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 317/01)

Treść Strona

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001945/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Turchia e club Bilderberg 2013

Premesso:

che l'incontro annuale del club Bilderberg del 2013 (6-9 giugno) ha avuto fra gli invitati ben 6 esponenti turchi, cioè una delegazione molto ampia, fra cui l'islamico Ali Babacan, vicepremier e ministro delle Finanze.

Risulta alla Commissione, anch'essa informalmente rappresentata a tale riunione dallo stesso Presidente Barroso, se fra gli argomenti trattati fosse compreso lo stato della procedura di adesione della Turchia all'Unione europea e a quali risultati si sia addivenuti in merito?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(1º aprile 2014)

La Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-000218/2014 ([1]) relativa all'ultima conferenza del gruppo Bilderberg tenutasi nel giugno 2013. Per quanto riguarda la partecipazione alla conferenza del gruppo Bilderberg e gli argomenti trattati, l'onorevole parlamentare è invitato a consultare il sito ufficiale del gruppo Bilderberg ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://www.bilderbergmeetings.org/meeting_2013.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001945/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Turkey and the 2013 meeting of the Bilderberg Club

Given that the annual meeting of the Bilderberg Club (6-9 June 2013) was attended by as many as six Turkish guests, in other words a very large delegation including the Muslim Ali Babacan, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, does the Commission, which was also informally represented at that meeting by its own President, Mr Barroso, know whether the subjects dealt with included the stage reached in the process of Turkish accession to the European Union, and what conclusions were reached on the subject?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(1 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000218/2014 ([1]) concerning the last Bilderberg conference in June 2013. As regards the participation to the Bilderberg conference and the topics covered, the Honourable Member is invited to consult the Bilderberg official website ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://www.bilderbergmeetings.org/meeting_2013.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001947/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: La costruzione del terzo aeroporto di Istanbul deve rispettare il patrimonio boschivo

Il nuovo aeroporto di Istanbul è in costruzione in un'area prevalentemente di foreste a nord-est, vicino al Lago Terkos, sulle coste del Mar Nero.

A seguito del ricorso di un gruppo di abitanti, che hanno denunciato il grave impatto del progetto sulla natura e l'ingente inquinamento elettromagnetico nei lavori del terzo aeroporto della megalopoli del Bosforo, il tribunale di Istanbul ne ha ordinato la sospensione. La corte ha disposto una nuova perizia sull'impatto ambientale.

La Commissione come intende vigilare affinché la realizzazione dell'opera non comporti la distruzione di intere parti rilevanti del patrimonio boschivo?

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

La Commissione è a conoscenza della questione sollevata dall'onorevole deputato. Nella relazione del 2013 sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia ([1]), la Commissione esprimeva preoccupazione per l'introduzione, nella legislazione orizzontale turca, di deroghe supplementari non conformi alla direttiva sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale, che hanno escluso dalla valutazione diversi grandi progetti infrastrutturali tra cui il nuovo aeroporto di Istanbul. La Commissione continuerà ad esprimere le proprie preoccupazioni alle autorità turche in tutte le sedi appropriate, tra cui il prossimo comitato di associazione UE-Turchia.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001947/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: The construction of Istanbul's third airport must conserve forest assets

Istanbul's new airport is under construction in a largely forested area to the north-east, near Lake Terkos, on the Black Sea coast.

A group of residents lodged an appeal, complaining that the project has a serious impact on the natural environment and that there is immense electromagnetic pollution from the work on the Bosphorus mega-city's third airport. As a result, the Court of Istanbul has ordered the work to be suspended and commissioned a new environmental impact study.

How does the Commission intend to keep watch, so that completion of this work does not entail the destruction of whole swathes of forest assets?

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

The Commission is aware of the issue raised by the Honourable Member. In its 2013 Progress Report on Turkey ([1]), the Commission noted with concern that Turkey has introduced additional exceptions in its horizontal legislation, which are not consistent with the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive. As a result several large infrastructure projects, including the new airport in Istanbul have been excluded from the environmental impact assessment. The Commission will continue raising its concerns with the Turkish authorities at all appropriate fora, including the upcoming EU-Turkey Association Committee.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001951/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Criminale iracheno accolto in Turchia

L'ex Vicepresidente sunnita dell'Iraq Tareq al-Hashemi, ora latitante, è stato condannato a morte a Baghdad con l'accusa di crimini contro l'umanità, che avrebbe commesso insieme ai suoi squadroni della morte. Secondo alcune fonti Tareq al-Hashemi sarebbe stato accolto in Turchia.

Se tale grave fatto criminale corrisponde al vero, può la Commissione far sapere come si può tollerare che, pendente il processo di adesione della Turchia all'UE, il governo turco apra le porte a un latitante iracheno imputato di crimini contro l'umanità?

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

L'onorevole deputato fa riferimento a una questione bilaterale tra la Turchia e l'Iraq.

In generale, l'Unione europea segue da vicino le relazioni tra i due paesi. Le relazioni della Turchia con il governo regionale curdo (KRG) a Erbil hanno continuato a migliorare negli ultimi anni. L'UE ha accolto con favore questi sviluppi, anche nel quadro del più ampio dialogo politico UE-Turchia, nel quale ha ribadito più volte la necessità di migliorare le relazioni tra la Turchia e l'Iraq. In questo contesto, il recente riavvicinamento tra i due paesi e le reciproche visite ad alto livello rappresentano una svolta positiva che potrebbe contribuire a rafforzare la stabilità regionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001951/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Iraqi criminal welcomed in Turkey

The Sunni former Vice-President of Iraq, Tareq al-Hashemi, now a fugitive, was sentenced to death in Baghdad. The charge against him was crimes against humanity, which he allegedly committed with his death squads. According to some sources, Tareq al-Hashemi has been welcomed in Turkey.

If such a serious criminal act is true, can the Commission state how it is tolerable that, during the process of Turkish accession to the EU, the Turkish Government opens its doors to an Iraqi fugitive indicted for crimes against humanity?

Answer given by Commissioner Füle on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

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

In general, the EU is following closely relations between the two countries. Turkey's relations with the Kurdish Regional Government (KRG) in Erbil have continued to improve in recent years. The EU has welcomed this development -also in the framework of the EU-Turkey wider political dialogue- while consistently stressing the need to also improve relations between Ankara and Baghdad. In this context, the recent rapprochement and high level visits between Ankara and Baghdad are a welcome development that could help strengthen regional stability.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001953/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Emergenza rifiuti a Roma e nel Lazio: indagine della Corte dei conti su Cupinoro

Dopo la chiusura della discarica di Malagrotta, la situazione di emergenza rifiuti a Roma e nella Regione Lazio continua a destare preoccupazione. Non sono stati ancora individuati siti idonei al conferimento dei rifiuti di Roma e di numerosi enti locali della provincia di Roma, il che comporta una situazione di grave criticità nella gestione dei rifiuti urbani. L'assenza di una strategia adeguata e il continuo ricorso a politiche di emergenza avevano condotto il commissario Sottile ad autorizzare, in via straordinaria ed urgente, il conferimento dei rifiuti nella discarica di Cupinoro fino al 31 dicembre 2013, nonostante la discarica stessa fosse di fatto satura e impossibilitata a ricevere ulteriori conferimenti. La discarica di Cupinoro, amministrata dalla società Bracciano Ambiente S.p.A., interamente partecipata dal comune di Bracciano, è stata recentemente oggetto di controlli tesi a verificare la corretta gestione della stessa. A conclusione di un'indagine condotta dalla Guardia di Finanza di Civita Castellana, coordinata dal Comando Provinciale di Viterbo, è stato accertato un danno alle casse dello Stato per oltre 4,7 milioni di euro, oltre ad un rilevante debito accumulato dal Comune di Bracciano nei confronti della partecipata Bracciano Ambiente S.p.A., nonché spese per cessioni di crediti ad istituti bancari e/o finanziari sostenute dalla Bracciano Ambiente S.p.A. per sopperire ad esigenze di liquidità causate da ritardi nei pagamenti da parte degli enti locali conferenti rifiuti solidi urbani presso la discarica di Cupinoro.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è a conoscenza dei recenti sviluppi della situazione?

2. Ritiene che la vicenda cosi ricostruita costituisca una violazione della direttiva 2011/85/UE, in particolare, riguardo alla trasparenza delle finanze dell'amministrazione pubblica?

3. Ritiene che la prolungata e irrisolta questione relativa allo smaltimento dei rifiuti della città di Roma e nella Regione Lazio e la conseguente emergenza sanitaria e ambientale costituiscano violazioni della direttiva sui rifiuti 2008/98/CE?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001954/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Emergenza rifiuti a Roma e nel Lazio: preoccupazione per impianto TMB di Casale Bussi e discarica Monterazzano insistenti sul territorio del Comune di Viterbo

Desta grande preoccupazione la situazione relativa alla gestione del ciclo dei rifiuti della città di Roma e della Regione Lazio. In particolare, appare critica la situazione venutasi a creare dopo la chiusura della discarica di Malagrotta nel mese di ottobre 2013. Risulta che parte dei rifiuti di Roma Capitale sia stata trattata fuori ATO presso l'impianto TMB di Casale Bussi e che una parte degli scarti di lavorazione sia stata smaltita presso la discarica di Monterazzano. Entrambi gli impianti insistono sul territorio del Comune di Viterbo. La criticabile e arbitraria decisione di conferire i rifiuti di Roma nel Viterbese è frutto di un sostanziale immobilismo della Regione Lazio riguardo alla gestione dei rifiuti. L'amministrazione regionale, infatti, ha autorizzato, per ciò che attiene al trattamento dei rifiuti urbani, un aumento dei quantitativi massimi ricevibili dall'impianto TMB di Casale Bussi pari a ben 20 000 tonnellate/anno (passando da 182 000 a 202 000 t/a), provocando il risentimento delle comunità territoriali circostanti nonché problemi dal punto di vista ambientale e sanitario. Inoltre, durante i mesi di ottobre e novembre sarebbero stati smaltiti presso la discarica di servizio di Monterazzano scarti riferibili a Roma Capitale per un totale di circa 2 500 tonnellate. A ciò si aggiunga che la chiusura della discarica di Cupinoro, avvenuta lo scorso 31 gennaio, ha determinato che almeno 8 dei Comuni che precedentemente conferivano i propri rifiuti a Cupinoro non solo hanno iniziato a trattare i rifiuti presso l'impianto di TMB di Casale Bussi ma, con tutta probabilità, inizieranno a smaltirli presso la discarica di servizio di Monterazzano. Desta quindi ulteriore preoccupazione l'istanza per l'Autorizzazione Integrata Ambientale giacente presso gli uffici regionali per un aumento di circa il 10 % relativo proprio alla discarica di Monterazzano.

Tutto ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se è informata degli sviluppi della vicenda;

2. se la costante pratica dell'amministrazione regionale di ampliare in via urgente e straordinaria il quantitativo massimo di rifiuti ricevibili da diversi impianti di stoccaggio sia conforme alla direttiva 2008/98/CE;

3. se è consapevole della totale esclusione dei cittadini delle zone interessate dalle procedure decisionali, considerato che non sono stati né coinvolti né informati su tempistiche, procedure e documenti relativi all'eventuale ampliamento del sito.

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

Negli ultimi due anni la Commissione ha seguito da vicino l'attuazione delle misure di gestione dei rifiuti nella regione Lazio. Gli ultimi sviluppi in questo ambito riguardano la necessità di trattare i rifiuti prima di avviarli alle discariche di Casale e Monterazzano e la carenza di alternative per il conferimento dei rifiuti della città di Roma a seguito della chiusura della discarica di Malagrotta. Benché sia necessario migliorare la gestione dei rifiuti nella regione, come indicato in recenti raccomandazioni della Commissione ([1]), in questa fase la Commissione non ravvisa violazioni della direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti ([2]) e si aspetta che la Regione Lazio continui ad impegnarsi per applicare le citate raccomandazioni.

Per quanto concerne il coinvolgimento dei cittadini nel previsto ampliamento della discarica di Monterazzano, la Commissione rileva che, stando alle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato, tale progetto non ha ancora ottenuto l'autorizzazione delle autorità italiane. Poiché il diritto dell'UE prevede che l'opinione pubblica sia consultata prima che un progetto abbia ottenuto la definitiva autorizzazione dalle autorità nazionali competenti, in questa fase non è possibile ravvisare una violazione del diritto UE.

Il caso in questione non sembra quindi rientrare nell'ambito di applicazione della direttiva 2011/85/UE relativa ai requisiti per i quadri di bilancio degli Stati membri ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/framework/pdf/IT_SOUTH_Roadmap_FINAL.pdf
([2]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008, pag. 3.
([3]) GU L 306 del 23.11.2011, pag. 41.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001953/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Waste disposal emergency in Rome and Lazio: investigation of Cupinoro by the Court of Auditors

After the closure of the Malagrotta waste disposal site, the waste emergency in Rome and the Lazio region continues to arouse concern. As yet, no sites suitable for the disposal of waste from Rome and the numerous local authorities in Rome Province have been identified, which constitutes a situation of grave criticality in terms of urban waste management. Lack of an adequate strategy and continuing recourse to emergency policies led Special Waste Emergency Commissioner Sottile to issue an extraordinary emergency permit for waste to be deposited at the Cupinoro disposal site until 31 December 2013, despite the fact that the site was already at saturation point and unable to accommodate further waste. The Cupinoro disposal site, administered by Bracciano Ambiente S.p.A., a 100% subsidiary of the Bracciano Municipality, was recently inspected to establish whether the site was being correctly managed. An investigation conducted by the Civita Castellana Financial Police and coordinated by the Provincial Headquarters at Viterbo revealed that over EUR 4.7 million of government money had been lost, that the Bracciano Municipality had incurred a substantial debt to its subsidiary Bracciano Ambiente S.p.A. and that Bracciano Ambiente S.p.A. had incurred expenses in the assignment of receivables to bank and/or financial institutions to meet liquidity shortfalls generated by late payments from local authorities depositing solid urban waste at the Cupinoro site.

In full consideration of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of recent developments in this situation?

2. Does the Commission consider the situation described above to be a breach of Directive 2011/85/EU, with particular reference to transparency in public finances?

3. Does the Commission consider the protracted and unresolved issue of waste disposal in the city of Rome and the Lazio region and the resultant health and environmental emergency to be in breach of the waste Directive 2008/98/EC?

Question for written answer E-001954/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Waste emergency in Rome and Lazio: persisting concerns for the municipality of Viterbo regarding the MBT plant in Casale Bussi and the landfill site in Monterazzano

The ways in which the waste cycle of the city of Rome and the surrounding Lazio region is currently being managed are proving to be a major cause for concern, with the situation arising from the closure of the Malagrotta landfill site in October 2013 appearing especially alarming. As a result of this closure, some of the waste generated by the city of Rome is now being treated outside the Optimal Territorial Area (OTA) at the MBT plant in Casale Bussi, and a percentage of its industrial waste is being disposed of at the Monterazzano landfill site. Both facilities are placing enormous strain on the municipality of Viterbo. The lamentable and arbitrary decision to send Rome's waste there has come about as a result of the Lazio Regional Government's complete inflexibility to manage the region's waste in any other way. Indeed, it has recently increased the maximum amount of urban waste that can be sent to the MBT plant in Casale Bussi by 20 000 tonnes/year (rising from 182 000 to 202 000 tonnes/year) — this move, which has sparked further environmental and health-related concerns, has been met with fury by the surrounding local communities. In addition, over the course of October and November last year it appears that around 2 500 tonnes of waste produced by Rome were disposed of in the Monterazzano landfill site. To make matters worse, the recent closure of the landfill site in Cupinoro (which took place on 31 January) means that at least eight municipalities that had previously sent their waste to Cupinoro have not only started sending it to the MBT plant in Casale Bussi, but will also, in all likelihood, soon start disposing of it at the Monterazzano landfill site. Yet more concerns have been raised following an application (currently with the regional authorities) for an Integrated Environmental Permit to expand the Monterazzano landfill site by around 10%.

1. Is the Commission aware of the latest developments surrounding this case?

2. Does the regional authority's continual implementation of extraordinary and emergency measures to increase the maximum amount of waste that can be received by various waste storage facilities comply with Directive 2008/98/EC?

3. Is the Commission aware that the citizens living in the affected regions have been completely left out of any decision-making processes, since they have neither been involved in drawing up the time frames, procedures and documents relating to the possible expansion of the site, nor even been informed of them?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

Over the last two years, the Commission has been closely monitoring the waste management measures implemented in the Lazio region. The latest developments respond to the need to treat waste before being landfilled at the available sites of Casale and Monterazzano, respectively, and to the shortage of alternatives to landfilling in the city of Rome following the closure of the Malagrotta landfill. Although waste management in the region needs to be improved, as indicated in the recent Commission recommendations ([1]), at this stage the Commission cannot detect a violation of Directive 2008/98/EC ([2]) on waste and expects the region of Lazio to continue its efforts to apply the recommendations.

As concerns the citizens' involvement in the planned expansion of the Monterazzano landfill, the Commission notes that, according to the information provided by the Honourable Member, this project has not yet been authorised by the Italian authorities. Since EC law requires that consultation of the public be carried out before a project has been finally authorised by the competent national authorities, at this stage it is not possible to identify a breach of EC law

The case in point does not appear to fall under the incidence of Council Directive 2011/85/EU ([3]) on requirements for budgetary framework from Member States.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/framework/pdf/IT_SOUTH_Roadmap_FINAL.pdf
([2]) OJ L 312/3, 22.11.2008.
([3]) OJ L 306/41, 23.11.2011

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001955/14
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: ISTAT

A seguito della risposta scritta all'interrogazione E-013635/2013, fornita in data 11 febbraio 2014, può la Commissione comunicare, quanto ai quesiti 1, 2 e 3, se in base ai regolamenti i dati di previsione dell'indebitamento netto (*net borrowing*) per l'anno in corso (nel caso specifico era il 2013) devono fare riferimento al quadro normativo vigente (*account at unchanged legislation*) o al quadro programmatico (*planned government figures*)?

Quanto ai quesiti 4 e 5, l'Istituto nazionale di statistica italiano (ISTAT) conduce annualmente l'indagine sul reddito e le condizioni di vita (EU-SILC); nell'anno 2011, la fase di raccolta dati, iniziata nel mese di settembre, si è conclusa a fine marzo 2012, tre mesi dopo la scadenza programmata, restando sul campo tre mesi in più rispetto a quanto previsto/raccomandato nelle linee guida Eurostat; le interviste realizzate nei sette mesi di rilevazione sono state complessivamente 19 399 di cui 14 490 effettuate nell'anno 2011 e 4 909 nel 2012.

Può la Commissione comunicare se ritiene che l'Istat si sia attenuto alle norme e ai regolamenti richiamati nonché alla deontologia professionale: a) non avendo rispettato le indicazioni relative a tempi e durata della raccolta dati e dichiarato, invece, di averlo regolarmente fatto, mentre in realtà ha modificato la variabile «giorno dell'intervista» nel caso di tutte quelle svolte nel 2012 (4 909), facendole risultare effettuate nel 2011; b) avendo modificato direttamente anche i dati relativi alla variabile reddito degli autonomi, moltiplicando gli stessi per la costante 1 173, e ciò per non dover interrompere, data la notevole differenza rispetto al 2010, la serie storica?

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

Facendo seguito alla risposta della Commissione a E-013635/2013 e con riferimento alle interrogazioni 1, 2 e 3, la Commissione ricorda che il regolamento (CE) n. 479/2009 del Consiglio chiede agli Stati membri di indicare i dati di previsione per l'anno n (l'anno in corso). L'articolo 2, paragrafo 1, dello stesso regolamento specifica quanto segue: «*le cifre relative all'ammontare previsto del disavanzo pubblico e del debito pubblico* per l'anno in corso sono le cifre determinate dagli Stati membri. Esse rispecchiano le previsioni ufficiali più recenti, tenuto conto delle ultime decisioni in materia di bilancio e delle prospettive e degli sviluppi economici. Esse dovrebbero essere presentate quanto prima possibile a ridosso della scadenza fissata per la trasmissione».

Per quanto riguarda l'indagine EU-SILC (statistiche europee relative al reddito e alle condizioni di vita) e con riferimento alla stessa risposta alle interrogazioni 4 e 5 nella replica del 2013, Eurostat non dispone di elementi che lo inducano a ritenere che l'istituto statistico nazionale italiano non abbia rispettato i requisiti stabiliti dal regolamento (CE) n. 1177/2003. La data delle attività sul campo è correttamente registrata nel fascicolo dei dati validati e la relazione di qualità documenta l'evoluzione della metodologia utilizzata e delle procedure d'imputazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001955/14
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: ISTAT

Further to the written answer to Question E-013635/2013 provided on 11 February 2014, can the Commission disclose, with reference to Questions 1, 2 and 3, whether the regulations require the predicted net borrowing figures for the current year (in the case in point 2013) to make reference to the current regulatory framework *(account at unchanged legislation)* or the policy framework *(planned government figures)*?

With regard to Questions 4 and 5, the Italian National Statistics Institute (ISTAT) carries out an annual survey on income and living conditions (EU-SILC). In 2011 data collection began in September and was completed at the end of March 2012, three months after the deadline stipulated/recommended in the Eurostat guidelines. A total of 19 399 interviews were conducted during the seven months of the survey period, 14 490 in 2011 and 4 909 in 2012.

Can the Commission indicate whether it considers that ISTAT has complied with the standards and regulations referred to above and professional ethics in the light of the fact that it has: a) failed to follow the guidelines on data collection timescales and indeed claimed to have adhered to the guidelines, while in fact, in the case of all interviews carried out in 2012 (4 909), it altered the 'interview date' variable to a date in 2011; b) also directly altered figures for the 'income of the self-employed' variable, multiplying it by the constant 1.173 to avoid interrupting the historical series, given the substantial difference by comparison with 2010?

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

Further to the Commission's reply to E-013635/2013, and with reference to questions 1, 2 and 3, the Commission recalls that Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2009 requests Member States to report planned data for year n (the current year). Article 2(1) of the same Regulation specifies 'Planned government deficit and government debt level figures' means the figures established for the current year by the Member States. They shall be the most recent official forecasts, taking into account the most recent budgetary decisions and economic developments and prospects. They should be produced in as short a time as possible before the reporting deadline'.

Concerning the EU-SILC survey, and further to the same answer to questions 4 and 5 in the 2013 reply, Eurostat has no element to consider that the Italian national statistical institute has not complied with the regulation (EC) No 1177/2003. The field work date is correctly recorded in the validated data file and the quality report documents the evolution of the methodology used and of the imputation procedures.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001956/14
alla Commissione
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Minaccia radioattiva alle porte di Taranto

Da circa 20 anni nel piccolo Comune di Statte, alle porte di Taranto, è presente un capannone in lamiera con migliaia di fusti radioattivi in stato di abbandono.

Nel 1995 sono stati effettuati controlli e perquisizioni della struttura da parte di ispettori del Corpo forestale italiano che hanno stimato tra i 14 000 e i 18 000 fusti disposti in torri alte 20 metri, che sembrano grattacieli.

Da allora ad oggi la situazione non ha visto evoluzioni positive e non è stato possibile ottenere dati precisi sui fusti a causa del modo in cui sono stati collocati e del fatto che, nel corso del tempo, hanno subito un deterioramento inevitabile.

Nessuno ha potuto aprirli per scoprirne il contenuto ma su alcuni è stata addirittura riportata una decadenza della radioattività a 10 000 anni.

La società proprietaria del sito ha ricevuto nel tempo fusti da tutta Italia e, dopo una lunga vicenda giudiziaria, è fallita scaricando i costi per la bonifica sulla collettività, con le difficoltà che scaturiscono da uno stanziamento di fondi insufficiente.

È importante adottare iniziative che mettano in sicurezza la struttura e blocchino il deterioramento dei fusti e valutare azioni per ridurre lo stock presente nel capannone, distribuendolo anche in altre zone del paese.

Un impegno da parte di tutte le istituzioni italiane ed europee a breve termine potrebbe essere fondamentale per evitare che accadano incidenti imprevisti, quali esplosioni ed incendi, che comprometterebbero la salute di chi popola quel territorio.

1. È la Commissione già a conoscenza della situazione che colpisce la zona di Taranto? Può prendere in considerazione la possibilità di inviare un team di esperti per quantificare i fusti in modo dettagliato e verificarne il contenuto?

2. È consapevole della grande importanza della messa in sicurezza della struttura e dei danni che possibili incidenti potrebbero provocare alla salute dei cittadini e all'ambiente?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza delle segnalazioni, riportate dalla stampa, riguardo alla struttura citata dall'onorevole parlamentare ed ha stabilito contatti con le autorità italiane, chiedendo ulteriori informazioni. La Commissione deciderà sulle eventuali azioni da intraprendere non appena disporrà di informazioni sufficienti e attendibili.

2. Al fine di garantire che i rifiuti radioattivi nell'UE siano gestiti in modo sicuro e responsabile, la direttiva 2011/70/Euratom ([1]) del Consiglio impone agli Stati membri, tra l'altro, di istituire entro il 2015 un programma nazionale per la gestione dei rifiuti radioattivi, che deve essere adeguatamente finanziato e deve includere un inventario di tutti i rifiuti in questione. La direttiva stabilisce inoltre la responsabilità ultima degli Stati membri nella gestione sicura di tutti i rifiuti radioattivi generati nel loro territorio. La Commissione sta verificando che gli Stati membri abbiano pienamente recepito la direttiva nella legislazione nazionale. Il tipo di rifiuti a cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare dovrebbe essere preso in considerazione nel programma nazionale italiano.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/70/Euratom del Consiglio, del 19 luglio 2011, che istituisce un quadro comunitario per la gestione responsabile e sicura del combustibile nucleare esaurito e dei rifiuti radioattivi (GU L 199 del 2.8.2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001956/14
to the Commission
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Radioactive threat on outskirts of Taranto

In the little municipality of Statte, on the outskirts of Taranto, a sheet-metal shed has stood for about 20 years, containing thousands of abandoned radioactive drums.

Inspectors from the Italian Forest Corps inspected and searched the building in 1995. They estimated that there were 14 000 to 18 000 drums stacked in 20-metre towers, which looked like skyscrapers.

Since then there has been no changes for the better in the situation. It has been impossible to obtain accurate data about the drums, because of the way they have been positioned and the inevitable deterioration which they have suffered in the course of time.

No-one has been able to open them to find out what is inside, but some will reportedly cease to be radioactive in 10 000 years' time.

As time went by, the company which owned the site received drums from all over Italy. It went bankrupt after a long lawsuit, leaving the local authority to meet the costs of the clean-up. Difficulties arise from an insufficient budget.

It is important to take initiatives to secure the building and stop the drums deteriorating. Action must be assessed to reduce the stock present in the shed, and spread it to other parts of the country.

A commitment by all the institutions of Italy and Europe could be essential, in the short term, to prevent unforeseen accidents occurring, such as explosions and fires, which would put public health at risk in the area.

1. Is the Commission already aware of the situation affecting the Taranto area? Can it consider the possibility of sending a team of experts to count the drums in detail and check their contents?

2. Is it aware of the great importance of making the building secure, and of the damage which possible accidents might cause to public health and to the environment?

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

1. The Commission is aware of reports in the press concerning the facility. It has established contacts with the Italian authorities and requested further information from them. Once the Commission is in possession of sufficient and reliable information, it will decide on the possible actions to be taken.

2. In order to ensure that radioactive waste across the EU is managed in a safe and responsible manner, Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom ([1]) requires each Member State, *inter alia*, to establish a national programme for the management of radioactive waste by 2015. This programme has to be adequately financed and has to include inventories of all relevant waste. The directive also establishes the ultimate responsibility of the Member States for the safe management of all radioactive waste generated in their territories. The Commission is currently checking that Member States have fully transposed the directive into national legislation. The type of waste that the Honourable Member is referring to is expected to be taken into account in the Italian national programme.

([1]) Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom of 19 July 2011 establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste, OJ L 199, 2.8.2011.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001957/14
a Bizottság számára
Winkler Gyula (PPE) és Sógor Csaba (PPE)
(2014. február 19.)

Tárgy: Miért nem kommunikál magyarul is az Európai Bizottság bukaresti képviselete?

Alulírottak kérjük az Európai Bizottságot (EB), hogy romániai képviseletének legyen magyar nyelvű kommunikációja is. Jelenleg a bukaresti EB képviseletnek nincs sem magyar nyelvű sajtó-, sem politikai monitorizálása; a képviselet kommunikációjából pedig hiányzik a magyar nyelv.

Mi az 1,3 millió lélekszámú romániai magyar közösséget képviseljük az Európai Parlamentben. Aggódunk, hogy országunkban a magyar nyelvű média nem kap az EB-től közvetlen, anyanyelvi tájékoztatást, és nem része az uniós intézmények monitorizációjának, ezáltal az EB nem figyel közösségünkre. A probléma nem csupán a romániai magyarság érdekeit sérti; az EB nem engedheti meg magának, hogy ne tájékoztasson és ne monitorizáljon közvetlenül médiacsatornákat egy olyan népes közösség körében, amelynek lélekszáma nagyobb, mint egyes tagállamok összlakosságáé. Romániában 1,3 millió magyar él. Ennyi Észtország össznépessége. És több, mint Ciprus, Luxemburg és Málta összlakossága. Nevezett országoknak van saját EB képviseletük. Számos példa értelmében az EB – képviseletei révén – már elkötelezte magát egyes tagállamok etnikai vagy kisebbségi közösségeinek irányába (Barcelonában például katalánul kommunikál). Több esetben az érintett közösségek létszáma sokkal kisebb, mint a romániai magyaroké: Helsinkiben az EB svédül (0,3 millió személy számára), Nicosiában törökül (0,3 millió), Brüsszelben pedig németül is kommunikál az EB a helyi nyelvi közösséggel (0,08 millió). A romániai magyar közösség az EU egyik legnépesebb és legjobban szervezett közössége. Saját média-rendszerrel rendelkezik: országos szinten fogható magán TV csatornával, magyar nyelvű tévéadásokkal a köztelevízióban, 10-nél több helyi TV-csatornával, két országos- és 20-nál több helyi rádióval, 30-nál több helyi/regionális sajtóorgánummal, illetve legalább 10 népszerű online hírportállal.

A romániai magyar közösség és médiája ugyanolyan szintű és minőségű tájékoztatásra és monitorizálásra (politikai tájékoztatásra) jogosult, mint a román anyanyelvűek és a román nyelvű sajtó. Az EU intézményeknek is fontos, hogy a romániai magyar polgárokat anyanyelvükön, saját médiacsatornáik révén tájékoztassák a mindennapjaikat érintő uniós kérdésekről és politikákról.

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. március 28.)

Az Európai Bizottság tagállamokban működő képviseletei annak az országnak a hivatalos nyelveit használják kommunikációs célokra, amelyben működnek. Ebben az esetben a román alkotmány értelmében a román az egyetlen hivatalos nyelv. A magyar nyelv Romániában (19 másik nyelvvel együtt) kisebbségi nyelv, ahogyan azt a román állam a Regionális vagy Kisebbségi Nyelvek Európai Kartájának 2007. évi ratifikálásával ([1]) elismerte. A magyar nyelv regionális/helyi használatáról a helyi közigazgatásra vonatkozó törvény rendelkezik azokban az esetekben, amikor a kisebbség a lakosság több mint 20%-át teszi ki. Azokban az országokban, ahol a kisebbségi nyelveket hivatalos nyelvként ismerték el, a Bizottság e nyelveken is kommunikál.

Ugyanakkor a Bizottság valamennyi képviselete kapcsolódik a Bizottság honlapjához, valamint – a hivatalos dokumentumokhoz az EU 24 hivatalos nyelvének mindegyikét használó – Europa portálhoz, és népszerűsíti azokat. A képviseletek emellett az uniós intézmények kiadványait a hivatalos nyelven és – amennyiben e nyelvi verziók rendelkezésre állnak – a kisebbségi nyelveken egyaránt terjesztik. Az EDIC ([2]) hálózata három olyan irodával rendelkezik Románia többségében magyar nyelvű megyéiben ([3]), amelyek elsősorban a magyar nyelvet használják az európai uniós témákról szóló kommunikáció során.

Emellett a Bizottság romániai képviseletén dolgozó tisztviselők egyike a magyar közösség tagja.

A magyar nyelvű médiával való kommunikációra vonatkozó kérdése tekintetében szeretnénk felhívni a figyelmét arra, hogy a Bizottság romániai képviselete elsősorban a média országos szintű csatornáival foglalkozik. A képviselet az Európai Médiafigyelőt ([4]) (EMM) is felhasználja arra, hogy tájékozódjon a média érdeklődésére számot tartó témákban. Az EMM weboldala számos magyar nyelvű online hírforrást tartalmaz Románia vonatkozásában.

([1]) 282/2007. sz. törvény.
([2]) Europe Direct Információs Központok.
([3]) Kovászna, Erdőszentgyörgy, Székelyudvarhely.
([4]) Az Európai Médiafigyelőt a Bizottság Közös Kutatóközpontja hozta létre világszintű médiainformációs eszközként: http://emm.jrc.it/NewsBrief/sourceslist/en/list.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001957/14
to the Commission
Iuliu Winkler (PPE) and Csaba Sógor (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Why does the Commission's representation in Bucharest not communicate in Hungarian?

We, the undersigned, ask the Commission to ensure that its representation in Romania also use Hungarian in its communications. Its representation in Bucharest currently has no Hungarian-language media or political monitoring, and Hungarian is absent from its communications.

We represent the 1.3 million-strong Hungarian community in Romania at the European Parliament. We are concerned that the Hungarian-language media in our country receives no direct information from the Commission in Hungarian and is not monitored by the EU institutions, so that the Commission effectively neglects our community. The problem damages the interests not only of the Hungarian community in Romania. The Commission must not maintain a situation whereby it neither provides information to nor monitors directly the media channels in a community which has more members than some Member States have inhabitants. 1.3 million Hungarians live in Romania: as many as the population of Estonia and more than the combined populations of Cyprus, Luxembourg and Malta. These countries have their own Commission representations. There are a number of instances of the Commission making a commitment through its representations to ethnic or minority communities in certain Member States — in Barcelona, for example, communication is in Catalan. In a number of cases the number of people in the communities in question is far lower than the number of Hungarians in Romania: in Helsinki the Commission communicates in Swedish with that language community (numbering 0.3 million), in Nicosia it does so in Turkish (0.3 million) and in Brussels, in German (0.08 million). The Hungarian community in Romania is one of the biggest and best-organised communities in the EU. It has its own media setup, with a countrywide private TV channel, Hungarian-language programmes on public service television, more than 10 regional channels, two national and more than 20 local radio stations, over 30 local/regional media bodies, and at least 10 popular online news portals.

The Hungarian community in Romania is entitled to information and monitoring (political information) at the same level and of the same quality as Romanian native speakers and the Romanian-language media. It is also important for the EU institutions that Hungarians in Romania be informed in their own language and via their own media channels of the EU issues and policies which affect their daily lives.

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

European Commission Representations in Member States communicate in the official languages of the country in which they are based. In this case, the only official language is Romanian, as per the Constitution of Romania. The hungarian language is a minority language in Romania (along with other 19 minority languages), recognised as such by the Romanian state through the ratification in 2007 ([1]) of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. The use of Hungarian at regional/local level is regulated by the Law of public local administration, where the minority represents more than 20% of the population. In countries where minority languages have been recognised as official languages, the Commission communicates also in these languages as well.

At the same time, all Commission Representations are connected to and promote the general website of the Commission, as well as the Europa portal, which uses for official documents all the 24 EU official languages. They also distribute official publications issued by the EU institutions in both national and minority languages, when available. The EDIC ([2]) network has 3 outlets in the majority Hungarian-speaking counties in Romania ([3]) that communicate mainly in Hungarian on European topics.

Moreover, the Commission Representation in Romania includes among its officials a member of the Hungarian community.

In reference to your question about communication with the Hungarian language media, we would inform you that the Commission Representation in Romania monitors mostly national level media outlets. To get informed on topics of interest for the media, the Representation also uses the Europe Media Monitor ([4]) (EMM) website which includes several Hungarian-speaking online sources for Romania.

([1]) Law no 282/2007.
([2]) Europe Direct Information Centres.
([3]) In the cities Covasna, Tarnave and Odorhei.
([4]) EMM is developed by the Commission's Joint Research Centre as a tool for worldwide media information: http://emm.jrc.it/NewsBrief/sourceslist/en/list.html

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001958/14
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(19 februarie 2014)

Subiect: VP/HR — Procesul de pace din Orientul Mijlociu

Care sunt prioritățile Înaltului Reprezentant pentru anul 2014, în vederea realizării de progrese în negocierile din procesul de pace israeliano-palestinian? Ce măsuri active de promovare a dialogului între cele două părți are în vedere Înaltul Reprezentant, dat fiind faptul că, la sfârșitul anului 2013, după reuniunea Consiliului Afaceri Externe din 16 decembrie, a fost anunțat un pachet de sprijin al UE fără precedent din punct de vedere economic în cazul ajungerii la un acord între părți?

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

Înaltul Reprezentant/vicepreședintele (ÎR/VP) se implică pe deplin împreună cu partenerii israelieni și palestinieni în susținerea actualelor negocieri mediate de SUA în vederea găsirii unei soluții a conflictului care să fie bazată pe coexistența a două state. ÎR/VP coordonează politicile statelor membre ale UE și inițiativele bilaterale pentru elaborarea unei abordări europene eficace a procesului de pace din Orientul Mijlociu. De asemenea, ÎR/VP menține strânse legături de cooperare în domeniul diplomatic cu partenerii internaționali, în special cu Liga Arabă. În acest moment-cheie al procesului de pace, ÎR/VP va continua să își desfășoare activitatea de cooperare în domeniul diplomatic și să evidențieze contribuția UE la un acord de pace definitiv și la punerea în aplicare a acestuia.

Consiliul Afaceri Externe din decembrie 2013 a hotărât ca UE să furnizeze un pachet de sprijin fără precedent pentru ambele părți în contextul acordului privind statutul final pe baza unui parteneriat privilegiat special (PPS). PPS va dezvolta în continuare relațiile bilaterale bogate care există între Europa și fiecare parte și, de asemenea, va clădi un parteneriat triunghiular între israelieni, europeni și palestinieni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001958/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Middle East peace process

What are the High Representative's priorities for 2014 as regards ensuring that progress is made in the negotiations within the Israel-Palestine peace process? What proactive steps does the High Representative plan to take to promote dialogue between the two sides, given that in late 2013, following the Foreign Affairs Council on 16 December, it was announced that a raft of EU support measures of unprecedented economic value would be implemented if the parties came to an agreement?

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

The HR/VP is fully engaged with Israeli and the Palestinian partners in support to the current US-brokered negotiations towards the two-state solution of the conflict. She is coordinating EU Member States' policies and bilateral initiatives to devise an effective European approach to the MEPP. She is also maintaining close diplomatic engagement with international partners, particularly the Arab League. At this key time in the peace process, the HR/VP will continue to pursue her diplomatic engagement and further highlight EU's contribution to a final peace agreement and its implementation.

The December 2013 Foreign Affairs Council committed the EU to provide unprecedented support package for both parties in the context of the final status agreement on the basis of a special privileged partnership (SPP). The SPP will further develop the existing rich bilateral relations between Europe and each party and also build a triangular partnership between Israelis, Europeans and Palestinians.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001959/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(19 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Situația copiilor instituționalizați în Uniunea Europeană

Agenda UE privind drepturile copilului prezintă 11 acțiuni pe care Comisia a început să le pună în aplicare și care au ca scop reafirmarea angajamentului ferm al instituțiilor UE și al statelor membre față de promovarea, protejarea și respectarea drepturilor copilului în cadrul tuturor politicilor relevante ale UE și materializarea acestui angajament în rezultate concrete.

Deși sunt menționate diferite grupuri vulnerabile de copii, categoria copiilor instituționalizați nu este inclusă. Numai în România, conform ultimelor date statistice disponibile, peste 65 000 de copii sunt instituționalizați.

Are Comisia date statistice referitoare la numărul real al acestor copii la nivelul UE și date referitoare la condițiile de instituționalizare (cazare, alimentație, asistență medicală și socială etc.) în statele membre?

Deși gestionarea sistemelor de asistență socială și protecție a copilului este de competența statelor membre, care sunt măsurile pe care le are în vedere Comisia pentru această categorie de copii defavorizați?

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(2 mai 2014)

Comisia este ferm angajată față de protecția tuturor copiilor și tinerilor aflați în situații vulnerabile.

Comisia, împreună cu succesorul Grupului ad-hoc de experți pentru tranziția de la îngrijirea instituțională către cea din cadrul comunității, a organizat în statele membre seminarii naționale ca să sprijine promovarea unor acțiuni finanțate din fondurile structurale și de investiții europene, menite să promoveze o tranziție eficace către viața în rândul comunității, pe baza unui instrumentar elaborat în acest scop ([1]).

Trecerea de la îngrijirea instituțională către cea din cadrul comunității face acum parte din noul pachet legislativ privind fondurile structurale și de investiții europene. În documentele de programare pentru perioada 2014-2020, Comisia preconizează măsuri solide în acest domeniu. Fondul european de dezvoltare regională ar trebui să sprijine trecerea la îngrijirea din cadrul comunității prin investiții în infrastructura socială, de sănătate, a locuințelor și educațională.

În plus, atât recomandarea Comisiei intitulată „Investiția în copii: ruperea cercului vicios al defavorizării” ([2]), cât și Strategia europeană pentru persoanele cu handicap 2010-2020 sprijină statele membre în promovarea tranziției de la îngrijirea instituțională către cea din cadrul comunității, prin reforme și investiții specifice în servicii de îngrijire alternativă.

În sfârșit, în cooperare cu statele membre, Comisia caută modalități de a îmbunătăți colectarea datelor privind persoanele care trăiesc în instituții. Comisia preconizează că rezultatele recensământului din 2011 al populației și al locuințelor din UE, care vor fi disponibile în cursul anului 2014, vor oferi informații privind numărul și caracteristicile demografice ale persoanelor care trăiesc în instituții.

([1]) http://deinstitutionalisationguide.eu/
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32013H0112&qid=1398686205110&from=RO

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001959/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Situation of children living in institutions in the EU

The EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child lists 11 actions which the Commission has begun to implement and which seek to reinforce the firm commitment of the EU institutions and the Member States to promoting, upholding and enforcing the rights of the child in all relevant EU policies and to turn that commitment into concrete achievements.

Although the Agenda refers to various different kinds of vulnerable children, those living in institutions are not one of the groups. According to the latest statistics, in Romania alone there are over 65 000 children living in institutions.

Does the Commission have statistics on the actual numbers of such children across the EU and information on the conditions in which they are living (accommodation, food, healthcare and social assistance, etc.) in the Member States?

Managing child social assistance and welfare is the competence of the Member States, but can the Commission state what plans it has to help this category of underprivileged children?

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

The Commission is strongly committed to the protection of all children and young people in vulnerable situations.

The Commission, together with the successor of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on the Transition from Institutional to Community-based Care, has been organising national seminars in the Member States to support the programming of ESI Funds actions promoting effective transition to community-based living, based on a toolkit developed for this purpose. ([1])

The shift from institutional to community-based care is now part of the new European Structural and Investment Funds legislative package. The Commission expects powerful measures in this field in the programming documents for 2014-2020. The European Regional Development Fund should support the shift to community-based care through investments in social, health, housing and education infrastructure.

Furthermore, both the Commission recommendation on 'Investing in Children: breaking the cycle of disadvantage' ([2]) and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 support the Member States in promoting the transition from institutional to community-based care, through reforms and targeted investment in alternative care services.

Finally, the Commission in cooperation with Member States is working in ways to improve the collection of data on people living in institutions. The Commission expects that information on the size and demographic characteristics of the population living in institutions will be available from the results of the 2011 EU Population and Housing Censuses, which will be available later in 2014.

([1]) http://deinstitutionalisationguide.eu/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/c_2013_778_en.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-001960/14
til Kommissionen
Rina Ronja Kari (GUE/NGL)
(19. februar 2014)

Om: EU-støtte til udflytning af virksomheder

En række danske virksomheder har modtaget EU-strukturfondsmidler til produktion i Polen, herunder Royal Greenland, Carlsberg, Flügger og LM Wind Power. Ifølge den danske fagforening 3F er EU-støtten gået til udflytning af flere hundrede danske job.

For eksempel peger 3F på, at Royal Greenland i 2008 flyttede 110 arbejdspladser fra Danmark til Polen, efter at virksomheden modtog 53 mio. DKK i EU-støtte til produktion i Polen ([1]).

I 2012 skrev kommissær Johannes Hahn i et brev om tefabrikken Twinings udflytning fra Storbritannien til Polen, at virksomheder ikke må modtage EU-midler til investeringer, der fører til nedlæggelse af arbejdspladser i samme firma i en anden region i EU. Derudover står der i Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 1080/2006 om Den Europæiske Fond for Regionaludvikling, »at fællesskabsmidler ikke støtter flytning inden for EU«.

Det er medlemmet bekendt, at kommissær Hahn's talsperson, Shirin Whealer, har udtalt, at Kommissionen vil igangsætte en undersøgelse af de konkrete sager.

Kommissionen bedes derfor besvare følgende spørgsmål:

1. Fører Kommissionen kontrol med, om virksomheder misbruger EU-midler til at flytte job fra et EU-land til et andet? Hvordan gennemføres en sådan kontrol i givet fald?

2. Kan Kommissionen garantere, at der ikke har fundet lignende tilfælde af misbrug sted? Hvis Kommissionen ikke kan garanter dette, agter Kommissionen da at iværksætte en undersøgelse af omfanget af misbrug med EU-midler?

3. Hvilke nye tiltag vil Kommissionen iværksætte for at stoppe denne type misbrug af EU-midler?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Johannes Hahn
(21. marts 2014)

Kommissionen støtter ikke anvendelsen af EU-strukturfondsmidler på en måde, der tilskynder eller befordrer relokaliseringen af tjenesteydelser eller produktion til andre medlemslande. Kommissionens tjenestegrene undersøger lige nu en række sager om mulig relokalisering i forbindelse med store projekter (projekter på over 50 mio. EUR), der er underlagt Kommissionens direkte kontrol.

I henhold til princippet om delt forvaltning er det i første række de nationale eller regionale forvaltningsmyndigheders ansvar at sikre, at der ikke finder ulovlig relokalisering sted. Gøres Kommissionen opmærksom på et eventuelt tilfælde af relokalisering i forbindelse med støtte inden for samhørighedspolitikken, forlanger den, at medlemsstaterne indleder en undersøgelse. Hvis de pågældende regler ikke er blevet fulgt, sikrer Kommissionen, at enhver støtte inddrives.

For at styrke det juridiske grundlag for de europæiske struktur- og investeringsfonde i perioden 2014-2020 er der blevet vedtaget nye bestemmelser om relokalisering. Disse præciserer, at et projekt som hovedregel skal tilbagebetale enhver EU-støtte, som det har modtaget, hvis produktionsvirksomheden flyttes uden for programområdet (men inden for Unionen) inden for 5 år efter den endelige betaling til støttemodtageren, eller hvis den flyttes uden for Unionen inden for 10 år efter den endelige betaling. Der gælder særlige bestemmelser for SMV'er, og såfremt statsstøttereglerne finder anvendelse.

Derudover er de nye retningslinjer for statsstøtte med regionalt sigte for 2014-2020 ([2]), der fastsætter, hvordan medlemsstater kan yde investeringsstøtte til virksomheder for at støtte udviklingen i ugunstigt stillede regioner i Europa, også blevet styrket. Statsstøtte med regionalt sigte, der bevirker, at samme eller en tilsvarende aktivitet flyttes inden for Det Europæiske Økonomiske Samarbejdsområde (EØS), vil ikke blive tilladt.

([1]) http://www.fagbladet3f.dk/temaer/polsk_jobfest/d60c6f0f99814f549116925d4f3f3cf5-20140213-eu-penge-kostede-110-job-i-fisken.
([2]) EUT C 209 af 23.7.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001960/14
to the Commission
Rina Ronja Kari (GUE/NGL)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: EU funding for the relocation of operations

A number of Danish firms have received EU Structural Fund monies for production facilities in Poland, including Royal Greenland, Carlsberg, Flügger and LM Wind Power. According to the Danish trade union 3F, the EU funding has been used to relocate several hundred Danish jobs.

For instance, 3F points out that Royal Greenland relocated 110 jobs from Denmark to Poland in 2008 after receiving DKK 53 million in support for production facilities in Poland ([1]).

In 2012, in a letter concerning relocation by tea producer Twinings from the United Kingdom to Poland, Commissioner Johannes Hahn stated that firms should not receive EU funding for investment which would lead to job losses in those firms in another region of the EU. In addition, Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 on the European Regional Development Fund states that 'Community funding does not support relocation within the European Union'.

I am aware that Commissioner Hahn's spokesperson, Shirin Wheeler, has stated that the Commission is willing to launch an investigation into the specific cases concerned.

Accordingly:

1. Is the Commission carrying out checks as to whether firms are making improper use of EU funding in order to relocate jobs from one Member State to another? If so, how are such checks carried out?

2. Can the Commission give an assurance that there have been no similar instances where monies have been improperly used? If the Commission is unable to give such an assurance, does it intend to carry out an investigation into the extent of improper use of EU monies?

3. What new measures will the Commission take to put an end to this type of improper use of EU monies?

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

The Commission does not support the use of EU Structural Funds in a way that would encourage or facilitate the relocation of services or production to another Member State. The Commission services are currently investigating a number of cases of possible relocation in the context of major projects (projects of over EUR 50 million), which are subject to direct appraisal by the Commission.

In accordance with the shared management principle, national or regional management authorities are ultimately responsible for ensuring that no prohibited relocation takes place. Whenever the Commission is made aware of a potential case of relocation involving cohesion policy support, it requires Member States to investigate. If the relevant rules have not been followed, the Commission ensures that any funding provided is recovered.

In order to strengthen the European Structural and Investment Funds' legal basis in the 2014-2020 period, new provisions on relocation were adopted specifying that, as a general rule, a project will have to repay any Union funding it has received if the productive activity relocates outside the programme area (but within the Union) within 5 years of the final payment to the beneficiary, or outside the Union within 10 years of the final payment. There are specific provisions for SMEs and in case State Aid rules apply.

Moreover, the new Guidelines on Regional State Aid for the 2014-2014 period, ([2]) which establish how Member States can grant investment aid to companies in order to support the development of disadvantaged regions in Europe, have also been strengthened: regional state aid that has caused a same or a similar activity to relocate within the European Economic Area (EEA) will not be allowed.

([1]) http://www.fagbladet3f.dk/temaer/polsk_jobfest/d60c6f0f99814f549116925d4f3f3cf5-20140213-eu-penge-kostede-110-job-i-fisken
([2]) Official Journal C209, 23.7.2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001961/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Pobreza hídrica en España

En España, la situación de crisis actual y la privatización han disparado los cortes de agua por impago. La Asociación Española de Operadores Públicos de Abastecimiento y Saneamiento (AEOPAS) ha realizado un estudio para calcular los cortes de agua que se realizan en España y ha determinado que cada año se tramitan más de 500 000 avisos de corte, un 30 % más que hace cuatro años, y que de estos, se llegan a ejecutar un 60 %, es decir, 300 000 ([1]).

En España no existen datos oficiales sobre el fenómeno masivo de cortes, ya que el suministro de agua es un servicio local y cada municipio lo gestiona a su manera.

Algunos municipios como Medina Sidonia (Cádiz), medio centenar de pueblos de Huelva gestionados por la empresa pública Giahsa, Zaragoza o El Prat de Llobregat (Barcelona) han aprobado no cortar el agua a quien no pueda pagar.

Esta semana el Parlamento Europeo ha debatido la primera iniciativa ciudadana europea admitida a trámite, que ha recogido 1,8 millones de firmas de ciudadanos y ciudadanas de 28 Estados de la UE distintos y que solicita considerar el agua como un derecho humano.

El 28 de julio de 2010, a través de la Resolución 64/292, la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas reconoció explícitamente el derecho humano al agua y al saneamiento, reafirmando que un agua potable limpia y el saneamiento son esenciales para la realización de todos los derechos humanos.

1. ¿Conocía la Comisión el número de cortes de agua que se realizan en España?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión que debería existir un registro de datos oficiales de los cortes de agua que se realicen en España?

3. ¿Considera la Comisión que no se debería cortar el agua a quien no la puede pagar?

4. ¿Considera la Comisión, tal y como reconocieron las Naciones Unidas, que el acceso al agua potable y saneamiento debe ser un derecho humano?

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

La Comisión está al corriente de la situación de España. La Comisión cree que las medidas de protección de las personas desfavorecidas se han convertido en un elemento tanto más importante considerando el aumento de los problemas relacionados con la pobreza y el acceso al agua, así como la imposibilidad para algunas personas de pagar las facturas del agua.

Las autoridades nacionales de los Estados miembros tienen competencia para adoptar medidas concretas de apoyo para proteger a las personas desfavorecidas y abordar cuestiones relacionadas con la pobreza y el acceso al agua (por ejemplo, mediante ayudas a las familias con bajos ingresos o el establecimiento de obligaciones de servicio público). Estas medidas deberían ser parte integrante de las estrategias de los Estados miembros para reducir la pobreza y la exclusión social, que también están respaldadas y complementadas por la UE, como es el caso, por ejemplo, del conjunto de medidas de inversión social publicado por la Comisión en febrero de 2013.

En su Comunicación relativa a la Iniciativa Ciudadana Europea «El Derecho al agua y el saneamiento como derecho humano» [COM(2014) 177], la Comisión insta a los Estados miembros a intensificar sus esfuerzos por garantizar el suministro de agua potable y saneamiento seguros, limpios y asequibles para todos los ciudadanos, de acuerdo con las recomendaciones de la Organización Mundial de la Salud.

([1]) http://sociedad.elpais.com/sociedad/2014/02/17/actualidad/1392670324_651915.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001961/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Water poverty in Spain

In Spain the current situation of crisis and privatisation has caused a sharp rise in the number of people having their water supply cut off for non-payment. The Spanish Association of Public Water Supply and Sanitation Operators (AEOPAS) has carried out a survey to calculate the number of water supply cut-offs that are carried out in Spain. The result is that over 500 000 cut-off warnings are sent out each year, which is 30% more than four years ago, and that 60% of these, i.e. 300 000, are then carried out ([1]).

Spain does not have official data on the huge phenomenon of water cut-offs, because water supplies are local services and each town and village administers them in their own way.

Some towns, such as Medina Sidonia in Cadiz, fifty or so villages in Huelva, whose supplies are managed by the public company Giahsa, Zaragoza and El Prat de Llobregat in Barcelona, have decided not to cut off the water supplies of people who are unable to pay.

This week the European Parliament has debated the first European citizens' initiative given leave to proceed, signed by 1.8 million people from 28 different Member States of the Union, which asks that access to water be considered a human right.

On 28 July 2010, in terms of Resolution 64/292, the General Assembly of the United Nations explicitly recognised the human right to water and sanitation and reaffirmed that clean drinking water and sanitation are essential to the realisation of all human rights.

1. Was the Commission aware of the number of water supply cut-offs that are carried out in Spain?

2. Does the Commission consider that there should be a register of official data for water cut-offs in Spain?

3. Does the Commission consider that the water supplies of people who cannot pay should not be cut off?

4. Does the Commission consider that access to drinking water and sanitation ought to be a human right, as recognised by the United Nations?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation in Spain. The Commission believes that measures to safeguard disadvantaged people have become all the more important given the increase in water-poverty issues during the economic crisis and the inability of some people to pay their water bills.

It is national authorities in the Member States who are competent for taking concrete support measures safeguarding disadvantaged people and tackling water-poverty issues (e.g. through support for low-income households or through the establishment of public service obligations). Such measures should be part and parcel of the Member States' policies to reduce poverty and social exclusion, which are also supported and complemented at EU level, for instance with Social Investment Package published by the Commission in February 2013.

In its communication on the European Citizens' Initiative 'Right2Water', COM(2014) 177, the Commission invites the Member States to step up their efforts to guarantee the provision of safe, clean and affordable drinking water and sanitation to all citizens, in accordance with the recommendations of the World Health Organisation.

([1]) http://sociedad.elpais.com/sociedad/2014/02/17/actualidad/1392670324_651915.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001962/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(19 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ιδιωτικοποιήσεις στην Κύπρο και διασφάλιση των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων

Η κυβέρνηση της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, στα πλαίσια της εφαρμογής του Μνημονίου Συναντίληψης με την Τρόικα, προωθεί για έγκριση ειδικό νομοσχέδιο για ιδιωτικοποιήσεις κρατικών οργανισμών, μεταξύ άλλων στους τομείς των τηλεπικοινωνιών, του ηλεκτρισμού και των λιμανιών. Το νομοσχέδιο συναντά ισχυρές αντιδράσεις από εργαζομένους και πολιτικά κόμματα. Ένα από τα επιχειρήματα που προβάλλονται εναντίον του νομοσχεδίου είναι ότι δεν διασφαλίζει τη συνέχιση της εργασίας, το εισόδημα και τα συνταξιοδοτικά δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων, τα οποία, ας σημειωθεί, είναι κατοχυρωμένα και στο ίδιο το Σύνταγμα της Κύπρου, αφού οι εργαζόμενοι στους οργανισμούς αυτούς έχουν καθεστώς ισότιμο με εκείνο δημοσίου υπαλλήλου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σε ανάλογες περιπτώσεις άλλων κρατών μελών που προχώρησαν σε ιδιωτικοποιήσεις, υπήρξε κατοχύρωση των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων και με ποιους τρόπους;

2. Υπάρχουν καλές και κοινά αποδεκτές πρακτικές που χρησιμοποιήθηκαν σε άλλες περιπτώσεις, και θα μπορούσαν να χρησιμοποιηθούν και στην Κύπρο;

3. Πώς μπορεί η Επιτροπή να βοηθήσει στην επίλυση του προβλήματος αυτού και τι εισηγείται στην κυβέρνηση της Κύπρου;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Μαρτίου 2014)

Κάθε κράτος μέλος διαθέτει το οικείο νομικό πλαίσιο για τις ιδιωτικοποιήσεις και για την ιατροφαρμακευτική περίθαλψη των υπαλλήλων των οργανισμών που παύουν να ανήκουν στο δημόσιο. Το δίκαιο της ΕΕ (συμπεριλαμβανομένης της οδηγίας 2001/23/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου) καθορίζει ορισμένες υποχρεώσεις στα κράτη μέλη σχετικά με το θέμα αυτό.

Ο αναθεωρημένος και εκδοθείς κυπριακός νόμος για την ιδιωτικοποίηση της 4ης Μαρτίου ορίζει ότι η κυβέρνηση διασφαλίζει το καταστατικό και τα δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων στην κρατική επιχείρηση (ΚΕ), συμπεριλαμβανομένων των συντάξεων, επιδομάτων και δικαιωμάτων εκπροσώπησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001962/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Privatisation in Cyprus and the safeguarding of workers' rights

The Republic of Cyprus, as part of the memorandum of understanding with the Troika, is pushing for the adoption of a special bill on the privatisation of state organisations, including in the areas of telecommunications, electricity and ports. The bill has encountered stiff resistance from workers and the political parties. One of the objections to the bill is that it fails to ensure the continuation of employment for, and the income and the pension rights of, workers — rights which, it should be noted, are enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus, since employees in these organisations have a status equivalent to that of civil servants.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. In similar cases in other Member States that have undertaken privatisation programmes, were workers' rights protected and, if so, how?

2. Are there any are good and commonly accepted practices adopted in other cases that could also be applied in Cyprus?

3. How can it help solve this problem and what does it recommend that the government of Cyprus do?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

Each Member State has its own legal framework for privatisation and for the treatment of the employees of organisations moving out of public ownership. EC law (including Council Directive 2001/23/EC) places some obligations on Member States in this respect.

The revised and adopted Cypriot privatisation law of 4 March specifies that the Government will safeguard the state-owned enterprise (SOE) employees' existing status and rights, including pensions, benefits and representation rights.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001963/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Free trade agreements

In the view of the Commission, to what extent should free trade agreements and other agreements encompassing trade be determined by Article 21(1) of the Treaty on European Union?

For ease of reference, the article reads as follows: 'The Union's action on the international scene shall be guided by the principles which have inspired its own creation, development and enlargement, and which it seeks to advance in the wider world: democracy, the rule of law, the universality and indivisibility of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality and solidarity, and respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law'.

Question for written answer E-001966/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Free trade agreements

In the Commission's opinion, to what extent should free trade agreements and other agreements encompassing trade be determined by Article 21(2)(f) of the Treaty on European Union?

