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 307/01)

Treść Strona

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001170/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(5 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Sedicenne sepolta viva dai familiari in Turchia

Una ragazza di 16 anni di Kahta, villaggio della provincia turca sudorientale di Adiyaman è stata sepolta viva nel giardino di casa dai familiari per aver stretto amicizia con alcuni ragazzi.

Per l'omicidio sono stati arrestati il padre e il nonno. Durante un interrogatorio il padre avrebbe ammesso che la famiglia era scontenta del fatto che la ragazza frequentasse amici di sesso maschile.

L'uccisione della ragazza è stata decisa nell'ambito di un «consiglio di famiglia», composto dai membri anziani del nucleo familiare.

Come valuta la Commissione questo increscioso avvenimento che lede il diritto di associazione e viola, più in generale, i diritti fondamentali delle donne?

È in grado la Commissione di fornire un elenco di tutti i delitti d'onore commessi in Turchia?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001369/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Omicidi d'onore familiare in Turchia

Nel sud-est della Turchia una diciannovenne incinta di 8 mesi è stata strangolata con filo elettrico dai fratelli che ne hanno poi gettato il corpo in un dirupo profondo 18 metri. La famiglia aveva infatti deciso che ucciderla era l'unico modo per lavare l'onta di una gravidanza indesiderata.

Alcuni studi dimostrano che sono quasi 1 000 le donne uccise in un anno per motivi connessi all'onore della famiglia; inoltre, in alcune zone della Turchia il delitto d'onore è considerato una pratica corrente e socialmente giustificabile. Un sondaggio rileva che il 37 % degli intervistati ritiene che una donna colpevole di adulterio debba essere uccisa e il 21 % sostiene che occorra almeno tagliarle il naso o un orecchio.

La Commissione come commenta questa ennesima violazione dei diritti delle donne?

Non ritiene che questi atteggiamenti siano del tutto incompatibili con il modo di vivere dell'UE alla quale Ankara intende aderire?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001512/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Violenza sulle donne turche

In Turchia, nonostante le diverse rassicurazioni, la violenza contro le donne pare non cessare, anche e soprattutto per quanto concerne i c.d. «delitti d'onore».

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se la banca dati sulla violenza nei confronti delle donne è già operativa;

2. qual è il numero dei «delitti d'onore» in Turchia;

3. qual è l'impegno dei giudici, ovvero con quale frequenza i giudici si sono pronunciati sui «delitti d'onore» e quali pene hanno comminato?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001643/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Centri di accoglienza per le donne turche

In Turchia i centri di accoglienza per le donne vittime di violenza sono 81 (dato 2012), esigui se si considera che la Turchia conta circa 70 milioni di abitanti.

Può la Commissione comunicare qual è attualmente il numero dei centri di accoglienza in Turchia e la loro distribuzione sul territorio, nonché il numero delle donne che vi si recano?

Non ritiene che il governo turco debba creare un numero di centri di accoglienza sufficienti e uniformemente distribuiti in tutto il paese, conformemente alle disposizioni della Convenzione del Consiglio d'Europa del maggio 2012?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001644/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Prospettiva 2020 per le donne in Turchia

Nella sua risoluzione del maggio 2012 il Parlamento europeo invitava la Turchia a organizzare iniziative di sensibilizzazione con l'obiettivo di combattere la violenza contro le donne, compresa quella domestica.

Inoltre, la risoluzione considerava limitati i progressi della Turchia nel migliorare e attuare il quadro legislativo al fine di garantire l'equa partecipazione delle donne alla vita sociale, economica e politica.

Può la Commissione aggiornare sulla situazione sopra descritta?

In che modo lavora con le autorità turche per affrontare dette questioni?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(8 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente delle questioni a cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato.

La Commissione segue da vicino le tematiche dei diritti delle donne e della parità fra i sessi e fornisce una sua analisi nella relazione annuale sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia. Tutti i principali sviluppi inerenti ai diritti delle donne e alla parità fra i sessi saranno valutati nella prossima relazione della Commissione, che verrà pubblicata nell'autunno 2014.

Sebbene il quadro legislativo che garantisce i diritti delle donne e la parità fra i sessi sia stato in buona parte approntato, l'applicazione pratica di questi principi rimane una sfida fondamentale. Il problema dei delitti d'onore è tuttora fonte di notevole preoccupazione.

In quanto paese candidato all'adesione all'Unione europea, la Turchia deve garantire, de iure e de facto, i diritti fondamentali ai sensi della Convenzione europea dei diritti dell'uomo e della giurisprudenza della Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo.

La Commissione solleva tali problematiche con le autorità turche in tutte le sedi opportune.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001170/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(5 February 2014)

Subject: Sixteen-year-old buried alive by family-members in Turkey

A 16-year-old girl in Kahta, a village in the Province of Adiyaman in south-east Turkey, was buried alive in the garden of her home by family-members for having close friendships with boys.

Her father and grandfather have been arrested for the murder. Under questioning, the father admitted that the family were unhappy that the girl had been associating with friends of the male gender.

It had been decided to kill the girl at a 'family council' made up of family elders.

How does the Commission view this regrettable occurrence, which breaches the right of association and, more generally, the fundamental rights of women?

Can the Commission provide a comprehensive list of honour crimes perpetrated in Turkey?

Question for written answer E-001369/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Family honour killings in Turkey

In south-east Turkey, a nineteen-year-old girl who was eight months pregnant has been strangled with electrical cable by her brothers, who then threw her body into an eighteen-metre-deep ravine. The family had actually decided that killing her was the only way of washing away the shame of an unwanted pregnancy.

Some studies suggest that nearly 1 000 women are killed every year for reasons associated with family honour; furthermore, honour crimes are seen as a standard and socially justifiable practice in some parts of Turkey. A survey reveals that 37% of respondents believe that women who commit adultery should be killed, and that 21% think they should at least have their nose or an ear cut off.

What does the Commission have to say about yet another violation of women's rights?

Does it not consider that such attitudes are utterly incompatible with the way of life in the EU, which Ankara is hoping to join?

Question for written answer E-001512/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Violence against women in Turkey

Despite the assurances that have been given, violence against women — in particular 'honour crimes' — appears to be continuing in Turkey.

1. Is the database on violence against women up and running?

2. How many 'honour crimes' have been committed in Turkey?

3. How seriously do the courts treat 'honour crimes'? How many people have been found guilty of such crimes, and what sentences have been handed down?

Question for written answer E-001643/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Shelters for Turkish women

According to the figures for 2012, Turkey has 81 shelters for abused women, which is very few for country with a population of around 70 million.

Can the Commission provide updated information regarding the number of women's shelters in Turkey, indicating their geographical distribution and the number of women seeking refuge there?

Does it not consider that the Turkish Government should provide an adequate number of such shelters, uniformly distributed throughout the country, in accordance with the Council of Europe Convention of 2012?

Question for written answer E-001644/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: A 2020 perspective for women in Turkey

In its resolution of 22 May 2012, Parliament called on Turkey to organise awareness-raising activities to combat violence against women, including domestic violence.

It also noted that Turkey was making limited progress in improving its legislative framework and implementing it in such a way as to ensure equal participation by women in social, economic and political life.

Can the Commission say how the situation stands today?

How is the Commission working with the Turkish authorities to address these issues?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2014)

The Commission is aware of the issues the Honourable Member refers to.

The Commission monitors women's rights and gender equality issues closely and provides its analysis in the context of its yearly Progress Reports on Turkey. All major developments in the area of women's rights and gender equality will be assessed in the Commission's next Progress Report, due in the autumn of 2014.

Although the legal framework guaranteeing women's rights and gender equality is broadly in place, ensuring them in practice remains a key challenge. Amongst them, honour killings remain a serious problem.

Turkey, as a candidate country for accession to the EU, needs to guarantee in law and practice fundamental rights according to the European Convention on Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights.

The Commission raises all these issues with the Turkish authorities on all appropriate occasions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001171/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(5 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Epurazione di centinaia di poliziotti in Turchia

All'indomani dei colloqui con i rappresentati dell'UE, il Premier Erdogan, a dispetto di quanto promesso, ha sollevato dall'incarico 470 agenti di polizia nell'ambito della cosiddetta «Tangentopoli del Bosforo». Durante la sua visita a Bruxelles, Erdogan aveva infatti assicurato che avrebbe rispettato l'indipendenza del sistema giudiziario, così da garantire progressi nel capitolo «sistema giudiziario», chiave nei negoziati di adesione.

1. Come ha intenzione di reagire la Commissione di fronte a questo ennesimo disimpegno da parte di Erdogan?

2. Non ritiene la Commissione che questo atteggiamento ambivalente debba suggerire un esame molto approfondito di tutti gli aspetti relativi alla effettiva realizzazione in Turchia di un sistema di giustizia e di polizia che corrisponda *all'acquis* europeo?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

La Commissione ha espresso notevole preoccupazione per gli effetti che la destituzione di un gran numero di agenti di polizia e procuratori potrebbe avere in termini di indipendenza, imparzialità, efficacia e efficienza del sistema giudiziario.

In quanto paese candidato tenuto al rispetto dei criteri politici di adesione, ivi compresa l'applicazione dello Stato di diritto, la Turchia deve prendere tutte le misure necessarie per garantire che le denunce di illeciti siano oggetto di indagini trasparenti e imparziali, senza discriminazioni o preferenze. Va evitata qualsiasi azione tale da compromettere l'efficacia delle indagini.

La situazione attuale ribadisce la necessità per l'UE di intensificare l'impegno, e non di ridurlo, in relazione alla Turchia, anche nell'ambito del capitolo 23 Sistema giudiziario e diritti fondamentali, perché questo è il modo più efficace di affrontare tali questioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001171/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(5 February 2014)

Subject: Hundreds of police purged in Turkey

On the day following talks with EU representatives, in spite of his promises, Prime Minister Erdogan dismissed 470 police officers in the context of the so-called 'Bribesville of the Bosphorus' scandal. During his visit to Brussels, Erdogan had in fact provided assurances that he would respect the independence of the judicial system and in so doing guarantee progress with regard to the 'judicial system' chapter, key to the accession negotiations.

1. How does the Commission intend to react to yet another example of lack of commitment on the part of Erdogan?

2. Does the Commission not consider that this ambivalent attitude suggests the need for an exhaustive analysis of all aspects of the effective creation of a police and justice system in Turkey which corresponds to the *acquis communautaire* [body of EC law]?

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

The Commission has expressed serious concern about the removal of a large number of police officers and prosecutors from their duties due to its possible impact on the independence, impartiality, effectiveness and efficiency of the judiciary.

As a candidate country committed to the political criteria of accession, including the application of the rule of law, Turkey needs to take all the necessary measures to ensure that allegations of wrongdoing are addressed without discrimination or preference in a transparent and impartial manner. Any action which undermines the effectiveness of investigations into these allegations should be avoided.

The current situation demonstrates once more that the EU needs to be engaged more rather than less with Turkey, including in the framework of Chapter 23 — Judiciary and fundamental rights of the accession negotiations, as this is the most effective way of tackling these issues.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001172/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(5 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Legge turca in contrasto con l'etica medica

Da fonti di stampa si apprende che il governo di Erdogan ha promulgato una nuova legge che vieta ai medici di prestare pronto soccorso ai manifestanti feriti se non hanno prima ricevuto una regolare autorizzazione da parte del governo stesso.

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'emanazione di questa legge?

Come valuta la Commissione questo increscioso provvedimento che costituisce palese violazione del giuramento di Ippocrate, oltre ad essere in totale contrasto con il diritto europeo?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(11 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della questione a cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato.

Secondo la Commissione, l'articolo 46 della legge n. 6514 sull'organizzazione e sui compiti del ministero della Sanità, che modifica altre leggi, potrebbe avere effetti dannosi sulla prestazione di servizi medici in situazioni di emergenza. La Commissione continuerà a esprimere alle autorità turche, in tutte le sedi appropriate, le sue preoccupazioni in merito a tale disposizione, anche in termini di deontologia medica e disponibilità di assistenza medica di emergenza in Turchia.

Inoltre, la Commissione ha esortato sistematicamente le autorità turche ad avviare ampie consultazioni con tutte le parti interessate prima di adottare atti legislativi fondamentali. La relazione del 2013 sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia ([1]) (pag. 8) evidenzia la necessità di adoperarsi con maggiore impegno per rendere più inclusivo il processo legislativo consultando sistematicamente tutte le parti interessate, anche sulle questioni più delicate.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001172/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(5 February 2014)

Subject: Turkish law in conflict with medical ethics

We learn from press sources that the Erdogan Government has passed a new law which prohibits doctors from giving first aid to wounded demonstrators unless they have been issued with a valid authorisation from the government.

Is the Commission aware of this new law?

How does the Commission view this regrettable measure, which constitutes a manifest violation of the Hippocratic oath and also a total breach of European law?

Question for written answer E-001572/14
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Turkish Health Bill

On 2 January 2014, the Republic of Turkey signed a health bill into law. Article 46 of this bill will criminalise emergency medical care and punish doctors with heavy fines and imprisonment for simply assisting Turkish citizens in need of emergency medical care.

The bill states that emergency services provided by authorised personnel would only be permitted until the 'arrival of formal health services and health service becomes continuous'. Such vague and unnecessary conditions regarding who can provide medical care and when will result in the arbitrary arrest and punishment of emergency medical responders.

International standards on human rights and medical ethics make it clear that doctors, nurses, paramedics and other health workers must be able to carry out their professional duties to provide emergency medical care to those in need without interference or fear of reprisal. The Ministry of Health and the Turkish Government have an obligation to support and protect health workers, who are simply adhering to their moral, ethical and professional responsibilities to provide care to the sick and injured.

Can the Commission inform us as to whether they are taking a stand on this issue?

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

The Commission is aware of the issue mentioned by the Honourable Members.

In the Commission's view, Article 46 of the Law No 6514 on the organisation and duties of the Ministry of Health and amending other laws could have a potentially damaging effect on the delivery of medical services during emergency situations. The Commission will continue to raise its concerns regarding this provision, including in terms of medical ethics and availability of emergency medical care in Turkey, with the Turkish authorities at the appropriate occasion.

Furthermore, the Commission has been constantly encouraging Turkish authorities to launch extensive consultations with all relevant stakeholders before adopting crucial legislation. This has been reflected as well in our 2013 Progress Report ([1]) on Turkey (p. 8), stating that 'more attention needs to be paid to the adoption of an inclusive approach to law-making, with systematic consultation of all stakeholders, including on sensitive issues.'

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001184/14
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(6 février 2014)

Objet: Euroscepticisme et éducation

L'Union européenne est confrontée à la montée de l'euroscepticisme. En effet, nombreux sont ceux qui profitent de cette période de crise pour tenir des discours populistes. Or, l'Europe a beau ne pas être parfaite, elle n'est pas pour autant la source de tous nos maux. L'information est primordiale pour renverser cette tendance qui consiste à faire de l'Union un bouc émissaire. Les jeunes sont la principale cible de ce genre de mouvement. C'est pourtant ces mêmes jeunes citoyens européens qui seront aux affaires demain.

1. Existe-t-il déjà des programmes d'information et d'éducation sur l'Union européenne mis en place par la Commission?

2. Si cela est le cas, les fonds nécessaires à l'élaboration de tels programmes sont-ils disponibles?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(25 mars 2014)

La Commission a pleinement conscience de l'importance de mettre à disposition des citoyens de l'UE, et en particulier des jeunes, des informations relatives au fonctionnement et aux actions de l'Union européenne.

À cette fin, elle a publié deux ouvrages traduits dans 23 langues: «À la découverte de l'Europe!» destiné à l'enseignement primaire et «Europe. Le magazine des jeunes curieux» destiné à l'enseignement secondaire.

En outre, la Commission communique de plus en plus par voie numérique, moyen de communication jouissant d'une grande popularité auprès des jeunes. L'institution est présente sur les principales plateformes de médias sociaux et a créé deux sites web dédiés en particulier à ce public: l'espace enseignants et le coin des enfants.

Parmi les autres outils permettant d'atteindre les jeunes figurent le Centre de visites de la Commission européenne et l'initiative «Retour à l'école», qui permet aux membres du personnel des institutions européennes de retourner dans leur ancienne école pour discuter de l'Union avec les élèves.

Le Centre de visites reçoit environ 60 000 jeunes visiteurs par an. En 2013, les fonctionnaires de l'UE qui sont retournés dans leur ancienne école ont rencontré 65 400 étudiants dans 22 États membres. La même année, plus d'un million d'exemplaires des deux brochures scolaires ont été commandés et les pages web de l'espace enseignants et du coin des enfants ont reçu environ 12 millions de visites.

La Commission dispose des fonds nécessaires pour gérer et tenir à jour ces outils d'information.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001184/14
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(6 February 2014)

Subject: Euroscepticism and education

Euroscepticism is on the rise in the EU, with many using the crisis as a pretext to engage in populist rhetoric. Whilst Europe may not be perfect, it is not the source of all our problems. Information holds the key to reversing this tendency to blame the EU for everything. Young people are the main targets of the Eurosceptics, and we should not forget that these same young EU citizens are tomorrow's leaders.

1. Has the Commission already set up programmes to inform and educate people about the European Union?

2. If so, is the funding needed to develop such programmes further available?

Answer given by Ms Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission is fully aware of the importance of providing EU citizens — and particularly young people — with material that explains how the EU works and what it does.

To this end, it has produced two publications: in 23 languages, one for primary schools: 'Let's explore Europe!' and one for secondary schools: 'Europe: what's it all about?'.

Furthermore, the Commission is communicating more and more through digital channels, which are particularly popular among young people. The institution is present on the major social media platforms and has created two websites specifically dedicated to this particular audience: Teachers' Corner and Kids' Corner.

Other methods of reaching young people, include the Commission's Visitors' Centre and the 'EU Back to School' initiative, where staff of the European institutions return to their former schools to discuss about the EU with students.

The Visitors Centre receives around 60 000 young visitors a year. In 2013 EU officials going back to their schools met with 65 400 students in 22 Member States. In the same year over 1 million copies were ordered of the two school publications, and Teachers' Corner and Kids' Corner received around 12 million page views.

The Commission has the funding required to maintain and regularly update these information tools.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001188/14
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(6 février 2014)

Objet: Horizon 2020

Horizon 2020 vient d'être lancé par l'Union européenne. Ce projet permet à l'Europe d'avancer en matière de recherche et d'innovation, deux vecteurs très importants de la relance économique de l'Union favorisant la compétitivité des entreprises européennes. Le budget de ce programme s'élève à 80 000 000 000 d'euros pour la période 2014-2020.

1. La Commission peut-elle nous renseigner sur la répartition de ce fonds?

2. De quelle manière seront sélectionnés les programmes?

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

La répartition des fonds entre les priorités et les objectifs spécifiques du programme «Horizon 2020» a été décidée par le Parlement européen et le Conseil par l'adoption du règlement (UE) n° 1291/2013 instituant Horizon 2020 — le Programme-cadre pour la recherche et l'innovation (2014-2020) ([1]).

En décembre 2013, les négociations sur Horizon 2020 ayant abouti, la Commission a adopté les premiers programmes de travail et a publié les premiers appels à propositions, dans le respect total des actes législatifs.

Ces programmes de travail, assortis d'un calendrier, de budgets pour les activités, d'informations relatives aux modalités des appels à propositions et aux activités connexes — telles que l'évaluation des propositions et des modèles de conventions de subvention, sont disponibles sur des sites web publics ([2]).

([1]) JO L 347 du 20.12.2013.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/ et http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001188/14
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(6 February 2014)

Subject: Horizon 2020

The European Union recently launched the Horizon 2020 programme, which will enable it to advance research and innovation — major drivers of its economic recovery, helping to make European companies more competitive. Horizon 2020 has a budget of EUR 80 000 000 000 for the years 2014-2020.

1. Can the Commission tell us how this funding will be allocated?

2. How will participant programmes be selected?

Answer given by Commissioner Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

The budgetary distribution between the priorities and specific objectives of Horizon 2020 was decided by the European Parliament and the Council through the adoption of Regulation (EU) No 1291/2013 establishing Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([1]).

Following the successful conclusion of negotiations on Horizon 2020, the Commission, in full respect of the legislative acts, adopted the first work programmes and published the first calls for proposals in December 2013.

These work programmes, including deadlines, budgets for the activities, information on the modalities of the calls and related activities — such as the evaluation of proposals and model grant agreements, are available on public websites ([2]).

([1]) OJ L 347, 20/12/2013.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/ and http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001189/14
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(6 février 2014)

Objet: La santé et les droits sexuels et génésiques

Conformément à l'article 5 du traité sur l'Union européenne, le principe de subsidiarité est de mise pour répartir les compétences entre les États membres et l'Union. Celui-ci stipule que l'UE ne peut pas intervenir dans les domaines qui ne relèvent pas de sa compétence sauf si «les objectifs de l'action envisagée ne peuvent pas être atteints de manière suffisante par les États membres». C'est le cas pour la santé et les droits sexuels et génésiques, qui relèvent de la compétence des États membres. Le rapport d'Edite Estrela en cette matière avait déjà fait l'objet d'un rejet du Parlement européen au profit d'une résolution alternative émanant du groupe PPE rappelant la compétence des États membres en ce domaine.

Étant donné la tenue d'un débat sur la question durant la séance plénière de janvier, je m'interroge quant aux intentions de la Commission en cette matière.

Celle-ci estime-t-elle que les compétences de l'Union européenne doivent être élargies en ce qui concerne la santé et les droits sexuels et génésiques?

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

Le Parlement européen a invité la Commission à faire une déclaration sur «la non-discrimination dans le cadre de la santé sexuelle et des droits génésiques».

L'organisation et le financement des services de santé et des soins médicaux et la définition des politiques de santé relèvent de la compétence des États membres. Cela comprend tous les services de santé, y compris les services de santé sexuelle.

L'article 35 de la Charte des droits fondamentaux garantit à tous le droit d'avoir accès à des soins de santé préventifs et de bénéficier de traitements médicaux selon les conditions établies par le droit national.

Tout en respectant les compétences des États membres, la Commission soutient activement les pouvoirs publics afin de garantir que les systèmes de santé sont en mesure de répondre efficacement aux besoins sanitaires, de partager les bonnes pratiques et de déployer les ressources nécessaires de la manière la plus bénéfique et la plus efficace possible.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001189/14
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(6 February 2014)

Subject: Sexual and reproductive health and rights

Under Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union, competences are divided between the Member States and the Union in line with the principle of subsidiarity. Article 5 stipulates that in areas which do not fall within its competence, 'the Union shall act only if […] the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States'. This is the case when it comes to sexual and reproductive health and rights, which fall within the competence of the Member States. Edite Estrela's report on the subject was rejected by the European Parliament in favour of an alternative resolution by the PPE Group emphasising that the matter fell within the competence of the Member States.

Given that a debate on the issue was held during the January part-session, what are the Commission's intentions on this matter?

Does the Commission take the view that the EU's competences should be widened where sexual and reproductive health and rights are concerned?

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

The European Commission was invited by the European Parliament to make a statement on 'Non-discrimination in the framework of sexual health and reproductive rights' upon request by the European Parliament.

The organisation and financing of health services and medical care and the definition of health policies is a matter for the Member States. This applies to all health services, including those related to sexual health.

The Charter of Fundamental rights in its Article 35 enshrines the right for everybody to access preventive healthcare and to benefit from medical treatment under the conditions established by national law.

Whilst respecting the national competences of Member States, the Commission actively supports governments to ensure that health systems have the capacity to deal effectively with health needs, to share good practices and to deploy resources in the most beneficial and effective way.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001297/14
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Krishna Maharaj

I have been contacted by a constituent regarding the case of Krishna Maharaj, a British citizen who is currently serving a sentence of life imprisonment in South Florida for double murder (the initial death sentence was overturned in 2002).

I would like to ask the Commission whether it is aware of this case and whether it has made any representations to the US authorities on this matter?

Question for written answer E-001464/14
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: British citizen Krishna Maharaj on death row in USA

British citizen Krishna Maharaj (aged 75) was sentenced to death in 1987 in Florida for two murders that were carried out not by him, but by operatives of Colombian drug cartels with links to organised crime in the USA and Jamaica.

Mr Maharaj has six alibi witnesses and overwhelming evidence concerning the murder victims' involvement in laundering billions of dollars in drug money around the world, and a former Miami police officer has come forward stating that the Miami police framed Mr Maharaj. Despite this, the state of Florida continues to block the examination of important fingerprint evidence, thereby both preventing the potential release of an innocent man and protecting the drug cartels which were responsible for the murders.

Can the Commission advise as to its official reaction to this troubling case, and whether any representations will be made to the national authorities?

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

In 2006, the European Union, joined by Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland, filed an *amicus curiae* brief with the US Supreme Court supporting Mr Maharaj in his request for review and reconsideration of his conviction and sentence. This was done on account of the violation of his rights to consular notification and assistance, as the United Kingdom, country of which Mr Maharaj is a citizen, was made aware of Mr Maharaj's case only in October 1988, almost a year after his conviction. Mr Maharaj's petition for rehearing was however dismissed by the US Supreme Court.

The HR/VP has been informed that a motion for a retrial filed by Mr Maharaj's lawyers is currently under examination and that the United Kingdom is providing consular assistance to Mr Maharaj and his family. The United Kingdom has not requested any intervention of the EU but the HR/VP continues to follow closely the matter of death penalty and incarceration conditions in the world.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001298/14
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Action to end the recruitment and use of child soldiers

Despite a number of international conventions to reduce the impact of armed conflict on children, figures from the United Nations suggest there are still 250 000 child soldiers worldwide. Taking place on 12 February, Red Hand Day, also known as the International Day against the Use of Child Soldiers, is an annual commemoration which aims to raise awareness of the plight of child soldiers worldwide.

1. What steps is the VP/HR taking to push third-country governments to take immediate action to stop the use and recruitment of child soldiers?

2. What action is the Commission taking to address the short, medium and long-term impact of armed conflict on children?

3. What action is being taken to ensure not only the demobilisation and disarmament of children but also their reintegration into society?

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

There are currently 8 states listed by the UN for recruiting and using children in armed conflict. The EU supports fully the initiative of the Special Representative L. Zerrougui and Unicef 'Children, Not Soldiers' that aims to eradicate child recruitment and use by government armed forces by 2016. Since mid-February 2014, the EU delegations have lobbied the ministers in 8 concerned countries to join 'Children, Not Soldiers' and implement their respective Action Plans. The EU believes that the international community should continue to tackle the issue of child recruitment and use by non-State armed groups that represent a vast majority of perpetrators of violations against children.

The Council is discussing in which pilot countries the EU will support the conclusions and the implementation of the action plans signed by the UN and relevant governments or non-State actors, including in the context of peace-talks. The intention is to include support to children affected by armed conflict in the assistance programming documents for 2014-2020 ([1]).

The most urgent needs of children affected by armed conflict are covered by the EU's humanitarian aid. For example, the EU's Children for Peace initiative — a legacy of the EU's Nobel Prize — is specially designed to provide education to children in emergencies ([2]).

The longer-term impact of conflict on children is addressed through various development instruments ([3]). These projects are implemented with different partners, based on their respective expertise. For example, in Myanmar, the EU is working closely with the ILO due to its expertise in socioeconomic reintegration of children associated with armed groups or forces.

([1]) For example, the EU is working with Unicef in Somalia on a project worth EUR 900 000 which will directly contribute to the implementation of the action plan.
([2]) Through this programme, in 2012-2014, the EU has reached out to approximately 108.000 children in countries like Syria, DRC, Pakistan or Colombia.
([3]) Through various call for proposals, the EU is supporting global actions aiming at protecting children from violence in armed conflicts, projects dedicated to the implementation of the EU guidelines on children in armed conflicts (e.g. In Colombia, Sri Lanka, DRC…) and specific projects for the long term, multi-facetted and sustainable reintegration into their communities of children formerly associated with armed forces and groups.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001299/14
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(10 février 2014)

Objet: Établissement de plage

L'Agence européenne pour l'environnement a publié une brochure (ISSN 1725-9177) intitulée «Balancing the future of Europe's coasts — knowledge base for integrated management».

Le document fait largement l'impasse sur les établissements de plage. En effet, ces établissements très présents en France et en Italie, principalement, sont des sources d'emplois inexploitées. Ils permettent également une gestion plus précise de l'environnement des côtes. Ces établissements se trouvent souvent dans des zones largement fréquentées par la population et les touristes et ils sont donc très vigilants sur la qualité de l'eau de baignade et la pollution marine. De par la situation géographique, ils sont très sensibles aux tempêtes et aux déformations des paysages côtiers et sont donc une force de pression en matière de prévention et de préservation des côtes européennes.

Dans ce contexte, la Commission souhaite-t-elle:

— intégrer ce secteur spécifique dans ses futures politiques côtières?

— reconnaitre le rôle environnemental potentiel de ces établissements?

— sensibiliser les professionnels à leur rôle environnemental au sein de la stratégie de la «croissance bleue»?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(11 avril 2014)

La recommandation de l'Union européenne sur la gestion intégrée des zones côtières ([1]) et le protocole à la convention sur la protection du milieu marin et du littoral de la Méditerranée relatif à la gestion intégrée des zones côtières de la Méditerranée ([2]) encouragent les États membres à prendre les mesures nécessaires pour faire participer les parties prenantes appropriées à l'élaboration, à la mise en œuvre et au suivi de leurs politiques côtières. Il incombe aux États membres d'établir les modalités de la participation des parties prenantes. Cette obligation se retrouve dans la directive à venir relative à l'aménagement de l'espace maritime, qui exigera une prise en compte des interactions terre-mer mais laissera la responsabilité de la mise en œuvre aux États membres. Cette directive comportera également des dispositions relatives à la participation du public.

La Commission attache une grande importance à ce que tous les citoyens se rallient aux responsabilités environnementales et elle mesure bien l'importance du rôle que le tourisme littoral joue dans la création d'emplois durables et la promotion d'actions de lutte contre la pollution marine. C'est pourquoi elle a adopté récemment une Communication intitulée «Une stratégie européenne pour plus de croissance et d'emploi dans le tourisme côtier et maritime» ([3]), qui encourage les États membres, leurs régions et industries à élaborer et à promouvoir des actions durables dans ce domaine économique important.

([1]) JO L 148 du 6.6.2002.
([2]) JO L 34 du 4.2.2009.
([3]) COM(2014) 086 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001299/14
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Beach establishment

The European Environment Agency has published a brochure (ISSN 1725-9177) entitled 'Balancing the future of Europe's coasts — knowledge base for integrated management'.

The document almost entirely ignores beach establishments, when in fact these are very common in France and Italy in particular and are untapped sources of employment. These establishments enable more accurate management of coastal environments and are often located in areas that are very popular with local people and tourists. They are therefore extremely vigilant with regard to marine pollution and to the quality of bathing water. Owing to their geographical location, they are highly sensitive to storms and to changes in the coastal landscape. Consequently, they are a lobby group with regard to the prevention and preservation of Europe's coastlines.

In this context, does the Commission wish to:

— integrate this specific sector into its future coastal policies?

— acknowledge the potential environmental role that these establishments could play?

— make professionals aware of their environmental role as part of the 'blue growth' strategy?

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

The EU Recommendation on Integrated Coastal Management ([1]) and the Protocol on Integrated Coastal Zone Management to the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean ([2]) encourage Member States to take the necessary actions to engage with appropriate stakeholders in relation to the development, implementation and monitoring of their coastal policies. It is up to Member States how engagement with stakeholders shall be achieved. This obligation is also reflected in the upcoming Directive on Maritime Spatial Planning, which will require land-sea interactions to be taken into account but leaves the responsibility for effecting this to Member States. The directive will also include provisions for public participation.

The Commission is keen that environmental responsibilities should be embraced by all citizens and is very aware of the important role that coastal tourism can play in creating sustainable jobs and in encouraging action against marine pollution. It has, therefore, recently adopted a communication on 'A European Strategy for more Growth and Jobs in Coastal and Maritime Tourism' ([3]) that encourages Member States, their regions and industries to develop and promote sustainable actions in this important economic area.

([1]) OJ L 148, 6.6.2002.
([2]) OJ L 34, 4.2.2009.
([3]) COM(2014) 086 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001300/14
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(10 février 2014)

Objet: Fin du libre choix de l'assurance maladie des frontaliers

Le gouvernement français a prévu de mettre fin à la dérogation existant pour les ressortissants français exerçant une profession en Suisse, qui leur permet de choisir entre le système de sécurité social suisse, le système français ou une assurance privée.

À partir du 1er juin 2014, l'ensemble des ressortissants français exerçant une activité frontalière seront couverts par la caisse générale de la sécurité sociale française (CMU).

Cependant, cette décision arbitraire n'est pas sans conséquence pour le quotidien des travailleurs et remet en cause les accords sur la liberté de circulation signés avec la Suisse en 2002.

L'accord de 2002 prévoit «la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale». Cette remise en cause unilatérale de la part du gouvernement français est-elle compatible avec le droit communautaire et avec les accords signés avec la Suisse, membre de l'Espace économique européen?

Avec la CMU, les frontaliers devront financer l'ensemble de la branche maladie, qui couvre d'autres prestations comme les indemnités journalières en cas d'accident de travail, d'invalidité, de congé de maternité et de paternité, etc. Pour ces prestations, les frontaliers cotisent déjà avec leur employeur en Suisse. Cette double imposition n'est-elle pas une entrave à la libre circulation des travailleurs via la double imposition?

Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(6 mai 2014)

Les règles de l'UE relatives à la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale ([1]) s'appliquent à la Suisse depuis le 1er juin 2002 conformément à l'accord entre la Communauté européenne et la Confédération suisse ([2]). L'annexe II de l'accord en question, qui porte sur la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale, prévoit une exception au principe général de la *lex loci laboris* ([3]). En conséquence, les personnes soumises aux dispositions juridiques suisses peuvent demander ([4]) à être exemptées de l'assurance obligatoire en Suisse pour autant qu'elles résident en France, par exemple ([5]).

Une personne, soumise à l'assurance maladie obligatoire en Suisse, qui choisit d'être affiliée au régime français de l'assurance maladie, a la possibilité d'être affiliée à un régime obligatoire ou privé. Dès le départ, cette possibilité a été envisagée comme une dérogation temporaire proposée par la législation française ([6]). Ces dispositions prendront automatiquement fin, l'article en question fixant une durée d'application de 12 ans (soit jusqu'au 1er juin 2014).

La législation de l'UE en matière de sécurité sociale prévoit la coordination et non l'harmonisation des régimes de sécurité sociale des États membres. Cela signifie que chaque État membre est libre de fixer les modalités de son propre système de sécurité sociale, notamment la nature des prestations accordées et leurs conditions d'attribution, leur mode de calcul et le montant des cotisations.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 883/2004 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 29 avril 2004 portant sur la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale (JO L 166 du 30.4.2004, p. 1) et règlement (CE) n° 987/2009 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 16 septembre 2009 fixant les modalités d'application du règlement (CE) n° 883/2004 portant sur la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale (JO L 284 du 30.10.2009, p. 1).

([2]) Accord entre la Communauté européenne et ses États membres, d'une part, et la Confédération suisse, d'autre part, sur la libre circulation des personnes (JO L 114 du 30.4.2002).

([3]) Le principe directeur est le suivant: «Les personnes auxquelles le présent règlement est applicable ne sont soumises qu'à la législation d'un seul État membre». En règle générale, dans le cas de travailleurs salariés, c'est la législation de l'État membre dans lequel l'intéressé exerce son activité qui s'applique. Il s'agit du principe dit de la lex loci laboris.

([4]) Cette demande doit intervenir dans les trois mois qui suivent la prise d'effet de l'obligation de s'assurer en Suisse.

([5]) L'exception concerne l'Allemagne, la France, l'Italie, l'Autriche et le Portugal.

([6]) Article L 380-3-1, paragraphe II, du code de la sécurité sociale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001300/14
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: End of free choice regarding health insurance for cross-border workers

The French Government intends to put an end to the existing dispensation for French nationals who work in Switzerland, which allows them to choose between the Swiss social security system, the French system and private insurance.

As of 1 June 2014, all French nationals working across the border will be covered by the French social security general fund (universal medical cover, CMU).

However, this arbitrary decision will have an impact on the daily lives of these workers and undermines the agreements on freedom of movement that were signed with Switzerland in 2002.

The 2002 agreement provides for 'coordination of social security systems'. Is this unilateral change by the French Government compatible with Community law and the agreements that have been signed with Switzerland, a member of the European Economic Area?

With CMU, cross-border workers will have to pay for their entire health insurance, which also covers other services such as sick pay in the event of an accident at work, invalidity, maternity and paternity leave, etc. Cross-border workers are already paying contributions with their employer in Switzerland for these services. Does this double taxation not constitute a restriction on the free movement of workers?

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

The EU rules on the coordination of social security systems ([1]) apply to Switzerland since 1 June 2002 in accordance with the Agreement between the European Community and the Swiss Confederation ([2]). The Annex II of this Agreement, related to social security coordination, foresees an exception to the general principle of *lex loci laboris* ([3]). Consequently, persons subject to Swiss legal provisions, may, on request ([4]), be exempted from compulsory insurance in Switzerland if and as long as they are resident in e.g. France ([5]).

A person, subject to Swiss compulsory sickness insurance, who chooses to be covered by the French sickness insurance, has an option to be insured in a private or statutory scheme. From the beginning, this option was considered as a temporary derogation proposed by the French legislation ([6]). The provisions will come automatically to an end as the said article sets its own time limit of 12 years (1 June 2014).

EC law in the field of social security provides for the coordination and not the harmonisation of the Member States' national social security systems. This means that each Member State is free to determine the details of its own social security system, including which benefits shall be provided, the conditions of eligibility, how these benefits are calculated and how many contributions should be paid.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 166, 30.4.2004) and Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 284, 30.10.2009).

([2]) Agreement between the European Community and its Member States, of the one part, and the Swiss Confederation, of the other, on the free movement of persons [OJ L 114 of 30.4.2002].

([3]) The guiding principle is that persons to whom the regulations apply are subject to the legislation of a single Member State only. In the case of employed persons the legislation of the Member State where the activity is carried out usually applies. This principle is referred to as *lex loci laboris*.

([4]) This request must be submitted within three months of the date on which the obligation to take out insurance in Switzerland comes into effect.

([5]) The exception covers: Germany, France, Italy, Austria, and Portugal.

([6]) Paragraph II Article L380-3-1 du code de la sécurité sociale.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001301/14
upućeno Komisiji
Nikola Vuljanić (GUE/NGL)
(10. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Nepravilnosti u projektu Županijskog centra za gospodarenje otpadom (ŽCGO) Marišćina, sufinaciranom od EK-a i EIB-a

Ugovorom u sufinanciranju projekta pod nazivom „Dvostrani sporazum o projektu između Vlade RH i Europske komisije vezano uz sufinanciranje velikog projekta ŽCGO Marišćina CCI BR.: 2007HR16IPR001", točno su definirane faze projekta ŽCGO Marišćina.

Ugovorom je i jasno definirano da „Faza 0" projekta obuhvaća samo preliminarne aktivnosti na pripremi terena i prateće infrastrukture. Poglavlje 6. Dodatka Ugovoru definira direktive EU-a vezane uz odlagališta, otpad i zaštitu okoliša koje projekt mora poštovati.

Međutim „Faza 0" projekta se prije dvije godine pretvorila u „Fazu 0-1" u okviru koje su nadležne institucije (Ministarstvo graditeljstva i Ministarstvo zaštite okoliša i prirode) izdanim dozvolama dopustile formiranje primitivnog smetlišta na koje se protivno Direktivi EU-a 2006/12/EZ u iskopane rupe u zemlji (tzv. „kazete") istresa neobrađeno smeće, pod krinkom „privremenog skladištenja" smeća na rok od tri godine.

1. Može li se od Europske komisije očekivati da će angažirati stručnu osobu koja će pregledati trenutačno stanje na terenu?

2. U slučaju da se utvrdi kako su izdane dozvole za privremeno skladištenje Faze 0-1, izdane protivno Ugovoru i Direktivi, te da za privremeno odlaganje otpada u kazete nije napravljena studija utjecaja na okoliš, može li se očekivati sankcioniranje institucija RH te donošenje odluke o zabrani daljnjeg odlaganja neobrađenog smeća u tzv. kazete?

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001804/14
upućeno Komisiji
Nikola Vuljanić (GUE/NGL)
(18. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Revizija projekta Županijskog centra za gospodarenje otpadom (ŽCGO) Marišćina, sufinaciranom od EK-a i EIB-a

Prema Ugovoru „Faza 1" projekta Županijskog centra za gospodarenje otpadom Marišćina u osnovi obuhvaća izgradnju postrojenja za mehaničko-biološku obradu otpada (MBO).

Natječajnom dokumentacijom predviđa se provedba postupka nabave u skladu s regulativom EU-a primjenom standarda FIDIC („yellow book") koji podrazumijeva da izbor tehnologije predlaže izvođač i da se paralelno s izborom tehnologije izrađuje i Studija utjecaja na okoliš.

Studija utjecaja na okoliš izrađena je prije 13 (trinaest) godina i pretpostavlja primjenu tehnologije sortiranja i kompostiranja. Službeni nalazi revizora izabrane tehnologije projekta, objavljeni u srpnju 2013. godine, jasno su potvrdili da se radi o tehnološki zastarjelom, ekonomski i ekološki neodrživom projektu koji nije sukladan direktivi EU-a o IPPC-u (Integrated pollution prevention and control) koja definira objedinjene uvjete zaštite okoliša, te da nije izabrana tehnologija BAT (best available technology) što je preduvjet za dobivanje okolišne dozvole IPPC.

1. Koje su mogućnosti Komisije da poduzme hitne korake k tehnološkoj, ekonomskoj i ekološkoj reviziji projekta?

2. Jesu li EK-u dostavljena izvješća vezana uz provedbu projekta ŽCGO Marišćina te ima li u izvješću određenih nepravilnosti?

Odgovor g. Hahna u ime Komisije
(7. travnja 2014.)

Odlukom C(2009) 2241 od 6. travnja 2009. ([1]) Komisija je dodijelila potporu ŽCGO-u Marišćina ([2]) kao velikom projektu na temelju ažuriranih podataka sadržanih u zahtjevu i uzimajući u obzir najnoviju mjerodavnu procjenu utjecaja na okoliš.

([1]) Kako je izmijenjena Odlukama C(2011) 1831 od 17.3.2011. i C(2012) 9480 od 17.12.2012.
([2]) Županijski centar za gospodarenje otpadom Marišćina.

Taj veliki projekt dio je niza različitih fazi cjelokupnog projekta Marišćina kojim se uspostavlja sustav integriranog gospodarenja otpadom u Primorsko-goranskoj županiji kako bi se osigurala provedba obveza u okviru *pravne stečevine* EU-a koje proizlaze iz Ugovora o pristupanju. EU-ovo sufinanciranje velikog projekta ograničeno je na prihvatljive troškove povezane s „fazom 1”, tj. izgradnjom dviju kazeta te postrojenja za mehaničko i biološko pročišćavanje i pripadajuće opreme. Komisija nema posebne informacije o „fazi 0-1” koju spominje uvaženi zastupnik i nije u mogućnosti to komentirati.

Komisija je primila pritužbu o navodnom kršenju zakonodavstva EU-a u provedbi cijelog projekta. Komisija ispituje tu pritužbu, ali u ovom je trenutku prerano reći je li potrebna revizija odnosno stručni posjet.

Komisija dobiva redovita izvješća o dijelovima projekta koji se odnose na EU. Do sada nisu utvrđene posebne nepravilnosti. Komisija će i dalje biti u kontaktu s hrvatskim nadležnim tijelima u pogledu provedbe tog velikog projekta i osigurat će da je projekt u skladu s uvjetima dogovorenima u odluci o sufinanciranju.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001301/14
to the Commission
Nikola Vuljanić (GUE/NGL)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Irregularities in the project to set up the Marišćina county waste management centre (ŽCGO), co-financed by the Commission and the EIB

Under the bilateral co-financing agreement (No 2007HR16IPR001) between the Croatian Government and the Commission concerning the Marišćina ŽCGO project, which is termed a major project, the individual phases of the project are exactly laid down.

The agreement also clearly stipulates that phase 0 of the project covers only the preliminary activities of preparing the site and the ancillary facilities. Chapter 6 consists of an appendix listing the EU directives relating to landfills, waste, and environmental protection with which the project has to comply.

Two years ago, however, phase 0 of the project was turned into phase 0-1, enabling the authorities concerned (the Ministry of Construction and the Ministry for Environmental Protection and Nature Conservation) to issue permits that have served to create a crude rubbish tip where, contrary to Directive 2006/12/EC, unauthorised waste is dumped in holes dug in the ground (or cells, as they are called) under the guise of three-year 'temporary storage'.

1. Will the Commission call in an expert to examine the current situation on the ground?

2. If it proves to be the case that the phase 0-1 temporary storage permits have been issued in breach of the agreement and the directive, and that no study has been carried out on the environmental impact of temporary landfilling of waste, will the Croatian authorities be penalised and a decision taken to prohibit the further disposal of unauthorised waste in landfill cells?

Question for written answer E-001804/14
to the Commission
Nikola Vuljanić (GUE/NGL)
(18 February 2014)

Subject: Audit of the Marišćina County Waste Management Centre (CWMC) project co-financed by the EC and EIB

According to the Contract, Phase 1 of the Marišćina County Waste Management Centre project would essentially involve the construction of a plant for the mechanical biological treatment of waste.

The tender documentation envisaged the procurement process being conducted in accordance with EU regulations on the acceptance of FIDIC ('Yellow Book') standards, which implied that the contractor would propose the choice of technology and that an environmental impact assessment would be prepared in relation to this choice of technology.

The environmental impact assessment was prepared 13 years ago, which assumed that sorting and composting technology would be applied. However, the auditor's official findings, published in July 2013, on the technology selected clearly confirmed that this project is technologically obsolete, economically and environmentally unsustainable, not compliant with the EU's Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive that defines integrated environmental protection conditions, and that the best available technology, a prerequisite for obtaining the IPPC environmental permit, was not selected.

1. What are the chances of the Commission taking urgent steps for a technological, economic and environmental audit of the project?

2. Have the reports concerning implementation of the Marišćina CWMC project been submitted to the Commission, and are there any particular irregularities in the reports?

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

By Decision C(2009) 2241 of 6 April 2009 ([1]), the Commission granted support to the 'CWMC Marišćina' ([2]) as a major project, based on up-to-date information contained in the application and taking into account the latest relevant environmental assessment.

([1]) As amended by Decision C(2011) 1831 of 17.3.2011 and C(2012) 9480 of 17.12.2012.
([2]) 'County Waste Management Centre Marišćina'.

This major project is part of a series of different phases concerning the whole Marišćina project of establishment of an integrated waste management system in Primorsko-Goranska County, ensuring the implementation of the EU *acquis* commitments stemming from the Accession Treaty. The EU co-funding in the major project is limited to the eligible costs related to 'stage 1', i.e. the construction of two landfill cells, a mechanical and biological treatment plant and the related equipment. The Commission has no specific information on the 'phase 0-1' referred to by the Honourable Member and is unable to comment on this.

The Commission has received a complaint regarding alleged breaches of EU legislation in the implementation of the whole project. The Commission is examining this complaint but it is too early to say whether any audit or expert visit is required.

The Commission receives regular reports on the EU part of the project. No particular irregularities have been identified yet. The Commission will remain in regular contact with the Croatian authorities regarding the implementation of this major project and will ensure that the project shall operate in accordance with the terms agreed in the co-financing decision.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001305/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Tutela UE della chiesa emersa dal lago di Nicea

Una chiesa che risale a circa 1500 anni fa (500 D.C.) è emersa a seguito di scavi archeologici condotti nel lago di Iznik, noto ai cristiani con il nome di Nicea, situato nella provincia turca di Bursa, a sud di Istanbul.

È probabile che si tratti di resti della chiesa di San Pietro e sono previsti ulteriori studi e scavi per accertarne la datazione e qualsiasi altro studio.

La Commissione, nella sua comunicazione COM(2013) 0700 del 16 ottobre 2013, dichiara che «la Turchia dovrà infine garantire il pieno rispetto dei diritti di proprietà, in particolare per quanto riguarda i beni delle comunità religiose non musulmane».

La Commissione è in grado di garantire che la Turchia rispetterà questo monito, anche nel rispetto del diritto alla libertà religiosa, rispetto che non è ancora conforme alla CEDU?

La Commissione ha intenzione di stanziare dei fondi per gli studi archeologici e la manutenzione dell'edificio cristiano?

In caso positivo, quanto si prevede di finanziare, a chi e in quali tempi?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

La Commissione riferisce in merito alle questioni inerenti alla libertà di pensiero, di coscienza e di religione, nonché in merito alle questioni connesse ai diritti di proprietà, nelle sue relazioni annuali sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia. Nella relazione del 2013 ([1]) la Commissione ha preso atto degli sforzi compiuti per intensificare il dialogo con le comunità religiose non musulmane. La Commissione ha ricordato altresì che il paese non si è ancora dotato di un quadro legislativo sulle questioni religiose compatibile con la CEDU. La Turchia deve inoltre garantire il pieno rispetto di tutti i diritti di proprietà, compresi quelli delle comunità non musulmane. Queste conclusioni rimangono valide.

In linea con l'articolo 167 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, l'UE può intraprendere azioni in campo culturale e favorire la cooperazione con i paesi terzi in questo settore. L'assistenza alla Turchia viene fornita attraverso lo strumento di assistenza preadesione, il cui principale obiettivo è promuovere il graduale allineamento con le norme e le politiche dell'UE ai fini dell'adesione. Nell'ambito delle relazioni di buon vicinato e del sostegno al dialogo tra le società civili della Turchia e dell'UE, la Commissione ha finanziato, in via eccezionale, azioni pilota relative a studi archeologici e alla manutenzione di siti del patrimonio culturale.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001305/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: EU protection for church discovered in Lake Nicaea

A church dating from around 1 500 years ago (500 AD) has been discovered following archaeological excavations carried out in Lake Iznik, known to Christians by the name of Nicaea, located in the Turkish province of Bursa, south of Istanbul.

It is likely that these are the remains of the Church of Saint Peter, and further studies and excavations are planned in order to confirm its age and to carry out any other research.

In its communication COM(2013)0700 of 16 October 2013, the Commission states that 'Turkey needs to ensure full respect for all property rights, including those of non-Muslim religious communities'.

Is the Commission in a position to guarantee that Turkey will respect this warning, together with the right to religious freedom, in relation to which it is not yet in compliance with the ECHR?

Does the Commission intend to allocate funds to the archaeological study and maintenance of this Christian building?

If so, how much funding does it intend to provide, to whom and in what period of time?

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

The Commission reports on the issues related to the freedom of thought, conscience and religion, as well as on the issues related to property rights in its annual Progress Reports on Turkey. In this respect, in the 2013 Progress Report ([1]) the Commission noted efforts to intensify dialogue with non-Muslim religious communities. The Commission also recalled that an ECHR-compatible legal framework has yet to be established on matters of faith. With regard to property rights, Turkey needs to ensure full respect for all property rights, including those of non-Muslim communities. These findings remain valid.

In line with Article 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the EU can take actions in the sphere of culture and in this respect foster cooperation with third countries. Assistance to Turkey is provided through the Instrument for Pre-accession assistance, which primary aims at supporting the progressive alignment with EU standards and policies with a view to membership. Within the framework of good neighbourly relations and supporting dialogue between civil societies from Turkey and the EU, the Commission has been financing exceptionally pilot actions relating to archaeological studies and maintenance of cultural heritage sites.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001306/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Rapporti economici tra la Turchia e altri paesi

Il ministero dell'Economia turco ha invitato gli imprenditori a non prendere contatti con partner in paesi «sensibili», se non in casi eccezionali e con l'avvallo dello stesso dicastero in coordinamento con quello degli Esteri. La nota del ministero dell'Economia non precisa quali siano i paesi politicamente «sensibili» e le circostanze da valutare prima di intraprendere contatti economici con tali paesi.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza di queste limitazioni poste dal ministero dell'Economia turco?

2. Può indicare quali sono i paesi considerati politicamente «sensibili»?

3. Quali sono le circostanze che devono essere considerate per poter intraprendere o meno contatti con tali paesi?

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

La Commissione non dispone di alcun elemento in merito alla questione sollevata dall'onorevole deputato.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001306/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Economic relations between Turkey and other countries

The Turkish Ministry of the Economy has invited businesses not to engage in contacts with partners in 'sensitive' countries except in exceptional circumstances and with the approval of that department in coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The memorandum from the Ministry of the Economy does not specify which countries are politically 'sensitive' or the circumstances to be assessed prior to initiating economic contacts with such countries.

1. Is the Commission aware of these restrictions imposed by the Turkish Ministry of the Economy?

2. Can it advise which countries are considered politically 'sensitive'?

3. What are the circumstances which must be considered in order to be able to initiate contacts with those countries?

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

The Commission cannot find any trace of the issue to which the Honourable Member refers.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001307/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Verità sull'omicidio di un giornalista turco di origine armena

Ad Istanbul si è commemorato un giornalista turco di origine armena, caporedattore del giornale bilingue turco-armeno «Agos», ucciso 7 anni fa, colpevole di aver definito i massacri subiti dagli armeni un vero e proprio genocidio. La giustizia turca ha individuato l'esecutore e il mandante ma non la «mente» dell'omicidio che pare tuttora coperto dallo Stato.

La Commissione può fornire delucidazioni circa questo omicidio sulla base anche della tutela della libertà di stampa e di espressione fortemente latente in Turchia nei confronti dei giornalisti?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente delle questioni sollevate dall'onorevole deputato, che segue con attenzione e su cui riferisce in modo esauriente, anche nelle sue relazioni annuali sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia.

La relazione dell'ottobre 2013 ([1]) segnalava la persistenza di problemi per quanto riguarda la libertà di espressione, tra cui pressioni costanti sui media da parte di funzionari statali, la diffusione dell'autocensura, i licenziamenti di giornalisti che esprimono posizioni critiche, la frequente censura operata nei confronti di siti Internet e il fatto che in realtà la libertà di espressione e la libertà dei media sono compromesse dall'approccio seguito dall'autorità di regolamentazione audiovisiva e dalla magistratura (pag. 13).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001307/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: The truth behind the murder of a Turkish journalist of Armenian descent

A memorial service has recently been held in Istanbul for a Turkish journalist of Armenian descent who was the editor of the Turkish-Armenian bilingual newspaper *Agos*, who was murdered seven years ago for having committed the 'crime' of defining the massacre of Armenian citizens as an actual genocide. The killer and the instigator were both subsequently convicted by the Turkish courts, but the 'brains' behind the assassination has still not been identified, amid suspicions of a State cover-up.

Can the Commission shed any light on this murder, also taking into account the scant regard shown by Turkey in protecting the freedom of the press and freedom of expression which journalists are having to face?

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

The Commission is aware of the issues raised by the Honourable member, follows them closely and reports on them extensively including in its yearly Progress Report on Turkey.

In the 2013 Progress Report published last October ([1]), it is mentioned that as regards freedom of expression 'Problems remained, including continued pressure on the media by state officials, widespread self-censorship, the firing of critical journalists, frequent website bans and the fact that freedom of expression and media freedom are in practice hampered by the approach taken by the audiovisual regulator and the judiciary.' (page 13).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001309/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Pressioni della Turchia sulla Germania

Il Premier Erdogan, che si è recentemente recato in Germania a colloquio con Angela Merkel circa i negoziati di adesione della Turchia all'UE, ha rimarcato che i cittadini di origine turca sono diventati una componente importante della società tedesca: infatti la Germania ospita la più numerosa comunità di origine turca d'Europa, ovvero circa tre milioni di persone. Sulla base di questo fatto, il governo tedesco, sostiene Erdogan, dovrebbe supportare più convintamente l'entrata della Turchia in Europa.

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

1. Non considera le parole di Erdogan un velato ricatto da parte di un Paese extraeuropeo che, forte di una grande comunità di immigrati, tenta di condizionare l'appoggio alla propria adesione da parte di uno Stato membro?

2. Non ritiene che questo atteggiamento possa essere utilizzato anche nei confronti di altre procedure di adesione?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(14 aprile 2014)

Secondo la Commissione non vi è niente di male nel fatto che un paese candidato cerchi di convincere gli Stati membri dell'opportunità della sua adesione all'UE, anche insistendo sui legami derivanti dalla presenza di comunità di migranti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001309/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Turkish pressure on Germany

Prime Minister Erdoğan recently went to Germany for talks with Angela Merkel about the negotiations for Turkey to join the EU. He remarked that citizens of Turkish origin have become an important part of German society: in fact Germany is home to the largest community of Turkish origin in Europe, about three million people. Based on this fact, Erdoğan maintains that the German Government should be more convinced in its support for Turkish entry to Europe.

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

1. Does it not consider Erdoğan's words to represent veiled blackmail by a non-European country which, on the strength of a large immigrant community, is trying to influence a Member State's support for its own accession?

2. Does it not believe that this attitude can also be used in connection with other accession procedures?

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

The Commission sees no harm in the efforts of candidate countries to make the case for their EU accession with Member States, including by highlighting existing links through migrant communities.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001310/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Il ruolo della Turchia nel progetto «Musa»

Si apprende che l'Università Yildirim Beyazid di Ankara fa parte del partenariato del cosiddetto progetto «MUSA» («MUSic performing and creative Arts professions involved in healthcare»), cofinanziato dall'UE e avente come obiettivo di favorire la mobilità professionale e la trasparenza delle qualifiche per valorizzare le attività artistiche nei percorsi di cura quali la musicoterapia e la clownterapia.

Si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Qual è il ruolo dell'Università turca in questo progetto?

2. Quale partner, l'Ateneo ha ricevuto e/o riceve finanziamenti? In caso positivo, in quale misura e con quale scopo?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(14 aprile 2014)

Il progetto MUSA ([1]) è stato finanziato nell'ambito del programma di apprendimento permanente — Leonardo da Vinci/formazione professionale (2007-2013), un programma gestito dall'EACEA ([2]).

Il consorzio che porta avanti il progetto comprende 7 partner di 5 paesi diversi che sono debitamente qualificati nell'assistenza sanitaria, nell'IFP e nell'istruzione superiore per quanto concerne la terapia musicale, l'accreditamento e il riconoscimento delle qualifiche europee sulla base di ECVET ([3]) e di ECTS ([4]) nonché nelle politiche dell'istruzione e del mercato del lavoro.

Il ruolo dell'università Yildirim Beyazit nel progetto consiste nel realizzare quanto segue:

— stipulare contratti con i candidati al progetto e sostenere il promotore a tutti i livelli del progetto

— implementare in Turchia la «Relazione di sintesi»

— una responsabilità complessiva per lo sviluppo del contenuto

— sviluppo della «Recognition Map for creative and Performing Arts Professions in Healthcare in Europe» (Mappa per il riconoscimento degli artisti creativi e dello spettacolo nell'ambito dell'assistenza sanitaria in Europa) per la Turchia

— dirigere la piattaforma del progetto in Turchia

— sviluppare in modo specifico il «Music Therapist Professional Profile» (Profilo professionale del terapeuta musicale)

— sviluppare un contributo per il Libro verde del progetto in una prospettiva turca

— ospitare la terza riunione transnazionale del progetto ad Ankara (TR)

— effettuare attività di divulgazione attraverso le proprie reti e i media

— traduzione di tutti i prodotti in lingua turca

— partecipazione proattiva a tutte le valutazioni

— stretta cooperazione con gli stakeholder.

([1]) Music performing and creative Arts professions involved in healthcare — Musicisti ed artisti creativi che partecipano all'assistenza sanitaria.
([2]) Agenzia esecutiva per l'Istruzione, gli audiovisivi e la cultura.
([3]) Sistema europeo di crediti per l'istruzione e la formazione professionale.
([4]) Sistema europeo per l'accumulazione e il trasferimento dei crediti.

In quanto partner l'università fa parte del progetto e non riceve direttamente finanziamenti dall'EACEA. I pagamenti sono versati all'organizzazione coordinatrice che verserà le rispettive sovvenzioni ai partner conformemente ai loro accordi di partenariato internazionale. Nel caso dell'università Yildirim Beyazit la sovvenzione totale prevista nell'ambito del progetto è di 21 144 euro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001310/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Turkey's role in the MUSA project

It has recently been announced that Yildirim Beyazit University in Ankara has joined the MUSA project (MUSic performing and creative Arts professions involved in healthcare), which is co-funded by the EU and seeks to promote professional mobility and the transparency of qualifications in order to raise the merits of artistic activities in courses of treatment, such as music therapy and clown therapy.

1. What role does this Turkish university have in the project?

2. As a partner, has the university received, or is it currently receiving, any funding? If so, how much and for what purpose?

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

The MUSA project ([1]) has been financed under the Lifelong Learning Programme — Leonardo da Vinci/Vocational training (2007-2013), a programme managed by the EACEA ([2]).

The project consortium includes 7 partners from 5 different countries, which are suitably qualified in healthcare systems, VET and higher education with regard to music therapy, accreditation and recognition of European qualifications on the basis of ECVET ([3]) and ECTS ([4]) as well as educational and labour market policy.

The role of the Yildirim Beyazit University in the project consists of:

— Contract partner of project's applicant and support to the promoter on all levels of the project

— Implementation of the 'State of the Art Report' in Turkey

— Overall responsibility for content development

— Development of the 'Recognition Map for creative and Performing Arts Professions in Healthcare in Europe' for Turkey

— Piloting the project platform in Turkey

— Developing focus on the 'Music Therapist Professional Profile'

— Development of a contribution for the project's 'Green Paper' with a Turkish perspective

— Hosting of transnational project meeting 3 in Ankara (TR)

— Dissemination activities through own networks and media

— Translation of all products into Turkish language

— Proactive participation at all evaluation

— Close cooperation with stakeholders.

As a partner, the University is part of the project and does not directly receive any money from the EACEA. Payment is made to the coordinating organisation which will pay out the respective grants to the partners according to their internal partnership agreements. In the case of Yildirim Beyazit University, the total grant foreseen within the project is of EUR 21 144.

([1]) Music performing and creative Arts professions involved in healthcare.
([2]) Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.
([3]) European Credit system for Vocational Education and Training.
([4]) European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001312/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Esondazioni e alluvioni, aumenta la percezione del rischio degli eventi idrogeologici — verso una campagna europea di prevenzione

Le recenti esondazioni e alluvioni verificatesi in Italia portano di nuovo «a galla» il problema del dissesto idrogeologico e dell'adeguata protezione del suolo attraverso misure di prevenzione e impermeabilizzazione. In provincia di Alessandria il fiume Bormida è salito un metro e mezzo sopra il limite di allarme ed ha esondato in tutte le aree golenali. Anche nel Novarese sono stati molti i corsi d'acqua minori esondati. Una situazione critica che attraversa tutta l'Italia e che non dovrebbe essere più tollerata da parte delle istituzioni e delle amministrazioni locali, «colpevoli» in questi anni di una politica urbanistica superficiale o di interesse poco attenta alle realtà territoriali. Regioni come il Piemonte, la Valle d'Aosta e la Calabria hanno il 100 per cento di rischio idrogeologico. Il Ministero dell'Ambiente ha quantificato in circa 8,4 miliardi i finanziamenti statali per politiche di prevenzione, mentre nello stesso periodo sono stati spesi 22 miliardi di euro per riparare i danni causati da frane ed alluvioni. Negli ultimi 20 anni per ogni miliardo stanziato per la prevenzione di tali disastri, ne sono stati spesi oltre 2,5 per riparare i danni.

Da un'indagine condotta in Italia emerge che il 41 % dei cittadini si sente minacciato dalle alluvioni e dalle frane sul territorio nazionale, dove l'82 % dei comuni presenta una parte del territorio a rischio per il dissesto idrogeologico. Risulta, dunque, che la percezione sociale sui pericoli di alluvioni e frane sia peggiorata.

Alla luce delle risposte fornite dalla Commissione alle due interrogazioni parlamentari sul tema (E-011624/2012 ed E- 001568/2013) già presentate, può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Nell'ambito degli obiettivi programma generale di azione per l'ambiente 2020, che prevedono una gestione sostenibile del suolo, intende integrare tali obiettivi con linee guida che conducano ad una campagna europea e nazionale itinerante di monitoraggio, prevenzione e informazione per la mitigazione del rischio idrogeologico?

2. Intende intraprendere ulteriori azioni al fine di garantire un percorso educativo e di aggiornamento di tutta la popolazione contro i rischi idrogeologici per prevenire i pericoli connessi?

3. Ritiene che un'adeguata politica di prevenzione europea, ben delineata, potrebbe portare anche a un risparmio finanziario nell'ambito dell'istituendo sistema di protezione civile europeo?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

Gli Stati membri dovrebbero determinare gli obiettivi e le misure di gestione del rischio di inondazioni. Inoltre, la direttiva sulle alluvioni ([1]) impone agli Stati membri di mettere a disposizione del pubblico mappe della pericolosità e del rischio di alluvioni e piani (preliminari) di gestione del rischio di inondazioni e di incoraggiare una maggiore partecipazione dei soggetti interessati. Al momento, la Commissione non intende adottare ulteriori provvedimenti relativi a campagne di monitoraggio, di prevenzione e di attenuazione dei rischi.

Il JRC ([2]) cura un portale sulle inondazioni ([3]) contenente informazioni sulle inondazioni fluviali e sui rischi di inondazione in Europa. L'AEA ([4]) ospita una mappa interattiva che illustra il potenziale rischio di alluvione per le città europee dovuto a precipitazioni abbondanti e sta preparando un aggiornamento della pagina interattiva ([5]) in cui sono illustrate le zone segnalate dagli Stati membri ai fini della gestione delle inondazioni.

La Commissione promuove l'uso delle infrastrutture verdi ([6]) per il ripristino delle pianure alluvionali naturali come soluzione economicamente vantaggiosa atta a ridurre gli effetti negativi delle inondazioni. Allo stadio attuale la Commissione non intende intraprendere ulteriori azioni volte a educare o informare il pubblico.

([1]) Direttiva 2007/60/CE (GU L 288 del 6.11.2007).
([2]) Centro comune di ricerca.
([3]) http://floods.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home.html
([4]) Agenzia europea dell'ambiente.
([5]) http://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/water/interactive/floods-directive-viewer
([6]) COM(2013) 249 final.

Il meccanismo di protezione civile dell'Unione ([7]) impone inoltre agli Stati membri di elaborare valutazioni dei rischi e stabilisce che le attività di prevenzione sono il primo passo verso una politica integrata di gestione delle catastrofi. Al momento, la Commissione non intende elaborare una politica dell'UE in materia di prevenzione, ma ritiene che le politiche nazionali in materia di prevenzione potrebbero realizzare sostanziali risparmi. Da uno studio recente ([8]) risulta che gli investimenti in misure volte a ridurre le inondazioni sono altamente efficienti, con costi mediamente inferiori di circa 6-8 volte rispetto ai danni causati dalle inondazioni.

([7]) Decisione 1313/2013/UE.
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/green_semester/pdf/RPA%20Final%20Report-main%20report.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001312/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Increased perception of risk of hydrogeological events due to flooding — towards a European campaign of prevention

The recent flooding in Italy has again brought to the surface the issue of hydrogeological instability and proper protection of the ground by prevention and waterproofing measures. In Alessandria Province the River Bormida rose by one and a half metres above the emergency level and spilled out into all areas of the flood plain. In Novara Province many smaller waterways also overflowed. A critical situation which is facing the whole of Italy and should no longer be tolerated from institutions and local authorities, 'guilty' in recent years of a superficial planning policy or of paying little regard to the realities of the territory. Regions such as Piedmont, Valle d'Aosta and Calabria have a hydrogeological risk of 100%. The Ministry of the Environment quantified state funding for prevention policies at around EUR 8.4 billion, whereas during the same period EUR 22 billion was spent on repairing damage caused by landslides and flooding. Over the last 20 years, for every EUR 1 billion allocated to the prevention of such disasters, more than EUR 2.5 billion has been spent on repairing the damage.

A survey conducted in Italy reveals that 41% of citizens feel threatened by flooding and landslides within national territory, whereas in 82% of municipalities part of the territory is at risk from hydrogeological instability. It appears, therefore, that the popular perception of the hazards of flooding and landslides has deteriorated.

In view of the answers given by the Commission to the two parliamentary questions previously submitted on this topic (E-011624/2012 and E-001568/2013), can the Commission specify the following:

1. Within the scope of the objectives of the general action programme for the environment 2020, which provide for sustainable management of the ground, does it intend to integrate those objectives with guidelines leading to a travelling European and national campaign for the monitoring, prevention and information on the mitigation of hydrogeological risk?

2. Does it intend to undertake any further actions to provide for the education and updating of the entire population in relation to hydrogeological risks so as to avoid the associated hazards?

3. Does it consider that an appropriate, well-defined European prevention policy could also bring about financial savings in the context of the European civil protection system which is due to be set up?

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

Member States (MS) should determine the objectives and measures of flood risk management. In addition, the Floods Directive ([1]) requires MS to make flood hazard and risk maps, and (preliminary) flood risk management plans publically available and encourage involvement of stakeholders. At this moment, the Commission does not intend to take further measures related to monitoring, prevention and risk mitigation campaigns.

The JRC ([2]) maintains a Floods Portal ([3]) containing information on river floods and flood risk in Europe. The EEA ([4]) hosts an interactive map showing potential flood risk for European cities from heavy rainfall and is preparing an updated Floods Directive viewer showing the areas designated by MS for flood management ([5]).

The Commission promotes the use of Green Infrastructure ([6]) for the restoration of natural floodplains as a cost-efficient solution to reduce the adverse consequences of flooding. Currently, the Commission does not intend to take further actions to provide education and information.

([1]) Directive 2007/60/EC, OJ L 288, 6.11.2007.
([2]) Joint Research Centre.
([3]) http://floods.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home.html
([4]) European Environment Agency.
([5]) http://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/water/interactive/floods-directive-viewer
([6]) COM(2013) 249 final.

The Union Civil Protection Mechanism ([7]) further obliges MS to develop risk assessments and puts preventions as a first step in an integrated disaster management policy. At this moment, the Commission does not intend to set up an EU prevention policy, but considers that national prevention policies could bring about substantive savings. A recent study ([8]) concludes that investing in measures to reduce flooding is highly efficient, on average costing some 6-8 times less than the damage caused by flooding.

([7]) Decision No 1313/2013/EU.
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/green_semester/pdf/RPA%20Final%20Report-main%20report.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001314/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Somalia e fase di transizione e stabilizzazione: allarme per nuova ondata di violenza nel centro-sud del paese

La Somalia centrale e meridionale resta ancora un luogo estremamente pericoloso. Non esistono al momento statistiche complete sul numero di vittime e di feriti causati del conflitto, ma i dati forniti dal gruppo di ricerca ACLED mostrano che tali cifre sono risultate sensibilmente più alte nel 2012 e all'inizio del 2013 di quanto non fossero nel 2011. Ogni mese sono state registrate tra 100 e 600 vittime e nel giugno 2013 violenti combattimenti hanno provocato la morte di 314 persone nella sola Chisimaio. I rischi per la popolazione civile sono quelli di rimanere uccisi o feriti negli scontri a fuoco tra le forze governative e i miliziani Al-Shabaab a causa degli attacchi bomba o nelle aree dove sono in corso attacchi mirati.

L'Alto Commissariato delle Nazioni Unite per i Rifugiati (UNHCR) ha pubblicato un aggiornamento delle linee guida sul bisogno di protezione internazionale delle persone in fuga dalla Somalia centrale e meridionale. Sebbene in alcune aree di queste regioni le condizioni di sicurezza siano migliorate, il conflitto armato è tuttora in corso e molti cittadini somali sono costretti ad abbandonare il proprio paese a causa della diffusa insicurezza e delle violazioni dei diritti umani. Nel 2013 oltre 42mila somali hanno cercato asilo nei paesi limitrofi e in altre regioni del mondo.

Considerato che:

— nel periodo 2008-2013, l'UE ha stanziato 1,2 miliardi di aiuti per il paese, di cui 521 milioni per lo sviluppo e 697 milioni per la sicurezza, in parte impiegati in tre missioni PSDC: la Military Training Mission (EUTM), la EU Naval Force (EU NAVFOR) e la EUCAP NESTOR;

— i fondi per lo sviluppo, erogati attraverso il Fondo europeo di sviluppo, sono indirizzati principalmente agli ambiti della governance, dello sviluppo economico e dell'educazione;

— la Somalia nel 2013 risultava ancora al primo posto del *Failed State Index* elaborato annualmente dal Fund for Peace;

può la Commissione:

1. riferire sullo stato d'implementazione dei menzionati progetti?

2. illustrare come intende migliorare l'efficacia del sistema di aiuti nel quadro della cooperazione UE-Somalia alla luce dei recenti dati pubblicati dall'UNHCR?

3. indicare se intende ancora rivedere le priorità sotto una prospettiva che abbandoni il carattere «emergenziale»?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(7 aprile 2014)

Poiché la sicurezza e lo sviluppo sono strettamente collegati in Somalia, l'UE segue un approccio globale nei confronti di questo paese utilizzando tutte le risorse di cui dispone a livello politico e di sviluppo unitamente a missioni della politica di sicurezza e di difesa comune (PSDC). Il sostegno globale dell'UE ha avuto un impatto determinante in Somalia, che dal 2012 ha visto per la prima volta l'elezione di un governo, una forte diminuzione dell'influenza di Al-Shabaab e la riduzione a livelli minimi del tasso di successo degli atti di pirateria. L'UE è il principale donatore di aiuti allo sviluppo a favore della Somalia e ha già ottenuto notevoli risultati (scolarizzazione di 40 000 bambini, fornitura di acqua potabile a circa 700 000 persone, sostegno a 70 000 persone che si dedicano all'allevamento, ecc.).

L'UE continuerà a garantire che il sostegno sia coordinato con quello degli altri donatori internazionali e venga erogato in funzione delle necessità del paese. Sotto questo profilo la conferenza di Bruxelles per un «New Deal» per la Somalia del 16 settembre 2013 ha rappresentato un'importante pietra miliare per affrontare le fondamentali priorità politiche, socioeconomiche e in materia di sicurezza in Somalia e approvare il «patto per la Somalia» ([1]). L'UE sta conformando le sue priorità in materia di sviluppo alle priorità definite nel «patto». Il patto ha comportato anche una modifica della struttura degli aiuti destinati alla Somalia che dovrebbe incrementare l'efficacia degli aiuti al paese e una nuova serie di meccanismi di finanziamento e di strutture di coordinamento degli aiuti in base a un quadro di responsabilità reciproca per i donatori e il governo.

([1]) http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/somalia/press_corner/all_news/news/2013/20130916_01_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001314/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Somalia in a stage of transition and stabilisation: alarm at new wave of violence in the centre and south of the country

Central and southern Somalia remain extremely dangerous places. There are no complete statistics at present for the deaths and injuries caused by the conflict. However, data supplied by the research group ACLED show much higher figures recorded in 2012 and early 2013 than in 2011. Between 100 and 600 deaths were recorded each month. In June 2013 violent clashes caused 314 deaths in Chisimaio alone. The civilian population is at risk of death or injury in exchanges of fire between government forces and the Al-Shabaab militia, in bomb attacks or in areas under targeted attack.

The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) has published an update of its guidelines on the need for international protection of people fleeing from central and southern Somalia. Although security conditions have improved in parts of these regions, the armed conflict continues. Widespread insecurity and human rights violations are forcing many Somali citizens to abandon their country. In 2013 more than 42 000 Somalis sought asylum in neighbouring countries and other regions of the world.

Considering:

— that the EU aid budget for the country in the period 2008-2013 was EUR 1.2 billion, including EUR 521 million for development and EUR 697 million for security, part of which was spent on three CSDP missions: the Military Training Mission (EUTM), the EU Naval Force (EU NAVFOR) and EUCAP Nestor;

— that the development funds granted through the European Development Fund mainly target the fields of governance, economic development and education;

— and that in 2013 Somalia still ranked first in the Failed State Index drawn up annually by the Fund for Peace,

can the Commission:

1. report on the implementation status of the projects mentioned?

2. describe how it plans to improve the efficiency of the aid system in the context of EU-Somalia cooperation, in the light of the recent figures published by UNHCR?

3. and state whether it still intends to review its priorities with a view to downgrading from 'emergency' status?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

Security and development go hand in hand in Somalia and the EU takes a Comprehensive Approach to Somalia using all its capabilities, political, developmental and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions. The comprehensive EU support has made a substantial difference in Somalia, where since 2012 we have seen a government elected for the first time, Al-Shabaab influence seriously diminished and successful piracy attacks brought back down to negligible levels. The EU is the biggest donor in development aid to Somalia and already achieved considerable results -getting 40,000 children into school, providing safe water for some 700,000 people and helping 70,000 people to produce livestock, to name but a few.

The EU will continue to ensure that this support is fully coherent with other international donors and in line with Somali needs. In this regard the Brussels Conference on a New Deal for Somalia on 16 September 2013 was a major milestone for addressing the most critical political, security, and socioeconomic priorities in Somalia and endorsing the Somali Compact ([1]). The EU is aligning its development priorities to the ones defined in the Compact. This Compact agreed also to new aid architecture for Somalia which has the potential of increasing aid efficiency in Somalia; a new set of financing mechanisms and aid coordination structures through a mutual accountability framework for donors and government.

([1]) http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/somalia/press_corner/all_news/news/2013/20130916_01_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001315/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: «Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership»: prospettive in materia di sanità e in materia agroalimentare e farmaceutica

Il «Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership» è un trattato che vorrebbe creare tra USA e UE la più consistente area di libero scambio, e i cui negoziati stanno procedendo per mano della Commissione e dovrebbero giungere a conclusione entro la fine del 2014.

Molti dubbi sono già stati sollevati riguardo all'effettiva necessità di tale accordo e molte critiche sono state sollevate riguardo alle controversie che si potrebbero andare a creare, soprattutto considerando gli obblighi reciproci inseriti nell'accordo temporaneo previsto nella fase III del protocollo d'intesa che ha posto fine alla controversia in sede OMC riguardo alle sanzioni per il bando all'importazione delle «carni bovine agli ormoni». Non è infatti chiaro come future possibili controversie in materia di sanità e in materia agroalimentare o farmaceutica possano essere risolte visto che, da comunicazione della Commissione, nessuna delle due parti ha messo in agenda l'armonizzazione delle norme su questo fronte. Inoltre, il campo dei controlli sanitari e fitosanitari è quello in cui UE e USA presentano le difformità più marcate nell'applicazione degli standard internazionali, nella tracciabilità dei prodotti o rispetto ai sistemi di valutazione dei rischi. Gli aspetti prioritari dovrebbero riguardare la trasparenza delle procedure, la proprietà intellettuale, le attività verso i Paesi terzi e i dazi proprio nei settori menzionati, dove la mancanza di armonizzazione e la divergenza regolamentare comportano la duplicazione di procedure e costituiscono un costo fisso per le imprese, riducendone l'accesso al mercato e la competitività.

Considerato che alcune scelte ostinatamente rigoriste compiute dall'Unione europea a scapito della crescita economica e quelle, invece, marcatamente espansive adottate dagli Stati Uniti (e dal Giappone), unitamente al già ampio spread di produttività tra le due aree, hanno infatti determinato un differenziale in termini di produzione industriale destinato ad acuirsi, intende la Commissione proseguire i negoziati seguendo un approccio volto al mutuo riconoscimento, e/o all'adozione di standard comuni o internazionali, in particolare nei settori menzionati?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

Prima ancora che iniziassero i negoziati, l'UE e gli USA hanno concordato che l'obiettivo era di ridurre i costi inutili e i ritardi amministrativi di natura regolamentare raggiungendo nel contempo i livelli di protezione della salute, della sicurezza e dell'ambiente che entrambe le parti ritenevano appropriati ([1]).

L'obiettivo di lungo termine finalizzato alla realizzazione di un mercato transatlantico maggiormente integrato può essere raggiunto attraverso una più stretta cooperazione tra i regolatori, l'adozione di regolamentazioni compatibili sviluppate in modo trasparente, prevedibile e inclusivo, il riconoscimento dell'equivalenza o il riconoscimento reciproco per certi settori, come la sicurezza delle automobili, la sicurezza dei prodotti chimici, le regole in materia sanitaria e fitosanitaria, ecc.

Tuttavia, gli strumenti usati per raggiungere questi obiettivi regolamentari dipenderanno dalle problematiche e specificità di ciascun settore. Essi comprenderanno una migliore convergenza regolamentare a monte, l'informazione tempestiva sulle iniziative previste in campo regolamentare, meccanismi di consultazione e un miglior meccanismo per formulare commenti, una cooperazione scientifica pre-normativa, il riconoscimento dell'equivalenza o il riconoscimento reciproco, segnatamente per quanto concerne le ispezioni.

L'obiettivo complessivo dei negoziati TTIP è di ridurre gli oneri burocratici non necessari e i costi legati al commercio transatlantico nonché aiutare le imprese ad ottemperare sia alla legislazione americana che a quella europea. In tutti i casi, le disposizioni della TTIP non dovrebbero intaccare il diritto sovrano di entrambe le parti a legiferare ai fini del perseguimento dei legittimi obiettivi di politica pubblica. La TTIP dovrebbe inoltre ribadire l'importanza e il ruolo particolari delle discipline internazionali.

([1]) Gruppo di lavoro ad alto livello sulla crescita e l'occupazione, relazione finale, 11 febbraio 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001315/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership: implications for the health, agri-food and pharmaceuticals sectors

The proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership between the European Union and the United States would create the largest free trade area in existence. The negotiations being conducted by the Commission are expected to be finalised by the end of 2014.

Numerous doubts have been expressed as to whether the agreement is really necessary and regarding disputes which may arise as a result, especially in view of the reciprocal obligations contained in the provisional agreement provided for in phase 3 of the memorandum of understanding which ended the WTO controversy regarding penalties for banning hormone-treated beef imports. It is not clear how possible future disagreements concerning the health, agri-food and pharmaceuticals sectors could be resolved since, according to the Commission communication, neither party has placed the harmonisation of standards on the agenda. Furthermore, health and plant health checks are the areas in which the biggest differences exist between the EU and USA regarding the application of international product traceability or risk evaluation standards. Priority should be given to the transparency of procedures, intellectual property, relations with third countries and the duties applicable in the above sectors, where the absence of harmonisation and the lack of uniform regulations are leading to duplication of procedures, creating an ongoing financial burden for companies, restricting their market access and undermining their competitiveness.

A number of uncompromisingly restrictive policies followed by the EU at the expense of economic growth, compared with the markedly liberal policies adopted by the United States (and Japan), are likely to widen the already substantial disparity between them in terms of industrial output.

In view of this:

Does the Commission intend to continue the negotiations seeking the mutual recognition and/or adoption of common international standards, particularly in the above sectors?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

Before negotiations even started, both the EU and US have agreed that the aim was 'to reduce unnecessary costs and administrative delays stemming from regulation, while achieving the levels of health, safety, and environmental protection that each side deems appropriate' ([1]).

The long-term goal of a more integrated transatlantic market can be done through enhanced cooperation between regulators, adoption of compatible regulations developed in a transparent, predictable and inclusive manner, recognition of equivalence or mutual recognition for some sectors, such as car safety, chemicals safety, Sanitary and Phytosanitary rules etc.

Nevertheless, the tools used to achieve these regulatory objectives will depend on the issues and the specificities of each sector. They will include better upstream regulatory convergence, timely information on any forthcoming regulatory initiatives, consultation mechanisms and improved mechanism for comments, pre-normative scientific cooperation, recognition of equivalence, or mutual recognition notably of inspections.

The overall objective of TTIP negotiations is to cut unnecessary red tape, reduce the costs of doing business across the Atlantic and make it easier for companies to comply with both American and European laws. In any event, TTIP provisions should not affect the ultimate sovereign right of either party to regulate in pursuit of legitimate public policy objectives. TTIP should also affirm the particular importance and role of international disciplines.

