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 286/01)

Treść Strona

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000302/14
a la Comisión
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(14 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Acuerdo de Asociación Mercosur-UE: obstáculos

Tras iniciarse formalmente en el año 2000 y suspenderse en el año 2004, las negociaciones del posible Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Mercosur se retomaron el 17 de mayo de 2010 en la Cumbre que ambos bloques celebraron en Madrid.

Nueve han sido las rondas de negociación que han tenido lugar, centrándose todas ellas en la parte «normativa» del Acuerdo.

El 26 de enero de 2013, durante la reunión ministerial UE-Mercosur celebrada en Santiago de Chile, ambas partes acordaron que la manera adecuada para ahondar en el desarrollo del Acuerdo fuese el intercambio de ofertas concretas en lo relativo a las obligaciones aduaneras y las cuotas, intercambio que habría de producirse no más tarde del último trimestre de 2013.

Sin embargo, finalizado 2013, tal intercambio de ofertas no ha tenido lugar y parece haber sido pospuesto para una fecha no determinada.

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior, ¿puede la Comisión indicar cuáles han sido y siguen siendo los obstáculos principales para lograr un Acuerdo cuyas negociaciones empezaron hace más de 12 años?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000303/14
a la Comisión
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(14 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Acuerdo de Asociación Mercosur-UE en relación con el mandato de la Comisión

El 26 de enero de 2013, durante la reunión ministerial UE-Mercosur celebrada en Santiago de Chile, ambas partes acordaron fijar el último trimestre de 2013 como plazo máximo para que el siguiente paso en las negociaciones del Acuerdo de Asociación entre ambos bloques (el intercambio de ofertas concretas) tuviera lugar.

Dado que dicho intercambio no se ha producido todavía, y teniendo en cuenta que el actual mandato de la Comisión finalizará el 31 de octubre de 2014:

¿Considera posible la Comisión que dichas negociaciones puedan concluir con éxito antes de esa fecha?

De no ser así, ¿en qué punto prevé la Comisión que estarán las negociaciones en la fecha mencionada?

¿Cuál es el grado de prioridad que otorga la Comisión a las negociaciones de este acuerdo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000380/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(16 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Mercosur: obstáculos

Tras iniciarse formalmente en el año 2000 y suspenderse en el año 2004, las negociaciones del posible Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Mercosur se retomaron el 17 de mayo de 2010 en la Cumbre de los dos bloques celebrada en Madrid.

Nueve han sido las rondas de negociación que han tenido lugar, centrándose todas ellas en la parte «normativa» del Acuerdo.

El 26 de enero de 2013, durante la Reunión Ministerial UE-Mercosur celebrada en Santiago de Chile, ambas partes acordaron que la manera adecuada para ahondar en el desarrollo del Acuerdo fuese el intercambio de ofertas concretas en lo relativo a las obligaciones aduaneras y las cuotas, intercambio que habría de producirse no más tarde del último trimestre de 2013.

Sin embargo, finalizado el año 2013, tal intercambio de ofertas no ha tenido lugar y parece haber sido pospuesto a una fecha no determinada.

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior,

¿Podría el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior valorar, desde su punto de vista, cuáles han sido y siguen siendo los obstáculos principales para lograr un Acuerdo cuyas negociaciones empezaron hace más de 12 años?

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

La UE sigue concediendo gran importancia a las negociaciones sobre un Acuerdo de Asociación global con Mercosur para reforzar la asociación en los ámbitos político, comercial y de cooperación. El intercambio de ofertas de acceso a los mercados acordado con Mercosur en enero de 2013 será un jalón crucial para el Acuerdo en su conjunto. Supondrá el primer intercambio de ofertas desde 2004, cuando las negociaciones se suspendieron durante varios años, y será importante para hacer avanzar el proceso de negociación hasta su conclusión. No obstante, ambas partes han de garantizar que el fondo del asunto es correcto y que se dan las condiciones para un intercambio fructífero.

Durante 2013, la UE y el Mercosur se han preparado para un intercambio de ofertas y han celebrado consultas internas. En la actualidad, ambas partes estén finalizando las ofertas. A principios de este año se fijará de común acuerdo una fecha exacta para el intercambio de ofertas, en función de la finalización del trabajo por ambas partes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000302/14
to the Commission
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: EU-Mercosur Association Agreement: Obstacles

After negotiations on a possible EU-Mercosur Association Agreement formally commenced in 2000 and were then suspended in 2004, they were resumed on 17 May 2010 at the Summit held in Madrid between the two blocs.

There have been nine rounds of these negotiations, all of which have focused on the 'regulatory' aspects of the Agreement.

At the EU-Mercosur ministerial meeting held on 26 January 2013 in Santiago de Chile, both parties agreed that the most appropriate way of moving the Agreement forward was to exchange specific offers relating to customs duties and quotas, which should take place no later than the last quarter of 2013.

However, 2013 has now come to an end and the proposed exchange of offers has not happened. Indeed, it seems rather to have been postponed to an indeterminate later date.

Bearing in mind the foregoing, can the Commission say what have been and still are the main obstacles to reaching an Agreement on which negotiations began over 12 years ago?

Question for written answer E-000303/14
to the Commission
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: EU-Mercosur Association Agreement in relation to the term of the Commission

On 26 January 2013, during the EU-Mercosur Ministerial Meeting held in Santiago de Chile, both parties agreed on the last quarter of 2013 as the final deadline for completion of the next stage in the negotiations concerning the Association Agreement between both blocs (the exchange of specific offers).

As this exchange has still not taken place, and in view of the fact that the term of the current Commission ends on 31 October 2014:

Does the Commission believe that it will be possible to bring these negotiations to a successful conclusion by this date?

If not, what stage does the Commission feel that the negotiations will have reached by this date?

What level of priority does the Commission attach to the negotiations relating to this Agreement?

Question for written answer E-000380/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Obstacles to the EU-Mercosur Association Agreement

After formally being launched in 2000 and subsequently suspended in 2004, negotiations on the possible EU-Mercosur Association Agreement resumed on 17 May 2010 at the Summit that was held between the two blocs in Madrid.

There have been nine rounds of negotiations, which have all focused on the 'regulatory' part of the Agreement.

On 26 January 2013, during the EU-Mercosur Ministerial Meeting held in Santiago in Chile, both parties agreed that the appropriate way to further develop the Agreement was an exchange of specific offers in relation to customs duties and quotas. This exchange was supposed to have taken place by the last quarter of 2013, at the latest.

However, 2013 has now ended and this exchange of offers did not take place; it seems to have been postponed to an unspecified date.

Bearing in mind all of the above, would the European External Action Service be able to assess what, from its perspective, have been, and continue to be, the main obstacles to reaching an Agreement, which has been the subject of negotiation for more than 12 years?

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

The EU continues to attach high importance to these negotiations on an overall Association Agreement with Mercosur in order to strengthen the partnership in the political, trade and cooperation fields. The exchange of market access offers agreed with Mercosur in January 2013 will be a crucial step for the Agreement as a whole. It would be the first exchange of offers since 2004, when the negotiations were suspended for several years, and it will be important for driving the negotiation process forward towards its conclusion. But both sides need to ensure that the substance is right and that conditions are there for a successful exchange.

During 2013, both the EU and Mercosur have prepared for an exchange of offers and consulted internally. Currently, both sides are in the process of finalising the offers. A precise date for the exchange of offers early this year will be fixed by common agreement, depending on the finalisation of work on both sides.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-000304/14
до Комисията
Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE)
(14 януари 2014 г.)

Относно: Антидискриминационни директиви 2000/43/ЕО и 2000/78/ЕО

Европейската комисия е подготвила доклад за транспонирането и приложението на антидискриминационните директиви: Директива 2000/43/ЕО на Съвета на ЕС относно прилагане на принципа на равно третиране на лица без разлика на расата или етническия произход и Директива 2000/78/ЕО на Съвета на Европейския съюз за създаване на основна рамка за равно третиране в областта на заетостта и професиите. За изготвянето на доклада е събрана информация от всички държави — членки на ЕС. В него се посочват затруднения при предприемането на общи и специални мерки на национално ниво за транспонирането на двете директиви, както и необходимост от точни дефиниции на основните понятия в тях. Комисията споделя ли мнението за необходимост от бързи действия за допълнения към директивите и в състояние ли е да ги предприеме, особено като се имат предвид проблемите в страните членки, произтичащи от пълното отваряне на трудовите пазари в ЕС?

Отговор, даден от г-жа Рединг от името на Комисията
(18 февруари 2014 г.)

На 17 януари 2014 г. беше приет съвместният доклад за прилагането на директиви 2000/43/ЕО за равенството между расите и 2000/78/ЕО за равното третиране в областта на заетостта. В доклада Комисията беше в състояние да заключи, че всичките 28 държави членки са транспонирали директивите в националното си право. В доклада се признава, обаче, че макар законодателната уредба да е налице, все още съществуват предизвикателства по отношение на правилното приложение на разпоредбите на практика. Сред основните предизвикателства са липсата на обществена осведоменост за правата и фактът, че не се съобщава за всички случаи на дискриминация.

Комисията вече предприе някои мерки за подпомагане на държавите членки при намирането на отговор на тези предизвикателства. Те включват финансиране от ЕС с цел повишаване на осведомеността и обучаване на практикуващите юристи в областта на равното третиране. Освен това, заедно с доклада, Комисията публикува насоки за жертвите на дискриминация.

Комисията ще следи отблизо прилагането и ще оказва подкрепа на органите на държавите членки в това отношение.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000304/14
to the Commission
Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Anti-discrimination Directives 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC

The Commission has drawn up a report on the transposition and implementation of the following anti-discrimination directives: Council Directive 2000/43/EC implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin and Council Directive 2000/78/EC establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation. In preparing that report, it collected information from all the EU Member States. The report points to problems with the implementation in the Member States of general and specific measures for the transposition of the two directives, and to the need for precise definitions of the basic concepts they contain. Does the Commission share the view that swift additional action needs to be taken to implement these directives, and will it take such action, especially considering the problems that have arisen in the Member States as a result of the full opening of labour markets in the EU?

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

The joint implementation report on Directives 2000/43/EC on Racial Equality and 2000/78/EC on Employment Equality was adopted on 17 January 2014. In the report, the Commission was able to conclude that all 28 Member States have transposed the directives into their national law. However, the report recognises that while the legislative framework is in place there are still challenges to the rules being properly applied on the ground. Among the key challenges are lack of public awareness of rights and underreporting of discrimination cases.

The Commission has already taken a number of actions to support the Member States in tackling these challenges. These include EU funding to awareness-raising and to training of legal practitioners in equality law. In addition, together with the report, the Commission published guidance for victims of discrimination.

The Commission will continue to closely monitor the implementation and support Member States' authorities in this respect.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000307/14
à la Commission
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(14 janvier 2014)

Objet: Mise en œuvre de la garantie pour la jeunesse au sein des États membres

La garantie pour la jeunesse a pour objectif de proposer aux jeunes Européens jusqu'à l'âge de 25 ans un emploi, une formation continue, un apprentissage ou un stage dans les quatre mois suivant leur sortie de l'enseignement officiel ou la perte de leur emploi.

1. La Commission peut-elle indiquer les progrès effectués par les États membres dans la rédaction et la mise en œuvre effective de leurs plans nationaux depuis le lancement de cette initiative en avril 2013, et si ces plans nationaux incluent des critères particuliers portant sur les secteurs professionnels qui manquent notamment de main d'œuvre en Europe?

2. Peut-elle préciser les mesures et soutiens financiers supplémentaires accordés aux États membres dont le taux de chômage des jeunes de moins de 25 ans est supérieur à la moyenne européenne?

3. A-t-elle envisagé des facilités permettant de proposer, dans le cadre de la garantie jeunesse ou de tout autre programme de coopération, des offres dans un autre État membre que le leur?

4. La Commission peut-elle indiquer comment et quand elle procédera à l'évaluation de l'impact de la garantie pour la jeunesse?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(28 février 2014)

1. Dix-neuf États membres ont présenté leurs plans de mise en œuvre de la garantie pour la jeunesse. ([1]) La Commission examine actuellement ces plans. Les autres États membres doivent soumettre leurs plans de mise en œuvre de la garantie pour la jeunesse dans les mois à venir.

2. Les Fonds structurels et d'investissement européens (ESI), en particulier le FSE ([2]) et l'IEJ ([3]), fourniront une aide substantielle à la mise en œuvre de la garantie pour la jeunesse. L'IEJ et le FSE soutiendront l'offre directe d'emplois de qualité, les initiatives de formation et d'apprentissage, etc., dans les régions de l'UE où les taux de chômage des jeunes en 2012 excédaient 25 %. Le FSE peut également soutenir l'emploi, l'éducation, les services sociaux et les réformes des systèmes. En parallèle, les États membres sont encouragés à utiliser le Fonds européen de développement régional pour soutenir les mesures en faveur de l'emploi des jeunes, et à donner un accès au financement aux PME, principales créatrices d'emplois dans l'UE.

3. La garantie pour la jeunesse recommande également d'encourager la mobilité des jeunes travailleurs. Le FSE et l'IEJ peuvent soutenir la mobilité professionnelle et les activités de formation dans un autre État membre. Le réseau EURES est en cours de modernisation afin d'élargir le champ des offres d'emploi, en y incluant progressivement les propositions d'apprentissage et de formation, et d'améliorer les services de placement.

4. La Commission est invitée à «suivre la mise en œuvre de ladite garantie pour la jeunesse et d'instaurer, par l'intermédiaire du comité de l'emploi, une surveillance multilatérale». Le sous-groupe «indicateurs» du comité de l'emploi (EMCO) examine actuellement les exigences de suivi de la garantie pour la jeunesse et, sur la base d'une proposition de la Commission, présentera des recommandations en vue de la collecte d'informations au niveau de l'UE.

La Commission continuera, en coopération avec le réseau européen des services publics de l'emploi, à contrôler les instances de ces services chargées de l'application des recommandations de la garantie pour la jeunesse et à faire rapport sur les résultats obtenus.

([1]) PMGJ.
([2]) Fonds social européen.
([3]) Initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000307/14
to the Commission
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Implementation of the youth guarantee scheme in the Member States

The aim of the youth guarantee scheme is to offer young Europeans under the age of 25 a job, continued education, an apprenticeship or an internship within four months of them completing their formal education or losing their job.

1. Can the Commission say what progress Member States have made in drafting and implementing their national plans since this initiative was launched in April 2013? Do these national plans include specific criteria for professions that are facing a shortage of workers?

2. Can it specify what additional measures and financial support are available to Member States in which the unemployment rate for young people under 25 is above the European average?

3. Has it considered arrangements, under the youth guarantee scheme or any other cooperation programme, on the basis of which young people could be offered jobs or training in a Member State other than their own?

4. Can the Commission say how and when it will assess the impact of the youth guarantee scheme?

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

1. 19 Member States (MS) have submitted their Youth Guarantee Implementation Plans ([1]). The Commission is currently assessing these plans. The other MS are due to submit their YGIP in the coming months.

2. The European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF), in particular the ESF ([2]) and YEI ([3]) will provide substantial support to help implement the Youth Guarantee (YG). The YEI and ESF will support direct provision of quality job offers, traineeships, apprenticeships etc. in EU regions with youth unemployment rates above 25% in 2012. The ESF can also support employment, education and social services and systems reforms. Similarly MS are encouraged to use the European Regional Development Fund to bolster youth employment measures and provide access to finance for SMEs as the main creator of employment in the EU.

3. The YG recommendation includes the promotion of labour mobility of young people. The ESF and YEI can support job mobility measures and training activities in another European Member States. EURES is being modernised to include a wider scope of job vacancies, including a gradual inclusion of apprenticeships and traineeships, and to offer improved matching services.

4. The Commission is called upon to 'monitor the implementation of this [YG] recommendation, and establish through the Employment Committee a multilateral surveillance'. The EMCO Indicators Sub-Group is looking at the data requirements for monitoring the YG, and on the basis of a proposal from the Commission, will come forward with recommendations on the collection of information at EU level.

The Commission will in cooperation with the European Network of Public Employment Services continue to monitor and report on the PES-relevant parts of the implementation and results of YG schemes.

([1]) YGIP.
([2]) European Social Fund.
([3]) Youth Employment Initiative.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000308/14
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(14 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Diossina e policlorobifenili (PCB) nelle uova: risultanti allarmanti della Regione italiana della Lombardia

Il 19 novembre 2013 sono stati resi noti i primi risultati dell'attività di monitoraggio coordinata dal Ministero della Salute italiano volta a verificare la presenza di diossine e PCB nelle uova e nel latte — indice contaminazione del ciclo alimentare — che ha interessato tutti i 57 siti inquinati di interesse nazionale ([1]).

I risultati provenienti dalla Regione della Lombardia sono allarmanti. I dipartimenti di prevenzione veterinaria delle ASL (Aziende Sanitarie Locali) lombarde hanno analizzato campioni di uova provenienti da 91 allevamenti destinati all'autoconsumo (non destinati a finire, quindi, sui banchi di negozi, mercati e supermercati) ubicati nel raggio di dieci chilometri dai siti industriali di Sesto San Giovanni (provincia di Milano), Mantova e Cerro al Lambro (provincia di Milano). In base a quanto emerso, nel 75 % delle uova analizzate il quantitativo di diossina e PCB risulterebbe essere superiore al limite di 6 picogrammi per grammo di grasso ([2]). Non è la prima volta che le uova dei pollai familiari lombardi destano preoccupazione. Era già successo nel 2010, quando grazie a una campagna straordinaria della Direzione Generale alla Salute della Regione della Lombardia erano emersi diversi casi. A Mantova, a esempio, la diossina era presente in 7 dei 9 campioni prelevati in tre aree vicine a poli industriali. Indagini successive avevano poi confermato la presenza dei contaminanti in 4 dei 7 casi iniziali. La contaminazione, tuttavia, era stata attribuita a pratiche di allevamento sbagliate (quali a esempio il riutilizzo di bidoni di vernici e oli esausti come contenitori per il mangime, i roghi di materiale plastico, la presenza nei pollai di frammenti di pneumatici o polistirolo espanso) e non alla vicinanza ai poli industriali. In alcuni casi, tuttavia, tali cattive pratiche zootecniche non sembrerebbero essere sufficienti a giustificare la contaminazione.

Tutto ciò premesso, la Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza del fenomeno di contaminazione?

2. Può riferire se sia stata rilevata analoga contaminazione delle uova anche in altri Stati membri dell'UE?

3. Quali iniziative intende intraprendere o ha già intrapreso a tutela della salute dei cittadini dell'UE in merito ai prodotti alimentari destinati all'autoconsumo in siti contaminati e nelle loro vicinanze, che non sono sottoposti quindi ai normali controlli a cui sono invece sottoposti i prodotti destinati alla commercializzazione?

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

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza di questa forma di contaminazione.

2. La Commissione può confermare che casi analoghi di contaminazione delle uova si sono verificati anche in altri Stati membri dell'UE.

3. La raccomandazione 2013/711/UE della Commissione, del 3 dicembre 2013, sulla riduzione della presenza di diossine, furani e PCB nei mangimi e negli alimenti ([3]) raccomanda agli Stati membri di eseguire un monitoraggio specifico della presenza di diossine, di PCB diossina-simili e di PCB non diossina-simili nelle uova biologiche e in quelle di allevamento all'aperto, comprese quelle per il consumo personale.

Tale disposizione prevede inoltre che, in particolare, qualora si riscontrino livelli superiori al livello d'azione nel caso delle uova biologiche e delle uova da allevamento all'aperto, si compiano indagini per identificare la fonte della contaminazione e si adottino misure per ridurre o eliminarla.

Livelli massimi per le diossine e i PCB diossina-simili sono fissati dal regolamento (CE) n. 1881/2006 della Commissione, del 19 dicembre 2006, che definisce i tenori massimi di alcuni contaminanti nei prodotti alimentari ([4]). L'articolo 1 del regolamento stabilisce che i prodotti alimentari non possono essere commercializzati se contengono un contaminante in quantità superiore al tenore massimo indicato.

([1]) Aree che necessitano di interventi di bonifica del suolo, del sottosuolo e/o delle acque superficiali e sotterranee, come previsto dal decreto legislativo n. 152/2006 cosiddetto «Codice dell'Ambiente».
([2]) Previsto dal regolamento (CE) n. 1881/2006 della Commissione.
([3]) GU L 323 del 4.12.2013, pag. 37.
([4]) GUL 364 del 20.12.2006, pag. 5.

Per assicurare un livello elevato di protezione della sanità pubblica, le uova che presentino un livello di diossine e di PCB superiore al livello massimo stabilito non possono essere commercializzate nell'UE. Gli Stati membri hanno la responsabilità di adottare tutte le misure necessarie per proteggere la salute pubblica in relazione alle uova prodotte nei cortili e destinate al consumo personale e non alla commercializzazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000308/14
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Dioxins and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in eggs: alarming results in the Italian Region of Lombardy

On 19 November 2013, the first results of the inspections coordinated by the Italian Ministry of Health in order to check for the presence of dioxins and PCBs in eggs and milk — and thereby indicate any contamination of the food chain — were published, which concerned all 57 polluted sites of national interest ([1]).

The results recorded for the Region of Lombardy were particularly alarming. The veterinary divisions of Lombardy's Local Health Authorities visited 91 different farms, each located within a ten-kilometre radius of the industrial sites at Sesto San Giovanni (Province of Milan), Mantua and Cerro al Lambro (Province of Milan), to take samples of eggs intended for personal consumption (and thus not intended to be sold to the public), which they subsequently analysed. In 75% of cases, the amount of dioxins and PCBs present in the analysed eggs exceeded the limit of 6 picograms per gram of fat ([2]). This is not the first time that eggs collected from garden henhouses in Lombardy have been a cause for concern; several other cases were brought to light in 2010 by an extraordinary campaign conducted by the Directorate-General of Health for the Region of Lombardy: in Mantua, for example, dioxins were found to be present in seven of the nine samples taken from three areas lying in the vicinity of industrial hubs, with further tests confirming the presence of contaminants in four of these seven samples. However, such contamination had been put down to improper farming practices (such as storing feed in empty paint tins and oil drums, throwing plastic materials on to bonfires, or having bits of tyres or expanded polystyrene in the henhouses) rather than to the fact that the farms were located very close to industrial hubs. In some cases, however, these poor farming practices did not appear to offer a sufficient explanation for the levels of contamination that had been discovered.

1. Taking the above into account, is the Commission aware of this form of contamination?

2. Can it confirm whether any similar cases of egg contamination have also arisen in other EU Member States?

3. What actions does it intend to take — or what actions has it already taken — to protect the health of EU citizens concerning foodstuffs that have been produced in contaminated areas or their immediate surroundings and are intended for personal consumption, and are thus not subject to the standard inspection procedures under which similar products to be sold to the public are placed?

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

1. The Commission is aware of this form of contamination.

2. The Commission can confirm that similar cases of egg contamination have also arisen in other EU Member States.

3. Commission Recommendation 2013/711/EU of 3 December 2013 on the reduction of the presence of dioxins, furans and PCBs in feed and food ([3]) recommends to Member States to monitor specifically the presence of dioxins, dioxin-like PCBs and non-dioxin-like PCBs in free range and organic eggs including those for personal consumption.

Furthermore it is provided that in particular in case of findings of levels above the action level in the case of free-range eggs and organic eggs, investigations to identify the source of contamination have to be performed and measures to be taken to reduce or to eliminate the source of contamination.

Maximum levels for dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs are established by Commission Regulation (EC) 1881/2006 of 19 December 2006 setting maximum levels for certain contaminants in food ([4]). Article 1 of this regulation provides that foodstuffs shall not be placed on the market if they contain a contaminant at a level exceeding the maximum level.

To ensure a high level of public health, eggs with a level of dioxins and PCBs above the established maximum level shall not be marketed in the EU. Member States have the responsibility to adopt all necessary measures to protect public health with regard to eggs produced in backyards and intended for personal consumption and not for marketing.

([1]) Areas that require measures for purifying the soil, undersoil and/or surface and underground water, as stipulated in Italian Legislative Decree No 152/2006, the so-called 'Environmental Code'.
([2]) As stipulated in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006.
([3]) OJ L 323, 4.12.2013, p. 37.
([4]) OJ L 364, 20.12.2006, p. 5.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000309/14
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(14 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Problemi di tenuta del percolato nella discarica «Corsea» di Sarcedo in provincia di Vicenza, con contaminazione della sottostante falda acquifera

A Sarcedo in provincia di Vicenza esiste una discarica per rifiuti speciali denominata «Corsea», che insiste nel sito di una cava della quale da qualche anno è cessata la coltivazione. L'impianto in questione inizia ad avere seri problemi di tenuta del percolato, con conseguente contaminazione della sottostante falda acquifera. In seguito ad alcune analisi effettuate dall'ARPAV (Agenzia Regionale per la Prevenzione e Protezione Ambientale del Veneto) di Vicenza sulle acque sotterranee, infatti, è emerso che i valori di manganese ed ammoniaca riscontrati hanno raggiunto soglie preoccupanti, pari rispettivamente a 550 µg/l (microgrammi per litro) e 6,44 mg/l (milligrammi per litro) ([1]). Tali valori sono emersi in un confronto effettuato tra l'acqua prelevata a monte della discarica, che presentava valori sotto la norma, e l'acqua prelevata a valle della discarica, che presentava i valori alterati. La falda acquifera che lambisce il fondo della discarica rappresenta il più grande bacino sotterraneo della zona, con milioni di metri cubi di acqua la cui qualità è stata continuamente messa in pericolo all'attività di cava e ora viene messa in pericolo dalla presenza della discarica stessa. Il pericolo di contaminazione coinvolge i pozzi del comune di Montecchio Precalcino e quelli del comune di Dueville, sempre in provincia di Vicenza, che riforniscono di acqua potabile non solo i comuni più vicini, ma anche le città di Vicenza e Padova nonché le rispettive periferie. In occasione del sopralluogo nel corso del quale sono stati effettuati i prelievi di acqua poi analizzati, l'Unità operativa di Vigilanza Ambientale dell'ARPAV, inoltre, segnalava che l'impianto presenta rifiuti affioranti e non adeguatamente coperti, con compromissione delle scoline di convogliamento delle acque superficiali, e concludeva il proprio rapporto tecnico rilevando la necessità di un intervento urgente di risistemazione da parte dell'Amministrazione provinciale ([2]).

Sulla base di quanto esposto, la Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza dell'impianto e dei problemi di tenuta del percolato riscontrati, con contaminazione della sottostante falda acquifera?

2. Non intende approfondire la questione, e in caso affermativo, può indicare quali iniziative intende intraprendere a tutela della qualità dell'acqua?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

La Commissione non dispone di informazioni sulla discarica di Sarcedo (provincia di Vicenza).

Dalle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato risulta che le autorità italiane competenti stiano già affrontando attivamente i problemi ambientali del sito. Alla fase attuale la Commissione non intende avviare ulteriori indagini sulla questione.

([1]) Rapporto di prova del Dipartimento Regionale Laboratori — Servizio Laboratorio di Verona — Sede operativa di Vicenza dell'ARPAV n. 2744141 rev. 1 del 10.1.2013.

([2]) Rapporto Tecnico dell'Unità Operativa di Vigilanza Ambientale ARPAV — sede di Thiene del 29.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000309/14
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Groundwater contamination by leachate from the 'Corsea' landfill site in Sarcedo in the Province of Vicenza

The 'Corsea' landfill site, which is located in a decommissioned quarry in the town of Sarcedo in the province of Vicenza, is beginning to experience serious leaching problems resulting in contamination of the groundwater below. A number of groundwater analyses carried out by the ARPAV (Agency for Pollution Prevention and Environmental Protection in the Veneto Region) in Vicenza have revealed alarmingly high levels of manganese and ammonia amounting to 550 µg/l (micrograms per litre) and 6.44 mg/l (milligrams per litre) ([1]) respectively. This has emerged from a comparison between water sampled upstream of the landfill site, giving readings below the norm, and water sampled downstream of the site, giving different readings. The aquifier directly below the landfill site is the largest underground basin in the area and contains millions of cubic metres of water, the quality of which has been constantly endangered, firstly by the quarry and now by the landfill site. A number of wells located in the municipalities of Montecchio Precalcino and Dueville are similarly at risk of contamination. They are also situated in the province of Vicenza and supply drinking water not only to nearby municipalities but also to the cities of Vicenza and Padua and their suburbs. The ARPAV environmental inspectorate, which carried out water sampling and analysis, also revealed the presence of inadequately contained surface waste at the facility, which was likely to affect surface water drainage channels. Its technical report concluded by recommending urgent measures by the provincial authorities to remedy matters. ([2]).

In light of the above:

1. Is the Commission aware of the facility and the problems of groundwater contamination by leachate?

2. Does the Commission intend to investigate the matter further, and if so can it indicate what action it will take to safeguard water quality?

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

The Commission has no information on the 'Corsea' landfill site in the town of Sarcedo (Province of Vicenza).

From the information provided by the Honorable Member, it appears that the Italian competent authorities are already actively dealing with the environmental problems affecting this site. The Commission will not investigate this matter further at this stage.

([1]) ARPAY test report No 2744141 Revision 1, 10.1.2013 by the Regional Laboratory Department — Verona Laboratory Service — Operational headquarters in Vicenza.

([2]) Technical Report of 29.12.2012 by the ARPAY environmental inspectorate — Thiene office

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000310/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Ritardi nei pagamenti della pubblica amministrazione italiana

Da un'inchiesta recente dell'Associazione dei costruttori italiani risulta che i tempi di pagamento relativi ai contratti pubblici nel 62 % dei casi sforano i termini di legge, andando ben oltre i 60 giorni; risulta inoltre che in almeno 1 appalto su 2 la pubblica amministrazione italiana impone alle imprese di rallentare l'emissione delle fatture, così da eludere la normativa sui pagamenti, che impone gli stessi a 30 giorni e solo in casi eccezionali fino a 60 giorni; tale situazione coinvolge la generalità dei contratti pubblici in Italia

La Commissione intende intervenire per verificare la fondatezza di questa denuncia, per assicurare l'adempimento della pubblica amministrazione italiana alle norme europee e quindi tutelare le imprese che, di fronte ad un suo comportamento così scorretto, non hanno di fatto alcuna difesa?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(26 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione segue da vicino il recepimento e l'implementazione corretti della direttiva 2011/7/UE in tutti i 28 Stati membri. Si intrattengono contatti con gli Stati membri le cui misure di recepimento presentano interrogativi quanto alla loro piena ottemperanza al disposto della direttiva. Durante gli eventi legati alla campagna contro i ritardi nei pagamenti la Commissione prende inoltre nota delle eventuali criticità in relazione all'implementazione della direttiva.

La Commissione opera attualmente di concerto con le autorità italiane per chiarire alcune questioni che non sembrano corrispondere al dettato della direttiva.

Conformemente all'articolo 258 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFUE), la Commissione ha facoltà di avviare procedure di infrazione nel caso in cui uno Stato membro sia venuto meno a un obbligo che gli incombe in forza dei trattati. Se le misure nazionali che recepiscono la direttiva nella normativa nazionale risultassero non conformi ai requisiti della direttiva o se la direttiva fosse applicata in modo incorretto, la Commissione può intervenire nei modi adeguati avviando, se del caso, procedure di infrazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000310/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Delay in payments from the Italian Civil Service

A recent survey carried out by the Association of Italian Builders found that in 62% of cases the time taken for payment for public contracts exceeded the statutory time limits, going well beyond 60 days; it also found that in at least 1 in 2 contracts the Italian Civil Service forced companies to delay the issuing of invoices so as to circumvent the regulations regarding payments, which require them to make payment within 30 days or, in exceptional cases only, within 60 days; this is true of the majority of public contracts in Italy.

Does the Commission intend to get involved here in order to determine the authenticity of this statement, to ensure that the Italian Civil Service is complying with the European standards and therefore to protect the companies which are in fact unable to defend themselves when confronted with such unethical behaviour?

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

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

The Commission is currently in contact with the Italian authorities in order to clarify some issues that seem not to be applied in compliance with the directive.

According to Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the Commission has the right to initiate infringement proceedings if a Member State has failed to fulfil an obligation under the Treaties. Should the national measures transposing the directive into national law reveal non-compliance with the requirements of the directive, or if the directive is being incorrectly applied, the Commission may take the necessary action including, where appropriate, infringement procedures.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000311/14
do Komisji
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(14 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Termin konsultacji społecznych w sprawie przeglądu przepisów prawa autorskiego

W grudniu 2013 r. Komisja Europejska ogłosiła konsultacje społeczne w ramach prowadzonego przez nią przeglądu europejskich norm prawa autorskiego. Komisja zaprosiła do udziału w tych konsultacjach wszystkich zainteresowanych tematyką prawa autorskiego – m.in. twórców, wykonawców, wydawców, producentów, nadawców, organizacje zbiorowego zarządzania, użytkowników, konsumentów, jak również rządy państw członkowskich.

Konsultacje społeczne będą trwały do 5 lutego 2014 r. Krótki termin konsultacji oraz stopień skomplikowania konsultowanej materii niosą uzasadnione obawy, że ich zasięg zostanie znacznie ograniczony zwłaszcza, że treść konsultacji społecznych jest dostępna wyłącznie w języku angielskim, a to pociąga za sobą konieczność przede wszystkim przetłumaczenia obszernego dokumentu, liczącego 80 punktów, a dopiero później ustosunkowania się do niego merytorycznie. Należy również zauważyć, że materia będąca przedmiotem konsultacji dotyczy nie tylko wąskiej grupy zainteresowanych, ale praktycznie każdego z nas i dlatego wszystkim należy zapewnić możliwość swobodnego wypowiedzenia się w ramach konsultacji społecznych.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się do Komisji z pytaniem, czy – uwzględniając wagę konsultowanej materii, jej znaczenie dla szerokiej grupy podmiotów oraz ograniczenia językowe – uważa, że 2 miesiące przewidziane na konsultacje publiczne są wystarczające, aby każdy mógł się odnieść do interesujących go zagadnień? Czy w przypadku otrzymania niewielkiej liczby odpowiedzi, Komisja przewiduje przedłużenie lub powtórzenie konsultacji w celu zapewnienia szerszego udziału społeczeństwa oraz stworzenia lepszych regulacji prawnych w tak istotnej dla nas wszystkich materii?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Michela Barniera w imieniu Komisji
(3 marca 2014 r.)

Komisja otrzymała już szereg wniosków o przedłużenie konsultacji publicznych w tej sprawie, i, po dogłębnej analizie, postanowiła przedłużyć czas wysyłania odpowiedzi do dnia 5 marca 2014 r.

Komisja docenia zasadnicze znaczenie swobody wypowiedzi i zaangażowania zainteresowanych stron dla toczącej się debaty na temat praw autorskich, żywiąc nadzieję, że przesunięcie terminu umożliwi zainteresowanym przedstawienie zróżnicowanych opinii. W konsultacjach można uczestniczyć w dowolnym języku urzędowym Unii Europejskiej.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000311/14
to the Commission
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Deadline for public consultation on review of copyright rules

In December 2013 the Commission announced a public consultation on its review of European copyright rules. It invited all interested parties to take part, including authors, performers, publishers, producers, broadcasters, collective management organisations, users, consumers and the governments of the Member States.

The consultation will last until 5 February 2014. The short period available and the complexity of the subject matter give rise to legitimate concerns that the scope of the consultation will be severely limited, particularly since the long, 80-point document on which it is based is available in English only, meaning that it will have to be translated before any views can be expressed on it. It should also be pointed out that the subject matter of the consultation does not concern just a small number of stakeholder groups but virtually all of us. Everyone should therefore have the opportunity freely to express their views during the consultation procedure.

Bearing in mind the subject matter of the consultation, its significance for a wide range of stakeholders and the linguistic restrictions, does the Commission think that the period of two months set aside for the public consultation is sufficient for everyone to state their views on the issues that are of interest to them? If it receives only a small number of replies, does the Commission envisage extending or rerunning the consultation in order to ensure wider public participation and produce better legislation governing an area which is so important for us all?

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

The Commission has received a number of requests to extend the public consultation and, upon careful consideration, it has decided to extend the deadline to reply until 5 March 2014.

The Commission believes that stakeholders' input and engagement is crucial in the ongoing copyright debate and trust that the extended deadline will allow all interested parties to bring forward their different positions. The consultation can be answered in any official language of the European Union.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000312/14
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(14 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: W sprawie projektu wprowadzenia opłat za korzystanie z autostrad w Niemczech

Powyborcza umowa koalicyjna niemieckich władz przewiduje uruchomienie opłat za korzystanie z krajowych autostrad. Choć projekt obowiązkowych winiet ma objąć wszystkich kierowców, to jednak właściciele samochodów zarejestrowanych w Niemczech mieliby otrzymywać zwrot kosztów w formie ulgi w podatku drogowym. W opinii komisarza transportu Siima Kallasa zapis taki oznaczałby dyskryminację kierowców z zagranicy, kwestionując ponadto prawo wspólnotowe.

Zgadzam się ze stanowiskiem pana komisarza. W związku z powyższym chciałbym zapytać, czy w oparciu o jego deklarację Komisja podejmie działania nakierowane na zablokowanie postulowanego rozwiązania w obecnej formie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Komisji Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji
(24 lutego 2014 r.)

Komisja pragnie zwrócić uwagę Szanownego Pana Posła na udzielone już odpowiedzi na wcześniejsze, analogiczne zapytania pisemne (np. E-012734/2013 i P-013592/2013 ([1])), w których stwierdzono, co następuje:

Komisja nie została oficjalnie poinformowana o ewentualnej przyszłej zmianie systemu opłat dla pojazdów prywatnych w Niemczech, o której mowa w Pańskim zapytaniu. Dopóki nie są znane szczegóły takiego systemu, Komisja nie może wydać opinii w tej kwestii ani podjąć jakiejkolwiek inicjatywy w tym zakresie.

W komunikacie Komisji z dnia 14 maja 2012 r. (COM(2012) 199 final) określa się ogólne zasady dotyczące pobierania od lekkich pojazdów prywatnych opłat za użytkowanie krajowej infrastruktury drogowej. W komunikacie tym wskazano na szczególne znaczenie zasady niedyskryminacji cudzoziemców przy wprowadzaniu opłat za użytkowanie infrastruktury.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000312/14
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Planned tolls on German motorways

A post-election agreement reached by Germany's coalition parties sets out plans to introduce a toll for using the country's motorways. Although the toll disc (vignette) would be obligatory for all drivers, owners of cars registered in Germany would be able to recoup the cost in the form of reliefs on road tax. In the view of Transport Commissioner Siim Kallas, such a regulation would constitute discrimination against foreign drivers and would possibly infringe EC law.

I agree with the Commissioner's position. In the light of his statement, will the Commission take steps to block the proposed regulation in its current form?

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

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the replies already provided to similar questions (e.g. E-012734/2013 and P-013592/2013 ([1])) in which it was stated:

The Commission has not been officially informed of a possible future German charging scheme for private vehicles as referred to in your question. As long as the details of such a scheme are not available, the Commission cannot provide an opinion on the subject or take any other initiative on the matter.

A Commission Communication of 14 May 2012, (COM(2012) 199 final), sets out the general principles on the application of national road infrastructure charges levied on light private vehicles. In this communication, the general principle of non-discrimination of non-nationals is highlighted as particularly relevant when introducing infrastructure charging schemes.

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000313/14
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Arbeitssituation der Textilarbeiterinnen in Kambodscha

Textilarbeiterinnen in Kambodscha protestierten Ende Dezember für höhere Löhne, für ausreichend Nahrung, für ihr Recht auf ein menschenwürdiges Leben. Diese friedlichen Proteste wurden mit Gewalt niedergeschlagen. Dabei starben fünf Menschen. Immer noch sind einige der Streikenden inhaftiert; manche wurden misshandelt.

Auslöser dieser Proteste waren die extrem schlechten Arbeitsbedingungen in der Textilindustrie. Die Arbeiterinnen haben oft nur Kurzzeit-Verträge; die Löhne liegen unter dem Existenzminimum. Viele der Arbeitsschutzregelungen — beispielsweise Mutterschutz — sind de facto außer Kraft gesetzt.

1. Ist sich die Kommission der Situation der Textilarbeiterinnen in Kambodscha bewusst?

2. Was gedenkt die Kommission zur Verbesserung dieser Situation zu unternehmen?

3. Hat die Kommission bereits im Rahmen der diplomatischen Beziehungen zur Regierung Kambodschas die Menschenrechtsverletzungen und die schlechten Arbeitsbedingungen für die Arbeiterinnen zur Sprache gebracht?

4. Wird die Kommission die Forderung unterstützen, den Mindestlohn für eine Textilarbeiterin zu erhöhen?

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

Der EAD verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf die Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage 113/2014. Es sollte hinzugefügt werden, dass die EU die unlängst erfolgte Verlängerung des von ihr erleichterten IAO-Programms „Better Factories“ unterstützt hat, mit dem die Einhaltung der Arbeitnehmerrechte in allen Textilfabriken in Kambodscha überwacht wird; dazu zählen die Überwachung und Offenlegung von 21 kritischen Aspekten in nicht-konformen Fabriken. Viele dieser Fragen sind geschlechtsbezogen (ungleiche Bezahlung, Entlassung schwangerer Arbeitnehmerinnen, Mutterschaftsurlaub, sexuelle Belästigung).

Die EU fördert auch Arbeiten zur Analyse der Löhne und unterstützt die Einführung eines Mechanismus für Lohnanpassungen.

Sie überwacht die Lage kontinuierlich und steht zwecks Erörterung dieser Fragen in regelmäßigem Kontakt mit der IAO, Arbeitgeberverbänden, Gewerkschaften und den zuständigen Ministerien (vor allem Handels- und Arbeitsministerium).

Die EU ist der Auffassung, dass es eines umfassenden Ansatzes bedarf, damit die Industrie sich auf Sektoren verlagern kann, die einen höheren Mehrwert schaffen und besser bezahlte Arbeitsplätze bieten. Dies erfordert insbesondere besser qualifizierte Arbeitskräfte und ein attraktives Investitionsumfeld. Die EU setzt in diesen Bereichen die handelsbezogene Hilfe ein, die derzeit aus dem Instrument für die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit für den Zeitraum 2007-2013 finanziert wird.

Die Thematik wird auch auf der nächsten Sitzung des Gemischten Ausschusses EU-Kambodscha im März 2014 erörtert.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000313/14
to the Commission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Working conditions of female textile workers in Cambodia

At the end of December female textile workers in Cambodia protested for higher wages, for enough food, and for their right to a decent human standard of living. These peaceful protests were put down by force. Five people died as a result. Some of the strikers are still in prison; many have been mistreated.

These protests were triggered by the extremely poor working conditions in the textile industry. The female workers often only have short-term contracts, and their wages are below the minimum income required for subsistence. Many of the health and safety regulations — for example maternity protection — have been effectively annulled.

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation of female textile workers in Cambodia?

2. What does the Commission intend to do to improve this situation?

3. Has the Commission raised the issue of human rights violations and the poor working conditions of the female workers within the context of diplomatic relations with the Cambodian Government?

4. Will the Commission support the demand for an increase in the minimum wage for female textile workers?

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

The EEAS refers the Honourable Member to the reply to question 113/2014. It should be added that the EU facilitated the recent renewal of the ILO Better Factories programme that was facilitated by the EU and that monitors the compliance of labour rights of all exporting garment factories in Cambodia, and which includes the monitoring and public disclosure of non-compliant factories on 21 critical issues. Many of these issues are gender related (equal pay, dismissal of pregnant workers, maternity leave, sexual harassment).

The EU is also funding work on the analysis of wages, and is helping to establish a mechanism of wage adjustment.

The EU is constantly monitoring the situation and is in regular contact with ILO, employers' associations, trade unions and relevant Ministries (Commerce and Labour in particular) to discuss these issues

The EU believes that a comprehensive approach is necessary to help the industry move to higher added value sectors, with better paid jobs. This requires in particular better skilled labour and an attractive investment environment. The EU is working on these areas with the Trade Related Assistance currently funded under the Development Cooperation Instrument 2007-2013.

These issues will also be raised at the forthcoming Cambodia-EU Joint Committee in March 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000315/14
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Laws and regulations on farm animal welfare

Can the Commission advise me as to what steps it is taking to ensure that the laws and regulations on farm animal welfare are observed by all EU Member States?

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

Member States are primarily responsible for implementing the EC law on animal welfare. The Commission must ensure that Member States apply EU legislation.

Achieving a better enforcement of the EU legislation on animal welfare is one of the objectives of the EU animal welfare strategy ([1]).

The Food and Veterinary Office, audit service of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General ([2]) carry out on-the-spot audits in Member States and visit farms, slaughterhouses and transport facilities. During these audits, the system of animal welfare controls put in place by Member States is assessed. In case deficiencies are found, recommendations to take corrective actions are addressed to Member States. In addition, the Commission receives information on issues relating to the enforcement of EU animal welfare legislation through complaints and enquiries launched by citizens, non-governmental animal protection organisations and other stakeholders.

The Commission also organises training sessions on animal welfare for staff performing the controls of Member States in the framework of the programme Better Training for Safer Food ([3]). Moreover, the Commission arranges workshops and working groups on problematic issues.

Finally the Commission opens infringement proceedings against Member States when all other means to reach compliance have been exhausted. This has been the case for some Member States in relation to the ban on 'un-enriched' cages for the protection of laying hens, the group housing of sows for the protection of pigs and the welfare of animals during transport.

([1]) COM(2012) 006 final.
([2]) Food and Veterinary Office: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/training_strategy/index_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000316/14
adresată Comisiei
Victor Boştinaru (S&D)
(14 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Necesitatea de a asigura o mai mare consecvență între normele care reglementează fondurile structurale și de investiții ale UE, normele privind ajutorul de stat și cele privind achizițiile publice în vederea dezvoltării infrastructurii de interes general

În conformitate cu strategia Europa 2020, alocarea fondurilor UE pentru proiectele de infrastructură de interes general este necesară și trebuie realizată de urgență, astfel încât autoritățile locale și regionale europene să fie în măsură să se conformeze *acquis*-ului UE, în special în domeniul mediului (de exemplu în ceea ce privește tratarea apelor uzate) și să contribuie la coeziunea socială. Finanțarea acordată de UE pentru aceste proiecte este justificată, având în vedere că, în numeroase cazuri, cetățenii nu pot suporta cheltuielile pe care le implică recuperarea totală a costurilor aferente investițiilor masive necesare în vederea modernizării sau a construcției infrastructurii de interes general (cum ar fi rețelele municipale de termoficare).

Instituțiile UE au adoptat sau urmează să adopte trei seturi diferite de norme care vor avea un impact asupra dezvoltării infrastructurii de interes general: pachetul privind politica de coeziune, inclusiv normele care guvernează proiectele generatoare de venituri; normele revizuite privind ajutorul de stat, inclusiv normele referitoare la proiectele energetice și în domeniul mediului; și pachetul privind achizițiile publice.

În urma modificării poziției Comisiei (ulterior hotărârii pronunțate recent în cauza Leipzig Halle), este obligatoriu ca evaluările ajutoarelor de stat în cazul proiectelor de infrastructură care beneficiază de finanțare din partea UE să fie efectuate în cadrul procesului de acordare a finanțării UE, după ce a fost realizată în prealabil evaluarea bazată pe normele referitoare la generarea de venituri. Această nouă verificare obligatorie a creat restricții suplimentare în legătură cu posibilitatea de a finanța proiectele de infrastructură de interes general. Se presupune că aceste restricții au dat naștere la întârzieri în evaluarea și aprobarea a aproximativ 200 de proiecte eligibile pentru finanțare din partea UE în perioada de programare 2007-2013.

Va exista în continuare o lipsă de coerență între normele privind ajutorul de stat și normele referitoare la generarea de venituri, întrucât va fi necesar și în viitor, în conformitate cu noul pachet privind politica de coeziune, să se efectueze o dublă verificare a oricărei finanțări acordate de UE proiectelor de infrastructură de interes general. O combinație între normele din domeniul politicii de coeziune și procedurile de achiziții publice conforme cu reglementările UE oferă deja suficiente garanții în vederea determinării unei contribuții relevante din partea fondurilor UE.

Având în vedere aceste considerente, intenționează Comisia să asigure o mai mare consecvență între aceste trei seturi de norme prin:

1. publicarea unor orientări specifice care să stabilească în mod clar care sunt normele aplicabile atunci când se alocă fonduri UE pentru a sprijini dezvoltarea proiectelor de infrastructură de interes general?

2. crearea unei secțiuni specifice privind infrastructura în cadrul Regulamentului general de exceptare pe categorii de ajutoare în sprijinul obiectivelor Europa 2020, care să precizeze că ajutorul pentru investiții acordat proiectelor generatoare de venituri în condițiile prevăzute în noul pachet privind politica de coeziune va fi compatibil cu principiile pieței interne și va fi scutit de obligația de notificare prevăzută la articolul 108 alineatul (3) din tratat?

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

Articolul 61 din Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1303/2013 stabilește normele privind proiectele generatoare de venituri. Aceste norme nu se aplică operațiunilor pentru care sprijinul financiar acordat prin fondurile ESI ([1]) constituie (i) „ajutor de minimis”, (ii) ajutor de stat compatibil pentru IMM-uri în cazul în care intensitatea sau valoarea ajutorului este limitată sau (iii) ajutor de stat compatibil în cazul în care a fost efectuată verificarea individuală a nevoilor de finanțare. Toate celelalte operațiuni trebuie să respecte normele privind proiectele generatoare de venituri.

([1]) Fondurile structurale și de investiții europene.

În cauza *Leipzig-Halle* ([2]), Curtea de Justiție a clarificat faptul că realizarea infrastructurii destinate exploatării economice (pistă de aeroport) nu poate fi disociată de utilizarea ulterioară a acesteia și constituie o activitate economică. Sprijinul public acordat pentru construirea unor astfel de infrastructuri poate implica ajutor de stat. Statele membre trebuie să asigure respectarea normelor privind ajutoarele de stat și, dacă este necesar, să notifice măsurile. Fondurile publice alocate pentru crearea unei infrastructuri nedestinate exploatării comerciale nu fac, în principiu, obiectul normelor privind ajutoarele de stat. În prezent, Comisia intenționează să pună la dispoziție orientări suplimentare în acest sens ([3]) și a supus consultării publice un astfel de proiect ([4]). De asemenea, serviciile Comisiei au oferit orientări în privința așa-numitelor „grile de analiză" care au fost trimise printr-o scrisoare adresată statelor membre, inclusiv o grilă de analiză privind apa.

În prezent, Comisia revizuiește, de asemenea, Regulamentul general de exceptare pe categorii de ajutoare ([5]). Proiectul acestui nou regulament prevede situațiile și condițiile în care sprijinul pentru anumite tipuri de infrastructură ar putea fi scutit de obligația notificării ([6]). De asemenea, în cazul în care sprijinul public pentru infrastructură îndeplinește condițiile deciziei privind serviciul de interes economic general ([7]), acesta nu trebuie notificat. În cele din urmă, pentru măsurile care nu se încadrează în domeniul de aplicare al Regulamentului general de exceptare pe categorii de ajutoare, anumite orientări privind ajutoarele de stat ([8]) conțin criterii de compatibilitate pentru ajutorul care trebuie notificat ce pot implica investiții în infrastructură.

([2]) Cauzele conexate T-443/08 și T-455/08, Freistaat Sachsen și alții/Comisia [2011] ECR II-1311; confirmat de Curte în hotărârea sa din 19.12.2012 în cauza C-288/11P.

([3]) În Comunicarea Comisiei cu privire la noțiunea de ajutor de stat în temeiul articolului 107 alineatul (1) din TFUE.

([4]) A se vedea http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2014_state_aid_notion/draft_guidance_ro.pdf

([5]) Regulamentul Comisiei de declarare a anumitor categorii de ajutoare compatibile cu piața internă în conformitate cu articolele 107 și 108 din tratat . (a se vedea http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2013_consolidated_gber/index_en.html).

([6]) Și anume, ajutorul pentru investiții pentru sisteme de termoficare și răcire centralizată eficiente din punct de vedere energetic, ajutor pentru extinderea infrastructurilor de internet în bandă largă etc.

([7]) Decizia Comisiei privind aplicarea articolului 106 alineatul (2) din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene în cazul ajutoarelor de stat sub formă de compensații pentru obligația de serviciu public acordate anumitor întreprinderi cărora le-a fost încredințată prestarea unui serviciu de interes economic general.

([8]) De exemplu, Orientările privind ajutoarele de stat regionale pentru perioada 2014-2020, JO C209, 23.7.2013, proiectul de orientări privind energia și protecția mediului, http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2013_state_aid_environment/index_ro.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000316/14
to the Commission
Victor Boştinaru (S&D)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Need to ensure greater consistency between the rules governing EU structural and investment funds, state aid and public procurement with a view to the development of general interest infrastructure

In line with the Europe 2020 strategy, the allocation of EU funding to general interest infrastructure projects is necessary and urgent if European local and regional authorities are to comply with the EU acquis, particularly in the environmental field (e.g. as regards wastewater treatment), and to contribute to social cohesion. EU funding for these projects is justified, given that, in many cases, citizens cannot bear the full cost recovery of the heavy investments needed to upgrade or build general interest infrastructure (such as municipal heating networks).

The EU institutions are either adopting or have adopted three different sets of rules that will have an impact on the development of general interest infrastructure: the cohesion policy package, including rules governing revenue-generating projects; revised state aid rules, including rules on environmental and energy projects; and the public procurement package.

The Commission's shift of position (following the recent Leipzig-Halle judgment) has made it mandatory for state aid assessments of infrastructure projects benefiting from EU funding to be conducted during the EU funding process already assessed under the revenue-generating rules. This new compulsory check has put additional constraints on the possibility to finance general interest infrastructure projects. It would have allegedly caused delays in the evaluation and approval of about 200 projects eligible for EU funding in the 2007-2013 programming period.

The lack of coherence between state aid rules and revenue-generating rules remains, as it will still be necessary under the new cohesion policy package to double-check any EU funding allocated to general interest infrastructure projects. The combination of cohesion policy rules and EU-compliant tendering procedures already provides significant guarantees for calculating what a relevant contribution from EU funds would be.

In view of the above, will the Commission ensure greater consistency between these three set of rules by:

1. publishing specific guidelines to clarify which rules apply when EU funds are used to support the development of general infrastructure projects?

2. creating a specific section on infrastructure in the General Block Exemption Regulation in support of the Europe 2020 objectives, specifying that investment aid granted to revenue-generating projects under the conditions laid down in the new cohesion policy package will be compatible with the internal market and will be exempt from the notification requirement provided for in Article 108(3) of the Treaty?

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

Article 61 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 sets out the rules for revenue generating projects. These rules do not apply to operations for which ESI ([1]) Fund financial support constitutes (i) '*de minimis* aid', (ii) compatible state aid to SMEs where aid intensity or aid amount is limited or (iii) compatible state aid where individual verification of financing needs has been done. All others need to comply with the rules for revenue generating projects.

In *Leipzig-Halle* ([2]), the Court of Justice clarified that the construction of infrastructure meant for economic exploitation (an airport runway) cannot be dissociated from its subsequent use and constitutes an economic activity. Public support to such infrastructure may then involve state aid. Member States need to ensure compliance with state aid rules and, if necessary, notify the measures. Public funding of infrastructure not for commercial exploitation is, in principle, not subject to state aid rules. The Commission currently intends to provide further guidance on this matter ([3]), a draft of which is undergoing a public consultation ([4]). The Commission services also provided guidance with so-called 'Analytical Grids' that were sent by letter to Member States, including an analytical grid on water.

([1]) European Structural and Investment.
([2]) Joined Cases T-443/08 and T-455/08 Freistaat Sachsen and Others v Commission [2011] ECR II-1311; confirmed by the Court in its judgment of 19.12.2012 in Case C-288/11 P.
([3]) In the Commission Notice on the notion of state aid pursuant to Article 107(1) TFEU.
([4]) See http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2014_state_aid_notion/draft_guidance_en.pdf

The Commission is also reviewing the GBER ([5]). The draft of the new GBER foresees situations and conditions whereby support for certain types of infrastructure could be exempt from notification ([6]). Also, if public support to infrastructure fulfils the conditions of the SGEI decision ([7]), it does not need to be notified. Finally, for measures not falling under the scope of the GBER, certain state aid guidelines ([8]), contain compatibility criteria for notifiable aid that may involve investments in infrastructure.

([5]) Commission Regulation declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the internal market in application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty. (see http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2013_consolidated_gber/index_en.html)

([6]) i.e., investment aid for energy efficient district heating and cooling, aid for broadband infrastructures, etc.

([7]) Commission decision on the application of Article 106(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to state aid in the form of public service compensation granted to certain undertakings entrusted with the operation of services of general economic interest.

([8]) e.g. Guidelines on regional state aid for 2014-2020, OJ Ci209, 23.7.2013, the draft Energy and Environmental Guidelines, http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2013_state_aid_environment/index_en.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000319/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(14 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Oposición vecinal a las obras en la calle Vitoria en el barrio burgalés de Gamonal

Desde el pasado viernes 10 de enero de 2014, el barrio burgalés de Gamonal se ha levantado en intensas protestas contra la construcción de un aparcamiento en la calle Vitoria, una de las más importantes para el tráfico del barrio.

Tras estas fuertes protestas se encuentra el rechazo vecinal a un nuevo proyecto de especulación urbanística que perjudica la calidad de vida de los vecinos. El citado aparcamiento tendrá unos prohibitivos precios que no podrán permitirse los habitantes del barrio, mientras por su construcción perderán la mitad de los carriles de la calle Vitoria —una de las principales vías de comunicación del barrio— que en la actualidad son manejados por los vecinos para un sistema de aparcamiento en doble fila respetado por estos.

Los vecinos del barrio de Gamonal han respondido con fuerza al inicio de la obras, un proyecto de más de 8 millones de euros que recaerá en una empresa constructora perteneciente a un influyente empresario de la ciudad procesado hace unos años por casos de corrupción urbanística. El aparcamiento, construido en un momento de absoluto colapso de las cuentas del ayuntamiento y de la capacidad económica del barrio, ofrecerá la cesión por 40 años de las plazas de aparcamiento por 20 000 euros, una operación especulativa que prácticamente ningún ciudadano del popular barrio burgalés podrá permitirse.

Según fuentes periodísticas, la concesión de esta obra ha sido cedida a un conocido empresario burgalés que ya fue condenado en un juicio por prevaricación al alcalde de Burgos en 1992. Estas relaciones con empresarios corruptos parecen haber motivado la realización de unas obras que en nada beneficiarán a un barrio que no ha solicitado dicho aparcamiento y que no podrá adquirir sus plazas.

¿Dispone la Comisión de información detallada sobre el proceso de concesión de las obras del bulevar de la calle Vitoria en el barrio burgalés de Gamonal?

¿Considera que dicha adjudicación se ha hecho conforme a lo estipulado en la Directiva 2004/18/UE? ¿Considera que un agente económico que previamente ha sido juzgado por prevaricación en el mismo ayuntamiento debiera ser excluido de la participación en este concurso?

¿Considera que ha existido suficiente publicidad y transparencia en una decisión que ha sido claramente contraria a la voluntad de los habitantes del barrio?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión Europea no dispone de ninguna información acerca del procedimiento de licitación de las obras a las que se refiere su Señoría.

En general, la Directiva 2004/18/CE se aplica a los contratos públicos celebrados por las entidades adjudicadoras cuyo objeto sea la ejecución de obras, el suministro de productos o la prestación de servicios en la medida en que el valor de los contratos correspondientes supere determinados umbrales definidos en dicha Directiva. Las entidades adjudicadoras siguen siendo plenamente responsables de la definición de sus necesidades con vistas a la licitación de los contratos públicos pertinentes. Teniendo esto en cuenta, la Comisión Europea no está en condiciones de considerar la idoneidad de las obras a las que se refiere su Señoría.

La Directiva 2004/18/CE establece que quedará excluido de la participación en una licitación pública todo candidato o licitador que haya sido condenado mediante sentencia firme por uno de los motivos enumerados en la Directiva y que consten a la entidad adjudicadora. Dada la naturaleza de esta disposición, la lista de motivos de exclusión debe considerarse exhaustiva e interpretarse de manera restrictiva.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000319/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Local opposition to calle Vitoria road works in the Gamonal neighbourhood of Burgos

Since Friday 10 January 2014, the Gamonal neighbourhood of Burgos has been the scene of intense protest against the construction of a car park in calle Vitoria, one of the neighbourhood's main traffic arteries.

These vigorous protests are motivated by residents' rejection of yet another speculative urban development project, which threatens their quality of life. The car park in question will be prohibitively expensive and beyond the means of local residents, while its construction will mean that traffic lanes in the calle Vitoria — one of the main thoroughfares in the neighbourhood — will be reduced by half. Residents currently operate a generally-respected double-parking system in these lanes.

People from the Gamonal neighbourhood have strongly reacted to the start of work on the project, which has a budget of over EUR 8 million and has been assigned to a construction company owned by an influential local businessman who a few years ago was taken to court for corruption linked to urban development. The car park, which is being built at a time when both Burgos city council's finances and the neighbourhood's economic capacity are at rock bottom, will offer parking bays on 40 year leases for EUR 20 000 each, a speculative venture which virtually no-one living in this working-class neighbourhood of the city can afford.

According to press reports, the works contract has been awarded to a well-known Burgos businessman who was found guilty of perverting the course of justice at the trial of the then mayor of Burgos in 1992. These links with corrupt entrepreneurs seem to underlie the decision to carry out a works project which will be of no benefit to the local community, which has neither requested the car park nor will be able to acquire spaces in it.

Does the Commission have any detailed information about the tendering process for the works in calle Vitoria in Burgos' Gamonal neighbourhood?

Does it consider the procurement procedure to have complied with the terms laid down in Directive 2004/18/EU? Does it consider that an economic agent who has already been convicted of corrupt practice in the same municipality should be excluded from participation in such a procedure?

Does the Commission feel that this decision, which clearly overrides the wishes of local residents, was made with sufficient publicity and transparency?

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

The European Commission does not have any information concerning the tendering procedure for the works to which the Honourable Member refers.

In a general manner, Directive 2004/18/EC applies to public contracts concluded by contracting auhtorities having as their object the execution of works, the supply of products or the provision of services to the extent that the value of the correpsonding contracts are above some thresholds, as defined in that directive. The contracting auhtorities remain fully responsible of the defintion of their needs with a view to tendering the relevant public contracts. Taking that into account, the European Commission is not in a position to consider the appropriateness of the works to which the Honourable Member refers.

Directive 2004/18/EC states that any candidate or tenderer who has been the subject of a conviction by final judgment for one of the reasons listed in the directive and of which the contracting auhtority is aware, shall be excluded from participation in a public tender. Given the nature of this provision, the list of grounds for exclusion has to be considered exhaustive and interpreted in a restrictive manner.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000320/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Adipositas und Übergewicht in der EU

Laut dem Overseas Developments Institute sind weltweit 1,45 Milliarden Menschen fettleibig oder übergewichtig. Dies betrifft 58 % der Erwachsenen in Europa. Auf der Grundlage der gewonnenen Erkenntnisse muss in der Folge davon ausgegangen werden, dass der starke Anstieg an Folgeerkrankungen eine weitaus höhere Belastung für sowohl die Sozial- als auch die Gesundheitskosten darstellt.

1. Welche Einschätzungen hat die Kommission hierzu?

2. Gibt es rein europäische Studien dieser Art?

3. Ist diese Studie der Kommission bekannt?

4. Wenn ja, welche Erkenntnisse werden daraus für die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten gezogen?

5. Welche Empfehlungen im Sinne von Prävention kann die Kommission den Mitgliedstaaten schon heute geben, um eine bereits jetzt abzusehende Explosion eben dieser Kosten zumindest abzuschwächen?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(27. Februar 2014)

Die von der Frau Abgeordneten erwähnte Studie ist der Kommission nicht bekannt.

Gemäß den verfügbaren Daten ([1]) sind 52 % der Erwachsenen in der EU übergewichtig oder adipös. Im Durchschnitt sind 17 % der Erwachsenen adipös. In 18 Mitgliedstaaten liegt die Prävalenz von Übergewicht und Adipositas bei über 50 % ([2]). In vielen europäischen Ländern hat sich die Prävalenz von Adipositas seit den 1980er Jahren mehr als verdreifacht, wodurch auch Krankheiten wie Diabetes, Krebs und Herz-Kreislauf-Erkrankungen zugenommen haben ([3]). Zudem war 2010 in der EU beinahe jedes dritte Kind im Alter von 6 bis 9 Jahren übergewichtig oder adipös — dies ist ein deutlicher Anstieg gegenüber 2008 (jedes vierte Kind) ([4]).

Schätzungen zufolge entfallen jährlich 7 % der Gesundheitsausgaben der EU auf mit Adipositas zusammenhängende Krankheiten. Hierzu addieren sich weitere Kosten infolge der Produktivitätsverluste durch Gesundheitsprobleme und vorzeitige Sterbefälle (so stehen jedes Jahr 2,8 Mio. Todesfälle mit Übergewicht und Adipositas in Zusammenhang) ([5]).

Die Europäische Gesundheitsbefragung ([6]) liefert Daten über das Ausmaß von Adipositas, die aus Eigenaussagen der Befragten gewonnen wurden. Komplettiert werden diese Daten durch die Projekte NOPA ([7]) und COSI ([8]), die die WHO mit Unterstützung der EU durchführt.

Im Weißbuch „Ernährung, Übergewicht, Adipositas: Eine Strategie für Europa“ von 2007 ([9]) werden eine ausgewogene Ernährung und eine aktive Lebensweise propagiert. Im Rahmen dieser Strategie werden Aktions-Partnerschaften unter Einbeziehung der EU-Mitgliedstaaten (Hochrangige Gruppe für Ernährung und Bewegung) und der Zivilgesellschaft (Europäische Aktionsplattform für Ernährung, körperliche Bewegung und Gesundheit) gefördert. Die Hochrangige Gruppe erarbeitet einen Aktionsplan zur Bekämpfung von Adipositas bei Kindern für die Mitgliedstaaten.

([1]) Gemeinsamer Bericht „Health at a Glance — Europe 2012“ (Gesundheit auf einen Blick) der OECD und der Kommission http://www.oecd.org/els/healthpoliciesanddata/HealthAtAGlanceEurope2012.pdf

([2]) Dabei reicht die Prävalenz der Adipositär von 8 % in Rumänien bis über 25 % in Ungarn und im Vereinigten Königreich. Einige Unterschiede sind möglicherweise auf unterschiedliche Verfahren bei der Datenerhebung zurückzuführen.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_determinants/life_style/nutrition/documents/10keyfacts_nut_obe.pdf

([4]) Weltgesundheitsorganisation. Initiative zur Überwachung von Adipositas bei Kindern in Europa (COSI), Erhebungen 2008 und 2010.

([5]) Weltgesundheitsorganisation. Global Status Report on Non-Communicable Diseases 2010 (Bericht über den weltweiten Sachstand in Bezug auf nicht übertragbare Krankheiten für 2010) http://www.who.int/nmh/publications/ncd_report2010/en/

([6]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/health_status_determinants/data/database

([7]) Datenbank der WHO zum Thema Ernährung, Adipositas und körperliche Betätigung in Europa http://data.euro.who.int/nopa/

([8]) Initiative zur Überwachung von Adipositas bei Kindern http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/disease-prevention/nutrition/activities/monitoring-and-surveillance/who-european-childhood-obesity-surveillance-initiative-cosi.

([9]) KOM(2007)279.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000320/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Obesity and excess weight in the EU

According to the Overseas Development Institute, 1.45 billion people worldwide are obese or overweight. This applies to 58% of adults in Europe. Based on the findings obtained, it must be assumed that the future sharp increase in secondary diseases will represent a much greater burden in terms of both social and health costs.

1. What are the Commission's estimates on this?

2. Are there any purely European studies of this type?

3. Is the Commission aware of this study?

4. If so, what findings have been drawn from it for the individual Member States?

5. What recommendations can the Commission make to the Member States today in terms of prevention to at least reduce an already foreseeable explosion of these costs?

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

The Commission is not aware of the mentioned study.

Based on the available data ([1]), 52% of the adult population in the EU are overweight or obese. On average, 17% of adults are obese. The prevalence of overweight and obesity exceeds 50% in 18 Member States. ([2]) The prevalence of obesity has more than tripled in many European countries since the 1980s entailing an increase in rates of associated diseases such as diabetes, cancer and cardiovascular disease. ([3]) Furthermore, around 1 in 3 children in the EU aged 6-9 years old were overweight or obese in 2010, a substantial increase from 2008, when estimates were 1 in 4 ([4]).

It is estimated that 7% of EU health budgets are spent on diseases linked to obesity each year. Additional costs result from loss of productivity due to health problems and premature death (2.8 million deaths per year from causes associated with overweight and obesity) ([5]).

The European Health Interview Survey ([6]) provides information on self-reported levels of obesity. The NOPA ([7]) and COSI ([8]) projects carried out by the WHO with EU support provide additional information.

The 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([9]) promotes a balanced diet and active lifestyles. The strategy encourages action-oriented partnerships involving the Member States (High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity) and civil society (EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health). The High Level Group is drafting a Member States-led Action Plan to tackle childhood obesity.

([1]) Joint Commission/OECD report 'Health at a Glance — Europe 2012' http://www.oecd.org/els/healthpoliciesanddata/HealthAtAGlanceEurope2012.pdf
([2]) With obesity varying from 8% in Romania to over 25% in Hungary and the UK. Some of the variations may be due to different methodologies in data collection.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_determinants/life_style/nutrition/documents/10keyfacts_nut_obe.pdf
([4]) World Health Organisation. European Childhood Obesity Surveillance Initiative, COSI, rounds 2008 and 2010.
([5]) World Health Organisation. Global Status Report on Non-Communicable Diseases 2010 http://www.who.int/nmh/publications/ncd_report2010/en/
([6]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/health_status_determinants/data/database
([7]) European Database on Nutrition, Obesity and Physical Activity (jointly with WHO) http://data.euro.who.int/nopa/
([8]) Childhood Obesity Surveillance Initiative http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/disease-prevention/nutrition/activities/monitoring-and-surveillance/who-european-childhood-obesity-surveillance-initiative-cosi
([9]) COM(2007) 279.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000321/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Ausbau von Kinder- und Jugendsport

Entsprechend einer US-Studie treiben die Kinder von Eltern mit geringerem Bildungsstand weniger und weniger regelmäßig Sport als etwa Kinder von Eltern mit höherem Bildungsstand. So betrage der Prozentsatz der Kinder von Eltern mit höherem Bildungsstand, die in den vergangenen 30 Tagen Sport getrieben haben, mehr als 90 %, und der Prozentsatz der Kinder jener Eltern mit geringerem Bildungsstand liegt dabei nur knapp über 80 %.

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission dieses soziale Phänomen — den Zusammenhang zwischen Bildungsgrad der Eltern und sportlicher Betätigung der Kinder — für die Europäische Union?

2. Ist die Kommission in der Lage, hierzu konkrete Zahlen zu geben?

3. Gedenkt die Kommission, durch konkrete, gezielte Empfehlungen das Gesundheitsniveau der europäischen Jugend in den Mitgliedstaaten zu fördern?

Antwort von Androulla Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(25. Februar 2014)

1. Die Kommission ist sich des sozialen Phänomens bewusst, dass sportliche Betätigung mit dem Bildungsstand zusammenhängt. Die Ergebnisse der Eurobarometer-Umfrage zu Sport und körperlicher Betätigung bestätigen dies: 64 % der Personen, die im Alter von 15 Jahren von der Schule abgegangen sind, geben an, nie Sport zu treiben, während dieser Prozentsatz bei denjenigen, die das Bildungssystem im Alter zwischen 16 und 19 Jahren verlassen haben, auf 39 % sinkt und bei denjenigen, die bei Verlassen des Bildungssystems 20 Jahre oder älter sind, auf 24 % ([1]). Laut einer in Europa durchgeführten Studie ([2]) besteht ein enger Zusammenhang zwischen der sportlichen Betätigung von Kindern und derjenigen ihrer Eltern, was den Schluss zulässt, dass der Bildungsstand der Eltern auch die sportliche Betätigung ihrer Kinder beeinflusst. Allerdings wird der Kindersport in den Mitgliedstaaten unterschiedlich organisiert und dementsprechend variiert auch die Rolle der Eltern.

2. Die erwähnte Eurobarometer-Studie liefert Daten zur Beteiligung am Sport von Jugendlichen ab 15 Jahren in Europa. Über die Beteiligung an sportlichen Aktivitäten von Kindern der Altersgruppe der 6- bis12-Jährigen und derjenigen der 12- bis 15-Jährigen sowie über den Zusammenhang mit dem Bildungsstand der Eltern liegt für Europa kein aktueller Überblick vor.

3. Die Förderung von Sport und gesundheitsfördernder körperlicher Betätigung, u. a. von Kindern, steht ganz oben auf der Sportagenda der Kommission. Konkrete Maßnahmen sind im Kontext der Empfehlung des Rates zu gesundheitsfördernder körperlicher Aktivität (2013) ([3]) und des neuen Programms Erasmus+ ([4]) vorgesehen.

([1]) Eurobarometer Spezial 334, Sport und körperliche Betätigung (2010).
([2]) Sports participation in the European Union, Mulier Institute Netherlands (2005).
([3]) ABl. C 354 vom 4.12.2013, S. 1.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/sport/opportunities/index_de.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000321/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Developing children's and youth sports

According to an American study, children of parents with a lower level of education are involved in sport less, and also less regularly than children of parents with a higher level of education. The percentage of children of parents with a higher level of education who were involved in sport in the past 30 days was over 90%, whilst the percentage of children of parents with a lower level of education was only slightly above 80%.

1. What is the Commission's view of this social phenomenon — the connection between educational level and participation in sport by children — for the European Union?

2. Is the Commission able to provide concrete figures here?

3. Does the Commission intend to promote the level of health of European children in Member States with concrete, targeted recommendations?

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

1. The Commission is aware of the social phenomenon according to which participation in sport is related to education level. Results from the Eurobarometer on Sport and Physical Activity confirm this: 64% of people who left the education system by the age of 15 say they never play sport; this falls to 39% for those who left the education system between the ages of 16 and 19, and 24% for those who left education at the age of 20 or over. ([1]) As research in Europe has shown that children's participation in sport is strongly related to the sport participation of parents, ([2]) it could be inferred that parents' education levels also affect the sport participation of their children. However, children's sport is organised in various ways in the Member States and the role of parents differs accordingly.

2. The abovementioned Eurobarometer study sets out data on sport participation in Europe for young people aged 15 and over. There is no recent European overview of the participation of children in the age groups of 6-12 and 12-15 years and its relation to the education level of their parents.

3. The promotion of sport and health-enhancing physical activity (HEPA), covering also children, ranks high on the Commission's agenda for sport. Concrete measures are foreseen in the context of the implementation of the 2013 Council Recommendation on HEPA ([3]) and the new programme Erasmus+ ([4]).

([1]) Special Eurobarometer 334 on Sport and Physical Activity (2010).
([2]) Sports participation in the European Union, Mulier Institute Netherlands (2005).
([3]) OJ C 354/1 of 4.12.2013.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/sport/opportunities/index_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000322/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Bildungsstandards und deren Einfluss auf die Gesundheit von Kindern

Laut einer amerikanischen Studie gibt es einen klaren Zusammenhang zwischen dem Bildungsgrad und -stand der Eltern und der Adipositas bei Kindern.

1. Ist der Kommission dieser Umstand bekannt, und gilt dies auch für die EU?

2. Wo liegt der europäische Durchschnitt jener Kinder, die aus einem Elternhaus mit geringerem Bildungsgrad stammen und an Adipositas leiden?

3. Wie gedenkt die Kommission, die Mitgliedstaaten beim Ausgleich dieses Mankos zu unterstützen, da es langfristig gesehen billiger sein wird, verstärkt in Bildung als in hohe Gesundheits- und Sozialkosten zu investieren?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(4. März 2014)

Auch in Europa besteht ein Zusammenhang zwischen Übergewicht und Fettleibigkeit bei Kindern und Jugendlichen und dem sozioökonomischen Status der Eltern ([1]). Ein niedriger sozioökonomischer Status, Bewegungsmangel, Lebensmittel- und Ernährungsunsicherheit und Fettleibigkeit hängen alle miteinander zusammen ([2]). Die Forschung hat gezeigt, dass bei Personen, die von Lebensmittelunsicherheit betroffen sind, das Risiko, fettleibig zu werden, um 20-40 % höher ist als bei Personen, die nicht davon betroffen sind ([3]).

Derzeit liegen nur wenige Daten über die Prävalenz von Fettleibigkeit bei Kindern im Verhältnis zum Bildungsniveau der Eltern oder in verschiedenen sozioökonomischen Gruppen in der EU vor. Die verfügbaren Daten ([4]) deuten darauf hin, dass Übergewicht und Fettleibigkeit bei Personen mit höherem Bildungsniveau tendenziell seltener vorkommen. Für Frauen ist das Muster in allen Mitgliedstaaten, für die Daten zur Verfügung stehen, deutlich erkennbar; bei Männern sind die Unterschiede geringer und das Verhältnis ist je nach Mitgliedstaat unterschiedlich ([5]).

Mit der Strategie „Ernährung Übergewicht, Adipositas: Eine Strategie für Europa" von 2007 ([6]) werden eine ausgewogene Ernährung und ein aktiver Lebensstil für alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger propagiert. Im Rahmen dieser Strategie werden Aktions-Partnerschaften unter Einbeziehung der 28 EU-Mitgliedstaaten (Hochrangige Gruppe für Ernährung und Bewegung ([7])) und der Zivilgesellschaft (Europäische Aktionsplattform für Ernährung, körperliche Bewegung und Gesundheit ([8])) gefördert. Die Hochrangige Gruppe erarbeitet derzeit einen von den Mitgliedstaaten durchzuführenden Aktionsplan zur Bekämpfung von Fettleibigkeit bei Kindern, in dem auch speziell auf Kinder aus niedrigeren Bildungsschichten eingegangen wird.

Für die Lehrinhalte und die Gestaltung des Bildungssystems sind gemäß Artikel 165 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union die Mitgliedstaaten verantwortlich. Die Kommission unterstützt die Bemühungen der Mitgliedstaaten zur Verbesserung ihrer Bildungssysteme im Rahmen der Methode der offenen Koordinierung.

([1]) Fernández-Alvira JM, Mouratidou T, Bammann K, Hebestreit A, Barba G, Sieri S, Reisch L, Eiben G, Hadjigeorgiou C, Kovacs E, Huybrechts I, Moreno LA. Parental education and frequency of food consumption in European children: the IDEFICS study. Public Health Nutr. 2013 Mar; 16 (3):487-98.
([2]) Metallinos-Katsaras E, Must A, Gorman K. A longitudinal study of food insecurity on obesity in preschool children. J Acad Nutr Diet. 2012 Dec; 112(12): 1949-58.
([3]) Robertson A, Lobstein T, Knai C. Obesity and socio-economic groups in Europe: Evidence review and implications for action. 2007. Vergeben von SANCO/2005/C4-NUTRITION-03, EC.
([4]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Overweight_and_obesity_-_BMI_statistics.
([5]) In 8 Mitgliedstaaten ist bei Männern mit dem geringsten Bildungsniveau der Anteil übergewichtiger und fettleibiger Personen am höchsten, in 6 Mitgliedstaaten bei Männern mit einem mittleren Bildungsniveau und in 4 Ländern bei Männern mit einem hohen Bildungsniveau.
([6]) KOM(2007)279.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_de.htm
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_de.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000322/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Educational standards and their effect on children's health

According to an American study, there is a clear connection between the educational level and background of parents and obesity in children.

