico riguardo agli effetti sull'ambiente delle operazioni esplorative in mare programmate nel settore degli idrocarburi. Gli Stati membri sono tenuti ad adottare le disposizioni legislative, regolamentari ed amministrative necessarie per conformarsi alla direttiva entro il 19 luglio 2015.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011673/13**
**to the Commission**
**Aldo Patriciello (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Off-shore oil exploration in the Ionian Sea

Numerous applications for authorisation for hydrocarbon exploration have been submitted in Italy to the Ministry of the Environment in relation to the Ionian Sea, and, despite the fact that these requests were rejected in 2010 by the Ministry of Economic Development, under Article 35 of the 'Cresci Italia' Decree 83/2012 (decree for economic growth in Italy) the Italian Government has restored the order, thus in practice authorising the applications.

The abovementioned applications were submitted by numerous oil companies without the relevant public being informed, thus hindering public participation in the pre-feasibility study.

Because of the particular topography of the Ionian Sea, which makes this area of water a semi-closed sea, an accident similar to that in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010 could have serious cross-border environmental consequences for the fragile marine and coastal ecosystems in the Mediterranean.

In addition, oil exploration activities and possible hydrocarbon extraction could change the Gulf of Taranto from a tourist oasis rich in sites of environmental interest, such as the marine protected area of Porto Cesareo and the sandbank of Amendolara, into a marine dumping ground.

Decision 2013/5/EU lays down measures on the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution.

Scientific evidence from studies conducted by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) shows that the exploration techniques to be used, which are based on the air-guns system, produce noise pollution that causes serious damage to marine environments, with a resulting reduction in fish catches of up to 50%.

In addition, there are risks of discharge, not only during extraction activities but also during exploration activities, as seen during the exploration stage of the Ombrina Mare project in Abruzzo.

The search for hydrocarbons in the Gulf of Taranto would negate the huge amounts of financing granted by the EU from the regional funds for upgrading the regions concerned.

Article 191 TEU sets out the precautionary principle, and in May 2013 the European Parliament adopted provisions on the environmental safety of gas and oil drilling activities.

In view of all the above, does the Commission not believe that hydrocarbon exploration and extraction activities in the Mediterranean Sea and the resulting environmental risks in a semi-closed sea such as the Mediterranean appear to be in conflict with the provisions listed? Does it not believe that Article 35 of Legislative Decree 83/2012 ignores the precautionary principle?

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

Neither Council Decision 2013/5/EU, on EU accession to the Barcelona Convention Offshore Protocol, nor the recently-adopted Directive on the safety of offshore oil and gas operations (Offshore safety directive) ([1]) prohibit exploration or exploitation of hydrocarbons in any particular conditions or geographical areas. While it is within the competence of the Member State to decide or not to exploit their natural resources, these activities shall comply with all relevant EU safety and environmental legislation.

In particular, the Offshore safety directive sets clear rules for effective prevention and response of a major accident, while also improving and clarifying existing EU liability provisions. The approach followed by the Offshore safety directive is based on the precautionary principle, and on the principles that preventive action needs to be taken, that environmental damage needs as a matter of priority to be rectified at source and that the polluter must pay.

([1]) Directive 2013/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 June 2013 on safety of offshore oil and gas operations and amending Directive 2004/35/EC.

Moreover, the Offshore safety directive provides that early and effective public participation relating to the effects of planned offshore oil and gas exploration operations on the environment shall be ensured. Member States shall bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with the directive by 19 July 2015.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011674/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Barbara Matera (PPE)**
*(14 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Riforme del governo turco

Il 30 settembre il premier turco ha annunciato una riforma legislativa che focalizza la propria attenzione su diversi punti. Verrà introdotto l'insegnamento del curdo nelle scuole private, ma non in quelle pubbliche. Si prevede anche una revoca del divieto di indossare il velo islamico per le dipendenti pubbliche. Il bando sul velo nelle istituzioni pubbliche sarà rimosso ad eccezione di alcune professioni: giudici, procuratori, funzionari di polizia e i membri dell'esercito. Tali soggetti hanno infatti un loro specifico codice per l'abbigliamento.

Il premier ha inoltre promesso di abbassare la soglia del 10 %, necessaria per l'accesso di qualsiasi gruppo politico in parlamento. Ciò garantirebbe al partito curdo Bdp la possibilità di entrare in parlamento. Vi sarà un aumento da uno a tre anni delle pene per i reati di odio, al fine di combattere la discriminazione, nonché una modifica delle discipline dei reati di odio commessi su base religiosa, nazionale o etnica. Vi saranno anche pene per chi cercherà di impedire a gruppi religiosi di praticare la loro fede. Nel pacchetto di riforme sono state inserite anche nuove regole per consentire una maggiore libertà di assemblea, estendendo alla mezzanotte il diritto a manifestare che prima era limitato al tramonto.

Il pacchetto dispone anche misure a favore delle minoranze religiose, tra cui i rom, i cristiani, e la comunità sciita degli aleviti.

La differente disciplina fra scuole private e pubbliche in merito all'insegnamento del curdo influirà negativamente sul rapporto che la Commissione pubblicherà il prossimo 16 ottobre?

Affinché sia rispettata l'agenda della Turchia sui diritti umani, la Commissione ritiene che l'abolizione dell'obbligo di indossare il velo debba essere estesa a tutte le professioni?

**Risposta data da Stefan Füle a nome della Commissione**
*(2 dicembre 2013)*

Come sottolineato dall'onorevole parlamentare, il 30 settembre 2013 il governo turco ha annunciato l'adozione di un pacchetto di misure di democratizzazione. La Commissione ha illustrato il contenuto del pacchetto nella relazione del 2013 sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia ([1]). Nella relazione si specificava che le misure previste avrebbero affrontato importanti preoccupazioni e che era fondamentale che venissero attuate in collaborazione con le parti in causa e in linea con gli standard europei.

Per quanto riguarda la questione del velo, la Commissione ha sottolineato in varie occasioni che esistono norme e pratiche diverse in Europa e che non esistono standard unici in questo senso. Già in passato la Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo ha statuito che si tratta di una questione sulla quale ciascuno Stato membro del Consiglio d'Europa deve decidere per sé. La Commissione non esprime pertanto osservazioni su questo tema per quanto riguarda la conformità con i criteri politici: spetta alla società turca trovare la propria via di compromesso sull'argomento. La Commissione accoglie con favore il crescente consenso sulla questione in Turchia. È importante che in tale contesto di consenso si continui a garantire la libera scelta delle donne turche, a prescindere dal loro credo e dalle loro opinioni, senza pressioni di qualsiasi genere, compresa la pressione da parte delle altre donne.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/brochures/turkey_2013.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011674/13**
**to the Commission**
**Barbara Matera (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Turkish Government's reform

On 30 September 2013 the Turkish Prime Minister announced a legislative reform which focuses on various issues. Teaching of Kurdish will be introduced in private schools, but not in state schools. Also planned is a repeal of the prohibition on wearing the Islamic veil for public employees. The ban on the veil in public institutions will be removed, with the exception of certain professions: judges, prosecutors, police officers and members of the army. These individuals have their own specific dress codes.

The Prime Minister has also promised to lower the 10% threshold currently required for any political group to have access to parliament. That would offer the Kurdish Peace and Democracy Party (BDP) the possibility of entering parliament. The penalties for hate crimes will increase from one to three years, with the aim of combating discrimination, and the rules on hate crimes committed on religious, national or ethnic grounds will be amended. There will also be penalties for anyone seeking to prevent religious groups from practising their faith. New rules have also been added to the reform package to allow greater freedom of assembly, extending the right to demonstrate until midnight, where previously demonstrations were only permitted before dusk.

The package also contains measures in favour of religious minorities, including Roma, Christians, and the Shia Muslim community of Alevis.

Will the different rules for private and state schools for the teaching of Kurdish have an adverse effect on the report the Commission is to publish on 16 October 2013?

Does the Commission believe that the abolition of the obligation to wear the veil should be extended to all professions, to ensure that Turkey's human rights agenda is adhered to?

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

As the Honourable Member has noted, the Turkish government announced a democratisation package on 30 September 2013. The Commission outlined the content of the package in the Turkey 2013 Progress Report. ([1]) The report indicated that the measures included in it hold out the prospect of addressing important concerns, and that implementation in cooperation with stakeholders and in line with European standards is key.

Regarding the question of headscarves, the Commission has pointed out, on several occasions, that there are different rules and practices across Europe and that there is no unified standard on the issue. The European Court of Human Rights has in the past ruled that the issue of headscarves is one for each Member State of the Council of Europe to decide for itself. It is for this reason that the Commission does not comment on this issue in relation to compliance with the political criteria. It is up to Turkish society to find its own compromise on this subject. The Commission welcomes the growing consensus on this issue in Turkey. It is important that this consensus continues to ensure the free choice of Turkish women, whatever their beliefs and opinions, free from pressures of any kind, including peer pressure.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/brochures/turkey_2013.pdf

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011675/13**
**à la Commission**
**Gaston Franco (PPE)**
*(14 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Secteur européen du bois et de l'ameublement face à la concurrence chinoise

En raison d'un taux de croissance élevé et d'une main-d'œuvre bon marché, conjugués à une pénurie de ressources intérieures en bois, la Chine a acquis une importance grandissante dans le commerce mondial du bois, devenant ainsi le principal importateur de bois industriel et de produits forestiers et un important exportateur de produits bois transformés, très compétitifs en termes de prix et de qualité, principalement dans le secteur du meuble, mais aussi dans celui du contreplaqué. Comme le constatait le CESE dans son avis du 26.10.2011 «*Opportunités et défis pour un secteur européen du travail du bois et du mobilier plus compétitif*», les prix du contreplaqué et du mobilier sont soumis à une forte pression de la concurrence chinoise. Les rondins exportés vers la Chine retournent en Europe sous forme de produits finis ou semi-finis. Depuis de nombreuses années, la Chine est le plus important fournisseur étranger de l'Union en mobilier. Depuis 2008, plus de 50 % des importations totales en Europe proviennent de la Chine. Les importations européennes de mobilier en provenance de Chine sont actuellement supérieures de 46,9 % à celles de 2005, alors que les importations totales de mobilier n'ont augmenté que de 12,6 % en valeur, ce qui démontre la prédominance de la Chine.

Les scieurs européens déplorent que la matière première bois européenne soit captée massivement par la Chine au détriment d'une valorisation sur le territoire européen, l'industrie européenne du meuble ne pouvant concurrencer les faibles coûts de production, de règlementation, de transport et d'accès aux marchés des produits transformés par les Chinois. Le secteur européen du meuble fait en outre face à des problèmes structurels (main-d'œuvre vieillissante) et a été sévèrement touché par les récentes crises, qui ont conduit à une baisse significative du nombre d'entreprises, de l'emploi et du chiffre d'affaires. La Commission a pris conscience de l'ampleur de ces défis dans la nouvelle stratégie forestière européenne du 20 septembre 2013.

Comment la Commission compte-t-elle concrètement garantir des conditions de concurrence équitables pour les producteurs européens (face à leurs concurrents chinois) et renforcer leur compétitivité sur les marchés internationaux? Comment compte-t-elle soutenir le processus d'innovation du secteur européen du meuble (sur le plan de la technologie, de la fonctionnalité et de l'esthétique), à même de le différencier de ses concurrents chinois? Quels instruments financiers mettra-t-elle à la disposition des PME du secteur? Comment compte-t-elle encourager la valorisation de la ressource bois sur le territoire européen?

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

L'UE soutient un commerce ouvert et équitable entre les producteurs nationaux et étrangers. Dans ce contexte, les accords commerciaux et les instruments de défense commerciale sont des éléments essentiels pour assurer, au niveau mondial, l'égalité des conditions de concurrence nécessaire pour que l'industrie de l'UE soit compétitive.

Les PME des secteurs de l'ameublement et de la menuiserie pourront profiter des instruments de financement par l'emprunt et les capitaux propres proposés pour la prochaine période de programmation (2014-2020) dans le cadre du programme COSME pour les PME ainsi que du programme Horizon 2020 pour les PME axées sur la RDI et les petites entreprises à capitalisation moyenne (jusqu'à 500 salariés) innovantes.

De plus, le plan d'action pour l'innovation axée sur la conception [(SWD(2013)380] comporte des mesures visant à promouvoir l'innovation axée sur la conception dans les industries afin de renforcer la compétitivité de l'Europe, tandis que l'action de l'UE dans le domaine de la fabrication avancée vise à promouvoir l'adoption de nouvelles techniques de production dans tous les secteurs, y compris celui de l'ameublement.

Pour relever le défi de l'accès durable au bois et aux autres matières premières, la Commission a lancé le partenariat d'innovation européen concernant les matières premières. Le plan de mise en œuvre stratégique adopté le 25 septembre 2013 comporte des actions concrètes dans ce domaine. La nouvelle stratégie forestière de l'UE [COM(2013)659] reconnaît aussi le besoin d'évaluer l'approvisionnement potentiel en bois et de faciliter l'exploitation durable du bois.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011675/13**
**to the Commission**
**Gaston Franco (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* European timber and furniture sectors in the face of Chinese competition

A high growth rate and cheap labour market, coupled with a shortage of domestic timber resources, has meant that China has become an increasingly important player in the global timber trade. It has become the largest importer of industrial wood and forest products and a major exporter of processed timber products, and is extremely competitive in terms of price and quality, primarily in the furniture sector, but also in the plywood industry. As the EESC noted in its own-initiative opinion of 26 October 2011 'Opportunities and challenges for a more competitive European woodworking and furniture sector', the prices of plywood and furniture are subject to enormous pressure from Chinese competition. The logs exported to China return to Europe as finished or semi-finished products. For many years, China has been the largest foreign supplier of furniture to the European Union. Since 2008, more than 50% of all imports in Europe have come from China. European furniture imports from China are currently 46.9% greater than in 2005, whilst furniture imports overall have only increased by 12.6%, highlighting China's predominance.

European sawyers lament the fact that European wood as a raw material has been harnessed to such an extent by China to the detriment of its exploitation in Europe, with the European furniture industry unable to compete with the low costs in terms of production, regulation, transport and access to markets of the products processed by the Chinese. The European furniture industry is also facing structural problems such as an ageing workforce, and was severely affected by the recent crises, which have led to a significant decrease in turnover and the number of businesses and jobs. The Commission became aware of the extent of these challenges in the new EU forest strategy of 20 September 2013.

How does the Commission specifically intend to guarantee fair competition for European producers (in the face of their Chinese competitors) and strengthen their competitiveness on international markets? How will it support the process of innovation in the European furniture industry (in terms of technology, functionality and aesthetics) so that it can differentiate itself from its Chinese competitors? What financial instruments will it make available to SMEs in the sector? How will it encourage the exploitation of timber resources in Europe?

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

The EU supports open and fair trade between domestic and foreign producers. In this context, trade agreements and trade-defence instruments are essential tools to provide a global level playing field required for the competitive position of the EU industry.

SMEs from the furniture and woodworking sectors will be able to benefit from debt and equity financial instruments proposed for the next programming period (2014-2020), under the COSME Programme for SMEs as well as under the Horizon 2020 Programme for RDI-driven SMEs and small midcaps (up to 500 employees).

In addition, the action plan on Design-Driven Innovation (SWD(2013) 380) includes measures to promote design-driven innovation in industries to strengthen Europe's competitiveness. While the EU action on advanced manufacturing aims at fostering the uptake of new production technologies in any industry, including the furniture industry.

In response to the challenge of sustainable access to wood and other raw materials, the Commission has launched the European Innovation Partnership on Raw Materials. The Strategic Implementation Plan adopted on 25 September 2013 contains concrete actions in this area. The new EU Forest Strategy (COM(2013) 659) also recognises a need to assess potential wood supply and facilitating increased sustainable wood mobilisation.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011677/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Fiona Hall (ALDE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Karen rights in Burma

In recent years, the EU has provided funding to assist vulnerable populations in Burma/Myanmar, as well as for Burmese refugee camps in Thailand. Despite steps to improve social and economic development and human rights in Burma, there have been reports of continued human rights abuses against Burma's Karen community and ongoing conflict and displacement in ethnic states.

In light of this, what is the European External Action Service (EEAS) doing to assist the Karen community in Burma?

What steps is the EEAS taking to encourage the Burmese Government to address human rights violations and the displacement of ethnic Karen refugees?

How will the EEAS encourage the Burmese Government to move towards a permanent ceasefire agreement with groups in the Karen state?

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

The EU is providing both humanitarian and development assistance for all disadvantaged groups in Myanmar/Burma regardless of ethnicity or religion. In the eastern border areas, including Karen state, support is provided for shelter and livelihoods, human rights, demining and strengthening civil society.

The EU is also the largest donor for peace projects in Myanmar/Burma. It not only supports the Myanmar Peace Centre, which has played an important role in the ethnic peace process, but also non-state actors and initiatives which include ceasefire monitoring. A new EUR 25 million programme to support peace, reconciliation and development will start in early 2014.

In addition to assistance projects, the EU regularly raises its concerns about the human rights situation with the Government of Myanmar. The EU-Myanmar Task Force on 13-15 November 2013 led by the HR/VP, discussed human rights not only with civil society and development partners, but also with Government, both Houses of Parliament and with the local business community.

The Joint Statement by the President of the European Council, the President of the Commission and the President of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar on 'Building a Lasting EU-Myanmar Partnership' of 5 March 2013 includes the agreement to promote human rights and the rule of law for all people living in Myanmar. A human rights dialogue is being established to help Myanmar/Burma to fulfil its commitments.

Finally, the EU has been over the last few years the main sponsor of the UN General Assembly human rights resolution on Myanmar, which on 19 November 2013 for the second consecutive year was adopted by consensus in close cooperation with the country concerned.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011678/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(14 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Γυναίκες και ανισότητα

Σύμφωνα με μία πρόσφατη έκθεση σχετικά με την ανισότητα των φύλων, η οποία δημοσιεύθηκε από την Παγκόσμια Τράπεζα, οι γυναίκες σε 15 χώρες αντιμετωπίζουν ακόμη ανισότητες λόγω φύλου στο νομικό και επιχειρηματικό πεδίο, καθώς οι σύζυγοί τους μπορούν νομίμως να τις παρεμποδίσουν να εργαστούν. Από τη δεκαετία του 1960, πάνω από είκοσι οικονομίες σε διάφορες χώρες, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της Ινδονησίας και του Μαρόκο, έχουν σημειώσει πρόοδο, περιορίζοντας τα νόμιμα δικαιώματα των ανδρών να θέτουν όρια στην εργασία των συζύγων τους. Τα τελευταία δύο χρόνια, η Ακτή Ελεφαντοστού, το Μαλί και η Γκάνα έχουν προβεί σε μεταρρυθμίσεις των νομοθεσιών τους προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση. Χώρες όπως η Ακτή Ελεφαντοστού, το Μαλί, οι Φιλιππίνες και η Σλοβακία έχουν εισαγάγει τον μεγαλύτερο αριθμό μεταρρυθμίσεων τα τελευταία χρόνια.

Η έκθεση ([1]) επισημαίνει ότι το 90% των 143 οικονομιών του κόσμου εμπεριέχουν τουλάχιστον μία νομική διάκριση, η οποία περιορίζει τις οικονομικές ευκαιρίες που παρέχονται στις γυναίκες, σε σχέση με τους άνδρες, στη συγκεκριμένη χώρα, ενώ 28 από τις οικονομίες αυτές παρουσιάζουν τουλάχιστον 10 νομικές διακρίσεις μεταξύ των ανδρών και των γυναικών στον επιχειρηματικό κόσμο. 25 από τις χώρες αυτές βρίσκονται στη Μέση Ανατολή, Βόρεια Αφρική και στην υποσαχάρια Αφρική.

Επί του παρόντος, 79 χώρες θέτουν συνταγματικά όρια στο είδος των επαγγελμάτων που δικαιούνται να ασκούν οι γυναίκες. Τέτοιου είδους περιορισμοί υφίστανται στην Ανατολική Ευρώπη και στην Κεντρική Ασία και προκαλούν αρνητικές επιπτώσεις στις επιχειρήσεις, στην ανταγωνιστικότητα της οικονομίας συνολικά, καθώς και στο ποσοστό συμμετοχής των γυναικών στο εργατικό δυναμικό. Η έκθεση υπογραμμίζει, επίσης, ότι εξακολουθούν να υφίστανται μισθολογικές αποκλίσεις εις βάρος των γυναικών στην αγορά εργασίας και υπο-εκπροσώπηση των γυναικών σε συνταγματικά δικαστήρια ή σε άλλα ανεξάρτητα όργανα δικαστικού χαρακτήρα σε 19 χώρες.

Δεδομένου ότι η ΕΕ μπορεί να διαδραματίσει αποφασιστικό ρόλο στις εξωτερικές σχέσεις και στις διμερείς συμφωνίες με τις χώρες αυτές:

α. Τι είδους δράση προτίθεται να αναλάβει η Επιτροπή, τόσο στις χώρες της ΕΕ, όσο και σε τρίτες χώρες, προκειμένου να διασφαλίσει την ίση μεταχείριση των γυναικών στην αγορά εργασίας και να τερματίσει περαιτέρω περιορισμούς τιθέμενους από τους συζύγους τους, λαμβανομένων υπόψη των ανωτέρω πορισμάτων της έκθεσης της Παγκόσμιας Τράπεζας;

β. Δύναται η Επιτροπή να παράσχει πληροφορίες για κοινές δράσεις που έχουν ήδη αναλάβει η ΕΕ και ο ΟΗΕ, σχετικά με την αλλαγή της νοοτροπίας και την καταπολέμηση στερεοτύπων εις βάρος της ισότητας των φύλων;

**Απάντηση του κ. Piebalgs εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(12 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

1. Η χειραφέτηση των γυναικών προϋποθέτει μακροχρόνια αλλαγή της κοινωνίας και της πολιτισμικής παιδείας σε πολλούς τομείς. Για να αποδώσει και να είναι βιώσιμη πρέπει να είναι το αποτέλεσμα δέσμευσης και δυναμικών πρωτοβουλιών της κοινωνίας των πολιτών, παρά επιβολής από εξωτερικούς παράγοντες. Πάντως, σε χώρες εκτός της ΕΕ, η ΕΕ υποστηρίζει την κοινωνία των πολιτών και νομοθετικές μεταρρυθμίσεις με στόχο τη μείωση του χάσματος των φύλων όσον αφορά την πρόσβαση στις αγορές εργασίας και τις συνθήκες εργασίας.

Στην Ευρώπη, το άρθρο 23 του Χάρτη των Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ ορίζει ότι «Η ισότητα γυναικών και ανδρών πρέπει να εξασφαλίζεται σε όλους τους τομείς, μεταξύ άλλων στην απασχόληση, την εργασία και τις αποδοχές». Η οδηγία 2006/54/ΕΚ ([2]) απαγορεύει τη διαφορετική μεταχείριση μεταξύ ανδρών και γυναικών όσον αφορά την πρόσβαση στην απασχόληση και την επαγγελματική κατάρτιση και σε σχέση με τους όρους εργασίας, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της αμοιβής. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί συνεχώς την εφαρμογή και την επιβολή της εν λόγω οδηγίας και βοηθά τα κράτη μέλη και άλλους εμπλεκόμενους παράγοντες για την ορθή επιβολή και εφαρμογή των ισχυόντων κανόνων.

([1]) http://wbl.worldbank.org/~/media/FPDKM/WBL/Documents/Reports/2014/Women-Business-and-the-Law-2014-Key-Findings.pdf
([2]) Οδηγία 2006/54/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 5ης Ιουλίου 2006, για την εφαρμογή της αρχής των ίσων ευκαιριών και της ίσης μεταχείρισης ανδρών και γυναικών σε θέματα εργασίας και απασχόλησης (αναδιατύπωση), ΕΕ L 204 της 26.7.2006, σ. 23-36.

2. Σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο, η ΕΕ αναπτύσσει πλούσια δραστηριότητα στην προώθηση των κοινωνικοοικονομικών δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών. Το 2012, χρηματοδότησε 39 έργα σε όλο τον κόσμο, για να εξασφαλιστεί η ισότιμη πρόσβαση των γυναικών στους οικονομικούς πόρους και τις υπηρεσίες, ώστε να αυξηθεί η συμμετοχή τους στην οικονομική ανάπτυξη (30 εκατ. ευρώ). Έχει αναπτυχθεί πολύ καλά η συνεργασία με τον ΟΗΕ σχετικά με την ισότητα των φύλων. Πέρα από πλήθος έργων με οργανισμούς των Ηνωμένων Εθνών επί του ζητήματος αυτού, το 2012 υπεγράφη μνημόνιο συνεννόησης μεταξύ της ΕΕ και της Unwomen. Ένα επιτυχημένο έργο με την Unicef σε πέντε χώρες εστιάστηκε στην καταπολέμηση επιβλαβών κοινωνικών προτύπων, και ιδίως του ακρωτηριασμού των γυναικείων γεννητικών οργάνων και του πρόωρου γάμου. Επιπλέον, ένα έργο κόστους 20 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ πρόκειται να υλοποιηθεί με το UNFPA στη Λαϊκή Δημοκρατία του Κονγκό, με στόχο την υποκίνηση αλλαγής στην αντίληψη του ρόλου των γυναικών στην κοινωνία.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011678/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Women and inequality

According to a recent gender inequality report published by the World Bank, women in 15 countries still face gender inequalities in the world of business and law, as their husbands can legally prevent them from working. Since the 1960s, over two dozen economies in various countries, including Indonesia and Morocco, have made progress by curtailing the legal rights of men to place restrictions on their wives working. In the last two years, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali and Ghana have reformed their laws to that effect. Countries such as Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, Philippines and Slovakia have introduced the largest number of reforms in recent years.

The report ([1]) shows that 90% of the world's 143 economies have at least one legal difference restricting economic opportunities available to women compared to those for men in that country, whereas 28 of these economies have at least 10 legal differences for men and women in the business world. 25 of these countries are located in the Middle East, North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa.

79 countries currently place constitutional limits on the kinds of jobs that women can do. Such restrictions exist in Eastern Europe and in Central Asia and have a negative impact on businesses, the competitiveness of the overall economy and on the female labour force participation rate. The report also highlights persisting wage gaps to the detriment of women in the labour market and the under-representation of women in constitutional courts or court-like bodies in 19 countries.

Given the pivotal role that the EU can play in foreign relations and bilateral agreements with these countries:

(1) What action does the Commission intend to take, in both EU and non-EU countries, to ensure the equal treatment of women in the labour force, and to stop further hindrance by their husbands, in view of these findings in the World Bank report?

(2) Can the Commission provide information on joint actions already undertaken by the EU and the UN on changing mentalities and combating stereotypes against gender equality?

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

1. Women's empowerment involves lengthy societal and cultural change in many areas. To be efficient and sustainable, it must be the result of civil society engagement and activism, rather than being imposed by external partners. Nevertheless, in non-EU countries, the EU supports civil society and legislative reforms aiming at reducing the gender gap in access to labour markets and working conditions.

In Europe, Article 23 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU provides that 'equality between women and men must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay'. Directive 2006/54/EC ([2]) prohibits differential treatment of men and women in access to employment and vocational training and in relation to working conditions, including pay. The Commission is constantly monitoring the application and enforcement of this directive and assisting MS and other stakeholders in properly enforcing and applying the existing rules.

2. At global level, the EU is very active in promoting women's socioeconomic rights. In 2012, it funded 39 projects around the world, to ensure women's equal access to economic resources and to services in order to increase their participation in economic growth (EUR 30 million). Collaboration with the UN on gender equality is very well developed. Apart from many projects with UN agencies on this issue, a memorandum of understanding was signed in 2012 between the EU and UNWOMEN. A successful project with Unicef focused on fighting harmful social norms, notably female genital mutilation and early marriage in five countries. In addition, a EUR 20 million project is about to be implemented with UNFPA in the Democratic Republic of Congo aiming at initiating a change in perception of women's role in society.

([1]) http://wbl.worldbank.org/~/media/FPDKM/WBL/Documents/Reports/2014/Women-Business-and-the-Law-2014-Key-Findings.pdf
([2]) Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation (recast), OJ L 204, 26.7.2006, p. 23-36.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011679/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nicole Sinclaire (NI)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Progress Microfinance Facility

The Commission's report on the implementation of the European Progress Microfinance Facility (COM(2013)0562) states: 'Currently there are 26 participating institutions in 15 Member States using either or both of the Facility's windows. A contract with a UK-based provider (non-bank) was due to be completed by May 2013'.

Could the Commission inform me when this provider will become operational? When will British citizens be able to access funding through the Progress Microfinance Facility?

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

An agreement for the funding from the European Progress Microfinance Facility has been signed with Fair Finance. The agreement under the guarantee window of Progress Microfinance is fully financed by the European Union. A small ceremony was held in London on 7th of October 2013. The provider is already operational.

While Fair Finance is the first institution in the UK to receive support under this facility, British citizens are also able to benefit from microloans provided by Progress Microfinance intermediaries throughout the EU, subject to specific conditions of the providers.

Possibilities also exist to support microfinance development through Operational Programmes co-financed by the European Social Fund or the European Regional Development Fund, including by way of loan, equity or guarantee instruments.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011680/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nicole Sinclaire (NI)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Welfare of pigs — illegal tail docking

The EU directive on the protection of pigs, which came into force in 2003, makes the docking of pigs' tails illegal.

The NGO Compassion in World Farming has revealed that this practice is still widespread ([1]).

Has the Commission done anything to identify those Member States that are routinely flouting the law?

What steps has the Commission taken, or what steps does it envisage taking, to address this cruel and unnecessary practice?

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

Routine tail-docking, which is contrary to the requirements of Directive 2008/120/EC ([2]), is widespread across the EU.

The Commission takes the implementation of animal welfare rules seriously. Thus several actions are foreseen in the EU Animal Welfare Strategy 2012-2015 ([3]) to improve the degree of enforcement across EU.

The Commission began to develop guidelines on the provision of manipulable material and avoidance of tail biting in 2013 and has already convened two meetings with the Member States and stakeholders. Such guidelines may assist both pig producers and Member States' authorities in their efforts to comply with Directive 2008/120/EC, and thus to abandon tail-docking.

Additionally, the Commission provides national officials with training programmes ([4]) to build a common understanding of the legislative requirements.

---

([1]) http://www.ciwf.org.uk/news/pig_farming/pigs_in_europe_still_suffering.aspx
([2]) OJ L 47, 18.2.2009, p. 5-13.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm
([4]) Better Training for Safer Food; http://www.sancotraining.izs.it/joomla/index.php/training-activities-2013-2014/training-calendar

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011681/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Lucas Hartong (NI)**
*(14 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Bizarre boete Urker visser

Afgelopen vrijdag blijkt Urker visser PW 447 in Noorwegen te zijn beboet ten bedrage van 16 000 euro ([1]). Zijn overtreding? Het per ongeluk overboord glijden van een zevental scharretjes die bij het uitzetten van de netten weggleden. Inclusief visverlet, juridische bijstand en duurder vistransport vanuit Noorwegen een schadepost van 23 000 euro, becijfert de eigenaar. Toen hij de Noorse hoofdcontroleur meldde dat hij nog nooit zoiets had meegemaakt in zijn 35-jarige loopbaan, kreeg hij ten antwoord: „(Norway) We protect our waters". De discardban wordt door de Noren kennelijk gebruikt om vissers uit EU lidstaten te weren. In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Vindt de Commissie met de PVV dat dit optreden van het land Noorwegen jegens een visser uit een EU lidstaat volstrekt onacceptabel gedrag is?

2. Kan een visser uit een EU lidstaat meer van dit soort idiote boetes verwachten bij het per ongeluk overboord glijden van zeven scharretjes? Wat gaat uw Commissie doen om dat te voorkomen?

3. Wat gaat de Commissie doen om het land Noorwegen op het matje te roepen en ervoor te zorgen dat deze boete jegens PW447 per direct ongedaan wordt gemaakt?

4. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat de discardban nu al een volstrekt mislukte maatregel is?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Damanaki namens de Commissie**
*(3 januari 2014)*

Noorwegen voerde ruim tien jaar geleden een teruggooiverbod in om zijn hulpbronnen te beschermen. Noorwegen houdt intensief toezicht op de visserijactiviteiten in de wateren die onder zijn jurisdictie vallen en geeft systematisch zware boetes voor overtredingen van de visserijregelgeving. EU-vissers die regelmatig in de Noorse wateren vissen, zijn hier meestal goed van op de hoogte. Met de hervorming van het gemeenschappelijk visserijbeleid wordt een verplichting ingevoerd om ook in EU-wateren alle vangsten aan land te brengen. De Commissie is van mening dat de invoering van de aanlandingsverplichting een belangrijke stap is voor de bescherming van de visserijbronnen. Het Europees Parlement en de Raad treden dit standpunt bij.

De Commissie respecteert het Noorse teruggooiverbod en is van mening dat dit alleen kan slagen als het wordt nageleefd en gehandhaafd.

EU-vissers die zich niet aan de Noorse regels houden, kunnen een zware boete krijgen; bij herhaalde inbreuken kunnen zij hun vergunning om in Noorse wateren te vissen, kwijtraken.

De reder heeft de mogelijkheid om in beroep te gaan binnen het Noorse rechtsstelsel.

([1]) http://visserijnieuws.punt.nl/content/2013/10/Noorse-boete-van-16000-euro-voor-een-paar-scharretjes#sthash.nEsTtowt.dpuf.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011681/13**
**to the Commission**
**Lucas Hartong (NI)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Bizarre fine for Urk fisherman

Last Friday, it seems that Urk-based fishing vessel PW 447 was fined EUR 16 000 in Norway ([1]). What was the offence? It was the accidental release overboard of seven dabs that fell out when the nets were put out. According to the owner, when lost fishing hours, legal bills and the increased costs in bringing the fish back from Norway are taken into account, this all amounts to a loss of EUR 23 000. When he told the Norwegian head inspector that he had never been involved in anything like it in his 35-year career, he was told, 'Norway: we protect our waters.' The Norwegians are evidently using the discard ban to keep fishermen from EU Member States away.

1. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV) that this action on Norway's part against a fisherman from an EU Member State is completely unacceptable behaviour?

2. Can fishermen from EU Member States expect more of this kind of idiotic fines, should seven dabs accidently slip overboard? What is the Commission going to do to prevent this?

3. What is the Commission going to do to call Norway to account and ensure that this fine against PW 447 is immediately reversed?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the discard ban should now be considered a completely failed measure?

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

Norway established a discard ban in order to protect their resources more than a decade ago. Norway carries out extensive surveillance of fishing activities in the waters under its jurisdiction and systematically applies a deterrent level of fines for violations of its fisheries legislation. EU fishermen regularly operating in Norwegian waters are generally well aware of this. With the reform of the common fisheries policy, an obligation to land all catches is being introduced also in EU waters. The Commission believes that the introduction of the landing obligation is an important step towards conserving fisheries sources. The European Parliament and the Council have endorsed that view.

The Commission respects the Norwegian discard ban and believes it can only be successful if it is complied with and properly enforced.

EU fishermen not complying with Norwegian rules run a risk of being confronted with deterrent fines; in case of repeated offences they risk losing their license to fish in Norwegian waters.

The owner of the vessel has the possibility to lodge an appeal under the Norwegian judicial system.

([1]) http://visserijnieuws.punt.nl/content/2013/10/Noorse-boete-van-16000-euro-voor-een-paar-scharretjes#sthash.nEsTtowt.dpuf

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011682/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)**
*(14 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Nombramientos en la Comisión Nacional de los Mercados y la Competencia

Como sabe la Comisión, el Gobierno español ha creado la Comisión Nacional de los Mercados y la Competencia (CNMC), en la que fusiona los distintos organismos reguladores y la Comisión Nacional de la Competencia. A pesar de las distintas cartas remitidas por la Comisión al Gobierno español manifestando su preocupación y advirtiendo sobre la necesidad de que los nombramientos y ceses de los miembros de los consejos de las ANR con mandato en vigor sean conformes con los requisitos que se derivan de la legislación de la UE, el Gobierno español ha procedido al cese de los miembros de los organismos reguladores y de la competencia con mandato en vigor. Esta decisión del Gobierno español, que atenta gravemente contra la independencia de los organismos reguladores consagrada en la legislación de la UE, supone un precedente que, si la Comisión Europea no lo remedia, puede tener consecuencias nefastas para la eficiencia y la independencia de los organismos reguladores en España.

En base a estos hechos, deseo realizar las siguientes preguntas a la Comisión:

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que la independencia de las Autoridades Nacionales de Regulación (ANR) se ve comprometida por el cese de los miembros de sus consejos con mandato en vigor por motivos de reestructuración o fusión de los organismos reguladores?

2. ¿Cuáles son los indicios o criterios que, en ocasiones anteriores, ha utilizado el Servicio Jurídico de la Comisión para considerar que los ceses de los miembros de consejos de las Autoridades Nacionales de Regulación (ANR) por reestructuración o fusión de los organismos reguladores podrían socavar la independencia del regulador?

3. ¿Considera que el Gobierno español ha atendido las llamadas de atención recibidas a través de varias misivas de la Comisaria, Sra. Kroes, acerca del cese de los consejeros con nombramientos en vigor?

4. ¿Ha considerado la Comisión la oportunidad de aplicar a España medidas adoptadas con respecto a otros países, como Hungría o Polonia, por situaciones análogas?

**Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión**
*(10 de diciembre de 2013)*

La Comisión confiere gran importancia a la independencia de las autoridades nacionales de reglamentación, lo que incluye la independencia de los miembros de sus consejos. Si bien los Estados miembros disfrutan de un considerable grado de autonomía, en virtud de la legislación de la UE, para decidir cómo establecer sus organismos de la competencia y de regulación sectorial, deben cumplir debidamente todos los requisitos impuestos por dicha legislación, en particular los relativos al cese de los presidentes y consejeros de esas autoridades.

La Comisión ha supervisado muy estrechamente la adopción y aplicación de la Ley 3/2013, de creación de la Comisión Nacional de los Mercados y la Competencia (CNMC), manteniéndose en contacto con las autoridades españolas al respecto. Tras la aprobación de la Orden ministerial ECC/1796/2013 ([1]), que puso fin al periodo transitorio, la CNMC inició sus actividades el 7 de octubre de 2013. Los presidentes y consejeros de las autoridades previas que se fusionaron en la CNMC fueron cesados por sendos decretos reales publicados en el Boletín Oficial del Estado el 15 de octubre de 2013 ([2]).

La creación de la CNMC representa una reforma sustancial de los organismos de la competencia y de regulación sectorial de España, ya que ocho organismos se fusionan en una sola autoridad única. Ahora bien, una de las consecuencias de la aplicación de la reforma de la CNMC ha sido el cese de los presidentes y consejeros de las autoridades previas, por lo que los servicios de la Comisión están evaluando la compatibilidad de la legislación nacional pertinente con los requisitos aplicables en el marco de la legislación de la UE sobre las condiciones del cese de los presidentes y consejeros de las autoridades nacionales de reglamentación.

Los servicios de la Comisión concluirán su evaluación y adoptarán las medidas oportunas.

---

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/10/05/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-10371.pdf
([2]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/10/15/index.php?d=247&s=2

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011682/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Appointments to the National Commission for Markets and Competition

As the Commission is aware, the Spanish Government has set up a National Commission for Markets and Competition (CNMC), by merging individual regulators and the National Competition Commission. Despite several letters sent by the Commission to the Spanish Government expressing its concern and warning that serving board members of National Regulatory Authorities (NRAs) should be appointed and dismissed in compliance with the requirements of EC law, the Spanish Government has dismissed serving members of the regulatory bodies and the competition commission. This decision by the Spanish Government, which seriously compromises the independence of regulatory bodies as enshrined in EU legislation, sets a precedent that, if the Commission does not remedy the situation, may damage the effectiveness and independence of regulatory bodies in Spain.

1. Does the Commission think that the independence of the National Regulatory Authorities is compromised by the dismissal of serving board members due to the restructuring or merging of regulatory bodies?

2. On previous occasions, on what grounds or criteria did the Legal Service of the Commission determine that the dismissal of NRA board members due to the restructuring or merging of regulatory bodies could undermine regulatory independence?

3. Does it think that the Spanish Government has heeded the warnings it has received in a number of letters sent by Commissioner Kroes, concerning the dismissal of serving board members?

4. Has the Commission considered whether it should apply to Spain measures taken against other countries such as Hungary or Poland, in similar situations?

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

The Commission attaches great importance to the independence of national regulatory authorities, including the independence of their Board members. Whilst under EC law Member States have a considerable degree of autonomy in deciding how to set up their competition and sector regulatory bodies any requirements imposed by EC law shall be duly complied with, including those regarding the dismissal of Heads and Board Members of these authorities.

The Commission has been monitoring very closely the adoption and implementation of Law 3/2013 creating the National Commission for Markets and Competition (CNMC) and has been in contact with the Spanish authorities in this regard. Following the adoption of Ministerial Order ECC/1796/2013 ([1]), ending the transitory period, the CNMC began its activities on 7 October 2013. The Heads and Board Members of the previous authorities merged into the CNMC were dismissed by Government Royal Decrees published in the Spanish Official Journal on 15 October 2013 ([2]).

The creation of the CNMC represents a fundamental reform of the competition and sector regulatory bodies in Spain, merging into a new single authority a total of eight bodies. However, as one of the consequences of the implementation of the CNMC reform has been the termination of the mandates of Heads and Board Members of the previous authorities, the Commission services are carrying out the assessment of the compatibility of this national legislation with the applicable requirements under EC law regarding the conditions for the dismissal of Heads and Board Members of national regulatory authorities.

The Commission services will finalise their assessment and take the necessary actions as appropriate.

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/10/05/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-10371.pdf
([2]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/10/15/index.php?d=247&s=2

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011683/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Χάρτες υψηλής πιθανότητας συγκέντρωσης πληθυσμού που διατρέχει κίνδυνο φτώχειας

Η Επιτροπή, σύμφωνα με προηγούμενη απάντησή της (E-006404/2013) διερεύνησε, σε έργο που ξεκίνησε από κοινού με την Παγκόσμια Τράπεζα, τη δυνατότητα δημιουργίας χαρτών υψηλής πιθανότητας συγκέντρωσης πληθυσμού που διατρέχει κίνδυνο φτώχειας, δηλαδή με εισόδημα χαμηλότερο του 60% του εθνικού διάμεσου εισοδήματος. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για τα αποτελέσματα της έκθεσης; Ποια κράτη μέλη συμπεριλαμβάνει σε αυτό το πρώτο πιλοτικό πρόγραμμα; Προτίθεται να επεκτείνει την έρευνά της στο σύνολο των κρατών μελών της ΕΕ;

**Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(3 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Τα πορίσματα της μελέτης υπάρχουν μόνο ως χάρτες, οι οποίοι θα διατεθούν στο αξιότιμο μέλος χωριστά. Σε σύγκριση με τις στατιστικές EU-SILC ([1]) (επίπεδο NUTS 2 ([2])), οι συγκεκριμένοι χάρτες εκτιμήσεων για μικρές περιοχές αποτυπώνουν μια πιο διαφοροποιημένη εικόνα όσον αφορά τη γεωγραφική κατανομή των πληθυσμών που διατρέχουν τον κίνδυνο φτώχειας στη Ρουμανία (NUTS 3 ([3])), στην Ουγγαρία (LAU 1 ([4])), στην Εσθονία (LAU 2 ([5])), στη Σλοβενία (LAU 2) και στη Λετονία (NUTS 3). Η Παγκόσμια Τράπεζα έχει σχεδιάσει χάρτες της Σλοβακίας στο πλαίσιο άλλου έργου, για την κυβέρνηση της Σλοβακίας σχετικά με το επίπεδο LAU 1.

Οι χάρτες για την Πολωνία, την Τσεχική Δημοκρατία και τη Λιθουανία αναμένονται έως τον Φεβρουάριο του 2014. Δεν θα υπάρξουν χάρτες για τη Βουλγαρία και την Κροατία, αφού οι χώρες αυτές δεν καλύπτονται από το συγκεκριμένο σχέδιο.

Δεν έχει ληφθεί ακόμα απόφαση σχετικά με πιθανές ενέργειες παρακολούθησης.

Το ESPON ([6]), χωριστό πρόγραμμα της Επιτροπής, παρέχει εκτιμήσεις για μικρές περιοχές της ΕΕ-15.

([1]) European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions.
([2]) Ονοματολογία εδαφικών στατιστικών μονάδων, επίπεδο 2 — Βασικές περιφέρειες για την εφαρμογή των περιφερειακών πολιτικών.
([3]) Ονοματολογία εδαφικών στατιστικών μονάδων, επίπεδο 3 — Μικρές περιφέρειες για συγκεκριμένες διαγνώσεις.
([4]) Η τοπική διοικητική μονάδα επιπέδου 1, που ορίζεται για ορισμένες χώρες, αφορά μονάδες όπως κομητείες, επαρχίες, καντόνια κ.λπ.
([5]) Τοπική διοικητική μονάδα επιπέδου 2: δήμοι.
([6]) Ευρωπαϊκό δίκτυο παρατηρήσεων για την εδαφική ανάπτυξη και συνοχή (www.espon.eu).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011683/13**
**to the Commission**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Maps indicating areas where there is a high probability that people at risk of poverty will be concentrated

In answer to a previous question (E-006404/2013) the Commission indicated that it was, in cooperation with the World Bank, investigating the possibility of drawing up maps indicating areas where there is a high probability that people at risk of poverty, that is to say whose income is below 60% of the national median, will be concentrated. Can the Commission outline the findings of this study? Which Member States are included in this first pilot programme? Does the Commission intend to extend its investigations to all EU Member States?

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

The findings of the study exist only as maps and will be made available to the Honourable Member separately. Compared with EU-SILC ([1]) (NUTS2 ([2]) level), these small area estimation maps deliver a more differentiated picture of the spatial distribution of at-risk-of-poverty in Romania (NUTS3 ([3])), Hungary (LAU1 ([4])), Estonia (LAU2 ([5])), Slovenia (LAU2) and Latvia (NUTS3). The World Bank has prepared maps of Slovakia as part of a different project, for the Slovak government on the LAU1 level.

Maps for Poland, Czech Republic and Lithuania are expected by February 2014. No maps will be provided for Bulgaria and Croatia as these countries are not part of this project.

No decision has yet been taken about possible follow-up.

A separate Commission project, ESPON ([6]) delivers small area estimations for the EU-15.

([1]) European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions.
([2]) Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, level 2 — basic regions for the application of regional policies.
([3]) Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, level 3 — small regions for specific diagnoses.
([4]) Local Administrative Unit, level 1, defined for some countries, denote units such as counties, districts, cantons etc.
([5]) Local Administrative Unit, level 2, municipalities.
([6]) The European Observation Network for Territorial Development and Cohesion (www.espon.eu).

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011684/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Άμισθη μαθητεία

Η άμισθη μαθητεία, που είναι ευρέως διαδομένη στις ΗΠΑ και τα τελευταία έτη κερδίζει σημαντικό έδαφος και στην Ευρώπη, κατηγορείται συχνά για εκμετάλλευση νέων με προσόντα, με αφορμή, μεταξύ άλλων, τα υψηλά ποσοστά ανεργίας. Μετά από πολλές ομαδικές αγωγές μαθητευομένων εναντίον εταιριών, οι ΗΠΑ πρόσφατα αποφάσισαν να θέσουν σαφή πλαίσια στο καθεστώς των μαθητειών. Για παράδειγμα, το Υπουργείο Εργασίας των ΗΠΑ ορίζει ότι οι περίοδοι μαθητείας πρέπει αποδεδειγμένα να ωφελούν κατά κύριο λόγο τον μαθητευόμενο και όχι τις επιχειρήσεις, ενώ με δικαστικές αποφάσεις αμφισβητείται η άμισθη εργασία και προκρίνεται η έμμισθη με ελάχιστη αμοιβή τον βασικό μισθό. Παρόμοιος προβληματισμός αναπτύσσεται και σε αρκετά κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, με την Γαλλία να θεσπίζει μέτρο σύμφωνα με το οποίο οι μαθητευόμενοι που εργάζονται για περισσότερο από δύο μήνες θα πρέπει να λαμβάνουν τον βασικό μισθό.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Καθώς στις σχετικές εκθέσεις της κρίνει ότι θα πρέπει να δοθεί σαφέστερος ορισμός σχετικά με το ποιος είναι μαθητευόμενος και να ορισθούν υψηλότερα επίπεδα αποζημίωσης των μαθητευομένων, διαπιστώνει πρόοδο των κρατών μελών σε αυτόν τον τομέα;

2. Αναμένονται νέες πρωτοβουλίες, κατά το πρότυπο των ΗΠΑ, για μεγαλύτερη διασφάλιση και προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των μαθητευομένων στην ΕΕ;

**Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(10 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Οι πρωτοβουλίες που αναφέρει στην ερώτησή του ο κ. βουλευτής αποσκοπούν στην αντιμετώπιση καταχρήσεων στις περιπτώσεις πρακτικής άσκησης (γνωστές και ως μαθητείες), που έχουν επεκταθεί τα τελευταία χρόνια. Για να αντιμετωπιστεί το πρόβλημα της πρακτικής άσκησης χαμηλής ποιότητας, η Επιτροπή πρόκειται τον Δεκέμβριο να υποβάλει πρόταση για ένα πλαίσιο ποιότητας για την πρακτική άσκηση, με σκοπό να εξασφαλίζονται κατάλληλες συνθήκες εργασίας και ένα υψηλό επίπεδο μαθησιακού περιεχομένου για τους ασκούμενους.

Παράλληλα, στις 2 Ιουλίου 2013 η Επιτροπή καθιέρωσε την Ευρωπαϊκή Συμμαχία για θέσεις μαθητείας, για να ενισχυθούν η ποιότητα και το κύρος των μαθητειών. Αντίθετα με την πρακτική άσκηση, που έχει μικρή διάρκεια και δεν οδηγεί σε εθνικά αναγνωρισμένη πιστοποίηση, οι μαθητείες νοούνται ως μορφές της αρχικής επαγγελματικής εκπαίδευσης και κατάρτισης (ΑΕΕΚ) που συνδυάζουν επίσημα, και εναλλάσσονται με αυτήν, την κατάρτιση σε επιχειρήσεις (περίοδοι πρακτικής επαγγελματικής εμπειρίας στη θέση εργασίας) με τη σχολική εκπαίδευση (περίοδοι θεωρητικής/πρακτικής εκπαίδευσης στο πλαίσιο σχολείου ή κέντρου κατάρτισης). Η επιτυχής ολοκλήρωση της μαθητείας οδηγεί στην απόκτηση εθνικά αναγνωρισμένων τυπικών προσόντων ΑΕΕΚ ([1]).

Στις 18 Οκτωβρίου 2013 τα κράτη μέλη, σε δήλωση του Συμβουλίου ([2]), τόνισαν ότι πρέπει να ενθαρρύνονται η αποτελεσματικότητα και η ελκυστικότητα των συστημάτων μαθητείας μέσω, μεταξύ άλλων, της εξασφάλισης κατάλληλων αμοιβών και κοινωνικής προστασίας για τους μαθητευόμενους.

([1]) Βλ. τη μελέτη «Προσφορά μαθητείας στα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης», http://ec.europa.eu/education/vocational-education/doc/forum12/supply_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/139011.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011684/13**
**to the Commission**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Unpaid apprenticeships

Unpaid apprenticeships, which are widespread in the US and are rapidly gaining ground in Europe, are often accused of exploiting skilled young people on the pretext, among other things, of high unemployment rates. Following numerous class actions brought by apprentices against companies, the US recently decided to introduce a clear framework for apprenticeship schemes. For example, the US Department of Labour has stipulated that apprenticeships must demonstrably primarily benefit the apprentice, not the company, and courts have passed judgments contesting unpaid work in favour of paid work at no less than the minimum wage. Similar concerns are emerging in several EU Member States; France has enacted a measure whereby apprentices who work for more than two months must be paid the basic wage.

1. As reports on the matter have concluded that a clearer definition is needed as to who qualifies as an apprentice and that high levels of remuneration are needed for apprentices, does the Commission believe that the Member States are making progress in this sector?

2. Does it anticipate new initiatives similar to those taken in the US, in order to provide greater safeguards and protection for the rights of apprentices in the EU?

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

The initiatives mentioned in the question by the Honourable Member aim at tackling abuses in traineeships (known also as internships), which have grown more widespread in recent years. To address the problem of low quality traineeships, the Commission intends to make a proposal on a Quality Framework for Traineeships in December, with the aim of ensuring adequate working conditions and a high-level learning content for trainees.

In parallel, the Commission has launched the European Alliance for Apprenticeships on 2 July 2013 to strengthen the supply, quality and image of apprenticeships. In opposition to traineeships, which are usually of short duration and do not lead to a nationally recognised certification, apprenticeships are understood as those forms of Initial Vocational Education and Training (IVET) that formally combine and alternate company based training (periods of practical work experience at a workplace) with school based education (periods of theoretical/practical education followed in a school or training centre), and whose successful completion leads to nationally recognised initial VET qualifications. ([1])

On 18 October 2013 Member States have declared in a Council Declaration ([2]) that the effectiveness and attractiveness of apprenticeship schemes should be encouraged by, *inter alia*, ensuring adequate remuneration and social protection of apprentices.

([1]) See study 'Apprenticeship Supply in the Member States of the European Union', http://ec.europa.eu/education/vocational-education/doc/forum12/supply_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/139011.pdf

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011685/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Δημογραφική πορεία των κρατών μελών της Ευρώπης

Παράλληλα με την οικονομική κρίση, το δημογραφικό πρόβλημα εμφανίζεται, μεταξύ άλλων, και ως σημαντικός δυνητικός παράγοντας αρνητικών επιπτώσεων στην ευρωπαϊκή οικονομία. Τα στοιχεία είναι αποκαλυπτικά. Για να ανανεωθεί ομαλά ο πληθυσμός της γης, κάθε γυναίκα θα πρέπει να γεννάει 2,1 παιδιά. Στην Ευρώπη όμως, το ποσοστό αυτό είναι μόλις 1,52, με αποτέλεσμα ο αριθμός των θανάτων να ξεπερνά τον αριθμό των γεννήσεων.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε θέση να μου παραθέσει συγκριτικά στοιχεία για την εκτιμώμενη πορεία του δημογραφικού των κρατών μελών; Σε ποια ευρωπαϊκά κράτη παρατηρείται το εντονότερο πρόβλημα και σε ποια εκτιμάται ότι η πορεία του πληθυσμού δεν θα είναι ιδιαίτερα αρνητική στο μέλλον;

2. Καθώς σε διάφορα έγγραφα της Επιτροπής και ψηφίσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου έχει προταθεί ως μέτρο ανάσχεσης της μείωσης του πληθυσμού στα κράτη μέλη, η πολιτική ενίσχυσης της αναπαραγωγής, διαπιστώνει η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή την ύπαρξη σχετικών πρόσφατων πολιτικών σε κράτη μέλη; Είναι σε θέση να μου παραθέσει καλές πολιτικές πρακτικές από ορισμένα από αυτά;

**Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(2 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

1. Σε τακτά χρονικά διαστήματα, η Επιτροπή (Eurostat) συλλέγει δημογραφικές στατιστικές από τα κράτη μέλη και υπολογίζει, με βάση τα δεδομένα που συλλέγονται, διάφορους δημογραφικούς δείκτες.

Στις χώρες της ΕΕ, η γονιμότητα παρουσίασε σταθερή μείωση από τα μέσα της δεκαετίας του 1960 έως το 2001. Σε γενικές γραμμές, κατά τις τελευταίες δεκαετίες οι Ευρωπαίοι αποκτούν λιγότερα παιδιά, γεγονός που εξηγεί εν μέρει την επιβράδυνση της αύξησης του πληθυσμού της ΕΕ. Ωστόσο, στην αρχή της προηγούμενης δεκαετίας, το συνολικό ποσοστό γονιμότητας ([1]) στην ΕΕ παρουσίασε κάποια σημάδια ανάκαμψης και, επί του παρόντος, είναι περίπου 1,6 γεννήσεις ζώντων ανά γυναίκα.

Ο δείκτης υποχώρησε απότομα μεταξύ 1980 και 2000-2002 σε πολλές χώρες, σε ποσοστό πολύ χαμηλότερο από το επίπεδο αντικατάστασης: το 2000, το ποσοστό ήταν κάτω από 1,3 στη Βουλγαρία, τη Δημοκρατία της Τσεχίας, την Ελλάδα, την Ισπανία, την Ιταλία, τη Σλοβενία και τη Σλοβακία. Αφού έφτασε στο κατώτατο όριο μεταξύ των ετών 2000 και 2002, το συνολικό ποσοστό γονιμότητας αυξήθηκε ξανά στα περισσότερα κράτη μέλη στη διάρκεια των εννέα ετών έως το 2011 (το τελευταίο έτος για το οποίο υπάρχουν διαθέσιμες πληροφορίες), με τα ποσοστά όλων των χωρών της ΕΕ να υπερβαίνουν το 1,3, με εξαίρεση την Ουγγαρία (1,2 γεννήσεις ζώντων ανά γυναίκα), την Πολωνία και τη Ρουμανία (αμφότερες με 1,3 γεννήσεις ζώντων ανά γυναίκα) ([2]).

2. Η απάντηση στην ερώτηση E-011418/2013 ([3]) αναφέρεται σε αποτελεσματικές πολιτικές για την αντιμετώπιση του ζητήματος της γονιμότητας και στο ρόλο της Επιτροπής στην ενθάρρυνσή τους.

---

([1]) Το συνολικό ποσοστό γονιμότητας είναι ο μέσος αριθμός ζώντων παιδιών που θα αποκτούσε μια γυναίκα στη διάρκεια της ζωής της, εάν έπρεπε να συμμορφωθεί με τα ειδικά κατά ηλικία ποσοστά γονιμότητας για ένα δεδομένο έτος σε όλη την αναπαραγωγική ηλικία της. Ένα συνολικό ποσοστό γονιμότητας περίπου 2,1 γεννήσεις ζώντων ανά γυναίκα θεωρείται ως επίπεδο αντικατάστασης: δηλαδή, ο μέσος αριθμός γεννήσεων ζώντων ανά γυναίκα που απαιτείται για να διατηρηθεί το μέγεθος του πληθυσμού σταθερό, αν δεν υπάρχει εσωτερική ή εξωτερική μετανάστευση.

([2]) Βλ. τη Δημογραφική έκθεση του 2010 στην ιστοσελίδα
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=502&newsId=1007&furtherNews=yes
και το συμπλήρωμα για τη δημογραφία της Τριμηνιαίας επιθεώρησης του Μαρτίου 2013 στην ιστοσελίδα
http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?pager.offset=0&langId=en&mode=advancedSubmit&policyArea=0&subCategory=0&year=0&country=0&type=0&advSearchKey=quarterlyreview&orderBy=docOrder

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

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011685/13**
**to the Commission**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Demographic trends in EU Member States

Alongside the economic crisis, the demographic problem appears, among other things, to be an important potential factor in terms of its adverse impact on the European economy. The figures speak for themselves. If the earth's population is to renew at a normal rate, every women will need to give birth to 2.1 children. However, in Europe, this rate is just 1.52; in other words, the number of deaths exceeds the number of births.

1. Is the Commission able to provide comparative statistics on demographic trends in the Member States? In which European countries is the problem most acute and in which is the trend considered to be most unfavourable in terms of their future demographic?

2. As various Commission documents and EP resolutions have proposed that a policy to support reproduction would help to reverse the decline in the population in the Member States, has the Commission noted any such policies recently in the Member States? Is it able to identify best political practices in any of them?

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

1. The Commission (Eurostat) regularly collects demographic statistics from the Member States and calculates, based on the collected data, several demographic indicators.

Fertility steadily declined from the mid-1960s to the turn of the century in the EU countries. In recent decades Europeans have generally been having fewer children, which partly explains the slowdown in the EU's population growth. At the beginning of the last decade, however, the total fertility rate ([1]) in the EU has shown some signs of rising again and it currently stands at around 1.6 live births per woman.

The indicator declined steeply between 1980 and 2000-2002 in many countries to far below the replacement level: in 2000 values had fallen below 1.3 in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Greece, Spain, Italy, Slovenia and Slovakia. After bottoming out between 2000 and 2002, the total fertility rate has increased again in most Member States in the nine years to 2011 (the latest year for which information is available), with all EU countries seeing rates above 1.3 with the exception of Hungary (1.2 live births per woman), Poland and Romania (both at 1.3 live births per woman) ([2]).

2. The reply to Question E-011418/2013 ([3]) addresses effective policies to address fertility and the Commission's role in fostering them.

---

([1]) The total fertility rate is the mean number of children that would be born alive to a woman during her lifetime if she were to conform to the age-specific fertility rates for a given year throughout her childbearing years. A total fertility rate of around 2.1 live births per woman is considered to be the replacement level: in other words, the average number of live births per woman required to keep the population size constant in the absence of inward or outward migration.

([2]) See the 2010 Demography Report at http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=502&newsId=1007&furtherNews=yes and the demography supplement to the March 2013 Quarterly Review at http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?pager.offset=0&langId=en&mode=advancedSubmit&policyArea=0&subCategory=0&year=0&country=0&type=0&advSearchKey=quarterlyreview&orderBy=docOrder

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

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011686/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Διαχείριση ψηφιακών αρχείων μετά τον θάνατο πολίτη

Σήμερα δεν υπάρχει νομικό πλαίσιο που να διέπει τη διαχείριση των ψηφιακών αρχείων, μετά τον θάνατο ενός πολίτη στην ΕΕ, με αποτέλεσμα οι οικογένειες να χάνουν το δικαίωμα πρόσβασης στα αρχεία αγαπημένων τους προσώπων. Κάποιες εταιρίες ωστόσο προχωρούν σε ορισμένες προβλέψεις. Για παράδειγμα η google επιτρέπει στον χρήστη να προγραμματίσει τι θέλει να συμβεί στον λογαριασμό του σε ενδεχόμενο θανάτου, ενώ το facebook επιτρέπει στους συγγενείς να επιλέξουν αν θα κλείσουν τον λογαριασμό ή θα τον μετατρέψουν σε σελίδα μνήμης.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Προτίθεται να αναλάβει συγκεκριμένη πρωτοβουλία ώστε να θεσπιστούν στα κράτη μέλη σαφείς κανόνες για τα δικαιώματα πρόσβασης των οικογενειών στα δεδομένα των αγαπημένων τους προσώπων που έχουν αποβιώσει;

2. Υπάρχουν σήμερα παραδείγματα από κράτη μέλη που έχουν αναλάβει πρωτοβουλίες για τη ρύθμιση του συγκεκριμένου ζητήματος;

**Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(13 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το αξιότιμο μέλος στην απάντηση που είχε δώσει στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-007232/2012.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011686/13**
**to the Commission**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Management of citizen's digital files after their death

There is currently no legal framework governing the management of an EU citizen's digital files after their death; as a result, families are losing the right to access their loved ones' files. However, some companies are making certain provisions. For example, Google allows users to programme what they want to happen to their account in the event of their death, while Facebook allows relatives to choose between closing the account or turning it into a memorial page.

1. Does the Commission propose to take a specific initiative in order to introduce clear rules in the Member States on families' right to access the data of their deceased loved ones?

2. Do the Member States which have taken initiatives on this particular matter have examples of how it can be regulated?

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

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-007232/2012.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011687/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Πορεία εμβασμάτων από και προς την Ελλάδα

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή για τα πλέον πρόσφατα στοιχεία σχετικά με τα μεταναστευτικά εμβάσματα από και προς την Ελλάδα; Ποια είναι κατάσταση εισροής και εκροής εμβασμάτων σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο;

**Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(4 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα εμβάσματα που εισέρχονται σε μια χώρα (πιστώσεις/εισαγωγές/εισροές) και εξέρχονται από μια χώρα (χρεώσεις/εξαγωγές/εκροές) συλλέγονται σε τακτική βάση και διαδίδονται από την Eurostat ως μέρος των στατιστικών για το ισοζύγιο πληρωμών.

Κατά την περίοδο 1999-2012 οι ροές των μεταναστευτικών εμβασμάτων παρουσιάζουν σταθερά αρνητικό υπόλοιπο, επειδή οι εκροές κεφαλαίων είναι πολύ μεγαλύτερες από τις εισροές. Τα εξερχόμενα εμβάσματα από την ΕΕ αυξάνονταν με ταχείς ρυθμούς έως το 2008, ενώ στη συνέχεια παρέμειναν σχετικά σταθερά, σε ποσό λίγο μεγαλύτερο από 40 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ.

Η Ελλάδα ήταν καθαρός αποδέκτης εμβασμάτων μέχρι το 2009 και κατόπιν έγινε καθαρός αποστολέας, ιδίως λόγω της μείωσης των εισροών από τους κύριους εταίρους της, τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και τη Γερμανία. Οι κυριότεροι αποδέκτες εμβασμάτων από την Ελλάδα είναι η Αλβανία και η Γεωργία.

Μαζί με τα δεδομένα που αφορούν τα μεταναστευτικά εμβάσματα θα μπορούσαν να εξεταστούν και τα δεδομένα που σχετίζονται με τις αμοιβές των εργαζομένων. Ενώ η ΕΕ 27 είναι καθαρός αποδέκτης ροών που συνδέονται με τις αμοιβές των εργαζομένων (κυρίως λόγω των εισροών που προέρχονται από την Ελβετία), η Ελλάδα από το 2008 είναι καθαρός αποστολέας, κυρίως λόγω της απασχόλησης στον ελληνικό εμπορικό στόλο (οι Φιλιππίνες είναι ο μεγαλύτερος αποδέκτης) και της μεγάλης εποχιακής δραστηριότητας που συνδέεται με τον τουρισμό.

Παρά το γεγονός ότι, το 2010 και το 2011, η ΕΕ 27 ήταν καθαρός αποδέκτης μεταναστών, το 2011 στην Ελλάδα καταγράφηκε αύξηση του αριθμού των εξερχόμενων μεταναστών.

Μια επισκόπηση των ροών που συνδέονται με τα εμβάσματα της ΕΕ 27 και της Ελλάδας περιλαμβάνεται στο παράρτημα, το οποίο θα διαβιβαστεί απευθείας στον αξιότιμο βουλευτή.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011687/13**
**to the Commission**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Remittances to and from Greece

Is the Commission able to provide the most recent statistics on migrants' remittances to and from Greece? What is the situation in terms of incoming and outgoing remittances at European level?

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

Information on remittances entering a country (credits/imports/inward flows) and leaving a country (debits/exports/outwards flows) is regularly collected and disseminated by Eurostat as part of the Balance of Payments statistics.

In the period 1999-2012 EU-27 workers' remittances flows always show a negative balance due to the outflows of funds being much larger than the inflows. Outflows of remittances from the EU increased rapidly till 2008, and then remained rather stable, slightly above EUR 40 billion.

Greece was a net beneficiary of remittances up to 2009, and then became a net sender, mainly due to a decline in the inward flows from its main partners, United States and Germany. The main receivers of remittances from Greece are Albania and Georgia.

Together with the data related to workers' remittances, the data related to compensation of employees could also be considered. While the EU 27 is a net receiver of flows related to compensation of employees (mainly due to the flows arriving from Switzerland), Greece is a net sender, since 2008, mainly due to the employment in the Greek maritime fleet (with the Philippines being the biggest recipient) and the large seasonal activity related to tourism.

While in 2010 and 2011 the EU-27 was a net receiver of migrants, Greece in 2011 records an increase in the number of emigrants.

An overview of the flows related to remittances of the EU-27 and Greece is included in the annex, which will be transmitted directly to the Honourable Member.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011688/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Φορολογικές μεταρρυθμίσεις στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ

Πρόσφατη έκθεση ([1]) της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής που φέρει τον τίτλο «Φορολογικές μεταρρυθμίσεις στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ», ειδικά για την Ελλάδα προτείνει, μεταξύ άλλων, αλλαγές στον τρόπο φορολόγησης των ακινήτων με μείωση του φόρου μεταβίβασης και αύξηση των φόρων για την κατοχή ακινήτων. Σε έρευνα ωστόσο της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος αποτυπώνεται ότι, εξαιτίας της οικονομικής κρίσης, η πτώση των αντικειμενικών αξιών των ακινήτων στην χώρα, από το τέλος του 2008 έως το β' τρίμηνο του 2013, υπολογίζεται κατά μέσο όρο σε 30,3%.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Οι προτάσεις της αφορούν και προσαρμογή των αξιών των ακινήτων στις νέες πραγματικές αντικειμενικές τους αξίες στην Ελλάδα;

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012489/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)**
*(5 Νοεμβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Άμεση αναπροσαρμογή των αντικειμενικών αξιών στην Ελλάδα και ευθυγράμμισή τους με τη σημερινή πραγματικότητα στην αγορά ακινήτων

Οι αντικειμενικές αξίες, σύμφωνα με το συνολικότερο πλαίσιο του φορολογικού συστήματος της Ελλάδας αλλά και τις ειδικότερες κατευθύνσεις για την επικείμενη θέσπιση του Ενιαίου Φόρου Ακινήτων, αποτελούν τη βάση για τον προσδιορισμό και την επιβολή των συντελεστών φορολόγησης (κατοχή και μεταβίβαση) των ακινήτων. Μολονότι η πολυετίπεδη και παρατεταμένη κρίση που πλήττει τη χώρα μας έχει οδηγήσει σε κατακόρυφη πτώση τις τιμές των ακινήτων, οι αντικειμενικές αξίες παραμένουν αμετάβλητες από το 2007 δημιουργώντας ένα σημαντικό και διαρκώς αυξανόμενο «χάσμα» ανάμεσα στην πραγματική (εμπορική) και την αντικειμενική αξία των ακινήτων που αφενός προκαλεί δυσανάλογα μεγάλη επιβάρυνση για τους κατόχους και αφετέρου λειτουργεί ως «τροχοπέδη» για τις αγοραπωλησίες, εκτινάσσοντας το φόρο μεταβίβασης σε σχέση με την τιμή αγοράς. Σε αυτήν την κατεύθυνση ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς κρίνει αυτή σοβαρή στρέβλωση που διαμορφώνεται στη φορολογική πραγματικότητα της Ελλάδας με συνέπεια την άδικη και υπέρ του δέοντος φορολόγηση της πλειονότητας των κατόχων ακινήτων;

2. Προτίθεται να προωθήσει την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών προκειμένου να αναδειχθούν οι πλέον ενδεδειγμένοι τρόποι προσδιορισμού των αντικειμενικών αξιών των ακινήτων;

3. Ως μέλος της Τρόικας, προτίθεται να προωθήσει την άμεση αναπροσαρμογή και ευθυγράμμιση των αντικειμενικών αξιών με τις πραγματικές τάσεις που επικρατούν στην αγορά ακινήτων με δεδομένη και την εκπορευόμενη από τις Συμβάσεις Δανεισμού ανάγκη για αναθεώρηση των αντικειμενικών αξιών;

**Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(20 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η έκθεση σχετικά με τις φορολογικές μεταρρυθμίσεις στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, στην οποία αναφέρεται ο κύριος βουλευτής, είναι ένα τεχνικό έγγραφο αναφοράς.

Όσον αφορά τις προτάσεις για τον νέο φόρο ακίνητης περιουσίας στην Ελλάδα αρμόδια είναι η ελληνική κυβέρνηση. Η Επιτροπή εξετάζει αυτές τις προτάσεις στο πλαίσιο των επισκοπήσεων εφαρμογής του προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής που εκπονούνται από κοινού από την Επιτροπή, την ΕΚΤ και το ΔΝΤ. Οι τρέχουσες προτάσεις για τον νέο φόρο ακίνητης περιουσίας, όπως υποβλήθηκαν για δημόσια διαβούλευση, προτείνουν ένα σύστημα αποτίμησης ακίνητης περιουσίας που βασίζεται στις επονομαζόμενες αντικειμενικές αξίες που χρησιμοποιούνται από το 2005. Αυτό το καθεστώς αποτίμησης βάσει της αντικειμενικής αξίας έχει χρησιμοποιηθεί για άλλους πρόσφατους φόρους ακινήτων και φόρους κεφαλαίου στην Ελλάδα, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των τοπικών φόρων. Παρόμοιες μέθοδοι εφαρμόζονται σε άλλα κράτη μέλη, όπως στη Φινλανδία, την Πορτογαλία και την Ισπανία. Το μνημόνιο συμφωνίας του Ιουλίου 2013 περιλαμβάνει δέσμευση για ανάπτυξη μεθόδου η οποία θα επιτρέπει την αναθεώρηση των αντικειμενικών αξιών των ακινήτων ώστε να αντικατοπτρίζουν τις τιμές της αγοράς (τμήμα 2.2).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/gen_info/economic_analysis/tax_papers/taxation_paper_34_en.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011688/13**
**to the Commission**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Tax reforms in EU Member States

A recent Commission report entitled 'Tax reforms in EU Member States' ([1]) includes proposals, specifically for Greece, to change the way in which property is taxed, by reducing transfer tax and increasing real estate taxes. However, according to a survey by the Bank of Greece, property values in Greece fell by an average of 30.3% between the end of 2008 and the second quarter of 2013 due to the economic crisis.

Do the Commission's proposals involve adjusting the property values in line with their new market values in Greece?

**Question for written answer E-012489/13**
**to the Commission**
**Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)**
*(5 November 2013)*

*Subject:* Immediate adjustment of rateable values of properties in Greece in line with current market values

Rateable values are the basis on which tax rates on the ownership and sale of properties are assessed and applied within the overall framework of the tax system in Greece and the specific guidelines on the single property tax which is to be introduced shortly. Although the multiple-faceted and extended crisis which has hit Greece has caused property prices to plummet, rateable values have not changed since 2007 and this is creating a large and ever-increasing 'gap' between real (market) values and the rateable values of properties, causing disproportionately high charges for owners and discouraging sales by inflating the transfer tax in relation to the purchase price. In view of this, will the Commission say:

1. What is its opinion of the serious distortion emerging in the tax system in Greece, which is resulting in unfair and overly high taxes for most property owners?

2. Does it intend to promote an exchange of best practices in order to highlight the most appropriate methods for determining the rateable value of properties?

3. As a member of the Troika, does it intend to promote an immediate adjustment of rateable values in line with actual trends on the property market, given that the loan agreements require rateable values to be revised?

**Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**
*(20 December 2013)*

The report on Tax Reforms in EU Member States as referred by the Honourable Member is a technical background paper.

The proposals on the new Property Tax in Greece are the responsibility of the Greek Government. The Commission examines such proposals in the context of the Economic Adjustment Programme implementation reviews carried out jointly by the Commission, the ECB and the IMF. The current proposals for the Property Tax as released for public consultation proposes a property valuation system based on so-called Objective Values used since 2005. This legal valuation system has been used for other recent property and capital taxes in Greece, including local taxes. Similar methodologies are used in other Member States, for example Finland, Portugal and Spain. The Memorandum of Understanding of July 2013 contains a commitment to develop a methodology to allow for the revision of legal values for real estate to better reflect market prices (Section 2.2).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/gen_info/economic_analysis/tax_papers/taxation_paper_34_en.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011689/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Possible misuse of EU funds

On a recent visit to the occupied city of Famagusta in order to see first-hand the extent of the decay affecting homes and hotels belonging to Greek Cypriots in the fenced-off area of Varosha, I came across the Venetian Palace, the restoration of which received EU funding through the UNDP-implemented 'Partnership for the Future' (PFF) programme. I noticed, however, that most of the area covered by the Venetian Palace was being used as a car park.

1. Can the Commission confirm whether the purpose of the funding was to transform the remains of a sixteenth-century palazzo into a car park?

2. If this was not the purpose, will the Commission seek a refund from the Turkish Cypriot community for misusing EU funds?

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

The renovation of the Venetian Palace Courtyard in Famagusta was carried out in 2005 as part of a wider modernisation support programme for that city. This included the modernisation of the water/sanitation system of Famagusta as well as urban upgrading, together with the revitalisation of the walled city and the conservation of the architectural and cultural heritage and improvement of the living environment of Famagusta residents. The programme was funded by the EU under the 2003 pre-accession funds and implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) — Partnership for the Future.

For the Venetian Palace, the aim of the renovation was to decommission the old car park, identify a new parking space and provide illumination for the walls of the Palace courtyard. Since then a number of public events have taken place in this location, which is in good condition.

The Commission was recently informed that bollards were put in place to prevent the palace courtyard from being used as a parking space. The Commission will follow the application of this measure.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011690/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)**
*(14 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Scomparsa dei saperi manuali

Le associazioni della piccola impresa e dell'artigianato hanno lanciato l'allarme, che non emoziona più di tanto i cittadini utenti italiani. Falegnami, fabbri, sarti, idraulici, macellai, saldatori, ecc. sono sempre più difficilmente reperibili sul mercato del lavoro. A mano a mano che gli anziani scompaiono, nessuno, o ben pochi, li rimpiazzano. Sicché risulta sempre più arduo mantenere in vita certe attività artigianali e trasmettere quei saperi manuali che hanno rappresentato un'eccellenza artigianale in diversi settori. Chi dà la colpa alla scomparsa delle «botteghe» in cui i giovani, fin da ragazzi, imparavano un mestiere. Chi invece ritiene che l'eliminazione dell'apprendistato abbia allontanato i giovani dai mestieri manuali. Chi infine crede che la responsabilità sia del progresso, in nome del quale, con l'introduzione di nuove tecnologie, si elimina il lavoro manuale a vantaggio di quello meccanico ed automatico. Ma ci sono mestieri che non possono essere automatizzati. Per fare un violino, ad esempio, non è concepibile usare macchine automatiche. Così dicasi per certe opere dei fabbri o dei mosaicisti. La scomparsa degli artigiani è una tendenza che si potrebbe arrestare, anche se è correlata ad un atteggiamento culturale radicato che collega i mestieri ad intensità manuale a un disvalore. La scomparsa di certi saperi non è un danno solo per l'individuo, ma lo è dell'intera comunità umana. Come provvedere altrimenti? Andando culturalmente in controtendenza e allineare il sistema scolastico a quello delle aziende, riorientando la scuola tecnico-professionale sul mondo del lavoro, partendo dai contesti locali. A Cremona, per esempio l'orientamento professionale non può dimenticare il violino, oppure il settore dolciario (torrone e caramelle), o ancora il settore alimentare (salumi). Sono le eccellenze locali e la loro produzione abbisogna di giovani preparati in quei contesti. Il mercato del lavoro assicurerebbe posti certi e specializzati. E l'Europa?

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Può dire se la diminuzione del lavoro artigianale si avverte anche in altri Paesi dell'Unione?

2. In caso affermativo, perché non prevedere un capitolo speciale dei Fondi di Coesione dedicato al sostegno delle professioni artigianali e delle scuole professionali idonee allo scopo?

**Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione**
*(10 dicembre 2013)*

Le preoccupazioni dell'on. parlamentare in merito al declino delle abilità manuali è confermato dalle ricerche sul mercato del lavoro effettuate dal CEDEFOP. Il numero di lavoratori specializzati nella meccanica di precisione, nell'artigianato, nella stampa e lavoratori assimilati ([1]) è diminuito da 1,7 milioni a 1,2 milioni tra il 2000 e il 2010 nell'UE ([2]); un'ulteriore diminuzione del 17 % è prevista entro il 2020. In alcuni paesi (ad es. Finlandia, Ungheria e Lettonia) si prevede che i livelli d'occupazione aumenteranno mentre in altri tenderanno a decrescere (ad es. Irlanda, Italia e Regno Unito). ([3]) Il Consiglio europeo delle competenze settoriali tessile, pelletteria e abbigliamento ha a sua volta affrontato il problema di preservare le competenze rare consolidando geograficamente l'offerta di formazione per tali competenze ([4]).

L'Alleanza europea per l'apprendistato ([5]), varata il 2 luglio 2013, ha lo scopo di aumentare la disponibilità, la qualità e l'immagine degli apprendistati. L'esperienza dei paesi nei quali esistono regimi di apprendistato ben sviluppati mostra che tali strumenti di formazione sono offerti prevalentemente dalle PMI.

Inoltre il Fondo sociale europeo potrebbe finanziare la formazione professionale nell'artigianato nell'ambito dell'obiettivo tematico 10 del futuro regolamento recante disposizioni comuni. Tali azioni devono basarsi su elementi concreti riguardanti la domanda di queste competenze.

---

([1]) I lavoratori di questa categoria fabbricano e riparano strumenti, articoli vari come gioielli, oggetti di metallo prezioso, ceramiche, porcellana e vetro, oltre a prodotti dell'artigianato in legno, tessili, cuoio o materiali affini. Operano anche nei settori della stampa e della rilegatura di libri. Per ulteriori particolari si veda «EU Skills Panorama (2013) Precision, handicraft, craft printing and related trades workers Analytical Highlight», documento preparato da ICF GHK per la Commissione europea, http://euskillspanorama.ec.europa.eu/docs/AnalyticalHighlights/73%20PrecisionHandicraftPrintWorkers_en.pdf

([2]) CEDEFOP, 2013, Skills Forecast Detailed data, strumento online, http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/EN/about-cedefop/projects/forecasting-skill-demand-and-supply/skills-forecasts/detailed-data.aspx

([3]) EU Skills Panorama (2013) idem.

([4]) http://europeanskillscouncil.t-c-l.eu/eng/structure/general/results.html

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/apprenticeship/index_en.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011690/13**
**to the Commission**
**Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Disappearance of manual skills

Associations of small businesses and craft enterprises have sounded the alarm, but it is not exciting much interest among Italian consumers. It is becoming increasingly difficult to find joiners, blacksmiths, tailors, plumbers, butchers, welders, etc., on the labour market. As older tradesmen disappear, nobody, or very few individuals, are replacing them. It is therefore becoming increasingly hard to keep certain crafts alive and to pass on the manual skills that have characterised high-quality craftsmanship in various sectors. Some blame the disappearance of the workshops in which young people would learn a trade from childhood. Some believe that getting rid of apprenticeships has distanced young people from manual trades. Finally, some believe that progress, through the introduction of new technologies and the consequent elimination of manual work in favour of mechanical, automated work, is responsible. However, there are trades that cannot be automated. Using automated machines to make a violin, for example, is inconceivable. The same applies to certain work done by tailors or mosaicists. The disappearance of craftsmen is a trend that could be halted, although it is correlated to an entrenched cultural attitude that regards highly manual trades as being of no value. The disappearance of certain skills is damaging not only for individuals, but for humanity as a whole. How can we change the way we do things? We could go against the tide in cultural terms, and align the school system to that of businesses, reorienting the technical and trades schools towards the world of work, based on local conditions. In Cremona, for example, vocational training should not neglect the violin, or the confectionery sector (nougat and sweets), or the food sector (salted meats). These are the local quality products, and producing them requires young people who are trained in these sectors. The labour market would provide secure, specialised jobs: what about Europe, as a whole?

Could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Can a decrease in skilled manual work be seen in other EU countries too?

2. If so, why not set up a special chapter of the Cohesion Funds dedicated to supporting the craft professions, and vocational schools that train craftsmen?

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

The Honourable Member's concern regarding the decline in manual skills is supported by available labour market intelligence from Cedefop. The numbers of employed precision, handicraft, craft printing and related trades workers ([1]) declined from 1.7 million to 1.2 million between 2000 and 2010 in the EU ([2]) while further decline by 17% is expected up to 2020. In some countries (e.g. Finland, Hungary, and Latvia), the levels of employment are expected to grow, while in others they are expected to decline (e.g. Ireland, Italy and the UK). ([3]) The European Sector Skills Council Textile Leather and Clothing also raised the issue of preserving rare skills by consolidating geographically the training offer in such skills ([4]).

The European Alliance for Apprenticeships ([5]) launched on 2 July 2013 aims to increase the supply, quality and image of apprenticeships. Experience in countries with well-developed apprenticeship schemes shows that placements for apprenticeships are mostly offered by SMEs.

Moreover, the European Social Fund could finance vocational training in the craft industry under the thematic objective 10 of the future Common Provisions Regulation. Such actions should be based on evidence concerning the demand for such skills.

---

([1]) Workers within this occupation make and repair instruments, various articles such as jewellery, precious metalware, ceramics, porcelain ware and glassware, as well as produce handicrafts from wood, textile, leather or related materials. They also work in printing and book-binding. For more details see EU Skills Panorama (2013) Precision, handicraft, craft printing and related trades workers Analytical Highlight, prepared by ICF GHK for the European Commission.
http://euskillspanorama.ec.europa.eu/docs/AnalyticalHighlights/73%20PrecisionHandicraftPrintWorkers_en.pdf

([2]) Cedefop, 2013, Skills Forecast Detailed data, online tool,
http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/EN/about-cedefop/projects/forecasting-skill-demand-and-supply/skills-forecasts/detailed-data.aspx

([3]) EU Skills Panorama (2013) idem.

([4]) http://europeanskillscouncil.t-c-l.eu/eng/structure/general/results.html

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/apprenticeship/index_en.htm

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011691/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)**
*(14 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Progetto Transacqua (2)

Nella sua risposta all'interrogazione P-008774/13 dell'interrogante, la Commissione afferma che «è al corrente del progetto di trasferimento delle acque dell'Oubangui verso il lago Ciad (Transacqua)» e che «gli studi di fattibilità preliminare indicano tuttavia che il progetto comporterebbe notevoli rischi ambientali».

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Quale progetto comporterebbe notevoli rischi ambientali? Il progetto Transacqua (dal fiume Congo al lago Ciad), o il progetto ridotto Oubangui?

2. Nel caso si trattasse di quest'ultimo progetto, significa che i lavori non sono nemmeno cominciati?

3. Perché la Commissione non ha comunque risposto da che cosa dipenda il fatto che Transacqua non sia stato nemmeno preso in considerazione?

4. Perché la Commissione dà l'impressione di non volersi interessare dei grandi progetti infrastrutturali, usando il pretesto della tutela dell'ambiente, e privilegiando le micro iniziative?

5. Sa la Commissione che negli Anni Cinquanta in Italia coloro che erano contrari alla realizzazione dell'Autostrada del Sole affermavano che non si doveva fare perché divideva il Paese in due, nuocendo all'ambiente?

**Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione**
*(19 dicembre 2013)*

Nel progetto di trasferimento delle acque dell'Oubangui verso il lago Ciad sono stati evidenziati rischi ambientali. Sono ancora in corso studi di fattibilità e di impatto socioambientale e i lavori per questo progetto non sono ancora iniziati. La Commissione non partecipa al finanziamento di questi studi.

Nella scelta dei suoi interventi, la Commissione prende in considerazione l'insieme delle strategie e dei progetti di sviluppo dei paesi partner. Il sostegno dell'Unione europea al Ciad si articola da un lato in funzione della strategia nazionale di lotta alla povertà del paese partner e dall'altro al livello dei piani regionali di sviluppo.

Il quadro delle azioni regionali prioritarie a breve, medio e lungo termine nelle infrastrutture (acqua, energia, trasporti e tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione) è stato definito nel programma per lo sviluppo delle infrastrutture in Africa (PIDA) da tutti i partner nazionali e regionali. Per il momento, il progetto Transaqua non è stato scelto tra i 51 progetti selezionati.

Il piano nazionale di sviluppo proposto dal Ciad, che individua le priorità per il paese nel periodo 2013-2015, non fa riferimento al progetto Transaqua.

Anche se la Commissione europea attribuisce un'importanza fondamentale alla questione dell'impatto ambientale dei programmi finanziati, ciò non intacca il suo forte impegno nei confronti delle grandi opere infrastrutturali, in particolare quelle stradali, idriche e dell'elettricità, in Ciad e nella regione.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011691/13**
**to the Commission**
**Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Transaqua project (2)

In its reply to Written Question P-008774/13, the Commission states that it is aware of the water-transfer project from the Ubangi River to Lake Chad (Transaqua) and that preliminary feasibility studies, however, indicate that the project 'would involve major environmental risks'.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Which project would have significant environmental risks? The Transaqua project (from the Congo River to Lake Chad), or the scaled-down Ubangi project?

2. Should it be the latter, does this mean that the work has not even begun?

3. Why did the Commission not reply to the question: why has Transaqua not even been taken into consideration?

4. Why does the Commission give the impression that, under the pretext of environmental protection, it is not interested in major infrastructure projects, and would rather support micro-initiatives?

5. Is the Commission aware that in the 1950s, in Italy, those who were against the construction of the Autostrada del Sole motorway claimed that it should not be built because it would split the country into two and harm the environment?

*(Version française)*

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

Des risques environnementaux ont été identifiés pour le projet de transfert des eaux de l'Oubangui vers le lac Tchad. Des études de faisabilité et d'impacts sociaux-environnementaux sont encore en cours et les travaux n'ont pas encore commencé pour ce projet. La Commission ne participe pas au financement de ces études.

Dans le choix de ses actions, la Commission prend en considération l'ensemble des stratégies et projets de développement des pays partenaires. Les appuis de l'Union européenne au Tchad sont définis d'une part en fonction de la stratégie nationale de lutte contre la pauvreté du pays partenaire d'autre part au niveau des plans régionaux de développement.

Le cadre des actions régionales prioritaires à court, moyen et long termes dans les infrastructures (Eau, Energie, Transport et Technologie de l'information et des communications) a été défini dans le Programme pour le Développement des Infrastructures en Afrique (PIDA), par l'ensemble des partenaires nationaux et régionaux. À ce stade, le Projet Transaqua n'est pas retenu parmi les 51 projets sélectionnés.

Dans le Plan National de Développement proposé par le Tchad qui identifie les priorités du pays pour la période 2013-2015, il n'est pas fait mention du projet Transaqua.

La question de l'impact environnemental des programmes financés est d'une importance capitale pour la Commission européenne. Cependant, cela ne limite pas le fort engagement de la Commission européenne dans les travaux de grandes infrastructures, au Tchad et dans la région notamment dans les infrastructures routières, de l'eau et de l'électricité.

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011692/13**
**do Komisji**
**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**
*(14 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Podwyższenie cen skupu zboża

Jak poinformował mnie poseł Kazimierz Ziobro z Podkarpacia, sytuacja rolników w południowo wschodnich regionach Polski staje się dramatyczna. Aktualne ceny zbóż spadły poniżej kosztów opłacalności produkcji. Aby uzyskać zwrot kosztów produkcji, przy średnim plonie pszenicy na poziomie 4 ton z hektara, cena powinna wynosić ok. 900 zł za tonę. Przy obecnych cenach (600 zł za tonę) strata na uprawie jednego hektara pszenicy wynosi 3,2 tys. zł. Przy cenie 600 zł za tonę, aby produkcja stała się opłacalna, rolnik musiałby uzyskać 8,3 tony z hektara, a to jest niemożliwe. Dalszy rozwój sytuacji grozi zapaścią wśród producentów zboża w Polsce i bankructwami gospodarstw rolnych. Sytuację na rynku zbóż można stabilizować wykorzystując m.in. unijny mechanizm skupu interwencyjnego. Powinien być on uruchamiany wtedy, gdy dochody rolników spadają poniżej kosztów produkcji. Niestety, jak wspomina poseł Kazimierz Ziobro, cena płacona za tonę, wyznaczona przez KE, 101,3 euro nie jest w stanie pokryć kosztów produkcji. Zdaniem polskich rolników ceny powinny wahać się między 160-165 euro za tonę.

Czy wobec powyższego Komisja planuje w trybie pilnym podwyższenie obowiązującej ceny skupu interwencyjnego zboża?

Jakie działania zamierza podjąć Komisja, aby wspomóc rolników uprawiających zboże, szczególnie w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej? Czy zostaną uruchomione dodatkowe-interwencyjne programy skupu?

Czy Komisja przewiduje wprowadzenie dodatkowych opłat dla importerów taniego zboża ze wschodu – Ukrainy i Rosji, co pozwoliłoby na ustabilizowanie cen zboża na giełdach w Europie?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji**
*(26 listopada 2013 r.)*

W ramach reformy wspólnej organizacji rynków produktów rolnych mechanizm zabezpieczający systemu interwencji w sektorze zbóż został sprowadzony do poziomu 101,31 EUR/t. Utrzymano również zasady automatycznego otwarcia przetargów na pszenicę zwyczajną powyżej 3 mln ton oraz otwarcia – w zależności od sytuacji rynkowej – przetargów na pszenicę durum, kukurydzę i jęczmień, począwszy od pierwszej tony.

Podniesienie ceny interwencyjnej byłoby sprzeczne z zapoczątkowanym wiele lat temu zorientowaniem wspólnej polityki rolnej na rynek.

Ponadto poziom wsparcia wynoszący 101,31 EUR/t należy oceniać wspólnie z mechanizmem przyznawania płatności bezpośrednich, który gwarantuje duży stopień stabilności dochodów producentów, zapewniając jednocześnie konkurencyjność rolnictwa europejskiego oraz jego dostosowanie do warunków rynkowych.

W ramach wspomnianej reformy rolnicy będą mieli możliwość zbiorowego negocjowania umów kontraktacji na dostawy oliwy z oliwek, wołowiny, zbóż i innych roślin uprawnych z zastrzeżeniem określonych warunków i gwarancji.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011692/13**
**to the Commission**
**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The increase in the purchase price of wheat

I have been informed by my fellow Member Kazimierz Ziobro from the Subcarpathian region that the situation of farmers in the south-eastern regions of Poland is becoming quite dramatic. The current price of cereals has dropped below the costs of production, making it unprofitable. In order to obtain a return on the cost of production on an average wheat harvest at a level of 4 tonnes per hectare, the price should be around PLN 900 per tonne. At current prices (PLN 600 per tonne), the loss per hectare of wheat amounts to PLN 3 200. At a price of PLN 600 per tonne, in order for production to be profitable, a farmer would have to obtain 8.3 tonnes per hectare, but this is not possible. If the situation worsens there is a danger that cereal producers in Poland will collapse and their farms go into bankruptcy. The situation in the cereals market can be stabilised using the European Union intervention mechanism. It should be activated when farmers' incomes fall below the costs of production. Unfortunately, as my fellow Member Kazimierz Ziobro has mentioned, the intervention price set by the Commission of EUR 101.30 per tonne is not enough to cover the costs of production. In the opinion of Polish farmers, the prices should range from EUR 160 to EUR 165 per tonne.

In view of the above, does the Commission plan to increase the mandatory price of interventional purchases of cereals as a matter of urgency?

What action does the Commission intend to take in order to support farmers who produce cereals, in particular in central and eastern Europe? Will additional intervention purchase programmes be activated?

Does the Commission anticipate the introduction of additional fees for importers of cheap cereals from the East — Ukraine and Russia — which would allow the prices of cereals in European cereal markets to stabilise?

*(Version française)*

**Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission**
*(26 novembre 2013)*

Dans le cadre de la réforme de l'Organisation Commune des Marchés agricoles, le filet de sécurité du régime d'intervention dans le secteur des céréales a été reconduit au niveau de 101,31 euros/t. Les principes de l'ouverture automatique des adjudications pour le blé tendre au-delà de 3 millions de tonnes et de l'ouverture en fonction de la situation de marché, pour le blé dur, le maïs et l'orge, à compter de la première tonne ont été également maintenus.

Augmenter le prix d'intervention serait contraire à l'orientation de la Politique Agricole Commune vers le marché entamée depuis de nombreuses années.

Par ailleurs, le niveau de soutien de 101,31 euros/t doit être évalué conjointement avec le mécanisme d'octroi des paiements directs, lequel garantit un fort degré de stabilité aux revenus des producteurs tout en assurant la compétitivité de l'agriculture européenne et son adaptation aux conditions du marché.

Dans le cadre de ladite réforme, les agriculteurs auront la possibilité de négocier collectivement des contrats pour la fourniture d'huile d'olive et de viande de bœuf, de céréales et de certaines grandes cultures sous réserve de certaines conditions et garanties.

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011693/13**
**do Komisji**
**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**
*(14 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Przypadki importu ukraińskiej pszenicy z terenów Czarnobyla

Posłowie Kazimierz Ziobro i Mieczysław Golba z Podkarpacia poinformowali mnie o przypadkach importowania do Polski ukraińskiej pszenicy i rzepaku z terenów skażonych przez wybuch w Czarnobylu. W 2010 r. ukraiński minister ds. rolnictwa poinformował o rozpoczęciu zasiewów w rejonach objętych skażeniem. Jak stwierdził na prawie 1,3 mln hektarów rolnicy będą mogli rozpocząć uprawę zbóż oraz rzepaku. Decyzja ta pozwoliła zwiększyć areał uprawny, a co za tym idzie ilość zebranych plonów. Od ogłoszenia tej decyzji zbiory zbóż na Ukrainie wzrosły z ok 39,5 mln ton w 2010 do ok 57 mln ton w 2013. Pozwoliło to na większy eksport ukraińskiego zboża również do krajów UE. Jak informował poseł Kazimierz Ziobro w Polsce import taniego rzepaku oraz zboża z Ukrainy negatywnie wpływa na ceny skupu.

1. Czy Komisja otrzymała informację o uprawie na terenach skażonych przez wybuch w Czarnobylu? Czy monitoruje te uprawy?

2. Czy Komisja zgadza się z argumentami strony ukraińskiej potwierdzającymi bezpieczeństwo upraw położonych na terenach skażenia wybuchem w Czarnobylu dla ludzi i zwierząt? Kiedy i jakie przeprowadzono badania w tej sprawie?

3. Czy Komisja zamierza dokładniej monitorować uprawy oraz produkty rolne importowane do Unii z państw trzecich?

4. Jakie środki podjęła Komisja aby zapobiec importowi zboża i rzepaku uprawianych na skażonych terenach Ukrainy i Kazachstanu?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji**
*(4 grudnia 2013 r.)*

Komisja nie została poinformowana o prowadzeniu upraw na obszarach do tej pory skażonych na skutek awarii w Czarnobylu.

Zgodnie z przepisami rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 733/2008 ([1]) państwa członkowskie są zobowiązane do sprawdzania zgodności produktów rolnych pochodzących z państw trzecich, w tym z Ukrainy, z maksymalnym dozwolonym poziomem ustalonym dla sumy radionuklidów cezu-134 oraz cezu-137. Kontrole należy przeprowadzać z intensywnością, która uwzględnia stopień skażenia kraju pochodzenia, właściwości przedmiotowych produktów, wyniki poprzednich kontroli i obejmować świadectwa wywozowe. Kontrole te muszą być przeprowadzane przed dopuszczeniem danych produktów do swobodnego obrotu. Szczegółowe zasady kontroli zostały określone w rozporządzeniu Komisji (WE) nr 1635/2006 ([2]).

Każdy przypadek nieprzestrzegania prawodawstwa UE wiążący się z poważnym zagrożeniem dla zdrowia spowodowanym przez żywność lub paszę musi być zgłaszany za pomocą RASFF ([3]). Jeśli chodzi o przypadki niezgodności z maksymalnymi poziomami promieniotwórczości, od 2003 r. zgłoszono 8 przypadków dotyczących produktów z Ukrainy (5 w odniesieniu do grzybów, 2 w odniesieniu do borówek i jeden w odniesieniu do soku z borówek) natomiast nie odnotowano żadnych przypadków w odniesieniu do produktów pochodzących z Kazachstanu.

Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 733/2008 pozostaje w mocy do dnia 31 marca 2020 r. i w związku z tym kontrole produktów rolnych pochodzących z państw trzecich przewidziane na mocy tego rozporządzenia powinny być nadal prowadzone.

([1]) Rozporządzenie Rady (WE) nr 733/2008 z dnia 15 lipca 2008 r. w sprawie warunków regulujących przywóz produktów rolnych pochodzących z krajów trzecich w następstwie wypadku w elektrowni jądrowej w Czarnobylu (Dz.U. L 201 z 30.7.2008).

([2]) Rozporządzenie Komisji (WE) nr 1635/2006 z dnia 6 listopada 2006 r. ustanawiające szczegółowe zasady stosowania rozporządzenia Rady (EWG) nr 737/90 w sprawie warunków regulujących przywóz produktów rolnych pochodzących z państw trzecich w następstwie wypadku w elektrowni jądrowej w Czarnobylu (Dz.U. L 306 z 7.11.2006).

([3]) System wczesnego ostrzegania o niebezpiecznej żywności i paszach (RASFF).

Do tej pory nie odnotowano przypadków niezgodności z maksymalnym poziomem promieniotwórczości w odniesieniu do zbóż i rzepaku importowanych z Ukrainy i Kazachstanu. Dlatego też Komisja nie zamierza na razie podejmować dodatkowych działań w odniesieniu do tych produktów w związku z ewentualną obecnością promieniotwórczości.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011693/13**
**to the Commission**
**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Cases of importing Ukrainian wheat from areas near Chernobyl

Fellow Members Kazimierz Ziobro and Mieczysław Golba from the Subcarpathian region have informed me of instances of Ukrainian wheat and rape being imported into Poland from areas contaminated by the Chernobyl accident. In 2010, the Ukrainian minister of agriculture reported that areas which had been contaminated were starting to be used to grow crops. He said that farmers would be able to commence sowing cereals and rape on an area of almost 1.3 million hectares. This decision allowed acreage under cultivation, and therefore the amount of crops harvested, to be increased. Since this decision was announced, the cereal harvest in Ukraine has grown from around 39.5 million tonnes in 2010 to around 57 million tonnes in 2013. This has allowed more Ukrainian cereals to be exported to European Union Member States, as well as to others. As my fellow member Kazimierz Ziobro has said, the import of cheap rape and cereals from Ukraine has had a negative impact on purchase prices in Poland.

1. Was the Commission informed about the growing of crops on areas previously contaminated by the Chernobyl accident? Is it monitoring these crops?

2. Does the Commission agree with the Ukrainian arguments which confirm the safety of crops grown in areas contaminated by the Chernobyl accident for people and animals? What tests have been carried out in this matter, and when were they conducted?.

3. Does the Commission intend to continue to monitor crops and agricultural products imported into the European Union from third countries?

4. What measures has the Commission taken in order to prevent the import of cereals and rape grown in the contaminated areas of Ukraine and Kazakhstan?

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

The Commission has not been informed about the growing of crops on areas previously contaminated by the Chernobyl accident.

In accordance with the provisions of Council Regulation (EC) No 733/2008 ([1]), Member States have to check compliance of agricultural products originating in third countries, including Ukraine, with the maximum permitted level established for the sum of the radionuclides caesium -134 and -137. The intensity of the controls must take into account the degree of contamination of the country of origin, the characteristics of the products in question, the results of the previous checks and the export certificates. These controls must be performed before the release for free circulation of the products concerned. Detailed rules for the controls are laid down in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1635/2006 ([2]).

Every non-compliance with EU legislation involving a serious health risk deriving from food or feed has to be reported through the RASFF ([3]). As regards the findings of non-compliance with the maximum levels for radioactivity, there have been since 2003, 8 notifications on products from Ukraine (5 on mushrooms, 2 on blueberries and one on blueberry juice) and no notifications on products from Kazakhstan.

Regulation No (EC) No 733/2008 is in force until 31 March 2020 and consequently the controls on agricultural products from third countries provided for by this regulation should continue to be carried out.

No non-compliant findings with the maximum level of radioactivity have yet been reported on imports of cereals and rape from Ukraine and Kazakhstan. Therefore, the Commission has no intention for the time being to take additional measures for these products as regards possible presence of radioactivity.

---

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 733/2008 of 15 July 2008 on the conditions governing imports of agricultural products originating in third countries following the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station (OJ L 201, 30.7.2008).

([2]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1635/2006 of 6 November 2006 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EEC° No 737/90 on the conditions governing imports of agricultural products originating in third countries following the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power-station (OJ L 306, 7.11.2006).

([3]) Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF).

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011694/13**
**do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)**
**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**
*(14 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Zamachy ugrupowania Boko Haram w Nigerii

Islamska grupa Boko Haram zorganizowała atak terrorystyczny wymierzony w grupę studentów z Gujby. W wyniku strzelaniny śmierć poniosło co najmniej 40 osób.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się do Wysokiej Przedstawiciel z prośbą o udzielenie odpowiedzi na następujące pytania:

1. Jakie działania podjęła Wysoka Przedstawiciel, aby wesprzeć rząd w Nigerii w walce z grupą Boko Haram?

2. Jakie działania podjęto dotychczas, aby monitorować i zapobiegać atakom terrorystycznym wymierzonym w ludność cywilną w Nigerii?

3. Głównym celem ataków islamskich terrorystów są nigeryjscy chrześcijanie. Czy Wysoka Przedstawiciel planuje specjalne programy pomocowe dla nigeryjskich chrześcijan?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton**
**w imieniu Komisji**
*(10 grudnia 2013 r.)*

UE współpracuje zarówno z rządem, jak i ludnością Nigerii na rzecz położenia kresu panującej tam przemocy poprzez nieustający dialog polityczny dotyczący znalezienia odpowiednich rozwiązań istniejących problemów oraz ukierunkowane działania pomocowe w celu wspierania inicjatyw nigeryjskich i wyeliminowania przyczyn leżących u ich podstaw.

10. EFR wspiera szeroki zakres programów i działań związanych ze sprawowaniem rządów w dziedzinie wody, infrastruktury sanitarnej i zdrowia matek. Instrument na rzecz stabilności zapewnia ponadto konkretną pomoc w dziedzinie bezpieczeństwa i praworządności.

Naczelnym celem ataków islamskich buntowników są instytucje państwowe i instytucje bezpieczeństwa publicznego. W ostatnim czasie, jak w przypadku opisanym przez Szanownego Pana Posła Parlamentu, zaatakowane zostały także obiekty edukacyjne. Ofiarami tych brutalnych zabójstw są zarówno chrześcijanie, jak i muzułmanie. Proponuje się zatem nie dokonywać jakiegokolwiek rozróżnienia na tle religijnym w reagowaniu UE na te ataki, gdyż takie rozróżnienie przyniosłoby efekty odwrotne do zamierzonych jeśli chodzi o ogólne starania zmierzające do ochrony życia wszystkich Nigeryjczyków przed tym zagrożeniem.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011694/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**
*(14 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Attacks by the Boko Haram group in Nigeria

The Islamic group Boko Haram was behind a recent terrorist attack on a group of students from Gujba. At least 40 people were killed as a result of the shooting.

In relation to the above, I would like to ask the High Representative the following questions:

1. What action has the High Representative taken in order to support the Nigerian Government in its fight against the Boko Haram group?

2. What action has been taken to date to monitor and prevent terrorist attacks aimed at civilians in Nigeria?

3. The main target of these attacks by Islamic terrorists are Nigerian Christians. Is the High Representative planning any special aid programmes for Nigerian Christians?

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

The EU is working with the government and people of Nigeria to help bring an end to the current cycle of violence through both continuous political dialogue on appropriate solutions to the problems, as well as targeted aid interventions in support of Nigerian initiatives and addressing the underlying root causes.

The 10th EDF is supporting a broad range of governance related programmes and interventions in the field of water, sanitation and maternal health. In addition, the Instrument for Stability is providing specific assistance in the area of security and rule of law.

The main target of the attacks by Islamist insurgents are state and security insitutions. Lately, as in the case referred to by the Honourable Member of Parliament, education facilities have also been attacked. The victims of these brutal killings are both Christians and Muslims. It is not therefore proposed to draw any religious distinctions in the EU's response to these attacks on the grounds that these would be counter-productive to the overall efforts to protect the lives of all Nigerians from this threat.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011697/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**
*(15 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Εφαρμογή κανόνων κρατικών ενισχύσεων στις τράπεζες

Σύμφωνα με την ανακοίνωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής (2013/C 216/01) για τις «κρατικές ενισχύσεις των τραπεζών», δηλώνεται με τον πλέον σαφή τρόπο ότι η «Επιτροπή δεν θα απαιτεί την καταβολή εισφοράς από τους κατόχους χρεωστικών τίτλων αυξημένης εξασφάλισης (ιδίως από κατόχους ασφαλισμένων καταθέσεων, ανασφάλιστων καταθέσεων, ομολόγων και κάθε άλλου χρεωστικού τίτλου αυξημένης εξασφάλισης) ως υποχρεωτικό στοιχείο του καταμερισμού των επιβαρύνσεων».

Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Έχει τη δυνατότητα ένα κράτος μέλος να προβεί σε πρόσθετα μέτρα, όπως η καταβολή εισφοράς (φορολογίας) από κατόχους ασφαλισμένων καταθέσεων, προς όφελος της κεφαλαιακής ενίσχυσης μιας τράπεζας, παρά το γεγονός ότι η Επιτροπή «δεν θα απαιτεί» τέτοιου είδους επιβαρύνσεις;

— Στα πλαίσια της ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας, ποια είναι η διαφορά, μεταξύ της εξασφαλισμένης και της μη εξασφαλισμένης κατάθεσης; Ποια είναι η διαφορά μεταξύ «ομολόγων και άλλων χρεωστικών τίτλων» αυξημένης και μη, εξασφάλισης;

**Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(5 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής (2013/C 216/01· «τραπεζική ανακοίνωση του 2013») θεσπίζει την ελάχιστη απαίτηση για τον καταμερισμό των επιβαρύνσεων. Σύμφωνα με αυτή, πριν τη χορήγηση ενίσχυσης αναδιάρθρωσης σε μια τράπεζα, τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να εξασφαλίσουν ότι οι ζημίες καλύπτονται πρώτα από τους μετόχους, και ότι οι κάτοχοι υβριδικού κεφαλαίου και οι κάτοχοι μετοχικών τίτλων μειωμένης εξασφάλισης θα συμβάλουν στη μείωση του κεφαλαιακού ελλείμματος στο μέγιστο δυνατό βαθμό, έτσι ώστε να ελαχιστοποιηθεί το κόστος για τους φορολογούμενους.

Η παράγραφος 42 της τραπεζικής ανακοίνωσης του 2013 ορίζει ότι η Επιτροπή δεν θα απαιτεί την καταβολή εισφοράς από τους κατόχους χρεωστικών τίτλων αυξημένης εξασφάλισης (ιδίως από κατόχους ασφαλισμένων καταθέσεων, ανασφάλιστων καταθέσεων, ομολόγων και κάθε άλλου χρεωστικού τίτλου αυξημένης εξασφάλισης) ως υποχρεωτικό στοιχείο του καταμερισμού των επιβαρύνσεων σύμφωνα με τους κανόνες για τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις είτε με μετατροπή σε κεφάλαιο, είτε με μείωση της αξίας των μέσων.

Κάθε κράτος μέλος έχει την εξουσία να αποφασίσει εάν θα εφαρμόσει πρόσθετα μέτρα καταμερισμού των επιβαρύνσεων.

Ασφαλισμένες είναι οι καταθέσεις που καλύπτονται από συστήματα εγγύησης των καταθέσεων τα οποία προβλέπει το εθνικό δίκαιο σύμφωνα με την οδηγία 94/19/ΕΚ, και μέχρι του ποσού που ορίζει το άρθρο 7 της οδηγίας 94/19/ΕΚ. Ανασφάλιστες καταθέσεις είναι εκείνες που δεν καλύπτονται από συστήματα εγγύησης των καταθέσεων σύμφωνα με τον νόμο.

Η παράγραφος 42 της τραπεζικής ανακοίνωσης του 2013 εξαιρεί από το πεδίο εφαρμογής του καταμερισμού των επιβαρύνσεων τις ασφαλισμένες καταθέσεις, τις ανασφάλιστες καταθέσεις, τα ομόλογα και κάθε άλλο χρεωστικό τίτλο αυξημένης εξασφάλισης. Η παράγραφος 42 διευκρινίζει ότι οι χρεωστικοί τίτλοι μειωμένης εξασφάλισης εμπίπτουν στο πεδίο εφαρμογής του καταμερισμού των επιβαρύνσεων που η Επιτροπή θα απαιτεί όταν τα κράτη μέλη της ζητούν να εγκρίνει ενίσχυση αναδιάρθρωσης σε τράπεζα βάσει των κανόνων για τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις, αλλά όχι χρεωστικό τίτλο αυξημένης εξασφάλισης, οποιουδήποτε είδους κι αν είναι αυτός.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011697/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Application of state aid rules to the banks

According to the communication from the Commission (2013/C 216/01) on 'support measures in favour of banks', it states very clearly that 'The Commission will not require contribution from senior debt holders (in particular from insured deposits, uninsured deposits, bonds and all other senior debt) as a mandatory component of burden-sharing'.

Given the above, will the Commission answer the following:

— Can a Member State proceed to additional measures, such as a contribution (taxation) from insured deposit holders, to boost the capital support of a bank, in spite of the fact that the Commission 'will not require' burdens of such kind?

— What is the difference, in a European context, between insured deposits and uninsured deposits? What is the difference between 'bonds and other debt', both senior and non-senior?

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

The communication from the Commission (2013/C 216/01; 'the 2013 Banking Communication') establishes a minimum requirement for burden-sharing. Accordingly, before granting restructuring aid to a bank, Member States need to ensure that losses are first absorbed by shareholders, and that hybrid capital holders and junior capital holders contribute to reducing the capital shortfall to the maximum extent, in order to minimise the cost for taxpayers.

Paragraph 42 of the 2013 Banking Communication establishes that the Commission will not require contribution from senior debt holders (in particular from insured deposits, uninsured deposits, bonds and all other senior debt) as a mandatory component of burden-sharing under state aid rules, whether by conversion into capital or by write-down of the instruments.

If a Member State decides to apply additional burden-sharing measures, it would be a sovereign decision of that Member State.

Insured deposits are those deposits which are guaranteed by deposit guarantee schemes under national law in accordance with Directive 94/19/EC and up to the coverage level provided for in Article 7 of Directive 94/19/EC. Uninsured deposits are those that are not guaranteed by deposit guarantee schemes in accordance with the law.

Paragraph 42 of the 2013 Banking Communication excludes insured deposits, uninsured deposits, bonds and all other senior debt from the scope of burden-sharing. Paragraph 42 clarifies that subordinated debt comes within the scope of burden-sharing which the Commission would expect when asked by a Member State to approve restructuring aid to a bank under state aid rules, but not senior debt, whatever kind of senior debt it might be.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011698/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**
*(15 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Καταπάτηση δικαιωμάτων πολιτών και ατόμων με αναπηρία στο Δήμο Αθηναίων

Δεκάδες είναι οι καταγγελίες κατοίκων του Δήμου Αθηναίων ότι η δημοτική αρχή με την πολιτική της στην αδειοδότηση τραπεζοκαθισμάτων επιχειρήσεων εστίασης και ψυχαγωγίας, εμποδίζει την ελεύθερη πρόσβαση των πολιτών στα πεζοδρόμια της πόλης.