([1]) Hich-Level Working Group on Growth and Jobs, Final report, February 11, 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001316/14
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Decreto carceri (Italia)

Considerando che:

— la Corte europea per i diritti dell'uomo ha accusato l'Italia di violazione dell'articolo 3 della Convenzione europea sui diritti umani che vieta la tortura o il trattamento disumano o degradante a causa della situazione in cui versano le carceri italiane;

— il 17 dicembre 2013 il Consiglio dei Ministri ha approvato il decreto «Misure urgenti in tema di tutela dei diritti fondamentali dei detenuti e di riduzione controllata della popolazione carceraria» e il 6 febbraio il governo ha ottenuto la fiducia con 296 sì e 183 no, in attesa della decisione del Senato;

— la finalità del decreto è diminuire in maniera selettiva il numero di persone nelle carceri e migliorare la qualità della vita dei detenuti, garantendo il rispetto dei diritti umani e condizioni di vita accettabili;

— il decreto è strutturato in otto punti che prevedono l'affidamento in prova per condanne non superiori a quattro anni, la liberazione anticipata in seguito ad una valutazione di merito, la detenzione domiciliare con braccialetto elettronico per pene non superiori a 18 mesi, l'estensione ad ulteriori campi dell'espulsione degli immigrati, l'istituzione di un Garante che vigili sul rispetto dei diritti umani nelle carceri, nei centri di identificazione ed espulsione e nelle stazioni di polizia, l'istituzione di nuove figure istituzionali alle quali i detenuti possano rivolgersi per far valere i propri diritti e, infine, l'affido terapeutico per i detenuti tossicodipendenti e il reato di spaccio lieve;

— alcune carceri hanno strutture inadeguate, poiché fatiscenti, troppo piccole e prive di servizi sanitari efficienti, che costringono i detenuti a vivere in condizioni precarie;

può la Commissione far sapere se, nell'ambito della programmazione 2014-2020, sono previsti fondi europei da destinare alla ristrutturazione delle carceri e alla riorganizzazione delle attività e degli spazi di cui dispongono i detenuti affinché siano conformi alle Regole penitenziarie europee proposte dal Comitato dei Ministri con la raccomandazione R (2006)2?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(7 aprile 2014)

Nel 2011 la Commissione ha pubblicato un libro verde volto a rafforzare la fiducia reciproca nel settore della detenzione ([1]). Sul sito internet ([2]) è stata pubblicata una sintesi delle risposte alla consultazione.

Sulla base dell'esito del libro verde, la Commissione intende concentrarsi sulla corretta attuazione degli strumenti di riconoscimento reciproco vigenti nel settore della detenzione ([3]) prima di elaborare eventuali nuove proposte legislative, e il 5 febbraio 2014 ha pubblicato una relazione sull'attuazione delle tre decisioni quadro ([4]). La corretta attuazione di questi strumenti potrebbe comportare una riduzione delle pene detentive irrogate dai giudici e di conseguenza un miglioramento delle condizioni di detenzione.

Gli investimenti nelle carceri non sono considerati investimenti che contribuiscono allo sviluppo e all'adeguamento strutturale delle regioni (articolo 176 del TFUE); non possono quindi essere considerati investimenti infrastrutturali che potrebbero beneficiare del sostegno del Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR). Pertanto, gli interventi cofinanziati dal FESR nell'ambito del periodo di programmazione 2014-2020 non prevedono finanziamenti per la ristrutturazione delle carceri.

([1]) Rafforzare la fiducia reciproca nello spazio giudiziario europeo — Libro verde sull'applicazione della normativa dell'UE sulla giustizia penale nel settore della detenzione, COM(2011) 327 def.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/criminal/opinion/110614_en.htm

([3]) Decisione quadro 2008/909/GAI, del 27 novembre 2008, relativa all'applicazione del principio del reciproco riconoscimento alle sentenze penali che irrogano pene detentive o misure privative della libertà personale, ai fini della loro esecuzione nell'Unione europea (GU L 327 del 5.12.2008, pag. 27), decisione quadro 2008/947/GAI, del 27 novembre 2008, relativa all'applicazione del principio del reciproco riconoscimento alle sentenze e alle decisioni di sospensione condizionale in vista della sorveglianza delle misure di sospensione condizionale e delle sanzioni sostitutive (GU L 337 del 16.12.2008, pag. 102) e decisione quadro 2009/829/GAI, del 23 ottobre 2009, sull'applicazione tra gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea del principio del reciproco riconoscimento alle decisioni sulle misure alternative alla detenzione cautelare (GU L 294 dell'11.11.2009, pag. 20).

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/criminal/news/140205_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001316/14
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Prisons Decree (Italy)

Considering

— that the European Court of Human Rights has accused Italy of violating Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights which forbids torture or inhumane or degrading treatment, because of the conditions which exist in Italian prisons;

— that, on 17 December 2013, the cabinet passed the Decree on Urgent Measures for the Protection of Basic Rights of Detainees and Controlled Reduction of the Prison Population and that, on 6 February, the Government won the vote by 296 to 183, pending decision by the Senate;

— that the purposes of the Decree are selective reduction of the number of people in prison and improvement in the quality of life of detainees; guaranteeing respect for human rights and acceptable living conditions;

— that the Decree breaks down into eight points providing as follows: offenders to be placed under supervision of a social worker for sentences not exceeding four years; early release following assessment of merit; home detention with electronic tag for sentences not exceeding 18 months; extension to more immigrant deportation camps; institution of a guarantor to monitor respect for human rights in prisons, identification and deportation centres and police stations; set-up of new institutions to which detainees can turn to assert their rights; and, finally, treatment orders for detainees who are addicted to drugs and for petty drug dealing offences;

— and that some prisons are structurally inadequate because they are dilapidated, cramped and lack efficient health services and sanitation, obliging detainees to live in unsettled conditions;

can the Commission state whether its 2014-2020 planning includes European funding to be spent on prison upgrading and reorganisation of the activities and spaces at detainees' disposal, to ensure conformity to the European Prison Rules proposed by the Committee of Ministers in Recommendation Rec(2006)2?

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

In 2011 the Commission published a Green Paper on strengthening mutual trust in the field of detention ([1]). A summary of the replies has been published on the website ([2]).

Based on the outcome of the Green Paper, the Commission intends to focus on the proper implementation of the existing mutual recognition instruments adopted in the field of detention ([3]) before developing any new legislative proposals and has published an implementation report on the three Framework Decisions on 5 February 2014 ([4]). Proper implementation of these instruments might lead to a reduction of custodial sentences imposed by judges and therefore to an improvement of detention conditions.

Investments in prisons are not considered to contribute to the development and structural adjustment of regions (Article 176 TFEU) and hence, they cannot be considered as investments in infrastructure which could benefit from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) support. Funding for prison upgrading is therefore not foreseen among the actions co-financed by ERDF within the framework of the 2014-2020 programming period.

([1]) Green Paper Strengthening mutual trust in the European judicial area — A Green Paper on the application of EU criminal justice legislation in the field of detention, COM(2011)0327 final.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/criminal/opinion/110614_en.htm

([3]) The framework Decision 2008/909/JHA of 27 November 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, the framework Decision 2008/947/JHA of 27 November 2008 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments and probation decisions with a view to the supervision of probation measures and alternative sanctions, OJ L 337/102, 16.12.2008, and the framework Decision 2009/829/JHA of 23 October 2009 on the application, between Member States of the European Union, of the principle of mutual recognition to decisions on supervision measures as an alternative to provisional detention, OJ L 294/20, 11.11.2009.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/criminal/news/140205_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001317/14
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(10 februari 2014)

Betreft: Stadionverbod hooligans

Op 5 februari jl. waren er tijdens de bekervoetbalwedstrijd Oostende — Lokeren rellen in het stadion waarbij Nederlandse hooligans betrokken waren die in Nederland een stadionverbod hebben.

De Belgische autoriteiten waren op de hoogte van de komst van deze hooligans, maar konden hen de toegang tot het stadion niet ontzeggen zolang zij niets verkeerds gedaan hadden.

In haar resolutie van 2 februari 2012 over de Europese dimensie van de sport (P7_TA(2012)0025) vraagt het Europees Parlement expliciet dat er op Europees niveau samengewerkt wordt om ervoor te zorgen dat een stadionverbod voor amokmakende „supporters" ook gehandhaafd wordt bij wedstrijden in andere lidstaten en om hiertoe een Europees informatiesysteem op te zetten.

Heeft de Commissie al acties ondernomen om ervoor te zorgen dat het vrije verkeer van personen in de EU het goede verloop van voetbalwedstrijden niet in gedrang brengt?

Op welke manier wil de Commissie gehoor geven aan de oproep van verschillende lidstaten (België, Duitsland, Nederland, Verenigd Koninkrijk) en van het Europees Parlement om een stadionverbod in de hele EU afdwingbaar te maken?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(30 april 2014)

De betreffende regelgeving wordt vastgesteld door Besluit 2002/348/JBZ van de Raad ([1]) inzake veiligheid naar aanleiding van voetbalwedstrijden met een internationale dimensie, dat in 2007 werd gewijzigd door Besluit 2007/412/JBZ van de Raad ([2]). Dit kader schrijft de oprichting van nationale informatiepunten betreffende voetbal voor en biedt de mogelijkheid om tussen deze punten informatie uit te wisselen voor de preventie en de bestrijding van geweld met betrekking tot voetbalwedstrijden met een internationale dimensie.

In verband met dit rechtsinstrument bestaat er ook een EU-groep van deskundigen voor grote sportevenementen, die expertise uitwisselen en een EU-actieplan uitvoeren om veiligheidskwesties in verband met voetbalwedstrijden.aan te pakken. De groep deskundigen gebruikt een EU-handboek met aanbevelingen voor internationale politiesamenwerking op dit gebied, en werkt dit boek bij.

Via deze instrumenten kunnen lidstaten ervaringen en informatie uitwisselen die overeenkomstig hun nationale wetgeving een vervolg kunnen krijgen. Afgezien hiervan kunnen stadionverboden ook door voetbalclubs worden opgelegd, in samenwerking met de nationale voetbalbonden en de UEFA.

([1]) 2002/348/JBZ: Besluit van de Raad van 25 april 2002 inzake veiligheid naar aanleiding van voetbalwedstrijden met een internationale dimensie; PB L 121 van 8.5.2002, blz. 1-3.

([2]) Besluit 2007/412/JBZ van de Raad van 12 juni 2007 tot wijziging van Besluit 2002/348/JBZ inzake veiligheid naar aanleiding van voetbalwedstrijden met een internationale dimensie; PB L 155 van 15.6.2007, blz. 76-77.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001317/14
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Banning hooligans from stadiums

On 5 February this year, there was rioting in the stadium at the football cup match between Ostend and Lokeren involving Dutch hooligans who had been banned from entering stadiums in the Netherlands.

The Belgian authorities knew that these hooligans were coming, but could not prevent them from entering the ground so long as they did nothing wrong.

In its resolution of 2 February 2012 on the European dimension of sport (P7_TA(2012)0025), the European Parliament explicitly called for cooperation at European level to ensure that bans to prevent 'supporters' from entering grounds if they were known hooligans were also enforced at matches in other Member States and for a European information system to be set up for the purpose.

Has the Commission taken any action to ensure that the free movement of persons in the EU does not jeopardise the smooth running of football matches?

How will the Commission respond to the call by various Member States (Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK) and by the European Parliament for stadium bans to be made enforceable throughout the EU?

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

The relevant EU measures in this field are set out in Council Decision 2002/348/JHA ([1]) concerning security in connection with football matches with an international dimension which was amended in 2007 by Council Decision 2007/412/JHA ([2]). This framework requires the setting up of national football information points and provides the possibility to exchange information between those points for the purposes of preventing and combating violence related to football matches with an international dimension.

In connection to this legal instrument, there is an EU expert group for major sport events which shares expertise and implements an EU action plan to address security issues in connection to football matches. The group updates and uses an EU handbook with recommendations for international police cooperation on this matter.

Through these tools, Member States can share expertise and information which can be followed up according to their national legislation. Apart from this, stadium bans can also be imposed by football clubs, a step which is coordinated with national football associations and UEFA.

([1]) 2002/348/JHA: Council Decision of 25 April 2002 concerning security in connection with football matches with an international dimension; OJ L 121, 8.5.2002, p. 1-3.

([2]) Council Decision 2007/412/JHA of 12 June 2007 amending Decision 2002/348/JHA concerning security in connection with football matches with an international dimension; OJ L 155, 15.6.2007, p. 76-77.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001318/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Facilități pentru îngrijirea copiilor

Legislația în domeniul protecției femeilor cu copii, în special proaspetele mame, variază foarte mult de la stat la stat în Uniunea Europeană. Întrucât gradul de armonizare în acest domeniu este foarte redus, iar competențele revin în cea mai mare măsură statelor membre, fiecare țară aplică standarde diferite în domeniu.

Fie că vorbim despre fenomene precum discriminarea la angajare sau la locul de muncă, ori despre îngrădirea mobilității, fiecare stat are grade diferite de protecție a acestei categorii sociale.

Una dintre problemele de care se lovesc proaspetele mame, reducându-le mobilitatea și, în final, generând o discriminare a acestora în raport cu celelalte categorii sociale, este absența facilităților pentru îngrijirea copiilor, în special mesele pentru înfășarea și îngrijirea copilului.

Pe lângă faptul că la nivelul Uniunii nu există legislație în domeniu care să asigure un set minim de obligații pentru instituții publice sau spații publice (centre comerciale, restaurante, muzee etc.), nici în statele membre astfel de reglementări nu sunt prezente.

În acest context, mobilitatea proaspetelor mame este îngreunată, cu consecințe sociale și economice pentru acestea. Astfel, reinserția socială și economică, precum și cea în câmpul muncii este îngreunată și se poate constata o formă de discriminare.

A efectuat Comisia studii sau deține statistici despre impactul fenomenului la nivelul statelor membre, precum și despre potențialul cost pentru economie și pentru proaspetele mame a acestei forme de discriminare?

Are în vedere Comisia realizarea unor campanii de informare la nivelul statelor membre care să crească gradul de conștientizare a problemei și care să genereze în final reglementări legislative la nivelul fiecărei țări?

Intenționează Comisia, în cazul în care constată că această problemă este una generală la nivelul statelor membre, să propună recomandări sau să traseze linii directoare pentru autoritățile naționale responsabile?

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(2 aprilie 2014)

Comisia este conștientă de problema adusă în discuție și a adoptat recent un raport privind obiectivele de la Barcelona ([1]) care prezintă situația actuală în ceea ce privește dezvoltarea unor structuri de îngrijire a copiilor în statele membre.

Comisia mobilizează toate instrumentele specifice ale UE de care dispune pentru a sprijini eforturile depuse de statele membre în scopul dezvoltării unor astfel de structuri. În cadrul semestrului european 2013, 11 state membre au primit recomandări specifice fiecărei țări privind serviciile de îngrijire a copiilor pentru a spori disponibilitatea/furnizarea acestora, precum și calitatea și/sau accesibilitatea lor ([2]).

În plus, există un număr semnificativ de posibilități de cofinanțare ce vin în sprijinul statelor membre. În perioada precedentă, 2007-2013, a fost alocată o sumă estimată la 3,2 miliarde EUR din fondurile structurale, cu scopul de a fi investită în centre de îngrijire a copiilor și în programe de promovare a participării femeilor pe piața forței de muncă. Au beneficiat de cofinanțare în special proiectele care vizează reintegrarea socială și economică a mamelor pe piața muncii ([3]). Și în perioada actuală, 2014-2020, structurile de îngrijire a copiilor sunt eligibile pentru sprijin financiar din partea fondurilor structurale și de investiții europene.

([1]) COM(2013) 322 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0322&qid=1395839799205&from=EN
([2]) AT, CZ, DE, EE, ES, HU, IT, MT, PL, UK și SK. http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/europe-2020-in-your-country/index_ro.htm
([3]) A se vedea, de exemplu, proiectul „La balle au bond" prezentat pe site-ul Fondului social european, precum și proiectul „Les castors": http://www.gouvernement.fr/gouvernement/les-castors-une-creche-pas-comme-les-autres

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001318/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Childcare facilities

Legislation providing protection for women with children, particularly mothers of young children, varies widely from one country to the other in the European Union. Given that very little harmonisation has been done in this field and the matter chiefly falls within the competence of the Member States, each country applies different standards.

Whether we are talking about issues such as discrimination on the labour market or obstacles to mobility, each country provides a different level of protection for women with children.

One of the problems facing mothers with young children, reducing their mobility and ultimately causing them to suffer discrimination by comparison with other social groups, is the lack of childcare facilities, particularly changing tables and nursing facilities.

In addition to the fact that there is no EU legislation laying down a minimum set of obligations for public institutions and public areas (shopping centres, restaurants, museums, etc.), not even the Member States have such regulations.

Mobility for mothers with young children is very difficult in these circumstances, and this has a social and economic impact on these women. Social and economic reintegration, in the world of work, for example, is made difficult and this can be seen as constituting a form of discrimination.

Has the Commission carried out any studies or does it have any statistics on the impact of this problem in the Member States, and on the potential cost of this form of discrimination for the economy and for mothers of young children?

Is the Commission planning to conduct information campaigns in the Member States to raise awareness of the problem and encourage them to introduce national legislation in this area?

If the Commission finds that this is a general problem in the Member States, will it propose recommendations or issue guidelines for the competent national authorities?

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

The Commission is aware of the problem and has recently adopted a report on the Barcelona objectives ([1]) which gives a state of play in the development of childcare facilities in the Member States.

The Commission is mobilising the range of EU instruments available to support Member States' efforts for the development of such facilities. As part of the 2013 European semester, 11 Member States have received Country Specific Recommendations on childcare services to increase their availability/provision, their quality and/or affordability ([2]).

Moreover, significant co-funding possibilities are offered to support Member States. In the previous 2007-2013 period an estimated EUR 3.2 billion from the Structural Funds was allocated to invest in childcare facilities and promote women's participation in the labour market. In particular projects aiming at the social and economic reintegration of mothers in the labour market were co-financed ([3]). Also in the current 2014-2020 period childcare facilities are eligible for financial support by the European Investment and Structural Funds.

([1]) COM(2013)322 http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130531_barcelona_en.pdf
([2]) AT, CZ, DE, EE, ES, HU, IT, MT, PL, UK and SK. http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/europe-2020-in-your-country/index_en.htm
([3]) See for instance 'la balle au bond' project presented on the ESF website, see also: http://www.gouvernement.fr/gouvernement/les-castors-une-creche-pas-comme-les-autres

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001319/14
adresată Consiliului
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Raportul pe 2013 privind progresele înregistrate de FYROM

Parlamentul European a aprobat în data de 6 februarie Raportul privind progresele înregistrate de FYROM în 2013. Raportul cere Consiliului, ca și în anii trecuți, fixarea unei date de începere a negocierilor de aderare cu Skopje, solicitând de asemenea rezultate mai concrete în relațiile dintre Atena, Sofia și Skopje.

Atât Comisia, cât și Parlamentul au propus de mai multe ori fixarea unei date pentru începerea negocierilor, iar principalul impediment a fost problema numelui țării — fapt ce nu a condus la un consens în rândul statelor membre.

În contextul în care, printre prioritățile Președinției grecești a Consiliului, se numără și avansarea dialogului cu FYROM, poate detalia președinția Consiliului dacă intenționează să pună pe agenda Consiliului o decizie în acest sens?

De asemenea, care sunt demersurile avute în vedere pentru ca FYROM să facă următorul pas pe drumul integrării europene — așa cum specifică Programul de lucru al Președinției pentru următoarea perioadă?

Răspuns
(14 aprilie 2014)

Consiliul atrage atenția distinsei deputate asupra concluziilor sale din 17 decembrie 2013 privind extinderea și procesul de stabilizare și de asociere, care au fost aprobate de Consiliul European, în care Consiliul a subliniat că este necesar ca discuțiile îndelungate cu privire la chestiunea denumirii să se încheie fără întârziere și în care a luat notă de recentele contacte cu mediatorul ONU. Din perspectiva importanței de ansamblu a menținerii unor relații de bună vecinătate, Consiliul a luat act și de contactele continue la nivel înalt dintre fosta Republică iugoslavă a Macedoniei și Bulgaria și a așteptat cu interes transpunerea acestora în acțiuni și rezultate concrete.

Consiliul a afirmat de asemenea că, în vederea unei posibile decizii a Consiliului European de a deschide negocieri de aderare cu fosta Republică iugoslavă a Macedoniei, Consiliul va reveni asupra acestei chestiuni în cursul acestui an, pe baza unei actualizări de către Comisie a punerii în aplicare în continuare a reformelor în contextul dialogului la nivel înalt privind aderarea, inclusiv a punerii în aplicare a acordului politic din 1 martie, precum și pe baza unor măsuri concrete adoptate pentru promovarea relațiilor de bună vecinătate și pentru a se ajunge la o soluție negociată și acceptată de ambele țări cu privire la chestiunea denumirii.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001319/14
to the Council
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: 2013 FYROM progress report

On 6 February, the European Parliament approved the 2013 FYROM progress report, which, as in previous years, urges the Council to set a date for the commencement of accession negotiations with Skopje and calls for more substantial progress regarding relations between Athens, Sofia and Skopje.

Both the Commission and Parliament have, on several occasions, proposed dates for the commencement of negotiations. However, it has not been possible to reach consensus between the Member States, chiefly owing to disagreements over the name of the country.

Given that the priorities of the Greek Presidency include progress in negotiations with FYROM, does it intend to enter a decision regarding this matter on its agenda?

Similarly, what measures are being envisaged to enable FYROM to take the next step towards accession, as specified in the Council's programme of work for the forthcoming period?

Reply
(14 April 2014)

The Council draws the attention of the Honourable Member to its conclusions of 17 December 2013 on enlargement and the Stabilisation and Association process, which were endorsed by the European Council, in which the Council underlined that there was a need to bring the longstanding discussions on the name issue to a definitive conclusion without delay, and took note of the recent contacts with the UN mediator. In the light of the overall importance of maintaining good neighbourly relations, the Council noted the continued high-level contacts between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Bulgaria and looked forward to their translation into concrete actions and results.

The Council further stated that, with a view to a possible decision of the European Council to open accession negotiations with the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, it would revert to the issue this year, on the basis of an update by the Commission on further implementation of reforms in the context of the High-Level Accession Dialogue, including the implementation of the 1 March political agreement and on tangible steps taken to promote good neighbourly relations and to reach a negotiated and mutually accepted solution to the name issue.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001322/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Implicațiile rezultatului referendumului din Elveția

Prin intermediul a numeroase acorduri în diferite sectoare, UE are o relație mai apropiată cu Elveția decât cu orice altă țară din afara Spațiului Economic European.

Mai mult, Elveția este al patrulea cea mai mare partener comercial al UE, iar UE este cel mai mare partener comercial al Elveției. Mai mult de 1 milion de cetățeni UE trăiesc în Elveția și alți 230 000 trec frontiera zi de zi pentru a merge la locul de muncă.

În 1999, Uniunea Europeană și Elveția au semnat un acord cu privire la libera circulație a persoanelor, oferindu-le reciproc cetățenilor dreptul de a intra, trăi și munci pe teritoriul lor.

Nu în ultimul rând, Elveția este un membru asociat al zonei Schengen fără frontiere a Europei.

Cetățenii elvețienii au participat duminică, 9 februarie 2014, la un referendum intitulat „Împotriva imigrației în masă", votând în proporție de 50,3% în favoarea unei limitări a imigrației.

Așadar, teoretic, țara ar urma să reinstaureze sistemul pe bază de cote și contingente, care exista înainte de acordul de liberă circulație cu Uniunea Europeană.

Poate Comisia să explice care vor fi implicațiile, în practică, ale rezultatului referendumului organizat în 9 februarie anul curent în Elveția? Este de acord Comisia cu faptul că aplicarea rezultatului referendumului de către Elveția va pune capăt acordului de liberă circulație a persoanelor semnat cu UE?

Care vor fi implicațiile asupra celorlalte acorduri UE-Elveția, și cum vor fi adaptate acestea în lumina noii situații prefigurate în Elveția?

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

Ca urmare a referendumului, legislatorul elvețian are acum trei ani la dispoziție pentru a adopta legislația necesară de punere în aplicare pentru inițiativa care vizează introducerea unor limite cantitative anuale în materie de imigrație. Conformitatea legislației de punere în aplicare cu acordul UE-Elveția privind libera circulație a persoanelor, precum și orice eventuale inițiative vor fi analizate în momentul în care vor fi cunoscute detalii ale proiectului legislativ. Între timp, Consiliul Federal Elvețian a asigurat UE că va continua să își îndeplinească obligațiile internaționale existente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001322/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Implications of the Swiss referendum result

The EU has closer relations with Switzerland than with any other country outside the European Economic Area, thanks to a large number of agreements in various sectors.

Switzerland is the EU's fourth largest trading partner, and the EU is Switzerland's main trading partner. More than 1 million EU citizens live in Switzerland, and a further 230 000 cross the border every day to work.

In 1999, the EU and Switzerland signed an agreement on the free movement of persons under which citizens were granted the reciprocal right to enter, live and work on their territories.

Moreover, Switzerland is an associate member of Europe's border-free Schengen area.

On Sunday 9 February 2014, Swiss citizens took part in a referendum 'against mass immigration', voting in favour of curbs on immigration by 50.3%.

This means that the country could in theory reintroduce the quota system that was in force before the agreement on freedom of movement was signed with the European Union.

Can the Commission explain the practical implications of the result of the referendum held in Switzerland on 9 February 2014? Does the Commission agree that Switzerland's implementation of the referendum result will put an end to the agreement on the free movement of persons signed with the EU?

What implications will this have for other EU-Switzerland agreements, and how will they be adapted in the light of the new situation in Switzerland?

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

As a consequence of the referendum, the Swiss legislator now has three years to adopt the necessary implementing legislation for the intiative which aims to introduce annual quantitative limits to immigration. Compliance of the implementing legislation with the EU-Swiss Agreement on the free movement of persons as well as any possible initiatives will be analysed once the details of the draft legislation are known. In the meantime, the Swiss Federal Council has assured the EU that it will continue to fulfil its existing international obligations.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001323/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Comunicarea Comisiei Europene „Un cadru pentru politica privind clima și energia în perioada 2020-2030”

Comisia Europeană a lansat în data de 22 ianuarie 2014 o Comunicare intitulată „Un cadru pentru politica privind clima și energia în perioada 2020-2030”. Documentul propune un angajament din partea statelor membre referitor la reducerea emisiilor de gaze cu efecte de seră până în 2030. De asemenea, se introduc o serie de alte obiective care privesc procentul de energie regenerabilă și eficiența energetică.

Totuși, așa cum arată și evaluarea impactului realizată de Comisie (documentul SWD(2014)16), consecințele unor asemenea angajamente la nivelul statelor membre ar fi foarte variate.

Analiza arată că statele membre cu venituri mai reduse trebuie să depună eforturi mai mari în comparație cu țările cu venituri mai ridicate. Totodată, se estimează că vor exista creșteri suplimentare ale costurilor sistemului energetic pentru grupul de state membre cu un PIB/cap de locuitor situat sub 90 % din media UE în 2010. Așadar, impactul unei astfel de decizii este diferit de la stat la stat.

Documentul Comisiei avansează ideea unor mecanisme de distribuire a eforturilor pentru a permite rezultate mai echitabile, cum ar fi obiective diferențiate, distribuirea veniturilor din licitații, utilizarea instrumentelor financiare inteligente sau a fondurilor structurale etc.

Poate oferi Comisia mai multe detalii despre natura acestor mecanisme și dacă are de gând să propună ținte diferențiate, în funcție de nivelul veniturilor pe cap de locuitor din fiecare stat membru?

Răspuns dat de dna Hedegaard, în numele Comisiei
(2 aprilie 2014)

Cadrul propus în domeniul climei și al energiei pentru orizontul anului 2030 reflectă setul mai amplu de obiective ale politicilor UE privind clima și energia, și anume durabilitatea, competitivitatea și securitatea aprovizionării. Evaluarea impactului care însoțește propunerea respectivă analizează costurile și beneficiile aferente unei puneri în aplicare eficiente din punctul de vedere al costurilor a acestui cadru de politică, luând în considerare efectele economice, sociale și de mediu. De asemenea, evaluarea impactului analizează efectele pentru fiecare stat membru în cazul în care s-ar asigura o astfel de eficacitate din punctul de vedere al costurilor la nivelul UE. Cadrul pentru orizontul anului 2030 se bazează pe progresele realizate deja și valorifică experiența dobândită ca urmare a pachetului legislativ Europa 2020.

Analiza Comisiei confirmă faptul că necesitățile în materie de investiții ar fi relativ mai mari în statele membre cu venituri mai scăzute. În acest context, în document se recunoaște că respectivul cadru de politică pentru orizontul anului 2030 ar trebui să se bazeze pe o repartizare echitabilă globală a eforturilor între statele membre, care să reflecte condițiile și capacitățile lor specifice. Prin urmare, obiectivul fiecărui stat membru în ceea ce privește reducerea emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră ar trebui să țină seama în continuare de factorii de distribuție. Având în vedere importanța investițiilor viitoare, vor fi necesare, de asemenea, soluții care să contribuie la îmbunătățirea finanțării.

Comisia își exprimă întreaga disponibilitate de a analiza în continuare mecanismele menite să asigure o distribuție echitabilă, care sunt menționate în cadrul propus pentru orizontul anului 2030 și în evaluarea impactului acestuia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001323/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Commission communication concerning 'A framework for climate and energy policies for the period 2020-2030'

On 22 January 2014, the Commission issued a communication entitled 'A framework for climate and energy policies for the period 2020-2030' seeking a commitment by the Member States to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and achieve a number of other objectives in terms of renewable energy and energy efficiency percentages.

As indicated by the impact assessment carried out by the Commission (document SWD (2014) 16), implications for the Member States would vary widely.

Those with lower revenues would be called upon to make a proportionately greater effort than wealthier countries, with additional increases in energy costs for those with a capita GDP below 90% of the EU average for 2010. In other words, the impact of such decisions would differ from country to country.

The Commission document proposes the introduction of mechanisms to ensure fairer distribution of the effort required in this respect, for example differentiated objectives, the sharing of auctioning revenues, the use of intelligent financial instruments or structural funds, etc.

Can the Commission give further details concerning the nature of these mechanisms, indicating whether it intends to recommend different objectives in line with the per capita revenue of each Member State?

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

The proposed 2030 climate and energy framework reflects the broader set of objectives of EU climate and energy policies, namely sustainability, competitiveness and security of supply. The accompanying impact assessment analyses the costs and the benefits of a cost-efficient implementation for this policy framework, taking into account economic, social and environmental impacts. It also explores impacts for individual Member States if such cost-efficiency at the EU level were to be ensured. The 2030 framework builds on the progress already made and is learning from the lessons of the Europe 2020 package.

The Commission analysis confirms that the investment needs would be relatively higher in lower income Member States. In this context, it recognises that the 2030 policy framework should be based on an overall fair sharing of efforts between Member States which reflects their specific circumstances and capacities. Therefore each Member State's GHG reduction target should continue to take into account distributional factors. Given the importance of future investments, solutions that contribute to improved finance will also be required.

The Commission is open to further explore the mechanisms for a fair distribution, referred to in the proposed 2030 framework and its Impact Assessment.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001460/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Inkwiet ċivili fil-Bosnja

Rapporti reċenti ([1]) dwar il-protesti attwali fil-Bosnja juru li din it-tip ta' inkwiet ċivili huwa bla preċedent fil-Bosnja ta' wara l-gwerra.

Sa minn tmiem il-gwerra fl-1995, l-UE segwiet mill-qrib is-sitwazzjoni fil-Bosnja. Minn dak iż-żmien 'l hawn, għadd ta' ftehimiet ġew konklużi bejn l-UE u l-Bosnja. Barra minn hekk, l-UE żammet il-preżenza tagħha fil-Bosnja permezz tal-qafas tal-PESK u tal-PSDK.

Fil-kuntest tal-inkwiet attwali, il-Kummissjoni għandha xi indikazzjoni dwar jekk l-UE hijiex se ssaħħaħ il-preżenza tagħha fil-Bosnja billi tibgħat aktar persunal, jew inkella jekk hijiex se tipprovdi aktar appoġġ f'termini ta' riżorsi?

Tweġiba konġunta mogħtija mis-Sur Füle f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(14 ta' April 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni temmet l-iffaċilitar dwar ir-riforma kostituzzjonali li permezz tiegħu kellha l-intenzjoni tgħin lill-pajjiż iġib il-kostituzzjoni tiegħu konformi mad-deċiżjoni Sejdić-Finci tal-QEDB ([2]). Huwa f'idejn l-istituzzjonijiet tal-Bożnja u Ħerzegovina (BiH) li jieħdu azzjoni sabiex jintemm il-ksur tal-obbligi internazzjonali tagħha.

Il-Kummissjoni bdiet tagħti appoġġ addizzjonali fil-forma ta' tliet inizjattivi ġodda biex tgħin lill-pajjiż jegħleb il-fażi attwali ta' instabilità soċjoekonomika: L-ewwel inizjattiva għandha l-għan li ssaħħaħ ir-riforma ekonomika fil-pajjiż fil-livelli kollha. Tikkonsisti f'għajnuna għat-tħejjija tal-Programm ta' Riforma Ekonomika Nazzjonali u tal-Programm tal-Kompetittività u t-Tkabbir f'konformità mal-enfasi fuq il-governanza ekonomika mħabbra fl-Istrateġija għat-Tkabbir f'Ottubru li għadda ([3]). Dan għandu jtejjeb l-politiki makroekonomiċi, il-klima tal-investiment u b'hekk is-sitwazzjoni ekonomika taċ-ċittadini. It-tieni se tistabbilixxi grupp ta' ħidma konġunt bejn l-UE u l-Bożnja u Ħerzegovina biex titħaffef l-implimentazzjoni ta' proġetti IPA fil-pajjiż. Aktar minn EUR 350 miljun diġà huma disponibbli, parzjalment taħt implimentazzjoni li jeħtieġ li tiġi aċċellerata jew ta' flus ġodda li għad irid jiġu kkuntrattati. It-tielet se ssaħħaħ id-Djalogu Strutturat dwar il-Ġustizzja biex jinkludi suġġetti li jaqgħu fil-qasam tal-"Ġudikatura u d-Drittijiet Fundamentali" bħal ma huma miżuri kontra l-korruzzjoni. Is-soċjetà ċivili għandha tipparteċipa f'dawn l-inizjattivi kollha, li minnaħa tagħha għandha tħajjar lill-awtoritajiet tal-Bożnja u Ħerzegovina biex jinvolvi ruħhom mas-soċjetà ċivili.

([1]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-26089673
([2]) Il-Qorti Ewropea tad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001324/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Instabilitatea politică și socială din Bosnia și Herțegovina

În Raportul pe 2013 privind progresele înregistrate de Bosnia și Herțegovina, aprobat la data de 6 februarie 2014 de plenul Parlamentului European, se atrage atenția asupra lipsei de angajament și viziune din partea liderilor politici ai celor trei comunități din țară. De asemenea, se indică faptul că reformele stagnează, iar în prezent nu se poate vorbi despre un stat eficient și pe deplin funcțional.

Mai mult, la începutul lunii februarie, o serie de proteste au cuprins țara, manifestanții reacționând la problemele economice cu care se confruntă statul, printre care șomajul extrem de ridicat.

Care sunt măsurile avute în vedere de Comisie pentru ca, în contextul dialogului cu Bosnia și Herțegovina, să pună mai multă presiune pe liderii statului, în vederea accelerării procesului de reformă, inclusiv cea constituțională, și prevenirii escaladării instabilității în țară?

Răspuns comun dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(14 aprilie 2014)

Comisia nu mai acordă, pentru realizarea reformei constituționale, facilitatea menită să ajute această țară să își alinieze Constituția la hotărârea pronunțată de Curtea Europeană a Drepturilor Omului în cauza Sejdić-Finci ([1]). Este la latitudinea instituțiilor din Bosnia și Herțegovina (BiH) să ia măsuri în scopul de a pune capăt actelor de încălcare a obligațiilor pe care și le-a asumat la nivel internațional.

Comisia a început să acorde un sprijin suplimentar sub forma a trei inițiative noi în scopul de a ajuta această țară să depășească actuala fază de instabilitate socioeconomică. Prima inițiativă vizează consolidarea reformei economice în această țară, la toate nivelurile. Inițiativa constă în acordarea de asistență pentru elaborarea unui program național de reforme economice și a unui program în materie de competitivitate și creștere economică, în contextul importanței acordate guvernanței economice în strategia privind extinderea din luna octombrie a anului trecut ([2]). Această inițiativă ar trebui să îmbunătățească politicile macroeconomice și climatul investițional și, prin urmare, situația economică a cetățenilor. În cadrul celei de a doua inițiative se va institui un grup de lucru comun UE-Bosnia și Herțegovina pentru a se accelera implementarea în această țară a proiectelor IPA. Sunt disponibile deja mai mult de 350 de milioane EUR, parțial în curs de utilizare (proces care trebuie accelerat) sau sub formă de fonduri noi, care urmează să fie contractate. Cea de a treia inițiativă va consolida dialogul structurat privind justiția, astfel încât să fie incluse teme care privesc „Sistemul judiciar și drepturile fundamentale", cum ar fi măsurile de combatere a corupției. Societatea civilă ar trebui să participe la toate aceste inițiative, fapt care, la rândul său, ar trebui să stimuleze cooperarea autorităților din Bosnia și Herțegovina cu societatea civilă.

([1]) Cour Européenne des Droits de l'Homme.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001324/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Political and social instability in Bosnia and Herzegovina

The 2013 report on progress in Bosnia and Herzegovina adopted by Parliament on 6 February 2014 criticises the political leaders of the country's three communities for lack of commitment and vision.

It goes on to point out that the reform process is becoming bogged down and expresses concern at the absence of an efficient and fully functional state apparatus.

Furthermore, at the beginning of February, demonstrators took to the streets throughout the country in protest at the economic hardship and extremely high unemployment levels.

What moves are being envisaged by the Commission in negotiations with Bosnia and Herzegovina with the aim of stepping up pressure on the country's leaders to speed up constitutional and other reforms and prevent growing instability from taking hold?

Question for written answer E-001460/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Unrest in Bosnia

Recent reports ([1]) on the current protests in Bosnia show that this kind of civil unrest is unprecedented in post-war Bosnia.

Since the end of the war in 1995, the EU has been closely following the situation in Bosnia. Since then, a number of EU-Bosnia agreements have been concluded. In addition, the EU has maintained its presence in Bosnia through the CFSP and CSDP framework.

Bearing in mind the current unrest, does the Commission have any indication of whether the EU is going to enhance its presence in Bosnia by sending more personnel, or else if it will provide increased support in terms of resources?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

The Commission has ended the facilitation on constitutional reform by which it had intended to help the country to bring its constitution into line with the Sejdić-Finci ruling of the ECtHR ([2]). It is up to the institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) to take action in order to end the violations of its international obligations.

The Commission has started additional support in the form of three new initiatives in order to help the country overcome the current phase of socioeconomic instability: The first initiative aims at strengthening economic reform in the country at all levels. It consists of assistance to prepare a National Economic Reform Programme and a Competitiveness and Growth Programme in line with the focus on economic governance announced in the Enlargement Strategy last October ([3]). This should improve macroeconomic policies, the investment climate and hence the economic situation of citizens. The second will establish a joint EU-BiH working group to accelerate implementation of IPA projects in the country. More than 350 million euros are already available, partly under implementation that needs to be accelerated or new money that has yet to be contracted. The third will enhance the Structured Dialogue on Justice to include topics falling in the area of 'Judiciary and Fundamental Rights' such as anti-corruption measures. Civil society should participate in all these initiatives, which in return should entice the authorities of BiH to engage with civil society.

([1]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-26089673
([2]) European Court of Human Rights.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001325/14
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(10 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Garantía Juvenil

El Consejo de Empleo, Política Social, Sanidad y Consumidores alcanzó el pasado 28 de febrero de 2013 un acuerdo político sobre la Recomendación del Consejo relativa al establecimiento de la Garantía Juvenil.

El objetivo de la Garantía Juvenil es garantizar una buena oferta de empleo, educación continua, formación de aprendiz o período de prácticas a todos los jóvenes de hasta 25 años en un cierto plazo de tiempo tras perder su empleo o tras concluir su paso por el sistema educativo formal, un periodo de tiempo que la Unión Europea fija en 4 meses como máximo. De este modo se pretende garantizar la igualdad de oportunidades laborales para la juventud en el mercado laboral, contando para ello con un presupuesto de 6 000 millones de euros.

Teniendo en cuenta que el desempleo afecta a más del 23 % de los jóvenes europeos, recalcando que la lucha contra el desempleo juvenil es una prioridad de la Estrategia Europa 2020 y considerando que se estableció que la Garantía Juvenil se aplicaría a partir del año 2014, ¿podría responder la Comisión a las siguientes preguntas?:

— ¿Qué tipo de acciones está llevando a cabo para la efectiva implementación de la Garantía Juvenil?

— ¿En qué estado de desarrollo se encuentran actualmente esas acciones?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de abril de 2014)

Hasta la fecha, veintidós Estados miembros han presentado planes de aplicación de la Garantía Juvenil, conforme a la petición del Consejo Europeo. Ahora se están evaluando, junto con los progresos en la aplicación de las recomendaciones específicas por país de 2013, de conformidad con el proceso del Semestre Europeo de 2014.

La Comisión ha ayudado de diversas maneras a los Estados miembros en la elaboración de programas de Garantía Juvenil ambiciosos. Esta colaboración incluye un seminario para profesionales en este ámbito celebrado el pasado mes de octubre, la publicación de respuestas generales a las preguntas más frecuentes, la creación de una línea de asistencia telefónica para solicitar orientación y la creación de un sitio web dedicado a la Garantía Juvenil. Otras iniciativas, como la Alianza Europea para la Formación de Aprendices que se puso en marcha en julio de 2013 y la Recomendación del Consejo relativa a un marco de calidad para los periodos de prácticas, contribuyen sustancialmente en los aspectos fundamentales.

También los 6,4 millones de euros (a precios corrientes) con que cuenta la Iniciativa de Empleo Juvenil contribuirán a la aplicación de la Garantía Juvenil al tener como destinatarios directos a jóvenes sin empleo o sin estudios ni formación que residan en las regiones elegibles. La Iniciativa de Empleo Juvenil se pondrá en práctica a través de los programas operativos para el periodo 2014-2020, que se encuentran en proceso de elaboración y que está previsto adoptar en breve ([1]).

([1]) Véanse los Reglamentos (UE) nº 1303/2013 y (UE) nº 1304/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001325/14
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Youth Guarantee

On 28 February 2013, the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council reached a political agreement on the Council Recommendation to set up the Youth Guarantee.

The goal of the Youth Guarantee is to ensure that all young people up to the age of 25 are offered a job, further education, an apprenticeship or a placement a certain period of time after losing their job or concluding their formal education, which the European Union has established as a maximum of four months. A budget of 6 billion euros has thus been set aside for this scheme with the aim of guaranteeing equal opportunities for young people in the job market.

Bearing in mind that unemployment affects over 23% of young Europeans, in light of the fact that the fight against youth unemployment is one of the priorities of the Europe 2020 strategy, and taking into account the fact that the Youth Guarantee will be in force from 2014, could the Commission answer the following questions:

— What type of action is being carried out to ensure that the Youth Guarantee is being implemented effectively?

— How much progress has been made with this action?

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

To date, 22 Member States have submitted Youth Guarantee implementation plans as requested by the European Council. These are now being assessed, together with progress in implementing relevant 2013 country-specific recommendations, under the 2014 European Semester process.

The Commission has provided the Member States with help in preparing ambitious Youth Guarantee schemes in various ways. This includes a working seminar for practitioners held last October, the publication of comprehensive answers to frequently asked questions, the setting-up of a hotline for requesting guidance, and a dedicated Youth Guarantee website. Other initiatives, such as the European Alliance for Apprenticeships launched in July 2013 and the Council Recommendation on a Quality Framework for Traineeships, contribute substantially on key aspects.

The EUR 6.4 billion (current prices) available under the Youth Employment Initiative will provide support of the Youth Guarantee's implementation by directly targeting young people not in employment, education or training and residing in eligible regions. Youth Employment Initiative measures will be implemented through the operational programmes for 2014-20 ([1]), which are currently being drafted and should be adopted soon.

([1]) See Regulations (EU) Nos 1303/2013 and 1304/2013.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001327/14
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Conservarea terenurilor agricole periurbane

Conservarea terenurilor agricole periurbane, precum și dezvoltarea lor au devenit un obiectiv important și comun, ridicat la un nou standard de cadru legislativ la nivel european. Aceste elemente au dus la o sistematizare a problematicilor din cadrul spațiilor naturale periurbane, dar și în cadrul sistemului metropolitan european, ca bază a acțiunilor de analizare, planificare, gestionare, finanțare, comunicare, promovare, protejare, securitate și management privind spațiile naturale periurbane. Aceste spații sunt atât de fragile și amenințate de cristalizarea contradicțiilor și problemelor legate de dezvoltarea durabilă, fiind valoroase pentru oameni, în special pentru cei din mediul urban. Trăim în societăți din ce în ce mai metropolizate, unde spațiile naturale, agricole și forestiere sunt ținta unor presiuni foarte mari.

În aceste condiții, ce instrumente are în vedere Comisia Europeană pentru a ghida gestionarea spațiilor naturale periurbane, astfel încât aceste zone fragile sa fie protejate și identificate în cadrul zonelor metropolitane, pe baza unor analize structurale?

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

În cadrul celui de-al doilea pilon al PAC nu există instrumente specifice privind zonele periurbane.

Pe de altă parte, spațiile naturale ale suprafeței agricole periurbane pot face obiectul sprijinului din FEADR ([1]) în cazul în care normele de eligibilitate a sprijinului respectiv sunt respectate.

Acesta din urmă include măsuri privind agromediul și clima care permit acordarea de sprijin celor care gestionează terenuri agricole (definite de legislația națională) pentru aplicarea de practici agricole favorabile mediului, peisajului,și resurselor naturale.

Ajutorul pentru siturile Natura 2000 sau pentru zonele care fac obiectul Directivei-cadru privind apa și pentru practicile agricole ecologice poate fi acordat în cazul în care zonele sunt definite ca zone agricole.

FEADR sprijină studii și investiții asociate cu întreținerea, refacerea și modernizarea patrimoniului natural al satelor, al peisajelor rurale, al zonelor de mare valoare naturală, precum și acțiuni de sensibilizare cu privire la mediu. Investițiile trebuie să fie la scară mică și localizate în zone rurale.

FEADR poate sprijini sectorul forestier prin investiții și prin îmbunătățiri ale zonelor forestiere de exemplu, prin sprijinul pentru împădurire, pentru crearea de suprafețe împădurite, pentru instituirea de măsuri agroforestiere. Condiția este ca suprafața respectivă să se încadreze în definiția „pădurii" [a se vedea articolul 2 litera (r) din Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1305/2013 ([2])].

Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1301/2013 ([3]) privind FEDR ([4]) prevede mai multe priorități în materie de investiții care vizează protejarea mediului și promovarea utilizării eficiente a resurselor (prioritate de investiții 6c și 6d). Articolul 7 prevede ca cel puțin 5 % din resursele FEDR să fie alocate pentru acțiuni integrate în favoarea dezvoltării urbane durabile. Aceste acțiuni ar trebui să se bazeze pe o strategie urbană integrată care să ia în considerare necesitatea de a promova relațiile dintre zonele urbane și cele rurale, prin urmare, protecția zonelor naturale, agricole și silvice poate face parte dintr-o strategie integrată metropolitană, finanțată prin/din diferite fonduri structurale și de investiții europene (ESIF). ([5])

([1]) Fondul european agricol pentru dezvoltare rurală.
([2]) JO L 347, 20.12.2013.
([3]) JO L 347, 20.12.2013.
([4]) Fondul European de Dezvoltare Regională.
([5]) Fondurile structurale și de investiții europene.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001327/14
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Conserving periurban agricultural areas

Conserving and expanding periurban agricultural areas has become a key shared goal and a new benchmark in the European legislative framework. A systematic approach is being developed to the issues surrounding periurban natural spaces and the European metropolitan system, on the basis of actions geared to analysis, planning, administration, financing, communication, promotion, protection, safety and management of periurban natural spaces. These spaces are extremely fragile and valuable, particularly for people living in cities, and it seems that they may crystallise the contradictions and problems linked to sustainable development. We are living in an increasingly urbanised society where natural, agricultural and forested areas are coming under ever greater pressures.

What measures does the Commission have in mind with a view to guiding the management of periurban natural spaces to ensure that these fragile areas are protected and identified within the corresponding metropolitan areas, on the basis of structural analysis?

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

In the 2nd pillar of the CAP, there are no specific instruments concerning periurban areas.

However, natural spaces of the periurban agricultural area may be subject to EAFRD support ([1]) if the eligibility rules of such support are respected.

The latter includes agri-environment-climate measure enabling support to those managing agricultural land (defined by national law) for applying farming practices favourable for the environment, landscape, natural resources.

Aid for Natura 2000 sites or areas under Water Framework Directive and for organic farming practices can be given if the areas are defined as agricultural areas.

EAFRD supports studies and investments associated with the maintenance, restoration and upgrading of the natural heritage of villages, rural landscapes, high nature value sites, and environmental awareness actions. The investments have to be small scale and placed in rural areas.

EAFRD can support forest through investments in and improvements of forest areas e.g. support for afforestation, creation of woodland, establishment of agroforestry. The condition is: the area should fall under the definition of a 'forest' (see Article 2(r) of Regulation 1305/2013 ([2])).

Regulation 1301/2013 ([3]) on the ERDF ([4]) foresees several investment priorities aiming to protect the environment and promote resource efficiency (Investment Priority 6c and 6d). Article 7 requires at least 5% of ERDF resources being allocated to integrated actions for sustainable urban development. These actions should be based on an integrated urban strategy that takes into account the need to promote urban-rural links, thus the protection of natural, agricultural and forest areas can be part of an integrated metropolitan strategy, funded by different ESIFs ([5]).

([1]) European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development.
([2]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([3]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([4]) European Regional Development Fund.
([5]) European Structural and Investment Funds.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001328/14
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Situația zimbrilor din Bucșani

Direcția Silvică Dâmbovița încearcă să obțină aprobările necesare pentru a cuprinde Zimbrăria „Neagra", cea mai mare rezervație de zimbri din România, în fondul de vânătoare Bucșani. În prezent, Zimbrăria „Neagra", care a fost înființată în anul 1983, are un efectiv de 50 de exemplare și o suprafață de 162 de hectare, suficientă pentru doar 30 de exemplare, conform spuselor oficialilor Direcției Silvice Dâmbovița. Aceștia susțin că zimbrii ar putea fi vânați pentru rentabilizarea rezervației.

Având în vedere că Uniunea Europeană definește zimbrul drept „specie prioritară" în Directiva habitate, iar Convenția de la Berna definește Bison bonasus ca fiind o „specie protejată":

1. Consideră Comisia că inițiativa sus-menționată este compatibilă cu legislația UE?

2. Intenționează Comisia să-și reînnoiască sprijinul pentru protecția speciilor pe cale de dispariție în Uniunea Europeană?

Răspuns dat de dl Potočnik în numele Comisiei
(3 aprilie 2014)

Deși zimbrul european (*Bison bonasus*) este clasificat drept specie prioritară care trebuie protejată în temeiul Directivei 92/43/CEE a Consiliului din 21 mai 1992 privind conservarea habitatelor naturale și a speciilor de faună și floră sălbatică ([1]), aplicabilitatea juridică a directivei pentru populația din România a acestei specii nu este clară. Deși specia a fost reintrodusă în România în secolul XX, aceasta a fost crescută în condiții artificiale. Animalele sunt ținute pe terenuri îngrădite, fiind dependente de hrana suplimentară. Comisia va contacta autoritățile române pentru a clarifica situația referitoare la statutul juridic al acestei populații.

Comisia continuă să colaboreze strâns cu statele membre pentru a sprijini protejarea speciilor din UE amenințate cu dispariția care trăiesc în aria lor de extindere naturală, enumerate în anexele II și/sau IV sau V la directivă, precum și a speciilor de păsări care intră sub incidența Directivei privind păsările (Directiva 2009/147/CE ([2])).

([1]) JO L 206, 22.7.1992.
([2]) JO L 20, 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001328/14
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Bison in Bucșani

The Forestry Office in Dâmbovița is seeking the necessary approval to include the 'Zimbrăria Neagra' bison reserve, which is the largest in Romania, in the Bucșani hunting area. The 'Zimbrăria Neagra' bison reserve was founded in 1983 and currently has 50 bison in an area of 162 hectares. Official statements from the Forestry Office in Dâmbovița argue that this area is sufficient for only 30 bison and that the animals could be hunted to raise money for the reserve.

Given that the European Union classifies Bison *bonasus* as a 'priority species' in the Habitats Directive and the Berne Convention classifies it as a 'protected species':

1. Does the Commission consider the above initiative to be compatible with EU legislation?

2. Will the Commission renew its support for the protection of endangered species in the EU?

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

Although the European Bison (*Bison bonasus*) is listed as a priority species for protection under Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora ([1]) the legal applicability of the directive to the Romanian population of this species in unclear. Although the species was reintroduced into Romania in the 20th century it has been bred in artificial conditions. The animals are kept in enclosed areas, dependent on additional feeding. The Commission will contact the Romanian authorities to clarify the situation regarding the legal status of this population.

The Commission continues to work closely with Member States to support the protection of endangered species in the EU occurring in their natural range, listed in Annexes II and/or IV or V of the directive as well as bird species covered by the Birds Directive 2009/147/EC ([2]).

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([2]) OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001330/14
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Opoziție la nivel european împotriva brevetului EP 2140023 B1

Oficiul European de Brevete a acordat companiei Syngenta brevetul EP 2140023 B1 pentru ardeiul convențional rezistent la insecte dăunătoare, în data de 8 mai 2013.

Potrivit unei coaliții extinse, formate din 34 de organizații neguvernamentale și organizații de fermieri și amelioratori, reprezentând 27 de țări membre ale Convenției Brevetului European, Syngenta a încrucișat o plantă de ardei sălbatic din Jamaica cu plante de ardei comercial. Întrucât planta de ardei sălbatic este rezistentă la diferiți dăunători, rezistența brevetată exista deja în natură.

Având în vedere că Parlamentul European a adoptat, în mai 2012, o rezoluție care solicită Oficiului European de Brevete să excludă dintre produsele brevetate pe cele derivate din ameliorarea convențională, Comisia este rugată să exprime un punct de vedere legat de acest caz.

Răspuns dat de dl Barnier în numele Comisiei
(10 aprilie 2014)

Oficiul European de Brevete („OEB”) acordă brevete europene pentru invențiile care îndeplinesc criteriile generale de brevetare, și anume noutatea, inventivitatea și aplicabilitatea industrială. În plus, obiectul acestora trebuie, de asemenea, să fie considerat ca având un caracter brevetabil în temeiul normelor aplicate conform practicii de acordare a OEB.

În acest context, Directiva 98/44/CE ([1]) privind protecția juridică a invențiilor biotehnologice („Directiva privind biotehnologiile”) stabilește norme specifice aplicabile acestui sector. Invențiile care îndeplinesc criteriile generale de brevetare sunt brevetabile, chiar dacă privesc un produs care constă din sau conține material biologic sau un procedeu prin care se produce, se prelucrează sau se folosește material biologic (articolul 3). În schimb, procedeele esențialmente biologice pentru producerea plantelor nu au caracter brevetabil [articolul 4 litera (b)]. Dispozițiile aplicabile ale acestei directive au fost, de asemenea, incluse în regulamentele de punere în aplicare ale Convenției brevetului european, ceea ce înseamnă că acestea sunt, de asemenea, obligatorii pentru OEB.

În cadrul OEB, problema juridică privind caracterul brevetabil al procedeelor esențialmente biologice a fost clarificată de Marea Cameră de Apel a OEB în cauzele G 2/07 și G 1/08, ambele soluționate la data de 9 decembrie 2010. Se așteaptă însă în continuare pronunțarea Marii Camere de Apel a OEB cu privire la caracterul brevetabil al produselor derivate din astfel de procedee.

În ceea ce privește, la un nivel mai general, normele prevăzute de Directiva privind biotehnologiile și aplicarea acestora, Comisia a instituit un grup de experți ([2]) care analizează aceste aspecte. Contribuțiile furnizate de grupul respectiv vor fi integrate în raportul pe care Comisia îl elaborează în prezent, în conformitate cu obligațiile sale de raportare prevăzute la articolul 16 litera (c) din Directiva privind biotehnologiile.

([1]) Scopul directivei menționate anterior este armonizarea în acest domeniu a legislațiilor în materie de brevete din statele membre.
([2]) Informații privind activitățile grupului sunt furnizate de Registrul grupurilor de experți ai Comisiei și al altor entități similare, la următoarea adresă:. http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetail&groupID=2973&NewSearch=1&NewSearch=1&Lang=RO

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001330/14
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Europe-wide opposition to Patent EP 2140023 B1

On 8 May 2013, the European Patent Office issued a patent (EP 2140023 B1) to Syngenta for insect-resistant pepper plants.

According to a broad alliance of 34 NGOs and farmers' and breeders' organisations from 27 member countries of the European Patent Convention, Syngenta has in fact crossed a wild pepper plant from Jamaica with commercial pepper plants. Since the wild plant is resistant to various pests, the patented resistance already exists in nature.

Given that in May 2012 the European Parliament adopted a resolution calling on the European Patents Office to exclude from patenting products derived from conventional breeding methods, what view does the Commission take of this matter?

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

The European Patent Office ('EPO') shall grant European patents for any inventions that meet the general patentability criteria, namely novelty, inventiveness and industrial applicability. In addition, their subject-matter must also be regarded as patentable under the rules applied by the EPO's granting practice.

In this context, the directive 98/44/EC ([1]) on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions ('the Biotech Directive') sets out specific rules applicable to this sector. Inventions meeting the general patentability criteria shall be patentable even if they concern a product consisting of or containing biological material or a process by means of which biological material is produced, processed or used (Article 3). By contrast, essentially biological processes for the production of plants shall not be patentable (Article 4(b)). The relevant provisions of this directive were also included in the Implementing Regulations to the European Patent Convention, meaning that they are also binding on the EPO.

Within the EPO context, the question of the patentability of essentially biological processes was clarified by the Enlarged Board of Appeal of the EPO in G 2/07 and G 1/08, both of 9 December 2010. However, that of the patentability of products derived from such processes still awaits an answer from the Enlarged Board of Appeal of the EPO.

As concerns more generally the rules of the Biotech Directive and their application, the Commission has set up an expert group ([2]) looking into these matters. The Commission is currently preparing a report in the context of its reporting obligations in Article 16c of the Biotech Directive, and will draw on these contributions.

([1]) The aim of this directive is to harmonise patent laws in Member States in this area.
([2]) Information on the activities of the group can be found on the Register (See: http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetail&groupID=2973&NewSearch=1&NewSearch=1).

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001332/14
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Un posibil leac contra SIDA

Extractul din rădăcinile de mușcate Pelargonium sidoides dezactivează HIV-1 și previne infectarea organismului cu acest virus, conform unor studii realizate de către oamenii de știință de la Centrul German de Cercetări asupra Sănătății Mediului din München.

Experții consideră că această substanță ar putea deveni o nouă clasă de medicamente anti-HIV-1 ce vor fi folosite în tratamentele contra SIDA. Mai multe teste clinice au demonstrat deja faptul că extractul de mușcată este sănătos pentru om, iar Germania a autorizat comercializarea acestuia pe post de medicament pe bază de plante.

Având în vedere că SIDA reprezintă una dintre cele zece cauze majore de deces pe plan mondial:

1. Intenționează Comisia să examineze acest studiu recent și să emită un aviz pe această temă?

2. Intenționează Comisia să înceapă o nouă campanie de sensibilizare cu privire la lupta împotriva HIV/SIDA?

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

1. Comisia nu evaluează studiile de cercetare referitoare la posibilele medicamente în etapa de dezvoltare a acestora. Conform legislației UE privind produsele farmaceutice, studiile preclinice și clinice referitoare la medicamente sunt evaluate atunci când sunt prezentate în cadrul unei cereri de autorizație de introducere pe piață a unui medicament ([1]). Medicamentele care conțin o nouă substanță activă pentru tratamentul infecțiilor cu virusul HIV fac obiectul unei proceduri centralizate, în cadrul căreia evaluarea științifică este efectuată de Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente și autorizația de introducere pe piață este acordată de Comisie.

2. Cadrul politicii UE pentru combaterea HIV/SIDA în Uniunea Europeană și în țările vecine ([2]) prevede acțiuni de prevenire a HIV și de sensibilizare în vederea combaterii comportamentului de risc. La 14 martie, Comisia a prezentat un plan de acțiune referitor la HIV/SIDA care prelungește și extinde actualele măsuri luate la nivelul UE în acest domeniu, inclusiv măsurile menite să promoveze prevenirea HIV și sensibilizarea, precum și tratamentul și îngrijirea timpurie. Noul plan de acțiune pune un accent mai important asupra combaterii discriminării asociate virusului HIV și asupra ameliorării accesului la testarea voluntară.

Întrucât epidemia de HIV din Europa este concentrată în cadrul unor grupuri de populație specifice, strategiile și măsurile de prevenire se axează în special asupra grupurilor de risc. În conformitate cu această abordare, Comisia finanțează în prezent mai multe proiecte care se concentrează asupra prevenirii HIV/SIDA și a coinfecțiilor, inclusiv asupra sensibilizării și a testării. Printre aceste proiecte se pot enumera: „Quality Action — Improving HIV Prevention in Europe" (Acțiune pentru calitate — Îmbunătățirea prevenirii HIV în Europa) ([3]), „HIV COBATEST — HIV community-based testing practices in Europe" (HIV COBATEST — Practici de testare referitoare la HIV la nivelul comunităților în Europa) ([4]) și „TUBIDU — Empowering Civil Society and Public Health Systems to Fight Tuberculosis Epidemic among Vulnerable Groups" (TUBIDU — Sprijinirea societății civile și a sistemelor publice de sănătate în ceea ce privește combaterea epidemiei de tuberculoză în rândul grupurilor vulnerabile) ([5]).

([1]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 726/2004 de stabilire a procedurilor comunitare privind autorizarea și supravegherea medicamentelor de uz uman și veterinar și de instituire a unei Agenții Europene pentru Medicament, JO L 136, 30.4.2004, astfel cum a fost modificat, Directiva 2001/83/CE de instituire a unui cod comunitar cu privire la medicamentele de uz uman, JO L 311, 28.11.2001, astfel cum a fost modificată.
([2]) Comunicarea Comisiei privind combaterea HIV/SIDA în Uniunea Europeană și în țările vecine, 2009-2013, COM(2009) 569 final.
([3]) http://www.qualityaction.eu/
([4]) http://www.cobatest.org/
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database/database_new.inc.data.20101104.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001332/14
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Possible cure for AIDS

Research carried out by scientists at the German Research Centre for Environmental Health in Munich has shown that root extracts of the geranium plant Pelargonium sidoides inactivate the HIV-1 virus and prevent it from infecting cells.

Experts believe that this substance could be used in a new class of anti-HIV-1 medicines for the treatment of AIDS. Several clinical trials have already shown that geranium extracts are beneficial for human health, and in Germany Pelargonium sidoides extracts are licensed as a herbal medicine.

Bearing in mind that AIDS is one of the 10 leading causes of death worldwide:

1. Will the Commission look into this recent study and issue an opinion on this topic?

2. Will the Commission launch a fresh awareness-raising campaign on the fight againstHIV/AIDS?

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

1. The Commission does not evaluate research studies on potential medicinal products during their development stage. According to EU legislation on pharmaceuticals, preclinical and clinical studies on medicinal products are evaluated when submitted as part of an application for a marketing authorisation of a medicinal product ([1]). Medicinal products containing a new active substance for treatment of HIV infection are subject to a centralised procedure, in which the scientific evaluation is performed by the European Medicines Agency and the marketing authorisation is granted by the Commission.

2. The EU policy framework to combat HIV/AIDS in the European Union and neighbouring countries ([2]) foresees action on HIV prevention and awareness-raising to tackle risk behaviour. On 14 March the Commission put forward an Action Plan on HIV/AIDS which prolongs and extends existing EU action in this area including action to promote HIV prevention and awareness-raising as well as early treatment and care. The new Action Plan places a greater focus on tackling HIV-related discrimination and achieving better access to voluntary testing.

As the HIV epidemic in Europe is concentrated in specific population groups, prevention strategies and measures focus primarily on groups at risk. In line with this approach, the Commission is currently funding several projects which focus on prevention of HIV/AIDS and co-infections, including awareness raising and testing. These projects include: 'Quality Action — Improving HIV Prevention in Europe' ([3]), 'HIV COBATEST — HIV community-based testing practices in Europe' ([4]) and 'TUBIDU — Empowering Civil Society and Public Health Systems to Fight Tuberculosis Epidemic among Vulnerable Groups' ([5]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency, OJ L 136, 30.4.2004, as amended, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.
([2]) Commission Communication on Combating HIV/AIDS in the European Union and neighbouring countries, 2009-2013, COM(2009) 569 final.
([3]) http://www.qualityaction.eu/
([4]) http://www.cobatest.org/
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database/database_new.inc.data.20101104.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001334/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Probleme mit der E-Card

Seit der Einführung der Europäischen Krankenversicherungskarte im Jahre 2004 wird EU-Bürgern theoretisch überall in der Union eine ärztliche Leistung gewährt. Die grenzüberschreitende Behandlung in der EU funktioniert bis heute in vielen Fällen nicht. Auch viele Österreicher mussten die Erfahrung machen, dass Ärzte im Urlaubsland die Karte verweigerten oder dennoch Rechnungen ausstellten. Eigentlich ist für solche Fälle vorgesehen, dass die heimische Sozialversicherung dem Patienten den Betrag zurückerstattet. Die Kostenerstattung entspricht in vielen Fällen aber nicht dem gesamten Betrag, da die heimische Sozialversicherung nur den im Inland üblichen Tarif zahlt. Zudem können Probleme auch auftreten, wenn die angewandte Behandlung nicht im Leistungskatalog der Sozialversicherungen enthalten ist.

Vor allem von Spanien-Urlaubern sind solche Schwierigkeiten ja auch der EU-Kommission bekannt. Nachdem reihenweise Beschwerden eintrafen, wurde diesbezüglich ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen Spanien eingeleitet. Die deutsche Stiftung Warentest warnt, dass nicht nur spanische Ärzte die Europäische Krankenversicherungskarte verweigerten, sondern auch Kassenärzte in anderen EU-Ländern.

1. Wie ist der Stand des diesbezüglich gegen Spanien eingeleiteten Vertragsverletzungsverfahrens?

2. Inwieweit sind im Zuge der nach wie vor bestehenden Probleme mit der E-Card im EU-Ausland seitens der Kommission weitere Maßnahmen vorgesehen?

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

Das Vertragsverletzungsverfahren, das die Kommission 2013 gegen Spanien eingeleitet hat, betraf die Praxis bestimmter öffentlicher Krankenhäuser in Spanien, die Europäische Krankenversicherungskarte nicht zu akzeptieren, wenn ihr Inhaber auch eine Reiseversicherung hatte. Als Reaktion auf dieses Verfahren trafen die spanischen Behörden im Juli 2013 besondere Maßnahmen, deren Einzelheiten in der Antwort der Kommission auf die Anfrage E-10736/2013 ([1]) dargelegt wurden. Die Kommission hat keine weiteren Beschwerden bezüglich dieser Praxis in Spanien erhalten und erwägt deshalb, das Vertragsverletzungsverfahren einzustellen.

Die Kommission verfolgt weiterhin aufmerksam Berichte über die Weigerung in anderen Mitgliedstaaten, die Europäische Krankenversicherungskarte zu akzeptieren, insbesondere solche Berichte, die nahelegen, dass es sich bei solchen Weigerungen nicht nur um Einzelfälle, sondern um gängige Verwaltungspraxis handelt. Sie hat jedoch keine weiteren Beschwerden erhalten, die darauf hindeuten, dass es sich bei der Weigerung in anderen Mitgliedstaaten, die Europäische Krankenversicherungskarte zu akzeptieren, tatsächlich um gängige Verwaltungspraxis handelt.

Nach Auffassung der Kommission ist für die erfolgreiche Anwendung der Europäischen Krankenversicherungskarte die Information sowohl der Öffentlichkeit als auch der Leistungserbringer im Gesundheitswesen entscheidend. In den letzten Jahren hat sie EU-weite Kampagnen zur Förderung der Europäischen Krankenversicherungskarte durchgeführt. Derzeit arbeitet sie zusammen mit den Mitgliedstaaten an der Verbesserung der Kommunikationsstrategien für die EU-Vorschriften über die Koordinierung der sozialen Sicherheit. Dazu gehören auch Strategien zur Förderung der Verwendung und der Akzeptanz der Europäischen Krankenversicherungskarte.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001334/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Problems with the Austrian e-card

Since the introduction of the European Health Insurance Card in 2004, healthcare is theoretically guaranteed to EU citizens throughout the Union. In many cases, the cross-border treatment system has not worked in the EU thus far. Many Austrians have also had to endure the experience of doctors in the foreign country refusing the card or making out invoices in any event. For such cases, there is theoretically provision for the patient to be reimbursed the sum by the domestic social security system. In many cases, however, the reimbursement of the costs does not always correspond to the total sum, as the domestic social security system only pays the rate that is usually applicable domestically. Problems can also arise if the treatment carried out is not included in the service catalogue of the social security systems.

The European Commission, too, has certainly been made aware of these difficulties, particularly by holidaymakers in Spain. Following an influx of complaints, infringement proceedings were initiated against Spain in relation to this issue. The German foundation Stiftung Warentest warns that it is not only Spanish doctors who have refused the European Health Insurance Card, but doctors from national healthcare systems in other EU countries as well.

1. What is the status of the infringement proceedings that were initiated against Spain in relation to this issue?

2. To what extent is the Commission planning further measures in the context of the continuing problems with the Austrian e-card in other EU countries.

Question for written answer E-002003/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), Fiona Hall (ALDE), Rebecca Taylor (ALDE), Sharon Bowles (ALDE), Andrew Duff (ALDE), Phil Bennion (ALDE), Sir Graham Watson (ALDE) and Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Access to EU-wide healthcare

We are aware that the Commission is investigating Spain owing to continued complaints that certain hospitals there have refused to accept the EHIC for healthcare access on the same basis as Spanish nationals.

1. Can the Commission provide an update on this investigation and indicate when its findings will be presented?

2. Is the Commission aware of any other EU Member States failing to provide necessary healthcare to EHIC holders?

3. Since access to healthcare during a temporary stay in a Member State is one of the most fundamental rights of EU citizens, what action does the Commission propose to take to ensure future compliance in this matter across the EU?

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

The infringement procedure initiated by the Commission against Spain in 2013 concerned the practice in certain Spanish public hospitals of refusing to accept the European Health Insurance Card (EHIC) where the holder was in possession of travel insurance. In response to that procedure, in July 2013 the Spanish authorities adopted specific measures, the details of which are set out in the Commission's answer to Question E-10736/2013 ([1]). The Commission authorities have received no further complaints concerning this particular practice in Spain and the Commission is therefore considering terminating the infringement procedure.

The Commission continues to be alert to reports of refusals in other Member States to accept the EHIC, and in particular to reports suggesting that any such refusals constitute standard administrative practice as opposed to one-off incidents. It has received no other complaints suggesting that refusals in other Member States to accept the EHIC are standard administrative practice.

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

The Commission takes the view that providing both the public and the healthcare providers with information is crucial to ensuring the EHIC is applied successfully. Over the last few years it has run EU-wide campaigns to promote the use of the EHIC. It is currently working with the Member State authorities to improve communication strategies covering the EU social security coordination rules, including strategies to promote the use and acceptance of the EHIC.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001335/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Gotteskrieger in Mali — französische Militärintervention

Als die Islamisten im Januar 2013 jäh auf die Hauptstadt Bamako vorrücken und die Armee vor dem Zerfall stand, griff Paris ein und reagierte damit auf ein Hilfeersuchen der malischen Interimsregierung. Der Sicherheitsrat segnete die Aktion einstimmig als völkerrechtsgemäß ab. Die französische Verbände konnten im Vorjahr zwar radikal-islamische Gruppen, die 2012 den gesamten Norden Malis unter ihre Kontrolle gebracht hatten, weitgehend zurückdrängen, doch die Situation ist nach wie vor sehr angespannt. Zwar hat es Wahlen gegeben, doch diese waren nach Meinung von Kritikern bloße Fassade. Laut Experten organisieren sich die „Gotteskrieger" im benachbarten Algerien und in Mauretanien neu — und drohen auch mit Terroranschlägen in Europa.

Die militärische Intervention Frankreichs in Mali ist indes nicht unumstritten. Berichten zufolge soll die Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung den Oppositionspolitiker und Präsidentschaftskandidaten Oumar Mariko, der die französische Intervention in seinem Land kritisiert hatte, nach Deutschland einladen haben. Dafür wurde jedoch von Frankreich und Deutschland das Visum verweigert. Die offizielle Begründung lautete, Oumar Mariko sei ein Sicherheitsrisiko.

1. Wie wird auf EU-Ebene hinsichtlich der aus Mali drohenden Gefahr von Terroranschlägen reagiert?

2. Wie steht die Kommission dazu, dass anscheinend die zahlreichen von den verschiedenen Konfliktparteien begangenen Menschenrechtsverletzungen zumeist straffrei geblieben sind?

3. Teilt die Kommission die Einschätzung, wonach Oppositionspolitiker Oumar Mariko ein Sicherheitsrisiko darstellt?

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

1. Die Gefahr, dass terroristische Anschläge in und von Mali aus verübt werden, ist nach wie vor sehr hoch. Die EU ist entschlossen, das Land im Rahmen ihrer Sahel-Strategie weiterhin in den Bereichen Sicherheit und Verteidigung zu unterstützen. Diese Unterstützung schließt auch den Ausbau der Kapazitäten in den Bereichen Terrorismusbekämpfung, Bekämpfung von Radikalisierung, Justiz- und Governance-Reformen durch gezielte Projekte und GSVP-Missionen ein, die entweder militärischer (Mali) oder ziviler (Niger, Libyen, Mali) Natur sein können. Da der Terrorismus eine globale Bedrohung darstellt, gibt es auch Bestrebungen auf der Ebene des Europäischen Rates, die externe und die interne Dimension der Maßnahmen zur Terrorismusbekämpfung in der EU enger miteinander zu verknüpfen.

2. Unmittelbar nachdem die französische Militäroperation eingeleitet wurde, befürwortete die EU den Einsatz nationaler und internationaler Menschenrechtsbeobachter und stellte hierfür Finanzmittel bereit. Die EU wird ihre intensiven diplomatischen Bemühungen fortsetzen und sowohl Menschenrechtsverletzungen anprangern als auch die strafrechtliche Verfolgung genau verfolgen, da der Schutz der Menschenrechte für eine nachhaltige nationale Aussöhnung von zentraler Bedeutung ist.

3. Die EU setzt sich in allen Ländern für das Recht auf freie Meinungsäußerung im Rahmen der rechtlichen Grenzen ein.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001335/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Jihadists in Mali — French military intervention

When Islamists suddenly advanced on Bamako, the capital city, in January 2013 and the army was on the brink of collapse, Paris intervened, in response to a request for assistance from the Malian transitional government. The Security Council unanimously gave its blessing to the campaign, believing it to be in accordance with international law. Although, last year, the French units were able to push back, to a great extent, radical Islamist groups that had brought the entire northern part of Mali under their control in 2012, the situation continues to be very tense. Despite the fact that elections have been held, critics believe that they were merely a façade. According to experts, the 'holy warriors' are reorganising in neighbouring Algeria and Mauritania — and are also threatening to carry out terrorist attacks in Europe.

The military intervention of France is not uncontroversial, however. The Rosa Luxembourg Foundation reportedly invited Oumar Mariko, an opposition politician and presidential candidate who had criticised the French intervention in his country, to Germany. The visa for this was refused by France and Germany. The official reason given for this was that Oumar Mariko was a security risk.

1. What is the reaction at EU level with regard to the threatened danger of terrorist attacks from Mali?

2. What view does the Commission take of the fact that the large number of human rights violations perpetrated by the various parties to the conflict have allegedly gone unpunished for the most part?

3. Does the Commission share the view that opposition politician Oumar Mariko represents a security risk?

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

1. The risk of terrorist attacks in and from Mali remains very high. The EU is determined to continue its support to defence and security services as part of its Sahel Strategy. This includes capacity building in the field of counter-terrorism, counter-radicalisation, justice and governance reforms through targeted projects and CSDP missions, either military (Mali) or civilian (Niger, Libya, Mali). Given the nature of global terrorism, efforts are also being made at the level of the European Council in order to link up the external and internal dimensions of EU counter-terrorism efforts.

2. The EU encouraged and supported financially the deployment of national and international human rights observers immediately after the launch of the French military operation. The EU will continue its intense diplomatic activities, denouncing human rights abuses and monitoring legal proceedings, as the protection of human rights is key to long term national reconciliation.

3. The EU supports free speech in all countries, within the bounds of legality.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001336/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Anhebung der Akademikerquote

Die OECD hat Deutschland, Österreich und die Schweiz lange für angeblich zu niedrige Akademikerquoten geprügelt, während Spanien oder Großbritannien gelobt wurden. Eben diese Länder leiden nun besonders stark unter Jugendarbeitslosigkeit. In den deutschsprachigen Ländern mit ihrem dualen System aus Lehre und Berufsschule finden hingegen viel mehr Jugendliche Beschäftigung.

Die seit Jahren laufenden Bemühungen Deutschlands und Österreichs, die Akademikerquote zu erhöhen, fruchten langsam. Aus der deutschen Wirtschaft heißt es nun, der angebliche Segen sei ein Fluch und es gebe bereits zu viele Studenten und zu wenige Lehrlinge. Der Präsident des deutschen Industrie- und Handelskammertages, Eric Schweitzer, warnt ausdrücklich vor einer Akademisierung um jeden Preis: Die „undifferenzierte Forderung" nach mehr Studenten habe dazu geführt, „dass Hörsäle aus allen Nähten platzen, während Unternehmen händeringend Azubis suchen". Während also einerseits die Studienanfängerquote steigt, sinkt die Zahl der Ausbildungsverträge für Lehrlinge. Dabei soll nur für ein Fünftel der Stellen auf dem Arbeitsmarkt ein akademischer Abschluss erforderlich sein.

In Österreich übersteigt die Nachfrage nach Lehrstellen anscheinend noch das offizielle Angebot. Unter der Hand jedoch wird kritisiert, dass viele Jugendliche nicht vermittelbar seien. Dabei wird aus dem Lehrling von heute der Facharbeiter von morgen. Auch variieren die Bildungssysteme der Mitgliedstaaten derart, dass eine Ausbildung in einem EU-Land als akademische Ausbildung eingestuft wird, währendeine gleichwertige Ausbildung in einem anderen EU-Staat eben dem Rang einer Facharbeit zugeordnet ist.

Die EU besitzt keine Kompetenz im Bildungsbereich, allerdings erfolgt auf EU-Ebene eine gewisse Koordinierung bildungspolitsicher Themen:

1. Gibt es auf EU-Ebene Pläne zur Anhebung der Akademikerquote?
2. Ist in anderen EU-Staaten eine ähnliche Entwicklung zu verzeichnen?
3. Sieht die Kommission einen Zusammenhang zwischen dem viel beklagten Facharbeitermangel und dem Rückgang von Lehrlingsausbildungen?
4. Wie ist in diesem Zusammenhang der Stand der gegenseitigen Anerkennung von beruflichen Qualifikationen?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(13. Juni 2014)

Europa 2020 ([1]), die auf zehn Jahre angelegte Wachstumsstrategie der Europäischen Union, zielt darauf ab, die Voraussetzungen für ein intelligenteres, nachhaltigeres und integrativeres Wachstumsmodell zu schaffen. Eines der in der Strategie festgelegten Hauptziele der EU besteht darin, den Anteil der 30-34-Jährigen mit Hochschulabschluss auf mindestens 40 % zu erhöhen. Die durchschnittliche Beschäftigungsquote junger Hochschulabsolventen ist nachweislich um 12,1 Prozentpunkte höher als die der Absolventen der Sekundarstufe II.

Untersuchungen deuten darauf hin, dass die Nachfrage nach mittleren Qualifikationen ebenfalls hoch bleibt; auf dieser Stufe stellt die Berufsausbildung den wichtigsten Qualifizierungsweg dar. Deshalb hat die Kommission als Reaktion auf die anhaltend hohe Jugendarbeitslosigkeit die Europäische Ausbildungsallianz ([2]) ins Leben gerufen, deren Zweck es ist, die Qualität und das Angebot von Ausbildungsplätzen sowie das Ansehen dieser Qualifikation zu verbessern.

Der Europäische Qualifikationsrahmen (EQF) ([3]) trägt dazu bei, einzelstaatliche Qualifikationssysteme zu vergleichen und die Qualifikationen EU-weit verständlicher zu machen.

Die gegenseitige Anerkennung beruflicher Qualifikationen zur Ermöglichung des Zugangs zu reglementierten Berufen wurde seit den 1970er Jahren durch verschiedene Richtlinien geregelt. Vor kurzem trat eine neue Richtlinie über die Anerkennung beruflicher Qualifikationen (Richtlinie 2013/55/EU ([4])) in Kraft. Damit wird die Richtlinie 2005/36/EG ([5]) modernisiert, und die Anerkennung von Qualifikationen wird erleichtert. Die Mitgliedstaaten sind verpflichtet, die neue Richtlinie Anfang 2016 umzusetzen.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_de.htm über Fortschritte auf dem Weg zu mehr Hochschulabschlüssen wird im jährlich erscheinenden Anzeiger für die allgemeine und berufliche Bildung berichtet: http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/publications/monitor13_en.pdf

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/vocational-policy/alliance_en.htm

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/eqf/home_de.htm

([4]) Richtlinie 2013/55/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 20. November 2013 zur Änderung der Richtlinie 2005/36/EG über die Anerkennung von Berufsqualifikationen und der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1024/2012 über die Verwaltungszusammenarbeit mithilfe des Binnenmarkt-Informationssystems („IMI-Verordnung"), ABl. L 354 vom 28.12.2013, S. 132.

([5]) Richtlinie 2005/36/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 7. September 2005 über die Anerkennung von Berufsqualifikationen, ABl. L 255 vom 30.9.2005, S. 22.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001336/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Increasing the graduation rate

The OECD has long criticised Germany, Austria and Switzerland for having graduation rates that are supposedly too low, while Spain or the United Kingdom have been praised. Even these countries have now been severely affected by youth unemployment. However, a lot more young people are finding employment in the German-speaking countries with their dual system of an apprenticeship combined with attendance at a vocational school.

The efforts of Germany and Austria to increase the graduation rate, which have been underway for years now, are gradually bearing fruit. The German economy is now indicating that what appeared to be a blessing is a curse and there are already too many students and too few apprentices. The President of the German Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Eric Schweitzer, has expressly warned against increasing the graduation rate at all costs, stating that the 'undifferentiated demand' for more students has led to 'a situation in which lecture theatres are bursting at the seams while companies are desperately searching for trainees'. Thus, while the entry rate to university-level education increases on the one hand, the number of training contracts for apprentices is falling on the other, even though only one fifth of the vacancies on the labour market require a university-level qualification.

In Austria, it seems that the demand for apprenticeships still exceeds the official supply. Some have unofficially made the criticism that many young people are not employable, despite the fact that the apprentice of today is the skilled worker of tomorrow. The education systems of the Member States also differ to such an extent that a qualification in one EU country is categorised as an academic qualification while a comparable qualification in another EU country is only accorded a status corresponding to skilled work.

The EU does not have any competence in the education sector, yet there is a certain degree of coordination at EU level in relation to issues of educational policy:

1. Are there plans at EU level to increase the graduation rate?

2. Is it possible to see a similar development in other EU countries?

3. Does the Commission see a correlation between the much-lamented lack of skilled workers and the decline in apprentice training?

4. What, in this context, is the current status with regard to the mutual recognition of professional qualifications?

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

Europe 2020 ([1]), the EU's ten-year growth strategy, aims to create the conditions for a smarter, more sustainable and more inclusive model of growth. One of the EU key targets defined in the strategy is to increase the share of 30-34-year-olds completing third-level education to at least 40%. Evidence shows that the EU average employment rate of recent graduates from tertiary education is 12.1 percentage points higher than that from upper secondary education.

Research suggests that demand for medium-level qualifications will also remain high; vocational training is the main qualifying pathway at this level. Therefore, as part of the response to persistently high youth unemployment, the Commission has launched the European Alliance for Apprenticeships ([2]) which aims to improve the quality and supply of apprenticeships as well as the image of apprenticeship-type learning.

The European Qualifications Framework (EQF) ([3]) helps to compare national qualifications systems and to make qualifications more understandable across the EU.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm — Progress on the tertiary attainment target is reported in the yearly Education and Training Monitor: http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/publications/monitor13_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/vocational-policy/alliance_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/eqf/home_en.htm

The mutual recognition of professional qualifications, with a view to having access to a regulated profession, has been regulated by various directives since the 1970s. A new Directive on the recognition of professional qualifications (Directive 2013/55/EU ([4])) entered into force recently. It modernises Directive 2005/36/EC ([5]) and further facilitates the recognition of qualifications. Member States are obliged to transpose the new Directive in early 2016.