1. Is the Commission aware of this, and is the same true for the EU?

2. What is the European average for children who come from a family home with a low educational level and suffer from obesity?

3. How does the Commission intend to support Member States in efforts to remedy this deficiency, since in the long term it will be cheaper to invest more in education than in high health and social costs?

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

Overweight and obesity in children and young people in Europe can be associated with parental socioeconomic status ([1]). Lower socioeconomic status, physical inactivity, food and nutrition insecurity and obesity are all associated ([2]). Research indicates that individuals who are 'food insecure' have a 20% to 40% higher risk of becoming obese compared to those with food security ([3]).

At present, there is limited data available on the prevalence of obesity according to the parents' educational level or across different socioeconomic groups in the EU. Available data ([4]) indicates that the share of overweight and obese persons tends to be lower in people with higher educational level. For women, the pattern is clear in all Member States on which data is available. For men, differences are smaller and the relationship varies according to Member States ([5]).

The 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([6]) promotes a balanced diet and active lifestyles for all. The strategy encourages action-oriented partnerships involving the 28 EU Member States (High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity ([7])) and civil society (EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([8])). The High Level Group is currently preparing a Member States-led Action Plan to tackle childhood obesity with a special concern for those with lower socioeconomic status.

In accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems rests with Member States. Through the Open Method of Coordination, the Commission supports efforts to improve their education systems.

([1]) Fernández-Alvira JM, Mouratidou T, Bammann K, Hebestreit A, Barba G, Sieri S, Reisch L, Eiben G, Hadjigeorgiou C, Kovacs E, Huybrechts I, Moreno LA. Parental education and frequency of food consumption in European children: the IDEFICS study. Public Health Nutr. 2013 Mar; 16 (3):487-98.
([2]) Metallinos-Katsaras E, Must A, Gorman K. A longitudinal study of food insecurity on obesity in preschool children. J Acad Nutr Diet. 2012 Dec; 112(12): 1949-58.
([3]) Robertson A, Lobstein T, Knai C. Obesity and socioeconomic groups in Europe: Evidence review and implications for action. 2007. Work contracted by SANCO/2005/C4-NUTRITION-03, EC.
([4]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Overweight_and_obesity_-_BMI_statistics
([5]) In 8 Member States, the highest share of overweight and obese men is observed for those with the lowest educational level, in 6 Member States for those with a medium educational level and in 4 countries for those with a high educational level.
([6]) COM(2007) 279.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000323/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(14. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Konzept der „ecosystem services“ und die künftige gemeinsame Agrarpolitik

Die siebte europäische Biodiversitätskonferenz hat eines klar zum Vorschein gebracht: Die europäische Bevölkerung entwickelt immer mehr Bewusstsein für die Notwendigkeit von Naturschutz, Biodiversität und nachhaltiger Wirtschaft. Auf der Konferenz wurde zudem festgehalten, dass die Lebensmittelverschwendung nach wie vor auch in Europa ein sehr großes Problem ist. Diesen Umstand können sich Europa und auch die Welt nicht leisten.

1. Inwieweit gedenkt die Kommission, die Ergebnisse dieser Konferenz in die künftige Koordination von Gemeinsamer Agrarpolitik und Umweltschutz einzubeziehen?

2. Welche Rolle wird dabei das Konzept der „ecosystem services“ spielen, und wie kann dies gegebenenfalls integriert oder umgesetzt werden?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(28. Februar 2014)

In der Biodiversitätsstrategie der EU bis 2020 ([1]) wird anerkannt, dass die biologische Vielfalt und die von ihr erbrachten Dienstleistungen neben ihrem intrinsischen Wert von erheblichem wirtschaftlichem Nutzen sind und dieser bei der Entscheidungsfindung in wichtigen Politikbereichen und mittelfristig auch bei der Rechnungsführung und der Berichterstattung berücksichtigt werden sollte. Die Strategie umfasst auch Ziele und Maßnahmen zum Ausbau des positiven Beitrags insbesondere der Landwirtschaft zur Erhaltung der biologischen Vielfalt und zur nachhaltigen Nutzung von Ökosystemdienstleistungen.

Die jüngst reformierte gemeinsame Agrarpolitik (GAP) bietet den nationalen und regionalen Behörden eine Reihe von Möglichkeiten zur Förderung der biologischen Vielfalt, unter anderem: i) Öko-Auflagen (Cross Compliance), ii) Ökologisierungsmaßnahmen im Rahmen des „ersten Pfeilers“ und iii) Maßnahmen zur Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums im Rahmen des „zweiten Pfeilers“ der GAP. Mit den Ökologisierungsmaßnahmen werden landwirtschaftliche Praktiken unterstützt, die der Diversifizierung der Ackerkulturen, der Flächennutzung im Umweltinteresse und der Erhaltung von Dauergrünland dienen. Darüber hinaus tragen die Maßnahmen zur Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums vor allem durch Agrarumwelt- und Klimaschutzmaßnahmen, den ökologischen/biologischen Landbau und Maßnahmen im Rahmen von Natura 2000 zum Erhalt der biologischen Vielfalt bei.

Der Begriff „Ökosystemdienstleistungen“ wird ausdrücklich auch bei der strategischen Priorität „Wiederherstellung, Erhaltung und Verbesserung von Ökosystemen“ der Politik zur Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums anerkannt; diese Priorität steht in Bezug zu Ziel 2 der Biodiversitätsstrategie. In diesem Zusammenhang können die Maßnahmen zur Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums für eine bessere funktionale Konnektivität von Ökosystemen innerhalb von und zwischen Natura-2000-Gebieten sowie in größeren Landstrichen eingesetzt werden.

([1]) KOM(2011)244 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000323/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: The concept of 'ecosystem services' and the future common agricultural policy

The seventh European biodiversity conference clearly emphasised one thing: the people of Europe are developing more and more awareness of the need for nature conservation, biodiversity and sustainable industry. At the conference it was also put on record that food waste remains a very big problem in Europe. Europe and the rest of the world cannot afford for this to continue.

1. To what extent does the Commission intend to include the results of this conference in the future coordination of common agricultural policy and environmental protection?

2. What role does the concept of 'ecosystem services' play here, and how can this be integrated or implemented where appropriate?

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

The EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 ([1]) recognises that, in addition to its intrinsic value, biodiversity and the services it provides have significant economic value that ought to be factored into decision making in key sectoral policies, and in the medium-term also ought to be reflected in accounting and reporting systems. The strategy also includes targets and actions to enhance the positive contribution specifically of the agriculture sector to the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of ecosystem services.

The newly reformed Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) provides to national and regional authorities a range of opportunities to promote biodiversity including: (i) cross compliance , (ii) greening measures in the first pillar, and (iii) rural development measures in the second pillar of the CAP. The greening measures support agricultural practices for crop diversification, ecological focus areas and the maintenance of permanent grasslands. In addition, rural development measures contribute to the biodiversity target mainly through agri-environment-climate, organic farming and Natura 2000 measures.

The concept of 'ecosystem services' is explicitly recognised also in the strategic priority of Rural Development Policy concerning 'Restoring, preserving, and enhancing ecosystems', which is related to Target 2 of the Biodiversity Strategy. In this context, the rural development measures may be used for ensuring better functional connectivity between ecosystems within and between Natura 2000 areas and in the wider countryside.

([1]) COM(2011) 244 final.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-000325/14
до Комисията
Slavi Binev (EFD)
(14 януари 2014 г.)

Относно: Нарушения на фундаментални права и свободи на българското малцинство в Република Сърбия

Българското малцинство в Република Сърбия е поставено в крайно неприятно и неравностойно положение, отказват му се основоположни права и свободи. Република Сърбия не спазва човешки права и свободи, които са неотменна и фундаментална част от членството в ЕС. Сръбската държава трябва да зачита основните права и свободи на гражданите, залегнали и в Хартата на основните права на Европейския съюз. Българското малцинство е подложено на сериозен културен, образователен и социален натиск от страна на сръбската държава, която трябва: да улесни преподаването на български език в училищата, а не да го възпрепятства, както е в момента; да възстанови излъчването на програма на български език; да улесни разпространението на български печатни издания и радио-телевизионни програми; да прекрати подмяната на културно-историческото наследство на българското малцинство, сменяйки наименованията на български религиозни обекти; да не пречи на съхранението на културната идентичност на българското малцинство. Сръбските власти нехаят за престъпления срещу българи, не наказват виновните.

Моите въпроси са:

1. Какво смята да предприеме Комисията, за да защити правата и свободите на българското малцинство в Сърбия?

2. Възнамерява ли Комисията да започне присъединителни преговори с държава, неспазваща основните права и свободи?

Отговор, даден от г-н Фюле от името на Комисията
(28 февруари 2014 г.)

Преговорите за присъединяване между ЕС и Сърбия започнаха официално на 21 януари 2014 г. по време на първата междуправителствена конференция между ЕС и Сърбия и след приемането от държавите — членки на ЕС, през декември 2013 г. на рамката за преговори. Комисията очаква от Сърбия в процеса на присъединяване да продължи да постига съответствие със законодателството на ЕС, включително в областта на правата на човека.

По отношение на защитата на малцинствата Комисията следи внимателно ситуацията, включително тази на българското малцинство. Това е важен аспект от политическите критерии от Копенхаген за членство в ЕС, който трябва да бъде съблюдаван от всички държави, желаещи да се присъединят към ЕС, включително и от Сърбия. В последния доклад за напредъка на Сърбия ([1]) Комисията посочи, че правната рамка, с която се предвижда защитата на малцинствата, е налице и като цяло се спазва. При все това Комисията също така признава, че последователното прилагане навсякъде в Сърбия трябва да бъде гарантирано изцяло, особено в областта на образованието, използването на езици, както и достъпа до медиите и религиозните обреди, провеждани на езиците на малцинствата.

Комисията провежда редовен контакт с представителите на българското малцинство в Сърбия, включително с Националния съвет на българското малцинство. В сръбските райони, населени с българско малцинство, като Босилеград и Димитровград (Цариброд), бяха проведени няколко посещения на място, включително с международни експерти от Съвета на Европа. Комисията ще продължи да призовава Сърбия да подобрява положението на малцинствата и да ги подкрепя посредством специална финансова помощ, както и ще докладва относно положението на малцинствата в следващия си доклад за напредъка на Сърбия през октомври 2014 г.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000325/14
to the Commission
Slavi Binev (EFD)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Violation of basic rights and freedoms of the Bulgarian minority in Serbia

The Bulgarian minority in Serbia has been placed in an extremely difficult and unfair position, with fundamental rights and freedoms denied it. Serbia is failing to observe human rights and freedoms which are irrevocably associated with, and fundamental to, membership of the European Union. The Serbian state ought to respect the basic civil rights and freedoms set out in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. It is placing the Bulgarian minority under severe cultural, educational and social pressure, whereas it ought to: facilitate the teaching of Bulgarian in schools, rather than hindering it as it does at present; take steps to promote a Bulgarian-language curriculum; facilitate the dissemination of Bulgarian publications and radio and television programmes; stop the process of displacing the Bulgarian minority's cultural and historical heritage by changing the names of Bulgarian religious objects; and ensure that the preservation of the Bulgarian minority's cultural identity is not impeded. The Serbian authorities are indifferent to crimes against Bulgarians and are failing to punish the guilty parties.

1. What steps does the Commission intend to take to protect the rights and freedoms of the Bulgarian minority in Serbia?

2. Does the Commission intend to embark on pre-accession talks with a government that does not observe basic rights and freedoms?

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

Accession negotiations between the EU and Serbia have been formally opened on 21 January 2014 with the first EU-Serbia Inter-Governmental Conference and following the adoption by the EU Member States in December 2013 of the negotiating framework. The Commission expects Serbia to continue aligning with EU legislation, including on human rights, throughout the accession process.

Regarding the protection of minorities, the Commission closely monitors the situation, including for the Bulgarian minority. This is a key aspect of the Copenhagen political criteria for EU membership which has to be met by any EU-aspiring country, including Serbia. The Commission reported in the latest Progress Report on Serbia ([1]) that the legal framework providing for the protection of minorities is in place and generally respected. However, the Commission also acknowledges that consistent implementation throughout Serbia needs to be fully ensured, notably in the areas of education, use of language, and access to the media and religious services in minority languages.

The Commission is in regular contact with the Bulgarian minority representatives in Serbia, including the National Council of the Bulgarian minority. Several field visits took place in the Bulgarian minority populated areas in Serbia such as the towns of Bosilegrad and Dmitrovgrad, including with international experts from the Council of Europe. The Commission will continue urging Serbia to improve the situation and support with dedicated financial assistance and will report on the situation of minorities in its next progress report on Serbia in October 2014.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-000326/14
до Комисията
Slavi Binev (EFD)
(14 януари 2014 г.)

Относно: Груби законови нарушения при строеж на ново сметище

Съществува проект за изграждане на ново депо за отпадъци в Югозападна България, до село Баня, на по-малко от 1 км от къщите на хората. За целта ще бъдат изсечени декари вековна гора в туристически регион, известен с минералните си извори. Тези извори ще бъдат замърсени от това депо. Замърсен ще бъде и приток на река Места, която е основна за големи градове в България и съседна Гърция. Изграждането на това депо е предшествано от множество закононарушения — в ОВОС липсва задължителната оценка от регионалната здравна инспекция. Освен това е проведено обществено обсъждане за няколко общински имота, а всъщност депото ще бъде изградено върху много повече имоти, включително частни. Това сметище само ще навреди на хората и природата, то е в дълбок разрез със закона и аз очаквам Вашето съдействие да помогнем на гражданите в България и Гърция. Има данни за нарушения на Директиви 78/659/ЕИО, 1999/31/ЕО; 2000/60/ЕО, 2008/1/ЕО; 2011/92/ЕС. Това е поредното проблемно сметище в България след тези в Джерман и Ямбол, криещо опасности за живота на хората, и то е в дълбок разрез с европейските закони.

Моите въпроси са:

1. Наясно ли е Комисията с тези проблеми в България, вредящи на околната среда и живота на десетки хиляди хора в две държави членки?

2. Какво смята да предприеме Комисията срещу тези нарушения на европейското законодателство?

Отговор, даден от г-н Поточник от името на Комисията
(4 март 2014 г.)

Местоположението и характеристиките на инфраструктурите за депониране са въпроси от изцяло национална компетентност, доколкото решенията се вземат в съответствие със законодателството на Европейския съюз в областта на околната среда, и по-конкретно Директива 99/31/ЕО ([1]) относно депонирането на отпадъци и Директива 2011/92/ЕС ([2]) относно оценката на въздействието на някои публични и частни проекти върху околната среда („Директивата за ОВОС“).

Въз основа на изразеното безпокойство във връзка със заплануваното съоръжение за обезвреждане на отпадъци в село Баня, Комисията разгледа въпроса, но не намери доказателства за нарушение на горепосочените директиви.

([1]) ОВ L 182, 16.7.1999 г., стр. 1.
([2]) ОВ L 26, 28.1.2012 г., стр. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000326/14
to the Commission
Slavi Binev (EFD)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Law being flouted in construction of new waste depot

It is planned to construct a new waste disposal facility in south-western Bulgaria near the village of Banya, less than a kilometre away from people's homes. The project will entail felling substantial tracts of centuries-old forest in a tourist region famous for its mineral springs, which will be polluted by the dump. The pollution will also affect a tributary of the Mesta, a river of crucial importance to major towns in Bulgaria and neighbouring Greece. The construction of the waste depot has been preceded by numerous breaches of the law — the environmental impact assessment does not include the requisite evaluation by the regional health inspectorate — and moreover, while there has been public discussion about specific municipal properties affected, the site for the waste depot will extend over numerous other properties, some of them privately owned. This dump can only be harmful to people and to the natural environment, it flouts the law, and I am counting on your cooperation to help the Bulgarian and Greek citizens affected by it. Data is available in relation to violations of Directives 78/659/EEC, 1999/31/EC, 2000/60/EC, 2008/1/EC and 2011/92/EU. This is the latest in a series of problematic waste disposal sites in Bulgaria — including those at Dzherman and Yambol — which are threatening people's quality of life and are in serious breach of EC law.

1. Does the Commission know about these problems in Bulgaria and their potential for damage to the environment and the quality of life of tens of thousands of people in two Member States?

2. What steps does the Commission intend to take to counter the breaches of EC law which have occurred?

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

The location and features of landfill infrastructures are strictly matters of national competence, insofar as decisions are taken in compliance with EU environmental law, in particular Directive 99/31/EC ([1]) on the Landfill of waste and Directive 2011/92/EU ([2]) on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (the 'EIA Directive').

Based on concerns raised about the planned waste disposal facility in the village of Banya, the Commission has looked into the matter but has found no evidence of an infringement of the abovementioned Directives.

([1]) OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.
([2]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000329/14
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(14 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Interessi di massimo scoperto

La legge di stabilità finanziaria italiana del 2011 ha disciplinato, ponendo dei limiti, la «commissione di massimo scoperto» in un contratto di apertura di credito, a seguito di due pronunce della Suprema Corte di Cassazione che ne sottolineavano il carattere usurario, laddove non veniva ricompresa nel computo del TAEG.

La medesima legge finanziaria ha peraltro introdotto una «commissione d'istruttoria veloce» determinata in misura fissa, espressa in valore assoluto e commisurata ai costi, così come un tasso d'interesse debitore sull'ammontare dello sconfinamento.

Il tasso di tale «commissione d'istruttoria veloce», che viene discrezionalmente fissato dagli istituti di credito, è stato aumentato altrettanto discrezionalmente dalla maggioranza degli stessi istituti (come riportato dai principali organi di stampa italiani), venendo così a perdere il carattere di proporzionalità rispetto ai costi che la legge impone.

Tale «commissione d'istruttoria veloce» viene applicata indiscriminatamente ad ogni sconfinamento, anche in assenza di esplicita richiesta di affidamento, o in caso di tempestivo reintegro del conto (entro le 24 ore successive).

I consumatori lamentano pertanto una carenza nella trasparenza delle condizioni applicate dalle banche al momento dell'apertura del contratto di credito e successivamente nel corso del rapporto.

Può la Commissione riferire:

1. se è ravvisabile un profilo d'illegittimità per la «commissione d'istruttoria veloce», laddove rappresenti per il consumatore un onere aggiuntivo al tasso d'interesse debitore, che è escluso dal computo del TAEG e non è commisurato ai costi effettivi;

2. se è possibile ricomprendere nell'ambito delle scelte operative messe in atto dagli istituti di credito italiani la fissazione e l'aumento discrezionali dei costi della «commissione d'istruttoria veloce»;

3. se ritiene possibile che tale pratica, laddove insista in un contesto come quello bancario italiano già per molti altri versi asimmetrico e fortemente svantaggioso per famiglie e imprese, possa rappresentare ulteriore fattore di squilibrio; se quanto sopra esposto è da considerarsi lesivo del disposto dalla direttiva 2008/48/CE relativa ai contratti di credito ai consumatori agli articoli 4, 5, 6, 8, 10 e in special modo 11, 12, 18 e 19 e relativi allegati?

Risposta di Neven Mimica a nome della Commissione
(28 febbraio 2014)

La direttiva 2008/48/CE relativa ai contratti di credito ai consumatori ([1]) non introduce un massimale per gli interessi e altri oneri, non prescrive che essi rispecchino i costi realmente sostenuti dal prestatore né osta a che gli Stati membri lo facciano.

La cosiddetta «commissione di istruttoria veloce» è applicata dalle banche quando si superano i limiti dello scoperto. Questa situazione è considerata uno sconfinamento quale definito all'articolo 3, lettera e), della direttiva, vale a dire uno scoperto tacitamente accettato in forza del quale il creditore mette a disposizione del consumatore fondi che eccedono (…) la concessione di scoperto convenuta. Conformemente all'articolo 2, paragrafo 4, della direttiva, ai contratti di credito sotto forma di sconfinamento si applicano soltanto gli articoli da 1 a 3, 18, 20 e da 22 a 32. Come stabilito all'articolo 18, paragrafo 1, il contratto per l'apertura di un conto corrente che contempla la possibilità di concedere al consumatore uno sconfinamento deve contenere anche le informazioni di cui all'articolo 6, paragrafo 1, lettera e), vale a dire informazioni sul tasso debitore ed altre spese, ma in ciò non rientra il tasso annuo effettivo globale. Inoltre, conformemente all'articolo 18, paragrafo 2, in caso di sconfinamento consistente che si protragga per oltre un mese, si devono fornire informazioni addizionali, senza però che vi sia incluso il tasso annuo effettivo globale.

È importante notare che la direttiva impone la trasparenza degli oneri affinché i consumatori siano adeguatamente informati. La cosiddetta «commissione di istruttoria veloce» non è vietata in quanto tale, a condizione che l'istituto di credito rispetti le disposizioni di cui sopra in materia di informazione.

Sulla base dei dati di cui dispone, la Commissione non è in condizione di giudicare la compatibilità della legge italiana menzionata dall'Onorevole deputato, ma sarà lieta di ricevere tutte le informazioni addizionali pertinenti.

([1]) GU L 133 del 22.5.2008, pag. 66.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000329/14
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(14 January 2014)

Subject: Maximum overdraft interest

The Italian Financial Stability Act of 2011 set out limits in order to regulate the 'maximum overdraft charges' in a credit facility agreement, following two rulings by the Supreme Court of Cassation referring to the usurious nature of these charges where they were not re-included in the APR calculation.

This financial act therefore introduced a fixed fee known as the 'fast credit processing fee', which is expressed as an absolute value and is in line with costs, i.e. as a lending rate on the overdrawn amount.

The amount of this 'fast credit processing fee', which is fixed at the discretion of the credit institutions, has in fact been arbitrarily increased by most of these institutions (as has been reported by the main bodies of the Italian press), with the result that, contrary to the provisions of the above act, the charges are no longer proportional.

This 'fast credit processing fee' is applied indiscriminately whenever overdraft limits are exceeded, even in the absence of any application for credit, or where the account is promptly replenished (within 24 hours).

Consumers are therefore complaining of a constant lack of transparency in the terms and conditions imposed by the banks from the moment the credit facility agreement is taken out.

In view of this:

1. Does the Commission consider that the 'fast credit processing fee' should be ruled unlawful where it adds to the cost of borrowing, is not taken into account in the APR calculation and does not reflect the actual costs?

2. Is it admissible to include 'fast credit processing' costs and fee increases within the operational remit of the Italian credit institutions?

3. Does it consider that this practice in areas such as the Italian banking sector which, for many other reasons, is already skewed and highly unfavourable to families and businesses, might aggravate the imbalance? Does it consider this to be an infringement of; Directive 2008/48/EC on credit agreements for consumers, as well as 11, 12, 18 and 19 and the annexes to the directive?

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

Directive 2008/48/EC on credit agreements for consumers ([1]) does not introduce a cap on interests and other fees, nor requires that these reflect the actual costs incurred by lenders, but does not prevent Member States from doing so.

The so-called 'fast credit processing fee' is applied by banks whenever overdraft limits are exceeded. This situation is considered as an overrunning, which is defined by Article 3(e) of the directive as a tacitly accepted overdraft whereby a creditor makes available to a consumer funds which exceed (…) the agreed overdraft facility. According to Article 2.4 of the directive, in the case of credit agreements in the form of overrunning, only Articles 1 to 3, 18, 20 and 22 to 32 shall apply. As established in Article 18 (1), an agreement to open a current account that would allow a consumer to overrun, must contain, in addition, the information referred to in Article 6 (1)(e), that is, information on the borrowing rate and on other charges, which does not include the annual percentage rate of charge. Also, according to Article 18 (2), if the overrunning becomes significant and lasts for more than one month, additional information should be provided, but it still does not include the annual percentage rate of charge.

It is important to note that the directive requires transparency of fees so that customers are well informed. The so-called 'fast credit processing fee' is as such not prohibited, provided that the credit institution respects the information requirements referred above.

On the basis of the information available, the Commission is not in a position to judge on the compatibility of the Italian act referred to by the Honourable Member but is happy to receive any relevant additional information.

([1]) OJ L 133, 22.5.2008, p. 66.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000331/14
an die Kommission
Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL)
(15. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Eurosur

Das Überwachungsnetzwerk Eurosur schaltet bereits vorhandene Überwachungskapazitäten der EU-Mitgliedstaaten zusammen; die EU-Grenzagentur Frontex in Warschau dient als Hauptquartier. Eurosur vernetzt die Strukturen der seeseitigen Grenzüberwachungssysteme „Baltic Sea Region Border Control Cooperation" (BSRBCC), „Black Sea Littoral States Border/Coast Gurard Cooperation Forum" (BSCF), „Seahorse Atlantic Projekt" und das zukünftige „Seahorse Mediterranco Projekt" im Mittelmeer, an dem auch Libyen teilnehmen soll.

1. Über welche „Koordinierungszentren" sind welche nationalen Behörden an den seeseitigen Grenzüberwachungssystemen BSRBCC, BSCF, „Seahorse Atlantic" und dem im Aufbau befindlichen „Seahorse Mediterraneo" vernetzt?

2. Welche zivilen und militärischen Informationen werden in den Netzwerken erhoben, verarbeitet und weitergegeben?

3. Wie arbeitet Frontex mit den vier Netzwerken zusammen, und wie verändert sich dies mit dem Start von Eurosur?

4. Inwieweit haben auch Mauretanien, Marokko, Senegal, Gambia, Guinea Bissau und die Kap Verden „Koordinierungszentren" oder vergleichbare Einrichtungen zur Teilnahme an „Seahorse Atlantic" geschaffen bzw. sind derzeit damit befasst, und in welcher Höhe wurden EU-Mittel für die Technik eingesetzt?

5. Wird durch einzelne Mitgliedstaaten oder die Kommission die Integration von „Koordinierungszentren" oder vergleichbaren Einrichtungen in Libyen in Eurosur oder „Seahorse Mediterraneo" geplant? Existieren bereits Zentren in Benghasi und Tripolis, die an italienische Einrichtungen angebunden werden sollen?

6. Inwieweit sind „Koordinierungszentren" oder vergleichbare Einrichtungen in Algerien, Tunesien und Ägypten und deren Integration in Eurosur oder „Seahorse Mediterraneo" anvisiert?

7. Was ist der Kommission über Projekte Italiens und Libyens hinsichtlich des Verkaufs von Sensortechnik (etwa zur Fertigstellung einer „elektronischen Grenzüberwachung", Libya Herald, 3. November 2013) bekannt, und inwiefern soll diese in Eurosur, „Seahorse Mediterraneo" oder EUBAM Libyen integriert werden?

8. Welche Konsequenzen zieht die Kommission hinsichtlich ihrer weiteren Unterstützung Libyens im Bereich des Sicherheitssektors (SSR) zur Ausbildung von Polizei und Militär aus der Tatsache, dass das Asyl-Projekt SAHARAMED nicht weitergeführt werden kann, da die libysche Regierung die Zusammenarbeit mit dem italienischen Flüchtlingsrat CIR verweigert?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(7. März 2014)

1. Die regionalen Koordinierungszentren (RKZ) für das BSCF und das SEAHORSE-Netzwerk Atlantik sind an das bulgarische bzw. das spanische nationale Koordinierungszentrum (NKZ) angebunden. Die RKZ für das SEAHORSE-Netzwerk Mittelmeer werden ab 2015 im italienischen NKZ eingerichtet. Im Fall des Projekts BSRBCC muss noch entschieden werden, welcher Mitgliedstaat dafür verantwortlich sein wird.

2. Nach Kenntnis der Kommission werden keine militärischen Informationen verarbeitet, und der Informationsaustausch beschränkt sich üblicherweise auf operative Informationen (z. B. Ausschreibungen).

3. Frontex hat auf diese regionalen Netzwerke keinen Zugriff.

4. Die afrikanischen Länder haben sehr einfache Zentren errichtet. 1 838 000 EUR wurden für das Netzwerk selbst ausgegeben und 1 373 000 EUR für die Zentren — das sind insgesamt 3 211 000 EUR (80 % von der EU finanziert und 20 % von Spanien).

5. Die Einbindung von Drittländern in Eurosur ist nicht möglich. Es wurden keine Zentren in Libyen errichtet.

6. Algerien, Tunesien und Ägypten beabsichtigen zurzeit nicht, am SEAHORSE-Netzwerk Mittelmeer teilzunehmen.

7. Der Kommission liegen keine zusätzlichen Informationen über die im *Libya Herald* erwähnten Pläne vor.

8. SAHARA MED ist ein Entwicklungsprogramm, das aus verschiedenen Komponenten besteht, die unter anderem zur Identifizierung von Migranten und Personen dienen, die internationalen Schutz benötigen. Trotz der Schwierigkeiten in Bezug auf das Mandat des CIR wird das Projekt in Libyen weiterhin umgesetzt. Die Kommission ist bemüht, in enger Zusammenarbeit mit dem italienischen Innenministerium eine tragfähige Lösung mit den libyschen Behörden zu finden, damit die Ziele des Programms erreicht werden können.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000331/14
to the Commission
Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Eurosur

The surveillance network Eurosur coordinates Member States' existing monitoring capabilities, based at the EU border agency Frontex in Warsaw. Eurosur links the maritime border surveillance systems Baltic Sea Region Border Control Cooperation (BSRBCC), Black Sea Littoral States Border/Coast Guard Cooperation Forum (BSCF), and the Seahorse Atlantic network, and will also link the future Seahorse Mediterraneo network in the Mediterranean, which Libya will also be involved in.

1. Which coordination centres link which national authorities to the maritime border surveillance systems BSRBCC, BSCF, Seahorse Atlantic and the planned Seahorse Mediterraneo?

2. What civilian and military information is being collected, processed and shared in these networks?

3. How does Frontex work with the four networks and how has this changed since Eurosur became operational?

4. To what extent have Mauretania, Morocco, Senegal, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde set up coordination centres or similar facilities, or are in the process of doing so, in order to participate in Seahorse Atlantic? How much EU funding has been spent on the technical systems?

5. Are individual Member States or the Commission planning to integrate Libyan coordination centres, or similar facilities, into Eurosur or Seahorse Mediterraneo? Are there already coordination centres in Benghazi and Tripoli which will be linked with Italian facilities?

6. What plans are there for setting up coordination centres, or similar facilities, in Algeria, Tunisia and Egypt, and for their integration into Eurosur or Seahorse Mediterraneo?

7. What does the Commission know about Italian and Libyan plans with regard to the sale of sensor technology (for instance, to establish 'electronic border surveillance', Libya Herald, 3 November 2013)? To what extent will this be integrated into Eurosur, Seahorse Mediterraneo or EUBAM Libya?

8. In light of the fact that the asylum project SAHARAMED cannot be continued because the Libyan Government is refusing to work with the Italian refugee council CIR, does the Commission intend to continue providing Libya with security support (SSR) with regard to police and military training?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

1. The regional coordination centres (RCCs) for the BSCF and for the Seahorse Atlantic network are connected respectively to the Bulgarian and Spanish national coordination centres (NCCs). The RCC for the Seahorse Mediterranean network will be hosted by the Italian NCC as of 2015. For the BSRBCC a decision still needs to be taken on which Member State will be in charge.

2. As far as the Commission knows, no military information is processed and the information exchange is usually limited to operational information (e.g. alerts).

3. Frontex does not have access to these regional networks.

4. The African countries have etablished very basic centres. EUR 1 838 000 was spent on the network itself and EUR 1 373 000 for these centres — in total EUR 3 211 000 (80% EU-funded and 20% by Spain).

5. It is not possible to include any third countries in Eurosur. No centres have been established in Lybia.

6. Currently Algeria, Tunisia and Egypt do not intend to participate in the Seahorse Mediterranean network.

7. The Commission does not have any additional information on the plans mentioned in the Libya Herald.

8. The SAHARAMED is a development project made up of various components including the identification of migrants and people in need of international protection. Despite the difficulties encountered with the CIR mandate, the project is still being implemented in Libya. The Commission, in close cooperation with the Italian Ministry of Interior, is trying to find a viable solution with the Libyan Authorities in order to enable the programme to achieve its objectives.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor P-000332/14
upućeno Komisiji
Oleg Valjalo (S&D)
(15. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Demografija Europske unije

U Republici Hrvatskoj 17% populacije čine osobe starije od 65 godina. Prema stručnim prognozama, u ne tako dalekoj budućnosti, postotak populacije starije od 65 godina iznosit će punih 27%. Sličan trend prepoznaje se u cijeloj Europskoj uniji i Europa kao da doslovno postaje „stari" kontinent, kontinent osoba starijih od 65 godina.

Navedeni trend snažno utječe i još snažnije će utjecati na europski sustav blagostanja, mirovinske i socijalne sustave, te na cjelokupno europsko tržište rada.

U tom kontekstu, zanima me sljedeće:

1. Kako se Komisija suočava s ovim zabrinjavajućim trendom? Jesu li u planu nove javne politike koje će se učinkovitije suočiti s ovim problemom?

2. Koji su trenutačni instrumenti koje Komisija koristi za suočavanje s ovim problemom i kakvi su njihovi rezultati?

Odgovor g. Andora u ime Komisije
(13. veljače 2014.)

Komisija podržava države članice u njihovim naporima da poboljšaju uvjete za starije osobe u područjima poput mirovina, zdravstvene i dugoročne skrbi, zapošljavanja, informacijske i komunikacijske tehnologije, borbe protiv diskriminacije i obrazovanja odraslih ([1]). U Bijeloj knjizi iz 2012. ([2]) o mirovinama iznosi se kako osigurati primjerene, sigurne i održive mirovine. Paket mjera za socijalno ulaganje iz 2013. ([3]) sadržava upute o prilagođavanju sustava socijalne zaštite izazovima povezanima sa starenjem u vrijeme ograničenih državnih proračuna.

U Izvješću o starenju iz 2012. ([4]) iznose se scenariji o tome kako će starenje utjecati na javne izdatke u srednjoročnom i dugoročnom razdoblju, a u Izvješću o fiskalnoj održivosti analiziraju se izazovi fiskalne održivosti ([5]). U Izvješću ([6]) o primjerenosti mirovina razmatra se primjerenost trenutačnih i budućih mirovinskih povlastica. Prikupljene informacije poslužile su u pisanju posebnih preporuka po državama članicama ([7]) o reformi politike u vezi sa starenjem za vrijeme Europskog semestra.

Europsko inovacijsko partnerstvo za aktivno i zdravo starenje ([8]) usmjereno je na pretvaranje izazova demografskog starenja u mogućnosti za poboljšanje zdravlja i kvalitete života starijih osoba u EU-u. Svrha je Partnerstva pokazivanje dobre prakse i promicanje razvoja i povećanja inovativnih rješenja za aktivno i zdravo starenje u EU-u.

Europskom godinom aktivnog starenja i solidarnosti među generacijama mobilizirali su se dionici na stvaranje boljih mogućnosti za aktivno starenje. ([9]) U Vodećim načelima aktivnog starenja ([10]) iznosi se kontrolni popis potrebnih radnji za nacionalna tijela i dionike.

Pozivaju se države članice da korištenjem europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova u restrukturiranju javnih usluga (socijalne i zdravstvene skrbi) odgovore na demografske izazove u razdoblju 2014. — 2020.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=6920&type=2&furtherPubs=yes .
([2]) COM (2012) 55 završna verzija od 16. veljače 2012.; na http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=752&langId=en.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en.
([4]) Izrađeno u suradnji s Odborom za ekonomsku politiku; na: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/ageing_report/index_en.htm
([5]) Europska komisija (GU ECFIN), 2012., „Izvješće o fiskalnoj održivosti za 2012.", Europsko gospodarstvo, br. 8/2012, EK, Bruxelles, http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/fiscal-sustainability-report_en.htm .
([6]) „Primjerenost mirovina u Europskoj uniji 2010. — 2050.", izrađeno u suradnji s Odborom za socijalnu zaštitu; na: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7805&langId=en.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_hr.htm
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing&pg=home .
([9]) http://europa.eu/ey2012/ey2012.jsp?langId=hr .
([10]) Vidi Prilog Deklaraciji Vijeća o europskoj godini aktivnog starenja i solidarnosti. među generacijama (2012.): daljnji koraci na: http://europa.eu/ey2012/ey2012main.jsp?langId=hr&catId=970&newsId=1743&.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000332/14
to the Commission
Oleg Valjalo (S&D)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: EU demographics

In Croatia 17% of the population are aged over 65. Official forecasts suggest that, in the not too distant future, the proportion of over-65s will be as high as 27%. A similar trend can be seen throughout the EU, as if Europe were turning into the Old World in the literal sense, a continent of over-65s.

This trend is making itself strongly felt — and will make itself felt even more strongly — in European welfare, pension, and social systems and on the European labour market as a whole.

1. How is the Commission dealing with the worrying trend described above? Are new public policies being planned with a view to tackling this problem effectively?

2. What means is the Commission currently bringing to bear on the problem, and what kind of results are being achieved?

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

The Commission supports the Member States in their efforts to improve conditions for older people in areas such as pensions, health and long-term care, employment, ICT, anti-discrimination and adult education ([1]). The 2012 White Paper ([2]) on pensions sets out how to ensure pensions are adequate, safe and sustainable. The 2013 Social Investment Package ([3]) provides guidance on adapting social protection systems to the challenges of ageing in a time of limited public budgets.

The 2012 Ageing Report ([4]) sets out scenarios on how ageing will affect public expenditure in the mid to long-term and the Fiscal Sustainability Report analyses fiscal sustainability challenges ([5]). The report ([6]) on pension adequacy monitors the adequacy of current and future pension benefits. The information collected has provided input for the Country-Specific Recommendations ([7]) on ageing-related policy reform during the European Semester.

The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing ([8]) aims to turn the challenges of demographic ageing into opportunities to improve health and quality of life of older people in the EU. The Partnership showcases good practice and promotes the deployment and scaling up of innovative solutions for active and healthy ageing in the EU.

The European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity between Generations mobilised stakeholders to create better opportunities for active ageing ([9]). The Guiding Principles for Active Ageing ([10]) provide a checklist for national authorities and stakeholders on what needs doing.

Member States are invited to use the European Structural and Investment Funds in restructuring public services (social-, healthcare) responding to the demographic challenges in the 2014-2020 period.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=6920&type=2&furtherPubs=yes
([2]) COM(2012) 55 final of 16 February 2012; at http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=752&langId=en
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en
([4]) Produced jointly with the Economic Policy Committee; at: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/ageing_report/index_en.htm
([5]) European Commission (DG ECFIN), 2012, 'Fiscal Sustainability Report 2012', European Economy, No 8/2012, EC, Brussels, http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/fiscal-sustainability-report_en.htm
([6]) 'Pension Adequacy in the European Union 2010-2050', produced jointly with the Social Protection Committee; at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7805&langId=en
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing&pg=home
([9]) http://europa.eu/ey2012/
([10]) See Annex to the Council Declaration on the European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity. Between Generations (2012): The Way Forward, at: http://europa.eu/ey2012/ey2012main.jsp?langId=en&catId=970&newsId=1743&

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000333/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Caso Marò. Violazione della normativa internazionale da parte delle autorità indiane

Il 15 febbraio 2012 Massimiliano Latorre e Salvatore Girone, militari italiani impegnati nelle missioni internazionali antipirateria nell'Oceano Indiano, sono stati arrestati dalle autorità dello Stato indiano del Kerala poiché accusati dell'omicidio di due pescatori indiani scambiati per pirati. Secondo quanto statuito dal diritto internazionale generale e convenzionale, essendo il fatto avvenuto in acque internazionali su una nave battente bandiera italiana ed essendovi coinvolti militari italiani, la competenza a giudicare i due Marò sarebbe dovuta spettare alle autorità italiane.

Nonostante l'Italia abbia a lungo promosso un dialogo con le autorità indiane per la ricerca di una soluzione diplomatica del caso, dopo quasi due anni questa vicenda continua ad essere contrassegnata da azioni da parte dell'India non in linea con le consuetudini o le prassi giuridiche applicabili.

Da ultimo, l'ipotesi di applicare la «Sua Act», la legge antipirateria che prevede anche la pena di morte.

Si tenga presente che il Parlamento europeo nel maggio 2012 ha adottato una risoluzione sulla «pirateria marittima» in cui ribadiva che «in base al diritto internazionale, in alto mare si applica sempre alle navi e al personale militare a bordo la giurisdizione nazionale dello Stato di bandiera».

Alla luce di quanto precede, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza degli sviluppi del caso?

2. Quali provvedimenti e azioni intende prendere affinché lo Stato indiano rispetti il diritto internazionale?

3. Quale strumento — giuridico, politico e diplomatico — intende porre in essere per consentire a Massimiliano Latorre e Salvatore Girone di poter essere giudicati da un tribunale italiano?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente segue con estrema attenzione sin dall'inizio il caso dei due soldati della marina militare italiana, tenendosi in stretto contatto sia con le autorità italiane che con quelle indiane. La questione riguarda altresì la lotta mondiale contro la pirateria, oggetto di un fermo impegno dell'UE.

Secondo le ultime informazioni disponibili, benché dall'incidente siano trascorsi quasi due anni, non sono ancora stati depositati i capi d'imputazione contro i marò italiani, che restano in carcere a New Delhi. Preoccupa in particolare la presunta intenzione del governo indiano di trattare il caso nell'ambito della legislazione indiana antiterrorismo (la cosiddetta SUA — Suppression of Unlawful Acts), che comporta il rovesciamento dell'onere della prova e condanne a lungo termine (compresa la pena di morte).

L'AR/VP e il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna hanno sollevato la questione con il governo indiano a vari livelli negli ultimi tempi, ad esempio in concomitanza con le consultazioni di politica estera UE-India tenutesi a New Dehli il 24 gennaio 2014, e continueranno ad esercitare pressioni sul paese al riguardo.

In tutte queste occasioni, l'AR/VP e il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna hanno esortato l'India a trovare rapidamente una soluzione soddisfacente, nel pieno rispetto della convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sul diritto del mare e del diritto internazionale.

Le decisioni dell'India su questo caso saranno oggetto di un attento esame.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000333/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — the case of two marines: breach of international law by the Indian authorities

On 15 February 2012, Massimiliano Latorre and Salvatore Girone, Italian military personnel carrying out international anti-piracy duties in the Indian Ocean, were arrested by the authorities of the Indian State of Kerala on a charge of having killed two Indian fishermen whom they had mistaken for pirates. Under international law, both in general and in the form of treaty law, as the incident occurred in international waters on a vessel flying the Italian flag, and as Italian military personnel were involved in it, it is in the Italian courts that jurisdiction to try the two marines ought by rights to have been vested.

Although Italy sought dialogue with the Indian authorities over a long period of time in a bid to bring about a diplomatic solution to the matter, nearly two years after the incident India is still acting in a manner which is in breach both of custom and of the legal practices applicable.

This includes most recently a suggestion that the Act on the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation (SUA) should be applied — an anti-piracy law which also provides for the death penalty.

It should be recalled that in May 2012 the European Parliament adopted a resolution on maritime piracy in which it noted that, 'on the high seas, according to international law, in all cases, (…) the national jurisdiction of the flag state applies on the ships concerned, as well as to the military staff deployed on board'.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of developments in the case?

2. What measures will she take to induce the State of India to respect international law?

3. What legal, political and diplomatic instruments will she employ to enable Massimiliano Latorre and Salvatore Girone to stand trial before an Italian court?

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

The HR/VP has been following the case of the two Italian marines very attentively since its beginning, in close contact with both the Italian and Indian authorities. This issue has also a bearing on the global fight against piracy, to which the EU is strongly committed.

According to the latest available information, the Italian marines are still being held in New Delhi, with no charge sheet having been issued despite almost two years have passed since the incident. It is of particular concern the purported intention of the Indian Government to deal with the case under the Indian anti-terrorism legislation (the so-called SUA — Suppression of Unlawful Acts) which implies the reversal of the burden of proof and long term convictions (including the death penalty).

The HR/VP and the European External Action Service have raised this issue with the Indian government, at various levels, in the recent past, including at the EU-India Foreign Policy Consultations of 24 January 2014 in New Delhi, and they will continue to do so with increasing emphasis.

On all these occasions, the HR/VP and the EEAS have encouraged India to find as a matter of urgency a satisfactory outcome as soon as possible, based on the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and international law.

Any decision by India on this case will be carefully assessed.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000334/14
alla Commissione
Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Trasformazione e commercializzazione dell'olio d'oliva — Gruppo Deoleo

La produzione, la trasformazione e la commercializzazione dell'olio d'oliva costituisce un elemento portante dell'industria agroalimentare italiana e spagnola, e l'olio d'oliva è un prodotto che da secoli contraddistingue la cultura alimentare di una intera regione, la cosiddetta «cultura mediterranea», costituendone l'elemento fondamentale.

Alcuni marchi storici di produttori italiani, quali Bertolli e Sasso, che fanno capo alla Carapelli S.p.A., con i loro relativi luoghi di produzione siti ad Inveruno (MI) e Tavernelle Val Di Pesa (AR), sono oggi controllati dal gruppo spagnolo Deoleo (ex Sos Cuetara) cui fanno capo anche i marchi Carbonell, Hoijblanca, Koipe.

Si osservi che, secondo le informazioni fornite dalla multinazionale stessa, sia le marche spagnole che quelle italiane risultano essere leader nei loro rispettivi mercati nazionali e nel mercato europeo (ove Bertolli detiene il primato delle vendite in Germania e Olanda e Carapelli è la marca straniera leader in Francia).

Inoltre, Deoleo è presente in oltre 100 paesi del mondo nei quali detiene una posizione di prevalenza: in America del Nord (dove Bertolli è la marca più venduta ma dove anche Carapelli e Carbonell hanno oramai conquistato ingenti quote), nell'emisfero sud dove Bertolli e Carbonell detengono le maggiori fette di mercato in Australia e Nuova Zelanda, e nei mercati asiatici, dove il primato spetta a Bertolli e Carbonell (Giappone) e a Carapelli e Carbonell (Cina).

Si consideri che nonostante questa notevole espansione il Gruppo Deoleo ha da tempo messo in atto una strategia di ristrutturazione, delocalizzazione e riduzione dei propri siti produttivi, dapprima chiudendo il sito di Voghera (PV), quindi annunciando già nel 2012 l'intenzione di ridurre i siti produttivi da 4 (Inveruno, Tavernelle (I), Alcolea e Andujiar (E)) a soli 2, con sensibile riduzione del personale, in particolar modo in Italia, ove nel 2013 sono stati messi in mobilità oltre 40 lavoratori.

Inoltre, il gruppo parrebbe versare in una pesante situazione debitoria (oltre 600 milioni di euro).

Infine, le azioni messe in atto dalla Deoleo paiono essere del tutto prive di un piano industriale in grado di garantire e tutelare gli attuali livelli occupazionali, e potrebbero incidere pesantemente sull'industria agroalimentare dell'area mediterranea ed in particolare italiana.

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

1. È a conoscenza di questa situazione?

2. Non ritiene opportuno di dover convocare l'azienda per avere chiarimenti e garanzie in merito, e di convocare presso la sede della Commissione un tavolo di confronto tra l'azienda e le rappresentanze sindacali italiane e spagnole per affrontare adeguatamente la situazione?

3. Non ritiene che questo possa essere un caso sul quale far intervenire il Fondo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(11 febbraio 2014)

1 e 2. La Commissione non conosce i dettagli degli attuali piani di ristrutturazione del Gruppo Deoleo e non ha potere per interferire nelle sue decisioni o nelle sue procedure interne di dialogo sociale. Essa sollecita però tutte le parti interessate ad applicare le buone pratiche al fine di gestire proattivamente la ristrutturazione in modo socialmente responsabile, come ribadito nella sua comunicazione «Quadro UE per la qualità nell'anticipazione del cambiamento e delle ristrutturazioni» ([1]).

La Commissione fa presente che, nel caso della chiusura di un'impresa, il datore di lavoro deve far fronte ai propri obblighi per quanto concerne l'informazione e la consultazione dei lavoratori conformemente alla normativa dell'UE ([2]).

([1]) COM(2013) 882 final del 13 dicembre 2013.

([2]) In particolare, la direttiva 98/59/CE del Consiglio, del 20 luglio 1998, concernente il ravvicinamento delle legislazioni degli Stati membri in materia di licenziamenti collettivi (GU L 225 del 12.8.1998, pag. 16), la direttiva 2002/14/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'11 marzo 2002, che istituisce un quadro generale relativo all'informazione e alla consultazione dei lavoratori — Dichiarazione congiunta del Parlamento europeo, del Consiglio e della Commissione sulla rappresentanza dei lavoratori (GU L 80 del 23.3.2002, pag. 29) e la direttiva 2009/38/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 6 maggio 2009, riguardante l'istituzione di un comitato aziendale europeo o di una procedura per l'informazione e la consultazione dei lavoratori nelle imprese e nei gruppi di imprese di dimensioni comunitarie (GU L 122 del 16.5.2009, pag. 28).

3. A condizione che gli esuberi possano essere fatti risalire alla globalizzazione degli scambi o alla crisi economica e finanziaria globale, l'Italia e la Spagna potrebbero chiedere il sostegno del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG). Per ulteriori particolari la Commissione rinvia l'Onorevole deputato al regolamento ([3]) che stabilisce le nuove regole che si applicano al FEG a decorrere dall'inizio del 2014.

L'Onorevole deputato può inoltre rivolgersi alle persone di contatto del FEG responsabili per l'Italia e la Spagna ([4]) per accertare se sia in preparazione una domanda di sostegno per i lavoratori messi in esubero da Deoleo.

([3]) Regolamento (UE) n. 1309/2013 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 17 dicembre 2013, sul Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (2014-2020) e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1927/2006 (GU L 347 del 20.12.2013, pag. 855).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000334/14
to the Commission
Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Processing and marketing of olive oil — Deoleo Group

The production, processing and marketing of olive oil is a cornerstone of the Italian and Spanish food industry, and olive oil is a product that, for centuries, has characterised the food culture of an entire region — the so-called 'Mediterranean culture' — and is a fundamental part of that culture.

Some historic Italian brands, such as Bertolli and Sasso, which are part of the company Carapelli S.P.A. , and their respective production sites in Inveruno (Milan) and Tavernelle Val Di Pesa (Arezzo), are now controlled by the Spanish group Deoleo (formerly Sos Cuetara), which also owns the brands Carbonell, Hoijblanca and Koipe.

It is worth noting that, according to information provided by the multinational itself, both the Spanish brands and the Italian ones are leaders in their respective national markets and in the European market (where Bertolli comes out top in sales in Germany and the Netherlands and Carapelli is the leading foreign brand in France).

In addition, Deoleo is present in over 100 countries around the world, in which it holds a dominant position: in North America (where Bertolli is the most popular brand but where Carapelli and Carbonell, too, have won huge market shares), in the southern hemisphere, where Bertolli and Carbonell have the largest market shares in Australia and New Zealand, and in the Asian markets, where Bertolli and Carbonell hold the record in Japan and Carapelli and Carbonell in China.

Despite this significant expansion, the Deoleo Group has, for a long time, been implementing a strategy of restructuring, relocation and reduction of its production sites; first it closed its site in Voghera and then, in 2012, it announced its intention to reduce the number of its production sites from four (Inveruno and Tavernelle in Italy and Alcolea and Andujiar in Spain) to just two, with significant staff cuts, especially in Italy, where more than 40 workers were laid off in 2013.

In addition, the group is apparently full of debts (to the tune of over EUR 600 million).

The measures taken by Deoleo appear to be totally devoid of any industrial plan that is able to guarantee and protect existing employment levels, and could have a very adverse impact on the food industry in the Mediterranean area, in particular the Italian food industry.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of this situation?

2. Would it not consider it advisable to call on the company for clarification and assurances about this matter, and to convene, at the Commission headquarters, a round table for talks between the company and the Italian and Spanish union representatives, in order to deal with this situation appropriately?

3. Does it not agree that this might be a case in which the Globalisation Adjustment Fund might be able to intervene?

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

1-2. The Commission is not aware of the details of the Deoleo Group's current restructuring plans and has no power to interfere in its decisions or its internal social dialogue procedures. It does, however, urge all concerned to apply good practice in anticipating and managing restructuring in a socially responsible manner, as outlined in its communication 'EU Quality Framework for anticipation of change and restructuring' ([1]).

The Commission would point out that, in the event of an undertaking's closure, the employer must fulfil his or her obligations as regards worker information and consultation in accordance with EC law ([2]).

([1]) COM(2013) 882 final of 13 December 2013.

([2]) In particular, 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, p. 16), 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 — Joint declaration of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on employee representation (OJ L 80, 23.3.2002, p. 29) and Directive 2009/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 May 2009 on the establishment of a European Works Council or a procedure in Community-scale undertakings and Community-scale groups of undertakings for the purposes of informing and consulting employees (OJ L 122, 16.5.2009, p. 28).

3. Provided that any redundancies can be linked to trade-related globalisation or to the global financial and economic crisis, Italy and Spain could apply for support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF). For further details, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the regulation ([3]) setting out the new rules applying to the EGF from the beginning of 2014.

The Honourable Member may wish to get in touch with the EGF Contact Persons for Italy and Spain ([4]) to find out whether any application for support for workers made redundant by Deoleo is in the pipeline.

([3]) Regulation (EU) No 1309/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (2014-2020) and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 855.

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000336/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(15 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Απορρόφηση πόρων από την Ελλάδα

Είμαστε ήδη στο 2014 και κάποιοι κυβερνητικοί παράγοντες στην Ελλάδα υπερηφανεύονται (μιλώντας στα ελληνικά ΜΜΕ) για την απορρόφηση πόρων στα πλαίσια του ΕΣΠΑ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποια είναι σήμερα η πραγματική απορρόφηση, χωρίς να περιλαμβάνονται σε αυτήν οι συμβασιοποιήσεις;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Μαρτίου 2014)

Το σύνολο της χρηματοδότησης της πολιτικής συνοχής για την Ελλάδα την περίοδο 2007-2013 ανέρχεται σε 20,4 δισ. ευρώ. Στα τέλη του 2013, το ποσοστό πληρωμών από την Επιτροπή προς την Ελλάδα ήταν 70%.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000336/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Take-up of funds by Greece

It is already 2014, and some senior government officials in Greece (speaking to the Greek media) are boasting about the take-up rate of funds under the NSRF

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

What is the actual take-up rate to date, without taking account of funding still due under contract?

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

The total cohesion policy allocation for Greece for 2007-2013 is EUR 20.4 billion. At the end of 2013, the rate of payments from the Commission to Greece was 70%.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000337/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(15 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Έλεγχος των επιδοτήσεων για ξενώνες στην Ελλάδα

Πληροφορίες στον ελληνικό τύπο αναφέρουν ότι η Επιτροπή σκέπτεται να ανοίξει τον φάκελο των επιδοτήσεων (μέσω της ΕΕ) που έχουν δοθεί για την κατασκευή ξενώνων στην Ελλάδα, με αφορμή την πρόσφατη υπόθεση με τον τέως υπουργό κ. Λιάπη. Πολύ σωστά θα κάνει η Επιτροπή να ελέγξει τα πάντα, αν και υπάρχουν και «Επιτροπές Παρακολούθησης» και αποστολές υπαλλήλων στην Ελλάδα οι οποίες γίνονται πολύ συχνά και κάτι τέτοιο θα έπρεπε να είχε γίνει εγκαίρως και όχι «κατόπιν εορτής». Η Ελλάδα, όμως, δεν είναι η μόνη χώρα στην οποία έχουν επιδοτηθεί ξενώνες, καταλύματα κ.λπ. Υπάρχουν περιοχές (όπως π.χ. η πρώην Ανατ. Γερμανία) η οποία απορρόφησε μεγάλα ποσά από κοινοτικές πρωτοβουλίες και ακόμη δεν υπάρχει ενημέρωση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου σχετικά με τι ποσά μιλάμε, πότε έγινε έλεγχος και ποιές διαχειριστικές ανωμαλίες εντοπίστηκαν και σε ποιες περιπτώσεις.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποια ποσά δόθηκαν σε επιχειρήσεις και έργα στην πρώην Ανατολική Γερμανία, από το 1990 ως σήμερα, και από ποιες κοινοτικές πρωτοβουλίες; Ποιες οι ανωμαλίες που εντοπίστηκαν στην χρήση τους;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Μαρτίου 2014)

1. Τα στοιχεία του παραρτήματος δείχνουν ότι οι ανατολικές γερμανικές περιφέρειες (Ανατολικό Βερολίνο, Βρανδεμβούργο, Μεκλεμβούργο-Πομερανία, Σαξονία, Σαξονία-Άνχαλτ και Θουριγγία) έλαβαν ενισχύσεις ύψους 42 249 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ) για την περίοδο από το 1990 έως σήμερα.

2. Κατά την υλοποίηση του ΕΤΠΑ και του ΕΚΤ στις περιφέρειες της Ανατολικής Γερμανίας διαπιστώθηκαν ορισμένες περιπτώσεις παρατυπιών, όπως αφερεγγυότητα ορισμένων δικαιούχων, παραβίαση των κατευθυντηρίων γραμμών για τις δημόσιες προμήθειες και παρατυπίες όσον αφορά τη δημοσιονομική εκτέλεση. Ωστόσο, από τη σύγκριση περιπτώσεων παρατυπιών υλοποίησης σε άλλες περιφέρειες και κράτη μέλη δεν διαπιστώθηκαν ανωμαλίες στις ανατολικές περιφέρειες.

Όλες οι αποκαλυφθείσες παρατυπίες κατά τη χρησιμοποίηση των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων αντιμετωπίστηκαν και αποκαταστάθηκαν σύμφωνα με τις διαδικασίες που καθορίζονται στους οικείους κανονισμούς της ΕΕ και στις διατάξεις εφαρμογής τους.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000337/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Control of subsidies for hostels in Greece

Greek press reports suggest that, following the recent affair involving former Minister Michalis Liapis, the Commission intends to investigate the subsidies allocated (through the EU) for the construction of hostels in Greece. The Commission would be well advised to control everything, even though Greece is full of 'monitoring committees' and officials despatched on mission; this should have occurred earlier and not 'after the event'. However, Greece is not the only country in which hostels, accommodation, etc. have been subsidised. There are regions (such as the former GDR) which have received large amounts of funding under Community initiatives; the European Parliament has still not been informed what amounts were involved, when inspections were carried out and what management anomalies were identified and in which cases.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

What amounts have been allocated to enterprises and projects in the former GDR since 1990, and under which Community initiatives? What anomalies have beens detected in the use of these funds?

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

1. The data in the annex shows that the Eastern German regions (Ost-Berlin, Brandenburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Sachsen, Sachsen-Anhalt and Thüringen) have received an amount of payments from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF) of EUR 42 249 million over the period of 1990 to the present day.

2. The implementation of the ERDF and ESF in the Eastern German regions has been subject to some cases of irregularities, such as the insolvency of some beneficiaries, violation of public procurement guidelines and irregularities in financial execution. However, a comparison with cases of implementation irregularities in other regions and Member States does not reveal any anomalies in the Eastern regions.

All detected irregularities in the use of Structural Funds are handled and corrected according to procedures established in the relevant EU Regulations and implementing provisions.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000339/14
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(15 janvier 2014)

Objet: Soutien à la candidature d'un parc naturel transfrontalier européen au patrimoine mondial de l'Unesco

La candidature au patrimoine mondial de l'humanité de l'Unesco de l'espace transfrontalier franco-italien «Marittime-Mercantour» a été officialisée le 18 novembre 2013. Cette candidature, faite au titre de «bien naturel», intègre: le parc du Mercantour, le Parco Alpi-Marittime, le Parco Alpi Liguri, le Parco du Marguareis, la Provincia Imperia et l'aire protégée du jardin botanique Hanbury. La demande est articulée autour de la géologie et des patrimoines exceptionnels qui en découlent: les paysages, la nature et la culture. Les acteurs de ces territoires attendent beaucoup d'une reconnaissance de l'Unesco pour renforcer la protection de ces sites naturels.

Ce projet est l'une des très rares candidatures transfrontalières à l'Unesco et reflète le succès de la politique de coopération territoriale européenne en matière de développement durable.

La Commission envisage-t-elle, dans ces conditions, de soutenir la candidature de l'espace transfrontalier «Marittime-Mercantour» au patrimoine mondial de l'humanité de l'Unesco?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(27 février 2014)

L'Union européenne n'étant pas partie à la convention de l'Unesco concernant la protection du patrimoine mondial, culturel et naturel (1972), elle ne peut jouer un rôle dans le processus de propositions d'inscription à la liste du patrimoine mondial. Cependant, la Commission croit que les initiatives visant à améliorer la coopération transfrontalière peuvent être bénéfiques à différentes politiques de l'Union, telles que la cohésion territoriale, la cohérence et la fonctionnalité du réseau Natura 2000 ainsi que «l'infrastructure verte».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000339/14
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Supporting the nomination of a cross-border European natural park for Unesco World Heritage Site status

On 18 November 2013, the Franco-Italian cross-border area 'Marittime-Mercantour' was officially nominated for World Heritage Site status. This 'natural site' comprises: the Mercantour National Park, the Alpi-Marittime regional park, the Alpi Liguri regional park, the Marguareis natural park, the Province of Imperia and the Hanbury Botanical Gardens Regional Protected Area. The nomination focuses on the geology of the region and the exceptional landscapes, natural features and cultural heritage it has shaped. Local people involved believe that Unesco recognition could significantly boost efforts to conserve these natural sites.

This is one of the very few cross-border Unesco nominations and it reflects the success of European territorial cooperation policy on sustainable development.

Does the Commission plan to support the nomination of the cross-border area 'Marittime-Mercantour' for Unesco World Heritage Site status?

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

The European Union is not a party to the Unesco World Heritage Convention (1972). Therefore the European Union cannot play a role in the World Heritage Site nomination process. However, the Commission believes that initiatives to improve cross-border cooperation can deliver benefits for a range of the Union's policies, such as territorial cohesion, the coherence and functionality of the Natura 2000 network, and Green Infrastructure.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000343/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Restrizioni alla fornitura di servizi sul territorio dell'Unione da parte delle reti televisive pubbliche

In seguito alla vicenda che ha coinvolto una proprietaria di un pub inglese che era stata denunciata dalla English Premier League per aver mostrato la Champions League trasmessa da una pay-tv greca, conclusasi con una sentenza della Corte europea di giustizia in favore della imprenditrice inglese, la Commissione ha avviato un'indagine antitrust relativamente alle restrizioni territoriali legate alla fornitura di servizi televisivi a pagamento.

Un sistema di restrizione similare a quello applicato dalle pay-tv esiste anche per le reti pubbliche nazionali degli Stati membri. Ad esempio, un cittadino italiano che paga il canone delle tv nazionali ma che si trovi all'estero, non ha pieno accesso ai contenuti offerti dalle reti pubbliche, che gli sono garantiti invece solo entro il territorio nazionale italiano.

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

1. questo genere di restrizioni sussiste anche per le reti pubbliche di altri Stati membri;

2. tali restrizioni non violino i principi del mercato interno, andando a ledere i diritti dei consumatori europei?

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

Gli accordi di licenza tra emittenti e titolari di diritti possono dar luogo a restrizioni territoriali dell'accesso ai programmi televisivi. Tali accordi sono soggetti alla normativa dell'UE in materia di concorrenza e devono altresì rispettare il principio del mercato interno della libera prestazione di servizi.

Con la sentenza «Premier League» citata dall'onorevole deputato ([1]), la Corte di giustizia ha statuito che le disposizioni degli accordi di licenza che producono una compartimentazione del mercato interno ed eliminano qualsiasi forma di concorrenza tra le emittenti (restrizioni territoriali assolute) nel settore della prestazione transfrontaliera di servizi di radiodiffusione via satellite violano il principio della libera prestazione di servizi e la normativa dell'UE in materia di concorrenza. È molto probabile che questa sentenza abbia ripercussioni sulla circolazione delle opere audiovisive nel mercato unico del digitale nel settore della televisione a pagamento (cfr. punto 117 della sentenza). La causa in questione non verteva tuttavia sulla trasmissione in chiaro (ossia la modalità di trasmissione generalmente utilizzata dalle emittenti del servizio pubblico), il cui modello di finanziamento è molto diverso da quello delle pay-TV.

Conformemente al protocollo n. 29 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, il finanziamento del servizio pubblico radiotelevisivo rientra tra le competenze degli Stati membri, che possono pertanto scegliere di finanziare tale servizio ricorrendo a misure nazionali, compreso il pagamento del canone.

Quando riceve denunce relative a possibili restrizioni alle trasmissioni al di fuori del territorio nazionale, la Commissione ne valuta la compatibilità con il diritto dell'UE.

([1]) (C-403/08 e C-429/08 del 4 ottobre 2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000343/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Restrictions on service provision by public television networks on EU territory

Following the case involving an English pub landlady accused by the English Premier League of showing Champions League matches broadcast by a Greek pay-TV station, which concluded with a European Court of Justice judgment in favour of the English entrepreneur, the Commission has instigated anti-trust proceedings with regard to territorial restrictions on the supply of pay-TV services.

A system of restrictions similar to that applied to pay-TV also exists in respect of the national public networks of the Member States. For example, when abroad, despite having paid the fee for national TV, an Italian citizen does not have full access to content from the public networks, which is only guaranteed within Italian national territory.

In the light of the foregoing, can the Commission clarify whether:

1. this kind of restriction also exists in respect of the public networks of other Member States;

2. such restrictions violate the principles of the internal market, infringing the rights of European consumers?

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

Territorial restrictions on access to TV programmes may result from licensing agreements between broadcasters and right holders. These agreements are subject to EU competition law and must also respect of the freedom to provide services internal market principle.

In the Premier League ruling to which you refer, ([1]) the Court of Justice held that provisions in licence agreements that partition the internal market and eliminate all competition between broadcasters (absolute territorial restrictions) in the field of cross-border provision of satellite broadcasting services violate the freedom to provide services and EU competition law. This ruling will most likely impact on the circulation of audiovisual works in the Digital Single Market in the pay TV market (see paragraph 117 of the judgment). However, that case did not concern free-to-air broadcasting (which typically is the way public service broadcasters operate), whose financing model differs significantly from that of pay-TV.

According to Protocol No 29 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the financing of public service broadcaster lies within the competences of the Member States. Therefore, Member States may choose to finance their public service broadcasting according to national schemes including the fee to pay to public broadcasters.

Where the Commission receives complaints for possible restrictions to broadcast outside the national territory, it will examine whether such restrictions are compatible with EC law.

([1]) (C-403/08 and C-429/08 of 4 October 2011).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000344/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Stalking e violenza sulle donne

Un nuovo caso di stalking si è concluso oggi in seguito all'arresto di un usciere dell'università di Bologna, che iniettava morfina e cloroformio nelle bottigliette di una giovane donna che aveva rifiutato le sua proposte. Il femminicidio e la violenza di genere hanno conosciuto un forte risalto in Italia negli ultimi mesi con il decreto legge presentato lo scorso agosto alla Camera dei deputati.

A livello europeo, il Consiglio d'Europa ha redatto nel 2011 la Convenzione di Istanbul sulla prevenzione e la lotta contra la violenza nei confronti delle donne e contro la violenza domestica. Nel testo, gli Stati contraenti si propongono di prevenire tale piaga sociale attraverso l'educazione e la sensibilizzazione. Secondo obiettivo della Convenzione è creare strumenti per punire prontamente chi compie atti che ledono la dignità e l'integrità morale e fisica delle donne.

Ad oggi tuttavia, la Convenzione è stata ratificata soltanto da pochi paesi, di cui Italia, Portogallo e Austria unici tra gli Stati membri dell'UE, ma non entrerà in vigore fino a che non sarà ratificata da almeno dieci paesi firmatari, di cui 8 devono appartenere al Consiglio d'Europa.

1. Può la Commissione rendere noto se intende intraprendere azioni per promuovere tra gli Stati membri la ratifica della convenzione?

2. Intende firmare la convenzione a nome dell'UE, nella figura del presidente Barroso o del vice-presidente/Alto Rappresentante Catherine Ashton, a norma dell'articolo75 della convenzione stessa?

3. Quali sono i risultati concreti del programma DAFNE per la protezione delle donne e dei bambini vittime di violenza?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(28 febbraio 2014)

Combattere la violenza contro le donne rientra tra le priorità della Commissione, come dimostrato dal piano d'azione per l'attuazione del programma di Stoccolma, dalla Carta delle donne e dalla strategia per la parità tra donne e uomini 2010-2015. L'adozione di misure legislative, quando possibile, la lotta contro la discriminazione, l'impegno per l'emancipazione femminile, il miglioramento delle conoscenze, lo scambio di buone pratiche, la sensibilizzazione e lo stanziamento di finanziamenti costituiscono le azioni principali attuate dalla Commissione per sostenere gli Stati membri nell'eliminazione della violenza nei confronti delle donne.

La Commissione coglie inoltre tutte le opportunità per invitare gli Stati membri a concludere a livello nazionale la ratifica della Convenzione del Consiglio d'Europa sulla prevenzione e la lotta contro la violenza nei confronti delle donne e la violenza domestica. I servizi della Commissione stanno effettuando una valutazione dell'impatto e del valore aggiunto di una potenziale adesione dell'UE, che sarebbe possibile unicamente per gli ambiti di competenza dell'UE e che dovrebbe essere conforme alla procedura di cui all'articolo 218 del TFUE.

Per quanto riguarda l'impatto del programma DAPHNE III, secondo la valutazione intermedia adottata nel maggio 2011, ne sono stati complessivamente conseguiti gli obiettivi tramite il finanziamento di quasi 190 progetti dal 2007. Con un bilancio totale di 124 milioni di EUR sono stati finanziati progetti che hanno creato reti europee, permesso la condivisione di migliori pratiche, prodotto vari strumenti efficaci e sviluppato formazioni, e hanno portato a una conoscenza più approfondita del fenomeno della violenza. Una valutazione ex post del programma DAPHNE III sarà disponibile alla fine del 2014 e i suoi risultati saranno tenuti in considerazione nell'attuazione del programma Diritti, uguaglianza e cittadinanza per il periodo 2014-2020, che annovera azioni relative all'ex-programma DAPHNE III tra le sue priorità principali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000344/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Stalking and violence against women

A new case of stalking ended today following the arrest of a doorman at the University of Bologna, who injected morphine and chloroform into the drinks bottles of a young woman who had rejected his advances. Femicide and gender-based violence have risen sharply in Italy in recent months with the decree law filed last August with the Chamber of Deputies.

At European level, in 2011 the Council of Europe drew up the Istanbul Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence. In the text, the Contracting States seek to prevent this social evil through education and awareness-raising. The second objective of the Convention is to create tools to promptly punish those who commit acts that harm the dignity and the moral and physical integrity of women.

To date, however, the Convention has been ratified by only a few countries, with Italy , Portugal and Austria alone among EU Member States, but will not come into force until it is ratified by at least ten signatory countries, of which eight must belong to the Council of Europe.

1. Can the Commission say whether it intends to take action to promote ratification of the Convention among Member States?

2. Do President Barroso or Vice-President/High Representative Catherine Ashton intend to sign the agreement on behalf of the EU under Article 75 of the Convention?

3. What are the specific results of the Daphne programme for the protection of women and children who are victims of violence?

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

Combating violence against women is a priority of the Commission, as shown in the action plan implementing the Stockholm Programme, the Women's Charter and the strategy for Equality between Women and Men (2010-2015). Adoption of legislative measures when possible, fighting against discrimination and empowering women, improving knowledge, exchanging good practices, raising awareness and providing funding remain the Commission's main actions to support the Member States in eliminating violence against women.

The Commission also takes all opportunities to call upon Member States to complete individual ratification of the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. Commission services are carrying out an assessment of the impact and added value of a potential EU accession, which would be possible only in areas where there is EU competence and would require compliance with the procedure set out in Article 218 TFEU.

Regarding the impact of the DAPHNE III programme, the interim evaluation adopted in May 2011 confirmed overall success in achieving its objectives through the funding of nearly 190 projects since 2007. A total budget of EUR 124 million has funded projects that established European networks, shared best practices, produced various effective tools and trainings and improved knowledge on the phenomenon of violence. An *ex-post* evaluation of the DAPHNE III Programme will be available at the end of 2014. Lessons from this evaluation will be taken into account in the implementation of the Rights, Equality and Citizenship programme 2014-2020 in which one of the main priorities relates to the ex-DAPHNE III programme.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000346/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: «Compro Oro» e mercato nero

L'attività dei cosiddetti «Compro oro», su cui la Commissione è già stata interrogata lo scorso luglio e ha risposto per il tramite del Commissario Neven Mimica, prosegue più fiorente che mai.

Alla luce delle questioni in parte già sollevate nell'interrogazione E-008391/2013, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. continua a ritenere la questione dei «Compro oro» estranea alle proprie competenze e tale da non richiedere un suo intervento normativo?

2. Non teme il fiorire di un vero e proprio mercato nero, a dispetto sia della tutela del consumatore (in questo caso chi vende preziosi in oro) sia della corretta gestione fiscale delle attività economiche da parte dei singoli Stati membri?

3. Ritiene invece che i fiorenti scambi transfrontalieri di denaro contro oro (o altri preziosi) non possano che soggiacere alla libera circolazione delle merci, almeno ove avvengano tra Stati dell'Unione, senza ulteriori vincoli o limiti?

4. Non ritiene che il fatto di non invitare gli Stati membri ad applicare una normativa più severa rappresenti, nella pratica, un aiuto alla micro e macro criminalità e al contrabbando di refurtiva preziosa?

Risposta di Neven Mimica a nome della Commissione
(3 marzo 2014)

La Commissione è determinata ad assicurare un livello elevato di protezione dei consumatori. Essa segue da vicino le questioni sollevate dall'Onorevole deputata. Per i motivi esposti nella risposta all'interrogazione E-008391/2013 la Commissione non ravvisa, in questa fase, motivi sufficienti per un'azione specifica a livello unionale. Essa sarebbe tuttavia lieta di ricevere e analizzare le eventuali ulteriori informazioni che l'Onorevole deputata potesse trasmetterle.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000346/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Cash-for-gold traders and the black market

The activities of cash-for-gold traders, on which the Commission was questioned in July 2013, responding via Commissioner Neven Mimica, are thriving more fully than ever.

In the light of the issues already partially raised in Question E-008391/2013, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does it still consider the issue of cash-for-gold traders to lie outside its remit, and thus not to require any regulatory intervention?

2. Does it not fear the growth of a genuine black market detrimental to consumer protection (in this case people selling precious gold items) and to the sound fiscal management of economic activities by individual Member States?

3. Does it not believe, in fact, that the thriving cross-border trade in cash for gold (and other valuables) cannot, at least where it takes place between EU Member States, solely be subject to the rules on the free movement of goods, without any additional restrictions or limitations being imposed?

4. Does it not believe that its failure to call on Member States to implement more stringent legislation represents, in practice, an aid to petty and major criminals and to the smuggling of stolen precious goods?

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

The Commission is determined to ensure a high level of consumer protection. It closely follows the issue raised by the Honourable Member. For the reasons explained in the answer to Question E-008391/2013 the Commission does not see, at this stage, sufficient ground for specific action at Union level. It would however be happy to receive and analyse any additional information that the Honourable Member could share with the Commission.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000347/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR) e Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Assicurazioni e libertà di scelta

Il provvedimento del governo italiano «Destinazione Italia», in particolare nell'articolo 8, comma 1, punti D1, E1, F1, dà luogo a una grave situazione di emergenza per i carrozzieri italiani con le sue disposizioni in materia di responsabilità civile autoveicoli (RC auto). In particolare, i punti citati renderebbero obbligatoria la «forma specifica» nel risarcimento dei danni ai veicoli, obbligando gli automobilisti a far riparare il veicolo incidentato esclusivamente presso le officine convenzionate. Viene pertanto negata ai proprietari la libertà di scegliere a quale carrozziere fare riferimento. Inoltre la disposizione vieta nei fatti la possibilità di cedere il credito al carrozziere, ovvero permette alle compagnie di assicurazione di tenere sotto scacco sia i carrozzieri che gli automobilisti.

Nonostante il tutto sia fatto in nome della «liberalizzazione», si permette a chi deve risarcire il danno, ossia a chi lo paga (le assicurazioni) di decidere dove, come e quanto pagare, con un conflitto di interessi senza precedenti. Questa scelta espelle dal mercato 17 000 carrozzerie indipendenti, costringendo quelle convenzionate a lavorare sotto costo e mettendo a rischio 60 000 posti di lavoro.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è a conoscenza di questa situazione?

2. Non ritiene che questo decreto vada in controtendenza alle direttive europee sul libero mercato ponendo un vincolo ai consumatori?

3. Non valuta tale provvedimento contrario al principio di concorrenza leale sancito dai trattati e che questo decreto danneggi le PMI che fanno riparazioni a basso prezzo pur di concorrere con quelle associate alle assicurazioni?

4. Ritiene che questo provvedimento del governo italiano sia in linea con la legislazione europea Solvency 2, all'interno di Omnibus, o che, al contrario, ponga dei problemi di compatibilità?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000416/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(16 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Riforma della RC auto: danno per gli automobilisti e per le carrozzerie

Il Decreto legge n. 145/2013 (G.U. n. 300/2013), denominato anche decreto «Destinazione Italia», affronta anche il tema delle polizze assicurative automobilistiche.

Una norma del Decreto prevede l'obbligo della «forma specifica» nel risarcimento dei danni dei veicoli incidentati, che rende obbligatorio far riparare il veicolo incidentato esclusivamente nelle carrozzerie convenzionate con le assicurazioni e pagate direttamente dalle società assicurative.

Le associazioni nazionali di categoria dei carrozzieri di CNA, Confartigianato e Casartigiani denunciano che il provvedimento metterebbe a rischio 17 000 imprese e 60 000 posti di lavoro.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se ritiene che questo provvedimento violi il diritto dei cittadini di effettuare una libera scelta, impedendo all'assicurato di essere risarcito in denaro e di farsi riparare la propria auto nell'officina di fiducia?

2. Ritiene che il provvedimento possa mettere a rischio anche la sicurezza dei cittadini laddove le compagnie di assicurazione, imponendo alle carrozzerie rigide condizioni contrattuali, costringerebbero le stesse a lavorare sottocosto con possibili ripercussioni sulla qualità dell'intervento?

3. Ritiene che questo decreto possa, in qualche modo, provocare una distorsione delle dinamiche della libera concorrenza nel mercato unico?

Risposta congiunta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

La questione è già stata portata all'attenzione della Commissione.

Le autorità italiane sostengono che le misure mirano a prevenire le frodi; in effetti, la prevenzione delle frodi è un motivo imperativo di interesse generale che può giustificare restrizioni alla libertà di stabilimento e alla libera prestazione di servizi.

La Commissione europea sta monitorando le tendenze e gli sviluppi nei mercati nazionali delle assicurazioni negli Stati membri e, a tale riguardo, tiene contatti diretti con l'autorità italiana garante della concorrenza nel quadro della rete europea della concorrenza (REC). L'autorità garante della concorrenza sarebbe particolarmente indicata a indagare su presunte violazioni degli articoli 101 e 102 del TFUE nel mercato italiano delle polizze auto.