For ease of reference, the article reads as follows: 'help develop international measures to preserve and improve the quality of the environment and the sustainable management of global natural resources, in order to ensure sustainable development'.

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

Article 207(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU sets out that the common commercial policy of the EU 'shall be conducted in the context of the principles and objectives of the Union's external action'. The principles and objectives of the Union's external action are laid out in Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union, as partly cited by the Honourable Member.

The EU's trade and investment agreements represent instruments of the common commercial policy, which pursue commercial policy objectives as its main goal. At the same time, as stipulated by the abovementioned Treaties' provisions, trade agreements shall respect the EU's external action principles and be construed to reflect as well as pursue the objectives set out in Article 21, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Treaty on European Union.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001964/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Inflation in Germany

Does the Commission agree with the statement given by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development which claims that 'Germany must accept higher inflation or large parts of the Eurozone could be sucked into a deflationary spiral'?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

The Commission services' winter 2014 forecast published on 25 February projects a protracted period of low inflation for the euro area, with an annual change in the Harmonised Index of Consumer Prices (HICP) of 1.0% in 2014 followed by a slight acceleration to 1.3% in 2015. Only one country is forecast to experience a limited period of negative inflation (Greece: -0.6% in 2014, followed by 0.2% in 2015). In addition to the fading out of some temporary factors and the continued downward trend in commodity prices, low projected inflation in the euro area reflects weak demand in the current cyclical phase, reinforced by relative price adjustments. Given the gradually strengthening recovery, the increase in confidence and the ongoing efforts to improve the health of the banking system, the risk of outright deflation in the euro area as a whole seems low.

In its recent In-Depth Review on the German economy in the context of the Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure (MIP), the Commission has underlined the benefits of higher domestic demand in Germany. In particular, while a rebalancing of German economic growth implying a further strengthening of domestic demand would primarily be in the interest of Germany itself, it would entail the additional benefit of providing an impetus to demand in the euro area. While relative price changes remain an important element in euro area countries' adjustment process, a further strengthening of German domestic demand would thus help address one of the factors underlying the current weak inflation trends in the euro area.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001965/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Turkey's candidacy for EU membership

Is the Commission of the view that the current status of Turkey's candidacy for accession to the EU should be re-assessed in light of the recent deterioration of the Turkish economy?

Question for written answer E-001977/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Turkey's candidacy for EU membership

Will the Commission prepare an impact assessment of the cost of Turkish membership of the EU for contributing Member States?

If so, when would such an impact assessment be released?

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

EU membership requires, amongst other criteria, that the candidate country ensures the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union. The Commission considers Turkey a functioning market economy. Following a slowdown in 2012, Turkey's economy re-accelerated in 2013 and achieved an annual GDP growth rate of 4%.

As a candidate country, Turkey submits a Pre-Accession Economic Programme to the Commission on an annual basis. Following the Commission's assessment, the programme is discussed in a Ministerial Dialogue between the Economic and Finance Ministers of the EU and the Turkish authorities.

The financial implications of a possible accession by Turkey to the EU will be the subject of negotiations at a later stage of the accession process. An estimate of the financial implications would not be meaningful at this point.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001967/14
to the Council
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Luxembourg

In view of the very high GDP per capita of Luxembourg — over two times the EU average — does the Council have any plans to move Parliament operations to other countries in the EU?

Reply
(13 May 2014)

In accordance with Protocol No 6 to the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, 'the General Secretariat of the European Parliament and its departments shall remain in Luxembourg'. Modifying that Protocol would be a matter for the Member States, not for the Council. It is thus not for the Council to comment on the issue raised in the question.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001968/14
aan de Commissie
Peter van Dalen (ECR) en Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(19 februari 2014)

Betreft: Vragen over het rapport „Tainted Carpets — Slavery and child labour in India's Hand-Made Carpet Sector"

1. Kent u het rapport „Tainted Carpets — Slavery and Child Labor in India's Hand-Made Carpet Sector" van het FXB Center for Health and Human Rights van de Harvard University ([1])?

2. Hoe beoordeelt u het feit dat kinderarbeid en andere misstanden in de Indiase tapijtindustrie al ruim twintig jaar geleden uitvoerig in de publiciteit kwamen, dat sindsdien een aantal vrijwillige initiatieven is ondernomen maar dat de in het rapport beschreven situatie van tapijtarbeiders nog steeds ronduit dramatisch is en voor het overgrote deel bestaat uit gedwongen arbeid en kinderarbeid onder zeer ongezonde arbeidsomstandigheden en tegen extreem lage lonen?

3. Bent u bereid onderzoek te laten doen naar de betrokkenheid van in Europa actieve tapijtimporteurs en verkopers bij slavernij en kinderarbeid in de Indiase tapijtindustrie, waaronder de in het rapport genoemde bedrijven IKEA en Wal-Mart? Welke maatregelen gaat u nemen om er voor te zorgen dat de Indiase tapijten die op de Europese markt worden verkocht zonder slavernij en kinderarbeid zijn gemaakt?

4. Bent u bereid bij de Indiase regering aan te dringen op effectieve actie tegen slavernij en kinderarbeid in de tapijtindustrie en samen activiteiten daartegen te ondernemen?

5. Kunnen de Europese bedrijven die zijn aangesloten bij de keurmerken als Goodweave, Rugmark en/of het Care & Fair initiatief van de Europese tapijtindustrie met redelijke zekerheid aantonen dat hun tapijten uit India niet door slaven of kinderen zijn gemaakt?

6. Bent u bereid Europese brancheorganisaties die tapijtimporteurs en/of verkopers van Indiase tapijten vertegenwoordigen aan te spreken op de noodzaak actie te ondernemen tegen slavernij en kinderarbeid bij de productie van door hen ingekochte of verkochte Indiase tapijten?

Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie
(7 april 2014)

De Commissie verwijst naar de antwoorden op de schriftelijke vragen E-005948/2012 en E-009096/2012 over India, E-013322/2013 over de maatschappelijke verantwoordelijkheid van ondernemingen, E-13545/2013 inzake etikettering en E-000021/2014 en E-013160/2013 inzake kinderarbeid.

In het werkdocument van de diensten van de Commissie uit 2013 betreffende handel en de ergste vormen van kinderarbeid wordt de link tussen internationale handel en de ergste vormen van kinderarbeid nader onderzocht. Het is belangrijk dat een overkoepelende aanpak wordt nagestreefd die de diepere oorzaken van kinderarbeid aanpakt, zoals armoedebestrijding, toegang tot onderwijs, sociale bescherming enz.

De EU is een sterke voorstander van de ratificatie en uitvoering van de fundamentele verdragen van de Internationale Arbeidsorganisatie (IAO), waaronder de uitbanning van slavernij en kinderarbeid. De Commissie zal zich ook blijven inzetten voor de uitvoering van de langetermijnstrategie van de EU inzake kinderrechten.

De Commissie bedankt de geachte Parlementsleden voor het onder de aandacht brengen van een recente studie over arbeidspraktijken, meer bepaald in India's handgemaakte-tapijtindustrie. Gezien de al verrichte en lopende werkzaamheden, waaronder documenten van de Commissie, is de Commissie niet voornemens om een nieuwe studie te verrichten die specifiek gericht is op de sector en het land in kwestie.

De strijd tegen kinderarbeid in India werd behandeld tijdens de lokale mensenrechtendialoog tussen de EU en India, en in de ontwikkelingssamenwerking van de EU, waaronder door middel van specifieke projecten met betrekking tot kinderarbeid. De dialoog tussen de EU en India over het werkgelegenheidsbeleid en sociaal beleid omvat tevens ruimere aanverwante onderwerpen, zoals werkomstandigheden en sociale bescherming.

([1]) http://fxb.harvard.edu/tainted-carpets-report/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001968/14
to the Commission
Peter van Dalen (ECR) and Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Questions about the report 'Tainted Carpets — Slavery and Child Labour in India's Hand-Made Carpet Sector'

1. Is the Commission aware of the report 'Tainted Carpets — Slavery and Child Labour in India's Hand-Made Carpet Sector' by the FXB Center for Health and Human Rights at Harvard University ([1])?

2. What view does the Commission take of the fact that child labour and other abuses in the Indian carpet industry have already been amply publicised in the past 20 years and more, that, since then, a number of voluntary initiatives have been undertaken but that the situation of carpet workers as described in the report is still extremely serious, with the bulk of the industry using forced labour and child labour under very unhealthy working conditions and for extremely low wages?

3. Will the Commission order research into ways in which carpet importers and vendors operating in Europe are involved in slavery and child labour in the Indian carpet industry, including the companies named in the report, IKEA and Wal-Mart? What measures will the Commission take to ensure that Indian carpets sold on the European market have been made without resorting to slavery and child labour?

4. Will the Commission urge the Indian Government to take effective action against slavery and child labour in the carpet industry and jointly act against these phenomena?

5. Can European businesses which are affiliated to such European carpet industry certification schemes as Goodweave, Rugmark and/or the Care & Fair initiative demonstrate with a reasonable level of certainty that their Indian carpets have not been made by slaves or children?

6. Will the Commission contact European sectoral organisations representing importers and/or vendors of Indian carpets and draw their attention to the need to take action against slavery and child labour in the production of Indian carpets which they buy or sell?

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

The Commission refers to the replies to written questions E-005948/2012, E-009096/2012 on India, E-013322/2013 on corporate social responsibility, E-13545/2013 regarding labelling and E-000021/2014 and E-013160/2013, regarding child labour.

The Commission Staff Working Document on Trade and the Worst Forms of Child Labour of 2013 provides a deeper look at the link between international trade and the worst forms of child labour. It is important to pursue a holistic approach addressing the root causes of child labour such as poverty eradication, access to education, social protection, etc.

The EU strongly supports the ratification and implementation of the fundamental Conventions of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), including the abolition of slavery and child labour. The Commission is also committed to implement the EU's long-term strategy on children's rights.

The Commission thanks the Honourable Members for drawing attention to a recent study on labour practices specifically in India's hand-made carpet sector. Given the existing work, including Commission Documents, the Commission has no plan to carry out a further sector-and country-specific study.

Combating child labour in India has been addressed in the EU-India local Human Rights Dialogue, and EU development cooperation, including through specific projects on child labour. The EU-India dialogue on employment and social policy covers also broader related subjects such as working conditions, social protection.

([1]) http://fxb.harvard.edu/tainted-carpets-report/

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-001969/14
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)
(20 februari 2014)

Betreft: VP/HR — Anti-homowet Oeganda

Op 23 januari is de anti-homowet, waarmee homoseksualiteit strafbaar wordt gesteld, formeel door het Oegandese parlement aangeboden aan de President. Afgelopen weekend heeft president Museveni aangegeven dat hij de anti-homo wet wil ondertekenen.

1. Is de VP/HR van mening dat ondertekening van deze wet een grove schending betekent van de rechten van seksuele minderheden en dat dit derhalve onaanvaardbaar is?

2. Welke acties heeft de VP/HR reeds ondernomen om te verhinderen dat president Museveni de wet alsnog tekent?

3. Is de VP/HR van mening dat de Europese Unie maatregelen moet treffen tegen Oeganda indien de anti-homowet door de president wordt ondertekend? Welke maatregelen overweegt de VP/HR?

4. Verschillende lidstaten (Nederland, België) zijn voornemens om de financiële steun aan Oeganda te bevriezen indien de anti-homowet wordt ondertekend. Is de VP/HR bereid om met de lidstaten in gesprek te treden om gemeenschappelijke maatregelen tegen Oeganda te treffen indien de anti-homowet wordt ondertekend?

5. Ontvangt Oeganda thans financiële steun van de Europese Unie? Indien het geval, hoeveel Europees geld ontvangt Oeganda jaarlijks?

6. Is de VP/HR bereid om bovengenoemde Europese financiële steun direct te bevriezen indien de anti-homowet wordt ondertekend door president Museveni?

7. Eind januari meldden Belgische media dat een Belgische man in Oeganda was gearresteerd op beschuldiging van homoseksuele relaties. Kan de VP/HR aangeven of er nog meer Europeanen vast zitten in Oeganda op verdenking van homoseksualiteit?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(11 april 2014)

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter is van mening dat de wet tegen homoseksualiteit in strijd is met de internationale verbintenissen van de Oegandese regering om de fundamentele mensenrechten van al haar burgers te eerbiedigen en beschermen. Deze verbintenissen omvatten onder meer de Universele Verklaring van de rechten van de mens, het Internationaal Verdrag inzake burgerrechten en politieke rechten en het Afrikaanse Handvest van de rechten van de mens en de volkeren. De aanneming van de wet en de reactie van de EU zijn in detail besproken met de lidstaten in de desbetreffende werkgroepen van de Raad. Op 4 maart 2014 heeft de HV/VV namens de EU een verklaring afgelegd waarin ze de wet veroordeelt, hetgeen ze reeds in twee eerdere verklaringen had gedaan, op 18 februari 2014 en 20 december 2013. Het delegatiehoofd van de EU heeft er bij president Museveni verschillende keren persoonlijk voor gelobbyd om het wetsvoorstel niet te ondertekenen. Op 14 februari 2012 werd hij hierbij vergezeld door de EDEO-directeur voor Afrika.

Tijdens een versterkte politieke dialoog op 28 maart hebben de EU en Oeganda gepraat over de wet tegen homoseksualiteit en de potentiële impact ervan op de onderlinge betrekkingen in het kader van de Overeenkomst van Cotonou. In afwachting van het resultaat van de vergadering zijn alle verdere betalingen voor begrotingssteun bevroren. In het kader van het 10e EOF (2008-2013) kreeg Oeganda 439 miljoen euro steun toegewezen. De HV/VV heeft geen weet van Europeanen die momenteel in Oeganda opgepakt zouden zijn op verdenking van homoseksualiteit.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001969/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Uganda's Anti-Homosexuality Bill

On 23 January, the Ugandan Parliament formally submitted to the President the Anti-Homosexuality Bill, making homosexuality a criminal offence. Last weekend, President Museveni indicated that he was willing to sign it.

1. Does the VP/HR consider that signing this bill into law would constitute a serious violation of the rights of sexual minorities and is therefore unacceptable?

2. What action has the VP/HR already taken to prevent President Museveni from signing the bill?

3. Does the VP/HR consider that the European Union should take measures against Uganda if the President signs the Anti-Homosexuality Bill? What measures is the VP/HR considering?

4. Various Member States (the Netherlands, Belgium) intend to freeze financial assistance to Uganda if the Anti-Homosexuality Bill is signed. Will the VP/HR enter into discussions with the Member States with a view to instituting common measures against Uganda if the Anti-Homosexuality Bill is signed?

5. Is Uganda currently receiving financial assistance from the European Union? If so, how much European funding is Uganda receiving per annum?

6. Will the VP/HR immediately freeze the abovementioned European financial assistance if President Museveni signs the Anti-Homosexuality Bill?

7. At the end of January, the Belgian media reported that a Belgian man had been arrested in Uganda on suspicion of having homosexual relations. Can the VP/HR indicate whether any other Europeans are in detention in Uganda on suspicion of homosexuality?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President considers that the Anti-Homosexuality Act contradicts the international commitments of the Ugandan government to respect and protect the fundamental human rights of all its citizens under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the African Charter of Human and Peoples' Rights. The adoption of the Act, and the EU response, has been fully discussed with the Member States in the appropriate Council Working Groups. The HR/VP issued a declaration on behalf of the EU condemning the Act on 4 March 2014, as well as two previous statements on 18 February 2014 and 20 December 2013. The EU's Head of Delegation on several occasions, and in the company of the EEAS Managing Director for Africa on 14 February 2014, has lobbied President Museveni personally not to sign the bill into law.

The EU and Uganda will discuss the Anti-Homosexuality Act, and its potential impact on relations under the Cotonou Agreement, at a round of enhanced political dialogue on 28 March. Any further budget support payments are on hold until the outcome of their meeting. Under the 10th EDF (2008-2013), Uganda has been allocated assistance of EUR 439 million. The HR/VP is not aware of any Europeans currently in detention in Uganda on suspicion of homosexuality.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-001970/14
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(20 de fevereiro de 2014)

Assunto: Fundação de Serralves, Portugal

A existência e as atividades das fundações de utilidade pública que funcionam na União são cruciais nos domínios da educação, formação, investigação, memória histórica e reconciliação entre as nações, proteção do ambiente, juventude e desportos, bem como da arte e da cultura, sendo que o impacto de muitos dos projetos realizados por estas fundações ultrapassa largamente as fronteiras nacionais.

Em 2012, a Comissão apresentou uma proposta de regulamento do Conselho relativo ao Estatuto da Fundação Europeia que visava agilizar o apoio das fundações a causas de interesse público em toda a UE. Após a aprovação pelo Parlamento da sua resolução de 2 de julho de 2013 sobre a proposta de regulamento do Conselho relativo ao Estatuto da Fundação Europeia, tornou-se importante que as negociações sobre este diploma legislativo avancem rapidamente, por forma a proporcionar ao setor das fundações este novo instrumento, cuja necessidade é claramente urgente.

A Fundação de Serralves é reconhecida como uma das principais instituições culturais portuguesas e a mais relevante no norte de Portugal. Esta instituição, cujas atividades se inserem num âmbito internacional, embora estejam igualmente ao serviço da comunidade nacional, tem como missão sensibilizar o público para a arte contemporânea e as questões ambientais.

1. Que prioridades estão inscritas na agenda da Comissão no tocante às políticas da UE no domínio da cultura, em particular no que respeita ao sistema de incentivos fiscais em vigor para o mecenato cultural e os donativos para fins artísticos, e à criação de uma base de dados europeia de projetos culturais, uma vez que a existência de uma base de dados das instituições culturais a nível da Europa contribuiria para consolidar as redes e as ligações transfronteiras?

2. Tendo em conta os seus vários domínios de atividade, ao abrigo de que programas de financiamento da União Europeia poderia a Fundação de Serralves solicitar apoio?

3. Para quando prevê a Comissão o estabelecimento do quadro jurídico para o estatuto da fundação europeia?

Resposta dada por AndroullaVassiliou em nome da Comissão
(25 de março de 2014)

A Comissão está ao corrente do trabalho realizado pela Fundação Serralves, que a Fundação apresentou no último Fórum Europeu da Cultura em 5 de novembro de 2013.

As questões relacionadas com a fiscalidade direta, incluindo a decisão de conceder incentivos fiscais para o mecenato cultural e as doações artísticas são essencialmente da competência dos Estados-Membros. Consequentemente, estes últimos são praticamente livres de decidir as suas regras nesse domínio, desde que respeitem as suas obrigações decorrentes do Tratado. Não existe nenhum plano europeu global a nível de base de dados de projetos ou instituições culturais; dado o elevado número de instituições em toda a Europa e a diversidade dos seus estatutos, não é claro se seria prático criar uma base desse tipo.

Em termos práticos, a Fundação poderia candidatar-se no âmbito do programa Europa Criativa, que financia organizações culturais, em especial projetos de cooperação, de redes e de plataformas. As subvenções são concedidas mediante um processo de seleção, através de convites à apresentação de candidaturas. Para mais informações, consultar:
http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/index_en.htm

Em 8 de fevereiro de 2012, a Comissão apresentou uma proposta ao Conselho relativa a um regulamento sobre o Estatuto da Fundação Europeia. As negociações no Conselho estão ainda em curso. A Comissão espera que, no futuro próximo ([1]), os Estados-Membros cheguem a acordo sobre a referida proposta.

([1]) COM(2012) 035 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001970/14
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: The Serralves Foundation, Portugal

The existence and activities of foundations operating in the Union for the benefit of the public good are crucial in the fields of education, training, research, historical memory and reconciliation between peoples, protection of the environment, youth and sport, as well as arts and culture, with many of the projects undertaken by such foundations having an impact far beyond national borders.

In 2012 the Commission issued a proposal for a Council regulation on the European foundation statute to make it easier for foundations to support public benefit causes across the EU. Following the adoption by Parliament of its resolution of 2 July 2013 on the proposal for a Council regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation, it is imperative that negotiations on this important piece of legislation move forward quickly so as to provide the foundation sector with this new instrument of which it has been clearly in urgent need.

The Serralves Foundation is recognised as one of Portugal's leading cultural institutions and the most distinguished in northern Portugal. The foundation, international in its scope and serving also the national community, has as its mission to raise awareness on contemporary art and environmental issues.

1. What are the Commission's priorities regarding EU cultural policies, in particular with respect to the system of tax incentives in place for cultural patronage and artistic donations, and the establishment of a European database for cultural projects, given that the existence of a European database of cultural institutions would serve to strengthen networks and cross-border links?

2. In view of the various fields of activity of the Serralves Foundation, to which EU funding programmes would it be eligible to apply?

3. When does the Commission expect to have established the legal framework for the European foundation statute?

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

The Commission is aware of the work carried out by the Serralves Foundation, which the Foundation presented at the last European Culture Forum on 5 November 2013.

Direct tax issues, including the decision to provide tax incentives for cultural patronage and artistic donations, fall essentially within the competence of Member States. Hence they are basically free to decide upon their rules in this area, provided that they respect their treaty obligations. A comprehensive European database of cultural projects or institutions does not exist; given the sheer number of institutions across Europe and the diversity of their statutes, it is not clear how practical it would be to create one.

The Foundation could potentially apply under the Creative Europe programme, which provides funding to cultural organisations, in particular for cooperation projects, for networks and for platforms. Grants are awarded following a competitive selection, through calls for proposals. For more information see: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/index_en.htm

The Commission on 8 February 2012 made a proposal to the Council for a regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation. Negotiations in the Council are still ongoing. The Commission hopes that Member States will be able to agree on this proposal in the near future. ([1])

([1]) COM/2012/035 final.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-001971/14
Komisi
Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)
(20. února 2014)

Předmět: Interpelace ve věci certifikace a provozu letadel s elektrickým motorem

Rád bych prostřednictvím této interpelace požádal Evropskou komisi o zodpovězení následujících otázek:

1. Upravuje legislativa EU certifikaci a provoz letadel s elektrickým motorem?

2. Má Komise v úmyslu přijmout legislativu upravující certifikaci a provoz letadel s elektrickým motorem? Pokud ano, co bude jejím obsahem, v jaké fázi přípravy se nachází a kdy bude předložena Evropskému parlamentu?

Předem děkuji za odpověď.

Odpověď pana Kallase jménem Komise
(9. dubna 2014)

Otázky bezpečnosti letectví upravuje nařízení (ES) č. 216/2008 ([1]). Toto nařízení nerozlišuje mezi různými typy motorů. Motor je v souladu s článkem 3 uvedeného nařízení definován jako výrobek nehledě na to, zda jde o pístový, proudový nebo elektrický motor.

Certifikace motoru se provádí v souladu s nařízením (EU) č. 748/2012 ([2]) na základě certifikačních specifikací (CS), které stanoví přijatelné způsoby prokázání souladu se základními požadavky na letovou způsobilost. Pokud pro výrobek, který má být certifikován, neexistují vhodné bezpečnostní normy, jsou stanoveny zvláštní podrobné technické specifikace, nazvané „zvláštní podmínky". Pro elektrické motory v současnosti neexistují zvláštní certifikační specifikace. Tyto motory jsou certifikovány na základě CS-22H nebo CS-E, což jsou dokumenty obsahující certifikační specifikace pro motory a zvláštní podmínky.

Na letadla poháněná elektrickými motory se vztahuje i nařízení (EU) č. 965/2012 ([3]) o leteckém provozu.

Stávající předpisy není třeba měnit za účelem zohlednění elektrických motorů. Již v roce 2006 byl certifikován malý elektrický motor pro pohon motorových kluzáků.

([1]) Úř. věst. L 79, 19.3.2008.
([2]) Úř. věst. L 224, 21.8.2012.
([3]) Úř. věst. L 296, 25.10.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001971/14
to the Commission
Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Certification and operation of aircraft with electric motors

I would like to put the following questions to the Commission:

1. Does EC law regulate the certification and operation of aircraft with electric motors?

2. Is the Commission considering adopting legislation to regulate the certification and operation of aircraft with electric motors? If so, what will it contain, what stage are preparations at, and when will it be presented to Parliament?

Thank you for your response.

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

Flight safety in the field of the aviation is governed by Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 ([1]). This regulation does not differentiate the different types of engine. Wheter it be a piston engine, a turbine or an electrical engine, the engine is defined in accordance with Article 3 of the aforementioned Regulation as a product.

The certification of an engine is carried out in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 ([2]) on the basis of certification specifications (CS) which provide for acceptable means to demonstrate compliance with the essential requirements for airworthiness. When appropriate safety standards do not exist for the product to be certified, special detailed technical specifications, named special conditions, are prescribed. Currently, there are no specific CS for electrical engines. Those engines are certified on the basis of CS-22H or CS-E, documents listing the CS for engines, and special conditions.

With regard to Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 ([3]) on air operations, aircraft powered by electrical engines fall under the scope of applicability of this regulation.

There is no need to amend the existing Regulations to take into account the electrical engines. One small electrical engine for powering Powered Sailplans has already been certified in 2006.

([1]) OJ L 79, 19.3.2008.
([2]) OJ L 224, 21.8.2012.
([3]) OJ L 296, 25.10.2012.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001972/14
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(20. februar 2014)

Om: Retten til fri bevægelighed og juridiske problematikker for LGBT-personer

I mange EU-mdlemsstater nyder ægtepar godt af en række rettigheder og fordele. De er herunder ofte i besiddelse af en række skattefordele, ligesom de eksempelvis nyder godt af veldefinerede regler for forældremyndighed og mulighed for at dele sygesikring.

Personer af samme køn, der indgår i ægteskaber eller registrerede partnerskaber, har i mange EU-medlemsstater krav på samme fordele og rettigheder som heteroseksuelle ægtepar.

I forbindelse til retten til fri bevægelighed er det dog et stort problem, at mange EU-medlemsstater ikke anerkender ægteskaber, der er indgået mellem personer af samme køn i andre EU-medlemsstater. Den manglende anderkendelse medfører i mange tilfælde rettighedstab for de berørte personer — eksempelvis ugyldiggørelse af forældremyndighed, dårligere mulighed for at gøre brug af fælles sygesikring og bortfald af arveret. Det må ses som en hindring af retten til fri bevægelighed, idet sådanne rettighedstab kan afholde arbejdstagere fra at søge og tage arbejde på kryds og tværs af landegrænser i EU.

Kommissionen bedes derfor svare på, hvad den vil gøre for at modvirke, at mange EU-medlemsstater ikke anerkender ægteskaber, som er indgået mellem personer af samme køn i andre EU-medlemsstater.

Kommissionen bedes videre svare på, om det rettighedstab, som mange af de ovenfor omtalte personer udsættes for i forbindelse med, at de som arbejdstagere bevæger sig mellem forskellige EU-medlemsstater for at søge og tage arbejde, er i strid med retten til fri bevægelighed.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Viviane Reding
(15. april 2014)

Efter gældende EU-ret hører den juridiske definition og reguleringen af ægteskaber/registrerede partnerskaber under medlemsstaternes enekompetencer. EU-reglerne pålægger derfor ikke medlemsstaterne nogen forpligtelse til at indføre, regulere eller anerkende ægteskaber/registrerede partnerskaber, der er indgået mellem personer af samme køn, eller til at anerkende ægteskaber og registrerede partnerskaber, der er indgået i en anden medlemsstat.

I sager, der hører under EU's kompetence, såsom EU-regler om EU-borgernes frie bevægelighed og opholdsret, foreligger der en forpligtelse til ikke at forskelsbehandle på grund af seksuel orientering ([1]).

Kommissionen har forpligtet sig til at sikre, at LGBT-personer og deres familier fuldt ud kan udøve deres ret til fri bevægelighed og opholdsret. Kommissionen bestræber sig på at sikre, at medlemsstaterne ikke opstiller yderligere hindringer, når det skal afgøres, om EU-borgeres familiemedlemmer, herunder ægtefæller/partnere af samme køn, skal have tilladelse til indrejse og ophold, og at de respekterer grundlæggende rettigheder, såsom forbuddet mod forskelsbehandling på grund af seksuel orientering og retten til respekt for sit privatliv og familieliv, i alle situationer, der er knyttet til EU-borgernes frie bevægelighed.

Kommissionen har aktivt grebet ind i tilfælde, hvor en medlemsstat har nægtet at udstede civilstandsattester beregnet til anvendelse ved indgåelse af et partnerskab med en person af samme køn i en anden medlemsstat, og har indledt overtrædelsesprocedurer på grund af en medlemsstats manglende gennemførelse af den ret, som partnere af samme køn har til at blive forenet med EU-borgere i medlemsstaten og tage ophold dér.

([1]) I henhold til traktaterne og chartret om grundlæggende rettigheder.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001972/14
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Right of free movement and legal problems for LGBT individuals

In many EU Member States, married couples enjoy a number of rights and advantages. That often includes tax benefits, together with, for instance, well defined rules on parental responsibility and the possibility of joint health insurance.

In many EU Member States, two people of the same sex who marry each other or enter into a registered partnership enjoy the same advantages and rights as a heterosexual married couple.

In connection with the right to free movement, however, it is major problem that many Member States do not recognise same-sex marriages performed in other Member States. In many instances, non-recognition means a loss of rights for the persons concerned, e.g. invalidation of parental responsibility, less scope for joint health insurance or abrogation of inheritance rights. This should be regarded as a hindrance to exercising the right of free movement because, if rights are lost, workers may be stopped from seeking or taking up employment in other EU countries.

Accordingly, what will the Commission do to counter the fact that many Member States do not recognise same-sex marriages performed in other Member States.

In addition, is the loss of rights to which many of the individuals referred to above are subject, if they are workers moving between Member States in order to seek and take up employment, contrary to the right of free movement?

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

Under current EC law the legal definition and regulation of marriage/registered partnerships falls under exclusive competences of Member States. Therefore, no obligation upon Member States can be drawn from EU rules regarding introduction, regulation or recognition of same-sex marriages/registered partnerships, or to recognition by a Member State of marriages and registered partnerships contracted in other Member States.

Where matters fall within EU competences like EU rules on freedom of movement and residence of EU citizens, there is an obligation not to discriminate on the ground of sexual orientation ([1]).

The Commission is committed to ensure LGBT persons and their family can fully exercise rights to free movement and residence. The Commission seeks to ensure that Member States do not introduce additional obstacles when deciding upon the entry and residence of family members of any EU citizens including same sex spouses/partners and respect fundamental rights like the prohibition of discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and the right to respect for private and family life, in all situations linked to free movement by EU citizens.

The Commission has actively intervened when a Member State refused to issue civil status documents for the purpose of entering into a same sex partnership in another Member State and has launched infringement proceedings on the grounds of a Member State's failure to implement the right of same-sex partners to join and reside together with EU citizens there.

([1]) Under Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001973/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)
(20 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ναυάγιο του κρουαζιερόπλοιου «Sea Diamond»

Επανερχόμαστε σχετικά με το ναυάγιο του κρουαζιερόπλοιου «Sea Diamond» που βυθίστηκε στις 5 Απριλίου 2007 στην «Καλντέρα» της Σαντορίνης. Με παρεμβάσεις μας (ερωτήσεις H-0509/2007, H-0748/2008, H-0037/2010, E-002071/2011 και E-003198/2012) έχουμε επισημάνει επανειλημμένα τους περιβαλλοντικούς κινδύνους για το θαλάσσιο οικοσύστημα της περιοχής, που τεκμηριώνονται από επιστημονικούς φορείς, αλλά και τις επιπτώσεις στην οικονομία του νησιού, που βασίζεται στην δραστηριότητα στον τουριστικό τομέα εκατοντάδων εργαζομένων και αυτοαπασχολούμενων επαγγελματιών.

Πρόσφατα, το Πρωτοδικείο Πειραιά, με απόφασή του διέταξε, την άμεση ανέλκυση του ναυαγίου και υποχρεώνει την πλοιοκτήτρια εταιρεία να καταβάλει στο ελληνικό Δημόσιο και τον Δήμο Θήρας ποσό 14 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ. Υπενθυμίζουμε ότι και το 2012 είχε επιβληθεί πρόστιμο 1,2 εκατ. ευρώ στην πλοιοκτήτρια εταιρεία για τη ρύπανση από τη διαφυγή πετρελαιοειδών ουσιών.

Πώς τοποθετείται η Επιτροπή στην πρόταση των μαζικών φορέων και των εργαζόμενων κατοίκων της Σαντορίνης, που έχει επανειλημμένα στηρίξει το ΚΚΕ, οι οποίοι διεκδικούν επί 7 χρόνια την ανέλκυση του «Sea Diamond» και τον καθαρισμό της θαλάσσιας περιοχής της «Καλντέρας» από τις ρυπογόνες ουσίες του ναυαγίου;

Απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Απριλίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή επιθυμεί να παραπέμψει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στις απαντήσεις που έδωσε σε προηγούμενες ερωτήσεις σχετικά με το συγκεκριμένο ατύχημα, και συγκεκριμένα στις ερωτήσεις: E-2185/2007, E-2274/2007, E-2985/2007, H-0509/2007, E-5789/2007, E-1944/2008, H-0748/2008, E-5439/2008, E-6685/2008, E-4818/2009, H-0037/2010, E-2071/2011, E-5420/2011, E-3198/2012 και E-3650/2012.

Σε σχέση με τα θέματα που αναφέρθηκαν σε αυτές τις απαντήσεις, η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να επανέλθει στα ακόλουθα τέσσερα:

1. Δεν υπάρχει, σύμφωνα με το δίκαιο της ΕΕ, υποχρέωση που να επιβάλλει γενικά την ανέλκυση ναυαγίων μετά από θαλάσσια ατυχήματα.

2. Από το 2009 (Οδηγία 2009/20/ΕΚ ([1])), όλα τα πλοία είναι υποχρεωμένα να διαθέτουν κατάλληλη ασφάλιση όταν εισέρχονται σε οιονδήποτε λιμένα της ΕΕ ή εξέρχονται από αυτόν, όπως επίσης όταν φέρουν τη σημαία κράτους μέλους της Ένωσης. Αυτή η υποχρέωση ασφάλισης καλύπτει συγκεκριμένα, μεταξύ άλλων ναυτικών απαιτήσεων, το κόστος που απαιτείται για την ανέλκυση και την εξουδετέρωση των βλαπτικών επιπτώσεων ενός ναυαγίου ή τμημάτων του. Αυτό αποτελεί σημαντική ενίσχυση της ενωσιακής πολιτικής για τη θαλάσσια ασφάλεια, δεδομένου ότι οι ενέργειες ανέλκυσης ναυαγίου τείνουν να είναι άκρως δαπανηρές από άποψη οικονομικών και τεχνικών πόρων, όπως συνέβη με παρόμοια περιστατικά στην ΕΕ (ναυάγιο Costa Concordia).

3. Η οδηγία 2008/98/ΕΚ ([2]) για τα απόβλητα προβλέπει ειδικούς όρους για τα κράτη μέλη προκειμένου να συμμορφώνονται με την υποχρέωση διαχείρισης των αποβλήτων κατά τρόπο που να μην έχει αρνητικές επιπτώσεις στο περιβάλλον και την ανθρώπινη υγεία.

4. Η Επιτροπή προωθεί διαρκώς την επικύρωση διεθνών ναυτιλιακών συμβάσεων, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της διεθνούς σύμβασης του Ναϊρόμπι του 2007 για την ανέλκυση ναυαγίων.

([1]) ΕΕ L 131 της 28.5.2009.
([2]) Οδηγία 2008/98/ΕΚ, ΕΕ L 312 της 22.11.2008, σ. 3, η οποία καταργεί την οδηγία 2006/12/ΕΚ, ΕΕ L 114 της 27.4.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001973/14
to the Commission
Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Wreck of the Cruise Ship *Sea Diamond*

I wish to return to the subject of the wreck of the cruise ship *Sea Diamond* which sank on 5 April 2007 in the caldera of Santorini. Through my interventions (questions H-000509/2007, H-000748/2008, H-000037/2010, E-002071/2011 and E-003198/2012), I have repeatedly drawn attention to the environmental risks to the marine ecosystem of the region, documented by official scientific bodies, and also the impact on the island's economy, which is based on tourism, a sector in which hundreds of employees and self-employed persons work.

Recently, Piraeus Court of the First Instance ordered the immediate raising of the wreck from the seabed and forced the shipping company to pay EUR 14 million to the Greek state and the municipality of Thira (Santorini). It will be recalled that in 2012 the company had been fined EUR 1.2 million for pollution caused by oil leaks.

For seven years, representative organisations and workers resident on the island, with the consistent support of the Greek Communist Party, have been demanding that the *Sea Diamond* be raised and that the sea area of the caldera be cleaned from pollution emanating from the wreck. How does the Commission view this proposal?

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

The Commission wishes to refer the Honourable Member to its replies to earlier questions on this accident, namely: E-2185/2007, E-2274/2007, E-2985/2007, H-0509/2007, E-5789/2007, E-1944/2008, H-0748/2008, E-5439/2008, E-6685/2008, E-4818/2009, H-0037/2010, E-2071/2011, E-5420/2011, E-3198/2012 and E-3650/2012.

With reference to the points already made in these replies, the Commission would like to reiterate the following four:

1. There is no obligation under EC law that prescribes in general the removal of wrecks following maritime accidents.

2. Since 2009 (Directive 2009/20/EC ([1])), there is an obligation for all ships to have adequate insurance when entering or leaving any EU port, or when flying the flag of an EU Member State. This insurance obligation specifically covers, among other maritime claims, the cost of removal and rendering harmless of a shipwreck or any parts thereof. This is an important reinforcement of the EU maritime safety policy, as wreck removal operations tend to be extremely costly in terms of financial and technical resources, which has been the case with similar experiences in the EU (*Costa Concordia*).

3. Directive 2008/98/EC ([2]) on waste establishes specific conditions for Member States to comply with their obligation of ensuring that waste is disposed of without endangering human health or the environment.

4. The Commission continuously promotes the ratification of international maritime conventions, including the Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks of 2007.

([1]) OJ L 131, 28.5.2009.
([2]) Directive 2008/98/EC, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008, p. 3, repealing Directive 2006/12/EC, OJ L 114, 27.4.2006.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001974/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(20. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Sammelsysteme für nicht verwendete Arzneimittel

In der Richtlinie 2004/27/EG zu Humanarzneimitteln werden die Mitgliedstaaten dazu verpflichtet, Sammelsysteme für die pharmazeutischen Abfälle der Haushalte einzurichten. Einem aktuellen Bericht der Kampagne „Health Care Without Harm Europe" (Gesundheitsversorgung ohne Schädigung der Gesundheit/Zweigstelle Europa) zufolge sind die Systeme in den meisten Mitgliedstaaten eingerichtet worden, die Organisationstiefe und der Umsetzungsgrad variieren jedoch stark, und genaue Angaben über ihre Wirksamkeit fehlen bzw. sind unvollständig. Ferner gibt es für einige Mitgliedstaaten wie Bulgarien, Zypern und Malta keine Belege dafür, dass ein derartiges System eingeführt wird.

Durch die Harmonisierung europäischer Sammelsysteme könnte deren Effizienz gesteigert, die Vergleichbarkeit unter den Mitgliedstaaten ermöglicht und die Rechenschaftspflicht der pharmazeutischen Industrie und verbundener Akteure ausgeweitet sowie die Transparenz erhöht und die Konformität durchgesetzt werden.

In der Richtlinie 2010/84/EU und der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1235/2010 (zur Unbedenklichkeit von Arzneimitteln und zur Pharmakovigilanz) wurde die Kommission aufgefordert, einen Bericht über das Ausmaß des Problems zu erstellen und die Notwendigkeit von Änderungen des Arzneimittelrechts oder anderer einschlägiger Rechtsvorschriften der Union zu bewerten. Die Veröffentlichung des Berichts und die Einleitung einer öffentlichen Konsultation zu diesem Thema wurden wiederholt verschoben.

1. Ist der Kommission bekannt, ob die genannten Länder, d. h. Bulgarien, Zypern und Malta, ein Sammelsystem für nicht verwendete Arzneimittel eingerichtet haben? Falls nicht, welche Maßnahmen gedenkt die Kommission zu ergreifen, damit diese Länder ihren rechtlichen Verpflichtungen nachkommen?

2. Wann rechnet die Kommission mit der Vorlage des genannten Berichts? Ist eine öffentliche Konsultation der Interessenträger vorgesehen?

Wird in dem Bericht und bei den möglichen künftigen politischen Optionen die Harmonisierung von Sammelsystemen für abgelaufene und nicht verwendete Arzneimittel auf EU-Ebene in Erwägung gezogen?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(16. April 2014)

Die Kommission soll bis September 2015 ein strategisches Konzept gegen die Wasserverschmutzung durch pharmazeutische Stoffe entwickeln und bis zum 14. September 2017 Maßnahmen vorschlagen, die gegebenenfalls auf Ebene der Union und/oder der Mitgliedstaaten zu ergreifen sind, um gegen die möglichen Umweltauswirkungen von pharmazeutischen Stoffen vorzugehen ([1]). Dieses strategische Konzept ersetzt den ursprünglich in der Richtlinie 2010/84/EU ([2]) und in der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1235/2010 ([3]) vorgesehenen Bericht.

Bei der Entwicklung des strategischen Konzepts wird die Kommission für eine intensive Konsultation aller Interessenträger und der breiten Öffentlichkeit sorgen.

Der Kommission liegen keine genauen amtlichen Angaben über die Einrichtung von Sammelsystemen für nicht verwendete Arzneimittel in Bulgarien, Zypern und Malta vor. Die Verbesserung von Sammelsystemen für abgelaufene und nicht verwendete Arzneimittel durch die Mitgliedstaaten ist eine politische Option, die bei der Entwicklung des strategischen Konzepts berücksichtigt werden dürfte.

([1]) Richtlinie 2013/39/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 12. August 2013 zur Änderung der Richtlinien 2000/60/EG und 2008/105/EG in Bezug auf prioritäre Stoffe im Bereich der Wasserpolitik (ABl. L 226 vom 24.8.2013).

([2]) Richtlinie 2010/84/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 15. Dezember 2010 zur Änderung der Richtlinie 2001/83/EG zur Schaffung eines Gemeinschaftskodexes für Humanarzneimittel hinsichtlich der Pharmakovigilanz (ABl. L 348 vom 31.12.2010).

([3]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1235/2010 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 15. Dezember 2010 zur Änderung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 726/2004 zur Festlegung von Gemeinschaftsverfahren für die Genehmigung und Überwachung von Human- und Tierarzneimitteln und zur Errichtung einer Europäischen Arzneimittel-Agentur hinsichtlich der Pharmakovigilanz von Humanarzneimitteln und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1394/2007 über Arzneimittel für neuartige Therapien (ABl. L 348 vom 31. 12.2010).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001974/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Ppharma and collection schemes for unused pharmaceuticals

Directive 2004/27/EC relating to medicinal products for human use obliges Member States to implement collection schemes for household pharmaceutical waste. According to a recent report published by Health Care Without Harm Europe, systems are implemented in the majority of Member States, but the level of organisation and implementation is highly variable, and detailed information on their efficiency is scattered and lacking. Moreover, for some Members States like Bulgaria, Cyprus and Malta there is no indication that such a system is being implemented.

The harmonisation of European collection schemes could increase their efficiency, allow comparability among Member States and extend accountability to the pharmaceutical industry and associated players, as well as increase transparency and enforce compliance.

Directive 2010/84/EU and Regulation (EU) No 1235/2010 (relating to drug safety and pharmacovigilance) called upon the Commission to produce a report on the scale of the problem and an assessment of whether amendments to legislation on medicinal products or other relevant Union legislation are required. The publication of the report and launch of a public consultation on the issue has been consistently delayed.

1. Does the Commission know if the aforementioned countries, namely Bulgaria, Cyprus and Malta, have implemented a collection scheme for unused pharmaceuticals? If not, what measures is the Commission taking to ensure that these countries fulfil their legal obligations?

2. When does the Commission expect that the aforementioned report will be released? Is a stakeholders' public consultation planned?

Will the report and the possible upcoming policy options consider the harmonisation of collection schemes for expired and unused pharmaceuticals at European level?

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

The Commission is to develop a strategic approach to pollution of water by pharmaceutical substances by September 2015 and to propose by 14 September 2017 measures to be taken at Union and/or Member State level, as appropriate, to address the possible environmental impacts of pharmaceutical substances ([1]). This strategic approach replaces the report initially foreseen by Directive 2010/84/EU ([2]) and Regulation (EU) No 1235/2010 ([3]).

In the development of the strategic approach the Commission will ensure close consultation of all stakeholders as well as the public at large.

The Commission has no precise official information regarding the implementation of collection schemes for unused pharmaceuticals by Bulgaria, Cyprus and Malta. The improvement of collection schemes for expired and unused pharmaceuticals by Member States is a policy option likely to be considered in the development of the strategic approach.

([1]) Directive 2013/39/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 August 2013 amending Directives 2000/60/EC and 2008/105/EC as regards priority substances in the field of water policy. OJ L 226, 24.8.2013.

([2]) Directive 2010/84/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2010 amending, as regards pharmacovigilance, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, L 348, 31.12.2010.

([3]) Regulation (EU) No 1235/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2010 amending, as regards pharmacovigilance of medicinal products for human use, 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, and Regulation (EC) No 1394/2007 on advanced therapy medicinal products, L 348, 31.12.2010.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001975/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(20. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Ist das Vorsorgeprinzip bloß ein Prinzip?

Am 2. Februar 2000 veröffentlichte die Kommission eine Mitteilung zum Vorsorgeprinzip, in der sie auch ein Verfahren für die Anwendung dieser Maßnahme verabschiedete. Artikel 191 Absatz 2 des Vertrags von Lissabon lautet: „Die Umweltpolitik der Union zielt unter Berücksichtigung der unterschiedlichen Gegebenheiten in den einzelnen Regionen der Union auf ein hohes Schutzniveau ab. Sie beruht auf den Grundsätzen der Vorsorge und Vorbeugung, auf dem Grundsatz, Umweltbeeinträchtigungen mit Vorrang an ihrem Ursprung zu bekämpfen, sowie auf dem Verursacherprinzip".

Wie oft hat die Kommission seit der Veröffentlichung der genannten Mitteilung in Fällen im Zusammenhang mit dem Einsatz von Chemikalien und anderen gefährlichen Stoffen auf das Vorsorgeprinzip zurückgegriffen?

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

Im Einklang mit Artikel 191 Absatz 2 des Vertrags wird in der REACH-Verordnung ([1]) speziell auf das Vorsorgeprinzip verwiesen.

Gemäß der Mitteilung der Kommission über die Anwendbarkeit des Vorsorgeprinzips ([2]) wird in der Phase der Risikobewertung im Rahmen aller REACH-Verfahren routinemäßig ein vorbeugender Ansatz verfolgt. Bislang war es im Rahmen des REACH-Beschränkungsverfahrens nicht erforderlich, vorbeugende Risikomanagemententscheidungen im Einklang mit dem Vorsorgeprinzip zu treffen.

([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]) Mitteilung der Kommission über die Anwendbarkeit des Vorsorgeprinzips (KOM(2000)1 endg.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001975/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Is the precautionary principle just a principle?

On 2 February 2000, the Commission issued a communication on the precautionary principle in which it adopted a procedure for the application of this measure. Article 191(2) of the Treaty of Lisbon states that 'Union policy on the environment shall aim at a high level of protection taking into account the diversity of situations in the various regions of the Union. It shall be based on the precautionary principle and on the principles that preventive action should be taken, that environmental damage should as a priority be rectified at source and that the polluter should pay'.

How often has the Commission had recourse to the precautionary principal in cases relating to the use of chemicals and other hazardous agents since publication of the aforementioned communication?

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

In line with Article 191(2) of the Treaty, the REACH regulation ([1]) refers specifically to the precautionary principle.

A prudential approach is routinely applied at the risk assessment stage under all the REACH procedures in accordance with the Commission's Communication on the Precautionary Principle ([2]). To date, it has not been necessary to take preventive risk management decisions in accordance with the Precautionary Principle under the REACH restrictions procedure.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2206 of the European parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals.

([2]) Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle COM(2000) 1 Final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001978/14
aan de Commissie
Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(20 februari 2014)

Betreft: Follow-up over de kwestie van mededinging in de EU-suikersector

In antwoord op een eerder door mij ingediende vraag over concurrentie in de EU-suikersector (E-003464/2012), deelde de Commissie mee dat zij bereid is de suikermarkten te onderzoeken „indien er concrete aanwijzingen zijn van mogelijk concurrentieverstorend gedrag dat verder gaat dan loutere concentratie op deze markten".

Op 18 februari 2014 heeft het Bundeskartellamt, de Duitse nationale regelgever op het gebied van mededinging, de drie belangrijkste Duitse suikerproducenten (Nordzucker, Südzucker en Pfeifer & Langen) 280 miljoen EUR boete opgelegd wegens het sluiten van concurrentieverstorende overeenkomsten over afzetgebieden, quota en prijzen. Opvallend genoeg was gebleken dat de inbreuken zich over meerdere jaren uitstrekten en de periode besloegen van het midden van de jaren negentig tot 2009.

Ondanks het feit dat hiermee concurrentieverstorende praktijken op de EU-suikermarkt duidelijk bewezen zijn, heeft een woordvoerster van de Commissie recentelijk aan Reuter meegedeeld dat de Commissie haar onderzoek naar de suikersector momenteel niet zal voortzetten ([1]).

1. Waarom heeft de Commissie precies op het moment waarop het Bundeskartellamt een uitspraak heeft gedaan die als uitgangspunt zou kunnen dienen voor een EU-breed onderzoek naar concurrentieverstorende praktijken in de suikersector besloten om haar onderzoek af te breken?

2. Welke maatregelen is de Commissie van plan op EU-niveau te treffen, gezien het feit dat er nu concreet bewijs voorhanden is van concurrentieverstorende praktijken op de suikermarkten, waar het gevaar van dergelijke praktijken vanwege de hoge mate van concentratie binnen de sector reeds zeer groot was (twee derde van alle EU-productierechten is in handen van slechts vier ondernemingen die hun markten zorgvuldig hebben verdeeld)?

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

In april 2013 hebben ambtenaren van de Commissie onaangekondigde inspecties uitgevoerd in de gebouwen van ondernemingen die actief zijn in de suikerindustrie in verscheidene lidstaten. De Commissie zocht naar feiten die het bestaan van kartelafspraken tussen leveranciers van witte suiker konden bevestigen. Het onderzoek was niet gericht op de algemene werking van het quotastelsel als dusdanig of op de uitwerkingen ervan op de concurrentie tussen de suikerproducenten.

De Commissie heeft besloten om het onderzoek op dit moment niet verder te zetten. Het aanvankelijke vermoeden van de Commissie dat er heimelijke afspraken bestaan tussen de suikerproducenten in verschillende EU-landen, werd immers niet bevestigd door de informatie die ter plaatse werd verzameld. Dit werd vorige maand door onze woordvoerder meegedeeld.

Het onderzoek van de Commissie dat inmiddels werd gesloten, betrof mogelijk concurrentieverstorend gedrag in een andere periode dan die welke door het Bundeskartellamt werd onderzocht. Bovendien zijn ook de activiteiten die het onderwerp vormden van beide onderzoeken niet noodzakelijkerwijs dezelfde. De afsluiting van het onderzoek van de Commissie houdt dan ook geen verband met de conclusies van het onderzoek van het Bundeskartellamt.

De Commissie sluit niet uit dat zij de suikersector in een later stadium opnieuw aan een onderzoek zal onderwerpen, op basis van nieuwe elementen afkomstig van nationale mededingingsautoriteiten of andere bronnen. Sectoren met een sterke concentratie van bedrijven, zoals de suikerindustrie, zijn gevoelig voor kartelvorming zoals opnieuw wordt bevestigd door de conclusies van het onderzoek van het Bundeskartellamt. Deze sectoren verdienen de aandacht van mededingingsautoriteiten in de hele EU, inclusief de Commissie. Dit is precies waarom de Commissie in 2013 optrad en niet zal aarzelen om opnieuw op te treden, indien en wanneer dit nodig is.

([1]) Zie het persbericht van Reuters van 18.2.2014 „Suedzucker, other German sugar refiners fined over cartel".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001978/14
to the Commission
Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Follow-up on the issue of competition in the EU sugar sector

In response to a previous question I submitted on the issue of competition in the EU sugar sector (E-003464/2012), the Commission noted that it stands 'ready to investigate […] if there are concrete indications of possible anti-competitive behaviour beyond the mere fact of concentration in those markets'.

On 18 February 2014, Germany's national competition regulator, the Bundeskartellamt, fined Nordzucker, Südzucker and Pfeifer & Langen — the three major German sugar manufacturers — EUR 280 million for concluding anti-competitive agreements on sales areas, quotas and prices. It is striking that the infringements were found to have taken place over several years up to 2009, in some cases dating back to the mid-1990s.

Yet despite this clear evidence of anti-competitive behaviour in the EU sugar market, a Commission spokeswoman recently told Reuters that 'the Commission will not pursue its investigation into the sugar sector any further at this point in time' ([1]).

1. Why has the Commission decided to abandon its investigation precisely at a time when the Bundeskartellamt has provided a potential springboard for an EU-wide investigation into anti-competitive behaviour in the sugar sector?

2. Given that we now have concrete evidence of anti-competitive behaviour in a market which was already highly susceptible to such behaviour, due to the concentrated nature of the sector (just four companies hold two thirds of all EU production rights in carefully divided markets), what action does the Commission intend to take at the EU level on this issue?

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

In April 2013 Commission officials undertook unannounced inspections at the premises of companies active in the sugar industry in several Member States. The Commission searched for facts that could confirm the existence of cartel agreements between suppliers of white sugar. The investigation did not target the overall functioning of the quota system as such or its effects on competition between sugar producers.

As the Commission's initial suspicion as to the existence of collusion between the sugar producers in various EU countries was not conclusively confirmed by the information gathered on the spot, the Commission decided not to pursue this investigation at this point in time. This was communicated by our spokesperson last month.

The investigation of the Commission that has now been closed searched for possible anti-competitive behavior in a time period different from that investigated by the Bundeskartellamt. Nor is the behaviour targeted by both investigations necessarily the same. The closure of the Commission investigation has therefore no relation with the conclusions of the Bundeskartellamt investigation.

The Commission does not exclude that it may re-investigate the sugar sector at a later stage, on the basis of new elements originating from national competition authorities or otherwise. Highly concentrated sectors, such as the sugar industry, are sensitive to cartel behaviour, as again confirmed by the conclusions of the investigation of the Bundeskartellamt. These sectors deserve the attention of competition authorities throughout the EU, including the Commission. This is exactly why the Commission acted in 2013, and the Commission will not refrain from doing this again, if and when necessary.

([1]) See Reuters article of 18.2.2014 'Suedzucker, other sugar refiners fined over cartel'.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001979/14
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: UK bedroom tax

A recent UN report on UK housing conditions has called for the immediate suspension of the 'bedroom tax' and for it to be fully evaluated in light of evidence highlighting its negative impacts, particularly on a huge number of vulnerable individuals and households.

Can the Commission state what action it has or will be taking in its role of supporting Member States in the implementation of welfare reforms to ensure that EU citizens are not discriminated?

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

Social policy is primarily a matter of national competence. However, the Commission provides the Member States with support to promote social inclusion, including in the areas of housing exclusion and homelessness.

Through the European Semester process, the Commission sets overall budget, economic and social priorities, and gives policy guidance to boost growth, employment and social cohesion in line with the EU's long-term growth strategy. The Semester process allows practical recommendations to be issued in the social field. Cohesion policy funds ([1]) are mobilised to contribute to economic recovery, provide more support for the unemployed, young people and the disadvantaged, and alleviate the social consequences of the crisis. Under the social open method of coordination, the Commission supports the Social Protection Committee in mobilising various instruments to tackle poverty and social exclusion. It promotes cooperation among the Member States through an established framework for thematic and multilateral surveillance of Member States' social protection reforms.

In the Social Investment Package ([2]), the Commission called on the Member States to ensure access to high-quality, affordable social services, including social housing ([3]). It has also put forward a range of proposals for promoting good practice and ensuring better access to housing and preventing evictions ([4]).

As regards the potentially discriminatory aspects of the 'bedroom tax', the Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's answer to Questions E-4633/2013 ([5]) and E-4930/2013 ([6]).

([1]) In particular, the European Social Fund, the European Regional Development Fund, the Programme for Social Change and Innovation and the Fund for the Most Deprived.

([2]) Communication 'Towards Social Investment for Growth and Cohesion — including implementing the European Social Fund 2014-2020' (COM(2013) 83 final of 20 February 2013).

([3]) Commission Staff Working Document 'Follow-up on the implementation by the Member States of the 2008 European Commission recommendation on active inclusion of people excluded from the labour market — Towards a social investment approach' (SWD(2013) 39 final of 20 February 2013).

([4]) See Commission Staff Working Document 'Confronting Homelessness in the European Union' (SWD(2013) 42 final of 20 February 2013).

([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=WQ&reference=E-2013-004633&language=EN

([6]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-004930&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001980/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Common Agricultural Policy payments to new Member States

Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) payments to new Member States have been well below the average EU level for the first year of membership.

Could the Commission confirm that the formula used to allocate CAP payments to Member States which joined the EU after 2003 amounted to 25% of the average EU payments?

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

It is assumed that the reference to 25% of the average EU payments in the question of the Honourable Member relates to the phasing-in of the direct aids to farmers in the new Member States.

The direct aids envelopes for EU-10 and EU-2 were established on the basis of the same unit values as for the EU-15, using the actual yields, tonnes and numbers of animals, and resulting from the accession negotiations.

Irrespective of the allocations, direct aids in the Member States that joined the European Union after 2003 are subject to the principle of gradual introduction (phasing-in). In the first year of the accession, the phasing-in rate of the direct aids corresponded to 25% of the then applicable level of payments in the Member States other than the new Member States. Since their accession, the payments to these Member States have constantly increased as a result of the phasing-in.

For information and as regards rural development, Member States must adopt multiannual programmes which are always progressively implemented over the programming period. As a result, payments are usually very low the first year of programming irrespective of the amounts (commitment appropriations) allocated to programmes. For Member States that joined the EU after 2003, the amounts allocated to the rural development policy were established in the accession treaties.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001981/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Update on fuel duty rebate for rural areas in the UK

The UK Government has submitted an application to the Commission for 17 of the most rural areas in mainland UK to receive a fuel duty discount of up to five pence per litre.

1. Can the Commission provide an updated timescale for the implementation of this rebate?

2. How many road users does the Commission estimate could benefit from this rebate, should it be approved?

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

1. The Commission is currently assessing the United Kingdom's request for derogation under Article 19 of Directive 2003/96/EC. Depending on this assessment the Commission will decide whether to make a proposal for a Council Decision. The possible draft proposal for Council Decision would then be subject to a special legislative procedure, requiring unanimity involving all the 28 Member States in the Council. At this early stage it is difficult to provide an exact timetable for a possible implementation of this measure.

2. The Commission cannot comment at this stage on this question but would encourage the Honourable Member to contact the UK authorities about their estimate in this regard.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001982/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Organ harvesting in China

On 12 December 2013, Parliament adopted a resolution expressing its concern about organ harvesting in China. It called for the EU to raise awareness of the issue and publicly condemn organ transplant abuse in China.

Could the Commission detail the action taken to address these concerns since the adoption of the aforementioned resolution?

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

In its contacts with the Chinese authorities, the EEAS has regularly raised concerns about the re-education through labour system, the death Penalty and Freedom of Religion or Belief, with particular reference to Falun Gong followers. The EU has also repeatedly expressed its concerns over the secrecy that surrounds both death penalty and organ transplant statistics, which makes it impossible to gain an accurate picture of the source of transplanted organs, and at allegations that many organs were 'harvested' from prisoners, especially Falun Gong followers. The next EU-China Human Rights dialogue is likely to take place in the coming months and the EU will be able to reiterate its concerns.

This EU position is fully in line with WHO Guiding principles ([1]) and Conventions/Resolutions of the Council of Europe ([2]), based on voluntary and unpaid donation of organs. These principles are reflected in the EU legislation, e.g. Directive 2010/53/EU on standards of quality and safety of human organs intended for transplantation.

Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims ([3]) establishes minimum rules concerning the definition of criminal offences and sanctions in the area of trafficking in human beings including for the purposes of organ removal. Article 10 affords Member States the possibility of giving extra-territorial scope to its jurisdiction including for offences committed for the benefit of a legal person established in its territory. In addition the Organs Action Plan ([4]) calls on Member states to establish EU-wide agreements on monitoring the extent of organ trafficking. The Commission published a staff working document ([5]) for the mid-term review of this Action Plan on 25 April 2014.