([4]) Directive 2013/55/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20.11.2013 amending Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications and Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012 on administrative cooperation through the internal market Information System ('the IMI Regulation') OJ L354/132, 28.12.2013.

([5]) Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7.9.2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications, OJ L 255/22, 30.9.2005.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001339/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Bankbetrug — Graubereich bei Diebstahl und Phishing

Betrüger gehen bei Angriffen auf Bankkundendaten immer professioneller vor. So wird beispielsweise mittels Trojanern bei Online-Überweisungen eine gefälschte Webseite angesteuert und das Geld anstatt an den Empfänger auf das Konto der Betrüger überwiesen und unter Umständen anschließend die Festplatte des PCs gelöscht. Viel häufiger als mit Trojanern werden Bankkunden mit Phishing-eMails betrogen.

Kritiker sehen einen rechtlichen Graubereich bei Datendiebstahl und Phishing. Bereits vor einer Attacke wissen die Betrüger viel über den Kunden, oft fehlt nur noch ein Code. Die Sicherheitssysteme der Banken sollen hinterherhinken.

1. Inwieweit wird auf EU-Ebene im Rahmen der Banken-Regelungen dafür gesorgt, dass Banken für das Risiko, das sie schaffen, auch haften?

2. Inwieweit wird hinsichtlich der Weitergabe von Phising-Attacken innerhalb der Mitgliedstaaten zusammen gearbeitet, da die Täter oft im Ausland sitzen?

3. Welche Maßnahmen bzw. Initiativen plant die Kommission zur Bekämpfung von Phishing-Attacken auf internationaler Ebene, da sich die Täter auch oft in Drittstaaten befinden?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001708/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Bankbetrug — Graubereich bei Diebstahl und Phishing

Betrüger gehen bei Angriffen auf Bankkundendaten immer professioneller vor. So wird etwa bei einer Online-Überweisung mittels Trojaner eine gefälschte Webseite angesteuert und das Geld anstatt an den Empfänger auf das Konto der Betrüger überwiesen und unter Umständen anschließend die Festplatte des PC gelöscht. Viel häufiger als mit Trojanern werden Bankkunden mit Phishing-E-Mails betrogen ([1]).

Kritiker sehen einen rechtlichen Graubereich bei Datendiebstahl und Phishing. Bereits vor einer Attacke wissen die Betrüger viel über den Kunden, da fehlt oft nur noch ein Code. Die Sicherheitssysteme der Banken sollen hinterher hinken.

1. Inwieweit wird auf EU-Ebene im Rahmen der Banken-Regelungen dafür gesorgt, dass Banken für das Risiko, das sie schaffen, auch haften?

2. Da die Täter ja oft im Ausland sitzen, inwieweit wird hinsichtlich der Weitergabe von Phishing-Attacken innerhalb der Mitgliedstaaten zusammengearbeitet?

3. Da sich die Täter auch oft in Drittstaaten befinden, welche Maßnahmen bzw. Initiativen plant die Kommission zur Bekämpfung von Phishing-Attacken auf internationaler Ebene?

([1]) http://kurier.at/wirtschaft/marktplatz/fisch-attacke-aufs-bankkonto-betrug-im-Internet-wird-immer-raffinierter/49.392.954?utm_source=Sailthru&utm_medium=email&utm_term=daily_kurier&utm_campaign=daily%20kurier%202014-02-03

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

1. Artikel 60 der Richtlinie 2007/64/EG ([2]) (Payment Services Directive, PSD) regelt die Haftung von Zahlungsdienstleistern, unter anderem von Banken, für nicht autorisierte Zahlungsvorgänge. Im Falle von Betrug, einschließlich Identitätsdiebstahl, sind Banken verpflichtet, dem Zahler den Betrag des nicht autorisierten Zahlungsvorgangs unverzüglich zu erstatten. Die Haftung des Zahlers ist auf maximal 150 EUR begrenzt und kann von den Mitgliedstaaten noch weiter beschränkt werden. Der von der Kommission im Juli 2013 vorgelegte Vorschlag für eine Überarbeitung der PSD („PSD2“) sieht eine Reduzierung der Haftung von Zahlungsdienstnutzern auf maximal 50 EUR vor. Außerdem sollen Banken, die bei Fernzahlungen keine moderne, starke Kundenauthentifizierung anwenden, künftig in vollem Umfang für nicht autorisierte Zahlungen haftbar sein.

2. Das bei Europol eingerichtete Europäische Zentrum zur Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität (European Cybercrime Centre, EC[3]) sorgt für eine bessere Koordinierung der Informationsflüsse zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten und ermöglicht ein effektiveres Reagieren auf Bedrohungen durch Cyberkriminalität, wie etwa Phishing. Das EC[3] arbeitet eng mit Akteuren aus verschiedenen Bereichen zusammen, auch mit dem privaten Sektor und anderen EU-Agenturen. Die im August 2013 verabschiedete Richtlinie über Angriffe auf Informationssysteme ([3]) wird ein wirksames Vorgehen gegen Phishing und andere Bedrohungen im Bereich der Cyberkriminalität erleichtern. Ziel der Richtlinie ist es, die Bekämpfung von Cyberkriminalität (einschließlich Phishing) zu unterstützen und die Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Justizbehörden und anderen zuständigen Stellen zu verbessern.

3. Die Kommission unterstützt die Budapester Konvention des Europarates als globalen Rechtsrahmen für die Zusammenarbeit bei der Bekämpfung von Cyberkriminalität und als Modell für einschlägige nationale Rechtsvorschriften. Auf operativer Ebene haben Europol und das EC[3] operative und strategische Abkommen mit einer Reihe von Drittländern unterzeichnet, um gegen verschiedene Formen von Cyberkriminalität, unter anderem auch Phishing, vorzugehen.

([2]) Richtlinie 2007/64/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 13. November 2007 über Zahlungsdienste im Binnenmarkt, zur Änderung der Richtlinien 97/7/EG, 2002/65/EG, 2005/60/EG und 2006/48/EG sowie zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 97/5/EG (ABl. L 319 vom 5.12.2007, S. 1).

([3]) Richtlinie 2013/40/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 12. August 2013 über Angriffe auf Informationssysteme und zur Ersetzung des Rahmenbeschlusses 2005/222/JI des Rates (ABl. L 218 vom 14.8.2013, S. 8).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001339/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Bank fraud — the grey area between theft and phishing

Fraudsters are carrying out attacks on bank customer data in an ever more professional manner. As an example of this, a bogus website is activated by means of Trojan horses during online transfers, and the money is transferred to the account of the fraudster instead of that of the recipient and, under some circumstances, the hard drive of the PC is then wiped. Bank customers are much more frequently defrauded by means of phishing emails than Trojan horses.

Critics believe that there is a legal grey area between data theft and phishing. Even before an attack, the fraudsters know a lot about the customers and often lack only a code. The security systems of the banks are allegedly lagging behind.

1. To what extent, in the context of banking regulations, is it being ensured at EU level that banks are also liable for the risk that they are creating?

2. To what extent is there collaboration with regard to the disclosure of phishing attacks within the Member States, as the perpetrators are often based abroad?

3. What measures or initiatives is the Commission planning with a view to combating phishing attacks on an international level, as the perpetrators are also often based in non-member countries?

Question for written answer E-001708/14
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Bank fraud — grey area between theft and phishing

Fraudsters are using increasingly professional methods to gain access to the data of bank customers. For example, when a transfer is made online, a Trojan is used to connect to a fraudulent website and the money is transferred to the account of the criminals instead of the intended beneficiary, and in some cases the hard drive of the PC is then wiped. Far more frequently than by means of Trojans, bank customers are deceived by phishing e-mails. ([1])

Critics consider there to be a grey area between the theft of data and phishing. Even before they launch an attack, criminals know a lot about the customer, and in many cases all that they still lack is a code. Banks' security systems are said to be lagging behind the criminals.

1. To what extent does European banking law ensure that banks are liable for the risk which they create?

2. As the criminals are often, of course, based abroad, to what extent does cooperation take place between Member States to provide information about instances of phishing?

3. As the criminals are also often based in third countries, what measures and/or initiatives is the Commission planning to combat phishing at international level?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2014)

1. Article 60 of Directive 2007/64/EC ([2]) (PSD) specifies the liability of payment service providers (PSPs), incl. banks, in case of unauthorised payment transactions. In case of fraud, including identity theft, banks are obliged to immediately refund to the payer the amount of the unauthorised payment transactions. The liability of the payer is limited to a maximum of EUR 150 and can be further reduced by Member States. Furthermore, the proposal for a revised PSD (PSD2), presented by the Commission in July 2013, reduces the liability of payment service users (PSUs) to a maximum of EUR 50 and specifies that if the bank fails to use modern, strong customer authentication in the context of a distance payment transaction it is fully liable for any unauthorised payment.

([1]) http://kurier.at/wirtschaft/marktplatz/fisch-attacke-aufs-bankkonto-betrug-im-Internet-wird-immer-raffinierter/49.392.954?utm_source=Sailthru&utm_medium=email&utm_term=daily_kurier&utm_campaign=daily%20kurier%202014-02-03

([2]) Directive 2007/64/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on payment services in the internal market amending Directives 97/7/EC, 2002/65/EC, 2005/60/EC And 2006/48/EC and repealing Directive 97/5/EC, OJ L 319/1, 5.12.2007.

2. The European Cybercrime Centre (EC[3]) within Europol helps coordinating information flows between the Member States and enables a better response to cybercrime threats, including phishing. EC[3] cooperates closely with actors across communities, including the private sector and other EU agencies. The directive on attacks against information systems, adopted in August 2013 ([3]), will help to better tackle the phenomenon of phishing and other cybercrime threats. It aims to facilitate the fight against cybercrime (incl. phishing) and to improve the cooperation between the judicial and other competent authorities.

3. The Commission supports the Council of Europe Budapest Convention as the global legal framework cooperation against cybercrime and promotes it a model for national legislation on cybercrime. At operational level, Europol and its EC[3] have signed operational and strategic agreements with a number of third countries to counter various forms of cybercrime, incl. phishing.

([3]) Directive 2013/40/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 August 2013 on attacks against information systems and replacing Council Framework Decision 2005/222/JHA, OJ L 218/8, 14.8.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001340/14
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Matteo Salvini (EFD) e Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Introduzione dell'indicazione a «semaforo» in Gran Bretagna e possibili conseguenze per il mercato dell'agroalimentare

L'introduzione dell'etichettatura cosiddetta «a semaforo» nel Regno Unito fa riferimento ad un sistema di misurazione che non si basa sulle quantità effettivamente consumate bensì sulla generica presenza di un certo tipo di sostanze in un alimento.

Considerando che l'etichettatura in oggetto fornisce un'informazione parziale e che l'adozione di tale provvedimento potrebbe condurre a distorsioni sul mercato dell'Unione, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. In seguito all'interrogazione E-011011/2013, si sono avuti sviluppi nuovi e significativi in merito alla tematica sollevata?

2. La notizia di cui sopra risponde al vero? Segnatamente: ha il Regno Unito notificato un progetto di disposizione nazionale ai sensi dell'art. 38 del regolamento (UE) n. 1169/2011, oppure ai sensi dell'articolo 39 del regolamento medesimo e secondo la procedura di cui all'articolo 45?

3. Quali motivazioni ha addotto lo Stato membro in parola a giustificazione di tale progetto di disposizione nazionale?

4. Ha consultato il comitato permanente per la catena alimentare su sua iniziativa o su richiesta di uno Stato membro e, in caso affermativo, qual è lo stato del processo di consultazione?

5. Ha già espresso un parere, o qual è il termine esatto entro cui è tenuta ad esprimerlo?

6. In caso abbia espresso un parere in senso negativo, intende trasmettere al Parlamento il progetto di atto di esecuzione prima della sua adozione?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(15 maggio 2014)

1. Il 6 dicembre 2013 il Regno Unito ha trasmesso alla Commissione i particolari del regime volontario che raccomanda, ai sensi dell'articolo 35, paragrafo 2, del regolamento (UE) n. 1169/2011, relativo alla fornitura di informazioni sugli alimenti ai consumatori ([1]). La Commissione ha ricevuto alcuni reclami in materia e sta attualmente esaminando con attenzione il funzionamento del regime, in particolare la sua compatibilità con il regolamento e con le disposizioni degli articoli 34-36 del TFUE sulla libera circolazione dei beni.

2.-3. La procedura di notifica dell'articolo 45 non è applicabile in questo caso poiché riguarda solo i requisiti obbligatori di etichettatura imposti dal diritto nazionale. Gli Stati membri possono emettere raccomandazioni sull'uso di una o più forme addizionali di espressione o presentazione delle dichiarazioni nutrizionali, purché esse siano in linea con i criteri stabiliti dall'articolo 35, paragrafo 1, del regolamento.

4.-5.-6. Su richiesta dell'Italia, le autorità del Regno Unito hanno presentato i particolari del regime alla Commissione e agli altri Stati membri affinché esso fosse oggetto di discussione nell'ambito del comitato permanente per la catena alimentare e la salute degli animali il 4 ottobre 2013 ([2]). Dal momento che la procedura di notifica dell'articolo 45 non è applicabile, non è necessario adottare un parere della Commissione.

([1]) GU L 304 del 22.11.2011, pag. 18.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/general_food/docs/sum_04102013_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001340/14
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Matteo Salvini (EFD) and Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Introduction of the 'traffic light' labelling system in Great Britain and possible consequences for the agri-foodstuffs market

The 'traffic light' labelling system introduced in the United Kingdom refers to a measurement system based on the generic presence of a certain category of substance in a food rather than the quantities effectively consumed.

Considering that this labelling system provides partial information and that the adoption of this measure could distort the Union market, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. As a result of Question E-011011/2013, have there been new and significant developments on the issues raised?

2. Is the above information correct? In specific terms: has the United Kingdom notified a national measure envisaged within the meaning of Articles 38 or 39 or according to the procedure referred to in Article 45 of Regulation (EU) no 1169/2011?

3. What grounds has the Member State in question put forward in support of the national measure envisaged?

4. Has it consulted the Standing Committee on the Food Chain, at its own initiative or at the request of a Member State and, if so, what is the status of the consultation process?

5. Has it already expressed an opinion, or if not, what is the precise deadline by which it is required to express an opinion?

6. If it has expressed a negative opinion, does it intend to put the proposed enforcement measure before Parliament prior to its adoption?

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

1. On 6 December 2013, the United Kingdom transmitted to the Commission the details of the voluntary scheme it recommends pursuant to Article 35(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([1]). The Commission has received some complaints on this subject and is currently examining closer the functioning of the scheme, notably its compatibility with the regulation and the Treaty provisions of Articles 34-36 TFEU on the free movement of goods.

2 and 3. The notification procedure of Article 45 is not applicable in this case, since it concerns only mandatory labelling requirements imposed by national law. Member States can make recommendations on the use of one or more additional forms of expression or presentation of the nutrition declaration provided that they are in line with the criteria set out under Article 35(1) of the regulation.

4, 5 and 6. Following a request from Italy, the UK authorities have presented the details of the scheme for discussion to the Commission and the other Member States at the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health on 4 October 2013 ([2]). Since the notification procedure of Article 45 is not applicable, there is no Commission opinion to be adopted.

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/general_food/docs/sum_04102013_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001341/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Ritardi nei pagamenti della pubblica amministrazione alle imprese: richiesta di immediata applicazione della direttiva per il pagamenti dei crediti dovuti alle imprese

La Commissione europea ha recentemente avviato una procedura d'infrazione nei confronti dell'Italia a causa del mancato rispetto della direttiva 2011/7/UE relativa ai ritardi di pagamento alle imprese. La decisione è frutto delle molteplici segnalazioni giunte alla Commissione europea, tra cui alcuni fascicoli consegnati dall'ANCE e da Confartigianato.

I ritardi degli enti pubblici nei pagamenti superano nella gran parte dei casi 200 giorni, con picchi di 1000. Tale situazione comporta notevoli conseguenze negative: i ritardi costano infatti alle imprese italiane 2,1 miliardi di maggiori oneri finanziari, costringendo gli imprenditori a chiedere prestiti per finanziare la carenza di liquidità derivante dalla presenza di fatture non saldate. Nonostante numerosi interventi, i relativi decreti sulla fatturazione elettronica, la certificazione online e i termini di pagamento non sono ancora riusciti a risolvere definitivamente tale questione.

Le conseguenze dei ritardi nei pagamenti per le PMI sono evidenti, dal momento che tale fattore, unitamente a un'eccessiva burocratizzazione, a un'elevata pressione fiscale e alle crescenti difficoltà nell'ottenere crediti dal sistema bancario, costituisce un ostacolo alla competitività delle imprese, costringendole in molti casi al fallimento.

Premesso che più volte il Parlamento europeo si è pronunciato a favore di misure volte a stimolare crescita e occupazione, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— quali ulteriori misure possono essere messe in campo per consentire ai fornitori della pubblica amministrazione di avere tempi certi relativamente ai crediti vantati, o di disporre di sistemi di compensazione dei crediti?

— Intende definire una tabella di marcia e attivare una task force/cabina di regia che, assieme ai governi e agli enti locali (regioni e comuni), possa definire regole europee condivise in materia di opere e investimenti pubblici relativamente ai calcoli e ai criteri dei patti di stabilità?

— Quali altre misure possono essere adottate, a livello europeo e nazionale, anche nell'ambito del patto di stabilità, per stimolare crescita e occupazione?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(30 aprile 2014)

La Commissione chiarisce che non è stato avviato un procedimento di infrazione contro l'Italia in questa fase. La Commissione ha infatti contattato le autorità italiane attraverso EU Pilot, un passo obbligatorio prima dell'invio di una lettera di costituzione in mora, al fine di chiarire alcuni punti che non sembrano alla Commissione conformi con la direttiva. Se al termine di questo dialogo la situazione sarà considerata insoddisfacente, la Commissione ha il diritto di avviare un procedimento di infrazione a norma dell'articolo 258 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea ([1]).

Gli Stati membri sono responsabili delle loro politiche fiscali, anche per quanto riguarda le decisioni di investimento pubblico. Il quadro di riferimento per il coordinamento della politica fiscale a livello dell'UE è dato dal trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea e dalle disposizioni del Patto di stabilità e crescita. La Commissione non intende proporre emendamenti a tale quadro di riferimento giuridico per introdurre ulteriori differenziazioni nella spesa pubblica.

([1]) Se in seguito a tale procedimento lo Stato membro non pone termine all'inottemperanza, la Commissione può deferire il caso alla Corte di giustizia a motivo della violazione della normativa dell'UE. Se la Corte di giustizia riscontra che l'obbligo non è stato rispettato, lo Stato membro deve porre fine senza indugio all'inottemperanza. In caso contrario, la Corte di giustizia può, su richiesta della Commissione, imporre una sanzione finanziaria fissa o periodica.

Per quanto riguarda le misure volte a stimolare la crescita e l'occupazione, ricordiamo le seguenti a livello nazionale: i) riforme strutturali al fine di migliorare il contesto imprenditoriale (meno burocrazia e minori oneri fiscali) e agevolare l'allocazione delle risorse in termini di lavoro e di capitale verso attività più produttive; ii) migliorare la redditività e la capitalizzazione delle banche per sviluppare il credito; iii) ridurre l'onere fiscale sui fattori produttivi a bilancio invariato (ad esempio, ridurre il cuneo fiscale sul lavoro); iv) proseguire il risanamento del bilancio e diminuire costantemente il debito pubblico, al fine di migliorare ulteriormente la fiducia degli investitori e ridurre i tassi di interesse anche per l'economia reale. A livello dell'UE, si propone di continuare a progredire verso un'autentica e approfondita unione economica e monetaria (UEM) ([2]).

([2]) Si veda, ad esempio, «A blueprint for a deep and genuine economic and monetary union» (Piano per un'unione economica e monetaria autentica e approfondita). http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0777:REV1:EN:PDF).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001341/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Late payments by public authorities to undertakings: request for immediate application of the directive on the payment of amounts due to undertakings

The Commission recently brought infringement proceedings against Italy for failure to comply with Directive 2011/7/EU on late payments to undertakings. This decision reflects the many reports highlighting problems which have been forwarded to the Commission, including documentation submitted by the ANCE [Italian Association of Building Contractors] and Confartigianato [Italian Confederation representing SMUs and craft industries].

Many payments by public authorities are made more than 200 days late, and in the worst cases more than 1 000 days late. The consequences are disastrous: the delays cost Italian undertakings EUR 2.1 billion in increased financial charges, forcing them to take out loans to cope with the cash-flow problems caused by unpaid invoices. Despite all the action taken in this area, the decrees on electronic billing, online certification and payment terms have not yet resolved the problem once and for all.

Late payments have clear consequences for SMUs, given that, compounded by excessive red tape, high taxes and growing difficulties in obtaining credit from banks, this factor is undermining competitiveness and forcing many undertakings into bankruptcy.

Given that the European Parliament has repeatedly called for measures to stimulate growth and employment, can the Commission answer the following questions:

— What additional measures can be taken to provide public contractors with clear-cut payment timescales or arrangements to offset amounts due?

— Does the Commission intend to draw up a roadmap and set up a task force/steering committee which, working in conjunction with governments and local authorities (regions and municipalities), would draft common European rules on public investment and public works in the light of the figures and criteria laid down in stability pacts?

— What other measures to stimulate growth and employment can be taken at European and national level, for example under the Stability Pact?

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

The Commission would like to clarify that there is no open infringement against Italy at this stage. The Commission has indeed contacted the Italian authorities through the EU Pilot, which is a mandatory step before sending a letter of formal notice, in order to clarify some issues that seem to the Commission not to be in compliance with the directive. If, at the end of this dialogue, the situation is deemed not to be satisfactory, the Commission has the right to initiate infringement proceedings according to Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ([1]).

Member States are responsible for their fiscal policies, including public investment decisions. The framework for fiscal policy coordination at EU level is given by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and the Stability and Growth Pact regulations. It is not the intention of the Commission to propose amendments to this framework in order to introduce further differentiation amid government expenditure.

As regards measures to stimulate growth and employment, these comprise at national level: i) structural reforms to improve the business environment (less red tape and lower tax compliance costs) and to facilitate the allocation of labour and capital towards more productive activities; ii) enhancing banks' profitability and capitalisation to spur credit growth; iii) shifting taxation away from productive factors in a budgetary-neutral way (e.g. reduce the tax wedge on labour); iv) pursue fiscal adjustment and put the government debt on a steadily declining path, in order to further improve investor confidence and reduce interest rates also for the real economy. At EU level it is proposed to continue to progress towards a deep and genuine EMU ([2]).

([1]) If this procedure would not result in termination of the failure by the Member State, an action for breach of EC law may be brought before the Court of Justice. If the Court finds that indeed the obligation has not been fulfilled by Italy, the Member State must terminate the breach without any delay. If the Member State has not complied with the Court of Justice's judgment, the Court may, upon the request of the Commission, impose a fixed or a periodic financial penalty.

([2]) See e.g. 'A blueprint for a deep and genuine economic and monetary union' http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0777:REV1:EN:PDF

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-001342/14
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2014 m. vasario 10 d.)

Tema: Tarptinklinio ryšio mokesčių panaikinimas

Komisija yra pateikusi pasiūlymą nuo 2016 m. liepos 1 d. panaikinti tarptinklinio ryšio mokestį. Komisijos teigimu, šis pasiūlymas turėtų būti naudingas tiek vartotojams, tiek ryšių paslaugas teikiančioms bendrovėms. Vis dėlto šiame pasiūlyme neatsižvelgiama į tas valstybes nares, kuriose ryšio operatoriai jau taiko daug mažesnius įkainius negu nustatyta viršutinė didmeninė tarptinklinio ryšio mokesčio riba, pvz. Lietuvą, Rumuniją, Latviją, Lenkiją, Bulgariją. Šių valstybių narių ryšių operatoriams, kurių klientai išvykę į didesnius tarifus taikančias valstybes nares ir iš ten naudojasi savo tinklo operatoriaus ryšio paslaugomis, teks papildomai sumokėti skirtumą tarp savo taikomo tarifo ir nustatytos viršutinės ribos.

Tai reiškia, jog šių valstybių narių ryšių operatoriai patirs papildomų išlaidų padengdami kainų skirtumą vartotojams naudojantis ryšio paslaugomis kitose ES šalyse. Tokiu atveju naudą pajustų tik daug keliaujantys vartotojai.

Ryšių operatoriai, siekdami išlaikyti konkurencingumą bei išvengti nuostolių, bus priversti dirbtinai didinti ryšių įkainius savo šalies viduje, o tai lems didesnes vartotojų sąskaitas už ryšio paslaugas. Tokiu būdu bus sudaromas įspūdis, jog ES naikindama tarptinklinį ryšį dirbtinai skatina ryšio paslaugų įkainių didinimą vidaus vartotojams, ir šiuo argumentu pasinaudos telekomunikacijų sektorius, o tai yra politiškai žalinga visai ES. Tai iš esmės prieštarauja esminiam telekomunikacijų vidaus rinkos siekiui užtikrinti vartotojams kuo mažesnes ryšių kainas.

Ar Komisija, teikdama šį pasiūlymą, atsižvelgė į šį galimai neigiamą poveikį? Kaip Komisija ketina užtikrinti, kad tarptinklino ryšio mokesčių panaikinimas nesukeltų atvirkštinių pasekmių – išaugusių vartotojų sąskaitų bei konkurencingumo užtikrinimo ryšių operatoriams ES?

Komisijos narės N. Kroes atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2014 m. kovo 21 d.)

2013 m. rugsėjo mėn. Komisijos priimtame Žemyno ryšių infrastruktūros plėtros priemonių pasiūlyme (COM(2013) 627) yra tarptinklinio ryšio nuostatų, kuriomis papildomos galiojančios tarptinklinio ryšio taisyklės, visų pirma nustatant savanorišką tvarką, kuria siekiama labiau paskatinti tarptinklinio ryšio paslaugų teikėjus naudoti sutartis, pagal kurias jie galėtų internalizuoti ir mažinti didmenines sąnaudas, o jas mažindami tarptinklinio ryšio paslaugas teikti už kainas, neviršijančias šalies viduje nustatytų kainų. Šis pasiūlymas parengtas kaip tik tam, kad būtų sprendžiama jūsų klausime iškelta didmeninių kainų problema. Be to, savanoriškai taikant pasiūlytą sprendimą, galima nustatyti pagrįsto naudojimo kriterijų, kuriuo tarptinklinio ryšio paslaugų teikėjai būtų apsaugoti nuo didelių papildomų tarptinklinio ryšio mokesčių, o tai ypač svarbu mažų ryšio kainų šalyse.

Tarptinklinio ryšio rinka reguliuojama nuo 2007 m. – nesaikingai didelės kainos sumažintos iki dabartinių kainų. Per šį laikotarpį dėl konkurencijos šalių vidaus rinkose mažėjo ir šalių vidaus mobiliojo ryšio paslaugų kainos. Pritaikius pasiūlytas taisykles taip pat, tikimasi, padidės tarpvalstybinių ryšio paslaugų teikėjų konkurencija, todėl padidės konkurencinis spaudimas šalies vidaus ryšio operatoriams. Jei teisėkūros institucijos pritartų privalomajam įpareigojimui panaikinti papildomus mažmeninius tarptinklinio ryšio mokesčius, susijusius su mažmeniniais šalies vidaus mokesčiais, tektų laiku, prieš įsigaliojant tokiam įpareigojimui, nuodugniai išnagrinėti priemones, kuriomis būtų sprendžiamos didmeninės rinkos problemos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001342/14
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Elimination of roaming tax

The Commission has presented a suggestion to eliminate roaming tax starting from 1 July 2016. The Commission maintains that this would benefit both users and mobile network service providers. However, this does not take into account Member States whose network service providers offer much lower rates than the upper wholesale roaming tax level established, including Lithuania, Romania, Latvia, Poland and Bulgaria. Mobile network service providers in these States whose clients move to Member States with higher rates and use the mobile network service providers in this other Member State will have to cover the difference between their tariff and the upper level established.

This means that the mobile network service providers in these Member States will suffer additional expenditure aimed at covering the difference in prices from clients using network services while in other EU Member States. This would only be beneficial to users who are constantly travelling.

In order to maintain their competitive abilities and avoid losses, the network service providers will be forced to increase service rates in their countries, thus leading to higher bills for network services for users. This will look as though the EU is encouraging an artificial increase in network service rates for local users while eliminating roaming tax, and the telecommunications sector will use this argument and create a political disadvantage for the entire EU. This contradicts the essential effort of the internal telecommunication market to offer users the lowest possible prices for mobile network services.

Has the Commission taken into consideration the potentially negative impact in submitting this offer? In what ways does the Commission aim to ensure that the adverse effects of the elimination of roaming tax — such as higher bills for users — are avoided and the competitive ability of the EU's mobile network service providers is maintained?

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

The Connected Continent proposal adopted by the Commission in September 2013 (COM(2013) 627) includes provisions on roaming which complement the existing roaming regulation, in particular by introducing an optional regime which aims at providing further incentives for roaming providers to find agreements which allow them to internalize and reduce wholesale costs, and by so doing enable them to provide roaming services at the level of domestic prices. This proposal was precisely made to address the wholesale issue raised in your question. In addition, the proposed optional solution allows for the application of a reasonable use criterion protecting roaming providers from excessive roaming surcharges, something particularly important in low price countries.

The roaming market has been regulated since 2007 lowering roaming prices from exorbitant level to the current level. During this period the prices of domestic mobile services have also decreased, because of competition on domestic markets. Furthermore, increased competition from cross-border providers which is expected to result from the proposed rules would intensify the competitive constraints on domestic operators. If the co-legislators were to favour a binding obligation to end retail roaming surcharges relative to domestic retail charges, this would require close examination of the means to address the wholesale market problems in due time before such an obligation would come into effect.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001344/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(10 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Referéndum suizo sobre cuotas para inmigrantes

A raíz de los resultados del referéndum suizo sobre las cuotas para inmigrantes, Viviane Reding, Vicepresidenta de la Comisión, declaró el 9 de febrero que «respetamos la decisión democrática de la población suiza; Las cuatro libertades fundamentales, libre circulación de personas, bienes, capitales y servicios, no se pueden separar. El mercado único no es un queso suizo. No se puede tener un mercado único con agujeros» ([1]).

Suiza es un miembro asociado del espacio Schengen ([2]).

¿Qué medidas específicas adoptará la Comisión para limitar la aplicación del Acuerdo de Schengen? ¿Cuáles serán las consecuencias para los ciudadanos suizos que circulan libremente dentro de la UE?

¿Tiene intención la Comisión de renegociar sus acuerdos comerciales con la Confederación Suiza después de esta decisión?

Suiza ocupa la primera posición en el Índice de Secreto Financiero (Financial Secrecy Index) de 2013 ([3]).

¿Va la Comisión a adoptar acciones reales para cambiar esta situación y garantizar la adecuada aplicación del Acuerdo entre la UE y la Confederación Suiza para luchar contra el fraude?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de abril de 2014)

El resultado del referéndum suizo de 9 de febrero no cambia el *statu quo* de nuestros acuerdos vigentes. La UE y Suiza seguirán cumpliendo sus compromisos y sus obligaciones internacionales. *Pacta sunt servanda* hasta que Suiza decida cómo proceder tras la votación. El Consejo Federal Suizo ha anunciado que adoptará antes del verano un documento de reflexión sobre la manera en que se propone dar cumplimiento a la iniciativa. La Comisión Europea está dispuesta a escuchar las propuestas de las autoridades suizas. Sin embargo, no negociará cuotas, porque son contrarias al principio de la libre circulación de personas. La conformidad de las disposiciones de aplicación con el Acuerdo entre la UE y Suiza sobre la libre circulación de personas se analizará cuando se conozcan los detalles del proyecto de legislación correspondiente. Al mismo tiempo, se podrían estudiar medidas de la Comisión. La Comisión no ha recibido hasta la fecha ninguna solicitud de renegociación de los acuerdos comerciales entre la UE y Suiza.

El objetivo del Acuerdo de lucha contra el fraude celebrado entre la UE y Suiza es atajar el fraude y otras actividades ilegales que afectan a los intereses financieros tanto de la UE como de Suiza. Este incluye disposiciones relativas a la asistencia administrativa y a la asistencia judicial en materia penal para la protección de los intereses financieros y, según la información de que dispone la Comisión Europea, se aplica correctamente.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/f534a5fe-919c-11e3-8fb3-00144feab7de.html?siteedition=intl#axzz2srJEjDsU
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:053:0001:0002:ES:PDF
([3]) http://www.financialsecrecyindex.com/PDF/Switzerland.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001344/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Swiss referendum on quotas for immigrants

Following the outcome of the Swiss referendum on quotas for immigrants, Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission, stated on 9 February: 'We respect the democratic vote of the Swiss people. The four fundamental freedoms — free movement of people, goods, capital and services — are not separable. The single market is not a Swiss cheese. You cannot have a single market with holes in it.' ([1])

Switzerland is an associate member of the Schengen area ([2]).

What specific action will the Commission take to limit the application of the Schengen agreement? What will be the consequences for Swiss citizens who move freely within the EU?

Is the Commission willing to renegotiate its trade agreements with the Swiss Confederation after this decision?

Switzerland was ranked at first position on the 2013 Financial Secrecy Index. ([3])

Is the Commission going to take real action to reverse the situation and guarantee the proper application of the EU-Swiss Confederation anti-fraud agreement?

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

The outcome of the Swiss popular vote of 9 February does not change the status quo of our existing agreements. Both the EU and Switzerland will continue to honour their commitments and international obligations. *Pacta sunt servanda* until Switzerland decides on the way forward in follow-up to the vote. The Swiss Federal Council has announced to adopt a concept paper on how it intends to implement the initiative before the summer. The European Commission stands ready to listen to the Swiss authorities' proposals. It will, however, not negotiate quotas since these are contrary to the principle of the free movement of persons. Compliance of the implementing legislation with the EU-Swiss Agreement on the free movement of persons will be analysed once the details of the draft legislation are known. At the same time, action by the Commission may be considered. No request for a renegotiation of agreeements between the EU and Switzerland in the area of trade has been received to date by the European Commission.

The aim of the EU-Swiss anti-fraud agreement is to counter fraud and other illegal activities affecting the financial interests of both the EU and Switzerland. It contains provisions relating to administrative assistance and to mutual legal assistance in criminal matters for the protection of financial interests, and, to the European Commission's knowledge, is applied properly.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/f534a5fe-919c-11e3-8fb3-00144feab7de.html?siteedition=intl#axzz2srJEjDsU
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:053:0001:0002:EN:PDF
([3]) http://www.financialsecrecyindex.com/PDF/Switzerland.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001345/14
à la Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(10 février 2014)

Objet: Émigration européenne

Selon la Commission le nombre des chômeurs recensés dans l'Union européenne aurait commencé à stagner. En faisant ce genre de constat, les services de la Commission tiennent-ils compte du nombre très important de jeunes souvent bien qualifiés, qui, ne trouvant pas d'emploi dans leurs pays d'origine, ont choisi l'émigration vers l'Amérique du Nord et du Sud, l'Asie, l'Australie, et même l'Afrique?

La Commission peut-elle quantifier le nombre d'Européens ayant choisi l'émigration vers d'autres parties du monde? Quels sont notamment les chiffres pour des pays comme l'Espagne, le Portugal, la Grèce et l'Irlande?

Peut-on faire un bilan «émigration d'Européens hors de l'Union européenne» et «immigration vers l'Union européenne de ressortissants de pays tiers», et cela depuis le début de la grande crise en 2007-2008?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(26 mars 2014)

Eurostat publie des statistiques du chômage grâce à l'enquête sur les forces du travail (EFT), sur la base des définitions établies par l'Organisation internationale du travail (OIT). Ces statistiques fournissent des informations sur les jeunes, ventilées notamment selon l'âge et le niveau d'études. L'EFT menée dans un pays donné ne permet d'obtenir des informations que sur la population résidente de ce pays. Par conséquent, les flux de travailleurs migrants sont uniquement comptabilisés dans le pays de destination. Eurostat ne dispose d'estimations de ces flux que lorsque le pays de destination est un État membre de l'UE, un pays de l'AELE ou un pays candidat à l'adhésion à l'Union européenne.

Eurostat collecte des statistiques annuelles sur les migrations internationales vers les États membres ou en provenance de ceux-ci ([1]). Des données sur le nombre de personnes qui arrivent dans l'Union européenne ou la quittent sont disponibles à partir de l'année de référence 2008 ([2]); certaines données datant d'avant 2008 sont également disponibles, mais leur qualité est moindre.

Les chiffres actuels ([3]) indiquent que le nombre d'émigrants qui ont quitté l'UE-27 pour un pays tiers est passé de 1,1 million en 2009 à 1,2 million en 2011. À l'échelon des États membres ([4]), les chiffres pour 2011 révèlent que le flux d'émigration vers des pays tiers provenait principalement d'Espagne (260 000 personnes), du Portugal (16 000), de Grèce (57 000) et d'Irlande (43 000). La fiabilité et la disponibilité des statistiques sont généralement moins bonnes pour l'émigration que pour l'immigration. Il est en effet moins aisé de faire en sorte que les personnes qui quittent un pays soient bien comptabilisées dans les registres administratifs et les sondages utilisés pour l'établissement de statistiques sur les migrations.

Les statistiques d'Eurostat révèlent qu'au cours des dernières années le nombre de personnes qui sont entrées ([5]) dans l'UE-27 a été supérieur au nombre de personnes qui ont quitté l'UE: le flux d'immigration, d'environ 1,6 million de personnes en 2009, a atteint 1,7 million en 2010 et 2011. Les données relatives aux flux d'immigration et d'émigration sont disponibles par État membre déclarant.

([1]) Ces statistiques et les publications correspondantes sont disponibles sur le portail des statistiques de la population du site internet d'Eurostat: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/introduction.

([2]) Conformément au règlement (CE) n° 862/2007 (JO L 199 du 31.7.2007, p. 23).

([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/dataset?p_product_code=TPS00177 — certains pays, qui ont révisé leurs statistiques sur l'émigration après le recensement de 2011, ont envoyé à Eurostat des données post-recensement révisées pour l'ensemble ou une partie de la période intercensitaire. Ces données entraîneront une modification des chiffres mentionnés ci-dessus. Elles seront disponibles mi-mars 2014.

([4]) Des données sur l'émigration ventilées par prochain pays de résidence sont disponibles ici.

([5]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/dataset?p_product_code=TPS00176 — certains pays, qui ont révisé leurs statistiques d'immigration après le recensement de 2011, ont envoyé à Eurostat des données post-recensement révisées pour l'ensemble ou une partie de la période intercensitaire. Ces données entraîneront une modification des chiffres mentionnés ci-dessus. Elles seront disponibles mi-mars 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001345/14
to the Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: European emigration

According to the Commission, the number of registered unemployed people in the European Union has begun to stagnate. In making this kind of observation, are the departments of the Commission taking account of the very large number of young people who are often highly qualified but are unable to find work in their home countries and who therefore choose to emigrate to North and South America, Asia, Australia, and even Africa?

Can the Commission quantify the number of Europeans who have chosen to emigrate to other parts of the world? In particular, what are the figures for countries such as Spain, Portugal, Greece and Ireland?

Is it possible to conduct an assessment of 'emigration of Europeans to outside of the European Union' and 'immigration to the European Union by third-country nationals' since the start of the crisis in 2007/2008?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2014)

Eurostat produces unemployment statistics based on the Labour Force Survey (LFS), using the definitions of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). Young persons are taken into account in those statistics. Breakdowns by age and educational level attained are available. The LFS of a given country only collects information from the resident population in that country. Thus the flows of migrant workers are only captured for the destination country. Eurostat has estimates of those flows provided the destination country is an EU Member State, an EFTA country or a candidate country to the EU.

Eurostat collects annual statistics on international migration to and from Member States ([1]). Data on the number of emigrants and immigrants from/to European Union are available since reference year 2008 ([2]); some data are available before 2008 but with lower quality.

The currently available figures ([3]) indicate that the number of emigrants from EU-27 to non-EU-27 countries has risen from 1.1 million in 2009 to 1.2 million in 2011. At Member State level ([4]) figures for 2011 indicate that the emigration flow to non-EU-27 countries was for Spain 260 000, Portugal 16 000, Greece 57 000 and Ireland 43 000. The reliability and availability of statistics on people who emigrate tend to be lower than for immigrants because it is harder to ensure that people who leave a country are correctly accounted for in the administrative records and sample surveys used for migration statistics.

Eurostat statistics show that, in recent years, more people have moved into ([5]) the EU-27 than have left, the immigration flow being around 1.6 million people in 2009 and 1.7 in 2010 and 2011. Immigration and emigration flows are available by declaring Member State.

([1]) These statistics and related publications may be obtained via the Population Statistics portal of the Eurostat website: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/introduction.

([2]) under the regulation (EC) 862/2007: OJ L 199, 31.7.2007, p. 23.

([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/dataset?p_product_code=TPS00177 ; countries revising the emigration series after the 2011 Census round have sent revised post-census results to Eurostat for the whole intercensal period or shorter. These revisions of data will have an impact on the figures above and will be available by mid-March 2014.

([4]) Data on emigration by country of next residence are available here.

([5]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/dataset?p_product_code=TPS00176 ; countries revising the immigration series after the 2011 Census round have sent revised post-census results to Eurostat for the whole intercensal period or shorter. These revisions of data will have an impact on the figures above and will be available by mid-March 2014.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001346/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(10 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Violaciones constantes de los derechos humanos en el Tíbet

El 14 de diciembre de 2012 Catherine Ashton, Vicepresidenta de la Comisión Europea y Alta Representante de la Unión Europea para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad, hizo pública una declaración sobre la trágica situación en el Tíbet. En su Resolución de 14 de junio de 2012, el Parlamento Europeo solicitó al Representante Especial de la Unión Europea para los Derechos Humanos que informara periódicamente sobre la situación de los derechos humanos en el Tíbet y reclamó a la AR/VP que designara un coordinador especial con el mandato de informar periódicamente sobre el Tíbet.

Las graves violaciones de los derechos humanos persisten en el Tíbet y, desde diciembre de 2012, no se han reducido las actuaciones brutales y sistemáticas del Gobierno chino que las producen. Durante el año pasado hemos sido testigos del deterioro de la protección de derechos y el aumento de la represión. Ha habido tiroteos arbitrarios, detenciones y un uso indiscriminado de la fuerza, acciones que han situado a los tibetanos al nivel de un pueblo sometido. La negación de libertad religiosa y los asentamientos a gran escala realizados por ciudadanos no tibetanos con el apoyo del Gobierno amenazan con hacer desaparecer la identidad tibetana.

Hace muy poco tiempo nos alarmamos por la detención de un respetado *khenpo* (abad) tibetano que había sido detenido únicamente por su servicio pacífico a la comunidad con el fin de preservar la cultura y el medioambiente. Su caso es representativo de la situación de muchos tibetanos que se comprometen activamente por sus comunidades o se expresan sobre la situación política de su país natal.

Ya que la situación no ha mejorado desde 2012, ¿puede la VP/AR aportar información sobre qué medidas se han tomado o se planean tomar tras su declaración del 14 de diciembre de 2012?

¿Se designará un coordinador especial para el Tíbet? ¿Cuándo podemos esperar que esto ocurra?

¿Se ha tratado regularmente el asunto de la situación del pueblo tibetano en las distintas reuniones con los representantes de la República Popular China?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de mayo de 2014)

La UE ha suscitado públicamente la cuestión de los derechos de los miembros de minorías, incluidos, en numerosas ocasiones, los de los tibetanos. La situación del Tíbet se expone con regularidad en las declaraciones de la UE ante el Consejo de Derechos Humanos y la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas.

Con posterioridad a la declaración sobre las autoinmolaciones de tibetanos presentada por la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton el 14 de diciembre de 2012, el comisario Füle planteó, en su nombre, la situación del Tíbet durante el debate de aprobación del informe del Parlamento Europeo sobre las relaciones UE-China, el 13 de marzo de 2013. El 25 de junio de 2013, con ocasión del diálogo sobre derechos humanos UE-China celebrado en Guiyang (provincia de Guizhou), la situación del Tíbet fue objeto de intensas conversaciones con diversos ministerios chinos. Durante su visita a China, que incluyó la región tibetana, el Sr. Lambridinis, Representante Especial de la UE para los Derechos Humanos, mantuvo exhaustivas conversaciones sobre los derechos humanos de los tibetanos con las autoridades chinas. Por último, el 1 de febrero de 2014, la Sra. Ashton publicó unas nuevas declaraciones sobre el trato dispensado en China a los defensores de los derechos humanos y sus familiares, incluidos los que propugnan los derechos humanos de los miembros de minorías.

No se prevé actualmente nombrar a ningún coordinador específico para el Tíbet, pero el SEAE continuará supervisando la situación y expresando toda inquietud que albergue al Gobierno chino.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001346/14
to the Commission EN (Vice-President/High Representative)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Continued human rights violations in Tibet

On 14 December 2012, Catherine Ashton, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the Commission, issued a declaration on the tragic situation in Tibet. On 14 June 2012, an EP resolution called on the EU Special Representative for Human Rights to report regularly on the human rights situation in Tibet and urged the VP/HR to appoint a special coordinator with a mandate to report regularly on Tibet.

The grave human rights violations in Tibet are still continuing, with no reduction in the brutal violation of human rights systematised by the Chinese Government since December 2012. In the past year, we have witnessed a deterioration of rights protection and intensified crackdowns. There have been arbitrary shootings, arrests, and the indiscriminate use of force — actions which have reduced Tibetans to the level of a subject people. The denial of religious freedom, and large-scale government-sponsored settlements by non-Tibetans, threaten to obliterate Tibetan identity.

Very recently, we have been alarmed by the detention of a respected Tibetan khenpo ('abbot') who has been taken into custody solely because of his peaceful community service for the preservation of culture and environment. His case is representative of the situation of many Tibetans who take active responsibility for their communities or who express themselves on the political situation in their home country.

Given the lack of any improvement since 2012, can the VP/HR provide information on what action has been taken and/or has been planned since the declaration of 14 December 2012?

Will a special coordinator for Tibet be appointed? When can we expect this?

Has the issue of the situation of the Tibetan people been regularly raised at the various meetings with the representatives of the People's Republic of China?

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

The EU has publicly raised the rights of persons belonging to minorities, including that of Tibetans on many occasions. Tibet is also highlighted regularly in EU statements at the UN Human Rights Council and the UN General Assembly.

Since HR/VP Ashton's statement on Tibetan self-immolations on 14 December 2012, Commissioner Füle has raised Tibet, on her behalf, during the debate on the adoption of the European Parliament's report on EU-China relations, on 13 March 2013. On 25 June 2013, during the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue, which was held in Guiyang (Guizhou province), the situation in Tibet was discussed extensively with various Chinese ministries. During his visit to China, including to the Tibetan region, in September 2013 the EU Special Representative for Human Rights, Mr Lambrinidis, had in-depth discussions with the Chinese authorities about the human rights of Tibetans. Lastly, on 1st February 2014, HR/VP Ashton issued a new statement about the treatment of human rights defenders and their relatives in China, including those who promote the human rights of persons belonging to minorities.

There are no plans to appoint a specific coordinator for Tibet but the EEAS will continue to monitor the situation and to raise its concerns with the Chinese Government

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001347/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(10 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Condena de Victoire Ingabire — Ruanda

El 13 de septiembre de 2012, Victoire Ingabire —junto a otras dos políticas ruandesas— fue nominada al Premio Sájarov del Parlamento Europeo a la Libertad de Conciencia.

Un mes después, Victoire Ingabire fue condenada a ocho años de reclusión por supuesta conspiración para perjudicar a las autoridades mediante terrorismo y por minimizar el genocidio de 1994.

En abril de 2013, en el curso de su apelación ante el Tribunal Supremo, fue condenada por nuevos cargos no basados en documentos jurídicos que, según la defensa, no habían sido presentados en el juicio, incluyendo los de negacionismo del genocidio de 1994 y alta traición.

Recientemente, la Corte Suprema de Kigali, en Ruanda, hizo público su veredicto definitivo de condena de 15 años de cárcel para Victorire Ingabire, como final del largo proceso de apelación.

La gravedad de por sí de estos hechos, denunciados ya en la Declaración Unánime del Parlamento Europeo en Estrasburgo, de 23 de mayo de 2013, hace necesaria una respuesta contundente por parte de las instituciones europeas.

— ¿Es consciente la Alta Representante de la gravedad de la situación que se vive en Ruanda, plasmada en este caso en la persona de Victoire Ingabire?

— ¿Qué planes tiene la Alta Representante para hacer frente a la vulneración de derechos humanos que se vive en Ruanda?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de abril de 2014)

La Unión Europea ha estado muy atenta al asunto de Victoire Ingabire y ha tomado nota de la sentencia del Tribunal Supremo de Ruanda, de 13 de diciembre de 2013, que dobla la condena a 15 años de prisión. La Delegación de la UE y varios Estados miembros de la UE han asistido al juicio de Ingabire desde 2011. La mejora del sistema judicial de Ruanda es crucial para consolidar el Estado de Derecho en el país.

La Unión Europea lleva a cabo un seguimiento permanente de la evolución de la situación de los derechos humanos en Ruanda. Esto se hace gracias a la presencia dentro del país de la Delegación de la UE y de las representaciones diplomáticas de los Estados miembros y a través de contactos con la sociedad civil de Ruanda y con otros interlocutores nacionales e internacionales, tomando debida nota de sus análisis y posiciones. Esta labor de diagnóstico se comparte y debate con los Estados miembros y se traduce en una estrategia común de la UE en materia de derechos humanos, la cual da forma al diálogo político mantenido con el Gobierno de Ruanda y estructurado por los artículos 8 y 9 del Acuerdo de Cotonú. Este diálogo político periódico permite a la UE manifestar su preocupación en los casos delicados de derechos humanos. También se realiza con regularidad una evaluación periódica de los riesgos políticos (por ejemplo, derechos humanos, democracia, Estado de Derecho e inseguridad y conflictos) en relación con la prestación de ayuda presupuestaria, lo que a su vez da lugar a ajustes en la composición de la «caja de herramientas» de ayuda al desarrollo en beneficio de Ruanda, así como en el proceso de programación (incluido el Instrumento Europeo para la Democracia y los Derechos Humanos). La UE también supervisa los procesos multilaterales, principalmente el examen periódico universal del Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas y el seguimiento de sus recomendaciones, que determinan los propios puntos de vista de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001347/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Conviction of Victoire Ingabire — Rwanda

On 13 September 2012, Victoire Ingabire — together with two other Rwandan political figures — was nominated for the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought of the European Parliament.

One month later, Victoire Ingabire was sentenced to eight years in prison for allegedly conspiring to undermine the authorities through the use of terrorism and for belittling the 1994 genocide.

In April 2013 during her appeal in front of the Supreme Court she was sentenced on the ground of new charges based on documents without legal character, and which, according to her Defence Counsel, were not brought before it during the trial, including charges of negationism of the 1994 genocide and high treason.

Recently, the Kigali Supreme Court in Rwanda published its definitive verdict of a sentence of 15 years in prison for Victoire Ingabire at the end of a lengthy appeal process.

The seriousness of these events *per se*, which were condemned in the Unanimous Declaration of the European Parliament in Strasbourg of 23 May 2013, requires a forceful response from the European institutions.

— Is the High Representative aware of the seriousness of the on-going situation in Rwanda, which is embodied in this case in the figure of Victoire Ingabire?

— What are the High Representative's plans for confronting the on-going violation of human rights in Rwanda?

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

The European Union has closely followed the case of Victoire Ingabire and has noted the verdict of the Supreme Court of Rwanda on 13 December 2013 resulting in the doubling of the High Court sentence to 15 years in prison. Since 2011 the EU Delegation and several Member States have attended the Ingabire trial. The improvement of the Justice system in Rwanda is crucial to consolidate the rule of law in the country.

The European Union constantly monitors the evolution of the Human Rights situation in Rwanda. This is done through in-country presence of the EU Delegation and of diplomatic representations of Member States, through contacts with civil society in Rwanda, and other domestic and international actors, taking due note of their assessments and positions. This diagnostic work is shared and discussed with Member States and leads to a joint EU Human Rights Strategy, informing the political dialogue held with the government of Rwanda and structured by art 8 and 9 of the Cotonou Agreement. This regular political dialogue allows the EU to raise concerns on human rights sensitive issues. A regular assessment of the political risks is also regularly done (including Human Rights, Democracy, Rule of Law and Insecurity/Conflict), related to the provision of budget support, leading in turn to adjustments in the composition of the development aid 'toolbox' benefiting Rwanda, and the programming process (including of the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights). The EU also monitors multilateral processes, chiefly the Universal Periodic Review of the UN Human Rights Council and the follow-up of its recommendations, which informs the EU's own views.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001348/14
til Kommissionen
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(10. februar 2014)

Om: National skattelovgivning i uoverensstemmelse med de grundlæggende rettigheder

Artikel 7 i Chartret om Grundlæggende Rettigheder lyder: »Enhver har ret til respekt for sit privatliv og familieliv, sit hjem og sin kommunikation«.

Danmark har ved lov nr. 590 af 18. juni 2012 gennemført en række ændringer af den danske skattelovgivning. Således kan de danske skattemyndigheder, SKAT, uden forudgående retskendelse gennemføre kontrol af erhvervsdrivende (formodning om sort arbejde) på ejendom ejet af en privat borger, der tjener til privatbolig eller til fritidsbolig.

Professor lic.jur. Søren Friis Hansen har i en artikel belyst den danske lovs indflydelse på principperne i Chartret om Grundlæggende Rettigheder. Han skriver bl.a., at EU-retten eksempelvis finder anvendelse når »en borger fra et andet EU-land har erhvervet en fast ejendom i Danmark, der tjener som den pågældendes bolig, idet en sådan erhvervelse er omfattet af reglerne om kapitalens fri bevægelighed, jf. artikel 63 TEUF«.

Er Kommissionen enig i, at den danske skattelovgivning således giver de danske skattemyndigheder mulighed for uden forudgående retskendelse at krænke EU-borgeres hjem, privat- og familieliv?

Hvad kan og vil Kommissionen gøre for at sikre overensstemmelse mellem medlemsstaternes lovgivning og Chartret om Grundlæggende Rettigheder?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Johannes Hahn
(22. april 2014)

Den Europæiske Unions charter om grundlæggende rettigheder finder kun anvendelse på medlemsstater, når de gennemfører EU-retten. Nationale skattemyndigheders håndhævelsesbeføjelser kan være knyttet til gennemførelsen af EU-retten, f.eks. hvis der er tale om en forpligtelse til at indføre et system til inddrivelse af visse skatter, såsom moms, i henhold til EU-retten.

For så vidt angår det ærede parlamentsmedlems henvisning til artikel 63 i TEUF skal det nævnes, at restriktioner for kapitalbevægelser kan begrundes efter artikel 65, stk. 1, litra b, i TEUF, som udtrykkeligt indeholder bestemmelser om medlemsstaternes ret til »at træffe de nødvendige foranstaltninger for at hindre overtrædelser af deres nationale ret og forskrifter, især på skatte- og afgiftsområdet og i forbindelse med tilsynet med finansielle institutioner, eller til af administrative eller statistiske hensyn at fastlægge procedurer for anmeldelse af kapitalbevægelser eller til at træffe foranstaltninger, der er begrundet i hensynet til den offentlige orden eller den offentlige sikkerhed«. Efter artikel 65, stk. 3, i TEUF, må disse foranstaltninger imidlertid ikke udgøre et middel til vilkårlig forskelsbehandling eller en skjult begrænsning, og de skal være rimelige.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001348/14
to the Commission
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: National tax legislation not compatible with fundamental rights

Article 7 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union states that 'Everyone has the right to respect for his or her private and family life, home and communications'.

In Act No 590 of 18 June 2012, Denmark made a number of amendments to Danish tax legislation, enabling the Danish tax authorities (SKAT) to carry out checks on businesspeople without a prior court order (where there is a presumption of undeclared work) on property owned by a private citizen which serves as a private or holiday residence.

Law professor Søren Friis Hansen has written an article describing the Danish Act's impact on the principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. He states that EC law applies, for example, when 'a citizen from another EU Member State has acquired immovable property in Denmark which serves as his residence, where such acquisition is covered by the rules on the free movement of capital under Article 63 TFEU'.

Does the Commission agree that the Danish tax legislation thus gives the Danish tax authorities the power, without a prior court order, to infringe an EU citizen's right to home, private and family life?

What can and will the Commission do to ensure that Member States' legislation is compatible with the Charter of Fundamental Rights?

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

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union only applies to Member States where they implement EC law. Enforcement powers of national tax authorities may be connected to the implementation of EC law, e.g. where they concern an obligation under EC law to put in place a system ensuring collection of certain taxes such as VAT.

In so far as the Honourable Member refers to Article 63 TFEU, it needs to be pointed out that restrictions on the free movement of capital can be justified by Article 65(1) b) TFEU which expressly provides for the right of Member States 'to take all requisite measures to prevent infringements of national law and regulations, in particular in the field of taxation and the prudential supervision of financial institutions, or to lay down procedures for the declaration of capital movements for purposes of administrative or statistical information, or to take measures which are justified on grounds of public policy or public security'. However, these measures must not represent a means of arbitrary discrimination or a distinguished restriction in the sense of Art. 65(3) TFEU, and they must be proportionate.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001349/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Evelyn Regner (S&D), Karin Kadenbach (S&D), Josef Weidenholzer (S&D) und Hannes Swoboda (S&D)
(10. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Gegen EU-Bürgerin gerichtete Gefängnisdrohung nach einer Vergewaltigung in Dubai

Eine junge Österreicherin wurde kürzlich in Dubai Opfer einer Vergewaltigung. Danach suchte die Frau Zuflucht bei der Polizei in Dubai, doch die Polizei hat der Frau, anstatt ihr zu helfen, mit einem Jahr Gefängnis wegen „außerehelichen Geschlechtsverkehrs" gedroht, es sei denn, sie würde ihren Peiniger ehelichen. Dies ist nicht der einzige bekannte Fall. Auch einer Frau aus Norwegen war vor ca. einem halben Jahr ein ähnliches Schicksal beschieden. Diese Frau wurde vor dem Gefängnis bewahrt, weil sich der norwegische Außenminister persönlich für ihre Freilassung einsetzte. Dies war auch bei der jungen Österreicherin der Fall. Ein österreichisches Krisenteam konnte die Frau nun nach Österreich zurückbringen.

1. Sind der Hohen Vertreterin solche Fälle bekannt?

2. Gedenkt die Hohe Vertreterin, in dieser Sache tätig zu werden und sich für die Straffreiheit der Frau einzusetzen? Wenn ja, welche Vorgehensweise wird die Kommission wählen?

3. Gibt es irgendeine Möglichkeit, politischen Druck auszuüben, damit diese frauenfeindlichen Gesetze geändert werden?

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

Der Hohen Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin ist der von den Damen und Herren Abgeordneten genannte Fall bekannt.

Die EU setzt sich in ihren Beziehungen zu Drittländern konsequent für die Achtung des Verbots der Diskriminierung aus Gründen des Geschlechts ein, das zu den Grundprinzipien der Europäischen Union gehört. Anlass zu ernster Sorge gibt die Tatsache, dass in jüngster Zeit mehrere Fälle aufgetreten sind, in denen mutmaßliche Opfer einer Vergewaltigung sich der Gefahr ausgesetzt sehen, wegen außerehelicher Beziehungen strafrechtlich verfolgt zu werden, da davon ausgegangen wurde, dass sie *„einvernehmlich eine außereheliche Beziehung"* in den Vereinigten Arabischen Emiraten eingegangen sind.

Die EU steht in einem regelmäßigem Meinungsaustausch mit den Vereinigten Arabischen Emiraten, der sich auch auf die Rechte der Frau erstreckt, und bringt das Thema gegenüber den Behörden der Vereinigten Arabischen Emirate zur Sprache. Um die spezifischen von den Damen und Herren Abgeordneten genannten Fälle bemühen sich jedoch in erster Linie die Behörden der Herkunftsländer der Betroffenen, die sich stark für die Betreuung der Fälle engagieren bzw. engagiert haben.

Im Übereinkommen zur Beseitigung jeder Form der Diskriminierung der Frau (CEDAW) ist neben vielen anderen Grundsätzen auch der Grundsatz des Verbots der Diskriminierung aus Gründen des Geschlechts völkerrechtlich verankert. Die EU ist der Auffassung, dass alle Staaten, einschließlich der Vereinigten Arabischen Emirate, das CEDAW ratifizieren und vorbehaltlos umsetzen sollten. Im Rahmen der allgemeinen regelmäßigen Überprüfung, der die Vereinigten Arabischen Emirate 2012-2013 vom Menschenrechtsrat der Vereinten Nationen unterzogen wurden, haben die EU-Mitgliedstaaten auch dieses Thema — und generell die Diskriminierung von Frauen in den VAE — angesprochen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001349/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Evelyn Regner (S&D), Karin Kadenbach (S&D), Josef Weidenholzer (S&D) and Hannes Swoboda (S&D)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Threat of imprisonment levelled at EU citizen after being raped in Dubai

A young Austrian female was recently the victim of a rape in Dubai. The lady subsequently sought refuge with the police in Dubai, but, instead of helping her, the police threatened the lady with one year's imprisonment for 'extramarital sexual relations' unless she married her assailant. This is not the only known such case. A lady from Norway met with a similar fate approximately half a year ago. This lady was spared imprisonment because the Norwegian Foreign Minister personally saw to her release. This was also the case with the young Austrian female. An Austrian crisis team was then able to bring the lady back to Austria.

1. Is the High Representative aware of such cases?

2. Does the High Representative plan to take action in this matter and see to it that the lady obtains immunity from punishment? If so, what approach will the Commission choose to take?

3. Would it be at all possible for political pressure to be exerted with the aim of having these misogynistic laws changed?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President is aware of the case referred to by the Honourable MEPs.

The EU has consistently advocated in its relations with third countries for the respect for the principle of non-discrimination on the basis of gender as one of the fundamental principles of the EU. Several recent instances of alleged victims of rape facing the risk of being prosecuted for extramarital relations if it is deemed they have '*willingly engaged in extramarital relations*' in the UAE are a matter for serious concern.

The EU holds regular exchanges of views with the UAE, including on women's rights, and this issue is being raised with the Emirati authorities. However, the specific cases referred to in the Honourable MEPs' question are in the first instance dealt with by the authorities of the individuals concerned, who have been closely engaged on their follow up.

The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) sets the principle of non-discrimination on the basis of gender — along with many others — down in international law. The EU believes that all states — including the UAE — should ratify and implement CEDAW without reservations. This issue — and more generally that of discrimination vis-à-vis women in the country — was raised by EU Member States during the Universal Periodic Review that the UAE underwent at the UN Human Rights Council in 2012-13.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001352/14
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Mușamalizarea bombardării militare inutile din Turcia

La 7 ianuarie 2014, procurorul militar din Ankara a hotărât, după doi ani de amânări, să se pronunțe împotriva oricărei urmăriri pentru bombardarea militară inutilă de la Uludere, la granița Turciei cu Kurdistanul irakian. Procurorul s-a referit la bombardarea sătenilor din Uludere denumind-o pur și simplu „o eroare inevitabilă", cu toate că, conform Human Rights Watch, incidentul a implicat uciderea unor săteni care treceau înapoi granița după ce făcuseră contrabandă cu combustibil, ceai și zahăr.

În trecut, au fost pronunțate hotărâri similare în alte cazuri de bombardare inutilă aduse în fața justiției, cele de la Ortasu și Gülyazi. În aceste cazuri, procurorul militar a decis să urmeze linia trasată de guvern, de a nu începe urmărirea și de a încerca să mușamalizeze incidentele, chiar și după ce ONU solicitase desfășurarea urmăririi penale în mod transparent și imparțial. Familiile victimelor sunt în curs de a ataca hotărârea și intenționează să aducă acest caz în fața Curții Constituționale.

În ce fel va sprijini Comisia dezvoltarea unui sistem judiciar transparent și echitabil în Turcia, care să nu-i permită guvernului să-și mușamalizeze greșelile militare?

Răspuns dat de domnul Füle în numele Comisiei
(30 aprilie 2014)

Comisia monitorizează evoluțiile înregistrate în sistemul judiciar turc atât în ceea ce privește legislația, cât și practica judiciară, iar evaluarea Comisiei este prezentată în rapoarte anuale privind progresele înregistrate de Turcia. În acest context, Comisia a subliniat, printre altele, necesitatea ca sistemul judiciar militar să facă obiectul unei reforme. Lacunele identificate în rapoarte servesc drept orientări pentru Turcia în eforturile sale de a se alinia la standardele europene.

Comisia discută cu Turcia despre reforma sistemului judiciar în toate ocaziile relevante, inclusiv în cadrul Comitetului de asociere, al Consiliului de asociere și în cadrul unui grup de lucru Comisia-Turcia, special dedicat sistemului judiciar și drepturilor fundamentale. De asemenea, Comisia organizează evaluări *inter pares* în domeniul judiciar, ale căror calendar și tematică sunt discutate cu autoritățile turce. Comisia va continua să poarte discuții cu Turcia la nivel politic și tehnic pentru a o sprijini să creeze un sistem judiciar independent și imparțial, care să garanteze organizarea de procese echitabile.

UE sprijină reforma sistemului judiciar turc prin intermediul Instrumentului de asistență pentru preaderare. De asemenea, sistemul judiciar și drepturile fundamentale vor reprezenta una dintre prioritățile-cheie care vor face obiectul asistenței în perioada 2014-2020, obiectivul urmărit fiind consolidarea sistemului judiciar și întărirea respectării drepturilor și a libertăților fundamentale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001352/14
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Cover-up of unnecessary military bombing in Turkey

On 7 January 2014, the Ankara military prosecutor decided, after two years of delays, to rule against any prosecution for the unnecessary military bombing in Uludere, on Turkey's border with Iraqi Kurdistan. The prosecutor merely described the bombing of villagers in Uludere as 'an unavoidable error', although, according to Human Rights Watch, the incident involved the killing of villagers who were crossing back over the border after smuggling fuel, tea and sugar.

Similar rulings were issued in the past in other prosecuted cases concerning unnecessary bombing episodes in Ortasu and Gülyazi. In these instances, even after the UN had asked for the criminal investigations to be conducted in a transparent and impartial way, the military prosecutor decided to follow the government line, not to prosecute and to try to cover up the incident. The families of the victims are currently appealing the decision and intend to take the case to the Constitutional Court.

How will the Commission support the development of a transparent and fair justice system in Turkey that will not allow the government to cover up its military mistakes?

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

The Commission monitors the developments in the Turkish justice system, as regards both legislation and the judicial practice, and presents its assessment in the annual Progress Reports on Turkey. In this context the Commission has stressed *inter alia* the need to reform the military justice system. The gaps identified in the reports serve as guidance for Turkey in its efforts to align with European standards.

The Commission discusses the reform of the justice system with Turkey on all relevant occasions, including in the Association Committee, the Association Council and in a working group between the Commission and Turkey dedicated specifically to judiciary and fundamental rights. The Commission also organises peer assessments in the area of the judiciary, the timing and scope of which are being discussed with the Turkish authorities. The Commission will continue to engage with Turkey, at political and at technical level, to assist the country in the establishment of an independent and impartial judiciary that guarantees fair trial.

The EU supports the reform of the Turkish judiciary through the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance. Judiciary and fundamental rights will be also one of the key priorities for assistance in the period 2014 — 2020, with an objective to strengthen the judiciary and enhance respect for fundamental rights and freedoms.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001353/14
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(10 februarie 2014)

Subiect: VP/HR — Arderea de vii a fetelor în Yemen (întrebare ulterioară)

În 2013 s-a raportat un incident privind o fată de 15 ani căreia i s-a dat foc, o pedeapsă tradițională în Yemen. În urma acestui fapt, au fost adresate mai multe întrebări Comisiei referitoare la acțiunile pe care le poate adopta instituția pentru a ajuta la protecția fetelor din Yemen.

La 13 decembrie 2013, Baroneasa Ashton a răspuns întrebării mele cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012271/2013 privind planul de acțiune al UE în această privință, afirmând că „implicarea yemeniților este indispensabilă pentru a face progrese concrete, abordând tradițiile tribale, sociale, religioase și locale, cauze fundamentale ale discriminării și violențelor împotriva fetelor și femeilor.

1. Cum au răspuns autoritățile yemenite la schimbările pe care ar trebui să le facă pentru a proteja femeile și fetele din țara lor, după concluziile recente ale Conferinței pentru dialog național în Yemen?

2. De cât timp este nevoie pentru a asigura a protective minimă împotriva morții?

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

UE sprijină activ, prin intermediul instrumentelor sale tematice și bilaterale și în cooperare cu societatea civilă, cu organizațiile internaționale și cu instituțiile statului, eforturile de protejare a drepturilor femeilor și fetelor din Yemen și de înființare a unor instituții judiciare care să protejeze copiii. Implicarea yemeniților este indispensabilă pentru a face progrese concrete, abordând tradițiile tribale, sociale, religioase și locale, cauze fundamentale ale discriminărilor și violențelor împotriva fetelor și femeilor.

UE a salutat concluziile Conferinței din Yemen pentru un dialog național (NDC) din 25 ianuarie 2014, în cadrul căreia s-a ajuns la un acord privind incriminarea violenței împotriva femeilor, instituirea unei rate de angajare a femeilor în instituțiile publice de 30 % și reintroducerea legislației care stabilește o vârstă minimă pentru căsătorie.

În concluziile Consiliului Afaceri Externe din 10 februarie 2010, UE a solicitat Yemenului să pună în aplicare recomandările NDC în materie de drepturi și libertăți, inclusiv cele privind protejarea drepturilor femeilor și copiilor.

Va fi numit un organism național sau un comitet de supraveghere în care să fie reprezentate toate componentele NDC și care să acționeze ca „gardian” al punerii în aplicare a concluziilor NDC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001353/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Burning of Yemeni girls (follow-up question)

In 2013, an incident was reported concerning a 15-year-old girl who was burned to death as a traditional punishment in Yemen. Following this, many questions were put to the Commission regarding action that the institution can take in order to help protect Yemeni girls.

On 13 December 2013, Baroness Ashton answered my Written Question E-012271/2013 concerning the EU's plan of action on this matter, stating that 'the involvement of Yemenis is indispensable to achieve concrete progress by tackling the tribal, social, religious and local traditions, which are the root causes of discrimination and violence against women and girls'.

1. How responsive are the Yemeni authorities with regard to the changes they should make in order to protect women and girls in their country after the recent conclusions of Yemen's National Dialogue Conference?

2. How much time will it take to ensure a minimal protection against death?

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

The EU is actively supporting efforts to protect the rights of women and girls in Yemen and to establish child friendly judicial institutions via its thematic and bilateral instruments and in cooperation with civil society, international organisations and state institutions. The involvement of Yemenis is indispensable to achieve concrete progress by tackling the tribal, social, religious and local traditions, which are the root causes of discrimination and violence against women and girls.

The EU was encouraged by the conclusions of Yemen's National Dialogue Conference (NDC) on 25 January 2014 agreeing on the criminalization of violence against women, the establishment of a quota of 30% of women in public institutions and the reinstatement of legislation setting a minimum age for marriage.

In the conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council on 10 February 2010, the EU called on Yemen to implement the NDC recommendations on rights and freedoms including protecting the rights of women and children.

A National Body or Oversight Committee representing all components of the NDC will be nominated and act as the 'guardian' of the implementation of the NDC's outcome.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001354/14
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Anti-competition rules

It has come to my attention that the Automobile Association (AA), a UK company, and ADAC, a German company, may be in breach of the European Union's competition laws.

A constituent of mine has explained to me that he was unable to obtain insurance for his motor home from ADAC. As a reason for refusing his custom, the company cited undue pressure from the AA to refuse custom from UK residents.

By agreeing to this stipulation, it is my belief that both ADAC and the AA are parties to an 'agreement' which may be in breach of EC law.

Can the Commission confirm whether agreements of this type are compatible with EC law?

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

The Commission welcomes the observations of market participants or other parties in respect of possible breaches of the EU competition rules. However, assessing the facts currently available, there are no clear indications that an agreement in breach of the EU competition rules exist. The Commission would appreciate if more information could be provided which further supports the Honourable Member's constituent's initial suspicion. On this basis, the Commission could conduct a more detailed assessment regarding the existence of an agreement and, as the case may be, its compliance with EU competition law.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001355/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(10 février 2014)

Objet: Lignes directrices relatives à l'éligibilité des entités israéliennes établies dans les territoires occupés par Israël depuis juin 1967

L'Union européenne a adopté des lignes directrices relatives à l'éligibilité des entités israéliennes établies dans les territoires occupés par Israël depuis juin 1967, qui sont entrées en vigueur depuis le 1er janvier 2014. Plusieurs informations indiquant que certains États membres ont refusé de financer des projets israéliens dans les territoires occupés semblent indiquer que celles-ci sont en train de s'appliquer, mais l'attitude des autorités israéliennes avec l'extension des colonies, la violation des droits des Palestiniens et le maintien d'un climat de guerre et de souffrance infligé au peuple palestinien indiquent que l'impunité avec laquelle agit Israël est la même.

À ce jour:

1. Quels ont été les progrès concernant l'application de ces lignes directrices par les États membres?

2. La Commission peut-elle fournir des informations précises par pays, entités et résultats obtenus depuis l'entrée en vigueur des lignes directrices?

3. La Commission peut-elle fournir un bilan des premiers mois de mise en place des lignes directrices?

Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(22 avril 2014)

Les lignes directrices ne constituent pas une nouvelle politique de l'UE mais explicitent en un seul document la position, déjà ancienne, de l'UE, conforme au droit international, selon laquelle l'UE ne reconnaît pas la souveraineté d'Israël sur les territoires situés hors des frontières de 1967. Elles visent à clarifier cette position et ne concernent que le problème des entités établies et des activités déployées en dehors des frontières de 1967.

Les lignes directrices concernent l'exécution du budget de l'UE mais non les éventuels dispositifs bilatéraux de coopération financière entre des États membres de l'UE et Israël. Les lignes directrices précisent en leur point 7 que leur exécution fait intervenir les autorités compétentes des États membres dans la mesure où celles-ci sont chargées de l'exécution indirecte de programmes de l'UE au moyen de subventions, de prix ou d'instruments financiers.

Les lignes directrices seront appliquées dans l'ensemble de l'UE à partir du 1er janvier 2014. Le programme-cadre pour la recherche et l'innovation «Horizon 2020» est le premier dans la série de programmes de l'UE auxquels Israël sera associé. L'accord d'association d'Israël à Horizon 2020 a été paraphé en décembre 2013 et la signature de l'accord est prévue pour avril ou mai 2014 (par suite de son application provisoire, l'accord s'applique rétroactivement avec effet au 1er janvier 2014).

Le premier appel à propositions relatif à Horizon 2020 a été publié le 11 décembre 2013. Les premières évaluations auront lieu prochainement et la signature des premières conventions de subvention au titre d'Horizon 2020 est prévue pour début juin. Toute entité sollicitant un financement dans le cadre du programme est tenue de déclarer qu'elle satisfait aux critères d'éligibilité prévus par les lignes directrices. La procédure de candidature est conforme à la mise en œuvre des lignes directrices.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001355/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Guidelines on the eligibility of Israeli entities and their activities in the territories occupied by Israel since June 1967

The European Union has adopted guidelines on the eligibility of Israeli entities and their activities in the territories occupied by Israel since June 1967, which came into force on 1 January 2014. Several sources stating that some Member States have refused to fund Israeli projects in the occupied territories seem to indicate that these guidelines are being applied but the attitude of the Israeli authorities, demonstrated by the expansion of settlements, violation of the rights of Palestinians and maintaining a climate of war and suffering inflicted on the Palestinian people, shows that the impunity of Israel's actions remains unchanged.

As of today:

1. What progress has been made with regard to the application of these guidelines by Member States?

2. Can the Commission provide specific information for each country and entity and the results obtained since the guidelines came into force?

3. Can the Commission provide an overview of the first few months in which the guidelines have been implemented?

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

The Guidelines do not represent a new EU policy but reflect in one document the established EU position, in compliance with international law, that EU does not recognise Israeli sovereignty over the territories outside the 1967 borders. They serve to clarify this position and concern only the issue of entities established, and activities carried out, outside the 1967 borders.

The Guidelines concern the implementation of the EU budget but not bilateral financial cooperation arrangements that EU Member States might have with Israel. As per point 7 of the Guidelines, competent authorities in EU Member States are involved in their implementation insofar as they are responsible for the indirect implementation of EU programmes by means of grants, prizes or financial instruments.

The Guidelines will be implemented across all EU programmes, starting from 1 January 2014. Horizon 2020, the framework Programme for Research and Innovation, is the first of a number of EU programmes to which Israel will associate. Israel's agreement of association to horizon 2020 was initialled in December 2013 and the signature of the agreement is expected in April or May 2014 (due to provisional application, it applies retroactively with effect from 1 January 2014).

The first Call for Proposals for Horizon 2020 was published on 11 December 2013. The first evaluations will soon take place and the first Grant Agreements from Horizon 2020 are expected for signature in early June. All entities applying for funding to the programme are requested to declare that they fulfil the eligibility criteria stipulated in the Guidelines. The application process is compliant with the implementation of the guidelines.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001356/14
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(10 février 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Construction de logements dans des quartiers de colonisation de Jérusalem-Est

La municipalité israélienne de Jérusalem a donné son accord pour la construction de 558 nouveaux logements dans des quartiers de colonisation de Jérusalem-Est occupés et annexés.

Depuis le début des négociations de paix, en juillet 2013, les autorités israéliennes ont fait avancer des plans de construction pour 7 302 logements dans des colonies en Cisjordanie occupée et à Jérusalem-Est et lancé des appels d'offres pour 4 460 autres. Les négociations de paix sont compromises par l'extension des colonies d'Israël et par son impunité vis-à-vis des Palestiniens.

Selon les données publiées par le bureau de coordination des affaires humanitaires de l'ONU, au moins 350 maisons ou bâtiments palestiniens ont été détruits en Cisjordanie et à Jérusalem-Est au cours des six premiers mois de négociations, privant 562 personnes de domicile.

Selon l'ONG israélienne B'Tselem, en 2013, Israël a rasé 124 maisons uniquement dans la vallée du Jourdain, où il veut maintenir une présence militaire.

1. Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante de la Commission est-elle au courant des activités de destructions d'habitations et d'extension des colonies d'Israël dans les territoires occupées de Cisjordanie et Jérusalem-Est?

2. Les lignes directrices de l'Union européenne sont entrées en vigueur en janvier 2014 mais la position d'Israël reste la même. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante de la Commission a-t-elle envisagé de procéder au gel des accords de l'Union avec Israël, de quelque nature que ce soit, commerciaux, de recherche ou de coopération, jusqu'à ce qu'Israël s'engage à cesser toute extension des colonies?

3. Combien d'accords ont été signés avec Israël? Ne serait-il pas opportun de suspendre l'accord d'association UE-Israël sur la base de l'article 2 des accords d'association, qui établit que «les relations entre les parties, de même que toutes les dispositions du présent accord, se fondent sur le respect des Droits de l'homme et des principes démocratiques qui inspirent leurs politiques internes et internationales et qui constituent un élément essentiel du présent accord»?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(29 avril 2014)

La position de l'UE, qui a été approuvée par les États membres et le Parlement européen, consiste à dire que les colonies de peuplement israéliennes implantées dans les Territoires palestiniens occupés sont illégales et font obstacle à la paix. L'UE demeure fermement opposée aux colonies israéliennes et aux activités qui en découlent en Palestine et fait passer ce message auprès de ses homologues israéliens à tous les niveaux, ainsi qu'au sein de diverses enceintes internationales ([1]).

Les lignes directrices de l'UE publiées en juillet 2013 mettent cette politique en œuvre en empêchant les colonies et les activités israéliennes de bénéficier de fonds de l'UE. L'accord conclu avec Israël le 26 novembre 2013 sur la participation d'Israël au programme Horizon 2020 de l'UE respecte entièrement ces exigences.

La plupart des accords conclus avec Israël, de même que le plan d'action UE-Israël de 2005, relèvent de l'accord d'association. L'UE n'envisage pas de suspendre cet accord mais a indiqué qu'une amélioration des relations devait être fondée sur des valeurs partagées, dans le cadre de la résolution du conflit israélo-palestinien. De plus, les conclusions du Conseil de décembre 2012 stipulent clairement que tous les acords entre l'UE et l'État d'Israël doivent indiquer 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.

([1]) http://www.eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140111_02_fr.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001356/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Construction of housing in the settled neighbourhoods of East Jerusalem

The Israeli municipality of Jerusalem has given the go-ahead to the construction of 558 new homes in the settled neighbourhoods of East Jerusalem, which are occupied and annexed territory.

Since the start of peace talks in July 2013, the Israeli authorities have pushed forward with plans to build 7 302 homes in settlements in the occupied West Bank and in East Jerusalem and have issued calls for tender for 4 460 more. The peace talks are jeopardised by the expansion of Israeli settlements and by Israel's impunity with respect to the Palestinians.

According to data published by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, at least 350 Palestinian homes or buildings have been destroyed in the West Bank and East Jerusalem during the first six months of negotiations, leaving 562 people homeless.

According to the Israeli NGO B'Tselem, in 2013 Israel demolished 124 homes just in the Jordan valley where it wants to maintain a military presence.

1. Is the High Representative/Vice-President of the Commission aware of the destruction of homes and expansion of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories of the West Bank and East Jerusalem?

2. The European Union guidelines came into force in January 2014, but Israel's position remains unchanged. Has the High Representative/Vice-President of the Commission considered suspending the Union's agreements with Israel, regardless of whether these are commercial, research or cooperation agreements, until Israel pledges to stop all expansion of the settlements?

3. How many agreements have been signed with Israel? Would it not be appropriate to suspend the EU-Israel association agreement on the basis of Article 2 of the association agreements, which establishes that 'Relations between the Parties, as well as all the provisions of the Agreement itself, shall be based on respect for human rights and democratic principles, which guides their internal and international policy and constitutes an essential element of this Agreement'?

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

The EU position endorsed by MSs and the EP, is that Israeli settlements in the oPt are illegal and constitute an obstacle to peace. The EU remains firmly opposed to Israeli settlements and activities that derive from it in Palestine and is conveying this message to its Israeli counterparts at all levels as well as in various International fora ([1]).

The EU guidelines issued in July 2013 implement this policy by preventing Israeli settlements and activities from benefitting from EU funding. The agreement reached with Israel on 26 November 2013 on Israel's participation in EU Horizon 2020 programme fully respects these EU requirements.

Most of the agreements concluded with Israel, as well as the 2005 EU-Israel Action Plan, are concluded in the framework of the Association Agreement. While the EU is not contemplating suspending the Association Agreement, it has indicated that an upgrade in the relations must be based on shared values and in the context of resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Moreover, the Council conclusions of Dec 2012 clearly stipulated that all agreements between the EU and Israel must unequivocably and explicitely 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.

([1]) http://www.eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140111_02_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001358/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Maltempo a Roma e disagi causati dalla cattiva manutenzione operata da ditte appaltatrici

Nelle scorse settimane e, in particolare, nella settimana compresa tra il 28 gennaio e il 4 febbraio, la città di Roma è stata colpita da un'eccezionale ondata di maltempo che ha causato ingenti danni alle abitazioni e alle attività commerciali in diversi quartieri della città. In particolare, nel quartiere di Prima Porta e nelle zone adiacenti si sono verificati allagamenti che hanno paralizzato la viabilità e invaso abitazioni e locali commerciali situati ai piani terreni e nei limitrofi locali sotterranei. Sarebbe stato possibile evitare tali disagi se gli impianti idrovori predisposti dall'Agenzia regionale per la difesa del suolo (Ardis) del Lazio avessero funzionato correttamente. In particolare, il mancato funzionamento a livello dell'interconnessione tra lo scolmatore della fognatura ACEA in via Frassineto e il locale impianto idrovoro dell'ARDIS è stato causato da un danneggiamento delle tubature di sfioro verificatosi durante i recenti lavori per realizzare una nuova camera di sollevamento dell'impianto idrovoro. A causa della difettosa realizzazione dell'opera, la tubatura di sfioro è stata danneggiata al punto di ridurre al minimo la portata scolmabile dell'impianto fognario comunale.

La nuova normativa europea in materia di appalti pubblici e concessioni prevede misure che tengono in considerazione gli aspetti ambientali e sociali e, in particolare, maggiore trasparenza nei subappalti e la preferenza a criteri di qualità nella selezione dei lavori o dei servizi oggetto di gara, rispetto al mero criterio del prezzo più basso.

Alla luce di tale nuova normativa, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quali iniziative può e deve assume l'Ardis del Lazio per accertare le responsabilità e sanzionare l'impresa cui sono stati appaltati i lavori?

