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 357/01)

Treść Strona

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003830/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Droit d'auteur

Concernant la modernisation du droit d'auteur au niveau européen, la juste rémunération des créateurs via un système de «copyright» moderne et adapté est un principe essentiel. La consultation publique lancée à l'occasion de cette modernisation a reçu quelque 10 000 réponses.

Que peut-on retirer de cette consultation?

Quels ont été les avis émis et les idées directrices?

Quelle est la position de la Commission?

Quel est l'agenda européen?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(12 juin 2014)

Conformément à la communication de la Commission du 18 décembre 2012 ([1]), la rémunération des titulaires de droits s'inscrit dans le cadre du réexamen des règles en matière de droits d'auteur de l'UE.

À la suite de la consultation publique, la Commission a reçu un grand nombre de réponses dépendant des différents secteurs des industries créatives. Une synthèse sera prochainement publiée.

La Commission est actuellement en train de réexaminer les règles en matière de droits d'auteur de l'UE. Une fois que cet exercice sera achevé, la Commission prendra une décision sur la voie à suivre.

([1]) COM(2012)789 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003830/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Copyright

With regard to the modernisation of copyright at European level, the equitable remuneration of authors by means of an up-to-date and appropriate system is a basic principle. The public consultation launched for the purpose of this modernisation received some 10 000 responses.

What can we learn from this consultation?

What advice and guidelines have been issued?

What is the position of the Commission?

What is the European agenda?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The remuneration of rightholders forms part of the review of the EU copyright rules as set out in the Commission Communication of 18 December 2012. ([1])

The Commission received a wide variety of responses to the public consultation, which are dependent on the different sectors of the creative industries. A summary will be published soon.

The Commission is currently reviewing the EU copyright rules. Once this exercise is completed, the Commission will decide on the way forward.

([1]) COM(2012) 789 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003831/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Taxation des livres

La taxation des livres papier et numériques sera revue par la Commission européenne, a-t-il été annoncé.

Quels sont précisément les plans de la Commission en la matière?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(5 mai 2014)

La Commission est toujours engagée dans le processus d'analyse d'impact sur la révision de la structure existante des taux de TVA à laquelle elle a fait référence dans sa réponse à la question écrite P-011981/2013 posée par Sophia in 't Veld ([1]).

À ce stade, la Commission n'est pas en mesure de formuler des commentaires sur le contenu des futures initiatives qui pourraient découler de cette évaluation.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003831/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Taxation of books

It has been announced that the taxation of paper and digital books is to be reviewed by the Commission.

What exactly are the Commission's plans in this regard?

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

The Commission is still involved in the impact assessment process on the review of the current VAT rates structure to which it referred in its answer to Written Question P-011981/2013 by Sophia in 't Veld ([1]).

At this stage, the Commission is unable to comment on the content of future initiatives that may result from this evaluation.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003832/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Perturbateurs endocriniens

Comment la Commission justifie-t-elle sa décision de reporter l'annonce des critères scientifiques retenus pour définir les perturbateurs endocriniens?

La Commission ne s'était-elle pourtant pas engagée à les annoncer?

Pourquoi la Commission fait fi du rapport que nous, députés européens, avions adopté le 14 mars, qui comporte des recommandations «sur la protection de la santé publique contre les perturbateurs endocriniens»?

La Commission perçoit-elle réellement l'urgence du problème? Un report de la publication le temps que la nouvelle Commission se constitue ne donne-t-il pas l'impression que les procédures bureaucratiques priment la santé et la prévention de maladies chroniques?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(22 mai 2014)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à prendre connaissance de sa réponse à la question écrite E-002485/2014 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003832/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Endocrine disruptors

How does the Commission justify its decision to postpone the announcement of the scientific criteria used to define endocrine disruptors?

Had the Commission not pledged to announce them?

Why is the Commission ignoring the report that we, Members of the European Parliament, adopted on 14 March, which includes recommendations 'on the protection of public health from endocrine disruptors'?

Does the Commission really not see the urgency of the problem? Does the postponement of such publication, pending the establishment of the new Commission, not give the impression that bureaucratic procedures are taking precedence over health and chronic disease prevention?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written question E-002485/2014 ([1]).

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003833/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Recherche sur l'embryon

Vendredi 28 février, la Commission européenne a officiellement validé une initiative citoyenne européenne qui vise à faire interdire le financement par l'Union européenne de la recherche impliquant la destruction de l'embryon humain.

Lancée en mai 2012 sur l'idée d'un eurodéputé membre du Parti populaire européen, de centre droit, l'initiative «Un de nous» a recueilli 1,7 million de signatures dans 19 pays de l'Union — un minimum d'un million de signatures, collectées dans au moins sept pays de l'Union, avec un seuil par pays, est prévu par le règlement.

La bioéthique ne relève pas du champ de compétences de l'Union. Les promoteurs de «Un de nous» se fondent néanmoins sur un arrêt de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne rendu en octobre 2011, qui avait interdit de breveter une invention «qui requiert la destruction préalable d'embryons humains ou leur utilisation comme matériau de départ».

De leur point de vue, les fonds européens finançant la recherche sur l'embryon entrent en contradiction avec les principes affirmés par ce texte. Débloqués dans le cadre de divers programmes, ces fonds se seraient élevés à 50 millions d'euros sur la période 2007-2013.

Dans la proposition de «Un de nous», l'interdiction doit porter sur trois domaines: le budget de l'Union en général, le financement des programmes de recherche et l'aide au développement, qui peut, selon les défenseurs de l'initiative, soutenir indirectement des programmes d'avortement.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission en la matière?

2. Quels sont ses arguments pour contrer ces propositions rétrogrades?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Geoghegan-Quinn au nom de la Commission
(12 mai 2014)

L'initiative citoyenne a été présentée à la Commission.

Les représentants de la Commission ont rencontré les organisateurs le 9 avril 2014 afin que ces derniers puissent exposer en détail les raisons motivant leur initiative. Les organisateurs ont eu la possibilité de présenter leur initiative lors d'une audition publique au Parlement européen le 10 avril 2014.

Le 28 mai 2014 au plus tard, la Commission exposera dans une communication ses conclusions juridiques et politiques sur l'initiative citoyenne, les mesures qu'elle compte prendre, le cas échéant, et ses raisons pour prendre ou ne pas prendre de mesures. Cette communication sera notifiée aux organisateurs ainsi qu'au Parlement européen et au Conseil et sera rendue publique. La Commission ne peut d'ici là faire aucun commentaire sur sa position.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003833/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Embryonic research

On Friday 28 February, the Commission officially validated a European Citizens' Initiative that aims to ban European Union funding for research involving the destruction of human embryos.

Launched in May 2012, based on an idea of an MEP and member of the centre-right European People's Party, the 'One of Us' initiative has gathered 1.7 million signatures in 19 countries of the EU. The regulation requires a minimum of one million signatures collected in at least seven EU countries, with a minimum number of signatures per country.

Bioethics does not fall within the powers of the European Union. Nevertheless, the promoters of 'One of Us' base their argument on a judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union delivered in October 2011. That judgment ruled against the patentability of an invention that 'requires the prior destruction of human embryos or their use as base material'.

In the view of the promoters, European funds financing embryonic research run counter to the principles established in the aforesaid ruling. The funds in question were released within the framework of various programmes and are thought to total EUR 50 million over the period 2007 to 2013.

According to the proposal of 'One of Us', the ban should cover three areas: the EU budget in general, funding for research programmes, and development aid which could, according to the initiative's defenders, indirectly support abortion programmes.

1. What is the Commission's position on this matter?

2. What are its arguments to counter these retrograde proposals?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(12 May 2014)

The citizen's initiative has now been presented to the Commission.

Commission representatives met the organisers on April 9, 2014 so they could explain in detail the issues raised by their initiative. The organisers had the opportunity to present their initiative at a public hearing in the European Parliament on April 10, 2014.

By 28 May, 2014 the Commission will set out in a communication its legal and political conclusions on the citizen's initiative, the action it intends to take, if any, and its reasons for taking or not taking that action. This communication will be notified to the organisers as well as to the European Parliament and the Council and will be made public; until then the Commission cannot comment its position.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003834/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Retardateurs de flammes

Les retardateurs de flammes bromés sont-ils un problème? Les hexabromocyclododécanes (HBCD), les polybromodiphényléthers (PBDE) et les tétrabromobisphénol A sont-ils inoffensifs?

Un grand nombre des retardateurs de flammes bromés sont persistants, bioaccumulables et toxiques pour l'homme comme pour l'environnement. Ils sont suspectés de produire des effets neurocomportementaux et d'entraîner une perturbation endocrinienne, et ont été décelés dans le biote. Ces retardateurs de flammes se retrouvent in fine dans les denrées alimentaires, et en particulier dans les graisses animales.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission en la matière?

2. Les connaissances scientifiques relatives à ces substances sont insuffisantes, alors que les retardateurs sont présents dans un très grand nombre de produits. La Commission pourrait-elle ordonner ou faire ordonner une étude poussée à ce sujet?

Les voitures, les meubles, les matériaux de construction, les jouets ou encore les équipements électriques et électroniques contiennent ainsi des retardateurs de flammes.

4. L'Efsa avait publié une série de six avis, pour ensuite demander des données supplémentaires sur les concentrations dans les denrées alimentaires et chez l'homme. Quelle a été la suite donnée à cette demande?

5. Quel est l'agenda s'il y en a un?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(13 mai 2014)

Comme la persistance des retardateurs de flammes bromés dans l'environnement pourrait susciter des préoccupations concernant la chaîne alimentaire, en juin 2009, la Commission a demandé à l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) de donner un avis scientifique sur la présence de retardateurs de flammes bromés dans l'alimentation.

Les six avis scientifiques émis sur une période de deux ans s'achevant en septembre 2012 couvrent chacun une ou plusieurs catégories de ce groupe de substances, y compris les nouveaux retardateurs de flamme bromés. Suite à une discussion approfondie de ces avis avec les experts des États membres en 2013, il a été organisé au niveau de l'UE pour 2014 et 2015 un exercice de surveillance ([1]) axé sur la présence des retardateurs de flammes bromés en question relevée par les avis de l'EFSA dans des denrées alimentaires dans lesquelles ils pourraient présenter un danger pour les consommateurs, telles que les œufs, le lait, la viande et les produits dérivés, les graisses et huiles animales et végétales, le poisson et les autres produits de la mer ainsi que les produits destinés à une alimentation particulière et les aliments pour nourrissons et enfants en bas âge.

Sur la base des premiers résultats du contrôle des denrées alimentaires obtenus en 2014, une recommandation concernant les aliments pour animaux pourrait suivre en 2015. Les prochaines étapes seront décidées en fonction des résultats de l'exercice de surveillance organisé au niveau de l'UE.

([1]) Recommandation 2014/118/UE de la Commission sur la surveillance des traces de retardateurs de flamme bromés dans les denrées alimentaires (JO L 65 du 5.3.2014, p. 39).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003834/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Flame retardants

Are brominated flame retardants problematic? Are hexabromocyclododecanes (HBCDs), polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) and Tetrabromobisphenol A (TBBPAs) harmless?

A significant number of brominated flame retardants are persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic, both for humans and for the environment. They are suspected of producing neurobehavioural effects and of causing endocrine disruption. They have also been detected in the biota. Indeed, these flame retardants are found in food substances, especially in animal fats.

1. What is the Commission's position on this matter?

2. Scientific understanding of these substances is insufficient, given that retardants are present in a very large number of products. Could the Commission conduct a study, or arrange for one to be conducted, on this subject?

Cars, furniture, building materials and toys, as well as electrical and electronic equipment, also contain flame retardants.

4. EFSA has published a series of six scientific opinions and subsequently requested further data on the levels present in food substances and among people. What was the outcome of that request?

5. What plans are there, if any?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2014)

As the persistence of brominated flame retardants (BFRs) in the environment could potentially lead to levels of concern in the food chain, the Commission requested the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) in June 2009 to deliver a scientific opinion on the presence of brominated flame retardants in food.

The six resulting scientific opinions delivered over a period of two years ending September 2012 each cover one or more classes of this group of substances including emerging and novel BFRs. Following thorough discussion of these opinions with the Member States' experts during 2013, an EU wide monitoring exercise ([1]) was organised during 2014 and 2015 focusing on the presence of relevant BFRs identified by the EFSA's opinions in food commodities of concern for dietary consumer exposure such as eggs, milk, meat and derived products, animal and vegetable fats and oils, fish and other seafood as well as products for specific nutritional uses and food for infants and young children.

Based on the first results of the monitoring of food in 2014, a recommendation as regards the monitoring of animal feed could follow in 2015. Further steps will be decided depending on the outcome of the EU wide monitoring exercise.

([1]) Commission Recommendation 2014/118/EU on the monitoring of traces of brominated flame retardants in food (OJ L 65, 5.3.2014, p. 39).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003836/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Solvay et Ineos

Suite à la décision de la Commission européenne de poursuivre l'évaluation en Phase II de leur projet de coentreprise à 50/50 dans les activités chloro-vinyles, Solvay et Ineos ont convenu de proposer conjointement un ensemble de solutions pour répondre aux préoccupations soulevées par la Commission quant à l'évolution de l'environnement concurrentiel sur ce marché. Les solutions proposées à la Commission européenne portent sur la cession des usines de PVC situées à Schkopau (Allemagne), Beek (Pays-Bas) et Mazingarbe (France) et des unités de production de chlore-alcali d'EDC et VCM à Tessenderlo (Belgique). Ces usines, qui sont actuellement opérées par INEOS, occupent une place stratégique dans le secteur chimique en Europe.

Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

Sur quoi se base-t-elle pour prendre cette nouvelle décision?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(29 avril 2014)

Le 27 février 2014, Ineos et Solvay (les «parties notifiantes») ont rendu publique ([1]) leur proposition de céder les actifs mentionnés dans la question.

Le 11 mars 2014, les parties notifiantes ont annoncé publiquement, sur leurs sites web respectifs ([2]), leur décision de proposer deux autres choix possibles, à savoir «i) les actifs du patrimoine issus de LVM (Beek aux Pays-Bas, Mazingarbe en France et Tessenderlo en Belgique), ainsi que les usines de PVC et de chlorure de vinyle monomère à Wilhelmshaven (Allemagne) et ii) éventuellement, les usines de dichlorure d'éthylène et de membranes de chlore à Runcorn (Royaume-Uni), qui sont exploitées par Ineos».

L'enquête de la Commission n'est pas encore achevée. La date limite fixée pour la décision est le 16 mai 2014. Dans sa décision en vertu de l'article 8 du règlement (CE) nº 139/2004 du Conseil du 20 janvier 2004 relatif au contrôle des concentrations entre entreprises, la Commission expliquera en détail sa réponse définitive à la question de savoir s'il convient d'approuver, ou non, l'opération notifiée entre les parties notifiantes.

([1]) Voir les communiqués de presse respectifs, http://www.ineos.com/News/INEOS-Group/Solvay-INEOS-submit-revised-remedy-package/?business=INEOS+Group et http://www.solvay.com/en/media/press_releases/20140228-INEOS-EC.html

([2]) http://www.ineos.com/News/INEOS-Group/Final-phase-EU-clearance/ et http://www.solvay.com/en/media/press_releases/20140311-Ineos-EC.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003836/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Solvay and Ineos

Following the Commission decision to continue the Phase II evaluation of their 50/50 chloro-vinyl joint venture, Solvay and Ineos have agreed to jointly propose a set of solutions to address the concerns raised by the Commission relating to competition in this market. The solutions proposed to the Commission regard the divestment of the PVC plants in Schkopau (Germany), Beek (Netherlands) and Mazingarbe (France) and the chlor-alkali, EDC and VCM production units in Tessenderlo (Belgium). These plants, currently operated by INEOS, are strategically important within the European chemicals sector.

What is the Commission's reaction to this?

On what basis will it take its new decision?

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

On 27 February 2014 INEOS and Solvay ('the Notifying Parties') made public ([1]) their proposal to divest the assets mentioned in the question.

On 11 March 2014, the Notifying Parties publicly announced on their respective websites ([2]) their decision to propose two other alternative options, that is, '(i) the LVM heritage assets (Beek in The Netherlands, Mazingarbe in France and Tessenderlo in Belgium) as well as the PVC and VCM plants at Wilhelmshaven (Germany) and (ii) potentially the EDC and chlorine membrane plants at Runcorn (UK) which are operated by INEOS'.

The Commission's investigation is still underway. The final deadline for a decision is 16 May 2014. In its decision, based on Article 8 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 of 20 January 2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings, the Commission will fully explain its final position on whether to approve, or not, the notified operation between the Notifying Parties.

([1]) See their respective press releases, http://www.ineos.com/News/INEOS-Group/Solvay-INEOS-submit-revised-remedy-package/?business=INEOS+Group and http://www.solvay.com/en/media/press_releases/20140228-INEOS-EC.html

([2]) http://www.ineos.com/News/INEOS-Group/Final-phase-EU-clearance/ and http://www.solvay.com/en/media/press_releases/20140311-Ineos-EC.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003838/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Erasmus & Suisse

Le porte-parole de la Commission européenne a confirmé que la Suisse sera suspendue du programme européen Erasmus+ dès l'année académique 2014-2015.

Les étudiants suisses seront exclus du programme européen Erasmus+ à partir de la prochaine année académique 2014-2015, soit dès le semestre d'automne 2014. Les universitaires qui sont déjà à l'étranger dans le cadre de ce programme pourront continuer leur cursus. Mais ils pourraient bien être les derniers Suisses à en profiter, a précisé un porte-parole européen à l'ATS (Agence télégraphique suisse).

1. Que répond la Commission aux étudiants suisses qui expliquent dans un communiqué que «cette décision met à mort la dimension internationale du paysage suisse de la formation» et qu'ils ne peuvent «tolérer que la formation et la recherche soient sacrifiées sur l'autel des négociations politiques»?

2. Pourquoi la première sanction de la votation doit-elle viser la jeunesse et l'avenir plutôt que les transferts de capitaux, par exemple?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(23 mai 2014)

La Suisse a adhéré au programme Erasmus, qui promeut la mobilité des étudiants et du personnel universitaire, en 2011.

À la suite du référendum du 9 février, le gouvernement suisse a indiqué qu'il n'était pas en mesure de signer et conclure le protocole étendant l'accord UE-Suisse sur la libre circulation des personnes à la Croatie ni de garantir aux citoyens croates le bénéfice de la libre circulation vers la Suisse.

Le Conseil a subordonné la conclusion des négociations sur l'association et la participation de la Suisse aux programmes Horizon 2020 et Erasmus+ à la conclusion de ce protocole. La Commission européenne a par conséquent mis en veilleuse la négociation de ces accords. La décision de ne pas continuer sur la voie de la pleine participation de la Suisse au programme Erasmus+ ne «punit» ni ne «sanctionne» la volonté exprimée par l'électorat suisse, mais est une conséquence logique du choix que la Suisse a elle-même posé, conséquence qui était bien connue avant.

La Commission européenne respecte pleinement la tradition suisse de démocratie directe. Elle ne peut toutefois fermer les yeux sur la discrimination de l'un de ses États membres.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003838/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Erasmus and Switzerland

A spokesperson for the European Commission has confirmed that Switzerland will not participate in the European Erasmus+ programme as of the 2014-15 academic year.

Swiss students will be excluded from the European Erasmus+ programme as of the next academic year, 2014-15, i.e. from the 2014 autumn term. Those undergraduates who are already abroad, within the framework of the programme, will be able to continue with their studies. However, they could well be the last Swiss citizens to benefit from it, as a European spokesperson explained to the Swiss Telegraphic Agency (ATS).

1. Swiss students have issued a statement saying 'this decision sounds the death knell for the international aspect of the Swiss educational panorama'. The statement goes on to say that they cannot 'accept that education and research should be sacrificed on the altar of political negotiations'. What is the response of the Commission to those students?

2. Why must the first act of sanction against the Swiss referendum target the young and the future rather than, for example, money transfers?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2014)

Switzerland joined the Erasmus programme which promotes the mobility of students and university staff in 2011.

Following the popular vote of 9 February, the Swiss government has indicated that it is not in a position to sign and conclude the protocol extending the EU-Swiss agreement on the free movement of persons to Croatia and to guarantee the benefit of free movement to Switzerland to Croatian citizens.

The Council made the conclusion of negotiations on Swiss association and participation in Horizon 2020 and Erasmus+ dependent on the conclusion of this protocol. The European Commission has consequently put negotiations of these agreements on hold. The decision not to go ahead with the full participation of Switzerland in Erasmus+ is not a 'punishment' or 'sanction' for the expression of the Swiss electorate, but a logical consequence of the choice Switzerland itself has made, a consequence which was well-known before.

The European Commission fully respects the Swiss tradition of direct democracy. It can however, not overlook the discrimination against one of its Member States.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003839/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Règlement bio: stop aux dérogations

Suite au processus de consultation débuté en 2012, la Commission vient de présenter une proposition de nouveau règlement relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques.

La proposition est axée sur plusieurs objectifs: préserver la confiance des consommateurs, conserver la confiance des producteurs et faciliter l'accès à la filière biologique pour les agriculteurs. Le but est de veiller à ce que l'agriculture biologique reste fidèle à ses principes et à ses objectifs, de façon à répondre à la demande du public en termes de respect de l'environnement et de qualité.

La Commission propose de renforcer et d'harmoniser les règles applicables tant au sein de l'Union européenne qu'en ce qui concerne les produits importés, en supprimant une grande partie des dérogations en matière de production et de contrôle.

Combien y a-t-il de dérogations pour l'instant? Quel manque à gagner cela représente-t-il?

Quels sont les objectifs chiffrés de la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M.Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(19 mai 2014)

L'actuelle législation relative à la production biologique autorise une certaine souplesse dans les règles de production, comme cela est prévu par l'article 22 du règlement (CE) n°834/2007 du Conseil ([1]). Ces règles exceptionnelles sont décrites de manière plus détaillée dans le chapitre 6 du titre II du règlement (CE) nº 889/2008 ([2]) de la Commission. Elles concernent en particulier l'attache des animaux, la production parallèle, l'utilisation d'animaux non biologiques, l'utilisation de matières premières non biologiques riches en protéines pour l'alimentation animale, l'utilisation de semences ou de matériel de reproduction végétative non biologiques, et les catastrophes.

Par sa proposition ([3]) de révision de la législation sur la production biologique, la Commission vise notamment à renforcer et à harmoniser les règles, tant dans l'UE que pour les produits importés, en supprimant un certain nombre des exceptions actuelles aux règles de production, dont certaines ont été mises en place il y a plus de 20 ans. Par exemple, il ne sera plus possible de scinder une exploitation en unités de production biologique et non biologique. De même, l'utilisation de semences non biologiques et d'animaux non issus de l'agriculture biologique à des fins d'élevage ne sera plus possible après le 31 décembre 2021.

Les règles transitoires ou exceptionnelles ont tendance à faire pâtir d'un désavantage concurrentiel les agriculteurs qui se conforment à la lettre et à l'esprit de la législation par rapport à ceux qui utilisent les règles exceptionnelles assez librement. La réforme proposée devrait être à l'avantage des premiers.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n 834/2007 du Conseil du 28 juin 2007 relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques et abrogeant le règlement (CEE) n 2092/91 (JO L 189 du 20.7.2007).

([2]) Règlement (CE) n°889/2008 de la Commission du 5 septembre 2008 portant modalités d'application du règlement (CE) n°834/2007 du Conseil relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques en ce qui concerne la production biologique, l'étiquetage et les contrôles (JO L 250 du 18.9.2008).

([3]) Proposition de RÈGLEMENT DU PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN ET DU CONSEIL relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques, modifiant le règlement (UE) n°XXX/XXX du Parlement européen et du Conseil [règlement sur les contrôles officiels] et abrogeant le règlement (CE) n°834/2007 du Conseil [COM(2014) 180 final].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003839/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Organic Regulation: no more exceptions

Following a consultation process that began in 2012, the Commission has recently presented a proposal for a new regulation regarding organic production and labelling of organic products.

The proposal is founded on several objectives: safeguarding consumer confidence, maintaining producer confidence and facilitating access to the organic sector for farmers. The aim is to ensure that organic farming remains true to its principles and objectives in a way that responds to public demand in terms of respect for the environment and quality.

The Commission proposes strengthening and harmonising the rules, applicable both within the European Union and to imported products, by abolishing most of the exceptions regarding production and control.

How many exceptions currently exist? What does this represent in terms of lost profit?

What are the Commission's objectives in figures?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(19 May 2014)

The current legislation on organic production allows some flexibility in the production rules, as provided for in Article 22 of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([1]). These exceptional rules are further specified in Chapter 6 of Title II of Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 ([2]). They concern especially tethering of animals, parallel production, use of non-organic animals, use of non-organic protein feed, use of non-organic seed or vegetative propagating material, and catastrophic circumstances.

Through its proposal ([3]) to review the organic production legislation, the Commission aims in particular at strengthening and harmonising rules, both in the EU and for imported products, by removing a number of the current exceptions to the production rules, some of which have been in place for over 20 years. For instance, it would no longer be possible to split a holding into organic and non-organic units. Also, the use of non-organic seeds and non-organic animals for breeding purposes would no longer be possible after 31 December 2021.

Transitional or exceptional rules tend to put at a competitive disadvantage on those farmers who comply with the letter and the spirit of the legislation compared with those farmers who use the exceptional rules liberally. The proposed reform should be to the advantage of the former.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 (OJ L 189, 20.7.2007).

([2]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products with regard to organic production, labelling and control (OJ L 250, 18.9.2008).

([3]) Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on organic production and labelling of organic products, amending Regulation (EU) No XXX/XXX of the European Parliament and of the Council [Official controls Regulation] and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 (COM(2014) 180 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003840/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Règlement bio: nouvelles mesures d'exportation

À la suite au processus de consultation amorcé en 2012, la Commission vient de présenter une proposition de nouveau règlement relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques.

Cette proposition est axée sur plusieurs objectifs: préserver la confiance des consommateurs, conserver la confiance des producteurs et faciliter l'accès à la filière biologique pour les agriculteurs. Le but est de veiller à ce que l'agriculture biologique reste fidèle à ses principes et à ses objectifs, de façon à répondre à la demande de la population sur les plans du respect de l'environnement et de la qualité.

La Commission propose notamment de mieux prendre en considération la dimension internationale des échanges de produits biologiques grâce à l'ajout de nouvelles dispositions concernant les exportations.

La Commission peut-elle développer sa proposition en la matière?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(16 mai 2014)

L'exportation de produits biologiques n'est pas couverte par le règlement (CE) nº 834/2007 du Conseil relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques ([1]).

L'analyse d'impact ([2]) qui accompagne la proposition récente de la Commission concernant un règlement sur la production biologique et l'étiquetage des produits biologiques ([3]), indique que l'absence d'une politique d'exportation spécifique des produits biologiques freine les perspectives de croissance de la production de l'UE. Une politique d'exportation permettrait aux producteurs de l'UE de tirer parti de la croissance rapide du marché mondial des produits biologiques.

La proposition de la Commission répond à cela de deux façons:

— L'équivalence pourra être octroyée aux pays tiers sur une base de réciprocité en vertu des accords commerciaux qui doivent être négociés par la Commission. Ces accords permettent de se concentrer sur les marchés les plus intéressants du point de vue économique et politique pour l'Union européenne, en créant une valeur ajoutée pour le secteur, dans le respect intégral des obligations internationales de l'Union.

— Des dispositions spécifiques en matière d'exportations, et en particulier l'introduction d'un certificat d'exportation pour les produits biologiques, faciliteront l'accès des produits biologiques de l'Union européenne aux pays tiers. Des règles spécifiques sur les exportations de produits biologiques vers des pays tiers reconnus et sur le certificat d'exportation biologique seraient adoptées par la voie d'actes délégués.

Le développement d'une politique d'exportation spécifique est conforme à la demande des citoyens et des parties prenantes en faveur d'un accès renforcé au marché pour les produits biologiques de l'Union européenne dans les pays tiers.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n°834/2007 du Conseil du 28 juin 2007 relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques et abrogeant le règlement (CEE) n°2092/91 (JO L 189 du 20.7.2007).

([2]) DOCUMENT DE TRAVAIL DES SERVICES DE LA COMMISSION ANALYSE D'IMPACT accompagnant le document Proposition de RÈGLEMENT DU PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN ET DU CONSEIL relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques, modifiant le règlement (UE) n° XXX/XXX du Parlement européen et du Conseil [règlement sur les contrôles officiels] et abrogeant le règlement (CE) n°834/2007 du Conseil (SWD(2014) 65 final).

([3]) Proposition de RÈGLEMENT DU PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN ET DU CONSEIL relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques, modifiant le règlement (UE) n°XXX/XXX du Parlement européen et du Conseil [règlement sur les contrôles officiels] et abrogeant le règlement (CE) n°834/2007 du Conseil COM(2014) 180 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003840/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Organic Regulation: new export measures

Following a consultation process launched in 2012, the Commission has recently presented a proposal for a new regulation on organic production and the labelling of organic products.

The proposal is founded on several objectives: safeguarding consumer confidence, maintaining producer confidence and facilitating access to the organic sector for farmers. The aim is to ensure that organic farming remains true to its principles and objectives in a way that responds to public demand in terms of respect for the environment and quality.

In particular, the Commission is proposing to better take into consideration the international aspect of the trade in organic products through the addition of new provisions on exports.

Can the Commission provide further information regarding this proposal?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2014)

The export of organic products is not covered by Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products ([1]).

The Impact Assessment ([2]) accompanying the recent Commission Proposal for a regulation on organic production and labelling of organic products ([3]) shows that the absence of a specific export policy for organic products hampers the future potential growth of EU production. An export policy would allow EU producers to benefit from the fast growth of the world market for organic products.

The Commission Proposal addresses this in two ways:

— Equivalence would be granted to third countries on a reciprocal basis under trade agreements to be negotiated by the Commission. Such agreements allow focusing on markets of key economic and political interest to the EU, creating better value for the sector in full respect of the EU's international obligations.

— Specific provisions on exports and in particular the introduction of an export certificate for organic products will facilitate the access of EU organic products to third countries. Specific rules on exports of organic products to recognised third countries and on the organic export certificate would be adopted by delegated acts.

The development of a specific export policy is in line with the request of citizens and stakeholders for more market access for EU organic products in third countries.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 (OJ L 189, 20.7.2007).

([2]) Commission Staff Working Document Impact Assessment Accompanying the document Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on organic production and labelling of organic products, amending Regulation (EU) No XXX/XXX of the European Parliament and of the Council [Official controls Regulation] and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 (SWD(2014) 65 final).

([3]) Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on organic production and labelling of organic products, amending Regulation (EU) No XXX/XXX of the European Parliament and of the Council [Official controls Regulation] and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 COM(2014) 180 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003841/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Règlement bio: plus de contrôles

Suite au processus de consultation entamé en 2012, la Commission vient de présenter une proposition de nouveau règlement relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques.

La proposition est axée sur plusieurs objectifs: préserver la confiance des consommateurs, conserver la confiance des producteurs et faciliter l'accès à la filière biologique pour les agriculteurs. Le but est de veiller à ce que l'agriculture biologique reste fidèle à ses principes et à ses objectifs, de façon à répondre à la demande du public en termes de respect de l'environnement et de qualité.

La Commission propose notamment de renforcer les contrôles en les basant sur des analyses de risque.

La Commission peut-elle développer sa proposition en la matière?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(19 mai 2014)

La proposition de la Commission ([1]), qui sera examinée par le Parlement européen dans le cadre de la procédure législative ordinaire, vise à améliorer la contrôlabilité par la clarification, la simplification et l'harmonisation des règles de production et la suppression d'une série d'exceptions possibles à ces règles. L'évolution progressive de la reconnaissance des organismes de contrôle pour l'importation de produits en provenance de pays tiers à un régime de conformité vise également à renforcer la supervision et le contrôle.

Elle supprime la possibilité d'accorder des dérogations à certains types de détaillants, possibilité qui a donné lieu à des interprétations et des pratiques différentes dans les États membres et a rendu difficiles la gestion, la supervision et le contrôle.

Elle renforce l'approche fondée sur le risque par la suppression de l'obligation de vérifier chaque année la conformité de tous les opérateurs. Il deviendra ainsi possible d'adapter la fréquence des contrôles: les opérateurs présentant un niveau de risque faible pourront être soumis à des contrôles physiques plus espacés (intervalles de plus d'un an) alors que les opérateurs à haut niveau de risque feront l'objet d'une surveillance plus étroite. Il s'agit de mieux équilibrer la pression exercée sur les opérateurs en matière de contrôles, puisque ceux qui ont de bons antécédents sur le plan du respect des règles seront moins contrôlés, et d'assurer une utilisation plus efficace et plus efficiente des ressources par les autorités compétentes, les autorités de contrôle et les organismes de contrôle.

Elle instaure des dispositions en vue de renforcer la traçabilité (les opérateurs intervenant à différentes étapes de la filière biologique ne pourront pas être contrôlés par des autorités ou des organismes de contrôle différents pour les mêmes groupes de produits).

Elle définit les mesures à prendre dans toute l'Union pour faire face aux principales catégories de manquements, afin de garantir un traitement équitable des opérateurs, d'assurer le bon fonctionnement du marché intérieur et de préserver la confiance des consommateurs.

([1]) Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du conseil relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques, modifiant le règlement (UE) n°XXX/XXX du Parlement européen et du Conseil (règlement sur les contrôles officiels) et abrogeant le règlement (CE) n°834/2007 du Conseil. COM(2014) 180 final du 24.3.2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003841/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Regulation on organic products — tighter controls needed

In the wake of the consultation process launched in 2012, the Commission has just submitted a proposal for a new regulation on organic production and the labelling of organic products.

The proposal focuses on a number of goals: maintaining consumer confidence, maintaining producer confidence and making it easier for farmers to switch to organics. The aim is to ensure that organic farming remains faithful to its principles and objectives, so that public demands in terms of environment and quality are met.

The Commission is proposing, amongst other things, that controls be tightened and based on risk analyses.

Can the Commission give further details on this matter?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(19 May 2014)

The Commission's proposal ([1]), which will be discussed with the European Parliament under the ordinary legislative procedure, aims at enhancing controllability through the clarification, simplification and harmonisation of the production rules and the removal of a series of possible exceptions to such rules. The progressive shift of the recognition of control bodies for the import of products from third countries to a compliance regime also aims at enhanced supervision and control.

It removes the possibility to exempt certain types of retailers, which led to different interpretations and practices across Member States and made management, supervision and control difficult.

It reinforces the risk-based approach by removing the requirement for mandatory annual verification of compliance of all operators. This will make it possible to adapt the control frequency: operators with a low risk profile may be physically inspected less than annually while higher risk operators would be more closely targeted. This aims at a fairer balance of the control pressure on operators, with a reduced burden on those with a proven track record of compliance with the rules, and more effective and efficient use of resources by the competent authorities, control authorities and control bodies.

It introduces provisions for enhanced traceability (operators may not be controlled by different control authorities or bodies for the same groups of products across different stages of the organic chain).

It sets out action to be taken throughout the Union on the same broad categories of non-compliance to ensure a level playing field in the treatment of operators, a properly functioning internal market and maintenance of consumers' trust.

([1]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on organic production and labelling of organic products, amending Regulation (EU) No XX/XXX of the European Parliament and of the Council (official controls regulation) and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007. COM(2014) 180 final, 24.3.2014.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003842/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Produits dangereux

Vêtements, jouets, produits électriques ou cosmétiques sont les principaux secteurs concernés par le signalement de produits dangereux dans l'Union européenne. Les deux premiers représentent chacun 25 % des cas. Un phénomène qui atteint un record en 2013 avec 2 364 produits signalés comme dangereux, d'après une annonce de la Commission européenne mardi.

Derrière ce triste record, les exportations chinoises sont omniprésentes. La Chine — ville de Hong Kong comprise — se classe en tête des fournisseurs de produits chimiques cancérigènes et autres biens considérés, par leur composition ou leurs dysfonctionnements, comme dangereux. En effet, 64 % des produits chinois ont été bloqués en 2013, contre 58 % en 2012.

L'Union européenne et les autorités chinoises tentent toutefois de lutter contre ce phénomène, avec un succès mitigé. Seule la moitié des fabricants chinois de produits dangereux a pu être localisée par la Chine.

Les fabricants européens ont, quant à eux, amélioré la qualité de leur production. En 2013, 15 % des produits retirés du marché sont d'origine européenne, alors que ce chiffre se montait à 27 % il y a dix ans.

Ce nombre record de produits dangereux signalés n'est toutefois pas nécessairement une mauvaise nouvelle. L'augmentation de ce chiffre s'explique notamment par les progrès réalisés dans les contrôles douaniers, dans la traçabilité ainsi que dans le contrôle des achats en ligne. À elle seule, la traçabilité des produits a permis de réduire de 10 % la part des produits dangereux d'origine inconnue circulant dans l'Union.

1. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle enrayer ce phénomène?

2. Combien d'informations et d'alertes RAPEX a-t-elle envoyées en 2013?

3. Pourrait-elle fournir la ventilation par État membre des produits dangereux détectés?

Réponse donnée par M. Mimica au nom de la Commission
(3 juin 2014)

1. En ce qui concerne sa première question, l'Honorable Parlementaire est prié de consulter la réponse de la Commission aux questions écrites E-003732/2014 et E-003756/2014 ([1]).

2. Le contrôle de l'application de la réglementation et la surveillance du marché, y compris la notification via le système RAPEX de la présence de produits dangereux sur le marché et l'adoption de mesures pour l'empêcher, relèvent de la responsabilité des États membres. En 2013, le nombre total de notifications soumises dans le cadre du système RAPEX par les autorités nationales a été de 2 364.

3. Le nombre de notifications RAPEX par État membre s'est inscrit dans une fourchette allant de 7 pour le Luxembourg à 458 pour l'Espagne. Pour plus de détails sur la répartition par État membre, la Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se reporter au rapport d'activités 2013 de RAPEX ([2]), page 4, graphique 1.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/rapex/reports/docs/rapex_activity_2013_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003842/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Dangerous products

Clothing, toys, electrical goods and cosmetics are among the main sectors involved in dangerous product alerts in the European Union. The first two categories each account for 25% of cases. It is a phenomenon that reached record levels in 2013 with 2 364 products the subject of danger alerts, according to a statement of the European Commission issued on Tuesday.

Behind this unfortunate record, Chinese exports are ubiquitous. China, including Hong Kong, is a leading supplier of carcinogenic chemical products, along with other goods regarded as dangerous on account of their content or malfunctions. Indeed, 64% of Chinese products were blocked in 2013, compared with 58% in 2012.

Nevertheless, the European Union and the Chinese authorities are trying to combat this phenomenon, with mixed success. Only half of the Chinese manufacturers of dangerous products could be traced by China.

Meanwhile, European manufacturers have improved the quality of their production. In 2013, 15% of products withdrawn from the market were of European origin while, 10 years ago, the figure was 27%.

However, this record number of products subject to danger alerts is not necessarily bad news. The increase is largely due to progress in customs inspections, traceability and control of online purchases. Traceability of products alone has made it possible to achieve a 10% reduction in the number of dangerous products of unknown origin circulating within the EU.

1. How does the Commission intend to eradicate this phenomenon?

2. How many RAPEX notifications and alerts did it issue in 2013?

3. Could it supply distribution figures by Member State of dangerous products detected?

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

1. As regards the first question, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to the Written Questions E-003732/2014 and E-003756/2014 ([1]).

2. The enforcement and market surveillance, including the notification in RAPEX of dangerous products found on the market and measures taken against such products is the responsibility of the Member States. The total number of RAPEX notifications made by national authorities in 2013 was 2.364.

3. The number of RAPEX notifications by individual Members States in 2013 ranges from 7 in the case of Luxembourg to 458 notification received by Spanish authorities. For detailed information on distribution figures per Member State, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the figure 1 on page 4 of the document 'RAPEX Activity in 2013' ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/rapex/reports/docs/rapex_activity_2013_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003843/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: Haut débit harmonisable

Les derniers résultats concernant le haut débit sont consternants: on peut payer le même service jusqu'à 14 fois plus cher suivant les pays! Rien ne justifie qu'un consommateur européen paie quatre fois plus cher qu'un autre pour la même connexion au haut débit.

Où trouve-t-on les offres les plus basses? En Lituanie (à partir de 10,30 euros par mois), en Roumanie (à partir de 11,20 euros) et en Lettonie (à partir de 14,60 euros). Et les plus chères? Jusqu'à 140 euros en Pologne et 121 euros en Croatie. Enfin, concernant l'offre la plus répandue, c'est-à-dire le haut débit à 12-30 Mbps, les prix varient de 10 à 46 euros.

Un autre problème est que les débits réels n'atteignent en moyenne que 75 % des débits annoncés et parfois même 64 % seulement. Mais les opérateurs peuvent dormir tranquilles: 66 % des consommateurs ne connaissent pas le débit annoncé de leur connexion…

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission?

2. Est-elle pour un marché unique?

3. Comment la Commission va-t-elle réduire la différence entre les divers tarifs européens?

4. La Commission pourrait-elle prendre les sanctions adéquates ou, à tout le moins, encourager des sanctions vers les opérateurs qui trichent sur les débits annoncés?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(12 mai 2014)

Le cadre réglementaire de l'UE a favorisé l'arrivée régulière de nouveaux concurrents et a entraîné une forte baisse des prix sur les services à haut débit, dont la qualité s'est accrue. Si certains écarts de prix peuvent s'expliquer par des différences structurelles d'un pays à l'autre, l'incohérence qu'on observe actuellement est due en grande partie à la fragmentation persistante du marché. Sur de nombreux points, les clients et les opérateurs de l'UE se trouvent encore face à 28 marchés nationaux.

La Commission a présenté en septembre 2013 une proposition en vue de progresser vers l'achèvement d'un marché unique des télécommunications. Le Parlement européen a voté sur le texte le 3 avril, faisant avancer le débat en un temps record.

La proposition améliorera les conditions de l'accès au haut débit dans toute l'Union au meilleur niveau de qualité et au juste prix. Cela facilitera la mise en place d'un espace européen sans fil homogène, avec des réseaux robustes capables de faire face à l'explosion actuelle des flux de données due au haut débit mobile. Cela complète les autres initiatives de la Commission européenne, y compris la directive du Parlement européen et de la Commission récemment adoptée sur des mesures visant à réduire le coût de déploiement de réseaux de communication électronique à haut débit.

La proposition vise également à renforcer les droits des consommateurs, par une transparence accrue. Les opérateurs devront communiquer des informations précises sur les débits réels et les utilisateurs pourront ainsi comparer les performances de leur fournisseur de services et le coût de différents schémas d'utilisation. En outre, il sera plus facile pour les consommateurs de changer de fournisseur ou de contrat et de résilier un contrat si les vitesses d'Internet promises ne sont pas assurées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003843/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Harmonisable broadband

The most recent findings concerning broadband are perturbing: a person can pay up to 14 times more for the same service depending on the country! There is no justification for one European consumer paying four times more than another for the same broadband connection.

Where can we find the cheapest deals? They are in Lithuania, from 10.30 euros a month; in Romania, from 11.20 euros; and in Latvia, from 14.60 euros. The most expensive? As much as 140 euros in Poland, and 121 euros in Croatia. Finally, for the most widely available product, i.e. broadband at 12 to 30 Megabits per second, prices vary from 10 to 46 euros.

Another problem is that the actual speeds are, on average, only 75% of the advertised speeds, and sometimes only 64%. However, the operators can sleep easily: 66% of consumers do not know the advertised speed of their connection.

1. What is the Commission's position?

2. Is it in favour of a single market?

3. How is the Commission going to reduce the differences between the various European tariffs?

4. Could the Commission take appropriate measures or, at the very least, encourage measures against operators that cheat with regard to advertised speeds?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(12 May 2014)

The EU regulatory framework has fostered continuous entry by new competitors and generated a sharp decrease in prices for broadband services of growing quality. While some price differences can be explained by structural differences between countries, much of today's inconsistency is due to persistent market fragmentation. In many aspects EU customers and operators are still confronted to 28 national markets.

The Commission presented in September 2013 a proposal to advance towards the completion of a Single Telecoms Market. The European Parliament voted on the text on 3 April bringing the debate forward in record time.

The proposal will improve the conditions for making high speed broadband available across Europe at the best level of quality for a fair price. It will help building a European seamless wireless space with robust networks that can cope with the ongoing data explosion due to mobile broadband. This is complementing other initiatives of the European Commission, including the recently agreed European Parliament and Council Directive on measures to reduce the cost of deploying high speed electronic communication networks.

The proposal also aims at strengthening consumer rights with more transparency. Operators will have to provide precise information on real speeds and users will be able to compare the performance of their service provider as well as the cost of alternative usage patterns. Furthermore, it will be easier for consumers to switch provider or contract and to terminate a contract if promised Internet speeds are not delivered.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003844/14
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Rapport ONU et Jérusalem-Est

Le professeur américain Richard Falk, expert indépendant des Nations unies pour les territoires palestiniens occupés, a alerté dans son rapport final sur la détérioration de la situation à Jérusalem-Est qu'il décrit comme «un microcosme de la fragmentation du territoire se déroulant à travers la Cisjordanie», ajoutant que «plus de 11 000 Palestiniens ont été privés de leur droit à vivre à Jérusalem depuis 1996, selon les règles imposées par Israël».

1. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est-elle d'accord avec ce rapport des Nations unies? Quelle est son appréciation?

2. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante soutient-elle la demande faite devant la Cour de justice internationale d'évaluer le statut légal de l'occupation israélienne de Palestine?

3. L'ONU a déjà déclaré l'occupation de la Palestine illégale en vertu du droit international; la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante reverrait-elle ses positions concernant Israël dans le cas probable d'un avis de la Cour de justice internationale allant dans le même sens? Pour quelle raison?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003845/14
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(27 mars 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Cour de justice internationale et statut légal de l'occupation israélienne de la Palestine

Dans son rapport final, le rapporteur spécial de l'ONU sur la situation des Droits de l'homme dans les territoires palestiniens occupés, Richard Falk, a demandé une évaluation par la Cour internationale de justice (CIJ) concernant le statut légal de l'occupation prolongée de la Palestine par Israël.

La CIJ est ainsi invitée à étudier les allégations selon lesquelles cette occupation présenterait des «caractéristiques légalement inacceptables de colonialisme, d'apartheid et de nettoyage ethnique».

Outre l'institution judiciaire internationale, le rapporteur a également demandé au Conseil des Droits de l'homme des Nations unies (CDH) d'examiner les implications légales de l'occupation de la Palestine et a exhorté la communauté internationale à agir résolument pour faire respecter les Droits de l'homme des Palestiniens.

1. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est-elle au courant du rapport final de M. Falk, rapporteur spécial de l'ONU sur la situation des Droits de l'homme dans les territoires palestiniens occupés?

2. N'estime-t-elle pas que l'Union européenne doit faire de même et se pencher puis se prononcer sur le statut légal de l'occupation israélienne de la Palestine, occupation qui dure depuis plus de 45 ans et qui fait subir au peuple palestinien des violations constantes des Droits de l'homme?

3. Va-t-elle demander un avis juridique sur la question du statut de puissance occupante d'Israël afin d'être en accord avec le droit international lors de la signature d'accords avec Israël?

4. Peut-elle fournir les avis juridiques qui ont été demandés en vue de la négociation d'accords avec Israël?

Réponse commune donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(14 mai 2014)

Nous vous remercions d'avoir attiré notre attention sur l'évaluation, par la Cour internationale de justice (CIJ), de la légalité de l'occupation prolongée de la Palestine par Israël, demandée par le rapporteur spécial des Nations unies, M. Richard Falk.

L'Union européenne a affirmé à maintes reprises qu'elle considérait les colonies comme illégales au regard du droit international, et notamment dans les conclusions du Conseil des affaires étrangères de décembre 2012. À cette occasion, elle a rappelé qu'elle ne reconnaîtra aucune modification du tracé des frontières d'avant 1967, y compris en ce qui concerne Jérusalem, qui n'aurait pas été approuvée par les parties.

Elle a en outre déclaré qu'elle était déterminée à faire en sorte que — conformément au droit international — tous les accords entre l'État d'Israël et l'Union européenne indiquent clairement et expressément qu'ils ne s'appliquent pas aux territoires occupés par Israël en 1967, à savoir le plateau du Golan, la Cisjordanie, y compris Jérusalem-Est, et la bande de Gaza.

En ce qui concerne les Droits de l'homme et le droit humanitaire international ainsi que les obligations d'Israël dans les territoires palestiniens occupés, ces questions sont débattues à tous les niveaux pertinents, dans le cadre de la coopération avec Israël, et en particulier dans le contexte du dialogue politique entre l'Union européenne et Israël ainsi qu'au niveau du groupe de travail informel UE-Israël sur les Droits de l'homme.

L'UE continuera à suivre de près l'évolution de la situation sur le terrain et à exhorter les autorités israéliennes, sous la forme qui convient, à mettre leur pratique en conformité avec les normes internationalement reconnues.

Toutefois, le dialogue avec Israël constitue le moyen le plus efficace de faire comprendre à nos homologues les préoccupations de l'UE sur les questions de Droits de l'homme et du droit humanitaire international évoquées par l'Honorable Parlementaire.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003844/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — UN Report and East Jerusalem

In his final report, US academic Richard Falk, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Occupied Palestine, warned of the deterioration of the situation in East Jerusalem. He described this as a 'microcosm of the fragmentation of territory taking place throughout the West Bank', adding that 'more than 11 000 Palestinians have lost their right to live in Jerusalem since 1996, under rules imposed by Israel.'

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree with this United Nations report? What is her view?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative support the request issued to the International Court of Justice to assess the legal status of the Israeli occupation of Palestine?

3. The UN has already declared the occupation of Palestine illegal under international law. Would the Vice-President/High Representative review her position concerning Israel in the likely event of the International Court of Justice issuing an opinion in the same vein? Why?

Question for written answer E-003845/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — International Court of Justice and the legal status of the Israeli occupation of Palestine

In his final report, UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in the occupied Palestine territories, Richard Falk, called for an assessment by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) of the legal status of Israel's prolonged occupation of Palestine.

As such, the ICJ is invited to weigh allegations that the occupation has 'legally unacceptable characteristics of "colonialism, apartheid and ethnic cleansing"'.

As well as the international judicial body, the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) was also asked by the Rapporteur to examine the legal implications of the occupation of Palestine. Mr Falk called on the international community to take decisive action to ensure respect for the Palestinians' human rights.

1. Is the High Representative/Vice-President aware of the final report of Mr Falk, UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in the occupied Palestinian territories?

2. Does she not feel that the European Union must do the same and study the matter before issuing a statement on the legal status of the Israeli occupation of Palestine, an occupation which has lasted for over 45 years and which has subjected the Palestinian people to constant human rights violations?

3. Is she going to request a legal opinion on the question of Israel's status as occupying power in order to comply with international law when signing agreements with Israel?

4. Can she supply the legal opinions requested with a view to negotiating agreements with Israel?

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

Thank you for drawing our attention to the call by UN Special Rapporteur, Richard Falk, for an assessment by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) of the legal status of Israel's prolonged occupation of Palestine.

The EU has repeatedly stated its position on the illegality of settlements according to International Law, and namely in the conclusions of the EU Foreign Affairs Council of December 2012. On this occasion, the EU reiterated that it will not recognise any changes to the pre-1967 borders including with regard to Jerusalem, other than those agreed by the parties.

Furthermore, it expressed its commitment to ensure that — in line with international law — all agreements between the State of Israel and the European Union must unequivocally and explicitly indicate their inapplicability to the territories occupied by Israel in 1967, namely the Golan Heights, the West Bank including East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip.

As regards human rights and international humanitarian law and Israel's obligations in the oPt, those issues are discussed at all relevant levels in the context of the cooperation with Israel, and in particular in the framework of EU-Israel Political Dialogue and at the level of the EU-Israel informal working group on Human Rights.

The EU will continue monitoring closely the developments on the ground and calling upon Israeli authorities, in the appropriate format, to bring its practice in line with established international standards.

However, engagement with Israel is the most effective way to convey to our counterpart the European Union's concerns on matters of human rights and international humanitarian law referred to by the Honourable Member.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003846/14
alla Commissione
Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Sergio Berlato (PPE), Franco Bonanini (NI), Mario Borghezio (NI), Susy De Martini (ECR), Franco Frigo (S&D), Barbara Matera (PPE), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Marco Scurria (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Giommaria Uggias (ALDE) e Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(27 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Legge sul turismo cinese

Lo scorso ottobre è entrata in vigore una nuova legge sul turismo in Cina. Oltre a definire le regole che dovranno osservare i turisti cinesi che visitano un paese, la nuova legge si pone come obiettivo il rafforzamento dei diritti dei viaggiatori al fine di prevenire la concorrenza sleale e regolare i prezzi di ingresso alle attrazioni del paese di destinazione.

Il nuovo quadro normativo nasce per contrastare la pratica apparentemente largamente diffusa nei paesi dell'area (Taiwan, Nuova Zelanda, Corea del Sud) dei cosiddetti «tour a prezzo negativo».

Si tratterebbe di pacchetti turistici venduti a prezzi notevolmente inferiori a quelli dei loro costi effettivi con l'aspettativa che tale differenza venga poi colmata dagli acquisti in località o negozi predefiniti e concordati, ma non ufficialmente compresi nello stesso programma di visita.

Questa stessa logica, giustamente volta a combattere pratiche illegali e tutelare i diritti dei turisti cinesi, con la nuova legge sul turismo è stata tuttavia generalmente applicata e estesa a tutte le altre destinazioni turistiche mondiali dove le pratiche in questione non si verificano e non si sono mai verificate.

L'effetto è un significativo incremento dei prezzi dei tour turistici cinesi che potrebbe tradursi in ridotti flussi di visitatori e avere quindi risvolti discriminatori e penalizzanti per taluni paesi e località, soprattutto europei.

Stante l'impegno comunitario a rilanciare e potenziare il settore del turismo come risorsa per uscire dalla crisi e considerati i numeri e il valore per i mercati europei del turismo in arrivo dalla Cina — tra i primi al mondo per dimensioni, con circa 3 miliardi di turisti potenziali e un contributo al mercato mondiale superiore al 7 % — potrebbe la Commissione:

1. attivarsi per verificare che quanto disposto dalla legge in questione non sia una misura introdotta dalle autorità cinesi per scoraggiare di proposito i viaggi e gli acquisiti in Europa e colpire quindi in maniera discriminatoria le aziende e le produzioni europee e il loro indotto;

2. chiarire quali strumenti ha a disposizione per eventualmente contrastare una possibile volontà discriminatoria;

3. tenere in debita considerazione e sollevare tale situazione nelle opportune sedi negoziali?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2014)

La Commissione non dispone di nessuna prova a dimostrare che la nuova legge cinese sul turismo sia stata introdotta deliberatamente per scoraggiare i viaggi nell'Unione europea. La Commissione non ha ricevuto inoltre nessuna informazione dall'industria turistica europea che indichi un calo dei turisti cinesi.

La Commissione interpreta che l'obiettivo della nuova legge sia di assicurare la concorrenza leale e prevenire le pratiche di vendita sleali da parte dei tour operator cinesi. A prima vista una simile misura risulta essere un regolamento interno che non viola gli impegni internazionali sottoscritti dalla Cina in campo commerciale.

Per esaminare ulteriormente la questione la Commissione approfitterà dell'imminente Trade Policy Review of China (previsto nel luglio 2014), nell'ambito dell'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio, per chiedere chiarimenti alla Cina sulla nuova legge.

Tra la Cina e l'UE è attiva una linea continua di contatti bilaterali nell'ambito dei quali si affrontano, se del caso, gli eventuali casi di discriminazione di imprese e prodotti europei o le eventuali violazioni degli impegni commerciali sottoscritti dalla Cina nei confronti dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003846/14
to the Commission
Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Sergio Berlato (PPE), Franco Bonanini (NI), Mario Borghezio (NI), Susy De Martini (ECR), Franco Frigo (S&D), Barbara Matera (PPE), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Marco Scurria (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Giommaria Uggias (ALDE) and Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Chinese tourism law

Last October a new law on tourism came into force in China. It defines the rules which Chinese tourists must obey when visiting another country. It also seeks to consolidate the rights of tourists with a view to preventing unfair competition and to regulating admission prices to attractions in the destination country.

The new regulatory framework is designed to counter the practice of 'negative-fare tours', apparently widespread in countries of the region (Taiwan, New Zealand and South Korea).

These are package tours sold at prices well below cost, in the expectation that shopping in pre-agreed districts or shops, not on the official tour programme, will make up the difference.

The principle of combating illegal practices and safeguarding the rights of Chinese tourists is quite right. But the new law on tourism applies it universally, even to other tourist destinations in the world where the practices in question do not occur, and never have done.

As a result, Chinese tour prices have risen significantly. This could lead to reduced visitor numbers and therefore discriminate against, and penalise, certain countries and areas, especially in Europe.

The EU is committed to reviving and expanding the tourism sector as a resource in its recovery from recession, and the large numbers of inbound tourists from China are valuable to the European markets. China is a source of tourism on a world-leading scale, with around 3 billion potential tourists and accounting for over 7% of the global market.

1. Could the Commission take steps to check that the Chinese authorities have not introduced the provisions of the law in question deliberately to discourage trips to Europe and shopping there, and therefore to discriminate against European companies and products and their supplier industries?

2. Can it explain what means it has at its disposal to counter possible deliberate discrimination?

3. Can it give due consideration to the situation and raise the matter in the appropriate negotiations?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The Commission does not have any evidence that the new Chinese tourism law was introduced deliberately to discourage trips to the European Union. Moreover, the Commission has not received any information from the European tourism industry that would indicate a decrease of Chinese tourists.

The Commission understands that the purpose of the new law is to ensure fair competition and to prevent unfair selling practices by Chinese tour operators. Prima facie such a measure qualifies as domestic regulation which would not be contrary to China's international trade commitments.

In order to explore the issue further the Commission will use the upcoming World Trade Organisation Trade Policy Review of China (scheduled in July 2014) to request further information from China on the new law.

There are also continuous bilateral contacts between China and the EU where any potential issue of discrimination of European companies and products, or any violation of China's trade commitments towards the EU could be addressed, if necessary.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003850/14
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Transparency in energy markets

The UK energy regulator, Ofgem, is in the process of enacting reforms in price transparency. The Commission, for its part, is entrusted under Article 194 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) with ensuring 'the functioning of the energy market' within the EU. Article 101 TFEU prohibits 'distortion of competition within the internal market' and, in particular, distortions which 'directly or indirectly fix purchase or selling prices or any other trading conditions'.

1. Does the Commission believe that so long as energy companies in the EU are not required to publicly disclose the date, size, price and origin of all gas and oil purchases, there can be no certainty that the provisions of Article 101 TFEU are not being violated? Are the activities and differential gas pricing of Russia's Gazprom in accordance with all of these provisions?

2. Does the Commission believe that Article 194 TFEU entitles it to propose legislation establishing the minimum requirements for oil and gas storage facilities within the Member States, thus reducing exposure to increased volatility in commodities markets during times of international crisis, such as we currently face over the Russian invasion and annexation of Ukraine, when the ability of some Member States to respond with economic sanctions is curtailed by dependence on Russian gas, thus making external energy security a renewed major EU priority?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(16 June 2014)

1. Requiring energy suppliers publicly to disclose the terms of their purchases would not in itself ensure that the provisions of Article 101 TFEU are complied with. It could even undermine the competitive process and facilitate collusion. Also, sharing such terms between competitors could under certain circumstances amount to a violation of Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), which prohibits anti-competitive agreements.

The European Commission is currently investigating potential anticompetitive practices by Gazprom regarding the supply of natural gas in several Central and Eastern European Member States under Article 102 TFEU (abuse of a dominant position). While this investigation does not concern issues of transparency, it relates, among other things, to Gazprom's pricing policy.

2. According to Article 194 TFEU, one of the objectives of Union policy on energy is to ensure security of energy supply in the Union. The Commission can propose legislative proposals on the issues suggested in the question in so far as they aim at ensuring the security of energy supply provided that the proposals comply with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003851/14
to the Council
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Rare earth metal reserves in the Member States

Article 18 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union permits the European Central Bank to buy and sell precious metals in the spot and forward markets in order to defend the euro as a currency, but the central banks of non-eurozone countries, including the Bank of England, also carry out similar transactions.

The USA holds strategic reserves of oil for reasons of national security. Is there any move by Member States to store reserve stocks of rare earth metals, which are increasingly used in advanced manufacturing processes? If so, do the Member States possess storage facilities that are adequate to the task?

Given the severe disruption caused to Japan's electronics industry after China imposed a selective ban on the export of rare earth metals five years ago, does the Council believe that it is desirable for the EU to adopt a deliberate common coordinated policy of acquiring such metals as a strategic resource for the Member States, both individually and collectively for the EU as a whole?

Reply
(4 June 2014)

With its communication of 4 November 2008 entitled 'The raw materials initiative — meeting our critical needs for growth and jobs in Europe' ([1]) and the communication of 2 February 2011 entitled 'Tackling the challenges in commodity markets and on raw materials' ([2]), the Commission launched and subsequently reinforced the Raw Materials Initiative, an integrated strategy aimed at responding to different challenges related to access to non-energy and non-agricultural raw materials, including rare earth metals. The Raw Materials Initiative is based on three pillars: (1) ensuring a level playing field for access to resources in third countries; (2) fostering a sustainable supply of raw materials from European sources; and (3) boosting resource efficiency and recycling.

The Council endorsed the reinforced Raw Materials Initiative in its conclusions of 10 March 2011 on tackling the challenges on raw materials and in commodity markets ([3]). In its conclusions, the Council, *inter alia*, took note of the Commission's intention to analyse the feasibility and impact of cost-effective stockpiling of critical raw materials and improved monitoring of developments of supply and demand as a matter of priority, in consultation with industry.

The Council is aware of a Commission report from 24 June 2013 on the implementation of its Raw Materials Initiative ([4]) in which the Commission gave an overview of a study on stockpiling critical raw materials and of the related discussions in the Commission's Raw Materials Supply Group. For further information, the Honourable Member is invited to put a question to the Commission, which has undertaken in its report to continue to monitor this issue.

([1]) See 16053/08.
([2]) See 5992/11.
([3]) See 7029/11.
([4]) See 11876/13.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003852/14
al Consiglio
Guido Milana (S&D)
(27 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Riforma della gestione della pesca in acque profonde dell'UE

Il CIEM (Consiglio internazionale per l'esplorazione del mare) e altri organismi scientifici hanno concluso inequivocabilmente che la pesca con reti a strascico rappresenta la maggiore minaccia diretta per gli ecosistemi vulnerabili di acque profonde.

Dal 2004, l'UE è impegnata a gestire una serie di azioni sulla pesca in acque profonde durante i negoziati all'Assemblea Generale delle Nazioni Unite (UNGA) su questo tema.

La riforma UE del regolamento di pesca in acque profonde attualmente in corso di elaborazione costituisce un'unica opportunità per l'UE di dimostrare la sua leadership e attuare questi impegni.

La Commissione ha pubblicato una proposta nel luglio 2012 per un nuovo regolamento che stabilisca condizioni specifiche per la pesca degli stock ittici profondi nelle acque unionistiche e internazionali dell'Atlantico nordorientale, al fine di sostituire il vigente regime di accesso alle risorse marine profonde. Il testo adottato in prima lettura del Parlamento europeo nel dicembre 2013 ha rafforzato la proposta mediante disposizioni coerenti con gli accordi internazionali negoziati con l'Assemblea Generale delle Nazioni Unite, la FAO e la Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sulla diversità biologica.

È il Consiglio ancora intenzionato a formulare la sua posizione in linea con la proposta della Commissione e il testo adottato dal Parlamento europeo sotto l'attuale presidenza cioè entro la fine di giugno 2014?

Intende esso garantire che la sua posizione rifletta i principi fondamentali e gli obblighi del diritto internazionale, come accennato in precedenza, e che gli impegni politici che l'UE ha sostenuto fino a oggi e concordato con l'Assemblea Generale delle Nazioni Unite siano finalmente incorporati nel nuovo regolamento della pesca in acque profonde dell'UE?

Risposta
(4 giugno 2014)

La proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che istituisce condizioni specifiche per la pesca degli stock di acque profonde nell'Atlantico nord-orientale e disposizioni relative alla pesca nelle acque internazionali dell'Atlantico nord-orientale e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 2347/2002 ([1]), presentata dalla Commissione, è attualmente all'esame del Consiglio insieme alla posizione del Parlamento europeo adottata nel dicembre 2013. Il Consiglio non è in grado di anticipare i risultati o la durata delle discussioni interne in corso.

([1]) 12801/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003852/14
to the Council
Guido Milana (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Reform of the management of deep-sea fishing in the EU

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) and other scientific bodies have produced incontrovertible evidence showing that the greatest immediate threat to vulnerable deep-sea ecosystems comes from dragnet fishing.

In 2004, the EU gave a commitment to carry out a series of measures dealing with deep-sea fishing, as part of the negotiations in the UN General Assembly (UNGA) on this issue.

The revision, now in preparation, of the regulation on deep-sea fishing offers the EU a unique opportunity to show leadership and act on that commitment.

In July 2012 the Commission published a proposal for a new regulation laying down specific conditions to govern the fishing of deep-sea stocks in the north-east Atlantic, in both EU and international waters, which would replace the current arrangements concerning access to deep-sea resources. The text adopted at first reading in the European Parliament, in December 2013, strengthened the Commission's proposal by incorporating arrangements consistent with the international agreements negotiated with the UNGA and the FAO and under the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD).

Does the Council still intend to bring its position into line with the Commission proposal and with the European Parliament's adopted text during the current presidency, i.e. by the end of June 2014?

Does it intend to guarantee that its position reflects the fundamental principles and requirements of international law, as outlined above, and that the new EU regulation on deep-sea fishing incorporates provisions which finally enable the EU to honour its long-standing political commitments vis-à-vis the UNGA?

Reply
(4 June 2014)

The Council is currently examining the Commission's proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing specific conditions for deep-sea stocks in the North-East Atlantic and provisions for fishing in international waters of the North-East Atlantic and repealing Regulation (EC) No 2347/2002 ([1]), together with the European Parliament's position adopted in December 2013. The Council is not in a position to anticipate the outcome or the duration of its ongoing internal discussions.

([1]) 12801/12.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003853/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(27 maart 2014)

Betreft: ING

In het antwoord op mijn vraag over het wetsontwerp om pensioenspaargeld te mobiliseren voor langetermijnfinanciering (E-001836/14) stelt de Commissie dat als pensioenen onderdeel zijn van het socialezekerheidsstelsel, de lidstaten de exclusieve bevoegdheid hebben om te bepalen op welke wijze de pensioenen zijn georganiseerd. Daarnaast stelt de Commissie dat de lidstaten de volledige verantwoordelijkheid hebben voor het organiseren van hun eigen pensioenstelsel. Ten derde stelt de Commissie dat op pensioenen die door financiële instellingen worden verstrekt, secundaire wetgeving van de EU van toepassing is.

Nederland kent een pensioenstelsel dat is gebaseerd op zowel het socialezekerheidstelsel en bedrijfs(tak)pensioenen als individuele pensioenregelingen. Van de bedrijfs(tak)pensioenen worden de besturen gevormd door zowel werkgevers- als werknemersvertegenwoordigers (sociale partners). De individuele pensioenregelingen worden uitgevoerd door verzekeraars en banken.

Werknemers zijn verplicht aangesloten bij het bedrijfs(tak)pensioenfonds van hun werkgever.

1. Vindt de Commissie dat de bedrijfs(tak)pensioenfondsen onder het begrip financiële instellingen vallen?

2. Zo ja, vindt de Commissie dan niet dat, aangezien werknemers verplicht zijn aangesloten bij een bedrijfs(tak)pensioenfonds, deze fondsen het karakter hebben van een collectieve voorziening?

3. Zouden daarom bedrijfs(tak)pensioenfondsen kunnen worden gezien als een verlengde van het Nederlandse socialezekerheidsstelsel?

4. Vallen daarom deze fondsen buiten de bevoegdheid van de EU op grond van artikel 153, lid 4, VWEU?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(3 juni 2014)

In Richtlijn 2003/41/EC ([1]) (IBPV-richtlijn) worden bedrijfspensioenfondsen gedefinieerd en worden de fondsen vastgesteld die voldoen aan de specifieke vereisten van de definitie van financiële instelling.

Een Nederlands bedrijfspensioenfonds mag in het kader van een officieel besluit een dienst van algemeen economisch belang uitvoeren. In dat geval kan in overeenstemming met de staatssteunregels aan het fonds een compensatie voor openbare dienstverlening worden verleend ([2]). Dat betekent onder andere dat overcompensatie voor het uitvoeren van de dienst in kwestie moet worden vermeden.

De lidstaten blijven volledig verantwoordelijk voor het organiseren van pensioenpijlers die, bijvoorbeeld, een verplichte staatspijler op basis van het omslagstelsel, een verplichte pijler op basis van het kapitalisatiestelsel, een bedrijfspensioenpijler of een vrijwillige pensioenpijler omvatten. De Nederlandse bedrijfspensioenfondsen maken deel uit van de bedrijfspensioenpijler en bieden aanvullende voordelen die verder gaan dan de garanties van de eerste pijler.

Nederlandse bedrijfspensioenfondsen die voldoen aan de specifieke eisen van de definitie in de IBPV-richtlijn (2003/41/EC) vallen onder die richtlijn. De richtlijn stelt alleen bepaalde prudentiële vereisten en vereisten inzake informatieverstrekking voor bedrijfspensioenfondsen in als dergelijke fondsen een onderdeel van het pensioenstelsel van een lidstaat vormen. De richtlijn doet dus geen afbreuk aan het recht van een lidstaat om op basis van artikel 153, lid 4, VWEU de fundamentele beginselen van zijn pensioenstelsel vast te stellen.

([1]) PB L 235 van 23.09.2013, blz. 10.

([2]) Mededeling van de Commissie betreffende de toepassing van de staatssteunregels van de Europese Unie op voor het verrichten van diensten van algemeen economisch belang verleende compensatie (PB C 8 van 11.1.2012, blz. 4) en Besluit van de Commissie van 20 december 2011 betreffende de toepassing van artikel 106, lid 2, van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie op staatssteun in de vorm van compensatie voor de openbare dienst, verleend aan bepaalde met het beheer van diensten van algemeen economisch belang belaste ondernemingen (PB L 7 van 11.1.2012, blz. 3); EU-kaderregeling inzake staatssteun in de vorm van compensatie voor de openbare dienst (2011), PB C 8 van 11.1.2012, blz. 15.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003853/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: ING

In its reply to my question about the draft law to mobilise pension savings for long-term financing (E-001836/14), the Commission states that, if pensions are part of the social security system, Member States have exclusive competence as regards the way in which pensions are organised. The Commission also states that Member States retain full responsibility for the organisation of their national pension systems. Thirdly, the Commission states that, if pensions are provided by financial institutions, EU secondary legislation applies.

The Netherlands has a pension system based on both the social security system and occupational/sectoral pension schemes, on the one hand, and individual pension schemes on the other. Occupational or sectoral schemes are managed jointly by representatives of both employers and employees (the social partners). Individual pension schemes are run by insurers and banks.

Employees are compulsorily affiliated to their employer's occupational/sectoral scheme.

1. Does the Commission consider that occupational/sectoral pension funds can be defined as financial institutions?

2. If so, does the Commission not consider that, as employees are compulsorily affiliated to an occupational/sectoral pension fund, such funds constitute public service-providers?

3. Ought it therefore to be possible to regard occupational/sectoral pension funds as a continuation of the Dutch social security system?

4. Do these funds accordingly fall outside the competence of the EU pursuant to Article 153(4) TFEU?

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

The IORP Directive 2003/41/EC ([1]) defines occupational pension funds and identifies those funds which fulfil the specific requirements of the definition as financial institutions.

A Dutch occupational pension fund may carry out under an official act a service of general economic interest (SGEI). In that case public service compensation can be granted to the fund in compliance with state aid rules ([2]). That means *inter alia* that there must not be any overcompensation for the provision of the given service.

Member States retain full responsibility for the organisation of 'pension pillars' which encompass, for example, a State-run compulsory pillar based on the redistribution principle, a compulsory pillar based on the capitalisation principle, an occupational pension pillar or a voluntary pension pillar. Dutch occupational pension funds are part of the occupational pension pillar and offer complementary benefits going beyond the guarantees of the first pillar.

Dutch occupational pension funds which fulfil the specific requirements of the definition in the IORP Directive 2003/41/EC are covered by that directive. The directive is limited to establish certain prudential and information requirements for occupational pension funds, for those cases where such funds exist as part of a Member States' pension system. It therefore does not affect the right of Member States to define the fundamental principles of their pension systems based on Article 153(4) TFEU.

([1]) OJ L 235, 23.9.2013, p. 10.
([2]) Communication from the Commission on the application of the European Union state aid rules to compensation granted for the provision of services of general economic interest, OJ C 8, 11.1.2012, p.4 and Commission decision of 20.12.2011 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, OJ L 7, 11.1.2012, p.3; European Union Framework for state aid in the form of public service compensation 2011, OJ C8, 11.1.2012, p.15.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003855/14
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(27 martie 2014)

Subiect: Proiecte de investiții și de asistență tehnică în materie de eficiență energetică și de energie din surse regenerabile

Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1233/2010 de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 663/2009 de stabilire a unui program de ajutor pentru redresare economică prin acordarea de asistență financiară comunitară pentru proiecte în domeniul energiei a instituit Programul energetic european pentru redresare (PEER) pentru a sprijini redresarea economică prin acordarea unui pachet financiar în valoare de 3,98 miliarde EUR pentru 2009 și 2010.

Conform acestui regulament, „[i]ntermediarii financiari descriși în anexa II depun efortul de a aloca toate fondurile provenind din contribuția Uniunii disponibile în cadrul facilității unor proiecte de investiții și asistenței tehnice pentru proiecte în materie de eficiență energetică și de energie din surse regenerabile până la 31 martie 2014. Nu se alocă fonduri din contribuția Uniunii după data respectivă. Toate fondurile provenind din contribuția Uniunii ce nu au fost alocate de intermediarii financiari până la 31 martie 2014 sunt returnate la bugetul general al Uniunii. Fondurile provenind din contribuția Uniunii alocate unor proiecte de investiții sunt investite pentru o anumită perioadă de timp care nu poate depăși data de 31 martie 2034. Uniunea are dreptul la venituri provenind din investiția sa în facilitate pe toată durata de viață a facilității, proporțional cu contribuția sa la facilitate și în conformitate cu drepturile sale de acționar.”

Aș dori să întreb Comisia dacă fondurile provenind din contribuția Uniunii disponibile în cadrul facilității unor proiecte de investiții și asistenței tehnice pentru proiecte în materie de eficiență energetică și de energie din surse regenerabile au fost alocate în totalitate până la 31 martie 2014, și, dacă nu, care este suma nealocată și care sunt cauzele pentru care acestea nu au putut fi alocate?

Răspuns dat de dl Oettinger în numele Comisiei
(19 mai 2014)

Contribuția totală din partea UE la Fondul european pentru eficiență energetică (125 milioane EUR) a fost alocată cu succes investițiilor în proiecte. La 31 martie 2014, o sumă totală de aproximativ 217 milioane EUR (inclusiv resurse din partea UE și a altor investitori în fond) a fost alocată pentru 13 proiecte.

Pachetul de asistență tehnică (20 milioane EUR) a sprijinit 20 de proiecte pentru a ajuta la structurarea lor. Aproximativ 2,2 milioane EUR din pachetul de asistență tehnică vor rămâne nealocate. Acest lucru poate fi explicat prin faptul că majoritatea proiectelor finanțate până în prezent nu au necesitat asistență tehnică. Într-adevăr, primele proiecte identificate în faza de început a fondului au avut o perioadă mai mare de dezvoltare/un nivel de maturitate mai ridicat, pentru a aborda constrângerile de timp și recuperarea obiectivului regulamentului.

Situația actuală în cadrul EEEF va fi detaliată într-o secțiune specifică a raportului anual de punere în aplicare al PEER 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003855/14
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(27 March 2014)

Subject: Projected investment and technical assistance in energy efficiency and renewables

Under Regulation (EC) No 1233/2010 amending Regulation (EC) No 663/2009 establishing a programme to aid economic recovery by granting Community financial assistance to projects in the field of energy, the European energy programme for recovery (EEPR) was established with a budget of EUR 3.98 billion for 2009 and 2010 to help reinvigorate the economy.

The regulation states that 'the financial intermediaries described in Annex II shall endeavour to allocate all the funding from the Union contribution available in the facility to investment projects and to technical assistance for energy efficiency and renewable energy projects by 31 March 2014. No funding from the Union contribution shall be allocated after that date. All funding from the Union contribution not allocated by the financial intermediaries by 31 March 2014 shall be returned to the general budget of the Union. The funding from the Union contribution allocated to investment projects shall remain for a specified length of time that may not extend beyond 31 March 2034. The Union shall be entitled to returns on its investment in the facility throughout the lifetime of the facility in proportion to its contribution to the facility and in accordance with its shareholder rights'.