Το Δεκέμβριο του 2006, ο Συνήγορος του Πολίτη στην Ελλάδα, μετά από αρκετές καταγγελίες και αναφορές πολιτών, εξέδωσε πόρισμα (Υπόθεση 984/11.2.1999) για την «παρακώλυση της ελεύθερης χρήσης και προσπέλασης πεζοδρομίων και διαβάσεων εντός των ορίων του Δήμου Αθηναίων», στο οποίο αναφέρεται, μεταξύ άλλων, στις επιπτώσεις που έχει η άνευ ορίων αδειοδότηση τραπεζοκαθισμάτων των δημοτικών αρχών στην ελεύθερη χρήση και προσπέλαση πεζοδρομίων και διαβάσεων από τους πολίτες και τα άτομα με ειδικές ανάγκες. Τα τελευταία χρόνια η κατάσταση έχει γίνει δραματικότερη, θέτοντας πια σε άμεσο κίνδυνο, την ελεύθερη και ασφαλή διάβαση όλων των πολιτών της Αθήνας και ιδιαίτερα των ατόμων με αναπηρία.

Με δεδομένα, τόσο τον Χάρτη των Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ (άρθρο 26), όσο και την Ευρωπαϊκή Στρατηγική για την Αναπηρία 2010-2020 και συγκεκριμένα τον Τομέα Δράσης της Προσβασιμότητας, καθώς, επίσης, και τη Διεθνή Σύμβαση για τα Δικαιώματα των Ατόμων με Αναπηρία του ΟΗΕ που έχει επικυρωθεί από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση (23 Δεκεμβρίου 2010) και την Ελλάδα (11 Απριλίου 2012), ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Με δεδομένο ότι πολλά από τα πεζοδρόμια στο Δήμο Αθηναίων για τα οποία έχουν δοθεί άδειες τραπεζοκαθισμάτων και στα οποία εμποδίζεται η ελεύθερη πρόσβαση όλων των πολιτών, έχουν κατασκευαστεί και εκσυγχρονιστεί με κοινοτικούς πόρους (Ερώτηση E-006177/2009), ποιες είναι οι διαδικασίες που έχει η Επιτροπή στη διάθεσή της για τον έλεγχο της ορθής λειτουργίας υποδομών που έχουν λάβει κοινοτική χρηματοδότηση;

— Θεωρεί ότι η συγκεκριμένη κατάσταση έρχεται σε αντίθεση με την κοινοτική νομολογία σχετικά με τα δικαιώματα των ατόμων με αναπηρία; Με ποιο τρόπο μπορεί να συμβάλει στην εξάλειψη των εμποδίων και των φραγμών στην προσβασιμότητα των ατόμων με αναπηρία και στην ουσιαστική προάσπιση των δικαιωμάτων τους;

**Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(20 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η Επιτροπή έχει αρχίσει την εφαρμογή της σύμβασης του ΟΗΕ για τα δικαιώματα των ατόμων με αναπηρία (στην οποία συμμετέχει η ΕΕ από την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2011) μέσω των δράσεων της ευρωπαϊκής στρατηγικής για την αναπηρία 2010-2020 και στο πλαίσιο των αρχών του Χάρτη των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων. Οι δράσεις αυτές περιλαμβάνουν τόσο πρωτοβουλίες σε επίπεδο ΕΕ, όσο και τη στήριξη πρωτοβουλιών σε εθνικό, περιφερειακό και τοπικό επίπεδο.

Η διαχείριση των ευρωπαϊκών διαρθρωτικών ταμείων υπόκειται στους κανόνες της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης και τα κράτη μέλη είναι υπεύθυνα για την επιλογή, την εφαρμογή, την παρακολούθηση, την υποβολή εκθέσεων, τον λογιστικό έλεγχο και την αξιολόγηση των συγχρηματοδοτούμενων προγραμμάτων και έργων, με την εξαίρεση των «μεγάλων έργων» (δηλ. έργων άνω των 50 εκατ. ευρώ) ([1]). Το άρθρο 16 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) 1083/2006 ορίζει ότι «η δυνατότητα πρόσβασης για τα άτομα με αναπηρία αποτελεί ένα από τα κριτήρια που πρέπει να τηρούνται κατά τον καθορισμό επιχειρήσεων που συγχρηματοδοτούνται από τα ταμεία και που πρέπει να λαμβάνονται υπόψη κατά τις διάφορες φάσεις υλοποίησης».

Επί του παρόντος δεν υπάρχει νομοθεσία της ΕΕ στον συγκεκριμένο τομέα της δυνατότητας πρόσβασης στους δημόσιους χώρους. Συνεπώς, στην προκείμενη περίπτωση των αστικών/δημοτικών χώρων εφαρμόζεται η εθνική νομοθεσία και νομολογία.

Η Επιτροπή προωθεί ωστόσο την προσβασιμότητα του αστικού περιβάλλοντος μέσω μεγάλου αριθμού πρωτοβουλιών, όπως του βραβείου της φιλικής προς τα άτομα με αναπηρία πόλης (Access City Award) ([2]).

---

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου, της 11ης Ιουλίου 2006, περί καθορισμού γενικών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1260/1999 (ΕΕ L 210 της 31.7.2006, σ. 27.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/award/index_en.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011698/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Violation of the rights of citizens and disabled people in Athens

Athenians have made several complaints that the municipal authority hinders free access to the city's pavements, through its practice of licensing seating areas for food and entertainment establishments.

In December 2006, the Greek ombudsman, following a sufficient number of complaints and statements from citizens, issued a finding (Case 984/11.2.1999) on the 'Hindering of the free use of and access to pavements and crossings within the boundaries of the Municipality of Athens', in which he makes reference, among other things, to the impact that the unrestricted licensing of seating areas by the municipality has on the free use of and access to pavements and crossings by citizens and people with special needs. Over recent years the situation has deteriorated, now directly jeopardising free and safe passage by all citizens, and particularly people with disabilities.

Given the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Article 26), and also the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020, and specifically the Accessibility Action Sector, as well as the international UN Convention on the Rights of Disabled Persons, which has been ratified by the EU (23 December 2010) and by Greece (11 April 2012), will the Commission say:

— Given that many of the pavements in Athens licensed as seating areas — hindering the free access of all citizens — were constructed and modernised with Community funds (Question E-006177/2009) what process does the Commission have for checking the proper functioning of infrastructure that has received Community funding?

— Does it believe that the specific situation is contrary to Community jurisprudence relating to the rights of disabled persons? How can it contribute to the removal of barriers and obstacles to the accessibility of disabled persons, and to the substantive promotion of their rights?

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

The Commission is engaged in the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (to which the EU is a party since January 2011) through the actions of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 and in respect of the principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. These actions include both initiatives at EU level and support for initiatives at national, regional and local levels.

The management of the European Structural Funds is subject to the rules of shared management ([1]) and the Member States are responsible for the selection, implementation, monitoring, reporting, audit and evaluation of the co-financed programmes and projects, with the exception of 'major projects' (i.e. projects over EUR 50 million). As Art 16 of 1083/2006 (EC) Regulation stipulates 'Accessibility for disabled persons shall be one of the criteria to be observed in defining operations co-financed by the Funds and to be taken into account during the various stages of implementation'.

At the moment there is no EU legislation in the specific area of accessibility of public spaces. National legislation and jurisprudence therefore apply in this urban/municipal case.

The Commission is however promoting the accessibility of urban environment through several initiatives such as the Access City Award ([2]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006, p. 27.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/award/index_en.htm

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011699/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**
*(15 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Χρήση χρηματοοικονομικών εργαλείων τύπου swaps

Εντύπωση έχει προκαλέσει στην ευρωπαϊκή κοινή γνώμη μια σειρά από σκάνδαλα που έχουν να κάνουν με τη χρήση χρηματοοικονομικών εργαλείων τύπου swaps από τις κυβερνήσεις των κρατών μελών. Μετά την περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, με τη χρήση νομισματικών συναλλαγών currency swaps, αποκαλύφθηκε ότι και η κυβέρνηση της Πορτογαλίας έχει κάνει χρήση συναλλαγών επιτοκίου interest rate swaps.

Με δεδομένη την απάντησης της Επιτροπής (E-001021/2010), στην οποία αναφέρεται ότι «το 2007 η Eurostat έστειλε ερωτηματολόγιο στα κράτη μέλη, με σκοπό να ενημερωθεί για την ύπαρξη νομισματικών συναλλαγών και ιδιαίτερα νομισματικών συναλλαγών εκτός αγοράς», ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ποια είναι τα αποτελέσματα των ερευνών της Eurostat σχετικά με την ύπαρξη νομισματικών συναλλαγών εκτός αγοράς; Μπορεί να κοινοποιήσει τη σχετική έρευνα;

— Διαθέτει στοιχεία για το ποια κράτη μέλη της Ευρωζώνης έχουν κάνει χρήση χρηματοοικονομικών εργαλείων τύπου swaps, κατά την τελευταία δεκαετία;

— Γνωρίζει τις δύο εκθέσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας *(«The impact on government deficit and debt from off-market swaps. The Greek case»* και *«The Titlos transaction and possible existence of similar transactions impacting on the euro area government debt or deficit levels»*) που αφορούν τις επιπτώσεις των χρηματοοικονομικών εργαλείων τύπου swaps στο κρατικό έλλειμμα και χρέος της Ελλάδας και των άλλων χωρών της Ευρωζώνης; Εάν ναι, μπορεί να τις κοινοποιήσει, ώστε να σπάσει επιτέλους ο «νόμος της σιωπής» της ΕΚΤ, σχετικά με το θέμα;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(7 Ιανουαρίου 2014)*

1 & 2. Πολλές κυβερνήσεις της ΕΕ κάνουν χρήση χρηματοοικονομικών παραγώγων, όπως ανταλλαγές επιτοκίου και ανταλλαγές συναλλάγματος, για τους σκοπούς της διαχείρισης του δημόσιου χρέους τους. Οι συναλλαγές αυτές πραγματοποιούνται εν γένει με τους όρους της αγοράς, όπως στην περίπτωση της πορτογαλικής κυβέρνησης, και, ως εκ τούτου, η στατιστική καταγραφή είναι απλή. Οι ροές τόκων που σχετίζονται με τις εν λόγω συναλλαγές αναφέρονται σαφώς στο πλαίσιο των εκδιδόμενων γνωστοποιήσεων της διαδικασίας υπερβολικού ελλείμματος (ΔΥΕ) (ως η διαφορά μεταξύ των τόκων «EDP D41» και των τόκων «D 41» στον πίνακα 1).

Η περίπτωση των εκτός αγοράς χρηματοοικονομικών παραγώγων είναι αξιοσημείωτη διότι δημιουργούνται σημαντικές σχετικές ροές αξιών. Αυτός είναι ο λόγος για τον οποίο υπάρχουν στατιστικοί κανόνες που στοχεύουν να διασφαλίσουν ότι τα μέσα αυτά αντικατοπτρίζονται στο δημόσιο χρέος, και για τον οποίο η EUROSTAT παρακολουθεί τα μέσα αυτά και ζητεί από τα κράτη μέλη να την ενημερώνουν εφόσον υπάρχουν. Το ιστορικό των εκτός αγοράς συναλλαγών της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης με την Goldman Sachs περιγράφεται στην δημοσιευθείσα έκθεση της Eurostat για τις μεθοδολογικές επισκέψεις στην Ελλάδα κατά το 2010:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Greece%20-%202010%20methodological%20visits%20report.pdf

3. Η Επιτροπή σημειώνει ότι η πρόσβαση στα έγγραφα της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας διέπεται από το νομικό πλαίσιο της ΕΚΤ (απόφαση ECB/2004/3, όπως τροποποιήθηκε με την απόφαση ECB/2011/6). Το Αξιότιμο Μέλος καλείται συνεπώς να απευθύνει το αίτημά του στην ΕΚΤ.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011699/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Use of financial instruments in the form of swaps

The use of swap-type financial instruments by Member State governments has impacted European public opinion following a series of scandals. Following Greece's use of currency swaps , it has been revealed that the Portuguese Government has made use of interest rate swaps.

Given the Commission's answer (E-001021/2010) stating that 'in 2007, Eurostat sent a questionnaire to the Member States seeking information on the existence of currency transactions and in particular off-market currency transactions', will the Commission say:

— What are the results of Eurostat's enquiries relating to the existence of off-market currency transactions? Can it publish the enquiries?

— Does it have any data as to which eurozone Member States have used swap-type financial instruments during the last 10 years?

— Is it aware of the two European Central Bank reports 'The impact on government deficit and debt from off-market swaps. The Greek case' and 'The Titlos transaction and possible existence of similar transactions impacting on the euro area government debt or deficit levels', which address the impact of swap-type financial instruments on Greek and other eurozone country government deficits and debts? If so, can it make them known, so that the ECB's silence in relation to this matter can finally be broken?

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

1-2. Many EU governments make use of financial derivatives, such as interest rate swaps and foreign exchange swaps, for their debt management purposes.These transactions are generally undertaken on market terms, as in the case of the Portuguese Government, and therefore the statistical recording is straightforward. The interest flows relating to these transactions are clearly reported in Excessive Deficit Procedure (EDP) published notifications (as the difference between Interest 'EDP D41' and Interest 'D41' in Table 1).

The case of off-market financial derivatives is notable because there are significant associated value flows at inception. This is why there are statistical rules to ensure that these instruments are reflected in government debt, and why Eurostat monitors these instruments and asks Member States to inform Eurostat if they exist. The background to the off-market transactions of the Greek Government with Goldman Sachs is described in Eurostat's published report on the methodological visits to Greece in 2010:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Greece%20-%2020 10%20methodological%20visits%20report.pdf

3. The Commission notes that access to documents of the European Central Bank is governed by the legal framework of the ECB (Decision ECB/2004/3, as amended by Decision ECB/2011/6). The Honourable Member would therefore be invited to address his request to the ECB

*(Verżjoni Maltija)*

**Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-011700/13**
**lill-Kummissjoni**
**David Casa (PPE)**
*(15 ta' Ottubru 2013)*

*Suġġett:* L-effikaċja tal-għajnuna moħtija lir-Repubblika Demokratika tal-Kongo

Ir-Rapport Speċjali Nru 9 tal-Qorti Ewropea tal-Awdituri jiddikjara li l-allokazzjoni ta' EUR 1.9 biljun f'għajnuna lir-Repubblika Demokratika tal-Kongo (RDK) mill-2003 'l hawn ma ħallietx ir-riżultati maħsuba. Madankollu, il-Kummissarju għall-Iżvilupp isostni li għadu kmieni wisq biex naslu għal konklużjonijiet ta' dan it-tip. In-nuqqas ta' infrastruttura soċjali fir-RDK jagħmilha diffiċli biex l-għajnuna tissarraf f'servizzi li jikkontribwixxu għall-għan tal-UE tal-"istabilizzazzjoni sostenibbli".

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tindika l-programmi li din l-għajnuna qed tiffinanzja fir-RDK? X'inhuma s-sistemi li tista' tuża l-Kummissjoni biex tasal għall-effetti tal-għajnuna u l-programmi tagħha fir-RDK? Il-Kummissjoni kif se tadatta l-programmi tagħha għall-isfidi li qed tħabbat wiċċha magħhom?

**Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Piebalgs f'isem il-Kummissjoni**
*(17 ta' Diċembru 2013)*

Ir-rapport tal-Qorti tal-Awdituri jintrabat ma' qasam ta' attività wieħed biss — il-governanza — li jirrappreżenta madwar 20 % taċ-ċifra kkwotata ta' EUR1,9 biljun. Ir-rapport eżamina 16-il proġett (li jirrappreżentaw madwar EUR 400 miljun) fil-qasam tal-governanza, xi whud minnhom fi stadju bikri ta' implimentazzjoni, filwaqt li oħrajn għadhom qed jiġu implimentati.

Il-proġetti kollha offruti mill-Kummissjoni jinsabu fuq il-sit elettroniku EuropeAid. ([1]) L-Onorevoli Membru se jsib lista ta' proġetti ffinanzjati fil-qasam kopert mir-rapport mill-2003 sal-2011 fil-paġni 38 u 39 tad-dokument.

Rigward sistemi ta' monitoraġġ tal-Kummissjoni, kull sena numru ta' proġetti jiġu magħżula biex ikunu s-suġġett ta' missjonijiet ta' "monitoraġġ orjentat lejn ir-riżultati" , imwettqa minn konsulenti indipendenti. Id-delegazzjoni tal-UE twettaq ukoll evalwazzjonijiet regolari ta' nofs il-perjodu u finali tal-proġetti kif ukoll evalwazzjonijiet ta' pajjiżi fuq livell usa'. Dawn jipprovdu lezzjonijiet għat-tfassil ta' proġetti fil-ġejjieni. Fl-aħħar nett, id-Delegazzjonijiet tal-UE jwettqu wkoll żjarat tal-proġetti regolari u jagħmlu laqgħat mal-maniġers tal-proġetti sabiex jittrattaw problemi ta' konġestjoni urġenti b'rabta mal-implimentazzjoni tal-proġett.

L-impatt ta' portafoll totali ta' għajnuna fi kwalunkwe pajjiż partikolari jiġi evalwat matul ir-reviżjonijiet ta' nofs il-perjodu u tat-tmiem tal-perjodu tal-Programm Indikattiv Nazzjonali tiegħu. Id-dipartimenti tal-Kummissjoni qed jaħdmu wkoll fuq metodoloġija mtejba għall-kejl tar-riżultati u l-impatt tal-kooperazzjoni għall-iżvilupp.

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja li l-progress fil-qasam tal-governanza fir-RDK huwa kajman. Din hija konsegwenza partikolarment tal-ambjent diffiċli li fih tingħata assistenza għar-RDK. Madankollu, il-Kummissjoni hija konvinta li l-għajnuna tagħha lir-RDK miexja f'direzzjoni pożittiva u li l-kooperazzjoni tal-UE qiegħda tissarraf f'impatti pożittivi fis-settur tal-governanza.

([1]) https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/europeaid/online-services/index.cfm?ADSSChck=1384792329967&do=publi.welcome

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011700/13**
**to the Commission**
**David Casa (PPE)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Effectiveness of aid to the Democratic Republic of Congo

The European Court of Auditors' Special Report No 9 states that the allocation of EUR 1.9 billion in aid to the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) since 2003 has not delivered the intended results. However, the Commissioner for development claims it is too early to come to such conclusions. The lack of social infrastructure in the DRC makes it difficult to transform the aid into services that will contribute to the EU's goal of 'sustainable stabilisation'.

Can the Commission list the programmes which this aid is funding in the DRC? What systems does the Commission have in place for tracing the effects of its aid and programmes in the DRC? How will the Commission adapt its programmes to the challenges that it is facing?

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

The Court of Auditors' report relates to only one area of activity — governance — which represents around 20% of the EUR 1.9 billion figure quoted. The report examined 16 projects (representing around EUR 400 million) in the area of governance, some of them being at an early stage of implementation, while others are still being implemented.

All projects tendered by the Commission can be found on the EuropeAid website. ([1]) The Honourable Member will find a list of projects funded in the area covered by the report from 2003 to 2011 on pages 38 and 39 of the document.

Regarding the Commission's monitoring systems, each year a number of projects are selected to be the subject of 'results-oriented monitoring' missions, carried out by independent consultants. The EU Delegation also performs regular mid-term and final evaluations of projects as well as wider country evaluations. These provide lessons for future project design. Finally, EU Delegations also carry out regular project visits and hold meetings with project managers in order to deal with urgent bottlenecks and problems in project implementation.

The impact of the overall aid portfolio in any given country is assessed during mid-term and end-of-term reviews of its National Indicative Programme. The Commission's departments are also working on an improved methodology for measuring the results and impact of development cooperation.

The Commission is aware that progress in the area of governance in the DRC is slow. This is a consequence of the particularly difficult environment in which assistance to the DRC is provided. However, the Commission is convinced that its assistance to the DRC is moving in a positive direction and that EU cooperation is delivering positive impacts in the governance sector.

([1]) https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/europeaid/online-services/index.cfm?ADSSChck=1384792329967&do=publi.welcome

*(Verżjoni Maltija)*

**Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-011701/13**
**lill-Kummissjoni**
**David Casa (PPE)**
*(15 ta' Ottubru 2013)*

*Suġġett:* L-appoġġ tal-UE lil El Salvador

Fit-8 ta' Ottubru 2013, fl-istqarrija għall-istampa (IP/13/923), il-Kummissjoni ħabbret li ser tkompli tappoġġa l-isforzi ta' El Salvador biex jeqred il-faqar. Il-finanzjament li l-UE pprovdiet bejn l-2007 u l-2013 intefaq fit-trawwim tal-koeżjoni soċjali, it-tkabbir ekonomiku u l-integrazzjoni u l-kummerċ reġjonali.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tikkummenta b'mod aktar speċifiku dwar in-natura tal-appoġġ finanzjarju li qed tagħti lil El Salvador? X'fondi ġew allokati lil dan il-pajjiż bejn Ġunju 2012 u Ġunju 2013? Il-Kummissjoni wettqet xi valutazzjoni dwar l-effikaċja tal-finanzjament tal-UE fir-rigward tas-settur privat f'El Salvador? Jekk iva, tista' tipprovdi r-riżultati tal-valutazzjonijiet ikkonċernati?

**Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Piebalgs f'isem il-Kummissjoni**
*(6 ta' Diċembru 2013)*

L-appoġġ finanzjarju tal-UE għal kooperazzjoni bilaterali ma' El Salvador huwa definit mid-Dokument ta' Strateġija tal-Pajjiż (CSP) 2007-2013 b'portafoll ta' EUR 121 miljun. Kien totalment impenjat f'Ottubru 2011. Huwa implimentat prinċipalment permezz ta' appoġġ baġitarju settorjali (madwar 90%). L-implimentazzjoni miexja mingħajr problemi, iffaċilitata minn korpi governattivi żviluppati sew li huma motivati u interessati biex imexxu l-pajjiż "il quddiem.

Bejn Ġunju 2012 u Ġunju 2013 il-fondi allokati għal El Salvador kienu jikkonċernaw il-programmi tematiċi bħal Atturi Mhux Statali u Awtoritajiet Lokali (NSA/LA), l-Istrument Ewropew għad-Demokrazija u għad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem (EIDHR) u l-programm ta" assistenza fil-qasam tal-migrazzjoni u l-asil (AENEAS). Il-kontribut tal-UE għal proġetti tematiċi kurrenti jammonta għal madwar EUR 14-il miljun. Il-fondi allokati għal El Salvador matul il-perjodu Ġunju 2012-Ġunju 2013 jammontaw għal EUR 6,7 miljun.

Il-Kummissjoni ma wettqitx valutazzjoni tal-impatt ta' appoġġ għall-iżvilupp tas-settur privat għax ma kienx settur ewlieni fid-Dokument ta' Strateġija tal-Pajjiż tal-2007-2013. Il-programmazzjoni tal-UE għall-2014-2020 u l-qafas multiannwali għadhom ma ġewx adottati. Huwa prematur li l-Kummissjoni tiddeċiedi fuq azzjonijiet futuri.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011701/13**
**to the Commission**
**David Casa (PPE)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* EU support for El Salvador

On 8 October 2013 the Commission announced in a press release (IP/13/923) that it would continue to support El Salvador's efforts to eradicate poverty. EU funding provided between 2007 and 2013 was spent on fostering social cohesion, economic growth and regional integration and trade.

Can the Commission comment more specifically as to the nature of its financial support for El Salvador? What funds were allocated to that country between June 2012 and June 2013? Has the Commission carried out any assessments as to the effectiveness of EU funding with regard to the private sector in El Salvador? If so, can it provide the results of the assessments concerned?

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

The EU's financial support for bilateral cooperation with El Salvador is defined by the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) 2007-2013 with a portfolio of EUR 121 million. It was entirely committed in October 2011. It is implemented mainly through sector budget support (around 90%). Implementation is going smoothly, facilitated by well-developed governmental bodies which are motivated and interested in driving the country forward.

Between June 2012 and June 2013 the funds allocated to El Salvador concerned the thematic programmes such as Non State Actors and Local Authorities (NSA/LA), the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) and the programme of assistance in the area of migration and asylum (Aeneas). The EU's contribution to ongoing thematic projects amounts to approximately EUR 14 million. The funds allocated to El Salvador during the period June 2012-June 2013 amount to EUR 6.7 million.

The Commission has not carried out an impact assessment of support to private sector development because it was not a focal sector in the 2007-2013 Country Strategy Paper. The EU's programming for 2014-2020 and the multi-annual framework have not yet been adopted. It is premature for the Commission to decide on future actions.

*(Verżjoni Maltija)*

**Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-011702/13**
**lill-Kummissjoni**
**David Casa (PPE)**
*(15 ta' Ottubru 2013)*

*Suġġett:* Żieda fil-produzzjoni tal-fertilizzanti

Skont in-NU, il-produzzjoni dinjija tal-fertilizzanti mistennija tiżdied matul l-2014. Dan mistenni joħloq problemi ambjentali minħabba li l-fertilizzanti jaħlu l-enerġija filwaqt li jiġġeneraw it-tniġġis.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tikkumenta dwar l-effikaċja tar-regolamenti attwali tal-UE dwar il-fertilizzanti? Il-Kummissjoni biħsiebha twessa' l-ambitu ta' din il-leġiżlazzjoni bi tweġiba għax-xejriet previsti fil-produzzjoni tal-fertilizzanti? Jekk iva, x'miżuri biħsiebha tieħu l-Kummissjoni?

**Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Tajani f'isem il-Kummissjoni**
*(11 ta' Diċembru 2013)*

Skont l-industrija tal-fertilizzanti Ewropea, tul dawn l-aħħar 20 sena ġiet osservata xejra ta' tnaqqis fil-produzzjoni tal-fertilizzanti fl-UE minħabba tnaqqis tal-konsum Ewropew. It-titjib fl-effiċjenza tal-użu tal-fertilizzanti tippermetti lill-bidwi Ewropew jipproduċi aktar għelejjel b'inqas fertilizzant minn 20 sena ilu.

F'dan ir-rigward, il-Politika Agrikola Komuni (PAK) tħeġġeġ lill-bdiewa biex jestendu l-produzzjoni tagħhom permezz ta' miżuri agroambjentali, taħriġ u s-servizz tal-Iżvilupp Rurali. Mill-2005 "l hawn, l-integrazzjoni tal-interkundizzjonalità fil-PAK qed issaħħaħ il-limitazzjoni tal-użu tan-nitrat f'żoni vulnerabbli. Għall-ewwel darba, tliet prattiki ekoloġiki bil-pagamenti diretti se jiġu integrati taħt il-PAK il-ġdid. ([1])

Il-valutazzjoni ex-post tar-Regolament (KE) Nru 2003/2003 tal-2010 ([2]) wriet li l-koeżistenza bejn l-oqsfa regolatorji tal-fertilizzanti Ewropej u nazzjonali mhix qed tiffunzjona bl-aħjar mod. Hemm domanda dejjem tikber mill-awtoritajiet u l-partijiet interessati għal estensjoni tal-kamp ta" applikazzjoni tar-Regolament dwar il-Fertilizzanti tal-UE għal materjali fertilizzanti rregolati fil-livell nazzjonali kif ukoll għal dispożizzjonijiet aktar speċifiċi li jindirizzaw it-tħassib dwar is-sikurezza u l-ambjent.

Il-Kummissjoni qed tippjana li tindirizza dawn il-problemi billi tipproponi reviżjoni tar-Regolament dwar il-Fertilizzanti matul is-sena d-dieħla li se testendi l-kamp ta' applikazzjoni tiegħu għall-fertilizzanti organiċi, il-materjali li jtejbu l-ħamrija, il-mezzi ta' tkabbir, il-bijostimulanti tal-pjanti u l-addittivi tal-fertilizzanti. Dan se jikkontribwixxi għal Ewropa aktar effiċjenti fl-użu tar-riżorsi u li tiħeġġeġ l-innovazzjoni permezz tal-ħolqien ta' suq intern għall-irkupru ta' nutrijenti minn skart bijodegradabbli jew billi jiġi ffaċilitat it-tqegħid fis-suq ta' addittivi agronomiċi li jikkontribwixxu għal użu aktar effiċjenti tan-nutrijenti.

([1]) Dawn il-miżuri huma "il-konservazzjoni tad-diversifikazzjoni tal-għelejjel', il-konservazzjoni tal-mergħat permanenti u ż-żoni ta' fokus ekoloġiku" li għandhom jippermettu aktar tnaqqis fl-użu tal-fertilizzanti.

([2]) Għal aktar tagħrif: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/chemicals/files/fertilizers/final_report_2010_en.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011702/13**
**to the Commission**
**David Casa (PPE)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Increased fertiliser production

According to the UN, world fertiliser production is expected to soar during 2014. This is expected to cause environmental problems as fertiliser wastes energy and generates pollution.

Can the Commission comment on the effectiveness of current EU fertiliser regulations? Does the Commission expect to extend the scope of this legislation in response to projected trends in fertiliser production? If so, what measures does the Commission plan to take?

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

According to the European fertiliser industry, a declining trend in fertiliser production in the EU has been observed over the last two decades as a result of a reduction of the European consumption. Improved efficiency in the use of fertilisers allows European farmers to produce more crops with less fertiliser than 20 years ago.

In this respect, the common agricultural policy (CAP) encourages farmers to extensifying their production through the agri-environmental measures, training and the service of Rural Development. Since 2005, the integration of cross-compliance in the CAP is strengthening the limitation of nitrate use in vulnerable zones. For the first time, three greening practices under direct payments will be integrated under the new CAP ([1]).

The *ex-post* evaluation of Regulation (EC) No 2003/2003 of 2010 ([2]) has shown that the co-existence between European and national fertilisers regulatory frameworks is not functioning optimally. There is an increasing demand by authorities and stakeholders for an extension of the scope of the EU Fertiliser Regulation to fertilising materials regulated at national level as well as for more specific provisions addressing safety and environmental concerns.

The Commission is planning to address these problems by proposing a revised Fertiliser Regulation during the course of next year which will extend its scope to organic fertilisers, soil improvers, growing media, plant biostimulants and fertiliser additives. This will contribute to a more resource-efficient Europe and encourage innovation through the creation of an internal market for the recovery of nutrients from biodegradable waste or by facilitating the marketing of agronomic additives that contribute to a more efficient nutrient use.

([1]) These measures are 'crop diversification, permanent pasture conservation and the ecological focus areas' which should allow a further reduction of fertilisers use.

([2]) More info on: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/chemicals/files/fertilisers/final_report_2010_en.pdf

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011703/13**
**do Komisji**
**Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)**
*(15 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Kryzys związany ze zbiornikiem Sarsang

Zbiornik Sarsang jest zbiornikiem utworzonym w wyniku budowy zapory hydroelektrycznej usytuowanej de iure w Republice Azerbejdżanu. Zbudowano go, mając na względzie rozwój regionu oraz w celu dostarczania wody służącej do nawadniania oraz wody pitnej do sześciu obszarów administracyjnych – Ağcabadi, Ağdam, Barda, Goranboy, Tartar i Yevlax – zamieszkanych przez 400 tysięcy ludzi. Niemniej jednak w wyniku konfliktu o Górski Karabach zbiornik znajduje się obecnie na terenie nieuznawanej Republiki Górskiego Karabachu, której ludność stanowią głównie Ormianie.

Od 20 lat zbiornik Sarsang jest zaniedbywany, w wyniku czego zapora znajduje się w bardzo złym stanie. Hydrolodzy obliczyli, że w razie sytuacji nadzwyczajnej powodzią byłoby zagrożonych 30 miejscowości. Co więcej, zły stan zapory ma konsekwencje dla całego regionu – w tym związane z jego gospodarką, rozwojem i ochroną środowiska, a także staraniami o eliminację ubóstwa na tym obszarze.

Czy Komisja jest świadoma potencjalnego zagrożenia, jakie zapora stanowi dla tego regionu?

Czy Komisja ma plan zajęcia się złym stanem zapory Sarsang i pomocy na rzecz mieszkańców regionu?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton**
**w imieniu Komisji**
*(11 grudnia 2013 r.)*

UE zwraca szczególną uwagę na sytuację dotyczącą środowiska naturalnego w państwach partnerskich, ponieważ ma ona duży wpływ na jakość życia, a czasem nawet na kwestie transgraniczne. UE pomaga w rozwiązywaniu tego problemu przez finansowanie szeregu projektów w dziedzinie gospodarki wodnej ukierunkowanych między innymi na rzekę Kura.

O ile Unia Europejska może rozważyć udzielenie pomocy w związku z poważnymi obawami dotyczącymi obszaru rzeki Tartar, ciężko jest uzyskać dostęp do obiektywnych i możliwych do sprawdzenia danych dotyczących zagrożeń i niezbędnych działań w odniesieniu do regionów objętych konfliktami.

Unia Europejska wspiera wysiłki państw współprzewodniczących Grupie Mińskiej Organizacji Bezpieczeństwa i Współpracy w Europie (OBWE), w tym poprzez działalność Specjalnego Przedstawiciela Unii Europejskiej w Regionie Południowego Kaukazu i ds. konfliktu w Gruzji, a także przez finansowanie projektów mających na celu budowę zaufania.

W tym kontekście EU nie wyklucza dokładniejszego zbadania tej kwestii i wykorzystania środków finansowych i projektowych do oceny obecnej sytuacji dotyczącej środowiska naturalnego. Jest to jednak zależne od spełnienia niezbędnych warunków przez osoby odpowiedzialne w regionie.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011703/13**
**to the Commission**
**Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Sarsang reservoir crisis

The Sarsang reservoir is formed by a hydroelectric dam located de jure in the Republic of Azerbaijan. It was built with a view to develop the region and to provide drinking and irrigation water for 400 000 inhabitants in six administrative areas: Aghjabadi, Agdam, Barda, Goranboy, Tartar and Yevlakh. However, subsequent to the Nagorno-Karabakh War, the reservoir is now situated in the mostly Armenian-populated territory of the unrecognised Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh.

For 20 years the Sarsang reservoir has been neglected, and as a result the dam is in a very poor state. Hydrologists have calculated that, in the event of an emergency, 30 villages would be at risk of flooding. What is more, the serious situation of the dam has implications for the whole region, not least as regards its economy, development and environmental protection, and efforts to eliminate poverty in the area.

Is the Commission aware of the potential danger the dam poses to this region?

Does the Commission have a plan to address the poor condition of the Sarsang dam and help the inhabitants living in the region?

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

The EU pays close attention to the ecological situation in its partner countries, as this has a great influence on the quality of life and sometimes even has trans-border implications. The EU helps address this issue through a number of EU-funded projects in the field of water management, targeting among other things the Kura River.

While the EU can consider assistance to address grave concerns in the Tartar River area, it is difficult to get access to objective and verifiable data on the risks involved and solutions needed with regard to the conflict areas.

The European Union supports the conflict resolution efforts by the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Minsk Group Co-Chair countries, including through the activities of the EU Special Representative for the South Caucasus and the conflict in Georgia and through the financing of confidence building projects.

In this context, the EU does not exclude looking more closely at this issue and mobilising financial and project resources to assess the current environmental situation; however, this is contingent upon the necessary conditions being put in place by those responsible in the region.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011706/13**
**to the Commission**
**Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The extent of cooperation between Europol and Interpol

The European Police Office (Europol) assists cooperation between the EU's police forces in much the same way as Interpol assists cooperation between police forces worldwide, namely by facilitating information exchange between its members.

On 5 November 2001, Europol and Interpol concluded an agreement providing for the 'exchange of operational, strategic and technical information'. Europol and Interpol have recently agreed further cooperation arrangements, such as the opening of a secure line of communication.

However, it is unclear to what extent Europol circulates and/or records in its databases information received from Interpol in accordance with the agreement. In particular, it is not clear whether Europol issues alerts about 'wanted persons' on the basis of information received from Interpol.

It is also unclear to what extent Europol shares information, particularly personal information, with Interpol. This is important, given that many countries with access to Interpol's databases have ineffective data protection safeguards, and may retain indefinitely, or make inappropriate use of, information received.

The 2001 Agreement contains one provision, Article 5(2), which allows either party to refuse to process information received from the other party where this has clearly been obtained in obvious violation of human rights, including through abuse of due process or in politically motivated cases. It is not known whether Europol has had to rely on this provision, and, if so, how often.

1. Can the Commission confirm whether Europol circulates information on wanted persons received from Interpol? If so, how does Europol ensure that it does not target individuals being sought by an Interpol member state on political grounds or in the context of other clear violations of human rights?

2. Can the Commission confirm whether Europol shares personal information regarding EU citizens with Interpol, and for what purposes? What safeguards are in place to protect such data?

3. Can the Commission seek information from Europol as to how many times it has refused to process information on the grounds foreseen by Article 5(2) of the 2001 Agreement; namely, where the information has clearly been obtained in obvious violation of human rights?

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

1 and 2. There is no added value for Europol to re-distribute Interpol information. EU Member States are already members of Interpol. Europol shares information with Interpol including personal data regarding EU citizens on the basis of the operational cooperation agreement between the two organisations. This takes place in the framework of distinct analysis projects. Europol may, for crime analysis purposes, need to process personal data deriving from Interpol Red Notices. Europol will do so in compliance with its protection regime ([1]). Hence Europol has a legal obligation to reject information relating to individuals being sought on political grounds or in clear violations of human rights. Additional assurance is provided by annual inspections carried out by the Joint Supervisory Body (JSB) ([2]). Furthermore, the operational cooperation agreement between Europol and Interpol does not allow for the distribution of Europol information to all of Interpol's 190 members. Onward transfer of Europol information is restricted to those areas which the Council of the European Union has confirmed to provide for an adequate level of data protection. For information on the safeguards Interpol applies to prevent the abuse of its instruments, the Commission refers to its answer on Question E-011457/2013.

3. Europol does not have any record of the application of Article 5(2) of the 2001 Agreement in the course of the last 18 months, i.e. the term for which respective log-files are kept in accordance with the Europol Council Decision.

([1]) https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/publication/data-protection-europol-1721
([2]) http://europoljsb.consilium.europa.eu/about.aspx

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011708/13**
**à la Commission**
**Brice Hortefeux (PPE)**
*(15 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Lutte contre la criminalité organisée — mesures concrètes

Dans ma question écrite E-011929/2011, j'avais attiré l'attention de la Commission sur l'explosion des attaques de bijouteries résultant de l'envolée de l'or, qui sont bien souvent perpétrées par des groupes criminels transfrontaliers.

Dans sa réponse, la Commission avait indiqué qu'un réseau informel de praticiens des États membres avait été mis en place et qu'elle avait proposé une aide financière à des projets précis de lutte contre ce type de criminalité.

Depuis des mois, nous observons en France une recrudescence de ce type d'attaques d'une extrême violence qui suscite l'exaspération des citoyens et de la profession. Ces mêmes groupes criminels itinérants recourent à d'autres formes de délits (cambriolages, vols de métaux sur les lignes de chemin de fer, etc.) tout aussi inacceptables.

La Commission peut-elle dresser un état des lieux des mesures qui ont été prises depuis fin 2011 pour lutter contre ces groupes?

La mise en place du réseau informel de praticiens soutenus par Europol a-t-elle donné des résultats satisfaisants?

La Commission peut-elle nous indiquer si les aides financières pour des projets éligibles ont été attribuées? Dans l'affirmative, peut-elle transmettre la liste de ces projets et nous indiquer les montants accordés?

La Commission peut-elle nous indiquer si des projets de législation pour renforcer la lutte contre la criminalité transfrontalière et renforcer Europol sont envisagés dans les prochains mois?

**Réponse donnée par M^me^ Malmström au nom de la Commission**
*(11 décembre 2013)*

Les atteintes à la propriété commises par des groupes criminels organisés itinérants sont l'une des priorités définies dans le cadre du cycle politique de l'Union européenne sur la grande criminalité et la criminalité organisée. Ce cycle politique, auquel participent les États membres, Europol et les autres agences de l'UE, en collaboration étroite avec la Commission, fixe les priorités de l'Union européenne jusqu'en 2017 en matière de coopération transfrontière entre les services répressifs.

La Commission a présenté, en mars 2013, une proposition de règlement relatif à Europol (COM/2013/173 final), dont l'un des objectifs est de renforcer le rôle joué par cette agence en tant que pôle central de l'échange d'informations entre les services répressifs des États membres aux fins de la lutte contre la criminalité transfrontière. La Commission espère que ce règlement sera adopté d'ici au printemps 2014.

Ces dernières années, le programme «Prévenir et combattre la criminalité» (ISEC) a financé divers projets ayant trait aux groupes criminels organisés itinérants, parmi lesquels:

— Serious Offending by Mobile European Criminals — SOMEC (Infractions graves commises par des auteurs itinérants européens). Montant de la subvention de l'UE: 740 163 euros;

— Police-Private Partnership to Tackle Metal Theft II. (Partenariat police-privé pour la lutte contre les vols de métaux II) Montant de la subvention de l'UE: 792 108 euros;

— An integral methodology to develop an information-led and community orientated policy to tackle domestic burglary (une méthode intégrale pour élaborer une politique guidée par l'information et orientée vers la communauté en vue de lutter contre les cambriolages d'habitations). Montant de la subvention de l'UE: 246 772 euros;

— Crime Prevention in the habitation — towards a European «secure» home (Prévention de la criminalité dans les habitations — vers un logement européen «sûr»). Montant de la subvention de l'UE: 42 728 euros.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011708/13**
**to the Commission**
**Brice Hortefeux (PPE)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Fight against organised crime — specific measures

In my written question E-011929/2011, I brought to the Commission's attention the sharp increase in the number of attacks on jewellers as a result of the massive increase in the price of gold, often carried out by cross-border criminal groups.

In its answer, the Commission indicated that an informal network of Member State practitioners had been set up and that it had offered financial aid to specific projects aimed at combating this type of crime.

For months we have seen a recrudescence of these kinds of extremely violent attacks in France, which exasperates citizens and members of the profession alike. These same cross-border criminal groups commit other types of crime (burglaries, metal theft on railway lines, etc.) which are equally unacceptable.

Can the Commission provide an inventory of the measures that have been taken since the end of 2011 to combat these groups?

Has the establishment of an informal network of practitioners supported by Europol produced satisfactory results?

Can the Commission state whether the financial aid for eligible projects has been allocated? If so, can it provide a list of these projects and inform us of the amounts allocated?

Can the Commission state whether draft legislation to strengthen Europol and the fight against cross-border crime is planned in the coming months?

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

Property crime by mobile organised criminal groups has been included as one of the priorities within the EU policy cycle on serious and organised crime. The policy cycle sets EU level priorities for cross-border law enforcement cooperation until 2017, involving Member States, Europol and other EU agencies in close cooperation with the Commission.

A Commission proposal for a regulation on Europol (COM/2013/173 final) was presented in March 2013. One of the aims is to strengthen Europol's role as a hub for information exchange between law enforcement authorities of the Member States to fight cross-border crime. The Commission hopes to see it adopted by spring 2014.

Projects of relevance to mobile organised criminal groups, funded by the Prevention of and Fight against Crime (ISEC) programme in recent years, include:

— Serious Offending by Mobile European Criminals — SOMEC. EU grant: EUR 740.163

— Police-Private Partnership to Tackle Metal Theft II. EU grant: EUR 792.108

— An integral methodology to develop an information-led and community orientated policy to tackle domestic burglary. EU grant: EUR 246.772

— Crime Prevention in the habitation — towards a European 'secure' home. EU grant: EUR 42.728.

*(Versão portuguesa)*

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

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

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

Em face deste acontecimento, perguntamos à Comissão o seguinte:

1. Como justifica as gravíssimas declarações do seu presidente?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Versión española)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

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

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

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

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

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

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

In view of this:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) OJ L 10, 14.1.1997.
([2]) OJ L 197, 24.7.2012.

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* New EU rules for British businesses

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

How can this possibly be true?

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* Étiquetage de l'origine des viandes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

([1]) JO L 304 du 22.11.2011, p. 18.
([2]) Règlement (CE) n° 882/2004 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 29 avril 2004 relatif aux contrôles officiels effectués pour s'assurer de la conformité avec la législation sur les aliments pour animaux et les denrées alimentaires et avec les dispositions relatives à la santé animale et au bien-être des animaux, JO L 165 du 30.4.2004, p. 1.
([3]) JO L 304 du 22.11.2011, p. 18. Le règlement est applicable à partir du 13 décembre 2014.

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Origin labelling of meat

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules, OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1.
([3]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18. It enters into application on 13 December 2014.

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* Pesticides en bouteille

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

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

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

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

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

1. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Pesticides in wine

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

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

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

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

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

1. What is the Commission's reaction?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* La Fédération anglaise de football dans l'illégalité

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

1. Que pense la Commission de cette approche?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Illegality in the Football Association

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

1. What does the Commission think of this approach?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

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

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

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

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

1. Quelle est votre réaction?

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

3. De quelle teneur sont/seront-ils?

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* VP/HR — Geneva II talks encounter problems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* Plan de sauvetage UE

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* EU bailout

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

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* Allergies en Europe

Les allergies peuvent être mortelles. D'après l'Organisation mondiale de la santé (OMS), l'asthme, une inflammation commune des voies aériennes pouvant être déclenchée par des allergènes, entraîne le décès d'une personne par heure. Le réseau GA²LEN (Global Allergy and Asthma European Network), financé par l'Union et lancé en 2004, est devenu extrêmement influent dans la lutte contre les maladies allergiques. Ce réseau ne cesse de se développer et dispose aujourd'hui de 60 centres dans plus de 20 pays européens.

1. Quelles sont les principales avancées du réseau?

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

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

1. GA²LEN ([1]) était un réseau d'excellence financé par le sixième programme-cadre pour des actions de recherche, de développement technologique et de démonstration (2002-2006), visant à l'intégration des activités de recherche sur l'allergie et l'asthme en Europe et à la création d'une structure européenne durable pour traiter les questions d'allergie et d'asthme de façon globale. Le projet se poursuit sous la forme d'un réseau à but non lucratif, qui est devenu le plus grand réseau international de recherche sur l'allergie et l'asthme. Ce réseau a organisé, entre autres, des cours pour professionnels sur l'allergie et l'asthme et des programmes de formation spécialisés. En outre, il a établi une plate-forme ouverte pour l'organisation d'activités conjointes, comme la création de bases de données communes et de biobanques et la mise en place d'un réseau d'essais cliniques destiné à tester les nouvelles stratégies de gestion dans le domaine des allergies (notamment en matière de diagnostic, de traitement et de prévention).

2. La Commission n'établit pas de statistiques sur la prévalence des allergies dans l'ensemble de la population de l'UE, ni sur les sous-types d'allergies. C'est pourquoi GA²LEN a proposé de créer un réseau de surveillance de l'évolution des maladies allergiques dans l'ensemble de l'UE. Des données ont été collectées, notamment par des projets de recherche financés par l'UE, et peuvent être consultées. ([2]) Dans le cadre de l'enquête européenne par interview sur la santé (EHIS), la Commission recueille des données pour certains États membres sur les symptômes d'asthme déclarés par les patients ([3]), qui servent aux indicateurs de santé de l'UE (ECHI) sur l'asthme (prévalence subjective) ([4]).

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

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011725/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Allergies in Europe

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

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

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

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

1. GA²LEN ([1]) was a Network of Excellence funded by the Sixth Framework for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP6, 2002-2006), focusing on the integration of research activities in Europe on allergy and asthma and the establishment of a durable European structure for addressing allergy and asthma issues in a comprehensive fashion. The project is continuing as a non-profit network and is now the largest international network in allergy and asthma research. It has organised, among other things, allergy schools for professionals addressing various aspects of allergy and asthma and specialist training programmes. Furthermore, it has established an open platform for joint activities, including common databases and biobanks, and a clinical trials network to test novel management strategies in the field of allergy (including diagnostic, treatment and preventive strategies).

2. The Commission does not collect statistics on either the prevalence of allergies in the EU populations in general or allergy subtypes. For this reason, GA²LEN has proposed to set up a sentinel network to monitor emerging trends in allergic disease EU wide. Some data are available and have been collected, e.g., through EU funded research projects. ([2]) In the European Health Interview Survey (EHIS), the Commission collects data on self-reported asthma for some Member States ([3]) which covers the European Core Health Indicator (ECHI) on asthma (self-reported prevalence) ([4]).

([1]) http://www.ga2len.net
Final results: http://ec.europa.eu/research/environment/pdf/european_research_on_environment_and_health_fp6.pdf — page 129.
([2]) For example, EUROPREVALL: The prevalence, cost and basis of food allergy across Europe — http://www.europrevall.org
([3]) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_st1&lang=en
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/echi/list/index_en.htm

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* La Commission aux Fidji

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* The Commission in Fiji

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* Moscou instaure un rideau de lait

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Moscow establishes a milk curtain

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011730/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(15 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Prise en main des banques en faillite

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) Sur la base de l'article 114 du TFUE.
([2]) En décembre 2012 et en juin 2013.

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Taking charge of failed banks

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) Based on Article 114 TFEU.
([2]) In December 2012 and in June 2013.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011731/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(15 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Aides d'État aux énergies vertes en Allemagne

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

L'enjeu est tout sauf anecdotique.

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* State aid for green energy in Germany

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

The issue is hardly anecdotal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011732/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(15 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Obligation de circuler phares allumés de jour

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) Pour en savoir plus: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/safety/daytime-running-light/index_en.htm
([2]) Directive 2008/89/CE de la Commission du 24 septembre 2008 modifiant, en vue de son adaptation au progrès technique, la directive 76/756/CEE du Conseil concernant l'installation de dispositifs d'éclairage et de signalisation lumineuse des véhicules à moteur et de leurs remorques (JO L 257 du 25.9.2008, p. 14).
([3]) Arora, H. Collard, D. Robbins, G. Welbourne, E.R. White, J.G. Effectiveness of Daytime Running Lights in Canada, Report No. TP1298 (E), Transport Canada 1994.
Tofflemire, T. C., Whitehead, P.C. An Evaluation of the Impact of Daytime Running Lights on Traffic Safety in Canada, Journal of Safety Research, volume 28, numéro 4, 1997.
([4]) http://www.bast.de/cln_005/nn_42242/DE/Publikationen/Downloads/downloads-node.html?__nnn=true

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Obligation to drive with lights on during the day

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* Enquête sur Skype

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Skype investigation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* Chèques-innovation

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

1. Quels sont les objectifs de la Commission?

2. Que propose-t-elle aux régions?

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Innovation vouchers

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

1. What are the Commission's objectives?

2. What does it propose for the regions?

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

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

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

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* Salaire minimum européen

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* European minimum wage

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Nederlandse versie)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Nederlandse versie)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011738/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)**
*(15 October 2013)*

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

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

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

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

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

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**
*(14 November 2013)*

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

*(Versão portuguesa)*

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

*Assunto:* Deslocalização da Microsoft Portugal

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FSE

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

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

FEG

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Relocation of Microsoft Portugal

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

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

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

Can the Commission say:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ESF

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

([1]) COM(2013) 83 of 20 February 2013.
([2]) COM(2012) 173 of 18 April 2012.
([3]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 of 5 December 2012.

EGF

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

*(Version française)*

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

*Objet:* Suivi du site Natura 2000 de Kaliakra

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) (http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-966_fr.htm).
([2]) http://www.government.bg/cgi-bin/e-cms/vis/vis.pl?s=001&p=0228&n=5320&g.
([3]) Directive 2009/147/CE (version codifiée remplaçant la directive 79/409/CEE), JO L 20 du 26.1.2010.

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Follow-up on Kaliakra Natura 2000 site

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-966_en.htm
([2]) http://www.government.bg/cgi-bin/e-cms/vis/vis.pl?s=001&p=0228&n=5320&g
([3]) Directive 2009/147/EC (codified version replacing Directive 79/409/EEC), OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

*(Version française)*

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

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

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

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

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

La Commission peut-elle:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

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

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

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

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

Can the Commission:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Snaha o rešpektovanie a dodržiavanie ľudských práv v Kolumbii

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Sociálny dumping a obmedzenie voľného pohybu osôb v EÚ

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

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

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

Ak áno, kedy môžeme očakávať oficiálne stanovisko?

Je podľa názoru Komisie fenomén sociálneho dumpingu reálnou hrozbou?

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

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

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

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

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

If so, when can we expect an official opinion?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011745/13**
**Komisii**
**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**
*(15. októbra 2013)*

*Vec:* Podfinancovaný výskum vo východnej Európe

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

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

**Odpoveď pani Geogheganovej-Quinnovej v mene Komisie**
*(3. decembra 2013)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Underfunding of research in Eastern Europe

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Hudobné práva

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Music rights

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Demokratické reformy v Bielorusku

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

Je v možnostiach Komisie primäť bieloruských štátnych predstaviteľov k spolupráci?

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Democratic reforms in Belarus

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

Can the Commission get the Belarus leadership to cooperate?

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Napätá situácia v Turecku

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Tense situation in Turkey

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Migrácia obyvateľov v EÚ

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Migration within the EU

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Reforma európskej integračnej politiky

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/policy/legal.cfm#
([2]) KOM(2011) 455 v konečnom znení.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011750/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Reform of European integration policy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/policy/legal.cfm#
([2]) COM(2011) 455 final.

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Boj proti podvodom v EÚ

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

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

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

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

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

Spolupráca justičných orgánov jednotlivých členských štátov nespadá do právomocí Komisie.

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

([1]) Návrh zriadenia Európskej prokuratúry bol prijatý 17. júla 2013 – COM(2013) 534.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* The fight against fraud in the EU

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) The proposal for the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office has been adopted on 17 July 2013 — COM(2013) 534.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Tajné prijatie homofóbneho zákona o zákaze propagandy v Moldavsku

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Secret adoption of homophobic law prohibiting propaganda in Moldova

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Väznenie Bielorusa Alesa Bialiatskeho

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

Aký je postoj Komisie k prípadu väzneného Alesa Bialiatskeho?

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011753/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Imprisonment of Ales Bialiatski in Belarus

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

What is the Commission's position on Ales Bialiatski?

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Štvrtý železničný balíček

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* The Fourth Railway Package

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Problematika kvality potravinárskych výrobkov

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* A food product quality issue

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Sloboda médií v Rumunsku

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Media freedom in Romania

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Ruský nátlak na Ukrajinu

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* Russian pressure on Ukraine

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Vybudovanie uhoľnej elektrárne v Poľsku

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

([1]) Smernica 2011/92/EÚ o posudzovaní vplyvov určitých verejných a súkromných projektov na životné prostredie (Ú. v. EÚ L 26, 28.1.2012).
([2]) Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2001/80/ES o obmedzení emisií určitých znečisťujúcich látok do ovzdušia z veľkých spaľovacích zariadení (Ú. v. ES L 309, 27.11.2001).
([3]) Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2010/75/EÚ o priemyselných emisiách sa od 7. januára 2013 vzťahuje na nové spaľovacie zariadenia (Ú. v. EÚ L 334, 17.12.2010).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011759/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**
*(15 October 2013)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([2]) 2001/80/EC on the limitation of emissions of certain pollutants into the air from large combustion plants, OJ L 309, 27.11.2001.
([3]) Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions applies for new combustion plants since 7 January 2013, OJ L334, 17.12.2010.

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* EÚ a mierové rokovania na Blízkom východe

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* The EU and the Middle East peace talks

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Problematika pašovaného tovaru

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(English version)*

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

*Subject:* The problem of smuggled goods

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/customs/customs_controls/counterfeit_piracy/statistics/index_en.htm
([2]) Council Resolution (2013/C 80/01) — OJEU C80/1 of 19.03.2013.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/iprenforcement/docs/memorandum_04052011_en.pdf
([4]) COM(2013) 209 final.

*(Slovenské znenie)*

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

*Vec:* Vyhrocovanie násilností v Egypte

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

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

**Odpoveď vysokej predstaviteľky a podpredsedníčky Komisie Ashtonovej v mene Komisie**
*(12. decembra 2013)*

Európsku komisiu znepokojuje prehlbujúca sa politická polarizácia a pokračovanie násilia v Egypte. Rada pre zahraničné veci vo svojich záveroch z 21. augusta „jednoznačne odsudzuje všetky násilné činy“ a žiada o „začatie nezávislého vyšetrovania všetkých vrážd“. Delegácia priamo na mieste pozorne sleduje vývoj.

EÚ aj naďalej požaduje inkluzívny proces, z ktorého nie je vylúčená žiadna politická skupina, ktorá rešpektuje demokratické zásady a zriekne sa násilia. Cieľom EÚ v tomto úsilí je dosiahnuť hlboko zakorenenú a udržateľnú demokraciu ako jediné riešenie súčasnej situácie. Vysoká predstaviteľka navštívila Egypt pri viacerých príležitostiach a EÚ aj naďalej ponúka svoju pomoc a služby a je pripravená na rozhovory so všetkými stranami, ak ju o to požiadajú, bez toho, aby na seba prevzala úlohu sprostredkovateľa.

Zároveň sa aj vzhľadom na závery Rady pre zahraničné veci z 21. augusta spolupráca zameriava na podporu spoločensko-ekonomického vývoja a občianskej spoločnosti.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011762/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**
*(15 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Escalating violence in Egypt

Egypt has seen an escalation of violence in recent days. The political conflict is resulting in extensive bloodshed, loss of human life and material damage. The EU has halted supplies of weapons, so that they cannot be used repressively against opponents. At the same time, however, it is essential to continue providing assistance to the injured, and to defend civil society.

How can the Commission work towards a resumption of political dialogue? Is it considering taking concrete steps to help defuse the situation and facilitate negotiation?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(12 December 2013)*

The European Union is concerned about the continued political polarization and violence in Egypt. In its conclusions of 21 August, the Foreign Affairs Council condemned 'in the clearest possible terms all acts of violence' and asked 'to launch an independent investigation into all the killings'. The Delegation on the ground is following the developments closely.

The EU continues to call for an inclusive process not excluding any political group respecting democratic principles and renouncing the use of violence in order to lead to deep and sustainable democracy as the only solution to the current situation. The High Representative has been travelling to Egypt several times and the EU also continues to offer its good offices and is ready to talk to all sides if invited to do so without taking a mediation role.

At the same time, also following the conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council of 21 August, cooperation is focused on the support to socioeconomic development and civil society.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011765/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE)**
*(16. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Beschwerdekammer der Europäischen Schulen

Die Europäischen Schulen wurden gemeinsam von den Regierungen der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union sowie den Europäischen Gemeinschaften gegründet. Zu den gesetzlichen Grundlagen gehören Abkommen mit der EU, die u. a. sicherstellen, dass ein Vertreter der Kommission die EU im Obersten Rat und im Verwaltungsrat der Schulen vertritt. Dort getroffene Entscheidungen müssen laut Satzung so weit wie möglich einstimmig erfolgen. Des Weiteren trägt die EU knapp 60 % zum Haushalt der Europaschulen bei (2012 konkret 59,7 % des Gesamtbudgets).

Die Gemeinsame Gerichtsbarkeit aller Europäischen Schulen liegt bei der Beschwerdekammer der Europäischen Schulen. Gemäß Artikel 27 der Vereinbarung über die Satzung der Europäischen Schulen besitzt die Beschwerdekammer, nach Ausschöpfung des Verwaltungsweges, erst- und letztinstanzlich ausschließliche Zuständigkeit. Satzung und Verfahrensordnung der Beschwerdekammer selbst werden vom Obersten Rat einstimmig angenommen. Darüber hinaus sind die Beschwerdekammer sowie ihre Geschäftsstelle mit ihren hauptamtlichen Mitarbeitern, postalisch c/o Europäische Kommission in Brüssel zu kontaktieren.

1. Warum gibt es für Streitigkeiten bei Zulassungsverfahren an Brüsseler Schulen keine Ausschöpfung des Verwaltungsweges, sondern ausschließlich einen kostenpflichtigen Klageweg?

2. Auf welcher Rechtsgrundlage beruht dieser Widerspruch zu Artikel 27?

3. Womit wird gerechtfertigt, dass es sich hierbei zusätzlich um eine erst- und zugleich letztinstanzliche Entscheidung handelt?

4. Gibt es aus den letzten Jahren Statistiken über den Ausgang von Widersprüchen (168 im Jahr 2012) und Verwaltungsklagen (81 in 2012, davon 32 wegen Zulassungen an Brüsseler Schulen)? Hält die Kommission diese Ergebnisse für ausgewogen?

5. Ist sich die Kommission der Mängel der Zulassungsstrategien bewusst, die (Zitat aus der Rechtssache 13/25) „in der Umsetzung und in der Verwaltungsanwendung bei den betroffenen Eltern zu Recht auf viel Kritik und erhebliches Unverständnis gestoßen ist"? Ist sich die Kommission bewusst, dass das Verfahren (Zitat) „zu Recht als wenig flexibel und bürgernah zu qualifizieren ist" und daher von der Beschwerdekammer (Zitat) als „zukünftig zu überarbeiten (Leitlinien und Zulassungsstrategie)" angesehen wird? Wie sieht das die Kommission?

6. Was beabsichtigt die Kommission in ihrer Funktion im Obersten Rat und im Verwaltungsrat sowie als Adressat und als Finanzier an dieser Situation zu ändern?

**Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission**
*(17. Dezember 2013)*

1. In Artikel 50a Absatz 3 der allgemeinen Schulordnung der Europäischen Schulen (ES) ist Folgendes festgelegt: „Wenn der Beschluss über einen Zulassungsantrag von der Zentralen Zulassungsstelle für die Europäischen Schulen in Brüssel gefasst wird, kann die Beschwerdekammer gemäß Artikel 67 mit einer direkten Klage befasst werden". Daher gibt es in solchen Fällen keinen anderen administrativen Weg mehr, der vorher zu beschreiten wäre. Eltern haben nur dann eine Gebühr zu entrichten, wenn der Rechtsbehelf als Verfahrensmissbrauch angesehen wird.

2. Somit besteht kein Widerspruch zu Artikel 27 der Vereinbarung über die Satzung der Europäischen Schulen, in dessen Absatz 2 es heißt: „Die Voraussetzungen für ein Verfahren der Beschwerdekammer und die entsprechenden Durchführungsbestimmungen sind in den Beschäftigungsbedingungen für das Lehrpersonal bzw. der Regelung für die Lehrbeauftragten oder der allgemeinen Schulordnung festgelegt".

3. Es besteht keine rechtliche Verpflichtung für die Europäischen Schulen, eine weitere Beschwerdeinstanz zu schaffen. Die Europäische Menschenrechtskonvention sieht in Artikel 2 des Zusatzprotokolls Nr. 7 die Schaffung einer Berufungsinstanz nur für Strafsachen, nicht aber für andere, wie die hier behandelten Angelegenheiten vor.

4. 2012 gab es insgesamt 168 Verwaltungsbeschwerden und 81 formelle Beschwerden, von denen 32 Entscheidungen der Zentralen Zulassungsstelle betrafen. In 24 dieser 32 Fälle wies die Beschwerdekammer die Beschwerde zurück, in 6 Fällen beschloss sie, die Entscheidung der Zentralen Zulassungsstelle aufzuheben, und in zwei Fällen wurden die Beschwerden zurückgezogen.

5. Die Zulassungspolitik ist vor allem wegen der Überbelegung und der infrastrukturellen Beschränkungen ein komplexes Thema. Wie aus den neuen Leitlinien für 2014-2015 deutlich wird, strebt die Zulassungsstelle aber jedes Jahr nach mehr Flexibilität und Transparenz.

6. Auf Ersuchen der Kommission wurde eine Arbeitsgruppe eingesetzt, um den Rechtsschutz innerhalb des Systems der Europäischen Schulen zu analysieren und gegebenenfalls zu überarbeiten.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011765/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* European Schools Complaints Board

The European Schools were founded jointly by the governments of the Member States of the European Union and the European Communities. The legal bases include agreements with the EU, which ensure, *inter alia*, that a representative of the Commission represents the EU on the Board of Governors and on the Administrative Board of the schools. Decisions taken there must, as far as possible, be unanimous according to the Statute. Furthermore, the EU contributes just under 60% to the budget of the European Schools (exactly 59.7% of the total budget in 2012).

The judicial body common to all the European Schools is the Complaints Board of the European Schools. In accordance with Article 27 of the Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools, the Complaints Board shall have sole jurisdiction in the first and final instance, once all administrative channels have been exhausted. The Statute and rules of procedure of the Complaints Board itself are adopted by the Board of Governors, acting unanimously. The Complaints Board and the office at which its full-time employees work are also to be contacted by post c/o the Commission in Brussels.

1. Why is there no exhaustion of all administrative channels for disputes in connection with the admission procedures for schools in Brussels, but merely a means of appeal for which a mandatory fee is to be paid?

2. What is the legal basis for this contradiction of Article 27?

3. What is the justification for the fact that this is at the same time both a first- and a final-instance decision?

4. Are there any statistics from the last few years on the outcome of objections (168 in 2012) and administrative proceedings (81 in 2012, 32 of which related to admissions to schools in Brussels)? Does the Commission consider these results to be balanced?

5. Is the Commission aware of the shortcomings of the admissions strategies, which (quote from Case 13/25) 'in their implementation and administrative application have rightly met with a great deal of criticism and considerable confusion among the parents concerned'? Is the Commission aware that the procedure (quote) 'should rightly be classed as not very flexible and remote from citizens' and is therefore regarded by the Complaints Board as 'requiring revision in the future (guidelines and admissions strategy)'? What is the Commission's view of this?

6. What does it intend to do, in its role on the Board of Governors and on the Administrative Board and as addressee and provider of funding, to change this situation?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission**
*(17 December 2013)*

1. Art. 50a.3 of the General Rules of the European Schools (ES) states that 'When the decision on an application for enrolment is taken by the Central Enrolment Authority (CEA) for the Brussels ES, a contentious appeal may be lodged direct with the Complaints Board, in accordance with Article 67.' Therefore, there are no other administrative channels to be exhausted in such cases. A fee has to be paid by the parents only if the appeal is held to be an abuse of process.

2. There is therefore no contradiction with Art. 27 of the Convention of the ES, whose point 2 states that 'The conditions and the detailed rules relative to these proceedings shall be laid down, as appropriate, by the Service Regulations for the teaching staff or by the conditions of employment for part-time teachers, or by the General Rules of the Schools.'

3. There is no legal obligation for the ES to create a two-tier jurisdiction. The European Convention on Human Rights provides in Art.2 of Additional Protocol No 7 only for an obligation to create an appeal instance for criminal matters but not for other matters such as those at issue here.

4. In 2012, there were a total of 168 administrative appeals and 81 contentious appeals, 32 of which related to the decisions of the CEA. Out of these 32, in 24 cases the Complaint Board rejected the appeal, in 6 cases decided to annul the CEA decision and in 2 cases the appeals were withdrawn.

5. The Enrolments Policy is a complex issue due mainly to the overpopulation issue and infrastructure constraints. However, each year the CEA is striving for more flexibility and transparency, as is shown in the new guidelines for 2014-2015.

6. At the Commission's request, a working group has been convened to analyse and possibly revise the legal protection system within the ES System.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011767/13**
**to the Commission**
**Giles Chichester (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Gibraltar-Spain border

Following the visit of EU inspectors to the Gibraltar-Spain border, several incidents in which innocent Gibraltarians have been harassed by the Spanish authorities have again occurred.

Will the Commission continue to monitor the situation at the border between Gibraltar and Spain? Does the Commission intend to take any action against the Spanish authorities who are hindering the free movement of EU citizens in and out of Gibraltar?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(6 December 2013)*

On the basis of the observations during the technical visit of 25 September 2013 at the crossing point of La Línea de la Concepción and of the information provided by both authorities on that occasion, the Commission has not found evidence to conclude that the checks on persons and goods as operated by Spain at the border with Gibraltar have infringed the relevant provisions of Union law.

The management of this crossing point is nevertheless challenging, in view of the heavy traffic volumes in a relatively confined space and the increase in cigarette smuggling into Spain. The Commission believes that the authorities on both sides could take further measures to better address these challenges. Hence, it addressed recommendations to both authorities with a view to develop the mutual exchange of information on tobacco smuggling, to optimise the risk-based profiling at the border and the physical space on the Spanish side of the crossing point.

The Commission will continue to monitor the situation at this crossing point and asked to receive information from both authorities within six months on how the recommendations have been taken into consideration. The Commission reserves the right to reconsider its position should the situation change or evolve and also to pay another visit to this crossing point if appropriate in the future.

*(Svensk version)*

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-011768/13**
**till kommissionen**
**Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)**
*(16 oktober 2013)*

*Angående:* European Animal Welfare Platform

Vad var kommissionens sammanlagda utgifter för finansieringen av European Animal Welfare Platform?

European Animal Welfare Platform gav upphov till strategiska dokument för nötkreatur av kött- och mjölkras, svin, värphöns, slaktkycklingar och odlad lax. De strategiska dokumenten innefattar både en förteckning över centrala djurskyddsfrågor och färdplaner för hur de ska hanteras. Vilka åtgärder vidtar kommissionen för att främja användandet av dessa strategiska dokument? Hur används de i dagsläget?

Vad är kommissionens bedömning av de vinster för djurskyddet som finansieringen av European Animal Welfare Platform resulterat i?

**Svar från Máire Geoghegan-Quinn på kommissionens vägnar**
*(3 december 2013)*

*European Animal Welfare Platform* (EAWP) ([1]) var ett EU-finansierat projekt inom ramen för sjunde ramprogrammet ([2]) som samlade producenter, återförsäljare och det civila samhällets aktörer för att diskutera djurskyddsfrågor i livsmedelskedjan. Projektet varade i tre år (2008–2011) och fick EU-anslag på totalt omkring 1 miljon euro.

EAWP underlättade utbyte av kunskap mellan intressenter och visade sig vara effektiv när det gäller att identifiera centrala djurskyddsfrågor, föreslå mål för förbättrat djurskydd, sprida god praxis angående djurskyddskrav och fastställa prioriteringar för forskningen.

Kunskaperna från EAWP utnyttjades för utarbetandet av rapporten *"Evaluation of the EU policy on Animal Welfare and Possible Options for the Future"* ([3]), som utmynnade i EU:s strategi för djurskydd och djurs välbefinnande 2012–2015 ([4]). Vissa av de problem som ringats in av EAWP undersöks i andra forskningsprojekt, exempelvis benfel i det nyligen utvalda projektet ProHealth. ([5]) Kommissionen stödjer vidare spridning genom att uppmuntra återanvändning av projektresultaten för att utveckla nya projekt ([6]) och uppmuntra samarbete med berörda parter.

På begäran av Europaparlamentet har kommissionen dessutom inlett ett pilotprojekt om ett europeiskt samordnat djurskyddsnätverk (*European coordinated animal welfare network*, EUWelNet), som startades i januari 2013 ([7]), och som bygger vidare på kunskaperna från EAWP och det nätverk av berörda parter som byggdes upp inom EAWP.

---

([1]) http://www.animalwelfareplatform.eu
([2]) Sjunde ramprogram för verksamhet inom området forskning, teknisk utveckling och demonstration (2007–2013).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/3 %20Final%20Report%20-%20EUPAW%20Evaluation.pdf
([4]) KOM(2012) 6 final, 15.2.2012.
([5]) http://www.accelopment.com/en/infopool/news/ec-grant-agreement-signed-fp7-project-prohealth
([6]) Andra projekt för bedömning av djurskyddet: AWIN: http://www.animal-welfare-indicators.net . och AWARE: http://www.aware-welfare.eu.
([7]) http://www.euwelnet.eu

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011768/13**
**to the Commission**
**Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* European Animal Welfare Platform

What has been the Commission's overall expenditure to date in funding the European Animal Welfare Platform?

The platform has produced strategic approach documents for beef and dairy cattle, pigs, laying hens, broiler chickens and farmed salmon, which include both an inventory of key welfare issues and roadmaps for addressing these issues. What steps is the Commission taking to encourage the use of these strategic approach documents? How are they being used?

What is the Commission's assessment of the welfare gains achieved as a result of the expenditure in funding the European Animal Welfare Platform?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

The European Animal Welfare Platform (EAWP) ([1]) is a European project funded under FP7 ([2]), which brings together producers, retailers and civil society actors to address animal welfare issues in the food chain. This three-year project (2008- 2011) received a total EU contribution of circa EUR 1 million.

The platform facilitated the exchange of knowledge between stakeholders and proved successful in identifying key welfare issues, proposing goals for welfare improvement, disseminating best practices on animal welfare standards, and identifying research priorities.

The knowledge gained during the EAWP has been used for the 2010 'Evaluation of the EU policy on Animal Welfare and Possible Options for the Future' ([3]), which led to the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([4]). Some of the problems identified by EAWP are examined by other research projects, such as leg disorders in the recently selected ProHealth project ([5]). The Commission supports wider dissemination by promoting the reuse of the project's results for the development of new projects ([6]) and encouraging stakeholder collaboration.

Furthermore, at the request of the European Parliament, the Commission launched a pilot project on a European coordinated animal welfare network (EUWelNet), which started in January 2013 ([7]), building upon the knowledge and stakeholder network generated by the EAWP.

---

([1]) http://www.animalwelfareplatform.eu
([2]) The Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/3%20Final%20Report%20-%20EUPAW%20Evaluation.pdf
([4]) COM(2012) 6 final, 15.2.2012.
([5]) http://www.accelopment.com/en/infopool/news/ec-grant-agreement-signed-fp7-project-prohealth
([6]) Other animal welfare assessment projects : AWIN: http://www.animal-welfare-indicators.net
andAWARE: http://www.aware-welfare.eu
([7]) http://www.euwelnet.eu

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011769/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**
*(16 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Gestión descentralizada en los Estados del programa Europa Creativa

La Comisión sustituirá en 2014 los programas Media, Cultura y Media Mundus por la iniciativa «Europa Creativa». La nueva iniciativa, además de apostar por la competitividad mediante un apoyo efectivo a los agentes culturales, cita expresamente la promoción de la diversidad cultural como un objetivo específico.

Desde una perspectiva administrativa, las actuales oficinas (PCC) y Media serán sustituidas en todos los Estados miembros por las oficinas «Europa Creativa». El programa plantea la creación de un organismo de coordinación en cada Estado y atribuye a cada país la facultad de organizar la relación entre este organismo y la oficina u oficinas «Europa Creativa». De acuerdo con las informaciones disponibles, la Comisión va a ofrecer un único acuerdo contractual con cada organismo estatal de coordinación.

Ambas decisiones pueden propiciar una recentralización de las relaciones entre los sectores de producción y creación cultural y las autoridades de los Estados miembros. Esta posibilidad es inconveniente, pues en muchos países las competencias culturales están descentralizadas. En otros hay industrias culturales que producen en lenguas minorizadas. Ambas razones aconsejan que la relación entre creadores y Comisión a través de estas oficinas incorpore a las autoridades locales y regionales. Además, en Estados con lenguas oficiales distintas al idioma común, son las autoridades regionales quienes asumen, prácticamente en exclusiva, la promoción de la producción cultural en estas lenguas.

A la vista de estos hechos:

1. ¿Cree la Comisión que una centralización de estas oficinas es coherente con la promoción de la diversidad?

2. ¿Piensa la Comisión ofrecer acuerdos multibeneficiarios para los Estados miembros en estas circunstancias?

3. ¿Aconsejará la Comisión la descentralización en países con varios idiomas oficiales?

**Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión**
*(29 de noviembre de 2013)*

La estructura de las futuras oficinas «Europa Creativa» se ha diseñado, en colaboración con los Estados miembros, a fin de proporcionar la mejor información posible a los agentes de los sectores culturales y creativos. A tal fin, cada país organizará dichas oficinas de acuerdo con su situación específica, incluidas sus particularidades institucionales y lingüísticas. Al mismo tiempo, con el fin de simplificar y reforzar la gestión de las mismas, las autoridades nacionales designarán en cada país un organismo de coordinación responsable ante la Comisión en lo que se refiere a los derechos y obligaciones contractuales entre la Comisión y las oficinas en cuestión. Por lo tanto, las relaciones entre los sectores culturales y creativos y las autoridades de los Estados miembros no estarán centralizadas.

Las disposiciones contractuales también tendrán en cuenta la situación específica de cada país y se ha considerado la posibilidad de ofrecer, en su caso, acuerdos a beneficiarios múltiples.

Las oficinas «Europa Creativa» pueden organizarse, por tanto, de manera más descentralizada, en particular en aquellos países en los que existan varias lenguas oficiales o competencias culturales y audiovisuales transferidas. Sin embargo, incumbe a las autoridades nacionales tomar una decisión al respecto, en el marco contractual y financiero previsto por la Comisión.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011769/13**
**to the Commission**
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Decentralised management of the Creative Europe programme in Member States

In 2014, the Commission will replace the MEDIA, Culture and MEDIA Mundus programmes with the 'Creative Europe' initiative. In addition to backing competitiveness by means of effective support for cultural operators, the new initiative expressly cites the promotion of cultural diversity as a specific objective.

From an administrative perspective, the current offices (PCC and Media) will be replaced in all Member States by 'Creative Europe' offices. The programme is proposing to establish a coordinating body in each Member State and confer upon each country the authority to organise the relationship between this body and the 'Creative Europe' office or offices. According to the information available, the Commission is going to offer a single contractual agreement with each State coordinating body.

Both decisions may give rise to a re-centralisation of relationships between the cultural production and creativity sectors and the authorities of the Member States. This possibility is inappropriate, since in many countries the cultural decision-making authorities are decentralised. In other countries, there are cultural industries that work in minority languages. For both of these reasons, it is recommended that the relationship between creators and the Commission, by means of these offices, incorporates local and regional authorities. Furthermore, in States with official languages that are not the common language, it is the regional authorities that almost exclusively undertake the promotion of culture in these languages.

In view of the above:

1 Does the Commission believe that the centralisation of these offices is consistent with promoting diversity?

2 Is the Commission considering offering multi-beneficiary agreements for the Member States in these circumstances?

3 Will the Commission advise decentralisation in countries with several official languages?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission**
*(29 November 2013)*

The structure of the future Creative Europe Desks has been designed, in cooperation with the Member States, with a view to providing the best possible information to operators from the cultural and creative sectors. To this end, individual countries shall organise these offices so as to better take into account their specific situations, including institutional and/or linguistic specificities. At the same time, with a view to simplifying and strengthening the management of such offices, the national authorities shall appoint in each country a coordinating body that will be responsible vis-à-vis the Commission as regards the contractual rights and obligations between the Commission and these offices. Relationships between the cultural and creative sectors and the authorities of the Member States will therefore not be centralised.

The contractual arrangements will also take into account the specific situation of each country and the possibility of offering multi-beneficiary agreements, where appropriate, has indeed been considered.

The Creative Europe desks can indeed be organised on a more decentralised basis, in particular in countries that have several official languages or devolved cultural and audiovisual competences. However, it is up to national authorities to take such decisions, within the contractual and financial framework offered by the Commission.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011771/13**
**à la Commission**
**Christine De Veyrac (PPE)**
*(16 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Mise sur le marché du Pradaxa

L'anticoagulant de nouvelle génération Pradaxa est accusé par plusieurs familles françaises d'être à l'origine du décès de quatre personnes au début de l'année 2013. Les familles des défunts ont alors décidé de porter plainte contre le laboratoire allemand Boehringer Ingelheim, qui commercialise ce produit.

Il est notamment reproché à l'Agence nationale de sécurité du médicament en France (ANSM) d'avoir méconnu les principes de précaution et de prévention. Les plaignants considèrent également que le laboratoire n'a pas assez étudié la molécule et ses risques, notamment chez les patients les plus fragiles et plus particulièrement les seniors, qui sont les plus exposés à ce médicament.

De plus, les plaignants considèrent regrettable le fait que le laboratoire n'ait pas commercialisé concomitamment le Pradaxa et son antidote qui aurait, selon eux, permis d'éviter de nombreux décès.

Ces plaintes sont apparues quelques semaines après la mise en garde de l'ANSM sur cette nouvelle génération de médicaments. En 2011, le laboratoire commercialisant le produit avait notamment enregistré 260 décès suspects par hémorragie chez des patients traités avec cet anticoagulant.

Aussi, la Commission a-t-elle l'intention d'entreprendre des démarches pour analyser les risques de ce médicament et étudier son éventuel retrait du marché?

**Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission**
*(22 novembre 2013)*

Un médicament ne peut être commercialisé que si une autorisation de mise sur le marché lui a été accordée conformément à la législation de l'UE ([1]), lorsque sa qualité, sa sécurité et son efficacité ont été évaluées et qu'un rapport bénéfice/risque positif quant à son utilisation a été établi. La sécurité d'un médicament fait l'objet d'un suivi continu après sa mise sur le marché.

Les rapports d'effets indésirables chez les patients à la suite de l'utilisation d'un médicament sont recueillis et contrôlés par l'Agence européenne des médicaments (AEM) et les notifications de nouveaux effets indésirables sont examinées. La sécurité des différents médicaments est régulièrement revue dans le cadre des rapports périodiques actualisés relatifs à leur sécurité.

Les risques identifiés liés à l'utilisation du Pradaxa ([2]) font l'objet d'un suivi attentif. Les données relatives aux réactions négatives notifiées sont examinées par l'AEM sur une base semestrielle. Le rapport bénéfice/risque continue d'être considéré comme positif ([3]).

Si un nouveau problème de sécurité est détecté par des activités de pharmacovigilance, les autorités évaluent les nouvelles données et déterminent si des mesures doivent être prises. Dans ce cas, la Commission demande l'avis de l'AEM. Le comité pour l'évaluation des risques en matière de pharmacovigilance est responsable de la détection, de l'évaluation et de la réduction des risques d'effets indésirables des médicaments, et de la communication sur ces risques. Ce comité fait, le cas échéant, des recommandations d'action visant à réduire les risques identifiés, et la Commission prend les mesures appropriées.

---

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 726/2004 du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant des procédures communautaires pour l'autorisation et la surveillance en ce qui concerne les médicaments à usage humain et à usage vétérinaire, et instituant une Agence européenne des médicaments (JO L 136 du 30.4.2004) et directive 2001/83/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil instituant un code communautaire relatif aux médicaments à usage humain (JO L 311 du 28.11.2001).

([2]) La description détaillée des autorisations de mise sur le marché pour les médicaments autorisés centralement est disponible sur le registre communautaire des médicaments à usage humain, voir: http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm

([3]) Le dernier rapport périodique actualisé relatif à la sécurité concernant Pradaxa a été évalué par l'AEM en octobre 2013.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011771/13**
**to the Commission**
**Christine De Veyrac (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Marketing of Pradaxa

The new generation anticoagulant Pradaxa has been blamed by some French families for the deaths of four people in the early part of 2013. The families of the deceased have therefore decided to sue the German pharmaceutical company which sells the product, Boehringer Ingelheim.

The French medicines regulatory agency (ANSM) has also been accused of failing to follow the principles of precaution and prevention. The plaintiffs also claim that the pharmaceutical company did not perform sufficient studies on the drug and its risks, for example in the most vulnerable patients and in particular the elderly, who are more likely to be given the drug.

According to the plaintiffs, it is also regrettable that the company did not place an antidote to Pradaxa on the market at the same time as the drug itself, as this would have avoided many deaths.

These lawsuits were brought several weeks after ANSM issued a warning about this new generation drug class. In 2011, the company which sells the product recorded 260 deaths caused by bleeding in patients who had been taking this anticoagulant.

Does the Commission therefore intend to take steps to analyse the risks associated with this drug and the possibility of withdrawing it from the market?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(22 November 2013)*

A medicine can be placed on the market only after a marketing authorisation has been granted in accordance with the EU legislation ([1]), when its quality, safety and efficacy have been evaluated and a positive benefit-risk balance related to its use has been concluded. Once placed on the market, the safety of a medicine is continuously monitored.

Reports of adverse reactions in patients following the use of a medicine are collected and monitored by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and signals of new adverse events are investigated. The safety of individual medicines is regularly reviewed through their periodic safety update reports.

The identified risks associated with use of Pradaxa ([2]) are closely monitored. Data on the reported adverse events are reviewed by EMA on a 6 monthly basis. The benefit-risk balance continues to be considered positive ([3]).

If a new safety issue is identified through pharmacovigilance activities, the authorities will assess the new data and determine whether any action is needed. In such cases the Commission seeks the advice of the EMA. EMA's Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee is responsible for the detection, assessment, minimisation and communication relating to the risk of adverse reactions of medicines. The Committee makes recommendations for action when it is necessary to minimise the identified risk, and the Commission takes action as appropriate.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency (OJ L 136, 30.4.2004) and Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 311, 28.11.2001).

([2]) Details of the marketing authorisations for centrally authorised medicinal products are available on the Community Register of medicinal products for human use see: http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm

([3]) The most recent periodic safety update report for Pradaxa was assessed by EMA in October 2013.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011772/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Progetto per la creazione della 14ª discarica nel comune di Paese in provincia di Treviso, presentato dalla società Dal Zilio S.r.l.

La società Dal Zilio S.r.l. ha recentemente presentato un progetto di trasformazione in discarica per rifiuti speciali non pericolosi dell'ex cava di ghiaia denominata «Cava Castagnole» ubicata a Paese (TV) tra le località di Porcellengo e Castagnole. L'impianto progettato ha capacità di deposito pari a quasi 430 000 m3 di rifiuti, corrispondenti a circa 560 000 tonnellate, che verranno conferiti nell'arco temporale di 8 anni con traffico medio previsto di 8-9 mezzi pesanti giornalieri in entrata, per un conferimento medio annuo di 70 000 tonnellate. Il sito è ubicato nell'alta pianura trevigiana in piena zona di ricarica degli acquiferi, caratterizzata da una preoccupante presenza di nitrati e si trova in prossimità delle abitazioni e di una scuola dell'infanzia.

Lo scrivente deputato è autore di varie interrogazioni in merito all'anomala quantità di discariche e cave spesso irregolari e ai problemi di inquinamento delle falde acquifere riscontrati a Paese e nei comuni circostanti; solo nel comune di Paese, infatti, sono presenti ben 29 cave e 13 discariche. La presenza di una simile concentrazione di impianti e le conseguenti ripercussioni ambientali che il territorio ha subìto nel corso del tempo sembrano essere in contrasto con il principio di precauzione di cui all'articolo 191, paragrafo 2 TFUE.

Nelle risposte alle interrogazioni P-010621/2012 ed E-004885-13, presentate rispettivamente in relazione alle discariche di Paese «T.ER.R.A. S.r.l.» ed «Ex SEV», la Commissione si impegnava a contattare le autorità italiane per ottenere alcuni chiarimenti. Nella risposta all'interrogazione E-006642/13 sull'ampliamento di un'altra discarica nel vicino comune di Trevignano (TV), la Commissione precisava inoltre che le decisioni relative all'autorizzazione delle discariche sono adottate dalle autorità competenti degli Stati membri.

Tutto ciò premesso, la Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza del sopra esposto nuovo progetto di creazione di un'ulteriore a discarica a Paese (TV)?

2. Può far sapere l'esito dei contatti intercorsi con le autorità italiane in merito alla discariche «T.ER.R.A. S.r.l.» ed «ex SEV» e se intende contattare le autorità anche in merito al sopra esposto nuovo progetto?

3. Non ritiene opportuno un futuro aggiornamento della normativa comunitaria di settore, al fine di imporre agli Stati membri regole atte ad evitare il riproporsi di anomale concentrazioni di impianti come quella presente a Paese (TV)?

**Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**
*(13 dicembre 2013)*

1. La Commissione non dispone di informazioni riguardo al progetto di trasformazione dell'ex cava di ghiaia denominata «Cava Castagnole» in discarica per rifiuti speciali non pericolosi.

2. A seguito delle interrogazioni scritte E-004885/2013 ed E-004886/2013 ([1]), la Commissione ha chiesto alle autorità italiane di fornire chiarimenti sulla discarica dismessa in Via Veccelli, nel comune di Padernello di Paese (provincia di Treviso), e sulla discarica «Ex Nuova ESA», situata tra i comuni di Marcon (provincia di Venezia) e Mogliano Veneto (provincia di Treviso). La Commissione valuterà la risposta data dalle autorità italiane e deciderà se occorre adottare eventuali misure.

Inoltre, qualora dovesse risultare che il progetto presentato dalla società Dal Zilio S.r.l. possa dar luogo a una violazione della normativa ambientale dell'UE, la Commissione contatterà le autorità italiane.

3. Non occorrono norme specifiche per impedire la concentrazione di discariche, poiché queste ultime sono disciplinate dalla direttiva VIA ([2]), che impone di tener conto dell'impatto cumulativo con altri impianti.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati — GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011772/13**
**to the Commission**
**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Project for the creation of the 14th landfill in Paese (province of Treviso), presented by Dal Zilio S.r.l.

The company Dal Zilio S.r.l. recently presented a project to convert the former gravel quarry, Cava Castagnole, located in Paese (province of Treviso) between Porcellengo and Castagnole, into a landfill site for special non-hazardous waste. The planned facility has a waste storage capacity of almost 430 000 $m^3$, equal to approximately 560 000 tonnes, which will be landfilled over 8 years with a forecast average of 8-9 incoming heavy vehicles per day, giving an average annual landfilled amount of 70 000 tonnes. The site lies in Treviso's high plains in the middle of a groundwater replenishment area. There is a worrying presence of nitrates, and homes and an infant school are located nearby.

I have submitted several questions on the abnormal number of landfills and quarries, which are often illegal, and on the groundwater pollution problems in Paese and surrounding municipalities; there are, in fact, as many as 29 quarries and 13 landfills in the municipality of Paese alone. Such a high concentration of facilities and the consequent environmental effects on the area over time appear to run counter to the precautionary principle laid down in Article 191(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

In its answers to questions P-010621/2012 and E-004885-13, submitted respectively on the 'T.ER.R.A. S.r.l.' and 'Former SEV' landfills in Paese, the Commission undertook to contact the Italian authorities for clarification of certain issues. In its answer to Question E-006642/13 on the expansion of another landfill in the nearby municipality of Trevignano (province of Treviso), the Commission also stated that decisions about the authorisation of landfills are taken by the competent authorities of the Member States.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above new project to create another landfill in Paese?

2. Can it refer the outcome of its contacts with the Italian authorities regarding the T.ER.R.A. S.r.l. and former SEV landfills, and does it also plan to contact the authorities about the above new project?

3. Does it not believe that EU legislation in this area should be updated in the future, in order to impose on the Member States rules to prevent a repetition of abnormal concentrations of facilities such as that found in Paese?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

1. The Commission has no information on the project to convert the former gravel quarry, Cava Castagnole, into a landfill site for special non-hazardous waste.

2. Following written questions E-004885/2013 and E-004886/2013 ([1]), the Commission asked the Italian authorities to provide clarifications on the disused landfill in Via Veccelli in the municipality of Padernello di Paese (province of Treviso) as well as on the 'Ex Nuova ESA' landfill between the municipality of Marcon (province of Venice) and the municipality of Mogliano Veneto (province of Treviso). The Commission will assess the reply of the Italian authorities and decide if any steps are necessary.

Also, in case of any evidence that the project presented by Dal Zilio S.r.l. may breach EU environmental legislation, the Commission will contact the competent Italian authorities.

3. Specific legislation to prevent concentration of landfills is not necessary, as landfill are subject to the the EIA Directive ([2]) where cumulative impacts with other facilities have to be taken into account.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment — OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011773/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Criminalità organizzata nella filiera agroalimentare

In un periodo di forte crisi internazionale e in un paese come l'Italia, dove oltre l'86 % dei trasporti commerciali avviene su gomma, i consumatori vedono aumentare i prezzi dei prodotti alimentari del 200 % del loro prezzo a causa delle infiltrazioni della criminalità organizzata nel mercato ortofrutticolo.

Come riportato nell'articolo de «Il Sole 24ore» del 7 ottobre, le imprese agricole e i consumatori subiscono un impatto devastante dovuto alle infiltrazioni mafiose che danneggiano tutta l'economia locale. Il costo grava interamente sulla vendita del prodotto ed è scaricato completamente sul consumatore finale, raddoppiando o addirittura triplicando il prezzo delle derrate alimentari.

La criminalità organizzata in agricoltura opera attraverso furti di attrezzature e mezzi agricoli, racket, estorsioni, pizzo e truffe nei confronti dell'Unione europea, senza dimenticare le intromissioni nel sistema di distribuzione e trasporto che mettono a rischio non solo la sicurezza alimentare, ma determinano anche un danno economico.

Pertanto si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quali siano gli organismi (OLAF, Eurojust, Europol e altri) a livello europeo competenti per contrastare il problema di cui sopra;

2. se ci siano provvedimenti o programmi in atto da parte degli organi di controllo per contrastare le infiltrazioni della criminalità organizzata nella filiera agroalimentare.

**Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione**
*(3 dicembre 2013)*

La Commissione attribuisce un'elevata priorità alla lotta contro la criminalità organizzata. Tuttavia, alla Commissione non sono ancora pervenute prove di un'infiltrazione significativa della criminalità organizzata nel mercato agroalimentare transfrontaliero, come descritto dall'onorevole deputato.

L'attività di Europol comprende l'impegno contro il coinvolgimento della criminalità organizzata nel traffico di merci contraffatte e scadenti, che violano le norme sanitarie, di sicurezza e alimentari. Le misure operative di Europol per il 2014 nel quadro di questa priorità sono attualmente in fase di discussione.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011773/13**
**to the Commission**
**Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Organised crime in the agri-food industry

At this time of deep international crisis, consumers in Italy, where over 86% of commercial transport takes place by road, are seeing food prices increase by 200% owing to the involvement of organised crime in the fruit and vegetable market.

As reported in *Il Sole 24 Ore* on 7 October, mafia involvement is having a devastating effect on agricultural holdings and consumers, and harming the entire local economy. The cost is reflected entirely in the marketing of the goods and is passed on in full to the end consumer, thereby doubling or even tripling the price of foodstuffs.

Organised crime in the agricultural sector operates through theft of agricultural equipment and vehicles, rackets, extortion, demands for protection money and by defrauding the EU, not to mention its interference in the distribution and transport system which not only jeopardises food security but also results in economic damage.

1. Which EU bodies (OLAF, Eurojust, Europol and so on) are responsible for tackling the above problem?

2. Have the supervisory bodies implemented any measures or programmes to counter the involvement of organised crime in the agri-food industry?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

The Commission places a high priority on the fight against organised crime. However, the Commission has not so far been made aware of evidence of significant involvement of organised crime in the cross-border agri-food market as described by the Honourable Member.

Europol's work includes efforts against the involvement of organised crime in counterfeit goods that violate health, safety and food regulations, and substandard goods. Its operational measures for 2014 within this priority are currently under discussion.

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011774/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)**
*(16 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Nederlandse kentekenplaten (betreft antwoord op vraag E-007556/2013)

Is het antwoord op de vraag nummer E-007556/2013 wel juist, gezien het feit dat de Commissie in een soortgelijk geval in Spanje een andere zienswijze blijkt te hebben? (SG(2008) D/50925; Directiva 98/34/CE; 2008/0189/E; MSG: 200800925. ES)

Kan de Commissie een reactie geven op de volgende opmerkingen:

1. Het feit dat een overheid zegt dat iets een document is, betekent niet dat dat ook zo is, slechts de feiten kunnen dit aantonen.

2. De Commissie beweert dat een kentekenplaat gebruikt kan worden om vast te stellen om welk voertuig het gaat, doch dat is niet correct. Indien een auto van eigenaar verandert wordt alleen het kentekenbewijs (registratiepapieren) gebruikt; indien door bevoegde instanties de identiteit van een voertuig moet worden vastgesteld dan mag dat juridisch gezien slechts met het unieke VIN-nummer (Vehicle Identification Number). Kentekenplaten worden in deze juridische handelingen niet geaccepteerd als zijnde een officieel document. Een kentekenplaat is slechts een visualisatie van het kentekenbewijs.

3. Het kenmerk van een officieel document, zoals het kentekenbewijs, is dat het uitgegeven wordt door een officiële instantie. De overheid geeft in dit geval dan wel de gegevens af, doch de kentekenplaat wordt in Nederland niet uitgegeven door de overheid.

4. De Commissie gaat tevens voorbij aan het feit dat de Nederlandse overheid in 2008, 2009 en 2010 duidelijk heeft gecommuniceerd dat deze kentekenplaten verkocht mochten gaan worden. De genoemde bezwaren golden dus blijkbaar niet en sindsdien is er niets veranderd.

**Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie**
*(3 december 2013)*

In document SG(2008) D/50925 met betrekking tot kennisgevingsprocedure 2008/189/E in het kader van richtlijn 98/34 heeft de Commissie geen standpunt ingenomen dat in strijd is met het antwoord op vraag E-007556/2013.

Kentekenplaten zijn niet geharmoniseerd op EU-niveau. Bijgevolg zijn de lidstaten bevoegd om daarvoor regels vast te stellen en de desbetreffende technische specificaties te bepalen. Hoewel in sommige lidstaten vlakke kentekenplaten zijn toegestaan, vereisen andere lidstaten kentekenplaten met reliëf. In Nederland verlangt de bestaande wetgeving dat kentekenplaten van aluminium en folie zijn gemaakt, geperst zijn en reliëf bevatten, waardoor gedrukte onderscheidingstekens uitgesloten zijn.

Zoals in het antwoord op vraag E-007556/2013 is vermeld, kunnen alleen waren die op geld waardeerbaar zijn en het voorwerp van handelstransacties kunnen vormen, onder de artikelen 34-36 VWEU inzake het vrije verkeer van goederen vallen.

Hoewel materiaal dat voor de productie van kentekenplaten wordt gebruikt (zoals metaal of kunststof) het voorwerp van een handelstransactie kan vormen, is de Commissie van mening dat afgewerkte kentekenplaten in Nederland niet kunnen worden beschouwd als verhandelbare goederen in de zin van de artikelen 34-36 VWEU. De reden daarvoor is dat deze afgewerkte kentekenplaten in Nederland als officiële documenten worden beschouwd — in die zin dat zij een specifieke auto aanduiden — die nadat een voertuig is ingeschreven en op basis van een geldig inschrijvingsbewijs worden afgegeven door entiteiten die door de overheid zijn goedgekeurd. Wanneer de inschrijving eindigt, worden zij aan de bevoegde instantie teruggegeven.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011774/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Netherlands vehicle registration plates (concerning answer to Question E-007556/2013)

Is the answer to Question E-007556/2013 actually correct, given that the Commission seems to have a different view involving a similar case in Spain? (SG(2008) D/50925; Directive 98/34/EC; 2008/0189/E; MSG: 200800925.ES)

Can the Commission give a response to the following comments?

1. The fact that a government says that something is a document does not mean that this is also the case; only the facts can prove this.

2. The Commission claims that a registration plate can be used to identify a specific vehicle, but this is not correct. If a car changes owner, only the registration certificate (documents) is used. If the identity of a vehicle needs to be established by competent authorities, this can only be done legally using the unique VIN number (Vehicle Identification Number). Registration plates are not accepted in these legal proceedings as an official document. A registration plate is merely a representation of the registration certificate.

3. The feature of an official document, such as a registration certificate, is that it is issued by an official body. In this instance, the government actually provides the data, but the registration plate is not issued in the Netherlands by the government.

4. The Commission is also ignoring the fact that the Netherlands Government clearly announced in 2008, 2009 and 2010 that these registration plates were going to be allowed to be sold. Therefore, the abovementioned concerns did not seem to apply and nothing has changed since then.

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

In document SG(2008) D/50925 relating to notification procedure 2008/189/E under Directive 98/34, the Commission did not take a position that would contradict the answer given to Question E-007556/2013.

Car registration plates are not harmonised at EU level. Consequently, it is of the competence of the Member States to regulate these and to set the related technical specifications. While some Member States allow for flat car registration plates, other Member States require embossed registration plates. In the Netherlands the existing legislation requires registration plates to be made of aluminium and foil and to be embossed and contain relief, which excludes printed insignia.

As stated in the answer to Question E-007556/2013, only products that can be valued in money and are capable of forming the object of commercial transactions can fall within the scope of Articles 34-36 TFEU on the free movement of goods.

While the materials used for the production of registration plates (e.g. metal or plastic) could form the subject of a commercial transaction, the Commission holds the view that, in the Netherlands, finished registration plates cannot be considered as tradable goods within the meaning of Articles 34-36 TFEU. The reason for this is that these finished registration plates are considered in the Netherlands to be official documents, in the sense that they identify a specific car, being delivered by entities approved by the government as a consequence of vehicle registration and based on a valid registration document. They are then handed back to the authorised authority when the registration comes to an end.

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011775/13**
**do Komisji**
**Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)**
*(16 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Przepisy prawa unijnego a oznakowanie produktów mięsnych

Czy przepisy prawa unijnego zezwalają na informowanie konsumentów, że określony produkt mięsny nie pochodzi od zwierząt poddawanych ubojowi metodą uboju rytualnego, o którym mowa w artykule 4 ustęp 4 rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 1099/2009 z dnia 24 września 2009 r. w sprawie ochrony zwierząt podczas ich uśmiercania?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji**
*(4 grudnia 2013 r.)*

W obowiązującym prawodawstwie UE nie ma przepisu regulującego tę kwestię. Została ona jednak poruszona przez Parlament Europejski w trakcie negocjacji, które zakończyły się przyjęciem rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (UE) nr 1169/2011 w sprawie przekazywania konsumentom informacji na temat żywności ([1]). W rezultacie w motywie 50 tego rozporządzenia stwierdza się, że: „Konsumenci w Unii wykazują rosnące zainteresowanie wdrażaniem przepisów Unii dotyczących dobrostanu zwierząt w czasie uboju, w tym kwestią ogłuszania zwierząt przed ubojem. W związku z tym w kontekście przyszłej strategii Unii na rzecz ochrony i dobrostanu zwierząt należy rozważyć przeprowadzenie badania na temat możliwości dostarczania konsumentom stosownych informacji na temat ogłuszania zwierząt."

Komisja zleciła już takie badanie, a jego wyniki powinny ukazać się w kwietniu 2014 r.

([1]) Dz.U. L 304 z 22.11.2011, s. 18.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011775/13**
**to the Commission**
**Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* EU legislation and the labelling of meat products

Is there any provision under EU legislation for consumers to be informed whether a meat product is derived from ritually slaughtered animals as referred to in Article 4(4) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(4 December 2013)*

There is no such provision under existing EU legislation. This issue was, however, raised by the European Parliament during the negotiations that led to the adoption of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the provision of food information to consumers ([1]). Consequently, recital (50) of this regulation states that: 'Union consumers show an increasing interest in the implementation of the Union animal welfare rules at the time of slaughter, including whether the animal was stunned before slaughter. In this respect, a study on the opportunity to provide consumers with the relevant information on the stunning of animals should be considered in the context of a future Union strategy for the protection and welfare of animals.'

The Commission has now mandated this study and results are expected by April 2014.

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-011777/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Kerstin Westphal (S&D)**
*(16. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Subventionen für die Firma Schaeffler

Die Firma Schaeffler plant eine Erweiterung ihres Werkes in Kysucké (Slowakei). Dafür hat die Firma laut Medienberichten beim slowakischen Wirtschaftsministerium Investitionsbeihilfen in Höhe von 3,36 Mio. EUR beantragt. Gleichzeitig plant Schaeffler einen Stellenabbau bei der Radlagerproduktion in Schweinfurt (Deutschland). Über 800 Jobs sollen nach Kysucké verlagert werden.

1. Enthalten die beantragten 3,36 Mio. EUR europäische Investitionsbeihilfen?

2. Wird die Erweiterung des Werkes in Kysucké auf andere Art mit Gemeinschaftsmitteln, zum Beispiel aus Strukturfonds, gefördert? Wenn ja: in welcher Höhe?

**Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission**
*(29. November 2013)*

Nach Angaben des slowakischen Wirtschaftsministeriums hat das deutsche Unternehmen Industriewerk Schaeffler Investitionsbeihilfen bei ihm beantragt. Der Antrag bezieht sich auf ein Investitionsprogramm des Unternehmens in der Slowakischen Republik, wo das Unternehmen vorhat, seine Radlagerproduktion für die Automobilindustrie und andere Industriezweige auszuweiten. Diese Ausweitung soll in Kysucke Nove Mesto (Region Zilina) in der Slowakischen Republik erfolgen. Es wurden staatliche Beihilfen in Höhe von 3,36 Mio. EUR beantragt. Der Antrag auf staatliche Beihilfen liegt in der Slowakischen Republik bereits zur Genehmigung vor.

Es wurde bestätigt, dass in diesem Fall keine EU-Finanzierung vorliegt. Es handelt sich einzig und allein um staatliche Beihilfen der Slowakischen Republik.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011777/13**
**to the Commission**
**Kerstin Westphal (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Subsidies for Schaeffler

The company Schaeffler is planning an expansion of its factory in Kysucké, Slovakia. In order to do this, the company has applied for EUR 3.36 million of investment aid from the Slovak Ministry of Economic Affairs, according to media reports. Schaeffler is also planning to reduce its wheel bearing production workforce in Schweinfurt, Germany. Reportedly 800 jobs will be moved to Kysucké.

1. Does the requested EUR 3.36 million include EU investment aid?

2. Is the expansion of the factory in Kysucké being supported in any other way through EU funding, such as via the Structural Funds? If so, how much is being provided?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**
*(29 November 2013)*

According to the Slovak Ministry of Economy, an application has been made on behalf of the German company Industriewerk Schaeffler for investment aid from the Slovak Ministry of Economy. The application relates to an investment plan of the company in Slovakia, where the company plans to extend its production of ball bearings for automotive and other industries. This extension would take place in Kysucke Nove Mesto (Zilina region) in Slovakia. State aid of EUR 3.36 million has been requested. The state aid application is currently under approval in Slovakia.

It has been confirmed that no EU financing is involved in this case. It is a matter of national state aid only.

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-011778/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(16 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Retraso del proyecto del tren de alta velocidad (TAV) Barcelona — París

Los trenes de alta velocidad (TAV) directos que debían conectar París con Barcelona antes del verano no funcionarán al menos hasta «después de agosto», señaló en el mes de mayo la compañía ferroviaria francesa SNCF, que lo atribuyó a «razones técnicas» ([1]).

«Son razones técnicas» las que explican el retraso, subrayó el portavoz de la Sociedad Nacional de Ferrocarriles de Francia (SNCF), que negó los rumores sobre desencuentros con su homóloga española Renfe ([2]).

El portavoz insistió en refutar problemas en la cooperación entre la SNCF y Renfe por la liberalización del tráfico en España y las supuestas ambiciones de la compañía francesa para entrar a competir en ese mercado.

La empresa francesa señaló que las diferencias técnicas entre las dos redes ferroviarias requieren estudios en profundidad para garantizar la compatibilidad. Precisó que se están llevando a cabo pruebas en particular sobre la señalización, la alimentación de electricidad, así como la verificación de los materiales de cada una de las empresas en las redes del otro país.

Hoy se habla de proyecto retrasado hasta «antes de final de año».

A la luz de lo anterior,

1. ¿Puede la Comisión informarnos sobre la situación actual del proyecto y la fecha de puesta en marcha efectiva de esta infraestructura?

2. ¿Cree la Comisión que esos aparentes nuevos retrasos son causados por motivos «técnicos» o que son bloqueados por el Gobierno español por motivos «políticos»?

**Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión**
*(15 de noviembre de 2013)*

1. La línea de alta velocidad entre Barcelona y la frontera francesa está finalizada y es interoperable, y el sistema europeo de señalización y control ha sido implantado. El tramo transfronterizo ya ha entrado en funcionamiento y se utiliza actualmente para el tráfico tanto de mercancías como de pasajeros.

2. Según los datos de que dispone la Comisión, los retrasos a los que se refiere Su Señoría se deben a problemas en los tramos donde el sistema de señalización todavía no es interoperable, así como a la autorización mutua de material rodante que las respectivas autoridades nacionales deben expedir en este momento.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20131009/54388681137/alta-velocidad-conectara-barcelona-paris-antes-final-ano.html
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/barcelona/20130527/54374437090/tav-directo-paris-barcelona-retrasa-despues-agosto.html

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011778/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Barcelona-Paris high-speed train project delayed

The French railway company SNCF said in May that the high-speed trains (TAV) which were to provide a direct connection between Paris and Barcelona before the summer would not be in operation until 'after August', allegedly because of 'technical problems' ([1]).

'Technical problems' have caused this delay, insisted the spokesperson for French National Railways (SNCF), who denied rumours hinting at disagreements with their Spanish counterpart Renfe ([2]).

It has been suggested that conflict has arisen between the two companies as a result of the liberalisation of the Spanish rail network and the alleged aspirations of the French company to compete in this market, but the SNCF spokesperson categorically refuted these claims.

SNCF has explained that an in-depth study of the technical differences between the two railway networks is required in order to ensure that they are operationally compatible. Tests are being conducted on signalling systems and electricity supplies in particular, as well as on the materials used by each company in the network of the other country.

Now they are saying that the project may not be completed until the end of the year.

In light of the above:

1. Can the Commission provide details of the project's development thus far and the date of the effective launch of this infrastructure?

2. Does the Commission believe that these new delays have been caused by 'technical problems' or rather that the Spanish Government is blocking further advancement for 'political' reasons?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**
*(15 November 2013)*

1. The high-speed line from Barcelona to the french border is completed and interoperable, with European Signalling and Control System deployed. The cross-border section has already become operational and is currently used for both freight and passenger traffic.

2. To the knowledge of the Commission, the delays referred to by the Honourable Member are caused by problems in sections where the signalling system is still not interoperable, as well as by the mutual authorisation of rolling stock to be currently issued by the respective National Authorities.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20131009/54388681137/alta-velocidad-conectara-barcelona-paris-antes-final-ano.html
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/barcelona/20130527/54374437090/tav-directo-paris-barcelona-retrasa-despues-agosto.html

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011781/13**
**alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**
**Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* VP/HR — Richiesta di assistenza di sicurezza da parte della Libia

Il 23 settembre 2013 il sito web *Maghrebia* ha riferito che il primo ministro libico Ali Zidan ha suggerito di inviare 3 000 soldati libici in Turchia, Italia, Regno Unito e USA a fini di formazione militare. L'obiettivo è ottenere l'assistenza internazionale per affrontare l'incerta situazione della Libia in materia di sicurezza. Molti cittadini libici lamentano che i blocchi stradali, le rapine, i rapimenti e gli omicidi stanno diventando normale parte della vita quotidiana e che mancano una forza di polizia e un esercito nazionale efficaci nonché forze di sicurezza in campo.

Il primo ministro Zidan ha inoltre affermato che, oltre alla formazione all'estero, almeno 200 comandanti che hanno partecipato alla rimozione di Gheddafi stanno per essere ricompensati con un avanzamento di grado. Il governo libico ammette che sta attivamente cercando aiuto dai partner internazionali. Parlando ad un gruppo di investitori durante una conferenza svoltasi il 17 settembre a Londra, il primo ministro Zidan ha affermato che terroristi «di altri paesi» stanno cercando di costruire una «roccaforte» in Libia, rilevando che la situazione non è destinata a migliorare senza l'effettiva ed efficace partecipazione della comunità internazionale: «Dico sinceramente che, se la comunità internazionale non ci aiuterà a raccogliere armi e munizioni, il ritorno alla sicurezza richiederà un lungo periodo di tempo».

1. Quali passi stanno adottando l'UE e gli Stati membri per fornire assistenza alla Libia al fine di aiutarla a costruire una forza di polizia e un esercito nazionali?

2. L'UE sta lavorando con il governo libico per individuare le vulnerabilità fondamentali del paese in materia di sicurezza e valutare in che modo gli aiuti possano essere utilizzati nel modo più efficiente?

3. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in materia di impegno del governo libico ad affrontare i problemi di sicurezza del paese?

**Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**
*(27 novembre 2013)*

1. Il settore della sicurezza è uno degli ambiti principali del sostegno dell'Unione europea alla Libia. La sola UE fornisce un finanziamento di più di 20 milioni di euro, inclusi 10 milioni per un programma di riforma riguardante la polizia e la giustizia, il rafforzamento delle capacità in materia di indagini penali attraverso Interpol, la bonifica delle mine e degli ordigni inesplosi, la prevenzione e la riduzione della violenza armata, la sicurezza fisica e la gestione delle scorte.

2. L'UE e gli Stati membri intrattengono con le autorità libiche un dialogo regolare di riflessione sulla situazione della sicurezza e sul modo di affrontare i problemi principali con il sostegno internazionale. Il Ministero libico degli Interni organizza, sotto gli auspici delle Nazioni Unite, incontri periodici di coordinamento con tutti i principali interlocutori.

3. L'AR/VP non mette in dubbio l'impegno del governo libico nell'affrontare i problemi in materia di sicurezza.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011781/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Libya asks for security assistance

On 23 September 2013 the news website *Maghrebia* reported that Libyan Prime Minister Ali Zidan had suggested the idea of sending 3 000 Libyan troops to Turkey, Italy, the UK and the US for military training. The aim is to obtain international assistance in tackling Libya's faltering security situation. Many Libyan citizens complain that road blocks, robberies, kidnappings and assassinations are becoming a common part of daily life, and that there is an absence of an effective police force and national army, and of security forces on the ground.

Prime Minister Zidan has also said that, in addition to foreign training, at least 200 commanders who took part in the removal of Gaddafi are to be awarded with military ranks. The Libyan Government admits that it is actively seeking help from its international partners. Speaking to a group of investors at a conference in London on 17 September, Prime Minister Zidan said that terrorists 'from other countries' are trying to build a 'stronghold' in Libya, noting that the situation is not going to improve without the true and effective participation of the international community: 'I say frankly that if the international community does not help us collect arms and ammunition, then the return of security is going to take a long time'.

1. What steps are the EU and the Member States taking to provide assistance to Libya in order to help construct a national police force and military service?

2. Is the EU working with the Libyan Government to identify the country's key security vulnerabilities and assess how aid can be used most effectively?

3. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the commitment of the Libyan Government to tackle the country's security problems?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(27 November 2013)*

1. The security sector is among the key sectors for EU support to Libya. The EU alone provides over EUR 20 million, including a EUR 10 million programme on police and justice reform, capacity building for criminal investigation through Interpol, clearance of mines and unexploded ordnances, the prevention and reduction of armed violence and physical security and stockpile management.

2. The EU and Member States are in regular dialogue with the Libyan authorities to reflect on the security situation and how international support can address key concerns. Regular coordination meetings with all key actors are organised by the Libyan Ministry of Interior under the auspices of the UN.