La legislazione dell'UE sulle assicurazioni non si pronuncia sull'eventuale obbligo dei carrozzieri di stipulare convenzioni con le compagnie di assicurazioni ai fini del risarcimento dei danni nell'ambito della responsabilità civile autoveicoli.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000347/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR) and Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Insurance and freedom of choice

Italian vehicle body shops have been faced with a serious crisis in the wake of the Italian Government measure *Destinazione Italia*, particularly Article 8 (1)(D1), (E1), and (F1), because of the provisions relating to motor vehicle liability (car civil liability). In particular, the above points make it compulsory to accept the 'specific form' of compensation for damage to vehicles, whereby vehicles involved in accidents may be repaired only at garages which have agreements with the insurance companies. Owners are therefore denied the freedom of choosing their own vehicle body shops. In addition, the provision in effect rules out the option of transferring claims to body shops, thus allowing insurance companies to keep both body shops and motorists in check.

Although all this is being done in the name of 'liberalisation', it allows those who must make good any damage, in other words, those who pay the compensation (the insurance companies), to decide where, how and how much to pay, leading to an unprecedented conflict of interest. This option is driving 17 000 independent vehicle body shops out of the market; body shops which have agreements with insurance companies are being forced to work below cost, and 60 000 jobs are being put at risk.

Given the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of this situation?

2. Does it not believe that the decree concerned goes against European directives on the free market by shackling consumers?

3. Does it not consider this measure contrary to the principle of fair competition enshrined in the Treaties and that this decree harms SMEs that carry out repairs at low prices in order to compete with those which have agreements with insurers?

4. Does it believe that this Italian Government decision is in line with the European Solvency II/Omnibus II legislation, or does it instead raise issues of compatibility?

Question for written answer E-000416/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Reform of third-party motor insurance: detrimental to motorists and body repair workshops

One subject dealt with by Decree-Law 145/2013 (Official Gazette No 300/2013), also known as the 'Destination Italy' Decree, is motor insurance policies.

A provision of this Decree makes the 'specific form' of compensation for damage to vehicles involved in accidents mandatory. This means it is compulsory to have a damaged vehicle repaired exclusively in the body repair workshops which have agreements with, and are paid directly by, the insurance companies.

The national industry associations to which body repair workshops belong are Confederazione Nazionale dell'Artigianato (CNA), Confartigianato, and Casartigiani. These associations are complaining that the measure would place 17,000 businesses and 60,000 jobs at risk.

1. Given that this is so, can the Commission state whether it considers this measure a violation of citizens' right of free choice, by denying monetary compensation to insured persons and obliging them to have their cars repaired at the garage of their choice?

2. Does it consider that this measure could also jeopardise public safety if insurance companies impose strict contractual terms on body repair workshops, forcing them to work at below cost price, with possible repercussions on the quality of the work done?

3. Does it consider that this Decree may somehow cause distortion in the working of free competition in the single market?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2014)

The matter has already been brought to the attention of the Commission.

The Italian authorities claim that the measures aim to prevent fraud. Prevention of fraud is an overriding reason of public interest which might justify restrictions to the freedom of establishment and freedom to provide services.

The European Commission is monitoring trends and developments in the national insurance markets of Member States. In this respect, the Commission maintains direct contacts with the Italian competition authority within the European Competition Network (ECN). The Italian competition authority would be particularly well placed to investigate alleged infringements of Articles 101 and 102 TFUE in the Italian car insurance market.

EU legislation on insurance does not deal with the question whether car repair shops can be obliged to have agreements with insurance companies in order to make compensation from the motor third party liability insurance reimbursable.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000348/14
à la Commission
Catherine Trautmann (S&D)
(15 janvier 2014)

Objet: Suivi de la déclaration écrite sur la «dys»crimination et l'exclusion sociale des enfants «dys»

Le 13 novembre 2007, le Parlement européen a adopté une déclaration écrite sur la «dys»crimination et l'exclusion sociale des enfants «dys», demandant à la Commission européenne:

— d'établir une charte des enfants «dys»,

— de favoriser la reconnaissance des troubles «dys» comme handicaps,

— de promouvoir les meilleures pratiques sur l'accessibilité de l'information, sur la précocité du repérage, du dépistage, du diagnostic systématique et de la prise en charge, sur les structures pédagogiques performantes en milieu ordinaire ou spécialisé, pour enfants, adolescents et jeunes adultes, sur les structures d'insertion professionnelle adaptées;

— de promouvoir et d'encourager la création d'un réseau pluridisciplinaire européen pour les troubles spécifiques des apprentissages (learning specific difficulties); de collecter et d'étudier ainsi les informations et de favoriser la coordination des actions transfrontalières, et le dialogue institutionnel.

1. La Commission pourrait-elle présenter les suites données à cette déclaration écrite?

2. Pourrait-elle indiquer si une stratégie a été développée au niveau européen en faveur de la lutte contre la «dys»crimination, non seulement en faveur des enfants, mais aussi des adultes? Dans le cas contraire, la Commission envisage-t-elle d'en déployer une?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(4 mars 2014)

Les États membres sont seuls responsables du contenu et de l'organisation des systèmes d'éducation et de formation ([1]).

La protection juridique de l'UE contre la discrimination fondée sur le handicap est limitée à l'emploi, au travail et à la formation professionnelle. ([2]) En 2008, la Commission a proposé une directive interdisant la discrimination fondée sur le handicap également dans des domaines comme celui de l'éducation ([3]).

Toujours en 2008, la communication de la Commission «Améliorer les compétences pour le XXIe siècle: un programme de coopération européenne en matière scolaire» encourageait les États membres à renforcer l'éducation inclusive, à soutenir ceux qui ont des difficultés d'apprentissage et à repenser leurs politiques d'assistance aux élèves en difficulté et de l'enseignement personnalisé ([4]).

L'amélioration de l'assistance apportée aux élèves ayant des besoins particuliers dans l'enseignement traditionnel était également une priorité du cadre stratégique pour la coopération européenne dans le domaine de l'éducation et de la formation de 2009.

Dans sa communication de 2012 «Repenser l'éducation — Investir dans les compétences pour de meilleurs résultats socioéconomiques», la Commission soulignait que les enseignants devaient être formés afin de pouvoir répondre aux besoins des apprenants défavorisés.

La Commission coopère avec l'Agence européenne pour le développement de l'éducation des personnes ayant des besoins particuliers ([5]) et la soutient financièrement. Cette agence fournit des analyses et des informations au sujet de l'éducation inclusive dans toute l'Europe, des recommandations d'action ainsi que des outils de suivi des progrès réalisés.

([1]) Article 165 du TFUE.
([2]) Directive 2000/78/CE du Conseil, JO L 180 du 19.7.2000, p. 22.
([3]) Proposition de directive du Conseil relative à la mise en œuvre du principe de l'égalité de traitement entre les personnes sans distinction de religion ou de convictions, de handicap, d'âge ou d'orientation sexuelle, COM(2008) 426 final du 2.7.2008. Cette proposition de directive fait actuellement l'objet de discussions au sein du Conseil, où l'unanimité est requise pour son adoption.
([4]) COM(2008) 425 final.
([5]) L'agence européenne pour le développement de l'éducation des personnes ayant des besoins particuliers: http://www.european-agency.org/

La recommandation de la Commission de 2013 «Investir dans l'enfance pour briser le cercle vicieux de l'inégalité» ([6]) invite les États membres à intensifier leurs efforts de lutte contre la pauvreté infantile, en se concentrant sur les enfants défavorisés à de multiples égards et ayant des besoins ou des handicaps particuliers.

Le programme *Erasmus+* mettra à disposition des ressources financières pour améliorer l'éducation des apprenants ayant des besoins éducatifs spécifiques. Les États membres peuvent aussi mobiliser des ressources auprès des Fonds E.S.I. ([7]). afin d'améliorer l'organisation de l'assistance à l'apprentissage pour les personnes ayant des besoins éducatifs spécifiques.

([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=fr
([7]) Fonds structurels et d'investissement européens.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000348/14
to the Commission
Catherine Trautmann (S&D)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Follow-up to written declaration on 'dys'crimination and social exclusion affecting children with 'dys'abilities

On 13 November 2007, Parliament adopted a written declaration on 'dys'crimination and social exclusion affecting children with 'dys'abilities which asked the Commission to:

— draw up a charter for 'dys' children;

— encourage the recognition of 'dys'-type problems as disabilities;

— promote best practices regarding making information accessible, taking timely steps to identify, screen, systematically diagnose and treat these disorders at an early stage, designing effective learning structures within both the ordinary and the specialist educational environment for young children, adolescents and young adults, and adapting structures for integrating young people with these disabilities into the world of work;

— promote and encourage the creation of a European multidisciplinary network on specific learning difficulties, and by this means to collect and study information and promote the coordination of cross-border actions, as well as institutional dialogue.

1. What action has been taken by the Commission to follow up this written declaration?

2. Has a strategy been developed at European level to combat 'dys'crimination, not just to help children but also adults? If not, does the Commission plan to implement one?

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

The responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems rests entirely with Member States ([1]).

EU legal protection against discrimination based on disability is limited to employment, occupation and vocational training. ([2]) In 2008 the Commission proposed a directive that would prohibit discrimination based on disability also in areas like education ([3]).

Also in 2008, the Commission Communication 'Improving competences for the 21st century: an agenda for European cooperation on schools' encouraged MS to strengthen inclusive education, support those with learning difficulties, and re-think their policies on learning support and personalised learning ([4]).

Improving support within mainstream schooling for learners with special needs was also a priority in the 2009 Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training.

In its 2012 Communication 'Rethinking education: investing in skills for better socioeconomic outcomes', the Commission stressed that teachers must be trained to meet the needs of disadvantaged learners.

The Commission cooperates with and supports financially EASNIE ([5]) which provides analysis and evidence about inclusive education across Europe, policy recommendations, and tools to monitor progress.

The 2013 Commission Recommendation 'Investing in Children: breaking the cycle of disadvantage' ([6]) invites MS to step up their efforts against child poverty, with a focus on children facing multiple disadvantages, with special needs or disabilities.

The *Erasmus+* programme will provide funding to improve the education of learners with special educational needs (SEN). MS can also mobilise resources from the ESIF ([7]) to improve the organisation of learning support for people with SEN.

([1]) Article 165 TFEU.
([2]) Council Directive 2000/78/EC, OJ L 180, 19.7.2000, p. 22-26.
([3]) Proposal for a Council Directive on implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, 2.7.2008, COM(2008) 426 final. This is under discussion in the Council where unanimity is required for its adoption.
([4]) COM(2008) 425 final.
([5]) The European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education: http://www.european-agency.org/
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en
([7]) European Structural and Investment Funds.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000349/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti a favore di un progetto rivolto ai bambini affetti da Disturbi Specifici di Apprendimento (DSA)

I Disturbi Specifici di Apprendimento (DSA) hanno un'origine neurobiologica, riguardano il 2,5-3 % circa dei bambini in età scolare e si manifestano come un deficit nelle capacità di lettura, di scrittura e di calcolo.

Il più noto fra questi è la dislessia che compromette la velocità e/o la correttezza di lettura, con ripercussioni frequenti anche sulla comprensione del testo letto.

I DSA sono strettamente associati tra loro: spesso alle difficoltà di lettura (dislessia) si accompagnano anche problemi ortografici (disortografia), di grafia (disgrafia) e di calcolo (discalculia).

Riguardano bambini intelligenti, che non hanno problemi sensoriali (vista, udito) e neurologici e che hanno avuto adeguate possibilità di familiarizzare con la lingua scritta.

Purtroppo i DSA rappresentano la prima causa di insuccesso scolastico nei bambini, e, se non riconosciuti in tempo, possono determinare, oltre all'eventuale abbandono della frequenza scolastica, anche problemi psicologici importanti quali ansia e depressione.

Per evitare queste e altre conseguenze, è necessario individuare i bisogni educativi speciali di ciascun bambino attraverso strumenti compensativi. Questi ultimi sono strumenti didattici e tecnologici che aiutano il bambino ad affrontare una prestazione resa difficoltosa dal disturbo, senza peraltro facilitargli il compito dal punto di vista didattico. A tal fine, il progetto JOINT TO LEARN, lanciato da una Onlus italiana, prevede un percorso didattico flessibile, ma soprattutto individualizzato e personalizzato, senza l'utilizzo di ausili mirati al singolo disturbo, bensì soltanto mediante l'impiego della realtà aumentata in ambiente 3D, quindi dell'interazione uomo-macchina che aiuta il bambino ad incrementare i tempi di attenzione e le sue potenzialità. Il progetto si basa essenzialmente su un percorso didattico che si sviluppa con un filo logico di storie e avventure nonché attraverso esercizi ripetitivi che permettono al bambino di apprendere divertendosi.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. esistono finanziamenti per le Onlus con finalità di assistenza sociale?

2. Esistono finanziamenti dedicati a progetti finalizzati ad aiutare i bambini con Disturbi Specifici di Apprendimento?

3. Qual è il quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2014)

Offrire maggiori opportunità ai bambini con difficoltà di apprendimento è uno degli obiettivi fondamentali della Strategia europea sulla disabilità 2010-2020, in linea con la Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone con disabilità ([1]), di cui l'UE è parte contraente.

Il nuovo programma *Erasmus+* darà maggiori opportunità di finanziamento ad un ampio spettro di attori affinché possano migliorare la situazione educativa dei discenti con particolari esigenze o difficoltà di apprendimento. Il programma renderà inoltre disponibili finanziamenti per progetti finalizzati ad esplorare miglioramenti strategici in vista di sistemi di istruzione più inclusivi. Il sostegno ai discenti appartenenti a gruppi svantaggiati e vulnerabili, compresi i bambini con disturbi specifici di apprendimento (DSA), è integrato in tutte le opportunità di finanziamento offerte da *Erasmus+* ([2]). Le regole da seguire per poter ricevere una sovvenzione a valere su *Erasmus+* sono definite nella Guida del programma ([3]) e nei diversi inviti a presentare proposte.

In funzione del contesto nazionale, il FESR ([4]) è in grado di finanziare progetti di cui possono beneficiare bambini affetti da DSA, in particolare nel campo delle infrastrutture didattiche. Anche le organizzazioni non-profit a vocazione socio-assistenziale possono ricevere aiuti dal FESR.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/convention/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/index_it.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/documents/erasmus-plus-programme-guide_en.pdf
([4]) Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale.

Per quanto concerne il FSE ([5]), almeno il 20 % delle sue risorse sarà destinato all'obiettivo tematico «Promuovere l'inclusione sociale, combattere la povertà e qualunque discriminazione», nel cui ambito potrebbero ricevere un aiuto i bambini affetti da DSA. L'obiettivo tematico «Investire nell'istruzione, nella formazione e nella formazione professionale per le competenze e l'apprendimento permanente» è finalizzato, tra l'altro, a promuovere la parità di accesso all'apprendimento per tutti, compresi i gruppi svantaggiati.

Con il nuovo programma ([6]) «Diritti fondamentali e cittadinanza» ([7]) si istituiscono ulteriori possibilità di finanziamento per le organizzazioni che si occupano dei bisogni educativi dei bambini affetti da DSA.

([5]) Fondo sociale europeo.
([6]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0758:FIN:IT:PDF
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/news/newsletter_new_eu_programmes_2014_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000349/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Possible funding for a project for children with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLDs)

Specific Learning Disabilities (SLDs) are neurobiological in origin, affecting approximately 2.5-3% of school-age children and evident as an impairment in reading, writing and arithmetic skills.

The best known of these is dyslexia, which affects reading speed and/or accuracy, often also affecting the understanding of the text being read.

SLDs are closely associated with one another: reading difficulties (dyslexia) are often also associated with problems with spelling (dysorthography), handwriting (dysgraphia) and arithmetic (dyscalculia).

They concern intelligent children, who do not have sensory (vision, hearing) and neurological problems and who have had plenty of opportunity to become familiar with written language.

SLDs are unfortunately the leading cause of educational failure in children, and, if not identified in time, can lead to major psychological problems such as anxiety and depression as well as possible failure to attend school.

To avoid these and other consequences, it is necessary to identify the special educational needs of each child through compensatory measures. These are educational tools and technologies that help children deal with an activity that is made difficult by the disability, but without making their task any easier in educational terms. To this end, the JOINT TO LEARN project launched by an Italian non-profit organisation, provides teaching that is flexible but above all individualised and personalised. It does not use aids targeted at an individual disorder but simply uses augmented reality in a 3D environment, and thus human-machine interaction that helps children to increase their attention time and their potential. The project is based essentially on a teaching course that is developed through a logical strand of stories and adventures as well as through repetitive exercises that allow children to learn while having fun.

Given the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is funding available for non-profit organisations set up for social care purposes?

2. Are there any funds dedicated to projects for helping children with Specific Learning Disabilities?

3. What is the overall situation?

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

Increasing opportunities of children with learning disabilities is one of the key objectives of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020, which is in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities ([1]) to which the EU is a party.

The new *Erasmus+* programme will provide more funding opportunities to a broad range of actors to improve the educational situation of learners with special educational needs/learning difficulties. It will also offer funding for projects which explore strategic improvements that promote more inclusive education systems. The support for learners from disadvantaged and vulnerable groups — including children with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) — is mainstreamed in all the funding opportunities in *Erasmus+* ([2]). Eligibility rules for *Erasmus+* are defined in the Programme Guide ([3]) and the different Calls for Proposals.

Depending on the national context, the ERDF ([4]) can finance projects, which can benefit children with SLD, in particular in the field of education infrastructure. Non-profit organisations may also benefit from the ERDF in the field of social care.

As for the ESF ([5]), at least 20% of its resources shall be allocated to the thematic objective 'promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and any discrimination', where children with SLD could be supported. The thematic objective 'investing in education, training and vocational training for skills and life-long learning' aims, inter alia, to promote equal access to learning for all, including disadvantaged groups.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/convention/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/documents/erasmus-plus-programme-guide_en.pdf
([4]) European Regional Development Fund.
([5]) European Social Fund.

Further funding possibilities for organisations working on the educational needs of children with SLD will arise within the new Rights and Citizenship ([6]) Programme. ([7])

([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/news/newsletter_new_eu_programmes_2014_en.htm
([7]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0758:FIN:EN:PDF

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000350/14
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(15 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Represje wobec lidera białoruskiej opozycji

12 stycznia 2014 r. lider Zjednoczonej Partii Obywatelskiej Anatol Labiedźka został zatrzymany i pobity przez milicję za organizację akcji zbierania podpisów pod petycją przeciwko nowemu podatkowi na Białorusi.

Anatol Labiedźka po siedmiu godzinach został wypuszczony na wolność, lecz zarzucono mu naruszenia ustawy o zgromadzeniach masowych. 14 stycznia 2014 r. został skazany na grzywnę w wysokości 5,85 mln białoruskich rubli.

W związku z powyższym: Czy Komisja zamierza podjąć kroki w celu pomocy represjonowanemu liderowi białoruskiej opozycji? Czy Komisja wyrazi sprzeciw wobec kolejnych, motywowanych politycznie represji na Białorusi?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Füle w imieniu Komisji
(28 lutego 2014 r.)

UE uważnie śledzi sprawę A. Labiedźki, a delegatura UE w Mińsku ściśle współpracuje z ambasadą amerykańską, która uczestniczyła w rozprawie pana Labiedźki. UE wykorzystała wszystkie możliwe środki, by uświadomić władzom Białorusi obawy UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000350/14
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(15 January 2014)

Subject: Repression against Belarusian opposition leader

On 12 January 2014, the leader of the United Civil Party of Belarus, Anatoly Lebedko, was detained and beaten by police for organising a campaign to collect signatures for a petition against a new tax in the country.

Lebedko was released after seven hours, but was charged with breaking the law on mass actions. On 14 January 2014, he was fined 5.85 million Belarusian roubles.

In this connection, does the Commission intend to take action to support the leader of the Belarusian opposition? Will the Commission make clear its objection to this latest, politically motivated repression in Belarus?

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

The EU is following the case of A. Lebedko closely and the EU Delegation in Minsk coordinated closely with the US Embassy who attended the trial of Mr Lebedko. The EU took every opportunity to ensure that the authorities are made aware of the EU's concerns.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000396/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Déploiement de la technologie de captage et de stockage du carbone (CSC)

Le déploiement du CSC peut permettre à l'Union d'atteindre ses objectifs de faibles émissions de CO_2 à moindre coût et il est nécessaire, en particulier, pour la décarbonisation des industries à fortes émissions de CO_2.

La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis qu'il peut également contribuer à la diversité et à la sécurité de l'approvisionnement en énergie, tout en permettant de maintenir des emplois et d'en créer?

Il est urgent de mettre en place une série de projets phares couvrant l'ensemble de la chaîne du CSC afin de dégager les solutions les plus efficaces et les moins coûteuses. À ce propos, quand et comment la Commission va-t-elle fixer des objectifs pour y parvenir?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(27 février 2014)

Les analyses réalisées dans le cadre de la feuille de route de l'UE vers une économie compétitive à faible intensité de carbone à l'horizon 2050 et de la feuille de route sur l'énergie à l'horizon 2050 soulignaient le rôle important que pourraient jouer le captage et stockage du CO_2 (CSC), si cette technologie est commercialisée, dans la transition de l'UE vers une économie à faible intensité de carbone. Le captage et le stockage de CO_2 peuvent contribuer à la diversité et à la sécurité de l'approvisionnement énergétique et offre la possibilité de réduire les émissions de CO_2 provenant de la production d'électricité et du secteur industriel. Le CSC représente une aubaine pour l'industrie et l'emploi européens dans le secteur des technologies de capture, de transport et de stockage du carbone.

Deux outils visant à financer des projets de démonstration du CSC à l'échelle commerciale ont été mis en place: d'une part, le programme énergétique européen pour la relance (PEER) comprenant encore deux projets de CSC en attente d'une décision d'investissement définitive ([1]) et, d'autre part, le programme de financement NER 300 ([2]) comprenant un projet de CSC reçu dans le cadre du deuxième appel à propositions, qui sera conclu d'ici le milieu de l'année 2014. Dans sa récente communication intitulée «Un cadre d'action en matière de climat et d'énergie pour la période comprise entre 2020 et 2030», la Commission européenne, tout en proposant de fixer un objectif de réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre de l'UE de 40 % en 2030, a encouragé les États membres disposant de réserves de combustibles fossiles ou dont le bouquet énergétique est composé en grande partie de combustibles fossiles à soutenir le CSC pendant la phase de précommercialisation, afin de faire baisser les prix et de permettre le déploiement commercial de cette technologie d'ici cinq ans.

([1]) Rapport sur la mise en œuvre du PEER, COM(2013) 791.
([2]) JO L 292 du 6.11.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000396/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Roll-out of carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology

Roll-out of CCS could help the EU to achieve its low CO_2 emission objectives at lower cost and is necessary, in particular, for the decarbonisation of industries with high CO_2 emissions.

Does the Commission share the view that it can also contribute to diversity and security of energy supply, whilst helping to maintain and create jobs?

There is an urgent need for a series of flagship projects covering the whole of the CCS chain to come up with the most effective and least costly solutions. When and how is the Commission going to set targets for achieving these aims?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2014)

Assessments made in the context of the EU's Roadmap for moving to a competitive low carbon economy in 2050 and the Energy Roadmap 2050 see Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS), if commercialised, as an important technology contributing to low carbon transition in the EU. CCS can contribute to diversity and security of energy supply and has the potential to reduce CO_2 emissions in the power generation as well as in the industrial sector. CCS presents a significant opportunity for European industry and jobs within the field of capture, transport and storage technologies.

Two funding instruments were set up which aim at financing commercial-scale CCS demonstration projects, the European Energy Programme for Recovery (EEPR) with two remaining CCS projects awaiting Final Investment Decision ([1]) and the NER 300 funding programme ([2]) with one CCS project submitted under the second call, which will be concluded by mid-2014. In its recent Communication 'A policy framework for climate and energy in the period from 2020 to 2030' the European Commission — while proposing to set a greenhouse gas emission reduction target for domestic EU emissions of 40% in 2030 — encouraged the Member States with fossil reserves and/or high shares of fossil fuels in their energy mix to support CCS through the pre-commercialisation stage in order to bring down costs and enable commercial deployment by the middle of the next decade.

([1]) Report on the implementation of the EEPR, COM(2013) 791.
([2]) OJ L290, 6.11.2010.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000397/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Stratégie européenne de lutte contre le sans-abrisme

La Commission compte-t-elle proposer une stratégie européenne ambitieuse, intégrée et étayée par des stratégies nationales et régionales visant, à longue échéance et dans le cadre plus large du processus d'inclusion sociale, à inscrire l'objectif consistant à mettre un terme, comme le lui demande le Parlement, à la situation des sans-abri?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000399/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Sans-abri et Habitact

La Commission envisage-t-elle d'utiliser le programme pour l'emploi et l'innovation sociale comme principale source de fonds en faveur d'une stratégie européenne de financement de la recherche et des échanges transnationaux et de renforcer sa coopération avec des partenaires européens clés, tels que la Fédération européenne des associations nationales travaillant avec les sans-abri (Feantsa) et le Forum européen d'échange sur les stratégies locales de lutte contre le sans-abrisme (Habitact)?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(3 mars 2014)

La Commission constate que la question a été soulevée dans la résolution sur une stratégie de l'Union européenne pour les personnes sans-abri [2013/2994/(RSP)] que le Parlement européen a adoptée le 16 janvier 2014. Elle l'examinera dans le contexte du suivi de ladite résolution.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000397/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: European strategy to combat homelessness

Is the Commission planning to put forward an ambitious, integrated European strategy, backed by national and regional strategies and designed, in the long term and within the broader framework of the social inclusion process, to achieve the objective of bringing the homelessness situation to an end, as requested by Parliament?

Question for written answer E-000399/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Homelessness and Habitact

Is the Commission thinking of using the Programme for Employment and Social Innovation as the main source of funds for a European strategy to fund research and cross-border exchanges and strengthen its cooperation with key European partners, such as the European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless (Feantsa) and the European Exchange Forum on Local Homeless Strategies (Habitact)?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(3 March 2014)

The Commission notes that this question has been raised in the Resolution on an EU homelessness strategy (2013/2994/(RSP)) that the European Parliament adopted on 16 January 2014. The Commission will address this question in its follow-up to the abovementioned Resolution.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000398/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Stratégie RISE

La stratégie RISE doit poursuivre des objectifs industriels ambitieux et réalistes. L'objectif principal des 20 % nécessiterait, chaque année, la création d'au moins 400 000 nouveaux emplois dans l'industrie.

1. La Commission est-elle d'avis que cet objectif de 20 % doit être considéré comme un objectif directionnel aligné sur les objectifs «20-20-20» de l'Union?

2. Pour la Commission, ces objectifs ne devraient-ils pas refléter les nouvelles réalités industrielles, telles que l'intégration de la fabrication et des services, ainsi que le passage à une économie reposant sur les données et la production à valeur ajoutée?

3. Pourrait-elle dès lors évaluer et justifier ses travaux sur les objectifs et réexaminer le classement des secteurs industriels, comme le lui demande officiellement le Parlement?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(25 février 2014)

1. Comme indiqué dans la communication sur la politique industrielle [COM(2012) 582 final], la Commission entend inverser la tendance à l'affaiblissement du rôle de l'industrie en Europe en faisant passer la part de ce secteur dans le PIB de son niveau actuel d'environ 15 % à 20 %. Ce souhait n'est lié à aucun objectif spécifique de création d'emplois.

2. La Commission a clairement indiqué dans sa récente communication sur la politique industrielle [COM(2014) 14] que le rôle de l'industrie manufacturière est bien plus important que ne le suggère sa contribution au PIB en raison, en particulier, de ses interactions avec d'autres activités économiques et services. En témoigne l'objectif d'intégration de la compétitivité de la politique industrielle dans d'autres politiques de l'UE, et plus particulièrement dans celles relatives aux services aux entreprises.

3. La Commission a commandé une étude visant à définir un nouvel indicateur permettant d'évaluer quantitativement ces interactions et de mesurer leur incidence sur la compétitivité.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000398/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: RISE Strategy

The RISE strategy must pursue ambitious and realistic industrial objectives. The headline target of 20% would necessitate the creation of at least 400 000 new industrial jobs per annum.

1. Does the Commission believe that this 20% target should be considered a directional goal aligned with the EU's 20-20-20 goals?

2. Does the Commission not consider that these targets should reflect the new industrial realities, such as the integration of manufacturing and services as well as the shift to a data-driven economy and value-added production?

3. Could it therefore assess and substantiate its work on targets and rethink the classification of industrial sectors, as officially requested of it by Parliament?

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

1. As stated in the industrial policy communication COM(2012) 582 final, the Commission seeks to reverse the declining role of industry in Europe from its current level of around 15% of GDP to as much as 20%. This aspiration is not linked to any particular job creation target.

2. The Commission has clearly stated in the recent industrial policy communication COM(2014) 14 that the importance of manufacturing is much greater than suggested by its contribution to GDP due to its interactions with other economic activities and services in particular. This is reflected in the objective of mainstreaming industrial policy competitiveness in other EU policies and particularly in those related to business services.

3. The Commission has commissioned a study to develop a new metric that can allow for the monitoring of these interrelations in quantitative terms and their impact on competitiveness.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000400/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Mur de la honte

Long de 3 200 km, le plus grand mur de séparation du monde constitue une frontière de barbelés et de béton entre l'Inde et le Bangladesh.

Quelle est la réaction des autorités européennes sur ce sujet?

Le thème a-t-il été abordé lors des nombreuses rencontres entre la Commission et les autorités indiennes?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(28 février 2014)

L'UE est bien informée de la situation à la frontière entre l'Inde et le Bangladesh et des allégations d'abus de la part des forces indiennes de sécurité des frontières, ce qui constitue un sujet de grande préoccupation. La situation qui prévaut dans la zone frontalière où sévissent la contrebande et l'immigration clandestine s'avère complexe. Des rapports font également état de graves violations des Droits de l'homme, notamment de cas de torture, d'exécutions extrajudiciaires et de traite d'êtres humains. La torture et l'impunité des forces de sécurité sont des questions systématiquement abordées lors des dialogues sur les Droits de l'homme entre l'UE et l'Inde.

Toutefois, il s'agit essentiellement d'un problème bilatéral entre le Bangladesh et l'Inde et nous n'avons reçu aucune demande de soutien ou de participation plus poussée émanant de l'un des deux États directement concernés.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000400/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Wall of shame

With a length of 3200 km, the longest separation wall in the world, made of barbed wire and concrete, marks the border between India and Bangladesh.

What is the reaction of the European authorities on this subject?

Has this topic been raised at the numerous meetings that have taken place between the Commission and the Indian authorities?

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

The EU is well informed about the situation at the border and of alleged abuse by India's Border Security Force (BSF), which is of great concern. The situation in the border area is complex, with smuggling and illegal migration taking place. There are also reports about significant human rights violations, involving torture, extra-judicial killings and human trafficking. Issues such as torture and impunity of security forces are systematically addressed in human rights dialogues between the EU and India.

Primarily, however, this is a bilateral issue to be solved between Bangladesh and India, and we have not received any request for support or further involvement from any of the two states directly concerned.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000403/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Spectre des audits de l'OAV

La Commission pourrait-elle élargir le spectre des audits de l'Office alimentaire et vétérinaire (OAV) en vue d'y inclure la fraude alimentaire?

La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis que l'OAV et les États membres devraient pratiquer des inspections inopinées régulières, indépendantes et obligatoires afin de détecter les violations intentionnelles et de garantir le respect des normes de sécurité alimentaire les plus élevées?

En effet, pour rétablir et maintenir la confiance des consommateurs, il est important de faire preuve de transparence concernant la manière dont les inspections et contrôles officiels sont réalisés, et de publier les rapports ou les résultats relatifs aux contrôles et inspections effectués auprès d'exploitants du secteur alimentaire.

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(21 février 2014)

Par ses audits, l'OAV vérifie si les contrôles mis en place dans les États membres pour s'assurer du respect des règles de l'UE en matière de chaîne agroalimentaire fonctionnent efficacement et garantissent une application adéquate. Par la même occasion, l'OAV repère les éventuels points faibles dans les contrôles officiels tout au long de la chaîne alimentaire, ou dans le cadre juridique appliqué, susceptibles d'autoriser d'éventuelles irrégularités.

Selon le règlement (CE) nº 882/2004, les contrôles officiels effectués par les États membres pour vérifier le respect des principes de sécurité de la chaîne agroalimentaire sont inopinés. La proposition de règlement sur les contrôles officiels ([1]), qui est actuellement soumise à l'examen des colégislateurs, introduit et étend ce principe à des contrôles réguliers destinés à identifier les infractions intentionnelles. En ce qui concerne les audits de l'OAV, la législation actuelle n'impose pas d'effectuer des inspections inopinées. Par ailleurs, la Commission estime que les États membres sont mieux placés pour exécuter ces contrôles sur la base des renseignements dont ils disposent sur le terrain et de leurs pouvoirs d'investigation.

Le règlement (CE) nº 882/2004 exige déjà que les États membres informent le public des résultats de leurs contrôles. La proposition précitée prévoit que les autorités compétentes publient régulièrement et en temps utile des informations sur les contrôles officiels, les cas de non-conformité et les mesures ou sanctions appliquées. En outre, les autorités compétentes seront habilitées à mettre à la disposition du public les résultats de contrôles effectués auprès d'opérateurs individuels et des informations sur leur notation au regard des prescriptions de la législation sur la chaîne alimentaire (par exemple, avec des «émoticônes»). En ce qui concerne les audits de l'OAV, la Commission souligne que les résultats de ceux-ci sont publiés régulièrement depuis 1998.

([1]) Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil concernant les contrôles officiels et les autres activités officielles servant à assurer le respect de la législation sur les denrées alimentaires et les aliments pour animaux ainsi que des règles relatives à la santé et au bien-être des animaux, à la santé et au matériel de reproduction des végétaux et aux produits phytopharmaceutiques, et modifiant les règlements (CE) nº 999/2001, (CE) nº 1829/2003, (CE) nº 1831/2003, (CE) nº 1/2005, (CE) nº 396/2005, (CE) nº 834/2007, (CE) nº 1099/2009, (CE) nº 1069/2009, (CE) nº 1107/2009, (UE) nº 1151/2012, [….]/2013 ainsi que les directives 98/58/CE, 1999/74/CE, 2007/43/CE, 2008/119/CE, 2008/120/CE et 2009/128/CE (règlement sur les contrôles officiels) — COM(2013) 265 final du 6. 5 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000403/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Range of FVO audits

Could the Commission broaden the range of the Food & Veterinary Office (FVO) audits so that they cover food fraud?

Does the Commission share the view that the FVO and the Member States should carry out regular unannounced, independent and mandatory inspections in order to detect intentional infringements and ensure that the most stringent food safety standards are met?

In order to restore and maintain consumer confidence, it is important to be transparent as regards the manner in which official inspections and checks are carried out, and also to publish the reports or findings on the checks and inspections conducted on operators in the food industry.

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

Through its audits, the FVO assesses whether the controls in place in Member States to verify compliance with the EU agri-food chain rules deliver effectively and allow proper enforcement. In doing so, it also identifies potential weak points in official controls along the food chain, or the governing legal framework, which may provide opportunities for potential irregularities.

Member States' official controls to verify compliance with the agri-food chain rules are unannounced (Regulation (EC) No 882/2004). The proposed Regulation on official controls ([1]), currently discussed by the co-legislators, introduces and expands that principle to regular controls directed at identifying intentional violations. As regards FVO audits, the current legislation does not mandate it to carry out unannounced inspections. Moreover, the Commission considers that the Member States themselves are better placed to carry out such inspections on the basis of their on-the-ground intelligence, and their investigative powers.

Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 already requires Member States to make control information available to the public. The proposal referred to above requires competent authorities to publish regularly and timely information on official controls, non-compliances, and measures or penalties applied. Moreover, competent authorities will be enabled to make publicly available the outcome of controls performed on individual operators and information about their scoring against food chain law requirements (e.g. 'smileys'). As regards the audits of the FVO, the Commission underlines that the results of these are published routinely, and since 1998.

([1]) Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on official controls and other official activities performed to ensure the application of food and feed law, rules on animal health and welfare, plant health, plant reproductive material, plant protection products and amending Regulations (EC) No 999/2001, 1829/2003, 1831/2003, 1/2005, 396/2005, 834/2007, 1099/2009, 1069/2009, 1107/2009, Regulations (EU) No 1151/2012, [….]/2013 and Directives 98/58/EC, 1999/74/EC, 2007/43/EC, 2008/119/EC, 2008/120/EC and 2009/128/EC (Official controls Regulation) — COM(2013) 265 final of 6.5.2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000404/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Falsification des dossiers animaux

Quelles mesures la Commission compte-t-elle prendre concernant les cas de falsification des dossiers médicaux d'animaux destinés à l'abattage et exportés vers l'Union européenne qui sont révélés par les audits de l'OAV?

N'est-il pas indispensable d'exclure du marché de l'Union la viande et les autres produits d'origine animale en provenance de pays tiers pour lesquels il est impossible de garantir la conformité avec les obligations de l'Union en matière de sécurité alimentaire?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(26 février 2014)

Lorsque l'Office alimentaire et vétérinaire détecte des irrégularités au cours de contrôles, les autorités compétentes du pays tiers concerné en sont informées et sont invitées à rectifier la situation. Selon la réaction du pays concerné, les exportations peuvent se poursuivre ou sont suspendues ou interdites.

Les sanctions encourues en cas de pratiques frauduleuses dans le domaine de l'alimentation humaine et animale sont régies par le règlement (UE) nº 882/2004 relatif aux contrôles officiels.

La viande et les autres produits d'origine animale qui sont importés dans l'UE doivent satisfaire aux mêmes exigences de sécurité que les produits similaires fabriqués dans l'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000404/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Falsification of animal records

What steps is the Commission intending to take with regard to the instances of falsified medical records for animals destined for slaughter and exported to the European Union which have been revealed by audits of the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)?

Is it not essential that meat and other products of animal origin coming from third countries, for which it is impossible to ensure that the Union's food safety requirements have been complied with, are excluded from the Union market?

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

When irregularities are detected by the Food and Veterinary Office during audits, the Competent Authorities of the third country in question are informed and requested to correct the situation. Depending on the adequacy of the reaction of the third country, the export can either continue, is suspended or is terminated.

Penalties in relation to fraudulent practices in the food and feed area are regulated by Regulation (EU) No 882/2004 on official controls.

Meat and other products of animal origin imported into the EU must fulfil equivalent safety requirements as similar products produced in the EU.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000405/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Sanctions en cas de fraude alimentaire

La Commission accepte-t-elle la proposition du Parlement européen contenue dans le texte adopté lors de la période de session de janvier 2014, qui demande l'application de sanctions exemplaires aux auteurs de fraude alimentaire?

Plus précisément, la Commission compte-t-elle aller dans le sens de ce que propose le Parlement, de sorte que ces sanctions se montent au double des bénéfices potentiels occasionnés par la fraude?

En effet, des sanctions peu élevées incitent certains opérateurs à frauder et à réitérer leurs méfaits. À ce propos, nous demandons également qu'un opérateur reconnu coupable de fraude une deuxième fois soit mis définitivement hors circuit.

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(26 février 2014)

Le 6 mai 2013, la Commission européenne a publié un projet de règlement qui remplacerait le cadre législatif actuel sur les contrôles officiels ([1]) dans le but de renforcer les mécanismes d'application de la législation relative à la chaîne agroalimentaire dans les États membres.

La proposition prévoit notamment que les sanctions financières imposées éventuellement en cas d'infraction délibérée aux réglementations relatives à la chaîne agroalimentaire — en d'autres termes, en cas de fraude — soient fixées à un niveau suffisamment dissuasif, permettant d'annuler tout gain économique escompté par le fraudeur.

Il appartiendra à chaque État membre de se prononcer sur le montant exact de ces sanctions, de même que sur les mesures à prendre dans les cas de récidive.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/pressroom/docs/proposal-regulation-ep-council_fr.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000405/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Penalties for food fraud

Does the Commission accept the proposal of the European Parliament contained in the text adopted during the January 2014 session, calling for the imposition of exemplary penalties on food fraudsters?

More specifically, does the Commission expect to move in the direction proposed by Parliament, so that these penalties amount to twice the potential profits arising from the fraud?

If penalties are not very high, it might be an incentive for certain operators to commit the fraud and repeat the offences. We would also ask that operators found guilty of fraud for a second time be taken permanently out of circulation.

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

On 6 May 2013, the European Commission issued a draft proposal for a regulation that would replace the current legislative framework on official controls ([1]), with the objective to strengthen the enforcement mechanisms of the agri-food chain legislation across Member States.

Among other things, the proposal would require that where financial penalties are used in relation to intentional violations of agri-food chain rules, in other words frauds, they would need to be at a level which is sufficiently dissuasive and offsets at least the economic gain expected by the perpetrator.

The exact amount of such penalties, and the measures to be taken in cases of repeat offenders will be a matter to be decided upon by each Member State.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/pressroom/docs/proposal-regulation-ep-council_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000406/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: Origine de la viande des plats préparés

La Commission accepte-t-elle la proposition du Parlement, votée en janvier 2014, tendant à ce que soit mentionnée très clairement l'origine de la viande dans les plats préparés? Cela évitera de se retrouver avec des viandes aux origines et à l'identité inconnues et de finalement manger n'importe quoi à l'aveugle.

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(26 février 2014)

La Commission est au fait de la résolution du Parlement européen du 14 janvier 2014 sur la crise alimentaire, la fraude dans la chaîne alimentaire et son contrôle, qui demande à la Commission de présenter des propositions législatives rendant obligatoire l'indication d'origine des viandes entrant dans la composition des plats préparés. Dans le domaine de l'alimentation, l'indication de l'origine n'est pas considérée comme un outil utile pour lutter contre la fraude. Il existe d'autres mécanismes qui permettent d'assurer la sécurité et la traçabilité des aliments.

La Commission a déjà adopté un rapport qui sera soumis au Parlement européen et au Conseil en ce qui concerne l'indication du pays d'origine ou de la provenance des viandes utilisées comme ingrédients alimentaires, comme cela est exigé par le règlement (UE) n° 1169/2011 concernant l'information des consommateurs sur les denrées alimentaires ([1]).

Le rapport contient notamment des données sur les attentes des consommateurs et sur la question de savoir s'ils sont disposés à payer pour obtenir des informations sur l'origine des viandes utilisées comme ingrédients alimentaires.

La Commission est d'avis que toute décision sur l'opportunité d'une proposition législative et, si cette voie est choisie, sur les paramètres à adopter, ne devrait être prise qu'une fois que le Conseil et le Parlement européen auront discuté la question en connaissance de cause, c'est–à–dire sur la base du rapport de la Commission.

([1]) JO L 304 du 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000406/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Origin of meat in processed foods

Does the Commission accept the parliamentary proposal, voted for in January 2014, for very clearly indicating the origin of meat in processed foods? This will avoid having meats of unknown origins and identity and ultimately eating just anything blindly.

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

The Commission is aware of the European Parliament resolution of 14 January 2014 on the food crisis, fraud in the food chain and the control thereof, which requests the Commission to present legislative proposals making the indication of the origin of meat in processed foods mandatory. In the area of food, origin labelling is not considered as a tool to combat fraud. There are other mechanisms in place to ensure the safety and the traceability of food.

The Commission already adopted a report for the European Parliament and the Council regarding the indication of the country of origin or place of provenance for meat used as an ingredient, as requested by Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on food information to consumers ([1]).

The report provides, *inter alia*, data on the consumers' expectations and their willingness to pay to get information on the origin of meat used as an ingredient.

The Commission is of the opinion that any decision on whether to proceed with a legislative proposal and if so, along which parameters, should only be made once an informed discussion on the basis of the report has taken place with the Council and the European Parliament.

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000407/14
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante
Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL)
(16 janvier 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Respect des normes humanitaires internationales dans les conflits armés

Un nombre croissant de conflits implique des acteurs armés non étatiques (AANE) sur lesquels les actions avec les États n'ont aucune prise. Les civils sont les premières victimes de ces nouvelles formes de guerre. Un certain nombre d'ONG, soucieuses d'assurer la protection de ces civils, ont décidé de s'engager directement auprès de ces acteurs armés non étatiques pour assurer la protection effective des civils.

1. Dans quelle mesure l'Union travaille-t-elle en collaboration avec ces ONG afin d'encourager les AANE à respecter les normes internationales en matière de droit humanitaire? Comment l'Union peut-elle soutenir ces ONG dans le dialogue qu'elles engagent avec les AANE, notamment pour promouvoir le respect des normes humanitaires internationales dans les conflits armés et les autres situations de violence, en particulier en ce qui concerne la protection des enfants et des femmes ou l'utilisation des mines anti-personnel, par exemple en Birmanie, en Colombie, en RDC et au Soudan?

2. Les acteurs humanitaires étant la cible d'attaques dans les conflits armés non internationaux, comme en Somalie, de quelle stratégie l'Union dispose-t-elle pour protéger ces acteurs?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Asthon, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(28 février 2014)

L'UE est un défenseur de premier plan du droit international humanitaire (DIH). Elle soutient moralement, politiquement et financièrement le travail accompli par les principales organisations dans le domaine du DIH telles que le CICR ou l'Appel de Genève.

De nos jours, les conflits non internationaux représentent la forme prédominante de conflit armé. Le principal défi, dans le domaine du droit international humanitaire, consiste aujourd'hui à assurer l'application de ce dernier, ainsi qu'à faire en sorte qu'il soit davantage respecté dans les situations de conflit armé, surtout lorsque des acteurs non étatiques sont impliqués.

Au cours de ces dernières années, la Commission a financé plusieurs projets visant à informer les acteurs étatiques et non étatiques en matière de DIH. Elle soutient actuellement deux projets de ce type, l'un mené par le CICR et l'autre par les organisations Swiss Mine Action et Appel de Genève. Le projet du CICR contribuera à renforcer les capacités du CICR à informer et à former au droit international humanitaire les forces militaires/de sécurité régulières et les acteurs armés non étatiques engagés dans des pays touchés par des conflits: l'Irak, la Colombie et la République démocratique du Congo. Dans le cadre du projet Swiss Mine Action/Appel de Genève, quatre formations au DIH seront prodiguées à des acteurs armés non étatiques engagés au Soudan.

Le personnel humanitaire est essentiel pour assurer l'accès à l'aide humanitaire et aux soins médicaux. Par conséquent, les États ont l'obligation immédiate et permanente de leur assurer une protection adéquate lors de périodes de conflit.

L'UE s'efforce de faire traduire en justice tous ceux qui sont responsables de crimes de guerre et de catastrophes humanitaires. Des situations comme celle que connaît la Somalie sont inacceptables et déplorables. La lutte contre l'impunité et la responsabilisation restent des défis majeurs.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000407/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Respect for international humanitarian standards in armed conflicts

A growing number of conflicts involve armed non-state actors (ANSAs) over whose actions the states have no control. Civilians are the main victims of these new forms of war. A number of NGOs, anxious to protect these civilians, have decided to engage directly with these armed non-state actors to secure the effective protection of civilians.

1. To what extent does the Union work in collaboration with the NGOs in order to encourage the ANSAs to abide by international standards in matters of humanitarian law? How can the Union support those NGOs in the dialogue into which they enter with the ANSAs, especially on promoting respect for international humanitarian standards in armed conflicts and other violent situations, with particular regard to the protection of women and children and the use of anti-personnel mines, for example in Burma, in Colombia, in the DR Congo and in Sudan?

2. Since humanitarian workers are the targets of attack in non-international armed conflicts, such as in Somalia, what strategy does the Union have to protect these workers?

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

The EU is a major advocate for international humanitarian law (IHL). The EU supports morally, politically and financially the work of leading organisations in the field of IHL, such as the ICRC or Geneva Call.

Non-international conflicts are the predominant form of armed conflict today. The key challenge in the field of IHL today is compliance, as well as to promote increased respect for IHL in situations of armed conflict, especially when non-state actors are involved.

In recent years, the Commission has funded several projects on dissemination of IHL to both state and non-state actors. The Commission is currently supporting two projects concerning IHL dissemination, one by the ICRC and the other by Swiss Mine Action/Geneva Call. The ICRC project will contribute to enhancing ICRC's capacity to provide IHL training and dissemination for regular military/security forces and armed non-state actors in conflict affected countries: Iraq, Colombia and DRC. Under the Swiss Mine Action/Geneva Call project, four trainings of armed non-state actors on IHL will take place in Sudan.

Humanitarian workers are essential for ensuring the availability of humanitarian assistance and medical care. States therefore have an immediate and continuous obligation to provide them with adequate protection during periods of conflict.

The EU strives to bring to justice all those held responsible for war crimes and humanitarian catastrophes. Situations like in Somalia are unacceptable and appalling. Combating impunity and accountability remains a major challenge.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000408/14
alla Commissione
Susy De Martini (ECR)
(16 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Chiarimenti in merito agli incontri e ai rapporti finanziari tra la Commissione e i gruppi di interesse durante la fase di preparazione della direttiva sui prodotti del tabacco

L'11 maggio 2011 la Commissione e il Parlamento europeo hanno adottato l'accordo istituzionale sulla creazione di un registro di trasparenza per le organizzazioni, le persone giuridiche e i lavoratori autonomi impegnati nell'elaborazione e nell'attuazione delle politiche dell'UE, istituendo un codice di condotta nei confronti di questi attori.

Durante le procedure di negoziazione della proposta della Commissione di revisione della direttiva sui prodotti del tabacco (COM(2012) 0788, del 19.12.2012), in seguito votata dal Parlamento europeo durante la seduta plenaria dell'8 ottobre 2013, si è avuta notizia del fatto che gli standard di trasparenza nei confronti della gestione degli incontri con gli attori interessati non sono stati rispettati.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. stante che gli incontri con i rappresentanti dell'industria del tabacco sono documentati e resi pubblici, se ritiene che si possa sostenere lo stesso anche per quanto riguarda gli incontri con le ONG antitabacco e i rappresentanti delle case farmaceutiche;

2. quali conseguenze sono previste per il mancato rispetto delle norme di trasparenza;

3. se ritiene che si possa affermare l'esistenza di una discriminazione nei confronti dell'industria del tabacco in merito all'accesso agli incontri con la Commissione stessa;

4. se è in grado di fornire maggiori dettagli in merito alle fonti di finanziamento delle ONG che si autodefiniscono sostenitrici della lotta antitabacco e che — alla luce delle informazioni in nostro possesso — sembrano ricevere sostegno finanziario non solo dalla Commissione stessa, ma anche da diverse industrie farmaceutiche;

5. se può fornire dati in merito al numero di incontri avvenuti tra la Commissione e gli attori dell'industria del tabacco nel periodo 2009-2013;

6. se può fornire dati in merito al numero di incontri avvenuti tra la Commissione e le industrie farmaceutiche nel periodo 2009-2013?

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

Il servizio della Commissione che ha il ruolo di punta nel controllo del tabacco, la Direzione Generale Salute e consumatori (DG SANCO) ha pubblicato ([1]) i verbali di tutte le riunioni intervenute a partire dal 2011 con l'industria del tabacco in merito alla revisione della direttiva sui prodotti del tabacco. Sullo stesso sito web figurano i verbali delle riunioni svolte con l'industria farmaceutica, coi fabbricanti di sigarette elettroniche e con le loro associazioni, sempre in merito alla revisione della direttiva. La DG SANCO ha inoltre pubblicato ([2]) i verbali di diverse riunioni condotte con le ONG sullo stesso argomento.

Non si dispone di un quadro completo delle riunioni tra l'industria del tabacco e altre industrie e i diversi servizi della Commissione europea. Il Segretariato generale della Commissione e il Servizio giuridico hanno fatto il quadro delle loro riunioni nell'ambito di recenti risposte a interrogazioni della commissione per il controllo dei bilanci del Parlamento europeo.

L'inadempienza al codice deontologico da parte delle persone iscritte nel registro di trasparenza può portare all'adozione di misure come la sospensione o la rimozione dal registro e il ritiro del passi che dà accesso al Parlamento europeo ([3]).

La Commissione ritiene che l'industria del tabacco non subisca discriminazioni per quanto concerne la possibilità di esprimere i propri punti di vista.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/tobacco/events/index_en.htm#anchor3
([2]) Ibidem.
([3]) Disposizione contenuta nell'articolo VI, paragrafo 18 dell'accordo tra il Parlamento europeo e la Commissione europea sull'istituzione di un registro di trasparenza per le organizzazioni e le persone che agiscono in qualità di indipendenti e che partecipano all'elaborazione e all'attuazione delle politiche dell'Unione europea (22.07.2011) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:191:0029:0038:EN:PDF

La Commissione non dispone di informazioni dettagliate che vadano al di là delle informazioni disponibili al pubblico per quanto concerne le fonti di finanziamento delle ONG che si dicono sostenitrici della lotta anti-tabacco. La rete europea per la prevenzione del fumo e del tabagismo (ENSP) e la Smoke Free Partnership (partenariato contro il fumo) hanno ricevuto un finanziamento di progetto dal secondo programma Salute dell'UE ([4]). L'ENSP ha anche ricevuto quattro sovvenzioni di funzionamento ([5]) a valere sullo stesso programma.

([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:301:0003:0013:EN:PDF
([5]) Nel 2012, 2011, 2009 e 2008. http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000408/14
to the Commission
Susy De Martini (ECR)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Explanations of the meetings and financial relations between the Commission and interest groups during the preparatory stage of the Tobacco Products Directive

On 11 May 2011 the European Commission and Parliament adopted the Interinstitutional Agreement on the establishment of a transparency register for organisations, legal persons and self-employed individuals engaged in EU policymaking and policy implementation, which instituted a code of conduct for such registrants.

During the negotiation proceedings on the Commission's proposed revision of the Tobacco Products Directive (COM(2012)0788, 19.12.2012), which was later passed by the European Parliament in plenary session on 8 October 2013, news emerged that the standards of transparency had not been observed in the handling of the meetings with the interest groups.

Can the Commission let us know:

1. While the meetings with representatives of the tobacco industry have been documented and made public, does it consider that the same can be said of the meetings with the NGOs against tobacco and the representatives of the pharmaceutical companies?

2. What consequences are provided for breach of the transparency standards?

3. Does it consider that discrimination can be alleged to exist in the tobacco industry's access to meetings with the Commission?

4. Can it supply further details of the sources of finance of the NGOs which define themselves as supporters of the campaign against tobacco and which — from information in our possession — seem to receive financial support not only from the Commission itself, but also from various companies in the pharmaceutical industry?

5. Can it supply data on the number of meetings held between the Commission and the representatives of the tobacco industry in the period 2009-2013?

6. Can it supply data on the number of meetings held between the Commission and the pharmaceutical industry in the period 2009-2013?

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

The lead Commission service for tobacco control, Directorate Health and Consumers (DG SANCO) has published ([1]) minutes of all meetings with the tobacco industry on the revision of the Tobacco Products Directive since 2011. The minutes of meetings held with the pharmaceutical industry, with manufacturers of e-cigarettes and their associations on the revision of the directive are also published on the same website. SANCO has in addition published ([2]) minutes of several meetings held with NGOs on the topic.

There is no full overview of meetings between tobacco and other industries and all the different services of the European Commission. The Commission's Secretariat General and Legal Service provided an overview of their meetings in recent replies to questions of the Committee on Budgetary Control of the European Parliament.

Non-compliance with the Code of Conduct by registrants in the Transparency Register may lead to measures such as suspension or removal from the Register and withdrawal of the badges affording access to the European Parliament ([3]).

The Commission considers that the tobacco industry is not discriminated against as regards possibilities to express its views.

The Commission has no details of the finance sources of NGOs who support tobacco control measures beyond public information. The European Network on Smoking Prevention (ENSP) and the Smoke Free Partnership received project funding from the second EU health programme ([4]). ENSP has also received four annual operating grants ([5]) under the Programme.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/tobacco/events/index_en.htm#anchor3
([2]) Ibid.
([3]) Provision of Article VI, paragraph 18 of the Agreement between the European Parliament and the European Commission on the establishment of a transparency register for organisations and self-employed individuals engaged in EU policy-making and policy implementation (22.07.2011) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:191:0029:0038:EN:PDF
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:301:0003:0013:EN:PDF
([5]) In 2012, 2011, 2009 and 2008. http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000409/14
do Komisji
Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)
(16 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Fundusze UE na budowę drogi ekspresowej S3 (z Legnicy do granicy polsko-czeskiej)

Na początku grudnia 2013 r. polski rząd podjął decyzję o realokacji funduszy w wysokości 4 mld PLN przeznaczonych na budowę drogi łączącej Legnicę z granicą polsko-czeską (drogi ekspresowej S3) w celu budowy dodatkowego odcinka obwodnicy Warszawy.

Jednym z głównych argumentów polskiego rządu był fakt, że Republika Czeska nie zbudowała odcinka drogi po swojej części granicy. Jednakże w pierwszym kwartale 2014 r. Republika Czeska ogłosi przetarg na budowę 50-kilometrowego odcinka tej drogi łączącego Republikę Czeską z Polską.

W polityce transportowej UE kładzie się nacisk na priorytetowe współfinansowanie projektów transgranicznych, w jaki więc sposób można usprawiedliwić przeniesienie finansowania unijnego z projektu międzynarodowego na krajowy?

Czy Komisji wiadomo o zmianach w planach budowy drogi ekspresowej S3?

Jakie środki Komisja podejmuje, aby zagwarantować, że polski rząd zainwestuje w budowę drogi ekspresowej S3 pomiędzy Legnicą a granicą z Republiką Czeską?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(28 lutego 2014 r.)

W zakresie, w jakim Komisja jest świadoma sytuacji dotyczącej drogi ekspresowej S3, odcinek drogi ekspresowej S3 łączący Legnicę i Lubawkę stanowi część wcześniej ustalonego projektu wymienionego w załączniku do rozporządzenia w sprawie instrumentu „Łącząc Europę" (CEF) ([1]) i w związku z tym kwalifikuje się do wsparcia dla odcinka transgranicznego między Nową Solą (PL) i Hradec Kralove (CZ). Projekty będące przedmiotem wspólnego zainteresowania dotyczące odcinka transgranicznego muszą zapewnić ciągłość między dwoma państwami członkowskimi, zgodnie z definicją odcinka transgranicznego. Ponadto, zgodnie z zasadami instrumentu „Łącząc Europę" (CEF), działania związane z transportem obejmujące odcinek transgraniczny lub część takiego odcinka kwalifikują się do wsparcia finansowego UE tylko, jeśli istnieje pisemne porozumienie między zainteresowanymi państwami członkowskimi dotyczące ukończenia odcinka transgranicznego. Istnieją pewne obawy dotyczące ewentualnego porozumienia między polskimi i czeskimi władzami w sprawie kontynuacji odcinka S3 po stronie czeskiej, który, jak przedstawiono powyżej, stanowi warunek współfinansowania instrumentu „Łącząc Europę" (CEF).

Jednym z głównych celów polityki transportowej UE jest zakończenie tworzenia korytarzy europejskich znajdujących się w sieci TEN-T w celu zwiększenia dostępności regionów Europy, podczas gdy instrument „Łącząc Europę" zwraca szczególną uwagę na odcinki transgraniczne. Wielokrotnie podczas nieformalnego dialogu w sprawie transportu w Polsce w latach 2014-2020 Komisja podkreśliła znaczenie optymalnego wykorzystania europejskich funduszy strukturalnych i inwestycyjnych w przyszłości, w szczególności w odniesieniu do koordynacji z instrumentem „Łącząc Europę".

([1]) Rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (UE) nr 1316/2013 z dnia 11 grudnia 2013 r. ustanawiające instrument „Łącząc Europę", zmieniające rozporządzenie (UE) nr 913/2010 oraz uchylające rozporządzenia (WE) nr 680/2007 i (WE) nr 67/2010, Dz.U. L 348 z 20.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000409/14
to the Commission
Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: EU funds for the S3 Express Road (Legnica to the Polish/Czech border)

At the beginning of December 2013, the Polish Government decided to reallocate the funding to the sum of PLN 4 billion earmarked for the road link between Legnica and the Polish/Czech border (the S3 Express road) in order to construct an additional section of the Warsaw bypass.

One of the main arguments of the Polish Government was that the Czech Republic had not constructed its part of the road on the Czech side of the border. However, in the first quarter of 2014, a 50-km stretch of this road connecting the Czech Republic with Poland will be put out to tender by the Czech Republic.

Taking into account that the EU's transport policy focuses on prioritising co-financing of cross-border projects, how can such a shift of EU funds from an international to a national project be justified?

Is the Commission aware of this development concerning the S3 Express Road?

What measures are being taken by the Commission to ensure that the Polish Government invests in the S3 Express Road between Legnica and the Czech border?

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

Insofar as the Commission is aware on the developments concerning the S3 express road, the section Legnica-Lubawka of S3 expressway is a section of the pre-identified project listed in the annex of the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) regulation ([1]) and would therefore be eligible for support for the cross-border section between Nowa Sol (PL) and Hradec Kralove (CZ). Projects of common interest concerning the cross-border section have to ensure continuity between the two Member States, according to the definition of the cross-border section. In addition, under CEF rules, transport-related actions involving a cross-border section or a part of such a section are eligible to receive EU funding only if there is a written agreement between the Member States concerned relating to the completion of the cross-border section. There are some concerns regarding a possible agreement between the Polish and Czech authorities as to the continuation of the S3 on the Czech side, which, as stated above, constitutes a condition for the CEF co-financing.

One of the main objectives of EU transport policy is to complete the European corridors situated on the TEN-T network in order to increase the accessibility of European regions, while the CEF places special attention on the cross-border sections. On several occasions during the informal dialogue on transport in Poland in 2014-2020, the Commission has underlined the importance of an optimal use of European Structural and Investment Funds in the future, in particular as regards coordination with the CEF.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility, amending Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 680/2007 and (EC) No 67/2010, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-000410/14
an die Kommission
Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(16. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: EU-Förderung der Rheintalbahn

Presseberichten zufolge plant die Kommission, den Anteil der EU-Zuschüsse an Verkehrsprojekten, die zu den europäischen zentralen Achsen gehören, zu erhöhen.

1. Entsprechen diese Berichte den Tatsachen?

2. Welche Projekte gehören derzeit zu den europäischen zentralen Achsen und mit wie viel Prozent werden sie von der EU bezuschusst?

3. Wird die Rheintalbahn in Südbaden bereits von der EU mit Zuschüssen gefördert? Wenn nein, wie beurteilt die Kommission die Möglichkeit für eine Förderung?

4. Wenn die Rheintalbahn bereits gefördert wird oder eine Förderung in Planung ist, wie viel Prozent werden die Zuschüsse der EU zu dem Projekt betragen?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(7. Februar 2014)

1. Die Kommission bestätigt, dass der Anteil der EU-Zuschüsse für die 9 vorrangigen Kernnetzkorridore im Güter- und Personenverkehr im Rahmen der Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ ([1]) erhöht wird.

2. Die Rheintalbahn verbindet die Städte Mannheim, Karlsruhe und Basel auf dem Schienenweg. Diese Verbindung ist integraler Bestandteil des Kernnetzkorridors Rheingebiet-Alpen und kommt daher für eine Kofinanzierung in Betracht.

Im Rahmen der Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ gelten folgende Höchstsätze für die Förderung von Eisenbahnprojekten:

— Studien: bis zu 50 % der Kosten;

— grenzüberschreitende Verbindungen: bis zu 40 %, Engpässe: bis zu 30 %, Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse: bis zu 20 % der Kosten;

— Verringerung der von Güterzügen ausgehenden Lärmbelastung: bis zu 20 % der Kosten;

— ERTMS: bis zu 50 % der Kosten.

3. In Südbaden wird das Vorhaben 2007-DE-24060-P „Ausbaustrecke / Neubaustrecke Karlsruhe — Basel“ im Rahmen des TEN-V-Programms kofinanziert. Dieses Projekt läuft derzeit und trägt zum Ausbau der Rheintalbahn zwischen Karlsruhe und Basel bei. Weitere Informationen finden sich über den folgenden Link:

http://inea.ec.europa.eu/en/ten-t/ten-t_projects/ten-t_projects_by_country/germany/2007-de-24060-p.htm

4. Der Kofinanzierungssatz für die Maßnahme 2007-DE-24060-P belief sich vom 1.1.2007 bis zum 31.12.2011 auf 9,71 %. Nach der Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen des Jahres 2012 wurde der Kofinanzierungssatz der EU für den Zeitraum vom 1.1.2012 bis zum 31.12.2015 auf 20 % angehoben. Die geschätzten Gesamtkosten der Maßnahme betragen 576 010 186 EUR, wobei sich der EU-TEN-V-Beitrag voraussichtlich auf 89 652 418 EUR belaufen wird.

Es ist nicht möglich, Prognosen hinsichtlich einer künftigen Förderung für die Rheintalbahn oder Südbaden abzugeben, da dies von den Anträgen im Rahmen der derzeitigen und künftigen Aufforderungen zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen und deren Ergebnissen abhängen wird.

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1316/2013 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 11. Dezember 2013 zur Schaffung der Fazilität „Connecting Europe“, zur Änderung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 913/2010 und zur Aufhebung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 680/2007 und (EG) Nr. 67/2010, ABl. L 348 vom 20.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000410/14
to the Commission
Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: EU funding for Rheintalbahn (Rhine Valley Railway)

According to press reports, the Commission is planning to increase the percentage of EU contributions to funding for transport projects along European central axes.

1. Is this correct?

2. Which projects currently form part of the European central axes and what percentage of funding is made up of EU subsidies?

3. Is the Südbaden section of the Rheintalbahn already receiving EU funding? If not, does the Commission consider that such funding could be granted?

4. If the Rheintalbahn is already receiving funding of if funding is being envisaged, what percentage of this is or will be made up of EU subsidies?

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

1. The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that the Connecting Europe Facility ([1]) provides for an increase in the percentage of EU contributions along the 9 priority Core Network Corridors that have been defined for transport of freight and passengers.

2. The Rheintalbahn, connects the cities of Mannheim–Karlsruhe and Basel by railway. This railway link is an integral part of the Core Network Corridor 'Rhine–Alpine' and is as such eligible for co-funding.

The Connecting Facility maximum funding rates for railway projects are the following:

— Studies: up to 50% of the costs

— Cross border links: up to 40% — bottlenecks: up to 30% — projects of common interest: up to 20%

— Reduction of rail freight noise: up to 20%

— ERTMS: up to 50%

3. Südbaden benefits from co-funding under the TEN-T Programme for Project 2007-DE-24060-P 'Ausbaustrecke/Neubaustrecke Karlsruhe–Basel'. This project is ongoing and supports the upgrade of the Rheintalbahn between Karlsruhe and Basel. More information can be found at:
http://inea.ec.europa.eu/en/ten-t/ten-t_projects/ten-t_projects_by_country/germany/2007-de-24060-p.htm

4. The co-funding rate for Action 2007-DE-24060-P was 9.71% from 1.1.2007-31.12.2011. Following the 2012 Call for Proposal, the EU co-funding rate was increased to 20% as from 1.1.2012 to 31.12.2015. The foreseen total cost of the Action is EUR 576 010 186, of which the EU TEN-T contribution is expected to amount to EUR 89 652 418.

It is not possible to forecast future funding for Rheintalbahn or Sudbaden as that will depend on the applications submitted in the framework of the current and future calls for proposals and on their outcome.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility, amending Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 680/2007 and (EC) No 67/2010, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000411/14
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(16 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Malnutrición

Desgraciadamente son frecuentes en los medios de comunicación de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea las noticias de niños malnutridos que van al colegio sin desayunar o de familias que tienen que alimentarse con los productos perecederos desechados por los supermercados, con el grave riesgo contra su salud que ello genera y la malnutrición que está produciendo en la sociedad, fenómeno especialmente agravado en colectivos tan vulnerables como son los jóvenes o las personas mayores.

Ante noticias como estas y la alarma social que generan,

1. ¿Se ha planteado la Comisión proponer o desarrollar legislación o recomendaciones a los Estados miembros, respecto a salud pública y gestión sanitaria?

2. ¿Va a desarrollar la Comisión algún tipo de campaña para sensibilizar sobre malnutrición o sobre salud pública con referencia a esta problemática?

3. ¿Qué plan de acción va a realizar la Comisión?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de febrero de 2014)

La Comisión Europea remite a Su Señoría a su pregunta escrita 013584/2013.

La Estrategia europea sobre problemas de salud relacionados con la alimentación, el sobrepeso y la obesidad de 2007 ([1]) promueve una alimentación equilibrada y estilos de vida activos para todos. La Estrategia fomenta el desarrollo de asociaciones orientadas a la actuación en las que participen los veintiocho Estados miembros de la UE (el Grupo de Alto Nivel sobre Alimentación y Actividad Física ([2])) y la sociedad civil (Plataforma Europea de Acción sobre Alimentación, Actividad Física y Salud ([3])).

En la evaluación de 2013 de la Estrategia ([4]) se propone un estudio minucioso de los efectos que pueden tener las posibles iniciativas sobre los grupos socioeconómicos más bajos.

La Comisión trabaja en cooperación con los Estados miembros para facilitar el acceso a alimentos saludables a precios asequibles. A través del plan de consumo de fruta en las escuelas de la UE ([5]), la Comisión contribuye a establecer unos hábitos alimentarios más saludables entre los niños en edad escolar.

La Comisión ha puesto en marcha tres proyectos piloto ([6]), de los cuales dos tienen por objeto aumentar el consumo de frutas y hortalizas frescas en las comunidades en las que la renta de los hogares sea inferior al 50 % de la media de la UE y uno tiene por finalidad promover una alimentación saludable entre los niños, las mujeres embarazadas y las personas mayores.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_es.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_es.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/pheiac_nutrition_strategy_evaluation_en.pdf
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_es.htm
([6]) SANCO/2011/C4/01, SANCO/2012/C4/02 y SANCO/2013/C4/02.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000411/14
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Malnutrition

All too often, the EU media is obliged to report stories of malnourished children going to school without breakfast, and families living off foodstuffs that have been discarded by supermarkets. This latter situation poses serious health risks, and malnutrition in general is a growing social problem. This situation is particularly serious for the more vulnerable segments of society, such as the young and the elderly.

In view of such media reporting and the ensuing public alarm:

1. Is the Commission considering legislation or recommendations for the Member States regarding public health or health management?

2. Will the Commission run any kind of campaign to raise awareness of malnutrition or public health, focusing on these types of problem?

3. What is the Commission's plan of action in this regard?

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

The European Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its written question 013584/2013.

The 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([1]) promotes a balanced diet and active lifestyles for all. The strategy encourages action-oriented partnerships involving the 28 EU Member States (High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity ([2])) and civil society (EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([3])).

The 2013 Evaluation of the strategy ([4]) suggested a careful consideration of the effects that any implemented initiatives have on lower socioeconomic groups.

In cooperation with the Member States, the Commission works on facilitating the access to and affordability of healthy food. Through the EU School Fruit Scheme ([5]), the Commission contributes to establishing healthier eating habits among school children.

The Commission has launched three pilot projects ([6]), of which two projects aim to increase consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables in communities where the household income is below 50% of the EU, and one aims to promote healthy diets among children, pregnant women and elderly.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/pheiac_nutrition_strategy_evaluation_en.pdf
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm
([6]) SANCO/2011/C4/01, SANCO/2012/C4/02 and SANCO/2013/C4/02.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000413/14
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(16 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Dique flotante de Navantia en la ría de Ferrol

En su respuesta a mi pregunta parlamentaria E-012588/2013 de 7 de noviembre de 2013, la Comisión señala que aún no ha recibido información sobre varios aspectos complejos en relación con la posible construcción por Navantia de un dique flotante en Ferrol.

¿Puede la Comisión especificar a qué aspectos complejos se refiere la información solicitada e identificar quién debe remitirla?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de marzo de 2014)

En lo que respecta a la consulta informal remitida por las autoridades españolas el 10 de julio de 2013 acerca de la construcción prevista por Navantia de un dique flotante en Ferrol, la Comisión recabó información complementaria, entre otras cosas sobre la financiación del proyecto y el nivel de rentabilidad para Navantia, la estructura jurídica del proyecto de construcción, una cuantificación pormenorizada de los fondos públicos necesarios y la información financiera (real y previsiones) de Navantia para los años 2012, 2013 y 2014.

La destinataria de la petición de información es la Representación Permanente de España. Incumbe a las autoridades españolas decidir qué entidad es la más adecuada para facilitar la información solicitada.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000413/14
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Navantia floating dock in the Ferrol estuary

In its response to my parliamentary Question E-012588/2013 of 7 November 2013, the Commission indicates that it has not yet received information on various complex issues in relation to Navantia's possible construction of a floating dock in the Ferrol estuary.

Can the Commission specify which complex issues the requested information relates to and identify who is meant to be presenting it?

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

With regard to the informal consultation sent by the Spanish authorities on 10 July 2013 on the planned construction by Navantia of a floating dock in Ferrol, the Commission requested additional information on *inter alia* the financing of the project and the level of profitability for Navantia, the legal structure of the construction project, a detailed quantification of the level of public financing required, as well as financial data (actual and forecasts) of Navantia for 2012, 2013 and 2014.

The information request is addressed to the Permanent Representation of Spain. It is for the Spanish authorities to decide which entity is best placed to provide the information requested.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000414/14
to the Commission
Phil Prendergast (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Contracts directly awarded due to timeline constraints and public procurement

Could the Commission indicate whether the decision by Irish Water to directly award contracts worth about EUR 50 million to external consultants, which the company claims would otherwise not be delivered on time, owing to technical reasons, falls under acceptable exemptions to the requirement to open such contracts to tenders, as provided for under applicable EU procurement legislation?

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

Article 40 of Directive 2004/17/EC on procurement in the utilities sector provides for the possibility of awarding contracts directly 'insofar as is strictly necessary when, for reasons of extreme urgency brought about by events unforeseeable by the contracting entities, the time limits laid down for open procedures, restricted procedures and negotiated procedures with a prior call for competition cannot be adhered to'.

Therefore, in principle, it is possible to award contracts directly based on a situation of 'extreme urgency', provided that the conditions of the directive have been met. This must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The Commission departments have not received any complaint concerning the abovementioned procedure. On the other hand, facts presented by the Honourable Member do not allow to conclude if the rules concerning the award of the public procurement contract at stake have been respected or not.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000415/14
to the Commission
Phil Prendergast (S&D)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Extension of contracts to subsidiary companies and public procurement

Could the Commission clarify the circumstances under which a subsidiary of a publicly owned company can directly contract external consultant services on the grounds that it is merely extending currently existing contracts between such consultants and its parent company, further to competitive tender procedures?

Could the Commission further indicate whether there is a maximum threshold in contract values for such extension purposes?

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

In order to assess whether EU public procurement rules would potentially apply, it would first need to be established whether the (parent) publicly owned company is itself a 'contracting authority' within the meaning of Directive 2004/18/EC ([1]) or, possibly, a 'contracting entity' within the meaning of Directive 2004/17/EC ([2]); and then, whether the subsidiary is itself a contracting authority or a contracting entity. Unfortunately, the information provided by the Honourable Member is not sufficient to carry out this assessment.

Should the subsidiary be a contracting authority or a contracting entity, then the starting point would be that the Public Procurement Directives would be applicable where the contract would have an estimated value net of VAT of at least EUR 207 000, if a contracting authority, and EUR 414 000 if a contracting entity.

The directives allow under certain conditions to apply a negotiated procedure without a call for competition or to extend an existing contract without new call for tender (for instance, if the extensions are explicitly provided for in sufficiently clear option clauses in the original contracts). Again, the information provided is unfortunately not specific enough to assess whether any of these conditions are met in the case referred to by the Honourable Member.

([1]) 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, OJ L 134, 30.4.2004, p. 114.

([2]) Directive 2004/17/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 coordinating the procurement procedures of entities operating in the water, energy, transport and postal services sectors, OJ L 134, 30.4.2004, p. 1.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000419/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(16 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: L'approccio «diadico» per aiutare i bimbi autistici

Una recente ricerca scientifica israeliana del Milman Center di Haifa ha come obiettivo sperimentale la «mente binoculare» nella cura dell'autismo. La «terapia diadica» consiste nel creare una nuova entità composta da genitore-bambino e terapeuta-paziente per «evolvere» in sinergia. Come ha spiegato Ayelet Erez, la ricerca indaga da tempo sui misteriosi sintomi del disturbo autistico, intrecciando lo studio dello sviluppo infantile e le teorie relative al disturbo dello spettro autistico all'esperienza clinica. Ne è derivata una nuova comprensione dei fattori alla base del disturbo e del loro potenziale di cambiamento non lineare all'interno di una terapia innovativa.

Questa terapia è stata eseguita anche in una clinica specializzata italiana, dove sono seguiti 245 bambini autistici (199 maschi e 46 femmine) tra i 2 e i 17 anni, 152 dei quali presentavano sintomi gravi. I soggetti sono tutti migliorati progressivamente, sia i minori di 5 anni che i bambini più grandi. I bambini minori di 5 anni, oltre a migliorare già nel primo ciclo di terapia (2 anni), hanno anche cambiato diagnosi passando dalla condizione di autismo a quella di spettro autistico. Per i secondi (maggiori di 5 anni), invece, miglioramenti nella terapia sono stati riscontrati in modo significativo a lungo termine, ovvero dopo 4 anni. Considerato che l'attuale problema nelle Linee guida sono i risultati a lungo termine, è significativo poter vedere risultati dopo 4 anni.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se intende acquisire e valutare i risultati di tale studio e fornire raccomandazioni su possibili revisioni delle relative Linee guida?

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

L'approccio diadico nel trattamento dei bambini affetti da disturbi dello spettro autistico (Autistic Spectrum Disorders — ASD) è una tecnica ben nota tra i possibili interventi psicosociali sui bambini affetti da ASD.

Diverse iniziative condotte in Europa hanno studiato i processi diadici o di sviluppo interattivo cui partecipano i fratelli a rischio e le loro madri che interagiscono assieme. Un esempio ne è l'European Concerted Research Action Enhancing the scientific study of early autism ([1]) (Ricerca concertata europea che promuove lo studio scientifico dell'autismo precoce), finanziato dal programma di cooperazione europea in campo scientifico e tecnologico, nonché il progetto Sistema europeo di informazione sull'autismo finanziato dal programma Salute.

La Commissione europea non ha ricevuto nessun mandato dagli Stati membri per sviluppare linee guida legate al trattamento del ASD nelle fasi precoci.

([1]) http://www.cost-essea.com/cost-mem.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000419/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: The 'dyadic' approach to help children with autism

A recent scientific research study was conducted at the Milman Center in Haifa, Israel with the aim of investigating the 'binocular mind' in the treatment of autism. 'Dyadic therapy' involves the creation of a new entity composed of parent-child and therapist-patient to enable synergistic development. As Ayelet Erez explained, the study has long been investigating the mysterious symptoms of autistic disorder, combining the study of child development and theories relating to autistic spectrum disorder with clinical experience. This has resulted in a new understanding of factors underlying the disorder and their potential for nonlinear change within an innovative therapeutic model.

This therapy was also performed in a specialised Italian clinic and followed 245 autistic children (199 boys and 46 girls) between the ages of 2 and 17, 152 of whom had severe symptoms. All of the subjects improved progressively: both the under-fives and the older children. In addition to showing an initial improvement in the first therapy cycle (two years), the diagnosis of the under-fives was also downgraded from a condition of autism to that of an autistic spectrum disorder. For the latter (over-fives), on the other hand, the therapy brought significant improvements in the long term, i.e. after four years. Given that long-term results are the current problem according to the Guidelines, being able to see results after four years is a significant achievement.