2. Quali iniziative possono essere intraprese affinché la Regione Lazio risarcisca i cittadini e i commercianti che hanno subito danni a causa della riduzione della portata di sfioro del sistema idrovoro, che ha contribuito in modo decisivo a determinare gli allagamenti?

3. Quali iniziative possono essere assunte per sanzionare i casi di manutenzione negligente?

4. Quali iniziative possono essere messe in atto per rafforzare le modalità di controllo sulle imprese aggiudicatrici?

5. Sono state rispettate le disposizioni in materia di coperture assicurative per mancata, parziale o errata esecuzione dei lavori?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

Le direttive 2004/17/CE e 2004/18/CE stabiliscono le regole relative al coordinamento delle procedure di aggiudicazione degli appalti pubblici. Tali regole non disciplinano la fase successiva alla concessione, in particolare la fase esecutiva. I fatti descritti dall'onorevole deputato sembrano riguardare proprio la fase di esecuzione degli appalti pubblici, che non è disciplinata dalle direttive summenzionate. Tutte le questioni riguardanti la responsabilità dei subcontraenti, il risarcimento dei danni causati durante l'esecuzione dei contratti d'appalto pubblici, il monitoraggio dell'esecuzione dei contratti o la copertura assicurativa per l'esecuzione dei lavori, sono materie di competenza del diritto nazionale. Va nondimeno rilevato che un operatore economico che abbia commesso gravi illeciti professionali può essere escluso dalla partecipazione a futuri appalti pubblici, ai sensi dell'articolo 45 della direttiva 2004/18/CE.

Infine, le nuove direttive dell'UE in materia di appalti pubblici e concessioni, prevedono nuove norme in materia ambientale e sociale e per quanto riguarda i criteri per il subappalto e l'aggiudicazione, nonché la possibilità di escludere gli operatori economici che hanno dimostrato significative o persistenti carenze nell'esecuzione di una prescrizione fondamentale nel quadro di un precedente appalto pubblico. Le nuove direttive entrano in vigore dopo la loro pubblicazione nella Gazzetta ufficiale dell'Unione europea alla fine di marzo 2014; successivamente a tale data, gli Stati membri avranno 2 anni di tempo per recepirle.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001358/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Bad weather in Rome and problems caused by faulty maintenance work by contractors

In recent weeks — in particular the week between 28 January and 4 February — Rome has been hit by exceptionally bad weather which has caused extensive damage to housing and businesses in various parts of the city. In particular, flooding in the Prima Porta district and adjacent areas closed roads and caused damage to residential and commercial premises located at and below ground level. These problems could have been avoided if the pumping facilities put in place by the Lazio regional environment agency (Ardis) had been fully operational. One of the main problems was the disruption in the flow of water between the spillway for the drains maintained by the ACEA firm in via Frassineto and the Ardis pumping station caused by damage to the overflow pipes that occurred during works carried out recently on a new chamber for the pumping facilities. As a result of faulty workmanship, the overflow pipes were damaged, thus drastically reducing the capacity of the municipal drainage system.

The new EU rules on public procurement and concessions provide for measures to take account of environmental and social considerations and, in particular, make subcontracting arrangements more transparent and ensure that preference is given to quality criteria, as opposed to merely the lowest price, when selecting a contractor for works or services put out to tender.

1. What steps can and should Ardis Lazio take to establish where responsibility for the above problems lies and to hold the relevant contractor to account?

2. What steps can be taken to ensure that the Lazio regional authorities compensate private individuals and businesses who suffered losses as a result of the reduced capacity of the drainage system, which was a key cause of the flooding?

3. What penalties can be imposed for acts of negligence by maintenance firms?

4. What can be done to ensure closer scrutiny of firms that win public contracts?

5. Were the rules on insurance cover for improper or incomplete performance, or non-performance, of works complied with?

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

Directives 2004/17/EC and 2004/18/EC establish rules on the coordination of procedures for the award of public contracts. They do not cover the phase after award, especially the execution phase. The facts described by the Honourable Member seem to concern the execution phase of public contracts, therefore are not covered by the abovementioned directives. All issues related to the responsibility of subcontractors, request for damages caused during the execution of public contracts, monitoring the execution of contracts, or insurance cover for performance of the works, are a matter of national law. Nevertheless, it has to be noted that an economic operator that has been proven guilty of grave professional misconduct may be excluded from participation in future public contracts, according to Article 45 of Directive 2004/18/EC.

Finally, the new EU Directives on public procurement and concessions include new rules on environmental and social considerations, subcontracting and award criteria, and a possibility to exclude economic operators which have shown significant or persistent deficiencies in the performance of a substantive requirement under a prior public contract. The new directives will enter into force only after publication in the EU Official Journal at the end of March 2014; thereafter, Member States will have 2 years for their transposition.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001359/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(10 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Desigual persecución de la incitación al odio en el Estado español

Twitter ha sido desde su creación un medio de comunicación que ha permitido en todo el mundo expresar de forma directa y libre las ideas y reflexiones de sus usuarios. Aun así, en España han empezado a surgir interrogantes sobre cuáles son los límites de aquello que se puede expresar públicamente, especialmente cuando algunos comentarios tienen un carácter violento y amenazador haca ciertos sectores de la población. Por ello, la justicia española ha condenado a 1 año de prisión a una chica por glorificar grupos terroristas ([1]). Por otro lado, se hacen continuos comentarios profundamente violentos contra los catalanes (en la cuenta @apuntem se puede encontrar un recopilatorio exhaustivo). En algunos casos se llega a pedir la muerte y la cámara de gas para muchos catalanes: «Todos los independentistas merecéis la muerte! Cataluña es España y tu madre es una puta. #CamaraDeGas» ([2]).

Más comentarios en la misma línea se pueden encontrar en otros enlaces, en los que se llega a pedir puntualmente la muerte de los catalanes (y vascos) o de aquellos que tienen una cierta ideología independentista. La demanda de utilización de bombas contra ellos también ha sido notoria e impune ([3]). También es común que algunos individuos glorifiquen la dictadura franquista (responsable de decenas de miles de muertos) en Twitter.

Teniendo en cuenta la respuesta E-006770/2012 de la Comisión,

¿Cree la Comisión que la justicia española aplica los mismos estándares a las distintas muestras de odio que se realizan en Twitter?

¿No cree la Comisión que para evitar dobles raseros, debería publicar unas líneas maestras de cómo tratar el problema de la incitación a la violencia en las redes sociales?

¿Considera la Comisión que el Estado español cumple la Directiva 2010/13/UE en relación con todos los casos mencionados?

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

La Comisión reitera que compete a las autoridades nacionales investigar los casos individuales de supuesta incitación al odio. Con arreglo al artículo 9 de la Decisión Marco 2008/913/JAI, relativa a la lucha contra determinadas formas y manifestaciones de racismo y xenofobia, al establecer su competencia, los Estados miembros adoptarán las medidas necesarias para que esta incluya los casos en que la conducta se haya cometido por medio de un sistema de información y el autor o los materiales albergados en ese sistema se hallen en su territorio. En el informe de la Comisión sobre la aplicación de la Decisión Marco, publicado el 27 de enero de 2014, se hace referencia a los desafíos que plantean los actos de incitación al odio en línea. El programa «Una Internet más segura» cofinancia la creación de líneas directas (hotlines) en los Estados miembros, a través de las cuales se pueden denunciar contenidos ilícitos que, dependiendo de la legislación nacional, pueden incluir contenidos racistas o xenófobos.

Como se señaló en la respuesta a la pregunta E-006770/12, el artículo 6 de la Directiva 2010/13/UE (la «Directiva de servicios de comunicación audiovisual»), establece que los Estados miembros garantizarán, aplicando las medidas idóneas, que los servicios de comunicación audiovisual ofrecidos por prestadores bajo su jurisdicción no contengan incitaciones al odio por razón de raza, sexo, religión o nacionalidad. Compete en primer lugar a las autoridades nacionales evaluar la necesidad de intervenir de conformidad con el Derecho interno. Sobre la base de la información de que dispone la Comisión no es posible decidir si las normas de la Directiva de servicios de comunicación audiovisual serían aplicables a los casos a los que se hace referencia.

([1]) http://elpais.com/elpais/2014/02/04/inenglish/1391513715_931671.html
([2]) https://twitter.com/search?q=%23CamaraDeGas, https://twitter.com/jorgeatm/status/219842049166417920
([3]) https://twitter.com/apuntem

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001359/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Unequal persecution of the incitement to hatred in Spain

Since its creation, Twitter has been a form of communication that has enabled its users world-wide to express their ideas and thoughts freely and directly. Despite this, questions have started to be raised in Spain about the limits of what can be expressed publicly, especially when some comments express violence and threats towards certain sectors of the population. As a result of this, the Spanish judiciary has sentenced a girl to one year in prison for glorifying terrorist groups ([1]). In addition, extremely violent comments are constantly being made against Catalans (the account @apuntem contains an exhaustive list). Some users have even made death threats against large numbers of Catalans and suggested that they be sent to the gas chamber: 'All you separatists deserve to die! Catalonia is Spain and your mother's a whore. #GasChamber' ([2]).

More comments along these lines can be found via other links, which contain repeated death threats against Catalans (and Basques) and also those with a particular separatist ideology. There are also numerous calls for bombs to be used against them, which have gone unpunished ([3]). Some individuals also frequently glorify the Franco dictatorship (which was responsible for tens of thousands of deaths) on Twitter.

Taking into consideration the Commission's answer E-006770/2012:

Does the Commission believe that the Spanish judiciary is applying the same standards to the different displays of hatred made on Twitter?

Does the Commission not believe that, in order to avoid double standards, it should publish guidelines on how to treat the problem of the incitement to violence on social networks?

Does the Commission believe that Spain is complying with Directive 2010/13/EU vis-à-vis all of the abovementioned cases?

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

The Commission re-states that it is for national authorities to investigate individual cases of alleged hate speech. Article 9 of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia stipulates that Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that their jurisdiction extends to cases where the conduct is committed through an information system and the offender or materials hosted in that system are found within its territory. The Commission's report on the implementation of the framework Decision, published on 27 January 2014, makes reference to the challenges posed by online hate speech. The Safer Internet Programme co-funds hotlines in Member States. They deal with reports of illegal content and these, depending on national legislation, may cover racist or xenophobic content.

As outlined in reply to the Question E-006770/12, Article 6 of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive 2010/13/EU (AVMSD), provides that Member States shall ensure by appropriate means that audiovisual media services provided by media service providers under their jurisdiction do not contain any incitement to hatred based on race, sex, religion or nationality. It is primarily the competence of National authorities to examine the need to intervene on the basis of national law. On the basis of the information available to the Commission it is not possible to assess whether the rules of the AVMSD would apply to the content referred to.

([1]) http://elpais.com/elpais/2014/02/04/inenglish/1391513715_931671.html
([2]) https://twitter.com/search?q=%23CamaraDeGas, https://twitter.com/jorgeatm/status/219842049166417920
([3]) https://twitter.com/apuntem

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001360/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ενεργοποίηση του Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης για τους σεισμούς στην Κεφαλονιά

Στις 26.1.2014, ισχυρός σεισμός έντασης 5,9 βαθμών της κλίμακας Ρίχτερ έπληξε το νησί της Κεφαλονιάς. Ακολούθησαν δεκάδες αισθητοί μετασεισμοί και, στις 3.2.2014, νέος μεγάλος σεισμός έντασης 6,1 βαθμών Ρίχτερ χτύπησε το νησί, το οποίο στις 4.2.2014, κηρύχθηκε σεισμόπληκτο. Η κατάσταση στην Κεφαλονιά είναι πραγματικά πολύ δύσκολη. Χιλιάδες κάτοικοι κοιμούνται σε πλοία, αντίσκηνα, αυτοκίνητα, ενώ πολλοί έχουν εγκαταλείψει το νησί, καθώς τα σπίτια τους δεν είναι πλέον κατοικήσιμα. Επιπλέον, τεράστιας έκτασης ζημιές έχουν συμβεί σε υποδομές, όπως το οδικό δίκτυο, το δίκτυο ύδρευσης, τα λιμάνια, τα νοσοκομεία, κ.λπ. Όπως γίνεται αντιληπτό, η ζωή του νησιού έχει νεκρώσει, ενώ θεωρείται δεδομένο ότι οι συνέπειες θα είναι μακροχρόνιες, καθώς η οικονομία του νησιού βασίζεται σε μεγάλο βαθμό στον τουρισμό.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ενημερωθεί από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση για την κατάσταση στην Κεφαλονιά; Παρακολουθεί το θέμα; Για την ενίσχυση του συγκεκριμένου νησιού που έχει πληγεί από τους καταστροφικούς σεισμούς και, με βάση τον Κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 2012/2002 για την ίδρυση του Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης, είναι απαραίτητη προϋπόθεση να υπάρχουν σημαντικές μακροχρόνιες επιπτώσεις στην πλειονότητα του πληθυσμού της Περιφέρειας (Ιονίων Νήσων);

2. Έχει υποβάλει αίτηση η ελληνική κυβέρνηση για οικονομική ενίσχυση από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Αλληλεγγύης βάσει του Κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 2012/2002; Αν ναι, ποιο το ποσό της βοήθειας που αιτείται;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Απριλίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει την κατάσταση στην Κεφαλονιά και συνεχίζει να παρακολουθεί από κοντά την κατάσταση. Κατά την επίσκεψή του στην Αθήνα στις αρχές Φεβρουαρίου, ο επίτροπος Hahn συναντήθηκε με τον αντιπρόεδρο της κυβέρνησης κ. Ευάγγελο Βενιζέλο προκειμένου να συζητήσουν την κατάσταση.

Η κινητοποίηση του Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης της ΕΕ εξαρτάται κατά κύριο λόγο από την υποβολή σχετικής αίτησης από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση εντός 10 εβδομάδων από την ημερομηνία της πρώτης ζημίας, δηλαδή έως τις αρχές Απριλίου. Η αίτηση αυτή θα πρέπει να βασίζεται στην εκτίμηση των ζημιών και των συνεπειών τους για τις συνθήκες διαβίωσης και την οικονομία. Για το 2014, το κατώτατο όριο που ισχύει για την Ελλάδα προκειμένου να υπάρξει κινητοποίηση του Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης της ΕΕ είναι άμεσες ζημίες που υπερβαίνουν τα 1,168 δισ. ευρώ (0,6% του ακαθάριστου εθνικού εισοδήματος). Κάτω από αυτό το όριο, το Ταμείο μπορεί να κινητοποιηθεί μόνο με βάση το κριτήριο των εξαιρετικών περιπτώσεων τοπικών καταστροφών. Για να γίνει αυτό, πρέπει να προσκομιστούν στοιχεία ότι η καταστροφή έχει πλήξει το μεγαλύτερο μέρος του πληθυσμού στη συγκεκριμένη περιφέρεια, και ότι υπάρχουν σοβαρές και μακροχρόνιες επιπτώσεις για τις συνθήκες διαβίωσης και για την οικονομική σταθερότητα της περιφέρειας.

Μετά την υποβολή της αίτησης, η Επιτροπή θα την αξιολογήσει το συντομότερο και, εφόσον πληρούνται οι σχετικοί όροι, θα προτείνει ένα ποσό ενίσχυσης προς έγκριση στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και το Συμβούλιο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001360/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Mobilisation of the Solidarity Fund to address the situation caused by the earthquakes in Kefalonia

On 26 January 2014, a powerful earthquake measuring 5.9 on the Richter scale struck the island of Kefalonia. This was followed by dozens of perceptible aftershocks and, on 3 February 2014, a new major earthquake measuring 6.1 on the Richter scale struck the island, which on 4 February 2014 was officially declared as having been struck by an earthquake. The situation in Kefalonia is very difficult indeed. Thousands of people are sleeping on board ships and in tents and cars, and many have left the island, as their homes are no longer habitable. In addition, vast amounts of damage have occurred to infrastructure, such as roads, water supply, ports, hospitals, etc. Understandably, life on the island has come to standstill, and it is assumed that the effects will be long-lasting, as the island's economy relies heavily on tourism.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Has it been informed by the Greek Government of the situation in Kefalonia? Is it monitoring the situation? In order to aid this island that has been struck by devastating earthquakes and, on the basis of Council Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 establishing the European Union Solidarity Fund, is it an essential condition that it should have a significant long-term impact on the majority of the population of the Region (Ionian Islands)?

2. Has the Greek Government applied for financial assistance from the European Solidarity Fund on the basis of Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002? If so, what amount of assistance is being requested?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation in Kefalonia and is continuing to monitor it closely. Commissioner Hahn, while visiting Athens in early February, met with the Vice-President of the Greek Government, Evangelos Venizelos, to discuss the situation.

The mobilisation of the EU Solidarity Fund depends in the first instance on an application to be submitted by the Greek national government within 10 weeks of the date of the first damage, i.e. by the beginning of April. Any application should be based on the assessment of the damage and its consequences for living conditions and the economy. In 2014, the threshold applicable to Greece for mobilising the EU Solidarity Fund is direct damage in excess of EUR 1.168 billion (0.6% of gross national income). Below that threshold, the Fund can only be mobilised under the so-called exceptional regional disaster criterion. This requires evidence to be provided that the disaster has affected the major part of the population in the region concerned, and that there are lasting and serious repercussions for the living conditions and the economic stability of the region.

Once an application is submitted, the Commission will assess it as quickly as possible and, if the conditions are found to be met, propose an amount of aid for the approval of the European Parliament and the Council.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-001361/14
za Komisijo
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(10. februar 2014)

Zadeva: Urejanje prostih privezov na ribiškem pristanišču in spodbude za mlade ribiče

Slovenske obalne občine (Koper, Izola, Piran), v katerih se nahajajo ribiška pristanišča, ki so bila obnovljena s sredstvi Evropskega sklada za ribištvo (ESR), so me opozorile na težavo, s katero se soočajo, in sicer na prepoved oddaje prostih privezov na obnovljenem ribiškem pristanišču tistim subjektom, ki se ne ukvarjajo izključno z ribištvom. Omenjene občine, ki so prejele sredstva iz ukrepa „Ribiška pristanišča, mesta iztovora in zavetja“, so zavezane upoštevati določila 64. člena Uredbe o izvajanju Operativnega programa za razvoj ribištva v Republiki Sloveniji 2007–2013, ki pravi, da mora naložbena dejavnost, za katero upravičenec prejme sredstva v okviru ukrepa „Ribiška pristanišča, mesto iztovora in zavetja“, opravljati še vsaj naslednjih deset let po zadnjem izplačilu. Upravičenec v tem obdobju ne sme uvajati bistvenih sprememb oziroma odtujiti naložbe ter naložbe ne sme uporabljati v nasprotju z namenom dodeljenih sredstev, sicer mora vsa že pridobljena sredstva vrniti v proračun Republike Slovenije skupaj z zakonitimi zamudnimi obrestmi. Glede na navedeno in na podlagi določila 39. člena Uredbe Sveta (ES) št. 1198/2006 o Evropskem skladu za ribištvo izhaja, da se mora ribiško pristanišče, katerega obnova je bila sofinancirana iz ESR, uporabljati zgolj za namene ribičev in ribogojcev.

Zaradi drugih ukrepov iz ESR, ki so spodbujala prestrukturiranje ribičev v druge dejavnosti, je veliko slovenskih ribičev dalo v razrez svojo ribiško ladjo in tako prenehalo z izključno ribiško dejavnost ter s pomočjo sredstev EU kupilo ladje, ki so namenjene na primer dopolnilni dejavnosti turističnega prevoza potnikov, ali ekološka plovila za pomoč v primeru nesreč na morju. Ti subjekti, ki se po novem ne ukvarjajo izključno z ribištvom, temveč tudi z dopolnilno dejavnostjo, tako nimajo več možnosti pridobiti priveza na obnovljenem ribiškem pristanišču. Komisijo zato sprašujem, ali bo sprejela nova določila, s katerimi bo uredila nastalo težavo ter tako omogočila, da občine dodelijo prosto mesto za privez ladje na ribiškem pristanišču, sofinanciranem z sredstvi ESR, tudi tistim subjektom, ki se ukvarjajo z ribištvom le delno?

Poleg tega je Slovenija med pogajanji o novem Evropskem pomorskem in ribiškem skladu v obdobju 2014–2020 jasno izpostavila specifičnost našega sektorja ribištva, kjer nam je v zadnjih 20 letih celoten ulov padel s 6 tisoč ton na 317 ton, ter tako danes govorimo le še o vzdrževanju tradicije večnamenske funkcije slovenskega ribištva. Ker je še kako pomembno, da tradicija ribištva ostane privlačna tudi za mlade in nove ribiče, me zanima, katere podporne mehanizme in finančne spodbude bo Komisija namenila za mlade ribiče in pripravnike, ki bi si želeli pridobiti izkušnje z ribiških ladij?

Odgovor gospe Damanaki v imenu Komisije
(7. april 2014)

Evropski sklad za ribištvo (v nadaljnjem besedilu: ESR) zagotavlja podporo ribiškim pristaniščem za izboljšanje storitev, ki jih ta nudijo ribičem in ribogojcem.

V skladu z načelom deljenega upravljanja je organ upravljanja odgovoren predvsem za izvajanje operativnega programa ESR in ugotavljanje, ali so nastali odhodki upravičeni v okviru ESR.

Slovenski organ upravljanja je odgovoren za zagotavljanje skladnosti z veljavnimi pravili, vključno z morebitnimi nacionalnimi pravili, zlasti da projekt ne doživi pomembnega preoblikovanja, ki vpliva na njegovo naravo ali njegove pogoje izvajanja v 5 letih od odločitve o financiranju (člen 56(1)(a) Uredbe št. 1198/2006). Organ upravljanja je odgovoren za oceno, ali je kakršna koli sprememba prvotnega projekta pomembna in bistveno spreminja prvotne cilje projekta. V tem primeru mora upravljalni organ izvesti potrebne finančne popravke.

Glede drugega vprašanja pa nedavni politični dogovor o osnutku uredbe o Evropskem skladu za pomorstvo in ribištvo predvideva številne ukrepe za podporo mladih ribičev. Evropski sklad za pomorstvo in ribištvo zlasti predvideva usposabljanje mladih na krovu manjših ribiških plovil, ki so v lasti poklicnega ribiča, pa tudi podporo za ustanovitev podjetja mladih ribičev, kot je nakup prvega ribiškega plovila.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001361/14
to the Commission
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Free berths in fishing ports and incentives for young fishermen

Slovenia's coastal municipalities (Koper, Izola and Piran) with fishing ports that have been modernised using funding from the European Fisheries Fund (EFR) have informed me that they are having problems because of a ban on leasing free berths in these fishing ports to entities not involved exclusively in fishing. These municipalities, which received funding under the 'Fishing ports, landing sites and shelters' measure, were required to comply with the provisions of Article 64 of the regulation on the Implementation of the Operational Programme for Fisheries Development in the Republic of Slovenia 2007-2013, which provides that an investment activity for which a beneficiary receives funding under the 'Fishing ports, landing sites and shelters' measure must continue for at least 10 years after the final payment. During this period the beneficiary may not make substantial changes to or sell off the investments and may not use the investment for a purpose other than that for which the funds were allocated, otherwise all the funds received will have to be returned to the budget of the Republic of Slovenia, plus statutory interest. Consequently, and pursuant to Article 39 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 on the European Fisheries Fund, the fishing ports whose modernisation was co-financed by the EFF can only be used for fishing and fish-farming purposes.

As a result of other measures under the EFF which encouraged fishermen to reskill and diversify into other activities, a lot of fishermen scrapped their boats and stopped fishing as an exclusive activity. Then with EU funds they bought boats intended, for example, to transport tourists as a supplementary activity, or environmental vessels to assist in the event of accidents at sea. These people, who now find themselves not exclusively involved in fishing but also carrying out additional activities, thus no longer have the possibility of obtaining a berth in the modernised fishing ports. Will the Commission therefore adopt new rules to address this problem so as to allow the municipalities to allocate berths in fishing ports co-financed with EFF funds also to entities only partly engaged in fishing?

Furthermore, during the negotiations on the new European Maritime and Fisheries Fund for the period 2014-2020, Slovenia clearly highlighted the specific situation of its fisheries sector, in which over the last 20 years the total catch has fallen from 6 000 tons to 317 tons, so that today we are talking only about maintaining the traditional multipurpose function of Slovenian fisheries. Given the importance of ensuring that the tradition of fishing remains attractive to young and new fishermen, I would like to ask what support mechanisms and financial incentives the Commission will provide for young fishermen and apprentices wishing to gain experience of fishing boats?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The European Fisheries Fund (EFF) provides support to fishing ports to help improve the services offered to both fishermen and aquaculture producers using the ports.

In line with the principle of shared management, the Managing Authority is primarily responsible for implementing the EFF operational programme and determining whether the expenditure incurred is eligible under the EFF.

The Slovenian Managing Authority is responsible for ensuring compliance with the applicable rules, including any national rules, in particular that the project does not undergo a substantial modification affecting its nature or its implementation conditions within 5 years of the financing decision (Article 56 (1) (a) of Regulation 1198/2006). The Managing Authority is responsible for assessing whether any modification made to the original project is substantial and significantly modifies the original objectives of the project. If this is the case, then the Managing Authority should make the necessary financial corrections.

With regards to the second question, the recent political agreement on the draft regulation of the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) foresees a number of measures to support young fishermen. In particular, the EMFF foresees training of young persons on board of small scale fishing vessel owned by a professional fisherman as well as support for business start-ups for young fishermen, such as the purchase of their first fishing vessel.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-001362/14
za Komisijo
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(10. februar 2014)

Zadeva: Podporni mehanizmi za mlade podjetnike

V Sloveniji že peto leto poteka projekt podjetniškega inkubatorja za mlade v starosti 15–19 let pod imenom Ustvarjalnik. Mladi v okviru tega projekta pod okriljem mentorjev prostovoljcev razvijajo podjetniški način razmišljanja s končnim ciljem uresničiti lastno poslovno zamisel. V projektu je doslej sodelovalo več kot 2200 dijakov, ki so na koncu šolskega leta na trgu predstavili rezultate svoje podjetniške ideje. Veliko mladih, ki je sodelovalo v projektu Ustvarjalnik, je dejansko ustanovilo *start-up* podjetja; nekatera celo z nezanemarljivim odzivom na mednarodnem trgu.

Aktivnosti Ustvarjalnika so vezane zgolj na podporo pri samih začetkih začrtanja poslovne poti. Sama uresničitev poslovne zamisli in ustanovitev podjetja pa za uspešno nadaljevanje poslovne poti mladih ni dovolj, saj ti mladi nujno potrebujejo dodatno finančno, infrastrukturno, profesionalno in institucionalno podporo, da bi njihova *start-up* podjetja postala stabilna in trajnostna ter da bi si tako na dolgi rok zagotovili samozaposlitev. Glede na visok odstotek brezposelnih mladih v Sloveniji bi morala EU mladim, ki se podajajo v podjetništvo s samozaposlitvijo, na začetkih pomagati z nekaterimi sistemskimi in finančnimi spodbudami, s katerimi bi zgradili trdne temelje podjetja, ter jim omogočiti plačevanje nižjih davkov in prispevkov. Nemogoče je namreč za številne mlade, da ob začetku svojega podjetniškega delovanja zberejo dovolj sredstev, da bi pokrili vse dajatve in uspešno poslovali na trgu. Mnogi niso zmožni pokrivati tako visokih davkov in prispevkov, zato se zatekajo k „delu na črno“. Zato bi bilo po mojem mnenju potrebno uvesti neki minimalni pavšal, ki bi ga lahko mladi na začetku podjetniške poti brez težav plačevali vse dotlej, ko se podjetje na trgu uveljavi in dovolj uspešno posluje. Le na tak način bi mlade spodbudili, da se odločijo za podjetništvo in ne obupajo že ob samih začetkih poslovanja. Polega tega bi EU morala mladim podjetnikom zagotoviti profesionalno in infrastrukturno podporo v obliki podjetniških inkubatorjev, v katerih bi se lahko nadaljnje razvijali in od strokovnjakov pridobivali nasvete ter vse potrebne informacije za obstoj na trgu in uspešno poslovanje.

Komisijo zato sprašujem:

1. Ali razmišlja, da bi mladim ob ustanovitvi podjetja pomagala z davčnimi olajšavami oziroma z nižjim plačilom prispevkov?

2. Ali načrtuje kakršenkoli program, ki bi mladim podjetnikom omogočal finančne spodbude za lažji preboj na trg?

3. Ali razmišlja o zakonski podlagi, s katero bi mladi podjetniki lažje poslovali?

4. Ali predvideva sofinanciranje določenih subjektov, ki bi mladim podjetnikom nudili svetovanja in pomoč za ohranitev njihovega *start-up* podjetja na trgu?

Odgovor g. Antonia Tajanija v imenu Komisije
(9. april 2014)

Evropski socialni sklad podpira mnoge ukrepe, ki lahko koristijo mladim, na primer samozaposlovanje, podjetništvo, ustanavljanje podjetij ter ukrepe za podporo podjetjem in podjetnikom. Mladi iz držav članic, ki so upravičene do pobude za zaposlovanje mladih, ki niso zaposleni, se ne šolajo ali usposabljajo, so lahko na podlagi teh ukrepov od 1. septembra 2013 upravičeni do višjih ravni sofinanciranja in upravičenosti izdatkov. Evropski sklad za regionalni razvoj (ESRR) mladim podjetnikom s podjetniškimi inkubatorji zagotavlja podporne storitve za podjetja. Sofinancirani finančni instrumenti spodbujajo financiranje z mikrokrediti in subvencioniranimi obrestnimi merami. Skupna kmetijska politika ([1]) zagotavlja podporo mladim kmetom, ki začenjajo z izvajanjem dejavnosti, in mladim podjetnikom, ki ustanavljajo ali razvijajo nekmetijska podjetja na podeželskih območjih, za skupne projekte, usposabljanje in svetovanje. Podobno kot pri ESRR bi sofinancirane finančne instrumente lahko uporabile tudi države članice, vrste podpore pa bi bile lahko različne, vključno s subvencioniranimi obrestnimi merami.

Poleg tega Akcijski načrt za podjetništvo 2020 ([2]) vsebuje preko 20 ukrepov v podporo podjetnikom in podjetništvu ter vse ravni evropske uprave poziva k ukrepanju. Načrt poudarja pomembnost integrirane podpore, vključno z informiranjem in dostopom do financiranja; ne predvideva pa nove zakonodajne podlage. Države članice poziva, naj „okolja nacionalne davčne uprave naredijo bolj prijazna podjetjem v zgodnji fazi delovanja“ in „razmislijo o možnosti, da lahko lastniki novih podjetij za omejeno obdobje zaprosijo za prilagoditev časovnih razporedov plačil socialnih prispevkov, ki temelji na posebnem položaju podjetja in utemeljenih dokazilih“.

([1]) Preko Evropskega kmetijskega sklada za razvoj podeželja in Evropskega kmetijskega jamstvenega sklada.
([2]) Sporočilo Komisije Evropskemu parlamentu, Svetu, Evropskemu ekonomsko-socialnemu odboru in Odboru regij „Akcijski načrt za podjetništvo 2020 – Oživitev podjetniškega duha v Evropi“, COM(2012) 795 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001362/14
to the Commission
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Support mechanisms for young entrepreneurs

In Slovenia a business incubator project for young people aged 15 to 19, called *Ustvarjalnik*, is in its fifth year. Under the guidance of volunteer mentors, the young people involved in the project develop an entrepreneurial way of thinking, with the ultimate goal of realising their own business ideas. So far over 2 200 students have taken part in the project, presenting the results of their business ideas to the market at the end of the school year. A lot of the young people who have taken part in the *Ustvarjalnik* project have actually gone on to establish their own start-ups, some of which have attracted international attention.

The activities undertaken through the *Ustvarjalnik* project are about providing support for the embryonic stages of a business idea. But for these young people to successfully continue in business it is not sufficient simply to put the business idea into practice and set up a company, since they urgently need additional financial, infrastructural, professional and institutional support in order for their start-up company to become stable and sustainable and thus provide a basis for self-employment in the long run. Given the high rate of youth unemployment in Slovenia, the EU should provide system support and financial incentives to young people venturing into business on a self-employment basis so that they can build solid foundations for their companies, and allow them to pay reduced taxes and contributions. For young people it is impossible, for example, when they first go into business to find sufficient funds to pay all the necessary charges and operate successfully. Many are unable to pay such high taxes and contributions and therefore move into the black market. I believe, therefore, that we need to introduce a minimum fixed charge which young entrepreneurs could pay without difficulty while the company is finding its feet in the marketplace and is operating sufficiently successfully. This is the only way to encourage young people to become entrepreneurs and not to give up at the very beginning. In addition, the EU should provide young entrepreneurs with professional and infrastructural support in the form of business incubators where they could further their development and obtain advice from experts, as well as all the information they need to operate successfully.

In view of the above, I would like to ask the Commission:

1. Is it considering providing help to young people who start up a company by giving them tax breaks or letting them pay lower contributions?

2. Is it planning to introduce any programmes to provide young entrepreneurs with financial incentives to make market penetration easier?

3. Is it considering a legislative basis to help young entrepreneurs?

4. Does it intend to provide co-funding for organisations which offer young entrepreneurs advice and assistance in keeping their start-up companies operational?

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

The European Social Fund supports many measures that can benefit young people, such as self-employment, entrepreneurship, business creation, enterprises and entrepreneurs. For young people not in employment, education or training in Member States eligible for the Youth Employment Initiative, these measures may benefit from higher co-financing rates and eligibility of expenditure as from 1 September 2013. The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) provides young entrepreneurs via business incubators with business support. Co-funded financial instruments facilitate financing via microcredits and interest rate subsidies. The Common Agricultural Policy ([1]) provides support to young farmers' setting up, to young entrepreneurs starting up or developing non-agricultural businesses in rural areas, for collaborative projects, training and advice. Similar to the ERDF, co-funded financial instruments could also be utilised by Member States and support could be given in various forms, including interest rate subsidies.

([1]) Through the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Agricultural Guidance Fund.

Furthermore, under the Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan ([2]), over 20 actions are considered in favour of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship and a call to action was issued to all levels of administration in Europe. The Plan stresses the importance of integrated support including information and access to finance; it does not contemplate any new legislative basis. It invites Member States to 'make the national tax environments more favourable to early stage business' and to 'consider the option for owners of new enterprises to request possible adjustments of payment schedules for social contributions for a limited time and based on the specific situation of the firm and sound justifications'.

([2]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Entrepreneurship 2020 action plan Reigniting the entrepreneurial spirit in Europe COM(2012) 795 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001363/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Lavoratori minorenni in Turchia

Alcuni studi condotti da diversi enti turchi in relazione alla violazione dei diritti dei minori rilevano quanto segue:

— sulla base delle ricerche effettuate dal parlamento per la salute dei lavoratori e per la sicurezza sul lavoro di Istanbul (İstanbul İşçi Sağlığı Ve İş Güvenliği Meclisi), solo nel 2013 sono morti 55 lavoratori minorenni a causa di incidenti avvenuti sul luogo di lavoro;

— secondo l'Istituto nazionale di statistica (Türkiye Istatistik Kurumu), il 45 % dei lavoratori stagionali impiegati nel campo agricolo sono minorenni;

— secondo l'Istituto di ricerca del DISK (sindacato confederale dei lavoratori rivoluzionari), nel 1999 in Turchia si contavano 4 447 000 lavoratori minorenni, nel 2012 si arrivava a 7 503 000 e nel 2013 a 8 397 000.

Come intende la Commissione intervenire affinché in Turchia siano tutelati i diritti dei minori anche sulla base della Convenzione internazionale sui diritti dell'infanzia del 1989?

Conferma la Commissione che il governo turco ha emanato una legge secondo la quale i minorenni possono essere impiegati per lavori pesanti e pericolosi?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001365/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Necessità di un intervento dell'UE per quanto riguarda i matrimoni dei minori in Turchia

A seguito delle morte di una baby-sposa di 14 anni (data in moglie a 11, ma deceduta dopo il parto), una ONG che si occupa di diritti delle donne ha rivelato che in Turchia circa 4 711 donne si sono sposate a 16/17 anni, 2 217 fra i 13 e i 15, e 54 sotto i 12 anni.

Il fenomeno è diffuso nelle aree rurali delle Turchia, dove le unioni sono spesso di convenienza e volte a rafforzare la posizione di un clan rispetto a un altro. L'intervento a suo tempo attuato del governo di Erdogan, che aveva deciso di innalzare l'età minima per il matrimonio in modo da limitare il fenomeno delle spose bambine, non ha risolto il problema, anche a causa dell'omertà, della mancanza di controlli e dell'impostazione culturale della popolazione.

1. Come intende intervenire la Commissione per risolvere il problema descritto, anche in nome della tutela dei diritti dei minori e delle donne?

2. Non ritiene la Commissione che l'Ufficio del difensore civico e l'Ente nazionale per i diritti umani (istituzioni già operative in Turchia, come si evince dal COM(2013) 0700 del 16.10.2013) debbano intervenire energicamente per arginare il fenomeno sopra descritto?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001372/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Detenuti minorenni in Turchia

Alcuni studi condotti da diversi enti turchi in relazione alla violazione dei diritti dei minori rilevano quanto segue:

— in base alla ricerca condotta dalla sezione di Diyarbakir dell'Associazione per i diritti umani (IHD), dal 1988 fino ad oggi in Turchia sono morti 569 bambini per l'intervento diretto o indiretto della polizia e dei soldati oppure a causa delle mine antiuomo;

— l'IHD ha rilevato che in Turchia sono più di 2.000 i detenuti minorenni finiti in carcere durante le manifestazioni di protesta.

La Commissione come intende intervenire affinché in Turchia siano tutelati i diritti dei minori anche sulla base della Convenzione internazionale sui diritti dell'infanzia del 1989?

Afferma che il governo turco ha emanato una legge secondo la quale i minorenni possono essere impiegati per lavori pesanti e pericolosi?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001648/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Istruzione dei bambini in Turchia

In Turchia la percentuale di iscrizione agli istituti prescolari dei bambini fra gli 0 e i 5 anni è assolutamente bassa; inoltre non ci sono progressi nella costituzione di infrastrutture di custodia dei bambini e di istruzione prescolare.

La Commissione può indicare la percentuale dei bambini attualmente iscritti all'istruzione prescolare?

La Commissione non ritiene che i servizi per l'infanzia debbano avere prezzi accessibili a tutti per favorire l'iscrizione?

Il governo turco era stato sollecitato a modificare la normativa sui centri per la custodia dei bambini, la quale obbligava le sedi di lavoro dove sono impiegate più di 150 donne a prevedere asili gratuiti per i bambini.

La Commissione sa se questa modifica è stata apportata e, in caso positivo, con quali conseguenze?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

La Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla relazione 2013 sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia ([1]), in particolare per quanto riguarda i settori interessati dal capitolo 19 (politica sociale e occupazione). Nella relazione si osserva che, per quanto riguarda i bambini, sono necessari ulteriori sforzi per migliorare l'accesso all'istruzione e ai servizi sanitari, lottare contro il lavoro minorile e i matrimoni precoci nonché affrontare le questioni in materia di giustizia minorile.

A titolo di esempio, nel 2013 nella fascia di età compresa fra 4 e 5 anni, il tasso di iscrizione nelle strutture educative prescolari si attestava intorno al 44 %. La carenza di strutture abbordabili di assistenza all'infanzia per le donne che lavorano si conferma un problema per l'occupazione femminile. A norma della legislazione vigente, il datore di lavoro è tenuto a fornire i servizi di assistenza all'infanzia o ad aiutare l'accesso ad analoghi servizi abbordabili, affinché le donne possano conciliare vita professionale e familiare, solo se impiega oltre 150 donne.

I minori di età compresa fra 16 e 18 anni possono lavorare solo a condizioni specifiche. Al momento la Commissione non dispone di informazioni in merito a forme legali di lavoro minorile in settori pericolosi.

La Turchia, in qualità di Stato candidato all'adesione all'Unione europea, deve garantire sia da un punto di vista legislativo che pratico, i diritti fondamentali ai sensi della convenzione europea sui diritti dell'uomo e della giurisprudenza della Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo.

La Commissione segue da vicino le tematiche dei diritti dei minori e della parità dei sessi e fornisce una sua analisi, in particolare nella relazione annuale sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia. La Commissione continuerà a monitorare tali questioni per affrontarle al momento opportuno con le autorità turche.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/brochures/turkey_2013.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001363/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Child workers in Turkey

A number of studies conducted by various Turkish organisations on the violation of children's rights have produced the following findings:

— on the basis of research carried out by the İstanbul İşçi Sağlığı Ve İş Güvenliği Meclisi (workers' health and safety assembly in Istanbul), 55 child workers died in accidents at the workplace in 2013 alone ;

— according to the National Statistics Institute (Türkiye Istatistik Kurumu), 45% of seasonal workers employed in agriculture are minors;

— according to research conducted by the Research Institute of the Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey (DISK), while there were 4 447 000 child workers in Turkey in 1999, in 2012 and 2013 this figure had risen to 7 503 000 and 8 397 000, respectively.

How will the Commission intervene to ensure that minors' rights in Turkey are protected, in particular on the basis of the 1989 International Convention on the Rights of the Child?

Can it confirm that the Turkish government has promulgated a law that minors may be used for difficult and dangerous work?

Question for written answer E-001365/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Need for EU action regarding child marriages in Turkey

Following the death of a 14-year-old child bride (who was given in marriage at 11, but died after giving birth), an NGO that deals with women's rights has revealed that in Turkey approximately 4 711 women were married at 16 or 17 years of age, 2 217 between the ages 13 and 15, and 54 under the age of 12.

The phenomenon is widespread in rural areas of Turkey, where marriages of convenience are common and are intended to strengthen the position of one clan against another. The action taken by the Erdoğan government, which had decided to raise the minimum age for marriage in order to curb the phenomenon of child brides, has not solved the problem, partly because of a conspiracy of silence, a lack of controls and the cultural background of the population.

1. How does the Commission intend to solve the problem described above, in particular in order to protect the rights of children and women?

2. Does the Commission agree that the office of the ombudsman and the national human rights organisation (institutions that already operate in Turkey, as evidenced by COM(2013) 0700 of 16/10/2013), must take strong action to curb this phenomenon?

Question for written answer E-001372/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Children detained in Turkey

A number of studies conducted by various Turkish organisations on breaches of the rights of children have revealed the following:

— according to research carried out by the Diyarbakir branch of the Turkish Human Rights Association (IHD), 569 children have died in Turkey since 1988 as a result of direct or indirect action on the part of police and soldiers or due to antipersonnel mines;

— the IHD found that more than 2 000 children were imprisoned in Turkey during the protest demonstrations.

How does the Commission intend to intervene to ensure that the rights of children are protected in Turkey in consideration of the 1989 International Convention on the Rights of the Child?

Can the Commission confirm that the Turkish Government has passed a law to the effect that children can be used for heavy and dangerous work?

Question for written answer E-001648/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Education of children in Turkey

In Turkey the percentage of children aged between 0 and 5 years old enrolled in nursery schools is extremely low. Nor has any progress been made in setting up facilities for childcare and early years education.

Could the Commission say what percentage of children are currently enrolled for early years education?

Would the Commission not agree that to encourage enrolment, prices for children's facilities should be affordable for all?

The Turkish Government was urged to amend its legislation on childcare centres which stipulated that workplaces employing more than 150 women had to provide free childcare.

Does the Commission know whether this law has indeed been amended and if so, what has been the outcome?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the 2013 Progress Report on Turkey ([1]), particularly on areas covered by Chapter 19 Social Policy and Employment. The report noted that as regards children, greater efforts were needed to improve access to education and health services, combat child labour and early marriage, and address issues related to juvenile justice.

In particular, in 2013, enrolment rates in pre-school education institutions were set around 44% among 4 and 5 year olds. The lack of affordable childcare facilities for working women remained an issue for female unemployment. Under current legislation, employers are obliged to provide childcare services or to help improve access to affordable care services to reconcile work and family life only if they employ 150 women or more.

Minors from 16 to 18 are entitled to work only under specific conditions. The Commission has no information at this point that children may legally be employed for hazardous work.

Turkey, as a candidate country for accession to the EU, needs to guarantee in law and practice fundamental rights according to the European Convention on Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights.

The Commission monitors children' rights and gender equality issues closely and provides its analysis in particular in the context of the yearly Progress Reports on Turkey. The Commission will keep monitoring these issues and raise them with the Turkish authorities on all appropriate occasions.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/brochures/turkey_2013.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001364/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Uso di codici segreti per schedare i cittadini non musulmani in Turchia

Da alcune ricerche è emerso che la Turchia utilizza codici segreti per schedare i cittadini non musulmani: ad esempio i greci sono indicati con il codice 1, gli armeni con il 2, gli ebrei con il 3.

Come giudica la Commissione la schedatura dei cittadini non musulmani rispetto all'acquis comunitario e ai criteri di Copenaghen?

È la Commissione già intervenuta presso il governo turco sulla questione? In caso contrario, quali provvedimenti intende adottare?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(11 aprile 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alle risposte fornite alle interrogazioni scritte E-013925/2013 e E-009440/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001364/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Use of secret codes to record the names of non-Muslims in Turkey

Some studies have shown that Turkey uses secret codes to record the names of non-Muslim citizens: for example, Greeks are indicated by the code 1, Armenians by the code 2 and Jews by the code 3.

How does the Commission view the registration of non-Muslim citizens in the light of the *acquis communautaire* and the Copenhagen criteria?

Has the Commission already raised this matter with the Turkish Government? If not, what measures will it take?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-013925/2013 and E-009440/2013 ([1]).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001366/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Turchia e questione armena

Durante una recente visita a Erevan (capitale dell'Armenia), il ministro degli Esteri turco ha definito «atto disumano» la deportazione degli armeni avvenuta nel 1915.

Secondo alcuni, il premier turco Erdogan potrebbe lanciare segnali di disgelo nei confronti dell'Armenia entro il 2015, primo centenario del genocidio.

Può la Commissione confermare tale ipotesi?

Nel 2009 Turchia e Armenia avevano firmato un accordo di normalizzazione che prevedeva relazioni diplomatiche e l'apertura delle frontiere tra i due paesi. Tale accordo, però, non è mai entrato in vigore.

Intende la Commissione intervenire affinché tale accordo sia rispettato e inizi a essere applicato?

Può la Commissione illustrare dettagliatamente lo status quo dei rapporti fra la Turchia e l'Armenia nonché l'attuale ruolo dell'UE?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

La firma dei protocolli bilaterali del 2009 ha segnato una svolta importante nella normalizzazione delle relazioni tra Turchia e Armenia. L'UE continua a sostenere con vigore questo processo, incoraggiando costantemente entrambi i paesi a riprendere il dialogo e ad adoperarsi con impegno senza porre condizioni preliminari. Qualsiasi nuovo passo o sforzo della Turchia e dell'Armenia a tal fine sarebbe estremamente positivo.

Dal canto suo, l'UE ha varato un progetto di 2 milioni di EUR per sostenere gli sforzi della società civile finalizzati alla normalizzazione delle relazioni tra Armenia e Turchia intensificando i contatti fra le persone, rafforzando i legami economici e commerciali, promuovendo le attività culturali e didattiche e agevolando la diffusione di informazioni equilibrate in entrambe le società.

La normalizzazione delle relazioni tra Armenia e Turchia sarebbe un passo avanti di importanza strategica verso la pace e la stabilità nell'intero Caucaso meridionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001366/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(10 February 2014)

Subject: Turkey and the Armenian question

During a recent visit to Yerevan (the capital of Armenia), the Turkish Foreign Minister described the deportation of the Armenians in 1915 as an 'inhumane act'.

Some people believe that Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan could be signalling a thaw in relations with Armenia by 2015, the first centenary of the genocide.

Can the Commission confirm this?

In 2009, Turkey and Armenia signed a normalisation agreement which provided for diplomatic relations and the opening of borders between the two countries. However, this agreement has not so far entered into force.

Does the Commission intend to intervene to ensure that this agreement is finally respected and put into effect?

Can the Commission explain in detail the current state of relations between Turkey and Armenia as well as the current role of the EU?

Answer given by Mr Fule on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The signature of the bilateral protocols in 2009 was an important step forward towards normalisation of relations between Turkey and Armenia. The EU continues to strongly support the process of normalisation of Armenian-Turkish relations. It continuously encourages both countries to resume dialogue and remain committed to the process without preconditions . Any steps/renewed efforts to this end by Turkey and Armenia would be welcome.

On its side, the EU has launched a EUR 2m project to support civil society efforts towards the normalisation of relations between Armenia and Turkey by enhancing people-to-people contacts, expanding economic and business links, promoting cultural and educational activities, and facilitating dissemination of balanced information in both societies.

The normalisation of relations between Armenia and Turkey would be a strategic step forward towards peace and stability in South Caucasus as a whole.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001368/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Primo centro culturale turco a Roma

Il centro culturale turco *Yunus Emre* è stato recentemente inaugurato a Roma; questo centro, presente anche a Londra, Parigi, Amsterdam e Bruxelles, realizza attività didattiche, culturali e artistiche e sostiene la ricerca scientifica.

Può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Tale centro culturale riceve finanziamenti europei? In caso di risposta affermativa, la Commissione può indicarne l'entità?

2. Come monitora l'UE l'utilizzo di tali fondi?

3. La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'esistenza in Turchia di centri culturali europei dello stesso livello di quelli presenti in Europa?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(16 aprile 2014)

L'istituto Yunus Emre di Roma non ha ricevuto alcun finanziamento né dal precedente programma Cultura né dall'attuale programma Europa creativa.

La Commissione europea non ha alcuna competenza relativamente ai centri culturali nazionali e dunque non sa quanti centri culturali europei operano in Turchia e viceversa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001368/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: First Turkish cultural centre in Rome

The Turkish cultural centre *Yunus Emre* has recently opened in Rome. This centre, which has counterparts in London, Paris, Amsterdam and Brussels, organises educational, cultural and artistic activities and supports scientific research.

Could the Commission tell me:

1. Whether this cultural centre receives European funding? And if so, how much?

2. How is the EU monitoring the use of any such funds?

3. Does it know whether there are as many European cultural centres in Turkey as there are Turkish ones in Europe?

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

The Yunus Emre Institute in Rome has not received any funding from neither the previous Culture Programme nor the current Creative Europe Programme.

The European Commission has no competence in the area of national cultural centres and therefore does not know how many European cultural centres are operating in Turkey and vice-versa.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001371/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Relazioni Turchia-Cina

La Turchia è entrata a far parte della cosiddetta Shangai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in qualità di «partner di dialogo» prevalentemente nei settori culturali ed economici.

La dirigenza turca considera il ruolo di partner come preliminare a una futura adesione a pieno titolo alla SCO. L'avvicinamento di Ankara all'Organizzazione di Shangai e l'assenza di reali motivi di frizione fra i due paesi possono favorire a medio-lungo termine anche una convergenza politica, tant'è che, secondo le dichiarazioni del Premier Erdogan, la piena ammissione della Turchia allo SCO potrebbe portare ad un ridimensionamento delle aspirazioni turche rispetto all'UE.

1. La Commissione come valuta l'adesione attuale e futura della Turchia alla SCO?

2. Per quanto «partner di dialogo», la Turchia beneficia di finanziamenti da parte della Cina? In caso positivo, a quanto ammontano e a quale scopo vengono elargiti?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(30 aprile 2014)

1. La Turchia è un paese candidato sovrano libero di aderire a qualsiasi organizzazione, compresa la Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, purché questo non sia in conflitto con gli accordi vigenti. Se diventerà uno Stato membro dell'UE, la Turchia dovrà allinearsi in tutto e per tutto alla politica dell'Unione nel campo delle relazioni internazionali.

2. La Commissione non dispone di informazioni specifiche sui finanziamenti concessi alla Turchia tramite la Shanghai Cooperation Organisation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001371/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Turkey-China relations

Turkey is now part of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) in the capacity of a 'dialogue partner', predominantly in the cultural and economic sectors.

The Turkish leadership regards the role of partner as preliminary to full membership of the SCO. Ankara's rapprochement to the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation and the absence of real grounds of friction between the two countries could be conducive to a political convergence in the medium/long-term, to the extent that, according to Premier Erdogan, Turkey's full admission to the SCO could result in a scaling down of Turkey's aspirations regarding the EU.

1. How does the Commission view Turkey's current and future membership of the SCO?

2. As a 'dialogue partner', does Turkey receive funding from China? If so, in what amount and for what purpose?

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

1. Turkey is a sovereign candidate country which is free to choose its membership in any organisation — like the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation — that does not conflict with existing agreements. If it will become a Member State of the EU, Turkey will have to fully align with EU policy in the field of international relations.

2. The Commission does not hold specific information regarding funding for Turkey through the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001377/14
à la Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(11 février 2014)

Objet: Contrôle de la population canine en Roumanie

Le programme roumain d'éradication de la rage est cofinancé par le Fonds européen agricole de garantie, et le contrôle de la population canine figure explicitement parmi les mesures qu'il a été décidé de mettre en œuvre au titre dudit programme.

La Roumanie se livre actuellement au contrôle de la population canine au moyen d'opérations de grande ampleur visant à «attraper et tuer» les chiens.

La Commission estime-t-elle que ce programme respecte le principe du droit de l'Union européenne qui préconise le choix de politiques efficaces fondées sur les meilleures pratiques internationales en la matière?

La Commission est-elle d'avis que, dans les circonstances décrites, le programme d'éradication de la rage appliqué en Roumanie peut encore légalement prétendre à un cofinancement de la part du Fonds européen agricole de garantie?

La Commission est-elle en mesure de garantir que d'autres ressources de l'Union européenne accordées à la Roumanie au titre d'autres programmes de l'Union ne sont pas utilisées, directement ou indirectement, pour financer le programme à grande échelle de la Roumanie en matière de gestion des chiens?

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

À ce jour, de vastes régions de l'Union européenne sont exemptes de la rage. L'UE finance actuellement un programme d'éradication de cette zoonose dans 13 États membres, dont la Roumanie fait partie. Ce pays bénéfice du cofinancement de l'UE pour ce type de programme depuis 2008.

En Europe, la rage étant principalement sylvatique, les mesures de cofinancement approuvées pour ce programme, d'une part, l'achat d'appâts vaccinaux et leur distribution aérienne pour vacciner les renards contre la rage et, d'autre part, l'analyse d'échantillons prélevés sur des animaux sauvages retrouvés sur le terrain pour surveiller cette immunisation des renards.

Le programme, qui a été approuvé par la décision d'exécution 2013/722/UE ([1]) de la Commission et doit être appliqué en 2014, dresse la liste d'autres mesures utiles pour enrayer cette grave zoonose, notamment la vaccination de carnivores domestiques, mais l'UE ne cofinance pas ces mesures.

Le programme approuvé ne comprend pas, comme mesure de contrôle générale, des opérations de réduction de la population canine. Toutefois, l'euthanasie de carnivores est préconisée lorsque ces animaux ont été griffés ou mordus par un animal enragé ou lorsqu'ils montrent des signes cliniques de rage. Aucune de ces mesures n'est cofinancée par l'UE.

La Commission effectue les évaluations du programme sur la base de conseils d'experts qui tiennent compte des principes du droit de l'Union et des meilleures pratiques internationales dans le domaine.

La Commission n'est pas responsable de l'application, à l'échelon national, de mesures ne figurant pas dans le programme approuvé. La contribution de l'Union européenne au programme d'éradication de la rage se limite au remboursement, sur présentation de factures, des coûts d'achat et de distribution aérienne des vaccins utilisés lors de campagnes contre les animaux sauvages.

([1]) Décision 2013/722/UE de la Commission (JO L 328 du 7.12.2013, p. 101).
http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/docs/adopted_2013_722_eu_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001377/14
to the Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Dog population control in Romania

Romania's rabies eradication programme is co-financed by the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund, and the 'control of the population of dogs' was explicitly listed among the measures agreed to be implemented under the programme.

Romania is in the process of implementing dog population control through massive 'Catch and Kill' actions.

Does the Commission think that this programme respects the principle of EC law which calls for the choice of effective policies based on international best practice in this field?

Does the Commission think that, under the circumstances described, Romania's rabies eradication programme is still legally eligible for co-financing from the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund?

Can the Commission guarantee that other EU funds granted to Romania under other EU programmes are not being used directly or indirectly to fund Romania's large-scale dog management programme?

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

Today large areas of the EU enjoy the rabies free status. The EU is currently funding an eradication programme against rabies in 13 Member States. Romania is one of these Member States, beneficiary of the EU co-funding for this type of programme since 2008.

As rabies in Europe is predominately sylvatic rabies, the co-funded measures approved for this programme are the purchase of oral vaccine baits and their aerial distribution in order to vaccinate foxes against rabies and the testing of samples taken from wild animals collected in the field in order to monitor the immunisation of foxes.

The programme to be implemented in 2014 approved by Commission implementing Decision 2013/722/EU ([1]) lists other measures to tackle this important zoonosis, including the vaccination of domestic carnivores but those measures are not co-funded by EU.

The approved programme does not include 'catch and kill' of dog population as general control measure. However, euthanasia of carnivores is listed as measure in case they have been scratched or bitten by animal with Rabies or killing is foreseen in case they show clinical sign of Rabies: all those measures are not co-funded by EU.

The Commission bases its evaluation of the programme on experts' advice that take into account the principle of EC law and international best practices in the field.

The Commission is not responsible for the application, at national level, of measures non- listed in the approved programme. The EU contribution for the rabies eradication programme is limited to the reimbursement of the costs for the purchase and aerial distribution of the vaccine used in the campaigns against wild animals, based on invoices.

([1]) Commission Decision 2013/722/EU- OJ L 328 of 7/12/2013, p.101.
http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/docs/adopted_2013_722_eu_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001379/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Sondeos sísmicos para buscar petróleo entre la costa valenciana y las Islas Baleares

Está previsto que en octubre empiecen los sondeos sísmicos para buscar petróleo entre la costa valenciana y las Islas Baleares ([1]). La compañía ha elaborado el estudio de impacto ambiental sobre el que se harán las pruebas (emisiones acústicas de hasta 265 decibelios cada diez segundos) para obtener información sobre la existencia o no de hidrocarburos. En el documento sí se admite el riesgo de mortandad y huida de peces, con sus consecuencias sobre el sector pesquero. Parece ser que la propuesta hace caso omiso de la recomendación de la Dirección General de Sostenibilidad de la Costa y del Mar del Ministerio de Medio Ambiente de que no se hagan sondeos en áreas de presencia de cetáceos y, en consecuencia, se evite una zona de especial protección conocida como «corredor de migración de cetáceos».

Los pescadores están preocupados por la posible disminución de las capturas como consecuencia de la huida de bancos por las pruebas sísmicas (las cofradías pusieron el ejemplo de Noruega). Estas pruebas afectarán a 180 especies protegidas, 50 de ellas con la máxima protección ([2]).

A la luz de lo anterior, y teniendo en cuenta la Directiva 2013/30/EU:

¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento del estudio ambiental del proyecto?

¿Debería la declaración de impacto ambiental, según los estándares europeos, considerar los riesgos sísmicos que conllevan dichos proyectos?

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

La Comisión tiene conocimiento de las actividades de búsqueda de hidrocarburos que se ha propuesto efectuar en alta mar frente a las costas de Valencia y ha pedido más información sobre este asunto. Las autoridades españolas han aclarado así de qué forma se está aplicando la normativa ambiental de la UE vigente en la materia y cómo se están teniendo en cuenta los aspectos medioambientales de las actividades propuestas, especialmente los relacionados con la Directiva de Hábitats ([3]), con la Directiva de Aves ([4]), con la Directiva marco sobre la estrategia marina ([5]) y con el Convenio de Barcelona. Atendiendo a la información facilitada por dichas autoridades en agosto de 2013 y al no haberse completado todavía todas las evaluaciones requeridas, no ha podido demostrarse que las actividades en cuestión infrinjan la normativa de la UE o las disposiciones de ese Convenio.

La Comisión ha pedido que se le informe de los resultados de la EIA y de cualquier decisión que se adopte tras ella.

La Directiva 2013/30/UE que menciona Su Señoría establece unos niveles de seguridad muy altos para las actividades de exploración y producción de petróleo y de gas en alta mar. Dichas actividades —desde el diseño de las instalaciones hasta su desmontaje final— son subsiguientes a las fases de prospección en las que tienen lugar, entre otras medidas, los sondeos sísmicos que señala Su Señoría.

([1]) http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2014/01/08/valencia/1389207641_491621.html?rel=rosEP
([2]) http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2014/02/03/valencia/1391437531_354208.html
([3]) Directiva 92/43/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres.
([4]) Directiva 2009/147/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 30 de noviembre de 2009, relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres.
([5]) Directiva 2008/56/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 17 de junio de 2008, por la que se establece un marco de acción comunitaria para la política del medio marino (Directiva marco sobre la estrategia marina).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001379/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Seismic probes to map out oil locations between the Valencian coastline and the Balearic Islands

In October, there are plans to launch seismic probes to map out oil locations between the Valencian coastline and the Balearic Islands ([1]). The company has carried out an environmental study on which the tests will be based (acoustic emissions of up to 265 decibels every ten seconds) in order to obtain information on whether or not hydrocarbons are present. The document admits that there is a risk of fish being killed or fleeing the area, with the corresponding effects this will have on the fishing sector. The proposal seems to fly in the face of the recommendation made by the Spanish Ministry for the Environment's Directorate General for Sustainability of the Sea and Coastline that probes should not be used in areas where shellfish are present, so as to preserve an area of special protection known as a 'shellfish migration corridor'.

Fishermen are worried about the potential reduction in their hauls as a result of shoals fleeing the area because of the seismic tests (the associations pointed to the example of Norway). These tests will affect 180 protected species, 50 of which are in the highest category of protection ([2]).

In light of the above, and having regard to Directive 2013/30/EU:

Is the Commission aware of the environmental study on the project?

In accordance with European standards, should the declaration of environmental impact take into account the seismic risks that such projects entail?

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

The Commission is aware of the proposed hydrocarbon activities off the coast of Valencia and has asked for more information on this issue. The Spanish authorities have provided information to clarify how relevant EU environmental legislation is being implemented and how the environmental aspects of the proposed activities are being taken into account, in particular those arising from the Habitats ([3]) and Birds ([4]) Directives, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive ([5]) and the Barcelona Convention. Based on the information provided by the authorities in August 2013, no evidence was found of a breach of EU legislation or of the provisions of the Barcelona Convention as all the requested assessments were not completed.

The Commission has asked to be informed of the results of the EIA and of any subsequent authorisation decision.

Directive 2013/30/EU referred to by the Honorable Member sets very high safety standards for offshore oil and gas exploration and production activities. These activities, from installation design to its final removal, follow after prospection phases involving *inter alia* seismic surveys referred to by the Honorable Member.

([1]) http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2014/01/08/valencia/1389207641_491621.html?rel=rosEP
([2]) http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2014/02/03/valencia/1391437531_354208.html
([3]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.
([4]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds.
([5]) Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001381/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(11 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ακαδημαϊκή διαβάθμιση των ωδειακών μουσικών σπουδών στην Ελλάδα

Παρά το γεγονός ότι αφενός ολόκληρο το φάσμα των ωδειακών μουσικών σπουδών στην Ελλάδα εποπτεύεται στενά και ελέγχεται διαχρονικά από τις αρμόδιες κρατικές υπηρεσίες του Υπουργείου Πολιτισμού (απονέμουν και τον σχετικό τίτλο σπουδών), και αφετέρου δεν παρέχεται η δυνατότητα απόκτησης τίτλου σπουδών στην οργανική μουσική (π.χ. δίπλωμα σολίστ οργάνου) από τα υπάρχοντα Τριτοβάθμια Ιδρύματα της χώρας, εντούτοις δεν έχει πραγματοποιηθεί ακόμα η κατάταξη και διαβάθμιση αυτής της εκπαιδευτικής διαδικασίας. Ταυτόχρονα, και ενώ από το σύνολο των σχετικών νομοθετημάτων που διέπουν θεσμικά τη λειτουργία και την πιστοποίηση της ολοκλήρωσης του κύκλου των ανώτερων σπουδών σε μουσικά όργανα που παρέχονται από τα κρατικά και αναγνωρισμένα μη κρατικά ωδεία ημεδαπής ή αλλοδαπής (Ν.Δ. 1445/42, Β.Δ. 16/1966, Ν.1597/86, Ν. 2470/97) προκύπτει η αντιστοίχιση και ισοδυναμία των σχετικών διπλωμάτων και πτυχίων με τους τίτλους σπουδών ανώτερης σχολής της ημεδαπής τριετούς φοίτησης (έχει συσταθεί μάλιστα κλάδος Τεχνολογικής Εκπαίδευσης μουσικής που τους συμπεριλαμβάνει), στην πράξη οι πτυχιούχοι-διπλωματούχοι — παρά τη μακρά διάρκεια των σπουδών τους — αντιμετωπίζονται ως απόφοιτοι δευτεροβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης με συνέπεια είτε να αποκλείεται η πρόσβαση ή συμμετοχή τους σε μια σειρά επαγγελματικών (γενικές προκηρύξεις Δημοσίου Τομέα, συμμετοχή σε ειδικές επιτροπές κ.λπ.) και εκπαιδευτικών διαδικασιών (φοίτηση σε μεταπτυχιακά προγράμματα κρατικών Τριτοβάθμιων Ιδρυμάτων κ.λπ.), είτε να μην απολαμβάνουν τα απορρέοντα μισθολογικά δικαιώματα. Με δεδομένες τις αρνητικές επιπτώσεις αυτής της ασαφούς κατάστασης στην επαγγελματική ανέλιξη και επιστημονική εξέλιξή τους, καθώς και τις δυσμενείς προεκτάσεις στο πολιτισμικό κεφάλαιο της χώρας, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Υπάρχουν διαθέσιμα στοιχεία για τη διαβάθμιση των ανώτερων διπλωμάτων μουσικών οργάνων στα κράτη μέλη, καθώς και για τη θέση της οργανικής μουσικής στα συστήματα Τριτοβάθμιας Εκπαίδευσης;

Γνωρίζει σε ποιες χώρες της ΕΕ και υπό ποιο καθεστώς λειτουργούν Μουσικές Ακαδημίες;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Απριλίου 2014)

Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 165 της ΣΛΕΕ, η κατάταξη των πτυχίων καθώς επίσης και οι ρυθμίσεις βάσει των οποίων λειτουργούν τα εκπαιδευτικά ιδρύματα όπως οι μουσικές ακαδημίες — εμπίπτει στην αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών. Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει συγκριτικά στοιχεία ως προς την κατάταξη των ανώτερων πτυχίων στο παίξιμο μουσικών οργάνων ή την ακριβή τους θέση στα εκπαιδευτικά συστήματα των κρατών μελών.

Η Διεθνής Τυποποιημένη Ταξινόμηση της Εκπαίδευσης (ISCED), που αναπτύχθηκε από την Unesco, η οποία κατατάσσει τα εκπαιδευτικά προγράμματα όσον αφορά τα επίπεδα και τους τομείς της εκπαίδευσης, κατατάσσει τη μουσική στον γενικό τομέα των «τεχνών» (κωδικός EF21 της ταξινόμησης ISCED 5-6). Ενώ η ISCED αναπτύχθηκε με σκοπό να διευκολύνει τη διεθνή σύγκριση στατιστικών μεταξύ των εκπαιδευτικών συστημάτων, χρησιμοποιείται επίσης ως στοιχείο για την ανάπτυξη πλαισίων επαγγελματικών προσόντων. Η διεθνής πρακτική εν γένει κατατάσσει την προηγμένη μουσική εκπαίδευση στα επίπεδα 6-8 του ευρωπαϊκού πλαισίου επαγγελματικών προσόντων (EQF) και τα κράτη μέλη συχνά την εντάσσουν στα εθνικά πλαίσια επαγγελματικών προσόντων (NQF) ([1]). Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση Ωδείων (AEC) έχει επίσης συντάξει το εγχειρίδιο «*Η διεθνής αναγνώριση των σπουδών και των επαγγελματικών προσόντων στην τριτοβάθμια μουσική εκπαίδευση*», που παρέχει πληροφορίες σχετικά με την αναγνώριση των προσόντων στην τριτοβάθμια μουσική εκπαίδευση σε ένα πλαίσιο κινητικότητας ([2]).

([1]) Βλέπε, για παράδειγμα, το ιταλικό NQF http://www.quadrodeititoli.it/index.aspx?IDL=2
([2]) http://www.aec-music.eu/userfiles/File/the-international-recognition-of-studies-and-qualifications-in-higher-music-education.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001381/14
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: The academic classification of music studies at conservatoires in Greece

Despite the fact that, firstly, the entire range of music studies at conservatoires in Greece is closely monitored and controlled over time by the competent national authorities of the Ministry of Culture (they also award the diplomas) and, secondly, it is impossible to obtain a qualification in instrumental music (e.g. a diploma as an organ soloist) from existing institutes of higher education in the country, the qualifications provided by conservatoires have still not been classified and graded. Moreover, even though all the relevant legislation governing the operation and certification of the completion of the cycle of higher education in instrumental music provided by state and recognised non-state conservatoires in Greece or abroad (Decree-Law 1445/42 , Royal Decree 16/1966, Law 1597/86 and Law 2470/97) indicates that conservatoire diplomas and degrees correspond and are equivalent to the higher education qualifications awarded upon completion of three-year university courses in Greece ('a technological education in music' branch has in fact been set up which includes these qualifications), in practice, graduates and diploma holders from conservatoires are treated as secondary school graduates, despite the long duration of their studies: this means that they are excluded from access to, or participation in, a range of professional opportunities (general public sector vacancies, membership of special committees etc...) and educational procedures (enrolment in graduate programmes of state higher education institutions, etc.) and do not enjoy the same salary entitlements as graduates of institutes of higher education. Given the adverse impact of this confused situation on their professional and academic development and the adverse implications this has for Greece's cultural capital, will the Commission say:

Are any data available on the classification of higher qualifications in instrumental playing in the Member States and on the position of instrumental music in higher education systems?

Does it know in which EU countries and under which arrangements musical academies operate?

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

Pursuant to Article 165 TFEU, the classification of degrees as well as the arrangements under which education institutions — such as musical academies — operate fall within the exclusive competence of Member States. The Commission has no comparative data on the classification of higher qualifications in instrumental playing or on their exact position in Member States' higher education systems.

The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED), developed by Unesco which classifies educational programmes in terms of levels and fields of education, classifies music under the general field of 'Arts' (Code EF21 of the ISCED 5-6 classification). While ISCED was developed with a view to facilitating international comparison of statistics across education systems, it is also used as an element for developing qualification frameworks. International practice generally grades advanced music education at levels 6-8 of the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) and Member States often integrate it into National Qualifications Frameworks (NQF) ([1]). The Association Européenne des Conservatoires (AEC) has also developed a handbook *'The International Recognition of Studies and Qualifications in Higher Music Education'*, which provides information on the recognition of qualifications in higher music education in a mobility context ([2]).

([1]) See, for example, the Italian NQF http://www.quadrodeititoli.it/index.aspx?IDL=2
([2]) http://www.aec-music.eu/userfiles/File/the-international-recognition-of-studies-and-qualifications-in-higher-music-education.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001385/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Pale eoliche off-shore nel golfo di Manfredonia

Due società italiane vorrebbero impiantare in Puglia, e più precisamente nelle acque prospicienti i comuni di Manfredonia, Margherita di Savoia e Zapponeta, una serie di impianti eolici off-shore. Il progetto ha già incassato il no di diverse formazioni politiche locali e di una parte dei cittadini, secondo cui gli impianti causerebbero costi ambientali insopportabili per il territorio a fronte di ricadute economiche, occupazionali e sociali di scarso rilievo.

Allo stesso tempo, i progetti hanno ottenuto il parere favorevole del ministero dei Beni e delle attività culturali, anche se la decisione finale spetta alla presidenza del Consiglio dei ministri.

Occorre ricordare che, a fronte della necessità dell'Italia e dell'UE di ridurre la propria dipendenza dai combustibili fossili, le peculiari caratteristiche territoriali, sociali e ambientali della zona in questione hanno creato una forte interdipendenza tra la popolazione locale e l'ecosistema marino, per cui ogni azione che possa alterare tale relazione dovrebbe essere rigorosamente vagliata dalle autorità e da esperti.

In relazione alla questione in oggetto, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. è a conoscenza della situazione relativa agli impianti eolici off-shore?

2. ritiene che impianti di questo genere possano avere ripercussioni eccessivamente negative sull'ecosistema marino dell'area e, di conseguenza, sulle attività professionali attinenti al settore della pesca?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione non è al corrente dello specifico progetto di parco eolico su cui verte l'interrogazione scritta.

2. Come dichiarato in passato, la Commissione è del parere che sia possibile conciliare lo sviluppo di parchi eolici onshore e offshore con gli obiettivi della politica ambientale, compresa l'esigenza di tutelare la biodiversità e gli habitat, in particolare identificando gli eventuali problemi in una fase iniziale e adottando le opportune misure concernenti l'ubicazione ([1]). Gli eventuali impatti negativi di tali progetti sono di norma analizzati durante la procedura di valutazione dell'impatto ambientale che identifica altresì le idonee misure di attenuazione.

([1]) COM(2008) 768 definitivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001385/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Offshore wind farms in the Gulf of Manfredonia

Two Italian companies want to build a series of offshore wind farms in Puglia, more specifically in the waters adjacent to the municipalities of Manfredonia, Margherita di Savoia and Zapponeta. The project has already aroused objections from a number of local political groupings and from members of the public, who take the view that the wind farms would generate unacceptably high environmental costs for the local area, whilst the economic, employment and social benefits would be minimal.

The plans have been approved by the Ministry for National Heritage and Culture, although the final decision rests with the Prime Minister's Office.

Italy and the EU certainly need to reduce their dependency on fossil fuels. However the specific regional, social and environmental characteristics of the area in question have created a strong degree of interdependence between the local population and the marine ecosystem, which means any action liable to have an impact on that relationship would require rigorous assessment by experts and the relevant authorities.

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation regarding these offshore wind farms?

2. Does it take the view that installations of this kind could have disastrous repercussions for the local marine ecosystem and, therefore, on employment in the fishing industry?

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

1. The Commission is not aware of the particular wind farm project mentioned in the question.

2. As stated in the past, the Commission is of the opinion that it is possible to reconcile the development of onshore and offshore wind farms with environmental policy objectives, including the need to protect biodiversity and habitats, in particular by identifying potential problems at an early stage and appropriate siting decisions ([1]). Any potential negative impacts of such projects should be analysed during the impact assessment procedure, which will also identify appropriate mitigation measures.

([1]) COM(2008) 768 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001386/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Progetto a favore dell'occupazione femminile

La città di Barletta, in Puglia, ha attivato presso il locale Centro per l'impiego un Centro per l'occupabilità femminile, rivolto alla popolazione femminile del territorio provinciale, per migliorare l'occupabilità e l'orientamento di questa fetta della popolazione nella ricerca di un lavoro.

In pratica il Centro si rivolge alle donne disoccupate e inoccupate, per offrire loro strumenti di conoscenza delle proprie risorse, portare alla loro attenzione nuove opportunità e fornire tutta una serie di servizi che contribuiscano ad affrontare le tante problematiche che le donne incontrano nel percorso professionale.

Il Centro intende creare una rete di servizi con i settori «Servizi sociali» e «Attività produttive» della provincia, le associazioni locali attive sul territorio, l'Agenzia per l'inclusione sociale, gli istituti scolastici superiori, le università e gli enti di formazione accreditati, al fine di creare un circuito attivo tramite il quale le donne possano usufruire di servizi a 360 gradi che permettano un'inclusione o un reinserimento immediato nel mondo del lavoro.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se è a conoscenza del progetto in questione;

2. se è a conoscenza di progetti simili in Italia e in Europa e del relativo impatto sui tassi di occupazione femminile;

3. se ritiene che questo progetto possa fungere da spunto per raccomandazioni e suggerimenti destinati ai governi nazionali in tema di occupabilità femminile.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che, nel quadro del Programma operativo del FSE per la Puglia, la Regione ha sostenuto un progetto per lo sviluppo di servizi specifici (informazione, orientamento, tutoraggio) nel contesto dei Servizi pubblici per l'impiego locali al fine di sostenere le donne disoccupate o inattive nell'accesso al mercato del lavoro. Il progetto interessa i dipendenti dei servizi pubblici dell'impiego che avranno il compito di espletare tali servizi ed è finanziato nell'ambito dell'asse prioritario VII del PO «Capacità istituzionale». Il progetto è implementato nelle diverse province della Puglia che hanno sottoscritto precedentemente un accordo specifico con la Regione nel merito.

2. Progetti analoghi possono essere reperiti sul nostro sito del FSE ([1]). Inoltre, diversi progetti hanno ricevuto il sostegno del Programma di apprendimento permanente al fine di impartire una formazione alle donne così da migliorarne l'occupabilità ([2]).

Tra l'altro, la Rete di valutazione degli esperti del FSE ha raccolto e riassunto le valutazioni per paese e gli altri studi attinenti al sostegno del FSE per le donne. ([3]) Per il nuovo periodo di programmazione le azioni di monitoraggio e di valutazione della politica di coesione intensificheranno la raccolta di dati e l'analisi dell'efficacia degli interventi a seconda dei gruppi di destinatari tra cui le donne.

3. La Commissione promuove la modernizzazione dei servizi pubblici dell'impiego, anche attraverso l'erogazione di servizi personalizzati ad hoc che tengano conto delle esigenze di diverse categorie di persone in cerca di lavoro e con lo sviluppo di un forte approccio di partenariato ([4]). L'implementazione di una Garanzia per i giovani può essere l'opportunità per rafforzare ulteriormente queste riforme anche a vantaggio dell'occupazione femminile. Lo sviluppo di un adeguato *policy mix* che agevoli la conciliazione della vita lavorativa e di quella familiare, comprendente servizi per l'infanzia e un adeguato congedo parentale, andrà anch'esso a vantaggio dell'occupazione femminile ([5]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/esf/home.jsp?langId=en
([2]) Questi progetti, che hanno prodotto diverse guide, relazioni e altri strumenti utili, sono presentati sulla piattaforma di diffusione di Erasmus+: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/
([3]) Final Synthesis Report on Women and Young. People. (prepared by ESF Expert Evaluation Network) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=11111&langId=en
([4]) COM(2012) 173 final del 18 aprile 2012.
([5]) Per conoscere l'attuale stato di cose nel merito si rinvia alla relazione della Commissione sugli obiettivi di Barcellona in tema di servizi all'infanzia: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130531_barcelona_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001386/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Project to promote female employment

The town of Barletta in Puglia has set up a Female Employability Unit at the local Job Centre aimed at the female population of the Provincial region to improve employability and offer guidance in the search for employment to this section of the population.

In practice, the Unit targets unemployed and jobless women, offering resource awareness tools, informing them of new opportunities and providing a whole range of services to help women tackle the multiple problems encountered in their professional career paths.

It is intended that the Centre will create a network of services in cooperation with the 'social service' and 'manufacturing' sectors in the Province, local associations active in the region, the Social Inclusion Agency, further educational establishments, universities and accredited training bodies to create an active circuit through which women will be able to access 360 degree facilities leading to inclusion or immediate reintegration into the world of work.

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

1. it is aware of the project in question;

2. it is aware of similar projects in Italy and Europe and the relative impact on female employment rates;

3. it considers that this project could serve as a starting point for recommendations and suggestions to national Governments on the issue of female employability.

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

1. The Commission is aware that in the framework of the ESF OP Puglia, the Region supported a project for the development of specific services (information, orientation, mentoring) within the local Public Employment Services aimed at supporting unemployed or inactive women in the access to the labour market. The project targets employees of Public Employment Services who will be in charge of these services and is funded under the OP priority axis VII 'Institutional Capacity building'. The project is implemented through the different provinces of Puglia, who have previously subscribed a specific agreement with the region in this respect.

2. Similar projects can be found on our ESF website ([1]). Moreover a number of projects have been supported by the Lifelong Learning Programme, aimed at training women to improve their employability ([2]).

Among others, the ESF Expert Evaluation Network collected and synthesised country evaluations and other relevant studies on how ESF supports women. ([3]) For the new period, the Monitoring and Evaluation of Cohesion Policy will enhance the data gathering and analysis on effectiveness of interventions by target groups, including women.

3. The Commission promotes the modernisation of public employment services, including through the delivery of individualised services tailored on the needs of different categories of jobseekers and the development of a strong partnership approach ([4]). The implementation of a Youth Guarantee may be an opportunity to further strengthen these reforms, also to the benefit of female employment. The development of an adequate policy mix facilitating the reconciliation of work and family life, including childcare services and adequate parental leave will also benefit to women's employment ([5]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/esf/home.jsp?langId=en
([2]) These projects, which have produced a number of guides, reports and other useful tools, are presented in the Erasmus+ Dissemination Platform. http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/
([3]) Final Synthesis Report on Women and Young People. (prepared by ESF Expert Evaluation Network) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=11111&langId=en
([4]) COM(2012) 173 final of 18 April 2012.
([5]) For a state-of-play on this issue, seethe report of the Commission on the Barcelona objectives on childcare developments: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130531_barcelona_en.pdf

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001387/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(11 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Regulamentul privind compensarea și asistența acordată pasagerilor în eventualitatea refuzului la îmbarcare și a anulării sau întârzierii prelungite a zborurilor

În data de 5 februarie, Parlamentul European a aprobat Propunerea de regulament de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 261/2004 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de stabilire a unor norme comune în materie de compensare și de asistență a pasagerilor în eventualitatea refuzului la îmbarcare și anulării sau întârzierii prelungite a zborurilor și a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 2027/97 privind răspunderea operatorilor de transport aerian privind transportul aerian al pasagerilor și al bagajelor acestora.

În varianta aprobată de PE sunt incluse mai multe măsuri menite să consolideze drepturile pasagerilor și să asigure mai multă siguranță juridică pentru aceștia.

Există însă o serie de practici care nu fac obiectul propunerii Comisiei și care nu au fost incluse în varianta aprobată de Parlamentul European.

Totuși, aceste practici ar putea fi sancționate atât la nivel național, cât și la nivel comunitar. Este vorba despre presupusele urmăriri ale IP-ului unui utilizator atunci când acesta accesează un site al unei companii aeriene. Rezultatul unor accesări repetate este, în cele mai multe cazuri, creșterea prețului biletului pentru un anumit segment, datorită faptului că site-ul cu pricina „înregistrează" interesul utilizatorului pentru un anumit zbor și o anumită dată.

Deține Comisia informații despre astfel de practici cu care se confruntă tot mai mulți potențiali clienți ai unor companii aeriene?

Intenționează Comisia să propună legislație în domeniu, astfel încât să fie asigurată aplicarea unor reguli comune la nivel european și să fie descurajate astfel de practici care afectează interesele consumatorilor europeni?

Răspuns dat de dna Viviane Reding în numele Comisiei
(7 aprilie 2014)

Cu privire la tehnologiile de targetare online (*targeting*), cum ar fi urmărirea online a consumatorilor prin adresele IP ale acestora în scopul adaptării ofertelor comerciale, Comisia îi indică stimatului deputat, drept referință, răspunsul comun oferit la întrebările P-001257/13, E-001574/13 și E-000956/13.

Pentru a garanta punerea în aplicare corespunzătoare a dispozițiilor Directivei 2005/29/CE, inclusiv în cazul noilor practici, cum ar fi comerțul electronic bazat pe urmărirea online a consumatorilor, Comisia revizuiește în prezent orientările sale privind punerea în aplicare a directivei menționate [SEC (2009) 1666].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001387/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Regulation on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights

On 5 February 2014, Parliament approved the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights and Regulation (EC) No 2027/97 on air carrier liability in respect of the carriage of passengers and their baggage by air.

The version approved by Parliament includes several measures designed to strengthen passengers' rights and offer them greater legal certainty.

However, there are some practices that are not covered in either the Commission proposal or the version approved by Parliament.

These practices could nevertheless be penalised at both national and Community level. They involve tracking a user's IP address when the user accesses an airline's website. If the user makes repeated visits to the website, the price of a ticket for the particular route concerned usually goes up, since the site 'registers' the user's interest in a certain flight on a certain day.

Does the Commission have any information on these practices that have been affecting growing numbers of potential customers of some airlines?

Will the Commission propose legislation in this area to ensure that common rules are applied at European level and discourage such practices, which affect the interests of European consumers?

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

Regarding the use of targeting technologies, such as tracking consumers through IP addresses, to adjust commercial offers, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its joint answer given to questions P-001257/13, E-001574/13, and E-000956/13.

In order to ensure the adequate application of Directive 2005/29/EC also to newer practices, such as online marketing based on tracking of consumers, the Commission is currently reviewing its Guidance on the application of the directive (SEC(2009)1666).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001388/14
à la Commission
Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D) et Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 février 2014)

Objet: Le financement des entreprises sociales en Europe

En France, les fondateurs de Leka (une entreprise qui a mis au point des jouets robotisés interactifs adaptés aux besoins des enfants autistes) ou Robin Hood (une enseigne de restauration anti-gaspillage alimentaire) ont moins de 25 ans.