3. The HR/VP does not question the commitment of the Libyan Government to address the security problems.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011782/13**
**alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**
**Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* VP/HR — Tortura nelle carceri libiche

Il 1º ottobre 2013, varie agenzie di stampa hanno riferito le conclusioni di una nuova relazione dell'ONU secondo la quale tortura e brutalità sono normale amministrazione in Libia. La relazione precisa che circa 8000 prigionieri sono detenuti nelle carceri governative in quanto sospettati di aver combattuto per Muammar al-Gheddafi. Molti altri prigionieri sono però detenuti dalle milizie libere, in luoghi nascosti e in condizioni disumane. Le organizzazioni ONU per i diritti dell'uomo come l'UNHCHR riferiscono che «torture e maltrattamenti in Libia sono un problema costante e diffuso in molti centri di detenzione».

L'ONU ha registrato 27 casi di morte in prigione, quasi certamente causati da tortura, e si teme che, in mancanza di interventi, «vi sia il rischio che la tortura diventi istituzionalizzata all'interno della nuova Libia». Molti arresti sono stati effettuati per ragioni arbitrarie e motivati da vendette personali o tribali. La relazione dell'ONU ha illustrato nel dettaglio casi di uomini che sono stati prelevati a forza e senza spiegazione dalle milizie sulla via del lavoro o dalle proprie case. Il personale ONU ha avuto scarso accesso alle carceri gestite dalle milizie per elaborare questa relazione.

1. Quali passi sta adottando l'UE per verificare in modo indipendente l'entità dei casi in cui si applica la tortura nelle carceri libiche?

2. In che modo sta operando con le altre agenzie internazionali per negoziare il diritto delle organizzazioni esterne di ispezionare le carceri gestite dai miliziani?

3. Come giudicano i funzionari UE presenti nella regione gli sforzi compiuti dalle autorità libiche per attuare il loro impegno a porre termine alla tortura?

**Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**
*(5 dicembre 2013)*

L'Unione europea è consapevole delle condizioni inaccettabili che regnano nei centri di detenzione in Libia, in particolare in quelli sotto il controllo delle milizie.

L'UE ha invitato le autorità a porre sotto il loro controllo tutti i luoghi di detenzione e a indagare sulle presunte violazioni dei diritti dei detenuti. Il governo libico ha successivamente dichiarato di stare trasferendo le strutture di detenzione sotto il controllo delle autorità, sottraendole a quello delle milizie.

L'Unione europea si è avvalsa di progetti finanziati dallo Strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani per fornire servizi di sostegno alle vittime di tortura, e ha intrapreso attività di promozione di un quadro politico nazionale che affronti la tortura e le altre forme di maltrattamento. L'UE sta inoltre finanziando progetti attuati dall'OIM, dall'ACNUR, da Mercy Corps e dal Danish Refugee Council che vertono sulla protezione dei migranti vulnerabili, dei profughi, dei richiedenti asilo e degli sfollati.

Attraverso il dialogo politico con le autorità l'UE continuerà a perorare la necessità che la Libia rispetti gli obblighi nazionali e internazionali assunti in materia di diritti fondamentali.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011782/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Torture in Libyan prisons

On 1 October 2013, various news agencies reported the findings of a new UN report which stated that torture and brutality are commonplace in Libya. The report suggested that approximately 8 000 prisoners are being held in government jails on suspicion of having fought for Muammar al-Gaddafi. However, countless other prisoners are being detained by freelance militias, out of sight and in inhumane conditions. UN human rights organisations such as the UNHCHR reported that, 'Torture and ill-treatment in Libya is an ongoing and widespread concern in many detention centres.'

The UN has recorded 27 cases of death in detention, almost certainly caused by torture, and there are concerns that, unless steps are taken, 'there is a danger that torture will become institutionalised within the new Libya'. Many of the arrests have been for arbitrary reasons and motivated by personal or tribal score-settling. The UN report detailed cases of men hauled off the street on the way to work or from their homes by militia without explanation. The UN staff had very little access to militia-run jails when compiling their report.

1. What steps is the EU taking to verify independently the extent to which torture occurs in Libya's jails?

2. How is the EU working with other international agencies to negotiate the right for external organisations to inspect jails run by militia groups?

3. What is the assessment of EU officials in the region regarding efforts made by the Libyan authorities to act on its commitment to end torture?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

The EU is aware of the unacceptable conditions prevailing in detention centres in Libya, notably in those under the control of militias.

The EU has been calling on the authorities to bring all places of detention under their control and to investigate allegations of violations of detainees' rights. The Libyan government has subsequently declared that it is in the process of transferring the control of detention facilities to the authorities and away from the militias.

Through projects financed by the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights the EU has provided support services to victims of torture and has undertaken advocacy activities for a national policy framework that addresses torture and other forms of ill-treatment. The EU is also funding projects implemented by IOM, UNHCR, Mercy Corps and Danish Refugee Council focusing on the protection of vulnerable migrants, refugees, asylum-seekers and Internally Displaced People.

Through its political dialogue with the authorities the EU will continue to advocate for the need for Libya to comply with its national and international obligations regarding respect for fundamental right.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011783/13**
**alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**
**Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* VP/HR — Attivista per i diritti umani cinese tenuta segregata

Secondo la ONG Human Rights Watch, il 14 settembre 2013 all'attivista per i diritti umani Cao Shunli, residente a Pechino, che avrebbe dovuto partecipare a una sessione di formazione in vista dell'esame della situazione in Cina da parte del Consiglio dei diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite, è stato impedito di imbarcarsi su un volo per Ginevra. Da allora ella non è più apparsa in pubblico.

Cao e vari altri attivisti chiedono che il governo cinese, nell'elaborare la sua relazione per il Consiglio dei diritti umani, consulti degli attivisti indipendenti. Human Rights Watch afferma che la Cina opera per impedire agli attivisti di partecipare al processo e sta erodendo l'integrità del processo di esame della situazione dei diritti umani al massimo livello delle Nazioni Unite. A giugno di quest'anno i difensori dei diritti umani hanno dimostrato davanti al Ministero degli affari esteri cinese per protestare contro questa mancata consultazione, con l'unico risultato di essere allontanati con la forza in almeno tre occasioni. Un gruppo di attivisti ha cercato di intentare contro il Ministero un'azione legale amministrativa che renderebbe necessaria la divulgazione di informazioni riguardanti la Revisione Periodica Universale (UPR, Universal Periodic Review). A settembre un tribunale di Pechino ha tuttavia rigettato l'azione con la motivazione che lo svolgimento della UPR attiene esclusivamente alla sfera degli «affari esteri».

Dal febbraio di quest'anno il governo cinese ha privato arbitrariamente della libertà personale almeno 56 attivisti e ha arrestato oppositori e blogger d'opinione. Tutto ciò viene ad aggiungersi all'inasprimento dei controlli sui social media, sull'espressione on-line e sull'azione pubblica degli attivisti.

1. Intende la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante chiedere al governo cinese informazioni su dove si trovi attualmente Cao Shunli e sulle eventuali imputazioni formulate a suo carico?

2. È preoccupata la VP/AR per i tentativi del governo cinese di escludere dal processo dell'UPR gli attivisti per i diritti umani indipendenti e per le conseguenze che ciò potrà avere per il dialogo sui diritti umani dell'Unione europea con la Cina?

3. Che ruolo svolgono attualmente gli attivisti cinesi indipendenti nel contribuire al dialogo sui diritti umani UE-Cina?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**
*(20 dicembre 2013)*

Il 20 ottobre l'AR/VP ha rilasciato una dichiarazione in esprimeva profonda preoccupazione per l'improvvisa scomparsa di Cao Shunli il 14 settembre, cioè il giorno in cui si sarebbe dovuta recare a Ginevra per partecipare ad attività di promozione dei diritti umani. Come ha ricordato l'AR/VP, Cao Shunli chiede da anni che il governo cinese associ le organizzazioni della società civile al processo di preparazione della Revisione periodica universale (UPR) del Consiglio per i diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite e il 22 ottobre parteciperà al dialogo interattivo con la Cina sull'UPR.

Nella dichiarazione dell'AR/VP si chiedeva di precisare dove si trovi attualmente Cao Shunli e si esortava la Cina a garantire la piena partecipazione della società civile al processo UPR, compresa la sessione del 22 ottobre, conformemente alle norme pertinenti.

L'UE promuove sistematicamente un ruolo attivo della società civile in Cina e ha sollevato la questione sia nell'ambito del dialogo UE-Cina sui diritti umani che durante la recente visita nel paese del rappresentante speciale dell'UE per i diritti umani Stavros Lambrinidis, che ha potuto incontrare un gran numero di esponenti della società civile tra cui accademici, avvocati, giornalisti, artisti, blogger e difensori dei diritti umani.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011783/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Chinese human rights activist held incommunicado

According to the NGO Human Rights Watch, on 14 September 2013 the Beijing-based human rights activist Cao Shunli was prevented from boarding a flight to Geneva and hasn't made any public appearances since. She was due to attend a training session ahead of the UN Human Rights Council Review of China.

Cao and a number of other activists have been calling for the Chinese Government to consult with independent human rights activists in drafting the report for the Human Rights Council. Human Rights Watch says that China is working to prevent activists from taking part in the process and that it is 'eroding the integrity of the UN's top human rights review process'. In June of this year, human rights defenders demonstrated outside the Chinese Foreign Affairs Ministry to protest this lack of consultation, only to be forcibly removed on at least three occasions. A group of activists attempted to file an administrative lawsuit against the Ministry, which would require disclosure of information related to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR). In September, however, a Beijing court rejected the case on the grounds that the UPR process belonged solely to the realm of 'foreign affairs'.

Since February this year, the Chinese Government has arbitrarily detained at least 56 activists, and has taken into custody critics and online opinion bloggers. This comes on top of increased controls on social media, online expression, and public activism.

1. Will the Vice-President/High Representative make enquires to the Chinese Government as to the whereabouts of Cao Shunli and any charges that have been made against her?

2. Is the VP/HR concerned by the Chinese Government's efforts to exclude independent human rights activists from the UPR process, and the possible affect it may have on the EU's human rights dialogue with China?

3. At present, what role do independent Chinese activists play in contributing to the EU-China human rights dialogue?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(20 December 2013)*

On 20 October, HR/VP released a statement in which she expressed her deep concern over the sudden disappearance of Ms Cao Shunli on 14 September, the day she was due to travel to Geneva to participate in human rights promotion activities. The HR/VP recalled that, for years, Ms Cao Shunli has been advocating that the Chinese government includes independent civil society organisations in the preparation process of the United Nations Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and had also planned to attend China's UPR Interactive Dialogue on 22 October.

The EU asked for clarification on Ms Cao's whereabouts in the statement and also urged China to ensure the full participation of civil society in the UPR process, including in the 22 October session, as stipulated by UPR regulations.

The EU has systematically promoted an active role for civil society in China and raised the issue during the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue and during the recent visit of the EU Special Representative for Human Rights, Stavros Lambrinidis, to China, when he was also able to meet with a broad cross-section of civil society, including academics, lawyers, journalists, artists, bloggers and human right defenders.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011784/13**
**alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**
**Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* VP/HR — Attentato suicida a Peshawar, in Pakistan

Il 22 settembre 2013 due attentatori suicidi hanno fatto esplodere cariche esplosive nella chiesta di Tutti i Santi situata nella città pakistana di Peshawar. Al momento dell'attentato erano presenti nell'edificio almeno 350 persone. Secondo il quotidiano britannico *Telegraph*, il capo della locale unità artificieri ha dichiarato che la maggior parte delle vittime erano donne e bambini. La chiesa si trova all'interno di un'area mercato frequentata da donne per fare acquisti per la casa. Nell'attentato sono stati utilizzati 12 kg di esplosivo, che hanno danneggiato non solo la chiesa, ma anche edifici vicini. Il direttore sanitario di un ospedale della città ha dichiarato lo stato di emergenza medica perché molti dei feriti versano in condizioni critiche.

Molti cristiani si erano lamentati con la polizia pakistana per le scarse precauzioni prese a protezione della chiesa. Membri della comunità cristiana e di quella indù del Pakistan hanno reagito all'attacco chiudendo i loro negozi e bruciando pneumatici, esprimendo così la propria rabbia verso il governo per non averli protetti. L'episodio si aggiunge a un numero crescente di gravi attentati perpetrati contro i cristiani pakistani. Nel 2011 il Ministro pakistano per le minoranze, che era cristiano, è stato ucciso, e i cristiani sono colpiti dalle leggi pakistane contro la blasfemia in misura molto maggiore rispetto al resto della popolazione.

1. In considerazione dell'aumento degli attentati ispirati all'intolleranza religiosa che si è registrato in Pakistan negli ultimi anni, in che modo la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante si è adoperata per ottenere assicurazioni che le autorità pakistane stiano operando per tutelare gli interessi delle minoranze religiose?

2. È pronta l'UE ad offrire assistenza medica alle vittime dell'attentato del 22 settembre?

3. È pronta l'UE a rivolgersi ai membri delle varie minoranze presenti in Pakistan per conoscere le loro preoccupazioni e per chiedere loro di quale sostegno esterno abbiano bisogno?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**
*(10 dicembre 2013)*

Gli sforzi profusi dall'AR/VP per esprimere le proprie preoccupazioni e ottenere garanzie riguardo alle minoranze religiose in Pakistan sono illustrati nelle risposte alle interrogazioni E-011378/2013, E-010897/2013 e E-02947/2013 ([1]).

Il Regno Unito e la Germania sostengono il settore sanitario in Pakistan nell'ambito del coordinamento dei donatori. La cooperazione allo sviluppo dell'UE in Pakistan è incentrata su istruzione, sviluppo rurale, governance e commercio. Gli stanziamenti del bilancio dell'Unione destinati agli aiuti umanitari servono a sostenere l'assistenza medica e gli interventi chirurgici di emergenza.

La delegazione dell'UE in Pakistan è regolarmente in contatto con i membri delle minoranze religiose e dà loro la possibilità di esprimere le proprie preoccupazioni. L'UE si prepara a sostenere un progetto pluridimensionale che sarà attuato insieme a vari partner e, con una dotazione di 835 000 euro, affronterà il problema delle discriminazioni religiose in Pakistan. Il progetto mira a migliorare gli atteggiamenti personali attraverso i media, l'istruzione, la cultura, gli enti pubblici e le registrazioni, cercando inoltre il modo di affrontare il problema degli attacchi e delle discriminazioni a sfondo religioso attraverso il riesame della legislazione, l'assistenza giuridica e la creazione di meccanismi specifici. L'UE sostiene inoltre il governo e gli organismi che si occupano di diritti umani (commissione nazionale per lo status delle donne, commissione nazionale per i diritti umani), il cui compito consiste anche nel migliorare la capacità dello Stato di tutelare tali diritti, in particolare quelli delle donne, dei minori e delle minoranze religiose.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011784/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Suicide bombing in Peshawar, Pakistan

On 22 September 2013, two suicide bombers detonated explosives at the All Saints Church in the Pakistani city of Peshawar. At least 350 people were in the building at the time of the attack. According to Britain's *Telegraph* newspaper, the head of the local bomb disposal unit indicated that most of the victims were women and children. The church is located inside a market complex where women come to purchase household goods. The militants used 12 kilos of explosives in the attack, which caused damage not only to the church but also to nearby buildings. The medical superintendent from a local hospital declared a medical emergency as many of the injured were in a critical condition (and remain so).

Many Christians had complained to the Pakistani police about the limited precautions that had been taken to protect the church. Members of Pakistan's Christian and Hindu communities have responded to the attack by closing their shops and by burning tyres to voice their anger at the government's failure to protect them. This particular incident can be added to a growing number of high-profile attacks against Pakistani Christians. In 2011 the country's Minister for Minorities, a Christian, was killed, and Christians have been targeted disproportionately by Pakistan's blasphemy laws.

1. In light of the rise in sectarian attacks in Pakistan over the past few years, what efforts has the Vice-President/High Representative made to gain assurances that the Pakistani authorities are working to protect the interests of religious minorities?

2. Is the EU prepared to offer medical assistance to the victims of the 22 September attack?

3. Is the EU prepared to reach out to members of Pakistan's various minority groups to ask about their concerns and the external support they require?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

Efforts made by the HR/VP to raise concerns and obtain assurances concerning religious minorities in Pakistan are described in E-011378/2013, E-010897/2013, and E-02947/2013 ([1]).

In the context of donor coordination, the UK and Germany provide support for the health sector in Pakistan. The EU's development cooperation in Pakistan focuses on education, rural development, governance and trade. The EU humanitarian aid budget provides support for emergency medical services and surgical care.

The EU Delegation in Pakistan reaches out to members of religious minorities on a regular basis and is available to listen to their concerns. The EU is preparing to support a multi-pronged/multi-partner project worth EUR 835,000 addressing discrimination on the basis of faith in Pakistan. It will work towards improving attitudes through media, education, culture and public offices, as well as recording, and seeking ways to address, attacks and discrimination on the basis of faith, including through legislative review, legal aid, and setting up specific mechanisms to deal with attacks. Moreover the EU supports the Government and Human Rights bodies (National Commission on Status of Women, National Human Rights Commission), who have a duty to improve the state's capacity to protect human rights, in particular those of women, children and religious minorities.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011786/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(16 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Cuarta ayuda pública del Estado italiano a Alitalia desde 2001. Compatibilidad con las normas sobre ayudas estatales — Aplicación coherente de las ayudas estatales a líneas aéreas nacionales y de bajo coste

Alitalia, la deficitaria compañía aérea nacional de Italia, ha evitado la segunda quiebra en cuatro años al acordarse una inyección de capital de 300 millones de euros, que convertirá a Poste Italiane (el servicio postal público) en su nuevo accionista ([1]). El Estado invertirá 75 millones de euros en esta última ayuda pública a la empresa a través de Poste Italiane, que es en su totalidad de propiedad pública ([2]).

Esta es la cuarta ayuda pública que se le concede a la aerolínea nacional desde 2001, ya que recibió dinero en 2001, 2004, 2008 y 2013 ([3]). En 2009, Alitalia (antiguamente pública) fue rescatada de la bancarrota por un variado grupo de inversores italianos y por Air France-KLM, que se convirtió en su mayor accionista al adquirir el 25 % de la compañía.

En 2013, tras acumular una deuda de cerca mil millones de euros y pérdidas de 294 millones de euros durante el primer semestre, la aerolínea se volvió a encontrar a punto de quedarse en tierra si sus accionistas no acordaban un aumento de capital.

A la vista de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta las estrictas normas de la Comisión en materia de ayudas estatales:

1. ¿Ha notificado el Gobierno italiano esta decisión a la Comisión? En caso afirmativo, ¿lo hizo de forma detallada? ¿Podría proporcionar la Comisión esa información detallada?

2. ¿Abrirá la Comisión una investigación pormenorizada sobre la decisión del Gobierno italiano en favor de Alitalia?

3. Dado que se trata de la cuarta vez que Alitalia es rescatada por el Gobierno, ¿Puede garantizar la Comisión que se aplican coherentemente y de manera uniforme las normas relativas a las ayudas estatales con respecto a las líneas aéreas de bajo coste y las compañías aéreas nacionales tradicionales?

4. ¿Puede proporcionar la Comisión las cifras correspondientes a las pérdidas diarias de Alitalia a lo largo del pasado año?

**Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión**
*(22 de noviembre de 2013)*

Las autoridades italianas no han notificado las medidas en favor de Alitalia mencionadas en la pregunta de Su Señoría. Sin embargo, sobre la base de la información disponible en la prensa, así como los datos presentados por varios ciudadanos de la UE, la Comisión decidió abrir una investigación preliminar sobre estas medidas, registrada con el número SA.37491 (2013/CP). La Comisión solicitó información a las autoridades italianas mediante carta de 15 de octubre de 2013, que fue respondida en los días 23 y 25 de octubre de 2013. La Comisión está evaluando actualmente la información proporcionada y todavía no puede facilitar ninguna información.

La Comisión no puede afirmar en esta fase si será necesario un procedimiento de investigación formal con arreglo al artículo 108, apartado 2, del TFUE. Esto dependerá de los hechos relacionados con el caso y de la información que faciliten las autoridades italianas en el curso de la investigación preliminar.

En caso de que se confirme dicha ayuda estatal en el sentido del artículo 107, apartado 1, del TFUE en las medidas en favor de Alitalia, la Comisión, como en cualquier otro caso de ayuda estatal, aplicará las normas sobre ayudas estatales de la UE de forma coherente y consecuente.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/931e3432-3299-11e3-b3a7-00144feab7de.html#axzz2hmtUHhs1
([2]) http://www.corriere.it/economia/13_ottobre_14/giornata-cruciale-alitalia-lufthansa-noi-non-siamo-interessati-d33fd7ca-34ae-11e3-b0aa-c50e06d40e68.shtml
http://www.lastampa.it/2013/10/14/economia/attesa-per-lassemblea-di-alitalia-sul-salvataggio-lincognita-air-france-S4krIo8gWqAuqSK6L2C1aO/pagina.html
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-08-385_en.htm

La Comisión no dispone de ninguna información sobre las pérdidas diarias de Alitalia a lo largo del año pasado. Sobre la base de la información públicamente disponible, parece que el resultado neto de Alitalia en el primer trimestre de 2013 fue de −157 millones de euros ([4]), mientras que el resultado neto para el ejercicio financiero de 2012 fue de −280 millones de euros ([5]).

([4]) http://corporate.alitalia.com/en/media/press-releases/27-05-2013.html
([5]) http://corporate.alitalia.com/static/upload/8ac/8ac4a511869d65751ae3e4e7e345f605.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011786/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Fourth public aid transfer to Alitalia by the Italian state since 2001 — compatibility with state aid rules — coherent application of state aid rules with regard to low-cost and national carriers

Alitalia, Italy's lossmaking national carrier, has averted a second bankruptcy in four years by agreeing to a EUR 300 million capital injection that will bring in Poste Italiane, the state-owned postal services group, as a new shareholder ([1]). In this latest public aid transfer to the company, the government will contribute a further EUR 75 million through Poste Italiane, which is 100% state-owned ([2]).

This is the fourth public aid transfer to the national carrier since 2001. Alitalia received public funds in 2001, 2004, 2008 and 2013 ([3]). In 2009 the formerly state-owned company was rescued from bankruptcy by a diverse group of Italian investors and by Air France-KLM, which became its largest shareholder with a 25% stake.

In 2013 — after racking up a debt of about EUR 1 billion and first-half losses of EUR 294 million — the airline again found itself at risk of being grounded unless its shareholders agreed on a capital increase.

In the light of the above, and considering the Commission's strict rules on state aid;

1. Has the Italian Government notified this decision to the Commission and, if so, did it do so in a detailed way? Could the Commission provide the details?

2. Will the Commission launch an in-depth investigation into the Italian government's decision in favour of Alitalia?

3. Given the fact that this is the fourth time that the national carrier has been saved by the government, can the Commission guarantee that state aid rules are applied coherently and in a uniform way with regard to low-cost airlines and historic national carriers?

4. Can the Commission provide figures on how much money Alitalia lost each day in the course of the last year?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**
*(22 November 2013)*

The Italian authorities have not notified the measures in support of Alitalia referred to in the question of the Honourable Member. However, on the basis of information available in the press as well as information submitted by several EU citizens, the Commission decided to start a preliminary investigation on these measures, registered with number SA.37491 (2013/CP). The Commission requested information from the Italian authorities by letter of 15 October 2013, replied to on 23 and 25 October 2013. The Commission is currently assessing the information provided and cannot yet provide details.

The Commission cannot say at this stage whether a formal investigation procedure in the sense of Article 108(2) TFEU will be necessary. This will depend on the facts of the case and on the information the Italian authorities submitted in the course of the preliminary investigation.

If it is confirmed that state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the TFEU is present in the measures in favour of Alitalia, the Commission — as in any other state aid case — will apply the EU State aid rules in a coherent and consistent way.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/931e3432-3299-11e3-b3a7-00144feab7de.html#axzz2hmtUHhs1
([2]) http://www.corriere.it/economia/13_ottobre_14/giornata-cruciale-alitalia-lufthansa-noi-non-siamo-interessati-d33fd7ca-34ae-11e3-b0aa-c50e06d40e68.shtml
http://www.lastampa.it/2013/10/14/economia/attesa-per-lassemblea-di-alitalia-sul-salvataggio-lincognita-air-france-S4krIo8gWqAuqSK6L2C1aO/pagina.html
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-08-385_en.htm

The Commission does not have at its disposal the information regarding the daily losses of Alitalia in the course of the last year. On the basis of information publicly available, it appears that the net result of Alitalia in 1Q2013 was EUR -157 million ([4]) while the net result for financial year 2012 was EUR -280 million ([5]).

([4]) http://corporate.alitalia.com/en/media/press-releases/27-05-2013.html
([5]) http://corporate.alitalia.com/static/upload/8ac/8ac4a511869d65751ae3e4e7e345f605.pdf

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-011788/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Traçabilité de la viande

Nous apprenons que la Commission européenne donnerait une nouvelle fois cette semaine aux Européens des raisons de lui accorder une confiance moindre. Pouvez-vous nous confirmer que, contrairement à l'engagement que vous avez pris, vous seriez sur le point d'enterrer la possibilité de mentionner l'origine des viandes dans les plats préparés?

L'Union européenne s'honore d'offrir à nos concitoyens un niveau élevé de qualité et de protection sanitaire capable de la distinguer dans le monde entier: par une mesure allant à l'encontre de ce principe, quel message voudriez-vous adresser aux Européens, aux observateurs internationaux?

Car il s'agit bien sûr aussi de l'image de la qualité de nos produits et donc de l'équilibre de nos filières agro-alimentaires, dont on connaît la fragilité. Si de telles inquiétudes sur la qualité de nos produits survenaient, ce sont bien nos producteurs et nos agriculteurs qui seraient directement pénalisés. Par notre travail, nous respectons au quotidien le rôle de la Commission européenne, dans le cadre d'une coproduction législative constructive et concertée, avec comme seul cap la protection de l'intérêt des Européens.

**Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission**
*(18 novembre 2013)*

Alors que le règlement (UE) nº 1169/2011 du Parlement européen et du Conseil concernant l'information des consommateurs sur les denrées alimentaires ([1]) n'exige la publication du rapport auquel fait allusion l'Honorable Parlementaire que pour le 13 décembre 2013, la Commission s'est engagée à présenter ce rapport plus tôt. À la suite de sa publication, un débat informé sur les conclusions qui y figurent pourra avoir lieu au Parlement et au Conseil.

Sur la base des discussions avec les États membres de l'Union européenne et le Parlement européen, la Commission examinera les éventuelles suites à donner. Le cas échéant, celles-ci pourraient comprendre la présentation d'une proposition législative visant à réglementer l'origine de la viande utilisée comme ingrédient dans des denrées alimentaires.

La Commission a constamment défendu l'idée que, dans le domaine des denrées alimentaires, l'obligation d'indication de l'origine n'est pas un outil pour garantir la sécurité alimentaire (toutes les denrées alimentaires mises sur le marché européen doivent être sûres), ni pour dissuader les exploitants du secteur alimentaire de frauder.

([1]) JO L 304 du 22.11.2011, p. 18. Il sera applicable à partir du 13 décembre 2014.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011788/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Traceability of meat

This week it seems that the Commission will be giving Europeans one more reason to distrust it. Can the Commission confirm that, contrary to the commitments it has made, it is about to abandon the idea of origin labelling of meat in ready meals?

The European Union prides itself on offering its citizens high-quality and safe food products, for which it is known the world over. If it goes against this principle, what message does the Commission think it will be sending to people both inside and outside the EU?

Because what is at stake here is the reputation of our food products and, thereby, the stability of our agri-food industries, which is notoriously fragile. If the quality of our products is called into question, our producers and our farmers will be the ones who suffer. As MEPs, we fully respect the Commission's role as a partner in a constructive, shared law-making process whose overriding aim is to protect the interests of all Europeans. With this in mind, does the Commission intend to think again?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(18 November 2013)*

While Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the provision of food information to consumers ([1]) requires publication of the report referred to by the Honourable Member only by 13 December 2013, the Commission has committed to come forward with this report earlier. Following its publication, an informed discussion of the findings presented in the report can take place in Parliament and Council.

On the basis of the discussions with EU Member States and the European Parliament, the Commission will consider what, if any, appropriate next steps should be taken. This may include, if appropriate, tabling a legislative proposal to regulate the origin of meat used as an ingredient in foods.

The Commission has repeatedly held that in the area of food, mandatory origin labelling is not a tool to ensure food safety (all foods placed on the EU market must be safe) nor to deter fraudulent food operators.

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18. It enters into application on 13 December 2014.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011791/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nessa Childers (NI)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Worn tyres policy

Since the advent of recession in 2008, we have seen a proliferation of businesses offering part-worn tyres at discount prices being set up all over Ireland. These tyres, which arrive in Ireland as bulk scrap (usually from England or Germany), are not individually identified and so do not leave the same VAT trail that new tyres do. Not only do legitimate retailers lose business, but the government loses a VAT dividend. Naturally, there are also safety concerns associated with the trustworthiness of such tyres.

Has the Commission discussed or assessed the environmental factors of transporting scrap between borders?

Is there any legislation to protect consumers from being charged 'environmental disposal fees' at the point of transaction for tyres that are resold to other markets?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**
*(17 December 2013)*

The Waste Framework Directive (Directive 2008/98/EC ([1])) requires Member States to establish an integrated and adequate network of waste disposal installations which should allow waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations in order to ensure a high level of protection for the environment and public health. The transboundary shipment of waste tyres is subject to the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1013/2013 on shipments of waste ([2]) which include an obligation for those involved in the shipment to ensure that the waste is managed in an environmentally sound manner throughout the period of shipment and during its recovery or disposal. The Commission recently proposed amendments to the Waste Shipment Regulation with the aim of enhancing the effectiveness of inspections and controls by national authorities and these are currently being considered by the European Parliament ([3]).

Environmental disposal fees for tyres are not required under EU legislation. Where there are such fees, they are established in national legislation which may also include specific provisions on exemptions.

([1]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([2]) OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.
([3]) COM 2013 516 final of 11 July 2013.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011793/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Mario Borghezio (NI)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Archeomafia in Albania

Da fonti di stampa si apprende che oltre mille oggetti antichi di culto fra icone, dipinti ed persino opere murali sono stati rubati, principalmente in monasteri e chiese ortodosse, in Albania e Macedonia e successivamente sequestrati dalla polizia albanese. Gli autori del furto, due cittadini albanesi, sono stati poi arrestati.

La polizia sospetta di aver rintracciato una rete di traffico di opere d'arte destinate ai paesi dell'Unione europea.

Che provvedimenti intende intraprendere la Commissione europea per impedire o contrastare eventuali altri casi di archeomafia provenienti da Paesi in procinto di aderire all'UE?

È a conoscenza di quali Stati membri dell'UE sono coinvolti in questo traffico di opere d'arte?

**Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione**
*(18 dicembre 2013)*

Nell'ambito dello strumento di assistenza preadesione, la Commissione fornisce assistenza tecnica per il consolidamento delle capacità di contrasto in Albania attraverso il progetto PAMECA IV. Il progetto sostiene in particolare l'ulteriore sviluppo di attività di contrasto della criminalità basate sull'intelligence presso la polizia di Stato albanese, in partenariato con la Procura generale, e l'ulteriore potenziamento delle capacità di controllo e gestione delle frontiere per contrastare i traffici illeciti, compreso il traffico di opere d'arte rubate.

Stando alle informazioni fornite dalla polizia di Stato albanese, le opere d'arte recuperate erano state rubate da chiese situate nel sud del paese e nell'ex Repubblica jugoslava di Macedonia. La Commissione è al corrente che la polizia sta indagando, ma non dispone di informazioni specifiche su attività di questo gruppo della criminalità organizzata che interessino gli Stati membri.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011793/13**
**to the Commission**
**Mario Borghezio (NI)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Art trafficking in Albania

Media reports say that over 1 000 religious antiquities, including icons, paintings and even murals, have been stolen, mainly from monasteries and orthodox churches in Albania and Macedonia, and subsequently seized by Albanian police. The thieves, two Albanians, have been arrested.

The police believes that it has uncovered a network trafficking works of art destined for EU countries.

What measures does the Commission intend to take to prevent or fight any other cases of art trafficking from countries about to join the EU?

Does it know which EU Member States are involved in this art trafficking?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**
*(18 December 2013)*

The Commission is providing technical assistance for the consolidation of the law enforcement capacities in Albania under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance through the ongoing PAMECA IV project. Project activities include support notably to the further development of intelligence-led policing in the Albanian State Police in partnership with the General Prosecution Office, as well as support to further capacity building for border control and management in order to counter illegal trafficking activities, including trafficking in stolen works of art.

According to information provided by the Albanian State Police, the recovered works of art were stolen from churches in the south of the country and in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Commission understands that police investigations are ongoing, but does not have any specific information about any activities of the specific organised crime group involving Member States.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011794/13**
**alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**
**Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* VP/HR — Proibizione dell'uso della parola «Allah» ai Cristiani malesi

Secondo una recente notizia pubblicata da fonti giornalistiche, un tribunale malese avrebbe stabilito che la parola «Allah» sarebbe di uso esclusivo dei musulmani: i cristiani non possono riferirsi a Dio usando questa parola.

Secondo quanto avrebbero dichiarato alcuni giudici della Corte d'appello di Kuala Lumpur, la parola, se usata anche dai non musulmani, provocherebbe confusione all'interno della comunità.

La Malesia (Malaysia) è un paese a maggioranza musulmana (60 %), e i cristiani sono la terza confessione religiosa, dopo i buddisti.

Considerando che i Cristiani da sempre usano il nome «Allah» per definire anche il proprio Dio cristiano, e lo fanno da decenni, e che anche in altri paesi come l'Indonesia e nel Medio Oriente la parola è usata sia da cristiani che da musulmani;

considerando che molte autorità locali si dicono contrarie a questa sentenza, incoraggiando e autorizzando i cristiani a continuare ad usare questa parola,

l'Alto Rappresentante (VP/HR) è al corrente del recente avvenimento?

Intende prendere una posizione e supportare le autorità locali per tutelare maggiormente i diritti religiosi?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**
*(9 dicembre 2013)*

L'AR/VP è al corrente del fatto che la Corte d'appello malese ha cassato una decisione dell'Alta Corte di giustizia di Kuala Lumpur che sosteneva che la decisione del governo di vietare l'utilizzo del termine Allah per riferirsi al Dio cristiano era illegittima. In base alla sentenza della Corte d'Appello, pertanto, il divieto emanato dal Ministero degli Interni viene confermato ed il settimanale cattolico malese The Herald non potrà più utilizzare il termine «Allah» per riferirsi al Dio cristiano.

L'AR/VP è convinta che questa decisione della Corte d'Appello malese possa limitare l'interpretazione della libertà religiosa, prevista dalla costituzione malese. L'UE si è impegnata a monitorare la questione della libertà religiosa in Malaysia, così come in altre parti del mondo. Le iniziative dell'UE in tale ambito vanno dalla sensibilizzazione, nel quadro del dialogo politico con i paesi in cui esistono problemi di questa natura, al rispetto delle libertà di religione e di credo, al sostegno ai progetti locali in materia di diritti umani, alla promozione della tolleranza religiosa e delle libertà di religione e di credo presso i vari consessi dell'ONU.

L'AR/VP segue da vicino la situazione dei diritti dell'uomo in Malaysia ed è pronta a sollevare la questione presso le autorità.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011794/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Malay Christians banned from using the word 'Allah'

According to a recent news report, a Malaysian court has ruled that the word 'Allah' may be used exclusively by Muslims: Christians may not refer to God with this word.

Judges at the Court of Appeal of Kuala Lumpur reportedly said that if the word were also used by non-Muslims, it would cause confusion in the community.

Malaysia is a predominantly Muslim country (60%), with Christians constituting the third largest religious group, after Buddhists.

Christians have been using the name 'Allah' to refer to their own Christian God for decades, and also in other countries such as Indonesia and in the Middle East the word is used by Christians and Muslims alike.

Many local authorities do not agree with this ruling and are encouraging and allowing Christians to continue using this word.

Is the High Representative (VP/HR) aware of this recent situation?

Does she intend to take a position and support the local authorities to enhance protection of religious rights?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 December 2013)*

The HR/VP is well aware that the Malaysia Court of Appeal overruled a 2009 decision by the Kuala Lumpur High Court which had held that the government's decision to disallow the use of the term 'Allah' in order to refer to God was unlawful. The Court of Appeal's ruling, therefore, means that the Home Ministry's prohibition stands and that the Herald, a Malaysian Catholic weekly publication, can no longer use the term 'Allah' to refer to God.

The HR/VP believes that this decision by Malaysia's Court of Appeal could limit the interpretation of religious freedom, as enshrined in Malaysia's Constitution. The EU is committed to monitoring the issue of religious freedom in Malaysia and elsewhere in the world. EU action in this field includes raising actively respect of freedom of religion or belief in the political dialogue with countries where such problems exist, support to local human rights projects and promotion of religious tolerance and freedom of religion or belief at the UN forums.

The HR/VP is closely following the human rights situation in Malaysia and is prepared to raise the issue with the authorities.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011796/13**
**au Conseil**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Adhésion de la Turquie

Alors que les négociations d'adhésion piétinent depuis des années, la récente crise politique a compliqué davantage encore les relations entre la Turquie et les Vingt-Huit. Ces derniers, très choqués par son comportement répressif à l'égard des manifestants, ont multiplié les critiques à l'égard du gouvernement de Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Notre devoir à tous, États membres de l'Union européenne comme pays candidats, est d'aspirer aux plus hauts standards et pratiques démocratiques. Le recours excessif à la force n'est pas acceptable en démocratie.

Le gouvernement turc a aussitôt exigé «des explications». Il s'est ensuite offusqué d'une résolution très critique du Parlement européen, qui mettait M. Erdogan personnellement en cause dans l'usage excessif de la force par les autorités turques. «Vous vous prenez pour qui?», a-t-il demandé.

Depuis lors, le gouvernement turc a tout fait pour canaliser — à défaut de l'étouffer — le mouvement de protestation. Les manifestations sont devenues plus sporadiques. Le 30 septembre, M. Erdogan a présenté un «paquet démocratique» plutôt salué par les Européens.

1. Qu'entendez-vous quand vous annoncez par la voix d'un de vos hauts responsables: «Le climat doit changer, il est temps de faire un geste constructif, il nous faut maintenir un levier pour encourager les réformes en Turquie.» De quel levier est-il question?

2. À ce jour, toutes les discussions sont entravées par le quasi-gel des négociations d'adhésion. Pourtant plusieurs médias relèvent que l'Europe voudrait relancer les négociations avec pour véritable but de permettre principalement d'avancer dans des dossiers comme la Syrie ou l'OTAN, ainsi que sur leur rôle dans la Méditerranée, sur la politique de l'énergie ou sur la politique de l'immigration. Qu'en est-il vraiment?

3. Quel est votre réaction aux propos du premier ministre turc qui a même suggéré que son pays pourrait privilégier, faute de progrès avec les Européens, un rapprochement avec l'Organisation de coopération de Shanghai, emmenée par la Chine et la Russie?

**Réponse**
*(23 décembre 2013)*

Il n'appartient pas au Conseil de commenter les déclarations publiques faites par des personnalités politiques.

Dans ses conclusions du 11 décembre 2012, le Conseil a exposé les différents éléments de la stratégie globale d'élargissement de l'UE, réaffirmant entre autres l'importance d'une mise en œuvre cohérente du consensus renouvelé sur l'élargissement, qui repose sur la consolidation des engagements, une conditionnalité équitable et rigoureuse, une meilleure communication, auxquelles s'ajoute la capacité de l'UE, dans toutes ses dimensions, à intégrer de nouveaux membres, chaque pays candidat étant évalué selon ses mérites propres.

En ce qui concerne les négociations d'adhésion avec la Turquie, le Conseil a notamment réaffirmé, dans ces mêmes conclusions, que des efforts supplémentaires et soutenus étaient nécessaires en vue de satisfaire pleinement aux critères de Copenhague. Dans ses conclusions du 11 décembre 2012, le Conseil a évoqué ces aspects, ainsi que d'autres domaines importants dans lesquels des efforts supplémentaires sont attendus de la part de la Turquie.

Le rythme des négociations continue notamment de dépendre des progrès réalisés par la Turquie pour satisfaire aux critères de référence liminaires et finaux ainsi qu'aux exigences prévues dans l'accord d'association et le cadre de négociation, y compris la mise en œuvre du partenariat pour l'adhésion. Il convient de noter que, lors de la conférence intergouvernementale avec la Turquie qui a eu lieu le 5 novembre, l'UE et la Turquie ont décidé d'ouvrir un nouveau chapitre de négociation, à savoir le chapitre 22 (Politique régionale et coordination des instruments structurels). Cela porte le nombre de chapitres ouverts depuis le début des négociations d'adhésion à quatorze et prouve que les deux parties demeurent attachées au processus de négociation.

Les progrès accomplis par la Turquie sur le terrain continueront de faire l'objet d'une évaluation et d'un suivi étroits, conformément au cadre de négociation et au partenariat pour l'adhésion. Ces progrès orienteront les avancées réalisées dans le cadre du processus de négociation.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011796/13**
**to the Council**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Accession of Turkey

Accession talks with Turkey have made little headway for years and the country's recent political crisis has further complicated its relations with the EU-28. The Member States were deeply shocked at Turkey's repressive response to demonstrators and heaped criticism upon Recep Tayyip Erdogan's government. Both EU Member States and candidate countries have a duty to aspire to the highest democratic standards and practices. Excessive use of force is unacceptable in a democracy.

The Turkish Government demanded 'explanations' in response to these criticisms. It also took offence at a highly critical European Parliament resolution blaming Mr Erdogan personally for the excessive use of force by the Turkish authorities, with Mr Erdogan asking 'Who do you think you are?'.

Since then, the Turkish Government has done everything it can to channel the protest movement, short of stamping it out completely. The demonstrations have become more sporadic. On 30 September, Mr Erdogan announced a 'democratic package' which was largely welcomed by Europe.

1. What exactly does this statement by a senior EU official mean: 'The climate must change; it is time to take constructive action and we must keep up the pressure to encourage reform in Turkey'. What kind of pressure does this imply?

2. At the moment, all discussions are hampered by the near-standstill of the accession talks. According to some media reports, however, Europe is keen to revive the talks, primarily with a view to making real progress on subjects like Syria and NATO, the country's role in the Mediterranean, energy policy and immigration. What is the reality of the situation?

3. What is your response to the Turkish Prime Minister's suggestion that if no progress is made with Europe, his country might even favour closer ties with the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, led by China and Russia?

**Reply**
*(23 December 2013)*

It is not for the Council to comment on public statements made by political figures.

In its conclusions of 11 December 2012, the Council outlined the various elements of the EU's overall enlargement strategy, reaffirming *inter alia* the importance of coherent implementation of the renewed consensus on enlargement which is based on consolidation of commitments, fair and rigorous conditionality, better communication combined with the EU's capacity, in all its dimensions, to integrate new members, with each candidate country being assessed on its own merits.

With regard to accession negotiations with Turkey, the Council reaffirmed *inter alia* in its conclusions that further and sustained efforts towards fully meeting the Copenhagen criteria were required. These, and other important areas where further efforts are expected by Turkey, were set out in the Council conclusions of 11 December 2012.

The pace of negotiations continues to depend notably on Turkey's progress in addressing opening and closing benchmarks, as well as the requirements of the Association Agreement and the Negotiating Framework, including the implementation of the Accession Partnership. It should be noted that, at an Inter-Governmental Conference held with Turkey on 5 November, the EU and Turkey agreed to open yet another negotiating chapter, namely Chapter 22 — Regional policy and coordination of structural instruments. This brings the number of chapters opened since the start of the accession negotiations to 14, and demonstrates that both parties remain committed to the negotiation process.

Close monitoring and evaluation of Turkey's progress on the ground will continue, in accordance with the Negotiating Framework and the Accession Partnership. This progress will guide the advances made in the negotiating process.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011797/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Adhésion de la Turquie

Alors que les négociations d'adhésion piétinent depuis des années, la récente crise politique a compliqué davantage encore les relations entre la Turquie et les Vingt-Huit. Ces derniers, très choqués par son comportement répressif à l'égard des manifestants, ont multiplié les critiques à l'égard du gouvernement de Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Notre devoir à tous, États membres de l'Union européenne comme pays candidats, est d'aspirer aux plus hauts standards et pratiques démocratiques. Le recours excessif à la force n'est pas acceptable en démocratie.

Le gouvernement turc a aussitôt exigé «des explications». Il s'est ensuite offusqué d'une résolution très critique du Parlement européen, qui mettait M. Erdogan personnellement en cause dans l'usage excessif de la force par les autorités turques. «Vous vous prenez pour qui?», a-t-il demandé.

Depuis lors, le gouvernement turc a tout fait pour canaliser — à défaut de l'étouffer — le mouvement de protestation. Les manifestations sont devenues plus sporadiques. Le 30 septembre, M. Erdogan a présenté un «paquet démocratique» plutôt salué par les Européens.

1. Qu'entendez-vous quand vous annoncez par la voix d'un de vos hauts responsables: «Le climat doit changer, il est temps de faire un geste constructif, il nous faut maintenir un levier pour encourager les réformes en Turquie.» De quel levier est-il question?

2. À ce jour, toutes les discussions sont entravées par le quasi-gel des négociations d'adhésion. Pourtant plusieurs médias relèvent que l'Europe voudrait relancer les négociations avec pour véritable but de permettre principalement d'avancer dans des dossiers comme la Syrie ou l'OTAN, ainsi que sur leur rôle dans la Méditerranée, sur la politique de l'énergie ou sur la politique de l'immigration. Qu'en est-il vraiment?

3. Quel est votre réaction aux propos du premier ministre turc qui a même suggéré que son pays pourrait privilégier, faute de progrès avec les Européens, un rapprochement avec l'Organisation de coopération de Shanghai, emmenée par la Chine et la Russie?

**Réponse donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission**
*(6 décembre 2013)*

Les points mis en évidence par l'Honorable Parlementaire soulignent combien il est important que l'UE renforce ses relations avec la Turquie. L'avancement des négociations d'adhésion et l'avancement de la réforme politique en Turquie sont les deux facettes d'une même problématique. Ces avancées contribueraient de manière significative à faire en sorte que l'UE et ses normes demeurent le point de référence pour l'instauration de réformes en Turquie. Le potentiel de la relation UE-Turquie ne saurait être pleinement exploité que dans le cadre d'un processus d'adhésion actif et crédible.

La Turquie, avec son économie importante et dynamique, est un partenaire commercial incontournable pour l'UE et contribue à la compétitivité de cette dernière dans le contexte de l'union douanière. Elle occupe une position stratégique, notamment dans le domaine de la sécurité énergétique, et joue un rôle essentiel sur le plan régional. La Commission a mis en exergue l'importance de la coopération et du dialogue en cours sur les questions de politique étrangère.

La Commission mène ses travaux sur la base du cadre de négociation UE-Turquie. Ce dernier indique que l'objectif commun des négociations est l'adhésion (point 2). Dans ce contexte, les États membres ont décidé à l'unanimité d'ouvrir le chapitre 22 (politique régionale), dès que la Turquie satisferait aux critères de référence requis. Ce chapitre a été ouvert lors de la conférence d'adhésion du 5 novembre 2013, ce qui a donné un nouvel élan aux négociations d'adhésion et aux relations entre l'Union et la Turquie.

Enfin, les autorités turques ne cessent de réitérer leur volonté d'aboutir à l'adhésion. Le groupe ministériel de suivi des réformes, qui pilote ce processus, continue à se réunir.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011797/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Accession of Turkey

Accession talks with Turkey have made little headway for years and the country's recent political crisis has further complicated its relations with the EU-28. The Member States were deeply shocked at Turkey's repressive response to demonstrators and heaped criticism upon Recep Tayyip Erdogan's government. Both EU Member States and candidate countries have a duty to aspire to the highest democratic standards and practices. Excessive use of force is unacceptable in a democracy.

The Turkish Government demanded 'explanations' in response to these criticisms. It also took offence at a highly critical European Parliament resolution blaming Mr Erdogan personally for the excessive use of force by the Turkish authorities, with Mr Erdogan asking 'Who do you think you are?'.

Since then, the Turkish Government has done everything it can to channel the protest movement, short of stamping it out completely. The demonstrations have become more sporadic. On 30 September, Mr Erdogan announced a 'democratic package' which was largely welcomed by Europe.

1. What exactly does this statement by a senior EU official mean: 'The climate must change; it is time to take constructive action and we must keep up the pressure to encourage reform in Turkey'. What kind of pressure does this imply?

2. At the moment, all discussions are hampered by the near-standstill of the accession talks. According to some media reports, however, Europe is keen to revive the talks, primarily with a view to making real progress on subjects like Syria and NATO, the country's role in the Mediterranean, energy policy and immigration. What is the reality of the situation?

3. What is your response to the Turkish Prime Minister's suggestion that if no progress is made with Europe, his country might even favour closer ties with the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, led by China and Russia?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**
*(6 December 2013)*

The issues highlighted by the Honourable Member underline the importance for the EU to enhance its engagement with Turkey. Progress in the accession negotiations and progress on political reform in Turkey are two sides of the same coin. Such progress would significantly contribute to ensuring that the EU and its standards remain the benchmark for reforms in Turkey. The full potential of the EU-Turkey relationship is best fulfilled within the framework of an active and credible accession process.

Turkey, with its large, dynamic economy, is an important trading partner for the EU and contributes to EU competitiveness through the Customs Union. Turkey has a strategic location, including on energy security, and plays an important regional role. The Commission has underlined the importance of ongoing cooperation and dialogue on foreign policy issues.

The Commission conducts its work on the basis of the EU-Turkey Negotiating Framework. The latter states that the shared objective of these negotiations is accession (point 2). In this context, the Member States decided unanimously to open Chapter 22 — Regional policy upon fulfilment of the required benchmarks. The chapter was opened at the accession conference of 5 November 2013, providing new momentum to accession negotiations and EU-Turkey relations.

Finally, Turkish authorities continue to reiterate their commitment to EU accession. The ministerial reform Monitoring Group steering this process continues to meet.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011798/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(16 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Projets d'infrastructures énergétiques

Günther Oettinger, commissaire européen chargée de l'énergie, a présenté, le lundi 14 octobre 2013, une liste de 250 projets d'infrastructures énergétiques éligibles pour des cofinancements européens à hauteur de 5,85 milliards d'euros. Ce budget est alloué aux infrastructures transeuropéennes pour la période 2014-2020, au titre du mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe.

La liste comprend jusqu'à 140 projets dans le domaine du transport et du stockage de l'électricité, environ 100 projets dans le domaine du transport et du stockage du gaz ainsi que du GNL et plusieurs projets liés au pétrole et aux réseaux intelligents, a précisé la Commission dans un communiqué. Pour qu'un projet soit inscrit sur cette liste, il fallait qu'il présente «des avantages considérables» pour au moins deux États membres, qu'il contribue à l'intégration du marché et à l'intensification de la concurrence, qu'il «améliore» la sécurité de l'approvisionnement et qu'il «réduise les émissions de $CO_2$».

Nous saluons ces initiatives.

1. Comment la Commission va-t-elle s'assurer que les fonds limités dont la Commissiondispose soient utilisés à bon escient et que les fonds de l'Union soient alloués de manière àgénérer le plus d'avantages pour les consommateurs européens?

2. Avec cette liste de projets d'infrastructures dans le secteur de l'énergie et les avantages quien découlent, combien d'investisseurs et de capitaux la Commission compte-t-elle attirer?

3. Ces projets «d'intérêt commun» (PIC) pourraient-ils bénéficier de procédures accéléréespour l'octroi des licences et de meilleures conditions de régulation?

4. À quelle fréquence la liste des PIC sera-t-elle mise à jour?

**Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission**
*(4 décembre 2013)*

1. La Commission allouera l'aide financière du mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe (MIE) à des projets d'intérêt commun au moyen de subventions et d'instruments financiers. L'aide financière portera essentiellement sur des projets commercialement non viables qui présentent une valeur socio-économique élevée. Le MIE permet de financer des travaux au moyen de subventions, mais privilégie l'utilisation d'instruments financiers innovants afin d'améliorer l'effet de levier des dépenses à la charge du budget de l'Union.

2. La liste de PIC établie par l'Union vise à accélérer la mise en œuvre des projets d'infrastructures dans le domaine de l'énergie. L'aide financière du MIE encouragera la participation du secteur privé au financement des projets de ce type. La plupart des PIC sont exécutés par des gestionnaires de réseau de transport (GRT) qui prendront les décisions en ce qui concerne les investisseurs et les besoins en capitaux pour les projets. Pour l'instant, la Commission ne peut pas prévoir le nombre de (nouveaux) investisseurs et il ne serait pas crédible de communiquer un montant précis en euros étant donné que seule une partie des projets sont suffisamment aboutis pour qu'une estimation des coûts fiable puisse être établie.

3. Les PIC bénéficieront d'une procédure accélérée d'octroi des autorisations et d'un traitement réglementaire amélioré. Pour ce qui est de l'octroi des autorisations, les États membres doivent mettre en place une autorité compétente unique pour l'octroi des autorisations, ce qui assure un traitement plus efficace. Les PIC bénéficieront également de procédures d'octroi des autorisations d'une durée maximale de 3,5 ans. En ce qui concerne le traitement réglementaire, les autorités réglementaires nationales (ARN) veilleront à ce que les PIC bénéficient du traitement le plus préférentiel afin de garantir leur mise en œuvre.

4. La liste de projets d'intérêt commun établie par l'Union sera mise à jour tous les deux ans.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011798/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Energy infrastructure projects

On Monday 14 October 2013, the Commissioner for Energy Günther Oettinger presented a list of 250 energy infrastructure projects which qualify for part funding from the EU worth EUR 5.85 billion. This budget has been set aside for trans-European infrastructure projects for the period 2014-2020 under the Connecting Europe Facility.

In its press release, the Commission explained that of the projects on the list, up to 140 are for electricity transportation and storage, approximately 100 for gas and liquid natural gas transportation and storage and a handful for oil and smart networks. For a project to be included in the list, it had to have 'significant benefits' for at least two Member States, contribute to market integration and further competition, 'enhance' security of supply and 'reduce CO2 emissions'.

We welcome these initiatives.

1. What does the Commission intend to do to ensure that the limited funds at its disposal are used wisely and that EU funds are allocated in a way that generates the most benefits for Europe's consumers?

2. How many investors and how much capital does the Commission hope to attract with this list of infrastructure projects in the energy sector and the advantages attached to them?

3. Is it possible that these 'projects of common interest' (PCI) may benefit from faster permit granting procedures and improved regulatory treatment?

4. How often will the list of PCI be updated?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**
*(4 December 2013)*

1. The Commission will allocate the financial support from the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) for projects of common interest using grants and financial instruments. The financial support will focus on commercially non-viable projects with high socioeconomic value. The CEF allows funding by grants for works, but prioritises the use of innovative financial instruments to improve the leverage effect of the Union's budget spending.

2. The Union-list of PCIs aims at speeding up implementation of infrastructure projects in the field of energy. The financial support from the CEF will encourage private sector participation in the financing of such projects. Most of the PCIs are carried out by transmission system operators (TSOs) who will decide on investors and capital needs for the projects. For the time being the Commission cannot foresee the number of (new) investors and it would not be credible to communicate a specific amount in Euro as only a part of the projects are mature enough to show reliable cost estimates.

3. PCIs will benefit from a faster permit granting and improved regulatory treatment. Regarding permit granting, Member States need to set up one competent authority for permit granting which ensures more efficient handling. PCIs will also benefit from permit granting procedures within 3.5 years. Regarding the regulatory treatment, national regulatory authorities (NRAs) will ensure that PCIs receive the most preferential treatment to ensure their implementation.

4. The Union-list of projects of common interest will be updated every two years.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011799/13**
**au Conseil**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(16 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Présidence de la Commission

La nomination de candidats à la présidence de la Commission lors de la campagne électorale européenne n'est pas la meilleure solution pour rétablir la crédibilité de l'Union européenne, selon le président du Conseil européen.

Alors que les partis européens sont à la recherche de figures de proue pour leur campagne, Herman Van Rompuy estime que cette procédure ne suffira pas à résoudre le déficit démocratique dont souffre l'Europe.

«Vous ne devez pas chercher de solutions quand il n'y a pas de problème. Rechercher des "visages" pour guider l'UE n'est pas une solution», a indiqué le président du Conseil lors d'un débat sur l'avenir de l'Union européenne le 10 octobre 2013 à Bruxelles.

1. Quelle est la position officielle du Conseil? Rejoint-il la position d'Herman Van Rompuy,qui est antagoniste à celle du Parlement?

**Réponse**
*(16 décembre 2013)*

Il n'appartient pas au Conseil de commenter les déclarations attribuées aux présidents d'autres institutions (en l'occurrence, le Conseil européen).

Le Conseil n'a pas pris position à ce sujet.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011799/13**
**to the Council**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Commission Presidency

The President of the Council has stated that nominating candidates for election to the Commission Presidency during the European parliamentary election campaign is not the best solution to restoring the European Union's credibility.

While the European political parties are looking for figureheads for their campaigns, Herman Van Rompuy feels that this procedure will not be enough to resolve Europe's democratic deficit.

During a debate on the future of the European Union in Brussels on 10 October 2013, the Council President stated that 'You do not have to look for solutions to things that are not problems. To go and look for "faces" to guide the EU: that is not a solution'.

1. What is the Council's official position? Is it the same as that of Mr Van Rompuy, which is the opposite of Parliament's position?

**Reply**
*(16 December 2013)*

The Council does not comment on statements attributed to the Presidents of other institutions (in this case the European Council).

The Council has not taken a position on this subject.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011800/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Système d'identification électronique

Les entreprises, les citoyens et les autorités publiques qui veulent conclure des accords transfrontaliers devraient avoir accès à des outils faciles et fiables pour signer et certifier les documents.

1. La Commission européenne est-elle pour un système d'identification électronique?

2. Partage-t-elle l'avis selon lequel, avec un bon équilibre, une législation encouragerait l'économie numérique et contribuerait à créer des emplois tout en renforçant la fiabilité et la sécurité du commerce transfrontalier?

3. Est-elle en faveur d'une contrainte envers les États membres pour reconnaître mutuellement leurs systèmes nationaux d'identification électronique, à condition que ces systèmes aient été notifiés?

**Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission**
*(16 décembre 2013)*

La Commission attire depuis bien longtemps l'attention sur le manque d'interopérabilité entre les systèmes nationaux d'identification électronique, qui pour elle, constitue un obstacle majeur au marché unique numérique. L'action clé 16 de la stratégie numérique pour l'Europe ([1]) préconisait l'adoption d'une proposition législative visant à garantir la reconnaissance mutuelle des systèmes d'identification et d'authentification électroniques. Le 4 juin 2012, la Commission a adopté une proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil sur l'identification électronique et les services de confiance pour les transactions électroniques au sein du marché intérieur ([2]).

La Commission est favorable à une adoption rapide de ce règlement, car il permettra d'éliminer tous les obstacles juridiques existants à l'utilisation transnationale de moyens d'identification électronique dans le secteur public.

En outre, la Commission, s'appuyant sur les solutions existantes financées par le programme PIC TIC, a l'intention de créer une plateforme centrale de services d'identification électronique financée par le Mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe, qui sera un élément des services transnationaux en ligne au sein du marché unique numérique. En démontrant les avantages concrets de l'identification électronique transnationale, elle encouragera également le secteur privé à l'adopter, garantissant ainsi la viabilité économique à long terme des solutions mises au point.

([1]) Voir COM(2010) 245 final/2.
([2]) COM(2012) 238 + 2012/0146 (COD).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011800/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Electronic identification system

Any businesses, members of the public and public authorities who wish to sign cross-border agreements should have access to simple, reliable tools for signing and certifying documents.

1. Is the Commission in favour of an electronic identification system?

2. Does it share the opinion that, provided it strikes the right balance, a piece of legislation would encourage the digital economy and contribute to job creation, while improving the reliability and security of cross-border trade?

3. Is the Commission in favour of obliging Member States to mutually recognise their national electronic identification systems, provided that these systems have been duly reported on?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission**
*(16 December 2013)*

The Commission has long before identified the lack of interoperability of national electronic identification schemes as a major obstacle to the digital single market. Key action 16 of the Digital Agenda for Europe ([1]) called for a legislative proposal to ensure mutual recognition of e-identification and e-authentication. On 4 June 2012 the Commission adopted a Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions in the internal market ([2]).

The Commission supports a swift adoption of this regulation, as it will abolish all existing legal barriers regarding the use of notified electronic identification means across borders in the public sector.

Further to this, based on already existing solutions funded by the CIP ICT Programme, the Commission intends to set up an eID core service platform funded by the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF), which will be a building block for online cross-border services in the Digital Single Market. By demonstrating the tangible benefits of cross-border eID it will also motivate take-up by the private sector, thereby ensuring the financial sustainability of the developed solutions in the long run.

([1]) See the COM(2010) 245 final/2.
([2]) COM(2012) 238 + 2012/0146 (COD).

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011801/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Problème législatif autour de la protection des données

Au printemps, un texte législatif est passé dans nos mains en commission du marché intérieur du Parlement européen, qui avait pour objectif de rénover le droit sur la protection des données.

1. La proposition ne tient pas suffisamment compte des exigences spécifiques à la conservation et à l'échange des données en matière de santé publique. De manière générale, la proposition ne réalise pas un équilibre entre la protection de la vie privée et l'utilisation des données à des fins d'intérêt public, telles que la protection de la santé publique, la surveillance des maladies et l'organisation des soins de santé. Quelle est la réponse de la Commission à cet égard?

2. Pourquoi la Commission ne passe-t-elle pas par une directive plutôt que par un règlement? La question est en effet déjà régie par des réglementations nationales qui doivent pouvoir être adaptées avec souplesse.

3. En lien direct avec la deuxième question: sauf erreur de notre part, pourquoi la Commission n'envisage-t-elle pas d'appliquer à ses propres services le règlement proposé?

4. Si la transformation de la proposition en proposition de directive n'est pas possible, une option pourrait être d'exclure du champ d'application du règlement les données utilisées dans un but d'intérêt public (et donc la santé et la sécurité sociale). Ce compromis paraît-il envisageable pour la Commission? Dans la négative, pourquoi?

5. Pourquoi la Commission ne distinguerait-elle pas de manière claire et non équivoque le secteur public du secteur privé dans son texte?

**Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission**
*(13 décembre 2013)*

La proposition de règlement général sur la protection des données ([1]) harmonisera davantage les conditions de traitement des données dans le domaine de la santé, tout en garantissant un niveau uniforme et élevé de protection des personnes. La forme juridique de la proposition (un règlement au lieu d'une directive devant être transposée par les États membres) contribuera de manière essentielle à cette harmonisation, ce qui favorisera la prestation transfrontière de services de santé.

Le droit fondamental à la protection des données à caractère personnel (article 8 de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'UE) doit être garanti tant dans le secteur public que dans le secteur privé. Par conséquent, le règlement général sur la protection des données, tout comme la directive 95/46/CE actuelle, ne différencie pas les droits à la protection des données selon que le responsable du traitement ou le sous-traitant est public ou privé.

Les dispositions du règlement général sur la protection des données portant spécifiquement sur le traitement des données relatives à la santé (article 81, paragraphe 1) autorisent les services de soin de santé à traiter les données à caractère personnel à des fins de santé publique et de protection sociale, pour autant que les intérêts ou les droits et libertés fondamentaux des personnes concernées soient respectés. De plus, la proposition fixe des règles spécifiques sur le traitement des données à des fins de recherche historique, statistique et scientifique, notamment des registres de patients (article 81, paragraphe 2).

La Commission a l'intention de présenter les propositions nécessaires pour aligner le règlement (CE) n° 45/2001 ([2]), qui s'applique au traitement des données à caractère personnel par les institutions et organes de l'UE, sur les principes et dispositions du règlement général sur la protection des données, comme convenu par les co-législateurs, en temps utile pour permettre l'entrée en vigueur simultanée du règlement (CE) n° 45/2001 modifié et du règlement général sur la protection des données.

---

([1]) COM(2012) 11 final, proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif à la protection des personnes physiques à l'égard du traitement des données à caractère personnel et à la libre circulation de ces données (règlement général sur la protection des données).

([2]) Règlement (CE) n° 45/2001 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 18 décembre 2000 relatif à la protection des personnes physiques à l'égard du traitement des données à caractère personnel par les institutions et organes communautaires et à la libre circulation de ces données (JO L 8 du 12.1.2001, p. 1).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011801/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Problem regarding data protection legislation

Last spring, the Committee on the internal market and Consumer Affairs had the task of reporting on a proposal aimed at updating the data protection legislation.

1. The proposed legislation does not make enough provision for the special requirements associated with the storage and exchange of public health-related data. As a whole, it does not strike the right balance between protecting privacy and using data in the public interest, for example for the protection of public health, disease surveillance and healthcare provision. How does the Commission view this matter?

2. Why does the Commission not opt for a directive instead of a regulation, since the issue is already covered by national regulations and flexibility is required in adapting these?

3. This relates directly to my second question: if I am not mistaken, why is the Commission not intending to apply the proposed legislation to its own departments?

4. If this draft regulation cannot be converted into a draft directive, one option could be to exclude the use of data in the public interest (and hence healthcare and social security data) from the scope of the regulation. Would the Commission consider this compromise and if not, could it explain why?

5. Could the Commission not distinguish clearly and unequivocally between the public and private sector in the proposed legislation?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

The proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation ([1]) (GDPR) will further harmonise the conditions for data processing in the area of health, while ensuring a consistent and high level of protection of individuals. The GDPR's legal nature (a regulation, instead of a directive to be transposed by Member States) will be an essential factor for aforesaid harmonisation, thus fostering the provision of cross-border healthcare services.

The fundamental right to the protection of personal data (Article 8 EU Charter of Fundamental Rights) needs to be ensured both in the public and the private sector. Therefore, the GDPR, like the current Directive 95/46/EC, does not differentiate data protection rights on the basis of the public or private nature of the controller or processor.

The GDPR's specific provisions on processing of health data (Article 81(1)) authorise the processing by healthcare services, for the protection of public health and social protection with safeguards for the interests or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subjects. In addition, the GDPR lays down specific rules on data processing for historical, statistical and scientific purposes, including patient registries (Article 81(2)).

The Commission intends to present the necessary proposals to align Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 ([2]), which applies to the processing of personal data by EU institutions and bodies, with the principles and rules of the GDPR as agreed by the co-legislators in a timely manner in order to ensure that the amended Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 can enter into application at the same time as the GDPR.

([1]) COM(2012) 11 final, Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation).

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data, OJ L8, 12.01.2001, p. 1-22.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011802/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Othmar Karas (PPE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE) und Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)**
*(16. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Umsetzung der Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug

Zahlungsverzug ist innerhalb der EU ein weit verbreitetes Problem, welches viel zu häufig zu Konkurs und dem Verlust von Arbeitsplätzen und insbesondere zur Gefährdung von KMUs führt. Die Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug, die im Jahr 2011 angenommen wurde, ist ein wichtiges Instrument, um diese Herausforderung zu bewältigen und das große Hindernis zu beseitigen, mit dem die Unternehmen, insbesondere KMU, konfrontiert sind, wenn sie vollen Nutzen aus dem Binnenmarkt ziehen wollen.

Die Interfraktionelle Arbeitsgruppe „Kleine und mittlere Unternehmen" im Europäischen Parlament hat sich immer mit Nachdruck für die Richtlinie eingesetzt und wacht sorgfältig über ihre Umsetzung. Laut den Informationen der Fragesteller haben nur neun Mitgliedstaaten die überarbeitete Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug bis zum festgelegten Termin (16. März 2013) umgesetzt. Im September 2013 haben zwei Mitgliedstaaten die Richtlinie noch immer nicht umgesetzt.

1. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission im Hinblick auf die Mitgliedstaaten ergriffen, die die Richtlinie noch nicht umgesetzt haben? Welche weiteren Maßnahmen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um die Umsetzung in diesen Mitgliedstaaten zu beschleunigen?

2. Verfügt die Kommission bereits über Informationen über die Auswirkungen der überarbeiteten Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug in den Mitgliedstaaten, die die Richtlinie fristgerecht umgesetzt haben?

3. Wie will die Kommission sicherstellen, dass die Richtlinie innerhalb der EU einheitlich ausgelegt wird, und wie will sie die Umsetzung der Richtlinie bewerten?

4. Wie wird die Kommission zusätzlich zu ihrer Informationskampagne die ordnungsgemäße Umsetzung der neuen Vorschriften in den Mitgliedstaaten fördern?

5. Welche Maßnahmen schlägt die Kommission abgesehen von der Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug vor, um eine Kultur der termingerechten Zahlung im gesamten Binnenmarkt zu erreichen, und zwar sowohl bei Geschäften zwischen Unternehmen (B2B — business to business) als auch zwischen Privatkunden und Unternehmen (P2B — people to business), und um KMU vor Missbrauch durch dominante Marktakteure zu schützen?

**Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission**
*(17. Dezember 2013)*

1. Im Mai 2013 sendete die Kommission Aufforderungsschreiben an die Mitgliedstaaten ([1]), die bis dahin noch keine Maßnahmen zur Umsetzung mitgeteilt hatten. Belgien und Deutschland haben bis heute noch nicht mitgeteilt, mit welchen Rechtsvorschriften sie die Richtlinie umgesetzt haben. Daher ergingen am 20. November 2013 begründete Stellungnahmen an diese Länder. Der nächste Verfahrensschritt wäre es — wenn sich die Notwendigkeit ergibt — die Angelegenheiten an den Europäischen Gerichtshof zu verweisen.

2. Die betroffenen Kreise melden ein gestiegenes Interesse an der Richtlinie und ein zunehmendes Bewusstsein für sie. Es sei jedoch noch zu früh dafür, deutliche Verbesserungen in der Praxis beim Zahlungsfluss und beim Zeitpunkt der Zahlungen zu erkennen.

3. Die Kommission prüft zurzeit die von 26 Mitgliedstaaten mitgeteilten nationalen Umsetzungsmaßnahmen. Einige Mitgliedstaaten wurden bereits um weitere Angaben und/oder Klarstellungen ersucht; weitere könnten in Kürze folgen. Außerdem hält die Kommission regelmäßig Sitzungen mit der Gruppe nationaler Sachverständiger ab, deren Aufgabe es ist, die Umsetzung der Richtlinie zu erörtern und ihre durchgängige Auslegung sicherzustellen.

([1]) Belgien, die Tschechische Republik, Deutschland und Lettland.

4. Neben der Informationskampagne hat die Kommission die Website „Bekämpfung von Zahlungsverzug“ ([2]) eingerichtet, auf der betroffene Parteien wichtige Informationen zur Zahlungsverzugsrichtlinie und zur Informationskampagne sowie weitere nützliche Hinweise finden können.

5. Innerhalb des Europäischen Semesters zur wirtschaftspolitischen Steuerung hat die Kommission darauf hingewiesen, dass die Modernisierung der öffentlichen Verwaltung in vielen Mitgliedstaaten zu den wichtigsten Prioritäten für die Steigerung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit gehört. Zu einer effizienten öffentlichen Verwaltung gehört die unverzügliche Zahlung aufgrund vertraglicher Verpflichtungen. Die Kommission wird im Rahmen des Europäischen Semesters die weitere Entwicklung beobachten.

---

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/fighting-late-payments/index_de.htm

*(Magyar változat)*

**Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-011802/13**
**a Bizottság számára**
**Othmar Karas (PPE), Herczog Edit (S&D), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE) és Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)**
*(2013. október 16.)*

*Tárgy:* A késedelmes fizetésekről szóló irányelv végrehajtása

A késedelmes fizetés széles körű probléma az EU-ban, túl gyakran vezet csődhöz és munkahelyek elvesztéséhez, és különösen a kkv-kat veszélyezteti. A késedelmes fizetésekről szóló, 2011-ben elfogadott irányelv egy fontos eszköz e kihívás kezeléséhez és a vállalatoknak – különösen a kkv-knak – az egységes piac előnyeinek teljes kihasználását gátló főbb akadályok felszámolásához.

Az Európai Parlament kkv-kkal foglalkozó frakcióközi csoportja mindig szilárd támogatója volt az irányelvnek és figyelemmel kíséri annak végrehajtását. Információink szerint a 2013. március 16-i határidőig csak kilenc tagállam ültette át a késedelmes fizetésekről szóló felülvizsgált irányelvet. 2013. szeptemberben még két tagállam nem tette ezt meg.

1. Milyen intézkedéseket tett a Bizottság azon tagállamok tekintetében, amelyek még nem ültették át az irányelvet? Milyen további intézkedéseket tesz a Bizottság az átültetés felgyorsítására e tagállamokban?

2. Van-e már a Bizottságnak információja a felülvizsgált irányelv hatásáról azon tagállamokban, amelyek a határidő előtt átültették azt?

3. Hogyan szándékozik a Bizottság biztosítani az irányelv koherens értelmezését az EU-ban és értékelni annak végrehajtását?

4. A tájékoztató kampány mellett hogyan fogja a Bizottság előmozdítani az új szabályok helyes végrehajtását a tagállamokban?

5. Az irányelven kívül milyen intézkedéseket javasol a Bizottság az időben történő fizetés kultúrájának megteremtése érdekében az egységes piacon – mind a vállalkozások közötti, mind a vállalkozások és magánszemélyek közötti ügyletekben – és a kkv-k védelmében az erőfölénnyel rendelkező piaci szereplők visszaélése ellen?

**Antonio Tajani válasza a Bizottság nevében**
*(2013. december 17.)*

1. A Bizottság 2013 májusában hivatalosan értesítette azokat a tagállamokat ([1]), amelyek elmulasztották átültetési intézkedéseiket bejelenteni. Belgium és Németország a mai napig nem jelentették be az irányelvet nemzeti jogukba átültető intézkedéseket. Ennek következtében a Bizottság e két országnak 2013. november 20-án indokolással ellátott véleményt küldött. Az eljárás következő lépésében az érintett ügyeket szükség esetén az Európai Bíróság tárgyalja meg.

2. Az érdekelt felek azt állítják, hogy fokozott tudatosságot és érdeklődést tapasztaltak az irányelv meglétével kapcsolatban, ugyanakkor érvelésük szerint még nem telt el elegendő idő ahhoz, hogy a pénzforgalom vagy a kifizetések időtartama tekintetében a gyakorlatban egyértelmű javulást lehetne megfigyelni.

3. A Bizottság jelenleg vizsgálja a 26 tagállam által már bejelentett nemzeti átültető intézkedéseket. Egyes tagállamokat már felkértünk arra, hogy szolgáljanak további információkkal és pontosítással, míg másokkal a közeljövőben vesszük fel a kapcsolatot. A Bizottság emellett rendszeresen találkozik az irányelv végrehajtásának megvitatásával és egységes értelmezésének biztosításával megbízott tagállami szakértői csoporttal.

4. A tájékoztató kampány mellett a Bizottság létrehozta a késedelmes kifizetések elleni küzdelemben felhasználható „Fighting Late Payment” ([2]) honlapot, ahol az érdekeltek hasznos információkat találnak a késedelmes fizetésről szóló irányelvről és a tájékoztató kampányról; a honlapon emellett a témába vágó más dokumentumok is megtalálhatók.

([1]) Belgium, Cseh Köztársaság, Németország, Lettország.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/fighting-late-payments/index_en.htm

5. A Bizottság a kormányzás európai szemeszterének keretében jelezte, hogy a közigazgatás modernizációja számos tagállamban a versenyképesség javulásának egyik kulcsfontosságú prioritása. A szerződéses kötelezettségek szerinti gyors kifizetés a hatékony közigazgatás része. A Bizottság az európai szemeszter keretében továbbra is figyelemmel kíséri az előrehaladást.

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011802/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Othmar Karas (PPE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE) en Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)**
*(16 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Tenuitvoerlegging van de richtlijn betalingsachterstand

Betalingsachterstand is een veel voorkomend probleem in de EU, maar al te vaak leidend tot faillissementen en het verlies van banen, met name in het MKB. De richtlijn betalingsachterstand, goedgekeurd in 2011, is een belangrijk instrument voor de aanpak van dit probleem en voor het uit de weg ruimen van deze ernstige belemmering voor ondernemingen, en met name het MKB, om ten volle te profiteren van de interne markt.

De Interfractiewerkgroep MKB in het Europees Parlement is altijd groot voorstander geweest van deze richtlijn en houdt de tenuitvoerlegging ervan nauwlettend in het oog. Uit de door ons ontvangen informatie blijkt dat slechts negen lidstaten de herziene richtlijn betalingsachterstand hadden omgezet op de uiterste termijn van 16 maart 2013. In september 2013 hadden twee lidstaten dit nog altijd niet gedaan.

1. Welke maatregelen heeft de Commissie genomen met betrekking tot de lidstaten die de richtlijn nog niet hebben omgezet? Welke maatregelen gaat de Commissie verder nemen om de omzetting van de richtlijn in die lidstaten te versnellen?

2. Beschikt de Commissie reeds over informatie over het effect van de herziene richtlijn in de lidstaten die de richtlijn vóór de uiterste termijn hadden omgezet?

3. Hoe wil de Commissie een coherente uitlegging van de richtlijn in de hele EU waarborgen en hoe gaat zij de tenuitvoerlegging evalueren?

4. Hoe gaat de Commissie, naast de voorlichtingscampagne die zij hierover voert, een juiste tenuitvoerlegging van de nieuwe regels in de lidstaten bevorderen?

5. Welke maatregelen, naast de richtlijn, stelt de Commissie voor om een cultuur van tijdige betalingen in de hele interne markt te bewerkstelligen, zowel bij B2B- als bij P2B-transacties, en om het MKB te beschermen tegen misbruik door dominante marktdeelnemers?

**Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie**
*(17 december 2013)*

1. In mei 2013 heeft de Commissie schriftelijke aanmaningen toegezonden aan de lidstaten ([1]) die hun omzettingsmaatregelen niet hebben meegedeeld. Tot dusver hebben België en Duitsland hun wetgeving tot omzetting van de richtlijn niet meegedeeld. Daarom zijn op 20 november 2013 met redenen omklede adviezen aan deze landen toegezonden. De volgende procedurele stap is dat de zaken zo nodig aanhangig worden gemaakt bij het Hof van Justitie.

2. De belanghebbenden voeren aan dat zij een verhoogde belangstelling voor en kennis van het bestaan van de richtlijn hebben opgemerkt, maar stellen dat het nog te vroeg is om een duidelijke verbetering in de praktijk te zien wat de kasstroom of de promptheid van de betalingen betreft.

3. De Commissie beoordeelt momenteel de nationale omzettingsmaatregelen die door 26 lidstaten zijn meegedeeld. Met sommige lidstaten is reeds contact opgenomen om meer informatie en/of verduidelijking te ontvangen; met andere wordt waarschijnlijk binnenkort contact opgenomen. Voorts organiseert de Commissie regelmatig bijeenkomsten met de groep van nationale deskundigen, die als taak heeft de tenuitvoerlegging van de richtlijn te bespreken en voor een coherente interpretatie te zorgen.

4. Naast de voorlichtingscampagne is de Commissie gestart met de website „Fighting Late Payment" ([2]), waar de belanghebbenden belangrijke informatie kunnen vinden over de Richtlijn betalingsachterstand, de voorlichtingscampagne en andere nuttige documentatie.

([1]) België, Duitsland, Letland en Tsjechië.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/fighting-late-payments/index_en.htm

5. In het kader van het Europees semester voor economisch bestuur heeft de Commissie aangegeven dat de modernisering van het openbaar bestuur een prioriteit is voor een beter concurrentievermogen in veel lidstaten. Prompte betaling van contractuele verplichtingen is een wezenlijk onderdeel van een efficiënt openbaar bestuur. De Commissie zal blijven toezien op de vooruitgang in het kader van het Europees semester.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011802/13**
**to the Commission**
**Othmar Karas (PPE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE) and Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Implementation of the Late Payment Directive

Late payment is a widespread problem in the EU, leading all too often to bankruptcy and lost jobs and especially endangering SMEs. The Late Payment Directive, adopted in 2011, is an important tool for tackling this challenge and removing what constitutes a major obstacle to enterprises, in particular SMEs, taking full advantage of the single market.

The SME Intergroup in the European Parliament has always been a strong supporter of the directive and is keeping a close eye on its implementation. According to our information, only nine Member States had transposed the revised Late Payment Directive by the deadline of 16 March 2013. By September 2013, two Member States had still failed to do so.

1. What measures has the Commission taken with regard to those Member States that have not yet transposed the directive? What further measures will the Commission take to accelerate transposition in those Member States?

2. Does the Commission already have any information on the impact of the revised directive in those Member States that transposed it before the deadline?

3. How does the Commission intend to ensure coherent interpretation of the directive across the EU and assess its implementation?

4. In addition to its information campaign, how will the Commission promote the correct implementation of the new rules in the Member States?

5. Apart from the directive, what measures does the Commission propose in order to achieve a culture of timely payment throughout the single market, both in B2B and P2B transactions, and to protect SMEs against abuse by dominant market players?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**
*(17 December 2013)*

1. In May 2013 the Commission sent letters of formal notice to the Member States ([1]) who had failed to notify their transposing measures. To date Belgium and Germany have not notified their legislation transposing the directive. Hence, reasoned opinions were sent to these countries on 20 November 2013. The following procedural step is referring the cases to the European Court of Justice, if need be.

2. The stakeholders claim to have noticed an increased interest in and awareness of the directive's existence, but argue that it is too early yet to observe any clear improvement in practice as regards the cash flow or the duration of payments.

3. The Commission is currently assessing the national transposition measures notified by 26 Member States. Some Member States have already been contacted to receive further information and/or clarification, others may be contacted soon. The Commission also holds regular meetings with the national experts group, whose role is to discuss the implementation of the directive and to ensure its coherent interpretation.

4. Apart from the information campaign, the Commission has launched the website 'Fighting Late Payment' ([2]), where the stakeholders may find important information regarding the Late Payment Directive, the information campaign and other useful documentation.

([1]) Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany and Latvia.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/fighting-late-payments/index_en.htm

5. thin the framework of the European semester for economic governance, the Commission has indicated that modernising public administration is a key priority for improved competitiveness in many Member States. Prompt payment of contractual obligations is part of an efficient public administration. The Commission will continue to monitor progress within the framework of the European semester.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011803/13**
**to the Commission**
**Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* EU protocols on restriction of air travel in the event of a global pandemic

SARS, bird flu and, more recently, the coronavirus that affected Saudi Arabia and other parts of the Arabian Gulf are seen as harbingers of far more widespread and serious pathological outbreaks in the future. For most epidemiologists, the question is not so much whether the world will experience a global pandemic in the coming years, but when.

It will be incumbent on governments and supranational organisations such as the EU to exercise constant vigilance, to liaise with the World Health Organisation (WHO) and to have in place protocols that will allow restrictions on travel.

1. Can the Commission indicate whether the regulations pertaining to the 'Single European Sky' give the Commission any competences in terms of banning air travel to and from particular locations in the event of a pandemic, or does this remain the exclusive prerogative of individual Member States?

2. What restrictions on travel, if any, were put in place by the EU as a consequence of the recent Corona outbreak?

3. Has the Commission supported any recent research into the likely impact of the transmission of viruses (including SARS and bird flu) and other pathogens during flight? Is it the Commission's understanding that air-filtering systems can be modified on modern aircraft if deemed necessary by the appropriate authorities to remove certain pathogens?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(12 December 2013)*

1. According to Commission Regulation (EU) No 677/2011 ([1]), the air traffic management (ATM) Network Manager for the Single European Sky is responsible for managing the response to any network crisis in close cooperation with the Member States. In its task, the Network Manager is supported by the newly established European Aviation Crisis Coordination Cell, to which the Commission is a permanent member.

Although banning air travel to and from particular locations in the event of a pandemic (or any other crisis that would affect aviation) remains the exclusive prerogative of individual Member States, effective coordination process at EU level is now organised as a consequence of the eruption of the Eyjafjallajökull volcano in April 2010.

2. No travel restrictions have been taken as a consequence of the current ongoing outbreak of the Middle-East Respiratory Syndrome caused by the new coronavirus (MERS CoV). Health advice to travellers to affected countries was shared among the members of the Health Security Committee to assure consistency of the information in the Member States.

3. Two initiatives have been funded respectively by the Health Program ([2]) and by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control ([3]) to provide information to prevent and respond to communicable diseases potentially transmissible during air flights.

Most aircrafts built after the late 1980s are equipped with an environmental control system monitoring and controlling the pressure, humidity, temperature and ventilation in the cabin. High efficiency particulate air filters capture 99.97% of particles between 0.1 and 0.3 μm and 100% of other particles.

---

([1]) Commission Regulation (EU) No 677/2011 of 7 July 2011 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of air traffic management (ATM) network functions and amending Regulation (EU) No 691/2010, Chapter IV, OJCE L185 of 15.7.2011.
([2]) AIRSAN project: 'Coordinated action in the aviation sector to control public health threats'.
([3]) RAGIDA project: 'Risk assessment guidance for diseases transmitted on aircraft'.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011804/13**
**to the Commission**
**Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Air traffic control services in the EU

In a recent edition of the UK newspaper, '*Private Eye*', it was reported that the UK's national air traffic control service (NATS) is 'using instructions from the European Commission to reduce the amount it charges airlines to use air traffic services in the UK as an excuse to shed around 500 jobs'.

The Commission, which is now responsible for regulation across all EU airspace, has advocated that savings could be made if airspace was controlled in blocks based on operational efficiency rather than national borders, as has been the case in the past. The report suggests that the Commission has imposed set cost reductions of between 3% and 7%.

1. Can the Commission indicate whether it has sought specific levels of price reductions to airlines or whether these are simply estimates of the reductions likely to accrue as a result of implementation?

2. If these are predicted savings, are the Commission's estimates predicated on the basis of reductions in staff numbers, such as those alleged in the aforementioned article?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 December 2013)*

The Honourable member refers to the implementation of the Single European Sky (SES) legislation, in particular the SES Performance Scheme that include the establishement of Union-wide performance targets in the key performance areas of safety, environment, capacity and cost-efficiency. Member States then adopt national or functional airspace block (FAB) performance plans and targets that need to be consitent and foresee adequate contribution to the Union-wide targets.

For the so-called first reference period from 2012-2014 targets were adopted in 2010. Member States and the Commission are now in the process of agreeing and adopting targets for the second reference period starting in 2015 until 2019. For the first reference period in respect to cost-efficiency an annual reduction of unit cost of minus 3.2% was agreed.

Key principle of the SES Performance Scheme is that Member States and air navigation service providers should decide on the measures for achieving the targets. Thus, there is by no means any role for the Commission in determining measures such as specific reductions of costs or staff.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011805/13**
**to the Commission**
**Charles Tannock (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* UK limited liability partnerships and 'shell companies' operating within the EU

The UK satirical newspaper *Private Eye* recently published a special report which examines the roles of limited liability partnerships (LLPs) as vehicles for global tax evasion, money-laundering and the breaking of arms embargoes.

In 2005 there were approximately 5 000 LLPs in the UK. By 2012 this number had reached 52 348.

*Private Eye*'s investigation looked into the role of 'shell companies' in the EADS scandal, the Hermitage Capital tax frauds and the scandal involving the London branch of the Wachovia financial services company. It also looked at 'shell companies' that were implicated in sanction-busting arms deals.

1. Following the UK Prime Minister's initiatives on corporate transparency at the Fermanagh G8 Summit, does the Commission believe that the time has come to act internationally to better regulate and inspect 'shell companies'?

2. Does Europol have any powers to investigate allegations of companies based in EU Member States busting EU or UN sanctions?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

1. The Commission welcomes the increased prominence given to the issue of beneficial ownership under the UK's G8 presidency. The Commission's own proposal for a Fourth Anti-Money Laundering Directive has increased the onus on companies themselves to know who their beneficial owner is and to make this information available to competent authorities and obliged entities. This obligation applies to shell companies which could provide potential opportunities to obscure the identity of the persons operating behind them. Those features make such structures possible conduits for tax evasion schemes which often involve several jurisdictions, including one or more offshore centres. From a tax perspective, reliable information on the beneficial ownership of those structures is important for the investigation of tax evasion schemes.

2. Europol does not have any power to investigate allegations of companies based in EU Member States busting EU or UN sanctions. According to Council Decision 2009/371/JHA (Europol Council Decision) Europol may not autonomously investigate; it may only aid investigations of the Member States.

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011806/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**
*(16 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* El tratamiento de la industria conservera en el Acuerdo de comercio con Tailandia

El 27 de mayo comenzaron las negociaciones formales del Acuerdo entre la Unión Europea y Tailandia. El referido acuerdo tendrá una gran incidencia en las empresas transformadoras y comercializadoras de pesca del mar, que habitualmente están ubicadas en lugares altamente dependientes de ellas. Tailandia, por otra parte, es un país muy competitivo con los productos transformados, fundamentalmente del atún. Pero, sin embargo, sus estándares sociales, económicos y medioambientales no se ajustan a los parámetros europeos. Esta competencia desleal puede acarrear duras consecuencias para el sector transformador europeo.

1. ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión excluir las conservas preparadas de atún del proceso de liberalización arancelaria?

2. En el acuerdo, ¿exigirá a los productos tailandeses las mismas condiciones que a los productos europeos y, por lo tanto, incluirá algún capítulo referido al cumplimiento de los convenios internacionales en materia social, laboral, de gobernanza y medioambiental?

3. ¿Tiene previsto incluir la exigencia de medidas sanitarias y fitosanitarias europeas a los productos tailandeses?

4. ¿Tiene previsto incrementar los controles sanitarios y fitosanitarios a las conservas de atún procedentes del país de referencia?

**Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión**
*(2 de diciembre de 2013)*

La Comisión Europea es perfectamente consciente de la importancia de la industria conservera de pescados y mariscos de la UE, especialmente en el marco del comercio bilateral con un gran operador en el sector del atún en conserva como es Tailandia. Un acuerdo de libre comercio entre la Unión Europea y Tailandia ambicioso y equilibrado, que tenga en cuenta un sector tan sensible como el de la industria conservera de pescados y mariscos, entre otros, aportará importantes beneficios a la economía de la UE en su conjunto.

Sobre la liberalización arancelaria, si bien es demasiado pronto para prejuzgar el resultado de las negociaciones, el acuerdo deberá tener en cuenta las sensibilidades de la UE y los intereses de Tailandia en cuanto al acceso al mercado de las conservas de atún. La Comisión Europea dispone de información que le permitirá establecer prioridades y tomar decisiones durante el proceso de negociación gracias a un cuestionario específico que envió al sector pesquero de la UE. La Comisión ha tomado buena nota de las indicaciones y comentarios de esta industria.

El acuerdo recogerá un capítulo específico sobre la aplicación de medidas sanitarias y fitosanitarias que reforzará la cooperación. Tailandia debe seguir cumpliendo las rigurosas normas que establece actualmente la legislación de la UE. El acuerdo de libre comercio no rebajará las exigencias de esas normas.

La Comisión también procurará el establecimiento de disposiciones sólidas en materia de comercio y desarrollo sostenible que incluyan compromisos de Tailandia respecto a las normas laborales fundamentales y los convenios de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo, así como los acuerdos multilaterales de carácter medioambiental.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011806/13**
**to the Commission**
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Treatment of the canning industry in the Trade Agreement with Thailand

On 27 May, formal negotiations began on the Agreement between the European Union and Thailand. This agreement will have a major impact on sea fish processing and marketing companies, which are usually located in areas that are highly dependent on them. Thailand, for its part, is a highly competitive country with regard to processed products, particularly tuna. However, its social, economic and environmental standards do not meet European requirements. This unfair competition may have serious consequences for the European food processing sector.

1. Does the Commission intend to exclude canned tuna from the tariff liberalisation process?

2. In the agreement, will the Commission require the same conditions of Thai products as of European products and, therefore, include a chapter on compliance with international agreements on social, labour, governance and environmental issues?

3. Does the Commission intend to include a requirement for the application of European sanitary and phytosanitary measures to Thai products?

4. Does it plan to increase sanitary and phytosanitary controls on canned tuna from the abovementioned country?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**
*(2 December 2013)*

The European Commission is well aware of the importance of the EU seafood canning industry, in particular in the context of bilateral trade with a large player in the canned tuna sector such as Thailand. An ambitious and balanced free trade agreement (FTA) between the EU and Thailand, which takes into account the sensitive nature of the seafood canning industry (among others), will bring substantial benefits for the EU economy as a whole.

On tariff liberalisation, while it is too early to prejudge the outcome of the negotiations, the FTA will have to take into account the EU's sensitivities and Thailand's interest in market access for canned tuna. The EU fisheries sector has been given the opportunity, by means of a specific questionnaire, to provide the European Commission with information to enable it to establish priorities and take decisions throughout the negotiating process. The European Commission has taken good note of the industry input.

The FTA will include a separate chapter on the application of sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) matters, which will strengthen cooperation. Thailand has to continue to meeting the current high standards as set in EU legislation. The FTA will not lower these standards.

The Commission will also pursue robust provisions on trade and sustainable development, including commitments by Thailand to the International Labour Organisation core labour standards and conventions as well as multilateral environmental agreements.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011808/13**
**al Consiglio**
**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Reti di trasporti TEN-T, esclusione del porto di Brindisi

Entro la fine del 2013, il Parlamento europeo sarà chiamato a esprimersi sul regolamento sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti.

Da quanto risulta dai documenti disponibili sul sito e da quelli sinora pubblicati dalla regione Puglia, il testo del regolamento prevede finanziamenti per i porti di Bari e Taranto. Si evince invece che il porto di Brindisi ne sarà escluso.

Alla luce di ciò, può il Consiglio:

1. confermare che tale approdo è effettivamente escluso dal regolamento? In caso affermativo, può precisare le ragioni di tale esclusione e se esiste uno studio di settore che la giustifichi, visto che il porto di Brindisi è il secondo in Puglia per numero di passeggeri movimentati (oltre 530 000 l'anno)?

2. Far sapere se, stante l'esclusione del porto di Brindisi dall'allegato I, vol. 18, è possibile che la posizione assunta nel trilogo dello scorso 29 maggio 2013 sia riconsiderata, al fine di includere questo approdo pugliese nel progetto europeo TEN-T?

**Risposta**
*(16 dicembre 2013)*

Il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio hanno raggiunto un accordo politico sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti durante il trilogo conclusivo tenutosi il 29 maggio 2013.

Conformemente a tale accordo politico, il porto di Brindisi non è escluso dal succitato regolamento. Brindisi fa in effetti parte della rete globale e può pertanto beneficiare dei progetti di interesse comune nel quadro dei trasporti «autostrade del mare» con un porto centrale. Inoltre, sono disponibili strumenti finanziari anche per tutti i porti che si trovano nella rete globale.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011808/13**
**to the Council**
**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* TEN-T transport networks: port of Brindisi excluded

Parliament will be called upon to state its position on the regulation on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network by the end of 2013.

According to documents available on the site and those published to date by the Regional Government of Apulia, the regulation provides for funding for the ports of Bari and Taranto. It appears, however, that the port of Brindisi will be excluded.

1. Can the Council confirm that the latter port has indeed been excluded from the regulation? If so, can it state why it has been excluded and whether there is a sectoral study justifying this, given that the port of Brindisi is the second largest in Apulia in terms of passenger numbers (over 530 000 per year)?

2. Given that the port of Brindisi was excluded from Annex I Vol. 18, is it possible for the position taken in the trilogue on 29 May 2013 to be reconsidered so that this port in Apulia may be included in the EU TEN-T project?

**Reply**
*(16 December 2013)*

The European Parliament and the Council reached a political agreement on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the Trans-European Transport Network at a final trilogue which took place on 29 May 2013.

According to this political agreement, Brindisi is not excluded from the above Regulation. Indeed, Brindisi is part of the comprehensive network and is therefore eligible for projects of common interest under 'Motorways of the Sea' with a core port. Moreover, financial instruments are also available for all ports located on the comprehensive network.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-011809/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Jo Leinen (S&D)**
*(16. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Angekündigte Mitteilung über die Vollendung des Energiebinnenmarkts und die Rolle der Regierungen („Delivering the internal electricity market: making the best of public intervention")

In dieser Woche berichtete die deutsche Presse, die Kommission habe vor kurzem beschlossen, Schlüsseldaten zu Fördermitteln für fossile Energieträger und Atomenergie aus ihrer angekündigten Mitteilung zum Energiebinnenmarkt („Delivering the internal electricity market: making the best of public intervention") zu streichen.

Das Dokument soll den Mitgliedstaaten als Leitfaden für eine Energiepolitik dienen, die möglichst wenige Marktverzerrungen verursacht. Die ursprünglich enthaltenen Grafiken zu fossilen Energieträgern sowie zu Atomenergie und erneuerbaren Energien wurden als transparente und kohärente Informationen gewürdigt. Die Zuschüsse für die verschiedenen Energiequellen müssen mit dem übergeordneten Ziel einer Reduzierung der Emissionen von Treibhausgasen um 80-95 % bis 2050 im Vergleich zu 1990 vereinbar sein. Daher sind Zuschüsse für erneuerbare Energien vor dem Hintergrund der Verpflichtung der EU, den Energiebinnenmarkt zu vollenden und den Anteil erneuerbarer Energien bis 2020 auf 20 % und als „No-regrets-Option" darüber hinaus zu steigern, äußerst wichtig.

Die Kommission wird gebeten, die Beweggründe für die Streichung der oben genannten Angaben in der Endfassung des Dokuments zu erläutern.

**Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission**
*(13. November 2013)*

Die Kommission hat die feste Absicht, die Zahlen über die finanzielle Förderung von Energie für alle Technologien zu ermitteln und zu veröffentlichen. Eine solche umfassende Analyse ist derzeit nicht verfügbar. Die Bewertung der Förderkosten für die verschiedenen Stromerzeugungsarten ist komplex. Sie muss die Investitionen und die Betriebskosten, einschließlich der Netz- und der Regelenergiemarktkosten, und alle damit verbundenen externen Kosten wie Emissionen und Abfallentsorgung umfassen. Um die Kosten dieser verschiedenen Technologien zu reduzieren, verwenden die Mitgliedstaaten verschiedene staatliche Förderinstrumente wie Steuervergünstigungen, Gebühren und Abgaben, die vom Verbraucher zu tragen sind, sowie direkte Subventionen. Einige Formen dieser Förderung stellen staatliche Beihilfen im Sinne des EU-Rechts dar, andere nicht. Die OECD ([1]) und die IEA ([2]) haben Methoden entwickelt, um die Höhe der Subventionen für fossile Brennstoffe und erneuerbare Energien zu berechnen. Diese Studien sind jedoch nicht miteinander vergleichbar und nicht uneingeschränkt auf die Situation der Stromerzeugung in der EU anwendbar. Zu beachten ist zudem, dass sie nicht alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten und auch nicht alle einschlägigen subventionierten Technologien umfassen. Sie stellen daher alleine keine ausreichende Basis für die Formulierung der künftigen EU-Energiepolitik dar. Eine solche Grundlage benötigen wir jedoch. Die Kommission beabsichtigt daher, ihre eigene Analyse der Vergleichskosten für alle Technologien weiter voranzutreiben. In diesem Zusammenhang wird die Kommission ihre eigene vorläufige Analyse, die auf den derzeit vorliegenden Informationen beruht, in den bevorstehenden Bericht über die Energiepreistreiber aufnehmen. Eine eingehende Studie zu den vollständigen Kosten und Subventionen der verschiedenen Technologien im Stromsektor soll bis Juni nächsten Jahres vorliegen.

---

([1]) Siehe: http://www.oecd.org/site/tadffss/
Die Analyse umfasst direkte Transferleistungen aus dem öffentlichen Haushalt und Steuervergünstigungen, die der Gewinnung oder dem Verbrauch fossiler Brennstoffe zugutekommen oder diese bevorzugen. Darüber hinaus werden die Gesundheitssysteme in der EU durch externe Effekte konventioneller Brennstoffe (soziale Kosten und Gesundheitskosten) jährlich mit schätzungsweise 40 Mrd. EUR belastet.

([2]) International Energy Agency, 2012 World Energy Outlook
http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011809/13**
**to the Commission**
**Jo Leinen (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Upcoming communication: 'Delivering the internal electricity market: making the most of government intervention'

It was reported in the German press this week that the Commission had recently decided to remove key data on support measures for fossil fuels and nuclear energy from its upcoming communication, 'Delivering the internal electricity market: making the best of public intervention'.

This document aims to provide guidance to Member States on designing energy policies which keep market distortions to a minimum. The initial inclusion of the relevant figures for fossil fuels, nuclear, and renewable energy alike was appreciated as being transparent and coherent information. The subsidies for the different energy sources must be in line with the overall objective of achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions of 80-95% by 2050 as compared to 1990. Thus, support for renewable energy is crucial, given the EU's commitment to realising the internal energy market and increasing the share of renewable energy to 20% by 2020, and also beyond as a 'no regrets' option.

Can the Commission please explain the rationale for the decision not to include the above figures in the final document?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 November 2013)*

The Commission has the firm intention to establish the figures on financial support to energy across all technologies and to make them public. Such a comprehensive analysis is currently not available. The assessment of the costs of support for the various types electricity generation is complex. It must reflect investments and operating costs, including network and balancing costs and all related external costs such as emissions and waste disposal. To subsidise these costs, Member States use a number of different tools and instruments, including tax breaks, fees and levies added to consumer bills and direct subsidies. Some of these forms of support fall under the EC law definition of state aid whereas others do not. The OECD ([1]) and IEA ([2]) have developed methodologies to calculate the amount of subsidy for fossil fuels and renewables. However, these studies are not comparable and not fully applicable to the situation of electricity production in the EU. Importantly, they do not cover all EU Member States and they do not cover subsidies to all relevant technologies. As a result they do not in themselves provide a sufficient basis for the formulation of future EU energy policy. We do however need such a basis. The Commission therefore intends to deepen its own analysis of comparative costs across all technologies. In this context the Commission will integrate its own preliminary analysis based on currently available information in the upcoming report on drivers for energy prices. An in-depth study on full costs and subsidies of the various technologies in the electricity sector should be available by June 2014.

([1]) See http://www.oecd.org/site/tadffss/; the analysis covers direct budgetary transfers and tax expenditures that provide a benefit or preference for fossil-fuel production or consumption. Beyond this, externalities of conventional fuels in terms of their social and health costs have been estimated at an annual EUR40bn for the EU health systems.

([2]) International Energy Agency, 2012 World Energy Outlook http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-011810/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Matthias Groote (S&D)**
*(16. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Europäischer Mobilitätsausweis/Europäische Strategie zugunsten von Menschen mit Behinderungen 2010-2020

In der EU leben 83 Millionen Bürger mit einer Behinderung. Genauso wie nicht behinderte EU-Bürger haben sie gemäß Artikel 26 der Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union das Recht auf Freizügigkeit. Zwar gibt es in ihren Heimatländern eine Reihe von Leistungen für Menschen mit Behinderungen wie z. B. Fahrpreisermäßigungen, die ihre Mobilität und Inklusion in alle Bereiche des gesellschaftlichen, wirtschaftlichen und kulturellen Lebens erleichtern. Jedoch haben sie keinen Anspruch auf diese Leistungen bei Aufenthalten in einem anderen EU-Mitgliedstaat zum Zwecke der Arbeit, des Studiums usw. Dies stellt ein großes Hindernis für die uneingeschränkte Ausübung ihres Rechts auf Freizügigkeit dar.

Die gegenseitige Anerkennung von Behindertenausweisen und der damit verbundenen Ansprüche oder die Einführung eines mit bestimmten Rechten einhergehenden Europäischen Behindertenausweises wären geeignete Maßnahmen, um Abhilfe zu schaffen.

Der ursprüngliche Plan der Kommission zur Umsetzung der Europäischen Strategie zugunsten von Menschen mit Behinderungen 2010-2020 (KOM(2010)0636) enthielt den Aktionspunkt „Untersuchung der Auswirkungen einer gegenseitigen Anerkennung von Behindertenausweisen und damit verbundener Leistungsansprüche“ als Maßnahme zur Beseitigung der Hindernisse, denen Menschen mit Behinderungen bei der Wahrnehmung ihrer Rechte als Individuen, Studierende und Berufstätige begegnen.

Kann die Kommission vor dem Hintergrund dieser Ausführungen die beiden folgenden Fragen beantworten:

1. Was hat die Kommission unternommen, um den oben genannten Aktionspunkt (d. h. die Auswirkungen gegenseitig anerkannter Behindertenausweise zu untersuchen) in die Tat umzusetzen, und welche Ergebnisse sind dabei erzielt worden?

2. Wird die Kommission tätig werden, indem sie einen Vorschlag zur Einführung eines Europäischen Behindertenausweises vorlegt, und was wäre der Zeitrahmen für dessen Verwirklichung?

**Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission**
*(15. November 2013)*

Im Rahmen der Maßnahmen 2010-2015 ([1]) der Europäischen Strategie zugunsten von Menschen mit Behinderungen 2010-2020 ([2]) hat die Kommission das Akademische Netz europäischer Experten für Behindertenfragen (ANED) mit der Durchführung einer Studie über Leistungen und Vergünstigungen für Menschen mit Behinderungen in Europa beauftragt ([3]).

Anhand der Ergebnisse dieser Studie sowie einer weiteren Studie des Europäischen Behindertenforums (EDF) hat die Kommission gemeinsam mit den Vertretern der Mitgliedstaaten in der hochrangigen Gruppe für Behindertenfragen geprüft, wie ein allgemein anerkannter EU-Behindertenausweis eingeführt werden könnte. Die Kommission hat dieses Thema als eine der durchzuführenden Maßnahmen in ihrem Bericht über die Unionsbürgerschaft 2013 ([4]) verankert.

Dank des wachsenden Interesses der EU-Mitgliedstaaten konnte die Kommission eine Projektarbeitsgruppe ins Leben rufen, in der sich Vertreter interessierter Mitgliedstaaten und der Zivilgesellschaft mit den praktischen Fragen der Ausstellung und Verwaltung eines europäischen Musters für einen Behindertenausweis befassen. Diese Gruppe hat ihre Arbeit zwar erst aufgenommen, jedoch ist zu erwarten, dass ein solcher Ausweis Behinderten Vergünstigungen in den Bereichen Kultur, Freizeit, Sport, Verkehr und Tourismus bieten wird.

---

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT
([3]) http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Disability%20Benefits%20and%20Entitlements%20-%20Report%20-%20FINAL%20%282%29.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013eucitizenshipreport_de.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011810/13**
**to the Commission**
**Matthias Groote (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* European Mobility Card/ European Disability Strategy 2010-2020

There are 83 million EU citizens with some kind of disability. They are entitled to enjoy the right to freedom of movement, as recognised by Article 26 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, as much as non-disabled EU citizens. While in their home countries there are a number of benefits in place for people with disabilities, such as concessionary fares, which facilitate their mobility and inclusion in all areas of social, economic and cultural life. However, these benefits cannot be transferred when travelling to another EU Member State, in order to work or go to university or for other purposes. This is a serious obstacle to the full enjoyment of the right of freedom of movement.

The mutual recognition of disability cards and related entitlements, or the introduction of a European Disability Card with certain rights linked to it, would be appropriate measures to remedy this.

The Commission, in its initial plan to implement the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (COM(2010) 0636), included the action point 'Study the implications of a mutual recognition of disability cards and related entitlements' as a measure for removing the obstacles that people with disabilities face in exercising their rights as individuals, students and professionals.

In the light of these deliberations, I should like to ask two questions:

1. What has been done by the Commission to deliver on the action point mentioned above (i.e. to study the implications of mutually recognised disability cards), and what results have been achieved?

2. Will the Commission take action by introducing a proposal to create a European Disability Card, and what would be the timeframe for its realisation?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**
*(15 November 2013)*

As part of the actions for 2010-2015 ([1]) of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([2]) the European Academic Network of Experts in Disability (ANED) was tasked by the Commission to do a study on 'Disability Benefits and Entitlements in European Countries' ([3]).

The findings of this study and of a further study by the European Disability Forum (EDF) have enabled the Commission to examine together with the representatives from the Member States in the High Level Group on Disability how a mutually recognised EU disability card could be introduced. As a result this has become one of the actions included by the Commission in its EU Citizenship report 2013 ([4]).

The growing interest of EU Member States has enabled the Commission to initiate a project working group where representatives of interested Member States and civil society are dealing with practical details of issuing and managing a European model disability card. This group is still in the early stages of its work but the expectation is that the card to be developed is likely to grant benefits in the areas of culture, leisure, sport, transport and tourism.

---

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT
([3]) http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Disability%20Benefits%20and%20Entitlements%20-%20Report%20-%20FINAL%20%282%29.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013eucitizenshipreport_en.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011811/13**
**to the Commission**
**Rebecca Taylor (ALDE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Implementation of the Habitats Directive by the UK

In response to my Question E-009556/12 concerning implementation of the Birds Directive and Habitats Directive in the United Kingdom, and the severe degradation of protected blanket bog habitats on Walshaw Moor in the South Pennines, the Commission advised that it had not yet had an opportunity to assess the complaint made.

Can the Commission now confirm whether it has assessed the complaint and state whether or not the competent authorities in the UK are fulfilling their obligations to avoid the deterioration of natural habitats and habitats of protected species under Article 6(2) of the Habitats Directive?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 November 2013)*

The Commission has received two complaints — one in October 2012 and another in January 2013 — regarding the management of Walshaw Moor and in particular the issue of the burning of blanket bog habitats. The Commission has in consequence started an EU Pilot investigation and has contacted the UK-authorities on their views of the problems outlined. An answer has been received and the Commission has informed the complainants about the main elements of the answer of the UK in order for them to provide additional comments. So far such comments have been received only from one of the two complainants. Once all the necessary information is collected, the Commission will finalise its assessment and take appropriate action should its investigation lead to an assessment that UK is in breach of EU legislation.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011813/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(16. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Neue Verschlüsselungsstandards nach NSA-Enthüllungen

Neue Enthüllungen des Whistleblowers Edward Snowden machen deutlich, dass die U.S.-amerikanische National Security Agency (NSA) sowie der britische Geheimdienst Government Communication Headquarters (GCHQ) seit mindestens zehn Jahren gezielt Internet-Verschlüsselungsstandards untergraben. Dieses nach Informationen der britischen Tageszeitung „The Guardian" allein im Jahr 2013 mit 254,9 Millionen US-Dollar geförderte Programm soll den Geheimdiensten die Möglichkeit geben, den gesamten Internetverkehr nahezu in Echtzeit zu verfolgen. Gleichzeitig unterminiert dieses Programm aber die grundlegenden Sicherheitsstrukturen des Internet — vermeintlich verschlüsselte Daten von Privatleuten, Unternehmen, Militär und Regierungseinrichtungen sind gleichermaßen angreifbar und sollten als unsicher angesehen werden, wenn britische oder U.S.-amerikanische Unternehmen oder Regierungseinrichtungen an der Definition der bei der Übertragung und Speicherung verwendeten Verschlüsselungsstandards beteiligt waren.

1. Ist die Kommission derzeit an der Definition von wesentlichen Internet-Verschlüsselungsstandards beteiligt?

2. Wird die Kommission Initiativen vorschlagen, um neue sichere Verschlüsselungsstandards zu definieren, die zum Beispiel bestehende Systeme wie das „Secure Hypertext Transfer Protocol", Sicherheitselemente bestehender „Voice over IP"-Standards und des „Secure Sockets Layer" ersetzen können?

3. Welche Initiativen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um von den britischen und amerikanischen Geheimdiensten unterminierte Sicherheitsstandards zu ändern oder zu ersetzen?

4. Wenn die Kommission solche Initiativen vorschlägt oder an solchen Initiativen bereits beteiligt ist: Wie wird sichergestellt, dass insbesondere die U.S.-Geheimdienste nicht erneut Einfluss darauf gewinnen?

5. Über wie viele fest angestellte Experten für Sicherheits- und Verschlüsselungsstandards verfügt die Kommission?

**Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission**
*(9. Dezember 2013)*

Die Kommission ist derzeit nicht an der Festlegung von Internet-Verschlüsselungsstandards beteiligt und beabsichtigt auch in Zukunft nicht, Verschlüsselungsstandards zu definieren, zu ändern oder zu ersetzen. Die Festlegung von Standards ist in erster Linie ein marktgesteuerter Vorgang. Spezifische von der Kommission definierte oder unterstützte Verschlüsselungsstandards würden vielleicht nicht verabschiedet, und bei verbindlich vorgeschriebenen Standards bestünde die Gefahr, dass sie angesichts des raschen technologischen Wandels bald überholt wären.

Damit eine durchgängige Sicherheit — auch in Bezug auf den Schutz der Daten — gegeben ist, müssen die Endnutzer selbst ein angemessene Risikomanagement betreiben und auf sichere IKT-Lösungen zurückgreifen. Die Kommission bemüht sich mit einer Kombination von rechtlichen Maßnahmen, operativen Empfehlungen und Forschungs- und Innovationsförderung um eine höhere Cybersicherheit in Europa. Sie hat insbesondere einen Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie ([1]) vorgelegt, mit der öffentliche Verwaltungen und wichtige Marktakteure verpflichtet würden, Risikomanagementverfahren anzuwenden. Die Durchführung dieser Richtlinie soll durch eine öffentlich-private Plattform ([2]) unterstützt werden, die empfehlenswerte Verfahren im Bereich der Sicherheit von Datennetzen ermittelt, deren Übernahme erleichtert und den künftigen Forschungs- und Technologiebedarf für sichere IKT bestimmt. Die Kommission hat mit dem 7. Rahmenprogramm die europäische Verschlüsselungsforschung großzügig gefördert und wird auch im Rahmen von „Horizont 2020" Mittel dafür bereitstellen. Die Projekte müssen sich mit den wichtigsten Herausforderungen für die fortlaufende Sicherheit der Anwendungen auseinandersetzen, die auf Verschlüsselung zurückgreifen, und mit der Leistungssteigerung bei den IKT Schritt halten.

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-009773/2013 ([3]).