Given the above, does the Commission intend to acquire and evaluate the results of this study and issue recommendations regarding possible revisions of the relevant Guidelines?

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

The dyadic approach in the treatment of children suffering from Autistic Spectrum Disorders (ASD) is a well-known technique, among the possible psychosocial interventions for children suffering from ASD.

Several European actions have studied the dyadic or interactional developmental processes including siblings at risk and their mother interacting together. This has been the case in the European Concerted Research Action Enhancing the scientific study of early autism ([1]), funded by the *European Cooperation* in Science and Technology *programme,* as well as in the project European Autism Information System funded by the Health Programme.

The European Commission has not received any mandate from Member States to develop guidelines related to the treatment of ASD in early stages.

([1]) http://www.cost-essea.com/cost-mem.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000420/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(16 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Tumore alle ovaie: scoperte le cause dello sviluppo di metastasi

Una ricerca recentemente pubblicata sulla rivista Nature Communications, coordinata dall'Istituto di ricerche farmacologiche Mario Negri in collaborazione con un gruppo di ricercatori americani, ha rilevato come una molecola, denominata mir-181a, sembra essere estremamente importante nel guidare i meccanismi di proliferazione delle metastasi del tumore alle ovaie e di resistenza ai farmaci antitumorali.

Secondo i risultati dello studio, la presenza di elevati livelli della molecola mir-181a nel sangue delle pazienti con un carcinoma epiteliale ovarico (la forma più comune di tumore delle ovaie, circa il 90 % dei casi) può essere un importante biomarcatore sia perché favorisce la crescita della malattia sia perché in grado di predire una resistenza della neoplasia alla chemioterapia. Osservando l'espressione di questa molecola in 80 campioni tumorali prelevati da pazienti si può osservare che è presente soprattutto nelle donne che hanno una recidiva entro i primi sei mesi dopo il trattamento chemioterapico. Questa informazione può quindi aiutare a scegliere meglio la terapia da prescrivere e migliorare i tassi di sopravvivenza.

Bloccando questa molecola si invertono molte delle caratteristiche di malignità e di resistenza delle cellule tumorali. È la prima volta che viene dimostrato che un singolo miRNA allunga la vita delle cellule maligne la loro resistenza alle cure e favorisce lo sviluppo di metastasi tumorali, attivando un potente segnale di comunicazione fra le cellule cancerose.

Può la Commissione far sapere se intende acquisire e valutare i risultati di tale studio e se prevede di investire nello sviluppo delle innovazioni in tale campo?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(21 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio pubblicato sulla rivista Nature Communications cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato ([1]).

I risultati di detto studio indicano che la molecola miR-181A, una piccola molecola di RNA non codificante, svolge un ruolo importante per la proliferazione delle cellule tumorali in caso di tumore ovarico in condizioni sperimentali.

Per scelta politica, la Commissione non valuta i risultati di progetti di ricerca individuali che non riguardino direttamente la sua attività di finanziamento.

Orizzonte 2020, il programma dell'UE per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020) ([2]), offrirà opportunità di finanziamento alla ricerca nel settore del tumore alle ovaie, compresa la ricerca sullo screening, la diagnosi precoce e le cure, grazie al finanziamento destinato all'obiettivo «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere», contenuto nella priorità «Sfide per la società». Le informazioni sulle attuali possibilità di finanziamento possono essere ottenute attraverso il portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione ([3]).

([1]) Parik et al. (2014) Nature Communications 5:2977 | DOI: 10.1038/ncomms3977.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:IT:PDF
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000420/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Ovarian cancer: causes of metastatic development revealed

A study recently published in the journal Nature Communications, coordinated by the Mario Negri Institute of Pharmacological Research in cooperation with a group of US researchers, found that a molecule, known as mir-181a, appears to be extremely important in guiding mechanisms of ovarian cancer metastatic proliferation and anticancer-drug resistance.

According to the study results, the presence of high levels of the molecule mir-181a in the blood of patients with epithelial ovarian cancer (the most common form of ovarian cancer, about 90% of cases) may be an important biomarker because it promotes disease growth and is also able to predict tumour resistance to chemotherapy. Observing the expression of this molecule in 80 tumour samples taken from patients revealed that it is mainly present in women who have a relapse within the first six months after chemotherapy treatment. This information can then help to make the best choice of treatment to be prescribed and improve survival rates.

Blocking this molecule reverses many of the malignant and resistant traits exhibited by cancer cells. This is the first time that a single micro RNA has been shown to extend the life of malignant cells and their resistance to treatment as well as promote the development of cancer metastasis by activating a powerful communication signal between the cancer cells.

Can the Commission say whether it intends to acquire and evaluate the results of this study and whether it plans to invest in the development of innovations in this field?

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

The Commission is aware of the study published in the journal 'Nature Communications' referred to by the Honourable Member ([1]).

The results of this study suggest that miR-181a, a small non-coding RNA molecule, plays an important role in the invasive capacity of ovarian cancer cell lines under experimental conditions.

As a matter of policy, the Commission does not assess the results of individual research projects that do not relate directly to its funding activities.

Horizon 2020, the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([2]), will offer opportunities to address research on ovarian cancer, including research on screening, early diagnosis and treatment, through the 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the EC Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([3]).

([1]) Parik et al. (2014) Nature Communications 5:2977 | DOI: 10.1038/ncomms3977.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:EN:PDF
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000421/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(16 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Tumore al polmone, un esame del sangue e TAC per diagnosi precoce

Una ricerca recentemente pubblicata sulla rivista Journal of Clinical Oncology, coordinata dall'Istituto nazionale dei tumori (Int) di Milano, ha portato alla scoperta di una strategia efficace per diagnosticare il tumore al polmone in fase iniziale. L'utilità della Tac spirale per ridurre la mortalità dal cancro polmonare nelle persone considerate più a rischio di ammalarsi è risaputa. Da tutte le ricerche è emerso che in una persona su quattro che si sottopone all'esame viene riscontrato un nodulo polmonare, ma il 96 % dei noduli, dopo ulteriori accertamenti, si rivela non essere un tumore. Questo comporta ansia e stress per gli interessati, costi per il Sistema sanitario nazionale, legati alle successive verifiche e ai potenziali interventi «inutili» (come biopsie o asportazioni dei noduli di dubbia natura), nonché l'eccessiva esposizione dei pazienti alle radiazioni (per quanto di basso dosaggio) dalla Tac spirale, che in caso di esito positivo viene solitamente ripetuta nell'arco di alcuni mesi.

Lo studio si è occupato di ricercare biomarcatori che potessero essere in grado di scoprire le prime tracce della malattia quando ancora non sono visibili alla Tac, individuando 24 microRNA che sono in grado di indicare nei fumatori non solo la presenza di un tumore in fase molto iniziale, ma anche la sua prognosi. Il test dei microRNA ha dimostrato una sensibilità dell'87 % nell'identificare il tumore al polmone. La Tac spirale da sola non è in grado di differenziare o distinguere tra le forme tumorali che non si evolvono e quelle aggressive. Combinandola al test microRNA, invece, l'efficacia è notevole in quanto si riducono dell'80 % i falsi positivi mentre nessuno dei partecipanti alla sperimentazione risultato negativo ai test si è poi ammalato.

Poiché con 38mila nuove diagnosi ogni anno in Italia il carcinoma polmonare è il secondo tumore più frequente negli uomini, dopo quello alla prostata, e nelle donne, dopo quello al seno, dovuto nel 90 % dei casi al fumo attivo o passivo, può la Commissione far sapere se intende acquisire e valutare i risultati di tale studio e se prevede di investire nello sviluppo delle innovazioni in tale campo?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(19 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio pubblicato sulla rivista *Journal of Clinical Oncology* al quale si riferisce l'onorevole deputato ([1]), ([2]).

I risultati dello studio di validazione condotto indicano che la performance diagnostica non-invasiva di un classificatore di firma di espressione di microRNA plasmatico (MSC) ha valore predittivo, diagnostico e prognostico e potrebbe ridurre il tasso di falsi positivi della tomografia computerizzata, migliorando così l'efficacia dello screening del carcinoma del polmone.

Di regola, la Commissione valuta esclusivamente progetti di ricerca individuali direttamente collegati alle sue attività di finanziamento.

Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro dell'UE per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020) ([3]), consentirà di promuovere la ricerca sul tumore al polmone, nonché la ricerca sullo screening e sulla diagnosi precoce grazie al finanziamento destinato all'obiettivo «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere», contenuto nella priorità «Sfide per la società». È possibile accedere alle informazioni relative alle attuali opportunità di finanziamento attraverso il portale dedicato ai partecipanti ai programmi di ricerca e innovazione ([4]).

([1]) Sozzi et al. JCO 2014 doi: 10.1200/JCO.2013.50.4357.
([2]) Test for early diagnosis of lung cancer subject of new journal of clinical oncology paper' medical news today, 15 gennaio 2014, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/releases/271204.php
([3]) COM(2011) 809 del 30.11.2011.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000421/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(16 January 2014)

Subject: Lung cancer, a blood test and CT scan for early diagnosis

A study recently published in the Journal of Clinical Oncology, coordinated by the National Cancer Institute (INT) of Milan, led to the discovery of an effective strategy for diagnosing lung cancer at an early stage. The usefulness of spiral CT in reducing mortality from lung cancer in people considered most at risk of succumbing to the disease is known. All the research has revealed that a pulmonary nodule is found in one in four people who undergo the examination, but 96% of the nodules do not turn out to be cancer after further investigation. This leads to anxiety and stress for those involved, as well as costs for the national health system deriving from the subsequent verification and potential 'pointless' interventions (such as biopsies or removal of nodules of dubious nature). Patients are also excessively exposed to radiation (however low the dosage may be) from the spiral CT, which is usually repeated within a few months in the event of a positive result.

The study involved searching for biomarkers that might be able to reveal the first traces of the disease even when they are still not visible on a CT scan, identifying 24 micro RNAs that are able to indicate in smokers the presence of a tumour at its very early stages as well as its prognosis. The micro RNA test demonstrated a sensitivity of 87% in identifying lung cancer. A spiral CT alone is not able to differentiate or distinguish between cancers that do not develop and aggressive forms. The effectiveness of adding a micro RNA test is, however, remarkable since it reduces false positives by 80% while none of the trial participants who tested negative went on to develop the disease.

Given that, with 38 000 new diagnoses each year in Italy, lung cancer is the second most common cancer in men after prostate cancer, and in women after breast cancer, and is caused by active or passive smoking in 90% of cases, can the Commission indicate whether it intends to acquire and evaluate the results of this study and whether it plans to invest in the development of innovations in this field?

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

The Commission is aware of the study referred to by the Honourable Member that was published in the Journal of Clinical Oncology ([1]), ([2]).

The results of this validation study show that a non-invasive MSC (miRNA Signature Classifier) test based on plasma microRNA biomarkers has predictive, diagnostic, and prognostic value and could reduce the false-positive rate for lung cancer screening based on computer tomography, improving the efficacy of lung cancer screening.

As a matter of policy, the Commission does not judge individual research projects that do not directly relate to its funding activities.

Horizon 2020, the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), ([3]) will provide opportunities to address research on lung cancer, including research on screening and early diagnosis, through the 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([4]).

([1]) Sozzi et al. JCO 2014 doi: 10.1200/JCO.2013.50.4357.
([2]) Test for early diagnosis of lung cancer subject of new journal of clinical oncology paper' medical news today, 15 January 2014, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/releases/271204.php
([3]) COM(2011) 809, 30.11.2011.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000530/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(21 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Κρίση της Επιτροπής για το διακανονισμό ΟΛΠ-COSCO

Σε συνέχεια της ερώτησής μου E-010159/2013 σχετικά με τον φιλικό διακανονισμό μεταξύ της θυγατρικής εταιρίας της Cosco Ltd «Σταθμός Εμπορευματοκιβωτίων Πειραιά ΑΕ» (ΣΕΠ) και του Οργανισμού Λιμένος Πειραιώς (ΟΛΠ) και, δεδομένου ότι πρόσφατα δημοσιεύματα στην Ελλάδα αναφέρουν πως η Επιτροπή απέρριψε τον διακανονισμό, θεωρώντας πως η έγκρισή του και η εφαρμογή του θα προσέδιδε «δεσπόζουσα θέση» στην εταιρία Cosco στο λιμάνι του Πειραιά,

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί να επιβεβαιώσει ή να διαψεύσει τα εν λόγω δημοσιεύματα;

2. Μπορεί να αναλύσει το νομικό συλλογισμό της όποιας απόφασης έχει λάβει;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Μαρτίου 2014)

Διεξάχθηκαν συζητήσεις μεταξύ των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής και των ελληνικών αρχών σχετικά με το θέμα της ενδεχόμενης τροποποίησης του διακανονισμού μεταξύ ΣΕΠ και ΟΛΠ. Πάντως, μέχρι στιγμής, δεν έχει ληφθεί καμία απόφαση σχετικά με τη συμβατότητα της τροποποίησης αυτής προς το κοινοτικό δίκαιο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000530/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Commission decision on the arrangement between the PPA and COSCO

Further to my Question E-010159/2013 on the friendly arrangement between the Cosco subsidiary Piraeus Container Terminal SA (PCT) and the Piraeus Port Authority (PPA) and in view of recent reports in Greece that the Commission has rejected the arrangement, believing that the adoption and implementation thereof would give Cosco a 'dominant position' in the port of Piraeus, will the Commission say:

1. Can it confirm or deny these reports?

2. Can it analyse the legal reasoning behind whatever decision it has taken?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(5 mars 2014)

Des discussions ont eu lieu entre les services de la Commission et les autorités Grecques au sujet de la modification éventuelle de la concession entre PCT et PPA. Toutefois, à ce stade, aucune décision définitive n'a été prise sur la compatibilité de cette modification avec le droit communautaire.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000537/14
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(21 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Attività venatoria in Italia in contrasto con la direttiva «Uccelli» 2009/147/CE e conseguenti minacce alla fauna selvatica

Con riferimento alle interrogazioni E-007486/2012, P-007639/2012 e, in particolare, all'interrogazione P-010258/2013 del 12.9.2013 e alla risposta della Commissione P-010258/2013 del 15.10.2013 lo scrivente invia documentazione idonea a dimostrare la sussistenza di gravi minacce alla conservazione degli uccelli selvatici in Italia a causa dell'attività di caccia esercitata in violazione: a) della direttiva «Uccelli» 2009/147/CE; b) delle interpretazioni vincolanti da parte della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea ([1]); c) della Guida alla disciplina della caccia della Commissione europea. Trasmette a tal fine i calendari venatori 2013-2014 ([2]) adottati dalle regioni italiane, da cui risultano diffusamente disattese, in assenza di adeguata motivazione, le indicazioni indirizzate alle regioni italiane dall'ISPRA ([3]), Istituto cui la stessa Commissione europea ha riconosciuto funzioni di indirizzo scientifico uniforme a livello nazionale al fine di garantire la corretta e omogenea applicazione delle norme dell'Unione ([4]). Le indicazioni fornite dall'ISPRA sono il frutto di precise valutazioni effettuate in considerazione dell'incrocio tra i dati contenuti nei «Key Concepts of article 7(4) of Directive 79/409/CE», le sentenze della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea in materia di attività venatoria, le indicazioni contenute nella relativa Guida della Commissione europea e i nuovi dati valutati dall'ISPRA ([5]). A titolo di esempio: a) il tordo bottaccio è cacciato sino al 30 gennaio in Liguria, Toscana, Marche, Umbria e Calabria, nonostante l'ISPRA richieda la chiusura della caccia il 10 gennaio e i Key Concepts identifichino l'inizio della migrazione prenuziale nella prima decade di gennaio; b) la beccaccia è cacciata sino al 30 gennaio in Friuli, Umbria e Sicilia, nonostante l'ISPRA richieda la chiusura della caccia il 31 dicembre e i Key Concepts identifichino l'inizio della migrazione prenuziale nella prima decade di gennaio; c) la cesena è cacciata sino al 30 gennaio in Toscana e in Veneto, nonostante l'ISPRA richieda la chiusura della caccia il 10 gennaio e i Key Concepts identifichino l'inizio della migrazione prenuziale nella seconda decade di gennaio.

Può la Commissione riferire:

1. se sia al corrente della pratica di molte regioni italiane di disattendere: a) i Key Concepts della Commissione, b) i pareri tecnico-scientifici dell'ISPRA;

2. come intenda procedere per garantire la conservazione degli uccelli migratori in Italia, anche in considerazione di quanto esposto dettagliatamente sull'argomento da parte delle associazioni ENPA, LAC, LAV, Legambiente, LIPU-Birdlife Italia e WWF Italia con lettera del 20.11.2013 indirizzata al commissario per l'Ambiente Janez Potočnik.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(3 marzo 2014)

Il documento «Key Concepts of Article 7(4) of the Birds Directive (2009/147/CE ([6]))» è stato elaborato sulla base dei migliori dati scientifici disponibili, forniti dagli Stati membri, riguardo l'inizio e la fine dei periodi di riproduzione e di migrazione prenuziale di tutti i volatili cacciabili nell'UE.

La Commissione chiederà alle autorità italiane di fornire ulteriori informazioni per chiarire eventuali incongruenze tra il termine di chiusura della caccia per tordo bottaccio, beccaccia e cesena in alcune regioni italiane e le date indicate nel documento Key Concepts. Dopo aver valutato a fondo le informazioni fornite, la Commissione deciderà i provvedimenti appropriati.

([1]) Sentenza del 17 gennaio 1991, Commissione/Italia, causa C-157/89, Racc. 1991, pag. I-00057, punto 14.
([2]) Reperibili al link: http://www.andreazanoni.it/it/documenti/.
([3]) Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale. Pareri al link: http://www.andreazanoni.it/it/documenti/.
([4]) Si veda la risposta n. E-011510/2011 della Commissione ad interrogazione dello scrivente.
([5]) Ad esempio: Spina F. e Volponi S., Atlante della migrazione degli Uccelli in Italia, 2008. Consultabile al link: http://www.isprambiente.gov.it/it/pubblicazioni/pubblicazioni-di-pregio/atlante-della-migrazione-degli-uccelli-in-italia.
([6]) GU L 20 del 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000537/14
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Hunting in Italy in breach of the 2009/147/EC 'Birds' Directive and the consequent threats to wild fauna

With reference to Questions E-007486/2012, P-007639/2012 and in particular Question P-010258/2013 of 12.9.2013 and the Commission's answer P-010258/2013 of 15.10.2013, the undersigned is submitting documentation demonstrating the existence of serious threats to the conservation of wild birds in Italy as a result of hunting in breach of: a) the 'Birds' Directive 2009/147/EC; b) binding interpretations of the European Union Court of Justice ([1]); c) the European Commission's Guide to hunting regulations. For this purpose, the undersigned is providing data on the hunting seasons for 2013-2014 ([2]) applied in the Italian Regions, which reveal a widespread disregard, without adequate reason, for the guidelines laid down for the Italian regions by the ISPRA ([3]), a body which the European Commission has vested with functions of uniform scientific guidance at national level in the interests of the proper and consistent application of the rules of the Union ([4]). The guidelines issued by the ISPRA are the outcome of precise assessments made on the basis of the cross-referencing of data contained in the 'Key Concepts of Article 7(4) of Directive 79/409/EC', Judgments of the European Union Court of Justice concerning hunting, guidelines contained in the European Commission's Guide to hunting and new data evaluated by the ISPRA ([5]). For example: a) the song thrush is hunted up to 30 January in Liguria, Tuscany, the Marches, Umbria and Calabria although the ISPRA requires the hunting season to end on 10 January and the Key Concepts identify the start of prenuptial migration as occurring in the first 10 days of January; b) the woodcock is hunted up to 30 January in Friuli, Umbria and Sicily although the ISPRA requires the hunting season to end on 31 December and the Key Concepts identify the start of prenuptial migration as occurring in the first 10 days of January; c) the fieldfare is hunted up to 30 January in Tuscany and Veneto although the ISPRA requires the hunting season to end on 10 January and the Key Concepts identify the start of prenuptial migration as occurring in the second 10 days of January.

Can the Commission state:

1. Whether it is aware of the practice of many Italian regions to disregard: a) the Commission's Key Concepts, b) the ISPRA's technical/scientific opinions;

2. how it intends to proceed to ensure the conservation of migratory birds in Italy in consideration of detailed submissions on this matter by the following organisations: ENPA [Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals], LAC [Anti-Hunting League], LAV [Antivivisection League], Legambiente [League for the Environment], LIPU [Italian Society for the Protection of Birds]-Birdlife Italia and WWF Italy, in a letter to the Commissioner for the Environment, Janez Potočnik, dated 20.11.2013?

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

The document on 'Key Concepts of Article 7(4) of the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC ([6]))' was prepared on the basis of the best available scientific data, as provided by Member States, regarding the start and the end of the reproduction and pre-nuptial migration periods of all huntable birds in the EU.

The Commission will ask the Italian authorities for more information to clarify the possible inconsistency between the ending dates for hunting Song Thrush, Eurasian Woodcock and Fieldfare in certain Italian regions and the dates indicated in the Key Concepts document. After careful assessment of their reply, the Commission will decide on the appropriate course of action.

([1]) Judgment of 17 January 1991, Commission/Italy, Case C-157/89, Compilation 1991, page I-00057, Section 14.
([2]) Accessible on the following link: http://www.andreazanoni.it/it/documenti/
([3]) Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale [Higher Institute for Environmental Protection and Research]. Opinions on the following link: http://www.andreazanoni.it/it/documenti/
([4]) See the Commission's Answer no. E-011510/2011 to the Question posed by the undersigned.
([5]) For example: Spina F. and Volponi S., Atlante della migrazione degli Uccelli in Italia [Migration Atlas for Birds in Italy], 2008. Accessible on the following link: http://www.isprambiente.gov.it/it/pubblicazioni/pubblicazioni-di-pregio/atlante-della-migrazione-degli-uccelli-in-italia
([6]) OJ L 020, 26.1.2010.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-000544/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: El Gobierno español obliga a cerrar Catalunya Ràdio en Valencia — Aplicación de la Directiva 2010/13/UE y respeto de la libertad y el pluralismo de los medios de comunicación

Catalunya Ràdio y Catalunya Informació dejarán de escucharse hoy en la Comunidad Valenciana, después de 25 años, por una decisión del Gobierno central español. Tras el cierre de TV3, las emisiones de la radio pública catalana se mantenían a través de la red de repetidores de Acció Cultural del País Valencià. Pero el viernes pasado, dicha entidad recibió una comunicación del Gobierno español que la obligaba a poner fin a las emisiones y le anunciaba dos multas por un millón de euros, que, probablemente, se aplicarán incluso aunque cesen las emisiones ([1]).

Por primera vez, el Ministerio de Industria español, a través de la Secretaría de Estado de Telecomunicaciones y para la Sociedad de la Información, pretende castigar no solo las emisiones, sino la propiedad y la existencia de torres de repetidores de la emisión «sin autorización». Según el Ministerio de Industria, esta actuación se hace a raíz de la denuncia de un grupo llamado «Círculo Cívico Valenciano» ([2]).

Uno de los objetivos de la Directiva 2010/13/UE sobre servicios de comunicación audiovisual es el respeto a la diversidad cultural y lingüística en los medios de comunicación.

Teniendo en cuenta que la libertad y el pluralismo de los medios de comunicación constituyen valores en los que se fundamenta la Directiva sobre los servicios de los medios de comunicación audiovisuales y que la Comisión concede especial importancia a la función del sistema dual de organismos de radiodifusión públicos y comerciales, que preserva el pluralismo de los medios de comunicación y fomenta los valores europeos:

¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento de estos hechos?

¿Cree la Comisión que esta decisión pone en peligro la calidad y la diversidad de la oferta audiovisual en la Comunidad Valenciana tal y como se conciben en la Directiva?

¿Cree la Comisión que, tras el cierre de Cataluña Radio, los ciudadanos valencianos tendrán acceso a suficientes contenidos televisivos y radiofónicos para informarse debidamente sobre lo que acontece en su comunidad?

¿Piensa la Comisión pedir información al Gobierno español sobre este cierre?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de febrero de 2014)

La Comisión ha seguido la evolución de los acontecimientos ligados al cierre de Catalunya Ràdio y Catalunya Informació. No le quepa duda de que la Comisión concede una importancia especial a la función del sistema dual de organismos de radiodifusión públicos y comerciales, que preserva el pluralismo de los medios de comunicación y fomenta los valores europeos en todas las circunstancias económicas.

Ahora bien, no puede cuestionar la potestad de un gobierno para tomar decisiones sobre su servicio público de radiodifusión, ni siquiera cuando tales decisiones repercuten en la información disponible en una lengua específica. De hecho, con arreglo al Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea, el uso de lenguas mayoritarias y minoritarias en los Estados miembros sigue siendo una competencia nacional bajo la exclusiva responsabilidad de cada Estado miembro. Si bien la libertad y el pluralismo de los medios de comunicación son, en efecto, valores en los que se fundamenta la Directiva sobre los servicios de los medios de comunicación audiovisuales, la Comisión no puede pronunciarse sobre los efectos de la decisión de cerrar un organismo público de radiodifusión, ya que el Tratado establece con claridad que la gobernanza y las decisiones estratégicas sobre el servicio público de radiodifusión incumben a los Estados miembros. La libertad y el pluralismo de los medios de comunicación figuran entre las bases esenciales de nuestras sociedades democráticas consagradas en la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales, pero las disposiciones de la Carta se aplican únicamente en relación con la aplicación del Derecho de la Unión, circunstancia que no se da en el presente caso.

([1]) http://comunicacion.e-noticies.es/catalunya-radio-no-se-escuchara-en-valencia-82320.html
([2]) http://www.vilaweb.cat/noticia/4168323/20140121/govern-espanyol-obliga-tancar-catalunya-radio-pais-valencia.html?utm_source=Previsions+Subscriptors+%2BVilaWeb&utm_campaign=258a80b895-Av_s_urgent_copy_02_1_21_2014&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_fa90d2fe38-258a80b895-76265389

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000544/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Catalunya Ràdio forced to stop broadcasting in Valencia by the Spanish Government- application of Directive 2010/13/EU and respect for media freedom and pluralism

Today, after 25 years of service, Catalunya Ràdio and Catalunya Informació fell silent in the Autonomous Community of Valencia, on account of a decision by the Spanish national government. After the closure of TV3, Catalonia's public service radio continued to broadcast programmes via the booster network belonging to Acció Cultural del País Valencià. But last Friday the latter received a letter from the Spanish Government notifying it that it must stop the broadcasts and pay two fines totalling EUR 1 million which will probably be enforced even though broadcasting has stopped ([1]).

Through the State Secretariat for Telecommunications and the Information Society, the Spanish Industry Ministry is trying for the first time to penalise the ownership and very existence of the booster masts used for 'unauthorised broadcasting', and not just the broadcasts themselves. The Industry Ministry says this action has been taken in response to a complaint by a group called 'Círculo Cívico Valenciano' ([2]).

Respect for cultural and linguistic diversity in the media is one of the objectives of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (Directive 2010/13/EU).

Bearing in mind that media freedom and pluralism are core values for the Audiovisual Media Services Directive and that the Commission accords special importance to the role of the dual public/private system of radio broadcasters which preserves media pluralism and promotes European values:

Is the Commission aware of these facts?

Does the Commission consider that in the Autonomous Community of Valencia, this decision threatens the quality and diversity of audiovisual supply as envisaged in the directive?

Does the Commission believe that now that Catalunya Ràdio has closed down in Valencia, there will be sufficient television and radio programmes for members of the public there to be duly informed on what is happening in their community?

Will the Commission ask the Spanish Government for information about the closure of this station?

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

The Commission has followed the developments as regards the closing down of Catalunya Ràdio and Catalunya Informació. We would like to ensure you that the Commission attaches special importance to the role of the dual system of public and commercial service broadcasters in preserving media pluralism and promoting European values in all economic circumstances.

However, it cannot question a government's mandate to take decisions regarding their public service broadcasting system even in cases where this impacts on the available information in a specific language. In fact, under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union the use of majority or minority languages in the Member State remains within their jurisdiction and under their sole responsibility. While media freedom and pluralism are indeed values underpinning the Audiovisual Media Services Directive, the Commission cannot comment on the effects of the decision to close down a public service broadcaster, as the Treaty makes it clear that the governance and strategic choices on public service broadcasting lie with the Member States. Media freedom and pluralism constitute indeed essential foundations of democratic societies enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights however the provisions of the Charter apply only when implementing EC law. This is not the case in the present context.

([1]) http://comunicacion.e-noticies.es/catalunya-radio-no-se-escuchara-en-valencia-82320.html
([2]) http://www.vilaweb.cat/noticia/4168323/20140121/govern-espanyol-obliga-tancar-catalunya-radio-pais-valencia.html?utm_source=Previsions+Subscriptors+%2BVilaWeb&utm_campaign=258a80b895-Av_s_urgent_copy_02_1_21_2014&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_fa90d2fe38-258a80b895-76265389

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000553/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Derecho a la salud sexual y reproductiva

El Ministro de Justicia español, Alberto Ruiz-Gallardón, ha presentado el anteproyecto de Ley Orgánica «Para la protección de la vida del concebido y de los derechos de la mujer embarazada», que modifica la Ley de salud sexual y reproductiva eliminando la interrupción voluntaria del embarazo por plazos y penalizando el aborto. Tal reforma sitúa a España en una situación no solo más restrictiva que la actual ley de 2010, sino más retrógrada aún que la ley anterior de 1985. Se pasa de un sistema de plazos a uno de hechos —por el cual el aborto, entre otras restricciones, estaría penado hasta en caso de malformación del feto— y se prohíbe a las menores de edad el aborto sin el consentimiento paterno.

En la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-002933/2012, la Comisión indicó que «los abortos inseguros, no llevados a cabo por personal médico calificado, representan claramente un riesgo de salud para las mujeres» ([1]).

¿Considera la Comisión que el anteproyecto del ministro Gallardón generará abortos inseguros, los cuales son un riesgo para la salud de las mujeres? ¿Cómo valora la existencia de este problema de salud pública prevenible en la EU?

En la respuesta a la misma pregunta, la Comisión indica que «Teniendo en cuenta la dimensión ética, social y cultural de los abortos, corresponde a los Estados miembros desarrollar y poner en práctica sus políticas y marcos legales». Sin embargo, cabe reconocer que la ilegalidad del aborto en España generará consecuencias en los sistemas de salud de los Estados miembros que sí acepten estas prácticas. ¿Considera la Comisión que un marco común de la UE que asegure los derechos sexuales y reproductivos de las mujeres eliminaría la competencia entre políticas de los Estados miembros y garantizaría la no discriminación a las mujeres de bajos recursos, que no pueden migrar a otros países para practicar un aborto seguro?

¿Considera la Comisión que la salud sexual y reproductiva debe ser una parte integral de las políticas de salud pública? ¿Puede la Comisión aclarar si el Reglamento sobre el establecimiento de un Programa de Salud para el Crecimiento para el período 2014-2020, en particular el objetivo de «aumentar el acceso a la asistencia sanitaria mejor y más segura para los ciudadanos», abarca el acceso a la salud sexual y servicios de salud reproductiva, incluido el aborto seguro y legal? ¿Consideraría la Comisión que la ley española es contraria a dicho objetivo?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión reconoce las diferencias de las políticas y las legislaciones nacionales de los Estados miembros de la UE con respecto al aborto. De conformidad con el Tratado de la Unión Europea y el Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea, la definición de las políticas de salud y la organización y la prestación de los servicios sanitarios y la asistencia médica es sobre todo competencia de cada Estado miembro. Como tal, la UE no tiene competencias sobre la política del aborto a nivel nacional y no puede, por lo tanto, interferir en las políticas de los Estados miembros en este ámbito.

En relación con la salud y la asistencia sanitaria, los Tratados conceden competencias limitadas a la Unión Europea. Garantizan a cada persona el derecho a acceder a la asistencia sanitaria preventiva y a beneficiarse del tratamiento médico con arreglo a las condiciones establecidas por las legislaciones nacionales. Al mismo tiempo, la organización y la prestación de servicios sanitarios y asistencia médica, así como la gestión y la asignación de los recursos, son competencia de cada Estado miembro.

El próximo Programa de Salud persigue objetivos generales, a saber, la mejora de la salud de la población de la UE y la reducción de las desigualdades en materia de salud, en particular mediante el aumento de la sostenibilidad de los sistemas de salud y la facilitación del acceso a una asistencia sanitaria mejor y más segura. La Comisión Europea colabora con los Estados miembros y las partes interesadas para fomentar la puesta en común de buenas prácticas en estos ámbitos. El programa tiene sobre todo carácter horizontal. Sobre la base de un programa de trabajo anual, se hará hincapié en unas pocas medidas concretas que aporten un claro valor añadido y tengan un gran impacto y rendimiento.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-002933+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000553/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Right to sexual and reproductive health

The Spanish Minister for Justice, Alberto Ruiz-Gallardón, has submitted a draft framework law entitled 'For the protection of the life of the conceived child and the rights of the pregnant woman' which amends the law on sexual and reproductive health by removing the right to a termination within certain time limits and penalising abortion. A reform of this nature places Spain in a situation that is not only more restrictive than the current law of 2010, but that is also even more backward-looking than the previous law of 1985. The situation would change from a system of time limits to one of facts — under which abortion, among other restrictions, would be punishable even in the case of fetal malformation — and minors would be prohibited from having an abortion without the consent of their parents.

In its answer to question for written answer E-002933/2012, the Commission stated that 'unsafe abortions, not carried out by qualified medical personnel, clearly represent a health risk for women'. ([1])

Does the Commission think that Minister Gallardón's draft bill will lead to unsafe abortions, which pose a health risk for women? How does it assess the existence of this preventable public health problem in the EU?

In the answer to the same question, the Commission states that 'Considering the ethical, social and cultural dimension of abortions, it is for the Member States to develop and implement their policies and legal frameworks'. However, it should be acknowledged that the illegality of abortion in Spain will have knock-on effects for the health systems of Member States that do allow these practices. Does the Commission think that a common framework for the EU that safeguards the sexual and reproductive rights of women would eliminate competition between policies of Member States and would guarantee non-discrimination against women on low incomes, who cannot travel to other countries in order to have a safe abortion?

Does the Commission believe that sexual and reproductive health should be an integral part of public health policies? Can the Commission clarify whether the regulation on establishing a 'Health for growth' programme for the period 2014-2020, in particular the aim to 'increase access to better and safer healthcare for EU citizens', covers access to sexual and reproductive health services, including safe and legal abortions? Would the Commission consider that the Spanish law contradicts this aim?

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

The Commission acknowledges the differences in the EU Member States national policies and laws with regard to abortion. According to the Treaty of the European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the definition of health policies and the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care is primarily the responsibility of individual Member States. As such, the EU has no competences on abortion policy at national level and can therefore not interfere in Member States' policies in this area.

In relation to health and healthcare, the Treaties have granted limited competence to the European Union. They guarantee everyone the right to access preventive healthcare and to benefit from medical treatment under the conditions established by national laws. At the same time, the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care, and management and allocation of resources are the competence of the individual Member States.

The next Health Programme pursues overall objectives, namely to improve EU population's health and reduce health inequalities, notably by increasing the sustainability of health systems and facilitating access to better and safer healthcare. The European Commission works with Member States and stakeholders to foster the sharing of good practices in these areas. The Programme is mostly horizontal in nature. On the basis of an annual work programme, focus will be on fewer concrete actions that offer clear EU added value, and deliver high impact and high returns.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-002933+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000555/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(21 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Deficiencias en la depuración de aguas residuales

En varias ocasiones he trasladado a esa Comisión Europea algunas de mis inquietudes sobre la falta de establecimiento o el defectuoso funcionamiento de depuradoras de aguas residuales (E-005334/2010), así como la contaminación de las aguas continentales (E-010226/2011).

Hace unas semanas, esa Comisión facilitó un informe sobre la aplicación de las normas relativas al tratamiento de aguas residuales urbanas (Directiva 91/271/CEE, de 21 de mayo de 1991) congratulándose de los progresos alcanzados en los últimos años, aunque lógicamente alude a la existencia de procedimientos de infracción abiertos ante el incumplimiento en algunos países europeos. La lectura de tal informe y de sus anexos me suscita algunos interrogantes cuya respuesta recabo de esa Comisión.

1. ¿Podría precisarse cuál es el número de procedimientos abiertos al Reino de España?

2. ¿Se sabe cuántos municipios españoles de menos de cinco mil habitantes carecen del adecuado sistema de depuración de aguas residuales?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de marzo de 2014)

En la actualidad están abiertos contra España cuatro procedimientos legales en relación con la aplicación de la Directiva 91/271/CEE, sobre el tratamiento de las aguas residuales urbanas ([1]).

La Directiva no establece ningún umbral para las aglomeraciones con menos de 5 000 habitantes. La mayoría de las disposiciones de la Directiva se aplican a aglomeraciones con una población de más de 2 000 equivalentes habitante ([2]). En 2012, la Comisión remitió a las autoridades españolas una carta de emplazamiento en la que les solicitaba información sobre 612 pequeños municipios. La Comisión está examinando la información, sumamente compleja, facilitada por España en este contexto. De los 612 municipios a que se refería dicha carta, 404 tienen una población de entre 2 000 y 5 000 equivalentes habitante.

([1]) DO L 135 de 30.5.1991.
([2]) Medida utilizada para describir la carga de aguas residuales en una aglomeración, con la que se pretende representar el número de habitantes teóricos que habrían generado esa carga.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000555/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Deficiencies in the treatment of waste water

On several occasions, I have informed the European Commission of my concerns with regard to the failure to construct waste water treatment plants or the malfunctioning of these plants (E-005334/2010) and with regard to the pollution of inland waters (E-010226/2011).

Some weeks ago, the Commission provided a report on the application of the rules concerning urban waste water treatment (Directive 91/271/EEC of 21 May 1991), in which it congratulated itself on the progress made in the last few years, even though it logically refers to the existence of open infringement procedures for non-compliance in some European countries. After reading this report and its annexes, I have a number of questions, for which the Commission should be able to provide an answer.

1. Can the Commission specify how many open procedures there are in the Kingdom of Spain?

2. Is it known how many Spanish municipalities with fewer than 5 000 residents do not have an adequate waste water treatment system?

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

There are currently five legal proceedings open on the implementation of the directive concerning the treatment of urban waste water ([1]) (91/271/EEC) in Spain.

There is no threshold in the directive for agglomerations with fewer than 5 000 residents. Most of the provisions in the directive apply to agglomerations larger than 2.000 population equivalents ([2]). In 2012, the Commission issued a letter of formal notice requiring information from the Spanish authorities on 612 small agglomerations. The Commission is currently assessing the very complex information provided by Spain in this context. 404 out of the 612 agglomerations targeted in this letter have a size between 2 000 and 5 000 population equivalents.

([1]) OJ L 135, 30.5.1991.
([2]) The measure used to describe the load of waste water in an agglomeration; intended to represent the number of theoretical inhabitants that would generate that load.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000557/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(21. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Einheitliche EU-Maut

Jüngsten Medienberichten ([1]) zufolge zieht die Kommission in Erwägung, eine streckenbezogene Vignette im europäischen Raum einzuführen. Bisher waren die Richtlinien bezüglich der Mautgebühren in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten von großen Unterschieden geprägt: In manchen Ländern wird die Maut anhand der zurückgelegten Distanz errechnet, in anderen Ländern wiederum gilt die Vignette für einen festgelegten Zeitraum unabhängig davon, wie viele Kilometer tatsächlich auf den Autobahnen zurückgelegt werden. Aus diesem Grund wäre eine streckenbezogene Maut vor allem für Durchfahrtsländer eine interessante Erwägung. Besonders Länder wie Österreich, deren Autobahnen viel von LKWs befahren werden und die durch die extremen Witterungsverhältnisse im Winter in Mitleidenschaft gezogen werden, würden dadurch eine weitere signifikante Steuereinnahmequelle erhalten. Eine ähnliche Vignette wurde schon im Jahre 2004 in Erwägung gezogen, jedoch wurden die damaligen Verhandlungen durch eine Sperrminorität — bestehend aus den Ländern Frankreich, Italien, Spanien und Deutschland — gestoppt ([2]). Dieser Umstand könnte sich auch im Jahr 2014 wiederholen, da Deutschland eine zeitlich gestaffelte Vignette besonders für Ausländer in Erwägung zieht.

1. Wie erklärt die Kommission, dass einige Länder, die ihre eigenen Interessen vertreten, mittels einer Sperrminorität dem Verfahren Steine in den Weg legen können?

2. Wie gedenkt die Kommission zu kontrollieren, ob die Einwände der Länder der Sperrminoritäten mit den Interessen der Union in Einklang stehen?

3. Wie gedenkt die Kommission, die EU-Maut trotzdem einzuführen?

4. Mit welchem Zeitrahmen bis zur tatsächlichen Einführung muss gerechnet werden, wenn Störungen durch einzelne Länder die Entwicklung und Durchsetzung blockieren?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(3. März 2014)

Unter dem laufenden Mandat sind vonseiten der Kommission gegenwärtig keine Maßnahmen geplant. Allerdings wird im Moment erwogen, gegebenenfalls zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt eine Änderung der geltenden Rechtsvorschrift zur Lkw-Maut, der sogenannten „Eurovignetten-Richtlinie“ ([3]), vorzuschlagen. Den genauen Inhalt und Zeitplan einer solchen Änderung hat die Kommission bislang nicht festgelegt.

In Bezug auf Straßenbenutzungsgebühren für Pkw gibt es keine EU-Rechtsvorschriften, so dass die Mitgliedstaaten entsprechende (zeit- oder entfernungsgebundene) Mautregelungen frei gestalten und umsetzen können, sofern diese mit den allgemeinen Grundsätzen des EU-Vertrags im Einklang stehen.

In der Richtlinie 2004/52/EG ([4]) und der Entscheidung 2009/750/EG ([5]), die für alle Fahrzeuge gelten, werden die Voraussetzungen für die Interoperabilität entfernungsgebundener elektronischer Mautsysteme ([6]) in der Europäischen Union (EETS) bestimmt.

Im Hinblick auf die EETS-Einführung hat sich der EU-Gesetzgeber bislang stets für ein marktorientiertes Konzept ausgesprochen, das sich auf die wirtschaftlichen Bewertungen von Dienstleistern stützt.

([1]) http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/international/vignette-eu-kommission-erwaegt-genauere-vorgaben-zur-maut/9311900.html
([2]) http://www.heise.de/newsticker/meldung/Sperrminoritaet-gegen-einheitliche-EU-Maut-erfolgreich-107645.html
([3]) Richtlinie 1999/62/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 17. Juni 1999 über die Erhebung von Gebühren für die Benutzung bestimmter Verkehrswege durch schwere Nutzfahrzeuge, ABl. L 187 vom 20.7.1999.
([4]) Richtlinie 2004/52/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 29. April 2004 über die Interoperabilität elektronischer Mautsysteme in der Gemeinschaft, ABl. L 166 vom 30.4.2004.
([5]) Entscheidung der Kommission vom 6. Oktober 2009 über die Festlegung der Merkmale des europäischen elektronischen Mautdienstes und seiner technischen Komponenten, ABl. L 268 vom 13.10.2009.
([6]) Zeitvignetten gehören nicht dazu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000557/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Uniform EU toll

According to recent media reports ([1]), the Commission is considering introducing a mileage-based vignette in the EU. Until now, the rules governing toll charges have differed significantly from one Member State to another: in some countries tolls are calculated on the basis of the distance travelled, whereas in others vignettes are valid for a fixed period of time, regardless of the distance covered on motorways. For this reason, a mileage-based vignette is worth considering, especially for transit countries. For certain countries such as Austria, whose motorways are frequently used by HGVs and which experience extreme weather conditions during the winter, it would represent a significant additional source of tax revenue. The introduction of a vignette of this kind was discussed in 2004, but negotiations were halted by a blocking minority comprising France, Italy, Spain and Germany ([2]). We could find ourselves facing a similar situation in 2014, since Germany is thinking of introducing a time-based vignette aimed at foreign motorists.

1. How does the Commission explain the fact that a minority of countries, acting in their own interests, are able to obstruct these negotiations?

2. How does the Commission plan to establish whether or not the objections raised by these countries can be squared with the Union's broader interests?

3. How is the Commission planning to introduce the EU toll in the face of this opposition?

4. If individual countries interfere and block the development and implementation of the toll, how long will it take before it is actually introduced?

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

At this stage the Commission does not foresee any action under the current mandate, but is indeed considering proposing an amendment of the existing legislation on road charging related to Heavy Goods Vehicles, the so-called 'Eurovignette Directive' ([3]), in the future. The exact content and the timing of such a revision are still under consideration within the Commission.

There is no EU legislation on road charging related to passenger cars, which means that Member States are free to design and to implement (time or distance based) road charging schemes, as long as these respect general EU Treaty principles.

Directive 2004/52/EC ([4]) and Decision 2009/750/EC ([5]), applying to all vehicles, lay down the conditions for the interoperability of distance based electronic road toll systems ([6]) in the European Union (EETS).

As regards the implementation of EETS, the EU legislator has so far favoured a market-based approach relying on economic assessments of service providers.

([1]) http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/international/vignette-eu-kommission-erwaegt-genauere-vorgaben-zur-maut/9311900.html
([2]) http://www.heise.de/newsticker/meldung/Sperrminoritaet-gegen-einheitliche-EU-Maut-erfolgreich-107645.html
([3]) Directive 1999/62/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 1999 on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures, OJ L 187, 20.7.1999.
([4]) Directive 2004/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the interoperability of electronic road toll systems in the Community, OJ L 166, 30.4.2004..
([5]) Commission decision of 6 October 2009 on the definition of the European Electronic Toll Service and its technical elements, OJ L 268, 13.10.2009.
([6]) Time-based vignettes are not included.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000561/14
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(21 januari 2014)

Betreft: Subsidies voor media in het kader van verkiezingen 2014

In de „Information on the budgetary and financial management of the EP 2012" (kwijtingsprocedure 2012) staat een aantal opmerkingen die nopen tot de volgende nadere vragen.

1. Op pagina 8 stelt de Commissie dat „to increase Parliaments visibility in the run-up to the 2014 elections (…) grants were awarded in the areas of television, radio, web-based projects or specific events". Kan uw Commissie, gedetailleerd uitgesplitst naar soort medium, naam en lidstaat, aangeven welke „grants" het hier betreft en hoe groot deze per ontvanger waren?

2. Op pagina 8 wordt gesproken over „Editorial Community Managers". Zij zullen „continuously monitor the social media landscape". Kan de Commissie aangeven hoeveel personen het hier betreft, wat hun salaris is en aan wie zij rapporteren? Wat is precies het doel van hun werkzaamheden?

3. Op pagina 9 wordt vermeld onder „future of EuroparlTV": „external promotion in 3 main directions: partner media, social media and schools". Kan uw Commissie (uitgesplitst) aangeven wat het budget is voor deze doelen?

Antwoord van de heer Lewandowski namens de Commissie
(5 maart 2014)

Het document waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst: „Information on the budgetary and financial management of the EP 2012" is een publicatie van het EP. Aangezien het EP zijn begroting op administratief autonome wijze beheert overeenkomstig het Financieel Reglement, komt het de Commissie niet toe in deze aangelegenheden commentaar te geven of een standpunt in te nemen. De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid daarom door naar de bevoegde diensten van het EP.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000561/14
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(21 January 2014)

Subject: Media subsidies in connection with the 2014 elections

In the 'Information on the budgetary and financial management of the EP 2012' (discharge procedure 2012) there are a number of comments which give rise to the following further questions.

1. On page 8, the Commission states that 'to increase Parliament's visibility in the run-up to the 2014 elections (…) grants were awarded in the areas of television, radio, web-based projects or specific events'. Can the Commission provide a detailed list of the 'grants' referred to, broken down by type of medium, name and Member State, and the size of the grants received by each party?

2. Page 8 refers to 'Editorial Community Managers', who will 'continuously monitor the social media landscape'. Can the Commission indicate how many people this relates to, what their salary is and to whom they report? What is the exact purpose of their work?

3. Page 9, under the heading 'future of EuroparlTV', mentions: 'external promotion in 3 main directions: partner media, social media and schools'. Can the Commission provide an (itemised) list of the budget set aside for these objectives?

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

The publication to which the Honourable Member refers: 'Information on the budgetary and financial management of the EP 2012' is a publication of the EP. As the EP enjoys administrative autonomy in the management of its own budget in accordance with the Financial Regulation, it is not for the Commission to comment or take a position on these matters. The Commission therefore refers the Honourable Member to the EP administration with this question.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-000563/14
a la Comisión
Iratxe García Pérez (S&D)
(22 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Protección de la UE contra la plaga del punto negro (Black Spot)

Tras meses de pasividad en torno al problema, el pasado 13 de diciembre la Comisión publicó la Decisión por la que se establecen medidas restrictivas para la importación de cítricos procedentes de Sudáfrica producidos en la campaña 2012/2013.

La medida, cuyo objetivo era prevenir la introducción de la plaga del punto negro en el territorio de la UE, carecía ya de toda utilidad: toda vez que la campaña de exportación de Sudáfrica prácticamente acaba en octubre, la publicación de esta decisión en diciembre poco ha contribuido a la protección fitosanitaria de nuestro territorio, en particular si se tiene en cuenta la extrema peligrosidad registrada en el año 2013, en el que se efectuaron 33 interceptaciones de mercancías sospechosas de estar afectadas por el punto negro procedentes de Sudáfrica, a pesar de las medidas anunciadas por dicho país, para atajar el problema.

¿Qué medidas tiene intención de adoptar la Comisión antes del comienzo de la campaña de exportación que comienza en marzo 2014 para evitar la introducción de esta plaga en la EU?

El sector de los cítricos da empleo a miles de trabajadores en toda la UE y es un sector de vital importancia para las regiones productoras tanto por su componente social como económico. Además, los operadores de los terceros países destino de las exportaciones europeas, como los EE.UU., han anunciado que en el momento en que la UE tenga la plaga se restringirán las exportaciones europeas,

¿Ha evaluado la Comisión el perjuicio económico y social que se produciría si la plaga del punto negro entra en la EU?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de febrero de 2014)

La Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria (EFSA) adoptó a finales de enero un análisis sobre el riesgo de la plaga del punto negro que, en la actualidad, está abierto a consulta pública y se publicará más adelante. Está previsto que la Comisión y los Estados miembros estudien y debatan el informe en la próxima reunión del Comité Fitosanitario Permanente, que tendrá lugar en los días 27 y 28 de febrero de 2014, a raíz de lo cual podrán adoptarse otras medidas.

La Comisión está analizando actualmente la importancia económica y social del sector cítrico en el territorio de la UE. Este estudio, junto con el análisis de riesgo de la plaga del punto negro realizado por la EFSA, permitirá examinar en profundidad las consecuencias económicas y sociales que tendría la introducción del punto negro de los cítricos en el territorio de la Unión Europea.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000563/14
to the Commission
Iratxe García Pérez (S&D)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Protection of EU against black spot

Following months of inaction, on 13 December 2014 the Commission published its Decision establishing measures to restrict the import of citric fruit originating in South Africa and produced during the 2012/2013 growing season.

A move that is now completely useless: the decision was issued to prevent citrus black spot being introduced onto EU territory but since the South African export season finished, to all intents and purposes, in October, publication of this decision in December did little to help with phytosanitary protection within the EU. This is particularly so if the extremely high level of risk recorded in 2013 is taken into account. Despite the measures announced by South Africa to tackle the problem, goods originating there and suspected of being infected with black spot were intercepted on 33 occasions in 2013.

What measures does the Commission intend to adopt before the start of the next export season in March 2014 to prevent black spot being introduced into the EU?

The citric fruit sector employs thousands of workers throughout the EU. It is a vitally important sector for producer regions, both from a social and economic point of view. In addition, operators in non-EU countries to which the EU exports, such as the US, have said that EU exports to their country will be subject to immediate restrictions should this disease be found in the EU.

Has the Commission assessed the economic and social damage that entry of black spot into the EU would cause?

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

A pest risk analysis on citrus black spot was adopted by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) at the end of January. It is at present open for public consultation and will be published subsequently. This report will be analysed and discussed within the Commission and with Member States during the next Standing Committee on Plant Health (27-28 February 2014) and may trigger further action.

Currently, an analysis of the economic and social importance of the citrus sector in the EU territory is being carried out by the Commission. This study, together with the EFSA pest risk analysis on citrus black spot will allow a detailed analysis of the economic and social consequences that the introduction of the citrus black spot would have in the EU territory.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000564/14
alla Commissione
Giuseppe Gargani (PPE)
(22 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Chiarimenti in merito alle procedure di gara EuropeAID

La Commissione europea, con avviso pubblico n. 2012/S 223-366462 del 20 novembre 2012, ha indetto, in nome e per conto della Repubblica Popolare Cinese, che ne è la nazione beneficiaria, una gara con procedura ristretta per l'assistenza tecnica al progetto «Urbanizzazione sostenibile. Europa-Cina eco-cities link».

Dopo una prima valutazione dei requisiti tecnici e finanziari delle imprese partecipanti alla gara, la Commissione ha stilato una prima short list di otto consorzi ritenuti idonei.

In un secondo momento, l'autorità contrattuale ha ritenuto di non procedere all'assegnazione della gara per l'assenza di progetti qualitativamente idonei, formalizzando la non assegnazione del contratto sul sito web dedicato alla gara e indicando come unica possibilità per procedere all'assegnazione del contratto la pubblicazione di una nuova gara.

Contrariamente a quanto sopra menzionato però, la Commissione ha provveduto all'assegnazione del contratto, con trattativa diretta, in favore di un raggruppamento anch'esso selezionato nella short list, ma sostanzialmente modificato nella sua composizione dalla cooptazione di un quarto soggetto estraneo appartenente in precedenza a un altro consorzio presente nella short list.

Il consorzio beneficiario del contratto di assegnazione è stato quindi modificato d'ufficio con l'aggiunta di una componente già partecipante ad altro consorzio, creando di fatto un nuovo candidato alla gara, cosa non consentita dalla normativa di cui alla Guida pratica (par. 2.4.13).

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. perché ha ritenuto opportuno affidare con trattativa diretta i lavori di assistenza tecnica per un importo di oltre 9 000 000,00 EUR;

2. se la procedura adottata ha rispettato i principi di trasparenza, pari opportunità e libera concorrenza che devono contraddistinguere tutte le procedure finanziate dall'UE;

3. se sono stati rispettati gli interessi legittimi dei partecipanti alla gara?

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

L'appalto di assistenza tecnica oggetto del bando di gara pubblicato nel novembre 2012 è stato aggiudicato il 20 settembre 2013 con procedura negoziata a uno degli offerenti che avevano partecipato alla gara rimasta infruttuosa.

Conformemente alle disposizioni vigenti ([1]), dopo l'annullamento di una procedura di appalto l'amministrazione aggiudicatrice (AA) può decidere di avviare negoziati con uno o più offerenti che hanno partecipato alla procedura di appalto e che soddisfano i criteri di selezione. In considerazione dei costi e dei tempi necessari per indire o rilanciare la procedura di gara, l'AA ha deciso di avviare negoziati con un unico offerente, quello che nell'ambito della procedura di appalto iniziale aveva ottenuto un punteggio tecnico nettamente superiore agli altri.

Il partecipante invitato alla negoziazione ha proposto una modifica della composizione del raggruppamento, ossia l'aggiunta di una rete di città dell'UE; tale rete aveva fatto parte di un raggruppamento partecipante alla gara iniziale, nel frattempo sciolto, e che non aveva più obblighi nei confronti di tale raggruppamento.

La modifica della composizione del raggruppamento è consentita, in determinate situazioni e previa approvazione da parte dell'AA, persino nel corso della procedura di appalto purché siano soddisfatti i criteri di ammissibilità e di selezione ([2]). La proposta è stata accettata in quanto, soddisfacendo tutti i criteri del bando iniziale, migliorava la qualità dell'offerta grazie al rafforzamento della dimensione europea del progetto «Europa-Cina eco-cities link».

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, si può comunicare che la procedura di aggiudicazione si è svolta nel pieno rispetto delle norme, pubblicamente disponibili, in materia di aggiudicazione degli appalti per gli aiuti esterni dell'UE, dei principi di trasparenza, pari opportunità e leale concorrenza, e con la debita considerazione degli interessi di tutte le parti in causa, compresi i candidati, i contribuenti e i beneficiari.

([1]) Punto 2.4.13 della guida pratica e articolo 266, paragrafo 1, lettera d), delle modalità di applicazione del regolamento finanziario.
([2]) Punto 2.4.3 della Guida pratica alle procedure contrattuali per le azioni esterne dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000564/14
to the Commission
Giuseppe Gargani (PPE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Clarifications concerning tender procedures for EuropeAID

By way of notice No 2012/S 223-366462 of 20 November 2012, the Commission, acting in the name and on behalf of the People's Republic of China, which is the beneficiary, issued a restricted invitation to tender for technical assistance for a project entitled 'Sustainable urbanisation. Europe-China eco-cities link'.

After an initial assessment of the tenderers in the light of the technical and financial requirements, the Commission drew up a first shortlist of eight consortiums which it considered suitable.

At a second stage, the contracting authority decided not to award the contract, because none of the projects was of sufficient quality, and announced this decision formally on the website for the tender procedure, indicating that the only way in which the contract could be awarded was by publishing a new invitation to tender.

However, contrary to the above, the Commission then awarded the contract by private treaty to a consortium which had figured on the shortlist, but whose composition had been substantially modified by co-opting into it a fourth operator who had previously been a member of a different shortlisted consortium.

Thus the consortium to which the contract was awarded was modified by the contracting authority by adding a party which was already a member of a different consortium, thus effectively creating a new candidate for the tender procedure, which is a breach of the rules laid down in the Practical Guide (Section 2.4.13).

1. Why did the Commission consider it appropriate to award the technical assistance contract, worth more than EUR 9 000 000, by private treaty?

2. Did the procedure which was adopted comply with the principles of transparency, equal opportunities and free competition with which all EU-financed procedures must comply?

3. Were the legitimate interests of all participants in the tender procedure respected?

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

The technical assistance contract related to the procurement notice of November 2012 was awarded on 20 September 2013 via a negotiated procedure to one of the tenderers from the unsuccessful Call.

In line with the applicable rules ([1]), after the cancellation of a tender procedure, the Contracting Authority (CA) may decide to open negotiations with one or more of the tenderers which participated in the tender procedure and which meet the selection criteria. The CA, considering the costs and timing for launching or re-launching the tender, decided to open negotiations with one single tenderer which obtained a distinctively higher technical score than other tenderers during the initial tender procedure.

The participant invited to the negotiations proposed a modification in the composition of the consortium, i.e. the addition of a network of EU cities, that had been part of an original consortium which had been dissolved in the meantime and whose consortium obligations had expired.

Changes to the consortium are allowed, under certain circumstances and with CA approval, even during the tender procedure and provided eligibility and selection criteria are met ([2]). This proposal was accepted as it complied with all the criteria of the initial Call while improving the quality of the bid by reinforcing the European dimension of the Europe-China eco-cities link.

Based on the above, the award procedure was carried out in full compliance with the publically available EU external aid procurement rules, with the principles of transparency, equal opportunities and fair competition, and with due regard to the interests of all parties, including the applicants, EU taxpayers and the beneficiaries.

([1]) Section 2.4.13 of the Practical Guide and Article 266(1)(d) of the Rules of Application of the Financial Regulation.
([2]) Practical Guide to Contract Procedures for EU External Actions 2.4.3.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000565/14
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(22 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Discriminación entre pasajeros de líneas aéreas

En los últimos meses hemos detectado casos en los que varias compañías aéreas utilizan la misma definición para determinar el tipo de pasajero al que se obliga a viajar con un acompañante o a renunciar al vuelo. La definición utilizada por ejemplo por Air France o Air Europa es la misma: «personas capaces de asistirse físicamente a sí mismas en su propia evacuación». Sin embargo, para Air France, esa expresión descarta a «parapléjicos» y a «personas sordas y ciegas que no pueden comunicarse con la tripulación», mientras que Air Europa ha llegado a considerar como tales a personas que se desplazan en silla de ruedas. La inexistencia de una definición oficial asumida por todos los operadores permite pues a las compañías abrir el campo de causas de inadmisión en los aviones hasta alcanzar a personas que padezcan problemas de movilidad por razón de edad y otras circunstancias. Hay diferencias entre Estados y compañías, lo que da origen a casos de discriminación entre ciudadanos europeos a los que se aplica la misma normativa. Además, se exige acompañante por motivos de seguridad, pero nadie detalla qué requisitos debe cumplir esa figura para resultar útil. Finalmente estas exigencias contrastan con los criterios mucho más abiertos aplicados en otras zonas del mundo como los Estados Unidos. A la vista de estos datos:

1. ¿Dispone la Comisión de datos comparados de la incidencia de este problema en Europa por países y compañías?

2. Vistos los distintos criterios de aplicación, ¿no estamos ante un caso flagrante de discriminación entre ciudadanos europeos por aplicación no homogénea de las mismas normas comunitarias?

3. Además de las instrucciones de interpretación emitidas por la Comisión, ¿se está planteando mejorar la inspección y unificar una definición para estos colectivos e incorporarla a la normativa vigente?

4. ¿Es realmente útil a efectos de seguridad la previsión de un acompañante sin detallar las pericias de que debe disponer para ayudar en un caso de evacuación?

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

1. No. Dado que las compañías aéreas no tienen ninguna obligación de información, la Comisión no dispone de tales datos.

2. De conformidad con el artículo 4, apartados 1 y 2, del Reglamento (CE) n° 1107/2006 ([1]), la denegación de embarque a personas con discapacidad o con movilidad reducida (PMR) o el requisito de que la persona con movilidad reducida vaya acompañada por otra persona solo puede basarse en los requisitos de seguridad aplicables establecidos por la legislación internacional, nacional o de la UE o por la autoridad que emitió el certificado de operador aéreo, o en las dimensiones de la aeronave o sus puertas. De ello se desprende que diferentes requisitos de seguridad nacionales o administrativos o el uso de diferentes aeronaves pueden explicar diferentes comportamientos de las compañías aéreas. No obstante, el artículo 4, apartado 4, del Reglamento exige que la compañía aérea documente el motivo de cualquier negativa a transportar un pasajero.

3. El 11 de junio de 2012, la Comisión publicó unas directrices ([2]) para mejorar y facilitar la aplicación del Reglamento. Dichas directrices se discutieron con todas las partes interesadas: las autoridades de los Estados miembros, los representantes de la industria del transporte aéreo y de los consumidores, incluidas las personas con discapacidad. Los Estados miembros son responsables de la aplicación del Reglamento. No está previsto revisar el Reglamento a corto plazo.

4. Las directrices especifican que la persona acompañante debe ser capaz de facilitar la asistencia necesaria para dar cumplimiento a los requisitos de seguridad establecidos por el Derecho internacional, de la UE o de la legislación nacional, o por la autoridad que emitió el certificado de explotación de la compañía. La Agencia Europea de Seguridad Aérea (AESA) está trabajando actualmente en un aviso de propuesta de modificación sobre las categorías especiales de pasajeros, incluida una definición de asistente de seguridad.

([1]) Reglamento (UE) n° 1177/2010 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 24 de noviembre de 2010, relativo a los derechos de los pasajeros que viajan por mar y por vías navegables y por el que se modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 2006/2004 (DO L 334 de 17.12.2010, p. 1).

([2]) SWD(2012) 171 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000565/14
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Discrimination among airline passengers

In the last few months several airlines have been found to be using exactly the same definition for the purposes of deciding which types of passenger will be obliged to travel accompanied by another person, or else forfeit the right to fly. For instance, the definition used by both Air France and Air Europa is the same: 'Persons able to physically assist in his or her own evacuation of an aircraft'. However, in the case of Air France this definition excludes 'paraplegics' and 'people who are both blind and deaf thereby preventing the possibility of communication with the crew', while Air Europa considers passengers using wheelchairs as complying with this definition. The lack of an official definition accepted by all airlines therefore allows operators to choose from a much broader set of reasons for refusing air travel, going so far as to exclude passengers with reduced mobility on account of age or other circumstances. Differences exist between countries and airlines, a situation which thus causes discrimination among European citizens who are subject to the same basic rules. In addition, while travel companions are required for safety reasons, no details are given of what this person needs to do in order to play a useful role. Lastly, these requirements stand in stark contrast to the much more open criteria applied in other parts of the world, such as the United States.

In view of the above:

1. Does the Commission hold comparative data on the incidence of this problem in Europe by airline operator and by country?

2. In the light of the different criteria that are used, does this not amount to a clear case of discrimination among European citizens stemming from the discrepancies between the ways in which the same EU regulations are being applied?

3. Apart from interpretation instructions issued by the Commission, are there any plans to improve inspection, to impose a unified definition for the parties concerned and to incorporate this into the applicable regulations?

4. Is it really useful in the interests of safety to require a travel companion without specifying the skills required to assist in the event of an evacuation?

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

1. No. As there are no reporting requirements for air carriers, the Commission has no such data.

2. According to Article 4(1) and (2) of Regulation (EC) no 1107/2006 ([1]), refusal to embark a disabled person or a person with reduced mobility (PRM) or requirement that the PRM be accompanied by another person can only be based on applicable safety requirements established by international, EU or national law or by the authority that issued the air operator's certificate; or on the size of the aircraft or its doors. It results that different national or administrative safety requirements or the use of different aircraft can explain different behaviours of airlines. However Article 4(4) of the regulation requires an air carrier to document the reason for any refusal to transport a passenger.

3. On 11 June 2012 the Commission published guidelines ([2]) to improve and facilitate the application of the regulation. These were discussed with all parties concerned: Member States' authorities (NEBs), air transport industry and consumer representatives including for disabled persons. Member States are in charge of the application of the regulation. It is not planned to revise the regulation in the short term.

4. The guidelines specify that the accompanying persons should be capable of providing the assistance needed in order to comply with safety requirements established by international, EU or national law or by the authority that issued the carrier's operating certificate. The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) is currently working on a notice of proposed amendment on special categories of passengers, including a definition of safety assistant.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 concerning the rights of passengers when travelling by sea and inland waterway and amending Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004, 17.12.2010, OJ L 334, p.1.

([2]) SWD(2012) 171 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000566/14
alla Commissione
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)
(22 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Discariche illegali in Italia

Considerando che:

— con la procedura d'infrazione 2011/2215, aperta il 27 febbraio 2012, la Commissione europea contesta all'Italia la violazione dell'articolo 14 della direttiva 1999/31/CE, ovvero l'esistenza sul territorio italiano di 102 discariche considerate irregolari, di cui 3 contenenti rifiuti pericolosi;

— la Commissione europea ha successivamente deferito l'Italia davanti alla Corte di giustizia europea per non aver effettuato la bonifica di 255 discariche illegali e ha chiesto una multa di 56 milioni di euro, più un'ammenda da 256 819,20 euro al giorno per tutto il periodo che passerà dalla pronuncia di un'eventuale seconda condanna a quando la situazione non sarà stata totalmente sanata;

— non è dato rilevare dagli atti della procedura l'indicazione nominativa dei siti delle due procedure, né è chiarito se la Commissione prescriva specifici interventi di messa in sicurezza o di bonifica;

— che in particolare in Campania, tra le province di Napoli e Caserta, sono state rinvenute in più località quantità di gran lunga superiori ai limiti di legge di materiali inquinanti, interrati abusivamente, i quali determinano un gravissimo rischio ambientale e sanitario;

— la bonifica dei siti inquinati dallo sversamento illegale di rifiuti è urgente e particolarmente dispendiosa, soprattutto nella c.d. Terra dei Fuochi;

— che vari studi hanno dimostrato la bontà e convenienza delle attività di biorisanamento (*bioremediation*), che si basano su tecnologie di depurazione del suolo che utilizzano microorganismi naturali o ricombinanti per abbattere sostanze tossiche e pericolose attraverso processi aerobici e anaerobici, nel caso di attività di bonifica.

Si chiede alla Commissione:

1. di poter conoscere l'ubicazione delle 102 discariche di cui alla procedura 2011/2215;

2. di sapere se le stesse facciano parte delle 255 per le quali l'Italia è stata deferita dinanzi alla Corte di giustizia;

3. se tra i detti siti rientrino anche le aree della c.d. Terra dei Fuochi;

4. di chiarire se la violazione contestata riguardi anche la scelta tra messa in sicurezza e bonifiche;

5. nel caso di bonifiche, di considerare la possibilità di ricorrere ad attività di biorisanamento (*bioremediation*).

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(28 febbraio 2014)

Qualora i procedimenti di infrazione siano ancora in corso, la Commissione non è autorizzata a fornire informazioni dettagliate, nella fattispecie l'ubicazione di discariche specifiche.

Il procedimento 2011/2215 non è ancora giunto alla Corte di giustizia.

Sull'argomento specifico della Terra dei Fuochi, la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole deputato alla risposta data all'interrogazione scritta E-013777/2013 ([1]).

Spetta alle autorità italiane competenti decidere quali tecniche debbano essere usate per bonificare le discariche, tenendo conto delle specificità di ciascun sito.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000566/14
to the Commission
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Illegal waste dumps in Italy

On 27 February 2012 the Commission opened infringement proceedings 2011/2215 against Italy in respect of 102 waste dumps, three of them containing hazardous waste, which it deems to be in breach of Article 14 of Directive 1999/31/EC.

The Commission subsequently brought an action against Italy before the Court of Justice for failure to clean up 255 illegal landfill sites. It asked the Court to impose a fine of EUR 56 million on Italy for failing to comply with the Court's first judgment, and for a fine of EUR 256 819.20 per day to be levied between the date of any second judgment against Italy and the date on which the clean-up of the sites concerned has been completed.

The records for the proceedings do not state which sites are involved in the two cases, and it is not clear whether the Commission has laid down any specific requirements with regard to making the sites safe or cleaning them up.

Extremely large amounts of toxic materials have been found to have been dumped illegally in a number of locations in the provinces of Naples and Caserta (Campania). These dumps pose a major environmental and health risk.

There is an urgent need for sites polluted by illegally dumped waste — in particular in the 'Terra dei Fuochi' area — to be cleaned up. These operations will be particularly costly.

In connection with clean-up operations, it should be pointed out that various studies have demonstrated the efficacy and value for money of bioremediation techniques using natural or recombinant microorganisms to break down toxic and hazardous substances in the ground in aerobic and anaerobic processes.

1. Can the Commission say exactly where the 102 waste dumps covered by infringement proceedings 2011/2215 are located?

2. Are they among the 255 sites in respect of which Italy has been brought before the Court of Justice?

3. Are the Terra dei Fuochi sites included in that number?

4. Does the infringement have anything do with the choice between making the sites safe and cleaning them up?

5. Where sites are to be cleaned up, will consideration be given to using bioremediation techniques?

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

In relation to pending infringement procedures, the Commission cannot provide detailed information, such as the location of specific landfills.

Infringement procedure 2011/2215 has not yet reached the Court of Justice.

On the specific matter of the Terra dei Fuochi, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-013777/2013 ([1]).

It is for the competent Italian authorities to decide what kind of techniques shall be used to clean up the landfills, taking into account the specificity of each site.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000567/14
alla Commissione
Salvatore Iacolino (PPE)
(22 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Procedura di selezione del Garante europeo della protezione dei dati e del Garante aggiunto

Il 31 luglio 2013 la Commissione ha pubblicato l'avviso per selezionare il Garante europeo della protezione dei dati e il Garante aggiunto.

Considerato che sono trascorsi sei mesi dall'inizio della procedura; che delle 70 candidature ricevute 5 profili sono stati ammessi allo scrutinio del Comitato consultivo per le nomine, e di questi 5 candidati nessuno è stato ritenuto idoneo all'incarico, per asserita «mancanza di visione politica e capacità manageriale»; che il predetto Comitato consultivo per le nomine è costituito anche da una componente esterna alle istituzioni;

preso atto della corrispondenza intervenuta tra il presidente della commissione LIBE, Lopez Aguilar, e il commissario Šefčovič, delle audizioni del commissario Šefčovič e del Garante Hustinx avvenute in LIBE nei giorni scorsi, nonché della comunicazione del 20.01.2014 del Segretario generale Catherine Day;

può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se intende rinnovare la procedura con lo stesso o altro bando, oppure con bandi distinti per le due funzioni come sembrerebbe dalla comunicazione del Segretario generale? In ogni caso, come ritiene di condividere le proprie scelte con il Parlamento europeo?

2. perché la valutazione delle capacità di comprensione politica è stata rimessa ad un ufficio composto da tecnici, non rispettando le prerogative del Parlamento?

3. quali sono stati i costi sostenuti dai contribuenti per una procedura che non ha portato alcun risultato concreto?

4. come intende garantire la privacy dei cittadini con un'istituzione che nei prossimi mesi potrebbe non essere nella condizione di esercitare pienamente il suo mandato?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(14 febbraio 2014)

1. Nella sua decisione del 14 gennaio 2014 di non costituire un elenco dei candidati alle posizioni di garante europeo della protezione dei dati e di garante aggiunto, la Commissione ha proposto di pubblicare un nuovo bando per entrambe le funzioni. Il 20 gennaio 2014 il Vicepresidente Šefčovič ha invitato il presidente del Parlamento europeo a comunicare se e in che misura il Parlamento ritenesse necessario modificare l'avviso di posto vacante e se considerasse necessario pubblicare due avvisi separati in luogo di un solo avviso per entrambe le funzioni. La Commissione comunicherà al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio la decisione adottata secondo le procedure attualmente in vigore.

2. In nessuna fase della procedura di selezione le commissioni esaminatrici hanno valutato la «coscienza politica» dei candidati. Questi ultimi sono stati infatti valutati in base alla capacità di esercitare in futuro la funzione di garante europeo della protezione dei dati o di garante aggiunto, in vista delle innumerevoli sfide che l'Unione europea e in particolare il garante europeo della protezione dei dati dovranno affrontare. Tale valutazione è stata condotta in base ai criteri definiti nell'avviso di posto vacante e la decisione è stata adottata dalla Commissione.

3. I costi includono la pubblicazione dell'avviso di posto vacante nella Gazzetta ufficiale, la comunicazione sulla stampa internazionale, nonché i costi del centro di valutazione in quanto parte del processo di selezione.

4. L'articolo 42, paragrafo 6, del regolamento n. 45/2001 assicura la continuità dell'ufficio. L'attuale garante europeo della protezione dei dati, Peter Hustinx, ha dichiarato che resterà in carica e che continuerà a ricoprire il ruolo di GEPD.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000567/14
to the Commission
Salvatore Iacolino (PPE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Procedure for selecting the European Data Protection Supervisor and the Assistant Supervisor

On 31 July 2013, the Commission published a notice of competition with a view to selecting the new European Data Protection Supervisor and Assistant Supervisor.

Six months have now passed since the procedure was launched. Of the 70 applicants, five were selected for consideration by the Advisory Committee responsible for the appointment, but none of the five was deemed suitable, allegedly because of a 'lack of political vision and managerial skills'. The Advisory Committee on the appointment also included a member from outside the institutions.

Having regard to the correspondence between the Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, Lopez Aguilar, and Commissioner Šefčovič, the hearings of Commissioner Šefčovič and Data Protection Supervisor Hustinx in the Civil Liberties Committee in recent days, as well as the communication of 20 January 2014 from Secretary-General Catherine Day, can the Commission answer the following questions?

1. Does it intend to relaunch the procedure with the same or a different notice of competition, or with separate notices for the two posts, as would appear from the Secretary-General's communication to be the case? At all events, how does the Commission intend to inform the European Parliament of its decisions?

2. Why has the assessment of candidates' political awareness been entrusted to a body made up of technical experts, disregarding Parliament's prerogatives?

3. What costs were borne by taxpayers in paying for a procedure which produced no concrete result?

4. How will the Commission guarantee the privacy of citizens with an institution which in the next few months may be incapable of carrying out its mandate fully?

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

1. In its decision of 14 January 2014 not to establish a shortlist for the functions of European Data Protection Supervisor and Assistant Supervisor, the Commission suggested proceeding with a new publication of both functions. On 20 January 2014, Vice-President Šefčovič asked the President of the European Parliament for the Parliament's views to what extent the vacancy notice might need to be changed and whether one vacancy notice for both functions or for each function separately would be needed. The Commission will keep the European Parliament and the Council informed of its decision in line with existing established procedures.

2. At no stage in the selection procedure did selection panels assess the candidates' 'political awareness'. Candidates have been assessed as to their ability to exercise the function of European Data Protection Supervisor or Assistant Supervisor in the coming years in light of the many challenges facing the European Union and the European Data Protection Supervisor in particular. This assessment was based on the criteria laid down in the vacancy notice. The decision was taken by the Commission.

3. The costs relate to publishing the vacancy notice in the Official Journal, advertisements in the international press as well as the assessment centre as one element of the selection process.

4. Article 42(6) of Regulation 45/2001 ensures the continuity of the office. The current European Data Protection Supervisor, Mr Hustinx has declared to stay in his function. The EDPS will therefore continue to carry out its task.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000568/14
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(22 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wspólna polityka prorodzinna Unii Europejskiej

Początek roku 2014 to czas zwiększonej mobilizacji przedwyborczej w wielu państwach członkowskich. W kilku z nich w dyskursie na temat polityki prorodzinnej można się spotkać z opinią, że Unia Europejska przeżywa kryzys na poziomie demografii. Ostatnio pojawił się pomysł, by stworzyć „nowy filar Unii Europejskiej", oparty na polityce prorodzinnej.

Według tego pomysłu, polityka prorodzinna powinna „być uwspólnotowiona i być przedmiotem wspólnej troski i finansowania Unii". Dlatego wszystkie państwa UE powinny prowadzić wspólną politykę prorodzinną. Oznacza to, że przeznaczy się co najmniej 100 EUR na jedno dziecko do 18. roku życia z budżetu UE. Na politykę prorodzinną UE trafiałby 1 proc. PKB krajów członkowskich.

W związku z powyższym proszę o odpowiedź:

Czy Komisja dostrzega konieczność podejmowania takich działań?

W kontekście trudności negocjacyjnych w sprawie wieloletnich ram finansowych i presji na cięcia wydatków:

Jak Komisja odnosi się do pomysłu, by kraje członkowskie przekazały 1 proc. PKB na wspólną politykę prorodzinną? Tym samym czy Komisja widzi szansę na wzrost składek państw członkowskich?

Czy koncepcja ta wymagałaby zmian traktatowych Unii Europejskiej? Jeśli tak, to czy Komisja Europejska będzie takie zmiany rekomendowała?

Jakie działania podejmuje Komisja celem zapobieżenia negatywnym zmianom demograficznym w UE?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(24 lutego 2014 r.)

Komisja przywiązuje wielką wagę do wyzwań demograficznych, o czym wspomniano w komunikacie COM(2006) 571 final ([1]). Komisja – w ramach pierwszego obszaru polityki: „Europa sprzyjająca odnowie pokoleń", zajęła się problemem spadającego wówczas – i nadal pozostającego na niskim poziomie współczynnika urodzeń i wezwała do stworzenia warunków bardziej sprzyjających posiadaniu dzieci.