([1]) http://www.who.int/transplantation/Guiding_PrinciplesTransplantation_WHA63.22en.pdf
([2]) http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/healthbioethic/Activities/05_Organ_transplantation_en/default_en.asp
([3]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011, OJ L 101, 15.4.2011, p. 1.
([4]) COM(2008) 819/3 Action Plan on Organ Donation and Transplantation (2009-2015): Strengthened Cooperation between Member States.
([5]) SWD(2014) 147 final, Commission Staff Working Document on the mid-term review of the 'Action Plan on Organ Donation and Transplantation (2009-2015): Strengthened Cooperation between Member States': http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organs/docs/midtermreview_actionplan_organ_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001983/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Dispute over mackerel quotas with the Faroe Islands and Iceland

The long-standing dispute over mackerel quotas with the Faroe Islands and Iceland remains unresolved, as they continue to overfish stocks in the North-East Atlantic which have increased as a result of cooperation between the EU and Norway on sustainable fishing quotas.

Can the Commission provide an update on the current state of negotiations with the Faroe Islands and Iceland?

Is the Commission considering further punitive measures against the Faroe Islands and Iceland?

What is the latest scientific advice the Commission has received on mackerel stocks, and how will this influence the ongoing negotiations with the Faroe Islands and Iceland?

Is the Commission actively consulting with our partners in Norway on this issue?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

Following successive rounds of consultations among coastal States, an arrangement on the management of mackerel could be found involving the EU, the Faroe Islands and Norway. While Iceland does not yet adhere to this arrangement, provisions have been made for this country to join and adopt a total allowable catch in coherence with the catch limitations adopted by the other parties.

This arrangement was followed by successful bilateral consultations between the EU and Norway on one side and between the EU and Faroe Islands on the exchange of reciprocal fishing rights. The exchanges with Faroe Islands were particularly welcomed by the fishing industries of both parties given that since 2011 there had been no agreement on them.

In the now prevailing circumstances the Commission cannot take a position on any measure which would be contemplated under Regulation 1026/1012 with regard to mackerel fisheries.

The latest scientific advice available from ICES recommends total catches at around 900 000t. The TAC agreed by EU, Faroe Islands and Norway is somewhat higher for the first year, but the Commission does not believe this level puts the stock in jeopardy, as ICES also notes that the size of the stock is much higher than previously thought. Moreover, the TACs for the next 4 years (2015-2018) will be set in accordance with the scientific advice.

Norway is the EU's main partner in the management and exploitation of the mackerel stock and is therefore an important partner in the consultations.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001985/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Tuition fees in higher education institutions

In its recent White Paper on a possible independent Scotland, the Scottish Government made a series of assertions relating to how it could maintain certain advantages relating to its current UK and EU membership. Specifically relating to the charging of university tuition fees, it stated: 'Following independence, the Scottish Government proposes to maintain the status quo by continuing our current policy of charging fees to students from the rest of the UK to study at Scottish higher education institutions.'

In the Commission's answer to Written Question E-014162/2013 it stated that 'the Commission recalls that the conditions of access to education, including tuition fees, fall within the scope of EC law and any discrimination on grounds of nationality is prohibited in such matters […] any differences in treatment based on other, apparently neutral, criteria (such as residence requirements) must be seen as a covert form of discrimination on grounds of nationality if they lead in fact to the same result.'

What sanctions would be imposed on a Member State which did not adhere to EC law as referred to in the Commission's response to Written Question E-014162/2013?

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

The Commission recalls that non-compliance by a MS with Union law provisions constitutes a failure by that MS to fulfil its obligations under the Treaties.

In this respect, Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) states that 'If the Commission considers that a Member State has failed to fulfil an obligation under the Treaties, it shall deliver a reasoned opinion on the matter after giving the State concerned the opportunity to submit its observations'. However, before an infringement procedure is launched under Article 258 TFEU, as a general rule, the Commission makes use of the EU Pilot application, a tool designed to improve problem solving between the Commission services and MS authorities on issues concerning the application of Union law. ([1]) If the issue can neither be settled through EU Pilot nor by the MS's observations to the Commission's reasoned opinion, the Commission may bring the matter before the Court of Justice of the European Union.

According to Article 260(1) TFEU, 'If the Court of Justice of the European Union finds that a Member State has failed to fulfil an obligation under the Treaties, the State shall be required to take the necessary measures to comply with the judgment of the Court.' If the MS concerned fails to do so, the Commission may bring the case before the Court again specifying the penalty to be paid by the MS. According to Article 260(2) TFEU, 'If the Court finds that the Member State concerned has not complied with its judgment it may impose a lump sum or penalty payment on it'.

([1]) More information on the EU Pilot project may be found at the following address: http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/infringements/application_monitoring_en.htm

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001986/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Pulizija għat-turisti

Il-Gvern Malti beħsiebu jistabbilixxi skwadra żgħira ta' pulizija għat-turisti magħmula minn bejn wieħed u ieħor 25 pulizija lebsin l-uniformi li se jkunu bbażati f'postijiet turistiċi.

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja minn xi sistema simili adottata minn xi Stat Membru ieħor?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(19 ta' Mejju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja li unitajiet speċjalizzati tal-pulizija li jassistu t-turisti jeżistu f'xi Stati Membri tal-UE, bħal pereżempju fil-Greċja u l-Portugall.

Barra minn hekk, l-Istati Membri tal-UE regolarment jikkollokaw uffiċjali tal-pulizija għal Stati Membri oħra tal-UE biex jassistu uffiċjali tal-pulizija lokali f'każijiet fejn għadd kbir ta' turisti huma mistennija fil-pajjiż ospitanti. Dan pereżempju sar fi Franza u l-Kroazja. Id-Deċiżjoni 2008/615/ĠAI ([1]), dwar it-titjib tal-kooperazzjoni transfruntiera, hija bażi ġuridika xierqa għal dan il-għan.

([1]) Id-Deċiżjoni tal-Kunsill 2008/615/ĠAI tat-23 ta' Ġunju 2008 dwar it-titjib tal-kooperazzjoni transfruntiera, b'mod partikolari fil-ġlieda kontra t-terroriżmu u l-kriminalità transfruntiera; ĠU L 210, 06/08/2008, p. 1-11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001986/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Tourism police

The Maltese Government is to establish a small tourism police unit that will have roughly 25 uniformed officers based in places related to tourism.

Is the Commission aware of any similar system adopted by any of the other Member States?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(19 May 2014)

The Commission is aware that dedicated police units assisting tourists exist in some EU Member States, such as in Greece and Portugal.

In addition, EU Member States regularly second police officers to other EU Member States to assist local police officers in cases where large numbers of tourists are expected in the host country. This has for example been done in France and Croatia. Decision 2008/615/JHA ([1]), on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, is an appropriate legal basis for this purpose.

([1]) Council Decision 2008/615/JHA of 23 June 2008 on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime; OJ L 210, 6.8.2008, p. 1-11.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001987/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-votazzjoni fl-Isvizzera dwar l-inizjattiva tal-"immigrazzjoni tal-massa"

Il-Kummissjoni esprimiet id-dispjaċir tagħha dwar ir-riżultat tar-referendum fl-Isvizzera dwar l-inizjattiva għall-introduzzjoni ta' limiti kwantitattivi għall-immigrazzjoni. Inizjattiva ta' dan it-tip tmur kontra l-libertà tal-moviment tal-persuni stabbilita bejn l-Unjoni Ewropea u l-Isvizzera.

Il-Kummisjsoni kif biħsiebha tindirizza din is-sitwazzjoni? X'diffikultajiet huma mistennija f'dan ix-xenarju? Ir-riżultat tar-referendum kif se jolqot l-obbligi li jridu jitwettqu mill-Isvizzera fi ħdan is-suq intern Ewropew?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(11 ta' April 2014)

Ir-referendum introduċa artikolu ġdid fil-kostituzzjoni Svizzera li ma jidħolx fis-seħħ qabel mal-leġiżlazzjoni ta' implimentazzjoni neċessarja tkun adottata. L-inizjattiva tipprovdi "għan-negozjati mill-ġdid u l-adattament ta' ftehim internazzjonali li huma kontrarji għall-artikolu l-ġdid" fi żmien tliet snin wara l-aċċettazzjoni tal-inizjattiva. Il-konformità tal-leġiżlazzjoni ta' implimentazzjoni mal-Ftehim bejn l-UE u l-Isvizzera dwar il-libertà tal-moviment tal-persuni kif ukoll kull inizjattiva li tista' tittieħed se jkunu analizzati ladarba d-dettalji tal-abbozz ta' leġiżlazzjoni jkunu magħrufa. Fl-istess ħin, azzjoni mill-Kummissjoni se tiġi kkonsidrata. Il-gvern Svizzeru aċċerta lill-Unjoni Ewropea wara r-referendum li se jibqa' jonora l-obbligi internazzjonali eżistenti tiegħu, inkluż dawk fis-suq intern. Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea, min-naħa tagħha, ukoll tikkonsidra l-pacta sunt servanda u se tkompli twettaq l-obbligi tagħha skont il-ftehim bilaterali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001987/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Switzerland's vote on the 'mass immigration' initiative

The Commission has expressed its regret over the result of the Swiss referendum on the initiative for the introduction of quantitative limits to immigration. Such an initiative runs counter to the established freedom of movement of people between the European Union and Switzerland.

How does the Commission intend to address this situation? What difficulties are envisaged within this scenario? How will the referendum result affect the obligations which must be fulfilled by Switzerland within the European internal market?

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

The referendum introduced a new article into the Swiss constitution which only takes effect once the necessary implementing legislation is adopted. The initiative provides for 'the renegotiation and adaptation of international agreements which are contrary to the new article' within three years following acceptance of the initiative. 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. At the same time, action by the Commission will be considered. The Swiss government has assured the European Union following the referendum that it will continue to honour its existing international obligations, including those within the internal market. The European Commission, for its part, also considers that pacta sunt servanda and will continue to fulfil its obligations under the bilateral agreements.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001988/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Edukazzjoni mid-dar

Il-Gvern Malti riċentement ippubblika dokument ta' konsultazzjoni bħala parti minn pjan ta' riforma tal-att dwar l-edukazzjoni, li jistabbilixxi l-prinċipji sottostanti tas-sistemi u l-politika edukattivi ta' Malta. Ġie rappurtat li qed tiġi kkunsidrata l-possibilità li tiġi introdotta l-edukazzjoni mid-dar.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha informazzjoni dwar sistemi eżistenti ta' edukazzjoni mid-dar fi Stati Membri oħra u l-benefiċċji u/jew tħassib li jirriżulta minnhom?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' April 2014)

L-Onorevoli Membru għandu jkun konxju li, f'konformità mal-Artikolu 165 tat-Trattat dwar il-Funzjonament tal-Unjoni Ewropea, ir-responsabbiltà tal-kontenut u l-organizzazzjoni tas-sistemi edukattivi u ta' taħriġ hija kompletament fil-kompetenza tal-Istati Membri.

Il-Kummissjoni m'għandha ebda informazzjoni sistematika dwar il-kwistjoni ta' dispożizzjoniet dwar tagħlim mid-dar fl-Istati Membri.

Fid-deskrizzjoni tiegħu tas-sistemi edukattivi madwar l-Ewropa ("Eurypedia") ([1]), in-netwerk Eurydice jispjega, pajjiż pajjiż, id-drittijiet u r-responsabbiltajiet tal-istudenti u l-ġenituri fir-rigward tal-edukazzjoni obbligatorja. Dan jinkludi l-forom kollha ta' dispożizzjonijiet possibbli inkluż, jekk ikun rilevanti, forom speċjali bħalma hi dik tat-tagħlim mid-dar.

([1]) https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php?title=Home

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001988/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Home schooling

The Maltese Government recently issued a consultation document as part of a plan to reform the education act, which lays down the principles underpinning Malta's educational systems and policy. It has been reported that the possibility of introducing home schooling is being considered.

Does the Commission have any information on home-schooling systems in place in other Member States and the benefits and/or concerns arising therefrom?

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

The Honourable Member will be aware that, in accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems rests entirely with Member States.

The Commission does not dispose of any systematic information on the issue of home schooling provisions in the Member States.

In its description of education systems across Europe ('Eurypedia') ([1]), the Eurydice network outlines, country by country, the rights and responsibilities of pupils and parents with regard to compulsory education. This includes all possible forms of provisions including, if relevant, special forms, such as home schooling.

([1]) https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php?title=Home

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001989/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Governanza tal-Internet

Il-Kummissjoni ħarġet komunikazzjoni li fiha numru ta' azzjonijiet konkreti għar-riforma tal-mod li bih l-Internet huwa ġestit u amministrat. Il-komunikazzjoni tappella għal governanza tal-Internet aktar trasparenti, responsabbli u inklużiva. Il-Kummissjoni stiednet lill-Kunsill, lill-Parlament, lill-Kumitat Ekonomiku u Soċjali, lill-Kumitat tar-Reġjuni u lill-Istati Membri jaqblu dwar viżjoni komuni, bħal dik enfasizzata fil-komunikazzjoni, u jiddefenduha konġuntament fid-dibattiti internazzjonali imminenti.

Għal dan il-għan, il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tippjana li tiftaħ in-negozjati mal-pajjiżi mhux membri tal-UE dwar din il-kwistjoni sabiex ikollha pożizzjoni saħansitra aktar b'saħħitha matul id-dibattiti internazzjonali imminenti?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Kroes f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(1 ta' April 2014)

Għal xi snin, il-Kummissjoni Ewropea impenjat ruħha ma' għadd ta' pajjiżi terzi u organizzazzjonijiet tal-partijiet interessati dwar kwistjonijiet relatati mal-governanza globali tal-Internet. Il-Komunikazzjoni li ġiet adottata dan l-aħħar dwar il-Politika u l-Governanza tal-Internet tikkonferma l-pożizzjoni li ttieħdet s'issa, inklużi l-pożizzjonijiet adottati mill-Parlament Ewropew, b'mod partikolari dwar dak li jikkonċerna l-ħtieġa li jiġi mħares u msaħħaħ il-mudell b'ħafna partijiet interessati u li jiġi żgurat li l-qafas ta' governanza u l-funzjonijiet ewlenin tal-Internet jiġu verament globalizzati.

Għalissa, il-Kummissjoni Ewropea ma tipprevedix li tipproponi l-ftuħ ta' xi negozjati formali ma' pajjiżi terzi dwar dawn il-kwistjonijiet. Il-Komunikazzjoni dwar il-Politika u l-Governanza tal-Internet ma teħtieġx li kull strument legali internazzjonali ġdid jindirizza l-kwistjonijiet ta' governanza tal-Internet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001989/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Internet governance

The Commission has issued a communication containing a number of concrete actions to reform the way in which the Internet is managed and run. The communication calls for more transparent, accountable and inclusive Internet governance. The Commission has invited the Council, Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the Member States to agree on a common vision, such as that highlighted in the communication, and to defend it jointly in upcoming international debates.

To this end, does the Commission plan on opening negotiations with non-EU countries on this matter in order to hold an even stronger position during upcoming international debates?

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

The European Commission has engaged with a number of third countries and stakeholders organisations on matters related to the global governance of the Internet for some years. The recently adopted Communication on Internet Policy and Governance confirms the line taken so far, including on the basis of positions adopted by the European Parliament, in particular for what concerns the need to safeguard and strengthen the multi-stakeholder model and to make sure the governance framework and core Internet functions are truly globalised.

For the time being, the European Commission does not envisage proposing the opening of any formal negotiation with third countries on these matters. The communication on Internet Policy and Governance does not call for any new international legal instrument to address the issues of Internet governance.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001990/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Ċentru Ewropew taċ-Ċiberkriminalità

Fl-10 ta' Frar 2014 it-tnedija taċ-Ċentru Ewropew taċ-Ċiberkriminalità (EC[3]) għalqet sena.

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħti informazzjoni dwar jekk l-objettivi taċ-Ċentru nltaħqux f'dik li hija protezzjoni taċ-ċittadini u tan-negozji Ewropej minn theddid u sfidi online?

Iċ-Ċentru Ewropew taċ-Ċiberkriminalità kif qed jikkoopera mal-Istati Membri biex jindirizza dawn l-isfidi u jissensibilizza lill-utenti tal-internet?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(1 ta' April 2014)

Iċ-Ċentru Ewropew taċ-Ċiberkriminalità fi ħdan l-Europol (EC[3]) kellu suċċess matul l-ewwel sena tal-eżistenza tiegħu, fl-assistenza fil-koordinazzjoni ta' 19-il operazzjoni maġġuri taċ-ċiberkriminalità fl-oqsma li jiffoka fuqhom, li huma attakki ċibernetiċi, l-abbuż sesswali tat-tfal u l-frodi ta' pagamenti mhux bi flus kontanti. Rapport dettaljat tal-attivitajiet tiegħu u l-prijoritajiet futuri fil-ġlieda kontra ċ-ċiberkriminalità ġiet ippubblikata fl-10 ta' Frar 2014 ([1]). L-EC[3] taħdem mill-qrib mal-Istati Membri fuq dawn l-operazzjonijiet u oħrajn kurrenti. Kooperazzjoni strutturali sseħħ ukoll fil-kuntest taċ-Ċiklu tal-Politika EMPACT 2014-2017, li għalihom iċ-ċiberkriminalità (attakki ċibernetiċi, l-abbuż sesswali tat-tfal u l-frodi ta' pagamenti mhux bi flus kontanti) hija waħda mill-prijoritajiet. L-EC[3] huwa komexxej għal kull wieħed mit-tliet oqsma taċ-ċiberkriminalità msemmija. Rappreżentanti tal-Istati Membri parteċipanti u l-EC[3] jiltaqgħu mill-inqas erba' darbiet fis-sena sabiex jikkoordinaw l-attivitajiet.

F'termini ta' sensibilizzazzjoni, l-EC[3] jikkoopera mill-qrib ma' atturi fost il-komunitajiet, inkluż is-settur privat u aġenziji oħrajn tal-UE, u regolarment jipprovdi analiżi u spjegazzjonijiet dwar theddid u xejriet attwali lill-partijiet interessati tiegħu. Pjanijiet futuri għal sensibilizzazzjoni jinkludu wkoll il-parteċipazzjoni fix-Xahar taċ-Ċibersigurtà Ewropea u f'avvenimenti oħrajn.

([1]) Disponibbli fuq https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/ec3_first_year_report.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001990/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: European Cybercrime Centre

10 February 2014 marked the first anniversary of the launch of the European Cybercrime Centre (EC3).

Can the Commission provide any information about whether the objectives of the Centre have been fulfilled in terms of protecting European citizens and businesses against online threats and challenges?

How is the European Cybercrime Centre cooperating with Member States to address these challenges and raise awareness among online users?

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

The European Cybercrime Centre within Europol (EC[3]) has had a successful first year of existence, assisting in the coordination of 19 major cybercrime operations in its areas of focus, which are cyber attacks, child sexual abuse and non-cash payment fraud. A detailed report of its activities and future priorities in the fight against cybercrime was published on 10 February 2014 ([1]). The EC[3] works closely with Member States on these and other on-going operations. Structural cooperation also takes place in the context of the EMPACT Policy Cycle 2014-2017, for which cybercrime (cyber attacks, child sexual abuse and non-cash payment fraud) is one of the priorities. The EC[3] is a co-driver for each of the three cybercrime areas mentioned. Representatives of participating Member States and the EC[3] meet at least four times a year to coordinate activities.

In terms of raising awareness, EC[3] cooperates closely with actors across communities, including the private sector and other EU agencies, and regularly provides analysis and explanations of current threats and trends to its stakeholders. Future plans for awareness-raising also include participating in the European Cybersecurity Month and other events.

([1]) Available at https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/ec3_first_year_report.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001991/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Disleksja

F'dak li jirrigwarda l-istudenti li jbatu minn disleksja u minn diffikultajiet speċifiċi fil-qasam tat-tagħlim, il-Kummissjoni twettaq monitoraġġ tat-tranżizzjoni tagħhom mill-edukazzjoni għad-dinja tax-xogħol fl-Istati Membri differenti? U, jekk iva, kif tagħmel dan?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' April 2014)

L-Onorevoli Membru għandu jkun konxju li, f'konformità mal-Artikolu 165 tat-Trattat dwar il-Funzjonament tal-Unjoni Ewropea, l-Istati Membri huma kompletament responsabbli mill-kontenut u l-organizzazzjoni tas-sistemi edukattivi u ta' taħriġ, inkluż id-dispożizzjonijiet għall-edukazzjoni u t-taħriġ ta' persuni bi bżonnijiet speċjali u d-diffikultajiet speċifiċi ta' tagħlim kif ukoll dawk għat-tranżizzjonijiet tagħhom mill-edukazzjoni għax-xogħol.

Il-Kummissjoni taħdem mill-qrib mal-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Bżonnijiet Speċjali u l-Edukazzjoni Inklussiva ([1]) u tappoġġaha finanzjarjament. L-Aġenzija tipprovdi analiżi, evidenza u informazzjoni dwar l-edukazzjoni inklussiva madwar l-Ewropa; toħroġ rakkomandazzjonijiet ta' politika u tipprovdi għodod biex issegwi l-progress.

Fl-2012, l-Aġenzija lestiet il-proġett ta' tliet snin tagħha "Xejriet Ewropej ta' Prattiċi li kellhom Suċċess fl-Edukazzjoni u t-Taħriġ Vokazzjonali — tal-Parteċipazzjoni ta' Studenti bi bżonnijiet/diżabbiltajiet edukattivi speċjali fl-ETV" ([2]) li kien jinvolvi 26 pajjiż. Il-proġett analizza kemm il-programmi tal-ETV għall-istudenti bi bżonnijiet speċjali (inklużi l-persuni dislessiċi) jippreparawhom biex ikollhom suċċess fis-suq tax-xogħol.

([1]) L-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Bżonnijiet Speċjali u l-Edukazzjoni Inklussiva: http://www.european-agency.org/
([2]) https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/european-patterns-of-successful-practice-in-vet_vet-report_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001991/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Dyslexia

How does the Commission monitor, if at all, the transition of students suffering with dyslexia and specific learning difficulties from education into the work force in different Member States?

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

The Honourable Member will be aware that, in accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Member States are entirely responsible for the content and organisation of education and training systems, including provisions for the education and training of people with special needs and specific learning difficulties as well as their transition from education to work.

The Commission works closely with the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education ([1]) and supports it financially. The Agency provides analysis, evidence and information about inclusive education across Europe; it issues policy recommendations and provides tools to monitor progress.

In 2012, the Agency completed its 3-year project 'European Patterns of Successful Practice in Vocational Education and Training — participation of learners with special educational needs/disabilities in VET' ([2]) involving 26 countries. The project analysed the extent to which VET programmes for learners with special needs (which includes people with dyslexia) prepare them to succeed in the labour market.

([1]) The European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education: http://www.european-agency.org/
([2]) https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/european-patterns-of-successful-practice-in-vet_vet-report_en.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001992/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Disleksja

Liema sostenn qed jingħata lil studenti li jinsabu f'istituzzjonijiet ta' edukazzjoni għolja u li jbatu mid-diskleksja u minn diffikultajiet speċifiċi fil-qasam tat-tagħlim?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(7 ta' April 2014)

L-appoġġ għall-istudenti huwa r-responsabbiltà tal-awtoritajiet nazzjonali u hemm varjetà ta' miżuri ta' appoġġ nazzjonali għall-istudenti dislessiċi, li jvarjaw minn appoġġ miżjud fl-IT, l-iskennjar tal-kotba edukattivi f'fajls awdjo, iktar ħin biex ilestu l-eżamijiet jew għotjiet miżjuda. L-Unjoni Ewropea, fir-rwol tagħha biex tappoġġa l-Istati Membri, hija attiva wkoll f'dan il-qasam.

Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġa l-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Ħtiġijiet Speċjali, li tiffaċilita l-ġbir, l-ipproċessar u t-trasferiment tal-informazzjoni, sew fil-livell Ewropew sew dik li hija speċifika skont il-pajjiż, lill-Istati Membri tagħha biex b'hekk tgħinhom jitgħallmu minn xulxin permezz tal-iskambju tal-esperjenza u l-aħjar prattika. Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġa wkoll l-Istati Membri permezz ta' tfassil ta' politika bbażata fuq l-evidenza, biex tindirizza sfidi komuni.

Il-Programm Lifelong Learning preċedenti appoġġa proġetti bħal EUPALT li żviluppa "Passaport Ewropew" biex jgħallem lit-terapisti/għalliema li jaħdmu flimkien ma' persuni dislessiċi sabiex jappoġġa r-rikonoxximent tal-kompetenzi u l-kwalifiki tal-persuni li jħarrġu, li tradizzjonalment ġejjin minn oqsma differenti inkluż it-tagħlim mhux formalizzat. Il-programm Erasmus+ jipprovdi wkoll appoġġ speċifiku għal studenti u persuni oħrajn li qed jitgħallmu, li għandhom bżonnijiet speċjali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001992/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Dyslexia

What support is provided to students in higher education suffering from dyslexia and specific learning difficulties?

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

Student support is the responsibility of national authorities and there is a diversity of national support measures for dyslexic students, ranging from extra IT support, scanning of textbooks into audio files, more time to complete written exams or extra grants. The European Union, in its role of supporting Member States, is also active in this area.

The Commission supports the European Agency for Special Needs, which facilitates the collection, processing and transfer of European level and country-specific information to its Member States enabling them to learn from each other through exchange of experience and best practice. The Commission also supports the Member States through evidence-based policy making to address common challenges.

The former Lifelong Learning Programme supported projects like EUPALT which developed a 'European Passport' for the education of therapists/teachers working with people with dyslexia in order to support the recognition of competences and qualifications of trainers who traditionally come from different fields including informal learning. The Erasmus+ programme also provides specific support for students and other learners with special needs.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001993/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-governanza tal-internet bħala libertà fundamentali u dritt tal-bniedem

Fl-istqarrija għall-istampa tagħha tal-10 ta' Frar 2014 bit-titolu "Iċ-Ċentru Ewropew taċ-Ċiberkriminalità — sena wara", il-Kummissjoni argumentat li l-governanza tal-internet għandu jkollha għeruq sodi fil-libertajiet fundamentali u d-drittijiet tal-bniedem.

Il-Kummissjoni kif qed tqis li se tkun il-governanza tal-internet bħala parti mill-istandards Ewropej tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem u l-libertajiet fundamentali? Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi informazzjoni dwar jekk il-governanza tal-internet tistax twassal għal kunflitti ma' drittijiet tal-bniedem u libertajiet fundamentali stabbiliti oħrajn?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Kroes f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' April 2014)

L-istqarrija għall-istampa speċifika msemmija mill-Onorevoli Membru bit-titlu "Ċentru Ewropew taċ-Ċiberkriminalità — sena wara" ([1]) tiffoka fuq il-kisbiet tal-EC[3] fl-ewwel sena tal-eżistenza tiegħu u fuq l-isfidi futuri tiegħu, aktar milli tittratta l-governanza tal-internet.

Madankollu, fit-12 ta' Frar 2013 il-Kummissjoni adottat Komunikazzjoni dwar il-Politika u l-Governanza tal-Internet ([2]) li tinkludi "viżjoni Ewropea komuni għall-governanza tal-internet biex tiddefendi u tippromwovi d-drittijiet fundamentali u l-valuri demokratiċi, u strutturi pluripartiċipattivi ta' governanza li jkunu bbażati fuq regoli ċari li jirrispettaw dawk iddrittijiet u l-valuri". Dan ifisser li l-istess liġijiet u regoli li japplikaw f'oqsma oħra tal-ħajja ta' kuljum tagħna japplikaw ukoll onlajn, kif diġà ġie ddikjarat fil-Komunikazzjoni tal-2013 tal-Kummissjoni dwar Strateġija ta' Ċibersigurtà tal-Unjoni Ewropea. ([3])

Il-viżjoni tal-Kummissjoni hija spjegata fil-qosor mill-akronimu COMPACT ([4]): l-internet bħala spazju ta' responsabbiltajiet ċiviċi, riżorsa waħda, mhux frammentata, irregolata permezz ta' approċċ plurilaterali għall-promozzjoni tad-demokrazija u d-drittijiet tal-bniedem, ibbażat fuq arkitettura teknoloġika solida li tiġġenera l-fiduċja u tiffaċilita governanza trasparenti tal-infrastruttura sottostanti tal-internet u tas-servizzi li jimxu fuqha.

Dawn il-komunikazzjonijiet huma xhieda tal-impenn tal-Kummissjoni li tiddefendi l-internet bħala spazju għall-eżerċizzju liberu tad-drittijiet fundamentali u li tħares id-drittijiet fundamentali.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-14-129_en.pdf
([2]) Il-Politika u l-Governanza tal-Internet: Ir-rwol tal-Ewropa fid-definizzjoni tal-futur tal-Governanza tal-Internet, COM(2014) 72 finali tat-12.2.2013.
([3]) L-istrateġija ta' Ċibersigurtà tal-Unjoni Ewropea: Ċiberspazju Miftuħ, Sikur u Sigur, JOIN(2013) 1 finali tas-7.2.2013.
([4]) Ippreżentata għall-ewwel darba fl-okkażjoni ta' Laqgħa ta' Livell Għoli tal-OECD dwar l-Ekonomija tal-Internet, 28.06.2011, http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kroes/en/blog/i-propose-a-compact-for-theinternet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001993/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Internet governance as a fundamental freedom and human right

In its press release of 10 February 2014 entitled 'European Cybercrime Centre — one year on', the Commission maintained that Internet governance is to be firmly anchored in fundamental freedoms and human rights.

How does the Commission envisage Internet governance as part of the European standards of human rights and fundamental freedoms? Can the Commission provide information as to whether Internet governance may lead to conflicts with other established human rights and fundamental freedoms?

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

The specific press release referenced by the Honourable Member entitled 'European Cybercrime Centre — one year on' ([1]) focuses on the achievements of the EC[3] in its first year of existence and on its future challenges, rather than dealing with Internet governance.

However, on 12 February 2013 the Commission adopted a communication on Internet Policy and Governance ([2]) which includes 'a common European vision for Internet governance to defend and promote fundamental rights and democratic values, and multi-stakeholder governance structures that are based on clear rules that respect those rights and values'. This requires that the same laws and norms that apply in other areas of our day-to-day lives also apply online, as already affirmed in the Commission's 2013 Communication on a Cybersecurity Strategy for the European Union ([3]).

The Commission's vision is summarised by the Compact acronym ([4]): the Internet as a space of Civic responsibilities, One unfragmented resource governed via a Multistakeholder approach to Promote democracy and Human Rights, based on a sound technological Architecture that engenders Confidence and facilitates a Transparent governance both of the underlying Internet infrastructure and of the services which run on top of it.

These communications are evidence of the Commission's commitment to defending the Internet as a space for the free exercise of fundamental rights and to protecting fundamental rights.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-14-129_en.pdf
([2]) Internet Policy and Governance: Europe's role in shaping the future of Internet Governance, COM(2014) 72 final of 12.2.2013.
([3]) Cybersecurity Strategy of the European Union: An Open, Safe and Secure Cyberspace, JOIN(2013) 1 final of 7.2.2013.
([4]) First presented at the occasion of the OECD's High-Level Meeting on the Internet Economy, 28.6.2011, http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kroes/en/blog/i-propose-a-compact-for-theInternet

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001994/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Disleksja

Liema passi beħsiebha tieħu l-Kummissjoni biex tivvaluta jekk it-taħriġ u s-sostenn li pprovdiet lill-għalliema u lil professjonisti oħrajn fis-settur tal-edukazzjoni bil-għan li tiżgura li l-istudenti li jbatu mid-disleksja jiġu identifikati aktar kmieni, u jirċievu aċċess aktar rapidu għas-sostenn li jeħtieġu, humiex qed jilħqu l-objettivi ddikjarati?

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001996/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Disleksja

Liema passi qed tieħu l-Kummissjoni biex tiżgura li l-għalliema jkollhom l-għarfien u l-ħiliet meħtieġa sabiex jidentifikaw lil dawk it-tfal li jinsabu f'riskju ta' diffikulatjiet speċifiċi fil-qasam tat-tagħlim bħad-disleksja?

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001997/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Disleksja

Il-Kummissjoni kif qed twettaq il-monitoraġġ tal-livell ta' sensibilizzazzjoni u ta' għarfien espert dwar id-disleksja u d-diffikultajiet speċifiċi fil-qasam tat-tagħlim fost il-membri tal-persunal fl-iskejjel fl-Istati Membri differenti?

Tweġiba konġunta mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(16 ta' April 2014)

L-Istati Membri huma responsabbli għall-organizzazzjoni u l-kontenut tas-sistemi edukattivi tagħhom, inklużi t-taħriġ u l-appoġġ għall-għalliema. Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġa l-ħidma kollaborattiva, l-iskambju tal-aqwa prassi, u l-istudju bejn il-pari fost l-Istati Membri fit-tiftix ta' soluzzjonijiet għal sfidi komuni.

Fl-2008, il-Ministri tal-Edukazzjoni ftiehmu ([1]) li jiżguraw appoġġ f'waqtu u adegwat għall-istudenti bi bżonnijiet edukattivi speċjali, inkluż billi jidentifikaw kmieni d-diffikultajiet tagħhom fl-istudju, u billi jsibu soluzzjonijiet abbażi ta' approċċi pedagoġiċi personalizzati.

Il-Kummissjoni stabbiliet Grupp ta' Livell Għoli ta' esperti fil-qasam tal-Litteriżmu sabiex jistħarreġ ir-riċerka, politiki effettivi, u prassi tajba biex jitnaqqas l-għadd ta' persuni mingħajr ħiliet bażiċi fil-qari u fil-kitba. Fir-rapport aħħari tiegħu ([2]) ppubblikat fl-2012, il-Grupp indirizza l-kwistjoni tad-diffikultajiet fil-qari. Ikkonkludew li dawk li jbatu biex jaqraw jeħtieġu, primarjament, appoġġ edukattiv speċifiku li jiddedikalhom ammont ta' ħin xieraq, filwaqt li japplika l-metodu t-tajjeb biex jappoġġjahom fil-kisba ta' ħiliet fil-qari. Ikkonkludew ukoll li l-programmi mmirati li jtejbu l-ħiliet ta' dawk li jbatu biex jaqraw għandhom rata għolja ta' suċċess, u huma mill-aktar kosteffettivi.

Ir-rapport tal-2013 "*Supporting Teachers' Competence Development for Better Learning Outcomes*" ([3]), miktub mill-Grupp ta' Ħidma tal-Kummissjoni dwar l-għalliema, joffri gwida lil dawk li jfasslu l-politika rigward l-iżvilupp tal-kompetenzi tal-għalliema, inklużi l-għarfien u l-ħiliet meħtieġa biex jittrattaw id-diffikultajiet fl-istudju.

([1]) Il-Konklużjonijiet tal-Kunsill u tar-Rappreżentanti tal-Gvernijiet tal-Istati Membri, f'laqgħa fi ħdan il-Kunsill, rigward it-tħejjija taż-żgħażagħ għas-seklu 21: aġenda għal kooperazzjoni Ewropea dwar l-iskejjel; Novembru 2008.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/school/doc/literacy-report_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/school/doc/teachercomp_en.pdf

Il-programm Erasmus+, kif ukoll il-FSE ([4]), joffru opportunitajiet ta' finanzjament għal proġetti li jindirizzaw diffikultajiet fil-qari. Nitolbok ġentilment tirreferi wkoll għat-tweġiba bil-miktub E-001991/2014 dwar il-kooperazzjoni u l-appoġġ tal-Kummissjoni lill-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Bżonnijiet Edukattivi Speċjali u l-Edukazzjoni Inklussiva ([5]).

([4]) Il-Fond Soċjali Ewropew.

([5]) L-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Bżonnijiet Speċjali u l-Edukazzjoni Inklussiva: http://www.european-agency.org

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001994/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Dyslexia

What steps does the Commission plan to take to assess whether the training and support it has provided for teachers and other professionals within the education sector to ensure that dyslexic pupils are identified earlier, and receive quicker access to the support they need, is meeting the stated objectives?

Question for written answer E-001996/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Dyslexia

What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that teachers have the knowledge and skills to be able to identify those children who are at risk of specific learning difficulties such as dyslexia?

Question for written answer E-001997/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Dyslexia

How is the Commission monitoring the level of awareness and expertise on dyslexia and specific learning difficulties among school staff in different Member States?

Joint answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

Member States are responsible for the organisation and content of their education systems, including the training and support for teachers. The Commission supports collaborative work, exchange of good practice, and peer learning between MS in order to find solutions to common challenges.

Education Ministers agreed ([1]) in 2008 to ensure timely and adequate learning support for pupils with special needs, including by identifying learning difficulties early and finding solutions based on personalised pedagogical approaches.

The Commission established a High Level Group of experts in the field of Literacy to examine research, effective policies, and good practices to reduce the number of people who lack basic reading and writing skills. In their final report ([2]) published in 2012 the Group addressed the issue of reading difficulties. They concluded that struggling readers primarily need specific educational support dedicating adequate time and applying the proper method to support them to acquire reading skills. They also found that programmes aimed at improving the skills of struggling readers have a high rate of success and are extremely cost-effective.

The 2013 report 'Supporting Teachers' Competence Development for Better Learning Outcomes' ([3]) by the Commission Working Group on teachers offers guidance to policymakers for the development of teachers' competences, including the knowledge and skills to deal with learning difficulties.

The Erasmus + programme offers funding opportunities for projects tackling reading difficulties as well as the ESF ([4]).

([1]) Conclusions of the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on preparing young people for the 21st century: an agenda for European cooperation on schools; November 2008.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/school/doc/literacy-report_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/school/doc/teachercomp_en.pdf
([4]) European Social Fund.

Please also refer to Written Question E-001991/2014 on the Commission's cooperation with and support to the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education ([5]).

([5]) The European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education: http://www.european-agency.org/

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001995/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Disleksja

Liema proporzjon ta' għalliema kkwalifikati fl-Istati Membri rċevew taħriġ ta' sensibilizzazzjoni dwar id-disleksja u d-diffikultajiet speċifiċi fil-qasam tat-tagħlim bħala parti mill-iżvilupp professjonali kontinwu tagħhom fl-aktar perjodu reċenti li għalih jeżistu ċifri disponibbli?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(23 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Ma hemm l-ebda dejta disponibbli fil-livell tal-UE fir-rigward tal-proporzjon ta' għalliema kkwalifikati li rċevew taħriġ fid-dyslexia-SpLD.

Ir-rapport Eurydice "Teaching reading in Europe", ippubblikat fl-2011, jiddeskrivi l-qagħda attwali tat-tagħlim tal-qari fl-Ewropa u jiġbor dejta dwar it-tagħlim tal-litteriżmu fl-Ewropa. Għalkemm din id-dejta ma tkoprix speċifikament l-iżvilupp professjonali kontinwu dwar id-Disleksja u SpLD, ir-rapport jenfasizza kif l-għalliema futuri qed jitħejjew sabiex jindirizzaw id-diffikultajiet fil-qari.

Għal aktar dettalji jekk jogħġbok ikkonsulta r-rapport sħiħ, b'mod partikolari l-paragrafu *2.3.1. L-għarfien u l-ħiliet biex jiġi mgħallem il-qari fil-bidu tal-edukazzjoni tal-għalliem:* http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/130en.pdf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001995/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Dyslexia

What proportion of qualified teachers in Member States received dyslexia-SpLD awareness training as part of their continuing professional development in the latest period for which figures are available?

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

There is no EU-level data available regarding the proportion of qualified teachers that received dyslexia-SpLD training.

The Eurydice report 'Teaching reading in Europe', published in 2011, describes the state of play on teaching reading in Europe and gathers data on literacy teaching in Europe. Although these data do not specifically cover continuing professional development on Dyslexia and SpLD, the report highlights how future teachers are prepared to tackle reading difficulties.

For more details please consult the full report, in particular paragraph 2.3.1. Knowledge and skills for teaching reading in initial teacher education: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/130en.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001998/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Screening tal-kanser

Fl-2003, il-ministri tas-saħħa tal-UE adottaw unanimament rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kunsill dwar screening tal-kanser li tistabbilixxi prinċipji tal-aħjar prassi għal sejba bikrija tal-kanser u tistieden lill-Istati Membri kollha jimplimentaw programmi nazzjonali ta' skreening ibbażati fuq il-popolazzjoni għall-kanser tas-sider, ċervikali u kolorettali.

Fost l-objettivi tagħha biex tittieħed azzjoni, il-komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni tal-2009 dwar is-Sħubija Ewropea għall-Azzjoni Kontra l-Kanser tistabbilixxi l-mira li sal-2013 tinkiseb kopertura demografika ta' 100 % tal-iscreening għall-kanser tas-sider, ċervikali u kolorettali.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha informazzjoni dwar jekk Malta laħqitx il-mira ta' kopertura demografika ta' 100 % tal-iscreening għall-kanser tas-sider, ċervikali u kolorettali?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Skont l-aktar statistika li ġiet ippubblikata ([1]), il-kopertura għall-ittestjar mammografiku f'Malta hija ta' 48.70% għan-nisa li għandhom bejn 60 u 69 sena u 53.74% għan-nisa li għandhom bejn 50 u 59 sena. Skont il-Pjan Nazzjonali dwar il-Kanċer 2011-15, afil-preżent qed jiġi introdott programm għall-ittestjar tal-kanċer kolorettali.

Skont l-informazzjoni li għandha l-Kummissjoni, għadu ma ġiex introdott programm nazzjonali għall-ittestjar tal-kanċer ċervikali. ([2])

Fl-2008, Malta wettqet l-Istħarriġ b'Intervista dwar is-Saħħa Ewropea li pprovda dejta mwassla unikament mill-parteċipanti dwar l-ittestjar tal-kanċer tas-sider ([3]), dak ċervikali ([4]) u dak kolorettali ([5]) . Id-dejta tinsab ukoll fir-Rapport tal-UE/OECD: "Ħarsa ħafifa lejn is-Saħħa tal-Ewropa 2012" għal xi Stati Membri, b'paragun bejn l-2000 u l-2010 jew l-eqreb sena ([6]).

([1]) http://www.epaac.eu/from_heidi_wiki/Malta_National_Cancer_Plan_Maltese.pdf
([2]) http://www.epaac.eu/from_heidi_wiki/Malta_National_Cancer_Plan_Maltese.pdf .
([3]) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_hc2&lang=mt
([4]) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_hc3&lang=mt
([5]) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_hc4&lang=mt
([6]) http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/8112121e.pdf?expires=1394554597&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=62B7766250D4F8B644D6AC81F7A4EA1D , p.106 ff

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001998/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Cancer screening

In 2003 EU health ministers unanimously adopted a Council recommendation on cancer screening setting out best-practice principles for early detection of cancer and inviting all Member States to implement national, population-based screening programmes for breast, cervical and colorectal cancer.

Among its objectives for action, the Commission's 2009 communication on the European Partnership for Action Against Cancer sets the goal of achieving 100% population coverage of screening for breast, cervical and colorectal cancer by 2013.

Does the Commission have information on whether Malta has achieved the goal of 100% population coverage of screening for breast, cervical and colorectal cancer?

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

According to the most recently published statistics ([1]), the coverage for mammography screening in Malta is 48.70% of women aged 60-69 and 53.74% of women aged 50-59. According to the National Cancer Plan 2011-15, a colorectal cancer screening programme is currently being introduced.

According to the information available to the Commission, a national programme for cervical cancer screening has not been introduced so far. ([2])

In 2008, Malta conducted the European Health Interview Survey which provided self-reported data on breast ([3]), cervical ([4]) and colorectal ([5]) cancer screening. Data is also available in the EU/OECD Report: 'Health at a glance Europe 2012' for some Member States, with a comparison between 2000 and 2010 or nearest year ([6]).

([1]) http://www.epaac.eu/from_heidi_wiki/Malta_National_Cancer_Plan_English.pdf
([2]) http://www.epaac.eu/from_heidi_wiki/Malta_National_Cancer_Plan_English.pdf
([3]) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_hc2&lang=en
([4]) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_hc3&lang=en
([5]) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_hc4&lang=en
([6]) http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/8112121e.pdf?expires=1394554597&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=62B7766250D4F8B644D6AC81F7A4EA1D p.106 ff

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001999/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Benefiċċji għal ħaddiema qiegħda

Fil-bajt 2014 ta' Malta tħabbru inċentivi li permezz tagħhom il-ħaddiema qiegħda li jkunu qed jirċievu benefiċċji tal-qgħad jew benefiċċji soċjali u li jsibu impjieg ikunu jistgħu jżommu 65 % ta' dawn il-benefiċċji soċjali fl-ewwel sena, 45 % fit-tieni sena u 25 % fit-tielet sena. Dawk li jħaddmuhom jirċievu perċentwal tal-benefiċċji soċjali mħallsa lill-ħaddiema għal tliet snin.

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja ta' benefiċċji soċjali simili fl-Istati Membri l-oħra?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(9 ta' April 2014)

It-tnaqqis gradwali tal-benefiċċji (forma ta' esklużjonijiet ta' introjtu) mad-dħul mill-ġdid fis-suq tax-xogħol huwa prattika li ġiet promossa mill-Kummissjoni Ewropea ([1]) biex tkompli tnaqqas id-diżinċentivi biex in-nies jaħdmu.

L-esklużjonijiet ta' introjtu jeżistu f'ħafna mill-Istati Membri, għalkemm ivarjaw fil-livell u d-durata.

Il-bażi tad-dejta MISSOC ([2]) tipprovdi informazzjoni dettaljata u komparabbli dwar is-sistemi tal-protezzjoni soċjali nazzjonali tal-UE aġġornata sal-2013. Għall-benefiċċji tal-qgħad hemm taqsima apposta għall-akkumulazzjoni minn introjtu minn xogħol u informazzjoni simili rapportati għal benefiċċji oħrajn.

Il-bażi tad-dejta tal-Informazzjoni Kwalitattiva ESSPROS ([3]), li tikkompleta d-dejta kwantitattiva ta' ESSPROS ([4]) (dejta dwar in-nefqa), tipprovdi informazzjoni deskrittiva komparabbli li tikkonċerna l-benefiċċji soċjali fi 32 pajjiż (28 UE + l-Islanda, l-Isvizzera, u s-Serbja) sal-2011. L-"Unemployment function" tipprovdi informazzjoni dwar il-benefiċċji tal-qgħad.

Il-bażi tad-dejta tat-taxxa u l-benefiċċji tal-OECD ([5]) fiha informazzjoni komparabbli dwar l-esklużjonijiet ta' introjtu għall-qgħad u benefiċċji soċjali oħrajn fil-pajjiżi tal-OECD għas-snin magħżula (2005, 2007, 2010) u informazzjoni aktar dettaljata dwar il-pajjiżi sal-2011.

Barra minn hekk, malli jibdew jaħdmu, l-impjegaturi jistgħu jingħataw l-inċentivi. Il-bażi tad-dejta LABREF ([6]) tipprovdi xi informazzjoni dwar in-naħa tal-impjegaturi sal-2011, l-aktar taħt it-taqsima "Active labour market policies — Employment subsidies".

([1]) Ara l-Komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni lill-Parlament Ewropew, lill-Kunsill, lill-Kumitat Ekonomiku u Soċjali Ewropew u lill-Kumitat tar-Reġjuni Lejn Investiment Soċjali għat-Tkabbir u l-Koeżjoni — inkluża l-implimentazzjoni tal-Fond Soċjali Ewropew 2014-2020 /* COM/2013/083 final */.
([2]) http://www.missoc.org/MISSOC/INFORMATIONBASE/COMPARATIVETABLES/MISSOCDATABASE/comparativeTableSearch.jsp
([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/social_protection/data/qualitative_information.
([4]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/social_protection/data/database
([5]) http://www.oecd.org/els/benefitsandwagespolicies.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/indicators/economic_reforms/labref/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001999/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Benefits for unemployed workers

Incentives were announced in the 2014 Malta budget whereby the unemployed receiving unemployment benefits or social benefits would, on securing a job, retain 65% of these social benefits in the first year, 45% in the second year and 25% in the third year. Their employers would get a percentage of the social benefits paid to the workers for three years.

Is the Commission aware of any similar social benefits in the other Member States?

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

Tapering off benefits (a form of earnings disregards) upon re-entering the labour market is a practice that has been promoted by the European Commission ([1]) to further reduce disincentives to work.

Earning disregards do exist in most Member States, although they vary in level and duration.

The Missoc database ([2]) provides detailed and comparable information about EU national social protection systems updated up to 2013. For unemployment benefits there is a section dedicated to the accumulation with earnings from work and similar information are reported for other benefits.

The Esspros Qualitative Information database ([3]), which completes the Esspros quantitative data ([4]) (expenditure data), provides comparable descriptive information concerning the social benefits in 32 countries (28 EU + Iceland, Norway, Switzerland, and Serbia) until 2011. The 'Unemployment function' provides information on unemployment benefits.

The OECD tax and benefit database ([5]) contains comparable information on earning disregards for unemployment and other social benefits in OECD countries for selected years (2005, 2007, 2010) and more detailed country information up to 2011.

In addition, on taking up employment, employers can be given incentives. The LABREF database ([6]) provides some information on the employer side up to 2011, mostly under the section 'Active labour market policies — Employment subsidies'.

([1]) See Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Towards Social Investment for Growth and Cohesion — including implementing the European Social Fund 2014-2020, COM(2013) 083 final.
([2]) http://www.missoc.org/MISSOC/INFORMATIONBASE/COMPARATIVETABLES/MISSOCDATABASE/comparativeTableSearch.jsp
([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/social_protection/data/qualitative_information
([4]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/social_protection/data/database
([5]) http://www.oecd.org/els/benefitsandwagespolicies.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/indicators/economic_reforms/labref/

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002000/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Tniġġis tal-arja f'Delimara

Skont studju dwar il-kwalità tal-arja mwettaq minn korp independenti, il-livelli ta' sustanzi niġġiesa minuskoli fl-arja rreġistrati qrib l-impjant taż-żejt tal-karburanti tqil f'Delimara jirrispettaw il-limiti stabbiliti mill-UE.

Abbażi ta' din il-valutazzjoni, tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħti informazzjoni dwar jekk l-impjant tal-elettriku ta' Delimara huwiex konformi mal-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE dwar il-kwalità tal-arja?.

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Potočnik f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(13 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni ma tiġborx dejta ta' monitoraġġ dwar l-emissjonijiet ta' impjanti tal-enerġija individwali jew installazzjonijiet industrijali oħra. Sta għall-awtoritajiet nazzjonali kompetenti jiżguraw li l-kondizzjonijiet tal-permess u l-valuri ta' limitu tal-emissjonijiet jiġu mħarsa.

Fir-rapport tagħhom dwar il-kwalità tal-arja għall-2012, imressaq skont id-Direttiva 2008/50/KE dwar il-kwalità tal-arja fl-ambjent u arja iktar nadifa għall-Ewropa ([1]), l-awtoritajiet Maltin irrappurtaw konformità mal-valuri ta' limitu applikabbli għall-NO_2 u l-PM10 għaż-żona "Żona Maltija" MT0002 fejn jinsab l-impjant tal-elettriku ta' Delimara.

([1]) ĠU L 152, 11.6.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002000/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Air pollution in Delimara

According to an air quality study carried out by an independent body, the levels of minute airborne pollutants recorded near the heavy fuel oil plant in Delimara fall within EU limits.

Following this assessment, can the Commission provide information on whether the Delimara power station conforms with EU legislation on air quality?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission does not collect monitoring data concerning emissions of individual power plants or other industrial installations. It is up to the competent national authorities to ensure that the permit conditions and emission limit values are complied with.

In their air quality report for 2012, submitted according to Directive 2008/50/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe ([1]), the Maltese authorities reported compliance with the applicable limit values for NO_2 and PM10 for the zone MT0002 'Maltese zone' within which the Delimara power plant is located.

([1]) OJ L 152, 11.6.2008.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002001/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Moħqrija tal-annimali

Każijiet reċenti ta' moħqrija tal-annimali f'Malta qajmu dibattitu dwar jekk għandhiex tiġi introdotta leġiżlazzjoni ġdida b'deterrenti aktar effikaċi sabiex tiġi miġġielda l-moħqrija tal-annimali.

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja mis-sistemi ta' infurzar adottati minn xi Stat Membru ieħor bħala deterrenti fil-ġlieda kontra l-moħqrija tal-annimali?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(2 ta' April 2014)

Il-kompetenzi tal-UE relatati mat-trattament xieraq tal-annimali huma limitati għal kwistjonijiet li għandhom l-għan li jiksbu objettivi speċifiċi tal-UE limitati għal dawk imniżżla fl-Artikolu 13 tat-Trattat dwar il-Funzjonament tal-Unjoni Ewropea bħall-agrikoltura jew is-suq intern.

Fl-2012 il-Kummissjoni adottat Strateġija għat-Trattament Xieraq tal-Annimali li stipulat għadd ta' azzjonijiet li hija kompetenti fihom u li diġà wettqet bħall-iżvilupp ta' għodda, inklużi fejn rilevanti, pjanijiet ta' implimentazzjoni biex tissaħħaħ il-konformità tal-Istati Membri; l-appoġġ għall-kooperazzjoni internazzjonali; l-għoti ta' informazzjoni xierqa lill-konsumaturi u lill-pubbliku; l-ottimizzazzjoni tal-effetti sinerġiċi mill-Politika Agrikola Komuni attwali u l-investigazzjoni dwar it-trattament xieraq tal-ħut imrobbi.

Din stipulat ukoll għadd ta' azzjonijiet li proponiet biex jiġu kkunsidrati waqt il-perjodu kopert mill-istrateġija 2012-2015: bħall-użu tal-indikaturi tat-trattament xieraq tal-annimali bbażati fuq ix-xjenza bħala mezz possibbli għas-simplifikazzjoni tal-qafas legali u biex jippermettu li l-flessibbiltà ttejjeb il-kompetittività tal-produtturi tal-bhejjem, qafas ġdid tal-UE biex iżid it-trasparenza u l-adegwatezza tal-informazzjoni tal-konsumaturi dwar it-trattament xieraq tal-annimali għall-għażla tagħhom ta' xiri, it-twaqqif ta' netwerk Ewropew ta' ċentri ta' referenza u l-ħolqien ta' rekwiżiti komuni għall-kompetenza tal-persunal li jieħu ħsieb l-annimali.

Madankollu, il-Kummissjoni ma titlobx informazzjoni dwar il-mezzi u l-metodi ta' infurzar tal-liġijiet li jipprojbixxu l-moħqrija tal-annimali inġenerali fl-Istati Membri billi dawn jibqgħu fil-kompetenza tal-istess Stati Membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002001/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Animal cruelty

Recent cases of animal cruelty in Malta have raised a debate as to whether new legislation with more effective deterrents should be introduced to fight animal cruelty.

Is the Commission aware of the enforcement systems adopted by any of the other Member States as deterrents to fight animal cruelty?

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

EU competences related to animal welfare are limited to issues that aim at achieving specific EU objectives limited to those listed in Article 13 of the Treaty for the Functioning of the European Union such as agriculture or the internal market.

The Commission in 2012 adopted an Animal Welfare Strategy which set out a number of actions for which it has competence and already performed such as: the development of tools, including where relevant implementing plans, to strengthen Member States' compliance; supporting international cooperation; providing consumers and the public with appropriate information; optimizing synergistic effects from current Common Agriculture Policy, and investigating the welfare of farmed fish..

It also set out a number of actions which it proposed to consider during the period covered by the strategy 2012-2015: such as the use of science-based animal welfare indicators as a possible means to simplify the legal framework and allow flexibility to improve competitiveness of livestock producers, a new EU framework to increase transparency and adequacy of information to consumers on animal welfare for their purchase choice, the establishment of a European network of reference centres, the creation of common requirements for competence of personnel handling animals.

However the Commission, does not request information on the means and method of enforcement of laws prohibiting animal cruelty in general in the Member States which remains the competence of the Member States.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002002/14
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: EU roaming charges

Liberal Commissioner Neelie Kroes is leading the campaign to reduce mobile roaming fees across the EU. We would like to see roaming fees phased out completely in the EU as soon as possible.

1. Could the Commission provide an estimate of the total savings for EU consumers from the reduction in roaming costs since 2009?

2. Could the Commission clarify whether the roaming legislation, restricting the price of calls, texts and data, would apply to a UK phone number calling an Irish phone number while on holiday in Spain?

3. Could the Commission explain whether it intends to abolish roaming charges completely, including in the circumstances specified in point 2, across the EU?

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

1. The total savings for EU consumers from the reduction of roaming charges (calls made, calls received, SMS and data) since 2009 (third quarter 2009 to third quarter 2013 included) can be estimated at about EUR 9.6 billion (estimation based on data from BEREC's 12th Benchmark Report).

2. Yes, current EU roaming legislation applies, and the roaming provisions in the Connected Continent proposal would apply, to a UK phone number calling an Irish phone number while on holiday in Spain.

3. The Commission indeed aims at ensuring that citizens can confidently use roaming services at domestic prices when travelling in the EU, including in the circumstances specified in point 2.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-002004/14
a Bizottság számára
Marian Harkin (ALDE), Göncz Kinga (S&D) és Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2014. február 20.)

Tárgy: Az Európai Bizottság fogyatékossággal kapcsolatos ügyekkel foglalkozó igazgatóságának létrehozása

Az EU-n belüli több mint 80 millió fogyatékkal élő ember jelentős akadályokba ütközik az oktatáshoz, foglalkoztatáshoz, árukhoz és szolgáltatásokhoz való hozzáférés során, ami növeli a társadalmi kirekesztést és a szegénységet.

Az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés 10. cikke, az Európai Unió Alapjogi Chartájának 21. és 26. cikke, valamint az európai strukturális és beruházási alapokat 2014-től irányító új rendelet hozzáféréssel kapcsolatos új szabályai rendelkeznek arról, hogy a fogyatékkal élő személyeknek joguk van az önállóságuk és társadalmi beilleszkedésük biztosítását célzó minden lehetséges uniós intézkedésre és fellépésre.

Az ENSZ fogyatékkal élő személyek jogairól szóló egyezményének – amelynek az EU is részes fele – 4. cikke kötelezi a szerződő feleket, hogy valamennyi politikában és programban hozzanak meg „minden megfelelő jogalkotási, közigazgatási és egyéb intézkedést az […] egyezményben foglalt jogok végrehajtása érdekében".

Annak érdekében, hogy jelentős előrelépés történjen a fogyatékkal élő emberek és családjaik életében, garantáljuk társadalmi befogadásukat, és biztosítjuk, hogy megszülessenek a megfelelő és szükséges jogalkotási intézkedések. Úgy véljük, hogy kiemelkedő jelentősége van az Európai Bizottságon belül egy olyan igazgatóság, nem csupán egy osztály létrehozásának, amely kifejezetten a fogyatékossággal kapcsolatos ügyekért felel. Ezért felelős európai parlamenti képviselőként az alábbi kérdéseket szeretnénk feltenni:

1. Megfontolta-e valaha is a Bizottság egy kizárólag a fogyatékossággal kapcsolatos ügyekért felelős igazgatóság létrehozását?

2. Ha igen, mikor és melyik főigazgatóságon belül tervezte a Bizottság annak létrehozását?

3. Ha nem, mi indokolta ezt a döntést?

4. Tervezte-e valaha a Bizottság, illetve tervezi-e, hogy egy fogyatékkal élő képzett szakértőkből álló tanácsadó bizottság által segített főigazgatóságot hozzon létre?

5. Ha nem, hogyan tervezi a Bizottság az ENSZ fogyatékkal élő személyek jogairól szóló egyezményének való megfelelést a Bizottság igazgatásán belül?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. április 10.)

A Bizottság a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezménnyel ([1]) és különösen annak 4. cikkével összhangban támogatja a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogait az uniós politikák és jogszabályok kidolgozása és végrehajtása során. Annak érdekében, hogy a fogyatékossággal kapcsolatos ügyek a Bizottság valamennyi vonatkozó kezdeményezésében hatékonyan érvényesüljenek, a Jogérvényesülési Főigazgatóságon belül működő, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogaival foglalkozó csoport koordinálja a fogyatékossággal foglalkozó szolgálatközi csoportot, amely összefogja a különböző érintett bizottsági szervezeti egységeket. Ez biztosítja, hogy a fogyatékossággal élő személyek szükségleteit és jogait figyelembe vegyék egyrészt a releváns új jogszabályjavaslatok és kezdeményezések kidolgozása, másrészt pedig az uniós szakpolitikák és tevékenységek végrehajtása során. A fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló egyezmény és az új javaslatok közötti összhangot az alapvető jogoknak a bizottsági hatásvizsgálatok végzése során történő figyelembevételére vonatkozó gyakorlati útmutatás alapján rendszeresen ellenőrzik.