([1]) KOM(2013)48.
([2]) https://resilience.enisa.europa.eu/nis-platform
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011813/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* New encryption standards following the NSA revelations

New revelations by the whistle-blower Edward Snowden make it clear that the US National Security Agency (NSA) and the United Kingdom intelligence agency, the Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ), have been directly undermining Internet encryption standards for at least 10 years. This programme, which, according to the UK daily newspaper *The Guardian*, was funded by USD 254.9 million in 2013 alone, is intended to enable the intelligence agencies to monitor traffic on the entire Internet virtually in real time. At the same time, however, this programme undermines the basic security structures of the Internet — deliberately encrypted data belonging to individuals, companies, the military and governmental institutions are equally vulnerable and should be regarded as unsecure if UK or US companies or governmental institutions were involved in defining the encryption standards used for transmission and storage.

1. Is the Commission currently involved in defining essential Internet encryption standards?

2. Will it propose initiatives to define new secure encryption standards that, for example, will be able to replace existing systems such as Secure Hypertext Transfer Protocol, security elements of existing Voice over IP standards and the Secure Sockets Layer?

3. What initiatives will the Commission take in order to change or replace the security standards undermined by the UK and US intelligence agencies?

4. If it proposes such initiatives or is already involved in such initiatives, how will it be ensured that the US intelligence agencies in particular do not gain influence over these once again?

5. How many experts in security and encryption standards are permanently employed by the Commission?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 December 2013)*

The Commission is currently not involved in defining Internet encryption standards and does not plan to define, change, or replace encryption standards in the future. Standardisation is primarily a market-driven process. Specific encryption standards defined or supported by the Commission may not be adopted, while mandated standards would run the risk of becoming obsolete in view of rapid technological change.

To ensure end-to-end security, including data confidentiality, end-users need to implement proper risk management and adopt secure ICT solutions. The Commission has adopted a combination of legal action, operational recommendations and research and innovation funding to increase the level of cybersecurity in Europe. In particular, the Commission has made a proposal for a directive ([1]), which would require public administrations and key market operators to adopt risk management practices. This directive is underpinned by a public-private platform ([2]), which aims to identify and facilitate the up-take of good cybersecurity practices and identify future research and technological needs in the field of secure ICT. The Commission has extensively funded European encryption research in the 7th Framework Programme and will continue to fund it in Horizon 2020. Projects will have to address the key challenges to guarantee permanent security of the applications supported by encryption and keep pace with the performance increase of ICT technology.

The Commission further refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-009773/2013 ([3]).

([1]) COM(2013) 48.
([2]) https://resilience.enisa.europa.eu/nis-platform.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011868/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(17 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Ayuda europea en Palestina

Según el Tribunal de Cuentas Europeo, millones de euros de la UE destinados a ayuda en Palestina fueron derrochados o perdidos por la corrupción
(http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world_news/Middle_East/article1326858.ece).
Los investigadores europeos, que visitaron campamentos en Jerusalén y Gaza, notaron una escasez significativa de recursos. Los auditores se quejaron de las pocas medidas de control de los recursos europeos, dado el elevado riesgo de corrupción en la zona.

¿Está al corriente la Comisión de estos hechos?

¿Qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión para que hechos parecidos no se repitan en el futuro y para asegurar que los recursos económicos europeos destinados a ayuda humanitaria se utilicen para este fin?

**Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión**
*(5 de diciembre de 2013)*

El Tribunal todavía no ha hecho pública la auditoría de la gestión a que parece aludir Su Señoría.

Por lo tanto, la Comisión no hará ningún comentario al respecto hasta su publicación, prevista para finales de 2013.

Se remite a Su Señoría a las respuestas de la Comisión a las preguntas escritas P-11738/2013 y P-11858/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011818/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Auke Zijlstra (NI) en Lucas Hartong (NI)**
*(16 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* EUR 2,3 miljard van EU aan Palestijnen zoek

In het Britse blad The Sunday Times, van 13 oktober jl., wordt melding gemaakt van een ongepubliceerd rapport van de Europese Rekenkamer. In het rapport wordt ingegaan op het gebrek aan toezicht op de besteding van Europese hulpfondsen aan de „Palestijnse autoriteiten". Daardoor is het zicht op de besteding van EUR 2 300 000 000 aan hulpfondsen, die de EU tussen 2008 en 2012 aan de zogenaamde „bezette gebieden" heeft overgemaakt, verdwenen.

Op 20 september 2012 heeft de heer Zijlstra, MEP, vragen gesteld aan de Commissie over de besteding van gelden die door de EU aan de Palestijnse Autoriteit worden overgemaakt (E-008299/2012). Hij uitte daarbij zijn zorg dat deze gelden werden aangewend om terroristen die in Israëlische gevangenissen zijn opgesloten duizenden dollars per maand te betalen. De Commissie heeft in zijn antwoord aan de heer Zijlstra medegedeeld dat, van de door de Europese burgers aan de Palestijnse autoriteit betaalde belastingmiddelen, niets bij de veroordeelde terroristen terechtkomt.

1. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat de Europese Rekenkamer een rapport heeft uitgegeven waarin kritiek wordt geleverd op de controle van de EU, of liever gezegd het gebrek hiervan, over de wijze waarop Europees belastinggeld is besteed dat aan de „Palestijnse autoriteit" is overgemaakt?

2. Zo ja, komt dan het antwoord dat de Commissie heeft gegeven aan MEP Zijlstra, in een ander licht te staan?

3. Blijft de Commissie er in het licht van de bevindingen van de Europese Rekenkamer nog steeds aan vasthouden dat er geen cent aan EU-belastinggeld terechtkomt bij Palestijnse terroristen?

4. Zo ja, waar baseert de Commissie dit standpunt op? Graag een gedetailleerde toelichting met ondersteunend bewijsmateriaal.

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011826/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Peter van Dalen (ECR)**
*(16 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Besteding Europese hulpfondsen in Palestijnse gebieden

De Sunday Times berichtte op 13 oktober dat de Europese Rekenkamer in een nieuw onderzoeksrapport concludeert dat de EU hulpgelden aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten mogelijk niet correct zijn besteed. Tussen 2008 en 2012 heeft de EU voor 1,95 miljard euro steun gegeven aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten. EU onderzoekers zouden bij de controle op de besteding van dit geld significante tekortkomingen hebben geconstateerd. Er is onvoldoende controle geweest of het geld niet verkeerd is uitgegeven, verspild en/of verduisterd.

1. Heeft de Europese Commissie kennis genomen van het artikel in de Sunday Times van 13 oktober over de controle op EU-helpgelden aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten?

2. Deelt de Commissie de conclusie van de Europese Rekenkamer dat de hulpgelden aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten niet correct verantwoord kunnen worden? Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Hoe groot is het bedrag aan EU-hulpgelden precies dat tussen 2008 en 2012 door de EU is uitgekeerd aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten en niet voldoende verantwoord kan worden?

4. Zal de Europese Commissie dit geld terugvorderen van de Palestijnse Autoriteiten? Zo nee, waarom niet?

5. Hoe gaat de Europese Commissie de controle op de besteding van EU gelden in de Palestijnse gebieden in de toekomst verbeteren?

6. Kan de Europese Commissie mij er nogmaals van verzekeren dat EU hulpgelden niet terecht komen bij (leden van) organisaties die op de Europese lijst van terroristische organisaties staan.

**Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie**
*(5 december 2013)*

De prestatie-audit waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid lijkt te verwijzen, is nog niet door de Rekenkamer gepubliceerd.

De Commissie kan derhalve geen opmerkingen maken, tot dit verslag naar verwachting tegen het einde van 2013 is gepubliceerd.

Verder verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoorden op de schriftelijke vragen P-11738/2013 en P-11858/2013 ([1]).

---

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011818/13**
**to the Commission**
**Auke Zijlstra (NI) and Lucas Hartong (NI)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* EUR 2.3 billion of EU aid to Palestinians missing

The edition of the UK newspaper *The Sunday Times* published on 13 October last mentions an unpublished report from the Court of Auditors. The report describes the lack of supervision with regard to the spending of the European aid funds given to the 'Palestinian Authority'. This has resulted in failure to keep an eye on the spending of EUR 2.3 billion in aid which the EU paid to the so-called 'occupied territories' between 2008 and 2012.

On 20 September 2012 the MEP Mr Zijlstra submitted questions to the Commission about the spending of the funds paid by the EU to the Palestinian Authority (E-008299/2012). He expressed his concern that this money was being used to pay thousands of dollars a month to terrorists locked up in Israeli prisons. The Commission stated in its answer to Mr Zijlstra that none of the funds paid by European taxpayers to the Palestinian Authority go to the convicted terrorists.

1. Can the Commission confirm that the Court of Auditors has published a report containing criticism about the EU's management, or rather lack of it, in terms of the way in which European taxpayers' money paid to the 'Palestinian Authority' is spent?

2. If so, does this cast in a different light the answer which the Commission gave to Mr Zijlstra?

3. In light of the Court of Auditors' findings, does the Commission still stand by its statement that not a penny of EU taxpayers' money goes to Palestinian terrorists?

4. If so, on what does the Commission base this view? Would it please provide a detailed explanation with supporting evidence?

**Question for written answer E-011826/13**
**to the Commission**
**Peter van Dalen (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Spending of European aid funds in the Palestinian territories

*The Sunday Times* reported on 13 October that the Court of Auditors concluded in a recent investigation report that the EU aid funds given to the Palestinian Authority may not be being spent properly. The Palestinian Authority has been given EUR 1.95 billion in support from the EU between 2008 and 2012. EU investigators were reported to have identified significant shortcomings in the management of how this money was spent. There has been inadequate monitoring to see whether the money has been misspent, wasted and/or misappropriated.

1. Is the Commission aware of the article which appeared in *The Sunday Times* on 13 October about the management of the EU aid funds given to the Palestinian Authority?

2. Does the Commission agree with the conclusion of the Court of Auditors that the aid funds given to the Palestinian Authority may not be properly accounted for? If not, why not?

3. What is the exact amount of EU aid funds which have been paid to the Palestinian Authority by the EU between 2008 and 2012 and may not have been sufficiently accounted for?

4. Will the Commission recover this money from the Palestinian Authority? If not, why not?

5. How will the Commission improve, in future, its management of how EU funds are spent in the Palestinian territories?

6. Can the Commission give me the reassurance that EU aid funds are not going to (members of) organisations featuring on the European list of terrorist organisations?

**Question for written answer E-011868/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* European aid to Palestine

According to the European Court of Auditors, millions of euros of EU aid to Palestine have been squandered or lost through corruption (http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world_news/Middle_East/article1326858.ece). EU investigators who visited sites in Jerusalem and Gaza noted a significant shortage of resources. The auditors complained of the lack of measures to control European resources, given the high risk of corruption in the area.

Is the Commission aware of these facts?

What steps will the Commission take to ensure that similar events do not recur in future and that European economic resources intended for humanitarian aid are used for this purpose?

**Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

The Performance Audit which the Honourable Member appears to allude to has not yet been published by the Court.

The Commission has therefore no comments to make until such time as it has been published, estimated to be by the end of 2013.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions P-11738/2013 and P-11858/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011819/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**
*(16 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Possibile violazione della direttiva «Habitat» 92/43/CEE in relazione alla realizzazione del «Passante Nord» (Traforo delle Torricelle) nel Comune di Verona

Nel territorio del Comune di Verona verrà realizzata un'opera denominata «Passante Nord», collegamento autostradale di circa 13 km, volto a completare l'anello circonvallatorio a nord della città e a collegare il casello di Verona Est con quello di Verona Nord, ubicati rispettivamente lungo le autostrade A4 e A22; il progetto prevede, in particolare, la realizzazione di due gallerie (una per senso di marcia) al fine di consentire l'attraversamento dell'area collinare detta «Le Torricelle» . L'infrastruttura verrà realizzata in regime di project financing da un'ATI (Associazione Temporanea di Imprese) che collaborerà, tra le altre, con Impresa Costruzioni Mantovani S.p.A., recentemente coinvolta in due procedimenti penali paralleli, uno dei quali in merito all'operato del Consorzio Venezia Nuova (concessionario per la realizzazione del progetto MOSE per la salvaguardia di Venezia e della sua laguna dalle acque alte) del quale tale società fa parte. La realizzazione del complesso infrastrutturale è strenuamente avversata da buona parte della cittadinanza costituitasi in un comitato, la quale ritiene l'opera costosa, inutile al fine di risolvere il problema del traffico urbano e approvata in violazione di quanto previsto dalla direttiva «Habitat» 92/43/CEE. Il progetto, infatti, prevede la costruzione di due ponti sul fiume Adige all'interno dell'area SIC (Sito di Interesse Comunitario) IT3210043 «Fiume Adige tra Belluno Veronese e Verona Ovest»; parte del tracciato tanto a cielo aperto quanto in galleria, inoltre, si snoderà poco lontano dal SIC IT3210012 «Val Galina e Progno Borago». In ragione di ciò, si è resa necessaria la stesura di una VINCA (Valutazione di incidenza ambientale) ai sensi dell'articolo 6 della direttiva «Habitat», conclusasi con l'assenza di conseguenze negative per l'area. I membri del succitato comitato, tuttavia, contestano il mancato ricorso a un gruppo interdisciplinare di professionisti e la mancanza di comprovata e documentata competenza da parte dell'unico autore dell'elaborato e ritengono inoltre il documento superficiale, errato e lacunoso in molti suoi punti, laddove, a esempio, omette di indicare molte delle specie di uccelli anche prioritarie presenti, con conseguente mancata rappresentazione della peculiare varietà ornitica della zona fluviale in questione.

Tutto ciò premesso, la Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza di detto progetto?

2. non ritiene opportuno contattare le autorità locali al fine di verificare il rispetto della direttiva «Habitat»?

**Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**
*(6 dicembre 2013)*

La Commissione non era a conoscenza del progetto cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato.

Se esiste la possibilità che il progetto determini effetti negativi sui siti Natura 2000, deve essere sottoposto ad una valutazione adeguata a norma dell'articolo 6 della direttiva habitat ([1]). La qualità di tale valutazione costituisce in primo luogo una responsabilità dei promotori ma anche delle autorità nazionali competenti.

È di competenza dell'Italia garantire la corretta applicazione sul proprio territorio della normativa UE in materia di ambiente. Se la Commissione dovesse ricevere prove in merito ad una possibile violazione del diritto UE, contatterà le autorità italiane per chiarire la conformità alla normativa pertinente.

Per quanto riguarda gli eventuali reati imputabili alle società responsabili dei lavori, sono di competenza esclusiva delle autorità nazionali.

([1]) Direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio, del 21 maggio 1992, relativa alla conservazione degli habitat naturali e seminaturali e della flora e della fauna selvatiche. GU L 206 del 22.7.1992, pag. 1.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011819/13**
**to the Commission**
**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Possible infringement of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) in relation to construction of the north link road ('Traforo delle Torricelle') in the municipality of Verona

A 'north link road' is to be built in the municipality of Verona. This motorway link, around 13 km long, will complete the ring road to the north of the city and connect the Verona Est and Verona Nord toll stations, located respectively on the A4 and A22 motorways. In particular, the project envisages the construction of two tunnels (one for each direction) to provide a means of crossing the hilly area known as 'Le Torricelle'. The infrastructure will be built under a project-financing system by a temporary joint venture which will collaborate with Impresa Costruzioni Mantovani S.p.A, among others. The latter company was recently involved in two parallel criminal prosecutions, one of which concerned the actions of Consorzio Venezia Nuova (licensee for the execution of the MOSE project to protect Venice and its lagoon from high tides), of which it is a member. Construction of the infrastructure complex is strenuously opposed by many local inhabitants who have formed a committee which judges the project costly, ineffective in resolving the problem of urban traffic, and approved in breach of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). The project envisages the construction of two bridges over the Adige river within SCI (site of Community interest) IT3210043 ('Adige river between Belluno Veronese and Verona Ovest'). Furthermore, part of the route (both open-air and in a tunnel) will run near SCI IT3210012 ('Val Galina and Progno Borago'). It was therefore necessary to carry out an environmental impact assessment (EIA) pursuant to Article 6 of the Habitats Directive, which found no negative consequences for the area. The members of the above committee, however, are challenging the failure to use an interdisciplinary panel of professionals and the lack of proven and documented expertise on the part of the sole author of the report. They also find the document to be superficial, incorrect and sketchy on many points. It omits, for example, to mention many of the species of birds present, including priority species, and consequently fails to describe the characteristic variety of birds in the river area in question.

1. Is the Commission aware of this project?

2. Should the Commission not contact the local authorities to verify compliance with the Habitats Directive?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**
*(6 December 2013)*

The Commission was not aware of the project mentioned by the Honourable Member.

If the project is likely to have adverse effects on Natura 2000 sites, it must be subject to an appropriate assessment according to Art. 6 of the Habitats Directive ([1]). The quality of such an assessment is primarily a responsibility of the developers but also of the national competent authorities.

It is for Italy to ensure correct application of EU environmental legislation on its territory. If the Commission receives evidence of a possible breach of EC law, it will contact the Italian authorities to clarify compliance with the relevant legislation.

As regards the criminal allegations concerning the companies in charge of the works, these fall under the exclusive competence of national authorities.

([1]) Council Directive 92/43//EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. OJ L 206, 22.7.1992 .

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011821/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders (REMO) — Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 (Maintenance Regulation 4/2009)

What is the Commission doing to ensure that Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 (Maintenance Regulation) is being properly and effectively enforced in all Member States?

Are there plans to review how the reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders (REMO) is working across the EU, given the findings of the Heidelberg Conference in March 2013 which reported problems in practice and jurisprudence and a need for further education and training?

What is the average time for applications for alimony made under REMO rules to be finalised? Would the Commission consider it to be unacceptable that a claim, of which I am aware, has already taken two years and seven months and has not yet been finalised?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 November 2013)*

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that it ensures that Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 ([1]) is being properly and effectively enforced in all Member States, in various ways. First, the Commission can take action under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Furthermore, it monitors Member States' implementation of the regulation in the European Judicial Network in Civil and Commercial Matters and regularly meets the Central Authorities of the Member States under the regulation. In addition, the Commission co-finances projects aimed at raising awareness of how to apply the regulation properly, such as the Heidelberg Conference of March 2013.

According to the information of the Commission, the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders (REMO) designates a specific two-way arrangement by which United-Kingdom maintenance orders can be enforced in other countries and foreign maintenance orders likewise can be enforced in the United Kingdom. The regulation specifically requires the Commission to include an evaluation of the functioning of the procedure for recognition, declaration of enforceability and enforcement applicable under the regulation in other Member States to decisions given in the UK, in its report on the application of the regulation.

As the REMO rules form part of a UK-specific scheme, the Commission does not have the information requested by the Honourable Member. However, the report on the application of the regulation will include all relevant statistics that will be requested in due time by the Commission for its delivery due by mid-June 2016. The Commission makes every endeavour to prevent a situation such as that described in the question from arising.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and cooperation in matters relating to maintenance obligations, the mechanisms for the recovery of maintenance in another Member State, OJ L 7, 10.1.2009, p. 1.

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011822/13**
**do Komisji**
**Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)**
*(16 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Sytuacja Cyganów w Szwecji

Narastające w Europie nastroje antyimigranckie i nacjonalistyczne budzą coraz większy niepokój. Z praktykami przejawiającymi taki charakter spotkać można się na poziomie ustawodawstwa krajowego, administracji państwowej czy różnorodnych działań prowadzonych przez służby publiczne w państwach członkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Przykładem mogą być ujawnione w Szwecji, a prowadzone przez policję rejestry kryminalistów, do których wpisano wszystkich Cyganów mieszkających na terenie południowej Szwecji, niezależnie od ich statusu prawnego. W rejestrze tym prócz danych osobowych Cyganów były również informacje o powiązaniach rodzinnych, dochodach, pracy, sytuacji mieszkaniowej, znajomych itp. Argumentowano, że rejestr powstał ze względów bezpieczeństwa. Istnieje jednak podejrzenie, że jego prowadzenie mogło mieć podłoże ksenofobiczne i rasistowskie.

Czy Komisja Europejska otrzymała sygnały o tych praktykach, a jeżeli tak to czy bada tą sprawę i rozważa podjęcie kroków prawnych mających na celu ochronę praw i wolności zagwarantowanych Traktatem?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji**
*(8 stycznia 2014 r.)*

Niektóre informacje podane w prasie wskazują, że rejestr Romów, w tym wielu nieletnich, został stworzony przez szwedzką policję w celach, które nie były tylko związane z działalnością przestępczą.

Zgodnie z dostępnymi informacjami, rejestr wiąże się z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych. Przetwarzanie danych osobowych przez właściwe organy państwowe w obszarze prawa karnego nie wchodzi w zakres dyrektywy o ochronie danych ([1]). Jest jednak ono objęte zakresem dyrektywy zaproponowanej przez Komisję w styczniu 2012 r. jako część pakietu reformy ochrony danych ([2]).

W odniesieniu do przetwarzania danych osobowych do celów innych niż te, które dotyczą prawa karnego, bez uszczerbku dla kompetencji Komisji jako strażnika traktatów, nadzór i egzekwowanie przepisów o ochronie danych leży w kompetencji władz nadzorujących ochronę danych i sądów. W tym względzie Komisja podkreśla, że na mocy art. 8 dyrektywy o ochronie danych przetwarzanie danych osobowych ujawniających rasę lub pochodzenie etniczne jest zasadniczo zabronione. Ograniczoną liczbę wyjątków od tego zakazu przewidziano w dyrektywie.

Komisja będzie w dalszym ciągu monitorować sytuację w szczególności w odniesieniu do działań, które mogą zostać podjęte przez właściwe władze szwedzkie w celu zapewnienia zgodności z przepisami o ochronie danych.

---

([1]) Dyrektywa 95/46/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 24 października 1995 r. w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w zakresie przetwarzania danych osobowych i swobodnego przepływu tych danych, Dz.U. L 281 z 23.11.1995, s. 31-50.

([2]) Wniosek dotyczący dyrektywy Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w związku z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych przez właściwe organy do celów zapobiegania przestępstwom, prowadzenia dochodzeń w ich sprawie, wykrywania ich i ścigania albo wykonywania kar kryminalnych oraz swobodnego przepływu takich danych (COM(2012)0010).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011822/13**
**to the Commission**
**Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Situation of the Roma in Sweden

The rising tide of anti-immigrant and nationalist feeling in Europe is becoming an increasing concern, with practices influenced by such attitudes enshrined in national legislation, state administrative structures and various measures implemented by the public authorities in the EU Member States. The recently uncovered criminal register kept by the Swedish police, which contains information on all Roma living in southern Sweden regardless of their legal status, is a good example of this phenomenon. It is not only personal data about Roma which is kept on this register, but also information about family ties, income, employment, living situation, friends etc. It has been argued that this register arose on the basis of security concerns, but there are grounds for suspecting that the motives behind its creation may have been rooted in xenophobia and racism.

Has the Commission been informed about this and similar practices? If so, has it examined the issue, and it is considering taking any legal steps aimed at protecting the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**
*(8 January 2014)*

Some information reported by the press suggests that registers of Roma people, including many minors, have been set up by the Swedish police for purposes that were not only related to criminal activities.

According to the available information, the register involves the processing of personal data. Processing of personal data by competent State authorities in areas of criminal law does not fall within the scope of the Data Protection Directive ([1]). It is however covered by the scope of the directive proposed by the Commission in January 2012 as a part of the data protection reform package ([2]).

With regard to the processing of personal data for purposes other than those which concern criminal law, without prejudice to the competence of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation falls within the competence of the data protection supervisory authorities and courts. In this respect, the Commission underlines that under Article 8 of the Data Protection Directive the processing of personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin is generally prohibited. A limited number of exemptions from this prohibition have been foreseen in the directive.

The Commission will continue to monitor the situation in particular with regard to any steps that might be taken by the competent Swedish authorities to ensure compliance with the data protection rules.

---

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31-50.

([2]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data (COM(2012) 0010).

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011823/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)**
*(16 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Επιβάρυνση κρατικού προϋπολογισμού από το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ

Το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ έπληξε τους δημοκρατικούς κανόνες και το δικαίωμα της πληροφόρησης. Το κύριο επιχείρημα της κυβέρνησης ήταν η μείωση του κόστους λειτουργίας και η εξυγίανση των οικονομικών της. Φαίνεται όμως, ότι με το κλείσιμο, εκτός από τα σοβαρά νομικά και κοινωνικά προβλήματα που δημιουργούνται, προκαλείται και μεγάλη επιβάρυνση του κρατικού προϋπολογισμού. Μέχρι το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ, το κόστος λειτουργίας της καλύπτονταν από τις συνεισφορές των πολιτών, μέσω του λογαριασμού του ηλεκτρικού. Μάλιστα, τα τελευταία χρόνια η ΕΡΤ συνεισέφερε ποσό 80 000 000 ευρώ στον κρατικό προϋπολογισμό. Όμως, από το κλείσιμο μέχρι σήμερα, σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα, ο κρατικός προϋπολογισμός έχει επιβαρυνθεί με πάνω από 25 000 000 ευρώ, ενώ υπολογίζεται ότι το κόστος θα ανέλθει στα 100-125 000 000 ευρώ μέχρι την έναρξη λειτουργίας της ΝΕΡΙΤ. Να σημειωθεί επίσης ότι η νέα «Δ.Τ» δεν έχει ακόμα νομικό πρόσωπο, Αριθμό Φορολογικού Μητρώου, κανονισμό λειτουργίας, καθώς και εγκεκριμένο από το Εθνικό Συμβούλιο Ραδιοτηλεόρασης τηλεοπτικό και ραδιοφωνικό πρόγραμμα.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

— ο εκπρόσωπός της στην τρόικα έχει στοιχεία για το ύψος της συνολικής επιβάρυνσης του κρατικού προϋπολογισμού από το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ και την δημιουργία της νέας «Δ.Τ»; Σε μια εποχή βίαιων περικοπών σε εισοδήματα, συντάξεις, δημόσια υγεία και κοινωνικές πολιτικές είναι αποδεκτή η επιβάρυνση του κρατικού προϋπολογισμού κατά 100-125 000 000, λόγω άστοχων ενεργειών της κυβέρνησης;

— ενόψει της ελληνικής προεδρίας της ΕΕ αλλά και των ευρωεκλογών 2014, είναι αποδεκτό να μην λειτουργεί δημόσια τηλεόραση και ραδιοφωνία; Τι μέτρα σκοπεύει να πάρει για να μην συμβεί αυτό αλλά και να τηρήσει η ελληνική κυβέρνηση τις υποχρεώσεις της ([1]) ([2]) που προκύπτουν από την Ευρωπαϊκή Χάρτα για την Ελευθερία στα ΜΜΕ ([3]) και το Πρωτόκολλο του Άμστερνταμ ([4]);

— πώς αντιμετωπίζει το γεγονός ότι μήνες μετά το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ, δεν έχει γίνει σοβαρή συζήτηση με τους εργαζόμενους, τα πολιτικά κόμματα και την κοινωνία των πολιτών για να διαμορφωθεί δημόσια ραδιοτηλεόραση με πλουραλιστική κι αξιόπιστη λειτουργία;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(5 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η ΕΡΤ ήταν ζημιογόνος το 2012 και η νέα εταιρεία αναμένεται να αποβεί επικερδής κατά 100 εκατ. ευρώ ήδη το 2014. Η δημιουργία κερδών στον νέα εταιρεία θα προκύπτει κατά κύριο λόγο από τη μείωση των δαπανών προσωπικού. Συνεπώς το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ δεν συνιστά κατά κανένα τρόπο επιβάρυνση για το ελληνικό κράτος.

Η Επιτροπή έχει ήδη εκφράσει τις απόψεις της σχετικά με το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ από την άποψη της ελευθερίας της έκφρασης και της πληροφόρησης. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το αξιότιμο μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στη δήλωσή της της 12ης Ιουνίου (MEMO/13/545), στις απαντήσεις της στις κοινοβουλευτικές ερωτήσεις O-69/13, E-6815/2013· E-6912/2013· E-6826/2013· E-6920/2013· E-6924/2013· E-6955/2013· E-6986/2013· E-7171/2013· E-7241/2013 ([5]), και στη συζήτησή της 3ης Ιουλίου 2013 στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

([1]) http://www3.ebu.ch/files/live/sites/ebu/files/Knowledge/Initiatives%20-%20Policy/Topical%20Issues/Funding/27%2010%202009%20Communication%20from%20the%20Commission%20on%20the%20application%20of%20State%20aid%20rules%20to%20public%20service%20broadcasting.pdf
([2]) http://www3.ebu.ch/files/live/sites/ebu/files/Knowledge/Initiatives%20-%20Policy/Topical%20Issues/Media%20Freedom%20and%20Media%20Pluralism/EC%20Consultation_MFMP%20Regulatory%20Bodies_EBU%20response.pdf
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A7-2013-0117&language=EN
([4]) http://www.pressfreedom.eu/en/index.php
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/el/parliamentary-questions.html

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011823/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Burdens on the state budget resulting from the ERT closure

ERT's closure was a blow to democratic principles and the right to information. The Government's main argument was the need to reduce operating costs and bring finances under control. However, apart from creating serious legal and social problems, it is clear that the closure has placed a major burden on the state budget. Prior to the closure, ERT's operating costs were covered by citizens' contributions through electricity bills. Additionally, ERT has contributed EUR 80 million to the state budget over recent years. However, since the closure, the state budget has faced a burden of more than EUR 25 million to date, according to publications, while it is estimated that the cost will rise to EUR 100-125 million up to the operational launch of NERIT. It should also be noted that the new public service broadcaster still has no legal personality, tax number, operating rules, or a television and radio schedule approved by the National Council for Radio and Television.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Does its Troika representative have information on the total burden for the national budget from the ERT closure and the creation of a new public service broadcaster. In a time of drastic cuts to incomes, pensions, public health and social policies, is it acceptable for the state budget to be burdened to the tune of EUR 100-125 million as a result of inappropriate Government action?

— With regard to the Greek Presidency of the EU, and also the EU elections of 2014, is it acceptable to have no public television and radio broadcaster in operation? What steps does it intend to take so that this will not happen, and so that the Greek Government will fulfil its obligations ([1]) ([2]) arising from the European Charter on Freedom of the Press ([3]) and the Amsterdam Protocol ([4])?

— How does it respond to the fact that, months after the closure of ERT, no serious discussion has taken place yet with the employees, political parties or civil society in order to develop pluralistic and dependable public service radio and television broadcasting?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

ERT was loss-making in 2012 and the new company is expected to generate profitability of EUR 100 million already in 2014. The generation of profits in the new company will be derived primarily from a reduction of personnel costs. The closure of ERT is therefore in no way a burden for the Greek state.

The Commission has already expressed its views on the closure of ERT from the point of view of freedom of expression and information. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its statement of 12 June (MEMO/13/545), to the replies to parliamentary questions O-69/13, E-6815/2013; E-6912/2013; E-6826/2013; E-6920/2013; E-6924/2013; E-6955/2013; E-6986/2013; E-7171/2013; E-7241/2013 ([5]), and to the European Parliament debate of 3 July 2013 .

([1]) http://www3.ebu.ch/files/live/sites/ebu/files/Knowledge/Initiatives%20-%20Policy/Topical%20Issues/Funding/27%2010%202009%20Communication%20from%20the%20Commission%20on%20the%20application%20of%20State%20aid%20rules%20to%20public%20service%20broadcasting.pdf
([2]) http://www3.ebu.ch/files/live/sites/ebu/files/Knowledge/Initiatives%20-%20Policy/Topical%20Issues/Media%20Freedom%20and%20Media%20Pluralism/EC%20Consultation_MFMP%20Regulatory%20Bodies_EBU%20response.pdf
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A7-2013-0117&language=EN
([4]) http://www.pressfreedom.eu/en/index.php
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011825/13**
**do Komisji**
**Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)**
*(16 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Dyskryminacja Romów w Szwecji

We wrześniu w Szwecji wybuchł skandal medialny dotyczący prowadzenia przez szwedzką policję z prowincji Skanii rejestrów Romów mieszkających na terenie południowej Szwecji. Rejestr, pod pretekstem środków bezpieczeństwa, zawierał oprócz danych osobowych Romów informacje o powiązaniach rodzinnych, dochodach, pracy, sytuacji mieszkaniowej, znajomych itp. Ponadto rejestr obejmował dzieci, osoby w podeszłym wieku oraz już nieżyjące. Tworzenie podobnych rejestrów jest w Szwecji prawnie zakazane, a względy bezpieczeństwa nie wyjaśniają objęcia spisem np. dzieci. Istnieje, zatem podejrzenie, iż prowadzenie rejestru ma podłoże ksenofobiczne i rasistowskie.

Zgłaszam się więc z pytaniem do Komisji o legalność podobnych praktyk w Unii oraz o podanie, jakie środki stosowane są we Wspólnocie, aby zapobiegać podobnym praktykom.

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji**
*(5 grudnia 2013 r.)*

Z niektórych informacji prasowych wynika, że rejestr Romów – obejmujący również nieletnich – był prowadzony przez szwedzką policję w celach wykraczających poza działania związane z monitorowaniem działalności przestępczej.

Według dostępnych informacji prowadzenie rejestru wiąże się z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych. Przetwarzanie danych osobowych przez właściwe organy państwowe w obszarze prawa karnego nie wchodzi w zakres dyrektywy o ochronie danych ([1]). Wchodzi ono jednak w zakres wniosku dotyczącego dyrektywy przygotowanego przez Komisję w styczniu 2012 r. w ramach pakietu dotyczącego reformy przepisów dotyczących ochrony danych ([2]).

Bez uszczerbku dla uprawnień Komisji jako strażniczki Traktatów, w przypadku przetwarzania danych osobowych do celów innych niż te, które dotyczą prawa karnego, nadzór nad przepisami w sprawie ochrony danych i ich egzekwowanie należą do kompetencji organów nadzorczych ds. ochrony danych oraz do sądów. W związku z powyższym Komisja podkreśla, że na mocy art. 8 dyrektywy o ochronie danych przetwarzanie danych osobowych ujawniających rasę lub pochodzenie etniczne jest co do zasady zabronione. W dyrektywie przewidziano ograniczoną liczbę wyjątków od tego zakazu.

Komisja będzie w dalszym ciągu monitorować sytuację, w szczególności w odniesieniu do działań, które mogą zostać podjęte przez właściwe władze szwedzkie w celu zapewnienia zgodności z przepisami o ochronie danych.

---

([1]) Dyrektywa 95/46/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 24 października 1995 r. w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w zakresie przetwarzania danych osobowych i swobodnego przepływu tych danych, Dz.U. L 281 z 23.11.1995, s. 31-50.

([2]) Wniosek dotyczący dyrektywy Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w związku z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych przez właściwe organy na potrzeby zapobiegania przestępstwom, prowadzenia dochodzeń w ich sprawie, wykrywania ich i ścigania albo wykonywania kar kryminalnych oraz swobodnego przepływu takich danych (COM(2012) 0010.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011825/13**
**to the Commission**
**Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Discrimination against the Roma in Sweden

A media storm erupted in Sweden in September in connection with the discovery that Swedish police in the province of Scania had compiled a register of Roma living in southern Sweden. Under the guise of a security measure, the register contained not only personal data about the Roma but also information on family ties, income, employment, living situation, friends etc. Children, elderly people and deceased persons are also included on this register. It is illegal to compile registers of this kind in Sweden, and certain decisions such as the inclusion of children cannot be explained by security concerns. There are therefore grounds for suspecting that the motives behind keeping the register are rooted in xenophobia and racism.

I would therefore like to ask the Commission whether such practices are legal in the EU, and what methods are used in the EU to prevent them.

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

Some information reported by the press suggests that registers of Roma people, including many minors, have been set up by the Swedish police for purposes that were not only related to criminal activities.

According to the available information, the register involves the processing of personal data. Processing of personal data by competent State authorities in areas of criminal law does not fall within the scope of the Data Protection Directive ([1]). It is however covered by the scope of the directive proposed by the Commission in January 2012 as a part of the data protection reform package ([2]).

With regard to the processing of personal data for purposes other than those which concern criminal law, without prejudice to the competence of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation falls within the competence of the data protection supervisory authorities and courts. In this respect, the Commission underlines that under Article 8 of the Data Protection Directive the processing of personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin is generally prohibited. A limited number of exemptions from this prohibition have been foreseen in the directive.

The Commission will continue to monitor the situation in particular with regard to any steps that might be taken by the competent Swedish authorities to ensure compliance with the data protection rules.

---

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31-50.

([2]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data (COM(2012)0010).

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011827/13**
**a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)**
**Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)**
*(16 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* VP/HR — Declaraciones de las Naciones Unidas sobre la situación del conflicto mapuche en Chile

El pasado 31 de agosto, el Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre la promoción y la protección de los derechos humanos y las libertades fundamentales en la lucha contra el terrorismo, Ben Emmerson, formulaba unas declaraciones tras su visita a Chile en las que expresaba su preocupación por la aplicación por parte del Estado chileno de la Ley antiterrorista contra miembros del pueblo mapuche.

El Relator Especial señalaba en sus declaraciones que, en el marco del conflicto mapuche, existe un riesgo real de escalada y resulta imperativo que Chile tome medidas para abordar la situación. Ben Emmerson afirmó que el Estado chileno está abandonando su deber de promover una solución pacífica y justa a la cuestión mapuche. Ante dichas afirmaciones del más alto nivel, Chile ha continuado su política represiva y de bloqueo del diálogo pacífico, con la aplicación de normas como la Ley 2568, adoptada durante la dictadura de Pinochet, o la Ley antiterrorista 18314. Más allá de la aplicación de un marco jurídico represivo, las comunidades mapuches han denunciado numerosos casos de detenciones arbitrarias, ejecuciones extrajudiciales, allanamientos masivos, etc.

Ante la situación denunciada por el Relator Especial, así como las gravísimas acusaciones realizadas por diferentes representantes de comunidades mapuches, el Estado chileno no ha cambiado su aproximación al conflicto y continúa rechazando la apertura de un proceso pacífico de diálogo político entre el Gobierno de Chile y las comunidades mapuches sobre el estatus político de la región de la Araucanía.

¿Conoce la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante las declaraciones de Ben Emmerson sobre el conflicto mapuche? ¿Cómo las valora?

¿Instará la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante al Gobierno chileno a que tome en cuenta las citadas declaraciones del Relator Especial e inicie un diálogo político con las comunidades mapuches para buscar una salida política al conflicto?

¿Instará la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante al Gobierno chileno a que aplique la Convección 169 de la OIT, ratificada por Chile en 2008, en lo relativo a los derechos históricos y políticos del pueblo mapuche?

¿Se plantea la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante la congelación del Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Chile hasta que Chile respete los derechos humanos y los acuerdos internacionales violados en el marco del conflicto mapuche?

¿Solicitará la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante al Gobierno chileno que detenga la aplicación de la Ley antiterrorista y que esclarezca las gravísimas acusaciones de violaciones de los derechos humanos?

**Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión**
*(19 de diciembre de 2013)*

La UE y Chile tienen unas buenas relaciones bilaterales basadas en el respeto de los principios democráticos y de los derechos humanos, de conformidad con el Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Chile de 2002.

Desde 2010, la UE y Chile mantienen un diálogo periódico sobre los derechos humanos, en el que ambas partes cambian impresiones sobre las prioridades de sus respectivos programas de derechos humanos. En este contexto, la UE plantea sistemáticamente la cuestión de los derechos de los pueblos indígenas. La UE sigue la situación en Chile, inclusive en lo referido a la aplicación de la Ley Antiterrorista y el desarrollo de mecanismos de consulta en línea con el Convenio 169 de la OIT, y plantea estos asuntos en sus contactos con las autoridades chilenas.

Durante el último diálogo sobre derechos humanos entre la UE y Chile del pasado 7 de noviembre, el jefe de la Delegación de la UE y los embajadores de los Estados miembros de la UE volvieron a abordar el respeto de los derechos de los pueblos indígenas, también a la vista de las declaraciones formuladas por Ben Emmerson, relator especial de las Naciones Unidas. La UE está a la espera de sus recomendaciones finales, que promoverá en los foros bilaterales e internacionales pertinentes, sobre todo con ocasión del próximo examen periódico universal de Chile en 2014.

En virtud del Instrumento Europeo para la Democracia y los Derechos Humanos, la UE ha financiado proyectos concretos dirigidos a fomentar lo siguiente: i) el acceso de los indígenas a la justicia, ii) el reconocimiento de los derechos de los indígenas en las decisiones en materia de medio ambiente y territorio y iii) la defensa de los derechos de los niños en el marco de la aplicación de la Ley Antiterrorista. La ayuda actual se ofrece para mejorar las condiciones políticas y judiciales, de forma que los ciudadanos y los indígenas puedan ejercer su derecho a la participación política, y asistir a los defensores de los derechos humanos en seis regiones del país.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011827/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — United Nations declarations on the situation of the Mapuche conflict in Chile

On 31 August, the UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the fight against terrorism, Ben Emmerson, made some statements, after his visit to Chile, expressing his concern about the Chilean State's use of the Anti-Terrorism Act against members of the Mapuche community.

The Special Rapporteur noted in his statements that there is a real risk of escalation of the Mapuche conflict and that it is imperative for Chile to take steps to address the situation. Ben Emmerson stated that the Chilean State is abandoning its duty to promote a peaceful and just solution to the Mapuche question. Despite these statements made at the highest level, Chile has continued its repressive policy and to block peaceful dialogue, using legislation such as Act 2568, passed during the Pinochet dictatorship, and the Anti-Terrorism Act 18314. In addition to the application of a repressive legal framework, the Mapuche communities have reported numerous cases of arbitrary arrests, extrajudicial executions, mass detentions, etc.

Despite the situation reported by the Special Rapporteur and the extremely serious accusations made by various representatives of the Mapuche communities, the Chilean State has not changed its approach to the conflict and continues to reject opening a peaceful process of political dialogue between the Government of Chile and the Mapuche communities about the political status of the region of Araucanía.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of Ben Emerson's declarations on the Mapuche conflict? What is its assessment of them?

Will the Vice-President/High Representative urge the Chilean Government to take account of the Special Rapporteur's declarations and start a political dialogue with the Mapuche communities to seek a political solution to the conflict?

Will the Vice-President/High Representative urge the Chilean Government to implement ILO Convention 169, ratified by Chile in 2008, with respect to the Mapuche people's historical and political rights?

Is the Vice-President/High Representative considering putting a freeze on the EU-Chile Association Agreement until Chile respects human rights and international agreements breached in the context of the Mapuche conflict?

Will the Vice-President/High Representative ask the Chilean Government to stop using the Anti-Terrorism Act and to answer the extremely serious allegations of human rights violations?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(19 December 2013)*

The EU and Chile enjoy good bilateral relations underpinned by the respect for democratic principles and human rights, in accordance with the EU-Chile Association Agreement of 2002.

Since 2010, the EU and Chile have had a regular dialogue on human rights, during which both parties exchange views on priorities of their respective human rights agenda. In this context, the EU raises systematically the rights of indigenous people. The EU monitors the situation in Chile, including with regards to the application of the Anti-Terrorism Law and the development of consultation mechanisms in line with ILO Convention 169, and brings it up in its contacts with the Chilean authorities.

During the last EU-Chile Human Rights Dialogue on 7 November the respect for the rights of indigenous people was raised again by the EU Head of Delegation and EU Member States' Ambassadors, including in the light of the statements made by UN Special Rapporteur Ben Emmerson. The EU awaits his final recommendations and will promote these in relevant bilateral and international fora, notably in the context of the upcoming Universal Periodic Review for Chile in 2014.

Under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, the EU has financed specific projects aimed to promote the: (i) access of indigenous people to justice, (ii) recognition of indigenous rights in environmental and territorial decisions, and (iii) defence of children rights in the framework of the application of the Anti-terrorism Law. The current support provides for enhancing political and judicial conditions so as to allow for citizens and indigenous people to exercise their right to political participation, and assisting human rights defenders in six regions of the country.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-011829/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Stadiul acordului între Comisie, statele membre și producătorii de țigarete

În 2012, s-a ajuns la un acord cu Philip Morris International, conform căruia producătorul va efectua plăți suplimentare (confiscări) la semnarea unui acord modificat în acest sector între toate statele membre, UE și această companie. În iulie 2013, nu toate statele membre au semnat acordul modificat.

1. A fost între timp semnat acordul modificat cu Philip Morris International de către toate statele membre? Dacă nu, ce state membre trebuie încă să semneze și ce motive au prezentat acestea pentru întârziere?

2. Conform acordului modificat, care va fi noul pachet financiar, atât în termeni de sume, cât și de termene de implementare și cum va fi el divizat între UE și statele membre?

**Răspuns dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei**
*(26 noiembrie 2013)*

1. Acordul de modificare a fost semnat, între timp, de toate statele membre, în afară de Croația ([1]). Al 28-lea stat membru a semnat acordul de modificare la sfârșitul lunii septembrie a anului 2013. Întârzierea la semnare s-a datorat procedurii interne a statului membru respectiv.

2. Pachetul financiar nu este prestabilit, deoarece eventualele sume depind de cantitatea de țigarete confiscate. Din plata suplimentară, partea corespunzătoare impozitelor și taxelor care ar fi fost datorate dacă țigaretele ar fi fost importate în mod legal va fi reținută de UE, iar restul va fi distribuit statului membru care a confiscat țigaretele Philip Morris autentice. Acordul de modificare va intra în vigoare de îndată ce va fi semnat de către companiile PMI în cauză și de către reprezentanții Comisiei Europene în numele UE.

În perioada 2006-2013, partea medie care revine Uniunii Europene a fost de 4.7 % din plățile suplimentare în caz de confiscare. Partea care revine UE depinde de mai multe variabile, cum ar fi marca țigărilor confiscate.

([1]) Croația, ca urmare a aderării sale la UE, are în vedere în prezent să adere la acordul de cooperare. Plățile suplimentare în caz de confiscare vor fi posibile în Croația de la data aderării acestei țări la acordul de cooperare, modificat prin acordul de modificare.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011829/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* State of play on the agreement between the Commission, the Member States and cigarette manufacturers

In 2012 an agreement was reached with Philip Morris International, according to which the manufacturer would make supplementary (seizure) payments upon signature of a modified agreement on the matter by all Member States, the EU and the company. In July 2013, not all Member States signed the modified agreement.

1. Has the modified agreement with Philip Morris International now been signed by all Member States? If not, which Member States have still to sign it and what reasons have they given for the delay in doing so?

2. Under the modified agreement, what will the new financial envelope be, both in terms of the amount and the time frame for implementation, and how will it be divided between the EU and the Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission**
*(26 November 2013)*

1. The Modification Agreement has now been signed by all Member States, apart from Croatia ([1]). The 27th Member State signed the Modification Agreement at the end of September 2013. The delay in signing was due to the Member State's internal procedure.

2. The financial envelope is not pre-determined because the amounts potentially involved depend on the quantity of cigarettes seized. A share of the supplementary payment, which corresponds to the taxes and duties that would have been due had the cigarettes been imported legally, will be retained by the EU, and the remainder will be distributed to the Member State that seized the authentic Philip Morris cigarettes. The Modification Agreement will enter into effect as soon as it is signed by the PMI companies concerned and representatives of the European Commission on behalf of the EU.

In the period 2006-2013 the average share of the European Union was 4.7% of the seizure payments. The EU share depends on several variables, e.g. the brand of the seized cigarettes.

([1]) Croatia, following its accession to the EU, is currently considering acceding to the cooperation agreement. Croatia will qualify for seizure payments from the day that it will have acceded to the cooperation agreement, as amended by the Modification Agreement.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011830/13**
**to the Commission**
**James Nicholson (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Cutting unwarranted red tape

A taskforce report on some of the UK's leading businesses, such as Kingfisher and Diageo, suggests that a plethora of burdensome EU rules and regulations are impeding the competitiveness of British firms, both large and small. For the first time, a report has quantified the true impact of 'red tape' on British industry, rather than discussing it in the abstract. The report's recommendations include simplifying 'costly and complex' chemicals legislation and the requirement for all SMEs to keep written health and safety assessments, as just some of the areas where the EU has over-regulated.

Given the findings of the taskforce's report, and the fact that Commission President, José Manuel Barroso, is due to present proposals for cutting unwarranted regulation at the Council next week, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that Member States have more flexibility to remove burdensome regulations and allow local businesses, large and small, to flourish in the single market?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission**
*(15 November 2013)*

The Commission welcomes the report of a UK business task force published on 15 October 2013 as a useful contribution to better regulation efforts and to reducing regulatory burden to business which is a joint objective for European institutions and Member States alike.

In order to correct inefficiencies and burdens in EU legislation, the Commission initiated a Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT) at the end of 2012. The results of this programme, published on 2 October 2013, included initiatives to simplify legislation and reduce regulatory burden, the repeal of laws and withdrawal of proposals that are no longer required and evaluations and Fitness Checks in other areas to determine the focus and extent of future simplification and burden reduction actions.

The conclusions of the European Council of 24 and 25 October 2013 welcomed the Commission's Communication on REFIT and stressed the need for rapid implementation.

REFIT will be implemented as an annual rolling programme to identify and correct weaknesses and burdens in EU legislation. It includes a scoreboard to monitor the progress of Commission proposals to simplify and reduce regulatory burden in the EU legislative procedure-and implementation by Member States.

Studies show that approximately 1/3 of regulatory burden is added through implementation by Member States It is therefore important that action to reduce burdens for business is taken at national, regional and the local levels of government more broadly than just on the implementation of EC law.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011834/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**
*(16 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Λειτουργία περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων της Ελλάδας

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιογραφικές πληροφορίες, η εταιρία Lufthansa Consulting, σύμβουλος του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ για τη διαχείριση των ελληνικών αεροδρομίων, εισηγήθηκε το κλείσιμο πολλών περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων της χώρας. Η είδηση αυτή διαψεύστηκε ωστόσο από το ΤΑΙΠΕΔ, το οποίο επισημαίνει ότι διενεργεί διεθνή ανοιχτό διαγωνισμό για την παραχώρηση της εκμετάλλευσης των περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων σε ιδιώτες επενδυτές.

Ανεξάρτητα από την άποψη που μπορεί να έχει κάποιος για τον τρόπο λειτουργίας και εκμετάλλευσης των δημόσιων υποδομών, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

α. Πόσα και ποια περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια περιλαμβάνονται στις λίστες του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ; Τι προβλέπεται να γίνει με όσα περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια δεν περιλαμβάνονται στις λίστες αυτές; Στο πλαίσιο των συζητήσεων της τρόικα με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση, έχουν εκφρασθεί απόψεις υπέρ του κλεισίματος περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων; Εάν ναι, ποια είναι τα επιχειρήματα που προβάλλονται;

β. Υπάρχει πρόβλεψη οι ιδιώτες επενδυτές που θα αναλάβουν τη λειτουργία των αεροδρομίων να μη μπορούν να εγείρουν στο μέλλον απαίτηση «κρατικής ενίσχυσης» των πιο «άγονων» αεροδρομίων;

**Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(13 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η κατάρτιση του σχεδίου ιδιωτικοποίησης βάσει του 2ου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα, και η απόφαση όσον αφορά τα περιουσιακά στοιχεία του Δημοσίου ή τις δημόσιες επιχειρήσεις που θα ιδιωτικοποιηθούν, τον βαθμό και τη σειρά με την οποία θα διεξαχθούν οι εν λόγω ιδιωτικοποιήσεις, εναπόκεινται αποκλειστικά στις ελληνικές αρχές.

Δεν έχει γίνει απολύτως καμία συζήτηση σχετικά με το κλείσιμο περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων στο πλαίσιο του σχεδίου ιδιωτικοποίησης. Ο επιδιωκόμενος στόχος είναι να βελτιωθεί η οικονομική ρύθμιση και η διαχείριση της εναέριας κυκλοφορίας στην Ελληνική Υπηρεσία Πολιτικής Αεροπορίας, και να βελτιωθεί ο συντονισμός των χρονοθυρίδων.

Στο ταμείο ιδιωτικοποιήσεων ξεκίνησε η διαδικασία εκδήλωσης ενδιαφέροντος για σύναψη συμφωνίας για τη χορήγηση σύμβασης παραχώρησης υπηρεσιών για τη συντήρηση και τη λειτουργία δύο συστάδων που αποτελούνται έκαστη από 7 βασικά αεροδρόμια με τη δυνατότητα να περιληφθούν τρία πρόσθετα αεροδρόμια σε κάθε συστάδα. Ειδικότερες πληροφορίες όσον αφορά τα αεροδρόμια που περιλαμβάνονται στις δύο συστάδες δημοσιεύονται στον ακόλουθο δικτυακό τόπο: http://www.hradf.com/en/infrastructure/regional-airports. Τα υπόλοιπα μη ιδιωτικοποιημένα αεροδρόμια θα συμπεριληφθούν σε χωριστή εταιρεία η οποία θα χρηματοδοτείται με επιδοτήσεις δημόσιας υπηρεσίας.

Η Επιτροπή επανεξετάζει επί του παρόντος τις προϋποθέσεις βάσει των οποίων τα περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια μπορούν να λαμβάνουν κρατικές ενισχύσεις. Η Επιτροπή δρομολόγησε δημόσια διαβούλευση το 2013 και προτίθεται να εκδώσει νέες κατευθυντήριες γραμμές στις αρχές του 2014. Στο τρέχον υπό διαβούλευση κείμενο τα περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια ενδέχεται να λαμβάνουν κυρίως επενδυτικές ενισχύσεις, ανάλογα με τον αριθμό επιβατών κάθε αεροδρομίου, λειτουργικές ενισχύσεις για μεταβατική περίοδο 10 ετών κατ' ανώτατο όριο, καθώς και ενισχύσεις για αντιστάθμιση παροχής δημόσιας υπηρεσίας ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2013_aviation_guidelines/index_en.html

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011834/13**
**to the Commission**
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Regional Greek airports

According to media reports, the company Lufthansa Consulting, which is advising the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund on the management of Greek airports, has advised that numerous regional Greek airports should be closed. However, these reports have been denied by the HRADF, which has pointed out that it is holding an international open procedure to grant operating franchises to regional airports to private investors.

Irrespective of what one may think about how public infrastructures should be operated and used, will the Commission say:

a) How many and which regional airports are included in the HRADF list? What does it expect will happen to the regional airports which are not included on that list? Have views in favour of closing regional airports been expressed during discussions between the Troika and the Greek government? If so, what arguments were expounded?

b) Is there a provision whereby private investors which undertake to operate airports cannot file a claim in the future for 'State aid' for the most 'stranded' airports?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

The design of the privatisation plan under the 2nd economic adjustment programme for Greece and the choice of what, how far and in which sequence public assets or companies should be privatised is the exclusive result of the Greek authorities' decision.

There have been no discussions whatsoever about closing regional airports in the context of the privatisation plan. The aim is to improve economic regulation and air traffic management in the Hellenic Civil Aviation Authority and improve the slot coordination aspects.

The Privatisation Fund launched the process for expressions of interest to enter into an agreement for the granting of a services concession for the maintenance and operation of two clusters consisting each of 7 core airports with the option of including three additional airports in each of the clusters. The specific information regarding the airports included in the two clusters can be found in the following link: http://www.hradf.com/en/infrastructure/regional-airports. The remaining non-privatised airports would be included in a separate company to be financed with public service subsidies.

The Commission is currently reviewing the conditions under which regional airports can benefit from state aid. The Commission launched a public consultation in 2013 and should adopt new guidelines at the beginning of 2014. In the current text under consultation regional airports might notably benefit from investment aid, depending on the number of passengers at each airport, operating aid for a transitional period of maximum 10 years as well as aid for public service compensation ([1]).

---

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2013_aviation_guidelines/index_en.html

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011835/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Super fruits ou super marketing

Marketing. Goji, acerola, cranberry, noni, maqui, açaï et quelques autres sont les derniers nommés d'une lignée de «super fruits» dont la célébrité «santé» s'établit depuis les années 2000 dans la foulée des grenades, goyaves et autres papayes.

Les super fruits, souvent des baies, seraient bien plus riches que d'autres en vitamines, flavonoïdes, anthocyanines, polyphénols et autres caroténoïdes. Ils feraient la santé d'Indiens d'Amazonie ou de Tibétains: miracles minceur, antioxydant, anti-âge, anti-radicaux libres, anti-cancer. Sans preuve clinique de leur efficacité et en l'absence d'une définition officielle des «super fruits», le marketing s'est emparé de cette manne, s'appuyant sur l'intérêt croissant du consommateur pour la santé «au naturel».

Si le goji se consomme séché, on avalera généralement les «super fruits» sous forme de gélules et comprimés ou de produits transformés (jus, yaourt, bonbons, biscuits, etc.) aux concentrations variables et apports nutritionnels contestables. Venues de très loin, ces baies ont aussi un lourd sac à dos écologique et leur cueillette outrancière compromet les ressources des populations locales.

Un habile marketing vert voudrait nous faire croire qu'il suffit d'avaler quotidiennement des doses de «super fruits» pour être en super santé. Ne s'agit-il pas de publicité mensongère?

Comment se positionne la Commission sur ces «super fruits», leur publicité et les vertus qui leur sont prêtées?

**Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission**
*(28 novembre 2013)*

La directive 2000/13/CE prévoit que l'étiquetage et les méthodes employées ne doivent pas induire l'acheteur en erreur, en particulier sur les caractéristiques de la denrée alimentaire, et également sur sa nature, son identité, ses propriétés, sa composition, ou en lui attribuant des effets ou propriétés qu'elle ne possède pas.

Dans l'Union européenne, les allégations nutritionnelles et de santé ne peuvent être employées dans l'étiquetage, la présentation et la publicité des denrées alimentaires que si elles sont conformes au règlement (CE) n° 1924/2006 concernant les allégations nutritionnelles et de santé portant sur les denrées alimentaires.

Dans le registre des allégations nutritionnelles et de santé de l'Union européenne sont énumérées toutes les allégations de santé autorisées, non autorisées et en suspens, ainsi que toutes les allégations nutritionnelles autorisées. Ce registre apporte de la clarté, renforce la position des autorités de contrôle nationales et, en fin de compte, garantit une meilleure protection des consommateurs face à des allégations trompeuses.

Par conséquent, toute information fournie aux consommateurs quant aux qualités nutritionnelles ou aux effets bénéfiques pour la santé d'une denrée alimentaire, y compris celles en cause, doit être donnée en conformité avec les dispositions du règlement (CE) n° 1924/2006 et doit également respecter les dispositions de la directive 2000/13/CE.

Toutefois, la Commission tient à préciser que, conformément au règlement (CE) n° 178/2002, les États membres sont responsables de l'application de la législation alimentaire et qu'ils doivent aussi contrôler et vérifier le respect par les exploitants du secteur alimentaire des prescriptions applicables de la législation alimentaire.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011835/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Superfruits or super marketing

Marketing. Goji berry, acerola cherry, cranberry, noni berry, maqui berry, açaí berry, to mention a few, are the latest in a long line of 'superfruits' with famed 'health' properties, which have become popular since the 2000s, following in the footsteps of pomegranates, guavas and papayas.

These superfruits, for the most part berries, are supposedly richer than others in vitamins, flavonoids, anthocyanins, polyphenols and carotenoids. They are apparently the key to the Amazonian Indians' and Tibetans' good health. They are claimed to work miracles for slimming and to have antioxidant, anti-ageing, anti-free radical and anti-cancer properties. However, with no clinical evidence of their effectiveness and with no official definition of 'superfruit', the marketing people have jumped on the berry bandwagon, driven by growing consumer interest in 'natural' health.

Goji berries are eaten dried, but the other 'superfruits' are mostly taken as capsules, tablets or in processed products (fruit juices, yoghurts, sweets, biscuits, etc.) in varying concentrations and with questionable nutritional value. These berries clock up the food miles and therefore carry a heavy ecological burden. Furthermore, the appalling way in which they are harvested threatens the resources of local populations.

Crafty 'green' marketing, however, would have us believe that all we need to do to stay super healthy is to take our daily dose of these 'superfruits'. Is this not misleading advertising?

What is the Commission's position on these 'superfruits', the way in which they are advertised and the virtues ascribed to them?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(28 November 2013)*

Directive 2000/13/EC provides that the labelling and methods used must not be misleading to the purchaser to a material degree. In particular, for the characteristics of the foodstuff and also to its nature, identity, properties, composition or by attributing to the foodstuff effects or properties which it does not possess.

In the European Union, nutrition and health claims made on foods may be used in the labelling, presentation or advertising of foods only if they comply with Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods.

In the EU Register of nutrition and health claims are listed all authorised, non-authorised and on 'hold' health claims as well as all permitted nutrition claims. This brings clarity, strengthens the position of national controlling authorities and ultimately ensures better protection of consumers from misleading claims.

Therefore, any information provided to consumers about the nutrition or health benefits of any food including those in question, should be given in compliance with the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 and should also respect the provisions of Directive 2000/13/EC.

However, the Commission would like to clarify that according to Regulation (EC) No 178/2002, Member States are responsible for the enforcement of food law and shall also monitor and verify that the relevant requirements of food law are fulfilled by food business operators.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011837/13**
**adresată Consiliului**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Colectarea datelor referitoare la traficul de ființe umane

Combaterea eficientă a traficului de ființe umane necesită date comparabile, actualizate și reale, la nivel național și european, pentru a putea înțelege optim dimensiunile reale ale fenomenului. Astfel de date statistice sunt greu de colectat, mai ales datorită diferențelor dintre codurile penale ale statelor membre, dintre sistemele lor de raportare și monitorizare și gradul de raportare a cazurilor la poliție, la ONG-uri sau la alte structuri.

În iunie 2011, Consiliul Justiție și Afaceri Interne a adoptat Concluziile Consiliului privind „Combaterea formelor emergente de trafic de persoane în statele membre ale UE" prin care statele membre sunt încurajate să creeze mecanisme de colectare de date multisectoriale, pentru a stimula colectarea de date referitoare la așa numitele forme emergente de trafic de ființe umane și pentru a îmbunătăți calitatea datelor colectate.

1. La doi ani de la adoptarea concluziilor Consiliului, care dintre statele membre au dat curs concluziilor cu privire la colectarea datelor referitoare la traficul de ființe umane?

2. Pentru acele state membre care nu au dat încă curs concluziilor, cum și-au justificat fiecare întârzierea?

**Răspuns**
*(23 decembrie 2013)*

În urma Concluziilor Consiliului din 4 iunie 2009 privind crearea unei rețele UE informale de raportori naționali sau mecanisme echivalente privind traficul de persoane, a fost creată o astfel de rețea. Obiectivul rețelei este de a îmbunătăți înțelegerea fenomenului traficului de persoane și de a furniza Uniunii și statelor membre ale acesteia informații obiective, fiabile, comparabile și actualizate de ordin strategic în domeniul traficului de persoane. Articolul 19 din Directiva 2011/36/UE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 5 aprilie 2011 privind prevenirea şi combaterea traficului de persoane şi protejarea victimelor acestuia (transpusă până la 6 aprilie 2013) include și obligația de a institui raportori naționali sau mecanisme echivalente. Astfel de mecanisme ar trebui să includă realizarea unor evaluări ale tendințelor în materie de trafic de persoane, măsurarea rezultatelor acțiunilor de combatere a traficului, inclusiv colectarea de date statistice în strânsă cooperare cu organizațiile relevante ale societății civile din acest domeniu și prezentarea de rapoarte.

Toate statele membre participă la rețea, reunindu-se cel puțin de două ori pe an.

Comisia (Biroul de coordonare pentru combaterea traficului de persoane) sprijină rețeaua și raportează cu privire la progresele înregistrate de aceasta. Acest lucru se realizează în colaborare cu președinția Consiliului.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011837/13**
**to the Council**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Data collection on human trafficking

Tackling human trafficking effectively requires comparable, up-to-date and reliable data at both national and European level in order to grasp the full extent of the phenomenon. Such statistical data are difficult to collect, mainly due to the differences between the Member States' criminal codes, reporting and monitoring systems and rates of reporting cases to the police, NGOs and other bodies.

In June 2011, the Justice and Home Affairs Council adopted Council conclusions 'Targeting developing forms of trafficking in human beings in the EU Member States' in which Member States are encouraged to establish multi-sector data collection mechanisms, to further develop data collection on so-called developing forms of trafficking in human beings and to improve the quality of the data collected.

1. Two years after the adoption of the Council conclusions, which Member States have complied with the conclusions on data collection on human trafficking?

2. For those Member States which have not yet followed the conclusions, what individual justifications have been given to explain the delay?

**Reply**
*(23 December 2013)*

Following the Council Conclusions of 4 June 2009 on establishing an informal EU Network of National Rapporteurs or Equivalent Mechanisms on Trafficking in Human Beings, such a network was established. The aim of the network is to improve the understanding of the phenomenon of trafficking in human beings and to provide the Union and its Member States with objective, reliable, comparable and up-to-date strategic information in the field of trafficking in human beings. Article 9 of Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims (to be transposed by 6 April 2013) also includes an obligation to establish national rapporteurs or equivalent mechanisms. Such mechanisms should include the carrying out of assessments on trends in trafficking in human beings, the measuring of results from anti-trafficking measures, including the gathering of statistics in close cooperation with relevant civil society organisations active in this field, and reporting.

All Member States participate in the network, which meets at least twice a year.

The Commission (the Anti-Trafficking Coordinator's office) supports the network and reports on its progress. This is done in collaboration with the Council Presidency.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011838/13**
**to the Commission**
**Jim Higgins (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* European Schools system

As the Commission is aware, there has been a lot of talk regarding the reform of the European Schools system but still no action.

It has already been established that this is a matter of urgency and that the crisis regarding the state of the European Schools should finally be resolved.

It is known that the EU Ombudsman, Parliament, the Court of Justice and the Council have expressed their concern regarding the extent of the crisis and the lawlessness of the European Schools system (EURSC), in that the EURSC falls outside the jurisdiction of all EC law and is thereby outside of EU control and utterly unaccountable.

In 2011 it was suggested that the legal nature of the European Schools system is in serious need of reform. Since then, nothing has changed, and this is why the issue was tabled by the Irish Presidency in May 2013.

I am aware that the Commission has called for a meeting of all national education ministers to discuss the matter. To my knowledge, this meeting has not yet been arranged.

I know that I am not alone when I say that this issue has been pending long enough and we can no longer ignore the importance of reforming the European Schools system.

Can the Commission state what it will now do to finally oblige the European Schools to comply with European and national law? Does the Commission plan to arrange the aforementioned meeting of the national education ministers?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission**
*(16 December 2013)*

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its replies to the written questions E-10390/2013 and E-11375/2013.

The European Schools System (ESS) is governed jointly by governments of the EU Members States (MS) within the Board of Governors (BoG) and is subject to international law and its own corpus juris defined in the Convention on the Functioning of the European Schools. Thus, the Commission does not agree that the ESS is unaccountable or that it is outside the EU control. Moreover, the Commission is not in a position to change the legal system of the ES on its own.

The legal protection system of the ESS is currently being analysed by a Working Group convened to deal with that matter. The group will present the outcomes of its reflections to the BoG, accompanied where necessary by proposals for improvements, in the course of 2014. The Commission is represented in this group and may inform about the results of the analysis, should the Honourable Member wish so.

The critical point in the ESS is the cost-sharing issue. A structural proposal to solve it was discussed in September by the BoG and widely accepted by the majority of the MS, so that a discussion of the ESS at the Ministers' level in the framework of the November Education Council was not any more necessary.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011839/13**
**to the Commission**
**James Nicholson (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* New rules on flight time limitations

On Wednesday, 9 October 2013 Parliament voted against a motion for a resolution calling on the Commission to withdraw new rules on maximum flight times for pilots and cabin crews. I voted for the motion, in light of the concerns that many of my constituents, including several airline pilots, have raised about the impact on flight safety.

Moving forward into negotiations with the Council, what steps will the Commission take to ensure that flight safety is the absolute priority of any rule changes, and further, what assurances can the Commission give that it will take on board the views and need for flexibility of individual Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

There are no further negotiations with the Council. No objections were raised by the Parliament or Council during the scrutiny period and the next step is for the Commission to formally adopt the Commission Regulation on flight time limitations. The European Parliament will be involved in the future when an adaptation to the legislative framework is necessary in accordance with the regulatory procedure with scrutiny.

Other relevant information has been provided by the Commission in its answers to written questions E-010759/2013 and E-011452/2013 ([1]).

([1]) Available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011842/13**
**to the Commission**
**James Nicholson (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Protection for animal researchers

The Northern Ireland life sciences sector comprises approximately 60 businesses employing 4 100 people. There are clearly beneficial aspects of animal research in terms of healthcare breakthroughs, in my own constituency and across the EU. Nevertheless, the majority of research is undertaken by universities and medical schools operating under a different regulatory environment than industry. This has made universities and medical schools more vulnerable to those who oppose the use of animals in scientific research.

In light of the scientifically important nature of this aspect of the research industry, what plans does the Commission have to harmonise the regulatory environment between businesses and research schools, thereby providing better protection for this important research sector?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**
*(27 November 2013)*

Directive 2010/63/EU ([1]) on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes took effect on 1 January 2013. It covers all use of animals for scientific purpose irrespective of who, industry or research institute is using the animals, and whether the operator is part of a public or private institute. It follows that the regulatory environment perscribed by the directive applies in the same manner to the former and to the latter.

([1]) OJ L 276, 20.10.2010.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011844/13**
**to the Commission**
**James Nicholson (ECR)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Glorification of terrorism

The EU Strategy for Combating Radicalisation and Recruitment to Terrorism includes the aim 'to disrupt the activities of individuals and networks that draw people into terrorism'. On 11 August 2013, a parade took place in the town of Castlederg, in my own constituency of Northern Ireland , to commemorate two Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) members who died in 1973 when their bomb, due to be planted in Castlederg, went off prematurely. On 20 October 2013, a commemoration is due to take place for Thomas Begley, who died when the PIRA bomb he was planting on the Shankill Road exploded prematurely, killing nine people and injuring more than 50. These commemorations are not only grossly insensitive to the victims of such heinous acts, they also serve to glorify acts of terrorism.

What measures can the Commission take to prevent acts that glorify terrorism, and, further, what support will the Commission provide for victims who have been re-traumatised as a result of the glorification of terrorist activities that affected them directly?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(11 December 2013)*

The Commission strongly condemns all use of terrorist violence to advance political causes, whatever their origin.

The Commission is very much involved in the commemoration and support of victims of terrorism. Every year since 2005, on 11 March, the Commission takes an active role in the European Day on Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism.

In addition to funding of projects, the Commission is in the process of establishing a new European Network of Associations of Victims of Terrorism aimed at enhancing the representation of victims' interests at European Union level, and raising awareness among European citizens, in order to strengthen European solidarity with victims of terrorism.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011845/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Model standard pentru tratatele bilaterale de investiții

Într-una din notele de informare privind relațiile externe, emisă de Consiliu, a fost menționată lipsa unui model pentru tratatele bilaterale de investiții. Un astfel de model ar îmbunătăți coerența în politica de investiții a UE și ar contribui la consolidarea normelor la nivel internațional. Având în vedere dimensiunile și capacitatea pieței UE, o standardizare a acestor tratate cu piețe externe și de dimensiuni importante ar putea conduce la instituirea unor standarde pentru protecția investițiilor.

1. Ce măsuri a luat Comisia în direcția unei politici standardizate a UE în domeniul acestor tratate?

2. În ce fel consideră Comisia că poate îmbunătăți transparența și legitimitatea pe piața investițiilor străine?

**Răspuns dat de dl De Gucht în numele Comisiei**
*(26 noiembrie 2013)*

Comisia consideră că ar fi important să se adapteze conținutul viitoarelor acorduri în funcție de caracteristicile partenerilor UE. Pentru aceasta, ar fi necesar ca acordurile de investiții să nu se bazeze pe un model unic. Această intenție a fost deja exprimată în Comunicarea Comisiei din 2010 privind politica de investiții a UE ([1]), pentru a se putea ține cont de contextul specific al fiecărei negocieri și pentru a respecta nivelul de dezvoltare al fiecărui partener.

UE este un mediu de investiții foarte deschis și transparent. Competența exclusivă a UE în domeniul investițiilor, introdusă de Tratatul de la Lisabona, are drept scop menținerea și îmbunătățirea calității cadrului juridic în materie de investiții.

Acordurile UE privind investițiile, pe lângă faptul că asigură cel mai ridicat nivel posibil de protecție a investitorilor, vor crea, de asemenea, condiții de concurență echitabile pentru toți investitorii din UE, precum și pentru investitorii străini prezenți pe piața Uniunii. Aceste acorduri conțin dispoziții moderne și inovatoare, inclusiv cu privire la transparență.

([1]) COM(2010) 343 final.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011845/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Standard model for Bilateral Investment Treaties (BIT)

In a policy briefing on foreign relations released by the Council, the EU's lack of a standard for Bilateral Investment Treaties was mentioned. A template BIT would increase coherence in EU investment policy and would strengthen international norms. With the size and capacity of the EU market, a standardisation of BIT in partnership with large, external markets could lead to an international standard for investment protection.

1. What steps has the Commission taken towards a standardised EU BIT policy?

2. In what ways does the Commission feel it can improve transparency and legitimacy in the foreign investment market?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**
*(26 November 2013)*

The Commission believes that it would be important to adjust the content of future agreements to the characteristics of the EU's partners. This would be better served by not adopting a one-size-fits-all model for investment agreements. This intention has already been expressed in the Commission's Communication of 2010 on the EU investment policy ([1]) for the precise purpose of being able to take into account each specific negotiating context and of respecting the level of development of each partner.

The EU is a very open and transparent investment environment. The EU's exclusive competence on investment, introduced by the Treaty of Lisbon, aims at preserving and improving the quality of the investment legal framework.

The EU agreements on investment, in addition to ensuring the highest possible level of protection for investors, will also create a level-playing field for all EU investors, as well as for foreign investors into the EU. These agreements contain modern and innovative provisions, including on issues such as transparency.

([1]) COM(2010) 343 final.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011846/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Statutul de membru plin în instituțiile financiare internaționale

În ciuda faptului că piața UE constituie atât cel mai mare investitor internațional cât și cea mai mare piață beneficiară de investiții străine directe, Comisia este obligată să funcționeze numai în calitate de observator în cadrul Băncii Mondiale și a Fondului Monetar Internațional (FMI). Acest statut reduce în mod semnificativ protecția și capacitatea UE pe piața mondială.

1. Ce măsuri sunt luate în vederea realizării statutului de membru plin, de către UE, în Banca Mondială și în FMI?

2. Care este calendarul previzibil pentru realizarea statutului de membru plin, de către UE, în Banca Mondială și în Fondul Monetar Internațional?

**Răspuns dat de dl Rehn în numele Comisiei**
*(25 noiembrie 2013)*

La 28 noiembrie 2012, Comisia a adoptat planul de acțiune intitulat „Proiect pentru o Uniune economică și monetară profundă și veritabilă”, în care stabilește o serie de acțiuni prioritare pentru întărirea și consolidarea reprezentării economice externe a zonei euro în cadrul FMI.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011846/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Full member status in international financial institutions

Despite the EU market being both the largest international investor and the largest recipient market of foreign direct investment, the Commission is forced to operate only as an observer in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). This status significantly reduces the protection and capacity of the EU in the global market place.

1. What steps are being taken towards achieving full membership status for the EU in the World Bank and the IMF?

2. What is the foreseeable timetable for full EU membership in the World Bank and the IMF?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**
*(25 November 2013)*

The Commission's Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine Economic and Monetary Union on 28 November 2012 sets out a number of priority actions for the strengthening and consolidation of the external economic representation of the euro area in the IMF.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011847/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Acordarea de licență vaccinului contra malariei de către Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente

Potrivit unui raport al BBC News de miercuri, 9 octombrie 2013, compania farmaceutică GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) are intenția de a prezenta în 2014 Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente (EMA) o cerere de licență pentru un vaccin împotriva malariei. GSK a raportat o cantitate mare de date promițătoare, iar vaccinul este considerat de către unii oameni de știință ca fiind probabil următorul pas în direcția eradicării malariei. De la acțiuni îndreptate spre atingerea Obiectivelor de Dezvoltare ale Mileniului în materie de sănătate până la finanțarea inițiativelor de cercetare pentru combaterea malariei, UE a fost foarte activă în cadrul apelului global privind eradicarea acestei boli. În ciuda acestor eforturi, milioane de persoane sunt încă afectate de malarie în fiecare an.

În perspectiva acestui pas care ar putea avea o importanță esențială în eradicarea malariei, Comisiei i se adresează următoarele întrebări:

1. Care este protocolul EMA pentru evaluarea produselor cu date care indică potențiala eradicare a unei boli globale?

2. Dat fiind faptul că o boală ca malaria este diagnosticată mai ales în afara Europei și că, în comparație, un număr restrâns de cazuri apar în statele membre, care este probabilitatea ca un medicament ca cel descris mai sus să primească din partea EMA statutul de „medicament orfan" (destinat combaterii bolilor rare)?

3. Dacă vaccinul împotriva malariei ar urma să primească „statutul de medicament orfan", prevede Comisia apariția unor conflicte provenind din exclusivitatea comercială pe zece ani de care ar beneficia medicamentul în UE?

**Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei**
*(10 decembrie 2013)*

1. Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente (EMA) dispune de procedurile adecvate pentru a evalua eficacitatea unui potențial vaccin pentru prevenirea malariei. Dacă vaccinul se dovedește a fi de înaltă calitate, eficient și sigur, EMA poate emite un aviz științific, în contextul colaborării cu Organizația Mondială a Sănătății, care poate fi utilizat ulterior de autoritățile naționale de reglementare din statele care nu sunt membre ale UE ca bază pentru o autorizație de introducere pe piață într-o țară din afara UE (așa-numita procedură prevăzută la articolul 58) ([1]). Un ghid pentru solicitanți este disponibil pe site-ul internet al EMA ([2]).

2. Avizul EMA în contextul procedurii prevăzute la articolul 58 este independent de statutul de medicament orfan. În acest context, desemnarea de produs orfan ([3]) ar putea fi acordată în cazul în care solicitantul demonstrează că produsul medicamentos respectiv are ca scop prevenirea unei boli potențial mortale sau a unei boli care provoacă o invaliditate cronică ce afectează mai puțin de cinci din zece mii de persoane din Uniunea Europeană și că nicio altă metodă satisfăcătoare de diagnosticare, prevenire sau tratare a bolii nu mai este autorizată în Uniune. Dacă există o astfel de metodă, compania trebuie să demonstreze că medicamentul va prezenta avantaje semnificative față de tratamentele existente. De exemplu, Comisia a acordat deja în 2012 desemnarea de produs medicamentos orfan unui produs menit să trateze malaria ([4]).

3. În cazul în care vaccinul este autorizat drept produs medicamentos orfan, solicitantul va beneficia de exclusivitate pe piața din Uniunea Europeană timp de zece ani. În acest stadiu, Comisia nu a identificat conflicte cu Obiectivele de dezvoltare ale mileniului pentru a eradica această boală.

---

([1]) Articolul 58 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 726/2004 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 31 martie 2004 de stabilire a procedurilor comunitare privind autorizarea și supravegherea medicamentelor de uz uman și veterinar și de instituire a unei Agenții Europene pentru Medicamente.

([2]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000157.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05800240d1

([3]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 141/2000 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 16 decembrie 1999 privind produsele medicamentoase orfane.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/o1079.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011847/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Licensing of a malaria vaccine by the European Medicines Agency

As reported by BBC News on Wednesday 9 October 2013, British pharmaceutical company GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) intends to submit a licensing application for a malaria vaccine to the European Medicines Agency (EMA) in 2014. GSK has reported a large quantity of promising data, and the vaccine is being considered by some scientists as possibly the next step towards eradicating malaria. From working towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals for health to funding malaria research initiatives, the EU has been very active in the global call to eradicate this disease. Despite these efforts, millions of people are still affected by malaria each year.

In the light of this potentially pivotal step towards ending malaria, the Commission is asked the following:

1. What is the EMA protocol for evaluating products with data pointing to the potential eradication of a global disease?

2. Given that a disease such as malaria is most prominently found outside of Europe, and that comparatively few cases arise in Member States, what is the likelihood of a drug such as the one described above receiving 'orphan drug status' from the EMA?

3. If a malaria vaccine were to receive 'orphan drug status', does the Commission foresee any conflicts arising from the ten-year marketing exclusivity the drug would receive within the EU?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

1. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) has the appropriate procedures to assess the efficacy of a potential vaccine aiming to prevent malaria. If the vaccine proves to be of high quality, efficacious and safe, EMA can adopt a scientific opinion, in the context of the cooperation with the World Health Organisation, which can then be used by Non-EU National Regulatory Authorities as a basis for a Marketing Authorisation in a Non-EU country (so called Article 58-procedure) ([1]). Guidance to applicants is available on the EMA website ([2]).

2. The EMA opinion in the context of the article 58-procedure is independent of the orphan status. In this context, an orphan designation ([3]) could be granted if the applicant establishes that the product intends to prevent a life threatening or chronically debilitating disease affecting less than five in ten-thousand persons in the European Union, and that no other satisfactory method of diagnosis, prevention or treatment of the disease is authorised in the Union. If such method exists, the company has to establish that the medicine will be of significant benefit over existing treatments. For example, the Commission has already granted an orphan designation to a product aiming to treat malaria in 2012 ([4]).

3. If the vaccine is authorised as an orphan medicinal product, the applicant will benefit from 10 years of market exclusivity in the European Union. At this stage the Commission has not identified conflicts with the Millennium Development Goals to eradicate this disease.

---

([1]) Article 58 of Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004. Laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency.
([2]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000157.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05800240d1
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 141/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1999 on orphan medicinal products.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/o1079.htm

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011848/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Rezultate și acțiuni viitoare legate de sistemul automat de recunoaștere a plăcuțelor de înmatriculare

În 2012, Lituania și Estonia au dezvoltat, cu sprijin financiar prin programul Hercule II, un sistem automat de recunoaștere a plăcuțelor de înmatriculare (ANPRS). Colectând informații despre autoturismele și alte autovehicule care intră și ies din Estonia, Letonia și Lituania, scopul ANPRS este de a consolida lupta împotriva contrabandei cu țigări și a contrafacerii acestora.

1. Ce cantitate de țigări de contrabandă/contrafăcute capturate poate fi atribuită ANPRS și care este raportul dintre țigările de contrabandă/contrafăcute capturate înainte de introducerea ANPRS și cele capturate ulterior?

2. Are Comisia informații în legătură cu alte state membre sau țări terțe din zone cu grad ridicat de risc care doresc să introducă ANPRS urmând exemplul Lituaniei și al Estoniei? Dacă da, care sunt aceste țări?

**Răspuns dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei**
*(6 ianuarie 2014)*

1. Pe baza informațiilor furnizate de către beneficiarul unui grant Hercule, sistemul automat de recunoaștere a plăcuțelor de înmatriculare (ANPRS) implementat în Estonia, Letonia și Lituania a fost de o importanță crucială în detectarea mărfurilor de contrabandă, inclusiv a țigărilor și tutunului. În acest stadiu însă nu este posibilă furnizarea unor date exacte cu privire la procentul pe care îl reprezintă țigările și tutunul confiscate cu ajutorul ANPRS din cantitatea totală de țigări și tutun confiscate. În prezent, beneficiarii granturilor Hercule trebuie să raporteze la un an de la încetarea acordării grantului cu privire la principalele rezultate obținute cu echipamentele achiziționate în cadrul unui grant de asistență tehnică acordat prin programul Hercule. Aceste informații vor fi incluse în raportul anual privind punerea în aplicare a programului Hercule, astfel cum se prevede în Decizia privind programul Hercule II. Următorul raport anual care va oferi o imagine de ansamblu asupra rezultatelor din 2013 aferente programului Hercule II va fi publicat sub formă de DLSC ([1]) anexat la raportul anual elaborat în temeiul articolului 325 ([2]). Se preconizează că acest raport va fi adoptat de Colegiu la jumătatea anului 2014.

2. UE a finanțat sisteme automate de recunoaștere a plăcuțelor de înmatriculare în mai multe state membre, cum ar fi Finlanda, Polonia, Ungaria și Slovacia, în vederea monitorizării traficului transfrontalier al acestora cu țările terțe. În prezent, 54 din cele 86 (63 %) de puncte vamale de trecere a frontierei situate la frontierele terestre estice ale UE sunt dotate cu ANPRS. Aceste puncte de trecere a frontierei acoperă aproximativ 74 % din trafic.

Recent, Comisia a fost informată cu privire la inițiative care vizează extinderea la Polonia și interconectarea ANPRS-ului dezvoltat de cele trei state membre baltice. În plus, Comisia a acordat recent subvenții în temeiul programului Hercule II Irlandei, Poloniei și României pentru a achiziționa și implementa ANPRS-uri care vor fi utilizate în vederea combaterii contrabandei cu tutun și țigări.

([1]) Document de lucru al serviciilor Comisiei.
([2]) Raport privind protecția intereselor financiare ale UE și combaterea fraudei, elaborat în temeiul articolului 325.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011848/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Results and future actions related to automated number-plate recognition system

In 2012 Lithuania and Estonia developed, with financial support through the Hercule II programme, an automated number-plate recognition system (ANPRS). By capturing information about cars and other vehicles entering and leaving Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, the purpose of the ANPRS is to reinforce the fight against cigarette smuggling and counterfeiting.

1. What amount of smuggled / counterfeit cigarettes seized is attributable to the ANPRS, and what is the ratio of smuggled / counterfeit cigarettes seized before and after the establishment of the ANPRS?

2. Is the Commission aware of other Member States or third countries in high-risk areas willing to introduce an ANPRS following the example of Lithuania and Estonia? If so, which countries?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission**
*(6 January 2014)*

1. On the basis of the information provided by the beneficiary of a Hercule grant, the ANPRS deployed in the Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania has been instrumental in the detection of smuggled goods, including cigarettes and tobacco. At this stage, it is not possible however to provide precise figures on the share of cigarettes and tobacco seized with the help of the ANPRS in the overall amount of seized cigarettes and tobacco. The beneficiaries of Hercule grants now have to report one year after closure of the grant on the main results achieved with the equipment purchased under a Technical Assistance grant awarded under the Hercule programme. This information will be included in the annual report on the implementation of the Hercule programme, as provided for in the Hercule II Decision. The next annual report with an overview of the 2013 results in relation to the Hercule II programme will be published as CSWD ([1]) annexed to the annual Article 325 Report ([2]). This report is expected to be adopted by the College mid-2014.

2. The EU funded ANPRS in several Member States, such as Finland, Poland, Hungary or Slovakia, in order to monitor their cross-border traffic with third countries. Now 54 out of 86 (63%) Customs Border Crossing Points on the Eastern land borders of the EU have an ANPRS system. These crossing points cover around 74% of the traffic.

The Commission has recently been informed of initiatives aimed at extending and interconnecting the ANPRS system developed by the three Baltic Member States to Poland. Moreover, the Commission recently awarded grants under the Hercule II programme to Ireland, Poland and Romania for the purchase and implementation of ANPRS that will be used in the fight against the smuggling of tobacco and cigarettes.

([1]) Commission Staff Working Document.
([2]) Article 325 Report on the protection of the EU's financial interests and fight against fraud.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011849/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Statele membre și nivelurile diferite de depistare și raportare a neregulilor frauduloase în 2012

Raportul anual pe 2012 privind protecția intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene, „Combaterea fraudei", menționează faptul că rata fraudelor variază masiv de la un stat membru la altul. De exemplu, Italia, Polonia, România, Danemarca și Germania depistează și raportează în mod eficient neregulile frauduloase, în timp ce alte state membre depistează și raportează foarte puține astfel de cazuri (Belgia, Franța, Cipru, Țările de Jos și Austria) sau niciunul (Grecia, Luxemburg, Malta și Finlanda).

Comisia a explicat că aceste diferențe decurg din doi factori principali:

— existența unor abordări diferite pentru depistarea și raportarea neregulilor frauduloase în cadrul statelor membre și în cadrul diferitelor administrații existente în aceeași țară;

— abordarea statelor membre cu privire la neregulile frauduloase: în timp ce unele state investesc resurse semnificative pentru a contracara fraudele, altele preferă să aplice sancțiuni financiare fără a continua cercetarea unor eventuale activități infracționale.

1. Ce măsuri ia Comisia pentru a asigura un nivel minim de armonizare la nivelul tuturor statelor membre și al administrațiilor lor respective competente?

2. Care sunt statele membre care aplică sancțiuni financiare fără a continua cercetarea unor eventuale infracțiuni existente în cazurile de nereguli frauduloase?

3. Ce politici implementează Comisia pentru a îndemna respectivele state membre să investească mai mult în combaterea fraudelor?

**Răspuns dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei**
*(19 decembrie 2013)*

1. Comisia o roagă pe doamna deputat să consulte raportul anual pe 2012 „Protejarea intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene — Combaterea fraudei" ([1]), în special recomandările 1, 4, 5, 8 și 9 ([2]).

Atunci când există suspiciuni privind posibile nereguli frauduloase, sarcina de a deschide cercetări penale revine autorităților competente ale statelor membre. Comisia a adoptat în 2012 o inițiativă prin care se vizează o mai bună armonizare a legislațiilor penale în acest domeniu ([3]). Această inițiativă se află în prezent în discuție în cadrul Consiliului și al Parlamentului European.

Atunci când OLAF transmite autorităților naționale informații sau le recomandă acestora să întreprindă măsuri de urmărire judiciară, autoritățile competente din statele membre trebuie să informeze OLAF cu privire la eventualele măsuri întreprinse pe baza informațiilor care le-au fost transmise ([4]).

2. Comisia a emis o recomandare de intensificare a eforturilor depuse de statele membre pentru detectarea fraudelor în domeniul politicii de coeziune ([5]). Această recomandare se adresează în special Greciei, Franței și Spaniei, țări care, în legătură cu finanțările primite, fie nu au detectat și nu au raportat nimic în ultimii ani, fie au detectat și au raportat foarte puține cazuri în care există suspiciuni de fraudă.

([1]) Raportul anual al Comisiei intitulat „Protejarea intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene — Combaterea fraudei", COM(2013) 548.
([2]) Recomandarea 1: desemnarea sau stabilirea unui serviciu de coordonare antifraudă (AFCOS);
Recomandarea 4: consolidarea eforturilor de depistare a fraudelor;
Recomandarea 5: autoritățile competente ar trebui să ia în considerare rezultatele analizei în momentul planificării verificărilor și controalelor;
Recomandarea 8: statele membre ar trebui să adopte și să dezvolte verificări și controale, să structureze și să îmbunătățească cooperarea dintre autoritățile de gestionare și organismele antifraudă și să îmbunătățească analizele de risc și instrumentele IT;
Recomandarea 9: adoptarea dispozițiilor CFM privind prevenirea fraudelor.
([3]) Propunere de directivă privind combaterea fraudelor îndreptate împotriva intereselor financiare ale Uniunii prin intermediul dreptului penal, COM(2012) 363.
([4]) Articolul 12 alineatul (3) din Regulamentul 883/2013.
([5]) Raportul anual al Comisiei intitulat „Protejarea intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene — Combaterea fraudei", COM(2013) 548, anexa 1 și recomandarea 4.

3. Programul Hercule II ([6]) promovează activități în domeniul protecției intereselor financiare ale UE, în scopul prevenirii și al combaterii fraudelor care aduc atingere intereselor financiare ale Uniunii, inclusiv a contrabandei cu țigări și a contrafacerii acestora. Acest program are scopul de a îmbunătăți cooperarea dintre statele membre, Comisie și OLAF ([7]) prin furnizarea unui sprijin financiar autorităților naționale și regionale din statele membre. Comisia transmite anual Parlamentului European informații cu privire la rezultatele programului ([8]).

Comisia o invită pe doamna deputat să consulte și comunicările Comisiei cu privire la o strategie antifraudă ([9]) și la combaterea corupției în UE ([10]).

([6]) Decizia nr. 878/2007/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 23 iulie 2007.
([7]) Decizia Comisiei privind adoptarea unei decizii de finanțare pentru anul 2013 în cadrul programului Hercule II, C(2013)612 din 7 februarie 2013.
([8]) SWD(2012) 445 din 11 decembrie 2012: Annual Overview with Information on the Results of the Hercule II Programme in 2011 și SWD(2013) 287 din 27 iulie 2013: Annual Overview with Information on the Results of the Hercule II Programme in 2012.
([9]) COM(2011) 376 final și SEC(2011) 787.
([10]) COM(2011) 308 final.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011849/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Member States and the variable level of detection and reporting of fraudulent irregularities in 2012

The 2012 Annual Report on the Protection of the EU's financial interest, 'Fight against fraud', mentions that the rate of fraud still varies widely from one Member State to another. For instance, Italy, Poland, Romania, Denmark and Germany efficiently detect and report fraudulent irregularities, while other Member States detect and report very few (Belgium, France, Cyprus, the Netherlands and Austria) or none at all (Greece, Luxembourg, Malta and Finland).

The Commission explains that these differences derive from two main factors:

— the existence of very diverse approaches for the detection and reporting of fraudulent irregularities among Member States and among the different administrations existing in the same country;

— the Member States' approach towards fraudulent irregularities: while some Member States invest significant resources to counter fraud, others prefer to apply financial corrections without further investigation of the potential criminal activities.

1. What measures is the Commission taking to ensure a minimum level of harmonisation across all Member States and their respective responsible administrations?

2. Which Member States apply financial corrections without further investigation of the potential criminal offence in cases of fraudulent irregularities?

3. What policies is the Commission implementing in order to urge those Member States to invest more in countering fraud?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission**
*(19 December 2013)*

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its 2012 annual report on the Protection of the EU financial interests 'Fight against fraud' ([1]), in particular to the recommendations number 1, 4, 5, 8 and 9 ([2]).

Where fraudulent irregularities are suspected, it is in the remit of the competent MS (Member States) authorities to launch criminal investigations. The Commission adopted in 2012 an initiative aimed at a better harmonisation of criminal laws in this area ([3]). This is currently under discussion at the Council and the European Parliament.

When OLAF transmits information to the national authorities or recommend judicial follow up, the competent authorities of MS shall inform OLAF on action taken if any on the basis of the information transmitted to them ([4]).

2. The Commission issued a recommendation to strengthen the efforts to detect fraud by the MS, in particular to Greece, France and Spain in the area of the Cohesion policy ([5]), as they are the countries that, in relation to the funding received, have detected and reported no (or very few) cases of suspected fraud in recent years.

([1]) Commission's annual report on the Protection of the European Union's financial interests — Fight against fraud COM(2013) 548.
([2]) No 1: to designate or establish an AFCOS;
No 4: to strengthen the efforts to detect fraud;
No 5: competent authorities should take the results of the analysis into account where planning their checks and controls;
No 8: all Member States (MS) shall adopt and develop checks and controls, structure and improve cooperation between managing authorities and anti-fraud bodies, and improve risk analysis and IT tools;
No 9: to adopt the MFF provisions on fraud prevention.
([3]) COM(2012) 363: Proposal for a directive on the fight against fraud to the Union's financial interests by means of criminal law.
([4]) Article 12(3) of Regulation 883/2013.
([5]) Commission's annual report on the Protection of the European Union's financial interests — Fight against fraud COM(2013) 548 — Annex 1 and Recommendation 4.

3. The Hercule II programme ([6]) promotes activities in the field of the protection of the financial interests of the EU in order to prevent and combat fraud affecting the financial interests of the Union, including the fight against cigarette smuggling and counterfeiting. This programme aims to improve the cooperation between the MS, the Commission and OLAF ([7]) by providing financial support to national and regional authorities in the MS. The Commission provides annual information to the European Parliament on the results of the Programme ([8]).

The Commission would also invite the Honourable Member to refer to its communications on an anti-fraud strategy ([9]) and on Fighting Corruption in the EU ([10]).

([6]) Decision No 878/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2007.
([7]) Commission decision concerning the adoption of a financing decision for 2013 in the framework of the Hercule II Programme C(2013) 612 of 7 February 2013.
([8]) SWD(2012) 445 of 11 December 2012 : Annual Overview with Information on the Results of the Hercule II Programme in 2011 and SWD(2013) 287 of 27 July 2013: Annual Overview with Information on the Results of the Hercule II Programme in 2012.
([9]) COM(2011) 376 final and SEC(2011) 787.
([10]) COM(2011) 308 final.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011850/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Acțiunile judiciare și sumele recuperate ca urmare a recomandărilor OLAF din 2012

În 2012, Oficiul European de Luptă Antifraudă (OLAF) a emis pentru autoritățile naționale 54 de recomandări de acțiuni judiciare și a recomandat, de asemenea, recuperarea unei sume de aproximativ 284 de milioane de euro, din care 165,8 milioane de euro legate de venituri și 118,2 milioane de euro legate de cheltuieli.

1. Din cele 54 de recomandări de acțiuni judiciare, câte au dus la inițierea de către autoritățile naționale competente a unor proceduri judiciare efective? La ce state membre se referă recomandările respective?

2. În urma recomandării OLAF, ce fonduri au fost recuperate în ceea ce privește veniturile și, respectiv, cheltuielile?

**Răspuns dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei**
*(9 ianuarie 2014)*

OLAF a primit informații potrivit cărora 37 din cele 54 de recomandări emise în 2012 au condus la inițierea unor proceduri penale, iar alte 10 recomandări au determinat adoptarea unor decizii de concediere. OLAF nu a primit încă informații cu privire la punerea în aplicare a celorlalte 7 recomandări restante.

Următoarele state membre au primit recomandări judiciare din partea OLAF în 2012: Austria, Belgia, Bulgaria, Cipru, Estonia, Finlanda, Franța, Germania, Grecia, Italia, Luxemburg, Malta, Polonia, Portugalia, Regatul Unit, Republica Cehă, România, Slovacia, Spania și Țările de Jos.

Astfel cum se specifică în Raportul anual al OLAF pe 2012 la care se referă distinsul membru, pentru a reflecta mai bine activitatea pe parcursul anului de raportare, OLAF înregistrează sumele recuperate în anul care face obiectul recuperării, indiferent de momentul în care au fost emise efectiv recomandările în materie de recuperare. În conformitate cu această abordare, OLAF va furniza informații cu privire la sumele recuperate în 2013 în Raportul său anual pe 2013.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011850/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Judicial actions and recoveries following recommendations by the OLAF in 2012

In 2012 the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) issued 54 recommendations for judicial action to national authorities and a sum of about EUR 284 million was recommended for recovery, of which EUR 165.8 million related to revenue and EUR 118.2 million to expenditure.

1. Out of the 54 recommendations for judicial action, how many have led to actual judicial proceedings by the competent national authorities? Which Member States are concerned by those recommendations?

2. Following the recommendation by the OLAF, what amount of funding has been recovered in term of revenue and expenditure respectively?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 January 2014)*

OLAF has received information that 37 of the 54 recommendations issued in 2012 have resulted in the initiation of criminal proceedings and a further 10 have resulted in dismissal decisions. As regards the implementation of the remaining 7 recommendations, OLAF has not yet received information.

The following Member States received judicial recommendations issued by OLAF in 2012 — Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain and United Kingdom.

As indicated in the OLAF Annual Report for 2012 to which the Honourable Member refers, in order to better reflect the activity during the reporting year, OLAF records the amounts recovered in the year of the recovery, regardless of when the recommendations for recovery were actually issued. In line with this approach, OLAF will report on the recoveries made in 2013 in the OLAF Annual Report for 2013.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011853/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Proiectul pilot pentru combaterea traficului de ființe umane

Traficul de ființe umane este un veritabil flagel care afectează fiecare stat membru și UE ca întreg. Victimele traficului de ființe umane provin nu numai din țări non-UE precum Nigeria, Vietnam, Ucraina, Rusia și China, ci și din interiorul UE (în principal din Bulgaria, România, Polonia și Ungaria). Statele membre care se află la frontierele estice sunt în mod deosebit vulnerabile la acest fenomen. De exemplu, Lituania este recunoscută nu numai ca o țară sursă a traficului de ființe umane pentru exploatare sexuală și în muncă, ci și ca cea mai importantă țară de tranzit între Europa de Est și Europa Centrală.

Conform „Strategiei UE pentru eradicarea traficului de ființe umane 2012-2016", UE a finanțat un proiect pilot în 2012 pentru a întări cooperarea regională în combaterea traficului de ființe umane pe rutele dinspre est spre UE, utilizând Instrumentul pentru stabilitate.

1. Cât va dura proiectul, ce buget îi este alocat și cine sunt beneficiarii?

2. Ce politici și/sau acțiuni au fost implementate prin acest proiect pilot?

3. Care sunt rezultatele preliminare ale proiectului pilot?

**Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei**
*(11 decembrie 2013)*

Comisia împărtășește preocupările distinsei deputate în Parlamentul European.

Conform Eurostat, ponderea resortisanților țărilor terțe din numărul total de victime ale traficului de persoane din Uniunea Europeană a crescut în perioada 2008-2010, de la 12 % în 2008 la 37 % în 2010, în cazul victimelor de sex masculin, și de la 18 % la 39 %, în cazul victimelor de sex feminin.

Etapa a II-a a programului care vizează ruta heroinei a fost lansată în 2012, beneficiind de o contribuție de 6 milioane EUR din partea Uniunii Europene. Acest program are ca scop combaterea traficului de persoane și a criminalității organizate către și dinspre Afganistan. Acest program include un proiect privind traficul de persoane, care este finanțat cu până la 1,5 milioane EUR din fondurile Instrumentului de stabilitate ([1]). Promotorul proiectului este Centrul internațional pentru dezvoltarea politicilor de migrație. Proiectul a început în ianuarie 2013 și se va încheia în iulie 2014.

Acest proiect este menit să completeze și să consolideze inițiativele regionale și internaționale care au fost adoptate în scopul combaterii traficului de persoane și a criminalității organizate de-a lungul rutei heroinei, fiind vizate țări cum ar fi Azerbaidjan, fosta Republică iugoslavă a Macedoniei și Republica Moldova. Proiectul se concentrează asupra a trei direcții principale de acțiune: îmbunătățirea colectării datelor; promovarea și acordarea de asistență în ceea ce privește schimbul de informații și coordonarea regională; consolidarea cooperării naționale și transnaționale în domeniul aplicării legii și consolidarea capacității procurorilor, a personalului consular și a personalului organizațiilor neguvernamentale.

Proiectul se află încă în plin proces de punere în aplicare, Comisia urmând să evalueze rezultatele sale la momentul oportun. Toate informațiile referitoare la evoluțiile înregistrate în cadrul proiectului pot fi consultate pe site-ul internet al UE privind combaterea traficului de persoane ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Projects/IFS_2012_299415
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011853/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Pilot project on fighting human trafficking

Human trafficking is a blight which affects every Member State and the EU as a whole. Victims of human trafficking come not only from non-EU countries such as Nigeria, Vietnam, Ukraine, Russia and China, but also from within the EU (mainly from Bulgaria, Romania, Poland and Hungary). Member States located at the eastern boarders are particularly vulnerable to this phenomenon. For instance, Lithuania is recognised not only as a source country for trafficking in human beings for sexual and labour exploitation, but also as the most important country of transit between eastern and central Europe.

According to the 'EU strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in human beings 2012-2016', the EU funded a pilot project in 2012 to strengthen regional cooperation in the fight against trafficking in human beings along routes from the East to the EU using the Instrument for Stability.

1. How long will the pilot project last, what budget has it been allocated and who are the beneficiaries?

2. What policies and/or actions have been implemented through the pilot project?

3. What are the preliminary results of the pilot project?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(11 December 2013)*

The Commission shares the concerns of the Honourable Member.

According to Eurostat, the proportion of non-EU citizens within the total number of victims of trafficking in human beings in the European Union increased between 2008 and 2010, from 12% in 2008 to 37% in 2010 for male victims, and from 18% to 39% for female victims.

Phase II of the programme Heroin Route was launched in 2012 with a EUR 6 million contribution from the European Union. It aims at fighting trafficking in human beings and organised crime to and from Afghanistan. It includes a project on trafficking in human beings which is funded up to EUR 1.5 million by the Instrument for Stability ([1]). The promoter of the project is the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD). The project started in January 2013 and will be finalised in July 2014.

This project aims at complementing and reinforcing regional and international initiatives taken in order to address trafficking in human beings and organised crime along the Heroin Route, targeting countries such as Azerbaijan, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Moldova. It is organised around three clusters: the improvement of data collection, the promotion and the assistance in information sharing and regional coordination, and the enhancement of national and transnational law enforcement cooperation and of the capacity of prosecutors, consular and non-governmental organisations staff.

The project is still in process of implementation; the Commission will assess the results in due course. All information on project developments can be found on the EU Anti Trafficking website ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Projects/IFS_2012_299415
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011854/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Anchetarea și urmărirea penală a traficanților de ființe umane în Uniunea Europeană

Traficul intern de ființe umane este în creștere, și multe dintre victimele sale sunt cetățeni ai UE. Fără anchete și o urmărire penală eficace, fenomenul va continua să ia amploare. În prezent, numărul total al urmăririlor penale în UE rămâne scăzut. În plus, datele arată o scădere de 13% a numărului condamnărilor în cazurile de trafic cu ființe umane între 2008 și 2010: 1 534 în 2008, 1 445 în 2009 și 1 144 în 2010.

În 2012, în cadrul Strategiei UE pentru „Eradicarea traficului de ființe umane 2012-2016", Comisia recomandă statelor membre să înființeze unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii în domeniul traficului de ființe umane. O astfel de măsură va permite o îmbunătățire a investigațiilor și a urmăririi penale a traficanților, precum și o cooperare transfrontalieră mai strânsă și centralizarea cunoștințelor cu privire la traficul de ființe umane.

1. La un an de la publicarea Strategiei UE pentru „Eradicarea traficului de ființe umane 2012-2016", ce statele membre au urmat recomandarea Comisiei de a înființa unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii în domeniul traficului de ființe umane?

2. Ce măsuri a luat Comisia și alte agenții responsabile ale UE pentru a convinge statele membre care nu au înființat încă unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii în domeniul traficului de ființe umane să facă acest lucru?

**Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei**
*(2 decembrie 2013)*

Comisia Europeană împărtășește preocupările doamnei deputat legate de acest nou fenomen de trafic de persoane în interiorul UE și de estimările Eurostat privind numărul total de urmăriri penale și scăderea numărului de condamnări din UE între 2008 și 2010.

Subiectul înființării de unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii în domeniul traficului de persoane a fost inclus în concluziile Consiliului privind noua Strategie a UE pentru perioada 2012-2016 în vederea eradicării traficului de persoane ([1]). Așa cum se precizează în Prioritatea C prima acțiune din Strategia UE pentru perioada 2012-2016 în vederea eradicării traficului de persoane, sarcina înființării acestor unități le revine statelor membre.

Pentru moment, Comisia nu este în măsură să furnizeze informații specifice cu privire la statele membre care au creat deja astfel de unități. Primul raport privind punerea în aplicare a acestei strategii UE va fi publicat în 2014. În măsura în care acest lucru va fi posibil, raportul va cuprinde informații relevante cu privire la înființarea de unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii.

Comisia înțelege că înființarea de noi structuri de acest tip la nivel național ar putea fi dificilă pentru anumite țări, având în vedere constrângerile economice și bugetare actuale. În concluzie, Comisia subliniază necesitatea de a se consolida cooperarea dintre unitățile de aplicare a legii care se ocupă de diversele aspecte ale problemei traficului de persoane și ia măsuri menite să încurajeze o astfel de cooperare și să creeze sinergii pentru a se asigura o abordare multidisciplinară, pentru a se consolida contactele cu părțile interesate implicate și pentru ca lupta împotriva traficului de persoane să fie abordată la toate nivelurile de cooperare.

([1]) Concluziile Consiliului privind noua Strategie a UE pentru perioada 2012-2016 în vederea eradicării traficului de persoane — Cea de a 3195-a reuniune a Consiliului Justiție și Afaceri Interne, Luxemburg, 25 octombrie 2012. Disponibile la adresa: http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/download.action?nodePath=/EU+Policy/Council+conclusions+on+the+new+EU+Strategy+towards+the+Eradication+of+Trafficking+in+Human+Beings+2012+-+2016.pdf&fileName=Council+conclusions+on+the+new+EU+Strategy+towards+the+Eradication+of+Trafficking+in+Human+Beings+2012+-+2016.pdf&fileType=pdf.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011854/13**
**to the Commission**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Investigation and prosecution of human traffickers in the European Union

Internal human trafficking is on the rise and many of its victims are EU citizens. Without effective investigation and prosecution, the phenomenon will keep flourishing. At present, the total number of prosecutions in the EU remains low. In addition, data showed a decrease of 13% in the number of convictions on trafficking in human beings between 2008 and 2010: 1 534 in 2008, 1 445 in 2009 and 1 144 in 2010.

In 2012, in the framework of the EU Strategy towards the 'Eradication of trafficking in human beings 2012-2016', the Commission recommended that Member States establish national multidisciplinary law-enforcement units on human trafficking. Such a measure would enable better investigation into, and prosecution of, traffickers, as well as deeper cross-border cooperation and the centralisation of knowledge on trafficking in human beings.

1. A year after the publication of the EU Strategy towards the 'Eradication of trafficking in human beings 2012-2016', which Member States have followed the Commission's recommendation and established national multidisciplinary law-enforcement units on human trafficking?

2. What measures have been put in place by the Commission and other responsible EU Agencies in order to convince Member States that have not yet established national multidisciplinary law-enforcement units on human trafficking to do so in the near future?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(2 December 2013)*

The European Commission shares the concerns of the Honourable Member on the new phenomenon of intra-EU trafficking in human beings, and on the Eurostat estimates on the total number of prosecutions and on the decrease of convictions in the EU between 2008 and 2010.

The establishment of national multidisciplinary law enforcement units on trafficking in human beings was part of the Council conclusions on the new EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 ([1]). As stated in the first action under 'Priority C' of the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016, the establishment of such units is left to Member States.

For the moment, the Commission is not in the position to provide specific information on which Member States have already established such units. The first implementation report of the EU Strategy will be published in 2014. As far as possible, the relevant information regarding the establishment of those national multidisciplinary law enforcement units will be incorporated.

The Commission understands that the establishment of new structures of this kind at national level might be difficult for some countries given current economic and budgetary constraints. Having said this, the Commission highlights the need to strengthen cooperation between law enforcement units dealing with different aspects of the issue of trafficking in human beings and is taking steps to encourage such cooperation and create synergies to ensure a multidisciplinary approach, and to develop contacts with stakeholders involved, to address trafficking in human beings through every level of cooperation.

([1]) Council conclusions on the new EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 — 3195th JUSTICE and HOME AFFAIRS Council meeting Luxembourg, 25 October 2012 available at http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/download.action?nodePath=/EU+Policy/Council+conclusions+on+the+new+EU+Strategy+towards+the+Eradication+of+Trafficking+in+Human+Beings+2012+-+2016.pdf&fileName=Council+conclusions+on+the+new+EU+Strategy+towards+the+Eradication+of+Trafficking+in+Human+Beings+2012+-+2016.pdf&fileType=pdf

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011855/13**
**à Comissão**
**Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)**
*(16 de outubro de 2013)*

*Assunto:* Cooperativas — Acesso ao financiamento e aplicação dos princípios cooperativos da ACI

Em 2004, numa Comunicação relativa à promoção das cooperativas na Europa (COM(2004)0018), a Comissão recomendava que os legisladores nacionais baseassem as suas legislações sobre cooperativas na definição, nos valores e nos princípios expostos na «Declaração sobre a Identidade Cooperativa», aprovada pela Aliança Cooperativa Internacional (ACI) em 1995.

Tendo em conta as enormes dificuldades sentidas pelas sociedades cooperativas no que respeita ao acesso ao financiamento, que subsistem, em parte, devido à não distinção entre estas e as pequenas e médias empresas e à inexistência de instrumentos financeiros próprios, pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a evolução registada no que respeita à recomendação dirigida aos Estados-Membros sobre o reconhecimento dos princípios da ACI?

2. Se se mantém a intenção de atribuir às cooperativas um enquadramento legislativo mais claro e coerente, que tenha em conta as suas características particulares e as necessidades específicas em termos de financiamento? Concretamente, o que está a ser feito a este respeito?

3. Tenciona a Comissão continuar a tratar as sociedades cooperativas como se fossem pequenas e médias empresas, ou existe a intenção de incluir no orçamento comunitário e, em particular, nos instrumentos do Fundo Europeu de Investimento, referências específicas às cooperativas?

**Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão**
*(29 de novembro de 2013)*

1. Na sequência da sua comunicação de 2004, e no sentido de contribuir para a sensibilização para o modelo de empresa cooperativa, a Comissão organizou conferências ([1]), financiou um estudo sobre a aplicação do Estatuto da Sociedade Cooperativa Europeia (Regulamento (SCE) n.° 1435/2003) ([2]), encomendou a recolha de dados estatísticos ([3]), procedeu a consultas sobre a necessidade de alterar a legislação existente ([4]) e apresentou um relatório exaustivo sobre esta questão ao Conselho e ao PE ([5]).

2. No seguimento de uma consulta acerca da necessidade de simplificar o Regulamento SCE e da sua relativa baixa popularidade entre os utilizadores, a Comissão concluiu que o reduzido aproveitamento se deve, principalmente, à falta de compreensão dos possíveis benefícios das cooperativas para os seus membros e, por conseguinte, está atualmente a organizar grupos de trabalho com representantes das cooperativas europeias e nacionais, para analisar formas de promover e apoiar o desenvolvimento das cooperativas ao nível europeu.

3. A política da Comissão sobre as cooperativas é a de garantir que as cooperativas, independentemente da sua dimensão, possam continuar a operar no mercado, preservando o seu papel social, estilo específico de funcionamento e ética. Estes aspetos são tidos em conta nas políticas da UE em matéria de auxílios estatais, harmonização do direito das sociedades, contabilidade, desenvolvimento regional, financiamento a partir dos fundos estruturais e liberdade de estabelecimento. O projeto de proposta do programa do quadro financeiro plurianual 2014-2020 não inclui instrumentos específicos para promoção das cooperativas. A Comissão tem, no entanto, recomendado aos Estados-Membros que forneçam apoio específico às empresas sociais através de programas dos fundos estruturais da UE e lhes concedam acesso aos regimes de apoio em pé de igualdade com os restantes tipos de PME.