Can the Commission indicate whether funds from the Union contribution earmarked for projected investment and technical assistance for energy efficiency and renewables have been allocated in full up to 31 March 2014? If not, can it say what amount remains unallocated and why?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(19 May 2014)

The full EU contribution to the European Energy Efficiency Fund (EUR 125 million) has been successfully allocated to project investments. At 31 March 2014 a global amount of approximately EUR 217 million (including resources from the EU and from other investors in the Fund) was allocated to 13 projects.

The Technical Assistance (TA) envelope (EUR 20 million) supported 20 projects in helping to structure them. Approximately EUR 2.2 million from the TA envelope will remain unallocated. This can be explained by the fact that most of the project financed up to now did not need TA. Indeed, the first projects identified in the ramp-up phase of the Fund had a higher advancement stage/maturity level, in order to deal with the time constraint and recovery objective of the regulation.

The state of play under the EEEF will be detailed in a dedicated section of the EEPR annual implementation report 2014.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003856/14
til Kommissionen
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(28. marts 2014)

Om: Afsoning af straf i hjemlandet

Ti EU-lande mangler at implementere Rådets rammeafgørelse 2008/909/JHA om anvendelse af princippet om gensidig anerkendelse på domme i straffesager om idømmelse af frihedsstraffe eller frihedsberøvende foranstaltninger (afsoning af straf i hjemlandet), i følge Kommissionens pressemeddelelse IP/14/100 af den 5. februar 2014.

Hvilke muligheder har Kommissionen for at håndhæve Rådets rammeafgørelse og sikre, at alle medlemsstater anvender princippet om gensidig anerkendelse af domme?

Hvordan agter Kommissionen at sikre implementering af Rådets rammeafgørelse?

Har Kommissionen tal på, hvor mange frihedsberøvede personer der blev udvekslet mellem medlemslandene i 2013?

Vil Kommissionen overveje at fremsætte nye lovforslag med lovhjemmel i Lissabon-traktaten for at sikre anvendelsen af princippet om gensidig anerkendelse af domme i straffesager og dermed medlemsstaternes mulighed for at sende kriminelle til afsoning af straf i deres eget hjemland, hvis betingelserne i den nuværende rammeafgørelse er opfyldt?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Viviane Reding
(2. juni 2014)

Kommissionen opfordrer i sin gennemførelsesrapport af 5. februar 2014 alle medlemsstater, som endnu ikke har gennemført rammeafgørelse 2008/909/RIA om anvendelse af princippet om gensidig anerkendelse på domme ([1]), om hurtigt at træffe foranstaltninger til fuldstændig gennemførelse af dette EU-instrument.

Kommissionen kan først iværksætte overtrædelsesprocedurer for manglende gennemførelse i december 2014, som er fristen for overgangsperiodens udløb, jf. artikel 10, stk. 1, i protokol 36 om overgangsbestemmelser, der er knyttet som bilag til traktaten om Den Europæiske Unions funktionsmåde.

Kommissionen har dog i den seneste årrække nøje fulgt medlemsstaternes gennemførelse af rammeafgørelsen. Med henblik på at fremskynde gennemførelsen arrangerede Kommissionen tre workshops i 2010 samt to ekspertmøder i 2012 og et i november 2013.

Derudover har Kommissionen finansieret mange projekter, som skal hjælpe medlemsstaterne med at gennemføre rammeafgørelsen og øge de retlige aktørers kendskab til instrumentet. Denne praksis vil fortsætte under det nye program for retlige anliggender gældende for perioden 2014-2020 ([2]).

Kommissionen har ikke tal på, hvor mange frihedsberøvede personer, som blev udvekslet mellem medlemsstaterne i 2013.

Kommissionen har ikke planer om at fremlægge et nyt lovforslag om gensidig anerkendelse af domme i straffesager, da den vil sikre sig, at medlemsstaterne gennemfører den eksisterende rammeafgørelse 2008/909/RIA korrekt.

([1]) Rådets rammeafgørelse 2008/909/RIA af 27. november 2008 om anvendelse af princippet om gensidig anerkendelse på domme i straffesager om idømmelse af frihedsstraffe eller frihedsberøvende foranstaltninger med henblik på fuldbyrdelse i Den Europæiske Union, EUT L 327 af 5.12.2008, s. 27.

([2]) Forordning (EU) nr. 1382/2013 af 17. december 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003856/14
to the Commission
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Serving custodial sentences in country of origin

According to Commission press release IP/14/100 of 5 February 2014, ten EU Member States have yet to implement Council Framework Decision 2008/909/JHA on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty (serving of sentences in country or origin).

What options does the Commission have for enforcing the Council Framework Decision and ensuring that all Member States apply the principle of mutual recognition of sentences?

How does the Commission propose to ensure the implementation of the Council Framework Decision?

Does the Commission have figures on how many persons subject to deprivation of liberty were exchanged between the Member States in 2013?

Will the Commission consider submitting new legislative proposals with a legal basis in the Lisbon Treaty to secure the application of the principle of mutual recognition of judgments in criminal matters, thus enabling Member States to send criminals to serve their sentences in their home countries, provided the conditions of the current Framework Decision are met?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

In its implementation report of 5 February 2014, the Commission urges all Member States that have not yet transposed Framework Decision 2008/909/JHA on the Transfer of Prisoners ([1]) to take swift measures to implement this EU instrument fully.

The Commission cannot launch infringement proceedings for non-implementation until December 2014, the end of the transitional period as provided in Article 10(1) of Protocol 36 on transitional provisions annexed to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

However, over the last number of years, the Commission has been closely monitoring the implementation of the framework Decision by Member States. To this effect, and to speed up the implementation process, the Commission organised three workshops in 2010, two experts' meetings in 2012 and one in November 2013.

Moreover, the Commission has funded many projects that aim to support Member States in the implementation of the framework Decision and to raise awareness of this instrument among legal practitioners. This practice will be continued within the new Justice programme for the period 2014 to 2020 ([2]).

The Commission does not have figures on how many persons subject to deprivation of liberty were exchanged between the Member States in 2013.

The Commission is not considering submitting a new legislative proposal on mutual recognition of prison sentences as it will ensure that Member States properly implement the existing FD 2008/909/JHA.

([1]) Framework Decision 2008/909/JHA of 27.11.2008 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty for the purpose of their enforcement in the European Union, OJ L 327/27, 5.12.2008.
([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1382/2013 of 17.12.2013.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003857/14
do Komisji
Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR)
(28 marca 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Łamanie praw chrześcijan w Pakistanie

Sytuacja wspólnoty chrześcijańskiej w Pakistanie jest obecnie opłakana; prawa chrześcijan są tam często łamane. W sierpniu 2012 r. pakistańska dziewczynka Rimshah Masih została niesłusznie oskarżona o spalenie Koranu i zaaresztowana po zarzutem bluźnierstwa. Inna chrześcijanka, Asia Bibi, została brutalnie pobita przez współpracownice, a następnie zaaresztowana przez policję za to, że powiedziała, iż w przeciwieństwie do proroka Mohameta, Jezus Chrystus nie umarł. W czerwcu 2013 r. w mieście Pattoki w okręgu Kasur trzy chrześcijanki zostały pobite i były oprowadzane nago przez uzbrojonych mężczyzn w służbie potężnego lokalnego posiadacza ziemskiego popieranego przez partię rządzącą (PML-N). W dniu 25 czerwca chrześcijańskiemu prawnikowi zagrożono tragicznymi konsekwencjami, jeżeli zaoferuje on pomoc prawną tym trzem kobietom ([1]).

W rezolucji Parlamentu w sprawie propagowania i ochrony wolności religii lub przekonań ([2]) stwierdzono, że „zgodnie ze standardami prawa międzynarodowego wszystkie państwa mają obowiązek zapewnić skuteczną ochronę wszystkim swoim obywatelom oraz wszystkim innym osobom podlegającym ich jurysdykcji" oraz że „propagowanie prawa do wolności religii lub przekonań oraz zapobieganie naruszaniu tego prawa musi być priorytetem w polityce zewnętrznej UE" ([3]).

1. Czy Komisji wiadomo, że w Pakistanie są łamane prawa chrześcijan?

2. Jakie środki zamierza podjąć UE, aby zapewnić przestrzeganie przez Pakistan praw mniejszości na swoim terytorium?

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

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji odsyła Szanownego Pana Posła do odpowiedzi na pytania wymagające odpowiedzi na piśmie E-008959/2013, E-011378/2013, E-003283/2014 i E-003347/2014.

([1]) Źródła: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jul/01/pakistan-girl-accused-blasphemy-canada; http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-south-asia-11930849; http://www.humanrights.asia/news/urgent-appeals/AHRC-UAC-085-2013
([2]) P7_TA(2013)0279.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2013-0279+0+DOC+XML+V0//PL

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003857/14
to the Commission
Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Violation of human rights of Christians in Pakistan

The plight of the Christian community in Pakistan is currently deplorable, with Christians being subjected to frequent violations of their human rights. In August 2012, Rimshah Masih, a Pakistani Christian girl, was falsely accused of burning the Qur'an and arrested on charges of blasphemy. Asia Bibi, another Christian woman, was brutally beaten by her co-workers and then arrested by the police for declaring that Jesus Christ is not dead but the Prophet Mohammed is. Currently, she faces charges of blasphemy, and is serving a four-year prison term while further facing a death sentence. In June 2013, in the Pattoki area of Kasur district, three Christian women were beaten and then paraded naked by armed men in the service of a powerful local landlord supported by the ruling PML(N) party. On 25 June, a Christian lawyer was threatened with dire consequences if he offered legal assistance to the three women ([1]).

Parliament's resolution on the promotion and protection of freedom of religion and belief ([2]) states that 'according to the standards of international law, all states have the duty to provide effective protection to all their citizens and all other persons under their respective jurisdictions' and that 'promoting the right to freedom of religion or belief or preventing it from being violated has to be a priority in the EU's external policies' ([3]).

1. Is the Commission aware of the human rights abuses against Christians in Pakistan?

2. What measures will the EU take to ensure that Pakistan does not violate the human rights of minorities within its territory?

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

The HR/VP refers the Honourable Member to the replies to written questions E-008959/2013, E-011378/2013, E-003283/2014, and E-003347/2014.

([1]) *Sources:* http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jul/01/pakistan-girl-accused-blasphemy-canada; http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-south-asia-11930849; http://www.humanrights.asia/news/urgent-appeals/AHRC-UAC-085-2013
([2]) P7_TA(2013)0279.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2013-0279+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003858/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Fatturar-e u kompetittività

Il-fatturar elettroniku Ewropew kemm se jagħti spinta lill-kompetittività tal-UE?

Il-Kummissjoni kkunsidrat l-ispejjeż tal-installazzjoni tas-softwer neċessarju kontra l-benefiċċji tas-sistema?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Barnier f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(10 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-fatturar elettroniku jiġġenera firxa wiesgħa ta' benefiċċji għall-intrapriżi: inaqqas il-kost u l-kumplessità tal-fatturar billi jawtomatizza ħafna mill-proċessi interni u jelimina l-kostijiet tal-karti u dawk postali, jippermetti r-riallokazzjoni tal-persunal għal kompiti aktar produttivi, inaqqas il-ħinijiet tal-pagamenti billi jiffaċilita l-ipproċessar tal-fatturi li jkunu dħlin mill-awtoritajiet pubbliċi. Billi tistabbilixxi *standard* tal-fatturar elettroniku Ewropew u tobbliga lill-awtoritajiet u lill-entitajiet kontraenti kollha madwar l-UE biex jaċċettaw il-fatturi mibgħuta b'dan l-i*standard*, id-Direttiva dwar il-fatturar elettroniku fl-akkwist pubbliku telimina wieħed mill-ostakoli għall-parteċipazzjoni fi proċeduri ta' akkwist pubbliku transfruntiera, biex b'hekk jinħolqu opportunitajiet ġodda ta' negozju. Min-naħa l-oħra, iż-żieda fil-kompetizzjoni fl-akkwist pubbliku tirriżulta fi prezzijiet aktar baxxi għall-awtoritajiet pubbliċi. Dawn il-benefiċċji kollha jikkontribwixxu għat-tisħiħ tal-kompetittività tal-ekonomija Ewropea.

Huwa diffiċli li wieħed jagħti figura eżatta tal-implimentazzjoni tal-fatturar elettroniku f'kull każ speċifiku minħabba l-għadd kbir ta' metodi differenti biex wieħed jagħmel dan (l-ipproċessar tal-fatturi elettroniċi direttament, permezz ta' pjattaforma ċentrali, jew permezz ta' fornitur ta' servizzi estern). Madankollu, fuq il-bażi tal-esperjenza ta' xi pajjiżi u l-awtoritajiet pubbliċi li diġà jużaw il-fatturar elettroniku, jista' jingħad b'ċertezza li l-benefiċċji potenzjali tal-fatturi elettroniċi huma ogħla b'mod sinifikanti mill-kostijiet tal-implimentazzjoni mistennija, li f'ħafna każijiet jistgħu jiġu amortizzati fi żmien sena jew tnejn.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003858/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: E-invoicing and competitiveness

How far will European e-invoicing boost EU competitiveness?

Has the Commission factored in the cost of installing the necessary software against the benefits of this system?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

Electronic invoicing generates a wide range of benefits for enterprises: it reduces the cost and complexity of invoicing by automating many of the internal processes and eliminating the paper and postal costs, it allows for the reallocation of staff to more productive tasks, it reduces payment times by facilitating the processing of incoming invoices by public authorities. By putting in place a European e-invoicing standard and obliging all contracting authorities and entities across the EU to accept invoices sent in this standard, the directive on e-invoicing in public procurement eliminates one of the barriers to participation in cross-border public procurement procedures, thereby creating new business opportunities. On the other hand, greater competition in public procurement results in lower prices for public authorities. All of these benefits contribute to strengthening the competitiveness of the European economy.

It is difficult to provide a precise figure of the implementation of e-invoicing in any specific case due to the large number of different methods of doing so (processing e-invoices directly, through a central platform, or via an external service provider). However, on the basis of the experience of some countries and public authorities which already use e-invoicing, it can be stated with some certainty that the potential benefits of e-invoicing are several magnitudes higher than the expected implementation costs, which in most cases can be amortised within one or two years.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003859/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: It-tħaffif tal-fatturar elettroniku

Ir-regoli l-ġodda dwar il-fatturar elettroniku sa liemapunt se jissemplifikaw l-ipproċessar tiegħu, kemm għall-gverinijiet u kemm għan-negozji?

Il-Kummissjoni għandha informazzjoni rigward kemm in-negozji sejrin jiffrankaw b'din is-sistema?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Barnier f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(10 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Fatturar elettroniku — fil-forma ta' dejta elettronika strutturata u mhux biss immaġni elettronika ta' fattura stampata — inaqqas b'mod sinifikanti l-kumplessità tal-fatturar għal kemm l-ispeditur kif ukoll ir-riċevitur billi tiġi eliminata kompletament il-ħtieġa ta' intervent manwali: it-tħejjija u l-produzzjoni ta' fattura, il-proċess li tintbagħat b'mod stampat, il-wasla u r-reġistrazzjoni tagħha, u l-attribuzzjoni u l-ipproċessar tagħha jistgħu jsiru kollha b'mod awtomatizzat. Madankollu, l-għadd kbir ta' *standards* u *formats* ta' fatturar elettroniku u n-nuqqas ta' interoperabbiltà bejniethom illimitaw l-użu tiegħu fl-Ewropa. Id-Direttiva l-ġdida dwar il-fatturar elettroniku fl-akkwist pubbliku ssolvi l-problema li l-utenti jkollhom diversi *formats* ta' fatturar elettroniku billi tipproponi li tiżviluppa standard Ewropew ġdid għall-fatturar elettroniku u tobbliga lill-awtoritajiet u lill-entitajiet kontraenti kollha fl-UE li jirċievu u jipproċessaw il-fatturi elettroniċi mibgħuta f'dan l-istandard. Dan se jwassal għal aktar użu tal-fatturar elettroniku u jiżgura li l-benefiċċji tiegħu jsiru realtà.

Il-Kummissjoni tikkalkula l-benefiċċji netti ġenerali tal-introduzzjoni tal-fatturar elettroniku fl-akkwist pubbliku għal madwar EUR 2.3 biljun fis-sena. Huwa diffiċli li tiġi provduta ċifra preċiża ta' ffrankar minħabba l-għadd ta' metodi differenti għall-implimentazzjoni tal-fatturar elettroniku: il-produzzjoni u l-ipproċessar tal-fatturi elettroniċi jistgħu jsiru direttament mill-ispeditur/mir-riċevitur jew billi jingħataw kuntratti marbuta ma' dawn il-kompiti lil fornitur estern tas-servizz. Fl-ewwel każ, il-partijiet jistgħu jaġixxu waħedhom jew permezz ta' pjattaforma ċentrali. Il-forniturі tas-servizz għandhom firxa wiesgħa ħafna ta' tariffi u strutturi ta' tariffi (għal kull fattura, kull ammont tal-fattura, kull xahar, eċċ.). Madankollu, l-istudji juru li t-tranżizzjoni minn karta għal fatturar elettroniku awtomatizzat b'mod sħiħ tista' twassal għal iffrankar ta' 80 % jew aktar. ([1])

([1]) Pereżempju, it-Teżor l-Istat Finlandiż u xi kumpaniji Finlandiżi kkalkulaw li jekk jimxu lejn fatturar elettroniku kompletament awtomatiku, il-kost tal-ipproċessar tal-fattura stampata għall-kumpanija riċeventi jista' jitnaqqas minn EUR 30-50 għal EUR 1 biss għal kull fattura. L-iffrankar għall-parti mittenti, għalkemm mhux wisq, huwa madankollu mistenni li jkun sinifikanti. ("Electronic Invoicing Initiatives in Finland and in the European Union — Taking steps towards the Real Time Economy", Helsinki School of Economics, B-95.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003859/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Simplification of e-invoicing

To what extent will the new rules on e-invoicing simplify the processing thereof for both governments and businesses?

Does the Commission have information regarding the savings which this system will yield for businesses?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

Electronic invoicing — in the form of structured electronic data and not just an electronic image of a paper invoice — greatly reduces the complexity of invoicing for both senders and recipients by virtually eliminating the need for manual intervention: the preparation and generation of an invoice, its physical sending, its reception and registration, and its attribution and processing can all be automated. However, the multiplicity of e-invoicing standards and formats and the lack of interoperability among them have limited its use in Europe. The new Directive on e-invoicing in public procurement resolves the problem of users having to support several different e-invoicing formats by proposing to develop a new European e-invoicing standard and obliging all contracting authorities and entities in the EU to receive and process e-invoices sent in this standard. This will lead to greater uptake of e-invoicing and ensure that its benefits materialise.

The Commission estimates the overall net benefits of the introduction of e-invoicing in public procurement at around EUR 2.3 billion per annum. It is difficult to provide a precise savings figure due to the many different methods of implementing e-invoicing: the generation and processing of e-invoices can be done either directly by the sender/recipient or by contracting these tasks out to an external service provider. In the first case, the parties can act on their own or via a central platform. The service providers have a very broad range of fees and fee structures (per invoice, per amount of the invoice, per month, etc.). Nevertheless, studies show that savings of 80% or more can be generated by moving from paper to fully automated electronic invoicing. ([1])

([1]) For example, the Finnish state Treasury and some Finnish companies have estimated that by moving to fully automatic electronic invoicing, the processing cost of an incoming paper invoice for the receiving company can be reduced from EUR 30-50 to as little as EUR 1 per invoice. The savings for the sending party, while not as large, are nevertheless expected to be significant. ('Electronic Invoicing Initiatives in Finland and in the European Union — Taking steps towards the Real Time Economy', Helsinki School of Economics, B-95.).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003860/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Regoli ġodda ta' sorveljanza tas-suq u l-konsumaturi

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tispjega sa fejn ir-regoli ġodda ta' sorveljanza tas-suq se jipproteġu lill-konsumaturi?

X'forma se tieħu din is-"sorveljanza" fir-rigward tal-protezzjoni tal-konsumatur?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Tajani f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(27 ta' Mejju 2014)

L-objettiv tal-proposta għal Regolament dwar is-Sigurtà tal-Prodotti għall-Konsumatur [COM(2013)78] hu li jissaħħaħ il-ħarsien tal-konsumatur billi jitpoġġew obbligi ġenerali fuq l-operaturi ekonomiċi biex jiżguraw is-sigurtà tal-prodotti kollha għall-konsumatur, b'responsabbiltajiet iktar ċari għall-manifatturi, l-importaturi u d-distributuri tul il-katina tal-provvista kollha. Il-proposta għandha wkoll l-għan li ttejjeb it-traċċabilità tal-prodotti għall-konsumatur u tippermetti reazzjoni rapida u effettiva għall-problemi ta' sigurtà (eż. meta l-prodotti jintbagħtu lura) permezz ta' operaturi ekonomiċi kif ukoll awtoritajiet ta' sorveljanza tas-suq.

Wieħed mill-għanijiet tal-proposta għal Regolament dwar is-Sorveljanza tas-Suq tal-Prodotti [COM(2013)75] huwa wkoll li ssaħħaħ il-ħarsien tal-konsumatur billi tipprovdi għodod iktar effettivi biex jinfurzaw is-sigurtà u rekwiżiti oħra relatati mal-prodotti, u dan sabiex tkun tista' tittieħed azzjoni kontra prodotti perikolużi u mhux konformi li jesponu lill-konsumaturi għal riskji għas-saħħa jew tipi oħra ta' ħsara (ħsara ambjentali, kejl mhux korrett, sigurtà, eċċ.). Dawn l-għodod jikkonsistu, fost oħrajn, f'sett uniku ta' regoli koerenti għas-sorveljanza tas-suq fis-setturi kollha u skambju aktar effiċjenti ta' informazzjoni u kooperazzjoni bejn l-awtoritajiet nazzjonali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003860/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: New market surveillance rules and consumers

Can the Commission explain to what extent the new market surveillance rules will protect consumers?

What form will this 'surveillance' take vis-à-vis consumer protection?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2014)

The objective of the proposal for a regulation on Consumer Product Safety [COM(2013) 78] is to enhance consumer protection because it places general obligations on economic operators to ensure the safety of all consumer products, with clearer responsibilities for manufacturers, importers and distributors, i.e., throughout the entire supply chain. It also aims at improving the traceability of consumer products, enabling a swift and effective response to safety problems (e.g. recalls) by both economic operators and market surveillance authorities.

One of the objectives of the proposal for a regulation on Market Surveillance for Products [COM(2013) 75] is also to enhance consumer protection by providing more effective tools to enforce safety and other product-related requirements, so that action can be taken against dangerous and non-compliant products that expose consumers to health risks or other types of harm (environmental harm, incorrect measurement, security, etc.). These tools consist, *inter alia*, of a single set of coherent rules for market surveillance across all sectors and more efficient exchange of information and cooperation among national authorities.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003861/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Il-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ

Dejjem niddiskutu l-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ, li hu kkunsidrat bħala prijorità ewlenija Madankollu, fil-verità l-istatistiki mhumiex daqshekk inkoraġġanti.

L-Unjoni Ewropea x'tista' tagħmel aktar f'dan ir-rigward?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(23 ta' Mejju 2014)

Il-ġlieda kontra l-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ hija tabilħaqq prijorità għolja għall-Kummissjoni. Wara l-Pakkett għall-Impjieg taż-Żgħażagħ (YEP) ([1]) ta' Diċembru 2012 u l-ftehim dwar ir-rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kunsill fuq it-twaqqif ta' Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ ([2]), il-Kummissjoni qed tiffoka l-isforzi tagħha biex tgħin lill-Istati Membri jimplimentaw malajr il-Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ. Fost affarijiet oħra dan jinvolvi assistenza teknika lill-Istati Membri; monitoraġġ u analiżi tal-impatt tal-politiki fis-seħħ — fil-kuntest tas-Semestru Ewropew; appoġġ lill-iskambju ta' prattiki tajbin bejn l-Istati Membri; u għajnuna lill-Istati Membri biex jagħmlu l-aħjar użu possibbli mill-Fondi Ewropej Strutturali u ta' Investiment, b'mod partikolari mill-Fond Soċjali Ewropew u l-Inizjattiva favur l-Impjieg taż-Żgħażagħ.

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni se tkompli taħdem fuq ir-Rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kunsill dwar Qafas tal-Kwalità għall-Apprendistati, adottata fil-10 ta' Marzu 2014 ([3]), u tippromwovi l-implimentazzjoni tagħha. Hija se tkompli wkoll tmexxi u tiżviluppa l-Alleanza Ewropea għall-Apprendistati ([4]), u tissokta tappoġġa l-mobbiltà taċ-ċittadini żgħażagħ tal-UE għal xogħol fl-UE.

([1]) COM (2012) 727-728-729, 05.12.2012.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:MT:PDF.
([3]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/141424.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/apprenticeships-alliance.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003861/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Youth unemployment

We are always discussing youth unemployment, which is seen as a top priority. However, in reality the statistics are not that encouraging.

What more can the European Union do in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2014)

The fight against youth unemployment is indeed a top priority for the Commission. Following the December 2012 Youth Employment Package (YEP) ([1]) and the agreement on the Council Recommendation on establishing a Youth Guarantee ([2]), the Commission is focusing its efforts to help Member States rapidly implement the Youth Guarantee. This involves, *inter alia*, technical assistance to Member States; monitoring and analysing the impact of policies in place — in the context of the European Semester; supporting the exchange of good practices between Member States; and helping Member States to make the best possible use of European Structural and Investment Funds, in particular the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative.

Furthermore, the Commission will follow up on the Council Recommendation on the Quality Framework for Traineeships, adopted on 10 March 2014 ([3]), and promote its implementation. It will also continue to steer and develop the European Alliance for Apprenticeships ([4]), and continue to support for intra-EU labour mobility of young EU citizens.

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 of 5.12.2012.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:EN:PDF
([3]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/141424.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/apprenticeships-alliance

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003862/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: L-elezzjonijiet tal-2014 u t-tkabbir ekonomiku

Ġie ddikjarat li "l-elezzjonijiet Ewropej tal-2014 huma opportunità biex l-UE terġa' lura għat-tkabbir ekonomiku u biex niżguraw sistemi finanzjarji sostenibbli". Xi pjanijiet hemm sabiex din il-proposta ssir realtà?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Rehn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(30 ta' Mejju 2014)

L-elezzjonijiet tal-2014 għall-Parlament Ewropew huma element ċentrali tal-proċess demokratiku fl-UE. Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea tittama għal kampanja elettorali attiva fejn il-gruppi politiċi Ewropej jimpenjaw ruħhom mal-votanti biex jispjegaw il-viżjoni tagħhom għall-UE futura b'mod partikolari fir-rigward tal-promozzjoni ta' tkabbir, impjiegi u stabbiltà ekonomika iktar sostenibbli. Il-Parlament Ewropew għandu rwol importanti bħala koleġiżlatur fuq livell ta' UE u biex jiżgura leġittimità, kontabilità u skrutinju tad-deċiżjonijiet demokratiċi meħuda fuq livell ta' UE.

Il-Kummissjoni se tkompli taħdem mill-qrib mal-Parlament elett il-ġdid fit-tisħiħ tal-irkupru ekonomiku, billi tippromwovi t-tkabbir u tiżgura sistemi finanzjarji sostenibbli. Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġa b'mod sħiħ ir-rwol attiv tal-Parlament Ewropew fid-djalogu ekonomiku, kif ukoll fir-rapporti tiegħu dwar, pereżempju, is-Semestru Ewropew. F'dawn l-oqsma tinkoraġġixxi b'mod qawwi l-Parlament Ewropew il-ġdid biex ikompli jieħu r-rwol attiv tiegħu 'l quddiem.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003862/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: The 2014 elections and economic growth

It has been stated that 'the 2014 European elections are a chance to return the EU to growth and ensure sustainable financial systems'. What plans are there to make this proposal reality?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2014)

The 2014 elections to the European Parliament are a central element of the democratic process in the EU. The European Commission hopes for an active electoral campaign in which the European political groups will engage with voters to explain their vision for the future EU in particular with respect to promoting more sustainable growth, jobs and economic stability. The European Parliament has an important role as co-legislator at EU level and in ensuring democratic legitimacy, accountability and scrutiny of decisions taken at the EU-level.

The Commission will continue to work closely with the newly elected Parliament in strengthening the economic recovery, promoting growth and ensuring sustainable financial systems. The Commission fully supports the active role of the European Parliament in the economic dialogue, as well as its reports on, for instance, the European Semester. It in these areas strongly encourages the new European Parliament to continue taking its active role forward.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003863/14
à la Commission
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(28 mars 2014)

Objet: Généralisation des résultats de la consultation publique sur l'ISDS dans le cadre de l'accord UE-États-Unis aux autres accords d'investissements de l'Union

L'Union dispose d'une pleine compétence en matière de politique d'investissements depuis l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Lisbonne. La question du règlement des différends entre des investisseurs privés et des États par l'arbitrage international (via le centre international pour le règlement des différends relatifs aux investissements (CIRDI) ou la commission des Nations unies pour le droit commercial international (CNUDCI)) fait aujourd'hui l'objet d'un intérêt renouvelé, notamment en raison des négociations commerciales avec le Canada ou les États-Unis. Le 21 janvier dernier, le commissaire européen chargé du commerce a annoncé une consultation sur cette question, précisément dans le cadre de l'accord UE-États-Unis. Aujourd'hui ouverte, elle se tiendra jusqu'au 21 juin prochain.

La Commission peut-elle indiquer:

1. Par quels moyens elle va assurer une communication suffisante autour de l'ouverture de cette consultation, afin d'obtenir des réponses de la part d'un maximum de parties intéressées?

2. Quand le texte de cette consultation sera disponible dans les langues officielles del'Union?

3. Si les résultats de cette consultation pourront également être pris en compte dans le cadre des autres négociations en cours (notamment avec le Canada), s'il s'avérait qu'ils ne sont pas conformes au chapitre tel qu'il a été négocié?

4. Si ces résultats s'appliqueront également aux négociations des traités bilatéraux d'investissements, et notamment de celui adopté récemment avec le Myanmar (Birmanie)?

5. Si la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne a déjà eu l'occasion de se prononcer sur l'opportunité de ce mécanisme, ainsi que sur la notion de droit de l'Union et de ses États membres de légiférer dans l'intérêt public?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(28 mai 2014)

La Commission a annoncé le lancement de la consultation publique de plusieurs manières: elle a tenu une conférence de presse et a présenté un exposé technique aux journalistes le jour du lancement de la consultation, et elle organisera un événement destiné aux parties prenantes le 13 mai à Bruxelles. De plus, la Commission communique avec un grand nombre de citoyens européens et leur fournit des informations circonstanciées au moyen de sa page web et par des tweets. La Commission encourage également les États membres et le Parlement européen à jouer un rôle dans ce processus.

L'avis de consultation et le questionnaire de la consultation publique sont désormais disponibles dans toutes les langues officielles de l'UE. Par ailleurs, je tiens à préciser que la consultation se déroulera jusqu'au 6 juillet 2014.

Cette consultation publique porte sur l'approche de l'Union européenne en matière de protection des investissements dans le cadre du partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement. Les autres négociations de l'UE relatives aux investissements comportent toutes leurs particularités. La Commission va toutefois prendre dûment en considération l'ensemble des observations et avis exprimés par les citoyens de l'Union européenne et n'exclut pas d'affiner son approche en conséquence dans le cadre d'autres négociations.

En ce qui concerne la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne, la Commission n'a pas connaissance du fait que les problèmes spécifiques liés au règlement des différends entre investisseurs et État que vous évoquez aient été traités en tant que tels dans des affaires soumises à la Cour. Cependant, celle-ci a, dans son avis 1/91, examiné l'inclusion, dans les accords commerciaux de l'UE, de mécanismes de règlement des différends entre investisseurs et État comportant un système juridictionnel pour régler les litiges, et elle n'a pas détecté d'incompatibilités avec le droit de l'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003863/14
to the Commission
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Results of the public consultation on ISDS in connection with the EU/USA agreement, and their wider application to other EU investment agreements

The EU has had an exclusive competence in the sphere of investment policy since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. There is now renewed interest in the regulation of disputes between private investors and states by means of international arbitration (via the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ISDS) and the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (Uncitral)), particularly owing to the trade negotiations with Canada and the USA. On 21 January 2014, the EU Commissioner responsible for trade announced a consultation on this issue, specifically in the context of the EU-US agreement. This consultation is now open and will continue until 21 June 2014.

In the light of the above, I should like to ask the following questions:

1. How will the Commission ensure that the opening of this consultation is sufficiently publicised, in order to obtain replies from as many interested parties as possible?

2. When will the text of this consultation be available in the EU's official languages?

3. Will it be possible for the results of this consultation also to be taken into account in the context of other negotiations currently under way (particularly with Canada) if they prove not to be in line with the chapter as negotiated?

4. Will these results also apply to negotiations on bilateral investment treaties, particularly the one recently adopted with Myanmar/Burma?

5. Has the Court of Justice of the European Union yet had the opportunity to rule on the desirability of this mechanism, and on the right of the Union and its Member States to legislate in the public interest?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2014)

The Commission has publicised the launch of the public consultation in several ways. It held a press conference and a technical briefing for journalists on the day of the launch of the consultation and will hold a stakeholder event on the 13 of May in Brussels. The Commission is further reaching out to a large number of European citizens via its fully informative webpage and tweet activities. The Commission is also encouraging Member States and the European Parliament to play a role in the process.

The consultation notice and the questionnaire of the public consultation are now available in all EU's official languages. As a matter of clarification, the consultation will last until 6 July 2014.

This public consultation concerns the European Union's approach to investment protection in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. Other EU investment negotiations all carry their own specificities. The Commission will however give due consideration to all the general comments and views expressed by EU citizens and does not exclude refining its approach in other negotiations accordingly.

As regards the European Court of Justice (ECJ), the Commission is not aware that specific issues related to Investor-state dispute settlement that you mention has as such been considered in cases before the ECJ. However the ECJ has in its opinion 1/91 considered the inclusion of dispute settlement mechanisms in EU trade agreements, including a system of courts for hearing disputes, and did not identify any incompatibility with EC law.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003867/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Aumento delle esecuzioni di condanne a morte nel 2013

Una nota ONG internazionale attiva nel settore dei diritti umani ha registrato come tra il 2012 e il 2013 vi sia stata un nuovo aumento delle esecuzioni capitali nel mondo. I dati raccolti indicano che nel 2013 sono state eseguite 778 condanne a morte, quasi 100 in più rispetto al 2012 (682), in ventidue diversi paesi (uno in più rispetto all'anno precedente). L'organizzazione ha però chiarito che i propri dati sono in realtà parziali, perché si ritiene che la Cina abbia messo a morte migliaia di persone: si tratta, stando a quanto sostenuto dall'organizzazione in questione, del paese che da solo è responsabile di oltre la metà delle esecuzioni a livello globale. Inoltre, la relazione manca di dati relativi a paesi che in questi anni stanno vivendo momenti convulsi di instabilità e guerra civile, come Siria ed Egitto, che potrebbero portare il numero registrato a livelli ben più alti.

Alcuni trend positivi riguardano l'Europa, che nel 2013 non ha registrato esecuzioni, dopo che per la prima volta dal 2009, la Bielorussia, unico paese della regione in cui la pena di morte non è stata abolita, non ha eseguito alcuna condanna.

In merito a questi trend, positivi in Europa, ma negativi a livello globale, può la Commissione chiarire quali sono i principali canali e strumenti tramite cui l'UE, baluardo internazionale del movimento abolizionista della pena di morte, combatte per l'abolizione e contro la reintroduzione di questa palese e anacronistica violazione del più basilare dei diritti umani, il diritto alla vita?

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

In linea con la sua politica forte e di principio contro la pena di morte, l'Unione europea è senza dubbio uno dei più importanti attori internazionali e maggiori finanziatori della causa abolizionista a livello mondiale. La lotta contro la pena di morte è al centro della politica dell'UE in materia di diritti umani. L'Unione utilizza costantemente tutti gli strumenti disponibili per promuovere la propria politica abolizionista, secondo le sue linee guida in materia che sono state recentemente aggiornate e rivedute.

In questo contesto, l'Unione si adopera attivamente per reagire all'aumento delle esecuzioni in tutto il mondo per mezzo di a) dichiarazioni, b) iniziative a livello diplomatico nei confronti dei paesi interessati, c) sanzioni, come nel caso dell'Iran, d) dialoghi sui diritti umani, durante i quali la questione della pena di morte viene costantemente sollevata, e) finanziamento di progetti in favore dell'abolizione della pena di morte attraverso lo strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani (EIDHR) e f) un'azione nei consessi multilaterali, in particolare le Nazioni Unite.

A livello multilaterale, l'UE si è adoperata attivamente per promuovere un sostegno internazionale a favore di tutte le risoluzioni dell'Assemblea generale dell'ONU relative a una moratoria sulle esecuzioni, l'ultima delle quali è stata adottata nel 2012 con un numero di voti a favore mai raggiunto prima. Nello stesso ordine di idee, l'UE continuerà a cercare di mobilitare un sostegno interregionale a favore della risoluzione 69 (2014) dell'Assemblea generale dell'ONU, il che presuppone un'interazione costante con i paesi in cui la pena di morte è tuttora in vigore.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003867/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Increase in the number of executions in 2013

A famous international NGO, which works in the human rights sector, has noted that there was a further increase in the number of executions around the world between 2012 and 2013. The data collected show that 778 executions were carried out during 2013, almost 100 more than in 2012 (682), in twenty-two different countries (one more than the previous year). However, the organisation explained that its data are, in fact, incomplete, since it believes that China has executed thousands of people: the organisation claims that China alone is responsible for more than half of all the executions carried out around the world. Furthermore, the report lacks data from countries which are currently undergoing dramatic upheaval, caused by instability or civil wars, such as Syria and Egypt; such data could raise the number of executions to a much higher total.

There are some positive trends in Europe, where no executions took place in 2013, with Belarus, the only country in the region where the death penalty has not been abolished, not carrying out a single execution for the first time since 2009.

In light of these trends, positive in Europe, but negative overall, can the Commission explain the main channels and instruments which enable the EU, an international leader of the abolitionist movement, to fight for abolition and against the reintroduction of this flagrant and anachronistic violation of the most basic human right, the right to life?

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

Consistent with its strong and principled policy against the death penalty, the EU is undoubtedly one of the most prominent international players and lead donors in the abolitionist cause worldwide. The fight against the death penalty is at the heart of the EU's Human Rights policy.The EU constantly uses all tools available in order to promote its abolitionist policy, according to the relevant EU guidelines, which were recently updated and revised.

In this light, the Union is very active in responding to the increase in executions throughtout the world, through a) Statements/Declarations, b) diplomatic level demarches to targeted countries, c) Sanctions, such as in the case of Iran, d) Human rights dialogues where the death penalty is constantly raised, e) funding of abolitionist projects through the European Instrument of Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) and f) Action in multilateral fora, especially in the context of the UN.

As far as the multilateral context is concerned, the EU has been equally active in building international support for all the UNGA Resolutions Moratorium of Executions, the last one being adopted in 2012 with an uprecedented maximum of votes in favour. In the same vein, the EU will continue to seek interregional support for this year's UNGA 69 Resolution, an exercise that implies constant interaction with countries that still retain the capital punishment.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003868/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Controffensiva russa in seguito alle sanzioni e risposta europea

In seguito al crollo della borsa di Mosca e del rublo e in seguito alle sanzioni economiche di UE e USA contro la Russia, pare che Mosca stia implementando una controstrategia di acquisizione di imprese chiave in Europa. Pochi giorni fa un colosso statale russo ha acquisito una quota importante di due società italiane al fine di influenzarne gli acquisti, favorendo come materia prima il petrolio estratto dal colosso russo stesso. Un caso simile è accaduto in Germania, dove un altro oligarca russo ha rilevato pochi giorni fa le attività petrolifere di una nota compagnia elettrica tedesca.

Nel frattempo il rublo ha ricominciato a prendere vigore e riguadagnare posizioni, così come l'indice di borsa MICEX. Il rischio che pare emergere è che l'offensiva economica euroamericana fallisca, senza obbligare la Russia a ripensare la propria strategia.

In merito a questo rischio, può la Commissione riferire se:

1. ritiene che investire nell'efficienza energetica possa essere uno strumento utile per combattere la strategia russa, basata per lo più sulla monopolizzazione dell'offerta energetica;

2. ritiene, a tal riguardo, che il *fracking*, tecnica peraltro già utilizzata dagli USA, possa rappresentare una soluzione?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

L'efficienza energetica è uno dei cardini delle politiche dell'UE in materia di energia e clima. Uno degli obiettivi della strategia Europa 2020 punta ad aumentare del 20 % l'efficienza energetica nell'UE e per conseguirlo è stata adottata la direttiva sull'efficienza energetica ([1]). Gli Stati membri hanno l'obbligo di utilizzare l'energia in maniera più efficiente in tutte le fasi della catena energetica: aumentare l'efficienza è infatti un modo per garantire una riduzione costante della domanda di energia negli Stati membri, con una conseguente diminuzione della dipendenza dai fornitori esterni. Anche il quadro normativo per il 2030 mette l'accento su questo elemento, sottolineando come «una maggiore efficienza energetica, sulla cui importanza esiste un ampio consenso politico, [possa] contribuire in misura fondamentale al conseguimento di tutti i principali obiettivi delle politiche climatiche ed energetiche dell'UE: maggiore competitività, sicurezza dell'approvvigionamento, sostenibilità e transizione verso un'economia a basse emissioni di carbonio.»

Aumentare la produzione interna di energia nel territorio dell'UE, come la produzione di gas naturale dalle formazioni di scisto, potrebbe contribuire a diversificare l'approvvigionamento energetico dell'UE. A tale proposito, il 22 gennaio 2014, la Commissione ha pubblicato una comunicazione ([2]) in cui rileva che se gli Stati membri intendessero sviluppare questa risorsa, nella migliore delle ipotesi, «la produzione di gas naturale dalle formazioni di scisto potrebbe, almeno parzialmente, compensare il calo della produzione di gas convenzionale ed evitare un aumento della dipendenza dell'UE dalle importazioni di gas». La Commissione ha adottato anche una raccomandazione ([3]), rivolta agli Stati membri, per assicurare che la tecnica di fratturazione idraulica ad alto volume utilizzata nell'estrazione di gas di scisto sia accompagnata da adeguate misure di salvaguardia dell'ambiente e del clima.

Per continuare a favorire la diversificazione delle fonti di approvvigionamento dell'UE non cessa di essere fondamentale intensificare l'uso delle tecnologie a basse emissioni di carbonio, in particolare le energie rinnovabili.

([1]) Direttiva 2012/27/UE sull'efficienza energetica, che modifica le direttive 2009/125/CE e 2010/30/UE e abroga le direttive 2004/8/CE e 2006/32/CE.
([2]) Comunicazione della Commissione al Consiglio e al Parlamento europeo sulla ricerca e la produzione di idrocarburi (come il gas di scisto) mediante la fratturazione idraulica ad elevato volume nell'UE, COM(2014) 23 final.
([3]) Raccomandazione 2014/70/UE della Commissione, del 22 gennaio 2014, sui principi minimi applicabili alla ricerca e la produzione di idrocarburi (come il gas di scisto) mediante la fratturazione idraulica ad elevato volume.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003868/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Russian counter-offensive against sanctions and European response

Following the collapse of the Moscow stock exchange and the rouble and the economic sanctions imposed against Russia by the EU and USA, it seems that Moscow is implementing a counter-strategy to acquire key businesses in Europe. A few days ago, a Russian state-owned giant purchased a major stake in two Italian companies in order to influence their purchases, making oil extracted by the Russian giant itself their raw material of choice. A similar case has occurred in Germany, where, a few days ago, another Russian oligarch revealed details of the oil-related activities of a famous German electric company.

In the meantime, the rouble has begun to recover and regain its status, as has the MICEX index. The risk which seems to be emerging is that the European and American economic offensive could fail, without forcing Russia to reconsider its strategy.

In light of this risk, can the Commission state whether:

1. it believes that investing in energy efficiency could be a useful instrument to combat the Russian strategy, which is primarily based on monopolising the energy supply;

2. it believes that, in this regard, *fracking*, a technique which is, moreover, already employed in the USA, could represent a solution?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

Energy efficiency is a cornerstone of the EU energy and climate policies. Europe 2020 targets include increasing EU's energy efficiency by 20%, this objective being supported namely through the Energy Efficiency Directive ([1]). Member States are required to use energy more efficiently at all stages of the energy chain, and increasing energy efficiency is a way to ensure continued reduction of energy demand in Member States, which would lead to decreasing dependency on external suppliers. The 2030 Framework also underlines that 'Improved energy efficiency makes an essential contribution to all of the major objectives of EU climate and energy policies: improved competitiveness; security of supply; sustainability; and the transition to a low carbon economy.'

Increasing domestic energy production in the EU like the production of natural gas from shale formations could contribute to diversifying EU's energy supply. In that respect, on 22 January 2014, the Commission issued a communication ([2]) noting that in a best case scenario, 'natural gas production from shale formations could, at least partially, compensate the decline in the EU's conventional gas production and avoid an increase in the EU's reliance on gas imports', should Member States wish to develop such resources. The Commission also adopted a recommendation ([3]) to Member States aiming to ensure that proper environmental and climate safeguards are in place with regard to the high-volume hydraulic fracturing technique used in shale gas operations.

Increased uptake of low carbon technologies, in particular renewable energies, remains essential to further foster EU diversification of supplies and reach its decarbonisation objectives.

([1]) Directive 2012/27/EU on energy efficiency, amending Directives 2009/125/EC and 2010/30/EU and repealing Directives 2004/8/EC and 2006/32/EC.
([2]) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the exploration and production of hydrocarbons (such as shale gas) using high volume hydraulic fracturing in the EU. /* COM/2014/023 final */.
([3]) 2014/70/EU: Commission Recommendation of 22 January 2014 on minimum principles for the exploration and production of hydrocarbons (such as shale gas) using high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003869/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Norme in materia di sicurezza sportiva

Lo scorso 14 aprile 2012 moriva durante una partita di calcio della Serie B italiana un giovane calciatore di ventisei anni, in seguito a una cardiomiopatia aritmogena. I tre medici sociali intervenuti in soccorso del giovane sono stati ieri rinviati a giudizio con l'accusa di omicidio colposo, per non aver utilizzato il defibrillatore semiautomatico disponibile allo stadio.

Può la Commissione chiarire se esistono norme a livello europeo in tema di primo soccorso durante le manifestazioni sportive, o relative all'obbligo di presenza e utilizzo, in caso di necessità, di defibrillatori durante manifestazioni sportive?

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

Non esistono norme a livello di UE in tema di pronto soccorso durante le manifestazioni sportive, compreso l'uso di defibrillatori.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003869/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Regulations on sports safety

On 14 April 2012, a young 26-year-old football player died during an Italian Serie B match after suffering a heart attack caused by arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy. The three club doctors who gave the young man first aid appeared in court yesterday, accused of manslaughter because they failed to use the semiautomatic defibrillator that was available at the stadium.

Can the Commission clarify whether there are any European regulations governing first aid at sporting events, or concerning the statutory presence and use, when necessary, of defibrillators at sporting events?

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

There is no EU legislation governing first aid at sporting events, including the use of defibrillators.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003871/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Ricadute dei social network in termini di trasparenza e offerta di lavoro

Un'università italiana ha condotto una ricerca per valutare quanto le università italiane siano presenti sui social network a scopo informativo, comunicativo e professionale, basandosi su una mappatura delle buone pratiche e delle principali lacune nel campo. I dati sono confortanti, dal momento che l'80 % delle università italiane ha almeno un account Facebook e il 76 % uno su Twitter. La ricerca ha inoltre fatto emergere un altro dato: in alcuni casi gli account social delle università sono gestiti da uffici esclusivamente preposti alla comunicazione virtuale, delineando nuove figure professionali specificatamente formate e attrezzate per la comunicazione istituzionale tramite social network.

Un dato negativo riguarda però l'interazione, dal momento che quasi la metà dei canali universitari non permette agli utenti di lasciare messaggi in bacheca.

In merito a questi dati, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. Se dispone di dati relativi alla presenza e all'uso dei social network da parte di altri poli universitari europei?

2. Se dispone di dati, a livello europeo, riguardo l'emersione della figura professionale esplicitamente ed esclusivamente dedicata alla comunicazione tramite social network?

3. Ritiene che i social network possano dare un contributo effettivo in tema di miglioramento della trasparenza istituzionale delle università e, per estensione, di altre istituzioni pubbliche e private?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(13 giugno 2014)

La Commissione non raccoglie dati in merito alla presenza nei social network e all'utilizzo di queste reti da parte delle università europee o in merito all'emergere di figure professionali destinate alla comunicazione tramite questi strumenti. Tuttavia,secondo due studi recenti ([1]), nel 2013, a livello di UE il 30 % delle imprese (con 10 o più dipendenti) hanno utilizzato i media sociali a fini professionali, e circa un terzo di quest'ultime ha personale a tempo pieno per lo svolgimento delle attività sui media sociali.

La Commissione ha sottolineato l'importanza di ottimizzare le potenzialità delle tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione a tutti i livelli di istruzione, in particolare nell'iniziativa sull'«apertura dell'istruzione». ([2]) Al di là del loro potenziale nella comunicazione con il pubblico, i media sociali possono essere utilizzati in modo costruttivo all'interno delle istituzioni a sostegno dell'apprendimento. Il gruppo di alto livello per la modernizzazione dell'istruzione superiore sta attualmente esaminando come massimizzare l'impatto di nuovi metodi che offrano una migliore qualità nell'istruzione superiore, tra i quali i media sociali, e dovrà presentare una relazione nel giugno di quest'anno.

Il programma di apprendimento permanente (ora Erasmus +) ha sostenuto — e continuerà a sostenere in misura crescente — progetti sull'utilizzo delle TIC nel campo dell'istruzione, compreso l'uso dei social network. Si veda ad esempio «*Entrepreneurship in Serious. Improving the entrepreneurs' skills through the serious games supported on social networks.*» ([3])

([1]) (i) «Use of Social Media by European SMEs», studio SMART 2011/0076 di IPTS, pubblicato nel dicembre 2013: http://bookshop.europa.eu/it/use-of-social-media-by-european-smes-pbKK0113565/.
(ii) «Businesses raise their internet profile by using social media», Statistics in Focus 28/2013 di Eurostat: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/publication?p_product_code=KS-SF-13-028.

([2]) http://www.openeducationeuropa.eu/it/home_new.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/eplus-project-details-page/?nodeRef=workspace://SpacesStore/b8ec130d-db8a-4438-8731-97f024c6693b.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003871/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Impact of social networks in terms of transparency and employment

An Italian university has conducted a study to assess Italian universities' presence on social networks for information, communication and professional purposes. The assessment was based on a mapping of good practices and the main gaps in the field. The figures are reassuring, with 80% of Italian universities having at least a Facebook account and 76% having an account on Twitter. The research also revealed another fact: in some cases, universities' social network accounts are managed by staff devoted solely to virtual communications, which means that new professional roles are emerging, with people being specially trained and equipped to manage institutions' communications via social networks.

There was, however, a negative finding as regards interaction, with almost half of universities' pages not allowing users to leave messages on a wall.

Can the Commission clarify the following in connection with these figures:

1. Does it have any figures on the social network presence and usage of other European universities?

2. Does it have any figures, at European level, concerning the emergence of professionals explicitly and exclusively dedicated to communications via social networks?

3. Does it think social networks can make a positive contribution in terms of improving the transparency of university institutions and, by extension, other public and private institutions?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission does not collect data on the social network presence and usage of European universities, nor on the emergence of professionals dedicated to communications via social networks. However, two recent studies ([1]) have estimated that, in 2013, at EU level, 30% of enterprises (with 10 or more employees) were using social media for business purposes and around one third of them have full-time staff supporting their social media activities.

The Commission has stressed the importance of harnessing the potential of Information and Communication Technologies at all levels of education, notably in the initiative on 'Opening-Up Education' ([2]). In addition to its potential for communicating with the public, social media can also be used constructively inside institutions to support learning. A High Level Group on the Modernisation of Higher Education is currently looking into how to maximise the impact of new methods of delivering quality higher education, including social media, and is due to report in June this year.

The Lifelong Learning Programme (now Erasmus+) has supported — and will increasingly — support projects on using ICT in education, including the use of social networks. See for example 'Entrepreneurship in Serious. Improving the entrepreneurs' skills through the serious games supported on social networks'. ([3])

([1]) (i) 'Use of Social Media by European SMEs', study SMART 2011/0076 by IPTS, published December 2013: http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en_GB/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=KK0113565
(ii) 'Businesses raise their Internet profile by using social media', Statistics in Focus 28/2013 by Eurostat:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/publication?p_product_code=KS-SF-13-028

([2]) http://www.openeducationeuropa.eu/en

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/eplus-project-details-page/?nodeRef=workspace://SpacesStore/b8ec130d-db8a-4438-8731-97f024c6693b

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003872/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Rischi per i consumatori e le PMI legati all'avanzamento delle nuove tecnologie digitali

Un'impresa americana, nota soprattutto per il più diffuso social network al mondo, ha recentemente affermato di voler sviluppare una tecnologia e un database intelligente che siano in grado di riconoscere gli oggetti presenti all'interno delle foto pubblicate sul social network, arrivando a individuarne anche il produttore.

Questo genere di tecnologia in parte già esiste: esistono infatti software in grado di riconoscere la fisionomia di un volto umano che appare in video o in foto e, di recente, diversi colossi informatici e delle telecomunicazioni hanno cominciato a investire in piccole aziende che si occupano di studio e sviluppo di intelligenze artificiali.

Il timore di alcuni è che questo genere di software possa dare luogo a conseguenze spiacevoli per i consumatori, dal momento che potrebbe essere sfruttato per operazioni di direct online marketing che rischierebbero di «aggredire» i potenziali clienti, oltre a porre in una situazione di svantaggio competitivo le piccole aziende che, soprattutto per ragioni economiche, non avranno immediato accesso a questo genere di strumenti.

La Commissione ritiene che tali timori possano essere fondati? L'attuale disciplina normativa europea in materia di pratiche commerciali sleali e di pubblicità ingannevole sarebbe in grado di rispondere a detti timori, alla luce dell'avanzamento tecnologico?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2014)

Il diritto dell'UE in materia di tutela dei consumatori prevede che questi ultimi siano correttamente informati circa le caratteristiche di un prodotto. Infatti, le direttive 97/7/CE relativa ai contratti a distanza e 2005/29/CE relativa alle pratiche commerciali sleali impongono agli operatori di fornire informazioni sulle principali caratteristiche dei loro prodotti. La direttiva 2011/83/UE sui diritti dei consumatori, che sostituirà la direttiva 97/7/CE a decorrere dal 13 giugno 2014, prevede specificamente informazioni sulle funzionalità e l'interoperabilità dei contenuti digitali.

Sulla base delle informazioni disponibili, la Commissione non è in grado di valutare se e in quale misura, questo tipo di uso commerciale delle nuove tecnologie possa avere un impatto negativo sulle PMI.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003872/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Risks for consumers and SMEs associated with the progress of new digital technologies

An American company, known primarily for the world's biggest social network, has recently said it wants to develop an intelligent database and technology capable of recognising objects in photos posted on the social network, to the extent that even the manufacturer could be identified.

This type of technology already exists to a degree: there is software that can recognise the physiognomy of a human face in a video or photo, and various IT and telecommunications giants have recently started investing in small companies that specialise in researching and developing artificial intelligence.

Some people are afraid this type of software might have unpleasant consequences for consumers because it could be used for direct online marketing 'assaults' on potential customers. It would also put small businesses at a competitive disadvantage because they will not have immediate access to this type of tool, mainly for financial reasons.

Does the Commission think there are grounds for these fears? Would current European legislation on unfair commercial practices and misleading advertising provide a sufficient response to these fears, in the light of technological progress?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

EC law on consumer protection requires that consumers are properly informed about the characteristics of a product. Indeed, Directives 97/7/EC on Distance Selling and 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices require traders to provide information on the main characteristics of their offer. Directive 2011/83/EU on Consumer Rights, which will replace Directive 97/7/EC from 13 June 2014, requires specifically information on functionality and interoperability of digital products.

Based on the information available, the Commission is not in a position to asses to what extent, if at all, this type of business use of new technologies could have a negative impact on small-and-medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003873/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Sei ufficiali ucraini prigionieri delle forze armate russe

Il viceministro della Difesa ucraino ha denunciato il fatto che le forze armate russe abbiano preso prigionieri sei alti ufficiali ucraini, tra cui un generale. Il viceministro ha inoltre affermato che il governo e l'esercito hanno perso le tracce dei sei militari, ma di essere certi che essi si trovino in mano alla Russia, anche perché tra di essi è presente il colonnello a capo dell'ultima base militare ucraina sgomberata in Crimea. Il governo di Kiev ha mostrato profonda preoccupazione per la situazione e il destino degli ufficiali, temendo per la loro incolumità.

In merito a questa situazione, può la Commissione chiarire se dispone di ulteriori informazioni in merito alla questione? Ha motivo di ritenere che i timori espressi dal viceministro ucraino siano fondati?

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

La situazione è notevolmente cambiata da quando è stata presentata l'interrogazione: stando a quanto annunciato pubblicamente dal ministero della Difesa ucraino, tutti gli ufficiali che all'epoca erano tenuti in ostaggio sono stati liberati. Si sono però verificati altri incidenti, come il caso di un soldato ucraino ucciso il 6 aprile a Novofedorivka. L'UE deplora e condanna questi incidenti e continuerà a seguire le indagini.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003873/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Six Ukrainian officers held prisoner by the Russian armed forces

Ukraine's Deputy Defence Minister has denounced the fact that the Russian armed forces have taken six high-ranking Ukrainian officers prisoner, including a general. The deputy minister has also said that the government and army have lost track of the six officers but are sure they are in the hands of the Russians, not least because they include the colonel who was head of the last Ukrainian military base to be evacuated in Crimea. The government in Kiev has said it is deeply concerned about the situation and the officers' fate, fearing for their safety.

Can the Commission clarify whether it has any further information on this situation? Does it have reason to believe there are grounds for the fears voiced by the Ukrainian deputy minister?

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

Since your question was submitted, the situation has changed considerably: according to the information provided in public announcements by the Ministry of Defence of Ukraine, all the officers held hostage at the time of your question have been released. At the same time, other incidents have occurred, such as the case of a Ukrainian soldier shot dead in Novofedorivka on 6 April. The EU deplores and condemns such incidents. It will continue to follow the investigations.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003874/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Soglie di presenza di vera frutta nelle bevande analcoliche

Ieri in seno alla Camera dei deputati italiana è stato respinto un emendamento che innalzava la percentuale minima di vera frutta nelle bevande analcoliche dall'attuale 12 % al 20 %.

L'organizzazione italiana di rappresentanza dei coltivatori diretti ha aspramente criticato il risultato, accusando le lobby di grandi multinazionali di andare contro le PMI italiane di settore e contro una maggiore tutela della salute derivante dall'aumento della percentuale. Alla critica si è unita, con toni meno duri, anche la confederazione italiana degli agricoltori, che però ha invitato le istituzioni europee a occuparsi della questione a livello di Unione.

Dal canto loro, i produttori di bevande analcoliche hanno paventato il rischio di forti distorsioni della concorrenza nel caso in cui l'emendamento fosse passato, perché avrebbe avuto giurisdizione solo sui produttori italiani e non anche su quelli europei ed esteri.

In merito alla questione, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. esiste attualmente una legislazione a livello europeo che ponga delle soglie minime di presenza di vera frutta nelle bevande analcoliche? L'emendamento in questione avrebbe violato tale legislazione dell'Unione?

2. Ritiene che la modifica di queste soglie possa avere effetti distorsivi della concorrenza nel mercato interno dell'UE?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2014)

1. Non vi è una legislazione unionale specifica che disciplini il contenuto minimo di succo di frutta nelle bibite. La legislazione dell'UE riguarda soltanto i succhi di frutta in quanto tali ([1]). La Commissione sta attualmente esaminando le disposizioni nazionali italiane in merito al livello minimo di succo di frutta genuino contenuto nelle bibite per vedere se sono in linea con le disposizioni unionali sulla libera circolazione delle merci, in particolare con gli articoli da 34 a 36 del TFUE.

2. Le disposizioni dell'UE sulla libera circolazione delle merci non ostano a che gli Stati membri trattino i loro prodotti domestici meno favorevolmente di quelli importati.

L'applicazione delle regole unionali in materia di concorrenza prescrive che si identifichino le distorsioni della concorrenza risultanti dalle azioni di:

— imprese in forma di:

a) accordi, decisioni o pratiche proibite dall'articolo 101 del TFUE o

b) abuso di posizione dominante proibito dall'articolo 102 del TFUE

— ovvero di Stati membri in forma di:

a) misure anticompetitive da essi adottate in relazione a imprese pubbliche e a imprese cui gli Stati membri riconoscono diritti speciali o esclusivi (articolo 106 del TFUE)

b) inadempienza al dovere di assicurare il rispetto degli obblighi derivanti dai trattati o risultanti dagli atti delle istituzioni dell'Unione (articolo 4, paragrafo 3, del TUE), compresa l'adeguata attuazione delle regole unionali in tema di concorrenza.

Dalle informazioni esposte nell'interrogazione non risulta che si diano tali elementi.

([1]) Direttiva 2001/112/CE del Consiglio, del 20 dicembre 2001, concernente i succhi di frutta e altri prodotti analoghi destinati all'alimentazione umana (GU L 10 del 12.1.2002, pag. 58).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003874/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Minimum genuine fruit content of soft drinks

Yesterday, in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, an amendment was rejected which would have increased the minimum genuine fruit content of soft drinks from the current level of 12% to 20%.

The Italian growers' organisation was highly critical of this result, accusing the lobby group representing large multinationals of acting against the interests of Italian SMEs in the sector and of preventing benefits to public health from an increase in the percentage. The outcome of the vote was also criticised, albeit more mildly, by the Italian farmers' federation, which, however, called upon the European institutions to consider the issue at Union level.

Soft drinks producers, meanwhile, had feared that, if the amendment were to be adopted, it could have led to serious distortions of competition because it would have applied only to Italian producers and not to other European or non-European producers.

1. Does any European legislation currently exist which regulates the minimum genuine fruit content of soft drinks? Would the amendment in question have infringed such Union legislation?

2. Could an amendment to the minimum fruit content distort competition on the EU internal market?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

1. There is no EU specific legislation regulating the minimum fruit juice content of soft drinks. The EU legislation covers only the fruit juices as such ([1]). The Commission is currently investigating whether the Italian national provisions regarding the minimum level of the genuine fruit content of soft drinks are in line with the EU provisions on free movement of goods, notably Articles 34 to 36 TFEU.

2. The EU provisions on the free movement of goods do not prevent Member States from treating their domestic products less favourably than imports.

The application of EU competition rules requires the identification of a distortion of competition resulting from actions of:

— Either undertakings in the form of:

(a) agreements, decisions or practices prohibited by Article 101 TFEU or

(b) an abuse of dominant position prohibited by Article 102 TFEU

— Or Member States in the form of :

(a) anticompetitive measures adopted by them with respect to public undertakings and undertakings to which Member States grant special or exclusive rights (Article 106 TFEU)

(b) non-compliance with the obligation to ensure fulfilment of the obligations arising out of the Treaties or resulting from the acts of the institutions of the Union (Article 4(3) TEU), including proper implementation of EU competition rules.

Presence of such elements does not follow from the information available in the question.

([1]) Council Directive 2001/112/EC of 20.12.2001 relating to fruit juices and certain similar products intended for human consumption (OJ L 10, 12.1.2002, p. 58).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub P-003876/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Ħlasijiet għall-biljett tal-imbarkazzjoni

Fl-10 ta' Marzu 2014, f'ittra indirizzata lili, Ryanair, b'referenza għall-Mistoqsija bil-Miktub E-012497/2013, wieġeb għal numru ta' punti imqajma fiha, inklużi l-ħlasijiet li jridu jsiru mill-passiġġiera biex jipprintjaw il-biljetti tal-imbarkazzjoni maċ-check-in.

Ryanair informani li l-ħlas għall-passiġġieri li jagħmlu check-in mingħajr biljett tal-imbarkazzjoni tnaqqas minn EUR 70 għal EUR 15 u rrefera għat-termini u l-kundizzjonijiet ppubblikati tal-kumpanija bħala ġustifikazzjoni għall-ħlas.

Irrispettivament mill-ammont, il-Kummissjoni, bħala prinċipju, tikkunsidra dan il-ħlas bħala leġittimu, meta wieħed jikkunsidra li biljett tal-imbarkazzjoni mhuwiex xi għażla iżda huwa dokument mandatorju li hu meħtieġ biex wieħed jakkwista aċċess għal post f'ajruplan li l-ħlas għalih ikun diġà sar?

Jekk il-Kummissjoni tikkunsidra dan il-ħlas inġust jew illegali, x'beħsiebha tagħmel dwaru?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Skont il-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE dwar il-konsumatur, il-ħlasijiet minn passiġġieri għall-istampar tal-biljetti tal-imbarkazzjoni mal-bank taċ-check-in mhuwiex, minnu nnifsu, illegali.

Skont ir-Regolament (KE) Nru 1008/2008 dwar regoli komuni għall-operat ta' servizzi tal-ajru fil-Komunità, il-linji tal-ajru huma liberi li jistabbilixxu nollijiet tal-ajru u rati tal-ajru. Madankollu, il-prezz finali li għandu jitħallas mill-konsumatur (jiġifieri inklużi n-nollijiet, il-ħlasijiet, il-ħlasijiet addizzjonali, it-taxxi u t-tariffi kollha applikabbli li huma inevitabbli u prevedibbli) għandu jiġi kkomunikat fil-ħin tal-pubblikazzjoni. Barra minn hekk, jeħtieġ li l-kundizzjonijiet mehmuża jiġu kkomunikati b'mod ċar u trasparenti lill-passiġġier.

Id-Direttiva 2005/29/KE dwar prattiċi kummerċjali żleali ma tipprojbixxix din il-prattika, sakemm il-konsumaturi jkunu pprovduti bl-informazzjoni li din it-tariffa hija pagabbli qabel ma jibbukkjaw il-biljetti tagħhom.

Id-Direttiva 93/13/KEE dwar klawżoli inġusti f'kuntratti mal-konsumatur tipprovdi li l-klawżoli tal-kuntratt standard li jikkawżaw żbilanċ sinifikanti bejn il-partijiet għad-detriment tal-konsumatur għandhom jitqiesu bħala inġusti u, bħala tali, ma jkunux vinkolanti. Żbilanċ sinifikanti jista' jikkonsisti, pereżempju, fil-ħtieġa li konsumatur li jonqos milli jissodisfa l-obbligi kuntrattwali tiegħu jħallas somma sproporzjonatament għolja bħala kumpens.

Huwa l-kompitu tal-awtoritajiet u l-qrati nazzjonali li jivvalutaw jekk prattika partikulari tiksirx il-liġi tal-konsumatur. Pereżempju, diversi sentenzi fl-ewwel istanza fi Spanja qatgħu bħala sproporzjonati, u għaldaqstant inġusti, termini li jimponu prezz ta' EUR 40 għall-istampar ta' biljett tal-imbarkazzjoni. Sa issa, il-Qorti tal-Appell Spanjola qieset li dawn it-termini ma kinux inġusti billi l-prezz kien prevedibbli, ma kienx ta' detriment sostanzjali għall-konsumatur, seta' jiġi evitat u ma kienx eċċessiv.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003876/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Boarding pass charges

On 10 March 2014 in a letter addressed to me, Ryanair, referring to Written Question E-012497/2013, responded to a number of points raised therein, including the fees charged to passengers for printing boarding passes at the check-in counter.

Ryanair informed me that the fee for passengers who check in without a boarding pass has been reduced from EUR 70 to EUR 15, citing the company's published terms and conditions as a justification for the charge.

Irrespective of the amount, does the Commission, in principle, consider this charge to be legitimate, bearing in mind that a boarding pass is not an optional, but rather a mandatory, document required to gain access to an aircraft seat for which payment has already been made.

If the Commission considers this charge to be unfair or illegal, what does it intend to do about it?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

Under EU consumer legislation the charging of passengers for printing boarding passes at the check-in counter is not, *per se*, illegal.

Under Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008 on common rules for the operation of air services in the Community, airlines are free to set air fares and air rates. However, the final price to be paid by the consumer (i.e. including all applicable fares, charges, surcharges, taxes and fees which are unavoidable and foreseeable) has to be communicated at the time of publication. Furthermore, the conditions attached need to be communicated in a clear and transparent manner to the passenger.

Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair commercial practices does not prohibit such practice, as long as consumers are provided with the information that this fee is payable before booking their tickets.

Directive 93/13/EEC on unfair terms in consumer contracts provides that standard contract terms causing a significant imbalance between the parties to the detriment of the consumer should be regarded as unfair and, as such, shall not be binding. A significant imbalance may consist, for instance, in requiring a consumer who fails to fulfill his contractual obligations to pay a disproportionately high sum in compensation.

It is for national authorities and courts to assess whether a given practice infringes upon consumer law. For instance, several judgments at first instance in Spain have ruled as disproportionate, and thus unfair, terms imposing a EUR 40 cost for printing a boarding pass. So far, the Spanish Court of appeal has considered that such terms were not unfair as the cost was foreseeable, did not produce substantial detriment to the consumer, could be avoided and was not excessive.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-003878/14
a Bizottság számára
Glattfelder Béla (PPE)
(2014. március 28.)

Tárgy: A kábításra vonatkozó követelmények ellenőrzése harmadik országbeli vágóhidak esetében

Az európai fogyasztók védelme érdekében fontos, hogy megfelelő ellenőrzéseket végezzünk az olyan harmadik országbeli vágóhidakat illetően, ahonnan húst exportálnak az Európai Unióba. A harmadik országok vágóhídjai esetében a kábításra vonatkozóan ugyanazokat vagy azokkal egyenértékű követelményeket kell alkalmazni, mint amelyek az EU-ban hatályban vannak. Az e témával kapcsolatban szükséges átláthatóság előmozdítása érdekében kérem a Bizottságot, hogy szíveskedjék válaszolni a következő kérdésekre:

1. Meg tudja-e adni a Bizottság azoknak a harmadik országoknak a listáját, amelyek baromfihúst exportálnak az EU-ba, különbséget téve azon országok között, amelyek „ugyanazokat" a kábítási követelményeket alkalmazzák, mint az EU, illetve azok között, amelyek ezekkel „egyenértékű" követelményeket alkalmaznak?
2. Részletezni tudja-e a Bizottság, hogy a baromfik esetében milyen egyenértékű kábítási előírásokat nyújtottak be a Bizottság számára, illetve hogy a Bizottság milyen egyenértékű előírásokat fogadott el? Az egyenértékűségre vonatkozó értékelésben milyen szerepet töltött be az Európai Élelmiszerbiztonsági Hatóság?
3. Amennyiben a Bizottságnak nincs egyértelmű válasza a harmadik országokban a baromfikra vonatkozóan alkalmazott kábítási előírásokra irányuló kérdéseket illetően, egyetért-e azzal, hogy jobb, ha aktívan megkérdőjelezzük az érintett harmadik országokban érvényes előírásokat, mint hogy megvárjuk az Élelmiszerügyi és Állat-egészségügyi Hivatal vizsgálatainak eredményét?
4. Milyen lépéseket fog tenni a Bizottság, ha nem kap kielégítő választ ésszerű időn belül?
5. Amennyiben valamelyik kábítási módszert az uniós követelményekkel „egyenértékűnek" értékelik, engedélyezni fogja-e a Bizottság annak bevezetését az EU vágóhídjain?
6. A Tanács 1099/2009/EK rendelete 4. cikkének (1) bekezdésével összefüggésben, amelynek rendelkezései nem alkalmazhatók olyan esetben, amikor az állatok levágása vágóhídon történik, tájékoztatta-e valamely harmadik ország a Bizottságot arról, hogy az EU-ba exportált baromfihús származhat szárnyasok sajátos vallási rítusok által előírt levágási módszereiből?

Tonio Borg válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. május 21.)

A 798/2008/EK rendelet ([1]) tartalmazza azon harmadik országok felsorolását, amelyekből engedélyezett baromfi és baromfitermékek behozatala. Az uniós követelmények értelmében a harmadik országoknak a hús behozatala tekintetében az uniós előírásokkal egyenértékű rendelkezéseket kell foganatosítaniuk az állatoknak a vágóhidakon megvalósuló kímélete vonatkozásában. Az állatok leölésük során való védelméről szóló 1099/2009/EK rendelet ([2]) közös minimumszabályokat állapít meg. A rendelet nem írja elő, hogy a harmadik országoknak ugyanazokat a követelményeket kell elfogadniuk, amelyek az Unióban érvényesek, vagy azokkal megegyezőket, hanem azonos célokat tekintve egyenértékű előírások alkalmazásáról rendelkezik.

A rendelet emellett figyelembe veszi az állatok levágására alkalmazandó nemzetközi állatjóléti előírásokat ([3]) is, amelyeket az Állategészségügyi Világszervezet dolgozott ki és fogadott el. Ezeket az előírásokat a rendelet a behozatalok tekintetében az uniós követelményekkel való egyenértékűség megállapítását szolgáló eszközökként említi.

Az uniós előírásokkal való egyenértékűség tekintetében a Bizottság Egészség- és Fogyasztóügyi Főigazgatóságának Élelmiszerügyi és Állategészségügyi Hivatala – az említett követelményeknek való megfelelés ellenőrzése érdekében – ellenőrzéseket végez a 854/2004/EK rendeletnek megfelelően az uniós behozatal tekintetében jóváhagyott harmadik országokban működő létesítményekben.

Az Élelmiszerügyi és Állategészségügyi Hivatal az illetékes hatóságnál tett rendszeres ellenőrző látogatások során megvizsgálja, hogy az adott ország által benyújtott adatok megbízhatók-e. Az ellenőrzések folyamata átlátható, a jelentések pedig nyilvánosan hozzáférhetők az interneten ([4]).

Az EFSA (Európai Élelmiszerbiztonsági Hatóság) nem tölt be szerepet az egyenértékűség megállapításában.

Az 1099/2009/EK rendelet 4. cikke (1) bekezdésének összefüggésében harmadik országok nem kötelesek értesíteni a Bizottságot.

([1]) HL L 226, 2008.8.23., 1–94. o.
([2]) HL L 303., 2009.11.18.
([3]) http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Health_standards/tahc/2010/chapitre_1.7.5.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003878/14
to the Commission
Béla Glattfelder (PPE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Checking the requirements for stunning in third-country slaughterhouses

In the interest of protecting European consumers, it is important to carry out appropriate checks on third-country slaughterhouses which export meat to the EU. Stunning requirements that are the same as or equivalent to those in place in the EU have to be applied in third-country slaughterhouses. With a view to promoting the necessary transparency in relation to this issue, could the Commission please answer the following questions:

1. Can the Commission provide a list of third countries that export poultry meat to the EU, differentiating between those that apply the 'same' stunning requirements as the EU and those that apply 'equivalent' requirements?

2. Can the Commission detail which equivalent stunning standards for poultry have been presented to and/or accepted by the Commission? What role has the European Food Safety Authority played in the assessment of equivalence?

3. If the Commission does not have a clear answer to the questions regarding the stunning standards for poultry applied in third countries, does it agree that it is better to actively question the third countries concerned rather than wait for the results of inspections by the Food and Veterinary Office?

4. What steps will the Commission take if it does not receive a satisfactory answer within a reasonable time?

5. If a stunning method is assessed as 'equivalent', will the Commission permit its introduction in EU slaughterhouses?

6. In the context of Article 4(1) of Council Regulation 1099/2009/EC, the provisions of which do not apply where slaughter takes place in a slaughterhouse, has the Commission been notified by any third country that poultry meat exported to the EU may derive from fowl subjected to particular methods of slaughter prescribed by religious rites?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2014)

The third countries from which poultry and poultry products may be imported are listed in Commission Regulation (EC) No 798/2008 ([1]). The EU requires third countries to provide equivalent provisions to EU standards on the protection of animals in slaughterhouses for the importation of meat. Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 ([2]) on the protection of animals at the time of killing establishes common minimum rules. It does not oblige third countries to adopt the same or identical requirements, rather ones that are equivalent in achieving the same objectives.

This regulation also takes into account the international animal welfare standards on the slaughter of animals ([3]) developed and adopted by the World Organisation for Animal Health. These standards are referred to in the regulation as a tool for establishing equivalency with EU requirements for the purpose of imports.