A 2010–2020 közötti időszakra szóló európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégia ([2]) végrehajtása során a Bizottság igénybe veszi az európai fogyatékosságügyi szakértők tudományos hálózatának (Academic Network of European Disability experts, ANED) segítségét. A Bizottság 2008 óta finanszírozza az ANED-et, hogy a hálózat a fogyatékossággal kapcsolatos kérdéskörök nemzeti és uniós szintű szakpolitikai fejleményeiről készített tematikus elemzések révén tudományos segítséggel és tanáccsal szolgáljon ([3]). A Bizottság számos uniós szintű, fogyatékossággal foglalkozó nem kormányzati szervezettel – köztük fogyatékossággal élő személyek szervezeteivel ([4]) – folytat rendszeres párbeszédet, és pénzügyi támogatást biztosít számukra. Emellett konzultációt folytat az EU fogyatékossággal foglalkozó magas szintű csoportjának szakértőivel, akik a tagállamokat és a fogyatékossággal élő személyek szervezeteit egyaránt képviselik.

([1]) 2010/48/EK, HL L 23., 2010.1.27., 35. o.
([2]) COM(2010) 636 végleges.
([3]) http://www.disability-europe.net/
([4]) A 2007–2013 közötti programozási időszakban e terület finanszírozása elsősorban a „Progress" közösségi foglalkoztatási és társadalmi szolidaritási programon keresztül valósult meg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002004/14
to the Commission
Marian Harkin (ALDE), Kinga Göncz (S&D) and Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: The establishment of a European Commission directorate for disability

Over 80 million people with disabilities face considerable barriers to accessing education, employment, goods and services in the EU, leading to greater social exclusion and poverty.

Article 10 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Articles 21 and 26 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, and the new accessibility-related rules in the new regulation governing all European Structural and Investment Funds from 2014 provide that people with disabilities should benefit from all possible EU measures and action to ensure their independence and social inclusion.

Article 4 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), to which the EU is party, requires States Parties 'to adopt all appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the rights recognised in the […] Convention' in all policies and programmes.

In order to achieve significant advancement in the lives of disabled people and their families, to safeguard their social inclusion, and to ensure that the relevant and necessary legislative measures are taken, we consider the establishment of a European Commission directorate, and not simply a unit within one, which is specifically responsible for disability affairs to be of paramount importance. Therefore, we, as responsible MEPs, would like to know ask the following questions:

1. Has the Commission has ever considered establishing a directorate responsible exclusively for disability affairs?

2. If yes, when and under which DG has the Commission planned to establish it?

3. If not, what was the reason behind this decision?

4. Has the Commission ever planned, or is it planning, to provide a DG with an advisory board of qualified disabled experts?

5. If not, how does the Commission plan to comply with the relevant article of UN CRPD in the Commission administration?

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

The Commission promotes the rights of persons with disabilities in the development and implementation of EU policies and legislation in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and particularly Article 4 thereof ([1]). To effectively mainstream disability issues in all relevant Commission's initiatives, the unit for the rights of persons with disabilities in DG Justice coordinates the Inter-Service Group on Disability which gathers different relevant Commission departments. This ensures that the needs and rights of people with disabilities are taken into consideration when relevant new legislative proposals and initiatives are prepared and also in the implementation of EU policies and actions. Compliance of new proposals with the CRPD is checked systematically following the operational guidance on taking account of fundamental rights in Commission impact assessments.

In implementing the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([2]), the Commission benefits from the expertise of the Academic Network of European Disability experts (ANED). The Commission funds ANED since 2008 to provide scientific support and advice through thematic analysis of national and EU-level policy developments in disability-related fields ([3]). The Commission maintains a regular dialogue with a number of EU-level disability NGOs, including DPOs ([4]), that it financially supports. It also benefits from consulting the experts of the EU Disability High-level Group, coming both from the Member States and from DPOs.

([1]) 2010/48/EC — OJ 27.1.2010, L 23, page 35.
([2]) COM(2010) 636 final.
([3]) http://www.disability-europe.net/
([4]) In the 2007-2013 programming period, funding in this area has been mainly provided through the Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity — Progress.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002005/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Zugang zu medizinischer Versorgung bei Multiple Sklerose aus der Sicht der Patienten

Die Kommission kennt die gerade veröffentlichte Studie zum Thema „Zugang zu medizinischer Versorgung bei Multiple Sklerose: Herausforderungen und Chancen" ([1]).

1) Ist die Kommission bereit, eine ähnliche Studie mit Blick auf die Patienten aller 28 Mitgliedstaaten in Auftrag zu geben?

a) Wenn ja, wann wird sie diese Initiative starten?

b) Falls nein, wie genau begründet sie dies?

2) Kann die Kommission angeben, ob die Studie gegebenenfalls folgende Aspekte umfassen wird

a) Eine umfassende Erhebung über die Erfahrungen von MS-Patienten durch statistisch repräsentative Umfragen, damit vor dem Hintergrund fundierter Informationen Diskussionen mit den Gesundheitsbehörden und den Politikern auf Mitgliedstaatsebene geführt werden können;

b) Bereicherung aller bereits bestehenden MS-bezogenen Datenquellen um ein klares Bild dessen, was es heißt, mit MS leben zu müssen — und zwar einschließlich Schlussfolgerungen in Bezug auf Politik und Behandlungsgrundsätze;

c) Bewertung folgender Aspekte der Erfahrungswerte von Patienten

— Zugang zu Arzneimitteln und Therapien;

— Verfügbarkeit von Informationen;

— MS-spezifische Rehabilitationsangebote;

— Einbindung in die Beschlussfassung;

— Qualität von Behandlung und Versorgung?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002006/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Zugang zu Medikamenten zur Behandlung von Multiple Sklerose

Im Januar 2014 wurde eine Studie zum Thema „Zugang zu Medikamenten zur Behandlung von Multiple Sklerose: Herausforderungen und Chancen" veröffentlicht ([1]).

1. Ist sich die Kommission dessen bewusst, dass zwischen jenen 15 Mitgliedstaaten, die an dieser Studie teilgenommen haben, in Bezug auf den Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung bei Multiple Sklerose beträchtliche Unterschiede bestehen?

2. Ist die Kommission bereit, zu dieser Thematik eine Studie durchzuführen, an der alle 28 Mitgliedstaaten beteiligt sind? Wenn ja, wann kann sie damit beginnen? Wenn nein, kann sie spezifische Gründe dafür angeben, weshalb sie dazu nicht bereit ist?

([1]) http://crai.com/Publications/listingdetails.aspx?id=16931&pubtype=All%20Type

Gemeinsame Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(31. März 2014)

Für die Organisation des Gesundheitswesens und die medizinische Versorgung sind gemäß dem Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union die EU-Mitgliedstaaten zuständig.

Dementsprechend und angesichts der angesprochenen bereits vorliegenden Studie und weiterer Berichte zu diesem Thema beabsichtigt die Kommission nicht, eine ähnliche Studie über den Zugang zu medizinischer Versorgung von Patienten mit Multipler Sklerose in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten in die Wege zu leiten.

Im Rahmen des Schwerpunkts „Gesellschaftliche Herausforderungen — Gesundheit, demografischer Wandel und Wohlergehen" des Rahmenprogramms für Forschung und Innovation „Horizont 2020" (2014-2020) ([2]) können Forschungsarbeiten in diesem Bereich unterstützt werden. Informationen zu aktuellen Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten sind über das Teilnehmerportal für Forschung und Innovation der Europäischen Kommission ([3]) erhältlich. EU-Forschungsmittel werden im Zuge von wettbewerbsorientierten Aufforderungen zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen nach einer unabhängigen Peer-Review-Bewertung gewährt.

([2]) KOM(2011)808 endg., KOM(2011)811 endg.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002005/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Access to healthcare for multiple sclerosis from the patients' perspective

The Commission will be aware of the newly published study 'Access to medicines for multiple sclerosis: Challenges and opportunities'. ([1])

1. Is the Commission ready to launch a similar a study, with the focus on the patients, for all 28 Member States?

a. If so, when will the Commission launch this study?

b. If not, can the Commission please give specific reasons?

2. Can the Commission state whether, when it launches such a study, it will focus on the following aspects:

a. carrying out a baseline measurement of MS patient experiences through statistically representative survey results, so as to enable informed discussions with health authorities and policymakers at Member State level;

b. enriching existing MS-related data sources with a clearer picture of what it means to live with MS, including implications for policies and principles of treatment;

c. assessing the following aspects of the patient experience:

— access to medicines and therapies;

— availability of information;

— MS-specific rehabilitation services;

— involvement in decision-making;

— quality of care and services?

Question for written answer E-002006/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Access to medicines for multiple sclerosis

In January 2014, a study entitled 'Access to medicines for multiple sclerosis: Challenges and opportunities' was published. ([1])

1. Is the Commission aware of the fact that there are significant differences in access to healthcare with regard to multiple sclerosis among those 15 Member States participating in the above study?

2. Is the Commission willing to conduct a study on this topic involving all 28 Member States? If so, when will it be ready to begin? If not, can it give specific reasons for its unwillingness?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(31 March 2014)

According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care is a matter which falls under the responsibility of the EU Member States.

Against this background, and also given the existence of the study referred to and of further reports on this subject, the Commission has no plans to launch itself a similar study on access of people with multiple sclerosis to healthcare in EU-Member States.

([1]) http://crai.com/Publications/listingdetails.aspx?id=16931&pubtype=All%20Type

Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation ([2]) (2014-2020), through its 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge may provide further opportunities to support research in this area. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained at the EC Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([3]). EU research funding is granted on the basis of competitive calls for proposals, following an independent peer-review evaluation.

([2]) COM(2011) 808 final, COM(2011) 811 final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002007/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Auswirkungen der Richtlinie über die grenzüberschreitende Gesundheitsversorgung

Könnte die Kommission konkrete Beispiele für die Auswirkungen der Richtlinie über die grenzüberschreitende Gesundheitsversorgung auf das Leben einzelner Patienten in der EU geben?

Könnte die Kommission detaillierte Beispiele sowie eine Aufstellung der betroffenen Mitgliedstaaten zur Verfügung stellen?

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

In der Richtlinie 2011/24/EU ([1]) über die Ausübung der Patientenrechte in der grenzüberschreitenden Gesundheitsversorgung werden die Rechte von Patienten klargestellt, die in ihrem Heimatstaat eine Kostenerstattung für eine in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat erfolgte Behandlung beantragen. Patienten können von diesen Rechten Gebrauch machen, wenn ihnen die Inanspruchnahme von Gesundheitsdienstleistungen in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat den Zugang zu einer besseren, spezialisierten oder schnelleren Versorgung ermöglicht, was ihr Leben erheblich verbessern könnte.

Die Mitgliedstaaten sind gemäß der genannten Richtlinie verpflichtet, nationale Kontaktstellen einzurichten, die den Patienten eine Reihe von Informationen zur Verfügung stellen, damit diese in der Lage sind, ihre Rechte tatsächlich geltend zu machen (z. B. Transparenz in Bezug auf Qualitäts- und Sicherheitsnormen, Ansprüche in Bezug auf Gesundheitsleistungen, Beschwerde- und Rechtsbehelfsverfahren usw.) Diese Erhöhung der Transparenz kommt allen Patienten zugute, nicht nur denjenigen, die sich ins Ausland begeben.

Die Kommission kann keine Aussagen über die Anzahl der Patienten, die von der genannten Richtlinie Gebrauch gemacht haben, oder über die in Anspruch genommenen Behandlungen treffen. Die Mitgliedstaaten werden um Vorlage dieser Daten gebeten und sie werden im Oktober 2015 in einem Bericht über die Anwendung der genannten Richtlinie vorgestellt.

([1]) ABl. L 88 vom 04.04.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002007/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Impact of cross-border health directive

Would the Commission be willing to provide tangible examples of the impact of the cross-border health directive on the lives of individual patients in the EU?

Could the Commission please provide detailed examples and a list of the Member States concerned.

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

Directive 2011/24/EU ([1]) on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare clarifies rights of patients to seek reimbursement in their home Member State for treatment received in another Member State. Those patients who choose to use these rights may do so on the grounds that going to another Member State for healthcare may help them access better, more specialised or swifter care — which may make a considerable difference to their lives.

National contact points which Member States are required to establish under this directive provide a certain amount of information to ensure that patients are in a position to actually use these rights (e.g. transparency on quality and safety standards, entitlements to healthcare, complaints and redress procedures etc.). This increase in transparency will benefit all patients, not only those who choose to travel abroad.

The Commission is not in a position to know how many patients have used this directive or for which treatments. Member States will be asked for this data which will be presented in a report on the operation of this directive due in October 2015.

([1]) OJ L 88, 4.4.2011.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002008/14
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(20 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Muerte de 15 inmigrantes frente a la costa ceutí

Los disparos de pelotas de goma que efectivos de la Guardia Civil española efectuaron contra centenares de inmigrantes que pretendían entrar en España desde la frontera de Ceuta suponen una expulsión masiva y sumaria que contraviene la legislación europea y local sobre inmigración. Ambas priorizan el deber de auxilio sobre cualquier otra consideración y obligan, antes de iniciar cualquier proceso de expulsión, a asistir a las personas afectadas, individualizar los expedientes, comprobar que no son de aplicación condiciones que permitirían su entrada legal en el país e instruir en todo caso expedientes individualizados de expulsión. El incidente, saldado hasta ahora con la muerte de quince personas, contrasta con actuaciones anteriores del mismo instituto armado, que, hasta la fecha, no había utilizado este tipo de medios para enfrentar el problema de la inmigración ilegal y había respondido con operaciones de rescate y auxilio a personas en dificultades en cayucos en el mar. Es por ello que la Comisaria de Asuntos de Interior de la UE, Cecilia Malmström, ha enviado una carta al Gobierno de España pidiendo información sobre el uso de balas de goma contra los inmigrantes que trataban de alcanzar la costa ceutí. En este caso, y ante la vulneración de algunos principios fundamentales como los citados:

¿En qué se concreta la petición de explicaciones anunciada por la Comisaria a las autoridades españolas?

¿Cómo valora la Comisión la existencia de al menos seis versiones diferentes sobre estos hechos y sobre la negativa del Gobierno español a entregar copias de las grabaciones de esta actuación al Parlamento?

¿Piensa la Comisión solicitar estas grabaciones a las autoridades españolas?

¿Cree la Comisión que, tras esta nueva crisis, los Estados cambiarán las palabras por hechos, al contrario de lo que hicieron ante su propuesta de intervención coordinada tras la crisis de Lampedusa, como denunció la Comisaria de Asuntos de Interior ante el pleno el pasado 9 de octubre?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de abril de 2014)

Mediante escrito dirigido a las autoridades españolas el 18 de febrero de 2014, la comisaria responsable de Interior expresó su preocupación por el uso de pelotas de goma en el incidente ocurrido en Ceuta el 6 de febrero de 2014, y pidió explicaciones en cuanto a su uso en esa operación de vigilancia de las fronteras, la justificación de tal uso y las posibles consecuencias. La comisaria se congratuló de la iniciativa de las autoridades españolas de efectuar una investigación completa sobre el incidente y manifestó que esa investigación debe interesarse por el uso de la fuerza y las supuestas devoluciones sumarias de emigrantes a Marruecos.

La Comisión no acostumbra a hacer observaciones sobre las versiones no oficiales de sucesos. La Comisión esperará a disponer del resultado de la investigación emprendida por las autoridades españolas. Estas autoridades han informado a la Comisión, mediante escrito de 21 de febrero de 2014, de que las grabaciones del incidente de 6 de febrero de 2014 están disponibles en el sitio web del Ministerio del Interior de España.

La Comisión considera que las medidas señaladas por el Grupo Especial para el Mediterráneo a raíz de los trágicos sucesos de Lampedusa permitirán a los Estados miembros gestionar mejor la inmigración ilegal en sus fronteras. Dichas medidas, recogidas en la Comunicación de la Comisión de 4 de diciembre de 2013 ([1]), tienen un enfoque global, aunque ofrecen, al mismo tiempo, soluciones inmediatas y prácticas. Actualmente, se trabaja de cara a su aplicación.

([1]) COM(2013) 869 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002008/14
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Death of 15 immigrants off the coast of Ceuta

The firing of rubber bullets by agents of the Spanish Guardia Civil force against hundreds of immigrants who were trying to enter Spain by crossing the border at Ceuta represents a summary expulsion *en masse* that contravenes European and local laws on immigration. Both sets of laws prioritise the duty of succour over any other consideration and establish that, before any expulsion process is initiated, assistance must be provided to the people affected, each case must be treated individually, checks must be made to see whether any conditions apply that would allow them to enter the country legally, and at any event expulsion orders must be individualised. This incident, which to date has led to the deaths of fifteen people, stands in contrast to the manner in which this semi-military force has acted on previous occasions. Up until now, they had not used these means to deal with the problem of illegal immigration but instead had responded with rescue and assistance operations for people found in difficulties in small boats at sea. That is why the EU Home Affairs Commissioner, Cecilia Malmström, has sent a letter to the Spanish Government asking for information about the use of rubber bullets against the immigrants who were attempting to reach the coast of Ceuta. In this case, in view of the breach of fundamental principles such as those referred to above:

What specific explanations has the Commissioner requested from the Spanish authorities?

What are the Commission's views regarding the fact that at least six different versions of these events have been issued and on the Spanish government's refusal to hand over copies of the videos recording this incident to parliament?

Does the Commission intend to ask for these recordings from the Spanish authorities?

Does the Commission believe that, following this new crisis, Member States will exchange words for action, in contrast to what happened with their proposal for coordinated intervention after the crisis of Lampedusa, as the Commissioner for Home Affairs denounced at the plenary session on 9 October last?

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

In her letter to the Spanish authorities of 18 February 2014, the Member of the Commission responsible for Home Affairs expressed her concerns over the use of rubber bullets in the Ceuta incident of 6 February 2014 and asked for explanations on: their use during that border surveillance operation, the justification for their use and possible consequences. She welcomed the initiative of the Spanish authorities to carry out a full inquiry into the incident and considered that the inquiry should look into the use of force and the alleged summary return of migrants to Morocco.

It is not Commission policy to comment on unofficial versions of events. The Commission will wait for the outcome of the inquiry being carried out by the Spanish authorities. The Commission has been informed by the Spanish authorities, by letter of 21 February 2014, that video footage of the events of 6 February 2014 was placed on the website of the Spanish Ministry of Interior.

The Commission considers that the steps identified by the Task Force Mediterranean in the aftermath of the Lampedusa tragedies will allow Member States to better manage irregular migration at their borders. These steps, set out in the Commission Communication of 4 December 2013 ([1]), follow a comprehensive approach, while at the same time focusing on immediate and practical solutions. Work on the implementation of these actions is in progress.

([1]) COM(2013) 869 final.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002009/14
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(20. februar 2014)

Om: Salmonella i kyllingekød

Danmark søger for øjeblikket om den samme særlige status for salmonella i kyllingekød, som Sverige og Finland har i henhold til artikel 8, litra 3b, i forordning EC 853/2004 om specifikke hygiejneregler. Danmark har siden 2006 haft et konsekvent salmonellaprogram med fuld sporbarhed af flere salmonellatyper, end det kræves i forordningen. Det danske program ligner til forveksling det svenske og finske program. I 2012 og 2013 var der i Danmark ingen tilfælde af salmonella hos mennesker fra danskproduceret kyllingekød. Dansk kyllingekød er i dag helt frit for salmonella, og Danmark bør derfor have status derefter.

Danmark ansøgte tilbage i 2007 Kommissionen om at få særstatus for salmonella i såvel kyllingekød som konsum-æg, da landet lever op til alle kriterierne i Kommissionens retningslinjer for tildeling af særstatussen. I 2012 fik Danmark den særlige status mede hensyn til konsum-æg, men Kommissionen har endnu ikke fremsendt et forslag om særstatus for kyllingekød. Sidstnævnte er mig uforståeligt, da Danmark netop lever op til alle forskrifter. Kommissionen er forpligtet til at handle på sådanne ansøgninger — det viser dommen fra Den Europæiske Domstol om manglende handling i sagen om GMO-majs 1507 med al tydelighed.

Hvornår har Kommissionen tænkt sig at stille forslag om dansk særstatus for salmonella i kyllingekød, når nu alle betingelserne herfor er opfyldt?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(28. marts 2014)

Kommissionen anerkender de betydelige fremskridt, som Danmark har gjort med hensyn til at mindske forekomsten af salmonella i fjerkræ. De danske programmer for flokke af æglæggende høner og slagtekyllinger anses ganske rigtigt som ligestillede med programmerne i Finland og Sverige, som har opnået særlige garantier vedrørende salmonella, jf. artikel 8 i forordning (EF) nr. 853/2004 ([1]). Der er således givet yderligere garantier for æg fra Danmark ([2]).

Medlemsstaterne gik imidlertid ikke ind for at udvide garantierne til at omfatte kyllingekød, hvilket var konklusionen på adskillige drøftelser i Den Stående Komité for Fødevarekæden og Dyresundhed. Branchen i Danmark er desuden blevet kritiseret af sine handelspartnere for at sende salmonellainficerede flokke til slagtning uden for landets grænser.

Kommissionen agter ikke at fremsætte noget forslag, så længe andre medlemsstater giver udtryk for en sådan skepsis, og der ikke kan opnås kvalificeret flertal ved en afstemning. Artikel 8 i forordning (EF) nr. 853/2004 giver kun mulighed for en eventuel udvidelse af de særlige garantier, den giver ikke Kommissionen noget direkte mandat til at handle.

([1]) EUT L 139 af 30.4.2004, s. 55.
([2]) EUT L 132 af 23.5.2012, s. 8.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002009/14
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Salmonella in broiler meat

Denmark has applied for the same special status in respect of Salmonella in broiler meat which Sweden and Finland have under Article 8(3)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 on specific hygiene rules. Since 2006, Denmark has had a coherent Salmonella programme which ensures full traceability of more types of Salmonella than are required under the regulation. The Danish programme is virtually indistinguishable from the Swedish and Finnish programmes. In 2012 and 2013, there were no cases of human Salmonella infection from broiler meat produced in Denmark. Danish broiler meat is now totally Salmonella-free, and that ought therefore to be reflected in Denmark's status.

Back in 2007, Denmark applied to the Commission for special status in respect of Salmonella in both broiler meat and table eggs, since the country met all the criteria in the Commission's guidelines on granting special status. In 2012, Denmark was granted special status for table eggs; but the Commission has not yet submitted a proposal on special status for broiler meat. That is unfathomable, given that Denmark does comply with all provisions. The Commission is obliged to act on such applications, as is made abundantly clear by the Court of Justice judgment, in connection with failure to act, in the case concerning genetically modified maize 1507.

When does the Commission envisage submitting a proposal on special status for Denmark in respect of Salmonella in broiler meat, given that all conditions for obtaining it have been met?

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

The Commission acknowledges the considerable progress made by Denmark on the reduction of *Salmonella* in poultry. The Danish programmes for flocks of laying hens and broilers have indeed been considered equivalent to the ones in Finland and Sweden, who have obtained special guarantees regarding *Salmonella* as provided for in Art. 8 of Reg. (EC) No 853/2004 ([1]). Additional guarantees for eggs of Denmark have thus been granted ([2]).

However Member States were not in favour of extending such guarantees to broiler meat, which was the conclusion of several discussions held in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health. The Danish industry has in addition been criticised by trading partners for dispatching *Salmonella* infected flocks to slaughter outside the country.

The Commission does not intend to proceed with presenting a proposal as long as there is such an expressed scepticism of other Member States and no qualified majority can be obtained in a vote. Art. 8 of Reg. (EC) No 853/2004 does only provide for a possible extension of special guarantees, however does not contain a direct mandate for the Commission to act.

([1]) OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 55.
([2]) OJ L 132, 23.5.2012, p. 8.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002011/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(20 février 2014)

Objet: Lourdes pertes pour les pêcheurs bretons victimes des intempéries

Les tempêtes exceptionnelles de l'hiver, combinées aux grandes marées qui ont frappé la Bretagne, n'ont pas seulement détruit une partie du littoral, elles ont aussi atteint les pêcheurs, condamnés à rester à quai pendant plus de deux mois, sans pouvoir exercer leurs activités, ce qui fait subir de lourdes pertes à leur chiffre d'affaires.

1. Quelles sont les mesures urgentes prises par la Commission en faveur des entreprises de pêche et des matelots en difficulté?

2. Le Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et de pêche (FEAMP) vient d'être adopté et sera opérationnel à partir du mois de mai. Il semblerait que des aides puissent être octroyées aux professionnels de la pêche pour indemniser les pertes subies en raison des conditions climatiques difficiles: quels seront les conditions et les délais pour pouvoir bénéficier d'une telle aide?

3. La Commission va-t-elle mettre en place des mesures pérennes pour les pêcheurs en cas de mauvais temps?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(10 avril 2014)

Au titre du Fonds européen pour la pêche (FEP), un soutien peut être accordé aux pêcheurs pour qu'ils remplacent le matériel perdu ou endommagé, pour autant que le nouvel engin de pêche soit plus sélectif et respecte des critères et des pratiques environnementaux reconnus allant au-delà des obligations réglementaires prévues par la législation de l'Union européenne. En France, le programme opérationnel du FEP est géré par les autorités françaises. Si cette mesure est incluse dans le programme, les pêcheurs devront faire directement une demande d'aide en utilisant la procédure habituelle de demande.

Le Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et la pêche (FEAMP) récemment adopté pourrait à l'avenir cofinancer des Fonds de mutualisation destinés aux pêcheurs, afin de leur permettre de financer des systèmes spéciaux d'assurance visant à compenser les pertes de revenus dues à des phénomènes climatiques défavorables. En ce qui concerne les pertes de matériel occasionnées par des phénomènes climatiques défavorables (par exemple des tempêtes), le FEAMP continuera à soutenir l'achat d'équipements neufs plus sélectifs.

Les aides accordées par les États destinées à remédier aux dommages causés par les calamités naturelles ou par d'autres événements extraordinaires sont, conformément à l'article 107, paragraphe 2, point b), du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne (TFUE), compatibles avec le marché intérieur. Dès lors que l'existence d'une calamité naturelle ou d'un autre événement extraordinaire est attestée et qu'un lien de causalité direct a été établi entre ces événements et les pertes spécifiques entraînées, une aide de la part des fonds nationaux pouvant atteindre un taux de 100 % est autorisée pour compenser les dommages matériels subis.

La Commission réexamine actuellement le règlement d'exemption par catégorie qui s'applique au secteur de la pêche et de l'aquaculture ([1]) et envisage d'accorder à ce type d'aides d'État compensatoires une exemption de l'obligation de notification.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 736/2008 de la Commission du 22 juillet 2008 relatif à l'application des articles 87 et 88 du traité CE aux aides d'État accordées aux petites et moyennes entreprises actives dans la production, la transformation et la commercialisation de produits de la pêche (JO L 201 du 30.7.2008).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002011/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Serious losses for fishermen in Brittany as a result of severe weather conditions

The violent storms and abnormally high tides which hit Brittany this winter not only destroyed part of the coastline, but also prevented fishermen from working for more than two months, leaving them facing a substantial loss of income.

1. What urgent measures has the Commission taken to help fishing companies and fishermen in financial difficulty?

2. The new European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) has just been adopted and will come into force in May. The fund will apparently be used to pay compensation to fishermen to cover losses suffered as a result of bad weather conditions. On the basis of what criteria will fishermen be awarded compensation and how long will they have to wait to receive it?

3. Will the Commission take long-term measures to support fishermen hit by adverse weather conditions?

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

Under the current European Fisheries Fund (EFF), assistance can be available to help fishermen replace lost or damaged gear, so long as the new gear is more selective and meet recognised environmental criteria and practices which go beyond regulatory obligations under EC law. The EFF Operational Programme for France is managed by French authorities. If this measure in included in the programme, fishermen should apply directly for support through the usual application procedure.

The recently agreed European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) may in the future co-finance mutual funds for fishermen, to allow them to finance special insurance schemes to compensate income losses in cases of adverse climatic conditions. As to gear lost due to adverse climactic conditions (e.g. storms), the EMFF will continue supporting the purchase of new more selective gear.

State aid to make good the damage caused by natural disasters and exceptional occurrences is, in accordance with Article 107(2)(b) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), compatible with the internal market. Once the existence of a natural disaster or exceptional occurrence has been demonstrated and a direct causal link between those events and the specific losses incurred has been established, aid from national funds of up to 100% to compensate for the material damage is permitted.

The Commission is currently reviewing the Block Exemption Regulation applicable to the fishery and aquaculture sector ([1]) and envisages exempting from notification this type of compensatory state aid measure.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 736/2008 of 22 July 2008 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty to state aid to small and medium-sized enterprises active in the production, processing and marketing of fisheries products (OJ L 201, 30.7.2008).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002012/14
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(20 février 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Village agricole Wadi Fukin (Bethléem)

Les agriculteurs de Wadi Fukin ont, à nouveau, subi l'agression des colons israéliens et de l'armée israélienne, qui est intervenue le 6 février dernier pour saccager des terres agricoles et déraciner 300 oliviers nouvellement plantés.

Wadi Fukin est un village agricole palestinien situé près de Bethléem, dont les habitants résistent courageusement aux tentatives d'Israël visant à étouffer la vie économique et à confisquer les terres au profit de la colonisation.

Les terres confisquées sont souvent réutilisées par les autorités israéliennes pour accroître la superficie des colonies ou en créer de nouvelles.

La Cour internationale de justice de La Haye a rappelé en 2004 que l'établissement des colonies est illégal et qu'il constitue une «violation flagrante» de la quatrième convention de Genève, avis ratifié par les Nations unies.

1. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante est-elle au courant des agissements d'Israël contre les agriculteurs et paysans palestiniens?

2. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle condamné ces actions illégales? Par quel moyen?

3. Jusque quand l'impunité d'Israël?

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

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est pleinement consciente du problème soulevé par l'Honorable Parlementaire. De fait, l'UE reste fermement opposée aux colonies israéliennes et aux activités qui en découlent en Palestine et fait passer ce message auprès de ses homologues israéliens à tous les niveaux, ainsi qu'au sein de diverses enceintes internationales (http://www.eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140111_02_fr.pdf).

S'il est vrai que nous avons arrêté une position claire sur les colonies, selon laquelle les implantations israéliennes dans les territoires palestiniens occupés sont illégales et font obstacle à la paix, et que cette position a été approuvée par l'ensemble des États membres et par le Parlement européen, actuellement nous n'avons pas l'intention de recourir à des sanctions dans le cadre des relations bilatérales UE-Israël. En effet, des sanctions ne doivent être envisagées que si aucun autre instrument n'est disponible, ce qui n'est pas le cas des relations bilatérales UE-Israël. Le partenariat UE-Israël est mis en place dans le cadre du plan d'action de 2005 et aucun approfondissement n'est prévu tant que des progrès n'auront pas été accomplis en ce qui concerne le processus de paix au Proche-Orient et les valeurs communes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002012/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Wadi Fukin farming village (Bethlehem)

Farmers in Wadi Fukin have again come under attack from Israeli settlers and the Israeli army. On 6 February 2014, troops entered the village to destroy farmland and uproot 300 newly-planted olive trees.

The inhabitants of Wadi Fukin, a Palestinian farming village near Bethlehem, have courageously resisted Israeli attacks designed to deprive them of a livelihood and seize the land for Israeli settlers.

The land seized by the Israeli authorities is often used to extend settlements or create new ones.

The International Court of Justice in The Hague issued an advisory opinion in 2004 stating that Israel's policy of establishing settlements is illegal and constitutes a 'flagrant violation' of the Fourth Geneva Convention. The opinion was ratified by the United Nations.

1. Is the VP/HR aware of the Israeli attacks on Palestinian farmers?

2. Has she condemned these illegal actions? If so, through what channels?

3. How much longer will Israel be permitted to violate international law with impunity?

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

The HR/VP is fully aware of the issue mentioned by the Honourable Member. Indeed, 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 (http://www.eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140111_02_en.pdf).

While we have a clear position on settlements, endorsed by all Member States and the European Parliament that Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territory are illegal and constitute an obstacle to peace, we are not contemplating the use of sanctions in the context of bilateral EU-Israel relations, since sanctions should only be considered when there is no other instrument at reach, which is not the case on bilateral EU-IL relations. The EU-IL partnership is developed in the framework of the 2005 Action Plan, and no upgrade is foreseen until there is progress on MEPP and shared values.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002013/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Alimenti a lunghissima conservazione per i militari

Alcuni ricercatori di un laboratorio militare del Massachusetts sono riusciti a creare la pizza quasi «immortale», vale a dire un prodotto alimentare che è in grado di rimanere commestibile fino a tre anni senza ricorrere al frigorifero o al congelatore. Il progetto è nato dalla necessità di sostituire i classici cibi in scatola usati dai soldati statunitensi che sono impiegati in missioni all'estero.

Gli scienziati si sono impegnati a sviluppare un metodo di contrasto contro lo sviluppo di muffe, impedendo all'umidità della salsa del pomodoro o del formaggio di essere assorbita nella pasta della pizza causando lo sviluppo di batteri o di muffe che così avrebbero immancabilmente causato la sua decomposizione. La soluzione è stata trovata usando ingredienti «umettanti» come zucchero, sale e sciroppi vari che possono legarsi all'acqua evitando che intacchino la pasta.

La pizza è stata giudicata dai soldati americani come il «rancio» che avrebbero sempre desiderato, ma mai potuto avere, al fronte.

Alla luce di questo esperimento, può la Commissione chiarire quanto segue:

1. È a conoscenza dell'esperimento in questione?

2. Ritiene che questo genere di alimenti possa essere in qualche modo nocivo per la salute umana?

3. Ritiene che questo genere di alimentazione possa avere effetti collaterali sulla capacità operativa dei militari?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(26 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione non è conoscenza dell'esperimento di consumo di alimenti di lunghissima conservazione per i militari. La durata minima di un alimento è una decisione che spetta al produttore dell'alimento stesso conformemente al disposto della direttiva 2000/13/CE ([1]).

2. La Commissione non dispone di informazioni per esprimersi sull'eventuale nocività dell'alimento in questione.

3. La Commissione non ritiene che tale questione rientri nelle sue competenze.

([1]) Direttiva 2000/13/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 20 marzo 2000, relativa al ravvicinamento delle legislazioni degli Stati membri concernenti l'etichettatura e la presentazione dei prodotti alimentari, nonché la relativa pubblicità (GU L 109 del 6.5.2000, pag. 29).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002013/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Very long-life foods for military consumption

Researchers at an army laboratory in Massachusetts have succeeded in creating an almost 'immortal' pizza. This food product remains edible up to three years without refrigeration or freezing. The project arose from the need for substitutes for the conventional tinned foods used by US soldiers on foreign assignments.

The scientists undertook to develop a method of preventing mould growth. This prevents the pasta dough from absorbing the moisture in the tomato sauce or cheese, which feeds the growth of bacteria or mould which inevitably causes the pizza to rot. Their solution uses humectants such as sugar, salt and various types of syrup as ingredients which bind to water and keep it from getting to the dough.

US troops rated the pizza the 'ration' they have always wanted in the front line, which has hitherto not been available to them.

In the light of this experiment, can the Commission clarify the following:

1. Is it aware of this experiment?

2. Does it consider foods of this kind harmful in any way to human health?

3. Does it believe that this type of nutrition can have side-effects on military operational capability?

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

1. The Commission is not aware of the experiment on very long-life foods for military consumption. The minimal durability of a food is a decision to be made by the food producer in accordance with Directive 2000/13/EC ([1]).

2. The Commission does not have information to judge on the harmfulness of the food in question.

3. The Commission does not consider this question within its competence.

([1]) Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs (OJ L 109, 6.5.2000, p. 29).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002014/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Inquinamento atmosferico e complicanze prenatali e neonatali

Secondo un recente studio americano, i fumi dell'inquinamento atmosferico possono avere, su una donna incinta, effetti ancora più nocivi del fumo da sigaretta, facilitando lo sviluppo di complicanze anche mortali come per esempio la preeclampsia. I ricercatori hanno confrontato i dati sulle nascite con le stime dell'Environmental protection agency (EPA) sull'inquinamento atmosferico, relativi a più di 22 000 donne in gravidanza.

Il confronto dei dati ha mostrato che una pesante esposizione a monossido di carbonio, biossido di zolfo e anidride solforosa ha portato a un significativo aumento del rischio di sviluppare il disturbo caratterizzato da alta pressione sanguigna durante la gravidanza. Essendo lo sviluppo fetale molto sensibile ai fattori ambientali, l'ipertensione nella madre incide sul tasso di morbilità e mortalità del feto.

Alla luce di questo studio, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se dispone di dati relativi a un eventuale nesso tra l'esposizione all'inquinamento atmosferico e complicanze prenatali o neonatali?

2. se dispone di dati relativi al tasso di sviluppo di complicanze nell'organismo delle donne in gravidanza, in particolare relativamente alla preeclampsia?

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

Di recente la Commissione ha chiesto all'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità (OMS) di esaminare le prove scientifiche degli effetti sulla salute connessi all'inquinamento atmosferico ([1]). Da questa analisi è emerso un nesso di causalità tra l'esposizione al particolato e l'aumento del rischio di tumore ai polmoni e di malattie cardiovascolari (mortalità e morbilità). L'esame fa inoltre riferimento a studi recenti che dimostrano l'esistenza di interrelazioni tra vari inquinanti atmosferici e altri effetti, compresi il basso peso alla nascita e la nascita prematura.

([1]) Cfr. il sito dell'OMS, http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/air-quality/activities/health-aspects-of-air-pollution-and-review-of-eu-policies-the-revihaap-and-hrapie-projects.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002014/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Atmospheric pollution and pre-natal and post-partum complications

According to a recent American study, fumes from atmospheric pollution can have even more harmful effects on pregnant women than cigarette smoke. They exacerbate potentially fatal complications such as pre-eclampsia. The researchers compared their data on births with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s atmospheric pollution estimates relating to over 22 000 pregnant women.

The data comparison revealed that severe exposure to carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide significantly increased the risk of developing high blood pressure as a disorder during pregnancy. As foetal growth is highly sensitive to ambient factors, hypertension in the mother influences rates of foetal morbidity and mortality.

In the light of this study, can the Commission explain:

1. if it holds data on any link between exposure to atmospheric pollution and pre-natal or post-partum complications?

2. if it holds data on the rate of development of complications in the organism of pregnant women, especially pre-eclampsia?

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

The Commission has recently asked the World Health Organisation (WHO) to review the scientific evidence of air pollution-related health effects ([1]). The WHO review established that there is a causal relationship between particulate matter exposure and increased risk for lung cancer and cardiovascular diseases (mortality and morbidity). It also identified recent studies which have shown links between various air pollutants and other effects, including low birth weight and preterm birth as well as with pre-eclampsia.

([1]) See WHO web page, http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/air-quality/activities/health-aspects-of-air-pollution-and-review-of-eu-policies-the-revihaap-and-hrapie-projects

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002015/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Giornalista ucciso in Ucraina

Nei giorni scorsi l'Ucraina ha registrato un forte inasprimento delle violenze di strada. I media italiani riportano la notizia della morte di un giornalista, che era in taxi quando lo hanno fermato, gli hanno lanciato contro una molotov e lo hanno trascinato fuori e crivellato di colpi, poco lontano da Piazza Maidan. A ucciderlo sarebbe stato un commando di uomini mascherati. Il giornale per cui la vittima lavorava accoglie spesso posizioni filo-governative, ma secondo alcuni testimoni l'uomo sarebbe stato vittima di una formazione militare filo-governativa che da tempo combatte sulla piazza protetta dalle forze di polizia.

In merito all'episodio riportato,

1. Può la Commissione far sapere se dispone di informazioni che possano chiarire le reali modalità della vicenda?

2. La Commissione ha avviato programmi o intrapreso azioni volte a garantire il rispetto dei diritti fondamentali in Ucraina, a norma di quanto stabilito dall'articolo 21, paragrafo 1, del TUE?

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

L'UE condanna tutte le forme di violenza, indipendentemente dagli autori, ed esprime profonda simpatia per le vittime delle recenti violenze in Ucraina. L'UE ritiene di fondamentale importanza che si indaghi con la debita efficacia su tutti i casi di decessi, intimidazioni, torture, sparizioni e trattamenti inumani o degradanti, compresi quelli riguardanti giornalisti. L'efficienza e la trasparenza degli organi di contrasto e della magistratura e il rispetto dei diritti umani sono priorità assolute in questo campo. La riforma della giustizia è un elemento centrale dell'assistenza dell'UE all'Ucraina. L'Unione ha reagito immediatamente agli eventi straordinari verificatisi in Ucraina, anche individuando e introducendo misure restrittive contro le persone responsabili di violazioni dei diritti umani o di appropriazione indebita di fondi dello Stato nel paese. L'UE invita tutte le parti ad adoperarsi per allentare le tensioni, ivi compreso in Crimea, e a garantire la libertà dei media conformemente agli impegni internazionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002015/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Journalist killed in Ukraine

The past few days have seen a severe escalation of violence on the streets of Ukraine. The Italian media have released news reports concerning the death of a journalist, who was in a taxi when the vehicle was stopped and a petrol bomb thrown at it. The journalist was dragged out of the vehicle and beaten to death, not far from Independence Square. He was apparently killed by a group of masked men. The newspaper the victim worked for often takes a pro-government stance, but several witnesses claimed the man was the victim of a pro-government military group that has for some time now been fighting on the square under the protection of the police.

With regard to this event:

1. Does the Commission have any information to clarify what actually happened?

2. Has the Commission launched any programmes or taken measures to ensure that fundamental rights are respected in Ukraine, in compliance with Article 21(1) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU)?

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

The EU condemns all forms of violence perpetrated by any party and expresses deep sympathy for victims of recent violence in Ukraine. The EU attaches the utmost importance to the proper investigation of all cases involving death, intimidation, torture, disappearances, and inhumane or degrading treatment of any individual, including journalists. In this regard, ensuring that law-enforcement bodies and the judicial system are efficient and transparent, and respect human rights, are top priorities. Reform of judiciary is a main feature of EU assistance to Ukraine. The EU responded immediately to extraordinary circumstances in Ukraine, including by pointing to and introducing restrictive measures against persons identified as responsible for human rights violations or misappropriation of State funds in Ukraine. The EU urges all sides to de-escalate the situation, including in Crimea, and allow the media to report freely in accordance with international commitments.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002016/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Emissioni delle centrali a carbone

Il procuratore capo di Savona, che si sta occupando delle due inchieste sulle emissioni di una centrale a carbone situata a Vado Ligure, ha affermato che l'inquinamento provocato dallo stabilimento ha provocato per lo meno 400 morti dal 2000 al 2007, tra i 1 700 e i 200 ricoveri di adulti per malattie respiratorie e cardiovascolari e il ricovero di 450 bambini per patologie respiratorie e attacchi d'asma tra il 2005 e il 2012.

I periti sono arrivati a questi dati analizzando il tasso di mortalità in diverse aree vicine alla centrale in questione, nelle quali sarebbe stato accertato un sensibile incremento di decessi tra le zone di minima e massima ricaduta degli elementi inquinanti, escludendo altri fattori come traffico automobilistico, altre aziende della zona o fumi delle navi in porto.

La società, di proprietà di un noto industriale italiano, ha cercato di smentire questo nesso, accusando il metodo di valutazione utilizzato.

Alla luce di questa indagine, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. dispone di dati relativi all'incremento di patologie respiratorie o cardiovascolari legate alle emissioni di centrali a carbone?

2. È a conoscenza di situazioni simili a quella descritta in altri Stati membri dell'UE?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(1º aprile 2014)

La Commissione non dispone di dati specifici relativi all'impatto sulla salute delle singole centrali termoelettriche a carbone, ma dispone di valutazioni relative agli impatti generici sulla salute e sull'ambiente delle emissioni totali nell'UE nonché di valutazioni relative ai benefici sulla salute e sull'ambiente delle azioni per contrastare tali emissioni ([1]). L'Agenzia europea dell'ambiente ha stimato che i costi dei danni dell'inquinamento atmosferico generato dai grandi impianti industriali, comprese le centrali termoelettriche a carbone, siano dell'ordine di almeno 102-169 miliardi di euro annui ([2]). Queste valutazioni si fondano sui dati relativi alle emissioni comunicati dagli Stati membri nonché sul parere espresso dall'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità ([3]) sui rischi per la salute derivati dall'inquinamento atmosferico e dal metodo standard usato dalla Commissione europea per valutare i danni alla salute.

Le centrali termoelettriche a carbone sono tenute a rispettare i limiti di emissioni stabiliti dalla legislazione dell'UE in materia di emissioni industriali, in particolare la direttiva 2001/80/CE ([4]) (sui grandi impianti di combustione) e la direttiva 2010/75/UE ([5]) (sulle emissioni industriali). Spetta alle competenti autorità degli Stati membri accertare che gli impianti siano autorizzati e gestiti conformemente a quanto prescritto da queste direttive.

([1]) Cfr. il pacchetto 2013 della Commissione «Aria pulita»: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/clean_air_policy.htm
([2]) Cfr. la relazione tecnica 11/2011 dell'EEA: http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/cost-of-air-pollution
([3]) Cfr. OMS: http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/air-quality/activities/health-aspects-of-air-pollution-and-review-of-eu-policies-the-revihaap-and-hrapie-projects
([4]) GU L 309 del 27.11.2001, pag. 1.
([5]) GU L 334 del 17.12.2010, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002016/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Emissions from coal-fired power stations

The Chief Prosecutor of Savona, who is dealing with two enquiries concerning emissions from a coal-fired power station in Vado Ligure, has said that the pollution caused by the power station resulted in at least 400 deaths between 2000 and 2007, between 1 700 and 200 hospital admissions of adults suffering from respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, and the hospitalisation of 450 children for respiratory disorders and asthma attacks between 2005 and 2012.

The experts reached these figures by analysing the mortality rate in several areas close to the power station in question. The rate in areas most affected by pollutants, after excluding other factors such as road traffic, other companies in the area or fumes from ships in port, was markedly higher than in the least affected areas.

The company, which is owned by a well-known Italian industrial group, has sought to dismiss the connection by challenging the assessment method used.

In the light of this investigation, can the Commission clarify:

1. whether it has figures on the increase in respiratory or cardiovascular disorders linked to emissions from coal-fired power stations?

2. Whether it is aware of similar situations to the one described here in other EU Member States?

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

The Commission has no specific figures on the health impact of individual coal-fired power plants. It has assessments of the overall health and environmental impacts of the total emissions within the EU as well as the health and environmental benefits from taking action on these emissions ([1]). The European Environment Agency has valued the air pollution damage costs due to large industrial facilities, including coal-fired plants, being at least EUR 102-169 billion per year ([2]). These assessments build on reported emissions from Member States combined with advice on health risks of air pollution provided by the World Health Organisation ([3]) and standard health damage valuation method of the European Commission.

Coal-fired power plants have to comply with the emission limits set out in the EU legislation concerning industrial emissions, in particular Directive 2001/80/EC ([4]) (on large combustion plants) and Directive 2010/75/EU ([5]) (on industrial emissions). It is the responsibility of the competent authorities in the Member States to ensure that the plants are permitted and operated in line with the requirements set out in those Directives.

([1]) See the 2013 Commission Clean air policy package, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/clean_air_policy.htm
([2]) See EEA Technical Report 11/2011, http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/cost-of-air-pollution
([3]) See WHO, http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/air-quality/activities/health-aspects-of-air-pollution-and-review-of-eu-policies-the-revihaap-and-hrapie-projects
([4]) OJ L 309, 27.11.2001.
([5]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002017/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Lotta allo stress da lavoro

Un'azienda di telecomunicazioni tedesca da circa quattro anni ha vietato l'invio di e-mail e messaggi di lavoro fuori dagli orari d'ufficio. L'idea è nata dalla preoccupazione dei dirigenti che, analizzando i dati di una concorrente francese, hanno notato un alto tasso di suicidi dei dipendenti a causa del forte clima di stress sul posto di lavoro. In seguito anche altre imprese hanno adottato questa politica, anche in altri settori industriali. In alcuni casi è possibile stabilire degli orari di reperibilità «extra», conteggiati poi come orario di straordinario e quindi recuperabili nel corso della settimana lavorativa.

Un'altra azienda ha stabilito che tutta la posta elettronica che arrivi dopo che qualcuno ha attivato la risposta automatica in cui informa della sua assenza temporanea dalla scrivania, venga cancellata. Un ministro tedesco ha addirittura ammesso di essere a favore di una norma che vietasse messaggi di lavoro nel tempo libero, pur senza proporre mai alcun testo.

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

1. Quali sono le principali strategie adottate in tema dalle imprese europee?

2. Risulta già in vigore uno scambio di buone pratiche in materia?

3. Sono disponibili dati che confermino che lo stress da lavoro possa essere provocato da richieste fuori orario?

4. Sono disponibili dati relativi alla diffusione dello stress da lavoro tra i cittadini europei?

5. Sono disponibili dati relativi al nesso tra suicidi e stress da lavoro in Europa?

Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione
(14 aprile 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'Onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione E-000717/2014.

1. Nel 2004 le parti sociali dell'UE hanno concluso l'accordo quadro sullo stress da lavoro che i membri di UNICE/UEAPME, CEEP e CES s'impegnano ad attuare nel rispetto delle procedure specifiche nazionali in tema di gestione e di lavoro.

2. Tra le relazioni sull'attuazione emerge che l'accordo ha contribuito a far opera di sensibilizzazione, a promuovere i principi e le regole e a creare consenso sulla natura strutturale dello stress da lavoro e sulla necessità di risposte concertate. Una campagna paneuropea per ambienti di lavoro sani e sicuri 2014-15 ([1]) affronta la gestione dello stress e dei rischi psicosociali sul lavoro, compreso il lavoro eccessivamente gravoso e gli squilibri tra vita lavorativa e vita familiare. Un pacchetto operativo in merito a un'azione congiunta ([2]) nell'ambito del programma salute dell'UE sta identificando le buone pratiche che possono essere utilmente applicate sul posto di lavoro per ovviare ai problemi di salute mentale.

3. L'organizzazione del lavoro influisce risaputamente sullo stress da lavoro ([3]). La Commissione non dispone di cifre relative agli effetti del lavoro fuori orario.

4. Dati recenti indicano un lieve aumento nell'occorrenza dei fattori dello stress da lavoro ([4]). Secondo i dati dell'indagine sulle forze di lavoro 2007 ([5]) (IFS), il 21,7 % dei lavoratori dichiara di essere esposto a ritmi stressanti o a sovraccarichi di lavoro suscettibili di nuocere alla sua salute. I rispettivi dati dell'IFS 2013 saranno disponibili alla fine del 2014.

([1]) Campagna paneuropea coordinata da EU-OSHA: http://www.healthy-workplaces.eu/
([2]) Joint Action Mental health and Well-being: http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/
([3]) https://osha.europa.eu/en/topics/stress
([4]) 2010 European Working Conditions Survey, Eurofound, reperibile all'indirizzo: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/working/surveys/. Ad esempio, la percentuale di lavoratori dell'UE che segnalano di lavorare con scadenze ravvicinate o a ritmi elevati per almeno un quarto del loro orario di lavoro è passata dal 50 % nel 1991 a più del 60 %. Inoltre, il 18 % dei lavoratori non è soddisfatto del proprio equilibrio tra vita lavorativa e vita privata.
([5]) Modulo ad hoc sugli infortuni sul lavoro e sugli altri problemi di salute connessi al lavoro. Eurostat http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/product?code=hsw_exp3&mode=view

5. Una relazione di EUROGIP ([6]) del 2013 fa il quadro delle prassi seguite in 10 paesi per quanto concerne il riconoscimento delle malattie mentali legate al lavoro, tra cui i casi di suicidio sul posto di lavoro. EUROFOUND fornisce alcune informazioni della Francia sulla correlazione tra stress da lavoro e suicidi ([7]) ([8]). La Commissione ha pubblicato due documenti di consenso sulla prevenzione della depressione e del suicidio ([9]) e sulla salute mentale in relazione al luogo di lavoro ([10]), in cui si riconosce l'importanza di ridurre lo stress da lavoro.

([6]) http://www.eurogip.fr/en/publications-d-eurogip/3483-what-recognition-of-work-related-mental-disorders-a-study-on-10-countries
([7]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2007/11/articles/fr0711039i.htm
([8]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2009/11/articles/fr0911029i.htm
([9]) Documento di consenso: Prevention of Suicide and Depression, 2008, disponibile all'indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_determinants/life_style/mental/docs/consenso_depression_en.pdf
([10]) Documento di consenso: Mental health in workplace settings, 2008, disponibile all'indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/mental/docs/consenso_workplace_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002017/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Combating work-related stress

For about four years now, a German telecommunications company has banned the sending of work messages and emails outside office hours. The idea was born of a concern on the part of managers who, when analysing a French competitor's figures, observed a high rate of suicide among employees as a result of high levels of stress in the workplace. Other companies, including in other industries, have since adopted this policy. In some cases, it is possible to establish 'extra' hours of availability, which are then counted as overtime and can therefore be reclaimed during the working week.

Another company has arranged for the deletion of any electronic mail that arrives after someone has activated the automatic response saying that they are temporarily away from their desk. A German minister has even said that he is in favour of a regulation banning work messages during free time, though without actually proposing a text.

In the light of this, can the Commission clarify the following:

1. what are the main strategies being adopted by European companies on this issue?

2. Are any exchanges under way concerning good practices in this respect?

3. Are any figures available confirming that work-related stress can be caused by out-of-hours demands?

4. Are any figures available on the incidence of work-related stress among European citizens?

5. Are any figures available on the connection between suicides and work-related stress in Europe?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Question E-000717/2014.

1. The EU social partners concluded in 2004 the framework Agreement on Work-related Stress, committing members of UNICE/Ueapme, CEEP and ETUC to implement it following procedures specific to national management and labour.

2. Implementation Reports show that the Agreement has contributed to raising awareness, promoting principles and rules and building consensus on the structural nature of work-related stress and the need for concerted responses. A pan-European Healthy Workplaces Campaign 2014-15 ([1]) addresses management of stress and psychosocial risks at work, including excessively demanding work and poor work-life balance. A work package of a Joint Action ([2]) under the EU-Health Programme is identifying good practices in supporting workplaces on mental health issues.

3. Work organisation is known to influence work-related stress ([3]). The Commission has no figures on the effect of out-of-hours demands.

4. Recent data shows a slight increase in occurrences of work-related stress factors ([4]). According to the 2007 Labour Force Survey ([5]) (LFS), 21.7% of workers reported exposure to time pressures or overload of work that would harm their health. Similar data from the 2013 LFS should be available end 2014.

([1]) Pan-European Campaign coordinated by EU-OSHA: http://www.healthy-workplaces.eu/
([2]) Joint Action Mental health and Well-being: http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/
([3]) https://osha.europa.eu/en/topics/stress
([4]) 2010 European Working Conditions Survey, Eurofound, available at http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/working/surveys/ For example, the share of EU workers who report that they work to tight deadlines or at high speed at least a quarter of their working time rose from 50% in 1991 to over 60%. In addition, 18% of workers are not satisfied with their work-life balance.
([5]) Ad hoc module on accidents at work and work-related health problems. Eurostat http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/product?code=hsw_exp3&mode=view

5. A 2013 Eurogip ([6]) report outlines practices in 10 countries on the recognition of work-related mental diseases, including suicide at work. Eurofound provides some information from France about the link between work-related stress and suicides ([7]) ([8]). The Commission published two consensus papers on the prevention of depression and suicide ([9]) and on mental health and the work place ([10]), recognising the importance of reducing work-related stress.

([6]) http://www.eurogip.fr/en/publications-d-eurogip/3483-what-recognition-of-work-related-mental-disorders-a-study-on-10-countries
([7]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2007/11/articles/fr0711039i.htm
([8]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2009/11/articles/fr0911029i.htm
([9]) Consensus Paper: Prevention of Suicide and Depression, 2008, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_determinants/life_style/mental/docs/consensus_depression_en.pdf
([10]) Consensus Paper: Mental health in workplace settings, 2008, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/mental/docs/consensus_workplace_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002018/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuova droga sintetica

Una nuova droga sintetica in polvere ha ucciso 15 persone in Europa: si tratta dell'oppioide AH-7921. I decessi causati da questo prodotto sono stati segnalati dall'Osservatorio europeo delle dipendenze e il prodotto è stato sequestrato in Inghilterra, Germania, Francia.

L'oppioide AH-7921 è facilmente reperibile sul mercato europeo e la sua molecola di base non è stata ancora inserita nelle tabelle delle sostanze stupefacenti di alcuni Stati membri.

Può la Commissione indicare quali Stati membri hanno già inserito il prodotto tra le sostanze stupefacenti illegali? Dispone di dati aggiornati sui casi di decesso o rischio di decesso causati dal citato prodotto? Intende adottare misure volte a ridurne la distribuzione sul mercato europeo?

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

La Commissione è al corrente della diffusione dell'oppioide AH-7921 nell'Unione e si è già attivata per porvi rimedio, nel quadro della procedura prevista dalla decisione 2005/387/GAI del Consiglio sulle nuove sostanze psicoattive ([1]).

Secondo il rapporto sull'AH-7921 pubblicato congiuntamente a gennaio dall'Osservatorio europeo delle droghe e delle tossicodipendenze e dall'Europol ([2]), da luglio 2012 la presenza di questa nuova sostanza è stata rilevata in sette Stati membri e in Norvegia. Al consumo di questa sostanza sono associati sei casi d'intossicazione non mortali e 15 decessi in tre paesi.

Il comitato scientifico dell'Osservatorio sta conducendo una valutazione dei rischi legati all'AH-7921: nel relativo rapporto saranno disponibili informazioni su caratteristiche, effetti e conseguenze dell'uso di questa sostanza, come anche dati aggiornati sul numero di decessi e di intossicazioni. Sulla base dei dati disponibili, l'AH-7921 è soggetta a misure di controllo o regolamentazione in cinque Stati membri (Svezia, Finlandia, Paesi Bassi, Polonia e Romania) e in Norvegia.

Sulla base dei risultati del rapporto sulla valutazione dei rischi, previsto per aprile 2014, la Commissione deciderà se presentare o meno una proposta per sottoporre la nuova sostanza a misure di controllo in tutta l'UE.

A settembre 2013 la Commissione ha presentato due proposte legislative ([3]) che rivedono la decisione 2005/387/GAI del Consiglio sulle nuove sostanze psicoattive. L'intento è rendere più incisiva la risposta dell'Unione estendendo il monitoraggio e la valutazione del rischio delle sostanze e favorendo un'azione più rapida e proporzionata per ridurre la diffusione delle sostanze rischiose. Le proposte sono attualmente oggetto di negoziato tra il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio.

([1]) Decisione 2005/387/GAI del Consiglio, del 10 maggio 2005, relativa allo scambio di informazioni, alla valutazione dei rischi e al controllo delle nuove sostanze psicoattive, GU L 127 del 20.5.2005, pag. 32.
([2]) http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/joint-report/AH-7921
([3]) COM(2013) 618 def. e COM(2013) 619 def.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002018/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: New synthetic drug

A new synthetic drug in powder form has killed 15 people in Europe; it is the opioid AH-7921. The deaths caused by this product have been reported by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction and the product has been seized in the United Kingdom, Germany and France.

AH-7921 can easily be found on the European market and its basic molecule has not yet been added to the list of narcotic substances in some Member States.

Can the Commission state which Member States have classed this product as an illegal narcotic substance so far? Does it have up-to-date information on the number of fatal or life-threatening cases caused by this product? Does it plan to adopt measures to curb its distribution on the European market?

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

The Commission is aware of the spread of the synthetic opioid AH-7921 in the EU and is taking action to address it, following the procedure provided by Council Decision 2005/387/JHA on new psychoactive substances ([1]).

According to the Joint Report on AH-7921 published by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) and Europol in January ([2]), this substance has been detected in seven EU Member States and in Norway since July 2012. Its consumption has been associated with six non-fatal intoxications and 15 deaths in three countries.

The Scientific Committee of the EMCDDA is currently conducting a risk assessment of the substance AH-7921. The risk assessment report will provide information about the characteristics, effects and consequences of the use of this substance, and will contain updated information on the number of fatalities and intoxications associated with the use of AH-7921. Available information indicates that AH-7921 is subjected to regulatory or control measures in five EU Member States — Sweden, Finland, the Netherlands, Poland and Romania — and in Norway.

Based on the results of the risk assessment report, which are expected in April 2014, the Commission will decide whether or not to table a proposal for subjecting AH-7921 to EU-wide control measures.

In September 2013, the Commission presented legislative proposals ([3]) to revise Council Decision 2005/387/JHA on new psychoactive substances. The proposals aim at strengthening the EU response by enhancing the monitoring and risk assessment of substances, and by enabling swifter and more proportionate action to reduce the availability of those substances that pose risks. The proposals are currently being negotiated by the European Parliament and the Council.