La création d'entreprises sociales est perçue comme un moyen de concilier réussite professionnelle et aspiration personnelle. Malgré leur valeur ajoutée reconnue, ces entreprises rencontrent des difficultés à se développer, notamment parce qu'elles manquent de capitaux et sont méconnues des responsables politiques — et donc peu soutenues. Malgré leur motivation, les jeunes rencontrent des difficultés pour aller au bout du processus et créer réellement leur société.

De quelle façon la Commission européenne envisage-t-elle de soutenir les jeunes à créer leur propre entreprise sociale, qui participe à la croissance et à la création d'emplois?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(8 avril 2014)

Les entreprises sociales et les startups peuvent toutes prétendre à un financement au titre du programme de l'UE pour la compétitivité des entreprises et les petites et moyennes entreprises (COSME), si elles ont le statut de PME et qu'une banque est disposée à leur accorder un prêt et à assumer la moitié du risque. Le programme COSME vise à promouvoir les entreprises/PME en général, indépendamment de leur type ou de leur forme.

Au moins 86 millions d'euros (pour la période 2014-2020) ont été affectés au financement des entreprises sociales dans le cadre du programme EaSI ([1]), en vue d'appuyer le développement du marché de l'investissement social et de faciliter l'accès des entreprises sociales au financement.

En outre, le règlement concernant les Fonds structurels et d'investissement européens pour 2014-2020 permet aux États membres de choisir l'entrepreneuriat social comme priorité d'investissement, principalement dans le cadre de l'objectif thématique 8 («promouvoir un emploi durable et de qualité et soutenir la mobilité de la main-d'œuvre») afin d'offrir une large gamme de mécanismes de soutien aux microentreprises et aux PME et de favoriser la création d'entreprises dans le domaine de l'entrepreneuriat social.

Les gestionnaires de fonds d'entrepreneuriat social européens ([2]), qui constituent un régime relativement récent, sont tenus d'enregistrer ces fonds d'investissement auprès des autorités nationales de surveillance compétentes dans l'État membre d'origine. La Commission s'attend à ce que les progrès réalisés dans ce domaine soient graduels.

([1]) Programme pour l'emploi et l'innovation sociale, voir le règlement (UE) nº 1296/2013 établissant un programme de l'Union européenne pour l'emploi et l'innovation sociale (EaSI).

([2]) EuSEF, voir le règlement (UE) nº 346/2013 relatif aux fonds d'entrepreneuriat social européens.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001388/14
to the Commission
Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D) and Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Financing social enterprises in Europe

In France, the founders of Leka (a company which has developed interactive robotic toys adapted to the needs of children with autism) and of Robin Hood (a restaurant chain which opposes food wastage) are less than 25 years old.

The creation of social enterprises is seen as a way of reconciling professional success and personal aspirations. Although they are acknowledged as adding value, these enterprises face difficulties in achieving growth, particularly as they lack capital and are ignored by politicians — and thus receive little support. Despite the fact that they are well motivated, young people find themselves faced with difficulties in getting to the end of the process and actually setting up their companies.

How does the European Commission plan to assist young people to create their own social enterprises, which will contribute to growth and job creation?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2014)

Social enterprises and start-ups are all eligible for funding under the EU Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME), if they have SME status and a bank is willing to give them a loan and keep half of the risk. COSME's objective is to promote enterprises/SMEs in general, irrespective of their type or business form.

At least EUR 86 million (for 2014-20) have been earmarked for financing social enterprises under the EaSI ([1]) programme with the aim of supporting the development of the social investment market and facilitate social enterprises' access to finance.

In addition, the regulation of the European Structural and Investment Funds for 2014-20 allows the Member States to choose social entrepreneurship as an investment priority, mainly under the thematic objective 8 ('promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility') to provide a broad range of support mechanism to micro-enterprises and SMEs and to support business creation in the field of social entrepreneurship.

Managers of European social entrepreneurship funds ([2]), which are a relatively recent scheme, are required to register such fund vehicles with the competent national supervisors in the home Member State. The Commission expects progress in this area to be incremental.

([1]) Programme for Employment and Social Innovation, see Regulation (EU) No 1296/2013 on a European Union Programme for Employment and Social Innovation ('EaSI').

([2]) EuSEFs; see Regulation (EU) No 346/2013 on European social entrepreneurship funds.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001389/14
à la Commission
Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D) et Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 février 2014)

Objet: La corruption, un fléau dans tous les pays de l'Union européenne

Selon les conclusions du premier rapport «anticorruption de l'Union européenne», la corruption coûterait cent vingt milliards d'euros à l'économie européenne chaque année. C'est la première fois que nous avons une évaluation qui concerne tous les pays de l'Union européenne.

Plus de la moitié (56 %) des Européens estiment que le niveau de corruption dans leur pays a augmenté au cours des trois dernières années.

1. De quelle façon la Commission européenne entend-elle utiliser les résultats de ce rapport, compte tenu du fait que la plupart des moyens de répression sont entre les mains des États membres?

2. La Commission ne pense-t-elle pas qu'il serait opportun de mettre en place un réseau d'échanges des bonnes pratiques, afin de lutter contre la corruption dans les États membres?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Malmström au nom de la Commission
(19 mars 2014)

1. Le rapport anticorruption de l'UE met l'accent sur une série de questions clés qui revêtent un intérêt particulier pour chaque État membre. Certaines de ces questions relèvent exclusivement de la compétence nationale. Toutefois, il est dans l'intérêt commun de l'Union de veiller à ce que tous les États membres se dotent de politiques de lutte contre la corruption efficaces et de les aider à mener à bien cette tâche. La Commission engagera donc un dialogue avec les États membres au sujet du suivi à donner aux mesures préconisées dans ce rapport.

2. Cette année, la Commission mettra en place un programme d'échange d'expériences afin de permettre aux États membres, aux ONG locales et à d'autres parties prenantes d'échanger de bonnes pratiques, de remédier aux insuffisances de la politique de lutte contre la corruption, de faciliter son suivi, d'améliorer la sensibilisation à cette problématique et d'organiser des formations.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001389/14
to the Commission
Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D) and Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Corruption — a curse for all countries of the European Union

According to the findings of the first 'EU Anti-Corruption Report', corruption is said to cost the European economy EUR 120 billion per year. This is the first time that we have had a valuation that covers all the countries of the European Union.

More than half (56%) of Europeans believe that the level of corruption in their country has increased over the last three years.

1. How does the European Commission intend to use the results of this report, given that most of the means of law enforcement are in the hands of the Member States?

2. Does the Commission not consider that it would be appropriate to put in place a network for the exchange of good practices so as to combat corruption in the Member States?

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

1. The EU Anti-Corruption Report focuses on selected key issues of particular relevance to each Member State. Some of these issues are solely national competence. It is, however, in the Union's common interest to ensure that all Member States have efficient anti-corruption policies and that the EU supports the Member States in pursuing this work. The Commission will therefore engage Member States in dialogue on follow-up of future steps suggested in the report.

2. The Commission will put in place this year an experience sharing programme to help Member States, local NGOs and other stakeholders exchange good practice and overcome shortcomings in anti-corruption policy, facilitate follow-up, raise awareness, and provide training.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001390/14
à la Commission
Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D) et Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 février 2014)

Objet: Le rôle de l'hormone de l'accouchement dans l'autisme

Une équipe de chercheurs de l'Inserm a progressé dans la compréhension du syndrome autistique. À partir de travaux menés sur des souris, les chercheurs ont démontré que l'ocytocine, dite aussi «hormone de l'accouchement», fait naturellement chuter le taux de chlore dans les neurones au moment de la naissance.

Ces données suggèrent donc que l'ocytocine est un important modulateur de l'expression du syndrome autistique. Ce résultat valide la stratégie thérapeutique mise en œuvre dans un essai clinique réalisé à Brest en 2012.

De quelle façon la Commission pense-t-elle exploiter les résultats de cette étude?

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

La Commission a eu connaissance des résultats de plusieurs études sur le rôle joué par l'ocytocine. Pour autant qu'elle sache, les études entreprises à ce jour ne constituent pas des essais cliniques sur l'efficacité de l'ocytocine en tant que traitement de l'autisme. Selon le registre des essais cliniques de l'Union européenne, un essai clinique sur l'efficacité de l'ocytocine est réalisé actuellement par la Philipps-University de Marburg (en Allemagne). Cet essai porte spécifiquement sur l'effet d'un spray nasal d'ocytocine sur les processus neuronaux d'empathie ([1]).

([1]) https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/ctr-search/search?query=Autism+Spectrum+Disorders+AND+Autistic+Disorder

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001390/14
to the Commission
Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D) and Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: The role of the 'love hormone' in autism

A team of researchers from Inserm (the French Institute of Health and Medical Research) has made progress in understanding autism. On the basis of work carried out on mice, the researchers have shown that oxytocin, also known as the 'love hormone', causes a natural decrease in the level of chlorine in the neurons at the moment of birth.

This data therefore suggests that oxytocin is an important modulator of the expression of autism. This result validates the therapeutic strategy implemented in a clinical trial carried out at Brest in 2012.

How does the Commission intend to take advantage of the results of this study?

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

The Commission is aware of the results of several studies on the role of Oxytocin. To the Commission's knowledge, the studies undertaken to date do not constitute formal clinical trials into the effectiveness of oxytocin as a treatment for autism. According to the European Union Clinical Trials Register, there is however one clinical trial on-going on the effectiveness of oxytocin, from the Philipps-University in Marburg (Germany), which is specifically about the effect of an oxytocin nasal spray on neuronal processes of empathy ([1]).

([1]) https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/ctr-search/search?query=Autism+Spectrum+Disorders+AND+Autistic+Disorder

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001393/14
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(11. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Uvođenje useljeničkih kvota Švicarske prema državama članicama EU-a

Na referendumu u Švicarskoj održanom 9. veljače 2014. godine građani su glasovali za ponovno uvođenje useljeničkih kvota prema građanima zemalja članica Europske unije. Čak 50,3 % švicarskih birača podržalo je taj zahtjev, a inicijativa je prihvaćena jer ju je, sukladno propisima, podržalo više od polovice švicarskih kantona.

Iako Švicarska nije članica EU-a, ona je povezana s Unijom nizom bilateralnih ugovora, među kojima je i Ugovor o slobodi kretanja ljudi, kojim se Švicarska obvezala otvoriti svoje tržište radno aktivnim stanovnicima država članica EU-a.

Budući da se ovdje radi o povredi jednog od osnovnih načela na kojima počiva EU, a to je sloboda kretanja ljudi, te oslanjajući se na činjenicu da rezultati provedenog referenduma u Švicarskoj ne idu u prilog mobilnosti radne snage, čime se direktno krše potpisani ugovori između EU-a i Švicarske, koje korake Komisija planira poduzeti s obzirom na rezultate provedenog referenduma?

Odgovor visoke predstavnice/potpredsjednice Ashton u ime Komisije
(15. travnja 2014.)

Kao što je uvaženi član ispravno primijetio, referendumom je dovedeno u pitanje ključno načelo slobodnog kretanja osoba. Međutim, prije no što novi članak švicarskog ustava, uveden nakon referenduma, stupi na snagu, potrebno je donijeti provedbeno zakonodavstvo, za što švicarski zakonodavac ima rok od tri godine.

Nakon što se objave pojedinosti tog nacrta zakonodavstva, Komisija će provesti analizu njegove sukladnosti sa Sporazumom između EU-a i Švicarske o slobodnom kretanju osoba te s drugim bilateralnim sporazumima između EU-a i Švicarske, kao i sa svim mogućim inicijativama.

U međuvremenu, Federalno vijeće Švicarske zajamčilo je EU-u da će nastaviti ispunjavati svoje međunarodne obveze.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001393/14
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Switzerland's imposition of immigration quotas for EU Member States

In a referendum held on 9 February 2014 Switzerland voted to reintroduce immigration quotas for citizens of EU Member States. As many as 50.3% of Swiss voters backed that demand, and the initiative has thus been approved, as it was supported by more than half of the Swiss cantons, the proportion required by the rules.

Although Switzerland is not a Member State, it does have ties with the EU under a number of bilateral agreements, including the Agreement on the free movement of persons, whereby Switzerland has undertaken to open up its market to working residents of EU Member States.

Given that what is involved here is a violation of one of the core principles on which the EU is built, namely free movement of persons, and that the Swiss referendum result is not conducive to labour mobility, and hence amounts to a direct breach of the agreements signed between the EU and Switzerland, how does the Commission propose to respond?

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

As the Honourable Member rightly points out, the referendum called the essential principle of the free movement of persons into question. Before, however, the new Swiss constitutional article introduced by the referendum becomes effective, implementing legislation will have to be adopted, for which the Swiss legislator has three years.

Once the details of this draft legislation will be known, the Commission will analyse its compliance with the EU-Swiss Agreement on the free movement of persons and other bilateral agreements between the EU and Switzerland, as well as any possible initiatives.

In the meantime, the Swiss Federal Council has assured the EU that it will continue to fulfil its existing international obligations.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001395/14
to the Commission
Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Consumer credit data

Retailers usually make use of consumer credit histories when offering financial services such as loans, mortgages and credit cards. However, as this information is not normally shared across borders, consumers who may have a good credit history in one Member State often struggle to obtain credit, or even basic financial services such as a bank account, in another Member State.

The Commission's 2007 Single Market Review recognises that this inability to access complete consumer credit data reduces customer mobility and choice. An expert group was therefore established in 2008 to assist in identifying measures that could improve access to and exchange of consumer credit data within the EU. The expert group advised against establishing an EU central credit data system on the basis that there is a low level of market demand for cross-border retail credit data and that setting up such a system would represent a risk to the protection of consumers' personal data.

1. Has consumer demand for cross-border credit sharing been monitored and has it increased since 2009?

2. What action does the Commission intend to take to help those EU citizens who struggle to obtain credit or other financial services due to the difficulty in accessing credit data across borders?

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

The Commission is not aware of any substantial increase of cross-border lending in relation to consumer credits.

Information contained in credit registers is one of the tools for creditors to assess consumers' creditworthiness. In this context the Commission considers access to credit data important to promote cross-border supply of credit in the long-run. Directive 2014/17/EU ([1]) and Directive 2008/48/EC ([2]) contain provisions to enable non-discriminatory access for creditors to relevant credit databases in the creditworthiness assessment process.

As regards Directive 2008/48/EC, the requirement of non-discriminatory access for creditors to relevant credit databases has been in general terms correctly transposed to national legal orders of the Member States.

The Commission services will be paying close attention to the transposition by Member States of Directive 2014/17/EU concerning mortgage credits.

([1]) Directive 2014/17/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 February 2014 on credit agreements for consumers relating to residential immovable property and amending Directives 2008/48/EC and 2013/36/EU and Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 (OJ L60, 28.2.2014, p.34).

([2]) Directive 2008/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2008 on credit agreements for consumers (OJ L133, 22.5.2008, p.66).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001396/14
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(11. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Finanzierung eines Erweiterungsbaus der Europäischen Schule in Frankfurt am Main

Die Ansiedlung der Europäischen Bankenaufsicht bei der Europäischen Zentralbank (EZB) in Frankfurt am Main bedeutet ein Zuwachs von mehr als 1 000 Mitarbeitern. Deren Kinder haben Anspruch auf Unterricht an der dort bestehenden Europäischen Schule. Aufgrund der steigenden Schülerzahl ist ein Erweiterungsbau notwendig. Die Frage der Finanzierung ist bisher noch nicht geklärt.

1. Wie hoch sind die geschätzten Kosten für die Erweiterung der Europäischen Schule in Frankfurt a.M.?

2. Wer wird in welcher Höhe für die Kosten aufkommen?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(3. Juni 2014)

Die Europäische Schule in Frankfurt schätzt, dass infolge der Schaffung des Einheitlichen Aufsichtsmechanismus rund 350 neue Schüler für das Schuljahr 2014/2015 eingeschrieben werden.

Nach der Vereinbarung über die Satzung der Europäischen Schulen ist das jeweilige Gastland für die Bereitstellung der notwendigen Infrastruktur verantwortlich. Daher wird die Europäische Kommission nicht zur Finanzierung der Infrastruktur beitragen.

Im Hinblick auf das Gesamtbudget der Schule verhandeln die Europäische Zentralbank (EZB) und die Europäische Kommission derzeit über einen möglichen finanziellen Beitrag der EZB für die Kinder ihrer eigenen Mitarbeiter. Bislang wurde noch keine endgültige Entscheidung getroffen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001396/14
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Financing an extension to the European School in Frankfurt am Main

The establishment of the Single Supervisory Mechanism at the European Central Bank (ECB) in Frankfurt am Main will mean an increase of over 1 000 employees. Their children are entitled to be educated at the European School located there. Owing to the increasing number of pupils, an extension is required. The question of financing has not yet been resolved.

1. What are the estimated costs of the extension to the European School in Frankfurt am Main?

2. Who will bear the costs, and to what extent?

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

Within the context of the creation of the Single Supervisory Mechanism, the European School in Frankfurt expects about 350 new pupils to be enrolled for the school year 2014/2015.

According to the Convention defining the statute of the European schools, it is the obligation of the host country to provide for the necessary infrastructure. The European Commission will therefore not contribute to the financing of infrastructure.

Concerning the overall budget of the school, the European Central Bank (ECB) and the European Commission are negotiating about a potential financial contribution of the ECB for the pupils of their own staff. No final decision has been taken yet in that respect.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001400/14
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(11 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Personas con discapacidad e información

La falta de datos concretos sobre las personas con discapacidad supone un desafío a la hora de formular políticas de desarrollo realmente inclusivas. En consecuencia, no se divulga la realidad que afrontan las personas con discapacidad.

En reiteradas ocasiones se ha destacado la importancia de que la Unión Europea y los Gobiernos nacionales adopten medidas relativas a la recopilación de datos y estadísticas en relación con la discapacidad. Las estadísticas, hoy por hoy, sólo se centran en el número de personas con discapacidad.

La falta de datos sobre las personas con discapacidad y sus condiciones sociales y económicas, y las de sus hogares, limitan el diseño y la evaluación de las políticas y programas en materia de discapacidad.

Son múltiples los factores que limitan el acceso a la atención médica de las personas con discapacidad. Para atender adecuadamente a estas personas y aumentar el acceso a los servicios sanitarios es necesario un mayor grado de concienciación, conocimiento e información.

Como mínimo, el 10 % de la población mundial tiene alguna discapacidad. No obstante, estos datos dependen de la definición de «discapacidad» que se utilice. Distintas definiciones se aplican para distintos objetivos. Por otra parte, no existe una medida de la discapacidad.

Teniendo en cuenta el artículo 15 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea y el artículo 31 de la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad, ¿podría indicar la Comisión qué opina sobre la importancia de definir objetivos y de escoger una fuente apropiada para recopilar datos sobre las personas con discapacidad?

¿Considera la Comisión necesario apoyar la recopilación de datos sobre la discapacidad que sean apropiados e internacionalmente comparables?

¿Cree la Comisión que es necesario incluir preguntas relacionadas con la discapacidad en las consultas externas que acostumbra a realizar en la fase previa a la elaboración de los textos legislativos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

En la Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad 2010-2020 ([1]), la Comisión se compromete, de acuerdo con el artículo 31 de la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los derechos de las personas con discapacidad, a «complementar la elaboración de estadísticas periódicas sobre cuestiones de discapacidad a fin de estar al tanto de la situación de las personas de este colectivo».

La discapacidad es una de las variables sociales incluidas en los datos estadísticos recopilados por la Comisión. Actualmente, cuatro encuestas o módulos de encuesta de población del Sistema Estadístico Europeo (SEE) proporcionan datos sobre cuestiones de discapacidad. Consultas como la Encuesta comunitaria de salud por entrevista (EHIS) o la Encuesta sobre la renta y las condiciones de vida (siglas en inglés: SILC) proporcionan periódicamente datos sobre, por ejemplo, la educación y la situación de riesgo de pobreza de las personas con discapacidad. Los módulos *ad hoc* sobre discapacidad de las encuestas de población activa (EPA) de 2002 y 2011 proporcionan datos detallados sobre el empleo. Por último, la Encuesta europea de integración social y salud (EISS) que se realizó en 2012/2013 es la fuente más completa de datos sobre los obstáculos que impiden la participación en diferentes ámbitos de la vida de las personas con algún problema de salud o dificultad en una actividad básica.

La Comisión participa activamente en el Grupo de Washington para estadísticas sobre la discapacidad, uno de cuyos objetivos es facilitar información básica necesaria sobre discapacidad comparable a nivel mundial.

La Red académica de expertos europeos en discapacidad (ANED) ([2]) y la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea (FRA) ([3]) realizan trabajos de investigación y análisis adicionales sobre la situación de las personas con discapacidad.

La Comisión está a favor de incluir, en las consultas externas, preguntas sobre discapacidad si se trata de un aspecto relevante del asunto en cuestión.

([1]) «Un compromiso renovado para una Europa sin barreras», COM(2010) 0636 final
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:es:NOT
y la lista de acciones para 2010-2015 SEC(2010) 1324 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:ES:NOT

([2]) www.disability-europe.net

([3]) http://fra.europa.eu/en/theme/people-disabilities

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001400/14
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Information about persons with disability

The lack of specific data on persons with disabilities poses a challenge when it comes to designing properly inclusive development policies. It prevents the reality of the situation facing persons with disability from becoming fully visible.

It has often been stressed that it is important for the EU and national governments to introduce measures to assist the collection of data and statistics on disability. Current statistics only look at the numbers of persons with disabilities.

The lack of data on persons with disabilities and their social, economic and household situation hampers the design and assessment of disability policies and programmes

Many factors restrict the ability of disabled persons to access medical services. A greater level of awareness, knowledge and information is needed in order to properly meet the needs of these people and increase their access to health services.

At least 10% of the world's population suffers from some form of disability. However, these figures vary according to the definition of 'disability' applied. Different definitions are used for different purposes. On the other hand, there is no standard measurement of disability.

In light of Article 15 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and Article 31 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, can the Commission express its views on the importance of defining objectives and selecting an appropriate source for the collection of data on persons with disabilities?

Does the Commission see a need to support the collection of appropriate, internationally comparable data on disability?

Does the Commission consider it necessary to include questions related to disability in the external consultations which it normally carries out prior to drafting legislative texts?

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

In the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]), the Commission undertakes, in line with Article 31 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, to 'supplement the collection of periodic disability-related statistics with a view of monitoring the situation of persons with disabilities'.

Disability is among the social variables included in the statistical data gathered by the Commission. Currently four population-based surveys or survey modules provide some disability-related data within the European Statistical System (ESS). Surveys such as the European Health Interview Survey (EHIS) or the Survey of Income and Living Conditions (SILC) provide regularly data on for instance the education, and poverty-risk situation of persons with disabilities while the ad-hoc modules on disability in the Labour Force Surveys (LFS) of 2002 and 2011 provide detailed data on employment. Finally, the European Health and Social Integration Survey (EHSIS) conducted in 2012/2013 is the most comprehensive source of data on the barriers to participation in different life areas for people having a health problem or a basic activity difficulty.

The Commission actively participates in the Washington group of disability statistics. One of the aims of the group is to provide basic necessary information on disability which is comparable throughout the world.

Additional research and analytical work on the situation of persons with disabilities is done by the Academic Network of European Disability Experts (ANED) ([2]) and by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) ([3]).

The Commission is in favour of including questions on disability in external consultations when this is a relevant aspect of the subject matter.

([1]) 'A renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe', COM(2010) 0636 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT and the list of actions for 2010-2015 SEC(2010)1324 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
([2]) www.disability-europe.net
([3]) http://fra.europa.eu/en/theme/people-disabilities

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001403/14
an die Kommission
Paul Rübig (PPE)
(11. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Überprüfung der Sinnhaftigkeit eines REACH-Zulassungs- bzw. Beschränkungsverfahrens

Während der Konsultationsperiode zur Priorisierung von Al-RCF und Zr-RCF für die Aufnahme in Anhang XIV der REACH-Verordnung sind sehr viele die Zulassungsnotwendigkeit in Zweifel ziehende Kommentierungen von Wissenschaftlern und Anwendern bei der ECHA eingegangen. Trotz dieser einhelligen Kommentierungen wurde von ECHA/MSC eine Aufnahme von Al-RCF und Zr-RCF in Anhang XIV empfohlen. Einige bedeutende Mitgliedstaaten (UK; AT; CZ; HU) haben in einem „Minority Statement" massive rechtliche und wettbewerbsrelevante Einwände dargelegt.

1. Warum werden „Erzeugnisse" wie AL-RCF und Zr-RCF für ein REACH-Zulassungsverfahren priorisiert?

2. Beruht die Einstufung von Al-RCF auf den neuesten verfügbaren Erkenntnissen (z. B. Fraunhofer-Studie 2001; IARC 2002; Brown et. al 2005; SCOEL 2011; UBA-Austria 2010/2011)?

3. Wieso weicht die europäische Einstufung als einzige von der weltweit geltenden IARC-Einstufung für Al-RCF ab?

4. Warum wird keine von der ECHA empfohlene RMO-Analyse für Al-RCF und Zr-RCF im Rahmen des REACH/CLP-Prozesses durchgeführt angesichts der Tatsache, dass es wissenschaftlich fundierte Kritik an der Einstufung gibt?

5. Wie können die Zielkonflikte verschiedener EU-Regulierungen mit einer Zulassungsbestimmung aufgelöst werden?

6. Wie gedenkt die Kommission, Marktverschiebungen bzw. Wettbewerbsverzerrungen durch die Zulassung von Al-RCF mit Importen von Al-RCF-Erzeugnissen zu verhindern?

7. Wie stellt die Kommission die Verfügbarkeit, Produktsicherheit, Qualität und den Preis für Produkte aus Al-RCF sicher?

8. Wäre eine Regulierung über den Arbeitsschutz unter Federführung der GD Beschäftigung nicht zielführender (z. B. über Arbeitsplatzgrenzwert-BOELV)? Wenn nein, welche Gründe sprechen dagegen?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(14. April 2014)

Die Prioritätensetzung zugunsten der Aufnahme der Feuerfestfasern A1-RCF und Zr-RCF in die Liste der Stoffe für das Zulassungsverfahren (Anhang XIV von REACH ([1])) ist auf das allgemeine Konzept für die prioritäre Behandlung besonders besorgniserregender Stoffe (substances of very high concern — SVHC) ([2]) zurückzuführen, auf das sich der Ausschuss der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Chemikalienagentur (ECHA) im Mai 2010 auf der Grundlage von Artikel 58 Absatz 3 der REACH-Verordnung geeinigt hat.

Der Kommission ist bewusst, dass diese Fasern meist in Erzeugnisse eingearbeitet werden und dass einige Mitgliedstaaten Bedenken haben, ob die Zulassung der am besten geeignete Weg für den Umgang mit diesen Stoffen ist, da die Zulassung weder die Herstellung von Erzeugnissen außerhalb der EU betrifft noch die Einfuhr derartiger Erzeugnisse. Wenn jedoch diese Stoffe in Erzeugnissen (auch in Importen) ein Risiko für die menschliche Gesundheit oder die Umwelt mit sich bringen, kann gemäß Artikel 69 Absatz 2 der REACH-Verordnung eine Beschränkung eingeführt werden, die innerhalb und außerhalb der EU hergestellte Erzeugnisse gleichermaßen betreffen würde. Tatsächlich gelten Beschränkungen für alle in der EU in Verkehr gebrachten Erzeugnisse, unabhängig vom Herstellungsort, d. h. innerhalb oder außerhalb der EU.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1907/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 18. Dezember 2006 zur Registrierung, Bewertung, Zulassung und Beschränkung chemischer Stoffe (REACH).

([2]) Allgemeines Konzept für die prioritäre Behandlung besonders besorgniserregender Stoffe (auf Englisch), abrufbar unter: http://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13640/axiv_prioritysetting_general_approach_20100701_en.pdf

Die Kommission wird im Hinblick auf eine Änderung des Anhangs XIV nun die Empfehlung der ECHA ([3]) sowie die der Kommission vorgelegte begleitende und ergänzende Dokumentation prüfen, einschließlich der Möglichkeit, bestimmte Verwendungen gemäß Artikel 58 Absatz 2 der REACH-Verordnung von der Zulassungspflicht auszunehmen.

Die auf EU-Ebene harmonisierte Klassifikation der Stoffe kann im Lichte neuer Daten und Testergebnisse überprüft werden. Dazu müsste die Behörde eines Mitgliedstaats der ECHA einen neuen Klassifikationsvorschlag unterbreiten. Ein solcher Vorschlag könnte gemäß Artikel 36 der Verordnung über die Einstufung, Kennzeichnung und Verpackung von Stoffen ([4]) von der Industrie erarbeitet werden.

([3]) http://echa.europa.eu/addressing-chemicals-of-concern/authorisation/recommendation-for-inclusion-in-the-authorisation-list/previous-recommendations/5th-recommendation.

([4]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1272/2008 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 16. Dezember 2008 über die Einstufung, Kennzeichnung und Verpackung von Stoffen und Gemischen, zur Änderung und Aufhebung der Richtlinien 67/548/EWG und 1999/45/EG, und zur Änderung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1907/2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001403/14
to the Commission
Paul Rübig (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Review of the meaningfulness of a REACH authorisation and restriction process

During the consultation period regarding the prioritisation of Al-RCF and Zr-RCF for inclusion in Annex XIV of the REACH Regulation, the ECHA received a great number of comments from scientists and users casting doubt on the necessity of the authorisation. Despite these unanimous comments, the ECHA/MSC recommended that Al-RCF and Zr-RCF be included in Annex XIV. In a Minority Statement, several significant Member States (UK; AT; CZ; HU) raised serious legal and competition-related objections.

1. Why are 'products' such as Al-RCF and Zr-RCF prioritised for the REACH authorisation process?

2. Is the Al-RCF classification based on the latest available knowledge (e.g. the Fraunhofer study, 2001; IARC, 2002; Brown et.al, 2005; SCOEL, 2011; UBA Austria, 2010/2011)?

3. Why is the European classification the only classification that departs from the globally applicable IARC classification for Al-RCF?

4. Given the fact there is scientifically substantiated criticism of the classification, why are none of the RMO analyses recommended by the ECHA carried out for Al-RCF and Zr-RCF as part of the REACH/CLP process?

5. How can the conflicts between the aims of various EU regulations be resolved by means of an authorisation requirement?

6. How does the Commission intend to prevent market shifts and/or distortions of competition caused by the authorisation of Al-RCF with imports of Al-RCF products?

7. How is the Commission guaranteeing availability, product safety, quality and price in respect of products made from Al-RCF?

8. Would a regulation on health and safety protection at the workplace under the overall control of the DG for Employment not be more expedient (using BOELV occupational exposure limit values, for example)? If not, what are the reasons for not doing so?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

The prioritisation for inclusion of the refractory fibres Al-RCF and Zr-RCF in the list of substances subject to the authorisation process (Annex XIV to REACH ([1])) resulted from the General Approach for Prioritisation of Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC) ([2]) agreed by the Member State Committee of the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) in May 2010 on the basis of Article 58(3) of REACH.

The Commission is aware that these fibres are mostly used for incorporation into articles and that some Member States have concerns about whether authorisation is the most appropriate way to address these substances as authorisation does not apply to the production of articles outside the EU neither to the import of such articles. However, in cases when these substances in articles (including imports) pose a risk to health or the environment, a restriction can be introduced in line with Article 69(2) of REACH which would equally affect articles produced inside and outside of the EU. Indeed, restrictions apply to all articles placed on the EU market regardless of their place of production, i.e. inside or outside the EU.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the registration, evaluation, authorisation and restriction of chemicals (REACH).

([2]) 'General Approach for Prioritisation of SVHCs', available at: http://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13640/axiv_prioritysetting_general_approach_20100701_en.pdf

The Commission, with a view to amend Annex XIV, will now consider the recommendation of ECHA ([3]), its accompanying and additional documentation provided to the Commission, including the possibility of applying the exemption from authorisation for certain uses in line with Article 58(2) of REACH.

The EU-harmonised classification of the substances can be revisited in the light of new data and test results. A Member State authority would have to submit to ECHA a new proposal for classification. Such a proposal could be prepared by Industry, in accordance with Article 36 of the CLP Regulation ([4]).

([3]) http://echa.europa.eu/addressing-chemicals-of-concern/authorisation/recommendation-for-inclusion-in-the-authorisation-list/previous-recommendations/5th-recommendation

([4]) Regulation (EC) 1272/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures, amending and repealing Directives 67/548/EEC and 1999/45/EC, and amending Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002108/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-klieb tat-toroq fir-Rumanija

Is-sitwazzjoni tal-klieb tat-toroq fir-Rumanija laħqet punt kritiku. Il-politika attwali tar-Rumanija rigward il-qbid u l-qtil mhijiex xierqa għall-Ewropa tas-seklu 21. Madankollu, dawn il-prattiki għadhom isiru, xi kultant iffinanzjati mill-fondi tal-UE.

1. Il-Kummissjoni taqbel li għandha l-kompetenza ġuridika li tintervjeni fil-kwistjoni tal-klieb fir-Rumanija, abbażi tal-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE dwar is-saħħa pubblika? Jekk le, għal liema raġuni?

2. Il-programm tar-Rumanija dwar il-qerda tar-rabja jsemmi l-kontroll tal-popolazzjoni tal-klieb fost il-miżuri li għandhom jittieħdu?

3. Il-Kummissjoni taqbel li, bħala fatt ta' urġenza, il-finanzjament tal-programm tar-Rumanija dwar il-qerda tar-rabja għandu jkun soġġett għal rekwiżit espliċitu sabiex ir-Rumanija timplimenta miżuri fuq żmien twil fil-livell nazzjonali għall-ġestjoni tal-popolazzjoni tagħha tal-klieb skont l-aħjar prattika internazzjonali (fi kliem ieħor, miżuri aktar effiċjenti u umani li jieħdu post il-politika attwali tal-qbid u l-qtil?) Jekk le, għal liema raġuni?

4. Il-Kummissjoni tkompli teskludi l-possibbiltà li l-fondi tal-UE qed jiġu użati, direttament jew indirettament, biex jiffinanzjaw in-negozju tal-ġestjoni tal-qbid u l-qtil li jiswa bosta miljuni ta' euro fir-Rumanija permezz tal-bażits tal-amministrazzjoni lokali? Jekk iva, fuq liema bażi?

Tweġiba konġunta mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(7 ta' April 2014)

1. Id-Deċiżjoni Nru 1082/2013/UE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tat-22 ta' Ottubru 2013 stabbilixxiet dispożizzjonijiet għall-implimentazzjoni ta' sorveljanza tal-UE għal każijiet ta' rabja (rabies) fil-bnedmin u n-notifika ta' allert permezz ta' Sistema tal-UE ta' Twissija Bikrija u ta' Reazzjoni (EWRS — Early Warning and Response System) tal-avvenimenti kollha tar-rabja, inkluż dawk fil-klieb, li jikkawżaw jew jistgħu jikkawżaw theddid transkonfinali serju għas-saħħa pubblika.

2.-3. Il-miżuri ta' kofinanzjament approvati għall-programm tar-Rabja tar-Rumanija huma x-xiri ta' nases b'tilqima orali u d-distribuzzjoni tagħhom mill-ajru sabiex il-volpi jitlaqqmu kontra r-rabja, u r-rimborż ta' dawk l-ispejjeż huwa bbażat fuq il-fatturi.

Il-programm li għandu jiġi implimentat fl-2014, approvat mid-Deċiżjoni ta' Implimentazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni 2013/722/EU ([1]) jelenka miżuri oħrajn biex jindirizza din iż-żoonożi importanti, inkluż it-tilqim ta' karnivori domestiċi iżda dawk il-miżuri mhumiex kofinanzjati mill-UE.

Il-programm approvat ma jinkludix xi kampanja enormi ta' "qbid u qtil" tal-popolazzjoni tal-klieb bħala miżura ta' kontroll ġenerali. Madankollu, l-ewtanażja tal-karnivori hija elenkata bħala miżura fil-każ li jkunu ingirfu jew ingidmu minn annimal li għandu r-Rabja jew jiġi previst il-qtil fil-każ li juru sinjal kliniku ta' Rabja: dawk il-miżuri kollha mhumiex kofinazjati mill-UE.

Il-Kummissjoni mhix responsabbli mill-applikazzjoni, fil-livell nazzjonali, ta' miżuri li mhumiex elenkati fil-programm approvat.

4. Fir-rigward tal-użu ħażin allegat tal-fondi tal-UE f'appoġġ għall-benessri tal-annimali, dawn l-għajnuniet huma pagabbli biss biex jitjiebu l-istandards tat-trobbija tal-annimali għall-annimali tar-razzett. Il-klieb li jiġru barra mhux se jkunu eliġibbli.

([1]) Id-Deċiżjoni tal-Kummissjoni 2013/722/UE, ĠU L 328, tas-7.12.2013,p.101. http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/docs/adopted_2013_722_eu_en.pdf

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001404/14
komissiolle
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(11. helmikuuta 2014)

Aihe: Rabieksen torjuntaohjelma Romaniassa

Komissio totesi vastauksessaan kirjalliseen kysymykseen E-013324/2013, että rabieksen torjuntaohjelma Romaniassa koskee vain kettujen rokottamista ja että Euroopan unionin toiminnasta tehdyn sopimuksen 13 artikla ei tarjoa oikeusperustaa, jonka nojalla unioni voisi ryhtyä toimiin kyseisessä tapauksessa.

1. Myöntääkö komissio, että sillä on oikeudellista toimivaltaa puuttua Romanian koiria koskevaan kysymykseen kansanterveyttä koskevan unionin lainsäädännön nojalla?

2. Mainitaanko Romanian rabieksen torjuntaohjelman toteutettavissa toimissa koirakannan rajoittaminen?

3. Myöntääkö komissio, että Romanian rabieksen torjuntaohjelmaa olisi täsmennettävä kiireellisesti soveltamalla nimenomaista ehtoa, että Romanian on toteutettava pitkän aikavälin kansallisen tason toimia sen koirakannan rajoittamiseksi kansainvälisten parhaiden käytäntöjen mukaisesti? Toisin sanoen nykyinen vangitse ja tapa -toimintalinja olisi korvattava tehokkaammilla ja inhimillisemmillä toimenpiteillä.

4. Kieltääkö komissio edelleen sen mahdollisuuden olemassaolon, että EU:n varoja käytetään suorasti tai epäsuorasti miljoonien eurojen arvoisen, koirakannan rajoittamiseen tarkoitetun ”ota kiinni ja tapa” -liiketoiminnan rahoittamiseen Romaniassa paikallishallintojen budjettien kautta?

Tonio Borgin komission puolesta antama yhteinen vastaus
(7. huhtikuuta 2014)

1. Lokakuun 22 päivänä 2013 annetussa Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston päätöksessä N:o 1082/2013/EU vahvistetaan säännökset ihmisissä todettujen raivotautitapausten EU:n laajuisen seurannan ja EU:n varhaisvaroitus- ja reagointijärjestelmän välityksellä tapahtuvien kaikkia raivotautitapauksia koskevien ilmoitusten toteuttamiseksi. Tämä koskee myös koirissa todettuja tapauksia, joista saattaa aiheutua valtioiden rajat ylittäviä vakavia terveysuhkia.

2. ja 3. Romanian raivotaudin torjuntaohjelman yhteisrahoituksen piiriin hyväksytyt toimenpiteet liittyvät suun kautta annettavien rokotesyöttien hankintaan ja ilmasta tapahtuvaan levittämiseen kettujen rokottamiseksi raivotautia vastaan. Näistä kustannuksista maksetaan korvaukset laskujen perusteella.

Komission täytäntöönpanopäätöksellä 2013/722/EU ([1]) hyväksytyssä ohjelmassa, joka pannaan täytäntöön vuonna 2014, luetellaan myös muita toimenpiteitä kyseisen vakavan zoonoosin torjumiseksi, kotieläiminä pidettyjen lihansyöjien rokottaminen mukaan luettuna, mutta näihin toimenpiteisiin ei myönnetä EU:n yhteisrahoitusta.

Hyväksyttyyn ohjelmaan ei sisälly laajamittainen ota ”kiinni ja tapa” -toimintalinja yleisenä toimenpiteenä koirakannan rajoittamiseksi. Lihansyöjien lopettaminen luetellaan kuitenkin toimenpiteenä siinä tapauksessa, että raivotautia kantava eläin on aiheuttanut niille naarmuja ja puremia, samoin kuin eläinten tappaminen, jos niissä esiintyy kliinisiä raivotaudin oireita, mutta EU ei osallistu minkään näiden toimenpiteiden rahoitukseen.

Komissio ei vastaa sellaisten toimenpiteiden toteuttamisesta kansallisella tasolla, joita ei ole lueteltu hyväksytyssä ohjelmassa.

4. Väitetyn eläinten hyvinvoinnin tukemiseen liittyvän EU:n rahoituksen väärinkäytön osalta on todettava, että kyseistä tukea voidaan maksaa ainoastaan maatilaeläinten tuotantostandardien parantamiseen. Kulkukoirat eivät ole tukikelpoisia.

([1]) Komission päätös 2013/722/EU, EUVL L 328, 7.12.2013, s. 101. http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/docs/adopted_2013_722_eu_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001404/14
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Rabies programme in Romania

The Commission replied in its answer to Written Question E-013324/2013 that the rabies programme in Romania only concerns the vaccination of foxes and that Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union does not provide a legal basis for the EU to act in this case.

1. Does the Commission acknowledge that it has legal competence to intervene in relation to the issue of Romanian dogs, on the basis of EU legislation on public health?

2. Does Romania's rabies eradication programme mention dog population control among the measures to be carried out?

3. Does the Commission acknowledge that Romania's rabies eradication programme should be clarified as a matter of urgency by way of an explicit condition to the effect that Romania must implement long-term measures at national level for the management of its dog population in accordance with international best practice? In other words, the current 'catch and kill' policy should be replaced by more efficient and humane measures.

4. Does the Commission continue to rule out the possibility that EU funds are, directly or indirectly, being used to finance the multi-million-euro 'catch and kill' dog management business in Romania via local administration budgets?

Question for written answer E-002108/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Stray dogs in Romania

The situation of stray dogs in Romania has reached a critical point. Romania's current catch-and-kill policy is not appropriate in 21 st-century Europe. However, such practices are still occurring, sometimes financed by EU funds.

1. Does the Commission agree that it has legal competence to intervene in the issue of Romanian dogs, on the basis of EU legislation on public health? If not, why not?

2. Does Romania's rabies eradication programme mention dog population control among the measures to be carried out?

3. Does the Commission agree that, as a matter of urgency, the funding of Romania's rabies eradication programme should be made subject to an explicit requirement for Romania to implement long-term measures at national level for the management of its dog population in accordance with international best practice (in other words, to replace its current catch-and kill-policy with more efficient and humane measures)? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission continue to rule out the possibility that EU funds are being used, directly or indirectly, to finance the multi-million-euro catch-and-kill dog management business in Romania via local administration budgets? If so, on what grounds?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

1. Decision No 1082/2013/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 set up provisions for implementation of EU surveillance of rabies cases in humans and alert notification through the EU Early Warning and Response System (EWRS) of all the rabies events, including those in dogs, which cause or might cause a serious cross-border threats to public health.

2 and 3. The co-funded measures approved for Romania's Rabies programme are the purchase of oral vaccine baits and their aerial distribution in order to vaccinate foxes against rabies and the reimbursement of those costs are based on invoices.

The programme to be implemented in 2014 approved by Commission implementing Decision 2013/722/EU ([1]) lists other measures to tackle this important zoonosis, including the vaccination of domestic carnivores but those measures are not co-funded by EU.

The approved programme does not include any massive 'catch and kill' of dog population as general control measure. However, euthanasia of carnivores is listed as measure in case they have been scratched or bitten by animal with Rabies or killing is foreseen in case they show clinical sign of Rabies: all those measures are not co-funded by EU.

The Commission is not responsible for the application, at national level, of measures non- listed in the approved programme.

4. As regards the alleged misuse of EU funds in support to animal welfare, these aids are only payable to improve husbandry standards for farm animals. Stray dogs would not be eligible.

([1]) Commission Decision 2013/722/EU, OJ L 328 of 7.12.2013, p. 101. http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/docs/adopted_2013_722_eu_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001408/14
à la Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE)
(11 février 2014)

Objet: Conséquences de l'énergie océanique renouvelable sur l'industrie de la pêche

Dans une communication du 20 janvier 2014, la Commission européenne invite au développement de l'énergie océanique renouvelable en Europe. La Grèce a par ailleurs déclaré qu'il s'agissait d'une priorité d'action de la présidence actuelle du Conseil de l'Union européenne.

Une évaluation d'impact de la Commission estime que d'ici 2035, 40 000 emplois pourraient être créés dans le domaine de l'énergie océanique.

Pour autant, les conséquences possibles sur l'industrie de la pêche n'ont pas fait l'objet de recherches détaillées. En effet, l'analyse d'impact annexée à la communication de la Commission ne fait référence que quatre fois au secteur de la pêche pour un document de 141 pages.

À ce titre, alors que la pêche européenne représente des milliers d'emplois:

1. la Commission compte-t-elle faire une analyse d'impact détaillée des répercussions de l'énergie océanique sur la pêche européenne?

2. Comment s'assurer que ces infrastructures maritimes ne contreviendront pas à l'activité de pêche?

3. Les cycles migratoires de certaines espèces halieutiques peuvent-ils en être modifiés?

4. L'exploitation de l'énergie des marées et des courants de marée peut-elle avoir des effets sur l'écosystème?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(23 avril 2014)

La Commission est convaincue que les populations côtières tireront parti des nouveaux débouchés commerciaux dans «l'économie bleue», et notamment des énergies marines renouvelables, mais elle reconnaît que l'apparition de nouvelles activités marines et maritimes risque d'exacerber la concurrence pour l'utilisation de l'espace marin.

La proposition de directive de la Commission établissant un cadre pour la planification de l'espace maritime prévoit que les programmes de planification de l'espace maritime (qui pourront aussi concerner le développement de l'énergie océanique) prennent en considération un certain nombre d'activités, et plus particulièrement la pêche. Cette directive, si elle était adoptée, constituerait un outil important pour régler les conflits relatifs à l'utilisation de l'espace maritime et créer de plus grandes synergies entre les secteurs. Qui plus est, les programmes de planification de l'espace maritime susceptibles d'avoir des incidences notables sur l'environnement devront faire l'objet d'une évaluation environnementale conformément à la directive 2001/42/CE («directive ESE») ([1]) et, selon que de besoin, à la directive 92/43/CEE.

L'analyse d'impact qui accompagne la communication à laquelle il est fait référence fait allusion aux possibles effets du développement de l'énergie océanique sur le comportement des poissons et sur les écosystèmes marins, effets qui peuvent aussi être positifs. La Commission a commandé une étude sur les incidences environnementales du bruit, des vibrations et des émissions électromagnétiques liés aux énergies marines renouvelables. Les résultats de cette étude seront publiés en juin 2015. En outre, plusieurs projets de recherche financés par l'UE étudient actuellement les relations et les synergies entre les sources d'énergie renouvelables en mer et d'autres utilisations de l'espace marin (telles que, par exemple, les projets «Seanergy» et «Coconet» en Méditerranée et dans la mer Noire et les projets sur plates-formes en mer polyvalentes tels que «H2ocean», «Tropos» et «Mermaid», qui combinent l'aquaculture, la production d'énergie, les services de transport et les loisirs).

([1]) JO L 197 du 21.7.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001408/14
to the Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Consequences of offshore renewable energy on the fishing industry

In a communication of 20 January 2014, the European Commission encourages the development of offshore renewable energy in Europe. Greece has also declared that this is a priority for action of the current Presidency of the Council of the European Union.

An impact evaluation by the Commission estimates that, by 2035, 40 000 jobs might be created in the field of offshore energy.

However, the possible consequences on the fishing industry have not been the subject of detailed research. In fact, the impact analysis attached to the Commission's communication only refers to the fishing sector four times in a document of 141 pages.

Therefore, as European fishing involves thousands of jobs:

1. Is the Commission intending to carry out a detailed impact analysis of the repercussions of offshore energy on European fishing?

2. How is it ensured that these maritime infrastructures will not come into conflict with fishing activity?

3. May the migratory cycles of certain species of fish be altered thereby?

4. May the utilisation of tidal energy and tidal current energy have effects on the ecosystem?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

The Commission is convinced that the new commercial opportunities in the blue economy, including marine renewables, will benefit coastal communities while recognising that the emergence of new marine and maritime activities may increase competition over the use of marine space.

The Commission proposal for a directive establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning envisages that maritime spatial plans (which may encompass the development of ocean energy) should take into account a number of activities including specifically fishing. This directive will be important to address conflicts on the use of the maritime space and to create more synergies between sectors. Furthermore, maritime spatial plans likely to have significant effects on the environment should be subject to an assessment of their environmental effects pursuant to Directive 2001/42/EC (SEA Directive) ([1]) and, as appropriate, pursuant to Directive 92/43/EEC.

The impact assessment supporting the communication referred to alludes to the possible effects of ocean energy development on fish behaviour and marine ecosystems, which may also be positive. The Commission has commissioned a study of the environmental impacts of noise, vibrations and electromagnetic emissions from marine renewables. It will be available in June 2015. In addition, several ongoing EU-funded research projects explore the interplay and synergies between offshore renewables and other uses of the marine space e.g. Seanergy and Coconet from the Mediterranean and Black Sea and projects on multiuse offshore platforms such as H2ocean, Tropos and Mermaid, combining aquaculture, energy generation, transport services and leisure.

([1]) OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001411/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(11 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per servizi di telefonia destinati ai turisti europei al di fuori degli Stati membri dell'Unione europea

Negli ultimi anni, il mercato della telefonia mobile ha avuto e sta avendo un tasso di crescita esponenziale nei paesi europei, grazie all'impegno di tutte le parti coinvolte e alla crescente domanda di comunicazione.

In Europa sono già stati fatti importanti passi per ridurre i costi delle comunicazioni telefoniche.

Nonostante ciò i costi del roaming all'interno dell'Unione europea, sebbene ridotti rispetto al passato, continuano a essere elevati quando si comunica con paesi extra europei.

Il settore che risente maggiormente di questa situazione è quello turistico, dal momento che la breve permanenza all'estero non consente al turista di cercare soluzioni economiche vantaggiose.

In questo contesto la Telecom International, società costituita a norma delle leggi della Repubblica Dominicana e autorizzata dal 2006 dall'Autority locale a fornire servizi pubblici di telecomunicazione, ha messo a punto avanzate applicazioni di telefonia mobile che permettono di ridurre drasticamente il costo delle comunicazioni telefoniche internazionali fra paesi europei ed extraeuropei, di particolare interesse per i turisti europei.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali sono gli strumenti disponibili per concedere un finanziamento a un'impresa telefonica dominicana nell'ambito dei programmi per i paesi ACP, oppure a un'impresa italiana che è partner tecnologica della stessa per il progetto sopra esposto?

2. Quali sono le azioni previste nel settore TLC nel quadro dell'accordo ACP 2014-2020?

3. Qual è il quadro generale della situazione?

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

L'emergere di offerte alternative rappresenta uno sviluppo positivo e può aumentare la pressione concorrenziale sui prezzi del roaming e delle chiamate internazionali. Sebbene si compiaccia della comparsa di offerte alternative e degli sviluppi tecnologici, la Commissione assume una posizione neutra nei confronti delle diverse tecnologie o offerte disponibili sul mercato per evitare di discriminare determinate soluzioni. La proposta della Commissione del settembre 2013 di creare un continente connesso contiene una disposizione volta a porre fine alle differenze di prezzo ingiustificate tra chiamate nazionali e intraunionali.

Nell'ambito della politica di sviluppo e dell'assistenza esterna dell'UE, la Commissione è impegnata a continuare a sostenere le azioni intese a promuovere e diffondere l'uso delle TIC nei paesi in via di sviluppo, compresi i paesi ACP, nel QFP ([1]) 2014-2020. Le azioni si concentrano su tre priorità ([2]).

La Commissione collabora con i governi beneficiari e appoggia le loro politiche di sviluppo; non sostiene direttamente le imprese private per evitare di distorcere la concorrenza. L'aggiudicazione degli appalti per le imprese private avviene tramite gare pubbliche indette dai governi e non è gestita direttamente dalla Commissione.

I finanziamenti dell'Unione sono disponibili, tuttavia, per le imprese con sede nell'UE per investimenti effettuati negli Stati membri tramite programmi cofinanziati dai Fondi strutturali dell'UE per il periodo 2007-2013 e realizzati dalle autorità nazionali ([3]).

([1]) Quadro finanziario pluriennale.
([2]) Armonizzazione e allineamento su scala regionale o continentale dei quadri normativi e delle politiche in materia di comunicazioni elettroniche tra paesi in via di sviluppo e UE; interconnessione di reti di ricerca e istruzione ad elevata capacità; rafforzamento delle capacità nel settore delle TIC per tutti, ossia cittadini, imprese (in particolare PMI), governi e organizzazioni.
([3]) Per l'Italia si faccia riferimento al sito: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/commu/beneficiaries/index.cfm?LAN=IT&PAY=it&lang=it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001411/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Possible funding of telephone services intended for European tourists visiting non-EU Member States

The growth of the mobile telephone market throughout Europe has been phenomenal over the past few years, and is showing no signs of slowing down today, thanks to the pledges made by all the parties involved and the ever-rising demand for communication.

A number of important steps have already been taken in Europe to reduce the costs of telephone calls.

However, roaming charges within the European Union, although much lower than in the past, are still high for those wishing to make calls to countries outside Europe.

Tourists are bearing the brunt of this situation, since they are not in a position to seek out the best deals when staying abroad for relatively short periods of time.

In this context, Telecom International, a company that was formed under the laws of the Dominican Republic and has been licensed by the local telecoms authority to provide public telecommunications services since 2006, has developed advanced mobile telephone apps that drastically bring down the costs of international telephone calls made between European and non-European countries, which are of particular interest to European tourists.

1. Taking this situation into account, can the Commission reveal what instruments are in place for granting funding to a telephone company based in the Dominican Republic as part of the programmes developed for ACP countries, or to an Italian company that has entered into a technology partnership with that company concerning the project detailed above?

2. What initiatives are scheduled to be rolled out in the telecommunications sector, within the framework of the ACP agreement for the 2014-2020 period?

3. Can the Commission provide a general overview of the situation?

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

The emergence of alternative offers and substitutes to international calling and roaming is a positive development as it has a potential to increase competitive pressure on roaming and international calling prices. Although the Commission welcomes the emergence of alternative offers and technological developments, it takes a neutral stance as regards different technologies or offerings available on the market to avoid discrimination against certain solutions. The Commission's proposal for a Connected Continent of September 2013 includes a provision to put an end to unjustified price differences between national and intra-EU calls.

In the context of the EU external assistance and development policy, the Commission is committed to continue supporting actions aiming at the promotion and overall take-up of ICT in the developing countries, including ACP, within the 2014-2020 MFF ([1]). Actions are concentrated on 3 priorities ([2]).

The Commission collaborates with beneficiary governments and supports their development policies. The Commission does not directly support private companies in order not to distort competition. Contracts for private companies are awarded through public tenders by the governments and not directly managed by the Commission.

EU funding is available, however, for EU based companies for investments carried out in EU Member States through programmes co-financed by the EU Structural Funds for 2007-2013 that are implemented by national authorities ([3]).

([1]) Multiannual Financial Framework.

([2]) Harmonisation and alignment on a regional or continental scale of the e-communications policies and regulatory frameworks between the developing countries and the EU; interconnection of high-capacity research and education networks; enhancement of ICT capacity-building for all, i.e. citizens, businesses with a focus on SMEs, governments and organisations.

([3]) in case of Italy, please see: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/commu/beneficiaries/index.cfm?PAY=it&lang=en

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001412/14
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(11 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Sytuacja pracowników w Katarze

Parlament Europejski wypowiadał się kilkakrotnie w sprawie sytuacji pracowników przyjeżdżających do pracy w sektorze budowlanym w Katarze.

Niedawny raport organizacji „Human Rights Watch" donosi, że osoby zatrudnione na budowach, szczególnie obiektów przygotowywanych z myślą o Pucharze Świata w Piłce Nożnej 2022, pracują w zagrażających życiu i zdrowiu warunkach. Wysoki współczynnik umieralności wśród nich jest tego dowodem.

W związku z tym pytam Wiceprzewodniczącą/Wysoką Przedstawiciel o następujące kwestie:

1. W nawiązaniu do odpowiedzi na pytania poselskie udzielonych przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel (E-013654/2013, E-011091/2013, P-011553/2013, E-011648/2013, E-011649/2013) proszę o udzielenie informacji, jakie konkretne działania dyplomatyczne zostały podjęte przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel i Europejską Służbę Działań Zewnętrznych w sprawie praw pracowników migrujących w następujących krajach Zatoki Perskiej: Katarze, Kuwejcie, Bahrajnie, Arabii Saudyjskiej, Omanie i Zjednoczonych Emiratów Arabskich.

2. Jakie działania na forum organizacji międzynarodowych podejmuje Unia Europejska, aby zapewnić jak najwyższe standardy ochrony pracowników?

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

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca, ESDZ i delegatury UE w Rijadzie i Abu Zabi ściśle monitorują sytuację pracowników migrujących w regionie Zatoki.

Korzystają one przy tym z pełnego wachlarza instrumentów dyplomatycznych, aby przekonywać do przeprowadzenia reform w państwach RWPZ. Czynią to również przekazując, nieformalnie i formalnie, wiadomości władzom sześciu państw Zatoki poprzez mechanizmy Rady Praw Człowieka, Międzynarodową Organizację Pracy i kontakty na szczeblu lokalnym.

Więcej informacji w tej kwestii szanowny Pan Poseł może znaleźć w odpowiedzi udzielonej na pytanie poselskie E-001866/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001412/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Conditions facing workers in Qatar

The European Parliament has expressed its views several times on the situation of workers who go to Qatar to work in the building sector.

According to a recent report by Human Rights Watch, people employed on construction sites, especially those working on facilities for the 2022 World Cup, are working in unhealthy, life-threatening conditions. This is clear from the high mortality rate among these workers.

In this connection, could the Vice-President/High Representative answer the following questions:

1. Further to the Vice-President/High Representative's answers to a number of parliamentary questions (E-013654/2013, E-011091/2013, P-011553/2013, E-011648/2013 and E-011649/2013), what specific diplomatic action have the High Representative and the European External Action Service taken in respect of the rights of migrant workers in the following Persian Gulf countries: Qatar, Kuwait, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Oman, the United Arab Emirates?

2. What action is the EU taking through international organisations to ensure that the workers receive the highest possible standards of protection?

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

The HR/VP, the EEAS and the EU Delegations in Riyadh and Abu Dhabi have been closely monitoring the situation of migrant workers in the Gulf.

They have been using the full range of diplomatic instruments to argue for reforms in GCC countries, including conveying messages in private and public to authorities in the six Gulf states, through the UN Human Rights Council mechanisms, the ILO and through contacts at local level.

The Honourable MEP is kindly referred to the answer given to EPQ E-001866/2014 for more details on this issue.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001413/14
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(11 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Zamachy w Libanie

Ludność Libanu, ze względu na położenie geograficzne, jest szczególnie narażona na ataki terrorystyczne.

W styczniu światowe media doniosły o kilku atakach na miasta takie jak Bejrut, Trypolis, Hermel czy Arsal. Ataki były skierowane zarówno wobec ludności alawickiej, jak i sunnickiej. Przynajmniej 30 osób, w tym dzieci, straciło życie w ciągu 1 tygodnia.

Liban nie jest krajem w stanie wojny, więc liczne akty przemocy wobec mieszkańców tego kraju są szczególnie niepokojące. W związku z tym proszę Wiceprzewodniczącą/Wysoką Przedstawiciel o udzielenie odpowiedzi na następujące pytania:

1. Jaka jest ocena Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel ataków w Libanie?

2. Czy działania względem Libanu, podejmowane za pośrednictwem europejskiej dyplomacji w zakresie zarówno promowania demokracji i praworządności były wystarczające?

3. Czy i w jaki sposób Unia Europejska zamierza wpłynąć na poprawę sytuacji ludności Libanu oraz zminimalizowanie skutków rozlewającego się konfliktu w sąsiedniej Syrii?

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

1. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji zdecydowanie potępiła niedawne ataki w Libanie. Terroryzm i stosowanie przemocy wobec ludności cywilnej są absolutnie niedopuszczalne. UE jest nadal głęboko zaniepokojona falą aktów przemocy w tym kraju i uważnie śledzi wpływ konfliktu w Syrii na Liban.

2. UE pozostaje wierna swojemu zobowiązaniu do wspierania w Libanie demokracji i rządów prawa, które to wartości należą do priorytetów działań w ramach europejskiej polityki sąsiedztwa. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji z zadowoleniem przyjęła wiadomość o utworzeniu w lutym br. nowego rządu w Libanie, co jest kluczowym etapem w działaniach tego kraju na rzecz zmierzenia się z bieżącymi wyzwaniami. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji ponownie potwierdza, że UE będzie w dalszym ciągu wspierać Liban w obliczu tych wyzwań i pomagać w umacnianiu instytucji oraz wspierać realizację programu reform w Libanie.

3. Z głębokim niepokojem UE zwraca uwagę na ogromne wyzwania w dziedzinie bezpieczeństwa, gospodarki i polityki, przed jakimi stoi Liban. Od początku kryzysu UE przeznaczyła na działania związane z sytuacją kryzysową w Libanie ponad 300 mln EUR, zwłaszcza udzielając pomocy syryjskim uchodźcom i wspólnotom ich przyjmującym, dostarczając pomocy humanitarnej najbardziej potrzebującym, a także wspierając rząd Libanu w budowaniu potencjału umożliwiającego zareagowanie na tak bezprecedensowy kryzys. UE jest również zdania, że łagodzenie istniejących napięć stanowi priorytet i w pełni popiera rolę libańskich sił zbrojnych, głównego organu zajmującego się utrzymaniem porządku i stabilności. W grudniu 2013 r. ministrowie spraw zagranicznych UE wyrazili swoje zaangażowanie na rzecz zbadania możliwości udzielenia większego wsparcia libańskim siłom zbrojnym. UE określiła więc na poziomie UE i państw członkowskich obszary, w których takiego zwiększonego wsparcia można udzielić, w perspektywie rozpoczęcia konkretnych dalszych działań.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001413/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Attacks in Lebanon

The people of Lebanon, given the location of the country, are particularly vulnerable to terrorist attacks.

In January the world's media reported on a number of attacks in cities and towns including Beirut, Tripoli, Hermel and Arsal. The attacks targeted both the Alawite and Sunni communities. At least 30 people, including children, were killed in the course of a week.

Lebanon is not officially at war, so these numerous attacks against those living in the country are all the more worrying. With this in mind:

1. What is the Vice-President/High Representative's assessment of the attacks in Lebanon?

2. Have European diplomatic efforts to promote democracy and the rule of law in Lebanon been sufficient?

3. Is the European Union intending to help improve the lot of the people of Lebanon and minimise the spillover effects of the conflict in neighbouring Syria? If so, how?

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

1. The HR/VP strongly condemned the recent attacks in Lebanon. Terrorism and any use of violence against civilians are completely unacceptable. The EU remains deeply concerned by the spiral of violence in the country and closely follows the repercussions of the Syrian conflict in Lebanon.

2. The EU is steadfast in its commitment to promoting democracy and the rule of law in Lebanon, which are between the priorities of action under the European Neighbourhood Policy. The HR/VP warmly welcomed the formation of the new Lebanese government in February, a key step in Lebanon's effort to tackle its current challenges. The HR/VP reconfirms that the EU will continue to stand by Lebanon to face those challenges, and to support the strengthening of Lebanon's institutions and the implementation of its reform agenda.

3. The EU notes with great concern that Lebanon is facing a set of extraordinary security, economic and political challenges. Since the outbreak of the crisis the EU has allocated more than EUR 300 million to address the crisis situation in Lebanon, notably by assisting the Syrian refugees and their host communities, delivering humanitarian assistance to the most vulnerable as well as building the capacities of the Lebanese Government to deal with this unprecedented crisis. The EU also believes that de-escalating tensions is a priority and thus fully supports the role of the Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF), a key actor in maintaining order and stability. In December 2013, EU foreign ministers expressed their commitment to explore possibilities for increased support to the LAF. The EU has thus identified specific areas for such enhanced support, at both EU and Member States' level, with a view to concrete follow-up.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-001414/14
za Komisijo
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(11. februar 2014)

Zadeva: Podpora EU ohranjanju kulturne dediščine

Za Evropo je značilno veliko število raznolikih kultur in temu dejstvu gre v precejšnji meri pripisati tudi raznolikost oblikovanja krajine, mest kot tudi arhitekturno dediščino Evrope. Ta kulturna raznolikost in dediščina danes predstavlja neprecenljiv potencial za trajnostni prostorski razvoj.

Granadska konvencija, ki govori o ohranitvi evropske arhitekturne dediščine, Konvencija iz La Valette o zaščiti arheološke dediščine, pa tudi Listina iz Firenc o zaščiti zgodovinskih parkov in vrtov, navajajo pomembna načela o ohranjanju in izboljševanju stanja kulturne dediščine v kontekstu trajnostnega prostorskega razvoja.

Zato bi morali povečati fond kulturne dediščine kot razvojnega dejavnika in tako prispevati h gospodarskemu razvoju. To pomeni med drugim tudi investicije v stara mestna središča, ki predstavljajo ne le veliko bogastvo kulturne dediščine, ampak tudi razvojno priložnost. Zato je nujno iskati rešitve za obnovo in razvoj starih mestnih središč tudi v obliki spodbud javno-zasebnim partnerstvom.

Obnova infrastrukture, ki spada pod zaščito kulturne dediščine je pogosto prevelik strošek za zasebne lastnike, poleg tega je potrebna za kvalitetno prenovo tudi dobra strokovna podlaga s konservatorskimi projekti za prenovo.

Komisijo zato sprašujem:

1. Kakšen način podpore na ravni EU je namenjen ohranjanju kulturne dediščine tako za javne ustanove kot za zasebne lastnike takšne infrastrukture?

2. Katera sredstva EU so na voljo za obnovo in razvoj starih mestnih središč in mestnih predelov, ki so zaščiteni kot kulturni spomenik?

3. Kako je urejeno financiranje projektov obnove kulturne dediščine znotraj strukturnih skladov?

4. Kakšne so možnosti ustanovitve posebnega sklada za kulturo po vzorcu sedanjih strukturnih skladov, kjer bi bil nacionalnim organom upravljanja dodeljen delež sredstev v naslednji finančni strukturi 2020–2027?

5. Kako so finančne spodbude za ohranjanje kulturne dediščine dodeljene v okviru trenutnega programa EU za kulturo, Ustvarjalna Evropa?

Odgovor Androulle Vassiliou v imenu Komisije
(9. april 2014)

Program Ustvarjalna Evropa ([1]) podpira ukrepe za varovanje in spodbujanje evropske kulturne in jezikovne raznolikosti ter za krepitev konkurenčnosti evropskih kulturnih in ustvarjalnih sektorjev.

Zaradi spoštovanja načela subsidiarnosti program Ustvarjalna Evropa ne more neposredno podpirati varstva, obnove ali ohranjanja kulturnih spomenikov. Lahko pa financira projekte sodelovanja, ki vključujejo kulturne izvajalce iz različnih sodelujočih držav in ki so namenjeni promociji in spodbujanju evropske kulturne dediščine, če izpolnjujejo merila in zahteve programa ([2]). Poleg tega Ustvarjalna Evropa podpira nagrado EU za kulturno dediščino ([3]), ki poudarja odlične primere ohranjanja dediščine ter prizadevanja za ozaveščenost o evropski kulturni dediščini in njeni vrednosti za evropsko družbo in gospodarstvo.

Evropski strukturni in investicijski skladi lahko zagotovijo podporo za obnovo kulturne dediščine, vendar mora biti ta tesno povezana z regionalnim in lokalnim (npr. mestnim) gospodarskim razvojem ter spodbujanjem ustvarjanja delovnih mest.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/index_en.htm
([2]) Več informacij je na voljo na: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/calls/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/prizes/cultural-heritage_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001414/14
to the Commission
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: EU support for the conservation of cultural heritage

What sets Europe apart is its many and varied cultures, which find expression not least in the diverse configuration of its regions and cities, as well as in its architectural heritage. Today this cultural diversity and heritage constitute invaluable spatial development potential in terms of sustainability.

The Granada Convention, relating to the protection of Europe's architectural heritage, the Valletta Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, and the Florence Charter on the Preservation of Historic Gardens set out key principles for maintaining and enhancing the status of cultural heritage in the context of sustainable spatial development.

That is why cultural heritage funding should be increased, given that it is a development factor and as such contributes to economic development. One inference to be drawn from that fact is that investment should also be channelled into old town quarters, which not only represent the great richness of cultural heritage, but also offer a development opportunity. Solutions for their restoration and development accordingly need to be sought, for instance by encouraging public-private partnership.

Infrastructure renovation constituting protection of cultural heritage is often too expensive for private owners, and good renewal, moreover, has to proceed from a sound specialist basis in the shape of conservation projects.

1. What form of support is earmarked at EU level for cultural heritage conservation, whether granted to public institutions or to private owners?

2. What types of EU resources are available for the restoration and development of old town quarters and other urban districts which have the protected status of cultural monuments?

3. By what arrangements are cultural heritage restoration projects financed under the Structural Funds?

4. What are the prospects for setting up a special fund for culture, modelled on the present Structural Funds, whereby a proportion of the resources would be assigned to national managing authorities under the next financing arrangement for the years 2020 to 2027?

5. How are financial incentives for the conservation of cultural heritage being allocated under the current EU culture programme, Creative Europe?

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

The Creative Europe Programme ([1]) supports actions to safeguard and promote Europe's cultural and linguistic diversity and to strenghten the competitiveness of the European cultural and creative sectors.

In respect of the principle of subsidiarity, the Creative Europe Programme cannot directly support the protection, restoration or maintenance of cultural heritage sites. It can, however, fund cooperation projects involving cultural operators from different participating countries which aim to highlight and promote European cultural heritage provided they match the criteria and requirements of the Programme ([2]). Furthermore, Creative Europe supports the EU Prize for cultural heritage ([3]) which emphasises excellent examples of heritage care and showcases awareness raising efforts about European cultural heritage and its value to European society and the economy.

The European Structural and Investment Funds can support the restoration of cultural heritage, but it should be closely linked to regional and local (e.g. urban) economic development, and to boosting job creation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/index_en.htm
([2]) More information can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/calls/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/prizes/cultural-heritage_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001415/14
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE) et Dominique Vlasto (PPE)
(11 février 2014)

Objet: Protection des indications géographiques pour le vin européen

En juin 2011, la Société pour l'attribution des noms de domaine et des numéros sur Internet (ICCAN), organisme chargé de gérer les noms de domaines sur l'internet, a décidé de lancer un programme visant à accroître le nombre de noms de domaines, en envisageant notamment de commercialiser les domaines .vin ou .wine.

Alors que le nom de domaine .wine a été déposé par trois pays (États-Unis, Irlande et Gibraltar) et celui de .vin a été déposé par une société de l'Union européenne, la filière viticole européenne est particulièrement inquiète de cette évolution, car aucune protection des indications géographiques n'est garantie, d'autant que les sociétés candidates ont fait part de leur intention de mettre aux enchères ces noms de domaines.

Concrètement, les producteurs de vins pourraient être contraints de racheter leurs noms de domaine au mépris d'une tradition et d'une notoriété bien établie, caractérisée par l'indication géographique et sans respect des droits de propriété intellectuelle, qu'ils possèdent par principe.

Le sommet qui a réuni les dirigeants de l'ICCAN à Buenos Aires, en novembre 2013 , n'a pas permis de trancher la question de la protection des indications géographiques.

Le 31 janvier dernier, les États-Unis ont rappelé à l'ICCAN leur volonté de déléguer sans contrôle les domaines .vin et .wine.

La Commission européenne a quant à elle indiqué, le 3 février, à l'ICCAN son souhait de protéger les droits de propriété intellectuelle européens, en prévenant que l'ICCAN outrepasserait son mandat si elle venait à se prononcer sur une délégation sans condition des noms de domaine.

Si l'ICCAN venait à se prononcer en défaveur des arguments de la Commission européenne, quelles seraient les voies de recours de l'Union pour protéger les indications géographiques européennes?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(4 avril 2014)

Les Honorables Parlementaires soulèvent une question importante. Depuis le lancement du nouveau programme gTLD ([1]) de l'ICANN, la Commission, en étroite coopération avec les États membres de l'Union européenne, a activement cherché à obtenir un ensemble de garanties concernant les noms de domaine qui pourraient avoir une incidence négative sur la politique publique ou enfreindre les législations nationales (y compris le droit de l'Union). Nous y sommes parvenus en partie.

Les noms de domaine «.wine» et «.vin» ont fait l'objet d'un vif débat au sein du comité consultatif des gouvernements (GAC). En concertation avec les États membres de l'Union, la Commission a fermement défendu, face à l'ICANN, la position selon laquelle ces noms de domaines ne devraient pas être délégués et les sociétés candidates et les parties intéressées devraient être encouragées à poursuivre les négociations pour parvenir à un accord en la matière. La Commission a tenu le Parlement européen régulièrement informé, par l'intermédiaire de la commission interparlementaire sur le vin.

Par une récente décision du 22 mars 2014, le conseil d'administration de l'ICANN, comme le suggèrent les Honorables Parlementaires, a décidé de déléguer ces noms de domaine sans garanties appropriées. Ce faisant, il a ignoré l'avis d'un grand nombre de parties prenantes. La première mesure prise par la Commission a été de contester, pour vice de procédure, la décision du conseil d'administration de l'ICANN et de demander sa révision. La Commission a été soutenue sur ce point par le GAC dans son communiqué du 27 mars 2014. Les mesures ultérieures, au niveau politique ou juridique, dépendront du processus de révision de la décision du conseil d'administration de l'ICANN et du contenu de cette révision. Pour la Commission, il est évident que toute loi doit s'appliquer dans toutes les enceintes, y compris sur l'internet. La Commission, les États membres et les parties prenantes utiliseront tous les moyens à leur disposition présentant des chances raisonnables de succès, depuis l'action politique vis-à-vis du gouvernement américain jusqu'à l'action en justice devant les tribunaux européens ou américains.

([1]) Noms de domaine génériques de premier niveau (generic Top Level Domain names).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001415/14
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE) and Dominique Vlasto (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Protection of geographical indications for European wine

In June 2011, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), the body charged with managing domain names on the Internet, decided to launch a programme aimed at increasing the number of domain names, envisaging in particular the marketing of the domains .vin and .wine.

As the domain name .wine has been filed by three countries (United States, Ireland and Gibraltar) and that of .vin has been filed by a company of the European Union, the European wine industry is particularly worried about this development, as no protection of geographical indications is guaranteed, especially since the applicant companies have announced their intention to put these domain names up for auction.

Specifically, wine producers may be forced to buy back their domain names, with there being no regard for a well-established tradition and reputation, characterised by the geographical indication, and no respect for intellectual property rights, which they possess on principle.

The meeting of the leaders of ICANN in Buenos Aires, in November 2013, did not resolve the question of the protection of geographical indications.

On 31 January this year, the United States reminded ICANN of their wish to assign the domains .vin and .wine without control.

For its part, the European Commission indicated to ICANN, on 3 February, its desire to protect European intellectual property rights, warning that ICANN would go beyond its mandate if it were to give a decision on an assignment of the domain names without condition.

If ICANN were to pronounce itself against the arguments of the European Commission, what would be the Union's recourse in order to protect European geographical indications?

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

The Honourable Members of Parliament raise a question on an important issue. Since the launch of ICANN's new gTLD ([1]) programme, the Commission, in close cooperation with EU Member States, has been actively pursuing a set of safeguards regarding domain names that could negatively impact on public policy or infringe national laws (including EC law). In doing this we have been partially successful.

The gTLDs .wine and .vin have been heavily debated in the Government Advisory Committee GAC and through a concerted effort with EU Member States the Commission has taken a strong stance to ICANN saying that these strings should not be delegated and the applicants and interested parties should be encouraged to continue their negotiations with a view to reach an agreement on the matter. The Commission regularly informed the European Parliament through the inter-Parliamentary Committee on Wine.

With a recent decision of 22 March 2014 the ICANN Board, as the Honourable Members of Parliament suggest, has taken a decision to delegate the strings without proper safeguards. They thus ignore the advice from many stakeholders. The first action point the Commission has taken is to challenge the Board on procedural grounds and ask them to review their decision. This was supported by the (GAC) in its communiqué of 27 March 2014. Further action at political level or legal level will depend on the content and process of the Board's review. It is clear to the Commission that any law offline also applies online. The Commission, EU Member States and interested stakeholders will pursue any mean open to them with any reasonable chance of success, ranging from political action towards the US government to legal action in EU and/or US Courts.

([1]) generic Top Level Domain names.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001417/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(11 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Canal de Panamá y mediación por parte de la Comisión

El Vicepresidente de la Comisión Europea (CE) Antonio Tajani intervino en las negociaciones entre la Autoridad del Canal de Panamá y el consorcio liderado por la española Sacyr y la italiana Impregilo, ante la disputa que enfrenta al consorcio Grupo Unidos por el Canal (GUPC) y la Autoridad del Canal de Panamá (ACP) por unos sobrecostes de 1 600 millones de dólares en las obras de ampliación del Canal.

El Sr. Tajani declaró: «Confío y deseo que las partes reconsideren sus posiciones en los próximas días, porque la interrupción de las obras sería una mala noticia para el empleo, para la economía mundial, para las propias obras de ampliación del Canal y para las propias partes» ([1]).

¿Puede aclarar la Comisión en qué base legal se ampara la decisión del Sr. Tajani de mediar para un acuerdo comercial entre empresas europeas y un Estado soberano, como es Panamá?

¿No consideraría más adecuado permitir que la justicia actúe para determinar si hubo una mala proyección de costes por parte de Sacyr y, en ese caso, que esta deba asumir la responsabilidad pertinente?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta E-510/2014 ([2]). Asimismo, la Comisión destaca que la ampliación del Canal de Panamá es un proyecto único de importancia global para la economía, por lo que resulta clave para que la industria europea goce de buena imagen en el mundo, lo cual constituye como es lógico la principal preocupación de la Comisión.

La intervención política de la Comisión se ajusta plenamente a las disposiciones del Tratado, en concreto a su artículo 173 sobre la industria de la UE, y se ha coordinado íntegramente con los gobiernos de los tres Estados miembros de mayor implicación en este asunto.

Por último, cabe destacar que el acuerdo alcanzado por las partes —según publicaron diferentes medios de comunicación— prevé que la cuestión de los sobrecostes se resuelva conforme a procedimiento de arbitraje, según se dispone en el contrato.

([1]) http://www.elfinancierocr.com/negocios/Comision-Europea-Autoridad-Canal-Panama_0_459554042.html
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001417/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Panama Canal and Commission mediation

Commission Vice-President Antonio Tajani has intervened in the negotiations between the Panama Canal Authority and the consortium led by the Spanish and Italian firms Sacyr and Impregilo, respectively, to settle the dispute over USD 1.6 billion in cost overruns which has set the Unidos por el Canal Group o(GUPC) consortium and the Canal Authority at loggerheads.

Mr Tajani said 'I trust and hope that the parties reconsider their positions in the coming days. Interruption of the work would be bad news for employment, for the worldwide economy, for the expansion of the canal and for the parties themselves' ([1]).

Can the Commission explain the legal basis for Mr Tajani's decision to act as mediator in relation to a commercial agreement between European companies and a sovereign state, in this case Panama?

Does it not consider it more appropriate that the courts should decide whether or not Sacyr underestimated the cost of the project and, if so, that it should take responsibility for having done so?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to Question E-510/2014 ([2]). In addition, the Commission underlines that the expansion of the Panama Canal is a unique project of global importance for the economy and therefore it is key for the positive image of European industry in the world, which is logically a principal concern of the Commission.

The political intervention of the Commission is entirely in line with the provisions of the Treaty, in particular Art 173 concerning the industry of the EU, and has been fully coordinated with the governments of the three Member States most concerned.

Finally, it is noted that the agreement between the parties, as reported by different media, leaves the resolution of the cost overruns to the arbitration procedure foreseen in the contract.

([1]) http://www.elfinancierocr.com/negocios/Comision-Europea-Autoridad-Canal-Panama_0_459554042.html
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001418/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Expediente de regulación de empleo en Coca-Cola

El pasado 22 de enero, la empresa Coca-Cola Iberian Partners hacía pública su intención de despedir a 750 trabajadores y de recolocar a 500. Este Expediente de Regulación de Empleo (ERE) se produce apenas cumplido un año desde que todas las embotelladoras de la exitosa bebida se agrupasen en la citada única sociedad.

La fusión de las siete compañías que embotellaban el producto en España comenzó en 2013 con la reducción del número de plantas y oficinas; un año más tarde, la sociedad se prepara para un ERE que puede afectar a un 30 % de la plantilla. El citado ERE afectaría, en caso de producirse de manera definitiva, a seis plantas de la compañía repartidas por toda la geografía española.

Esta regulación de plantilla se produce para la introducción de un nuevo método logístico que permitirá a la compañía incrementar su margen de beneficios, que continúa siendo amplio. No se trata de una repuesta a las necesidades de la crisis, sino de una adaptación a la reforma laboral de Rajoy, que permite los ERE en empresas que han obtenido beneficios en su ejercicio económico, como es el caso de Coca-Cola. La empresa solo pretende reducir su plantilla aprovechando la cuantiosa reducción de costes que el Gobierno ha implementado siguiendo las recomendaciones de la Comisión Europea.

¿Conoce la Comisión la decisión de la citada compañía?

¿Considera que la compañía ha respetado lo dispuesto en la Directiva 2002/14/CE relativo a la información y consulta de los trabajadores, considerando el desacuerdo que ha generado en la plantilla de la citada compañía?

¿Cuál es el coste social que la Comisión estima que acarreará a las cuentas públicas dicho Expediente de Regulación de Empleo?

¿Considera que resulta eficiente para el conjunto de la sociedad que una empresa pueda realizar un Expediente de Regulación de Empleo pese a estar generando beneficios? ¿Piensa establecer una legislación vinculante para impedirlo?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

1. La Comisión está al corriente del proceso iniciado por Coca Cola Iberian Partners, pero no dispone de información pormenorizada sobre la situación actual en las plantas de Coca Cola en España.

2. La Comisión no está en condiciones de evaluar los hechos ni de determinar si una empresa privada ha cumplido o no las disposiciones nacionales destinadas a aplicar la legislación de la UE. Compete a las autoridades nacionales, incluidos los tribunales, velar por que el empleador en cuestión aplique de manera correcta y efectiva las leyes de transposición de la Directiva de la UE a la que se refiere Su Señoría, teniendo en cuenta las circunstancias específicas del caso.

3. La Comisión no realiza cálculos de esta índole y no está en situación de realizarlos.

4. La Comisión no está facultada para interferir en las decisiones específicas de una empresa. No obstante, les insta a aplicar buenas prácticas en materia de anticipación y gestión socialmente responsable de las reestructuraciones como expone en su Comunicación de 13 de diciembre de 2013 por la que se establece un marco de calidad de la UE en materia de anticipación de los cambios y las reestructuraciones ([1]). La Comisión revisará en 2016 la aplicación de este instrumento no vinculante y evaluará la conveniencia de presentar una propuesta legislativa.

([1]) COM(2013) 882 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001418/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Labour force adjustment plan at Coca Cola

On 22 January 2104, Coca Cola Iberian Partners announced its plan to lay off 750 workers and relocate another 500. The labour force adjustment plan (*expediente de regulación de empleo* — ERE) is taking place only a year after all Coca Cola's bottling plants were combined to form this single company.

The fusion of the successful soft drink's seven bottling plants began in 2013, with a reduction in the number of plants and offices; one year on, the new company is preparing for an ERE which could affect 30% of its workforce. If the plan goes ahead, it will affect six of the company's plants, scattered all across Spain.

The workforce adjustment is taking place in order to implant a new logistic procedure which will enable the company to increase its already broad profit margin. The company is not responding to the needs of the crisis, but taking advantage of Rajoy's labour reform, which allows companies which have made a profit in the marketing year — as Coca Cola has — to carry out an ERE. The company is simply trying to reduce its workforce, making use of the substantial reduction in costs offered by the government at the Commission's instigation.

Is the Commission aware of this decision by Coca Cola Iberian Partners?

Does it feel the company has respected the provisions of Directive 2002/14/EC with regard to informing and consulting employees, given the disagreement it's action has caused within its workforce?