Concerning the assessment procedure of equivalence with EU standards, the Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General (FVO) carries out audits in establishments from third countries approved for export to the EU according to the regulation (EC) No 854/2004 to check compliance with these requirements.

The FVO verifies that the guarantees given by the country are reliable, by auditing the competent authority during regular missions. The process of these audits is transparent and all audit reports are publicly available on the Internet ([4]).

The EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) is not involved in the procedure for determination of equivalence.

Third Countries are not required to notify the Commission in the context of Article 4(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009.

([1]) OJ L 226, 23.8.2008 p. 1-94.
([2]) OJ L 303, 18.11.2009.
([3]) http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Health_standards/tahc/2010/chapitre_1.7.5.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003879/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Ampliamento della rete ferroviaria turca

Il ministro turco dei trasposti ha annunciato che entro il 2023 i progetti dell'attuale governo prevedono la costruzione di 10 000 km di linee ferroviarie ad alta velocità, che collegheranno 15 delle principali città, e di 25 500 km di binari in tutto il Paese.

Tra le opere previste vi è anche la costruzione della linea dell'alta velocità che collegherà la regione del Mar Nero con il Sud-Est della Turchia, nel quadro di un progetto ben più esteso che prevede la prosecuzione di tali collegamenti con la Siria e l'Iraq.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza dei fatti sopra esposti?

2. Può essa indicare se la Turchia ha beneficiato di finanziamenti europei per le opere sopra descritte e, in caso affermativo, a quanto ammontano?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(16 maggio 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente dell'annuncio in questione, che finora non è stato però suffragato da studi tecnici di base o da stanziamenti di bilancio specifici.

La prevista costruzione di linee ad alta velocità in Turchia riguarda due brevi tratte (Ankara-Konya e Ankara-Eskişehir); le Ferrovie dello Stato turche, comunque, non hanno realizzato piani molto ambiziosi per la costruzione di linee ad alta velocità.

L'UE ha contribuito, in cofinanziamento con la BEI, a tre progetti ferroviari in Turchia:

— sezione Köseköy-Gebze della linea ad alta velocità Ankara-Istanbul: malgrado la denominazione, questa sezione di 56 km non è una linea ad alta velocità, ha una velocità di progetto di 160 km/h e consiste prevalentemente nella modernizzazione del corridoio esistente. Il contributo dell'UE ammonta a 136 milioni di EUR. Il costo totale del progetto Ankara-Istanbul supera i 3,5 miliardi di EUR;

— linea ferroviaria Irmak-Karabük-Zonguldak: linea convenzionale per il trasporto merci che collega Ankara a Zonguldak. Il contributo dell'UE ammonta a 188 milioni di EUR. Il costo totale del progetto è di 320 milioni di EUR;

— linea ferroviaria Samsun-Kalin (in fase di valutazione): linea convenzionale per il trasporto merci che collega il porto di Samsun a Sivas. Il contributo dell'UE ammonta a 240 milioni di EUR. Il costo totale del progetto è di 390 milioni di EUR.

L'UE ha inoltre finanziato due studi nell'ambito dell'assistenza tecnica e ha assistito la Turchia per l'adozione della legge sulla liberalizzazione del trasporto ferroviario e la creazione di un organismo di regolamentazione del settore ferroviario.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003879/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Expansion of the Turkish rail network

The Turkish Transport Minister has announced the current government's plan to construct 10 000 km of high-speed rail lines, to link 15 of the main cities, and 25 500 km of tracks across the entire country, by 2023.

One of the scheduled works is the construction of a high-speed rail line to link the Black Sea region with south-east Turkey, as part of a much larger plan to extend these links to Syria and Iraq.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above facts?

2. Can it indicate whether Turkey has benefited from European financing for the aforementioned works and, if so, the amounts allocated?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2014)

The Commission is aware of this announcement. However, so far there are no basic technical studies or budget to support this stated intention.

Turkey's initiatives to construct high speed lines are limited to two short stretches (Ankara — Konya and Ankara — Eskişehir), although Turkish State Railways has not followed up very ambitious plans of constructing high speed lines.

The EU provided financial support to three railway projects in Turkey, all jointly financed with the EIB. These are:

— Köseköy — Gebze section of Ankara — Istanbul High Speed Line: this 56 km section is not a high speed line regardless of the name. Its design speed is 160 km/h and is mainly modernisation of the existing corridor. The assistance of the EU amounts to EUR 136 million. The total Ankara — Istanbul project cost is more than EUR 3.5 billion.

— Irmak — Karabük — Zonguldak Railway Line: this is a conventional freight line connecting Ankara and Zonguldak. The assistance of the EU amounts to EUR 188 million. Total project cost is EUR 320 million.

— Samsun — Kalin Railway Line (under appraisal): this is a conventional freight line connecting Samsun port to Sivas. The assistance of the EU amounts to EUR 240 million. Total project cost is EUR 390 million.

The EU also financed two technical assistance studies and assisted Turkey in the adoption of rail liberalisation law and establishment of a rail regulatory body.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003880/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Applicazione della direttiva «servizi» in Croazia

Come valuta la Commissione l'impatto dell'applicazione della direttiva «servizi» sul mercato interno croato?

Entro quale data la Croazia dovrà dare piena applicazione alla direttiva 2006/123/CE?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(27 maggio 2014)

La direttiva 2006/123/CE (direttiva servizi) è entrata in vigore prima dell'adesione della Croazia all'Unione europea. Tale Paese ha assunto l'impegno di recepire la direttiva servizi nel proprio ordinamento a partire dalla sua adesione il 1º luglio 2013.

La direttiva servizi fa obbligo agli Stati membri (articolo 39) di rivedere e valutare la loro legislazione nazionale vigente nel settore dei servizi coperti dalla direttiva e di riferire alla Commissione i risultati di tale esercizio di valutazione.

Nel 2013 la Commissione ha invitato la Croazia a effettuare la suddetta valutazione e a trasmetterle relazioni in materia.

L'esercizio di valutazione è stato completato dalla Croazia nel marzo 2014 e attualmente la Commissione sta traducendo e valutando la legislazione trasmessale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003880/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Application of the Services Directive in Croatia

How does the Commission assess the impact of applying the Services Directive to the Croatian internal market?

What is the deadline for Croatia to apply Directive 2006/123/EC in full?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2014)

Directive 2006/123/EC (the Services Directive) came into force before Croatia's accession to the EU. Croatia took the commitment to transpose the Services Directive as of its accession to the EU on 1 July 2013.

The Services Directive requires Member States to review and assess their existing legislation applicable in the services sector covered by the directive (according to Article 39) and to report to the Commission the results of this screening exercise.

In 2013, the Commission invited Croatia to carry out such a screening and reporting exercise.

This was completed by Croatia in March 2014. The Commission is now in the process of translating and assessing the reported legislation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003881/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Blocco dei siti pericolosi

Preso atto che la Corte UE ha autorizzato il blocco dell'accesso ai siti che violano il copyright, nel rispetto del principio di proporzionalità richiamato dalla Corte la Commissione ritiene possibile bloccare l'acceso ai siti pericolosi come ask.fm. quando mettono palesemente in pericolo l'incolumità degli utenti?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(8 luglio 2014)

La Commissione europea condanna tutti i comportamenti online offensivi e dannosi e invita l'onorevole deputata a consultare la risposta data all'interrogazione scritta 1649-14. Aggiunge poi che l'esercizio della libertà di espressione può essere sottoposto a restrizioni solo se ciò è necessario e risponde effettivamente agli obbiettivi di interesse generale riconosciuti dall'Unione o di tutela dei diritti e delle libertà altrui. Tali restrizioni devono essere trasparenti, non discriminatorie e proporzionate.

La direttiva sul commercio elettronico ([1]) solleva da ogni responsabilità il prestatore di servizi *hosting* che rimuova o disabiliti immediatamente l'accesso a informazioni o attività illegali e prevede che i giudici o le autorità amministrative nazionali possano esigere dal prestatore di servizi che impedisca una violazione o vi ponga fine, ma anche che definiscano procedure per la rimozione delle informazioni o per la disabilitazione dell'accesso alle medesime. La direttiva 2011/93/UE ([2]) impone agli Stati membri di prendere misure adeguate al fine di assicurare la tempestiva rimozione delle pagine web contenenti materiale pedopornografico e consente agli Stati Membri di bloccare l'accesso a tali pagine web nel loro territorio.

La proposta della Commissione per un continente connesso ([3]), al momento in procedura di co-legislazione, vieta espressamente al fornitore di servizi di accesso a internet di bloccare, rallentare o discriminare il traffico. La proposta contiene inoltre regole sul modo in cui applicare una gestione ragionevole del traffico, le quali includerebbero misure necessarie e proporzionate per prevenire o impedire gravi reati. Le disposizioni proposte lascerebbero impregiudicata la normativa dell'Unione o nazionale relativa alla legittimità delle informazioni, dei contenuti, delle applicazioni e dei servizi trasmessi.

([1]) Direttiva 2000/31/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'8 giugno 2000, relativa a taluni aspetti giuridici dei servizi della società dell'informazione, in particolare il commercio elettronico, nel mercato interno («Direttiva sul commercio elettronico») (GU L 178 del 17.7.2000, articolo 14).

([2]) La Direttiva 2011/93/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, relativa alla lotta contro l'abuso e lo sfruttamento sessuale dei minori e la pornografia minorile, e che sostituisce la decisione quadro 2004/68/GAI del Consiglio (GU L 335 del 17.12.2011, articolo 25).

([3]) Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che stabilisce misure riguardanti il mercato unico europeo delle comunicazioni elettroniche e per realizzare un continente connesso, recante modifica delle direttive 2002/20/CE, 2002/21/CE e 2002/22/CE e dei regolamenti (CE) n. 1211/2009 e (UE) n. 531/2012 (COM(2013) 627 final).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003881/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Blocking dangerous websites

In view of the fact that the EU Court has authorised blocking access to websites which breach copyright, in accordance with the principle of proportionality referred to by the Court, does the Commission believe it possible to block access to dangerous websites such as ask.fm, which clearly place the safety of users in jeopardy?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(8 July 2014)

The European Commission condemns all forms of offensive and harmful behaviour online. It would like to refer to its response given to Written Question 1649-14. In addition, any limitation on the exercise of the freedom of expression may only be made if it is necessary and genuinely meets the objectives of general interest recognised by the European Union or the need to protect the rights and freedoms of others. It has to be transparent, non-discriminatory and proportionate.

The e-commerce directive ([1]) allows hosting providers to avoid liability by expeditiously removing or to disabling access to illegal activity or information, as well as for the possibility for national courts or administrative authorities to require the service provider to terminate or prevent an infringement, and for establishing procedures governing the removal or disabling of access to information. Directive 2011/93/EU ([2]) obliges Member States to take measures to ensure the prompt removal of webpages containing child pornography, and Member States may also block access to those pages within their territory.

The Commission proposal for a Connected Continent ([3]) currently in the co-legislative process expressly prohibits blocking, slowing down or discriminating traffic by Internet access providers. It also contains rules on what reasonable traffic management can be applied, which would include measures that are necessary and proportionate to prevent or impede serious crimes. These draft provisions would also be without prejudice to Union or national legislation related to the lawfulness of the information, content, application or services transmitted.

([1]) Directive 2000/31/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8.6.2000 on certain legal aspects of information society services, in particular electronic commerce, in the internal market, OJ L 178 of 17.7.2000, Article 14.

([2]) Directive 2011/93/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA, OJ L335/1 of 17.12.2011, Article 25.

([3]) Proposal for a regulation of the European parliament and of the Council laying down measures concerning the European single market for electronic communications and to achieve a Connected Continent, and amending Directives 2002/20/EC, 2002/21/EC and 2002/22/EC and Regulations (EC) No 1211/2009 and (EU) No 531/2012; COM(2013)0627 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003882/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Condannato per crimini contro l'umanità accolto in Turchia

Secondo alcune fonti, l'ex Vicepresidente sunnita iracheno Tareq al-Hashemi, condannato a morte dal tribunale di Bagdad per crimini commessi mentre era in carica, sarebbe stato accolto in Turchia.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è a conoscenza dei fatti sopra esposti?

2. Può confermarli e, nell'affermativa, considerando il processo di adesione della Turchia all'UE, come valuta il fatto che questo paese accolga un latitante accusato di crimini contro l'umanità?

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

La questione sollevata dall'onorevole deputato deve essere gestita a livello bilaterale dalla Turchia e dall'Iraq.

La Commissione, comunque, segue con attenzione le relazioni fra i due paesi. Le relazioni della Turchia con il governo regionale curdo di Erbil sono in costante miglioramento da qualche anno a questa parte. L'UE ha espresso soddisfazione in proposito, anche nell'ambito del dialogo politico generale, pur insistendo sistematicamente sulla necessità di migliorare anche le relazioni fra Ankara e Baghdad. In questo contesto, il recente ravvicinamento e le visite ad alto livello fra Ankara e Baghdad sono sviluppi positivi che potrebbero contribuire a consolidare la stabilità regionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003882/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Turkey grants residence to a man convicted of crimes against humanity

According to some sources, the former Sunni Vice-President of Iraq, Tareq al-Hashemi, sentenced to death by a court in Baghdad for crimes committed while he was in office, has been granted residence by Turkey.

1. Is the Commission aware of the aforementioned facts?

2. Can it confirm them and, if so, considering the process of Turkey's accession to the EU, how does it assess the fact that this country has granted residence to a fugitive accused of crimes against humanity?

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

The issue to which the Honourable Member is referring to is a bilateral issue between Turkey and Iraq.

In general, the Commission is following closely relations between the two countries. Turkey's relations with the Kurdish Regional Government (KRG) in Erbil have continued to improve in recent years. The EU has welcomed this development -also in the framework of the EU-Turkey wider political dialogue- while consistently stressing the need to also improve relations between Ankara and Baghdad. In this context, the recent rapprochement and high level visits between Ankara and Baghdad are a welcome development that could help strengthen regional stability.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003883/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Contributori e beneficiari netti del bilancio europeo: classifica aggiornata al 2013

Può la Commissione fornire una classifica aggiornata al 31 dicembre 2013 dei contributori e dei beneficiari netti del bilancio dell'Unione europea?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(13 giugno 2014)

La Commissione preparerà tali dati per l'anno 2013. Questi dati saranno inseriti nella relazione finanziaria sul bilancio 2013 dell'UE, che dovrebbe essere pubblicata nel settembre 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003883/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Net contributors and beneficiaries to the European budget: updated classification for 2013

Can the Commission provide an updated classification, as of 31 December 2013, of the net contributors and beneficiaries to the European Union budget?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission will indeed prepare these data for the year 2013. They will be included in the EU Budget 2013 Financial Report, which is expected to be published in September 2014.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003884/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Costi delle Agenzie europee

Può la Commissione indicare l'ammontare totale degli stanziamenti destinati alle Agenzie europee nell'ultimo bilancio UE approvato?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(19 maggio 2014)

I contributi dell'UE iscritti nel bilancio generale dell'UE del 2014 destinati alle agenzie decentrate ed esecutive sono i seguenti:

— i contributi dell'UE iscritti nel bilancio 2014 destinati alle agenzie decentrate sono complessivamente pari a 799,310 milioni di EUR. Nel bilancio votato per il 2014, il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio hanno deciso di aumentare di complessivi 9,174 milioni di EUR i contributi dell'UE alle agenzie decentrate, rispetto agli importi proposti dalla Commissione nel progetto di bilancio 2014 (790,136 milioni di EUR), al fine di rafforzare, rispetto a quanto previsto nel progetto di bilancio, il contributo dell'UE alle seguenti sei agenzie: *Autorità bancaria europea* (EBA), *Autorità europea delle assicurazioni e delle pensioni aziendali e professionali* (EIOPA), *Autorità europea degli strumenti finanziari e dei mercati* (ESMA),*Ufficio europeo di sostegno per l'asilo* (EASO), *Frontex* ed *Europol*;

— i contributi dell'UE iscritti nel bilancio 2014 destinati alle agenzie esecutive sono complessivamente pari a 195,720 milioni di EUR. Nel bilancio votato per il 2014, il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio hanno approvato senza modifiche i contributi dell'UE a ciascuna delle sei agenzie esecutive che la Commissione ha proposto nella lettera rettificativa n. 2 al progetto di bilancio 2014 (COM(2013) 719 del 16 ottobre 2013);

— informazioni dettagliate relative al finanziamento e al personale delle singole agenzie dell'UE sono contenute nel documento di lavoro III («organismi istituiti dall'Unione europea aventi personalità giuridica»), che accompagna ogni anno il progetto di bilancio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003884/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Costs of European agencies

Can the Commission indicate the total amounts allocated to European agencies in the latest approved EU budget?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(19 May 2014)

The EU contributions to decentralised and executive agencies entered in the EU budget for 2014 are as follows:

— The EU contributions to decentralised agencies entered in the 2014 budget amount to EUR 799 310 million in total. In the voted budget for 2014, the European Parliament and the Council decided to increase the EU contributions to decentralised agencies as compared to the amounts proposed by the Commission in the 2014 Draft Budget (EUR 790 136 million) by a total amount of EUR 9 174 million, so as to reinforce the EU contributions to six agencies as compared to the DB, namely for European Banking Authority (EBA), European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA), European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA), European Asylum Support Office (EASO), Frontex and Europol.

— The EU contributions to executive agencies entered in the 2014 budget amount to EUR 195 720 million in total. In the voted budget for 2014, the European Parliament and the Council accepted the EU contributions to each of the six executive agencies as proposed by the Commission in the Amending Letter No 2 to the 2014 Draft Budget (COM(2013) 719 of 16 October 2013), without any changes.

— Detailed information relating to funding and staffing of individual EU agencies is given annually in the Working Document III accompanying the Draft Budget ('bodies set up by the EU and having legal personality').

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003885/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Costo del Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna

Può la Commissione indicare l'ammontare dei fondi destinati al Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna (SEAE) nell'ultimo bilancio approvato?

Può indicare la percentuale di aumento degli stanziamenti erogati a favore del SEAE, dalla sua istituzione a oggi?

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

Il bilancio del SEAE per il 2014 ammonta complessivamente a 518 628 447 EUR. L'aumento percentuale da quando il SEAE è stato istituito, il 1° gennaio 2011, è del 12,6 %.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003885/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Cost of the European External Action Service

Can the Commission indicate the amount of funding allocated to the European External Action Service (EEAS) in the latest approved budget?

Can it indicate the percentage increase in funding allocated to the EEAS since it was established?

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

The EEAS budget for 2014 totals EUR 518 628 447. This represents a 12.6% increase since the EEAS was established on 1 January 2011.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003886/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Fondi strutturali 2014-2020 — risorse destinate all'Italia

Il 27 giugno 2013, il presidente del Consiglio dell'UE, con il sostegno del Presidente della Commissione europea, al termine di una riunione straordinaria che ha coinvolto anche il Parlamento europeo, ha comunicato il raggiungimento di un accordo politico sul Quadro Finanziario Pluriennale 2014-2020 (QFP).

Può la Commissione indicare le risorse che verranno erogate all'Italia per i prossimi sette anni sotto forma di Fondi strutturali e indicare eventuali riduzioni rispetto al settennato precedente?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(3 giugno 2014)

Per il periodo 2014-2020 lo stanziamento finanziario complessivo destinato all'Italia per la politica di coesione ammonta a 32 256 miliardi di EUR rispetto a uno stanziamento complessivo di 27 962 miliardi di EUR per il periodo 2007-2013. La ripartizione finale per il periodo 2014-2020 tra il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale e il Fondo sociale europeo e tra i singoli programmi/le singole regioni sarà determinata nelle negoziazioni tra l'Italia e la Commissione in merito all'accordo di partenariato. Si riporta in allegato una tabella con il dettaglio degli stanziamenti per i due periodi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003886/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Structural funds for 2014-20 — resources allocated to Italy

On 27 June 2013, the President of the Council of the EU, with the support of the President of the European Commission and following an extraordinary meeting which also included the European Parliament, announced that a political agreement had been reached concerning the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) for 2014-20.

Can the Commission indicate how much will be allocated to Italy over the next seven years in the way of Structural Funds, and whether there will be any reductions compared with the previous seven-year period?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

For the 2014-2020 period, the overall financial allocation for Italy for cohesion policy equals EUR 32 256 billion compared to an overall allocation of EUR 27 962 billion for the 2007-2013 period. The final breakdown for the 2014-2020 period between the European Regional Development Fund and the European Social Fund and between individual programmes/regions will be determined between Italy and the Commission in the negotiations on the Partnership Agreement. A table with detailed allocations for the two periods is provided in the annex.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003887/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Fondo europeo per sostenere le operazioni di bonifica di eventuali ordigni rinvenuti risalenti alle due guerre mondiali

Con riferimento alla risposta all'interrogazione E-000749/2014 dell'interrogante, può la Commissione riferire se intende creare un apposito fondo destinato a supportare gli Stati membri nelle operazioni di bonifica di ordigni rinvenuti risalenti alle due guerre mondiali?

Risposta data da José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

La Commissione non intende proporre l'istituzione di un tale fondo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003887/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: European fund to support clean-up operations concerning unexploded ordnance dating back to the two world wars

With reference to the answer to my Question E-000749/2014, can the Commission say whether it is planning to set up a special fund to support Member States in clean-up operations concerning unexploded ordnance dating back to the two world wars?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

The Commission does not intend to propose any such fund.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003888/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Costo delle delegazioni UE

La rappresentanza dell'Unione europea nel mondo è assicurata da una rete di delegazioni.

Può la Commissione comunicare quanto segue:

1. A quale livello si collocano i finanziamenti destinati alle delegazioni nell'ultimo bilancio approvato?

2. A quale livello si collocano le stime sul costo previsionale dello stanziamento necessario per il prossimo bilancio in base agli aumenti dettati negli anni passati?

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

1. Il bilancio del SEAE per il 2014 comprende uno stanziamento di 305,7 milioni di EUR per le spese amministrative delle delegazioni dell'UE. La Commissione contribuisce inoltre a coprire queste spese in ragione di 372,7 milioni di EUR (185,4 milioni di EUR provenienti dalla rubrica 5 e 187,3 milioni di EUR provenienti da altre rubriche). L'importo totale disponibile quest'anno per coprire le spese amministrative delle delegazioni dell'UE ammonta quindi a 678,4 milioni di EUR. Il documento di lavoro che accompagna il progetto di bilancio 2014 (parte VIII, Spese relative all'azione esterna dell'Unione europea, COM(2013) 450 — giugno 2013) contiene informazioni più dettagliate al riguardo.

2. Si sta ancora lavorando sulle cifre da inserire nel progetto di bilancio dell'UE per il 2015, che sarà approvato dalla Commissione il 4 giugno 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003888/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Cost of EU delegations

The European Union is represented around the world by a network of delegations.

1. How much funding has been allocated to the delegations in the latest approved budget?

2. How much funding is expected to be allocated in the next budget, based on the increases imposed over previous years?

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

1. The EEAS budget for 2014 includes EUR 305.7 million for the EU delegations' administrative costs. In addition, the Commission contributes EUR 372.7 million to such costs (EUR 185.4 million from heading 5 and EUR 187.3 million from other headings). In total, EUR 678.4 million are therefore available for EU delegations' administrative costs this year. More detailed information can be found in the working document accompanying the 2014 draft budget (Working Document part VIII, Expenditure related to the external action of the European Union, COM(2013) 450 — June 2013).

2. The EU draft budget for 2015 is due to be approved by the Commission on 4 June 2014. Figures to be included are still being worked on.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003889/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Disciplina comunitaria dei fondi pensione

Il Commissario Barnier ha reso noto che in Europa si contano 125000 fondi pensione che raccolgono un asset di circa 2,5 triliardi di euro. Sebbene i fondi pensione siano già stati regolati nel 2003 da una direttiva che ne ha fissato i requisiti fondamentali, gli attuali cambiamenti dello scenario economico mondiale, secondo lo stesso Barnier, impongono all'UE una revisione della disciplina.

Può la Commissione:

1. spiegare quali aspetti della disciplina europea sui Fondi pensione intende innovare attraverso la nuova proposta di direttiva?

2. in che modo intende rafforzare la protezione degli investitori europei?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(21 maggio 2014)

La proposta di revisione ([1]) della direttiva 2003/41/CE ([2]) relativa alle attività e alla supervisione degli enti pensionistici aziendali o professionali è intesa a migliorare la governance e la trasparenza di questi enti e a rafforzare i poteri di vigilanza. La proposta apporta i seguenti principali miglioramenti:

— introduce nuovi requisiti per la gestione del rischio e per la governance;

— introduce un prospetto delle prestazioni pensionistiche standard a livello dell'UE che fornisce agli aderenti agli schemi informazioni chiare e semplici sui loro diritti pensionistici individuali;

— rimuove gli ostacoli alla prestazione transfrontaliera di servizi;

— modernizza le regole di investimento al fine di rafforzare la capacità degli enti pensionistici aziendali o professionali di investire in attività finanziarie aventi un profilo economico a lungo termine, sostenendo così il finanziamento della crescita nell'economia reale.

Nell'insieme, queste norme miglioreranno il funzionamento degli enti pensionistici aziendali o professionali, rafforzandone la stabilità, a beneficio degli aderenti allo schema pensionistico e dell'economia in generale.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/pensions/docs/directive/140327_proposal_en.pdf
([2]) Direttiva 2003/41/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 3 giugno 2003, relativa alle attività e alla supervisione degli enti pensionistici aziendali o professionali (GU L 235 del 23.9.2003, pag. 10).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003889/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Community rules on pension funds

Commissioner Barnier has revealed that pension funds in Europe number 125 000 and hold in total assets of approximately EUR 2.5 trillion. Although pension funds are already regulated by a 2003 directive which laid down basic requirements concerning them, Commissioner Barnier is of the view that current changes in the global economic scene required the EU to revise the rules governing these funds.

1. Could the Commission explain which aspects of the EU rules and regulations on pension funds it intends to reform through the new proposal for a directive?

2. How does it plan to give EU investors greater protection?

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

The proposed revision ([1]) of Directive 2003/41/EC ([2]) on the activities and supervision of institutions for occupational retirement provision (IORPs) aims to make those institutions better governed and more transparent, as well as to enhance supervisory powers. The proposal introduces the following main improvements:

— It introduces new requirements for risk management and governance;

— It introduces a 'pension benefit statement' (PBS) standardised at the EU level that provides scheme members with simple and clear information about their individual pension entitlements

— It removes obstacles for cross border provision of services

— It modernizes investment rules in order to reinforce the capacity of IORPs to invest in financial assets with a long-term economic profile and thereby support the financing of growth in the real economy.

Altogether, these rules will improve the functioning and enhance the stability of IORPs, to the benefit of pension scheme members and the economy at large.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/pensions/docs/directive/140327_proposal_en.pdf
([2]) Directive 2003/41/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 June 2003 on the activities and supervision of institutions for occupational retirement provision OJ L 235, 23/09/2003, p. 10-21.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003890/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Euro e micro Stati d'Europa

La Commissione può spiegare perché alcuni micro Stati d'Europa, come Andorra, Città del Vaticano, San Marino e Principato di Monaco, pur avendo adottato l'euro, non seguono la stessa disciplina imposta agli altri Stati membri dell'eurozona?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(30 maggio 2014)

Il Principato di Andorra, il Principato di Monaco, la Repubblica di San Marino e la Città del Vaticano non partecipano alla politica economica e monetaria dell'Unione. L'ambito di applicazione delle convenzioni monetarie concluse dall'UE con questi paesi si limita infatti a consentire loro di utilizzare l'euro come moneta ufficiale ed emettere un quantitativo concordato e limitato di monete proprie in euro. Tali paesi applicano comunque la legislazione dell'UE relativa alla comunicazione sui dati statistici, alla lotta contro il riciclaggio di denaro, alla frode e alla falsificazione dell'euro, e, se del caso, la legislazione bancaria e finanziaria dell'Unione, come stabilito nelle relative convenzioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003890/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: The euro and European micro-states

Could the Commission explain why some of Europe's micro-states, such as Andorra, Vatican City State, San Marino and the Principality of Monaco, have the euro as their currency but do not follow the same rules and regulations as are imposed on other countries belonging to the euro area?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2014)

Andorra, Monaco, San Marino and the Vatican do not participate in the economic and monetary policy of the Union, as the scope of the Monetary Agreements concluded by the EU with these countries is limited to allowing them to use the euro as official currency and issue own euro coins at agreed small amounts. They nevertheless apply relevant EU legislation on statistical reporting, fight against money laundering, fraud and counterfeiting of the euro, and, where applicable, EU banking and financial legislation, as stated in the agreements.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003891/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Fondi erogati all'ex Repubblica jugoslava di Macedonia in quanto paese in fase di preadesione

Può la Commissione indicare l'ammontare dei fondi ricevuti, a titolo di preadesione, dall'ex Repubblica jugoslava di Macedonia dall'acquisizione dello status di paese candidato a oggi?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(3 giugno 2014)

Il Consiglio europeo ha concesso ufficialmente all'ex Repubblica jugoslava di Macedonia lo status di paese candidato il 17 dicembre 2005.

Nel 2006 è stato messo a disposizione del paese un importo complessivo di 40 milioni di EUR sotto forma di assistenza CARDS (Assistenza comunitaria alla ricostruzione, allo sviluppo e alla stabilizzazione).

Nel 2007 il programma CARDS è stato sostituito dallo strumento di assistenza preadesione (IPA), rimasto in vigore fino al 2013. In questo periodo sono stati messi a disposizione del paese circa 615 milioni di EUR di assistenza bilaterale preadesione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003891/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Pre-accession funding for the former Yugloslav Republic of Macedonia

Could the Commission say how much money the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has received in pre-accession funding since being granted the status of candidate country?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

The European Council officially granted the country candidate status on 17 December 2005.

In 2006, a total of around EUR 40 million of CARDS (Community assistance for reconstruction, development and stabilisation) assistance was made available to the country.

In 2007, the CARDS Programme was replaced by the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA), which ran until 2013. During this period, around EUR 615 million of bi-lateral pre-accession assistance has been made available to the country.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003892/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Grecia: allarme influenza stagionale

Il Centro per il controllo e la prevenzione delle malattie greco (KEELPNO) ha reso noto che sono almeno 110 le persone morte dopo aver contratto l'influenza stagionale. Secondo l'Istituto la virulenza dell'influenza H1N1 e la mancanza di vaccini adeguati nel paese sarebbero le cause principali dell'aumento del numero delle vittime rispetto all'anno precedente.

La Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza dei fatti?

2. Ritiene che esistano pericoli per gli altri cittadini europei che si recano per lavoro o per turismo in quelle zone?

3. Come intende intervenire per aiutare i cittadini ellenici a fronteggiare questa emergenza?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della situazione epidemiologica dell'influenza stagionale in Grecia.

Secondo il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (ECDC) non vi è alcuna indicazione che in Grecia nel corso dell'attuale stagione sia colpito un numero di persone maggiore rispetto alle stagioni precedenti, né che in Grecia l'influenza stagionale sia più intensa che in altri Stati membri. L'influenza stagionale può infettare fino al 18 % della popolazione non vaccinata in qualsiasi stagione e paese.

Sebbene l'adozione di misure in materia di sanità pubblica sia un settore di competenza nazionale, nell'ambito della decisione n. 1082/2013/UE ([1]) del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio la Commissione incoraggia gli Stati membri a coordinare la loro risposta alle gravi minacce per la salute a carattere transfrontaliero, compresa l'influenza stagionale. La raccomandazione del Consiglio dell'UE sulla vaccinazione contro l'influenza stagionale ([2]) invita gli Stati membri ad adottare provvedimenti al fine di raggiungere un tasso di copertura vaccinale del 75 per cento per le «fasce di età più avanzata». Nel 2014 la Commissione ha pubblicato un documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione ([3]) sullo stato di avanzamento dell'attuazione della raccomandazione sopra citata, indicando le opzioni per attenuare gli effetti dell'influenza stagionale.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:293:0001:0015:it:PDF
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:348:0071:0072:it:PDF
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/vaccination/docs/seasonflu_staffwd2014_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003892/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Greece: seasonal influenza alert

The Hellenic Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (Keelpno) has announced that at least 110 people have died after contracting seasonal influenza. Keelpno say that the main reasons for the rise in the number of victims compared to the previous year are the virulence of H1N1 influenza and the lack of suitable vaccines in Greece.

1. Is the Commission aware of these facts?

2. Does it believe other EU citizens travelling to this area for work or leisure are in any danger?

3. How does it plan to assist Greek citizens in tackling this emergency?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

The Commission is aware of the epidemiological situation of seasonal influenza in Greece.

According to the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) there is no indication that in Greece in the current season more people are affected than in previous seasons, nor that seasonal influenza in Greece is more intense than in other Member States. Seasonal influenza can infect up to 18% of the unvaccinated population in any given season in any country.

Although the adoption of measures related to public health is a national competence, under Decision 1082/2013/EU ([1])of the European Parliament and of the Council, the Commission supports Member States to coordinate their response to serious cross border threats to health, including seasonal influenza. The EU Council Recommendation on seasonal influenza vaccination ([2]) calls on Member States to take action with the aim of reaching a vaccination coverage rate of 75% for 'older age groups'. In 2014 the Commission published a Staff Working Document ([3]) on the state of play of the implementation of the aforementioned Recommendation indicating options to mitigate the impact of seasonal influenza.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:293:0001:0015:EN:PDF
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:348:0071:0072:EN:PDF
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/vaccination/docs/seasonflu_staffwd2014_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003893/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Impiego di alluminio nel settore alimentare

L'alluminio è un materiale molto impiegato nel settore alimentare: si va dalla cottura fino ad arrivare alla conservazione dell'alimento. Preso atto degli studi che hanno evidenziato che l'alluminio è tossico per il sistema nervoso centrale, come altri metalli pesanti, nel caso in cui l'organismo non sia in grado di espellerlo, ad esempio in caso di gravi malattie renali; la Commissione ha effettuato precise verifiche che permettano di escludere che l'impiego di alluminio nel settore alimentare possa causare problemi alla salute dei cittadini europei?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

Sulla base degli attuali dati scientifici, l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA) ha stabilito una dose settimanale tollerabile (TWI — Tolerable Weekly Intake) di 1 mg di alluminio per kg di peso corporeo a settimana. ([1]) Se rimane al di sotto di questo limite, l'assunzione di alluminio non comporta rischi per la salute.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 1935/2004 ([2]) sui materiali e gli oggetti a contatto con gli alimenti prevede misure di salvaguardia generale volte ad assicurare che tali materiali e oggetti non rappresentino un pericolo per la salute umana al momento dell'immissione sul mercato dell'UE. Tuttavia la legislazione dell'Unione non prevede un limite specifico per la migrazione dell'alluminio dai materiali a contatto con gli alimenti. I materiali in metallo a contatto con gli alimenti sono disciplinati dalla legislazione nazionale.

Al momento la Commissione sta valutando se sia necessario definire un limite specifico per l'alluminio sulla base della dose settimanale tollerabile fissata dall'EFSA per proteggere la salute umana.

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/754.htm; doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2008.754
([2]) GU L 338 del 13.11.2004, pag. 4.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003893/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Aluminium and food

Aluminium is used a great deal at every stage of food preparation, from cooking to canning. Given that a number of studies have found that aluminium, like other heavy metals, can be very harmful to the central nervous system of people whose bodies are unable to excrete it, as is the case with people suffering from severe kidney diseases, has the Commission carried out any specific checks which make it possible to state unequivocally that the use of aluminium in food preparation does not cause health problems?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

On the basis of current scientific information, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) established a Tolerable Weekly Intake (TWI) of 1 mg aluminium per kg body weight per week ([1]). The intake of aluminium does not pose a health risk if it remains below this limit.

Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 ([2]) on food contact materials and articles provides general safeguards ensuring that these materials and articles do not endanger human health when placed on the EU market. Union legislation however does not provide a specific limit for the migration of aluminium from food contact materials. Food contact materials made out of metal are regulated under national legislation.

The Commission is currently assessing whether defining a specific limit for aluminium on the basis of the TWI established by the EFSA would be required to protect human health.

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/754.htm; doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2008.754
([2]) OJ L 338, 13.11.2004, p. 4.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003894/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Indonesia e radicalismo islamico

In alcune aree dell'arcipelago indonesiano, la nazione musulmana più popolosa al mondo, l'influenza dell'islam radicale si fa sempre più marcata, così come gli episodi di violenza o intolleranza verso le altre fedi. I gruppi fondamentalisti islamici della provincia di Aceh, in Indonesia, hanno chiesto per esempio di mettere al bando i programmi di intrattenimento o gli spettacoli dal vivo per i propri ospiti e per il pubblico esterno nelle strutture turistiche. Nella provincia di Aceh vige la sharia che ha comportato un'ulteriore restrizione ai costumi e pesanti punizioni per chi contravviene alle norme grazie alle presenza per le strade della «polizia della morale», un corpo speciale che reprime le violazioni al costume. Fra le decisioni contestate dai cittadini di Aceh, vi sono tutta una serie di divieti rivolti in particolare alle donne: indossare jeans e gonne attillate, viaggiare cavalcioni a bordo di motocicli, ballare in pubblico.

Può pertanto la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. È essa a conoscenza di tale situazione?

2. Come intende fermare le ondate di radicalismo islamico che, insieme alle restrizioni della libertà religiosa e all'inasprimento delle coercizioni contro la donna, rischiano anche di mettere in seria difficoltà l'economia dei territori?

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

L'UE è a conoscenza dei problemi che l'applicazione della Sharia e delle norme ispirate alla legge islamica comporta ad Aceh e in alcuni altri distretti. La delegazione dell'UE a Giacarta sta seguendo da vicino la situazione delle minoranze religiose in Indonesia.

Gli orientamenti 2013 dell'UE sulla promozione e protezione della libertà di religione o di credo comprendono un insieme di principi d'azione a cui l'UE può appellarsi o ricorrere nell'ambito delle relazioni con i paesi terzi.

La libertà di espressione e di credo è un tema ricorrente del dialogo sui diritti umani tra l'UE e l'Indonesia.

Il SEAE ha inoltre cercato di stimolare il dibattito pubblico in Indonesia sulla necessità di combattere l'estremismo e promuovere la tolleranza, lavorando anche con Nahdlatul Ulama, la più grande organizzazione musulmana del mondo, che ha un ruolo chiave nella protezione delle minoranze in Indonesia.

L'UE aiuta anche a contrastare la radicalizzazione e a promuovere la libertà di religione o di credo attraverso lo Strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani (EIDHR). Per esempio, nella provincia di Aceh, l'UE sta rafforzando la capacità delle minoranze religiose e dei difensori dei diritti umani di controllare e sensibilizzare alle violazioni dei diritti dell'uomo. In Giava occidentale, un progetto finanziato dall'EIDHR ha fornito a funzionari, predicatori e insegnanti nelle moschee una formazione sulla tolleranza religiosa. Quest'anno la delegazione dell'UE sosterrà iniziative di sviluppo delle competenze nel campo della risoluzione dei conflitti, compresi quelli di carattere etnico o religioso, a favore delle organizzazioni della società civile. Inoltre, grazie al notevole sostegno fornito al sistema scolastico del paese (circa 350 milioni di EUR), l'UE contribuisce a creare un clima di tolleranza e comprensione, garantendo una più equa erogazione dei servizi scolastici, indipendentemente dalla comunità religiosa di appartenenza.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003894/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Indonesia and radical Islam

In some parts of Indonesia, the country with the world's largest Muslim population, the influence of radical Islam is growing, and intolerance and violence against other faiths are increasingly common. Islamic fundamentalist groups in the province of Aceh have called for entertainment programmes and live performances for both locals and foreign tourists to be banned. The imposition of Sharia law in Aceh has resulted in restrictions on what people can wear and severe punishments for anyone who breaks the rules, which are enforced by special 'religious police', who patrol the streets. The decisions that have been criticised by local people include a whole series of bans affecting women, who, for instance, are no longer allowed to wear jeans or tight-fitting skirts, straddle motorbikes or dance in public.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. What does it intend to do to tackle the rise of radical Islam which, in addition torestricting religious freedom and the rights of women, is likely to have an extremelydamaging economic impact?

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

The EU is aware of issues over the implementation of Sharia law in Aceh as well as Sharia inspired regulations in certain districts. The EU Delegation in Jakarta follows closely the situation of religious minorities in Indonesia.

The 2013 EU Guidelines on the promotion and protection of freedom of religion or belief include a set of principles of action the EU may invoke or use in contacts with third countries.

Freedom of expression or belief is a regular topic at the EU-Indonesia Human Rights Dialogue.

The EEAS has further sought to stimulate public debate in Indonesia about the need to tackle extremism and promote tolerance including working with Nahdlatul Ulama, the world's largest Muslim organisation which has a pivotal role in protecting minorities in Indonesia.

The EU is also helping countering radicalisation and promoting freedom of religion or belief through the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). For example, in Aceh, the EU is strenghtening the capacity of religious minorities and human rights defenders to monitor and raise awareness of human rights violations. In West Java, an EIDHR funded project has provided training on religious tolerance for mosque officials, preachers and senior teachers. This year, the EU Delegation will support capacity building initiatives of civil society organisations in conflict resolution, including conflicts with ethnic or religious dimensions. In addition, the EU's considerable support to the education sector in Indonesia (around EUR 350 million) is an important contributor towards an environment of tolerance and understanding, as it aims at a more equitable provision of education services, irrespective of religious beliefs.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003895/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Fondo Sociale Europeo 2014-2020: risorse destinate all'Italia

A dicembre 2013, dopo un negoziato lungo e difficile, è stato definitivamente approvato il Quadro Finanziario Pluriennale 2014-2020.

Il QFP 2014-2020 ha uno stanziamento complessivo per gli impegni di spesa di 960 miliardi di euro.

Può la Commissione indicare le risorse da destinare all'Italia, per i prossimi sette anni, nell'ambito del Fondo Sociale Europeo?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(19 maggio 2014)

Sulla base delle conclusioni del quadro finanziario pluriennale e del quadro legislativo per la politica di coesione per il periodo 2014-20, la dotazione finanziaria definitiva assegnata all'Italia dai due fondi strutturali — il Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) e il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) — è pari a 31,1 miliardi di EUR (a prezzi correnti).

Il regolamento recante disposizioni comuni stabilisce una percentuale minima che ogni Stato membro deve destinare all'FSE. La percentuale per l'Italia è pari al 26,5 % delle risorse nel quadro dell'obiettivo «Investimenti a favore della crescita e dell'occupazione», ovvero 8,2 miliardi di EUR. Si tratta tuttavia dell'importo minimo, e le risorse effettivamente assegnate all'FSE dovrebbero tener conto delle problematiche specifiche cui fa fronte l'Italia.

L'Italia potrà inoltre disporre di 1,1 miliardi di EUR nel quadro dell'obiettivo «Cooperazione territoriale europea», di 670,6 milioni di EUR dal Fondo di aiuti europei agli indigenti e di 567,5 milioni di EUR dalla linea di bilancio specifica per l'iniziativa a favore dell'occupazione giovanile.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003895/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: European Social Fund 2014-2020: financing allocated to Italy

The Multiannual Financial Framework for the period 2014-2020 was definitively adopted in December 2013, after long and difficult negotiations.

An overall amount of EUR 960 billion in expenditure commitments is available under the MFF 2014-2020.

Can the Commission state what financing has been allocated to Italy for the next seven years under the European Social Fund?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(19 May 2014)

Based on the conclusion of the Multiannual Financial Framework and the legislative framework for Cohesion Policy for 2014-20, Italy's definitive financial allocation from the two Structural Funds (the European Social Fund (ESF) and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) is EUR 31.1 billion (at current prices).

The Common Provisions Regulation establishes a minimum percentage that each Member State is to earmark for the ESF. The percentage for Italy is 26.5% of resources under the Investment for Growth and Jobs goal, or EUR 8.2 billion. However, that is a minimum, and the actual resources allocated to the ESF should reflect the specific challenges facing Italy.

In addition, Italy will receive EUR 1.1 billion under the European Territorial Cooperation objective, EUR 670.6 million from the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived and EUR 567.5 million from the dedicated budget line of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003896/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Frutti di bosco e trasmissione dell'epatite A

Il 2013 in Europa sarà ricordato come l'anno dell'epidemia di epatite A causata dai frutti di bosco surgelati contaminati. In pochi mesi il virus ha colpito oltre 800 persone in Italia e numerose all'estero. Le aziende coinvolte sono state una decina, 15 i lotti ritirati dagli scaffali. Di fronte a questa emergenza, il Ministero della salute italiano lo scorso dicembre — trascorsi 9 mesi dopo i primi casi — ha diffuso un avviso rivolto alla cittadinanza invitando a non consumare i frutti di bosco surgelati senza cuocerli prima del consumo.

Preso atto che dall'inizio di novembre 2013 le autorità sanitarie italiane hanno smesso di rilasciare aggiornamenti sull'andamento dell'epidemia e che la stima delle persone colpite è rimasta ferma al mese di settembre;

la Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza dei fatti e, in caso di risposta affermativa, le è stata comunicata la causa della contaminazione e l'origine dei frutti di bosco che presentavano il virus? In caso di risposta negativa, intende raccogliere informazioni a tale proposito?

2. Intende attivarsi presso le autorità italiane per verificare quale sia la situazione attuale?

3. Intende chiedere al Ministero della Salute italiano se si è attivato con ogni mezzo per far sì che i frutti di bosco utilizzati da gelaterie, ristoranti e pasticcerie siano stati davvero restituiti al fornitore e/o distrutti?

4. Ritiene che la scelta di richiamare solo i lotti con la contaminazione confermata sia sufficiente a fermare l'epidemia?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della presenza in vari Stati membri, tra cui l'Italia, di focolai dell'epatite A. L'ultima valutazione di tali focolai suggerisce che essi siano stati causati da bacche surgelate, come pubblicato da una valutazione congiunta del Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (ECDC) e dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA). ([1])

Le autorità italiane hanno informato la Commissione del ritiro di diversi lotti di bacche risultate positive all'epatite A per il tramite del sistema di allarme rapido per gli alimenti e i mangimi (RASFF). Le autorità italiane hanno inoltre fornito aggiornamenti sulla situazione epidemiologica nel comitato permanente per la catena alimentare e la salute degli animali, come pure altri Stati membri interessati.

Nell'ottobre 2013 la Commissione ha chiesto all'EFSA di effettuare una ricerca dei vettori sospetti di contaminazione. Ad oggi tuttavia la fonte originaria di questa diffusione transnazionale della contaminazione da virus dell'epatite A non è stata individuata. La Commissione continua a coordinare gli interventi delle autorità competenti sulla sicurezza alimentare e la sanità pubblica degli Stati membri con il sostegno dell'ECDC e dell'EFSA

Da solo, il richiamo dei lotti contaminati non è efficace per impedire ulteriori casi di contagio umano, ma è necessaria una migliore comprensione della situazione epidemiologica. Gli Stati membri interessati hanno messo in atto ulteriori provvedimenti, come la raccomandazione di bollire le bacche prima di consumarle e raccomandazioni in materia di vaccinazione.

([1]) http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/_layouts/forms/Publication_DispForm.aspx?List=4f55ad51-4aed-4d32-b960-af70113dbb90&ID=1072

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003896/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Berries and transmission of Hepatitis A

2013 will be remembered in Europe as the year of the Hepatitis A outbreak caused by contaminated frozen berries. Within the space of a few months, the virus struck over 800 people in Italy and many others elsewhere. A dozen enterprises were involved and 15 batches of berries were recalled. In December 2013 — nine months after the first cases had been reported — the Italian Ministry of Health addressed the emergency situation by issuing a warning to the public not to eat frozen berries raw.

In view of the fact that the health authorities in Italy stopped releasing updates on the status of the epidemic in November 2013, and that September 2013 was the last month they provided estimates for the number of people infected, can the Commission answer the following questions.

1. Is it aware of the events described above? If it is, has it been notified of the cause of the contamination and the origin of the berries contaminated with the virus? If it is not, does it plan to gather the relevant information?

2. Will it ask the Italian authorities what the current situation is?

3. Will it ask the Italian Ministry of Health whether it has done everything in its power to ensure that berries for use by ice-cream parlours, restaurants and pastry shops really are returned to the suppliers and/or destroyed?

4. Does it consider that only recalling batches confirmed to be contaminated will be sufficient to halt the epidemic?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

The Commission is aware of the multinational outbreak of Hepatitis A involving many Member States including Italy. The most recent outbreak assessment suggests frozen berries as a source as published by a joint assessment of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) ([1]).

The Italian authorities have informed the Commission of the recall of several batches of berries found positive for Hepatitis A via the Rapid Alert System for Feed and Food (RASFF). The Italian authorities have furthermore given updates on the epidemiologic situation on the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health as well as other affected Member States.

In October 2013 the Commission has requested EFSA to carry out a tracing exercise of any suspected vehicles of contamination. To date however, the original source causing this multinational spread of the contamination with Hepatitis A virus was not found. The Commission is further coordinating the actions of the competent authorities of the Member States of the food safety and public health side with the support of ECDC and EFSA

A sole recall of the contaminated batches is not effective to prevent further human cases, but a better understanding of the epidemiologic situation is needed. Additional measures have been implemented by the affected Members States, such as recommendations to boil berries before consumption and recommendations for vaccination.

([1]) http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/_layouts/forms/Publication_DispForm.aspx?List=4f55ad51-4aed-4d32-b960-af70113dbb90&ID=1072

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003897/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Gas: accordo di libero scambio UE-USA e ruolo del progetto Nabucco

L'accordo di libero scambio tra UE e USA consentirà la liberalizzazione delle licenze per l'esportazione del gas di scisto americano. Alla luce di questa importante evoluzione del settore, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Può spiegare il ruolo assunto dal progetto Nabucco?

2. Sarà emarginalizzato a favore dello sviluppo di nuove traiettorie verso occidente o manterrà lo stesso ruolo strategico inizialmente annunciato?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(28 maggio 2014)

1. Il gasdotto Nabucco era stato pianificato come progetto a finanziamento privato che avrebbe potuto contribuire a un'ulteriore estensione del corridoio meridionale del gas; quest'ultimo ha l'obiettivo di garantire le forniture di gas proveniente dall'Asia centrale, dal Medio Oriente e dal Mediterraneo orientale, al fine di diversificare gli approvvigionamenti e migliorare la sicurezza dell'approvvigionamento di gas nell'Unione europea. Il consorzio di produttori Shah Deniz in Azerbaigian ha deciso di utilizzare il gasdotto transanatolico in Turchia e il gasdotto transadriatico verso l'Italia per il trasporto del gas e l'apertura del corridoio meridionale del gas. Tuttavia, altre infrastrutture saranno necessarie in futuro per sostenere l'ampliamento del corridoio.

2. Il «secondo riesame strategico della politica energetica» del 2008 ha definito il corridoio meridionale del gas una delle principali priorità dell'UE in materia di sicurezza energetica e il regolamento sugli orientamenti per le infrastrutture energetiche transeuropee, di recente adozione, lo ha inserito tra i dodici corridoi prioritari. I progetti nell'ambito del gas che sostengono l'apertura e l'ulteriore estensione del corridoio sono stati definiti progetti di interesse comune a dimostrazione della loro continua importanza per l'attuazione della politica di diversificazione energetica dell'UE. L'elenco dei progetti d'interesse comune nel corridoio meridionale del gas è disponibile al seguente link: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/pci/pci_en.htm

L'accesso a nuove risorse di GNL costituisce un elemento in più della politica di diversificazione energetica e non riduce l'importanza strategica del corridoio meridionale del gas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003897/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Gas: EU-US free trade agreement and role of the Nabucco pipeline project

The free trade agreement between the EU and the US will allow for the liberalisation of export licences for American shale gas. In the light of this important development in the industry, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Can the Commission explain the role of the Nabucco pipeline project?

2. Is this project going to be marginalised in favour of the development of new trajectories to the west, or will it still have the strategic role originally announced?

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

1. The Nabucco pipeline was planned as a privately-sponsored project that could underpin the further extension of the Southern Gas Corridor. The objective of this Corridor is to deliver gas from Central Asian, the Middle East and the East Mediterranean in order to diversify gas supplies and improve the security of gas supply in the European Union. The Shah Deniz producers' consortium in Azerbaijan has decided to use the Trans-Anatolian Pipeline in Turkey and the Trans-Adriatic Pipeline to Italy in order to transport its gas and open the Southern Gas Corridor. Nonetheless, additional infrastructures will be needed in the future to support its future extension.

2. The Southern Gas Corridor has been identified as one of the EU's highest energy security priorities in the Second Strategic Energy Review in 2008 and as one of the twelve priority corridors in the recently adopted Regulation on Guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure. Gas projects supporting its opening and further extension have been identified as Projects of Common Interest (PCIs), demonstrating their continued importance for the implementation of EU energy diversification policy. The list of PCIs in the Southern Gas Corridor is available at the following link: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/pci/pci_en.htm

The access to new LNG resources is just another element of the energy diversification policy and does not reduce the strategic importance of the Southern Gas Corridor.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003898/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Nuova PAC 2014-2020: stato dell'arte e tabella di marcia per la sua effettiva applicazione

Il 20 novembre 2013 il Parlamento europeo ha approvato la nuova Politica agricola comune 2014-2020.

Preso atto che il cammino che ha portato alla formulazione della Nuova PAC 2014-2020 è durato oltre due anni; considerato che questa riforma segnerà per i prossimi sette anni il futuro di circa 12 milioni di agricoltori europei e che il capitolo sulla PAC, con il 38 % delle risorse comunitarie, rappresenta il capitolo di spesa più importante di tutto il bilancio dell'UE; tenuto conto che per la sua effettiva applicazione si attende ancora la stesura dei cosiddetti «atti delegati» o «regolamenti attuativi»;

può la Commissione:

1. fornire un quadro completo circa lo stato dell'arte della nuova Politica agricola comune 2014-2020?

2. Indicare una tempistica delle tappe restanti che porteranno all'effettiva applicazione della nuova PAC?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(16 maggio 2014)

L'11 marzo 2014 la Commissione europea ha adottato gli atti delegati per la PAC 2014-2020 e li ha trasmessi al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio. Le due istituzioni non hanno sollevato obiezioni.

Il 2 aprile la Commissione ha pertanto adottato una dichiarazione speciale connessa agli atti delegati ([1]); seguiranno nei prossimi mesi le tappe procedurali che porteranno infine alla modifica di uno degli atti.

Oltre agli atti delegati, saranno adottati diversi atti di esecuzione per completare la riforma.

La pubblicazione di tali atti legislativi di diritto derivato (delegati e di esecuzione) è prevista tra maggio e luglio 2014. Nel complesso, sarà quella la scadenza prevista per la preparazione del quadro giuridico di attuazione della PAC a livello europeo.

In questo quadro, le fasi attuative necessarie sono già in corso.

Per quanto riguarda i pagamenti diretti, gli Stati membri potranno adeguare gli strumenti alle loro esigenze specifiche grazie ad una maggiore flessibilità. Ciò significa operare scelte importanti (ad esempio sugli agricoltori in attività e sui giovani agricoltori) per lo più entro il 1º agosto 2014. In base a queste scelte il nuovo sistema di pagamenti diretti entrerà pienamente in vigore il 1º gennaio 2015.

Parallelamente, gli Stati membri e la Commissione europea stanno ultimando l'elaborazione e l'adozione degli accordi di partenariato e dei programmi di sviluppo rurale. La maggior parte di questi documenti sarà adottata prima della fine dell'anno. Va notato che l'ammissibilità delle azioni nell'ambito dei programmi di sviluppo rurale è già iniziata il 1º gennaio 2014.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/newsroom/161_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003898/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: New CAP 2014-2020: state of progress and roadmap for actual implementation

On 20 November 2013, the European Parliament approved the new common agricultural policy 2014-2020.

Given that it took more than two years to draw up the new CAP 2014-2020; considering that this reform will mark the future of some 12 million European farmers for the next seven years, and that the chapter on the CAP, accounting for 38% of community resources, is the largest chapter of expenditure in the entire EU budget; taking account of the fact that it cannot actually be implemented until the 'delegated acts' or 'implementing regulations' have been drawn up,

can the Commission:

1. Provide a full picture as regards the state of progress of the new common agricultural policy 2014-2020?

2. Indicate the timing of the remaining stages leading to actual implementation of the new CAP?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2014)

On 11 March 2014 the Delegated Acts for the CAP 2014-2020 were adopted by the European Commission and transmitted to the European Parliament and the Council. No objections were raised by the two institutions on the acts transmitted.

In relation to this, the Commission adopted a special declaration linked to the Delegated Acts ([1]) on 2 April. This is to be followed by procedural steps over the next months eventually leading to an amendment of one of the acts.

In addition to the Delegated Acts, a number of Implementing Acts will be adopted to complete the reform.

The publication of these secondary legislative acts (i.e. Delegated and Implementing Acts) is planned for the months of May-July 2014. Overall, this will be the envisaged end date for the preparation of the legal framework for the CAP implementation at the European level.

Within this framework, necessary steps for implementation are already ongoing.

With regard to Direct Payments, Member States will be able to adapt the instruments to their specific needs on the basis of an enhanced flexibility. This means making important choices (e.g. on active and young farmers) mostly by 1 August 2014. On the basis of these choices, the new Direct Payment system will fully enter into force on 1 January 2015.

In parallel, Member States and the European Commission are finalising the preparation and adoption of the Partnership Agreements and the Rural Development Programmes. The majority of these documents will be adopted before the end of the year. It has to be noted that the eligibility of actions within the Rural Development programmes has already started on 1 January 2014.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/newsroom/161_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003899/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: PAC 2014-2020: risorse destinate all'Italia

Gli accordi politici del 26 giugno 2013 e del 24 settembre 2013 tra la Commissione, il Consiglio e il Parlamento europeo (trilogo) hanno sancito le regole del sostegno alla nuova PAC 2014-2020.

Il 27 giugno 2013, il Presidente del Consiglio dell'UE, con il sostegno del Presidente della Commissione europea, al termine di una riunione straordinaria che ha coinvolto anche il Parlamento europeo, ha comunicato il raggiungimento di un accordo politico sul Quadro finanziario pluriennale (QFP) 2014-2020.

Con questi accordi politici, approvati in via definitiva nel mese di novembre 2013, l'UE ha decretato quindi l'avvio della nuova programmazione 2014-2020, sia per la PAC che per tutte le altre politiche europee.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione fornire un quadro completo ed esaustivo delle risorse destinate alla PAC nel periodo 2014-2020, indicando eventuali riduzioni rispetto al settennato precedente?

2. Può indicare la cifra destinata all'Italia nell'ambito della nuova PAC per i prossimi sette anni?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(28 maggio 2014)

Per il quadro finanziario pluriennale (QFP) 2014-2020, l'importo massimo disponibile per la politica agricola comune (PAC) è pari a 362 787 milioni di EUR a prezzi del 2011, corrispondenti a 408 313 milioni di EUR a prezzi correnti. Esso copre sia le spese di mercato e gli aiuti diretti finanziati dal Fondo europeo agricolo di garanzia (FEAGA), per i quali vi è un submassimale specifico indicato nella rubrica 2 del QFP, sia le spese per lo sviluppo rurale finanziate dal Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR).

Per il periodo 2007-2013, l'importo totale disponibile per la PAC è pari a 409 064 milioni di EUR a prezzi correnti.

Per il periodo 2014-2020, i massimali nazionali annuali per l'Italia fissati per gli aiuti diretti ammontano a 27 090 milioni di EUR, mentre il totale della sua dotazione per le misure di sviluppo rurale ammonta a 10 430 milioni di EUR (tutti gli importi sono in prezzi correnti e arrotondati). Tali importi sono stati definiti prima di prendere in considerazione la possibile flessibilità tra i due pilastri della PAC, che, a seguito di una decisione dell'Italia di applicare tale flessibilità, potrebbe risultare in un trasferimento tra gli aiuti diretti e lo sviluppo rurale. I suddetti massimali per gli aiuti diretti sono inoltre stati definiti prima dell'applicazione del meccanismo di disciplina finanziaria conformemente all'articolo 26 del regolamento (UE) n. 1306/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003899/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: CAP 2014-20: resources allocated to Italy

The political agreements of 26 June 2013 and 24 September 2013 between the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament (trialogue) set the rules in support of the new CAP for 2014-20.

On 27 June 2013, the President of the Council of the EU, with the support of the President of the European Commission and following an extraordinary meeting which also included the European Parliament, announced that a political agreement had been reached concerning the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) for 2014-20.

Through these political agreements, approved definitively in November 2013, the EU has thus determined the launch of the new programming for 2014-20, for both the CAP and all other European policies.

1. In light of this, can the Commission provide a complete and exhaustive framework of the resources allocated to the CAP for the 2014-20 period, indicating any reductions compared with the previous seven-year period?

2. Can it indicate the amount allocated to Italy under the new CAP for the next seven years?

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

For the multiannual financial framework (MFF) 2014-2020, the maximum amount available for the common agricultural policy (CAP) is EUR 362 787 million in 2011 prices, corresponding to EUR 408 313 million in current prices. It covers both market expenditure and direct aids financed by the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF), for which there is a specific sub-ceiling under Heading 2 of the MFF, and expenditure for rural development financed by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD).

For the period 2007-2013, the overall amount available for the CAP corresponds to EUR 409 064 million in current prices.

For the period 2014-2020, Italy's annual national ceilings for direct aids sum up to EUR 27 090 million and its total envelope for rural development measures amounts to EUR 10 430 million (all amounts in current prices and rounded). These amounts are before taking into account possible flexibility between the two CAP pillars, which would result, following a decision of Italy to apply such flexibility, in a transfer between direct aids and rural development. The abovementioned ceilings for direct aids are also before the application of the financial discipline mechanism as laid down in Article 26 of Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003900/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Personale delle delegazioni dell'UE

La Commissione può fornire dati in merito al personale attualmente operante presso le sue delegazioni indicando il numero di persone assunte e la percentuale delle donne?

Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vice-Presidente Ashton a nome della Commissione
(14 maggio 2014)

Il numero complessivo dei membri del personale operante presso le delegazioni dell'UE (funzionari del SEAE e della Commissione, agenti temporanei, contrattuali e locali) è pari a 5 255, di cui 2 632 donne (50 %).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003900/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Personnel in EU delegations

Can the Commission provide data about the personnel currently working in its delegations, indicating the number of staff employed and the percentage of women?

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

The total number of staff in EU Delegations (EEAS and Commission officials, temporary, contract and local agents) is 5 255 of which 2 632 are women (50%).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003901/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Indonesia: fermato progetto di costruzione di una chiesa cattolica

L'Indonesia, nazione musulmana più popolosa al mondo, è sempre più spesso teatro di attacchi o episodi di intolleranza contro le minoranze, siano esse composte da cristiani, musulmani ahmadi o di altre fedi. Nella provincia di Aceh — unica nell'Arcipelago — vige la legge islamica (sharia), in seguito a un accordo di pace fra governo centrale e Movimento per la liberazione di Aceh (Gam), e in molte altre aree (come Bekasi e Bogor nel West Java) si fa sempre più radicale ed estrema la visione dell'islam fra i cittadini. Recentemente, a Jakarta, il tribunale ha ceduto alle intimidazioni dei gruppi estremisti islamici locali e ha bloccato il progetto di costruzione della chiesa cattolica di San Stanislao Kostka a Cibubur, nella reggenza di Bekasi, avviato con regolare permesso nel 2012.

Il presidente della corte ha deciso di revocare il permesso per evitare episodi di «violenza confessionale» fra comunità religiose diverse. La vicenda è solo l'ultima di una lunga serie di violazioni e abusi alla libertà religiosa, che hanno caratterizzato la storia recente dell'Indonesia dalla fine del regime di Suharto. Fenomeni che si sono moltiplicati negli ultimi anni della presidenza di Yudhoyono, capo di Stato accusato di mantenere una linea fin troppo morbida con l'ala estremista islamica.

La Commissione:

1. È a conoscenza di tale situazione?

2. Intende sospendere i progetti finanziati in queste aree almeno fino a che le autorità locali non garantiscano con tutti i mezzi il pluralismo e la libertà religiosa?

3. Intende intervenire anche attraverso il proprio servizio di azione esterna per garantire la libertà religiosa dei cattolici presenti in queste aree?

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

La Commissione segue attentamente la situazione di tutte le minoranze religiose in Indonesia. La delegazione di Giacarta è al corrente dell'applicazione della sharia nella provincia di Aceh e di normative ispirate alla sharia in alcuni distretti.

Nell'ultimo dialogo UE-Indonesia sui diritti umani la Commissione ha espresso apprensione per la tutela delle minoranze religiose, tra cui le comunità Ahmadiyah e cristiana, e ha esortato il governo a prendere misure per evitare azioni illecite da parte di gruppi estremisti.

Nel quadro dello strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani (EIDHR) l'UE sostiene anche ONG indonesiane che promuovono la libertà di credo offrendo formazioni sulla tolleranza religiosa rivolte a officianti e predicatori delle moschee e agli insegnanti delle pesantren a Giava occidentale. Nella provincia di Aceh l'UE contribuisce a sviluppare la capacità delle minoranze religiose e dei difensori dei diritti umani, mentre a Giava e Papua occidentale offre formazioni ai giudici mirate a una migliore applicazione delle norme sui diritti umani nei casi riguardanti la libertà religiosa e sviluppa la capacità delle organizzazioni della società civile locali nei casi riguardanti la libertà di credo.

Grazie al notevole sostegno fornito al sistema scolastico del paese (circa 350 milioni di euro) l'Unione contribuisce inoltre a creare un clima di tolleranza e comprensione garantendo una più equa erogazione dei servizi scolastici, indipendentemente dalla comunità religiosa di appartenenza.

L'azione dell'Unione è incentra al rispetto dei diritti umani e della libertà di culto e si ritiene controproducente sospendere i progetti in questi settori.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003901/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Indonesia: the construction of a Catholic church blocked

Indonesia, the most populous Muslim nation in the world, is witnessing more and more attacks and incidents of intolerance against minorities, whether Christians, Ahmadi Muslims or other faiths. Aceh is the only province in the Indonesian Archipelago where Islamic Law (Sharia) is in force following a peace agreement between the central government and the Free Aceh Movement (Gam), yet in many other areas (such as Bekasi and Bogor in West Java) an increasingly radicalised and extreme vision of Islam is spreading among the citizens. Recently, a court in Jakarta gave into intimidation by local Islamic extremist groups and blocked the construction of the Catholic church of San Stanislao Kostka in Cibubur, in the regency of Bekasi, which had begun, with a legal permit, in 2012.

The president of the court decided to revoke the permit to avoid incidents of 'sectarian violence' among different religious communities. This is just the latest episode in a long series of violations and abuses of religious freedom, which have blighted the recent history of Indonesia since the end of the Suharto regime. The phenomena have increased in recent years under the leadership of President Yudhoyono, who is accused of being overly soft with Islamic extremists.

1. Is the Commission aware of these events?

2. Does it intend to suspend projects financed in these areas, at least until the local authorities ensure pluralism and religious freedom by all available means?

3. Does it also intend to intervene through the External Action Service in order to guarantee the religious freedom of Catholics present in these areas?

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

The Commission follows closely the situation of all religious minorities in Indonesia. The Delegation in Jakarta is aware of issues over the implementation of Sharia law in Aceh as well as Sharia inspired regulations in certain districts.

At the last EU-Indonesia Human Rights Dialogue the Commission raised its concerns regarding the protection of religious minorities, including the Ahmadiyah and Christian churches, and encouraged the government to take action to prevent unlawful action by extremist groups.

Through the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) the EU also supports Indonesian NGOs in promoting freedom of belief such as training mosque officials, preachers and senior teachers of pesantren in West Java on aspects of religious tolerance. In Aceh, the EU is strengthening the capacity of religious minorities and human rights defenders while in Java and West Papua, the EU is training district judges to better apply human rights standards in cases related to religious freedom as well as enhancing the capacities of local Civil Society Organisations to deal with cases related to freedom of belief.

The EU's considerable support to the Education sector in Indonesia (around EUR 350 million) is equally an important contribution towards an environment of tolerance and understanding, as it aims at a more equitable provision of education services, irrespective of religious beliefs.

As respect for human rights and freedom of belief are important components of EU interventions, we believe that suspension of projects in these areas would prove detrimental.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003902/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Mafia turca attiva in Europa

Da varie inchieste risulta che gruppi criminali organizzati legati alla mafia turca operino in tutta l'Europa occidentale, soprattutto in paesi nei quali le comunità di immigrati turchi sono più presenti, e che il traffico di stupefacenti sia il loro canale primario di guadagno e interessi vari Stati membri fra i quali l'Italia.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione riferire:

1. se è a conoscenza di quanto sopra esposto;

2. se intende tracciare un quadro di analisi dell'infiltrazione di questi gruppi criminali provenienti dalla Turchia in Europa;

3. quali misure sono state adottate a livello dell'Unione per contrastare questi fenomeni e per supportare le forze dell'ordine degli Stati membri nella lotta alla criminalità organizzata turca?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(28 maggio 2014)

La Commissione europea è consapevole del ruolo svolto dai gruppi di criminalità organizzata turchi nel traffico di merci e di immigranti irregolari nell'UE.

Sulla base della valutazione della minaccia rappresentata dalla criminalità organizzata e dalle forme gravi di criminalità (*Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment*, SOCTA) effettuata da Europol ([1]), il ciclo programmatico dell'UE per il 2014-2017 per la criminalità organizzata e le forme gravi di criminalità internazionale si prefigge di intervenire in settori prioritari e stabilisce obiettivi fondamentali a livello di UE per la cooperazione transfrontaliera nelle attività di contrasto fino al 2017, con la partecipazione degli Stati membri, di Europol e di altre agenzie dell'Unione, in stretta collaborazione con la Commissione ([2]).

([1]) https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/socta2013.pdf
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/137401.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003902/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Turkish Mafia activities in Europe

Various investigations have shown that organised criminal groups linked to the Turkish Mafia are active across the whole of western Europe, especially in countries with large communities of Turkish immigrants, and that their main source of revenue is drug trafficking in various Member States including Italy.

1. Is the Commission aware of the aforementioned facts?

2. Does it intend to draw up an analytical framework of the infiltration into Europe of these Turkish criminal groups?

3. Which measures have been adopted at European Union level to combat this phenomenon and to support the police forces in the Member States in their fight against Turkish organised crime?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2014)

The European Commission is aware of the role of Turkish organised crime groups in trafficking goods and irregular migrants to the EU.

Based on Europol's EU Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment ([1]) (SOCTA), the 'EU policy cycle 2014-2017 for organised and serious international crime' aims to tackle priority areas and sets EU-level priorities for cross-border law enforcement cooperation until 2017, involving Member States, Europol and other EU agencies, in close cooperation with the Commission. ([2])

([1]) https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/socta2013.pdf
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/137401.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003903/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Multinazionali cinesi in Europa: rischi per i cittadini europei

La Guardia di Finanza di Verona ha sequestrato da una ditta individuale di proprietà cinese sita a Povegliano Veronese oltre una tonnellata di spaghetti. Le confezioni non riportavano le informazioni prescritte dalle normative dell'UE riguardo ai prodotti alimentari mentre risultavano incerte sia le materie prime utilizzate che la data di confezionamento.

Si osservi che molte aziende multinazionali di capitale cinese, come la Synutra, hanno cominciato ad aprire attività in Europa per operare soprattutto nel settore agroalimentare. Inoltre, molti produttori europei sono preoccupati per il fatto che i cinesi avranno la forza di mercato per contrattare il prezzo delle materie prime come ad esempio il latte.

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

1. Può fornire dati sulle aziende a capitale cinese operanti in Europa?

2. Crede che l'insediamento massiccio di multinazionali cinesi possa in qualche modo influire sulle regolari dinamiche di concorrenza del mercato europeo?

3. Ritiene che la presenza di queste aziende che hanno insita nel loro management una cultura di prodotto e di produzione molto lontana da quella definita dagli standard europei di sicurezza aumenterà i rischi per la salute dei cittadini europei?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2014)

La Commissione raccoglie annualmente statistiche sulle imprese affiliate estere insediate nell'UE ripartite in base al paese dell'azionario di maggioranza. Dalle ultime cifre disponibili emerge che il numero di affiliate di proprietà cinese insediate nell'UE è aumentato del 26 % dal 2010 al 2011 per l'intera attività imprenditoriale (da 2040 a 2600 affiliate). Nel settore manifatturiero, tuttavia, il numero di affiliate di proprietà cinese è rimasto stabile (169).

Le aziende attive nel mercato interno devono rispettare le regole del medesimo, le norme di sicurezza e qualità nonché la legge sulla concorrenza che vieta le pratiche concorrenziali illecite. Gli Stati membri hanno la responsabilità di assicurare un'efficace supervisione del mercato e di controllare il rispetto delle norme a tutela della salute e dei consumatori. Lo stesso vale per i controlli alle frontiere delle importazioni provenienti da paesi terzi.

La Commissione incoraggia un vigoroso enforcement di tali norme, ragion per cui non vi dovrebbero essere rischi sanitari per i cittadini europei derivanti dalle attività delle imprese di proprietà cinese insediate in Europa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003903/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Chinese multinationals in Europe: risks for European citizens

Verona's Finance Police have seized more than a tonne of spaghetti from a Chinese-owned sole proprietorship in Povegliano Veronese. The packaging did not provide the information required by EU legislation on food products, and the raw materials used and date of packaging were unclear.

Many Chinese-owned multinational companies, such as Synutra, have started operating in Europe, particularly in the agrifood industry, and many European producers are worried the Chinese will have the market strength to squeeze the price of raw materials such as milk.

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

1. Can it provide figures on Chinese-owned companies operating in Europe?

2. Does it think a mass influx of Chinese multinationals might affect the normal competitive dynamics of the European market?

3. Does it think the presence of these companies, whose management is instilled with a product and production culture that is very different from the one required by European safety standards, will lead to increased health risks for European citizens?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The Commission collects annually statistics on foreign affiliate enterprises resident in the EU by country of controlling entity. The last available figures show that the number of Chinese-owned affiliates resident in the EU increased by 26% from 2010 to 2011 for the whole of the business economy (from 2040 to 2600 affiliates). In the manufacturing sector however, the number of Chinese-owned affiliates remained stable (169).

Firms active in the internal market need to comply with internal market rules, safety and quality standards as well as with competition law preventing abusive practices in competition. Member States are responsible for effective market supervision and for controlling compliance with health and consumer protection rules. The same applies to border controls of imports from third countries.

The Commission promotes a strong enforcement of such rules, therefore there should be no impact on health risks for European citizens derived from the operation of Chinese-owned companies in Europe.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003904/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Rispetto dei diritti umani in Pakistan

In riferimento alla mia interrogazione E-007645/2012 «Arresto di una bambina down cristiana per blasfemia e tutela dei diritti umani in Pakistan», la Commissione:

1. può fornire un aggiornamento sulla sorte di Rimsha Masih?

2. può indicare quali sono i progressi compiuti dal paese ad oggi per il rispetto dei diritti umani?

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

1. Si veda la risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-001501/2014.

2. Sebbene il Pakistan abbia ratificato la maggior parte delle convenzioni sui diritti umani, in molti settori la situazione è ancora precaria; questo punto viene regolarmente sollevato nell'ambito del dialogo UE-Pakistan.

Fra i progressi osservati in questo campo vanno segnalate le elezioni del 2013, le prime da quando il Pakistan ha ratificato l'ICCPR, che segnano una transizione storica tra due governi democraticamente eletti. Nonostante le minacce dei talebani, l'affluenza alle urne è stata massiccia. Il numero di candidate è più che raddoppiato dalle elezioni del 2008. Per migliorare la rappresentanza delle donne, il governo ha riservato loro il 33 % dei seggi nei governi locali, il 17 % all'Assemblea nazionale e il 12 % al Senato.

Nel 2011 e nel 2012 il Pakistan ha promulgato nuove leggi volte a tutelare i diritti umani, in particolare quelli delle donne, come la legge sulla prevenzione delle pratiche misogine, che definisce esplicitamente come atti criminali pratiche quali le aggressioni con acidi, i matrimoni forzati e i delitti d'onore, prevedendo protezione e azioni giudiziarie a favore delle vittime. Nel 2012 è stata promulgata la legge sulla commissione nazionale per lo status delle donne, che concede alla commissione un'autonomia finanziaria e amministrativa.

La 19a modifica della Costituzione ha formalizzato il processo di nomina dei giudici, rafforzando l'indipendenza della magistratura. Ora è possibile avviare procedimenti penali contro politici e funzionari precedentemente accusati di corruzione. La Costituzione garantisce attualmente il diritto di tutti i cittadini ad accedere alle informazioni.

Il paese dovrà tuttavia garantire l'applicazione di queste nuove leggi, soprattutto perché la responsabilità è condivisa tra il governo nazionale e le autorità provinciali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003904/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Respect of human rights in Pakistan

With reference to my earlier question E-007645/2012, 'Arrest of a Christian girl with Down's syndrome for blasphemy', can the Commission state:

1. whether it has any information about the fate of Rimsha Masih?