([1]) Council Decision 2005/387/JHA of 10 May 2005 on the information exchange, risk-assessment and control of new psychoactive substances, OJ L 127, 20.5.2005, p. 32.
([2]) http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/joint-report/AH-7921
([3]) COM(2013) 618 final and COM(2013) 619 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002019/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Mercato dei test genetici

Negli Stati Uniti sono disponibili sul mercato test genetici a prezzi facilmente accessibili. Questi sono in genere effettuati da coloro che vogliono scoprire se sono a rischio di determinate patologie ereditarie, scandagliando il proprio patrimonio genetico.

Questo genere di test non è tuttavia sempre attendibile e, talvolta, test simili possono portare a risultati anche opposti. In realtà esistono diversi test, alcuni effettuati sotto prescrizione medica e mirati a individuare la probabilità di sviluppare determinate patologie derivanti dalla mutazione di un gene specifico; altri invece, quelli rivolti ai consumatori, analizzano numerosi geni e i risultati sono meno certi, specialmente in relazione alle malattie multifattori, in cui diversi geni hanno un ruolo nello sviluppo della patologia, ma questo dipende anche dall'ambiente, la dieta e lo stile di vita delle persone.

Ad esempio, per le patologie cardiovascolari, immunitarie, neurodegenerative, reumatiche esistono numerosi geni che possono aumentare o meno la suscettibilità ad ammalarsi, ma trovare queste varianti «pericolose» non equivale a una «condanna» certa alla malattia, bensì significa avere un rischio un po' maggiore rispetto alla popolazione che non ha quella stessa mutazione. Un noto medico italiano ha affermato che sottoporsi a questi test «è come tentare di capire un libro leggendo solo la prima lettera di ogni pagina». Non guardare a tutte le varianti in gioco significa, infatti, avere solo una visione parziale.

In relazione a questo genere di analisi, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. questo genere di analisi viene effettuato anche nell'UE?

2. esistono Stati membri in cui è vietato?

3. quanti cittadini europei si sottopongono a questo genere di analisi? Il dato è in crescita?

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

Tutti i test genetici a fini medici che soddisfano i requisiti della direttiva 98/79/CEE relativa ai dispositivi medico-diagnostici *in vitro* ([1]) possono circolare liberamente sul mercato dell'Unione europea. La Commissione non dispone di informazioni sul tipo di test genetici effettuati nei singoli Stati membri, né a quali condizioni. Conformemente all'articolo 168, paragrafo 7, del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, l'azione dell'Unione rispetta le responsabilità degli Stati membri per la definizione della loro politica sanitaria e per l'organizzazione e la fornitura di servizi sanitari e di assistenza medica.

Nel contesto della sua proposta di regolamento relativo ai dispositivi medico-diagnostici *in vitro* ([2]), la Commissione ha prestato la massima attenzione all'adeguata regolamentazione dei test genetici, in particolare assicurando un'appropriata classificazione del rischio e controlli pre-commercializzazione, nonché rafforzando il livello delle evidenze cliniche necessarie prima che tali test possano essere immessi sul mercato.

La proposta della Commissione intende inoltre assicurare un'adeguata regolamentazione dei dispositivi offerti tramite servizi della società dell'informazione, nonché dei dispositivi che non sono immessi sul mercato ma vengono usati nel contesto di un'attività commerciale per la fornitura di un servizio diagnostico o terapeutico mediante i servizi della società dell'informazione o con altri mezzi di comunicazione a una persona fisica o giuridica stabilita nell'Unione.

La proposta della Commissione è attualmente discussa dai colegislatori e le modifiche votate dal Parlamento il 22 ottobre 2013 hanno introdotto requisiti addizionali nel campo dei test genetici per quanto concerne gli aspetti dell'informazione, della consulenza e del consenso informato. Tra le modifiche figura inoltre la proposta che i dispositivi per test genetici possano essere forniti soltanto su prescrizione medica.

([1]) GU L 331 del 7.12.1998, pag. 1.
([2]) COM(2012) 541 def. — Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo ai dispositivi medico-diagnostici in vitro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002019/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: The market in genetic tests

Genetic tests are available on the market in the United States at readily affordable prices. They are generally done by people who want to find out if they are at risk of certain hereditary diseases by probing their own genetic make-up.

Such tests are not yet always reliable, and sometimes similar tests may even give opposite results. There are in fact many different tests, some requiring a medical prescription and aimed at identifying the likelihood of developing certain diseases deriving from mutations in a specific gene, while others aimed at consumers analyse numerous genes and provide less definite results. This is especially true for multi-factor diseases, in which several genes play a part in the development of the condition but it also depends on the person's environment, diet and lifestyle.

For cardiovascular, immune, neurodegenerative and rheumatic conditions, for example, there are numerous genes that may or may not make their carriers more likely to become ill, but finding these 'dangerous' variants does not mean they will inevitably get the disease, but rather that they have a slightly higher risk than people who do not carry that mutation. A well-known Italian doctor has stated that undergoing these tests 'is like trying to understand a book by reading just the first letter on each page'. Not looking at all the variables involved results in only having a partial view.

1. Can the Commission say whether these kinds of tests are also being carried out in the European Union?

2. Are there any Member States in which they are banned?

3. How many European citizens are taking these kinds of tests? Is the number growing?

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

Any medical genetic test fulfilling the requirements of Directive 98/79/EEC on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices ([1]) can freely circulate on the European Union market. The Commission has no information on which genetic tests are carried out in individual Member States, and under which conditions. In accordance with Article 168(7) of the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union, the Union action shall respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care.

In the context of its proposal for a regulation on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices ([2]), the Commission has paid the utmost attention to the proper regulation of genetic tests, in particular by ensuring appropriate risk classification and pre-market controls, and by reinforcing the level of clinical evidence required prior to their placing on the market.

The Commission proposal also aims at ensuring the proper regulation of devices offered by means of information society services, as well as devices that are not placed on the market, but are used in the context of a commercial activity for the provision of a diagnostic or therapeutic service offered by means of information society services, or by other means of communication, to a natural or legal person established in the Union.

The Commission proposal is currently discussed by the co-legislators and the amendments voted by the Parliament on 22 October 2013 introduced additional requirements in the field of genetic tests like information, counselling and informed consent. The amendments also propose that devices for genetic testing may only be supplied on medical prescription.

([1]) OJ L 331, 7.12.1998, p. 1.
([2]) COM(2012) 541 final — Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002020/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuove tecniche e farmaci per la cura della depressione

Per trattare la depressione vengono generalmente utilizzati psicofarmaci come quelli che agiscono sull'inibizione dei neurotrasmettitori, ma non sempre i risultati di questo genere di trattamenti sono soddisfacenti. Uno studio americano condotto da un'università dell'Ohio suggerisce che esistano altri farmaci e altre tecniche per curare la depressione.

Le alternative più comuni sarebbero la stimolazione elettrica e magnetica del cervello, la terapia cognitivo-comportamentale a lungo termine per la gestione dello stress, o anche una nuova generazione di farmaci che non abbia come bersaglio i neurotrasmettitori. I farmaci che agiscono sui neurotrasmettitori, infatti, sono stati creati perché per svariati anni si è pensato che la depressione fosse causata da una carenza di questi messaggeri chimici.

Al contrario, le nuove teorie sulla depressione si stanno concentrando sulle differenze di densità dei neuroni in varie regioni del cervello, sugli effetti dello stress sulla nascita e la morte delle cellule cerebrali, sull'alterazione dei percorsi di feedback nel cervello e sul ruolo dell'infiammazione cerebrale causata dalla risposta allo stress. E proprio lo stress cronico si ritiene possa essere implicato in prima persona nello sviluppo della depressione, poiché questa situazione a lungo andare danneggia le cellule sia del corpo che del cervello. Gli scienziati hanno infatti osservato che in condizioni di stress cronico sono le cellule nervose dell'ippocampo a soffrirne, iniziando ad atrofizzarsi.

In seguito a quanto detto, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. quanti cittadini europei soffrono di depressione?

2. se intende analizzare queste nuove teorie per sostenere lo sviluppo di nuove terapie e nuovi farmaci per curare il cosiddetto «male oscuro»?

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

1. L'indagine europea sulla salute (IES), condotta nel periodo 2006-2009, fornisce i dati relativi a 14 Stati membri ([1]) sulla percentuale di persone che hanno dichiarato di aver sofferto di disturbi depressivi cronici. Si registrano livelli di incidenza molto diversi, che vanno dallo 0,8 % in Bulgaria e Romania al 5,6 % in Belgio, con un valore medio del 3 %. Queste cifre riguardano la depressione autovalutata, non necessariamente quella diagnosticata da operatori sanitari. L'indagine IES viene effettuata ogni 5 anni. La prossima è prevista per il 2014.

Uno studio condotto nel 2011 per il Consiglio europeo per il cervello ([2]) evidenzia un'incidenza maggiore, stimando a 30,3 milioni, ossia il 6,9 % della popolazione, il numero di cittadini che hanno sofferto di una grave depressione unipolare nel 2011.

2. La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'articolo pubblicato da Rao and Alderson ([3]).

Nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7° PQ, 2007-2013), la Commissione ha stanziato oltre 70 milioni di EUR per le attività di ricerca sulla depressione che concentrano l'attenzione sui meccanismi patofisiologici soggiacenti e sugli approcci terapeutici innovativi. Il sostegno prevede anche 8,2 milioni di EUR a titolo dell'impresa comune per l'iniziativa in materia di medicinali innovativi (IMI) ([4])·([5]).

Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione ([6]) (2014-2020), può offrire ulteriori opportunità di sostegno alla ricerca in questo settore attraverso l'obiettivo «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere». Le informazioni sulle attuali possibilità di finanziamento possono essere ottenute attraverso il portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione ([7]).

([1]) Belgio, Bulgaria, Cipro, Repubblica ceca, Francia, Grecia, Lettonia, Malta, Polonia, Slovenia, Spagna.
([2]) H.U. Wittchen: The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010, in: European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.
([3]) Rao, M and Alderson, JM. (2014). Dissecting melancholia with evidence-based biomarker tools. Current Psychiatry, 13(2):41-48, 57.
([4]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/.
([5]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/content/newmeds; http://www.newmeds-europe.com/
([6]) COM(2011) 808 def., COM(2011) 811 def.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002020/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: New techniques and drugs for treating depression

Depression is usually treated with psychotropic drugs, such as those that act on neurotransmitter inhibition, but the results of this kind of treatment are not always satisfactory. A study carried out by a university in Ohio, United States, suggests that there are other drugs and other techniques for treating depression.

The most common alternatives appear to be electrical and magnetic brain stimulation, long-term cognitive-behavioural therapy for stress management, or even a new generation of drugs that do not target neurotransmitters. The reason why neurotransmitter-targeting drugs were developed was that for many years depression was thought to be caused by a lack of these chemical messengers.

In contrast, the new theories about depression are focusing on differences in neuron density in various regions of the brain, the effects of stress on the birth and death of brain cells, alterations in brain feedback pathways and the role of brain inflammation caused by the response to stress. It is thought that chronic stress itself may be intimately involved in the development of depression, since over the long term stress damages cells in both the body and the brain. Scientists have in fact observed that nerve cells in the hippocampus suffer under chronic stress conditions and begin to atrophy.

1. Can the Commission say how many European citizens suffer from depression?

2. Does the Commission plan to examine these new theories to support the development of new therapies and new drugs to treat what has been called the 'dark condition'?

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

1. The European Health Interview Survey (EHIS) carried out in the years 2006-2009 provides figures for fourteen Member States ([1]) about the share of persons who reported that they had experienced depressive disorders as a chronic disease. The prevalence levels varied significantly, from 0.8% in Bulgaria and Romania to 5.6% in Belgium, with an average value of 3%. These figures are on self-reported depression, not necessarily diagnosed by a health professional. The EHIS is conducted every 5 years. The next wave is foreseen for 2014.

A study for the European Brain Council carried out in 2011 ([2]) arrived at a higher prevalence, estimating that 30.3 million EU citizens, corresponding to 6.9% of the population, experienced a major unipolar depression in 2011.

2. The Commission is aware of the review article published by Rao and Alderson ([3]).

Under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013), the Commission has invested over EUR 70 million in research on depression with a focus on the underlying pathophysiological mechanisms and on novel therapeutic approaches for the affected people. This support includes EUR 8.2 million through the Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking ([4]) ([5]).

Horizon 2020, the framework Programme for Research and Innovation ([6]) (2014-2020), may provide further opportunities to support research in this area through its 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the EC Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([7]).

([1]) Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Greece, Latvia, Malta, Poland, Slovenia, Spain.
([2]) H.U. Wittchen: The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010, in: European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.
([3]) Rao, M and Alderson, JM. (2014). Dissecting melancholia with evidence-based biomarker tools. Current Psychiatry, 13(2):41-48, 57.
([4]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/
([5]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/content/newmeds; http://www.newmeds-europe.com/
([6]) COM(2011) 808 final, COM(2011) 811 final.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002021/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuove pillole contro i dolori da artrite

Un'équipe di ricercatori danese ha esaminato le proprietà terapeutiche delle bacche di rosa canina contro i dolori da artrite. Questa scoperta potrebbe portare alla creazione di nuovi farmaci contro questo genere di dolori.

I ricercatori hanno rilevato che il rimedio riduce in modo significativo i dolori, anche forti, nel 90 per cento dei casi e in particolare i dolori alle mani. Lo studio è stato condotto su 30 pazienti affetti da osteoartrosi con problemi agli arti sia superiori sia inferiori. L'osteoartrite, infatti, colpisce proprio le articolazioni rendendo spesso difficile compiere le normali azioni quotidiane come aprire un barattolo, tenere le posate in mano o allacciarsi le scarpe. Le bacche in questione sono ricche di vitamina C, presente in quantità fino a 50-100 volte superiore rispetto ai più noti agrumi. Altro componente interessante è il licopene, un antiossidante che aiuta a ridurre il colesterolo LDL, a combattere l'invecchiamento e le infiammazioni. I test hanno poi dimostrato che l'estratto ha un effetto a lungo termine.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, si chiede alla Commissione se è a conoscenza dello studio in questione e se intende permettere l'immissione sul mercato europeo di pillole alla rosa canina.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza degli studi realizzati nell'UE sull'uso delle bacche di rosa canina per alleviare il dolore artritico.

Nessun medicinale può essere immesso sul mercato di uno Stato membro se non ha ricevuto un'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione o se non è stato registrato dalla pertinente autorità competente ([1]).

Le domande di autorizzazione di un medicinale contenente estratto di rosa canina quale sostanza attiva per alleviare il dolore artritico vanno presentate all'autorità competente di uno Stato membro. Un'autorizzazione è concessa soltanto se il rapporto rischio/beneficio è favorevole. I richiedenti devono dimostrare la qualità, la sicurezza e l'efficacia del prodotto.

Quale alternativa, un medicinale a base di rosa canina può essere registrato quale medicinale vegetale tradizionale ([2]). Anche in questo caso le domande di registrazione sono sottoposte all'autorità competente di uno Stato membro che procede a valutarle. Oltre a dimostrare la qualità del prodotto il richiedente deve fornire dati sull'uso tradizionale dello stesso, in particolare il prodotto non deve essere nocivo e la sua efficacia deve essere plausibile in base a un'esperienza e a un uso di lunga durata.

Nell'UE la bacca di rosa canina può essere usata negli integratori alimentari conformemente alle pertinenti disposizioni della direttiva 2002/46/CE sugli integratori alimentari ([3]) e alle regole nazionali sull'uso di altre sostanze negli integratori alimentari. Tuttavia, l'etichettatura, la presentazione e la pubblicità non devono attribuire agli integratori alimentari la proprietà di prevenire, trattare o curare una malattia umana né fare riferimento a tali proprietà.

La classificazione di un prodotto quale alimento o medicinale rientra nelle responsabilità degli Stati membri tenendo conto di tutte le caratteristiche del prodotto finale, non solo degli ingredienti che contiene.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 726/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 31 marzo 2004, che istituisce procedure comunitarie per l'autorizzazione e la sorveglianza dei medicinali per uso umano e veterinario, e che istituisce l'Agenzia europea per i medicinali (GU L 136 del 30.4.2004) e direttiva 2001/83/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 6 novembre 2001, recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano (GU L 311 del 28.11.2001).

([2]) Titolo III, Capo 2 bis della direttiva 2001/83/CE recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano (GU L 311 del 28.11.2001) modificata dalla direttiva 2004/24/CE che modifica, per quanto riguarda i medicinali vegetali tradizionali, la direttiva 2001/83/CE recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano (GU L 136 del 30.4.2004).

([3]) GU L 183 del 12.7.2002, pag. 51.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002021/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: New pills for arthritic pain

A Danish research team has been examining the therapeutic properties of rose hips for arthritic pain. This discovery could lead to the development of new drugs to treat this kind of pain.

The researchers found that the remedy significantly reduced even severe pain in 90% of cases, particularly pain in the hands. The study was conducted on 30 osteoarthritis patients with problems in either their upper or their lower limbs. Osteoarthritis specifically affects the joints, often making it difficult to do ordinary, everyday things like opening a tin, holding a knife and fork or tying one's shoelaces. Rose hips are rich in vitamin C, with up to 50-100 times more than in the better-known citrus fruits. Another component of interest is lycopene, an antioxidant that helps to reduce LDL cholesterol levels and fight ageing and inflammation. The tests showed that the extract has a long-term effect.

Is the Commission aware of the study in question and does it plan to allow rose hip pills to be marketed in the European Union?

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

The Commission is aware that studies on rosehip for arthritic pain are carried out in the EU.

No medicine may be placed on the market of a Member State unless a marketing authorisation or registration has been granted by the relevant competent authority ([1]).

Applications for an authorisation for a medicine containing rosehip as active substance to relieve arthritic pain have to be submitted to the Competent Authority of a Member State. An authorisation is only granted if the benefit-risk balance is favourable. Applicants must demonstrate the quality, safety and efficacy of his product.

Alternatively, a medicine containing rosehip may be registered as a traditional herbal medicinal product ([2]). Applications for a registration are also submitted to and evaluated by the Competent Authority of a Member State. In addition to demonstrating the quality of the product, the applicant has to provide data on the traditional use of the product, in particular it proves not to be harmful and its efficacy is plausible on the basis of long-standing use and experience.

Rosehip may be used in food supplements in the EU in compliance with the relevant provisions of Directive 2002/46/EC on food supplements ([3]) and with national rules on the use of other substances in food supplements. However, the labelling, presentation and advertising must not attribute to food supplements the property of preventing, treating or curing a human disease, or refer to such properties.

The classification of a product as food or medicine is the responsibility of the Member States, taking into account all the characteristics of the final product, not only of the ingredients it contains.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency (OJ L 136, 30.4.2004) and Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 311, 28.11.2001).

([2]) Title III, Chapter 2a of Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 311, 28.11.2001) as amended by Directive 2004/24/EC amending, as regards traditional herbal medicinal products, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 136. 30.4.2004).

([3]) OJ L 183, 12.7.2002, p. 51.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002022/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Prezzo del latte di soia

Il latte di soia è una bevanda vegetale che ormai si trova in tutti, o quasi tutti, i supermercati e i negozi di generi alimentari, utilizzato da numerosi cittadini europei come sostituto del «classico» latte di mucca, sia per scelta etica (come nel caso dei vegani) sia per motivi di salute (per gli intolleranti al lattosio). Eppure in Italia è considerato come un bene di lusso e dunque ad esso viene applicata l'IVA al 22 %, mentre per il latte di mucca il tasso è del 4 %.

In rete è già stata lanciata una petizione per chiedere che ai latti vegetali sia applicata l'IVA al 4 %, raccogliendo 30 000 firme nei primi tre giorni, a dimostrazione dell'attenzione dell'opinione pubblica al problema.

1. Alla luce di questi dati, può la Commissione chiarire se anche in altri Stati membri il latte di soia è tassato come bene di lusso?

2. Ritiene che la riduzione dell'aliquota sul latte di soia possa incentivare un'economia a basso impatto ambientale?

3. Ritiene necessaria un'azione di coordinamento a livello europeo in materia?

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

1. La normativa dell'UE in materia di IVA ([1]) prevede l'applicazione a qualsiasi operazione imponibile di un'aliquota normale non inferiore al 15 %, con la possibilità di applicare due aliquote ridotte pari almeno al 5 % a un elenco ristretto di beni e servizi. I prodotti alimentari, comprese le bevande e quindi il latte di soia, rientrano in tale opzione. Le aliquote IVA maggiorate o sui beni di lusso sono state abolite nel 1993 ([2]).

2. Una visione d'insieme delle aliquote IVA nell'UE basata sulle informazioni fornite dai rispettivi Stati membri è consultabile sul sito web della Commissione ([3]), ma non comprende informazioni così dettagliate come quelle richieste sul latte di soia. Dal momento che la normativa dell'Unione in materia di IVA si fonda su una direttiva, gli Stati membri sono gli unici a poter fornire informazioni così precise.

3. La finalità principale dell'IVA non è incentivare o favorire un particolare settore, ma piuttosto riscuotere entrate in modo efficiente, semplice e neutrale. Poiché una riduzione delle aliquote IVA non si riflette necessariamente sul prezzo finale, è impossibile prevederne con certezza gli effetti e, se la riduzione influisce sul prezzo finale, eventuali cambiamenti nel comportamento dei consumatori dipendono da altri fattori, quali l'elasticità dei prezzi. Altre misure politiche più mirate saranno pertanto più efficaci.

In conformità al principio di sussidiarietà, spetta a ciascuno Stato membro fissare le proprie aliquote IVA nel rispetto della politica di bilancio e di altre priorità nazionali, purché tali misure siano in linea con il diritto dell'Unione.

Per ulteriori informazioni sulle norme in materia di IVA la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole deputato alla risposta data alle interrogazioni scritte E-003100/2012 di Anne Delvaux e E-009493/2013 di Ines Cristina Zuber.

([1]) Direttiva 2006/112/CE del Consiglio, del 28 novembre 2006, relativa al sistema comune d'imposta sul valore aggiunto — GU L 347 dell'11.12.2006, pag. 1.
([2]) Con la direttiva 92/77/CEE del Consiglio, del 19 ottobre 1992, che completa il sistema comune di imposta sul valore aggiunto e modifica la direttiva 77/388/CEE (ravvicinamento delle aliquote dell'IVA).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/vat/how_vat_works/rates/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002022/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Price of soya milk

Soya milk is a vegetable drink which can now be found in all, or almost all, supermarkets and grocery stores, used by numerous European citizens as a substitute for 'classic' cow's milk, either by ethical choice (as in the case of vegans) or for health reasons (for lactose-intolerant people). However, in Italy it is considered a luxury good and accordingly attracts VAT at a rate of 22%, whereas for cow's milk the rate is 4%.

An online petition has been launched requesting that VAT should be charged on vegetable milks at a rate of 4%; it has attracted 30 000 signatures in the first three days, showing the attention of public opinion to the problem.

1. In view of this, can the Commission clarify whether soya milk is also taxed as a luxury good in other Member States?

2. Does it consider that a reduction in the rate on soya milk could incentivise an economy with low environmental impact?

3. Does it consider that Europe-wide coordination action is necessary in this matter?

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

1. The European Union (EU) VAT law ([1]) provides for the application of a standard rate of not less than 15% to any taxable operation and an option to apply up to two reduced rates of at least 5% to a restricted list of goods and services. Foodstuffs, including beverages and therefore soya milk, are covered by such an option. The increased or luxury VAT rates were abolished in 1993 ([2]).

2. A general overview on VAT rates in the EU based on the information supplied by the respective Member States, but which does not cover such detailed information as requested on soya milk, is available in the Commission's website ([3]). Since EU VAT legislation is based on a directive, only Member States are in a position to give such precise information.

3. VAT is not primarily designed to incentivise or favour a particular sector but rather to efficiently collect revenue in a simple and neutral way. As a reduction in VAT rates is not necessarily passed through to the final price, any effect is uncertain and where it is passed through, any change in the consumers' behaviour is dependent on other factors such as price elasticities. Therefore other more targeted policy measures will be more effective.

In conformity with the principle of subsidiarity, it is up to each Member State to set its VAT rates, in accordance with its budgetary policy and other national priorities, provided that these measures are compliant with EC law.

For additional information concerning the rules on VAT, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-003100/2012 by Ms Delvaux and E-009493/2013 by Ms Zuber.

([1]) Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 on the common system of value added tax — OJ L 347, 11.12.2006, p. 1.
([2]) By Council Directive 92/77/EEC of 19 October 1992 supplementing the common system of value added tax and amending Directive 77/388/EEC (approximation of VAT rates).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/vat/how_vat_works/rates/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002023/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Sperimentazione di un nuovo farmaco contro diverse malattie autoimmuni

Alcune patologie, come la sclerosi multipla, sono caratterizzate da un'infiammazione cronica del cervello, che si ritiene causata da un'iperattività del sistema immunitario in cui sono coinvolte le cellule immunitarie note con il nome di cellule T. Un'équipe di ricercatori danese ha scoperto alcune cellule sanguigne in grado di combattere le cellule T iperattive e, di conseguenza, l'infiammazione cerebrale da esse causata.

Si tratta di globuli bianchi che esprimono il gene FOXA1, responsabile dello sviluppo delle cellule con funzioni soppressive nei confronti delle cellule T. Stimolando l'attività di queste cellule regolatrici, gli scienziati sono riusciti a diminuire in modo significativo il livello di infiammazione cerebrale e la malattia

Il team di ricercatori ha esaminato il sangue dei pazienti con sclerosi multipla prima e dopo due anni di trattamento con il farmaco interferone-beta. I risultati dei test hanno mostrato che i pazienti trattati con questo farmaco avevano visto aumentare il numero di questo nuovo tipo di cellule del sangue che combattono la malattia. La fase attuale di ricerca prevede una serie di test con cui valutare se i nuovi linfociti FOXA1 possano impedire il deterioramento dello strato di mielina delle cellule nervose e la degenerazione cerebrale in un modello di sclerosi multipla progressiva.

Inoltre, questa terapia potrebbe avere risvolti importanti anche nella cura di altre malattie autoimmuni come il diabete di tipo 1 o l'artrite reumatoide.

Alla luce di questi dati, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se è a conoscenza di questo studio;

2. quale sia il tasso di incidenza della sclerosi multipla sui cittadini europei;

3. quali sono le altre principali malattie autoimmuni maggiormente diffuse tra i cittadini europei?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio pubblicato di recente dal Professor Helin, dal Professor Issazadeh-Navikas e dai loro collaboratori ([1]).

Non sono disponibili dati o registri ufficiali sull'incidenza delle malattie autoimmuni in Europa. Le malattie autoimmuni comprendono più di 50 patologie e sindromi diverse e interessano circa il 5 % della popolazione in Europa e nel Nord America. Due terzi dei pazienti sono donne.

Nel 2007 il progetto «Multiple Sclerosis — the information Dividend» ([2]) ha elaborato il capitolo sulla sclerosi multipla della relazione finanziata dall'UE sulle malattie gravi e croniche ([3]). La relazione include stime attendibili della prevalenza e dell'incidenza della sclerosi multipla ripartite per sesso e fascia d'età in Europa. Ulteriori informazioni sulla sclerosi multipla provengono da progetti più recenti finanziati nell'UE quali il Registro europeo della sclerosi multipla ([4]) o la Piattaforma europea della sclerosi multipla ([5]).

Si riportano in allegato i dati relativi alle dimissioni ospedaliere per casi di sclerosi multipla registrate nel 2011 e ripartite per sesso.

([1]) FoxA1 directs the lineage and immunosuppressive properties of a novel regulatory T cell population in EAE and MS. Liu Y, Carlsson R, Comabella M, Wang J, Kosicki M, Carrion B, Hasan M, Wu X, Montalban X, Dziegiel MH, Sellebjerg F, Sørensen PS, Helin K, Issazadeh-Navikas S. Nat Med. 2014 Mar;20(3):272-82. doi: 10.1038/nm.3485. Epub 2014 Feb 16.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2006104
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_threats/non_com/docs/mcd_report_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20101213
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20123302

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002023/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Trial of a new drug against various autoimmune diseases

Some pathologies, such as multiple sclerosis, are marked by a chronic inflammation of the brain, which is believed to be caused by hyperactivity of the immune system involving the immune cells known as T cells. A Danish research team has discovered some blood cells which are able to combat hyperactive T cells and, consequently, the cerebral inflammation they cause.

These are white cells which emit the gene FOXA1, responsible for the development of cells which can suppress T cells. By stimulating the activity of these regulatory cells, the scientists have been able to reduce significantly the level of cerebral inflammation and illness.

The research team has examined the blood of multiple sclerosis patients before and after two years of treatment with the drug interferon beta. The test results showed that patients treated with this drug had experienced an increase in the number of this new type of blood cell which combats the disease. The current stage of the research provides for a series of tests to evaluate whether the new FOXA1 lymphocytes can prevent the deterioration of the myelin layer of the nerve cells and cerebral degeneration in a progressive multiple sclerosis model.

Also, this therapy could also have significant implications for the treatment of other autoimmune diseases such as type 1 diabetes or rheumatoid arthritis.

In view of these data, can the Commission clarify:

1. whether it is aware of this study;

2. what the rate of incidence of multiple sclerosis is among European citizens;

3. what the other main autoimmune diseases most widespread among European citizens are?

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

The Commission is aware of the study recently published by Professor Helin, Professor Issazadeh-Navikas and their collaborators ([1]).

There are no official available data or registries on the incidence of auto immune diseases in Europe. Auto immune diseases comprise more than 50 distinct diseases and syndromes, and affect about 5% of the population in Europe and North America, with two thirds of the patients being female.

In 2007, the 'Multiple Sclerosis — the information Dividend' Project ([2]) drafted the chapter on Multiple Sclerosis of the EU-funded report on Major and Chronic Diseases ([3]). The report includes best estimates on prevalence and incidence of Multiple Sclerosis by gender and age group in Europe. More information on Multiple Sclerosis is available from more recent EU-funded projects such as the European Register for Multiple Sclerosis ([4]) or the European Multiple Sclerosis Platform ([5]).

In annex, data is provided on hospital discharges for multiple sclerosis in 2011 by gender.

([1]) FoxA1 directs the lineage and immunosuppressive properties of a novel regulatory T cell population in EAE and MS. Liu Y, Carlsson R, Comabella M, Wang J, Kosicki M, Carrion B, Hasan M, Wu X, Montalban X, Dziegiel MH, Sellebjerg F, Sørensen PS, Helin K, Issazadeh-Navikas S. Nat Med. 2014 Mar;20(3):272-82. doi: 10.1038/nm.3485. Epub 2014 Feb 16.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2006104
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_threats/non_com/docs/mcd_report_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20101213
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20123302

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002024/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Tre ragazzini intossicati in una piscina a Roma

Il 18 febbraio 2014, a Roma, tre ragazzini sono rimasti intossicati da esalazioni di monossido di carbonio in una piscina a Roma. I tre minori sono ricoverati in gravi condizioni e sottoposti a un trattamento in camera iperbarica. Sono intervenuti i carabinieri della stazione Madonna del Riposo, che sono in attesa di una relazione dei vigili del fuoco che hanno ispezionato la struttura e per verificare con esattezza la causa del malore dei tre ragazzini.

In merito a questo incidente, può la Commissione chiarire se esistano norme europee specifiche in materia di sicurezza in questo genere di strutture? Chi deve essere considerato responsabile dell'incidente in casi simili a quello descritto?

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

La regolamentazione delle strutture per il tempo libero, come le piscine, compresi anche gli aspetti legati all'enforcement, rientrano nelle competenze degli Stati membri. Non esistono attualmente norme europee. La responsabilità è determinata conformemente alle norme nazionali applicabili.

Per ulteriori informazioni la Commissione rinvia l'Onorevole deputato alle proprie risposte all'interrogazione scritta P-010013/2013 ([1]) sulla sicurezza delle piscine e alle interrogazioni scritte E-011346/2013 ([2]), E-000641/2013 ([3]) ed E-010563/2012 ([4]) sull'avvelenamento da monossido da carbonio.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bP-2013-010013%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-011346%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-000641%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2012-010563%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002024/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Three boys poisoned at a Rome swimming pool

On 18 February 2014, in Rome, three boys were overcome by carbon monoxide fumes in a swimming pool in Rome. The three children were taken to hospital in a serious condition and treated in a hyperbaric chamber. The carabinieri of the Madonna del Riposo station attended, and await the report of the fire service which inspected the premises to verify the exact cause of the three boys' sickness.

In view of this incident, can the Commission clarify whether any specific European standards exist in relation to safety in premises of this kind? Who should be held responsible for the incident in cases similar to the one described?

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

The regulation of safety of leisure services such as swimming pools, including the enforcement falls into the competence of Member States. There are currently no European standards in place. Liability is determined in accordance with the applicable national rules.

For additional information the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Question P-010013/2013 ([1]) on swimming pool safety and to written questions E-011346/2013 ([2]), E-000641/2013 ([3]) and E-010563/2012 ([4]) on carbon monoxide poisoning.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bP-2013-010013%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-011346%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-000641%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2012-010563%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002025/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Utilizzo dei semi di uva per ridurre gli effetti collaterali della chemioterapia

Uno studio medico di un'università australiana ha studiato un metodo per ridurre gli effetti collaterali della chemioterapia, analizzando i semi d'uva, che contengono sostanze attive particolarmente utili in questo caso. Si tratta dei tannini e i polifenoli, agenti antinfiammatori in grado di ridurre gli effetti collaterali e aumentare l'efficacia della chemioterapia utilizzata nel trattamento del cancro all'intestino, uno dei più diffusi e piuttosto ostici da curare.

La ricerca effettuata ha anche mostrato che il vinacciolo assunto per via orale ha ridotto in modo significativo l'infiammazione e i danni ai tessuti causati dalla chemioterapia nel piccolo intestino, senza danneggiare le cellule non tumorali, agendo quindi selettivamente sulle cellule tumorali. I test hanno mostrato che l'estratto di semi d'uva non ha causato effetti collaterali sull'intestino sano a concentrazioni fino a 1 000 mg, diminuendo sensibilmente il danno intestinale da chemioterapia rispetto alle cellule di controllo; ha inoltre promosso una diminuzione dell'infiammazione indotta dalla chemioterapia fino al 55 % e, infine, ha aumentato del 26 % gli effetti inibitori della chemioterapia sulla crescita delle cellule cancerose del colon.

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

1. è a conoscenza dello studio?

2. è a conoscenza di studi simili condotti da università o centri di ricerca europei?

3. intende promuovere questo studio, dal momento che l'incidenza del cancro è ancora piuttosto alta tra i cittadini europei?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(7 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei risultati dello studio dell'università di Adelaide (Australia), pubblicato nel gennaio 2014 sulla rivista scientifica PLOS ONE, in merito all'uso dei semi di uva per ridurre gli effetti collaterali della chemioterapia ([1]).

In linea di principio, la Commissione europea non valuta progetti di ricerca che non siano direttamente legati ai suoi finanziamenti.

Anche se nessuna ricerca analoga sui semi di uva è attualmente sostenuta nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7PQ, 2007-2013), sono stati stanziati 68 milioni di euro per approcci di ricerca collaborativa e di frontiera in tema di qualità della vita dei pazienti. Tra i progetti sostenuti vi sono studi sui meccanismi molecolari del dolore oncologico, al fine di alleviare gli effetti collaterali degli interventi chirurgici, della chemio e radioterapia nonché della terapia mirata e disamine delle questioni legate alla sopravvivenza dei pazienti nel lungo periodo.

Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione (2014-2020) ([2]), offrirà ulteriori opportunità di sostegno della ricerca sulla prevenzione del cancro, sulla sua diagnosi precoce, sulla terapia e sulle questioni legate alla qualità della vita dei pazienti attraverso la sfida societale *«Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere»* ([3]). Ulteriori informazioni sono reperibili sul Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([4]).

I finanziamenti unionali per la ricerca sono erogati in base a concorsi in forma di inviti a presentare proposte ed in seguito a una valutazione indipendente tra pari.

L'azione dell'UE in materia di cancro si basa sulle migliori evidenze scientifiche disponibili. La Commissione non intende tuttavia promuovere specificamente lo studio menzionato dall'Onorevole deputato.

([1]) Cheah et al (2014) PLoS ONE 9(1): e85184. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0085184.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:EN:PDF
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002025/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Grape seeds used to reduce the side effects of chemotherapy

A medical study carried out by an Australian university has been looking at how to reduce the side effects of chemotherapy by analysing grape seeds, which contain active substances that are particularly useful in this case. These are tannins and polyphenols, anti-inflammatory agents that can reduce side effects and increase the efficacy of chemotherapy used in the treatment of bowel cancer, one of the most common forms of cancer and one that is rather difficult to treat.

The research also showed that grape pips taken orally significantly reduced chemotherapy-induced inflammation and tissue damage in the small intestine without damaging the non-tumorous cells; they therefore acted selectively on the tumour cells. Tests showed that grape seed extract had no side effects on a healthy bowel at concentrations up to 1 000 mg, while it appreciably reduced intestinal damage from chemotherapy compared with control cells. It also reduced chemotherapy-induced inflammation by up to 55% and, lastly, it enhanced the inhibitory effects of chemotherapy on the growth of cancerous cells in the colon by 26%.

1. Is the Commission aware of this study?

2. Is it aware of similar studies carried out by European universities or research centres?

3. Does it intend to promote this study, given that the incidence of cancer is still rather high among Europeans?

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

The Commission is aware of the results of the study of the University of Adelaide (Australia), published in January 2014 in the PLOS ONE scientific journal about the use of grape seeds to reduce the side effects of chemotherapy ([1]).

As a matter of policy, the European Commission does not assess research projects that do not directly relate to its funding activities.

Although no similar research on grape seeds is being supported by the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007- 2013), EUR 68 million have been devoted to support frontier and collaborative research on patient-centred quality-of-life issues. Projects supported include studies addressing molecular mechanisms of cancer pain, alleviating side-effects to surgery, chemo-, radio- and targeted therapy and long-term survivorship issues.

Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([2]), will offer further opportunities to support research on cancer prevention, early diagnosis, treatment and patient-centred quality-of-life issues, through the 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge ([3]). More information can be found at the Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([4]).

EU research funding is granted on the basis of competitive calls for proposals, following an independent peer-review evaluation.

EU action on cancer is based on the best available scientific evidence. The Commission does not however intend to specifically promote the study referred to by the Honourable Member.

([1]) Cheah et al (2014) PLoS ONE 9(1): e85184. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0085184.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:EN:PDF
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002026/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Vitamina C e rischio di ictus emorragico

Un recentissimo studio ha rivelato che mangiare cibi ricchi di vitamina C può aiutare a ridurre il rischio del tipo più comune di ictus emorragico e che una carenza può invece aumentarne in modo significativo il rischio. I ricercatori francesi alla guida dello studio hanno coinvolto 65 persone che avevano subito un ictus emorragico intracerebrale, ossia una rottura dei vasi sanguigni all'interno del cervello, per poi confrontare i dati relativi alla loro condizione con quelli di 65 persone sane. Le analisi hanno così mostrato che nel 41 per cento dei casi vi erano normali livelli di vitamina C, nel 45 per cento dei casi invece vi erano bassi livelli e, infine, nel 14 per cento dei casi vi era una vera e propria carenza. Lo studio ha altresì mostrato che la vitamina C sembra offrire altri benefici come la produzione di collagene, una proteina che si trova in ossa, pelle e tessuti.

La vitamina C è contenuta soprattutto in cibi come frutta e verdura.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, si chiede alla Commissione se intende promuovere campagne di sensibilizzazione a favore del consumo di cibi contenti vitamina C, al fine di garantire un apporto vitaminico sufficiente a ridurre il rischio di ictus e altre patologie legate alla carenza di tale vitamina.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(26 marzo 2014)

L'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare funge da istanza di valutazione del rischio e fornisce pareri scientifici indipendenti. Per quanto concerne i livelli raccomandati di assunzione di vitamina C, la Commissione ha chiesto all'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare di fornire un parere sul quantitativo di assunzione di riferimento per la popolazione in relazione ai micronutrienti nella dieta, in cui rientrano anche consigli in merito alla vitamina C, nel contesto di un'alimentazione equilibrata che, unitamente a uno stile di vita complessivo sano, contribuisce a condizioni di salute buone grazie a un'alimentazione ottimale. L'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare ha presentato nel 2013 un parere scientifico su valori dietetici di riferimento per la popolazione europea in relazione alla vitamina C ([1]). Spetta agli Stati membri monitorare la situazione nutrizionale della popolazione e decidere se desiderano o meno introdurre misure per ovviare a un'assunzione insufficiente di nutrienti essenziali. Per quanto concerne le campagne di sensibilizzazione, l'educazione alla salute rientra nelle competenze degli Stati membri. La Commissione sostiene gli sforzi condotti a livello nazionale.

In cooperazione con gli Stati membri la Commissione si adopera per promuovere il consumo di frutta e verdura. Con il programma Frutta nelle Scuole ([2]) la Commissione contribuisce a diffondere abitudini alimentari più sane tra i bambini in età scolastica. Il 24 febbraio 2014 il gruppo ad alto livello su Nutrizione e Attività fisica ha concordato ([3]) un piano d'azione sull'obesità infantile ([4]), che promuove anche il consumo di frutta e verdura.

La Commissione ha anche avviato due progetti pilota ([5]) volti ad accrescere il consumo di frutta fresca e verdure nelle collettività in cui i redditi delle famiglie sono inferiori al 50 % della media unionale.

([1]) EFSA: Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for vitamin C. EFSA Journal 2013;11(11):3418, 68 pp. EFSA Journal 2013;11(11):3418.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_it.htm
([3]) Tuttavia, i membri del gruppo di alto livello che rappresentavano i Paesi Bassi e la Svezia hanno informato che, a motivo di considerazioni collaterali, non potevano unirsi all'iniziativa.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([5]) SANCO/2011/C4/01 e SANCO/2013/C4/02.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002026/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Vitamin C and risk of haemorrhagic stroke

A very recent study has shown that eating foods rich in vitamin C may help to reduce the risk of the most common type of haemorrhagic stroke, and that on the other hand a deficiency may increase the risk significantly. The French researchers leading the study recruited 65 people who had suffered an intercerebral haemorrhagic stroke, that is, a rupture of the blood vessels in the brain, and compared the data relating to their condition with those of 65 healthy people. Their analysis showed that in 41% of cases there were normal levels of vitamin C, but in 45% of cases there were low levels, and, finally, in 14% of cases there was a genuine deficiency. The study has also shown that vitamin C appears to offer other benefits such as the production of collagen, a protein found in bones, skin and tissues.

Vitamin C occurs particularly in foods such as fruit and vegetables.

In view of the above, does the Commission intend to promote awareness campaigns to encourage consumption of foods containing vitamin C, so as to ensure a vitamin intake sufficient to reduce the risk of stroke and other pathologies associated with a deficiency of this vitamin?

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

The European Food Safety Authority acts as a risk assessor and provides independent scientific advice. With regard to the recommended levels of vitamin C intake, the Commission has asked the European Food Safety Authority to advice on population reference intakes of micronutrients in the diet, which includes advice on vitamin C, in the context of a balanced diet which, when part of an overall healthy lifestyle, contributes to good health through optimal nutrition. The European Food Safety Authority delivered a scientific opinion on Dietary Reference Values for the European population for vitamin C in 2013 ([1]). It is the responsibility of Member States to monitor the nutritional situation of the population, and to decide whether or not they wish to introduce measures to address insufficient intake of essential nutrients. Regarding awareness campaigns, health education is within the competence of Member States. The Commission is supporting national efforts.

In cooperation with the Member States the Commission works on promoting the consumption of fruits and vegetables. Through the EU School Fruit Scheme ([2]) the Commission contributes to establishing healthier eating habits among school children. On 24 February 2014 the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity agreed ([3]) an Action Plan on Childhood Obesity ([4]), which also addresses the promotion of fruits and vegetables.

The Commission has launched two pilot projects ([5]) that aim to increase consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables in communities where the household income is below 50% of the EU average.

([1]) EFSA: Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for vitamin C. EFSA Journal 2013;11(11):3418, 68 pp. EFSA Journal 2013;11(11):3418.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm
([3]) However, the Dutch and Swedish Members of the High Level Group informed that, based on subsidiarity concerns, they could not join in the initiative.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([5]) SANCO/2011/C4/01 and SANCO/2013/C4/02.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002027/14
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Rivalutazione del capitale della Banca d'Italia

La legge italiana n. 4 del 24 gennaio 2014 ha convertito il DL che, tra le altre disposizioni, prevede un aumento di capitale della Banca d'Italia (BI). La legge impone un limite del 3 % di partecipazione al capitale; pertanto diverse banche azioniste di BI con partecipazioni più elevate del 3 % saranno tenute a vendere tali partecipazioni a terzi. L'invenduto potrà essere riacquistato da BI. Il capitale di BI passa da 300 milioni di lire (definito nel 1936) a un valore attuale di 7,5 miliardi di Euro. Un passaggio importante in tale vicenda è la privatizzazione delle banche pubbliche che nel '90 sostanzialmente ha consentito il passaggio delle azioni di Banca d'Italia da soggetti di matrice pubblica a soggetti in corso di privatizzazione.

Nella fase precedente la privatizzazione non è stata operata alcuna adeguata rivalutazione delle quote di BI. La riforma ha anche provocato la modifica degli art. 39 e 40 dello statuto di BI, articoli che prevedono forme sistematiche di passaggio da riserve a capitale e di distribuzione di utili.

Considerato che non ci risulta che lo Stato italiano abbia effettuato alcuna notifica volontaria, può la Commissione europea verificare:

1. se la rivalutazione delle quote di BI introdotta dalla legge 5/2014 e la riforma degli art. 39 e 40 dello Statuto di BI, che consente una sistematico passaggio da riserva a capitale e che consente una distribuzione degli utili di BI ai soci di quest'ultima, rappresenti aiuto di Stato incompatibile con le regole dell'Unione?

2. Se le riserve di BI sono da considerare risorse pubbliche o utili liberamente distribuibili ai soci di BI o destinabili ad aumenti di capitale di BI?

3. Se la facoltà di vendita delle quote di BI e di eventuale riacquisto delle quote di BI da parte della stessa (qualora le partecipazioni che devono essere vendute a terzi risultino invendute) possa essere valutata come aiuto di Stato incompatibile con le regole dell'Unione?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(28 marzo 2014)

La Commissione ha già inviato una richiesta di informazioni alle autorità italiane per verificare se la rivalutazione del capitale della Banca d'Italia comporti elementi di aiuto, e, in caso affermativo, se tali aiuti risultino compatibili con il mercato interno.

Dopo aver ricevuto e analizzato la risposta a tale richiesta di informazioni, la Commissione sarà in grado di stabilire se la riforma introdotta dal decreto-legge convertito in legge il 29 gennaio 2014 comporti aiuti di Stato.

Su tale base, la Commissione deciderà se avviare o meno un'indagine preliminare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002027/14
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Revaluation of capital of Banca d'Italia

Italian Law No 4 of 24 January 2014 converted the Legislative Decree which, among other measures, provided for an increase in the capital of Banca d'Italia (BI). The law imposes a maximum shareholding of 3%; therefore a number of banks with a shareholding in excess of 3% in BI will be required to dispose of their holdings. Any unsold shares may be bought back by BI. BI's capital increases from 300 million lire (set in 1936) to a present value of EUR 7.5 billion. An important step in this event is the privatisation of the public banks which in 1990 substantially allowed the transfer of Banca d'Italia shares from public sector bodies to bodies in the process of privatisation.

In the period leading up to privatisation no proper revaluation of BI shares took place. The reform has also led to the amendment of Articles 39 and 40 of BI's Statute, which provide for systematic means of transferring reserves to capital and for the distribution of profits.

Since we are unaware of any voluntary notification by the Italian State, can the European Commission verify:

1. whether the revaluation of BI shares introduced by Law No 5/2014 and the amendment of Articles 39 and 40 of BI's Statute, which provides for systematic transfer from reserves to capital and allows distribution of BI's profits to its shareholders, represents state aid, incompatible with the rules of the Union?

2. Whether the BI's reserves are to be considered public resources or profits which may be freely distributed to the shareholders of BI or allocated to increasing the capital of BI?

3. Whether the ability to sell shares in BI and for BI to buy back its own shares (where shareholdings to be sold to third parties remain unsold) may be considered state aid, incompatible with the rules of the Union?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

The Commission has already sent a request for information to the Italian authorities in order to verify whether there might be elements of state aid in the revaluation of Italy's Central Bank, Banca d'Italia, and, if so, whether they would seem compatible with the internal market.

After receiving and analysing the reply to that request for information, the Commission will be better placed to determine whether there might be elements of state aid in the reform introduced by the Decree-Law converted into law on 29 January 2014.

On that basis, the Commission will decide whether or not to conduct a preliminary examination.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002028/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Cristiano torturato ed ucciso da poliziotti in Pakistan: il caso di Sabir Masih

Secondo alcune fonti giornalistiche in Pakistan il ventiquattrenne cristiano, Sabir Masih, sarebbe stato torturato ed ucciso dalla polizia.

Gli agenti avrebbero dichiarato la morte del ragazzo per suicidio, ma i referti medici rilasciati dopo l'autopsia indicherebbero che il decesso sarebbe sopraggiunto in seguito a gravi ferite interne, causate da torture e abusi. Sabir Masih sarebbe stato arrestato l'11 febbraio scorso e le violenze sarebbero state inflitte durante un interrogatorio avvenuto presso la caserma di Kohsar (Islamabad), in seguito alle accuse di furto rivolte al giovane.

Secondo la famiglia, il ragazzo non poteva essere l'artefice del reato, in quanto avrebbe passato tutta la giornata al lavoro.

Va ricordato che la tortura sarebbe una pratica usata spesso in questo paese e secondo alcune testimonianze, i cristiani arrestati sarebbero vittime di abusi particolarmente violenti.

Pare che la polizia, per non far emergere dettagli della violenza, avrebbe intimato alla famiglia di celebrare il funerale il giorno stesso della sua morte e che non sono stati ancora presi provvedimenti verso i presunti responsabili.

Si consideri che il 97 % della popolazione pakistana è islamica, mentre i cristiani sono una minoranza pari all'1,6 % della popolazione.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è l'Alto Rappresentante al corrente del fatto in questione, e dei tanti altri casi avvenuti nel paese negli ultimi anni?

2. Intende far luce sulla vicenda a seguito di questo ennesimo episodio nei confronti dei cristiani che in tutto il mondo vengono perseguitati?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton ringrazia l'onorevole deputato per la segnalazione. Sono frequenti le denunce in relazione a torture e maltrattamenti di detenuti e a decessi verificatisi durante la detenzione preventiva in Pakistan. L'associazione non governativa per i diritti umani e l'assistenza ai detenuti ha segnalato 69 decessi avvenuti in carcere nel 2013. Dalle relazioni risulta che spesso la polizia dichiara che tali decessi sono avvenuti perché il sospettato ha cercato di scappare o di commettere suicidio. Gli incidenti riguardano sia i musulmani che le minoranze religiose, ma molti avvocati delle minoranze sostengono che sono più frequenti i casi di maltrattamento da parte della polizia nei confronti di cittadini appartenenti alle minoranze rispetto ai musulmani.

L'Unione europea ha costantemente ribadito, nel dialogo sui diritti politici e umani con il Pakistan, che lo Stato deve garantire il rispetto dei diritti umani fondamentali e la protezione di tutti i cittadini, compresi quelli appartenenti a minoranze religiose. Dal gennaio 2014 al Pakistan è stato concesso lo status «GSP+», a condizione che attui efficacemente le convenzioni internazionali di base, tra cui la convenzione delle Nazioni Unite contro la tortura. Nei futuri dialoghi sui diritti umani e lo status «GSP+» l'Unione europea continuerà a sollevare la questione della libertà di religione e di credo e a ricordare la responsabilità del Pakistan di tutelare tutti i Pakistani, e quindi anche le minoranze compresa quella cristiana, proteggendoli da maltrattamenti, torture e esecuzioni extragiudiziali. Inoltre, l'UE sostiene la libertà di religione e credo in Pakistan attraverso la cooperazione allo sviluppo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002028/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Christian tortured and killed by police in Pakistan: the case of Sabir Masih

Some news sources in Pakistan are reporting that a twenty-four year old Christian, Sabir Masih, has been tortured and killed by police.

It is said that the officers reported that the young man had committed suicide, but medical records released after the autopsy show that death occurred following serious internal injuries, caused by torture and abuse. Sabir Masih was arrested on 11 February last and the violence was inflicted during an interrogation, which took place at the barracks at Kohsar (Islamabad), into accusations of theft made against the young man.

According to his family, the young man could not have been responsible for the offence, since he spent the whole day at work.

It is recalled that torture is a practice frequently used in that country, and according to some witnesses, any Christians who are arrested are subjected to particularly violent abuse.

It appears that in order to prevent the details of the violence emerging, the police pressured the family to hold the funeral on the same day as the death, and no action has yet been taken against the suspects.

It must be considered that 97% of the population of Pakistan is Muslim, whereas Christians are in a minority of 1.6% of the population.

Can the Commission answer these questions:

1. Is the High Representative aware of this event, and of the many other cases occurring in the country in recent years?

2. Does the Commission intend to look into this issue, following this latest of many episodes against Christians who are persecuted throughout the world?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President thanks the honourable member for drawing attention to this case. Allegations of torture and mistreatment of detainees as well as deaths in police custody are frequent in Pakistan. The NGO Society for Human Rights and Prisoner's Aid reported 69 deaths in jails in 2013. According to reports the police often state that these occur when suspects attempt to escape or commit suicide. The incidents affect both Muslims and religious minorities, but many minority advocates contend that minorities are more often subject to mistreatment by the police than Muslims.

In its political and human rights dialogue with Pakistan, the EU has repeatedly stressed the need for the state to ensure that the fundamental human rights and the protection of all its citizens, including religious minorities, are respected. From January 2014 Pakistan has been granted GSP+ status, contingent on the effective implementation of core international conventions, including the UN Convention Against Torture. In future dialogues on human rights and GSP+, the European Union will continue to raise the issue of freedom of religion and belief and responsibility of the Pakistan in protecting all Pakistanis, including Christian and other minorities, against mistreatment, torture and extrajudicial killings. In addition the EU also provides support to freedom of religion and belief in Pakistan through its development cooperation.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002029/14
upućeno Komisiji
Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)
(20. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Uzgoj industrijske konoplje i njezinih nusproizvoda

Europska industrija konoplje velikim dijelom ovisi o političkom i ekonomskom okviru Europske unije.

Aspekti ozelenjivanja mogu velikim dijelom doprinijeti uzgoju konoplje kao biljke prihvatljive za okoliš. Osim toga, sve je više zahtjeva za certifikate za sve vrste biomase. Sve bi prethodno navedeno trebalo pridonijeti povećanju proizvodnje konoplje u predstojećem razdoblju, uzimajući u obzir i povećanu potražnju građevinskog sektora, automobilske industrije, te prehrambenog sektora.

Što se tiče pravnog okvira, konoplja se u EU-u može uzgajati pod uvjetom da vrste usjeva udovoljavaju posebnim pravilima na razini Unije obzirom na razinu THC-a koja ne smije biti veća od 0,2 %. Postoje određene relevantne odredbe u Uredbi 1307/2013 (nova uredba o izravnim plaćanjima poljoprivrednicima), uvodne izjave 28. i 31., te članak 32. stavak 6., članak 35. stavak 3. i članak 52. stavak 2., kao i u Uredbi 1308/2013 (nova uredba o organizaciji zajedničkog tržišta za poljoprivredne proizvode), članak 189. stavak 1. točka (b).

Postojeći pravni okvir u Hrvatskoj omogućava poljoprivrednicima proizvodnju industrijske konoplje, međutim od nusproizvoda dozvoljeno je proizvoditi samo ulje od sjemenki. Ostatak ove visokovrijedne biljke proizvođači su primorani neškodljivo uništiti.

Pitanja za Komisiju su sljedeća:

1. Bi li Komisija bila u mogućnosti pružiti određene smjernice/preporuke uzimajući u obzir najbolju praksu država članica kako bi Hrvatska mogla usmjeriti svoju zakonsku regulativu u svrhu stvaranja dodatne vrijednosti korištenjem nusproizvoda industrijske konoplje?

2. Što bi Komisija preporučila u okviru europske politike i industrije ozelenjivanja? Primjerice, čak i na razini Unije, usprkos povećanoj potražnji i interesu za vlaknima konoplje kao vrste nusproizvoda industrijske konoplje, ne postoji pozitivan učinak od tog trenda razvoja.

Odgovor g. Cioloşa u ime Komisije
(23. travnja 2014.)

Industrijska konoplja uzgaja se u EU-u na površini od otprilike 10 000 ha do 15 000 ha. Osim ulja koje se dobiva iz sjemena konoplje, razvili su se novi raznovrsni načini uporabe njezina vlakna i pozdera. Vlakno se uglavnom upotrebljava za cigaretni papir, izolacijski materijal i kompozite dobivene od bioloških sirovina, dok se pozder uglavnom upotrebljava za stelje za životinje i za izgradnju.

Za potrebe izravnih plaćanja, prihvatljive su samo sorte u kojima sadržaj tetrahidrokanabinola ne prelazi 0,2 %. Države članice obvezne su uvesti sustav za provjeru sadržaja tetrahidrokanabinola u usjevima konoplje.

Hrvatska nadležna tijela mogu stupiti u kontakt s nadležnim tijelima glavnih država članica proizvođača (Francuska, Ujedinjena Kraljevina i Nizozemska) kako bi se informirala o načinu provođenja odgovarajućeg zakonodavstva EU-a.

U pogledu plaćanja za poljoprivredne prakse korisne za klimu i okoliš (ekologizacija), najvažnije točke interesa u pogledu konoplje odnose se na obveze raznolikosti usjeva, s obzirom na to da se taj usjev može koristiti za ispunjavanje zahtjeva iz članka 44. Uredbe (EU) br. 1307/2013. ([1])

Komisija je istakla potencijal proizvoda dobivenih od bioloških sirovina u kontekstu napora za promicanje prelaska na zeleno gospodarstvo, uključujući u Planu za resursno učinkovitu Europu, Biogospodarstvenoj strategiji i Komunikaciji za Europsku industrijsku renesansu. U Komunikaciji se također obavješćuje o različitim djelatnostima ponude i potražnje, što će također zahtijevati primjenu kaskadnog ([2]) načela u upotrebi biomase.

([1]) SL L 347, 20.12.2013.

([2]) Za opis i tumačenje kaskadnog načela vidi: http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/pdf/201202_commision_staff_working.pdf — Radni dokument službi Komisije uz Komunikaciju Komisije o biogospodarskoj strategiji — vidi stranice 25. — 26., drugi stavak odjeljka 1.3.3.1. i http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A7-2013-0201+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN — Mišljenje Europskog parlamenta o Komunikaciji Komisije o biogospodarskoj strategiji — vidi točku 28.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002029/14
to the Commission
Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Cultivation of industrial hemp and its by-products

The European hemp industry depends in large part on the political and economic framework of the European Union.

Aspects of greening can make a significant contribution to the cultivation of hemp as an environmentally friendly crop. Additionally, more and more requirements must now be met to obtain certificates for all types of biomass. All of this should help to expand hemp production in the near future, given the increased demand for it in the construction, automotive and food industries.

As regards legality, hemp may be cultivated in the EU, provided that the types of crops meet particular EU rules regarding THC levels, i.e. these levels may not exceed 0.2%. Relevant provisions are laid down in Recitals 28 and 31, Article 32(6), Article 35(3) and Article 52(2) of Regulation No 1307/2013 establishing rules for direct payments to farmers, and in Article 189(1)(b) Regulation No 1308/2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products.

The current legal framework in Croatia allows farmers to produce industrial hemp, but the only by-product that they are allowed to produce is hempseed oil. Producers are forced to securely destroy the remainder of this highly valuable plant.

1. Could the Commission offer specific guidelines or recommendations that take account of best practices in the Member States, so that Croatia can direct its legislation towards achieving additional value through using industrial hemp by-products?

2. What would the Commission recommend in terms of European greening policy and the greening of industry? For instance, in spite of the increased demand and interest for hemp industry by-products such as hemp fibres throughout the EU, this trend has not yet had any positive effect.

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

Industrial hemp is cultivated in the EU on some 10 000 ha to 15 000 ha. Besides the oil that is obtained from hemp seeds, multiple new uses have been developed for its fibres and shives. The fibre is mainly used for cigarette paper, insulation material and bio-based composites, while the shives are mainly used for animal bedding and construction.

For the purpose of direct payments, only varieties which have tetrahydrocannabinol content not exceeding 0.2% are eligible. Member States are obliged to introduce a system to verify the tetrahydrocannabinol content of the hemp crops.