W ramach pakietu dotyczącego inwestycji społecznych ([2]) wezwano państwa członkowskie do stworzenia rodzinom bardziej korzystnych warunków, na przykład poprzez zachęcanie pracodawców do oferowania możliwości służących pogodzeniu życia zawodowego i prywatnego. W komunikacie oraz towarzyszącym mu „Zaleceniu w sprawie inwestowania w dzieci" ([3]) również podkreślono znaczenie dostępności wysokiej jakości usług wczesnej edukacji i opieki nad dzieckiem dla poprawy możliwości rozwojowych dzieci oraz wsparcia pracujących rodziców. Usługi związane z wczesną edukacją i opieką nad dzieckiem mogą być finansowane przez EFRR ([4]).

Ponadto w kilku zaleceniach dla poszczególnych krajów wydanych w ramach europejskiego semestru wezwano do opracowania bardziej skutecznej polityki sprzyjającej rodzinom i zachęcającej do posiadania dzieci. Chociaż przydział zasobów (finansowych) przeznaczonych na realizację celów społecznych należy do uprawnień państw członkowskich, instrumenty finansowe UE (takie jak EFS, EFRR oraz Europejski program na rzecz zatrudnienia i innowacji społecznych) wspierają, między innymi, rodziny i rodzicielstwo w UE.

Komisja nie przewiduje żadnych inicjatyw zmierzających do zmiany do traktatów w tej dziedzinie.

([1]) COM(2006) 571 final „Demograficzna przyszłość Europy – Przekształcić wyzwania w nowe możliwości".
([2]) Zob. COM(2013) 083.
([3]) Zob. COM(2013) 778 final.
([4]) Europejski Fundusz Rozwoju Regionalnego.

Dwie dyrektywy UE, w których ustanowiono minimalne standardy, ułatwiają ponadto pogodzenie życia prywatnego i zawodowego: dyrektywa o urlopie rodzicielskim ([5]) oraz dyrektywa w sprawie pracownic w ciąży ([6]). Wniosek Komisji dotyczący przedłużenia urlopu macierzyńskiego do 18 tygodni czeka na rozpatrzenie przez współprawodawców od 2008 r. ([7])

([5]) Zob. COM(2010) 18.
([6]) Zob. COM(1992) 85.
([7]) Wniosek dotyczący DYREKTYWY PARLAMENTU EUROPEJSKIEGO I RADY zmieniającej dyrektywę Rady 92/85/EWG w sprawie wprowadzenia środków służących wspieraniu poprawy w miejscu pracy bezpieczeństwa i zdrowia pracownic w ciąży, pracownic, które niedawno rodziły, i pracownic karmiących piersią COM(2008) 600.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000568/14
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Common EU pro-family policy

The beginning of 2014 is a period of increased pre-election activity in many Member States. In several of these, an opinion that is often put forward during discussions on pro-family policy is that the European Union is facing a demographic crisis. Recently, a proposal was made to establish a new pillar of the European Union based on pro-family policy.

According to this proposal, pro-family policy should be brought into the Community sphere and be the object of common EU concern and funding. All EU Member States should therefore pursue a common pro-family policy. This would mean allocating at least EUR 100 per child up to the age of 18 years from the EU budget. One per cent of Member States' GDP would go towards the EU's pro-family policy.

Does the Commission see the need to take such steps?

Given the difficult negotiations on the multiannual financial framework and pressures to cut expenditure:

What is the Commission's opinion on the idea that Member States should allocate 1% of GDP to a common pro-family policy? Does the Commission see scope for increasing contributions from Member States?

Would this idea require changes to be made to the Treaties of the European Union? If so, will the Commission be recommending that changes be made?

What steps is the Commission taking to prevent negative demographic changes in the EU?

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

The Commission attaches great importance to demographic challenges, as outlined in its communication COM(2006) 571 final ([1]). Under its first policy area, 'Promoting demographic renewal in Europe', it addressed the then falling — now still low — birth-rates and called for the creation of supportive conditions for people who wish to have children.

The Social Investment Package ([2]) has called on Member States to create supportive conditions to having a family, for instance by encouraging employers to offer measures to help reconcile private and professional lives. The communication and its accompanying 'Recommendation on Investing in Children' ([3]) also stress the importance of quality, accessible early childhood education and care (ECEC) services to improve children's opportunities for development while supporting working parents. ECEC facilities can be financed by the ERDF ([4]).

Furthermore several country specific recommendations given in the framework of the European Semester call to pursue more effective policies in favour of families and children. While allocating (financial) resources to pursue social targets is within the competence of Member States, the EU financial instruments (like the ESF, ERDF and EaSI) are, *inter alia*, supporting family and parenthood in the EU.

The Commission does not foresee any initiative to modify the Treaties in this area.

Furthermore, two EU directives facilitate the reconciliation of private and working life by setting minimum standards: the Parental Leave Directive ([5]) and the Pregnant Workers Directive ([6]). A proposal of the Commission to prolong maternity leave to 18 weeks is pending before the co-legislators since 2008 ([7]).

([1]) COM(2006) 571 final 'The demographic future of Europe — from challenge to opportunity'.
([2]) See COM(2013) 083.
([3]) See C(2013) 778 Final.
([4]) European Regional Development Fund.
([5]) See COM(2010) 18.
([6]) See COM(1992) 85.
([7]) Directive Of The European Parliament And Of The Council amending Council Directive 92/85/EEC on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health at work of pregnant workers and workers who have recently given birth or are breastfeeding COM(2008) 600.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000569/14
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(22 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Retrasos no explicados en la resolución de «cuellos de botella» europeos

Tras la aprobación de los presupuestos generales del Estado en España, se ha confirmado que el Gobierno de ese Estado miembro ha consignado solo un 5,75 % de la inversión prevista en este ejercicio (3 032 millones de euros) a la zona del corredor atlántico conocida como Y vasca. Este tramo de la infraestructura es prioritario, de acuerdo con las especificaciones aprobadas por el Parlamento Europeo para las TEN-T (redes transeuropeas del transporte). La Y vasca es la base para mejorar una de las dos conexiones ferroviarias entre España y Francia y cumple todas las condiciones en materia de fomento de la interoperabilidad e intermodalidad que distinguen las obras que en todo el continente deben realizarse de modo inmediato.

Pese a esta evidencia, los recursos destinados a esta inversión prioritaria se han reducido en un 50 % respecto al ejercicio anterior y el ritmo de la obra se mantiene exclusivamente gracias al esfuerzo del Gobierno Vasco que ha asumido la ejecución de una parte de la construcción de esta infraestructura. La decisión no tiene su origen en carencias presupuestarias, puesto que otros tramos que no eliminan «cuellos de botella» no han experimentado esa reducción de las inversiones. Las decisiones adoptadas ni están alineadas con los criterios de las TEN-T ni con las declaraciones públicas de los responsables españoles de transporte, ni con presuntos memorandos de intenciones firmados en reuniones interestatales. A la vista de los datos:

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que estas decisiones son coherentes con las prioridades expresadas en los TEN-T?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión positivo para fomentar la cooperación interestatal centrar los esfuerzos inversores inmediatos en solventar los llamados «cuellos de botella» entre Estados miembros?

3. ¿Dispone la Comisión de explicaciones oficiales por parte del Estado español de las razones que sustentan estas decisiones?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000668/14
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(23 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Paralización de obras básicas en la «Y» vasca

El Presidente del Gobierno español ha desvelado hoy, en el transcurso de una comparecencia en las Cortes Generales de España, que no hay plazo para acometer las obras del nudo de Bergara, un tramo crítico para finalizar las obras de la denominada «Y» vasca, pues, en esta zona, se unen los ramales de dicha infraestructura. La «Y» vasca es clave, a su vez, para eliminar el cuello de botella que ralentiza los intercambios ferroviarios entre España y Francia por Hendaya. El Presidente español ha añadido que estas obras se harán «cuando haya presupuesto para ello».

Esta actitud no es nueva en el Gobierno estatal. De hecho, el Gobierno regional vasco se hizo cargo, mediante un acuerdo financiero, de la ejecución de parte de los trabajos para superar el retraso al que estaban sometidos. De hecho, las obras realizadas gracias a este acuerdo permitirían abrir la «Y» vasca al tráfico en 2018. Este plazo está en riesgo por la indefinición que afecta al citado «nudo de Bergara». Por ello, el ejecutivo regional vasco está reclamando insistentemente que se le permita extender el acuerdo empleado en otras zonas de la obra para concluir estos trabajos dentro del plazo.

A la vista de estas informaciones:

1. ¿Dispone la Comisión de información adicional sobre los plazos que maneja el Gobierno de España para licitar y ejecutar el nudo de Bergara?

2. ¿Considera que este trabajo debería estar listo para 2018 so pena de no rentabilizar y optimizar inversiones ya acometidas y que han contado con financiación europea?

3. ¿Es coherente esta paralización con la ejecución de otras obras de alta velocidad sin ningún tipo de conexión ni prioridad mientras que abandonan un eje prioritario?

4. ¿Anima la Comisión a extender el acuerdo que ha hecho posible la realización de las obras en otros tramos al «nudo de Bergara» y posibilitar que las ejecute el Gobierno vasco?

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

Tras la adopción del Reglamento (UE) n° 1315/2013, sobre las orientaciones de la Unión para el desarrollo de la Red Transeuropea de Transporte ([1]), el proyecto de la Y vasca, que ya estaba incluido en el proyecto prioritario n° 3 de la RTE-T, se ha convertido en un componente fundamental del corredor atlántico de la red básica de la RTE-T.

En este contexto, en 2014 se diseñará un plan de trabajo del corredor y se nombrará un coordinador europeo que presidirá un foro de este corredor, en el que participarán los Estados miembros implicados, encaminado, entre otros fines, a afinar las prioridades y el desarrollo del proyecto.

A partir de 2014, se disponen de más fondos de la UE y de unos porcentajes de cofinanciación más elevados que hasta ahora, gracias al nuevo Reglamento (UE) n° 1316/2013, por el que se crea el Mecanismo «Conectar Europa» ([2]).

Así pues, la Comisión:

— reitera la importancia del proyecto de la Y vasca en el corredor atlántico;

— espera que se presenten propuestas para el proyecto de la Y vasca en la próxima convocatoria de propuestas del Mecanismo «Conectar Europa»;

— espera que el plan de trabajo del corredor aclare la planificación nacional general con respecto a las necesidades del corredor:

([1]) DO L 348 de 20.12.2013.
([2]) DO L 348 de 20.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000569/14
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Unexplained delays in clearing 'bottlenecks' in Europe

Following the approval of the general state budget in Spain it has been confirmed that the government of this Member State has allocated only 5.75% of the investment envisaged in this financial year (3 032 million euros) to the zone of the Atlantic Corridor known as the 'Basque Y'. In terms of the specifications approved by the European Parliament for the TEN-T (trans-European transport network), the Basque Y has priority status. This stretch of infrastructure forms the basis for improving one of the two rail connections between Spain and France, and it fulfils all the conditions for promoting interoperability and intermodality, which characterise the works to be carried out all across Europe in the near future.

However, despite these facts, the resources dedicated to this priority investment have been reduced by 50% with respect to the previous financial year. The progress of the works is being maintained thanks exclusively to the efforts of the Basque Government, which has taken over responsibility for the construction of part of this infrastructure. The decision has not been adopted as a result of any budget shortfall, since other stretches that do not involve the elimination of 'bottlenecks' have not seen their allocations of funds cut. The decisions that have been taken neither follow the criteria of the TEN-T nor are they in accord with the public declarations of the Spanish transport authorities or the terms of presumed memoranda of intentions signed at inter-state meetings.

In light of the foregoing:

1. Does the Commission consider that these decisions are consistent with the priorities laid down in the TEN-T?

2. Does the Commission consider that focusing short-term investment on solving the problems of so-called 'bottlenecks' between Member States is positive for the encouragement of inter-state cooperation?

3. Has the Commission received any official explanations from the Spanish Government regarding the grounds for these decisions?

Question for written answer E-000668/14
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Halting of basic works on the Basque Y high-speed rail network

The Spanish Prime Minister has today revealed in Parliament that there is no set date for beginning work on Bergara Junction, a critical section for the completion of works on the Basque Y high-speed rail network because this is where the branches of the network are to meet. In turn, the Basque Y is essential to get rid of the bottleneck that slows down rail links between Spain and France through Hendaye. The Spanish Prime Minister added that these works would be done 'when the budget allows'.

This attitude is not new in the Spanish Government. In fact, the Basque regional government has already taken responsibility, under a financial agreement, for implementing part of the works in order to make good existing delays. And indeed the work done under this agreement would make it possible for the Basque Y to open to traffic in 2018. This deadline is now at risk because of the uncertainty surrounding Bergara Junction. The Basque regional government is therefore demanding that it be permitted to extend the agreement covering other areas of the network so that these works can be completed on time.

In the light of this information:

1. Does the Commission have any further information on the Spanish Government's schedule for tendering and implementing work on Bergara Junction?

2. Does it think that this work should be completed by 2018 to ensure the viability and optimisation of the sums already invested, which have included European funding?

3. Does it make sense to halt these works when work is continuing on other high-speed lines with neither connections nor priority status, while a priority axis lies abandoned?

4. Is the Commission in favour of extending the agreement that has made it possible to implement works on other sections to Bergara Junction and allowing the Basque government to implement them?

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

Following the adoption of Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 establishing the new Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network ([1]), the Y-Basque project, which was already included in the TEN-T Priority Project n° 3, is now a key component of the Atlantic Corridor of the TEN-T Core Network.

Within this framework, a Corridor work plan will be defined in 2014 and a European Coordinator will be appointed to chair a Corridor Forum involving the Member States concerned with a view, *inter alia*, to fine-tune priorities and project development.

A larger amount of EU funding with higher co-financing rates as compared to the past, is available from 2014 under the new Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility ([2]).

The Commission therefore:

— reaffirms the importance of the Y-Basque project within the Atlantic Corridor;

— awaits the submission of proposals concerning the Y-Basque project in the next calls for proposals under the Connecting Europe Facility;

— expects the Corridor work plan to clarify the overall national planning vis-à-vis the Corridor needs.

([1]) OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.
([2]) OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000570/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(22. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Fehlende Statistiken über den Verkauf von Pflanzenschutzmitteln trotz Einführung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1185/2009

Die europäischen Verbraucher halten Rückstände von Pflanzenschutzmitteln in ihrer Nahrung für das größte Risiko bei Lebensmitteln (Eurobarometer 238 von 2006 und Eurobarometer 354 von 2010). Trotz Einführung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1185/2009 über Statistiken zu Pestiziden stammt die jüngste vollständige Datenbank von Eurostat über Pestizide, in die alle Mitgliedstaaten erfasst sind, aus dem Jahr 2001; die jüngsten verfügbaren Informationen in der Datenbank von Eurostat sind aus dem Jahr 2008, aber nur vier Mitgliedstaaten haben in dem betreffenden Jahr Daten über Pestizide veröffentlicht. Die einzige Veröffentlichung von Eurostat über den Einsatz von Pestiziden in der EU datiert aus dem Jahr 2007, wobei die Daten für den Zeitraum von 1992 bis 2003 unter anderem von der European Crop Protection Association (Europäische Vereinigung der Pflanzenschutzmittelindustrie) bereitgestellt wurden.

Laut der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1185/2009 müssen die Mitgliedstaaten folgende Statistiken bereitstellen:

— jährlich: Übermittlung über den Verkauf von Pestiziden ab 2011, wobei die Statistiken im Dezember 2012 übermittelt werden müssen;

— fünfjährlich: Übermittlung über den Einsatz von Pestiziden ab 2014, wobei die Statistiken im Dezember 2015 übermittelt werden müssen.

1. Weshalb werden die Daten über den Verkauf von Pestiziden nicht veröffentlicht?

2. Wann werden die Daten über den Verkauf von Pestiziden veröffentlicht?

3. Wie will die Kommission dafür Sorge tragen, dass die gegebenenfalls von den Mitgliedstaaten festgelegten Vertraulichkeitsbestimmungen eingehend geprüft werden?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(10. März 2014)

1./2. Die ersten Daten über Verkäufe von Pestiziden (d. h. für das Jahr 2011) mussten Eurostat bis Ende 2012 übermittelt werden. Anschließend waren die Daten jährlich vorzulegen, d. h. die Daten für das Bezugsjahr 2012 mussten bis Ende 2013 vorliegen. Nach Artikel 3 Absatz 4 der Verordnung Nr. 1185/2009 ([1]) aggregiert Eurostat die Daten vor ihrer Veröffentlichung nach den chemischen Produktklassen oder -kategorien gemäß Anhang III und berücksichtigt dabei in gebührender Weise den Schutz vertraulicher Daten auf der Ebene der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten. Dies bedeutet, dass Eurostat keine Daten über Wirkstoffe, sondern nur aggregierte Daten veröffentlichen kann.

Eurostat hält es nicht für zweckmäßig, Daten auf seiner Website zu veröffentlichen, bei denen für die meisten Zellen und Aggregate aufgrund des Schutzes der statistischen Geheimhaltung keine Angaben gemacht werden können. Eurostat versucht derzeit zusammen mit den nationalen statistischen Ämtern, eine Lösung zu finden; sein Ziel ist es, einen ersten Datensatz für die Bezugsjahre 2011 und 2012 auf den zwei höchsten Aggregierungsebenen im ersten Quartal 2014 herausgeben zu können.

Die Daten über den Pestizideinsatz in der Landwirtschaft sind Eurostat vor Ende 2015 zu übermitteln. Geplant ist, diese Daten in der ersten Hälfe des Jahres 2016 veröffentlichen zu können.

3. Die Frage der vertraulichen Behandlung der Daten über die Pestizidverkäufe wurde im September 2013 in der zuständigen statistischen Arbeitsgruppe erörtert. Der Standpunkt von Eurostat war klar: Nur Daten über Wirkstoffe, für die es nur wenige Datenlieferanten gibt, können als vertraulich angesehen werden. Die Diskussionen über dieses höchst wichtige und schwierige Thema dauern an.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1185/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 25. November 2009 über Statistiken zu Pestiziden, ABl. L 324 vom 10.12.2009, S. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000570/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Missing statistics on sale of pesticides despite introduction of Regulation (EC) No 1185/2009

European consumers consider pesticide residues in their food to be the main food risk (*Eurobarometer* 238 of 2006 and *Eurobarometer* 354 of 2010). Despite the introduction of Regulation (EC) No 1185/2009 concerning statistics on pesticides, Eurostat's latest complete database on pesticides, covering all the Member States, dates from 2001; the latest available information in Eurostat's database dates from 2008, but only four Member States released pesticide data that year. The only Eurostat publication on the use of pesticides in the EU dates back to 2007, with data for 1992 to 2003 having been provided by the European Crop Protection Association, among others.

Regulation (EC) No 1185/2009 requires the Member States to provide the following statistics:

— annual delivery of statistics on the sale of pesticides, starting with 2011 statistics to be delivered in December 2012;

— five-yearly delivery of statistics on the use of pesticides, starting with 2014 statistics to be delivered in December 2015.

1. Why are data on the sale of pesticides not being published?

2. When will data on the sale of pesticides be published?

3. How will the Commission ensure that potential confidentiality requirements laid down by the Member States are closely scrutinised?

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

1 and 2. The first data on the sales of pesticides (i.e. for the year 2011) were to be transmitted to Eurostat by the end of 2012, and then annually, which means data for reference year 2012 due by end 2013. According to Article 3(4) of Regulation 1185/2009 ([1]), Eurostat shall aggregate the data before publication in accordance with the chemical classes or categories of products indicated in Annex III, taking due account of the protection of confidential data at the level of the individual Member State. This means that Eurostat cannot publish data on active substance, but only aggregated data.

Eurostat considers it of no use to disseminate data on its website where most cells and aggregates are left empty due to protection of statistical confidentiality. Eurostat is currently working to find a solution in liaison with National Statistical Institutes and aims at being able to publish a first set of data referring to reference years 2011 and 2012 at the two highest aggregation levels in the first quarter of 2014.

The data on agricultural use of pesticides are to be transmitted to Eurostat before the end of 2015. The plans are to be able to publish this data during the first half of 2016.

3. The issue of confidential treatment of pesticide sales data was discussed in the relevant Statistical Working Group in September 2013. The message from Eurostat was clear: only active substances for which there are only few data providers can be accepted as being confidential. Discussions on this highly important and difficult issue continue.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1185/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 concerning statistics on pesticides, OJ L 324/1 of 10.12.2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000576/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(22 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Partecipazione attiva alla cultura

In Italia sono stati recentemente diffusi alcuni dati relativi al rapporto tra cittadini e cultura. I dati che si riferiscono al 2013 sono particolarmente allarmanti. 39 italiani su 100 non hanno partecipato ad alcuna attività culturale, il 3,7 % in più rispetto al 2012. Sono aumentati del 3 % gli italiani che non leggono nemmeno un libro l'anno, mentre l'indice di partecipazione culturale degli italiani è pari all'8 %: vuol dire che 8 italiani su 100 prendono parte assiduamente ad attività culturali. In Europa sono il 18 %, in Svezia il 43 %.

Il bilancio del ministero dei Beni culturali è calato di quasi un miliardo di euro in dieci anni, scendendo a 1,5 miliardi, mentre le previsioni per il triennio 2014-2016 non sono per nulla incoraggianti, con un calo previsto a 1,4 miliardi.

Nella sola capitale, per il 2014 i tagli alla cultura saranno del 30-50 %, mentre dal 2008 i fondi per la tutela del patrimonio sono stati più che dimezzati, passando da 165 milioni e mezzo a poco più di 75 milioni.

Il calo degli investimenti non interessa solo il settore pubblico: nel privato si assiste a un calo del 28 % delle sponsorizzazioni e del 40,5 % delle erogazioni bancarie.

Gli investimenti nelle nuove tecnologie sono scarsissimi: solo il 3 % dei musei italiani ha applicazioni per smartphone e tablet, il 6 % audioguide per la visita, il 13 % un catalogo online.

Alla luce di questi dati, può la Commissione:

1. fornire dati aggiornati sulla partecipazione culturale dei cittadini negli altri paesi europei;

2. chiarire come intende incentivare la crescita culturale dei cittadini europei, elemento essenziale per la formazione di un senso comune di appartenenza all'Europa;

3. far sapere se l'UE dispone di fondi specifici per la promozione della cultura e il sostegno delle attività culturali (musei, siti archeologici, percorsi turistici, concerti, laboratori culturali, eccetera)?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(7 marzo 2014)

Per un quadro generale della partecipazione alla cultura in Europa si rinvia ai risultati dell'indagine Eurobarometro 2013 sulla partecipazione alla cultura ([1]).

Il programma «Europa Creativa» della Commissione sosterrà azioni volte a salvaguardare e promuovere la diversità culturale e linguistica dell'Europa e a rafforzare la competitività dei settori culturali e creativi europei. Ciò avverrà agendo su tutta una serie di strumenti che, essenzialmente, incoraggeranno la circolazione delle opere culturali europee o degli artisti europei e saranno volti all'allargamento e alla diversificazione del pubblico, al capacity *building* nel settore e/o alla digitalizzazione.

Nel sotto-programma Cultura ciò avverrà offrendo un sostegno ai progetti di cooperazione, alle traduzioni letterarie, alle reti e alle piattaforme. Il sotto-programma Media supporterà, tra l'altro, la distribuzione e la promozione delle opere culturali, l'allargamento e la diversificazione del pubblico e i festival cinematografici. Esso contribuirà inoltre alla formazione degli operatori professionali, sosterrà i mercati della coproduzione e gli strumenti di impresa, nonché lo sviluppo delle realizzazioni audiovisive europee.

Per rafforzare la consapevolezza di appartenere a uno spazio culturale comune, la promozione del dialogo interculturale e della comprensione reciproca e per promuovere il valore del retaggio culturale, il programma sostiene inoltre le Capitali europee della Cultura e il Marchio del Patrimonio europeo nonché tutta una serie di premi culturali europei.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/news/20131105-eurobarometer_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000576/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Active participation in culture

Figures have recently been published in Italy concerning the relationship that the Italian people have with culture. The statistics for 2013 are a particular cause for concern: 39 out of every 100 Italians claim not to have taken part in any cultural activity, 3.7% more than in 2012. The number of Italians who say they do not read even one book a year has increased by 3%, while cultural participation in Italy stands at 8%; this means that only 8 Italians in every 100 regularly take part in cultural activities. The equivalent figure in Europe is 18%, and in Sweden 43%.

In the past decade, the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage has had its budget slashed by almost EUR 1 billion to EUR 1.5 billion, and the outlook for 2014-2016 is bleaker still, with a further decrease of EUR 1.4 billion being anticipated.

In Rome alone the culture budget will be cut by 30-50% in 2014, while funding for heritage protection has more than halved since 2008, dropping from EUR 165.5 million to little more than EUR 75 million.

The public sector is not alone in feeling the effects of declining investment: private sponsorships have fallen by 28% and bank grants by 40.5%.

Very little money is being invested in new technologies: only 3% of Italian museums have smartphone and tablet applications, 6% offer audio guides and 13% have an online catalogue.

1. In light of the above, can the Commission provide up-to-date figures on the cultural participation in other European countries?

2. Can it clarify how it intends to stimulate cultural development amongst European citizens, this being essential for establishing a common European identity?

3. Can it state whether the EU has specific funds set aside for promoting culture and supporting cultural activities (museums, archaeological sites, tourist routes, concerts, cultural workshops, etc.)?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

For an overview of cultural participation in Europe, please see the results of the 2013 Eurobarometer Survey on Cultural Participation ([1]).

The Commission's Creative Europe Programme will support actions to safeguard and promote European cultural and linguistic diversity and to strenghten the competitiveness of the European cultural and creative sectors. It does so by a variety of means which, in essence, all support the circulation of European works or European artists and aim at the development of audiences, capacity building in the sector and/ or digitalisation.

In the Culture Sub-programme this is done by providing support to cooperation projects, literary translations, networks and platforms. The Media Sub-programme will amongst others give support to the distribution and promotion of works, audience development and film festivals. It will also support training for professionals, co-production markets and business tools and the development of European audiovisual works.

To strengthen the feeling of belonging to a common cultural area, the promotion of intercultural dialogue and mutual understanding, and the enhancement of the value of cultural heritage, the Programme also supports the European Capitals of Culture and the European Heritage Label, as well as a variety of European cultural prizes.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/news/20131105-eurobarometer_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000580/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(22 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Interdição da apanha de bivalves na Ria Formosa

Relativamente à recente interdição da apanha de bivalves na Ria Formosa e à possível ligação com uma queixa apresentada pelas autoridades espanholas à Comissão Europeia sobre um alegado caso de contaminação de berbigão, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. De que informações dispõe a este respeito?

2. Recebeu alguma queixa, por parte das autoridades espanholas, referente à contaminação de bivalves oriundos da Ria Formosa? Em caso afirmativo, qual o teor dessa queixa?

3. Que diligências foram efetuadas pela Comissão? Qual o curso do processo?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(10 de março de 2014)

A Comissão remete para a sua resposta à anterior pergunta escrita E-000152/2014 ([1]).

A Comissão não tem conhecimento, nesta fase, de qualquer denúncia apresentada pelas autoridades espanholas em relação a um alegado caso de contaminação de bivalves originários da Ria Formosa.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000580/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Ban on the harvesting of bivalves in Ria Formosa

In relation to the recent ban on the harvesting of bivalves in Ria Formosa and the possible connection with a complaint submitted to the European Commission by the Spanish authorities in relation to an alleged case of contamination of cockles, I would ask the Commission for information on the following:

1. What information does the Commission have in this respect?

2. Did the Commission receive any complaint from the Spanish authorities in relation to the contamination of bivalves originating in Ria Formosa? If a complaint was received, what did it state?

3. What steps have been taken by the Commission? What stage is this procedure at?

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

The Commission refers to its answer to previous Written Question E-000152/2014 ([1]).

The Commission is not aware at this stage of any complaint submitted by the Spanish authorities in relation to an alleged case of contamination of bivalves originating in Ría Formosa.

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000581/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(22 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Queixas relativas ao projeto de transvase Tejo-Segura

De acordo com as queixas que recebi de um grupo de cidadãos, os desenvolvimentos em torno do transvase Tejo-Segura (nomeadamente a celebração de um memorando de entendimento entre o Ministério da Agricultura, Alimentação e Meio Ambiente espanhol e as regiões de Múrcia, Comunidade Valenciana, Madrid, Estremadura e Castela-Mancha) configuram um desrespeito da legislação ambiental e da legislação relativa à água. Consideram que se trata de um procedimento irregular, que ignora o processo de planificação da bacia do Tejo, e que é incorporado de forma irregular no sistema jurídico, independentemente de qualquer discussão pública, análise e informação aos cidadãos, violando a Diretiva-Quadro da Água, bem como a própria legislação sobre a água e o acesso à informação por parte dos cidadãos. Assinalam que com a falta de água que se fará sentir no futuro, alguns ecossistemas do distrito de Portalegre, e de toda a bacia hidrográfica do Tejo, serão afetados por este tipo de medidas.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Que avaliação faz das queixas e dos alertas feitos por este grupo de cidadãos relativamente ao transvase Tejo-Segura?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(7 de março de 2014)

A Comissão recebeu uma queixa de diversas ONG ambientais e está a investigar a compatibilidade das recentes alterações regulamentares introduzidas no transvase Tejo-Segura com a legislação ambiental da UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000581/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Complaints relating to the draft Tagus-Segura transfer

According to the complaints which I have received from a group of citizens, the developments surrounding the Tagus-Segura transfer (namely the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the Spanish Ministry for Agriculture, Food and the Environment and the regions of Murcia, Valencia, Madrid, Extremadura and Castile-La Mancha) constitute a disregard of environmental legislation and of the legislation relating to water.

They consider that this constitutes an irregular procedure, which ignores the planning process covering the Tagus basin and which is incorporated into the legal system in an irregular form, independent of any public discussion, analysis and notification to the citizens, in breach of the Water Framework Directive, together with the existing legislation concerning water and the access to information on the part of the citizens. They state that, with the shortage of water which will be felt in the future, some eco-systems in the Portalegre district and in the whole of the Tagus hydrographic basin will be affected by measures of this type.

I would ask the Commission:

What weight does the Commission give to the complaints and warnings made by this group of citizens in relation to the Tagus-Segura transfer?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

The Commission has received a complaint from several environmental NGOs and is currently investigating the compatibility of the recent regulatory changes to the Tajo-Segura transfer with EU environmental legislation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000584/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(22 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Aplicação da Diretiva 2009/128/CE relativa à utilização sustentável dos pesticidas

A Diretiva 2009/128/CE estabeleceu como eixo central obrigatório para «uma utilização sustentável dos pesticidas» a prática da Proteção Integrada (PI), estabelecendo no artigo 14.°, n.° 4 (Proteção Integrada), que «os princípios gerais da proteção integrada previstos no Anexo III são aplicados por todos os utilizadores profissionais até 1 de janeiro de 2014».

Nos termos do n.° 3 do mesmo artigo 14.°, «até 30 de junho de 2013 os Estados-Membros transmitem à Comissão um relatório sobre a aplicação dos n.°s 1 e 2, que deve referir, nomeadamente, se se encontram reunidas as condições necessárias para a aplicação da proteção integrada».

Solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que avaliação faz a Comissão, face aos relatórios nacionais dos Estados-Membros, das condições de aplicação da proteção integrada a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2014?

2. Quais os Estados-Membros que não conseguiram cumprir esse objetivo? Foram estabelecidas para esses Estados-membros novas datas e assumidas moratórias para a aplicação dos princípios gerais da PI?

3. Que avaliação faz a Comissão do relatório do Estado Português? Considerou o Estado Português que se encontram reunidas as condições necessárias para a aplicação da PI até 1 de janeiro de 2014? Poderá esse relatório ser consultado?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000585/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(22 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Aplicação da Diretiva 2009/128/CE relativa à utilização sustentável dos pesticidas — apoio aos agricultores

Tendo em conta a Diretiva 2009/128/CE, que estabelece um quadro de ação a nível comunitário para uma utilização sustentável dos pesticidas, e a definição oficial dos pesticidas que são compatíveis com a Proteção Integrada, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

Qual a metodologia escolhida por cada um dos seguintes Estados-Membros do sul — Bulgária, Grécia, França, Itália, Espanha e Portugal — no apoio aos agricultores para o uso de pesticidas em Proteção Integrada (PI):

a. definição pela autoridade pública competente da lista dos pesticidas autorizados em PI?

b. obrigatoriedade da informação toxicológica nos rótulos dos pesticidas, deixando ao livre arbítrio do agricultor, a opção na escolha do pesticida?

c. outras?

Resposta conjunta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(7 de março de 2014)

A Comissão está atualmente a acompanhar a obrigação de os Estados-Membros apresentarem um relatório sobre as condições para a aplicação da gestão integrada das pragas (IPM), em conformidade com o artigo 14.° da Diretiva 2009/128/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, que estabelece um quadro de ação a nível comunitário para uma utilização sustentável dos pesticidas ([1]).

Considerando que três Estados-Membros, incluindo Portugal, ainda não apresentaram o seu relatório, a Comissão está atualmente a exigir a esses países que cumpram essa obrigação, o mais rapidamente possível, estando ainda a avaliar a possibilidade de dar início a um processo por infração. É intenção da Comissão disponibilizar todos os relatórios ao público, na condição de os Estados-Membros darem o seu acordo.

([1]) JO L 309 de 24.11.2009, p. 71.

Além disso, a Comissão está a supervisionar a correta implementação da Diretiva 2009/128/CE através das auditorias realizadas pelo Serviço Alimentar e Veterinário.

Os requisitos da IPM estabelecidos na Diretiva 2009/128/CE não preveem que os Estados-Membros enumerem separadamente os pesticidas permitidos ao abrigo da IPM. A rotulagem de pesticidas é regida pelo Regulamento (CE) n.° 1272/2008 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo à classificação, rotulagem e embalagem de substâncias e misturas, complementado pelo Regulamento (UE) n.° 547/2011 da Comissão, e abrange informação toxicológica.

Além disso, a Comissão está atualmente a avaliar os Planos de Ação Nacionais (PAN) que foram apresentados em conformidade com o artigo 4.° da Diretiva 2009/128/CE. Os referidos PAN devem fornecer informações complementares sobre a IPM. Até 26 de novembro de 2014, a Comissão apresentará um relatório ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho sobre os resultados da sua avaliação.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000584/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Application of Directive 2009/128/EC concerning the sustainable use of pesticides

Directive 2009/128/EC established as the mandatory core for 'The sustainable use of pesticides' the implementation of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), establishing, in Article 14, paragraph 4 (Integrated Pest Management), that 'the general principles of Integrated Pest Management as set out in Annex III are to be implemented by all professional users by 1 January 2014'.

In compliance with paragraph 3 of that same Article 14, 'By 30 June 2013, Member States shall report to the Commission on the implementation of paragraphs 1 and 2 and, in particular, whether the necessary conditions for implementation of Integrated Pest Management are in place'.

We would ask the Commission to advise us on the following:

1. What assessment is made by the Commission, in response to the national reports of the Member States, in respect of the implementation of Integrated Pest Management as from 1 January 2014?

2. Which Member States have failed to meet this target? Have new dates and assumed moratoria been established for these Member States for implementation of the general principles of IPM?

3. What assessment is made by the Commission in respect of the report from Portugal? Did Portugal consider that the necessary conditions for the implementation of IPM had been met by 1 January 2014? Is it possible to consult this report?

Question for written answer E-000585/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Application of Directive 2009/128/EC concerning the sustainable use of pesticides — support to farmers

Taking into consideration Directive 2009/128/EC, which establishes a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides and the official definition of those pesticides which are compatible with Integrated Pest Management, we would ask the Commission:

Which of the following approaches has been adopted by each of the following southern Member States — Bulgaria, Greece, France, Italy, Spain and Portugal — in their support to farmers in respect of the use of pesticides under Integrated Pest Management (IP):

(a) Have the relevant local authorities compiled a list of pesticides permitted under IPM?

(b) Has it been made mandatory to include toxicological information on pesticide labels, in order to allow farmers to freely choose which pesticides to use?

(c) Or have other measures been implemented?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

The Commission is currently following up on the obligation of Member States to report whether the conditions for implementation of Integrated Pest management (IPM) are in place in compliance with Article 14 of Directive 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides. ([1])

Considering that three Member States, including Portugal, have not yet reported, the Commission is currently requiring them to comply with that obligation as soon as possible and is also evaluating whether to initiate an infringement procedure. It is the intention of the Commission to make all reports publicly available, provided the agreement of Member States.

([1]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p. 71.

In addition, the Commission is monitoring the correct implementation of Directive 2009/128/EC through the audits carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office.

The IPM requirements laid down in Directive 2009/128/EC do not foresee that Member States list separately the pesticides permitted under IPM. The labelling of pesticides is ruled by Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures, supplemented by Commission Regulation (EU) No 547/2011 and covers toxicological information.

In addition, the Commission is currently assessing the National Action Plans (NAPs) which were submitted in compliance with Article 4 of Directive 2009/128/EC. These NAPs are expected to provide further information as regards IPM. The Commission will report the outcome of the assessment to the European Parliament and Council by 26 November 2014.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000592/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(22 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Resolução do Parlamento Europeu sobre Organismos Geneticamente Modificados

O Parlamento Europeu aprovou, na sua sessão plenária de Janeiro, uma resolução sobre a proposta de decisão do Conselho relativa à colocação no mercado, para cultivo, em conformidade com a Diretiva 2001/18/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de um milho (Zea mays L., linha 1507) geneticamente modificado para lhe conferir resistência a determinados lepidópteros. Nesta resolução, o Parlamento opõe-se à aprovação desta proposta e solicita que não seja autorizada nenhuma nova variedade de OGM, nem renovadas as autorizações antigas, até que os métodos usados para a avaliação dos riscos tenham sido consideravelmente melhorados.

Este tipo de OGM, em particular, tem consequências sobre espécies de insetos não-alvo extremamente sensíveis e faltam estudos de impacto sobre outros organismos.

Na avaliação de riscos, a EFSA admitiu não ter tido em conta os potenciais riscos associados à tolerância deste tipo de milho ao herbicida à base de glufosinato de amónio, classificado como tóxico para a reprodução, podendo levar a um aumento do uso deste herbicida.

Além dos riscos para a biodiversidade que a proliferação de culturas transgénicas apresenta, já que possuem uma vantagem competitiva relativamente a outras espécies, não modificadas, podendo a libertação destes organismos geneticamente modificados no meio ambiente acarretar sérias consequências ao nível dos ecossistemas, comprometendo, em particular, as culturas agrícolas convencionais e biológicas, acresce que, atualmente, não é possível garantir de forma cientificamente credível a inocuidade dos produtos transgénicos na alimentação humana e animal.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que avaliação faz do conteúdo da resolução do Parlamento Europeu?

2. Que medidas pensa tomar na sequência da aprovação desta resolução?

3. Que avaliação faz, em concreto, sobre as supramencionadas falhas da EFSA, que não teve em conta os potenciais riscos associados à tolerância deste tipo de milho ao herbicida à base de glufosinato de amónio?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(3 de março de 2014)

1. e 2. O período de 3 meses de que o Conselho dispunha para adotar uma posição relativa a uma proposta de decisão do Conselho no que respeita ao Zea mays L., linha 1507 acabou de expirar (12 de fevereiro de 2014), não tendo o Conselho adotado qualquer parecer.

O processo está novamente nas mãos da Comissão, que está atualmente a analisar a resolução do Parlamento Europeu. A Comissão responderá oficialmente ao Parlamento Europeu no que respeita à resolução.

3. Convida-se o Senhor Deputado a consultar as respostas da Comissão à pergunta escrita P-012662/2013, relativa ao pedido da Pioneer para que o milho GM 1507 seja autorizado para cultivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000592/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: European Parliament Resolution on genetically modified organisms

At its plenary session in January, the European Parliament passed a resolution on the Council's proposed decision concerning the placing on the market, for cultivation, in accordance with Directive 2001/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, of a maize (Zea mays L., line 1507) genetically modified to make it resistant to certain butterflies and moths. In this resolution, the Parliament calls on the Council to reject the proposed authorisation and urged it not to authorise any new varieties of GMO, or renew any existing authorisations, until risk assessment methods have been considerably improved.

This type of GMO, in particular, has an impact on highly sensitive non-target insect species and no impact assessments have been conducted with regard to other organisms.

In its risk assessment, the EFSA acknowledged that it had not considered the potential risks linked to this type of maize's tolerance to the herbicide glufosinate-ammonium (which is classified as toxic to reproduction), which could lead to increased use of this herbicide.

In addition to the risks to biodiversity implied by the proliferation of transgenic crops, due to them having a competitive advantage over other, non-modified species, meaning that the release of these genetically modified organisms into the environment could have a serious impact on ecosystems, particularly by compromising conventional, biological agricultural crops, there is also the fact that it is currently impossible to guarantee in any scientifically credible way that transgenic products are safe for human and animal consumption.

I ask the Commission:

1. How does the Commission assess the content of the European Parliament's resolution?

2. What measures will the Commission be taking as a result of this resolution?

3. How does the Commission assess, in practical terms, the aforementioned failings of the EFSA, which has not considered the potential risks linked to this type of maize's tolerance to the herbicide glufosinate-ammonium?

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

1-2. The 3-month period dedicated to the Council to take position on the proposal for a Council decision on 1507 maize has just expired (12 February 2014) and no opinion was adopted by the Council.

The file is now again with the Commission which is currently analysing the European Parliament resolution. The Commission will reply officially to the European Parliament as regards the resolution.

3. The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the Commission's replies to Written Question P-012662/2013 dealing with Pioneer's application for GM maize 1507 to be authorised for cultivation.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000594/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(22 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Condiciones de trabajo abusivas (2)

En respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-013217/2013 sobre la situación de los trabajadores de Qatar, la Comisión afirmó que había adoptado unas medidas jurídicas pero que aún esperaba mejoras de acuerdo con los convenios internacionales de la OIT, sobre todo para saber qué legislación aplicar.

Como ya hemos subrayado, la situación de los trabajadores de Qatar es muy preocupante, pero no solo se trata del respeto de los derechos de los trabajadores, es un caso de esclavitud moderna. Por ello, nos parece que una situación tan urgente necesita la adopción de medidas inmediatas. El derecho a la protección de la dignidad humana de aquellos trabajadores no debe ser negociable.

¿Podría la Comisión precisar cuáles son los actos jurídicos concretos que ha adoptado?

¿Piensa la Comisión impulsar medidas jurídicas vinculantes en el marco de la política extranjera de la UE?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión declaró en su respuesta E-013217/2013 que la UE «siempre ha abogado por la adopción de medidas jurídicas y ejecutivas enérgicas por parte de nuestros socios del Golfo Pérsico». Por lo tanto, se hizo una referencia a la legislación nacional de Qatar.

La UE está atenta a estas cuestiones, especialmente en el marco de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo (OIT). La UE apoya el Programa de Trabajo Decente y la ratificación y aplicación efectiva de los convenios de la OIT, en particular por lo que respecta a las normas laborales fundamentales, y coopera con la OIT en este sentido.

La UE considera que la legislación y las disposiciones de aplicación deben mejorar en conformidad con las normas laborales internacionales (en especial, los convenios de la OIT n° 111 y n° 81, que han sido ratificados por Qatar) y en estrecha colaboración con los países de origen de los trabajadores extranjeros, sobre todo en lo referido al cumplimiento de la legislación vigente, entre otras cosas para resolver el problema de las «agencias de contratación».

Las relaciones de la UE con Qatar se basan actualmente en el Acuerdo de cooperación UE-CCG de 1988, que no incluía disposiciones en materia de normas laborales.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000594/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Abusive working conditions (2)

In response to my written question (E-013217/2013) on the situation of migrant workers in Qatar, the Commission stated that it had adopted certain legal measures but that it was also awaiting improvements in accordance with the international treaties of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), above all in order to know what legislation to apply.

As we have stressed before, the situation of the Qatar workers is very worrying. However, the question is not just about respect for workers' rights — this is a case of modern slavery. It therefore seems to us that a situation of such urgency requires the adoption of immediate measures. The right of these workers to the protection of their dignity as human beings ought not to be a matter for negotiation.

Could the Commission therefore state in detail what specific legal measures it has adopted?

Is the Commission considering promoting the adoption of binding legal measures in the ambit of the EU's foreign policy?

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

In its answer to E-013217/2013, the Commission stated that 'the EU has consistently advocated for more decisive legislation and enforcement measures to be taken by our Gulf partners.' Reference was therefore made to domestic Qatari legislation.

The EU follows these issues notably under the framework of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The EU supports the Decent Work Agenda and the ratification and effective implementation of ILO Conventions, in particular with regard to core labour standards, and cooperates with the ILO in this respect.

The EU believes legislation and enforcement measures should be improved in accordance with international labour standards (in particular ILO conventions No 111 and No 81 which have been ratified by Qatar) and in close collaboration with the countries of origin of foreign workers — in particular as regards implementation of existing legislation (*inter alia* to address the issue of 'recruitment agencies').

The EU's relations with Qatar are currently based on the EU-GCC Cooperation Agreement of 1988, which did not include provisions on labour standards.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-000597/14
a la Comisión
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(22 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Energías renovables y fracking

En la actualidad, la UE cuenta con un triple objetivo obligatorio de cara al año 2020: un 20 % de recorte de emisiones, un 20 % de cuota de energías renovables y un 20 % de ahorro energético.

He tenido conocimiento de que la Comisión Europea está sopesando la posibilidad de prescindir de un objetivo vinculante de renovables de la UE para 2030 —que daría continuidad a la cuota del 20 % decidida para 2020— por considerar que sería «imposible» lograr un acuerdo debido a las grandes diferencias entre los Estados miembros.

Además de los nuevos objetivos en los ámbitos de energía y cambio climático, la Comisión va a presentar recomendaciones a los Estados miembros sobre la explotación del gas de pizarra mediante la fracturación hidráulica (*fracking*)

En este escenario, quisiera saber si la Comisión podría estar renunciando a objetivos ambiciosos en el ámbito de las energías renovables al impulsar el *fracking* como fuente de energía.

En este sentido, ¿no cree la Comisión que la extracción de estos hidrocarburos mediante *fracking* puede afectar negativamente a nuestra huella de carbono, comprometiendo incluso los objetivos energéticos y climáticos de la UE?

¿Está pensando la Comisión en rebajar los actuales compromisos internacionales en el futuro con el fin de poder favorecer el *fracking*?

¿Estima la Comisión que es necesario que se realicen estudios de impacto ambiental para todo el ciclo de vida de los pozos, y está de acuerdo en que estos deberían realizarse antes de iniciar cualquier actividad de exploración o construcción?

¿Ha valorado la Comisión en conciencia los múltiples e inevitables impactos que puede tener esta técnica sobre el medio ambiente, el clima y la salud de la población?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión no tiene intención de rebajar sus compromisos en cuanto a la descarbonación, las mejoras en materia de eficiencia energética y el fomento del uso de energía procedente de fuentes renovables. El objetivo de una reducción del 40 % de los gases de efecto invernadero presentado para 2030 transmitiría un firme mensaje y alentaría a la comunidad internacional a formular contribuciones igualmente ambiciosas de cara a un acuerdo internacional. También se ha propuesto aumentar la cuota de energías renovables hasta al menos un 27 % del consumo energético de la UE de aquí a 2030 ([1]). El papel fundamental de la eficiencia energética se precisará con más detalle en el marco de la revisión de la Directiva relativa a la eficiencia energética.

La extracción de hidrocarburos mediante procesos de fracturación hidráulica puede reportar beneficios climáticos siempre y cuando reemplace eficazmente a los combustibles fósiles que producen más emisiones de carbono, no sustituya a las fuentes de energía renovables, y las emisiones atmosféricas, incluido el metano, se atenúen de manera adecuada.

La Recomendación ([2]) relativa a la exploración y producción de hidrocarburos utilizando la fracturación hidráulica de alto volumen solo se aplica a los Estados miembros que deseen llevar a cabo tales actividades y no les impide mantener o introducir medidas más detalladas. Esta invita a dichos Estados miembros a tomar las medidas necesarias para garantizar que se efectúe una evaluación de impacto ambiental antes de proceder a la exploración y producción de hidrocarburos utilizando la fracturación hidráulica de alto volumen.

La evaluación de impacto ([3]) que acompaña a la Recomendación se basa en estudios ([4]) relativos a las repercusiones de tales actividades sobre la salud pública, el medio ambiente y el clima. La Comisión llevará a cabo un seguimiento de los avances tecnológicos en este campo y los tendrá en cuenta a la hora de examinar la eficacia de la Recomendación transcurridos 18 meses.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/2030/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/unconventional_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/pdf/ia_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/uff_studies_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000597/14
to the Commission
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Renewable energy and fracking

The EU currently aims to meet an obligatory triple objective by 2020: a 20% cut in emissions, a 20% share for renewable energies and 20% savings in energy consumption.

I understand that the Commission is considering the possibility of dropping one of the binding objectives for renewables towards 2030 — which would be a continuation of the 20% quota decided for 2020 — as it believes it will be impossible to reach an agreement because of the huge differences between Member States.

In addition to the new objectives relating to energy and climate change, the Commission is to present recommendations to the Member States on the exploitation of shale gas by hydraulic fracturing (fracking).

In light of this, I would like to know whether this means the Commission is giving up on ambitious goals in the field of renewable energies by promoting fracking as a source of energy.

Dos the Commission not feel that extracting hydrocarbons by fracking could have a negative impact on our carbon footprint and even compromise the EU's energy and climate objectives?

Is the Commission considering future action to water down the current international commitments in order to pave the way for fracking?

Does the Commission see a need to carry out environmental impact studies covering the whole life cycle of such wells and does it agree that this should be done before any exploratory or construction work is started?

Has the Commission conscientiously evaluated the varied and inevitable impacts which this technology can be foreseen to have on the environment, the climate and on public health?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

The Commission has no intention of watering down its commitments towards decarbonisation, energy efficiency improvements and the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources. The 40% GHG reduction target put forward for 2030 would constitute a strong signal, encouraging the international community to come forward with equally ambitious contributions to an international agreement. It has also proposed to increase the share of renewable energy to at least 27% of the EU's energy consumption by 2030 ([1]). The fundamental role of energy efficiency will be further determined as part of the review of the Energy Efficiency Directive.

Hydrocarbons extracted using hydraulic fracturing may bring climate benefits provided they effectively take the place of more carbon-intensive fossil fuels, do not replace renewable energy sources and that air emissions, including methane, are adequately mitigated.

The recommendation ([2]) on the exploration and production of hydrocarbons using high volume hydraulic fracturing is only applicable to Member States who wish to pursue such activities and does not prevent them from maintaining or introducing more detailed measures. It invites these Member States to take necessary measures to ensure that an environmental impact assessment is carried out prior to carrying out exploration and production of hydrocarbons using high volume hydraulic fracturing.

The Impact Assessment ([3]) accompanying the recommendation builds on studies ([4]) on public health, environment and climate impacts of such activities. The Commission will continue to follow technological developments in this area and will take them into account when reviewing the effectiveness of the recommendation after 18 months.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/2030/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/unconventional_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/pdf/ia_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/uff_studies_en.htm

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-000599/14
a Bizottság számára
Glattfelder Béla (PPE)
(2014. január 22.)

Tárgy: A piacra jutással kapcsolatos lehetséges uniós csereajánlat a MERCOSUR számára

Az EU felhatalmazással rendelkezik, hogy a MERCOSUR-ral mint egy tömbbel tárgyalásokat folytasson szabadkereskedelmi megállapodás megkötése céljából. A Paraguayjal és Venezuelával fennálló intézményi problémák, valamint Argentínának a szabadkereskedelmi megállapodáshoz való csatlakozással kapcsolatos vonakodása fényében kérem a Bizottságot, hogy válaszoljon az alábbi kérdésekre.

1. Akkor is felhatalmazása szerint járna-e el a Bizottság, ha az csak a tömb egy részének nyújtana tényleges engedményeket?

2. Hogyan szándékozik a Bizottság eljárni a tekintetben, hogy csereajánlatot tegyen a tömbnek mint egésznek? Szándékában áll-e bizonyos érzékeny termékeket kizárni az ajánlatból? Amennyiben igen, melyeket? Különösen az alábbi termékeket hogyan kívánja kezelni: cukor, bioetanol és biodízel, marhahús, sertéshús, szárnyas, tej és egyéb tejtermékek, csemegekukorica, más gyümölcsök és zöldségek?

3. Amennyiben Venezuela és Argentína a MERCOSUR-megállapodáson felül kétoldalú megállapodást is kívánna kötni az EU-val, mi lenne az EU válasza?

Az európai sajtó tényként közli, hogy a piacra jutással kapcsolatos csereajánlat 2014 februárjában vagy márciusában realizálódni fog.

4. Mikor akarja a Bizottság a piacra jutással kapcsolatos ajánlatát megtenni a MERCOSUR-nak?

5. Mikor fogja a Bizottság erről a lépésről teljes mértékben tájékoztatni a Parlamentet és a Tanácsot?

Karel De Gucht válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. február 17.)

A Bizottság a Mercosurral mint csoporttal folytat tárgyalásokat egy társulási megállapodásról, a Tanács által 1999-ben elfogadott tárgyalási irányelveknek megfelelően. A tárgyalási folyamat soron következő lépése a piacra jutással kapcsolatos ajánlatok kölcsönös megtétele. A Mercosur közös, valamennyi tagjára kiterjedő ajánlat véglegesítésén dolgozik, amely alól egyedül Venezuela képez kivételt, mivel ez az ország a külkapcsolatok helyett jelenleg a csoportba történő hatékony beilleszkedésre összpontosít. Ebből adódóan Venezuela továbbra is tárgyaló fél marad, ám ebben a szakaszban nem lesz aktív résztvevő.

A Bizottság most véglegesíti az EU árukereskedelmi ajánlattervezetét. Az ajánlat szerint bizonyos érzékeny mezőgazdasági termékekre nem vonatkozik a teljes liberalizáció, ezek csupán a számszerű korlátokon (vámkontingenseken) belül részesülnek preferenciális elbánásban. Mindkét fél részéről folyamatban van az ajánlatok véglegesítése, és a felek változatlanul arra törekednek, hogy a kölcsönös ajánlattételre még idén sor kerüljön. Ennek időpontját az előkészítő munka mindkét oldalon történő lezárását figyelembe véve fogják meghatározni.

A Bizottság rendszeresen tájékoztatta a Tanács Kereskedelempolitikai Bizottságát és az Európai Parlament Nemzetközi Kereskedelmi Bizottságát a tárgyalások alakulásáról. Emellett a Tanács és az Európai Parlament rendelkezésére bocsátotta a szolgáltatásokra, letelepedésre és a közbeszerzésekre vonatkozó uniós ajánlattervezeteket. A Bizottság ugyanígy fog eljárni az árukereskedelmi ajánlat esetében is, amint az ajánlat véglegessé válik.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000599/14
to the Commission
Béla Glattfelder (PPE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Possible EU exchange offer to MERCOSUR on market access

The EU has a mandate to negotiate a free trade agreement with MERCOSUR as a block. In the light of the institutional problems arising with Paraguay and Venezuela, and Argentina's reluctance to adhere to a free trade agreement, the Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. Would the Commission be acting in accordance with its mandate if it granted de facto concessions to only part of the block?

2. How does the Commission intend to proceed with a view to making an exchange offer to the block as a whole? Does it intend to exclude certain sensitive products from the offer? If so, which ones? How does it intend to treat the following products in particular: sugar, bioethanol and biodiesel, beef, pork, poultry, milk and other dairy products, sweet corn, and other fruits and vegetables?

3. Should Venezuela or Argentina wish to enter into a bilateral agreement with the EU in addition to the agreement with MERCOSUR, what would be the EU's response?

The European press is presenting it as a fact that the exchange offer on market access will be made in February or March 2014.

4. When does the Commission intend to make its offer to MERCOSUR on market access?

5. When does the Commission plan to fully inform Parliament and the Council about this move?

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

The Commission is negotiating an Association Agreement with Mercosur as a bloc, in accordance with the negotiating directives adopted by the Council in 1999. The next step in this negotiation is the exchange of market access offers. Mercosur is working to finalise a joint offer including all members, with the only exception of Venezuela which is currently focusing on its effective integration in the bloc rather than its external agenda. Therefore, while remaining a party in the negotiations, it will not participate actively at this stage.

The Commission is finalising the EU draft goods offer. In this offer, certain sensitive agricultural products will not be subject to full liberalisation but only be subject to preferential treatment within quantitative limits (i.e. tariff quotas). Both sides are finalising the respective offers and remain committed to exchange offers early this year. A date for the exchange of offers will be set in accordance with the state of finalisation of work on both sides.

The Commission has regularly informed the Council's Trade Policy Committee (TPC) and the European Parliament's INTA Committee on the progress of these negotiations. It has also shared the EU draft offers on services and establishment and government procurement with the Council and the European Parliament. This will also be the case for the offer on trade in goods once it is finalised.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000605/14
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(22 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Minerały z regionów ogarniętych konfliktami

W roku 2013 DG ds. Handlu przeprowadziła publiczne konsultacje dotyczące „ewentualnej inicjatywy UE na rzecz odpowiedzialnego pozyskiwania minerałów pochodzących z obszarów ogarniętych konfliktem lub o wysokim poziomie ryzyka", które zakończono w dniu 26 czerwca 2013 r. W dniu 17 września 2013 r., podczas wysłuchania zorganizowanego przez Parlament, komisarz ds. handlu Karel De Gucht oświadczył, że zamiarem DG ds. Handlu jest przedstawienie odpowiedniego wniosku przed końcem roku. Mamy już rok 2014, a nie opublikowano jeszcze ani wyników publicznych konsultacji i oceny skutków, ani wniosku ustawodawczego.

Komisja jest zatem proszona o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Czy Komisja może udzielić informacji na temat oceny dokonanej przez Radę ds. Ocen Skutków w odniesieniu do sprawozdania DG ds. Handlu dotyczącego oceny skutków?

2. Czy Komisja może ponadto udzielić informacji na temat sposobu, w jaki DG ds. Handlu uwzględniła zalecenia Rady ds. Ocen Skutków we wniosku ustawodawczym?

3. Kiedy Komisja spodziewa się przedstawienia wniosku ustawodawczego w związku z jego opóźnieniem i jakie jest prawdopodobieństwo, że stanie się to przed wyborami europejskimi w maju 2014 r.?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(6 marca 2014 r.)

W 2013 r. Komisja przeprowadziła konsultacje społeczne dotyczące ewentualnej inicjatywy UE na rzecz odpowiedzialnego pozyskiwania minerałów pochodzących z obszarów ogarniętych konfliktem lub o wysokim poziomie ryzyka, które zakończono w dniu 26 czerwca 2013 r.

Na podstawie tych konsultacji Komisja określiła cele unijnej inicjatywy i przeprowadziła ocenę skutków w odniesieniu do zidentyfikowanych wariantów osiągnięcia celów.

Komisja pracuje obecnie nad przygotowaniem zintegrowanego podejścia UE na rzecz odpowiedzialnego pozyskiwania minerałów z obszarów objętych konfliktem. Wyniki konsultacji społecznych oraz sprawozdanie z oceny skutków wraz z odnośną opinią Rady ds. Ocen Skutków oraz informacjami o tym, w jaki sposób odniesiono się do jej zaleceń, zostaną opublikowane wraz z odpowiednim wnioskiem Komisji.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000605/14
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Conflict minerals

In 2013 DG Trade carried out a public consultation on 'a possible EU initiative on responsible sourcing of minerals originating from conflict-affected and high-risk areas', which was completed on 26 June 2013. On 17 September 2013, during a hearing organised by Parliament, Trade Commissioner Karel De Gucht stated that it was DG Trade's intention to present the proposal before the end of the year. It is now 2014, and neither the results of the public consultation and impact assessment nor the legislative proposal have yet been published.

The Commission is therefore asked to answer the following:

1. Can it provide information on the evaluation by the impact assessment Board (IAB) of DG Trade's impact assessment report?

2. Can it provide further information on how DG Trade has incorporated the IAB's recommendations into its legislative proposal?

3. Given the Commission's delay in presenting the legislative proposal, when does it expect the proposal to be presented, and what is the likelihood that this will take place before the next European elections in May 2014?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

In 2013, the Commission carried out a public consultation on 'a possible EU initiative on responsible sourcing of minerals originating from conflict-affected and high-risk areas', which was completed on 26 June 2013.

On the basis of the public consultation, the Commission defined the objectives of an EU initiative and carried out an Impact Assessment as regards identified options to address the objectives.

The Commission is currently working on preparing an integrated EU approach on responsible sourcing of minerals from conflict areas. The results of the public consultation and the impact assessment report, including the evaluation of the impact assessment Board and how its recommendations were addressed, will be published together with any related Commission proposal.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-000607/14
upućeno Komisiji
Biljana Borzan (S&D)
(22. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Prekomjerna potrošnja antibiotika

Konzumacija antibiotika u bolnicama i u osobnoj upotrebi je značajno porasla u gotovo svim zemljama Europe, a Island, Latvija i Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo su zabilježili porast upotrebe antibiotika u razdoblju 2009.-2010. za čak 5%. U čak trećini europskih zemalja je porasla otpornost bakterija *Klebsiella pneumoniae* i *E.coli* na više vrsta antibiotika. Njima se ljudi najčešće zaraze u bolnicama. To vodi ka situaciji gdje će ljudi na operacijskim stolovima umirati od infekcije. Isto tako, neki antibiotici više uopće nisu djelotvorni za neke početne namjene. Primjerice, penicilin više nije djelotvoran u liječenju stafilokokne infekcije rana.

Prema procjenama u Europi godišnje umre 25 000 ljudi zbog infekcije otpornim bakterijama, a 0,9 milijardi eura se godišnje potroši na potrebnu dodatnu zdravstvenu skrb. Vjerojatnost smrtnosti nakon zaraze otpornim bakterijama je 50%. Prekomjernom upotrebom slabi se učinkovitost antibiotika kao prve linije obrane ljudskog zdravlja, dok su zamjenski tretmani skuplji, štetniji te dugotrajniji.

Europska komisija sveobuhvatnim pristupom nastoji odgovoriti na prijetnju otpornosti bakterija. Akcijski plan je donesen 2011. Mjere se prije svega odnose na ulaganja u istraživanja i podizanje svijesti o štetnosti prekomjerne upotrebe antibiotika. Postoje li novija istraživanja o učinkovitosti tih mjera?

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

Od 2008. Europski dan svjesnosti o antibioticima, europska zdravstvena inicijativa koju koordinira Europski centar za sprečavanje i kontrolu bolesti, pruža potporu državama članicama u naporima pri podizanju svijesti o razumnoj uporabi antibiotika. Inicijativa se posebno temelji na iskustvima Belgije i Francuske, zemalja koje su opetovanim javnim kampanjama uspjele smanjiti potrošnju i otpornost na antibiotike izvan bolnica ([1]).

Nedavno istraživanje Eurobarometra o antimikrobnoj otpornosti pokazuje da su europski građani bolje osviješteni o antimikrobnoj otpornosti i o pitanjima povezanima s razumnom uporabom antibiotika te da su medijske kampanje učinkovit izvor informacija. Nadalje, izvješće je za razdoblje između 2009. i 2013. pokazalo značajno smanjenje postotka Europljana koji su uzimali antibiotike tijekom posljednjih 12 mjeseci ([2]).

Primjer učinkovitosti ulaganja u istraživanja u tom području je projekt GRACE ([3]). Dokazao je da propisivanje antibiotika (amoksicilina) za nekomplicirane upale donjih dišnih putova nije nimalo učinkovitije kod ublažavanja simptoma od nekorištenja lijekova ([4]).

Učinkovitost mjera poduzetih za provedbu akcijskog plana EZ-a o antimikrobnoj otpornosti ocjenjivat će se naknadno.

([1]) U pripremi je ocjena Europskog dana svjesnosti o antibioticima (2008. — 2012.) od strane Europskog centra za sprečavanje i kontrolu bolesti (ECDC).
([2]) Vidi posebni Eurobarometar 407, EB 79.4: http://ec.europa.eu/health/antimicrobial_resistance/docs/ebs_407_en.pdf
([3]) Projekt „Genomika za borbu protiv otpornosti na antibiotike u Europi pri upalama donjih dišnih putova dobivenima u zajednici" (GRACE) financira se u sklopu Šestog okvirnog programa za istraživanje i tehnološki razvoj (FP6, 2002. — 2006.) pod temom biološke znanosti, genomika i biotehnologija za zdravlje. Više informacija potražite na http://www.grace-lrti.org/portal/en-GB/homepage.
([4]) Vidi također i vijest koju je Komisija objavila kako bi ukazala na taj važan rad: http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=NEWSLINK_EN_C&RCN=35362&ACTION=D.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000607/14
to the Commission
Biljana Borzan (S&D)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Over-consumption of antibiotics

The consumption of antibiotics in hospitals and for personal use has risen sharply in almost every European country; in Iceland, Latvia, and the United Kingdom the rates of increase recorded for the years 2009 and 2010 were as high as 5%. In as many as a third of all European countries the *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and *E. coli* bacteria have become more resistant to every type of antibiotic. Infection with these bacteria occurs most often in hospitals, and this is even leading to a situation in which infected persons are dying in the operating theatre. Furthermore, certain antibiotics are now totally incapable of serving some of their initial purposes. Penicillin, for example, is no longer effective in the treatment of staphylococcal infection of wounds.

It is estimated that 25 000 people a year in Europe die because they have been infected with resistant bacteria, and EUR 0.9 is spent annually on the necessary additional medical care. The probability of death as a result of infection with resistant bacteria is 50%. Over-consumption is undermining the efficacy of antibiotics as the first line of defence for human health, but substitute treatments are more expensive, damaging, and time-consuming.

Through its comprehensive approach the Commission is endeavouring to respond to the threat posed by bacterial resistance. The action plan was adopted in 2011. The main emphasis of the measures is on investment in research and raising awareness that over-consumption of antibiotics is harmful. Do any recent studies exist on the effectiveness of these measures?

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

Since 2008, the European Antibiotic Awareness Day, a European health initiative coordinated by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, has provided support to Member States in their efforts to raise awareness about prudent use of antibiotics. The initiative is based in particular on the experience of Belgium and France, countries which succeeded through repeated public campaigns to reduce antibiotic consumption and resistance outside of hospitals ([1]).

The recent Eurobarometer survey on antimicrobial resistance shows increased awareness of European citizens about antimicrobial resistance and issues related to the prudent use of antibiotics, and confirmed that media campaigns are an effective source of information. Furthermore, the report showed a significant decrease between 2009 and 2013 of the percentage of Europeans that had taken antibiotics during the past 12 months ([2]).

An example of the effectiveness of investment into research in this area is the GRACE project ([3]). It demonstrated that prescribing an antibiotic (amoxicillin) for uncomplicated lower respiratory tract infections is no more effective at relieving symptoms than the use of no medication ([4]).

Overall, the effectiveness of the measures taken to implement the EC Action plan on antimicrobial resistance will be assessed by an *ex-post* evaluation.

([1]) An evaluation of European Antibiotic Awareness Day (2008-2012) by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) is under preparation.
([2]) See Special Eurobarometer 407, EB 79.4 http://ec.europa.eu/health/antimicrobial_resistance/docs/ebs_407_en.pdf
([3]) The project 'Genomics to Combat Resistance against Antibiotics in Community-acquired LRTI in Europe' (GRACE) is funded via the Sixth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP6, 2002-2006) under the 'Life Sciences, Genomics and Biotechnology for Health' theme. For more information see http://www.grace-lrti.org/portal/en-GB/homepage
([4]) See also a news item published by the Commission to highlight this important work http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=NEWSLINK_EN_C&RCN=35362&ACTION=D

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000616/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(22 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Incremento de la morosidad

Un reciente Informe del Instituto español de la pequeña y mediana empresa desvela que se ha producido un preocupante incremento de la morosidad. En concreto, ha aumentado 1,4 puntos la ratio de morosidad del crédito comercial interempresarial. Es cierto que, al mismo tiempo, también se ha reducido el plazo del pago, que, sin embargo, sigue superando los sesenta días previstos en la normativa vigente. Otros elementos negativos que subraya el citado informe se refieren a los peligros que generan los retrasos extremos, así como a los superiores costes de financiación derivados de la morosidad que han de afrontar las pequeñas y medianas empresas, frente a la práctica que beneficia a las grandes compañías mercantiles.

Hace meses pregunté a la Comisión sobre la adecuada incorporación de la Directiva europea 2011/7/UE, de 16 de febrero de 2011, por la que se establecen medidas de lucha contra la morosidad en las operaciones comerciales (E-5940/2013). En su respuesta, la Comisión me anunció que evaluaría las medidas adoptadas por los ordenamientos nacionales, así como los posibles incumplimientos. También me informó del previsible incremento de instrumentos financieros para facilitar la financiación a las pequeñas y medianas empresas.

Por todo ello, interesa conocer:

1. ¿De qué datos dispone la Comisión sobre el incremento de la morosidad entre las empresas europeas?

2. ¿Ha elaborado ya algún estudio que valore la incorporación de la citada Directiva europea en los ordenamientos de los Estados miembros? ¿Ha iniciado algún procedimiento de incumplimiento del Derecho europeo?

3. ¿Podría precisar cuáles son las cuantías de los distintos instrumentos de financiación a las pequeñas y medianas empresas que se han propuesto para el periodo 2014-2020?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de marzo de 2014)

1. La Comisión recopila la información relativa a la morosidad en los pagos a través del Grupo de expertos sobre morosidad, que será convocado para su próxima reunión en mayo de 2014, y a través de la campaña de información sobre la morosidad en los pagos ([1]) que se puso en marcha en octubre de 2012. Otra fuente de información es el Índice de Pago Europeo preparado por Intrum Justitia, que puede consultarse en la dirección http://www.intrum.com/Press-and-publications/European-Payment-Index

2. Hasta ahora, la Comisión ha hecho un análisis positivo de las medidas nacionales de transposición de cinco Estados miembros. La Comisión está en contacto con las autoridades de los demás Estados miembros para aclarar los puntos que podrían no ser conformes con la Directiva. Si la evaluación jurídica de las medidas nacionales de incorporación de la Directiva al ordenamiento jurídico nacional pone de manifiesto la no conformidad con la Directiva, la Comisión podrá adoptar las medidas necesarias, incluida la apertura de procedimientos de infracción.

3. Sobre la base de las cantidades indicadas en los distintos programas del Marco Financiero Plurianual (MFP), se calcula que la cantidad destinada a las PYME será de aproximadamente 100 000 millones de euros. Los fondos destinados a las PYME se canalizarán principalmente a través de la Política Regional (78 000 millones de euros), la PAC (10 000 millones de euros del Desarrollo Rural), Horizonte 2020 (8 000 millones de euros para las PYME, de los cuales 3 000 millones de euros procederán del «Instrumento para las PYME»), el Programa «Europa Creativa» (500 millones de euros) y el Programa para el Cambio y la Innovación Sociales (171 millones de euros), además del Programa COSME (2 300 millones de euros, de los cuales 1 380 millones de euros se destinan a los instrumentos financieros).

([1]) La campaña europea de información sobre la morosidad en los pagos tiene por finalidad sensibilizar a las partes interesadas europeas, en particular las PYME, y a los poderes públicos acerca de los nuevos derechos que confiere la Directiva 2011/7/UE. Esta campaña se está llevando a cabo en todos los Estados miembros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000616/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Increase in the level of late payments

A recent report by the Spanish Institute for small and medium-sized enterprises has revealed an alarming rise in the level of late payments. The rate of late payment in business-to-business commercial credit has risen by 1.4 points. Although the payment period has been reduced at the same time, it nevertheless still exceeds the 60 days provided for under the current rules. Other negative aspects highlighted by the report concern the problems caused by extreme delays, as well as the higher financing costs for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) resulting from late payment, a practice which favours big businesses.

Some months ago I asked the Commission whether Directive 2011/7/EU of 16 February 2011 on combating late payment in commercial transactions (E-005940/2013) had been adequately transposed. In its reply, the Commission said that it would examine the measures adopted under national legislation and any possible infringements. I was also informed that there was likely to be an increase in the financial instruments available to help SMEs access funding.

In view of the above:

1. What information does the Commission have at its disposal concerning the increase in late payments among European companies?

2. Has it carried out any assessment of the transposition of the aforementioned Directive into the Member States' legal systems? Has it launched any infringement proceedings?

3. Could the Commission specify the proposed amounts for the various SME funding instruments in the period 2014-2020?

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

1. The Commission is gathering the information concerning late payments through the late payment expert group, which will be called for its next meeting in May 2014, and through the Late Payment Information Campaign ([1]) that has been running since October 2012. Another source of information is the European Payment Index prepared by *Intrum Justitia* which can be found at: http://www.intrum.com/Press-and-publications/European-Payment-Index.

2. So far, the Commission has positively analysed the national transposition measures of five Member States. The Commission is in contact with the authorities of the other Member States in order to clarify the issues that may not be in accordance with the directive. If the legal assessment of the national measures transposing the directive into national law reveals non-compliance with the directive, the Commission may take the necessary action, including infringement procedures.

3. According to the amounts indicated in the individual MFF programmes, it is estimated that the amount going to SMEs will be around EUR 100 billion. Funds for SMEs will mainly be channelled through Regional Policy (EUR 78 billion), the CAP (EUR 10 billion from Rural Development), Horizon 2020 (EUR 8 billion for SME out of which EUR 3 billion concerning the 'SME instrument'), Creative Europe Programme (EUR 500 million) and the Programme for Social Change and Innovation (EUR 171 million) on top of the COSME programme (EUR 2.3 billion out of which EUR 1.38 billion for the financial instruments).

([1]) The European Late Payment Information Campaign aims to increase awareness amongst European stakeholders, in particular SMEs, and within public authorities on the new rights conferred by Directive 2011/7/EU. This campaign is being carried out in all Member States.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-000617/14
Komisi (Místopředsedkyně Komise / Vysoká představitelka)
Hynek Fajmon (ECR)
(22. ledna 2014)

Předmět: VP/HR – Výbuch bomby na palestinské ambásádě v Praze

Dne 1.1. 2014 byl výbuchem bomby umístěné v budově palestinské ambasády v Praze usmrcen palestinský velvyslanec. Následné vyšetřování ukázalo, že se v budově nacházely i další nelegálně držené střelné zbraně ve značném množství. Ze strany Palestiny tak došlo k porušení Vídeňské úmluvy o diplomatických stycích. Několik dní poté si dle českých médií údajně palestinské vedení stěžovalo u orgánů Evropské unie na vystupování českého velvyslance v Izraeli na besedě na universitě v osadě Ariel.

Rád bych položil následující otázky:

1. Je Váš úřad obeznámen s výbuchem na palestinském velvyslanectví v Praze a s následnými událostmi?

2. Jak na tuto situaci Váš úřad reagoval?

3. Jakým způsobem reagoval Váš úřad na stížnosti palestinské strany na českého velvyslance?

4. Bude Váš úřad hájit bezpečnostní, politické a jiné zájmy České republiky vůči Palestině?

Odpověď vysoké představitelky a místopředsedkyně Komise Ashtonové jménem Komise
(10. března 2014)

Událost, kterou vážený zmiňuje, právě řeší palestinská a česká vláda v rámci dvoustranných jednání. Palestinské ministerstvo zahraničí vydalo také oficiální omluvu za nezákonnou přítomnost zbraní v prostorách palestinského velvyslanectví. Incident se stále vyšetřuje.

V reakci na obavy palestinské strany ohledně návštěvy českého velvyslance na Arielské univerzitě na okupovaném Západním břehu Jordánu vysoká představitelka a místopředsedkyně Komise zdůraznila, že tento krok není vyjádřením změny politiky EU vůči izraelským osadám, konkrétně dále platí, že všechny osady jsou pode mezinárodního práva nezákonné.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000617/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Hynek Fajmon (ECR)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Bomb explosion at the Palestinian Embassy in Prague

On 1 January 2014, a bomb exploded inside the Palestinian Embassy in Prague, killing the Palestinian ambassador. The investigation that followed showed that the building also contained significant quantities of other illegally held firearms. The Palestinians have therefore breached the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. Several days after the explosion, the Czech media reported that the Palestinian leadership had apparently complained about the conduct of the Czech Ambassador to Israel, who attended discussions at a university in the settlement of Ariel.

I should like to put the following questions:

1. Is your office aware of the explosion at the Palestinian Embassy in Prague and of the events that followed?

2. How did your office react to this situation?

3. How did your office respond to the Palestinians' complaints regarding the Czech Ambassador?

4. Will your office defend the Czech Republic's security, political and other interestsvis-à-vis the Palestinian Territories?

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

The incident being referred to by the Honourable Member is being dealt with bilaterally between the Palestinian and Czech goverments. The Palestinian Foreign Ministry has also issued an official apology for the illegal presence of weapons on the premises of the Palestinian embassy. The investigations into the said incident are still ongoing.

In response to Palestinian concern about the visit of the Czech Ambasssador to Ariel University in the occupied West Bank, the HR/VP underlined that this does not reflect a change in EU policy vis-à-vis the Israeli settlements namely that all settlements are illegal under international law.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000619/14
to the Commission
Peter Skinner (S&D)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Fourth EU railway package

Will the recently adopted fourth EU railway package be able to tackle the issue of two railway companies whose routes interlink? I will give you the example of a constituent of mine who attempted to buy tickets three months in advance for a railway journey which involved both the cross-channel Eurostar and French domestic rail companies.

Please inform me of the Commission's view on the fact that the SNCF allows reservations to be made within 120 days of the journey, yet Eurostar does not allow journeys to be booked earlier than 90 days in advance. What action will the Commission take, under the latest railway package, to address this situation?

Due to the expense often involved in purchasing international rail journeys, would it not be in the interests of the European consumer to allow for similar railway companies to have similar terms and conditions?

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

The Commission does not envisage currently to harmonise the number of days in advance of the journey when reservations can be made, as this would exceed what is necessary and proportional to set up the Single European Railway Area.

Similarly, the full harmonisation of terms and conditions of rail transport is likely to exceed what is necessary and proportional to set up the Single European Railway area.

Under Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations ([1]), railway undertakings and ticket vendors should offer, where available, tickets, through tickets and reservations ([2]). This regulation is, however, silent on the advance handling time, when tickets should be offered by railway undertakings for reservation. Nevertheless, railway undertakings must provide passengers with pre-journey information on the general conditions applicable to the contract ([3]).

([1]) OJ L 315, p. 18 of 3.12.2007.
([2]) Article 9.
([3]) Article 8 in connection with Annex II, part I.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000622/14
à la Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(22 janvier 2014)

Objet: Sirop de maïs

À partir de 2017, l'Union européenne accueillera sur son territoire du sirop de maïs à haute teneur en fructose, alors même que le sucre de canne sera encore placé sous le régime des quotas.

En Europe, les industries utilisent le sucre naturel, et ce pas seulement à cause des faibles quotas aujourd'hui accordés par l'Union européenne à l'importation de sirop de maïs à haute teneur en glucose. Aux États-Unis, cette technique est déjà largement répandue, notamment dans les sodas, qui sont majoritairement sucrés avec de l'isoglucose issu du maïs.

De nombreux experts estiment que l'isoglucose est en partie responsable de l'augmentation de l'obésité aux États-Unis, cette molécule complexe étant très difficile à détruire et à assimiler pour le corps humain.