2. the progress that has been made by the country to date as regards the respect of human rights?

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

1. See reply to Written Question E-001501/2014.

2. Although Pakistan has ratified most of the international human rights conventions, we are aware that in many areas the human rights situation in Pakistan is precarious; this is regularly raised in the EU's dialogue with Pakistan.

Examples of progress include the 2013 elections — the first following Pakistan's ratification of the ICCPR, marking a historic transition from one democratically elected government to another. The vote was characterised by a massive turn out in spite of Taliban threats. The number of women candidates more than doubled since the elections of 2008. To the improve representation of women, the Government reserved for them 33% of seats in local governments, 17% in the National Assembly and 12% in the Senate.

In 2011 and 2012 Pakistan introduced new legislation to protect human rights with a particular focus on women, e.g. the Prevention of Anti Women Practices Bill, which explicitly recognises practices from acid violence and forced marriage to honour killings as criminal acts, affording protection and legal action for victims. The National Commission on the Status of Women Bill was enacted in 2012, granting the Commission financial and administrative autonomy.

The 19th amendment to Pakistan's Constitution formalised the process for the appointment of judges strengthening the independence of the Judiciary. Charges can be brought against politicians and officials who had previously been accused of corruption. The right of every citizen to access of information is now constitutionally guaranteed.

But it remains the case that implementation of these new laws will need to be ensured, especially as responsibility is shared between national and provincial governments.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003905/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Rispetto della libertà di informazione nell'ex Repubblica iugoslava di Macedonia

Vista la risposta all'interrogazione E-008105/2011; considerato che l'ex Repubblica iugoslava di Macedonia ha acquisito lo status di candidato ufficiale all'adesione e vista la tutela accordata dall'UE alla libertà di espressione dei mezzi di comunicazione, può la Commissione fornire un aggiornamento circa i progressi conseguito finora dal paese nelle delicate tematiche del rispetto della libertà di espressione e dei media?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(28 maggio 2014)

La relazione sui progressi pubblicata dalla Commissione a ottobre 2013 ([1]) contiene un'analisi approfondita della situazione dell'ex Repubblica jugoslava di Macedonia per quanto riguarda la libertà di espressione e dei media. La Commissione prende atto delle modifiche legislative che hanno depenalizzato la diffamazione e l'ingiuria, dell'esistenza di una formazione specifica per i giudici sulla libertà di espressione e del miglioramento del monitoraggio del contenuto e della proprietà dei media da parte del Consiglio per l'emittenza radiotelevisiva. La Commissione rileva inoltre la polarizzazione del paesaggio mediatico, lo squilibrio nella copertura mediatica durante le elezioni locali, le tensioni fra l'associazione dei giornalisti e il governo, gli standard professionali insufficienti e la mancanza di un sistema di autoregolamentazione. Dopo la pubblicazione della relazione, il paese ha adottato due nuove leggi che riguardano, rispettivamente, i media e i servizi audiovisivi, basandosi sui risultati di ampie consultazioni pubbliche e sui contributi di esperti dell'UE, del Consiglio d'Europa e dell'OSCE. È ancora troppo presto per valutare l'applicazione di queste nuove leggi, che sono state adottate alla fine del 2013. La Commissione attribuisce particolare importanza alla libertà di espressione e alla libertà dei media nel processo di adesione e continuerà a valutare la situazione, ivi compreso nella relazione sui progressi che sarà pubblicata in autunno.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003905/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Respect for freedom of information in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

In the light of the answer to Question E-008105/2011 and bearing in mind the fact that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has officially become a candidate for membership and that the EU seeks to protect the media's freedom of expression, can the Commission give an update on the progress which that country has made so far in the delicate matter of respecting freedom of expression and media freedom?

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

In the progress report published in October 2013 ([1]) the Commission reported extensively on the situation as regards freedom of expression and the media in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Commission took note of legislative amendments which decriminalised defamation and insult, training provided to judges concerning freedom of expression, as well as the Broadcasting Council's improved monitoring of media content and ownership. The Commission also reported on the polarised media situation, the problem of unbalanced media coverage during local elections and the strained relations between the association of journalists and the government, as well as poor professional standards and the absence of a system of self-regulation. Since the publication of the progress report, the country has adopted two new laws on media and on audiovisual media services respectively, following extensive public consultations as well as advice from with EU, Council of Europe and OSCE experts in the field. It is still too early to assess the implementation of these new laws, which were adopted at the end of 2013. The Commission attaches particular importance to the freedom of expression and freedom of media in the accession process and will continue to assess the situation, including in the upcoming Progress Report in the autumn.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003906/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Salmoni di allevamento e minaccia all'ecosistema marino e fluviale europeo

In Europa i salmoni di allevamento, che hanno un patrimonio genetico diverso da quelli selvatici, fuggono sempre più spesso dalle gabbie, causando squilibri nei branchi selvatici e minacciandone integrità genetica e sopravvivenza. L'allarme, che riguarda i salmoni allevati soprattutto in Norvegia e Gran Bretagna, è stato sollevato dai ricercatori dell'Università dell'East Anglia, i quali hanno verificato che i salmoni di allevamento possono mettere a serio rischio le specie esistenti, ibridandosi con esse e alterando il loro patrimonio genetico. Questi pesci, che esprimono varianti genetiche selezionate per le loro caratteristiche, sono molto più aggressivi rispetto a quelli selvatici e crescono più in fretta. Nel tempo, essi minacciano l'integrità e la varietà genetica delle specie esistenti, rischiando di introdurre tratti genetici meno desiderabili.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se ritiene che l'Europa rischi uno sbilanciamento dei branchi naturali a favore di quelli di allevamento?

2. Ritiene che questa ibridazione possa essere pericolosa per l'ambiente e in generale per tutto l'ecosistema marino e fluviale europeo?

Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(28 maggio 2014)

Le prove scientifiche attualmente disponibili suggeriscono che le interazioni tra i pesci fuggiti da allevamenti e le popolazioni di pesci selvatici — comprese le ibridazioni e la concorrenza tra le specie — possono avere un impatto sui pesci selvatici. Esse, tuttavia, non indicano che la popolazione di salmoni selvatici e gli ecosistemi dell'UE siano in grave pericolo a causa di questa situazione.

Gli Stati membri in cui è allevato il salmone seguono procedure per prevenire, segnalare, monitorare e reagire ad eventuali fughe. Rientra anche nell'interesse degli allevatori evitare le fughe dei pesci, in quanto comportano perdite economiche.

Sono inoltre in corso progetti per ridurre al minimo il rischio di fughe, anche attraverso iniziative di ricerca come il progetto del 7°PQ «Prevent escape» (prevenire le fughe). La Commissione seguirà gli sviluppi della situazione e continuerà a sostenere i progetti intesi minimizzare il rischio di fughe.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003906/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Farmed salmon and threat to Europe's marine and river ecosystem

In Europe farmed salmon, whose gene pool is different from that of wild salmon, are straying an increasingly long way from their cages, interfering with wild populations and threatening their genetic integrity and their survival. The alarm, relating chiefly to salmon reared in Norway and the United Kingdom, has been raised by researchers at the University of East Anglia, who have established that farmed salmon could pose a serious risk to existing species by interbreeding with them and altering their gene pool. These fish, in which the gene variants expressed are selected for their characteristics, are much more aggressive than wild fish and grow more rapidly. Over time they jeopardise the genetic integrity and variety of existing species and may introduce less desirable genetic traits.

1. Is there any risk, in the Commission's opinion, that wild populations in Europe will be thrown out of kilter by farmed populations?

2. Does the Commission consider that this crossbreeding might be dangerous for the environment and for Europe's entire marine and river ecosystem?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2014)

The scientific evidence that is currently available suggests that interactions between escapes from farms and wild fish population — including through interbreeding and competition — can have an impact on wild fish. It does not however indicate that the EU wild salmon population and ecosystems are in serious danger as a result of this pressure.

Member States where salmon is farmed have procedures in place to prevent, report, monitor and react to escape events. It is also in the interest of farmers to avoid escapes of farmed fish, as these result in economic loss.

Additionally, there are ongoing efforts to minimise the risk of escapes, including through research initiatives such as the FP7 project 'Prevent Escape'. The Commission will monitor the situation and continue to support efforts to minimise the risk of escapes.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003907/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Presenza di amianto su auto di produzione cinese, richiesta di informazioni all'Agenzia europea per le sostanze chimiche

In riferimento alla risposta alla mia interrogazione E-007967/2012, può la Commissione fornire un aggiornamento sull'argomento in base alle informazioni ottenute dall'Agenzia europea per le sostanze chimiche?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(5 giugno 2014)

Nel 2012 in alcuni paesi non appartenenti all'UE sono stati richiamati numerosi veicoli da due produttori di automobili cinesi, dopo che era stato riscontrato amianto nel motore e nelle guarnizioni di scarico. La Commissione ha chiesto pertanto ai membri del Forum per lo scambio di informazioni sull'applicazione dei regolamenti REACH e CLP di trasmettere e scambiare informazioni sull'importazione di automobili cinesi nel loro territorio e di indagare se veicoli o pezzi di ricambio contenenti amianto fossero stati individuati dalle autorità competenti. Le uniche informazioni di cui la Commissione disponeva all'epoca indicavano che i due produttori cinesi avevano esportato automobili in Europa nel 2011.

In cinque dei ventidue Stati membri che hanno comunicato l'esito delle loro indagini è stato registrato un numero molto esiguo di importazioni dei modelli potenzialmente in causa, mentre in un solo Stato membro, l'Italia, sono state registrate importazioni più cospicue. Le informazioni fornite all'epoca dagli Stati membri interessati non contenevano dati sulla presenza di amianto nelle unità sottoposte a un controllo. L'Italia ha anche inviato informazioni su una campagna avviata nel gennaio 2013 per verificare la presenza di tali veicoli sul suo territorio.

In base alle informazioni fornite dagli Stati membri, discusse nella riunione del Forum svoltasi dal 18 al 20 giugno 2013, sembra che l'importazione di veicoli dei produttori potenzialmente in causa sia stata molto limitata, eccetto nel caso sopra menzionato. Per quanto riguarda l'Italia, dove è stato individuato un numero cospicuo di casi, è stato avviato un ritiro da parte del costruttore.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003907/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Asbestos in Chinese-made cars — request for information from the European Chemicals Agency

With reference to my Question E-007967/2012, can the Commission give an update on the matter further to the information received from the European Chemicals Agency?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

In 2012 a number of vehicles in several non-EU countries were recalled by two Chinese vehicle manufacturers after asbestos was found in engine and exhaust gaskets. The Commission then requested the members of the Forum for Exchange of Information on Enforcement of REACH and CLP to report and exchange information related to the import of Chinese cars into their territory and to investigate whether any asbestos containing vehicles or spare parts thereof, had been detected by the enforcement authorities. The only information available to the Commission at that time indicated that the two Chinese manufacturers had exported cars to Europe in 2011.

Out of the twenty-two Member States that reported their findings, five reported a very small number of imports of the potentially affected models, whereas only one Member State, Italy, reported more significant imports. The information provided by the concerned Member States at the time did not contain information on the presence of asbestos in the inspected units. Italy also informed of a campaign, initiated in January 2013 to verify the presence of such vehicles in Italy.

Based on the information provided by the Member States, as discussed in the Forum meeting of 18-20 June 2013, it appears that, with the exception of the case mentioned above, the import of vehicles of the potentially affected manufacturers seems to have been very limited. In the case of Italy, where a significant number of cases were detected, a recall was initiated by the manufacturer.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003908/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Prossima elezione del Presidente della Commissione

La Commissione può illustrare quale sarà la procedura per l'elezione del prossimo Presidente della Commissione? L'elezione dei futuri commissari sarà in qualche modo modificata? Quando si insedierà il prossimo esecutivo comunitario?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(30 aprile 2014)

L'elezione del presidente della Commissione e la nomina dei membri della Commissione avvengono secondo la procedura di cui all'articolo 17, paragrafo 7, del trattato UE.

Il prossimo collegio di commissari assumerà le proprie funzioni allo scadere del mandato dell'attuale Commissione, al termine della summenzionata procedura.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003908/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Forthcoming election of the Commission President

Can the Commission describe the procedure by which its next President will be elected? Will there be any changes regarding the election of the future Commissioners? When will the new Commission take office?

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

The procedure by which the President of the Commission is elected and by which the Commission is appointed is set out in Article 17, paragraph 7 TEU.

The next Commission will take up office at the end of the current Commission's term, after the conclusion of the above referred procedure.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003909/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Sharia in Gran Bretagna

La Sharia è entrata nel sistema legale britannico per quel che riguarda i testamenti: l'associazione di avvocati e notai d'Inghilterra e Galles hanno infatti elaborato nuove linee guida per notai e avvocati per consentire di redigere documenti riconosciuti dai tribunali ma che abbiano allo stesso tempo specifiche conformi ai dettami musulmani. La Commissione è a conoscenza di iniziative analoghe in altri Stati membri?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(26 giugno 2014)

Per quanto riguarda la domanda dell'onorevole parlamentare relativa all'esistenza di linee guida sull'applicazione delle regole della Sharia, la Commissione non è a conoscenza del caso specifico menzionato dall'onorevole parlamentare o di altre iniziative analoghe in altri Stati membri.

In materia di successioni, le norme applicabili sono state armonizzate di recente a livello dell'Unione europea mediante il regolamento (UE) n. 650/2012 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 4 luglio 2012, relativo alla competenza, alla legge applicabile, al riconoscimento e all'esecuzione delle decisioni e all'accettazione e all'esecuzione degli atti pubblici in materia di successioni e alla creazione di un certificato successorio europeo. Questo regolamento, al quale il Regno Unito non partecipa, si applica alle successioni delle persone decedute dal 17 agosto 2015 in poi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003909/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Sharia in the United Kingdom

Sharia law has entered the British legal system as far as wills are concerned: the Law Society, which represents solicitors in England and Wales, has drawn up new guidelines to help solicitors draft documents which, as well as being recognised by the courts, are specifically designed to conform to Muslim dictates. Does the Commission know of similar moves in other Member States?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2014)

Concerning the Honourable Member's question on the existence of guidelines on the application of foreign Sharia rules, the Commission is not aware of the concrete case mentioned by the Honourable Member or of any other similar initiatives in other Member States.

In matters of succession, applicable legal rules have been recently harmonised at Union level by Regulation (EU) No 650/2012 of 4 July 2012 on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and acceptance and enforcement of authentic instruments in matters of succession and on the creation of a European Certificate of Succession. This regulation, in which the United Kingdom does not participate, will apply to the succession of persons who die on or after 17 August 2015.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003910/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Massacro di cristiani in Siria

L'arcivescovo metropolitano della Chiesa apostolica ortodossa di Antiochia Antonio Chedraui Tannous lancia un allarme atroce: i cristiani di Siria sono ammazzati come se si trattasse di animali. Mentre la comunità interazionale finge di non vedere, il prelato denuncia che «la chiesa ortodossa antiochena vive un martirio interminabile: sequestro dei due arcivescovi e di alcuni sacerdoti, mattanza di sacerdoti e fedeli innocenti che non hanno niente a che vedere con ciò che sta accadendo, persecuzioni, distruzione di chiese, assassini. E la cosa peggiore, la peggiore barbarie è che si uccidono i cristiani come si ammazzano gli animali, e tutto questo nel nome di Dio». Gli islamisti, dopo la conquista di Raqqa, hanno distrutto chiese e croci e bruciato bibbie, e hanno imposto regole precise a tutta la popolazione. I cristiani, se non vogliono essere uccisi o convertirsi all'islam, devono versare all'emiro 13 grammi d'oro puro come umiliante tributo. Tutte le donne sono obbligate a portare il velo integrale, fumare è vietato, ascoltare la musica è vietato, così come «portare la croce o altri simboli legati alla Bibbia nei mercati e nelle piazze dove ci siano dei musulmani».

La Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza dei fatti?

2. intende sospendere tutte le forme di sostegno e i rapporti di natura economica fino a quando queste barbarie e questi massacri contro i cristiani non avranno fine?

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

La situazione dei cristiani in Siria è veramente preoccupante. Nelle conclusioni del Consiglio sulla Siria adottate a gennaio e ad aprile di quest'anno, i ministri hanno espresso preoccupazione per il peggioramento della situazione delle minoranze etniche e religiose nel paese rilevando che i cristiani sono sempre più presi di mira da gruppi estremisti.

Per quanto riguarda la morte di padre Frans van der Lugt, anziano gesuita che il 7 aprile 2014 è stato ucciso nella città vecchia di Homs da uomini armati non identificati, l'AR/VP ha rilasciato una dichiarazione in cui esprime profonda preoccupazione per la drammatica situazione della popolazione in Siria, dove aumenta costantemente il numero di vittime e di persone bisognose di aiuti umanitari.

L'UE continuerà a promuovere una soluzione politica del conflitto, che dovrebbe portare a una Siria democratica e pluralista in cui trovino spazio tutte le minoranze e i gruppi vulnerabili.

Per quanto riguarda il sostegno economico, sebbene la cooperazione bilaterale con il governo siriano sia sospesa dal maggio 2011 la Commissione continua a fornire direttamente aiuti umanitari e assistenza allo sviluppo alle popolazioni più colpite all'interno e al di fuori della Siria.

La Commissione continuerà a finanziare operazioni umanitarie attuate attraverso organizzazioni accreditate (ONU, organizzazioni internazionali e organizzazioni non governative internazionali) in Siria e nella regione per coprire il fabbisogno dei civili più vulnerabili in linea con i principi umanitari di umanità, imparzialità, neutralità e indipendenza. La Commissione e gli Stati membri hanno guidato l'azione internazionale mobilitando collettivamente oltre 2,8 miliardi di EUR per la risposta regionale alla crisi in termini umanitari, di sviluppo, economici e di stabilizzazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003910/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Massacre of Christians in Syria

The Metropolitan Archbishop of the Apostolic Church of Antioch, Antonio Chedraui Tannous, has made a heartrending appeal for help, indicating that Christians in Syria are being slaughtered as if they were animals, while the international community is turning a blind eye to their fate. He refers to the endless tribulations of the Orthodox Church of Antioch, which include the kidnapping of two archbishops and a number of priests, the killing of other priests and innocent members of the congregation who have nothing to do with the current upheavals and acts of persecution and destruction of church property. Christians are being subject to the worst possible excesses, all in the name of God. Following the fall of ar-Raqqa, the Jihadists have destroyed churches and crosses, burned bibles and imposed their own strict rules on the entire population, requiring Christian congregations to pay the Emir the equivalent 13 grams of pure gold as a humiliating tribute if they do not wish to convert to Islam or be killed. All women are obliged to wear a full veil and it is forbidden to smoke or listen to music or carry the cross or other symbols relating to the Bible in markets or squares in which Muslims are present.

In view of this:

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation?

2. Will it suspend all forms of support and economic relations until these barbarous acts of persecution and the slaughter of Christians are ended?

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

The situation of Christians in Syria is of real concern. In the last two Council conclusions on Syria adopted in January and April this year, the ministers have expressed their concern with the worsening plight of ethnic and religious minorities in Syria, and noted that Christians have been increasingly targeted by extremist groups.

In relation to the death of Father Frans van der Lugt, an elderly priset that was killed in the Old City of Homs by unidentified armed gunmen on 7 April 2014, I issued a statement emphasising my concern with the continuation of the dire situation for the Syrian people with the constantly increasing numbers of casualties and persons in need of humanitarian aid.

The EU will continue to promote a political solution to the conflict in Syria, which should result in a settlement that would lead to a democratic and pluralist Syria, where all minorities and vulnerable groups have a place.

As regards economic support, bilateral cooperation with the Syrian government has been suspended since May 2011, but the Commission still provides direct support to the most affected population inside and outside Syria through both humanitarian aid and development assistance.

The Commission will continue to fund humanitarian operations channelled through accredited humanitarian organisations (UN, IOs and INGOs) inside Syria and in the region in order to meet the needs of the most vulnerable civilians in line with the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence. The Commission together with Member States have spearheaded the international response with over EUR 2.8 billion of total budget mobilised collectively for the regional humanitarian, development, economic and stabilisation response to crisis.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003911/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Soppressione continua di animali nello zoo di Copenaghen

Dopo il caso di Marius, il cucciolo di giraffa soppresso senza motivazione nello zoo di Copenaghen, la direzione della stessa struttura ha deciso di eliminare una famiglia di leoni.

Preso atto dei contenuti e delle indicazioni contenute nella strategia UE per la protezione e il benessere degli animali 2012-2015;

considerando il ruolo essenziale dei giardini zoologici in fatto di conservazione della biodiversità;

la Commissione:

1. è al corrente dei fatti sopra descritti?

2. Intende raccogliere maggiori informazioni sulle motivazioni che hanno determinato lo zoo ad agire in questi termini ?

3. Intende aumentare i controlli per garantire che il personale operante in queste strutture mantenga un elevato livello qualitativo nella conservazione degli animali grazie ad un vasto programma di trattamenti veterinari preventivi e curativi piuttosto che la soppressione?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta congiunta fornita alle interrogazioni scritte E-001351/2014 e E- 001471/2014 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003911/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Animal cull continues at Copenhagen zoo

Following the unjustified killing of Marius, a young giraffe at Copenhagen zoo, the zoo authorities have now decided to put down a family of lions.

In view of the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 and the essential role of zoological gardens in the conservation of biodiversity:

1. Is the Commission aware of the above situation?

2. Does it intend to obtain more information concerning the factors prompting the zoo authorities to adopt this course of action?

3. Will it step up controls to ensure that the staff of such establishments strives to maintain high standards of animal conservation through a comprehensive veterinary programme of prevention and treatment, rather than resorting to culling?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its joint answer to Written Questions E-001351/2014 and E-001471/2014 ([1]).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003912/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Tensioni UE-Russia: possibili ripercussioni sul settore lattiero-caseario italiano

Il settore lattiero-caseario italiano e in particolare i produttori di Parmigiano Reggiano e di Grana Padano sono molto preoccupati per la battaglia diplomatica tra Russia e Unione europea.

Preso atto che nel 2010 le esportazioni italiane di formaggio verso la Russia hanno toccato quota 10mila tonnellate, di cui almeno 2mila rappresentate dal Grana Padano e dal Parmigiano Reggiano, e considerato che la Russia è per molti produttori del settore un mercato in forte crescita;

la Commissione:

1. sta valutando di applicare misure restrittive all'esportazione di questi prodotti verso la Russia?

2. ha notizie di possibili misure restrittive applicate dalla Russia all'importazione di questi prodotti?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(26 maggio 2014)

1. Le decisioni su potenziali restrizioni economiche nei confronti della Russia vengono prese dal Consiglio europeo, non dalla Commissione.

2. La Commissione non dispone di alcuna informazione relativa a misure restrittive applicate dalla Russia nei confronti delle importazioni di prodotti lattiero-caseari dall'Italia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003912/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Tensions between the EU and Russia — possible repercussions on the Italian dairy sector

The Italian dairy sector, and in particular the producers of Parmigiano Reggiano (parmesan) and Gran Padano, are very concerned about the diplomatic battle between Russia and the EU.

In 2010, 10 000 tonnes of Italian cheese were exported to Russia, at least 2 000 of which were Gran Padano and Parmigiano Reggiano. For many producers in the sector Russia is a fast-growing market.

1. Is the Commission thinking of applying any restrictive measures as regards the export of these products to Russia?

2. Does it have any news of possible restrictive measures imposed by Russia on the import of these products?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(26 May 2014)

1. Any decision on potential economic restrictions *vis à vis* Russia lies with the European Council and not the Commission.

2. The Commission does not have any information concerning Russian restrictive measures on the import of dairy products from Italy.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003913/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Scandalo preparati alimentari sofisticati in Europa: il punto delle indagini

Alla luce di quanto segue:

— lo scandalo dei preparati alimentari a base di carne di manzo sofisticati con altre tipologie di carni che ha investito l'UE nei primi mesi del 2013,

— la risposta alla mia interrogazione E-001557/2013 «Hamburger di manzo sofisticati con altre carni: necessità di una normativa sulla tracciabilità della filiera dei preparati alimentari trasparente per i consumatori», nella quale la Commissione afferma che si sarebbe attivata a livello politico-tecnico per coordinare le indagini in corso,

— alcune rilevanze emerse da un recente rapporto di funzionari polacchi che, nell'ambito di tale inchiesta, hanno riscontrato in una fabbrica irlandese partite di «carne inadatta al consumo umano» che stavano per essere immesse sul mercato;

può la Commissione fornire un aggiornamento sui risultati delle indagini sin ora svolte nell'UE in merito allo scandalo sopra menzionato?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(12 maggio 2014)

I risultati delle indagini condotte nel 2013 sull'impiego di carni equine non dichiarate in prodotti a base di carni bovine mostravano che la sostituzione di carne bovina con quella equina in prodotti a base di carni bovine rappresentava una pratica diffusa e organizzata all'interno degli Stati membri dell'UE.

Circa il 4,5 % dei prodotti a base di carni bovine testati nell'UE in occasione del piano coordinato di controllo nel secondo trimestre del 2013 contenevano carni equine, senza che vi fosse alcuna informazione relativa a tale ingrediente al momento della commercializzazione. Dalle indagini effettuate negli Stati membri è emersa una serie di pratiche fraudolente. Le indagini dimostravano peraltro l'assenza di residui illegali in carni equine, cosicché l'adulterazione non era da considerarsi una minaccia per la salute pubblica.

Al momento sono in corso ulteriori indagini su commercianti e istituti coinvolti presenti negli Stati membri e informazioni dettagliate su tali indagini sono di competenza dei singoli Stati membri.

Prossimamente verrà avviato un nuovo ciclo di controlli a livello europeo per individuare l'eventuale presenza di carni equine non dichiarate in prodotti a base di carni bovine, così da garantire che i problemi riscontrati lo scorso anno non si ripropongano. Il 29 marzo 2014 sono stati pubblicati nella Gazzetta ufficiale dell'Unione europea ([1]) i dettagli del nuovo piano coordinato di controllo.

([1]) Raccomandazione della Commissione, del 27 marzo 2014, relativa a un secondo piano coordinato di controllo volto a stabilire la prevalenza di pratiche fraudolente nella commercializzazione di determinati prodotti alimentari. GU L 95 del 29.03.2014, pag. 64-68.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003913/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Scandal of ready-made food in Europe — latest developments in the investigation

In early 2013 a scandal concerning ready-made meals made of beef adulterated with other types of meat hit the EU.

In the answer to my Written Question E-001557/2013 'Beefburgers adulterated with other types of meat: need for a transparent set of rules on traceability in the food preparations sector for consumers', the Commission said it would be active on both political and technical levels in coordinating pending investigations.

Some important issues have emerged in a recent report by Polish officials, who, as part of this investigation, found batches of meat in an Irish factory that were 'unfit for human consumption' and were about to be placed on the market.

Can the Commission provide an update on the results of the investigations carried out so far into the abovementioned scandal in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 May 2014)

The results of the investigations into use of undeclared horse meat in beef products in 2013 showed that there was a widespread organised substitution of horse meat in beef products in EU Member States.

Approximately 4,5% of beef products tested in the EU during the coordinated control plan in the second quarter of 2013 included horse meat without any information concerning this ingredient at the point of marketing. The investigations performed in Member States showed a number of fraudulent practices. The investigations also showed that there was not an issue of illegal residues in horse meat, and therefore the adulteration was not considered a public health threat.

Further investigations into involved traders and establishments in Member States are on-going and detailed information on such investigations are the competence of the individual Member States.

A new round of EU-wide coordinated testing for undeclared horsemeat in beef products will commence in the Member States shortly to ensure that the problems discovered last year are not reoccurring. The details of the new coordinated control plan were published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* on 29 March 2014 ([1]).

([1]) Commission Recommendation 2014/180/EU of 27 March 2014 on a second coordinated control plan with a view to establishing the prevalence of fraudulent practices in the marketing of certain foods. OJ L 95, 29.3.2014, p. 64-68.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003914/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Sfruttamento dei lavoratori in Bangladesh

Da una ricerca condotta dall'organizzazione non-profit del Regno Unito «War on Want», gli operai in Bangladesh subiscono continui maltrattamenti da parte dei datori di lavoro. Le operaie, particolare, sarebbero la categoria più debole. Le donne incinte sono costrette a lavorare fino all'ultima settimana prima del parto e almeno la metà delle volte non ottengono i cento giorni di maternità prescritti dalla legge.

La Commissione:

1. è al corrente dei fatti sopra descritti?

2. come intende agire per tutelare la salute di questi lavoratori e garantire condizioni di lavoro migliori?

3. quali responsabilità ritiene che abbiano le aziende occidentali verso tali fabbriche che producono per loro?

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

La Commissione europea è al corrente delle condizioni di lavoro nell'industria della confezione in Bangladesh e della necessità di tutelare i diritti dei lavoratori e di garantire la piena applicazione delle normative sulla sicurezza.

Spetta ai datori di lavoro garantire il rispetto dei diritti dei lavoratori. Dal canto suo, il governo del Bangladesh deve garantire l'effettiva applicazione delle leggi e regolamentazioni nazionali e lo svolgimento di controlli e ispezioni periodici. I sindacati, i consumatori responsabili e le ditte che importano capi di abbigliamento nell'UE possono inoltre dare un contributo positivo per garantire che la produzione si svolga in condizioni dignitose. A tale riguardo, la Commissione europea accoglie con favore l'accordo sulla sicurezza antincendio e degli edifici in Bangladesh, che finora è stato sottoscritto da oltre 120 imprese europee.

Dopo il tragico crollo dell'edificio Rana Plaza, nei pressi di Dacca, il 24 aprile 2013, il governo del Bangladesh, l'OIL e l'UE hanno firmato un patto di sostenibilità comprendente un chiaro calendario di impegni a migliorare e rispettare i diritti dei lavoratori, garantire l'integrità strutturale degli edifici nonché la salute e la sicurezza sul posto di lavoro e promuovere il comportamento responsabile delle imprese nel settore della confezione.

Anche se la piena attuazione di certe misure richiede più tempo del previsto, vi è già qualche segno di miglioramento. Quest'estate è prevista una riunione ad alto livello per valutare i progressi compiuti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003914/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Exploitation of workers in Bangladesh

From research conducted by the UK non-profit organisation 'War on Want', workers in Bangladesh are constantly ill-treated by employers. Female workers, in particular, are the most vulnerable category. Pregnant women are forced to work until the very last week before giving birth and at least half the time they do not get the 100 days of maternity leave prescribed by law.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. What will it do to protect the health of these workers and ensure better working conditions?

3. What responsibilities does it think Western companies have towards those factories thatproduce on their behalf?

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

The European Commission is aware of working conditions in the Ready Made Garment industry in Bangladesh and of the need to ensure that workers' rights are protected and that safety and security regulations are fully implemented.

The direct responsibility for ensuring that workers' rights are respected falls on the employers. The Government of Bangladesh also has a responsibility to ensure that national law and regulations are effectively implemented and that regular monitoring and inspections take place. In addition, independent trade unions, and responsible consumers and companies importing clothes to the EU, can make a positive contribution to ensuring that production takes place under decent conditions. In this regard, the European Commission welcomes the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh, which more than 120 European companies have signed up to.

Following the tragic collapse of the Rana Plaza building near Dhaka on 24 April 2013, the Government of Bangladesh, the ILO and the EU signed a Sustainability Compact with clear time bound commitments to improve and respect labour rights, ensure the structural integrity of buildings and occupational health and safety, and promote responsible business conduct in the RMG sector.

While some measures are taking longer than expected to implement fully, there are already clear signs of improvement. A High-Level meeting planned for this summer will evaluate progress made.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003915/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Baġitjar għall-kunsiderazzjoni tal-ġeneri

Bl-għajnuna ta' data diżaggregata dwar il-ġeneri, il-ġvernijiet jistgħu jindirizzaw ibbaġitjar għall-kunsiderazzjoni tal-ġeneri sabiex il-politiki jiffavorixxu l-ugwaljanza bejn il-ġeneri. Il-ħsieb wara bbaġitjar għall-kunsiderazzjoni tal-ġeneri hu li jintwera kif baġit nazzjonali jibbenefika lill-irġiel u lin-nisa rispettivament.

1. Il-Kummissjoni, sa liema punt tipprattika għall-kunsiderazzjoni tal-ġeneri meta tkun qiegħda tittratta l-baġit tal-UE?

2. Il-Kummissjoni tikkondividi l-fehma li jekk effetti fuq il-ġeneri ma jiġux esplorati qabel ma jitfasslu l-baġits, il-politiki jista' jkollhom effett aktar prominenti fuq in-nisa milli l-irġiel u b'hekk ixekklu l-ekwità soċjali?

3. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tiddikkjara sa liema punt l-Istati Membri iwettqu bbaġitjar għall-kunsiderazzjoni tal-ġeneri meta ikunu qegħdin jittrattaw il-baġits lokali, reġjonali u nazzjonali tagħhom?

4. X'proġetti tipprevedi il-Kummissjoni biex ibbaġitjar għall-kunsiderazzjoni tal-ġeneri jsir għodda mandatorja essenzjali għall-progress lejn l-ekwità?

5. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tistqarr liema Stati Membri naqqsu l-infiq tagħhom għat-trasport pubbliku, is-saħħa u l-kura tat-tfal, li lkoll jitqiesu bħala oqsma ta' importanza partikolari għan-nisa?

6. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tispeċifika sa liema punti dawn l-Istati Membri li naqqsu l-infiq baġitarju tagħhhom ikkummissjonaw analiżi ta' bbaġitjar għall-kunsiderazzjoni tal-ġeneri qabel ma implimentaw dan it-tnaqqis?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Lewandowski f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(2 ta' Ġunju 2014)

1. Is-Servizzi tal-Kummissjoni huma mogħtija struzzjonijiet fiċ-Ċirkolari tal-Baġit annwali biex jippreżentaw, fejn xieraq, għanijiet dwar l-ugwaljanza tas-sessi u riżultati relatati mal-infiq fid-Dikjarazzjonjiet ta' Programmi li jiġġustifikaw l-Abbozz tal-Baġit annwali tal-Kummissjoni. Tali għanijiet huma akkumpanjati minn indikaturi u miri tar-riżultati, u din l-informazzjoni hija kkunsidrata meta jiġu ġġustifikati l-approprjazzjonijiet rilevanti.

2. Il-Kummissjoni taqsam il-ħsieb li jekk l-effetti fuq is-sessi ma jiġux eżaminati qabel ma jitfasslu l-baġits, il-politiki jistgħu jkollhom effett iktar evidenti fuq in-nisa milli fuq l-irġiel u b'hekk ifixklu l-ekwità soċjali.

3 u 6. Ir-rapport tal-2013 dwar il-progress dwar l-ugwaljanza tas-sessi jenfasizza li x-xejriet mhumiex uniformi u ambigwi fir-rigward tal-integrazzjoni tas-sessi u l-ibbaġittjar tas-sessi: 15-il Stat Membru għamlu xi progress iżda l-użu tal-għodod bħall-valutazzjoni tal-impatt tas-sessi u l-ibbaġittjar tas-sessi għadu mhux daqshekk komuni. Ir-rapport "*The impact of the economic crisis on the situation of women and men and on gender equality policies*" ([1]) jipprovdi iktar dettalji dwar l-ibbaġittjar tas-sessi waqt l-ewwel snin tal-kriżi.

4. F'konformità mal-impenji biex jiġu integrati elementi sensittivi għall-kwistjoni tal-ġeneru fil-QFP il-ġdid magħmula f'dikjarazzjoni konġunta mill-Parlament Ewropew, il-Kunsill u l-Kummissjoni, il-bażijiet ġuridiċi ġodda jidentifikaw l-ugwaljanza tas-sessi bħala għan trasversali għall-oqsma ta' politika rilevanti kollha. Il-Kummissjoni tkompli tapplika l-approċċ deskritt bħala tweġiba għall-mistoqsija 1) sabiex jiġi żgurat li elementi ta' ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi huma riflessi fil-proċedura tal-baġit annwali, kif xieraq.

5. L-Onorevoli Membru hija riferuta għat-tweġiba għal E-012403/2013 u għall-preżentazzjoni "*the effects of the crisis on childcare*" ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/130522_crisis_report_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201311/20131122ATT74843/20131122ATT74843EN.pdf , paġni 28 sa 37.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003915/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Gender budgeting

With the help of gender-disaggregated data, governments could take on gender budgeting so that policies favour gender equality. Gender budgeting is meant to show how a national budget benefits men and women respectively.

1. To what extent does the Commission have a practice of gender budgeting when dealing with the EU budget?

2. Does the Commission share the view that if effects on gender are not explored before drawing up budgets, policies can have a more pronounced effect on women than on men and thus hamper social equity?

3. Can the Commission state to what extent Member States undertake gender budgeting when dealing with their respective national, regional or local budgets?

4. What projects does the Commission envisage to make gender budgeting an essential mandatory tool towards equity?

5. Can the Commission state which Member States have reduced spending on public transport, health and childcare, all areas which are considered to be particularly important for women?

6. Can the Commission specify to what extent those Member States which have reduced budget spending commissioned a gender budgeting analysis prior to the spending cuts?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

1. Commission Services are instructed in the annual Budget Circulars to present, where appropriate, gender equality objectives and expenditure-related outputs in the Programme Statements which justify the Commission's annual Draft Budget. Such objectives are accompanied by indicators and output targets, and this information is taken into consideration when justifying the relevant appropriations.

2. The Commission shares the view that if effects on gender are not explored before drawing up budgets, policies can have a more pronounced effect on women than on men and thus hamper social equity.

3 and 6. The 2013 report on progress on gender equality highlights that trends are uneven and ambivalent as regards gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting: 15 Member States have made some progress but the use of tools such as gender impact assessment and gender budgeting is still not very common. The report 'The impact of the economic crisis on the situation of women and men and on gender equality policies' ([1]) provides more details on gender budgeting during the first years of the crisis.

4. In line with commitments to integrate gender-responsive elements in the new MFF made in a joint declaration by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission, the new legal bases identify gender equality as a cross-cutting objective for all relevant policy areas. The Commission continues to apply the approach described in reply to question 1) to ensure that gender equality elements are reflected in the annual budget procedure, as appropriate.

5. The Honourable Member is referred to the reply to E-012403/2013 and to the presentation 'the effects of the crisis on childcare' ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/130522_crisis_report_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201311/20131122ATT74843/20131122ATT74843EN.pdf pages 28 to 37.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003917/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: L-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi fil-qasam tax-xjenza

Hija u twieġeb mistoqsija fir-rigward tar-rappreżentazzjoni baxxa tan-nisa fil-qasam tax-xjenza, il-Kummissarju Geoghegan-Quinn ammettiet, f'isem il-Kummissjoni, li "hemm bżonn ta' approċċ aktar konsistenti rigward it-tibdil istituzzjonali fl-UE kollha u għal politiki speċifiċi fil-livell tal-Istati Membri tal-UE" (P-012032/2013). Il-Kummissjoni stqarret ukoll li "skont l-ewwel rapport ta' progress taż-ŻER tal-Kummissjoni, ftit Stati Membri jidhru li għandhom dispożizzjonijiet dwar l-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi fil-qafas legali tar-riċerka tagħhom u tingħata ftit attenzjoni lill-integrazzjoni tad-dimensjoni tas-sessi fil-programmi tar-riċerka nazzjonali" u li r-rapport inkwistjoni "jirrakkomanda li Stati Membri jimplimentaw strateġiji komprensivi ta' bidla strutturali biex jingħelbu d-diskrepanzi fl-istituzzjonijiet u l-programmi tar-riċerka".

1. X'miżuri konkreti qiegħda tieħu l-Kummissjoni biex tbiddel dan l-istatus quo?

2. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tgħid għal liema pajjiżi qiegħda tirreferi meta tisħaq li "ftit Stati Membri jidhru li għandhom dispożizzjonijiet dwar l-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi fil-qafas legali tar-riċerka tagħhom u tingħata ftit attenzjoni lill-integrazzjoni tad-dimensjoni tas-sessi fil-programmi tar-riċerka nazzjonali"?

3. Il-Kummissjoni għandha analiżi tal-Istati Membri li mhumiex konformi?

4. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tagħti analiżi ddettaljata u analiżi statistika dwar in-nisa impjegati fl-istituzzjonijiet Ewropej f'karigi għolja relatati max-xjenza?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Geoghegan-Quinn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(20 ta' Mejju 2014)

1. Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġa l-Istati Membri (SM) fil-promozzjoni tal-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi fl-istituzzjonijiet tar-riċerka u l-integrazzjoni tad-dimensjoni tas-sessi fil-programmi tar-riċerka. FP7 ([1]) u Orizzont 2020, il-Programm ta' Finanzjamnet tal-UE għar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni (2014-2020), jipprovdu appoġġ finanzjarju għall-implimentazzjoni tal-pjanijiet tal-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi fl-organizzazzjonijiet tar-riċerka ([2]). FP7 appoġġa wkoll in-netwerking bejn l-SM permezz tal-Gender-Net ERA-Net ([3]). Il-Kummissjoni qed tikkoopera mal-SM għall-iżvilupp tal-pjan direzzjonali tal-ERA fil-livell Ewropew ([4]).

2. Skont il-Fatti u ċ-Ċifri tal-ERA 2013 ([5]), fl-Awstrija, il-Finlandja, Franza u Spanja jeżistu dispożizzjonijiet dwar l-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi fil-qafas legali tar-riċerka, filwaqt li d-dimensjoni tas-sessi fil-kontenut tar-riċerka hija integrata fil-programmi nazzjonali fl-Awstrija, Franza, Spanja u parzjalment fil-pajjiżi Nordiċi permezz ta' NordForsk (il-kooperazzjoni tar-riċerka Nordika).

3. Id-Direttivi tal-UE ([6]) dwar l-opportunitajiet indaqs u t-trattament indaqs tal-irġiel u n-nisa fis-suq tax-xogħol ġew trasposti fl-SM kollha. Il-progress li sar fl-implimentazzjoni tal-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi fil-qasam speċifiku tar-riċerka pubblika se jiġi vvalutat fir-Rapport ta' Progress tal-ERA 2014, li bħalissa għaddej ix-xogħol fuqu mal-SM.

4. Fid-Direttorati Ġenerali prinċipali tal-Kummissjoni u l-aġenziji eżekuttivi responsabbli għar-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni (jiġifieri DĠ RTD, DĠ JRC, EASME, ERCEA, INEA, REA) hemm seba' nisa mit-30 post ta' amministrazzjoni anzjana. Ma' dawn għandha tiżdied il-Professur Anne Glover, il-Kap Konsulent Xjentifiku tal-President Barroso.

([1]) Is-Seba' Programm Qafas għall-Attivitajiet tar-Riċerka, l-Iżvilupp Teknoloġiku u ta' Dimostrazzjoni (FP7, 2007-2013).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-geri-2014-1.html
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/111445_en.html
([4]) Konklużjonijiet tal-Kunsill ("Kompetittività") adottati fil-laqgħa tal-21.2.2014.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/eraprogress_en.htm
([6]) Id-Direttiva 1996/34, ĠU L 145, 19/06/1006.
Id-Direttiva 2006/54 (recast), ĠU L 204, 26/07/2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003917/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Gender equality in science

When answering a question in relation to women's under-representation in science, Commissioner Geoghegan-Quinn admitted on behalf of the Commission that 'there is a need for a more consistent approach with respect to institutional changes across the EU and for specific policies at EU Member State level' (P-012032/2013). The Commission has also stated that 'according to the first ERA progress report of the Commission, few Member States appear to have provisions on gender equality in their research legal framework and little attention is paid to integrating the gender dimension into national research programmes' and that the report in question 'recommends that Member States implement comprehensive strategies of structural change to overcome gaps in research institutions and programmes'.

1. What concrete measure is the Commission taking to change this status quo?

2. Can the Commission state to which countries it is referring when it states that 'few Member States appear to have provisions on gender equality in their research legal framework and little attention is paid to integrating the gender dimension into national research programmes'?

3. Does the Commission have an analysis of the Member States which are not compliant?

4. Can the Commission give a detailed analysis and breakdown of women employed in the European institutions in top positions pertaining to science?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(20 May 2014)

1. The Commission supports the Member States (MS) in promoting gender equality in research institutions and integrating the gender dimension in research programmes. FP7 ([1]) and Horizon 2020, the EU funding Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), provide financial support to the implementation of gender equality plans in research organisations ([2]). FP7 has also supported the networking between MS through the Gender-Net ERA-Net ([3]). The Commission is cooperating with the MS for the development of an ERA roadmap at European level ([4]).

2. According to the ERA Facts and Figures 2013 ([5]), provisions on gender equality exist in the research legal framework in Austria, Finland, France and Spain, while the gender dimension in research content is integrated into the national programmes in Austria, France, Spain, and partly in the Nordic countries through NordForsk (the Nordic research cooperation).

3. The EU directives ([6]) on equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women on the labour market have been transposed in all MS. The progress made in the implementation of gender equality in the specific field of public research will be assessed in the ERA Progress Report 2014, for which work with the MS is on-going.

4. In the main Commission's Directorates-General and executive agencies responsible for research and innovation (i.e. DG RTD, DG JRC, EASME, ERCEA, INEA, REA) there are seven women out of 30 senior management posts. To this should be added Professor Anne Glover, Chief Scientific Adviser to President Barroso.

([1]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-geri-2014-1.html
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/111445_en.html
([4]) Conclusions of the Council ('Competitiveness') adopted in the meeting of 21.2.2014.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/eraprogress_en.htm
([6]) Directive 1996/34, OJ L 145, 19.6.2006.
Directive 2006/54 (recast), OJ L 204, 26.7.2006.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003918/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Ġenituri single, benefiċċji soċjali u l-edukazzjoni tat-tfal

Il-parlament Malti stqarr, abbażi tal-informazzjoni pprovduta mill-Ministeru għall-Familja u s-Solidarjetà Soċjali, li, minn total ta' 3 399 ġenituri single li qegħdin jirċievu benefiċċji soċjali f'Malta sas-sena 2013, 3 356 minnhom kienu nisa.

Minn dawn, 2 282 minnhom għandhom tifel uniku jew tifla unika, 810 għandhom żewġt itfal, u 202 għandhom erba' jew aktar. Il-bqija huma rġiel ġenituri single, li minnhom 37 għandhom tifel uniku jew tifla unika u l-bqija għandhom tnejn jew tlieta.

Is-sena l-oħra twieldu 185 tifel u tifla għal ommijiet single li, meta marru biex jirreġistrawhom, speċifikaw li l-missier "ma kienx magħruf".

1. Il-Kummissjoni tipposjedi statistiċi dwar dawk il-ġenituri single fl-UE li qegħdin jirċievu benefiċċji soċjali?

2. Għall-finijiet tal-politiki tagħha, il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tqis l-istudji dwar l-impatt fuq l-edukazzjoni ta' tifel jew tifla li jkollu jew ikollha ġenitur wieħed minflok tnejn?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(19 ta' Mejju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni m'għandhiex dejta amministrattiva dwar l-għadd ta' ġenituri waħedhom li qed jirċievu benefiċċji fl-Istati Membri tal-UE. Madankollu, fl-istħarriġ għall-EU-SILC (l-istatistika tal-UE dwar l-introjtu u l-kondizzjonijiet tal-għajxien) l-għadd tagħhom jista' jiġi stmat abbażi ta' kampjuni rappreżentattivi. B'kollox fl-UE, 7.5 miljun adult waħdu li jgħix bi tfal dipendenti kienu qed jirċievu xi tip ta' benefiċċji soċjali fl-2012. Barra minn hekk, f'29% ta' dawk l-unitajiet domestiċi, l-adult (ta' 18-59 sena) ħadem inqas minn 20% tal-potenzjal kollu għax-xogħol tiegħu jew tagħha. Il-biċċa l-kbira ta' dawn il-ġenituri waħedhom, li ma jaħdmux jew għandhom intensità ta' xogħol baxxa ħafna, x'aktarx li għall-għajxien tagħhom jiddependu fuq il-benefiċċji soċjali. Il-kalkolatur tal-appoġġ għall-familji tal-OECD jipprovdi informazzjoni dwar ir-regoli ta' politika relatati mal-intitolament għal benefiċċji lil tipi differenti ta' unitajiet domestiċi, inklużi l-ġenituri waħedhom, għal firxa wiesgħa ta' pajjiżi ([1]).

Il-politiki dwar l-impjiegi u s-sitwazzjoni soċjali tal-ġenituri waħedhom u l-edukazzjoni tat-tfal tagħhom huma primarjament responsabbiltà tal-Istati Membri. L-istudji dwar l-impatt fuq l-edukazzjoni tat-tfal li jgħixu ma' ġenitur wieħed huma għalhekk l-aktar rilevanti għal dawk li jfasslu l-politika nazzjonali. Madankollu, il-Kummissjoni tkun infurmata dwar dawn il-kwistjonijiet permezz ta' Netwerk ta' Esperti dwar l-Aspetti Soċjali tal-Edukazzjoni u t-Taħriġ ("Network of Experts on Social Aspects of Education and Training" — NESET) ([2]).

([1]) http://www.oecd.org/els/family/oecdfamilydatabasethefamilysupportcalculator.htm
([2]) Ara http://www.nesetweb.eu/home

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003918/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Single parents, social benefits and child education

It has been claimed in the Maltese parliament, on the basis of information provided by the Ministry for Family and Social Solidarity, that, out of 3 399 single parents receiving social benefits in Malta up to the year 2013, 3 356 were women.

Of these, 2 282 have one child, 810 have two, and 202 have four or more. The remainder are single men, of whom 37 have one child and the rest have two or three.

Last year there were 185 children born to single mothers who, when registering them, specified that the father was 'unknown'.

1. Does the Commission have statistics relating to single parents in the EU receiving social benefits?

2. For the purposes of its policies, does the Commission take into account studies relating to the impact on a child's education of having one parent?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(19 May 2014)

The Commission does not have administrative data on the number of single parents receiving benefits in the EU Member States. However, the EU-SILC survey allows estimating their number on the basis of representative samples. In total in the EU, 7.5 million single adults living with dependent children were receiving some kind of social benefits in 2012. Moreover, in 29% of such households, the adult (18-59 years old) has worked less than 20% of his or her total work potential. Most of these single parents who are non-working or with very low work intensity can be expected to rely on social benefits for their livelihood. The OECD family support calculator provides information on policy rules related to benefit entitlement for various types of households including single parents for a wide set of countries ([1]).

Policies relating to the employment and social situation of single parents and the education of their children are primarily a responsibility of the Member States. Studies relating to the impact on a child's education of living with a single parent are therefore mostly relevant for national policy-makers. However, the Commission is advised on such matters by a 'Network of Experts on Social Aspects of Education and Training' (NESET) ([2]).

([1]) http://www.oecd.org/els/family/oecdfamilydatabasethefamilysupportcalculator.htm
([2]) See http://www.nesetweb.eu/home

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003919/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Traffikar tal-bnedmin

It-traffikar tal-bnedmin hu kkunsidrat bħala wieħed mill-aġħar reati u ksur serju tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem. Soltu jkun marbut mal-kriminalità organizzata u jitqies bħala waħda mill-attivitajiet kriminali li l-aktar tħalli qligħ madwar id-dinja. In-numru ta' persuni li ġew traffikati lejn jew ġewwa l-UE stmat li jammonta għal diversi mijiet/eluf fis-sena.

Fil-komunikazzjoni tagħha bit-titolu "L-istrateġija tal-UE lejn il-Qerda tat-Traffikar tal-Bnedmin 2012-2016", il-Kummissjoni ħeġġet lill-Istati Membri biex jirratifikaw l-istrumenti, il-ftehimiet u l-obbligi ġuridiċi internazzjonali rilevanti kollha sabiex il-ġlieda kontra t-traffikar tal-bniedem issir aktar effettiva, koordinata u koerenti.

1. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħtina l-istatistiċi l-aktar reċenti u speċifikati għas-sess dwar it-traffikar tal-bnedmin fl-UE?

2. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tipprovdi lista li tistabbilixxi sa liema punt l-Istati Membri individwali rratifikaw u implimentaw l-istrumenti u l-ftehimiet internazzjonali rilevanti u żammew mal-obbligi ġuridiċi tagħhom?

3. X'se tagħmel il-Kummissjoni biex tiġġieled il-gruppi ta' kriminalità organizzata li jwettqu t-traffikar tal-bnedmin?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(12 ta' Mejju 2014)

Ir-rapport tal-Eurostat dwar it-Traffikar tal-Bnedmin ([1]), ippubblikat fl-2013, jipprovdi l-aħħar statistika fil-livell tal-UE. Din tinkludi dejta mill-2008 sal-2010, maqsuma skont il-ġeneru, li turi x-xejriet u l-għadd totali kemm tal-vittmi kif ukoll fuq traffikanti suspettati, ipproċessati u misjuba ħatja. Dejta aktar riċenti mill-2010 sal-2012 se tkun disponibbli fl-2014, b'riżultat ta' inizjattiva ta' segwitu.

L-istrument legali ewlieni tal-UE hija d-Direttiva 2011/36/UE ([2]), li l-Istati Membri għandhom l-obbligu legali li jimplimentaw bis-sħiħ. Il-Kummissjoni qed tissorvelja mill-qrib il-proċess ta' traspożizzjoni u se tressaq rapport lill-Parlament Ewropew u lill-Kunsill mhux aktar tard minn April 2015, li jevalwa sa fejn l-Istati Membri ħadu l-miżuri meħtieġa sabiex jikkonformaw ma' din id-Direttiva. L-istrateġija tal-UE għall-Qerda tat-Traffikar tal-Bnedmin 2012-2016' ([3]) adottata f'Ġunju 2012 tikkumplimenta l-qafas legali. Il-Kummissjoni se tippreżenta rapport ta' nofs it-terminu dwar l-implimentazzjoni tal-Istrateġija fil-ħarifa tal-2014.

L-UE ħolqot qafas politiku u legali soda biex tindirizza b'mod effettiv ċrieki tal-kriminalità organizzata li joperaw it-traffikar tal-bnedmin. Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġja attivitajiet implimentati fil-kuntest taċ-Ċiklu tal-Politika tal-UE dwar il-Kriminalità Serja u Organizzata u kooperazzjoni intensa ma' seba' aġenziji tal-ĠAI li jaħdmu fil-qasam tal-Ġustizzja u Affarijiet Interni ([4]) li ffirmaw dikjarazzjoni konġunta fit-18 ta' Ottubru 2011 ([5]).

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/publication?p_product_code=KS-RA-13-005
([2]) Direttiva 2011/36/UE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tal-5 ta' April 2011 dwar il-prevenzjoni u l-ġlieda kontra t-traffikar tal-bnedmin u l-protezzjoni tal-vittmi tiegħu, u li tissostitwixxi d-Direttiva Qafas tal-Kunsill 2002/629/ĠAI; ĠU L 101, 15.4.2011, p. 1-11.
([3]) COM(2012) 286 finali.
([4]) CEPOL, EUROJUST, EUROPOL, EASO, EIGE, FRA u FRONTEX
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/download.action?nodePath=/EU+Policy/joint_statement_final_18_oct_2011.pdf&fileName=joint_statement_final_18_oct_2011.pdf&fileType=pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003919/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Trafficking in human beings

Trafficking in human beings is considered one of the worst crimes and a gross violation of human rights. It is usually linked with organised crime and is considered one of the most profitable criminal activities worldwide. The estimated number of people trafficked to or within the EU amounts to several hundreds/thousands a year.

In its communication entitled 'The EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016', the Commission urged the Member States to ratify all relevant international instruments, agreements and legal obligations in order to make the fight against trafficking in human beings more effective, coordinated and coherent.

1. Can the Commission provide us with the latest, gender-specified, statistics on trafficking in human beings in the EU?

2. Can the Commission provide a list setting out to what extent individual Member States have ratified and implemented the relevant international instruments and agreements and complied with their legal obligations?

3. What will the Commission do to target the organised criminal rings that operate human trafficking?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(12 May 2014)

The Eurostat report on Trafficking in Human Beings ([1]), published in 2013, provides the latest statistics on EU level. It includes data from 2008 to 2010, broken down by gender, showing trends and total number both of victims and on suspected, prosecuted and convicted traffickers. More recent data from 2010 to 2012 will be available in 2014, as a result of a follow-up initiative.

The main EU legal instrument is Directive 2011/36/EU ([2]), which Member States have a legal obligation to fully implement. The Commission is closely monitoring the transposition process and will submit a report to the European Parliament and Council by April 2015, assessing the extent to which the Member States have taken necessary measures to comply with this directive. The EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016' ([3]) adopted in June 2012 complements the legal framework. The Commission will present a mid-term report on the implementation of the strategy in autumn 2014.

The EU created a solid legal and policy framework to effectively address the organised criminal rings that operate human trafficking. The Commission supports the activities implemented in context of the EU Policy Cycle on Serious and Organised Crime and intense cooperation with seven JHA Agencies working in the area of Justice and Home Affairs ([4]) which signed a Joint Statement on 18 October 2011 ([5]).

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/publication?p_product_code=KS-RA-13-005
([2]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA ; OJ L 101, 15/04/2011, p. 1-11.
([3]) COM(2012) 286 final.
([4]) CEPOL, Eurojust, Europol, EASO, EIGE, FRA and Frontex.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/download.action?nodePath=/EU+Policy/joint_statement_final_18_oct_2011.pdf&fileName=joint_statement_final_18_oct_2011.pdf&fileType=pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003920/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Ir-regoli l-ġodda tas-sorveljanza tas-suq u n-negozji

Sar studju biex ikun determinat sa liema punt ir-regoli l-ġodda tas-sorveljanza tas-suq se jgħinu lin-negozji biex inaqqsu l-ispejjeż u jtejbu l-koordinament?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Tajani f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' Mejju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni vvalutat l-impatt tal-proposta tagħha għal Regolament ġdid dwar is-Sikurezza tal-Prodotti tal-Konsumatur [COM(2013)78] u l-proposta tiegħu għal Regolament dwar is-Sorveljanza tas-Suq għall-Prodotti [COM(2013)75]) fil-valutazzjoni tal-impatt mehmuża [SWD (2013)33 u l-annessi tiegħu] ([1]). Il-biċċa l-kbira tal-analiżi mwettqa mill-Kummissjoni għall-fini tal-valutazzjoni tal-impatt tiddependi fuq konsultazzjonijiet pubbliċi. Barra minn hekk, fil-każ ta' xi kategoriji ta' dejta, il-valutazzjoni tal-impatt toqgħod fuq studji esterni u fuq valutazzjonijiet tal-impatt preċedenti.

Il-valutazzjoni tal-impatt tal-Kummissjoni tikkonkludi li kieku l-operaturi ekonomiċi kellu jkollhom regoli iktar koerenti għas-setturi kollha tal-prodotti, dan ikun jaqblilhom. Fil-prattika dan ifisser tnaqqis fl-ispejjeż marbuta mal-konformità, speċjalment għall-intrapriżi ż-żgħar u dawk ta' daqs medju. Barra minn hekk, titjib fil-koordinazzjoni ta' verifiki u kontrolli b'rabta mas-sikurezza tal-prodotti fil-livell tal-UE jwassal biex tinqered il-kompetizzjoni inġusta minn operaturi malizzjużi u diżonesti, u dan ikun għall-benefiċċju ta' dawk il-kumpaniji li jagħmlu sforzi ġenwini biex jirrispettaw ir-regoli u biex joffru prodotti sikuri u konformi. Filwaqt li l-kumpaniji jistgħu jidħlu f'xi spejjeż meta jiġu biex jadattaw il-prattiki kummerċjali tagħhom għar-Regolamenti l-ġodda, instab li dawn l-ispejjeż huma negliġibbli.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/psmsp/docs/psmsp-impact_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003920/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: New market surveillance rules and businesses

Has a study been conducted to determine how far the new market surveillance rules will help businesses to reduce costs and improve coordination?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2014)

The Commission assessed the impact of its proposal for a new Regulation on Consumer Products Safety [COM(2013)78] and its proposal for a regulation on Market Surveillance for Products [COM(2013)75]) in the accompanying impact assessment [SWD(2013)33 and its annexes] ([1]). The bulk of the analysis carried out by the Commission for the purpose of the impact assessment relies on public consultations. In addition, the impact assessment draws, for some categories of data, on external studies and previous impact assessments.

The Commission's impact assessment concludes that economic operators will benefit from having more coherent rules across all product sectors. In practice this means lower compliance costs, especially for small and medium-sized enterprises. Moreover, better coordination of product safety checks and controls at EU level means eliminating unfair competition from dishonest or rogue operators, to the benefit of companies who make efforts to follow the rules and offer safe and compliant products. Companies may incur some costs when adapting their business practices to the new Regulations, but these costs were found to be negligible.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/psmsp/docs/psmsp-impact_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003922/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: Antibiotikaresistenz von Salmonellen und Campylobacter

Die Häufigkeit resistenter Bakterien gibt seit Jahren Anlass zur Sorge. Wie ein am 25. März 2014 von der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) veröffentlichter Bericht offenbart, sind mittlerweile sogar Bakterien wie Salmonellen und Campylobacter oftmals gegen gängige Antibiotika resistent. Dies ist insofern problematisch, als diese Bakteriengruppen zu den häufigsten Verursachern von lebensmittelbedingten Infektionen gehören. Damit können dem Bericht zufolge solche Resistenzen bei Bakterien, die in Tieren und Lebensmitteln zu finden sind, die wirksame Behandlung von Infektionen auch beim Menschen beeinträchtigen. Eine umsichtige Anwendung von Antibiotika wäre daher auch bei Tieren von größter Wichtigkeit.

Inwieweit fließen diese Erkenntnisse in die EU-Strategie zur Lebensmittelsicherheit ein?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(26. Mai 2014)

Bezüglich Ihrer Anfrage zur Resistenz zoonotischer Bakterien gegen Antibiotika und zu den von der Kommission in dieser Angelegenheit ergriffenen Maßnahmen möchte die Kommission auf die Antworten auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-006941/2013, E-011036/2013 und E-000042/2014 ([1]) verweisen.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003922/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Resistance of salmonella and campylobacter to antibiotics

The frequency of resistant bacteria has long been a cause for concern. As a report by the European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) published on 25 March 2014 shows, even bacteria such as salmonella and campylobacter are now often resistant to common antibiotics. This is a problem, because these groups of bacteria are among the most common causes of food-borne infections. According to the report, this can even lead to resistant bacteria found in animals and food interfering with the effective treatment of infections in humans. Careful use of antibiotics is therefore extremely important, even in animals.

To what extent does the EU's food safety strategy take this situation into account?

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

Regarding the question about resistance of zoonotic bacteria to antibiotics and the actions taken by the Commission on this issue, the Commission refers to its answers to previous written questions E-006941/2013, E-011036/2013 and E-000042/2014 ([1]).

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003923/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: Beschlagnahme von Mobiltelefonen nach Unfällen

Anscheinend ist die Zahl der Unfälle mit ungeklärter Ursache stark gestiegen. Darum beschlagnahmt die Polizei in Köln gezielt Mobiltelefone, um herausfinden, ob die am Unfall beteiligten Lenker zum Zeitpunkt des Zusammenstoßes telefonierten und dadurch abgelenkt waren. Prinzipiell muss jedoch für die Beschlagnahme eines Mobiltelefons ein begründeter Verdacht vorliegen oder Gefahr im Verzug sein, außerdem muss die Verhältnismäßigkeit gewahrt bleiben.

In Österreich kann nur die Staatsanwaltschaft die Sicherstellung eines Mobiltelefons als Beweismittel beantragen. Viel gängiger ist zudem die Rufdatenrückerfassung beim Netzanbieter. Nach einem richterlichen Beschluss können so Anrufe und SMS auf die Sekunde genau ermittelt werden.

Problematisch ist in diesem Zusammenhang nur, dass das Telefonieren mit einer Freisprecheinrichtung oder einem Headset ja gestattet ist und mithin Mobiltelefone ohne begründeten Verdacht konfisziert werden. Zudem wird es für den Lenker schwierig sein zu beweisen, dass ein Gespräch im fraglichen Zeitraum etwa über eine integrierte Freisprecheinrichtung oder ein Headset erfolgt ist. Schließlich lässt sich bei einigen Geräten die Verwendung der Freisprecheinrichtung auch während des Gesprächs beliebig oft ein- oder ausschalten.

1. Gibt es auf EU-Ebene Studien über den Zusammenhang von Telefonieren am Steuer und Unfällen?

2. Gibt es diesbezüglich Studien über den Einfluss von Freisprecheinrichtungen hinsichtlich der Einschränkung der Unfallwahrscheinlichkeit?

3. Wie steht die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang zur Schwierigkeit der Beweiserbringung, dass eine vorhandene Freisprecheinrichtung bzw. ein Headset auch tatsächlich eingesetzt wurden?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(19. Mai 2014)

1. Die Kommission hat ein Forschungsprojekt ([1]), das eine gründliche Überarbeitung der Daten zur Straßenverkehrssicherheit beinhaltet, mitfinanziert. Ablenkung für den Fahrer und der Gebrauch des Mobiltelefons stellen einige der Aspekte dar, die dabei eingehend untersucht werden. Durch Verkehrssicherheitsforschung und Studien zu Unfallursachen wurde zudem bestätigt, dass Ablenkung für den Fahrer eine wichtige Rolle als Unfallrisikofaktor spielt. Insbesondere innerhalb der SafetyNet-Datenbank für Unfallursachen ([2]) war bei 32 % der Unfälle ein Verkehrsteilnehmer beteiligt, der abgelenkt oder unaufmerksam war.

2. Die Kommission will 2014 in einer Studie bewährte Verfahren zur Verringerung der Gefahren durch unaufmerksame/abgelenkte Verkehrsteilnehmer untersuchen lassen, in der auch das Unfallverhütungspotenzial von Freisprechanlagen thematisiert werden könnte. Die Ergebnisse dürften 2015 vorliegen.

3. In Bezug auf die Durchsetzung des Verbots der Handy-Benutzung ohne Freisprechanlage möchte die Kommission den Herrn Abgeordneten darauf hinweisen, dass dieser Bereich nicht den EU-Rechtsvorschriften unterliegt und somit in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten fällt.

([1]) DaCoTA: www.dacota-project.eu
([2]) https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/handle/2134/6265

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003923/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Seizure of mobile telephones after accidents

Apparently the number of accidents with unexplained causes has increased significantly. For this reason the police in Cologne seize mobile telephones in order to determine whether the drivers involved in an accident were using the telephone at the time of the accident and were therefore distracted by it. However, in principle the seizure of a mobile telephone is only possible if there is justified suspicion or if there is risk in delay; furthermore proportionality must also be maintained.

In Austria only the public prosecutor's office can apply for the seizure of a mobile telephone as evidence. Moreover, the retrieval of call data from the network operator is more common. After a court order has been issued, both phone calls and SMS can be pinpointed to the second.

The problem in this regard is that telephoning is permitted if using a handsfree device or a headset and consequently mobile telephones are confiscated without justified suspicion. In addition it is difficult for the driver to prove that a conversation during the period in question was carried out via an integrated handsfree device or a headset. Finally, several devices allow the handsfree facility to be switched on and off as required, even during the course of a conversation.

1. Are there any studies at an EU level concerning the connection between telephoning while driving and accidents?

2. Are there any studies concerning the effect of handsfree devices with regard to the reduction of accident probability?

3. What is the stance of the Commission in this regard on the difficulty of providing evidence that an existing handsfree device and/or headset was actually being used?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(19 May 2014)

1. The Commission has co-financed a research project ([1]) which includes a thorough revision of road safety knowledge. Driver distraction and the use of the phone are some of the aspects treated in-depth. The important role of driver distraction as an accident factor has also been well established through road safety research and accident causation studies. In particular within the SafetyNet accident causation database ([2]), 32% of accidents involved a road user who was distracted or inattentive.

2. The Commission is currently launching a study on best practices for reducing risks related to inattentive/distracted road users during 2014 which could also include the question of accident-reduction potential of hands-free devices. The results are expected to be available in 2015.

3. As regards the enforcement of rules concerning the prohibition of the use of mobile telephones without a hands-free device, the Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member that this area is not governed by EC law and therefore falls under the competence of Member States.

([1]) DaCoTA www.dacota-project.eu
([2]) https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/handle/2134/6265

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003924/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: Intransparente Kreditangebote und hohe Kosten bei Finanzprodukten

Wie die Tageszeitung Der Standard berichtet, gibt es hinsichtlich Finanzangelegenheiten anscheinend nach wie vor Probleme hinsichtlich des Konsumentenschutzes: „Jeder zehnte Verbraucher hat sich mit Finanzangelegenheiten geärgert. Finanzprodukte sind meist kompliziert und unübersichtlich gestaltet. Die Werbung dagegen sei häufig irreführend verkürzt. Bei den Krediten haben die Konsumenten oft mit intransparenten Kreditangeboten oder hohen Spesen zu tun. Das betraf zuletzt vor allem die Mahnspesen bei Krediten, Spesen für die Stundung eines Kredites oder Nebenspesen bei Hypothekarkrediten, etwa Schätzkosten für die Immobilie, Kosten für die Löschung der Hypothek …".

1. Welche Regelungen gibt es im Rahmen der EU-Strategie für Finanzdienstleistungen hinsichtlich intransparenter Kreditangebote und hoher Spesen?

2. Wie sind die EU-Regelungen hinsichtlich irreführend verkürzter Werbung für Finanzprodukte?

Antwort von Herrn Mimica im Namen der Kommission
(4. Juni 2014)

1. In der Richtlinie 2008/48/EG über Verbraucherkreditverträge ist festgelegt, welche Angaben in die Werbung für Verbraucherkredite und in die vorvertraglichen Informationen zu diesen Krediten aufzunehmen sind; diese Angaben sind von den Kreditgebern in klarer, prägnant gefasster Form an optisch hervorgehobener Stelle zu erteilen.

Die Richtlinie 2014/17/EU über Wohnimmobilienkreditverträge für Verbraucher ist am 20. März 2014 in Kraft getreten und muss von den Mitgliedstaaten bis zum 21. März 2016 umgesetzt werden. Gemäß dieser Richtlinie müssen Kreditgeber die Kreditnehmer mittels eines „Europäischen standardisierten Merkblatts" über sämtliche Einzelheiten der angebotenen Hypothek informieren, einschließlich aller anfallenden Kosten. Darüber hinaus sieht die Richtlinie vor, dass die Kreditgeber bestimmte Standardinformationen in die Werbung aufnehmen.

2. Es gibt jedoch keine Rechtsvorschriften der Union über die Höhe von Darlehensgebühren. Gemäß den vorstehend genannten Richtlinien darf die Werbung für Kredite nicht dadurch verkürzt werden, dass Standardinformationen ausgelassen oder in nicht ausreichend deutlicher Weise dargestellt werden.

Der Richtlinie 2005/29/EG über unlautere Geschäftspraktiken im Geschäftsverkehr zwischen Unternehmen und Verbrauchern zufolge müssen Gewerbetreibende ihre berufliche Sorgfaltspflicht erfüllen und wesentliche Informationen, die die Verbraucher für eine fundierte Kaufentscheidung benötigen, wie die Hauptmerkmale und der Preis eines Produkts, auf klare und verständliche Weise sowie rechtzeitig bereitstellen. Im Falle einer Aufforderung zum Kauf muss der Gewerbetreibende gemäß dieser Richtlinie den Preis oder in den Fällen, in denen der Preis aufgrund der Beschaffenheit des Produkts vernünftigerweise nicht im Voraus berechnet werden kann, die Art der Preisberechnung angeben.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003924/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Non-transparent offers of credit and high charges for financial products

As the daily newspaper *Der Standard* reports, there are apparently still problems with regard to consumer protection in financial matters: 'One in ten consumers has been irritated by financial matters. Financial products are mostly complicated in structure and not transparent. By contrast advertising is often misleadingly abbreviated. Consumers are often faced with non-transparent offers of credit or high charges for loans. This concerns above all reminder fees for loans, charges for the deferment of a loan or ancillary fees for mortgages, valuation fees for property, charges for the repayment of a mortgage …'

1. Which regulations are there as part of the EU strategy for financial services with regard to non-transparent offers of credit and high charges?

2. What are the EU regulations with regard to misleadingly abbreviated advertising for financial products?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

1. Directive 2008/48/EC on credit agreements of consumers standardises the information to be included in consumer credit advertising and in pre-contractual information on those credits, which should be provided by creditors in clear, concise and prominent way.

Directive 2014/17/EU on credit agreements for consumers relating to residential immovable property entered into force on 20 March 2014 and has to be transposed by the Member States by 21 March 2016. The directive requires from creditors to inform the borrowers via a European Standardised Information Sheet of all details of the mortgage on offer, including all the costs to be paid. Moreover, the directive requires creditors to use certain standard information in advertising.

2. However, there is no Union legislation concerning the level of charges for loans. Pursuant to above Directives, the advertising of credits cannot be limited in a manner where elements of standard information are omitted or where the standardised information is insufficiently prominent.

Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices requires traders to operate in accordance with professional diligence and to provide in a clear, intelligible and timely manner material information that consumers need in order to take an informed purchase decision, such as the main characteristics and the price of a product. In case of an invitation to purchase, this directive requires the trader to provide information about the price, and where the nature of the product means that the price cannot reasonably be calculated in advance, the manner in which the price is calculated.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003925/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: Telefon-Tarife — Irreführende Werbung

Wie die Tageszeitung „Der Standard“ ([1]) berichtet, gibt es im Bereich der Telekommunikationsdienstleistungen anscheinend nach wie vor Probleme hinsichtlich des Konsumentenschutzes: „Die Telekomanbieter nervten 8,5 % der hilfesuchenden Konsumenten: Sie regten sich über irreführende Werbung auf — die als günstig beworbenen Tarife verteuerten sich über zusätzliche Kosten; Tarife änderten sich rasch; unübersichtliches Kleingedrucktes oder Kostenfallen durch WAP Billing, also Bezahlen mit dem Handy“.

1. Wie steht die Kommission im Rahmen ihrer Konsumentenschutzbemühungen zu irreführender Werbung, wenn die als günstig beworbenen Telefon-Tarife sich etwa über zusätzliche Kosten massiv verteuern?

2. Wie steht die Kommission im Rahmen ihrer Konsumentenschutzbemühungen zu unübersichtlichem Kleingedrucktem?

3. Wie steht die Kommission im Rahmen ihrer Konsumentenschutzbemühungen zu Kostenfallen durch „WAP Billing“?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(23. Mai 2014)

Im vergangenen September legte die Kommission einen Legislativvorschlag zur Verbesserung des Verbraucherschutzes im Bereich der elektronischen Kommunikation vor. Der Vorschlag zur Verwirklichung des vernetzten Kontinents ([2]) enthält unter anderem Anforderungen in Bezug auf bessere vertragliche Informationen und Transparenz im Hinblick auf Informationen und bestehende Möglichkeiten zur Überwachung des Nutzungsumfangs und der Nutzungskosten, zur Festlegung von Obergrenzen für Nutzungsentgelte und zum Erhalt von Einzelgebührennachweisen. Das Europäische Parlament hat am 3. April eine Stellungnahme in erster Lesung zu den Vorschlägen angenommen.

Das EU-Verbraucherrecht sieht bereits ggf. direkt anwendbare Schutzmaßnahmen vor, die von den zuständigen nationalen Behörden durchzusetzen sind. So untersagt die Richtlinie über unlautere Geschäftspraktiken ([3]) es Händlern beispielsweise, falsche oder irreführende Preisinformationen oder Informationen über besondere Preisvorteile anzugeben, wenn dies den Verbraucher wahrscheinlich dazu veranlasst, eine Kaufentscheidung zu treffen, die er andernfalls nicht treffen würde. Die Richtlinie über Verbraucherrechte ([4]), die von den Mitgliedstaaten spätestens bis zum 13. Juni 2014 umgesetzt werden muss, schreibt unter anderem vor, dass die Verbraucher etwaigen zusätzlichen Zahlungen ausdrücklich zustimmen müssen und Händler keine Gebühren für die Nutzung von Zahlungsmitteln verlangen dürfen, die ihre eigenen Kosten für die Bereitstellung solcher Mittel überschreiten.

Mobile Zahlungen und das „WAP ([5])-Billing“ wurden ferner im Rahmen der Überarbeitung der Richtlinie über Zahlungsdienste ([6]) berücksichtigt. In der vom Parlament geänderten Fassung des Kommissionsvorschlags würden Zahlungsvorgänge, die von einem Telekommunikationsanbieter in Vermittlerfunktion durchgeführt werden und 20 EUR je Vorgang oder monatlich insgesamt 100 EUR überschreiten, in den Anwendungsbereich dieser Richtlinie fallen, die auch Bestimmungen über Transparenz, Informationspflichten sowie die Rechte und Pflichten von Nutzern und Anbietern im Zusammenhang mit Zahlungsdiensten enthält.