---

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=5876
para comemorar a Ano Internacional das Cooperativas 2012, proclamado pelas Nações Unidas, em Bruxelas, em abril de 2012, e em Nicósia, em setembro de 2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/files/sce_final_study_part_i.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=487
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/public-consultation/past-consultations/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/files/smes/1_en_act_part1_v7_en.pdf e
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=3318

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011855/13**
**to the Commission**
**Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Cooperatives — access to funding and application of the ICA's cooperative principles

In 2004, in a communication on the promotion of cooperative societies in Europe (COM(2004)0018), the Commission recommended that national legislators base their laws governing cooperatives on the definition, values and principles set out in the 'Statement on the Cooperative Identity', adopted by the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) in 1995.

In view of the enormous difficulties facing cooperative societies in terms of access to funding, which are partly down to no distinction being made between cooperative societies and small and medium-sized enterprises, and cooperative societies not having their own financial instruments:

1. What progress has been made in terms of the recommendation made to Member States regarding recognition of the ICA's principles?

2. Is there any intention to give cooperatives a clearer legislative and more consistent legislative framework, which takes account of their specific features and their particular financing needs? Specifically, what is being done in this regard?

3. Will the Commission continue to treat cooperative societies as if they were small and medium-sized enterprises, or does it intend to include specific references to cooperatives in the EU budget and, in particular, in European Investment Fund instruments?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**
*(29 November 2013)*

1. Following its 2004 Communication and to improve awareness of the cooperative business model, the Commission organised conferences ([1]), funded a study on the implementation of the Statute for a European Cooperative Society (SCE Regulation 1435/2003) ([2]), commissioned the collection of statistical data ([3]), proceeded to consultations on the need to amend the existing legislation ([4]), and made a comprehensive report on this issue to the Council and the EP ([5]).

2. Following a consultation about the need to simplify the SCE Regulation and its relative lack of popularity among users, the Commission concluded that the poor uptake is mostly due to a lack of understanding of the possible benefits of cooperatives for their members; therefore it is currently organising working groups with representatives of European and national cooperatives, to examine ways of promoting and supporting the development of cooperatives at European level.

3. The Commission's policy about cooperatives is to guarantee that cooperatives, independently of their size, can continue to operate in the market by preserving their social role, particular style of functioning and ethics. These aspects are taken into account in EU policies relating to state aids, harmonisation of company law, accounting, regional development, financing from structural funds and freedom of establishment. The draft proposal for a 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework programme does not include specific instruments to promote cooperatives. The Commission has however recommended to the Member States to provide specific support to social business via the EU's structural funding programmes and give them access to its support schemes on an equal footing with all other types of SMEs.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=5876 to celebrate the UN 2012 International Year of Cooperatives in Brussels April 2012 and in Nicosia September 2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/files/sce_final_study_part_i.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=487
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/public-consultation/past-consultations/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/files/smes/1_en_act_part1_v7_en.pdf and http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=3318

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011856/13**
**à Comissão**
**Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL) e Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL)**
*(16 de outubro de 2013)*

*Assunto:* Violação da legislação europeia pela STCP (Sociedade de Transportes Colectivos do Porto, S.A.)

Muito recentemente, a Sociedade de Transportes Colectivos do Porto, S.A. (STCP) entendeu concessionar a privados várias linhas da sua rede, abstendo-se de consultar a Comissão de Trabalhadores para o efeito, violando a legislação europeia.

Todo este processo parece ter sido conduzido pela STCP com má-fé, através de esquemas que visam diminuir a procura dos seus próprios serviços para assim justificar a inevitabilidade da concessão a privados, em desrespeito do interesse público e de um modo nada transparente. A Comissão de Trabalhadores não foi ouvida, apesar de estarmos perante mudanças substanciais no funcionamento da empresa, que podem pôr em causa postos de trabalho.

Tendo em conta a legislação europeia existente, nomeadamente o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1370/2007 e a Diretiva 2002/14/CE, solicita-se à Comissão que se pronuncie sobre:

— a validade do contrato em causa, e

— a violação flagrante dos direitos dos trabalhadores.

Pergunta-se ainda à Comissão como pretende agir face a esta situação, e se iniciará uma investigação que esclareça o caso, a bem do interesse público e dos trabalhadores da STCP.

**Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão**
*(9 de dezembro de 2013)*

A Comissão não tem competência para intervir em decisões específicas das empresas. No entanto, o empregador tem de informar e consultar os seus empregados antes de tomar decisões que lhes dizem respeito, em conformidade com a legislação da UE e, em especial, com as Diretivas 2002/14/CE ([1]), 2001/23/CE ([2]) e 98/59/CE ([3]). Cabe às autoridades nacionais competentes, nomeadamente os tribunais, assegurar que a legislação nacional que transpõe essas diretivas da UE é correta e eficazmente aplicada pelo empregador em causa, tendo em conta as circunstâncias específicas de cada caso.

([1]) Diretiva 2002/14/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 11 de março de 2002, que estabelece um quadro geral relativo à informação e à consulta dos trabalhadores na Comunidade Europeia, JO L 80 de 23.3.2002.

([2]) Diretiva 2001/23/CE do Conselho, de 12 de março de 2001, relativa à aproximação das legislações dos Estados-Membros respeitantes à manutenção dos direitos dos trabalhadores em caso de transferência de empresas ou de estabelecimentos, ou de partes de empresas ou de estabelecimentos, JO L 82 de 22.3.2001.

([3]) Diretiva 98/59/CE do Conselho, de 20 de julho de 1998, relativa à aproximação das legislações dos Estados-Membros respeitantes aos despedimentos coletivos, JO L 225 de 12.8.1998.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011856/13**
**to the Commission**
**Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL) and Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL)**
*(16 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Violation of EC law by Sociedade de Transportes Colectivos do Porto, S.A. (STCP)

STCP very recently planned to hand over several lines of its network to private companies, failing to consult the Workers' Commission on the matter, in breach of EC law.

This whole process seems to have been conducted by STCP in bad faith, through schemes seeking to reduce demand for its services in order to justify them being inevitably handed over to private companies, going against the public interest in a totally opaque manner. The Workers' Commission has not been consulted, despite being faced with major changes to the way the company operates, which could put jobs at risk.

In view of existing EU legislation, particularly Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 and Directive 2002/14/EC:

What does the Commission have to say about the validity of the contract in question and the flagrant breach of the workers' rights?

What action does the Commission plan to take in view of this situation and will it launch an investigation to clarify matters, in the public interest and for the sake of the workers at STCP?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 December 2013)*

The Commission has no power to interfere in specific company decisions. However, the employer has to inform and consult employees before taking decisions affecting them, in accordance with EC law and in particular Directives 2002/14/EC ([1]), 2001/23/EC ([2]) and 98/59/EC ([3]). It is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the national legislation transposing those Directives is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of each case.

([1]) Directive 2002/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2002 establishing a general framework for informing and consulting employees in the European Community, OJ L 80, 23.3.2002.

([2]) Council Directive 2001/23/EC of 12 March 2001 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the safeguarding of employees' rights in the event of transfers of undertakings, businesses or parts of undertakings or businesses, OJ L 82, 22.3.2001.

([3]) Council Directive 98/59/EC of 20 July 1998 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies, OJ L 225, 12.8.1998.

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-011858/13**
**aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)**
**Bastiaan Belder (EFD)**
*(17 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* VP/HR — Verslag van de Europese Rekenkamer over corruptie en misbruik van EU-steun in de Palestijnse gebieden

Heeft de VV/HV kennis genomen van het artikel in *The Sunday Times* van 13 oktober 2013 ([1]), waarnaar wordt verwezen in een persbericht van het AJC Transatlantic Institute ([2]), met betrekking tot een ongepubliceerd verslag van de Rekenkamer waarin uitvoerig wordt beschreven hoe EU-steun aan Palestina tussen 2008 en 2012 is „verspild, verkwist of verloren is gegaan door corruptie"?

Hoe verhouden deze bevindingen zich tot de verklaring van de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger van 22 februari 2013 dat „een strikt en uitgebreid audit- en controlemechanisme (ervoor) zorgt (…) dat de EU de precieze bestemming kan nagaan van elke afzonderlijke euro ([3])"?

Is de VV/HV voornemens aan te dringen op onverwijlde publicatie van dit verslag? Is zij het ermee eens dat deze zaak, gezien de ernst ervan en de telkens weer gebleken wijdverbreide corruptie binnen de Palestijnse regering (zoals gedocumenteerd in het rapport van AMAN-Transparancy Palestine van april 2013 ([4])), onmiddellijke opheldering en actie vereist?

Welke maatregelen denkt de VV/HV te treffen om degenen die voor dit misbruik verantwoordelijk zijn, om rekenschap te vragen? Is zij bereid een grondig onderzoek in te stellen naar corruptie en misbruik van steun en naar gelang de bevindingen doeltreffende waarborgen in te voeren om ervoor te zorgen dat Europese steun volledig ten bate van de Palestijnse bevolking wordt gebruikt?

**Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie**
*(25 november 2013)*

Het auditverslag waarnaar het geacht Parlementslid lijkt te verwijzen, is nog niet door de Rekenkamer gepubliceerd.

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter zal derhalve geen opmerkingen maken, tot dit verslag is gepubliceerd, naar verwachting tegen het einde van 2013.

---

([1]) Bojan Pancevski, „GBP 1.95bn EU aid lost in Palestine", The Sunday Times, 13 October 2013. http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world_news/Middle_East/article1326858.ece.
([2]) „TAI calls for investigation into corruption and misuse of Palestinian aid", 14 October 2013. http://www.transatlanticinstitute.org/2013/10/14/tai-calls-for-investigation-into-corruption-and-misuse-of-palestinian-aid/.
([3]) Antwoord van Vice-voorzitter/Hoge vertegenwoordiger Baroness Ashton namens de Commissie, 22 februari 2013.
([4]) „Corruption Report — Palestine 2012", AMAN-Transparency Palestine, April 2013. http://www.aman-palestine.org/data/uploads/62444af9c6958242d3ff8c0e76d9b03e.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011858/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Bastiaan Belder (EFD)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — European Court of Auditors report documenting corruption and misuse of EU aid in the Palestinian Territories

Has the VP/HR taken note of the article in *The Sunday Times* of 13 October 2013 ([1]), mentioned in a press release by the AJC Transatlantic Institute ([2]), regarding an unpublished report by the Court of Auditors detailing how EU aid to Palestine has been 'misspent, squandered or lost to corruption' between 2008 and 2012?

How do the findings relate to the statement by the High Representative on 22 February 2013 that 'a strict and extensive mechanism of audit and verification is in place which allows the European Union to verify the precise destination of every single Euro'? ([3])

Will the VP/HR consider insisting on the immediate release of the report to the public? Does she agree that, given the severity of the matter and the long-standing evidence of widespread corruption within the Palestinian Government (as documented in the April 2013 report by AMAN-Transparency Palestine ([4])), this requires immediate clarification and action?

What measures does the VP/HR envisage to hold those responsible for the abuses accountable? Is she willing to launch a full investigation into corruption and misuse of aid and, depending on the findings, implement effective safeguards to ensure that European aid is being used for the full benefit of the Palestinian people?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(25 November 2013)*

The Performance Audit which the Honourable Member appears to allude to has not yet been published by the Court.

The HR/VP has therefore no comments to make until such time as it shall have been published, estimated to be by the end of 2013.

---

([1]) Bojan Pancevski, 'GBP 1.95bn EU aid lost in Palestine', The Sunday Times, 13 October 2013. http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world_news/Middle_East/article1326858.ece

([2]) 'TAI calls for investigation into corruption and misuse of Palestinian aid', 14 October 2013. http://www.transatlanticinstitute.org/2013/10/14/tai-calls-for-investigation-into-corruption-and-misuse-of-palestinian-aid/

([3]) Answer given by Vice-President/High Representative Baroness Ashton on behalf of the Commission, 22 February 2013.

([4]) 'Corruption Report — Palestine 2012', AMAN-Transparency Palestine, April 2013. http://www.aman-palestine.org/data/uploads/62444af9c6958242d3ff8c0e76d9b03e.pdf

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011859/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Matteo Salvini (EFD)**
*(17 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Misure che intende apportare la Commissione per tutelare i lavoratori della «Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena»

La Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS), nata nel 1472, costituisce, assieme alle altre società consorelle, la terza realtà italiana per numero di filiali. L'operatività del gruppo, oltre all'attività bancaria tradizionale, copre l'asset management, il private banking (fondi comuni di investimento mobiliari, gestioni patrimoniali, fondi pensione e polizze vita) e l'investment banking oltre alla finanza innovativa d'impresa (project finance, merchant banking e consulenza finanziaria).

Al 4 febbraio 2011 risultava essere la quarta banca italiana nella classifica delle prime 15 a maggiore capitalizzazione tra quelle quotate sulla borsa nazionale. MPS chiude il 2011 con una perdita netta di 4,69 miliardi di euro. Nell'assemblea dei soci del 27 aprile 2012, su indicazione della Fondazione MPS, viene nominato presidente del consiglio di amministrazione della banca Alessandro Profumo, mentre amministratore delegato diviene Fabrizio Viola, che da gennaio 2012 è anche direttore generale.

Il 27 giugno 2012 viene approvato il nuovo piano di riassetto del gruppo Monte dei Paschi di Siena, fortemente improntato alla riduzione dei costi e alla razionalizzazione. Il 7 ottobre 2013 il consiglio di amministrazione ha votato per il piano di ristrutturazione di MPS che prevede, entro il 2017, un maxi aumento di capitale pari a 2,5 miliardi di euro. Il piano prevede ingenti tagli sia sul personale che sulle filiali. Infatti sono previsti 8.000 esuberi su di un totale di 30.000 dipendenti e la chiusura di 550 filiali (il 25 % sul totale). Il 30 giugno 2013 ci sono già stati 2700 esuberi e a fine settembre 400 sportelli hanno cessato di esistere. L'obiettivo è di realizzare un risparmio sul costo del personale di circa 500 milioni di euro. La riduzione dei dipendenti, si legge nella nota del CdA, si dovrebbe ottenere attraverso operazioni industriali di cessione delle attività non strategiche e di esternalizzazione.

Intende la Commissione introdurre, in occasione della prossima programmazione e della revisione del FSE, un Fondo di emergenza destinato a sostenere lavoratori come quelli della «Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena»?

**Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione**
*(16 dicembre 2013)*

Il Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) mira a migliorare le possibilità di occupazione, a promuovere l'istruzione e l'apprendimento permanente nonché a elaborare politiche di inclusione attiva a norma dell'articolo 162 del trattato. Di per sé il FSE non fornisce alcun sostegno di emergenza ai lavoratori, quali i dipendenti della Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS). I lavoratori interessati possono tuttavia beneficiare delle attività cofinanziate dal FSE e, se sono soddisfatte le condizioni necessarie, dal Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG).

La Commissione ricorda che la mobilitazione del FEG in base al criterio della crisi economica è stata possibile solo fino alla fine del 2011. Sulla scorta dell'esperienza acquisita nel periodo 2007-2013 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta relativa al FEG (2014-2020) che ha ricevuto l'accordo preliminare di Parlamento e Consiglio. Tale proposta contempla la possibilità di utilizzare nuovamente il criterio della crisi economica ai fini della mobilitazione del FEG e, se confermata all'atto dell'adozione formale del progetto di regolamento, consentirà all'Italia di chiedere il sostegno del FEG per i lavoratori interessati a partire da gennaio 2014.

La Commissione invita l'onorevole parlamentare a contattare il referente del FEG per l'Italia ([1]) al fine di ottenere informazioni sulla possibilità di mobilitare il FEG nel caso in questione.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011859/13**
**to the Commission**
**Matteo Salvini (EFD)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Measures the Commission intends to introduce to protect the employees of the 'Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena'

The Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS), founded in 1472, represents, together with its sister companies, the third biggest entity in Italy in terms of number of branches. In addition to traditional banking, the group's activities include asset management, private banking (investment funds, asset management, pension funds and life insurance) and investment banking, as well as innovative corporate finance (project finance, merchant banking and financial consultancy).

On 4 February 2011, it was ranked fourth out of the 15 Italian banks with the greatest capitalisation, listed on the national stock exchange. MPS finished 2011 with a net loss of EUR 4.69 billion. During the shareholders' meeting of 27 April 2012, on the recommendation of the MPS Foundation, Alessandro Profumo was appointed Chairman of the Board of Directors at the bank, while Fabrizio Viola, who had been Managing Director since January 2012, was named Chief Executive Officer.

On 27 June 2012, the reorganisation plan for the Monte dei Paschi di Siena group was approved. This plan is marked by a reduction of costs and rationalisation. On 7 October 2013, the board of directors voted in favour of the MPS restructuring plan which stipulates a maximum capital increase of EUR 2.5 billion by 2017. The plan provides for huge cuts in both personnel and the number of branches. Indeed, the plan calls for 8 000 redundancies out of a total of 30 000 employees and the closure of 550 branches (25% of the total). On 30 June 2013, there had already been 2 700 redundancies and 400 branches had been closed by the end of September. The objective is to achieve a reduction in personnel costs of around EUR 500 million. According to the minutes of the meeting of the board of directors, the staff cuts should be achieved through industrial operations to terminate non-strategic activities and externalisation.

When planning and revising the ESF, does the Commission intend to introduce an emergency fund aimed at supporting workers, such as those of the Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**
*(16 December 2013)*

The aim of the European Social Fund (ESF) is to improve employment opportunities, promote education and life-long learning, and develop active inclusion policies in accordance with Article 162 of the Treaty. As such, the ESF does not provide emergency support to workers, such as those employed by Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS). However, the workers concerned may benefit from the activities co-financed by the ESF and, if the necessary conditions are met, from the European Adjustment Globalisation Fund (EGF).

The Commission recalls that mobilisation of the EGF on the basis of the economic crisis criterion was possible only until the end of 2011. Building on the experience during the 2007-2013 period, the Commission adopted a proposal on the EGF (2014-2020) on which Parliament and Council have reached preliminary agreement. The latter includes the possibility to use again the economic crisis criterion to mobilise the EGF. If this is confirmed when the draft regulation is formally adopted, Italy may apply for EGF support for the workers concerned as from January 2014.

The Commission would invite the Honourable Member to contact Italy's EGF Contact Point ([1]) and enquire about the possibility to mobilise the EGF in the case in question.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

*(българска версия)*

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-011860/13**
**до Комисията**
**Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)**
*(17 октомври 2013 г.)*

*Относно:* Бежански поток вследствие на конфликта в Сирия

Всеки ден нови 100 лица, които твърдят, че са бежанци от Сирия, навлизат на територията на Европейския съюз през българо-турската граница. Сирийците, пребиваващи на територията на България, вече са над 7 000 души. Възможностите на страната да приема, настанява и да се грижи за този наплив вече са изчерпани. Постоянно расте социалното напрежение, породено от факта, че издръжката на едно лице струва над 1 000 лв. по данни на държавните власти, докато стотици хиляди български пенсионери мизерстват с по 200 лв. пенсия, а Здравната каса не може да осигури на стотици раково болни жизнено необходимите им лекарства поради „липса на средства“. Хигиенните условията в центровете за задържане са на критичния минимум, което води до риск от избухване на епидемии. Капацитетът на българските власти да разграничават истинските бежанци от икономически емигранти също е недостатъчен. Има сериозни опасения, че заедно с прииждащите, които наистина имат нужда от помощ, навлизат и лица, които могат да бъдат потенциални терористи. Последното е особено тревожно, като се вземе предвид, че България е последната държава от ЕС, на чиято територия беше извършен атентат от ислямисти. ЕС набра фонд от 2 млрд. евро за справяне с последствията от сирийската криза. Половината от тези средства са предоставени от държавите членки. Поради изложеното се обръщам към Комисията със следните въпроси:

1. България предоставила ли е средства в рамките на този 1 млрд. евро, набран от държавите членки и ако е предоставила — колко?

2. Колко са изразходваните средства от фонда за сирийската криза към момента?

3. Смята ли Европейската комисия да предостави на България безвъзмездна помощ от фонда за сирийската криза и в какви срокове?

**Отговор, даден от г-жа Малмстрьом от името на Комисията**
*(12 декември 2013 г.)*

На първо място следва да бъде пояснено, че ЕС не е създал специален фонд за справяне с последствията от кризата в Сирия. От своя страна, държавите членки (ДЧ) не са предоставяли средства за подобна инициатива.

ЕС и ДЧ съвместно събраха 2 млрд. EUR, от които 943 млн. EUR от група специални фондове на ЕС, под формата на хуманитарна помощ и помощ за развитие с цел подкрепа на дейностите в Сирия и съседните държави ([1]). България е осигурила двустранно 295 874 EUR от тези 2 млрд. EUR.

С хуманитарната помощ на ЕС се подпомагат предимно животоспасяващи дейности при спешни случаи ([2]), за да се помогне на най-уязвимите семейства. В региона се предоставя също така помощ за развитие за посрещане на по-дългосрочните нужди на засегнатото население с цел да се подкрепи стабилността в съседните държави и да се намали напрежението между бежанците и местните общности. ([3])

Комисията, подпомагана от Frontex и Европейската служба за подкрепа в областта на убежището (ЕСПОУ), внимателно следи ситуацията в България. Видът на помощта, която може да бъде предоставена, варира от финансова подкрепа до помощ в натура чрез ЕСПОУ, например чрез разгръщане на място на екипите за подкрепа в областта на убежището, за да се окаже съдействие на органите на ДЧ при изграждането на капацитет и качество. Такава помощ може да бъде оказана, ако бъде поискана от органите на ДЧ.

Комисията е в процес на обсъждане на тези възможности с българските власти. На 17 декември 2013 г. бе подписан оперативен план между ЕСПОУ и България, като бе отделено по-специално внимание на разширяването и подобряването на приемния капацитет на България и на нейния капацитет за обработване на молбите за предоставяне на закрила от българската Държавна агенция за бежанците. Налице е финансова подкрепа (Решение на ЕК C(2013) 8558 final от 28 ноември 2013 г.), която се основава на нуждите на България.

---

([1]) Ливан, Йордания, Ирак и Турция.

([2]) Това включва животоспасяващи дейности при спешни медицински случаи, осигуряването на основни лекарства, храна и продоволствие, питейна вода, санитарни и хигиенни условия, подслон, предоставяне на нехранителни стоки от първа необходимост и защита.

([3]) Например образование, професионално обучение, подкрепа за поминъка и създаване на работни места, основни услуги и инфраструктура и др.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011860/13**
**to the Commission**
**Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Inflow of refugees as a result of the conflict in Syria

People claiming to be refugees from Syria are crossing the Turkish-Bulgarian border into the European Union at a rate of 100 a day. Already, more than 7 000 Syrians have arrived in Bulgaria and the country's capacity to receive, accommodate and provide for this influx is stretched to the limit. Social tension is gradually mounting because, according to Government figures, upkeep for the refugees is costing BGN 1 000 per head at a time when hundreds of thousands of Bulgarian pensioners are eking out an existence on pensions of BGN 200 and the health insurance system has 'insufficient resources' to cover the cost of vital medicines for hundreds of cancer patients.

In the refugee reception centres, hygiene conditions are basic in the extreme, creating a risk of outbreaks of disease. Moreover, the Bulgarian authorities do not have the capacity to distinguish genuine refugees from economic migrants, and there is a serious danger that, alongside those actually in need of help, the surge of incomers may include potential terrorists. This is a particular cause for alarm given that the most recent terrorist attack by Islamic extremists in the EU took place on Bulgarian soil. The EU has set up a EUR 2 billion fund for coping with the consequences of the Syrian crisis. Half the money was supplied by the Member States. I therefore have a number of questions for the Commission.

1. Did Bulgaria provide any part of the EUR 1 billion contributed by the Member States and, if so, how much?

2. How much of the Syrian crisis fund has been spent to date?

3. Does the Commission intend to grant Bulgaria assistance from the Syrian crisis fund free of charge and, if so, how soon will it do so?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(12 December 2013)*

It should first be clarified that the EU has not set up a dedicated fund for coping with the consequences of the Syrian crisis. In turn, Member States (MS) have not supplied funds to such an initiative.

The EU and the MS combined have so far mobilised EUR 2 billion — of which EUR 943 million from a number of dedicated EU financial lines — in humanitarian aid and development assistance to support activities in Syria and the neighbouring countries ([1]). Bulgaria has bilaterally provided EUR 295 874 out of the EUR 2 billion.

The EU humanitarian assistance primarily supports life-saving emergency responses ([2]) to help the most vulnerable families. Development assistance is also provided in the region to address longer term needs ([3]) of the affected population to support the stability of the neighbouring countries and mitigate tensions between refugees and host communities.

The Commission, assisted by Frontex and the European Asylum Support Office (EASO), is closely following the situation in Bulgaria. The kind of assistance that can be provided ranges from financial support to assistance in kind through EASO, for instance through deployment of asylum support teams to assist the authorities of the MS with capacity and quality building. Such assistance can be rendered if it is requested by the authorities of the MS.

The Commission is currently discussing these possibilities with the Bulgarian authorities. On 17 October 2013 an EASO-Bulgaria Operating Plan was signed, with particular attention to the enlargement and improvement of Bulgaria's reception capacity and its capacity to process claims for protection by the Bulgarian State Agency for Refugees. Financial support is made available (EC Decision C(2013) 8558 final, 28 November 2013) based on Bulgaria's needs.

---

([1]) Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Turkey.
([2]) This includes life-saving medical emergency responses, the provision of essential medicines, food and nutritional items, safe water, sanitation and hygiene, shelter, distribution of basic non-food items and protection.
([3]) E.g. Education, vocational training, support to livelihoods and job creation, basic services and infrastructures, etc.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011861/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD) e Clemente Mastella (PPE)**
*(17 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Gestione affidamento appalti per servizi autostradali nella Repubblica slovacca

La gestione degli appalti per la fornitura dei servizi autostradali in Slovacchia è affidata alla compagnia statale National Motorway Company (NDS). Nel giugno e nell'agosto 2012 la NDS ha indetto gare d'appalto per la costruzione di alcune tratte sulle due arterie autostradali principali, la D1 e D3, un progetto cofinanziato da diversi fondi dell'UE. Ad oggi, ancora nessun lotto è stato assegnato. Intanto sono stati presentati numerosi ricorsi all'Ufficio responsabile per gli appalti (UVO) per ingiusta esclusione. Ad esempio, nel caso della joint venture INC-HANT, esclusa dall'appalto dopo aver presentato l'offerta migliore, la NDS ha ignorato le disposizioni dell'UVO di riammissione del consorzio, perseverando sulle proprie posizioni e causando uno stallo nella fornitura dei servizi pubblici. Già nel 2010 la Commissione europea aveva ammonito con un parere motivato la pratica della NDS di escludere dall'appalto i consorzi vincitori (in quell'occasione, Kapsch TrafficCom, ToSy e Slovakpass) a favore dell'offerta più costosa. In quell'occasione, la CE ha denunciato i rischi di chiusura del mercato e di spreco di risorse pubbliche. Dopo pochi mesi, nel maggio 2011, il ministro dei Trasporti ha deposto il direttore della NDS per la conclusione di contratti dubbi. La Commissione:

1. ritiene opportuno chiedere alla NDS, in quanto società di gestione di interesse economico generale, in virtù dell'articolo 106, paragrafo 2, del TFUE, di fornire le motivazioni del blocco di fatto nell'assegnazione degli appalti e dell'indifferenza ai richiami dell'UVO?

2. Non ritiene che tale comportamento possa configurare delle violazioni agli articoli 101 e 102 del TFUE in materia di concorrenza e una consequenziale chiusura del mercato interno?

**Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione**
*(13 dicembre 2013)*

L'articolo 106 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFUE) impone alle imprese pubbliche di conformarsi alle regole di concorrenza e può essere applicato unicamente in combinato disposto con altre disposizioni del TFUE, come ad esempio gli articoli 101 e 102 del TFUE in materia di diritto della concorrenza e l'articolo 107 del TFEU riguardante gli aiuti di Stato.

L'articolo 101 del TFEU non può essere applicato al comportamento unilaterale di un'impresa, poiché presuppone un accordo, una decisione o una pratica concordata tra due o più imprese. Le informazioni fornite dagli onorevoli deputati non sembrano indicare un abuso di posizione dominante ai sensi dell'articolo 102 del TFEU.

Il caso precedente citato dagli onorevoli deputati non riguardava un appalto di lavori, bensì un appalto pubblico di servizi per la riscossione elettronica del pedaggio. L'indagine si basava su una possibile violazione della direttiva 2004/18/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 31 marzo 2004, relativa al coordinamento delle procedure di aggiudicazione degli appalti pubblici di lavori, di forniture e di servizi.

I servizi della Commissione sono disposti a esaminare eventuali altri elementi sostanziali sottoposti alla loro attenzione che dimostrino una possibile violazione delle norme antitrust o delle norme europee in materia di appalti pubblici nelle nuove gare d'appalto indette dalla NDS nel 2012.

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011861/13**
**do Komisji**
**Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD) oraz Clemente Mastella (PPE)**
*(17 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Zarządzanie udzielaniem zamówień na usługi autostradowe w Republice Słowackiej

Zarządzanie udzielaniem zamówień na świadczenie usług autostradowych w Słowacji zostało powierzone przedsiębiorstwu państwowemu National Motorway Company (NDS). W czerwcu i w sierpniu 2012 r. NDS ogłosiło przetargi na budowę kilku odcinków dwóch głównych autostrad, D1 i D3, w ramach projektu współfinansowanego z różnych funduszy UE. Do dzisiaj żaden z tych przetargów nie został rozstrzygnięty. W tym czasie do Urzędu Zamówień Publicznych (UVO) zostały złożone liczne skargi w związku z niesłusznym wykluczeniem z przetargu. Przykładowo w przypadku spółki joint venture INC–HANT, wykluczonej z przetargu po przedstawieniu najlepszej oferty, NDS zignorowało wydane przez UVO zarządzenie ponownego dopuszczenia konsorcjum do przetargu, nie zmieniając swojej pozycji i powodując zablokowanie świadczenia usług publicznych. Już w 2010 r. Komisja Europejska w umotywowanej opinii udzieliła NDS upomnienia w związku ze stosowaną przez nią praktyką wykluczania z przetargu zwycięskich konsorcjów (w tym przypadku chodziło o firmy Kapsch TrafficCom, ToSy i Slovakpass) i wybierania droższej oferty. Komisja wskazała wówczas na ryzyko zamknięcia rynku i marnotrawstwa środków publicznych. Po kilku miesiącach, w maju 2011 r., Minister Transportu odwołał ze stanowiska dyrektora NDS za zawarcie umów budzących zastrzeżenia. Czy Komisja:

1. uważa za właściwe zażądać od NDS jako od spółki zarządzającej usługami świadczonymi w ogólnym interesie gospodarczym, zgodnie z art. 106 ust. 2 TFUE, przedstawienia uzasadnienia faktycznego zablokowania udzielania zamówień i braku reakcji na wezwania UVO?

2. nie uważa, że takie postępowanie może stanowić naruszenie art. 101 i 102 TFUE w dziedzinie konkurencji, a w konsekwencji powodować zamknięcie rynku wewnętrznego?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Joaquína Almunię w imieniu Komisji**
*(13 grudnia 2013 r.)*

Zgodnie z art. 106 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej (TFUE) przedsiębiorstwa publiczne są zobowiązane przestrzegać przepisów prawa konkurencji stosowanych w połączeniu z innymi przepisami TFUE, takimi jak art. 101 i 102 TFUE w dziedzinie prawa konkurencji i art. 107 TFUE w dziedzinie pomocy państwa.

Jednostronne zachowanie przedsiębiorstwa nie podlega art. 101 TFUE, który wymaga porozumienia, decyzji lub praktyki uzgodnionej między co najmniej dwoma przedsiębiorstwami. Informacje przekazane przez szanownych Panów Posłów nie zdają się wskazywać na nadużycie pozycji dominującej w rozumieniu art. 102 TFUE.

Poprzednia sprawa, o której wspominają szanowni Panowie Posłowie, nie dotyczyła zamówień publicznych na roboty budowlane, ale zamówienia publicznego na usługi w zakresie elektronicznego poboru opłat. Postępowanie oparte było na możliwym naruszeniu dyrektywy 2004/18/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 31 marca 2004 r. w sprawie koordynacji procedur udzielania zamówień publicznych na roboty budowlane, dostawy i usługi.

Służby Komisji są gotowe dokonać oceny wszelkich przedłożonych im istotnych informacji wskazujących na możliwość naruszenia zasad ochrony konkurencji albo europejskich przepisów dotyczących udzielania zamówień publicznych w nowych przetargach ogłoszonych przez NDS w 2012 r.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011861/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD) şi Clemente Mastella (PPE)**
*(17 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Gestionarea procedurilor de atribuire a contractelor pentru serviciile pe autostrăzi în Republica Slovacă

Gestionarea contractelor pentru furnizarea de servicii pe autostrăzi în Slovacia este încredințată companiei de stat National Motorway Company (NDS). În iunie și în august 2012, NDS a inițiat invitații de participare la procedura de ofertare pentru construirea unor tronsoane pe cele două artere principale de autostradă, D1 și D3, un proiect cofinanțat din diverse fonduri ale UE. Până în prezent, nu a fost atribuit niciun lot. Totuși, din cauza unei excluderi neîntemeiate, au fost introduse acțiuni la Biroul responsabil cu atribuirea contractelor (UVO). De exemplu, în cazul întreprinderii comune INC-HANT, exclusă de la atribuirea contractului după ce a prezentat cea mai bună ofertă, NDS a ignorat dispozițiile UVO de readmitere a consorțiului, menținându-și poziția și cauzând o situație de blocaj în furnizarea serviciilor publice. În 2010, Comisia Europeană sancționase deja, printr-un aviz motivat, practica NDS de a exclude de la atribuirea de contracte consorțiile câștigătoare (în acel context Kapsch TrafficCom, ToSy și Slovakpass) în favoarea ofertei celei mai costisitoare. Cu acea ocazie, Comisia Europeană a denunțat riscurile de închidere a pieței și de risipire a unor resurse publice. După câteva luni, în mai 2011, ministrul transporturilor l-a delegat pe directorul NDS pentru încheierea unor contracte echivoce. Comisia:

1. consideră oportun să solicite NDS, în calitate de societate de gestionare a interesului economic general, în temeiul articolului 106 alineatul (2) din TFUE, să furnizeze motivații ale stării de fapt privind atribuirea contractelor și ale indiferenței față de reclamațiile UVO?

2. nu consideră că acest comportament poate determina încălcarea articolelor 101 și 102 din TFUE în materie de concurență și închiderea în consecință a pieței interne?

**Răspuns dat de dl Almunia în numele Comisiei**
*(13 decembrie 2013)*

Articolul 106 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene (TFUE) prevede că întreprinderile publice se supun regulilor de concurență; acest articol poate fi pus în aplicare numai în strânsă legătură cu celelalte dispoziții ale tratatului, precum articolele 101 și 102 din TFUE în materie de concurență și articolul 107 din TFUE privind ajutoarele de stat.

Comportamentul unilateral al unei întreprinderi nu poate intra sub incidența articolului 101 din TFUE, prin care sunt interzise orice acorduri, decizii ale asocierilor de întreprinderi și orice practici concertate între două sau mai multe întreprinderi Informațiile furnizate de distinșii membri nu par să indice folosirea în mod abuziv a unei poziții dominante, în sensul articolului 102 din TFUE.

Cazul anterior menționat de distinșii membri nu se referă la contracte privind executarea de lucrări, ci la un contract privind prestarea de servicii publice pentru sistemele de taxare rutieră electronică. Investigațiile au avut ca obiect o posibilă încălcare a Directivei 2004/18/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 31 martie 2004 privind coordonarea procedurilor de atribuire a contractelor de achiziții publice de lucrări, de bunuri și de servicii.

Serviciile Comisiei sunt pregătite să evalueze eventualele elemente importante care le sunt prezentate, care să demonstreze o posibilă încălcare a normelor antitrust sau a normelor europene în materie de achiziții publice în cadrul noilor cereri de oferte lansate de NDS în 2012.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011861/13**
**to the Commission**
**Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD) and Clemente Mastella (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The management of the awarding of contracts for motorway services in the Slovak Republic

The management of contracts for the provision of motorway services in Slovakia has been entrusted to a state company, the National Motorway Company (NDS). In June and August 2012, the NDS announced a call for tenders for the construction of certain stretches of the two main arterial motorways, the D1 and D3, a project co-financed by various EU funds. As of today, no lot has yet been awarded. Meanwhile, there have been a number of appeals lodged with the Office in charge of contracts (UVO) on grounds of unfair exclusion. For example, in the case of the INC-HANT joint venture, which was excluded from the contract after having presented the best offer, the NDS ignored the stipulations of the UVO to readmit the consortium, maintaining its position and thus causing deadlock in the provision of public services. Back in 2010, the Commission issued a warning with a reasoned opinion concerning the NDS practice of excluding victorious consortia from contracts (in that case Kapsch TrafficCom, ToSy and Slovakpass) in favour of the most expensive bid. On that occasion, the EU deplored the risks of closing the market and wasting public resources. A few months later, in May 2011, the Minister of Transport dismissed the head of the NDS for having concluded questionable contracts. Can the Commission state:

1. whether it should ask the NDS, a management company of general economic interest, as per Article 106(2) of the TFEU, to provide reasons for its de facto obstruction of the awarding of contracts and its indifference towards the reprimands issued by the UVO?

2. Whether it believes that such behaviour could represent violations of Articles 101 and 102 of the TFEU in terms of competition and the resultant closure of the internal market?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

Article 106 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) requires public undertakings to comply with the rules on competition and can only be applied in conjunction with other provisions of the TFEU, such as Articles 101 and 102 TFEU in the field of competition law and Articles 107 TFEU in respect of state aid.

The unilateral behaviour of one undertaking cannot be caught by Article 101 TFEU, which requires an agreement, decision or concerted practice between two or more undertakings. The information provided by the Honourable Members does not appear to indicate an abuse of dominant position within the meaning of Article 102 TFEU.

The previous case the Honourable Members mention did not concern works contracts but a public service contract for Electronic Toll Collection. The investigation was based on a possible violation of Directive 2004/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts.

The services of the Commission are ready to assess any substantial elements submitted to them demonstrating a possible violation of either antitrust rules or European public procurement rules in the new calls for tender launched by NDS in 2012.

*(Dansk udgave)*

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011862/13**
**til Kommissionen**
**Dan Jørgensen (S&D)**
*(17. oktober 2013)*

*Om:* Hurtig færdiggørelse af de reviderede miljørammebestemmelser om statsstøtte

Med henvisning til den igangværende revision af statsstøttepolitikken opfordrer jeg hermed Kommissionen til snarest muligt at færdiggøre arbejdet med formuleringen af de reviderede miljørammebestemmelser.

Idet jeg henviser til den aktuelle problematik som følge af forsinkelsen af udformningen af miljørammebestemmelserne og dennes udsættende effekt på den danske regerings arbejde med formuleringen af støtteordninger til sikring af energieffektiviseringer hos energitunge virksomheder (jf. Vækstplan DK), der risikerer at have vidtgående konsekvenser for det danske gartnerierhverv, fremsætter jeg hermed følgende spørgsmål til Kommissionen:

1. Hvornår forventer Kommissionen, at den endelige lovgivning foreligger i vedtaget form?

2. Hvorledes vil Kommissionen søge at fremme en hurtig færdiggørelse af arbejdet med de reviderede miljørammebestemmelser?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Joaquín Almunia**
*(13. december 2013)*

De gældende retningslinjer for miljø- og energistøtte udløber den 31. december 2014, og de nye retningslinjer forventes derfor vedtaget i løbet af 2014.

Der er allerede gennemført to offentlige høringer: den første i efteråret 2012 med fokus på de eksisterende retningslinjer og den anden i marts 2013 om et debatoplæg med de vigtigste emner for revisionen.

Kommissionen vil gennemføre endnu en offentlig høring om det reviderede udkast til retningslinjerne. Bidragene fra denne høring vil indgå i udarbejdelsen af det endelige udkast, som derefter vil blive fremsat til vedtagelse af Kommissionen. Kommissionen gennemfører denne proces så hurtigt som muligt.

Kommissionen bemærker desuden, at de gældende retningslinjer for miljøbeskyttelsesstøtte allerede tillader støtte til energieffektiviseringer og støtte i form af lempelser af energiafgifter på visse betingelser. Ligeledes kan energitunge virksomheder i visse sektorer i henhold til ETS-retningslinjerne blive delvist kompenseret for deres indirekte $CO_2$-omkostninger (som sendes videre fra elforsyningsselskaberne).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011862/13**
**to the Commission**
**Dan Jørgensen (S&D)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Swift completion of the revised environmental aid guidelines

With regard to the review of state aid policy that is currently underway, I would urge the Commission to complete the work of drafting the revised environmental aid guidelines as soon as possible.

With reference to the current problems resulting from the delay in developing the environmental aid guidelines and the suspensive effect of this on the work of the Danish Government to develop aid schemes to ensure an improvement in energy efficiency among energy-intensive undertakings (cf. *Vækstplan DK* [Growth Plan DK]), which runs the risk of having far-reaching consequences for the Danish horticulture industry, I would like to ask the Commission the following questions:

1. When does it expect the definitive legislation to be adopted?

2. How will it seek to promote the swift completion of the work of revising the environmental aid guidelines?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

The new Guidelines on environmental and energy aid are expected to be adopted in the course of 2014, since the currently applicable Guidelines expire on 31 December 2014.

Two public consultations have already taken place: the first in autumn 2012 with a focus on the existing Guidelines and the second on a discussion paper setting out the main topics for revision in March 2013.

The Commission will conduct a further public consultation on the revised draft of the Guidelines. The comments received during this consultation will be taken into account in preparing the final draft, which will then be tabled for adoption by the Commission. The Commission is conducting this process as swiftly as possible.

The Commission notes that the currently applicable Environmental Aid Guidelines already allow aid for energy-efficiency measures and aid in the form of tax reductions from energy taxes under certain conditions. Similarly, under the ETS Guidelines, energy-intensive undertakings from certain sectors can be partly compensated for their indirect $CO_2$ costs (which are passed on by electricity suppliers).

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011863/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Bernd Lange (S&D)**
*(17. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Energie-Subventionen

In der Europäischen Union profitieren die verschiedenen Energieträger von staatlichen Förderungen.

Diese Subventionen wurden bisher allerdings noch nicht von der Kommission offiziell dargelegt.

Um die korrekte und zügige Vollendung des europäischen Energiebinnenmarkts bis zum Jahr 2014, eine verantwortungsbewusste Energiewende weg von fossilen hin zu klimafreundlichen Energien sowie die größtmögliche Wirksamkeit der staatlichen Eingriffe im Energiebereich sicherzustellen, ist der Transparenz höchste Priorität einzuräumen.

1. Inwieweit entsprechen die kürzlich zu Tage gekommen Zahlen — 30 Mrd. EUR für erneuerbare Energien, 35 Mrd. EUR für Atomenergie und 26 Mrd. EUR für fossile Energieträger — der Realität?

2. Sollte es sich dabei um „nicht gesicherte Summen" handeln: Welche staatlichen Subventionen werden gegenwärtig für die einzelnen Energieträger aufgewendet?

3. Sollte noch keine gerechtfertigte Auflistung der staatlichen Subventionen im Energiebereich bestehen: Wann und wie gedenkt die Kommission sie offiziell vorzulegen, um größtmögliche Transparenz und somit eine gerechte Förderung der diversen Energieträger zu gewährleisten?

**Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission**
*(26. November 2013)*

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage P-11809/2013 ([1]) von Herrn J. Leinen.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011863/13**
**to the Commission**
**Bernd Lange (S&D)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Energy subsidies

In the European Union, the various energy sources benefit from state funding.

However, these subsidies have not as yet been set out officially by the Commission.

In order to ensure the proper and expeditious completion of the European internal energy market by 2014 and a responsible switch from fossil fuels to climate-friendly sources of energy, and to make sure that state interventions in the energy sector are as effective as possible, transparency must be given top priority.

1. To what extent do the figures that have recently been disclosed — EUR 30 billion for renewable energy, EUR 35 billion for nuclear energy and EUR 26 billion for fossil fuels — reflect reality?

2. If these are 'unverified sums', what state subsidies are currently going to the individual energy sources?

3. If no legitimate list of state subsidies in the energy sector exists as yet, when and how does the Commission intend to formally present one in order to ensure the greatest possible degree of transparency and thus the equitable promotion of the various energy sources?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**
*(26 November 2013)*

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-11809/2013 ([1]) by Mr J. Leinen.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011865/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D)**
*(17 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Ayuda europea al Reino de Marruecos

Recientemente, la Comisión Europea (Nota de prensa: IP/13/795) ha anunciado que va a conceder una ayuda de 110 millones de euros para el sector agrícola y la cobertura médica universal del Reino de Marruecos, de los cuales 60 millones irán destinados al sector agrícola, y estos se distribuirán preferentemente a explotaciones pequeñas y familiares.

1. ¿Cuál ha sido el volumen de ayudas concedidas por la Comisión Europea al Reino de Marruecos durante el periodo 2009-2013?

2. ¿Cuál ha sido el volumen de ayudas al sector agroalimentario del Reino de Marruecos en el periodo 2009-2013?

3. ¿Cuál es el desglose por subsectores de las ayudas concedidas al sector agroalimentario del Reino de Marruecos?

4. ¿Ha realizado la Comisión algún estudio de impacto en puestos de trabajo creados o incremento del PIB como efecto de las ayudas concedidas al Reino de Marruecos?

**Respuesta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión**
*(5 de diciembre de 2013)*

1. Entre 2009 y el primer semestre de 2013, la UE ha comprometido 786 millones EUR en el contexto de su cooperación bilateral con Marruecos. Este importe incluye subvenciones a las organizaciones de la sociedad civil, el suministro de asistencia técnica a las autoridades marroquíes, pagos efectuados en el entorno de los programas de apoyo sectorial así como subvenciones para la construcción de infraestructuras al amparo del Mecanismo de Apoyo a la Inversión en los Países Vecinos.

2. y 3. La UE está prestando ayuda tanto al desarrollo rural como al sector agrícola en la agricultura a pequeña escala dentro de un programa que apoya el segundo pilar del Plan Marruecos Verde, es decir, la estrategia de desarrollo agrícola de Marruecos (el primer pilar del Plan Marruecos Verde tiene como finalidad prestar apoyo al sector empresarial agrícola a gran escala, al cual la UE no ha concedido ayuda nunca). La ayuda concedida al desarrollo rural desde 2009 asciende a 48 millones EUR.

En 2013, la UE ha comprometido 70 millones EUR para prestar apoyo a la segunda fase de la estrategia de desarrollo agrícola de Marruecos y al funcionamiento de la Agencia Nacional de Servicios de Asesoría Agrícola.

4. En 2013, la UE inició una evaluación de sus actividades de apoyo presupuestario en Marruecos junto con una serie de agencias de cooperación de los Estados miembros (Francia, Bélgica y España). Si bien que la evaluación no analiza específicamente la contribución de estas actividades al número de puestos de trabajo o al crecimiento del PIB, sí que analizará el impacto de las actividades de la UE sobre las reformas (gobernanza pública, reformas económicas, reformas sociales, etc) y su potencial de mejora de la gobernanza democrática y del crecimiento económico. Se espera que los resultados de esta evaluación se publiquen en abril de 2014.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011865/13**
**to the Commission**
**Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* European aid to the Kingdom of Morocco

Recently, in Press release: IP/13/795, the Commission announced that it will grant EUR 110 million of aid to the Kingdom of Morocco for the agricultural sector and universal health coverage. EUR 60 million will go to the agricultural sector, to be distributed with preference to small and family farms.

1. How much aid has the Commission granted to the Kingdom of Morocco in the period 2009-2013?

2. What was the volume of aid to the agri-food sector in the Kingdom of Morocco in the period 2009-2013?

3. What is the breakdown by sub-sector of aid granted to the agri-food sector in the Kingdom of Morocco?

4. Has the Commission conducted any impact study on the number of jobs created or the increase in GDP resulting from the aid granted to the Kingdom of Morocco?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

1. Between 2009 and the first half of 2013, the EU has committed EUR 786 million in the context of its bilateral cooperation with Morocco. This amount includes grants to civil society organisations, the provision of technical assistance to the Moroccan authorities, payments made in the context of sector support programmes as well as grants for infrastructure construction in the context of the Neighbourhood Investment Facility.

2 and 3. The EU is aiding both rural development and the agricultural sector in small-scale farming in the context of a programme supporting the second pilar of the 'Plan Maroc Vert', i.e. the Moroccan agricultural development strategy (the first pilar of the 'Plan Maroc Vert' aims to support large-scale/agri-business sector in Morocco, which the EU has never supported). Aid granted to rural development since 2009 amounts to EUR 48 million.

In 2013, the EU has committed EUR 70 million to support the second phase of the Moroccan Agricultural Development Strategy and the implementation of the National Agency for Agricultural Advisory Services.

4. In 2013, the EU initiated an evaluation of its budget support operations in Morocco together with a number of Member States' cooperation agencies (France, Belgium, Spain). While the evaluation does not specifically look into the contribution of these operations to the number of jobs or GDP growth, it will look into the impact of EU operations on reforms (public governance, economic reforms, social reforms, etc.) and their potential for enhancing democratic governance and economic growth. The results of this evaluation are expected to be published in April 2014.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011869/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Mario Borghezio (NI)**
*(17 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Dichiarazioni di esponenti politici sull'adesione della Turchia all'UE

A fronte di un sondaggio Tavak circa la possibilità dell'adesione della Turchia all'UE, nel quale il 74 % degli intervistati non crede più che ciò avverrà, anche due personalità vicine al premier islamico Erdogan hanno evocato nelle ultime settimane l'ipotesi di una fine della prospettiva di integrazione europea per Ankara. Per la prima volta un ministro, il titolare degli affari europei, ha detto quello che molti pensano: «non entreremo mai». Il primo consigliere di Erdogan, invece, ha affermato: «dobbiamo sbarazzarci dello scenario Unione europea perché il paese possa assumere invece la leadership del "mondo nuovo" che emerge in Medio Oriente, Asia Centrale, Africa».

Dopo le dichiarazioni di questi importanti esponenti politici e l'opinione sfavorevole dei cittadini turchi, la Commissione europea non ritiene sia il caso di sospendere permanentemente qualsiasi tipo di negoziato di adesione con la Turchia?

**Risposta di Stefan Füle a nome della Commissione**
*(10 dicembre 2013)*

La Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta fornita alle precedenti interrogazioni scritte E-010763/2013 e E-011052/2013 ([1]).

---

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011869/13**
**to the Commission**
**Mario Borghezio (NI)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Declarations from political figures concerning Turkey's accession to the EU

In response to a Tavak opinion poll about the possibility of Turkey acceding to the EU, in which 74% of those interviewed no longer believe it will occur, two people close to the Islamist Prime Minister Erdogan have, over the last few weeks, evoked the proposition of an end to Ankara's prospects of European integration. For the first time, a minister responsible for European affairs has given voice to what many people are thinking, declaring: 'we will never get in'. Conversely, Erdogan's Minister Counsellor stated: 'we need to get rid of the European scenario because our country can instead become the leader of the "new world" which is emerging in the Middle East, Central Asia and Africa'.

Following the declarations from these important political figures and the unfavourable opinion expressed by Turkish citizens, does the Commission not believe that it would be appropriate to permanently suspend any kind of accession negotiations with Turkey?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to previous written questions E-010763/2013 and E-011052/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011870/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Mario Borghezio (NI)**
*(17 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Allarme per la crescita di flussi migratori irregolari dai Balcani

Nel corso di una conferenza dei capi della polizia dell'area balcanica tenutasi recentemente a Belgrado è stato rilevato che tra le principali rotte dei flussi migratori irregolari, quella balcanica continua a essere largamente utilizzata per raggiungere via terra gli Stati membri dell'UE. Negli ultimi mesi i flussi lungo la rotta balcanica hanno registrato un sensibile aumento.

Anche in vista di un ulteriore ampliamento dello spazio di libera circolazione europeo, che sarà la diretta conseguenza dell'ingresso nell'UE di un sempre maggior numero di paesi dell'area balcanica, non ritiene la Commissione europea si renda necessario intensificare i controlli e rafforzare la collaborazione in materia di immigrazione e nel contrasto alle organizzazioni che gestiscono la tratta di esseri umani?

L'immigrazione clandestina, cui è correlato il fenomeno del traffico di esseri umani, negli ultimi anni ha assunto proporzioni tali da divenire, in virtù dei suoi enormi risvolti economici, uno dei principali business delle holding criminali transnazionali.

Come intende la Commissione europea prevenire e contrastare questo fenomeno?

**Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione**
*(11 dicembre 2013)*

La Commissione si impegna notevolmente per prevenire e ridurre la migrazione irregolare in molti modi, fra l'altro combattendo il traffico e la tratta di esseri umani, rafforzando la gestione delle frontiere e intensificando la cooperazione con i paesi terzi, compresi quelli dei Balcani occidentali.

Sulla base di un meccanismo di allerta mensile gestito da Frontex, la Commissione utilizza un meccanismo di controllo successivo alla liberalizzazione dei visti per affrontare la migrazione irregolare in provenienza dagli Stati balcanici nei quali è stato liberalizzato il rilascio del visto. I colegislatori hanno recentemente adottato una modifica della direttiva sulle procedure di asilo, allo scopo di impedire che si abusi del diritto di asilo moltiplicando le domande. È altresì prossima l'adozione di modifiche del regolamento sui visti, tra cui un meccanismo di sospensione che permetterà all'Unione europea, in circostanze eccezionali, di sospendere temporaneamente l'esenzione dal visto per i cittadini di paesi terzi.

Se vuol essere equa e credibile, la politica migratoria europea deve innanzitutto contrastare lo sfruttamento dei migranti da parte di criminali. La lotta contro il traffico di migranti è l'obiettivo del cosiddetto «pacchetto favoreggiatori», una parte dell'acquis dell'UE in materia di migrazione la cui eventuale revisione è attualmente in discussione nell'ambito della Task Force Mediterraneo, di recente creazione, insieme ad altri aspetti di un'azione dell'UE di più vasta portata sul traffico, quali la cooperazione rafforzata con le agenzie dell'UE, con i paesi terzi di origine e di transito e con le organizzazioni internazionali, anche per la condivisione dell'intelligence.

Per quanto riguarda la tratta degli esseri umani, i cardini dell'azione dell'UE sono la direttiva 2011/36/UE ([1]) e l'attuazione della strategia dell'UE per l'eradicazione della tratta degli esseri umani ([2]). Nell'ambito di quest'azione sono stati individuati alcuni paesi e regioni prioritari, tra cui paesi candidati e potenziali candidati dei Balcani occidentali ([3]).

([1]) Direttiva 2011/36/UE concernente la prevenzione e la repressione della tratta di esseri umani e la protezione delle vittime, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:101:0001:0011:IT:PDF
([2]) COM(2012) 286 final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Policy/Second_report_AOP

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011870/13**
**to the Commission**
**Mario Borghezio (NI)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Concern about the growth in irregular migration flows from the Balkans

During a conference of police chiefs in the Balkan area, held recently in Belgrade, it was revealed that, among the main routes of irregular migration flows, the Balkan route continues to be widely used to reach the territory of the EU Member States. Over the last few months, the flow along the Balkan route has increased markedly.

Moreover, considering the further growth of the European area of free movement, which will be the direct consequence of an ever greater number of Balkan countries joining the EU, does the Commission not deem it necessary to intensify checks and reinforce collaboration in terms of immigration and combating organisations that run human trafficking operations?

Over the last few years, illegal immigration, directly linked to the phenomenon of human trafficking, has assumed such proportions that it has, thanks to its enormous financial returns, become one of the main businesses of transnational criminal holding companies.

How does the Commission intend to prevent and tackle this phenomenon?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(11 December 2013)*

The Commission has made a considerable effort to prevent and reduce irregular migration in several ways, including by combating smuggling and trafficking in human beings, enhancing border management and strengthening cooperation with third countries, including from the western Balkans.

On the basis of a monthly alert operated by Frontex, the Commission operates a post-visa liberalisation monitoring mechanism seeking to address irregular migration from the Western Balkan visa-free states. The co-legislators have recently adopted a revised Asylum Procedures Directive, seeking to prevent asylum abuse through multiple applications. They are also close to adopting amendments to the Visa regulation, including a suspension mechanism, which will allow the EU, under exceptional circumstances, to temporarily suspend the visa waiver for third-country nationals.

Tackling criminals who profit from immigrants is a precondition for a fair and credible EU migration policy. Fighting against human smuggling is the objective of the so-called 'facilitators package', a part of the EU acquis on migration whose possible revision is being discussed by the recently created EU Task Force on the Mediterranean, together with other aspects of a broader EU action on smuggling such as reinforced cooperation with EU agencies, third countries of origin and transit, and international organisations, including in sharing intelligence.

Concerning trafficking in human beings, the directive 2011/36/EU ([1]) and the implementation of the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings ([2]) are cornerstones of EU action. Priority countries and regions were identified, including candidate and potential candidate countries from the western Balkans ([3]).

---

([1]) Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:101:0001:0011:EN:PDF
([2]) COM(2012) 286 final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Policy/Second_report_AOP

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011871/13**
**au Conseil**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Assurer un véhicule au sein de l'Union européenne

Les démarches administratives pour faire assurer un véhicule neuf ou d'occasion peuvent être particulièrement contraignantes et sont un frein à la libre circulation des biens et des personnes au sein de l'Union.

Alors que les citoyens européens sont de plus en plus mobiles et que l'Union européenne encourage notamment les travailleurs à se déplacer au sein de l'Union, les conditions et les tarifs pour faire assurer un véhicule varient grandement d'un État membre à l'autre, selon des critères appliqués par les compagnies d'assurance qui sont complexes et peu transparents.

La Conseil pourrait-il initier une réflexion sur une harmonisation des règles en matière de critères d'assurance d'un véhicule au sein de l'Union européenne et une information claire aux consommateurs, notamment sur le coût de l'assurance automobile?

**Réponse**
*(23 décembre 2013)*

Il appartient à la Commission — dans le cadre de son droit d'initiative — de présenter les propositions appropriées en vue d'une future législation. Le Conseil examinerait et débattrait toute proposition que la Commission pourrait présenter à cet égard.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011871/13**
**to the Council**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Insuring a vehicle within the European Union

The administrative requirements to insure a new or second-hand vehicle can be particularly demanding and hinder the free movement of goods and persons within the Union.

Whereas European citizens are increasingly mobile and the European Union is encouraging workers to move within the Union, the conditions and costs of insuring a vehicle vary enormously from one Member State to another and depend on criteria applied by the insurance companies which are complex and lack transparency.

Could the Council initiate discussions about harmonising the rules on the criteria for insuring vehicles within the European Union and providing clear information to consumers, particularly regarding the cost of car insurance?

**Reply**
*(23 December 2013)*

It is for the Commission — in the context of its right of initiative — to make the appropriate proposals for future legislation. The Council would examine and discuss all proposals that might be presented by the Commission on this subject.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011872/13**
**à la Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Assurer un véhicule au sein de l'Union européenne

Les démarches administratives pour faire assurer un véhicule neuf ou d'occasion peuvent être particulièrement contraignantes et sont un frein à la libre circulation des biens et des personnes au sein de l'Union.

Alors que les citoyens européens sont de plus en plus mobiles et que l'Union européenne encourage notamment les travailleurs à se déplacer au sein de l'Union, les conditions et les tarifs pour faire assurer un véhicule varient grandement d'un État membre à l'autre, selon des critères appliqués par les compagnies d'assurance qui sont complexes et peu transparents.

La Commission européenne pourrait-elle proposer une harmonisation des règles en matière de critères d'assurance d'un véhicule au sein de l'Union européenne et une information claire aux consommateurs, notamment sur le coût de l'assurance automobile?

**Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission**
*(2 décembre 2013)*

La troisième directive assurance non vie 92/49/CEE autorise les compagnies d'assurance à fixer librement les critères sur lesquels elles évaluent les risques associés aux assurés et déterminent en conséquence les primes.

Ce n'est toutefois pas principalement en raison des critères appliqués que les primes varient sensiblement entre les États membres. Un autre élément important est l'étendue de la couverture de la police d'assurance. Bien que la directive 2009/103/CE sur l'assurance automobile prévoie une couverture minimale obligatoire de l'assurance de responsabilité civile vis-à-vis des tiers dans l'ensemble de l'UE, les États membres peuvent définir librement le régime de responsabilité civile applicable aux sinistres résultant de la circulation des véhicules afin de déterminer l'étendue précise de cette couverture sur la base de leurs règles nationales en matière de responsabilité civile. Dans ce contexte, les États membres doivent veiller à ce que la responsabilité civile applicable selon leur droit national soit couverte par une assurance conforme à la directive 2009/103/CE et exercer leurs compétences dans ce domaine dans le respect du droit de l'Union, en s'assurant que la directive 2009/103/CE n'est pas privée d'effets.

La Commission a l'intention d'examiner le fonctionnement du système de responsabilité civile automobile au sein de l'UE, et notamment la question de la transparence pour le consommateur. Elle tirera, le cas échéant, des conclusions en ce qui concerne les politiques à mener.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011872/13**
**to the Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Insuring a vehicle within the European Union

The administrative requirements to insure a new or second-hand vehicle can be particularly demanding and hinder the free movement of goods and persons within the Union.

Whereas European citizens are increasingly mobile and the European Union is encouraging workers to move within the Union, the conditions and costs of insuring a vehicle vary enormously from one Member State to another and depend on criteria applied by the insurance companies which are complex and lack transparency.

Could the European Commission propose a harmonisation of the rules on the criteria for insuring vehicles within the European Union and offer clear information to consumers, particularly regarding the cost of car insurance?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**
*(2 December 2013)*

The Third non-life insurance Directive 92/49/EEC allows insurance companies to freely set criteria on the basis of which they assess the risks associated with policy holders and thus determine the premiums.

However, the different criteria applied are not the main reason why premiums vary significantly between Member States. Another important aspect is the extent of the cover of the insurance policy in question. Whilst the Motor insurance Directive 2009/103/EC provides for a mandatory minimum cover for third party liability insurance across the EU, Member States are free to determine the rules of civil liability applicable to road accidents to determine the precise scope of this cover on the basis of their national civil liability rules. In this context, Member States are obliged to ensure that the civil liability arising under their domestic law is covered by insurance which complies with Directive 2009/103/EC and must exercise their powers in this field in compliance with European Union law, ensuring that directive 2009/103/EC is not deprived of its effectiveness.

The Commission intends to examine the functioning of the motor insurance liability system within the EU, including the issue of transparency to the consumer, and will draw policy conclusions, as appropriate.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011873/13**
**à la Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Réponses aux consultations publiques de la Commission européenne

La Commission pourrait-elle indiquer si elle publie systématiquement sur Internet les réponses reçues aux consultations publiques qu'elle lance, et dans quels délais?

**Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission**
*(21 novembre 2013)*

Conformément aux exigences liées aux normes minimales applicables aux consultations engagées par la Commission ([1]), les réponses reçues aux consultations publiques ouvertes devraient être systématiquement publiées sur les pages web de ces consultations spécifiques, normalement dans les quinze jours ouvrables suivant la date d'achèvement de la consultation. Le réexamen de la politique globale de la Commission en matière de consultation effectué en 2012 ([2]) a montré que dans la pratique, ces exigences sont, pour l'essentiel, remplies. Afin d'améliorer encore la qualité des consultations qu'elle organise, la Commission procède actuellement à une révision de ses lignes directrices en matière de consultation; les lignes directrices révisées feront l'objet d'une consultation publique.

([1]) COM(2002) 704.
([2]) SWD(2012) 422.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011873/13**
**to the Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Responses to the European Commission's public consultations

Could the Commission indicate whether it systematically publishes on the Internet the responses received during its public consultations and according to what timeframe?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission**
*(21 November 2013)*

In line with the requirements of the Commission minimum standards for consultation ([1]), the responses to open public consultations should be systematically published on individual consultation webpages, usually within 15 working days after the consultation end date. The review of the Commission's overall consultation policy carried out in 2012 ([2]) showed that these requirements are broadly respected in practice. To further improve the quality of consultations, the Commission is currently revising its consultation guidelines which will be put out for public consultation.

([1]) COM(2002) 704.
([2]) SWD(2012) 422.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011875/13**
**à la Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Commercialisation de la production d'absinthe européenne dans les pays tiers

Alors que la Suisse entreprend des démarches pour l'enregistrement de la dénomination «Absinthe» comme indication géographique, il est à craindre que les États tiers avec lesquels la Suisse a un accord bilatéral restreignent la commercialisation de l'absinthe à la seule production suisse, selon les dispositions de l'accord.

La Commission peut-elle garantir que les producteurs de l'Union européenne ne verront pas leurs droits à utiliser le terme «absinthe» limités dans des pays tiers suite à une demande de protection de son IG par la Suisse via un accord bilatéral avec ces pays tiers?

**Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission**
*(6 décembre 2013)*

Les autorités suisses ont décidé le 16 août 2012 d'enregistrer l'absinthe en tant qu'indication géographique protégée («IGP») en Suisse. Plusieurs recours ont été introduits contre cette décision auprès du Tribunal administratif fédéral de Suisse. Il convient de souligner que ces recours ont un effet suspensif. Par conséquent, à l'heure actuelle, le terme «absinthe» n'est pas encore protégé en droit national suisse.

Toutefois, la Commission a eu récemment connaissance des efforts déployés par les autorités suisses pour inclure l'absinthe en tant qu'IGP dans des accords internationaux conclus avec des pays tiers. Dans ces situations, si l'accord concerné prévoit la possibilité pour les parties intéressées de s'opposer à l'enregistrement, les opérateurs de l'Union européenne devraient être en mesure de contester l'inclusion de l'absinthe dans la liste en question, en faisant valoir qu'il s'agit d'un terme générique.

La Commission s'informera sur les intentions et les actions des autorités suisses concernant l'inclusion du terme «absinthe» dans des accords internationaux lors de la prochaine réunion du comité mixte UE-Suisse sur l'agriculture, qui se tiendra à Berne le 28 novembre 2013.

Il y a lieu de souligner également que, l'UE ne donnant pas de définition du terme «*absinthe*», les producteurs européens ne sont pas en mesure, dans l'UE, de mentionner sur l'étiquette le terme «*absinthe*» en tant que dénomination commerciale. La Commission a présenté une proposition visant à ajouter la définition de l'absinthe à l'annexe II du règlement (CE) n° 110/2008 ([1]). Cette proposition a cependant été rejetée par le Parlement européen.

([1]) JO L 39 du 13.2.2008, p. 1.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011875/13**
**to the Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Marketing in third countries of absinthe produced in the European Union

Given the measures taken in Switzerland to register the name 'Absinthe' as a geographical indication (GI), there is cause for concern that third countries with which Switzerland has bilateral agreements might restrict absinthe marketing to that produced in Switzerland by virtue of these agreements.

Can the Commission guarantee that producers in the European Union will not have their rights to use the name 'Absinthe' restricted in third countries following an application to protect its geographical indication made by Switzerland through its bilateral agreements with these third countries?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission**
*(6 December 2013)*

The Swiss authorities decided on 16 August 2012 to register Absinthe as a protected geographical indication ('GI') in Switzerland. A number of appeals against this decision have been submitted to the Tribunal administratif fédéral of Switzerland. It should be noted that these appeals have suspensory effect. Therefore, at the moment, the term absinthe is not yet protected in the Swiss internal legal order.

Despite this, the Commission became recently aware of the efforts of the Swiss authorities to include absinthe as a protected GI in international agreements with third countries. Under these circumstances, provided the agreement in question foresees the possibility of interested parties to oppose the registration, EU operators should be able to object to the inclusion of absinthe in the relevant list, arguing that the term is generic.

The Commission will enquire on the intentions and actions of the Swiss authorities as to the inclusion of the term absinthe in international agreements during the upcoming meeting of the EU-Switzerland Joint Committee on agriculture, to be held in Bern in 28 November 2013.

It should also be noted that due to the absence of an EU definition of the term 'absinthe', EU producers are not able in the EU to indicate on the label the term 'absinthe' as a sale denomination. The Commission had submitted a proposal to add the definition of 'absinthe' in Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 ([1]). This proposal was however rejected by the European Parliament.

([1]) OJ L 39, 13.2.2008.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011876/13**
**à la Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Indication «Absinthe»

1. Concernant les démarches d'enregistrement par la Suisse de la dénomination «Absinthe» comme indication géographique (IG), la Commission peut-elle garantir que le terme sera considéré comme suffisamment générique en Europe pour éviter une demande de protection suisse, soit via l'accord bilatéral, soit via le dispositif autonome de demande de protection?

2. Quelle est l'influence à cet égard de l'absence de définition européenne du terme concerné?

**Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission**
*(5 décembre 2013)*

L'enregistrement du terme «absinthe» en tant qu'indication géographique en Suisse n'aurait aucune incidence sur son utilisation pour des produits commercialisés dans l'Union européenne. Ce terme est déjà utilisé dans l'UE pour désigner des boissons spiritueuses produites dans différents États membres et est donc considéré comme un terme générique.

La question de l'enregistrement du terme «absinthe» en Suisse a été largement débattue dans le cadre des échanges bilatéraux avec la Suisse, en particulier au sein du comité mixte UE-Suisse sur l'agriculture. Dans ce contexte, la Commission a souligné que l'enregistrement du terme «absinthe» ne pourrait être envisagé que s'il est accompagné du nom de la zone géographique où la production a traditionnellement lieu, par exemple «Absinthe du Val-de-Travers».

En raison de l'absence de définition par l'UE du terme «absinthe», les producteurs de cette boisson spiritueuse dans l'UE ne sont pas en mesure d'indiquer sur l'étiquette le terme «absinthe» en tant que dénomination de vente. Il convient d'observer que la Commission a présenté une proposition en vue d'ajouter la définition du terme «absinthe» à l'annexe II du règlement (CE) n° 110/2008 ([1]). La proposition a toutefois été rejetée par le Parlement le 13 mars 2013 dans le cadre de la procédure de réglementation avec contrôle, aux motifs que tous les producteurs devraient être autorisés à continuer d'appliquer leurs propres méthodes et critères de production. Les producteurs de l'UE doivent dès lors commercialiser leur produit dans l'une des catégories (dénominations de vente) inscrites à l'annexe II du règlement (CE) n° 110/2008, s'il satisfait aux conditions requises pour être inclus dans ladite catégorie, ou, dans le cas contraire, sous la dénomination de vente «boisson spiritueuse». L'indication «absinthe» ne peut être utilisée qu'en tant que descriptif facultatif.

([1]) JO L 39 du 13.2.2008.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011876/13**
**to the Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* 'Absinthe' indication

1. With respect to the procedures undertaken by Switzerland to register 'Absinthe' as a geographical indication (GI), can the Commission guarantee that the term will be considered sufficiently generic in Europe to prevent a Swiss request for protection, either through the bilateral agreement or through the stand-alone measure for protection?

2. What is the impact of the lack of a European definition of the term 'Absinthe'?

**Answer given by M.Cioloș on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

The registration of the term 'absinthe' as a geographical indication in Switzerland would have no impact on its use for products marketed in the EU. That term is already used in the EU to describe spirit drinks produced in various Member States and is therefore considered as a generic term.

The issue concerning the registration of the term 'absinthe' in Switzerland has been largely discussed in the framework of bilateral exchanges with Switzerland, in particular within the EU-Switzerland Joint Committee on Agriculture. In that context, the Commission has stressed that the registration of the term 'absinthe' could only be envisaged if accompanied by the name of the geographical area where the production traditionally takes place, for example 'Absinthe du Val-de-Travers'.

Due to the absence of an EU definition of the term 'absinthe', the EU producers of this spirit drink are not able to indicate on the label the term 'absinthe' as a sale denomination. It should be noted that the Commission submitted a proposal to add the definition of 'absinthe' in Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 ([1]). However, the proposal was rejected by the negative vote of the Parliament on 13 March 2013 in the framework of the PRAC procedure, on the grounds that all producers should be allowed to continue to use their own production methods and criteria. EU producers must therefore sell their product under one of the categories (sales denominations) listed in Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 110/2008, if the compliance with such category exists, or, on the contrary, under the sales denomination 'spirit drink'. The indication 'absinthe' may only be used as an optional descriptor.

([1]) OJ L 39, 13.2.2008.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011877/13**
**à la Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Commercialisation de l'absinthe de production européenne en Suisse

1. Suite aux démarches entreprises en Suisse pour l'enregistrement des dénominations «Absinthe», «Fée Verte» et «La Bleue» comme indications géographiques (IG), que fait la Commission pour régler la possible entrave à la commercialisation en Suisse des «absinthes» produites dans l'Union européenne?

2. Est-ce que cette problématique sera maintenue à l'ordre du jour de la prochaine réunion du Comité mixte EU-Suisse sur l'agriculture?

**Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission**
*(22 novembre 2013)*

Lors de contacts bilatéraux avec la Suisse, la Commission a soulevé à plusieurs reprises la question de l'enregistrement des indications géographiques (IG) «Absinthe», «Fée Verte» et «La Bleue».

Plusieurs recours contre ces enregistrements ont été introduits auprès du Tribunal administratif fédéral de Suisse. Ces recours ont un effet suspensif.

La Commission a demandé des informations sur l'état d'avancement des procédures judiciaires lors de la réunion du groupe de travail sur le vin et les boissons spiritueuses qui s'est tenue à Berne le 29 juillet 2013. À la demande de la Commission, cette question a été inscrite à l'ordre du jour de la prochaine réunion du comité mixte UE-Suisse de l'agriculture, qui aura lieu à Berne le 28 novembre 2013.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011877/13**
**to the Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Marketing in Switzerland of absinthe produced in the European Union

1. Following the measures taken in Switzerland to register the names 'Absinthe', 'Fée Verte' and 'La Bleue' as geographical indications (GI), what is the Commission doing to address this potential impediment to the marketing in Switzerland of 'absinthe' produced in the European Union?

2. Will this issue be kept on the agenda of the next meeting of the EU-Switzerland Joint Committee on agriculture?

**Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission**
*(22 November 2013)*

During bilateral contacts with Switzerland, the Commission has repeatedly raised the issue of the registration of the geographical indications (GIs) 'Absinthe', 'Fée Verte' and 'La Bleue'.

A number of appeals against the registrations have been submitted to the *Tribunal administratif fédéral* of Switzerland. These appeals have suspensory effect.

The Commission enquired on the state of play of the judicial proceedings, during the working group meeting on wine and spirit drinks, held in Bern in 29 July 2013. At the request of the Commission, the matter has been included on the agenda of the next meeting of the EU-Switzerland Joint Committee on agriculture, to be held in Bern on the 28th of November 2013.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011878/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(17 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri — Enti nazionali

La Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri (regolamento (CE) n. 261/2004) è da tempo in vigore e, in molti casi, è servita ai cittadini europei quale utile strumento per ottenere gli indennizzi dovuti, oltre all'assistenza e quant'altro possa essere connesso ai disservizi causati dalle compagnie aeree.

Viene però sovente rilevata una forte differenza in termini di efficienza e puntualità tra l'attività dei vari enti nazionali incaricati di vigilare sulla questione.

Può la Commissione far sapere quali azioni vengono intraprese per controllare ed eventualmente sanzionare gli enti nazionali per l'Aviazione Civile che non garantiscono un servizio ai consumatori decoroso ed efficiente?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011879/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(17 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri

La Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri (regolamento (CE) n. 261/2004) è da tempo in vigore e, in molti casi, è servita ai cittadini europei quale utile strumento per ottenere gli indennizzi dovuti, l'assistenza e quant'altro sia connesso ai disservizi causati dalle compagnie aeree.

Viene però sovente rilevata una forte differenza in termini di efficienza e puntualità tra l'attività dei vari enti nazionali incaricati di vigilare sulla questione.

Può la Commissione far sapere quali azioni vengono intraprese per vigilare affinché i vari enti nazionali diano un servizio ai consumatori decoroso e uniforme in tutti gli Stati dell'Unione?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011880/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(17 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* ENAC e Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri

La Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri (regolamento (CE) n. 261/2004) è da tempo in vigore e, in molti casi, è servita ai cittadini europei quale utile strumento per ottenere gli indennizzi dovuti, l'assistenza e quant'altro sia connesso ai disservizi causati dalle compagnie aeree.

Viene però sovente rilevata una forte differenza in termini di efficienza e puntualità tra l'attività dei vari enti nazionali incaricati di vigilare sulla questione.

Può la Commissione far sapere quali azioni vengono intraprese per vigilare affinché l'Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile italiano garantisca un servizio ai consumatori decoroso e uguale a quello fornito in altri Stati dell'Unione?

**Risposta congiunta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione**
*(9 dicembre 2013)*

A norma del regolamento (CE) n. 261/2004 ogni Stato membro ha istituito organismi nazionali di applicazione (ONA) responsabili dell'applicazione del regolamento stesso.

Sempre secondo il regolamento, la Commissione è incaricata di sorvegliare e verificarne l'attuazione e l'applicazione da parte di ciascuno Stato membro. Pur tenendo in debito conto le differenze nazionali tra i quadri giuridici, amministrativi e giudiziari, la Commissione si adopra al massimo per garantire che le pratiche nazionali siano allineate il più possibile, in particolare per quanto riguarda le scadenze per il trattamento dei singoli reclami. Su impulso della Commissione, nel 2007 gli organismi nazionali di applicazione hanno concluso un accordo volontario tra loro in base al quale, tra l'altro, detti organismi dispongono di 6 mesi per trattare i singoli reclami ([1]).

La Commissione verifica costantemente che gli ONA adempiano correttamente ai loro obblighi e adotta le misure necessarie in caso di mancata conformità delle compagnie aeree alla legislazione dell'UE. Tutto questo è sbrigato principalmente tramite contatti regolari, riunioni e scambio di informazioni con gli ONA. La Commissione chiede loro regolarmente di fornire informazioni su casi specifici che sono stati sottoposti alla sua attenzione. Grazie a questi contatti regolari, gli ONA cooperano attivamente con la Commissione e tra loro. La Commissione ha proposto di rafforzare ulteriormente tale cooperazione nella proposta di revisione del regolamento.

Se da elementi di informazione risultasse che uno Stato membro non applica correttamente il regolamento, la Commissione avvierebbe indagini e, nel caso, una procedura di infrazione. A titolo informativo, sono state avviate indagini nei confronti del Portogallo e dell'Italia e una lettera di costituzione in mora è stata trasmessa all'Italia il 21 giugno 2013.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/passengers/air/doc/neb/neb_complaint_handling_procedures.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011878/13**
**to the Commission**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Charter of Passengers' Rights — National bodies

The Passengers' Rights Charter (Regulation (EC) No 261/2004) has been in force for a while and, in many cases, has been a useful tool for European citizens in obtaining assistance, the compensation they are owed and anything related to disruptions caused by airlines.

However, there have been frequent observations about the considerable differences in terms of efficiency and punctuality between the activities of the various national bodies charged with monitoring this issue.

Can the Commission state which measures are being taken to monitor and, potentially, sanction national civil aviation bodies which fail to guarantee consumers a decent and efficient service?

**Question for written answer E-011879/13**
**to the Commission**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Charter of Passengers' Rights

The Passengers' Rights Charter (Regulation (EC) No 261/2004) has been in force for some time and, in many cases, has been a useful tool for European citizens in obtaining the compensation they are owed, assistance and anything related to disruptions caused by airlines.

However, there have been frequent observations about the considerable differences between the various national bodies charged with monitoring this issue, in terms of the effectiveness and timeliness of their activities.

Can the Commission state what measures are being taken to monitor the various national bodies and ensure that they guarantee consumers a decent and uniform service in all the EU Member States?

**Question for written answer E-011880/13**
**to the Commission**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* ENAC and the Charter of Passengers' Rights

The Passengers' Rights Charter (Regulation (EC) No 261/2004) has been in force for some time and, in many cases, has been a useful tool for European citizens in obtaining the compensation they are owed, assistance and anything related to disruptions caused by airlines.

However, there have been frequent observations about the considerable differences between the various national bodies charged with monitoring this issue, in terms of the effectiveness and timeliness of their activities.

Can the Commission state which measures are being taken to monitor the Italian National Civil Aviation Body (ENAC) and ensure that it guarantees consumers a decent service equal to that provided in other EU Member States?

**Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 December 2013)*

Under Regulation (EC) 261/2004, each Member State has designated a National Enforcement Body (NEB) which is responsible for the application of this regulation.

The role of the Commission under the regulation is to oversee and monitor the implementation and application of the regulation by each Member State. Whilst taking due account of national differences between legal, administrative and judicial frameworks, the Commission does its utmost to ensure that national practices are aligned as far as possible, notably regarding the time-limit to deal with individual complaints. Encouraged by the Commission, the NEBs have concluded in 2007 a NEB-NEB voluntary agreement that provides, *inter alia*, that NEBs have up to 6 months in principle to deal with individual complaints ([1]).

The Commission constantly verifies that the NEBs carry out their obligations properly and take the necessary measures in cases of non-compliance by airlines with EU legislation. This is primarily achieved through regular contacts, meetings and exchange of information with the NEBs. The Commission regularly requests NEBs to provide information on specific cases which have been brought to its attention. As a result of such regular contacts, NEBs actively cooperate with the Commission and with each other. The Commission proposed to further strengthen this cooperation in its proposal for a revision of the regulation.

Should elements of information show that a Member State is failing to enforce the regulation, the Commission would launch investigation and, as appropriate, infringement procedures. For information, investigations were started against Portugal and Italy and a letter of formal notice was sent to Italy on 21 June 2013.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/passengers/air/doc/neb/neb_complaint_handling_procedures.pdf

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011881/13**
**au Conseil**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Éolienne et santé humaine

L'installation d'éoliennes pose de nombreuses questions sur le terrain, de la part des élus locaux, des habitants et des scientifiques. Concernant l'impact de l'installation d'éoliennes, le Conseil s'est-il interrogé sur le possible impact négatif de l'éolienne sur la santé humaine?

Le Conseil n'envisage-t-il pas d'adopter une harmonisation des distances entre une éolienne et une habitation?

**Réponse**
*(9 décembre 2013)*

Le Conseil n'a pas débattu de cette question.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011881/13**
**to the Council**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Wind farms and human health

Building wind farms raises many questions for people locally, including elected representatives, inhabitants and scientists. With respect to the installation of wind farms, has the Council looked into the potentially negative impact of wind turbines on human health?

Is the Council planning to adopt a harmonisation of distances between wind turbines and dwellings?

**Reply**
*(9 December 2013)*

The Council has not discussed the issue.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011882/13**
**à la Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Éolienne et santé humaine

L'installation d'éoliennes pose de nombreuses questions sur le terrain, de la part des élus locaux, des habitants et des scientifiques. Concernant l'impact de l'installation d'éoliennes, la Commission s'est-elle interrogée sur le possible impact négatif de l'éolienne sur la santé humaine?

La Commission n'envisage-t-elle pas d'adopter une harmonisation des distances entre une éolienne et une habitation?

**Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission**
*(5 décembre 2013)*

1. La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à consulter la réponse qu'elle a donnée à la question écrite P-012246/2013, posée par M. Childers ([1]).

2. À ce jour, il n'existe pas de projets visant à proposer une harmonisation, au niveau de l'Union, de la distance entre les éoliennes et les habitations. Les distances recommandées peuvent varier selon les États membres de l'Union, mais la majorité d'entre eux ont convenu d'exigences spécifiques en matière d'implantation et de distances minimales entre les éoliennes et les habitations, les routes et d'autres infrastructures (EWEA, 2011) ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=FR
([2]) http://www.ewea.org/wind-energy-basics/faq/

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011882/13**
**to the Commission**
**Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Wind farms and human health

Building wind farms raises many questions for people locally, including elected representatives, inhabitants and scientists. With respect to the installation of wind farms, has the Commission looked into the potentially negative impact of wind turbines on human health?

Is the Commission planning to adopt a harmonisation of distances between wind turbines and dwellings?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

1. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question P-012246/2013 by Mr Childers ([1]).

2. There are at present no plans to propose harmonisation at EU level of the distance between wind turbines and dwellings. Recomended distances may vary between Member States, but the majority of EU Member States have agreed on specific siting requirements and minimum distances of wind turbines and dwellings, roads and other infrastructure (EWEA, 2011) ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN
([2]) http://www.ewea.org/wind-energy-basics/faq/

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011886/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE)**
*(17 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Comercio con Marruecos

Marruecos, país vecino de España, está emergiendo económicamente con el paso del tiempo, generando una riqueza interior que es interesante aprovechar mediante relaciones bilaterales de comercio.

España, tradicionalmente, siempre ha tenido relaciones comerciales y relaciones bilaterales, generando mucha riqueza con ellas.

El próximo paso que está dando la Unión Europea es comenzar las negociaciones para elaborar un convenio por el cual todos los países de la UE puedan establecer relaciones comerciales beneficiosas con este país vecino, pudiendo abrir mercado en su territorio o dejando que Marruecos pueda abrir mercado en el territorio europeo.

¿Están siendo positivas las negociaciones de libre comercio con Marruecos comenzadas en abril de este año?

¿Piensa la Comisión que es posible el acercamiento legislativo de Marruecos y de la Unión Europea en este aspecto para beneficio mutuo?

**Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión**
*(5 de diciembre de 2013)*

El Presidente Barroso y el Primer Ministro marroquí Benkirán dieron comienzo a las negociaciones sobre una zona de libre comercio de alcance amplio y profundo (DCFTA) entre la UE y Marruecos el 1 de marzo de 2013 en Rabat. Desde entonces, han tenido lugar dos rondas de negociaciones. La tercera ronda tendrá lugar a finales de 2013 o comienzos de 2014. Hasta ahora, las negociaciones progresan adecuadamente y hay textos de negociación sobre la mesa para casi todos los ámbitos.

La DCFTA formará parte del actual Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Marruecos y tendrá por objetivo general profundizar significativamente en la integración económica entre la UE y Marruecos. Ambas Partes buscan un acuerdo global centrado en cuestiones no arancelarias. El principal instrumento en este contexto será la aproximación de la legislación a la legislación de la UE en ámbitos tales como la normalización industrial o las medidas sanitarias y fitosanitarias sobre la base de las prioridades fijadas de común acuerdo. El acuerdo incluirá asimismo diversos compromisos sobre otros aspectos comerciales, especialmente la facilitación del comercio, la contratación pública, la competencia, los servicios, la protección de las inversiones y el desarrollo sostenible.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011886/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Trade with Morocco

Spain's neighbour Morocco is gradually emerging economically, generating internal wealth that we ought to tap into through bilateral trade relations.

Spain has a long tradition of trade and bilateral relations with Morocco, which have generated considerable wealth.

The next step being taken by the European Union is to begin negotiations to draw up an agreement through which all EU countries can establish beneficial trade relations with this neighbouring country, allowing them to open up markets in Morocco and allowing Morocco to do the same in Europe.

Are the free-trade negotiations with Morocco, which began in April this year, proving to be positive?

Does the Commission believe that Moroccan and European Union legislation can be brought into closer alignment in this regard to our mutual benefit?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

The Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) negotiations between the EU and Morocco were launched on 1 March 2013 by President Barroso and Moroccan Prime Minister Benkirane in Rabat. Since then two rounds of negotiations have been taken place. The third round will take place end of 2013 or beginning of 2014. The negotiations are advancing well so far, negotiating texts are on the table for nearly all areas.

The DCFTA will be part of the existing EU-Morocco Association Agreement and will have the overall objective to significantly deepen economic integration between the EU and Morocco. Both sides seek for a comprehensive agreement focusing on non-tariff matters. The main instrument in this context will be the approximation of legislation to EU legislation in areas such as industrial standards or sanitary and phytosanitary measures based on mutually agreed priorities. The agreement will also include commitments on other trade related aspects, notably trade facilitation, public procurement, competition, services, investment protection and sustainable development.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011891/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(17 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Situazione degli interventi in tema di amianto

Con riferimento alle misure volte a contrastare le conseguenze derivanti dall'utilizzo dell'amianto, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— quali interventi ha sostenuto in passato, economicamente e non, al fine di favorire azioni di smaltimento dell'amianto e prevenzione dei rischi per la popolazione ad esso riconducibili?

— Quali misure ha adottato per la formazione degli operatori del settore edile e delle strutture predisposte alla gestione delle problematiche inerenti l'amianto e, nel caso in cui il tema non sia stato affrontato, come intende procedere al riguardo?

— Qual è lo stato dell'arte della normativa europea in tema di amianto?

**Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**
*(5 dicembre 2013)*

L'UE offre agli Stati membri sostegno finanziario nell'ambito dei fondi strutturali e dei fondi di coesione che, in funzione delle priorità dei programmi operativi pertinenti, possono cofinanziare programmi e progetti relativi sia alla prevenzione dei rischi sia alla bonifica di siti contaminati e aree dismesse.

In materia di informazione e formazione degli operatori del settore, sul sito web della Commissione sono disponibili due pubblicazioni, la cui redazione è stata affidata a un consorzio indipendente: si tratta di una guida pratica (*Practical guidelines for the information and training of workers involved with asbestos removal or maintenance work*, non disponibile in italiano) e di un opuscolo destinato soprattutto ai negozi del settore «fai da te» e ad altri esercizi commerciali di questo tipo ([1]). La guida contiene una serie di esempi di buone pratiche rilevati in Bulgaria, Francia, Germania, Polonia e Regno Unito.

Un'ulteriore guida pratica, pubblicata dal comitato degli alti responsabili degli ispettorati del lavoro, è reperibile sul sito web della DG EMPL: *Guida pratica sulle migliori prassi per prevenire o minimizzare i rischi dell'amianto in lavori che implicano (o possono implicare) la presenza di amianto: per il datore di lavoro, i lavoratori e l'ispettore del lavoro* ([2]).

La normativa applicabile in tema di amianto consta, in particolare, dei seguenti atti:

a) direttiva 87/217/CEE ([3]) che obbliga gli Stati membri a prescrivere le dovute misure preventive nel piano di lavoro previsto all'articolo 13 della direttiva 2009/148/UE ([4]);

b) direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti ([5]), che copre i rifiuti di amianto e obbliga gli Stati membri a garantire che la gestione dei rifiuti sia effettuata senza mettere in pericolo la salute umana;

c) direttiva 1999/31/CE relativa alle discariche di rifiuti ([6]) e punto 2.3.3 dell'allegato della decisione 2003/33/CE del Consiglio ([7]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=716&langId=en&intPageId=225.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=148&intPageId=685&langId=en. Cliccare sul link «library entries».
([3]) Concernente la prevenzione e la riduzione dell'inquinamento dell'ambiente causato dell'amianto, GU L 85 del 28.3.1987.
([4]) Sulla protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi connessi con un'esposizione all'amianto durante il lavoro, GU L 330 del 16.12.2009.
([5]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.
([6]) GU L 182 del 16.7.1999.
([7]) Che stabilisce criteri e procedure per l'ammissione dei rifiuti nelle discariche, GU L 11 del 16.1.2003.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011891/13**
**to the Commission**
**Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* State of play with regard to action taken on asbestos

With reference to the measures intended to tackle the consequences of asbestos use:

— What measures, both financial and otherwise, has the Commission supported in the past in order to facilitate activities aimed at the disposal of asbestos and the prevention of related risks for the local population?

— What steps has it taken for the training of operators in the construction sector and the structures set up to deal with asbestos-related problems and, should this subject not have been tackled, how does it intend to proceed in this regard?

— What is the latest European legislation concerning asbestos?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

As regards possible EU financial support, Member States can draw on the assistance provided by structural and cohesion funds. In the framework of the priorities in their relevant Operational Programmes, programmes and projects related to risk prevention as well as the rehabilitation of contaminated sites and brownfield could be co-financed.

'Practical guidelines for the information and training of workers involved with asbestos removal or maintenance work' and a 'flyer' to be displayed, inter alia, in DIY shops and similar ones, have been published in the Commission website ([1]). They have been drafted by an independent consortium under contract with the Commission. The guidelines include a series of 'best practice' examples collected from Bulgaria, France, Germany, Poland and the United Kingdom.

The Senior Labour Inspectors Committee also issued a practical guide on best practice to prevent or minimise asbestos risks in work that involves (or may involve) asbestos. This guide is available on the DG EMPL website. ([2])

The applicable legislation concerning asbestos includes:

(a) Directive 87/217/EEC ([3]) which requires Member States to prescribe the necessary preventive measures in the work plan provided in accordance with Article 13 of Directive 2009/148/EU ([4]);

(b) Directive 2008/98/EC ([5]) on waste, which covers asbestos waste, requires Member States to ensure that waste management is carried out without endangering human health;

(c) Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste ([6]) and Chapter 2.2.3 of the annex to Council Decision 2003/33/EC ([7]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=716&langId=en&intPageId=225
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=148&langId=en&intPageId=685 Follow 'library entries'.
([3]) On the prevention and reduction of environmental pollution by asbestos, OJ L 85, 28.3.1987.
([4]) On the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to asbestos at work, OJ L 330, 16.12.2009.
([5]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([6]) OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.
([7]) Establishing criteria and procedures for the acceptance of waste at landfills, OJ L 11, 16.1.2003.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011892/13**
**à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)**
**Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE) et Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* VP/HR — Persécutions d'opposants politiques au régime kazakh ainsi que de leur famille et collègues vivant en Europe

Au cours des derniers mois, nous avons assisté à l'intensification de la vague de répression orchestrée par les autorités kazakhes contre les opposants au régime, mais aussi leur famille et leurs anciens collègues vivant en Europe. De nombreux citoyens kazakhs, russes et ukrainiens sont détenus dans différents pays de l'Union européenne, souvent à la suite de demandes émanant des autorités de l'un des trois pays dont ils sont ressortissants, par l'intermédiaire du système d'Interpol.

La situation est particulièrement médiatisée depuis les derniers rebondissements de l'affaire Moukhtar Abliazov, dont l'épouse a été expulsée d'Italie vers le Kazakhstan à la fin du mois de mai 2013 à la suite d'une procédure accélérée impliquant Interpol et des dizaines d'agents des forces spéciales italiennes. Abliazov a lui-même été arrêté en France le 31 juillet 2013 et est actuellement détenu à Aix-en-Provence. Le 5 décembre 2013, la cour d'appel devrait examiner la demande d'extradition adressée par l'Ukraine. M. Abliazov, qui a déjà été emprisonné une fois au Kazakhstan, est un opposant déclaré au régime actuel. S'il est extradé vers l'Ukraine, il risque d'être remis au Kazakhstan et d'y être victime de torture et de mauvais traitements.

Les vastes poursuites engagées contre Moukhtar Abliazov semblent également concerner les membres de sa famille et ses anciens collègues vivant en Europe. Deux personnes sont actuellement dans l'attente de décisions concernant leur extradition: Tatiana Paraskevich, détenue en République tchèque, dont l'Ukraine et la Russie ont demandé l'extradition; et Alexandr Pavlov, détenu en Espagne et faisant l'objet d'une demande d'extradition adressée par le Kazakhstan. Ils risquent tous deux l'extradition à cause des relations qu'ils entretiennent avec Moukhtar Abliazov.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle connaissance de ces affaires, et le Service européen pour l'action extérieure (SEAE) en surveille-t-il régulièrement l'évolution?

Le SEAE a-t-il pris des mesures pour s'assurer que les États membres et les instances nationales compétentes soient conscients du contexte politique dans lequel s'inscrivent les affaires mentionnées ci-avant?

Quels sont, le cas échéant, les mécanismes et actions prévus par le SEAE pour éviter que les gouvernements autoritaires fassent un usage abusif des accords et organes internationaux, tels qu'Interpol, pour persécuter les opposants politiques et leur famille et amis?

**Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission**
*(5 décembre 2013)*

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a connaissance de la problématique soulevée par l'Honorable Parlementaire et suit de près la situation de M. Alexandr Pavlov et de M^me^ Alma Shalabayeva ainsi que de M. Moukhtar Abliazov. La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à prendre connaissance de sa réponse à la question écrite E-009748/2013 ([1]), qui traite de ce sujet.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante continuera à suivre cette affaire et d'autres affaires similaires. Des moyens formels et informels sont utilisés pour encourager les autorités kazakhes à respecter leurs obligations internationales, notamment la Convention contre la torture et autres peines ou traitements cruels, inhumains ou dégradants et son protocole facultatif auxquels le Kazakhstan est partie.

L'UE soulève les questions liées à la justice et aux Droits de l'homme dans le cadre de son dialogue politique avec le Kazakhstan, et continuera à le faire, systématiquement et à chaque occasion, et tout particulièrement lors des réunions annuelles dans le cadre du dialogue sur les Droits de l'homme et du comité de la justice et des affaires intérieures, organisées cette année les 27 et 28 novembre à Astana.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-009748&language=EN

Pour ce qui est des questions liées à l'extradition, cette procédure relève de la compétence des États membres et est appliquée dans le respect de la législation nationale et des traités internationaux. Il convient toutefois de rappeler que les décisions finales prises au niveau national en matière d'extradition peuvent faire l'objet d'un recours formé devant la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011892/13**
**alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**
**Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE) e Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**
*(17 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* VP/HR — Persecuzione di oppositori politici al regime kazako, nonché dei loro parenti e colleghi che vivono in Europa

Negli scorsi mesi si è assistito a una crescente ondata di repressioni da parte delle autorità kazake nei confronti non solo degli oppositori al regime, ma anche dei loro parenti ed ex colleghi che vivono in Europa. Diversi cittadini kazaki, russi e ucraini sono detenuti in vari paesi dell'Unione europea, spesso a seguito di richieste ricevute tramite il sistema Interpol e provenienti dalle autorità di uno dei tre paesi che rilasciano suddetti passaporti.

La situazione è stata posta sotto i riflettori in particolare a seguito dei recenti sviluppi nel caso di Mukhtar Ablyazov, la cui moglie è stata espulsa dall'Italia verso il Kazakistan, alla fine di maggio 2013, nell'ambito di una procedura accelerata che ha visto il coinvolgimento di Interpol e di decine di agenti delle forze speciali italiane. Ablyazov stesso è stato arrestato in Francia il 31 luglio 2013 ed è attualmente detenuto a Aix-en-Provence. Il 5 dicembre la Corte dovrebbe esaminare la richiesta di estradizione presentata dall'Ucraina. Ablyazov, che è già stato incarcerato una volta in Kazakistan, è un dichiarato oppositore dell'attuale regime. Se venisse estradato in Ucraina, rischia di essere consegnato al Kazakistan, dove potrebbe subire torture e maltrattamenti.

Le massicce persecuzioni di Mukhtar Ablyazov sembrano interessare anche i membri della famiglia e gli ex colleghi che vivono in Europa. Attualmente, sono in attesa di decisioni di estradizione Tatiana Paraskevich, detenuta in Repubblica ceca, con richieste di estradizione da parte di Ucraina e Russia, e Alexandr Pavlov, detenuto in Spagna, con richiesta di estradizione da parte del Kazakistan. Entrambi rischiano l'estradizione a causa delle loro relazioni con Mukhtar Ablyazov.

È il Vicepresidente/Alto commissario a conoscenza di questi casi? Sta il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna (SEAE) monitorando tali casi su base regolare?

Ha il SEAE adottato delle misure per garantire che gli Stati membri e le agenzie nazionali competenti siano consapevoli del contesto politico in cui si inseriscono suddetti casi?

Quali sono gli eventuali meccanismi/provvedimenti previsti dal SEAE per garantire che i governi autoritari non si avvalgano impropriamente degli accordi e degli organismi internazionali, come Interpol, per perseguire gli oppositori politici e le loro famiglie e amici?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**
*(5 dicembre 2013)*

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza delle questioni sollevate dall'onorevole parlamentare e sta seguendo con attenzione le situazioni di Aleksandr Pavlov e Alma Shalabayeva, come pure quella di Mukhtar Ablyazov. A questo proposito la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-009748/2013 ([1]).

L'AR/VP continuerà a controllare l'evoluzione di questo caso e di altri casi analoghi. Tanto nelle occasioni formali quanto in quelle informali le autorità kazake sono incoraggiate a rispettare i loro obblighi internazionali, in particolare la Convenzione contro la tortura e altre pene o trattamenti crudeli, inumani o degradanti e il suo protocollo opzionale, di cui il Kazakhstan è firmatario.

L'Unione europea solleva e continuerà costantemente a sollevare, in ogni possibile contesto, i problemi relativi alla giustizia e ai diritti umani nel suo dialogo politico con il Kazakhstan, in particolare nel quadro del dialogo annuale sui diritti umani e della commissione per la giustizia e gli affari interni, che quest'anno si svolgerà il 27-28 novembre ad Astana.

L'estradizione, d'altra parte, è di competenza degli Stati membri, che devono applicarla in conformità del diritto nazionale e dei trattati internazionali. Si rammenta tuttavia che le decisioni definitive prese a livello nazionale in materia di estradizione possono essere oggetto di appello dinanzi alla Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-009748&language=EN

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011892/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE) and Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Persecution of political opponents to the Kazakhstan regime and of their relatives and colleagues living in Europe

Over the past months we have witnessed a rising wave of repression on the part of the Kazakhstan authorities targeting not only opponents to the regime but also their relatives and former colleagues living in Europe. A number of Kazakhstan, Russian and Ukrainian citizens have been detained in different EU countries, often in response to requests received through the Interpol system from authorities in one of the three passport-issuing countries.

The situation has been made particularly visible through recent developments in the case of Mukhtar Ablyazov, whose wife was deported from Italy to Kazakhstan at the end of May 2013 in a rapidly expedited procedure involving Interpol and dozens of Italian special forces agents. Ablyazov himself was arrested in France on 31 July 2013 and is currently being held in detention in Aix-en-Provence. On 5 December 2013 the court is due to hear an extradition request filed by Ukraine. Mr Ablyazov, who has already been imprisoned once in Kazakhstan, is an outspoken critic of the current regime. If extradited to Ukraine, he risks being handed over to Kazakhstan, where he could face torture and ill treatment.

The wide-ranging pursuit of Mukhtar Ablyazov seems also to include family members and former colleagues living in Europe. Currently awaiting decisions on extradition are the following persons: Tatiana Paraskevich, detained in the Czech Republic and subject to extradition requests from Ukraine and Russia; and Alexandr Pavlov, detained in Spain and subject to an extradition request from Kazakhstan. Both risk extradition because of their relationships with Mukhtar Ablyazov.

Is the VP/HR aware of these cases, and is the European External Action Service (EEAS) monitoring them on a regular basis?

Has the EEAS taken steps to ensure that the Member States and their relevant national agencies are aware of the political context of the abovementioned cases?

What (if any) are the mechanisms/actions foreseen by the EEAS to ensure that international agreements and bodies, such as Interpol, are not abused by authoritarian governments to persecute political opponents and their families and friends?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

The HR/VP is aware of the issues raised by the Honourable Member and is following closely the situation of Mr Aleksandr Pavlov and Ms. Alma Shalabayeva as well as that of Mr Mukhtar Ablyazov. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to written question on this issue E-009748/2013 ([1]).

The HR/VP will continue to monitor this and other similar cases. Formal and informal opportunities are used to encourage Kazak authorities to respect their international obligations, notably the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol that Kazakhstan is party to.

The EU raises and will continue to raise justice and human rights issues in its political dialogue with Kazakhstan consistently and at every opportunity in particular, in the framework of the annual Human Rights Dialogue and Justice and Home Affairs Committee which will take place this year on 27-28 November in Astana.

Regarding the questions pertaining to extradition, this is under the competence of Member States and is done in accordance with national law and international treaties. It is however recalled that national final decisions on extradition can be subject to appeal before the European Court of Human Rights.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-009748&language=EN

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011893/13**
**adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(17 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* VP/HR— Relația UE cu China și Taiwan având în vedere Tratatul bilateral de investiții UE-China

La 18 octombrie 2013, Consiliul ar trebui să aprobe cererea Comisiei de inițiere a negocierilor cu China privind un Tratat bilateral de investiții (TBI).

Cu toate acestea, politica externă cu privire la relația China-Taiwan este dublă: EU gestionează legături diplomatice prin politica „O Chină unică", recunoscând în același timp Taiwanul ca entitate economică separată.

1. Cum va gestiona Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant aceste politici diplomatice și economice divergente în negocierile sale privind un TBI cu China?

2. În conformitate cu care dispoziții va mandata Consiliul negocierile privind un TBI cu Taiwanul ca entitate economică separată?

**Răspuns dat de Înaltul Reprezentant /doamna vicepreședinte Ashton în numele Comisiei**
*(5 decembrie 2013)*

La 18 octombrie 2013, în cadrul Consiliului Afaceri Externe, Comisia a primit autorizația de a negocia un acord global de investiții cu China. UE s-a angajat să inițieze relații comerciale cu China. Această strategie de promovare a comerțului deschis și a concurenței loiale, coroborată cu o atitudine fermă prin care să se asigure că China respectă normele comerciale și drepturile de proprietate intelectuală și că își îndeplinește obligațiile care îi revin în cadrul OMC, este principiul fundamental al politicii comerciale a UE referitoare la China. Negocierile privind încheierea unui acord de investiții între UE și China au fost lansate în cadrul celei de a 16-a reuniuni la nivel înalt UE — China, care a avut loc la 21 noiembrie, la Beijing.

UE va continua să urmărească politica sa care vizează „O Chină unică" și să sprijine dialogul privind relațiile dintre cele două maluri ale strâmtorii Taiwan și soluționarea pașnică a diferendelor legate de suveranitate. În ultimii ani, apropierea dintre China și Taiwan a continuat într-un ritm rapid. Au fost semnate nouăsprezece acorduri de cooperare între China și Taiwan, printre care s-a numărat și Acordul-cadru de cooperare economică (ECFA).

UE consideră Taiwanul drept o entitate economică și comercială distinctă. „Teritoriul vamal distinct Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen și Matsu (Taipei-ul Chinez)" este membru cu drepturi depline al OMC. Taiwanul se află pe locul 23 în clasamentul partenerilor comerciali ai UE, valoarea bunurilor și serviciilor care fac obiectul schimburilor comerciale fiind de aproximativ 40 de miliarde EUR. Pentru moment, nu sunt planificate negocieri privind încheierea unui acord comercial bilateral și nici a unui acord de investiții cu Taiwan.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011893/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — EU relationship with China and Taiwan in view of the EU-China Bilateral Investment Treaty

On 18 October 2013 the Council is expected to approve the Commission's request to initiate negotiations with China on a Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT).

However, at present, EU external policy with regard to the China-Taiwan relationship is two-sided: the EU manages diplomatic ties through the 'One China' policy while recognising Taiwan as a separate economic entity.

1. How will the Vice-President/High Representative manage these divergent diplomatic and economic policies in its negotiations on a BIT with China?

2. Under what provisions will the Council mandate BIT negotiations with Taiwan as a separate economic entity?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

At the Foreign Affairs Council of 18 October 2013, the Commission was given a mandate to negotiate a compehensive investment agreement with China. The EU is committed to open trading relations with China. This strategy of supporting open trade and fair competition while being firm on ensuring that China trades fairly, respects intellectual property rights and meets its World Trade Organisation (WTO) obligations is the guiding principle of the EU's trade policy with China.The negotiations for the EU-China Investment Agreement were launched at the 16th EU-China Summit on 21 November 2013 in Beijing.

The EU will continue to follow its 'One China' policy, and supports cross-straits dialogue and the peaceful resolution of differences over sovereignty. Over the past years, the rapprochement between China and Taiwan has continued at a fast pace. Nineteen cooperation agreements have been signed between China and Taiwan, including the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA).

The EU treats Taiwan as a separate economic and commercial entity. The 'Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu (Chinese Taipei)' is a full member of the WTO. With around EUR 40 billion of goods and services exchanged, Taiwan is the 23rd trade partner of the EU. For the time being, negotiations of a Bilateral Trade and Investment Agreement with Taiwan are not planned.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011895/13**
**à la Commission**
**Bruno Gollnisch (NI)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Rachat de la division mobile de Nokia par Microsoft

La presse a fait état des circonstances très particulières qui entoureraient la cession annoncée à Microsoft de la division mobile de Nokia. Outre l'aspect désolant de voir le dernier constructeur européen de terminaux mobiles vendu à une entreprise étrangère, il a été allégué que cette cession pourrait présenter un aspect délictueux, sous la forme d'une manipulation des cours de l'action de Nokia.

La Commission a des pouvoirs étendus en matière de surveillance et de contrôle des fusions et acquisitions dans l'Union et prétend, par ailleurs, vouloir développer une stratégie européenne industrielle.

1. La Commission, a-t-elle été saisie de cette affaire?

2. Quels sont ses moyens d'action, juridiques et matériels, pour contrôler la légalité de cette opération?

3. Inclut-elle, dans sa «stratégie» industrielle, la conservation et la protection, au niveau européen, de secteurs stratégiques ou importants, étant entendu, comme on le voit dans le cas de Mittal, que la nationalité du propriétaire d'une entreprise n'est pas sans influence sur la localisation géographique de ses activités?

**Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission**
*(13 décembre 2013)*

Le rachat, par Microsoft, de la division «téléphonie mobile» de Nokia a été notifié à la Commission le 29 octobre 2013 conformément au règlement sur les concentrations ([1]). La concentration notifiée a été autorisée sans conditions le 4 décembre 2013.

La compétence dont jouit la Commission pour ce qui est de l'examen de cette acquisition au titre du règlement sur les concentrations se limite à apprécier si l'opération envisagée est susceptible d'entraver de manière significative le jeu d'une concurrence effective dans le marché intérieur ([2]). La Commission n'est pas habilitée à enquêter sur de possibles infractions au droit, qu'elles aient trait à une manipulation du prix de vente ou à d'autres aspects éventuels de l'opération.

L'initiative en faveur de la politique industrielle ([3]) vise à renforcer l'industrie européenne. Elle a débouché sur le lancement d'un nouveau partenariat entre l'UE, les États membres et les entreprises. Cette stratégie repose sur quatre piliers: la réalisation d'investissements en faveur de l'innovation, essentiellement dans six domaines prioritaires très prometteurs, l'amélioration des conditions de marché, tant au sein du marché intérieur que sur les marchés internationaux, l'accès au financement et aux capitaux grâce à la mobilisation de fonds publics, dont ceux de la Banque européenne d'investissement, ainsi que la mise en œuvre d'investissements dans le capital humain et les compétences en vue de promouvoir la création d'emplois et de favoriser la compétitivité de l'industrie. Par ailleurs, Nokia est une entreprise privée, et la Commission n'a pas le droit d'intervenir dans sa stratégie. La Commission peut seulement examiner la compatibilité de l'opération envisagée avec le règlement sur les concentrations et s'assurer que l'entreprise concernée respecte les dispositions des articles 101 et 102 du traité.

---

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 139/2004 du Conseil.
([2]) Dans le cadre de cette compétence limitée, la Commission peut notamment réclamer aux parties et aux tiers des renseignements et des documents utiles à son enquête.
([3]) COM(2012) 582.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011895/13**
**to the Commission**
**Bruno Gollnisch (NI)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Microsoft's buyout of Nokia's mobile division

According to press reports, the circumstances surrounding the sale of Nokia's mobile division to Microsoft are very unusual. Apart from the sorry sight of seeing the last European manufacturer of mobile handsets sold to a foreign company, it has been alleged that this sale could be criminal as Nokia's share price might have been manipulated.

The Commission has broad powers when it comes to the supervision and monitoring of mergers and acquisitions in the EU; it also claims that it intends to develop a European industrial strategy.

1. Has this matter been referred to the Commission?

2. What legal and material means does the Commission have at its disposal to check whether this transaction was legal?

3. Does the Commission include in its industrial 'strategy' the conservation and protection, at European level, of important or strategic sectors given that, as we have seen in the Mittal case, the nationality of a company's owner has an effect on the geographical location of its activities?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

In accordance with the Merger Regulation ([1]), the acquisition of Nokia's Devices and Services unit by Microsoft was notified to the Commission on 29 October 2013. The notified concentration was unconditionally cleared on 4 December 2013.

The Commission's powers to review this transaction under the Merger Regulation are limited to assessing whether the proposed transaction may lead to a significant impediment to effective competition in the internal market ([2]). The Commission does not have any power to investigate possible criminal violations, whether related to the manipulation of the purchase price or to other elements that may have occurred in the context of this transaction.

The Industrial Policy initiative ([3]) is aimed at strengthening the European industry and has launched a new partnership between the EU, Member States and industry. The European Industrial strategy is based on four pillars, namely: investments in innovation, with a focus on six priority areas with great potential; better market conditions in the internal market as well as in international markets; access to finance and capitals by mobilising public funding including the European Investment Bank; and investment in human capital and skills to promote job creation and industry's competitiveness. Furthermore, Nokia is a private company and the Commission has no power to intervene in its strategy, apart from reviewing the proposed concentration's compatibility with the Merger Regulation and the undertaking's compliance with Articles 101 and 102 of the Treaty.

---

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) 139/2004.
([2]) Within this limited remit, the Commission has, among other things, the power to request information and documents that are relevant to its investigation from the parties and third parties.
([3]) COM(2012) 582.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011898/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Dépistage du VIH

Mardi a eu lieu, à Bruxelles, la présentation officielle du Plan national VIH, 2014-2019, sous l'égide de la ministre Onkelinx. Près de 500 personnes ont apporté leur expertise pour l'élaboration des 58 actions.

Une des idées est de faire pratiquer le dépistage par des personnes formées et non plus obligatoirement par le médecin.

La Commission entend-elle promouvoir cette bonne idée parmi les États membres?

**Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission**
*(9 décembre 2013)*

La prévention et le traitement du VIH, y compris l'organisation des services de dépistage, relèvent en premier lieu de la responsabilité des autorités nationales des États membres. En complément des politiques nationales, la Commission a mis en place un cadre stratégique relatif au VIH/sida avec la communication intitulée «La lutte contre le VIH/sida dans l'Union européenne et les pays voisins, 2009-2013». Dans ce cadre, la Commission soutient la prévention du VIH, laquelle passe notamment par un meilleur accès au dépistage pour les populations les plus exposées et dans les régions où la prévalence du VIH est élevée.

Le Centre européen de prévention et de contrôle des maladies a, en outre, élaboré des lignes directrices en matière de dépistage du VIH, dans l'objectif d'accroître la diffusion et l'efficacité du dépistage dans l'UE ([1]).

De plus, la Commission soutient l'échange de meilleures pratiques sur la prévention, le dépistage et le traitement du VIH/sida dans le cadre du programme d'action de l'UE dans le domaine de la santé, qui comporte des projets tels que le «HIV-Cobatest», axé sur les pratiques de dépistage communautaire du VIH en Europe, ou le projet «Imp.Ac.T», dont l'objectif est d'améliorer l'accès au dépistage du VIH/de la tuberculose pour les groupes marginalisés.