What does the Commission calculate as being the social cost to public funds of this labour force adjustment plan?

Does it consider it to be an efficient result for society as a whole for a company to be able to carry out a labour force adjustment plan even while making a profit? Does the Commission plan to introduce binding legislation to prevent this happening?

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

1. The Commission is aware of the procedure initiated by Coca Cola Iberian Partners but has no information of the details of the current developments in the Coca Cola plants in Spain.

2. The Commission is not in a position to assess the facts or state whether a private company has or has not complied with any national provisions which serve to implement EC law. It is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the national legislation transposing the EU Directive to which the Honourable Member refers, is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of the case.

3. The Commission does not run such calculation and is not in a situation to do it.

4. The Commission has no powers to interfere in specific company's decisions. It urges them, however, to follow good practices on anticipation and socially responsible management of restructuring as outlined in its communication of 13 December 2013 establishing a EU Quality Framework for Anticipation of Change and Restructuring ([1]). The Commission will review in 2016 the implementation of this non-binding instrument and assess then the need to present a legislative proposal.

([1]) COM(2013) 882 final.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001420/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Protesta antineoliberales en Bosnia y Herzegovina

El pasado 5 de febrero, la sociedad civil de Bosnia y Herzegovina comenzaba sus protestas contra la corrupción del Gobierno y la falta de soluciones económicas a las que se enfrenta una sociedad que sufre la imposición de la corrupción como forma de gobierno desde la intervención imperialista de la OTAN que creó este protectorado.

Las manifestaciones comenzaban en la ciudad de Tuzla por la privatización de cuatro fábricas que dejaría en el desempleo a miles de personas. El corrupto gobierno del protectorado bosnio aplicaba las recetas neoliberales que ordenaban sus valedores internacionales, entre los que se encuentra la Unión Europea. La arquitectura constitucional diseñada en los Acuerdos de Dayton ha mostrado el más estrepitoso de los fracasos.

Bosnia es un ejemplo más del doble rasero de la UE y su Alta Representante en el ámbito internacional al exigir intervenir en los países donde hay intereses económicos, mientras silencia los conflictos donde se gana más con la guerra. Catherine Ashton llama acaloradamente a intervenir y cambiar el destino de países como Ucrania, Siria, Libia, etc., generando lugares más corruptos y peligrosos.

En el caso de Bosnia, y trascurridos 20 años desde el conflicto, vemos en la intervención de los Estados miembros de la UE la introducción de medidas políticas neoliberales en contra de la voluntad del pueblo. Mientras se anima a los colectivos militarizados de extrema derecha de Ucrania a continuar la lucha contra un Gobierno legítimo, veremos cuál es la postura de la UE frente a unas legítimas protestas del pueblo bosnio ante un Gobierno impuesto por la intervención militar exterior.

¿Cómo valora la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante los recientes conflictos que han tenido lugar en Bosnia y Herzegovina?

Recientemente, Catherine Ashton se ha reunido con las organizaciones de extrema derecha que protestan en Ucrania y ha apoyado sus demandas. ¿Piensa reunirse con la oposición de Bosnia y Herzegovina y apoyar sus demandas en contra de las privatizaciones del Gobierno? ¿Piensa exigir el fin de las privatizaciones y políticas neoliberales del Gobierno bosnio? ¿Piensa exigir la disolución de un Gobierno impuesto por fuerzas militares internacionales para que sean los propios bosnios los que puedan decidir su futuro?

Respuesta conjunta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de abril de 2014)

Las recientes protestas públicas en Bosnia y Herzegovina han suscitado preocupación. La alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton viajó a Sarajevo los días 11 y 12 de marzo y se reunió con las autoridades de Bosnia y Herzegovina, así como con la sociedad civil, exhortando a la calma y a una actuación responsable en respuesta a las protestas públicas.

En nombre de la UE, la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta expresó la opinión clara de que se debe prestar mayor atención a la solución de las dificultades socioeconómicas inmediatas del país. La UE insta a las instituciones de Bosnia y Herzegovina a entablar un diálogo con los ciudadanos y la sociedad civil, incluidos los llamados «plenos» (reuniones informales de los ciudadanos participantes en las protestas). Las autoridades de Bosnia y Herzegovina también deben tomar iniciativas concretas para atajar la corrupción y las carencias en materia de derechos humanos y de Estado de Derecho. La UE está dispuesta a ayudar a Bosnia y Herzegovina, pero la responsabilización y la voluntad política locales siguen siendo indispensables.

El hecho de que la UE haya nombrado un Representante Especial de la UE en Bosnia y Herzegovina, que también dirige la Delegación de la UE, es una clara señal de la importancia que tiene el país para la UE.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001496/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Scontri tra forze di polizia e manifestanti in Bosnia

Dopo tre giorni di proteste, lo scorso 7 febbraio in Bosnia sono scoppiate violenze di strada tra i manifestanti e le forze di polizia, arrivando all'incendio di alcuni edifici governativi nella capitale Sarajevo e in alcune altre località. Le proteste sono scaturite dalla dura situazione economica del paese, investito dalla crisi economica. Le forze di polizia hanno impiegato gas lacrimogeni e proiettili di gomma contro il lancio di pietre e petardi da parte dei manifestanti.

Le forze di polizia si sono viste obbligate a spiegare le truppe anti-terrorismo per fermare gli attacchi contro gli uffici governativi e l'ospedale di Sarajevo ha contato circa 60 feriti nella sola capitale.

Il primo ministro bosniaco aveva già indetto una riunione straordinaria giovedì scorso. Nel frattempo, nel distretto di Tuzla circa 140 poliziotti e 40 manifestanti sono stati ricoverati in seguito agli scontri e il primo ministro del distretto ha offerto le proprie dimissioni in seguito alle violenze di venerdì.

Alla luce di quanto detto può l'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente chiarire:

1. se è già entrato in contatto con le autorità bosniache centrali e locali e con i portavoce dei manifestanti, al fine di allentare la tensione nel paese;

2. quali azioni ha intrapreso per moderare il dialogo in Bosnia e porre fine alle violenze?

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

Le recenti manifestazioni pubbliche in Bosnia-Erzegovina hanno destato preoccupazione. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton si è recata l'11 e il 12 marzo a Sarajevo, dove ha avuto incontri con le autorità e la società civile della Bosnia-Erzegovina ed ha sollecitando una reazione pacata e responsabile in risposta ai movimenti di protesta.

A nome dell'UE, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Ashton ha chiaramente comunicato che le difficoltà socioeconomiche attuali del paese devono essere affrontate con maggior convinzione. L'UE esorta le istituzioni della Bosnia-Erzegovina a impegnarsi in un dialogo con i cittadini e la società civile, di cui fanno parte i cosiddetti «Plenums» (riunioni informali di cittadini che partecipano ai movimenti di protesta). Le autorità della Bosnia-Erzegovina devono inoltre adottare iniziative concrete volte ad affrontare la corruzione e le carenze nell'ambito dei diritti umani e dello Stato di diritto. L'UE è disposta ad aiutare la Bosnia-Erzegovina, ma la partecipazione a livello locale e la volontà politica rimangono indispensabili.

Il fatto che l'UE abbia nominato un suo rappresentante speciale in Bosnia-Erzegovina, che è anche il capo della delegazione dell'UE, costituisce un segnale chiaro dell'importanza che questo paese riveste per l'Unione europea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001420/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Anti-neoliberal protests in Bosnia-Herzegovina

On 5 February 2014, civil society in Bosnia-Herzegovina launched protests against the government's corruption and the lack of economic solutions available to a society on which corruption has been imposed as a form of government ever since the imperialist NATO intervention which created this protectorate.

The demonstrations began in the city of Tuzla in response to the plan to privatise four factories, which will leave thousands of people jobless. The corrupt government of the Bosnian protectorate has been applying the neoliberal strategies ordered by its international backers, which include the EU. The constitutional structure designed by the Dayton Accords has proved spectacularly unsuccessful.

Bosnia is yet another example of the double standards observed by the EU and its High Representative at international level, where it urges intervention in countries where there are economic interests, while silencing conflicts from which more profit can be made by allowing war to continue. Catherine Ashton makes impassioned calls for intervention to change the fortunes of countries such as Ukraine, Syria and Libya, making places more corrupt and dangerous in the process.

In the case of Bosnia, 20 years after the conflict there, what we see from the EU Member States is the introduction of neoliberal policy measures against the will of the population. While far-right paramilitary groups in Ukraine are being encouraged to continue fighting a legitimate government, we have yet to see what the EU's response will be to legitimate protests by the Bosnian people against a government imposed by foreign military intervention.

How does the Vice-President/High Representative assess the recent conflicts in Bosnia-Herzegovina?

Catherine Ashton recently met with the far-right organisations which are protesting in Ukraine and expressed support for their demands. Does she intend to meet with the opposition in Bosnia-Herzegovina and support their protest against the government's privatisation moves? Does she intend to ask for an end to the Bosnian Government's privatisations and neoliberal policies? Will she ask for the dissolution of this government imposed by international military forces, so that the Bosnian people can decide their own future?

Question for written answer E-001496/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Clashes between police and demonstrators in Bosnia

On 7 February, after three days of protests, violence broke out on the streets of Bosnia between demonstrators and the police, with several government buildings in the capital Sarajevo and elsewhere being set on fire. The protests were triggered by the difficult economic situation in Bosnia, which has been hit by the economic crisis. The police used tear gas and rubber bullets in response to the stones and flares thrown by demonstrators.

The police were forced to deploy anti-terrorism troops to stop the attacks on government offices, and the hospital in Sarajevo recorded 60 casualties in the capital alone.

The Bosnian Prime Minister had already called an emergency meeting last Thursday. Since then, around 140 police officers and 40 demonstrators have been hospitalised following clashes in Tuzla, and the canton's prime minister has offered to resign following Friday's violence.

In the light of the above, could the Vice-President/High Representative clarify the following?

1. Has she already made contact with central and local Bosnian authorities and with the demonstrators' spokesmen in order to ease tension in the country?

2. What action has she taken to moderate the dialogue in Bosnia and put an end to the violence?

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

The recent public protests in Bosnia and Herzegovina have raised concerns. HR/VP Ashton travelled to Sarajevo on 11/12 March and met with the BiH authorities and civil society urging calm and responsible action in reply to the public protests.

On behalf of the EU, HR/VP conveyed the clear view that there must be a stronger focus on addressing the immediate socioeconomic challenges in the country. The EU urges BiH institutions to engage in a dialogue with citizens, civil society including the so-called 'Plenums' (informal gatherings of citizens participating in the protests). Concrete initiatives also need to be undertaken by BiH authorities to address corruption, deficiencies in the area of human rights and rule of law. The EU is ready to assist BiH but local ownership and political will remain indispensable.

The fact that the EU appointed an EU Special Representative to Bosnia and Herzegovina, who is also the Head of the EU Delegation, is a clear signal of the importance the country plays for the EU.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001421/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Incremento de los grupos de consumo de bienes agrícolas y necesidad de acciones en dicho ámbito

En los últimos años se ha producido un desarrollo exponencial de los diferentes canales cortos de comercialización y redes alternativas de alimentación a lo largo y ancho de toda la geografía de los 28 Estados miembros de la Unión Europea.

Los diferentes tipos de grupos de consumo ofrecen a sus clientes garantías que las cadenas tradicionales no son capaces de incluir en sus productos. Entre estas ofertas está la posibilidad de estar bien informados sobre la procedencia del producto, pudiendo tomar decisiones para un consumo más responsable, la presencia de organismos transgénicos o el empleo de métodos de cultivo biológicos. Los sistemas de información de las grandes cadenas de productos alimentarios europeas han sido caracterizados por el fraude, la desinformación, el riesgo para la salud, etc., obstáculos estos que solo son salvados en los productos que gozan de una indicación geográfica o requisitos específicos de calidad.

Los consumidores, ante la práctica del engaño y la desinformación, prefieren cada vez más recurrir a los sistemas de compra directa que garantizan los grupos de consumo. Se trata del fracaso de la política agroalimentaria que hace a los consumidores desconfiar de los sistemas mayoritarios y buscar otras opciones para su consumo. Transgénicos, productos orgánicos de otros continentes, falta de indicación del empleo de pesticidas, transporte kilométrico, etc. son elementos que afectan a los productos convencionales y que los consumidores prefieren evitar. Pese a la constatación de que estos grupos de consumo constituyen una realidad en fuerte crecimiento, aún no existen instrumentos que puedan permitir fijar objetivos en este ámbito de la política agraria. En su respuesta a mi anterior pregunta E-009588/2012, el Comisario se congratulaba de la elaboración del estudio externo «Short Food Supply Chains and Local Food Systems in the EU» pero no se proponía elaborar ninguna operación estadística que permita dar seguimiento a una realidad que no deja de crecer.

¿Comparte la Comisión la opinión de que el incremento del número de estos grupos de consumo se debe a la generalización de la desconfianza a las cadenas alimentarias convencionales?

A raíz de las conclusiones del citado estudio, ¿qué acciones políticas en este ámbito está desarrollando la Comisión?

¿Continúa negándose la Comisión a desarrollar una operación estadística sobre canales cortos de comercialización y redes alimentarias alternativas?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de abril de 2014)

El estudio «Short Food Supply Chains and Local Food Systems in the EU» ([1]) (Cadenas de distribución cortas y sistemas alimentarios locales en la EU) describe la situación actual en la EU y reflexiona acerca de los instrumentos para abordar las cadenas de distribución cortas y los sistemas alimentarios locales, en particular, la creación de un etiquetado común de la UE para los productos agrícolas. El estudio fue una de las fuentes en las que se basó la Comisión para elaborar su informe al Parlamento Europeo y al Consejo sobre la posibilidad de crear un nuevo sistema de etiquetado para la producción agrícola local y la venta directa ([2]), adoptado en diciembre de 2013.

En dicho informe, la Comisión presentó elementos objetivos para contribuir a un debate sobre la conveniencia de una nueva etiqueta de la UE, así como sobre cuestiones más amplias de la agricultura local y la venta directa, como las normas de higiene alimentaria y la contratación pública. La Comisión ha instado al Parlamento Europeo, al Consejo, a los Estados miembros y a las regiones a **reflexionar sobre si las medidas e instrumentos existentes son los adecuados.** Basándose en las conclusiones resultantes, la Comisión decidirá sobre la conveniencia de adoptar nuevas medidas en este ámbito.

La reforma de la política de desarrollo rural introduce un nuevo instrumento en forma de ayuda a la cooperación a efectos de la creación y el fomento de las cadenas de distribución cortas y los mercados locales, que se complementará con el apoyo a actividades de promoción en un contexto local relacionado con el desarrollo de cadenas de distribución cortas y mercados locales ([3]).

([1]) http://ftp.jrc.es/EURdoc/JRC80420.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/local-farming-direct-sales/index_en.htm
([3]) Artículo 35 del Reglamento (UE) nº 1305/2013 relativo a la ayuda al desarrollo rural (DO L 347 de 20.12.2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001421/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Increase in the number of agricultural products consumer groups and need for responsive action

In recent years there has been an exponential increase in the development of short marketing chains and alternative food supply networks throughout the territory of the 28 EU Member States.

The different types of consumer groups offer their customers guarantees which the traditional chains are unable to provide for their products. These offers include the possibility of being well informed about the source of the product, enabling people to make choices concerning more responsible consumption and about the presence of genetically modified organisms or the use of organic farming methods. The information systems of the major European food chains have been tainted by fraud, misinformation, health risks, etc., and only products with a geographical denomination of origin or specific quality standards are able to clear these hurdles.

In the face of widespread fraud and misinformation, consumers are turning more and more to direct purchasing systems backed by consumer groups. The failure of agro-food policies has led consumers to distrust major retail systems and seek out other options. The issues affecting conventional products and leading consumers to move away from them include GMOs, organic products sourced on other continents, lack of information about pesticide use and long transport distances. Although there is an undeniable boom in these types of consumer group, there are still no instruments in place to set objectives in this area of agricultural policy. In response to my previous question for written answer, E-009588/2012, the Commissioner referred to the launch of the external study 'Short Food Supply Chains and Local Food Systems in the EU', but did not propose to set up any statistical exercise which would enable it to monitor this constantly expanding situation.

Does the Commission share the view that the increase in consumer groups is a result of a general lack of confidence in conventional food distribution chains?

What political initiatives is the Commission developing in this field, based on the results of the abovementioned study?

Does the Commission still refuse to carry out a statistical study of short distribution chains and alternative food supply networks?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The study 'Short Food Supply Chains and Local Food systems in the EU' ([1]) has described the state of play in the EU and reflected on the policy tools to address short supply chains and local food systems, in particular on the introduction of a common EU labelling scheme for farm produce. It represented one of the sources for the Commission Report to the EP and the Council on the case for a local farming and direct sales labelling scheme ([2]), adopted in December 2013.

In the report, the Commission has provided factual elements to facilitate a debate on whether a new EU label should be considered as well as on the broader issues of local farming and direct sales, like food hygiene rules and public procurement. The Commission has called on the Parliament and the Council, Member States and regions to reflect whether existing policy tools and measures are appropriate. Based on the conclusions of these reflections, the Commission will decide on whether further action is appropriate in this area.

In the framework of the reformed rural development policy, a new tool is introduced in the form of support for cooperation in establishing and developing short supply chains and local markets, complemented by support for promotion activities in a local context related to their development. ([3])

([1]) http://ftp.jrc.es/EURdoc/JRC80420.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/local-farming-direct-sales/index_en.htm
([3]) Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 on support for rural development, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001483/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Απάντηση της Επιτροπής (E-008001/2012)

Στην απάντηση του κ. Fule, εξ ονόματος της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής (E-008001/2012), της 14ης Νοεμβρίου 2012 αναφέρεται πως η Επιτροπή έχει δώσει τεχνική βοήθεια στην τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα όσον αφορά τη διαχείριση και την προστασία πιθανών τόπων Natura 2000 στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου και πως εναπόκειται στους σχετικούς τουρκοκυπριακούς φορείς να λάβουν τα αναγκαία μέτρα διατήρησης.

Ζητείται από τη Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στις ακόλουθες ερωτήσεις:

1. Σε ποιες επτά Προστατευόμενες Περιοχές Ειδικής Περιβαλλοντικής Προστασίας (SEPAs) αναφέρεται η Επιτροπή;

2. Ποίοι είναι οι σχετικοί Τ/Κ φορείς που ανέλαβαν τη συντήρηση/προστασία των πιο πάνω περιοχών και ποίες είναι οι αρμοδιότητες τους;

3. Ποία μέτρα έχουν ήδη λάβει για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος των πιθανών τόπων Natura 2000 και, ειδικά, για τερματισμό της παράνομης λατόμησης στον Πενταδάκτυλο;

4. Ποιος αξιολογεί την αποτελεσματικότητα των όποιων μέτρων λαμβάνονται για πρόληψη και καταστολή της παράνομης λατόμησης;

5. Γνωρίζει η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή πως τα προϊόντα της παράνομης λατόμησης εξάγονται παράνομα στη Τουρκία;

6. Πώς διασφαλίζεται πως η τεχνική βοήθεια προς την Τ/Κ κοινότητα αξιοποιείται μόνο για τους σκοπούς που δίνεται;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001484/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Απορρέοντα από απάντηση της Επιτροπής (E-008001/2012) (Natura 2002)

Στην απάντηση του κ. Fule, εξ ονόματος της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής (E-008001/2012), της 14ης Νοεμβρίου 2012 αναφέρεται πως η Επιτροπή έχει δώσει τεχνική βοήθεια στην τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα για τη διαχείριση και την προστασία πιθανών τόπων Natura 2000 στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου και πως εναπόκειται στους σχετικούς τουρκοκυπριακούς φορείς να λάβουν τα αναγκαία μέτρα διατήρησης.

Ζητείται από τη Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στις ακόλουθες ερωτήσεις:

1. Σε ποιες επτά Προστατευόμενες Περιοχές Ειδικής Περιβαλλοντικής Προστασίας (SEPAs) αναφέρεται η Επιτροπή;

2. Ποίοι είναι οι σχετικοί Τ/Κ φορείς που ανέλαβαν τη συντήρηση/προστασία των περιοχών αυτών και ποίες είναι συγκεκριμένα οι αρμοδιότητές τους;

3. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή ποία μέτρα έχουν λάβει μέχρι σήμερα οι Τουρκοκύπριοι για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος στους πιο πάνω πιθανούς τόπους Natura 2000, και ειδικά για την πρόληψη, την προστασία και τον άμεσο τερματισμό της παράνομης λατόμησης που δυστυχώς συντελείται σήμερα στον Πενταδάκτυλο;

4. Ποιος αξιολογεί την αποτελεσματικότητα των τυχόν μέτρων που λαμβάνονται τόσο για την πρόληψη όσο και την άμεση καταστολή της παράνομης λατόμησης;

5. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή πως τα προϊόντα της παράνομης λατόμησης εξάγονται παράνομα στην Τουρκία;

6. Πώς διασφαλίζεται από την Επιτροπή πως η τεχνική βοήθεια που παρέχεται προς την Τ/Κ κοινότητα όντως αξιοποιείται για τους σκοπούς που δίνεται;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001485/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Απορρέοντα από απάντηση της Επιτροπής (E-013415/13, E-012969/13) — Παθητικός ρόλος Επιτροπής

Αναφέρομαι στην μη ικανοποιητική απάντηση του κ. Fule, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής, στις γραπτές μου ερωτήσεις (E-013415/2013, E-012969/2013) ημερομηνίας 8 Ιανουαρίου, 2014 και ερωτώ:

1. Γιατί η Επιτροπή αρκείται στον παθητικό ρόλο ενός απλού παρατηρητή, που παρακολουθεί την συνεχιζόμενη καταστροφή και αρκείται απλά να επισημαίνει στην ανάγκη εφαρμογής μέτρων;

2. Είναι αυτό αρκετό, όταν σε μια ημικατεχόμενη ευρωπαϊκή χώρα υπάρχουν τουρκικά κατοχικά στρατεύματα, διενεργείται εθνοκάθαρση, βεβήλωση ναών, κοιμητηρίων, παράνομες αγοραπωλησίες ελληνοκυπριακών περιουσιών και η ΕΕ να μένει απαθής ως να είναι ένας ουδέτερος τρίτος παρατηρητής, τηρώντας ίσες αποστάσεις;

3. Γιατί δεν υπάρχει η αναγκαία πολιτική βούληση και η πολιτική τόλμη ώστε η ίδια η ΕΕ να αναλάβει ενεργότερο ρόλο και να ενδυναμώσει τους μηχανισμούς στήριξης, προστασίας και επίδειξης ουσιαστικής κοινοτικής αλληλεγγύης σε μια χώρα μέλος, την Κύπρο, που αφέθηκε παντέρμη να είναι βορά στον τουρκικό επεκτατισμό και μεγαλοϊδεατισμό;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001486/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Απορρέοντα από απάντηση της Επιτροπής (E-008900/2013) (Σημαία στον Πενταδάκτυλο)

Στην απάντηση του κ. Fule, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής ημερομηνίας 5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013, στα ερωτήματα που έθεσα (E-008900/2013) αναφέρεται πως η τουρκοκυπριακή πλευρά έδωσε διαβεβαιώσεις ότι η σημαία στον Πενταδάκτυλο δεν θα έχει σημαντικές συνέπειες για την υγεία ή το περιβάλλον.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να μου αποστείλει πιο εμπεριστατωμένα τις συγκεκριμένες διαβεβαιώσεις που έλαβε και κατά πόσον αυτές συνάδουν με τα μέτρα που η ίδια θα ελάμβανε αν αντιμετώπιζε παρόμοιο πρόβλημα σε άλλη ευρωπαϊκή χώρα;

2. Είναι η Επιτροπή το ίδιο ελαστική στις απαιτήσεις εφαρμογής του ευρωπαϊκού κεκτημένου όταν απευθύνεται σε κυβερνήσεις κρατών μελών, όπως όταν αναφέρεται στην Τουρκία και την τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα;

3. Γιατί η Επιτροπή παρακάμπτει το γεγονός πως η Τ/Κ κοινότητα όχι μόνο δεν τηρεί τις υποχρεώσεις της έναντι της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας αλλά διαρκώς ζητά μόνο δικαιώματα, χωρίς να επωμίζεται ευθύνες; Πρόθεσή της είναι να απολαμβάνει τα ωφελήματα που προκύπτουν από την ευρωπαϊκή ιθαγένεια, χωρίς ωστόσο να πληροί και τις αναγκαίες υποχρεώσεις έναντι της ΕΕ; Παρακαλώ την Επιτροπή όπως σχολιάσει αυτή την συμπεριφορά.

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001487/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Απορρέοντα από την απάντηση της ΕΕ (E-5053/2009) (Πενταδάκτυλος)

Με αφορμή πρόσφατη συζήτηση στην Κοινοβουλευτική Επιτροπή Περιβάλλοντος της Βουλής των Αντιπροσώπων της Κύπρου, με θέμα την «Περιβαλλοντική καταστροφή και την παράνομη λατόμηση» που συντελείται στην οροσειρά του Πενταδακτύλου (κατεχόμενη Κύπρος) και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη προηγούμενες ερωτήσεις που υπέβαλα και αντίστοιχες απαντήσεις που πήρα από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, επανέρχομαι ερωτώντας τα ακόλουθα ερωτήματα για ζητήματα που εκκρεμούν:

Στην απάντησή του κ. Rehn, εξ ονόματος της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής (E-5053/2009) της 27ης Ιανουαρίου 2010; αναγράφεται επί λέξει πως η Επιτροπή «θα χαιρετίσει κάθε πρωτοβουλία της Τ/Κ Κοινότητας για τη διευθέτηση του προβλήματος αυτού και θα διενεργήσει έρευνες στην Τ/Κ Κοινότητα για τυχόν περιβαλλοντική ζημία».

Ερωτάται λοιπόν η Επιτροπή αν γνωρίζει οποιαδήποτε πρωτοβουλία της τουρκοκυπριακής κοινότητας (Τ/Κ) που έχει ήδη αναληφθεί για διευθέτηση του προβλήματος και αν η ίδια η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έχει διενεργήσει έρευνες για τυχόν περιβαλλοντική ζημία, ώστε να μας ενημερώσει για τα αποτελέσματα.

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Απριλίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τα αξιότιμα μέλη του Κοινοβουλίου στις απαντήσεις που έδωσε στις προηγούμενες γραπτές ερωτήσεις E-012602/2013, E-012969/2013, E-013093/2013, E-013547/2013 και E-014037/2013 ([1]) όσον αφορά την αναστολή του κεκτημένου στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου· το πρόγραμμα βοήθειας της Ένωσης για τη τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα και τους δικαιούχους του· την εφαρμογή και παρακολούθηση του προγράμματος· την προσέγγιση της Επιτροπής όσον αφορά τα όρη της Κυρήνειας· και τις προσδοκίες της Επιτροπής ως προς τη συνέχιση της ενεργού στήριξης, από την Τουρκία, των συνομιλιών για τη διευθέτηση του κυπριακού ζητήματος.

Η έκκληση εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής για βοήθεια στην προετοιμασία των σχεδίων διαχείρισης σε επτά ειδικές περιοχές προστασίας του περιβάλλοντος αφορά την Καρπασία/Karpaz, την Αγία Ειρήνη/Akdeniz, τη νότια παράκτια ζώνη της Καρπασίας/Karpaz, την παράκτια ζώνη της Ακανθού/Tatlısu, το Αλακάτι/Alagadi, τους υγρότοπους της Αμμοχώστου και τα όρη της Κηρύνειας.

Η Επιτροπή έλαβε τη διαβεβαίωση ότι για τη σημαία στο όρος Πενταδάκτυλος χρησιμοποιήθηκε αμόλυβδη και χαμηλής πτητικότητας οργανική τροποποιημένη ακρυλική βαφή διαλύματος σιλικόνης εξωτερικού τοιχώματος.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001423/14
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Environmental degradation in occupied Cyprus

A number of Cypriots have expressed to me their concerns about environmental degradation and the destruction of sites of great cultural importance in the occupied North of the island.

The occupied part of Cyprus is, legally, EU territory.

Could the Commission advise me as to whether the Turkish authorities have complied with the EU Environmental Impact Directive Assessment Directive in respect of works carried out in the occupied zone?

If not, could the Commission advise me of what, if any, efforts it has made to put pressure on the occupying power to comply with the directive?

Question for written answer E-001483/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Response to Commission answer (E-008001/2012)

The answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission (E-008001/2012) on 14 November 2012 states that the Commission has provided technical assistance to the Turkish Cypriot community in order to manage and protect potential Natura 2000 sites in the northern part of Cyprus and that it is up to the relevant Turkish Cypriot bodies to take the necessary conservation measures.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. To which seven Special Environmental Protection Areas (SEPAs) does the Commission refer?

2. What are the relevant Turkish Cypriot bodies that have undertaken the conservation/protection of those areas and what are their precise responsibilities?

3. What measures have already been taken to protect the environment in potential Natura 2000 sites and, specifically, to put a stop to the illegal quarrying that is taking place on Mount Pentadaktylos?

4. Who evaluates the effectiveness of any measures taken to prevent and put an immediate stop to illegal quarrying?

5. Is the Commission aware that the products of illegal quarrying are being illegally exported to Turkey?

6. How does the Commission ensure that the technical assistance provided to the Turkish Cypriot community is being used solely for its intended purpose?

Question for written answer E-001484/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Response to Commission answer (E-008001/2012) (Natura 2002)

The answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission (E-008001/2012) on 14 November 2012 states that the Commission has provided technical assistance to the Turkish Cypriot community in order to manage and protect potential Natura 2000 sites in the northern part of Cyprus and that it is up to the relevant Turkish Cypriot bodies to take the necessary conservation measures.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. To which seven Special Environmental Protection Areas (SEPAs) does the Commission refer?

2. What are the relevant Turkish Cypriot bodies that have undertaken the conservation/protection of those areas and what are their precise responsibilities?

3. Is the Commission aware of the measures taken to date by the Turkish Cypriot community to protect the environment in the above potential Natura 2000 sites and, specifically, to prevent, protect and put an immediate stop to the illegal quarrying that is unfortunately currently taking place on Mount Pentadaktylos?

4. Who evaluates the effectiveness of any measures taken to prevent and put an immediate stop to illegal quarrying?

5. Is the Commission aware that the products of illegal quarrying are being illegally exported to Turkey?

6. How does the Commission ensure that the technical assistance provided to the Turkish Cypriot community is, in fact, being used for its intended purpose?

Question for written answer E-001485/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Response to Commission answers (E-013415/13, E-012969/13) — Commission's passive role

I refer to the unsatisfactory answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission (E-013415/2013, E-012969/2013) and my written questions of 8 January 2014:

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Why is the Commission content to take the passive role of a spectator merely watching the ongoing destruction and to simply note that measures need to be taken?

2. Is it enough, when there are occupying Turkish troops, ethnic cleansing, desecration of temples and cemeteries and illegal sales of Greek Cypriot property in a partly occupied European country, for the EU to remain apathetic, like a third-party spectator refusing to take sides?

3. Why does the EU not have the political will and political courage to take a more active role and to strengthen support, protection and substantial community solidarity mechanisms in a Member State, namely Cyprus, which has been left prey to Turkish expansionism and megalomania?

Question for written answer E-001486/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Response to Commission's answer (E-008900/2013) (Flag on Mount Pentadaktylos)

The answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission (E-008900/2013) on 5 September 2013, in response to the questions raised by me, states that the Turkish Cypriot community has given assurances that no significant health or environmental effects will arise from the flag on Mount Pentadaktylos.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Could the Commission send me the specific assurances it received and advise of the extent to which these are in keeping with the measures that the Commission would have taken if it were dealing with a similar matter in another European country?

2. Is the Commission equally flexible in demanding the application of the Community *acquis* when dealing with governments of Member States as is it when dealing with Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community?

3. Why is the Commission sidestepping the fact that, in addition to failing to fulfil its obligations to the Republic of Cyprus, the Turkish Cypriot community is also constantly demanding rights without assuming any responsibilities? Is it its intention to reap the benefits of European nationality without fulfilling the necessary obligations to the EU? I would like to hear the Commission's comment on this behaviour.

Question for written answer E-001487/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Response to Commission's answer (E-5053/2009) (Mount Pentadaktylos)

Á propos of the recent debate in the Parliamentary Committee on the Environment of the Cypriot House of Representatives on 'Environmental damage and illegal quarrying' on Mount Pentadaktylos (in occupied Cyprus) and bearing in mind previous questions I submitted and corresponding answers I received from the European Commission, I revert to the subject by asking the following questions regarding outstanding matters:

The answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the European Commission on 27 January 2010 (E-5053/2009) states, and I quote, that the Commission 'would welcome any initiative of the Turkish Cypriot community to remedy the situation and will make enquiries to the Turkish Cypriot community about possible environmental damage'.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Is the Commission aware of any initiative already taken by the Turkish Cypriot community to remedy the situation and has the European Commission conducted any enquiries into possible environmental damage? If so, could it please advise us of the outcome?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Members to its answers to previous written questions E-012602/2013, E-012969/2013, E-013093/2013, E-013547/2013 and E-014037/2013 ([1]) as regards the suspension of the *acquis* in the northern part of Cyprus; the EU's Aid Programme for the Turkish Cypriot community and its beneficiaries; the Programme's implementation and monitoring; the Commission's approach regarding the Kyrenia Mountains; and the Commission's expectations for Turkey's continued active support of the Cyprus settlement talks.

The Commission's reference to assistance in the preparation of management plans for seven Special Environmental Protection Areas refers to Karpasia/Karpaz, Agias Eirinis/Akdeniz, South Karpasia/South Karpaz Coastal Area, Akanthou/Tatlısu Coastal Area, Alakati/Alagadi, Famagusta Wetlands and Kyrenia Mountains.

The Commission received assurances that unleaded and low-volatile organic compound water-based silicone modified acrylic outdoor wall paint was used for the flag on Mount Pentadaktylos.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001424/14
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Erasmus Plus — Student Loan Guarantee Facility

Erasmus Plus includes the Student Loan Guarantee Facility, which is aimed at students who want to study abroad for a full Master's degree. Loans ranging from EUR 12 000 for a one-year Master's to EUR 18 000 for a two-year Master's will be available, according to the agreement on Erasmus Plus.

Can the Commission confirm in a statement that the Student Loan Guarantee Facility will be in place for all EU students for the 2014-2015 academic year?

Can the Commission also confirm whether all Member States, including Ireland, must participate in this scheme and make the Student Loan Guarantee Facility available to their students wishing to travel abroad to undertake a Master's degree?

Can the Commission outline the role of the European Investment Bank in the provision of the Student Loan Guarantee Facility and confirm whether banks from each Member State will be ultimately responsible for providing the Student Loan Guarantee Facility?

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

The European Commission is working to ensure that the Student Loan Guarantee Facility will be in place for the beginning of the 2014/15 academic year.

The student loan guarantee facility is an integral part of the Erasmus+ programme and therefore all programme countries can benefit from it. Applications will be selected following a competitive process; there is no obligation upon individual financial intermediaries, or countries, to submit applications, however wide geographic coverage is sought, and the intermediaries offering the best conditions for the students will be chosen.

The European Investment Fund (EIF), part of the European Investment Bank Group, will be entrusted with the management of the facility at the EU level. The EIF will contract with financial intermediaries such as banks or student loan agencies in Member States, which will provide the loans and be the point of contact for students. In addition, financial intermediaries may apply to the European Investment Bank to access capital for the loans. The advantage of lower cost capital should be reflected in lower interest rates for student borrowers.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001425/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(11 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Estatus de Gibraltar en la Unión

El Gobierno del Reino de España, en una respuesta a una pregunta parlamentaria del diputado vasco de la coalición Amaiur Jon Inarritu, sostiene que Gibraltar no es un territorio de la Unión Europea sino un territorio europeo cuyas relaciones exteriores asume un Estado miembro, de conformidad con la letra del artículo 355, apartado 3, del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea.

Esta interpretación de los tratados es justamente contraria a la que se infiere de la lectura conjunta del artículo 52 del TUE y el artículo 355 del TFUE. De hecho, el apartado 3 del artículo 355 del TFUE confirma que a estos territorios se les aplican los tratados.

¿Cuál es el estatus de Gibraltar respecto a la Unión Europea?

¿Corresponde dicho estatus a lo indicado por el Gobierno del Reino de España?

¿Tiene la Comisión la intención de aclarar la situación a las autoridades españolas? ¿En qué sentido?

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

La Unión Europea no tiene un territorio en la forma en que lo tienen los Estados. La Unión se basa en el Tratado de la Unión Europea (TUE) y el Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea (TFUE), que contemplan un ámbito territorial de aplicación (artículos 52 del TUE y 355 del TFUE).

En virtud del artículo 52, apartado 1, del TFUE, los Tratados se aplican a los Estados miembros. En virtud del artículo 355, apartado 3, del TFUE, los tratados se aplican también a los territorios europeos de cuyas relaciones exteriores sea responsable un Estado miembro. Gibraltar se considera un territorio de este tipo.

Como consecuencia, el Derecho europeo se aplica en principio a Gibraltar. Sin embargo, no forma parte del territorio aduanero de la Unión [artículo 4 del Reglamento (UE) nº 952/2013] y no se aplica a Gibraltar el Derecho de la Unión en los ámbitos de la política agrícola común, la política pesquera común y del sistema común del impuesto sobre el valor añadido (artículo 28 del Acta de adhesión de 1972).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001425/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Status of Gibraltar in the Union

In response to a parliamentary question asked by the Basque MP Jon Inarritu of the Amaiur coalition, the Spanish Government maintains that Gibraltar is not a territory of the European Union but rather a European territory for whose external relations a Member State is responsible, pursuant to Article 355(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU).

This interpretation of the treaties is exactly the opposite to what is inferred from reading Article 52 of the Treaty on European Union and Article 355 TFEU together. In fact, Article 355(3) TFEU confirms that the treaties apply to these territories.

What is the status of Gibraltar with respect to the European Union?

Does this status correspond to that indicated by the Spanish Government?

Does the Commission intend to clarify the situation to the Spanish authorities? If so, in what respect?

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

The European Union does not dispose of a territory in the way states do. The European Union is founded on the Treaty on European Union (TEU) and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) which provide for a territorial scope of application (Articles 52 TEU and 355 TFEU).

By virtue of Article 52(1) TEU, the treaties apply to the Member States. By virtue of Article 355(3) TFEU, the treaties apply as well to European territories for whose external relations a Member State is responsible; Gibraltar is considered to be such a territory.

As a consequence, European law applies in principle to Gibraltar. However, it is not part of the customs territory of the Union (Article 4 of Regulation (EU) No 952/2013), and Union legislation in the areas of the common agricultural policy, the common fisheries policy and the common system of the value added tax does not apply to Gibraltar (Article 28 of the 1972 Act of Accession).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001426/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(11 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Χρήση του όρου «Republic of Macedonia» σε site της Επιτροπής

Στην ιστοσελίδα της Γεν.Δ/νσης «ΠΟΛΙΤΙΣΜΟΣ» της Επιτροπής (και συγκεκριμένα στα Cultural contacts points) υπάρχει παραπομπή στην δ/νση του Υπουργείου Πολιτισμού των Σκοπίων με την αναφορά σε «Republic of Macedonia».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποιος είναι ο λόγος που επιμένει η Επιτροπή στην χρήση του προκλητικού αυτού όρου αντί του ακριβούς (και σύντομου) FYROM;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Απριλίου 2014)

Στον ιστότοπο του προηγούμενου προγράμματος «Πολιτισμός» υπήρχε η λανθασμένη πληροφορία ότι η διεύθυνση του Υπουργείου Πολιτισμού της πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβικής Δημοκρατίας της Μακεδονίας βρίσκεται στη «Δημοκρατία της Μακεδονίας». Δεδομένου ότι το πρόγραμμα «Πολιτισμός» έληξε το 2013, ο εν λόγω ιστότοπος δεν υπάρχει πλέον στο διαδίκτυο.

Στο πλαίσιο του τρέχοντος προγράμματος «Δημιουργική Ευρώπη», η συγκεκριμένη χώρα δεν έχει ακόμη υπογράψει το μνημόνιο συμφωνίας για να συμμετάσχει στο πρόγραμμα· κατά συνέπεια, δεν έχει ακόμη ιδρύσει Γραφείο Δημιουργικής Ευρώπης και για τον λόγο αυτό το Γραφείο δεν εμφανίζεται ακόμη στην τρέχουσα σελίδα:
http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/creative-europe-desks_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001426/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Use of the term 'Republic of Macedonia' on a Commission website

The website of the Commission's Directorate-General for Culture (to be more specific: the Cultural Contact Points) gives the address of the FYROM Ministry of Culture as being located in the 'Republic of Macedonia'.

Will the Commission say:

Why does it insist on using this provocative term instead of the more accurate and shorter 'FYROM'?

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

Giving the address of the Ministry of Culture of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as being located in the 'Republic of Macedonia' was a mistake which occurred on the former Culture programme website. As the Culture programme has come to an end in 2013, the website in question is no longer online.

Under the current Creative Europe programme, the country has not yet signed the Memorandum of understanding to participate in the Programme; it has therefore not yet established a Creative Europe Desk which, consequently, does not yet appear on the current page: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/creative-europe-desks_en.htm

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001427/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Rapport dwar is-sitwazzjoni ekonomika u soċjali ta' Għawdex

Id-Dikjarazzjoni 36 annessa għat-Trattat ta' Adeżjoni ta' Malta għall-UE tirrimarka li l-klassifikazzjoni NUTS 3 mogħtija lil Għawdex, waħidha, ma kenitx se tkun biżżejjed biex tiżgura l-implimentazzjoni tal-impenn tal-UE li tieħu miżuri li jkunu ta' benefiċċju għal reġjuni anqas vantaġġati fl-Unjoni bħalma huwa Għawdex.

Id-Dikjarazzjoni 36 tiddikjara li qabel l-aħħar ta' kull perjodu baġitarju Komunitarju:

"Malta ser titlob li l-Kummissjoni tirraporta lill-Kunsill dwar is-sitwazzjoni ekonomika u soċjali ta' Għawdex, u b'mod partikolari, dwar l-inugwaljanza fil-livelli ta' żvilupp soċjali u ekonomiku bejn Għawdex u Malta. Il-Kummissjoni tintalab li tipproponi miżuri xierqa, kif meħtieġ, fil-qafas tal-politika reġjonali Komunitarja jew ta' politiki Komunitarji rilevanti oħra, sabiex tiżgura li tkompli titnaqqas l-inugwaljanza bejn Għawdex u Malta kif ukoll li jkun hemm iktar integrazzjoni ta' Għawdex fis-suq intern b'kondizzjonijiet ekwi."

Il-Gvern Malti talab li l-Kummissjoni tirrapporta lill-Kunsill dwar is-sitwazzjoni ekonomika u soċjali ta' Għawdex u, b'mod partikolari, dwar id-differenzi soċjoekonomiċi bejn Għawdex u Malta għall-perjodu baġitarju 2014-2020?

Jekk iva, il-Kummissjoni abbozzat rapport dwar is-sitwazzjoni soċjali u ekonomika ta' Għawdex?

Jekk ir-rapport ġie abbozzat, il-Kummissjoni bagħtet dan ir-rapport lill-Gvern Malti?

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

F'Mejju 2012, il-Kummissjoni ġiet mitluba mill-Gvern Malti biex tipprepara r-rapport imsemmi f'Dikjarazzjoni 36 dwar ir-reġjun tal-Gżira ta' Għawdex anness mat-Trattat tal-Adeżjoni ta' Malta mal-UE. Dan ir-rapport ġie ppreparat u mibgħut lill-awtoritajiet Maltin fit-22 ta' Ottubru 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001427/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Report on Gozo's economic and social situation

Declaration 36 annexed to Malta's Treaty of Accession to the EU points out that the NUTS 3 classification given to Gozo would not, on its own, be sufficient to ensure the implementation of the EU's commitment to take measures to benefit less-favoured regions in the Union such as Gozo.

Declaration 36 states that before the end of each Community budgetary period:

'Malta will request that the Commission report to the Council on the economic and social situation of Gozo and, in particular, on the disparities in the social and economic development levels between Gozo and Malta. The Commission would be asked to propose appropriate measures, as required, in the framework of the Community regional policy or other relevant Community policies, to ensure the continuation of the reduction of disparities between Gozo and Malta as well as the further integration of Gozo into the internal market on fair conditions'.

Did the Maltese Government request that the Commission report to the Council on the economic and social situation of Gozo and, in particular, on the socioeconomic disparities between Gozo and Malta for the budgetary period 2014-2020?

If so, has the Commission drafted a report on Gozo's social and economic situation?

If the report has been drafted, has the Commission sent the report to the Maltese Government?

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

In May 2012, the Commission was asked by the Maltese Government to prepare the report referred to in Declaration 36 on the island region of Gozo annexed to the Treaty of Accession of Malta to the EU. This report was prepared and was sent to the Maltese authorities on 22 October 2012.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001428/14
lill-Kunsill
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ

Il-konsulenti tal-ġestjoni McKinsey & Co qalu li waħda mill-ikbar għejun tal-kriżi tal-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ fl-Ewropa hu l-ispariġġ kbir bejn il-persuni gradwati u l-ħiliet meħtieġa min-negozji.

Il-Kunsill kif biħsiebu jindirizza dan l-ispariġġ bejn il-persuni gradwati u l-ħiliet meħtieġa għall-impjegar?

Tweġiba
(14 ta' April 2014)

Il-Kunsill f'bosta okkażjonijiet indirizza l-kwistjoni mqajma mill-Onorevoli Membru.

Fil-15 ta' Ottubru 2013, il-Kunsill adotta *Dikjarazzjoni dwar l-Alleanza Ewropea għall-Apprentistati* ([1]), fejn esprima l-impenn qawwi tiegħu għall-ġlieda kontra l-qgħad u l-inattività fost iż-żgħażagħ, filwaqt li nnota li l-apprendistati ta' kwalità għolja u skemi oħrajn ta' tagħlim ibbażati fuq ix-xogħol kienu strumenti effettivi għat-titjib tat-transizzjonijiet sostenibbli mill-iskola għax-xogħol, b'mod partikolari bit-trawwim tal-ħiliet li huma rilevanti għas-suq tax-xogħol u t-titjib fit-tqabbil tal-ħiliet.

Fl-24 ta' Frar 2014, il-Kunsill adotta *Konklużjonijiet dwar l-edukazzjoni u t-taħriġ effiċjenti u innovattivi biex isir investiment f'ħiliet — b'appoġġ għas-Semestru Ewropew 2014* ([2]), fejn qies li xorta baqa" ħafna xi jsir biex jitreġġa' lura l-impatt tal-kriżi u biex jiġu indirizzati l-problemi strutturali sottostanti, u li data reċenti ssuġġeriet li dawn il-problemi strutturali kienu parzjalment marbutin man-nuqqas ta' ħiliet rilevanti. Il-Kunsill saħaq li kien hemm ħtieġa urġenti li jiġu indirizzati l-isfidi ewlenin tal-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ u l-livelli inadegwati ta' ħiliet.

Għalhekk, il-Kunsill qabel li jiġi enfasizzat li persuni ta' kull età jiġu mgħammra b'ħiliet aħjar u aktar rilevanti, b'mod partikolari billi jissaħħaħ it-tagħlim tul il-ħajja u jiġu promossi l-opportunitajiet indaqs għall-aċċess għal edukazzjoni u taħriġ ta' kwalità, inkluż għal studenti li ġejjin minn ambjenti żvantaġġati. Huwa qabel ukoll li tiġi ffaċilitata t-transizzjoni mill-edukazzjoni u t-taħriġ għax-xogħol, b'mod partikolari billi jiġu promossi skemi ta' tagħlim ibbażati fuq ix-xogħol u, fejn adatt, tiżdied id-disponibbiltà ta' traineeships jew apprendistati ta' kwalità tajba ([3]).

Ukoll, fil-Konklużjonijiet tiegħu tad-19-20 ta' Diċembru 2013, il-Kunsill Ewropew issottolinja li, fost l-oħrajn, il-politiki dwar l-impjiegigħandhom jiffokaw b'mod partikolari fuq l-indirizzar tad-diskrepanzi fil-ħiliet ([4]).

([1]) 14986/13.
([2]) 6285/14.
([3]) idem.
([4]) EUCO 217/13, il-punt 25.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001428/14
to the Council
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Youth unemployment

Management consultants McKinsey & Co have stated that one of the main sources of Europe's youth unemployment crisis is the severe mismatch between graduates and the skills required by businesses.

How does the Council intend to address this mismatch between graduates and the skills required for employment?

Reply
(14 April 2014)

The Council has on several occasions addressed the issue raised by the Honourable Member.

On 15 October 2013, the Council adopted a Declaration on European Alliance for Apprenticeships ([1]), where it expressed its strong commitment to combating youth unemployment and inactivity, whilst noting that high-quality apprenticeships and other work-based learning schemes were effective instruments for improving sustainable transitions from school to work, notably by fostering skills that are relevant to the labour market and improving skill matches.

On 24 February 2014, the Council adopted Conclusions on efficient and innovative education and training to invest in skills — supporting the 2014 European Semester ([2]), where it considered that much still remained to be done to reverse the impact of the crisis and to tackle underlying structural problems, and that recent data suggested that these structural problems were partly linked to the lack of relevant skills. The Council stressed that there was an urgent need to address the key challenges of youth unemployment and inadequate skills levels.

Therefore, the Council agreed to focus on equipping people in all age groups with better and more relevant skills, notably by strengthening lifelong learning and promoting equal opportunities for access to quality education and training, including for learners with disadvantaged backgrounds. It also agreed to facilitate the transition from education and training to work, notably by promoting work/based learning schemes and, where appropriate, increasing the availability of good quality traineeships or apprenticeships ([3]).

Also, in its Conclusions of 19-20 December 2013, the European Council underlined that, *inter alia*, employment policies should focus in particular on addressing skills mismatches ([4]).

([1]) 14986/13.
([2]) 6285/14.
([3]) idem.
([4]) EUCO 217/13, point 25.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001429/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Appoġġ lill-SMEs

L-SMEs huma s-sinsla u l-mutur tal-ekonomija tal-Ewropa. Dan hu partikolarment il-każ f'Malta, fejn madwar 99% tal-kumpaniji lokali kollha huma SMEs, li minnhom 95% huma mikrokumpaniji. L-SMEs lokali jikkontribwixxu għal madwar 65% tal-PDG totali ta' Malta, filwaqt li l-mikro SMEs jikkontribwixxu madwar 24% tal-PDG.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' telabora dwar il-pjanijiet tagħha f'terminu ta' żmien qasir, medju u fit-tul biex tkompli tappoġġa l-pjanijiet għat-tkabbir tal-SMEs Ewropej?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Tajani f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(1 ta' April 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni hija impenjata bis-sħiħ biex tappoġġa l-SMEs Ewropej. Għal din ir-raġuni, l-isforzi jiffukaw fuq l-implimentazzjoni tal-"*Small Business Act*" ([1])għall-Ewropa u r-Reviżjoni tiegħu, b'mod partikolari billi jiġi applikat bis-sħiħ il-prinċipju "Aħseb l-Ewwel fiż-Żgħir". Il-Kummissjoni beħsiebha tkompli ssegwi din il-linja billi tiżgura post prominenti għall-SMEs fil-programmi l-ġodda tagħha ta' appoġġ.

L-ewwel nett, il-programm speċjali għall-SMEs, COSME ([2]) (il-Programm għall-Kompetittività tal-Intrapriżi u l-SMEs) għandu l-għan li joħloq kundizzjonijiet aħjar ta' negozju għan-negozji Ewropej u b'mod partikolari għall-SMEs. EUR 1.4 biljun minn dan il-programm se jiġu allokati għall-mobilizzazzjoni ta' self u għall-finanzjament mill-bejgħ ta' ishma għall-SMEs. Huwa mistenni li sal-2020, bejn 220.000 u 330.000 negozju se jingħataw appoġġ bil-faċilità ta' garanzija.

Il-programm COSME se jappoġġa wkoll in-Netwerk Enterprise Europe li għandu rwol deċiżiv fl-għajnuna tal-SMEs biex igawdu bis-sħiħ minn opportunitajiet kummerċjali fis-Suq Intern tal-UE u lil hinn minnu. Se jiġu appoġġati madwar 450.000 kumpanija tal-UE fis-sena minn 600 organizzazzjoni f'aktar minn 55 pajjiż.

Fl-aħħar nett, il-programm se jipprovdi miżuri li jippromwovu l-intraprenditorija bħall-proġett "Erasmus għall-Intraprendituri Żgħażagħ" li sal-2020 mistenni jiffaċilita madwar 10 000 relazzjoni ġodda ta' intraprendituri ospitanti.

Barra minn hekk, programmi oħra tal-Kummissjoni għandhom dispożizzjonijiet speċjali għall-SMEs. Se jiġu allokati EUR 2.7 biljun mill-baġit tal-programm Orizzont 2020 biex jipprovdu finanzjament għan-negozji mmexxija mir-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni, inklużi l-SMEs. L-appoġġ għall-SMEs u l-intraprenditorija huwa wkoll fost l-objettivi tal-programmi ewlenin tal-infiq bħall-Fondi Strutturali u l-Fond Soċjali Ewropew.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/small-business-act/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/initiatives/cosme/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001429/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Support to SMEs

SMEs are the backbone and engine of Europe's economy. This is particularly the case in Malta, where SMEs comprise approximately 99% of all local firms, of which 95% are micro companies. Local SMEs contribute to around 65% of Malta's total GDP, with micro SMEs contributing around 24% of this.

Could the Commission elaborate on its short-, medium- and long-term plans to continue supporting European SMEs' growth plans?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(1 April 2014)

The Commission is strongly committed to supporting the growth of European SMEs. For this reason efforts focus on implementing the Small Business Act ([1]) for Europe and its Review, in particular by fully applying the Think Small First principle. The Commission intends to continue along this line by ensuring a prominent place for SMEs in its new support programmes.

First of all, the special programme for SMEs, COSME ([2]) (Competitiveness of enterprises and SMEs) aims at creating a better business environment for European businesses and in particular for SMEs. EUR 1.4 billion of this programme will be devoted to mobilising loans and equity financing for SMEs. By 2020 it is expected that 220 000 to 330 000 businesses will be supported with the guarantee facility.

COSME will also support the Enterprise Europe Network which has a decisive role to play in helping SMEs to fully profit from business opportunities in the EU Internal Market and beyond. About 450 000 EU companies per year will be supported by 600 organisations in more than 55 countries.

Finally, the programme will provide measures promoting entrepreneurship such as the project 'Erasmus for young entrepreneurs' which is expected to facilitate some 10 000 new-host entrepreneur relationships by 2020.

In addition, other Commission programmes have special provisions for SMEs. EUR 2.7 billion of the Horizon 2020 programme budget will be allocated to providing financing to research and innovation driven businesses, including SMEs. Support for SMEs and entrepreneurship are also among the objectives of the main spending programmes such as the Structural Funds and European Social Fund.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/small-business-act/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/initiatives/cosme/index_en.htm

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001434/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Aċċidenti tax-xogħol

Statistika riċenti turi li Malta rreġistrat żieda sostanzjali f'aċċidenti tax-xogħol (11.6 %) fl-aħħar tliet xhur tal-2013 b'paragun mal-istess perjodu fl-2012. L-akbar proporzjon tal-aċċidenti involviet persuni li jaħdmu xogħol ta' sengħa u snajja relatati, u l-aktar tipi komuni ta' korrimenti mġarrba kienu ġrieħi, feriti superfiċjali, żlugar, tfekkik u strapazz.

Għal dan il-għan, il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tipprevedi xi tip ta' azzjoni, fosthom kampanji tal-informazzjoni jew proposti leġiżlattivi, maħsuba biex inaqqsu n-numru ta' aċċidenti tax-xogħol li jseħħu fl-Istati Membri tal-UE?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(10 ta' April 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja dwar iż-żieda fl-ammont ta' aċċidenti fuq il-post tax-xogħol f'Malta fir-raba' kwart tal-2013, kif irrapurtat mill-Istitut Nazzjonali tal-Istatistika ta' Malta.

It-tnaqqis fl-ammont u l-inċidenza ta' aċċidenti fuq il-post tax-xogħol minn dejjem kienet prijorità fil-qasam ta' politika tas-saħħa u s-sigurtà fuq ix-xogħol fil-livell tal-UE, u dan jidher kemm fil-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE li tapplika f'dan il-qasam kif ukoll fi strumenti oħra ta' politika. L-għan ewlieni tal-Istrateġija tal-UE dwar is-Saħħa u s-Siġurtà fuq il-Post tax-Xogħol għall-2007-12 kien li r-rata ta' inċidenza tal-aċċidenti fuq il-post tax-xogħol fl-UE tinżel b'25% matul il-perjodu kopert. L-aħħar stimi tal-Eurostat juru li r-rata ta' inċidenza ta' aċċidenti serji mhux fatali fil-livell tal-UE niżlet bi 27.9% mill-2007 sal-2011. Implimentazzjoni aħjar tal-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE dwar is-sikurezza u s-saħħa okkupazzjonali, żvilupp ta' strateġiji nazzjonali dwar is-saħħa u s-sigurtà okkupazzjonali, kooperazzjoni aktar mill-qrib fost l-Istati Membri fil-promozzjoni ta' prattika tajba u l-kampanji ta' informazzjoni u gwida kienu fost il-fatturi li kkontribwew għall-kisba ta' dan ir-riżultat.

Il-Kummissjoni se tkompli tissorvelja l-implimentazzjoni tal-leġiżlazzjoni rilevanti mill-Istati Membri u attwalment qiegħda tevalwa parti sostanzjali tal-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE fil-qasam tas-saħħa u s-sigurtà (24 direttiva). Ir-riżultati ta' din l-evalwazzjoni huma mistennija sa tmiem l-2015 u se jgħinu biex jitfasslu l-inizjattivi futuri tal-Kummissjoni.

Il-Kummissjoni dalwaqt se tippreżenta Qafas Strateġiku tal-UE dwar is-Saħħa u s-Sikurezza fuq il-Post tax-Xogħol li se jikkontribwixxi wkoll biex is-sitwazzjoni fl-UE tkompli tittejjeb.

Azzjonijiet oħrajn mhux leġiżlattivi wkoll se jikkontribwixxu biex ir-riżultati jkomplu jittejbu; pereżempju il-kampanja tal-2014 tal-Kumitat ta' Livell Għoli għall-Eżaminar tax-Xogħol għal prevenzjoni ta' aċċidenti fuq il-post tax-xogħol minħabba żliq u tgerbib fuq l-istess livell, li għadha kif bdiet ([1]).

([1]) Ara https://osha.europa.eu/en/news/eu-slic-campaign-launched-prevention-of-work-accidents-due-to-slips-and-trips-2014

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001434/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Occupational accidents

Recent statistics show that Malta registered a substantial increase in occupational accidents (11.6%) in the fourth quarter of 2013 compared to the same period in 2012. The largest proportion of accidents involved people in craft and related trades, with the most common types of injuries sustained being wounds, superficial injuries, dislocations, sprains and strains.

To this end, is the Commission envisaging any action, including information campaigns or legislative proposals, aimed at reducing the number of occupational accidents occurring in EU Member States?

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

The Commission is aware of the rising trend in occupational accidents in Malta in the fourth quarter of 2013, as recorded by the Maltese national statistical institute.

Reducing the number and incidence of accidents at work has always been a priority at EU level in the health and safety at work policy area, and is reflected both in the EU legislation applying in this field and in other policy instruments. The main objective of the EU Strategy on Health and Safety at Work for 2007-12 was to reduce the incidence rate of accidents at work in the EU by 25% over the period covered. The latest Eurostat estimates show that the incidence rate of serious non-fatal accidents at EU level fell by 27.9% from 2007 to 2011. Better implementation of EU occupational safety and health legislation, the development of national occupational safety and health strategies, closer cooperation among the Member States in promoting good practice, and information campaigns and guidance were among the factors which contributed to achieving that result.

The Commission will continue monitoring the implementation of the relevant legislation by Member States and is now in the process of evaluating a substantial part of the EU legislation in the field of health and safety (24 directives). The results of this evaluation, expected by the end of 2015, will help shaping future Commission initiatives.

The Commission will shortly present an EU Strategic Framework on Health and Safety at Work which will also contribute to further improve the situation in the EU.

Other non-legislative actions will contribute to improving results, an example being the 2014 Senior Labour Inspectors Committee campaign to prevent work accidents due to slips and trips on the same level, which started recently ([1]).

([1]) See https://osha.europa.eu/en/news/eu-slic-campaign-launched-prevention-of-work-accidents-due-to-slips-and-trips-2014

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001435/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: L-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi

Waqt laqgħa tal-Grupp ta' Ħidma ta' Livell Għoli dwar l-Ugwaljanza bejn is-Sessi li saret f'Ateni mis-6 sas-7 ta' Frar 2014, ġie enfasizzat li "l-parteċipazzjoni ugwali tan-nisa fl-ekonomija u l-isforzi biex tingħata spinta lit-tkabbir għandhom ikunu fil-qofol ta' politika aġġornata dwar l-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi fl-Unjoni Ewropea f'dan il-mument storiku".

Fid-dawl ta' dan, qiegħda l-Kummissjoni tippjana xi tip ta' azzjoni rigward il-politika tal-UE dwar l-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi, l-aktar peress li "l-istrateġija għall-ugwaljanza bejn in-nisa u l-irġiel" attwali se tiġi fi tmiemha fl-2015?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(1 ta' April 2014)

Indipendenza ekonomika ugwali għan-nisa u l-irġiel hija waħda mill-oqsma ta' prijorità ewlenin tal-Istrateġija għall-ugwaljanza bejn in-nisa u l-irġiel (2010-2015). L-analiżi ta' nofs it-term tal-Istrateġija [1] sabet li, f'nofs l-iskala ta' żmien ta' ħames snin tal-istrateġija, il-Kummissjoni qiegħda twettaq l-impenji tagħha u tistabbilixxi l-azzjonijiet li għandhom ikunu mwettqa bejn l-2013 u l-2015. Meta l-Istrateġija tintemm, il-Kummissjoni, f'kollaborazzjoni mal-partijiet interessati kollha, se tidentifika l-isfidi li fadal u l-azzjoni xierqa li għandha tittieħed fuq livell Ewropew.

[1] SWD (2013) 300 finali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001435/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Gender equality

During a meeting of the High-Level Working Group on Gender Mainstreaming that took place in Athens from 6 to 7 February 2014, it was highlighted that the 'equal participation of women in the economy and the efforts to boost growth should be a principle concern of an up-to-date gender equality policy in the European Union at this point in time'.

Following this outcome, is the Commission envisaging any action on the EU's gender equality policy, particularly given that the current 'strategy for equality between women and men' will end in 2015?

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

Equal economic independence for women and men is one of the key priority areas of the strategy for equality between women and men (2010-2015). The mid-term review of the strategy ([1]) found that, half-way through the strategy's five-year time scale, the Commission is delivering on its commitments and sets out the actions to be carried out between 2013 and 2015. When the strategy comes to an end, the Commission will, in collaboration with all stakeholders, identify remaining challenges and appropriate action to be taken at European level.

([1]) SWD (2013) 300 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001440/14
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 février 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Mission de paix en RDC

1. Est-il dans les plans européens de déployer tous les efforts diplomatiques possibles auprès du Conseil de sécurité des Nations unies afin qu'une mission de maintien de la paix dotée d'un mandat fort (de nature incluante, notamment) soit décidée dans les plus brefs délais?

2. Partagez-vous notre avis selon lequel cette mission devrait notamment assurer la protection des défenseurs des Droits de l'homme et des autres groupes vulnérables?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Asthon, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(31 mars 2014)

Une mission des Nations unies pour la stabilisation, la Monusco, intervient déjà en République démocratique du Congo (RDC). Un Bureau conjoint des Nations unies aux Droits de l'homme (BCNUDH) a été créé en février 2008 et intègre la Division des Droits de l'homme (HRD) de la Monusco ainsi que l'ancien bureau du Haut commissariat des Nations unies aux Droits de l'homme en RDC (HCDH-RDC). Les deux bureaux ont été entièrement intégrés et le BCNUDH travaille en concordance avec les deux mandats.

L'Union européenne entretient un dialogue régulier avec les défenseurs des Droits de l'homme en RDC. En outre, par le truchement des missions EUSEC et EUPOL et grâce au soutien au système judiciaire, l'UE s'emploie activement à mieux faire connaître les droits des groupes vulnérables, dont les femmes et les enfants, et à faire prendre conscience de la nécessité de respecter les Droits de l'homme dans les domaines de la formation de la police, du pouvoir judiciaire et de l'armée en RDC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001440/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Peace mission in DRC

1. Is it in the European plans to make every possible diplomatic effort at the United Nations Security Council in order that a peacekeeping mission with a strong mandate (of an inclusive nature, in particular) is decided on as soon as possible?

2. Do you share our opinion that this mission should in particular ensure the protection of the defenders of human rights and other vulnerable groups?

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

A United Nations Stabilisation Mission, MONUSCO, already operates in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. A United Nations Joint Human Rights Office (UNJHRO) was created in February 2008 and is comprised of the MONUSCO Human Rights Division (HRD) and the former Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in the DRC (OHCHR/DRC). The two offices have been fully integrated and the UNJHRO functions in accordance with their two mandates.

The European Union has a regular dialogue with human rights defenders in DRC. In addition, through the Missions EUSECand EUPOL, and through support to the justice system, the EU actively promotes awareness of the rights of vulnerable groups, including women and children, and of the need to respect human rights, in training of the police, judiciary and army in DRC.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001441/14
à la Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(11 février 2014)

Objet: Ratification par les États membres de la convention nº 169 de l'Organisation internationale du travail relative aux droits des peuples indigènes et tribaux

Survival international, mouvement mondial de soutien aux peuples indigènes fondé à Londres en 1969, mène une campagne d'envergure internationale visant à promouvoir la ratification de la convention n° 169 de l'Organisation internationale du travail relative aux droits des peuples indigènes et tribaux dans les pays indépendants, adoptée en 1989 et en vigueur depuis 1991.

Cette convention reconnaît un ensemble de droits fondamentaux essentiels à la survie des peuples indigènes (respect et reconnaissance de leurs propres coutumes et institutions, propriété et gestion collectives de la terre et de ses ressources, principes de participation et de consultation, etc.).

La convention nº 169 a été ratifiée par 22 pays, dont, en Europe, l'Espagne, les Pays-Bas, le Danemark et la Norvège, et, en Amérique latine, le Brésil, la Colombie et la Bolivie, pays dans lesquels elle a suscité d'importantes réformes et inspiré des politiques visant à la reconnaissance de la légitimité de la diversité ethnique et culturelle de la population.

La ratification de cette convention par les États membres devrait non seulement répondre à un impératif de la politique de développement et de l'action extérieure de l'Union européenne mais aussi s'articuler à sa nouvelle stratégie sur la responsabilité sociale des entreprises — notamment européennes —, dans la mesure où elle les engagerait à respecter les droits des peuples indigènes dans toute exploitation de leurs territoires en les associant aux processus décisionnels et à des projets qui les concernent directement.

Quelles initiatives la Commission compte-t-elle prendre en vue d'inciter les États membres à ratifier la convention nº 169?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(15 avril 2014)

La Commission favorise, dans toutes ses politiques, la ratification et l'application effective, par les États membres, des conventions actualisées de l'OIT.

La Commission procède actuellement à une analyse des conventions actualisées de l'OIT à la lumière de l'acquis de l'UE, notamment pour faire suite à une demande en ce sens que le Parlement européen lui avait adressée (résolution du 26 novembre 2009). Elle a l'intention de se fonder sur les résultats de cette analyse pour décider de la nécessité de prendre de nouvelles initiatives concernant certaines conventions.

La Commission favorise la responsabilité sociale des entreprises (RSE) et encourage l'ensemble des entreprises de l'UE à respecter les normes internationales en matière de RSE, telles que les principes directeurs de l'OCDE à l'intention des entreprises multinationales (qui prévoient la mise en place de points de contact nationaux chargés d'apporter une aide dans les mécanismes de mise en œuvre, de plainte et de médiation), la déclaration tripartite de l'OIT sur les entreprises multinationales et la politique sociale, et les principes directeurs des Nations unies relatifs aux entreprises et aux Droits de l'homme.

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à prendre connaissance de ses réponses aux questions écrites 2738/2012 et 13660/2013 au sujet de sa volonté d'encourager l'application de la convention nº 169 de l'OIT dans les pays tiers.

Un projet financé par l'IEDDH est en cours de réalisation. Son objectif général est de protéger et de promouvoir les droits des peuples indigènes en Asie, en Amérique latine et en Afrique, conformément aux normes internationales, notamment la convention nº 169 de l'OIT. Ce projet a contribué de façon notable à l'obtention de résultats marquants en Asie, en Amérique latine et en Afrique. Il a, par exemple, concouru à la ratification de la convention nº 169 par le Népal et la République centrafricaine.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001441/14
to the Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Ratification by the Member States of Convention No 169 of the International Labour Organisation relating to the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples

Survival international, a global movement for the support of indigenous peoples which was founded in London in 1969, is leading an international campaign aimed at promoting the ratification of Convention No 169 of the International Labour Organisation relating to the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples in independent countries, which was adopted in 1989 and has been in force since 1991.

This convention recognises a set of fundamental rights which are essential for the survival of indigenous peoples (respect for and recognition of their specific customs and institutions, collective ownership and management of the earth and its resources, principles of participation and consultation, etc.).

Convention No 169 has been ratified by 22 countries, including, in Europe, Spain, the Netherlands, Denmark and Norway, and, in Latin America, Brazil, Colombia and Bolivia, countries in which it has given rise to significant reforms and inspired policies aimed at recognition of the legitimacy of the ethnic and cultural diversity of the population.

The ratification of this convention by the Member States should not only meet an essential requirement of the development and external action policy of the European Union but also tie in with its new strategy regarding the social responsibility of companies — particularly European companies — in so far as it would oblige them to respect the rights of indigenous peoples in any use of their territories by including them in the decision-making processes and projects which directly concern them.

What initiatives are being planned by the Commission with a view to encouraging the Member States to ratify Convention No 169?

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

The Commission promotes the ratification and effective implementation by Member States of up to date ILO Conventions in all its policies.

The Commission is currently conducting a review of up-to-date ILO conventions in the light of the EU acquis, including for complying with a request made to the Commission by the European Parliament (Resolution of 26 November 2009). The Commission intends to use the results of this review to decide on the need for further initiatives related to specific Conventions.

The Commission promotes Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and encourages all EU companies to adhere to international CSR standards, such as the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (which provide for National Contact Points assisting in implementation, complaint and mediation mechanisms), the ILO Tripartite Declaration on Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, and the UN Guiding Principles on business and human rights.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions 2738/2012 and 013660/2013 for its commitment to encourage the implementation of the ILO Convention No169 in third countries.

There is an ongoing EIDHR-funded project whose overall objective is to have indigenous peoples' rights promoted and protected in Asia, Latin America and Africa, in accordance with international standards notably ILO Convention 169. The project has significantly contributed to landmark results in Asia, Latin America and Africa, and contributed for instance to the ratification of Convention No.169 by Nepal and by Central African Republic.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001442/14
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(11 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Animali esotici nell'UE

Lo scorso 15 gennaio, il Parlamento europeo ha approvato una risoluzione sui reati contro le specie selvatiche (2013/2747(RSP)), nella quale si chiede alla Commissione europea di creare senza indugio un piano d'azione dell'UE contro i reati ai danni delle specie selvatiche e il relativo traffico, che includa tempistiche e obiettivi chiari.

In Italia è in continuo aumento la presenza di animali esotici e, con essa, anche il loro commercio che, purtroppo, spesso viaggia nella completa illegalità.

Tutto questo costituisce un enorme danno, sia per gli importatori e commercianti seri e scrupolosi, che per i consumatori, nonché per le finanze pubbliche e gli animali stessi, che spesso sono costretti a condizioni indicibili.

Può la Commissione indicare se esiste un approccio comune in materia di importazione, commercio e vendita di animali esotici nell'UE?

Non ritiene che le fiere di settore siano realtà poco controllate, sotto molteplici aspetti?

Ritiene inoltre che sia necessario creare il piano chiesto dalla risoluzione e con quale tempistica?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(7 aprile 2014)

Nell'UE esiste un approccio comune in materia di importazione, commercio e vendita di oltre 30 000 specie che sono incluse negli allegati al regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 del Consiglio ([1]). Tali specie comprendono un gran numero di animali esotici che possono essere commercializzati unicamente nel caso in cui gli Stati membri dell'UE rilascino licenze o certificati che garantiscano la loro provenienza da fonti sostenibili e legittime. La Commissione lavora in stretta collaborazione con gli Stati membri per rafforzare costantemente l'esecuzione di tali norme.

La cooperazione in materia di commercio illegale di fauna selvatica è inoltre portata avanti dal gruppo «Esecuzione» dell'UE che si riunisce due volte all'anno sotto la presidenza della Commissione europea e comprende funzionari incaricati dell'applicazione della legge provenienti da tutti gli Stati membri dell'UE, da Europol, Eurojust, Interpol, dall'Organizzazione mondiale delle dogane e dal segretariato della CITES.

Nel seguente documento sono riportati esempi di confische importanti nell'UE effettuate nel 2012:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/cites/pdf/Overview%20significant%20seizures.pdf.

La Commissione ha recentemente adottato una comunicazione sulla strategia dell'UE contro il traffico illegale di specie selvatiche ([2]) che include molte raccomandazioni contenute nella risoluzione del PE e avvia una consultazione dei soggetti interessati. Sulla base dei risultati di tale consultazione la Commissione deciderà in merito alle azioni opportune da intraprendere.

([1]) GU L 61 del 3.3.1997.
([2]) Comunicazione della Commissione al Consiglio e al Parlamento europeo COM(2014) 64 final, del 7 febbraio 2014, sulla strategia dell'UE contro il traffico illegale di specie selvatiche (cfr. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52014DC0064:IT:NOT).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001442/14
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Exotic animals in the EU

On 15 January, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on wildlife crime (2013/2747(RSP)), in which it urged the European Commission to establish without delay an EU plan of action against wildlife crime and trafficking, including clear deliverables and timelines.

In Italy, the number of exotic animals is constantly on the increase, as is the trade in these creatures, which unfortunately is often conducted entirely outside the law.

This is all hugely detrimental to honest, reputable importers and traders, to consumers, to public finances and to the animals themselves, which are often kept in unspeakably bad conditions.

Can the Commission indicate whether there is a common approach in place for dealing with the importation, trade and sale of exotic animals in the EU?

Does it not agree that in many respects trade events in this sector are subject to few controls?

Does it believe it necessary to establish the plan requested by the resolution and, if so, within what timescale?

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

There is a common approach across the EU in respect to the import, export and internal trade of more than 30 000 species which are included in the annexes to Council Regulation 338/97 ([1]). Those species include a large number of exotic animals which can only be traded if the EU Member States issue permits or certificates guaranteeing that they come from sustainable and legal sources. The Commission works closely with the Member States to constantly strengthen the enforcement of those rules.

Cooperation on illegal wildlife trade issues also takes place through the EU enforcement group, which meets twice a year under the chairmanship of the European Commission and gathers law enforcement officers from all EU Member States, as well as Europol, Eurojust, Interpol, the World Customs Organisation, Interpol and the CITES Secretariat.

Examples of important seizures done in the EU in 2012 have been compiled in the following document:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/cites/pdf/Overview%20significant%20seizures.pdf

The Commission has recently adopted a communication on the EU approach on wildlife trafficking ([2]), covering many of the recommendations contained in the EP resolution, and launching a wide stakeholder consultation. On the basis of the outcome of the consultation, the Commission will decide on the appropriate course of action.

([1]) OJ L 61, 3.3.1997.
([2]) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament COM(2014) 64 final of 7 February 2014 on the EU Approach against Wildlife Trafficking (see http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52014DC0064:EN:NOT)

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001451/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(11 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Primer rescate a Grecia y a la banca europea

En mayo de 2010 se concedió a Grecia el primer préstamo internacional. En este participó el Fondo Monetario Internacional con una aportación de 30 000 millones de euros.

El periódico *El País* reveló hace unos días el documento confidencial del FMI ([1]). En este se indican los riesgos que entrañaba el rescate, según países como Rusia, la India, Suiza, Brasil y Argentina. Concretamente, Brasil advirtió que el rescate a Grecia, sin una restructuración de la deuda, era el rescate a las instituciones financieras europeas.

El documento también indica que había un compromiso por parte de Francia, Alemania y los Países Bajos de que sus bancos apoyarían a Grecia y no se desharían de deuda griega. Sin embargo, este compromiso fue incumplido.

¿Considera la Comisión que este documento preveía la quita y la restructuración de la deuda que sufrió posteriormente Grecia? ¿Cree que estas advertencias deberían haber sido tenidas en cuenta por el Gobierno griego?

Analizando con perspectiva, ¿considera la Comisión que debería haber pedido inicialmente la reestructuración y cancelación de la deuda griega, de manera que los bancos alemanes, franceses y neerlandeses asumiesen parte del coste y se redujera el sufrimiento de la población griega a causa de la política de austeridad?

¿Considera la Comisión que Alemania, Francia y los Países Bajos incumplieron su compromiso político al no garantizar que su banca no se deshiciera de la deuda griega y no especulara con la misma?

¿Conoce la Comisión otros documentos confidenciales del FMI que debieran ser de conocimiento público para garantizar la transparencia y democracia de las decisiones macroeconómicas de la UE?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión no hace comentarios sobre documentos difundidos a raíz de supuestas filtraciones.

La información detallada acerca de la aplicación del programa de ajuste macroeconómico en Grecia, incluida la participación del sector privado, figura en los informes publicados periódicamente en:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm

([1]) http://ep00.epimg.net/descargables/2014/02/01/3d638976e4fd3cd4001ab63dfa750acf.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001451/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: First rescue package for Greece and the European banks

In May 2010, Greece was granted its first international loan, with a contribution from the International Monetary Fund of EUR 30 billion.

A few days ago, the Spanish daily *El País* uncovered a confidential document from the IMF ([1]), which highlighted the risks involved in the rescue package, raised by countries such as Russia, India, Switzerland, Brazil and Argentina. Brazil, specifically, warned that the rescue package afforded to Greece, which did not entail a restructuring of its debt, amounted to a rescue package for European financial institutions.

The document also indicated that France, Germany and the Netherlands promised that their banks would support Greece and would not offload its debt. This promise, however, was not honoured.

Does the Commission believe that this document foresaw the release and restructuring of debt that Greece would later experience? Does it believe that these warnings should have been taken into consideration by the Greek Government?

In retrospect, does the Commission believe that it should have initially requested Greece's debt to be restructured and cancelled, such that German, France and Dutch banks would have assumed a part of the cost, thereby reducing the suffering endured by the Greek people as a result of a policy of austerity?

Does the Commission believe that Germany, France and the Netherlands have defaulted on their political promise by not guaranteeing that their banks would offload Greek debt and would not speculate with it?

Is the Commission aware of any other confidential IMF documents that should have been made public in order to ensure that the macroeconomic decisions made by the EU are transparent and democratic?

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

The Commission does not comment on allegedly leaked documents.

Detailed information regarding the implementation of the macroeconomic adjustment programme in Greece, including on private sector involvement, can be found in reports published regularly at:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm

([1]) http://ep00.epimg.net/descargables/2014/02/01/3d638976e4fd3cd4001ab63dfa750acf.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001454/14
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli)
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: VP/HR — ir-rekwiżit tal-viża tal-Istati Uniti għaċ-ċittadini ta' Stati Membri tal-UE

Il-Kummissjoni talbet lill-Istati Uniti tneħħi r-rekwiżit tal-viża għaċ-ċittadini mill-Polonja, ir-Rumanija, il-Bulgarija, Ċipru u l-Kroazja, li għad għandhom bżonn permess biex jidħlu f'dan il-pajjiż.

L-Istati Uniti stabbilew li, sabiex jissieħbu fil-Programm għall-Eżenzjoni mill-Viża tagħha, il-pajjiżi msemmija hawn fuq iridu jaqblu li jagħtu lill-Istati Uniti informazzjoni rilevanti dwar iċ-ċittadini tagħhom biex tiġi żgurata protezzjoni mit-terroriżmu u għal raġunijiet ta' sigurtà oħrajn.

Bħalma ġara fl-2008, l-UE wissiet li tippenalizza lill-Istati Uniti billi timponi r-rekwiżit tal-viża għall-membri tal-korp diplomatiku Amerikan jekk il-pajjiż jonqos milli jindirizza din is-sitwazzjoni fis-sitt xhur li ġejjin ([1]).

Erbgħa minn dawn il-pajjiżi, ir-Rumanija, il-Bulgarija, Ċipru u l-Kroazja, għadhom mhumiex parti miż-żona Schengen. Filwaqt li huma obbligati jissieħbu fis-snin li ġejjin, għadhom ma ssodisfawx ir-rekwiżiti biex jagħmlu dan. Xi whud minn dawn ir-rekwiżiti għandhom x'jaqsmu mal-kontrolli tas-sigurtà transkonfinali.

Taħseb ir-Rappreżentant Għoli li l-Istati Uniti jistgħu jużaw dan l-argument biex jevitaw li jneħħu r-rekwiżit tal-viża għal dawn il-pajjiżi, tal-inqas sa ma jissieħbu fiż-żona Schengen?

Jekk tiġi applikata sanzjoni fuq l-Istati Uniti, din tibqa' fis-seħħ sa ma jitneħħa r-rekwiżit tal-viża għal dawn il-pajjiżi?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(16 ta' April 2014)

L-għan aħħari tal-UE u prijorità fir-relazzjonijiet tagħha mal-Istati Uniti huwa li tikseb reċiproċità sħiħa dwar il-viża billi jkun żgurat li l-Istati Membri li fadal jissieħbu fil-Programm għall-Eżenzjoni mill-Viża tal-Istati Uniti malajr kemm jista' jkun.

Filwaqt li mal-ewwel daqqa ta' għajn il-kwistjoni tar-reċiproċità tal-viża u s-sħubija sħiħa fiż-żona Schengen jistgħu jidhru relatati, il-Kummissjoni enfasizzat li l-kundizzjonijiet ta' sħubija fiż-żona Schengen mingħajr fruntieri interni — li huma bbażati fuq it-twettiq ta' numru ta' rekwiżiti stretti fil-qasam tal-kontroll tal-fruntieri esterni, l-armonizzazzjoni tal-kundizzjonijiet tad-dħul, il-kooperazzjoni ġudizzjarja u tal-pulizija u l-protezzjoni tad-dejta personali — huma ħafna iktar stretti u qawwija mill-kundizzjonijiet għal eżenzjoni mill-viża.

Skont il-mekkaniżmu ta' reċiproċità riveduta adottat bħala parti mir-Regolament 1289/2013 ([2]), u mingħajr preġudizzju għall-applikazzjoni tiegħu għal annullament parzjali tar-Regolament 1289/2013, il-Kummissjoni għandha tadotta, fi żmien sitt xhur wara l-pubblikazzjoni imminenti tan-notifikazzjonijiet mill-Istati Membri ta' sitwazzjonijiet ta' nuqqas ta' reċiproċità, att ta' implimentazzjoni li jissospendi l-eżenzjoni mill-viża għal ċerti kategoriji ta' ċittadini tal-pajjiż terz ikkonċernat għal perjodu ta' mhux aktar minn sitt xhur, jew rapport li jivvaluta s-sitwazzjoni u jispjega r-raġunijiet għalfejn hija ma pproponietx tali miżura.

Sal-lum il-Kummissjoni ma tistax tippreġudika r-riżultat tal-analiżi tagħha dwar jekk kinitx se tadotta tali att ta' implimentazzjoni jew rapport. Din l-analiżi għandha tqis il-fatturi rilevanti kollha.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/justice/eu-gives-usa-deadline-reciprocat-news-533275

([2]) Ir-Regolament (UE) Nru 1289/2013 tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tal-11 ta' Diċembru 2013 (ĠU L 347, 20.12.2013) li jemendar-Regolament tal-Kunsill (KE) Nru 539/2001tal-15 ta' Marzu 2001 li jelenka l-pajjiżi terzi li ċ-ċittadini tagħhom għandu jkollhom viża fil-pussess tagħhom meta jaqsmu l-fruntieri esterni u dawk li ċ-ċittadini tagħhom huma eżenti minn dik il-ħtieġa (ĠU L 81, 21.3.2001).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001454/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — US visa requirements for EU Member States

The Commission has asked the United States to remove visa requirements for citizens from Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Cyprus and Croatia, who still need an entry permit to travel to the country.