([1]) http://derstandard.at/1392688290873/Wo-Konsumenten-der-Schuh-drueckt
([2]) KOM(627)2013.
([3]) Richtlinie 2005/29/EG (ABl. L 149 vom 11.6.2005, S. 22).
([4]) Richtlinie 2011/83/EU (ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011, S. 64).
([5]) Wireless Application Protocol.
([6]) Richtlinie 2007/64/EG (ABl. L 319 vom 5.12.2007, S. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003925/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Misleading advertising on telephone rates

According to the Austrian daily 'Der Standard' ([1]), consumer protection problems apparently still exist in the field of telecommunications services. According to the paper, 8.5% of consumers seeking assistance were annoyed by telecommunication service providers. They were angered by misleading advertising, with advertised 'cheap' rates becoming more expensive as a result of additional costs, rates changing rapidly, confusing small print, and hidden costs through WAP billing (payment by mobile phone).

1. In connection with the Commission's efforts to protect the consumer, what is its position on misleading advertising, when phone rates which are advertised as being cheap become massively more expensive, for example as a result of additional costs?

2. In connection with the Commission's efforts to protect the consumer, what is its position on confusing small print?

3. In connection with the Commission's efforts to protect the consumer, what is its position on hidden costs as a result of WAP billing?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2014)

The Commission made a legislative proposal last September to enhance consumer protection in the field of electronic communications. The Connected Continent proposal ([2]) contains *inter alia* requirements for enhanced information on contracts, transparency of information and facilities, to control consumption to monitor costs, set financial limits to expenditure, and the possibility to receive itemised billing. The European Parliament adopted its first Reading Opinion on these proposals on 3 April.

EU consumer law already contains safeguards which may be applicable and are to be enforced by the competent national authorities. For example, the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive ([3]) prevents traders from providing false or deceptive information on the price of the product or the existence of a specific price advantage, if this is likely to lead the consumer to take a purchase decision he would not have taken otherwise. The Consumer Rights Directive ([4]), which Member States must transpose by 13 June 2014, provides *inter alia* that consumers must expressly consent to any additional payments, and that traders may not charge fees for the use of means of payment in excess of their costs for offering such means.

Finally, mobile payments and WAP ([5]) billing have been considered in the context of the Payment Services Directive review ([6]). In the Commission proposal amended by the Parliament, payment transactions carried out on an intermediary capacity by a telecommunication provider exceeding 20 euros for a transaction, or 100 euros cumulated on a month, would fall under the scope of the directive imposing rules concerning transparency, information requirements and rights and obligations of payment services for users and providers.

([1]) http://derstandard.at/1392688290873/Wo-Konsumenten-der-Schuh-drueckt
([2]) COM(627)2013.
([3]) Directive 2005/29/EC, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.
([4]) Directive 2011/83/EU, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 64.
([5]) Wireless Application Protocol.
([6]) Directive 2007/64/EC, OJ L 319, 5.12.2007, p.1.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003926/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Extremistische Anschläge auf die christliche Bevölkerung Nigerias

Bereits zum zweiten Mal in diesem Jahr haben islamische Extremisten der Sekte Boko Haram unter dem Schlachtruf „Allah ist groß" im Nordosten Nigerias Gemeinden gestürmt und dort wahllos Frauen, Kinder und Männer erschossen sowie viele Häuser angezündet. Insgesamt fielen diesen Massakern 150 Christen zum Opfer. Seit dem Beginn des Terrors 2009 gibt es viele Tausende Tote. Die seit Mitte Dezember letzten Jahres angesetzte Militäroffensive der nigerianischen Armee war bisher hilf- und nutzlos. Die radikalen Extremisten können daher noch immer ungebremst Anschläge auf die nicht-muslimische Bevölkerung verüben.

1. Hat die Hohe Vertreterin für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik diesbezüglich bereits Stellung genommen? Wenn nein, warum wird das hingenommen? Gedenkt sie Stellung zu nehmen?

2. Wie viel Geld sendet die Europäische Union derzeit im Rahmen wirtschaftlicher Entwicklungshilfe nach Nigeria? Welche sonstigen finanziellen Hilfen erhält das Land? Ist eine weitere finanzielle Unterstützung für die Zukunft geplant? Wenn ja, in welcher Höhe?

3. Sieht die Kommission Handlungsbedarf, diese und zukünftige Zahlungen an die Einhaltung der Menschenrechte, speziell an den Schutz von Christen zu koppeln? Wenn nein, wieso nicht?

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

1. Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat in verschiedenen Erklärungen zu der anhaltenden Gewalt in Nigeria mehrfach Stellung bezogen, zuletzt am 15. April nach dem Anschlag auf den Buspark im Vorort Nyanya in Abuja. Dabei verurteilte sie scharf die sinnlose Gewalt und forderte, dass die Verantwortlichen vor Gericht gestellt werden. Darüber hinaus versprach sie Nigeria Unterstützung bei seinem Kampf gegen den Terrorismus.

2. Im Rahmen des 10. Europäischen Entwicklungsfonds wurden für Nigeria 677 Mio. EUR für den Zeitraum 2008-2013 bereitgestellt. Darüber hinaus erhält Nigeria Unterstützung aus dem Instrument für Stabilität und Frieden (20 Mio. EUR) sowie aus den thematischen Haushaltslinien für Zivilgesellschaft/Menschenrechte (3,5 Mio. EUR).

3. Die Terroranschläge in Nigeria sind sowohl gegen Christen als auch gegen Muslime gerichtet. Sie werden durch eine Mischung unterschiedlich motivierter terroristischer Gruppen verübt, die versuchen, den nigerianischen Staat mit allen Mitteln zu destabilisieren, insbesondere indem sie die Bevölkerung zu spalten versuchen, auch in religiöser Hinsicht (religiöse Unterschiede haben in den letzten Jahren in Nigeria keine Rolle gespielt). Die Zahlung von Entwicklungshilfe an den Schutz der Christen zu koppeln kommt daher nicht in Frage. Menschenrechtsfragen allgemein werden im Rahmen des 8. Dialogs regelmäßig mit den nigerianischen Behörden erörtert. Sie sind Teil der facettenreichen Beziehungen zu Nigeria und werden gemäß Art. 9 des Abkommens von Cotonou fortlaufend überwacht.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003926/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Extremist attacks on the Christian population in Nigeria

For the second time this year, Islamic extremists from the Boko Haram sect have stormed communities in the North-East of Nigeria with the battle-cry of 'Allah is great!', indiscriminately shooting men, women and children and burning many houses. A total of 150 Christians have been killed in these massacres. Since the beginning of the terror campaign in 2009 there have been thousands of deaths. The military offensive undertaken by the Nigerian army since mid-December 2013 has so far been pathetic and useless. As a result, the radical extremists are still able to perpetrate attacks on the non-Muslim population with impunity.

1. Has the High Representative on Foreign and Security Policy yet expressed a view on this matter? If not, why is she acquiescing in this situation? Is she proposing to express a view?

2. How much money is the European Union currently sending to Nigeria by way of economic development aid? What other financial aid is the country receiving? Is any future financial support envisaged? If so, how much?

3. Does the Commission see a need for action to link these and subsequent payments to respect for human rights, and specifically to the protection of Christians? If not, why not?

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

1. The HR/VP has issued several statements on the on-going violence in Nigeria, the latest on 15 April following the attack on the bus park in the Nyanya suburb of Abuja. She has clearly stated her view: condemning the senseless violence, calling for those responsible to be brought to justice and expressing support to Nigeria in its fight against terrorism.

2. Under the 10th European Development Fund EUR 677 million have been allocated to Nigeria in the period from 2008 to 2013. In addition Nigeria is receiving support from the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (EUR 20 million) and from thematic budget lines for civil society/human rights (EUR 3.5 million).

3. The terrorist attacks in Nigeria target both Christians and Muslims. They are perpetrated by an amalgam of variously motivated terrorist groups seeking to destabilise the State of Nigeria by all means, especially by seeking to widen all differences, including religious (which in recent years have not been a problem in Nigeria). Linking the development aid payments to the protection of Christians is therefore not an issue. Human rights matters more broadly are regularly discussed with the Nigerian authorities in the framework of the Art.8 dialogue. They form part of a multifaceted relationship with Nigeria and are constantly monitored in line with Art.9 of the Cotonou Agreement.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003927/14
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: Asylmissbrauch durch Ankerkinder

Asylanten-Ankerkinder sind durch Schlepperorganisationen eingeschleuste unbegleitete minderjährige Flüchtlinge, die nach der Erlangung eines Aufenthaltsstatus in den betroffenen EU-Mitgliedstaaten ihre Kernfamilie, vor allem Eltern und Geschwister, nachholen. Allein in Österreich fanden somit seit 2011 fast 4 000 Ankerkinder Zuflucht. Da diese Kinder nach Eingliederung in das System des jeweiligen Mitgliedstaates ein offizielles Anrecht darauf haben, dass ihre Eltern oder andere Familienmitglieder nachreisen dürfen, stellt dies ein zusätzliches Einfallstor für Asylmissbrauch dar.

1. Sieht die Kommission Handlungsbedarf, international agierende Schlepperunternehmen, die Minderjährige ausnutzen, um andere Flüchtlinge in ein Land zu schleusen, gezielt zu erfassen und rechtlich gegen diese vorzugehen? Wenn ja, mit welchen Mitteln? Wenn nein, warum?

2. Sieht die Kommission Handlungsbedarf, stärkere Kontrollen an den Grenzen aller EU-Mitgliedstaaten einzuführen, um einen solchen Missbrauch des Asylrechts zukünftig unterbinden zu können? Wenn ja, mit welchen Mitteln? Wenn nein, warum?

3. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Notwendigkeit, legislative Anpassungen bestehender Regelungen im Asylrecht vorzunehmen, um diesem offensichtlichen Missbrauch geltenden EU-Asylrechts zu bekämpfen?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(27. Mai 2014)

1. Für die Kommission hat die Bekämpfung von Menschenhandel, Schleuserkriminalität und kriminellen Netzen hohe Priorität. Dies wurde in der Mitteilung über die Arbeit der Mittelmeer-Task Force ([1]) eigens als einer der Aktionsbereiche festgelegt, einschließlich der Umsetzung einer Reihe von spezifischen Maßnahmen wie der Entwicklung einer umfassenden EU-Strategie zur Bekämpfung des Schleusens von Migranten.

2. Die Mitgliedstaaten sind verpflichtet, die Personenkontrollen an ihren Grenzen in Übereinstimmung mit den Vorschriften des Schengener Grenzkodex ([2]) durchzuführen. Dieser Kodex gilt unbeschadet der Rechte von Personen, die um internationalen Schutz ersuchen, insbesondere hinsichtlich der Nichtzurückweisung ([3]), und des Rechts auf wirksamen Zugang zum Asylverfahren, einschließlich des Rechts auf Einreise gemäß den Bestimmungen der Asylverfahrensrichtlinie ([4]) sowie der Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union.

3. Unerlaubte Einreise stellt an sich noch keinen Missbrauch des Asylsystems dar. Der EU-Besitzstand garantiert den Zugang zum Asylverfahren sowie eine vollständige und angemessene Prüfung des Asylantrags. Ferner wird gewährleistet, dass die Entscheidung darüber, ob internationaler Schutz gewährt wird, unabhängig davon getroffen wird, ob der Antragsteller unerlaubt eingereist ist oder nicht. Diese Garantien gelten im Hoheitsgebiet der Mitgliedstaaten, einschließlich der Grenzgebiete und Transitzonen. Was die Familienzusammenführung betrifft, so wird sie Flüchtlingen gemäß den Bestimmungen der Familienzusammenführungsrichtlinie ([5]) und Personen mit subsidiärem Schutzstatus gemäß den nationalen Vorschriften gewährt.

([1]) KOM(2013)869 endg.
([2]) 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.
([3]) Artikel 3 Buchstabe b des Schengener Grenzkodex.
([4]) Artikel 3 Buchstabe a und 13 Absatz 1 des Schengener Grenzkodex, für die derzeit gültige Asylverfahrensrichtlinie siehe Richtlinie 2005/85/EG des Rates vom 1. Dezember 2005 über Mindestnormen für Verfahren in den Mitgliedstaaten zur Zuerkennung und Aberkennung der Flüchtlingseigenschaft, ABl. L 326 vom 13.12.2005, S. 13-34.
([5]) Richtlinie 2003/86/EG des Rates vom 22. September 2003 betreffend das Recht auf Familienzusammenführung, ABl. L 251 vom 3.10.2003, S. 12-18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003927/14
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Asylum abuse through 'anchor children'

Asylum-seeking 'anchor children' are unaccompanied, underage refugees smuggled in by smuggling organisations who, once they have been granted residency status in the EU Member State in question, are joined by their family members, in particular parents and siblings. In Austria alone nearly 4 000 such anchor children have found refuge since 2011. After incorporation into the system of the respective Member State, these children have an official entitlement to be joined by their parents or other family members, meaning that this constitutes an additional gateway for the misuse of asylum status.

1. Does the Commission see a need for action in the targeting of and imposition of legal measures against internationally active smuggling organisations that use underage children in order to smuggle other refugees into a country? If yes, with which means? If no, why not?

2. Does the Commission see a need for action in the introduction of stronger controls at the borders of all EU Member States in order to prevent such abuse of asylum laws in the future? If yes, with which means? If no, why not?

3. How does the Commission assess the necessity of legislative adjustments to the existing regulations of asylum law in order to combat this obvious abuse of current EU asylum legislation?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2014)

1. The Commission is addressing the fight against trafficking and smuggling of human beings and criminal networks as a matter of priority. It has been specifically identified as one of the lines of action in the communication on the results of the Task Force Mediterranean ([1]), including the implementation of a set of specific measures such as the development of a comprehensive EU Plan to tackle smuggling of migrants.

2. Member States have an obligation to carry out border control of persons crossing their external borders in accordance with the rules set out in the Schengen Border Code ([2]). That Code applies without prejudice to the rights of persons requesting international protection, in particular as regards non-refoulement ([3]), and the right to effective access to asylum procedure, including the right to enter in accordance with the conditions laid down in the Asylum Procedures Directive ([4]), as well as the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.

3. Unauthorised entry does not constitute as such an abuse of the asylum system. The EU *acquis* guarantees access to the asylum procedure, a complete and adequate examination of the asylum application, and that the decision on the qualification as a beneficiary of international protection is taken, irrespective of whether the asylum applicant entered illegally or not. These guarantees apply in the territory of Member States, including at the border or in the transit zones. As regards family reunification, it is guaranteed to refugees in line with the provisions of the Family Reunification Directive ([5]) and to beneficiaries of subsidiary protection in line with national law.

([1]) COM(2013) 869 final.
([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]) Article 3(b) of the Schengen Borders Code.
([4]) Articles 3a and 13 (1) of the Schengen Borders Code; For the currently applicable Asylum Procedures Directive: Council Directive 2005/85/EC of 1 December 2005 on minimum standards on procedures in Member States for granting and withdrawing refugee status; OJ L 326, 13.12.2005, p. 13-34.
([5]) Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification; OJ L 251, 3.10.2003, p. 12-18.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003928/14
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: Genetisch verändertes Saatgut

Bislang war in Österreich der Anbau von genetisch veränderten Lebensmitteln verboten. Nach Vorschlag der Kommission soll nun auch die genetisch veränderte Maissorte 1507 des amerikanischen Chemiekonzerns Pioneer Dupont zugelassen werden. Hier werden Bakterien genutzt, die Schädlinge töten sollen. Leider werden durch diese Bakterien auch Nützlinge, Bienen und Schmetterlinge gefährdet. Auch Ratten wurden mit diesem Gen-Mais gefüttert — diese erkrankten schlussendlich an riesigen Krebstumoren und starben viel schneller. In der Vergangenheit wandte man sich zwar mehrheitlich gegen eine Anbauzulassung von Genmais, jedoch konnte sich der Ministerrat im Februar nicht für ein endgültiges Verbot aussprechen. Nun hat das Europäische Parlament den Vorschlag außerordentlich deutlich abgelehnt. Wieso weigert sich die Kommission, den Vorschlag zurückzunehmen?

1. Gibt es Studien, durch die bestätigt wird, dass der langfristige Konsum von Genmais nicht schädlich sein kann — das heißt: Kann die EU hier dem Vorsorgeprinzip gerecht werden?

2. Bei Einführung von Genmais könnten Schäden für Umwelt und Gesundheit auftreten. Gibt es seitens der Kommission Vorschläge, wer für diese potenziellen Schäden in Zukunft haften wird?

3. Kann der forcierte Versuch der Kommission, die Maissorte 1507 auf dem europäischen Markt zuzulassen, als notwendiges Zugeständnis — das heißt als „guter Wille" — gegenüber den USA für die derzeitigen Verhandlungen zum Freihandelsabkommen (TTIP) gesehen werden?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(5. Mai 2014)

1. Ein genetisch veränderter Organismus (GVO) darf für die Verwendung als Lebens- und Futtermittel in der EU nur zugelassen werden, nachdem die Risiken, die der GVO potenziell für die Gesundheit von Mensch und Tier sowie für die Umwelt darstellt, umfassend, unter Berücksichtigung des Vorsorgeprinzips und von Fall zu Fall bewertet worden sind.

Gemäß der Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 503/2013 der Kommission betreffend genetisch veränderte Lebens- und Futtermittel ([1]) müssen für jeden einzelnen GVO eine 90-tägige Fütterungsstudie mit ganzen genetisch veränderten Lebens- und Futtermitteln bei Nagetieren sowie, wenn bei der Risikobewertung eine Gefahr festgestellt wurde, eine weitere Langzeituntersuchung durchgeführt werden. Bisher haben die Ergebnisse der 90-tägigen Studien in keinem Fall eine weitere Langzeituntersuchung erforderlich gemacht.

2. Die Risikobewertung von GVO — insbesondere hinsichtlich ihrer Auswirkungen auf die Umwelt — erfolgt durch die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit; für das Zulassungsverfahren gilt der einschlägige gesetzliche Rahmen.

Der Zulassungsinhaber und die sonstigen Beteiligten (etwa die Unternehmer, die das Produkt verwenden) müssen sich an die Zulassungsbedingungen halten; andernfalls haften sie ([2]).

3. Hierzu erlaubt sich die Kommission, den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die Anfrage E-2414/2014 ([3]) zu verweisen.

([1]) Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 503/2013 der Kommission vom 3. April 2013 über Anträge auf Zulassung genetisch veränderter Lebens- und Futtermittel gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1829/2003 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 641/2004 und (EG) Nr. 1981/2006 der Kommission (ABl. L 157 vom 8.6.2013, S. 1).

([2]) Artikel 19 der Richtlinie 2001/18/EG sowie Artikel 7 und 9 bzw. 19 und 21 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1829/2003.

([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2014-002414+0+DOC+XML+V0//DE

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003928/14
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Genetically modified crops

Until now the cultivation of genetically modified foodstuffs has been prohibited in Austria. According to a Commission proposal, the genetically modified maize type 1507 of the American chemical company Pioneer Dupont should now be permitted. This uses bacteria that supposedly kill pests. Unfortunately these bacteria also endanger beneficial creatures, bees and butterflies. Rats were also fed with this genetically modified maize — these ultimately became ill with huge cancerous tumours and died much quicker. In the past there has been majority opposition to the permitting of the cultivation of genetically modified maize, however in February the Council of Ministers could not rule in favour of a final prohibition. Now the European Parliament has extraordinarily clearly rejected the proposal. Why does the Commission refuse to withdraw the proposal?

1. Are there studies that confirm that the long-term consumption of genetically modified maize cannot be harmful — i.e.: can the EU meet the requirements of the precautionary principle?

2. The introduction of genetically modified maize could lead to damage to the environment and health. Does the Commission have any proposals as to who would be liable for this potential damage in the future?

3. Can the accelerated efforts of the Commission to permit maize type 1507 on the European market be seen as a necessary concession — i.e. as 'good will' — towards the USA for the current negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)?

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

1. A GMO can only be authorised for food and feed uses in the EU after having been risk assessed fully taking the precautionary principle into account, on a case-by-case basis, as regards human and animal health and the environment.

Commission Implementing Regulation (EC) 503/2013 on genetically modified food and feed ([1]) introduced a requirement for performing a 90-day toxicity study in rodents with whole GM food/feed for each single GMO and other long-term studies if any hazard has been identified in the risk assessment. As of today, no 90-day study result has led to requiring longer studies.

2. GMOs are risk assessed by the European Food Safety Authority in particular as regards their impact on the environment and are authorised under the GM legislative framework.

The authorisation holder and other parties concerned (such as other operators using the product) are obliged to comply with the terms of authorisation, otherwise they will be held liable ([2]).

3. The Commission would like to refer to its answers to Question E-2414/2014 ([3]).

([1]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EC) No 503/201 of 3 April 2013 on applications for authorisation of genetically modified food and feed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council and amending Commission Regulations (EC) No 641/2004 and (EC) No 1981/2006 (OJ L 157, 8.6.2013, p. 1).

([2]) Article 19 of Directive 2001/18/EC and Articles 7 and 19, and 9 and 21 of Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003.

([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2014-002414%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003930/14
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: Jede dritte Frau ist Opfer von Gewalt

Laut einer Studie des Europäischen Instituts für Gleichstellungsfragen aus dem Jahre 2013 wurde festgestellt, dass häusliche Gewalt gegen Frauen noch immer ein sehr großes weltweites Problem ist. Die Studie besagt, dass ungefähr neun von zehn Personen, die in Europa Opfer von Gewalt in Partnerschaften werden, Frauen sind. 62 Millionen EU-Bürgerinnen wurden schon einmal Opfer sexueller oder auch physischer Gewalt ([1]). Leider werden viele Übergriffe, die vorwiegend im eigenen Zuhause stattfinden, nicht zur Anzeige gebracht. Weiterhin besagt die Studie, dass eine von 20 Frauen seit ihrem 15. Lebensjahr vergewaltigt wurde und rund ein Drittel der Frauen, die schon in ihrer frühen Kindheit Opfer sexueller Gewalt waren, auch von ihren Partnern missbraucht wurden. Die Ergebnisse sind erschreckend und sollten uns zu denken geben.

1. Sind in Zukunft wirkungsvolle Projekte geplant, die Gewalt gegen Frauen in Europa entgegenwirken sollen?

2. Wenn ja, gibt es dazu schon Entwürfe?

3. Frauenbeschneidungen, Zwangsehen und Unterdrückung sind durch die Massenzuwanderung auch in Europa häufiger geworden. Gedenkt die Kommission, den Aspekt der Gewalt gegen Frauen durch Männer mit Migrationshintergrund bzw. mit muslimischer Religion genauer zu untersuchen? Wenn nein, warum nicht?

4. Welche Strategien und Projekte gab es in der Vergangenheit? Gibt es dazu auch Studien, durch die Erfolg bzw. Misserfolg nachgewiesen werden kann?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(2. Juni 2014)

Seit 2007 wurden durch das Daphne II-Programm mehr als 200 Projekte zur Bekämpfung der Gewalt gegen Frauen, Kinder und junge Menschen finanziert. Mehrere mit Mitteln aus 2011 und 2012 finanzierte Projekte sind noch nicht abgeschlossen. In der Halbzeitbewertung dieses Programms, das im Mai 2011 angenommen wurde, wird sein Erfolg bei der Zielerreichung insgesamt bestätigt. Mit einer Förderung von insgesamt 124 Mio. EUR sind Projekte entstanden, mit deren Hilfe europäische Netzwerke eingerichtet, bewährte Verfahren ausgetauscht, zahlreiche Instrumente und Fortbildungen geschaffen und das Wissen um das Phänomen „Gewalt" vertieft wurden. Die Ergebnisse aus dieser Bewertung werden bei der künftigen Umsetzung des Programms „Rechte, Gleichstellung und Unionsbürgerschaft" im Zeitraum 2014 bis 2020 berücksichtigt, bei dem sich eine der Hauptprioritäten auf das ehemalige Daphne-Programm bezieht.

Am 25. November 2013 hat die Kommission auch einen Mitteilung zur Abschaffung der weiblichen Genitalverstümmelung ([2]) angenommen, in der eine Reihe von konkreten Maßnahmen für die folgenden Jahre festgelegt wurde. Mit dem Programm „Rechte, Gleichstellung und Unionsbürgerschaft" wird die Kommission auch weiterhin Aktivitäten fördern, die von Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft durchgeführt werden. Dabei ist zu berücksichtigen, dass die weibliche Genitalverstümmelung zahlreiche Facetten hat, für die multidisziplinäre Maßnahmen und enge Zusammenarbeit mit den Gemeinschaften, die sie anwenden, notwendig sind.

([1]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1570643/EUStudie_62-Millionen-Frauen-erlebten-Gewalt
([2]) KOM(2013)833.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003930/14
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: One in three women is a victim of violence

A 2013 study by the European Institute for Gender Equality revealed that domestic violence against women remains a serious problem worldwide. The study indicated that approximately nine out of ten people in Europe who are subjected to violence in a relationship are women. Sixty-two million EU citizens have been victims of sexual or physical violence at least once ([1]). Unfortunately, many assaults, which predominantly occur within the home, go unreported. Furthermore, the study reported that one in twenty women have been abused since the age of fifteen and around a third of these women, who had already been victims of sexual violence in their early childhood, were also abused by their partners. The results are horrifying and should give us some food for thought.

1. Are there any effective projects in the pipeline to tackle violence against women in Europe?

2. If so, have any already been drafted?

3. Female genital mutilation, forced marriages and oppression are also becoming increasingly common in Europe due to mass immigration. Does the Commission intend to study the aspect of violence against women by men with a migrant background or who are members of the Muslim faith more closely? If not, why not?

4. What strategies and projects have there been in the past? Are there also any studies that can serve as successful or unsuccessful examples?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

Since 2007, more than 200 projects have been funded through the Daphne II programme, aiming at fighting violence against women, children and young people. Several projects, funded through the 2011 and 2012 budgets are still on-going. The interim evaluation of this programme, which was adopted in May 2011, confirmed the overall success in achieving its objectives. A total budget of EUR 124 million has funded projects establishing European networks, shared best practices, produced various tools and trainings and improved knowledge on the phenomenon of violence. Lessons learned resulting from this evaluation will be taken into account in the forthcoming implementation of the Rights, Equality and Citizenship programme 2014-2020 where one of the main priorities relates to the ex-Daphne programme.

The Commission also adopted on 25 November 2013 a communication on eliminating female genital mutilation ([2])defining a list of concrete measures to be taken in the coming year. Through the Rights, Equality and Citizenship program, the Commission will continue to fund activities implemented by civil society organisations, bearing in mind that FGM has multi-faceted aspects, requiring multi-disciplinary measures and close cooperation with communities in which it is practised.

([1]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1570643/EUStudie_62-Millionen-Frauen-erlebten-Gewalt
([2]) COM(2013) 833.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003931/14
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: Weltwassertag — Zugang zu sauberem Trinkwasser

Der Fragesteller möchte anlässlich des Weltwassertags am 22. März auf die Wasserproblematik aufmerksam machen. Für die Meisten von uns ist Wasser ein selbstverständliches Gut und jederzeit verfügbar. Dass Wasser jedoch in hochwertiger Qualität und fast unbegrenzt zur Verfügung steht, ist für 11 % der Weltbevölkerung unvorstellbar. 768 Millionen Menschen leben weltweit ohne sauberes Trinkwasser und 2,5 Milliarden Menschen ohne Sanitärversorgung. 40 % dieser Notleidenden leben in Afrika und haben keine Hausanschlüsse, Zapfstellen, Quellen oder Regenwasser-Sammlungen. Jeder Mensch sollte Zugang zu ausreichend Wasser haben, leider sieht die Realität anders aus. Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Garantiert die Kommission als eine klare Zielsetzung für die Zukunft eine sichere und vor allem auch bezahlbare Versorgung mit sauberem Wasser für alle Menschen in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten?

2. Auch für die nachfolgende Generation sollte die Wasserversorgung gesichert werden. Gibt es dazu ein ausgearbeitetes Programm, das die Sicherstellung der Ressource Wasser zum Ziel hat?

3. Sind Wasser und sanitäre Dienstleistungen in Zukunft ein Gegenstand von Handelsabkommen wie zum Beispiel dem CETA?

4. Wasserdienstleistungen dürfen nach Ansicht des Fragestellers nicht zu gewinnorientierten Dienstleistungen verkommen. Kann sich die Kommission dazu verpflichten, Wasserdienstleistungen auch für die Zukunft vom Geltungsbereich der Binnenmarktvorschriften auszunehmen?

5. Ist in Zukunft eine offizielle Entwicklungshilfe zur Verbesserung der Wasser- und Abwasserwirtschaft vorgesehen?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(19. Mai 2014)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Mitteilung über die Europäische Bürgerinitiative „Wasser und sanitäre Grundversorgung sind ein Menschenrecht! Wasser ist ein öffentliches Gut, keine Handelsware“ (KOM(2014)177) ([1]), die rechtzeitig zum Weltwassertag 2014 veröffentlicht wurde.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/com_r2w_de.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003931/14
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: World Water Day — Access to clean drinking water

To mark this day, 22 March, also known as World Water Day, I would like to bring the Commission's attention to the problems we face with water. For most of us, water is a resource that we take for granted and can access at any time, but the fact that good-quality water can be supplied in practically unlimited amounts is unimaginable for 11% of the world's population. There are 768 million people across the world living without access to clean drinking water, and 2.5 billion people without sanitation facilities. 40% of these people in desperate need live in Africa and have no domestic water connection, taps, sources or means to collect rainwater. Everyone should have access to a sufficient supply of water. Unfortunately, this is far from the case in reality. That is why I ask the following questions:

1. Will the Commission commit to setting a clearly-defined target for the future in order to ensure access to a safe and, above all, affordable supply of clean water for every person in EU Member States?

2. Access to water should also be secured for the next generation. Is there already a programme devised to guarantee water supplies?

3. In future, will water and sanitation services be subject to trade agreements such as CETA?

4. Water services, to my mind, should not degenerate into profit-orientated services. Can the Commission commit to excluding water services from the scope of internal market rules in the future as well?

5. Has any development aid been officially earmarked to improve water and waste water management in the future?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(19 May 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its communication on the European Citizens' Initiative 'Right2Water', COM(2014) 177 ([1]) published in time for the World Water Day 2014.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/com_r2w_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003933/14
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: USA-Freihandelsabkommen ermöglicht Klon-Fleisch-Import in die EU

In verschiedenen Medienberichten wurde dargestellt, dass im Zuge des Freihandelsabkommens mit den USA in Zukunft Fleisch geklonter Kälber und Rinder im Supermarkt zum Verkauf angeboten werden könnte. Außerdem würde auch noch die Kennzeichnungspflicht aufgehoben. Dies würde selbstverständlich dem Konsumenten keine Chance mehr geben, die Herkunft des Produkts nachzuverfolgen. Das derzeitige Klon-Importverbot wurde lediglich für fünf Jahre ausgesprochen und ist somit keine verlässliche Absicherung. Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Garantiert die Kommission den Bürgern der EU, dass der Import von Klonfleisch, ob direkt oder verarbeitet, in den TTIP-Verhandlungen nicht zur Disposition gestellt wird?

2. Plant die Kommission derzeit irgendeine Veränderung der Kennzeichnungspflicht von Fleischwaren in der EU innerhalb der nächsten ca. 2 Jahre?

3. Wird eine Erneuerung des Klon-Importverbotes nach Ablauf der fünf Jahre angestrebt?

4. Wenn nein, warum?

5. Über welche weiter gehenden Argumente verfügt die Kommission, über die Verteidigung des in der EU geltenden Vorsorgeprinzips hinaus, um den USA in den TTIP-Verhandlungen hier keine Zugeständnisse machen zu müssen?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(26. Mai 2014)

Ziel der transatlantischen Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft (TTIP) ist es, unnötige ordnungspolitische Handelshemmnisse abzubauen. Entsprechend ihrer Erklärung anlässlich der Ankündigung des TTIP wird die Kommission nicht über Änderungen der grundlegenden Vorschriften über die Lebensmittelsicherheit verhandeln.

Die Kennzeichnungsvorschriften der Union für Lebensmittel wurden kürzlich überarbeitet: Mit der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 ([1]) (die ab dem 13. Dezember 2014 gilt) wurden neue Kennzeichnungsvorschriften für Lebensmittel eingeführt, auch für Fleisch, Fleischzubereitungen und Fleischerzeugnisse. Ab dem 1. April 2015 muss bei frischem, gekühltem oder gefrorenem Schweine-, Schaf-, Ziegen- und Geflügelfleisch das Ursprungsland bzw. der Herkunftsort angegeben werden ([2]). Die Kommission hat ferner einen Bericht angenommen, in dem die Machbarkeit einer obligatorischen Ursprungskennzeichnung für als Zutat verwendetes Fleisch geprüft wird; über diesen Bericht wird mit dem Europäischen Parlament noch weiter beraten.

Die von der Union vorgeschlagenen Maßnahmen betreffend das Klonen sehen eine Berichterstattung durch die Mitgliedstaaten vor. 5 Jahre nach Umsetzung der entsprechenden Richtlinie müssen die Mitgliedstaaten der Kommission über ihre Erfahrungen berichten. Die Kommission muss dem Europäischen Parlament und dem Rat dann einen Bericht über die Anwendung der Richtlinie vorlegen.

Beim Gesundheitsschutz wählt die EU entsprechend dem WTO-Übereinkommen über die Anwendung gesundheitspolizeilicher und pflanzenschutzrechtlicher Maßnahmen ein ihr angemessen erscheinendes Maß. Die Grundsätze und Rechtsvorschriften der EU stützen sich auf die Anwendung des Vorsorgeprinzips. Der Grundsatz der Vorsorge ist dabei eine der Hauptvorschriften des EU-Lebensmittelrechts (Verordnung (EG) Nr. 178/2002 ([3])) und auch im Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union erwähnt (Artikel 191).

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 25. Oktober 2011 betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 1924/2006 und (EG) Nr. 1925/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 87/250/EWG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 90/496/EWG des Rates, der Richtlinie 1999/10/EG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates, der Richtlinien 2002/67/EG und 2008/5/EG der Kommission und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 608/2004 der Kommission (ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011).

([2]) Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 1337/2013 der Kommission vom 13. Dezember 2013 mit Durchführungsbestimmungen zur Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates hinsichtlich der Angabe des Ursprungslandes bzw. Herkunftsortes von frischem, gekühltem oder gefrorenem Schweine-, Schaf-, Ziegen- und Geflügelfleisch (ABl. L 335 vom 14.12.2013).

([3]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 178/2002 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 28. Januar 2002 zur Festlegung der allgemeinen Grundsätze und Anforderungen des Lebensmittelrechts, zur Errichtung der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit und zur Festlegung von Verfahren zur Lebensmittelsicherheit (ABl. L 31 vom 1.2.2002).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003933/14
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Free trade agreement with the US allows cloned meat imports into the EU

According to various media reports, the free trade agreement with the US could allow the meat of cloned calves and cattle to be sold in supermarkets in future. Moreover, the requirement to label products as such would be lifted, which of course would no longer give consumers the opportunity to trace the origin of the product. The current ban on importing cloned meat will only be imposed for five years and therefore offers no reliable safeguard. This raises the following questions:

1. Will the Commission assure EU citizens that the import of cloned meat, whetherdirect or processed, will not be conceded in TTIP negotiations?

2. Does the Commission currently have any intention of amending the requirement to labelmeat goods in the EU within the next 2 years or so?

3. Will a renewal of the ban on imports on cloned meat be sought after the five years havepassed?

4. If not, why?

5. What further arguments does the Commission have to defend the precautionaryprinciple that applies within the EU so that no concessions will have to be made to the USon this matter in the TTIP negotiations?

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

The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) aims at removing unnecessary regulatory constraints on trade. The Commission in line with the statement made when presenting the TTIP will not negotiate changes of the basic rules on food safety.

The Union food labelling rules have recently been revised: Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 ([1]) (applicable from 13 December 2014) introduces new labelling requirements for foods including for meat, meat preparations and meat products; indication of the country of origin or place of provenance for fresh, chilled and frozen meat of swine, sheep, goats and poultry will become mandatory as of 1 April 2015 ([2]). The Commission adopted also a report on the feasibility of the mandatory indication of origin for meat as an ingredient, which will be subject to further discussion with the European Parliament.

The proposed Union measures on cloning foresee a reporting by the Member States. 5 years after the date of transposition of this directive, the Member States shall report to the Commission on the experience gained by them. The Commission shall then present a report to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of this directive.

The EU sets its sanitary protection at a level that it considers appropriate, in accordance with the WTO Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures. The EU principles and legislation make reference to the application of the precautionary principle. In particular the precautionary principle is one of the basic rules of Union Food Law (Regulation 178/2002 ([3])) and it is also quoted in the in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union -Article 191.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1924/2006 and (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Commission Directive 87/250/EEC, Council Directive 90/496/EEC, Commission Directive 1999/10/EC, Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Directives 2002/67/EC and 2008/5/EC and Commission Regulation (EC) No 608/2004, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.

([2]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1337/2013 of 13 December 2013 laying down rules for the application of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the indication of the country of origin or place of provenance for fresh, chilled and frozen meat of swine, sheep, goats and poultry, OJ L 335/19 14.12.2013

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety, OJ L 31, 1.2.2002.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003934/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) y Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(28 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Informe provisional alemán sobre los migrantes sin empleo procedentes de Estados miembros de la UE

El 26 de marzo de 2014, el Gobierno alemán publicó un informe provisional en el que examinaba la posibilidad de limitar el derecho de los migrantes sin empleo procedentes de otros Estados miembros de la UE a permanecer en Alemania y la posibilidad de restringir el acceso a las prestaciones y servicios de bienestar social.

El ministro del Interior afirmó que los problemas de migración interior de la UE «son gestionables al nivel nacional, pero sus consecuencias son de escala regional», haciendo referencia a la concentración de inmigrantes pobres y sin empleo en algunas ciudades. El debate alemán sobre la libertad de circulación se intensificó cuando los ciudadanos rumanos y búlgaros obtuvieron plenos derechos de libertad de circulación el 1 de enero de 2014.

Aunque en el informe no se ofrecen pruebas de abuso de los servicios de bienestar social, se propone que se establezcan prohibiciones de reentrada para los migrantes que «abusen» de la libertad de circulación. Se propone, asimismo, que se limite en particular el tiempo de estancia de los migrantes si se encuentran en Alemania para buscar empleo. El Gobierno alemán también desea aplicar medidas muy severas para dificultar que los inmigrantes soliciten prestaciones para menores, exigiéndoles, entre otras cosas, un número de identificación fiscal.

Como señalaba la Comisión en su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-000356/2014, el artículo 14 del TFUE garantiza el derecho de libertad de circulación, sin condiciones, a todos los trabajadores de la UE, mientras que el artículo 21 del TFUE otorga ese derecho a los ciudadanos de la UE sin actividad laboral únicamente dentro de determinados límites. En el artículo 7 de la Directiva 2004/38/CE se estipula que para tener derecho a residir durante más de tres meses en otro Estado miembro, los ciudadanos de la UE no activos deben disponer de una amplia cobertura de seguro de enfermedad y recursos económicos suficientes para no convertirse en una carga para el sistema de asistencia social del Estado miembro de acogida. Las personas en busca de empleo pueden residir en otro Estado miembro, sin condiciones, por un periodo de hasta seis meses, e incluso por un periodo más prolongado si demuestran tener probabilidades ciertas de encontrar trabajo.

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que las propuestas del Gobierno alemán en el sentido de limitar la libertad de circulación están en conformidad con el derecho de la UE? En particular, ¿sería una medida proporcionada imponer prohibiciones de reentrada a las personas que solicitasen de manera ilegítima prestaciones de bienestar social?

2. ¿Serían conformes con el Derecho de la UE las limitaciones propuestas para las prestaciones a menores y para la duración de la estancia de los solicitantes de empleo?

3. ¿Cómo piensa asegurarse la Comisión de que Alemania respete plenamente el Derecho de la UE cuando ponga en práctica estas propuestas u otras disposiciones relacionadas con la libertad de circulación?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión está al corriente del informe provisional, de 26 de marzo de 2014, de la comisión *ad hoc* de Secretarios de Estado titulado «Cuestiones y problemas jurídicos relativos a la utilización de los sistemas de seguridad social por parte de los ciudadanos de la UE» y de las medidas que en él se analizan y proponen.

La Comisión sigue de cerca la evolución de esos debates y está en contacto con las autoridades alemanas, a fin de asegurar que todas las medidas futuras cumplan plenamente el Derecho de la UE a este respecto. Tras el informe, la Comisión procederá a su evaluación relativa a la compatibilidad con el Derecho de la UE de las medidas que Alemania decida adoptar.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003934/14
an die Kommission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) und Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(28. März 2014)

Betrifft: Deutscher Zwischenbericht über arbeitslose Migranten aus EU-Mitgliedstaaten

Die deutsche Regierung hat am 26. März 2014 einen Zwischenbericht veröffentlicht, in dem erwogen wird, das Aufenthaltsrecht von arbeitslosen Migranten aus EU-Mitgliedstaaten zu beschneiden und den Zugang zu Sozialleistungen und -diensten zu erschweren.

Nach Aussagen des Innenministers seien die Probleme der unionsinternen Migration „auf nationaler Ebene beherrschbar, aber auf regionaler Ebene besorgniserregend". Er verwies dabei auf die Konzentration armer erwerbsloser Einwanderer in manchen Städten des Landes. Die deutsche Diskussion über die Freizügigkeit wurde dadurch ausgelöst, dass die Bürger Rumäniens und Bulgariens seit dem 1. Januar 2014 uneingeschränkt das Recht auf Freizügigkeit genießen.

Obwohl in dem Bericht keine Belege für den „Missbrauch von Sozialleistungen" angeführt werden, werden darin Widereinreiseverbote für Migranten vorgeschlagen, die das Recht auf Freizügigkeit „missbrauchen". Des Weiteren wird vorgeschlagen, den Aufenthalt von Migranten zu begrenzen, wenn sie in Deutschland eine Arbeitsstelle suchen. Die deutsche Regierung möchte zudem gegen Einwanderer vorgehen, die Kindergeld beantragen, indem sie unter anderem eine Steuernummer vorweisen sollen.

Wie die Kommission in ihrer Antwort auf die die Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000356/2014 mitgeteilt hat, garantiert Artikel 45 AEUV vorbehaltlos das Recht auf Freizügigkeit für alle EU-Arbeitnehmer, und in Artikel 21 AEUV wird dieses Recht für nicht erwerbstätige EU-Bürger lediglich gewissen Beschränkungen unterworfen. In Artikel 7 der Richtlinie 2004/38 ist festgelegt, dass EU-Bürger ohne Erwerbstätigkeit das Recht auf einen Aufenthalt von über drei Monaten nur dann haben, wenn sie über eine umfassende Krankenversicherung und ausreichende finanzielle Mittel für sich und ihre Familie verfügen, so dass sie das Sozialhilfesystem des Aufnahmemitgliedstaats nicht belasten. Arbeitsuchende können sich — ohne weitere Bedingungen zu erfüllen — bis zu sechs Monate in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat aufhalten oder gegebenenfalls länger, wenn sie nachweisen, dass sie realistische Aussichten auf einen Arbeitsplatz haben.

1. Sind die Vorschläge der deutschen Regierung, das Recht auf Freizügigkeit einzuschränken, nach Ansicht der Kommission mit den EU-Rechtsvorschriften vereinbar? Wäre es insbesondere verhältnismäßig, Wiedereinreiseverbote gegen Personen zu verhängen, die widerrechtlich Sozialleistungen beantragt haben?

2. Wären die vorgeschlagenen Beschränkungen in Bezug auf das Kindergeld und die Aufenthaltsdauer von Arbeitssuchenden mit EU-Rechtsvorschriften vereinbar?

3. Wie wird die Kommission sicherstellen, dass Deutschland bei der Umsetzung dieser Vorschläge oder andere Maßnahmen in Bezug auf die Freizügigkeit die EU-Rechtsvorschriften in vollem Maße einhält?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(5. Juni 2014)

Der Kommission sind der Zwischenbericht „Rechtsfragen und Herausforderungen bei der Inanspruchnahme der sozialen Sicherungssysteme durch Angehörige der EU-Mitgliedstaaten" vom 26. März 2014 des ad-hoc eingesetzten Staatssekretärs-Ausschusses und die darin erörterten und vorgeschlagenen Maßnahmen bekannt.

Die Kommission verfolgt die Entwicklung dieser Erörterungen genau und steht mit den deutschen Behörden im Kontakt, um die vollständige Übereinstimmung künftiger Maßnahmen mit dem EU-Recht sicherzustellen. Sobald der Bericht fertiggestellt ist, wird die Kommission prüfen, inwieweit die Maßnahmen, die Deutschland zu treffen gedenkt, mit dem EU-Recht vereinbar sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003934/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) and Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: German interim report on unemployed migrants from EU Member States

On 26 March, the German Government published an interim government report considering limiting the right of unemployed migrants from other EU Member States to remain in Germany and tightening access to welfare benefits and services.

The interior minister said that problems of EU internal migration were 'manageable at a national level but of concern regionally', referring to the concentration of poor jobless immigrants in some cities. The German debate on free movement was spurred by the fact that Romanians and Bulgarians obtained full movement rights on 1 January 2014.

Although the report does not provide any evidence of 'welfare abuse', it proposes to impose re-entry bans on migrants 'abusing' freedom of movement. In addition, it proposes in particular to limit the stay of migrants if they are in Germany for purposes of seeking a job. The German Government also wants to crack down on immigrants claiming child benefits, inter alia by requiring a tax registration number.

As stated by the Commission in its answer to Written Question E-000356/2014, Article 45 TFEU guarantees the right to free movement for all EU workers without conditions, whereas Article 21 TFEU confers such a right to non-active EU citizens subject only to certain limitations. Article 7 of Directive 2004/38 specifies that, to have the right to reside for longer than three months in another Member State, non-active EU citizens must have comprehensive health insurance and sufficient financial resources not to become a burden on the host Member State's social assistance system. Jobseekers can reside for up to six months without conditions and possibly longer if they show that they have a genuine chance of finding a job.

1. Does the Commission consider the proposals to limit free movement by the German Government to be in line with EC law? In particular, would it be proportionate to impose re-entry bans on persons unlawfully claiming social benefits?

2. Would the proposed limitations on child benefit and on the length of stay of jobseekers be in accordance with EC law?

3. How will the Commission make sure that Germany, when implementing these proposals or other policies related to free movement, is in full compliance with EC law?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of the interim report of 26 March 2014 by the ad hoc committee of State Secretaries entitled 'Legal questions and challenges regarding the utilization of social security systems by EU citizens' and the measures it discusses and proposes.

The Commission is closely monitoring the evolution of these discussions and is in contact with the German authorities with a view to ensuring full compliance of any future measures with EC law in this regard. After the report is finalised, the Commission will make its assessment as to the compatibility with EC law of the measures which Germany decides to take.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003935/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD) e Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Attacchi del governo turco al popolo armeno

Il popolo armeno continua a subire violenze e minacce da parte del governo di Ankara. La città armena di Kessab, nella Siria nordorientale, è stata attaccata improvvisamente da milizie paramilitari turche con il sostegno dei gruppi fondamentalisti islamici che si trovano in Siria. L'intera cittadina è stata occupata, le chiese profanate e le case saccheggiate, tutto questo all'indomani dell'incidente che ha visto l'abbattimento di un aereo militare siriano da parte della contraerea turca per presunto sconfinamento. Preso atto che la situazione dei cristiani del Medio Oriente, compresa quella del popolo armeno, è sempre più difficile a causa delle repressioni da parte dei gruppi fondamentalisti, la Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza dei fatti descritti?

2. intende bloccare i negoziati di adesione con la Turchia fino a quando il governo di Erdogan non comincerà a rispettare i diritti umani e la libertà religiosa?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(5 giugno 2014)

L'Unione rimane in stretto contatto con la Turchia per quanto riguarda la crisi siriana. Nell'ambito del dialogo intensificato tra l'UE e la Turchia sulle questioni di politica estera che interessano entrambe le parti, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente e il servizio europeo per l'azione esterna tengono regolarmente consultazioni con la Turchia, a diversi livelli, su tutti gli aspetti della crisi siriana.

Gli avvenimenti a cui si riferisce l'onorevole deputato non sono stati accertati. Il ministero degli Esteri turco ha negato che il suo paese sostenga le forze di opposizione siriane permettendo loro di utilizzare il suo territorio, o con altri mezzi, nell'ambito del conflitto intensificatosi di recente nella regione Latakia/Kessab. Secondo il ministero, inoltre, la Turchia ha comunicato agli organismi competenti dell'ONU di essere disposta ad accogliere e a proteggere i siriani di origine armena che vivono nella regione di Kessab.

I negoziati di adesione con la Turchia proseguono in base al quadro negoziale adottato all'unanimità dal Consiglio nell'ottobre 2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003935/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD) and Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 March 2014)

Subject: Attacks by the Turkish Government on the Armenian people

The Armenian people are continuing to suffer acts of violence and threats by the Ankara Government. The Armenian city of Kessab in north-eastern Syria has now been attacked without warning by militias from Turkey with the support of Islamic fundamentalist groups in Syria. The entire town was occupied, churches desecrated and houses looted after a Syrian Air Force jet allegedly trespassing in Turkish airspace was shot down by Turkish antiaircraft batteries. The situation of Christians in the Middle East, including the Armenian people, is becoming increasingly difficult as a result of acts of repression by fundamentalist groups. In view of this:

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Does it intend to suspend negotiations with Turkey until Erdogan's government begins to respect human rights and religious freedoms?

Answer given by Commissioner Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The EU remains in close contact with Turkey on the crisis in Syria. In the framework of the enhanced EU-Turkey foreign policy dialogue on issues of common interest, the High Representative/Vice-President HR/VP and the European External Action Service hold regular consultations with Turkey at various levels on all aspects of the Syrian crisis.

The reported events mentioned by the Honourable Member have not been verified. The Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs refuted allegations that Turkey is providing support to the opposition forces by letting them use its territory or through other means during the conflict which has intensified recently in the Latakia/Kessab region. It also stated that Turkey notified the relevant UN bodies that Syrian Armenians residing in the Kessab region could be admitted into Turkey and protection could be provided to them.

As for Turkey's accession negotiations, they continue to be conducted on the basis of the Negotiating Framework adopted unanimously by the Council in October 2005.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003937/14
an die Kommission
Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(31. März 2014)

Betrifft: Plastikmüll in der Donau

Laut einer aktuellen Studie ([1]) schwemmt die Donau pro Tag 4,2 Tonnen Plastikmüll in das Schwarze Meer. Im Rahmen der Studie gingen den Forschern mehr Plastikteile als Fischlarven ins Netz. Plastikpartikel im Wasser sind ein sehr ernstes ökologisches und in weiterer Folge gesundheitliches Problem. Flora und Fauna werden dadurch stark beschädigt; durch die Aufnahme in die Nahrungskette ist auch der Mensch betroffen da die Chemikalien gesundheitsschädlich bzw. hormonell wirksam sind.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Hat die Kommission Kenntnis von den Ergebnissen dieser Studie?

2. Geht die Kommission davon aus, dass die Verschmutzung durch Plastikteile in anderen europäischen Flüssen vergleichbar mit der in der Donau ist?

3. Verfügt die Kommission über Daten, wie viel Plastik in europäischen Flüssen mitgeführt wird und in weiterer Folge in die Meere gespült wird?

4. Wenn nein, plant die Kommission derartige Daten erheben zu lassen?

5. Verfügt die Kommission über Daten zum Anteil der Meeresverschmutzung durch Plastik, der von europäischen Flüssen ins Meer geschwemmt wurde?

6. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission bisher ergriffen um der Verschmutzung europäischer Flüsse durch Plastik entgegenzuwirken?

7. Welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission, um diesem Problem zu begegnen?

8. Wie viel Forschungsmittel der Europäischen Union wurden bis jetzt eingesetzt, um die Verunreinigung von Flüssen durch Plastik zu untersuchen?

9. In welchen konkreten Forschungsprojekten wurden diese Mittel verwendet, und zu welchen Ergebnissen kamen diese Arbeiten?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(13. Mai 2014)

Der Kommission ist die Studie bekannt.

Die Verunreinigung der Flüsse durch Kunststoffabfälle ist ein Thema von zunehmender Bedeutung. Es gibt jedoch noch keine eindeutigen Belege für ihren Einfluss auf den ökologischen Zustand der Flüsse. Diese Form der Verunreinigung wurde nur in sehr wenigen Bewirtschaftungsplänen für Einzugsgebiete, die die Mitgliedstaaten für die erste Runde der Wasserrahmenrichtlinie ([2]) erstellt haben, als signifikante Belastung angesehen.

Der Kommission liegen keine Statistiken darüber vor, woher die Verschmutzung der Flüsse mit Kunststoffabfällen stammt und welche Mengen an Kunststoff von europäischen Flüssen mitgeführt werden und in der Folge ins Meer gelangen. Gemäß Artikel 11 der Meeresstrategie-Rahmenrichtlinie müssen die Mitgliedstaaten bis zum 15. Juli 2014 Überwachungsprogramme erstellen, die alle in Anhang I der Richtlinie aufgeführten Deskriptoren der Meeresumwelt, einschließlich Abfällen im Meer, umfassen.

([1]) Lechner, A. et al., The Danube so colourful: A potpourri of plastic litter outnumbers fish larvae in Europe's second largest river, Environment Pollution (2014) http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0269749114000475

([2]) Richtlinie 2000/60/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 23. Oktober 2000 zur Schaffung eines Ordnungsrahmens für Maßnahmen der Gemeinschaft im Bereich der Wasserpolitik (ABl. L 327 vom 22.12.2000).

Die Kommission unterstützt ein Projekt zur Feststellung und Bewertung des Abfalleintrags in die Umwelt (auch in die Meeresumwelt) durch die Flüsse mit einem Betrag von 192 450 EUR. Die Ergebnisse werden voraussichtlich im Herbst 2014 vorliegen. Ziel ist es, Programme zur Überwachung von Abfällen in Flüssen festzulegen, gemeinsame Ansätze zu entwickeln und einige erste Bewertungen der in die Meeresumwelt gelangenden Klein- und Kleinstabfälle vorzulegen, indem europäische Flüsse überwacht werden. Die Kommission beabsichtigt, Fragen zu Meeresabfällen und der Verunreinigung durch Kunststoff in ihrer Mitteilung zur Kreislaufwirtschaft aufzugreifen, die im Laufe dieses Jahres angenommen werden soll.

Mit dem Projekt DANCERS ([3]) soll ein strategischer Forschungsplan für Umweltforschung und Innovation erarbeitet werden. Das damit befasste Konsortium hat als Schwerpunktbereiche für künftige Forschungstätigkeiten die Auswirkungen von Abfällen in Flüssen auf die Meeresumwelt und die Suche nach innovativen Überwachungsverfahren festgelegt.

([3]) Eine laufende Koordinierungs- und Unterstützungsmaßnahme, die über das Siebte Forschungsrahmenprogramm finanziert wird und zum Kapazitätsaufbau, zur Exzellenz und zur Innovation im Donaugebiet einschließlich des Donaudeltas und des Einzugsgebiets der Flüsse am Schwarzen Meer (Meeresbecken, Delta und Meer) beitragen soll.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003937/14
to the Commission
Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Plastic litter in the Danube

According to a recent study ([1]) every day 4.2 tonnes of plastic litter are carried down the Danube into the Black Sea. The samples taken by researchers conducting the study contained more pieces of plastic than fish larvae. Plastic particles in the water give rise to serious environmental and, subsequently, health problems: they cause extensive damage to river flora and fauna and, when they enter the food chain, people are affected as well, because the chemicals the particles contain are harmful to health and in some cases disrupt the hormonal system.

1. Is the Commission aware of the findings of this study?

2. Does the Commission assume that plastic-litter pollution affects other European rivers to a similar extent?

3. Does the Commission have statistics on the amount of plastic carried into the sea by European rivers?

4. If not, does the Commission plan to have such statistics compiled?

5. Does the Commission have statistics on the share of marine pollution by plastics accounted for by plastic litter carried into the sea by European rivers?

6. What steps has the Commission taken thus far to counter the pollution of European rivers by plastics?

7. What further steps does the Commission plan to take to address this problem?

8. How much EU research funding has been devoted to investigating the pollution of rivers by plastics?

9. For what specific research projects was this funding used and what findings did those projects produce?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2014)

The Commission is aware of the study in question.

Plastic litter in rivers is an emerging issue. There is no clear evidence yet about its impact on the ecological status of rivers. This pollution was considered as a significant pressure in only a very few River Basin Management Plans established by Member States (MS) for the 1st cycle of the Water Framework Directive. ([2])

The Commission does not have statistics on the sources of plastic pollution in rivers, the amount of plastic carried into the seas by rivers or on the share of marine pollution by plastics accounted for by plastic litter carried out into the sea by European rivers. MS are required under Art. 11 of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive to establish and implement monitoring programmes, by 15 July 2014, which cover all descriptors of marine environment outlined in Annex I of that directive, including marine litter.

The Commission supports a project on the 'identification and assessment of riverine input (including into the marine environment) of litter', to the value of EUR 192,450. Results are expected in autumn 2014. It aims to identify monitoring programmes of riverine litter, to develop common approaches, and to make some initial assessments of small and micro-sized litter entering the marine environment by monitoring European rivers. The Commission intends to include the issues of marine litter and plastic waste in its communication on the circular economy, scheduled for adoption later this year.

([1]) Lechner, A. et al., The Danube so colourful: A potpourri of plastic litter outnumbers fish larvae in Europe's second largest river, Environment Pollution (2014), http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0269749114000475

([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (OJ L 327, 22.12.2000).

The Dancers ([3]) project is expected to come up with a Strategic Research Agenda for environmental research and innovation. The consortium has identified the impact of river litter to marine environment, including innovative ways of monitoring, as a priority area for future research activities.

([3]) An on-going Coordination and Support Action funded under the 7th Framework Programme to promote capacity building, excellence and innovation in the Danube Region, including the Danube Delta and the Black Sea River Systems (basin, delta and sea).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-003938/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Εκ των υστέρων ουσιώδης αλλαγή των όρων του διαγωνισμού για το Ελληνικό

Το Ελληνικό Ταμείο Αξιοποίησης Ιδιωτικής Περιουσίας (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ) συστήθηκε με αποστολή την αξιοποίηση της δημόσιας περιουσίας. Στις συνεδριάσεις του ΔΣ παρίστανται δυο παρατηρητές που προτείνονται από τα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωζώνης και την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή. Το Ταμείο λειτουργεί συνεπώς χωρίς τις συνήθεις διασφαλίσεις ελέγχου που προσφέρει η εθνική νομοθεσία και με σοβαρό ρόλο σε ό,τι αφορά τη διασφάλιση της διαφάνειας από πλευράς Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής.

Σε 6 μεγάλους διαγωνισμούς του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ, όπου υπήρξε ενδιαφέρον 3 και περισσότερων επενδυτών (ΔΕΣΦΑ, ΟΠΑΠ, Κρατικά Λαχεία, Διεθνές Κέντρο Ραδιοτηλεόρασης, ΔΕΠΑ, Ελληνικό), παραδόξως οι 5 έμειναν με μία μόνον τελική προσφορά. Ειδικά στο Ελληνικό, η κατάθεση μίας μόνο προσφοράς αναγράφεται στον Τύπο ότι συνδέεται με την αλλαγή ουσιωδών όρων του διαγωνισμού στη διάρκειά του. Ειδικότερα στην τελευταία φάση, τον Δεκέμβριο του 2013, και κατόπιν αποχώρησης ενός εκ των τεσσάρων προεπιλεγμένων επενδυτών, το Ταμείο άλλαξε ουσιώδη όρο του διαγωνισμού, αυξάνοντας (εκ των υστέρων) κατά πολύ την ελκυστικότητα της σχετικής επένδυσης. Συγκεκριμένα, και ενώ το ΤΑΙΠΕΔ επρόκειτο, με βάση την αρχική προκήρυξη (Request For Proposal, 9.1.2013 σελ. 28), να λαμβάνει το 30% όλων των οικονομικών ωφελημάτων που θα έδινε η πωλούμενη εταιρία προς τους μετόχους της, στην τελική ανακοίνωση του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ (26.3.2014) αναφέρεται ότι ο επενδυτής θα δικαιούται μιας σωρευτικής αποδοτικότητας της επένδυσης (IRR) 15%, χωρίς να πληρώσει τίποτε στο ελληνικό δημόσιο, που θα λαμβάνει το 30% (earn out right) μόνο για το υπερβάλλον ποσό.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Τι εξυπηρετεί η ύπαρξη των παρατηρητών που έχει ορίσει;

Γνώριζαν οι προτεινόμενοι από την ίδια παρατηρητές τη δραστική αλλαγή των όρων του σχετικού διαγωνισμού;

Γνωρίζουν αν προσεκλήθη υπό τους νέους όρους ο επενδυτής που είχε αποσυρθεί λόγω χαμηλής απόδοσης της επένδυσης και αν δόθηκε μεγαλύτερος χρόνος για να καταθέσουν προσφορές οι άλλοι δύο επενδυτές που τελικά απείχαν, μετά την δραστική αλλαγή των όρων του διαγωνισμού που έγινε μετά το Δεκέμβριο του 2013;

Συμφωνεί ότι οι αποκρατικοποιήσεις πρέπει να προχωρούν με ταχύτητα αλλά προπαντός με διαφάνεια και τους ουσιώδεις όρους να είναι εκ των προτέρων και έγκαιρα γνωστοί σε όλους τους ενδιαφερόμενους;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005218/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(23 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Διαδικασίες του διαγωνισμού ΤΑΙΠΕΔ για το Ελληνικό

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έχει προνομιακή πληροφόρηση για τον διαγωνισμό του Ελληνικού Ταμείου Αξιοποίησης Δημόσιας Περιουσίας (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ), για το οικόπεδο του τέως αεροδρομίου του Ελληνικού, λόγω της παρουσίας παρατηρητών τους οποίους έχει ορίσει στο ΔΣ του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ.

Έχει ενημερωθεί η Επιτροπή για τις διαδικασίες που ακολουθήθηκαν και μπορεί να διαβεβαιώσει υπεύθυνα ότι δεν υπήρξε καμία παραβίαση του ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου στο πλαίσιο των διαδικασιών αυτών;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Ιουνίου 2014)

Το έργο του Ελληνικού άρχισε τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011 με την εκδήλωση ενδιαφέροντος, τη δημοσίευση του νόμου για το Ελληνικό τον Μάρτιο του 2012, την προεπιλογή επενδυτών τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2012, τις διαπραγματεύσεις με τους τέσσερις επενδυτές κατά τη διάρκεια του Νοεμβρίου του 2013, την οριστικοποίηση της συμφωνίας αγοράς μετοχών τον Ιανουάριο του 2014 και των προσφορών στη συνέχεια. Τη διαδικασία διαχειρίζεται το ΤΑΙΠΕΔ σε συνεργασία με εταιρείες εξωτερικών συμβούλων.

Οι δυνητικοί επενδυτές έχουν το δικαίωμα να προσβάλουν νομικά τις αποφάσεις του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ, εάν θεωρούν ότι η διαδικασία δεν ήταν ανοικτή και δίκαιη. Βάσει των διαθέσιμων πληροφοριών, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει υπόψη της τυχόν ανησυχίες σχετικά με την (ενδεχόμενη) εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ για τις δημόσιες συμβάσεις στη συναλλαγή.

Οι τελικοί όροι της διαδικασίας του διαγωνισμού φαίνεται να προβλέπουν εύλογη απόδοση για τους επενδυτές, γεγονός που δημιουργεί κίνητρα για την ανάληψη σημαντικών επενδύσεων. Επιπλέον των 915 εκατ. ευρώ που κατέβαλε για να κερδίσει τον διαγωνισμό, ο επιλεγείς υποψήφιος θα επενδύσει 1,3 δισ. ευρώ στο πάρκο και τις υποδομές. Το σχέδιο αναμένεται να δημιουργήσει 59 000 θέσεις εργασίας, να δώσει ώθηση στην οικονομία και να αναβαθμίσει το περιβάλλον ([1]).

([1]) Περισσότερες πληροφορίες μπορείτε να βρείτε στη διεύθυνση: www.hraf.gr/en/portfolio/hellinikon

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003938/14
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Retroactive substantial change in the terms of the call for tenders for Elliniko

The Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (HRADF) was set up with the task of maximising value from the sale and/or development of state assets. Its board meetings are attended by two observers proposed by the Eurozone Member States and the Commission. The Fund thus operates without the usual safeguards provided by controls through national legislation, and the Commission has an important role to play in ensuring transparency. to maximise the value to the Hellenic Republic from the development and/or sale of assets.to maximise the value to the Hellenic Republic from the development and/or sale of ass

It is a curious fact that, of six major calls for tender organised by HRADF, in which three or more investors were involved (DESFA, OPAP, State Lotteries, the International Broadcasting Centre, DEPA and Elliniko), five attracted only one final bid. Especially in the case of the Elliniko, the submission of one single bid is linked in the press to a change in the substantive terms of the call for tenders while it was still under way. Especially in the latest phase, in December 2013, after the withdrawal of one of the four preselected investors, the Fund changed a substantive condition of the call for tenders, retroactively greatly increasing the attractiveness of the investment. More, specifically, while on the basis of the original announcement (Request For Proposal, 9.1.2013 p. 28), HRADF was to take 30% of all the economic benefits that the enterprise being sold off would pay to its shareholders, HRADF's latest press release of 26.03.2014 states that the investor will be entitled to an Internal Rate of Return (IRR) of 15%, without paying anything to the Greek Government, which would earn outright 30% only on the excess amount.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

What purpose is served by the observers it has appointed?

Did the observers proposed by the Commission itself know of the drastic change made in the terms of the call for tenders?

Do they know whether the investor who had withdrawn due to a low return on the investment was invited to bid again under the new conditions and whether two other investors who ultimately withdrew were given a longer period of time to submit their bids after the drastic change in the terms of the call for tenders made after December 2013?

Does it agree that privatisation measures must proceed very expeditiously, but above all transparently, and that the substantive conditions must be made known in good time to all interested parties?

Question for written answer E-005218/14
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: HRADF tendering procedures for the Ellinikon site

Due to the presence of observers it has appointed to the Board of HRADF, the Commission is well informed about the tendering procedures held by the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (HRADF) for the site of the former Ellinikon airport.

Has the Commission been informed about the procedures followed and can it responsibly confirm that no violation of EC law occurred during the course of these procedures?

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

The Hellinikon project started in December 2011 with the expression of interest, the publication of the 'Hellinikon law' in March 2012, the pre-qualification of investors in September 2012, negotiations with the four investors through November 2013, the finalisation of the Share Purchase Agreement in January 2014 and of the bids thereafter. The process was managed by HRADF with the cooperation of external advisor firms.

Potential investors are entitled to challenge the HRADF decisions legally, if they feel that the process has not been open and fair. Based on the available information, the Commission is not aware of any concerns relating to the application of the EU public procurement law (if applicable) to the transaction.

The final tender terms seem to provide for a reasonable return to investors, creating incentives to undertake sizeable investment. In addition to EUR 915 million paid to win the tender, the retained bidder will invest EUR 1.3 billion in the park and infrastructure. The project is expected to create 59 000 jobs, give impetus to the economy and upgrade the environment ([1]).

([1]) More information you can find at: www.hraf.gr/en/portfolio/hellinikon

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-003939/14
adresată Consiliului
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(31 martie 2014)

Subiect: Crearea de locuri de muncă pentru tineri prin investiții în cercetare și inovare

Strategia Europa 2020 își propune să asigure o creștere economică inteligentă (prin investiții mai eficiente în educație, cercetare și inovare), durabilă (prin orientarea decisivă către o economie cu emisii scăzute de carbon și o industrie competitivă), favorabilă incluziunii (prin punerea accentului pe crearea de locuri de muncă și pe reducerea sărăciei). Strategia Europa 2020 continuă și completează Strategia de la Lisabona adoptată în luna martie 2000, strategie care impunea statelor membre ale UE alocarea anuală a 3% din PIB pentru investiții în cercetare și inovare, din care o treime să fie asigurate de către sectorul public și două treimi de către sectorul privat. Investițiile în cercetare și inovare facilitează atât modernizarea industriei europene, cât și crearea de locuri de muncă, de care ar putea beneficia în special tinerii. În prezent, rata șomajului în rândul tinerilor europeni este de aproximativ 25%, în unele țări, precum Spania și Grecia, aceasta ajungând chiar la 50%. În același timp, un număr mare de state membre nu au investit anual 3% pentru cercetare și inovare, limitând astfel oportunitățile de angajare de care ar putea să beneficieze în special tinerii.

Având în vedere că principala preocupare a cetățenilor europeni și, în special, a tinerilor europeni este legată de lipsa locurilor de muncă, aș dori să întreb Consiliul UE care sunt măsurile pe care le are în vedere pentru a determina statele membre să aloce 3% din PIB pentru cercetare și inovare?

Răspuns
(19 mai 2014)

Măsurile care asigură alocarea a 3 % din PIB cercetării și inovării, precum și măsurile care promovează ocuparea forței de muncă și crearea de locuri de muncă sunt, în principal, măsuri care țin de politica națională și, prin urmare, sunt de competența fiecărui stat membru în parte.

La 21 februarie 2014, Consiliul a reafirmat importanța dezvoltării în continuare a Spațiului european de cercetare în contextul Uniunii inovării, ca o componentă necesară a Strategiei Europa 2020 pentru creștere economică și ocuparea forței de muncă ([1]).

În acest context, Consiliul consideră de asemenea că consolidarea fiscală pe cheltuiala cercetării și dezvoltării va pune în pericol în viitor creșterea economică și crearea de locuri de muncă și subliniază necesitatea de a acorda atenție calității, eficienței și compoziției cheltuielilor pentru cercetare și inovare, în vederea obținerii unui impact cât mai mare asupra noii faze de creștere economică și de creare de locuri de muncă în Uniunea Europeană și a valorizării la maximum a banilor publici investiți în cercetare și inovare, inclusiv în legătură cu semestrul european.

([1]) Documentul 6945/14.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003939/14
to the Council
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Creating jobs for young people through investment in research and innovation

The Europe 2020 strategy aims to deliver growth that is smart (through more effective investments in education, research and innovation); sustainable (thanks to a decisive move towards a low-carbon economy and competitive industry); and inclusive (with a strong emphasis on job creation and poverty reduction). The Europe 2020 strategy continues and supplements the Lisbon strategy adopted in March 2000, under which the EU Member States were to allocate 3% of annual GDP to investment in research and innovation, a third of which was to be provided by the public sector and two thirds by the private sector. Investment in research and innovation helps to modernise European industry and create jobs, especially for young people. The youth unemployment rate in Europe currently stands at around 25%, reaching 50% in some countries such as Spain and Greece. At the same time, many Member States have failed to invest 3% per year in research and innovation, and this has restricted the job opportunities that could have benefited young people in particular.

Given that the main concern for European citizens, and in particular for young Europeans, is linked to the lack of jobs, can the Council say what measures it is planning to take to ensure that the Member States allocate 3% of GDP to research and innovation?

Reply
(19 May 2014)

Measures to ensure the allocation of 3% of GDP to research and innovation as well as measures to promote employment and job creation are mainly issues of national policy and are therefore a matter for individual Member States.

On 21 February 2014, the Council reaffirmed the importance of the further development of the European Research Area in the context of the Innovation Union, as a necessary component of the Europe 2020 strategy to create growth and jobs ([1]).

In this context, the Council also considers that fiscal consolidation at the expense of R&D will endanger future growth and job creation and emphasises the need to pay attention to the quality, efficiency and composition of research and innovation spending in order to make the most of its impact on the new phase of growth and jobs in the European Union and to derive maximum value from public money invested in research and innovation, including in connection with the European Semester.

([1]) Doc. 6945/14.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003940/14
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(31 martie 2014)

Subiect: Crearea de locuri de muncă pentru tineri prin investiții în cercetare și inovare

Strategia Europa 2020 își propune să asigure o creștere economică inteligentă (prin investiții mai eficiente în educație, cercetare și inovare), durabilă (prin orientarea decisivă către o economie cu emisii scăzute de carbon și o industrie competitivă), favorabilă incluziunii (prin punerea accentului pe crearea de locuri de muncă și pe reducerea sărăciei). Strategia Europa 2020 continuă și completează Strategia de la Lisabona adoptata în luna martie 2000, strategie care impunea statelor membre ale UE alocarea anuală a 3% din PIB pentru investiții în cercetare și inovare, din care o treime să fie asigurate de către sectorul public și două treimi de către sectorul privat. Investițiile în cercetare și inovare facilitează atât modernizarea industriei europene, cât și crearea de locuri de muncă, de care ar putea beneficia în special tinerii. În prezent, rata șomajului în rândul tinerilor europeni este de aproximativ 25%, în unele țări precum Spania și Grecia, aceasta ajungând chiar la 50%. În același timp, un număr mare de state membre nu au investit anual 3% pentru cercetare și inovare, limitând astfel oportunitățile de angajare de care ar putea să beneficieze în special tinerii.

Având în vedere că principala preocupare a cetățenilor europeni și, în special, a tinerilor europeni este legată de lipsa locurilor de muncă, aș dori să întreb Comisia care sunt măsurile pe care le are în vedere pentru a determina statele membre să aloce 3% din PIB pentru cercetare și inovare.

Răspuns dat de dna Geoghegan-Quinn în numele Comisiei
(21 mai 2014)

În contextul Strategiei Europa 2020, fiecare stat membru a fost invitat să își stabilească propriul obiectiv național privind intensitatea C&D. Comunicarea Comisiei „Bilanțul Strategiei Europa 2020 pentru o creștere inteligentă, durabilă și favorabilă incluziunii” ([1]) prezintă în anexa 2 situația pentru fiecare stat membru privind propriul obiectiv.

După ce a rămas stabilă la aproximativ 1,85 % între 2000 și 2007, intensitatea C&D totală a UE a crescut la 2,01 % în 2009 și a crescut doar moderat ulterior, atingând un nivel de 2,06 % în 2012. Progresele înregistrate în ultimii ani în direcția atingerii obiectivului de 3 %, deși lente, decurg în principal din politicile la nivelul UE și al statelor membre de stimulare a investițiilor private în C&D (printre altele, crearea unui efect de pârghie mai eficient prin finanțare publică, condiții-cadru mai favorabile inovării și stimulente fiscale), precum și de protejare și promovare a finanțării publice a C&D în ciuda crizei, în conformitate cu principiul de consolidare bugetară favorabilă creșterii. Progresele în ceea ce privește angajamentele inițiativei emblematice „O Uniune a inovării” au dus la un brevet unitar, accelerarea procesului de standardizare, modernizarea normelor UE în materie de achiziții publice și un pașaport european pentru fondurile cu capital de risc, toate contribuind la un mediu de afaceri mai favorabil inovării în Europa și, prin urmare, mai atractiv pentru investițiile private în C&D.

Comisia va continua, în contextul semestrului european, să monitorizeze eforturile depuse de statele membre în ceea ce privește investițiile și reformele în materie de cercetare și inovare și să le propună recomandări, după caz. Mai mult, Comisia va face propuneri pentru implementarea Strategiei Europa 2020 la începutul anului 2015.

([1]) COM(2014)130, 5/3/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003940/14
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Creating jobs for young people through investment in research and innovation

The Europe 2020 strategy aims to deliver growth that is smart (through more effective investments in education, research and innovation); sustainable (thanks to a decisive move towards a low-carbon economy and competitive industry); and inclusive (with a strong emphasis on job creation and poverty reduction). The Europe 2020 strategy continues and supplements the Lisbon strategy adopted in March 2000, under which the EU Member States were to allocate 3% of annual GDP to investment in research and innovation, a third of which was to be provided by the public sector and two thirds by the private sector. Investment in research and innovation helps to modernise European industry and create jobs, especially for young people. The youth unemployment rate in Europe currently stands at around 25%, reaching 50% in some countries such as Spain and Greece. At the same time, many Member States have failed to invest 3% per year in research and innovation, and this has restricted the job opportunities that could have benefited young people in particular.

Given that the main concern for European citizens, and in particular for young Europeans, is linked to the lack of jobs, can the Commission say what measures it is planning to take to ensure that the Member States allocate 3% of GDP to research and innovation?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2014)

In the context of the Europe 2020 strategy, each Member State has been invited to set its own national R&D intensity target. The communication of the Commission 'Taking stock of the Europe 2020 strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth' ([1]) presents in its Annex 2 the situation for each Member State regarding its own target.