1. Concernant le principe de précaution, si cher à la Commission, des recherches indépendantes ont-elles été entreprises avant de lever les quotas sur l'importation de sirop de maïs?

2. Pourquoi ne pas privilégier le sucre de betterave issu de productions européennes ou le sucre de canne dont dépendent de nombreuses raffineries européennes?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(4 mars 2014)

En ce qui concerne le sirop de maïs à haute teneur en fructose ou isoglucose, il faut établir une distinction entre les quotas d'importation et les quotas de production.

Alors que les quotas de production de sucre, d'isoglucose et de sirops d'inuline seront bel et bien levés en 2017, les droits et quotas d'importation n'ont pas été modifiés. Toutefois, ils font l'objet de plusieurs négociations de libre-échange. Toute ouverture de nouvelles possibilités d'importation d'isoglucose dépend du résultat de ces négociations.

En ce qui concerne les quotas de production, au mois de juin 2013, le Parlement européen et le Conseil ont pris la décision de les supprimer pour 2017. Une analyse d'impact a accompagné la proposition de la Commission visant à ne pas prolonger les quotas au delà de 2015.

Après la suppression des quotas, le sucre de betterave européen viendra concurrencer l'isoglucose produit principalement à partir de céréales européennes et le sucre de canne provenant de pays tiers. La plupart des importations de sucre de canne proviennent aujourd'hui des États d'Afrique, des Caraïbes et du Pacifique (ACP) et des pays les moins avancés (PMA) qui ont un accès au marché de l'UE en franchise de droits et sans contingent.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000622/14
to the Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Corn syrup

From 2017, the European Union will welcome onto its territory high-fructose corn syrup, even though cane sugar will still be subject to the quota regime.

In Europe, industry uses natural sugar — the low quotas currently set by the European Union for the import of high-glucose corn syrup are not the only reason for this. In the United States, this technology is already widespread, in particular in fizzy drinks, which are for the most part sweetened with isoglucose derived from corn.

Many experts believe that isoglucose is partly responsible for the increase in obesity in the United States, as this complex molecule is very difficult to destroy and to assimilate for the human body.

1. Having regard to the precautionary principle, which is so dear to the Commission, were independent studies carried out before the quotas on the import of corn syrup were lifted?

2. Why is preference not being given to beet sugar from European production facilities or to cane sugar, on which many European refineries depend?

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

As regards high fructose corn syrup or isoglucose, a distinction has to be made between import quotas and production quotas.

Whereas the production quotas on sugar, isoglucose and inulins syrups will indeed end in 2017, the import tariffs and import quotas have not been modified. However, they are subject to several Free Trade negotiations. Any opening of new import opportunities for isoglucose depends on the outcome of such negotiations.

As regards the end of the production quotas the European Parliament and the Council decided in June 2013 to end the quotas in 2017. An impact assessment accompanied the Commission proposal not to prolong quotas beyond 2015.

After the end of quotas European beet sugar will compete with isoglucose, produced mainly from European cereals and cane sugar from third countries. Most imports of cane sugar today originates from ACP and Least Developed Countries that have duty free, quota free access to the EU market.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000625/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(22 januari 2014)

Betreft: Terugvordering toeslagen

De Nederlandse staatssecretaris van Financiën heeft op 15 januari jl. een brief aan de Tweede Kamer van de Staten-Generaal gestuurd waarin hij ingaat op de terugvorderbaarheid van toelagen die frauderende Bulgaren onterecht hebben ontvangen. Het gaat hierbij om onrechtmatig verkregen kinderopvangtoeslag, zorgtoeslag, kindgebonden budget en huurtoeslag. De staatssecretaris geeft in zijn brief aan dat de inning van de teruggevorderde toelagen in het buitenland mogelijk is op grond van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004. De terugvordering van de huurtoeslag blijkt echter niet op basis van deze verordening mogelijk te zijn.

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven welke andere toeslagen zich onttrekken aan de reikwijdte van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004?

2. Kan de Commissie aangeven op grond van welke overweging de huurtoeslag niet valt onder de werking van bovengenoemde verordening?

3. Wat vindt de Commissie van dergelijk misbruik?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(4 maart 2014)

Het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie heeft steeds geoordeeld ([1]) dat enkel socialezekerheidsuitkeringen die behoren tot een van de takken van sociale zekerheid waarop Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 ([2]) van toepassing is, op EU-niveau worden gecoördineerd. Tot die takken van sociale zekerheid behoren onder meer uitkeringen bij ziekte en zwangerschap, invaliditeits- en ouderdomspensioenen, werkloosheidsuitkeringen en gezinsbijslagen.

Toeslag voor kinderopvang en zorgtoeslag behoren tot de socialezekerheidsuitkeringen die door die verordening worden gecoördineerd. Daarom zal artikel 71 van Verordening (EG) nr. 987/2009 ([3]) betreffende de terugvordering van ten onrechte verstrekte prestaties van toepassing zijn. Socialebijstandsuitkeringen die worden verstrekt aan personen onder het sociale minimuminkomen en niet behoren tot een van de takken van sociale zekerheid waarop bovengenoemde verordeningen van toepassing zijn, zoals huursubsidie, worden er niet door gecoördineerd.

In de mededeling van de Commissie „Het recht van vrij verkeer van EU-burgers en hun gezinsleden: vijf stappen die een verschil maken" ([4]) worden de sterke waarborgen die het EU-recht biedt ter bestrijding van misbruik van het recht van vrij verkeer, reeds beschreven. In de mededeling worden eveneens de praktische maatregelen beschreven die in samenwerking met de lidstaten kunnen worden genomen om nationale en lokale instanties te helpen optimaal gebruik te maken van de voordelen van het vrije verkeer van EU-burgers, gevallen van misbruik en fraude aan te pakken en de uitdagingen op het gebied van sociale integratie aan te gaan.

([1]) Zie bijvoorbeeld de zaken Hoeckx (249/83, Jurispr. 1985, blz. 973, punten 12-14), Scrivner (122/84, Jurispr. 1985, blz. 1027, punten 19-21), Newton (C-356/89, Jurispr. 1991, blz. I-3017) en Hughes (C-78/91, Jurispr. 1992, blz. I-4839).

([2]) 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, blz. 1.

([3]) Verordening (EG) nr. 987/2009 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 16 september 2009 tot vaststelling van de wijze van toepassing van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 betreffende de coördinatie van de socialezekerheidsstelsels, PB L 284 van 30.10.2009, blz. 1.

([4]) COM(2013) 837 definitief van 25 november 2013, te raadplegen op het adres http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0837:FIN:NL:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000625/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Recovery of benefits

On 15 January 2014 the Dutch State Secretary for Financial Affairs wrote to the Second Chamber (Lower House) of the Dutch Parliament concerning the recoverability of benefits unduly received by Bulgarians as a result of fraud. The unduly paid benefits in question were childcare allowance, care allowance, the child-related budget and rent support. In his letter, the State Secretary maintains that the undue benefits in question may be recovered in another Member State under Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 for the . However, it seems that the recovery of the rental support is not possible under that regulation.

1. Can the Commission state what other benefits are not covered by the scope of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004?

2. Can the Commission state for what reason rental support is not covered by the scope of the aforementioned regulation?

3. What is the Commission's view on such abuses?

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

The Court of Justice of the European Union has consistently held ([1]) that only social security benefits which concern one of the branches of social security covered by Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 ([2]) are coordinated at EU level. The branches of social security covered include sickness, maternity, invalidity, old-age, unemployment and family benefits.

Childcare allowances and carers' allowances are social security benefits coordinated by that regulation. Article 71 of implementing Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 ([3]) on the recovery of unduly paid benefits will therefore apply. Social assistance benefits, such as rent allowances, which are payable to persons with less than the minimum subsistence income and which are not linked to one of the branches of social security covered by those Regulations are not coordinated by them.

The Commission communication 'Free movement of EU citizens and their families: Five actions to make a difference' ([4]) describes the robust safeguards already provided for by EC law to prevent abuse of the right of free movement. It also describes the practical action that can be taken with the Member States' cooperation to help national and local authorities maximise the benefits of free movement of EU citizens, tackle cases of abuse and fraud and address the challenges for social inclusion.

([1]) See, for example, Case 249/83 Hoeckx [1985] ECR 973, paragraphs 12, 13 and 14; Case 122/84 Scrivner [1985] ECR 1027, paragraphs 19, 20 and 21; Case C-356/89 Newton [1991] ECR I-3017; and Case C-78/91 Hughes [1992] ECR I-4839.

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 166, 30.4.2004, p. 1.

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 284, 30.10.2009, p. 1.

([4]) COM(2013) 837 final of 25 November 2013, available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0837:FIN:EN:PDF

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000626/14
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(22 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Efectele adverse ale unor aditivi alimentari

Consumul unor produse alimentare în care se utilizează anumiți coloranți artificiali (E102 — tartrazină, E104 — galben de chinolină, E110 — galben apus de soare, E122 — azorubin, E124 — roșu cochineal și E129 — roșu allura), împreună cu E 211 — benzoat de sodiu, poate avea efecte negative asupra comportamentului copiilor, conform unor studii realizate de către Universitatea Southampton și publicate în revista „The Lancet".

În condițiile în care E 102 a fost deja interzis în Finlanda, E 122 este interzis în Suedia, folosirea E 129 nu mai este permisă în țări precum Danemarca, Belgia, Franța și Suedia, iar compania Coca-Cola a promis, pe fondul îngrijorării crescânde a consumatorilor, că va retrage treptat E 211 din produsele sale:

1. Are Comisia intenția de a propune modificări cu privire la conținutul listei aditivilor alimentari autorizați la nivel european?

2. Ce măsuri are în vedere Comisia pentru a asigura o informare mai clară a consumatorilor în legătură cu efectele acestor aditivi alimentari?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(27 februarie 2014)

Utilizarea aditivilor alimentari este armonizată la nivelul Uniunii Europene (UE) ([1]). Astfel, produsele alimentare nu pot conține aditivi care nu sunt incluși în lista Uniunii ([2]). Aditivii alimentari pot fi incluși pe listă doar dacă nu pun nicio problemă de siguranță și dacă îndeplinesc o serie de criterii stricte ([3]).
Aditivii E 102 – tartrazină, E 104 – galben de chinolină, E 110 – galben apus de soare, E 122 – azorubin, E 124 – roșu cochineal, E 129 – roșu allura și E 211 – benzoat de sodiu sunt autorizați pentru utilizare în UE, iar siguranța lor a fost evaluată de Comitetul științific pentru alimentație și, în cazul respectivelor culori, reevaluată ulterior de Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară (EFSA). EFSA a analizat, de asemenea, studiul publicat de McCann et al. în 2007 și a concluzionat că acesta nu aduce dovezi suficiente cu privire la eventualele efecte ale aditivilor asupra comportamentului și atenției copiilor. Prin urmare, studiul nu poate fi invocat pentru a modifica doza zilnică acceptabilă pentru coloranții menționați sau pentru benzoatul de sodiu[4]. Cu toate acestea, ținând seama de incertitudinile științifice, a fost introdusă o cerință obligatorie de etichetare[5], cu scopul de a informa corespunzător consumatorii. Comisia consideră că măsurile luate sunt proporționale și că nu sunt necesare acțiuni suplimentare în acest stadiu.

În cele din urmă, precizăm că aditivii sunt ținuți sub observație permanentă, iar Comisia va lua măsuri corespunzătoare atunci când acestea se vor dovedi necesare, în funcție de noile informații științifice.

([1]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1333/2008 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 16 decembrie 2008 privind aditivii alimentari.
([2]) Anexa II la Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1333/2008.
([3]) Articolele 6, 7 și 8 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1333/2008.
([4]) Jurnalul EFSA (2008) 660, 1-54.
([5]) Anexa V la Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1333/2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000626/14
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: The side effects of certain food additives

Eating foods containing certain artificial colourings (E102 — tartrazine, E104 — quinoline yellow, E110 — sunset yellow, E122 — azorubine, E124 — cochineal red and E129 — allura red), along with E 211 — sodium benzoate, may have negative effects on child behaviour, according to studies conducted by the University of Southampton and published in the journal 'The Lancet'.

Given that E 102 has already been banned in Finland, E 122 is banned in Sweden, the use of E 129 is no longer permitted in countries such as Denmark, Belgium, France and Sweden, and that the Coca-Cola Company promised, as a result of increasing concerns expressed by consumers, that it will gradually cease to use E 211 in its products:

1. Does the Commission plan to propose changes in the contents of the list of Europe-wide authorised food additives?

2. What measures does the Commission envisage in order to make sure that consumers are better informed about the effects of such food additives?

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

The use of food additives is harmonised in the European Union (EU) ([1]). Only additives included in the Union list ([2]) may be used in foods. A food additive may be included in the list if it does not pose a safety concern and fulfils other strict criteria ([3]).

E 102 Tartrazine, E 104 Quinoline yellow, E 110 Sunset yellow, E 122 Carmoisine, E 124 Ponceau 4R, E 129 Allura red and E 211 Sodium benzoate are authorised for use in the EU and their safety was assessed by the Scientific Committee for Food and in case of the respective colours re-evaluated later on by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). The EFSA assessed also the study by McCann et al. (2007) and concluded that it provided limited evidence of an effect on activity and attention in children which cannot be used as a basis for altering the Acceptable Daily Intakes of the respective colours or sodium benzoate ([4]). However, taking into account the scientific uncertainties the additional mandatory labelling requirement was introduced ([5]) to inform consumers. The Commission considers the measures taken to be proportionate and no further steps are envisaged at this stage.

Finally, additives are kept under continuous observation and the Commission will consider taking appropriate measures when needed in the light of new scientific information.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on food additives.
([2]) Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008.
([3]) Articles 6, 7 and 8 of Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008.
([4]) The EFSA Journal (2008) 660, 1-54.
([5]) Annex V to Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000627/14
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(22 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Implementarea Programului Național Apicol

Programul Național Apicol (PNA), elaborat de România pentru perioada 2014-2016, a fost aprobat de Guvern la finele anului trecut. Comisia Europeană participă la finanțarea acțiunilor din PNA cu 50% din cheltuielile efectuate de România pentru fiecare acțiune accesată, excluzând TVA.

Nu mai puțin de 8 milioane de lei, din totalul celor 44,5 milioane de lei disponibile, s-au alocat către Agenția Națională pentru Ameliorare și Reproducție în Zootehnie (ANARZ), în vederea realizării unui sistem informatic pentru identificarea stupilor. Acest sistem prevede, printre altele, ca fiecărui stup să îi fie atribuit un „cod unic de identificare al stupului — cod alcătuit din maximum 13 caractere, inclusiv spațiile".

Comisia este rugată să precizeze:

1. dacă apreciază aceste alocări ca fiind întemeiate, în condițiile în care statisticile sunt deja incluse în Registrul Agricol, care este în curs de informatizare la ora actuală;

2. dacă există vreo obligativitate în acest sens, conform legislației europene în vigoare.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(3 martie 2014)

Noul Regulament (UE) nr. 1308/2013 de instituire a unei organizări comune a pieţelor produselor agricole ([1]) se aplică de la 1 ianuarie 2014 și conține normele reformate referitoare la ajutoarele destinate sectorului apicol. În conformitate cu articolul 231 alineatul (2) din acest regulament, programele naționale apicole adoptate înainte de 1 ianuarie 2014 continuă să facă obiectul dispozițiilor Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1234/2007 ([2]) după intrarea în vigoare a respectivului regulament.

Instituirea unui sistem de identificare a stupilor de albine poate fi considerată o măsură de asistență tehnică pentru apicultori și pentru grupurile de apicultori în sensul articolul 106 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1234/2007 de stabilire a măsurilor apicole eligibile. Autoritățile române, în colaborare cu organizațiile de apicultori reprezentative, trebuie să propună acțiuni pe care le consideră relevante pentru programul apicol al României în perioada 2014-2016.

Atunci când transmit programele naționale apicole, statele membre au obligația de a comunica Comisiei numărul total de stupi de pe teritoriul lor, iar contribuția financiară a Uniunii se calculează pentru fiecare stat membru, în conformitate cu cota fiecăruia din numărul total de stupi din Uniune.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:347:0671:0854:EN:PDF
([2]) JO L 299, 16.11.2007, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000627/14
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: The implementation of the National Beekeeping Programme

The National Beekeeping Programme (NBP), developed by Romania for the period 2014 — 2016, was approved by the government late last year. The European Commission's contribution to the funding of NBP actions is 50% of the expenditure incurred by Romania for each accessed action, excluding the VAT.

As much as 8 million RON of the available total of 44.5 million RON was allocated by Agenția Națională pentru Ameliorare și Reproducție în Zootehnie (The National Agency for Improvement and Zootechnic Reproduction — ANARZ) for the development of a computer-assisted beehive identification system. This system requires, among other things, that each beehive be assigned a 'unique beehive identification code — a code composed of a maximum of 13 characters, including spaces'.

I would like to ask the Commission to clarify:

1. whether it is of the opinion that such allocations are justified, given that the statistics are already included in the Farming Register, which is currently being computerized;

2. whether there is any obligation to this effect, in accordance with applicable EC law.

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

The new Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products ([1]) is applicable since 1 January 2014 and lays down the reformed rules regarding the aid to the apiculture sector. According to Article 231(2) of this regulation, the national apiculture programmes adopted before the 1 January 2014 continue to be governed by the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 ([2]) following the entry into force of this regulation.

Setting up an identification system for beehives can be considered as a measure for technical assistance to beekeepers and groupings of beekeepers in the meaning of Article 106 of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 laying down the eligible apiculture measures. The Romanian authorities in collaboration with the representative beekeeping organisations are responsible for proposing the actions they consider relevant in the Romanian apiculture programme 2014-2016.

When submitting their national apiculture programmes, Member States have the obligation to provide to the Commission their total number of hives and the Union financial contribution is calculated for each Member State according to its share of the total number of hives in the Union.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:347:0671:0854:EN:PDF
([2]) OJ L 299, 16.11.2007, p.1.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000634/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(22 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Τραγωδία στο Φαρμακονήσι κατά τη διάρκεια ρυμούλκησης από σκάφος του λιμενικού και πνιγμός ατόμων που πιθανόν δικαιούνταν προστασίας

Σύμφωνα με χθεσινή ανακοίνωση της Ύπατης Αρμοστείας του ΟΗΕ για τους Πρόσφυγες ([1]), Αλιευτικό σκάφος στο οποίο επέβαιναν 28 άτομα (25 Αφγανοί και 3 Σύριοι), μεταξύ των οποίων πολλά γυναικόπαιδα, ανατράπηκε και βυθίστηκε τις πρώτες πρωινές ώρες της Δευτέρας 20 Ιανουαρίου 2014, στη θαλάσσια περιοχή του Φαρμακονησίου. Δεκαέξι από τους επιβαίνοντες περισυνελέγησαν από το Λιμενικό Σώμα. Μια γυναίκα και ένα παιδί 5 ετών εντοπίστηκαν νεκροί κοντά στις τουρκικές ακτές, ενώ δέκα ακόμη άτομα (2 γυναίκες, 8 βρέφη και μικρά παιδιά) αγνοούνται. Σύμφωνα με μαρτυρίες επιζώντων στην Ύπατη Αρμοστεία, το σκάφος του Λιμενικού που ρυμουλκούσε το πλοιάριό τους κατευθυνόταν με μεγάλη ταχύτητα προς τις τουρκικές ακτές, όταν συνέβη το τραγικό συμβάν εν μέσω θαλασσοταραχής. Οι ίδιες μαρτυρίες αναφέρουν ότι οι άνθρωποι φώναζαν για βοήθεια, δεδομένου ότι στο πλοιάριο υπήρχε μεγάλος αριθμός παιδιών. Παρόλο ότι το Λιμενικό διαψεύδει ότι το σκάφος του επιχειρούσε επαναπροώθηση προς την Τουρκία, στο παρελθόν έχουν αποδειχθεί παρόμοια περιστατικά ([2]). Με δεδομένο ότι

— στην Μεσόγειο έχουν χάσει τη ζωή του δεκάδες χιλιάδες άτομα στην προσπάθεια τους να περάσουν στην Ευρώπη και τόσο το Συμβούλιο της Ευρώπης ([3]) όσο και το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο, έχουν ζητήσει την λήψη μέτρων από τις κυβερνήσεις ώστε να μην χάνονται τόσες ανθρώπινες ζωές στη Μεσόγειο,

— στο σκάφος επέβαιναν άτομα από Συρία και Αφγανιστάν που είναι πιθανόν ότι έπρεπε να τύχουν προστασίας, λόγω της κατάστασης που επικρατεί στις δύο χώρες.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Γνωρίζει και προτίθεται να διερευνήσει τις συνθήκες υπό τις οποίες έλαβε χώρα το περιστατικό και το πώς ανθρώπινες ζωές χάθηκαν σε πλοιάριο υπό ρυμούλκηση, ιδιαίτερα μάλιστα από τη στιγμή που υπάρχουν καταγγελίες των διασωθέντων ότι το πλοίο βυθίστηκε ενώ επιχειρούνταν παράνομη επαναπροώθηση των προσφύγων στη Τουρκία;

2. Δεδομένου ότι υπάρχουν πολλές καταγγελίες για παράνομες επαναπροωθήσεις μεταναστών στο Αιγαίο, τι μέτρα διατίθεται να λάβει για να συμμορφωθούν τα κράτη μέλη και ιδιαίτερα η Ελλάδα με την ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία που απαγορεύει τέτοιες πρακτικές;

Απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Μαρτίου 2014)

1. Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει το περιστατικό στο οποίο αναφέρεται ο κ. βουλευτής. Οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν την ευθύνη να διερευνήσουν τις συνθήκες του συγκεκριμένου περιστατικού. Οι ελληνικές αρχές πρέπει να παράσχουν σχετικές διευκρινίσεις μετά το πέρας των ερευνών τους.

2. Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει τις καταγγελίες για εικαζόμενες πρακτικές επαναπροώθησης από την Ελλάδα στην Τουρκία καθώς και τους ισχυρισμούς για κακή μεταχείριση των μεταναστών. Η Επιτροπή είναι σε επαφή με τις ελληνικές αρχές σχετικά με τις εν λόγω καταγγελίες. Ως θεματοφύλακας των Συνθηκών, η Επιτροπή δεν θα διστάσει να λάβει τα κατάλληλα μέτρα, εφόσον υπάρξουν αποδεικτικά στοιχεία ότι ένα κράτος μέλος έχει παραβιάσει τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ.

([1]) http://www.unhcr.gr/nea/artikel/f0ebeca9d578ed228e357bc0c2660de6/i-ya-ekfrazei-tin-a-1.html?L=oehdbfqkb
([2]) http://issuu.com/tvxorissinora/docs/pushed_back_web_01/3?e=2936379/5589585
([3]) http://assembly.coe.int/committeedocs/2012/20120329_mig_rpt.en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000634/14
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Tragedy in Farmakonisi: people, possibly entitled to protection, drowned while their boat was being towed by a Coast Guard vessel

According to a press release issued yesterday by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, ([1]) a fishing vessel carrying 28 passengers (25 Afghans and 3 Syrians), including many women and children, capsized and sank off Farmakonisi in the early hours of Monday, 20 January 2014. Sixteen of the passengers were picked up by the Coast Guard. One woman and one five-year-old child were found dead close to the Turkish coast and a further ten people (2 women and 8 infants and children) are missing. According to survivors' accounts given to the UNHCR, the Coast Guard vessel towing the vessel was taking them at high speed towards the Turkish coast when the tragic accident occurred during bad weather. The same witnesses reported that the people were shouting for help, as there were a large number of children on board. Although the port authorities deny that its vessel was trying to push the boat back to Turkey, similar incidents have demonstrably taken place in the past. ([2]) In view of the fact that:

— tens of thousands of people have died in the Mediterranean in a bid to reach Europe and both the Council of Europe ([3]) and the European Parliament have called on governments to take measures to reduce the number of lives lost in the Mediterranean;

— the boat was carrying people from Syria and Afghanistan who may have qualified for protection, due to the current situation in both those countries.

Will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of and does it intend to investigate the conditions under which this incident occurred and how people died on the vessel being towed, especially as survivors complain that the vessel sank during an illegal attempt to push the refugees back to Turkey?

2. Given that numerous complaints have been made of illegal push-backs of immigrants in the Aegean, what measures does it intend to take in order to ensure that Member States — and especially Greece — comply with European legislation, which bans such practices?

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

1. The Commission is aware of the incident referred to by the Honourable Member. The Greek authorities have a responsibility to carry out an investigation into the circumstances of this particular incident. The Greek authorities should provide clarification on this incident once their investigation is finished.

2. The Commission is aware of reports alleging push-back practices by Greece to Turkey as well as allegations of ill-treatment of migrants. The Commission is currently in contact with the Greek authorities over these allegations. As guardian of the Treaties, the Commission will not hesitate to take appropriate steps where there is evidence that a Member State has violated EC law.

([1]) http://www.unhcr.gr/nea/artikel/f0ebeca9d578ed228e357bc0c2660de6/i-ya-ekfrazei-tin-a-1.html?L=oehdbfqkb
([2]) http://issuu.com/tvxorissinora/docs/pushed_back_web_01/3?e=2936379/5589585
([3]) http://assembly.coe.int/committeedocs/2012/20120329_mig_rpt.en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000635/14
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Restrictions on tyre waste exports to Pakistan

I have been contacted by a constituent who represents a London-based shipping and logistics company looking to export used, waste-baled and shredded tyres from various locations in the UK and Ireland to customers in Pakistan.

According to my constituent, under the Waste Shipment Regulation (1013/2006/EC), shipment of waste cargo is currently prohibited and this prohibition has been implemented in the EU at the request of the Pakistani authorities.

However, my constituent tells me that he has evidence that cargo is being imported into Pakistan from certain EU points of origin regardless of this ban.

This notwithstanding, regulators in the UK and Ireland continue to say that they must obey EU regulations regardless of what is happening elsewhere.

1. Can the Commission confirm that a ban has been implemented at the behest of the Pakistani authorities? If it has, can it explain the rationale behind the restriction?

2. Has the Commission received reports that waste material is being exported from EU points of origin to Pakistan and, if so, what has it done to prevent this?

3. Has the Commission been advised by the Pakistani authorities of the conditions under which they would be willing to lift the ban on used, waste-baled and shredded tyres?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

In accordance with the Waste Shipment Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007 sets conditions for exports of non-hazardous waste, including used, waste-baled and shredded tyres ('waste' tyres), from the EU to the countries, such as Pakistan, to which the OECD-Decision on the control of trans boundary movements of waste does not apply. Regulation 1418/2007 is based on information provided by the partner countries — it is their right to choose whether they will or not accept non-hazardous waste originating in the EU.

When Regulation 1418/2007 was being prepared, Pakistani authorities requested a prohibition of exports of waste tyres from the EU to their country. This has been reflected in the regulation, which currently bans such exports.

In January this year, Pakistan informed the Commission that it intended to allow imports of waste tyres from the EU, and asked to modify the regulation accordingly. This modification is going to be included in the next periodical update of the regulation that is currently underway.

The Commission has no reports that waste tyres are exported to Pakistan from any EU Member States.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000639/14
a la Comisión
Eric Andrieu (S&D), Isabelle Thomas (S&D), Marc Tarabella (S&D), Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos (S&D), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Michel Dantin (PPE) y Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(22 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Incumplimiento de la Directiva 2003/91/CE en relación con la inscripción de variedades de chalotes de siembra

Desde el año 2005, la inclusión de las variedades nuevas de chalotes en los catálogos nacionales y a continuación en el europeo está sometida a la reglamentación de la UE, la cual descansa, por una parte sobre un protocolo técnico preciso el Protocolo de la OCVV TP 46/2 que se actualizó el 1 de abril de 2009 y, por otra, sobre el artículo 1 de la Directiva 2003/91/CE, que estipula que la inscripción de nuevas variedades en los catálogos nacionales es responsabilidad de los Estados miembros, que se aseguran de que se respete convenientemente el protocolo de la OCVV en cuestión.

Ahora bien, algunas variedades de chalotes de siembra inscritas en el catálogo holandés no cumplen en absoluto las condiciones que se definen en el Protocolo. Se trata de las variedades Conservor, Picador, Armador, Camelot, Ambition y Obelisk, que deberían clasificarse en el catálogo de cebollas. Así lo demuestran pruebas experimentales llevadas a cabo en Francia por el GEVES, organismo público que realiza las pruebas requeridas por la legislación europea cuando se registran nuevas variedades; dichas pruebas están a disposición de la Comisión.

Las infracciones observadas plantean varias cuestiones que deseamos someter a la atención de la Comisión:

1. El protocolo es lo suficientemente claro y preciso para permitir una clasificación sencilla e incontestable de las variedades. El problema está en el control de la buena aplicación por parte de los Estados miembros. ¿Cómo se asegura la Comisión, guardiana del Derecho de la Unión, de que se respetan las normas sobre la inscripción de la especie chalote, y en particular del protocolo correspondiente?

2. Estas variedades, erróneamente inscritas en el catálogo de los chalotes y que se benefician de forma abusiva de una protección de la OCVV, se comercializan en la actualidad ampliamente en la Unión y en terceros países, y el producto circula ilegalmente bajo la denominación «chalote». Estamos hablando de engaño al consumidor y de fraude. ¿Qué tiene previsto hacer la Comisión, teniendo en cuenta el Derecho de protección de los consumidores, contra el Estado miembro infractor?

3. El perjuicio engendrado afecta a los consumidores y a todo el sector del chalote tradicional. El método de producción holandés es menos costoso, sobre todo por cuanto se refiere a la mano de obra, y puede acabar rápidamente con el sector del chalote tradicional y la biodiversidad. El incumplimiento de la legislación sobre la comercialización de las variedades vegetales afecta indirectamente a las normas de la competencia europea. ¿Qué tiene previsto hacer la Comisión para poner remedio? ¿Cómo piensa, al mismo tiempo, limitar la pérdida de la biodiversidad, elemento indispensable para un desarrollo sostenible?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de marzo de 2014)

El protocolo de la OCVV TP 46/2 ([1]) establece que las oficinas de examen, en este caso, Naktuinbouw (NL) y GEVES (FR), deben coordinar e intercambiar cuestionarios técnicos e información para los exámenes técnicos. También podrán intercambiar material vegetal para resolver problemas concretos. Ambas oficinas de examen están autorizadas por la OCVV para el examen de distinción, homogeneidad y estabilidad de las variedades de cebolla/chalote.

En diciembre de 2013, la Comisión solicitó a la OCVV que los futuros trabajos se lleven a cabo respetando el protocolo arriba mencionado, especialmente en lo que se refiere a la aplicación de determinados elementos que puedan ser pertinentes para la solución de resultados contradictorios. La Comisión seguirá el trabajo de la OCVV en esta materia, con el fin de lograr un acuerdo común para todas las partes.

El método de producción, ya sea por semillas o por bulbos, no afecta a la biodiversidad. Por lo que se refiere a la lucha contra la pérdida de biodiversidad a nivel de las explotaciones agrícolas, la nueva política agrícola común refuerza las medidas para la conservación de dicha biodiversidad.

([1]) http://www.cpvo.europa.eu/documents/TP/vegetales/TP_046-2_Onion-shallot.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000639/14
à la Commission
Eric Andrieu (S&D), Isabelle Thomas (S&D), Marc Tarabella (S&D), Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos (S&D), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Michel Dantin (PPE) et Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(22 janvier 2014)

Objet: Non-respect de la directive 2003/91/CE concernant l'inscription de variétés d'échalotes de semis

Depuis 2005, l'inscription de variétés nouvelles d'échalotes aux catalogues nationaux puis européen, est soumise à la réglementation communautaire. Celle-ci repose d'une part sur un protocole technique précis: le protocole de l'OCVV TP 46/2 qui a été actualisé le 1er avril 2009, mais d'autre part sur l'article 1er de la directive 2003/91/CE, qui dispose que l'inscription de nouvelles variétés dans les catalogues nationaux relève de la responsabilité des États membres, qui s'assurent du bon respect du protocole de l'OCVV en question.

Or il s'avère que certaines variétés d'échalotes de semis inscrites sur le catalogue hollandais ne remplissent absolument pas les conditions définies dans le protocole. Cela concerne les variétés Conservor, Picador, Armador, Camelot, Ambition et Obelisk, qui devraient être classées dans le catalogue oignon. Des tests expérimentaux effectués en France par le GEVES, organisme public réalisant les tests requis par la législation européenne lors de l'enregistrement de nouvelles variétés, le prouvent et sont à la disposition de la Commission.

Les infractions observées posent plusieurs questions que nous soumettons à la Commission:

1. Le protocole est suffisamment clair et précis pour permettre une classification aisée et incontestable des variétés. Le contrôle de sa bonne application par les États membres pose question. Comment la Commission, gardienne du droit communautaire, s'assure-t-elle du respect des règles sur l'inscription pour l'espèce échalote et en particulier du protocole qui s'y rapporte?

2. Ces variétés, inscrites à tort dans le catalogue échalote et bénéficiant abusivement d'une protection de l'OCVV, sont actuellement largement commercialisées au sein de l'Union et dans les pays tiers, et le produit issu de leur culture circule illégalement sous l'appellation échalote. Il y a tromperie des consommateurs et fraude. Que compte faire la Commission au regard du droit sur la protection des consommateurs contre l'État membre en infraction?

3. Le préjudice engendré affecte les consommateurs et toute la filière de l'échalote traditionnelle. La méthode de production hollandaise est moins onéreuse, en main d'œuvre surtout, et peut rapidement anéantir le secteur de l'échalote traditionnelle et la biodiversité. Le non-respect de la législation sur la commercialisation des variétés végétales affecte indirectement les règles de la concurrence européenne. Que pense entreprendre la Commission pour y remédier? Comment entend-elle simultanément limiter la perte de la biodiversité, élément indispensable à la promotion d'un développement durable?

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

Le protocole de l'OCVV 46/2 ([1]) prévoit que les offices d'examen, dans ce cas le Naktuinbouw (NL) et le GEVES (FR), coordonnent et échangent des questionnaires et informations techniques pour l'examen technique. Ils peuvent aussi échanger des matériels végétaux afin de résoudre des problèmes particuliers. L'examen de la distinction, de l'homogénéité et de la stabilité des variétés d'oignon/échalote est confié aux deux offices d'examen.

En décembre 2013, la Commission a adressé à l'OCVV une demande que les travaux futurs soient réalisés dans le respect du protocole susmentionné, en ce qui concerne notamment l'application de certains éléments qui pourraient être pertinents pour la résolution des contradictions entre les résultats. La Commission suivra les travaux de l'OCVV dans ce domaine afin de parvenir à une conception commune pour toutes les parties.

La méthode de production, par graine ou par bulbe, n'affecte pas la biodiversité. En ce qui concerne la lutte contre l'appauvrissement de la biodiversité au niveau des exploitations agricoles, la nouvelle politique agricole commune renforce les mesures en faveur du maintien de la biodiversité.

([1]) http://www.cpvo.europa.eu/documents/TP/vegetales/TP_046-2_Onion-shallot.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000639/14
alla Commissione
Eric Andrieu (S&D), Isabelle Thomas (S&D), Marc Tarabella (S&D), Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos (S&D), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Michel Dantin (PPE) e Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(22 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Mancato rispetto della direttiva 2003/91/CE per quanto riguarda l'iscrizione di varietà di cipolline da seminagione

Dal 2005, l'iscrizione di nuove varietà di cipolline nei cataloghi nazionali e quindi in quello europeo, è soggetta alla regolamentazione comunitaria che si basa, da un lato, su un protocollo tecnico specifico, il protocollo dell'UCVV TP 46/2 che è stato aggiornato il 1º aprile 2009, e dall'altro sull'articolo 1 della direttiva 2003/91/CE, che stabilisce che l'iscrizione di nuove varietà nei cataloghi nazionali è di competenza degli Stati membri che si assicurano che sia correttamente rispettato il protocollo dell'UCVV in questione.

Risulta però che talune varietà di cipolline da seminagione iscritte nel catalogo olandese non rispettano affatto le condizioni definite nel protocollo. Ciò riguarda le varietà Conservor, Picador, Armador, Camelot, Ambition et Obelisk, che dovrebbero essere classificate nel catalogo cipolle. Test sperimentali effettuati in Francia dal GEVES, organismo pubblico che realizza i test richiesti dalla legislazione europea al momento della registrazione di nuove varietà, lo comprovano e sono a disposizione della Commissione.

Alla luce delle irregolarità osservate, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se il protocollo è sufficientemente chiaro e preciso per permettere una classificazione agevole e incontestabile delle varietà, se il controllo della sua corretta applicazione da parte degli Stati membri pone dei problemi e in che modo la Commissione, in quanto custode del diritto comunitario, si assicura che vengano rispettate le regole in materia di iscrizione per la varietà cipollina, in particolare per quanto riguarda il relativo protocollo;

2. se le varietà in questione, iscritte a torto nel catalogo come cipolline e beneficiando abusivamente di una protezione dell'UCVV, vengono attualmente ampiamente commercializzate nell'UE e nei paesi terzi e se il prodotto ottenuto dalla loro coltivazione circola illegalmente sotto la denominazione cipollina, se vi è inganno o frode nei confronti dei consumatori e che cosa intende fare riguardo al diritto alla protezione dei consumatori contro lo Stato membro in infrazione;

3. se il danno arrecato riguarda i consumatori e l'intera filiera della cipollina tradizionale, se il metodo di produzione olandese è meno oneroso in termini soprattutto di mano d'opera e se può rapidamente annientare il settore della cipollina tradizionale e la biodiversità, se il mancato rispetto della legislazione sulla commercializzazione delle varietà vegetali intacca indirettamente le regole della concorrenza europea, cosa intende essa fare per porvi rimedio, in che modo intende limitare simultaneamente la perdita di biodiversità, elemento indispensabile alla promozione di uno sviluppo insostenibile?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(5 marzo 2014)

Il protocollo TP 46/2 ([1]) dell'UCVV stabilisce che gli uffici preposti all'esame, in questo caso Naktuinbouw (NL) e GEVES (FR), coordinino e scambino questionari e informazioni tecnici per l'esame tecnico. Essi possono scambiare anche materiale vegetale per risolvere problemi particolari. Entrambi gli uffici di esame sono incaricati dall'UCVV dell'esame di distinguibilità, uniformità e stabilità delle varietà di cipolle/scalogni.

Nel dicembre 2013 la Commissione ha inviato all'UCVV una richiesta di ulteriori lavori in relazione al protocollo summenzionato, in particolare per quanto concerne l'implementazione di certi elementi che possono essere pertinenti per risolvere risultanze conflittuali. La Commissione seguirà i lavori dell'UCVV in questo ambito al fine di raggiungere una posizione comune tra tutte le parti.

Il metodo di produzione, se tramite sementi o bulbi, non incide sulla biodiversità. Per quanto concerne la lotta contro la perdita di biodiversità a livello di aziende agricole, la nuova politica agricola comune rafforza le misure finalizzate alla conservazione della biodiversità.

([1]) http://www.cpvo.europa.eu/documents/TP/vegetales/TP_046-2_Onion-shallot.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000639/14
à Comissão
Eric Andrieu (S&D), Isabelle Thomas (S&D), Marc Tarabella (S&D), Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos (S&D), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Michel Dantin (PPE) e Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(22 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Não-observância da Diretiva 2003/91/CE no que diz respeito à inclusão de variedades de chalotas de sementes

Desde 2005, a inclusão de variedades novas de chalotas nos catálogos nacionais e europeus está sujeita à regulamentação comunitária. Esta regulamentação baseia-se, por um lado, num protocolo técnico específico — o Protocolo ICVV TP 46/2, atualizado em 1 de abril de 2009 — e, por outro, no artigo 1.º da Diretiva 2003/91/CE, que estabelece que a inclusão de novas variedades nos catálogos nacionais é da responsabilidade dos Estados-Membros, que devem assegurar o respeito do dito Protocolo ICVV.

Sucede, porém, que algumas variedades de chalotas de sementes incluídas no catálogo holandês não satisfazem de todo as condições definidas no protocolo, nomeadamente as variedades Conservor, Picador, Armador, Camelot, Ambition e Obelisk, que deveriam ser classificadas no catálogo da cebola. Comprovam-no os ensaios experimentais efetuados em França pelo GEVES (o organismo público que realiza os testes exigidos pela legislação europeia aquando do registo de novas variedades) e que estão à disposição da Comissão.

As infrações observadas suscitam várias questões, que colocamos à Comissão:

1. O protocolo é suficientemente claro e preciso para permitir uma classificação fácil e incontestável das variedades. O controlo da sua correta aplicação pelos Estados-Membros levanta algumas questões. Como assegura a Comissão, guardiã do direito comunitário, o respeito das disposições sobre a inclusão da espécie chalota e, em particular, do protocolo pertinente?

2. Estas variedades, incorretamente incluídas no catálogo da chalota e beneficiando abusivamente da proteção do ICVV, são atualmente comercializadas em larga escala na União e nos países terceiros, e o produto da sua cultura circula ilegalmente sob a designação de chalota. Trata-se de um engano dos consumidores e de fraude. Que medidas tenciona a Comissão tomar no que se refere ao direito relativo à proteção dos consumidores contra o Estado-Membro infrator?

3. Os danos causados afetam os consumidores e toda a cadeia da cebola tradicional. O método de produção holandês é menos oneroso, sobretudo em mão de obra, e pode aniquilar rapidamente o setor da chalota tradicional e a biodiversidade. O incumprimento da legislação relativa à comercialização das variedades vegetais afeta indiretamente as regras da concorrência europeia. Que medidas tenciona a Comissão tomar para remediar esta situação? Como tenciona a Comissão, simultaneamente, limitar a perda de biodiversidade, elemento indispensável para a promoção de um desenvolvimento sustentável?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(5 de março de 2014)

O Protocolo ICVV TP 46/2 ([1]) prevê que os organismos de exame, neste caso Naktuinbouw (NL) e GEVES (FR), coordenem e efetuem um intercâmbio de questionários técnicos e de informação para efeitos de exame técnico. Podem igualmente trocar material vegetal, a fim de resolver problemas específicos. Ambos os organismos de exame foram autorizados pelo ICVV a efetuar o exame da distinção, da homogeneidade e da estabilidade das variedades de cebola/chalota.

Em dezembro de 2013, a Comissão enviou um pedido ao ICVV para que fosse levado a cabo um trabalho suplementar sobre o referido protocolo, em especial no que se refere à aplicação de determinados elementos suscetíveis de ser pertinentes para resolver casos de resultados contraditórios. A Comissão acompanhará os trabalhos do ICVV neste domínio, com o objetivo de alcançar um entendimento entre todas as partes.

O método de produção, quer por sementes quer por bolbos, não afeta a biodiversidade. No que diz respeito à luta contra a perda de biodiversidade ao nível das explorações agrícolas, a nova política agrícola comum veio reforçar as medidas para a preservação da biodiversidade.

([1]) http://www.cpvo.europa.eu/documents/TP/vegetales/TP_046-2_Onion-shallot.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000639/14
to the Commission
Eric Andrieu (S&D), Isabelle Thomas (S&D), Marc Tarabella (S&D), Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos (S&D), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Michel Dantin (PPE) and Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(22 January 2014)

Subject: Failure to comply with Commission Directive 2003/91/EC regarding the inclusion of varieties of seed shallots

Since 2005, the inclusion of new varieties of shallots, first in national then in European catalogues, has been subject to EU regulation. This is based on the one hand on a precise technical protocol — CVPO protocol TP 46/2 which was updated on 1 April 2009 — but on the other on Article 1 of Directive 2003/91/EC, which states that the inclusion in national catalogues of new varieties is the responsibility of Member States, which shall ensure that the CVPO protocol in question is properly complied with.

Yet it appears that certain varieties of seed shallots included in the Dutch catalogue definitely do not meet the conditions set out in the protocol. This relates to the varieties Conservor, Picador, Armador, Camelot, Ambition and Obelisk, which should be classified in the onion catalogue. Experimental tests conducted in France by GEVES, the public body which carries out the tests required by European legislation when new varieties are registered, prove this and are available to the Commission.

The infringements observed raise several questions which we put to the Commission:

1. The protocol is sufficiently clear and precise to enable varieties to be classified easily and without doubt. However, it is questionable whether Member States are checking that the protocol is being correctly applied. How does the Commission, the guardian of Community law, verify compliance with the rules on inclusion in the case of the variety shallot and in particular with the protocol relating thereto?

2. These varieties, which are wrongly entered in the shallot catalogue and unfairly enjoy CVPO protection, are currently widely sold within the Union and outside countries, and the product of their culture circulates illegally under the name shallot. Consumers are being duped and defrauded. What does the Commission intend doing with regard to consumers' right to protection against the infringing State?

3. The damage caused affects consumers and the whole of the traditional shallot industry. The Dutch production method is less onerous, especially in terms of labour, and could rapidly destroy the traditional shallot sector and biodiversity. Failure to comply with legislation on the sale of plant varieties indirectly affects the rules of European competition. What does the Commission propose doing to rectify this? How does it intend to simultaneously limit the loss of biodiversity, a vital element in the promotion of sustainable development?

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

CPVO protocol TP 46/2 ([1]) provides that the examination offices, here Naktuinbouw (NL) and GEVES (FR), coordinate and exchange technical questionnaires and information for the technical examination. They may also exchange plant material in order to solve particular problems. Both examination offices are entrusted by CPVO for the examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability of onion/shallot varieties.

In December 2013, the Commission sent a request to CPVO that further work is to be carried out with respect to the abovementioned protocol, especially as regards implementation of certain elements that may be relevant to resolve conflicting findings. The Commission will follow the work of CPVO in this area with a view to achieving a common understanding by all sides.

The production method, if by seeds or by bulbs, does not affect biodiversity. As regards the fight against the loss of biodiversity at the level of agricultural holdings, the new common agricultural policy reinforces measures for the conservation of biodiversity.

([1]) http://www.cpvo.europa.eu/documents/TP/vegetales/TP_046-2_Onion-shallot.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-000641/14
à Comissão
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(23 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Atribuição de vistos dourados em Portugal e na União Europeia

Em 2013, Portugal, sob supervisão da Troika, emitiu 471 «vistos dourados» por conta de 306,7 milhões investidos no país, 80 % dos quais concedidos a cidadãos chineses.

Desde outubro de 2012, um individuo de um país terceiro pode obter um «visto dourado» ou uma «autorização de residência para catividade de investimento», pessoalmente ou através de uma sociedade, por um período mínimo de cinco anos, desde que invista em Portugal um montante igual ou superior a um milhão de euros ou crie pelo menos dez postos de trabalho, ou compre imóveis num valor mínimo de 500 mil euros. O «visto dourado» autoriza um investidor de um país terceiro a circular livremente no espaço Schengen, a trabalhar sem restrições e a beneficiar do direito de reagrupamento familiar. Depois de cinco anos com «visto dourado» os estrangeiros podem candidatar-se à cidadania portuguesa e obtê-la ao fim de 6 anos.

Não pensa a Comissão que este sistema de atribuição de «vistos dourados» põe em causa os direitos e obrigações da cidadania europeia e a segurança no Espaço Schengen, originando um esquema de venda da nacionalidade a prazo e fomentando uma situação de desigualdade no tratamento de nacionais de países terceiros desejosos de aceder ao espaço Schengen, mas sem avultados recursos financeiros?

O que fez a Comissão, que integra a Troika, para desencorajar o Governo português e outros governos de Estados-Membros de edificar este sistema ou outros semelhantes de «venda da nacionalidade» ou de «vistos dourados» que atentam contra os princípios, valores e interesses da União Europeia e contra a segurança no Espaço Schengen?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(4 de março de 2014)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-000462/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-000462&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000641/14
to the Commission
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Issue of 'golden visas' in Portugal and elsewhere in the EU

In 2013, Portugal, which is under Troika supervision, issued 471 'golden visas' in return for investments in the country worth EUR 306.7 million. Eighty per cent of these visas were granted to Chinese citizens.

As of October 2012, it is possible for third-country nationals to obtain a 'golden visa' or 'residence permit for attracting investment', either personally or through a company and for a minimum period of five years, provided they invest in Portugal an amount of EUR 1 million or more, or create ten jobs, or purchase property worth at least EUR 500 000. The 'golden visa' entitles the third-country investor to move freely within the Schengen area, work without restrictions and benefit from the right to family reunification. After five years, the holder of the 'golden visa' can apply for Portuguese citizenship and obtain it at the end of six years.

Does the Commission not see this system of allocating 'golden visas' as undermining the rights and obligations of European citizenship and the security of the Schengen area, creating a system for the sale of nationality by instalments and promoting the unequal treatment of third-country nationals wishing to gain access to the Schengen area but lacking substantial financial resources?

What did the Commission, as part of the Troika, do to discourage the governments of Portugal and other Member States from constructing this and other similar 'nationality-vending' or 'golden visa' systems, which undermine the principles, values and interests of the EU and the security of the Schengen area?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000462/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-000462&language=EN

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-000643/14
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(23 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Contrabanda cu țigări: ofițeri de legătură ai UE

Potrivit estimărilor oficiale, în 2011, valoarea totală a pierderilor de venituri fiscale provenite din contrabanda cu țigarete s-a ridicat la peste 11 miliarde de EUR. Țigările de contrabandă în Uniunea Europeană provin în special din China, Emiratele Arabe Unite, Vietnam, Malaezia, Rusia, Singapore, Belarus și Ucraina.

Rolul ofițerilor de legătură din afara teritoriului UE este recunoscut ca fiind deosebit de eficient în eforturile de a combate și perturba mecanismele de contrabandă cu țigări. De exemplu, Regatul Unit are în prezent 28 de ofițeri de informații în afara teritoriului UE. Din cele 1928 de milioane de țigări cu destinația Regatul Unit confiscate în 2012-2013, 1272 de milioane au fost confiscate în afara teritoriului UE.

Din 2012, Oficiul European de Luptă Antifraudă (OLAF) a avut un singur ofițer de legătură în Kiev. Studiul Parlamentului European intitulat „Politica UE și comerțul ilegal cu tutun: evaluarea impactului" recomandă numirea unor ofițeri suplimentari ai UE în țări importante în ceea ce privește sursa țigărilor ilegale și tranzitul acestora, inclusiv cel puțin China, Emiratele Arabe Unite, Ucraina și Rusia.

Cum intenționează Comisia și OLAF să răspundă recomandării Parlamentului pentru a mări numărul ofițerilor de legătură?

Răspuns dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei
(25 februarie 2014)

Comisia împărtășește pe deplin îngrijorarea distinsei membre cu privire la contrabanda cu țigarete. Această problemă a fost abordată în comunicarea Comisiei intitulată „Intensificarea luptei împotriva contrabandei cu țigări și a altor forme de comerț ilicit cu produse din tutun — O strategie globală a UE" ([1]) și planul de acțiune aferent ([2]) din 6 iunie 2013.

Comisia este conștientă de importanța ofițerilor de legătură, aspect care a fost, de asemenea, evidențiat în recomandarea formulată de dl Luk Joossens, de dr. Hana Ross și de dl Michał Sokłosa în studiul lor „Politica UE și comerțul ilegal cu tutun: evaluarea impactului".

Distinsa membră ar trebui să aibă în vedere faptul că detașarea de ofițeri de legătură suplimentari presupune resurse umane și bugetare și că, în prezent, Comisia, inclusiv OLAF, face demersuri de reducere a personalului ([3]). Cu toate acestea, în conformitate cu punctul 3.2.10 din planul de acțiune susmenționat, Comisia analizează posibilitatea de a mări numărul ofițerilor de legătură.

([1]) COM(2013) 324.
([2]) SWD (2013) 193.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/sefcovic/administration/eu_civil_service/the_eu_civil_service_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000643/14
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Cigarette smuggling: EU liaison officers

According to official estimates, the total amount lost in tax revenue on account of cigarette smuggling in 2011 was over EUR 11 billion. Smuggled cigarettes in the European Union come mainly from China, the United Arab Emirates, Vietnam, Malaysia, Russia, Singapore, Belarus and Ukraine.

The role of overseas liaison officers is recognised as being particularly efficient in efforts to fight and disrupt cigarette smuggling schemes. For instance, the United Kingdom currently has 28 overseas intelligence officers. Of the 1 928 million cigarettes destined for the UK which were seized in 2012-2013, 1 272 million were actually seized overseas.

Since 2012, the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) has had only one liaison officer stationed in Kiev. The European Parliament's study entitled 'EU Policy and Illicit Tobacco Trade: Assessing the Impacts' recommends posting additional EU liaison officers to important illicit cigarette source and transit countries, including at least China, the United Arab Emirates, Ukraine and Russia.

How do the Commission and OLAF intend to respond to Parliament's recommendation to increase the number of liaison officers?

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

The Commission fully shares the concerns of the Honourable Member regarding cigarette smuggling. This issue was raised in the Commission's Communication 'Stepping up the fight against cigarette smuggling and other forms of illicit trade in tobacco products — A comprehensive EU strategy' ([1]) and its Action Plan ([2]) from 6 June 2013.

The Commission is aware of the importance of the liaison officers which was also mentioned in the recommendation made by Mr Luk Joossens, Dr Hana Ross and Mr Michał Sokłosa in their study 'EU Policy and Illicit Tobacco Trade: Assessing the Impacts'.

The Honourable Member should be aware that the posting of additional liaison officers requires available human and budgetary resources and the Commission, including OLAF, is currently subject to staff cuts ([3]). However, in accordance with point 3.2.10 of the abovementioned Action Plan, the Commission is reflecting on the possibility of increasing the number of liaison officers.

([1]) COM(2013) 324.
([2]) SWD(2013) 193.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/sefcovic/administration/eu_civil_service/the_eu_civil_service_en.htm

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-000650/14
upućeno Komisiji
László Surján (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE), Andrej Plenković (PPE), Zdravka Bušić (PPE) i Jelko Kacin (ALDE)
(23. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Simbolička zaštita trgova, spomenika i parkova pomirenja

Francusko-njemačka pomirba nije bila nuspojava europskog integracijskog procesa, već njegovo srce. Mlađe generacije trebale bi imati na umu taj duh pomirenja kako bi održale uzajamno povjerenje i poštovanje među narodima Europe. Diljem Europe postoje posebna mjesta koja simboliziraju to nasljeđe, kao što su grad Strasbourg i Europski most između Francuske i Njemačke. Postoje trgovi, spomenici i parkovi širom Europe posvećeni duhu pomirenja, čak i u novim državama članicama, primjerice u Aradu u Rumunjskoj.

Je li Komisija voljna sastaviti europski registar takvih mjesta? Bi li Komisija mogla obilježiti ta mjesta spomen-pločama kako bi ih simbolički zaštitila te privukla pozornost mlađih generacija na važnost uzajamnog povjerenja i poštovanja među različitim nacijama?

Odgovor gđe Vassiliou u ime Komisije
(7. ožujka 2014.)

Komisija dijeli mišljenje poštovanog zastupnika da su podsjećanje na duh pomirenja u Europi te kulturna baština općenito od velike važnosti za naša društva.

Međutim, u skladu s člankom 167. Ugovora o funkcioniranju Europske unije, zaštita, očuvanje i održavanje kulturne baštine prvenstveno su nacionalna odgovornost: „Unija doprinosi procvatu kultura država članica, poštujući pritom njihovu nacionalnu i regionalnu raznolikost i stavljajući istodobno u prvi plan zajedničko kulturno nasljeđe. Djelovanje Zajednice usmjereno je prema poticanju suradnje između država članica te, prema potrebi, podupiranju i dopunjavanju njihovog djelovanja" […] između ostalog, s ciljem „očuvanja i zaštite kulturnog nasljeđa od europskog značaja."

Komisija aktivno promiče ta načela, unutar okvira za suradnju u području kulture, Europskog programa za kulturu i Programa Europske unije „Kreativna Europa", koji uključuje Oznaku europske kulturne baštine, godišnjih Dana europske baštine i Nagrade Europske unije za kulturnu baštinu/nagrade Europa Nostra. Osobito se Oznakom europske kulturne baštine želi istaknuti mjesta kulturne baštine koja su spomenici i simboli europskih integracija, ideala i povijesti. Ta je oznaka zamišljena kao način premošćivanja jaza između Unije i njezinih građana unapređenjem znanja o europskoj povijesti te ulozi i vrijednostima Europske unije.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-000650/14
a Bizottság számára
Surján László (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE), Andrej Plenković (PPE), Zdravka Bušić (PPE) és Jelko Kacin (ALDE)
(2014. január 23.)

Tárgy: A megbékélést jelképező terek, emlékművek és parkok szimbolikus védelme

A francia–német megbékélés az európai integrációs folyamatnak nem mellékhatása, hanem központi tényezője volt. A fiatalabb generációknak igenis emlékezniük kell a megbékélés szellemére annak érdekében, hogy Európa népei között fennmaradjon a kölcsönös bizalom és tisztelet. Európában léteznek olyan különleges helyek, amelyek ezt az örökséget szimbolizálják, például Strasbourg városa vagy a Franciaországot és Németországot összekötő Európa-híd. Egész Európában, még az új tagállamokban is, mint például a romániai Aradon, terek, emlékművek és parkok testesítik meg a megbékélés szellemét.

Szándékában áll-e a Bizottságnak, hogy összeállítsa e helyek európai jegyzékét? Elképzelhetőnek tartja-e a Bizottság, hogy ezeket a helyeket emléktáblával jelölje, így részesítve azokat szimbolikus védelemben, és egyben a fiatalabb generációk figyelmét is felhívva a különböző nemzetek közötti kölcsönös bizalom és tisztelet fontosságára?

Androulla Vassiliou válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. március 7.)

A Bizottság osztozik a Tisztelt Képviselők azon álláspontjában, hogy a megbékélés szelleme és általában a kulturális örökség kiemelkedő fontosságú európai társadalmaink jövője szempontjából.

Ugyanakkor az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés 167. cikke értelmében a kulturális örökség megóvása, megőrzése és fenntartása elsődlegesen nemzeti hatáskörbe tartozik: „az Unió hozzájárul a tagállamok kultúrájának virágzásához, tiszteletben tartva nemzeti és regionális sokszínűségüket, ugyanakkor előtérbe helyezve a közös kulturális örökséget. Az Unió fellépésének célja a tagállamok közötti együttműködés előmozdítása és szükség esetén tevékenységük támogatása és kiegészítése” egyebek között „az európai jelentőségű kulturális örökség megőrzése és védelme” területén.

A Bizottság aktívan előmozdítja ezeket az elveket, többek között a kultúrpolitika terén folytatott együttműködés, az európai kulturális menetrend, a Kreatív Európa elnevezésű uniós program és azon belül az „Európai Örökség” cím, továbbá az évente megrendezésre kerülő Európai Örökség Napok és az Európai Unió Kulturális Öröksége díj/Europa Nostra-díj révén. Külön kiemelendő az „Európai Örökség” cím, amely az európai integrációt, eszméket és történelmet idéző és jelképező helyszínekre hivatott felhívni a figyelmet. Ez a kezdeményezés az európai történelemre, az EU szerepére és értékeire vonatkozó ismeretek elmélyítése révén az EU és a polgárok között meglévő szakadék áthidalását szolgálja.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000650/14
adresată Comisiei
László Surján (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE), Andrej Plenković (PPE), Zdravka Bušić (PPE) şi Jelko Kacin (ALDE)
(23 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Protecția simbolică a piețelor, monumentelor și parcurilor dedicate reconcilierii

Reconcilierea franco-germană nu a fost un efect secundar al integrării europene, ci motorul acesteia. Tinerele generații ar trebui să-și amintească de spiritul reconcilierii pentru a menține încrederea reciprocă și respectul între popoarele Europei. Există peste tot în Europa locuri speciale care simbolizează această moștenire, de exemplu orașul Strasbourg și Podul Europa dintre Franța și Germania. Peste tot în Europa există piețe, monumente și parcuri dedicate spiritului reconcilierii, chiar și în noile state, cum ar fi în România, la Arad.

Dorește Comisia să creeze un registru al acestor locuri? Ar putea Comisia să marcheze aceste locuri cu o tăbliță memorială care să le confere simbolic protecție și care să le atragă atenția generațiilor mai tinere asupra importanței încrederii reciproce și a respectului între diferitele națiuni?

Răspuns dat de dna Vassiliou în numele Comisiei
(7 martie 2014)

Comisia împărtășește opinia distinșilor membri ai Parlamentului. Punerea în valoare a spiritului de reconciliere și a patrimoniului cultural din Europa are o importanță majoră pentru societățile noastre.

Totuși, în conformitate cu articolul 167 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, protecția, conservarea și întreținerea patrimoniului cultural sunt în primul rând o responsabilitate națională: „Uniunea contribuie la înflorirea culturilor statelor membre, respectând diversitatea națională și regională a acestora și punând în evidență, în același timp, moștenirea culturală comună. Acțiunea Uniunii urmărește să încurajeze cooperarea dintre statele membre și, în cazul în care este necesar, să sprijine și să completeze acțiunea acestora" […], printre altele, în vederea „conservării și protejării patrimoniului cultural de importanță europeană".

Comisia promovează în mod activ aceste principii în cadrul cooperării privind politica în domeniul culturii, prin intermediul Agendei europene pentru cultură și al Programului UE „Europa creativă", care include marca patrimoniului european, Zilele europene ale patrimoniului, organizate anual și Premiul UE pentru patrimoniu cultural/Premiile Europa Nostra. În special, marca patrimoniului european este menită să pună în valoare siturile care celebrează și simbolizează integrarea, idealurile și istoria Europei. Ea își propune să apropie UE de cetățenii săi, printr-o mai bună cunoaștere a istoriei europene și a rolului și valorilor UE.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-000650/14
za Komisijo
László Surján (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE), Andrej Plenković (PPE), Zdravka Bušić (PPE) in Jelko Kacin (ALDE)
(23. januar 2014)

Zadeva: Simbolično varstvo trgov, spomenikov in parkov sprave

Francosko-nemška sprava ni bila stranski učinek procesa evropskega povezovanja, temveč njegovo bistvo. Da bi se ohranilo medsebojno zaupanje in spoštovanje med evropskimi narodi, mlajše generacije ne bi smele pozabiti tega duha sprave. Po vsej Evropi so posebni kraji, ki simbolizirajo to dediščino, na primer mesto Strasbourg in Evropski most med Francijo in Nemčijo, pa tudi trgi, spomeniki in parki, ki so posvečeni duhu sprave in jih najdemo celo v novih državah članicah, na primer v romunskem Aradu.

Ali je Komisija pripravljena pripraviti evropski register teh krajev? Ali bi lahko na teh krajih postavila spominsko ploščo, da se jim zagotovi simbolično varstvo ter da se mlajše generacije opozori na pomen medsebojnega zaupanja in spoštovanja med različnimi narodi?

Odgovor Androulle Vassiliou v imenu Komisije
(7. marec 2014)

Komisija se strinja z mnenjem spoštovanih poslancev, da sta spomin na duh sprave v Evropi ter kulturna dediščina na splošno velikega pomena za našo družbo.

Vendar pa sta v skladu s členom 167 Pogodbe o delovanju Evropske unije varstvo in ohranjanje kulturne dediščine predvsem v nacionalni pristojnosti: „Unija prispeva k razcvetu kultur držav članic, pri čemer upošteva njihovo nacionalno in regionalno raznolikost ter hkrati postavlja v ospredje skupno kulturno dediščino. Dejavnost Unije je namenjena spodbujanju sodelovanja med državami članicami in, če je to potrebno, podpiranju in dopolnjevanju njihove dejavnosti […]“, med drugim na področju „ohranjanje in varstvo kulturne dediščine evropskega pomena“.

Komisija dejavno spodbuja ta načela, in sicer znotraj okvira za sodelovanje na področju kulturne politike, z evropsko agendo za kulturo in programom EU „Ustvarjalna Evropa“, ki vključuje znak evropske dediščine, vsakoletne dneve evropske dediščine in nagrado EU za kulturno dediščino – nagrado Europa Nostra. Z znakom evropske dediščine naj bi izpostavili spomeniška območja, ki ovekovečujejo in simbolizirajo evropsko združevanje, ideale in zgodovino. Tako naj bi z boljšim poznavanjem evropske zgodovine ter vloge in vrednot EU premostili vrzel med EU in njenimi državljani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000650/14
to the Commission
László Surján (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE), Andrej Plenković (PPE), Zdravka Bušić (PPE) and Jelko Kacin (ALDE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Symbolic protection for the squares, monuments and parks of reconciliation

The French-German reconciliation was not a side effect of the European integration process, but the heart of it. Younger generations should remember that spirit of reconciliation in order to maintain mutual trust and respect between the peoples of Europe. There are special places all over Europe which symbolise this heritage, for example the city of Strasbourg and the Europe Bridge between France and Germany. There are squares, monuments and parks all over Europe dedicated to the spirit of reconciliation, even in the new Member States, such as in Arad, Romania.

Is the Commission willing to create a European register of these places? Would it be possible for the Commission to mark these places with a memorial tablet in order to give them symbolic protection and to draw the attention of younger generations to the importance of mutual trust and respect between the different nations?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

The Commission shares the Honourable Members' view that the remembrance of the spirit of reconciliation in Europe as well as cultural heritage in general are of high importance for our societies.

However, pursuant to Article 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the protection, conservation and upkeep of cultural heritage are primarily a national responsibility: 'The Union shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore. Action by the Union shall be aimed at encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action' […] inter alia, with a view to 'conservation and safeguarding cultural heritage of European significance.'

The Commission actively promotes these principles, within the framework for cooperation on culture policy, the European Agenda for Culture and the EU Programme Creative Europe which includes the European Heritage Label, the annual European Heritage Days and the EU Prize for cultural heritage/Europa Nostra award. In particular, the European Heritage Label aims at highlighting heritage sites that celebrate and symbolise European integration, ideals and history. It is conceived as a way to bridge the gap between the EU and its citizens by improving knowledge of European history and the role and values of the EU.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000653/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(23 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Direttiva dwar is-Swieq fl-Istrumenti Finanzjarji II

F'Ottubru 2011, il-Kummissjoni ħarġet il-proposta tagħha biex temenda u testendi d-Direttiva dwar is-Swieq fl-Istrumenti Finanzjarji (MiFID), magħrufa bħala MiFID II.

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tgħid liema stadju ntlaħaq fid-diskussjonijiet rigward din il-proposta leġiżlattiva ġdida?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Barnier f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' Marzu 2014)

Wara li fl-20 ta' Ottubru 2011 il-Kummissjoni adottat il-proposti għal rieżami tal-MiFID (li jikkonsistu f'Direttiva riformulata u f'Regolament ġdid) il-passi ewlenin tal-proċess ta' negozjar kienu dawn li ġejjin:

Fil-Parlament, fis-26 ta' Settembru 2012 il-kumitat ECON adotta unanimament l-abbozz tar-rapport tar-Relatur Markus Ferber (EPP/DE). Il-vot fis-seduta Plenarja tas-26 ta' Ottubru 2012 ittieħed għall-emendi biss u mhux għar-riżoluzzjoni leġiżlattiva (l-ewwel qari għadu possibbli).

Fil-Kunsill, intlaħaq qbil fuq approċċ ġenerali fil-21 ta' Ġunju 2013.

Fl-14 ta' Jannar 2014 intlaħaq qbil politiku u l-adozzjoni plenarja mill-PE hija prevista għal April 2014 (il-pubblikazzjoni f' *Il-Ġurnal Uffiċjali tal-Unjoni Ewropea* tkun f'Ġunju).

Imbagħad il-Kummissjoni tibda taħdem fuq l-atti tal-implimentazzjoni u ddelegati previsti fir-Regolament u fid-Direttiva bl-għajnuna tal-ESMA. Kien hemm qbil fuq perjodu ta' 30 xahar biex jiġu żviluppati dawn il-miżuri, inklużi l-istandards tekniċi, li jfisser li l-MiFID II għandha tidħol fis-seħħ sal-aħħar tal-2016.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000653/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Markets in Financial Instruments Directive II

In October 2011 the Commission released its proposal to amend and extend the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID), referred to as MiFID II.

Can the Commission say what stage has been reached in the discussions on this new legislative proposal?

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

Following the adoption by the Commission on 20 October 2011 of the proposals for the MiFID review (consisting of a recast Directive and of a new Regulation) the main steps of the negotiation process were the following:

In Parliament, the ECON committee adopted the draft report of Rapporteur Markus Ferber (EPP/DE) by unanimity on 26 September 2012. The vote in Plenary took place on 26 October 2012, only for the amendments and not the legislative resolution (1st reading still possible).

In Council, a general approach was reached on 21 June 2013.

A political agreement was reached on 14 January 2014 and plenary adoption by the EP is foreseen in April 2014 (publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in June).

The Commission would then start working on the implementing and delegated acts foreseen in the regulation and in the directive with the assistance of ESMA. A 30 months period was agreed to develop these measures, including technical standards, which means that MiFID II would enter into application by the end of 2016.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000655/14
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: A re-definition of 'free-range' in labelling

The EU's definition of free-range egg standards specifically states that 'hens must have continuous daytime access to open-air runs'. However, this requirement does not by any means prevent a producer from restricting this access for a limited period of time to the morning hours, in accordance with usual good farming practice.

'Free-range' was intended to mean 'free roaming', yet 'the maximum stocking density of open-air runs must not be greater than 2 500 hens per hectare of ground available to the hens or one hen per 4 m2 at all times. However, where at least 10 m^2 per hen is available and where rotation is practised and hens are given even access to the whole area over the flock's life, each paddock used must at any time assure at least 2.5 m^2 per hen'. This has inevitably loosened the terms of the definition of 'free-range' and, as a consequence, the term has now lost its real meaning and is far from correct.

1. This now well-established term has become firmly cemented in the public mindset as a definition of high standards of animal welfare. Does the Commission not feel that there is a need to redefine what has now become an exceptionally loose definition of what are essentially loose standards when it comes to farming practices?

2. Given that the Commission is so trapped in a mindset of 'minimum' requirements and 'minimum' standards, perhaps it is now time to look beyond these minimum standards and strive for greater welfare standards?

3. The EU has yet to adopt mobility standards for other livestock. Does the Commission intend to extend legislation to cover other produce, in particular as regards milk cows being allowed sufficient grazing time each day?

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

When assessing animal welfare, the question will always arise as to how a given procedure or housing system affects the animals in question and to conclude on what is considered acceptable both from a scientific and ethical perspective. An important parameter to keep in mind when considering animal welfare is good husbandry practice, such as the rotation of open-air-runs for all species or the protection of layers in the morning hours.

The end result is then often a minimum base line level to be achieved by all. However this does not prevent the application of standards which go beyond this minimum. Today, indicators are increasingly used to measure the animals' welfare state. Such indicators are already embedded in EU legislation in addition to the minimum standards (Directive 2007/43/EC [1]). The EU animal welfare strategy 2012-2015 [2] will consider the overall introduction of such indicators which would help improve the welfare of animals.

The Commission is currently not proposing to draft new animal welfare legislation for any farmed animal species.

---

[1] Council Directive 2007/43/EC laying down minimum rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production; OJ L 182, 12.7.2007, p 19.
[2] http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000659/14
à la Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE) et Jean-Jacob Bicep (Verts/ALE)
(23 janvier 2014)

Objet: Épandages aériens de pesticides en France

Le 23 décembre 2013, le gouvernement français a émis son nouvel «Arrêté relatif aux conditions d'épandage par voie aérienne des produits mentionnés à l'article L. 253-8 du code rural et de la pêche maritime».

L'arrêté reprend en grande partie le précédent arrêté sur le sujet datant de 2011. Il prévoit des «dérogations temporaires accordées pour une durée maximale de 3 mois pour le maïs, 4 mois pour la vigne et 12 mois pour le bananier».

L'auteur de la présente question avait déjà posé une question écrite à la Commission à ce sujet en 2012 (P-005964/2012). Celle-ci avait répondu que l'article 9 de la directive sur les pesticides (2009/128/CE) prévoit l'interdiction de la pulvérisation aérienne, sauf dérogations pouvant être accordées par les États membres dans des conditions extrêmement rigoureuses. Or, avec des dérogations temporaires de 12 mois pour la banane, les épandages sur cette culture seront dorénavant systématiquement autorisés. La perte du caractère exceptionnel constitue une infraction à la directive sur les pesticides.

Les épandages en France continueront par ailleurs d'enfreindre la directive-cadre sur l'eau ainsi que les directives «Habitats» (92/43/CEE) et «Oiseaux» (79/409/CEE).

1. La Commission est-elle informée de l'existence de ces dérogations et de leurs conséquences environnementales?

2. Qu'entend faire la Commission pour que les directives précitées soient respectées?

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

Comme indiqué dans la réponse précédente P-0005964/2012 ([1]), la directive 2009/128/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 21 octobre 2009 instaurant un cadre d'action communautaire pour parvenir à une utilisation des pesticides compatible avec le développement durable ([2]) ne prévoit pas que les États membres informent la Commission des dérogations accordées en ce qui concerne la pulvérisation aérienne.

La Commission a contacté la France à ce sujet et examine actuellement la réponse qu'elle a reçue le 25 février 2014. La Commission continuera de suivre l'application des dispositions relatives à la pulvérisation aérienne. Ce sujet sera discuté avec les experts des États membres du Comité permanent de la chaîne alimentaire et de la santé animale et devrait faire l'objet d'audits dans le cadre du prochain programme d'inspection de l'Office alimentaire et vétérinaire. Ces audits vérifieront le respect des critères de dérogation, des exigences de suivi et des dispositions qui s'appliquent dans les zones sensibles protégées telles que définies par les directives 79/409/CEE ([3]) et 92/43/CEE ([4]).

Enfin, la Commission effectue actuellement une analyse des informations communiquées par les États membres dans le cadre des plans d'action nationaux et présentera un rapport au Parlement européen et au Conseil conformément aux dispositions de l'article 4 de la directive susmentionnée.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) JO L 309 du 24.11.2009, p. 71.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31979L0409:fr:HTML
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31992L0043:FR:HTML

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000659/14
to the Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE) and Jean-Jacob Bicep (Verts/ALE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Aerial application of pesticides in France

On 23 December 2013, the French Government issued a new decree, 'Arrêté relatif aux conditions d'épandage par voie aérienne des produits mentionnés à l'article L. 253-8 du code rural et de la pêche maritime', concerning the aerial spreading of the products listed in Article L. 253-8 of the French Rural and Maritime Fishing Code.

The decree largely restates the content of the previous decree on the topic, dated 2011. It provides for 'temporary derogations granted for a maximum period of 3 months for maize crops, 4 months for grapevine plantations, and 12 months for banana trees'.

The author of this question had already submitted a written question to the Commission on this topic in 2012 (P-005964/2012). The latter had responded that Article 9 of the directive on pesticides (2009/128/EC) prohibits aerial spraying, except in the event of derogations that may be granted by Member States under extremely strict conditions. Yet, with these temporary derogations of 12 months for banana trees, spreading over this crop will from now on be systematically authorised. The loss of the exceptional nature constitutes a breach of the directive on pesticides.

Spreading in France will therefore continue to infringe upon the Water Framework Directive, as well as the 'Habitats' (92/43/EEC) and 'Birds' (79/409/EEC) Directives.

1. Is the Commission aware of these requests for derogations and their environmental implications?

2. What does the Commission intend to do to ensure that the aforementioned directives are complied with?

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

As mentioned in the previous reply P-0005964/2012 ([1]), Directive 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides ([2]), does not provide for Member States to inform the Commission on derogations issued with respect to aerial spraying.

The Commission has contacted France on this case and is currently examining the reply received on 25 February 2014. The Commission will further follow up on the implementation of the provisions regarding aerial spraying. The topic will be discussed with Member States' experts in the context of the Standing Committee of the Food Chain and Animal Health and is planned to be audited in the next inspection programme of the Food and Veterinary Office. These audits will verify the respect of criteria for derogations, monitoring requirements and provisions applying in protected and sensitive areas such as those identified under Directives 79/409/EEC ([3]) and 92/43/EEC ([4]).

Finally, the Commission is currently carrying out an analysis of information communicated by Member States in the National Action Plans and will report to the European Parliament and the Council in compliance with provisions of Article 4 of the abovementioned Directive.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p. 71.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31979L0409:en:HTML
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31992L0043:EN:HTML

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000666/14
à Comissão
Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(23 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Soprattutto Café S.A.

Nos últimos meses, o grupo parlamentar do Bloco de Esquerda na Assembleia da República tem alertado e questionado várias entidades sobre a situação vivida pela Soprattutto Café S.A., que requer a liquidação de 214 375,00 euros correspondentes à aplicação da taxa de imposto de selo de 5 % sobre o preço total pago pela transmissão de atividade, nos termos da tabela geral do imposto de selo.

Entre as entidades questionadas estão o Ministério da Economia (ME) e o Ministério das Finanças portugueses, com o primeiro a identificar o segundo como entidade competente na resolução desta questão, o qual, por sua vez, tem vindo a ignorar sucessivamente este assunto.

A ausência de uma resposta e de uma decisão do Ministério das Finanças sobre a legalidade e respetiva restituição dos valores em causa — cuja primeira questão (de três) foi enviada em junho passado (e outras duas posteriormente à resposta do ME) — tem, como tal, vindo a agravar drasticamente a situação financeira da Soprattutto Café S.A., a ponto de colocar em causa a sua sobrevivência e os postos de trabalho dos cerca de 50 trabalhadores que dela dependem, direta ou indiretamente.

Cientes de que todos os assuntos em matéria fiscal são da exclusiva responsabilidade dos Estados-Membros e que, como tal, a UE não pode nem irá intervir, solicitamos então à Comissão que se pronuncie e se, possível, que de alguma maneira tome medidas relativamente ao seguinte:

1. De que forma são os vários programas de apoio às PME (que a Comissão tem afirmado serem prioritários) compatíveis com estas práticas de Estados-Membros?

2. Que instrumentos pensa a Comissão desenvolver de forma a evitar situações semelhantes à que está a acontecer na Soprattutto Café S.A. e que está a pôr em risco 50 postos de trabalho?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(10 de março de 2014)

1. A Comissão não pode pronunciar-se sobre casos específicos que não estejam abrangidos ou eventualmente relacionados com programas de apoio às PME e práticas abrangidas pelo âmbito de competência nacional.

2. Em termos gerais, de acordo com o princípio da subsidiariedade, cabe aos Estados-Membros definir estabelecer a sua política fiscal e as características dos respetivos sistemas fiscais, desde que estejam em conformidade com a legislação da UE. Desde 1994, tem sido prática constante da Comissão convidar os Estados-Membros ([1]) a melhorar as disposições jurídicas, administrativas e fiscais em matéria de transmissão de empresas, entre outros aspetos, através de medidas de execução relacionadas com uma reestruturação jurídica fiscalmente neutra de uma empresa.

([1]) Recomendação de 1994 sobre a transmissão de empresas:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31994H1069:EN:HTML
Comunicação da Comissão de 1996 sobre a transmissão de empresas:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0117:FIN:PT:PDF
Lei das pequenas empresas e sua revisão de 2011: COM(2008) 394 final. «Think Small First» Um «Small Business Act» para a Europa:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0394:FIN:PT:PDF
Plano de Ação «Empreendedorismo 2020»:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0795:FIN:PT:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000666/14
to the Commission
Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Soprattutto Café S.A.

In recent months, the parliamentary group Bloco de Esquerda in the Assembly of the Republic has advised and questioned various bodies about the situation being experienced by Soprattutto Café S.A., which is having to pay EUR 214 375.00 on account of the imposition of stamp duty at a rate of 5% on the total price paid for transfer of the business, in accordance with the general schedule of stamp duty.