The US has established that, in order to join its Visa Waiver Program, the countries mentioned above need to agree to provide the US with relevant information on their citizens to ensure protection from terrorism and for other security purposes.

As was the case in 2008, the EU has promised to sanction the US by imposing visa requirements for US diplomats if the country fails to address this situation in the next six months ([1]).

Four of the above countries, Romania, Bulgaria, Cyprus and Croatia, are not part of the Schengen area yet. While they are obliged to join in the upcoming years, they have not yet completed the requirements to join. Several of these requirements concern cross-border security controls.

Does the High Representative think that the US could use this argument to avoid removing visa requirements for these countries, at least until they join the Schengen area?

If a sanction on the US is applied, would it remain in place until these countries' visa requirements are waived?

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

The EU's ultimate goal and a priority in its relations with the US is to achieve full visa reciprocity by ensuring that the remaining Member States join the US Visa Waiver Program as soon as possible.

While at first sight the issue of visa reciprocity and a full Schengen area membership may seem related, the Commission has stressed that the conditions for joining the Schengen area without internal borders — which are based on the fulfilment of a number of stringent requirements in the area of controlling the external borders, harmonisation of the conditions of entry, police and judicial cooperation, and the protection of personal data — are much stricter and far-reaching than the conditions for a visa waiver.

In accordance with the revised reciprocity mechanism adopted as part of Regulation 1289/2013 ([2]), and without prejudice to its application for annulment in part of Regulation 1289/2013, the Commission should adopt, within six months of the upcoming publication of Member States' notifications of non-reciprocity situations, an implementing act suspending the visa waiver for certain categories of citizens of the third country concerned for a period of up to six months, or a report assessing the situation and explaining the reasons why it did not propose such a measure.

To date the Commission cannot prejudge the outcome of its analysis on whether it would adopt such an implementing act or a report. Such analysis should take into account all relevant factors.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/justice/eu-gives-usa-deadline-reciprocat-news-533275

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1289/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 (OJ L 347, 20.12.2013) amending Council Regulation (EC) No 539/2001 of 15 March 2001 listing the third countries whose nationals must be in possession of visas when crossing the external borders and those whose nationals are exempt from that requirement (OJ L 81, 21.3.2001).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001456/14
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli)
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: VP/HR — L-Għanijiet ta' Żvilupp tal-Millennju tan-NU

Filwaqt li sar progress sinifikanti biex jiġu indirizzati wħud mit-tmien Għanijiet ta' Żvilupp tal-Millennju, uħud minnhom għadhom lura biex jintlaħqu qabel l-2015 ([1]).

Xi pajjiżi qed jitolbu li l-pajjiżi żviluppati jiġu obbligati jikkontribwixxu għall-għajnuna u li jiġu imposti sanzjonijiet fuq dawk minnhom li jonqsu milli jirrispettaw dan l-obbligu. Oħrajn jargumentaw li mhux l-għajnuna kienet, iżda kien ir-ristrutturar tal-gvernijiet u l-istituzzjonijiet tagħhom li ppermetta lil ċerti pajjiżi li qed jiżviluppaw jiksbu tkabbir notevoli mis-sena 2000 ' l hawn.

Liema spjegazzjoni r-Rappreżentant Għoli tqis għandha tingħata prijorità fit-tfassil ta' soluzzjonijiet potenzjali biex jitħaffef it-twettiq tal-objettivi sal-2015?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(14 ta' Mejju 2014)

L-UE tibqa' impenjata biex tikseb il-Millennium Development Goals, MDGs sal-2015 u tilqa' l-progress li jkun sar. Hemm ħafna raġunijiet għal dan il-progress. Fattur kruċjali huwa l-ambjent ta' politika u istituzzjonali fil-pajjiżi msieħba, flimkien mar-riżorsi disponibbli għall-iżvilupp domestiku. It-tkabbir rapidu fil-kummerċ kien ukoll fattur ewlieni. L-UE hija l-ikbar sieħba kummerċjali għall-pajjiżi li qed jiżviluppaw u kienet fuq quddiem biex tagħti aċċess bla dazju u bla kwota għall-prodotti kollha tal-LDCs. Riċerka ffinanzjata mill-UE kkontribwixxiet ukoll għall-kisba tal-MDGs. Id-dispożizzjoni tal-Għajnuna Uffiċjali għall-Iżvilupp (*Official Development Assistance*, ODA) tappoġġa wkoll il-progress, u l-UE u l-Istati Membri tagħha kollettivament huma l-ikbar donaturi, u b'ħekk jipprovdu EUR 53 biljun annwali f'ODAs (2011), jew iktar minn nofs l-ODA globali.

Ħafna pajjiżi fraġli, affettwati mill-vjolenza, madankollu, mhumiex mistennija jilħqu kwalunkwe miri tal-MDG sal-2015. Governanza dgħajfa, inkluż nuqqas ta' demokrazija, l-istat tad-dritt u r-rispett għad-drittijiet tal-bniedem, qed ixekkel l-isforzi lejn l-eradikazzjoni tal-faqar u l-iżvilupp sostenibbli. L-UE kienet attiva ħafna fl-implimentazzjoni tal-Patt il-Ġdid għall-involviment fl-istati fraġli u affettwati mill-vjolenza, u l-"Aġenda għall-Bidla" tal-UE tafferma li r-riżorsi għandhom ikunu mmirati lejn il-pajjiżi l-iktar fil-bżonn fejn jista' jkollhom l-ikbar impatt ta' żvilupp f'termini ta' tnaqqis tal-faqar.

Bl-involviment tagħna fl-aġenda ta' wara l-2015 aħna nikkommettu ruħna lejn qafas ġenerali li jimmira kemm lejn l-eradikazzjoni tal-faqar kif ukoll lejn l-iżvilupp sostenibbli, minħabba li dawn iż-żewġ kwistjonijiet huma intrinsikament marbuta. Dan se jirrikjedi l-integrazzjoni tat-tliet dimensjonijiet interrelatati tal-iżvilupp sostenibbli (ekonomiċi, soċjali u ambjentali) u l-assigurazzjoni ta' approċċ ibbażat fuq id-drittijiet li jinkludu d-drittijiet kollha tal-bniedem.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/specialreport-un-development-goa/waning-eu-aid-promises-spur-un-g-news-530517

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001456/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — UN Millennium Development Goals

While significant progress has been made in addressing some of the eight Millennium Development Goals, a few of them are still far from being achieved before 2015 ([1]).

Some countries are calling for mandatory aid contributions from developed countries and sanctions for those countries which fail to comply. Others argue that it is not aid, but a restructuring of their governments and institutions that has allowed certain developing countries to achieve remarkable growth since 2000.

Which explanation does the High Representative consider should be prioritised when designing potential solutions to accelerate the completion of the goals by 2015?

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

The EU remains committed to achieving the MDGs by 2015 and welcomes the progress made. There are many reasons for this progress. A critical factor is the policy and institutional environment within partner countries, together with resources available for development domestically. The rapid growth in trade has also been a major factor. The EU is the biggest trading partner for developing countries and is has led the way in granting duty-free and quota-free access to all LDC products. EU-funded research has also contributed to the achievement of the MDGs. Provision of Official Development Assistance (ODA) also supports progress, and the EU and its Member States are collectively the largest donor, providing an annual EUR 53 billion in ODA (2011), or more than half of global ODA.

Many fragile, violence-affected countries, however, are not expected to meet any of the MDG targets by 2015. Poor governance, including a lack of democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights, is hampering efforts towards poverty eradication and sustainable development. The EU has been very active in the implementation of the New Deal for engagement in conflict affected and fragile states, and the EU 'Agenda for Change' affirms that resources should be targeted at countries most in need where they can have the greatest development impact in terms of poverty reduction.

In our engagement with the post-2015 agenda we commit to an overarching framework aiming at both poverty eradication and sustainable development, as these two issues are intrinsically linked. This will require integrating the three interrelated dimensions of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) and ensuring a rights-based approach encompassing all human rights.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/specialreport-un-development-goa/waning-eu-aid-promises-spur-un-g-news-530517

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001457/14
lill-Kunsill
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Inkwiet ċivili fil-Bosnja

L-inkwiet ċivili attwali huwa meqjus bħala l-agħar li qatt seħħ fil-Bosnja ta' wara l-gwerra ([1]).

Anke wara tmiem il-gwerra fl-1995, l-UE dejjem baqgħet issegwi lill-Bosnja mill-qrib. L-UE żammet ukoll il-preżenza tagħha fir-reġjun permezz tal-qafas tal-PESK u tal-PSDK.

Fil-kuntest tal-livell ta' vjolenza u tensjoni attwali fil-Bosnja, il-Kummissjoni għandha xi informazzjoni dwar l-involviment potenzjali tal-Istati Membri fil-Bosnja bil-għan li tiġi evitata aktar vjolenza?

Tweġiba
(23 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-protesti pubbliċi reċenti fil-Bosnja-Ħerzegovina (BiH) juru l-parteċipazzjoni attiva taċ-ċittadini fl-użu tad-drittijiet demokratiċi tagħhom. Fl-istess waqt, l-imġiba vjolenti inizjali minn xi whud hija kwistjoni ta' tħassib kbir. Ir-Rappreżentant Għoli vvjaġġat lejn Sarajevo fil-11 u t-12 ta' Marzu 2014 u ltaqgħet mal-awtoritajiet u s-soċjetà ċivili tal-BiH, u ħeġġet azzjoni kalma u responsabbli bi tweġiba għall-protesti pubbliċi.

Il-BiH hija stabbilita fil-Proċess ta' Stabbilizzazzjoni u ta' Assoċjazzjoni (PSA), li ġie żviluppat tard fis-snin 90. L-għan tal-PSA huwa li jappoġġa l-istabbilizzazzjoni u jħejji għal adeżjoni possibbli mal-UE.

B'mod speċifiku fil-BiH, l-għodod immirati biex tinżamm l-istabbiltà jinkludu l-missjoni militari PESK/PSDK EUFOR ALTHEA. B'mod aktar ġenerali, l-UE hija rrappreżentata fil-BiH mir-Rappreżentant Speċjali tal-UE/Kap tad-Delegazzjoni, li jaħdem mill-qrib mal-Istati Membri, il-Kummissjoni Ewropea u l-Parlament Ewropew.

L-UE ser tassisti lill-awtoritajiet tal-BiH sabiex jegħlbu l-isfidi għas-sitwazzjoni politika domestika u jkomplu bil-progress fit-triq tal-UE; madankollu, ir-responsabbiltà ewlenija tinsab għand il-mexxejja tal-politika tal-BiH.

Barra minn hekk, matul iż-żjara tagħha, ir-Rappreżentant Għoli kkundannat l-atti ta' vjolenza b'rabta mal-protesti, filwaqt li fl-istess ħin enfasizzat li l-protesti paċifiċi huma leġittimi u li t-talbiet mill-protestanti għal riformi soċjoekonomiċi għandhom jittieħdu bis-serjetà.

F'dan l-isfond, hija wasslet messaġġ ġenerali li l-awtoritajiet u l-mexxejja lokali jridu jingħaqdu flimkien sabiex ikunu jistgħu jagħtu r-riżultati billi jindirizzaw l-isfidi soċjoekonomiċi immedjati fil-pajjiż. Hija ħeġġet lill-istituzzjonijiet tal-BiH biex jisimgħu u jifhmu t-tħassib leġittimu taċ-ċittadini, u appellatilhom biex jiffokaw fuq ir-riforma tal-ekonomija, is-sistema tas-sigurtà soċjali u l-promozzjoni tal-kummerċ, kif ukoll fuq it-tisħiħ tal-istat tad-dritt u l-protezzjoni tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem. L-UE hija lesta li tassisti l-BiH, iżda r-responsabbiltà u l-politika lokali ser jibqgħu indispensabbli.

Il-Kunsill (Affarijiet Barranin) iddiskuta s-sitwazzjoni fil-Bosnja-Ħerzegovina fis-sessjoni tiegħu ta' April 2014. Il-Kunsill laħaq qbil dwar konklużjonijiet li fost kwistjonijiet oħrajn affermaw mill-ġdid l-impenn inekwivoku tal-Kunsill għall-integrità territorjali tal-Bosnja-Ħerzegovina bħala pajjiż sovran u magħqud. Huwa ħeġġeġ ukollbis-sħiħ lill-istituzzjonijiet tal-BiH u lill-mexxeja eletti biex iżommu kuntatt man-nies, jinvolvu ruħhom mas-soċjetà ċivili u jipprovdu tweġibiet responsabbli u immedjati għat-tħassib leġittimu tagħhom. Il-Kunsill enfasizza li din hija r-responsabbiltà kollettiva tal-mexxejja politiċi kollha tal-BiH. Jeħtieġ li jsir aktar, u mhux anqas, qabel l-elezzjonijiet ġenerali f'Ottubru 2014.

([1]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/02/07/us-bosnia-unrest-idUSBREA160UU20140207

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001457/14
to the Council
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Unrest in Bosnia

The current civil unrest is said to be the worst ever in post-war Bosnia ([1]).

Even after the end of the war in 1995, the EU always kept a close eye on Bosnia. The EU also maintained a presence in the region through the CFSP and CSDP framework.

Given the degree of violence and tension in Bosnia, does the Council have any information on potential Member State involvement in Bosnia aimed at preventing further violence?

Reply
(23 June 2014)

The recent public protests in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) show the active participation of citizens making use of their democratic rights. At the same time, initial violent outbursts by few are a matter of utmost concern. The High Representative travelled to Sarajevo on 11 and 12 March 2014 and met with the BiH authorities and civil society, urging calm and responsible action in response to the public protests.

BiH is anchored in the Stabilisation and Association Process (SAP), which was developed in the late 1990s. The aim of the SAP is to support stabilisation and prepare for possible accession to the EU.

Specifically in BiH, the tools aimed at maintaining stability include the CFSP/CSDP EUFOR Althea military mission. More generally, the EU is represented in BiH by the EU Special Representative/Head of Delegation, who works closely with Member States, the European Commission and the European Parliament.

The EU will assist the BiH authorities in overcoming challenges to the domestic political situation and continuing progress on the EU path; however, the main responsibility lies with BiH political leaders.

Moreover, during her visit, the High Representative condemned the acts of violence in connection with the protests, while at the same time underlining that peaceful protests are legitimate and that the demands by the protesters for socioeconomic reforms must be taken seriously.

Against this background, she conveyed an overall message that local authorities and leaders must join forces so that they can deliver results by addressing the immediate socioeconomic challenges in the country. She urged BiH institutions to listen to and understand the legitimate concerns of citizens, and called on them to focus on reforming the economy, the social welfare system and promoting trade, as well as on strengthening the rule of law and protecting human rights. The EU is willing to assist BiH, but local ownership and political will remain indispensable.

The Council (Foreign Affairs) discussed the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina at its April 2014 session. The Council agreed conclusions which amongst other issues reaffirmed the Council's unequivocal commitment to the territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a sovereign and united country. It also strongly urged the BiH institutions and elected leaders to reach out to the people, engage with civil society and provide responsible and immediate answers to their legitimate concerns. The Council emphasised that it is the collective responsibility of all BiH political leaders. Ahead of the general elections in October 2014, more needs to be done, not less.

([1]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/02/07/us-bosnia-unrest-idUSBREA160UU20140207

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001458/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Indipendenza Katalana minn Spanja

F'dawn l-aħħar ġimgħat ix-xewqa tal-Katalonja li tikseb l-indipendenza minn Spanja attirat l-attenzjoni tal-aħbarijiet. Bħal fil-każ tal-Iskozja, jekk eventwalment ir-reġjun isir indipendenti, jitlef l-istatus ta' membru tal-UE, tal-anqas provviżorjament.

X'inhuma l-passi li jeħtieġ li jittieħdu f'każ li reġjun fi ħdan l-UE jikseb l-indipendenza?

Billi l-Katalonja hija parti miż-żona tal-euro, x'kunsiderazzjonijiet speċjali jridu jittieħdu f'dan ir-rigward?

X'riperkussjonijiet fuq Spanja tbassar il-Kummissjoni f'każ li l-Katalonja tkun imġiegħla tbiddel il-munita?

Il-Katalonja tkun imġiegħla taqleb għal munita differenti immedjatament wara l-indipendenza (jekk dan ikun il-każ) sakemm jerġa' jiġi nnegozjat trattat ġdid bejn iż-żewġ partijiet?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Barroso f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(20 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni tirreferi lill-Onorevoli Membru għat-tweġibiet tagħha għall-mistoqsijiet parlamentari E-008133/ 2012, P-009756/2012, u P-009862/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001458/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Catalonia's independence from Spain

Catalonia's desire to gain independence from Spain has made news in recent weeks. As in the case of Scotland, if the region were to eventually become independent it would lose EU member status, at least temporarily.

What are the steps that would need to be taken should a region within the EU gain independence?

Seeing as Catalonia is part of the eurozone, what special considerations must be made in this regard?

What impact on Spain does the Commission foresee should Catalonia be forced to change currency?

Would Catalonia be forced to switch to a different currency immediately after independence (if this were to be the case) until a new treaty is renegotiated between both parties?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its replies to parliamentary questions E-008133/2012, P-009756/2012, and P-009862/2012 ([1]).

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

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001459/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Obeżità infantili

Dan l-aħħar il-Kummissjoni ħabbret il-kampanja tagħha bl-isem "Kul sew — u thossok tajjeb" bil-għan li tippromwovi l-ikel tajjeb għas-saħħa fost it-tfal tal-iskola tal-età ta' sitt snin u aktar, fi sforz li jonqos in-numru ta' tfal b'piż eċċessiv fl-Ewropa ([1]).

F'Jannar 2014, studju fl-Istati Uniti identifika l-bżonn ta' promozzjoni ta' drawwiet alimentari tajbin fost it-tfal sa mill-età ċkejkna tal-kindergarten, pjuttost milli mill-età tal-iskola primarja ([2]). L-istudju skopra li l-probabilità li t-tfal b'piż eċċessiv fil-kindergarten ikollhom problemi ta' obeżità sat-tmien sena skolastika kienet erba' darbiet akbar, meta mqabbla mat-tfal b'piż normali. Barra minn hekk, ir-riżultati wrew li t-tfal li kienu mdaqqsin fit-twelid u b'piż eċċessiv fil-kindergarten kellhom l-ogħla riskju ta' obeżità qabel l-età ta' 14-il sena.

Fid-dawl ta' dan it-tagħrif il-ġdid, il-Kummissjoni sejra tikkunsidra l-estensjoni tal-programm tagħha biex jinkludi t-tfal Ewropej ta' età inqas minn sitt snin?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Cioloş f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(2 ta' April 2014)

L-Artikolu 22 tar-Regolament (UE) Nru 1308/2013 tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tas-17 ta' Diċembru 2013 li jistabbilixxi organizzazzjoni komuni tas-swieq fi prodotti agrikoli ([3]) (ir-Regolament dwar l-OKS) jistipula li l-Iskema ta' Frott u Ħxejjex għall-Iskejjel u l-Iskema ta' Ħalib għall-Iskejjel huma maħsubin għal tfal li jattendu nurseries, kindergartens u stabilimenti tal-edukazzjoni primarja u sekondarja b'mod regolari. Għalhekk il-programmi jistgħu jkopru tfal iżgħar minn 6 snin. Id-deċiżjoni aħħarija titħalla f'idejn l-Istati Membri li huma responsabbli biex jagħżlu l-grupp ta' mira għall-programmi tal-iskejjel tagħhom.

Il-proposta tal-Kummissjoni COM(2014) 32 tat-30 ta' Jannar 2014 biex jiġu emendati d-dispożizzjonijiet attwali tal-OKS fejn jidħlu l-iskemi għall-iskejjel, ma tipproponix tibdiliet fl-Artiklu 22 imsemmi hawn fuq u li skontu l-Istati Membri jistgħu jiffukaw ukoll fuq tfal iżgħar minn 6 snin fin-nurseries u fl-edukazzjoni pre-primarja. Dan jibqa' japplika wkoll għall-progamm tal-iskejjel potenzjali l-ġdid li bħalissa qed jgħarbluh il-leġiżlaturi fil-proċedura leġiżlattiva ordinarja.

Barra minn hekk, l-Istrateġija tal-2007 għall-Ewropa dwar Kwistjonijiet ta' Saħħa Marbuta man-Nutriment, il-Piż Żejjed u l-Obeżità ([4]) tippromwovi dieta bilanċjata u stili ta' ħajja attiva b'enfasi fuq it-tfal ta' kull età. Fl-24 ta' Frar 2014, il-Grupp ta' Livell Għoli dwar in-Nutriment u l-Attività Fiżika qabel ([5]) fuq Pjan ta' Azzjoni dwar l-Obeżità fit-Tfal ([6]) li għandu l-għan jippromwovi l-ikel san fost l-iżgħar ġenerazzjoni, mit-trabi tat-twelid saż-żgħażagħ ta' tmintax-il sena.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/video/commission-unveils-new-plan-comb-533160
([2]) http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/01/29/kindergarten-weight-kids/4945785/
([3]) ĠU L 347, 20.12.2013.
([4]) COM(2007) 279.
([5]) Madankollu l-Membru Olandiż tal-Grupp ta' Livell Għoli għarraf li minħabba t-thassib dwar is-sussidjarjetà, il-Pajjiżi l-Baxxi ma jistax jieħu sehem f'din l-inizjattiva.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001459/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Childhood obesity

The Commission has recently announced its 'Eat well — feel good' campaign, with the aim of promoting healthy eating among schoolchildren aged six and above, in an effort to reduce the number of overweight children in Europe ([1]).

In January 2014, a study in the US identified the need to promote good eating habits among children as young as kindergarten age, rather than waiting until elementary [primary] school ([2]). They discovered that children who were overweight in kindergarten were four times more likely to become obese by the eighth grade, compared with children of normal weight. Additionally, the results showed that children who were large at birth and overweight by kindergarten ran the highest risk of becoming obese before the age of 14.

In light of this new information, will the Commission consider expanding its programme to reach European children aged under six?

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

Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council (EU) No 1308/2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products (CMO Regulation) ([3]) lays down in its Article 22 that the current School Fruit and Vegetable Scheme and the School Milk Scheme are aimed at children who regularly attend nurseries, pre-schools or primary or secondary-level educational establishments. Therefore, the programmes may cover children below the age of 6 years. The final decision is left up to the Member States which are responsible for choosing the target group for their school programmes.

The Commission's proposal COM(2014) 32 of 30 January 2014 to amend the current CMO provisions pertaining to the school schemes does not propose any changes to abovementioned Article 22 under which Member States have the possibility to focus also on nursery and pre-primary children under the age of 6 years. This would thus remain applicable also for the potential new school programme which is currently being examined by the legislators in the ordinary legislative procedure.

Moreover, the 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([4]) promotes a balanced diet and active lifestyles with children of all ages in the focus. On 24 February 2014 the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity agreed ([5]) an Action Plan on Childhood Obesity ([6]) that aims to promote healthy eating among children in the age group 0-18.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/video/commission-unveils-new-plan-comb-533160
([2]) http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/01/29/kindergarten-weight-kids/4945785/
([3]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([4]) COM(2007) 279.
([5]) However, the Dutch Member of the High Level Group informed that, based on subsidiarity concerns, the Netherlands could not join in the initiative.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001461/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Kriżi tal-inflazzjoni fl-Arġentina

L-Arġentina qiegħda għaddejja minn żvalutazzjoni monetarja rapida (19 % f'Jannar 2014), l-akbar waħda fost il-169 munita sorveljata minn Bloomberg. L-inflazzjoni wkoll qiegħda tiżdied b'rata allarmanti ([1]).

Minkejja t-tentattivi tal-gvern li jsib tarf is-sitwazzjoni, il-poplu Arġentin qiegħed jesperjenza żidiet terribbli fil-prezzijiet u pagi modesti, li wasslu għal skuntentizza pubblika, skarsezza ta' oġġetti b'limitu fil-prezz u eċċess ta' oġġetti mingħajr limitu fil-prezz.

X'se jkunu r-riperkussjonijiet ta' dan il-fenomenu fuq ir-relazzjonijiet kummerċjali UE-Arġentina?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur De Gucht f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(31 ta' Marzu 2014)

Huwa diffiċli biex jiġi previst l-impatt tar-rata tal-kambju attwali u t-tendenzi tal-inflazzjoni fl-Arġentina dwar il-kummerċ bejn l-UE u l-Arġentina. Il-bilanċ kummerċjali tal-Arġentina mal-UE bħalissa huwa negattiv, u fl-ewwel 11-il xahar tal-2013, jilħaq it-USD 2.81 biljun. L-iżvalutazzjoni tal-peso u inflazzjoni għolja twassal għal telf ta' kapaċità tal-akkwist li jista' jnaqqas l-importazzjonijiet Arġentini. L-iżvalutazzjoni tista' żżid ukoll il-kompetittività tal-esportazzjonijiet Arġentini u ttejjeb il-bilanċ kummerċjali. Madankollu, il-kompetittività tal-prezzijiet hija biss aspett wieħed biex tiġi spjegata l-prestazzjoni tal-esportazzjoni, minbarra fatturi mhux relatati mal-prezzijiet u l-kundizzjonijiet tad-domanda globali. Barra minn hekk, il-kummerċ estern fl-Arġentina, b'mod partikolari l-importazzjonijiet, huwa rregolat ħafna. Ir-restrizzjonijiet fuq l-importazzjoni imposti mill-Arġentina huma s-suġġett ta' tilwim mal-UE fl-Organizzazzjoni Dinjija tal-Kummerċ.

F'termini ta' negozjati bejn l-UE u l-Mercosur, l-Arġentina tibqa' involuta f'dawn in-negozjati u qiegħda tipparteċipa fit-tħejjija tal-offerta ta' aċċess għas-suq tal-Mercosur li se tkun skambjata mal-UE fix-xhur li ġejjin.

([1]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-02-04/dad-can-t-buy-daughter-shoes-as-argentine-currency-falls.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001461/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Argentinian inflation crisis

Argentina has been experiencing rapid currency devaluation (19% in January 2014), the largest among the 169 currencies tracked by Bloomberg. Inflation is also increasing at an alarming rate ([1]).

Despite the government's attempts to address the situation, the people of Argentina are experiencing dramatic price increases and modest wages, which has led to public discontent, a shortage of 'price-capped' goods and a surplus of uncapped ones.

What will the impact of this phenomenon on be EU-Argentina trade relations?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(31 March 2014)

It is difficult to predict the impact of current exchange rate and inflation trends in Argentina on EU-Argentina trade. Argentina's trade balance with the EU is currently negative, reaching in the first 11 months of 2013, USD 2.81 billion. The peso devaluation and high inflation result in a loss of purchasing power that could reduce Argentinian imports. The devaluation may also increase the competitiveness of Argentine exports and improve the trade balance. However, price competitiveness is only one aspect in explaining export performance, in addition to non-price factors and global demand conditions. Moreover, external trade in Argentina, in particular imports, is heavily regulated. Import restrictions imposed by Argentina are the subject of a dispute with the EU in the World Trade Organisation.

In terms of EU-Mercosur negotiations, Argentina remains engaged in these negotiations and is participating in the preparation of the market access offer of Mercosur due to be exchanged with the EU in the coming months.

([1]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-02-04/dad-can-t-buy-daughter-shoes-as-argentine-currency-falls.html

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001462/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Gvernijiet tal-UE akkużati bi spjunaġġ illegali

Waqt li l-UE qed tipprova ssib kompromess bejn l-Istati Membri sabiex tiżviluppa pakkett dwar il-protezzjoni tad-dejta biex tħares iċ-ċittadini kollha tal-UE, il-Chaos Computer Club, il-Lega Internazzjonali għad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem (ILHR) u l-grupp tad-drittijiet ċivili Digitalcourage bdew proċeduri ġudizzjarji kontra l-gvernijiet tal-Ġermanja, tar-Renju Unit u tal-Istati Uniti, mixlija bi spjunaġġ illegali ([1]).

L-akkuża jinkludu "l-ksur tad-dritt għall-privatezza u t-tfixkil tal-ġustizzja fil-qadi tal-kariga permezz ta' appoġġ u kooperazzjoni fis-sorveljanza elettronika ta' ċittadini Ġermaniżi mill-NSA u l-GCHQ." Huwa mistenni li, jekk ir-rikorsi ma jintlaqgħux fil-pajjiżi individwali, l-ILHR tiftaħ kawża fil-Qorti Ewropea tad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem bħala ksur tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropea dwar id-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem.

Jistgħu dawn l-iżviluppi jfixklu mhux biss il-ħolqien ta' pakkett tal-UE dwar il-protezzjoni tad-dejta, iżda anke r-relazzjonijiet kummerċjali li reġgħu ssaħħu bejn l-UE u l-Istati Uniti?

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

L-UE u l-Istati Uniti huma impenjati li jikkonkludu Shubija Trans-Atlantika ta' Kummerċ u ta' Investiment komprensiva u ambizzjuża skont l-Artikolu XIV tal-GATS, dan il-Ftehim ma jaffettwax ir-regoli tal-UE dwar il-protezzjoni tad-dejta. Rigward il-flussi tad-dejta bejn l-UE u l-Istati Uniti, l-UE u l-Istati Uniti huma impenjati wkoll għal konklużjoni rapida ta' ftehim umbrella għal skambji tad-dejta fil-kuntest tal-kooperazzjoni tal-pulizija u dik ġudizzjarja f'materji kriminali li jiżgura livell għoli ta' protezzjoni għaċ-ċittadini fuq iż-żewġ naħat tal-Atlantiku, li jipprovdi għal drittijiet infurzabbli u mekkaniżmu ta' rimedju ġudizzjarju effettiv. L-UE u l-Istati Uniti qed jimmiraw ukoll għat-tishiħ b'mod komprensiv tal-iskema tal-protezzjoni tad-dejta Safe Harbour sas-sajf tal-2014, sabiex tiġi żgurata kontinwità tal-protezzjoni tad-dejta u ċ-ċertezza legali meta d-dejta tiġi ttrasferita bejn l-Atlantiku għal skopijiet kummerċjali. Barra minn hekk, il-pakkett ta' riforma tal-UE dwar il-protezzjoni tad-dejta jinsab għaddej b'ritmu tajjeb u rċieva l-appoġġ sħiħ tal-Parlament Ewropew.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/infosociety/complaint-filed-merkel-governmen-news-533256
http://www.euractiv.com/infosociety/data-protection-reform-peril-ger-news-532189

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001462/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: EU governments accused of illegal spying

As the EU seeks to reach a compromise between Member States in order to develop a data protection package to protect all European citizens, the governments of Germany, the UK and the US have been sued by Chaos Computer Club, the International League for Human Rights (ILHR) and the civil rights group Digitalcourage for illegal spying ([1]).

The charges include a 'violation of the right to privacy and obstruction of justice in office by bearing and cooperating with the electronic surveillance of German citizens by NSA and GCHQ.' It is expected that, if the charges are dismissed in the individual countries, the ILHR will file the case with the European Court of Human Rights as a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Could these new developments hinder not only the creation of an EU data protection package, but also the newly strengthened EU-US trade relations?

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

The EU and the US are strongly committed to concluding a comprehensive and ambitious Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership in accordance with Article XIV of the GATS, this agreement will not affect the EU's data protection rules. As regards the EU-US data flows the EU and US are also committed to swift conclusion of an umbrella agreement for data exchanges in the context of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters ensuring a high level of protection for citizens on both sides of the Atlantic, providing for enforceable rights and effective judicial redress mechanism. The EU and US are also aiming at strengthening the Safe Harbour data protection scheme in a comprehensive manner by summer 2014, in order to ensure continuity of data protection and legal certainty when data is transferred across the Atlantic for commercial purposes. In addition the EU data protection reform package is well in progress and has received full support of the European Parliament.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/infosociety/complaint-filed-merkel-governmen-news-533256
http://www.euractiv.com/infosociety/data-protection-reform-peril-ger-news-532189

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001463/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: L-industrija tal-enerġija mill-oċeani u l-finanzjamenti għaliha

Fl-ambitu tas-settur enerġetiku, wieħed mill-għanijiet ewlenin tal-UE huwa l-promozzjoni tal-użu tas-sorsi enerġetiċi rinnovabbli. Għalhekk rajna żieda konsiderevoli fis-sussidji u fl-infiq fir-riċerka u żvilupp fir-rigward tas-sorsi enerġetiċi rinnovabbli.

Fid-dawl tat-tħabbir reċenti tal-ħolqien tal-Forum tal-Enerġija mill-Oċeani, u meta dak li jkun iżomm quddiem għajnejh l-għanijiet tal-Inizjattiva Industrijali Ewropea għall-Enerġija mill-Oċeani, x'inhuma l-implikazzjonijiet għas-setturi enerġetiċi l-oħra? Fi kliem ieħor, il-finanzjamenti tal-UE għall-industrija l-ġdida tal-enerġija mill-oċeani se jiġu minn bidla fl-allokazzjoni tal-fondi għat-tipi differenti ta' enerġija ekoloġika, jew fl-2020 se tiżdied it-taqsima kumplessiva tal-baġit iddedikata lil dan is-settur?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Geoghegan-Quinn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Kif imsemmi mill-Onorevoli Membru, l-UE qed tippromwovi l-użu ta' sorsi ta' enerġija rinnovabbli sabiex sal-2020, fit-taħlita enerġetika ġenerali, ikun hemm 20% ta' enerġija rinnovabbli , u li dan il-perċentwal jibqa' jiżdied għal mill-inqas 27% fil-qafas tal-politiki dwar il-klima u l-enerġija għall-2030. L-enerġija mill-oċeani kienet diġà ġiet appoġġata għal ħafna snin permezz tal-Programm Qafas dwar ir-Riċerka, l-Iżvilupp Teknoloġiku u l-Attivitajiet ta' Dimostrazzjoni, NER 300 ([1]), u l-Fondi Strutturali. F'dawn l-aħħar snin, is-settur żviluppa b'mod sinifikanti u llum għandu l-potenzjal li jikkontribwixxi bil-kbir biex jinkisbu l-miri tal-enerġija rinnovabbli Ewropea kif ukoll għat-tkabbir ekonomiku u l-impjiegi.

Għalhekk il-Forum tal-Enerġija mill-Oċeani se jidentifika l-problemi speċifiċi li din it-teknoloġija ġdida qed tiffaċċa attwalment, fosthom kwistjonijiet mhux teknoloġiċi importanti ferm għall-implimentazzjoni fuq skala kbira. L-appoġġ lis-settur, biex jegħleb kemm l-isfidi teknoloġiċi kif ukoll dawk mhux teknoloġiċi, se jinkoraġġixxi tnaqqis kemm f'termini ta' kapital kif ukoll fl-ispejjeż operattivi.

Kif inhu l-każ għat-teknoloġija kollha b'emissjoni baxxa ta' karbonju, ma hemm l-ebda baġit speċifiku u garantit. Il-finanzjament tal-UE se jiġi minn sorsi ta' finanzjament għat-teknoloġiji tal-enerġija rinnovabbli kollha, bħalma hi l-isfida tal-enerġija Orizzont 2020. Is-settur jista' japplika għal finanzjament fuq bażi kompetittiva ([2]). L-isfidi fis-settur tal-Enerġija mill-Oċeani ġew definiti fil-Programm ta' Ħidma Orizzont 2020 tal-2014-2015, u jiżguraw li l-appoġġ għal dan il-qasam li qed jiżviluppa b'rata mgħaġġla jista' jiġi indirizzat b'mod intelliġenti.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/lowcarbon/ner300/index_en.htm
([2]) Informazzjoni dwar opportunitajiet attwali ta' finanzjament tinsab fil-Portal għall-Parteċipanti tar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni — http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001463/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Ocean energy industry and funding

In the energy sector, one of the EU's principal aims is to promote the use of renewable energy sources. We have therefore seen a considerable increase in subsidies and spending on research and development in respect of renewable energy sources.

Given the recent announcements concerning the creation of the Ocean Energy Forum, and keeping in mind the goals of the European Industrial Initiative for Ocean Energy, what are the implications for other energy sectors? In other words, will EU funding for the new ocean energy industry come from a change in the allocation of funds for the different kinds of green energy, or will the overall section of the budget devoted to this sector be increased in 2020?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

As mentioned by the Honourable Member, the EU is promoting the use of renewable energy sources in order to achieve 20% renewables in 2020, as part of the overall energy mix, with a further increase to at least 27% under the 2030 framework for climate and energy policies. Ocean energy has already been supported for many years through the framework Programmes for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities, NER300 ([1]), and the Structural Funds. In the last few years, the sector has developed significantly and now has the potential to contribute significantly to the European renewable energy targets as well as to economic growth and jobs.

The Ocean Energy Forum will therefore identify the specific problems this nascent technology now faces, including in terms of non-technological issues critical for large-scale deployment. Supporting the sector to overcome both technological and non-technological challenges will encourage a reduction in both capital and operating costs.

As it is the case for all other low carbon technologies, there is no specific 'ring-fenced' budget. EU funding will come from funding sources for all renewable energy technologies, such as the Horizon 2020 Energy challenge. The sector can apply on a competitive basis for funding ([2]). The challenges for the ocean energy sector have been defined in the 2014-2015 Horizon 2020 work programme, ensuring that support for this rapidly developing area can be targeted intelligently.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/lowcarbon/ner300/index_en.htm
([2]) Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal — http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001465/14
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Raimon Obiols (S&D) y Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(12 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Informe de la Comisión sobre la Decisión marco 2008/913/JAI

El pasado 27 de enero, Día Internacional del Holocausto, la Vicepresidenta Viviane Reding denunció la actitud de los Estados europeos que no han cumplido aún las disposiciones de la Decisión marco 2008/913/JAI del Consejo, que obliga a los Estados a considerar delito la negación o trivialización del Holocausto y otros crímenes contra la humanidad cometidos por el régimen nazi o sus aliados europeos. Igualmente anunció que mientras no pueda sancionar presionará a dichos Estados. España, uno de los incumplidores, registra una alarmante proliferación de homenajes a figuras señeras de la dictadura franquista que incluyen en las últimas semanas desde el patrocinio público en Burgos de una exposición sobre el general Yagüe, responsable entre otras atrocidades de las órdenes que condujeron al exterminio de más de 4 000 civiles en Extremadura, a la inacción gubernamental ante todo tipo de actos que glosan la figura del dictador, incluidas las protagonizadas por la Fundación que lleva su nombre. En ese contexto, Pablo de Greiff, Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre la promoción de la verdad, la justicia, la reparación y las garantías de no repetición, presentó el pasado 3 de febrero un duro informe ([1]) en el que reclama a las autoridades españolas que se juzguen los crímenes del franquismo, completamente impunes, y se dé otro tratamiento a sus víctimas. La Comisión se comprometió a elaborar un informe de situación para finales de 2013 (respuesta a la pregunta E-005756/2013) y podrá comenzar a expedientar a los Estados miembros por incumplimientos desde diciembre del presente año.

1. ¿Podría indicar la Comisión cuándo estará disponible dicho informe y cuándo se conocerán sus conclusiones?

2. ¿Conoce la Comisión las conclusiones del informe del Relator de las Naciones Unidas sobre los crímenes del franquismo en España?

3. ¿Considera la Comisión que este panorama constata que las actuales autoridades españolas trivializan los crímenes cometidos por la dictadura franquista?

4. ¿Podría detallar la Comisión en qué se va a concretar en el caso español la presión anunciada por la Vicepresidenta en el acto al que alude esta pregunta?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de abril de 2014)

El informe de la Comisión sobre la aplicación de la Decisión marco 2008/913/JAI ([2]) se aprobó el 27 de enero de 2014.

En lo que se refiere a casos concretos de supuestas manifestaciones de odio en los Estados miembros, corresponde a los órganos jurisdiccionales nacionales determinar si cada situación específica, en función de sus circunstancias y su contexto, supone incitación a la violencia o al odio por motivos racistas o xenófobos. La Comisión no puede sustituir la evaluación del juez penal a nivel nacional.

Tal y como se indica en el informe anteriormente mencionado, se mantendrán debates bilaterales con los Estados miembros durante 2014, con el fin de garantizar la incorporación íntegra y correcta de la Decisión marco al Derecho nacional.

([1]) http://politica.elpais.com/politica/2014/02/03/actualidad/1391443224_877477.html
([2]) Dicho informe está disponible en inglés en http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/com_2014_27_en.pdf y http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/swd_2014_27_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001465/14
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Raimon Obiols (S&D) and Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Report of the Commission on Framework Decision 2008/913/JAI

On 27 January last, the International Day of the Holocaust, Vice-President Viviane Reding denounced the attitude of those European States that have not yet complied with the provisions of Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JAI, which binds States to treat as criminal offences the denial or trivialisation of the Holocaust and other crimes against humanity committed by the Nazi regime and its European allies. She also announced that, while she cannot penalise these States, she will put pressure on them. Spain, which is one of the infringers, is seeing an alarming proliferation of homages to leading figures of the Francoist dictatorship, which over the last few weeks has included the public sponsoring in Burgos of an exhibition about General Yagüe, who was responsible among other atrocities for the orders that led to the extermination of more than 4 000 civilians in Extremadura, as well as failure to act on the part of the government against various activities extolling the figure of the dictator, including those carried out by the Foundation that bears his name. In this context, Mr Pablo de Greiff, the United Nations' Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence, presented on 3 February last a harsh report ([1]) in which he called on the Spanish authorities to bring the crimes committed by the Franco regime, which have gone totally unpunished, to justice and to treat the victims differently. The Commission undertook to draw up a report on the situation by the end of 2013 (answer to Question E-005756/2013) and may launch infringement proceedings against Member States who are in breach as from December this year.

1. Can the Commission say when the said report will be ready and when its conclusions will be published?

2. Is the Commission aware of the conclusions of the UN's Special Rapporteur's report on the crimes of the Franco regime in Spain?

3. Does the Commission consider that this situation shows that the present Spanish authorities are trivialising the crimes committed by the Franco dictatorship?

4. Could the Commission say what specific steps will be taken to apply pressure in the case of Spain, as announced by the Vice-President during the act to which this question refers?

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

The Commission report on the implementation of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA was adopted on 27 January 2014 ([2]).

When it comes to concrete cases of alleged hate speech in the Member States, it is for the national courts to determine, according to the circumstances and context of each individual situation, whether such situation represents an incitement to racist or xenophobic violence or hatred. The Commission cannot replace the assessment of the criminal judge at national level.

As mentioned in the report referred to above, bilateral discussions will be held with the Member States throughout 2014 with a view to ensuring full and correct transposition of the framework Decision into national law.

([1]) http://politica.elpais.com/politica/2014/02/03/actualidad/1391443224_877477.html
([2]) The report is available at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/com_2014_27_en.pdf and http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/swd_2014_27_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001467/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(12. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: REACH: Umsetzung des VerbraucherInnenauskunftsrechts

Mit der REACH-Verordnung ((EG) Nr. 1907/2006) wurde die Möglichkeit geschaffen, dass VerbraucherInnen auf eigene Anfrage hin zu den „besonders besorgniserregenden Stoffen" („substances of very high concern", SVHC) in Produkten Auskunft erhalten können.

1. Liegen der Kommission Zahlen vor, wie viele VerbraucherInnen in den jeweiligen Mitgliedstaaten diese Möglichkeit bisher genutzt haben? Wie sehen diese ggf. aus?

2. Hat die Kommission ein Interesse daran, diese Zahlen in Erfahrung zu bringen, um bewerten zu können, ob dieses Auskunftsrecht überhaupt umgesetzt wird?

3. Sieht die Kommission nicht auch die Notwendigkeit, den VerbraucherInnen beispielsweise mit einer Datenbank einen einfacheren Zugriff auf Informationen über Produkte zu ermöglichen, die SVHC-Stoffe enthalten?

4. Sieht die Kommission nicht darüber hinaus die Notwendigkeit einer obligatorischen Kennzeichnung von besonders besorgniserregenden Stoffen, um die mit der REACH-Verordnung gewünschte Transparenz für die VerbraucherInnen zu gewährleisten?

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

Enthält ein Erzeugnis einen besonders besorgniserregenden Stoff (substance of very high concern — SVHC), der in der Liste der für eine Aufnahme in Anhang XIV infrage kommenden Stoffe aufgeführt ist, in einer Konzentration von mehr als 0,1 Massenprozent (w/w), haben Verbraucher gemäß Artikel 33 Absatz 2 der REACH-Verordnung ([1]) das Recht, vom Lieferanten dieses Erzeugnisses die ihm vorliegenden, für eine sichere Verwendung des Erzeugnisses ausreichenden Informationen, mindestens aber den Namen des betreffenden Stoffes zu verlangen. Informationen darüber, wie oft Verbraucher diese Möglichkeit nutzen, liegen auf EU-Ebene nicht vor, da die Verordnung keine Erfassung oder Meldung solcher Daten vorsieht.

Im Bericht über die Überprüfung der REACH-Verordnung ([2]) hat die Kommission die korrekte Anwendung des Artikels 33 Absatz 2 als ein Problem erkannt, das weiter beobachtet werden sollte.

Die Schaffung einer Datenbank mit den häufigsten SVHC, untergliedert nach Art der Erzeugnisse, wurde mit der ECHA und der Branche erörtert. Dabei kam man zu dem Schluss, dass dies von der ECHA sehr schwer umzusetzen wäre. Die Kommission fordert die Wirtschaftszweige auf, den im Anhang zum Bericht ([3]) aufgeführten guten Beispielen zu folgen, die in der Automobil- und Kunststoffindustrie sowie in den Bereichen Luft- und Raumfahrt und Verteidigung entwickelt wurden.

SVHC, die als solche in Verkehr gebracht werden oder in Gemischen enthalten sind, müssen gemäß den Anforderungen der Verordnung über die Einstufung, Kennzeichnung und Verpackung von Stoffen und Gemischen ([4]) (CLP) gekennzeichnet werden. Auf die Gesundheits- und Umweltgefahren sowie physikalischen Gefahren werden die Verbraucher durch Gefahrenpiktogramme, Signalwörter, Gefahrenhinweise, Sicherheitshinweise und gegebenenfalls ergänzende Informationen auf dem Kennzeichnungsetikett aufmerksam gemacht. Weder in der CLP- noch in der REACH-Verordnung ist eine spezielle Kennzeichnung von Erzeugnissen, die besonders besorgniserregende Stoffe enthalten, vorgesehen. Würde eine solche Kennzeichnung als angemessen erachtet, müsste der derzeitige Rechtsrahmen geändert werden.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1907/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 18. Dezember 2006 zur Registrierung, Bewertung, Zulassung und Beschränkung chemischer Stoffe.

([2]) Siehe Arbeitsunterlage der Kommissionsdienststellen, Begleitunterlage zum Bericht der Kommission, S. 39, direkt über folgende Adresse zugänglich (in englischer Sprache):
http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2013:0025:FIN:EN:PDF

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/201203-final-report-chemical-market-annexes_en.pdf, S. 27.

([4]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1272/2008 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 16. Dezember 2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001467/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: REACH: Implementation of consumers' right to information

The REACH Regulation ((EC) No 1907/2006) created the possibility for consumers to request and receive information regarding 'substances of very high concern' (SVHC) contained within products.

1. Does the Commission have figures detailing how many consumers in the individual Member States have made use of this possibility thus far? If so, what are those figures?

2. Is the Commission interested in making those figures available, so that it is possible to assess whether this right to information is actually being implemented?

3. Does the Commission not also see the need to make it easier for consumers to gain access to information regarding products that contain SVHCs, by setting up a database, for example?

4. In addition, does the Commission not also see a necessity for the compulsory labelling of substances of very high concern, as a means of guaranteeing the level of transparency that the REACH Regulations sets out to achieve?

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

According to Article 33(2) of REACH ([1]) consumers have the right to request any supplier of an article which contains a substance of very high concern (SVHC) included in the candidate list in a concentration above 0,1% (w/w) to provide sufficient information, available to the supplier, to allow safe use of the article and as a minimum the name of that substance. Information on the number of times this possibility has been used by consumers is not available at EU level as the regulation foresees no collection or reporting of such information.

In the report on the Review of REACH ([2]), the Commission has identified the correct implementation of the provisions of Article 33(2) as a challenge which should be further monitored.

Creating a database listing the most frequent SVHC by type of articles has been discussed with ECHA and industry with the conclusion that this would be very difficult to implement by ECHA. The Commission encourages industry sectors to follow the good examples developed by the automotive and plastics industries, as well as aerospace and defence, referred to in the annex to the report ([3]).

SVHC, when placed on the market as such or contained in mixtures, must be labelled in accordance with the requirements of the regulation on the classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures (CLP) ([4]). The health, physical and environmental hazards are communicated to the consumer through hazard pictograms, signal words, hazard statements, precautionary statements and supplemental information on the label, where applicable. Neither CLP nor REACH foresee specific labelling of articles containing substances of very high concern. If deemed appropriate, such labelling would require a modification of the current legal framework.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals.

([2]) See Commission Staff Working Document, which accompanies the report from the Commission, p.39 directly accessible at the following address: http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2013:0025:FIN:EN:PDF

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/201203-final-report-chemical-market-annexes_en.pdf page 27.

([4]) Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 of the European Parliament and the Council of 16 December 2008.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001469/14
an die Kommission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
(12. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Verhandlungen zum TTIP-Abkommen

Aktuell verhandelt die EU-Kommission federführend das Abkommen zur Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) mit den USA und hat unter http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/july/tradoc_151668.pdf die Namen der Verhandlungsführer veröffentlicht.

1. Ist garantiert, dass diese Verhandlungsführer vollkommen unabhängig von wirtschaftlichen Einzelinteressen bzw. außereuropäischen Interessen verhandeln?

2. Handelt es sich bei den Verhandlungsführern durchgängig um EU-Beamte auf Lebenszeit? Befinden sich auch nationale Experten oder aus der Wirtschaft entliehene Experten darunter?

3. Kann die Kommission die Unabhängigkeit ihrer Verhandlungsführer garantieren? Gibt es im Zuge der Transparenz ausführliche Angaben über die Verhandlungsführer — vor allem bezogen auf etwaige Nebenverdienste und Honorarverträge?

4. Zur Vorbereitung des Abkommens hatte die EU eine Hochrangige Arbeitsgruppe für Wachstum und Beschäftigung eingerichtet, jüngst gefolgt von einer ähnlichen Beratergruppe. Wer konkret waren und sind die Mitglieder dieser Beratergremien? Wie lautet ihr detaillierter beruflicher Hintergrund?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(25. April 2014)

Abgeordnete nationale Sachverständige wirken zwar an den kommissionsinternen Arbeiten an der TTIP mit, die Verhandlungsführer der Europäischen Union (EU) sind jedoch allesamt EU-Beamte. In der Ausübung ihres Amtes sind sie, auch im Hinblick auf Unabhängigkeit und Integrität, an die Verpflichtungen gebunden, die in der „Verordnung Nr. 31 (EWG) 11 (EAG) über das Statut der Beamten und über die Beschäftigungsbedingungen für die sonstigen Bediensteten der Europäischen Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft und der Europäischen Atomgemeinschaft“ ([1]) niederlegt sind. Die Verhandlungsführer der EU beziehen keinerlei Nebeneinkünfte und dürfen keine Honorarverträge abschließen. Experten aus der Privatwirtschaft sind an den Verhandlungen nicht beteiligt. Wie schon bei früheren Freihandelsabkommen hat die Kommission externe Berater mit einer handelsbezogenen Nachhaltigkeitsprüfung beauftragt. Alle Berichte der Berater werden zu gegebener Zeit auf der Website der Kommission veröffentlicht.

Gleichzeitig hält die Kommission, wie in den Verträgen gefordert, die Mitgliedstaaten und das Europäische Parlament umfassend über den Fortgang der Verhandlungen auf dem Laufenden, insbesondere, indem sie vor und nach jeder Runde Bericht erstattet und alle relevanten Informationen einschließlich sensibler Verhandlungsunterlagen nach besonderen Vereinbarungen zwischen den beiden Organen dem Parlament zur Verfügung stellt.

Was die Zusammensetzung der hochrangigen Arbeitsgruppe zu Wachstum und Beschäftigung sowie die vor kurzem eingerichtete Beratungsgruppe betrifft, so möchte die Kommission den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Beantwortung der Anfragen P-008302/2013 und E-000960/2014 verweisen.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1962R0031:20140101:DE:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001469/14
to the Commission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Negotiations regarding the TTIP agreement

The European Commission is currently leading negotiations with the USA regarding the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and has published the names of the negotiators, which can be found here: http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/july/tradoc_151668.pdf

1. Have guarantees been obtained that the named negotiators are acting completely independently of individual commercial interests and/or of the interests of parties from outside Europe?

2. Are the negotiators all career EU-officials? Do they also include experts from individual Member States or experts seconded from the commercial sector?

3. Is the Commission able to guarantee the independence of its negotiators? In the name of transparency, are full details about each of the negotiators available — with particular reference to any additional earnings and fee-based contracts?

4. In preparation for the Agreement, the EU set up a High Level Working Group on Jobs and Growth, which was most recently followed by a similar group of advisers. Who were and are the members of these advisory bodies? What details are available regarding their professional background?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2014)

While some National Detached Experts participate in the work on TTIP within the Commission, All European Union (EU) lead negotiators are EU officials. In the exercise of their duties, they are bound by the obligations, including with regard to independence and integrity, set out in 'Regulation No 31 (EEC), 11 (EAEC) laying down the Staff Regulations of Officials and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community' ([1]). EU negotiators do not receive any additional earnings, nor benefit from fee-based contracts. Experts from the private sector are not involved in the negotiations. As it has done for previous Free Trade Agreements, the Commission has launched a Trade Sustainability Impact Assessment conducted by external consultants. All reports delivered by the consultants will be published on the Commission's website in due time.

At the same time, as required by the Treaties, the Commission keeps Member States and the European Parliament fully informed with progress in the negotiations, notably by reporting before and after each round and by sharing all relevant information including sensitive negotiating documents according to specific arrangements agreed between the two institutions.

Concerning the composition of the High Level Working Group on Jobs and Growth and the recently launched Advisory Group, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the answers provided to questions P-008302/2013 and E-000960/2014.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1962R0031:20140101:EN:PDF

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001470/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Κατασκευή νέου εργοστασίου ΔΕΗ

Η κατασκευή νέου εργοστασίου παραγωγής ηλεκτρισμού της ΔΕΗ στο βορειοδυτικό άκρο της νήσου Ρόδου, έχει πυροδοτήσει μεγάλες αντιδράσεις στην τοπική και όχι μόνο κοινωνία.

Οι ενεργειακές ανάγκες ηλεκτροδότησης του νησιού καλύπτονται ήδη και με το παραπάνω από το υπάρχον εργοστάσιο ΔΕΗ στη Σορώνη (βορειοδυτικό άκρο του νησιού), το οποίο χρησιμοποιεί απαρχαιωμένες τεχνολογίες και η λειτουργία του καθίσταται εξαιρετικά ρυπογόνα και επιζήμια για το περιβάλλον.

Το νέο εργοστάσιο, πέραν του ότι θα αυξήσει τις ήδη υπάρχουσες εστίες μόλυνσης, θα δημιουργηθεί εντός προστατευόμενης περιοχής Natura 2000, που αποτελεί Ζώνη Ειδικής Προστασίας, είναι καταφύγιο άγρια ζωής και έχει κηρυχθεί και αρχαιολογικός χώρος.

Ο κίνδυνος οικολογικής και περιβαλλοντικής καταστροφής από την πιθανότητα διαρροής μαζούτ στην θάλασσα είναι έκδηλος.

Δεδομένου ότι η λύση της υποθαλάσσιας διασύνδεσης αποτελεί την βέλτιστη από πάσης πλευρά λύση των μη διασυνδεδεμένων νήσων δημιουργούνται εύλογα ερωτήματα για την επιλογή της παρωχημένης και επικίνδυνης τεχνολογίας του πετρελαϊκού σταθμού.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Θεωρεί ότι η κατασκευή του παρωχημένου πετρελαϊκού σταθμού σε προστατευόμενη περιοχή ενταγμένη στο ευρωπαϊκό δίκτυο Natura 2000 συνάδει με την κοινοτική νομοθεσία σχετικά με τον σεβασμό του περιβάλλοντος και ενώ οι ανάγκες του νησιού καλύπτονται πλήρως από το υπάρχον εργοστάσιο;

2. Χρησιμοποιούνται κοινοτικοί πόροι για το εγχείρημα αυτό;

3. Στις 5.11.2013 εκδόθηκε νέα υπουργική απόφαση έγκρισης περιβαλλοντικών όρων. Πώς είναι δυνατόν να μην υπάγεται στις διατάξεις της υπ' αριθμόν 29457/1511/05 (ΦΕΚ 992/Β/2005) και, κατ' επέκταση, στην κοινοτική οδηγία 2001/80/ΕΚ, η οποία ορίζει τα όρια των εκπομπών ρύπων; Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να εξετάσει αν υπήρξε παράβαση της σωστής εφαρμογής της κοινοτικής νομοθεσίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Απριλίου 2014)

1. Η οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ ([1]) για τους οικοτόπους προβλέπει ένα πλαίσιο για τη βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη των δραστηριοτήτων εντός των περιοχών του δικτύου Natura 2000. Βάσει αυτής απαιτείται η δέουσα εκτίμηση των έργων που ενδέχεται να έχουν σημαντικές επιπτώσεις σε μια περιοχή. Τα σχέδια αυτά μπορούν να επιτραπούν εάν συναχθεί το συμπέρασμα ότι αυτά δεν θα επηρεάσουν την ακεραιότητα του τόπου ή, σε περίπτωση αρνητικού συμπεράσματος, κατά πόσον αντιπροσωπεύουν υπερισχύον δημόσιο συμφέρον και πληρούν τους λοιπούς ειδικούς όρους οι οποίοι καθορίζονται στο άρθρο 6 παράγραφος 4 της οδηγίας.

2. Οι κανονισμοί των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων ([2]) προβλέπουν ότι ο σχεδιασμός, η προετοιμασία, η υλοποίηση, η παρακολούθηση, ο έλεγχος και η αξιολόγηση των συγχρηματοδοτούμενων παρεμβάσεων στο πλαίσιο προγραμμάτων αποτελεί αρμοδιότητα των εθνικών αρχών, στο καταλληλότερο διοικητικό επίπεδο και σύμφωνα με το θεσμικό σύστημα κάθε κράτους μέλους. Με εξαίρεση τα μεγάλα έργα ([3]), η Επιτροπή δεν έχει υπόψη της επιμέρους έργα που να υποστηρίζονται από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία. Ωστόσο, σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που ελήφθησαν από τις ελληνικές αρχές, κανένα έργο σχετικό με σταθμό παραγωγής ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας της ΔΕΗ στο βορειοδυτικό τμήμα της νήσου Ρόδου δεν έχει λάβει κονδύλια της ΕΕ.

3. Οι μονάδες καύσης με ονομαστική θερμική ισχύ 50 MW και άνω, υπόκεινται στην οδηγία 2010/75/ΕΕ ([4]) περί βιομηχανικών εκπομπών και, έως την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2016, όσον αφορά τις υφιστάμενες μονάδες, στην οδηγία 2001/80/ΕC ([5]). Η λειτουργία των εν λόγω εγκαταστάσεων απαιτεί τη χορήγηση αδείας από τις αρμόδιες αρχές, η οποία περιλαμβάνει όρους με βάση τις βέλτιστες διαθέσιμες τεχνικές. Επιπλέον, οι εκπομπές διοξειδίου του θείου, οξειδίων του αζώτου και σκόνης από τις εγκαταστάσεις στην ατμόσφαιρα δεν πρέπει να υπερβαίνουν τις οριακές τιμές εκπομπών που καθορίζονται στις εν λόγω οδηγίες για ορισμένα είδη μονάδων καύσης.

Είναι ευθύνη των ελληνικών αρμόδιων αρχών η εξασφάλιση της συμμόρφωσης με τις απαιτήσεις αυτές.

([1]) Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου της 21ης Μαΐου 1992 για τη διατήρηση των φυσικών οικοτόπων καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας, ΕΕ L 206 της 22.7.1992.
([2]) Κανονισμός 1083/2006, ΕΕ L 210 της 31.7.2006.
([3]) (δηλ. έργα ύψους 50 000 000 ευρώ και άνω).
([4]) ΕΕ L 334 της 17.12.2010.
([5]) ΕΕ L 309 της 27.11.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001470/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Construction of a new PPC plant

The construction of a new PPC power plant on the northwest point of Rhodes has sparked uproar both within the local community and beyond.

The island's electricity needs are already amply provided for by the existing PPC plant in Soroni (on the northwest point of the island), which uses outdated technology that causes serious pollution and environmental damage.

Aside from the fact that the new plant will increase pollution even further, it is also to be built within a Natura 2000 protected site which forms part of a Special Protection Area (SPA), acts as a sanctuary for wildlife and has been declared an archaeological site.

The danger of an ecological and environmental disaster arising from the possibility of an oil spillage into the sea is evident.

As a submarine interconnection is by far the optimum solution on all counts for non-interconnected islands, the decision to opt for the outdated and dangerous technology used by an oil-fired plant obviously needs to be questioned.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it consider that construction of an outdated oil-fired plant on a protected site that forms part of the European Natura 2000 network is in keeping with Community legislation on environmental protection, given that the island's energy requirements are already amply provided for by the existing plant?

2. Are community resources being used for this project?

3. On 5 November 2013, a new ministerial decision approving environmental terms was issued. Why is it not subject to the provisions of Decision no 29457/1511/05 (Government Gazette II/992/2005) and, by extension, Directive 2001/80/EC on the limitation of emissions of certain pollutants? Could the Commission investigate whether or not the proper application of Community legislation has been infringed?

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

1. The Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC ([1]) provides a framework for the sustainable development of activities within Natura 2000 sites. It requires an appropriate assessment of projects likely to have a significant effect on a site. Such projects can be authorised if it is concluded that they will not affect the integrity of the site or, in case of a negative conclusion, if they represent an overriding public interest and fulfil the other specific conditions set out in Art. 6(4) of the directive.

2. The Structural Funds Regulations ([2]) provide that the design, preparation, implementation, monitoring, audit and evaluation of co-funded interventions under programmes is the responsibility of national authorities, at the most appropriate territorial level and according to the institutional system of each Member State. With the exception of major projects ([3]), the Commission is not aware on individual projects supported by the Structural Funds. However, according to information received from the Greek authorities, no project regarding a PPC power plant in the northwest part of the island of Rhodes has received EU funds.

3. Combustion plants with a rated thermal input of 50 MW or more are subject to the Industrial Emissions Directive 2010/75/EU ([4]) and, until 1 January 2016 in the case of existing plants, to Directive 2001/80/EC ([5]). Operation of these plants requires that the competent authorities issue a permit, containing conditions based on best available techniques. In addition, emissions to air of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and dust from the plant shall not exceed the emission limit values set in these directives for certain types of combustion plants.

It is the responsibility of Greek competent authorities to ensure compliance with these requirements.

([1]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora Official Journal L 206, 22.7.1992.
([2]) Regulation 1083/2006, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.
([3]) (i.e. projects of EUR 50 000 000 and above).
([4]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.
([5]) OJ L 309, 27.11.2001.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001473/14
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(12 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Eforturi depuse în vederea combaterii traficului de ființe umane în Bosnia și Herțegovina

Pe măsură ce țările din Balcanii de Vest înregistrează progrese în cadrul procesului de aderare la UE, devine tot mai decisivă garantarea faptului că aceste țări respectă principiile justiției și ale statului de drept în absolut toate privințele. Bosnia și Herțegovina (BiH) este una dintre țările din această regiune care are cel mai mult de suferit de pe urma problemei reprezentate de traficul de ființe umane. Guvernul BiH a realizat progrese semnificative în ceea ce privește combaterea acestei probleme, însă traficul de ființe umane constituie în continuare o activitate infracțională de amploare în această țară. În 2011, au fost raportate 35 de victime ale acestui trafic, dar este posibil ca cifra reală să fie mult mai mare, deoarece este deseori dificil ca astfel de victime să fie depistate.

În martie 2013, Consiliul de miniștri al Bosniei și Herțegovina a adoptat „strategia de combatere a traficului de ființe umane în Bosnia și Herțegovina în perioada 2013-2015”, prin care BiH se angaja să își îmbunătățească în continuare mecanismele de depistare și urmărire penală a acestor infracțiuni. Angajamentul continuu în vederea îmbunătățirii este în mod deosebit esențial în ceea ce privește măsurile de protecție a victimelor și a martorilor, reforma juridică și judiciară și finanțarea sporită și consolidarea capacităților operațiunilor de combatere a traficului. Spre exemplu, în ceea ce privește domeniul juridic, există, la nivel național, o legislație strictă de combatere a traficului de ființe umane, dar în cadrul entităților și al districtului Brčko există reglementări diferite. Această discrepanță ridică probleme în ceea ce privește urmărirea penală a cazurilor grave de trafic de ființe umane. Astfel de probleme juridice, precum și altele legate de depistare, aplicare și protecție reprezintă o provocare constantă la adresa primatului legii și ordinii în BiH.

1. Poate oferi Comisia informații actualizate cu privire la stadiul eforturilor aferente aplicării măsurilor de combatere a traficului de ființe umane și reformei în BiH, la un an aproape de la adoptarea strategiei 2013-2015?

2. Cum intenționează Comisia să acorde asistență liderilor BiH și ai altor state din Balcani nemembre ale UE în ceea ce privește adoptarea unor măsuri suplimentare de combatere a traficului de ființe umane, dat fiind faptul că această activitate infracțională constituie un potențial obstacol în calea aderării lor?

Răspuns dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(15 aprilie 2014)

Așa cum precizați și dumneavoastră, Comisia este de părere că Bosnia și Herțegovina continuă să fie o țară de origine, de tranzit și de destinație pentru traficul de ființe umane, astfel cum se menționează în raportul din 2013 privind progresele înregistrate. Punerea în aplicare a strategiei naționale de combatere a traficului de ființe umane necesită încă eforturi structurale din partea autorităților din Bosnia și Herțegovina pentru consolidarea tuturor acțiunilor și a măsurilor prevăzute, în special a celor privind identificarea și protejarea victimelor. Inclusiv prin intermediul mecanismului de monitorizare ulterioară liberalizării vizelor, Comisia va continua să monitorizeze aceste eforturi operaționale, precum și evoluția necesară a legislației relevante. S-a acordat și se va acorda în continuare asistență direcționată prin intermediul instrumentului TAIEX. În ceea ce privește urmărirea în justiție a autorilor infracțiunilor, se fac eforturi de consolidare a capacităților în Bosnia și Herțegovina și în alte țări implicate în procesul de aderare, prin intermediul Instrumentului de asistență pentru preaderare. În acest cadru, se finanțează proiecte la nivel regional și național pentru a sprijini capacitățile de investigație din agențiile de aplicare a legii, inclusiv capacitățile lor de cooperare la nivel regional și internațional. În plus, se asigură asistență sistemului judiciar. Comisia va continua să inițieze dialoguri relevante pe această temă atât cu țările candidate, cât și cu țările potențial candidate și să organizeze reuniuni la nivel de subcomitete în cadrul procesului de stabilizare și asociere.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001473/14
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Anti-human trafficking efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina

As countries of the western Balkans progress in the EU accession process, it becomes more and more crucial to ensure that these countries uphold justice and the rule of law in every possible instance. Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) is one of the countries in this region that suffers most from the problem of human trafficking. The BiH Government has made great strides in combating this problem, but human trafficking still remains a sizable criminal enterprise there. In 2011, 35 trafficking victims were reported, and the actual figure is likely to be much higher, as it is often difficult to detect such victims.

In March 2013, Bosnia and Herzegovina's Council of Ministers adopted the 'strategy to counter trafficking in human beings in Bosnia and Herzegovina 2013-2015', which committed BiH to further improving its mechanisms to detect and prosecute these offences. Continued commitment to improvement is particularly crucial in the areas of victim and witness protection, legal and judicial reform, and increased funding and capacity building of anti-trafficking operations. For example, in the legal field, stringent anti-human trafficking legislation exists at national level, but in the entities and the Brčko District there are different regulations. This discrepancy poses a challenge for prosecuting serious cases of human trafficking. Such legal issues, as well as other problems with detection, enforcement and protection, pose a continued challenge to the prevalence of law and order in BiH.

1. Can the Commission provide updated information on the status of anti-human trafficking enforcement and reform efforts in BiH, almost one year after the 2013-2015 strategy was adopted?

2. How does the Commission plan to assist the leaders of BiH and other non-EU Balkan states in taking further measures against human trafficking, particularly in view of the fact that this criminal activity is a potential obstacle to their accession?

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

In line with the assessment by the Honourable Member, the Commission maintains that Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) continues to be a country of origin, transit and destination for trafficking in human beings, as indicated in the progress report 2013. The implementation of the national anti-trafficking strategy still requires structural efforts on the part of BiH authorities to progressively consolidate all envisaged actions and measures, particularly for the identification and protection of victims. Including through the framework of the Post-Visa Liberalisation Monitoring Mechanism, the Commission will continue to monitor these operational efforts, as well as the necessary developments related to relevant legislation. Targeted assistance through the TAIEX instrument has been and will continue to be provided. On the side of prosecution of perpetrators, capacity building efforts are ongoing in BiH and other Enlargement countries through the Instrument for Pre-Accession assistance. In such framework, projects at both national and regional levels are financed to support the investigative capacities of law enforcement agencies, including their abilities to cooperate at regional and international levels. Assistance to the judiciary is also guaranteed. The Commission will continue to engage on the matter with both candidate and potential candidate countries at relevant dialogues and Sub-Committee meetings in the framework of the Stabilisation and Association Process.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001479/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(12 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Falta de medicación a enfermos de sida en el CIE de Zapadores, en Valencia

Recientemente, las organizaciones integrantes de la campaña política «CIEs no» que aboga por el cierre de los Centros de Internamiento de Extranjeros en España han denunciado la falta de atención médica a las personas inmigrantes detenidas, de manera contraria a lo establecido en la Declaración Universal de los Derechos Humanos.

Los integrantes de la campaña denuncian el caso de dos inmigrantes, ingresados en el CIE de Zapadores, en Valencia, que durante su estancia en dicho Centro no recibieron el adecuado tratamiento médico que necesitaban. Los casos conocidos son los de Alessandra, de origen ecuatoriano, y María, de origen peruano, detenidas en Barcelona y ambas infectadas con el virus de inmunodeficiencia adquirida o sida, enfermedad con graves consecuencias para la salud que necesita de una medicación constante para reducir la vulnerabilidad a otras afecciones.

El pasado agosto Alessandra realizó una reclamación a la dirección del centro solicitando atención médica apropiada ante los fallos renales que estaba sufriendo, a lo que el centro accedió proporcionando dos de los cuatro medicamentos que normalmente necesitaba. Asimismo, María, enferma también de sida desde hace más de ocho años, recibía tratamiento en el hospital Vall d'Hebron de Barcelona. La paciente dispone de un informe del citado hospital donde se prescribe la necesidad de recepción ininterrumpida del tratamiento. María logró automedicarse en el centro por lo que no presentó queja escrita, tan solo se quejó informalmente al médico de la prisión.

¿Conoce la Comisión los citados casos de falta de asistencia sanitaria a enfermos de sida en los CIEs españoles?

¿Piensa investigar si dicha falta de atención sanitaria cumple con lo estipulado en la Directiva 2008/115/CE?

Conociendo los precedentes de España en la falta de atención médica a inmigrantes irregulares, sometidos a un procedimiento de retorno o no, ¿piensa abrir un procedimiento de infracción al Gobierno de España por la violación de la citada Directiva?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión remite a Sus Señorías a su respuesta a las preguntas escritas E-005506/2013 ([1]), P-000090/2014 ([2]) y E-000669/2014 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-005506&language=ES
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2014-000090&language=ES
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2014-000669%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001479/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Lack of medication for patients with AIDS at Zapadores Immigrant Detention Centre in Valencia

Organisations that are part of the 'CIEs no' political campaign, which calls for the closure of Immigrant Detention Centres in Spain, recently criticised the lack of medical care provided to immigrants in detention, which contravenes the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Members of the campaign condemned the case of two immigrants held at Zapadores Immigrant Detention Centre in Valencia, who during their stay there did not receive the appropriate medical treatment that they required. The cases that have come to light relate to Alessandra, from Ecuador, and María, from Peru, who were both detained in Barcelona and are infected with the acquired immunodeficiency virus [sic] — or AIDS — a condition with serious health consequences that requires constant medication to reduce susceptibility to other infections.

Last August, Alessandra made a complaint to the centre management, requesting suitable medical care following kidney failure, in response to which the centre agreed to provide two of the four items of medication that she usually required. Equally, María, also suffering from AIDS for over eight years, received treatment at Vall d'Hebron hospital in Barcelona. The patient received a report from this hospital specifying that she required uninterrupted treatment. María was able to treat herself in the detention centre so she did not make a written complaint, but had only complained informally to the prison doctor.

Is the Commission aware of such instances of a lack of healthcare provided to people suffering from AIDS who are being held in Immigrant Detention Centres in Spain?

Does it intend to investigate whether such a failure to provide medical care is in line with the provisions of Directive 2008/115/EC?

In view of this lack of medical care provided to illegal immigrants in Spain, regardless of whether they are to be returned or not, does the Commission intend to initiate an infringement procedure against the Spanish Government for violating this directive?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-005506/2013 ([1]), P-000090/2014 ([2]) and E-000669/2014 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-005506&language=EN
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2014-000090&language=EN
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2014-000669%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001480/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(12 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Empresas aspirantes a la destrucción del arsenal químico sirio y sus riesgos

El pasado mes de septiembre de 2013 el Gobierno de Siria llegó a un acuerdo con los respectivos Gobiernos de Rusia y Estados Unidos, en el que se comprometía a la entrega de su arsenal de armas de destrucción masiva para su desmantelamiento y destrucción.

La Unión Europea, que ni siquiera tomó parte en dicho acuerdo, está encargándose de la gestión y la destrucción del citado arsenal armamentístico. Para la realización de dicha tarea, la Organización para la Prohibición de las Armas Químicas (OPAQ) ha publicado el pasado 20 de enero los catorce nombres de las empresas que han optado por llevar a cabo la incineración de dichos residuos. Para su destrucción se pretenden desplazar desde Siria hacia los países de destino, incurriendo en graves riesgos por el mero transporte por vía marítima del material peligroso.

De entre las catorce compañías citadas, seis son europeas y una española, llamada SITA Ibérica, dándose la paradójica situación de que las incineradoras no tienen permiso para tratar residuos de otras regiones de un mismo país, pero parece que sí pueden importar residuos químicos peligrosos desde la otra punta del mar Mediterráneo. El hecho de que no se realice la primera fase del desmantelamiento antes de realizar el transporte por vía marítima incrementa el riesgo de forma exponencial, ignorando por completo el principio de precaución y de proximidad que desarrolla la normativa europea, en concreto la Directiva 2000/76/CE relativa a la incineración de residuos.

¿Conoce la Comisión la candidatura de las seis empresas europeas citadas?

¿Considera que dicha candidatura para la destrucción de este armamento se ha hecho respetando lo estipulado en la normativa europea relativa a la gestión e incineración de residuos?

¿Piensa permitir que las citadas compañías europeas lleven a cabo dicha tarea aunque esté claramente en contra del espíritu de la normativa?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de julio de 2014)

La destrucción del arsenal de armas químicas de Siria fue aprobada y ha sido supervisada por el Consejo Ejecutivo de la Organización para la Prohibición de las Armas Químicas (OPAQ) y el Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas. El plan de destrucción de estas armas se recoge en una serie de documentos públicos de la OPAQ que contienen las decisiones pertinentes del Consejo Ejecutivo de la OPAQ. Participaron activamente en la planificación de la operación tanto el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente (PNUMA) como la Organización Mundial de la Salud (OMS). La misión conjunta ha organizado recientemente una reunión con las principales ONG medioambientales para explicar que la destrucción se llevará a cabo de conformidad con la legislación nacional e internacional. La hidrólisis de los precursores químicos se efectuará en el mar a bordo de un buque estadounidense y no hay intención de verter al mar los productos químicos ni sus efluentes tras la hidrólisis. Los Gobiernos de Dinamarca y el Reino Unido, además de Noruega, han acordado facilitar buques en apoyo del plan. Además, Alemania, el Reino Unido y Finlandia también han acordado tratar los efluentes de residuos en su territorio. La empresa finlandesa Ekokem ha sido seleccionada mediante licitación internacional de la OPAQ. Las empresas y las instalaciones de la UE que se han comprometido a realizar la destrucción de armas químicas deben cumplir el Derecho medioambiental de la UE, incluidas la Directiva 2008/98/CE sobre los residuos, la Directiva 2010/75/UE sobre las emisiones industriales y la Directiva 2012/18/UE relativa al control de los riesgos inherentes a los accidentes graves en los que intervengan sustancias peligrosas. La Comisión no tiene noticias de ningún problema de cumplimiento por parte de las seis empresas de la UE a que se refiere la pregunta de Su Señoría.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001480/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Firms applying to destroy Syria's chemical weapons arsenal and the attendant dangers

In September 2013 the Syrian Government reached an agreement with the Governments of Russia and the United States to hand over its arsenal of weapons of mass destruction to be dismantled and destroyed.

The European Union was not involved in this agreement. However it is involved in the management and destruction of this arsenal of weapons. On 20 January 2014, the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) published the names of 14 firms that have chosen to tender for the incineration of this chemical waste. The plan is to ship this highly dangerous material by sea from Syria to the countries where it will be destroyed, something which is in itself a dangerous enterprise.

Six of the aforementioned 14 companies are in the EU and one — SITA Ibérica — is Spanish, creating a paradoxical situation whereby incinerators are not permitted to treat waste from other regions in the same country but are, it would seem, able to import hazardous chemical waste from the other end of the Mediterranean. The dangers are increased exponentially by the fact that the first stage of dismantling will not be carried out prior to transporting the waste by sea. This completely ignores the precautionary principle and the proximity principle developed in EU legislation, specifically in Directive 2000/76/EC on the incineration of waste.

Is the Commission aware that the aforementioned six EU companies submitted tenders?

Does it consider that these companies have complied with EU legislation on waste management and incineration in tendering to destroy these weapons?

Will it allow the aforesaid EU companies to carry out this work even though it is clearly contrary to the spirit of the legislation?

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

The destruction of the Syrian chemical weapons arsenal has been agreed and is supervised by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) Executive Council and the UN Security Council. This plan is contained in a series of public OPCW documents containing relevant decisions by the OPCW Executive Council. In the planning of the operation both United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and World Health Organisation (WHO) were actively involved. The Joint Mission has recently organised a meeting with leading environmental NGOs to explain that the destruction will take place in accordance with international and national legislation. Hydrolysis of chemical precursors will take place at sea on a US ship, and there is no intention to discharge any chemicals or their effluent after hydrolysis into the sea. The Danish and UK Governments, along with Norway, have agreed to provide vessels to support the plan and, in addition to Germany, the UK and Finland have also agreed to treat waste effluents on their territory. The Finnish company Ekokem has been selected by OPCW through international tendering. EU companies/facilities which commit to undertake the destruction of chemical weapons have to comply with EU environmental legislation, including with Directive 2008/98/EC on waste, Directive 2010/75/EU on Industrial emissions and Directive 2012/18/EU on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances. The Commission is not aware of any compliance issues related to the six EU companies referred to in the question posed by the Honourable Member.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001482/14
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(12 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Restricciones a la libre circulación de trabajadores de la UE en Suiza

En el referéndum celebrado el pasado domingo 9 de febrero en Suiza, el 50,3 % de los votos emitidos se pronunció a favor de limitar la entrada de ciudadanos de la UE a su mercado laboral por medio de cuotas anuales que deben aplicarse en el plazo de tres años. Este resultado choca con el acuerdo bilateral Suiza-UE sobre la libre circulación de trabajadores de la UE, en vigor desde 2002.

El argumento central de los promotores del referéndum fue que la inmigración provocaba un número creciente de desempleados que se beneficiaban del sistema social suizo. Desde la entrada en vigor del acuerdo de 2002, la Unión Helvética ha visto llegar cerca de 800 000 trabajadores extranjeros de los que el 75 % son ciudadanos de la UE. Según datos oficiales relativos al año pasado, la tasa de paro en Suiza fue del 3,2 % (2,9 % en 2012) de la que corresponde a los ciudadanos suizos una tasa del 2,2 % y a los extranjeros una del 6 % (5,2 % ciudadanos comunitarios).

Desde principios de la pasada década, Suiza ha sido favorable a una apertura de fronteras. Ocurrió en el año 2000, en el referéndum sobre libre circulación de personas de la UE; en 2005, con su extensión a los diez nuevos Estados miembros; y en 2009, con la incorporación de Rumania y Bulgaria. El referéndum del domingo rompe esta tendencia e implica el retorno a un sistema de contingentes de inmigrantes que se traduciría cada año en un número limitado de permisos para trabajadores procedentes de la UE, como ocurre actualmente con el resto del mundo.

¿Cómo evalúa la Comisión el resultado del referéndum? ¿Va a afectar al cumplimiento del Acuerdo bilateral Suiza-UE sobre libre circulación de trabajadores? ¿Descarta que produzca efectos sobre los trabajadores de la UE que actualmente residen en la Confederación Helvética? ¿Tiene previsto alguna iniciativa para asegurar su protección? ¿Qué medidas va a adoptar para que Suiza cumpla sus compromisos? ¿Prevé la aplicación de un trato recíproco a los ciudadanos suizos y a Suiza por parte de la UE u otras medidas extraordinarias en caso de incumplimiento?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión Europea hizo pública su opinión sobre el resultado del referéndum inmediatamente después de la votación, lamentando la aprobación de una iniciativa por la que se introducen límites cuantitativos a la inmigración, lo que va contra el principio de libre circulación de personas entre la UE y Suiza. El poder legislativo suizo tiene ahora tres años para adoptar las disposiciones de aplicación necesarias para dar cumplimiento a la iniciativa. La conformidad de estas disposiciones de aplicación con el Acuerdo entre la UE y Suiza sobre la libre circulación de personas se analizará cuando se conozcan los detalles de los proyectos de ley. Al mismo tiempo, se podrán estudiar medidas de la Comisión. El Consejo Federal Suizo ha asegurado a la UE que seguirá observando sus obligaciones internacionales vigentes. Por lo tanto, los ciudadanos de la UE que residen actualmente en Suiza no se verán afectados a corto plazo. Si hubiera un riesgo de que sus derechos sí se vieran afectados a medio plazo, la Comisión Europea estudiaría la mejor manera de salvaguardarlos y haría todo lo necesario al efecto. La Comisión, por su parte, también considera que *pacta sunt servanda* y seguirá cumpliendo sus obligaciones en virtud de los acuerdos bilaterales con Suiza.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001482/14
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Restrictions on the free movement of EU workers in Switzerland

In the referendum held on Sunday 9 February 2014 in Switzerland, 50.3% of the votes cast were in favour of restricting the entrance of EU citizens into their labour market by means of annual quotas to be applied within three years. This result goes against the bilateral Swiss-EU accord on the free movement of EU workers, which has been in force since 2002.

The central argument put forward by the promoters of the referendum was that a growing number of unemployed people were benefitting from the Swiss social security system as a result of immigration . Since the 2002 accord came into force, the Swiss Confederation has received almost 800 000 foreign workers, of which 75% are EU citizens. According to official statistics for last year, the rate of unemployment in Switzerland was 3.2% (2.9% in 2012), with a rate of 2.2% corresponding to Swiss citizens and 6% to foreigners (5.2% for EU citizens).

Since the beginning of the last decade, Switzerland has been in favour of an opening of borders. It happened in 2000, in the referendum on the free movement of EU persons; in 2005, with its extension to the ten new Member States; and in 2009, with the incorporation of Romania and Bulgaria. Sunday's referendum breaks this tendency and implies a return to a system of immigrant quotas, which would result in a limited number of work permits being issued each year for workers coming from the EU, as happens now in the case of workers from the rest of the world.

What is the Commission's view on the result of the referendum? Will it affect compliance with the bilateral Swiss-EU accord on the free movement of workers? Does the Commission reject the idea that it will affect EU workers currently residing in the Swiss Confederation? Is it considering any initiatives to protect such workers? What measures is it planning to adopt to ensure that Switzerland complies with its obligations? Does it envisage the application by the EU of reciprocal treatment for Switzerland and Swiss citizens or any other extraordinary measures in the event of non-compliance?