After remaining stable at around 1.85% between 2000 and 2007, the EU's overall R&D intensity increased to 2.01% in 2009 and increased only moderately thereafter, reaching a level of 2.06% in 2012. The progress made in recent years towards the 3% target, although slow, results mainly from policies at EU and Member State level to foster private investment in R&D (i.e. improved leveraging through public funding, more innovation-friendly framework conditions and fiscal incentives), and to protect and promote public funding of R&D despite the crisis, in line with the principle of growth-friendly fiscal consolidation. Progress with respect to the commitments of the 'Innovation Union' flagship initiative has resulted in a unitary patent, faster standard-setting, modernised EU procurement rules and a European passport for venture capital funds, all of which make the business environment in Europe more innovation-friendly and thereby more attractive for private R&D investment.

The Commission will continue, in the context of the European Semester, to monitor the efforts of Member States as regards research and innovation investments and reforms and to propose recommendations to them as appropriate. Furthermore, the Commission will make proposals for the pursuit of the Europe 2020 strategy early in 2015.

([1]) COM(2014)130, 5.3.2014.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003941/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(31 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Cierre de plantas de cogeneración y contaminación por purines

El Gobierno español aprobó una «Reforma energética» que ataca directamente a las energías renovables modificando el sistema retributivo de la producción de energía renovable, la cogeneración y los residuos. Esta reforma supone la desaparición del actual sistema de primas a las energías renovables y perjudica a la energía eólica, a la solar y a las plantas de cogeneración ([1]). Las plantas de cogeneración se utilizan para el tratamiento de purines y actualmente representan un elemento esencial para el mantenimiento del sector porcino, muy importante en todo el Estado español. La modificación aprobada por el Ejecutivo español hará que las 29 plantas de tratamiento de purines españolas acaben cerrando debido a su inviabilidad económica (en Cataluña ya han cerrado las seis plantas de cogeneración que gestionaban los excedentes de 480 explotaciones porcinas). Esto supondrá una acumulación de residuos de purines y, en consecuencia, una situación crítica para las explotaciones ganaderas y un elevado riesgo ambiental. Los vertidos ilegales de purines tienen una elevada carga de nitratos y, si el suelo no los absorbe bien, contaminan las aguas subterráneas provocando un grave impacto ambiental. Ganaderos de Lleida (Cataluña) ya han vertido de manera ilegal más purines de los permitidos en el campo alegando el cierre de las plantas de tratamiento ([2]). Los Estados miembros de la UE tienen como objetivo conseguir un 20 % de producción energética mediante energías renovables para el 2020, como contempla la Directiva de Energías Renovables (2009/28/CE). La Directiva Marco del Agua (2000/60/CE) tiene como objetivo alcanzar el buen estado ecológico de todas las masas de agua para 2015 y la Directiva de nitratos (91/676/CEE) tiene por objeto proteger las aguas contra la contaminación producida por nitratos.

¿Conocía la Comisión los efectos de la reforma energética sobre las plantas de cogeneración y, en consecuencia, sobre el tratamiento de los purines?

¿Considera la Comisión que el Estado español está infringiendo las Directivas europeas citadas anteriormente?

¿Esta reforma supone una amenaza para la calidad de las aguas subterráneas?

¿Se debería frenar la ampliación de las autorizaciones de las granjas de engorde y apostar por un modelo que no se base en la ganadería intensiva?

¿Se debería exigir a los ganaderos que se acojan al Decreto 136/2009 que preveía el cambio de alimentación con nuevos piensos que disminuían los nitratos de las deyecciones?

¿Qué medidas pretende llevar a cabo la Comisión ante esta situación?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión es conocedora de la reforma del sector eléctrico llevada a cabo por España y analizará la compatibilidad de los textos legislativos definitivos con la legislación de la UE, para estudiar si es necesaria y adecuada una actuación adicional de la UE.

Según los datos de Eurostat, en 2012 la cuota de las energías renovables en el consumo final de energía era del 14.3 %, por encima del objetivo intermedio para el período 2011-2012, fijado en la Directiva 2009/28/CE sobre las energías renovables., del 11 %. Así pues, España debería asegurarse de que esta trayectoria se mantiene con medidas nacionales efectivas, a fin de alcanzar su objetivo nacional en materia de energía renovable del 20 % para 2020.

La Directiva sobre los nitratos tiene por objeto prevenir y reducir la contaminación del agua por nitratos procedentes de la agricultura. Exige a los Estados miembros que controlen la calidad del agua, designen zonas vulnerables a los nitratos y establezcan programas de acción obligatorios que incluyan las medidas de su anexo III. Los Estados miembros pueden incluir otras medidas, como, por ejemplo, estrategias en materia de alimentación animal para reducir el contenido de estiércol en los nutrientes. Además, deben llevarse a cabo acciones reforzadas en caso de que se demuestre que las medidas en vigor no son suficientes para alcanzar los objetivos. Esto puede implicar, si un Estado miembro lo considera necesario, reducir la intensidad de la producción ganadera.

Por otra parte, la Directiva marco sobre el agua pretende conseguir un buen estado de las aguas (ecológico, químico y cuantitativo) y prevé obligaciones adicionales para los Estados miembros en relación con la contaminación de las aguas causada por los nutrientes.

La Comisión pedirá información adicional a las autoridades en el contexto de la evaluación continua del grado de la aplicación en España de la Directiva sobre los nitratos y en función de ella adoptará una decisión sobre la actuación más adecuada.

([1]) http://cincodias.com/cincodias/2014/02/04/empresas/1391534932_421008.html
([2]) http://www.324.cat/noticia/2325353/catalunya/Ramaders-de-Lleida-aboquen-de-manera-illegal-mes-purins-dels-permesos

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003941/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Closure of cogeneration plants and pollution caused by liquid manure

The Spanish Government has approved an energy reform which directly threatens the renewable energy sector, by altering the system of financial incentives for renewable energy production, cogeneration and waste treatment facilities. The reform involves the abolition of the current system of premiums for renewable energy production, and is detrimental to the wind and solar energy sectors, and to cogeneration plants ([1]). Cogeneration plants are used to treat liquid manure and are currently key to the survival of the pig industry, which is of major importance for the Spanish economy. The reform that has been approved by the Spanish Government will lead to the closure of Spain's 29 liquid pig manure treatment plants, on the grounds that they are not economically viable (the six cogeneration plants in Catalonia that treated the manure from 480 pig farms have already closed). This will lead to a build-up of untreated liquid manure, which will be an extremely serious problem for livestock farms and pose a major risk to the environment. Liquid manure that is not disposed of legally contains high levels of nitrates, which, if the soil does not absorb them properly, pollute groundwater and cause major environmental damage. Livestock farmers in Lleida (Cataluña) have already disposed of more liquid manure on their farms than they are allowed to under the law, and have justified their actions by pointing to the closure of the treatment plants ([2]). The EU Member States have undertaken to meet 20% of their energy consumption needs through renewable sources by 2020, as required under the Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC). The Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) seeks to ensure that all bodies of water have good ecological status by 2015, and the Nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC) to protect water from becoming polluted by nitrates.

Was the Commission aware of the energy reform's impact on cogeneration plants and, consequently, on the treatment of liquid manure?

Does the Commission think that Spain is breaching the aforementioned EU directives?

Does the reform pose a threat to groundwater quality?

Should the granting of licences for livestock fattening farms be scaled back in favour of an approach that is not based on intensive farming?

Should farmers be required to bring their practices into line with Decree 136/2009, which provided for changes to livestock feed in order to decrease the nitrate content of animal waste?

How does the Commission intend to respond to this situation?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of the electricity sector reform adopted by Spain and will analyse the compatibility of the final legislative texts with EU legislation, with the view to consider whether additional EU action is needed and appropriate.

According to Eurostat data, in 2012 renewable energy share of final energy consumption was 14.3%, above the interim target for 2011-2012 of 11% set in Directive 2009/28/EC on renewable energy. Spain should therefore ensure that this trajectory is maintained with effective national measures, in order to reach its national renewable energy target of 20% by 2020.

The Nitrates directive aims at preventing and reducing water pollution by nitrates from agriculture. It requires Member States to monitor water quality, designate Nitrates Vulnerable Zones and establish mandatory action programmes including the measures of its Annex III. Member States can include other measures such as, for example, feeding strategies to reduce manure nutrient content. In addition, reinforced actions should be undertaken if it becomes apparent that the measures in place are not sufficient for achieving the objectives. This may entail, if a Member State deems it necessary, reducing livestock production intensity.

Moreover, the Water Framework Directive aims at achieving good water status (ecological, chemical, quantitative) and provides for additional obligations for Member States in relation to water pollution caused by nutrients.

The Commission will seek further information from the authorities in the context of the ongoing evaluation of the state of implementation of the Nitrates Directive in Spain and will decide accordingly on the appropriate course of action.

([1]) http://cincodias.com/cincodias/2014/02/04/empresas/1391534932_421008.html
([2]) http://www.324.cat/noticia/2325353/catalunya/Ramaders-de-Lleida-aboquen-de-manera-illegal-mes-purins-dels-permesos

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003942/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Συγκεκριμένα μέτρα οικονομικής πολιτικής της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης

Στη συμφωνία μεταξύ ελληνικής κυβέρνησης και τρόικας στα μέσα Μαρτίου, εκδόθηκε κοινό ανακοινωθέν της Επιτροπής, της ΕΚΤ και του ΔΝΤ, στο οποίο, μεταξύ άλλων, αναφέρεται ότι οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν δεσμευτεί «να λάβουν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα για την απελευθέρωση των αγορών μεταφορών και ενοικίασης και να ανοίξουν τα κλειστά επαγγέλματα. Και τέλος, να μειώσουν τις εισφορές κοινωνικής ασφάλισης και τους περιττούς φόρους».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια είναι η συγκεκριμένη στρέβλωση και ποιες ρυθμίσεις απομένουν να απελευθερωθούν στην αγορά μεταφορικού έργου, εκτός από την υποχρέωση των οδηγών να κατέχουν δίπλωμα οδήγησης;

2. Ποια είναι τα «κλειστά επαγγέλματα» που δεν έχουν ακόμα απελευθερωθεί;

3. Ποιοι είναι ακριβώς οι περιττοί φόροι που πρέπει να μειώσει η ελληνική κυβέρνηση; Ποια θα είναι η δημοσιονομική επίπτωση της μείωσης αυτής και ποια τα ισοδύναμα μέτρα κάλυψης του δημοσιονομικού κενού που θα δημιουργήσουν;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Ιουνίου 2014)

Λεπτομέρειες όσον αφορά την καταγραφή της προόδου που έχει σημειωθεί και τα επόμενα βήματα που έχουν συμφωνηθεί στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα σχετικά με τις πολιτικές στις οποίες αναφέρεται ο κ. βουλευτής διατίθενται στην επικαιροποιημένη τεκμηρίωση του προγράμματος που περιέχεται στην έκθεση συμμόρφωσης([1]), η οποία καταρτίστηκε μετά την ολοκλήρωση της 4ης αναθεώρησης του προγράμματος.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003942/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Specific economic policy measures by the Greek Government

The Commission, the ECB and the IMF have issued a joint press release on the agreement between the Greek Government and the Troika in mid-March which states, *inter alia*, that the Greek authorities are committed 'to taking concrete measures to liberalise the transport and rental markets and open up closed professions; and to reducing social security contribution rates and nuisance taxes'.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What is the specific distortion in question and what arrangements have yet to be liberalised in the transport market, apart from the requirement for drivers to possess a driver's license?

2. What are the 'closed professions' that have not yet been liberalised?

3. What exactly are the nuisance taxes that the Greek Government should reduce? What will the financial impact of this reduction be and what equivalent measures will be taken to cover the financial shortfall thereby created?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

A detailed account of the progress made and the next steps agreed in the framework of the adjustment programme for Greece on the policies mentioned by the Honourable Member is available in the updated programme documentation contained in the compliance report ([1]) following the conclusion of the 4th review of the programme.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003943/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(31 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: In-nisa fir-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni

Fil-21 ta' Ġunju 2012, id-DĠ tal-Innovazzjoni u r-Riċerka tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea nediet kampanja bit-titolu "in-Nisa fir-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni", relatata mal-ħtieġa li aktar nisa jistudjaw suġġetti relatati max-xjenzi u biex aktar nisa jsegwu karrieri fir-riċerka.

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħti rapport dettaljat dwar l-eżitu ta' din il-kampanja?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Geoghegan-Quinn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(23 ta' Mejju 2014)

Il-kampanja "Ix-xjenza għall-bniet ukoll!" hija mfassla biex tħeġġeġ lit-tfajliet ta' bejn it-13 u t-18-il sena jistudjaw ix-xjenza. L-għalliema u l-ġenituri huma fil-mira wkoll.

Il-kampanja għandha websajt ([1]) dinamika — aktar minn 300 000 żjara — disponibbli f'24 lingwa u paġna fuq Facebook ([2]) attiva ħafna b'posts ta' kuljum (kwotazzjonijiet ta' xjentisti nisa, ritratti, vidjos, avvenimenti), u b'aktar minn 69 000 ammiratur. Il-paġna fuq Facebook tospita ċetts ma' mudelli eżemplari, u ġiet żviluppata applikazzjoni speċifika għat-tfajliet fejn jistgħu jagħmlu mistoqsijiet dwar karrieri relatati max-xjenza. Aktar minn 150 mudell/a kienu involuti fil-kampanja, u dan in-numru għadu qed jikber.

L-ewwel edizzjoni tal-kompetizzjoni tar-ritratti "Xi tfisser ix-xjenza għalik?" kienet suċċess: Ġew sottomessi 383 ritratt minn 23 Stat Membru. Twaqqfet wirja mobbli tar-ritratti rebbieħa. Fil-bidu tal-2014 tnediet it-tieni edizzjoni tal-konkors.

Mill-2013, il-kampanja ngħaqdet mal-Kompetizzjoni għax-Xjentisti Żgħażagħ tal-Unjoni Ewropea ([3]), l-inizjattiva tal-Ambaxxaturi Lura għall-Iskola ([4]) u l-kampanja Żgħażagħ Attivi ([5]). Ġiet stabbilita shubija mal-proġett Scientix ([6]) iffinanzjat mill-UE, komunità onlajn ta' għalliema tax-xjenza, bil-għan li jiġu żviluppati għodod li jippromwovu kuxjenza dwar l-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi fil-klassi.

Il-kampanja twassal il-messaġġi tagħha wkoll permezz tal-parteċipazzjoni tagħha f'fieri u avvenimenti pubbliċi.

Din is-sena infetħet sejħa għal proposti fil-programm ta' ħidma tax-Xjenza mas-Soċjetà u għas-Soċjetà li jagħmel parti minn Orizzont 2020, il-programm ta' finanzjament tal-UE għar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni ([7]), biex jiġu ffinanzjati kollaborazzjonijiet ġodda u inizjattivi għal din il-kampanja.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/science-girl-thing.
([2]) https://www.facebook.com/sciencegirlthing.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/eucys/index_en.cfm?pg=home.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/news/eu_explained/110117_mt.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/youthonthemove/.
([6]) http://scientix.eu.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/science-and-society.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003943/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Women in research and innovation

On 21 June 2012, the European Commission's Research and Innovation DG launched a campaign entitled 'Women in Research and Innovation', relating to the need for more girls to study sciences-related subjects and for more women to pursue research careers.

Can the Commission give a detailed report regarding the outcome of this campaign?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2014)

The campaign 'Science: it's a girl thing!' is designed to encourage girls aged 13-18 to study science. Teachers and parents are targeted as well.

The campaign has a dynamic website ([1]) — over 300 000 visits — available in 24 languages and a very active Facebook page ([2]) with daily posts (quotes from women scientists, photos, videos, events), with more than 69 000 fans. The Facebook page hosts chats with role models, and a specific application has been developed for girls to ask questions on careers in science. Over 150 role models have been involved in the campaign, and their number is still growing.

The first edition of the photo contest 'What does science mean to you?' was a success: 383 photos were submitted from 23 Member States. An itinerant exhibition has been set up with the winning photos. A second edition of the contest was launched early in 2014.

Since 2013, the campaign has teamed up with the European Union Contest for Young Scientists ([3]), the Back to School Ambassadors initiative ([4]) and the Youth on the Move campaign ([5]). A partnership was established with the EU funded project Scientix ([6]), an online community of science teachers, to develop tools to promote awareness on gender equality in the classroom.

The campaign also spreads its messages through its participation to fairs and public events.

A call for proposals is open this year in the Science with and for Society work programme of Horizon 2020, the EU Funding Programme for research and Innovation ([7]), to fund new collaborations and initiatives for the campaign.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/science-girl-thing
([2]) https://www.facebook.com/sciencegirlthing
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/eucys/index_en.cfm?pg=home
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/news/eu_explained/110117_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/youthonthemove/
([6]) http://scientix.eu
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/science-and-society

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003944/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(31 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Għajxien indipendenti

Skont il-websajt tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea, ħafna nies mhumiex kapaċi jieħdu ħsieb lilhom nfushom fil-ħajja ta' kuljum tagħhom. Dan l-għadd ta' persuni jinkludi l-anzjani u persuni li dan l-aħħar għamlu xi operazzjoni jew persuni li qegħdin isofru minn marda deġenerattiva li ma jistgħux ifiqu minnha.

Is-sitwazzjoni tpoġġi pressjoni konsiderevoli fuq ħbieb u l-familji u jnaqqas il-kwalità tal-ħajja ta' dawk ikkonċernati. L-użu ta' teknoloġija ddisinjata b'mod speċifiku jista' jipprovdi soluzzjoni biex il-persuni b'diżabbiltà jingħataw l-għajnuna u l-anzjani jiksbu mill-ġdid l-indipendenza tagħhom.

1. X'inhi l-fehma tal-Kummissjoni fir-rigward tal-finanzjament ta' riċerka dwar il-ħolqien ta' teknoloġija ta' għajnuna għan-nies?

2. X'inhuma l-pjanijiet tal-Kummissjoni, fuq żmien qasir u fit-tul, biex tippromwovi l-għajxien indipendenti?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Kroes f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(20 ta' Mejju 2014)

Bħala parti mill-istrateġija tal-Aġenda Diġitali, il-Kummissjoni għandha parti kbira mill-ħidma tagħha ddedikata għall-appoġġ tal-għejxien indipendenti permezz tal-użu ta' teknoloġiji ġodda. Il-portafoll attwali tar-R&Ż għall-proġetti tal-inklużjoni diġitali fil-qasam tat-teknoloġiji assistivi jinkludi proġetti bħal TOBI, MINDWALKER jew BETTER, ilkoll immirati lejn l-iżvilupp ta' Brain Computer Interfaces u prototipi esoskeletali li jtejbu l-kundizzjonijiet tal-ħajja ta' nies li għandhom diżabbiltajiet motorji. Ir-riċerka f'dawn il-kwistjonijiet se tkompli fil-kuntest tal-programm qafas Orizzont 2020.

Orizzont 2020 fih attività intiża apposta biex tindirizza l-iżvilupp u l-varar mifrux ta' soluzzjonijiet ġodda biex jittawwal l-għejxien indipendenti għal persuni li għandhom limitazzjonijiet funzjonali, inkluż l-adulti mdaħħla fiż-żmien. Tikkonċerna proġetti għal djar u ambjenti tal-għejxien intelliġenti, robotiċi tas-servizz, u mobbiltà u sikurezza intelliġenti. Il-Programm Konġunt tal-Għejxien Attiv Assistit (AAL JP — Active Assisted Living Joint Programme) huwa inizjattiva xprunata mill-Istati Membri għar-riċerka applikata fi prodotti u servizzi tal-ICT għal tixjiħ aħjar (www.aal-europe.eu). Mill-2008 tlestew iktar minn mitt proġett u mistenni jkompli għaddej sal-2020 taħt l-Isfida tas-Soċjetà 1 ta' H2020. Is-Sħubija Ewropea għall-Innovazzjoni dwar it-Tixjiħ Attiv u b'Saħħtu (EIP-AHA: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/eipaha/ — European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing) hija sħubija bejn ħafna partijiet interessati biex jimplimentaw teknoloġiji innovattivi xprunati mill-ICT għal tixjiħ attiv u b'saħħtu fuq skala Ewropea u biex ineħħu l-ostakli sistemiċi li jfixklu l-varar tagħhom. Wieħed mis-sitt Gruppi ta' Azzjoni tagħha jiffoka fuq l-Għejxien Indipendenti, filwaqt li oħrajn jittrattaw suġġetti relatati bħall-prevenzjoni tal-waqgħat u d-detezzjoni bikrija tagħhom, u komunitajiet u ambjenti tajbin għall-anzjani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003944/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Independent living

According to the European Commission's website, many people are unable to look after themselves in their everyday life. This number includes the elderly and persons who have recently undergone surgery or are suffering from an incurable degenerative disease.

The situation puts a considerable strain on friends and family and reduces the quality of life of those concerned. The use of specially designed technology could be the answer in helping disabled persons and the elderly regain their independence.

1. What is the Commission's view regarding the funding of research on the creation of technology to help people?

2. What short and long-term plans does the Commission have to promote independent living?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(20 May 2014)

The Commission has a substantial effort devoted to support of independent living through the use of new technologies as part of the Digital Agenda strategy. The current R&D portfolio of digital inclusion projects in the area of assistive technologies includes projects like TOBI, Mindwalker or Better aimed at developing Brain Computer Interfaces and exoskeleton prototypes for improving life conditions of people with motor disabilities. Research on these issues will continue under the new Horizon 2020 framework programme.

Horizon 2020 contains a dedicated activity addressing development and wide deployment of new solutions for prolonging independent living for people with functional limitations, including older adults. It concerns projects for intelligent homes and living environments, service robotics, and smart mobility and safety. The Active Assisted Living Joint Programme (AAL JP) is a member state driven initiative for applied research on ICT products and services for ageing well (www.aal-europe.eu). It has delivered well over a hundred projects since 2008 and a continuation till 2020 is foreseen under Societal Challenge 1 of H2020. The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing (EIP-AHA: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/eipaha/) is a multi-stakeholder partnership to implement innovative ICT-driven technologies for active and healthy ageing at European scale and to remove systemic barriers that prevent their deployment. One of its six Action Groups focuses on Independent Living, while others deal with related topics like the prevention and early detection of falls and age friendly communities and environments.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003945/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(31 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Xogħol mhux iddikjarat fl-UE

Xogħol mhux iddikjarat għandu diversi aspetti Ivarja, pereżempju, minn babysitting okkazzjonali sal-kostruzzjoni ta' bini sħiħ min-netwerks professjonali oraganizzati ta' ħaddiema mhux iddikjarati. Xi whud minn dawn il-varjanti ta' xogħol mhux iddikjarat huma aċċettati ferm fil-biċċa l-kbira tas-soċjetajiet, filwaqt li oħrajn huma anqas aċċettati mill-pubbliku ġenerali.

Skont rapport Speċjali tal-Ewrobarometru ppubblikat f'Marzu tal-2014, l-Ewropej huma aktar probabbli li jixtru oġġetti jew servizzi mhux iddikjarati minn xi ħadd li jafu, fejn ftit aktar minn żewġ kwinti (42 %) jixtru mill-ħbieb, il-kollegi jew minn nies li jafu, ftit anqas minn wieħed minn kull għaxra (9 %) jixtru mill-qraba u proporzjon simili (9 %) jixtru mill-ġirien.

Kważi tlieta minn kull għaxar Ewropej (28 %) qalu li huma xtraw oġġetti jew servizzi mhux iddikjarati minn persuni privati jew familji oħra f'dawn l-aħħar 12-il xhar, u madwar kwart (24 %) qalu li xtraw tali oġġetti u servizzi minn ditti jew negozji. Proporzjonijiet iżgħar ta' Ewropej jirrapportaw li huma xtraw oġġetti jew servizzi li setgħu involvew xogħol mhux iddikjarat minn fornituri għall-kura tas-saħħa (7 %) jew minn xi sors ieħor (4 %)

1. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tipprovdi data speċifika skont il-ġeneru dwar dawk li qegħdin ifornu x-xogħol mhux iddikkjarat?

2. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħti stima dwar l-għadd ta' nisa li huma wkoll fornituri ta' xogħol mhux iddikjarat?

3. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħti stima tal-kostijiet tax-xogħol mhux iddikkjarat għall-gvernijiet u għall-ekonomija inġenerali, f'termini ta' telf ta' dħul?

4. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tiddikjara x'behsiebha tagħmel biex tnaqqas ix-xogħol mhux iddikjarat?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(2 ta' Ġunju 2014)

1. Abbażi tar-rapport Speċjali tal-Ewrobarometru, hemm aktar irġiel (5 %) milli nisa (3 %) li ma jiddikjarawx il-prodotti/servizzi li jfornu.

2. Ma teżistix dejta solida biżżejjed dwar in-numru ta' nisa li jwettqu xogħol mhux iddikjarat fl-UE.

3. Huwa estremament diffiċli li wieħed jistma l-prezz li jrid jitħallas għax-xogħol mhux iddikjarat, iżda fost il-konsegwenzi hemm l-ostaklu għall-politiki ekonomiċi, baġitarji u soċjali li huma immirati lejn it-tkabbir konvenzjonali. Ix-xogħol mhux iddikjarat inaqqas id-dħul tat-taxxa u jikkompromietti l-finanzjament tas-sistemi tas-sigurtà soċjali, kif ukoll il-fiduċja f'dawn l-istess sistemi. Għandu t-tendenza li jfixkel il-kompetizzjoni bejn l-impriżi u jnaqqas l-effiċjenza peress li n-negozji informali normalment jevitaw li jirrikorru għal servizzi u inputs formali u għaldaqstant għandhom it-tendenza li jibqgħu żgħar.

4. Fid-9 ta' April 2014, il-Kummissjoni adottat proposta [1] biex tiġi stabbilita Pjattaforma Ewropea li ttejjeb il-kooperazzjoni tal-Istati Membri fil-livell tal-UE bil-għan li x-xogħol mhux iddikjarat jiġi indirizzat b'aktar effiċjenza. Il-pjattaforma se tlaqqa' flimkien il-korpi ta' infurzar tal-Istati Membri, bħal pereżempju l-ispettorati tax-xogħol u l-awtoritajiet tas-sigurtà soċjali, tat-taxxa u tal-migrazzjoni.

[1] COM(2014)221 final — Proposta għal Deċiżjoni tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill dwar l-istabbiliment ta' Pjattaforma Ewropea biex tissaħħah il-kooperazzjoni fil-prevenzjoni u l-iskoraġġiment ta' xogħol mhux iddikjarat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003945/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Undeclared work in the EU

Undeclared work is multifaceted. It ranges, for example, from occasional babysitting to the construction of entire buildings by professionally organised networks of undeclared workers. Some of these variants of undeclared work are widely accepted within most societies, whereas others are less accepted by the general public.

According to a Special Eurobarometer report published in March 2014, Europeans are most likely to purchase undeclared goods or services from someone that they know, with just over two fifths (42%) buying from friends, colleagues or acquaintances, just under one in ten (9%) from relatives and a similar proportion (9%) from neighbours.

Nearly three in ten Europeans (28%) say that they have purchased undeclared goods or services from other private persons or households in the last 12 months, and around a quarter (24%) that they have bought such goods or services from firms or businesses. Smaller proportions of Europeans report purchasing goods or services that may have involved undeclared work from healthcare providers (7%) or from another source (4%).

1. Can the Commission provide gender-specified data on those providing undeclared work?

2. Can the Commission give an estimate of how many women are the providers of undeclared work?

3. Can the Commission give an estimate of the costs of undeclared work to governments and the economy in general, in terms of loss of revenue?

4. Can the Commission state what it intends to do to mitigate undeclared work?

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

1. Based on the Special Eurobarometer report, more men, 5%, than women, 3%, supply goods/services undeclared.

2. There are no hard data on the number of women performing undeclared work in the EU.

3. It is extremely difficult to estimate the costs of undeclared work, but these include obstruction to conventional growth oriented economic, budgetary and social policies. It decreases tax revenues and undermines the financing of, and trust in, social security systems. It tends to distort competition between firms and reduce efficiency since informal businesses typically avoid accessing formal services and inputs and hence tend to remain small.

4. The Commission adopted on 9 April 2014 a proposal ([1]) to establish a European Platform to improve Member States' cooperation at EU level to tackle undeclared work more efficiently. It will bring together Member States enforcement bodies, such as the labour inspectorates and the social security, tax and migration authorities.

([1]) COM(2014) 221 final — Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing a European Platform to enhance cooperation in the prevention and deterrence of undeclared work.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003947/14
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) en Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(31 maart 2014)

Betreft: Verkrachting als oorlogswapen in Syrië

Hoewel de media dikwijls het onmenselijke en illegale gebruik van chemische wapens en foltering in de Syrische burgeroorlog benadrukken, wordt er meestal geen melding van gemaakt dat verkrachting wordt ingezet als oorlogswapen tegen vrouwen en meisjes. Verkrachting is niet minder ontoelaatbaar en niet minder wijdverbreid ([1]). De afgelopen maanden is aan het licht gekomen dat in Syrië een wijdverbreid verkrachtingspatroon bestaat ([2]). Dikwijls krijgen verkrachte vrouwen en meisjes te maken met uitsluiting door familie en maatschappij, ernstige verwondingen en ongewenste zwangerschappen. Toch krijgen zwangere meisjes en vrouwen geen toegang tot levensreddende abortussen omdat de VS verregaande anti-abortusbeperkingen heeft verbonden aan zijn humanitaire hulp aan Syrië. Dit leidt ertoe dat veilige abortussen worden geweigerd en slachtoffers soms hun toevlucht nemen tot onveilige abortus en zelfs zelfmoord.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het feit dat Syrische slachtoffers van verkrachting geen fatsoenlijke humanitaire hulp krijgen vanwege de strikte abortusbeperkingen van de VS?

2. Accepteert de Commissie de anti-abortusbeperkingen die de VS verbindt aan zijn humanitaire hulp aan Syrië? Kan zij aangeven in welke mate deze beperking de uitvoering van humanitaire EU-hulp aan slachtoffers van verkrachting in de weg staat?

3. In haar antwoord ([3]) op schriftelijke vraag E-005386/2012 stelt de Commissie dat zij „humanitaire hulp verleent die op beginselen en behoeften is gebaseerd, onafhankelijk van door andere donoren eenzijdig gestelde voorwaarden". Kan de Commissie duidelijk maken hoe dit in de praktijk werkt, aangezien de VS de grootste donor van humanitaire hulp is?

4. De Commissie stelt in haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-005386/2012 dat hulp van de EU ook „vertrouwelijke medische zorg omvat aan slachtoffers van verkrachting en andere vormen van genderspecifiek geweld, in het kader van het zogeheten Minimum Initial Service Package of Reproductive Health in Crises" en dat „ook noodanticonceptiemiddelen worden verstrekt aan slachtoffers van verkrachting als profylaxe na blootstelling". Onderkent de Commissie dat levensreddende abortussen geen deel uitmaken van de profylaxe na blootstelling?

5. Kan de Commissie aangeven in welke mate nieuwe instrumenten zijn ontwikkeld ter bevordering van het genderbewustzijnsaspect van humanitaire acties, en om welke soorten humanitaire hulp het precies gaat?

Antwoord van mevrouw Georgieva namens de Commissie
(27 mei 2014)

De Europese Commissie is zeer verontrust over de berichten over verkrachting en seksueel geweld waar vrouwen, mannen en kinderen slachtoffer van zijn in Syrië ([4]).

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van de anti-abortusbeperkingen die de VS hebben verbonden aan hun humanitaire hulp, zoals voor het eerst vastgelegd door het Helms-amendement in 1973.

2-3. Door het collectief mobiliseren van een totaal budget van 2,8 miljard euro heeft de EU de leiding genomen van de internationale humanitaire respons. Zoals wettelijk voorzien, laat de Commissie haar humanitaire hulp niet afhangen van het al dan niet eerbiedigen door haar humanitaire partners van beleidsbeperkingen die andere donoren opleggen. Indien een humanitaire partner enkel de VS bereid vindt om een bepaald project te cofinancieren, kan de Commissie in de praktijk de volledige financiering op voorwaarde dat het verenigbaar is met haar op beginselen en behoeften gebaseerde aanpak. De Commissie financiert meerdere humanitaire projecten die zich richten op vrouwen in zowel Syrië als de omringende landen, waaronder ook projecten inzake preventie van en respons op genderspecifiek geweld.

([1]) New York Times, 18 maart 2014, on line geraadpleegd op http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/21/opinion/rape-as-a-weapon-in-syria.html?partner=rssnyt & emc=rss & _r=0.
([2]) Harvard Health Policy Review, december 2013, on line geraadpleegd op http://hhpronline.org/un-inaction-and-rape-as-a-weapon-of-war-in-syria/.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-005386&language=EN.
([4]) Rapport van de onafhankelijke internationale onderzoekscommissie voor de Arabische Republiek Syrië, 12.2.2014 (blz. 11-12).

4. Het is vaak zo dat slachtoffers van seksueel geweld hier niet alleen fysieke en psychische letsels aan overhouden, maar ook aan verschillende ziekteverwekkers werden blootgesteld. Daarnaast bestaat de mogelijkheid dat de aanranding tot een ongewenste zwangerschap met hoog risico kan leiden. Daarom wordt er bij uitgebreide profylaxe na blootstelling medicatie voor verschillende mogelijke infecties en aandoeningen gebruikt, waaronder ook noodanticonceptie. Medisch begeleide abortus wordt over het algemeen niet als profylaxe na blootstelling beschouwd, die in de eerste uren na de aanranding moet worden verstrekt.

5. Op 22 juli 2013 keurde de Commissie een werkdocument over humanitaire bijstand goed ([5]), waarin zij haar aanpak inzake gender en genderspecifiek geweld in humanitaire hulp uiteenzet. Er werd ook een gender-leeftijdstoets ([6]) ingevoerd, die vanaf januari 2014 op alle humanitaire projecten van toepassing zal zijn.

([5]) Gender in Humanitarian Assistance: Different Needs, Adapted Assistance (SWD (2013)290final).

([6]) Dit instrument werd ontworpen om gender- en leeftijdsspecifieke vereisten aan bod te laten komen bij het opzetten van humanitaire projecten en deze verder te blijven volgen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003947/14
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) and Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Rape as a weapon of war in Syria

While the media frequently highlight the inhumane and illegal use of chemical weapons and torture in the Syrian civil war, they often fail to mention the use of rape as a weapon of war against women and girls, which is no less intolerable and no less widespread ([1]). A pervasive pattern of rapes has been documented in Syria in the past few months ([2]). Frequently, women and girls who are raped face familial and social rejection, severe injuries, and unwanted pregnancies. However, impregnated young girls and women are denied access to life-saving abortions, because of the harsh anti-abortion restrictions placed by the US on its humanitarian aid to Syria. This results in safe abortion services being refused, and victims sometimes resort to unsafe abortion and even suicide.

1. Is the Commission aware of the fact that Syrian rape victims are being denied proper humanitarian aid because of strict US abortion restrictions?

2. Does the Commission accept the anti-abortion restrictions placed by the US on the provision of humanitarian aid to Syria? Can it state to what extent this restriction impedes the implementation of EU humanitarian aid for rape victims?

3. In its answer ([3]) to Written Question E-005386/2012, the Commission stated that it 'provides principled and needs-based humanitarian aid' and 'is not subject to any restrictions unilaterally imposed by other donors'. Could the Commission explain how this works in practice, given the fact that the US is the largest provider of humanitarian aid?

4. In its answer[3] to Written Question E-005386/2012, the Commission stated that EU assistance includes 'confidential clinical care for survivors of rape and other forms of gender-based violence, as part of the Minimum Initial Service Package of Reproductive Health in Crises' and that 'emergency contraception is also used for rape survivors as part of the Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP)'. Does the Commission acknowledge that life-saving abortions are not part of the PEP?

5. Could the Commission specify to what extent new tools have been developed to improve the gender sensitivity aspect of humanitarian actions, and exactly what kinds of humanitarian aid are concerned?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2014)

The European Commission is deeply concerned about the reports of rape and sexual violence perpetrated against women, men and children in Syria ([4]).

1. The Commission is aware of the US restrictions related to humanitarian funding for abortions under the Helms amendment first enacted in 1973.

2 and 3. The EU has spearheaded the international humanitarian response with over EUR 2.8 billion of total budget mobilised collectively. As a matter of law, the Commission's humanitarian aid is not made conditional upon compliance by its humanitarian partners with policy restrictions by other donors. In practice, when a partner could not find a donor other than the US to co-finance a given action, the Commission may consider fully funding it, if this is deemed in line with its principled and needs-based approach. The Commission funds several humanitarian projects focusing on women both inside Syria and in the neighbouring countries, including prevention and response to gender-based violence.

4. Acknowledging that survivors of sexual violence often have been exposed not only to physical and mental trauma, but to a variety of pathogens and that the sexual assault may have led to unwanted high-risk pregnancy, comprehensive PEP includes medication to address various possible infections and conditions, including emergency contraception. In general, medical abortion procedures are not considered part of PEP, which should take place within the first hours of the assault.

([1]) New York Times, 18 March 2014, accessed online at: http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/21/opinion/rape-as-a-weapon-in-syria.html?partner=rssnyt&emc=rss&_r=0
([2]) Harvard Health Policy Review, December 2013, accessed online at: http://hhpronline.org/un-inaction-and-rape-as-a-weapon-of-war-in-syria/
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-005386&language=EN
([4]) Report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, 12 February 2014 (page.11-12).

5. On 22 July 2013, the Commission adopted a working document on gender in humanitarian assistance ([5]), which outlines the approach to gender and gender-based violence in humanitarian aid. A Gender-Age marker has also been introduced, which will apply to all humanitarian projects as of January 2014 ([6]).

([5]) Gender in Humanitarian Assistance: Different Needs, Adapted Assistance (SWD (2013) 290final).

([6]) This tool is designed to foster and track gender- and age- sensitive programming.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003948/14
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: State aid — disclosure of information and transparency regulations

Can the Commission confirm whether Bus Éireann is in breach of the transparency regulations, as its annual accounts do not show how the payments received from the Irish Department of Education and Skills are spent?

Can the Commission confirm whether the public entity paying the money has a responsibility to ensure compliance with the transparency regulations?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

The state aid guidelines as revised in the context of the State Aid Modernisation initiative, as well as the General Block Exemption Regulation, will include the principle that relevant information (name of beneficiary, amount of aid, etc.) on all state aid awards above a certain threshold are to be published on a state aid website. This principle will enter into force in July 2016, so as to ensure that Member States have sufficient time to put transparency in place.

Under the revised EU State aid rules, the aid beneficiaries will not have to show the information themselves; it will be the responsibility of the Member State to ensure that information related to individual aid awards is published on a comprehensive website, at national or regional level. To address the specific issue of Bus Éireann raised by the Honourable Member, the company is not obliged under the revised state aid rules to publish the information in its annual account.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003953/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Licenziamenti Micron

Nel 2010 la statunitense Micron ha acquisito Numonyx, azienda nata nel 2008 dallo scorporo delle memorie di STMicroelectronics, ovvero una delle società in Italia a più alto valore tecnologico situata tra i primi produttori mondiali di microelettronica.

L'acquisizione, che includeva impianti, attrezzature, capitale umano, tecnologie, portafoglio prodotti e relativi clienti, è risultata estremamente redditizia per Micron, come dimostrano i dati pubblicati in merito al suo fatturato e al considerevole utile.

Nonostante ciò, in data 21 gennaio 2014 l'azienda ha avviato una procedura di licenziamento collettivo per 419 dipendenti, su un totale di 1 070, in riferimento alle cinque sedi italiane di Agrate, Vimercate, Avezzano, Napoli e Catania.

Considerando che:

— il settore microelettronico è tra quelli ritenuti altamente strategici dall'UE e che in particolare i rami europei dell'azienda in oggetto hanno sviluppato negli anni competenze altamente specializzate con risultati e brevetti di alto valore;

— le risorse umane impiegate nei settori in esame hanno profili di alta qualità e hanno acquisito un *know how* che rischia oggi di essere disperso senza che sia adottato alcun provvedimento in proposito;

— il piano industriale presentato, che l'azienda ha motivato con esigenze di trasformazione organizzativa globale, penalizza invece in maniera sproporzionata gli stabilimenti italiani e lascia intravedere una completa delocalizzazione dell'azienda,

l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito elencati.

1. Quali azioni possono essere intraprese per evitare che un settore considerato strategico dall'UE perda o veda ridursi una realtà produttiva così importante?

2. Quale prospettiva di sviluppo a livello europeo è riservata all'Italia nell'ambito delle attività specifiche di microelettronica?

3. Ritiene necessario un maggiore coinvolgimento dei lavoratori nella rinegoziazione e ridefinizione del piano industriale? In particolare, considera importante sollecitare un incontro del *management* della Micron con le parti sociali in vista della definizione della presenza industriale in Italia e della valutazione di una concreta disponibilità a stabilire di comune accordo con le organizzazioni sindacali nazionali le misure di tutela dei lavoratori?

4. Quali forme di supporto possono essere fornite ai lavoratori considerati in esubero?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2014)

1. La questione sollevata dall'Onorevole deputato è essenzialmente di competenza degli Stati membri. Al fine di porre le basi per la crescita, la Commissione ha emanato nel gennaio 2014 una comunicazione sulla politica industriale con cui sollecitava gli Stati membri a inserire la tematica della competitività industriale in tutti gli ambiti politici e a portare avanti la reindustrializzazione ([1]). La comunicazione ha identificato una priorità di investimento nelle tecnologie abilitanti chiave ([2]) come la micro e nano-elettronica. Nel maggio 2013 la Commissione ha adottato una strategia per la micro e nano-elettronica al fine di arrestare il declino dell'UE nella fornitura mondiale di semiconduttori ([3]).

2. Nel campo della micro e nano-elettronica l'EU ha avviato partenariati specifici pubblico-privati ([4]), nonché numerosi progetti nell'ambito dei programmi quadro per la ricerca.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/IT/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0014
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52012DC0341:IT:NOT
([3]) Ciò è finalizzato essenzialmente a i) attirare investimenti per una tabella di marcia europea per una leadership industriale nella micro e nano-elettronica, per gli aspetti della componentistica dei sistemi, ii) istituire un partenariato pubblico-privato in tema di componenti e sistemi elettronici e iii) porre in atto condizioni eque e affrontare i deficit di competenze per arrestare il declino della quota dell'UE nella fornitura mondiale di semiconduttori.
([4]) ARTEMIS per i sistemi integrati e ENIAC per la nano-elettronica.

3. La Commissione propugna le buone pratiche al fine di anticipare i cambiamenti e per una gestione socialmente responsabile ([5]), ma non può influenzare le decisioni delle imprese. Tuttavia, essa è fortemente impegnata ad assicurare che l'Europa sia il luogo più attraente per gli investimenti nella ricerca, nell'innovazione e nell'industria manifatturiera. Ciò è al centro delle politiche industriali e imprenditoriali insite nella Strategia Europa 2020.

4. Il Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) sostiene i lavoratori messi in esubero a causa della globalizzazione o della crisi economica e finanziaria globale. Se sono soddisfatte le condizioni prescritte, l'Italia può presentare una domanda al FEG conformemente al regolamento FEG (2014-2020). Il Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) non eroga un sostegno di emergenza ai lavoratori, ma svolge un ruolo importante per prevenire gli esuberi, cofinanziando attività volte a promuovere l'adattamento dei lavoratori, delle imprese e degli imprenditori al cambiamento e migliorando l'abbinamento delle competenze con le necessità del mercato del lavoro.

([5]) Comunicazione del 13 dicembre 2013 in merito a un quadro UE per la qualità nell'anticipazione dei cambiamenti e delle ristrutturazioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003953/14
to the Commission
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Redundancies at Micron

In 2010, the US-based Micron acquired Numonyx, a company set up in 2008 following the separation of the memory business of STMicroelectronics, which is one of the most high-tech companies in Italy and is one of the leading world producers of microelectronics.

The acquisition, which included facilities, equipment, human capital, technology, product portfolio and customers, has been extremely profitable for Micron, as evidenced by the published data on turnover and the considerable profits made.

Despite this, on 21 January 2014, the company launched a collective redundancy procedure for 419 employees, out of a total of 1 070, in its five Italian branches in Agrate, Vimercate, Avezzano, Naples and Catania.

The microelectronics industry is among those considered to be highly strategic by the EU; the European branches of the company in question, in particular, have, over the years, developed highly specialised skills with high-value results and patents.

The staff employed in these sectors have high-quality profiles and have acquired a know-how that is now in danger of being lost without anything being done to prevent it.

The restructuring plan presented, which, according to the company, is due to the need for global transformation of the organisation, is disproportionately penalising the Italian factories and could be a sign that the company is about to be completely relocated.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. What measures can be taken to prevent a sector that is seen as strategic by the EU from losing such an important part of its production facilities or from seeing them downsized in such a way?

2. What development prospects at EU level does Italy have as regards the specific business of microelectronics?

3. Does the Commission not agree that a greater involvement of employees is needed in the renegotiation and redefinition of the restructuring plan? In particular, would it not be important to call for a meeting of Micron management with the social partners, with a view to establishing the company's industrial intentions in Italy and assessing whether it is genuinely willing to establish, by common agreement with the national trade unions, measures to protect workers?

4. What forms of support can be provided to workers who have been made redundant?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2014)

1. The issue raised by the Honourable Member is mainly within Member States' competence. To lay the basis for growth, the Commission issued an Industrial Policy Communication in January 2014 urging Member States to mainstream industrial competitiveness across all policy areas and to endorse reindustrialisation ([1]). The communication identified Key Enabling Technologies ([2]) such as micro and nano-electronics as a priority for investment. The Commission adopted in May 2013 a Strategy for micro and nano-electronics to stop the decline of the EU's share of the world's supply in semiconductor components ([3]).

2. In micro and nano-electronics the EU has launched specific public-private partnerships ([4]) and many projects under the framework Programmes for Research.

3. The Commission champions good practice on anticipation and socially responsible management ([5]) but cannot influence company decisions. However, it is strongly committed to ensure that Europe is the most attractive location for investment in research, innovation and manufacturing. This is at the core of the Europe 2020, Industrial and Entrepreneurship policies.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0014
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52012DC0341:EN:NOT
([3]) This essentially aims to (i) attract investments for a European Roadmap for Industrial Leadership in electronic components and systems, (ii) set up a private public partnership on Electronic Components and Systems, and (iii) move towards a global playing field and address skills gaps to stop the decline of EU share of the world's supply in semiconductor components.
([4]) Artemis for embedded systems and ENIAC in case of nano-electronics.
([5]) Communication of 13.12.2013 establishing an EU Quality Framework for Anticipation of Change and Restructuring.

4. The European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) supports workers made redundant due to globalisation or the global financial and economic crisis. If the required conditions are met, Italy may apply to the EGF according to EGF Regulation (2014-2020). The European Social Fund (ESF) does not provide emergency support to workers but plays an important role in preventing redundancy problems by co-financing activities that promote the adaptation of workers, enterprises and entrepreneurs to change and by improving the matching of skills with the needs of the labour market.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003954/14
alla Commissione
Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Etichettatura di autenticità dei prodotti in pelle

Nell'ottobre del 2013 la Commissione ha lanciato una consultazione pubblica — conclusasi lo scorso 31 gennaio 2014 — su un sistema di etichettatura di autenticità del cuoio a livello di UE; l'obiettivo era raccogliere opinioni sulla dimensione della questione dell'etichettatura per i prodotti in oggetto e sull'impatto delle eventuali misure proponibili in merito.

Dai risultati preliminari degli studi di indagine sembrano emergere chiaramente — da parte di imprese e consumatori — richieste di maggiore trasparenza nonché una preferenza per la presenza di un sistema di etichettatura obbligatorio per i manufatti in pelle.

Tuttavia, nonostante i primi favorevoli esiti citati, il continuo registrarsi di problemi relativi a situazioni di etichettatura fraudolenta o a forme di contraffazione, e i comprovati danni che l'assenza di un sistema come quello in esame provoca ai consumatori europei, non sembrano ancora chiare le intenzioni della Commissione in merito alla possibilità di una misura giuridica in materia.

Considerando che la trasparenza sull'origine dei beni di consumo dovrebbe essere una priorità delle politiche europee in quanto strumento di tutela della salute dei consumatori e di contrasto delle forme di concorrenza sleale, l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito elencati.

1. Quali sono gli ulteriori passi che intende intraprendere in materia di etichettatura di autenticità dei prodotti in pelle?

2. In che misura intende prendere in considerazione le richieste espresse più volte in tal senso da consumatori, lavoratori e imprese europee?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2014)

La consultazione pubblica avviata dalla Commissione nell'ottobre 2013 e conclusasi il 31 gennaio 2014 rientra nel processo di valutazione di impatto che la Commissione conduce in merito a un eventuale sistema di etichettatura dell'autenticità dei prodotti in pelle a livello di UE. In effetti, le risultanze iniziali della consultazione indicano che le imprese e i consumatori apprezzerebbero una maggiore trasparenza e sarebbero favorevoli all'esistenza di un sistema obbligatorio di etichettatura dei prodotti in pelle. Tuttavia, l'opzione di uno strumento normativo non vincolante («soft law»), che ad esempio fornisca orientamenti su come affrontare le indicazioni prive di fondamento, è stata caldeggiata anch'essa da diversi rispondenti.

La Commissione analizzerà ulteriormente i risultati della consultazione pubblica ed esaminerà inoltre le diverse opzioni strategiche, tra cui quella di non far nulla, al fine di identificare l'opzione più efficace sul piano dei costi. È in corso uno studio condotto da un consulente esterno al fine di coadiuvare la Commissione in tale analisi. La relazione finale dello studio dovrebbe essere pronta a fine luglio 2014.

La Commissione assicura l'Onorevole deputato che terrà conto di tutte le richieste pervenute dai consumatori, dagli operatori e dalle imprese europei in merito all'etichettatura dei prodotti in pelle e le valuterà attentamente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003954/14
to the Commission
Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Authenticity labelling for leather products

In October 2013, the Commission launched a public consultation (which ended on 31 January 2014) regarding a labelling system for the authenticity of leather at EU level; the objective was to gather views about the scale of the issue of labelling the products in question and the impact of any measures which could be implemented in this regard.

The initial findings of the investigation seem to show that companies and consumers would welcome greater transparency and the presence of a mandatory labelling system for leather manufacturers.

Nevertheless, despite the aforementioned initial favourable findings, the fact that there are ongoing problems with fraudulent labelling and forms of counterfeiting, and the proven damage that the absence of such a system causes to European consumers, there is still a lack of clarity as regards the Commission's intentions concerning the possibility of a legal measure in this matter.

Considering that transparency about the origins of consumer goods should be a priority for European policy, since it represents an instrument to protect the safety of consumers and to combat forms of unfair competition, I should like to ask the Commission to answer the following questions.

1. What further steps does it intend to take concerning authenticity labelling for leather products?

2. How does it intend to take into consideration the repeated requests for such labelling from European consumers, workers and companies?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The public consultation that the Commission launched in October 2013 and which ended on 31 January 2014 is a part of the impact assessment process that the Commission is currently carrying out on a possible authenticity leather labelling scheme at EU level. Indeed, the initial findings of the consultation show that companies and consumers would welcome greater transparency and the presence of a mandatory leather labelling system. However, a 'soft law' option, such as providing guidance on tackling unsubstantiated claims, also received positive support from many respondents.

The Commission will further analyse the results of the public consultation as well as different policy options, including a 'no action' option, in view of identifying the most cost-effective option. A study by an external consultant is being carried out in order to support the Commission in this assessment. The final report of the study is due by the end of July 2014.

The Commission assures the Honourable Member that it will take into account and carefully assess all received requests for leather labelling from European consumers, workers and companies.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003955/14
alla Commissione
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Snellimento delle procedure per le adozioni

Le adozioni internazionali, in particolar modo quelle che riguardano bambini provenienti da paesi extra-UE, costringono le famiglie ad affrontare un processo lungo, complicato ed anche costoso, che mette a dura prova chi lo intende intraprendere. Lo dimostra il fatto che, complice anche la crisi economica che ha limitato il potere d'acquisto delle famiglie, in vari Stati membri si è assistito negli ultimi anni ad un calo complessivo delle procedure di adozione. Dal 2007 ad oggi, in Germania sono passate da 4 509 a 4 060, in Francia da 3 162 a 1 343, in Spagna da 3 648 a 2 573 (nel 2011, ultimo dato disponibile, ma con tendenza al calo costante negli anni), in Gran Bretagna da 3 330 a 3 050. Infine, in Italia, si è passati da 3 420 adozioni nel 2007 a 2 825 nel 2013. In particolare, è crollato il numero di coppie che hanno fatto richiesta di adozione, da 3 154 del 2010 a 2 291 del 2013.

Il 19 gennaio 2011 il Parlamento europeo ha approvato una risoluzione a tale riguardo per armonizzare la legislazione degli Stati membri, invitando a migliorare l'assistenza alle coppie richiedenti nei servizi d'informazione, nella preparazione, nel trattamento delle procedure di candidatura e nei servizi post-adozione.

Inoltre, le complicazioni e le lungaggini burocratiche, oltre ad essere un deterrente verso nuove adozioni, possono anche favorire il permanere, e anzi il proliferare, di un inaccettabile traffico illegale di minori.

Quali attività ha avviato la Commissione per rispondere alle richieste contenute nella risoluzione approvata dal Parlamento?

Intende sviluppare accordi bilaterali con le nazioni dalle quali provengono prevalentemente i bambini adottati nell'UE?

In che modo intende influenzare le procedure di adozione internazionale alla Conferenza dell'Aia?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2014)

L'adozione non è disciplinata a livello dell'Unione europea. A livello internazionale, la questione è regolata dalla Convenzione dell'Aja del 1993 sull'adozione internazionale ([1]), che rafforza la Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti del fanciullo cercando di garantire che nelle adozioni internazionali siano rispettati i diritti fondamentali del minore e sia considerato preminente l'interesse superiore del minore (articolo 21 della Convenzione dell'Aja). La Convenzione mira inoltre a impedire la sottrazione, la vendita e la tratta dei minori.

La Commissione favorisce la corretta applicazione delle garanzie istituite dalla Convenzione dell'Aja del 1993 partecipando regolarmente alle commissioni speciali organizzate nel quadro della Conferenza dell'Aia di diritto internazionale privato. Scopo di tali commissioni è migliorare il funzionamento della Convenzione e contribuire allo scambio delle migliori prassi. La prossima commissione speciale sul funzionamento pratico della Convenzione dell'Aja del 1993 è prevista per la prima metà del 2015.

Attualmente non esiste alcuna normativa dell'Unione europea sulle adozioni, materia regolata dalle leggi nazionali e dalle convenzioni internazionali. Spetta alle autorità nazionali di ciascuno Stato membro stabilire regole per l'adozione, misure preparatorie o provvedimenti di annullamento.

([1]) Della Convenzione dell'Aja sono parti 93 Stati, compresi tutti gli Stati membri dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003955/14
to the Commission
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Streamlining adoption procedures

Intercountry adoptions, especially those involving children from non-EU countries, force families to go through a long, complicated and expensive process, which represents an extremely difficult test for all concerned. The fact that there has been an overall fall in the number of adoption procedures in a number of Member States proves this, although the economic crisis is also a factor, since families now have more limited purchasing power. Since 2007, the number of adoptions has fallen from 4 509 to 4 060 in Germany, from 3 162 to 1 343 in France, from 3 648 to 2 573 in Spain (the latest data available dates from 2011, but there has been a consistent downward trend over the years) and from 3 330 to 3 050 in Great Britain. Lastly, the number of adoptions in Italy has fallen from 3 420 in 2007 to 2 825 in 2013. In particular, the number of couples who have applied for adoption has fallen from 3 154 in 2010 to 2 291 in 2013.

On 19 January 2011, Parliament adopted a resolution in this regard to harmonise the legislation in the Member States, inviting them to improve the assistance provided to couples who have applied for adoption, in terms of information services, preparation, processing application procedures and post-adoption services.

Furthermore, bureaucratic complications and red tape, in addition to acting as a deterrent to new adoptions, can also encourage the continuing existence and even proliferation of the unacceptable and illegal trafficking of minors.

What steps has the Commission taken to respond to the requests set out in the resolution adopted by Parliament?

Does it intend to draw up bilateral agreements with the nations from which most of the children adopted in the EU originate?

How does it intend to influence international adoption procedures at the Hague Conference?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2014)

Adoption is not regulated at EU level. At international level, the issue is dealt with by the 1993 Hague Convention on Inter-country Adoption ([1]), which reinforces the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and seeks to ensure that for inter-country adoptions the child's fundamental rights are respected and the best interests of the child are the paramount consideration (Article 21 UNCRC). It also seeks to prevent the abduction, the sale of, or traffic in children.

The Commission supports the correct implementation of the safeguards set out in the 1993 Hague Convention by participating on a regular basis in the Special Commissions organised in the context of the Hague Conference on Private International Law. These meetings aim to improve the functioning of the Convention and serve to exchange best practices. The next Special Commission on the practical operation of the 1993 Hague Convention is scheduled for the first half of 2015.

There is currently no European Union legislation on adoption. This matter is regulated by national laws and international conventions. It is for the national authorities in each EU Member State to establish rules regarding preparatory measures, adoption to adoption or its annulment.

([1]) 93 States are Party to the 1993 Hague Convention, including all EU Member States.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003956/14
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(31. marts 2014)

Om: Kompensation til danske fiskere

Det er meget beklageligt, at forhandlingerne mellem EU og Norge om en bilateral aftale inden for fiskeriet kom alt for sent i gang, da det resulterede i, at det norske farvand var lukket for danske fiskere i to en halv måned i 2014. Det har haft store økonomiske og menneskelige omkostninger til følge.

Jeg anerkender Kommissionens indsats under forhandlingerne og kompleksiteten af dette spørgsmål og glæder mig naturligvis over den indgåede aftale. Jeg mener imidlertid også, at det må være helt på sin plads, at de fiskere, der led under dette, har en mulighed for at blive kompenseret økonomisk. Vi må huske, at netop fiskerne er fuldstændigt uden ansvar for, at der ikke var en aftale fra den 1. januar 2014.

Derfor beder jeg Kommissionen svare på, om der er en mulighed for, at EU kompenserer de danske fiskere økonomisk? I benægtende fald bedes Kommissionen begrunde dette. I bekræftende fald bedes Kommissionen oplyse detaljer såsom tidsperspektiv, procedure og beløbsstørrelse.

Jeg vil finde det vanskeligt at anerkende et svar, hvor Kommissionen afviser enhver form for kompensation, da der er mange eksempler på, at der er givet former for kompensation indenfor landbruget.

Slutteligt beder jeg Kommissionen svare på, hvad den konkret vil gøre for at sikre, at denne situation ikke gentager sig?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Maria Damanaki
(12. juni 2014)

Kommissionen beklager, at drøftelserne mellem EU og Norge om en fiskeriaftale for 2014 først blev afsluttet i marts 2014. Da der ikke var opnået enighed mellem EU og Norge for 2014, og der derfor ikke var noget grundlag for eventuelle fiskeriaftaler, blev EU's fartøjer udelukket fra at fiske i de norske farvande, og tilsvarende blev de norske fartøjer udelukket fra at fiske i EU-farvande.

Det bør bemærkes, at EU var klar til at indgå bilaterale aftaler med Norge i de første uger af 2014. I det tidsrum, hvor der ikke forelå en aftale, kunne EU's fiskere, herunder også de danske, fortsat fiske i EU-farvandene på grundlag af de foreløbige kvoter, der blev vedtaget i december 2013.

Hvad angår kompensation til fiskere, henviser Kommissionen det ærede medlem til Kommissionens svar på skriftlig forespørgsel P-003063/2014. Endvidere henviser Kommissionen det ærede medlem til svaret fra Kommissionen på skriftlig forespørgsel E-004681/2014.

Kommissionen vil gøre sit bedste for at undgå en gentagelse af dette års situation, men det ærede medlem vil forstå, at forhandlinger i kraft deres natur ikke giver mulighed for at udstede absolutte garantier.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003956/14
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Compensation for Danish fishermen

It is most regrettable that the EU-Norway negotiations on a bilateral fisheries agreement got under way far too late, since, as a result, Norwegian waters were off-limits to Danish vessels for two and a half months in 2014. The economic and human cost of that has been considerable.

I acknowledge the Commission's efforts during the negotiations, as well as the complexity of the issue, and am of course pleased with the agreement that has been reached. I also take the view, however, that it would be entirely appropriate for the fishermen adversely affected to be given financial compensation. It must be borne in mind that the fact that there was no agreement from 1 January 2014 onwards had absolutely nothing to do with the fishing industry.

Accordingly, is there a possibility of EU financial compensation for Danish fishermen? If there is no such possibility, why is that the case? If compensation is possible, will the Commission give details concerning the time frame, procedure and amounts, for example?

Should the Commission reject any form of compensation, that would be a difficult answer to accept, since there are many instances of such compensation in agriculture.

Lastly, will the Commission say what specifically it intends to do to prevent this situation from reoccurring?

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

The Commission regrets that EU-Norway consultations on fisheries arrangements for 2014 were not finalised until March 2014. With no agreement having been reached between the EU and Norway for 2014, and therefore no basis for any fishing arrangements, EU vessels were excluded from fishing in Norwegian waters and, similarly, Norwegian vessels were excluded from Union waters.

It should be noted that the Union had been prepared to conclude bilateral arrangements with Norway in the early weeks of 2014. In the absence of an agreed arrangement, EU fishermen, including Danish, could still fish in EU waters on the basis of the provisional quotas agreed in December 2013.

As regards compensation for fishermen, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question P-003063/2014. The Commission also refers the Honourable Member to the answer given by the Commission to Written Question E-004681/2014.

Whilst the Commission will maximise its efforts to avoid a repetition of this year's situation, the Honourable Member will understand that, by the very nature of negotiations, no absolute guarantees can be given.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003957/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Εμπλοκή με την έκθεση της Blackrock για την επανακεφαλαιοποίηση των τραπεζών

Η Τράπεζα της Ελλάδας, εφαρμόζοντας το Μνημόνιο ΕΕ-ΔΝΤ-ΕΚΤ, ανέθεσε στην εταιρεία Blackrock τον έλεγχο των κεφαλαιακών αναγκών των ελληνικών τραπεζών, μέσω ασκήσεων προσομοίωσης ακραίων καταστάσεων. Οι εν λόγω ασκήσεις οδήγησαν σε εκτιμήσεις κεφαλαιακών αναγκών για τις ελληνικές τράπεζες, ύψους περίπου 6,3 δισ. ευρώ.

Ωστόσο, αυτές οι εκτιμήσεις αμφισβητήθηκαν από τους δανειστές, τόσο κατά τη διάρκεια, όσο και μετά την ολοκλήρωση των συζητήσεων μεταξύ ελληνικής κυβέρνησης και Τρόικας (Κομισιόν, ΕΚΤ, ΔΝΤ), με κύριο επιχείρημα τους κινδύνους που ενέχει η ανοδική τάση των μη εξυπηρετούμενων δανείων στην Ελλάδα. Στην κοινή δήλωση των εκπροσώπων της Τρόικα στην Ελλάδα, αναφέρεται συγκεκριμένα ότι «σύμφωνα με αξιολόγηση των κλιμακίων αποστολής, υπάρχουν ανοδικοί κίνδυνοι όσον αφορά τις εκτιμήσεις κεφαλαιακών αναγκών, ιδίως εάν οι αρχές και οι τράπεζες δεν αντιμετωπίσουν ταχέως και αποτελεσματικά το υψηλό επίπεδο των μη εξυπηρετούμενων δανείων».

Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είχε συμφωνήσει, εκ των προτέρων, η Τρόικα με την μεθοδολογία και τις υποθέσεις των ασκήσεων προσομοίωσης ακραίων καταστάσεων που θα διενεργούσε η εταιρεία Blackrock, κατά την εξέταση του ελληνικού τραπεζικού συστήματος; Εάν ναι, πιστεύει η Επιτροπή ότι, η εταιρεία Blackrock άλλαξε κάτι στον τρόπο διενέργειας των ελέγχων που να δικαιολογεί την αμφισβήτηση των στοιχείων αυτών από την Τρόικα;

2. Μπορεί να περιγράψει τους «ανοδικούς κινδύνους όσον αφορά τις εκτιμήσεις κεφαλαιακών αναγκών» των ελληνικών τραπεζών; Σε τι συνίσταται η «ταχεία και αποτελεσματική» αντιμετώπιση του υψηλού επιπέδου των μη εξυπηρετούμενων δανείων; Τι θα έπρεπε να κάνουν οι ελληνικές αρχές;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Ιουνίου 2014)

Κατά τη διενέργεια ασκήσεων προσομοίωσης ακραίων καταστάσεων το 2013, την Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος συνέδραμε μια συμβουλευτική επιτροπή που απαρτιζόταν από εκπροσώπους της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας, του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου και της Ευρωπαϊκής Αρχής Τραπεζών. Η συμβουλευτική επιτροπή παρείχε συμβουλές επί του περιεχομένου και του πεδίου εφαρμογής της διαγνωστικής μελέτης για το χαρτοφυλάκιο δανείων και τα βασικά συστατικά στοιχεία της εκτίμησης για τις κεφαλαιακές ανάγκες ([1]). Το βασικό σενάριο που χρησιμοποίησε η Blackrock αντικατοπτρίζει τις μακροοικονομικές προβλέψεις που περιέχονται στην τρίτη αναθεώρηση του προγράμματος η οποία ολοκληρώθηκε τον Ιούλιο του 2013 προς διασφάλιση της συνοχής με το πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής. Το δυσμενές σενάριο αναπτύχθηκε από την Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος σε διαβούλευση με την ΕΕ/ΕΚΤ/ΔΝΤ.

Θα πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι οι τελικές αποφάσεις σχετικά με τις μεθοδολογικές πτυχές ελήφθησαν από την Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος, η οποία έχει την πλήρη ευθύνη για τη μεθοδολογία των ασκήσεων προσομοίωσης ακραίων καταστάσεων και τα αποτελέσματά τους.

Οι πολιτικές δράσεις τις οποίες η Ελληνική Δημοκρατία έχει δεσμευτεί να αναλάβει προκειμένου να αντιμετωπίσει αποτελεσματικά το υψηλό επίπεδο των μη εξυπηρετούμενων δανείων περιέχονται στο «Δεύτερο πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα» — τέταρτη αναθεώρηση, σελίδα 46, παράγραφος 84, που δημοσιεύθηκε τον Απρίλιο του 2014 ([2]).

([1]) Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες βλ. «2013 Stress Test of the Greek Banking Sector» (σελίδα 4) διαθέσιμο στη διεύθυνση: http://www.bankofgreece.gr/BogEkdoseis/2013%20Stress%20test%20of%20the%20Greek%20banking%20sector.pdf

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2014/pdf/ocp192_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003957/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Impasse over the Blackrock report on the recapitalisation of Greek banks

The Bank of Greece, in applying the EU-IMF-ECB Memorandum, entrusted the company Blackrock with monitoring the capital needs of Greek banks through stress tests. These stress tests estimated the capital needs of Greek banks at approximately EUR 6.3 billion.

However, these estimates have been disputed by creditors, both during, and after the completion of discussions between the Greek Government and the Troika (the Commission, the ECB and the IMF), the main argument being the risks posed by the upward trend in non-performing loans in Greece. A joint statement by the representatives of the Troika in Greece states in particular that 'according to the assessment of the mission teams, there are upside risks to the capital needs estimates, in particular, if the authorities and banks do not urgently and efficiently address the high level of non-performing loans.'

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Did the Troika agree in advance to Blackrock's methodology and assumptions in carrying out the stress tests on the Greek banking system? If so, does it believe that the Blackrock changed the way in which the checks were carried out so as to justify the Troika's present doubts about the estimates it produced?

2. Can it describe the 'upside risks to the capital needs estimates' of Greek banks? What is meant by 'urgently and efficiently address(ing) the high level of non-performing loans'? What should the Greek authorities do?

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

In conducting the 2013 stress test the Bank of Greece was assisted by an Advisory Panel, comprising of representatives of the European Commission, European Central Bank, International Monetary Fund and the European Banking Authority. The Advisory Panel advised on the content and scope of the diagnostic study for the loan portfolio and the key components of the capital needs assessment ([1]). The baseline scenario used by Blackrock reflects the macroeconomic projections included in the Third Review of the programme completed in July 2013 to ensure consistency with the Economic Adjustment Programme. The Adverse Scenario was developed by the Bank of Greece in consultation with the EC/ECB/IMF.

It should be noted that the ultimate decisions on the methodological aspects were taken by the Bank of Greece, which has the full responsibility for the stress test methodology and results.

Policy actions that the Hellenic Republic has committed to undertake in order to efficiently address the high level of NPLs can be found in 'The Second Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece — Fourth Review' on page 46 paragraph 84, published in April 2014 ([2]).

([1]) For more info see '2013 Stress Test of the Greek Banking Sector' (page 4) available at: http://www.bankofgreece.gr/BogEkdoseis/2013%20Stress%20test%20of%20the%20Greek%20banking%20sector.pdf

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2014/pdf/ocp192_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003958/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Παραβίαση του Κανονισμού 561/2006

Ο κανονισμός 561/2006, για την εναρμόνιση των κοινωνικών διατάξεων στον τομέα των οδικών μεταφορών, ψηφίστηκε στις 15 Μαρτίου 2006 και θεσπίζει κανόνες για το μέγιστο αριθμό ωρών οδήγησης και τις απαραίτητες περιόδους ανάπαυσης των οδηγών που απασχολούνται στην οδική μεταφορά εμπορευμάτων και επιβατών. Σύμφωνα με καταγγελίες εργαζομένων στον κλάδο των οδικών μεταφορών στην Ελλάδα, ο συγκεκριμένος κανονισμός παραβιάζεται συστηματικά από τους ιδιοκτήτες εταιρειών μεταφορικού (εμπορευματικού και επιβατικού) έργου, θέτοντας σε κίνδυνο τόσο τη ζωή των εργαζομένων-οδηγών, όσο και την ίδια την οδική ασφάλεια.

Η προαναφερθείσα κατάσταση στον τομέα της ασφάλειας των οδικών μεταφορών χειροτέρεψε πολύ περισσότερο, με την απόφαση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης να αναθεωρήσει το ύψος των προστίμων που επιβάλλονται κατά παράβαση του κανονισμού 561/2006, καθιστώντας τα επί της ουσίας μη αποτρεπτικά των παραβατικών συμπεριφορών εκ μέρους των επιχειρήσεων.

Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Γνωρίζει τις παραπάνω καταγγελίες σχεδόν όλων των οργανώσεων εργαζομένων στις οδικές μεταφορές, αναφορικά με τις παραβιάσεις του κανονισμού 561/2006; Εάν όχι, σκοπεύει να διερευνήσει τις εν λόγω καταγγελίες;

2. Θεωρεί ότι αντιβαίνει στο άρθρο 19 του κανονισμού 561/2006, το οποίο τονίζει ότι οι κυρώσεις που επιβάλλει ένα κράτος μέλος κατά παράβαση του κανονισμού θα πρέπει να είναι αποτελεσματικές, αναλογικές και αποτρεπτικές, η απόφαση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης για μείωση των προστίμων;

3. Διαθέτει στοιχεία αναφορικά με το ύψος των προστίμων που επιβάλλονται κατά παράβαση του κανονισμού 561/2006 στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, και συγκεκριμένα στη Βουλγαρία, την Ιταλία, τη Γαλλία, τη Γερμανία και την Ισπανία;

Απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Μαΐου 2014)

1. Η Επιτροπή είναι ενήμερη για την κατάσταση και προβαίνει στις δέουσες ενέργειες όταν λαμβάνει συγκεκριμένες τεκμηριωμένες πληροφορίες σχετικά με παραβιάσεις του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 561/2006 για την εναρμόνιση ορισμένων κοινωνικών διατάξεων στον τομέα των οδικών μεταφορών ([1]). Δεν έχει λάβει, ωστόσο, καταγγελίες σχετικά με παραβάσεις που φέρεται ότι διέπραξαν μεταφορικές επιχειρήσεις στην Ελλάδα. Η επιβολή των κανόνων εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών, τα οποία είναι σε θέση να διερευνούν καλύτερα παραβάσεις που διέπραξαν οι επιχειρήσεις οδικών μεταφορών και οι οδηγοί.

2. Οι ελληνικές αρχές επιβεβαίωσαν ότι τα προσφάτως θεσπισθέντα πρόστιμα ([2]) είναι ανάλογα της σοβαρότητας της σχετικής παράβασης. Η αξιολόγηση της αναλογικότητας των κυρώσεων είναι σύνθετο ζήτημα, διότι πρέπει να λαμβάνεται υπόψη όχι μόνο η σοβαρότητα της παράβασης καθεαυτής, αλλά και η κοινωνικοοικονομική κατάσταση σε συγκεκριμένο κράτος μέλος. Πρόσφατη απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου ([3]) δίνει ορισμένες κατευθύνσεις ως προς το κριτήριο της αναλογικότητας των κυρώσεων. Η Επιτροπή είναι της άποψης ότι ο μικρός αριθμός ελέγχων που διενεργούνται ανά έτος ([4]) στην Ελλάδα, δεν αποτρέπει ίσως αποτελεσματικά επιχειρήσεις και οδηγούς από την παραβίαση της ισχύουσας νομοθεσίας. Η Επιτροπή θα ζητήσει πληροφορίες από τις ελληνικές αρχές όσον αφορά το επίπεδο επιβολής και των κυρώσεων.

3. Η Επιτροπή δρομολόγησε το 2012 μελέτη προκειμένου να αποκτήσει λεπτομερή επισκόπηση των κυρώσεων που επιβάλλονται στα κράτη μέλη. Η έκθεση δείχνει ότι, λόγω των διαφορετικών κοινωνικοοικονομικών καταστάσεων στα κράτη μέλη και των διαφόρων εθνικών ποινικών συστημάτων, είναι δύσκολο να θεσπιστεί ευρωπαϊκό σύστημα προστίμων. Η τελική έκθεση της «μελέτης σχετικά με τις κυρώσεις στον τομέα των επαγγελματικών οδικών μεταφορών» πρόκειται να δημοσιευτεί σύντομα ([5]).

([1]) ΕΕ L 102 της 11.4.2006, σ. 1.
([2]) Κοινή Υπουργική Απόφαση Φ450/38668/3534 της 2ας Αυγούστου 2013 (Φ.Ε.Κ. 2061, Τεύχος Β'), που εκδόθηκε δυνάμει του άρθρου 117 του νόμου 4070/2012 (Φ.Ε.Κ. 82, Τεύχος Α') και προβλέπει νέες διοικητικές κυρώσεις για την παράβαση των κανονισμών (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 3821/85 και (ΕΚ) αριθ. 561/2006.
([3]) Απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, της 9ης Φεβρουαρίου 2012, Υπόθεση C-210/10 Márton Urbán.
([4]) Από την διετή εθνική έκθεση για την εφαρμογή του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 561/2006 προκύπτει ότι η Ελλάδα δεν πληροί το ελάχιστο όριο ετησίων ελέγχων που πρέπει να διενεργούνται προκειμένου να ελεγχθεί η συμμόρφωση προς τις διατάξεις του κανονισμού.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/road/social_provisions/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003958/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Violations of Regulation 561/2006

Regulation 561/2006 on the harmonization of certain social legislation relating to road transport, which was adopted on 15 March 2006, lays down standards for the maximum number of driving hours and the necessary rest periods for drivers engaged in the carriage of goods and passengers by road. According to complaints by workers in the road transport sector in Greece, this regulation is being systematically flouted by the owners of freight and passenger transport companies, thereby endangering the lives of workers/drivers and road safety itself.

The road safety situation in Greece has been made much worse by the Greek government's decision to revise the level of fines imposed for violations of Regulation 561/2006, so that they will basically no longer act as a deterrent for companies seeking to evade compliance.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of these complaints by virtually all road transport workers' organisations about violations of Regulation 561/2006? If not, will it investigate these complaints?

2. Does it consider that the Greek government's decision to reduce the fines represents a breach of Article 19 of Regulation 561/2006, which stresses that the penalties imposed by a Member State for violations of the regulation should be effective, proportionate and dissuasive?

3. Does it have any information regarding the level of the fines imposed for breaches of Regulation 561/2006 in other European Union countries, particularly in Bulgaria, Italy, France, Germany and Spain?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2014)

1. The Commission is aware of the situation and it takes appropriate steps whenever it receives concrete evidence-based information of infringements of Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 on the harmonisation of certain social legislation relating to road transport ([1]). It has not, however, received complaints about alleged infringements committed by transport undertakings in Greece. Enforcement of the rules falls within the responsibility of the Member States which are best placed to investigate infringements committed by the road haulage undertakings and the drivers.

2. The Greek authorities affirmed that the newly issued fines ([2]) are proportional to the seriousness of the corresponding infringement. The assessment of the proportionality of penalties is a complex matter, as it should take into account not only the level of seriousness of the infringement itself, but also the socioeconomic situation in a given Member State. A recent judgment of the Court of Justice ([3]) provides some guidance on the criterion of proportionality of penalties. The Commission is of the opinion that the low number of controls carried out in Greece every year ([4]) may not effectively deter undertakings and drivers from disrespecting the laws in force. The Commission will enquire with the Greek authorities with regard to the level of enforcement and penalties.