Among the bodies questioned are the Portuguese Ministry of Economy (ME) and the Ministry of Finance; the former identified the latter as the body competent to deal with this matter, and the latter, in turn, has repeatedly ignored this matter.

The lack of any response and of a decision from the Ministry of Finance regarding the legality and respective repayment of the amounts in question — to which the first (of three) questions was sent last June (and two more following the response from the ME) — has, as such, caused a drastic deterioration in the financial situation of Soprattutto Café S.A., to the point of placing at risk its survival and the jobs of some 50 workers who are directly or indirectly employed by it.

Aware that all tax matters are the sole responsibility of Member States, and that, as such, the EU cannot and will not intervene, we therefore request the Commission to give its opinion and, if possible, in some way take measures in relation to the following:

1. In what way are the various programmes supporting SMEs (which the Commission has stated are essential) compatible with these practices by Member States?

2. What instruments does the Commission intend to develop to avoid situations such as the one being experienced by Soprattutto Café S.A. which is placing 50 jobs at risk?

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

1. The Commission cannot comment on individual cases that are not within its purview or on the possible relationship between SME support programmes and practices that fall under national competence.

2. In general terms, according to the principle of subsidiarity, the EU Member States are free to fix their tax policy and the characteristics of their tax systems, provided that they comply with EC law. Since 1994, the Commission has consistently invited the Member States ([1]) to improve legal, administrative, and tax provisions for transfers of business, among other things, through implementing measures relating to tax neutral legal restructuring of a company.

([1]) 1994 Recommendation on business transfers http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31994H1069:EN:HTML
2006 Commission Communication on business transfers.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0117:FIN:EN:PDF
Small Business Act and its 2011 revision: COM(2008) 394 final. — 'Think Small First' A 'Small Business Act' for Europe:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0394:FIN:EN:PDF
Entrepreneurship p 2020 Action Plan.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0795:FIN:EN:PDF

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-000667/14
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(23 janvier 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Accord de Genève et rétablissement des liens financiers avec l'Iran

Alors que l'Iran a gelé, le lundi 20 janvier 2014, une partie de ses activités nucléaires pour six mois dans le cadre de l'Accord de Genève et que les États-Unis, la Chine, la France, le Royaume-Uni, la Russie et l'Allemagne vont lever une partie de leurs sanctions équivalentes à près de cinq milliards d'euros, de nombreuses sociétés européennes qui ont des contrats avec l'Iran restent en difficulté.

Des sommes importantes ne peuvent circuler, ni pour entrer en Iran ni pour en sortir, suite aux sanctions décidées dans le cadre du règlement du Conseil du 23 mars 2012.

Dans ce contexte, envisagez-vous à terme la levée de l'interdiction faite aux institutions iraniennes d'accéder aux transferts interbancaires SWIFT? Quelles autres actions l'Union européenne entreprend-elle en vue de rétablir les transferts financiers avec l'Iran et de lui permettre d'honorer ses contrats avec ses clients européens? Quels moyens l'Union européenne met-elle à disposition pour aider les entreprises européennes pénalisées par les sanctions imposées à l'Iran?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(6 mars 2014)

Les mesures restrictives de l'Union européenne à l'encontre de l'Iran visent à pénaliser le programme nucléaire iranien, les personnes et entités contribuant à ce programme et les recettes du gouvernement iranien affectées à son financement.

Bien qu'il existe des restrictions aux échanges commerciaux portant sur certains biens, le commerce en général avec l'Iran n'est pas interdit. Les transactions autorisées peuvent donc être effectuées avec l'accord des autorités compétentes des États membres et selon des procédures simples et clairement définies.

En outre, l'accès au service SWIFT n'est interdit qu'aux personnes et entités reprises sur la liste du régime de sanctions à l'encontre de l'Iran. Même si certaines banques iraniennes figurent sur cette liste en raison de leur participation au programme nucléaire iranien, de nombreux réseaux de transferts financiers restent disponibles et garantissent le bon déroulement de telles transactions avec l'Iran.

Il convient également de noter que ces sanctions comportent une dérogation permettant à une personne ou une entité reprise sur la liste d'effectuer un payement dû au titre d'un contrat conclu avant l'inscription de cette personne ou entité sur cette liste. Les sanctions ne sauraient servir de prétexte lorsque des opérateurs économiques privés évaluent le risque commercial que représente la situation politique en Iran.

L'Union européenne a suspendu certaines mesures restrictives le 20 janvier 2014, date convenue pour le début de la mise en œuvre de l'accord du 24 novembre 2013 (le Plan d'action conjoint). Afin de faciliter le commerce légitime avec l'Iran, les seuils d'autorisation des transferts financiers pour les échanges commerciaux non soumis aux sanctions ont été multipliés par dix.

Toutes les autres mesures restent en place dans le cadre de cette première étape. Des négociations visant à atteindre une solution globale à long terme en ce qui concerne le dossier nucléaire iranien se tiendront dans les six prochains mois.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000667/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Geneva Agreement and re-establishment of financial links with Iran

On 20 January 2014 Iran froze some of its nuclear work for six months under the Geneva Agreement, while the US, China, France, Germany, Russia and the United Kingdom are going to lift partial sanctions worth nearly EUR 5 million. However, a great many EU companies which have contracts with Iran remain in difficulty.

Large sums of money cannot be moved into or out of Iran, as a result of sanctions established in the Council's Regulation of 23 March 2012.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative considering lifting in the long-term the ban on Iranian institutions having access to inter-banking SWIFT transfers? What other action is the European Union taking to re-establish financial transfers with Iran and allow it to honour its contracts with its European customers? How can the European Union help EU businesses penalised by the sanctions imposed on Iran?

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

EU restrictive measures against Iran are aimed at affecting Iran's nuclear programme, those persons and entities supporting the programme and revenues of the Iranian government used to fund the programme.

While there are restrictions on trade in certain goods, there are no general prohibitions on trade with Iran. Allowed transactions may therefore proceed with the authorisation of Member States' authorities under clearly defined and straightforward procedures.

Furthermore, the access to SWIFT is prohibited only for persons and entities listed under the Iran sanctions regime. Although certain Iranian banks have been designated for their involvement in the Iranian nuclear programme, there are still a number of channels for financial transfers which remain open and which ensure that such transactions with Iran can continue.

It is noted in addition that the sanctions include a derogation allowing payments by a listed person or entity due under a contract concluded before the designation of that person or entity.

Sanctions are not accountable for the assessment by private economic operators of the business risk represented by Iran's political situation.

On 20 January 2014, the date agreed for the beginning of the implementation of the agreement reached on 24 November 2013 (known as the Joint Plan of Action), the EU suspended some restrictive measures. In order to ease legitimate trade with Iran, the thresholds for authorising financial transfers for non-sanctioned trade have been increased tenfold.

All other measures remain in place in the framework of this first step. Negotiations with a view to reaching a long-term comprehensive solution to the Iranian nuclear issue will take place in the coming six months.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000671/14
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(23 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: VP/HR — Misiunea de poliție a Uniunii Europene și eforturile Afganistanului în sprijinul femeilor (întrebare ulterioară)

În Afganistan a avut loc un eveniment crucial pentru drepturile femeilor, odată cu numirea unei femei în funcția de șef al poliției în Kabul. Cu toate acestea, violența împotriva femeilor continuă să fie o problemă majoră și un obstacol în calea securității și prosperității Afganistanului. La începutul lui 2014, președintele Comisiei independente pentru drepturile omului din Afganistan a declarat că, în 2013, violențele împotriva femeilor au devenit mai frecvente și mai brutale decât în perioadele anterioare. Funcționare proeminente din Afganistan continuă să se confrunte cu amenințări și intimidare, violențele de gen continuă să fie subraportate și există o lipsă de femei în rândul personalului din structurile de aplicare a legii.

Depunând eforturi pentru a remedia această problemă, Misiunea de Poliție a Uniunii Europene în Afganistan (EUPOL Afganistan) a instruit forțele de poliție afgane pentru a se ocupa într-un mod mai adecvat de infracțiunile în care sunt implicate femei. Ca răspuns la întrebarea E-006016/2013, Comisia a afirmat că EUPOL Afganistan „sprijină Unitatea responsabilă de problematica familiei din cadrul Ministerului de interne, Unitatea responsabilă de violența împotriva femeilor din cadrul biroului Procurorului General, precum și alți actori relevanți, instruindu-i în tehnici de cercetare penală, de intervievare sensibilă a victimelor și examinări medico-legale ale violențelor de gen". De asemenea, EUPOL depune eforturi pentru recrutarea unu număr mai mare de femei și pregătirea lor pentru a deveni ofițeri de poliție, dar și conducători a forțelor de poliție.

1. S-a făcut o evaluarea a programului EUPOL? În caz afirmativ, care au fost rezultatele și, în special, câte femei sunt ofițeri de poliție și câte infracțiuni au fost reclamate de către femei?

2. Ce măsuri sunt avute în vedere pentru a continua susținerea drepturilor femeilor și a protecției acestora după încheierea misiunii EUPOL Afganistan, programată pentru sfârșitul anului 2014?

Răspuns dat de Înaltul Reprezentant/doamna vicepreședinte Ashton în numele Comisiei
(10 martie 2014)

Progresele înregistrate în vederea punerii în aplicare a mandatelor misiunii EUPOL Afghanistan sunt evaluate în mod regulat, semestrial (acesta este cazul pentru toate misiunile PSAC).

Numărul femeilor ofițeri de poliție la nivelul poliției naționale afgane rămâne scăzut, fiind cuprins în prezent între 1 500 și 2 000. Misiunea de poliție a UE în Afganistan se axează în mod special pe sprijinirea Ministerului de Interne în scopul îmbunătățirii mediului de lucru pentru femei, ca un mijloc prin care femeile ofițeri de poliție să poată deveni parte integrantă a unui serviciu de poliție afgan. Acest lucru ar trebui să contribuie, de asemenea, la realizarea obiectivului declarat al Ministerului de a spori în mod substanțial numărul de femei în cadrul poliției naționale. Nu sunt disponibile date cu privire la numărul de infracțiuni denunțate de către femei, însă, conform informațiilor transmise de misiune, cazurile de violență împotriva femeilor încep să fie aduse la cunoștința autorităților.

În ceea ce privește viitoarea implicare a UE în Afganistan, concluziile Consiliului Afaceri Externe referitoare la Afganistan din ianuarie 2014 evidențiază faptul că asistența oferită în prezent de UE prin programe de dezvoltare și prin intermediul misiunii EUPOL Afganistan în domeniul poliției civile și al justiției ar trebui consolidată până la sfârșitul anului 2016, în contextul definirii în mod clar a unei abordări cuprinzătoare, luând în considerare situația din perioada de după 2014 și pe baza unui transfer corespunzător al sarcinilor către actorii relevanți. În conformitate cu concluziile menționate anterior, promovarea statului de drept și a respectării drepturilor omului, în special a drepturilor femeilor și fetelor, va rămâne un obiectiv esențial pentru UE în Afganistan în anii următori.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000671/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — European Union Police Mission in Afghanistan's efforts on behalf of women (follow-up question)

Afghanistan recently experienced a milestone in the cause of women's rights when it saw its first female police chief appointed in Kabul. Yet violence against women continues to be a major problem and a hindrance to security and prosperity in Afghanistan. At the beginning of 2014 the chair of the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission stated that violence against women had become more common and more brutal in 2013 than previously. Prominent female officials in Afghanistan continue to face threats and intimidation, gender-based violence continues to be underreported, and there is a dearth of female law-enforcement personnel.

In an effort to remedy this problem, the European Union Police Mission in Afghanistan (EUPOL Afghanistan) has been training the Afghan police force to deal more appropriately with crimes involving women. In response to Question E-006016/2013, the Commission stated that EUPOL Afghanistan 'has supported the Ministry of the Interior's Family Response Units, the Attorney General's Office Violence against Women Unit and other relevant actors through training in criminal investigation techniques, victim-sensitive interviewing and medical forensic examination on gender-based violence'. What is more, EUPOL has been working to increase recruitment of women and to train them to be both police officers and police leaders.

1. Has an assessment been carried out to evaluate the EUPOL programme? If so, what are the results of this and, in particular, what are the current numbers of female police officers and crimes reported by women?

2. What plans are in place to continue to support the rights and protection of women after the end of the EUPOL Afghanistan mission, which is currently scheduled to conclude at the end of 2014?

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

Progress towards the implementation of the EUPOL Afghanistan mission mandates is assessed on a regular, six-monthly basis (this is the case for all CSDP missions).

The number of female police in the Afghan National Police remains low, currently between 1 500 and 2 000. The EU Police Mission to Afghanistan is particularly focused on assisting the Ministry of Interior in improving the working environment for women as a way to enable female police to become an integral part of an Afghan police service. This should also help the Ministry fulfil its stated aim of substantially increasing the numbers of females within the National Police. Numbers of crimes reported by women are not available, but the Mission reports that instances of violence against women are starting to be reported to the authorities.

Concerning future EU involvement in Afghanistan, Foreign Affairs Council Conclusions on Afghanistan of January 2014 read that the EU assistance currently provided through development programmes and through EUPOL Afghanistan in civilian policing and the justice sector should, by the end of 2016, be consolidated in the context of a clearly defined comprehensive approach, taking into account the post-2014 situation and based on a proper transition of tasks to relevant actors. In line with the abovementioned conclusions, fostering the rule of law and respect for human rights — in particular the rights of women and girls — will remain a key objective for the EU in Afghanistan in the years to come.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-000673/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Kanada-Abkommen (CETA): Investor-Staat-Klage von US-Unternehmen unter Umgehung der TTIP

1. Wie hat die Kommission bei den Verhandlungen über das umfassende Wirtschafts- und Handelsabkommen (Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement — CETA) die Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments vom 6. April 2011 zur künftigen europäischen Auslandsinvestitionspolitik (2010/2203(INI)) berücksichtigt, in der die Forderung enthalten ist, „dass die derzeitige Regelung zur Streitbeilegung geändert werden muss, damit folgenden Aspekten Rechnung getragen werden kann: sie muss […] vorschreiben, dass lokale Rechtsmittel ausgeschöpft werden müssen, sofern sie ein ordnungsgemäßes Verfahren garantieren" (Ziffer 31)?

2. Könnten Unternehmen aus den USA, die eine Tochtergesellschaft oder Niederlassung in Kanada haben, durch die Bestimmungen des CETA-Investitionsschutzkapitels auch dann eine Investor-Staat-Klage gegen Maßnahmen europäischer Regierungen erheben, wenn die TTIP kein Investitionsschutzkapitel enthält, sofern sie ihre Investitionen in der EU über ihre kanadischen Tochtergesellschaften tätigen?

3. Warum strebt die Kommission die Aufnahme einer Meistbegünstigungsklausel im CETA-Investitionsschutzkapitel an? Kann die Kommission ausschließen, dass dann ein Investor Bestimmungen aus Investitionsschutzkapiteln Kanadas mit anderen Ländern heranziehen würde, und durch diese MFN-Klauseln Investoren Abkommen in der EU anwenden könnten, die die EU weder mitverhandelt noch ratifiziert hat?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(7. März 2014)

1. Weder Kanada noch die Mitgliedstaaten der EU pflegen eine Bestimmung zu vereinbaren, der zufolge lokale Rechtsmittel ausgeschöpft werden müssen, bevor man zur Streitbeilegung im Rahmen einer Investor-Staat-Klage übergeht. Die Kommission hat in das Abkommen mit Kanada detaillierte Vorschriften aufgenommen, die sich mit dem Zusammenhang zwischen der Investor-Staat-Streitbeilegung und innerstaatlichen Rechtsmitteln befassen, um sicherzustellen, dass eine übermäßige Entschädigung des Investors (bei erfolgreicher Geltendmachung seiner Ansprüche) im Hinblick auf Gleichbehandlung oder uneinheitliche Auslegung des Abkommens nicht möglich ist.

2. Die Investitionsschutzbestimmungen würden sich auf alle in Kanada oder der EU niedergelassenen Unternehmen beziehen, die in diesen Gebieten Geschäfte erheblichen Umfangs tätigen, und zwar unabhängig von den Eigentumsverhältnissen. Dies entspricht der seit Jahren üblichen Vorgehensweise der EU-Mitgliedstaaten in ihren eigenen bilateralen Investitionsabkommen. Im Rahmen der EU-Übereinkommen sind Briefkastenfirmen jedoch ausgeschlossen, und dies gilt auch für das CETA.

3. Die Meistbegünstigungsklausel (MFN) ist eine grundlegende Bestimmung des internationalen Investitions- und Handelsrechts; sie verhindert, dass sich Länder diskriminierend verhalten, indem sie Investoren aus anderen Ländern besser behandeln. Die Aufnahme einer Meistbegünstigungsverpflichtung in das Abkommen mit Kanada ist somit ein wesentliches Element des Investitionsschutzes in Bezug auf die Gewährleistung der bestmöglichen Behandlung für Investoren aus der EU jetzt und in Zukunft. Die Kommission ist sich jedoch der von der Frau Abgeordneten angesprochenen Möglichkeit bewusst und hat durch spezifische Formulierungen die Auswirkungen der Meistbegünstigungsklausel so begrenzt, dass die Investitionsschutzvorschriften anderer zwischen Kanada und Drittländern geschlossener Abkommen nicht über die Anwendung der Meistbegünstigungsklausel in das CETA eingeschleust werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000673/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: CETA with Canada: governments may face challenges from US companies circumventing the TTIP

1. What account has the Commission taken, in negotiating the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) with Canada, of Parliament's resolution of 6 April 2011 on future European international investment policy (2010/2203(INI)), in which Parliament urges that 'changes must be made to the present dispute settlement regime, in order to include […] the obligation to exhaust local judicial remedies where they are reliable enough to guarantee due process' (paragraph 31)?

2. Could the investment protection chapter of the CETA enable companies based in the USA which have subsidiaries or branches in Canada — provided their investments in the EU are channelled through those subsidiaries — to use the investor-to-state dispute resolution mechanism to challenge measures taken by European governments, even if the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) agreement does not include an investment protection chapter?

3. Why is the Commission seeking to have a 'most favoured nation' clause included in the investment protection chapter of the CETA? Can the Commission rule out the possibility of investors then invoking investment protection provisions agreed between Canada and other countries, and of their being able, thanks to this 'most favoured nation' clause, to secure in the EU the application of agreements neither negotiated nor ratified by the EU?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

1. Neither Canada nor the EU Member States have a practice to include a requirement to exhaust local remedies before accessing investor-to-state dispute settlement. The Commission has included detailed provisions in the Agreement with Canada setting out the relationship between investor-to-state dispute settlement and domestic remedies, to ensure that there is no possibility of over compensation of the investor (should there be a successful claim) as regards the same treatment or of inconsistent interpretations of the agreement.

2. The investment protection provisions would cover all companies established in Canada or the EU with substantive business operations in these territories, irrespective of their ownership. This has been the standard practice of EU Member States in their own Bilateral Investment Treaties for years. Under the EU's agreements, including CETA, mailbox companies are however excluded.

3. The Most-Favoured Nation clause (MFN) is a fundamental provision of international investment and trade law and ensures that countries do not discriminate by providing better treatment to investors of other countries. The inclusion of an MFN obligation in the Agreement with Canada is thus an essential element of investment protection with regard to guaranteeing the best possible treatment for EU investors, both now and in the future. However, the Commission is aware of the possibility raised by the Honourable Member and has included specific language limiting the effect of the MFN clause to ensure that investment protection provisions contained in other agreements between Canada and third countries are not imported into the CETA through the application of the MFN clause.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000674/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(23 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Ulteriori ricerche sul metodo Di Bella

È attualmente in esame della commissione sanità del Senato italiano il trattamento dei tumori con il metodo Di Bella, bocciato nel 1998 dal ministero della Sanità, ma somministrato in Italia a oltre 2000 ammalati curati a spese dello Stato in seguito a sentenze della magistratura, cui si aggiungono un migliaio di pazienti circa che si curano a proprie spese. I pazienti interessati dichiarano spesso un miglioramento e ritengono la cura più compassionevole della molto più invasiva chemioterapia, e anche alcuni oncologi e riviste specializzate come il British Medical Journal si sono dimostrate interessate. Il presidente della commissione sanità del Senato, sen. De Biasi, ha annunciato che ci saranno approfondimenti: parrebbe dunque riaprirsi un caso mai chiuso, che vide la bocciatura tra le proteste del ministero della Sanità, ma che ha visto numerose aperture positive da parte della magistratura che ha permesso ad alcuni ammalati, la maggioranza, di curarsi con il metodo Di Bella con riconoscimento della gratuità.

Può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. non ritiene iniquo che alcuni cittadini italiani abbiano diritto alle cure gratuite, evidentemente basate su una bontà scientifica riconosciuta della terapia, ed altri no?

2. Dispone di dati o ricerche della DG JRC di Ispra che sostengano la bontà del metodo Di Bella?

3. È a conoscenza di altri Stati Membri in cui sia somministrato il metodo Di Bella dalla sanità pubblica?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(10 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione non può esprimersi sul trattamento di malattie individuali che rientrano nella responsabilità degli Stati membri per quanto concerne l'organizzazione dei servizi sanitari e dell'assistenza medica.

2. Il Centro comune di ricerca della Commissione sta sviluppando un sistema di informazione sul cancro per l'Europa che elaborerà i dati sulla popolazione provenienti dai registri del cancro. Per quanto concerne lo studio e la valutazione dell'efficacia dei trattamenti del cancro (come il metodo Di Bella), si dovrebbero porre in atto e realizzare studi controllati randomizzati *ad hoc*. Tuttavia, i dati provenienti dai registri del cancro sono destinati a scopi estremamente diversificati e non possono pertanto (almeno attualmente) fornire gli strumenti adeguati per affrontare simili questioni.

3. La Commissione non sa se altri Stati membri, al di là dell'Italia, offrano il metodo Di Bella nell'ambito del settore sanitario pubblico.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000674/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Further research on the Di Bella method

The Di Bella method for treating cancer, which was rejected by the Italian Ministry of Health in 1998, is currently being reviewed by the Italian Senate's Health Committee. Despite being rejected, the method has nevertheless been used to treat more than 2 000 patients through State funding (following a number of court decisions), with a further 1 000 or so paying for the treatment themselves. Many of these patients felt better after receiving the treatment and declared it to be less gruelling than the far more invasive option of chemotherapy; in addition, the method has aroused the interest of a number of oncologists and medical journals, including the British Medical Journal. The President of the Italian Senate's Health Committee, Senator De Biasi, has now announced that the method merits further analysis. Consequently, it appears that the Di Bella method, which has never actually been shelved despite drawing the protests of, and ultimately being rejected by, the Italian Ministry of Health, is now once again being seen as a viable form of therapy. Moreover, thanks to the actions of the Italian courts, the majority of patients have been able to benefit from this treatment without having to pay for it.

1. Does the Commission consider it unfair that while some Italian citizens have received free treatment owing to the scientifically proven effectiveness of the method, others have been forced to pay?

2. Does it have any data or studies from the Directorate-General Joint Research Centre in Ispra that it could provide to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Di Bella method?

3. Does it know of any other Member States in which the Di Bella method is offered in the public health sector?

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

1. The Commission cannot take a view on issues of treatment of individual diseases which are matters which fall within the responsibilities of the Member States for the organisation at health services and medical care.

2. The Commission's Joint Research Centre is in the process of developing a cancer information system for Europe which will handle population-based data coming from cancer registries. With regard to studying and evaluating cancer treatment effectiveness (such as the Di Bella method), *ad -hoc* randomized controlled trials should be set up and implemented. However, data coming from cancer registries are meant for very different purposes and therefore cannot (at least at present) provide the proper means to address such issues.

3. The Commission is not aware of whether other Member States, besides Italy offer the Di Bella method in the public health sector.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000676/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(23 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Alegados objetivos acordados entre o governo português e os «parceiros internacionais» para 2015

Em resposta à pergunta E-012673/2013, sobre as previsões económicas do outono da Comissão Europeia e a evolução dos salários em Portugal, a Comissão Europeia refere que «as projeções para 2015 baseiam-se em hipóteses de trabalho, já que até ao momento não foram discutidas com o Governo português medidas de política orçamental para esse ano. A escolha de medidas através das quais Portugal pretende atingir em 2015 os objetivos acordados com os parceiros internacionais continua a ser da exclusiva competência do Governo».

Em aditamento à pergunta anterior, e tendo em conta o fim previsto do programa UE-FMI já este ano, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre a que «objetivos acordados com os parceiros internacionais», para 2015, se refere.

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(5 de março de 2014)

Os «objetivos acordados com os parceiros internacionais» referem-se aos objetivos orçamentais para o défice das administrações públicas acordados na 7.ª avaliação do programa, ou seja, 5,5 % do PIB em 2013, 4 % do PIB em 2014 e 2,5 % do PIB em 2015. Estes são os objetivos orçamentais que Portugal se comprometeu a atingir no contexto do quadro de supervisão orçamental da União Europeia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000676/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Claimed objectives agreed between the Portuguese Government and 'international partners' for 2015

In response to Question E-012673/2013, on the autumn economic forecasts of the European Commission and the movement of wages in Portugal, the European Commission states that 'the projections for 2015 were based on working hypotheses, since up to now no budgetary policy measures for that year have been discussed with the Portuguese Government. The choice of measures by means of which Portugal intends to achieve the objectives agreed with international partners in 2015 continues to be a matter solely for the Government'.

Further to the previous question, and taking into account that the EU-IMF programme is scheduled to conclude this year, we request that the Commission inform us as to what the 'objectives agreed with international partners' for 2015 refer to.

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

The 'objectives agreed with international partners' refer to fiscal targets for the general government deficit agreed at the 7th programme review, i.e. 5.5% of GDP for 2013, 4% of GDP for 2014 and 2.5% of GDP for 2015. These are the fiscal targets which Portugal has committed to achieving in the context of the EU fiscal surveillance framework.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000685/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(23 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Tributación de las transnacionales de tecnología en España

El pasado 18 de enero, un medio de comunicación español publicaba una noticia relativa a la recaudación impositiva por las arcas de la Agencia Tributaria española de las siete mayores empresas de tecnologías de la información que operan en el país.

Estas grandes empresas multinacionales, que en su mayoría tienen su origen en los Estados Unidos, tributaron en el Estados español 1 251 608 euros durante el ejercicio 2012. Esta miserable cantidad es reflejo de la estrategia de ingeniería fiscal que estas empresas desarrollan y de un marco normativo constituido para permitir la elusión fiscal a estas grandes empresas. Las filiales españolas de estos gigantes tecnológicos trasladan el grueso de su facturación a paraísos fiscales o a países que —sin ser considerados como tales — ofrecen ventajas fiscales a las empresas, tales como Irlanda o Luxemburgo.

Esta humillante cantidad de impuestos pagados por las empresas que más están incrementando su volumen de operaciones en el país supone un atentado directo contra la cohesión social, el Estado del bienestar y la calidad democrática en España. En un momento en el que la crisis económica está hundiendo las arcas públicas, el Gobierno de España permite que estas multinacionales operen en el país destruyendo a su competencia gracias a este dumping fiscal. Asimismo, viola el principio de progresividad fiscal, de forma que se cargan impuestos a las rentas del trabajo y se permite que las rentas del capital paguen tipos impositivos ridículamente reducidos. Estos resultados exponen el fracaso de todas las iniciativas europeas para la coordinación fiscal. Mientras se obliga a recortar el gasto público a los Estados miembros, en lo relativo a ingresos fiscales, las instituciones europeas mienten y no tienen una verdadera voluntad política de terminar con la elusión fiscal de las grandes empresas que operan en el continente.

¿Conoce la Comisión los datos mencionados sobre el ejercicio 2012?

En su respuesta a mi pregunta E-010547/2012, la Comisión señaló la Recomendación C (2012) 8806. ¿Qué Estados miembros han aplicado dicha Recomendación? En concreto, ¿se ha aplicado en España? ¿Y de qué manera? ¿Qué resultados ha obtenido? ¿Qué otras medidas plantea para que los Estados miembros luchen de una manera eficaz contra la elusión fiscal de las multinacionales? ¿Piensa publicar un listado de las multinacionales que tributan a tipos exageradamente bajos, para que los consumidores europeos estén informados sobre las multinacionales que eluden sus responsabilidades fiscales?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión no tiene información precisa sobre el importe exacto de los impuestos pagados por los contribuyentes particulares de cada Estado miembro, pero la Comisión es consciente de las preocupaciones a que se refiere su Señoría. La Recomendación C (2012) 8806 de la Comisión a que se refiere su Señoría no ha sido, hasta ahora, plenamente aplicada por España ni por otros Estados miembros. Su puesta en práctica y su aplicación siguen siendo debatidas por la plataforma para la buena gobernanza fiscal, que ayudará a la Comisión en la elaboración del informe a que se hace referencia en el artículo 5 de la Recomendación.

En relación con otras medidas destinadas a luchar contra la evasión fiscal, el 25 de noviembre de 2013 la Comisión adoptó una propuesta legislativa por la que se modifica la Directiva sobre sociedades matrices y filiales, con vistas a la revisión de la cláusula contra las prácticas abusivas y la eliminación de la doble no imposición en la EU que se ve facilitada por los mecanismos híbridos. La propuesta se está debatiendo actualmente en el Consejo, en el marco de la Presidencia griega, y en el Parlamento Europeo. La Comisión también continúa presionando a los Estados miembros para que refuercen el papel del Grupo «Código de conducta» con el fin de luchar contra las prácticas fiscales perjudiciales y participa activamente en el proyecto base del G20/OCDE para combatir la erosión de la base imponible y la transferencia de beneficios. La Comisión no está estudiando actualmente la publicación de información sobre los impuestos pagados por las distintas multinacionales. No dispone de la información exacta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000685/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Payment of taxes by technology multinationals in Spain

On 18 January 2014, the Spanish media reported a news item relating to the collection of taxes by the Spanish tax office from the seven biggest IT companies operating in the country.

These large multinational companies, which for the most part originate from the United States of America, paid EUR 1 251 608 in tax to the Spanish State during the financial year 2012. This paltry amount reflects the strategy of 'fiscal engineering' that these companies are developing, as well as a regulatory framework that is set up so as to allow these large companies to avoid paying tax. The Spanish subsidiaries of these technology giants are transferring the bulk of their turnover to tax havens or to countries such as Ireland or Luxembourg, which, while not considered to be tax havens, offer tax benefits to businesses.

The fact that companies that are continuing to increase their volume of business in Spain are paying such a pathetic amount of tax is a direct attack on social cohesion, the welfare state and the nature of democracy in Spain. At a time when public funds are being severely impacted by the economic crisis, the Spanish Government is allowing these multinationals to operate in the country and to destroy their competition by means of this 'fiscal dumping'. Furthermore, this is in breach of the principle of fiscal progressiveness, with earnings from work being burdened with taxes yet tax rates for capital income are ridiculously low. These results expose the failure of all of the European initiatives aimed at fiscal coordination. While Member States are having to cut public spending, the European institutions, as far as tax revenue is concerned, are lying and do not have any real political will to put an end to the tax avoidance that is being committed by the big businesses operating in Europe.

Is the Commission aware of the data mentioned for the financial year 2012?

In its answer to my Question E-010547/2012, the Commission referred to Recommendation C (2012) 8806. Which Member States have applied this recommendation? To be precise, has it been applied in Spain, and if so, how? What results have been obtained? What other measures is the Commission considering to help Member States to effectively combat tax avoidance by multinationals? Does the Commission intend to publish a list of the multinationals that are paying excessively low rates of tax, so that European consumers are informed about those multinationals that are not fulfilling their fiscal responsibilities?

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

The Commission has no exact information on the amount of taxes paid by individual tax payers per Member State, but the Commission is aware of the concerns addressed by the Honourable Member. The Commission Recommendation C (2012)8806 to which the Honourable Member refers has not so far been fully implemented by Spain nor by any other Member State. Its implementation and application continues to be discussed by the Platform for Tax Good Governance, which will assist the Commission in preparing its report referred to in Article 5 of the recommendation.

Concerning other measures aimed at combating tax avoidance, on 25 November 2013 the Commission adopted a legislative proposal amending the Parent-Subsidiary Directive with a view to revising the anti-abuse clause and eliminating double non-taxation in the EU facilitated by hybrid arrangements. The proposal is currently being discussed in Council under the EL Presidency and in the European Parliament. The Commission also continues to push Member States to strengthen the role of the Code of Conduct Group to fight harmful tax measures and actively participates in the G20/OECD Project to counter Base Erosion and Profit Shifting. The Commission is not currently considering publishing information on taxes paid by individual multinationals. It does not have such exact information.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000687/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Kanada-Abkommen (CETA): Investitionsschutzkapitel ohne öffentlichen Dialog

Das Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, kurz CETA, ist ein geplantes Europäisch-Kanadisches Handelsabkommen.

1. Karel de Gucht, Mitglied der Kommission mit Zuständigkeit für den Handel, hat die Verhandlungen mit den USA über das Investitionsschutzkapitel im TTIP ausgesetzt und will nun den Dialog mit der europäischen Öffentlichkeit führen, weil dieser Investitionsschutz so umstritten ist. Werden dementsprechend auch die Verhandlungen mit Kanada über das Investitionsschutzkapitel im CETA ausgesetzt?

2. Wenn ja, warum wurde dies nicht öffentlich bekanntgegeben? Wenn nein, warum nicht?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(4. März 2014)

Die Kommission weist die Frau Abgeordnete darauf hin, dass die Verhandlungen über das Investitionskapitel der Transatlantischen Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft (TTIP) nicht förmlich ausgesetzt wurden. Solange die öffentliche Konsultation stattfindet, ist es der EU jedoch nicht möglich, mit den USA Gespräche über vorgeschlagene Inhalte in Bezug auf Investitionen zu führen. Die Konsultationsmaßnahme ist begrenzt auf den möglichen Text, den die EU als Grundlage für Erörterungen im Rahmen der TTIP-Verhandlungen heranziehen sollte. Dieses spezifische Kapitel ist für andere Verhandlungen mit anderen Handelspartnern nicht von Belang.

Was das umfassende Wirtschafts- und Handelsabkommen (CETA) angeht, so laufen die Verhandlungen seit über vier Jahren, und im Oktober 2013 wurde auf politischer Ebene eine Einigung erzielt, auch über ein gemeinsam vereinbartes Investitionskapitel. Der Schwerpunkt der verbleibenden Gespräche liegt auf der abschließenden Formulierung bestimmter technischer Details. Deshalb findet keine öffentliche Konsultation über das Investitionskapitel des CETA statt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000687/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: The agreement with Canada (CETA): investment protection chapter without public consultation

The Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) is a planned trade agreement between the EU and Canada.

1. Karel de Gucht, the member of the Commission responsible for trade, suspended the negotiations with the USA regarding the investment protection chapter in TTIP and now wishes to consult the European public, because this investment protection is so controversial. Will the negotiations with Canada regarding the investment protection chapter in CETA be correspondingly suspended?

2. If so, why was this not publicly announced? If not, why not?

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

The Commission wishes to clarify to the Honourable Member that the investment negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) have not been formally suspended. However, while the public consultation is ongoing it will not be possible for the EU to engage with the US on proposed texts in relation to investment. The scope of the consultation exercise is limited to the possible text that should be used by the EU as a basis for discussion in the context of the TTIP negotiations. This specific text does not concern other negotiations with other trading partners.

Insofar as the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) is concerned, negotiations have been ongoing for more than 4 years and a political agreement has been reached in October 2013, including on a mutually agreed text on investment. The remaining talks are focused on the finalisation of certain technical drafting details. Hence, there is no public consultation on the CETA investment text.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000689/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Tötung von männlichen Eintagsküken

In der EU werden pro Jahr allein in Deutschland 40 Mio. männliche Eintagsküken getötet. Ein gewisser Teil der Tiere findet als Tierfutter Verwertung, der übrige Teil wird entsorgt. Eine Landwirtschaft/Wirtschaftsform, die systemimmanent die Tötungen von Mio. Tiere ohne vernünftigen Grund akzeptiert, ist nicht vereinbar mit dem Tierschutz.

1. Wie unterstützt/betreibt die EU den Ausstieg aus dieser Produktionsform?

2. Wie fördert die Kommission die Erforschung von Alternativen, z. B. das Zweinutzungshuhn als Zuchtform oder die Geschlechtsbestimmung im Ei?

3. Welche wissenschaftlichen Projekte in Mitgliedstaaten dazu sind der Kommission bekannt?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(27. Februar 2014)

Die EU-Kommission ist derzeit nicht in Projekte zur Abschaffung der Tötung männlicher Eintagsküken oder zur Bewertung der Machbarkeit von Alternativen einbezogen. Ebenso wenig stehen in diesem Bereich EU-Mittel zur Verfügung.

In den vergangenen Jahren haben einige Mitgliedstaaten (z. B. die Niederlande, Deutschland) Alternativen erforscht, wie etwa die Geschlechtsbestimmung bei Embryonen in frühen Entwicklungsstadien oder die Haltung von Zweinutzungshühnern für die Erzeugung von Fleisch und Eiern. Nach unserer Kenntnis hat ein deutsches Bundesland die Praxis verboten. Das Verbot wird am 1. Januar 2015 in Kraft treten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000689/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Killing of day-old male chicks

In the EU, 40 million day-old male chicks are killed each year in Germany alone. A certain proportion of the animals are used as animal feed, while the remainder are disposed of. An agricultural/economic model that systemically accepts the killing of millions of animals without good reason is not compatible with the protection of animals.

1. How is the EU supporting/conducting the phasing out of this production model?

2. How is the Commission encouraging the investigation of alternatives, e.g. the dual-purpose chicken for breeding, or the determination of the gender from the egg?

3. What scientific studies relating to this and being conducted in the Member States is the Commission aware of?

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

The EU Commission is currently not involved in any projects to phase out the killing of day-old male chicks or to assess the feasibility of alternatives. Similarly no EU funding is available in this area.

In recent years some Member States (e.g. the Netherlands, Germany) have conducted research into alternatives such as differentiating male and female chicken embryos during early stages of development or the keeping of combination chickens for both meat and egg production. We are also aware that one German Bundesland has adopted a ban of the practice which will come into force on 1 January 2015.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000696/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(23 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Lenti a contatto per la cura del glaucoma

Nei pazienti affetti da glaucoma, la pressione interna all'occhio sale mettendo a rischio la vista. Le terapie attuali prevedono soltanto l'uso regolare di colliri, ma, di recente, un gruppo di ricercatori statunitensi ha messo a punto una innovativa lente a contatto che garantisce un nuovo metodo di assunzione dei medicinali necessari a correggere i difetti visivi.

La nuova lente a contatto, composta di metafilcon, un materiale già approvato per la costruzione di lenti a contatto, ha dato ottimi risultati nei test condotti sugli animali. Il farmaco contro l'ipertensione oculare viene inserito nella lente tramite l'impiego di raggi ultravioletti e «legato» alla lente tramite pellicole di polimeri. In seguito, una volta indossata, la lente è in grado di rilasciare gradualmente e con regolarità il farmaco per settimane o addirittura mesi. Il metodo non ha inoltre suscitato particolare stress o effetti collaterali durante gli esperimenti. Come qualsiasi altra lente, la nuova lente può poi anche correggere l'eventuale difetto visivo.

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

1. è a conoscenza dello studio condotto dall'équipe statunitense;

2. è a conoscenza di studi simili da parte di ricercatori e istituti europei;

3. intende promuovere programmi per finanziare studi simili, dal momento che tale ricerca potrebbe portare a nuovi metodi di cura e somministrazione di farmaci anche per altre patologie oculari?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(3 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza di recenti studi clinici internazionali che mettono in luce lo sviluppo di piattaforme innovative per il rilascio di farmaci destinati alla cura del glaucoma. In particolare conosce l'articolo pubblicato nel 2014 dalla rivista scientifica Biomaterials sulle lenti a contatto in metafilcon che eluiscono il latanoprost, consentendo in tal modo il rilascio controllato del farmaco.

2. Nell'ambito del 7° programma quadro di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7° PQ, 2007-2013) la Commissione sostiene diversi progetti di ricerca (sovvenzioni del CER, azioni Marie Skłodowska-Curie e progetti in cooperazione nel tema Salute) che mirano a curare le patologie oculari ereditarie e causate dall'età, tra cui il glaucoma.

Citiamo a titolo di esempio: STRONG ([1]), inteso a sviluppare un trattamento locale per un tipo raro di glaucoma, il glaucoma neovascolare; DRUGSFORD ([2]), che si propone di sviluppare composti e sistemi di rilascio volti a prevenire la degenerazione dei fotorecettori nei modelli preclinici di malattia; e VISION ([3]), che mira a sviluppare un approccio terapeutico inteso ad arrestare la morte delle cellule neuronali grazie all'uso di un impianto intraoculare biodegradabile di nuova generazione.

3. Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione (2014-2020) ([4]), ha l'obiettivo di sostenere la ricerca in terapie e tecnologie d'avanguardia, in particolare nell'ambito dei programmi di lavoro pubblicati per il periodo 2014-2015 nel contesto della sfida per la società «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere» ([5]).

I ricercatori interessati sono invitati a proporre progetti per la convalida del concetto in merito a interventi terapeutici di ultima generazione per valutarne l'efficacia rispetto alle terapie esistenti.

([1]) http://www.orpha.net/consor/cgi-bin/ResearchTrials_Networks.php?lng=FR&data_id=96678&title=STRONG--European-Consortium-for-the-Study-of-a-Topical-Treatment-of--Neovascular-Glaucoma&search=Directory_Professionals_Simple
([2]) http://www.drugsford.eu/
([3]) http://fp7-vision.eu/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-phc-2015-two-stage.html#tab2

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000696/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Contact lenses for treating glaucoma

Glaucoma is an eye condition that is caused by the build-up of intra-ocular pressure, which could lead to visual impairment or even blindness. To date, the only effective way of treating it has been through the regular administration of eye drops. However, a team of researchers in the United States has recently developed an innovative contact lens that provides a new way of administering the drugs needed to treat the condition.

The new contact lens, which is made of methafilcon (a material that has long been used for producing contact lenses), has given extremely promising results in tests carried out on animals. The drug used to combat abnormally high intra-ocular pressure is inserted into the lens via ultraviolet radiation and is kept 'affixed' to the lens by polymer films. Once it is placed on the eye, the lens gradually releases the drug in uniform doses, and can last for weeks or even months. No particular stress or other harmful side-effects were observed during the tests either. In addition, just like any other contact lens, the new lens can correct any visual defects.

1. Is the Commission aware of this work that has been carried out in the United States?

2. Is it aware of any similar studies that are being conducted by researchers and scientific institutes in Europe?

3. Does it intend to promote any schemes to finance similar studies, given that this research could lead to new treatment and drug administration methods being developed for other eye conditions besides glaucoma?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(3 March 2014)

1. The Commission is aware of recent international clinical studies highlighting the development of innovative drug delivery platforms for the treatment of glaucoma. In particular, it is aware of the article presented in the Biomaterials journal in 2014, with regard to latanoprost-eluting contact lenses made of methafilcon enabling the controlled release of the therapeutic substance.

2. Under the 7th Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013), the Commission is supporting several research projects (ERC grants, Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions and collaborative projects in the Health programme) that aim at combatting inherited and age-related visual impairment including glaucoma.

Some indicative examples are: STRONG ([1]), which develops a topical treatment for a rare type of glaucoma, neovascular glaucoma; DRUGSFORD ([2]), which develops targeted compounds and delivery systems to prevent photoreceptor damage in preclinical disease models; and VISION ([3]), which intends to develop a therapeutic approach to stop the death of neural cells by using a novel intraocular biodegradable implant.

3. Horizon 2020, the framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([4]), envisages support for research into advanced therapies and technologies, especially under the published Work Programmes 2014-2015 of its Societal Challenge 'Health, Demographic Change and Wellbeing' ([5]).

Interested researchers are encouraged to propose proof of concept projects for novel therapeutic interventions and assess their effectiveness to the existing treatments.

([1]) http://www.orpha.net/consor/cgi-bin/ResearchTrials_Networks.php?lng=FR&data_id=96678&title=STRONG--European-Consortium-for-the-Study-of-a-Topical-Treatment-of--Neovascular-Glaucoma&search=Directory_Professionals_Simple
([2]) http://www.drugsford.eu/
([3]) http://fp7-vision.eu/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-phc-2015-two-stage.html#tab2

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000700/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(23 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Głośność reklam w polskich mediach

W ostatnim czasie Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich zwróciła się do Przewodniczącego Krajowej Rady Radiofonii i Telewizji z wnioskiem o podjęcie działań dotyczących respektowania przepisów nadawania reklam w mediach publicznych. Dziennik Gazeta Prawna, informując o przedmiotowej sytuacji, przytacza twierdzenie Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich, która twierdzi, że reklamy telewizyjne emitowane są zbyt głośno, ponieważ „stacje nie respektują przepisów" ([1]).

Jak podaje Dziennik Gazeta Prawna, z przeprowadzonego w czerwcu i lipcu zeszłego roku przez KRRiT monitoringu głośności reklam telewizyjnych, wynika, że wiele telewizji przekraczało normy wyznaczone przez obowiązujące wówczas rozporządzenie regulujące dopuszczalny poziom głośności reklam.

Zdaniem Rzecznik niestosowanie się do rozporządzenia może wynikać z faktu braku solidarnej współpracy między stacjami.

Czy powyżej opisany problem przedstawiany był Komisji przez wyznaczające czas reklam i jej głośność w krajach UE Europejskie Centrum Konsumenckie?

Czy Komisji znane są problemy z respektowaniem rozporządzenia dotyczącego dopuszczalnego poziomu głośności reklam w Polsce?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącą Neelie Kroes w imieniu Komisji
(10 marca 2014 r.)

Dyrektywa o audiowizualnych usługach medialnych nie reguluje kwestii dopuszczalnej głośności reklam. Możliwość wprowadzenia odpowiednich przepisów dotyczących tego problemu była omawiana w trakcie przyjmowania dyrektywy o audiowizualnych usługach medialnych ([2]), jednak nie zostały one uwzględnione w ostatecznej wersji dyrektywy. Powodem tego był fakt, że przepis taki byłby zbyt szczegółowy, aby włączyć go do prawodawstwa na poziomie UE. Zgodnie z zasadą pomocniczości właściwsze byłoby wprowadzenie odpowiednich przepisów na poziomie krajowym. Ewentualne uregulowania byłyby również dość trudne do określenia w kategoriach technicznych. W związku z tym w motywie 84 wyjaśniono, że państwa członkowskie mają swobodę ustanawiania różnych ograniczeń dotyczących głośności reklam.

Uregulowania, na które powołuje się Szanowny Pan Poseł, są przepisami krajowymi. Za ich egzekwowanie odpowiada zatem krajowy organ regulacyjny ds. audiowizualnych usług medialnych, czyli Krajowa Rada Radiofonii i Telewizji. Komisja Europejska nie ma uprawnień do nadzorowania egzekwowania przepisów o wyłącznie krajowym charakterze przez organy regulacyjne państw członkowskich.

([1]) http://prawo.gazetaprawna.pl/artykuly/650745,reklamy_wciaz_zbyt_glosne_ale_stacje_telewizyjne_pozostaja_bezkarne.html

([2]) Dyrektywa Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady 2010/13/UE z dnia 10 marca 2010 r. w sprawie koordynacji niektórych przepisów ustawowych, wykonawczych i administracyjnych państw członkowskich dotyczących świadczenia audiowizualnych usług medialnych (dyrektywa o audiowizualnych usługach medialnych), Dz.U. L 95 z 15.4.2010, s. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000700/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Volume of adverts in Polish media

The Polish Ombudsman recently asked the Director of the National Broadcasting Council (KRRiT) to take action to ensure compliance with the rules on the broadcasting of commercials in public media. Writing on this subject, the *Gazeta Prawna* newspaper quotes the Ombudsman's assertion that television commercials are too loud and that the stations are 'not complying with regulations' ([1]).

According to *Gazeta Prawna*, monitoring of the volume of television commercials carried out in June and July last year by KRRiT revealed that many television stations exceeded the maximum permitted volume of advertising as laid down in the relevant regulation.

According to the Ombudsman, this failure to comply with the regulation may result from a lack of cooperation between the stations.

Has the issue of the duration and volume of television advertising in EU countries been brought to the Commission's attention by the European Consumer Centre?

Is the Commission aware of the problems concerning compliance with the regulation on the permissible volume of advertising in Poland?

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

The Audiovisual Media Services Directive does not regulate the admissible volume of advertising. A possibility to regulate this issue was discussed during the adoption process of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) ([2]), but it was not included in the final text of the directive. The reason for this is that such provision would be too detailed for the legislation at EU level and therefore more appropriate for possible regulation at national level, in line with the principle of subsidiarity. It would also be quite difficult to define in technical terms. Thus Recital 84 clarifies that Member States are free to lay down different limits for the volume of advertising.

The regulations, the Honourable Member refers to, are of national character and thus they are enforced by the national regulatory body for the audiovisual media services — KRRiT. The European Commission does not have supervisory powers over enforcement of purely national law by the Member States' regulatory authorities.

([1]) http://prawo.gazetaprawna.pl/artykuly/650745,reklamy_wciaz_zbyt_glosne_ale_stacje_telewizyjne_pozostaja_bezkarne.html

([2]) Directive 2010/13/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2010 on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services (Audiovisual Media Services Directive) OJ L 95, 15.4.2010, p.1.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-000701/14
upućeno Komisiji
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(23. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Reforma kreditnog sustava

Prilikom prošlotjedne rasprave o reindustrializaciji u Europskom parlamentu naglašena je potreba za reformom kreditnog sustava kako bi se smanjile velike razlike između država članica u uvjetima financiranja malih i srednjih poduzeća. Svjedoci smo nerazmjernih razlika visina kamatnih stopa, naročito visokih u pojedinim zemljama, kao primjerice u Hrvatskoj, što koči razvoj gospodarstva.

U tom pogledu Vas molim da me izvijestite o konkretnim mjerama kojima Komisija pokušava riješiti ovaj problem.

Odgovor g. Rehna u ime Komisije
(6. ožujka 2014.)

Komisija u svojem Godišnjem pregledu rasta ([1]) priznaje da je „fragmentacija financijskog tržišta uzrokovala vrlo raznolike kamate za zajmove za poduzeća i kućanstva u cijelom EU-u (…) te da se opseg zajmova i mogućnosti financiranja veoma razlikuju među potencijalnim zajmoprimcima, ovisno o njihovoj lokaciji".

Komisija se nadalje slaže da se „takve razlike u pristupu zajmovima ne mogu objasniti samo razlikama u prevladavajućim gospodarskim uvjetima". Stoga vraćanje pozajmljivanja u gospodarstvo ostaje prioritet za 2014.

Uspostavljanje bankarske unije temeljni je element odgovora EU-a na ovu situaciju. Osim toga, predviđene su i posebne mjere: europski strukturni i investicijski fondovi trebali bi udvostručiti financiranje dostupno putem financijskih instrumenata na osnovi poluge za MSP-ove za razdoblje od 2014. do 2020. u odnosu na prethodno razdoblje, pomažući pritom posebno državama u kojima su financijski uvjeti teški. Program COSME za razdoblje od 2014. do 2020. također će pružanjem jamstava i poduzetničkog kapitala davati potporu pristupu MSP-ova financiranju.

Komisija će uz to, uzimajući u obzir izvješće na tu temu o kojem se glasalo u Europskom parlamentu, tijekom idućih tjedana objaviti daljnje aktivnosti u vezi sa Zelenom knjigom o dugotrajnom financiranju gospodarstva ([2]), u kojima će se posebnim odjeljkom o MSP-ovima dati prikaz daljnjih aktivnosti kojima bi se poboljšao pristup MSP-ova financijama.

([1]) COM (2013)800 — http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_hr.pdf
([2]) COM (2013) 150.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000701/14
to the Commission
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: Reform of the credit system

During last week's debate in Parliament on reindustrialisation one point to be stressed was the need to reform the credit system in order to narrow the considerable differences between Member States as regards the financing terms applying to small and medium-sized enterprises. We have seen inordinate interest rate variations, and the fact that the rates in some countries — Croatia, for example — are particularly high is hampering economic development.

What specific measures is the Commission employing to resolve this problem?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2014)

The Commission, in its Annual Growth Survey ([1]) recognises that 'financial market fragmentation has led to very divergent interest rates for loans to businesses and households across the EU (…), and loan volumes and financing possibilities differ widely among potential borrowers depending on their location'.

The Commission agrees further that 'such differences in access to credit cannot be explained only by differences in prevailing economic conditions'. Restoring lending to the economy thus remains a priority in 2014.

The completion of Banking Union is the core element of the EU's response to this situation. In addition specific measures are also foreseen: the European Structural and Investment Funds should double the funding available through leverage-based financial instruments for SMEs for the period 2014-2020 compared to the previous period, helping in particular countries where financial conditions remain tight. The COSME programme 2014-2020 will also support the access of SMEs to financing through the provision of guarantees and venture capital.

The Commission will additionally, and taking due account of the report voted in the European Parliament on that subject, publish in the coming weeks the follow-up to the Green Paper on long term financing of the economy ([2]) where a dedicated section on SMEs will present further actions to improve SME access to finance.

([1]) COM(2013)800 http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_en.pdf
([2]) COM(2013) 150.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-000702/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(24 januari 2014)

Betreft: Beleid Frontex

Naar aanleiding van een debat in het Nederlands parlement zijn er vragen gerezen over de werkwijze van de grensbewaking op de Middellandse Zee. Op grond van de richtlijnen voor Frontex dienen irreguliere immigranten door de grensbewakers naar een veilige plaats te worden overgebracht. In de praktijk worden zij de laatste tijd altijd naar een haven van een van de lidstaten overgebracht. Dit gebeurt op basis van recente uitspraken van het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens (EHRM) ([1]).

Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat door de grensbewaking onderschepte vaartuigen met irreguliere migranten in de praktijk altijd naar een haven van een lidstaat worden overgebracht?

Kan de Commissie aangeven of het nog wel de bedoeling is dat deze boten worden teruggestuurd naar de plaats waarvandaan zij zijn vertrokken?

Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat de lidstaten zijn gebonden aan de uitspraken van het EHRM en dat zij daarom verplicht zijn irreguliere vluchtelingen naar een haven van een lidstaat over te brengen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(21 februari 2014)

De lidstaten zijn bij de uitvoering van het EU-recht gebonden aan de bepalingen van het Handvest van de grondrechten van de EU (het Handvest), dat wordt uitgelegd in het licht van de rechtspraak van het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens (EHRM). Bijgevolg moeten zij bij de uitvoering van het EU-recht tijdens grensbewakingsoperaties de grondrechten eerbiedigen, waaronder het beginsel van non-refoulement, zoals vastgelegd in het Handvest en uitgelegd door het EHRM.

Noch het toepasselijk EU-recht, met name de Schengengrenscode ([2]) en Besluit 2010/252/EU van de Raad ([3]), noch de rechtspraak van het EHRM sluit ontscheping in derde landen uit, op voorwaarde dat die niet in strijd is met het beginsel van non-refoulement.

([1]) Sufi en Elmi vs. het Verenigd Koninkrijk (28 juni 2011) en Hirsi Jamaa vs. Italië (23 februari 2012).

([2]) Verordening (EG) nr. 562/2006 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 15 maart 2006 tot vaststelling van een communautaire code betreffende de overschrijding van de grenzen door personen (Schengengrenscode), PB L 105 van 13.4.2006, blz. 1.

([3]) Besluit 2010/252/EU van de Raad van 26 april 2010 houdende aanvulling van de Schengengrenscode op het gebied van de bewaking van de maritieme buitengrenzen in het kader van de operationele samenwerking die wordt gecoördineerd door het Europees Agentschap voor het beheer van de operationele samenwerking aan de buitengrenzen van de lidstaten van de Europese Unie, PB L 111 van 4.5.2010, blz. 20. Dit besluit is nietig verklaard bij het arrest van het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie van 5 september 2012 in zaak C-355/10, maar blijft van kracht tot het wordt vervangen door nieuwe voorschriften die door het Europees Parlement en de Raad dienen te worden aangenomen. Op 12 april 2013 heeft de Commissie hiertoe een voorstel ingediend (COM(2013) 197 final).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000702/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Policy on the use of Frontex

In connection with a debate in the Netherlands Parliament, questions have arisen concerning the procedure for protecting borders in the Mediterranean. According to the guidelines for Frontex, border control officers are required take irregular immigrants to a place of safety. In practice, of late they have always been taken to a port in one of the Member States. This is being done on the basis of recent judgments by the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) ([1]).

Can the Commission confirm that, in practice, vessels intercepted by border control officers with irregular migrants on board are always taken to a port in a Member State?

Can the Commission indicate whether it is still the intention that these vessels should be sent back to their place of departure?

Can the Commission confirm that the Member States are bound by the judgments of the ECHR and that they are therefore under an obligation to take irregular refugees to a port in a Member State?

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

When implementing EC law, Member States are bound by the provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU (Charter) which is interpreted in the light of the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). Therefore when implementing EC law during border surveillance operations, Member States must respect fundamental rights including the principle of non-refoulement as set out in the Charter and interpreted by the ECtHR.

Neither the applicable EC law, namely the Schengen Borders Code ([2]) and the Council Decision 2010/252/EU ([3]), nor the case law of the ECtHR exclude the possibility of disembarkation in third countries provided that this is not in violation of the principle of non-refoulement.

([1]) *Sufi and Elmi* v *the United Kingdom* (28 June 2011) and *Hirsi Jamaa* v *Italy* (23 February 2012).

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code), OJ L 105, 13.4.2006, p. 1.

([3]) Council Decision 2010/252/EU of 26 April 2010 supplementing the Schengen Borders Code as regards the surveillance of the sea external borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union, OJ L 111, 4.5.2010, p. 20. This decision was annulled by judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union on 5 September 2012 in Case C-355/10 but remains in force until it is replaced by new rules to be adopted by the European Parliament and the Council. On 12 April 2013, the Commission presented a proposal in this regard (COM(2013) 197 final).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-000703/14
à la Commission
Isabelle Thomas (S&D)
(24 janvier 2014)

Objet: Importations de produits de la pêche de pays «non coopérants»

L'article 31 du règlement nº 1005/2008 établissant un système communautaire destiné à prévenir, à décourager et à éradiquer la pêche illicite, non déclarée et non réglementée (INN) permet d'empêcher l'importation sur le marché européen de produits de la pêche provenant de pays qui ont été identifiés comme «non coopérants» dans la lutte contre la pêche INN.

L'article 38 du règlement dispose qu' en plus de bloquer les importations de produits de la pêche capturés par des navires arborant le pavillon de ces pays «non coopérants», il est interdit pour les ressortissants d'un État membre de l'Union européenne d'avoir un accord de licence privé avec lesdits pays pour opérer dans leurs eaux.

Au vu de ces éléments:

1. La Commission est-elle consciente du vide juridique qui permet que les navires arborant le pavillon de pays tiers aient la possibilité d'opérer dans les eaux des pays non coopérants et de continuer à exporter vers l'Union?

2. La Commission peut-elle expliquer ce qui est prévu pour remplir ce vide juridique, afin de s'assurer que le poisson capturé dans les eaux des pays qualifiés comme «non coopérants» ne soit pas importé dans l'Union?

3. La Commission peut-elle aussi préciser s'il serait interdit d'importer le poisson transbordé dans les eaux des pays «non coopérants» sur le marché européen?

Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(7 mars 2014)

Le règlement de l'Union relatif à la pêche INN ([1]) repose sur le principe de responsabilité de l'État du pavillon conformément au droit international. Par conséquent, l'Union ne peut ni réglementer ni imposer des sanctions aux États du pavillon qui ne sont pas reconnus comme des pays non coopérants pour avoir exercé des activités de pêche dans les eaux d'un pays reconnu comme non coopérant. Il incombe à l'État du pavillon d'assurer la durabilité des ressources exploitées par ses navires ainsi que la légalité des captures de ses navires.

S'il n'y a pas de preuves suffisantes que la capture a eu lieu au mépris des règles et des règlements de conservation de l'État côtier en vigueur ainsi que, le cas échéant, des mesures internationales de conservation et de gestion des ORGP ([2]) concernées, ces cas ne sont pas considérés comme relevant de l'INN en vertu du règlement INN de l'UE. À ce stade, la Commission ne considère pas utile de proposer une modification à cet égard.

Le poisson transbordé dans les eaux des pays non coopérants peut être importé sur le marché européen, pour autant que, premièrement, aucun des deux navires ne batte pavillon d'un pays non coopérant; deuxièmement, le transbordement soit légal dans les eaux concernées, selon la législation nationale de l'État côtier en vigueur et/ou les mesures internationales de conservation et de gestion en vigueur établies par les ORGP concernées; troisièmement, le transbordement soit effectué conformément aux règles et conditions applicables ainsi qu'aux autorisations requises des États du pavillon concernés.

([1]) Pêche illicite, non déclarée et non réglementée (INN).
([2]) Organisation régionale de gestion des pêches (ORGP).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000703/14
to the Commission
Isabelle Thomas (S&D)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Importation of fishery products from 'non-cooperating' countries

Article 31 of Regulation (EC) No 1005/2008 establishing a Community system to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU) provides for a ban on the importation into the European market of fishery products from states deemed to be 'non-cooperating' in combating IUU fishing.

Article 38 of the regulation also prohibits the importation of fishery products caught by vessels flying the flag of 'non-cooperating' states and bans EU nationals from concluding private trade arrangements to operate in such countries' waters.

In the light of this:

1. Is the Commission aware of the legal loophole which allows vessels flying the flag of a third country to operate in the waters of non-cooperating states and still export to the Union?

2. Can the Commission explain how it plans to eliminate this loophole so that fish caught in the waters of 'non-cooperating' countries cannot be imported into the Union?

3. Can the Commission also say whether or not it is forbidden to import into the European market fish trans-shipped in the waters of 'non-cooperating' states?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2014)

The EU IUU ([1]) Regulation is based on the principle of flag State responsibility in line with international law. The Union cannot therefore regulate or impose sanctions on flag States that are not identified as non-cooperating countries for fishing in the waters of an identified non-cooperating country. It is the responsibility of the flag State to ensure sustainability of the resources exploited and the legality of catch by their vessels.

In cases where fish is caught without there being proper evidence that applicable conservation rules or regulations of the coastal State and, as appropriate, international conservation and management measures of relevant RFMO ([2])s have been disregarded, there is no IUU dimension under the EU IUU Regulation. The Commission does not consider it appropriate at this stage to propose any amendment in this respect.

Fish that has been transhipped between two vessels in the waters of a non-cooperating country can be imported into the EU provided that, firstly, neither of the vessels is flagged to a non-cooperating country and secondly, that transhipping is legal in the waters concerned according to relevant national legislation of the coastal State and/or the applicable international conservation and management measures established by relevant RFMO and, thirdly, that transhipment is conducted according to the relevant rules, conditions and required authorisations of the flag States involved.

([1]) Illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU).
([2]) Regional fisheries management organisation (RFMO).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-000704/14
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος / Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(24 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Χημικά όπλα Συρίας — Αμερικανικό πλοίο MV CAPE RAY

Σε συνέχεια της προηγούμενης ερώτησης σε σχέση με το σχέδιο καταστροφής των χημικών της Συρίας σε διεθνή ύδατα της Μεσογείου και κατόπιν νέων στοιχείων που έχουν προκύψει από έρευνα και στοιχεία της γαλλικής περιβαλλοντικής ΜΚΟ Robin des Bois, σύμφωνα με τα οποία:

— το αμερικανικό πλοίο MV CAPE RAY, στο οποίο έχουν εγκατασταθεί οι ειδικές μονάδες υδρόλυσης, είναι παλαιό και θα έπρεπε να έχει ήδη αποσυρθεί,

— η υδρόλυση (FDHS) πάνω στη θάλασσα για την προεπεξεργασία του όπλου των χημικών ουσιών είναι ένα πιλοτικό πρόγραμμα που η ανάπτυξή του ολοκληρώθηκε μόλις το περασμένο καλοκαίρι και συνεπώς η ικανότητα του συστήματος να παρακολουθεί συνεχώς και με ασφάλεια τη καταστροφή 500 έως 600 τόνων τοξικών ουσιών στο υδάτινο περιβάλλον, δεν έχει αποδειχτεί αφού κατασκευάστηκε για να χρησιμοποιηθεί στο έδαφος,

— με βάση τον σχεδιασμό δεν έχει οριστεί λιμένας καταφυγής στην περίπτωση που υπάρξει μείζων επιπλοκή κατά την διαδικασία υδρόλυσης επάνω στο MV CAPE RAY,

— αναμένονται και ατμοσφαιρικές εκπομπές τοξικών ρύπων κατά τη διάρκεια της διαδικασίας υδρόλυσης δεδομένου ότι μεταξύ των αποβλήτων που θα προκύψουν από τη διαδικασία περιλαμβάνονται φίλτρα άνθρακα και τα φίλτρα HEPA, ενώ παράλληλα θα πρέπει να βρεθεί τρόπος να αποθηκευθούν και οι 800 τόνοι λάσπης που επίσης αναμένεται ότι θα προκύψουν,

Ερωτάται η Αντιπρόεδρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής:

— Έχει γνώση των παραπάνω στοιχείων που επηρεάζουν καθοριστικά την ασφάλεια της επιχείρησης;

— Πως αξιολογεί την δήλωση του αρμόδιου γραμματέα του Υπουργείου Άμυνας των ΗΠΑ κ. Κένταλ σύμφωνα με την οποία η θάλασσα της Μεσογείου επιλέχθηκε γιατί έτσι «αποφεύγουμε να μεταφέρουμε το υλικό σε οποιαδήποτε περιοχή όπου θα πρέπει να αντιμετωπίσουμε τις κατά τόπους πολιτικές και περιβαλλοντικές συνθήκες, όπως αυτές διαμορφώνονται από την τοπική νομοθεσία»;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Μαρτίου 2014)

Η καταστροφή των συριακών χημικών όπλων έχει συμφωνηθεί και εποπτεύεται από τον Οργανισμό για την απαγόρευση των χημικών όπλων και τον ΟΗΕ, σε συνεργασία με το πρόγραμμα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για το περιβάλλον και την Παγκόσμια Οργάνωση Υγείας και σύμφωνα με τις διεθνείς και εθνικές νομοθετικές διατάξεις.

Το M/V Cape Ray προσαρμόστηκε πρόσφατα στις ειδικές απαιτήσεις που προβλέπονται στο σχέδιο ΟΑΧΟ/ΟΗΕ και το σύστημα υδρόλυσης FDHS (field-deployable hydrolysis system) βασίζεται σε μια προσέγγιση εξουδετέρωσης της οποίας οι αρχές των ΗΠΑ έχουν ευρεία γνώση και πείρα, δεδομένης της χρήσης της εν λόγω μεθόδου στις ΗΠΑ στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος για την καταστροφή των χημικών όπλων. Οι διαδικασίες FDHS έχουν σχεδιαστεί έτσι ώστε να μην περιλαμβάνουν αποτέφρωση, ούτε απόρριψη λυμάτων στη θάλασσα, ούτε εκπομπές ρύπων. Δεν υπάρχει καμία πρόθεση απόρριψης οποιωνδήποτε υλικών στη Μεσόγειο. Τα παραχθέντα λύματα θα αποθηκεύονται σε κατάλληλων προδιαγραφών εμπορευματοκιβώτιο και θα μεταφέρονται για διάθεση σε εμπορική εγκατάσταση επεξεργασίας, αποθήκευσης και διάθεσης επικίνδυνων αποβλήτων. Οι εργασίες εξουδετέρωσης θα εκτελεστούν σε διεθνή ύδατα, ενώ η κυβέρνηση των ΗΠΑ εξυπακούεται ότι έχει καταρτίσει σχέδια έκτακτης ανάγκης.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000704/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Syrian chemical weapons aboard the American vessel MV Cape Ray

Following a previous question relating to the planned destruction of Syrian chemical substances in the international waters of the Mediterranean and in the light of recent findings by the French environmental NGO, 'Robin des Bois', to the effect that:

— the American vessel MV Cape Ray, on which special hydrolysis units have been fitted, is old and should already have been decommissioned,

— the field-deployable hydrolysis system (FDHS) for the pre-processing of the chemical weapons components, a pilot project only completed last summer, was designed for use on land and its suitability for the safe and continuous destruction of between 500 and 600 tons of toxic wastes at sea has not been proven,

— no port of refuge has been designated should any major problems occur during the hydrolysis process on the MV Cape Ray,

— the hydrolysis process is expected to cause toxic emissions into the air, since the matter produced will include carbon and HEPA filters, while a solution must also be found for the storage of 800 tonnes of sludge expected to be produced:

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the above factors, which seriously compromise the safety of the operation?

2. What view does she take of utterances by Mr Kendall, US Under Secretary of Defence, to the effect that the chemicals are to be disposed of in the Mediterranean because this avoids the need to enter territory where local political factors and environmental laws must be taken into account?

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

The destruction of the Syrian chemical weapons (has been agreed and supervised by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the UN in cooperation with the UN Environment Programme and the World Health Organisation and in accordance with international and national legislation provisions.

The M/V Cape Ray has been recently specifically adapted to the tasks set out in the OPCW/UN plan and the field-deployable hydrolysis system (FDHS) is based upon a neutralisation approach of which the US authorities have extensive knowledge and experience given the use of this methodology in the US chemical weapons destruction programme. FDHS operations are designed not to involve incineration, neither to discharge effluent into the sea nor to produce polluting emissions nor to produce polluting emissions. There is no intention to jettison any of the material into the Mediterranean. The effluent produced will be stored in an appropriate standard of container and transported to a commercial hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facility for disposal. Neutralisation operations will be performed in international waters and it is understood that the US Government has contingency plans in place.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000707/14
a la Comisión
Raimon Obiols (S&D), Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D) y Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D)
(24 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Cierre de Catalunya Ràdio y Catalunya Informació en Valencia

Catalunya Ràdio y Catalunya Informació han dejado de emitirse en Valencia como consecuencia de la apertura de un expediente sancionador por parte del Ministerio de Industria, Energía y Turismo del Gobierno español a Acció Cultural del País Valencià (ACPV), propietaria de los repetidores que hasta ayer distribuían la señal radiofónica.

Hace pocos meses, ACPV ya se vio obligada al cese de las emisiones de TV3. En los últimos meses, hay que añadir también el cierre de Canal 9, Nou 2, Ràdio 9 y Ràdio Sí, cadenas autonómicas que también emitían en catalán.

Este tipo de medidas, que se han venido repitiendo a lo largo de los años y evocan la prohibición y persecución de la lengua catalana durante la dictadura franquista, generan un enorme malestar en la opinión pública y ponen en cuestión la libertad de la información, la diversidad de opinión y el pluralismo de los medios de comunicación.

— ¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento de estos hechos? ¿Cuál es su valoración al respecto?

— ¿Cree la Comisión que estos cierres vulneran el artículo 11, apartado 2, de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea, así como la Directiva 2010/13/UE de servicios de comunicación audiovisual?

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

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta que dio a la pregunta escrita E-012860/2013 de D. Ramón Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE) de 12 de diciembre de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000707/14
to the Commission
Raimon Obiols (S&D), Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D) and Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: The closure of Catalunya Ràdio and Catalunya Informaciò in Valencia

Catalunya Ràdio and Catalunya Informaciò have stopped broadcasting in Valencia as a result of the initiation of sanctions proceedings by the Spanish Ministry for Industry, Energy and Tourism against Acció Cultural del País Valencià (ACPV), which owns the transmitters that until yesterday distributed the radio signal.

A few months ago, ACPV was ordered to cease broadcasting on TV3. The last few months have also seen the closure of Canal 9, Nou 2, Ràdio 9 and Ràdio Sí — autonomous channels that also broadcast in Catalan.

These kinds of measures, which have cropped up again and again over the years and bring back memories of the prohibition and persecution of the Catalan language under the Franco dictatorship, are hugely detrimental to public opinion and call into question the freedom of information, diversity of opinions and media pluralism.

— Is the Commission aware of these facts? What is its assessment of them?

— Does the Commission believe that these closures contravene Article 11(2) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, as well as Audiovisual Media Services Directive 2010/13/EU?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to a Written Question E-012860/2013 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE) of 12.12.2013.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000709/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(24 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Inscripționarea băuturilor alcoolice cu mesaje de descurajare a consumului în timpul sarcinii

Conform „Global Status Report on Alcohol and Health 2011", alcoolul este cauza principală a aproximativ 4% din totalul deceselor la nivel mondial. Totodată, în baza ultimului raport Eurobarometru „EU Citizens' Attitudes towards Alcohol" din 2010, 43% dintre cetățenii UE consideră intervenția autorităților necesară în vederea reducerii consumului de alcool și a protecției indivizilor în acest sens. De asemenea, 79% dintre respondenți susțin etichetarea băuturilor alcoolice cu mesaje sau simboluri de avertizare pentru femeile însărcinate și conducătorii auto. Spre exemplu, conform aceluiași studiu, 93% dintre români susțin includerea de mesaje de avertisment pe sticlele de băuturi alcoolice. Europa este regiunea cu cel mai ridicat consum de alcool pe cap de locuitor din lume.

Anual, UE cheltuiește 125 de miliarde Euro (echivalentul a 1,3% din PIB) din cauza accidentelor, crimelor, îmbolnăvirilor, rănirilor și pierderilor cauzate de consumul de alcool. În rândul statelor membre s-a constatat un consum excesiv de băuturi alcoolice de către femeile însărcinate. Alcoolul cauzează anual aproximativ 60 000 de nașteri premature. Printre prioritățile Comisiei, conform Strategiei UE de sprijinire a statelor membre în reducerea efectelor nocive ale consumului de alcool, se numără și reducerea expunerii la consumul de alcool a femeilor însărcinate și astfel reducerea numărului de copii născuți cu sindromul alcoolismului fetal, precum și a nașterilor premature.

În conformitate cu prioritățile strategiei UE în domeniu (protejarea copiilor, a tinerilor și a fătului), are în vedere Comisia introducerea obligatorie a mesajelor și/sau imaginilor de avertisment pe ambalajul produselor alcoolice, în scopul descurajării consumului de alcool pe durata sarcinii?

În anumite state membre, în baza legislației naționale sau a unor inițiative voluntare, astfel de etichetări cu mesaje de avertizare există deja; prevede Comisia posibilitatea armonizării acestor demersuri la nivelul Uniunii?

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

Protejarea tinerilor, a copiilor, inclusiv a celor nenăscuți, este una dintre temele prioritare ale strategiei UE vizând sprijinirea statelor membre în reducerea efectelor dăunătoare ale consumului de alcool COM(2006) 625 ([1]).

În domeniul sănătății publice, rolul Comisiei este de a sprijini și de a completa acțiunile desfășurate la nivel național, precum și de a stimula coordonarea și cooperarea între statele membre, în particular prin identificarea și difuzarea bunelor practici.

Ca instrument în sprijinul strategiei, Comisia a înființat, în 2007, Comitetul pentru politicile și măsurile naționale în domeniul consumului de alcool, pentru a facilita schimbul de opinii și de bune practici între statele membre. Cele mai bune practici de utilizare a etichetelor de avertizare asupra efectelor dăunătoare ale consumului de alcool în cursul sarcinii și al conceperii fac parte din aceste schimburi, iar statele membre pot adopta la nivel național dispoziții privind astfel de avertismente.

Ca un alt pilon principal de sprijinire a strategiei, Comisia încurajează, de asemenea, o multitudine de părți interesate — inclusiv industria alcoolului și ONG-urile care activează în domeniul sănătății publice — să întreprindă acțiuni care să aibă în vizor efectele dăunătoare ale consumului de alcool, prin intermediul Forumului european privind alcoolul și sănătatea.

În acest context, Comisia sprijină producătorii de alcool să plaseze în mod voluntar mesaje pe recipientele cu băuturi alcoolice, prin care să informeze consumatorii cu privire la riscurile pentru sănătate, inclusiv la consecințele consumului de alcool în cursul sarcinii. În acest scop, unii producători utilizează în mod voluntar avertismente privind riscurile asociate consumului de alcool în cursul sarcinii. În prezent, Comisia nu are în vedere impunerea obligativității unor astfel de avertismente.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000709/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Labelling of alcoholic drinks with messages discouraging their consumption during pregnancy

Alcohol, according to the 'Global Status Report on Alcohol and Health 2011', is the main contributory factor in around 4% of all deaths worldwide. At the same time, the latest Eurobarometer report in this field — 'EU citizens' attitudes towards Alcohol' (2010) — indicates that 43% of EU citizens believe that the authorities should take action to reduce consumption and hence protect individuals. Similarly, 79% of those surveyed for the report were in favour of the labelling of alcoholic drinks with warning messages and symbols aimed at pregnant women and drivers. 93% of respondents in Romania, for example, supported the placing of warning messages on alcoholic drinks bottles.

Europe has the highest per capita levels of alcohol consumption in the world. Each year, the EU outlays EUR 125 billion (or 1.3% of total EU GDP) as a result of accidents, crime, illnesses, injuries and damage arising from the consumption of alcohol. Excessive levels of alcohol consumption by pregnant women have been noted in the Member States. Alcohol is responsible for around 60 000 premature births each year. One of the Commission's priorities under the EU Strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm is to reduce exposure to alcohol during pregnancy and thereby reduce the number of children born with foetal alcohol disorders and the number of premature births.

Does the Commission intend — in line with the EU's strategic priority in this field of protecting young people, children and unborn babies — to make it compulsory to place warning message and/or images on alcoholic products, in order to discourage the consumption of alcohol during pregnancy?

In some Member States, alcoholic drinks are already labelled with warning messages, as a result of national legislation or voluntary initiatives. Is the Commission considering the possibility of harmonising those measures across the EU?

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

Protecting young people, children and the unborn child is one of the priority themes of the EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm COM(2006) 625 ([1]).

In public health, the Commission's role is to support and complement national action and foster coordination and cooperation between Member States, in particular by identifying and disseminating good practices.

As a supporting tool to the strategy, the Commission set up in 2007 the Committee on National Alcohol Policy and Action, to facilitate exchange of views and good practices between Member States. Best practices concerning the use of warning labels on the harmful effects of alcohol during pregnancy and conception are part of these exchanges and Member States can adopt provisions for such warnings at national level.

As another main element to support the strategy, the Commission is also encouraging a broad range of stakeholders — including alcohol industry and public health NGOs — to take action to address alcohol related harm, through the European Alcohol and Health Forum.

In this context, the Commission is supporting alcohol producers to voluntarily put messages on alcoholic drinks to inform consumers about health risks, including the consequences of drinking during pregnancy. To this end, some producers are voluntarily using the warning about pregnancy related risks. The Commission is not currently planing to make such warnings obligatory.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000711/14
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(24 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Reato di immigrazione irregolare

Negli scorsi giorni in Italia è stato abolito il reato di clandestinità, ossia una norma che puniva penalmente l'ingresso o il soggiorno irregolare nel nostro paese.

Può la Commissione indicare se e in quali altri Stati membri sia in vigore una misura analoga?