([1]) Les documents pertinents sont disponibles en ligne à l'adresse: http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/activities/diseaseprogrammes/hash/Pages/index.aspx

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011898/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* HIV testing

On Tuesday in Brussels, the official national HIV plan for 2014-2019 was unveiled under the auspices of Minister Onkelinx. Some 500 people contributed their expertise to the development of the 58 actions.

One of the ideas is to have tests carried out by trained personnel and no longer necessarily by a doctor.

Will the Commission promote this good idea among the Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 December 2013)*

Prevention and treatment of HIV, including the organisation of testing services, is primarily a responsibility of the national authorities in the Member States. To complement the national policies, the Commission established a policy framework on HIV/AIDS through the communication 'Combating HIV/AIDS in the European Union and neighbouring countries, 2009-2013'. Through this framework the Commission supports HIV prevention including improved access to HIV testing to most at risk populations and in areas with high prevalence of HIV infection.

The European Centre for Disease Preventions and Control has further developed guidance on HIV testing, with a view to increasing the uptake and effectiveness of testing in the EU ([1]).

In addition, the Commission supports exchange of best practice on prevention, detection and treatment of HIV/AIDS under the EU Health Programme, which includes projects, such as 'HIV COBATEST' focusing on HIV community-based testing practices in Europe, or 'Impact', which aims at improving Access to HIV/TB Testing for marginalized groups.

([1]) The relevant documents are available online at: http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/activities/diseaseprogrammes/hash/Pages/index.aspx

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011899/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Vache folle

Un Britannique sur 2 000 environ serait porteur de l'agent de la forme humaine de la maladie de la vache folle, selon une étude publiée mardi. Mais il est impossible de prédire combien de porteurs de la protéine prion anormale sont réellement susceptibles de développer un jour cette maladie neurodégénérative incurable et toujours fatale, soulignent les auteurs de l'étude publiée dans le *British Medical Journal* (BMJ). Ce travail représente la plus solide mesure de la fréquence de «l'infection» par l'agent du variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob (vCJD), forme humaine de la maladie bovine qui a émergé en Grande-Bretagne via l'alimentation contaminée par des animaux malades entre la fin des années 1980 et le début des années 1990. Le pays compte 177 cas de VCJD (tous décédés). 51 autres cas ont été recensés ailleurs dans le monde, dont 27 en France.

1. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

2. Quelles sont les statistiques européennes?

3. Comment la Commission prévoit-elle la situation à long terme concernant la vache folle?

**Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission**
*(29 novembre 2013)*

L'épidémie du variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob a atteint son point culminant dans l'Union européenne au cours de la période 1999-2004. Elle a décru de façon régulière après la mise en œuvre de mesures de prévention rigoureuses.

Les conclusions de l'étude récemment publiée dans le *British Medical Journal* (BMJ) sur le nombre estimé de cas d'infections par le variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob (un Britannique sur 2 000 pourrait avoir été exposé à la protéine anormale en ayant consommé de la viande contaminée) ne coïncident pas avec le nombre total de 174 cas de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob déclarés au Royaume-Uni et imputables à une consommation de viande contaminée (trois cas supplémentaires ont été reliés à des transfusions sanguines).

De même, la répartition géographique des échantillons positifs était relativement homogène, contrairement à une surabondance de cas d'infections par le variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob dans le nord du Royaume-Uni.

Les risques dans d'autres États membres sont susceptibles d'être nettement plus bas qu'au Royaume-Uni en raison du nombre de cas beaucoup plus faible, et dans de nombreux pays de l'Union européenne, la maladie n'a pas du tout été décelée.

Il reste, cependant, des préoccupations, notamment sur les différentes formes de sensibilité génétique, la transmission potentielle par l'intermédiaire des produits dérivés du plasma ou les instruments chirurgicaux, le statut de porteur dans la population et la levée partielle des interdictions relatives à certains aliments pour animaux. Dans cette perspective, il est essentiel de poursuivre la détection et la notification rapide de tous les nouveaux cas d'infections par le variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob dans l'Union européenne et dans le monde.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011899/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* 'Mad cow' disease

According to a study published on Tuesday, 1 in 2 000 Britons could be carrying the human form of 'mad cow' disease. However, the authors of the study published in the *British Medical Journal* (BMJ) stress that it is impossible to predict how many carriers of the abnormal protein (prion) are really likely to develop this incurable, and always fatal, neurodegenerative disease. The study represents the most robust measure of the frequency of 'infection' by the protein causing variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (vCJD), the human form of the bovine disease that emerged in the United Kingdom through feed contaminated by infected animals in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The country has had 177 cases of vCJD (all with a fatal outcome). In addition, 51 other cases have been identified elsewhere in the world, including 27 in France.

1. What is the Commission's reaction?

2. What are the European statistics?

3. What is the Commission's long-term outlook for variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob or 'mad cow' disease?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(29 November 2013)*

The variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease epidemic peaked in the EU in the period 1999-2004. It has decreased steadily after the implementation of stringent prevention measures.

The findings of the recent study published in the *British Medical Journal* about the estimated number of variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob diseases infections (allegedly one in 2,000 of the United Kingdom population could have been exposed to the abnormal protein in contaminated meat) do not correlate with the total number of 174 cases of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease reported in the UK which were acquired by the consumption of contaminated meat (3 cases additional cases were linked to blood transfusion).

Also, the geographical distribution of the positive samples was relatively even in contrast with an excess of cases of variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob diseases infections in the north of the UK.

The risks in other Member States are likely to be significantly lower than the United Kingdom on the grounds that the number of cases is much lower, and in many EU countries the disease has not been identified at all.

There are, however, remaining concerns such as different patterns of genetic susceptibility, the potential for transmission via plasma derived products or surgical instruments, carrier status in the population and the partial lift of feed bans. In this perspective, it is crucial to continue the identification and early notification of all new cases of the variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob diseases in the EU and worldwide.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011900/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Explosion des faux euros

L'année 2013 est bien partie pour battre les derniers records, en matière de faux euros saisis. Sur les six premiers mois de l'année, on en est déjà à 21 580 billets récupérés en Belgique, contre 22 433 sur toute l'année précédente. Qui plus est, rien que pour 2013, cela représente déjà la bagatelle de 1,39 million d'euros retirés de la circulation, contre 1,15 million en 2012.

1. Est-ce un phénomène européen?

2. Quel est le montant de faux euros saisis depuis le début de l'année en Europe, pays par pays?

3. À quoi attribue-t-on cette sensible augmentation?

4. Peut-on en conclure que la sécurisation de nos billets n'est plus assez élevée?

**Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission**
*(13 décembre 2013)*

1. Le faux monnayage n'est pas seulement un phénomène européen, il a aussi une dimension mondiale. Afin de protéger l'euro, la Commission européenne et la BCE ([1]) travaillent en étroite collaboration avec Europol ([2]), qui a été désigné comme office central de coordination de la protection de l'euro, ainsi qu'avec Interpol ([3]).

2. Le tableau présente les chiffres concernant les fausses pièces détectées en circulation par pays pour la période du 1.7.2012 au 30.6.2013. La Commission établit les statistiques en année glissante. Elle n'est pas en mesure de communiquer les statistiques confidentielles sur les fausses pièces en euros saisies pour chaque État membre.

Des informations plus détaillées sont disponibles dans les rapports de la Commission sur la protection des pièces en euros ([4]).

| Valeur unitaire ordinaire | 0,50 EUR | 1 EUR | 2 EUR | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valeur unitaire totale | 33 561 | 33 719 | 140 162 | 207 442 |

La BCE publie deux fois par an sur son site web les statistiques sur la contrefaçon des billets en euros. ([5])

3. Une hausse d'environ 11 % a été enregistrée de 2012 au premier semestre de 2013. Cette augmentation est imputable à la meilleure authentification des pièces en euros dans certains États membres, grâce à la mise en œuvre, depuis le 1er janvier 2012, du règlement (UE) nº 1210/2010 concernant l'authentification des pièces en euros ([6]). Les autorités ont pu repérer davantage de fausses pièces en euros. Ce règlement est devenu un instrument puissant de protection de l'euro contre le faux monnayage.

4. L'émission de billets neufs ne relève pas de la compétence de la Commission, mais de celle de la BCE. Par conséquent, l'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à transmettre sa demande directement à la BCE.

---

([1]) La Banque centrale européenne.
([2]) L'Office européen de police.
([3]) L'Organisation internationale de police criminelle.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/about-us/reports/euro-reports/index_en.htm
([5]) http://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/pr/date/2013/html/pr130719.fr.html
([6]) Le règlement (UE) nº 1210/2010 définit les règles permettant aux institutions financières de s'assurer que toutes les pièces en euros remises en circulation sont authentiques.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011900/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The boom in counterfeit euros

The year 2013 is well on the way to beating the previous record for the number of fake euros seized. In the first six months of the year, 21 580 notes have already been recovered in Belgium, compared with 22 433 for the entire previous year. Furthermore, and just for 2013, this amounts to a mere EUR 1.39 million withdrawn from circulation, compared with EUR 1.15 million in 2012.

1. Is this a Europe-wide phenomenon?

2. How many fake euros have been seized since the beginning of the year in Europe, country by country?

3. What is the reason for this significant increase?

4. Should we conclude that the security features of our banknotes are insufficient?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

1. Counterfeiting is not only a European, but also a worldwide phenomenon. In order to protect the euro, the European Commission and the ECB ([1]) work closely with Europol ([2]) which has been designated as the central ofice for coordinating the protection of the euro, as well as with Interpol ([3]).

2. The table shows figures of counterfeit coins detected in circulation per country for the period 1.7.2012 and 30.6.2013. The Commission prepares statistics on the one year rolling basis. The Commission is not in a position to disclose the confidential statistics on the seized counterfeited euro coins for individual Member States.

More detailed information is available in the Commission reports on the protection of euro coins ([4]).

| Regular Denominations | 0.5 EUR | 1 EUR | 2 EUR | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Denomination Total: | 33 561 | 33 719 | 140 162 | 207 442 |

The ECB publishes biannually on their website statistics on euro banknote counterfeiting ([5]).

3. The increase from 2012 to the first half of 2013 is around 11%. The reason for this is the improvement in the authentication of euro coins in some Member States which is due to the implementation of Regulation 1210/2010 ([6]) on the authentication of euro coins since 1 January 2012. This has enabled the authorities to detect more false euro coins. This regulation has become a powerful instrument to protect the euro against counterfeiting.

4. The issuance of new banknotes is not a competence of the Commission, but of the ECB. Therefore, the Honourable Member is invited to forward his request directly to the ECB.

---

([1]) The European Central Bank.
([2]) The European Police Office.
([3]) The International Criminal Police Organisation.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/about-us/reports/euro-reports/index_en.htm
([5]) http://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/pr/date/2013/html/pr130719.en.html
([6]) Regulation 1210/2010 sets out the rules for financial institutions to ensure that all euro coins put back into circulation are genuine.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011902/13**
**à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(17 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* VP/HR — Champs de la mort

Le conflit paysans-propriétaires a déjà fait 55 victimes en quatre ans. Jusqu'en 1998, votre banane venait probablement du Honduras, plus précisément de la vallée de Bajo Aguán, paradis agricole du nord de cette petite république d'Amérique centrale qui a longtemps rapporté à lui seul un tiers des revenus d'exportation du pays. Les revenus étaient bien plus juteux encore pour les multinationales fruitières, politiquement et économiquement aux commandes du pays pendant des décennies, avec le soutien du gouvernement américain, pour conserver une mainmise sur ces terres aussi fertiles que profitables. «United Fruit Company», la plus importante d'entre elles, n'est plus là aujourd'hui. Elle a quitté le pays après la destruction d'une grande partie de ses plantations par l'ouragan Mitch. D'autres multinationales ont pris le relais et partagent désormais le terrain avec de grands propriétaires terriens.

Tout irait donc pour le mieux si 12 000 paysans sans terre n'avaient pas l'outrecuidance de venir réclamer la petite parcelle cultivable qui leur est due pour nourrir leur famille et éviter de mourir de faim. Malheureusement pour eux, leurs dirigeants sont plus proches des grands propriétaires. Les terres promises à de multiples reprises par les autorités n'ont jamais été octroyées, et le «Mouvement des ouvriers» a fini par occuper des plantations privées en 2009 pour tenter de forcer la décision. Résultat de l'opération: 55 morts en quatre ans. Des dizaines de paysans, un journaliste, un défenseur des Droits de l'homme, et quelques membres de milices privées armées jusqu'aux dents par les propriétaires multimillionnaires. En 1991, des dizaines de milliers d'hectares devaient être attribués à des familles paysannes sur un ancien terrain d'entraînement militaire américain, avant d'être vendus à de grands propriétaires, des cultivateurs et des responsables politiques. Le président Zelaya a recréé un certain espoir en 2009 en excluant toute expulsion de paysans tant que la légitimité de leurs titres de propriété n'avait pas été examinée, mais il a immédiatement été renversé par un coup d'État favorable aux mêmes propriétaires.

Depuis lors, Bajo Aguán se militarise. Selon les associations locales et les organisations de défense des Droits de l'homme, forces armées, police et milices privées sont omniprésentes et lancent régulièrement des attaques contre les communautés paysannes.

1. Comment cela est-il justifiable?

2. Quelle est la position officielle des autorités européennes face à ces méfaits?

3. Nous entretenons-nous avec les autorités du Honduras à ce sujet? Que se dit-il lors des rencontres diplomatiques?

**Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission**
*(3 décembre 2013)*

L'Union européenne demeure préoccupée par la situation dans le Bajo Aguán.

La promotion de la justice et le plein respect des Droits de l'homme sont au cœur du dialogue politique et de la coopération de l'UE avec le Honduras. L'Union s'entretient avec des organisations de défense des Droits de l'homme, rencontre des défenseurs des Droits de l'homme en danger et publie des déclarations sur des cas spécifiques. Elle a publiquement demandé aux autorités d'enquêter sur les violations des Droits de l'homme et de préserver l'intégrité physique des défenseurs des Droits de l'homme en danger. Elle s'est rendue dans le Bajo Aguán en 2010 et 2012, puis à nouveau en avril 2013. Sa délégation et ses États membres se sont entretenus à ces différentes occasions avec l'ensemble des parties prenantes. Elle a encouragé les autorités nationales à parvenir à un règlement pacifique du conflit social et à s'attaquer au problème de l'impunité qui gangrène cette partie du pays.

L'UE, dans le cadre de son projet de coopération *Programa de Apoyo a los Derechos Humanos*, appuie la mise en œuvre de la politique nationale en faveur des Droits de l'homme. Cette dernière soutient les droits des paysans, l'une de ses principales priorités dans les actions à réaliser en vue de garantir le droit à l'alimentation. Les questions de propriété foncière, la réforme agraire et des enquêtes efficaces dans les cas d'assassinats de paysans figurent parmi les actions prévues. La résolution de conflits constitue un autre volet stratégique de cette politique, qui contribuera à la mise en place de mécanismes visant à favoriser l'établissement d'un consensus entre les différents intervenants.

Par ailleurs, l'UE continue à apporter son soutien à la société civile hondurienne et aux défenseurs des Droits de l'homme de ce pays par l'intermédiaire de l'IEDDH. Cette initiative comprend, entre autres, la possibilité pour les paysans de bénéficier d'une aide juridique et de mesures de protection d'urgence pour les personnes en danger.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011902/13**
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Killing fields

In the last four years, the conflict between peasants and landowners has claimed 55 victims. Until 1998, your bananas probably came from Honduras, or more precisely from the Bajo Aguán valley, a rural paradise in the north of this small Central American republic which for a long time brought in one third of the country's export revenue. The market was even more lucrative for the multinational fruit companies who, with the USA's support, have held the country's political and economic reigns for decades, in order to keep control of this fertile and highly profitable land. Today, the largest of the multinationals, the United Fruit Company, is no longer there, having pulled out of the country after many of the plantations were destroyed by Hurricane Mitch. However, others have taken its place and now share the land with the big landowners.

Everything would be wonderful, therefore, if 12 000 peasants with no land had not had the presumption to claim the tiny plot of land that is their right in order to grow food to feed their families and avoid dying of starvation. Unfortunately for them, their bosses have closer ties with the landowners than with them. The land promised many times over by the authorities was never granted and in the end, the Workers' Movement occupied the plantations in 2009 to try to force a decision. The outcome of the operation: 55 people killed in four years — dozens of peasants, one journalist, one human rights activist and several members of the private militias armed to the teeth by the multimillionaire owners. In 1991, tens of thousands of hectares were supposed to have been allocated to peasant families on a former American military training ground, but instead were sold to big landowners, growers and political leaders. President Zelaya introduced a glimmer of hope in 2009 by ruling that no peasants could be expelled until the legitimacy of their property titles had been examined. He was immediately deposed by a coup d'état which favoured the landowners themselves.

Bajo Aguán has become progressively more militarised ever since. According to local associations and human rights organisations, armed forces, police and private militia are everywhere and regularly launch attacks against the peasant communities.

1. How can this be justified?

2. What is the European authorities' official stance on these crimes?

3. Do we ever bring up this subject with the Honduran authorities? What is said during diplomatic meetings?

**Answer given by the High Representative/Vice-President on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

The EU remains concerned with the situation in Bajo Aguan.

The promotion of justice and full respect of Human Rights are at the core of the EU's political dialogue and cooperation with Honduras. The EU speaks with Human Rights organisations, meets with Human Rights defenders at risk, and issues statements on specific cases. The EU has publicly called on the authorities to investigate violations of Human Rights and to safeguard the physical integrity of Human Rights defenders at risk. The EU visited Bajo Aguan in 2010 and 2012, and again in April 2013, where EU Missions, Delegation and Member States, spoke to all stakeholders involved. The EU has encouraged national authorities towards a peaceful resolution of social conflict and to tackle the problem of impunity predominant in this part of the country.

The EU, through its cooperation Programa de Apoyo a los Derechos Humanos, supports the implementation of the National Human Rights Policy. This policy supports the rights of peasants as one of its main priorities in the actions to be implemented to achieve the Right to Food. Land tenure issues, agrarian reform and effective investigations in the cases of peasants assassinations are amongst the actions foreseen. Conflict resolution is also a strategic action of this policy, which will contribute to establishing mechanisms aimed at promoting consensus between different stakeholders.

In addition, the EU continues to support Honduran civil society and Human Rights defenders through the EIDHR. This initiative includes, amongst other, the possibility for peasants to receive legal support and urgent protection actions for those at risk.

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-011903/13**
**do Komisji**
**Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)**
*(17 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Zmiana ustawy o bezpieczeństwie żywności i żywienia – notyfikacja w trybie dyrektywy 98/34/WE nr 2013/0509/PL

Sejm Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej, a dokładnie Klub Parlamentarny Polskiego Stronnictwa Ludowego, pragnie zmodyfikować ustawę z dnia 25 sierpnia 2006 r. o bezpieczeństwie żywności i żywienia (tj. Dz.U. z 2010 r., nr 136, poz. 914 z późniejszymi zmianami). Planowane zmiany mają na celu ochronę zdrowia dzieci w wieku szkolnym poprzez ograniczenie w placówkach edukacyjnych dostępu do różnych kategorii produktów żywnościowych zawierających substancje, których nadmierne i wielokrotne spożycie przyczynia się do nieprawidłowego rozwoju i wielu chorób dietozależnych wśród dzieci i młodzieży.

Nadmierne spożycie tłuszczu, nasyconych kwasów tłuszczowych, izomerów trans nienasyconych kwasów tłuszczowych, sodu i cukrów (mono- i disacharydów) jest łączone z niekorzystnym wpływem na zdrowie, wzrostem ryzyka rozwoju niezakaźnych chorób przewlekłych, tj.: choroby serca, otyłość i cukrzyca. Do osób najbardziej narażonych na skutki nieprawidłowego żywienia należą dzieci i młodzież. Na marginesie należy stwierdzić, iż według danych Światowej Organizacji Zdrowia aż 29 proc. polskich 11-latków ma nadwagę. Jak pokazują badania przeprowadzone zarówno w Polsce, jak i w innych krajach europejskich, wskaźnik nadwagi i otyłości społeczeństwa, szczególnie w grupie dzieci i młodzieży w wieku szkolnym rośnie w zastraszającym tempie.

Projektowana regulacja oparta jest o wskazanie kategorii produktów zawierających wysokie stężenia substancji uznanych za niepożądane do spożycia dla dzieci i młodzieży w wieku szkolnym. Chodzi tu przede wszystkim o wyroby cukiernicze, ciastkarskie, napoje gazowane, słone przekąski, posiłki typu fast-food, napoje energetyzujące czy izotoniczne dostępne niemal w każdym sklepiku, stołówce, automacie czy innym punkcie sprzedaży produktów spożywczych na terenach placówek edukacyjnych.

Z powyższych względów, należy wprowadzić zakaz promocji i sprzedaży wspomnianych produktów na terenach placówek edukacyjnych. Nowe zapisy ustawy wprowadzają również zakaz podawania posiłków zawierających opisywane kategorie produktów w stołówkach i innych punktach gastronomicznych na terenie wymienionych placówek, zarówno przygotowywanych na miejscu, jak również dostarczanych przez firmy zewnętrzne.

Czy KE przygotowała już opinię w tej sprawie? Jak KE odnosi się do problemu zdrowego odżywiania dzieci w szkołach UE? Czy zamierza podjąć działania mające na celu zagwarantowanie zdrowiej, zbilansowanej diety młodym Europejczykom i ograniczenia dostępu do niezdrowych produktów w placówkach oświatowych?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji**
*(15 listopada 2013 r.)*

Władze polskie zgłosiły Komisji poprawki do polskiej ustawy o bezpieczeństwie żywności i żywienia z dnia 25 sierpnia 2006 r. ([1]) Projekt ten zgłoszono dnia 10 września 2013 r. zgodnie z dyrektywą 98/34/WE ([2]) pod numerem referencyjnym 2013/509/PL. Okres zawieszenia zakończy się w dniu 11 grudnia 2013 r. Procedura ta jest w toku i Komisja nie zakończyła jeszcze oceny zgłoszonego środka.

„Owoce w szkole" ([3]) jest programem UE, którego celem jest wspieranie dobrych nawyków żywieniowych wśród dzieci poprzez oferowanie im owoców i warzyw w szkołach. Jest to ważna inicjatywa, obejmująca całą UE i skierowana do dzieci w wieku od 1 do 18 lat. Jak dotąd z programu skorzystało 8,1 mln dzieci. Ponadto Komisja uruchomiła projekty pilotażowe mające na celu promowanie zdrowego żywienia i zwiększanie spożycia świeżych owoców i warzyw w szczególnie wrażliwych grupach społecznych, w tym wśród dzieci.

W ostatnim czasie Grupa Wysokiego Szczebla ds. Żywienia i Aktywności Fizycznej, będąca jednym z instrumentów realizacji strategii, rozpoczęła prace nad wspólnym planem działania w celu zwalczania otyłości wśród dzieci, który powinien objąć lata 2014-2020.

([1]) Dz.U. 2010 nr 136 poz. 914.
([2]) Dyrektywa 98/34/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 22 czerwca 1998 r. ustanawiająca procedurę udzielania informacji w zakresie norm i przepisów technicznych, Dz.U. L 204 z 21.7.1998, s. 37-48.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_pl.htm

Wspólne Centrum Badawcze opracowuje obecnie analizę standardów w zakresie posiłków w stołówkach szkolnych w państwach członkowskich. Wyniki tej analizy zostaną omówione w Grupie Wysokiego Szczebla ds. Żywienia i Aktywności Fizycznej. Nie wiadomo jednak jeszcze, jakie działania zostaną podjęte w tej sprawie w przyszłości.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011903/13**
**to the Commission**
**Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Amendment to the Law on Food Product Safety — notification under Directive 98/34/EC, No 2013/0509/PL

The Polish Parliament, specifically the Parliamentary Club of the Polish People's Party, is seeking to amend the law of 25 August 2006 on food product safety (Official Journal, 2010, No 136, item. 914, as subsequently amended). The planned amendments are intended to protect the health of school-age children by limiting access in educational establishments to various categories of food products containing substances which, when consumed excessively or repeatedly, contribute to abnormal development and a number of diet-related diseases among children and adolescents.

Excessive consumption of fat, saturated fatty acids, trans-fatty acids, sodium and sugars (mono-and disaccharides) is linked to adverse health effects and increased risk of developing non-communicable chronic diseases, such as heart disease, obesity and diabetes. Children and adolescents are among those most vulnerable to the effects of poor nutrition. It should be noted that, according to the World Health Organisation, as many as 29% of Polish 11-year-olds are overweight. Studies carried out in Poland and other European countries show that levels of overweight and obesity in society, particularly among children of school age, are increasing at an alarming rate.

The proposed regulation is based on indicating the categories of products containing high concentrations of substances classified as undesirable as a food for children of school age. This mainly concerns confectionery, cakes, carbonated drinks, salty snacks, meals, fast food, energy and isotonic drinks available in almost every shop, canteen, vending machine or other point of sale for food products on the premises of educational establishments.

For these reasons, the promotion and sale of these products should be prohibited on the premises of educational establishments. The new provisions in the law also introduce a ban on the serving of meals containing the aforementioned product categories in canteens and other catering outlets on the premises of the establishments in question, and cover both meals prepared on site as well as those supplied by outside firms.

Has the Commission already drawn up an opinion on this matter? What is the Commission's stance on the issue of healthy eating among schoolchildren in the EU? Does the Commission intend to take action to ensure that young Europeans enjoy a healthy, balanced diet and that access to unhealthy products in educational establishments is restricted?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(15 November 2013)*

The Polish Authorities notified to the Commission amendments to the Polish Food and Nourishment Safety Act of 25 August 2006 ([1]). This project was notified on 10 September 2013 in accordance with Directive 98/34/CE ([2]) under the reference 2013/509/PL. The end of standstill period is due on 11 December 2013. The procedure is ongoing and the Commission is still assessing the notified measure.

The School Fruit Scheme ([3]) is an EU programme that aims to encourage good eating habits in children by providing them with fruit and vegetables at school. The scheme is an important EU-wide initiative targeting schoolchildren aged 1 to 18, and thus far 8.1 million children have benefited from the scheme. Additionally, the Commission has launched pilot projects aimed at promoting healthy diets and increasing consumption of fresh fruit and vegetables in vulnerable societal groups, including children.

Recently, the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity, one of the instruments for the purpose of implementing the strategy, started the development of a common Action Plan to tackle childhood obesity, which should cover the period 2014-2020.

([1]) Polish Journal of Laws of 2010, No 136(914).
([2]) Directive 98/34/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 June 1998 laying down a procedure for the provision of information in the field of technical standards and regulations, OJ L 204, 21.7.1998, p. 37-48.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm

The Joint Research Centre is currently working on a study that will look into school meal standards in Member States. It is planned to discuss the findings in the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity. However, it would be premature to predict any actions that may follow in the future at this point in time.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-011904/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)**
*(17 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Νέες ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου στο Facebook για εφήβους

Την Τέταρτη 16 Οκτωβρίου 2013 το Facebook ανακοίνωσε ότι άλλαξε τις ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου για εφήβους που γίνονται μέλη του συγκεκριμένου ιστοτόπου. Για τους έφηβους νέους χρήστες του Facebook οι προκαθορισμένες ρυθμίσεις για δημοσιεύσεις θα είναι «Φίλοι» (για τους ενήλικες χρήστες η προκαθορισμένη ρύθμιση θα συνεχίσει να είναι «Όλοι»), αλλά οι χρήστες ηλικίας από 13 έως 17 ετών θα μπορούν, εάν το επιθυμούν, να επιλέξουν να κοινοποιήσουν τις φωτογραφίες τους, την κατάστασή τους και τα σχόλιά τους στο ευρύ κοινό. Οι προηγούμενες προκαθορισμένες ρυθμίσεις για έφηβους χρήστες καθιστούσαν τις δημοσιεύσεις ορατές μόνο σε «Φίλους» και «Φίλους φίλων», ώστε το περιεχόμενό τους να είναι ορατό μέχρι τα άτομα που συνδέονται μαζί τους σε δεύτερο βαθμό.

Οι νέες ρυθμίσεις συνεπάγονται ότι οι επιλεγμένες δημοσιεύσεις θα είναι ορατές σε αγνώστους, καθώς και σε εταιρείες που συλλέγουν δεδομένα για διαφημιστές και εταιρείες μάρκετινγκ. Επιπλέον, άγνωστοι θα μπορούν να «ακολουθούν» εφήβους που δεν γνωρίζουν και να βλέπουν τις δημοσιοποιήσεις τους στην κεντρική σελίδα τους. Το Facebook στοχεύει πλέον πιο δυναμικά στους εφήβους για να συγκεντρώσει δημόσια δεδομένα για αυτούς τα οποία είναι ελκυστικότερα για τους διαφημιστές. Παράλληλα, οι νέες ρυθμίσεις αυξάνουν τον κίνδυνο να αφήσουν οι ανήλικοι ψηφιακά ίχνη τα οποία θα μπορούσαν να οδηγήσουν σε διαδικτυακό εκφοβισμό, ιδιαίτερα λόγω του ότι οι ανήλικοι ενδέχεται να μην κατανοούν τις επιπτώσεις της δημοσιοποίησης πληροφοριών.

Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με την πολιτική της εταιρείας, οι ανήλικοι χρήστες πρέπει να δηλώσουν ότι οι γονείς τους έχουν δώσει τη συγκατάθεσή τους για να χρησιμοποιούν το Facebook, αλλά ο ιστότοπος δεν απαιτεί περαιτέρω σχετική επιβεβαίωση.

Αξίζει να σημειωθεί ότι το Facebook έχει περισσότερους από 200 εκατομμύρια ενεργούς χρήστες, το 15% των οποίων είναι έφηβοι.

Υπό το πρίσμα των ανωτέρω, η Επιτροπή ερωτάται:

1. Ποια είναι η γνώμη της για τις νέες ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου του Facebook; Θεωρεί ότι αποτελούν απειλή για τους έφηβους στην ΕΕ και ότι θα μπορούσαν να αυξηθούν τα περιστατικά διαδικτυακού εκφοβισμού εξαιτίας αυτών;

2. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι βασική δέσμευση του Ψηφιακού Θεματολογίου για την Ευρώπη είναι η ασφάλεια των παιδιών στο διαδίκτυο, τι σχεδιάζει να πράξει η Επιτροπή για να αντιμετωπίσει τις ενδεχόμενες βλαβερές επιπτώσεις τέτοιου τύπου ρυθμίσεων απορρήτου για τους ανήλικους;

3. Οι νέες αυτές ρυθμίσεις εκφράζουν τις προτεραιότητες της συμμαχίας CEO, δηλαδή «τη βελτίωση του διαδικτύου προς όφελος των παιδιών» διασφαλίζοντας, για παράδειγμα, ότι οι ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου είναι κατάλληλες για την εκάστοτε ηλικία ή παρέχοντας ευρύτερες δυνατότητες για γονικό έλεγχο;

4. Σε ποιες ενέργειες προβαίνει η Επιτροπή προκειμένου να ευαισθητοποιήσει τα παιδιά και τους εφήβους, αλλά και τους γονείς, σχετικά με τη διαδικτυακή ασφάλεια; Μπορεί να προβεί στην ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών σχετικά με ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου που είναι κατάλληλες για την εκάστοτε ηλικία;

5. Πώς μπορούν οι γονείς να αποκτήσουν εύχρηστα εργαλεία για τη ρύθμιση των γονικών ελέγχων; Διαθέτει ήδη η Επιτροπή στοιχεία σχετικά με την πρακτική εφαρμογή ή την ενδεχόμενη επιτυχία των προτεραιοτήτων της συμμαχίας CEO, όπως είναι η ευρύτερη διαθεσιμότητα και η χρήση γονικών ελέγχων;

**Απάντηση της κ. Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(18 Νοεμβρίου 2013)*

Η αναζήτηση της κατάλληλης ισορροπίας ανάμεσα στην προστασία και στην ελευθερία έκφρασης για τους νέους είναι σύνθετο έργο, ιδίως σε ένα περιβάλλον όπου οι νέοι ενεργά και αιτιολογημένα διαθέτουν δημόσιο λόγο. Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες που παρείχε το Facebook, οι νέες ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου έχουν ενσωματωμένες προειδοποιήσεις και υποδείξεις κάθε φορά που ο έφηβος θέλει να αναρτήσει δημόσια κάποια πληροφορία και αυτό ευθυγραμμίζεται με τις συμβουλές του δικτύου INSAFE σχετικά με την ανάγκη συνεχούς εκπαίδευσης των νέων στην υπεύθυνη χρήση του διαδικτύου. Οι εργασίες του Συνασπισμού CEO σχετικά με τις κατάλληλες για την εκάστοτε ηλικία ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου κατέληξαν σε συστάσεις βέλτιστων πρακτικών και, μαζί με άλλα υπογράφοντα μέρη, το Facebook δήλωσε επίσημα τη δέσμευσή του στις πρακτικές αυτές ([1]).

Μέσα από τις εργασίες του δικτύου INSAFE, των κέντρων «Safer Internet» και του επιγραμμικού δικτύου «EU-KIDS», η Επιτροπή συνεχίζει να παρακολουθεί τα στοιχεία για τους αναδυόμενους κινδύνους, περιλαμβανομένης της διαδικτυακής παρενόχλησης, και δεσμεύτηκε να συνεργαστεί με τις πολυμερείς πλατφόρμες κοινωνικής δικτύωσης, όπως ο Συνασπισμός CEO, για την πλέον κατάλληλη διαχείριση των θεμάτων αυτών. Η μείωση των κινδύνων δεν είναι μόνον ζήτημα προστασίας αλλά και παροχής στρατηγικών αντιμετώπισης μέσω της αύξησης της ευαισθητοποίησης και της εκπαίδευσης. Ειδικότερα, η αντιμετώπιση της διαδικτυακής παρενόχλησης, απαιτεί τη συμμετοχή των σχολείων και του εκπαιδευτικού τομέα. Οι αποτελεσματικές στρατηγικές θα εξαρτηθούν από την κοινή προσέγγιση γονέων και εκπαιδευτικών και την καθοδήγηση από ομοτίμους.

Τα μέλη του Συνασπισμού επιβεβαίωσαν τον Ιανουάριο του 2013 τη διαθεσιμότητα εργαλείων γονικού ελέγχου ([2]) και δεσμεύτηκαν για την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών σχετικά με την προώθηση της αφομοίωσης και χρήσης τους. Η Επιτροπή αναθέτει επίσης τακτικά την εκπόνηση μελετών συγκριτικής ανάλυσης ([3]) σχετικά με τα εργαλεία γονικού ελέγχου και το λογισμικό.

---

([1]) Η συγκεκριμένη δήλωση του Facebook διατίθεται στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση: https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year

([2]) Όλες οι δηλώσεις της εταιρείας διατίθενται στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση: https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year

([3]) Τα αποτελέσματα της πλέον πρόσφατης ολοκληρωμένης μελέτης διατίθενται στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/benchmarking-study-parental-control-tools-latest-findings

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011904/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Facebook's new privacy settings for teenagers

On Wednesday 16 October 2013, Facebook announced that it was changing its privacy settings for teenagers who join the site. For teenagers new to Facebook, the default privacy setting for posts will be 'Friends' (for adult users, the default setting will continue to be 'Public'), but users aged 13 to17 may, if they so choose, elect to share their photos, updates and comments with the general public. Previously, the default setting for teenage users was for posts to be visible only to friends and friends-of-friends, so nobody beyond second-degree connections could see their content.

The new settings mean that strangers, as well as companies collecting data for advertisers and marketing companies, will be able to see selected posts. Strangers will also be able to 'follow' teenagers who are unknown to them and see their public posts in the main news feed. Facebook is now targeting teenagers more aggressively in order to collect public data on them that are more appealing to advertisers. At the same time, the new settings increase the risk of minors leaving a digital trail that could lead to cyberbullying, especially since minors might not necessarily understand the implications of sharing information publicly.

In addition, under the company's policies, underage users have to state that their parents have given them permission to use Facebook, but the site does not require further confirmation of this.

It is worth noting that Facebook has more than 200 million active users in the EU, of whom 15% are teenagers.

In light of the above, the Commission is asked:

1. What does it think about Facebook's new privacy settings? Does it think they pose a threat to teenagers in the EU and that incidents of cyberbullying could increase as a result?

2. Considering the Digital Agenda for Europe's key commitment of 'keeping children safe online', what is the Commission planning to do in order to deal with the potential harmful effects on minors of these types of privacy settings?

3. Do these new settings reflect the priorities of the CEO Coalition, namely to 'make the Internet a better place for kids' by, for example, ensuring that privacy settings are age-appropriate or by offering wider options for parental control?

4. What is the Commission doing in order to raise awareness of online safety among children and teenagers, and also among parents? Can it share best practice on age-appropriate privacy settings?

5. How can parents be equipped with easy-to-use tools in order to configure parental controls? Does the Commission already have data on how the priorities of the CEO Coalition, such as wider availability and use of parental controls, are working in practice and on whether they have been successful?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission**
*(18 November 2013)*

Finding the balance between protection and freedom of speech for young people is a complex task, especially in an environment where young people are actively and justifiably seeking a public voice. According to information provided by Facebook, the new privacy settings have in-built warnings and tutoring every time the teenager wants to post publicly and this is in line with the advice from the INSAFE network of the need to keep educating young people in responsible use of the Internet. The CEO Coalition's work on age-appropriate privacy settings resulted in best practice recommendations and along with other signatories, Facebook issued a company statement of its commitment to these ([1]).

([1]) Individual Facebook Statement available from: https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-Internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year

Through the work of INSAFE, the Safer Internet Centres and the EU-KIDS online network the Commission is continuing to monitor evidence of emerging risks, including cyberbullying, and is committed to working with its multi-stakeholder platforms, such as the CEO Coalition, to manage these appropriately. Mitigating risk is not only an issue of protection but of providing coping strategies through awareness raising and education. Tackling cyberbullying, in particular, requires the involvement of schools and the education sector. Effective strategies will depend on a joined-up approach by parents and teachers and peer-mentoring.

Coalition members confirmed in January 2013 the availability of parental controls ([2]) and are committed to sharing best practices on promoting their take-up and use. The Commission also runs regular benchmarking studies ([3]) on parental control tools and software.

---

([2]) All company statements available on: https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-Internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year

([3]) The results of the most recent completed study are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/benchmarking-study-parental-control-tools-latest-findings

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011906/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Ivo Belet (PPE)**
*(17 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Europese bijdrage tot verbetering van de veiligheid in de textielsector in Bangladesh

In haar antwoord op vraag E-006345/2013 verwijst de Commissie naar „werkzaamheden betreffende een Duurzaamheidspact om de arbeidsomstandigheden en gezondheids- en veiligheidsnormen voor werknemers in kledingfabrieken in Bangladesh te verbeteren."

De Commissie stelt dat in het pact „wordt verwelkomd dat meer dan 70 grote ondernemingen die zaken doen met Bangladesh het akkoord inzake brandveiligheid en veiligheid van gebouwen („Accord on Fire and Building Safety") hebben ondertekend" en dat andere ondernemingen worden aangemoedigd om dit voorbeeld te volgen.

Hoe evalueert de Commissie het feit dat enkele grote Europese kledingbedrijven zoals Benetton, C&A, Carrefour, Zara en Mango het pact weliswaar ondertekend hebben en zich ertoe verbonden hebben in te zetten op preventie, maar niet bereid zijn te delen in de kosten voor compensatie aan de slachtoffers?

Daarnaast is er vijf maanden na de ramp nog niet veel veranderd in Bangladesh. Dit doet twijfels rijzen over het engagement van de Bengaalse overheid om de problemen in de textielsector ernstig aan te pakken.

Hoe evalueert de Commissie de situatie in Bangladesh en welke acties verwacht de Commissie van de Bengaalse overheid wil ze haar dreigement om de handelspreferentie op te schorten niet in de praktijk brengen?

**Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie**
*(17 december 2013)*

Voor zover de Europese Commissie bekend is, onderhandelen de regering van Bangladesh, bedrijven, vakbonden en andere belanghebbenden nog steeds over de compensatie van de slachtoffers, inclusief over een mogelijk op te zetten fonds voor geldtransacties. De Internationale Arbeidsorganisatie (IAO) coördineert deze onderhandelingen als neutrale voorzitter. Compensatie van de slachtoffers is een complexe kwestie, waarbij rekening moet worden gehouden met de juridische aspecten van de identificatie van slachtoffers en van het vaststellen van wie aanspraak kan maken op compensatie, alsook de mate van verantwoordelijkheid en het delen van de kosten.

De Commissie verwacht dat de regering van Bangladesh verder gaat met de implementatie van het Duurzaamheidspact, waarin de toezegging van de regering om de arbeidsnormen en omstandigheden in Bangladesh te verbeteren wordt geconsolideerd. Resultaten die op de korte termijn kunnen worden verwacht, zijn onder anderen de implementatie van de nieuwe arbeidswet (die in juli is aangenomen), voldoen aan de eisen voor deelname aan het Better Work-programma (in oktober door de IAO opgestart) en de werving van extra inspecteurs (in gang). De start van fabrieksinspecties, het akkoord inzake brandveiligheid en veiligheid van gebouwen en de Alliantie voor arbeidsveiligheid in Bangladesh („Alliance for Bangladesh Worker Safety") worden verwacht in de komende weken. De inspecties zullen worden uitgevoerd volgens de gemeenschappelijke normen die vorige week in Dhaka door de drie partners zijn overeengekomen.

Voor wat betreft handelspreferenties voorziet de EU-wetgeving in de opschorting van „Alles behalve wapens" wanneer serieuze en systematische inbreuk is gepleegd op essentiële internationale verdragen. Volgens de huidige wetgeving moet de beoordeling van dergelijke inbreuken worden gebaseerd op de conclusies met betrekking tot de situatie in het hele land door de controleorganen van de Verenigde Naties (waaronder de IAO) die belast zijn met het toezicht op de naleving van de verschillende verdragen. De Commissie blijft de verslagen van deze monitoringsorganen op de voet volgen.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011906/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ivo Belet (PPE)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* European contribution to improving safety in Bangladeshi textile industry

In its answer to Question E-006345/2013, the Commission refers to activities relating to 'a Sustainability Compact to improve labour, health and safety conditions for workers in Bangladeshi garment factories'.

The Commission states that 'the Compact welcomes that over 70 major companies sourcing from Bangladesh have signed up to the Accord on Fire and Building Safety', and that other companies are encouraged to follow suit.

How does the Commission view the fact that some large European clothing companies such as Benetton, C&A, Carrefour, Zara and Mango have actually signed the compact and committed to focusing on prevention, but are not prepared to share the costs of compensating the victims?

Furthermore, five months after the disaster, not a great deal has changed yet in Bangladesh. This casts doubts on the commitment of the Bangladeshi Government to tackling the problems in the textile industry seriously.

What is the Commission's view of the situation in Bangladesh? What action is the Commission expecting from the Bangladeshi Government to prevent it from carrying out its threat to suspend trade preferences?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**
*(17 December 2013)*

The European Commission understands that talks are still underway between the Government of Bangladesh, companies, trade unions and other stakeholders about the issue of compensation, including with regard to the possibility of setting-up a fund for cash transfers. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) is coordinating these talks as neutral chair. The issue of compensation is complex and linked to legal aspects of identifying victims, determining eligibility, as well as the levels of responsibility and cost-sharing.

The Commission expects Bangladesh's Government to continue the implementation of the Sustainability Compact, which consolidates commitments by the Government with regard to improving labour standards and working conditions in Bangladesh. Short-term deliverables include: the implementation of the new labour law (adopted in July), achieving eligibility for the Better Work Programme (launched by the ILO in October) and recruitment of additional inspectors (underway). The launch of inspections of factories together with the 'Accord on Fire and Building Safety and the Alliance for Bangladesh Worker Safety' is foreseen within weeks. Inspections will be following common standards agreed between the three partners last week in Dhaka.

As to trade preferences, EC law provides for the suspension of Everything But Arms where serious and systematic violations of core international conventions have taken place. The current law mandates that the assessment of such violations must be based on the conclusions as to the country-wide situation of the United Nations' monitoring bodies (including the ILO) in charge of the different conventions. The Commission continues to follow closely reports of these monitoring bodies.

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011907/13**
**à Comissão**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**
*(17 de outubro de 2013)*

*Assunto:* Situação em Fukushima — novas contaminações e fugas de radioatividade

Segundo notícias recentes, o primeiro-ministro do Japão anunciou que o país precisa de ajuda internacional para deter as fugas de água radioativa da central nuclear. O apelo surgiu depois da operadora Tokyo Electric Power (Tepco) ter admitido uma segunda fuga de 4 toneladas, de ter sofrido um revés na implementação de uma técnica de descontaminação e de ter lançado ao mar 1,13 mil toneladas de água contaminada.

No verão, a Tepco já havia confirmado a fuga de 300 toneladas de material radioativo, as quais acrescem às infiltrações permanentes no subsolo provenientes dos reatores danificados, fugas que acabam por contaminar igualmente lençóis freáticos e oceano.

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Recebeu algum pedido de ajuda das autoridades japonesas?

2. Que medidas de apoio podem ser postas em marcha pela UE?

3. Que avaliação faz do impacto das novas contaminações e fugas de radioatividade?

4. Vai tomar algumas medidas na sequência dos resultados desta avaliação?

**Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão**
*(9 de dezembro de 2013)*

No que respeita aos recentes problemas ocorridos na central nuclear de Fukushima, a Comissão gostaria de remeter o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada às perguntas escritas E-003609/13 e E-007824/13.

1. A Comissão não recebeu nenhum pedido de assistência da parte do Japão.

2. A Comissão ofereceu-se para cooperar com o Japão em várias questões relacionadas com o acidente nuclear de Fukushima, como a monitorização do impacto ambiental do acidente e as operações de valorização em curso. Desde o acidente, são efetuados contactos bilaterais entre especialistas de ambas as partes ([1]). Caso o Japão venha a solicitar assistência específica, a Comissão prestará o correspondente apoio através dos seus instrumentos de assistência.

3. Com base nas informações divulgadas pela Tokyo Electric Power Company (TEPCO), pelas autoridades japonesas e pela Agência Internacional da Energia Atómica, e na sequência de reuniões de trabalho específicas entre peritos japoneses e europeus, a Comissão considera que não deverá haver qualquer impacto para os consumidores europeus, mas que é necessária a monitorização contínua dos produtos importados pela Europa da zona afetada.

No que respeita à radioecologia marinha da zona, estão em curso dois projetos, STAR ([2]) e COMET ([3]), ao abrigo do Sétimo Programa-Quadro da Comunidade Europeia da Energia Atómica (Euratom) de actividades de investigação e formação em matéria nuclear (2007 to 2011). Esses projetos fornecerão mais informações sobre a natureza exata e as quantidades de radionuclídeos descarregados no mar, bem como sobre o seu impacto potencial nos organismos vivos.

4. Tendo em conta a avaliação acima referida, a Comissão não prevê tomar de momento outras medidas.

---

([1]) O Japão foi convidado a observar em 2011 o exercício de «testes de resistência» da UE destinado a verificar a segurança das instalações nucleares europeias, a fim de partilhar as experiências e as lições adquiridas. O Centro Comum de Investigação da Comissão cooperou também com a Agência da Energia Atómica e a Sociedade Oceanográfica do Japão sobre questões relacionadas com a caracterização do combustível fundido de Fukushima e as medições de radionuclídeos na água do mar.

([2]) *Strategy for Allied Radioecology*, (www.star-radioecology.org). No âmbito deste programa, foi lançado um convite à apresentação de propostas visando orientar a investigação sobre o impacto ambiental do acidente nuclear no Japão para o ambiente oceânico vizinho; o prazo para apresentação de propostas termina em 18 de dezembro de 2013.

([3]) *COordination and iMplementation of a pan-European instrumenT for radioecology*, (www.comet-radioecology.org). No âmbito deste programa, está a ser elaborado um relatório sobre a radioecologia marinha a fim de dar resposta às legítimas preocupações dos cidadãos europeus no que respeita ao impacto das fugas de materiais radioativos para o mar provenientes dos reatores acidentados de Fukushima.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011907/13**
**to the Commission**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Situation in Fukushima — fresh contamination and radioactive leaks

According to recent news reports, the Japanese Prime Minister has said that his country needs international support to stop the leaks of radioactive water from the power station. His appeal came after the operator, Tokyo Electric Power (Tepco), admitted a second leak of 4 tonnes and acknowledged that it had suffered a setback in its implementation of a decontamination technique and had released 1 130 tonnes of contaminated water into the sea.

Tepco had already confirmed a leak of 300 tonnes of radioactive material in the summer, on top of the fact that the damaged reactors are constantly leaking into the ground, polluting the groundwater and the ocean.

1. Has the Commission received any request for help from the Japanese authorities?

2. What support measures could the EU put in place?

3. How does the Commission assess the impact of the fresh contamination and radioactiveleaks?

4. Will it take any action in the light of this assessment?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 December 2013)*

With regard to the recent problems at the Fukushima nuclear power plant, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to written questions E-003609/13 and E-007824/13.

1. The Commission has not received any detailed request for assistance from Japan.

2. The Commission has offered to cooperate with Japan on various issues related to the nuclear accident at Fukushima, such as the monitoring of the environmental impact of the accident and the ongoing recovery operations. Bilateral contacts between both sides' specialists have been going on since the accident ([1]). Should Japan request any specific assistance, the Commission will provide appropriate support through its assistance mechanisms.

3. Based on the information released by Tokyo Electric Power Company (TEPCO), the Japanese authorities and the International Atomic Energy Agency, and following specific working meetings between Japanese and European experts, the Commission's assessment is that there should be no impact on European consumers, but there is a continuing need to monitor products imported to Europe from the affected area.

With regard to the marine radioecology of the area, two projects, STAR ([2]) and COMET ([3]), are being run under the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) for nuclear research and training activities (2007 to 2011). These projects will provide more information on the exact nature and amounts of radionuclides being discharged into the sea and their potential impact on living organisms.

4. In light of the assessment referred above the Commission does not foresee to take additional measures at this stage.

---

([1]) Japan was invited to observe the EU's own 2011 'stress test' exercise looking at the safety of European nuclear power plants to share experiences and lessons learned. The Commission's Joint Research Centre has also cooperated with the Japanese Atomic Energy Agency and the Oceanographic Society of Japan on issues related to the characterisation of the molten fuel from Fukushima and measurements of radionuclides in sea water.

([2]) Strategy for Allied Radioecology (www.star-radioecology.org). Under this programme, a call for proposals has been launched to focus research on the environmental impact of the nuclear accident in Japan on the nearby oceanic environment, with a deadline for submission of 18 December 2013.

([3]) COordination and iMplementation of a pan-European instrumenT for radioecology (www.comet-radioecology.org). Under this programme, a report is currently being drafted on marine radioecology to address the legitimate concerns of European citizens regarding the impact of the leaks of radioactive material into the sea from the damaged reactors in Fukushima.

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011913/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)**
*(17 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Omvang problematiek sociale dumping

De detacheringsrichtlijn (96/71/EG) heeft een ongewenst neveneffect van sociale dumping met zich meegebracht. Sociale dumping kenmerkt zich door uitbuiting van werknemers en absolute wantoestanden. Bovendien vormt het een oneerlijke concurrentie voor bedrijven die wél de spelregels volgen.

Graag had ik van de Europese Commissie vernomen of er concrete info en cijfergegevens beschikbaar zijn over de omvang van het probleem:

1. Hoeveel werknemer worden jaarlijks gedetacheerd naar een andere lidstaat?

2. Hoeveel bedrijven worden jaarlijks gecontroleerd op het correct toepassen van de detacheringsrichtlijn? Wat is het resultaat van deze controles (% bedrijven in regel — % bedrijven met inbreuk)

3. In het geval er een inbreuk tegen de bepalingen van de detacheringsrichtlijn wordt vastgesteld, hoeveel werknemers zijn betrokken?

4. Is hier een dalende / stijgende trend te bemerken? Hoe evolueert dit ten opzichte van vorige jaren? Dit zowel met betrekking tot het aantal controles, de vastgestelde inbreuken en het aantal betrokken werknemers.

**Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie**
*(10 december 2013)*

1. De Commissie heeft geen gegevens over het aantal werknemers dat overeenkomstig Richtlijn 96/71/EG ([1]) in de EU wordt gedetacheerd. De effectbeoordeling ([2]) bij het voorstel van de Commissie voor een Richtlijn betreffende de handhaving van Richtlijn 96/71/EG bevat evenwel een aantal gegevens over dit verschijnsel, waaronder het aantal detacheringen, de detacheringsstromen met de belangrijkste uitzendende en ontvangende landen, en een sectorspecifieke analyse. Uit gegevens van de lidstaten ([3]) blijkt dat het aantal meeneembare documenten A1 die op grond van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 betreffende de coördinatie van de socialezekerheidsstelsels ([4]) worden afgegeven voor een detachering naar andere lidstaten in het laatste jaar waarvoor gegevens beschikbaar zijn (2011), ongeveer 1,2 miljoen bedroeg. Detachering heeft dus slechts betrekking op een klein deel van de beroepsbevolking (0,5 % van de beroepsbevolking in de EU).

2, 3 en 4. De Commissie wijst erop dat de controle en de handhaving van de arbeidsvoorwaarden van werknemers, met inbegrip van die van gedetacheerde werknemers, een bevoegdheid van de lidstaten is. De Commissie kan bijgevolg niet de statistieken leveren waarom het geachte Parlementslid verzoekt; zij kan die opvragen bij de arbeidsinspecties van de lidstaten.

([1]) Richtlijn 96/71/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 16 december 1996 betreffende de terbeschikkingstelling van werknemers met het oog op het verrichten van diensten (PB L 18 van 21.1.1997).

([2]) Deel I van het werkdocument van de diensten van de Commissie „Impact Assessment, Revision of the legislative framework on the posting of workers in the context of provision of services", (SWD(2012) 63 final, van 21 maart 2012), beschikbaar op: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=471&langId=en.

([3]) Posting of workers in the European Union and EFTA countries: Report on A1 portable documents issued in 2010 and 2011, Europese Commissie, 2012, beschikbaar op: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=9675&langId=en.

([4]) Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 29 april 2004 betreffende de coördinatie van de socialezekerheidsstelsels (PB L 166 van 30.4.2004).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011913/13**
**to the Commission**
**Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Extent of the problem of social dumping

The directive on posting of workers (96/71/EC) has produced the undesirable side-effect of social dumping. Social dumping is characterised by exploitation of workers and abuses in absolute terms. Moreover, it is a source of unfair competition with businesses which do obey the rules.

Do any specific statistics and information exist concerning the extent of the problem:

1. How many workers per annum are posted to another Member State?

2. How many businesses per annum are inspected to check whether they are applying the directive on the posting of workers correctly? What is the result of these inspections (percentage of businesses that apply the rules and percentage which commit breaches)?

3. Where a breach of the directive on the posting of workers is identified, how many workers are involved?

4. Is there a rising or falling trend in these statistics? How do they compare with previous years? Please indicate this with regard to the number of inspections, the breaches identified and the number of workers involved.

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

1. The Commission has no figure on the number of workers posted in the EU in accordance with Directive 96/71/EC ([1]). However, the Commission's Impact Assessment ([2]) accompanying the proposal for a directive on the Enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC presents some data relating to the phenomenon, including the number of postings, flows of posting as regards the most important sending and receiving countries and a sector-specific breakdown. Member State data ([3]) show that the number of A1 portable documents issued for posting to other Member States under Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 ([4]) on the coordination of social security systems was around 1.2 million per year in the latest year for which data are available (2011). Posting thus concerns only a small percentage of the active population (equivalent to 0.5% of the EU active population).

2, 3 and 4. The Commission would point out that the monitoring and enforcement of the working and employment conditions of workers, including posted workers, fall within the competence of the Member States. As a consequence, the Commission cannot provide the statistics requested by the Honourable Member, who could request them from the labour inspectorates of the Member States.

---

([1]) Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services, OJ L 18, 21.1.1997.

([2]) Part I of Commission Staff Working Document 'Impact Assessment, Revision of the legislative framework on the posting of workers in the context of provision of services' (SWD(2012) 63 final of 21 March 2012); available at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=471&langId=en

([3]) Posting of workers in the European Union and EFTA countries: Report on A1 portable documents issued in 2010 and 2011, European Commission, 2012, at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=9675&langId=en

([4]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 166, 30.4.2004.

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011914/13**
**à Comissão**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**
*(17 de outubro de 2013)*

*Assunto:* Consequências das restrições orçamentais para as autoridades regionais e locais no que respeita às despesas dos Fundos Estruturais nos Estados-Membros

Numa resolução aprovada pelo Parlamento Europeu no primeiro período de sessões plenárias de outubro de 2013 sobre as consequências das restrições orçamentais para as autoridades regionais e locais no que respeita às despesas dos Fundos Estruturais da UE nos Estados-Membros (A7-0269/2013), o Parlamento Europeu:

— «Reitera categoricamente a sua oposição à introdução de uma condicionalidade macroeconómica na política de coesão 2014-2020, que penalizaria as regiões e os grupos sociais já debilitados pela crise» (n.° 19);

— «Solicita à Comissão que a despesa pública suportada pelos Estados-Membros no âmbito do cofinanciamento dos programas apoiados pelos Fundos Estruturais não seja incluída nas despesas estruturais, públicas ou equivalentes, consideradas no acordo de parceria para a verificação do respeito do Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento» (PEC) (n.° 24);

— Considera «que se demonstrou que o pacto orçamental não é adequado para fazer face aos desafios da crise e que um pacto de crescimento que permita investimentos significativos à escala da UE é considerado a solução mais viável, porquanto existe atualmente um consenso em relação ao facto de a austeridade e os cortes orçamentais sem investimento não relançarem a economia e não criarem as condições favoráveis à criação de emprego e ao crescimento económico» (considerando D).

Em face do exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que iniciativas pensa desenvolver na sequência da tomada de posição do Parlamento Europeu agora conhecida?

2. Considera a possibilidade de propor que a despesa pública suportada pelos Estados-Membros no âmbito do cofinanciamento dos programas apoiados pelos Fundos Estruturais não seja incluída nas despesas estruturais (para efeitos do PEC)?

3. Considera a possibilidade de propor o fim da condicionalidade macroeconómica na política de coesão 2014-2020?

**Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**
*(10 de dezembro de 2013)*

1. A Comissão já explicou que tenciona equilibrar os investimentos produtivos com os objetivos de disciplina orçamental, através de uma cláusula de investimento que será incluída na avaliação dos orçamentos nacionais para 2014 e dos resultados orçamentais de 2013.

2. A cláusula de investimento abrange os Estados-Membros incluídos na vertente preventiva do Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento, em conformidade com o disposto no Plano pormenorizado para uma União Económica e Monetária efetiva e aprofundada ([1]). No que diz respeito a esses Estados-Membros, a Comissão irá considerar a possibilidade de permitir, em certas condições ([2]), um desvio temporário em relação ao objetivo de médio prazo ou à respetiva trajetória de ajustamento. O desvio permitido está ligado às despesas nacionais em projetos cofinanciados pela UE no âmbito da política estrutural e de coesão (ou seja, o Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional, o Fundo Social Europeu e o Fundo de Coesão), das redes transeuropeias e do Mecanismo Interligar a Europa, com efeitos orçamentais positivos, diretos e verificáveis a longo prazo.

3. A Comissão considera que, para serem plenamente eficazes, as intervenções apoiadas pelos Fundos Estruturais e de Investimento Europeus devem ter lugar num enquadramento macroeconómico sólido, em estreita relação com o Semestre Europeu e com os procedimentos de governação económica, através da condicionalidade macroeconómica.

([1]) COM(2012) 777 final/2.
([2]) Ver carta de 3 de julho de 2013 do VP Rehn aos Ministros das Finanças.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011914/13**
**to the Commission**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**
*(17 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Effects of budgetary constraints for regional and local authorities regarding the EU's structural funds expenditure in the Member States

The European Parliament, in a Resolution on the effects of budgetary constraints for regional and local authorities regarding the EU's Structural Funds expenditure in the Member States (A7-0269/2013), approved at its first October 2013 part-session:

'Strongly reiterates its opposition to the introduction of macroeconomic conditionality in the Cohesion Policy 2014-2020, which would penalise regions and social groups already weakened by the crisis' (point 19);

'Calls on the Commission to ensure that public expenditure incurred by Member States to co-finance programmes supported by the Structural Funds is not included in the public or equivalent structural expenditure taken into account under partnership agreements for the purpose of ascertaining that the Stability and Growth Pact is being complied with' (point 24);

and considers that 'whereas the fiscal compact has been shown to be inappropriate in facing the challenges of the crisis and a growth compact enabling significant investment across the Community is envisaged as the most viable solution, as there is a consensus today that fiscal austerity and budgetary cuts without investments do not revitalise the economy and will not create favourable conditions for job creation and economic growth' (recital D);

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. What steps does it plan to take in the light of Parliament's position statement on this matter?

2. Is it considering proposing that public spending by the Member States to co-finance programmes supported by the Structural Funds should not be included in structural expenditure (for the purposes of the SGP)?

3. Is it considering the option of eliminating macroeconomic conditionality from the Cohesion Policy 2014-2020?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

1. The Commission has already clarified how it will balance productive investments with fiscal discipline objectives via an investment clause to be implemented in the assessment of the national budgets for 2014 and the budgetary outcomes for 2013.

2. The investment clause covers Member States in the preventive arm of the SGP in line with the provision of the blueprint ([1]). For those Member States, the Commission will consider allowing, under certain conditions ([2]), a temporary deviation from the medium-term objective or from the adjustment path towards it. The allowed deviation is linked to national expenditure on projects co-funded by the EU under structural and cohesion policy (i.e. the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund), Trans-European Networks and the Connecting Europe Facility with positive, direct and verifiable long-term budgetary effects.

3. The Commission is of the opinion that in order to be fully effective, interventions supported by the European Structural and Investment Funds must take place in a sound macroeconomic framework, with a close connection to the European semester and to the economic governance procedures through macroeconomic conditionality.

---

([1]) COM(2012) 777 final/2.
([2]) See letter of VP Rehn to Finance Ministers of 3 July 2013.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-011916/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Joachim Zeller (PPE)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* 30 Mio. EUR Flüchtlingshilfe für Italien

Bei seinem Besuch auf der Mittelmeerinsel Lampedusa in der vergangenen Woche hat der Präsident der Kommission, Manuel Barroso angekündigt, Italien 30 Mio. EUR zur Bewältigung des Flüchtlingsnotstands zur Verfügung zu stellen. So notwendig den Flüchtlingen geholfen werden muss, so ergeben sich doch auch einige Fragen.

1. Werden diese Finanzmittel in Form von Verpflichtungsermächtigungen (commitments) oder als Direktzahlungen (payments) gewährt?

2. Kann die Kommission detailliert Auskunft darüber geben, aus welchem Haushaltsposten diese Finanzmittel bereitgestellt werden bzw. welche Umschichtungen hierfür genau vorgenommen werden?

3. Legt die Kommission für diese Mittel eine Zweckbindung fest, und wird sie den zweckgemäßen Mitteleinsatz kontrollieren?

Hat die Kommission genaue Kenntnis darüber, ob Italien über eine Infrastruktur für die Flüchtlingsaufnahme verfügt, die mit diesen Mitteln erweitert werden kann, oder dienen diese Mittel dazu, eine derartige Infrastruktur für die Unterbringung und Versorgung von Flüchtlingen erst aufzubauen?

**Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission**
*(5. Dezember 2013)*

Zur Bewältigung der Krisen in mehreren Mitgliedstaaten, die durch den hohen Migrationsdruck auf Grenzverwaltungs- und Migrationssteuerungssysteme ausgelöst wurden, hat die Kommission als Teil eines koordinierten EU-Unterstützungspakets etwas mehr als 60 Mio. EUR als Notfallhilfe zur Verfügung gestellt (in Form von Mitteln für Verpflichtungen). Bereitgestellt wurden diese Mittel durch interne Umschichtungen (32,4 Mio. EUR) und die Verwendung vorhandener Soforthilfemittel (etwa 28. Mio. EUR). Ein Berichtigungshaushaltsplan war somit nicht erforderlich. Der umgeschichtete Betrag stammt aus den Haushaltsmitteln für den Bereich Inneres für das Jahr 2013 (14,4 Mio. EUR) und aus Einsparungen in anderen Programmen („Lebensmittel- und Futtermittelsicherheit" (Kapitel 17 04), technische Unterstützung der „Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums" (Kapitel 05 04), „Internationale Übereinkommen im Bereich der Landwirtschaft" (Kapitel 05 06) und „LIFE+" (Kapitel 07 03)) in Höhe von 18 Mio. EUR.

Fast die Hälfte der 60 Mio. EUR dient der Aufstockung der Mittel für Sofortmaßnahmen im Rahmen des EFF ([1]), um die erste Aufnahme von Personen, die möglicherweise internationalen Schutz benötigen, zu finanzieren. Der andere Teil der Mittel ist für die Nothilfe im Rahmen des Außengrenzenfonds und des Europäischen Rückkehrfonds sowie die Aufstockung des Frontex-Haushalts für 2013 zur Förderung gemeinsamer Einsätze im Mittelmeer vorgesehen.

Was die speziell für Italien angekündigten 30 Mio. EUR angeht, so würde die vorläufige Mittelzuweisung folgendermaßen aussehen: 8 Mio. EUR für Frontex-Einsätze, 10 Mio. EUR für Sofortmaßnahmen im Rahmen des EFF und 12 Mio. EUR für Soforthilfemaßnahmen, die hauptsächlich aus dem Außengrenzenfonds und (gegebenenfalls) dem Europäischen Rückkehrfonds finanziert werden sollen. Wie bei allen Sofortmitteln, die Mitgliedstaaten zugewiesen werden, wird die Kommission überprüfen, ob die betreffenden Mittel zweckgemäß — in diesem Fall also zur Bewältigung der Krise — eingesetzt werden. Mit Blick auf die Sofortmaßnahmen im Rahmen des EFF hat Italien der Kommission mitgeteilt, dass die Mittel für die Finanzierung der Erweiterung bestehender und den Aufbau neuer Aufnahmeeinrichtungen verwendet werden sollen.

([1]) Europäischer Flüchtlingsfonds.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011916/13**
**to the Commission**
**Joachim Zeller (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* EUR 30 million in refugee aid for Italy

During his visit to the Mediterranean island of Lampedusa last week, the President of the Commission, Manuel Barroso, announced that Italy would receive EUR 30 million to help manage the refugee crisis. Of course, we must help the refugees, but this raises some questions.

1. Will this funding be granted in the form of commitments or payments?

2. Can the Commission give details about where in the budget this funding will come from or exactly what funds will be reallocated for this purpose?

3. Will the Commission specifically earmark these resources and will it check that they have been used for that specific purpose?

Does the Commission have any precise information on whether Italy has refugee reception and care facilities that can be expanded with this funding, or whether the resources will be used to establish such facilities?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

To address the crises in a number of Member States resulting from high migratory pressure on border and migration management systems, the Commission has made available slightly more than EUR 60 million (in commitment appropriations) as an emergency response, as part of a coordinated package of EU support. This has been done via internal redeployments (EUR 32.4 million) and by using existing emergency Funds (approx. EUR 28 million); it did not require an amending budget. The redeployed amount comes from within the 2013 Home Affairs budget (EUR 14.4 million) and from EUR 18 million savings in other programmes: Food and feed safety — Chapter 17.04; technical assistance for Rural Development — Chapter 05.04; international agreements in agriculture — Chapter 05.06; and Life+ — Chapter 07.03.

Almost half of the EUR 60 million will increase funds for emergency measures under the ERF ([1]), to finance initial reception of persons who may be in need of international protection. The other part is for emergency resources under the External Borders Fund (EBF) and the European Return Fund, and to increasing the 2013 Frontex budget to boost Joint Operations in the Mediterranean.

Regarding the EUR 30 million specifically announced for Italy, the tentative allocation would be EUR 8 million for Frontex operations, EUR 10 million for ERF emergency measures, and EUR 12 million for emergency activities to be funded mainly under the EBF and (as appropriate) the European Return Fund. As with all emergency funding allocated to a Member State, the Commission will check that it is used as intended: to remedy the crisis. Regarding ERF emergency measures, Italy has informed the Commission of its plans to use this funding to expand existing reception facilities and to create new ones.

([1]) European Refugee Fund.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011917/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(18 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* STOP à la spéculation alimentaire

La spéculation alimentaire provoque des conséquences dramatiques dans le monde. Des milliers de personnes meurent de faim, alors que la production mondiale pourrait nourrir toute la planète, tout simplement parce que certains se permettent de spéculer et donc de rendre ces denrées alimentaires inaccessibles.

La spéculation alimentaire rend aussi la viabilité des producteurs du sud comme du nord très précaire voire même impossible. Même en Belgique, les revenus de nos agriculteurs sont affectés par cette spéculation.

En cette journée mondiale de l'alimentation, il faut rappeler que le premier objectif du Millénaire pour le développement visait à réduire de moitié la faim dans le monde d'ici 2015. Pourtant, aujourd'hui, nous sommes encore loin du compte: une personne sur huit souffre de malnutrition.

À l'heure où les Nations unies revoient les objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement, il est nécessaire d'accomplir des actes concrets: lutter contre la spéculation sur les prix des denrées alimentaires, contribuer à la lutte contre la faim dans le monde.

1. Quels sont les engagements pris par la Commission sur le sujet?

2. Quels sont ses projets?

3. La Commission nous rejoint-elle dans la volonté claire de légiférer afin d'encadrer la commercialisation, la diffusion ou la promotion d'instruments financiers dont le rendement dépend de l'évolution d'indices liés au cours de matières premières agricoles?

**Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission**
*(13 décembre 2013)*

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se reporter à sa réponse à la question écrite E-005929/2013.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011917/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* STOP food speculation

Food speculation has dramatic consequences throughout the world. There are thousands dying of hunger while world production could feed the whole planet, all because some people indulge in speculation which puts these foodstuffs out of reach.

Food speculation makes the viability of southern and northern production precarious, if not downright impossible. The incomes of even our Belgian farmers are affected by this speculation.

Today, on World Food Day, we need to remember that the first Millennium Development Goal set out to halve world hunger by 2015. Yet today we are still very wide of the mark: one person in eight suffers from malnutrition.

Just as the United Nations is reviewing the Millennium Development Goals, we have to take concrete action: fight against food price speculation, join in fighting world hunger.

1. What commitments has the Commission made in this respect?

2. What are the Commission's plans?

3. Does the Commission join us in wanting to legislate in favour of limiting the commercialisation, distribution and promotion of financial products whose yield derives from variations in agricultural commodity price indices?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005929/2013.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011918/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Roberta Angelilli (PPE)**
*(18 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Comune di Bracciano — informazioni sulla discarica nella zona di Cupinoro

Nelle scorse settimane, dopo la chiusura della discarica di Malagrotta, il Commissario Sottile ha disposto il conferimento di ulteriori 20.000 tonnellate di rifiuti urbani provenienti da Roma, Fiumicino, Ciampino e Città del Vaticano presso la discarica di Cupinoro (Bracciano) fino al 31.12.2013, oltre ai rifiuti già conferiti in discarica da 27 Comuni limitrofi.

Al tempo stesso, secondo notizie riportate dalla stampa la Regione Lazio, su richiesta della società Bracciano Ambiente controllata dal comune di Bracciano, avrebbe intenzione di aumentare la volumetria della discarica di altri 450mila metri cubi.

Per questi motivi, i comitati di quartiere e la popolazione residente hanno espresso forti preoccupazioni per la viabilità pubblica e la salute, dal momento che a valle della discarica (a circa 1 km) sono presenti i pozzi dell'acquedotto comunale «Spanora Casalone» di proprietà del comune di Cerveteri che risulterebbero in parte già compromessi. Inoltre, su alcuni terreni gravano usi civici e altri sono qualificati come «zone protezione speciale (ZPS)».

Considerato che la Commissione si è più volte espressa a favore del superamento della logica emergenziale e contro la realizzazione di discariche temporanee e provvisorie, può la stessa far sapere:

1. se è stata correttamente esperita la procedura di valutazione d'impatto ambientale preventiva e se esistono o meno le condizioni previste dalla direttiva 2011/92/CE;

2. se sono state chieste le autorizzazioni relative ai codici CER, che definiscono la tipologia di rifiuti che deve essere conferita in discarica;

3. se è effettivamente previsto un ampliamento della discarica di Cupinoro che nonostante la prevista dismissione nel 2011 è tuttora aperta in regime di proroga;

4. se sono state effettuate le procedure obbligatorie di pubblicità e informazione della cittadinanza (VIA e VAS);

5. se sono state prese adeguatamente in considerazione da parte delle autorità italiane le disposizioni contenute nella direttiva 2008/98/CE e nella decisione 2003/33/CE del Consiglio che stabilisce criteri e procedure per l'ammissione dei rifiuti nelle discariche;

6. quali garanzie ha fornito la Regione Lazio nell'ambito del procedimento d'infrazione 2011/4021 volto a garantire che le autorità locali italiane approntino sufficienti capacità per trattare tutti i rifiuti smaltiti nelle discariche della Regione?

**Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**
*(10 dicembre 2013)*

Spetta agli Stati membri garantire la corretta applicazione nel loro territorio del diritto dell'UE, comprese tutte le direttive ambientali e le decisioni citate dall'onorevole deputato. La Commissione non è coinvolta nelle procedure di autorizzazione per impianti di gestione dei rifiuti effettuate a livello nazionale dalle autorità competenti degli Stati membri. La Commissione può intervenire solo se dispone di elementi a riprova di una possibile violazione delle pertinenti disposizioni dell'Unione europea in materia di gestione dei rifiuti, valutazione ambientale o autorizzazioni in relazione alle autorizzazioni, alla costruzione o alla gestione di un tale impianto.

Sulla base delle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato la Commissione non ravvisa alcuna potenziale violazione delle succitate disposizioni dell'UE in relazione alla decisione delle autorità italiane di trattare una quantità maggiore di rifiuti nella discarica di Cupinoro e di aumentarne la capacità.

Per quanto riguarda invece la gestione dei rifiuti nel Lazio, nel giugno 2013 la Commissione ha adito la Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea nel quadro del procedimento di infrazione 2011/4021. Il procedimento è volto a garantire che il Lazio sia dotato delle necessarie capacità di trattamento meccanico-biologiche per una corretta gestione futura dei rifiuti attualmente smaltiti in tutte le discariche della regione. Il caso è ancora pendente dinanzi alla Corte.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011918/13**
**to the Commission**
**Roberta Angelilli (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Municipality of Bracciano — information on the Cupinoro landfill site

Over the last few weeks, after the closure of the Malagrotta landfill site, the Commissioner for waste, Goffredo Sottile, has authorised a further 20 000 tonnes of urban waste from Rome, Fiumicino, Ciampino and the Vatican City to be sent to the Cupinoro landfill site in Bracciano between now and 31 December 2013, on top of the waste that is already sent to the site by 27 other municipalities in the area.

At the same time, according to press reports, the Lazio regional government intends to increase the site's capacity by a further 450 000 cubic metres, at the request of the company Bracciano Ambiente, which is controlled by Bracciano municipal council.

As a result, the area's district committees and local residents have voiced serious concerns about the impact both on the roads in the area and on health, given that the wells which feed the Spanora Casalone water tower belonging to the municipality of Cerveteri are around 1 km downstream from the landfill site and some are reported to have already been contaminated. In addition, there are public rights of use on some parts of the site and others are designated Special Protection Areas (SPAs).

The Commission has spoken out more than once encouraging a move away from the emergency management approach and against the creation of temporary landfill sites.

1. Can the Commission state whether a proper prior environmental impact assessment was performed and whether the conditions laid down in Directive 2011/92/EU have been met?

2. Were the relevant permits applied for in relation to the EWC codes, which define which waste types can be sent to landfill?

3. Is it true that there are plans to extend the Cupinoro landfill site, which is still being allowed to operate under an extension, even though it was supposed to have been decommissioned in 2011?

4. Were the mandatory public notice and information procedures carried out (EIA and SEA)?

5. Did the Italian authorities give due consideration to the provisions of Directive 2008/98/EC and Council Decision 2003/33/EC establishing criteria and procedures for the acceptance of waste at landfills?

6. What guarantees has the Lazio regional government provided in the context of infringement proceeding No 2011/4021 aimed at ensuring that Italian local authorities develop enough capacity to process all of the waste disposed of in the region's landfill sites?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

It is for the Member States to ensure the correct application in their territories of EC law, including all the environmental Directives and Decisions mentioned by the Honourable Member. The Commission is not involved in the authorisation procedures for waste management installations, which are carried out at national level by the competent authorities of the Member States. The Commission can intervene only if it has evidence that a given waste installation has been authorised, built or operated in potential breach of relevant EU provisions on waste management, environmental assessment or permits.

Based on the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission cannot identify a potential breach of relevant EU provisions in relation to the Italian authorities' decision to send more waste to the Cupinoro landfill and to increase the site's capacity.

As concerns the situation of waste management in Lazio, in June 2013 the Commission applied to the Court of Justice of the European Union in the framework of infringement procedure 2011/4021. This case is aimed at ensuring that Lazio is equipped with the necessary mechanic-biological treatment (MBT) capacity, so that the waste currently landfilled in all the Lazio landfills is adequaltely treated in the future. The case is still pending before the Court.

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011919/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Auke Zijlstra (NI)**
*(18 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Vingerafdrukken in paspoorten (follow-up)

Het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie heeft vandaag een klacht van een Duitse burger verworpen die zich verzet tegen de opname van zijn vingerafdrukken in zijn paspoort. Bovendien is het Hof van oordeel dat het paspoort de enige plaats zou moeten zijn waar de vingerafdrukken mogen worden opgeslagen.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze uitspraak van het Hof van Justitie?

2. Welke invloed zal deze uitspraak hebben op de verdere uitvoering van de desbetreffende verordening van de Raad?

3. Is de Commissie van plan wijzigingen voor te stellen voor het beleid ter verbetering van de veiligheid van door EU-lidstaten uitgereikte paspoorten?

4. Kan de Commissie de concrete gevolgen van deze uitspraak toelichten?

5. Blijft de Commissie bij haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-005669/2012?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Malström namens de Commissie**
*(29 november 2013)*

In het kader van zijn prejudiciële beslissing in de zaak „Verwaltungsgericht Gelsenkirchen" (Michael Schwarz tegen de stad Bochum) over de vraag of artikel 1, lid 2, van Verordening nr. 2252/2004 als geldig kan worden beschouwd, bevestigt het Hof dat bij het onderzoek ervan niets is gebleken van feiten of omstandigheden die de geldigheid van de verordening kunnen aantasten.

In het bijzonder heeft het Hof vastgesteld dat het afnemen en bewaren van vingerafdrukken (als bedoeld in artikel 1 lid 2 van de verordening) geschikt zijn om de door die verordening nagestreefde doelstellingen en dus ook die van voorkoming van illegale binnenkomst van personen op het grondgebied van de Unie, te verwezenlijken. De verordening brengt geen verwerking van vingerafdrukken met zich mee die verder gaat dan noodzakelijk is voor de verwezenlijking van de doelstelling van bescherming van paspoorten tegen frauduleus gebruik ervan. Derhalve beperkt zij niet overmatig het recht op eerbiediging van het privéleven en op bescherming van persoonsgegevens.

In dat verband zijn er geen veranderingen van het beleid vereist. Het antwoord van de Commissie op vraag E-005669/2012 is dus in overeenstemming met het arrest en blijft geldig.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011919/13**
**to the Commission**
**Auke Zijlstra (NI)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Fingerprints in passports (follow-up)

The European Court of Justice today rejected a German citizen's challenge to the inclusion of his fingerprints in his passport. The judgment also states that the passport should be the only place where the fingerprints may be stored.

1. Is the Commission aware of this ECJ ruling?

2. How will this ruling affect the further implementation of the relevant Council regulation?

3. Does the Commission intend to propose any kind of change in the policy of improving the security of passports issued by EU Member States?

4. Can the Commission specify the concrete consequences of this ruling?

5. Is the Commission still keeping to the answer it gave to my Written Question E-005669/2012?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(29 November 2013)*

In its preliminary judgment in the case 'Verwaltungsgericht Gelsenkirchen' (Michael Schwarz v Stadt Bochum), on the question of whether Article 1(2) of Regulation No 2252/2004 can be considered valid, the Court confirms that the examination has revealed nothing capable of affecting the validity of the regulation.

In particular the Court established that the taking and storing of fingerprints (referred to in Article 1(2) of the regulation) are appropriate for attaining the aims of the regulation and, in particular, the objective of preventing illegal entry to the European Union. The regulation does not imply any processing of fingerprints that would go beyond what is necessary in order to achieve the aim of protecting against the fraudulent use of passports. It thus does not unduly restrict the rights to respect of private life and the protection of personal data.

In this respect no changes in policy are requested or necessary. The answer given by the Commission to Question E-005669/2012 is therefore in line with the judgment and remains valid.

*(Versión española)*

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011920/13**
**a la Comisión**
**Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D) y Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)**
*(18 de octubre de 2013)*

*Asunto:* Inclusión de la Vespa velutina en la nueva legislación de la UE sobre especies invasoras

La llegada a territorio de la Unión de la *Vespa velutina*, o avispa asiática, ha venido provocando desde 2004 graves problemas para los sectores de la agricultura hortofrutícola y la apicultura, así como importantes daños a especies autóctonas, a la biodiversidad en general y a la salud humana (a partir de ocho picaduras es necesaria hospitalización). Aunque el foco más preocupante de concentración de esta especie ha sido avistado en La Garrotxa (Catalunya), ejemplares de la avispa asiática han sido ya detectados en varios puntos del norte de España y todo apunta a que podría desplazarse hacia el sur por Tarragona.

Esta avispa de gran tamaño, que alimenta a sus larvas básicamente con abejas melíferas autóctonas, se nutre a su vez del néctar de la fruta. Dada su gran capacidad de reproducción —12 000 ejemplares por hembra fecundada a razón de 200 madres por nido—, la ausencia de un depredador natural para esta especie y su rápida dispersión —puede alcanzar los 30 km por cada golpe de viento racheado—, la *Vespa velutina* está suponiendo la desaparición de un gran número de colmenas y poniendo en peligro cultivos y frutales. A todo ello, cabe añadir su difícil erradicación que, de momento, se realiza mayoritariamente a través del método de detección visual y destrucción de los nidos.

Dado que, según datos de la Comisión Europea, las especies invasoras cuestan al menos 12 000 millones de euros al año a la Unión Europea, ¿está la Comisión realizando un seguimiento de la evolución y los daños causados por la *Vespa velutina* en territorio de la UE, a nivel socioeconómico y medioambiental?

¿Ha recibido la Comisión, por parte de las autoridades españolas, algún tipo de comunicación o solicitud de ayuda para controlar y combatir dicha plaga?

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión estudiar la inclusión de este tipo de avispas cuando elabore la lista de las 50 especies exóticas invasoras anunciadas en su COM(2013) 620?

¿Qué medidas está dispuesta a emprender la Comisión para evitar la propagación transfronteriza de la *Vespa velutina* que, después de llegar a Francia por vía marítima, ya ha sido detectada en tres países de la UE?

**Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión**
*(26 de noviembre de 2013)*

La Comisión es consciente de la propagación de la *Vespa velutina* en el territorio de la UE; sin embargo, no existe actualmente ningún seguimiento oficial de la evolución o de los daños ocasionados por esta especie a escala de la UE. No se ha recibido hasta la fecha ninguna información de las autoridades españolas sobre esta especie concreta.

La Comisión ha propuesto recientemente una serie de medidas para hacer frente al problema de las especies exóticas invasoras en la EU ([1]). El Reglamento propuesto prevé un mecanismo de la UE para evaluar cuáles son las especies que requieren una intervención sobre la base de una evaluación de riesgos científica que determine el impacto de dichas especies sobre las especies autóctonas. Sobre esta base, se examinará la posible inclusión en la lista de especies exóticas invasoras preocupantes para la Unión de especies tales como *Vespa velutina*, si cumplen los criterios establecidos en el Reglamento.

El Reglamento propuesto recoge medidas sobre prevención, alerta temprana y respuesta rápida, así como medidas de gestión de las especies exóticas invasoras destinadas a evitar la introducción y posterior propagación de estas especies. El Reglamento establece además disposiciones relativas a la gestión de las vías de introducción y propagación, que podrían contribuir también a evitar la propagación transfronteriza de las especies exóticas invasoras.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/invasivealien/docs/proposal/es.pdf

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011920/13**
**to the Commission**
**Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D) and Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Inclusion of Vespa velutina in new EU legislation on invasive species

The arrival in the EU of *Vespa velutina*, or the Asian predatory wasp, has been causing serious problems for the agricultural, fruit and vegetable, and beekeeping sectors since 2004, as well as seriously harming native species, biodiversity in general and human health (eight stings require hospitalisation). Although the most worrying invasion of this species has been observed in Garrotxa (Catalonia), specimens of the Asian predatory wasp have been found in several parts of northern Spain and all this suggests that it could move south towards Tarragona.

This large wasp, which feeds its larvae essentially with native honeybees, feeds on fruit nectar. Given its tremendous capacity to reproduce (12 000 specimens per fertilised female at a ratio of 200 queens per nest), the absence of a natural predator for this species and its ability to spread rapidly — it can travel 30 km on each gust of wind –, *Vespa velutina* is causing a large number of beehives to disappear and is threatening crops and fruit. On top of this, the wasp is difficult to get rid of; it is currently exterminated largely through visual detection and destruction of the nests.

Considering that, according to the Commission's figures, invasive species cost the European Union at least EUR 12 billion per year, is the Commission monitoring developments and the damage caused by *Vespa velutina* in the EU, in socioeconomic and environmental terms?

Has the Commission received any communication from the Spanish authorities or any request for help to control and combat this pest?

Does the Commission plan to consider including of this type of wasp when it draws up the list of 50 invasive alien species set out in its proposal for a regulation COM(2013) 620?

What action is the Commission prepared to take to prevent the cross-border spread of *Vespa velutina*, which, since arriving in France by sea, has already been found in three EU countries?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**
*(26 November 2013)*

The Commission is aware of the spread of *Vespa velutina* in the EU territory; however, there is at present no formal monitoring of developments or of the damage caused by this species at EU level. To date, no information has been received from the Spanish authorities on this particular species.

The Commission recently proposed measures to address the issue of invasive alien species (IAS) in the EU ([1]) in a comprehensive manner. The proposed Regulation provides for an EU mechanism to assess which species will require action on the basis of science-based risk assessments that will establish the impact such species have on native species. On this basis, species such as *Vespa velutina* will be considered for listing as IAS of Union concern if they meet the criteria established by the regulation.

The proposed Regulation includes measures on prevention, early warning and rapid response as well as on the management of IAS, designed to prevent the entry and further spread of such species. Furthermore, the proposed Regulation includes provisions on the management of pathways of introduction and spread, which could also contribute to preventing the cross-border spread of IAS.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/invasivealien/docs/proposal/en.pdf

*(Dansk udgave)*

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011921/13**
**til Kommissionen**
**Dan Jørgensen (S&D)**
*(18. oktober 2013)*

*Om:* OIE's henstillinger om dyrevelfærd

Verdensorganisationen for Dyrevelfærd (OIE) har sendt en e-mail til visse udviklingslande om, at den gerne ser sine standarder for dyrevelfærd blive »fast etablerede som det eneste og fremherskende internationale referencepunkt for dyrevelfærd«. I e-mailen fortsætter organisationen, idet den siger, at denne »status vil forenkle Deres handelsmæssige forhandlingsposition betydeligt med hensyn til dyrevelfærd og give Dem et stærkt modargument over for de handelspartnere, som eventuelt søger at påtvinge Dem deres egne bindende krav til dyrevelfærd«. Dette viser, at OIE ønsker at hindre EU og andre i at stille krav om, at import skal opfylde dyrevelfærdsstandarder, der er strengere end OIE's standarder.

Vil Kommissionen gøre det klart, at den ikke accepterer OIE's henstillinger om dyrevelfærd som internationale standarder, der hindrer den i at kræve, at import opfylder Kommissionens egne standarder, forudsat at den ved at gøre det agerer på en måde, der er i overensstemmelse med WTO's regler?

Hvis EU ikke fremsætter en klar erklæring om dette, kan det komme til at opleve, at et WTO-panel i en fremtidig handelstvist afgør, at EU tidligere har accepteret OIE's henstillinger som internationale standarder for dyrevelfærd og ikke senere kan kræve, at import lever op til dets egne standarder, som er strengere end OIE-standarderne.

Vil Kommissionen også gøre det klart, at:

— OIE's rolle burde bestå i at forbedre dyrevelfærd globalt, men ikke i at gøre det vanskeligt at vedtage højere standarder for de lande, som ønsker at gøre dette?

— OIE bør anerkende, at WTO's regler og retspraksis gør det muligt for medlemslande at kræve, at import lever op til standarder, som er højere end internationale standarder, under visse omstændigheder og på visse betingelser?

— at OIE's standarder bør betragtes som minimumstandarder, ikke maksimumstandarder?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg**
*(23. december 2013)*

Kommissionen tilstræber at fremme høje velfærdsstandarder i dyrebesætninger i hele verden. For at gøre dette støtter den de specifikke standarder og henstillinger vedrørende dyrevelfærd fra OIE og fremmer dyrevelfærd i de samarbejdsaftaler, der indgås med tredjelande. Ud over at øge omfanget, i hvilket OIE standarder vedrørende dyrevelfærd gennemføres, fremmer dette også kapacitetsopbygning med hensyn til dyrevelfærdsspørgsmål i forbindelse med nogle af EU's vigtigste handelspartnere.

Endvidere har EU været i stand til at indhente garantier med hensyn til dyrevelfærd på slagterier. De slagterier, der eksporterer kød til EU, skal tilvejebringe den relevante certificering af, at dyrene er blevet behandlet i overensstemmelse med forordning (EF) nr. 1099/2009 om beskyttelse af dyr på aflivningstidspunktet, og have opfyldt krav, der mindst svarer til kravene i forordningen.

Ved OIE's tredje verdenskonference om dyrevelfærd, der blev afholdt i Kuala-Lumpur i 2012, blev spørgsmålet om at indføre strengere foranstaltninger end dem, der nævnes i OIE standarderne, diskuteret, og en konklusion blev draget med hensyn til OIE-medlemslandes ret til at fastsætte niveauet for deres nationale videnskabsbaserede foranstaltninger.

Til dato begrænser ingen af disse aftaler EU's modparters kapacitet til at indføre strengere standarder end OIE's.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011921/13**
**to the Commission**
**Dan Jørgensen (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* OIE Animal Welfare Recommendations

The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) has sent an email to certain developing countries saying that it would like the OIE animal welfare standards to be 'firmly established as the single pre-eminent international reference point for animal welfare'. The email continues by saying that the 'status will greatly simplify your trade negotiating position with respect to animal welfare and provide you with a strong counterargument to those trading partners who may seek to impose their prescriptive animal welfare requirements on you'. This shows that the OIE wishes to prevent the EU and others from requiring imports to meet animal welfare standards which are more stringent than those of the OIE.

Will the Commission make clear that it does not accept the OIE Recommendations on animal welfare as international standards which prevent it from requiring imports to meet its own standards, provided that in so doing it acts in a manner that is consistent with WTO rules?

Should the EU fail to make a clear statement to this effect it may find that, in a future trade dispute, a WTO panel will rule that the EU has previously accepted the OIE Recommendations as international standards on animal welfare and cannot later require imports to meet its own standards which are more stringent than OIE standards.

Will the Commission also make clear that:

— the role of the OIE ought to be to improve animal welfare worldwide but not to make it difficult for those countries wishing to adopt higher standards to do so?

— the OIE should recognise that WTO rules and case law allow member countries to require imports to meet standards which are higher than international standards in certain circumstances and subject to certain conditions?

— the OIE standards should be seen as minimum rather than maximum standards?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(23 December 2013)*

The Commission seeks to promote high welfare standards in animal livestock populations worldwide. To do this, it supports both the specific standards and recommendations on animal welfare of the OIE and promotes animal welfare in the cooperation agreements it signs with third countries. Apart from enhancing the degree of implementation of OIE standards on animal welfare, this also facilitates capacity-building on animal welfare matters in some of the EU's key trading partners.

In addition, the EU has been able to secure guarantees as regards animal welfare in slaughterhouses. Those slaughterhouses exporting meat to the EU must provide the relevant certification attesting to the fact that the animals have been handled in compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing, and have met requirements at least equivalent to those laid down in the regulation.

At the third OIE Global Conference on animal welfare held in Kuala-Lumpur in 2012, the issue of introducing stricter measures than those mentioned in the OIE standards was discussed and a conclusion was added with respect to the right of OIE Member Countries to determine the level of their national science-based measures.

To date, none of these agreements limits the capacity of the EU's counterparts to adopt more stringent standards than those of the OIE.

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011922/13**
**à Comissão**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**
*(18 de outubro de 2013)*

*Assunto:* Despedimentos na Alcatel Lucent e na Siemens

De acordo com notícias recentes, a Alcatel Lucent e a Siemens pretendem liquidar 25 mil postos de trabalho no próximo biénio.

O grupo franco-americano anunciou que, até ao final de 2015, planeia despedir 10 mil trabalhadores, sendo 4 100 na Europa, 3 800 no Médio Oriente e em África e 2 100 no continente americano.

A multinacional alemã, por seu lado, informou, no final do mês de setembro, da intenção de prescindir de 15 mil trabalhadores em todo o mundo durante o ano de 2014, um terço dos quais nas unidades industriais, de energia e de infraestruturas situadas na Alemanha.

Em face do exposto, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que medidas tomou ou pensa tomar na sequência destes anúncios?

2. Efetuou ou vai efetuar alguma avaliação do impacto destas decisões?

3. Tem conhecimento sobre que fundos da UE foram até hoje atribuídos à Alcatel Lucent e à Siemens?

**Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão**
*(9 de dezembro de 2013)*

A Comissão está ciente da situação das empresas Alcatel Lucent e Siemens, mas não tem poder para interferir nas suas decisões. Contudo, incentiva efetivamente os empregadores a adotarem boas práticas na gestão da mudança de forma socialmente responsável. É de referir também que, em caso de encerramento de empresas, o empregador tem de respeitar as obrigações relativas à informação e consulta dos trabalhadores, em conformidade com a legislação da UE.

A Comissão não analisa o impacto das decisões de reestruturação adotadas por cada empresa.

Até à data, a Comissão não recebeu ainda qualquer pedido de financiamento ao abrigo do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização (FEG) relativamente aos despedimentos referidos pelos Senhores Deputados.

As informações sobre as organizações e empresas que beneficiaram de financiamento do orçamento da UE podem ser consultadas utilizando o motor de pesquisa criado no âmbito do Sistema de Transparência Financeira, disponível na página Web da DG BUDG, através do seguinte endereço:
http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_pt.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011922/13**
**to the Commission**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Lay-offs at Alcatel Lucent and at Siemens

It has recently been reported that Alcatel Lucent and Siemens plan to cut 25 000 jobs over the next two years.

The French-US group announced that it intends to lay off 10 000 workers between now and the end of 2015, with 4 100 jobs to go in Europe, 3 800 in the Middle East and Africa and 2 100 on the American continent.

The German multinational also said at the end of September that it will cut its worldwide workforce by 15 000 during the course of 2014. One third of the jobs affected will be at its industrial, energy and infrastructure units in Germany.

1. What steps has the Commission taken or does it intend to take in response to these announcements?

2. Has it assessed the impact of these decisions? Does it intend to do so?

3. Is it aware of any EU funding received to date by Alcatel Lucent and Siemens?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 December 2013)*

The Commission is aware of the situation at Alcatel Lucent and Siemens, but has no powers to interfere in company's decisions. It does, however, encourage employers to follow good practices in socially responsible management of change. It should also be noted that in case of closure of undertakings, the employer must respect obligations relating to information and consultation of workers in accordance with EC law.

The Commission does not analyse the impact of individual company restructuring decisions.

The Commission has not so far received any application for funding from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) related to the redundancies referred to by the Honourable Members.

Information on which organisations and companies have received funding form the EU budget may be found by using the search engine set up within the Financial Transparency System available on BudgWeb at the following address: http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_en.htm

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011923/13**
**à Comissão**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**
*(18 de outubro de 2013)*

*Assunto:* Trabalhadores portugueses explorados em Inglaterra

Recentemente, recebemos denúncias sobre a exploração a que foram submetidos um conjunto de trabalhadores portugueses contratados através de uma agência de trabalho inglesa, instalada no Estoril (Portugal), para trabalharem em Birmingham (Inglaterra).

Os trabalhadores foram aliciados por salários elevados apesar de terem de trabalhar 12 horas diárias sem período de descanso semanal. Em Inglaterra não lhe deram trabalho e nem lhe pagaram.

Após a presença dos funcionários consulares portugueses, solicitada que foi a sua intervenção, 29 trabalhadores fizeram um acordo com o empregador e vieram para Portugal. Outros, perante a promessa de melhores condições de trabalho, resolveram ficar. Contudo, o acordado não foi, mais uma vez, cumprido.

Este é mais um exemplo de como a profunda crise económica e social, que os programas de intervenção FMI-UE vieram agravar, nomeadamente em Portugal, tem empurrado muitos trabalhadores para fora do país, vulneráveis a todo o tipo de abusos e a situações de brutal exploração.

Em resposta a uma pergunta anterior (E-010509/2011), a Comissão refere que: «tem conhecimento de casos idênticos ocorridos em vários Estados-Membros. Por conseguinte, a Comissão tomará medidas para melhorar e reforçar a transposição, a aplicação e o cumprimento da Diretiva 96/71/CE, nomeadamente para prevenir e sancionar eventuais abusos ou evasão às normas aplicáveis».

Em face do exposto, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Tem conhecimento deste caso concreto?

2. Que medidas tomou, desde a resposta à pergunta E-010509/2011, para impedir situações como a descrita?

3. Tendo em conta a persistência destas situações, que medidas vai ainda adotar a Comissão?

**Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão**
*(12 de dezembro de 2013)*

1. A Comissão não tinha conhecimento da situação específica referida pelos Senhores Deputados.

2. Desde a resposta à pergunta E-10509/2011, a Comissão adotou uma proposta ([1]) de diretiva respeitante à execução da Diretiva 96/71/CE ([2]), destinada a melhorar, na prática, a aplicação, a execução e o cumprimento dessa diretiva pelos Estados-Membros, tendo em vista prevenir e punir a evasão às regras aplicáveis, bem como conferir uma melhor proteção aos trabalhadores destacados na UE. A proposta, que se encontra atualmente em exame pelo Conselho e o Parlamento, irá melhorar os instrumentos à disposição dos Estados-Membros para o acompanhamento e o cumprimento das disposições relativas às condições de emprego, nomeadamente através de regras que permitam a aplicação de coimas e sanções, para além de prever medidas destinadas a proporcionar aos trabalhadores e às empresas uma melhor informação sobre os seus direitos e deveres.

3. Para tornar mais eficaz a legislação da UE no domínio da livre circulação dos trabalhadores e da luta contra a discriminação em razão da nacionalidade, a Comissão adotou, em 26 de abril de 2013, uma proposta ([3]) de diretiva destinada a facilitar o exercício dos direitos dos trabalhadores da UE. A proposta, que também se encontra atualmente em exame pelo Conselho e o Parlamento, implica um maior respeito dos direitos existentes, obrigando os Estados-Membros da União a fornecer aos trabalhadores da UE informação relativa os seus direitos e mais assistência com vista ao exercício dos mesmos.

([1]) COM(2012) 131 — final de 21 de Março de 2012.
([2]) Diretiva 96/71/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 16 de dezembro de 1996, relativa ao destacamento de trabalhadores no âmbito de uma prestação de serviços, JO L 18 de 21.1.1997.
([3]) COM(2013) 236 final, de 26 de abril de 2013.

A Comissão relembra, porém, que o acompanhamento e a fiscalização do cumprimento das disposições nos domínios das condições de trabalho e de emprego, e bem assim da remuneração dos trabalhadores são da competência dos Estados-Membros, que possuem organismos especializados para efetuar controlos e determinar as ações corretivas necessárias, mormente as inspeções do trabalho.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011923/13**
**to the Commission**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Portuguese workers exploited in England

We recently received complaints concerning the exploitation of a group of Portuguese workers, who were offered jobs in Birmingham (England) through an English employment agency based in Estoril (Portugal).

The workers were attracted by the high wages, despite being required to work 12 hours a day, seven days a week. Once in England, they were neither given work nor paid.

Following the involvement of Portuguese consular staff, who were asked for assistance, 29 workers reached an agreement with the employer and returned to Portugal. Others decided to stay, having been promised better working conditions. Despite this, the agreement was again not honoured.

This is yet another example of the way in which the economic and social crisis, exacerbated by the EU-IMF intervention programmes, has forced many workers to seek employment outside Portugal, making them vulnerable to all forms of abuse and brutal exploitation.

In response to a previous Written Question (E-010509/2011, the Commission said that it was 'aware of similar cases which have occurred in several Member States. Therefore, the Commission will take measures aimed at improving and reinforcing the transposition, implementation and enforcement in practice of Directive 96/71/EC, which will include measures to prevent and sanction any abuse and circumvention of the applicable rules.'

1. Is the Commission aware of this specific case?

2. What steps has it taken since its reply to Written Question E-010509/2011 to prevent such situations recurring?

3. Given that such incidents continue to take place, what further action does the Commission plan to take?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**
*(12 December 2013)*

1. The Commission was not aware of the specific case referred to.

2. Since answering Question E-10509/2011, the Commission has adopted a proposal ([1]) for an enforcement directive to improve the way Directive 96/71/EC ([2]) is implemented, applied and enforced in practice by the Member States with a view to preventing, and providing for penalties for, the circumventing of the rules applicable and improving the protection of posted workers in the EU. The proposal, which is currently before the Council and Parliament, would improve the instruments available to the Member States for monitoring, and enforcing provisions on, employment conditions, *inter alia* through rules to allow the cross-border enforcement of administrative fines and penalties, in addition to measures to provide workers and companies with better information on their rights and obligations.

3. To make EC law on free movement of workers more effective and fight against discrimination on the basis of nationality and to free movement of workers, the Commission adopted a proposal ([3]) on 26 April 2013 for a directive to facilitate the exercise of rights of Union workers. The proposal, which is also currently before the Council and Parliament, involves better enforcement of existing rights and would require the Member States to provide Union workers with information on their rights and more assistance in asserting them.

The Commission would point out, however, that the monitoring and enforcement of provisions on working and employment conditions and the remuneration of workers fall within the competence of the Member States, which have specialised bodies, such as labour inspectorates, to carry out checks and determine the corrective measures required.

---

([1]) COM(2012) 131 final of 21 March 2012.
([2]) Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services, OJ L 18, 21.1.1997.
([3]) COM(2013) 236 final of 26 April 2013.

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011924/13**
**à Comissão**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**
*(18 de outubro de 2013)*

*Assunto:* Declarações da OIT sobre emprego precário

Segundo a Organização Internacional do Trabalho, dois terços dos trabalhadores não têm um emprego decente, carecem de direitos e de proteção social. Para além da precariedade em que se encontram dois mil milhões de um total de três mil milhões de trabalhadores, o diretor da OIT em Espanha denunciou ainda que cerca de 50 milhões de jovens engrossam todos os anos os números do desemprego, pelo que, concluiu, são necessários 250 milhões de postos de trabalho nos próximos cinco anos para manter a atual taxa de desocupação.

Em face destes números, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Pode garantir que os programas recentemente anunciados para promoção do emprego jovem não serão utilizados para promover formas diversas de trabalho precário?

2. Que medidas de combate ao trabalho precário estão em curso na UE neste momento?

3. Como justifica as pressões desenvolvidas pela Comissão, por via dos programas UE-FMI, para uma ainda maior precarização das relações laborais?

**Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão**
*(10 de dezembro de 2013)*

A Recomendação do Conselho relativa ao estabelecimento de uma «Garantia para a Juventude» ([1]) salienta que os jovens devem beneficiar de uma «boa oferta» (de emprego, aprendizado, estágio ou formação contínua). A Comissão sublinha a importância de essa oferta de qualidade constituir uma oferta individualizada relevante para a pessoa em causa, ajudando-a a desenvolver os seus pontos fortes, para que possa estabelecer-se adequadamente no mercado de trabalho.

A «Iniciativa para o Emprego dos Jovens» dará apoio financeiro às medidas tomadas pelos Estados-Membros no âmbito da «Garantia para a Juventude», atribuindo a mesma ênfase à qualidade das ofertas de emprego.

As informações relativas às medidas que visam combater o emprego precário nos Estados-Membros da UE podem ser consultadas no âmbito dos programas nacionais de reforma sobre as reformas estruturais e as medidas destinadas a estimular o crescimento e o emprego, que os Estados-Membros apresentam à Comissão no contexto do procedimento anual do Semestre Europeu.

Sobre as medidas tomadas a nível da UE, a Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta à pergunta escrita P-009626/2013 ([2]).

As recomendações procuram, em geral, estimular a criação de emprego e, simultaneamente, reduzir a precariedade também nos países apoiados pelos programas de assistência financeira.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:PT:PDF
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2013-009626&language=EN

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011924/13**
**to the Commission**
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* International Labour Organisation comments on precarious employment

According to the International Labour Organisation (ILO), two thirds of workers do not have decent work and have no rights or social protection. In addition to the precarious situation faced by 2 billion people — out of a total of 3 billion workers —, according to the head of the ILO in Spain, around 50 million young people swell the ranks of the unemployed every year; he has therefore concluded that 250 million jobs are needed in the next five years just to maintain the current level of unemployment.

In view of these figures:

1. Can the Commission guarantee that the recently announced programmes to promote youth employment will not be used to promote various forms of precarious employment?

2. What actions to combat precarious employment are currently under way in the EU?

3. How can the Commission justify pushing for even more insecure labour relations, through EU-IMF programmes?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

The Council Recommendation on Establishing a Youth Guarantee ([1]) stresses that a 'high-quality offer' (of employment, an apprenticeships, traineeship or continuous education) should be made to young people. The Commission stresses that a 'good-quality offer' should be an individualised offer meaningful for the person in question, helping them develop their strengths with a view to gaining a proper foothold in the labour market.

The Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) will provide financial support to the measures undertaken by Member States under the Youth Guarantee with the same focus on the quality of job offers.

Information on actions taken to combat precarious employment in the EU Member States can be found in the National Reform Programmes on structural reforms and measures to boost growth and jobs that the Member States submit to the Commission in the context of the yearly European Semester procedure.

As regards action at EU level, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-009626/2013 ([2]).

Recommendations are generally geared to stimulate job creation while reducing precariousness also in countries supported by financial assistance programmes.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:EN:PDF
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2013-009626&language=EN

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011925/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Ivo Belet (PPE)**
*(18 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Dimethylformamide

Veel bedrijven in de farmaceutische industrie, de agrochemie en de textielsector maken in hun productieprocessen gebruik van het solvent dimethylformamide. De producenten van dimethylformamide in de EU, vaak kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen, doen dit met inachtneming van strenge veiligheidsnormen. Als solvent in het productieproces zou dimethylformamide ook geen sporen in het eindproduct mogen achterlaten.

Het Europees Agentschap voor Chemische Stoffen werkt momenteel aan een aanbeveling om dimethylformamide op de autorisatielijst bij de REACH-verordening te plaatsen.

— Zal de Commissie dimethylformamide opnemen in de autorisatielijst?

— Heeft de Commissie weet van volwaardige alternatieven voor het gebruik van dimethylformamide?

— Hoe kan de Commissie verhinderen dat de productie en het gebruik van dimethylformamide in bepaalde productieprocessen in de toekomst enkel nog door bedrijven buiten de EU en in vele gevallen onder minder strikte veiligheidsvoorwaarden gebeurt, terwijl eindproducten op basis van een productieproces met dimethylformamide via import toch hun weg naar de Europese consument vinden?

**Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie**
*(3 januari 2014)*

De openbare raadpleging overeenkomstig artikel 58, lid 4, van Reach ([1]) over de ontwerpaanbeveling van het ECHA ([2]) om N,N-dimethylformamide (DMF) en vier andere stoffen op te nemen in de lijst van autorisatieplichtige stoffen ([3]), werd op 23 september 2013 afgesloten. De aanbeveling van het ECHA wordt momenteel afgerond en de Commissie verwacht dat zij deze begin 2014 ontvangt. De Commissie zal de aanbeveling tot wijziging van bijlage XIV dan overwegen. Het uiteindelijke doel van autorisatie is geleidelijke vervanging van zeer zorgwekkende stoffen (SVHC's) zoals DMF, voor zover dat economisch en technisch haalbaar is.

Het ECHA verstrekt een beknopte beoordeling van de mogelijke alternatieven voor DMF in het achtergronddocument bij zijn ontwerpaanbeveling. Volgens de bepalingen van Reach moeten de technische en economische geschiktheid en de beschikbaarheid van alternatieven voor bepaalde vormen van gebruik, alsook informatie over de risico's als gevolg van het specifieke gebruik echter per geval worden beoordeeld in de fase van de procedure die betrekking heeft op de aanvraag voor autorisatie. Dat er momenteel geen geschikte alternatieven beschikbaar zijn, speelt dus geen rol bij de opname van een stof in bijlage XIV.

Autorisatie in het kader van Reach geldt niet voor het gebruik van in de lijst van bijlage XIV opgenomen stoffen in productieprocessen buiten de EU. Als het gebruik van die stoffen in (onder meer ingevoerde) voorwerpen een risico voor de gezondheid of het milieu met zich meebrengt, kan een beperking worden ingevoerd overeenkomstig artikel 69, lid 2, van Reach om de situatie te verhelpen indien die stoffen in het afgewerkte voorwerp aanwezig zijn.

Voorts verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar het antwoord op schriftelijke vraag P-10744/2013 van mevrouw Emma McClarkin.

([1]) Verordening (EG) nr. 1907/2006 inzake de registratie en beoordeling van en de autorisatie en beperkingen ten aanzien van chemische stoffen (REACH).
([2]) Europees Agentschap voor chemische stoffen (ECHA).
([3]) Bijlage XIV bij Reach.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011925/13**
**to the Commission**
**Ivo Belet (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Dimethylformamide

Numerous companies in the pharmaceutical industry, agrochemical and textile sectors use the solvent dimethylformamide in their production processes. The producers of dimethylformamide in the EU, frequently small and medium-sized companies, perform this task in compliance with strict safety regulations. When used as a solvent in the production process, there should be no traces left either of dimethylformamide in the end product.

The European Chemicals Agency is currently working on a recommendation to place dimethylformamide on the REACH Regulation's authorisation list.

— Will the Commission include dimethylformamide in the authorisation list?

— Is the Commission aware of acceptable alternatives to using dimethylformamide?

— How can the Commission prevent dimethylformamide being produced and used in certain production processes in the future only by companies outside the EU and, in many cases, under less stringent safety conditions, with end products based on a production process using dimethylformamide still finding their way to European consumers via imports?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 January 2014)*

The public consultation in accordance with Article 58(4) of REACH ([1]) on ECHA ([2])'s draft recommendation suggesting to include N, N-Dimethylformamide (DMF) and four other substances in the list of substances subject to authorisation ([3]) ended on 23 September 2013. The ECHA recommendation is being finalised and the Commission expects to receive it at the beginning of 2014. The Commission will then consider the recommendation with a view to amend Annex XIV. The final objective of authorisation is to progressively substitute Substances of Very High Concern (SVHCs) such as DMF, where economically and technically viable.

ECHA provides a brief assessment of the possible alternatives to DMF in the background document to its draft recommendation. However, in line with REACH provisions, technical and economic suitability and availability of alternatives for particular uses, as well as information on the risks arising from the specific use are to be considered case-by-case at the application for authorisation stage of the process. The fact that there are no suitable alternatives available at present is thus not a relevant consideration for the purposes of including a substance in Annex XIV.

REACH authorisation does not apply to the use of substances listed in Annex XIV in the production processes outside the EU and in cases when these substances in articles (including those from imports) pose a risk to health or the environment, a restriction can be introduced in line with Article 69(2) of REACH in order to remedy the situation, when those substances are present in the final article.

The Commission would also like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to P-10744/2013 by Mrs Emma McClarkin.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restrictionof Chemicals (REACH).
([2]) European Chemicals Agency (ECHA).
([3]) Annex XIV of REACH.

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011926/13**
**aan de Commissie**
**Wim van de Camp (PPE)**
*(18 oktober 2013)*

*Betreft:* Diefstal van koper uit hoogspanningsmasten

Op 15 oktober 2013 verscheen in de Nederlandse krant *Algemeen Dagblad* een artikel over de diefstal van koper uit hoogspanningsmasten ([1]). Deze nieuwe vorm van diefstal, die uiterst gevaarlijk wordt geacht, veroorzaakt stroomonderbrekingen en kan tot levensgevaarlijke situaties leiden. Volgens de elektriciteitsbedrijven slagen de dieven er soms in meerdere kilometers koperkabel te stelen. Koperdiefstal is een aanhoudend probleem, niet alleen in Nederland maar ook in andere Europese landen zoals Duitsland, Engeland, Italië, Frankrijk, Luxemburg en België. Volgens diverse nieuwsbronnen zijn met name criminele organisaties uit Oost-Europa verantwoordelijk voor de diefstal van koper. Waar deze criminele organisaties in het verleden koperkabel stalen van de spoorwegen, koper van kerkdaken en metalen rioleringsdeksels op de openbare weg, richten ze hun inspanningen nu blijkbaar ook op andere doelwitten zoals hoogspanningsmasten. Volgens deskundigen verleggen de meeste Oost-Europese criminelen hun activiteiten zoals koperdiefstal naar landen in West-Europa omdat de kans dat ze gepakt worden gering is. Zelfs als deze criminelen worden gepakt, zijn de straffen die ze krijgen relatief mild ten opzichte van die in Oost-Europa.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze problemen met betrekking tot koperdiefstal?

2. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat de grootschalige diefstal van koper een probleem op EU-niveau is, en niet een dat enkel van nationaal belang is voor de betrokken lidstaten? Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Is Europol op de hoogte van het bestaan van criminele organisaties die verantwoordelijk zijn voor de diefstal van koper? Zo ja, wat is er geweten over deze organisaties?

4. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat de verschillen inzake strafrecht tussen West- en Oost-Europese landen voor koperdieven een grote drijfveer kunnen zijn om hun misdaden bijvoorbeeld in Nederland te plegen?

5. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat koperdieven in hun thuisland moeten worden vervolgd om ervoor te zorgen dat criminele organisaties niet langer kunnen profiteren van de verschillen tussen lidstaten inzake strafrecht? Zo nee, waarom niet?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie**
*(11 december 2013)*

De Commissie is op de hoogte van het probleem van de metaaldiefstal in de EU en ook van de grensoverschrijdende dimensie ervan. Metaaldiefstal is één van de belangrijkste thema's die vallen onder de prioriteit „door mobiele dadergroepen gepleegde diefstal van onroerend goed" in het kader van de huidige EU-beleidscyclus 2013-2017 inzake georganiseerde en zware criminaliteit.

De EU-beleidscyclus inzake georganiseerde en zware criminaliteit is een eerste waardevolle poging om op Europees niveau gezamenlijk grensoverschrijdende fenomenen aan te pakken volgens het concept van inlichtingengestuurde rechtshandhaving. De lidstaten voeren die beleidscyclus op vrijwillige basis uit met krachtige steun van Europol en de andere JBZ-agentschappen en in nauwe samenwerking met de Commissie. EMPACT (European Multidisciplinary Platform Against Criminal Threats) biedt het operationele platform voor de beleidscyclus, waarvan Europol de uitvoering beheert.

De Commissie kan de straffen voor koperdiefstal in de verschillende Europese lidstaten niet beoordelen. Het is niet aan de Commissie om te bepalen in welke lidstaat koperdieven moeten worden vervolgd.

([1]) http://www.ad.nl/ad/nl/1012/Nederland/article/detail/3527345/2013/10/15/Ex-militairen-ingezet-om-op-koperdieven-te-jagen.dhtml.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011926/13**
**to the Commission**
**Wim van de Camp (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Theft of copper from electricity pylons

On 15 October 2013, the Dutch newspaper *Algemeen Dagblad* reported on the theft of copper from electricity pylons ([1]). This new form of theft, considered to be extremely dangerous, causes power cuts and can lead to life-threatening situations. According to electricity companies, offenders manage to steal several kilometres of brass wire in some cases. The theft of copper is an ongoing problem in the Netherlands, as well as in other European countries such as Germany, England, Italy, France, Luxembourg and Belgium. According to several news sources, it is criminal organisations from Eastern Europe that are mainly responsible for the theft of copper. Whereas in the past these criminal organisations stole brass wire from railways, copper roofs from churches and iron storm drains from the streets, they now seem to direct their efforts towards targets such as electricity pylons as well. Experts maintain that most Eastern European criminals shift to activities such as copper theft in Western European countries because of the low risk of being caught. Even if these criminals are caught, the sentences imposed on them are relatively low compared with those in Eastern Europe.

1. Is the Commission aware of these problems relating to the theft of copper?

2. Does the Commission agree that the large-scale theft of copper is an EU-level problem, not just one of national significance to the Member States concerned? If not, why not?

3. Is Europol aware of the existence of the criminal organisations responsible for the theft of copper? If so, what is known about these organisations?

4. Does the Commission agree that the differences between Western and Eastern European countries when it comes to their criminal justice systems might be a major incentive for copper thieves to commit their crimes in the Netherlands, for example?

5. Does the Commission agree that copper thieves should be prosecuted in their home country, so as to ensure that criminal organisations can no longer benefit from the differences in legal systems between Member States? If not, why not?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**
*(11 December 2013)*

The Commission is aware of the problem of metal theft in the EU as well as of its cross-border dimension. Metal theft is one of the most important commodities covered by the priority 'organised property theft committed by mobile organised criminal groups' in the framework of the current policy cycle on serious and organised crime 2013-2017. The EU policy cycle on serious and organised crime is a valuable first attempt to base cooperation on cross-border crime phenomena at EU level on the concept of intelligence-led policing. It is conducted by Member States on a voluntary basis with strong support from Europol and the other JHA agencies and in close cooperation with the Commission. EMPACT, standing for European Multidisciplinary Platform Against Criminal Threats, provides the operational platform for policy cycle implementation, managed by Europol.

The Commission is not in a position to assess the relative sanctions against copper theft in different EU Member States. It is not for the Commission to decide on jurisdiction in cases of prosecution of cooper theft in the Member States of the EU.

([1]) http://www.ad.nl/ad/nl/1012/Nederland/article/detail/3527345/2013/10/15/Ex-militairen-ingezet-om-op-koperdieven-te-jagen.dhtml

*(Hrvatska verzija)*

**Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-011929/13**
**upućeno Komisiji**
**Dubravka Šuica (PPE)**
*(18. listopada 2013.)*

*Predmet:* Problem objektivnosti informiranja — Hrvatska radiotelevizija

Osnovna funkcija javnog servisa je objektivno, točno i nepristrano informiranje. U Rezoluciji koju je 1994. godine usvojilo Vijeće Europe naglašava se potreba podupiranja javnih radio-televizija i donosi se poseban zaključak u kojem stoji da javni model najbolje podupire vrijednost političkih, pravnih i društvenih struktura demokratskog društva, a osobito poštovanje ljudskih prava, kulture i političkog pluralizma. Dobro je poznato kolika je snaga televizije (i medija općenito) u kreiranju javnog mnijenja, stoga mi se posebno opasnim čini eventualna kohabitacija Vlade i visokopozicioniranih zaposlenika državne televizije.

Stoga se moram referirati na aktualnu situaciju u vezi s navedenim pitanjem u Republici Hrvatskoj. Saborska većina bira ravnatelja HRT-a, a saborsku većinu ima ista koalicija koja čini Vladu RH. Takvom većinom izabrano je trenutačno vodstvo HRT-a koje se miješa u program i bira kadrove sukladno političkoj orijentaciji. Štoviše, takva situacija omogućena je izmjenama i dopunama Zakona o HRT-u iz 2012. g. koji je Europska komisija ocijenila lošijim od zakona iz 2010. g. na osnovi kojeg je biranje vodećih ljudi televizije obavljano političkim konsenzusom parlamentarnih stranaka. Nažalost, toga više nema. Također evidentan je i trend filtriranja informacija, tj. selektivne distribucije informacija.

Sukladno tome molim Komisiju da odgovori:

1. Što Komisija radi kako bi potakla slobodu medija i pluralizam u Hrvatskoj?

2. Što Komisija planira učiniti na temelju javnih konzultacija o neovisnosti audiovizualnih regulatornih tijela?

**Odgovor gospođe Kroes u ime Komisije**
*(23. prosinca 2013.)*

Komisija u okviru svoje nadležnosti nastoji osigurati poštovanje slobode i pluralizma medija kako je utvrđeno u članku 11. Povelje Europske unije o temeljnim pravima te prati razvoj tih načela u državama članicama.

Komisija podržava ulogu javne radiodifuzije kao sastavnog dijela europske demokracije. Ugovorom se jasno određuje da su upravljanje i strateške odluke o javnoj usluzi radiodifuzije u nadležnosti država članica. Iako ne može određivati državama članicama kako da organiziraju svojeg pružatelja javne usluge radiodifuzije, Komisija pridaje veliku važnost ulozi koju dvojni sustav javnih i privatnih pružatelja usluga radiodifuzije ima u očuvanju pluralizma medija i promociji europskih vrijednosti. Slučaj koji je cijenjeni član opisao nije obuhvaćen područjem primjene zakonodavstva Europske unije. U skladu s člankom 51. stavkom 1. Povelja se primjenjuje na države članice samo kada primjenjuju zakonodavstvo Europske unije. Nadalje, u članku 6. stavku 1. Ugovora o Europskoj uniji navodi da se „Odredbama Povelje ni na koji način ne proširuju nadležnosti Unije kako su utvrđene u Ugovorima".

Javno savjetovanje o neovisnosti regulatornih tijela za audiovizualne medijske usluge pokazalo je da postoji potreba za boljom i sustavnijom suradnjom na višoj razini između regulatornih tijela u području audiovizualnih medijskih usluga. Komisija promišlja o mogućim daljnjim koracima i u kontekstu savjetovanja o budućnosti Direktive o audiovizualnim medijskim uslugama koja je uvrštena u raspored Programa prikladnosti i učinkovitosti propisa REFIT. Odgovori na ta savjetovanja uzet će se u obzir prilikom donošenja odluke o mogućim daljnjim mjerama u okviru nadležnosti Europske unije.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011929/13**
**to the Commission**
**Dubravka Šuica (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Problem of media objectivity — Croatian Radio Television (HRT)

The basic function of a public service broadcaster is to report the facts objectively, accurately, and impartially. In a resolution adopted in 1994 the Council of Europe pointed to the need to support public service (radio and television) broadcasting and explicitly stated that the public service model is best suited to supporting the values underlying the political, legal, and social structures of democratic societies, and in particular respect for human rights, culture, and political pluralism. That television, and the media in general, are powerful opinion-formers is well known, and that is why the possibility of collusion between a government and senior employees of a state television broadcaster is, to my mind, especially dangerous.

That is why I have to speak about the current situation in Croatia regarding this matter. The Director-General of HRT is chosen by the majority in Parliament, held by the coalition now serving in the Croatian Government. The present HRT management, chosen with the support of the above majority, interferes with programming and selects personnel according to their political leanings. Furthermore, this state of affairs has been brought about by the amendments introduced by the 2012 HRT Act, which the Commission has judged to be worse than the 2010 law, whereby television executives were to be selected on the basis of a consensus among the parties represented in Parliament. Sadly, that is no longer happening. There is also a visible tendency to filter information, in other words to disseminate it selectively.

In this connection:

1. What is the Commission doing to promote freedom of the media and pluralism in Croatia?

2. What does it plan to do in response to public consultations on the independence ofaudiovisual regulatory bodies?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission**
*(23 December 2013)*

The Commission seeks to ensure the respect of media freedom and pluralism enshrined in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union within its competences and follows related developments in Member States.

The Commission supports the role of public broadcasting as an integral part of European democracy. The Treaty makes it clear that the governance and strategic choices on public service broadcasting lie with Member States. So while the Commission cannot prescribe Member States how to organise their public service broadcaster, we attach special importance to the role of the dual system of public and commercial service broadcasters in preserving media pluralism and promoting European values. The case described by the Honourable Member falls outside the scope of European Union law. According to its Article 51(1), the Charter applies to Member States only when they are implementing European Union law. Moreover, Article 6(1) of the Treaty of the European Union states that, 'the provisions of the Charter shall not extend in any way the competences of the Union as defined in the Treaties.'

The public consultation on the independence of audiovisual regulatory bodies showed that there is a need for stronger, more regular and at higher level cooperation between the regulatory bodies in the field of audiovisual media services. The Commission will reflect on possible follow up steps also in the context of deliberations about the future of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive which has been included in the scheduling of the REFIT exercise. The decision on any possible follow-up actions within the limits of the competences of the European Union will take account of the responses to those consultations.

*(българска версия)*

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-011931/13**
**до Комисията**
**Mariya Gabriel (PPE)**
*(18 октомври 2013 г.)*

*Относно:* Огнища на болестите шап и шарка по домашните животни в погранични райони на Република България

В граничния с Турция район на Странджапланина в България периодично възникват огнища на болестите шап и шарка, както и на други заразни болести по домашните животни, като последният случай е от преди броени дни. За ограничаване и ликвидиране на болестите всички заразени и контактни домашни животни се избиват, което възпрепятства всякакви опити за развитие на животновъдството в района.

Тежкото положение на животновъдите в този район, както и неблагоприятните тенденции, свързани с обезлюдяване и лошо състояние на инфраструктурата, ограничават възможностите за развитие на икономически дейности и осигуряване на устойчив поминък на населението. В същото време в Република Турция животните не се избиват, а ваксинирането е позволено, което не е от полза за българските животновъди.

В тази връзка може ли ЕК да разясни:

Какви мерки са установени на равнище на ЕС за противодействие в случай на поява на огнища на болестите шап и шарка, както и на други заразни болести по домашните животни, с цел рационално развитие на селскостопанския сектор и защита на здравето на животните в ЕС?

Има ли възможност за изключение от европейската политика на неваксиниране на домашните животни за регионите по външната граница на ЕС, което е единственият изход за излизане от създалата се ситуация в България?

Под каква форма могат да бъдат отпуснати европейски средства за компенсации на стопаните за избитите животни и за изграждане на центрове, в които да бъдат настанявани контактни здрави животни при налагане на карантинни мерки?

**Отговор, даден от г-н Борг от името на Комисията**
*(3 декември 2013 г.)*

Всички държави — членки на ЕС, са признати от Световната организация за здравето на животните (OIE) за свободни от болестта шап без извършена ваксинация. Много други основни болести по животните също бяха успешно ликвидирани от територията на ЕС. Високият здравен статус на животните в ЕС улеснява развитието на животновъдството в целия Съюз и е от съществено значение за функционирането на единния пазар на животни и животински продукти.

В законодателството на Съюза за борба с редица основни екзотични болести по животните се предвижда избиване на заразените стада с цел бързо ликвидиране на болестта; в него, обаче, се предвижда и възможността за извършването на спешна ваксинация. По отношение на спешната ваксинация срещу болестта шап ЕС поддържа банка с антигени за изготвяне на ваксини, разрешени за употреба при животни, отглеждани за производство на храни. Що се отнася до шарката по овцете, в Съюза няма разрешена ваксина.

През последните години ЕС инвестира значителни средства в мерките за борба с болестта шап в Турция. През 2010 г. OIE призна европейската част на територията на Турция за зона, свободна от шап с извършена ваксинация. Ваксинацията в райони на ЕС, разположени в близост до Турция, не е необходима, и би могла да влоши здравния статус на животните в съответните държави членки.

В законодателството на Съюза относно разходите във ветеринарната област се предвижда финансова подкрепа за държавите членки за загубите, понесени от животновъдите в резултат на мерки за борба с болестта. Финансова и техническа подкрепа се предоставя и на България, Гърция и Турция за изпълняването на програма за ранно откриване и борба с болестта шап при селскостопанските и дивите животни в Тракийския регион.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011931/13**
**to the Commission**
**Mariya Gabriel (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and sheep and goat pox among domestic animals in border regions of Bulgaria

Bulgaria's Strandzha Mountains region bordering Turkey regularly experiences outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and sheep and goat pox, as well as other infectious diseases affecting domestic animals, with the most recent incident occurring a few days ago. To contain and eradicate the diseases, all domestic animals which have been infected by or come into contact with them are culled, thereby thwarting any attempts to develop livestock farming in the region.

The difficult situation facing livestock farmers in this region, along with the adverse trends relating to depopulation and the poor state of the infrastructure, is restricting the opportunities for developing economic activities and providing a sustainable livelihood for the population. At the same time, animals are not being culled in Turkey, but vaccination is permitted, which is of no benefit to Bulgarian livestock farmers.

In this context, can the Commission explain the following?

What counter-measures are being implemented at EU level in the event of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease and sheep and goat pox, as well as of other infectious diseases among domestic animals, aimed at the realistic development of the agricultural sector and protecting animal health in the EU?

Is there any chance of exempting from the EU's policy of not vaccinating domestic animals the regions at the EU's external border, which is the only way out of the situation which has developed in Bulgaria?

What form can the European funds take which are awarded in compensation to farmers for the animals which have been culled and for building centres where healthy animals which have been in contact with the diseases will be housed, as part of implementing quarantine measures?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

All EU Member States are recognised by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) as free from foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) without vaccination. Many other major animal diseases have also been successfully eradicated from the EU. A high animal health status in the EU facilitates the development of animal husbandry throughout the Union and it is essential for the functioning of the single market in animals and their products.

Union law on the control of several major exotic animal diseases requires stamping out of the infected herds, to achieve rapid eradication; however, it also foresees the possibility to apply emergency vaccination. For emergency vaccination against FMD, the EU maintains an antigen bank for the formulation of vaccines authorised for the use in food producing animals. In the case of sheep pox, there is no authorised vaccine available in the Union.

During the past years, the EU substantially invested in the control of FMD in Turkey. In 2010 the OIE recognised the European part of Turkey as a zone free of FMD, with vaccination. Vaccination in areas of the EU close to Turkey appears unnecessary and would lower the current animal health status of the Member States in question.

Union law on expenditures in the veterinary field foresees financial support to Member States for losses incurred by farmers as a result of disease control measures. Financial and technical support is also provided to Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey to implement a programme for the early detection and control of FMD in livestock and wildlife in the Thrace region.

*(Wersja polska)*

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011932/13**
**do Komisji**
**Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)**
*(18 października 2013 r.)*

*Przedmiot:* Paliwa z alg

Parlament Europejski podejmuje działania do szybkiego przejścia na biopaliwa nowej generacji, które są uzyskiwane z alternatywnych źródeł energii takich jak wodorosty, odpady czy algi. Kraje członkowskie UE są zobowiązane, aby do 2020 r. zapewnić przynajmniej 10 % udział energii odnawialnej w całkowitej energii użytej w transporcie.

Olej z alg to kolejny pomysł na zastąpienie ropy naftowej biopaliwami. Z prowadzonych badań wynika, że olej algowy ma wszystkie właściwości oleju napędowego, dzięki czemu może sprawdzić się jako paliwo. Wielu przedsiębiorców i laboratoria prowadzą obecnie badania na ten temat, a nowe hodowle chcą produkować coraz więcej oleju z alg i uruchamiać produkcję na skalę przemysłową.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z następującymi zapytaniami do Komisji Europejskiej:

— czy Komisja prowadzi badania w przedmiotowej sprawie lub monitoruje technologie produkcji oleju z alg?

— czy Komisja posiada informacje, ile fotobioreaktorów (do produkcji i hodowli alg na skalę przemysłową) występuje w państwach członkowskich?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Máire Geoghegan-Quinn w imieniu Komisji**
*(3 grudnia 2013 r.)*

Rozwój bezpiecznych, niezawodnych, przystępnych cenowo i ekologicznych technologii energetycznych w Europie do 2020 r. jest dla Unii Europejskiej sprawą priorytetową.

UE wspierała badania naukowe nad zaawansowanymi biopaliwami w ramach 7PR ([1]), w tym badania nad biopaliwami z alg, zgodnie z wymogami w zakresie zrównoważonego rozwoju określonymi w dyrektywie w sprawie odnawialnych źródeł energii ([2]). Wkład UE w ramach tematu „Energia" zawartego w 7PR sięgnął 30 mln EUR, które przeznaczono na siedem projektów ([3]) w tej dziedzinie (z czego trzy to projekty w skali demonstracyjnej). Planuje się realizację dalszych projektów w ramach programu „Horyzont 2020" – kolejnego finansowanego przez UE programu w zakresie badań naukowych i innowacji (2014-2020), w którym przyjęto podejście zorientowane na wyzwania. Zaproszenia do składania wniosków mają zostać opublikowane w dniu 11 grudnia 2013 r. na portalu dla uczestników programu ramowego ([4]).

Ponadto Komisja wspiera rozwój zaawansowanych biopaliw na skalę przemysłową w kontekście europejskiej inicjatywy przemysłowej na rzecz bioenergii w ramach planu EPSTE ([5]). UE wspiera rozwój tych technologii na szeroką skalę również w ramach systemu ETS ([6]) poprzez program NER 300 ([7]), przeznaczając 300 mln przydziałów na projekty demonstracyjne obejmujące biopaliwa z alg, a także poprzez programy realizowane w ramach funduszy strukturalnych i Funduszu Spójności ([8]) oraz poprzez mechanizm finansowania oparty na podziale ryzyka obsługiwany przez Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny. Komisja nadzoruje wszystkie technologie wykorzystywane do produkcji biopaliw za pomocą narzędzia BIOMAP ([9]), a także poprzez wspieranie Europejskiej Platformy Technologicznej „Biopaliwa" ([10]), w ramach której prowadzona jest baza danych obejmująca badania naukowe oraz projekty demonstracyjne i przemysłowe.

Obecnie w Europie nie ma fotobioreaktorów do produkcji biopaliw na skalę przemysłową. Istnieje jednak kilka fotobioreaktorów produkujących algi na skalę handlową w celu pozyskiwania produktów o wartości dodanej (np. kosmetyków). Dokładna liczba tych fotobioreaktorów nie jest znana.

---

([1]) Siódmy program ramowy w zakresie badań, rozwoju technologicznego i demonstracji (PR7, 2007-2013).
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:140:0016:0062:pl:PDF
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/projects_pl.html
Projekty: AQUAFUELS, BIOWALK4BIOFUELS, DEMA, FUEL4ME, ALL-GAS, BIOFAT, INTESUSAL.
([4]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/technology/initiatives/doc/implementation_plan_2010_2012_eii_bioenergy.pdf
([6]) System handlu emisjami.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/funding/ner300/index_en.htm
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/prordn/index_pl.cfm
([9]) http://setis.ec.europa.eu/BIOMAP/#31016
([10]) http://www.biofuelstp.eu/

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011932/13**
**to the Commission**
**Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Fuel produced from algae

The European Parliament is taking measures to accelerate the transition to next-generation biofuels derived from alternative energy sources, such as seaweed, waste and algae. EU Member States are required to ensure that by 2020 renewable energy makes up at least 10% of their total energy used in transport.

Using oil from algae is the latest idea for replacing gas oil with biofuels. Studies show that algae oil has all the properties of gas oil and that it can therefore be used as a fuel. Many companies and laboratories are currently conducting research into this field, and new farms want to step up production of oil from algae to an industrial scale.

Can the Commission please state:

— whether it is carrying out research in this field or monitoring the technologies for producing oil from algae?

— whether it knows how many photobioreactors (for the production and cultivation of algae on an industrial scale) exist in the Member States?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

Developing safe, reliable, affordable and clean energy technologies for Europe by 2020 is of prime concern to the European Union.

The EU supported research on advanced biofuels under FP7 ([1]), including research on biofuels from algae, in line with the sustainability requirements of the Renewable Energy Directive ([2]). Under the Energy Theme of FP7, the EU contribution reached EUR 30 million for seven projects ([3]) on this subject (three of which at demonstration scale). More projects are expected under Horizon 2020, the next EU funding Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), which adopts a challenge-based approach. The calls for proposals are expected to open in the participant's portal ([4]) on 11 December 2013.

In addition, the Commission is encouraging, within the context of the SET-Plan ([5]) European Industrial Bioenergy Initiative, the development of advanced biofuels at an industrial scale. The EU also supports these technologies at large scale under the ETS ([6]) through the NER 300 Programme ([7]) with 300 million allowances for demonstration projects including biofuels from algae, as well as under the Structural and Cohesion Funds Programmes ([8]), and through the Risk-Sharing Financing Facility operated by the European Investment Bank. The Commission is monitoring all technologies producing biofuels in BIOMAP ([9]) and also via a support to the European Biofuels Technology Platform ([10]), which is maintaining a database on research, demonstration and industrial projects.

Currently, there are no industrial scale photobioreactors for producing biofuels in Europe. However, there are a few commercial scale photobioreactors producing algae for the purpose of extracting added-value products (e.g. cosmetics). The exact number is not known.

---

([1]) The Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:140:0016:0062:en:PDF
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/projects_en.html
Projects AQUAFUELS, BIOWALK4BIOFUELS, DEMA, FUEL4ME, ALL-GAS, BIOFAT, INTESUSAL.
([4]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/technology/initiatives/doc/implementation_plan_2010_2012_eii_bioenergy.pdf
([6]) Emission Trading System.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/funding/ner300/index_en.htm
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/prordn/index_en.cfm
([9]) http://setis.ec.europa.eu/BIOMAP/#31016
([10]) http://www.biofuelstp.eu/

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011933/13**
**à la Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(18 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Sécurité des consommateurs et des touristes dans les infrastructures hôtelières

En 25 ans, quels progrès ont été réalisés pour garantir une «protection adéquate» des voyageurs, protection à laquelle ils sont en droit de prétendre en vertu de la recommandation du Conseil en la matière?

En effet, ni la Commission, ni l'industrie hôtelière ne peuvent prouver de façon claire que la sécurité en cas d'incendie dans les hôtels de l'Union ait été améliorée depuis 1986. Il conviendrait à l'avenir de corriger cette défaillance.

Les personnes sont les plus vulnérables à la fumée et au feu lorsqu'elles sont endormies, particulièrement si elles se trouvent dans un endroit qui ne leur est pas familier, sans connaissance des issues de secours, ou dans un pays étranger dont elles risquent de ne comprendre ni la signalétique, ni la langue. Compte tenu du vieillissement de la population, et donc du nombre croissant de touristes «senior», les risques sont plus élevés que jamais.

Quelles sont les mesures envisagées par la Commission en matière de sécurité en cas d'incendie pour le secteur du tourisme dans l'Union européenne, un secteur critique pour la prospérité économique de celle-ci et pour son image de destination prisée par les touristes?

**Réponse donnée par by M. Mimica au nom de la Commission**
*(2 décembre 2013)*

La révision éventuelle de la recommandation 86/666 CEE concernant la sécurité des hôtels existants contre les risques d'incendie ([1]) fait l'objet d'un débat en cours impliquant les parties intéressées.

L'application et l'efficacité de la recommandation ont fait l'objet de diverses études ([2]) et collectes d'information de la part des États membres.

En juin 2012, les services de la Commission ont organisé un atelier destiné aux parties concernées pour discuter de la possibilité d'une révision de la recommandation du Conseil fondée sur une initiative d'autorégulation dans une partie de l'industrie hôtelière. Cependant, le résultat de cet exercice n'a pas été concluant.

Les services de la Commission réfléchissent actuellement à la possibilité et à la manière d'apporter éventuellement une solution à l'échelle de l'UE au problème de la sécurité des touristes dans les infrastructures hôtelières, notamment en cas d'incendie.

([1]) JO L 384 du 31.12.1986, pp. 60-68.
([2]) Étude sur la sécurité incendie dans les hôtels et les établissements d'hébergement de la Communauté Européenne, par Ceten-Apave, 1996; analyse de la mise en œuvre de la recommandation 86/666 CEE concernant la sécurité des hôtels existants contre les risques d'incendie, par S. Kidd, 2000; sécurité des hôtels européens contre les risques d'incendie, par S.D. Christian, 2002.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011933/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Consumer and tourist accommodation safety

After 25 years, what progress has been made towards guaranteeing travellers the 'adequate protection' to which they should be entitled under the terms of the relevant Council recommendation?

Neither the Commission nor the hotel industry can effectively demonstrate that fire safety in hotels has improved across the EU since 1986. This failure must be corrected for the future.

People are most vulnerable to smoke and fire when asleep and especially when in unfamiliar accommodation, with no knowledge of escape routes, or when abroad where languages and signs may be unfamiliar. With an ageing population resulting in increasing numbers of 'senior' tourists, the risks are more acute than ever.

What plans does the Commission have to address fire safety in the European tourism sector, a sector that is critical for the EU's economic well-being, as well as for the EU's image as a desirable destination?

**Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission**
*(2 December 2013)*

The possible revision of the Council Recommendation 86/666 EEC on Fire Safety in Existing Hotels ([1]) is the subject of an ongoing debate involving relevant stakeholders.

The implementation and effectiveness of the recommendation was subject to different studies ([2]) and information gathering from Member States.

In June 2012, the Commission services organised a stakeholder workshop to discuss the possibility of a revision of the Council Recommendation based on a self-regulatory initiative developed by part of the hospitality industry. However, the outcome of this exercise was not conclusive.

The Commission services are currently considering options on whether and how the issue of consumer safety in the area of tourism accommodation, including fire safety, could possibly be addressed at EU level.

([1]) OJ L 384, 31.12.1986, p. 60-68.
([2]) Étude sur la sécurité incendie dans les hôtels et les établissements d'hébergement de la Communauté Européenne, by CETEN-APAVE, 1996; Analysis of the implementation of the 1986 EC Recommendation on Fire Safety in Existing Hotels, by S. Kidd, 2000; Fire Safety in European Hotels by S.D. Christian, 2002.

*(Hrvatska verzija)*

**Pitanje za pisani odgovor P-011934/13**
**upućeno Komisiji**
**Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)**
*(18. listopada 2013.)*

*Predmet:* Kriminalizacija beskućništva

U cijeloj Europi postoji tendencija prema represivnim administrativnim režimima na lokalnoj razini čiji su čest rezultat kršenje temeljnih ljudskih prava osoba koje se nalaze u posebno osjetljivom položaju kao što su beskućnici, migranti, siromašni i oni koji izlaze iz zatvora, a koje se sve više kažnjava samo zbog njihova položaja. U nekim su slučajevima te osobe isključene iz samih socijalnih programa ili stambenih projekata koji su oblikovani kako bi se ljudima pomoglo da se integriraju ili reintegriraju u društvo.

Lokalne vlasti koriste se mjerama za kriminalizaciju svakodnevnih aktivnosti beskućnika u njihovoj borbi za preživljavanje. Te mjere mogu poprimiti oblik zakonskih propisa protiv prosjačenja, zabrane spavanja na otvorenom i uzimanja predmeta iz kanti za smeće, ili prisiljavanja ljudi na „pokret". Nakon što su jednom optuženi, beskućnicima je vrlo teško, ako ne i nemoguće, pristupiti pravdi.

Socijalna politika i poticanje socijalnog uključivanja oduvijek su se nalazili visoko na dnevnom redu socijalnih demokratskih vlada.

Kao i druge države članice posljednjih je godina i Hrvatska doživjela porast broja ljudi koji žive u siromaštvu. Oni su ranjivi članovi društva i imaju puno pravo na uživanje svojih temeljnih prava i sloboda na razini EU-a i na razini države članice.

U relevantnim ugovorima između ostalog se naglašava obveza Unije da se bori protiv socijalne isključenosti i diskriminacije, da promiče socijalnu pravdu i zaštitu, te da pridonosi iskorjenjivanju siromaštva i solidarnosti među građanima. Postoji potpuna zabrana podvrgavanja drugog ljudskog bića nečovječnom ili ponižavajućem postupanju ili kažnjavanju, u skladu s člankom 4. Povelje Europske unije o temeljnim pravima.

Nije socijalno pravedno da neke zemlje kriminaliziraju beskućništvo, dok mnoge druge čine sve kako bi svojim građanima omogućile da, primjerice, zadrže svoju imovinu unatoč nezaposlenosti i/ili nemogućnosti ispunjavanja svojih kreditnih obveza, a sve to imajući na umu da je, s obzirom na to da ekonomska kriza traje već pet godina, vrlo vjerojatno da će broj ljudi koji žive u siromaštvu i dalje rasti.

Koje pravne radnje Komisija namjerava poduzeti kako bi osigurala zaštitu vrijednosti i temeljnih prava građana, kako je opisano u Ugovorima, kako bi državama članicama bilo nemoguće usvojiti mjere ili zakonodavstvo u tom području koje bi negativno utjecalo na beskućnike?

**Odgovor gđe Reding u ime Komisije**
*(4. prosinca 2013.)*

Komisija upućuje časnog zastupnika na njezin pisani upit E-007293/2013.

Komisija će nastaviti pružati potporu državama članicama, koje imaju glavnu odgovornost boriti se protiv beskućništva, politikom EU-a i korištenjem sredstava EU-a. Sredstva EU-a dostupna su za financiranje aktivnosti za bolju socijalnu integraciju beskućnika, uključujući bolji pristup kvatitetnim uslugama i socijalnom stanovanju. Komisija je predložila, u sklopu sljedećeg višegodišnjeg financijskog okvira, daljnje povećanje sredstava za promicanje socijalne uključenosti i borbe protiv siromaštva.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011934/13**
**to the Commission**
**Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Criminalisation of homelessness

There is a tendency across Europe to move towards repressive administrative regimes at local level that often result in violations of the fundamental rights of people in vulnerable situations such as the homeless, migrants, the poor and prison leavers, who are increasingly being punished simply because of their situation. In some cases they are excluded from the very social programmes or housing projects that are designed to help people integrate or reintegrate into society.

Local authorities use measures to criminalise the everyday activities of the homeless in their struggle for survival. These may take the form of anti-begging legislation, bans on sleeping rough and removing items from rubbish bins, or forcing people to 'move on'. Once charged, homeless people find it very difficult, if not impossible, to access justice.

Social policy and the promotion of social inclusion have always been high on the agenda of social democratic governments.

Just like the other Member States, Croatia has, in recent years, witnessed an increase in the number of people living in poverty. These are vulnerable members of society and are fully entitled to enjoy their fundamental rights and freedoms at EU and Member State level.

The relevant treaties stress, *inter alia*, the Union's obligation to combat social exclusion and discrimination, to promote social justice and protection, and to contribute to the eradication of poverty and to solidarity among citizens. There is a blanket ban on the subjection of another human being to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

It is not socially just that some countries are criminalising homelessness while many others do their utmost to enable their citizens to, for instance, retain their property despite being unemployed and/or unable to meet their loan obligations, all that bearing in mind that, given that the economic crisis has been ongoing for five years, it is highly likely that the number of people living in poverty will continue to rise.

What legal action does the Commission intend to take in order to ensure that citizens' values and fundamental rights are protected as enshrined in the Treaties, such as to make it impossible for Member States to adopt measures or legislation in this area which would impact negatively on the homeless?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**
*(4 December 2013)*

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007293/2013.

The Commission will also continue to provide support to Member States — who have the primary responsibility to combat homelessness — through EU policy work and the use of EU funds. EU funds are available to finance actions for better social integration of homeless people, including improved access to quality services and social housing. The Commission has proposed, under the next multiannual financial framework, to further increase funds to promote social inclusion and combat poverty.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-011935/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Giovanni La Via (PPE)**
*(18 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Finanziamento di opere progettate su incarichi legittimamente conferiti prima della legge 109/1994 «Legge quadro in materia di lavori pubblici»

Al fine di usufruire di risorse comunitarie, numerosi comuni siciliani hanno presentato progetti redatti da tecnici, ai quali l'incarico professionale era stato conferito prima dell'entrata in vigore delle norme che impongono gare di evidenza pubblica per l'affidamento degli incarichi.

Inoltre, prima della riforma dei lavori pubblici, di cui alla legge 109/94, il ricorso all'accordo condizionato era spesso l'unico sistema che consentiva ai committenti di potersi dotare di un parco progetti generale o comunque di progetti di opere pubbliche il cui livello di progettazione esecutiva era vincolante o comunque determinante per l'ottenimento del relativo finanziamento.

La regione siciliana, con l'art. 41, comma 4, della legge regionale 2.8.2001 n. 7, nel testo modificato con la legge regionale 19 maggio 2003 n.7, ha fatto salvi e considerato legittimi i vecchi incarichi, dichiarando un principio pacifico: la disciplina della formazione di un atto è quella vigente nel momento in cui l'atto viene formato.

In qualche bando è evidenziato che gli affidamenti di incarico professionale devono effettuarsi attraverso procedure di evidenza pubblica, pena l'inammissibilità della relativa spesa a valere sulle risorse comunitarie di cui al bando medesimo.

Si consideri che l'avvio di procedure per il conferimento di incarichi relativi ad opere già progettate o in corso di progettazione (per le quali era stato già conferito incarico prima del recepimento delle direttive europee in materia) aprirebbe un probabile contenzioso tra professionisti e enti pubblici con la sicura soccombenza di questi ultimi e con l'inutile spesa per progettazione di servizi di cui non si è realmente fruito.

In considerazione di quanto precede, può la Commissione confermare l'ammissibilità a finanziamento, assieme alle relative competenze tecniche professionali negli stessi previste, dei progetti e domande i cui atti di conferimento degli incarichi per servizi tecnici professionali, sono stati conferiti senza procedure di evidenza pubblica, prima dell'entrata in vigore in Italia della L.109/1994, emanata in armonia alle direttive europee in materia di lavori pubblici, così come recepita in Sicilia dalla legge regionale 2.8.2002, n.7, e successive modifiche ed integrazioni?

**Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione**
*(3 dicembre 2013)*

In base alla giurisprudenza consolidata, nel determinare la legislazione dell'UE applicabile alla decisione di un'amministrazione aggiudicatrice relativa al tipo di procedura da seguire e alla necessità della preventiva pubblicazione del bando di gara, occorre tener conto, di norma, del momento in cui tale decisione è stata adottata. Sulla base delle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato, la Commissione non è in grado di stabilire quando è stata adottata la decisione relativa al tipo di procedura da seguire per l'aggiudicazione dei contratti di servizio pubblico citati per la progettazione di lavori, e pertanto di determinare se i contratti sono stati aggiudicati in violazione del diritto comunitario/dell'UE allora in vigore.

Per quanto riguarda l'ammissibilità al finanziamento dell'UE dei progetti menzionati dall'onorevole deputato, i finanziamenti dell'UE possono essere concessi solamente a progetti pienamente conformi alla normativa dell'UE applicabile, comprese le norme in materia di appalti pubblici.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-011935/13**
**to the Commission**
**Giovanni La Via (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Funding for projects for which contracts were legitimately awarded prior to the entry into force of Italian Framework Law 109/1994 on public works

When applying for EU funding, many municipal councils in Sicily have submitted proposals, drawn up by specialists, for which the works contracts were awarded prior to the entry into force of rules requiring that such contracts be awarded on the basis of public tendering procedures.

Prior to the reform of public works contracts under Law 109/1994, agreements conditional on obtaining public funding were often the only way for commissioning councils to embark on a general set of projects or public works projects. The quality of the executive planning for these projects was thus a key — if not to say decisive — factor in securing financing.

Under Article 41(4) of Regional Law No 7 of 2 August 2002, as amended by Regional Law No 7 of 19 May 2003, the Sicilian Regional Government made an exception for contracts awarded under the old system and declared them legitimate, setting out the clear principle that the rules applicable to the conclusion of contracts should be the ones in force when they were drawn up.

Some invitations to tender state that works contracts need to be awarded on the basis of public tendering procedures in order for the expenditure under those contracts to be eligible for the EU funding referred to in the invitation to tender.

However, initiating such procedures when awarding contracts for projects that have already been planned or are currently being planned (and for which contracts were awarded prior to the adoption of the EU directive in question) would likely result in legal disputes between professionals and public bodies, which the latter would most certainly lose, and mean that the amounts outlaid on planning for services not actually used would be wasted.

In the light of the above, can the Commission state whether specialist services projects and project applications — and the specialist tasks these entail — for which contracts were awarded without a public tendering procedure prior to the entry into force in Italy of Law 109/1994 — adopted in line with EU public works directives and transposed in Sicily by means of Regional Law No 7 of 2 August 2002, as subsequently amended and supplemented — are eligible for EU funding?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

According to settled case-law, in determining the applicable EU legislation to a decision by a contracting authority concerning the type of procedure to be followed and whether it is necessary that a prior call for competition is published, account must be taken, as a rule, of the point in time at which that decision was adopted. On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission cannot establish when the decision concerning the type of procedure to be followed for the award of the mentioned public service contracts for the design of works was adopted, and therefore whether the contracts have been awarded in breach of the Community/EC law applicable at the time.

With respect to the eligibility for EU funding of the projects mentioned by the Honourable Member, EU funding can only be granted to projects fully complying with all applicable EC law including on public procurement.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011937/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Webanwendungsentwicklung für die Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([1]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 ein Ausschreibungsverfahren für „Web application development, software maintenance and remote support to stakeholder services" im Umfang von 360 000 EUR vor.

1. Für welchen Zweck soll eine Webanwendung für die Agentur erstellt beziehungsweise gewartet werden?

2. Warum setzt die Agentur diese Kostenhöhe an?

3. Für welche Akteure ist Fernbetreuung zur Nutzung der Anwendung notwendig?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011938/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Personal der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([1]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 Personalkosten von 10 117 941 EUR vor. Für das Jahr 2013 waren noch 5 886 199 EUR vorgesehen. Im Jahr 2013 waren 49, für das Jahr 2014 sind 98 Stellen vorgesehen.

Warum bedarf die Agentur einer Verdoppelung des Personals?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011939/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Immobilien der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([1]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 Kosten von 1 439 960 EUR für Mieten und damit verbundene Kosten vor. Für das Jahr 2013 waren noch 1 120 000 EUR vorgesehen.

1. Welche Immobilien mietet die Agentur an?

2. Welche Quadratmeterzahl und welche Quadratmeterkosten haben diese Immobilien jeweils?

3. Welche Kosten sind mit jeder dieser Immobilien jeweils verbunden?

4. Wie genau erklärt sich die Steigerung um 319 960 EUR in nur einem Jahr?

5. Besitzt die Agentur auch eigene Immobilien oder plant sie, solche zu bauen oder zu erwerben?

([1]) http://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Acts_of_the_Agency/Publication/ACER%20Work%20Programme%202014.pdf

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011940/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Webseiten der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([2]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 einen Betrag von 314 600 EUR für „Stakeholder involvement, public relations and website" vor; für das Jahr 2013 waren noch 127 875 EUR vorgesehen. Ebenfalls sieht die Agentur ein Ausschreibungsverfahren für „Technical assistance for the Agency's website set-up and maintenance" im Wert von 60 000 EUR vor.

1. Wie genau berechnet die Agentur die vorgesehenen Kosten für den genannten Haushaltsposten von 314 600 EUR?

2. Welcher spezifischen Dienstleistungen bedarf die Agentur, für die sie das genannte Ausschreibungsverfahren vorsieht? Über wie viele Webpräsenzen verfügt die Agentur?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011941/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* „Operational Missions" der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([2]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 einen Betrag von 369 200 EUR für „Operational Missions" vor. Im Jahr 2013 waren es 225 000 EUR.

1. Welche „Operational Missions" führte die Agentur in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 jeweils durch?

2. Warum errechnet die Agentur von 2013 bis 2014 einen fast verdoppelten Kostenaufwand für „Operational Missions"?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011942/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Veranstaltungen der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([2]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 einen Betrag von 12 000 EUR (S. 28) für Empfänge und Veranstaltungen vor, sie sieht jeweils Vertragsvolumen von 60 000 EUR für das Catering von Veranstaltungen der Agentur wie für Konferenzräume der Agentur vor (S. 74). Im selben Arbeitsprogramm werden nur zwei vorgesehene Veranstaltungen ausdrücklich genannt, die Jahreskonferenz, für welche die Agentur mindestens 150 Teilnehmer erwartet (S. 15), sowie ein Workshop zum Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur, für welches die Agentur 5 Teilnehmer erwartet (S. 16). In den Jahren 2012 und 2013 nahmen 1 bzw. 3 Teilnehmer an dem Workshop teil.

1. Plant die Agentur weitere Veranstaltungen? Wenn ja, welche? Wie hoch schätzt die Agentur jeweils die Kosten für die beiden genannten Veranstaltungen sowie jede weitere Veranstaltungen?

2. Für welche der Veranstaltungen sollen Ausschreibungen erfolgen?

3. Warum führt die Agentur einen Workshop erneut durch, der in den vergangenen beiden Jahren jeweils weniger als 5 Teilnehmer hatte?

4. Welche Kosten fielen in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 jeweils für den Workshop an?

([2]) http://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Acts_of_the_Agency/Publication/ACER%20Work%20Programme%202014.pdf

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011971/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Sitzungsausgaben der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 sieht die Agentur für 2014 einen Haushaltsposten von 322 839 EUR für „Meeting Expenses“ vor. Im Jahr 2013 waren 367 609 EUR vorgesehen.

1. Welche Sitzungen fanden in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 jeweils statt?

2. Wie viele Personen nahmen an diesen Sitzungen jeweils teil?

3. Welche Kosten fielen für jede dieser Sitzungen an?

**Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission**
*(10. Dezember 2013)*

Die Kommission hat die Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) gebeten, die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu beantworten.

Die Kommission wird die Antwort der Agentur so schnell wie möglich an den Herrn Abgeordneten weiterleiten.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011937/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Web application development for the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([1]) the Agency provides for a tendering procedure for 2014 for 'web application development, software maintenance and remote support to stakeholder services' for an amount of EUR 360 000.

1. For what purpose is a web application to be developed or maintained for the Agency?

2. Why is the Agency setting the costs at this level?

3. For which stakeholders is remote support necessary for the use of the application?

**Question for written answer E-011938/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Staff of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([1]) the Agency provides for an appropriation of EUR 10 117 941 for staff expenditure for 2014. For 2013, an amount of EUR 5 886 199 was provided for. The number of posts envisaged was 49 in 2013 and 98 in 2014.

Why does the Agency need to double its complement of staff?

**Question for written answer E-011939/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Property belonging to the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([1]) the Agency provides for costs of EUR 1 439 960 for rent and associated costs for 2014. For 2013, an amount of EUR 1 120 000 was provided for.

1. What properties does the Agency rent?

2. What is the size of each of these properties in square metres and what do they cost per square metre?

3. What costs are associated with each of these properties?

4. What exactly is the explanation for the increase of EUR 319 960 in just one year?

5. Does the Agency also have property of its own or does it plan to build or acquire property of its own?

([1]) http://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Acts_of_the_Agency/Publication/ACER%20Work%20Programme%202014.pdf

**Question for written answer E-011940/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Websites of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([2]) the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2014 of EUR 314 600 for 'Stakeholder involvement, public relations and website'. For 2013, another EUR 127 875 was provided for. The Agency also provides for a tendering procedure for 'technical assistance for the Agency's website set-up and maintenance' to the value of EUR 60 000.

1. How exactly does the Agency calculate the envisaged costs of EUR 314 600 for the budget items mentioned?

2. For which specific services required by the Agency is the said tendering procedure envisaged? How many websites does the Agency have?

**Question for written answer E-011941/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* 'Operational missions' of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([2]) the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2014 of EUR 369 200 for 'Operational Missions'. In 2013, the amount was EUR 225 000.

1. What 'operational missions' did the Agency carry out in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. Why is the cost calculated by the Agency for 'operational missions' in 2014 almost twice that for 2013?

**Question for written answer E-011942/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Events organised by the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([2]) the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2014 of EUR 12 000 (p. 28) for receptions and events and EUR 60 000 each for catering for the Agency's events and for conference facilities for the Agency (p. 74). The same Work Programme explicitly mentions only two planned events, the Annual Conference, at which the Agency expects at least 150 participants (p. 15) and a workshop on the Agency's Work Programme, at which the Agency expects five participants (p. 16). In 2012 and 2013 there were one and three participants, respectively, at the workshop.

1. Is the Agency planning further events? If so, what are these events? How much does the Agency estimate that each of the two events mentioned and any further events will cost?

2. For which of the events are calls for tender to be issued?

3. Why is the Agency once again holding a workshop which, in both of the last two years, had fewer than five participants?

4. What costs were incurred for this workshop in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

([2]) http://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Acts_of_the_Agency/Publication/ACER%20Work%20Programme%202014.pdf

**Question for written answer E-011971/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Meeting expenses of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2014 of EUR 322 839 for 'meeting expenses'. In 2013, the amount provided for was EUR 367 609.

1. What meetings took place in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. How many people attended each of these meetings?

3. What costs were incurred for each of these meetings?

**Joint answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

The Commission has requested the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) to provide the answers to the questions raised by the Honourable member.

The Agency's reply will be transmitted by the Commission to the Honourable member as soon as possible.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011944/13**
**to the Commission**
**Catherine Stihler (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* EU funding streams

Can the Commission update Parliament on specific EU funding streams that are available to support local initiatives such as heritage trails, tourism initiatives and potential partner exchange programmes in regard to these types of initiatives or any other grants that may be available to socially deprived areas?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**
*(11 December 2013)*

Tourism and cultural heritage initiatives can benefit from EU funding programmes via co-financing of projects or via studies by the Commission through calls for tender related specifically to the tourism sector ([1]).

Tourism initiatives continue to be a potential activity area of future cohesion policy programmes under the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) provided they are connected to the thematic priorities and contribute, in particular, to the jobs and growth objectives of the funds ([2]). This applies to both the Investment for growth and jobs goal as well as the European Territorial Cooperation goal.

In addition, the urban dimension of EU regional policy provides the possibility to target the regeneration of deprived urban areas. For 2014-2020, each Member State must allocate a minimum of 5% of ERDF for integrated urban development, which support investments aimed at the reduction of poverty and social exclusion. Moreover, the ESIF programmes can support community-led local development, based on strategies designed by local partnerships.

The programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs ([3]) (COSME) also foresees financial resources for EU-added value transnational tourism initiatives. EU tourism enterprises can also benefit from free service-tailored support provided by the Enterprise Europe Network ([4]) which includes a dedicated tourism and cultural heritage sector group ([5]).

Finally, the Commission encourages the recognition of a shared European heritage and, through the future Creative Europe programme, provides support for cooperation in the field of cultural heritage, which is potentially a resource for tourism development.

---

([1]) For an overview of EU financial instruments for possible use by the tourism sector's public and private stakeholders: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/_getdocument.cfm?doc_id=7652
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/legi_en.cfm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/initiatives/cosme/index_en.htm
([4]) http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/about/about
([5]) http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/about/sector-groups/tourism-cultural-heritage

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011945/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Sachstand des Vertragsverletzungsverfahrens gegen Deutschland im Zusammenhang mit der Niederlassungsfreiheit

Am 31. Januar 2013 hat die Kommission eine Mitteilung mit dem Titel „Ein Europäischer Aktionsplan für den Einzelhandel" (KOM(2013)0036) veröffentlicht. Der vorgeschlagene Aktionsplan enthält unter anderem Maßnahmen für den Fall der Nichteinhaltung der Verpflichtungen nach der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie sowie Maßnahmen für die Sicherstellung der Niederlassungsfreiheit.

Die Kommission schreibt derzeit eine Rechtsstudie aus, in deren Rahmen die Beschränkungen der gewerblichen Niederlassung in den Mitgliedstaaten untersucht werden sollen (MARKT/2013/104/E). Darüber hinaus soll das Thema von einer Hochrangigen Gruppe für den Einzelhandel bearbeitet werden.

Am 25. Juni 2009 hat die Kommission wegen einer Rechtsvorschrift, die eine Beschränkung der Niederlassungsfreiheit für den Einzelhandel in Deutschland bewirken kann, ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen Deutschland eröffnet ([1]).

1. Die Kommission wird gebeten, den aktuellen Sachstand in Bezug auf dieses Vertragsverletzungsverfahren — sowie die voraussichtliche Entwicklung in der Zukunft — darzulegen. Wann ist mit einer Entscheidung zu rechnen? Werden in der Beurteilung der Kommission auch die Auswirkungen auf kleine und mittlere Unternehmen, insbesondere in ländlichen Gebieten, berücksichtigt?

2. Sind bei der Kommission Beschwerden über ähnliche Beschränkungen der Handelsniederlassung in anderen Mitgliedstaaten eingegangen? Gibt es weitere anhängige Vertragsverletzungsverfahren im Zusammenhang mit diesem Thema und/oder beabsichtigt die Kommission, in der nahen Zukunft neue Verfahren zu eröffnen? Wenn ja: Welcher Mitgliedstaat bzw. welche Mitgliedstaaten sind betroffen?

**Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission**
*(13. Dezember 2013)*

1. Im Nachgang zu den Maßnahmen des Europäischen Aktionsplans für den Einzelhandel steht die Kommission bezüglich der Niederlassungsfreiheit für den Einzelhandel derzeit im Austausch bewährter Verfahren mit den Mitgliedstaaten. Damit ist gewährleistet, dass die verschiedenen Interessen im Zentrum der Gespräche stehen. Ferner dürfte noch vor Ende 2013 eine Studie eingeleitet werden.

2. Die Kommission hat Beschwerden betreffend mehrere andere Mitgliedstaaten erhalten. Sie hat mit diesen Mitgliedstaaten einen konstruktiven Dialog aufgenommen, in dessen Rahmen es ihr gelingen dürfte, die in den anhängigen Vertragsverletzungsverfahren aufgeworfenen Probleme zu lösen.

([1]) IP/09/1002.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011945/13**
**to the Commission**
**Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* State of play of infringement procedure against Germany in relation to freedom of establishment

On 31 January 2013 the Commission published a communication entitled 'Setting up a European Retail Action Plan' (COM(2013)0036). Among other things, the proposed Action Plan includes measures to address non-compliance with the obligations of the Services Directive and to ensure the freedom of establishment.

The Commission is currently tendering out a legal study on the subject which will assess the restrictions on commercial establishment imposed by Member States (MARKT/2013/104/E). It has also taken steps to address the matter by means of a high-level group on retail services.

Back on 25 June 2009 the Commission launched infringement procedure against Germany for introducing legislation potentially restricting the establishment of retail facilities ([1]).

1. Could the Commission clarify the current state of play regarding — and the future roadmap for — this infringement procedure? When can we expect a decision? Will the Commission's assessment also take into account the impact on small and medium-sized enterprises, in particular in rural areas?

2. Has the Commission received any complaints about similar restrictions on commercial establishment in other Member States? Are there any other pending infringement procedures touching on this issue, and/or does the Commission envisage launching any new procedures in the near future? If so, which Member State(s) would be affected?

*(Version française)*

**Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission**
*(13 décembre 2013)*

1. Comme relevé par l'honorable membre, dans le prolongement des actions prévues par le Plan d'action européen pour le commerce de détail, la Commission est actuellement engagée dans un échange de bonnes pratiques avec les États membres en ce qui concerne les questions relatives à l'établissement des surfaces commerciales. Les divers intérêts en présence seront ainsi au centre des débats. Une étude devrait également être lancée d'ici fin de l'année 2013.

2. La Commission a reçu des plaintes concernant plusieurs États membres. La Commission a entrepris un dialogue constructif avec les États membres concernés qui devrait lui permettre de résoudre les problèmes soulevés dans le cadre des procédures d'infractions pendantes.

([1]) IP/09/1002.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011946/13**
**au Conseil**
**Marine Le Pen (NI)**
*(18 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Avenir de la Navfor

Sous la responsabilité du Conseil, la mission de coopération européenne Navfor (Atalante), dont le mandat a été étendu jusqu'en décembre 2014, recourt aux marines de guerre des pays membres de l'UE afin de participer à la lutte contre la piraterie au large de la Somalie.

Sans entrer dans les détails, le commandant de la Navfor, le contre-amiral Bob Tarrant, a évoqué de futures missions, notamment avec le concours de la marine de guerre chinoise ([1]).

1. De quelles autres missions s'agira-t-il?

2. Ces missions vont-elles s'élargir à d'autres territoires maritimes que ceux prévus par le mandat de la Navfor?

3. Sous quelle justification et dans quel cadre légal la coopération de la Navfor avec la marine de guerre chinoise a-t-elle été autorisée?

4. La Navfor continue-t-elle à s'inscrire dans le respect d'un mandat international limité strictement à la sécurisation d'une zone maritime et côtière allant du Golfe d'Aden à l'Océan Indien?

**Réponse**
*(23 décembre 2013)*

L'opération EU Navfor Somalie — Atalanta a été lancée par l'action commune 2008/851/PESC du 10 novembre 2008 et modifiée en dernier lieu par la décision 2012/174/PESC du Conseil du 23 mars 2012, à l'appui des résolutions 1814 (2008), 1816 (2008), 1838 (2008), 1846 (2008), 1851 (2008) et ultérieures du Conseil de sécurité des Nations unies.

L'opération EU Navfor Somalie — Atalanta a pour objet de contribuer à la protection des navires du PAM qui acheminent l'aide alimentaire aux populations déplacées de Somalie, à la protection des navires vulnérables naviguant au large des côtes de Somalie, ainsi qu'à la dissuasion, à la prévention et à la répression des actes de piraterie et des vols à main armée au large des côtes somaliennes.

La zone d'opérations des forces déployées à cet effet comprend le littoral somalien et les eaux intérieures, ainsi que les zones maritimes au large des côtes de la Somalie et des pays voisins dans la région de l'océan Indien.

Dans le cadre de son mandat en cours (article 2, point f)), Atalanta «établit une liaison avec les organisations et entités, ainsi qu'avec les États agissant dans la région pour lutter contre les actes de piraterie et les vols à main armée au large des côtes de la Somalie». Dans ce contexte, EU Navfor coopère avec la marine chinoise dans les limites à la fois de son mandat et de sa zone d'opérations.

([1]) http://www.eeas.europa.eu/csdp/missions-and-operations/eu-navfor-somalia/news/20130627_2_en.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011946/13**
**to the Council**
**Marine Le Pen (NI)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The future of EU NAVFOR Somalia

Under the responsibility of the Council, the European Union Naval Force (EU NAVFOR Somalia — Operation Atalanta) uses the navies of EU Member States to help counter piracy off the coast of Somalia. Its mandate has been extended to December 2014.

Rear Admiral Bob Tarrant, Operation Commander of EU NAVFOR Somalia, has spoken of future missions, involving in particular the Chinese Navy, without giving more details ([1]).

1. What other missions are these?

2. Are these missions to be extended to sea areas beyond those set out in EU NAVFOR's mandate?

3. What is the justification and legal framework for authorising EU NAVFOR's cooperation with the Chinese Navy?

4. Is EU NAVFOR continuing to comply with an international mandate strictly limited to ensuring the security of an area of sea and coastline stretching from the Gulf of Aden to the Indian Ocean?

**Reply**
*(23 December 2013)*

EUNAVFOR — Operation Atalanta was established by Joint Action 2008/851/CFSP of 10 November 2008, and most recently amended by Council Decision 2012/174/CFSP of 23 March 2012, in support of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1814 (2008), 1816 (2008), 1838 (2008), 1846 (2008), 1851 (2008) and successor Resolutions.

The mission of EUNAVFOR Atalanta is to contribute to the protection of WFP vessels delivering food aid to displaced persons in Somalia and the protection of vulnerable vessels cruising off the Somali coast, and the deterrence, prevention and repression of acts of piracy and armed robbery off the Somali coast.

The area of operations of the forces deployed to that end consists of the Somali coastal territory and internal waters, and the maritime areas off the coasts of Somalia and neighbouring countries within the region of the Indian Ocean.

Under its current mandate (Article 2, point f), ATALANTA is to 'liaise with organisations and entities, as well as States, working in the region to combat acts of piracy and armed robbery off the Somali coast'. In this context, EUNAVFOR cooperates with the Chinese Navy within the limits of both its mission and area of operation.

([1]) http://www.eeas.europa.eu/csdp/missions-and-operations/eu-navfor-somalia/news/20130627_2_en.htm

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011947/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Guido Milana (S&D) e Francesca Barracciu (S&D)**
*(18 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Tonno rosso — condizioni dello stock e conseguenti misure

Nell'ultimo anno numerose associazioni di pescatori hanno lamentato una presenza eccessiva dello stock di tonno nel Mediterraneo, tanto da mettere a repentaglio l'equilibrio di altre specie.

Secondo la relazione del comitato permanente di ricerca e statistica (SCRS) dell'ICCAT, nel 2012 la biomassa dello stock di tonno così come la taglia media sono aumentate.

Questo aspetto può essere valutato come un effetto positivo del regime di quote introdotto negli anni passati.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

— se anche secondo i dati della recente campagna di pesca la taglia media dello stock é aumentata;

— quali iniziative intende prendere per garantire un equilibrio tra le diverse specie presenti nel Mediterraneo;

— se e quali iniziative e misure concernenti lo stock di tonno intende assumere in sede ICCAT;

— se ritiene, qualora le condizioni dello stock di tonno dovessero risultare migliorate, di doversi impegnare per una revisione delle quote di pesca in sede ICCAT?

**Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione**
*(3 gennaio 2014)*

La consulenza dell'SCRS ([1]), basata sui dati delle catture del 2012, ha confermato i segnali positivi di ricostituzione dello stock di tonno rosso. La ricostituzione è probabilmente in corso e la biomassa riproduttiva dello stock è in crescita costante. Come l'anno scorso, lo studio indica che lo stock è ancora sovrasfruttato, ma che attualmente non è in corso una pesca eccessiva. Si osserva un aumento netto della taglia media nell'Atlantico e un aumento modesto nel Mediterraneo. La Commissione non è a conoscenza di nessuno squilibrio tra i vari stock nel Mediterraneo.

L'SCRS afferma che permangono molti elementi di incertezza relativi allo scorso anno, nonostante i recenti miglioramenti nella quantità e nella qualità dei dati. L'SCRS sottolinea che tali elementi d'incertezza non possono essere inglobati nelle matrici di rischio, poiché in tal caso il loro uso diretto risulterebbe difficile.

Sebbene la biomassa sembri aumentare, non si possono definire né la velocità né l'entità di tale tendenza, che rimane assai incerta.

Pertanto l'SCRS non può «*esprimere un parere inconfutabile su cui potrebbe basarsi un cambiamento sostanziale dei TAC*». L'SCRS osserva tuttavia che «*se le catture si mantengono attorno ai livelli recenti di TAC nell'attuale sistema di gestione, gli stock dovrebbero poter aumentare durante il periodo di riferimento, il che è coerente con l'obiettivo di raggiungere l'FMSY (indice di mortalità per pesca atto a garantire il rendimento massimo sostenibile) e il BMSY (biomassa corrispondente al rendimento massimo sostenibile) da qui al 2022 con almeno il 60 % di probabilità*» (che è l'obiettivo del piano di ricostituzione). L'SCRS aggiunge che «*un periodo di stabilità dei principali regolamenti di gestione del piano di ricostituzione consentirebbe all'SCRS di stimare in modo più esatto l'entità e la velocità delle recenti tendenze dell'FMSY (indice di mortalità) e del BMSY (biomassa) per gli anni futuri*».

Pertanto, e in base alla posizione concordata con gli Stati membri, all'ICCAT la Commissione ha promosso e ottenuto la permanenza delle misure esistenti fino alla prossima valutazione dello stock che avrà luogo nel 2014.

([1]) Comitato permanente di ricerca e statistica.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011947/13**
**to the Commission**
**Guido Milana (S&D) and Francesca Barracciu (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Status of bluefin tuna stocks and implications for action

Over the last year, many fishing organisations have complained about the excessive numbers of tuna in the Mediterranean, at levels which threaten the balance of other species.

According to the report by ICCAT's Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, both the biomass and the average size of tuna stocks increased in 2012.

This can be seen as a positive outcome of the quota rules introduced in previous years.

— Do the data from the latest fishing season also show an increase in the average size among the stock?

— What initiatives does the Commission intend to adopt to guarantee a balance between the different species present in the Mediterranean?

— What initiatives and measures does the Commission intend to adopt in the forum of ICCAT?

— Does the Commission think that steps should be taken within ICCAT to revise fishing quotas if the status of tuna stocks is found to have improved?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 January 2014)*

The advice of the SCRS ([1]) based on the 2012 catch data, confirmed the positive signs of recovery of the bluefin tuna stock. The recovery is likely taking place and the stock spawning biomass keeps increasing. As last year, the study suggests that the stock is still overfished but that no overfishing is currently ongoing. We observe a clear increase in average size in the Atlantic and a modest increase in the Mediterranean. The Commission is not aware of any imbalance between different stocks in the Mediterranean.

SCRS makes clear that important uncertainties from last year remain in spite of recent improvements in the data quantity and quality. SCRS stresses that such uncertainties cannot be reflected in the risk matrices, thus making the direct use of such matrices difficult.

Although the biomass seems to be increasing, both the speed and magnitude of this trend cannot be determined and remain highly uncertain.

Therefore, SCRS cannot 'give robust advice that would support a substantial change in the TAC'. SCRS notes however that 'maintaining catches at around recent TACs under the current management scheme will likely allow the stock to increase during that period and is consistent with the goal of achieving $F_{MSY}$ and $B_{MSY}$ through 2022 with at least 60% of probability' (i.e. the objective of the recovery plan). SCRS adds that 'a period of stabilisation in the main management regulations of the rebuilding plan would allow the SCRS to better estimate the magnitude and speed of recent trends in F and SSB in the coming years'.

Accordingly, and based on the position agreed with the Member States, in ICCAT the Commission promoted and obtained stability of the existing measures until the next stock assessment takes place in 2014.

([1]) Standing Committee on Research and Statistics.

*(Versiunea în limba română)*

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011948/13**
**adresată Comisiei**
**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)**
*(18 octombrie 2013)*

*Subiect:* Taxă pentru defrișările abuzive

Uniunea Europeană dorește să ocupe un loc important în lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice și combaterea efectelor acesteia la nivel european.

În cadrul acestor eforturi, o acțiune de bază rămâne refacerea suprafețelor defrișate prin plantarea de noi arbori și arbuști.

Are Comisia în vedere colaborarea cu statele membre pentru instituirea unui fond de refacere a suprafețelor împădurite în care să fie inclusă și o taxă pentru defrișările abuzive, în vederea schimbării destinației suprafețelor respective, tocmai pentru a preîntâmpina procentul de tăieri abuzive a pădurilor din diverse regiuni?

**Răspuns dat de dl Potočnik în numele Comisiei**
*(12 decembrie 2013)*

În ceea ce privește fondurile UE disponibile în prezent pentru refacerea suprafețelor împădurite, Comisia îl invită pe distinsul membru să consulte răspunsul la întrebarea scrisă nr. E-11514/2013 ([1]).

În plus, statele membre dețin mecanisme de control strict al transformării pădurilor în terenuri destinate altor întrebuințări și/sau impun măsuri compensatorii (care pot include plata unor sume) în cazul unor astfel de transformări.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011948/13**
**to the Commission**
**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Tax on illegal deforestation

The European Union wishes to play an important role in the fight against climate change and in tackling its impact across Europe.

One basic action still available as part of these efforts is to restore the deforested areas by planting new trees and shrubs.

Does the Commission intend to cooperate with Member States in setting up a fund for restoring forested areas, which also includes a tax on illegal deforestation, with a view to changing where the relevant areas are planted, precisely so as to curb the rate of illegal forest logging in various regions?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**
*(12 December 2013)*

As regards the EU funds currently available for the restoration of forests, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-11514/2013 ([1]).

Furthermore Member States have in place strict controls against the conversion of forest to other land uses, and/or require compensatory measures (which can include payments) for such conversions.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011949/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Esercizi commerciali di ottica e limiti alla libertà di stabilimento

Gli articoli da 49 a 55 del TFUE vietano le restrizioni alla libertà di stabilimento dei cittadini di uno Stato membro nel territorio di un altro Stato membro.

Alcune disposizioni legislative recentemente varate da istituzioni regionali italiane hanno sollevato problemi di compatibilità con le suddette norme, in particolare le disposizioni volte a limitare l'apertura di nuovi esercizi commerciali di ottica in presenza di altri esercizi simili in prossimità o per fascia di popolazione.

La Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea ha recentemente esaminato la questione con la sentenza del 26 settembre 2013 nella causa C-539/11, constatando come tale normativa ostacola e rende meno attraente l'esercizio, nel territorio italiano, dell'attività degli ottici di altri Stati membri, mediante un centro stabile di attività.

La Corte ha già statuito in passato che, nel perseguimento di un obiettivo siffatto, l'apertura di una farmacia può essere oggetto di pianificazione e di limitazioni, in modo che sia garantita un'assistenza sanitaria adeguata alle necessità della popolazione.

La Corte ha quindi stabilito che siffatti principi appaiono applicabili anche agli esercizi di ottica, allorché gli ottici forniscono servizi consistenti nella valutazione, nel mantenimento e nel ripristino dello stato di salute dei pazienti e rientrano nel settore della tutela della salute, rimandando quindi la competenza agli Stati membri in materia di tutela della salute pubblica.

Considerato che, a detta della stessa Corte di Giustizia UE, la normativa in oggetto rischia di portare a un accesso diseguale allo stabilimento degli esercizi di ottica, può la Commissione far sapere:

— Qual è la posizione della Commissione al riguardo?

— Intende trasmettere chiarimenti per un più effettivo e uniforme riconoscimento di cosa sia considerabile come esercizio commerciale con attività prevalente attinente alla tutela della salute pubblica?

**Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione**
*(17 dicembre 2013)*

Nella causa C-539/11 Ottica New Line, la Corte di giustizia dell'UE rilevava che le restrizioni territoriali e demografiche relative all'insediamento degli esercizi di ottica era atta a favorire una ripartizione equilibrata di tali esercizi nell'ambito di un dato territorio e contribuiva pertanto alla tutela della sanità pubblica. Tuttavia, la Corte indicava che, per essere compatibili con il diritto dell'UE, tali restrizioni dovrebbero garantire il conseguimento dell'obiettivo attinente alla salute pubblica in modo coerente e sistematico. La Corte indicava altresì che la legislazione italiana rischia di comportare un accesso diseguale allo stabilimento degli esercizi di ottica nelle diverse zone della regione considerata. Poiché la sentenza della Corte è stata pronunciata nel quadro di una domanda di pronuncia pregiudiziale, spetta alla giurisdizione nazionale esaminare se, nella pratica, la legislazione nazionale soddisfi il criterio della coerenza.

Gli Stati membri sono responsabili dell'organizzazione del loro sistema sanitario. Spetta ad essi decidere a quale livello intendono tutelare la salute pubblica e stabilire le misure necessarie a tal fine. Queste ultime possono variare da Stato membro a Stato membro. Tuttavia, nell'organizzare i rispettivi servizi sanitari, gli Stati membri sono tenuti a conformarsi al diritto dell'UE, e in particolare alle disposizioni del trattato riguardanti le libertà fondamentali, le quali vietano agli Stati membri di introdurre o mantenere restrizioni ingiustificate all'esercizio di tali libertà nel campo delle cure sanitarie. Allo stadio attuale, la Commissione non intende formulare orientamenti generali in questo settore, ma continuerà a seguire la situazione.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011949/13**
**to the Commission**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Optician businesses and restricted freedom of establishment

Articles 49 to 55 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union prohibit any restriction on the freedom of establishment of nationals of a Member State in the territory of another Member State.

Certain legislative provisions announced recently by some Italian regional bodies have raised the issue of compatibility with the abovementioned articles, in particular certain provisions designed to restrict people from opening new optician businesses if there are other similar businesses nearby or to limit the number of businesses per number of residents.

The European Court of Justice recently studied the matter in its judgment of 26 September 2013 in Case C 539/11, finding that these provisions presented an obstacle to opticians from other Member States practising in Italy at a fixed place of business and made it less attractive for them to do so.

The Court has previously ruled that opening a pharmacy business in a similar way may be subject to planning rules and restrictions, to ensure that the populations' health needs are adequately catered for.

The Court later established that such principles also applied to opticians' businesses, in that their services involve assessing, maintaining and restoring patients' health and thus fall within the health protection sector. The Court referred the matter back to the Member States, as they have jurisdiction over public health matters.

According to the European Court of Justice itself, the legislative provisions in question could lead to unequal access to setting up business as an optician.

— What is the Commission's position on this matter?

— Does the Commission intend to issue clarifications, to ensure that the definition of what constitutes a business primarily concerned with public health protection is more effectively and uniformly recognised?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**
*(17 December 2013)*

In Case C-539/11 Ottica New Line, the Court found that territorial and demographic restrictions on the establishment of opticians were likely to facilitate an even distribution of opticians' shops throughout a given territory and thus to contribute to the protection of public health. However, the Court indicated that, to be compatible with EC law, such restrictions should secure the attainment of the public health objective in a consistent and systematic manner. The Court indicated that the Italian legislation risks bringing about unequal access to the establishment of opticians' shops in the various areas of the region concerned. Given that the Court's judgment was issued in the framework of a preliminary ruling, it is for the national jurisdiction to examine whether, in practice, the national legislation satisfies the consistency test.

Member States are responsible for the organisation of their health system. It is for the Member States to decide on the level at which they wish to protect public health and on the way for achieving such protection. Such measures may differ from one Member State to another. However, in exercising the power to organise their health services, Member States must comply with EC law, in particular the provisions of the Treaty on the fundamental freedoms, which prohibit Member States from introducing or maintaining unjustified restrictions on the exercise of those freedoms in the healthcare sector. At this stage, the Commission does not intend to issue general guidance in this field but it will continue to monitor the situation.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011950/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Elevata incidenza tumorale nella provincia di Lecce

La «Repubblica salentina», conosciuta anche come Salento o penisola salentina, costituisce la parte meridionale della Puglia, situata tra il Mare Ionio ed il Mare Adriatico. È un'area geografica nota per le bellezze paesaggistiche e naturalistiche, tuttavia è anche la sede di un fenomeno inquietante: si registra un'elevata presenza di tumori al polmone, in particolare nella provincia di Lecce. Nello specifico, le statistiche rivelano che il 20 % degli individui che si ammalano di cancro lo contraggono al polmone. Si registra la più alta incidenza nei distretti di Maglie e di Galatina. Tale tendenza non è un fenomeno emerso recentemente, ma sono all'incirca 10 anni che alcuni studiosi ed esperti hanno evidenziato tale problematica, senza tuttavia riuscire a individuarne l'origine, a causa di una mancanza di fondi e di un coordinamento delle ricerche. Probabilmente si tratta di una causa ambientale: alcuni studi riferiscono che i venti convogliano le emissioni dei poli industriali di Taranto e Brindisi nella provincia leccese. Un'altra ipotesi è che si tratti del radon, riscontrato in valori oltre la soglia in alcune scuole.

Il 30 ottobre ci sarà una riunione di un importante istituto italiano di sanità che dovrebbe presentare un rapporto inedito sulla questione, ma si tratta solamente di un punto d'inizio.

Ogni anno si riscontrano circa 500 nuovi carcinomi polmonari. Si è consapevoli che si tratta di una tematica di competenza dello Stato membro, tuttavia risulta che le risorse per svolgere questi studi sono difficilmente reperibili.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, può la Commissione far sapere:

— se è a conoscenza dei dati relativi all'incidenza dei tumori nella provincia di Lecce;

— se esistono dei fondi europei che potrebbero essere destinati alle ricerche finalizzate a individuare le cause di tale diffusione tumorale;

— in caso di risposta affermativa, in che modo intende porre in essere azioni di monitoraggio sulle ricerche effettuate?

**Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione**
*(3 dicembre 2013)*

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'incidenza del cancro al polmone nella provincia italiana di Lecce ([1]) cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato.

Essa sostiene la Rete europea dei registri del cancro (ENCR) ([2]) che ha creato l'Osservatorio europeo del cancro (ECO) ([3]) in collaborazione con l'Agenzia internazionale per la ricerca sul cancro (IARC) ([4]). L'ECO fornisce i tassi di incidenza, mortalità e prevalenza del cancro nei vari paesi relativamente a luoghi specifici fino al 2009. Cifre più recenti (2012) sono reperibili nelle schede informative EUCAN ([5]) dell'ECO, che forniscono stime nazionali sull'incidenza, la mortalità e la prevalenza di 24 importanti tipi di cancro, compreso il cancro al polmone.

I fondi di ricerca dell'Unione europea sono attribuiti sulla base di inviti a presentare proposte concorrenziali pubblicati unitamente ai relativi programmi di lavoro. Le domande di ricerca collaborativa presentate in risposta ai suddetti inviti sono selezionate attraverso una procedura di valutazione *inter pares* indipendente, considerando l'eccellenza scientifica come criterio principale così da finanziare le migliori domande.

Orizzonte 2020, il prossimo programma per la ricerca e l'innovazione finanziato dall'UE (2014-2020), offrirà l'opportunità di realizzare ricerche sui fattori di rischio che causano il cancro al polmone nell'ambito della sfida per la società «Salute, evoluzione demografica e benessere». L'apertura degli inviti è prevista per l'11 dicembre 2013.

([1]) http://www.ij-healthgeographics.com/content/8/1/40
([2]) http://www.encr.eu/
([3]) http://eco.iarc.fr
([4]) http://www.iarc.fr/
([5]) http://eco.iarc.fr/eucan/Default.aspx

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011950/13**
**to the Commission**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* High incidence of cancer in the province of Lecce

The 'Salentine Republic', also known as Salento or the Salento Peninsula, forms the southern part of the Apulia region, situated between the Ionian and Adriatic seas. It is an area famous for its beautiful countryside and wildlife; however, it is also home to a worrying problem, as there is a high incidence of lung cancer in the area and in the province of Lecce in particular. Statistics show that 20% of cancer cases developed in the area are lung cancer. The highest incidence is recorded in the districts of Maglie and Galatina. This is not a recent problem: scholars and experts have been highlighting the problem for around 10 years, but have not managed to identify the cause due to a lack of funds and coordinated research. The cause is likely to be environmental: some studies report that the wind channels pollution from the industrial centres of Taranto and Brindisi into the province of Lecce. Another theory has looked at radon gas, which has been found at levels above the safe threshold in some schools.

On 30 October 2013, an important Italian health institute will hold a meeting at which an unprecedented report on the issue will be presented. However, this is only a starting point.

There are 500 new lung cancer cases every year. We are aware that this subject falls under Member State jurisdiction; however, in the present circumstances it is difficult to find the necessary funding to carry out these studies.

— Is the Commission aware of the statistics on the incidence of cancer in the province of Lecce?

— Are there any EU funds which could be set aside for research into the reasons for this high incidence?

— If so, what kind of monitoring would be carried out on the research?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

The Commission is aware of the lung cancer incidence in the Italian province of Lecce ([1]) referred to by the Honourable Member.

The Commission is supporting the European Network of Cancer Registries (ENCR), ([2]) which developed the European Cancer Observatory (ECO) ([3]) in collaboration with the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) ([4]). ECO provides incidence, mortality and prevalence rates across countries for specific cancer sites until 2009. More recent figures (2012) are provided by ECO's EUCAN ([5]) module, which provides national estimates on incidence, mortality and prevalence for 24 major cancer types, including lung cancer.

EU research funding is granted on the basis of competitive calls for proposals published with the relevant Work Programmes. Collaborative research applications submitted to these calls are selected through an independent peer-review evaluation process with scientific excellence as the overriding criterion and financial support awarded to the best applications.

Horizon 2020, the next EU funding Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), will offer opportunities to address research on risk factors that cause lung cancer through the 'Health, demographic change and well-being' societal challenge. The calls are expected to be opened on 11 December 2013.

([1]) http://www.ij-healthgeographics.com/content/8/1/40
([2]) http://www.encr.eu/
([3]) http://eco.iarc.fr
([4]) http://www.iarc.fr/
([5]) http://eco.iarc.fr/eucan/Default.aspx

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011951/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Situazione di povertà della Repubblica dello Zambia e finanziamenti europei

La Repubblica dello Zambia, con un PIL che cresce del 7,3 % l'anno, è oggi tra le prime dieci economie del mondo per tassi di crescita. Uno dei driver di tale crescita è l'«agricoltura blu» (detta anche «agricoltura conservativa») promossa dalla FAO e dall'UE che ha reso l'agricoltura in questo paese più redditizia. L'agricoltura blu si basa su tre principi: la copertura permanente del suolo per proteggerlo dall'erosione, una riduzione della lavorazione del terreno e una rotazione delle colture per migliorarne la fertilità.

Occorre notare che l'UE ha fornito cospicui aiuti allo Zambia: tra il 2008 e il 2013 sono stati erogati 489,7 milioni di euro per finanziare scuole, ospedali e 33 comunità locali. Tra gli altri, sono stati stanziati 16,9 milioni di euro per gli agricoltori negli ultimi tre anni e sono previsti altri 11,1 milioni nei prossimi quattro anni. Tuttavia, nonostante i progressi in corso, oggi lo Zambia resta fra i paesi più poveri al mondo.

Nello Zambia tre persone su quattro vivono sotto la soglia di povertà e lo stipendio medio pro capite annuale si aggira sui 395 USD; la maggioranza della popolazione vive nelle città, ma non ha un impiego; l'HIV/AIDS in questo paese è una piaga che contribuisce a collocare l'aspettativa di vita alla nascita degli zambiani intorno ai 37 anni.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, può la Commissione far sapere:

— se è a conoscenza dei dati relativi alle condizioni di povertà in cui versa la grande maggioranza degli abitanti dello Zambia;

— se sono stati elaborati programmi specifici per rilanciare l'occupazione in tale paese;

— se sono state poste in essere delle azioni di monitoraggio sui finanziamenti erogati dall'UE?

**Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione**
*(6 dicembre 2013)*

La Commissione è del tutto consapevole delle condizioni di povertà in cui vive la popolazione dello Zambia. Nel paese, che sulla scala dell'HDI ([1]) è al 163° posto su 187, si riscontra un palese contrasto tra l'andamento positivo della crescita economica e quello dello sviluppo umano. Il 61 % della popolazione (soprattutto giovani e persone che vivono in zone rurali) vive al sotto della soglia di povertà e oltre la metà di questi in condizioni di estrema povertà. Nonostante una tendenza al ribasso, la povertà urbana continua a sfiorare percentuali elevate (80 %). Il settore agricolo rappresenta meno del 20 % del PIL ([2]), ma la maggior parte dei cittadini dello Zambia dipende, per il reddito, il lavoro e i generi alimentari, da un'agricoltura di sussistenza priva di sistemi di irrigazione. La disoccupazione è stimata al 50 % ma la maggior parte del lavoro si svolge nel settore sommerso. Negli ultimi dieci anni, il coefficiente di Gini si è deteriorato dallo 0,47 allo 0,54, ponendo lo Zambia tra i primi venti paesi al mondo con le maggiori disparità di reddito.

Una delle priorità del governo è la creazione di posti di lavoro, come indicato nel programma nazionale a lungo termine 2030 (piena occupazione duratura entro il 2030 e un tasso di disoccupazione inferiore al 10 %) e nella politica nazionale per l'occupazione e il mercato del lavoro del 2006, che fornisce un quadro di riferimento per le strategie a favore dell'occupazione.

L'UE ha sostenuto il lavoro dell'OIL ([3]) nello Zambia, volto a potenziare la capacità degli operatori del mercato del lavoro pubblici e privati a valutare i propri risultati e i progressi compiuti verso un lavoro dignitoso. Il nuovo progetto dell'UE per la gestione delle finanze pubbliche, la responsabilità e le statistiche è inteso a migliorare il funzionamento di tutti i ministeri, compreso il Ministero del lavoro. L'UE sta riflettendo sui futuri interventi da attuare nel quadro dell'11° FES ([4]) al fine di promuovere la creazione di posti di lavoro nelle zone rurali.

([1]) Human Develoment Index (HDI).
([2]) Prodotto interno lordo.
([3]) Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro.
([4]) Fondo europeo di sviluppo.

L'utilizzo di finanziamenti dell'UE è sottoposto a monitoraggio mediante il sistema della relazione sulla gestione dell'assistenza esterna e regolari valutazioni intermedie e finali abbinate a visite di monitoraggio ad hoc orientate ai risultati a livello di progetto.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011951/13**
**to the Commission**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Situation of poverty in the Republic of Zambia and EU aid

With GDP growing by 7.3% per year, the Republic of Zambia is currently among the world's top 10 fastest growing economies. One of the drivers of this growth is conservation agriculture, promoted by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the EU, which has improved the productivity of farming in the country. Conservation agriculture is based on three principles: permanent coverage of the soil to protect it from erosion, reduced tillage and crop rotation to improve soil fertility.

It is worth noting that the EU has granted significant amounts of aid to Zambia: between 2008 and 2013 it gave EUR 489.7 million to fund schools, hospitals and 33 local communities. EUR 16.9 million have been earmarked for farmers over the last three years and a further EUR 11.1 million have been set aside for the next four years. However, in spite of the progress that is under way, Zambia is still one of the world's poorest countries.

In Zambia, three out of four people are living below the poverty line and the average annual salary per capita is in the region of USD 395.00. Most of the population live in the cities but do not have work; HIV/AIDS is a scourge in the country and is one of the factors which place life expectancy at birth for Zambians at around 37.

— Is the Commission aware of the statistics on the conditions of poverty in which most of Zambia's population is living?

— Have any special programmes been developed to boost employment in the country?

— Is there a system in place to monitor the use of EU funding?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission**
*(6 December 2013)*

The Commission is fully aware of the poverty conditions in which the Zambian population lives. In Zambia, which ranks 163 out of 187 on the HDI ([1]), there is a clear mismatch between the positive economic growth and human development. 61% of the population (mainly young and rural) live below the poverty line and above half of those in extreme poverty. Urban poverty continues to fall but rural poverty remains persistently high (80%). The agricultural sector accounts for less than 20% of GDP ([2]) but most Zambians depend on rain-fed subsistence farming for income, employment and food. Unemployment is estimated at 50% but most work is in the informal sector. Over the past 10 years, the Gini coefficient has worsened from 0.47 to 0.54, placing Zambia's income inequality among the top 20 in the world.

Employment creation is a high priority for the Government, as reflected in the National Long Term Vision 2030 (sustained full employment by 2030 with an unemployment rate below 10%) and the 2006 National Employment and Labour Market Policy that provides a major focus for pro-employment strategies.

The EU has supported ILO's ([3]) work in Zambia to strengthen the capacity of private and public labour market actors to self-monitor and assess progress towards decent work. The new EU 'PFM, Accountability and Statistics' project aims at improving the performance of all Ministries, including the Ministry of Labour. The EU is presently reflecting on future interventions under the 11th EDF ([4]) to boost the creation of employment in rural areas.

The use of EU funding is being monitored through the External Assistance Management Report system and regular mid-term and final evaluations combined with ad-hoc Results-Oriented Monitoring visits at project level.

([1]) Human Development Index.
([2]) Gross Domestic Product.
([3]) International Labour Organisation's.
([4]) European Development Fund.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011952/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Proprietà curative della liquirizia

Recenti studi hanno portato alla luce come la pianta di liquirizia abbia ulteriori proprietà curative oltre a quelle già conosciute, come per il riflusso gastrico, l'ulcera e il trattamento di alcune affezioni di bocca e gola come afte, herpes e mal di gola.

Questo arbusto legnoso che cresce fino a raggiungere un metro di altezza, viene coltivato per le sue proprietà medicinali e utilizzato come materia principale nella produzione di bevande. Le radici più sottili sono sottoposte al processo di essiccazione da cui derivano i comuni bastoncini che si masticano.

Dalle altre radici, invece, viene estratto un succo nero dal sapore agrodolce che contiene per il 10-20 % la glicirizzina, un edulcorante naturale con un potere dolcificante fino a cento volte superiore a quello del saccarosio. È soprattutto questa sostanza a garantire le molteplici proprietà curative della liquirizia.

Secondo recenti studi di università statunitensi e cinesi, la liquirizia potrebbe rivelarsi anche un'ottima arma contro alcuni tipi di tumore.

Suddetti studi hanno testato una molecola proveniente dalla liquirizia, la BHP, su tessuti prelevati dal tumore alla prostata e al seno. È stato dimostrato che le proprietà di tale molecola sono in grado di inibire lo sviluppo delle cellule tumorali sopracitate, mentre un altro studio ha rivelato che l'acido glicirrizico contenuto nella liquirizia può venire impiegato come «trasportatore» per portare al bersaglio i farmaci antitumorali. Grazie a questi studi si sono ampliate le speranze per l'attuazione di nuove e più efficaci terapie.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, quale posizione intende assumere la Commissione circa l'utilizzo dei derivati dalla pianta di liquirizia in campo medico? Intende predisporre uno studio aggiornato sulla valutazione dei rischi e benefici derivanti dall'assunzione regolare di tali derivati?

**Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione**
*(28 novembre 2013)*

La Commissione adotterà una posizione sull'uso dei derivati della liquirizia nei prodotti medicinali soltanto se verrà presentata domanda di autorizzazione alla commercializzazione in relazione a un simile prodotto medicinale, nel qual caso la domanda sarà sottoposta alla valutazione dell'Agenzia europea per i medicinali (EMA). In tale eventualità la Commissione fonderà la propria decisione di concessione dell'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione sulla valutazione scientifica effettuata dall'EMA.

La Commissione non prevede attualmente di organizzare uno studio o prove cliniche per valutare la sicurezza e l'efficacia del consumo regolare di sostanze derivanti dalla liquirizia.

Tuttavia, nell'Unione europea il Comitato dei medicinali vegetali (HMPC) ha redatto una monografia comunitaria sulle piante medicinali relativa alla radice di liquirizia per usi medicinali ([1]) che costituisce il parere scientifico dell'HMPC sui dati relativi alla sicurezza e all'efficacia. Una simile monografia comunitaria sulle piante medicinali può essere usata dai richiedenti quale documento di riferimento per presentare domanda di registrazione fondata sull'impiego tradizionale di un medicinale vegetale presentata a un'autorità nazionale competente in uno Stato membro e da essa valutata.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/herbal/medicines/herbal_med_000132.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001fa1d.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011952/13**
**to the Commission**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Curative properties of liquorice

Recent studies have shown that liquorice has further curative properties in addition to its known effects, for example on acid reflux, stomach ulcers and the treatment of some throat and mouth conditions such as mouth ulcers, herpes and sore throat.

This woody shrub, which can reach up to one metre in height, is grown for its medicinal properties and as a raw material for drinks manufacturing. The thinnest roots are dried to produce the well-known sticks for chewing.

The other roots are used to extract a black, bittersweet-flavoured juice which contains 10-20% glycyrrhizin, a natural sweetener up to 100 times sweeter than sucrose. The curative properties of liquorice derive primarily from this substance.

According to recent US and Chinese academic studies, liquorice could also prove to be an excellent weapon against some types of cancer.

These studies tested BHP, a substance derived from liquorice, on tissue samples taken from prostate and breast tumours. The substance was demonstrated to have the ability to inhibit the development of these tumour cells, while another study has shown that the glycyrrhizic acid contained in liquorice can be used as a 'carrier' to deliver anti-cancer drugs to their target. These studies have boosted hopes of introducing new, more effective treatments.

What position does the Commission intend to adopt on the use of derivatives of the liquorice plant in medicine? Does the Commission plan to organise an up-to-date study to assess the risks and benefits of regular consumption of these substances?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission**
*(28 November 2013)*

The Commission will adopt a position on the use of derivatives of the liquorice plant in medicinal products only if an application for a marketing authorisation for such a medicinal product is submitted to and evaluated by the European Medicines Agency (EMA). In such case, the Commission will base its decision on the granting of the marketing authorisation on the scientific evaluation performed by EMA.

The Commission has currently no plans to organise a study or clinical trial to assess the safety and efficacy of regular consumption of substances derived from the liquorice plant.

However, in the European Union the Committee on Herbal Medicinal Products (HMPC) has established a Community herbal monograph on liquorice root for medicinal use ([1]), i.e. the scientific opinion of the HMPC on safety and efficacy data. Such a Community herbal monograph may be used by applicants as a reference document for an application for a traditional use registration of a herbal medicinal product submitted to and evaluated by a National Competent Authority in a Member State.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/herbal/medicines/herbal_med_000132.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001fa1d

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011953/13**
**alla Commissione**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 ottobre 2013)*

*Oggetto:* Tracciabilità dell'oro e problematiche per le PMI operanti nel comparto

La normativa statunitense denominata Dodd-Frank Act prevede per le società statunitensi quotate in borsa l'obbligo di dimostrare che i prodotti oggetto delle loro attività che contengono oro, stagno, tungsteno e tantalio provengano da zone non interessate da conflitti (per cui si parla di «conflict free»), in particolare che non derivino dalla Repubblica democratica del Congo e dai paesi con essa confinanti, ma da Stati che applichino correttamente la legislazione vigente. Si è a conoscenza del fatto che la Commissione europea ha organizzato una consultazione pubblica a giugno nel contesto di uno studio realizzato allo scopo di implementare una normativa similare anche in territorio europeo.

La presenza di un sistema di produzione «a rete», i processi produttivi non standardizzati, l'acquisizione della materia prima presso molteplici fonti di approvvigionamento, nonché la natura stessa dell'oro (fungibile e indistruttibile) rendono complessa l'operazione di garantire al 100 % la provenienza dell'oro lavorato. Il comparto produttivo italiano è costituito da 9000 aziende con una media di 4,5 dipendenti, mentre in Spagna ci sono 9800 PMI che operano nel settore, per cui risulta che la grande maggioranza delle imprese in questi due paesi non è strutturata per poter implementare sistemi di tracciabilità di una certa complessità. Si sta verificando un blocco delle operazioni commerciali nei confronti del Congo e dei paesi limitrofi, facendo quindi fallire il proposito di tutelare le popolazioni di questi paesi.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, può la Commissione far sapere:

— se intende valutare attentamente le ripercussioni di un'eventuale iniziativa legislativa dell'UE sulle imprese del comparto, nel caso si volesse applicare una normativa similare anche alle imprese non quotate in borsa;

— se considera opportuna un'azione dell'UE per incentivare il controllo nei paesi di origine dei minerali nonché una regolamentazione relativamente alle fasi di estrazione e affinazione del minerale;

— se ritenga sia ragionevole estendere la normativa anche ad altri paesi oltre al Congo (ad esempio Cina, India e Brasile), allo scopo di evitare di danneggiare le imprese dislocate in particolari aree geografiche?

**Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione**
*(2 dicembre 2013)*

In seguito alla consultazione pubblica su «Una possibile iniziativa dell'UE sull'approvvigionamento responsabile di minerali provenienti da zone di conflitto e ad alto rischio», che si è conclusa nel giugno 2013, la Commissione sta attualmente valutando in dettaglio l'impatto delle varie opzioni identificate, sulla base del quale preparerà le sue proposte. Tale valutazione esaminerà in modo approfondito le possibili conseguenze di ciascuna opzione identificata sulle imprese e sulle altre parti interessate in termini di impatto economico, sociale e ambientale. La valutazione di impatto prende in considerazione tutti i tipi di imprese UE, comprese le piccole e medie.

La Commissione ritiene inoltre importante incoraggiare i paesi in via di sviluppo che producono minerali ad attuare essi stessi i controlli e a disciplinare in modo adeguato il settore minerario.

Nell'UE, come altrove, attraverso le catene globali di approvvigionamento dei minerali, le società sono potenzialmente e indirettamente esposte al finanziamento di gruppi armati, con impatti negativi nelle regioni in cui vi sono conflitti. La due diligence sull'origine e sull'approvvigionamento dei minerali aiuta a rafforzare le prassi di approvvigionamento responsabile. A tale scopo, le proposte della Commissione intendono aumentare la trasparenza delle catene di approvvigionamento di minerali, controllando nella misura del possibile le entità che si trovano al di fuori della giurisdizione dell'UE.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011953/13**
**to the Commission**
**Oreste Rossi (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Traceability of gold and problems for SMEs operating in the sector

In the United States, the Dodd-Frank Act provides that US companies listed on the stock exchange must demonstrate that any products they deal in which contain gold, tin, tungsten or tantalum come from 'conflict free' areas, and in particular are not sourced from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and its bordering countries, but from countries which properly apply the current legislation. We are aware that in June the Commission organised a public consultation as part of a study currently under way with a view to implementing similar legislation in Europe.

However, the 'network' production system, non-standardised production processes, the purchasing of raw materials from many different sources and the nature of gold itself (fungible and indestructible) all mean that to guarantee the origin of finished gold 100% would be a complicated task. In Italy, the gold production sector consists of 9 000 firms, each with an average of 4.5 employees, while in Spain there are 9 800 SMEs operating in the sector. The vast majority of companies in these two countries therefore do not have a structure that could cope with implementing traceability systems of any complexity. Trade with Congo and its neighbouring countries is being blocked, making the idea of protecting these countries' populations impossible.

— Does the Commission intend to carry out a detailed assessment of the possible repercussions EU legislation might have on businesses in the sector if this type of legislation were to be applied to non-listed companies also?

— Does the Commission think the EU should take action to encourage the countries of origin of the minerals to implement controls themselves and to regulate the mining and refining stages also?

— Does the Commission feel it would be reasonable to extend the regulations to cover other countries as well as Congo (such as China, India and Brazil), to avoid harming businesses with branches in specific geographical regions?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**
*(2 December 2013)*

Following the public consultation on 'A possible EU initiative on responsible sourcing of minerals originating from conflict-affected and high-risk areas', which closed in June 2013, the Commission is currently assessing in detail the impact of various options identified on the basis of which it will prepare its proposal. The impact assessment will duly assess the possible consequences of each option identified on businesses and other stakeholders in terms of economic, social and environmental impact. The impact assessment looks at all types of EU businesses including small and medium enterprises.

Furthermore, the Commission considers it important to encourage mineral-producing developing countries to implement controls themselves and appropriately regulate the mining sector.

In the EU, like elsewhere, through global mineral supply chains, companies are potentially and indirectly exposed to the financing of armed groups with adverse impacts in conflict regions. Due diligence over the origin and supply of minerals helps to ensure responsible sourcing practices. To this end, any Commission proposal would aim at increasing the transparency of mineral supply chains, covering entities outside the EU jurisdiction to the extent possible.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011954/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(18 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Σύγχρονη δουλεία

Σύμφωνα με την οργάνωση Walk Free, σχεδόν 30 εκατομμύρια άνθρωποι σε όλο τον κόσμο ζουν σε συνθήκες δουλείας. Η Ινδία βρίσκεται στην πρώτη θέση παγκοσμίως, εφόσον στη χώρα ζουν περίπου το ήμισυ του συνόλου των σκλάβων. Συνολικά, τα τρία τέταρτα των θυμάτων ζουν στην Ασία.

Σχεδόν 14 εκατομμύρια άνθρωποι ζουν σε καθεστώς σκλαβιάς στην Ινδία, 2,9 εκατομμύρια στην Κίνα, και πάνω από δύο εκατομμύρια στο Πακιστάν. Ακολουθούν η Νιγηρία, η Αιθιοπία, η Ρωσία, η Ταϊλάνδη, η Λαϊκή Δημοκρατία του Κονγκό (ΛΔΚ), η Βιρμανία και το Μπαγκλαντές. Αυτές οι δέκα χώρες συγκεντρώνουν τα 22 από τα 29,8 εκατομμύρια άτομα που ζουν σε καθεστώς σκλαβιάς σε όλο τον κόσμο.

Ο ορισμός της σύγχρονης δουλείας είναι κάπως διαφορετικός από εκείνο του δέκατου όγδοου αιώνα, την εποχή του δουλεμπορίου.

Ως σύγχρονη δουλεία μπορεί να θεωρηθεί η κατάσταση στην οποία οι άνθρωποι αντιμετωπίζουν τη βία, αναγκάζονται να δεχτούν θέσεις εργασίας ή συνθήκες υποταγής, δεν αμείβονται αλλά απλώς τους δίνεται το ελάχιστο για να επιβιώσουν, με αποτέλεσμα να μην είναι ελεύθεροι να φύγουν από τους δεσμώτες τους.

Δεκατέσσερις χώρες της Αφρικής, μεταξύ των οποίων η Μαυριτανία, το Μπενίν, η Ακτή Ελεφαντοστού, η Γκάμπια, η Γκαμπόν και η Σενεγάλη, είναι μεταξύ των 20 χωρών στην υψηλότερη κατάταξη, όσον αφορά τον αριθμό των σκλάβων σε κατά κεφαλήν βάση. Στο αντίθετο άκρο βρίσκονται χώρες όπως η Ισλανδία, η Ιρλανδία και το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, όπου ο αριθμός των σκλάβων είναι πολύ χαμηλός.

Υπό το πρίσμα των ανωτέρω, θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στα ακόλουθα:

α) γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή τα προαναφερθέντα γεγονότα;

β) είναι ενήμερη η Επιτροπή για τις περιπτώσεις της σύγχρονης δουλείας στα κράτη μέλη;

γ) ποια μέτρα μπορεί να λάβει η Επιτροπή για να βοηθήσει να ξεπεραστεί το πρόβλημα της σύγχρονης δουλείας στον κόσμο;

**Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου κ. Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(12 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Α) Η ΕΕ είναι ενήμερη για την ύπαρξη σύγχρονων μορφών δουλείας ανά τον κόσμο. Η γενικότερη δέσμευση της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της δουλείας αντικατοπτρίζεται στο άρθρο 5 του Χάρτη των Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων, που απαγορεύει τη δουλεία και την αναγκαστική εργασία.

Β) Παραπέμπω την αξιότιμο βουλευτή στη νομολογία του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικαστηρίου Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων που τα τελευταία χρόνια έχει ασχοληθεί με διάφορα φαινόμενα τα οποία εμπίπτουν στο πεδίο εφαρμογής του άρθρου 4 της Σύμβασης, συμπεριλαμβανομένων περιπτώσεων που αφορούν κράτη μέλη. Η ενωσιακή οδηγία αντιμετώπισης της εμπορίας ανθρώπων περιλαμβάνει τη δουλεία ή πρακτικές παρόμοιες με τη δουλεία ως ελάχιστες μορφές εκμετάλλευσης. Η 1η Έκθεση Στατιστικών Στοιχείων της ΕΕ δημοσιεύθηκε τον Απρίλιο 2013 ([1]).

Γ) Τοπικές ενωσιακές στρατηγικές για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα σε επίπεδο χώρας συνέτειναν στο να ριχθεί περισσότερο φως στο πρόβλημα της δουλείας σε ορισμένες χώρες, καθώς και στον σχεδιασμό δράσεων για την αντιμετώπιση του ζητήματος. Η ΕΕ προωθεί ενεργώς την εφαρμογή και επικύρωση των συμβάσεων 29 και 105 της ΔΟΕ για την αναγκαστική εργασία και τη σύμβαση 182 με αντικείμενο τις χειρότερες μορφές παιδικής εργασίας. Το άρθρο 8 της συμφωνίας του Κοτονού περιέχει διατάξεις με βάση τις οποίες η ΕΕ προβληματίζεται τακτικά για ζητήματα όπως η δουλεία και η αναγκαστική εργασία και ζητά από χώρες συγκεκριμένες δεσμεύσεις. Η δουλεία αντιμετωπίζεται επίσης και με άλλα κοινοτικά μέσα. Για παράδειγμα, στη Μαυριτανία, η καταπολέμηση της δουλείας συγκαταλέγεται στις προτεραιότητες μιας προκήρυξης υποβολής προτάσεων έργων που δρομολογήθηκε εφέτος στο πλαίσιο του Ευρωπαϊκού Μέσου για τη Δημοκρατία και τα Δικαιώματα του Ανθρώπου (ΕΜΔΔΑ).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/entity.action?breadCrumbReset=true&path=EU+Policy/Report_DGHome_Eurostat

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011954/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Modern-day slavery

According to the organisation Walk Free, nearly 30 million people live in slavery worldwide. India is the global leader, with roughly half of all slaves living in the country. Overall, three quarters of the victims live in Asia.

Almost 14 million people are living in slavery in India, followed by 2.9 million in China and over two million in Pakistan. These are followed by Nigeria, Ethiopia, Russia, Thailand, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Burma and Bangladesh. These ten countries account for 22 of the 29.8 million people living in slavery worldwide.

The definition of modern slavery is somewhat different to that which prevailed in the eighteenth century, the slave trade era.

Modern slavery can be seen as a situation in which people face violence, are forced to accept jobs or circumstances in which they are subordinated, or are not paid but simply given the minimum with which to survive, with the result of not being free to leave their captors.

Fourteen African countries, including Mauritania, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Gabon and Senegal, are among the 20 countries ranking highest, if we look at the number of slaves on a per-capita basis. At the bottom of the ranking are countries such as Iceland, Ireland and the United Kingdom, where the number of slaves is very low.

In light of the above, could the Commission answer the following:

a) Is the Commission aware of the abovementioned facts?

b) Is the Commission aware of any cases of modern slavery in Member States?

c) What measures can the Commission take to help overcome the problem of modern slavery worldwide?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**
*(12 December 2013)*

(a) The EU is aware of the existence of modern slavery worldwide. The EU's overall commitment to combating slavery is reflected in Article 5 of the Charter on Fundamental Rights, which prohibits slavery and forced labour.

(b) I can refer the Honourable Member to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights which in recent years has dealt with various phenomena falling within the scope of Article 4 of the Convention, including cases involving Member States. The EU Anti-Trafficking Directive includes slavery or practices similar to slavery as minimum forms of exploitation. The 1st EU Statistical Data Report was published in April 2013 ([1]).

(c) Local EU human rights country strategies have helped further shed light on the problem of slavery in some countries, as well as to draw up actions to address the issue. The EU actively promotes the implementation and ratification of ILO conventions 29 and 105 on forced labour, and convention 182 on the worst forms of child labour. Article 8 of the Cotonou agreement allows for the EU to regularly address its concern over issues such as slavery and forced labour and to call upon countries for specific commitments. Other EC instruments also address slavery. For example, in Mauritania, a call for project proposals launched this year under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), has the fight against slavery as one of its priorities.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/entity.action?breadCrumbReset=true&path=EU+Policy/Report_DGHome_Eurostat

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011955/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(18 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* «Διαρροή» από τον Snowden — ισχυρισμός περί συλλογής δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα από την Εθνική Υπηρεσία Ασφάλειας των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών

Σύμφωνα με το BBC News, ένα έγγραφο που διέρρευσε από τον Edward Snowden αναφέρει ότι η Εθνική Υπηρεσία Ασφάλειας των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών (NSA) συλλέγει έως 250 εκατομμύρια επιγραμμικά βιβλία διευθύνσεων ετησίως, τόσο από αλλοδαπούς όσο και από αμερικανικούς λογαριασμούς ηλεκτρονικών διευθύνσεων και στιγμιαίων μηνυμάτων. Τα βιβλία διευθύνσεων μπορεί να περιλαμβάνουν ονόματα, ηλεκτρονικές διευθύνσεις, αριθμούς τηλεφώνου, διευθύνσεις κατοικίας, καθώς και πληροφορίες σχετικά με την επιχειρηματική και οικογενειακή κατάσταση.

Οι εμπλεκόμενοι διαδικτυακοί πάροχοι, υποστηρίζουν ότι δεν επέτρεψαν στην NSA να έχει άμεση πρόσβαση στις εν λόγω πληροφορίες. Η συλλογή πληροφοριών υλοποιείται υπερπόντια, όταν οι χρήστες συνδέονται, συντάσσουν ένα μήνυμα ή συγχρονίζουν τις συσκευές τους. Εικάζεται ότι οι πληροφορίες έχουν συλλεχθεί από εταιρίες τηλεπικοινωνιών με έδρα εκτός των ΗΠΑ.

Η NSA δήλωσε ότι η παρακολούθηση αυτού του είδους χρησιμοποιείται για την καταπολέμηση της τρομοκρατίας, της παράνομης διακίνησης ναρκωτικών και της εμπορίας ανθρώπων, μεταξύ άλλων εγκλημάτων. Ακόμη και αν ισχύει κάτι τέτοιο, δεν θα πρέπει να λησμονείται το γεγονός ότι οι εν λόγω δραστηριότητες μπορούν να θεωρηθούν ως παραβιάσεις των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και του ιδιωτικού βίου.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, η Επιτροπή καλείται να απαντήσει στα ακόλουθα ερωτήματα:

α) Ποια είναι η γνώμη της για αυτούς τους νέους ισχυρισμούς εις βάρος της NSA;

β) Τι είδους δράσεις δύνανται να αναλάβουν, τόσο η ίδια όσο και η ΕΕ, προκειμένου να διαφυλάξουν τα θεμελιώδη ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των πολιτών της ΕΕ από αυτή την παράνομη συλλογή δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα;

γ) Έχει θέσει το ζήτημα ενώπιον των αρχών των ΗΠΑ, και σε περίπτωση καταφατικής απάντησης, ποια ήταν η αντίδρασή τους;

**Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(17 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-011733/2013.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011955/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Snowden leak — allegation that US National Security Agency collects personal data

According to BBC News, a document leaked by Edward Snowden alleges that the US National Security Agency (NSA) collects up to 250 million online address books each year, from both foreign and US email and instant message accounts. The address books may contain names, emails, telephone numbers, home addresses and business and family information.

The web providers involved say that they have not given the NSA direct access to this data. The data collection takes place overseas when users log in, compose a message or synchronise devices. The information has allegedly been collected by telecommunication companies based outside the US.

The NSA has stated that such surveillance is used to combat terrorism, drug smuggling and human trafficking, among other crimes. While this may be the case, it should not be forgotten that such activities can be regarded as violations of human rights and privacy.

In the light of this, the Commission is asked to answer the following:

(a) What is its view of these new allegations against the NSA?

(b) What actions can it and the EU take to safeguard the fundamental human rights of EU citizens against this illegal collection of personal data?

(c) Has it raised the matter with the US authorities and, if so, what was their reaction?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**
*(17 December 2013)*

The Commision would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-011733/2013.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011956/13**
**προς το Συμβούλιο**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(18 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Ύποπτες χρηματοδοτήσεις στη Γερμανία

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες του γερμανικού περιοδικού SPIEGEL και σχετικές αναφορές στην ιστοσελίδα του Γερμανικού Κοινοβουλίου, γερμανική αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία χορήγησε το ποσό των 690 000 ευρώ στο κυβερνών Χριστιανοδημοκρατικό Κόμμα της Γερμανίας, με σκοπό η Γερμανική Κυβέρνηση να μπλοκάρει απόφαση της ΕΕ με την οποία θα περιοριζόταν η εκπομπή καυσαερίων των αυτοκινήτων. Πρόκειται για σοβαρούς ισχυρισμούς που αγγίζουν καίρια θέματα δεοντολογίας και μάλιστα σε μια χώρα με ηγετικό ρόλο στην Ένωση.

Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο:

— Είναι σε γνώση της οι πιο πάνω πληροφορίες;

— Αληθεύει ο προβαλλόμενος ισχυρισμός ότι οι υπουργοί Περιβάλλοντος της ΕΕ, μετά από Γερμανικές πιέσεις, ενέδωσαν και απέρριψαν τη συμφωνία για περιορισμό των καυσαερίων των αυτοκινήτων;

— Θεωρεί ότι εγείρονται θέματα διαφθοράς, μαύρου χρήματος ή πολιτικής δεοντολογίας στην υπόθεση αυτή;

— Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε να διαλευκανθεί πλήρως η υπόθεση αυτή;

**Απάντηση**
*(23 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Το Συμβούλιο δεν είναι αρμόδιο να σχολιάζει δημοσιεύματα του τύπου.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011956/13**
**to the Council**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Suspicious funding in Germany

According to an article in the German magazine *Spiegel* and information on the German Parliament website, a German automotive manufacturer has donated the sum of EUR 690 000 to the ruling Christian Democratic Union in Germany, in a bid to get the German Government to block an EU decision limiting vehicle exhaust emissions. These are serious allegations concerning crucial questions of ethics, especially in a country which plays a leading role in the Union.

In view of the above, will the Council say:

— Has the above information come to its attention?

— Is it true that the EU Environment Ministers gave in and rejected an agreement to limit vehicle exhaust emissions under pressure from Germany?

— Does it consider that questions of corruption, bribery and political ethics have arisen in this case?

— What does it intend to do to fully elucidate this matter?

**Reply**
*(23 December 2013)*

It is not for the Council to comment on articles appearing in the press.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011959/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Richard Seeber (PPE)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Fehlende Koordinierung der Lerninhalte an europäischen Hochschulen

Die Verwirklichung des Europäischen Hochschulraums scheint in der Praxis bisweilen an den nicht abgestimmten Curricula der Universitäten innerhalb und zwischen den unterschiedlichen Mitgliedstaaten zu scheitern. Das Fehlen jeglicher Koordinierung der Lerninhalte kann die StudentInnen vor große organisatorische Schwierigkeiten stellen und zu Zeitverlusten im Studium führen.

Auch bereits der Wechsel von Universitäten innerhalb eines Mitgliedstaates kann aufgrund der unterschiedlichen Lerninhalte mit großen administrativen Hürden, wie zum Beispiel der Nichtanerkennung von absolvierten Kursen und dem verbindlichen Nachholen von Kursen, einhergehen.

Welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission zu ergreifen, um diesen in der Praxis auftretenden Hürden für StudentInnen zu begegnen?

**Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission**
*(28. November 2013)*

Für die Systeme der allgemeinen und beruflichen Bildung sind die nationalen Regierungen zuständig, und über die Curricula und Lehrinhalte der einzelnen Hochschulen bestimmen diese selbst. Es ist nicht Ziel des Europäischen Hochschulraums, eine Harmonisierung der Lehrinhalte herbeizuführen, sondern für mehr Kohärenz und Möglichkeiten der Interaktion zwischen den Hochschulen zu sorgen, wozu auch die Freizügigkeit der Studierenden gehört, für die sich der Herr Abgeordnete einsetzt.

Das von der Kommission geförderte Instrumentarium auf EU-Ebene ist ein Beitrag zur Verstärkung der Kohärenz unterschiedlicher Systeme. Das in den meisten Ländern des Europäischen Hochschulraums verwendete Europäische System zur Anrechnung von Studienleistungen (European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System, ECTS) ist ein starkes Instrument, das nicht nur die Übertragung von Leistungspunkten ermöglicht, sondern auch die Zusammenrechnung der in Studiengängen unterschiedlicher Hochschulen erworbenen Leistungspunkte; dadurch werden die an verschiedenen Hochschulen erzielten Lernergebnisse transparenter und lassen sich besser miteinander vergleichen. Die derzeit laufende Überarbeitung des ECTS-Leitfadens wird dazu führen, dass das ECTS im Europäischen Hochschulraum häufiger Verwendung als gemeinsame Grundlage von Studienprogrammen findet.

Erasmus+ wird die Kohärenz noch weiter verstärken. An den betreffenden Mobilitätsaktionen können sich nur Einrichtungen beteiligen, die die Erasmus-Hochschulcharta unterzeichnet haben. Die Unterzeichner der Charta verpflichten sich, die im Ausland erworbenen Leistungspunkte als integralen Bestandteil ihrer Studiengänge anzuerkennen. Alle Leistungspunkte, die Studierende aufgrund einer Studienvereinbarung erhalten, die im Rahmen einer Mobilitätsaktion geschlossen wurde, müssen von der Heimathochschule ohne weitere Kurse oder Prüfungen anerkannt werden.

Darüber hinaus werden strategische Partnerschaften im Rahmen von Erasmus+ Hochschulen die Gelegenheit zur Förderung und Entwicklung von Mobilitätsfenstern als integraler Bestandteil der Curricula bieten, wodurch die Anerkennung von Studienzeiten im Ausland noch weiter verbessert wird.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011959/13**
**to the Commission**
**Richard Seeber (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Lack of coordination of the material being taught at European universities

Realisation of the European Higher Education Area sometimes seems to fail in practice on account of the lack of coordination of the curricula of the universities within and between different Member States. The lack of any coordination of the material being taught can cause major organisational problems for students and lead to wasted time in their studies.

Even changing universities within a Member State can present major administrative obstacles on account of the differing course content, such as courses taken not being recognised and a student being obliged to take courses to catch up on what has been missed.