3. In 2012 the Commission launched a study to gain a detailed overview of penalties applied in Member States. It shows that due to different socioeconomic situations in Member States and various national penal systems, it is difficult to establish a European system of fines. The final report of the 'Study on sanctions in the field of commercial road transport' is to be published soon ([5]).

([1]) OJ L 102, 11.4.2006, p. 1.
([2]) Joint Ministerial Decision Φ450/38668/3534 of 2 August 2013 (Government Gazette, Series II, No 2061), issued under Article 117 of Law 4070/2012 (Government Gazette, Series I, No 82) and laying down new administrative penalties for infringement of Regulations (EEC) No 3821/85 and (EC) No 561/2006.
([3]) Judgment of the European Court of Justice of 9 February 2012, Case C-210/10 Márton Urbán,.
([4]) The biennial national report on the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 reveals that Greece does not meet the minimum threshold for annual checks to be carried out to control compliance with the regulation's provisions.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/road/social_provisions/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003959/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Φορολόγηση μερισμάτων στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με εγκύκλιο του Υπουργείου Οικονομικών, ο συντελεστής φορολόγησης των μερισμάτων ημεδαπών ανώνυμων εταιρειών σε φυσικά ή νομικά πρόσωπα, ημεδαπά ή αλλοδαπά, ενώσεις προσώπων ή ομάδες περιουσίας, θα μειωθεί από 25% που ισχύει για το έτος 2013 (για εισοδήματα του έτους 2012) σε 10% για το έτος 2014 (για εισοδήματα του έτους 2013).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει προϋπολογιστεί το δημοσιονομικό βάρος της μείωσης της φορολόγησης μερισμάτων από το 25% στο 10%; Εάν ναι, πόσο είναι αυτό;

2. Ποια είναι τα ισοδύναμα μέτρα που εφαρμόστηκαν από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση για την κάλυψη του δημοσιονομικού κενού που δημιουργεί η παραπάνω φοροελάφρυνση;

3. Μπορεί να μου παράσχει στοιχεία για τα ποσά που έχει συλλέξει το ελληνικό κράτος από τον προαναφερθέντα φόρο επί των μερισμάτων από το 2008 έως το 2013; Διαθέτει ανάλογα στοιχεία για τα άλλα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, καθώς επίσης για το ύψος των φορολογικών συντελεστών επί των μερισμάτων που ισχύουν στην Ένωση;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η μεταρρύθμιση στον φόρο εισοδήματος που έλαβε χώρα τον Ιανουάριο του 2013 στην Ελλάδα, παράλληλα με τη θέσπιση του κώδικα φορολογίας εισοδήματος τον Ιούλιο του 2013, αποτελούν σημαντική μεταρρύθμιση του ελληνικού φορολογικού συστήματος. Ως τμήμα της μεταρρύθμισης αυτής, ο συντελεστής φόρου στα μερίσματα μειώθηκε από 25% σε 10%, ευθυγραμμισμένος σε μεγάλο βαθμό με τον φορολογικό συντελεστή σε άλλες πηγές εισοδημάτων από κεφάλαια. Η αλλαγή συνοδεύτηκε από αύξηση των συντελεστών φορολογίας επιχειρήσεων από 20% σε 26% και σημαντική αναθεώρηση των αποσβέσεων.

Δεδομένα σχετικά με το εισόδημα από μερίσματα δεν δημοσιεύονται από τις ελληνικές αρχές χωριστά, αλλά οι εκτιμήσεις δείχνουν ότι τα εισοδήματα από μερίσματα είναι πολύ μικρά, αντιπροσωπεύοντας λιγότερο από το 2% του συνόλου των φορολογητέων κερδών. Οι επιπτώσεις από τη μείωση του συντελεστή φόρου επί των μερισμάτων θα αντισταθμιστεί συνεπώς από τις επιπτώσεις της αύξησης των εσόδων που προκύπτουν από την αλλαγή των συντελεστών φορολογίας επιχειρήσεων και των αποσβέσεων. Επιπλέον, στοιχεία από τη φορολογική μεταρρύθμιση του 2003 στις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες καταδεικνύουν πολύ υψηλή ελαστικότητα των μερισμάτων σε ό, τι αφορά το ποσοστό του φόρου, γεγονός που υποδηλώνει ότι η μείωση του φόρου επί των μερισμάτων μπορεί πράγματι να αυξήσει τα φορολογικά έσοδα από αυτή την πηγή.

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με τα φορολογικά έσοδα που το ελληνικό κράτος, καθώς και άλλα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ εισέπραξαν από φόρους επί των μερισμάτων κατά την περίοδο 2008-2013. Το έγγραφο εργασίας του ΟΟΣΑ με τίτλο ([1]) «Φορολογία μερισμάτων, τόκοι και εισοδήματα από κεφαλαιουχικά κέρδη» περιλαμβάνει δεδομένα σχετικά με τους φορολογικούς συντελεστές επί των μερισμάτων σε χώρες μέλη του ΟΟΣΑ από τον Ιούλιο του 2012.

([1]) http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k3wh96w246k-en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003959/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Taxation of dividends in Greece

According to a circular from the Greek Finance Ministry, the tax rate on dividends of domestic public limited companies distributed to natural or legal persons, both national and foreign, and associations of persons and funds will be reduced from 25%, the rate in 2013 (for income for 2012), to 10% for the year 2014 (for income for 2013).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Has the financial burden of reducing taxation on dividends from 25% to 10% been estimated? If so, how much is it?

2. What equivalent measures have been taken by the Greek Government to cover the financial shortfall created by the above tax reduction?

3. Can it provide data on the amounts collected by the Greek state from the aforesaid tax on dividends from 2008 to 2013? Does it have equivalent data for the other Member States of the European Union, as well as data on the tax rates on dividends applicable in the rest of the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Greek income tax reform of January 2013, along with the adoption of the Income Tax Code in July 2013, represented a major reform of the Greek tax system. As part of this reform, the tax rate on dividends was reduced from 25% to 10%, broadly in line with the tax rate on other sources of income from capital. The change was accompanied by a rise in corporate tax rates from 20% to 26% and a major review of depreciation allowances.

Data on income from dividends is not separately published by the Greek authorities, but estimates suggest that income from dividends is very small, representing less than 2% of total taxable profits. Any effect from the reduction in the tax rate on dividends would be therefore offset by the effects of increased revenues stemming from the change in corporate tax rates and depreciation allowances. Moreover, evidence from the 2003 tax reform in the United States suggest a very high elasticity of dividends with respect to the tax rate, suggesting that a reduction in dividends tax may actually increase tax revenues from this source.

The Commission has no data on the tax revenues collected by the Greek state and other EU Member States from taxes on dividends from 2008 to 2013. The OECD Working Paper ([1]) 'Taxation of Dividend, Interest, and Capital Gain Income' includes data on the tax rates on dividends in OECD member countries from July 2012.

([1]) http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k3wh96w246k-en

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003961/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Πρόγραμμα Ήλιος

Στη Δήλωση της Συνόδου Κορυφής για το Ευρώ στις 26 Οκτωβρίου 2011, και συγκεκριμένα στο σημείο (13), αναφέρονται τα εξής: «Η Ελλάδα δεσμεύει μελλοντικές ταμειακές ροές από το πρόγραμμα Ήλιος ή άλλα έσοδα από ιδιωτικοποιήσεις πέραν των ήδη περιλαμβανομένων στο πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής για την περαιτέρω μείωση του χρέους της Ελληνικής Δημοκρατίας έως 15 δισ. ευρώ με σκοπό την αποκατάσταση της δανειοδοτικής ικανότητας του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Χρηματοπιστωτικής Σταθερότητας (EFSF)». Επίσης, στην Πρώτη Αξιολόγηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής του Δεύτερου Προγράμματος Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής, σημειώνεται ότι η ελληνική κυβέρνηση θα διευκολύνει την αδειοδοτική διαδικασία του προγράμματος Ήλιος, καθώς επίσης και τη συνεργασία με τις υπόλοιπες χώρες της ΕΕ, για την εξαγωγή ηλιακής ενέργειας.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σε ποια φάση βρίσκεται η υλοποίηση του προγράμματος Ήλιος από την Ελλάδα; Έχουν ξεκινήσει οι διαγωνιστικές διαδικασίες; Με ποια κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ έχει υπάρξει «συνεργασία» για τη μελλοντική εξαγωγή ηλιακής ενέργειας;

2. Είναι ευχαριστημένη η Επιτροπή από την πορεία του προγράμματος, το οποίο μάλιστα συνδέεται άμεσα με τη βιωσιμότητα του ελληνικού χρέους και την επιτυχία του Δεύτερου Προγράμματος Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής;

3. Ποια άλλα φιλόδοξα σχέδια επεξεργάζεται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή για την Ελλάδα;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι οι ελληνικές αρχές προέβησαν σε εκτενή αξιολόγηση της τεχνικής και οικονομικής σκοπιμότητας ενός μεγάλου επενδυτικού προγράμματος για την παραγωγή ηλιακής φωτοβολταϊκής ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας στην Ελλάδα και την εξαγωγή της προς την κεντρική και τη βορειοδυτική Ευρώπη. Ως αποτέλεσμα της ανάλυσης αυτής, η οποία εντόπισε αρκετές επενδυτικές προκλήσεις, αποφασίστηκε να μην συνεχιστεί το έργο.

Επικαιροποιημένη ανάλυση της βιωσιμότητας του χρέους είναι διαθέσιμη στην τεκμηρίωση του προγράμματος που δημοσιεύθηκε μετά την ολοκλήρωση της 4ης αναθεώρησης του 2ου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα.

Η Επιτροπή συνεπικουρεί επί του παρόντος ένα σχέδιο παροχής τεχνικής βοήθειας για τη μεταρρύθμιση της ελληνικής πολιτικής στον τομέα των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας και του κανονιστικού πλαισίου.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003961/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Project Helios

The euro summit statement of October 26, 2011 declares in point 13: 'Greece commits future cash flows from project Helios or other privatisation revenue in excess of those already included in the adjustment programme to further reduce indebtedness of the Hellenic Republic by up to 15 billion euros with the aim of restoring the lending capacity of the EFSF.' Furthermore, the Commission's first review of the Second Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece notes that the Greek Government will facilitate the licensing procedure for project Helios, as well as cooperation with other EU countries over the export of solar energy.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What stage has the implementation by Greece of project Helios reached? Have the tendering procedures been launched? With which EU Member States has there been 'cooperation' over future exports of solar energy?

2. Is it pleased with the progress made by the programme to date, which is of course directly related to the sustainability of the Greek debt and the success of the Second Economic Adjustment Programme?

3. What other ambitious projects is the Commission drawing up for Greece?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

The Commission understands that the Greek authorities carried out an extensive evaluation of the technical and commercial feasibility of a large investment programme focused on generating solar PV electricity in Greece and exporting it to central and north-western Europe. As a result of this analysis, which identified several investment challenges, it was decided not to continue the project.

An updated debt sustainability analysis is available in the programme documentation published after conclusion of the 4th review of the 2nd economic adjustment programme for Greece.

The Commission is currently co-supporting a technical assistance project on the reform of the Greek renewable energy policy and regulatory framework.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003962/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Βιωσιμότητα Ελληνικού Χρέους

Σε μελέτη του ΔΝΤ για τη βιωσιμότητα του ελληνικού χρέους (Debt Sustainability Analysis — January 2013), ζητούνται να ληφθούν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση και τους επίσημους πιστωτές της, ώστε το 2022, το συσσωρευμένο κρατικό χρέος της Ελλάδας να βρίσκεται κάτω από το 110% του ΑΕΠ, όταν, για το 2020, υπολογίζεται από την Επιτροπή ότι θα φτάσει στο 124% του ΑΕΠ. Παρόμοια οπτική για τη βιωσιμότητα του ελληνικού χρέους έχει και ο Οργανισμός Οικονομικής Συνεργασίας και Ανάπτυξης (ΟΟΣΑ), ο οποίος, το Δεκέμβριο του 2013, ζήτησε άμεσο κούρεμά του, ώστε να καταστεί βιώσιμο. Επίσης, τον Ιανουάριο του 2014, στην ενδιάμεση Έκθεση του ελληνικού Γραφείου Προϋπολογισμού του Κράτους, σημειώνεται ότι «τα κράτη μέλη, όπως η Ελλάδα (με το δημόσιο χρέος να παραμένει στα δυσθεώρητα ύψη του 170%) δεν έχουν την παραμικρή δυνατότητα να μειώσουν τα χρέη (σε απόλυτα μεγέθη και ως ποσοστό του ΑΕΠ) στο επίπεδο που απαιτούν οι νέοι δημοσιονομικοί κανόνες αποκλειστικά μόνο με εθνικές προσπάθειες».

Με δεδομένο ότι ο έλληνας Υπουργός Οικονομικών δήλωσε σε συνέντευξή του ότι θα ξεκινήσουν οι διαπραγματεύσεις για το ελληνικό χρέος στη σύνοδο του Eurogroup στις αρχές Μαΐου, καθώς επίσης, με δεδομένες τις εξουσίες που έχει στις διαδικασίες ελέγχου των εθνικών προϋπολογισμών (Οικονομική Διακυβέρνηση, Ευρωπαϊκό Εξάμηνο), ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι βιώσιμο τελικά το ελληνικό χρέος, χωρίς να υπάρξει γενναίο κούρεμα του μεγάλου μέρους του;

2. Τι θα εισηγηθεί η Επιτροπή στις διαπραγματεύσεις της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης με τα κράτη μέλη του Eurogroup και δανειστές της Ελλάδας;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Ιουνίου 2014)

Στις 5 Μαΐου 2014, τα κράτη μέλη της ζώνης του ευρώ επιβεβαίωσαν τη δέσμευσή τους να παράσχουν επαρκή στήριξη μέχρις ότου η Ελλάδα ανακτήσει πλήρη πρόσβαση στην αγορά, υπό την προϋπόθεση ότι η Ελλάδα συμμορφώνεται πλήρως με τις απαιτήσεις και τους στόχους του προγράμματος προσαρμογής. Τα σχετικά πλεονεκτήματα των πιθανών μέτρων βιωσιμότητας του χρέους, όπως εκτέθηκαν από την Ευρωομάδα στις 27 Νοεμβρίου 2012, θα εκτιμηθούν στο πλαίσιο της επόμενης επανεξέτασης ([1]).

([1]) Βλ. δήλωση της Ευρωομάδας, της 5ης Μαΐου 2014, διαθέσιμη στην ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση: http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/newsroom/news/2014/05/eurogroup-statement-on-greece/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003962/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Greek debt sustainability

An IMF study on the sustainability of the Greek debt (Debt Sustainability Analysis — January 2013) calls for the Greek Government and its official creditors to take practical steps to ensure that by 2022 Greece's accumulated government debt falls below 110% of GDP; the Commission, by contrast, estimates that by 2020 it will be 124% of GDP. A similar view on the sustainability of Greek debt is taken by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which, in December 2013, called for an immediate 'haircut' in order to make it sustainable. Furthermore, in January 2014, the interim report of the Greek State Budget Office noted that 'Member States such as Greece (whose debt remains at an astronomical 170%) do not have the slightest chance of reducing their debts (in absolute terms and as a percentage of GDP) to the level required by the new financial rules by their own efforts only.'

Given that the Greek finance minister has stated in an interview that negotiations on the Greek debt will begin at the Eurogroup meeting at the beginning of May and given also the powers it has in procedures to control national budgets (Economic Governance , European Semester), will the Commission say :

1. Is the Greek debt ultimately sustainable without applying a drastic 'haircut' to most of it?

2. What course of action will it recommend in the Greek government's negotiations with the Member States of the Eurogroup and Greece's creditors?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

On 5 May 2014, the euro area member states reaffirmed their commitment to provide adequate support until Greece regains full market access, provided Greece fully complies with the requirements and objectives of the adjustment programme. The relative merits of possible debt sustainability measures, as stated by the Eurogroup on 27 November 2012, will be considered in the context of the next review ([1]).

([1]) See Eurogroup statement of 5.5.2014, available at: http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/newsroom/news/2014/05/eurogroup-statement-on-greece/

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-003963/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ανησυχητική η εξάπλωση του ιού H1N1 στην Ελλάδα

Ο ιός H1N1, γνωστός και ως «γρίπη των χοίρων», είναι ένας τύπος γρίπης που εμφανίστηκε τον Απρίλιο του 2009, χαρακτηρίζεται από την ταχεία εξάπλωσή του στον άνθρωπο και ήταν υπεύθυνος για την παγκόσμια επιδημία, με μεγάλο αριθμό θυμάτων.

Πράγματι, ενώ ο ιός είναι ως επί το πλείστον θεραπεύσιμος, μπορεί να αποβεί θανατηφόρος σε άτομα με χρόνιες ασθένειες, όπως το άσθμα, ο διαβήτης ή καρδιακές νόσοι, αλλά επίσης στις έγκυες γυναίκες και τα μικρά παιδιά. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 168 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σχετικά με την δημόσια υγεία, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει εργαστεί προς την κατεύθυνση της πρόληψης και της καταπολέμησης της εξάπλωσης του ιού, εστιάζοντας σε πέντε βασικούς τομείς: την εισαγωγή ενός εμβολίου, το σχεδιασμό στρατηγικών εμβολιασμού, την υποστήριξη κοινής προμήθειας εμβολίων, την επικοινωνία με το κοινό και τη στήριξη των μη ευρωπαϊκών χωρών. Πράγματι, είναι σημαντικό να υποστηριχθούν οι ενέργειες για την αντιμετώπιση μιας απειλής για τη δημόσια υγεία, με σοβαρές κοινωνικο-οικονομικές συνέπειες.

Σύμφωνα με την απογραφή που διεξήχθη σε 29 ευρωπαϊκές χώρες από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Ελέγχου και Πρόληψης Νοσημάτων, ανάμεσα στα τέλη Ιανουαρίου και στις αρχές Φεβρουαρίου 2014, η Ελλάδα έχει την πρωτιά σε «δραστηριότητα γρίπης», ενώ η Βουλγαρία, η Φινλανδία, η Γαλλία, το Λουξεμβούργο, η Μάλτα και η Ισπανία παρουσιάζουν μια μέση δραστηριότητα γρίπης ([1]). Οι υπόλοιπες 22 ευρωπαϊκές χώρες αντιμετωπίζουν χαμηλά επίπεδα γρίπης. Το Ελληνικό Κέντρο Ελέγχου και Πρόληψης Νοσημάτων (ΚΕΕΛΠΝΟ) κατέγραψε ανησυχητικά στοιχεία: μέχρι σήμερα 98 θάνατοι σχετίζονται με τον ιό και 48 άνθρωποι βρίσκονται σε κρίσιμη κατάσταση. Επιπλέον, οι ασθενείς ανήκουν στις πιο ευάλωτες ομάδες και δεν έχουν εμβολιαστεί, ενώ το ποσοστό θνησιμότητας των ασθενών που εισάγονται σε μονάδα εντατικής θεραπείας φτάνει το 35% ([2]). Ο Ιατρικός Σύλλογος Αθηνών έχει επανειλημμένα αναδείξει τα ποσοστά ανησυχητικής εξάπλωσης στην Ελλάδα και τις ελλείψεις σε εμβόλια και στρατηγικές αντιμετώπισης. Σύμφωνα με σχετικές ανακοινώσεις του ([3]), τόσο στις ευάλωτες ομάδες όσο και στα υγειονομικά επαγγέλματα, η φετινή εμβολιαστική κάλυψη φτάνει μόνο το 35%.

Επομένως, θεωρείται σκόπιμο να ερωτηθεί η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια μέτρα προβλέπονται προκειμένου να ξεπεραστούν οι ανησυχητικές ανισορροπίες αναφορικά με τη γρίπη μεταξύ των κρατών μελών;

2. Ποια μέτρα έχουν ληφθεί για να εξασφαλιστεί ο αποτελεσματικός συντονισμός σε επίπεδο ΕΕ, ιδίως όσον αφορά την υποστήριξη των κρατών μελών στην προσπάθεια καταπολέμησης της επιδημίας; Πού οφείλεται η μεγάλη εξάπλωση στην Ελλάδα και ο μεγάλος αριθμός θυμάτων;

3. Συνεργάζεται η ΕΕ με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση για τη στρατηγική και τα μέσα αντιμετώπισης; Ποια τα αποτελέσματα;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Μαΐου 2014)

Ενώ η έγκριση μέτρων που αφορούν τη δημόσια υγεία παραμένει εθνική αρμοδιότητα, σύμφωνα με την απόφαση 1082/2013/ΕΕ ([4]) η Επιτροπή συντονίζει τα εν λόγω μέτρα για τη δημόσια υγεία στο πλαίσιο της επιτροπής υγειονομικής ασφάλειας.

Όσον αφορά την εποχική γρίπη, η σύσταση του Συμβουλίου της ΕΕ σχετικά με τον «εμβολιασμό για την εποχική γρίπη» (2009/1019/ΕΕ) ([5]) καλεί τα κράτη μέλη να λάβουν μέτρα για τον μετριασμό των επιπτώσεων της εποχικής γρίπης με στόχο την επίτευξη, κατά προτίμηση μέχρι τη χειμερινή περίοδο 2014-15, ποσοστού εμβολιαστικής κάλυψης 75% για τις «ομάδες μεγαλύτερης ηλικίας».

Το έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής για την εποχική γρίπη ([6]) στοχεύει στη στήριξη της ανάπτυξης πολιτικών εμβολιασμού στα κράτη μέλη. Συνεπώς, οι ιδέες για την ανάπτυξη που θίγονται σε αυτό το έγγραφο πρέπει να θεωρούνται ως επιλογές τις οποίες τα κράτη μέλη θα λαμβάνουν υπόψη για τη στήριξη των προσπαθειών τους για την επίτευξη των στόχων που καθορίστηκαν στο πλαίσιο της σύστασης του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με τον εμβολιασμό για την εποχική γρίπη.

([1]) http://www.tovima.gr/science/article/?aid=567989
([2]) http://greece.greekreporter.com/2014/03/19/greece-influenza-outbreak-to-last-until-easter/#sthash.KnB3EL4D.dpuf
([3]) Δελτίο Τύπου του Ιατρικού Συλλόγου Αθηνών ΙΣΑ: «Η απουσία Εθνικής Πολιτικής Πρόληψης κοστίζει ζωές», 11/01/2014, «Απολογισμός θανάτου: η επιδημία της γρίπης στην Ελλάδα συγκριτικά με τις άλλες χώρες της Ευρώπης — Την αδράνεια του Υπουργείου Υγείας θα προσπαθήσει να καλύψει ο ΙΣΑ για την περίοδο 2014-15», 23/03/2014, «Εγκληματική η έλλειψη Εμβολιαστικής Πολιτικής στην Ελλάδα: 58 ανθρώπινες ζωές θα είχαν σωθεί μόνο με ένα αντιγριπικό εμβόλιο των 6 ευρώ!», 23/03/2014.
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:293:0001:0015:EN:PDF
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:348:0071:0072:EN:PDF
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/vaccination/docs/seasonflu_staffwd2014_en.pdf

Σύμφωνα με το Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Πρόληψης και Ελέγχου Νόσων, δεν υπάρχει καμία ένδειξη ότι η εν λόγω περίοδος έχει επηρεάσει περισσότερα άτομα στην Ελλάδα σε σχέση με τις προηγούμενες περιόδους ή σε σύγκριση με άλλα κράτη μέλη.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003963/14
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Alarming spread of the H1N1 virus in Greece

The H1N1 virus, also known as 'swine flu', is a type of influenza that first appeared in April 2009, spreads rapidly to humans and is responsible for a global epidemic, causing large numbers of deaths.

Indeed, while patients with the virus can mostly be cured, it can prove fatal to persons suffering from chronic diseases such as asthma, diabetes or heart disease, but also to pregnant women and young children. In accordance with the provisions of Article 168 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (on public health), the European Union has been working towards preventing and combating the spread of the virus, focusing on five key areas: the introduction of a vaccine, planning vaccination strategies, supporting the creation of a common supply of vaccines, communicating with the public and supporting non-European countries. For it is important to support actions to address a public health threat with potentially grave socioeconomic consequences.

According to a census conducted in 29 European countries by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control between the end of January and the beginning of February 2014, the most intense 'influenza activity' occurred in Greece, while there was average influenza activity in Bulgaria, Finland, France, Luxembourg, Malta and Spain ([1]). The remaining 22 European countries experienced low influenza activity. The Greek Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (KEELPNO) has recorded alarming figures: so far, 98 deaths are associated with the virus and 48 people are in a critical condition. Moreover, the patients belong to the most vulnerable groups and are unvaccinated, while the mortality rate of patients admitted to intensive care is now 35%. ([2]) The Athens Medical Association has repeatedly highlighted the alarming pace of the spread of the disease in Greece and the shortage of vaccines and lack of control and prevention strategies. It has announced ([3]) that among both vulnerable groups and health professionals this year's vaccination coverage has only reached 35%.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What measures are planned to overcome the alarming disparities between Member States regarding this influenza?

2. What measures have been taken to ensure effective coordination at EU level, in particular with regard to support for Member States in the fight against the epidemic? What is the reason for the rapid spread of the disease in Greece and the large number of victims there?

3. Is the EU cooperating with the Greek Government on the strategy and the means to tackle this disease? If so, what are the results?

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

While the adoption of measures related to public health is a national competence, under Decision 1082/2013/EU ([4]) the Commission coordinates such public health measures in the context of the Health Security Committee.

Regarding seasonal influenza, the EU Council Recommendation on 'seasonal influenza vaccination' (2009/1019/EU) ([5]) calls on Member States to take action to mitigate the impact of seasonal influenza with the aim of reaching, preferably by the 2014-15 winter season, a vaccination coverage rate of 75% for 'older age groups'.

The Commission Staff Working Document on seasonal influenza ([6]) aims to support the development of vaccination policies in the Member States. Therefore, ideas for development raised in this document should be seen as options that Member States may consider as supporting their efforts to reach the targets set under the Council Recommendation on seasonal influenza vaccination.

([1]) http://www.tovima.gr/science/article/?aid=567989
([2]) http://greece.greekreporter.com/2014/03/19/greece-influenza-outbreak-to-last-until-easter/#sthash.KnB3EL4D.dpuf
([3]) Press Release by the Athens Medical Association, ISA: 'The Lack of a National Prevention Policy Costs Lives', 11.01.2014, 'Death Toll: the Epidemic of Influenza in Greece Compared with other European Countries — The ISA will Endeavour to Cover the Ministry of Health's inertia for the period 2014-15', 23.3.2014, 'The Lack of a Vaccination Policy in Greece is Criminal: 58 Lives Would Have Been Saved by a Flu Vaccine Costing EUR 6!' 23.3.2014.
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:293:0001:0015:EN:PDF
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:348:0071:0072:EN:PDF
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/vaccination/docs/seasonflu_staffwd2014_en.pdf

According to the European Centre for Disease prevention and Control, there is no indication that this season has affected more people in Greece than previous seasons or compared to other Member States.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003964/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(31 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Το κόμμα της Νέας Δημοκρατίας παίρνει νέο δάνειο χωρίς να έχουν εξυπηρετηθεί παλαιότερα χρέη

Μετά από ερώτησή μου (E-013481/2013) σχετικά με τα προνομιακά δάνεια που χορηγήθηκαν σε κυβερνητικά πολιτικά κόμματα στην Ελλάδα, παραπέμπω στην απάντηση του Επιτρόπου Almunia εξ ονόματος της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, στις 7 Φεβρουαρίου 2014, σύμφωνα με την οποία «η συντριπτική πλειονότητα των εν λόγω δανείων είναι μη εξυπηρετούμενα ήδη από τον Ιανουάριο του 2013» ενώ «από τον Ιανουάριο του 2013 δεν χορηγήθηκε κανένα νέο δάνειο σε πολιτικό κόμμα» (όταν οι εντολοδόχοι παρακολούθησης που όρισε η Επιτροπή άρχισαν την παρακολούθηση τεσσάρων συστημικών τραπεζών στην Ελλάδα).

Ωστόσο, με βάση τον τελευταίο ισολογισμό της Νέας Δημοκρατίας (ΝΔ), κύριου εταίρου του κυβερνητικού συνασπισμού, που δημοσιεύθηκε πρόσφατα, το κόμμα της ΝΔ εμφανίζεται να έχει δανεισθεί άλλα 14 εκατομμύρια ευρώ το 2013, με αποτέλεσμα το ανεξόφλητο χρέος του να ανέρχεται στο ασύλληπτο ποσό των 160 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ συνολικά.

Η εξέλιξη αυτή φαίνεται να αντιτίθεται στις διαβεβαιώσεις της Επιτροπής ότι από τον Ιανουάριο του 2013 δεν χορηγήθηκε κανένα νέο δάνειο σε πολιτικό κόμμα, και θέτει σοβαρά υπό αμφισβήτηση την αποτελεσματικότητα της δράσης των ορισθέντων εντολοδόχων παρακολούθησης σε σχέση με τον έλεγχο της χρηστής διακυβέρνησης και τη χρήση εμπορικών κριτηρίων στις κύριες πολιτικές αποφάσεις, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της παρακολούθησης της διαδικασίας των νέων δανείων και της αναδιάρθρωσης υφιστάμενων δανείων των πολιτικών κομμάτων που συμμετέχουν στην κυβέρνηση.

Ως εκ τούτου, με βάση τις πληροφορίες που έδωσαν οι ορισθέντες εντολοδόχοι παρακολούθησης, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Δεδομένου ότι τα δάνεια της ΝΔ είναι ήδη μη εξυπηρετούμενα και ότι η οφειλή δεν μπορεί να αποπληρωθεί, με βάση ποια εγγύηση εγκρίθηκε αυτό το νέο δάνειο και από ποια τράπεζα;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005215/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(23 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ενημέρωση της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τα δάνεια της Νέας Δημοκρατίας

Από τον ισολογισμό του κόμματος της Νέας Δημοκρατίας του έτους 2013 προκύπτει ότι το κόμμα αυτό — που έχει ως πρόεδρο τον νυν πρωθυπουργό της Ελλάδος κ. Σαμαρά — έλαβε το 2013 νέα δάνεια ύψους 14 εκατ. ευρώ, με αποτέλεσμα τα συνολικά του δάνεια να φθάσουν τα 160 εκατ. ευρώ. Τα νέα αυτά δάνεια είναι βέβαιο ότι δεν μπορούν να εξυπηρετηθούν, όπως προκύπτει από απάντηση του Επιτρόπου κ. Αλμούνια σε ερώτησή μου, αλλά έχει ομολογήσει το ίδιο το κόμμα της Νέας Δημοκρατίας στην εισηγητική έκθεση τροπολογίας που είχε καταθέσει το 2012 ο τότε γενικός της γραμματέας, στην οποία ζητούσε ρύθμισή των σχετικών δανείων διά νόμου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πληροφορήθηκαν, και πότε, οι Επίτροποι σε ποιες συστημικές τράπεζες έχει τοποθετηθεί η νέα αυτή δανειοδότηση;

Αν ναι, ενημέρωσαν την Επιτροπή και πότε;

Αν δεν ενημερώθηκε η Επιτροπή, σκοπεύει να διερευνήσει τους λόγους της μη ενημέρωσης της;

Έχουν υπάρξει παραβιάσεις του ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου σε ό,τι αφορά τα δάνεια που δόθηκαν στα κόμματα το 2013;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή επιβεβαιώνει ότι, σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που διαθέτει όσον αφορά τον δανεισμό τεσσάρων βασικών ελληνικών τραπεζών σε συνδεδεμένους δανειολήπτες (συμπεριλαμβανομένων των πολιτικών κομμάτων), από τις αρχές του 2013 δεν χορηγήθηκε κανένα νέο δάνειο σε πολιτικό κόμμα.

Η Επιτροπή εφιστά την προσοχή στο γεγονός ότι, στο πλαίσιο της πρώτης αναθεώρησης σύμφωνα με το δεύτερο πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα, διορίσθηκαν εντολοδόχοι παρακολούθησης για τις τέσσερες βασικές τράπεζες — συγκεκριμένα, Πειραιώς, Alpha, Eurobank και Εθνική Τράπεζα Ελλάδος — και όχι για όλες τις ελληνικές τράπεζες. Ιδιαίτερα, οι εντολοδόχοι παρακολούθησης για την Πειραιώς, Alpha και Εθνική Τράπεζα Ελλάδος διορίσθηκαν στις 16 Ιανουαρίου 2013. Ο εντολοδόχος παρακολούθησης για την Eurobank διορίσθηκε στις 22 Φεβρουαρίου 2013, επειδή η Eurobank, κατά τους μήνες Ιανουάριο και Φεβρουάριο 2013, ευρίσκετο στο στάδιο της συγχώνευσης με την Εθνική Τράπεζα Ελλάδος και δεν ήταν σαφές το κατά πόσο αυτή θα αποτελούσε χωριστή οντότητα που θα χρειαζόταν χωριστό εντολοδόχο παρακολούθησης. Σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες των εντολοδόχων παρακολούθησης, οι τέσσερες βασικές τράπεζες δεν είχαν χορηγήσει δάνεια σε πολιτικά κόμματα από τον διορισμό των εντολοδόχων παρακολούθησης.

Στο συγκεκριμένο πλαίσιο, ο ρόλος της Επιτροπής συνίσταται στο να εξασφαλίζει, μέσω των εντολοδόχων παρακολούθησης, ότι τα νέα ή υφιστάμενα δάνεια ελέγχονται και ότι τα δάνεια που χορηγούνται από τις τέσσερες ενισχυόμενες βασικές τράπεζες χορηγούνται με εμπορικά κριτήρια και σε βάση πλήρους ανταγωνισμού. Ο ρόλος της Επιτροπής δεν έγκειται στον έλεγχο του ισολογισμού των ελληνικών πολιτικών κομμάτων ή στη διερεύνηση της προέλευσης της χρηματοδότησής τους.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003964/14
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: New Democracy party receives new loan while past debts are non-performing

Following my question (E-013481/2013) concerning the privileged loans granted to Greek political parties in government, I refer to the answer given by Commissioner Almunia on behalf of the Commission on 7 February 2014, to the effect that 'the vast majority of these loans are non-performing, as they were already in January 2013,' while 'no new loan to a political party has been granted since January 2013' (when the monitoring trustees appointed by the Commission started to monitor four pillar banks in Greece).

Nevertheless, the recently published latest balance-sheet of New Democracy (Nea Dimokratia or ND), the senior partner in the government coalition, shows that the party appears to have borrowed an additional EUR 14 million in 2013, raising its outstanding debt to the incredible sum of EUR 160 million in total.

This development seems to contradict the Commission's assurances that no new loan to a political party has been granted since January 2013, and seriously calls in question the efficacy of the appointed monitoring trustees in verifying proper governance and the use of commercial criteria in key policy decisions, including monitoring the process of new lending and restructuring of existing loans of the political parties in government.

Therefore, on the basis of the information made available by the appointed monitoring trustees, the Commission is asked:

Given that ND's loans are already non-performing and that the debt cannot be repaid, on what guarantee was this new loan authorised, and by which bank?

Question for written answer E-005215/14
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Commission information about New Democracy's loans

New Democracy's balance sheets for 2013 show that in 2013 this party — whose President is the current Prime Minister of Greece, Mr Samaras — received new loans totalling EUR 14 million; this means that it now has total loans of EUR 160 million. These new loans can certainly not be serviced, as is clear from the reply given by Commissioner Almunia to a question I had tabled, and the New Democracy party admitted as much in the explanatory statement to an amendment tabled by its then General Secretary in 2012 in which he calls for the loans to be settled by law.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Have the Commissioners been informed which systemic banks granted these new loans? If so, when?

If so, did they notify the Commission and when?

If not, does it intend to investigate why it was not informed?

Have there been any violations of EC law in respect of loans granted to the parties in 2013?

Joint answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission confirms that, according to the information available with regard to the four pillar Greek banks' lending to connected borrowers (including political parties), there has been no new loan granted to political parties since the beginning of 2013.

The Commission draws attention to the fact that, in the context of the first review under the second economic adjustment programme for Greece, the Monitoring Trustees were appointed for the four pillar banks — namely, Piraeus, Alpha, Eurobank and National Bank of Greece — and not for all Greek banks. In particular, the Monitoring Trustees for Piraeus, Alpha and National Bank of Greece were appointed on 16 January 2013. The Monitoring Trustee for Eurobank was appointed on 22 February 2013, since Eurobank, during January and February 2013, was in the process of merging with National Bank of Greece and it was not clear whether Eurobank would be a separate entity that would need a separate Monitoring Trustee. According to the information provided by the Monitoring Trustees, the four pillar banks have granted no new loans to political parties since the appointment of the Monitoring Trustees.

In this context, the role of the Commission is to ensure, via the Monitoring Trustees, that new or existing loans are monitored and that loans by the aided four pillar banks are granted on a commercial and arm's length basis. The role of the Commission is not to monitor the balance sheet of the Greek political parties or to trace where their financing comes from.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003966/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(31 mars 2014)

Objet: Production laitière déficitaire

Une étude scientifique, lancée par l'European Milk Board (EMB) et le MEG Milch Board, et consacrée à la production laitière en France, a indiqué que le coût de production en 2013 oscillait entre approximativement 40 et 45 centimes par kilo de lait. Les coûts dépassent donc nettement le prix moyen de 33,8 centimes le kilo au niveau national. Partout en France, les producteurs essuient, par conséquent, des pertes.

Une étude publiée en 2013 et consacrée au marché laitier en Allemagne avait révélé le sort semblable réservé aux éleveurs de ce pays. En Allemagne aussi, les producteurs doivent opérer en déficit.

Le nombre d'exploitations laitières continue de chuter, et l'homogénéité géographique de la production laitière se trouve, dès lors, sérieusement menacée. Il est prévu que des études relatives au coût de production soient également réalisées dans d'autres pays.

Dans la filière laitière européenne, la question ne se pose plus de savoir si les éleveurs doivent essuyer des pertes chroniques ou pas, mais quelle sera l'amplitude précise de ces déficits et à quel moment un grand nombre d'exploitations laitières aura disparu.

1. La Commission a-t-elle connaissance de ces études?

2. La Commission peut-elle fournir plus de données concernant la production laitière dans l'UE et par État membre?

3. La Commission compte-elle mettre en place une agence de surveillance chargée de superviser les coûts et la production dans le secteur laitier, laquelle, à travers les ajustements de l'offre à la demande, permettrait l'obtention de prix rémunérateurs?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloș au nom de la Commission
(28 mai 2014)

La Commission a connaissance des études citées par l'Honorable Parlementaire, études qui ont fait l'objet de discussions avec leurs auteurs. Celles-ci ont mis en évidence des divergences d'approche en ce qui concerne les méthodes suivies et les conclusions tirées.

La Commission publie des statistiques mensuelles relatives à la production laitière pour l'Union européenne dans son ensemble et par État membre. Comme annoncé lors de la conférence intitulée «Le secteur laitier de l'UE: évolution au-delà de 2015» («The EU dairy sector: developing beyond 2015») qui s'est tenue à Bruxelles le 24 septembre 2013, la Commission a lancé le 16 avril 2014 un observatoire du marché du lait, qui comprend une page internet spécifique ([1]) destinée à la diffusion des données pertinentes concernant le marché, y compris des données sur la production de lait et de produits laitiers.

L'objectif est de mettre à disposition des informations concernant le marché, pour que les acteurs économiques puissent prendre leurs décisions entrepreneuriales en s'appuyant sur les informations de la meilleure qualité possible. Le but n'est pas de créer une instance de contrôle ayant le pouvoir de définir les niveaux de l'offre.

Les mesures de marché concernant le secteur laitier figurant dans l'OCM unique ont été examinées et approuvées par le Parlement européen et le Conseil lors de la récente révision de la PAC. Des instruments de gestion de l'offre tels que celui qu'évoque l'Honorable Parlementaire ont également fait l'objet de discussions mais ils n'ont pas été retenus par le législateur.

Enfin, la Commission fera rapport au Parlement européen et au Conseil d'ici juin 2014 sur la situation du marché du lait et sur la mise en œuvre des mesures du «paquet lait», en évaluant, en particulier, leur incidence sur les régions défavorisées.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/milk-market-observatory/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003966/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Milk production at a loss

According to a scientific study on milk production in France, commissioned by the European Milk Board (EMB) and the MEG Milch Board, production costs in 2013 were in the region of 40 to 45 cents per kilo and hence significantly higher than the national average price of 33.8 cents per kilo. Producers all over France are thus making losses.

A study published in 2013 on the dairy market in Germany suggested that German farmers are facing a similar situation. In Germany too producers are being forced to operate at a loss.

The number of dairy farms is continuing to fall, and the even geographical spread of milk production is consequently being placed in severe jeopardy. Studies on production costs are also to be conducted in other countries.

In the European milk sector, the question is no longer whether farmers are doomed to make chronic losses, but how much — in exact terms — those losses amount to and at what point dairy farms will — to a large extent — go out of business.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above studies?

2. Can it supply further milk production figures for the EU as a whole and broken down by Member State?

3. Will it set up a monitoring agency to oversee costs and production in the milk sector, bearing in mind that such a body, by bringing supply into line with demand, could ensure that prices would be sufficient for producers to earn a livelihood?

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

The Commission is aware of the studies mentioned by the Honourable Member, and had the occasion to discuss them with their authors. The discussion highlighted divergences of approach with regard to the methods followed and the conclusions obtained.

The Commission publishes monthly milk production figures for the EU as a whole and per Member State. As announced at the conference 'The EU dairy sector: developing beyond 2015' held in Brussels on 24 September 2013, the Commission launched on 16 April 2014 a Milk Market Observatory, which includes a dedicated webpage ([1]) for the dissemination of relevant market data, including milk and dairy product production data.

The objective is to make market information available, so that the economic operators can make their entrepreneurial decisions with the best possible information basis. The idea is not to set up a monitoring agency with the powers of determining levels of supply.

The market measures for the milk sector contained in the single CMO were discussed and approved by the European Parliament and the Council in the recent review of the CAP. Supply management instruments like the one mentioned by the Honourable Member were also discussed but were not retained by the legislator.

Finally, the Commission will report to the European Parliament and the Council by June 2014 on the milk market situation and the implementation of the Milk Package measures, assessing in particular the effects of these measures on disadvantaged regions.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/milk-market-observatory/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003967/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(31 mars 2014)

Objet: Réforme de la PAC et petits exploitants et éleveurs bovins en France

Les négociations en vue de l'application de la nouvelle politique agricole commune (PAC) en France inquiètent particulièrement les éleveurs et petits exploitants bovins.

Avant la réforme de la PAC, un éleveur qui possédait au minimum trois vaches pouvait prétendre à des subventions européennes. Avec la réforme, le quota minimum passerait à 10, voire 30 têtes, ce qui veut dire qu'environ 70 % des exploitations laitières pourraient ne plus bénéficier du versement d'aides.

La réforme de la PAC pénalisera les petites exploitations avec cette mesure discriminatoire pour les éleveurs, dont l'avenir professionnel est en danger.

1. La Commission a-t-elle prévu des mesures urgentes de soutien aux petites exploitations qui seraient touchées par cette mesure limitant l'accès des éleveurs et producteurs bovins aux subventions européennes?

2. La Commission ne pense-t-elle pas qu'une prime au maintien du troupeau de vaches allaitantes financée par le budget européen pourrait être envisagée afin de protéger les petites exploitations et éleveurs bovins dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne?

3. Qu'en est-il d'une prime à la vache laitière avec une aide spécifique aux producteurs?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloș au nom de la Commission
(28 mai 2014)

Tout d'abord, la règle établie par le règlement (UE) n° 1121/2009 ([1]) en vigueur actuellement selon laquelle les États membres peuvent, pour des raisons administratives, exiger que les demandes de prime à la vache allaitante portent sur un nombre minimal d'animaux, à condition que ce nombre ne soit pas supérieur à trois, ne sera plus applicable à compter de 2015 étant donné que cette prime ne sera plus en vigueur à cette date. À partir de 2015, conformément à l'article 52 du règlement (UE) n° 1307/2013 ([2]), les États membres auront la possibilité, sous certaines conditions et dans certaines limites, de mettre en place un soutien couplé facultatif, en particulier dans le secteur de la viande bovine. Les critères d'admissibilité relatifs à l'octroi de ce soutien, y compris toute limite éventuelle concernant le nombre d'animaux faisant l'objet de la demande, seront fixés par les États membres.

En ce qui concerne la question 1, le titre V du règlement (UE) n° 1307/2013 établit les règles applicables au régime des petits agriculteurs. Il s'agit d'un régime de soutien spécifique et simplifié destiné aux petits agriculteurs et imposant une charge administrative réduite. Il consiste soit en un paiement forfaitaire qui remplace tous les paiements directs, soit en un paiement basé sur le montant dû aux agriculteurs chaque année. Sa mise en œuvre par les États membres n'est pas obligatoire.

En ce qui concerne les questions 2 et 3, l'article 52 du règlement (UE) n° 1307/2013 donne aux États membres la possibilité, sous certaines conditions et dans certaines limites, de mettre en place un soutien couplé facultatif, en particulier dans le secteur du lait et des produits laitiers, de la viande bovine et des viandes ovine et caprine.

([1]) JO L 316 du 2.12.2009.
([2]) JO L 347 du 20.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003967/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: CAP reform, smallholders and cattle breeders in France

The negotiations on the implementation of the new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in France are of particular concern to smallholders and cattle breeders.

Before the CAP reform, a farmer who owned at least three cows could claim EU subsidies. With the reform, the minimum quota would increase to 10, or even 30 heads of cattle, which means that about 70% of dairy farms would no longer be able to receive subsidies.

CAP reform will penalise small farms with this discriminatory measure for cattle breeders, whose professional future is in danger.

1. Has the Commission made provision for urgent support measures for the small farms that would be affected by this measure which restricts the access of cattle breeders and beef producers to EU subsidies?

2. Would the Commission not consider granting a premium, financed by the EU budget, for keeping suckler cows, to protect small farms and cattle farmers across the EU?

3. What about a dairy cow premium with special aid for producers?

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

First of all, the rule set up in current Regulation (EU) No 1121/2009 ([1]) according to which Member States may, for administrative reasons, provide that aid application for the suckler cow premium shall be for a minimum number of animals provided that that number does not exceed three, will no longer be applicable from 2015 as the premium will no longer be in force at that date. From 2015, according to Article 52 of Regulation (EU) No 1307/2013 ([2]), Member States will have the possibility under certain conditions and within certain limits to implement voluntary coupled support in particular in the beef and veal sector. The eligibility criteria for such a support, including any possible threshold regarding the number of animals applied for will be fixed by the Member States.

As for question 1, Title V of Regulation (EU) No 1307/2013 lays down the rules applicable to the Small farmers' scheme. This is a specific and simplified support scheme for small farmers with reduced administrative burden. It is established either as a lump-sum payment that replaces all direct payments, or as a payment based on the amount due to the farmer each year. Its implementation is optional for Member States.

As for questions 2 and 3, Article 52 of Regulation (EU) No 1307/2013 gives the possibility to Member States, under certain conditions and within certain limits, to implement voluntary coupled support in particular in the dairy, the beef and veal and the sheep meat and goat meat sectors.

([1]) OJ L 316, 2.12.2009.
([2]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003968/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Comune di Bracciano, zona di Cupinoro: informazioni circa la possibile riapertura della discarica con conseguente conferimento di rifiuti

In seguito all'interrogazione sulla situazione della discarica di Cupinoro (Comune di Bracciano) E-011918/2013, è emerso che la stessa è oggetto della procedura d'infrazione 2011/4021, in quanto in tale discarica è stato violato l'articolo 6, lettera a), della direttiva 1999/31/CE. Inoltre la stessa discarica è oggetto di una seconda procedura (Causa C-323/13), dal momento che non ha rispettato le prescrizioni della legislazione dell'UE in materia di rifiuti a causa di un'interpretazione restrittiva da parte delle Autorità italiane del concetto di «sufficiente trattamento dei rifiuti» .

Nonostante ciò, lo scorso 20 marzo 2014, la Conferenza dei Servizi della Regione Lazio, in cui erano presenti anche i rappresentanti del Comune di Bracciano e i vertici della Bracciano Ambiente, ha ipotizzato la riapertura della discarica di Cupinoro chiusa nel gennaio 2014, dopo una proroga concessa di due anni. Eppure il ministero dei Beni Culturali italiano nei mesi scorsi aveva dato parere negativo all'iter autorizzativo dell'AIA (Autorizzazione Integrata Ambientale) dal momento che non erano garantiti tutti i requisiti minimi previsti dalla normativa.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se le Autorità italiane hanno individuato un sito più idoneo per il conferimento dei rifiuti in alternativa a Cupinoro e contestualmente se è stato previsto un piano di bonifica e di riqualificazione ambientale di tutta l'area;

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

3. se siano state prese adeguatamente in considerazione, da parte delle autorità italiane, le disposizioni contenute nelle direttive 1999/31/CE e 2008/98/CE; nella decisione del Consiglio 2003/33 che stabilisce criteri e procedure per l'ammissione dei rifiuti nelle discariche e, infine, nel regolamento (CE) 1013/2006 relativo alle spedizioni dei rifiuti;

4. quali misure ed azioni possono essere messe in campo per tutelare il patrimonio paesaggistico e culturale dell'area coinvolta, oltre a tutelare la salute dei cittadini?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(2 giugno 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alle proprie risposte alle interrogazioni parlamentari E-011918/2013 e E-000258/2014 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003968/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Municipality of Bracciano, area of Cupinoro: information on the possible reopening of the landfill site and receipt of waste transfers

Following my question on the situation regarding the Cupinoro landfill site (Municipality of Bracciano), E-011918/2013, it emerged that the site is the subject of infringement procedure 2011/4021, because of breaches of Article 6(a) of Directive 1999/31/EC. The site is also the subject of another procedure (Case C-323/13), because of failure to respect the provisions of EU legislation on waste caused by the Italian authorities' restrictive interpretation of the concept of 'adequate waste treatment'.

Despite this, on 20 March 2014, the interdepartmental conference of the Region of Lazio, which was also attended by representatives of the Municipality of Bracciano and leading members of Bracciano Ambiente's management team, discussed the possibility of reopening the Cupinoro landfill site, which was closed in January 2014, following the granting of a two-year extension. However, in recent months, the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage has criticised the Integrated Environmental Authorisation (AIA) process, because it was failing to guarantee compliance with all the minimum requirements laid down by law.

In view of all of this, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Have the Italian authorities identified a more suitable site than Cupinoro for waste transfers and, if so, has provision been made for a plan for the reclamation and environmental regeneration of the whole area?

2. Has the prior environmental impact assessment procedure been conducted correctly and do the conditions comply with those laid down by Directive 2011/92/EC?

3. Have the Italian authorities taken due account of the provisions contained in Directives 1999/31/EC and 2008/98/EC, in Council Decision 2003/33 establishing criteria and procedures for the acceptance of waste at landfills, and lastly in Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste?

4. What measures and actions can be put in place to protect the natural and cultural heritage of the area concerned, and to protect people's health?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to parliamentary Questions E-011918/2013 and E-000258/2014 ([1]).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003969/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — 529 condanne a morte in Egitto in seguito a un attacco a una stazione di polizia

Lo scorso lunedì un tribunale egiziano ha condannato a morte 529 persone appartenenti ai Fratelli Musulmani, gruppo islamico dichiarato terrorista dal governo. La sentenza giunge alla fine di un processo scaturito dall'attacco a una stazione di polizia a Minya lo scorso agosto, terminata con la morte di un agente e diverse armi trafugate. I difensori dei condannati hanno anche accusato i giudici di non aver loro permesso di incontrare i propri assistiti o di interrogare i testimoni.

In merito alla questione, come intende agire il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante al fine di impedire queste violazioni di diritti basilari come il diritto a un equo processo o il diritto a essere giudicati individualmente?

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

La notizia della condanna a morte di massa emessa dal tribunale di Minya in Alto Egitto è stata accolta con grande preoccupazione dall'UE, come ha dichiarato il 24 marzo l'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente della Commissione. L'UE deplora l'assenza di un processo equo nelle due giornate di procedimenti sommari, in cui gli imputati sono stati processati come gruppo e non sulla base dei meriti dei singoli casi, senza quindi rispettare i più elementari principi di giustizia. L'UE ritiene che la pena di morte non possa essere giustificata in alcun caso e che un processo equo e adeguate condizioni di detenzione debbano essere sempre garantiti.

L'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha ribadito con fermezza queste preoccupazioni in occasione della riunione con il ministro degli Esteri egiziano Nabil Fahmi a Bruxelles il 31 marzo, nonché con tutte le autorità competenti durante la sua visita al Cairo il 10 aprile 2014.

L'Unione europea segue da vicino il caso in questione al Cairo, invitando le autorità provvisorie a intraprendere tutte le misure necessarie per garantire un processo equo basato su accuse precise, indagini corrette e indipendenti, nonché il diritto di accesso e di contatto con gli avvocati e i familiari.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003969/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — 529 people sentenced to death in Egypt following an attack on a police station

Last Monday, an Egyptian court gave the death sentence to 529 members of the Muslim Brotherhood, the Islamic group labelled as a terrorist organisation by the government. The sentencing comes at the end of proceedings triggered by the attack on a police station in Minya last August, during which a police officer died and a number of weapons were stolen. The lawyers defending the convicted men have accused the judges of not allowing them to meet their own clients or interview witnesses.

In connection with this case, what action is the Vice-President/High Representative planning to take to prevent such violations of basic rights, including the right to a fair trial and the right to be tried separately?

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

The news of the mass death sentence issued by a criminal court in Minya in Upper Egypt was received with utmost concern by the EU, as expressed in the statement by the HR/VP on 24 March. The EU deplores the lack of due process in the two-day summary proceedings in which the defendants were tried as a group rather than on the merits of individual cases, against the most basic standards of justice. The EU also believes that capital punishment can never be justified, and that a fair trial must always be ensured, as well as adequate detention conditions.

These concerns were firmly reiterated by the HR/VP during her meeting with the Egyptian Foreign Minister Nabil Fahmi in Brussels on 31st March, and with all the relevant authorities in the course of her visit to Cairo on 10 April 2014.

The EU is closely following up this case in Cairo, asking the interim authorities to undertake all the necessary steps to guarantee a fair trial based on clear charges and proper and independent investigations, as well as the right of access and contact to lawyers and family members.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003970/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Ammassamento di militari russi al confine con l'Ucraina

Alcuni funzionari statunitensi hanno stimato che siano quasi 50 000 i soldati russi ammassati al confine con l'Ucraina, sufficienti per «un'offensiva su vasta scala», mentre il segretario del Consiglio di sicurezza nazionale ucraino parla addirittura di circa 100 000 soldati russi. La frizione al confine orientale dell'Ucraina rischia di divenire insostenibile e il rischio che gli attriti sfocino in un conflitto aperto sembra aumentare di giorno in giorno.

In merito a questi numeri, dispone la Commissione di dati attendibili in merito alla presenza di militari russi al confine con l'Ucraina? Ritiene la Commissione che il rischio di un conflitto armato tra i due paesi sia una prospettiva realizzabile?

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

Per mezzo di un'autorizzazione formale dell'Assemblea federale al presidente Putin la Russia si è data il diritto di intervenire militarmente in Ucraina come aveva già fatto in Crimea, che si è successivamente annessa. L'UE continuerà ad adoperarsi con il massimo impegno per contribuire a una soluzione pacifica in base alla dichiarazione congiunta di Ginevra del 17 aprile 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003970/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Massing of Russian troops on the border with Ukraine

US officials have said that almost 50 000 Russian soldiers are massed on the border with Ukraine, enough to launch 'an offensive on a vast scale'. The secretary of Ukraine's National Security Council, however, is putting the figure at some 100 000 Russian troops. Friction on Ukraine's eastern border could become uncontainable, and every day sees an increased risk of tensions turning into open conflict.

Does the Commission have any reliable figures regarding the presence of Russian troops on the border with Ukraine? Does the Commission think there is a real risk of armed conflict between the two countries?

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

Russia has, by means of a formal authorisation by the Federal Assembly to President Putin, given itself the right to intervene militarily in Ukraine as was already done in Crimea, subsequently annexed by Russia. The EU will continue to do its utmost to contribute to a peaceful solution on the basis of the Geneva Joint Statement of 17 April 2014.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003971/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Cristiano condannato a morte per blasfemia in Pakistan

Un tribunale di Lahore, in Pakistan, ha condannato a morte un cristiano, con l'accusa di blasfemia per aver insultato il profeta Maometto durante una conversazione. Il caso ha fatto scoppiare una protesta in cui oltre tremila musulmani hanno incendiato un centinaio di abitazioni appartenenti a persone di fede cristiana.

Diverse ONG sostengono che, seppur la legge pakistana sia molto severa nei casi di blasfemia, questa viene spesso usata per sistemare «faccende private» e la stessa persona condannata ha affermato che in realtà sia stato denunciato in seguito a una disputa su una proprietà. Anche un recente rapporto redatto dal governo statunitense conferma che il Pakistan è il paese dove le leggi sulla blasfemia sono applicate più di sovente.

In merito a questo caso, può la Commissione chiarire se, nelle relazioni UE-Pakistan, la prima abbia affrontato la promozione e il rispetto dei diritti umani e in particolare il diritto alla vita e il diritto alla libertà di espressione in Pakistan?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente rinvia gli onorevoli parlamentari alla risposta data alle interrogazioni scritte E-004234/2014, E-004233/2014 and E-008959/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003971/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Christian sentenced to death for blasphemy in Pakistan

A court in Lahore, in Pakistan, has sentenced to death a Christian found guilty of blasphemy after insulting the prophet Mohammed during a conversation. The case triggered a riot in which more than three thousand Muslims set fire to about a hundred homes belonging to Christians.

Several NGOs say that, although Pakistan law on blasphemy is very severe, it is often used as a way of settling 'private matters', and the convicted man said he had been accused following a dispute over a property. A recent report drawn up by the US Government also confirms that Pakistan is the country in which blasphemy laws are most often enforced.

In connection with this case, can the Commission clarify whether the EU has, in its relations with Pakistan, raised the issue of the promotion and respect of human rights, particularly the right to life and the right to freedom of expression, in Pakistan?

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

The HR/VP refers the honourable members to reply written questions E-004234/2014, E-004233/2014 and E-008959/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003972/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Incidente di un'autocisterna sull'autostrada A19

L'autostrada A19 Palermo-Catania è stata molto recentemente teatro di un gravissimo incidente che ha coinvolto un'autocisterna. Il mezzo pesante si è schiantato contro un guard-rail nei pressi dello svincolo «Gelso Bianco», nei pressi di Catania. L'autista del mezzo è rimasto gravemente ferito e ustionato, ma nessun altro veicolo è stato coinvolto nell'incidente, causato forse da un colpo di sonno del guidatore.

L'autocisterna era vuota, avendo da poco scaricato un carico di benzina, ma i vapori presenti all'interno del serbatoio hanno innescato comunque un incendio che ha immediatamente intaccato l'abitacolo.

Può la Commissione chiarire quali siano, a livello unionale, le norme che disciplinano:

1. la circolazione di mezzi pesanti;

2. la circolazione di mezzi che trasportano merci infiammabili o pericolose;

3. l'attività lavorativa degli autisti di questo genere di mezzi (come ad esempio il numero di ore di riposo minimo, il numero di ore di viaggio massimo)?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

L'Unione europea ha elaborato una normativa organica (norme tecniche, sociali e di accesso al mercato) nel settore del trasporto su strada con l'obiettivo di migliorare la sicurezza stradale, garantire eque condizioni di concorrenza e condizioni di lavoro adeguate per i conducenti.

1. Tra i pertinenti atti legislativi che disciplinano i diversi aspetti della circolazione dei mezzi pesanti figurano i seguenti:

— il regolamento (CE) n. 1071/2009 ([1]) che stabilisce norme comuni sulle condizioni da rispettare per esercitare l'attività di trasportatore su strada;

— il regolamento (CE) n. 1072/2009 ([2]) che fissa norme comuni per l'accesso al mercato internazionale del trasporto di merci su strada;

— la direttiva 92/6/CEE concernente il montaggio e l'impiego di limitatori di velocità per talune categorie di autoveicoli nella Comunità, quale modificata dalla direttiva 2002/85/CE ([3]);

— la direttiva 96/53/CE che stabilisce, per taluni veicoli stradali che circolano nella Comunità, le dimensioni massime autorizzate nel traffico nazionale e internazionale e i pesi massimi autorizzati nel traffico internazionale ([4]);

— il pacchetto «controlli tecnici» si compone della direttiva 2014/45/UE relativa ai controlli tecnici periodici dei veicoli a motore e dei loro rimorchi, della direttiva 2014/46/UE relativa ai documenti di immatricolazione dei veicoli e della direttiva 2014/47/UE relativa ai controlli tecnici su strada dei veicoli commerciali circolanti nell'Unione ([5]).

2. Il trasporto interno di merci pericolose nell'UE è disciplinato dalla direttiva Direttiva 2008/68/CE ([6])che contiene, tra l'altro, requisiti dettagliati per il trasporto di cisterne vuote non pulite.

([1]) GU L 300 del 14.11.2009, pag. 51.
([2]) GU L 300 del 14.11.2009, pag. 72.
([3]) GU L 90 del 3.4.2003, pag. 37.
([4]) GU L 235 del 17.9.1996, pag. 59 e attualmente in corso di revisione COM(2013) 195 del 15.4.2013.
([5]) Adottata il 3 aprile e non ancora pubblicata nella GU.
([6]) GU L 260 del 30.9.3008, pag. 13.

3. Le norme di tipo sociale figurano nel regolamento (CE) n. 561/2006 ([7]), che fissa i periodi di guida giornalieri e settimanali massimi e i periodi di riposo giornalieri e settimanali minimi per i conducenti professionisti nel trasporto di merci e passeggeri. Il regolamento è corredato di norme di esecuzione stabilite dalla direttiva 2006/22/CE ([8]) e di norme relative ai tachigrafi stabilite dal regolamento (CE) n. 165/2014 ([9]). Esso è inoltre integrato dalla direttiva 2002/15/CE ([10]) contenente disposizioni relative al numero massimo di ore settimanali di lavoro e al lavoro notturno.

([7]) GU L 102 del 11.4.2006, pag. 1.
([8]) GU L 102 dell'11.4.2006, pag. 35.
([9]) GU L 60 del 28.2.2014, pag. 1.
([10]) GU L 80 del 23.3.2002, pag. 35.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003972/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Tanker accident on the A19 motorway

The A19 motorway between Palermo and Catania was recently the scene of a very serious accident involving a tanker. The heavy goods vehicle crashed into a guardrail near the 'Gelso Bianco' junction, not far from Catania. The driver was seriously injured and badly burned, but no other vehicles were involved in the accident, which was possibly caused by the driver falling asleep.

The tanker was empty, having just unloaded a load of petrol, but the fumes inside the tank still ignited, causing a fire that immediately engulfed the cab.

Can the Commission clarify which EU regulations govern the following:

1. the movement of heavy goods vehicles;

2. the movement of vehicles transporting inflammable or dangerous goods;

3. the work of drivers of this type of vehicle (such as the minimum number of hours of rest, and the maximum number of hours of driving)?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

The EU has developed an extensive framework of rules (market access rules, social and technical rules) governing the road transport market with the aim to enhance road safety, ensure undistorted competition and adequate working conditions of drivers.

1. The relevant legislative acts covering various aspects of circulation of heavy goods vehicles include:

— Regulation (EC) No 1071/2009 ([1]) on the requirements to pursue occupation of road transport operator;

— Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 ([2]) on the access to the international road haulage market;

— Directive 92/6/EEC on the installation and use of speed limitation devices, as amended by Directive 2002/85/EC ([3]);

— Directive 96/53/EC on maximum weights and dimensions of road vehicles circulating within the Community ([4]);

— The roadworthiness package composed of Directive 2014/45/EU on periodic roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers, Directives 2014/46/EU on the registration documents for vehicles and Directive 2014/47/EU on the technical roadside inspection of the roadworthiness of commercial vehicles ([5]).

2. Inland transport of dangerous goods in the EU is regulated by Directive 2008/68/EC ([6]), which provides detailed requirements, *inter alia*, for the transport of empty, uncleaned tanks.

3. The social rules are established by Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 ([7]), which provides for maximum daily and weekly driving times and minimum rest periods for professional drivers in freight and passenger transport. The regulation is accompanied by enforcement rules set out in Directive 2006/22 ([8]) and rules for the tachograph set out in Regulation (EC) No 165/2014 ([9]). It is complemented by Directive 2002/15/EC ([10]) establishing maximum weekly working time and night work provisions.

([1]) OJ L 300 of 14.11.2009, p. 51.
([2]) OJ L 300 of 14.11.2009, p. 72.
([3]) OJ L 90 of 3.4.2003, p. 37.
([4]) OJ L 235, 17.9.1996, p. 59 and currently under revision COM(2013) 195 of 15.4.2013.
([5]) Adopted on 3 April 2014, the publication in the Official Journal is pending.
([6]) OJ L 260 of 30.9.3008, p.13.
([7]) OJ L 102 of 11.4.2006, p.1.
([8]) OJ L 102 of 11.4.2006, p. 35.
([9]) OJ L 60 of 28.2.2014, p.1.
([10]) OJ L 80 of 23.3.2002, p.35.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003973/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Normativa europea in materia di sicurezza e igiene alimentare nelle scuole

Il 27 marzo, in una scuola elementare a Torino, quattro bambini sono rimasti intossicati dopo aver mangiato il cibo servito nella mensa scolastica. Tre di questi sono stati ricoverati in ospedale, dopo aver manifestato una serie di eruzioni cutanee e gonfiore che quasi impedivano la respirazione. Il referto è stato abbastanza chiaro: intossicazione da sindrome di sgombroide, legata alla platessa mangiata durante il pranzo, probabilmente conservata male. Altri bambini sono rimasti intossicati, ma con sintomi meno gravi, come nausea o diarrea.

In merito a questo incidente, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. Esiste una normativa europea in materia di sicurezza e igiene alimentare delle mense e degli istituti scolastici?

2. Esiste una normativa europea in merito alla corretta conservazione dei cibi destinati alla grande distribuzione?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(2 giugno 2014)

La Commissione conferma che la legislazione UE in materia di igiene e di sicurezza alimentare si applica agli alimenti forniti nelle mense e negli istituti di istruzione.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 178/2002 ([1]) rappresenta la base che garantisce un alto livello di tutela della salute umana e degli interessi dei consumatori rispetto agli alimenti e comprende le mense nella definizione di commercio al dettaglio.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 852/2004 ([2]) stabilisce norme generali nel campo dell'igiene dei prodotti alimentari e si applica a tutte le fasi di produzione, trasformazione e distribuzione degli alimenti. Ai sensi di tale regolamento, i locali in cui si preparano e si conservano i prodotti alimentari devono essere tenuti puliti; la loro progettazione deve evitare contaminazioni e predisporre adeguate strutture per manipolare e immagazzinare a temperatura controllata. Le materie prime e tutti gli ingredienti devono essere conservati in condizioni appropriate: ciò comprende le condizioni di temperatura, per evitare la contaminazione dell'intera catena alimentare. Il personale che lavora in una mensa deve mantenere uno elevato livello di pulizia personale ed evitare qualsiasi contaminazione incrociata.

Spetta agli Stati membri effettuare controlli ufficiali per assicurare l'osservanza di tale legislazione.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 178/2002 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 28 gennaio 2002, che stabilisce i principi e i requisiti generali della legislazione alimentare, istituisce l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare e fissa procedure nel campo della sicurezza alimentare. GU L 31 dell'1.2.2002, pag. 1.

([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 852/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, sull'igiene dei prodotti alimentari (GU L 139 del 30.4.2004, pag. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003973/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: European legislation for food safety and hygiene in schools

On 27 March, four primary school children in Turin suffered food poisoning after eating the food served in the school canteen. Three of these children were admitted to hospital with skin rashes and swellings which had made it difficult to breathe. The medical report was fairly clear: scombroid food poisoning from eating the plaice they had been served for lunch (which had probably not been conserved properly). Other children also suffered food poisoning, but their symptoms were less serious, e.g. nausea or diarrhoea.

1. In light of this incident, can the Commission state whether there is any European legislation governing food safety and hygiene in canteens and educational establishments?

2. Is there any European legislation governing the correct conservation of food for large-scale retail?

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

The Commission confirms that EU legislation on hygiene and food safety applies to food supplied in canteens and educational establishments.

Regulations (EC) No 178/2002 ([1]) provides the basis for the assurance of a high level of protection of human health and consumers' interest in relation to food and includes canteens in the definition of retail.

Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 ([2]) sets general requirements on the hygiene of foodstuffs and applies to all stages of production, processing and distribution of food. In accordance with this regulation, premises where food is prepared and stored have to be kept clean and their design must avoid contamination and provide suitable temperature-controlled handling and storage conditions. Raw materials and all ingredients are to be kept in appropriate conditions, including temperature conditions, to prevent contamination throughout the food chain. Staff working in a canteen is to maintain a high degree of personal cleanliness and must avoid any cross-contamination.

It is the responsibility of the Member States to carry out official controls in order to ensure enforcement of this legislation.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety. (OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1).

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the hygiene of foodstuffs (OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 1).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003974/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Presunte intercettazioni riguardo a un piano di intervento militare turco in Siria

Il governo turco ha deciso di oscurare un altro famoso sito web di condivisione di video, in seguito alla diffusione di una registrazione telefonica incriminante in cui funzionari governativi discutevano di una possibile azione militare in Siria. L'agenzia regolatrice delle telecomunicazioni turca ha giustificato l'azione sostenendo di aver eseguito un ordine governativo sulla base di un rischio contro la sicurezza nazionale. Nella registrazione audio si sente un funzionario, identificato da alcuni come il leader dei servizi segreti, sostenere che la Turchia lancerà un attacco in territorio siriano in caso di necessità, tramite l'invio di uomini e il lancio di missili, sostenendo anche che una giustificazione dell'attacco sarebbe poi fabbricata ad arte. Nella registrazione audio si sente anche parlare di un sito storico interno in Siria, la tomba di Suleyman Shah, nonno del fondatore dell'Impero Ottomano, ma che è tecnicamente parte del territorio nazionale turco, area che il gruppo qaedista ISIL ha minacciato di attaccare.

In merito a questa registrazione, può il Vice-presidente/Alto Rappresentante chiarire se:

1. È a conoscenza della registrazione?

2. Dispone di elementi che possano confermare che si tratti di un documento autentico?

3. Come intende agire in modo da evitare il coinvolgimento della Turchia nel conflitto siriano?

4. Quali potrebbero essere le conseguenze per l'UE dell'entrata nel conflitto delle forze armate turche?

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

L'AR/VP è stata informata della registrazione menzionata nell'interrogazione, ma finora all'UE non risulta che esistano prove della sua autenticità.

L'Unione rimane in stretto contatto con la Turchia per quanto riguarda la crisi siriana. Nell'ambito del dialogo intensificato tra l'UE e la Turchia sulle questioni di politica estera che interessano entrambe le parti, l'AR/VP e il SEAE tengono regolarmente consultazioni con la Turchia, a diversi livelli, su tutti gli aspetti della crisi siriana.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003974/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Apparent interceptions relating to planned Turkish military intervention in Syria

The Turkish Government has recently blocked a well-known video-sharing website after an incriminating audio recording was posted on it, in which government officials discuss taking possible military action in Syria. Turkey's telecommunications authority justified the measure by claiming that it had acted on government orders that were based on a threat to national security. In the audio recording, one official, who has been identified by some as the country's intelligence chief, can be heard arguing in favour of Turkey launching an attack on Syrian territory if it proves necessary, by sending in troops and launching missiles, and that a reason for the attack could then be fabricated afterwards. The officials can also be heard talking about the tomb of Suleyman Shah (the grandfather of the founder of the Ottoman Empire), a historic site within Syria but which technically forms part of Turkish national territory, and which the Al-Qaeda militant group ISIS has threatened to attack.

1. Is the High Representative/Vice-President aware of this recording?

2. Does she have any means at her disposal that could confirm whether this recording is genuine?

3. How does she intend to act in order to prevent Turkey from becoming embroiled in the conflict in Syria?

4. What potential consequences could there be for the EU if Turkish troops enter the conflict?

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

The HR/VP has been informed of the reports quoted in the question, but so far the EU is not aware of any proof that would confirm the authenticity of the audio recordings.

The EU remains in close contact with Turkey on the crisis in Syria. In the framework of the enhanced EU-Turkey foreign policy dialogue on issues of common interest, the HR/VP and the EEAS hold regular consultations with Turkey at various levels on all aspects of the Syrian crisis.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003975/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Risoluzione delle Nazioni Unite in tema di abuso dei diritti umani in Sri Lanka

Il Consiglio per i diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite ha votato una risoluzione che apre la strada a una possibile inchiesta sugli abusi di diritti umani nella guerra civile in Sri Lanka, ponendo dubbi su azioni compiute sia dall'esercito che dalle Tigri di Tamil. Un rapporto delle Nazioni Unite parla di circa 40mila vittime, solo nelle fasi finali del conflitto, principalmente ad opera delle forze regolari.

L'inchiesta dovrebbe essere condotta dal Rappresentante speciale per i diritti umani, ma il governo ha rifiutato questo rapporto e ha dichiarato che la risoluzione rischia di porre a rischio il processo di riconciliazione. Le critiche del governo muovono anche contro i seri dubbi riguardo potenziali intimidazioni della società civile da parte delle autorità governative.

In merito alla questione del rispetto dei diritti umani in Sri Lanka, può il Vice-presidente/Alto Rappresentante chiarire se:

1. L'UE abbia mai attivato strumenti o avviato azioni per promuovere il rispetto dei diritti umani nel paese?

2. L'UE si sia mai attivata al fine di mediare il conflitto civile in Sri Lanka?

3. Esistono dati qualitativi e quantitativi certi, provenienti da organizzazioni internazionali o ONG, in merito agli abusi dei diritti umani in Sri Lanka?

4. Come accoglie la risoluzione delle Nazioni Unite in oggetto?

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

I diritti umani occupano un ruolo centrale nelle relazioni tra l'UE e lo Sri Lanka. L'Unione nutre preoccupazione non solo per le violazioni dei diritti umani e del diritto umanitario internazionale segnalate durante la guerra, ma anche per la situazione dei diritti umani in generale. Durante la guerra l'Unione ha sostenuto, insieme a altri attori internazionali come Norvegia, Giappone e Stati Uniti, la mediazione e il dialogo tra il governo e le Tigri Tamil.

L'UE e gli Stati membri hanno rilasciato diverse dichiarazioni pubbliche e hanno intrapreso iniziative e sollevato molte questioni riguardanti i diritti umani nel quadro dei contatti con le autorità srilankesi. Queste questioni hanno avuto inoltre un posto centrale nella riunione della commissione mista ad alto livello, riunitasi a dicembre 2013.

Diritti umani e buon governo figurano tra le questioni trasversali del programma di sviluppo dell'UE nello Sri Lanka. La delegazione UE in Sri Lanka e gli Stati membri intrattengono contatti regolari con le organizzazioni della società civile, che beneficiano in alcuni casi del sostegno dello strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani.

In occasione del Consiglio delle Nazioni Unite per i diritti umani, riunitosi a Ginevra a marzo 2014, gli Stati membri hanno sostenuto una risoluzione critica sullo Sri Lanka e l'Unione ha invitato il governo nazionale a collaborare strettamente con l'Ufficio dell'Alto commissario per i diritti umani per attuare la risoluzione.

La delegazione dell'UE in Sri Lanka, gli Stati membri e il resto della comunità internazionale seguono da vicino la situazione dei diritti umani e si riuniscono regolarmente con i difensori dei diritti umani e altri soggetti interessati. L'Unione è fermamente intenzionata a continuare a far presenti queste problematiche in tutti i contatti con le autorità nazionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003975/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: HR/VP — UN resolution on human rights abuse in Sri Lanka

The UN Human Rights Council has recently passed a resolution that paves the way for an investigation to be launched into the human rights abuses that were allegedly perpetrated during the civil war in Sri Lanka, which would look into the actions of both the army and the Tamil Tigers. According to a UN report, around 40 000 people were killed during the latter stages of the conflict alone, principally down to the actions of government forces.

The investigation should be conducted by the Special Representative for Human Rights. However, the Sri Lankan Government has rejected the findings of the above-cited report and declared that the resolution risks jeopardising the ongoing peace process. Critics of the government are also raising serious concerns over possible threats being made to civilians by the ruling authorities.