In quale modo è gestita l'immigrazione illegale a livello europeo e nei singoli Stati membri?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(5 marzo 2014)

Nella maggior parte degli Stati membri sono in vigore leggi che qualificano come reato «l'ingresso e/o il soggiorno irregolare», sanzionandolo con un'ammenda o con la reclusione. In base alle informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione, soltanto il Portogallo non considera reato il soggiorno irregolare e soltanto la Spagna e il Portogallo non considerano reato l'ingresso irregolare. Né la direttiva «rimpatrio» né altri strumenti giuridici dell'UE vietano agli Stati membri di ritenere l'ingresso e/o il soggiorno irregolare un reato penale ai sensi del rispettivo diritto penale nazionale. ([1]) Tuttavia, la giurisprudenza della Corte di giustizia (in particolare: C-61/11, El Dridi ([2]); C-329/11 Achoughbabian ([3])) ha limitato la capacità degli Stati membri di mantenere le persone rimpatriate in stato di detenzione a causa di questi reati. Dette sentenze hanno condotto ad una serie di modifiche delle legislazioni nazionali. La Commissione segue attentamente la situazione.

La Commissione sta collaborando con gli Stati membri all'adozione di un approccio globale per ridurre i flussi migratori irregolari e garantire al contempo il diritto alla protezione internazionale a coloro che ne hanno bisogno. L'elemento centrale dell'approccio è la condivisione di informazioni sulle rotte migratorie tra gli Stati membri e con le agenzie dell'UE (Frontex). La cooperazione con i principali paesi terzi è stata intensificata attraverso il dialogo, progetti concreti e strumenti quali i partenariati per la mobilità e gli accordi di riammissione dell'Unione europea. Gli Stati membri, in cooperazione con l'Europol, hanno adottato misure di lotta contro la tratta di esseri umani, il favoreggiamento dell'immigrazione clandestina e la contraffazione di documenti. La gestione delle frontiere esterne dell'UE è stata rafforzata mediante l'attuazione del regolamento su EUROSUR ([4]) e la piena applicazione del sistema di informazione visti (VIS) e del sistema d'informazione Schengen di seconda generazione.

([1]) Direttiva 2008/115/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 dicembre 2008, recante norme e procedure comuni applicabili negli Stati membri al rimpatrio di cittadini di paesi terzi il cui soggiorno è irregolare (GU L 348 del 24.12.2008, pag. 98).
([2]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?num=C-61/11.
([3]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?num=C-329/11.
([4]) Regolamento (UE) n. 1052/2013 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 22 ottobre 2013, che istituisce il sistema europeo di sorveglianza delle frontiere (EUROSUR) (GU L 295 del 6.11.2013, pag. 11).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000711/14
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Illegal immigration as a criminal offence

In the past few days, Italy has scrapped the law that made the illegal entry and/or residence in the country a criminal offence.

Can the Commission indicate which Member States, if any, are currently taking similar measures?

How is illegal immigration being managed on a European level and in individual Member States?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

There are laws in place criminalising 'irregular entry and/or stay', either with a fine or imprisonment, in the majority of Member States. According to the information available to the Commission, only Portugal does not criminalise irregular stay and only Spain and Portugal do not criminalise irregular entry. Neither the Return Directive ([1]) nor any other EU legal instrument prevents Member States from considering irregular entry and/or stay a criminal offence under their national criminal law. However, case law of the Court of Justice (notably: C-61/11, El Dridi ([2]); C-329/11 Achoughbabian ([3])) has limited Member States' scope for keeping returnees in prison as a consequence of this. These judgments have led to a range of changes to national legislation. The Commission is following the situation closely.

The Commission is working with Member States to take a comprehensive approach to reducing irregular migratory flows, whilst ensuring the right to international protection for those in need of it. Intelligence sharing on migratory routes between Member States and with EU agencies (Frontex) is at the heart of this approach. Cooperation has been strengthened with key third countries through dialogue, concrete projects and instruments like Mobility Partnerships and EU Readmission Agreements. Action is being taken by Member States, in cooperation with Europol, to tackle trafficking in human beings, the facilitation of irregular migration and document fraud. The management of the EU's external borders has been enhanced through the implementation of the Eurosur Regulation ([4]), and the full roll out of the Visa Information System and the second generation Schengen Information System.

([1]) Directive 2008/115/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals; OJ L 348, 24.12.2008, p. 98-107.
([2]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?num=C-61/11
([3]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?num=C-329/11
([4]) Regulation (EU) No 1052/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur); OJ L 295, 6.11.2013, p. 11-26.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000712/14
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Avaliação do impacto do olival superintensivo

Numa reunião recente com a Ruralalentejo e a Confederação Nacional de Agricultura fomos alertados para os problemas que estarão a ser criados com a plantação de olival superintensivo, nomeadamente na região alentejana. A cultura do olival superintensivo é encorajada pelos financiamentos a 5 anos da UE. No entanto, podem ser incalculáveis os danos ao nível da destruição de solos e terrenos. No Alentejo, pode estar a destruir o montado de sobreiro, para cuja sobrevivência é fundamental a regeneração natural do terreno.

Desta forma, pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem informação sobre algum estudo sobre os impactos ambientais da cultura de olival superintensivo na região alentejana?

— A Comissão pretende, no quadro da futura PAC, continuar a subsidiar a monocultura de olival superintensivo?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(4 de março de 2014)

A Comissão informa que não tem conhecimento de qualquer estudo de impacto ambiental específico relativo a uma cultura de olival superintensivo na região do Alentejo.

Informa igualmente que, na sequência da reforma da PAC de 2003, o apoio ao setor olivícola no âmbito do primeiro pilar foi dissociado da produção e integrado no regime de pagamento único. Este pagamento é, por conseguinte, concedido, por hectare elegível, aos agricultores que detêm direitos ao pagamento, independentemente da sua produção efetiva.

No que respeita ao segundo pilar, compete aos Estados-Membros, no quadro da gestão partilhada dos programas de desenvolvimento rural (PDR) e em conformidade com a legislação nacional e da UE, conceber os seus próprios PDR e medidas. Os programas de desenvolvimento rural para 2014-2020 estão atualmente em elaboração, devendo ser apresentados aos serviços da Comissão nos próximos meses para avaliação aprofundada e aprovação posterior. Se forem propostas medidas de apoio a atividades de cultura de olivais superintensivos, estas terão de ser suportadas por uma avaliação *ex ante* e pela avaliação de impacto estratégica integrada no PDR.

Além disso, o artigo 45.° do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1305/2013 ([1]) estabelece que, para serem elegíveis para apoio do Feader, as operações de investimento devem ser precedidas de uma avaliação do impacto ambiental esperado, de acordo com a legislação específica aplicável a este tipo de investimentos, se o investimento for suscetível de ter efeitos negativos no ambiente. A avaliação destas operações é da responsabilidade do Estado-Membro.

([1]) JO L 347 de 20.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000712/14
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Impact assessment of superintensive olive groves

At a recent meeting with Ruralalentejo (a local farming group in Alentejo) and the Portuguese National Agricultural Confederation, we were warned of the problems that are going to be caused by the planting of superintensive olive groves, particularly in the Alentejo region — a practice that is being encouraged by five-year funding from the EU. It may, however, cause incalculable damage to the land and soil. In Alentejo, it could lead to the destruction of the cork oak, whose survival depends on natural regeneration of the land.

I therefore ask the Commission:

— Does it know of any study on the environmental impact of superintensive olive groves in the Alentejo region?

— Does the Commission intend to continue subsidising monocultures of superintensive olive groves under the CAP in the future?

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

The Commission informs that it is not aware of any specific study on the environmental impact of super-intensive olive groves in the Alentejo region.

It also informs that as a result of the 2003 CAP reform, support under Pillar I for the olive oil sector has been decoupled from production and integrated into the single payment scheme. Such payment is thus granted per eligible hectare to farmers holding payment entitlements independently from their actual production.

As regards Pillar II, in the framework of shared management of Rural Development Programmes (RDPs) and in conformity with the EU and national legislation, Member States are responsible for the design of respective RDPs and measures. The Rural Development Programmes for 2014-2020 are under preparation and should be submitted to the Commission services in the following months for thorough assessment and further approval. If measures supporting activities like intensive olive groves are proposed, they will have to be backed up by the *ex-ante* evaluation and the strategic environmental assessment incorporated in the RDP.

In addition, art. 45 of Regulation (EC) No 1305/2013 ([1]) foresees that, in order to be eligible for EAFRD support, investment operations shall be preceded by an assessment of the expected environmental impact in accordance with law specific to that kind of investment where the investment is likely to have negative effects on the environment. The assessment of these operations is under the responsibility of the Member State.

([1]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000713/14
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Avaliação dos projetos de agroturismo em Portugal

Os projetos de agroturismo têm proliferado em Portugal devido aos apoios financeiros da UE. Tivemos, no entanto, a informação de que muitos desses projetos encerram quando cessa o financiamento de 5 anos, não potenciando para o futuro as infraestruturas construídas para o efeito.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem algum estudo de avaliação dos projetos de agroturismo em Portugal, sobretudo no que se refere à sua sustentabilidade e continuidade? E em relação a outros Estados-Membros, tem essa informação?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloș em nome da Comissão
(3 de março de 2014)

A Comissão não tem conhecimento de quaisquer estudos específicos destinados a avaliar projetos de agroturismo em Portugal ou em qualquer outro Estado-Membro.

No âmbito da gestão partilhada dos programas de desenvolvimento rural (PDR) e em conformidade com as legislações nacionais e da UE, cabe aos Estados-Membros elaborar os respetivos programas e medidas de desenvolvimento rural depois de terem sido efetuadas uma análise SWOT (análise dos pontos fortes e fracos, das oportunidades e das ameaças) da zona do programa e uma avaliação das necessidades.

Os programas de desenvolvimento rural para 2014-2020 estão a ser preparados pelas autoridades nacionais e devem ser apresentados aos serviços da Comissão durante os próximos meses para serem objeto de uma avaliação minuciosa antes da respetiva aprovação. Se o agroturismo for proposto no âmbito de um programa nacional ou regional, deverá beneficiar de apoio na sequência da análise acima referida.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000713/14
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Assessment of agritourism schemes in Portugal

Agritourism schemes are proliferating in Portugal because of the financial support available from the EU. We understand, however, that many of these schemes collapse when the five-year funding comes to an end, meaning that no further use is made of purpose-built infrastructures.

I therefore ask the Commission:

— Have any studies been conducted to assess agritourism schemes in Portugal, particularly in terms of sustainability and continuity? And is this information available for other Member States?

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

The Commission is not aware of any specific studies aiming to assess agro-tourism schemes in Portugal or in any other Member State.

In the framework of the shared management of Rural Development Programmes (RDPs) and in conformity with the EU and national legislation, Member States are responsible for the design of respective RDPs and measures, following a SWOT analysis (analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threatens) of the programme area and the needs assessment.

The Rural Development Programmes for 2014-2020 are under preparation by national authorities and should be submitted to the Commission services in the following months for thorough assessment and further approval. If agro-tourism is proposed to be included in any national or regional programme, it should be supported by the above analysis.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000715/14
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Apoio à marca «Filhos da Tradição»

A «Filhos da Tradição» é uma marca registada pela Ruralalentejo que identificará produtos oriundos de explorações agrícolas e agroindustriais familiares e do mundo rural, produzidos ou obtidos segundo formas e métodos tradicionais, cumprindo regras não-intensificadoras e dando ao consumidor garantias de segurança e qualidade. Esta marca nasceu para valorizar os produtos das explorações familiares, dando especial atenção aos modos de produção.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Não sendo a «Filhos da Tradição» uma marca DOP ou de produtos tradicionais, quais os fundos da UE que poderão ser mobilizados para apoiar este projeto?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(7 de março de 2014)

A Comissão informa que, no contexto da política de desenvolvimento rural para 2014-2020, o artigo 16.° do Regulamento (UE) n.° 1305/2013 ([1]) prevê o apoio a: regimes de qualidade criados ao abrigo de legislação europeia, regimes de qualidade que cumpram os critérios previstos nesse regulamento ou regimes voluntários de certificação dos produtos agrícolas que, segundo os Estados-Membros, cumprem as orientações da União em matéria de boas práticas.

A marca referida deve, por conseguinte, preencher as condições necessárias para obter o apoio de pelo menos um dos regimes acima indicados.

Além disso, o artigo 35.° prevê, entre outras, a possibilidade de promover atividades de cooperação que envolvam pelo menos duas entidades, em contexto local, relacionadas com o desenvolvimento de cadeias de abastecimento curtas e de mercados locais.

Os programas de desenvolvimento rural para o período de 2014 a 2020 estão a ser ultimados e deverão ser apresentados aos serviços da Comissão nos próximos meses, para avaliação e aprovação. Depois de aprovados, cabe às autoridades de gestão competentes fornecer as informações acerca dos fundos disponíveis e das condições de elegibilidade para cada tipo de apoio.

No que se refere à promoção ([2]), a legislação em vigor não permite a concessão de apoio à promoção de marcas.

As normas vigentes preveem, no entanto, a possibilidade de conceder apoio a campanhas de promoção dos regimes nacionais de qualidade no setor da carne.

Há mais informações sobre os regimes de promoção em:
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/promotion/procedure/

É de assinalar que o regime de promoção está neste momento a ser revisto. Neste contexto, todos os parâmetros nele previstos, incluindo as condições em que as marcas podem ser mencionadas, serão reapreciados, tanto para o mercado interno como para os países terceiros.

([1]) JO L 347 de 20.12.2013.
([2]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 3/2008 do Conselho relativo a acções de informação e promoção a favor dos produtos agrícolas no mercado interno e nos países terceiros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000715/14
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Support for the 'Filhos da Tradição' brand

'Filhos da Tradição' is a brand registered by Ruralalentejo (a local farming group in Alentejo) to identify products from family-run farms and businesses in rural areas, which are made or produced using traditional methods, including non-intensive practices, and provide consumers with guarantees of safety and quality. The purpose of the brand is to promote the products of family farms and businesses, with special attention being given to production methods.

I therefore ask the Commission:

— Since 'Filhos da Tradição' is not a PDO or traditional-products brand, what EU funding might be available to support this initiative?

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

The Commission informs that in the framework of the 2014-2020 Rural Development (RD) Policy, Article 16 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 ([1]) foresees support for: a) quality schemes which are established under EU Regulations or provisions; b) quality schemes which comply with certain criteria laid down in the regulation; or c) voluntary agricultural product certification schemes recognised by the Member States as meeting the Union best practice guidelines.

The mentioned brand should therefore fulfil the respective conditions to be eligible under at least one of the abovementioned support schemes.

Furthermore, Article 35 foresees *inter alia* the possibility of the promotion of cooperation activities involving at least two entities in a local context relating to the development of short supply chains and local markets.

The RD Programmes for 2014-2020 are under preparation and should be submitted to the Commission services in the following months for assessment and approval. Once approved, it up to the respective Managing Authorities to provide information on the funds available and the eligibility conditions for such support.

As regards promotion ([2]), current provisions do not allow for granting support to the promotion of brands.

The current regime does however foresee the possibility of granting support to promotion campaigns for national quality schemes in the meat sector.

More information regarding promotion schemes can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/promotion/procedure/

Please note that a reform of the promotion scheme is currently under way. In this context all parameters of this regime, including the conditions in which brands may be mentioned, will be reconsidered, both for the internal market and third countries.

([1]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 3/2008, on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000716/14
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Incapacidade do Programa Erasmus para dar resposta às solicitações

Tivemos a informação de que, nos últimos anos, tem aumentado o número de alunos portugueses em mobilidade através do Programa Erasmus, aos quais é atribuída bolsa zero, uma vez que existe insuficiência de verbas para o número de candidaturas realizadas. Por outro lado, e num período em que o rendimento das famílias portuguesas tem decrescido substancialmente, crescerão o número de alunos com direito a bolsas Erasmus BSE-SOC, destinadas aos alunos mais carenciados.

Em face do exposto, pergunto:

— Qual a informação que tem acerca do número de alunos nos vários países a quem é atribuída bolsa zero? Quais os principais motivos?

— Os fundos comunitários destinados aos programas de mobilidade serão aumentados para Portugal no atual QFP (2014-2020) em relação ao anterior?

Resposta dada por AndroullaVassiliou em nome da Comissão
(4 de março de 2014)

Os últimos dados disponíveis, do ano académico de 2011-2012, mostram um número total de 7 955 estudantes Erasmus com bolsa zero, representando cerca de 3 % do total de estudantes em mobilidade. Os números mais elevados de estudantes com bolsa zero eram franceses, austríacos, italianos e lituanos. Em 2011-2012, houve 157 estudantes portugueses com bolsa zero, em comparação com 246 em 2010-2011.

Tal demonstra que o prestígio do «Erasmus» tem um efeito multiplicador, uma vez que em situações em que o orçamento Erasmus da UE já foi afetado pela agência nacional, estudantes adicionais podem beneficiar de todas as vantagens de ser um estudante Erasmus, como o não pagamento de propinas na instituição de acolhimento, sem receber financiamento da UE. Deve referir-se que os estudantes com bolsa zero recebem frequentemente financiamento de outras fontes (financiamento nacional, regional ou local).

O orçamento global do Erasmus+ representa um aumento de 40 % em comparação com o anterior orçamento de sete anos para os programas que reúne. Realisticamente, todos os países podem esperar beneficiar consideravelmente desse aumento; no entanto, o montante exato será calculado anualmente. Em 2014, espera-se que Portugal receba um total de 35,4 milhões de euros, um aumento de 10,3 % relativamente a 2013. Em relação à mobilidade no ensino superior, Portugal receberá 14,2 milhões de euros em 2014, um aumento de 17 % relativamente a 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000716/14
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Incapacity of Erasmus programme to meet applications

We have received information that, in recent years, there has been an increase in the number of Portuguese students in mobility through the Erasmus programme, who have been awarded a zero grant, due to there being insufficient funds for the number of applicants. On the other hand, and in a period in which the income of Portuguese families has decreased substantially, the number of students entitled to Erasmus Supplementary Allowances (BSE-SOC), intended for the most deprived students, will increase.

In view of this, I ask:

— What information does the Commission have regarding the number of students in the various countries who have been awarded a zero grant? What are the main reasons?

— Will Community funds intended for mobility programmes be increased for Portugal in the current QFP (2014-2020) in comparison with the previous one?

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

The last available figures, from the academic year 2011-12, show a total number of 7 955 zero-grant Erasmus students, representing around 3% of the total number of student mobility periods. The highest numbers of zero-grant students were from France, Austria, Italy and Lithuania. 157 Portuguese students were zero-grant students in 2011-12, as compared to 246 in 2010-11.

This shows that the 'Erasmus' branding has a leverage effect, since in situations where the EU Erasmus budget for an academic year has already been allocated by the national agency, additional students can receive all the advantages of being an Erasmus student, such as non-payment of tuition fees in the receiving institution, without receiving EU funding. It should be noted that zero-grant students often receive funding from other sources (national, regional or local funding).

The overall budget for Erasmus+ represents a 40% increase compared with the previous seven-year budget for the programmes it brings together. All countries can realistically expect to benefit considerably from this increase; however the precise amounts will be calculated on an annual basis. In 2014, Portugal can expect to receive in total EUR 35.4 million, a 10.3% increase as compared to 2013. For mobility in higher education, Portugal will receive EUR 14.2 million in 2014, a 17% increase as compared to 2013.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000720/14
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Porto da Figueira da Foz excluído da Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes

A rede de portos prioritários da Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes incluiu, em Portugal, entre outros, os portos do Porto, Aveiro, Lisboa e Sines. O porto da Figueira da Foz — que faz parte, tal como os outros, do corredor Atlântico — foi excluído da rede. O Porto da Figueira da Foz tem uma atividade bastante intensa em Portugal, nomeadamente ao nível das exportações.

Desta forma, perguntamos à Comissão:

— Quais os critérios que levaram à exclusão do Porto da Figueira da Foz da classificação de portos prioritários da Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes?

— Quando e como se alterarão esses critérios, de forma a rever a atual classificação?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(24 de fevereiro de 2014)

Segundo os dados do Eurostat, o porto da Figueira de Foz não satisfaz os critérios fixados pela Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes (RTE-T) relativamente aos portos marítimos ([1]).

Os critérios referidos referem-se ao volume total anual de carga e passageiros e à localização específica do porto. Se um porto preencher estes critérios durante pelo menos dois anos consecutivos, poderá ser incluído na rede RTE-T global, em conformidade com o procedimento previsto no artigo 49.° do Regulamento RTE-T.

([1]) Artigo 20.° do Regulamento (UE) n.º 1315/2013 (orientações da União para o desenvolvimento da rede transeuropeia de transportes): http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32013R1315:PT:NOT

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000720/14
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Exclusion of the port of Figueira da Foz from the Trans-European Transport Network

The network of priority ports in the Trans-European Transport Network includes, among others in Portugal, the ports of Oporto, Aveiro, Lisbon and Sines. The port of Figueira da Foz — which, like the others, forms part of the Atlantic corridor — has been excluded from the network. The port of Figueira da Foz is a very busy Portuguese port, particularly in terms of exports.

We therefore ask the Commission:

— On what criteria the port of Figueira da Foz has been excluded from classification as a priority port in the Trans-European Transport Network?

— When and how these criteria are to be changed and the current classification revised?

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

The Port of Figuera de Foz, according to Eurostat data, does not comply with the criteria as definded by the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) for maritime ports ([1]).

The abovementioned criteria relate to the total annual cargo and passenger volumes and the port specific location. Once the port qualifies for at least two consecutive years, it can be included in the comprehensive network of the TEN-T, in accordance with the procedure foreseen in Article 49 of the TEN-T Regulation.

([1]) Art 20 of Regulation 1315/2013 (on Union Guidelines for the development of the transEuropean transport network): http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32013R1315:EN:NOT.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000721/14
alla Commissione
Marco Scurria (PPE)
(24 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Pubblicazione del programma Erasmus+ in tutte le lingue ufficiali dell'Unione europea

A seguito dell'approvazione del nuovo programma Erasmus+ la Commissione ha provveduto a pubblicare i bandi relativi alle varie azioni.

Tutti gli aventi diritto sono quindi chiamati a presentare dei progetti per l'attuazione degli obiettivi previsti. Tutta la documentazione e in particolare i bandi di gara sono reperibili in lingua inglese, mentre le traduzioni nelle altre 23 lingue ufficiali dell'Unione Europea non saranno disponibili prima dell'aprile 2014. Tuttavia, la prima scadenza per presentare progetti nel quadro di Erasmus+ è fissata al 17 marzo 2014.

Non ritiene la Commissione che una tale circostanza costituisca un vantaggio per i soggetti anglofoni che risponderanno ai bandi di gara?

Non crede che questo possa costituire una discriminazione nei confronti della maggioranza dei cittadini dell'Unione Europea?

Considerato che la traduzione in tutte le lingue dell'Unione è prevista, non ritiene che sarebbe più equo e giusto che le informazioni venissero pubblicate contemporaneamente in tutte le lingue, quanto meno i bandi, così da evitare discriminazioni?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(19 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione può confermare di aver indetto un invito a presentare proposte per Erasmus+ nelle 24 lingue ufficiali dell'UE ([1]). L'invito è stato lanciato il 12.12.2013, il giorno successivo all'adozione del nuovo regolamento Erasmus+ da parte del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio.

La Commissione ha impartito istruzioni alle agenzie nazionali, che attuano Erasmus+ per suo conto a livello nazionale, di fornire ai candidati potenziali tutte le necessarie informazioni utili nella lingua nazionale. Le candidature possono essere presentate in qualsiasi lingua ufficiale. Pertanto, la Commissione non ritiene che alcun gruppo di candidati potenziali sia stato messo in posizione di svantaggio.

La guida al programma Erasmus+, che fornisce informazioni dettagliate sulle azioni previste nell'ambito del programma, è per il momento disponibile soltanto in inglese. Si tratta di un documento voluminoso che è attualmente in corso di traduzione presso i servizi della Commissione che stanno traducendo contemporaneamente guide affini relative ad altri nuovi programmi dell'UE. La guida verrà distribuita in tutte le lingue non appena possibile.

Considerato che l'invito a presentare proposte Erasmus+ è stato tradotto in tutte le lingue ufficiali dell'UE e considerato il sostegno disponibile presso le agenzie nazionali, la Commissione ha ritenuto che non vi fosse motivo per ritardare l'indizione del primo invito in attesa della traduzione della guida al programma. In effetti, un simile ritardo avrebbe avuto un impatto negativo per le organizzazioni dell'UE e per i cittadini desiderosi di partecipare al programma.

([1]) GU C 26 del 29.1.2014, pag. 6.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000721/14
to the Commission
Marco Scurria (PPE)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Publication of the Erasmus+ programme in all EU official languages

Now that the new Erasmus+ programme has been adopted, the Commission has begun to issue the calls for proposals relating to the individual actions.

All persons eligible under the programme will thus be called upon to submit projects serving to achieve the programme's aims. The necessary documents — and the calls for proposals in particular — can all be obtained in English, but the translations into the EU's 23 other official languages will not be available before April 2014. However, the first deadline for submitting Erasmus+ projects falls on 17 March 2014.

Does not the Commission consider that, in these circumstances, English-speakers who respond to the calls for proposals are being given an advantage?

Does it not believe that this might amount to discrimination against the majority of EU citizens?

Given that a version is to be produced in every EU language, does the Commission not take the view that it would be fairer and more proper to publish the information, or at least the calls for proposals, in all of the languages at the same time, so as to avoid discrimination?

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

The Commission can confirm that it launched the call for proposals for Erasmus+ in the 24 official EU languages ([1]). This launch took place on 12.12.2013, the day after the adoption by the European Parliament and Council of the new Erasmus+ Regulation.

The Commission has instructed all National Agencies, which implement Erasmus+ on behalf of the Commission at national level, to provide potential applicants with all necessary supporting information on the call in their own language. Applications can be submitted in any official language. Thus the Commission does not consider that any group of potential applicants has been put at a disadvantage.

The Erasmus+ Programme Guide, which provides detailed information about all actions under the Programme, is as yet only available in English. It is a long document that is currently being translated by the Commission's services, which are also simultaneously translating similar guides in respect of the other new EU programmes. The Guide will be made available in all languages as soon as possible.

Given that the Erasmus+ call for proposals was translated into all official EU languages and given the support available from National Agencies, the Commission saw no justification for delaying the first call while awaiting translation of the Programme Guide. Indeed, any such delay would have had a substantial negative impact on EU citizens and organisations wishing to participate in the programme.

([1]) OJ C 26, 29.1.2014, p. 6.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000722/14
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(24 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Finanziamenti europei per il Centro Ricerche e Alta Formazione (CReAF)

Nelle ultime settimane sono venute nuovamente alla luce molte polemiche legate al Centro Ricerche e Alta Formazione (CReAF) di Prato.

Nato per essere un centro di ricerca sul tessile da un'idea dell'ormai lontano 2003, si tratta di una struttura realizzata ma mai entrata in funzione, che negli anni è arrivata a costare una cifra superiore ai 20 milioni di euro, e che necessiterebbe di ulteriori, ingenti finanziamenti per una sua effettiva messa in attività.

Può la Commissione verificare se siano stati utilizzati eventuali finanziamenti europei da parte delle autorità italiane per la realizzazione di questo progetto, purtroppo mai entrato in funzione?

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

Il progetto indicato è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale nell'ambito del programma 2000-2006 della regione Toscana. L'autorità di gestione ha dichiarato il progetto completo e operativo. Per quanto riguarda il Fondo sociale europeo, in base ai dati disponibili in materia di coesione e ai rapporti annuali di esecuzione, non sono stati erogati fondi nel periodo attuale di programmazione.

Per ulteriori informazioni la Commissione suggerisce all'onorevole deputato di rivolgersi direttamente all'autorità di gestione del programma FESR per la regione Toscana:

Programma regionale Toscana 2007-2013
Direzione generale sviluppo economico
Via Luca Giordano, 13
50132 Firenze
Albino.caporale@regione.toscana.it
autoritagestionecreo@regione.toscana.it

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000722/14
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: EU funding for the Centro Ricerche e Alta Formazione (Centre for Research and Advanced Training — CReAF)

In recent weeks the controversy surrounding the Centro Ricerche e Alta Formazione (Centre for Research and Advanced Training — CReAF) in Prato has been rekindled.

Conceived as a textiles research centre, on the basis of an idea first put forward as long ago as in 2003, the centre was set up, but has never commenced operations, and its total cost now exceeds EUR 20 million, with further substantial funding needed if it is ever to fulfil its intended purpose.

Will the Commission check whether the Italian authorities have used EU funding for a project which has yet to come to fruition?

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

The project in question has been co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund under the 2000-2006 programme for Tuscany. The managing authority has declared the project as completed and operational. As regard as the European Social Fund, according to the open cohesion data-set and the annual implementation reports, no funds had been given under the current programming period

For further information the Commission suggests the Honourable Member to contact directly the managing authority of the ERDF programme for the region of Tuscany:

Regional programme for Tuscany 2007-2013
Directorate-General for Economic Development
Via Luca Giordano, 13
50132 Firenze
Albino.caporale@regione.toscana.it
autoritagestionecreo@regione.toscana.it

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-000723/14
an die Kommission
Monika Hohlmeier (PPE)
(24. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Überwachung und Aufsicht über die gemeinsamen Operationen auf See

Angesichts der jüngsten Ereignisse, bei denen ein Boot nahe der griechischen Insel Farmakonisi kenterte und von den 28 Personen an Bord nur 16 gerettet werden konnten, bleibt das Verhalten der griechischen Grenzbehörden weiterhin im Unklaren. Obwohl Farmakonisi im Einsatzgebiet der gemeinsamen EU-Operation Poseidon liegt, ist es der Europäischen Agentur für die operative Zusammenarbeit an den Außengrenzen (Frontex), die die gemeinsamen Operationen koordiniert, gemäß den geltenden Rechtsvorschriften nicht gestattet, derartige Vorfälle zu untersuchen. Frontex hat lediglich die Möglichkeit, die Folgemaßnahmen zu überwachen, sofern der Aufnahmemitgliedstaat bestätigt, dass Ressourcen der gemeinsamen Operation eingesetzt wurden. Den griechischen Behörden zufolge wurden jedoch weder Personalkräfte der gemeinsamen Operation noch kofinanzierte Ausrüstungsgegenstände eingesetzt.

1. Kann die Kommission bestätigen, dass die von den griechischen Behörden übermittelten Informationen zur Such- und Rettungsaktion im Widerspruch zu den Informationen stehen, die das Flüchtlingskommissariat der Vereinten Nationen (UNHCR) von den Überlebenden und aus anderen Quellen erhalten hat und die besagen, dass das Boot zurückgeschleppt worden und dabei gekentert sei?

2. Sind der Kommission ähnliche Vorfälle in dem Gebiet bekannt?

3. Wie will die Kommission den Mangel abstellen, dass die uneingeschränkte Überwachung des Einsatzgebietes durch die EU gemäß den derzeit geltenden Bestimmungen zu den gemeinsamen Operationen auf See nicht erlaubt ist, und der EU und den zuständigen Behörden die uneingeschränkte Überwachung der jeweiligen Einsatzgebiete gestatten?

4. Wird die Kommission die griechischen Behörden vor dem Hintergrund der europäischen Rechtsvorschriften und der Menschenrechte um vollständige Auskunft ersuchen und eine Untersuchung des Vorfalls einleiten?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(21. Februar 2014)

Tragischerweise kam es bei diesem Vorfall zum Verlust von Menschenleben. Die Kommission spricht den Familien der Opfer ihr aufrichtiges Beileid aus.

Zu den von der Frau Abgeordneten angesprochenen Punkten:

1. Nach den der Kommission vorliegenden Informationen scheint der Unfall während einer Such- und Rettungsaktion und nicht während einer Grenzkontrollmaßnahme passiert zu sein.

2. Der Kommission sind Berichte über mutmaßliche Abschiebungen aus Griechenland in die Türkei sowie Hinweise auf Misshandlungen von Migranten bekannt. Die Kommission steht derzeit wegen dieser Vorwürfe in Verbindung mit den griechischen Behörden.

3. Führen die Mitgliedstaaten Grenzkontrollmaßnahmen durch — sei es alleine, in Zusammenarbeit mit anderen Mitgliedstaaten oder durch Frontex koordiniert — so müssen sie ihren Verpflichtungen aus dem Schengener Grenzkodex ([1]) und der Frontex-Verordnung ([2]) nachkommen. Für die von Frontex koordinierten Grenzkontrollmaßnahmen auf See ist zudem der Beschluss 2010/252/EU des Rates ([3]) maßgebend.

4. Es liegt in der Verantwortung der griechischen Behörden, die Umstände dieses Vorfalls zu untersuchen. Nach Ansicht der Kommission sollten die griechischen Behörden zu dieser Sache Stellung nehmen, sobald ihre Untersuchungen abgeschlossen sind. Als Hüterin der Verträge behält sich die Kommission das Recht vor, geeignete Maßnahmen zu ergreifen, sollte ein Mitgliedstaat nachweislich EU-Recht verletzt haben.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 562/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 15. März 2006 über einen Gemeinschaftskodex für das Überschreiten der Grenzen durch Personen (Schengener Grenzkodex) (ABl. L 105 vom 13.4.2006, S. 1).

([2]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2007/2004 des Rates zur Errichtung einer Europäischen Agentur für die operative Zusammenarbeit an den Außengrenzen der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union (ABl. L 349 vom 25.11.2004, S. 1).

([3]) Beschluss 2010/252/EU des Rates vom 26. April 2010 zur Ergänzung des Schengener Grenzkodex hinsichtlich der Überwachung der Seeaußengrenzen im Rahmen der von der Europäischen Agentur für die operative Zusammenarbeit an den Außengrenzen der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union koordinierten operativen Zusammenarbeit (ABl. L 111 vom 4.5.2010, S. 20). Dieser Beschluss wurde durch das Urteil des Gerichtshofs der Europäischen Union vom 5. September 2012 in der Rechtssache C-355/10 für nichtig erklärt; er bleibt jedoch in Kraft, bis er durch eine neue von Parlament und Rat erlassene Regelung ersetzt wird. Am 12. April 2013 legte die Kommission in dieser Sache einen Vorschlag vor (KOM(2013)197 endg.).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000723/14
to the Commission
Monika Hohlmeier (PPE)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Oversight and monitoring of joint operations at sea

In light of recent events involving a vessel which capsized off the coast of the Greek island of Farmakonisi, where only 16 of the 28 people on board were rescued, the conduct of the Greek border authorities remains unclear. Although Farmakonisi lies within the operating area of the EU joint operation Poseidon Sea, the European Agency for the Management of External Borders, which is responsible for joint operations, has no basis under current legislation for investigating such incidents and can only monitor the follow-up to the incident if the host Member State confirms that joint operation resources were used. The Greek authorities have said that neither joint operation personnel nor co-financed equipment was involved.

1. Can the Commission confirm that the information received from the Greek authorities regarding a search and rescue operation contradicts the information that survivors have given to the UNHCR and that of other sources which claim the boat was subjected to a push-back operation and capsized?

2. Does the Commission know of any similar incidents in the region?

3. Given that the current regulations governing joint operations at sea do not allow for full oversight of the operating area by the EU, how does the Commission intend to address these shortcomings in order to grant the EU and competent agencies fully fledged oversight of areas where joint operations take place?

4. Does the Commission intend, in the light of European legislation and human rights law, to request full information from the Greek authorities and to initiate an investigation of the incident?

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

The loss of life in this incident was a tragedy. The Commission offers its condolences to the families of the victims.

With regard to the points raised by the Honorouble Member:

1. From information available to the Commission, it would appear that this accident occurred during a search and rescue operation and not a border control operation.

2. The Commission is aware of reports alleging push-back operations by Greece to Turkey as well as allegations of ill-treatment of migrants. The Commission is currently in contact with the Greek authorities over these allegations.

3. When carrying out border surveillance operations, individually, in cooperation with each other or under the coordination of Frontex, Member States must respect their obligations deriving from the Schengen Borders Code ([1]) and the Frontex Regulation ([2]). Furthermore, border surveillance operations carried out at sea under the coordination of Frontex are governed by Council Decision 2010/252/EU ([3]).

4. The Greek authorities have a responsibility to carry out an investigation into the circumstances of this particular incident. The Commission considers that the Greek authorities should provide clarification on this incident once their investigation is finished. As guardian of the Treaties, the Commission reserves the right to take appropriate steps where there is evidence that a Member State has violated EC law.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code), OJ L 105, 13.4.2006, p. 1.

([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No2007/2004 establishing a European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union, OJ L 349, 25.11.2004, p.1.

([3]) Council Decision 2010/252/EU of 26 April 2010 supplementing the Schengen Borders Code as regards the surveillance of the sea external borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union, OJ L 111, 4.5.2010, p. 20. This decision was annulled by judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union on 5 September 2012 in Case C-355/10 but remains in force until it is replaced by new rules to be adopted by the European Parliament and the Council. On 12 April 2013, the Commission presented a proposal in this regard (COM(2013) 197 final).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000725/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Aplicación preceptiva en los Estados miembros del concepto de «PYME» definido en la Recomendación 2003/316/CE de la Comisión

La Recomendación 2003/316/CE de la Comisión, de 6 de mayo de 2003, define la categoría de microempresas, pequeñas y medianas empresas (PYME) como aquella que está constituida por las empresas que ocupan a menos de 250 personas y cuyo volumen de negocios anual no excede de 50 millones de euros o cuyo balance general anual no excede de 43 millones de euros. Sin embargo, como se desprende de su propio título, dicho concepto no tiene carácter obligatorio, de manera que los Estados miembros optan libremente por su aplicación. Ello comporta un riesgo evidente de que las medidas estatales de apoyo a las PYME no tengan los mismos destinatarios en el conjunto de la Unión Europea. Es más, dentro de un mismo Estado, se están utilizando diversos conceptos ya sea para medidas de tipo fiscal, social o laboral.

¿Cómo vería la Comisión el establecimiento con carácter preceptivo para todos los Estados miembros del concepto de «PYME» y la aplicación uniforme del mismo en todos los diferentes ámbitos que afectan a dichas empresas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000726/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Posible modificación del concepto de «PYME»

La Recomendación 2003/316/CE de la Comisión, de 6 de mayo de 2003, la categoría de PYME está constituida por las empresas que ocupan a menos de 250 personas y cuyo volumen de negocios anual no excede de 50 millones de euros o cuyo balance general anual no excede de 43 millones de euros.

Sucede, sin embargo, que en determinados sectores de mano de obra intensiva (como pueden ser los servicios de limpieza o de vigilancia, por ejemplo) hay empresas que, sin ser tener gran significación económica, pueden tener más de 250 empleados. La facturación de estas empresas corresponde, principalmente, al coste laboral de los empleados.

¿Cómo vería la Comisión una modificación del concepto de PYME recogido en la Recomendación 2003/316/CE en virtud de la cual las empresas de los sectores de mano de obra intensiva pudieran superar, hasta cierto nivel, el número de 250 trabajadores sin perder la condición de medianas empresas?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión está de acuerdo en que una recomendación solo invita a los Estados miembros a aplicar la definición de PYME. No obstante, en la práctica, la mayoría de ellos lo hacen, de manera exclusiva o paralela y complementaria de sus definiciones nacionales. A menudo así lo justifican circunstancias locales particulares, y se presentan respetando el enfoque de la UE.

Aunque la posición de la definición habría adquirido mayor fuerza en un reglamento o una directiva, su valor jurídico nace de la aplicación de iniciativas de la UE (o de la referencia a ellas) como las ayudas públicas, las normas sobre competencia, la política de empresa y de cohesión, los fondos estructurales y los programas marco de investigación.

Desde la adopción de la Recomendación 2003/316/CE se han realizado tres evaluaciones de su aplicación ([1]). Los resultados muestran que la definición ha logrado con éxito establecer un punto de referencia central dentro y fuera de la UE, y que de momento no hay ninguna necesidad de llevar a cabo una revisión importante ni de cambiar sus límites. La Comisión está de acuerdo con las conclusiones y así lo comunicó el año pasado en este sentido a la Comisión de Industria, Comercio Exterior, Investigación y Energía del PE ([2]).

La evaluación de 2012 analizó definiciones de PYME basadas en límites diferentes en función del sector, aplicadas en otras regiones del mundo.

La conclusión fue que este enfoque no es necesariamente más «generoso» que el nuestro, ya que ello depende fundamentalmente del peso relativo de los sectores en una determinada economía.

Asimismo, añade una complejidad desproporcionada a los cálculos y hace que los criterios sean menos simples y transparentes.

([1]) Las conclusiones completas de las diferentes consultas y evaluaciones pueden consultarse en la página sobre la definición de PYME: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/facts-figures-analysis/sme-definition/

([2]) Mediante carta de 30 de mayo de 2013, a Dª Amalia Sartori, diputada del PE y presidenta de la Comisión de Industria, Comercio Exterior, Investigación y Energía.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000725/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Mandatory application in Member States of the concept of SMEs as defined in Commission Recommendation 2003/316/EC

Commission Recommendation 2003/316/EC of 6 May 2003 defines the category of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) as being made up of enterprises which employ fewer than 250 persons and which have an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million, and/or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million. However, as is clear from the very fact that this is a 'recommendation', this concept is not obligatory, and so Member States are free to choose whether to apply it or not. This carries the obvious risk that state support measures for SMEs are not going to the same recipients throughout the European Union. Moreover, different concepts are even being used within one and the same State, depending on whether fiscal, social or employment measures are involved.

How would the Commission view the mandatory establishment of the concept of SMEs for all Member States and the uniform application of this concept across all the different areas that affect these enterprises?

Question for written answer E-000726/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 January 2014)

Subject: Possible modification of the concept of SMEs

According to Commission Recommendation 2003/316/EC of 6 May 2003, the category of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) is made up of enterprises which employ fewer than 250 persons and which have an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million, and/or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million.

However, in certain sectors involving labour-intensive work (such as cleaning or surveillance services, for example), there are enterprises which, while not being of great economic significance, may have more than 250 employees. The turnover of these enterprises mainly corresponds to the labour costs for the employees.

How would the Commission view a modification of the concept of SMEs as defined in Recommendation 2003/316/EC, so as to allow enterprises operating in sectors involving labour-intensive work to exceed the threshold of 250 workers (up to a given limit) without losing their status as medium-sized enterprises?

Joint answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(10 March 2014)

The Commission agrees that with a recommendation, Member States are only invited to apply the SME Definition. However, in practice most of them do so, solely or in parallel to and complementing their national definitions. This is often warranted by particular local circumstances and presented with deference to the EU approach.

Whereas the position of the Definition would indeed have been stronger as a regulation or Directive, it draws legal force from application or reference in EU policies such as State Aid and Competition Law, Enterprise and Cohesion Policy, Structural Funds and Framework Research Programmes.

Since the adoption of Recommendation 2003/316/EC, 3 evaluations of its implementation have been carried out ([1]). Results show that the Definition has been very successful in establishing a central reference point in the EU and beyond and there is currently no need for major revision or change of ceilings. The Commission agrees with those conclusions and informed the ITRE Committee last year in that sense ([2]).

An analysis of SME definitions based on different ceilings depending on the sectors (applied in other regions of the world) was carried out by the 2012 evaluation.

The conclusion was that this approach is not necessarily more 'generous' than ours, as this depends basically on the relative weight of sectors in a given economy.

Furthermore, it adds disproportionate complexity to calculations and makes criteria less simple and transparent.

([1]) Full conclusions of the different consultations and evaluation can be consulted on the SME Definition webpage http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/facts-figures-analysis/sme-definition/

([2]) By letter dated 30 May 2013, to Mrs Amalia Sartori, MEP, Chair of the ITRE Committee.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000728/14
do Komisji
Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)
(27 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Pomoc państwa w zakresie wynagrodzeń młodocianych pracowników w sektorze rzemiosła

W Polsce, na podstawie Rozporządzenia Ministra Pracy i Polityki Społecznej z dn. 19 grudnia 2013 r., zmieniającego rozporządzenie w sprawie refundowania ze środków Funduszu Pracy wynagrodzeń wypłacanych młodocianym pracownikom (Dz.U. 2013, poz. 1671, z dnia 30 grudnia 2013 r.) okres dopuszczalnej pomocy państwa w formie refundowania ze środków Funduszu Pracy wynagrodzeń wypłacanych młodocianym pracownikom został ograniczony do dnia 30 czerwca 2014 r.

W związku z powyższym istnieje realna obawa, że wielu rzemieślników może zrezygnować z podpisywania umów o przygotowanie zawodowe z osobami młodocianymi. Obecnie, w skali kraju, funkcjonuje około 80 tysięcy takich umów, przez co rzemiosło ma realny wpływ na kształtowanie sytuacji na polskim rynku pracy, gdzie bezrobocie wśród ludzi młodych jest bliskie 30 %.

W uzasadnieniu podjętej decyzji polski rząd powołuje się na projekt nowego Rozporządzenia Komisji Europejskiej w sprawie tzw. wyłączeń blokowych odnośnie pomocy publicznej, które ma zastąpić obecne rozporządzenie WE/800/2008.

1. Czy wyeliminowanie przez polski rząd jednego z podstawowych narzędzi wsparcia rzemieślników nie budzi obaw ze strony Komisji co do istotnego wzrostu bezrobocia wśród osób młodocianych w naszym kraju?

2. W jakim terminie Komisja przewiduje publikację nowego rozporządzenia w sprawie wyłączeń blokowych?

3. Na jakim poziomie kosztów kwalifikowanych zostanie określony pułap dopuszczalnej pomocy publicznej przeznaczonej na szkolenia zawodowe?

4. Czy rzemieślnicy prowadzący szkolenia zawodowe będą mogli korzystać z dwóch form wsparcia w formie refundacji kosztów wynagrodzeń osób młodocianych oraz dofinansowania kosztów kształcenia osób młodocianych?

5. Czy polski rząd przedstawił Komisji wniosek o zachowanie w nowym rozporządzeniu europejskim przepisów dopuszczających refundację wynagrodzeń osób młodocianych, które zdobywają kwalifikacje zawodowe pracując w sektorze rzemiosła?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Joaquina Almunię w imieniu Komisji
(3 marca 2014 r.)

W dniu 1 lipca 2014 r. rozporządzenie nr 800/2008 zostanie zastąpione nowym ogólnym rozporządzeniem w sprawie wyłączeń grupowych (GBER), którego projekt został opublikowany w celu publicznej konsultacji w dniu 18 grudnia 2013 r. Uwzględnione w tym projekcie przepisy w sprawie pomocy dla pracowników znajdujących się w szczególnie niekorzystnej sytuacji są jeszcze bardziej korzystne niż te określone w rozporządzeniu nr 800/2008 – definicja pracownika znajdującego się w szczególnie niekorzystnej sytuacji została poszerzona tak, aby obejmowała młodych ludzi między 15 a 24 rokiem życia.

Przepisy dotyczące pomocy szkoleniowej zostały natomiast uproszczone przez usunięcie rozróżnienia między szkoleniem specjalistycznym a ogólnym oraz przez wprowadzenie pewnych zmian w kosztach kwalifikowalnych. Zgodnie z projektem GBER, kiedy przyznaje się pomoc dla MŚP, koszty zatrudnienia uczestników szkolenia poniesione za godziny, podczas których uczestnik uczestniczy w szkoleniu, oraz ogólne koszty pośrednie za godziny spędzone przez uczestników na szkoleniu stanowią koszty kwalifikowalne. Maksymalna intensywność pomocy wynosi 50 % kosztów kwalifikowalnych i może zostać zwiększona do 70 % w przypadku szkoleń dla pracowników niepełnosprawnych lub pracowników znajdujących się w szczególnie niekorzystnej sytuacji oraz w przypadku MŚP.

Należy jednak zauważyć, że państwa członkowskie mogą swobodnie określać bardziej rygorystyczne warunki przyznawania pomocy niż te określone w GBER.

Konsultacje publiczne na temat projektu GBER zakończyły się w dniu 12 lutego 2014 r., a w dniu 21 lutego 2014 r. został on omówiony z państwami członkowskimi

Wszystkie uwagi otrzymane w trakcie poprzednich konsultacji publicznych na temat projektu GBER, w tym uwagi przekazane przez polskie władze, są dostępne na stronie internetowej Komisji pod adresem:
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/closed.html.

Należy ponadto zaznaczyć, że polskie organy zarządzające EFS wyraziły poparcie dla rozszerzenia kosztów kwalifikowalnych do pomocy szkoleniowej i zwiększenia intensywności pomocy.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000728/14
to the Commission
Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: State aid for young workers' salaries in the trades sector

In Poland, pursuant to a regulation of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy dated 19 December 2013 amending the regulation on refunding young workers' salaries from the unemployment fund (OJ U 2013, item 1671, 30 December 2013), the period in which it is authorised to give state aid in the form of refunds of salaries paid to young workers from the unemployment fund is scheduled to expire on 30 June 2014.

In view of the above, there are real concerns that many tradesmen may cease to offer young people vocational training contracts. At present, there are approximately 80 000 such contracts throughout the country, which allows the trades sector to have a real influence on shaping the labour market in Poland, where youth unemployment is approaching 30%.

In justifying its decision, the Polish Government invokes the new draft Commission regulation on state aid block exemptions, which is set to replace the current Regulation (EC) No 800/2008.

1. Does the Polish Government's abolition of one of the main mechanisms for supportingtradesmen not worry the Commission, given that it would lead to a significant growth inyouth unemployment in Poland?

2. Within what time frame does the Commission expect to publish its new draft regulationon block exemptions?

3. What level of eligible costs will fall within the ceiling for permissible state aid forvocational training?

4. Will tradesmen providing vocational training be able to benefit from two types of supportin the form of refunds of the costs of paying young workers' salaries and in the form ofthe co-financing of their training costs?

5. Has the Polish Government submitted a request to the Commission on maintainingprovisions in the new regulation that allow for refunds of salaries paid to young workerswho are gaining vocational qualifications as they work in the trades sector?

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

On 1 July 2014 Regulation 800/2008 will be replaced by a new General Block Exemption Regulation (GBER), the draft of which was published for public consultation on 18 December 2013. The provisions on aid to disadvantaged workers included in this draft are even more generous than the ones set out in Regulation 800/2008, in that the definition of a disadvantaged worker was extended to include young people, between 15 and 24 years of age.

As regards the provisions on training aid, they have been simplified through abolition of the distinction between specific and general training and certain modifications of eligible costs. According to the draft GBER, where aid is granted to SMEs, trainees' personnel costs and general indirect costs for the hours during which the trainees participate in the training constitute eligible costs. The maximum aid intensity is set at 50% of the eligible costs. It may be increased, up to 70%, if the training is given to workers with disabilities or disadvantaged workers and for SMEs.

It should be noted, however, that Member States are free to set stricter conditions for granting the aid than the ones set out in the GBER.

The public consultation on the draft GBER closed on 12 February 2014 and the draft has been discussed with the Member States on 21 February 2014.

All contributions received in the course of previous public consultations on the draft GBER, including the ones submitted by the Polish authorities, are accessible on the Commission's website at http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/closed.html.

In addition, it should be noted that the Polish ESF Managing Authorities expressed to the Commission their support to the extension of eligible costs for training aid and to the increase of aid intensity.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-000743/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(27 janvier 2014)

Objet: Accord de libre-échange UE-États-Unis

Les négociations engagées pour conclure un accord de libre-échange entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis en vue de la création d'un grand marché transatlantique (GMT) aboutiraient à une uniformisation de toutes les réglementations liées au commerce entre les États-Unis et l'Union. Elles portent sur un rapprochement des législations en matière de droit du travail, d'alimentation et de santé, de diversité culturelle, d'environnement, etc. Il s'agirait d'un accord de libre-échange automatique et les négociateurs ont jusqu'à 2015 pour le sceller mais tout ce qui aura trait à l'harmonisation des normes, telles que les standards sanitaires, ou l'étiquetage serait conclu après 2017 ou 2020.

Le grand marché transatlantique fragilisera les filières agro-alimentaires européenne et française, qui ne disposeront plus de protection face à la concurrence nord-américaine caractérisée par des différences de niveaux et de droits sociaux et des exigences environnementales et sanitaires moindres. Potentiellement, les normes alimentaires sur l'utilisation du chlore, des hormones de croissance ou des antibiotiques dans les viandes exportées des États-Unis pourraient être autorisées.

Par ailleurs, l'Union applique le principe de précaution. Les États-Unis ne prévoient pas une telle approche.

La Commission va-t-elle donner à la représentation parlementaire des éléments sur les négociations en cours, notamment dans le secteur agro-alimentaire?

La Commission peut-elle nous informer des différends entre les négociateurs concernant les normes et règlementations en discussion ou à venir?

La Commission compte-t-elle maintenir le principe de précaution lors de la négociation de cet accord?

Est-ce exact que les standards sanitaires sur les produits agricoles seront discutés en 2017, voire en 2020, après la conclusion de l'accord? La Commission a-t-elle négocié des listes des produits qui seraient exclus de l'accord?

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

La Commission informe en permanence le Parlement européen, le Conseil et le grand public de l'état d'avancement des négociations sur le Partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement et continue à solliciter leurs avis et d'autres contributions, y compris dans le secteur agroalimentaire.

À ce stade des négociations, il est prématuré de parler de «différends» entre les négociateurs. Le chapitre du Partenariat consacré aux questions sanitaires et phytosanitaires ne prévoit pas de négociation sur les normes et les règlements. L'objectif de la Commission est de rationaliser les procédures administratives et réglementaires qui retardent et entravent indûment les échanges commerciaux. Le Parlement européen est tenu informé de l'avancement des négociations sur le Partenariat, comme le prévoient son propre mandat et le règlement de procédure interinstitutionnel agréé. Le principe de précaution est inscrit dans la législation alimentaire générale de l'Union européenne et reconnu dans l'Accord sanitaire et phytosanitaire de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce (OMC). Ces dispositions générales ne font pas l'objet de négociations et le Partenariat n'affaiblira pas les droits et les obligations des parties en matière de protection de la santé.

Les normes réglementaires pour les produits agricoles sont soumises pour commentaires aux membres de l'OMC, conformément à l'Accord sanitaire et phytosanitaire. L'obligation de transparence et les mécanismes destinés à la demande d'avis et à la consultation ne changeront pas. Il est actuellement impossible de dire si le Partenariat prévoira des obligations supplémentaires convenues d'un commun accord dans le domaine de la coopération réglementaire. La Commission n'a mis sur la table de négocier aucune liste de produits à exclure de l'accord.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000743/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: EU-US free trade agreement

Standardisation of all regulations linked to trade between the US and the EU will, it seems, be one outcome of the negotiations on a free trade agreement between the European Union and the United States seeking to create a big transatlantic marketplace. The negotiations are focusing on approximating laws on labour, food and health, cultural diversity, the environment, etc. This free trade agreement will, apparently, be an automatic one and the negotiators have until 2015 to finalise it. However negotiations on everything that has to do with harmonisation of standards — health standards or labelling for instance — will not, it seems, be concluded until after 2017 or 2020.

The big transatlantic marketplace will weaken EU and French agri-food sectors as they will no longer be protected against competition from North America characterised by different social rights and levels and lower environment and health requirements. Food standards on the use of chlorine, growth hormones or antibiotics in meat exported from the US might just possibly be authorised.

What is more, the European Union applies the precautionary principle. The United States does not envisage any such approach.

Will the Commission provide Parliament with information on the ongoing negotiations, particularly as regards the agri-food sector?

Could the Commission inform us about disagreements between negotiators concerning standards and regulations being discussed now or in the future?

Does the Commission intend to uphold the precautionary principle during negotiations on this agreement?

Is it true that health standards for agricultural products will be discussed in 2017, or even in 2020, after the agreement has been signed? Has the Commission negotiated lists of products to be excluded from the agreement?

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

The Commission is costantly keeping the European Parliament, the Council and the general public informed about the progress of Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations and continues to solicit their comments and other input, including on the agri-food sector.

At this early stage of the negotiatons it is premature to refer to 'disagreements' in the negotiations. Standards and Regulations are not subject to negotiation in the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Chapter of TTIP. The Commission's aim is to streamline admistrative and regulatory procedures that lead to avoid unnecessary delays and impediments to trade. The European Parliament is kept informed about the progress of TTIP negotiations in accordance with its mandate and agreed interinstitutional rules of procedure The precautionary principle is embedded in the European General Food Law and recognised in the World Trade Organisation (WTO)-Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement. These general provisions are not subject to negotiation and TTIP will not weaken the rights and obligations of the parties to protect health.

Regulatory standards for agricultural products are posted for comment by WTO members in conformity with the WTO-SPS Agreement. These obligations for transparency, comment and consultation mechanisms will not change. It is currently not possible to predict whether TTIP Agreement will contain further, mutually agreed commitments on regulatory cooperation. The Commission has not negotiated any lists of products to be excluded from the Agreement.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-000745/14
til Kommissionen
Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE)
(27. januar 2014)

Om: Sundheds- og miljømæssige konsekvenser af ILVA-værkerne i Italien

Den 26/9 2013 indledte Europa-Kommissionen en overtrædelsesprocedure mod Italien for at reducere miljøpåvirkningen fra ILVA-stålværkerne i Taranto (IP/13/866 af 2013/09/26).

Kommissionen fandt, at Italien ikke kunne garantere, at ILVA-værkerne, som er de største stålværker i Europa, opfylder EU-kravene om udledninger fra industri, hvilket har alvorlige konsekvenser for menneskers sundhed og for miljøet i området. Desuden handler Italien også i uoverensstemmelse med miljøansvarsdirektivet, som fastsætter princippet om at »forureneren betaler«. De fleste af problemerne i området skyldes, at man ikke har formået at kontrollere det høje niveau af udledninger af drivhusgasser, der genereres under stålproduktionsprocessen. I henhold til direktivet om integreret forebyggelse og forurening (IPPC-direktivet) skal aktiviteter med et højt luftforureningspotentiale have ansøgt om og fået tildelt de nødvendige tilladelser.

Luftkvaliteten i Taranto bliver forsat værre og værre. Ngo'en PeaceLink har givet Kommissionens generaldirektorat for miljø en række dokumenter, fotografier, videoer og rapporter, der bekræfter, at situationen ikke er blevet bedre, og at der er et akut sundheds- og miljømæssigt problem i Taranto.

Som følge heraf anmodes Kommissionen om at besvare følgende spørgsmål:

Hvornår og med hvilke foranstaltninger agter Kommissionen at fortsætte i forhold til overtrædelsesproceduren?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potočnik
(25. februar 2014)

Kommissionen har indledt en traktatbrudsprocedure med henblik på at sikre overholdelse af EU-retten og således sikre de italienske statsborgere de fordele, en sådan overholdelse bør medføre. Kommissionen vil i forbindelse med denne procedure vurdere oplysningerne fra klagerne og de italienske myndigheder og overveje, hvilke foranstaltninger der bør træffes, så snart proceduren er afsluttet.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000745/14
to the Commission
Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Health and environmental effects of the ILVA plant in Italy

On 26 September 2013, the Commission opened an infringement procedure against Italy in order to reduce the environmental impact of the ILVA steel plant in Taranto (IP/13/866 of 26/09/2013).

The Commission found that Italy was unable to ensure that the ILVA plant, Europe's largest iron and steel works, complies with EU requirements on industrial emissions, which has serious consequences for human health and the local environment. Italy is also failing to comply with the Environmental Liability Directive, which enacts the 'polluter pays' principle. Most of the problems in the area stem from a failure to control the high level of greenhouse gas emissions generated during the steel production process. Under the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) Directive, activities with a high air pollution potential must have applied for and been granted the necessary permits.

The air quality in Taranto continues to deteriorate. The NGO *PeaceLink* has given the Commission's Directorate-General for the Environment a number of documents, photos, videos and reports confirming that the situation has not improved and that there is an acute health and environmental problem in Taranto.

The Commission is therefore asked to answer the following question:

When and with what measures does the Commission intend to proceed with the infringement procedure?

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

The Commission has initiated the infringement procedure with a view to ensure compliance with the EC law and the benefits such compliance should confer in Italian citizens. In the context of this procedure, it is currently assessing the information received from the complainants and the Italian Authorities and will consider what are appropriate steps as soon as this is completed.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-000783/14
adresată Comisiei
George Sabin Cutaş (S&D)
(27 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Garantarea unui venit minim european

Conform indicatorilor Eurostat, în 2012, 124,5 milioane de persoane — 24,8 % din populația celor 28 de state membre UE — se aflau sub risc de sărăcie sau de excluziune socială. În contextul crizei economice și al politicilor de austeritate, aceste cifre continuă să crească de la un an la altul. Ratele cele mai ridicate se înregistrează în Bulgaria (49%), în România și Letonia (40% în ambele cazuri).

Având în vedere ca inegalitatea socială continuă să se adâncească, creând decalaje nu doar între statele membre, ci și între regiunile aceluiași stat, consider că este de datoria executivului european să inițieze o consultare cu scopul de a adopta o inițiativă legislativă privind un venit minim adecvat la nivel european.

Încă din octombrie 2010, Parlamentul European a adoptat o rezoluție referitoare la rolul venitului minim în lupta împotriva sărăciei și a cerut Comisiei Europene să vină cu o astfel de propunere. De asemenea, Comitetul Economic și Social European a adoptat pe 10 decembrie 2013 un aviz prin intermediul căruia se evidențiază nevoia urgentă de a garanta un venit minim corespunzător în Uniunea Europeană.

În contextul în care Carta drepturilor fundamentale a Uniunii Europene garantează respectarea și protejarea demnității umane (art.1), doresc să știu dacă executivul european analizează posibilitatea de finanțare a unui venit minim, inclusiv prin crearea unui fond european în acest sens.

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(24 februarie 2014)

Promovarea unui venit adecvat este unul dintre elementele fundamentale ale Recomandării Comisiei privind incluziunea activă din 2008. Statele membre s-au angajat să furnizeze strategii integrate de incluziune activă, bazate pe un sprijin pentru un venit adecvat, combinat cu măsuri pentru o piață a muncii care favorizează incluziunea și cu accesul la servicii de sprijin. În pachetul de măsuri privind investițiile sociale ([1]) adoptat la 20 februarie 2013 și în documentul de lucru al serviciilor Comisiei privind incluziunea activă care îl însoțește, Comisia analizează în mod detaliat modul în care statele membre au pus în aplicare recomandarea, subliniind cele mai bune practici din UE.

Comisia pune în aplicare în prezent un proiect-pilot solicitat de Parlamentul European în valoare de 1 milion EUR (2011), menit să promoveze crearea unei rețele privind venitul minim. De asemenea, Comisia a început să elaboreze o metodologie comună privind bugetele care pot servi drept referință pentru programele de asigurare a unui venit minim și care pot asigura astfel protecția persoanelor defavorizate.

Comisia nu are în vedere constituirea unui fond european specific pentru a asigura un venit minim garantat. Cu toate acestea, ea încurajează statele membre ale UE să utilizeze în mod optim FSE în special, să urmărească folosirea a cel puțin 20 % din acest fond pentru a promova incluziunea socială, inclusiv prin oferirea de sprijin în vederea elaborării, punerii în aplicare sau derulării unor programe de asigurare a unui venit minim (fără a furniza sprijin direct în numerar).

Conform articolului 51 din Carta drepturilor fundamentale a UE, dispozițiile acesteia se adresează statelor membre numai în cazul în care acestea pun în aplicare dreptul Uniunii. Aspectele legate de venitul minim țin de competența statelor membre și, prin urmare, este de datoria statelor membre să se asigure că își respectă obligațiile privind drepturile fundamentale.

([1]) COM(2013) 83 final: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000783/14
to the Commission
George Sabin Cutaş (S&D)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Guaranteed European minimum income

According to Eurostat, 124.5 million people, or 24.8% of the population in the 28 EU Member States, were at risk of poverty or social exclusion in 2012. In a context of economic crisis and austerity, this figure is continuing to increase from year to year, the highest levels being reported in Bulgaria (49%), Romania (40%) and Latvia (40%).

In view of the deepening social inequalities, creating disparities between not only Member States but also regions of the same country, it is arguably the duty of the Commission to initiate discussions with a view establishing an adequate statutory European minimum income.

As early as October 2010, the European Parliament adopted a resolution concerning a minimum income as a means of combating poverty and called on the Commission to submit a proposal along these lines. Similarly, on 10 December 2013 the Economic and Social Committee adopted an opinion stressing the urgent need for an adequate guaranteed minimum income in the European Union.

Given that Article 1 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union states that human dignity is inviolable and must be respected and protected, is the Commission considering the financial possibilities of ensuring a minimum income, for example by setting up a European fund for this purpose?

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

Promoting adequate income is one of the pillars of the Commission Recommendation of 2008 on active inclusion. Member States have committed themselves to provide integrated active inclusion strategies based on adequate income support combined with inclusive labour market measures and access to enabling services. In its Social Investment Package ([1]) adopted on 20 February 2013 and the annexed Staff Working Document on active inclusion, the Commission makes a detailed analysis on how Member States implemented the recommendation, evidencing best practices across the EU.

The Commission is currently implementing a European Parliament commissioned Pilot Project of EUR 1 million (2011) to promote the creation of a minimum income network. The Commission has also started to develop a common methodology on reference budgets that can serve as a benchmark for minimum income schemes and thus ensure protection of the most disadvantaged.

The Commission is not considering setting up a specific European fund in order to ensure a guaranteed minimum income. However, it encourages EU Member States to make the best use of the ESF in particular, in pursuing the minimum share of 20% of this fund for social inclusion, including support to design, implement, or pilot minimum income schemes (without providing direct cash assistance).

According to Article 51 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the provisions of the Charter are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law. The issue of minimum income is a national competence and it is thus for Member States to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights are respected.

([1]) COM(2013) 83 final : http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor P-000784/14
upućeno Komisiji
Nikola Vuljanić (GUE/NGL)
(27. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Radnička prava u Hrvatskoj i EU-u

Novi prijedlog Zakona o radu u Hrvatskoj predlaže da se u određenom razdoblju može raditi i do 60 sati tjedno, otkazivanje ugovora trudnicama, smanjenje otkaznog roka te fleksibilnije zapošljavanje koje pogoduje poslodavcima, a nikako radnicima. Taj novi prijedlog zakona pogoduje i velikim trgovačkim centrima koji ne samo da iskorištavaju radnike, već im pritom umanjuju teško stečena radnička prava.

Ovim paketom zakona Hrvatska se smješta na samo dno po pitanju radničkih prava. Zaposlenici u trgovačkim centrima moraju raditi nedjelje koje im nisu plaćene i prekovremeni sati se ne plaćaju. Isti trgovački lanci u Hrvatskoj nerijetko rade i do ponoći te nedjeljama, dok se iste trgovine u drugim državama članicama zatvaraju već u 18 sati a nedjelje su slobodne.

Koji je stav Komisije po pitanju radničkih prava u Hrvatskoj? Zar ne bi bilo bolje da se zbog prava radnika ujednače zakoni u državama članicama do određenog minimuma, jer vidimo da sustav inspekcija ne daje željene rezultate pa se dolazi do zaključka da su radnici u drugim državama članicama zaštićeniji nego u Hrvatskoj?

Odgovor g. Andora u ime Komisije
(27. veljače 2014.)

Komisiji je poznato da nadležne hrvatske ustanove trenutačno raspravljaju o nacrtu zakona o radu koji je spomenuo poštovani zastupnik.

U pogledu određenih aspekata radnog vremena, Direktivom o radnom vremenu ([1]) postavljaju se minimalni standardi za zaštitu zdravlja i sigurnosti radnika u cijelom EU-u. Konkretno, Direktivom se utvrđuje maksimalno prosječno tjedno radno vrijeme, uključujući prekovremeni rad, od 48 sati (izračunanih tijekom referentnog razdoblja od četiri mjeseca) te minimalno dnevno (11 uzastopnih sati) i tjedno razdoblje odmora (24 sata neprekidnog odmora, pored 11 sati dnevnog odmora).

To su minimalni standardi te se nacionalnim zakonima može osigurati povoljnija razina zaštite radnika. Države članice također mogu uvesti odstupanja od ovih odredbi u određenim slučajevima.

U Direktivi nisu određeni niti dan za minimalan tjedni odmor, koji određuju države članice, niti plaća za radno vrijeme ili prekovremeni rad. U skladu s člankom 153. stavkom 5. Ugovora o funkcioniranju Europske unije, pitanje plaća u nadležnosti je država članica.

Komisija će pažljivo pratiti stanje i poduzeti potrebne mjere ako ustanovi da nacionalno zakonodavstvo nije u skladu s relevantnim propisima EU-a, primjerice o ograničavanju prosječnog tjednog radnog vremena prema odredbama Direktive o radnom vremenu.

([1]) Direktiva 2003/88/EZ Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 4. studenoga 2003. o određenim vidovima organizacije radnog vremena, SL L 299, 18.11.2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000784/14
to the Commission
Nikola Vuljanić (GUE/NGL)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Labour rights in Croatia and the EU

A new Croatian draft labour law proposes allowing workers to work up to 60 hours per week over specified periods, revoking the contracts of pregnant women, reducing notice periods and making employment more flexible. These changes favour employers at the expense of workers. This new draft law also gives preferential treatment to large shopping centres that not only exploit their employees, but also chip at away at their hard-won labour rights.

This package of laws will put Croatia at the very bottom of the table in terms of labour rights. Shopping centre employees are required to work on Sundays and do overtime, both unpaid. Stores belonging to the same chains sometimes remain open until midnight on Sundays in Croatia, while in other EU Member States they close as early as 18.00 and remain closed on Sundays.

What is the Commission's position on the issue of labour rights in Croatia? Would it not be an improvement to harmonise laws on labour rights in the Member States and to set minimum standards? We see that the inspection system is not providing the desired outcomes and must conclude that workers in other Member States are better protected than those in Croatia.

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

The Commission is aware that the draft labour law referred to by the Honourable Member is presently being discussed by the competent Croatian institutions.

As regards certain aspects of working time, the Working Time Directive ([1]) sets minimum standards for the protection of workers' health and safety across the EU. In particular, it lays down a maximum average weekly working time, including overtime, of 48 hours (calculated over a reference period of four months), and minimum daily (11 consecutive hours) and weekly rest periods (24 hours of uninterrupted rest, in addition to the 11 hours' daily rest).

Those are minimum standards and national law may provide for a more favourable level of worker protection. The Member States can also introduce derogations from those provisions in certain cases.

The directive neither specifies the day on which the minimum weekly rest has to be provided, which is a matter for the Member State, nor does it deal with pay for working time or overtime. In accordance with Article 153(5) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the issue of pay falls within the competence of the Member State.

The Commission will closely monitor the situation and take the necessary steps if national legislation would be found not to be in line with the relevant EC law, such as the limit to average weekly working time as laid down in the Working Time Directive.

([1]) Directive 2003/88/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 November 2003 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time, OJ L 299, 18.11.2003.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000796/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(27 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Consecuencias de la secesión de una comunidad autónoma de España — Cataluña

Varias han sido las ocasiones en que la Comisión ha respondido que la secesión de una parte del territorio de un Estado miembro supone la exclusión de ese territorio de la Unión Europea.

Sabe también la Comisión que en España una de sus comunidades autónomas, Cataluña, ha dado varios pasos para iniciar un proceso de secesión. Junto a declaraciones de sus instituciones sobre la convocatoria de un referéndum, realiza también campañas publicitarias, en las que airean prejuicios, descalifican a la sociedad democrática española, incitan a sentimientos de rechazo y victimismo, etc.

Por todo ello, como considero que la Comisión a la que me dirijo será consciente de los riesgos de este conflicto y que, al menos mientras se desarrolle este largo proceso político, volverían a restaurarse las fronteras de ese territorio con España y Francia, comportando ello, entre otras consecuencias, una quiebra del mercado interior actualmente existente, pregunto:

1. ¿Qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión para que no se perjudique el comercio entre los actuales Estados de la Unión como consecuencia del nacimiento de una nueva frontera?

2. ¿Qué posición piensa adoptar ya en relación con los proyectos europeos en curso de infraestructuras de transporte, energía u otros de los que se beneficia ese territorio?

3. ¿Qué instrumentos pondrá en pie para proteger a los inversores europeos, teniendo en cuenta las abultadas cifras de déficit y deuda pública de la actual Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña?

4. ¿Qué piensa hacer con los procedimientos hoy en marcha de solicitud de ayudas de los fondos europeos?

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

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a sus respuestas a las preguntas parlamentarias E-008133/2012, P-009756/2012 y P-009862/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000796/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: The consequences of an autonomous community seceding from Spain — Catalonia

On many occasions, the Commission has given answers stating that the secession of part of the territory of a Member State would lead to that territory being excluded from the European Union.

The Commission also knows that one of Spain's autonomous Communities — Catalonia — has taken a number of steps to initiate a secession process. In addition to making announcements through its institutions that it intends to hold a referendum, it is also conducting publicity campaigns to air prejudices, discredit the democratic society of Spain, promote feelings of rejection and victimisation, etc.

In light of the above, since I believe that the Commission that I am addressing will be aware of the risks of this conflict and of the fact that, at least while this long political process is developing, the borders between this territory and France and Spain would be reinstated, which would result in, *inter alia*, a rupture in the internal market in its current form, could I ask:

1. What measures is the Commission thinking of taking to ensure that trade between current EU States is not adversely affected by the creation of a new border?

2. What stance is it now thinking of adopting in relation to on-going European infrastructure projects in the transport and energy sectors, among others, from which this territory is benefiting?

3. What mechanisms will be put in place to protect European investors, bearing in mind the present Autonomous Community of Catalonia's hefty deficit and public debt figures?

4. What is it thinking of doing about any outstanding applications for assistance from European funds?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its replies to parliamentary questions E-008133/2012, P-009756/2012, and P-009862/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000802/14
to the Commission
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Flu vaccination

Between 5% and 15% of the population of the northern hemisphere is affected by flu every year. This translates into 40 000 excess deaths in a moderate season and as many as 220 000 in a severe epidemic. Vaccination reduces the risk of serious complications or death in the elderly by 70-85% and is the cheapest and most efficient way to prevent flu.

In 2009, EU health ministers adopted a Council recommendation encouraging Member States to adopt plans or policies with the aim of reaching, by the 2014-2015 winter season, a vaccination coverage of 75% for older age groups and, if possible, other risk groups as well.

In fact, by the 2011-2012 flu season, in the 18 EU Member States for which we have information, the average vaccination rate for over-65s stood at just 47%.

The recent Commission staff working document on the state of play as regards implementation of the Council recommendation states that among the barriers reported by countries as reasons for individuals not being vaccinated are 'issues of cost, availability and convenience'.

This highlights the fact that there is a pressing need to increase vaccination rates and find new and innovative ways of increasing vaccination coverage.

Flu vaccinations are administered in pharmacy by pharmacists in three Member States (Portugal, Ireland, the UK). Studies have shown that vaccination in pharmacy increases patient choice and convenience, allowing individuals to be vaccinated at a time and place which are convenient to them. The service is popular and satisfaction rates are high. In those countries in which pharmacists administer vaccinations, the overall vaccination rate increases, providing benefits to patients and to government health budgets.

While the Commission staff working document lists 'ideas for improvement', what specific action is the Commission taking to ensure that the 75% coverage target is reached by the 2014-2015 winter season? Will the Commission encourage Member States to allow pharmacist-led vaccination in order to reach this target?

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

Since they fall under national competence, vaccination programmes vary across the EU. According to Decision 1082/2013/EU on serious cross-border threats to health ([1]), the Commission will strengthen cooperation and activities with the Member States to improve the methods and processes through which information related to the coverage of vaccine-preventable diseases is provided. In this regard, the Commission is supporting the Member States in maintaining or increasing coverage against vaccine-preventable diseases.

The Commission Staff Working Document on seasonal influenza ([2]) aims to support the development of vaccination policies in the Member States. Therefore, ideas for development raised in this document should be considered as options that Member States may consider as supporting their efforts to reach the targets set under the Council Recommendation on seasonal influenza vaccination ([3]). In this context, the Commission will organise a meeting with all stakeholders involved, providing them the opportunity to share best practices and agree on how to improve vaccination coverage rates.

([1]) OJ L 293, 5.11.2013, p. 1.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/vaccination/docs/seasonflu_staffwd2014_en.pdf
([3]) OJ L 348, 29.12.2009, p. 71.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000825/14
alla Commissione
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(28 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Erasmus+ Call for proposals

Erasmus+ è un programma di fondamentale importanza per i cittadini di tutta l'Unione e, in quanto tale, dovrebbe permettere la partecipazione del massimo numero di soggetti possibile.

Considerando che le lingue ufficiali dell'Unione sono 24 e che sul sito dedicato al programma Erasmus+ le informazioni sono in maggior parte scritte attualmente solo in lingua inglese.

Considerando che le informazioni contenute sul sito non saranno disponibili in lingua italiana prima dell'aprile 2014 e che la prima scadenza per la presentazione di progetti per il programma è fissata al 17 marzo 2014.

La Commissione intende provvedere a correggere questa mancanza che crea un ingiusto vantaggio per i cittadini dei paesi anglofoni rispetto al resto della popolazione europea?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(28 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione può confermare di aver pubblicato l'invito a presentare proposte relativo al programma Erasmus+ in 23 lingue ufficiali dell'UE in data 12.12.2013, vale a dire il giorno successivo all'adozione del programma da parte del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio.

Il sito Internet di Erasmus+ è attualmente disponibile in tutte le lingue ufficiali dell'UE. Inoltre, la Commissione sta ora perfezionando il sito dedicato all'istruzione e alla formazione «Education and Training» sul server Europa, che verrà tradotto quanto prima.

La Commissione ha invitato tutte le agenzie nazionali, chiamate ad attuare per suo conto il programma Erasmus+ a livello nazionale, a fornire ai potenziali richiedenti, nelle rispettive lingue, tutte le necessarie informazioni sull'invito a presentare proposte. Anche sui siti delle agenzie nazionali sono reperibili informazioni concernenti il nuovo programma nella lingua del paese interessato. Ai fini della relativa presentazione, le domande possono essere redatte in una qualsiasi delle lingue ufficiali.

Dato che l'invito a presentare proposte Erasmus+ è stato tradotto in tutte le lingue ufficiali dell'UE e visto il sostegno fornito dalle agenzie nazionali, la Commissione non ritiene che sia stato penalizzato alcun gruppo di potenziali richiedenti.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000825/14
to the Commission
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Erasmus+ call for proposals

Erasmus+ is a programme of fundamental importance for people throughout the Union and, as such, should be open to as many potential participants as possible.

While there are 24 official EU languages, most of the information provided on the Erasmus+ Programme website is currently only available in English.

That information will not be available in Italian until the end of April 2014, when the deadline for the submission of projects under the programme has been set at 17 March 2014.

In the light of the above, can the Commission state whether it plans to remedy this failing, which gives citizens of English-speaking countries an unfair advantage over the rest of the European public?

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

The Commission can confirm that it launched the call for proposals for the Erasmus+ programme in 23 official EU languages on 12/12/2013, the day after the adoption of the programme by the European Parliament and Council.

The Erasmus+ website is currently available in all official EU languages. Furthermore, the Commission is currently upgrading the Education and Training website on the Europa server; its translation will be ensured as soon as possible.

The Commission has instructed all National Agencies, which implement Erasmus+ on behalf of the Commission at national level, to provide potential applicants with all necessary supporting information on the call for proposals in their own language. The National Agencies' websites also provide information on the new programme in the language of the country. Applications can be submitted in any official language.

Given that the Erasmus+ call for proposals was translated into all official EU languages and given the support available from National Agencies, the Commission does not consider that any group of potential applicants has been put at a disadvantage.