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

The European Commission made its view of the result of the referendum public immediately after the vote. It regrets that an initiative for the introduction of quantitative limits to immigration, which goes against the principle of free movement of persons between the EU and Switzerland, has been passed. The Swiss legislator now has three years to adopt the necessary implementing legislation for the intiative. Compliance of the implementing legislation with the EU-Swiss Agreement on the free movement of persons will be analysed once the details of the draft legislation are known. At the same time, action by the Commission may be considered.The Swiss Federal Council has assured the EU that it will continue to fulfil its existing international obligations. EU citizens currently residing in Switzerland should therefore not be affected in the short term. Should there be a risk in the medium-term that their rights be affected, the European Commission will consider how to best safeguard these rights, and will make the necessary efforts to achieve this. The Commission, for its part, also considers that *pacta sunt servanda*, and will continue to honour its obligations under the bilateral agreements with Switzerland.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001488/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Επανέναρξη συνομιλιών στο Κυπριακό

Σήμερα, 11 Φεβρουαρίου 2014, έχουν επαναρχίσει οι συνομιλίες για το Κυπριακό. Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ζητηθεί από τα διαπραγματευόμενα μέρη ή τα Ηνωμένα Έθνη οποιαδήποτε εμπλοκή της Επιτροπής στη διαδικασία της επανέναρξης των συνομιλιών;

2. Είναι ενήμερη η Επιτροπή για το περιεχόμενο της κοινής ανακοίνωσης για την επανεκκίνηση των συνομιλιών;

3. Πώς η ίδια αξιολογεί το περιεχόμενο της κοινής ανακοίνωσης; Θεωρεί ότι συνάδει απόλυτα με το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002054/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(20 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Νέος κύκλος συνομιλιών για επίλυση του Κυπριακού προβλήματος

Στην Κύπρο έχει αρχίσει ένας νέος γύρος συνομιλιών, υπό την αιγίδα του Οργανισμού Ηνωμένων Εθνών, για επίλυση του χρονίζοντος πολιτικού προβλήματος, το οποίο δημιουργήθηκε λόγω της τουρκικής εισβολής, της βίαιης διαίρεσης και της συνεχιζόμενης για 40 χρόνια ημι-κατοχής του νησιού από τα τουρκικά στρατεύματα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Προτίθεται να εμπλακεί και να βοηθήσει στη επίτευξη μιας δίκαιης, λειτουργικής, βιώσιμης και σύμφωνης με το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο λύσης του προβλήματος;

2. Ποιους μοχλούς πίεσης διαθέτει και πώς προτίθεται να τους χρησιμοποιήσει ώστε να εξαναγκαστεί η κατοχική Τουρκία να συνεργαστεί, αποσύροντας τα στρατεύματά της και αποδεχόμενη την επανένωση του νησιού που, στο σύνολο του, αποτελεί μέλος της ΕΕ;

3. Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι οι βασικές αρχές που περιέχονται στο Κοινό Ανακοινωθέν του Προέδρου της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας κ. Ν. Αναστασιάδη και του Τουρκοκύπριου ηγέτη κ. Ν. Έρογλου μπορούν να οδηγήσουν σε μια λύση που να είναι σύμφωνη με το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο ως έχει σήμερα, χωρίς οποιεσδήποτε παρεκκλίσεις;

4. Αν η λύση που πιθανόν να συμφωνηθεί δεν διασφαλίζει όλα τα δικαιώματα που έχει κάθε ελεύθερος Ευρωπαίος πολίτης, όπως π.χ. το δικαίωμα της ελεύθερης διακίνησης, της εγκατάστασης, της περιουσίας και του εκλέγειν και εκλέγεσθαι στον τόπο διαμονής του, τι θα πράξει η ΕΕ; Θα προσυπογράψει μια τέτοια λύση ή θα επιμείνει στην χωρίς όρους και παρεκκλίσεις εφαρμογή όλων των ευρωπαϊκών αρχών καθώς και του κοινοτικού κεκτημένου;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Απριλίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον αξιότιμο βουλευτή στη δήλωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης της 11ης Φεβρουαρίου σχετικά με τη συμφωνία που επιτεύχθηκε από τους Ελληνοκύπριους και Τουρκοκύπριους ηγέτες για κοινή δήλωση και την επανάληψη των διαπραγματεύσεων ([1]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-103_el.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001488/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Resumption of talks on the Cyprus problem

Talks on the Cyprus problem resumed today, 11 February 2014. In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Have the negotiating parties, or the United Nations, requested any involvement on the part of the Commission in connection with the resumption of talks?

2. Is the Commission aware of the content of the joint announcement for the resumption of talks?

3. What is the Commission's opinion on the content of the joint announcement? Is it of the opinion that it is entirely in keeping with the Community *acquis*?

Question for written answer E-002054/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: New round of talks to resolve the Cyprus problem

A new round of talks has started in Cyprus, under the aegis of the UN, to resolve the long-standing political problem created by the Turkish invasion and the violent division of the island, which has been semi-occupied by Turkish troops for the past 40 years.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it intend to become involved in order to help achieve a fair, workable and sustainable solution to the problem in line with the Community *acquis*?

2. What means of applying pressure does it have at its disposal and how does it intend to use them in order to force Turkey, as the occupying country, to cooperate by withdrawing its troops and agreeing to the reunification of the island, which is an EU Member State in its entirety?

3. Does the Commission consider that the basic principles set out in the joint statement released by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr N. Anastasiades, and the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr N. Eroglu, can lead to a solution in line with the Community *acquis* as it stands, without any derogation?

4. If an agreed solution does not safeguard all the rights which every free European citizen enjoys, such as the right to freedom of movement, to freedom of establishment and to property and the right to vote and stand as a candidate in their place of residence, what will the EU do? Will it endorse such a solution or will it insist on the unconditional application of all European principles and the Community *acquis* without derogation?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the 11 February statement from the European Union on the agreement reached by the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leaders on a joint declaration and on the resumption of the negotiations. ([1])

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-103_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001490/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Σπόροι, βιοποικιλότητα και ανθεκτικότητα

Στη συζήτηση για τη νομοθεσία σχετικά με το αναπαραγωγικό υλικό (σπόροι) συχνά αναφέρεται ότι οι σημερινές ρυθμίσεις για την παραγωγή και την εμπορία των σπόρων ευνοούν την απώλεια της βιοποικιλότητας. Το αντεπιχείρημα είναι ότι η βιοποικιλότητα έχει ενισχυθεί με 42 000 διαφορετικές ποικιλίες γεωργικών και κηπευτικών ειδών να διατίθενται σήμερα στους αγρότες.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή,

Η βιοποικιλότητα που προκύπτει από τις νέες αυτές ποικιλίες εξασφαλίζει εξίσου με τις παραδοσιακές ποικιλίες τη θωράκιση της ανθεκτικότητας και τη διατήρηση των υπηρεσιών που παρέχουν τα οικοσυστήματα, προσφέροντας έτσι εναλλακτικές λύσεις για την άμβλυνση των επιπτώσεων της κλιματικής αλλαγής στο μέλλον;

Απάντηση του κ. Cioloş εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Απριλίου 2014)

Οι γενετικοί πόροι στη γεωργία αποτελούν καθοριστικό παράγοντα για την διασφάλιση του επισιτισμού, της ποιότητας των τροφίμων και της αειφορίας της γεωργίας, δεδομένου ότι συμβάλλουν στην ανθεκτικότητα των γεωργικών συστημάτων και αποτελούν πηγή χρήσιμων στοιχείων για την περαιτέρω εκτροφή. Τις τελευταίες δεκαετίες, ένα ευρύ φάσμα παραδοσιακών φυτικών ποικιλιών απώλεσε τη θέση που κατείχε, λόγω της εμφάνισης νέων ποικιλιών που αναπτύχθηκαν προσφάτως και, επομένως, υπάρχει κίνδυνος εξαφάνισής τους. Ωστόσο, η διαφύλαξη ενός ευρέος γενετικού αποθέματος επιτρέπει στους δημιουργούς φυτικών ποικιλιών να ανταποκρίνονται στα προβλήματα που δημιουργούν οι νέες και εξελισσόμενες ασθένειες φυτών, τα παράσιτα και οι μεταβαλλόμενες κλιματικές συνθήκες. Η διατήρηση γενετικών πόρων εξασφαλίζει επίσης προϊόντα ποιότητας.

Η διατήρηση και η αειφόρος χρήση των παραδοσιακών και τοπικών ποικιλιών λαμβάνονται υπόψη σε διάφορες πολιτικές. Ο νέος κανονισμός για την αγροτική ανάπτυξη (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1305/2013 ([1]) προβλέπει, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 28, μέτρα που στοχεύουν στη διατήρηση των γενετικών πόρων στη γεωργία, επιτόπου και εκτός τόπου. Έτσι οι παραδοσιακές και τοπικές ποικιλίες θα εξακολουθήσουν να προστατεύονται και να διατηρούνται.

Επιπλέον, το πρόγραμμα εργασίας 2014-2015 του Horizon 2020 προβλέπει ερευνητικά έργα που αφορούν την περιγραφή και αξιολόγηση, καθώς και τη διαχείριση και αειφόρο χρήση των γενετικών πόρων στη γεωργία.

Εξάλλου, εφαρμόζονται οι οδηγίες της Επιτροπής για τη διατήρηση ποικιλιών, ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί η επιτόπια διατήρηση των παραδοσιακών ποικιλιών (οδηγία 2010/60/ΕΕ ([2]), οδηγία 2009/145/ΕΚ ([3]) και οδηγία 2008/62/ΕΚ ([4])).

([1]) ΕΕ L 347 της 20.12.2013.
([2]) ΕΕ L 228 της 31.8.2010.
([3]) ΕΕ L 312 της 27.11.2009.
([4]) ΕΕ L 162 της 21.6.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001490/14
to the Commission
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Seeds biodiversity and resistance

Debates on legislation concerning reproductive material (seeds) often touch on the fact that current regulations on the production and sale of seeds contribute to biodiversity loss. However, the counter-argument is that biodiversity has been reinforced with 42 000 different varieties of agricultural and horticultural species that are currently available to farmers.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Is the biodiversity arising from these new varieties as efficient as the one arising from the traditional varieties in safeguarding resistance and maintaining services provided by the ecosystems, thereby offering alternative solutions in terms of mitigating the impact of climate change in the future?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

Genetic resources in agriculture are a key factor for ensuring food security, food quality and the sustainability of agriculture as they contribute to the resilience of farming systems and are a source of useful traits for further breeding. Over the last decades, a wide range of traditional plant varieties lost out against newly developed varieties and, therefore, are at the risk of disappearing. However, the preservation of a wide genetic pool allows plant breeders to respond to challenges presented by new and evolving diseases, pests, and changing climate conditions. The conservation of genetic resources provides also for quality products.

The conservation and sustainable use of traditional and local varieties is taken into account in different policies. The new Rural Development Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 ([1]) provides, under Article 28, for measures targeted at conserving genetic resources in agriculture, both in-situ and ex-situ. In this way traditional and local varieties will continue to be protected and conserved.

Furthermore, the Work Programme 2014-2015 of Horizon 2020 provides for research projects concerning the description and evaluation as well as the management and sustainable use of genetic resources in agriculture.

In addition, the Commission Directives on conservation of varieties are in application to ensure in-situ conservation of traditional varieties (Directive 2010/60/EU ([2]), Directive 2009/145/EC ([3]), and Directive 2008/62/EC ([4])).

([1]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([2]) OJ L 228, 31.8.2010.
([3]) OJ L 312, 27.11.2009.
([4]) OJ L 162, 21.6.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001495/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuovo sistema di produzione e immagazzinamento energetico

In provincia di Salerno un gruppo industriale, insieme a tre istituti del CNR, ha sperimentato con successo la proprietà della sabbia di accumulare calore, dando vita a un sistema che utilizza i letti fluidizzati nel solare a concentrazione. L'esperimento ha superato una prima fase di prova, con duemila ore di funzionamento e una capacità produttiva di 100-150 kilowatt.

Il sistema, definito Stem, adotta una tecnologia «a torre», vale a dire una serie di specchi montati su telai eliostati, che seguono il percorso del sole durante l'arco della giornata. In questo modo un'alta concentrazione di radiazioni raggiunge il ricevitore di calore, dove si raggiungono alte temperature. Indispensabili per il funzionamento del sistema sono i letti fluidizzati, composti da sabbia tenuta in sospensione con l'aria. Questo meccanismo è in grado di assorbire l'energia solare, accumularla e immagazzinarla anche in assenza del sole, oppure è in grado di trasferirla a un generatore di vapore che la trasforma in corrente elettrica.

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

1. è a conoscenza del sistema di immagazzinamento energetico in questione;

2. è a conoscenza di altri istituti di ricerca o imprese europee che hanno sperimentato il sistema;

3. dispone, eventualmente, di dati relativi ai livelli di produzione energetica, efficienza energetica e impatto ambientale emersi da passati esperimenti?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente del progetto in questione, che è estremamente innovativo e unico nel suo genere. Non siamo a conoscenza di altre imprese che effettuino ricerche su questa tecnologia che combina energia solare e utilizzo di sabbia.

Tali progetti possono essere finanziati su scala multinazionale nell'ambito del programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione «Orizzonte 2020». La ricerca che introduce flessibilità nel sistema energetico, tra cui lo stoccaggio dell'energia, costituisce una delle priorità del programma Orizzonte 2020. È attualmente in corso un invito a presentare proposte. Si possono trovare maggiori informazioni sul sito internet della Commissione: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001495/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: New energy generation and storage system

In the Italian province of Salerno, an industrial group, working in collaboration with three National Research Council (CNR) institutes, has experimented successfully with the heat-accumulation properties of sand, creating a system that uses fluidised beds in Concentrating Solar Power (CSP). An initial test phase has been completed, with two thousand hours of operation and production capacity of 100-150 kilowatts.

The system, known as Stem, uses power-tower technology, comprising a series of mirrors mounted on heliostat frames that follow the course of the sun throughout the day. This means that a high concentration of radiation reaches the heat receiver, where high temperatures are obtained. The fluidised beds, consisting of sand held in suspension with air, are a vital element in the way the system functions. This mechanism allows solar energy to be absorbed, accumulated and stored, even when the sun is not shining, or is able to transfer energy to a steam generator that turns it into electricity.

In the light of the above, could the Commission clarify the following:

1. Is it aware of this energy storage system?

2. Does it know of any other European companies or research bodies that have experimented with this system?

3. Dose it have any data from previous experiments on energy production figures, energy efficiency and environmental impact?

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

The Commission is aware of this project. It is highly innovative and rather unique. We are not aware of any other companies doing research on this technology combining solar energy with sand storage.

Such projects can be supported on a multinational scale in the research and innovation framework programme Horizon 2020. Research that adds flexibility to the energy system, including energy storage, is one of the research priorities for Horizon 2020. Currently a call for proposals is open. You find more information on our website: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001498/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Imprenditorialità, legalità e confisca dei beni mafiosi

Nuove possibilità di sviluppo, incentrate su concetti quali autoimprenditorialità, creatività e legalità si sostanziano nelle esperienze di associazioni e soggetti istituzionali che lavorano e progettano in sinergia ai fini di un virtuoso riutilizzo di beni e risorse sottratti ad organizzazioni criminali.

La riconversione dei patrimoni mafiosi, mirata a un loro reimpiego per finalità sociali, non costituisce oggi una novità; ciò nondimeno, essa rappresenta un coraggioso ed importante manifesto civico, che attesta l'affermazione e diffusione di una cultura della legalità che associa la rivalorizzazione di risorse altrimenti «immobilizzate» all'efficienza e la restituzione di servizi per le comunità territoriali.

Tali elementi non possono certamente considerarsi estranei alle filosofie e intenzioni programmatiche che caratterizzano le logiche di soggetti sovranazionali quali l'Unione europea.

Di conseguenza si reputa che — al di là di peculiarità nazionali — le pratiche di riconversione di beni appartenuti a organizzazioni devianti possano godere di una valenza extranazionale.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quali altre misure in tal senso sono state promosse e incentivate dall'Unione europea nel proprio contesto di giurisdizione?

2. Quali misure intende ulteriormente implementare a sostegno delle pratiche succitate, specie a tutela di operatori e volontari che, in prima linea, offrono il proprio impegno e lavoro?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

1. L'Unione europea promuove e incoraggia il riutilizzo a fini sociali dei beni confiscati. La nuova direttiva relativa al congelamento e alla confisca dei proventi di reato nell'Unione europea ([1]) richiede agli Stati membri di adottare misure che consentano di utilizzare i beni confiscati a fini sociali o nell'interesse pubblico. La Commissione seguirà l'applicazione di questa disposizione non vincolante negli Stati membri.

2. La Commissione finanzia diversi progetti sul riutilizzo a fini sociali dei beni confiscati nel quadro del programma «Prevenzione e lotta contro la criminalità» e intende incentivare il più vasto scambio di buone pratiche in materia. In tal senso ha organizzato una serie di riunioni di esperti nell'ambito della piattaforma degli uffici per il recupero dei beni dell'Unione nel quadro delle quali è stato elaborato un codice di buone pratiche per il riutilizzo dei beni confiscati negli Stati membri di prossima pubblicazione (il codice analizza la legislazione esistente, i soggetti coinvolti, una serie di casi specifici, le principali sfide e le buone pratiche). La protezione del personale e dei volontari in prima linea è di competenza degli Stati membri.

([1]) Adottata dal Parlamento europeo il 25 febbraio 2014 e dal Consiglio il 14 marzo 2014, non ancora pubblicata.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001498/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Entrepreneurship, legality and confiscation of Mafia assets

New possibilities for development, focusing on such concepts as entrepreneurship, creativity and legality are embodied in the experiences of associations and institutions working and planning in synergy to put to good use assets and resources confiscated from criminal organisations.

The recycling of Mafia assets, aimed at reusing them for social purposes, is not a novelty nowadays; however, it represents a courageous and significant civic manifesto, which is testimony to the affirmation and dissemination of a culture of legality which associates the recycling of otherwise 'immobilised' resources with efficiency and the restitution of services to the local communities.

These elements may certainly not be considered foreign to the philosophies and policy aims which make up the logic of supranational bodies such as the European Union.

Consequently, it is considered that, aside from national peculiarities, the practice of recycling assets belonging to deviant organisations may have an extranational value.

In view of the foregoing:

1. can the Commission state what other measures of this kind have been promoted and encouraged by the European Union within the context of each jurisdiction?

2. What further measures does it intend to implement in order to support the practices referred to, in particular to protect front-line operators and volunteers who provide their commitment and effort?

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

1. The European Union promotes and encourages the reuse of confiscated assets for social purposes. The new Directive on the freezing and confiscation of instrumentalities and proceeds of crime in the European Union ([1]) requires Member States to consider taking measures allowing confiscated property to be used for public interest or social purposes. The Commission will follow the implementation of this non-binding provision in the Member States.

2. The Commission is financing several projects on the reuse of confiscated assets for social purposes under the programme 'Prevention of and fight against organised crime' (ISEC). The Commission intends to promote the widest exchange of best practices on this topic. It has notably organised expert meetings on this topic within the EU Asset Recovery Offices' (ARO) Platform. Such meetings led to the drafting of a best practice report on the reuse of confiscated assets in the Member States (analysing existing legislation, players involved, specific cases, main challenges and best practices) which will be issued in the coming months. The protection of front line operators and volunteers remains under the competence of the Member States.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001500/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Unione europea e Pakistan: dialogo in materia di diritti umani e fondi stanziati in favore di questo paese

In riferimento alla risposta all'interrogazione E-007645/2012, la Commissione può:

1. aggiornare circa l'attuale andamento del dialogo strategico nell'ambito del piano di impegno quinquennale sui diritti umani fra Pakistan e Unione europea, avviato in occasione della visita dell'Alto Rappresentante ad Islamabad nel luglio del 2012?

2. Indicare quali cifre sono state stanziate per il finanziamento di progetti di sensibilizzazione sui diritti umani in Pakistan e quali sono i progetti attualmente in essere?

3. Indicare l'ammontare dei fondi stanziati in favore di questo paese dal 2001, anno della firma dell'accordo di cooperazione fra Unione europea e Pakistan, sino ad oggi?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

1. Le questioni relative ai diritti umani vengono sollevate sistematicamente in tutte le riunioni tra funzionari e parlamentari dell'UE e del Pakistan, cosi come nell'ambito del dialogo regolare UE-Pakistan sui diritti umani. Nel 2012 e nel 2013 l'UE ha espresso a più riprese e in vari modi (dichiarazioni, dialogo, iniziative diplomatiche e cooperazione allo sviluppo) le proprie preoccupazioni in settori quali la libertà di religione e di credo, la situazione delle donne e dei minori, lo Stato di diritto e l'accesso alla giustizia o la pena di morte. Dal gennaio 2014 il Pakistan figura nell'elenco dei beneficiari delle preferenze commerciali SPG+ che impongono, tra l'altro, il rispetto delle convenzioni internazionali sui diritti umani.

2. Nell'ultimo anno l'UE ha concesso complessivamente al Pakistan più di 12 milioni di EUR sotto forma di sovvenzioni attraverso l'EIDHR.

Un recente invito a presentare proposte finanziato dall'EIDHR stanzierà un importo considerevole per ulteriori appalti relativi all'empowerment delle donne e alla prevenzione della violenza nei loro confronti.

3. Dal 2001 ad oggi l'UE ha destinato 485 milioni di EUR al programma nazionale, 183 milioni di EUR in risposta alle crisi (terremoto e inondazioni) e 20 milioni di EUR attraverso gli strumenti tematici.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001500/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: European Union and Pakistan: dialogue on human rights and funds allocated to that country

With reference to the answer to Question E-007645/2012, can the Commission:

1. provide an update as to the current progress of the strategic dialogue within the five-year engagement plan on human rights between Pakistan and the European Union, which was initiated on the occasion of the High Representative's visit to Islamabad in July 2012?

2. State the figures which have been allocated to the funding of projects to increase awareness of human rights in Pakistan and list the projects that are currently ongoing?

3. State the amount of funds allocated to this country since 2001, the year in which the cooperation agreement between the European Union and Pakistan was signed?

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

1. Human rights concerns are raised systematically in all senior and high-level meetings between EU and Pakistani officials as well as parliamentarians, and in the EU-Pakistan regular human rights dialogue. Throughout 2012 and 2013, by means of statements, dialogue, demarches and development cooperation assistance the EU has highlighted concerns ranging from freedom of religion and belief, the situation of women and children to the rule of law and access to justice, as well as the death penalty. Since January 2014 Pakistan is listed among the beneficiaries of GSP+ trade preferences which require compliance with international human rights conventions, amongst others.

2. The EU has awarded grants for a total amount of over EUR 12 million through the EIDHR in the recent year.

A recent call for proposals under EIDHR will allocate a substantial amount to further contracts on women's empowerment and prevention on violence against women.

3. Altogether since 2001, the EU has allocated EUR 485 million to the country programme, EUR 183 million in response to crises (earthquake, floods) and EUR 20 million through thematic instruments.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001501/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Arresto di Rimsha Masih in Pakistan: aggiornamento

In riferimento alla risposta all'interrogazione E-007645/2012, la Commissione può fornire un aggiornamento sulla sorte di Rimsha Masih?

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

Rimsha Masih è stata rilasciata su cauzione dopo il ritiro degli addebiti nei suoi confronti nel settembre 2012 grazie a una mobilitazione senza precedenti del clero musulmano contro quelle che considerava accuse infondate. Rimsha Masih si è nascosta insieme alla sua famiglia per sfuggire alle minacce di violenza che spesso incombono sulle persone accusate di aver violato le leggi sulla blasfemia, anche quando sono state scagionate. La Corte suprema di Islamabad l'ha assolta da tutte le accuse nel novembre 2012. All'inizio del 2013 Rimsha è la sua famiglia hanno ricevuto visti e assistenza per recarsi in Canada, dove hanno ottenuto un permesso di soggiorno permanente per motivi umanitari e caritatevoli.

L'imam Khalid Chishti, che era stato il primo ad accusarla, è stato processato per aver falsificato le prove, ma è stato poi assolto nell'agosto 2013 dopo che i testimoni a suo carico avevano modificato le proprie dichiarazioni in tribunale, presumibilmente in seguito a pressioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001501/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Arrest of Rimsha Masih in Pakistan: update

With reference to the answer to Question E-007645/2012, can the Commission provide an update on the fate of Rimsha Masih?

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

Rimsha Masih was released on bail after charges were dropped against her in September 2012 thanks to a rare show of opposition by Muslim clerics to what they saw as an unfounded accusation. She went into hiding with her family to escape the threat of violence that often befalls persons accused under the blasphemy laws even if they are cleared. She was acquitted of all charges in November 2012 by the Islamabad High Court. In early 2013 Rimsha and her family received visas and help to travel to Canada where they have been given permanent residency on humanitarian and compassionate grounds.

The Muslim cleric who had accused her in the first place, Khalid Chishti, was put on trial for fabricating evidence, but was acquitted of all charges in August 2013 after witnesses against him changed their statements in court, allegedly due to pressure.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001503/14
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(12 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Sytuacja uchodźców z Erytrei

Opublikowany w dniu 11 lutego br. raport organizacji „Human Rights Watch" pt. *„I Wanted to Lie Down and Die:" Trafficking and Torture of Eritreans in Sudan and Egypt dokumentuje tragiczną sytuację uchodźców z Erytrei, którzy zdecydowali się szukać schronienia poza ojczyzną*.

Raport zawiera relacje uchodźców, którzy przeszli piekło porwania i torturowania przez handlarzy żywym towarem. Proceder występuje we wschodnim Sudanie i na półwyspie Synaj. Osoba porwana zostaje przetransportowana na półwysep Synaj, gdzie jest następnie poddawana torturom, aby przekonać rodzinę do zapłaty okupu. Gdy zostaje wypuszczona na wolność, egipskie siły bezpieczeństwa aresztują ją jako nielegalnego imigranta, odmawiając prawa do kontaktów z rodziną czy organizacjami zajmującymi się pomocą.

Służby sudańskie i egipskie nie podejmują interwencji w zgłaszanych sprawach porwań dla okupu, gwałtów, podpaleń czy różnorakich form okaleczeń dokonywanych na uchodźcach.

W związku z tym proszę Wiceprzewodniczącą/Wysoką Przedstawiciel o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Jaka jest ocena Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel przedstawionej w raporcie HRW sytuacji?

2. Czy działania względem Egiptu i Sudanu, podejmowane za pośrednictwem europejskiej dyplomacji w zakresie promowania praw człowieka, demokracji i praworządności były wystarczające?

3. Czy i w jaki sposób Unia Europejska zamierza wpłynąć na poprawę sytuacji uchodźców z Erytrei szukających schronienia w Egipcie i Sudanie?

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

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest bardzo zaniepokojona sprawozdaniem organizacji Human Rights Watch oraz tragiczną sytuacją uchodźców z Erytrei przetrzymywanych przez handlarzy ludźmi we wschodnim Sudanie i na półwyspie Synaj.

UE uważnie śledzi sytuację związaną z handlem ludźmi oraz z uchodźcami w Sudanie, w Egipcie, a w szczególności w regionie Synaju i utrzymuje regularne kontakty z władzami, jak również z regionalnymi biurami Wysokiego Komisarza Narodów Zjednoczonych ds. Uchodźców oraz Międzynarodowej Organizacji ds. Migracji (UNHCR). UE współpracuje również z rządami państw Rogu Afryki oraz z innymi partnerami, takimi jak Unia Afrykańska i Międzyrządowy Organ ds. Rozwoju w celu rozwiązania przedmiotowych kwestii. Po tragedii na wyspie Lampedusa Komisja ustanowiła Śródziemnomorską Grupę Zadaniową.

W odniesieniu do Egiptu, UE angażuje się w dialog polityczny z odpowiednimi władzami egipskimi, wzywając je do rozwiązania istniejących problemów oraz do zadbania o to, aby prawa człowieka migrantów i uchodźców były w pełni przestrzegane. UE wielokrotnie zwracała się do Egiptu z wnioskiem o poprawę jakości pomocy i ochrony zapewnianej osobom ubiegającym się o azyl i uchodźcom przebywającym na lub przejeżdżających przez jego terytorium. Unia domagała się również od władz egipskich, by zapewniły poszanowanie zasady non-refoulement dla wszystkich migrantów potrzebujących ochrony międzynarodowej. W ramach tego dialogu UE podkreślała, że Wysoki Komisarz Narodów Zjednoczonych ds. Uchodźców powinien uzyskać możliwość pełnej realizacji swojego mandatu na całym terytorium Egiptu, w tym regionie Synaju.

UE finansuje również projekt regionalny „Wspieranie partnerów rządowych i pozarządowych w celu ochrony praw człowieka migrantów wzdłuż szlaku wschodnioafrykańskiego" wdrażany przez UNHCR i Międzynarodową Organizację ds. Migracji w celu zajęcia się kwestiami przemytu i nielegalnego handlu w Egipcie, Etiopii i Sudanie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001503/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation of refugees from Eritrea

A report by Human Rights Watch published on 11 February 2014 entitled '"I Wanted to Lie Down and Die:" Trafficking and Torture of Eritreans in Sudan and Egypt' documents the tragic situation of refugees from Eritrea who decide to seek refuge outside their homeland.

The report includes accounts by refugees who have gone through the hell of kidnapping and torture by human traffickers, which takes place in eastern Sudan and the Sinai Peninsula. Victims are kidnapped and taken to the Sinai Peninsula, where they are first tortured in order to persuade their families to pay a ransom. When they are released, they are arrested by the Egyptian security forces as illegal immigrants and denied any contact with their families or organisations providing help.

The Sudanese and Egyptian authorities do not intervene in alleged cases of kidnapping for ransom, rape, burning or the various forms of mutilation inflicted on refugees.

1. What is the assessment of the Vice-President/High Representative of the report by Human Rights Watch?

2. Have members of the European Diplomatic Service taken sufficient action to promote human rights, democracy and the rule of law in Egypt and Sudan?

3. Does the European Union intend to take action to improve the situation of refugees from Eritrea seeking refuge in Egypt and Sudan, and if so, what does it plan to do?

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

The HR/VP is very concerned by the Human Rights Watch Report and the tragic situation of Eritrean refugees in the hands of human traffickers in Eastern Sudan and the Sinai Peninsula.

The EU follows closely the situation of human trafficking and refugees in Sudan, Egypt and in particular in the Sinai and keeps regular contacts with the authorities as well as with the regional offices of UNHCR and the International Organisation for Migration. The EU is also working with governments of the Horn of Africa and with partners, such as the African Union and the Inter-Governmental Authority for Development, to address the issues concerned. After the Lampedusa tragedy, the Commission launched a Task Force for the Mediterranean.

As regards Egypt, the EU engages in political dialogue with the relevant Egyptian authorities, urging them to address the problem and to ensure that human rights of migrants and refugees are fully respected. The EU has repeatedly invited Egypt to improve the quality of the assistance and the protection offered to asylum-seekers and refugees residing in or transiting its territory. It has pressed the Egyptian authorities to ensure that the principle of non-refoulement is observed for all migrants in need of international protection. In the dialogue the EU emphasises that the UNHCR should be given full possibility to implement its mandate on the entire territory of Egypt, including the Sinai region.

Finally, the EU is funding a regional project ('Supporting governmental and non-governmental partners to protect migrants' human rights along the East African Route') implemented by UNHCR and IOM to address smuggling and trafficking in Egypt, Ethiopia and Sudan.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001504/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(12 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Impactul migrației în UE

Libera circulație a persoanelor este un drept fundamental garantat cetățenilor Uniunii Europene (UE) de tratate. Parte a cadrului legal și instituțional al UE, cooperarea Schengen a fost treptat extinsă pentru a include majoritatea statelor membre UE, precum și unele țări din afara UE.

În ultimii ani, punerea sub semnul întrebării a liberei circulații, precum și încercările de îngrădire și denigrare a acesteia au devenit din ce în ce mai numeroase, iar concepte precum „turismul pentru beneficii sociale" sau „dumping social" au devenit parte a unei retorici populiste cel puțin îngrijorătoare, nu doar la nivelul statelor membre.

Toate acestea apar în contextul în care diverse studii arată faptul că puterea de muncă a imigranților aduce cu ea creștere economică, iar aceștia contribuie mai mult decât beneficiază de pe urma ajutoarelor sociale.

Comisia a condamnat astfel de derapaje și a cerut statelor membre în cauză să prezinte dovezi în sprijinul așa-zisului fenomen al turismului social, publicând în data de 11 februarie 2014 un studiu privind integrarea cetățenilor mobili din UE în șase orașe.

Cu toate acestea, are în vedere Comisia realizarea unui studiu amplu la nivelul UE sau chiar al întregului Spațiu Economic European centrat pe impactul migrației și o analiză costuri-beneficii a acestui fenomen?

Ce fel de măsuri și/sau sancțiuni pot fi adoptate împotriva statelor în cauză și cum poate fi consolidat principiul fundamental al liberei circulații în viitor?

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(2 aprilie 2014)

Comisia a reafirmat recent importanța și beneficiile liberei circulații a cetățenilor UE în comunicarea sa din 25 noiembrie 2013 intitulată „Libera circulație a cetățenilor Uniunii Europene și a familiilor acestora: cinci acțiuni pentru a produce rezultate notabile" ([1]).

Comisia și-a formulat argumentele în baza datelor primite de la autoritățile statelor membre și a unei serii de studii foarte recente întreprinse deja la nivelul UE, dintre care multe sunt citate în comunicare, studii care ilustrează foarte bine impactul mobilității cetățenilor europeni în interiorul UE.

În ceea ce privește aplicarea Directivei privind libera circulație, Comisia duce o politică riguroasă de asigurare a respectării legislației, în vederea realizării depline și corecte a transpunerii și a aplicării normelor UE în materie de liberă circulație în întreaga Uniune. Ca urmare a acțiunilor de constatare a neîndeplinirii obligațiilor inițiate în ultimii ani, majoritatea statelor membre au adoptat sau s-au angajat să adopte rapid măsurile necesare pentru a transpune pe deplin și în mod corect normele UE în materie de liberă circulație. De asemenea, Comisia asigură respectarea normelor specifice ale UE privind libera circulație a lucrătorilor ([2]).

Comisia nu va ezita să ia în continuare măsuri pentru a apăra dreptul la liberă circulație.

În plus, Comisia a propus anul trecut o directivă menită să faciliteze exercitarea drepturilor conferite în contextul liberei circulații a lucrătorilor. Propunerea a fost aprobată de Parlamentul European la 12 martie 2014, iar aprobarea finală din partea Consiliului este așteptată în curând.

([1]) COM(2013) 837 final — http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0837&qid=1396251711368&from=EN
([2]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 492/2011 privind libera circulație a lucrătorilor în cadrul Uniunii.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001504/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Impact of migration in the EU

The free movement of persons is a fundamental right of EU citizens guaranteed under the Treaties. The EU legal and institutional framework provisions for cooperation under the Schengen Agreement have been progressively extended to most of the EU Member States and a number of third countries.

In recent years, attempts to undermine, restrict and contest freedom of movement within the Member States and elsewhere, as evidenced for example by the use of populist catchphrases such as 'benefits tourism' or 'social dumping', have been giving increasing cause for concern.

At the same time, various studies have shown that the immigrant workforce in fact contributes far more to economic growth than it takes away in the form of welfare assistance.

The Commission has already expressed its disapproval of the populist rhetoric referred to above and has challenged the Member States concerned to produce evidence of benefits tourism. On 11 February 2014, it published a study on the integration of mobile EU citizens in six cities.

In view of this:

Does the Commission intend to carry out a comprehensive study of the impact of migration on the EU or even the entire European Economic Area, giving a cost-benefit analysis thereof?

What measures and/or sanctions can be adopted with regard to the offending countries and what action can be taken in future to uphold the fundamental principle of freedom of movement?

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

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

The Commission based its argumentation on data received by Member States' authorities and a number of very recent studies already carried out at EU level, many of which are cited in the communication, which illustrate well the impact of EU intra mobility in the EU.

As regards the application of the Free Movement Directive, the Commission is pursuing a rigorous enforcement policy with a view to achieving the full and correct transposition and application of EU free movement rules across the EU. As a result of the infringement proceedings launched in the last few years, most Member States adopted or committed to swiftly adopt the provisions necessary to fully and correctly transpose the EU free movement rules. It is also ensuring that the specific EU rules on the freedom of movement of workers ([2]) are fully respected.

The Commission will not hesitate to further pursue its action to uphold the right of free movement.

Additionally, the Commission has proposed last year a directive to facilitate the exercise of rights conferred in the context of the free movement of workers, approved by the European Parliament on 12 March 2014, and for which final approval from the Council is expected soon.

([1]) COM(2013) 837 final — http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/document/files/com_2013_837_free-movement_en.pdf
([2]) Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 on the free movement of workers within the Union.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001511/14
alla Commissione
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Impianto di smaltimento e recupero nel comune di San Floro (CZ), in località Battaglina

Nel comune di San Floro (CZ), in località Battaglina, la società *Sirim s.r.l.* ha avviato i lavori di realizzazione di un impianto di smaltimento e recupero rifiuti denominato «*Isola ecologica Battaglina*» avente dimensioni più che considerevoli (trattandosi di impianto appartenente al codice IPPC 5.1. «Impianti per l'eliminazione o il recupero di rifiuti pericolosi…», 5.4. «Discariche che ricevono più di 10 tonnellate al giorno o con una capacità totale di oltre 25.000 tonnellate, ad esclusione delle discariche per i rifiuti inerti»).

Premesso che:

— l'autorizzazione alla *Sirim s.r.l* è stata concessa con decreto regionale n. 16278 dell'8.9.2009 adottato dal dipartimento Politiche dell'ambiente della regione Calabria previa visione, fra l'altro, del decreto legislativo 18.2.2005 n. 59 «Attuazione integrale della direttiva 96/61/CE relativa alla prevenzione e riduzione integrale dell'inquinamento»;

— in sede giudiziaria sono stati sollevati problemi di legittimità di tale autorizzazione, visto che l'intervento era posto in area soggetta a ben cinque vincoli inibitori assoluti — idrogeologico, paesaggistico e ambientale, usi civici, vincolo assoluto conseguente ad un incendio verificatosi nel 2007 e rischio sismico essendo classificata zona a livello 1;

— la direttiva CEE 422/75 relativa ai rifiuti all'articolo 3 b)i) richiede «il ricupero dei rifiuti mediante riciclo, reimpiego, riutilizzo o ogni altra azione intesa a ottenere materie prime secondarie» senza creare rischi per l'acqua, l'aria, il suolo e per la fauna e la flora; (articolo 4);

— in base al combinato disposto del considerando 22 e dell'articolo 13, comma 1, della suddetta direttiva 96/61/CE sulla prevenzione e la riduzione integrate dell'inquinamento, «gli Stati membri adottano le misure necessarie affinché le autorità competenti riesaminino periodicamente e aggiornino, se necessario, le condizioni dell'autorizzazione; che in talune circostanze esse saranno comunque riesaminate»;

può la Commissione precisare se:

intende intervenire in modo da fare tutto quello che è in suo potere affinché l'autorizzazione rilasciata dalla regione Calabria possa essere riesaminata, così da fugare ogni ragionevole dubbio riguardo al rispetto della direttiva 96/61/CE e dei vincoli a cui l'area è soggetta?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

Spetta alle autorità competenti degli Stati membri garantire la conformità delle autorizzazioni a tutte le pertinenti norme unionali recepite negli ordinamenti nazionali. Nel caso specifico, la direttiva 2010/75/UE ([1]) sulle emissioni industriali ha abrogato e sostituito sei direttive UE, fra cui la direttiva 2008/1/CE ([2]) sulla prevenzione e la riduzione integrate dell'inquinamento (direttiva IPPC), a decorrere dal 7 gennaio 2014. Le autorizzazioni per impianti rilasciate a norma della direttiva IPPC dovevano essere riesaminate e, se necessario, aggiornate entro il 7 gennaio 2014 per garantirne la conformità alla direttiva sulle emissioni industriali.

Inoltre, la direttiva sulle emissioni industriali impone alle autorità competenti degli Stati membri di riesaminare e aggiornare le autorizzazioni entro 4 anni dalla pubblicazione di una pertinente decisione di esecuzione della Commissione contenente le conclusioni delle BAT (migliori tecniche disponibili). Tali conclusioni per quanto riguarda le attività di trattamento dei rifiuti sono attualmente in fase di elaborazione.

Poiché l'installazione cui si fa riferimento comprende una discarica, la relativa autorizzazione deve anche adempiere al disposto della direttiva 1999/31/CE ([3]) sulle discariche di rifiuti.

([1]) GU L 334 del 17.12.2010.
([2]) GU L 24 del 29.1.2008 (versione codificata della direttiva 96/61/CE).
([3]) GU L 182 del 16.7.1999.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001511/14
to the Commission
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Battaglina waste disposal and recovery plant in the municipality of San Floro (Catanzaro)

In Battaglina, part of the municipality of San Floro (Catanzaro), the operating company, Sirim s.r.l., has begun work on a very large waste disposal and recovery plant, the 'Isola ecologica Battaglina', which belongs to IPPC categories 5.1 ('Installations for the disposal or recovery of hazardous waste') and 5.4 ('Landfills receiving more than 10 tonnes per day or with a total capacity exceeding 25 000 tonnes, excluding landfills of inert waste').

Given that:

— the permit issued to Sirim s.r.l. was granted under Regional Decree No 16278 of 8 September 2009, adopted by the Calabrian regional Environment Policy Department after taking cognisance of Legislative Decree No 59 of 18 February 2005 giving full effect to Directive 96/61/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control;

— the lawfulness of that permit has been challenged in court, as the projected construction site lies in an area subject to absolute restrictions of no fewer than five types: hydrogeological restrictions, environmental protection and scenic restrictions, restrictions on forest privileges, an absolute restriction resulting from a fire in 2007, and a restriction due to the seismic risk, the area being classified at level 1;

— Article 3(b)(i) of Directive 75/422/EEC on waste calls for 'the recovery of waste by means of recycling, re-use or reclamation or any other process with a view to extracting secondary raw materials', without causing any risk to water, air, soil, or plants and animals (Article 4);

— under Article 13(1) of the abovementioned Directive 96/61/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control, in conjunction with Recital 22, 'Member States … [are required to] take the necessary measures to ensure that competent authorities periodically reconsider and, where necessary, update permit conditions'; and the directive stipulates in addition that, in certain circumstances, 'The reconsideration … [must] be undertaken in any event':

will the Commission do its utmost to ensure that the permit issued by the Calabrian regional authorities can be reconsidered in order to dispel all reasonable doubt as to compliance with Directive 96/61/EC and with the restrictions applying to the area concerned?

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

It is for the competent authorities of Member States to ensure that permits are in compliance with all relevant EU legislation as transposed into national law. In this particular case, the Industrial Emissions Directive 2010/75/EU ([1]) (IED) abrogated and replaced six EU Directives, including the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive 2008/1/EC (IPPC) ([2]) as of 7 January 2014. The permits granted to installations under the IPPC Directive had to be reconsidered and, if necessary, updated by 7 January 2014 to ensure their compliance with the IED Directive.

In addition, the IED Directive requires Member States' competent authorities to reconsider and update permits within 4 years of publication of a relevant Commission Implementing Decision laying down Conclusions on best available techniques. Such conclusions for waste treatment activities are currently in preparation.

As this particular installation includes a landfill, the permit should also comply with the requirements of Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste ([3]).

([1]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.
([2]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2008 (codified version of Directive 96/61/EC).
([3]) OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001513/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Abolizione dell'obbligo del visto per i cittadini turchi

Si apprende che l'obiettivo del dialogo tra l'UE e la Turchia sulla liberalizzazione dei visti dipende dalle decisioni che la Commissione europea prenderà sulla base dei progressi che devono essere compiuti dalla Turchia rispetto a una serie di parametri di riferimento.

Può la Commissione specificare quali sono questi parametri di riferimento?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001647/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Accordi di riammissione tra UE e Turchia degli immigrati clandestini

In riferimento all'accordo firmato tra UE e Turchia sulla riammissione degli immigrati clandestini, si desume che la Turchia è pronta a sospendere tale accordo nel caso in cui l'UE non tenga fede ai suoi impegni, ossia non proceda con l'abolizione dei visti di ingresso di breve periodo verso l'UE.

Conferma la Commissione questo atteggiamento ricattatorio della Turchia nei confronti dell'UE?

Stante che Ankara dovrebbe affrontare riforme sostanziali in materia di sicurezza, migrazione, gestione dell'ordine pubblico e giustizia, può la Commissione chiarire in quali specifici ambiti la Turchia dovrà realizzare tali riforme?

Risposta congiunta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(30 aprile 2014)

I parametri di riferimento sulla cui base saranno valutati i progressi della Turchia nell'ambito del dialogo sulla liberalizzazione dei visti figurano nella tabella di marcia per un regime di esenzione dal visto con la Turchia ([1]). Rispettando tali parametri la Turchia conseguirà importanti progressi in diversi settori: sicurezza dei documenti, gestione delle migrazioni, politica in materia di visti, protezione internazionale, prevenzione e lotta contro la criminalità organizzata, il terrorismo e la corruzione, cooperazione giudiziaria e certi aspetti dei diritti fondamentali.

Nei parametri rientra anche la riammissione dei migranti irregolari, in particolare la ratifica dell'accordo di riammissione UE — Turchia e l'attuazione piena e efficace dell'accordo in tutte le sue disposizioni, in modo tale da fornire prove solide del fatto che le procedure di riammissione funzionano correttamente in relazione a tutti gli Stati membri.

Lo scopo ultimo della liberalizzazione dei visti sarà raggiunto quando la Commissione avrà deciso, in base ai progressi realizzati dalla Turchia rispetto a tali parametri, che è opportuno presentare una proposta per revocare l'obbligo di visto e il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio avranno adottato tale proposta.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/news/news/docs/20131216-roadmap_towards_the_visa-free_regime_with_turkey_en.pdf (solo in inglese).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001513/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Lifting of visa requirements for Turkish nationals

The dialogue between the EU and Turkey on visa liberalisation apparently depends on decisions to be made by the Commission on the basis on the progress made by Turkey on a number of benchmarks.

Can the Commission say what those benchmarks are?

Question for written answer E-001647/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: EU-Turkey agreement on the readmission of illegal immigrants

Turkey has apparently said that it will suspend the agreement on the readmission of illegal immigrants that it signed with the EU if the latter fails to honour its undertaking to lift short-stay visa requirements for Turkish citizens.

Is Turkey really holding the EU to ransom in this way?

Given that Turkey has agreed to enact major reforms in the areas of security, migration, law enforcement and justice, can the Commission say exactly what those reforms involve?

Joint answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2014)

The benchmarks against which Turkey's progress will be assessed in the visa liberalisation dialogue are listed in the 'Roadmap towards a visa-free regime with Turkey' ([1]). The fulfilment of these benchmarks will constitute important progress in a number of areas, such as document security, migration management, visa policy, international protection, preventing and fighting organised crime, terrorism and corruption, judicial cooperation as well as certain aspects of fundamental rights.

The above requirements also include readmission of irregular migrants, in particular ratification of the EU-Turkey readmission agreement, and full and effective implementation of the agreement in all its provisions, in such a manner as to provide a solid track record of the fact that readmission procedures function properly in relation to all Member States.

The final goal of visa liberalisation will be achieved once the Commission decides that, on the basis of the progress made by Turkey against these benchmarks, it is appropriate to submit a proposal to lift the visa obligation, and the European Parliament and the Council have agreed on that proposal.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/news/news/docs/20131216-roadmap_towards_the_visa-free_regime_with_turkey_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001514/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Accordo di associazione UE-Turchia

Nel 2012 si denunciava che la Turchia, per il sesto anno consecutivo, non aveva ancora attuato gli obblighi derivanti dall'accordo di associazione UE-Turchia e del suo protocollo aggiuntivo.

La Commissione può informare circa l'attuazione dell'accordo citato?

In caso positivo, in quali misure questo accordo è stato concretizzato da parte della Turchia?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(11 aprile 2014)

Nelle sue relazioni annuali la Commissione riferisce in merito ai progressi compiuti sull'attuazione, da parte della Turchia, dell'accordo di associazione.

Nella relazione sui progressi del 2013 ([1]), la Commissione ha presentato un'analisi dettagliata degli sforzi di allineamento della Turchia, anche per quanto riguarda i criteri politici e la capacità di assumere gli obblighi che comporta l'adesione. Per quanto riguarda questi ultimi, la Commissione ha osservato che la Turchia ha raggiunto un elevato grado di allineamento in alcuni settori, quali la libera circolazione delle merci e la politica commerciale comune. Sono necessari ulteriori sforzi significativi per colmare le lacune ancora esistenti, tra cui alcuni ostacoli tecnici agli scambi.

La Commissione ha osservato che la Turchia non ha rispettato l'obbligo di assicurare l'attuazione piena e non discriminatoria del protocollo aggiuntivo all'accordo di associazione e non ha eliminato tutti gli ostacoli alla libera circolazione delle merci, comprese le limitazioni delle linee di collegamento diretto con Cipro.

I progressi su queste priorità di riforma sono incoraggiati e controllati dagli organismi istituiti nell'ambito dell'accordo di associazione, ossia il comitato di associazione e il consiglio di associazione.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001514/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: EU-Turkey association agreement

It was reported in 2012 that, for the sixth year running, Turkey had failed to meet its obligations under the EU-Turkey association agreement and the additional protocol to that agreement.

Can the Commission provide any information on the implementation of the agreement?

To what extent has Turkey has the agreement been honoured by Turkey?

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

The Commission reports on the implementation by Turkey of the Association Agreement in its annual Progress Reports.

In the 2013 Progress Report ([1]), the Commission presented a detailed analysis of Turkey's alignment efforts, including on the political criteria and the ability to take on the obligations of membership. As regards the latter, the Commission noted that Turkey has reached a high level of alignment in some areas, including free movement of goods and common commercial policy. Further significant efforts are needed to address the remaining gaps including some technical barriers to trade.

The Commission has noted that Turkey has not fulfilled its obligation to ensure full and non-discriminatory implementation of the additional protocol to the Association Agreement and has not removed all obstacles to the free movement of goods, including restrictions on direct transport links with Cyprus.

Progress on the reform priorities is encouraged and monitored by the bodies set up under the Association Agreement: the Association Committee and the Association Council.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001515/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Finanziamenti europei alla Turchia per agevolare la presenza femminile nel mercato del lavoro

La Turchia ha ricevuto finanziamenti dall'UE per progetti riguardanti l'inclusione delle donne nel mondo del lavoro.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. l'entità di tali finanziamenti e il periodo di riferimento;

2. quali sono i progetti e i settori coinvolti e se i fondi erogati sono stati impiegati correttamente?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001642/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Partecipazione delle donne turche al mondo del lavoro

In Turchia la partecipazione delle donne al mondo del lavoro è scarsissima, molto al di sotto degli obiettivi previsti dalla strategia UE 2020. Ciò dipende anche dalle condizioni e dagli orari di lavoro, nonché dalla retribuzione.

La Commissione può fornire dati aggiornati circa la partecipazione delle donne turche al mondo del lavoro e in quali settori?

La Commissione è a conoscenza se il governo di Erdogan sta incoraggiando la presenza femminile nel mercato del lavoro?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

Stando alle informazioni ufficiali, nel 2013 il tasso annuale di partecipazione delle donne alla forza lavoro in Turchia era del 30,8 % (contro il 71,5 % per gli uomini). Il tasso annuale di occupazione femminile era del 27,1 % (contro il 65,2 % per gli uomini). Le donne lavorano prevalentemente nel terziario (48 %), seguito dall'agricoltura (37 %, per la maggior parte come coadiuvanti familiari non retribuiti) e dall'industria (15 %).

Sebbene le autorità turche abbiano definito strategie volte a correggere queste disparità (come la strategia nazionale per l'occupazione, con il relativo piano d'azione, e il piano nazionale per lo sviluppo), l'occupazione femminile costituisce tuttora una questione problematica.

Dal 2008 l'UE ha erogato alla Turchia circa 68 milioni di EUR nell'ambito dello strumento di preadesione (IPA) per favorire l'accesso delle donne al mercato del lavoro. Il progetto Misure attive per il mercato del lavoro (12 000 000 EUR) è attuato dalle organizzazioni della società civile e dagli enti locali. Il progetto Promozione dell'occupazione femminile (23 000 000 EUR) ha sostenuto 131 progetti nelle regioni più povere della Turchia, aiutando inoltre l'agenzia turca per l'occupazione (ISKUR) ad attuare misure specifiche a favore delle donne. Il progetto Promozione della parità di genere nella vita lavorativa (950 000 EUR) mirava a colmare le lacune legislative del diritto del lavoro e della normativa sulla previdenza sociale in termini di parità di genere. Il programma Imprenditoria femminile (32 000 000 EUR), che sarà attuato a partire dall'estate 2014 insieme alla Banca europea per la ricostruzione e lo sviluppo, faciliterà l'accesso ai finanziamenti per le imprese a conduzione femminile e favorirà la creazione di posti di lavoro.

La Commissione effettua regolarmente verifiche contabili delle operazioni e dei sistemi di gestione e controllo predisposti in relazione ai fondi IPA. Le autorità turche hanno adottato misure correttive per risolvere le questioni individuate in occasione di dette verifiche.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001515/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: EU funding for projects to help women gain access to the labour market in Turkey

Turkey has received EU funding from projects to help women gain access to the labour market.

1. How much funding has been provided, and over what period?

2. What projects and what sectors are involved, and has the money been used properly?

Question for written answer E-001642/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Turkish women at the workplace

In Turkey, the percentage of women in employment is extremely low and well below the EU 2020 strategy objectives. This can be attributed in part to working hours, conditions of employment and pay.

Can the Commission provide updated information regarding the percentage of women in employment and in which sectors?

Does the Commission know whether the Erdogan administration is doing anything to encourage women to enter the employment market?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

According to official information, the annual female labour force participation rate in Turkey in 2013 was 30.8% (71.5% for men). The annual female employment rate was 27.1% (65.2% for men). Women are predominantly active in the services sector (48%) followed by agriculture (37%, mostly as unpaid family workers) and industry (15%).

The Turkish authorities have developed strategies aimed at addressing those disparities (such as the National Employment Strategy and Action Plan or the National Development Plan). However, women's employment remains a challenge.

Since 2008, the EU has provided to Turkey ca. EUR 68 million under the instrument for pre-accession assistance (IPA) to support the access of women to the labour market. The Active Labour Market Measures project (EUR 12 000 000) implemented by civil society organisations and local authorities. The Promoting Women's Employment project (EUR 23 000 000) supported 131 projects in the poorer regions of Turkey, also helping the Turkish Employment Agency (ISKUR) to implement specific measures targeting women. The Promoting Gender Equality in Working Life project (EUR 950 000) addressed the legislative gaps in the labour and social security legislation on gender equality. The Women in Business programme (EUR 32 000 000), which will be implemented from summer 2014 with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, will facilitate access to finance for women-led businesses and help job creation.

The Commission regularly audits operations and management and control systems put in place for the implementation of IPA funds. The Turkish authorities have taken corrective actions to address the findings identified during these audits.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001516/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Aperture verso la minoranza cristiana in Turchia

Nel pacchetto di democratizzazione presentato il 30 settembre 2013 il premier Erdogan ha sottolineato che sono previsti «gesti» verso le minoranze religiose, tra cui quella cristiana.

Può la Commissione specificare quali saranno, in concreto, queste aperture?

Vigilerà affinché le parole del premier Erdogan siano effettivamente messe in pratica?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

Il pacchetto sulla democratizzazione annunciato il 30 settembre 2013 prevedeva la restituzione delle terre al monastero siriaco ortodosso Mor Gabriel. Il 7 ottobre 2013 il Consiglio delle fondazioni ha restituito le terre, che erano state trasferite all'Erario in seguito a una sentenza della Corte di cassazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001516/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Concessions towards the Christian minority in Turkey

When he presented the 'democratisation package' on 30 September 2013, the Turkish Prime Minister stressed that concessions would be made towards religious minorities, including Christians.

Can the Commission say exactly what those concessions will be?

Will it look to see that Mr Erdogan keeps his word?

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

The democratisation package announced on 30 September 2013 provided for the return of property to the Mor Gabriel Syriac Orthodox Monastery. On 7 October 2013, the Foundations Council returned the lands that had been transferred to the Treasury pursuant to a Court of Cassation ruling.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001517/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Ďalší ukrajinský obrat vo vzťahu k EÚ

Najnovší vývoj udalostí na Ukrajine smeruje k ďalšiemu obratu v integračných zámeroch. Vysokí ukrajinskí predstavitelia predostreli vôľu čoskoro podpísať Asociačnú dohodu (AA). Postoj Ukrajiny sa tak mení už druhýkrát v priebehu pomerne krátkeho obdobia. Zmena ukrajinských preferencií by však, podľa všetkého, rozhnevala Ruskú federáciu.

Akým spôsobom by mohla Komisia prispieť k tomu, aby sa už i tak pomerne napätá situácia stále viac nevyhrocovala? Má kompetencie ovplyvniť zásahy ozbrojených zložiek voči demonštrantom?

Odpoveď vysokej predstaviteľky Únie a podpredsedníčky Komisie Catherine Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(15. apríla 2014)

O Ukrajine sa najnovšie diskutovalo na zasadnutí Európskej rady, ktoré sa konalo 20. marca. Európska únia a jej členské štáty odsúdili narušenie zvrchovanosti a územnej celistvosti Ukrajiny ruskými ozbrojenými silami a vyzvali Rusko, aby stiahlo svoje ozbrojené sily do oblastí ich stáleho rozmiestnenia v súlade s príslušnými dohodami. Vyzvali k mierovému riešeniu na základe rokovaní medzi Ruskom a Ukrajinou pri plnom rešpektovaní medzinárodného práva. Okrem pozastavenia rokovaní s Ruskom o otázkach víz a novej dohode, o ktorom rozhodli hlavy štátov a vlád EÚ 6. marca, Rada pre zahraničné veci 17. marca s ohľadom na absenciu krokov vedúcich k znižovaniu napätia rozhodla zaviesť cestovné obmedzenia a zmrazenie aktív vzťahujúce sa na osoby zodpovedné za konanie narúšajúce alebo ohrozujúce územnú celistvosť, zvrchovanosť a nezávislosť Ukrajiny. Vzhľadom na to, že naďalej nedošlo k uskutočneniu krokov vedúcich k zmierňovaniu napätia, Európska Rada 20. marca rozhodla rozšíriť zoznam osôb, na ktoré sa vzťahuje zákaz udeľovania víz a zmrazenie aktív. EÚ oceňuje zdržanlivú reakciu novej ukrajinskej vlády a nabáda ju, aby pokračovala v zapájaní všetkých ukrajinských regiónov a skupín obyvateľstva s cieľom zabezpečiť ochranu práv menšín v plnej miere.

Je mimoriadne dôležité, aby vláda Ukrajiny urýchlene prijala ambiciózny program štrukturálnych reforiem. Európska únia poskytuje na tento účel balík pomoci, ktorý by Ukrajine mohol priniesť minimálne 11 mld. EUR vo forme úverov a grantov. EÚ 21. marca podpísala politickú časť dohody o pridružení s Ukrajinou a čoskoro prijme jednostranné obchodné opatrenia, aby Ukrajine umožnila dosiahnuť včasné výhody prehĺbenej a komplexnej zóny voľného obchodu, ktorá sa má vytvoriť.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001517/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Another turn for the worse in Ukraine-EU relations

The latest developments in Ukraine are leading towards another about-turn in plans for integration. Senior Ukrainian officials have expressed their intention to sign the Association Agreement (AA) shortly. This signals a second change in Ukraine's position during a relatively short space of time. However, a change in Ukraine's preferences would, in all likelihood, anger the Russian Federation.

How could the Commission ensure that this already relatively tense situation does not continue to escalate? Does it have the power to influence interventions by the armed forces against demonstrators?

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

Ukraine was discussed most recently in the European Council on 20 March. The EU and its Member States have condemned the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity by Russian forces and called on Russia to withdraw its forces to the areas of their permanent stationing, in accordance with relevant agreements. They encouraged a peaceful solution, negotiated between Russia and Ukraine, in full respect of international law. In addition to suspending talks with Russia on visa matters and the New Agreement, as decided by the EU Heads of State and Government on 6 March, and in the absence of de-escalation steps, the Foreign Affairs Council decided on 17 March to introduce travel restrictions and asset freezes against persons responsible for actions which undermine or threaten the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine. The European Council on 20 March decided, in the continued absence of de-escalation steps to expand the list of individuals subject to visa bans and asset freezes. The EU commends the measured response shown by the new Ukrainian Government, and encourages it to continue reaching out to all Ukrainian regions and population groups to ensure minorities' rights are fully protected

It is essential that the Ukrainian government swiftly embarks on an ambitious structural reform programme. To this end, the EU is providing a support package which could bring Ukraine at least EUR 11 billion in loans and grants. The EU signed the political part of the Association Agreement with Ukraine on 21 March, and will soon adopt unilateral trade measures to allow Ukraine early benefits from the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area to be established.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001518/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Podpísaná dohoda EÚ – Turecko o imigrácii

Výmenou za vyhliadku zrušenia vízovej povinnosti pre tureckých občanov cestujúcich do členských štátov Únie sa Turecko postará o ilegálnych migrantov vstupujúcich na pôdu EÚ neoprávnene cez jeho územie. Práve toto je podstatou dohody, ku ktorej EÚ a Turecko dospelo v ostatnom období. Snahou je predovšetkým odstrániť vízovú povinnosť pre tureckých občanov, ktorí cestujú do schengenského priestoru na krátkodobé návštevy.

Hoci sa predpokladá, že okamžitý efekt dohôd bude pravdepodobne malý, je v možnostiach Komisie dohliadnuť, aby predmetná dohoda bola dôsledne dodržiavaná a aby nedošlo k jej zneužívaniu?

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001530/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Dohoda o imigrácii EÚ – Turecko

V posledných dňoch uzavrela Európska komisia v Ankare dohodu, na základe ktorej by mal v časovom horizonte troch rokov vzniknúť medzi Európskou úniou a Tureckom bezvízový styk. Paralelne bola podpísaná aj ďalšia dohoda, na základe ktorej sa Turecko zaväzuje k readmisii ilegálnych migrantov, ktorí smerujú na územie členských štátov Únie. Obe dohody však ešte musia byť ratifikované na pôde Európskeho parlamentu, v Rade EÚ, ako aj vo Veľkom národnom zhromaždení Turecka.

Neobáva sa Komisia, že v prípade liberalizácie vízového režimu s Tureckom vzrastie organizovaná kriminalita?

Akým spôsobom bude Komisia posudzovať schopnosť Turecka naplniť readmisnú dohodu a schopnosť účinne a bezpečne spravovať svoje hranice?

Spoločná odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie
(14. apríla 2014)

Komisia podpísala 16. decembra 2013 readmisnú dohodu EÚ s Tureckom a začala dialóg s tureckými orgánmi, pokiaľ ide o liberalizáciu vízového režimu.

Monitoring vykonávania readmisnej dohody bude vykonávať Komisia v úzkom kontakte so všetkými zúčastnenými členskými štátmi EÚ. Akékoľvek prípadné zistené problémy sa budú riešiť prostredníctvom spoločného readmisného výboru, ktorý bude zriadený po nadobudnutí platnosti príslušnej dohody.

Dialóg o liberalizácii vízového režimu, ktorý sa začal 16. decembra 2013, bude spočívať najmä v kontrole právnych predpisov, správnych postupov a zdrojov Turecka s cieľom posúdiť pokrok, ktorý táto krajina dosiahla, pokiaľ ide o splnenie požiadaviek stanovených Komisiou v dokumente nazvanom „Plán na dosiahnutie bezvízového režimu s Tureckom“ („Roadmap towards visa-free regime with Turkey)“.

Jedna z kapitol tohto dokumentu je celá venovaná vymedzeniu oblastí, v ktorých by turecké orgány mali vylepšiť svoju schopnosť predchádzať organizovanej trestnej činnosti a bojovať proti nej a nadviazať účinnú policajnú a súdnu spoluprácu s predmetnými členskými štátmi EÚ.

Komisia nepodá návrh Rady a Parlamentu, aby sa zrušila vízová povinnosť, ktorá sa v súčasnosti vzťahuje na tureckých občanov, pokiaľ nebude môcť potvrdiť, že požiadavky stanovené v uvedenom pláne sú efektívne splnené.

Komisia zaujala tento postoj práve s cieľom vyhnúť sa zrušeniu vízovej povinnosti pred tým, ako turecké orgány získajú nástroje potrebné na predchádzanie možným nepriaznivým dôsledkom takéhoto zrušenia a preukážu plnú ochotu a pripravenosť spolupracovať s EÚ pri ich riešení.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001518/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: The signed EU-Turkey immigration agreement

In exchange for the prospect of cancelling the visa regime for Turkish citizens travelling to EU Member States, Turkey is to tackle the issue of illegal immigrants entering the EU without authorisation through its territory. This is the basis of a recent agreement between the EU and Turkey. The main aim is to remove the visa obligation for Turkish citizens travelling to the Schengen Area on short-term visits.

Although the immediate impact of the agreements is expected to be slight, is it within the Commission's capabilities to ensure that the agreement in question is properly observed and not abused?

Question for written answer E-001530/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: EU-Turkey immigration agreement

In recent days, the European Commission signed a deal in Ankara which paves the way to a visa-free regime between the European Union and Turkey within three years. At the same time, another agreement was signed binding Turkey to readmit illegal immigrants heading for European Union Member States. Both agreements, however, must still be ratified by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union as well as the Grand National Assembly of Turkey.

Is the Commission concerned that organised crime will grow as a result of the liberalisation of the visa regime with Turkey?

How will the Commission assess Turkey's ability to fulfil the readmission agreement and its ability to manage its borders safely and effectively?

Joint answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

On 16 December 2013, the Commission signed the EU-Turkey readmission agreement and started the visa liberalisation dialogue with Turkish authorities.

Monitoring of the implementation of the readmission agreement will be carried out by the Commission, in close contact with all the EU Member States participating. Any problems identified will be addressed via the Joint Readmission Committee which will be established soon after the entry into force of the agreement.

The visa liberalisation dialogue, which was started on 16 December 2013, will primarily consist in a screening of legislation, administrative practices and resources of Turkey, with the objective of assessing the progress made by this country in fulfilling the requirements set by the Commission in the document called 'Roadmap towards visa-free regime with Turkey'.

One of the chapters of this document is entirely devoted to identifying areas where Turkish authorities should improve their capacity to prevent and combat organised crime, and to establish effective police and judicial cooperation with those of the EU Member States.

The Commission will not propose to the Council and the Parliament to lift the visa obligation currently imposed on Turkish citizens until and unless it is able to confirm that the requirements of the Roadmap are effectively fulfilled.

The Commission follows this approach exactly in view of avoiding that the removal of the visa obligation may take place before that Turkish authorities have acquired the instruments necessary to prevent possible adverse effects and have demonstrated full readiness to cooperate with the EU in addressing those these.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001519/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Holandské veto kandidátskeho statusu Albánska

Albánsko malo získať kandidátsky status na blížiacom sa samite EÚ konanom v decembri uplynulého roku. Európska komisia konštatovala, že krajina je na tento krok pripravená. Napriek všetkému však holandský parlament neschválil vládny návrh na udelenie statusu kandidátskej krajiny Albánsku. Tak sa súčasne pozastavil posun v rokovaniach s týmto balkánskym štátom, keďže rozhodnutia hláv štátov v rámci Únie musia byť jednomyseľné.

Má Komisia právomoc veto Holandska zvrátiť? Ako by bolo možné pozitívnym spôsobom ovplyvniť posun v prístupových rokovaniach s Albánskom?

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001528/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Albánsko a Európska únia

Európska komisia uviedla, že Albánsko splnilo podmienky na udelenie statusu kandidátskej krajiny na vstup do Európskej únie. V decembri minulého roku však holandská vláda negatívne rozhodla o pridelení tohto statusu, odmietla odporúčanie Európskej komisie a znemožnila ďalšie prístupové rokovania. Keďže rozhodnutia prijímané na úrovni hláv štátov v Európskej rade musia byť jednomyseľné, kandidátsky status Albánska týmto spôsobom Holandsko vetuje.

Aký je postoj Komisie k takémuto postupu Holandska?

Plánuje Európska komisia prijať v tejto súvislosti určité opatrenia a ak áno, aké konkrétne?

V akom časovom horizonte je podľa názoru Komisie reálne udeliť Albánsku status členskej krajiny Európskej únie?

Spoločná odpoveď pána Füleho v mene Komisie
(2. apríla 2014)

Komisia v októbri 2013 podala správu o pokroku, ktorý dosiahlo Albánsko, a odporučila Rade, aby Albánsku udelila status kandidátskej krajiny s tým, že Albánsko bude aj naďalej prijímať opatrenia v oblasti boja proti organizovanému zločinu a korupcii. V nadväznosti na správu Komisie a odporúčanie Rada v decembri 2013 uvítala pokrok, ktorý dosiahlo Albánsko, jeho záväzky a zintenzívnené úsilie novej vlády krajiny. Rada požiadala Komisiu, aby predložila nadväznú správu s cieľom prijať rozhodnutie týkajúce sa udelenia statusu kandidátskej krajiny Albánsku v júni 2014. Rozhodnutia Rady týkajúce sa otázky rozšírenia Únie sú prijímané jednomyseľne.

Komisia má preto v úmysle v júni 2014 predložiť správu o Albánsku, v ktorej posúdi pokračujúce vykonávanie stratégií boja proti korupcii a reformy súdnictva, ako aj nedávno prijaté právne predpisy a pokračujúci trend proaktívneho vyšetrovania a stíhania, a to aj v oblasti organizovaného zločinu.

Komisia bude aj naďalej podporovať Albánsko prostredníctvom finančnej pomoci, technických odborných znalostí a poradenstva a aj naďalej bude monitorovať a podporovať reformný proces, a to aj prostredníctvom dialógu na vysokej úrovni o piatich kľúčových prioritách, ktoré sa začali plniť v novembri 2013.

Závery Rady poskytujú jasné usmernenia týkajúce sa podmienok, ktoré treba splniť predtým, než bude možné uvažovať o začatí prístupových opatrení. Pokrok na ceste k pristúpeniu bude závisieť od toho, ako bude krajina plniť stanovené kritériá.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001519/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: The Dutch veto of Albania's candidate status

Albania was due to acquire candidate status at the recent EU summit in December of last year. The European Commission has stated that the country is ready for this step. Nevertheless, the Dutch parliament has not approved the government proposal to grant Albania candidate country status. Negotiations with this Balkan country have therefore stalled, as decisions by heads of state within the EU must be unanimous.

Does the Commission have the competence to overrule the Netherlands' veto? How could accession negotiations with Albania move forward in a positive way?

Question for written answer E-001528/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Albania and the European Union

The European Commission has stated that Albania has fulfilled the conditions to be granted the status of a European Union candidate country. Last December, however, the Dutch Government rejected the Albanian Government's application to be granted this status. It rejects the European Commission's recommendations and is thereby preventing further accession negotiations. Since decisions taken at the level of heads of states in the European Council must be unanimous, Albania's candidate status is thereby being vetoed by the Netherlands.

What is the Commission's position regarding the Netherlands' actions?

Is the European Commission planning to take specific measures in this respect and, if so, what exactly are these measures?

In the Commission's opinion, what is a realistic time frame for Albania to be granted the status of a European Union Member State?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

In October 2013 the Commission reported on Albania's progress and recommended that the Council should grant candidate status to Albania on the understanding that Albanian continues to take action in the fight against organised crime and corruption. Following up on the Commission's report and recommendation, the Council welcomed in December 2013 the progress achieved by Albania and the commitment and intensified efforts of the country's new government. The Council requested the Commission to present a follow-up report in view of taking a decision regarding granting candidate status to Albania in June 2014. Council decisions on enlargement-related issues are taken unanimously.

The Commission intends therefore to present a report on Albania in June 2014, in which it will assess the continued implementation of anti-corruption and judicial reform strategies and recently adopted legislation and the continued trend of pro-active investigations and prosecutions, including in the area of organised crime.

The Commission will continue supporting Albania with financial assistance, technical expertise and policy advice and will continue monitoring and supporting the reform process, including through the High Level Dialogue on the five Key Priorities launched in November 2013.

The Council conclusions provide clear guidance on the conditions that need to be met before opening of accession negotiations could be considered. Progressing on the accession path will depend on the country's performance against the established criteria.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001520/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Systém riešenia pre banky v problémoch

Dohoda na systéme riešenia bánk v problémoch je súčasťou snáh o vybudovanie bankovej únie. Prvý pilier predstavuje systém jednotného bankového dohľadu, ten druhý sa dotýka problematiky zmieňovaného systému riešenia pre banky čeliace problémom. Konečná podoba všetkých aspektov zmieňovaného mechanizmu je vecou konsenzu ministrov financií členských štátov Únie.

Môže k efektívnemu fungovaniu tohto systému prispieť svojim dohľadom i Komisia?

Odpoveď pána Barniera v mene Komisie
(14. apríla 2014)

Ako uvádza vážená pani poslankyňa, banková únia spočíva na dvoch pilieroch: na jednotnom mechanizme dohľadu, ktorý nadobudol účinnosť v novembri 2013 ([1]), a na jednotnom mechanizme riešenia krízových situácií, ktorý v súčasnosti prerokúva Európsky parlament a Rada.

V súlade s jednotným mechanizmom dohľadu bude ECB zodpovedná za dohľad nad bankovým systémom v eurozóne a v ostatných zúčastnených členských štátoch od novembra 2014 a bude predovšetkým priamo zodpovedná za dohľad nad významnými bankami v týchto členských štátoch. V rámci jednotného mechanizmu riešenia krízových situácií sa budú v zásade uplatňovať tie isté pravidlá, aké sú stanovené v rámci riešenia krízových situácií bánk v EÚ-28 (smernica o ozdravení a riešení krízových situácií bánk). Komisia zabezpečí, aby každé využitie verejných financií vrátane fondu na riešenie krízových situácií bánk bolo v súlade s pravidlami štátnej pomoci EÚ.

Okrem toho je od januára 2011 založený európsky systém orgánov finančného dohľadu (ESFS), ktorý je tvorený tromi európskymi orgánmi dohľadu (ESA), Európskym výborom pre systémové riziká a príslušnými vnútroštátnymi orgánmi. ESA zohrávajú dôležitú úlohu pri ďalšom rozvíjaní jednotného súboru pravidiel a prispievajú ku konzistentnosti v oblasti dohľadu. Komisia čoskoro prijme prvé preskúmanie ESFS, ktoré môže poslúžiť ako podklad pre Európsky parlament pri vypracovávaní jeho iniciatívnej správy o ESFS.

Dohľad nebude vykonávať samotná Komisia, ale zabezpečí, aby bol systém zavedený právnymi predpismi prijatými Európskym parlamentom a Radou vykonávaný správne.

([1]) Nariadenie Rady (EÚ) č. 1024/2013 z 15. októbra 2013, ktorým sa Európska centrálna banka poveruje osobitnými úlohami, pokiaľ ide o politiky týkajúce sa prudenciálneho dohľadu nad úverovými inštitúciami (Ú. v. EÚ L 287, s. 63).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001520/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: A resolution system for problem banks

An agreement on a resolution system for problem banks forms part of the efforts to create a banking union. The first pillar is a unified banking supervision system, and the second pillar concerns the question of the aforementioned resolution system for banks facing problems. The final form of all aspects of this mechanism is subject to a consensus among the finance ministers of the EU Member States.

Can the Commission also contribute with its own supervision to the effective functioning of this system?

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

As mentioned by the Honourable Member, the Banking Union rests on two pillars: the Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM), which has already entered into force in November 2013 ([1]), and the Single Resolution Mechanism (SRM), which is currently under negotiation by the European Parliament and by the Council.

In accordance with the SSM, the ECB will be in charge of overseeing the banking system in the Euro Area and in other participating Member States as of November 2014 and will notably be directly responsible for the supervision of significant banks in these Member States. Within the SRM the same rules as those set out in the framework for the resolution of banks in the EU-28 (Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive or BRRD) will, in principle, apply. The Commission will ensure that any use of the public funds, including the resolution fund, would be compliant with EU State aid rules.

In addition, as of January 2011, the European System of Financial Supervisors (ESFS), consisting of the three European supervisory authorities (ESAs), the European Systemic Risk Board and the national competent authorities has been established. The ESAs play an important role in further developing the single rulebook and in contributing to supervisory consistency. The Commission will adopt soon the first review of the ESFS which will give due consideration to the European Parliament's own initiative report on the ESFS.

The Commission will not carry out supervision itself, but will ensure that the system established by the legislation adopted by the European Parliament and by the Council is implemented correctly.

([1]) Council Regulation (EU) No 1024/2013 of 15 October 2013 conferring specific tasks on the ECB concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions (OJ L 287, p. 63).

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001521/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Základné platobné účty pre všetkých

V ostatných dňoch európski poslanci a poslankyne schválili legislatívny návrh, pričinením ktorého žiadatelia o zriadenie základného bankového účtu nemôžu byť diskriminovaní na základe štátnej príslušnosti či miesta trvalého pobytu. Európski spotrebitelia by mali mať možnosť zriadiť si platobný účet bez toho, aby mali pobyt v krajine, kde sídli poskytovateľ platobných služieb. Taktiež, zriadenie účtu by malo byť dostupné bez ohľadu na finančnú situáciu klientov.

Aký postoj k zmieňovanej problematike zastáva Komisia?

Odpoveď pána Barniera v mene Komisie
(7. apríla 2014)

Pre Komisiu má zásadný význam, aby občania EÚ neboli pri otváraní platobného účtu diskriminovaní na základe štátnej príslušnosti alebo miesta bydliska. Navyše, každý spotrebiteľ by mal mať v záujme podpory voľného pohybu a lepšieho finančného začlenenia v EÚ prístup k základnému platobnému účtu.

Na tento účel Komisia 8. mája 2013 prijala návrh smernice o porovnateľnosti poplatkov za platobné účty, o presune platobných účtov a o prístupe k platobným účtom so základnými funkciami. Uvedený návrh je v súčasnosti predmetom rokovaní v Európskom parlamente a v Rade.

V návrhu Komisie sa stanovuje právo na prístup k základnému platobnému účtu pre všetkých občanov EÚ bez ohľadu na ich finančnú situáciu alebo miesto pobytu. Základné účty sa budú viesť bezplatne alebo za primeraný poplatok a budú zahŕňať všetky nevyhnutné platobné služby, ako je napríklad otvorenie a zatvorenie účtu, výbery hotovosti, prevodné príkazy, inkasné platby a online platobné služby.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001521/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Basic payment accounts for all

MEPs have recently approved draft legislation whereby applicants wishing to open a basic bank account do not face discrimination on the basis of their nationality or place of permanent residence. European consumers should be able to open a payment account without being resident in the country where the provider of payment services is based. Furthermore, clients should be able to open an account regardless of their financial situation.

What is the Commission's stand on this issue?

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

For the Commission, it is essential that EU citizens are not discriminated against by the reason of nationality or place of residence when opening a payment account. In addition, every consumer should have access to a basic payment account in order to support free movement and to enhance financial inclusion in the EU.

To this end, on 8 May 2013, the Commission adopted a proposal for the directive on the comparability of fees related to a payment account, switching between payment accounts and access to a payment account with basic features. This proposal is currently under negotiation in the European Parliament and the Council.

The Commission proposal provides for a right of access to a basic payment account for all EU citizens irrespective of their financial situation or place of residence. The basic accounts will be offered either free of charge or at a reasonable fee, and will include all the necessary payment services, such as opening and closing of the account, cash withdrawals, credit transfers, direct debit and online payment services.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001525/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Intenzívnejší boj proti pašovaniu tabakových výrobkov

V decembri uplynulého roku ministri financií členských štátov EÚ dôrazne poukázali na vážne, predovšetkým finančné, dôsledky, ktoré so sebou nesie nelegálne obchodovanie s tabakovými výrobkami. Negatívny dopad sa odzrkadľuje predovšetkým na rozpočtoch a tiež na zdraví, najmä u mladých ľudí. Javí sa ako nevyhnutné zlepšiť spoluprácu, pokiaľ hovoríme o udeľovaní sankcií za túto trestnú činnosť.

Akými konkrétnymi legislatívnymi postupmi by sa prípadne i Komisia mohla pričiniť o zefektívnenie vynakladaného úsilia v boji proti pašovaniu cigariet a iných tabakových výrobkov?

Odpoveď pána Šemetu v mene Komisie
(10. apríla 2014)

Komisia prijala plný záväzok bojovať proti pašovaniu tabakových výrobkov a pracuje na širokom spektre legislatívnych opatrení.

Očakáva sa, že nová smernica o tabakových výrobkoch nadobudne účinnosť v máji 2014 a zlepší fungovanie vnútorného trhu v oblasti tabaku a príbuzných výrobkov a súčasne zabezpečí vysokú úroveň ochrany zdravia európskych občanov. Obsahuje osobitné ustanovenia, ktoré sa zaoberajú nezákonným obchodom.

V oblasti colnej spolupráce a boji proti nezákonnému obchodu aj v oblasti tabaku a príbuzných výrobkov sa v súčasnosti prerokúvajú viaceré legislatívne návrhy:

— návrh smernice Európskeho parlamentu a Rady o právnom rámci Únie pre porušenia colných predpisov a sankcie ([1])

— návrh smernice Európskeho parlamentu a Rady o boji proti podvodom poškodzujúcim finančné záujmy Únie prostredníctvom trestného práva ([2])

Protokol na odstránenie nezákonného obchodu s tabakovými výrobkami pripojený k Rámcovému dohovoru Svetovej zdravotníckej organizácie ([3]) o kontrole tabaku ([4]) bol zo strany EÚ podpísaný 22. decembra 2013. EÚ a jej členské štáty ([5]) v súčasnosti pripravujú uzavretie protokolu prijatím rozhodnutia a úpravou ich právnych predpisov.

Komisia koordinuje vykonávanie právne záväzných dohôd, ktoré EÚ a členské štáty podpísali so štyrmi výrobcami tabakových výrobkov ([6]) s cieľom vyriešiť problém pašovaných a falšovaných cigariet.

Európsky parlament 15. januára 2014 podporil program Hercule III, ktorého cieľom je podporovať členské štáty v ich boji proti podvodom, korupcii a iným nezákonným činnostiam. Boj proti pašovaniu cigariet bude aj naďalej významnou oblasťou v rámci tohto programu.

Komisia napokon v júni 2013 vydala oznámenie „Posilnenie boja proti pašovaniu cigariet a iným formám nezákonného obchodu s tabakovými výrobkami“ ([7]).

([1]) COM(2013) 884 final, 13.12.2013.
([2]) COM(2012) 363 final, 11.7.2012.
([3]) Svetová zdravotnícka organizácia.
([4]) Rámcový dohovor o kontrole tabaku: http://www.who.int/fctc/protocol/about/en/.
([5]) Členské štáty.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/investigations/eu-revenue/cigarette_smuggling_en.htm
([7]) COM(2013) 324 final, 6.6.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001525/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Intensifying the fight against the smuggling of tobacco products

Last December, the finance ministers of the EU Member States underlined the serious, predominantly financial consequences of the illegal trafficking of tobacco products. It has a negative impact mainly on budgets, and also on health, especially among young people. It seems that cooperation should be improved in terms of imposing sanctions for this criminal activity.

What specific, legislative steps could the Commission take to streamline efforts in the fight against the smuggling of cigarettes and other tobacco products?

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

The Commission is fully committed to the fight against the smuggling of tobacco products and is working on a wide range of legislative measures.

The new Tobacco Products Directive is expected to enter into force in May 2014 and will improve the functioning of the internal market for tobacco and related products, while ensuring a high level of health protection for European citizens. It contains dedicated provisions addressing illicit trade.

In the field of customs cooperation and the fight against illicit trade, including tobacco and related products, various legislative proposals are currently being discussed:

— Proposal for a directive of the EP and of the Council on the Union legal framework for customs infringements and sanctions ([1]);

— Proposal for a directive of the EP and of the Council on the fight against fraud to the Union's financial interests by means of criminal law ([2]);

The FCTC-Protocol annexed to the WHO ([3]) FCTC ([4]) was signed by the EU on 22 December 2013. The EU and its MS ([5]) are now in the process of preparing the conclusion of the Protocol by adopting a decision and adjusting their legislation.

The Commission is coordinating the implementation of the legally binding agreements that the EU and the MS signed with four tobacco manufacturers ([6]) in order to address the problem of contraband and counterfeit cigarettes.

On 15 January 2014 the EP endorsed the Hercule III programme aiming to support the MS in their fight against fraud, corruption and other illegal activities. An important area under this programme will continue to be the fight against cigarette smuggling.

Finally, the Commission has issued in June 2013 a communication on Stepping up the fight against cigarette smuggling and other forms of illicit trade in tobacco products ([7]).

([1]) COM(2013) 884 final, 13.12.2013.
([2]) COM(2012) 363 final, 11.7.2012.
([3]) World Health Organisation.
([4]) Framework Convention on Tobacco Control: http://www.who.int/fctc/protocol/about/en/
([5]) Member States.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/investigations/eu-revenue/cigarette_smuggling_en.htm
([7]) COM(2013) 324 final, 6.6.2013.