Can the High Representative/Vice-President please answer the following questions concerning the issue of human rights in Sri Lanka:

1. Has the EU ever launched any initiatives or actions to promote the respect of human rights in the country?

2. Did the EU ever act as a mediator during the civil war in Sri Lanka?

3. Is there any reliable qualitative and quantitative data, originating from international organisations or NGOs, concerning the abuse of human rights in Sri Lanka?

4. What is her opinion of the above-cited UN resolution?

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

Human rights are at the core of the EU's relations with Sri Lanka. Besides the reported human rights and international humanitarian law violations during the war, the EU remains concerned about the prevailing human rights situation in Sri Lanka. During the war, the EU supported mediation and dialogue between the Government and the Tamil Tigers, together with other international stakeholders, including Norway, Japan and the US.

The EU and its Member States have issued numerous public statements, made demarches and raised many human rights issues in contacts with the Sri Lankan authorities. These issues were also given prominence at the high-level Joint Commission meeting in December 2013.

Human rights and good governance are also a cross-cutting issue in the EU development programme in Sri Lanka. Besides regular contacts between civil society organisations and the EU Delegation to Sri Lanka and Member States, a number of these actors receive support from the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights.

At the UN Human Rights Council in March 2014 in Geneva, the EU Member States co-sponsored a critical resolution on Sri Lanka. The EU has invited the Government of Sri Lanka to cooperate closely with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in the implementation of the resolution.

The EU Delegation in Sri Lanka and Member States, together with the rest of the International Community, are monitoring closely the human rights situation and are meeting regularly with Human Rights Defenders and other key stakeholders. The EU intends to continue raising these matters in all contacts with the Sri Lankan authorities.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003978/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Difesa del Made in Italy in America

Recentemente da un'analisi condotta da un'associazione di categoria in Italia, emerge che negli Stati Uniti sono stati prodotti nel 2013 oltre 200 miliardi di chili di formaggi solo di tipo «italiano»: Parmesan, Asiago, Provolone, Mozzarella e Gorgonzola, che nulla hanno a che vedere con la produzione Made in Italy.

In Usa il mercato dei finti formaggi italiani ottenuti soprattutto in Wisconsin, California e nello Stato di New York vale 5 miliardi di euro e rappresenta oltre l'80 per cento delle vendite di formaggi «italiani»: in altre parole in 8 casi su 10 i consumatori statunitensi acquistano prodotti «italiani», interamente però made in Usa.

Si tratta di un grave inganno per i diritti dei consumatori quali la tutela della salute, della sicurezza e della qualità dei prodotti e dei servizi, poiché le caratteristiche e la lavorazione dei prodotti originali Made in Italy sono profondamente diverse dalle imitazioni che non devono rispettare i rigidi disciplinari di produzione dell'Unione europea, i quali determinano l'area di allevamento delle mucche, di trasformazione del latte, di stagionatura dei formaggi, ma anche l'alimentazione del bestiame e tutti gli aspetti rilevanti per garantire uno standard qualitativo unico che viene sottoposto a rigidi controlli.

Considerato che, essendo già in fase avanzata un accordo con il Canada in cui si prevede il riconoscimento di 145 tra DOP e IGP dell'Unione, è necessario un accordo per tutelare le denominazioni di origine riconosciute dall'Unione europea negli Stati Uniti, che secondo gli auspici l'accordo di libero scambio UE-Canada potrebbe fare da modello al negoziato UE-Usa, che i prodotti menzionati sono l'espressione di un'identità territoriale e vanno salvaguardati, può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

— Può riferire sullo stato dei negoziati bilaterali attualmente in corso fra UE, USA e Canada?

— Quali argomenti ha intenzione di portare sul tavolo della trattativa a difesa della tuteladei prodotti lattiero-caseari a denominazione?

— Come intende agire per vietare ai produttori caseari americani di usare termini come parmigiano, asiago, feta, groviera, gorgonzola, fontina, pecorino ed altri ancora che si riferiscono alle regioni europee di cui i formaggi sono originari?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(2 giugno 2014)

La Commissione è consapevole delle ripercussioni economiche connesse all'assenza di tutela sul mercato statunitense per numerosi prodotti europei di qualità che sul territorio UE sono invece protetti dalle denominazioni DOP/IGP, tra cui alcuni prestigiosi formaggi italiani menzionati dagli onorevoli parlamentari. La Commissione è pertanto consapevole dell'importanza di garantire una maggiore tutela delle indicazioni geografiche dell'UE nell'ambito dei negoziati bilaterali in corso con gli Stati Uniti. Il mercato statunitense è uno dei più importanti mercati d'esportazione per i prodotti alimentari UE di qualità e che si fregiano dell'indicazione di origine. Una maggiore protezione delle loro denominazioni contribuirebbe sicuramente a promuovere una crescita sostenuta di tali flussi di esportazione, con effetti positivi per l'occupazione nelle zone rurali.

Nel quadro dei negoziati bilaterali con il Canada, la Commissione è riuscita ad ottenere, per una lista di indicazioni geografiche dell'UE, un livello di protezione analogo a quello riconosciuto nell'Unione. Sulla base di questo precedente, la Commissione è impegnata a conseguire un risultato ambizioso per le indicazioni geografiche dell'UE nel quadro dei negoziati in corso con gli Stati Uniti. Per raggiungere questo scopo, l'Unione europea si prefigge l'obiettivo pragmatico di raggiungere un accordo su norme che garantiscano un adeguato livello di protezione e un'adeguata applicazione di tali norme per liste specifiche di indicazioni geografiche. Tali liste potrebbero comprendere sia indicazioni geografiche dell'UE che degli Stati Uniti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003978/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Defending Italian-made products in the United States

A trade association survey carried out recently in Italy found that in the United States, in 2013, over 200 billion kilos of 'Italian-style' cheese — Parmesan, Asiago, Provolone, Mozzarella and Gorgonzola — were produced. These cheeses have absolutely nothing to do with the genuine products made in Italy.

In the US, the fake Italian cheese market — made above all in Wisconsin, California and the State of New York — is worth EUR 5 billion and accounts for over 80% of 'Italian' cheese sales. In other words, in 8 cases out of 10, US consumers buy 'Italian' products that are entirely made in USA.

This is a serious deception in terms of consumer rights such as the protection of health, safety and the quality of products and services, since the characteristics and processing methods of original 'Made in Italy' products are profoundly different from their imitations. The latter do not have to comply with strict EU product specifications, determining, for instance, the area in which the cows are raised, how the milk is processed and the cheeses matured, but also how the cattle must be fed and many other important aspects to ensure harmonised quality standards that are subject to strict controls.

An agreement with Canada, providing for the recognition of 145 PDO and PGI products from the EU, is already at an advanced stage; we therefore need an agreement to protect recognised EU designations of origin in the United States, too. It is to be hoped that the EU-US negotiations could model themselves on the EU-Canada free trade agreement, since the products mentioned are the expression of a territorial identity and must be protected.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

— What are the latest developments in the bilateral negotiations currently under way between the EU, US and Canada?

— What issues is it going to take to the negotiating table to defend the protection of designated EU dairy products?

— What action will it take to ban US dairy producers from using terms such as Parmesan, Asiago, Feta, Gruyere, Gorgonzola, Fontina, Pecorino and others, which refer to the European regions from which the cheeses originate?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of the economic impact resulting from the lack of protection experienced in the U.S. market by an important number of EU quality products bearing the PDO/PGI protection in the EU territory, including some iconic Italian cheese names mentioned by the Honourable Members of the Parliament. The Commission is therefore aware of the importance to secure an enhanced protection for EU geographical indications in the context of bilateral negotiations under way with the U.S. The U.S. market is one of the most significant for the export of EU quality and origin food products. An enhanced protection of their names would certainly contribute to foster a sustained growth of those export flows with a positive impact in employment in rural areas

In the context of the bilateral negotiations with Canada, the Commission has secured for a list of EU GIs a level of protection similar to the protection provided for those names in the EU. Building on this precedent, the Commission will continue to pursue an ambitious outcome for EU geographical indications within the framework of the ongoing negotiations with the U.S. In order to achieve this objective, the EU is pragmatically looking for rules guaranteeing an appropriate level of protection and an appropriate enforcement of that protection for selected lists of geographical indications. These lists could include EU and U.S. geographical indications.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003979/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: «Droga del cannibale» o «sali da bagno»: effetti distruttivi della sostanza stupefacente del momento

L'ultima frontiera delle nuove droghe sintetiche in grado di creare dipendenza ed effetti allucinogeni devastanti per la salute umana viene chiamata «sali da bagno». Spesso accade che i mezzi d'informazione descrivano con poca chiarezza la natura di queste sostanze stupefacenti, insieme ai danni collaterali che possono produrre per l'uomo.

La ragione per cui sono chiamati «sali da bagno» dipende dal fatto che sono solitamente confezionati come un prodotto casalingo e venduti su Internet, in modo da evitare il sequestro da parte delle forze dell'ordine.

Queste nuove droghe sono sostanze sintetiche ottenute in laboratori fai-da-te (arrivate per la prima volta negli Stati Uniti direttamente dalla Cina) e sono estremamente pericolose. I danni provocati alla salute dipendono dal contenuto, sempre diverso, di queste misture, che includono un mix pericoloso di varie sostanze come il metadone, il PCP, lo *speed*, la ketamina, l'MDMA e altri cristalli simili.

Ma il problema principale relativo a questa tipologia di prodotti è che la loro composizione chimica cambia continuamente, per cui l'identificazione del loro livello di pericolosità da parte delle autorità competenti è solitamente rallentato e ritardato a causa di una meticolosa «caccia alla molecola». Le tracce rilevate dalle analisi chimiche e presenti nella maggior parte dei sali sono quelle relative al MDPV (una sostanza psicoattiva con proprietà stimolanti ed effetti simili a quelli prodotti da cocaina e anfetamine) e alla lidocaina (un farmaco usato comunemente come anestetico locale).

Considerato che il Consiglio ha richiesto la valutazione delle sostanze 251-NBOMe, AH-7921, MDPV e metoxetamina da parte dell'Osservatorio europeo sulle droghe e le tossicomanie (OEDT) onde conoscere i rischi per la salute e la società e le eventuali implicazioni di organizzazioni criminali nella loro vendita sul mercato;

si chiede alla Commissione:

— se può riferire la situazione sull'attuale presenza dei «sali da bagno» nei mercati illeciti degli Stati membri;

— quali azioni intende intraprendere al fine di limitare il più possibile l'uso di queste «nuove» sostanze per tutelare le nuove generazioni.

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

La Commissione è consapevole della diffusione delle nuove sostanze psicoattive, a volte denominate «sali da bagno» o «sostanze chimiche sperimentali», e sta intervenendo per far fronte al problema. La decisione 2005/387/GAI del Consiglio relativa allo scambio di informazioni, alla valutazione dei rischi e al controllo delle nuove sostanze psicoattive ([1]) fornisce il quadro per l'identificazione delle nuove sostanze psicoattive che rappresentano un rischio e per sottoporle a misure di controllo.

«Sali da bagno» è il nome comune delle miscele di stupefacenti contenenti una varietà di nuove sostanze psicoattive, compresi i catinoni sintetici come ad esempio il mefedrone o il 3,4-metilendiossipirovalerone (MDPV).

Dal 1997 sono state soggette a controlli e a sanzioni penali in tutta l'UE dieci nuove sostanze psicoattive, tra cui il mefedrone. Attualmente si stanno studiando i rischi di altre sei nuove sostanze psicoattive, compreso il MDPV. Se giustificate dai risultati della valutazione di tali rischi, la Commissione presenterà alcune proposte per sottoporre queste sei sostanze a controlli e a sanzioni penali nel corso del 2014.

Negli ultimi anni è emerso un numero crescente di nuove sostanze psicoattive, che si sono diffuse rapidamente in tutto il mercato interno dell'UE. Nel 2013 gli Stati membri dell'UE hanno notificato 81 sostanze di questo tipo. L'Osservatorio europeo delle droghe e delle tossicodipendenze monitora complessivamente circa 360 nuove sostanze psicoattive.

([1]) GU L 127 del 20.5.2005, pag. 32.

Nel settembre 2013 la Commissione ha presentato alcune proposte legislative ([2]) che modificano la decisione 2005/387/GAI del Consiglio al fine di rafforzare la risposta dell'UE a questo problema. Le proposte permetterebbero un'azione più rapida e proporzionata per ritirare dal mercato le sostanze pericolose. Attualmente sono all'esame del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio.

([2]) COM(2013) 618 final e COM(2013) 619 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003979/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: 'Cannibal drug' or 'bath salts': destructive effects of the latest substance in the news

The ultimate in new addictive, hallucinogenic synthetic drugs with devastating effects on human health goes by the name of 'bath salts'. Media reports often fail to spell out the nature of such substances and the side effects that they can cause in humans.

Bath salts are so called because they are usually packaged like a household product and sold online so as to avoid seizure by the police.

These new synthetic drugs (which first came to the United States directly from China) can be produced in do-it-yourself laboratories and are extremely dangerous. The damage to health depends on the ingredients — which always vary — used in the mix, a dangerous combination of methadone, PCP, speed, ketamine, MDMA, and similar crystalline substances.

The main problem with substances of this type, however, is that their chemical composition keeps changing. As a result, the authorities' task of determining the degree of danger tends to be slowed down and held up because they have to embark on a painstaking 'molecule hunt'. Chemical analysis has shown that bath salts generally contain MDPV (a psychoactive substance with stimulant properties and effects similar to those of cocaine and the amphetamines) and lidocaine (a drug commonly used as a local anaesthetic).

The Council has asked the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) to assess 251NBOMe, AH-7921, MDPV, and methoxetamine in order to establish what risks these substances pose to health and society and whether criminal organisations might be dealing in them.

Can the Commission report on the current state of play regarding bath salts on Member States' illicit markets?

What will it do to restrict the use of these 'new' substances as far as possible in order to protect younger generations?

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

The Commission is aware of the spread of new psychoactive substances, sometimes called 'bath salts' or 'research chemicals', and is taking action to address it. Council Decision 2005/387/JHA on the information exchange, risk assessment and control of new psychoactive substances ([1]) provides the framework for identifying the new psychoactive substances that pose risks and for subjecting them to control measures.

'Bath salts' is the street name for drug combinations that contain various new psychoactive substances, including synthetic cathinones, such as mephedrone, or 3,4-methylenedioxypyrovalerone (MDPV).

Ten new psychoactive substances were subjected to control and criminal penalties across the EU since 1997, including mephedrone. The risks of another six new psychoactive substances, including MDPV, are currently being explored. If justified by the results of the risk assessments, the Commission will present proposals to subject these six substances to control and criminal penalties in the course of 2014.

In the past years, a growing number of new psychoactive substances has emerged and rapidly spread across the EU internal market. In 2013, EU Member States notified 81 such substances. In total, around 360 new psychoactive substances are being monitored by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction.

In September 2013, the Commission presented legislative proposals ([2]) revising Council Decision 2005/387/JHA, to strengthen the EU response to new psychoactive substances. The proposals would enable swifter and more proportionate action to withdraw from the market those substances that pose risks. They are currently being negotiated by the European Parliament and the Council.

([1]) OJ L 127, 20.5.2005, p. 32.
([2]) COM(2013) 618 final and COM(2013) 619 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003980/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Irregolarità nella procedura di valutazione ambientale strategica (VAS) della variante 3 al piano regolatore del comune di Stregna

A seguito dell'interrogazione parlamentare del 18 dicembre 2013, numero E-014296-13, si forniscono di seguito ulteriori elementi a riprova del fatto che la direttiva VAS non è stata applicata correttamente.

La procedura di VAS della variante non si è mai avvalsa di alcun soggetto competente in materia ambientale, in violazione all'articolo 12, comma 2, del decreto legislativo 152/2006 di recepimento della direttiva, e il provvedimento della verifica di assoggettabilità è stato emesso solo sulla base delle valutazioni ambientali espresse dal professionista che ha redatto il piano, fatto che, essendo la variante di iniziativa privata, non appare tutelare adeguatamente i principi dello sviluppo sostenibile nell'ambito della scelta comparativa di interessi pubblici e privati, secondo quanto indicato all'articolo 3 quater, comma 2, del decreto legislativo 152/2006.

L'elaborato «Verifica di assoggettabilità a VAS» della variante adottata non contiene una valutazione corretta e oggettiva degli impatti ambientali, così come richiesto dall'allegato I alla parte seconda del decreto legislativo 152/2006, in quanto si limita a dichiarare la mancanza di effetti ambientali senza il supporto di alcuna analisi e valutazione ambientale.

In particolare tutta la documentazione inerente non è supportata da alcuna analisi dello stato dell'ambiente, nelle sue varie componenti. Non si comprende quindi come possa essere stata effettuata una corretta valutazione degli effetti ambientali ad opera delle azioni indotte dalla variante.

A solo titolo di esempio si rileva infatti che: non è stato preso in considerazione il consumo di suolo, considerato che vengono complessivamente interessati circa 20 ettari agricoli di nuove possibili edificazioni; non è stata indagata la presenza di habitat di interesse comunitario da salvaguardare ai sensi della direttiva Habitat 92/43/CEE; non sono stati valutati gli effetti delle acque reflue che verranno prodotte dagli insediamenti previsti, considerato che le aree interessate presentano elevata sensibilità ambientale e sono prive di fognatura.

Va considerato che a supporto del provvedimento approvato, nella relazione di sintesi finale di verifica di assoggettabilità, la valutazione degli effetti della variante è espressa in sole tre righe e mancano ogni considerazione e misura dei reali effetti sulle componenti ambientali, come richiesto dai criteri contenuti nell'allegato II della direttiva comunitaria e nell'allegato I alla parte seconda del decreto legislativo 152/2006.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione riferire, per quanto sopra descritto, se sia stata correttamente considerata e applicata la direttiva 2001/42/CEE, tenuto conto della valenza sostanziale della variante 3 di Stregna?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

L'articolo 3, paragrafo 3, della direttiva 2001/42/CE sulla valutazione ambientale strategica ([1]) (direttiva VAS) stabilisce che per i piani regolatori che determinano l'uso di piccole aree a livello locale e per le modifiche minori di tali piani, la valutazione ambientale è necessaria solo se gli Stati membri determinano che essi possono avere effetti significativi sull'ambiente (la cosiddetta verifica di assoggettabilità alla VAS). Pertanto, non tutte le modifiche dei piani esistenti, come nel caso della terza variante del piano regolatore del comune di Stregna, richiedono una procedura VAS completa. Inoltre, poiché la direttiva VAS non contiene la definizione di «piccole aree», spetta alle autorità nazionali determinare quali sono.

Le autorità italiane competenti, dopo avere proceduto alla verifica di assoggettabilità alla VAS della variante 3 al piano regolatore del comune di Stregna, hanno deciso di non sottoporla all'intera procedura VAS in quanto hanno ritenuto improbabile che produca effetti significativi sull'ambiente ([2]).

Dalle informazioni disponibili al momento risulta che i criteri ambientali previsti dall'allegato II della direttiva VAS siano stati tenuti nella dovuta considerazione ([3]). La Commissione non ha rilevato alcun elemento comprovante la violazione della direttiva VAS.

([1]) Direttiva 2001/42/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 27 giugno 2001, concernente la valutazione degli effetti di determinati piani e programmi sull'ambiente (GU L 197 del 21.7.2001).
([2]) http://www.comune.stregna.ud.it/uploads/media/5.All._3_-_VERIFICA_ASSOGGETTABILITA_A_VAS.pdf
([3]) Ivi, pagg. 8-11; cfr. anche altri documenti inerenti alla procedura alla pagina: http://www.comune.stregna.ud.it/Ufficio-tecnico.3818.0.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003980/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Irregularities in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) procedure regarding Version 3 of the land use plan of the Municipality of Stregna

Further to the written question of 18 December 2013 (No E-014296/2013), we hereby provide some additional information to show once again that the SEA Directive has not been properly implemented.

The SEA procedure for this third version of the plan has never called upon the services of any environmental expert, in breach of Article 12(2) of Legislative Decree 152/2006 transposing the relevant directive. Moreover, the decision relating to the screening of the project was delivered purely on the basis of the environmental assessments given by the professional who drew up the plan in the first place. Given that the new land use plan was a private initiative, this does not appear to adequately protect the principles of sustainable development in terms of comparing public and private interests, in accordance with Article 3(c)(2) of Legislative Decree 152/2006.

The document 'SEA screening report', relating to the land use plan adopted, does not contain an objective and fair assessment of the environmental impact, as required by Annex I to the second part of Legislative Decree 152/2006, since it merely states that there will be no impact on the environment, without the back-up of any analysis or environmental assessment.

More specifically, none of the relevant documentation is backed up by any analysis of the current state of the various components of the environment. It is not clear, therefore, how any proper assessment of the environmental impact could have been carried out in relation to this new plan.

By way of example: the land loss has not been taken into account, given that a total of approximately 20 agricultural hectares of new possible buildings are concerned; the presence of habitats of Community interest, which should be protected under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC, has not been investigated and the effects of the waste water that will be produced by the planned settlements have not been assessed, even though the areas in question are extremely environmentally vulnerable and have no sewers.

It is worth noting that in support of the plan adopted, in the final screening overview report, the assessment of the plan's impact is expressed in just three lines. There is no consideration or measurement of the real effects on the various parts of the environment, as required by the criteria set out in Annex II to the EU Directive and Annex I to the second part of Legislative Decree 152/2006.

Can the Commission therefore say, in view of the above, whether Directive 2001/42/EC has been properly considered and implemented, taking into account the significance of Version 3 of the Stregna land use plan?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

Art. 3(3) of the SEA Directive 2001/42/EC ([1]) foresees that plans regarding town and country planning, which determine the use of small areas at local level and minor modifications to these plans, require an environmental assessment to be carried out only where the Member States determine that these plans are likely to have significant environmental effects (the so-called 'SEA screening'). Therefore, not all the changes to existing plans, as is the case of the 3rd version of the Municipal Urban Management Plan of Stregna, require a full SEA procedure to be carried out. Furthermore, the SEA Directive does not foresee the definition of 'small areas', therefore it is for the competent national authorities to make such determination.

The SEA screening procedure for the 3rd version of the Municipal Urban Management Plan of Stregna has been carried-out by the competent Italian Authorities and was concluded with a decision to exempt this version from the full SEA procedure, being deemed as not likely to have significant environmental effects ([2]).

Based on the information currently available, it appears that the environmental criteria foreseen by Annex II of the SEA Directive have been duly taken into account ([3]). The Commission could not identify any evidence of a breach of the SEA Directive.

([1]) Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.
([2]) http://www.comune.stregna.ud.it/uploads/media/5.All._3_-_VERIFICA_ASSOGGETTABILITA_A_VAS.pdf
([3]) Idem, mainly pages 8-11; see also other relevant documents of the procedure by following this link: http://www.comune.stregna.ud.it/Ufficio-tecnico.3818.0.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003981/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Tubercolosi: dati epidemiologici ancora preoccupanti

Torna a fare paura la tubercolosi, una malattia che rimane un problema di sanità pubblica nella maggior parte dei paesi della regione europea dell'OMS.

Nonostante, infatti, negli anni l'impegno profuso a livello mondiale contro tale malattia abbia portato a una notevole riduzione di incidenza e mortalità (dal 1990 ad oggi la mortalità per tubercolosi è diminuita del 45 %), i dati epidemiologici rimangono preoccupanti.

È molto complessa la genesi del ritorno di una malattia che si pensava fosse debellata già negli anni settanta con l'impiego degli antibiotici antitubercolari.

Esaminando i dati dell'ultimo triennio ci si accorge che, a dispetto dei luoghi comuni, il 51 % dei malati sono stranieri, il resto locali. A preoccupare poi sono i ceppi più resistenti della malattia, frequenti soprattutto nei paesi dell'est Europa, come Romania e Ucraina, ma anche Russia e Moldavia sono fra i più coinvolti e spesso presentano ceppi con resistenza multifarmaco e quelli a estrema resistenza ai farmaci, ovvero ceppi che si dimostrano resistenti al trattamento di uno o più antibiotici o a tutti i farmaci antitubercolari.

Inoltre, sempre nei paesi dell'UE/SEE, solo un paziente su tre (34 %) con tubercolosi multi-resistente completa con successo il trattamento, mentre più della metà muore o si sottopone a un trattamento fallimentare o interrompe la terapia.

Nel 2012, nel mondo, sono stati diagnosticati circa 8,6 milioni di nuovi casi di tubercolosi e 1,3 milioni di pazienti sono deceduti, soprattutto in paesi a basso a medio reddito (95 %). Inoltre, se le comunità povere e i gruppi a rischio sono i più colpiti, è anche vero che la trasmissione per via aerea della malattia espone tutta la popolazione al rischio di contagio.

Negli Stati Uniti i centri per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (CDC) hanno creato una campagna sulla malattia chiamata «*TB Personal Stories project*», un progetto che, attraverso il racconto delle esperienze personali di alcuni pazienti, sensibilizza la popolazione sul rischio di contrarre la patologia.

Considerando quanto sopra, può la Commissione riferire quali sono i piani in vigore per la sensibilizzazione a livello pubblico e politico intesi a rafforzare le attività svolte in questo ambito dagli Stati membri e a contribuire al controllo della tubercolosi nell'UE?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2014)

Nel 2012, nei ventinove paesi dell'UE/SEE sono stati segnalati 68 423 casi di tubercolosi (TB), diminuiti del 6 % rispetto al 2011, calo che ha interessato 19 paesi. Nel complesso, i paesi dell'UE/SEE hanno raggiunto il loro obiettivo di assicurare una diminuzione media nel quinquennio. Tuttavia, l'individuazione e la terapia efficace della TB multiresistente rimane una sfida e gli obiettivi non sono stati ancora raggiunti.

Il 27 % di tutti i casi di TB è stato di origine straniera. La ripartizione per paese dei casi di TB di origine straniera andava dallo 0,2 % in Bulgaria e Romania all'85 % in Norvegia e Svezia. Ulteriori particolari sono reperibili nel Rapporto di sorveglianza «Controllo e monitoraggio della tubercolosi in Europa 2014» ([1]).

Su richiesta della Commissione, per contribuire a proteggere i cittadini dell'UE contro la TB, il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie ha sviluppato nel 2008 un «Framework Action Plan to fight TB in the EU», e il quadro di monitoraggio «Progressing towards TB elimination: A follow-up to the action plan to fight TB in the EU». Questi due documenti servono a orientare le attività vote a prevenire e a controllare la TB nell'UE/SEE.

L'obiettivo di lungo termine del piano d'azione è controllare e infine eliminare la TB nei paesi dell'UE/SEE. Il piano d'azione vuole far opera di sensibilizzazione tra i politici e il pubblico sulla problematica che la TB rappresenta per la sanità pubblica nell'UE e sostenere e rafforzare gli sforzi degli Stati membri dell'Ue nella lotta contro la TB in linea con la situazione epidemiologica nazionale. In quanto tale, il piano d'azione vuole contribuire al controllo della TB nell'UE.

([1]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/surveillance_reports/tuberculosis/Pages/annual-tuberculosis-surveillance-reports.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003981/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Tuberculosis: epidemiological data — continuing worry

Fears have revived on the subject of tuberculosis, a disease which remains a public health problem in most of the countries in the WHO European Region.

Although the extensive global effort to eradicate the disease has greatly reduced its incidence and the related death rate (which has dropped by 45% since 1990), the epidemiological data are still worrying.

Back in the 1970s tuberculosis was thought to have been wiped out by anti-TB antibiotics; the process which has led to its return is a highly complex one.

The figures for the last three years show that, for all the clichés, foreigners make up 51% of those who fall ill and local residents account for the remainder. Another disquieting factor is the more resistant strains of the disease, which are found especially frequently in eastern European countries, for example Romania and Ukraine; also among the countries most seriously affected are Russia and Moldova, which often have multi-drug-resistant and extensively drug-resistant strains, that is to say, strains which are resistant to treatment with one or more antibiotics or to all anti-TB drugs.

In addition, and still looking at the EU/EEA countries, only one patient in three (34%) with multi-drug-resistant tuberculosis successfully completes their course of treatment; more than half the time patients either die or are not cured or else cut their treatment short.

In 2012, at global level, approximately 8.6 million new cases of tuberculosis were diagnosed, and 1.3 million patients died, mainly in low- to middle-income countries (95%). Furthermore, although poor communities and risk groups are hardest hit, the fact that the disease is spread through the air means that anyone within the population as a whole could become infected.

In the United States the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have launched a campaign called the 'TB Personal Stories Project', which uses patients' accounts of their firsthand experiences to make the public aware of the risk of contracting TB.

What plans exist to raise awareness within the public and at political level with a view to intensifying Member States' activities in this area and helping to control tuberculosis within the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

In 2012, 68 423 cases of tuberculosis (TB) were reported in 29 EU/EEA countries, which was 6% less than in 2011, reflecting a decrease in 19 countries. Overall, the EU/EEA countries met their target of an average five-year decline. However, the detection and successful treatment of multidrug-resistant TB remains a challenge and targets have not yet been met.

27% of all TB cases were of foreign origin. Country-specific proportions of foreign-origin TB cases ranged from 0.2% in Bulgaria and Romania to 85% in Norway and Sweden. Further details are available in the Surveillance Report 'Tuberculosis surveillance and monitoring in Europe 2014' ([1]).

Upon request of the Commission, to help protect EU citizens against TB, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control developed in 2008 a 'Framework Action Plan to fight TB in the EU', and the monitoring framework 'Progressing towards TB elimination: A follow-up to the action plan to fight TB in the EU'. These two documents guide activities to prevent and control TB in the EU/EEA.

The long-term goal of the framework Action Plan is to control and ultimately eliminate TB in the EU/EEA countries. The action plan aims to increase political and public awareness of TB as a public health issue in the EU; support and strengthen EU Member States' efforts against TB in line with the national epidemiological situation. As such the action plan aims to contribute to the control of TB in the EU.

([1]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/surveillance_reports/tuberculosis/Pages/annual-tuberculosis-surveillance-reports.aspx

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003982/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: L'illegittimità della legislazione italiana in materia di precariato pubblico

Esprimendosi sulla vertenza avviata dal maestro della banda municipale di Aosta, la Corte di giustizia dell'UE, con l'ordinanza del 12 dicembre 2013, ha dichiarato nei giorni scorsi «l'illegittimità della legislazione italiana in materia di precariato pubblico, accertando che l'Italia e la normativa interna non riconoscono e non garantiscono ai lavoratori pubblici precari le tutele e le garanzie previste dal legislatore europeo». L'istituzione ha fornito un'indicazione netta all'Italia per «una revisione epocale» della normativa di riferimento.

La Corte di giustizia dell'UE ha chiarito che spetta al giudice del rinvio valutare in che misura le disposizioni di diritto nazionale, volte a sanzionare il ricorso abusivo, da parte della pubblica amministrazione, a una successione di contratti o rapporti di lavoro a tempo determinato, siano conformi a questi principi.

I commentatori rilevano come i risvolti della sentenza, sia nei confronti della tutela dei lavoratori a tempo determinato, sia nei confronti della giurisprudenza resa sul punto dalla Corte di Cassazione, saranno particolarmente rilevanti.

Considerato che ad oggi, in base ad una stima del ministro della Pubblica amministrazione e semplificazione, sono oltre 250 000 i precari che lavorano nelle fila della pubblica amministrazione, per i quali si potrebbero aprire le porte dell'assunzione a tempo indeterminato;

si chiede alla Commissione:

— se intende esprimersi riguardo a linee guida e procedure da intraprendere sul trattamento dei lavoratori riguardo ai contratti a tempo determinato perché tali rapporti non risultino illegittimi alla luce della sentenza;

— se intende esprimersi riguardo alle procedure straordinarie da intraprendere per ottemperare alla sentenza della Corte di giustizia dell'UE senza ricadere in infrazioni da parte della Commissione riguardo ai conti pubblici.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

La Commissione europea ha ricevuto centinaia di denunce riguardanti il ricorso al precariato nella pubblica amministrazione italiana, per le quali sono in corso indagini. Per quanto riguarda l'uso di contratti a tempo determinato presso le scuole pubbliche italiane, dove si riscontrano problemi analoghi, è stato emesso un parere motivato nel novembre 2013 ([1]). Da allora sono state presentate alla Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea due domande di pronuncia pregiudiziale ([2]) riguardanti le questioni sollevate nell'interrogazione scritta degli onorevoli deputati. Tali cause sono tuttora pendenti e, nel frattempo, le indagini di cui sopra continuano. Sarebbe tuttavia prematuro che la Commissione europea rilasciasse pubblicamente dichiarazioni formali prima che la Corte abbia chiarito la questione nelle sentenze che concluderanno i due procedimenti giudiziari in corso.

La Commissione europea ricorda che la clausola 5 dell'accordo quadro allegato alla direttiva 1999/70/CE impone agli Stati membri di adottare «misure» contro il ricorso abusivo a contratti di lavoro successivi a tempo determinato, senza specificare quale forma debbano assumere tali misure. Le normativa UE pertinente non stabilisce quindi un obbligo generale degli Stati membri di prevedere la conversione dei contratti di lavoro a tempo determinato in contratti a tempo indeterminato, purché esistano altre misure atte a prevenire l'uso abusivo di contratti di lavoro successivi a tempo determinato.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=89&langId=en&newsId=1799&furtherNews=yes
([2]) Causa C-418/13 — NAPOLITANO e cause riunite C-22, 61, 62, 63/13 — MASCOLO.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003982/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Italian legislation on fixed-term employment contracts in the public sector declared unlawful

Expressing its opinion of the case brought by the conductor of Aosta's municipal band, the European Court of Justice, which issued its ruling on 12 December 2013, has recently said that Italian legislation on fixed-term employment contracts in the public sector is unlawful, confirming that Italy and its national legislation fail to recognise or guarantee the right of workers on fixed-term contracts in the public sector to the protection and guarantees laid down by European law. The court provided Italy with a clear indication that it should conduct a total overhaul of its legislation in this area.

The European Court of Justice has stated that it is up to the national court to assess how far the provisions of national law — which are intended to sanction the public administration's abusive use of a succession of fixed-term employment contracts or relationships — comply with these principles.

Commentators have pointed out that the ruling will have very significant implications, both as regards the protection of workers on fixed-term contracts and as regards The Italian Court of Appeal's case law on the subject.

Given that Italy's Minister for Public Administration and Simplification has estimated that more than 250 000 people are employed on fixed-term contracts in the public administration, for whom this ruling could open the door to permanent contracts,

can the Commission answer the following questions:

— Is it planning to issue an opinion concerning the guidelines and procedures to be followed on the treatment of workers as regards fixed-term contracts to ensure that such relationships are not illegal in the light of the ruling?

— Is it planning to issue an opinion concerning the extraordinary procedures to be followed to ensure compliance with the ruling of the European Court of Justice and to prevent any infringements by the Commission as regards the public accounts?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

The European Commission has received hundreds of complaints regarding the use of fixed-term-employment in the Italian public service. Investigations are on-going. When it comes to the use of fixed-term employment in Italian public schools, where the problems are analogous, a Reasoned Opinion has been issued in November 2013 ([1]). Since then, two references for a preliminary ruling have been sent to the Court of Justice of the EU ([2]) which concern the issues raised in the Honourable Members' question. While these cases are pending, the abovementioned investigations are continuing. However, it would be premature for the European Commission to issue formal statements in public before the Court has clarified the issue in the rulings concluding these two pending court procedures.

The European Commission recalls that clause 5 of the framework agreement annexed to Directive 1999/70/EC requires Member States to take 'measures' against abusive successions of fixed-term employment, without specifying what form these measures must take. The relevant EC law therefore does not lay down a general obligation on Member States to provide for the conversion of fixed-term contracts of employment into permanent ones, if there are alternative measures to combat abusive use of successive fixed-term contracts.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=89&langId=en&newsId=1799&furtherNews=yes
([2]) Case C-418/13 — Napolitano and Joined Cases C-22, 61, 62, 63/13 — Mascolo.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003984/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Nitrati nelle verdure: un capitolo ancora aperto

Il regolamento (UE) 1258/2011 della Commissione ha innalzato i limiti massimi di residuo per nitrati, modificando così il precedente regolamento (CE) n. 1881/2006 che stabiliva tenori massimi ammissibili di alcuni contaminanti nei prodotti alimentari (e prevedeva, allo stesso tempo, in via provvisoria, deroghe per gli ortaggi a foglia e lattuga per superamento dei limiti, limitatamente ad alcuni paesi del nord Europa).

Il regolamento menzionato è stato redatto in seguito a un parere dell'EFSA, che avrebbe utilizzato una valutazione congiunta dei rischi e benefici associati al consumo di verdura, tenendo conto, quindi, del ruolo positivo delle proprietà antiossidanti nel limitare e in parte annullare o controbilanciare i rischi dovuti a nitrati e composti azotati.

Dal parere dell'EFSA è emerso che, a parte casi limite, in specifici gruppi della popolazione in cui vi sarebbe un consumo eccessivo di verdure (come la rucola e gli spinaci), e ritenendo improbabile che l'esposizione a nitrati comporti rischi significativi per la salute, prevalgono i noti effetti benefici del consumo di verdura. L'EFSA avrebbe inoltre dichiarato che aspetti di trasformazione del prodotto fresco e di lavaggio possono portare a sovrastimare l'assunzione teorica di nitrati, anche se gruppi come i bambini, qualora consumassero più di una porzione di spinaci al giorno, potrebbero superare i tenori massimi.

Alla luce della normativa di riferimento indicata, può la Commissione:

— spiegare come non vi sia alcuna variazione sulla categoria degli spinaci in conserva, surgelati o congelati che resta invariata a 2 000 mg NO_3/kg?

— Citare le evidenze scientifiche che hanno determinato l'applicazione di un trattamento diverso e differenziato per questa categoria di prodotti?

— Chiarire se l'applicazione della menzionata direttiva nel caso di specie non possa determinare un ingiusto trattamento normativo, e conseguentemente una differente applicazione, per alcuni «distinguo» (le tempistiche di raccolta inverno/primavera e i metodi di surgelazione per gli spinaci e le differenze relative al periodo di raccolta)?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(30 maggio 2014)

I tenori massimi di nitrati degli spinaci freschi stabiliti dal regolamento (CE) n. 1881/2006 ([1]) della Commissione non si applicano agli spinaci freschi destinati alla trasformazione e che vengono direttamente trasportati in blocco dal campo allo stabilimento di trasformazione. Di conseguenza, la variazione dei tenori massimi di nitrati per gli spinaci freschi non comporta la necessità di modificare i tenori massimi di nitrati per gli spinaci in conserva, surgelati o congelati.

Una relazione scientifica sullo «Study on the influence of food processing on nitrate levels in vegetables» ([2]) (studio sull'influenza della trasformazione degli alimenti sui livelli di nitrati nei vegetali) ha dimostrato che diverse tecniche di trasformazione (quali bollitura, sbollentatura, lavaggio) o una combinazione di tali tecniche riducono il livello di nitrati in alcuni casi di oltre il 50 %.

I tenori massimi sono stabiliti per garantire un livello elevato di protezione della salute umana e viene applicato il principio di fissare i tenori massimi al livello più basso ragionevolmente raggiungibile con l'applicazione di buone pratiche. Le condizioni di luminosità sono il fattore principale che influenza il livello di nitrati nei vegetali a foglia, e tali condizioni variano significativamente in relazione al periodo dell'anno e alle condizioni di coltivazione (all'aria aperta o in serra). Pertanto i tenori massimi raggiungibili applicando buone pratiche variano nei diversi periodi dell'anno.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1881/2006 della Commissione, del 19 dicembre 2006, che definisce i tenori massimi di alcuni contaminanti nei prodotti alimentari, modificato per quanto riguarda i nitrati dal regolamento (UE) n. 1258/2011 della Commissione (GU L 320 del 3.12.2011, pag. 15).

([2]) Ekart K, Hmelak Gorenjak A, Madorran E, Lapajne S and Langerholc T, 2013. Study on the influence of food processing on nitrate levels in vegetables. EFSA supporting publication 2013: EN-514, 150 pp. Disponibile online: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/doc/514e.pdf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003984/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Nitrates in vegetables: a chapter yet to be closed

Commission Regulation (EU) No 1258/2011 raised the maximum residue limits for nitrates, thus amending the earlier Commission Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006 which set maximum levels for certain contaminants in foodstuffs (and also made provision for temporary derogations for certain leafy vegetables and lettuce with nitrate levels higher than the established maximum levels, but only in certain countries in northern Europe).

The aforementioned regulation was drawn up on the basis of an assessment conducted by the EFSA, which evaluated both the risks and benefits associated with the consumption of vegetables, taking into account the positive effects of antioxidant properties in limiting and in some way counteracting or providing a balance to the risks arising from nitrates and nitroso-compounds.

It emerged from the EFSA assessment that, except in a limited number of cases in specific population groups with very high consumption of leafy vegetables (such as rucola and spinach), and given that exposure to nitrates is unlikely to result in appreciable health risks, the recognised beneficial effects of consumption of vegetables prevail. The EFSA also said that possible changes due to the processing of fresh vegetables, such as washing, can lead to an overestimation of the theoretical intake of nitrates, though groups such as infants and young children who consume more than one portion of spinach a day might exceed the maximum levels.

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

— Can the Commission explain why there is no change in the maximum level for preserved, deep-frozen or frozen spinach, which remains at 2 000 mg NO_3/kg?

— Can the Commission cite the scientific evidence underlying the different treatment of this category of products?

— Can the Commission clarify whether implementation of the aforementioned directive in the case in question implies unfair regulatory treatment and therefore different implementation in certain 'distinct cases' (the timing of winter/spring harvests, freezing methods for spinach and differences concerning the harvesting period)?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2014)

The maximum level for nitrate in fresh spinach as established by Commission Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006 ([1]) is not applicable for fresh spinach to be processed and which is directly transported in bulk from field to processing plant. Consequently, changes in the maximum level of nitrates for fresh spinach do not entail the need to change the maximum level of nitrate for preserved, deep-frozen or frozen spinach.

A scientific report on the 'Study on the influence of food processing on nitrate levels in vegetables' ([2]) demonstrated that different processing techniques (such as boiling, blanching, washing) or a combination of these processing techniques reduce the levels of nitrate in certain cases with more than 50%.

The maximum levels are established to provide a high level of human health protection and the principle of setting the maximum levels at a level as low as reasonably achievable by applying good practices is applied. The light conditions are the main factor influencing the nitrate levels in leafy vegetables and these vary significantly in the year and depend also on the growing conditions (open air versus under cover). Therefore, with the application of good practices, different maximum levels are achievable in different periods of the year.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006 of 19 December 2006 setting maximum levels for certain contaminants in foodstuffs (OJ L 364, 20.12.2006, p. 5) as amended as regards nitrates by Commission Regulation (EU) No 1258/2011 (OJ L 320, 3.12.2011, p. 15).

([2]) Ekart K, Hmelak Gorenjak A, Madorran E, Lapajne S and Langerholc T, 2013. Study on the influence of food processing on nitrate levels in vegetables. EFSA supporting publication 2013: EN-514, 150 pp. Available online: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/doc/514e.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003985/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Una «casa» per i malati cronici

Il 20 marzo la regione Lombardia ha deliberato l'istituzione dei Presidi ospedalieri territoriali (POT), un nuovo modello organizzativo per l'assistenza ai malati cronici. L'idea è di riconvertire alcune delle attuali piccole strutture sanitarie esistenti sul territorio regionale in ambulatori dedicati alla cura del malato cronico. Se il progetto sarà realizzato compiutamente, si tratterà di una «casa» della cronicità dove il paziente con diabete, scompenso cardiaco, ipertensione, bronchite cronica o altro verrà preso in carico per tutto il suo percorso di cura e seguito in tutte le fasi della sua malattia.

Il paziente così potrà sempre avere un riferimento per una visita, per una radiografia di controllo, ma anche per essere avviato a un ricovero ospedaliero qualora necessario e per essere ripreso poi in cura dal POT. Si tratta di un nuovo concetto organizzativo che si dovrebbe fare carico degli oltre 600.000 soggetti in condizione di cronicità socio-sanitaria nella regione Lombardia, oltre ai molti altri, quasi tre milioni in totale, che soffrono di condizioni croniche magari non invalidanti, come la pressione alta o l'asma, ma che necessitano di essere seguiti per tutta la vita.

È un percorso che va in parallelo alla sperimentazione in atto con i medici di medicina generale sui cosiddetti CREG, un altro strumento organizzativo per migliorare l'assistenza ai cronici, ottimizzando l'aderenza alle cure e riducendo poi le complicanze delle malattie e le ospedalizzazioni.

Considerato che i POT sono anche un'opportunità per tentare di riconvertire alcuni piccoli ospedali o strutture minori che chiudere sarebbe impopolare, così si garantirebbe un presidio di assistenza sanitaria sul territorio con obiettivi diversi da quelli di un piccolo ospedale ma certamente oggi più adeguati ai cambiamenti epidemiologici, può la Commissione precisare se intende esprimersi su quanto sopraesposto e divulgare a livello europeo questo nuovo modello organizzativo per l'assistenza dei malati cronici?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(23 giugno 2014)

La Commissione ha recentemente adottato una comunicazione in merito a sistemi sanitari efficaci, accessibili e resilienti ([1]) nella quale sottolinea la necessità di lavorare verso una migliore integrazione dei servizi di assistenza. In tale contesto la Commissione invita in particolare ad integrare i diversi livelli di assistenza (sanitaria di base, ospedaliera) nonché l'assistenza sanitaria e quella sociale, così da far fronte alle esigenze di anziani e malati cronici.

Nell'ambito delle attività relative all'attuale azione congiunta con gli Stati membri per combattere le malattie croniche ([2]) la Commissione sta inoltre sostenendo le attività di raccolta, validazione e divulgazione di pratiche esemplari per far fronte a tali patologie.

Secondo il trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea la definizione di politiche sanitarie nonché l'organizzazione e la prestazione di servizi sanitari (incluso lo specifico modello organizzativo cui fanno riferimento gli onorevoli deputati) sono di competenza dei singoli Stati membri.

([1]) COM(2014) 215 final.
([2]) Ulteriori informazioni sono disponibili al seguente indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/reflection_process/index_it.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003985/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: A 'home base' for patients with chronic conditions

On 20 March, the Region of Lombardy discussed the possibility of opening regional hospital units or POTs, a new organisational model for the care of patients with chronic conditions. The idea is to convert some of the region's small health units into clinics specialising in the treatment of chronic illnesses. If the scheme goes ahead as planned, there will be a 'home base' for patients with chronic conditions, which will be responsible for treating and monitoring patients with diabetes, heart failure, hypertension, chronic bronchitis and other chronic conditions through all the phases of their illness.

This means that patients would always have a referral point for check-ups and X-rays, but also for any necessary hospital admissions, after which the POT would once again take responsibility for their care. This is a new organisational concept for the care of more than 600 000 people with chronic sociomedical conditions in the region of Lombardy, as well as many others, almost three million in total, who suffer from chronic conditions that are not disabling, such as high blood pressure or asthma, but which need to be monitored throughout the patient's life.

This approach goes hand in hand with the current experiment in which GPs are offering chronic disease management services or CREGs, another organisational model to improve the care of patients with chronic conditions by ensuring that patients follow their treatment programmes, therefore reducing complications and hospital admissions.

Since POTs are also an opportunity to convert some small hospitals or other small units whose closure would be unpopular, thus guaranteeing the existence of regional healthcare units whose objectives would be different from those of a small hospital but would now certainly be more in line with epidemiological changes, can the Commission say whether it is planning to express an opinion on this matter and provide information, at European level, on this new organisational model for the care of patients with chronic conditions?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(23 June 2014)

The Commission recently adopted a communication on effective, accessible and resilient health systems ([1]), in which it highlights the need to work toward better integration of care. In this context, the Commission specifically calls for integration between different levels of care — primary care, hospital care — and between health and social care, as a means to meet the needs of elderly people and people with chronic illnesses.

In addition, within the activities of the on-going joint action with Member States on chronic diseases ([2]), the Commission is supporting the collection, validation and dissemination of best practices to address chronic conditions.

According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the definition of health policies and the organisation and delivery of health services — including the specific organisational model that the Honourable Members are referring to — is the responsibility of individual Member States.

([1]) COM(2014) 215 final.
([2]) Details on the joint action are available on: http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/reflection_process/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003986/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Il ritiro dalla sfera produttiva delle lavoratrici madri

Dati statistici forniti da un importante istituto di statistica italiano e da una multinazionale di servizi per le aziende rilevano l'entità della perdita economica subita dalle aziende in seguito al ritiro dal mercato del lavoro di lavoratrici in «dolce attesa».

Una donna su quattro rinuncerebbe al proprio percorso lavorativo e professionale entro i due anni dalla maternità. Le stesse aziende (sei su dieci) lamenterebbero la perdita delle proprie collaboratrici sottolineandone il contributo apportato.

Relativamente a tale questione, può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Quali sono le misure attuate dall'UE per rafforzare i dispositivi socioeconomici (a cominciare dalle politiche per la famiglia) atti a coadiuvare le donne lavoratrici nella conciliazione di tempi di lavoro e tempi dedicati alla famiglia?

2. Sono disponibili dati dettagliati relativi alla condizione professionale delle lavoratrici-madri in Europa?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2014)

La Commissione sostiene in vari modi lo sviluppo di politiche a favore della conciliazione tra lavoro e famiglia.

Nel 2013 nel contesto della strategia Europa 2020 il Consiglio, su proposta della Commissione, ha formulato raccomandazioni specifiche per paese indirizzate a diversi Stati membri per promuovere la partecipazione delle donne al mercato del lavoro. Si è raccomandato in particolare di potenziare i servizi all'infanzia e i servizi di assistenza agli anziani, di affrontare i disincentivi finanziari al lavoro e di promuovere formule di lavoro flessibili, al fine di consentire alle donne di entrare e/o di rimanere nel mercato del lavoro, anche con la possibilità di lavorare a tempo pieno.

La Commissione ha adottato una relazione sui risultati conseguiti dagli Stati membri in materia di strutture di assistenza all'infanzia per il raggiungimento degli obiettivi di Barcellona ([1]).

Consistenti possibilità di finanziamento (3,44 miliardi di euro dai fondi strutturali per il periodo 2007-2013, in particolare dal Fondo sociale europeo) sono state previste a sostegno degli Stati membri per lo sviluppo di strutture di assistenza all'infanzia e la promozione dell'occupazione femminile. Inoltre nell'attuale periodo di programmazione 2014-2020 le strutture di assistenza all'infanzia sono ammissibili al sostegno.

Incoraggiare i padri ad assumere maggiori responsabilità in casa e nell'educazione dei figli costituisce un'altra priorità per aiutare le donne a entrare nel mercato del lavoro. La direttiva 2010/18/UE rivista sul congedo parentale ([2]) conferisce a ciascun genitore che lavora il diritto ad almeno quattro mesi di congedo per la nascita o l'adozione di un figlio. Almeno uno dei quattro mesi non può essere trasferito all'altro genitore, il che rappresenta un incentivo per i padri ad avvalersi del congedo.

Nella relazione annuale sulla parità tra uomini e donne la Commissione analizza le tendenze recenti in materia di partecipazione delle donne ([3]) al mercato del lavoro. La Commissione ha anche appena pubblicato relazioni di esperti sulla conciliazione tra vita professionale e vita privata ([4]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130531_barcelona_en.pdf
([2]) Direttiva 2010/18/UE del Consiglio, dell'8 marzo 2010, che attua l'accordo quadro riveduto in materia di congedo parentale concluso da BUSINESSEUROPE, UEAPME, CEEP e CES e abroga la direttiva 96/34/CE.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/swd_2014_142_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/document/index_en.htm#h2-4

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003986/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Fewer and fewer mothers working in the productive sphere

The statistics published by a key Italian statistical institute and a multinational corporate service provider show the extent of the economic losses suffered by companies as a result of pregnant workers quitting their positions and leaving the job market.

According to the statistics, one woman in every four gives up their career within two years of becoming a mother. The majority of the companies they leave behind (six out of every ten) regret losing them as employees, and underline the important contributions that they made.

1. In light of the above, can the Commission indicate what measures have been put in place by the EU to strengthen the socioeconomic schemes (starting with family policies) capable of helping working women to reconcile work and family life?

2. Is there any detailed information available relating to the professional situation of working mothers in Europe?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

The Commission supports the development of reconciliation policies in several ways:

Within the context of the Europe 2020 strategy in 2013, and upon proposals of the Commission, the Council addressed country-specific recommendations to promote the participation of women in the labour market to several Member States. These covered the need to increase childcare and elderly care services, to tackle financial disincentives to work, to promote flexible working arrangements in order to enable women to enter and/or remain in the labour market, even including the possibility to work on a full time basis.

The Commission has adopted a report with regard to Member States' performance in the field of childcare facilities towards meeting the Barcelona targets ([1]).

Significant funding possibilities (EUR 3.44 billion from the 2007-13 Structural Funds and in particular from the European Social Fund) were allocated to support Member States in developing childcare facilities and promoting female employment. Also in the current 2014-2020 programming period childcare facilities are eligible for support.

Encouraging fathers to take on more responsibilities at home and in child-rearing is another priority to help women enter the labour market. The revised Directive 2010/18/EU on Parental Leave ([2]) gives each working parent the right to at least four months leave after the birth or adoption of a child. At least one of the four months cannot be transferred to the other parent offering an incentive for fathers to take the leave.

In its annual report on equality between women and men, the Commission analyses recent trends on the participation of women ([3]) in the work force. The Commission has also just released expert reports on reconciling work and private life. ([4])

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130531_barcelona_en.pdf
([2]) Council Directive 2010/18/EU of 8 March 2010 implementing the revised Framework Agreement on parental leave concluded by Businesseurope, Ueapme, CEEP and ETUC and repealing Directive 96/34/EC.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/swd_2014_142_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/document/index_en.htm#h2-4

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003987/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Caporalato e diritti dei migranti

Recenti notizie pubblicate su giornali locali italiani portano alla luce nuove vicende legate alla triste piaga del caporalato.

La manodopera alla quale attingevano le aziende agricole in questione, come da prassi, era costituita da migranti; provenienti, questi ultimi, da paesi dell'Est europeo.

Come da copione, le condizioni lavorative in cui versavano gli operai erano al limite, costituendo una lampante violazione dei diritti basilari dei lavoratori.

Naturalmente, il fenomeno del caporalato, oltre a ledere i presupposti della dignità umana, nonché contrastare le disposizioni vigenti in materia di lavoro, rappresenta un aspetto negativo nei confronti delle innumerevoli aziende del comparto agricolo che operano all'insegna della trasparenza e dell'impegno.

1. Può la Commissione fornire informazioni in merito alle misure adottate dall'UE per contrastare tali forme di schiavitù?

2. È disponibile un'informativa basata su dati statistici, relativa al caporalato in Europa?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(28 maggio 2014)

1. Secondo la direttiva sui lavoratori stagionali ([1]), che gli Stati membri devono recepire nella legislazione nazionale entro il 30 settembre 2016, i lavoratori migranti stagionali di paesi terzi avranno diritto alla parità di trattamento con i cittadini dello Stato membro ospitante, anche per quanto riguarda le condizioni di laoro o di impiego e il diritto di sciopero. Gli Stati membri devono richiedere le prove del fatto che i lavoratori stagionali beneficeranno di un alloggio che garantisca un tenore di vita adeguato durante il soggiorno, e devono assicurare che vi siano meccanismi adeguati per il controllo dei datori di lavoro e che siano effettuate ispezioni efficaci.

La Commissione garantirà che la direttiva sia applicata correttamente e presenterà una relazione sulla sua applicazione entro il 30 settembre 2019.

La direttiva sulle sanzioni ai datori di lavoro ([2]), che vieta di dare impiego ai cittadini di paesi terzi soggiornanti illegalmente nell'UE e che prevede sanzioni, incluse quelle penali, per coloro che li impiegano, dovrebbe altresì contribuire a combattere il fenomeno riferito dall'onorevole parlamentare. Una relazione sull'attuazione di questa direttiva è stata presentata dalla Commissione in data 22 maggio 2014.

Inoltre, il 9 aprile 2014 la Commissione ha adottato ([3]) una proposta di istituzione di una piattaforma europea per migliorare la cooperazione a livello dell'UE tra gli Stati membri al fine di affrontare il lavoro sommerso in modo più efficace. Essa raggrupperà gli organismi di contrasto degli Stati membri, come gli ispettorati del lavoro, le autorità competenti per la sicurezza sociale e l'immigrazione e le autorità tributarie.

Una direttiva ([4]) adottata di recente per migliorare l'applicazione dei diritti dei lavoratori mobili dell'UE impone agli Stati membri di informare tali lavoratori dei loro diritti e di aiutarli a esercitarli.

2. La Commissione non dispone di statistiche sulla diffusione del fenomeno.

([1]) Direttiva 2014/36/EU del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 26 febbraio 2014, sulle condizioni di ingresso e di soggiorno dei cittadini di paesi terzi per motivi di impiego in qualità di lavoratori stagionali (GU L 94 del 28.3.2014).

([2]) Direttiva 2009/52/EC del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 18 giugno 2009, che introduce norme minime relative a sanzioni e a provvedimenti nei confronti di datori di lavoro che impiegano cittadini di paesi terzi (GU L 168 del 30.6.2009).

([3]) Proposta di decisione del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa all'istituzione di una piattaforma europea per il rafforzamento della cooperazione volta a prevenire e scoraggiare il lavoro sommerso (COM(2014) 221 def. del 9 aprile 2014).

([4]) Proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa alle misure intese ad agevolare l'esercizio dei diritti conferiti ai lavoratori nel quadro della libera circolazione dei lavoratori (COM(2013) 236 def. del 26 aprile 2013); v. http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=EN&f=PE%204 %202014 %20REV%201.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003987/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: The gangmaster system and the rights of migrant workers

Recent reports published in several local Italian newspapers have brought to light yet more incidents linked with the terrible scourge of the gangmaster system (i.e. workers being illegally employed in the agricultural sector at very low wages).

The workforce exploited by the farms in question was made up of migrants, as is usually the case. These particular migrants had travelled to Italy from several Eastern European countries.

The migrants inevitably had to endure the most appalling working conditions, which constituted a flagrant breach of the fundamental rights of workers.

Of course, the gangmaster system, as well as breaking every employment regulation in the book and stripping away every last shred of human dignity from its victims, also tarnishes the image of the countless number of businesses in the agricultural sector that operate in a lawful, transparent and responsible manner.

1. Can the Commission provide any information on the measures adopted by the EU to combat this form of slavery?

2. Are there any reports available on the prevalence of the gangmaster system in Europe that are based on statistical data?

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

1. Under the Seasonal Workers Directive ([1]), which the Member States are to transpose into their legislation by 30 September 2016, non-EU migrant seasonal workers will be entitled to equal treatment with nationals of the host Member State, including as regards the terms of employment, working conditions and the right to strike. The Member States must require evidence that seasonal workers will have accommodation providing an adequate standard of living during their stay and must ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place for monitoring employers and that effective inspections are carried out.

The Commission will ensure that the directive is implemented properly and will report on its application by 30 September 2019.

The Employer Sanctions Directive ([2]), which prohibits the employment of non-EU nationals staying illegally within the EU and provides for penalties, including criminal ones, on those employing them, should also help tackle the phenomenon referred to by the Honourable Member. A report on the implementation of this directive was issued by the Commission on 22 May 2014.

Moreover, on 9 April 2014 the Commission adopted ([3]) a proposal to establish a European Platform to improve cooperation at EU level between the Member States in tackling undeclared work more effectively. It will bring together such Member State enforcement bodies as the labour inspectorates and the social security, tax and migration authorities.

A Directive ([4]) adopted recently to improve the enforcement of EU mobile workers' rights requires the Member States to inform such workers of their rights and help them to assert them.

2. The Commission has no statistics on the prevalence of the phenomenon.

([1]) Directive 2014/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on the conditions of entry and stay of third-country nationals for the purpose of employment as seasonal workers; OJ L 94, 28.3.2014.

([2]) Directive 2009/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 providing for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals; OJ L 168, 30.6.2009.

([3]) Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing a European Platform to enhance cooperation in the prevention and deterrence of undeclared work (COM(2014) 221 final of 9.4.2014).

([4]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on measures facilitating the exercise of rights conferred on workers in the context of freedom of movement for workers (COM(2013) 236 final of 26.4.2013); see at: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=EN&f=PE%204%202014%20REV%201

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003988/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Territori avvelenati: gli imprenditori si organizzano

Le notizie riguardanti l'occultamento di sostanze chimiche e scarti industriali in aree agrarie ormai si ripresentano con una certa ricorrenza. In particolar modo, paesi come l'Italia registrano diversi casi in tal senso; si tratta di tristi esempi di sfacelo ambientale, che si instaurano sulla base di connivenze fra industriali e criminalità organizzata.

Peraltro, la provenienza dei rifiuti tossici non è soltanto di ambito nazionale: non sono rari, difatti, «viaggi della morte» organizzati oltrefrontiera.

Spesso, alle autorità pubbliche deputate al monitoraggio della salubrità ambientale non resta che constatare lo scempio ormai consumatosi.

In particolar modo, qui si vuol portare all'attenzione la reazione di un gruppo di agricoltori del Sud Italia che, nonostante i controlli effettuati per conto della pubblica amministrazione, hanno commissionato a proprie spese nuovi rilevamenti dei terreni.

Relativamente a questi episodi di degrado ambientale e organizzazione di attori della sfera produttiva, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali siano le procedure e i dispositivi di controllo messi in atto dall'UE per monitorare i flussi di rifiuti pericolosi attraverso l'Europa;

2. quali siano le procedure di controllo messe in atto dall'UE per monitorare il comportamento delle imprese in relazione allo smaltimento delle scorie prodotte;

3. quali siano le misure concepite dall'UE per favorire rilevazioni chimiche periodiche e affidabili dei terreni?

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

1. La spedizione di rifiuti pericolosi in tutta l'Unione europea è soggetta alla procedura preventiva di notifica scritta e di autorizzazione, a norma dell'articolo 4 del regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 relativo alle spedizioni di rifiuti. ([1]) Ai sensi di detto regolamento, le autorità competenti di spedizione, di transito e di destinazione hanno la possibilità di opporsi a tale spedizione.

2. La direttiva 2008/98/CE ([2]) relativa ai rifiuti impone agli Stati membri l'obbligo di garantire che tutti gli operatori coinvolti nella produzione e nella gestione dei rifiuti svolgano tutte le operazioni connesse senza esporre a rischi l'ambiente e la salute umana. Spetta agli Stati membri istituire procedure di controllo specifiche volte a garantire che siano applicate le disposizioni della direttiva.

3. Il Settimo programma d'azione per l'ambiente (7° PAA) ([3]) conferma che per applicare la normativa ambientale dell'Unione e assicurare la parità delle condizioni di concorrenza nel mercato interno è necessario estendere gli obblighi vincolanti, ai fini dell'efficienza delle ispezioni e della sorveglianza degli Stati membri, all'insieme del diritto ambientale dell'Unione nonché sviluppare maggiormente la capacità di supporto delle ispezioni a livello di UE. Come seguito al 7° programma d'azione per l'ambiente, la Commissione sta attualmente esaminando le ispezioni ambientali e le relative misure di garanzia della conformità al fine di aumentare l'efficienza e l'efficacia delle ispezioni in tutta l'UE e dell'intero *acquis* in materia ambientale.

([1]) GU L 190 del 12.7.2006, pag. 1.
([2]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008, pag. 1.
([3]) GU L 354 del 28.12.2013, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003988/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Contaminated areas: the businesses responsible are becoming increasingly organised

Reports of chemicals and industrial waste being dumped in rural areas and then being covered up are now becoming increasingly frequent. The phenomenon is especially prevalent in countries such as Italy, where there have been many dismaying instances of environmental contamination stemming from the shady dealings between industrial business and the criminal underworld.

To make matters worse, the toxic waste does not only come from within the country but also from abroad, with so-called 'shipments of death' from outside Italy's borders being organised on a regular basis.

The public authorities in charge of monitoring environmental cleanliness are often powerless to do anything other than take note of the destruction, which has now reached staggering levels.

The response to the crisis by a group of farmers in southern Italy deserves a special mention: these farmers have commissioned new land inspections at their own expense, despite the checks being performed by the public administrative bodies.

In light of these instances of environmental contamination and given that manufacturers are becoming increasingly organised, can the Commission please answer the following questions:

1. What control systems and procedures have been put in place by the EU for monitoring flows of hazardous waste across Europe?

2. What control procedures have been put in place by the EU for monitoring how companies dispose of the waste that they generate?

3. What measures has the EU come up with to promote regular, reliable inspections being carried out in these areas to detect the presence of chemicals?

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

1. The shipment of hazardous wastes across the European Union is subject to the procedure of prior written notification and consent in accordance with Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste ([1]). Under this regulation, the competent authorities of dispatch, transit and destination have the possibility to raise an objection to such shipment.

2. Directive 2008/98/EC ([2]) on waste lays down obligations for the Member States to ensure that all operators involved in the generation and management of waste carry out all associated operations without endangering the environment and human health. It is up to the Member States to set up specific control procedures to ensure that the directive's provisions are implemented.

3. The seventh Environment Action Programme (7th EAP) ([3]) confirms that enforcing Union environment law and guaranteeing a level playing field in the internal market requires extending binding criteria for effective Member State inspections and surveillance to the wider body of Union environment law and further developing inspection support capacity at EU level. As follow-up to the 7th EAP, the Commission is currently examining environmental inspections and related compliance assurance measures with a view to increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of inspections across the EU and across the environment *acquis*.

([1]) OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.
([2]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([3]) OJ L 354, 28.12.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003989/14
alla Commissione
Guido Milana (S&D)
(31 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Delfini importati nell'Unione europea e usati a fini commerciali

Come specificato dalla Commissione in risposta a precedenti interrogazioni parlamentari:

— i delfini sono elencati nell'allegato A del regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 (regolamento UE sul commercio internazionale di specie protette) come specie la cui importazione è vietata;

— l'importazione di delfini nell'UE a fini commerciali (utilizzo in esposizione pubblica) è proibita dal regolamento (CE) n. 338/97;

— il regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 prevede un'eccezione alla proibizione sovramenzionata, ma solo in casi molto ristretti, e comunque non autorizza mai l'uso dei delfini a fini commerciali;

— negli ultimi anni nessun delfino è stato infatti importato nell'UE per uso a fini commerciali;

— è di dominio pubblico che tutti i delfini detenuti nei delfinari dell'Unione europea sono utilizzati per esposizione pubblica, show e performance di spettacolo e che quindi tali animali sono utilizzati a fini commerciali;

— negli ultimi anni diversi delfini sono stati importati nell'Unione europea con permessi rilasciati ai sensi del regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 e nessuno di questi permessi prevedeva l'autorizzazione all'uso degli animali a fini commerciali.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione chiarire:

quali azioni intende intraprendere nei confronti degli Stati membri che consentono l'utilizzo a fini commerciali (esposizione al pubblico, show, spettacoli) di delfini che sono stati importati nell'UE con un permesso CITES ai sensi del regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 rilasciato per finalità che non erano quelle commerciali?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004006/14
alla Commissione
Guido Milana (S&D)
(1º aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Commercio internazionale di delfini

Dal momento che non è disponibile un database UE ufficiale che diffonda informazioni sull'importazione ed esportazione di delfini da/verso l'UE e sul traffico di questi animali all'interno dell'Unione europea,

si chiede alla Commissione di chiarire quanto segue:

1. quanti delfini e altri cetacei sono stati importati nell'Unione europea negli ultimi dieci anni? I relativi permessi, rilasciati ai sensi del regolamento CE/338/97 sul commercio internazionale di specie protette, autorizzavano l'uso di questi animali per quale finalità?

2. Quali Stati membri hanno importato delfini e altri cetacei nell'Unione europea negli ultimi dieci anni? E da quali Stati non UE?

3. Quali Stati membri hanno rilasciato dei permessi di esportazione di delfini e altri cetacei ai sensi del regolamento CE/338/97 verso Stati non UE negli ultimi 10 anni?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004007/14
alla Commissione
Guido Milana (S&D)
(1º aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Spettacoli dei delfini e altri cetacei e direttiva Zoo (1999/22/CE)

Le strutture che detengono cetacei in cattività nell'Unione europea sono identificate come giardini zoologici ai sensi della direttiva 1999/22/CE relativa alla custodia degli animali selvatici nei giardini zoologici. L'articolo 1 della direttiva, definendone gli obiettivi, specifica che tale direttiva ha lo scopo di proteggere la fauna selvatica e di salvaguardare la biodiversità. Al momento, nell'Unione europea, tutti gli Stati membri che autorizzano i delfinari o altre strutture che detengono delfini e altri cetacei li regolamentano come «giardini zoologici», ad eccezione della Bulgaria, che è l'unico Stato membro che ha esonerato i delfinari dal rispetto delle disposizioni della direttiva 1999/22/CE e li ha inclusi nella regolamentazione applicata ai circhi. È di pubblico dominio che tutti i delfinari nell'Unione europea utilizzano i delfini e altri cetacei per numeri di intrattenimento, spettacolo e show, e che queste esibizioni sono previste più volte al giorno durante l'apertura al pubblico. Tale forma di utilizzo di delfini e altri cetacei non contribuisce in nulla alla protezione della fauna selvatica e alla salvaguardia della biodiversità, né alla promozione di istruzione e sensibilizzazione del pubblico circa la conservazione delle specie e le loro esigenze etologiche.

Si chiede alla Commissione di chiarire quanto segue:

— dal momento che la direttiva 1999/22/CE regolamenta la custodia degli animali selvatici nei giardini zoologici e che i delfinari nell'Unione europea, pur essendo autorizzati come giardini zoologici, utilizzano i delfini e altri cetacei per usi di natura commerciale (show, spettacolo, intrattenimento), quali azioni la Commissione intende intraprendere nei riguardi degli Stati membri che non intervengono a rettificare questa situazione?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004008/14
alla Commissione
Guido Milana (S&D)
(1º aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Identificazione dei delfini nell'Unione europea

Dal momento che ad oggi non è stato impostato un database ufficiale dell'Unione europea per monitorare l'importazione/esportazione dei delfini nell'UE e la loro movimentazione all'interno dell'Unione europea e che questa lacuna non permette di conoscere la vera natura di tali movimentazioni e dunque la loro tracciabilità,

si chiede alla Commissione:

— se considera di suggerire la realizzazione di tale database ufficiale europeo,

— se considera di raccomandare l'identificazione di delfini e altri cetacei con metodi genetici, cosi come già previsto ad esempio da normativa nazionale italiana del 2001.

Risposta congiunta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(26 maggio 2014)

I dati sugli scambi commerciali degli animali contemplati dalla CITES e dal regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 del Consiglio ([1]) (tra cui tutte le specie di cetacei) sono comunicati ogni anno da tutte le Parti aderenti alla CITES, ivi compresi gli Stati membri dell'UE.

Questi dati sono raccolti in una banca dati gestita dal Centro mondiale di monitoraggio della conservazione (WCMC — World Conservation Monitoring Centre). La Commissione non reputa quindi necessario istituire appositamente un'altra banca dati a questo fine.

Dalla banca dati del WCMC risulta che, nel periodo 2002-2012, gli Stati membri dell'UE hanno comunicato l'esportazione di 11 e l'importazione di 15 cetacei vivi, nessuno dei quali esportato a fini commerciali. Ulteriori dettagli su questi dati figurano nella tabella allegata.

La Commissione attualmente non prevede di interrogare gli Stati membri per ottenere più precisazioni su questa questione, né raccomandare lo sviluppo di strumenti per l'identificazione genetica dei delfini.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 del Consiglio, del 9 dicembre 1996, relativo alla protezione di specie della flora e della fauna selvatiche mediante il controllo del loro commercio (GU L 61 del 3.3.1997).

Per quanto riguarda i delfinari e la direttiva 1999/22/CE relativa alla custodia degli animali selvatici nei giardini zoologici ([2]), la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta unica fornita alle interrogazioni scritte E-000100/2011, E- 001029/2011 ed E-000172/2011 ([3]).

([2]) GU L 94 del 9.4.1999, pag. 24.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003989/14
to the Commission
Guido Milana (S&D)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Dolphins imported into the European Union and used for commercial purposes

As the Commission has indicated in answers to previous parliamentary questions:

— dolphins are listed in Annex A of Regulation (EC) No 338/97 (EU Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species) as a species that is prohibited from being imported;

— the importing of dolphins into the EU for commercial purposes (use in public water shows) is prohibited by Regulation (EC) No 338/97;

— Regulation (EC) No 338/97 makes provision for some exceptions to the above-cited prohibition, but only in extraordinary circumstances, and in any case certainly does not authorise the use of dolphins for commercial purposes;

— over the last few years, not a single dolphin has been imported into the EU to be used for commercial purposes;

— it is public knowledge that all the dolphins kept in dolphinariums in the EU are used for public water shows and performances, and that these animals are therefore used for commercial purposes;

— over the last few years, many dolphins have been imported into the European Union due to permits having been issued in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 338/97, and none of these permits allows for these animals to be used for commercial purposes.

In light of the above, can the Commission indicate what actions it intends to take against Member States that allow the use, for commercial purposes (such as public water shows and performances), of dolphins that have been imported into the EU with a CITES permit in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 338/97, this permit having been issued for purposes that were not commercial in nature?

Question for written answer E-004006/14
to the Commission
Guido Milana (S&D)
(1 April 2014)

Subject: International trade in dolphins

There is currently no official European Union database available to provide information on the importing and exporting of dolphins into and out of the EU and the trafficking of these animals within the EU.

1. In light of the above, could the Commission please indicate how many dolphins and other cetaceans have been imported into the European Union over the last 10 years, and for what purposes these animals were authorised to be used by the associated permits issued in accordance with Regulation EC/338/97 on international trade in endangered species?

2. Which Member States have imported dolphins and other cetaceans into the European Union over the last 10 years, and from which non-EU countries did these animals come?

3. Which Member States have issued permits for exporting dolphins and other cetaceans in accordance with Regulation EC/338/97 to non-EU countries over the last 10 years?

Question for written answer E-004007/14
to the Commission
Guido Milana (S&D)
(1 April 2014)

Subject: Water shows involving dolphins and other cetaceans, and the Zoo Directive (1999/22/EC)

The establishments in the European Union that hold cetaceans in captivity are identified as zoos in accordance with Directive 1999/22/EC relating to the keeping of wild animals in zoos. Article 1 sets out the objectives of the directive, namely to protect wild fauna and to conserve biodiversity. As things currently stand in the European Union, every Member State that allows dolphinariums or other establishments holding dolphins and other cetaceans in captivity regulates them as 'zoos', with the exception of Bulgaria, which is the only Member State that has made dolphinariums exempt from the requirements of Directive 1999/22/EC, and has instead included them in the regulation applicable to circuses. It is public knowledge that all dolphinariums in the European Union use dolphins and other cetaceans in many water shows and other forms of entertainment, and that these performances are held several times during the day whilst the dolphinariums are open to the public. Using dolphins and other cetaceans in this way does absolutely nothing to protect wild fauna and conserve biodiversity, and also does not help to educate the public and raise general awareness about the need to protect these species and fulfil their ethological requirements.

Given that directive 1999/22/EC governs the keeping of wild animals in zoos, and that dolphinariums in the European Union, even though they are regulated as zoos, use dolphins and other cetaceans for commercial purposes (water shows and other forms of entertainment), what actions does the Commission intend to take against any Member State that fails to take steps to rectify this situation?

Question for written answer E-004008/14
to the Commission
Guido Milana (S&D)
(1 April 2014)

Subject: Identification of dolphins in the European Union

To date, no official European Union database has been set up to monitor the importing and exporting of dolphins into and out of the EU and their internal movements within the EU. As a result, it is not possible to ascertain the true nature of these movements, and their traceability is therefore called into question.

1. In light of the above, would the Commission consider suggesting that such an official European database should be set up?

2. Would it consider recommending that dolphins and other cetaceans should be identified using genetic methods, as has already been provided for by an Italian national law passed in 2001, to give one example?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(26 May 2014)

Trade data for all animals included in CITES and Council Regulation 338/97 ([1]) (which is the case of all cetacean species) are reported on a yearly basis by all CITES Parties, including EU Member States.

Those data are compiled in a database maintained by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC). The Commission therefore does not see the need for establishing a specific additional database for this purpose.

The WCMC database shows that, during the period 2002-2012, EU Member States reported the export of 11 and the import of 15 live cetaceans. None of them was exported for commercial purpose. More details on those figures can be found in the attached table.

The Commission does not currently plan to launch specific enquiries towards Member States on this issue nor to recommend the development of genetic identification tools for dolphins.

As regards dolphinaria and Directive 1999/22/EC ([2]) on the keeping of wild animals in zoos, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its joint answer to written questions E-000100/2011, E-001029/2011 and E-000172/2011 ([3]).

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 of 9 December 1996 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein, OJ L 61, 3.3.1997.
([2]) OJ L 94/24, 9.4.1999.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html