Croatian authorities can get in contact with the authorities of the main producer Member States (France, UK and the Netherlands) to be informed on how they implement the corresponding EU legislation.

Regarding the payment for agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment (greening), the most important points of interest regarding hemp are related to the obligations on crop diversification, as this crop can be used to fulfil the requirements set in Article 44 of Regulation (EU) No 1307/2013 ([1]).

The Commission has highlighted the potential of sustainable bio-based products in the context of efforts to promote the transition towards a green economy, including in the Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe, the Bioeconomy Strategy and the communication for a European Industrial Renaissance. The latter Communication also informs about the different supply and demand activities, which will also require the application of the cascade ([2]) principle in the use of biomass.

([1]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

([2]) For a description and interpretation of the cascading principle, see http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/pdf/201202_commision_staff_working.pdf — Commission Staff Working Paper that is accompanying the Commission's Communication on the Bioeconomy Strategy — see pages 25-26, 2nd paragraph in Section 1.3.3.1. and http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A7-2013-0201+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN — European Parliament Opinion on the Commission Communication on the Bioeconomy Strategy — see item 28.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002031/14
upućeno Komisiji
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(20. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Fondovi za financiranje vojnih brodogradilišta

Povjerenik Siim Kallas na konferenciji „Europsko more" u Solunu, kojoj je domaćin grčko predsjedništvo, izjavio je da je Europskoj uniji potreban brodarski sektor koji će biti konkurentan na međunarodnoj razini uz sigurnosnu zaštitu svjetske klase, te visoke društvene i gospodarske standarde. Isto tako, Europski parlament usvojio je izvješće o pomorskoj dimenziji zajedničke sigurnosne i obrambene politike kojom je tražio korištenje fondova EU-a za financiranje vojnih brodogradilišta. Namjerava li Komisija poduzeti konkretne korake u tom smjeru?

Odgovor g. Kallasa u ime Komisije
(9. travnja 2014.)

Komisija može jedino ponoviti riječi potpredsjednika Kallasa koje su iznesene u pitanju uvaženog zastupnika.

Što se tiče želje koju je Parlament izrazio u svojem izvješću spomenutom u istom pitanju, Komisija može jedino podsjetiti da su za pitanja iz područja Zajedničke sigurnosne i obrambene politike nadležne države članice koje se sastaju u Vijeću.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002031/14
to the Commission
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Funding for naval dockyards

Addressing the Greek Presidency's 'Sea of Europe' summit in Thessaloniki, Vice-President Siim Kallas said that the EU needs 'a top-quality shipping sector that can compete internationally, based on world-class safety records with high social and environmental standards'. Furthermore, Parliament has adopted a report on the maritime dimension of the Common Security and Defence Policy calling for EU funds to be used to finance naval dockyards. Does the Commission intend to take specific steps in that direction?

(Version française)

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

La Commission ne peut que répéter les propos du Vice-président Kallas tels que rapportés dans la question de l'Honorable parlementaire.

S'agissant du souhait exprimé par la Parlement dans son rapport cité dans la même question, la Commission ne peut que rappeler que les questions relatives au domaine de la Politique Commune de Sécurité et de Défense relèvent des compétences des États membres réunis au sein du Conseil.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002032/14
upućeno Komisiji
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(20. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Uštede uvođenjem standardnih javnih dokumenata

Prema podacima Eurostata više od 12 milijuna građana Europske unije u 2011. godini živjelo je izvan svojih država članica te su bili suočeni s brojnim birokratskim barijerama i zahtjevima ovjeravanja raznih dokumenata. Ako bi došlo do provedbe standardnih javnih dokumenata, zanima me kolike se uštede europskih građana očekuju uvođenjem standardnih javnih dokumenata u prvoj godini primjene?

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

Komisija je svjesna činjenice da su danas slobodni protok javnih isprava unutar EU-a, a time i sloboda kretanja građana i poslovnih subjekata, ometani skupim birokratskim preprekama. Prema procjeni Komisije godišnje se potroši 330 milijuna eura na ovjere (apostile) i ovjerene prijevode javnih isprava. Zbog toga je Komisija 24. travnja 2013. donijela prijedlog Uredbe koji sadržava mjere za pojednostavnjenje prihvaćanja određenih javnih isprava u EU-u ([1]).

Cilj je tog prijedloga ukinuti birokratske prepreke i troškove za građane i poslovne subjekte koji u državi članici podnose javnu ispravu izdanu u drugoj državi članici radi korištenja nekog prava ili ispunjavanja neke obveze. Time bi se osiguralo da se javne isprave obuhvaćene tim prijedlogom moraju prihvatiti kao vjerodostojne bez apostila. Prijedlogom se također želi pod određenim uvjetima ukinuti obvezu podnošenja ovjerenih kopija i ovjerenih prijevoda uz javne isprave izdane u drugoj državi članici. Prijedlogom se predviđa sustav suradnje među državama članicama u borbi protiv prijevara. Njime se također uvode višejezični standardni obrasci Unije za određene isprave o građanskom stanju te pravnom statusu i zastupanju poduzeća. Tim neobveznim obrascima, koji će biti dostupni na zahtjev, uklonit će se potreba za prijevodima čime će se građanima i poslovnim subjektima EU-a uštedjeti novac (Komisija je izračunala da troškovi prijevoda iznose oko 30 eura po stranici).

Predmet tog prijedloga je vjerodostojnost javnih isprava, ali ne i priznavanje njihovih učinaka. Pregovori o prijedlogu u Vijeću su u tijeku. Parlament je donio svoje izvješće u veljači uz izmjene prijedloga.

([1]) Dostupno na http://ec.europa.eu/justice/civil/files/com_2013_228_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002032/14
to the Commission
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Creating savings by introducing standardised public documents

According to data provided by Eurostat, more than 12 million EU citizens were living outside their home Member States in 2011. They faced multiple bureaucratic barriers and had to have a variety of documents verified. If public documents were to be standardised, how much could EU citizens expect to save in the first year of standardisation?

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

The Commission is aware that there are today costly bureaucratic barriers that hinder the free movement of public documents within the EU and thus the free movement of citizens and businesses. The Commission estimates that EUR 330 million are spent each year in authentication stamps (apostilles) and certified translations of public documents. This is why the Commission adopted on 24 April 2013 a proposal for a regulation containing simplification measures for the acceptance of certain public documents in the EU ([1]).

The proposal's objective is to abolish red tape and costs for citizens and businesses that present in a Member State a public document issued in another Member State to benefit from a right or comply with an obligation. It provides that these public documents falling within its scope must be accepted as authentic without the need for an apostille. The proposal also aims at exempting, under certain conditions, public documents issued in another Member State from certified copies and certified translations. The proposal provides for a system of cooperation between Member States to fight against fraud. It also introduces Union multilingual standard forms concerning certain civil status documents and the legal status and representation of a company. These optional forms, available on request, will eliminate translation requirements thereby saving EU citizens and businesses money (the Commission calculated that costs related to translations amount to around EUR 30 per page).

The proposal deals with the authenticity of public documents but not with the recognition of their effects. Negotiations on the proposal within the Council are ongoing. The Parliament adopted its report in February introducing some amendments to the proposal.

([1]) Available at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/civil/files/com_2013_228_en.pdf

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002033/14
upućeno Komisiji
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(20. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Zaštita potrošača i tržišta od prodaje informacija

Svjestan sam prioriteta digitalizacije Europe i važnosti digitalne agende u strategiji EU 2020. Također sam svjestan činjenice da postoje poduzeća koja prodaju i odaju informacije svojih potrošača. Radi se o tzv. pljački imenika. Takvi scenariji koče razvoj tržišta, njegovu povezanost i rezultiraju strahom i nezadovoljstvom potrošača. Možete li mi reći koje mjere konkretno Komisija poduzima po tom pitanju, te na koji način štiti potrošače i tržište?

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

Sukladno članku 6. Direktive 95/46/EZ ([1]) osobni podaci moraju biti obrađeni pošteno i zakonito. Moraju biti prikupljeni s točno utvrđenom, nedvosmislenom i zakonitom namjenom i ne dodatno obrađeni na način koji je nespojiv s tom namjenom.

Osobni podaci mogu se obrađivati samo na temelju jednog od razloga iz članka 7. Direktive.

Direktivom 95/46/EZ dodjeljuju se prava osobama čiji se podaci obrađuju. U skladu s člancima 10. i 11. te Direktive, nadzornici podataka moraju osobama čiji se podaci obrađuju dostaviti pojedine podatke u vezi s obradom njihovih osobnih podataka. U skladu s člankom 12. Direktive, osobe čiji se podaci obrađuju imaju pravo pristupa svojim osobnim podacima i mogu zatražiti ispravak, brisanje ili blokiranje tih podataka. Prema članku 14. točki (b) Direktive, osoba čiji se podaci obrađuju ima pravo da, na zahtjev i besplatno, prigovori obradi osobnih podataka koji se odnose na nju za koje nadzornik predviđa da će se obrađivati u svrhe izravne trgovine ([2]) ili da je se obavijesti prije nego li se osobni podaci otkriju po prvi puta trećim strankama ili koriste u njihovo ime u svrhe izravne trgovine te da dobije izričito pravo na besplatni prigovor na takvo otkrivanje ili uporabu.

Što se tiče zaštite potrošača, Direktivom 2005/29/EZ ([3]) sprječava se zavaravajuća i agresivna poslovna praksa trgovaca prema potrošačima poput ustrajnog i neželjenog nuđenja telefonom, e-poštom ili drugim sredstvom daljinske komunikacije, što je često cilj poduzeća koja pribavljaju takve podatke.

Ne dovodeći u pitanje nadležnost Europske komisije kao čuvarice ugovora, nadzor i provedba propisa o zaštiti podataka i zaštiti potrošača u nadležnosti su nacionalnih tijela.

([1]) Direktiva 95/46/EZ Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 24. listopada 1995. o zaštiti pojedinaca u vezi s obradom osobnih podataka i o slobodnom protoku takvih podataka, SL L 281, 23.11.1995., str. 31. — 50.
([2]) Osobe čiji se podaci obrađuju moraju biti upoznate s postojanjem tog prava.
([3]) Direktiva 2005/29/EZ Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 11. svibnja 2005. o nepoštenoj poslovnoj praksi poslovnog subjekta u odnosu prema potrošaču na unutarnjem tržištu i o izmjeni Direktive Vijeća 84/450/EEZ, direktiva 97/7/EZ, 98/27/EZ i 2002/65/EZ Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća, kao i Uredbe (EZ) br. 2006/2004 Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća, SL L 149, 11.6.2005., str. 22.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002033/14
to the Commission
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Protecting consumers and the market from information-selling

I am aware that digitising Europe is a priority and that the Digital Agenda is central to the Europe 2020 strategy. I am equally aware that there are firms which sell and disclose information about their consumers, resorting to 'directory scams'. Scenarios of this kind impede the development of the market and undermine its cohesion, and lead to anxiety and frustration for consumers. What steps is the Commission taking in this matter at the practical level and how is it protecting consumers and the market?

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

Under Article 6 of Directive 95/46/EC ([1]) personal data must be processed fairly and lawfully. It must be collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and not further processed in a way incompatible with those purposes.

Personal data may be processed only if based on one of the grounds set out in Article 7 of the directive.

Directive 95/46/EC confers rights on the data subjects. In accordance with Articles 10 and 11 of that directive data controllers need to provide data subjects with various items of information relating to the processing of their personal data. Pursuant to Article 12 of the directive data subjects have the right of access to their personal data and can request these data to be rectified, erased or blocked. Under Article 14(b) of the directive data subjects have the right to object, on request and free of charge, to the processing of personal data relating to them which the controller anticipates being processed for the purposes of direct marketing ([2]), or to be informed before personal data are disclosed for the first time to third parties or used on their behalf for the purposes of direct marketing, and to be expressly offered the right to object free of charge to such disclosures or uses.

As far as consumer protection is concerned, Directive 2005/29/EC ([3]) prevents traders from engaging in misleading and aggressive commercial practices towards consumers, such as making persistent and unwanted solicitations by telephone, e-mail or other remote media, which is often the aim of companies that acquire such data.

Without prejudice to the competence of the European Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection and consumer legislation falls within the competence of national authorities.

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31-50 .

([2]) Data subjects need to be made aware of the existence of that right.

([3]) Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002034/14
upućeno Komisiji
Zdravka Bušić (PPE), Ivana Maletić (PPE), Andrej Plenković (PPE), Davor Ivo Stier (PPE) i Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(20. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Hrvatski jezik na konferencijama za medije EK-a

Hrvatska je postala punopravna članica Europske unije 1. srpnja 2013., a hrvatski jezik 24. službeni jezik EU-a. Nakon više od 7 mjeseci članstva u EU-u još uvijek nije dostupan prijevod konferencija za medije na hrvatski jezik nakon sastanaka Kolegija Komisije. Novinari iz ostalih država članica Unije imaju simultane prijevode tijekom navedenih konferencija te mogu postavljati pitanja povjerenicima Komisije na svojim materinjim jezicima. To pravo uskraćeno je hrvatskim novinarima.

Može li Komisija objasniti zašto do sada nije uvela te kada planira uvesti prijevod na hrvatski jezik tijekom konferencija za medije Komisije?

Odgovor gđe Reding u ime Komisije
(25. ožujka 2014.)

SCIC je od srpnja 2013. tijekom konferencija za tisak koje se održavaju srijedom nakon sastanka Kolegija povjerenika osigurao usmeno prevođenje s hrvatskog i na hrvatski na 8 od ukupno 24 takve konferencije za tisak organizirane u dvorani za tiskovne konferencije u zgradi Berlaymont. Zbog fizičkih ograničenja zgrade i broja dostupnih kabina za usmeno prevođenje, tijekom tih konferencija za tisak nije moguće osigurati usmeno prevođenje na sve jezike i sa svih jezika. Na jednoj konferenciji za tisak moguće je osigurati usmeno prevođenje za najviše 21 jezik, koji se određuje neformalnom rotacijom utemeljenom dijelom na dostupnosti usmenih prevoditelja, a dijelom na ostalim prioritetnim zahtjevima tog dana. Međutim, kada konferenciju za tisak održava hrvatski povjerenik ili je riječ o temi koja bi mogla osobito zanimati hrvatsku publiku, prednost se daje dvorani za tisak.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002034/14
to the Commission
Zdravka Bušić (PPE), Ivana Maletić (PPE), Andrej Plenković (PPE), Davor Ivo Stier (PPE) and Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Use of Croatian language at Commission press conferences

Croatia became a fully-fledged EU Member State on 1 July 2013, with Croatian becoming the EU's 24th official language. More than seven months after Croatia's EU accession, Croatian interpretation is still not available at the press conferences held after the meetings of the College of Commissioners. Journalists from the other Member States can benefit from simultaneous interpreting at these press conferences and put questions to the Commissioners in their native languages. However, this right is being denied to Croatian journalists.

Can the Commission explain why it has not yet introduced Croatian-language interpretation at its press conferences?

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

Since July 2013 SCIC has provided interpretation into and out of Croatian on 8 occasions in the Wednesday press conferences following the meeting of the College of Commissioners, out of a total of 24 such press conferences organised in the press room of the Berlaymont building. Due to the physical constraints of the building and the available number of interpretation booths, it is not possible to provide interpretation into and out of all languages at these press conferences. A maximum of 21 languages can be interpreted at one press conference, and so an informal rotation is therefore applied based in part on the availability of interpreters and other priority requests on the same day. If however, on a particular day, the Croatian Commissioner gives a press conference or there is a topic likely to be of particular interest to a Croatian audience, priority is given to the press room.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002038/14
à la Commission
Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE)
(20 février 2014)

Objet: Suspension des relations de l'Union européenne avec la Suisse sur les programmes «recherche» et «Erasmus»

Ce dimanche 9 février 2014, la Confédération suisse a adopté, par référendum, la fin de l'immigration de masse en décidant que la Suisse «gère de manière autonome l'immigration des étrangers» et que des «plafonds et contingents annuels» devront déterminer le nombre des autorisations à délivrer en fonction «des intérêts économiques globaux de la Suisse et dans le respect du principe de préférence nationale».

À la suite de l'adoption de ce texte, la Commission a réagi par l'intermédiaire de son président, José-Manuel Barroso, et un porte-parole de la Commission aurait déclaré que l'Union européenne suspendait les négociations en cours sur la participation de la Suisse aux programmes de recherche «Horizon 2020» et «Erasmus» du fait de ce vote.

En qualité de parlementaire européen, je suis surpris d'une telle précipitation dans les annonces.

De son côté la Confédération suisse considère qu'elle n'est pas en mesure de signer, dans sa forme actuelle, un projet d'accord bilatéral étendant le libre accès au marché du travail suisse dont bénéficient les citoyens de l'UE aux ressortissants de la République de Croatie qui vient, récemment, de rejoindre l'Union européenne.

C'est dans ce contexte que le député soussigné a l'honneur de demander à qui de droit au sein de la Commission européenne sur quelle base juridique la Commission, s'exprimant au nom de l'Union, peut suspendre l'exécution d'une politique communautaire en fonction d'une décision souveraine et démocratique d'un État tiers, la Suisse, avec lequel elle a des relations étroites?

De plus quelle est l'opinion de la Commission sur la capacité du gouvernement de la Confédération suisse quant à la non-acceptation, en l'état, des textes permettant le libre accès au marché du travail suisse par les citoyens d'un nouvel État membre de l'UE (la Croatie) et qui devraient faire partie de l'acquis communautaire prévu dans le traité d'adhésion à l'UE?

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

La Commission européenne respecte pleinement la tradition suisse de démocratie directe. Cela étant, elle ne saurait fermer les yeux sur la discrimination dont fait l'objet l'un de ses États membres. Le gouvernement suisse a indiqué qu'il n'était pas en mesure de signer et de conclure le protocole étendant à la Croatie l'accord entre l'UE et la Suisse relatif à la libre circulation des personnes et de garantir celle-ci aux citoyens croates. Le Conseil a subordonné la conclusion des négociations sur l'association et la participation de la Suisse aux programmes Horizon 2020 et Erasmus+ à la conclusion de ce protocole. Par conséquent, la Commission européenne a suspendu les négociations concernant ces accords jusqu'à ce que la Suisse signe le protocole.

Pour ce qui est de la deuxième question de l'Honorable Parlementaire, il convient de relever que la Suisse ne fait pas partie de l'Union européenne et qu'elle est libre, en tant que pays souverain, de décider quelles obligations internationales elle souhaite contracter ou réviser et celles auxquelles elle souhaite mettre fin. Ces décisions ont toutefois des conséquences sur sa participation au marché intérieur et, plus généralement, sur les relations entre l'UE et la Suisse, comme cela a été le cas pour le protocole.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002038/14
to the Commission
Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Suspension of talks on Swiss participation in Erasmus and Horizon 2020

On Sunday, 9 February 2014, voters in Switzerland approved by means of a referendum a proposal to end mass immigration into their country. The migration of foreign nationals to Switzerland will now be independently regulated by the Swiss Government through the introduction of annual ceilings and quotas, imposed in accordance with the country's overall economic interests and on the basis of national preference.

The President of the Commission, José Manuel Barroso, criticised this decision, and a spokesperson for the Commission warned that the EU would suspend ongoing negotiations on Switzerland's participation in the EU research and education programmes Horizon 2020 and Erasmus.

As an MEP, I was taken aback by this hasty reaction.

The Swiss Confederation believes that it is not in a position to sign the current draft bilateral agreement extending free access to the Swiss labour market, which is currently enjoyed by EU citizens, to the nationals of the EU's newest Member State, Croatia.

What legal basis can the Commission, acting on behalf of the Union, invoke to suspend the implementation of a Community policy in response to a sovereign and democratic decision taken by a third country which maintains close ties with the EU?

Does the Commission believe that Switzerland has the right to reject agreements which grant free access to the Swiss labour market for citizens of a new EU Member State (Croatia) and which in fact form part of the *acquis communautaire* set out in that country's accession treaty?

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

The European Commission fully respects the Swiss tradition of direct democracy. It can however, not overlook the discrimination against one of its Member States. The Swiss government has indicated not to be in a position to sign and conclude the protocol extending the EU-Swiss agreement on the free movement of persons to Croatia and to guarantee the benefit of free movement to Switzerland to Croatian citizens. The Council made the conclusion of negotiations on Swiss association and participation in Horizon 2020 and Erasmus+ dependent on the conclusion of this protocol. The European Commission has consequently put negotiations of these agreements on hold until Switzerland signs the the Protocol.

As to the Honourable Member's second question, Switzerland is not part of the European Union and as a sovereign country it is free to decide on the international obligations it wishes to enter into, to revise or to terminate. These decisions, however have consequences for its participation into the internal market and more generally for EU-Swiss relations, as has been the case for the protocol.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002039/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Truffe connesse alla somministrazione di cellule staminali fuori dall'Unione europea

Alcuni importanti medici italiani hanno lanciato l'allarme relativo alla pratica, riscontrata in diversi paesi extraeuropei, di effettuare cure a base di cellule staminali al di fuori di corrette procedure mediche e in base a false informazioni. Si tratterebbe di vere e proprie truffe, spesso organizzate con l'appoggio della criminalità organizzata, aventi come obiettivo principale quello di indurre persone affette da gravi malattie a intraprendere i cosiddetti «viaggi della speranza», al fine di ottenere un beneficio economico. Molti cittadini europei, spinti dal desiderio di trovare una cura efficace, si recano in paesi terzi dove sono soggetti a pratiche mediche che si rivelano essere inutili e, in molti casi, addirittura dannose.

Premesso ciò, si chiede alla Commissione se:

1. è a conoscenza di questo genere «di viaggi della speranza», che hanno come oggetto la somministrazione di cellule staminali?

2. È in grado di stilare una lista di paesi esterni all'Unione europea in cui sono state riscontrate pratiche mediche prive degli standard minimi di sicurezza e efficacia?

3. Intende proporre alle autorità competenti degli Stati membri una campagna informativa volta a scoraggiare i cittadini europei dall'intraprendere questo genere di viaggi?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente della periodica presenza, in una serie di riviste mediche, di relazioni su tali pratiche che hanno luogo in paesi terzi. La legislazione dell'UE su tessuti e cellule ([1]) stabilisce un quadro europeo in materia di qualità e sicurezza relativo a sostanze, cellule staminali incluse, che siano destinate all'impiego in esseri umani. Questa legislazione si applica anche ad importazioni ed esportazioni da e per paesi terzi. Il mandato dell'UE in questo campo non comprende tuttavia la facoltà di disciplinare la mobilità dei pazienti al di fuori dell'UE, né la Commissione si trova nella posizione di poter giudicare se le prestazioni mediche in paesi terzi soddisfino le condizioni necessarie a garantire il livello minimo di sicurezza ed efficacia.

Nel caso in cui le autorità competenti degli Stati membri esprimessero particolari preoccupazioni riguardo a tali pratiche e desiderassero condividerle con la Commissione o altri Stati membri, la Commissione raccomanda di consultare il gruppo di esperti «Competent Authorities on Substances of Human Origin Expert Group», che rappresenta una sede adatta per discutere tali argomenti come pure possibili misure preventive, quali campagne informative che dissuadano dall'intraprendere tali viaggi.

([1]) Direttiva 2004/23/CE (GU L 102 del 7.4.2004, pag. 48) e la relativa legislazione di attuazione: direttive della Commissione 2006/17/CE (GU L 38 dell'8.2.2006, pag. 40) e 2006/86/CE (GU L 294 del 24.10.2006, pag. 32).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002039/14
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Fraud in connection with stem-cell treatments provided outside the European Union

Some leading Italian doctors have raised the alarm about a practice, brought to light in various non-European countries, of providing stem cell-based treatments which do not follow proper medical procedures and are based on false information. This is actually fraud, and it is often committed with the support of organised crime groups. The main aim is to fleece seriously-ill patients by duping them into embarking on what are called 'journeys of hope'. Many EU citizens, prompted by the desire to find an effective remedy for their illnesses, travel to third countries, where they undergo medical procedures which prove useless, not to say harmful in many cases.

1. Does the Commission know about these 'journeys of hope' to undergo stem-cell treatment?

2. Can it draw up a list of countries outside the European Union in which medical practices have been found not to meet minimum standards of safety and effectiveness?

3. Does it plan to suggest to the competent authorities of the Member States that they organise an information campaign to discourage EU citizens from embarking on journeys of this type?

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

The Commission is aware of the periodic reporting in a number of medical journals of such practices taking place in third countries. EU tissue and cell legislation ([1]) sets out an EU quality and safety framework for such substances, including stem cells, which are intended for human application. This legislation also applies to imports coming from and exports going to third countries. The EU's mandate in this field does not, however, extend to the regulation of patient movements outside of the EU nor is the Commission in a position to assess whether medical practices in third countries meet minimum standards of safety and efficacy.

Should Member State authorities have particular concerns over such practices and wish to share these with the Commission or other Member States then the Commission would recommend the use of the Expert Group 'Competent Authorities on Substances of Human Origin' as an appropriate forum for discussion of the issue and potential preventive measures such as information campaigns discouraging such journeys.

([1]) Directive 2004/23/EC (OJ L 102, 7.4.2004. p. 48) and its implementing legislation: Commission Directives 2006/17/EC (OJ L 38, 8.2.2006. p. 40) and 2006/86/EC (OJ L 294, 24.10.2006. p.32).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002040/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Ripetute stragi di cristiani in Nigeria e contrasto al gruppo terroristico Boko Haram

In Nigeria è in corso una gravissima persecuzione ai danni dei cittadini di religione cristiana che continua a mietere centinaia di morti. I numerosi omicidi a sfondo religioso sono stati compiuti prevalentemente da un gruppo terroristico d'ispirazione islamica, noto con il nome di Boko Haram, setta affiliata ad Al Qaeda. L'ultimo episodio violento è accorso domenica 16 febbraio e ha visto cadere sotto i colpi di un feroce attacco ben 90 nigeriani di religione cristiana. Siamo di fronte a una delle persecuzioni religiose più drammatiche in atto nel XXI secolo, che non può lasciare inerti le istituzioni europee.

Premesso ciò, si chiede all'Alto Rappresentante per la politica estera e di sicurezza dell'Unione europea se:

— l'Unione europea è intenzionata a supportare il governo nigeriano nel contrasto al gruppo terroristico Boko Haram; in caso di risposta affermativa, è in grado di illustrare con quali modalità operative?

— Vista la situazione di pericolo in cui versano centinaia di migliaia di cristiani nel mondo, intende proporre agli Stati membri dell'UE un'azione coordinata al fine di tutelare la sicurezza dei cristiani nel mondo?

— Al di là della situazione nigeriana, intende l'Unione europea adottare particolari provvedimenti nei confronti di quei governi che non tutelano pienamente la libertà di culto e la sicurezza delle minoranze religiose al proprio interno, e beneficiano di aiuti alla cooperazione o altro genere di finanziamenti, provenienti dal bilancio dell'UE?

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

Le ripetute violenze nella Nigeria nord-orientale destano grande preoccupazione. Il 17 febbraio il portavoce dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha condannato gli attacchi a cui si riferisce l'onorevole depurato.

L'UE collabora con le autorità nigeriane per contribuire ad arginare la spirale di violenza attraverso un dialogo politico costante e aiuti mirati volti ad eliminare le cause profonde della violenza, che in Nigeria non sono di carattere religioso.

Il 10° FES sostiene un'ampia gamma di interventi a livello di democratizzazione, Stato di diritto, risorse idriche, impianti igienico-sanitari e salute materna. Lo strumento inteso a contribuire alla stabilità e alla pace (IcSP) finanzia diversi programmi di pacificazione e mediazione nonché progetti volti a riformare la giustizia penale e a potenziare l'ufficio del consulente nazionale per la sicurezza. Lo strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani finanzia azioni a tutela dei diritti umani, in particolare con le ONG.

Gli interventi dell'UE si basano su un'analisi estremamente accurata della situazione nel paese e sugli orientamenti dell'Unione in materia di diritti umani, compresi quelli sulla promozione e sulla protezione della libertà di religione o di credo. Gli attacchi terroristici in Nigeria colpiscono sia cristiani che musulmani e sono perpetrati da un amalgama di gruppi terroristici spinti da motivazioni diverse, che mirano a destabilizzare con qualsiasi mezzo lo Stato nigeriano, anche accentuando le differenze, ivi comprese quelle religiose (che negli ultimi anni non sono state un problema nel paese). È di fondamentale importanza evitare interventi che possano esacerbare le tensioni fra le diverse comunità.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002040/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — repeated massacres of Christians in Nigeria and action against the Boko Haram terrorist group

In Nigeria an extremely serious persecution is under way against citizens who are Christians. The deaths continue, in their hundreds. These numerous murders with a religious background have mostly been the work of a terrorist group inspired by Islam. Known as Boko Haram, it is a sect affiliated to Al-Qaeda. The last violent incident took place on Sunday 16 February. At least ninety Nigerian Christians were killed in this vicious attack. We are witnessing one of the most dramatic religious persecutions of the 21st century, and the European institutions cannot stand idly by.

Now, therefore, the following questions are referred to the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy:

— Does the European Union intend to back the Nigerian Government against the Boko Haram terrorist group? If so, can it describe what the operational arrangements will be?

— In view of the danger faced by hundreds of thousands of Christians worldwide, does it intend to propose to the EU Member States that coordinated action be taken to protect the security of Christians in the world?

— Apart from the Nigerian situation, does the European Union intend to adopt specific measures with regard to governments which do not fully protect freedom of worship and the security of the religious minorities in their countries, but which are in receipt of EU-funded cooperation aid or other forms of finance?

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

The continued violence in the North East of Nigeria is of great concern. The Spokesperson of the High Representative/Vice-President condemned the attacks referred to by the Honourable Member of Parliament on 17 February.

The EU is working with the Nigerian authorities to help bring an end to the cycle of violence through continuous political dialogue and targeted aid interventions focusing on the underlying root causes for violence, which are not religious in Nigeria.

The 10th EDF is supporting a broad range of actions in the field of democratisation, rule of law, water, sanitation and maternal health. The IcSP (Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace) is supporting several peace and mediation programmes and projects to reform criminal justice and strengthen the Office of the National Security Advisor. The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights funds actions to protect human rights, particularly with NGOs.

The EU is guided in its actions by a very careful case by case analysis of the situation in the country and by its human rights guidelines, including those on the promotion and protection of freedom of religion or belief. In Nigeria the terrorist attacks target both Christians and Muslims. They are perpetrated by an amalgam of variously motivated terrorist groups seeking to destabilise the State of Nigeria by all means, especially by seeking to widen all differences, including religious (which in recent years have not been a problem in Nigeria). It is important to avoid actions which may exacerbate inter-communal tensions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002041/14
alla Commissione
Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Fabrizio Bertot (PPE) e Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Incompatibilità tra l'articolo 177, comma 2, del TUIR e la direttiva «Fusioni» — ipotesi di discriminazione «a rovescio»

La direttiva «Fusioni» (direttiva 90/434/CE, ormai direttiva 2009/133/CE) detta le regole per la neutralità fiscale in tutta l'UE per tutti gli atti di riorganizzazione societaria. Il recepimento di tale direttiva è stato realizzato nell'ordinamento italiano attraverso il D. Lgs n. 544 del 1992, che detta le regole delle operazioni attuate tra soggetti residenti in Italia e soggetti residenti negli altri Stati membri. Sulla base della direttiva 90/434/CE, il Governo italiano ha anche emanato il D. Lgs. n. 358/97, che riconosce nel nostro ordinamento i principi comunitari di neutralità fiscale e di libera concorrenza e dà attuazione all'armonizzazione del regime tributario delle operazioni di scambio di partecipazioni previsto dal D. Lgs n. 544/92, permettendo così di affermare che l'esecuzione di tali operazioni nell'ambito della neutralità fiscale trovi la propria fonte giuridica anche nell'ordinamento comunitario. L'articolo 177, comma 2, del TUIR (D.P.R. 917/86 e successive modifiche), che trae la propria origine dall'articolo 5 del D. Lgs n. 385/97 e disciplina lo scambio delle partecipazioni mediante conferimento, prevede però che la possibilità di beneficiare del regime di neutralità sia subordinata al trattamento contabile seguito dalla società conferitaria, negando in questo modo il suddetto regime. Gli articoli 178 e 179 del TUIR, che regolano le operazioni di scambio intracomunitario, prevedono invece che tali operazioni, in costanza di valori fiscali dei beni coinvolti, non determinino mai l'emersione di materia imponibile indipendentemente dalle scelte contabili adottate dagli operatori.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Può valutare l'ipotesi discriminatoria che una siffatta situazione sembrerebbe creare dando luogo, per i soggetti interni, ad un trattamento meno vantaggioso di quello previsto per i transnazionali?

2. Può valutare se la predetta disarmonia tra la disciplina interna e quella di fonte comunitaria non possa realizzare una situazione di restrizione alla libertà di stabilimento e una limitazione della libera concorrenza, dissuadendo operatori di altri Stati membri dall'esercitare lo stabilimento in Italia al fine di non soggiacere alla più gravosa disciplina prevista dall'articolo 177, comma 2, del TUIR?

3. Ciò verificato, ritiene di intervenire per porre rimedio all'incompatibilità con i principi disposti dalla direttiva 90/434/CE e sostanziata nell'impossibilità di realizzare operazioni di riorganizzazione interna beneficiando del principio cardine di neutralità fiscale, sancito dalla direttiva «Fusioni»?

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

La Commissione ha già avuto modo di esaminare la questione se la disposizione di cui all'articolo 177, paragrafo 2, del testo unico delle imposte sui redditi ([1]) costituisca una discriminazione contraria al diritto dell'UE in quanto applica agli scambi di partecipazioni in ambito nazionale un trattamento fiscale che sarebbe meno vantaggioso rispetto al regime previsto dagli articoli 178 e 179 del TUIR per simili operazioni transfrontaliere.

1. La Commissione osserva che valutare la compatibilità con le norme UE (direttiva 90/434/CE) delle disposizioni in materia di imposizione diretta applicabili unicamente alle operazioni nazionali non rientra nella sua competenza, in quanto queste non comportano elementi transfrontalieri. In ogni caso, la Commissione è del parere che il requisito di mantenere una corrispondenza tra il valore fiscale delle partecipazioni trasferite per il cedente e per il cessionario non costituisca una norma che esclude la neutralità fiscale delle operazioni, lasciando nel contempo agli operatori interessati la libertà di decidere quale valore fiscale attribuire alle partecipazioni trasferite.

2. Gli Stati membri sono liberi di elaborare i propri regimi di imposizione diretta in funzione delle loro scelte politiche, tuttavia, nella misura in cui comportano elementi transfrontalieri, tali regimi devono essere conformi alla normativa dell'UE. La Commissione non vede in che modo i diversi regimi in questione applicati a operazioni nazionali potrebbero limitare la libertà di stabilimento o introdurre una discriminazione ai danni delle società straniere stabilite in Italia, in quanto i principi stabiliti dalla direttiva 90/434/CE non sono pertinenti per quanto riguarda operazioni puramente nazionali.

3. Poiché non esiste una violazione dei principi stabiliti nella direttiva 90/434/CE, la Commissione non intende intraprendere alcuna misura per porre rimedio alla presunta incompatibilità.

([1]) DPR 917/86 e successive modifiche.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002041/14
to the Commission
Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Fabrizio Bertot (PPE) and Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Incompatibility between Article 177 (2) of the Italian Consolidated Tax Act and the 'Mergers' Directive — possibility of 'reverse' discrimination

The 'Mergers' Directive (Directive 90/434/EC, now Directive 2009/133/EC) imposes rules on fiscal neutrality throughout the EU for acts of corporate reorganisation. This directive was transposed to the Italian judicial system in Legislative Decree no 544 of 1992, which lays down rules for transactions between persons resident in Italy and persons resident in other Member States. In line with Directive 90/434/EC, the Italian Government also pronounced Legislative Decree no 358/97, which recognises the Community principles of fiscal neutrality and freedom of competition in our system and harmonises the tax system for operations involving the exchange of holdings, as provided for under Legislative Decree no 544/92, in so doing demonstrating that the performance of such operations within the scope of fiscal neutrality derives in juridical terms from the Community system. However, Article 177 (2) of the Italian Consolidated Tax Act (Presidential Decree 917/86, as amended), which derives from Article 5 of Legislative Decree no 385/97 and regulates the exchange of holdings by transfer, renders eligibility for the neutrality system dependant on the accounting treatment adopted by the transferring company, thereby negating the neutrality system. Articles 178 and 179 of the Italian Consolidated Tax Act, which regulate intra-Community trade operations, instead provide that, on the assumption of constant tax values of the assets involved, such operations will not give rise to tax liability, irrespective of the accounting decisions made by the operators concerned.

In the light of the above, the Commission is asked the following questions:

1. Can the Commission evaluate the possibility of discrimination which this system generates by imposing a treatment on nationals which is less advantageous than that accorded to persons operating transnationally?

2. Can the Commission evaluate whether the lack of harmonisation between internal regulations and Community regulations, as described above, is liable to restrict freedom of establishment and freedom of competition by dissuading operators from other Member States from setting up business in Italy to avoid the more onerous regulations imposed under Article 177 (2) of the Italian Consolidated Tax Act?

3. Subject to the above, does the Commission envisage measures to remedy this incompatibility with the principles laid down in Directive 90/434/EC, a situation which excludes internal reorganisation operations from eligibility for the fundamental principle of fiscal neutrality sanctioned in the 'Mergers' Directive?

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

The Commission has already had the opportunity to analyse the issue of whether it would constitute discrimination contrary to EC law that the Italian provisions (Article 177 (2) of the Italian Consolidated Tax Act ([1])) apply a tax treatment on domestic transfers of holdings which would be less advantageous than the regime accorded by Articles 178 and 179 of the ICTA to similar cross-border operations.

1. The Commission notes that the assessment of compatibility with the EU rules (Directive 90/434/EC) of direct tax provisions applicable only to domestic transactions do not fall within its competence, as no cross-border elements are involved. In any event, the Commission is of the opinion that the condition of maintaining a correspondence between the tax-value of the holdings transferred for the transferring and the transferee does not amount to a rule excluding the tax neutrality of the operations while leaving to the operators involved the free choice to decide which tax value to give to the transferred holdings.

2. Member States are free to design their direct tax regimes according to their political choices, however -in so far as they involve cross-border elements — these regimes must comply with EC law. The Commission does not see how the different regimes in question as applied to domestic operations could restrict the freedom of establishment or introduce a discrimination against foreign companies established in Italy, the principles laid down in Directive 90/434/EC not being relevant in relation to purely domestic operations.

3. As there is no violation of the principles laid down in Directive 90/434/EC the Commission does not envisage taking any measure to remedy the alleged incompatibility.

([1]) Presidential Decree 917/86, as amended.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002042/14
till kommissionen
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(20 februari 2014)

Angående: Sveriges förändrade referensvärde för kungsörn

I den rovdjursproposition ([1]) som den svenska regeringen lagt fram och som nyligen godkändes av den svenska riksdagen slår Sverige fast att gynnsam bevarandestatus för kungsörn (Aquila chrysaetos) är uppnådd. Därutöver ändras även referensnivån för gynnsam bevarandestatus.

Förändringen medför en radikal minskning där referensvärdet fastställs till 150 lyckade häckningar per år, mot tidigare fastlagda 600 årliga häckningar. Riksdagen har slagit fast att kungsörnens hävdbetingade utbredning i Sverige är hela landet. Regeringen hävdar även att kungsörnen har utbredning över hela landet, något som det inte finns vetenskapliga belägg för (utbredningen uppgår till ca 40 % av Sverige). Sakkunniga organisationer som exempelvis Kungsörn Sverige (ansvariga för den nationella övervakningen av kungsörn) och Världsnaturfonden är mycket kritiska och menar att Sveriges nya lagstiftning på sikt öppnar upp för jakt på kungsörn ([2]) samt förhindrar att kungsörnen uppnår gynnsam bevarandestatus.

Anser kommissionen, exempelvis med beaktande av artikel 2 i fågeldirektivet, att Sveriges radikala förändring av referensvärdet för gynnsam bevarandestatus för kungsörn är förenligt med EU:s regler och ambitioner på detta område?

Anser kommissionen att Sveriges utpekande av utbredningsområdet för kungsörn, som saknar vetenskapliga belägg, är förenligt med EU:s regler och ambitioner på detta område?

Avser kommissionen vidta några åtgärder mot bakgrund av Sveriges dramatiska minskning av referensvärdet för gynnsam bevarandestatus för kungsörn samt gällande hur utbredningsområdet fastställts?

Svar från Janez Potočnik på kommissionens vägnar
(28 mars 2014)

Kommissionen var inte medveten om den svenska regeringens avsikt att ändra referensnivån för gynnsam bevarandestatus för kungsörn, utan känner endast till de referensvärden som anges i den senaste genomföranderapporten enligt artikel 12 i fågeldirektivet ([3]), som lämnades in i slutet av 2013. Kommissionen kommer att be de svenska myndigheterna om mer information om dessa ändringar.

([1]) http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/16553/a/223451.
([2]) http://www.wwf.se/press/pressrum/pressmeddelanden/1546162-rovdjurspropositionen-kan-rasera-skyddet-fr-hotade-arter-inom-eu.
([3]) Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 2009/147/EG av den 30 november 2009 om bevarande av vilda fåglar (kodifierad version).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002042/14
to the Commission
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Change in Sweden's reference value for golden eagles

A Swedish Government proposal ([1]) on predators recently adopted by the Swedish Parliament states that favourable conservation status for the golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*) has been achieved in Sweden. The reference value for favourable conservation status has also been changed.

As a result of this change, the reference value has been reduced significantly: it is now set at 150 successful breeding pairs per year, compared with the previous figure of 600 per year. The Swedish Parliament has laid down that the customary distribution area of the golden eagle in Sweden is the entire country. The government also claims that the golden eagle can be found throughout the country, but there is no scientific evidence to support this (they can actually be found across some 40% of Sweden's surface area). Expert organisations including *Kungsörn Sverige* (the body that monitors golden eagles in Sweden) and WWF have been very critical and take the view that Sweden's new legislation will, in the long term, pave the way for golden eagles to be hunted ([2]) and prevent favourable conservation status being attained for the species.

Does the Commission take the view, bearing in mind for example Article 2 of the Birds Directive, that the Swedish Government's radical change to the favourable conservation status reference value for the golden eagle is in line with the EU's rules and ambitions in this area?

Does the Commission take the view that Sweden's designation of the golden eagle's distribution area, which is not backed up by scientific evidence, is in line with the EU's rules and ambitions in this area?

Is the Commission intending to take action in response to the fact that Sweden has so drastically cut the favourable conservation status reference value for the golden eagle? And is the Commission intending to address the issue of how the distribution area is established?

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

The Commission was not aware of the intentions of the Swedish Government to change the reference values defining favourable conservation status of the Golden Eagle and only received information on the values indicated in the latest implementation report pursuant to Art.12 of the Birds Directive ([3]), submitted at the end of 2013. The Commission will ask the Swedish authorities for more information on these changes.

([1]) http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/16553/a/223451
([2]) http://www.wwf.se/press/pressrum/pressmeddelanden/1546162-rovdjurspropositionen-kan-rasera-skyddet-fr-hotade-arter-inom-eu
([3]) Council Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds (codified version).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002045/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wezwanie Komisji do walki z radykalizacją nastrojów w Unii Europejskiej

Komisja Europejska wezwała państwa Unii Europejskiej do skuteczniejszego zwalczania radykalizmu w Europie. Komisja uważa, że w Unii Europejskiej istnieje coraz większe zagrożenie ze strony ekstremistów – są to zorganizowane grupy, jak i pojedyncze osoby, przykładem może być tutaj Breivik. Stanowią zagrożenie też bojownicy z Unii, którzy walczą na przykład w Syrii i później wracają do Europy.

Wśród propozycji Komisji jest między innymi utworzenie europejskiego centrum wiedzy o brutalnym ekstremizmie. Ma to na celu pomóc władzom krajowym i lokalnym koordynować działania w lepszy sposób i ułatwić dostęp do ekspertów. Przeznaczono na ten cel 20 mln EUR.

Ponadto Komisja Europejska zachęca państwa Unii Europejskiej do opracowania narodowych strategii, uwzględniających współpracę z organizacjami pozarządowymi oraz ściślejszą współpracę policji ze społecznościami lokalnymi. Unijna strategia przewiduje też między innymi szkolenia aktywistów oraz działania pozwalające na efektywniejszą walkę z ekstremizmem w Internecie.

1. Czy Komisja może podać więcej szczegółów na temat europejskiego centrum wiedzy o brutalnym ekstremizmie?

2. W jaki sposób będzie funkcjonować takie centrum, jacy eksperci będą w nim zasiadali i kto będzie je nadzorował?

3. Czy Komisja mogłaby dokładnie sprecyzować, na czym polegać ma skuteczniejsza walka z ekstremizmem w Internecie?

4. Czy walka z ekstremizmem w sieci nie odbije się negatywnie na wolności słowa i ochronie danych osobowych w sieci?

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

W odniesieniu do pytań 1 i 2 Szanownego Pana Posła Komisja obecnie zastanawia się nad szczegółowymi warunkami dotyczącymi planowanego centrum wiedzy. Niemniej jednak, poza głównymi zadaniami przedstawionymi w komunikacie „Zapobieganie radykalizacji postaw prowadzącej do terroryzmu i brutalnego ekstremizmu: Wzmocnienie reakcji UE” ([1]), centrum powstanie w oparciu o obecną pomoc techniczną i strukturę wsparcia sieci upowszechniania wiedzy o radykalizacji postaw („Sekretariat RAN”) oraz zwiększy swoje wsparcie udzielane sieci ([2]).

W odniesieniu do pytań 3 i 4, sprawozdanie Europolu dotyczące sytuacji i tendencji w dziedzinie terroryzmu w UE z 2013 r. ([3]) stanowi, że Internet pozostaje podstawowym narzędziem komunikacyjnym terrorystów i ich zwolenników. Ponadto rozwój mediów społecznościowych stworzył nowe możliwości grupom terrorystycznym, które mogą w łatwy sposób kontaktować się ze swoimi zwolennikami i pozyskiwać nowych członków. Oprócz rozpowszechniania materiałów propagandowych, Internet może być również wykorzystywany do rozpowszechniania informacji instruktażowych.

Aby zmierzyć się z tymi wyzwaniami, dostępne są dwa warianty: działania koncentrujące się na zmniejszaniu dostępu (tj. usuwaniu nielegalnych treści) oraz działania zmierzające do ograniczenia zapotrzebowania na treści terrorystyczne w Internecie, np. alternatywne wersje wydarzeń. Komisja zamierza wspierać inicjatywy w obu obszarach, np. za pośrednictwem dialogu publiczno-prywatnego pomiędzy organami ścigania, firmami internetowymi i specjalistycznymi infoliniami (po stronie podaży) i rozwój alternatywnych wersji wydarzeń (po stronie popytu). Wszelkie praktyczne inicjatywy będące wynikiem wspomnianych procesów muszą być zgodne z obowiązującymi ramami prawnymi i w pełni szanować prawa podstawowe.

([1]) COM(2013) 0941 final.
([2]) W celu uzyskania dalszych informacji na temat sieci upowszechniania wiedzy o radykalizacji postaw zachęcamy Szanownego Pana Posła do zapoznania się z odpowiedzią Komisji udzieloną na pytanie parlamentarne 8264/2011 i specjalną stroną internetową: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/index_en.htm
([3]) https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/te-sat-2013-eu-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002045/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: European Commission call to fight radicalisation in the European Union

The European Commission has called upon European Union Member States to fight radicalism in Europe more effectively. The Commission believes that there is an increasing threat from extremists in the European Union, i.e. organised groups and individuals, such as Breivik. Fighters from the EU who fight in Syria for example and then return home, also constitute a threat.

One of the Commission's proposals is to create a European knowledge hub regarding violent extremism. This is intended to assist national and local authorities to coordinate their action better and to provide access to experts. EUR 20 million has been allocated for this purpose.

Furthermore, the European Commission is encouraging European Union Member States to develop national strategies, including cooperation with non-governmental organisations and closer cooperation between the police and local communities. The EU strategy anticipates, among other things, training of activists and steps to enable extremism on the Internet to be more effectively combated.

1. Can the Commission provide further details regarding the European knowledge hub regarding violent extremism?

2. In what way would such a hub operate, what experts will it have and who will supervise them?

3. Could the Commission specify what more effectively combating extremism on the Internet entails?

4. Will combating extremism on the Internet not have a negative impact on freedom of speech and the protection of personal data on the Internet?

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

Regarding the Honourable Member's questions 1 and 2, the Commission is currently reflecting on the detailed arrangements for the envisaged knowledge hub. Nevertheless, apart from the main tasks, as outlined in the communication 'Preventing Radicalisation to terrorism and Violent Extremism: Strengthening the EU's Response' ([1]), the hub will build upon the current Radicalisation Awareness Network Technical Assistance and Support structure (the 'RAN Secretariat') and will increase its support of the network ([2]).

As concerns questions 3 and 4; Europol's TE-SAT Report 2013 ([3]) states that the Internet remains an essential communication platform for terrorist organisations and their sympathisers. In addition, the development of social media has provided new opportunities for instant and personalised access to supporters of, and potential recruits to, terrorist groups. Apart from distributing propaganda, the Internet can also be used to disseminate instructional information.

Generally in order to address this challenge, there are two sets of options: those which focus on reducing the supply (i.e. removal of illegal content) and those which aim at reducing the demand-side of the terrorist online content e.g. counter-narratives. The Commission intends to support initiatives in both domains, such as via a public-private dialogue between law enforcement authorities, Internet companies and specialised hotlines (supply side) and development of counter-narratives (demand side). Any practical initiative resulting from these processes must comply with the existing legal framework and fully respect fundamental rights.

([1]) COM(2013) 941 final.
([2]) For further details about the RAN, the Honourable Member is invited to consult the Commission response to a Parliamentary Question 8264/2011 and a dedicated website: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/index_en.htm
([3]) https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/te-sat-2013-eu-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002046/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Finansowanie zabiegów medycznych pacjentów transgranicznych

Polski rząd zajmie się projektem ustawy o leczeniu transgranicznym, która będzie regulować zasady finansowania zabiegów medycznych przeprowadzanych w innych krajach Unii Europejskiej. Jednak przyjęcie stosownych regulacji może doprowadzić do utrudnień leczenia za granicą opłacanego z NFZ-etu. Świadczy o tym fakt, że np. fundusz zapłaci za daną procedurę w Niemczech maksymalnie tyle samo co w Polsce i że fundusz będzie miał odrębny budżet. Jeśli pacjentów transgranicznych będzie więcej, niż założy rząd, zostaną rozliczeni dopiero w kolejnych latach.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać:

1. Jakie jest stanowisko Komisji w sprawie finansowania zabiegów medycznych dla pacjentów transgranicznych na terenie Unii Europejskiej?

2. W jaki sposób Komisja pragnie przyczynić się do poprawy sytuacji leczenia pacjentów transgranicznych na terenie Unii Europejskiej?

3. Jak Komisja ocenia decyzję NFZ-etu w sprawie finansowania badań pacjentów transgranicznych i czy zdaniem Komisja taka polityka nie jest krzywdząca dla obywateli Polski?

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

Na podstawie dyrektywy 2011/24/UE w sprawie stosowania praw pacjentów w transgranicznej opiece zdrowotnej ([1]) pacjenci są uprawnieni do zwrotu kosztów leczenia, które uzyskali w innym państwie członkowskim, a do którego są uprawnieni na terytorium swojego państwa, do poziomu kosztów, które zostałyby pokryte w ich macierzystym państwie członkowskim.

Przepisy art. 9 tej dyrektywy nakładają na państwa członkowskie obowiązek zapewnienia, by pacjenci otrzymali zwrot kosztów bez zbędnej zwłoki. Komisja nie uznałaby ewentualnej zwłoki w płatności wynoszącej kilka lat za zgodną z dyrektywą 2011/24/UE.

Komisja przeprowadza obecnie szczegółową ocenę, czy notyfikowane środki krajowe w pełni i prawidłowo transponują środki zawarte w dyrektywie. Jeżeli Komisja uzna, że oceniane środki nie stanowią prawidłowej transpozycji dyrektywy, skorzysta z procedur określonych w Traktacie o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej dotyczących braku transpozycji prawodawstwa UE.

([1]) Dz.U. L 88 z 4.4.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002046/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Financing medical treatment for cross-border patients

The Polish Government is to prepare legislation on cross-border medical treatment, which will regulate the financing of medical treatment conducted in other European Union countries. However, the enactment of appropriate legislation may lead to difficulties in obtaining treatment abroad financed by the NFZ (the Polish National Health Service). This is indicated by the fact that the maximum amount the fund will pay for treatment, e.g. in Germany, will be the same as in Poland and the fund will have a separate budget. If the number of cross-border patients exceeds the government's expectations, payment will only be made in future years.

In respect of the above, I wish to ask:

1. What is the Commission's position regarding the financing of medical treatment for cross-border patients in the European Union?

2. In what way does the Commission wish to contribute to an improvement in the treatment situation for cross-border patients in the European Union?

3. What is the Commission's assessment of the NFZ's decision regarding the financing of tests for cross-border patients and, in the Commission's view, will this policy not be detrimental to Polish citizens?

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

Under the directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare ([1]) patients are entitled to be reimbursed for treatments they received in another Member State and to which they are entitled in their own territory and up to the level of costs that would have been assumed in their home Member State.

Article 9 of this directive requires Member States to ensure that patients receive reimbursement without undue delay. The Commission would not consider a possible delay in payment of several years in compliance with Directive 2011/24/EU.

The Commission is currently carrying out a detailed assessment of whether the notified national measures fully and adequately transpose the measures contained within the directive. If the Commission considers that measures do not adequately transpose the directive, it will have recourse to the procedures laid down in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union with regard to failure to transpose EU legislation.

([1]) OJ L 88, 4.4.2011.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002047/14
do Rady
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Prezydencja Grecji

Pierwszego stycznia Grecja rozpoczęła prezydencję w Radzie Unii Europejskiej. Wśród priorytetów greckiej prezydencji wymienia się zwalczanie problemu bezrobocia wśród młodzieży, zwiększanie dostępności kredytów dla małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw. Inne cele obejmują poprawę zarządzania gospodarczego w strefie euro, a także zakończenie negocjacji związanych z kolejnym etapem unii bankowej.

Grecja chce podjąć się także zwalczania nielegalnej imigracji, zmodyfikować unijną gospodarkę w dziedzinie gospodarki morskiej i przepisy dotyczące ochrony danych. Grecji zależy też na osiągnięciu porozumienia w sprawie wykorzystania gazu łupkowego i biopaliw pierwszej generacji.

1. Czy Rada pod przewodnictwem Grecji wezwie Komisję Europejską do inicjatywy ustawodawczej w sprawie zmniejszenia bezrobocia wśród młodzieży? Jeśli tak, to do jakich projektów?

2. W jaki sposób Rada pod greckim przewodnictwem będzie dążyć do porozumienia w sprawie wykorzystania gazu łupkowego? Czy Rada poprze postulaty Polski w tej sprawie?

3. Jakie działania podejmie Rada celem zmniejszenia imigracji do Europy przez Morze Śródziemne, która często kończy się tragicznie dla tysięcy imigrantów z Afryki i Bliskiego Wschodu?

4. Czy Rada zajmie się problemem nielegalnej imigracji na wschodnich granicach Unii Europejskiej, m.in. granicy polsko-białoruskiej, na której coraz częściej odnotowuje się przypadki nielegalnej imigracji?

Odpowiedź
(13 maja 2014 r.)

Rada Europejska na posiedzeniu w październiku 2013 r. uznała, że zwalczanie bezrobocia wśród młodzieży pozostaje jednym z kluczowych celów unijnej strategii na rzecz wzrostu gospodarczego, konkurencyjności i zatrudnienia. Rolą Komisji jest przedstawienie propozycji aktów prawnych odpowiednich do osiągnięcia tego celu, z użyciem stosownych podstaw prawnych zawartych w Traktatach.

W dniu 22 stycznia 2014 r. Komisja przyjęła komunikat w sprawie rozpoznawania i wydobywania węglowodorów (takich jak gaz łupkowy) w UE z zastosowaniem intensywnego szczelinowania hydraulicznego oraz powiązane z nim zalecenie; dokumenty te zostały przedstawione na posiedzeniu Rady w dniu 3 marca 2014 r.

Rada przeanalizuje wszelkie wnioski, które Komisja mogłaby przedstawić w tej dziedzinie, po przeglądzie skuteczności zalecenia, który ma zostać przeprowadzony przez Komisję w przyszłym roku.

Unia jest zaangażowana w opracowywanie i wdrażanie strategii, które mają na celu skuteczniejsze zarządzanie przepływami migracyjnymi, w interesie zarówno państw członkowskich UE, jak i państw pochodzenia i tranzytu migrantów, by zapobiegać napływowi nielegalnych migrantów i go zmniejszać.

Konkretnie, w wyniku incydentu u wybrzeży Lampedusy ustanowiono Śródziemnomorską Grupę Zadaniową, której celem jest podejmowanie działań pozwalających na uniknięcie ofiar na morzu i takich wypadków w przyszłości. W wyniku prac prowadzonych przez tę grupę zadaniową Komisja wydała w grudniu 2013 r. komunikat ([1]), w którym wymieniła 37 konkretnych środków operacyjnych.

Na posiedzeniu w dniach 19-20 grudnia 2013 r. Rada Europejska przyjęła z zadowoleniem komunikat Komisji i wezwała do podjęcia wszelkich wysiłków, by wprowadzić w życie zaproponowane działania, oraz zwróciła się do Rady o regularne monitorowanie ich realizacji.

Na posiedzeniu w dniach 3-4 marca 2014 r. Rada wezwała wszystkie zainteresowane strony – UE i jej agencje, państwa członkowskie i stosowne organizacje międzynarodowe – do dalszego aktywnego uczestnictwa w realizacji tych działań.

([1]) Komunikat Komisji do Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie prac Śródziemnomorskiej Grupy Zadaniowej (17398/13).

Ponadto w dniu 22 października 2013 r. Rada przyjęła rozporządzenie ustanawiające europejski system nadzorowania granic (EUROSUR), którego celem jest usprawnienie nadzorowania morskich granic zewnętrznych. EUROSUR rozpoczął działanie 2 grudnia 2013 r.

W lutym 2014 r. Parlament Europejski i Rada osiągnęły porozumienie co do zaostrzenia przepisów regulujących wspólne operacje morskie koordynowane przez FRONTEX; przepisy te mają zostać przyjęte w kwietniu lub maju 2014 r.

Akty te przyczynią się zarówno do poprawy nadzorowania morskich granic zewnętrznych państw członkowskich, jak i do zmniejszenia ryzyka ofiar na morzu.

Rada nie jest w stanie sformułować bardziej szczegółowych uwag dotyczących poruszonych przez Szanownego Posła konkretnych kwestii, takich jak nielegalna imigracja przez wschodnie granice Unii Europejskiej (np. granica polsko-białoruska), ale będzie nadal śledzić tendencje migracyjne, opierając się na informacjach przekazywanych przez FRONTEX, Europejski Urząd Wsparcia w dziedzinie Azylu (EASO) i EUROPOL, dotyczących konkretnych sytuacji na granicach zewnętrznych, w tym działalności przestępczej związanej z nielegalną migracją, która to działalność mogłaby zagrozić bezpieczeństwu Unii Europejskiej.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002047/14
to the Council
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Greek Presidency

On 1 January, Greece commenced its presidency of the Council of the European Union. The priorities of the Greek presidency include combating the problem of youth unemployment and increasing access to loans for small and medium-sized enterprises. Other objectives include improving commercial management in the Eurozone and ending negotiations associated with a further stage of the banking union.

Greece also wishes to combat illegal immigration, modify the EU maritime economy and amend data protection legislation. Furthermore, Greece wants to achieve agreement regarding the use of shale gas and first generation bio-fuels.

1. Will the Council, under Greece's presidency, call upon the European Commission to exercise its legislative initiative regarding the reduction of youth unemployment? If so, what draft legislation does this involve?

2. In what way will the Council, under Greece's presidency, attempt to reach agreement regarding the use of shale gas? Does the Council support Poland's proposals in this regard?

3. What steps will the Council take to reduce immigration to Europe via the Mediterranean Sea, which often ends in tragedy for thousands of immigrants from Africa and the Middle East?

4. Will the Council take action regarding illegal immigration on the Eastern borders of the European Union, e.g. the Polish-Belorussian border, at which cases of illegal immigration are increasingly noted.

Reply
(13 May 2014)

The October 2013 European Council concluded that the fight against youth unemployment remains a key objective of the EU strategy to foster growth, competitiveness and jobs. It is for the Commission to propose legal acts that may be suitable for achieving this aim, using the appropriate legal bases in the Treaties.