What steps does the Commission intend to take to address these obstacles that arise in practice for students?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission**
*(28 November 2013)*

National governments are responsible for their education and training systems, and individual higher education institutions organise their own curricula and course content. It is not an objective of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) to bring about harmonisation of educational content but to create greater coherence and possibilities for interaction between institutions, including the free movement of students as promoted by the honourable member.

European tools supported by the Commission are one lever for greater coherence among different systems. The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS — used by most countries of the EHEA) is a powerful tool, not only for transferring credits, but also for accumulating them in different institutions' study programmes, by making learning outcomes clearer and more directly comparable across institutions. The current revision of the ECTS Guide will strengthen the use of ECTS as a common basis of study programmes in the EHEA.

Erasmus+ will help bring further coherence. Only institutions that have signed the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education may participate in its mobility actions. Use of the Charter will require that credits gained abroad are recognised as an integral part of the student's degree programmes. All credits that the student earns under the Learning Agreement governing their mobility shall be recognised by the home institution without any further courses or exams.

Furthermore, Strategic Partnerships within Erasmus+ will provide the opportunity for higher education institutions to promote and develop mobility windows as an integral part of curricula, thereby further improving recognition of study abroad periods.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011961/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Richard Seeber (PPE)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Mängel bei der Umsetzung eines einheitlichen Europäischen Hochschulraums

Der Bologna-Prozess zielt auf die Schaffung eines einheitlichen Europäischen Hochschulraums ab. Obwohl bereits viele Fortschritte erzielt wurden, scheint die Verwirklichung des Europäischen Hochschulraums in der Praxis bisweilen an den unterschiedlichen akademischen Kalendern und internen Fristen der europäischen Universitäten zu scheitern.

So informieren etwa die unterschiedlichen Universitäten zukünftige Studenten über ihre Studienzulassung zu stark voneinander abweichenden Zeitpunkten. Dies kann dazu führen, dass Studenten, die sich für Studiengänge an Universitäten in mehreren unterschiedlichen Mitgliedstaaten bewerben, aufgrund des Fristlaufs einen Studienplatz verpflichtend annehmen müssen, bevor sie die Bescheide über Studienzulassungen an anderen europäischen Universitäten überhaupt erhalten haben. Ebenso weichen der Zeitpunkt des Studienbeginns und des Studienendes an den unterschiedlichen Universitäten teils stark voneinander ab.

Welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission zu treffen, um diesen in der Praxis auftretenden Hürden für Studenten zu begegnen?

**Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission**
*(3. Dezember 2013)*

Gemäß dem Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union tragen die Mitgliedstaaten die Hauptverantwortung für die Hochschulpolitik, was im Jahr 1999 in der Erklärung von Bologna bestätigt wurde. Die Europäische Union unterstützt und ergänzt die Maßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten durch Förderung der Zusammenarbeit und der Entwicklung politischer Konzepte, durch aktive Mitwirkung in den Entscheidungsgremien des Bologna-Prozesses sowie durch Finanzierung verschiedener Maßnahmen.

In Anbetracht der Tatsache, dass die Vielfalt der Kultur- und Bildungstraditionen in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten eine Stärke ist, die den hohen Grad an Autonomie der Hochschulen in allen Bereichen ihrer Tätigkeit reflektiert, zielt der Bologna-Prozess nicht auf eine Harmonisierung der unterschiedlichen Hochschulsysteme (oder ihrer akademischen Kalender) ab. Der Prozess zielt vielmehr darauf ab, die Systeme kohärenter zu gestalten, und die Kommission unterstützt dies, indem sie zur Entwicklung gemeinsamer europäischer Instrumente zur Förderung der Kohärenz und Konvergenz in der Hochschulbildung beiträgt.

Die Kommission unterstützt außerdem das Netz der nationalen Informationszentren für die akademische Anerkennung in der EU, das angehende Studierende über die Zulassungsbedingungen der Hochschulen in unterschiedlichen Ländern des Europäischen Hochschulraums informieren kann. Diese Informationen erleichtern die individuelle Mobilität von Studierenden.

Da sich die für die Hochschulbildung zuständigen Minister auf der Bukarester Bologna-Konferenz 2012 dazu verpflichtet haben, auf das langfristige Ziel einer automatischen Anerkennung vergleichbarer Hochschulabschlüsse hinzuarbeiten, fördert die Kommission derzeit eine Sondierungsgruppe von Ländern, die untersucht, welche Ansätze eine automatische Anerkennung ermöglichen würden. Die Sondierungsgruppe wird der Bologna-Ministerkonferenz, die 2015 in Eriwan stattfindet, ihren Bericht vorlegen.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011961/13**
**to the Commission**
**Richard Seeber (PPE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Shortcomings in the implementation of a single European Higher Education Area

The Bologna process aims to establish a single European Higher Education Area. Although a great deal of progress has already been made, the realisation of the European Higher Education Area sometimes appears to fail in practice on account of the different academic calendars and internal timescales of the European universities.

For example, the various universities inform future students of their admission at widely differing times. This can result in students who apply for courses at universities in several different Member States being compelled, on account of the deadline set, to accept a place before they have received the decisions regarding admissions to other European universities. The start and end dates of the courses also differ widely at different universities.

What steps does the Commission intend to take to address these obstacles that arise in practice for students?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission**
*(3 December 2013)*

Member States have the primary responsibility for higher education policies under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and this is confirmed under the Bologna Declaration of 1999. The European Union supports and supplements the actions of Member States by promoting cooperation and policy development, by playing an active role in the decision-making bodies of the Bologna Process, and by financing various actions.

The Bologna Process does not aim to harmonise different higher education systems (nor their academic calendars) — considering that the variety of cultural and educational traditions in the different member countries is a strength which reflects the high degree of autonomy of higher education institutions across all their activities. The Process rather aims to make systems more coherent, and the Commission supports this by contributing to the development of common European tools that foster coherence and convergence in higher education.

The Commission also supports the network of National Recognition Centres (NARICs) in the EU, which can provide information to potential students on conditions for admission to higher education institutions in different countries of the EHEA. This information facilitates individual mobility for the purposes of study.

Following the commitment of higher education ministers at the 2012 Bologna-Bucharest conference to work towards the long-term goal of automatic recognition of comparable academic degrees, the Commission is facilitating a pathfinder group of countries exploring approaches to automatic recognition. The pathfinder group will report to the 2015 Bologna ministerial conference in Yerevan.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011962/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE) und Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)**
*(18. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Vorbereitung der Verhandlungen zur transatlantischen Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft — Transparenz und Einbeziehung von Interessenträgern

Obwohl die Kommission eine Sitzung des zivilgesellschaftlichen Dialogs über die Gespräche der transatlantischen Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft (TTIP) durchgeführt hat, bleibt ein starkes Ungleichgewicht. Eine Liste von 135 „Sitzungen mit Interessenträgern", die von der Kommission organisiert wurden, wurde veröffentlicht. Sie zeigt, dass 119 von diesen Sitzungen mit großen Konzernen und deren Lobbyisten stattfanden und nur eine Hand voll mit Gewerkschaften und Verbrauchergruppen. Darüber hinaus wurden in den Sitzungen die EU-Vorbereitungen für die Handelsgespräche behandelt, wohingegen die offizielle Konsultation mit der Zivilgesellschaft kaum mehr als eine Informationsveranstaltung war, die dem Beginn der Gespräche folgte. Ebenso kamen die Beiträge der EU-Online-Konsultation fast ausschließlich von Unternehmen und Industrieverbänden, als ein Ergebnis einer Befragung, die sich auf diese Gruppen konzentrierte.

Welche konkreten Maßnahmen wird die Kommission vornehmen, um dieses starke Ungleichgewicht zu bewältigen?

Beim zivilgesellschaftlichen Dialog im Juli 2013 erklärte die Kommission, dass vielleicht eine Gruppe von Fachberatern einberufen wird. Wird die Kommission diesen Vorschlag zu Ende führen?

Was wird die spezifische Rolle einer solchen Gruppe sein und wer sollte ihr angehören? Werden zusätzlich zu Wirtschaftsdelegationen auch NGOs, die sich mit Umwelt-, Verbraucher- und Gesundheitspolitik befassen, Gewerkschaften und unabhängige Experten einbezogen? Falls nicht: warum nicht?

In der Welthandelsorganisation und den UN-Klimaschutzverhandlungen gaben die einzelnen betroffenen Parteien, einschließlich der EU, ihre Verhandlungspositionen bekannt. Die Kommission hat damit begonnen einige von ihren Positionen zu den Handelsverhandlungen zu veröffentlichen. Warum hat die Kommission die Dokumente, die sie den USA in der ersten Runde der Verhandlungen in Washington vorgelegt hat, noch nicht veröffentlicht?

Wann wird die Kommission alle ihre Verhandlungspositionen und ihr Verhandlungsmandat veröffentlichen? Wird sie die Texte der Verhandlungen veröffentlichen? Falls nicht: warum nicht? Seit nunmehr einigen Jahren veröffentlicht die Regierung des Vereinigten Königreichs eine Liste ihrer Sitzungen mit den Lobbyisten, die vierteljährlich aktualisiert wird. Wann wird die Kommission Listen von ihren Sitzungen mit den Lobbyisten auf ihrer Website veröffentlichen? Falls sie solche Listen nicht veröffentlicht: warum nicht?

**Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission**
*(13. Dezember 2013)*

Transparenz und Beteiligung der Interessenträger sind für die Kommission nach wie vor essenziell. Bei Verhandlungen über Handelsfragen bezieht die Kommission aktiv alle relevanten betroffenen Parteien ein, z. B. die Wirtschaft, Gewerkschaften, NRO ([1]) und die breite Öffentlichkeit. An den regelmäßigen Sitzungen im Rahmen des zivilgesellschaftlichen Dialogs der Kommission nehmen oft Vertreter von 60 Organisationen teil, die viele verschiedene Gruppen repräsentieren.

In Anbetracht des hohen öffentlichen Interesses an den Verhandlungen über eine transatlantische Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft (TTIP) mit den USA hat die Kommission weitere Schritte eingeleitet, damit alle relevanten Interessenträger angehört werden und ihre Standpunkte berücksichtigt werden. Sie hat zusätzliche Kanäle für die Information und die Öffentlichkeitsarbeit eingerichtet, z. B. über ihre Website und ein neu geschaffenes Twitter-Konto. Außerdem hat sie, was bisher beispiellos ist, die ersten Positionspapiere der EU veröffentlicht.

Im Allgemeinen ist die Kommission offen für Treffen mit allen Organisationen, ob aus der Wirtschaft oder aus anderen Bereichen. Darüber hinaus fordert sie die Wirtschaft, zivilgesellschaftliche Organisationen und allgemein die Öffentlichkeit auf, zur Ausarbeitung der EU-Politik beizutragen, z. B. durch Kommentare zu den Unterlagen, die auf der Website der Generaldirektion (GD) Handel eingestellt werden.

([1]) Nichtregierungsorganisationen.

Die Kommission hat kürzlich angekündigt, dass sie die Einsetzung einer beratenden Sachverständigengruppe der GD Handel zu den TTIP-Verhandlungen plant. Diese Gruppe soll vor allem dem Austausch der Standpunkte der Sachverständigen und der Beratung zu den in den Verhandlungen angesprochenen Fragen dienen. Sie wird ausgewogen zusammengesetzt sein; die Sachverständigen werden aus der Wirtschaft, aus Gewerkschaften, Verbraucherorganisationen, Umweltschutz-NRO, akademischen Kreisen und Ideenschmieden stammen. Nähere Informationen dazu werden in Kürze auf der Website der GD Handel veröffentlicht.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011962/13**
**à la Commission**
**Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE) et Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)**
*(18 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Préparation des négociations concernant le partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement — Transparence et participation des parties prenantes

Si la Commission a organisé une réunion de dialogue avec la société civile sur les négociations relatives au partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement, il demeure néanmoins un déséquilibre majeur. Une liste de 135 réunions organisées par la Commission avec des parties prenantes a été publiée; elle révèle que 119 réunions se sont tenues avec de grandes entreprises et leurs groupes de pression et que seule une poignée d'entre elles se sont déroulée en présence de syndicats et d'associations de consommateurs. Par ailleurs, les réunions traitaient des préparations de l'Union aux négociations commerciales, alors que la consultation officielle de la société civile ne constituait qu'une séance d'information postérieure au début des négociations. De même, les contributions apportées dans le cadre des consultations en ligne de l'Union provenaient presque exclusivement d'entreprises et d'organisations sectorielles, étant donné que le questionnaire ciblait ces groupes en particulier.

Quelles mesures concrètes la Commission va-t-elle prendre pour remédier à ce déséquilibre majeur?

Lors du dialogue organisé avec la société civile en juillet 2013, la Commission a déclaré qu'un groupe de conseillers experts pouvait être créé. La Commission va-t-elle donner suite à cette proposition?

Que va être le rôle spécifique de ce groupe et qui devrait en faire partie? Outre des délégués commerciaux, le groupe comptera-t-il également des ONG actives en matière d'environnement, de consommation et de santé publique, des syndicats et des experts indépendants? Si non, pourquoi?

Au sein de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce et dans le cadre des négociations sur le climat au sein des Nations unies, les diverses parties concernées, y compris l'Union européenne, annoncent leur position de négociation. La Commission a commencé à publier quelques-unes de ses positions concernant les négociations commerciales. Pourquoi la Commission n'a-t-elle pas encore publié les documents qu'elle a présentés aux États-Unis lors du premier cycle de négociations à Washington, DC?

Quand la Commission va-t-elle publier l'ensemble de ses positions de négociation et son mandat de négociation? Envisage-t-elle de publier le texte des négociations? Si non, pourquoi? Depuis déjà plusieurs années, le gouvernement britannique publie une liste de ses réunions avec les groupes de pression et la met à jour tous les trois mois. Quand la Commission mettra-t-elle en ligne une liste de toutes les réunions qu'elle tient avec les groupes de pression? Si elle ne publie pas ce type de liste, pour quelles raisons?

**Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission**
*(13 décembre 2013)*

La Commission reste très attachée à la transparence et à la participation des parties prenantes. Lorsqu'elle conduit des négociations commerciales, elle s'efforce d'associer toutes les parties prenantes concernées, telles que les entreprises, les syndicats, les ONG et le grand public. Les réunions régulières organisées par la Commission dans le cadre du dialogue avec la société civile attirent souvent des représentants de 60 organisations venant des horizons les plus divers.

Compte tenu du vif intérêt du public pour les négociations relatives à un partenariat transatlantique pour le commerce et l'investissement (PTCI) avec les États-Unis, la Commission a pris des dispositions supplémentaires pour faire en sorte que les points de vue de toutes les parties prenantes concernées soient entendus et pris en considération. Elle a établi des canaux d'information et de contact supplémentaires, par exemple par l'intermédiaire de son site web et d'un compte nouvellement créé sur Twitter. Elle a également publié les documents présentant la position initiale de l'Union européenne, ce qui constitue une première.

D'une manière générale, la Commission applique une politique d'ouverture et rencontre toutes les organisations (professionnelles ou non professionnelles) qui en font la demande. La Commission encourage également les entreprises, les organisations de la société civile et le public en général à contribuer à l'élaboration de la politique de l'UE, notamment par des observations concernant les documents publiés sur le site web de la direction générale du commerce.

La Commission a récemment annoncé qu'elle avait l'intention de créer un groupe consultatif d'experts sur les négociations PTCI sous l'égide de la DG Commerce. Ce groupe sera principalement chargé d'échanger des avis d'experts et de fournir des conseils sur les éléments en cours de négociation. Il aura une composition équilibrée et rassemblera des experts du secteur des entreprises, des syndicats, des organisations de consommateurs, des ONG de protection de l'environnement ([1]), des universitaires et des groupes de réflexion. Des informations détaillées seront publiées prochainement sur le site internet de la DG Commerce.

([1]) Organisations non gouvernementales.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011962/13**
**to the Commission**
**Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE) and Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)**
*(18 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Preparation of Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations — transparency and stakeholder involvement

Although the Commission has conducted a civil society dialogue meeting on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) talks, there remains a massive imbalance. A list has been released of 135 'meetings with stakeholders' organised by the Commission, revealing that 119 of these meetings were with large corporations and their lobby groups, and only a handful with trade unions and consumer groups. Moreover, the meetings dealt with the EU's preparations for the trade talks, whereas the official civil society consultation was merely an information session following the launch of the talks. Similarly, contributions to the EU's online consultations came almost exclusively from companies and industry associations, as a result of a questionnaire focusing on these groups.

What concrete action will the Commission take to tackle this massive imbalance?

At the civil society dialogue held in July 2013, the Commission stated that a group of expert advisors may be set up. Will the Commission follow through with this suggestion?

What will be the specific role of such a group, and who should be part of it? In addition to business delegates, will it also include environmental, consumer and public health NGOs, trade unions and independent experts? If not, why not?

In the World Trade Organisation and at UN climate negotiations, the various parties concerned, including the EU, announce their negotiation positions. The Commission has begun publishing a number of its positions on trade negotiations. Why has the Commission not yet published the documents that it presented to the US in the first round of negotiations in Washington DC?

When will the Commission publish all of its negotiation positions, and its negotiating mandate? Will it publish the texts of the negotiations? If not, why not? For several years now, the UK Government has published a list of its meetings with lobbyists, updated quarterly. When does the Commission post lists on its website of all meetings held with lobbyists? If it does not publish such lists, why not?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

The Commission remains fully committed to transparency and stakeholder involvement. When conducting trade negotiations, the Commission actively seeks the involvement of all relevant stakeholders, such as business, trade unions, NGOs, the broader public. The regular meetings of the Commission's dialogue with civil society often attract representatives from 60 organisations from many walks of life.

Given the high public interest for the negotiations on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership Agreement (TTIP) with the United States, the Commission has taken additional steps to ensure that the views of all relevant stakeholders are heard and taken into account. The Commission has created additional channels of information and outreach, for example via its website and a newly created Twitter account. It has also, in an unprecedented step, published the EU's initial position papers.

As a general rule, the Commission has an open door policy and meets all organisations (whether business or non-business) that request it. The Commission also encourages business, civil society organisations and the general public to contribute to the preparation of EU policy, for example by commenting on documents posted on the Directorate-General (DG) for Trade's website.

The Commission recently announced that it has the intention to create a DG Trade Expert Advisory Group on the TTIP negotiations. The Group's focus will be to exchange expert views and provide advice on the issues under negotiation. This Group will have a balanced composition. It will gather experts from the business sector, trade unions, consumer organisations, environmental NGOs ([1]), academics and think tanks. Detailed information will be published shortly on the DG Trade website.

---

([1]) Non-governmental organisations.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011967/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Kriterien für den Wechsel von EU-Beamten in nationale Behörden

In verschiedenen Medienberichten wird immer wieder auf Wechsel von Kommissionsbeamten in die Privatwirtschaft hingewiesen. Für den Wechsel von der Kommission in die Privatwirtschaft gibt es Kriterien der Kommission. Es gibt jedoch auch Kommissionbeamte, die in nationale Behörden wechseln.

1. Sieht die Kommission beim Wechsel von der Kommission in eine nationale Behörde keine Probleme mit Interessenkonflikten?

2. Wie viele Kommissionsbeamte wechselten nach Kenntnis der Kommission in den Jahren 2010, 2011 und 2012 in eine nationale Behörde?

3. Plant die Kommission, die gleichen Kriterien für Wechsel von der Kommission in nationale Behörden anzuwenden, wie sie bereits für Wechsel in die Privatwirtschaft gelten? Wenn ja, ab welchem Zeitpunkt soll dieses Kriterium gelten?

**Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission**
*(9. Januar 2014)*

1. Die Mitgliedstaaten und ihre Behörden sind Teil der Europäischen Union. Sie sind über den Rat an der Beschlussfassung beteiligt und wenden täglich Rechtsvorschriften und Strategien der EU an. Wechselt ein EU-Beamter in eine nationale Behörde, so bewertet die Kommission von Fall zu Fall die potenziellen Risiken für die Interessen der Kommission. Beamte bleiben weiterhin verpflichtet, sich jeder nicht genehmigten Verbreitung von Informationen zu enthalten, von denen sie im Rahmen ihrer Aufgaben Kenntnis erhalten, es sei denn, diese Informationen sind bereits veröffentlicht oder der Öffentlichkeit zugänglich.

2. Zur Beantwortung der Anfrage des Herrn Abgeordneten müsste die Kommission langwierige und kostspielige Recherchen anstellen, die sie zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt aufgrund anderer Prioritäten nicht in Erwägung zieht.

3. Die Bestimmungen von Titel II „Rechte und Pflichten des Beamten“ des Statuts der Beamten der Europäischen Union und der Beschäftigungsbedingungen für die sonstigen Bediensteten der Europäischen Union gelten gleichermaßen für alle Fälle; sie hängen nicht von der Art der Organisation ab, in die Bedienstete im Rahmen der externen Mobilität entsandt werden oder in der sie eine Tätigkeit ausüben.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011967/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Criteria for EU officials moving into national authorities

Moves by Commission officials into the private sector have been reported in the media on numerous occasions. The Commission has criteria that are to be applied when an official moves from the Commission into the private sector. However, there are also Commission officials who move into national authorities.

1. Does the Commission not see any problems in terms of conflicts of interests when an official moves from the Commission into a national authority?

2. To the Commission's knowledge, how many Commission officials moved into a national authority in 2010, 2011 and 2012?

3. Does the Commission plan to apply the same criteria to a move from the Commission into national authorities as already apply to a move into the private sector? If so, from what date is this to apply?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission**
*(9 January 2014)*

1. Member States and their national authorities are part of the European Union. They participate in the decision-making through the Council and apply EC law and policies on a daily basis. If an EU official moves to a national administration, an assessment of potential risks for the interests of the Commission is carried out by the Commission on a case by case basis. Officials remain bound by their obligation to refrain from any unauthorised disclosure of information received in the line of duty, unless that information has already been made public or accessible to the public.

2. In order to answer the Honourable Member's question the Commission would have to undertake lengthy and costly research. It cannot consider doing this at the present time because of other priorities.

3. The provisions of title II 'Rights and obligations' of the Staff Regulations of the officials and conditions of employments of other servants of the European Union apply equally to all cases; they do not depend on the type of organisation where staffs are sent on external mobility or where they take up activity.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011968/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Mitgliedschaft im Ethikrat der Kommission

In der Kommission gibt es einen Ethikrat, der das Verhalten von Mitgliedern der EU-Kommission bei ihrem Übertritt in die Privatwirtschaft begutachten soll. Ein Mitglied dieses Rates ist Michel Petite, der 2007 aus dem Juristischen Dienst der Kommission ausschied und seither bei der Anwaltskanzlei Clifford Chance arbeitet. Ein Großkunde von Clifford Chance ist der Tabakkonzern Philip Morris.

1. Wie viele Mitglieder hat der Ethikrat der Kommission derzeit?

2. Wie heißen diese Mitglieder?

3. Sieht die Kommission einen Interessenkonflikt zwischen der Mitgliedschaft von Michel Petite im Ethikrat der Kommission und seiner Tätigkeit als Anwalt für einen Tabakkonzern?

4. Welche Kriterien legt die Kommission für die Mitgliedschaft in ihrem Ethikrat an?

**Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission**
*(19. Dezember 2013)*

1. Gemäß Artikel 4 Absatz 1 des Kommissionsbeschlusses K(2003) 3750 vom 21. Oktober 2003 besteht der Ad hoc-Ethikausschuss aus drei Mitgliedern.

2. Derzeit gehören dem Ad hoc-Ethikausschuss an: Rafael García-Valdecasas, ehemaliger Richter am Gericht erster Instanz der Europäischen Union, Terry Wynn, ehemaliges Mitglied des Europäischen Parlaments, und Michel Petite, ehemaliger Generaldirektor des Juristischen Dienstes der Europäischen Kommission.

3. Die Kommission sieht keinen Interessenskonflikt.

Der Ad hoc-Ethikausschuss hat im Wesentlichen zu beurteilen, ob geplante Tätigkeiten ehemaliger Kommissionsmitglieder nach dem Ausscheiden aus dem Amt mit dem Vertrag und dem Verhaltenskodex für Kommissionsmitglieder vereinbar sind. Für die Arbeit der drei Ausschussmitglieder gilt das Kollegialitätsprinzip. Wenn Herr Petite als Mitglied des Ausschusses tätig wird und zusammen mit den anderen Mitgliedern Stellungnahmen für die Kommission erstellt, handelt er in völliger Unabhängigkeit.

4. Die Kriterien der Kommission für die Mitgliedschaft im Ad hoc-Ethikausschuss sind im eingangs genannten Kommissionsbeschluss K(2003)3750 festgelegt; darin heißt es, die Mitglieder des Ausschusses werden „aufgrund ihrer Kompetenz, Erfahrung und beruflichen Fähigkeiten benannt“ und „Voraussetzung für die Benennung sind Unabhängigkeit, eine untadelige Berufslaufbahn sowie eine gründliche Kenntnis des Rechtsrahmens und der Arbeitsmethoden der Kommission“.

Der Europäische Bürgerbeauftragte gelangte in seinen jüngsten Schlussfolgerungen zu einer Individualbeschwerde zu dem Ergebnis, dass die von der Kommission angewandten Kriterien zur Auswahl der Ausschussmitglieder nicht zu beanstanden und mehr als angemessen sind.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011968/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Membership of the Commission's Ethics Committee

Within the Commission there is an Ethics Committee, the purpose of which is to review the behaviour of members of the Commission who move into the private sector. One member of this committee is Michel Petite, who left the Legal Service of the Commission in 2007 and ever since then has worked at the law firm Clifford Chance. An important client of Clifford Chance is the tobacco corporation Philip Morris.

1. How many members does the Commission's Ethics Committee currently have?

2. What are the names of these members?

3. Does the Commission see a conflict of interest between Michel Petite's membership of the Commission's Ethics Committee and his work as a lawyer for a tobacco corporation?

4. What criteria does the Commission set for membership of its Ethics Committee?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission**
*(19 December 2013)*

1. According to Article 4(1) of Commission Decision C(2003) 3750 of 21 October 2003, the Ad hoc Ethical Committee consists of three members.

2. The current members of the Ad hoc Ethical Committee are Messrs Rafael García-Valdecasas, former Judge at the Court of First Instance of the European Union, Mr Terry Wynn, former Member of the European Parliament, and Michel Petite, former Director-General of the European Commission's Legal Service.

3. The Commission does not see any conflict of interests.

The Ad hoc Ethical Committee's remit is essentially to assess the compatibility with the Treaty and with the Code of Conduct for Commissioners of former Commissioners' envisaged post-office activities. Its three members work in a collegiate fashion. When acting as a member of the Committee and contributing with the other members to opinions to be delivered to the Commission, Mr Petite acts in full independence.

4. The Commission's criteria for membership to the Ad hoc Ethical Committee are set in the above referred provision of Commission Decision C(2003) 3750, which states that the Committee members are 'selected for their competence, experience and professional qualities' and that 'appointment as a member shall require, in particular, independence, an impeccable record of professional behaviour as well as a sound knowledge of the existing legal framework and the working methods of the Commission'.

In his recent conclusions on an individual complaint, the European Ombudsman considered that 'the criteria used by the Commission for selecting the members of the Committee are unobjectionable and more than adequate'.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011969/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Immobilien der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs (EMSA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge sah die Agentur für 2013 Miet- und Nebenkosten von 3 297 000 EUR vor.

1. Welche Immobilien mietet die Agentur an?

2. Welche Quadratmeterzahl und welche Quadratmeterkosten haben diese Immobilien jeweils?

3. Welche Miet- und Nebenkosten sind mit jeder dieser Immobilien jeweils verbunden?

4. Wie viele Mitarbeiter sind den Immobilien jeweils zugeordnet?

5. Besitzt die Agentur auch eigene Immobilien, oder plant sie, solche zu bauen oder zu erwerben?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011979/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Informatikanschaffungen der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs (EMSA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge sah die Agentur für 2013 Zahlungsverpflichtungen des Postens „Ausgaben für Informatik“ (in der englischen Version „Information Technology Purchases“) von 424 000 EUR vor. 2012 waren es 487 699 EUR, im Jahr 2011 gab es Zahlungsverpflichtungen von 542 982,30 EUR.

Wie genau gliederten sich die Kosten für den Kauf von Informatikausstattung in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 auf?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011980/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Entwicklung von Datenbanken für die Europäische Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs (EMSA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge sah die Agentur für 2013 Zahlungsverpflichtungen in Höhe von 4 324 707 EUR für den Posten „Entwicklung von Datenbanken“ vor. Im Jahr 2012 gab es Zahlungsverpflichtungen von 4 932 677 EUR und Zahlungen von 5 788 334 EUR.

Wie genau gliedern sich die Kosten der Entwicklung von Datenbanken in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 auf?

**Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission**
*(16. Dezember 2013)*

Die Kommission hat die Europäische Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs (EMSA) darum gebeten, die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu beantworten.

Die Antwort der Agentur hat die Kommission dem Herrn Abgeordneten am 2. Dezember 2013 übermittelt.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011969/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Property of the European Maritime Safety Agency

According to the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provided for rental and associated costs of EUR 3 297 000 for 2013.

1. What properties does the Agency rent?

2. What is the size of each of these properties in square metres and what do they cost per square metre?

3. What rental and associated costs are connected with each of these properties?

4. How many members of staff are assigned to each of these properties?

5. Does the Agency also have property of its own, or does it plan to build or acquire property of its own?

**Question for written answer E-011979/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The European Maritime Safety Agency's information technology purchases

According to the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provided for commitments of EUR 424 000 under the item 'information technology purchases' for 2013. In 2012, the amount was EUR 487 699, and in 2011 the commitments came to EUR 542 982.30.

What is the exact breakdown of the costs for the purchase of information technology in 2011 and 2012?

**Question for written answer E-011980/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Development of databases for the European Maritime Safety Agency

According to the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provided for commitments of EUR 4 324 707 for the item 'development of databases' for 2013. In 2012, the commitments amounted to EUR 4 932 677 and the payments to EUR 5 788 334.

What is the exact breakdown of the costs for the development of databases in 2012 and 2013?

**Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**
*(16 December 2013)*

The Commission has requested the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) to provide the answer to the questions raised by the Honourable member.

The Agency's reply was transmitted by the Commission to the Honourable Member on 2 December 2013.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011970/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Immobilien von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Mieten und Erbpachtzinsen" in der Höhe von 5 588 600 EUR vermerkt. Für 2012 waren es 5 449 500 und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 5 166 987 für Mieten und Erbpachtzinsen getätigt.

1. Über welche Immobilien verfügt Eurojust und wie viele Quadratmeter nutzbare Arbeitsfläche haben diese jeweils? Welche dieser Immobilien werden von Eurojust gemietet und wie hoch sind die Mietkosten für diese?

2. Welche Immobilien sind in vollem Besitz von Eurojust? Für welche Immobilien zahlt Eurojust Erbpacht und wie hoch fällt diese jeweils aus? Wie genau sieht der Vertrag mit dem Grundstückseigentümer aus, wer ist der Grundstückeigentümer und was passiert am Ende des Erbpachtvertrages mit dem Grundstück beziehungsweise dem Gebäude?

3. Warum hat Eurojust jährlich höhere Mittel für Mieten und Erbpachtzinsen veranschlagt? Insbesondere welche Kosten sind gestiegen?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011973/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Kosten für bewegliche Sachen und Nebenkosten von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Bewegliche Sachen und Nebenkosten" in Höhe von 107 000 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 137 500 EUR und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 257 404 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen beziehungsweise erwarteten Kosten für „Bewegliche Sachen und Nebenkosten" für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Werden die in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 tatsächlich getätigten Ausgaben die veranschlagten Mittel übersteigen?

3. Wie erreichte Eurojust die Kostensenkung von 2011 bis 2013? Erwartet Eurojust in den nächsten Jahren neue Kostensenkungen oder eher neue Kostensteigerungen?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011974/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Datenverarbeitungskosten von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Datenverarbeitung" in Höhe von 540 800 EUR vermerkt. Im Vorjahr waren es 467 900 EUR, und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 754 177 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen beziehungsweise erwarteten Kosten für Datenverarbeitung für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Über wie viele geleaste Geräte verfügt Eurojust? Was für Geräte sind dies jeweils, und wie hoch sind die monatlichen Kosten?

3. Wie viele eigene Geräte wie Drucker, Computer, Laptops, Beamer, Server, etc. hat Eurojust in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils erworben? Wie hoch waren dafür jeweils die Kosten?

4. Warum waren im Jahr 2011 die tatsächlichen Ausgaben höher als die Mittel, die für die Jahre 2012 und 2013 veranschlagt sind? Haben die tatsächlichen Ausgaben im Jahr 2012 die veranschlagten Mittel überstiegen? Erwartet Eurojust, dass die tatsächlichen Kosten im Jahr 2013 die veranschlagten Mittel wesentlich übersteigen werden?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011975/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Kosten für Post-, Fernmeldegebühren und Computerinfrastruktur von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Post-, Fernmeldegebühren und Computerinfrastruktur“ in Höhe von 963 800 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 1 398 800 EUR, und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 1 406 802 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen beziehungsweise erwarteten Kosten für „Post-, Fernmeldegebühren und Computerinfrastruktur“ für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Inwiefern überlappen sich die Posten „Post-, Fernmeldegebühren und Computerinfrastruktur“ und „Datenverarbeitung“ des Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplans?

3. Wie erreichte Eurojust die Kostensenkung von 2011 bis 2013? Erwartet Eurojust in den nächsten Jahren neue Kostensenkungen oder neue Kostensteigerungen?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011976/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Sitzungs-, Konferenz- und Repräsentationskosten von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Sitzungs-, Konferenz- und Repräsentationskosten“ in Höhe von 2 319 669 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 2 358 000 EUR, und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 2 078 532 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen bzw. die erwarteten Kosten für Sitzungs-, Konferenz- und Repräsentationskosten für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Wie viele Konferenzen organisierte Eurojust in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils? Wie hoch waren die Kosten und die Teilnehmerzahl je Konferenz?

3. Wie viele Sitzungen organisiert Eurojust jährlich, und in welcher Form fallen dafür Kosten an? Wie hoch waren die durchschnittlichen Kosten je Sitzung für 2011, 2012 und 2013?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011977/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Kosten für Daten und Dokumentation von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Daten und Dokumentation“ in Höhe von 2 543 225 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 2 791 125 EUR, und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 3 067 611 EUR getätigt.

Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen bzw. die erwarteten Kosten für „Daten und Dokumentation“ für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011978/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* Operative Dienstreisen und Dienstreisen von Sachverständigen von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Operative Dienstreisen und Dienstreisen von Sachverständigen" in Höhe von 1 797 000 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 1 907 109 EUR und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 1 463 791 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen beziehungsweise erwarteten operativen Dienstreisen und Dienstreisen von Sachverständigen für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Wie viele Dienstreisen wurden in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 von Eurojust-Personal unternommen? Wie hoch waren die Kosten für diese Reisen durchschnittlich? Welche waren die fünf teuersten Dienstreisen?

3. Wie viele Dienstreisen wurden in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 von Sachverständigen für Eurojust unternommen? Wie hoch waren die Kosten für diese Reisen durchschnittlich? Welche waren die fünf teuersten Dienstreisen?

**Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission**
*(17. Dezember 2013)*

Die Kommission hat Eurojust um die Beantwortung der Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten gebeten. Die Kommission wird dem Herrn Abgeordneten so rasch wie möglich die Antworten von Eurojust übermitteln.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011970/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Properties belonging to Eurojust

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 5 588 600 for 'rent and ground rent'. For 2012, the amount was EUR 5 449 500, and in 2011, the outturn for rent and ground rent was EUR 5 166 987.

1. What properties does Eurojust have at its disposal, and how many square metres of useful working area does each of these have? Which of these properties are rented by Eurojust, and what are the rental costs for these properties?

2. Which properties are fully owned by Eurojust? For which properties does Eurojust pay ground rent, and how much is the ground rent in each case? What is the exact nature of the contract with the landowner, who is the landowner, and what happens with the land or building when the ground rent contract ends?

3. Why have Eurojust's appropriations for rent and ground rent increased year on year? In particular, which costs have increased?

**Question for written answer E-011973/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Eurojust's costs for movable property and associated costs

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 107 000 for 'movable property and associated costs'. Last year, the amount was EUR 137 500, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 257 404.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for 'movable property and associated costs' for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. Will the amounts actually spent in 2012 and 2013 exceed the appropriated amounts?

3. How did Eurojust achieve the reduction in costs from 2011 to 2013? Does Eurojust expect further reductions in costs in the next few years, or does it instead expect the costs to rise once again?

**Question for written answer E-011974/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Eurojust's data processing costs

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 540 800 for 'data processing'. Last year, the amount was EUR 467 900, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 754 177.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for 'data processing' for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. How many items of leased equipment does Eurojust have? What is each of these items of equipment, and what are the monthly costs?

3. How many items of equipment of its own, such as printers, computers, laptops, projectors, servers, etc., did Eurojust acquire in 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively? How much did each of them cost?

4. Why was the outturn in 2011 higher than the appropriations for 2012 and 2013? Did the actual expenditure in 2012 exceed the appropriated amount? Does Eurojust expect the actual costs in 2013 to significantly exceed the appropriated amount?

**Question for written answer E-011975/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Eurojust's costs for postal charges, telecoms and computer infrastructure

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 963 800 for 'postal charges, telecoms and computer infrastructure'. Last year, the amount was EUR 1 398 800, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 1 406 802.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for 'postal charges, telecoms and computer infrastructure' for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. To what extent does the item 'postal charges, telecoms and computer infrastructure' overlap with the item 'data processing' in the statement of revenue and expenditure?

3. How did Eurojust achieve the reduction in costs from 2011 to 2013? Does Eurojust expect further reductions in costs in the next few years, or does it expect the costs to rise once again?

**Question for written answer E-011976/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Meetings, seminars and representation expenses of Eurojust

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 2 319 669 for 'meetings, seminars and representation expenses'. Last year, the amount was EUR 2 358 000, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 2 078 532.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for meetings, seminars and representation expenses for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. How many seminars did Eurojust organise in 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively? How much did each seminar cost and what were the participant numbers at each one?

3. How many meetings does Eurojust organise on an annual basis, and what form do the costs for these meetings take? What were the average costs per meeting for 2011, 2012 and 2013?

**Question for written answer E-011977/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Eurojust's costs for data and documentation

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 2 543 225 for 'data and documentation'. Last year, the amount was EUR 2 791 125, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 3 067 611.

What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for 'data and documentation' for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

**Question for written answer E-011978/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Eurojust's operational and expert missions

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation of EUR 1 797 000 for 'operational and expert missions'. Last year, the amount was EUR 1 907 109, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 1 463 791.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected operational and expert missions for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. How many missions were undertaken by Eurojust staff in 2011, 2012 and 2013? What were the average costs for these missions? Which were the five most expensive missions?

3. How many missions were undertaken by experts on behalf of Eurojust in 2011, 2012 and 2013? What were the average costs for these missions? Which were the five most expensive missions?

**Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**
*(17 December 2013)*

The Commission has asked Eurojust to provide a response to the questions raised by the Honourable Member. Eurojust's reply will be sent by the Commission to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

*(Deutsche Fassung)*

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011972/13**
**an die Kommission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21. Oktober 2013)*

*Betrifft:* ITK-Ausgaben der Europäischen Agentur für Flugsicherheit

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Agentur für Flugsicherheit (EASA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 veranschlagt die Agentur für 2013 Mittel in Höhe von 5 888 000 EUR für Informations- und Telekommunikationstechnologie (ITK). Im Jahr 2012 waren noch Mittel von 3 430 000 EUR veranschlagt.

1. Wie erklärt die Agentur, dass die ITK-Kosten innerhalb von nur einem Jahr um mehr als 2,4 Millionen EUR stiegen?

2. Insbesondere für welche Geräteklassen erwartet die Agentur für 2013 höhere Ausgaben?

3. Welches sind die fünf teuersten ITK-Geräte im Besitz der Agentur?

4. Welches sind die fünf nach Jahreskosten teuersten ITK-Leasingverträge der Agentur?

5. Welches sind die fünf nach Jahreskosten teuersten ITK-Dienstleistungsverträge der Agentur?

6. Welche Maßnahmen führt die Agentur durch, um die Kosten im ITK-Bereich gering zu halten beziehungsweise zu senken?

**Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission**
*(10. Dezember 2013)*

Die Kommission hat die Europäische Agentur für Flugsicherheit (EASA) gebeten, die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu beantworten.

Die Kommission wird die Antwort der Agentur so schnell wie möglich an den Herrn Abgeordneten weiterleiten.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011972/13**
**to the Commission**
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* ICT expenditure of the European Aviation Safety Agency

In the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2013 of EUR 5 888 000 for information and communication technology (ICT). In 2012, the appropriated amount was EUR 3 430 000.

1. How does the Agency explain the increase in ICT costs by more than EUR 2.4 million in just one year?

2. For which equipment classes in particular does the Agency expect higher expenditure for 2013?

3. What are the five most expensive items of ICT equipment owned by the Agency?

4. In terms of annual costs, what are the Agency's five most expensive ICT leasing contracts?

5. In terms of annual costs, what are the Agency's five most expensive ICT service contracts?

6. What steps is the Agency taking to keep ICT costs low or to reduce them?

*(Version française)*

**Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission**
*(10 décembre 2013)*

La Commission a demandé à l'Agence Européenne de la Sécurité Aérienne (AESA) de fournir les éléments de réponse à la question posée par l'Honorable Parlementaire.

La réponse de l'Agence sera transmise par la Commission à l'Honorable Parlementaire dès que possible.

*(българска версия)*

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-011982/13**
**до Комисията**
**Mariya Gabriel (PPE)**
*(21 октомври 2013 г.)*

*Относно:* Пчеларството в новата ОСП

Тристранните преговори по оформянето на новата Обща селскостопанска политика (ОСП) приключиха. Въпреки че тя залага на по-голяма справедливост за земеделските производители и повече гъвкавост при прилагане на регламентите за държавите членки, секторът на пчеларството няма да бъде подпомогнат нито чрез директни плащания, нито чрез обвързано с производството подпомагане. В същото време пчеларският сектор в Европейския съюз изпитва сериозни трудности и средствата, получени чрез националните пчеларски програми, са недостатъчни за устойчивото развитие на сектора. От друга страна, като земеделски производители пчеларите не притежават и необработват земя, което ги поставя в неравностойно положение спрямо другите сектори и ги изключва от подпомагане в новата ОСП, базирано основно на селскостопанска площ.

В тази връзка според ЕК какви са възможностите за подпомагане на сектора на пчеларството в новата ОСП?

И в частност какви са възможностите за подпомагане на пчеларството чрез новата ОСП в страните, прилагащи схема за единно плащане на площ (СЕПП), които да не се базират на притежаването и обработването на земя?

Какви мерки на национално ниво би могла да предложи Комисията за подпомагане на сектора на пчеларството?

**Отговор, даден от г-н Чолош от името на Комисията**
*(16 декември 2013 г.)*

В новата обща селскостопанска политика ([1]) се предвиждат няколко възможности за подпомагане на пчеларството.

Чрез новия Регламент за единна обща организация на пазарите и занапред на държавите членки се предоставя възможността да представят тригодишни национални програми в областта на пчеларството за съфинансиране от Съюза. Чрез реформата предходните шест мерки бяха актуализирани и завършени. По-специално ще бъдат обхванати всички пчелни продукти (а не само пчелният мед) и на разположение ще бъде предоставено финансиране от ЕС за нови мерки, насочени към борба срещу агресорите и болестите в кошера, както и към подобряване на мониторинга на пазара и на качеството на пчелните продукти.

Освен това съгласно новия Регламент за програмата за развитие на селските райони държавите членки ще разполагат с редица мерки за допълнителна подкрепа на пчеларството. Реформата предлага възможност за държавите членки да подкрепят проекти за обучение, инвестиции и сътрудничество, които биха могли да бъдат полезни за пчеларството.

На последно място, някои мерки в реформираната ОСП могат да бъдат косвено в полза на пчеларството. Задължителните мерки за обвързване с околната среда в новия Регламент за преките плащания, по-специално диверсификацията на културите и екологичните приоритетни области, биха могли да допринесат за създаването на по-добра околна среда за пчелите. Земеделските производители, по отношение на които се прилага схемата за единно плащане на площ, ще трябва да отговарят на същите задължения за обвързване с околната среда като земеделските производители, обхванати от схемата за основно плащане. Мерките, свързани с агроекологията и климата, които са предвидени в новия Регламент за програмата за развитие на селските райони, следва също така да имат положителен принос за подобряването на околната среда на пчелите.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/index_en.htm

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011982/13**
**to the Commission**
**Mariya Gabriel (PPE)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Beekeeping under the new CAP

The trilateral negotiations on the formation of the new common agricultural policy (CAP) have been concluded. Although it focuses on greater fairness for farmers and more flexibility in the application of the regulations for the Member States, the beekeeping sector will not be supported via direct payments or coupled support. Meanwhile the beekeeping sector in the European Union faces serious difficulties and the funds from national beekeeping programmes are inadequate for the sustainable development of the sector. Yet, as beekeepers do not have or cultivate land, they are at a disadvantage relative to other sectors and are excluded from support under the new CAP, which is mainly based on agricultural area.

In light of this, what does the Commission believe are the possibilities for supporting the beekeeping sector under the new CAP?

In particular, what possibilities exist for supporting beekeeping under the new CAP in countries that use the single area payment scheme (SAPS), which are not based on the possession and management of land?

What measures at the national level would the Commission propose to support the beekeeping sector?

**Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission**
*(16 December 2013)*

The new Common Agricultural Policy ([1]) provides for several possibilities to support the beekeeping sector.

The new single Common Market Organisation Regulation continues to provide to the Member States the possibility to submit tri-annual national apiculture programmes for co-financing by the Union. With the reform, the previous six measures have been updated and completed. In particular, all apiculture products (and not only honey) will be covered and EU funding will be available for new measures aiming to fight beehive invaders and diseases as well as to improve the marketing monitoring and the quality of apiculture products.

In addition, with the new Rural Development Programme Regulation, Member States will have at their disposal a series of measures to further support the apiculture sector. The reform offers the possibility for the Member States to support training, investments and cooperation projects which could be useful for the apiculture sector.

Finally, several measures in the reformed CAP may be indirectly in favour of beekeeping. The compulsory greening measures of the new Direct Payment Regulation, in particular crop diversification and ecological focus areas, could contribute to a better environment for bees. Farmers subject to the single area payment scheme will have to fulfil the same greening obligations as farmers covered by the Basic Payment Scheme. Agri-environment-climate measures in the new Rural Development Programme Regulation should also make a positive contribution to the environment of bees.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/index_en.htm

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011987/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Έργα Housing First Europe και Work in Stations για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος της έλλειψης στέγης

Η Επιτροπή χρηματοδοτεί έργα κοινωνικού περιεχομένου και συγκεκριμένα για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος της έλλειψης στέγης, σε πιλοτικό ακόμη επίπεδο, όπως τα έργα Housing First Europe και Work in Stations, τα οποία προσφέρουν καινοτόμες και νέες προσεγγίσεις πολιτικής για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σε ποια κράτη μέλη έχουν μέχρι σήμερα υλοποιηθεί τα παραπάνω έργα και ποια τα συμπεράσματα αναφορικά με τις καινοτόμες προσεγγίσεις πολιτικής για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος της έλλειψης στέγης; Είναι σε θέση να παραθέσει συγκεκριμένες νέες προσεγγίσεις και καλές πρακτικές των παραπάνω προγραμμάτων;

2. Ποιο το ύψος της συμμετοχής των κοινοτικών πόρων στα πιλοτικά αυτά προγράμματα; Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να επεκτείνει τη δράση τους και σε άλλα κράτη μέλη; Είναι δυνατή η συμπερίληψη κρατών μελών στο πιλοτικό πρόγραμμα κατόπιν αιτήματός τους;

**Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(6 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η Επιτροπή προωθεί την κοινωνική καινοτομία για να βοηθήσει τα κράτη μέλη να εφαρμόσουν πιο αποτελεσματικές κοινωνικές πολιτικές, περιλαμβανομένων πολιτικών για τους αστέγους. Το πιλοτικό έργο «Hope in Stations» συνέβαλε επιτυχώς στην ενίσχυση της ολοκλήρωσης των κοινωνικών υπηρεσιών που παρέχονται στους αστέγους στους σιδηροδρομικούς σταθμούς και στις πέριξ περιοχές, σε τέσσερα κράτη μέλη ([1]). Το «Housing First Europe» (HFE) ήταν ένα διετές έργο κοινωνικού πειραματισμού, που χρηματοδοτήθηκε από το ταμείο Progress ([2]). Στο έργο συμμετείχαν δέκα ευρωπαϊκές πόλεις ([3]) και εξετάστηκε η αποτελεσματικότητα της προσέγγισης της πολιτικής «Housing first», που βασίζεται στην ιδέα ότι η παροχή άμεσης πρόσβασης σε μόνιμη, ανεξάρτητη στέγαση με υποστήριξη για τους αστέγους με σύνθετες ανάγκες θα μπορούσε να αντιμετωπίσει με πιο βιώσιμο τρόπο το πρόβλημα της έλλειψης στέγης, σε σύγκριση με τα μεταβατικά προγράμματα για τους αστέγους. Το έργο HFE προσδιόρισε τα θετικά αποτελέσματα του προγράμματος «Housing first» και τους τομείς όπου η συγκεκριμένη προσέγγιση θα πρέπει να αναπτυχθεί περαιτέρω ([4]).

Το ταμείο Progress μπορεί να χρηματοδοτήσει έργα πειραματισμού και καινοτομίας κοινωνικής πολιτικής, καθώς και αξιολογήσεις ομοτίμων στους τομείς της κοινωνικής προστασίας και της κοινωνικής ένταξης. Οι πτυχές του ταμείου Progress που σχετίζονται με την καινοτομία προτείνεται να ενισχυθούν μετά το 2014, στο πλαίσιο του νέου προγράμματος για την απασχόληση και την κοινωνική καινοτομία. Ο καθορισμός του έργου και των συμμετεχόντων — όσον αφορά τις προδιαγραφές της πρόσκλησης και τους νόμους που διέπουν τη διαδικασία — εναπόκειται κυρίως στους αναδόχους, οι οποίοι επιλέγονται μέσω δημόσιων συμβάσεων. Η Επιτροπή προωθεί ενεργά τη διάδοση των αποτελεσμάτων του έργου: οι εμπειρίες από το έργο HFE παρουσιάστηκαν στην ετήσια διάσκεψη του 2013 ([5]) και οι προϋποθέσεις μιας ευρωπαϊκής δυνατότητας μεταφοράς συζητήθηκαν σε μια αξιολόγηση ομοτίμων της Επιτροπής Κοινωνικής Προστασίας ([6]). Αυτό δίνει τη δυνατότητα στα κράτη μέλη να ενημερώνονται σχετικά με τις νέες προσεγγίσεις και να τις χρησιμοποιούν στις δικές τους εθνικές πολιτικές.

---

([1]) Περιλαμβανομένου του Βελγίου, της Γαλλίας, της Γερμανίας και της Ιταλίας. Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με το έργο, μπορείτε να επισκεφθείτε την ιστοσελίδα
http://www.solidarites-actives.com/juin-parution-de-lanalyse-scientifique-du-projet-hope-stations

([2]) Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με το ταμείο Progress, επισκεφθείτε την ιστοσελίδα
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=987

([3]) Άμστερνταμ, Βουδαπέστη, Κοπεγχάγη, Γλασκόβη και Λισαβόνα (δοκιμαστικές πόλεις για το έργο Housing First Europe), Δουβλίνο, Γάνδη, Γκέτεμποργκ, Ελσίνκι και Βιέννη (ομότιμες πόλεις).

([4]) Περισσότερες πληροφορίες υπάρχουν στον επίσημο δικτυακό τόπο του προγράμματος, στη διεύθυνση
www.socialstyrelsen.dk/housingfirsteurope

([5]) Ετήσια διάσκεψη της Ευρωπαϊκής Πλατφόρμας για την καταπολέμηση της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού. Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες, επισκεφθείτε την ιστοσελίδα
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=961

([6]) Βιώσιμοι τρόποι για την πρόληψη της έλλειψης στέγης (Αξιολόγηση ομοτίμων για την κοινωνική προστασία και την κοινωνική ένταξη), 22 Νοεμβρίου 2013, Κοπεγχάγη, Δανία.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011987/13**
**to the Commission**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The Housing First Europe and Work in Stations projects for addressing homelessness

The Commission finances projects of a social nature, and specifically for addressing the problem of homelessness, at pilot level, such as the Housing First Europe and Work in Stations projects, which offer innovative and new policy approaches to dealing with this problem.

1. In which Member States have the above projects been implemented to date, and what conclusions can be drawn about the innovative policy approaches for dealing with homelessness? Can the Commission provide information about the specific new approaches and good practices of the above programmes?

2. What is the level of involvement of Community funds in these pilot programmes? Does the Commission intend to extend their operation to other Member States as well? Is it possible for Member States to be included in the pilot programme on request?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**
*(6 December 2013)*

The Commission promotes social innovation to help Member States implement more efficient social policies, including homelessness policies. The 'Hope in Stations' pilot project successfully contributed to strengthening the integration of social services delivered to homeless persons at and around train stations in four Member States ([1]). 'Housing First Europe' (HFE) was a 2-year social experimentation project financed from PROGRESS ([2]). It examined in ten European cities ([3]) efficiency of the 'housing first' policy approach, which is based on idea that providing immediate access to long-term, self-contained housing with support for homeless people with complex needs could be a more sustainable way to confront homelessness than transitional homeless programs. The HFE project has identified the positive effects of housing first and areas where the concept should be further elaborated. ([4])

PROGRESS may finance social policy experimentation and innovation projects as well as peer reviews in the areas of social protection and social inclusion. Innovation-related aspects of PROGRESS are proposed to be reinforced for the post-2014 period, under the new Programme for Employment and Social Innovation. Defining project and participants- with respect of the call specifications and the laws guiding the procedure — is primarily up to contractors who are selected through public procurement. The Commission actively fosters dissemination of project results: experiences of the HFE project were introduced at the 2013 Annual Convention ([5]) and conditions of a European transferability were discussed at a Social Protection Committee peer review ([6]). This enables Member States to learn about new approaches and use them in their own national policies.

([1]) Including Belgium, France, Germany and Italy; for more information on the project, you may visit http://www.solidarites-actives.com/juin-parution-de-lanalyse-scientifique-du-projet-hope-stations
([2]) For more information on the PROGRESS fund, please visit http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=987
([3]) Amsterdam, Budapest, Copenhagen, Glasgow and Lisbon (Housing First Europe test cities); Dublin, Ghent, Gothenburg, Helsinki and Vienna (peer cities).
([4]) More information is available at the official website of the programme at www.socialstyrelsen.dk/housingfirsteurope
([5]) Annual Convention for the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion. For more information, please visit http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=961
([6]) Peer Review on Social Protection and Social Inclusion on 'Sustainable ways of preventing homelessness', 22 November 2013, Copenhagen, Denmark.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011988/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Εξελίξεις στην πρωτοβουλία «εγγύηση για τους νέους»

Το διήμερο 17-18 Οκτωβρίου πραγματοποιείται στις Βρυξέλλες σεμινάριο υπό την αιγίδα της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, για την διευκόλυνση και βοήθεια των κρατών μελών προκειμένου να υλοποιήσουν το πρόγραμμα «Εγγύηση για τους νέους» κατά τη νέα πολυετή δημοσιονομική περίοδο (2014-2020).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Καθώς η Επιτροπή αναφέρει σε ανακοίνωση της (European Commission — IP/13/969 17.10.2013) ότι θα χρειαστούν διαρθρωτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη προκειμένου να καταρτιστεί και να εκτελεστεί επαρκώς το σχέδιο δράσης του προγράμματος «Εγγύηση για τους νέους», είναι σε θέση να μου παραθέσει συγκεκριμένα εμπόδια τα οποία εντοπίζει;

2. Με ποιο τρόπο τελικώς θα χρηματοδοτηθεί η πρωτοβουλία;

3. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για το χρονοδιάγραμμα και τον έλεγχο της διαδικασίας για την υλοποίηση του προγράμματος;

**Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(10 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

1. Η Εγγύηση για τη Νεολαία αποτελεί θεμελιώδη διαρθρωτική μεταρρύθμιση για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας των νέων και τη βελτίωση των μεταβάσεων από το σχολείο στην εργασία. Θα συμβάλλει στην πιο εύρυθμη λειτουργία και συνεργασία των δημόσιων φορέων, καθώς και στη βελτίωση της λειτουργίας της οικονομίας, αυξάνοντας την αντιστοίχιση δεξιοτήτων και την παραγωγικότητα.

2. Η Πρωτοβουλία για την Απασχόληση των Νέων (ΠΑΝ), το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και οι εθνικοί προϋπολογισμοί των κρατών μελών είναι οι κύριες πηγές χρηματοδοτικής υποστήριξης των μέτρων που λαμβάνονται από τα κράτη μέλη για την κατάρτιση των δικών τους προγραμμάτων Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία ([1]). Τα μέτρα αυτά στοχεύουν να βοηθήσουν απευθείας τους νέους που βρίσκονται εκτός απασχόλησης, εκπαίδευσης ή κατάρτισης, μέσω π.χ. δημιουργίας θέσεων εργασίας, περιόδων πρακτικής άσκησης και μαθητείας, υποστήριξης για την ίδρυση επιχειρήσεων κ.λπ. Η χρηματοδότηση ΠΑΝ θα συνίσταται σε 3 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ από συγκεκριμένη γραμμή προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ που προορίζεται για την απασχόληση των νέων και τουλάχιστον άλλα 3 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ από τις εθνικές χορηγήσεις του ΕΚΤ.

3. Τα κράτη μέλη που είναι επιλέξιμα για την ΠΑΝ πρέπει να υποβάλουν σχέδια εφαρμογής της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία έως τον Δεκέμβριο του 2013. Τα υπόλοιπα κράτη μέλη ενθαρρύνονται να υποβάλουν τα σχέδιά τους μέσα στο 2014 ([2]). Όσον αφορά την εποπτεία της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία, η Επιτροπή Απασχόλησης (ΕΑ) αποφάσισε να εκπονήσει μια επισκόπηση πολυμερούς εποπτείας στις 2 Δεκεμβρίου 2013 για την εφαρμογή των ειδικών κατά χώρα συστάσεων για τη νεολαία. Τα κράτη μέλη καλούνται να υποβάλουν τα δικά τους σχέδια εφαρμογής της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία στη συγκεκριμένη επισκόπηση. Επιπλέον, η υποομάδα της ΕΑ για τους δείκτες θα εξετάσει τις απαιτήσεις δεδομένων για την εποπτεία της εφαρμογής και τον αντίκτυπο της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία.

([1]) Σύσταση του Συμβουλίου για τη θέσπιση εγγυήσεων για τη νεολαία, ΕΕ 2013/C 120/01 της 22.04.2013.

([2]) Η «Πρόσκληση για δράση κατά της ανεργίας των νέων» κάλεσε τα κράτη μέλη με περιφέρειες στις οποίες τα ποσοστά ανεργίας των νέων υπερβαίνουν το 25%, να υποβάλουν σχέδιο εφαρμογής της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία έως τον Οκτώβριο του 2013 (άνοιξη του 2014 για τα άλλα κράτη μέλη). Στα συμπεράσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου του Ιουνίου αναφέρεται ότι «Τα κράτη μέλη που επωφελούνται από την πρωτοβουλία θα πρέπει να θεσπίσουν σχέδιο για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων, μεταξύ άλλων με την υλοποίηση της "Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία", πριν από το τέλος του έτους. Ενθαρρύνονται και άλλα κράτη μέλη να θεσπίσουν ανάλογα σχέδια το 2014». Ωστόσο, οι διμερείς επαφές με τα κράτη μέλη, ιδίως εκείνα με υψηλά επίπεδα ανεργίας των νέων, καταδεικνύουν ισχυρή δυναμική των κρατών μελών για την ολοκλήρωση των σχεδίων εφαρμογής της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία, έως το Δεκέμβριο του 2013.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011988/13**
**to the Commission**
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Developments in the 'Youth Guarantee' initiative

On 17-18 October, a seminar is taking place in Brussels under the auspices of the Commission to facilitate and assist Member States in implementing the 'Youth Guarantee' programme during the new multiannual budgetary period (2014-2020).

1. As the Commission states in its press release (European Commission — IP/13/969 17.10.2013) that there will be a need for structural reforms in certain Member States, with a view to setting up and adequately implementing an action plan for the 'Youth Guarantee' programme, can it specify the barriers it has identified?

2. How will the initiative ultimately be financed?

3. Can it inform me about the timetable for and controls over the procedure for implementing the programme?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

1. The Youth Guarantee is a fundamental structural reform in order to fight youth unemployment and to improve school to work transitions. It will help making public institutions work better (together) and improve the functioning of the economy, by increasing skill matching and productivity.

2. The Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), the European Social Fund and Member States' national budgets are the main sources of financial support to the measures undertaken by MS to establish their own Youth Guarantee schemes ([1]). These measures aim to directly help young people not in employment, education or training through, for instance, job provision, traineeships and apprenticeships, business start-up support, etc. The YEI funding will comprise EUR 3 billion from a specific EU budget line dedicated to youth employment and another at least EUR 3 billion from the ESF national allocations.

3. MS eligible for the YEI should submit Youth Guarantee Implementation Plans by December 2013; other MS are encouraged to submit their plans in 2014 ([2]). In the area of monitoring the Youth Guarantee, the Employment Committee (EMCO) has decided to undertake a multilateral surveillance review on 2 December 2013 on the implementation of youth Country-Specific Recommendations. MS are invited to submit their Youth Guarantee Implementation Plans to this review. In addition, the EMCO Indicators Sub-group will look at the data requirements for monitoring the implementation and impact of the Youth Guarantee.

---

([1]) Council recommendation on Establishing a Youth Guarantee, OJ 2013/C 120/01, 22.4.2013.

([2]) The 'Call to Action on Youth Unemployment' called for Member States with regions experiencing youth unemployment rates above 25% to submit a Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan by October 2013 (spring 2014 for other MS). The June European Council Conclusions state that 'Member States benefitting from the YEI should adopt a plan to tackle youth unemployment, including through the implementation of the "Youth Guarantee", before the end of the year. Other Member States are encouraged to adopt similar plans in 2014'. However, bilateral contacts with MS, notably those with high levels of youth unemployment, show a strong MS impetus to complete the YGIP by December 2013.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011989/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Εκκαθαριστής η ΕΕ

Σε πρόσφατη συνέντευξή του στη γερμανική εφημερίδα «Handelsblat», ο Επίτροπος για θέματα Εσωτερικής Αγοράς και υπηρεσιών, Μισέλ Μπαρνιέ, πρότεινε τον ρόλο της νέας Αρχής για την εκκαθάριση και αναδιάρθρωση των ευρωπαϊκών τραπεζών, για περιορισμένη περίοδο, να αναλάβει η Επιτροπή και, στην συνέχεια, να τον μεταβιβάσει στον Ευρωπαϊκό Μηχανισμό Σταθερότητας. Στόχος ενός τέτοιου εγχειρήματος θα είναι η αντιμετώπιση των πιέσεων που υφίστανται οι ευρωπαϊκές τράπεζες ώστε να σπάσει ο δεσμός μεταξύ των χρεωμένων χωρών και των τραπεζών τους. Στη συνέντευξη του, τονίζει επίσης πως «Το ταμείο διάσωσης, ο Ευρωπαϊκός Μηχανισμός Σταθερότητας (ΕΣΜ), θα μπορούσε να αναλάβει την εκκαθάριση των τραπεζών μόλις καταστεί ευρωπαϊκός θεσμός».

Ερωτάται λοιπόν ο κ. Μπαρνιέ:

1. Μήπως ο ίδιος παραδέχεται πως ο ΕΜΣ που εκδίδει σήμερα χρέος, από το Φεβρουάριο 2012, για να χρηματοδοτήσει τη χορήγηση δανείων και άλλων μορφών οικονομικής βοήθειας προς τις χώρες της ευρωζώνης, έχει αποτύχει;

2. Ποιος θα είναι ο ρόλος και οι αρμοδιότητες της νέας Αρχής;

3. Με ποιες εξουσίες θα περιβάλλεται όσον αφορά την εκκαθάριση προβληματικών τραπεζών, μικρών και μεγάλων;

4. Ποια θα είναι η σχέση της νέας Αρχής με τις εθνικές εποπτικές αρχές των τραπεζών;

5. Σε ποιο βαθμό το κούρεμα των καταθέσεων (όπως επιβλήθηκε στην περίπτωση της Κύπρου) θα αποτελεί πάγια πολιτική και για άλλες χώρες της Ευρωζώνης;

**Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(13 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

1. Στις 10 Ιουλίου 2013, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε τη θέσπιση ενιαίου μηχανισμού εξυγίανσης. Βάσει της ισχύουσας Συνθήκης ΕΕ, σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, μόνον ένα όργανο της ΕΕ μπορεί να λάβει την τελική απόφαση σχετικά με τον χρόνο ενεργοποίησης της εξυγίανσης μιας τράπεζας. Η Επιτροπή, σύμφωνα με την πρότασή της, θα έχει, τελικά, την ευθύνη των αποφάσεων για εξυγίανση των τραπεζών των κρατών μελών που συμμετέχουν στον ενιαίο μηχανισμό εξυγίανσης.

2-3. Η Επιτροπή πρότεινε να καλύπτονται όλες οι τράπεζες, μικρές και μεγάλες, από τον ενιαίο μηχανισμό εξυγίανσης, ο οποίος θα χρησιμοποιεί τα εργαλεία εξυγίανσης που προβλέπονται στην πρόταση οδηγίας για την ανάκαμψη και εξυγίανση των τραπεζών. Τα αναγκαία οικονομικά μέσα θα προέλθουν σε πρώτη φάση από τους μετόχους και τους πιστωτές της τράπεζας και, εφόσον αυτό δεν επαρκεί, από ενιαίο ταμείο εξυγίανσης που θα χρηματοδοτείται εξ ολοκλήρου από εισφορές του τραπεζικού τομέα.

4. Στο πλαίσιο του ενιαίου μηχανισμού εξυγίανσης, η Επιτροπή και το συμβούλιο θα συνεργαστούν στενά με τις εποπτικές αρχές. Η ΕΚΤ, ως εποπτική αρχή, θα επισημαίνει πότε μια τράπεζα στη ζώνη του ευρώ ή τράπεζα εγκατεστημένη σε κράτος μέλος που συμμετέχει στην Τραπεζική Ένωση αντιμετωπίζει σοβαρές χρηματοοικονομικές δυσχέρειες και πρέπει να εξυγιανθεί.

5. Στο πλαίσιο του ενιαίου μηχανισμού εξυγίανσης και σύμφωνα με τα σημερινά δεδομένα, οι καταθέσεις μέχρι ποσού 100 000 ευρώ θα προστατεύονται πάντοτε από εθνικά συστήματα εγγύησης καταθέσεων. Καταθέσεις που υπερβαίνουν αυτό το κατώτατο όριο μπορεί, δυνητικά, να επιβαρυνθούν σε περίπτωση εξυγίανσης των τραπεζών, αλλά σε κάθε περίπτωση, οι μέτοχοι και οι πιστωτές μειωμένης εξασφάλισης θα συμβάλουν κατά προτεραιότητα. Το θέμα αυτό θα ρυθμιστεί στην οδηγία για την ανάκαμψη και εξυγίανση των τραπεζών, προκειμένου να εξασφαλιστεί ασφάλεια δικαίου και σαφήνεια. Η εν λόγω οδηγία βρίσκεται επί του παρόντος υπό διαπραγμάτευση. Οι ίδιοι κανόνες θα ισχύουν και για τον ενιαίο μηχανισμό εξυγίανσης.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011989/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The EU as liquidator

In a recent interview in the German newspaper *Handelsblatt*, Michel Barnier, Commissioner for the internal market and Services, proposed that the Commission assume the role of the new authority for liquidating and restructuring European banks for a limited period, and, following that, to pass the role on to the European Stability Mechanism (ESM). The aim of this exercise is to address the pressures on European banks, so that the link between the indebted countries and their banks can be broken. In his interview, he also points out that 'The bail-out fund (the ESM) could take over the liquidation of banks as soon as it becomes a European institution'.

Will Mr Barnier therefore say:

1. Does he himself agree that the ESM, which has been issuing debt to finance its lending and other forms of financial assistance to the countries of the euro area since February 2012, has failed?

2. What will be the role and competences of the new authority?

3. What powers will the authority be given in relation to the liquidation of distressed banks, small and large?

4. What will the relationship be between the new authority and the national supervisory authorities for banks?

5. To what extent will the savings haircut (as applied in Cyprus) become a fixed policy for the other euro area countries as well?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**
*(13 December 2013)*

1. On 10 July 2013, the Commission has proposed a Single Resolution Mechanism (SRM). Under the current EU Treaty, at European level, only an EU body can take the final decision on when to trigger the resolution of a bank. According to its proposal, the Commission would be ultimately responsible to decide on the resolution of banks in Member States participating in the Single Supervisory Mechanism.

2 and 3. The Commission has proposed that the Single Resolution Mechanism will cover all banks, small and large, and will use the resolution tools provided for in the proposed Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive. The necessary financial means would be sourced in the first place from the bank's shareholders and creditors and, if this is insufficient, from a Single Resolution Fund fully financed by contributions from the banking sector.

4. Under the Single Resolution Mechanism, the Commission and the Board will closely cooperate with the supervisors. The ECB, as the supervisor, would signal when a bank in the euro area or established in a Member State participating in the Banking Union is in severe financial difficulties and needs to be resolved.

5. Under the Single Resolution Mechanism and as is the case today, deposits up to EUR 100 000 will always be protected by national Deposit Guarantee Schemes. Deposits above that threshold may potentially be called upon in case of bank resolution but in any event, shareholders and junior creditors would contribute first. This matter will be settled in the Bank Resolution and Recovery Directive, providing legal certainty and clarity. That directive is currently under negotiation. The same rules will apply in the SRM.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011990/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Ενδυνάμωση της Aegean — Πονοκέφαλος για τις Κυπριακές Αερογραμμές

Όπως μεταδόθηκε από τις Βρυξέλλες, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έδωσε το «πράσινο φως» για την εξαγορά της Olympic Air από την Aegean Airlines, προβάλλοντας το επιχείρημα ότι, αν η Olympic Air δεν εξαγοραζόταν από την Aegean, θα αναγκαζόταν στο άμεσο μέλλον να παύσει να λειτουργεί λόγω οικονομικών δυσχερειών.

Αυτή η απόφαση δημιουργεί σοβαρές ανησυχίες για τη βιωσιμότητα των Κυπριακών Αερογραμμών, αφού στον πιο προσοδοφόρο προορισμό τους (Κύπρος-Ελλάδα και αντίστροφα) βλέπουν τον βασικό τους αντίπαλο, την Aegean Airlines, να δυναμώνει ανησυχητικά, αφού εγκρίθηκε πια από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή η εξαγορά της Olympic Air.

Και όλα αυτά τη στιγμή που τα μηνύματα από τις Βρυξέλλες δεν είναι ικανοποιητικά αναφορικά με την έγκριση του σχεδίου αναδιάρθρωσης του εθνικού αερομεταφορέα της Κύπρου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Προτίθεται να στηρίξει τις Κυπριακές Αερογραμμές ώστε να μην βάλουν λουκέτο;

2. Ποια είναι η άποψή της για την υλοποίηση ενός σχεδίου Β, δηλαδή ίδρυσης μιας νέας αεροπορικής εταιρείας;

**Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(6 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η Επιτροπή έλαβε κοινοποίηση για χορήγηση ενίσχυσης αναδιάρθρωσης υπέρ της Cyprus Airways. Η Επιτροπή αξιολογεί τα κοινοποιηθέντα μέτρα για τη συμμόρφωση με τους κανόνες για τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις, σε συνδυασμό με άλλα μέτρα κρατικής στήριξης που αποτελούσαν ήδη αντικείμενο της έρευνας. Η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να προβλέψει το αποτέλεσμα της αξιολόγησης αυτής, δεδομένου ότι είναι ακόμη σε εξέλιξη.

Η Κύπρος δεν έχει κοινοποιήσει στην Επιτροπή σχέδιο για τη σύσταση νέας αεροπορικής εταιρείας στην Κύπρο. Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να σχολιάσει το τελευταίο σημείο.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011990/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The strengthening of Aegean Airlines — a headache for Cyprus Airlines

It has been reported from Brussels that the Commission has approved the acquisition of Olympic Air by Aegean Airlines, arguing that if Olympic Air was not acquired by Aegean, it would soon have to cease operating, due to financial difficulties.

This decision creates serious concerns for the viability of Cyprus Airlines, as it sees its main rival — Aegean Airlines — strengthened to a worrying extent on its most profitable route (Cyprus — Greece), following approval of the acquisition of Olympic Air by the Commission.

All of this at a time when the signals from Brussels are not favourable as regards approval of the restructuring plan of Cyprus's national carrier.

1. Does the Commission intend to support Cyprus Airways, so that it does not go under?

2. What is its view on the implementation of plan B, involving the establishment of a new airline company?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**
*(6 December 2013)*

The Commission has received a notification for restructuring aid in favour of Cyprus Airways. The Commission is assessing the notified measures for compliance with state aid rules, in conjunction with other State support measures already under investigation. The Commission cannot anticipate the outcome of this assessment, since it is still ongoing.

Cyprus has not communicated to the Commission any plan to establish a new airline company in Cyprus. Therefore, the Commission cannot comment on the latter.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011991/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Η ανησυχία των πολιτών για την οικονομική κατάσταση του νοικοκυριού τους

Για έναν στους έξι πολίτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, η άσχημη οικονομική κατάσταση του νοικοκυριού τους περιλαμβάνεται ανάμεσα στα δυο σημαντικότερα ζητήματα που τους απασχολούν αυτήν την περίοδο. Σύμφωνα με τα πορίσματα του πρόσφατου Ευρωβαρόμετρου για τα σημαντικότερα θέματα που απασχολούν τον Ευρωπαίο πολίτη στα 27 κράτη μέλη, στην Κύπρο καταγράφεται ο υψηλότερος βαθμός ανησυχίας των πολιτών για την οικονομική κατάσταση του νοικοκυριού τους, και είναι μάλιστα σχεδόν τριπλάσιος από τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ. Η οικονομική κατάσταση του νοικοκυριού των Κυπρίων πολιτών αποτελεί το υπ' αριθμόν ένα πρόβλημά τους, αυτήν την περίοδο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς μπορεί έμπρακτα να ανατρέψει την ολοένα αυξανόμενη δυσπραγία και δυσφορία των Κυπρίων Ευρωπαίων πολιτών για τη δραματική επιδείνωση που σημειώνεται στην οικονομική κατάσταση των νοικοκυριών τους;

2. Τι απαντά για τους λόγους στους οποίους οφείλεται;

3. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε να τους ενθαρρύνει να μην αποστρέψουν το πρόσωπο, αλλά να ψηφίσουν στις επερχόμενες Ευρωεκλογές;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(5 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Η Επιτροπή έχει επίγνωση των δυσκολιών που πολλά νοικοκυριά αντιμετωπίζουν σε όλη την ΕΕ, ιδίως στην Κύπρο.

Κατά τη διάρκεια της τελευταίας δεκαετίας, η Κύπρος βίωσε αυξανόμενες εξωτερικές και εσωτερικές μακροοικονομικές ανισορροπίες, όπως διάβρωση της διεθνούς ανταγωνιστικότητας, επιδείνωση των δημόσιων οικονομικών, διογκωμένο τραπεζικό τομέα, αυξανόμενο ιδιωτικό χρέος και αυξανόμενες τιμές ακινήτων.

Για την αντιμετώπιση των οικονομικών προκλήσεων της Κύπρου, οι αρχές της χώρας πρότειναν πολυετές πρόγραμμα μεταρρυθμίσεων. Το πρόγραμμα θα συμβάλει στη σταθεροποίηση του χρηματοπιστωτικού συστήματος, στην επίτευξη δημοσιονομικής διατηρησιμότητας και στη θεμελίωση της οικονομικής ανάπτυξης. Με την ανάκαμψη της κυπριακής οικονομίας, αυτό θα βοηθήσει τα νοικοκυριά που αντιμετωπίζουν δυσκολίες.

Η Επιτροπή στηρίζει την Κύπρο στην αποκατάσταση της χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας, της δημοσιονομικής διατηρησιμότητας και της ανάπτυξης για τους πολίτες της. Για την περίοδο 2007-2013 χορηγήθηκε στην Κύπρο επιπλέον ενίσχυση της τάξεως του 10% από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, με αποτέλεσμα το ποσοστό συγχρηματοδότησης να αυξηθεί σε 95%. Το Συμβούλιο διέθεσε πρόσθετο ποσό ύψους 100 εκατ. ευρώ στην Κύπρο από τον προϋπολογισμό του 2014, το οποίο θα μπορούσε να διατηρηθεί και το 2015.

Η αντιπροσωπεία της Επιτροπής στην Κύπρο εξακολουθεί να αναλαμβάνει δραστηριότητες με σκοπό την ενθάρρυνση της συμμετοχής στις επικείμενες ευρωπαϊκές εκλογές, καθώς και την ενημέρωση των πολιτών σχετικά με όλο το φάσμα των πολιτικών της ΕΕ. Η Επίτροπος κα Βασιλείου θα παραστεί στον διάλογο με τους πολίτες ([1]), ο οποίος θα πραγματοποιηθεί στις 28 Νοεμβρίου 2013 στη Λεμεσό, με σκοπό να ακούσει τις ανησυχίες των πολιτών.

([1]) Η Επιτροπή διοργανώνει σειρά διαλόγων με τους πολίτες σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη, στο πλαίσιο των προσπαθειών της, αφενός, να ενθαρρύνει τους πολίτες να ασκήσουν τα εκλογικά τους δικαιώματα και, αφετέρου, να ενισχύσει τη νομιμότητα της διακυβέρνησης της ΕΕ. (http://ec.europa.eu/debate-future-europe/citizens-dialogues/index_el.htm).

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011991/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Citizens' concerns over household finances

For one in six citizens of the EU, the poor financial situation of their households is one of the two most important issues that currently concern them. According to the findings of the recent Eurobarometer on the most important issues that concern European citizens in the 27 Member States, the greatest worry among Cypriot citizens — at a level almost three times the EU average — is the financial situation of their households. The financial situation of the households of Cypriot citizens is their number one problem at the moment.

1. What can the Commission do, in practical terms, to reverse the ever-increasing hardship and distress of Cypriot European citizens in relation to the dramatic deterioration that can be seen in their household finances?

2. What does it think are the causes of this problem?

3. What does it intend to do to encourage Cypriots to vote in the coming European elections, rather than staying away?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**
*(5 December 2013)*

The Commission is aware of the difficulties many households are facing across the EU, particularly in Cyprus.

Over the last decade, Cyprus saw growing external and internal macroeconomic imbalances. These included the erosion of international competitiveness, deteriorating public finances, an oversized banking sector, rising private debt and increasing property prices.

The Cypriot authorities have proposed a multiannual reform programme to address Cyprus's economic challenges. This will help stabilise the financial system, achieve fiscal sustainability and lay the foundations for economic growth. As the Cypriot economy recovers, this will help households in difficulty.

The Commission stands by Cyprus in restoring financial stability, fiscal sustainability and growth for its people. A 10% top up to the Structural Funds for Cyprus has been granted for the period 2007-2013, raising the co-financing rate to 95%. And the Council has allocated an additional EUR 100m to Cyprus in the 2014 budget, with the potential for this to be maintained in 2015.

The Commission Representation in Cyprus continues to undertake activities to promote participation to the upcoming European elections and to inform citizens on the whole spectrum of EU policies. Commissioner Vassiliou will attend the Citizens' Dialogue ([1]) in Limassol on 28 November 2013 to listen to citizens' concerns.

([1]) As part of its efforts to encourage citizens to use their voting rights and strengthen the legitimacy of EU governance, the Commission is holding a series of Citizens' Dialogues in all Member States. (http://ec.europa.eu/debate-future-europe/citizens-dialogues/index_en.htm).

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011992/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Κοινοτική συγχρηματοδότηση ζητά η Κύπρος

Ευελιξία από την πλευρά των εταίρων στο κυπριακό αίτημα για αύξηση της κοινοτικής συγχρηματοδότησης προς την Κύπρο, στο πλαίσιο του Πολυετούς Δημοσιονομικού Πλαισίου της περιόδου 2014-2020, αναμένει η Λευκωσία.

Λόγω της οικονομικής κρίσης που διέρχεται η Κύπρος και της έλλειψης εθνικών πόρων για χρηματοδότηση προγραμμάτων, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή, στο νομοθετικό πακέτο της πολιτικής συνοχής για την περίοδο 2014-2020, θα μπορούσαν να χρησιμοποιηθούν περισσότεροι κοινοτικοί πόροι, προς ενίσχυση των προσπαθειών της Κυπριακής Κυβέρνησης για ανάκαμψη της οικονομίας;

**Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(10 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Προκειμένου να ενισχυθεί η κυπριακή ανάκαμψη, η νομοθετική δέσμη για τα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά και επενδυτικά ταμεία για την περίοδο 2014-2020 περιλαμβάνει μια σειρά πρόσθετων μέτρων που απευθύνονται ειδικά προς την Κύπρο.

Εκτός από τις χρηματοδοτήσεις που ορίζονται στο πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο του 2014-2020, η Κύπρος θα επωφεληθεί από την πρόσθετη χρηματοδότηση ύψους 94,2 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ το 2014 και 92,4 εκατομμυρίων το 2015 (εκφρασμένα σε τιμές 2011), η οποία πρέπει θα προστεθεί στη χρηματοδότηση των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων της.

Επιπλέον, για την περίοδο από 1 Ιανουαρίου 2014 έως 30 Ιουνίου 2017, η Κύπρος θα επωφεληθεί από ένα ανώτατο ποσοστό συγχρηματοδότησης ύψους 85% για κάθε προτεραιότητα στα επιχειρησιακά της προγράμματα.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011992/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Cyprus seeks Community co-financing

Nicosia expects flexibility from its partners in relation to the Cypriot request for an increase in Community co-financing for Cyprus, within the multiannual financial framework for 2014-2020.

With regard to the economic crisis that Cyprus is going through and the lack of national resources to fund programmes, can the Commission say whether it would be possible for more Community funds to be utilised in the legislative package of the Cohesion Policy for 2014-2020 to enhance the Cypriot Government's efforts towards economic recovery?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**
*(10 December 2013)*

In order to assist the Cypriot recovery, the legislative package for the European Structural and Investment Funds for 2014-2020 sets out a number of additional measures specifically addressed to Cyprus.

On top of the allocations set out in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework, Cyprus will benefit from an additional allocation of EUR 94.2 million in 2014 and 92.4 million in 2015 (expressed in 2011 prices), to be added to its Structural Funds allocation.

Moreover, for the period from 1 January 2014 to 30 June 2017, Cyprus will benefit from a maximum co-financing rate of 85% for each priority in its operational programmes.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011993/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Οι δύο εναλλακτικές, η εξής … μία: στάση πληρωμών

Η προσπάθεια των χωρών του Ευρωπαϊκού Νότου να εφαρμόσουν την πολιτική της εσωτερικής υποτίμησης, με τεράστιο κόστος όσον αφορά τη μείωση του ΑΕΠ και την αύξηση της ανεργίας, δεν συνοδεύεται από αντίστοιχη πολιτική εσωτερική s ανατίμησης στις χώρες του Ευρωπαϊκού Βορρά, γεγονός που σημαίνει ότι ολόκληρο το βάρος της οικονομικής προσαρμογής πέφτει αποκλειστικά στις χώρες του Νότου.

Κάποιοι μάλιστα οικονομικοί αναλυτές παραλληλίζουν την κατάσταση που επικρατεί σήμερα στην Ευρωζώνη, με αυτήν που επικράτησε στη Γερμανία μετά τον Α' Παγκόσμιο Πόλεμο, διότι τα υπερχρεωμένα κράτη του Νότου είναι υποχρεωμένα να πληρώνουν επί δεκαετίες μεγάλα ποσά στις πιστώτριες χώρες.

Ερωτάται λοιπόν η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι προτείνει για να μπορέσει η Ευρωζώνη να αποφύγει την άτακτη χρεοκοπία των χωρών του Νότου;

2. Θα μπορούσε να υιοθετήσει συμμετρική δημοσιονομική πολιτική; Να αντισταθμίσουν δηλαδή εν μέρει οι χώρες του Βορρά την πολιτική λιτότητας στις χώρες του Νότου, υιοθετώντας επεκτατική δημοσιονομική πολιτική, η οποία θα ενισχύσει τη ζήτηση και την ανάκαμψη της Ευρωζώνης και, ταυτόχρονα, θα περιορίσει τις ανισορροπίες του ισοζυγίου τρεχουσών συναλλαγών μεταξύ Βορρά και Νότου;

3. Θα μπορούσε η ΕΚΤ να αγοράσει σημαντικό μέρος του υπάρχοντος δημοσίου χρέους των χωρών του Νότου και να προχωρήσει σε μερική διαγραφή του, τυπώνοντας παράλληλα νέο χρήμα;

4. Θα μπορούσε η Ευρωζώνη να συνδυάσει τη συμμετρική δημοσιονομική πολιτική με μερική διαγραφή χρέους από την ΕΚΤ;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(4 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

1. Τα προγράμματα χωρών της ζώνης του ευρώ απέτρεψαν την άτακτη χρεοκοπία και περιόρισαν τη διάχυση των κινδύνων. Παρά τις αντιξοότητες, η μακροοικονομική και δημοσιονομική κατάσταση σταθεροποιείται και έχουν δρομολογηθεί σημαντικές διαρθρωτικές προσαρμογές.

Η δέσμη εργαλείων πολιτικής προσαρμόστηκε ώστε να ενισχυθεί η ανθεκτικότητα των χωρών της ζώνης του ευρώ σε σοβαρές οικονομικές και χρηματοπιστωτικές κρίσεις. Η θέσπιση του ΕΜΣ (Ευρωπαϊκός Μηχανισμός Σταθερότητας ) τον Οκτώβριο του 2012 δημιούργησε ένα μόνιμο μηχανισμό χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής για τις χώρες της ζώνης του ευρώ με δανειοδοτική ικανότητα ύψους 500 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ.

2. Εδώ και πολύ καιρό, η Επιτροπή έχει υιοθετήσει μια διαφοροποιημένη προσέγγιση για τη δημοσιονομική εξυγίανση, δηλαδή όσα κράτη μέλη αντιμετωπίζουν μεγάλες δημοσιονομικές προκλήσεις, θα πρέπει να επισπεύσουν τη διαδικασία εξυγίανσης, ενώ εκείνα που διαθέτουν δημοσιονομικά περιθώρια, θα πρέπει να ακολουθήσουν μια σταδιακή διαδικασία εξυγίανσης. Σε γενικές γραμμές, τα κράτη μέλη ακολούθησαν τις συμβουλές αυτές. Ορισμένα κράτη μέλη που αντιμετωπίζουν δημοσιονομικές πιέσεις έχουν εφαρμόσει εκτεταμένα προγράμματα εξυγίανσης, ενώ ορισμένες άλλες χώρες με δημοσιονομικά περιθώρια έχουν υιοθετήσει έναν εν πολλοίς ουδέτερο δημοσιονομικό προσανατολισμό. Οι μεσοπρόθεσμοι δημοσιονομικοί στόχοι των χωρών αυτών αντανακλούν επίσης ανησυχίες σχετικά με τη μακροπρόθεσμη βιωσιμότητα των δημόσιων οικονομικών, η οποία εξαρτάται από τα τρέχοντα επίπεδα του χρέους και τις μελλοντικές δαπάνες που συνδέονται με τη δημογραφική γήρανση. Ακόμη και αν κάποια κράτη μέλη έχουν τη δυνατότητα να εφαρμόσουν πιο επεκτατική δημοσιονομική πολιτική χωρίς να θέσουν σε κίνδυνο την βιωσιμότητα των δημοσίων οικονομικών, από την ανάλυση προκύπτει ότι μια τέτοια πολιτική θα έχει περιορισμένες μόνο επιπτώσεις στις εξωτερικές ανισορροπίες των κρατών μελών που αντιμετωπίζουν τις μεγαλύτερες οικονομικές προκλήσεις.

3&4. Οι αποφάσεις για θέματα νομισματικής πολιτικής ([1]) εντός της ζώνης του ευρώ εμπίπτουν στην αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα της ΕΚΤ και η Επιτροπή τις σέβεται πλήρως. Αναφορικά με την ενδεχόμενη αγορά δημόσιου χρέους από την ΕΚΤ με σκοπό τη μερική διαγραφή του, η Επιτροπή υπενθυμίζει ότι η απαγόρευση της χρηματοδότησης με νομισματικά μέσα κατοχυρώνεται στις συνθήκες της ΕΕ.

([1]) συμπεριλαμβανομένων ενδεχόμενων προγραμμάτων αγοράς ομολόγων από την κεντρική τράπεζα,

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011993/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* The two alternatives are as follows… one: default

The efforts made by the countries of the European south to implement their policies of internal devaluation at enormous cost in terms of reducing GDP and increasing unemployment, are not accompanied by a corresponding internal policy on appreciation in the countries of the European north, which means that the entire burden of economic adjustment falls exclusively on the southern countries.

Some economic analysts even draw parallels between the current situation in the euro area and the situation in Germany after the First World War, as the indebted southern countries will have to pay considerable sums to the creditor countries for decades.

1. What does the Commission propose to enable the euro area to avoid the disorderly bankruptcy of the countries of the south?

2. Will it be able to adopt a symmetrical fiscal policy? In other words, can the countries of the north offset the austerity policy of the countries of the south by adopting an expansionist fiscal policy which will strengthen demand and the recovery of the euro area, and which will, at the same time, limit current account imbalances between north and south?

3. Could the ECB buy a substantial part of the existing public debt of the countries of the south and implement a partial write-off of the debt by printing new money?

4. Could the euro area combine a symmetrical fiscal policy with a partial write-off of debt by the ECB?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**
*(4 December 2013)*

1. The euro area programmes avoided disorderly default and limited contagion. Despite heavy headwinds, the macroeconomic and financial situation is stabilising and major structural adjustments are underway.

The policy toolkit has been adapted to enhance the resilience of the euro area countries against severe economic and financial crises. The establishment of the ESM (European Stability Mechanism) in October 2012 created a permanent financial assistance mechanism for euro area countries with a lending capacity of EUR 500 billion.

2. The Commission has for a long time now advocated a differentiated approach to consolidation, i.e. MS facing large fiscal challenges should frontload consolidation, while in those with fiscal space consolidation should be gradual. The MS have broadly followed this advice: MS under fiscal pressure have implemented impressive consolidation programmes while the fiscal stance in some of the countries with fiscal space has been broadly neutral. The medium-term budgetary objectives of these countries also reflect concerns about long-term sustainability linked to current debt levels and future age-related expenditure. Even if some of the MS could afford a more expansionary policy without endangering fiscal sustainability, the analysis shows that its impact on the external imbalances of the MS facing the largest economic challenges would be limited.

3 and 4. Monetary policy decisions ([1]) in the euro area are the exclusive competence of the ECB and the Commission fully respects them. With regard to potential purchases of public debt by the ECB with the purpose of partial write-offs, the Commission recalls that the prohibition of monetary financing is enshrined in the EU Treaties.

([1]) Including potential bond-purchase schemes by the central bank.

*(Ελληνική έκδοση)*

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011995/13**
**προς την Επιτροπή**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)*

*Θέμα:* Υπόδειξη Μπαγίς προς Φούλε

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα, ο Υπουργός Ευρωπαϊκών Υποθέσεων της Τουρκίας, Εγκεμέν Μπαγίς, προειδοποίησε τον Επίτροπο Διεύρυνσης, Στέφαν Φούλε, ότι, σε περίπτωση κατά την οποία η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή προέβαινε σε προσωπική κριτική κατά του Ταγίπ Ερντογάν στην έκθεση προόδου της ενταξιακής πορείας της Τουρκίας, οι σχέσεις Άγκυρας-Βρυξελλών θα εισέρχονταν σε νέα φάση κρίσης.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μήπως είναι αυτός ο λόγος που η ίδια δεν κατέγραψε τις εμπρηστικές τοποθετήσεις Ερντογάν και το κλίμα πόλωσης που προκάλεσε ο Τούρκος πρωθυπουργός στη διάρκεια των διαδηλώσεων;

2. Γιατί δεν περιέλαβε αυτές τις δηλώσεις στο προσχέδιο της έκθεσης προόδου;

**Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**
*(18 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)*

Οι εκθέσεις στις οποίες αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου είναι εντελώς αβάσιμες.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011995/13**
**to the Commission**
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Note from Mr Bargis to Mr Füle

According to reports, Turkey's Minister for European Affairs, Egemen Bargis, has warned Štefan Füle, European Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy, that if the Commission were to make a personal attack on Recep Tayyip Erdogan in its progress report on Turkey's accession process, the Ankara-Brussels relationship will be thrown into crisis.

1. Is this the reason for the Commission's failure to report the inflammatory positions taken by Mr Erdogan and the increasing polarisation he caused during the demonstrations?

2. Why did it not include these positions in the draft progress report?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**
*(18 December 2013)*

The reports referred to by the Honourable Member are completely unfounded.

*(Version française)*

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011996/13**
**à la Commission**
**Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)**
*(21 octobre 2013)*

*Objet:* Formation professionnelle d'experts nationaux en sûreté nucléaire

Sous l'impulsion de la Commission européenne, l'Union a entrepris, à la suite de l'accident de Fukushima, une évaluation générale du niveau de sûreté de ses installations électronucléaires, sous la forme de «stress tests» menés dans chaque État membre, complétés par des revues croisées et des groupes de travail thématiques. Cette revue va conduire à des mesures de renforcement de la sûreté vis-à-vis notamment des aléas naturels extrêmes.

Cependant, les circonstances de l'accident de Fukushima ont également mis clairement en évidence l'importance que revêt la capacité des autorités nationales de sûreté à disposer de moyens fiables et indépendants d'expertise, tant pour ce qui concerne la gestion des processus d'autorisation de l'exploitation nucléaire que la gestion en temps réel d'une situation accidentelle pouvant mettre en danger les populations et l'environnement. Or le mécanisme des «stress tests» ne permet pas de disposer d'éléments d'analyse suffisants pour apprécier à cet égard, de manière objective, la situation dans les différents États membres. Il n'existe pas non plus de mécanisme de soutien ciblé aux États membres qui rencontreraient des difficultés dans ce domaine.

Pourtant, en ce qui concerne les pays tiers, partenaires de l'Instrument relatif à la coopération en matière de sûreté nucléaire (INSC), l'Union s'est dotée d'une politique visant à analyser et développer si nécessaire la performance de ces États en matière d'expertise. Cette politique permet notamment le financement de la formation d'experts dans le cadre de l'institut européen de formation et de tutorat en matière de sûreté nucléaire et de radioprotection, l'Enstti, créé à l'initiative des TSO européens.

La Commission prévoit-elle donc d'engager des initiatives visant à renforcer les obligations des États membres en ce qui concerne la disponibilité suffisante d'experts de sûreté auprès des autorités de sûreté ou des TSO nationaux? Si nécessaire, va-t-elle soutenir les efforts restant à accomplir pour harmoniser davantage les méthodes d'analyse de sûreté et faciliter la formation des experts dans certains États membres?

**Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission**
*(17 décembre 2013)*

1. Les directives actuelles relatives la sûreté nucléaire ([1]) et aux déchets nucléaires ([2]) imposent déjà aux États membres de donner aux autorités de sûreté des ressources humaines suffisantes. La directive sur la sûreté nucléaire en particulier fait obligation aux États membres de soumettre au moins tous les dix ans leur cadre national et/ou leurs autorités nationales à un examen international par des pairs. Cet examen est actuellement réalisé en utilisant le programme de l'IRRS ([3]), qui couvre les effectifs et les compétences des autorités de sûreté. La proposition de la Commission modifiant la directive relative à la sûreté nucléaire ([4]) envisage de renforcer ces exigences ([5]). Une proposition de nouvelle directive sur les normes de base relatives à la protection sanitaire ([6]) inclut également des dispositions concernant la formation ([7]).

2. La proposition de modification de la directive sur la sûreté nucléaire introduit de nouveaux objectifs et de nouvelles exigences en termes de sûreté aux différents stades du cycle de vie des installations nucléaires ([8]). Elle instaure également un mécanisme visant à faciliter l'élaboration, à l'échelle de l'Union européenne, de recommandations et de lignes directrices génériques relatives à la sûreté nucléaire, sur la base des résultats des examens thématiques de sûreté des installations nucléaires réalisés par des pairs. Ces initiatives devraient contribuer à harmoniser les méthodes d'analyses de la sûreté au sein de l'Union.

([1]) Directive 2009/71/Euratom du Conseil du 25 juin 2009 établissant un cadre communautaire pour la sûreté nucléaire des installations nucléaires.
([2]) Directive 2011/70/Euratom du Conseil du 19 juillet 2011 établissant un cadre communautaire pour la gestion responsable et sûre du combustible usé et des déchets radioactifs.
([3]) Service d'examen intégré de la réglementation de l'AIEA (IRRS).
([4]) Proposition d'une directive du Conseil modifiant la directive 2009/71/Euratom du Conseil du 25 juin 2009 établissant un cadre communautaire pour la sûreté nucléaire des installations nucléaires (COM(2013)715 final).
([5]) La proposition prévoit l'obligation, pour les autorités réglementaires, d'employer en nombre suffisant du personnel possédant les qualifications, l'expérience et l'expertise adéquates.
([6]) Proposition de directive du Conseil fixant les normes de base relatives à la protection sanitaire contre les dangers résultant de l'exposition aux rayonnements ionisants (COM(2013)242 final).
([7]) La proposition impose aux États membres de mettre en place un cadre législatif et administratif adéquat permettant l'éducation, la formation et l'information appropriées en matière de radioprotection de toutes les personnes dont les missions nécessitent des compétences spécifiques dans ce domaine. Des exigences supplémentaires particulières ont été établies en ce qui concerne la formation des experts chargés de la radioprotection, des travailleurs exposés et des membres des équipes d'intervention.
([8]) Conception, implantation, construction, mise en service, exploitation et déclassement.

Dans le cadre du programme de la Communauté européenne de l'énergie atomique dans le domaine de la recherche et de la formation, la Commission accorde en outre aux organismes de recherche des aides pour la recherche et le développement technologique dans le domaine de la sûreté de la fission nucléaire. Depuis Fukushima, l'accent est mis, entre autres, sur l'harmonisation des méthodes et des normes européennes dans ce domaine. Le volet «fission (Euratom)» du programme-cadre «Horizon 2020» poursuit cet effort en promouvant l'intégration européenne de la recherche dans le domaine de la sûreté, de la radioprotection, de l'éducation et de la formation et en renforçant les capacités régionales dans ces domaines pour les nouveaux États membres.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011996/13**
**to the Commission**
**Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Professional training of national nuclear safety experts

Following the Fukushima accident, the European Union, on the initiative of the Commission, has undertaken a general assessment of the safety of its nuclear power plants in the form of 'stress tests', which were conducted in every Member State along with peer reviews and thematic working groups. This review will lead to improved safety measures in terms of extreme natural disasters in particular.

However, the circumstances surrounding the Fukushima accident also clearly emphasised the importance of national safety authorities having the capacity for reliable and independent expertise, both in terms of management of the authorisation process for nuclear operations and the real-time management of an accident with the potential to put people and the environment at risk. The 'stress test' mechanism, however, does not comprise enough analytical components in order to objectively assess the situation in the various Member States in this regard; neither is there a support mechanism targeted at Member States that would struggle in this area.

However, with regard to third countries that are Nuclear Safety Cooperation Instrument (NSCI) partners, the EU has adopted a policy to analyse and develop, if necessary, the performance of these states in terms of their expertise. In particular, the policy allows for funding the training of experts on nuclear safety and radiation protection under the European Nuclear Safety Training and Tutoring Institute (ENSTTI), established on the initiative of the European Technical Safety Organisations (TSOs).

Does the Commission therefore intend to take steps to strengthen Member States' obligations to have sufficient safety experts on hand from safety authorities or national TSOs? If necessary, will it support the efforts still required to further harmonise safety analysis methods and to facilitate the training of experts in certain Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**
*(17 December 2013)*

1. The current Nuclear Safety Directive (NSD) ([1]) and Nuclear Waste Directive ([2]) already require Member States to provide safety authorities with the necessary human resources. The NSD in particular requires Member States to invite, at least every 10 years, an international peer review of their national framework and/or authorities. This is currently conducted using the IRRS ([3]) scheme, which covers the staffing and competence of safety authorities. The Commission's proposal for an amended NSD ([4]) envisages strengthening these requirements further ([5]). A proposal for a new Basic Safety Standards Directive ([6]) also contains provisions on training ([7]).

2. The proposal for an amended NSD introduces new safety objectives and requirements for the different stages of the lifecycle of nuclear installations ([8]). It also establishes a mechanism to help formulate EU-wide generic safety recommendations and guidelines on the basis of the results of topic-based peer reviews of the safety of nuclear installations. These initiatives should contribute to the harmonisation of safety analysis methods in the European Union.

([1]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations.
([2]) Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom of 19 July 2011 establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste.
([3]) IAEA Integrated Regulatory Review Service (IRRS).
([4]) Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations (COM(2013) 715 final).
([5]) The proposal requires that regulatory authorities need to employ an appropriate number of staff with the necessary qualifications, experience and expertise.
([6]) Proposal for a Council Directive laying down basic safety standards for protection against the dangers arising from exposure to ionising radiation (COM(2012) 242final).
([7]) The proposal requires Member States to establish an adequate legislative and administrative framework ensuring the provision of appropriate radiation protection education, training and information to all individuals whose tasks require specific competences in radiation protection. Further detailed requirements exist in relation to the education and training of radiation protection experts, occupationally exposed workers and emergency workers.
([8]) Design, siting, construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning.

Moreover, Commission support is granted to research institutions for research and technological development in the field of nuclear fission safety under the European Atomic Energy Community Research and Training Programmes, After Fukushima, the emphasis was placed on, *inter alia*, the harmonisation of European methods and standards in this field. The Euratom fission part of Horizon 2020 is further pursuing this effort, namely by promoting the European integration of research in nuclear safety, radiation protection, education and training and in strengthening regional capabilities in these fields for new Member States.

*(Hrvatska verzija)*

**Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-011997/13**
**upućeno Komisiji**
**Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)**
*(21. listopada 2013.)*

*Predmet:* Uredba o jedinstvenom tržištu elektroničkih komunikacija

Europska komisija predložila je Uredbu Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća o utvrđivanju mjera u vezi s europskim jedinstvenim tržištem elektroničkih komunikacija i ostvarenju „Povezanog kontinenta" te o izmjeni direktiva 2002/20/EZ, 2002/21/EZ i 2002/22/EZ i uredbi (EZ) br. 1211/2009 i (EU) br. 531/2012.

U vezi s tim, želim Vam uputiti sljedeća pitanja:

1. Prema procjeni Komisije, kako bi stvaranje jedinstvenog digitalnog tržišta moglo utjecati na otvaranje radnih mjesta u Europskoj uniji?

2. Kako bi donošenje navedene uredbe moglo utjecati na zapošljavanje mladih?

3. Ima li Komisija projekcije o utjecaju predložene uredbe na stvaranje novih radnih mjesta u Hrvatskoj?

**Odgovor gđe Kroes u ime Komisije**
*(28. studenog 2013.)*

Postizanjem jedinstvenog tržišta telekomunikacijskih usluga trebao bi se ostvariti godišnji porast od 0,9 % BDP-a (ukupno 110 milijardi EUR godišnje). Njime će se stvoriti nove mogućnosti za djelovanje poduzeća na višoj razini uz manje regulatorno opterećenje i pojačati njihovu sposobnost za inovacije, rast i veću produktivnost te otvoriti radna mjesta osobito za mlađe generacije, povećati odabir za potrošače i poboljšati kvalitetu usluga.

Još važnije, poboljšanom povezanošću diljem Europe stvorile bi se i mogućnosti rasta u svim gospodarskim sektorima uporabom aplikacija kao što su eCommerce, računalstvo u oblaku i organizacijske inovacije, što bi osobito za MSP-ove poticalo rast produktivnosti.

Izgradnja jedinstvenog tržišta elektroničkih komunikacija na taj će način znatno utjecati na zapošljavanje u svim državama članicama — velikim i malim, „starim" i „mladim", uključujući Hrvatsku, pomoću općeg porasta produktivnosti i difuzijskog učinka u digitalnom ekosustavu i cjelokupnom gospodarstvu.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011997/13**
**to the Commission**
**Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Regulation on the single market for electronic communications

The Commission has put forward a proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down measures concerning the European single market for electronic communications and to achieve a Connected Continent, and amending Directives 2002/20/EC, 2002/21/EC and 2002/22/EC and Regulations (EC) No 1211/2009 and (EU) No 531/2012.

1. What impact does the Commission think that completion of the digital single market is likely to have from the point of view of opening up job opportunities in the EU?

2. How might the adoption of the above regulation make itself felt in terms of youth employment?

3. Does the Commission have any projections relating to the effect of the proposed regulation on the creation of new jobs in Croatia?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission**
*(28 November 2013)*

Achieving the Single Telecoms Market should bring an annual increase of up to 0.9% of the GDP (amounting yearly to EUR 110 billion). It will create opportunities for firms to operate on a bigger scale with less regulatory burden, enhancing their capacity to innovate, to grow, become more productive and generate jobs, especially for the younger generations, widen consumer choice and raise the quality of service.

Even more importantly, improved connectivity across Europe would in turn enable growth possibilities across all economic sectors enabling the use of applications such as eCommerce, cloud computing and organisational innovation, driving productivity gains especially for SMEs.

The building of a Single Telecoms Market will thus have a significant impact on employment in all Member States — big and small, 'old' and 'new', including Croatia, through the general productivity gains and diffusion effects in the digital eco-system and on the economy as a whole.

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011998/13**
**à Comissão**
**Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)**
*(21 de outubro de 2013)*

*Assunto:* Declarações do Representante da Comissão Europeia sobre o Tribunal Constitucional de Portugal

Tivemos hoje conhecimento de um relatório elaborado e assinado pelo Representante da Comissão Europeia em Portugal, no qual estão explanadas várias considerações sobre um órgão de soberania de Portugal, o Tribunal Constitucional.

O autor do documento acusa o Tribunal Constitucional de ser um ativista político, de pôr em risco, com as suas decisões, o Memorando de Entendimento e, consequentemente, de precipitar um segundo resgate.

O Tribunal Constitucional tem como competência específica, de acordo com a Constituição da República Portuguesa, administrar a justiça em matérias de natureza jurídico-constitucional, nomeadamente verificar a inconstitucionalidade das normas que infrinjam o disposto na Constituição, ou os princípios nela consignados. Além disso, a Constituição da República Portuguesa, bem como todas as revisões da mesma, foi votada na Assembleia da República portuguesa pelos deputados eleitos, ao contrário do Memorando de Entendimento.

Fundamentar as conclusões vertidas no relatório em debates de comentadores ou de um dos muitos professores de Direito do país, que, ao contrário dos juízes do Tribunal Constitucional, não estão obrigados a qualquer dever de imparcialidade, é um exercício grosseiro de manipulação e de irresponsabilidade. Usar esse exercício para encontrar justificações para os falhanços do governo português é mais grave e configura, isso sim, uma transformação da Comissão Europeia num ativista do debate político português, em completa violação dos limites do seu mandato.

Coagir a ação de um órgão de soberania independente de um Estado-Membro, através de chantagens e ultimatos, constitui um precedente gravíssimo de desrespeito pela autonomia dos Estados-Membros e pelo princípio da separação dos poderes político e judicial, central em todas as democracias europeias.

Assim, pretendemos saber da Comissão se subscreve o conteúdo do relatório do seu Representante em Portugal.

Se não subscreve, pretende a Comissão enviar algum pedido de desculpas ao Tribunal Constitucional e permitir que o autor do documento continue em funções?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011999/13**
**à Comissão**
**Edite Estrela (S&D) e Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)**
*(21 de outubro de 2013)*

*Assunto:* Ingerência da CE nos assuntos nacionais de um Estado-Membro

Considerando as notícias hoje publicadas na imprensa portuguesa, dando conta de um documento enviado para Bruxelas pelo Chefe da Representação Interino da Comissão Europeia em Portugal, que alerta para as consequências de um chumbo do Tribunal Constitucional a algumas medidas propostas no Orçamento de Estado para 2014;

Considerando que as notícias referem que o documento contém considerações políticas e alerta para a eventualidade de um parecer negativo do Tribunal Constitucional acarretar como consequência um segundo resgate;

Considerando o precedente aberto pelo referido funcionário aquando da apresentação da moção de censura ao governo por parte do Partido Socialista, em que se pronunciou politicamente contra a iniciativa, à revelia do Estatuto dos Funcionários das Instituições Europeias;

Manifestamos a nossa perplexidade e preocupação e solicitamos à Comissão que nos esclareça qual o seu enquadramento funcional e se tem condições para continuar no seu posto.

Mais, manifestamos a nossa indignação pelas considerações que, no referido documento, se tecem em relação ao Tribunal Constitucional português, sugerindo que se trata de um «legislador negativo» e responsabilizando-o, em tom de chantagem, por um possível segundo resgate e concomitante colapso do atual governo;

Tendo em conta o artigo 4.° do Tratado da União Europeia, que determina a igualdade dos Estados-Membros perante os tratados e o respeito pelas suas «estruturas políticas e constitucionais», como pode a Comissão, enquanto «guardiã dos Tratados», justificar uma pressão direta sobre o Tribunal Constitucional de um Estado-Membro?

Tendo em conta as disposições constantes no Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia, não considera a Comissão que esta atuação representa uma clara ingerência nos assuntos nacionais de um Estado-Membro?

**Resposta conjunta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão**
*(19 de dezembro de 2013)*

O relatório mencionado pelos Senhores Deputados faz parte de um documento interno elaborado pela sua representação em Lisboa, com vista a informar os serviços da Comissão sobre o debate político em curso em Portugal.

Este relatório interno apresenta uma descrição analítica do debate nacional em Portugal relativo às decisões do Tribunal Constitucional. A análise apresentada no relatório baseou-se nas posições dos vários intervenientes políticos e funcionários, além dos meios de comunicação social portugueses e internacionais. Inclui também informações baseadas na doutrina do Tribunal Constitucional, recolhidas a partir de estudos sobre a questão.

A Comissão não exerce qualquer pressão sobre o Tribunal Constitucional de qualquer Estado-Membro. Por conseguinte, a Comissão não põe em causa as competências do Tribunal Constitucional de Portugal no âmbito da constituição e da legislação portuguesas.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-011998/13**
**to the Commission**
**Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Statements by the Commission's representative on Portugal's Constitutional Court

Today we learned of a report prepared and signed by the Commission's representative in Portugal, which contains several comments on one of Portugal's sovereign bodies, the Constitutional Court.

The author of the document accuses the Constitutional Court of interfering in politics and, with its decisions, putting the memorandum of understanding in jeopardy and precipitating a second bailout as a result.

In accordance with the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic, the Constitutional Court is specifically tasked with administering justice on legal and constitutional matters, including establishing whether rules that infringe the provisions of the Constitution, or the principles enshrined therein, are unconstitutional. Moreover, the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic, as well as all the revisions thereto, was adopted in the Assembly of the Portuguese Republic by elected representatives, unlike the memorandum of understanding.

Basing the conclusions set out in the report on the debates of commentators or of one of the country's many law professors, who, unlike the judges of the Constitutional Court, are not bound by any duty of impartiality, is grossly manipulative and irresponsible. Using this exercise to find justifications for the Portuguese Government's failings is more serious and, in fact, means that the Commission is interfering in Portuguese political debate, totally overstepping the bounds of its mandate.

Putting pressure on the activity of a Member State's independent sovereign body, by means of blackmail and ultimatums, sets a very serious precedent of disrespect for Member States' autonomy and for the principle of separation of political and judicial powers, which is central to all European democracies.

Does the Commission agree with the content of the report by its representative in Portugal?

If not, will the Commission apologise to the Constitutional Court and allow the author of the report to continue in his post?

**Question for written answer E-011999/13**
**to the Commission**
**Edite Estrela (S&D) and Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)**
*(21 October 2013)*

*Subject:* Interference by the Commission in the domestic affairs of a Member State

According to reports published today in the Portuguese press, the acting Head of the Commission Representation in Portugal has sent a document to Brussels warning of the consequences of a ruling by the Constitutional Court on certain measures proposed in the State budget for 2014.

According to the reports, the document contains comments of a political nature and warns that a negative opinion from the Constitutional Court could possibly result in a second bailout.

When the Socialist Party tabled a motion of censure against the government, the aforementioned official set a precedent by expressing his political opposition to the initiative, disregarding the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union.

We are baffled and concerned and call on the Commission to clarify what the framework governing his role is and whether he is in a position to continue in his post.

Moreover, we are offended by the comments concerning the Portuguese Constitutional Court in the aforementioned document, which suggest that it is a 'negative legislator' and hold it responsible, in a blackmailing tone, for a potential second bailout and the attendant collapse of the current government.

Given that Article 4 of the Treaty on European Union establishes the equality of Member States before the Treaties and respect for their 'political and constitutional' structures, how can the Commission, as 'guardian of the Treaties', justify direct pressure being put on the Constitutional Court of a Member State?

In view of the provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, does the Commission not think that this act is a clear case of interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State?

**Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

*(19 December 2013)*

The report mentioned by the Honourable Members consists of an internal document drawn up by its Representation in Lisbon to inform the Commission services about the ongoing political debate in Portugal.

This internal report presents an analytical description of the domestic debate in Portugal regarding rulings of the Constitutional Court. The analysis in the report was based on the positions of several political actors, officials, Portuguese and international media. It also includes information collected from studies on the matter of constitutional court doctrine.

The Commission does not exert any pressure on the Constitutional Court of any Member States. Therefore the Commission does not call into question the competences of the Portuguese Constitutional Court under the Portuguese constitution and laws.