On 22 January 2014, the Commission adopted a communication on the exploration and production of hydrocarbons (such as shale gas) using high-volume hydraulic fracturing in the EU and a related Recommendation which were presented at the Council meeting on 3 March 2014.

The Council will examine any proposals that the Commission might wish to submit in this field, following the review of the recommendation's effectiveness to be carried out by the Commission next year.

The Union is actively developing and implementing policies which aim at more efficiently managing migratory flows, in the interest both of the EU Member States and of the countries of origin and transit of migrants, with the objective of preventing and reducing the inflow of persons in an irregular situation.

More specifically, following the Lampedusa incident, a Task Force for the Mediterranean (TFM) was established with the objective of taking action to prevent the loss of lives at sea and to prevent such human tragedies from happening again. As the result of the work carried out by the TFM, the Commission in December 2013 issued a communication ([1]) identifying 37 concrete and operational measures.

At its meeting on 19-20 December 2013, the European Council welcomed the Commission communication and called for the mobilisation of all efforts in order to implement the actions proposed and invited the Council to regularly monitor the implementation of those actions.

At its meeting on 3-4 March 2014, the Council invited all the stakeholders — the EU and its agencies, the Member States and relevant international organisations — to continue their active participation in the implementation of such actions.

In addition, on 22 October 2013 the Council adopted the regulation establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur) aimed at reinforcing the surveillance of maritime external borders. Eurosur became operational in 2 December 2013.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the work of the Task Force Mediterranean (17398/13).

Agreement was reached in February 2014 between the European Parliament and the Council on reinforced rules on joint sea operations coordinated by Frontex, scheduled for adoption in April-May 2014.

These acts will contribute both to improving the surveillance of Member States' maritime external borders and to reducing the risk of loss of lives at sea.

The Council is not in a position to comment in detail on the specific issues raised by the Honourable Member as regards illegal immigration at the eastern borders of the European Union (e.g. the Polish-Belarusian border), but will continue to follow migratory trends, relying on the information provided by Frontex, the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) and Europol as regards specific situations at the external borders, including criminal activities related to illegal migration, that could represent a threat to the security of the European Union.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002048/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Sytuacja na Ukrainie

W ostatnich dniach na łamach polskich i zagranicznych mediów toczy się debata na temat ewentualnego planu wsparcia dla Ukrainy.

Przywódcy europejscy zrozumieli bowiem, że może dojść tam do wprowadzenia stanu wyjątkowego i dalszego rozlewu krwi, jak i „jednoznacznego zaangażowania się Rosji". Oznaczałoby to utratę jakiegokolwiek wpływu na obszar niezwykle ważny z punktu widzenia Europy, bo leżący u granic Unii Europejskiej.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać:

1. Jaka jest opinia Komisji na temat przekształcenia mechanizmu Sąsiedzkiego Funduszu Inwestycyjnego w instrument wspierający ogólnie rozumianą przedsiębiorczość w krajach wschodniego sąsiedztwa oraz dokapitalizowania funduszu środkami pochodzącymi z EBI, EBOiR i Banku Światowego, w celu przeciwdziałania sytuacji, w której podmioty komercyjne muszą zwracać się o pomoc finansową do każdej z tych instytucji oddzielnie?

2. Czy Komisja rozpatrzyła wariant pomocy dla Ukrainy poprzez restrukturyzację ukraińskiego zadłużenia, zakładającą częściowe odroczenie spłaty niektórych rat kredytu, aby nie wpędzać kraju jeszcze bardziej w spiralę zadłużenia?

3. Czy Komisja nie uważa, że w ramach przybliżenia Ukrainy do Unii Europejskiej warto by było znieść wizy dla obywateli Ukrainy?

4. Wiedząc, że jednym z podstawowych problemów Ukrainy jest korupcja, czy Komisja rozpatrzyła możliwość skorzystania z pomocy krajów spoza Unii Europejskiej, np. Gruzji, które rozwiązały pomyślnie problemy korupcji we własnych krajach?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Füleg w imieniu Komisji
(30 kwietnia 2014 r.)

1. Komisja jest gotowa rozważyć innowacyjne koncepcje dotyczące sąsiedzkiego funduszu inwestycyjnego, jednak nie jest jej znana konkretna propozycja, o jakiej wspomniano w pytaniu. Wszelkie zmiany ukierunkowania strategicznego sąsiedzkiego funduszu inwestycyjnego określa się we współpracy z państwami członkowskimi i komitetem strategicznym funduszu.

2. Komisja całkowicie popiera warunki towarzyszące niedawno ogłoszonej umowie pomiędzy MFW a rządem Ukrainy, w myśl której, w ramach porozumienia stand-by, Ukraina ma otrzymać 14-18 mld USD na na ustabilizowanie sytuacji gospodarczej i finansowej. UE przyczynia się do międzynarodowych działań środkami, które w najbliższych latach mają przynieść wsparcie o łącznej wysokości 11 mld EUR.

3. Mobilność jest ważnym aspektem naszego zaangażowania na rzecz Ukrainy. Komisja jest gotowa wspomóc Ukrainę w osiągnięciu dotąd niewypełnionych benchmarków wymaganych do dokończenia pierwszego etapu wdrożenia planu działania na rzecz liberalizacji reżimu wizowego oraz przejścia do drugiego etapu.

4. Zwalczanie korupcji pozostaje istotnym wyzwaniem we wszystkich państwach Partnerstwa Wschodniego, w tym na Ukrainie. Wielostronne działanie Partnerstwa Wschodniego pozwala wszystkim sześciu państwom na wzajemne korzystanie ze swoich doświadczeń. Aby nadać działaniom antykorupcyjnym właściwą wagę, Europejski Urząd ds. Zwalczania Nadużyć Finansowych brał czynny udział w dyskusjach dotyczących programu europejskiego, który stanowi dla Ukrainy plan działań służących wdrożeniu zawartego przez nią układu o stowarzyszeniu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002048/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: The situation in Ukraine

In recent days, a debate has been conducted in the Polish and foreign press as regards a possible aid plan for Ukraine.

European leaders have understood that a state of emergency may be introduced there and there may be further bloodshed and 'unequivocal Russian engagement'. This would entail losing any influence over an area of extraordinary importance to Europe, as it lies on the European Union's borders.

In respect of the above, I wish to ask:

1. What is the Commission's opinion regarding the transformation of the Neighbourhood Investment Facility into a support instrument for enterprise in a general sense for neighbouring eastern countries and increasing the fund's capital with EIB, EBRD and World Bank funds in order to prevent a situation in which commercial entities have to apply for financial assistance to each of these institutions separately?

2. Has the Commission considered the option of assisting Ukraine by means of restructuring Ukrainian debt, assuming a partial postponement of repayments of certain loan instalments to ensure that the country is not pushed yet further into a spiral of debt?

3. Does the Commission not believe that as part of the improved relations between Ukraine and the European Union it would be worth abolishing visas for Ukrainian citizens?

4. In light of the fact that one of Ukraine's main problems is corruption, has the Commission considered using the assistance of countries from outside the European Union, such as Georgia, which have successfully resolved the problem of corruption in their own countries?

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

1. The Commission is open to considering innovative ideas with regard to the Neighbourhood Investment Facility (NIF), but is unaware of a specific proposal along the lines of that cited in the question. Any change to the NIF's strategic orientation would be determined in coordination with Member States and the NIF Strategic Board.

2. The Commission fully supports the conditions accompanying the recently announced agreement between the IMF and the Government of Ukraine, expected to result in a USD 14-18 billion Stand-by Arrangement to help stabilise Ukraine's economic and financial situation. The EU is contributing to international efforts, with measures that will bring overall support of EUR 11 billion in coming years.

3. Mobility is an important element of our engagement with Ukraine. The Commission is ready to assist Ukraine in fulfilling the remaining benchmarks to finalise the first stage of Visa Liberalisation Action Plan implementation and to advance to the second stage of the process.

4. The fight against corruption remains a major challenge in all Eastern Partnership (EaP) countries, including Ukraine. The EaP's multilateral track brings together the six EaP countries in a way that enables them to benefit from each other's experience. To ensure an appropriate focus on anti-corruption, the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) was closely involved in discussions on the European Agenda, which is the roadmap Ukraine will follow as it implements its Association Agreement.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002049/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wyłudzanie unijnych dopłat przez szajki pseudorolników

Zorganizowane szajki zajmują bezprawnie tysiące hektarów państwowych gruntów i pobierają unijne dopłaty. Maszyny prywatnej spółki wjeżdżają pod osłoną nocy na państwowe grunty, orzą, sieją. Przykładowo spółka występuje o 200 tys. zł dopłat z Unii; otrzymuje je, zarabia też na plonach.

Grunty są nielegalnie zasiewane, często przez fikcyjne firmy, a następnie na tej podstawie wyłudzane są dopłaty bezpośrednie. Proceder jest wynikiem luk we wnioskach o dopłaty, w których nie trzeba wykazać stosunku prawnego do ziemi, a jedynie udokumentować użytkowanie wskazanego we wniosku terenu na dzień 31 maja danego roku. Szacuje się, że proceder ten dotyczy ponad 20 tys. ha gruntów w całej Polsce, z czego większość znajduje się w województwach: warmińsko-mazurskim, pomorskim i podlaskim. Każdego roku „nielegalni rolnicy" mogą wyłudzać ponad 40 mln dopłat bezpośrednich.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać:

1. Dlaczego Komisja pozwala na taki proceder i nie podejmuje stosownych działań w celu zaprzestania wyłudzeń?

2. Czy Komisja kiedykolwiek rozważyła opcję zmiany tej sytuacji poprzez modyfikację kryteriów uzyskania dofinansowania?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Algirdasa Šemetę w imieniu Komisji
(9 kwietnia 2014 r.)

UE i państwa członkowskie ponoszą wspólnie odpowiedzialność za ochronę interesów finansowych UE i zwalczanie nadużyć finansowych. Władze krajowe zarządzają około 80 % wydatków UE. ([1])

Zgodnie z zasadami zarządzania dzielonego, które regulują fundusze strukturalne i rolne, państwa członkowskie są w pierwszym rzędzie odpowiedzialne za realizację polityki rolnej i działania strukturalne, ich audyt i kontrolę. W tych ramach państwa członkowskie są również zobowiązane do przekazywania Komisji w określonym terminie szczegółowych informacji na temat wykrytych nieprawidłowości. Europejski Urząd ds. Zwalczania Nadużyć Finansowych (OLAF) może interweniować w szczególnych przypadkach, gdy istnieją wystarczająco poważne podejrzenia o nadużycie finansowe, korupcję lub poważne nieprawidłowości przynoszące szkodę budżetowi UE.

Do celu płatności bezpośrednich, rolnik jest zdefiniowany jako osoba fizyczna lub prawna, która prowadzi działalność rolniczą. Celem pomocy jest przyznanie pomocy bezpośredniej dla osób wykorzystujących obszary rolne do celów prowadzenia działalności rolniczej. Nacisk w prawie UE nie jest więc na własność gruntów lub zgodnego z prawem wykorzystania gruntów, które jest regulowane przez prawo krajowe.

Jednakże w przypadku, gdy w odniesieniu do tej samej działki złożono więcej niż jeden wniosek, nie można przyznać pomocy do momentu ustalenia faktycznego jej użytkownika.

OLAF poinformował Komisję, iż zwrócił się do władz polskich o udzielenie informacji w sprawie poruszonej przez szanownego Pana Posła. Komisja będzie również wdzięczna, gdyby Pan Poseł mógł udostępnić OLAF-owi bardziej szczegółowe informacje, które może posiadać.

([1]) COM(2013) 0682 final i http://ec.europa.eu/budget/explained/management/managt_who/who_en.cfm#resp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002049/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Fraudulent receipt of EU subsidies by gangs of pseudo-farmers

Organised groups are unlawfully occupying thousands of hectares of state-owned land and obtaining EU subsidies. Machines owned by a private company access state-owned land at night to till and sow it. By way of example, the company applies for PLN 200,000 of subsidies from the EU, obtains it and also profits from the crop.

The land is unlawfully sown, often by fictitious businesses, and direct subsidies are then obtained by fraud on this basis. This procedure is a result of loopholes in applications for subsidies, in which no legal title to the land is required. It suffices to document use of the land stated in the application on 31 May each year. It is estimated that this procedure applies to over 20 000 ha of land in Poland overall, of which the majority is located in the Warmińsko-Mazurskie, Pomorskie and Podlaskie Voivodeships. Each year these 'illegal farmers' may fraudulently receive over 40m in direct subsidies.

In respect of the above, I wish to ask:

1. Why does the Commission permit such a procedure and why does it not take appropriate action to prevent fraud?

2. Has the Commission ever considered the option of changing this situation by modifying the criteria for obtaining subsidies?

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

The EU and the Member States share responsibility for the protection of the EU's financial interests and the fight against fraud. National authorities manage around 80% of EU expenditure ([1]).

Under the rules of shared management which govern the Structural and Agricultural Funds, Member States are responsible in the first instance for the implementation of the agricultural and structural measures, their audit and control. In this framework the Member States also are obliged to transmit detailed information on detected irregularities to the Commission within a certain time limit. OLAF may intervene in specific cases whenever there are sufficiently serious suspicions of fraud, corruption or serious irregularities detrimental to the EU budget.

For the purpose of direct payments, a farmer is defined as a natural or legal person who exercises an agricultural activity. The objective is to grant direct aids to persons who are using agricultural areas for the purpose of an agricultural activity. The emphasis in EC law is thus not on the ownership of the land or the lawful right to use the land which is governed by national law.

However, in the case there are more than one claim in respect of the same parcel, the aid cannot be granted until the actual user of the land is determined.

OLAF has informed the Commission that it has asked the Polish national authorities for information on the issue raised by the Honourable Member. The Commission would also be grateful if the Honourable Member could provide OLAF with any more detailed information he might possess.

([1]) COM(2013) 682 final and http://ec.europa.eu/budget/explained/management/managt_who/who_en.cfm#resp

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002050/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: UE zamierza usprawnić programy szkolne na rzecz zdrowego odżywiania

W większości krajów obserwujemy spadek spożycia owoców, warzyw i mleka wśród dzieci, a spożywane produkty są coraz bardziej przetworzone. Niewłaściwe odżywianie jest jednym z najbardziej niepokojących zjawisk naszych czasów, któremu można jednak zapobiegać. Wiele państw nie osiąga postępów w dążeniu do milenijnego celu rozwoju, jakim jest zmniejszenie o połowę odsetka głodujących. Nadal jedno na sześcioro dzieci na świecie ma niedowagę. Dzieci te wpadają w błędne koło ubóstwa, niewłaściwego odżywiania i chorób, które to zjawiska powodują, że ich start życiowy jest najgorszy z możliwych, przez co ubóstwem dotknięte są jednostki i całe społeczeństwa.

W związku z powyższym pragniemy zapytać:

W jaki sposób Unia Europejska będzie wspierać działania edukacyjne służące pogłębieniu wiedzy dzieci na temat zdrowych nawyków żywieniowych, produkcji żywności, a także kwestii odpadów żywnościowych?

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

Strategia dla Europy w sprawie zagadnień zdrowotnych związanych z odżywianiem, nadwagą i otyłością z 2007 r. ([1]) promuje zrównoważoną dietę i aktywny styl życia dla wszystkich. Strategia zachęca do tworzenia partnerstw ukierunkowanych na działanie obejmujących 28 państw członkowskich UE (grupa wysokiego szczebla ds. żywienia i aktywności fizycznej ([2])) oraz społeczeństwo obywatelskie (platforma UE ds. żywienia, aktywności fizycznej i zdrowia ([3])). W dniu 24 lutego 2014 r. grupa wysokiego szczebla ds. żywienia i aktywności fizycznej uzgodniła ([4]) plan działania w sprawie otyłości wśród dzieci ([5]).

Ogólnounijne programy „Owoce i warzywa w szkole" oraz „Mleko w szkołach" ([6]) ([7]) przyczyniają się do kształtowania zdrowszych nawyków żywieniowych wśród dzieci w wieku szkolnym. Komisja przyjęła nowy wniosek ([8]) dotyczący wzmocnienia wymiaru edukacyjnego tych programów i zwiększenia ich skuteczności. W ramach obecnego programu „Owoce i warzywa w szkole" można już teraz wspierać inicjatywy nauczania dzieci o rolnictwie, zdrowych nawykach żywieniowych i kwestiach ochrony środowiska związanych z owocami i warzywami, w tym o marnowaniu żywności ([9]).

Ponadto Komisja zainicjowała trzy projekty pilotażowe ([10]): dwa z nich mają na celu zwiększenie konsumpcji świeżych owoców i warzyw w społecznościach, w których dochód gospodarstw domowych wynosi poniżej poziomu 50 % średniej UE; trzeci projekt ma na celu promowanie zdrowego odżywiania się wśród dzieci, kobiet w ciąży i osób starszych.

W komunikacie „Zwiększenie roli żywienia matek i dzieci w pomocy zewnętrznej: ramy polityki UE" ([11]) przedstawiono propozycję UE, jak poprawić stan odżywienia osób żyjących w krajach rozwijających się, w których brak jest bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego, w szczególności w grupach najbardziej wrażliwych.

W odniesieniu do marnowania żywności Komisja pragnie odesłać Szanownego Pana Posła do odpowiedzi na pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi na piśmie E-013588/2013.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_pl.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_pl.htm
([4]) Z zastrzeżeniem wyrażonym przez Niderlandy.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_pl.htm
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/milk/school-milk-scheme/index_en.htm
([8]) COM (2014) 32 z 30 stycznia 2014 r.
([9]) Środki te będą kwalifikować się do pomocy UE, począwszy od roku szkolnego 2014/2015.
([10]) SANCO/2011/C4/01, SANCO/2012/C4/02 i SANCO/2013/C4/02.
([11]) COM(2013) 141 final, oraz powiązany dokument roboczy służb Komisji „Rozwiązanie problemu niedożywienia w sytuacjach nadzwyczajnych".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002050/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: EU intentions to improve school programmes for healthy eating

Most countries are recording a drop in the consumption of fruit, vegetables and milk among children, and the products that are being consumed are increasingly processed. Improper nutrition is one of the most worrying preventable phenomena of our time. Many countries are making no progress at all towards achieving the millennium development goal of reducing the percentage of those suffering from starvation by half. One in six children worldwide is still underweight. These children fall into a vicious circle of poverty, improper nutrition and disease, all of which means that they are condemned to the very worst possible start to life. This leads to individuals and entire communities being affected by poverty.

In respect of the above, I wish to ask:

How will the European Union support activities to educate children about healthy eating habits and food production, as well as about the issue of food waste?

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

The 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([1]) promotes a balanced diet and active lifestyles for all. The strategy encourages action-oriented partnerships involving the 28 EU Member States (High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity ([2])) and civil society (EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([3])). On 24 February 2014 the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity agreed ([4]) an Action Plan on Childhood Obesity ([5]).

The EU-wide School Fruit and Vegetables and School Milk Schemes ([6]) ([7]) contribute to establishing healthier eating habits among school children. The Commission adopted a new proposal ([8]) to strengthen the educational dimension of these schemes and increase their effectiveness. The current School Fruit Scheme can already support initiatives for educating children about agriculture, healthy eating habits and environmental matters related to fruits and vegetables including food waste ([9]).

In addition, the Commission has launched three pilot projects ([10]): two aim to increase consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables in communities where the household income is below 50% of the EU average; one aims to promote healthy diets among children, pregnant women and elderly.

The communication 'Enhancing Maternal and Child Nutrition in External Assistance: an EU Policy Framework' ([11]) outlines the EU response to improving the nutritional status of those living in developing countries with food insecurity, especially in the most vulnerable groups.

With respect to food waste, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to written question QE 13588/2013.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([4]) With reserve by The Netherlands.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/milk/school-milk-scheme/index_en.htm
([8]) COM(2014) 32 from 30 January 2014.
([9]) These measures will be eligible for EU aid as of 2014/2015 school year.
([10]) SANCO/2011/C4/01, SANCO/2012/C4/02 and SANCO/2013/C4/02.
([11]) COM(2013) 141 final, and the associated Staff Working Document, 'Addressing Undernutrition in Emergencies'.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002051/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Sprawa Ceuty

Z Morza Śródziemnego wyłowiono ciała siedmiu imigrantów, którzy zginęli, próbując wpław dostać się do nadmorskiej Ceuty. Marokańskie służby ratunkowe kontynuują poszukiwania kolejnych ofiar. Dotychczas udało się uratować 13 osób; trafiły one do szpitala. Ponadto zatrzymano 150 ludzi.

W niedzielę pięciu nielegalnych imigrantów, głównie Senegalczyków, utopiło się, gdy ich łódź zatonęła obok marokańskiego An-Nadur, na południe od innego miasta autonomicznego Hiszpanii, Melilli.

Tego samego dnia w Melilli doszło do masowego szturmu na granicę, w którym uczestniczyło 150 imigrantów z krajów subsaharyjskich. Zostali odepchnięci przez marokańskie i hiszpańskie siły bezpieczeństwa.

Każdego roku tysiące afrykańskich imigrantów próbują przedostać się do Ceuty i Melilli, gdyż te hiszpańskie miasta na terenie Maroka są wrotami do Unii Europejskiej.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać:

1. Jakie jest stanowisko Komisji w sprawie afrykańskich imigrantów?

2. Czy zdaniem Komisji działania sił bezpieczeństwa nie noszą znamion rasizmu?

3. Jakie kroki ma zamiar podjąć Komisja w celu niedopuszczenia, aby takie sytuacje powtarzały się w przyszłości?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(27 marca 2014 r.)

Komisja jest poinformowana o incydencie opisanym w pytaniu Szanownego Pana Posła i kontaktowała się z władzami Hiszpanii, które potwierdziły rozpoczęcie pełnego dochodzenia. Komisja przeanalizuje wyniki tego dochodzenia i będzie ściśle monitorować dalszy rozwój sytuacji.

1. Presja migracyjna w Afryce Północnej stanowi część szerszego zjawiska powstałego z braku stabilności w sąsiedztwie UE. UE przeciwdziała temu zjawisku wdrażając plan działania UE w sprawie presji migracyjnej, jak również 37 działań operacyjnych wynikających z pracy „Śródziemnomorskiej Grupy Zadaniowej". Komisja uprzejmie prosi Szanownego Pana Posła o zapoznanie się z komunikatem z dnia 4 grudnia 2013 r. na temat pracy Śródziemnomorskiej Grupy Zadaniowej ([1]).

2. Komisja wyraża głębokie ubolewanie z powodu ofiar w ludziach, ale nie ma podstaw do przypisania działaniom sił bezpieczeństwa charakteru rasistowskiego, jak Szanowny Pan Poseł zasugerował.

3. Wszelkie środki, które mogą przyczynić się do zapobiegania tego rodzaju incydentom powinny być kontynuowane, w tym ściślejsza współpraca z państwami trzecimi, w szczególności z ościennymi krajami trzecimi, oraz wzmocnienie nadzorowania granicy zewnętrznej, tak jak jest to określone w europejskim systemie nadzorowania granic ([2]), a także skuteczne procedury azylu i powrotu.

([1]) COM(2013) 0869 final.
([2]) Rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (UE) nr 1052/2013 z dnia 22 października 2013 r. ustanawiające europejski system nadzorowania granic (Eurosur); Dz.U. L 295 z 6.11.2013, s. 11-26.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002051/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: The Ceuta case

The bodies of seven immigrants who died during an attempted crossing to the exclave of Ceuta have been recovered from the Mediterranean Sea. Moroccan rescue teams are continuing to look for further victims. So far 13 people have been rescued and hospitalised. In addition, 150 people have been detained.

On Sunday, five illegal immigrants, mainly Senegalese, drowned when their boat sank next to the Moroccan city of An-Nadur, to the south of another autonomous Spanish city, Melilla.

On the same day there was a mass storming of the border in Melilla by 150 immigrants from sub-Saharan countries. They were forced back by Moroccan and Spanish security forces.

Every year, thousands of African immigrants attempt to enter Ceuta and Melilla, as these Spanish cities within Morocco are gateways to the European Union.

In respect of the above, I wish to ask:

1. What is the Commission's position regarding these African immigrants?

2. Does the Commission believe that the actions of the security forces are tantamount to racism?

3. What steps does the Commission intend to take to ensure that such situations are not allowed to reoccur in future?

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

The Commission is aware of the incident described in the Honourable Member's question and has been in contact with the Spanish authorities, who have confirmed they have launched a full inquiry. The Commission will examine the outcome of this inquiry and will closely monitor further developments.

1. Migratory pressure in North Africa is part of a wider phenomenon generated by instability in the EU neighbourhood. The EU addresses this phenomenon by implementing the EU Action Plan on Migratory Pressure, as well as the 37 operational actions emerging from the work of the 'Task Force Mediterranean'. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its communication of 4 December 2013 on the work of the Task Force Mediterranean ([1]).

2. The Commission deeply regrets the loss of life, but has no basis on which to ascribe the actions of the security forces to racism, as suggested by the Honourable Member.

3. All measures that can contribute to preventing such incidents should be pursued, including increased cooperation with third countries, in particular neighbouring third countries, and reinforced border surveillance as exemplified by the European Border Surveillance System ([2]) and effective asylum and return procedures.

([1]) COM(2013) 869 final.
([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1052/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur); OJ L 295, 6.11.2013, p. 11-26.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002052/14
a la Comisión
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(20 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Reconocimiento del título de visitador médico

La comunidad de visitadores médicos observa con preocupación las dificultades que está encontrando para obtener un reconocimiento jurídico de su profesión en la Unión Europea.

La Directiva 2001/83/CE por la que se establece un código comunitario sobre medicamentos para uso humano reconoce el importante papel desempeñado por los visitadores médicos en la promoción de los medicamentos y les impone determinadas obligaciones, en concreto, la obligación de entregar a la persona que visiten un resumen de las características del producto.

El artículo 93 de dicha Directiva establece que «los visitadores médicos deberán ser formados de manera adecuada por la empresa que les emplee y poseer conocimientos científicos suficientes para dar indicaciones precisas y lo más completas posible sobre los medicamentos que presenten».

Además, tanto la Directiva 2001/83/CE como el Reglamento (CE) n° 726/2004 por el que se establecen procedimientos comunitarios para la autorización y el control de los medicamentos de uso humano y veterinario y por el que se crea la Agencia Europea de Medicamentos, otorgan funciones de farmacovigilancia a los visitadores médicos.

¿Tiene constancia la Comisión de los problemas con los que se está encontrando la comunidad de visitadores médicos para ver reconocida su profesión en la Unión Europea mediante una titulación académica oficial?

¿Considera la Comisión que los visitadores médicos deben contar con un reconocimiento profesional y jurídico mediante una titulación académica oficial que asegure una formación adecuada para desarrollar las funciones científico-sanitarias que la legislación les atribuye?

¿Qué medidas tiene previsto adoptar la Comisión para facilitar el reconocimiento del título de visitador médico?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

La Directiva 2005/36/CE ([1]) («la Directiva») se aplica a los supuestos en que un nacional de un Estado miembro de la UE («EM») desea ejercer una profesión regulada en un Estado miembro distinto de aquel en el que haya obtenido su titulación profesional. Los visitadores médicos ya pueden acogerse al régimen de reconocimiento mutuo establecido en la Directiva (a través del llamado sistema general de reconocimiento mutuo) si aspiran a desempeñar una actividad profesional que esté regulada en el EM de destino ([2]).

Es preciso observar que, con la excepción de siete profesiones ([3]) a las que se aplican los requisitos mínimos armonizados de formación establecidos en la Directiva, es competencia exclusiva de cada EM ([4]) supeditar el acceso a otras actividades profesionales (como las de los visitadores médicos) o el ejercicio de las mismas en su territorio a la posesión de cualificaciones profesionales específicas, y definir la gama de actividades cubiertas por una profesión determinada o reservadas a ella.

El Derecho de la UE reconoce a los EM amplias competencias en lo que respecta a la regulación del sector de la sanidad. En relación con las libertades de establecimiento y de prestación de servicios, el TJUE ([5]) ha indicado específicamente que los EM tienen cierto margen de discrecionalidad en cuanto al nivel de protección que desean dispensar en el ámbito de la sanidad y a las soluciones adoptadas para alcanzar ese nivel ([6]).

La Comisión no dispone de información específica sobre los problemas encontrados por los visitadores médicos para obtener la regulación de sus actividades profesionales en Estados miembros concretos.

([1]) Directiva 2005/36/CE relativa al reconocimiento de cualificaciones profesionales, DO L 255 de 30.9.2005, p. 22.
([2]) Con arreglo al sistema general, la autoridad competente del EM de acogida puede comparar la formación de un profesional con los requisitos nacionales correspondientes y, en caso de apreciar diferencias sustanciales, imponer medidas compensatorias como paso previo al reconocimiento de las cualificaciones.
([3]) Médicos, enfermeros responsables de cuidados generales, farmacéuticos, matronas, odontólogos, arquitectos y veterinarios.
([4]) Obsérvese que la Directiva también es aplicable a Islandia, Noruega y Lichtenstein y que se aplican normas específicas a Suiza.
([5]) Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea.
([6]) Véanse, por ejemplo, los asuntos C-531/06 Comisión/Italia, 19 de mayo de 2009; C-171/07 y C-172/07, Apothekerkammer des Saarlandes, 19 de mayo de 2009; C-570/07 y C-571/07, Blanco Pérez, 1 de junio de 2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002052/14
to the Commission
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Recognition of the qualification of medical sales representative

The community of medical sales representatives is concerned about the difficulties they are facing in obtaining legal recognition of their profession in the European Union.

Directive 2001/83/EC, which establishes a Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, recognises the important role played by medical sales representatives in promoting medicinal products and imposes on them certain obligations, in particular that of providing the person they are visiting with a summary of each product's characteristics.

Article 93 of the directive lays down that 'Medical sales representatives shall be given adequate training by the firm that employs them and must have sufficient scientific knowledge to be able to provide information which is precise and as complete as possible about the medicinal products that they present'.

Furthermore, both Directive 2001/83/EC and Regulation (EC) No 726/2004, which lays down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishes a European Medicines Agency, award pharmacovigilance functions to medical sales representatives.

Is the Commission aware of the problems being encountered by the community of medical sales representatives in obtaining recognition of their profession in the European Union by means of an official academic qualification?

Does the Commission consider that medical sales representatives should enjoy legal and professional recognition by way of an official academic qualification that guarantees them adequate training to carry out the scientific/health functions attributed to them by law?

What measures does the Commission intend to adopt in order to facilitate recognition of the qualification of medical sales representative?

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

Directive 2005/36/EC ([1]) (the directive) applies to cases where a national of an EU Member State (MS) wishes to pursue a regulated profession in a MS other than the one in which the professional qualification was obtained. Medical sales representatives may already benefit from the mutual recognition regime provided for in the directive via a so-called general system of mutual recognition if they seek to pursue a professional activity which is regulated in the MS of destination ([2]).

It should be noted that with the exception of seven professions ([3]) that benefit from the harmonised minimum training requirements set out in the directive, it remains within the sole competence of individual MS ([4]) to make access to or the pursuit of other professional activities (such as those of medical sales representatives) in their territory subject to the possession of specific professional qualifications and to define the scope of activities covered by a given profession or reserved to it.

EC law recognises that MS have a broad competence in the regulation of the health sector. With regard to the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services in the healthcare sector, the CJEU ([5]) has specifically indicated that MS have a measure of discretion in the level of protection they wish to give to public health and the way in which that level is to be achieved ([6]).

The Commission does not have specific information about the problems encountered by medical sales representatives in obtaining regulation of their professional activities in individual MS.

([1]) Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications, OJ L 255/22, 30.09.2005.
([2]) The general system implies that the competent authority of the host MS may compare the training of a professional with their national training requirements. In case of substantial differences in training, the host MS may impose compensation measures before recognition of qualifications.
([3]) Doctors, nurses responsible for general care, pharmacists, midwives, dentists, architects and veterinary surgeons.
([4]) It must be noted that the directive also applies to Iceland, Norway and Lichtenstein; specific rules apply to Switzerland.
([5]) Court of Justice of the European Union.
([6]) See for instance C-531/06 Commission/Italy, 19 May 2009; C-171/07 and C-172/07, Apothekerkammer des Saarlandes, 19 May 2009; C-570/07 and C-571/07 Blanco Pérez, 1 June 2010.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002055/14
προς το Συμβούλιο
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(20 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Απάντηση του Συμβουλίου στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις μου E-012707/2013 και E-012726/2013

Αναφορικά με την απάντηση του Συμβουλίου στις πιο πάνω ερωτήσεις μου, επιθυμώ να παρατηρήσω τα ακόλουθα:

1. Δεν απαντήθηκαν τα ερωτήματα (1), (2) και (3) της γραπτής ερώτησης μου με αριθμό E-012707/2013.

2. Δεν θεωρώ ικανοποιητική την απάντηση του Συμβουλίου στην ερώτησή μου με αριθμό E-012726/2013, στην οποία αναφέρεται, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι «η Ευρωομάδα εξέφρασε την ικανοποίησή της καθώς η δεύτερη αποστολή ελέγχου της Τρόικας κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι το πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής είναι σε ομαλή πορεία». Η ερώτησή μου αποσκοπούσε στο να πληροφορηθώ τις απόψεις του Συμβουλίου αναφορικά με τις πολιτικές που επέβαλαν η Ευρωομάδα και η Τρόικα στην Κύπρο, και όχι να μάθω τις απόψεις της Ευρωομάδας και της Τρόικας για την πορεία εφαρμογής του κυπριακού προγράμματος.

3. Κατά την άποψή μου αλλά, και σύμφωνα με τις εκτιμήσεις έγκριτων αναλυτών στην Κύπρο, το πρόγραμμα δεν αποδίδει τα αναμενόμενα αποτελέσματα. Αντίθετα, η εφαρμογή του οδηγεί την Κύπρο σε μεγαλύτερη κρίση, αφού η ύφεση συνεχίζει να είναι πολύ βαθιά, η ανεργία καλπάζει και το τραπεζικό σύστημα της χώρας έχει περιέλθει σε πλήρη αδυναμία να χρηματοδοτήσει την οικονομική δραστηριότητα και την ανάπτυξη. Εκτός, βέβαια, αν σκοπός των ευρωπαϊκών πολιτικών είναι να ευημερούν οι δημοσιονομικοί δείκτες και η εικονική οικονομία, ανεξαρτήτως αν η πραγματική οικονομία και οι άνθρωποι υποφέρουν.

Θα το εκτιμούσα πολύ να έχω τις απόψεις του Συμβουλίου ως προς το τι πρέπει να γίνει για να αναστραφούν οι αρνητικές συνέπειες των αποφάσεων της Ευρωομάδας και της Τρόικας, ούτως ώστε να επανέλθει η Κύπρος, το συντομότερο δυνατό, σε πορεία ανάπτυξης και δημιουργίας θέσεων απασχόλησης.

Απάντηση
(13 Μαΐου 2014)

Η εκτελεστική απόφαση 2013/463/ΕΕ του Συμβουλίου της 13ης Σεπτεμβρίου 2013 για την έγκριση προγράμματος μακροοικονομικής σταθερότητας για την Κύπρο και την κατάργηση της απόφασης 2013/236/ΕΕ ([1]) ορίζει ως βασικούς στόχους του προγράμματος τους εξής: την αποκατάσταση της ευρωστίας του κυπριακού τραπεζικού τομέα, τη συνέχιση της διεξαγόμενης διαδικασίας δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης και την εφαρμογή των διαρθρωτικών μεταρρυθμίσεων για τη στήριξη της ανταγωνιστικότητας και της βιώσιμης και ισόρροπης ανάπτυξης.

Στις 10 Μαρτίου 2014, η Ευρωομάδα δήλωσε ότι πρέπει να ενταθούν οι προσπάθειες δημιουργίας των συνθηκών βιώσιμης ανάπτυξης. Επαίνεσε την σύνεση με την οποία οι αρχές συνεχίζουν την εκτέλεση του προϋπολογισμού και η οποία, χάρη στη μικρότερη από την αναμενόμενη ύφεση, συνέβαλε στην άνετη επίτευξη των δημοσιονομικών στόχων για το 2013. Επίσης, η Ευρωομάδα σημείωσε «με ικανοποίηση τις ενδείξεις βελτίωσης της μακροοικονομικής σταθερότητας καθώς προχωρά η εφαρμογή του προγράμματος» ([2]).

Η εκτελεστική απόφαση του Συμβουλίου της 24ης Μαρτίου 2014 ([3]) για την τροποποίηση της εκτελεστικής απόφασης 2013/463/ΕΕ για την έγκριση προγράμματος μακροοικονομικής σταθερότητας για την Κύπρο προβλέπει ότι «στο πλαίσιο της ανάπτυξης μιας εκτενούς και συνεκτικής αναπτυξιακής στρατηγικής που θα επιτρέψει την επανεκκίνηση της οικονομίας, η Κύπρος την ενσωματώνει στο εθνικό της θεσμικό πλαίσιο, αξιοποιώντας τις εν εξελίξει μεταρρυθμίσεις της δημόσιας διοίκησης και της διαχείρισης των δημόσιων οικονομικών, άλλες υποχρεώσεις που απορρέουν από το πρόγραμμα μακροοικονομικής προσαρμογής της Κύπρου και σχετικές πρωτοβουλίες της ΕΕ λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τη συμφωνία εταιρικής σχέσης για την αποτελεσματική εφαρμογή των Ευρωπαϊκών Διαρθρωτικών και Επενδυτικών Ταμείων».

([1]) ΕΕ L 250 της 20.9.2013, σ. 40.
([2]) http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/newsroom/news/2014/03/eurogroup-statement-on-cyprus/
([3]) ΕΕ L 91 της 27.3.2014, σ. 40.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002055/14
to the Council
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: The Council's answers to my written questions E-012707/2013 and E-012726/2013

Further to the Council's answers to the above questions, I wish to point out the following:

1. It has failed to answer questions 1, 2 and 3 of my Written Question E-012707/2013.

2. I am not satisfied with the Council's answer to my Question E-012726/2013 in which it states, *inter alia*, that 'the Eurogroup welcomed the conclusion of the Troika's second review mission that the adjustment programme is on track.' My question was intended to ascertain the Council's views about the policies imposed on Cyprus by the Eurogroup and the Troika, and not to know the views of the Eurogroup and the Troika on progress in implementing the Cyprus programme.

3. In my view — a view shared by reputable analysts in Cyprus — the programme is not delivering the desired results. In fact, it is plunging Cyprus deeper into the crisis, since the country is still in the throes of a very deep recession, unemployment is soaring and the country's banking system is now totally incapable of financing economic activity and growth. Unless, of course, the aim of European policies is to see financial indicators and the virtual economy flourish, regardless of whether or not the real economy and the people suffer.

In view of the above, will the Council kindly state its views on what should be done to reverse the adverse consequences of the decisions taken by the Eurogroup and the Troika, in order to restore Cyprus as soon as possible to growth and job creation?

Reply
(13 May 2014)

Council Implementing Decision 2013/463/EU of 13 September 2013 on approving the macroeconomic adjustment programme for Cyprus and repealing Decision 2013/236/EU ([1]) provides for the following key objectives of the programme: to restore the soundness of the Cypriot banking sector; to continue the on-going process of fiscal consolidation; and to implement structural reforms to support competitiveness and sustainable and balanced growth.

On 10 March 2014 the Eurogroup stated that efforts to create the conditions for sustainable growth need to be intensified. It commended the authorities' continued prudence in budgetary execution which, together with a less severe recession than anticipated, had contributed to meeting fiscal targets for 2013 with a considerable margin. The Eurogroup also noted 'with satisfaction the signs of improvement in macro-financial stability as programme implementation has progressed' ([2]).

Council Implementing Decision of 24 March 2014 ([3]) amending Implementing Decision 2013/463/EU on approving the macroeconomic adjustment programme for Cyprus, provides that 'when developing a comprehensive and coherent growth strategy that would allow the kick-starting of the economy, Cyprus shall integrate it into its national institutional framework leveraging on the on-going public administration, public financial management reform, other commitments in Cyprus's macroeconomic adjustment programme and relevant Union initiatives taking into account the Partnership agreement for the implementation of the European Structural and Investments Funds'.

([1]) OJ L 250, 20.9.2013, p. 40.
([2]) http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/newsroom/news/2014/03/eurogroup-statement-on-cyprus/
([3]) OJ L 91 of 27 March 2014, p. 40.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-002057/14
Komisijai
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(2014 m. vasario 20 d.)

Tema: Kada Komisija planuoja pateikti pasiūlymą dėl Europos prieinamumo akto?

2012 m. vasario pabaigoje Komisija baigė konsultacijas su nevyriausybinėmis organizacijomis ir pilietine visuomene dėl Europos prieinamumo akto (angl. *European Accessibility Act*). Komisija 2013 m. vasarą ketino pateikti pasiūlymą dėl šio akto. Kokią šio pasiūlymo pateikimo datą dabar yra numačiusi Komisija? Be to, kokie numatomi šio dokumento įgyvendinimo valstybėse narėse terminai? Ar jis apims prekių ir paslaugų prieinamumo tik neįgaliems asmenims aspektą, ar įtrauks ir kitas papildomas prieinamumo poreikius turinčias gyventojų grupes, ypač nėščias moteris, pagyvenusius žmones, mažų vaikų turinčius žmones?

Dar kartą norėčiau atkreipti dėmesį į tai, kad labai svarbu sudaryti vienodas sąlygas visiems Europos Sąjungos piliečiams dalyvauti visuomeniniame gyvenime, naudotis fizine infrastruktūra, transportu, informacinėmis ir ryšių technologijomis. Milijonams neįgalių žmonių šis dokumentas sudarytų kokybiškesnio gyvenimo sąlygas ir užtikrintų galimybę tapti visaverčiais visuomenės dalyviais.

V. Reding atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2014 m. balandžio 1 d.)

Europos Komisija yra pasiryžusi gerinti neįgaliųjų galimybes lygiavertiškai dalyvauti visuomenėje ir savo 2010-2020 m. Strategijoje dėl negalios nurodė, kad prieinamumas yra viena iš pagrindinių sričių, kurioje reikėtų imtis veiksmų siekiant šio tikslo.

Komisija toliau rengia Europos prieinamumo aktą, kuris numatytas 2014 m. Komisijos darbo programoje.

Šia iniciatyva siekiama pagerinti neįgaliesiems ir pagyvenusiems žmonėms prieinamą prekių ir paslaugų rinką.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002057/14
to the Commission
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: When does the Commission intend to submit a proposal for a European Accessibility Act?

In late February 2012, the Commission concluded consultations with non-governmental organisations and civil society on a European Accessibility Act. In the summer of 2013, the Commission was going to submit a proposal for this act. What deadline for the submission is now envisaged by the Commission? Also, what are the deadlines for the implementation of this document in Member States? Will it relate exclusively to accessibility of goods and services for the handicapped, or will it include additional groups of people with accessibility needs, especially pregnant women, elderly people and people with small children?

I would once again like to draw attention to the fact that it is very important to create a level playing field for all European citizens to participate in public life and make use of physical infrastructure, transportation, information and communication technologies. For millions of handicapped people, this document would lead to a better quality of life and provide the opportunity for them to become full participants in society.

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

The European Commission is committed to improve the opportunities for equal participation of persons with disabilities in society and has, in its Disability Strategy 2010-2020, identified accessibility as one of the main areas for action towards that end.

The Commission continues working on the preparation of the European Accessibility Act that is in the Commission work programme for 2014.

The initiative is aimed at improving the market of goods and services that are accessible for persons with disabilities and elderly persons.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002058/14
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE), Esther de Lange (PPE) en Wim van de Camp (PPE)
(20 februari 2014)

Betreft: Voorbehouden van provinciale en regionale kampioenschapstitels voor eigen onderdanen

In de studie over „equal treatment of non nationals in individual sports competitions" van 2010 wordt erkend dat het voorbehouden van nationale titels aan onderdanen met de eigen nationaliteit niet in strijd is met de regels van het Europees recht.

Over het toekennen van medailles in kampioenschappen erkennen de onderzoekers dat dit mogelijk niet onder de toepassing van het Verdrag valt, omdat het om een pure sportregel gaat.

Er zijn niettemin klachten van EU-onderdanen die reeds jarenlang in een bepaalde lidstaat verblijven, maar toch uitgesloten blijven van titels bij provinciale en regionale kampioenschappen. Bovendien zijn er tal van sporttakken in verschillende lidstaten die dergelijke titels wel openstellen voor EU-onderdanen die al een aantal jaren in de lidstaat verblijven.

Hoe kijkt de Commissie hiertegen aan?

Meent de Commissie dat het voorbehouden van titels bij provinciale en regionale kampioenschappen, en met name bij wielerwedstrijden, aan onderdanen met de eigen nationaliteit conform de Europese wetgeving is?

Antwoord van mevrouw Vassiliou namens de Commissie
(28 april 2014)

Het Europees Hof van Justitie heeft consequent geoordeeld dat de verdragsbepalingen inzake het vrije verkeer van personen zich niet verzetten tegen regelingen of praktijken waarbij buitenlandse spelers van bepaalde wedstrijden worden uitgesloten om niet-economische redenen, die verband houden met het specifieke karakter en kader van deze wedstrijden. Dit is bijvoorbeeld het geval bij wedstrijden tussen nationale ploegen van verschillende landen waarbij eenieder die gebruik maakt van het vrije verkeer kan worden uitgesloten in het gastland: deze worden beschouwd als een evenement waarbij het uitsluitend om de sport als zodanig gaat, zodat uitsluiting is toegestaan. Deze inperking moet evenwel beperkt blijven tot haar eigenlijke doel ([1]).

Daarom moet elke inperking van geval tot geval worden onderzocht en moet met alle overige relevante aspecten rekening worden gehouden om tot een conclusie te komen wat betreft de verenigbaarheid van zulke inperkingen met de bepalingen van het EU-recht inzake het vrije verkeer van personen.

([1]) Zie arrest van 15 december 1995 in zaak C-415/93 Bosman, Jurispr 1995, blz. I-4921, punt 127.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002058/14
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE), Esther de Lange (PPE) and Wim van de Camp (PPE)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Barring foreign nationals from competing for titles in provincial and regional championships

The study on 'equal treatment of non-nationals in individual sports competitions', dating from 2010, acknowledges that it is not a breach of European law to debar foreign nationals from competing for national titles.

With regard to the award of medals in championships, the researchers recognise that this may not fall under the Treaty because it is a pure sports rule.

Nonetheless, there are complaints from EU nationals who have lived for years in a particular Member State but remain excluded from titles in provincial and regional championships. Moreover, there are many sports in various Member States which do allow EU citizens to compete for such titles on condition that they have lived in the particular Member State for a given number of years.

What is the Commission's view of this?

Does the Commission consider that barring foreign nationals from competing for titles in provincial and regional championships, particularly cycling competitions, accords with European law?

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

The European Court of Justice has consistently held that the Treaty provisions concerning the freedom of movement for persons do not prevent the adoption of rules or practices excluding foreign players from certain matches for reasons which are not of an economic nature but relate to the particular nature and context of such matches. For example, such as matches between national teams of different countries from which those exercising free movement can be excluded within the host country are seen as being of sporting interest only and are not precluded. However, the restriction must remain limited to its proper objective ([1]).

Therefore, each restriction must be analysed on a case-by-case basis and all the relevant elements need to be taken into account in order to reach a conclusion as regards the compatibility of such restrictions with EC law provisions on freedom of movement for persons.

([1]) See the judgment of the Court in Case C-415/93 Bosman [1995] ECR I-4921, paragraph 127.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002059/14
do Komisji
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Internetowy nabór wniosków na dotacje

Z artykułu z Wrocławskich Wydarzeń z 13 lutego „40 mln zł w niespełna minutę" wynika, że Dolnośląska Instytucja Pośrednicząca otworzyła internetowy nabór wniosków na dotacje dla małych i średnich firm. Po kilkudziesięciu sekundach procedura rejestracji została zawieszona z powodu wyczerpania się puli alokacji. Podobno Zarząd kierował się potrzebą szybkiego zainwestowania ostatnich środków unijnych – ok 40 mln zł. Zaledwie 95 wniosków otrzymanych drogą internetową zakwalifikowało się w tym krótkim czasie i tylko te zostaną rozpatrzone.

Czy taka procedura nie powinna się opierać na merytoryce projektów, przyjmować i rozpatrywać wszystkie wnioski nie tylko te internetowe? Czy nie jest to forma dyskryminacji osób, które nie mają dostępu do Internetu? Jakie jest stanowisko Komisji w tej sprawie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(9 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Na podstawie informacji przekazanych przez instytucję zarządzającą programem dla województwa dolnośląskiego Komisja może potwierdzić, że zastosowana procedura zawierała wymóg składania wniosków przez Internet oraz że rejestracja wniosków trwała jedną minutę.

Przedłożone wnioski zostaną ocenione zgodnie z ustanowioną procedurą, czyli na podstawie kryteriów zatwierdzonych przez komitet monitorujący programu. Nie chodzi tu o procedurę, w której decyduje kolejność zgłoszeń, ale o procedurę przetargową, zgodnie z którą jedynie najlepsze wnioski z najwyższą liczbą punktów otrzymają pomoc UE.

Według instytucji zarządzającej celem procedury było zapewnienie najefektywniejszego wykorzystania pozostałych 35 milionów euro przydzielonych środków, biorąc pod uwagę, że decyzja o odpowiedniej pomocy państwa dla programów regionalnych wygasa z dniem 30 czerwca 2014 r. Potencjalni beneficjenci (przedsiębiorcy) zostali wcześniej poinformowani o przedmiotowym zaproszeniu do składania wniosków podczas spotkań informacyjnych. Tryb składania wniosków przez Internet zaproponowany został przez przedsiębiorców w celu uniknięcia długich kolejek w przypadku składania wniosków na papierze. Każdy potencjalny beneficjent miał możliwość wypełniania wniosku z wyprzedzeniem, przed rozpoczęciem rejestracji; udostępniony też został moduł „próbny" aplikacji do składania wniosków.

Wymóg dotyczący składania wniosków wyłącznie drogą elektroniczną niekoniecznie oznacza dyskryminację, biorąc pod uwagę, że przedsiębiorcy poinformowani zostali z odpowiednim wyprzedzeniem. Można się spodziewać, że przedsiębiorcy dysponują Internetem lub posiadają do niego łatwy dostęp. Mimo iż możliwość składania wniosków w formie papierowej może zwiększyć otwartość procedury, wymóg składania wniosków drogą elektroniczną jest obecnie powszechnie stosowaną praktyką.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002059/14
to the Commission
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Internet-based selection of subsidy applications

On 13 February 2014, Wrocławskie Wydarzenia published an article under the heading 'PLN 40 million in less than a minute' which announced that the Lower Silesian Intermediary Institution (Dolnośląska Instytucja Pośrednicząca) had launched an Internet-based selection procedure for subsidies for small and medium-sized enterprises. However, less than one minute in, the registration procedure was suspended due to exhaustion of the allocation pool. The board was allegedly motivated by the need to quickly invest the last remaining EU funds, amounting to approximately PLN 40 million. Barely 95 eligible applications were received over the Internet during this short period, and only those applications will be considered.

Should such a procedure not be based on the merit of the projects, and should it not be open to, and give consideration to, all applications, not just those submitted over the Internet? Is this not a form of discrimination against people who do not have access to the Internet? What is the Commission's position on this issue?

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

On the basis of the information received from the Dolnośląskie programme managing authority, The Commission can confirm that the procedure required submission of applications via Internet and that the registration of applications lasted one minute.

The submitted proposals will be assessed according to the established procedure, i.e. based on the criteria approved by the Monitoring Committee of the programme. This is not a 'first-in-first-approved' procedure, but a competitive procedure, whereby only the best proposals with the highest scoring will receive EU assistance.

According to the managing authority, the objective was to have the most efficient use of the remaining EUR 35 million of allocations, given that the relevant national state aid decision for regional programmes expires on 30 June 2014. The potential beneficiaries (entrepreneurs) were informed in advance of this call for proposals during information sessions. The Internet-based submission mode was suggested by the entrepreneurs, in order to avoid long waiting lines in case of paper submission of proposals. Every potential beneficiary had the possibility to fill in the proposal in advance before the opening of the registration; a 'trial' electronic module was made available.

The requirement for exclusive submission of proposals only via electronic format does not necessarily constitute discrimination, taking into account that the entrepreneurs were informed in advance. It can be reasonably expected that entrepreneurs are either equipped with or have easy access to the Internet. Even though the possibility to submit paper proposals might increase the openness of the process, it is nowadays current practice to request the electronic submission of proposals.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002060/14
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(20 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Atak na niezależną rosyjską telewizję internetową

Od dwóch tygodni w Rosji trwa nagonka na niezależną internetową telewizję Deszcz (TV Rain). 26 stycznia stacja wyemitowała kontrowersyjną sondę dotyczącą blokady Leningradu w czasie II wojny światowej, w której pytano o sensowność poddania się miasta w celu uniknięcia ofiar. Wywołało to ostrą reakcję władz – rządowa agencja Roskomnadzor wystosowała do stacji oficjalne ostrzeżenie, a najwięksi rosyjscy operatorzy kablowi przerwali nadawanie programu stacji, co doprowadziło do odcięcia 80 % widowni i zagroziło telewizji upadłością.

Takie działania władz to niewątpliwie kolejny atak na niezależne media i przypadek ograniczania wolności słowa w Rosji. Warto również podkreślić, że rosyjskie władze starają się tłumić akcje zwolenników tej niezależnej stacji. Podczas jednej z akcji solidarności z telewizją Deszcz, która odbyła się w Moskwie, policja zatrzymała ponad 40 uczestników. Jedna z demonstrantek, obywatelka Francji, została brutalnie potraktowana przez funkcjonariusza policji i ze złamaną nogą trafiła do szpitala.

W związku z tym zwracam się z pytaniem, czy Komisja Europejska zamierza interweniować w sprawie nagonki na niezależną rosyjską telewizję Deszcz i wyrazić zdecydowany sprzeciw wobec nieustających przypadków ograniczania wolności słowa w Rosji?

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

Jak wskazano w odpowiedzi na pytanie Szanownego Pana Posła E-000862/2014, wolność mediów odgrywa ważną rolę w dialogu UE z Rosją, w tym na najwyższym szczeblu i w ramach wspólnych dialogów politycznych, posiedzeń Stałej Rady Partnerstwa i konsultacji na temat praw człowieka.

W dniu 20 lutego, na forum Stałej Rady OBWE, UE dołączyła się do przedstawiciela OBWE ds. wolności mediów w wyrażeniu obaw w związku ze skoordynowanym wykluczeniem kanału telewizyjnego „Dożdż" z głównych sieci operatorów telewizji kablowej i satelitarnej w Rosji. UE odnotowała, że takie skuteczne wykluczenie będzie miało poważne skutki dla wolności mediów i pluralizmu mediów w Rosji.

UE będzie w dalszym ciągu wzywać władze rosyjskie do poszanowania swoich międzynarodowych zobowiązań w zakresie wolności wypowiedzi i wolności mediów oraz do zapewnienia, aby ogólne środowisko medialne było pluralistyczne i wolne od ingerencji politycznej.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002060/14
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Attack on independent Russian Internet television

Over the past two weeks, a witch-hunt has been conducted in Russia against *Telekanal Dozhd'* (TV Rain). On 26 January 2014, the channel broadcast a controversial survey on the Siege of Leningrad during the Second World War. In this survey, people were asked about whether it would have made sense to surrender the city in order to avoid casualties. This provoked a strong reaction from the authorities, with the Russian media watchdog, *Roskomnadzor*, issuing an official warning to the channel, and Russia's major cable operators halting broadcasts of the channel. This reduced the channel's viewing figures by 80% and put it in danger of bankruptcy.

These actions taken by the authorities undoubtedly represent yet another attack on the independent media and on freedom of speech in Russia. It should also be noted that the Russian authorities are attempting to crack down on protests organised by the supporters of the independent channel. During one protest held in Moscow in solidarity with *Telekanal Dozhd'*, the police detained over 40 demonstrators. One female demonstrator with French citizenship was subjected to brutal treatment at the hands of a police officer and was admitted to hospital with a broken leg.

In this connection, does the Commission intend to make representations with regard to the witch-hunt against Russia's independent *Telekanal Dozhd'* and to express its resolute opposition to the continued attacks on freedom of speech in Russia?

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

As indicated in the answer to the Honourable Member Question E-000862/2014, freedom of the media features prominently in the EU's dialogue with Russia, including at summit level and in our political dialogues, permanent partnership councils and human rights consultations.

On 20 February, at the OSCE Permanent Council, the EU joined the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media in expressing concerns about the orchestrated exclusion of TV channel 'Dozhd' from major cable TV networks and satellite operators in Russia. The EU noted that its effective cutting-off would have serious consequences for media freedom and media pluralism in Russia.

The EU wil continue to call on the Russian authorities to respect its international commitments on freedom of expression and media freedom and to ensure that the overall media environment remains pluralistic and free from political interference.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002061/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Adif aplaza el Corredor a Tarragona para valorar si deja el ancho ibérico — nuevas normas y criterios del RTE-Transporte y el principio de coste-beneficio

La empresa pública Adif, dependiente del Ministerio de Fomento, ha aplazado la tramitación del contrato de las obras de construcción del corredor mediterráneo entre Castellón y Vandellòs (Tarragona) para valorar si, además de implantar el ancho de vía internacional previsto, también mantiene el antiguo sistema del ancho ibérico ([1]).

El Boletín Oficial del Estado (BOE) publicó ayer la suspensión de la fecha de apertura de ofertas económicas de los contratos de los dos subtramos, referidos a vía y electrificación, un paso que Adif tenía previsto dar la semana pasada. El trámite del comprendido entre Castellón y Vinaròs se aplaza al 27 de marzo mientras que el de Vinaròs-Vandellòs se dilata al 20 de marzo. Adif sí llegó a adjudicar estos mismos trabajos en el tramo entre Valencia y Castellón.

El Ministerio de Fomento mantiene en cambio la licitación del contrato de suministro de traviesas de ancho mixto en los tramos del corredor entre Valencia y Vandellòs, y entre Vila-seca (Tarragona) y Castellbisbal (Barcelona), por 30,1 millones de euros más IVA.

1. ¿Puede la Comisión confirmar esta decisión del Gobierno español?

2. ¿Está en consonancia con lo decidido y aprobado en la revisión del RTE-Transporte y, en concreto, con lo relativo a la red básica?

3. ¿Es esta decisión resultado de un análisis coste-beneficio? En caso contrario, ¿podría la Comisión solicitar tal estudio al ministerio competente de España?

4. ¿Considera la Comisión que el dispendio dedicado a la alta velocidad en España respeta las nuevas normas RTE-T y el principio de coste-beneficio?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

1.-3. La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a las respuestas dadas a la pregunta escrita E-000067/2014 ([2]).

4. Aún no se ha asignado ningún fondo al amparo de las nuevas directrices de la RTE-T ([3]) debido a la reciente entrada en vigor de estas.

([1]) http://www.elperiodicomediterraneo.com/noticias/castellon/adif-aplaza-corredor-tarragona-valorar-deja-ancho-iberico_862005.html
([2]) Pueden consultarse en la siguiente dirección: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) Reglamento (UE) nº 1315/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 11 de diciembre de 2013, sobre las orientaciones de la Unión para el desarrollo de la Red Transeuropea de Transporte, y por el que se deroga la Decisión nº 661/2010/UE (DO L 348 de 20.12.2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002061/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: ADIF postpones the Corridor to Tarragona to assess whether to keep the Iberian gauge — new TEN-Transport criteria and rules and the cost/benefit principle

The public enterprise ADIF, which operates under the aegis of the Ministry of Public Works, has postponed the processing of the construction contract for the Mediterranean Corridor rail works between Castellón and Vandellòs in Tarragona in order to assess whether, in addition to laying the planned international gauge, the old Iberian gauge system should be kept as well ([1]).

Yesterday, the Official State Gazette (BOE) published that the date for opening tenders for contracts relating to the two stretches with respect to the railway and electrification, a step which ADIF had planned to take last week, has been postponed. The award of the contract for the stretch between Castellón and Vinaròs has been postponed until 27 March, while the one for Vinaròs-Vandellòs has been delayed until 20 March. ADIF did, however, award contracts for similar works on the stretch between Valencia and Castellón.

On the other hand, the Ministry of Public Works is maintaining its award in respect of the contract for the supply of mixed gauge sleepers on the stretches of the corridor between Valencia and Vandellòs and between Vila-seca in Tarragona and Castellbisbal in Barcelona, in the sum of 30.1 million euros plus VAT (*IVA*).

1. Can the Commission confirm this decision by the Spanish Government?

2. Is it in accordance with what was decided and approved in the TEN-Transport review, particularly with respect to the basic network?

3. Is this decision the result of a cost/benefit analysis? If not, could the Commission request such an assessment from the corresponding Spanish ministry?

4. Does the Commission consider that the funds allocated to high-speed rail in Spain comply with the new TEN-T rules and the cost/benefit principle?

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

1 to 3. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Question E-000067/2014 ([2]).

4. No funds have yet been allocated based upon the new TEN-T Guidelines ([3]) given the recent entry into force of the latter.

([1]) http://www.elperiodicomediterraneo.com/noticias/castellon/adif-aplaza-corredor-tarragona-valorar-deja-ancho-iberico_862005.html
([2]) Available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and repealing Decision No 661/2010/EU, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002062/14
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(21. februar 2014)

Om: Dansk fiskeris problemer som følge af stillestående kvoteforhandlinger

Som det vil være Kommissionen bekendt, er dansk fiskeri ramt af en alvorlig krise som følge af EU's forhandlinger med Norge om kvoter på rejer og konsumfisk. EU-Kommissionen synes at lægge vægt på, at konflikten om makrel-kvoterne i norsk og færøsk farvand skal løses, men lukker øjnene for, at de strandede forhandlinger rammer danske fiskere meget hårdt. Forhandlingerne har pågået i over fire år, og tilsyneladende er parterne kun adskilt af ganske små uenigheder.

Dette til trods synes der ikke at være nogen udsigt til en aftale, og konsekvenserne for danske fiskere stiger stødt fra dag og dag. Siden den 1. januar 2014 har danske fiskere kun haft 10 % af det farvand, de er vant til at fiske i. Hertil kommer, at danske fiskere er meget afhængige af at kunne følge de rejer, der normalt fanges i norsk zone på denne tid. Men på grund af de strandede forhandlinger er danske fiskere altså afskåret herfra.

Situationen er således ikke bare alvorlig, men forværres yderligere af, at der ikke er udsigt til en aftale.

Vil Kommissionen derfor:

1. oplyse, hvad udsigterne til en aftale er?

2. redegøre for, hvad der adskiller parterne?

3. tage initiativ til at hjælpe de danske fiskere, der rammes af situationen?

4. oplyse, om der kan gives anden form for støtte til de ramte fiskere?

5. meddele, hvad man agter at gøre for at undgå en lignende situation i fremtiden?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Maria Damanaki
(10. april 2014)

Som det ærede medlem nu er bekendt med, blev der den 12. marts i år i London opnået enighed om de bilaterale aftaler mellem EU og Norge for 2014, primært vedrørende Nordsøen og Skagerrak. Fra denne dato kunne de danske fiskerfartøjer genoptage fiskeriet i norsk farvand. Disse fartøjers fiskeri efter de samme bestande i EU-farvande har ikke været afbrudt.

Kommissionen beklager den midlertidige afbrydelse af adgangen til norsk farvand. Efter Kommissionens opfattelse kunne denne undtagelsesvise to-måneders forsinkelse med indgåelsen af de bilaterale fiskeriaftaler med Norge for 2014 være undgået, hvis Norge enten den 14. februar i Bergen eller den 7. marts i Edinburgh havde indvilliget i at skille de bilaterale aftaler fra forhandlingerne om makrel.

Aftalen om en ordning for makrel for 2014-2018 mellem EU, Norge og Færøerne bør sikre, at de bilaterale aftaler i de kommende år bliver indgået under mere rolige omstændigheder, så afbrydelser i fiskeriet undgås.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002062/14
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: The Danish fishing industry's problems as a result of the stalled quota negotiations

As the Commission will be aware, the Danish fishing industry is in serious crisis as a result of the EU's negotiations with Norway on quotas for shrimp and edible fish. The Commission seems to attach importance to resolving the dispute over mackerel quotas in Norwegian and Faroese waters, but is blind to the fact that the Danish fishing industry has been very hard-hit because negotiations have broken down. The negotiations have been under way for over four years; and, apparently, there is very little on which the parties are not in agreement.

There seems nonetheless to be no prospect of an agreement, with steadily worsening consequences for Danish fishing operators with each passing day. Since 1 January 2014, Danish vessels have fished only 10% of the waters which they customarily fish. In addition, Danish operators are very much reliant on being able to follow the shrimp, which are normally caught in the Norwegian zone at this time. Because the negotiations have broken down, however, Danish vessels are barred from the zone.

The situation is therefore not only serious, but is further exacerbated by the fact that there is no prospect of an agreement.

Accordingly, will the Commission:

1. Say what prospects there are of an agreement?

2. Explain what divides the parties?

3. Act to help the Danish fishing operators affected by the situation?

4. Say whether other support can be given to the fishing operators affected?

5. Say what it intends to do to prevent a similar situation in the future?

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

As the Honourable Member is now aware, agreement was reached on 12 March last in London between the Union and Norway on bilateral arrangements for 2013 relating primarily to the North Sea and Skagerrak areas. From that date, Danish fishing vessels could recommence their fishing activities in Norwegian waters. Those vessels have had no interruption in their fishing activities in EU waters on the same stocks.

The Commission regrets this temporary interruption of access to Norwegian waters. In its view, this exceptional two month delay in reaching agreement on the 2014 bilateral fisheries arrangements with Norway could have been avoided, either in Bergen on 14 February or in Edinburgh on 7 March, if Norway had agreed to separate the bilateral arrangements from the mackerel negotiations.

The agreement on a mackerel arrangement 2014-2018 between the EU, Norway and Faroe Islands should ensure that the bilateral arrangements in future years take place in a more serene context, thereby avoiding interruptions in fishing practices.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002064/14
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: European Central Bank

A recent paper by the legal department of the European Central Bank (ECB), entitled 'Withdrawal and Expulsion from the EU and EMU: Some Reflections' ([1]), asserts that after a Member State has been in settled membership of the EU for an extended period, it ceases to have the right to leave. Is the Commission aware of this working paper?

Does the Commission have a view on this matter?

Does the Commission agree that there is no legal basis in the Treaties to support the ECB's opinion? Is it not the case that the Lisbon Treaty sets out both the right of a Member State to leave the Union and the process to be followed?

Is the Commission aware of any principle in international law under which the clear terms of an international treaty can be set aside without the agreement of the signatories, or can be degraded over time?

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

The Commission is aware of this working paper. However, the paper referred to does not reflect the views of the ECB, but just of one member of its staff.

([1]) Athanassiou, P., 'Withdrawal and Expulsion from the EU and EMU: Some Reflections', ECB Legal Working Paper Series, No 10 (December 2009), http://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/scplps/ecblwp10.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002065/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Il cinema, strumento di valorizzazione del territorio

Negli ultimi anni la produzione cinematografica ha portato alla ribalta piccole realtà territoriali locali e le loro peculiarità — attrattive, risorse, contraddizioni — favorendo la promozione dell'immagine delle stesse, riattivando competenze locali sottoutilizzate, producendo interessanti ricadute economiche e creando nuove possibilità di sviluppo.

Nello specifico, si intende fare riferimento ad esperienze che hanno avuto luogo nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia, grazie anche alla sensibilità di soggetti istituzionali.

Tale argomento pare far convergere in sé diversi aspetti importanti: non solo la promozione di cinema e cultura, ma anche la valorizzazione della storia europea, declinata nelle sue peculiarità nazionali, e delle risorse locali — paesaggistiche, lavorative — non ultimo il rilancio delle attività economiche.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. di informare in merito alle ricadute socioeconomiche sortite dalla produzione cinematografica negli ultimi anni, specie in contesti territoriali considerati «svantaggiati»;

2. di informare riguardo alle specifiche misure promosse dall'UE — a valorizzazione di cinema e territori — nel nuovo corso di programmazione.

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

1. La Commissione non monitora la produzione cinematografica negli Stati membri e non è quindi in grado di fornire un'analisi delle ripercussioni socioeconomiche di tale settore.

2. La Commissione non contempla nessuna misura specifica in tale ambito, ma gli Stati membri possono avvalersi dei Fondi strutturali e di investimento europei per sostenere progetti nei settori culturali e creativi che siano in linea con gli obiettivi tematici dei fondi e contribuiscano allo sviluppo di un potenziale endogeno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002065/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: The cinema, a tool for regional development

In recent years, cinematographic production has brought prominence to small local areas and their idiosyncrasies, in terms of attractions, resources and distinctive traits, resulting in image promotion, the revival of underused local skills, significant economic benefits and fresh development opportunities.

I refer specifically to initiatives in southern Italy, achieved due to the sensitivity of certain institutions.

There are a number of key convergent factors: promotion not only of cinema and culture, but of the European story itself in its particular national forms, local landscape and employment resources, and last but not least, an upsurge in economic activity.

In light of the above, the Commission is asked to:

1. provide an update on the socioeconomic repercussions of cinematographic production in recent years, in particular in regional areas considered 'disadvantaged';

2. provide an update on specific measures contemplated by the EU in its new programmes to promote cinematographic production and regional development.

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

1. The Commission does not monitor cinematographic production in Member States and therefore is unable to provide an analysis of the socioeconomic repercussions of this sector.

2. The Commission is not contemplating any specific measures in this field, but Member States may make use of the European Structural and Investment Funds to support projects in the cultural and creative sectors where they support the thematic objectives of the funds and contribute to the development of endogenous potential.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002066/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuove competenze per le imprese agricole — progetto pilota

Nel meridione d'Italia, un progetto pilota promosso da enti locali e associazioni giovanili assegna nuove competenze e responsabilità sociali ad imprese agricole, in relazione alla cura del territorio nonché delle sue risorse naturali e paesaggistiche.

Gli attori interessati si occuperebbero della gestione delle aree verdi, boschive e agrarie, nonché del mantenimento dell'assetto idrogeologico. Tale formula apporta diversi vantaggi, sia in relazione alla valorizzazione delle figure agrarie che in merito all'emersione di nuove consapevolezze riguardo alla salvaguardia dei beni comuni, sia in termini finanziari e di impiego razionale delle risorse, soprattutto locali.

Alla luce di quanto illustrato, può la Commissione:

1. informare riguardo a iniziative analoghe, in altri contesti europei?

2. informare relativamente a questo specifico progetto, favorendone la riproposizione in altre realtà territoriali europee?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

La descrizione del progetto pilota fornita dall'onorevole parlamentare non consente di stabilire se questa iniziativa ricada nell'ambito degli interventi che possono essere finanziati a titolo dei programmi di sviluppo rurale del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR).

In generale il FEASR cofinanzia interventi nel settore dello sviluppo rurale, inclusi progetti di gestione del territorio, che sono definiti e attuati a livello regionale e gestiti congiuntamente alla Commissione. Una volta approvate dalla Commissione, le misure previste dai programmi di sviluppo rurale sono attuate dalle autorità nazionali competenti. Nel caso dell'Italia dalle autorità regionali.

La Commissione non raccoglie informazioni relative a progetti individuali e suggerisce, pertanto, all'onorevole parlamentare di contattate l'autorità di gestione di cui trattasi per acquisire ulteriori informazioni su tali iniziative.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002066/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: New functions accorded to agricultural holdings — pilot project

In southern Italy, a pilot project promoted by local authorities and youth organisations has assigned new functions and social responsibilities to agricultural holdings pertaining to management of the land and its natural and landscape resources.

Those involved will manage open spaces, woodland and agricultural areas and maintain the hydrogeological structure. This formula brings a number of benefits, in terms of enhancement of the status of farmers, the emergence of new awareness with regard to the protection of the commons, financial benefits and the rational use of resources, in particular at local level.

In light of the above, can the Commission:

1. provide an update on comparable initiatives in other European Member States;

2. provide information on this specific project and encourage its replication in other European Member States?

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

The description of the pilot project given by the Honourable Member does not allow the determination whether such an initiative can fall under the scope of interventions which can be financed under rural development programmes of the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD).

In general, the EAFRD co-finances interventions for rural development, including land management projects, which are defined and implemented at the regional level, in shared management with the Commission. The implementation of measures foreseen in the Rural Development Programs, approved by the Commission, is carried out by the competent national authorities. In the case of Italy, it is the task of the regional authorities.

The Commission does not collect information at the level of individual projects and therefore the Honourable Member is advised to contact the Managing Authority in question to inquire for further details on those initiatives.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002067/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuove tecnologie e salvaguardia della privacy

Nello scenario odierno, le nuove tecnologie digitali si sono ritagliate un posto di rilievo; nelle loro applicazioni spesso rivelano la propria efficacia, costituendo un valido ausilio per diversi settori di attività.

Aldilà di questa considerazione preliminare, s'intende comunque sottolineare come altrettanto frequentemente le applicazioni di nuovi prodotti elettronici non siano sempre pertinenti e appropriate.

Quanto detto è soprattutto vero riguardo ad aspetti particolarmente delicati come, ad esempio, la privacy. Tra l'altro — notizia delle ultime ore — un articolo realizzato da una famosa impresa di livello mondiale (ossia un paio di occhiali capace di videoriprendere l'ambiente circostante) sarebbe stato al centro di alcune polemiche perché potenzialmente invasivo, specie se utilizzato in contesti pubblici.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. di illustrare quanto fatto dall'UE in relazione alla valutazione dell'appropriatezza di ritrovati tecnologici potenzialmente invasivi;

2. di fornire informazioni in relazione a iniziative dell'UE volte a promuovere una maggiore consapevolezza nei cittadini dinanzi ai rischi derivanti da un utilizzo superficiale dei prodotti elettronici.

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

La Commissione invita l'onorevole deputato a consultare la risposta fornita all'interrogazione E-006143/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002067/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: New technologies and privacy safeguards

In today's world, the new digital technologies have carved out a significant niche, given that their applications frequently demonstrate their effectiveness and they are a valid aid in various sectors of activity.

However, leaving aside this preliminary observation, it is to be emphasised that applications of new electronic products are as frequently neither pertinent nor appropriate.

This is in particular true in the light of the more controversial features of such products, one of which is privacy. An example recently in the news is a product manufactured by a world-famous company (eyewear capable of filming the surrounding environment), which is liable to become a focus of controversy because it is potentially invasive, especially if used in public.

In light of the above, the Commission is asked to:

1. describe measures taken by the EU to evaluate the appropriateness of potentially invasive technological inventions;

2. provide details of EU initiatives designed to enhance public awareness of the risks of the superficial use of electronic products.

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

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E -006143/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002068/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Nuove vittime in Nigeria (20.2.2014)

Una notizia in data 20 febbraio 2014 riporta il grave attacco compiuto dalla fazione fondamentalista islamica che da tempo mina lo stato di sicurezza e incolumità della popolazione nigeriana.

La scellerata azione ha provocato sinora 60 vittime. La testa della componente integralista promette ulteriori nuove incursioni, a danno di compagnie che gestiscono le strutture petrolifere del Nord del paese.

Alla luce di questi ultimi eventi, l'Alto Rappresentante:

1. può riferire ulteriori notizie in merito all'attacco di cui sopra, specie in relazione alle vittime?

2. può dare delucidazioni in merito alle strategie di sicurezza da predisporre sia nei riguardi dei civili che nei confronti di civili, tecnici e professionisti europei residenti nello stato nigeriano?

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

Nel mese di febbraio sono stati perpetrati diversi attentati terroristici a danno di villaggi e strutture scolastiche nella Nigeria nord-orientale. Il persistere degli atti di violenza desta grande preoccupazione.

Per il momento le uniche informazioni disponibili in merito agli attacchi sono quelle riportate dalla stampa, visto che è difficile recarsi nei tre stati nord-orientali in cui vige lo stato di emergenza. Le vittime degli ultimi attacchi erano per la maggior parte abitanti dei villaggi e studenti innocenti. È stata segnalata anche l'uccisione di ribelli e militari.

L'UE collabora con il governo e il popolo della Nigeria per contribuire ad arginare la spirale di violenza attraverso aiuti mirati volti ad eliminare le cause profonde della violenza.

Il 10° FES sostiene un'ampia gamma di interventi a livello di democratizzazione, Stato di diritto, risorse idriche, impianti igienico-sanitari e salute materna. Lo strumento inteso a contribuire alla stabilità e alla pace (IcSP) finanzia diversi programmi di pacificazione e mediazione nonché progetti volti a riformare la giustizia penale e a potenziare l'ufficio del consulente nazionale per la sicurezza. Lo strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani finanzia diverse azioni a tutela dei diritti umani, in particolare con le ONG.

A quanto risulta all'AR/VP, finora gli Stati membri dell'UE non hanno adottato misure specifiche relative ai cittadini europei in Nigeria a parte la raccomandazione di non recarsi nei paesi dove vige lo stato di emergenza.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002068/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Fresh killings in Nigeria (20 February 2014)

On 20 February 2014, news outlets published reports that the fundamentalist Islamic faction in Nigeria, which has long threatened the safety and security of the Nigerian people, had carried out a major attack.

The appalling attack claimed the lives of 60 people. The leader of the fundamentalist faction has also threatened further attacks on oil companies operating in the north of the country.

In light of these recent events, can the VP/HR:

1. provide further details on the attack, in particular with regard to the victims?

2. say what security measures are to be implemented to protect both the Nigerian people and the European citizens living or working in Nigeria?

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

There were several terrorist attacks in the month of February on villages and education facilities in the North East of Nigeria. The continued violence is of great concern.

The details obtained on the attacks do not go beyond reports from the press since it is difficult to visit the three North Eastern states under emergency for the time being. The victims of the latest attacks were mostly innocent villagers and college students. Reports also refer to killed insurgents and military staff.

The EU is working with the government and people of Nigeria to help bring an end to the cycle of violence through targeted aid interventions focusing on the underlying root causes of violence.

The 10th EDF is supporting a broad range of actions in the field of democratisation, rule of law, water, sanitation and maternal health. The IcSP (Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace) is supporting several peace and mediation programmes and projects to reform criminal justice and strengthen the Office of the National Security Advisor. The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights funds several actions to protect human rights, particularly with NGOs.

To the HRVP's knowledge no specific measures — apart from advice against all travel to the states under emergency rule — have been taken so far by EU Member States regarding European citizens in Nigeria.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002069/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Razzismo allo stadio e squalifica delle curve

Lo sport rappresenta certamente un'occasione di incontro e di dialogo fra linguaggi differenti, di conseguenza, si attesta come risorsa che, al di là dell'aspetto agonistico, si propone nella sua funzione formativa.

Quanto detto, però, è spesso svilito da episodi, più o meno ricorrenti, che rivelano l'insussistenza di una sensibilità nei riguardi del principale messaggio veicolato dallo sport da parte di alcune frange violente. Nello specifico, si fa riferimento ai recenti fatti di intolleranza manifestatisi negli stadi italiani, che hanno portato, peraltro, alla squalifica di curve e tifoserie per taluni Club.

Allo stesso tempo, in relazione ad una più stringente normativa, posta in essere dalle autorità competenti sull'onda del carattere di emergenza che tali fenomeni portano con sé, i diversi Club appaiono ricattabili da parte dei tifosi razzisti. Inoltre, queste stesse vicende mettono in cattiva luce le dimensioni più genuine della tifoseria e adombrano lo spirito di fair play.

Alla luce di quanto illustrato, può la Commissione:

1. specificare le sue attuali posizioni in merito al riproporsi degli eventi summenzionati;

2. informare riguardo ad interventi specifici di controllo nei confronti di minoranze violente.

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

La posizione della Commissione in merito al ripetersi di atti di razzismo e di violenza nelle competizioni sportive non è cambiata. Come segnalato nelle risposte E-000026/2013 ed E-012392/2013 la Commissione ha seguito gli sviluppi che si registrano negli Stati membri in merito al razzismo in tutte le forme di sport attraverso lo studio avviato dall'Agenzia per i diritti fondamentali nel campo dello sport e del razzismo. Inoltre, nell'ambito delle azioni preparatorie nel campo dello sport e del programma per l'apprendimento permanente, la Commissione ha fornito un sostegno finanziario per progetti di prevenzione e di educazione in merito alla lotta contro il razzismo e l'intolleranza nel mondo dello sport e in quello dell'istruzione, coinvolgendo i tifosi, le scuole e le società sportive. Nel contesto del suo dialogo strutturato con gli stakeholder dello sport la Commissione opera a stretto contatto con l'Unione europea delle federazioni di calcio (UEFA) su varie tematiche, tra cui la lotta contro il razzismo nelle competizioni internazionali e nei grandi eventi sportivi.

Nel programma unionale «Erasmus+: Sport» la lotta contro il razzismo nello sport rimane un ambito prioritario entro il quale è possibile sostenere progetti rispondenti agli obiettivi del programma.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002069/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Racism on the field and a ban on rowdy supporters

Sport is certainly an opportunity for encounter and dialogue among different nationalities and therefore emerges as a resource which has an educational function over and above its competitive aspect.

However, this opportunity is frequently marred by recurrent episodes which reveal lack of sensitivity on the part of a minority of violent supporters to the key message of sport. I refer specifically to recent acts of intolerance on Italian pitches, resulting in a ban on rowdy fans and supporters in the case of some clubs.

At the same time, as a result of more stringent regulations implemented by the competent authorities in response to the emergency created by such episodes, certain clubs are liable to be held to ransom by racist supporters. This situation also causes the more genuine supporters to be viewed in a bad light and overshadows the spirit of fair play.

In light of the above, can the Commission:

1. clarify its present position regarding the repeated incidence of the events described above;

2. provide details of specific measures to control violent minorities?

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

The Commission's position regarding the repeated incidence of racism and violence in sport competitions has not changed. As reported in replies E-000026/2013 and E-012392/2013, the Commission surveyed developments in the Member States regarding racism in all sports through a study launched by the Fundamental Rights Agency on Sport and Racism. In addition, under the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport as well as the Lifelong Learning Programme, the Commission provided financial support to preventive and educational projects regarding the fight against racism and intolerance in sport and in education, involving supporters, schools and clubs. In the framework of its structured dialogue with sport stakeholders the Commission is in close contact with the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) on various topics including the fight against racism in international competitions and at major sport events.

In the EU programme 'Erasmus+: Sport', the fight against racism in sport remains a priority area and innovative projects which meet the programme's objectives can be supported.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002070/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Sport e morti bianche in Qatar

Recentemente, la carta stampata riporta alla nostra attenzione la serie di morti bianche che si ripresentano nello Stato del Qatar: trattasi di operai — per lo più migranti — impiegati per l'allestimento di imponenti strutture sportive destinate ad accogliere le manifestazioni dei Mondiali 2022.

Attualmente, l'ammontare delle vittime si assesta sulle 1000 unità, che andrebbero a crescere in maniera considerevole sino al completamento dei lavori, secondo stime di organismi economici internazionali. La stessa Fifa è stata interpellata al riguardo da organizzazioni umanitarie; mentre l'ILO sottolinea come nei Paesi mediorientali si ripropongano per diversi migranti condizioni di lavoro.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione fornire informazioni riguardo a:

1. la presenza di compagnie europee — e loro eventuali responsabilità — nell'ambito della sfera di soggetti coinvolti nella predisposizione di strutture ricettive sportive per Qatar 2022?

2. Statistiche, dati inerenti alle condizioni lavorative in Medio Oriente; specie in riferimento ai migranti?

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

La Commissione non dispone di informazioni sulle singole impres*e dell'UE che operano in paesi terzi. L'UE ha definito una strategia specifica per promuovere la responsabilità sociale delle imprese, che comprende l'impegno delle imprese dell'Unione a rispettare i principi e gli orientamenti riconosciuti a livello internazionale, come le linee guida dell'OCSE per le imprese multinazionali, la* dichiarazione tripartita dei principi relativi alle imprese multinazionali e alla politica sociale, l'ISO 26000, l'iniziativa «Global Compact» dell'ONU e i principi guida dell'*ONU sulle imprese e sui diritti umani*.

Si invita l'onorevole deputato a rivolgersi all'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro (OIL) e alle autorità locali per ottenere statistiche sulle condizioni di lavoro in Medio Oriente.

L'onorevole deputato potrà trovare informazioni più dettagliate sulla posizione dell'UE in merito nella risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-1866/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002070/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Sport and work-related deaths in Qatar

The print media has recently brought to our attention a series of work-related deaths in the State of Qatar involving manual workers, primarily migrants, employed to build major sports facilities to accommodate 2022 World Cup events.

The number of victims currently stands at 1 000, but, according to estimates formulated by international economic organisations, is expected to rise substantially before the work is completed. FIFA itself has been approached on this matter by humanitarian organisations and the ILO has drawn attention to the fact that employment conditions remain an issue for a number of migrants in Middle Eastern countries.

In light of the above, can the Commission provide:

1. information on the presence of European companies — and their prospective responsibilities — with regard to their involvement in the building of sporting facilities for Qatar 2022;

2. statistics on employment conditions in the Middle East, with reference to migrants in particular?

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

The Commission does not have information concerning individual EU companies operating in third countries. The EU promotes Corporate Social Responsibility as outlined in its CSR strategy , including the adherence of EU companies to internationally recognised principles and guidelines, such as the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (MNEs), the Tripartite declaration of principles concerning multinational enterprises and social policy, ISO 26000, the UN Global Compact and the UN Guiding Principles on business and human rights.

The Honourable MEP is kindly referred to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and to local authorities for statistics on employment conditions in the Middle East.

The Honourable MEP can find more details on the EU's position on this issue in the reply given to Written Question E-1866/2014.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002071/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Sulla logica del riciclo

Una recente notizia fa conoscere come studenti del *Massachusetts Institute of Technology* abbiano realizzato un particolare tipo di matite — prodotte con materiale ligneo coltivato in maniera sostenibile — capaci di riutilizzarsi come piantine di basilico, una volta consumate (ad una delle estremità della matita compare una piccola capsula provvista di semi).

L'idea — al di là della sua portata — contribuisce comunque a gettare ulteriore luce sull'importanza dell'educazione alle logiche del consumo intelligente, sostenibile; soprattutto nell'ambito di percorsi di istruzione.

Alla luce di quanto illustrato può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Quale è stato sinora il livello di coinvolgimento dei contesti scolastici riguardo al discorso del consumo sostenibile e del riutilizzo dei materiali «di scarto»?

2. Quali ulteriori iniziative di particolare risonanza si possono concepire per le agenzie educative e d'istruzione, al fine di formare maggiormente una coscienza ecologica nelle giovani generazioni?

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

Conformemente all'articolo 165 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, gli Stati membri sono i soli responsabili per quanto riguarda il contenuto dell'insegnamento e l'organizzazione dei sistemi di istruzione e formazione; la Commissione pertanto non raccoglie sistematicamente dati sul livello di interesse degli istituti scolastici alle tematiche del consumo sostenibile e del riciclaggio dei rifiuti.

Le politiche dell'UE sono intese a sostenere le iniziative nazionali e a contribuire ad affrontare le sfide comuni. La Commissione fornisce continuamente materiale stampato e audiovisivo su questioni ambientali, che può essere usato per sostenere iniziative di formazione negli Stati membri. Attualmente, nell'ambito della tabella di marcia verso un'Europa efficiente nell'impiego delle risorse, la Commissione gestisce inoltre una campagna ambientale a livello dell'UE, denominata «Generation Awake», che valorizza i rifiuti in quanto risorse. La documentazione in tutte le lingue dell'UE è disponibile nella pagina web della campagna www.generationawake.eu, e diversi istituti scolastici se ne servono. Quanto alla ricerca, i programmi quadro dell'UE in materia hanno finanziato le università su una serie di temi collegati all'ambiente, e si prevede di proseguire in questo senso nell'ambito del programma di finanziamento della ricerca e dell'innovazione Orizzonte 2020. I rifiuti figurano tra i dodici settori prioritari del programma di lavoro della Commissione 2014-15.

Nell'ambito dell'iniziativa «Si torna a scuola», diversi funzionari della Commissione esperti di politica ambientale sono rientrati nel proprio paese di origine per informare la nuova generazione in merito alla politica ambientale dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002071/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: On the logic of recycling

A recent news item has revealed that students of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have invented a special type of pencil produced from wood from sustainably grown trees which, when used up, can be reused to grow basil plants (a small capsule containing seeds is fitted to one end of the pencil).

Apart from its significance, this idea casts further light on the importance of education in the logic of intelligent sustainable consumption, primarily in an educational context.

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

1. What has hitherto been the level of involvement of educational establishments in the matter of sustainable consumption and the recycling of waste materials?

2. What further initiatives of specific resonance can be devised to enable training and educational agencies to heighten ecological awareness in the young generation?

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

In accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems rests entirely with Member States. Data about the level of involvement of educational establishments in the matter of sustainable consumption and recycling of waste is therefore not something that the Commission gathers in a systematic way.

EU policies are designed to support national actions and help address common challenges. The Commission continuously provides printed and audiovisual material on environmental issues which can be used to support educational initiatives in Member States. The Commission currently runs an EU-wide environmental campaign called 'Generation Awake' in the context of the Resource Efficiency Roadmap. The focus is on waste as a resource. Reading materials in all EU languages are available on the homepage of the campaign www.generationawake.eu. Many educational establishments make use of these materials. From the research angle, the EU framework research programmes have funded research by Universities on a variety of environment-linked topics and this is expected to continue under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation funding programme. Waste is one of a dozen focus areas under its 2014-15 Work Programme.

Under the 'Back to School' initiative, several Commission staff experienced in environment policy have returned to their country of origin and informed the next generation about EU environment policy.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002072/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Episodio in Place Luxembourg del 20 febbraio 2014

Nella mattinata del 20 febbraio 2014, in Place Luxembourg ha avuto luogo un'«incursione» di un uomo armato, che sarebbe stato bloccato, nella sua azione, da agenti della polizia. I dettagli relativi alla vicenda appaiono al momento piuttosto nebulosi.

Inoltre, la valenza del luogo che ha fatto da scenario alla vicenda summenzionata conferisce ovviamente a quest'ultima un significato particolare.

1. Può la Commissione fornire informazioni maggiormente dettagliate sulla dinamica del fatto occorso e i suoi moventi?

2. Può illustrare quali sono i principali dispositivi di sicurezza impiegati nelle aree di particolare interesse istituzionale?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(3 aprile 2014)

La sicurezza degli edifici pubblici è di competenza della polizia locale, mentre le istituzioni dell'UE sono incaricate di garantire la sicurezza dei loro edifici e locali rispettivi. L'incidente che si è verificato il 20 febbraio 2014 in Place du Luxembourg è pertanto stato gestito dalle autorità belghe. Secondo il diritto penale belga non è consentito divulgare a terzi informazioni dettagliate in materia.

Tra la Commissione europea e le autorità belghe preposte alla sicurezza, in particolare la polizia locale, vige una collaborazione stretta e regolare in occasione di eventi rilevanti sotto il profilo della sicurezza, ad esempio manifestazioni, o in occasione di minacce dirette contro le istituzioni dell'UE (non era il caso dell'incidente citato).

Inoltre la sicurezza nel quartiere europeo è regolarmente all'ordine del giorno di un'apposita *task force* di rappresentanti delle istituzioni dell'UE e delle autorità belghe. Un risultato concreto di tale cooperazione è, ad esempio, un maggior pattugliamento della polizia locale nel quartiere dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002072/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Incident in Place du Luxembourg on 20 February 2014

On the morning of 20 February 2014, an incident took place in Place du Luxembourg in Brussels involving an armed man who is said to have been stopped by police. Details on the incident provided thus far have been rather vague.

Furthermore, the incident is particularly significant given where it took place.

1. Can the Commission provide more detailed information on the events which took place and the motives behind it?

2. Can the Commission say what security mechanisms are in place in and around the European institutions?

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

Security on public premises falls within the responsibility of the local police, whilst the EU institutions are in charge of securing their respective buildings and premises. The incident that took place on the 20th of February 2014 on place Luxembourg has therefore been handled by the Belgian authorities. Under the Belgian penal law detailed information cannot be divulged to third parties.

Regular and close cooperation between the European Commission and Belgian security authorities, in particular local police, takes place in the context of security relevant events such as demonstrations or direct threats against the EU institutions (which was not the case in the incident mentioned above).

Furthermore, security in the European Quarter is regularly on the agenda of a dedicated task force between EU institutions and Belgian authorities. A concrete outcome of this cooperation is for example an increased patrol service of the local police in the EU quarter.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002073/14
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(21 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Cantine școlare sociale

Criza economică și financiară a determinat creșterea semnificativă a numărului de persoane care au dificultăți în a-și asigura necesarul de hrană.

Problema este și mai dificilă când vorbim de copiii sau de tinerii care merg la școală și cărora părinții nu reușesc să le asigure gustarea pentru perioada când sunt la cursuri. În plus, problemele sunt și mai mari în cazul familiilor cu copii care urmează cursuri de diferite tipuri, care locuiesc în localități de mici dimensiuni sau în mediul rural, în zone monoindustriale confruntate cu șomaj ridicat.

În unele state membre, una dintre soluții a fost înființarea de cantine școlare speciale pentru copiii sau de tinerii ce provin din familii cu dificultăți, însoțite de măsuri adiacente, precum acordarea de facilități pentru părinții acestora sau cooperarea cu alte structuri sau firme private și încurajarea folosirii de produse provenind de la producătorii locali.

În ce măsură are Comisia în vedere sprijinirea eforturilor autorităților locale și regionale vizând organizarea și funcționarea cantinelor școlare de acest gen?

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

Regulamentul Fondului european de ajutor pentru persoanele cele mai defavorizate oferă posibilitatea servirii meselor la școală pentru copiii cei mai defavorizați, împreună cu măsuri care vizează incluziunea socială a acestora.

Deciziile referitoare la tipul de asistență materială, la identificarea persoanelor care vor beneficia de aceasta și la locurile și modul de distribuire a ajutoarelor țin de responsabilitatea fiecărui stat membru, care este de asemenea cel mai în măsură să evalueze necesitățile la nivel național.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002073/14
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: School soup kitchens

The economic and financial crisis has led to a significant increase in the number of people finding it difficult to meet their food needs.

The problem is all the more acute in the case of children and teenagers who are at school but whose parents are unable to provide them with sustenance for the school day. Such problems are exacerbated still further in the case of families with children following different courses, those living in small towns and villages and in rural areas, and those in mono-industrial areas with high unemployment.

In some Member States, one of solutions has been to set up special soup kitchens in schools for children and teenagers from families experiencing difficulties, coupled with flanking measures such as extending facilities to the children's parents and working with other organisations or private companies to encourage the use of local produce.

To what extent is the Commission considering offering support to local and regional authorities seeking to set up and manage school soup kitchens?

(Version française)

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

Le Règlement du Fonds Européen d'Aide aux plus Démunis offre la possibilité d'une distribution de repas aux enfants les plus démunis dans les écoles, couplée avec des mesures d'accompagnement visant à leur inclusion sociale.

Les décisions quant au type d'assistance matérielle, quant à l'identification des personnes qui en bénéficieront ainsi qu'aux lieux et modes de distribution relèvent de la responsabilité de chaque État membre, qui reste le mieux à même d'évaluer les besoins nationaux.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002074/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(21 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Implicación de Frontex para hacer frente a la presión migratoria en Ceuta y Melilla

Las ciudades autónomas españolas de Ceuta y Melilla se enfrentan desde hace tiempo a una presión migratoria muy fuerte en su frontera con Marruecos. Centenares de personas intentan entrar cada día en territorio de la Unión atravesando la valla fronteriza de Melilla o alcanzando la costa de Ceuta en embarcaciones precarias, o incluso a nado.

Hace unos meses me dirigí a esta Comisión (E-013210/2013) para preguntar sobre las concertinas (alambre de cuchillas) que el Gobierno español colocó en las vallas de la frontera de Melilla, trasladándole las críticas que habían despertado por su escaso efecto disuasorio y los graves daños que causaban. La Comisión Europea respondió admitiendo que, si bien las medidas concretas en las fronteras exteriores las adoptan los Estados miembros, debe fomentarse el uso de otro tipo de medidas de vigilancia fronteriza. Ceuta vivió el pasado 6 de febrero una gran tragedia en la playa del Tarajal, donde quince subsaharianos fallecieron ahogados cuando trataban de llegar a nado desde Marruecos.

Frontex es la Agencia europea que se ocupa de la gestión de las fronteras exteriores de la Unión. Entre los medios de los que dispone está el mecanismo RABIT —despliegue de equipos de intervención rápida en las fronteras— cuando un Estado miembro se enfrente a situaciones urgentes y excepcionales resultantes de una gran afluencia de inmigrantes clandestinos. El Gobierno español ha señalado que en diversas ocasiones ha pedido a la Unión Europea financiación para luchar contra la inmigración irregular. La Comisión Europea en cambio ha negado haber recibido petición formal alguna por parte de las autoridades españolas para hacer frente a la presión migratoria en Ceuta y Melilla. Por todo ello, pregunto a esta Comisión.

— ¿Puede confirmar si la Comisión ha recibido o no petición formal por parte de las autoridades españolas para hacer frente a la presión migratoria en Ceuta y Melilla?

— ¿Ha pedido el Gobierno español en alguna ocasión a la Agencia Frontex que se active el mecanismo RABIT para reducir la presión migratoria en Ceuta y Melilla?

— ¿Cree que el apoyo de Frontex en la gestión de las fronteras de España con el Reino de Marruecos servirá para hacer frente a la actual delicada situación?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de marzo de 2014)

Las solicitudes de asistencia operativa en las fronteras exteriores de los Estados miembros de la UE deben, en principio, dirigirse a Frontex ([1]), quien coordina la cooperación operativa en algunas de las fronteras exteriores españolas mediante las operaciones conjuntas «Hera» e «Indalo» que, sin embargo, no cubren directamente Ceuta y Melilla.

La Comisión ha recibido de las autoridades españolas una solicitud de ayuda financiera de urgencia para hacer frente a la situación de presión migratoria en Ceuta y Melilla y la está evaluando actualmente.

Según la información de que dispone la Comisión, las autoridades españolas no han solicitado a Frontex el despliegue de un equipo de intervención rápida.

Frontex solo puede prestar asistencia a los Estados miembros en las fronteras exteriores previa solicitud de alguno de ellos. A falta de dicha solicitud, la Comisión no puede saber si la situación sería diferente en caso de que esta se hubiera presentado.

([1]) Agencia Europea para la Gestión de la Cooperación Operativa en las Fronteras Exteriores de los Estados Miembros de la Unión Europea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002074/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Role of Frontex in responding to migratory pressure in Ceuta and Melilla

The Spanish autonomous cities of Ceuta and Melilla have for some time been under considerable migratory pressure at their borders with Morocco. Every day hundreds of people try to enter Union territory by crossing the border fence at Melilla, or by travelling in dilapidated boats or even swimming to Ceuta.

A few months ago I submitted a question to the Commission (E-013210/2013) about the razor wire that the Spanish Government had installed on the Melilla border fences, drawing attention to concerns that this decision had raised. People were arguing that the wire was an ineffective deterrent and was causing serious injuries. In its answer the Commission said that, whilst the Member States were responsible for choosing which specific external border control measures to employ, other border control methods should nevertheless be promoted. On 6 February 2014 fifteen sub-Saharan Africans tragically drowned off the Tarajal beach in Ceuta while attempting to swim across from Morocco.

Frontex is the EU agency responsible for managing the Union's external borders. One of the mechanisms at its disposal is RABIT — the deployment of rapid border intervention teams — in cases where a Member State needs urgent support because of an exceptionally large influx of illegal immigrants. The Spanish Government says that it has asked the EU for financial support on several occasions to help tackle illegal immigration. The Commission, meanwhile, denies that it has ever received a formal request from the Spanish authorities asking for help to deal with the migratory pressure in Ceuta and Melilla.

— Can the Commission confirm whether or not it has ever received a formal request from the Spanish authorities for help in tackling the migratory pressure in Ceuta and Melilla?

— Has the Spanish Government ever asked the Frontex agency to activate the RABIT mechanism with a view to reducing the migratory pressure in Ceuta and Melilla?

— Does the Commission think that Frontex support for the management of Spain's borders with Morocco will help address this delicate situation?

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

A request for operational assistance at the external borders of the Member States of the Union should in principle be addressed to Frontex ([1]). Frontex is coordinating operational cooperation at some parts of the Spanish external borders through the joint operations 'Hera' and 'Indalo', but these do not cover directly Ceuta and Melilla.

The Commission has received from Spain a request for emergency financial assistance to deal with the situation of migratory pressure at Ceuta and Melilla. The Commission is currently assessing this request.

According to the information available to the Commission there has been no request from the Spanish authorities to the Frontex for the deployment of a rapid intervention team.

Frontex can only provide assistance to Member States at external borders upon the request of a given Member State. In the absence of such a request the Commission can not speculate if the situation would be different if a request would have been made.

([1]) European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002075/14
an die Kommission
Othmar Karas (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE) und Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(21. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Umsetzung der Verpackungsrichtlinie in den Mitgliedstaaten

In einer Studie zur Ausarbeitung von bewährten Verfahren für die Gestaltung von Abfallvermeidungs- und Abfalltrennungssystemen wird unter anderem die Erfassung und Verwertung von Haushaltsverpackungen in Österreich durch ARA behandelt. Es geht unter anderem um die Frage, ob die getrennte Erfassung von Abfällen besser einem monopolartigen System überantwortet wird (Dienstleistung von allgemeinem wirtschaftlichem Interesse) oder ob wettbewerbsorientierte Modelle zu bevorzugen sind.

Parallel dazu hat die GD Wettbewerb ein Verfahren gegen ARA auf der Grundlage von Artikel 102 AEUV eröffnet. ARA wird vorgeworfen, ein bestimmtes Wettbewerbsmodell in der Sammlung von Haushaltsverpackungen nicht zu unterstützen. Laut der GD Wettbewerb wäre der monopolistische Betreiber einer Sammelinfrastruktur für Haushaltsabfälle verpflichtet, jedem markteintrittswilligen System die mithilfe dieser Infrastruktur gesammelten Abfälle in Relation zum jeweiligen Marktanteil zu übergeben. Der neu in den Markt eintretende Wettbewerber soll sich nicht an den Kosten für die Planung des Systems und die laufende Systemverwaltung beteiligen müssen.

1. Sind die beiden Initiativen der GD Wettbewerb und der GD Umwelt aufeinander abgestimmt? Wie stellt die Kommission sicher, dass durch ihr wettbewerbsrechtliches Einschreiten kein Präjudiz geschaffen wird, das den umweltpolitischen Erkenntnissen aus der laufenden EPR-Studie widerspricht?

2. Findet die GD Wettbewerb eine vollständige Angleichung der Erfassungskosten von konkurrierenden Systembetreibern sinnvoll, damit es zu Wettbewerb auf Ebene der Verwertung von Sekundärrohstoffen kommt? Die Erfassungskosten bilden den höchsten Anteil (ca. 65 %) der Gesamtkosten dualer Systeme. Wie will die Kommission sicherstellen, dass Verbraucher vom neu angestoßenen Wettbewerb profitieren, wenn auf einem so großen Kostenblock kein Wettbewerbsdruck lastet?

3. Die Kommission hat in ihren Antworten auf frühere parlamentarische Anfragen (vgl. E-011658/2011) zum Ausdruck gebracht, dass die Organisation der Verpackungssammlung den Mitgliedstaaten überlassen sein sollte. Mit Austausch von bewährten Verfahren erziele man bei unterschiedlicher Umsetzung der Verpackungsrichtlinie ein gleichwertiges Ergebnis. Warum überlässt die Kommission die Anwendung des Artikels 102 AEUV auf nationale Sammelsysteme nicht den nationalen Behörden (siehe auch Subsidiaritätsprinzip nach Artikel 5 EUV)?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(22. April 2014)

Die Generaldirektionen Wettbewerb und Umwelt standen während des gesamten ARA-Verfahrens in engem Kontakt. Die Generaldirektion Umwelt wurde um Stellungnahme zu der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte gebeten, in der die Kommission ihre Bedenken im ARA-Kartellverfahren darlegte.

Das Wettbewerbsrecht gilt auch für Abfallsammlungs- und -verwertungssysteme (im Folgenden „Systeme"), und seine Anwendung steht der Erreichung der umweltrechtlichen Zielsetzungen nicht entgegen. Österreich hat kürzlich auch seine Abfallgesetzgebung geändert, um mehr Wettbewerb zwischen den Systemen einzuführen.

Es ist nicht ungewöhnlich, dass nur für einen Teil der Gesamtkosten eines Produkts oder einer Dienstleistung Wettbewerb stattfindet. Wettbewerb zwischen den Systemen in Bezug auf ein wichtiges Element des Produkt- bzw. Dienstleistungspreises ist für die Verbraucher besser als überhaupt kein Wettbewerb. So besteht für Systeme, die miteinander konkurrieren, ein Anreiz, beispielsweise durch effizientere Abfallsortierung die Kosten zu senken und durch Marketinginitiativen für den Verkauf der gesammelten Abfälle als Sekundärrohstoffe die Einnahmen zu steigern, wodurch sie wiederum ihre Lizenzgebühren verringern können.

Im ARA-Verfahren geht es nicht um die Organisation der Sammlung von Abfällen nach der Verpackungsrichtlinie, sondern um einen Verstoß gegen das EU-Wettbewerbsrecht. Die Kommission hatte bereits 2003 eine Entscheidung gegen ARA erlassen und befand sich daher in einer guten Ausgangslage, um das nachfolgende Verfahren gegen ARA zu führen. Sie stand über die gesamte Dauer des Verfahrens hinweg in engem Kontakt zu den österreichischen Behörden. Ein Widerspruch zum Grundsatz der Subsidiarität nach Artikel 5 EUV ist nicht gegeben.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002075/14
to the Commission
Othmar Karas (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE) and Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Implementation of Packaging Directive in the Member States

A study concerning the development of tried and tested methods for waste avoidance and separation includes an evaluation of the ARA household packaging collection and recycling system in Austria and weighs up the comparative advantages of monopolistic (services of general economic interest) and competing systems for separate waste collection.

In the meantime, the Directorate-General for Competition has initiated proceedings against the ARA under Article 102 TFEU for failure to uphold specific provisions regarding competition for the collection of domestic packaging, arguing that operators of household waste collection infrastructures, when in a dominant position, must allow all prospective market entrants to deal with a proportion of waste thus collected commensurate with their share of the market, while not requiring them to contribute to planning and day-to-day managements costs.

1. Have the Directorates-General for Competition and the Environment coordinated their actions in this respect? How can the Commission ensure that its intervention under competition law does not create a precedent contradicting the findings of the current EPR study with regard to environmental policy?

2. Does the Directorate-General for Competition consider full alignment of acquisition costs for competing systems operators to be the best way of ensuring competition for the recycling of secondary raw materials? Given that acquisition accounts for the largest share (around 65%) of the total cost of dual systems, how does the Commission intend to ensure that consumers benefit from recent measure to promote competition if it is failing to impact on such a large percentage of costs?

3. In reply to previous questions (e.g. E-011658/2011), the Commission indicated that Member States should be left to organise the collection of packaging and that equally satisfactory results could be achieved through the exchange of best practices with the Packaging Directive being transposed in different ways. Why does the Commission therefore not allow the national authorities to apply Article 102 TFEU to national collection systems as they see fit (in accordance with the subsidiarity principle under Article 5 TEU)?

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

The Directorates-General for Competition and for Environment have been in close contact throughout the ARA-procedure. The Directorate-General for Environment was consulted on the Statement of Objections setting out the Commission's concerns in the ARA investigation.

Waste collection and recycling systems ('systems') are not exempted from competition law and the application of competition law does not prevent the fulfilment of the environmental regulatory targets. Austria also recently amended its waste legislation in order to introduce more competition between systems.

It is not unusual that competition takes place for only part of the overall costs of a product or service. Competition between systems with respect to an important part of the acquisition costs is better for consumers than no competition at all. Competing systems would, for example, have an incentive to lower their costs (e.g. through more efficient sorting processes) and to increase their revenues (e.g. by marketing efforts to sell the collected waste as secondary raw materials) which in turn would lower their license fees.

The ARA investigation does not concern the organisation of waste collection under the Packaging Directive but an infringement of EU competition law. The Commission had issued an earlier decision against ARA in the year 2003 and was well placed to conduct the subsequent proceedings against ARA. The Commission has been in close contact with the Austrian authorities throughout the investigation. There is no conflict with the subsidiarity principle under Art. 5 TEU.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002077/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(21 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Mecanismo de Inversión en América Latina (MIAL)

El MIAL es un mecanismo financiero de cooperación al desarrollo creado por la Comisión en diciembre de 2009 en el marco del Instrumento de Financiación de la Cooperación al Desarrollo (ICD). Dicho mecanismo está dotado con 125 millones de euros para el período 2009-2013 y su principal objetivo es la financiación de proyectos en el ámbito de las infraestructuras en América Latina.

La Comisión Europea, a través de la página web de EuropeAid, facilita información sobre el MIAL de carácter general y superficial. El único informe operativo existente hasta el momento presenta algo más de información sobre los ocho proyectos aprobados en 2010-2011 pero es a todas luces insuficiente para hacer un análisis o una valoración objetiva de estos proyectos. Diferentes ONG (CIFCA, Grupo Sur, ALOP, Aprodev y Eeurodad) pidieron información pero la Comisión denegó parcialmente dicha solicitud aduciendo que no estaba facultada para compartir datos elaborados por las instituciones financieras elegibles en relación con el MIAL y que su publicación podría afectar intereses comerciales y de propiedad intelectual. Según el Reglamento (CE) n° 1049/2001 relativo al acceso público a los documentos del Parlamento, del Consejo y de la Comisión, mucha de esta información debería ser accesible a la ciudadanía.

¿Es favorable la Comisión a que el Consejo Estratégico del MIAL defina criterios y directrices claras de transparencia, rendición de cuentas y acceso a la información?

¿Podría indicar la Comisión si se harán públicas las «solicitudes de contribución» o la ficha técnica de los proyectos ya aprobados por el MIAL así como si se harán públicos y se divulgarán en la página web de EuropeAid/MIAL los informes de revisión orientada hacia los resultados?

¿Se plantea la Comisión que el Parlamento Europeo, en particular su Comisión de Desarrollo, así como las organizaciones de la sociedad civil del ámbito de la cooperación al desarrollo, cuenten con representación en el Consejo Estratégico del MIAL y en plataforma de la UE para la financiación combinada en el ámbito de la cooperación exterior?

Respuesta del Sr. Piebalgs en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de abril de 2014)

La financiación combinada, como instrumento de financiación de la cooperación al desarrollo de la UE, es un medio para lograr resultados en consonancia con las principales prioridades de desarrollo, como la reducción de la pobreza, las desigualdades y la exclusión social. Al aplicar la financiación combinada, la Comisión cumple los requisitos de los reglamentos aplicables, incluidos los relativos al acceso del público a los documentos de la Comisión, y aplica el máximo nivel de transparencia y responsabilidad.

Los informes anuales de todos los mecanismos de financiación combinada estarán a disposición del público en la página web de EuropeAid ([1]). Ya se han publicado los informes del Mecanismo de Inversión en América Latina (MIAL) correspondientes al período 2010-2011 y al año 2012 ([2]). El informe de 2013 está previsto para mediados de 2014. La página web de EuropeAid se está revisando actualmente y se reinicializará con un sitio específico con información sobre la financiación combinada y los proyectos individuales.

El Parlamento participa, en calidad de observador, en la plataforma de la UE para la financiación combinada en el ámbito de la cooperación exterior, cuyo objetivo es mejorar la calidad y la eficacia de la cooperación exterior y de desarrollo de la UE mediante la financiación combinada. La Comisión se congratula de que los expertos del Parlamento hayan participado y contribuido con su valiosa experiencia tanto a nivel político como técnico.

La Comisión está abierta a las aportaciones de la sociedad civil europea en lo relacionado con la cooperación al desarrollo de la UE, incluida la financiación combinada. Los servicios de la Comisión han entablado numerosos diálogos con representantes de las organizaciones de la sociedad civil, como las Jornadas Europeas del Desarrollo. También se han tenido en cuenta las observaciones de la sociedad civil en los trabajos de la plataforma mencionada.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/news/2012-12-12-platform-blending-funds_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/latin-america/regional-cooperation/laif/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002077/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Latin America Investment Facility (LAIF)(I)

The LAIF is a financing mechanism for development cooperation created by the European Commission in December 2009 in the framework of the Financing Instrument for Development Cooperation (DCI). This mechanism has been provided with 125 million euros for the period 2009-2013 and its main purpose is to finance infrastructure projects in Latin America.

The European Commission provides information about the LAIF via its EuropeAid website, but it is of a merely general and superficial nature. The only operative report available to date presents rather more information regarding the eight projects approved in 2010-2011, but it is clearly insufficient for the purposes of carrying out an objective analysis or assessment of these projects. Although various NGOs (CIFCA, Grupo Sur, ALOP, Aprodev and Eurodad) have requested information, the Commission has refused the request in part, on the grounds that it is not authorised to share data relating to the LAIF that are generated by the eligible financial institutions and that publishing such data might affect commercial interests and intellectual property rights. However, in terms of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 on public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents, much of this information ought to be available to the public.

Is the Commission in favour of the LAIF Strategic Board laying down clear guidelines and criteria for transparency, rendering of accounts and access to information?

Could the Commission say whether the 'contribution applications' or the technical details of projects that already have LAIF approval will be made public, and also whether the review reports vis-à-vis the results will be published and divulged on the LAIF/EuropeAid website?

Does the Commission consider that representatives from the European Parliament, in particular its Committee on Development, and from civil society organisations that operate in the ambit of development cooperation, should be included on the LAIF Strategic Board and on the EU Platform for Blending in External Cooperation?

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

Blending, as an EU development cooperation tool, is a means to achieve results in line with the main development priorities such as reducing poverty, inequalities and social exclusion. When implementing blending the Commission fulfils the requirements of the relevant regulations including those regarding public access to Commission documents and applies the highest standards of transparency and accountability.

Annual reports for all regional blending facilities are made available on the EuropeAid website ([1]). Currently LAIF reports for 2010-2011 and 2012 have been published ([2]). The report for 2013 is expected for mid-2014. The EuropeAid website is currently under revision and will be re-launched with a dedicated site containing detailed information on blending and individual projects.

The Parliament participates as an observer at the EU Platform for Blending in External Cooperation, whose objective is to improve the quality and efficiency of EU development and external cooperation through blending. The Commission welcomes the fact that experts from the Parliament have been involved and brought in their valuable expertise both at policy and technical level.

The Commission is open to input from European civil society on issues related to EU development cooperation, including blending. Commission departments have on multiple occasions engaged in dialogue with representatives of Civil Society Organisations such as the European Development Days. Comments from civil society have also been taken into account in the work of the Platform.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/news/2012-12-12-platform-blending-funds_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/latin-america/regional-cooperation/laif/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002078/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(21 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Mecanismo de Inversión en América Latina (MIAL)

El MIAL es un mecanismo financiero de cooperación al desarrollo creado por la Comisión Europea en diciembre de 2009 en el marco del Instrumento de Financiación de la Cooperación al Desarrollo (ICD). Dicho mecanismo está dotado con 125 millones de euros para el período 2009-2013 y su principal objetivo es la financiación de proyectos en el ámbito de las infraestructuras en América Latina.

La mayoría de los proyectos MIAL no contemplan directamente la reducción de la pobreza, de las desigualdades y de la exclusión entre sus objetivos. Su prioridad es fomentar el crecimiento económico a través de inversiones en infraestructuras confiando en que dichas inversiones incidan positivamente sobre la pobreza («teoría del derrame»).

Aunque la protección del medio ambiente y la mitigación del cambio climático sí aparecen como objetivos principales o secundarios en gran parte de los proyectos, no han destinado recursos adicionales a estos objetivos, tal y como se comprometió la UE en el marco de las negociaciones internacionales sobre el cambio climático.

Teniendo en cuenta los informes realizados por CIFCA, Grupo Sur, ALOP, Aprodev y Eeurodad sobre MIAL, ¿podría señalar la Comisión si conoce los efectos de las inversiones en términos de igualdad así como indicar qué mecanismos integrados de seguimiento, control y evaluación del impacto de los proyectos sobre la erradicación de la pobreza, la desigualdad, la exclusión y la integración regional han sido utilizados?

En lo que al próximo periodo se refiere, ¿se plantea la Comisión que los criterios principales en relación con los proyectos MIAL sean la reducción de la pobreza, la cohesión social y el apoyo a la integración regional y que cada proyecto presentado a MIAL incluya una evaluación de impacto ambiental, tal y como se pide a los proyectos en la EU?

¿Podría informar la Comisión si estos proyectos se realizan de conformidad con el Convenio 169 de la OIT y otros convenios internacionales en materia de derechos humanos, que incluyen procesos obligatorios de consulta previa, libre e informada a la población cuyos derechos podrían verse potencialmente afectados por los proyectos?

Respuesta del Sr. Piebalgs en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de abril de 2014)

La financiación combinada es un mecanismo de ejecución de proyectos que sirve para conseguir resultados que se ajustan a las principales prioridades de la UE en materia de desarrollo, como la reducción de la pobreza, de las desigualdades y de la exclusión social. Todos estos objetivos son y seguirán siendo criterios importantes en los proyectos MIAL. El MIAL se ha formulado desde una perspectiva ascendente, con un alto grado de responsabilización de los países socios que participan en la preparación de proyectos de financiación combinada desde el principio.

En las operaciones de financiación combinada se aplican los mismos procesos y normas, requisitos de transparencia y rendición de cuentas básicos, lo que incluye el cumplimiento de las normas medioambientales, igual que para otros proyectos financiados mediante otras formas de ayuda de la UE. Los proyectos MIAL también se llevan a cabo respetando los convenios y tratados internacionales pertinentes (por ejemplo, el Convenio n° 169 de la OIT). El cambio climático y la protección del medio ambiente son cuestiones transversales en los proyectos con financiación combinada en el marco del MIAL. Asimismo, cabe mencionar que se han proporcionado fondos adicionales al amparo del dispositivo relativo al cambio climático.

La Comisión realiza un seguimiento de todos los proyectos, con inclusión de los aprobados en el marco del MIAL. Este seguimiento se lleva a cabo tanto en la sede central como en las Delegaciones. Las Delegaciones de la UE mantienen un diálogo con la sociedad civil local. Si bien es importante evitar la duplicación de esfuerzos, se pedirá a las instituciones financieras que hagan participar sistemáticamente a las Delegaciones de la UE en el proceso de consulta con la sociedad civil local. La Comisión también está abierta a las aportaciones de la sociedad civil europea sobre temas generales relativos a la cooperación exterior de la UE, incluida la financiación combinada.

No es posible dar más detalles sobre el próximo período de financiación en esta fase de preparación ni sobre los procesos que afectan a todos los mecanismos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002078/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Latin America Investment Facility (LAIF)(II)

The LAIF is a financing mechanism for development cooperation created by the European Commission in December 2009 in the framework of the Financing Instrument for Development Cooperation (DCI). This mechanism has been provided with 125 million euros for the period 2009-2013 and its main purpose is to finance infrastructure projects in Latin America.

Most of the LAIF projects are not designed directly to reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion. Their priority is to foment economic growth through investment in infrastructures, on the basis that such financing will have positive effects on poverty (the 'trickle-down theory').

Although the protection of the environment and mitigation of the effects of climate change are included among the principal or secondary objectives of many of these projects, no additional funds have been allocated to these goals, as the EU undertook in the framework of the international climate change negotiations.

Bearing in mind the terms of the reports issued out by CIFCA, Grupo Sur, ALOP, Aprodev and Eurodad on the LAIF, could the Commission say if it knows what effects the investments have produced in the ambit of equal opportunities and state what integrated mechanisms have been employed to monitor and assess the impact of these projects in relation to the eradication of poverty, inequality and social exclusion and to regional integration?

As regards the next period, does the Commission consider that the main criteria for LAIF projects should be the reduction of poverty, promotion of social cohesion and support for regional integration and that each project submitted for LAIF funding should include an environmental impact assessment, as required for projects in the EU?

Can the Commission say whether these projects are carried out in compliance with ILO Convention 169 and other international treaties on human rights, which include compulsory procedures of prior, free and duly informed consultation with those peoples whose rights may potentially be affected by such projects?

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

Blending is a project implementation mechanism used to achieve results which are in line with the main EU development priorities such as the reduction of poverty, inequalities and social exclusion. All these objectives are and will continue to be major criteria for LAIF projects. LAIF is conceived from a bottom-up perspective, featuring a high degree of ownership by partner countries which are involved in the preparation of blending projects from the very start.

In blending operations, the same basic processes and rules, transparency and accountability requirements, including compliance with environmental standards, apply as for other projects financed via other forms of EU aid. LAIF projects are also carried out respecting relevant conventions and international treaties (for instance the ILO Convention 169). Climate change and environmental protection are cross-cutting issues in projects under the LAIF blending mechanism. It should also to be mentioned that additional funds have been provided through the Climate change window.

The Commission follows up on all projects including those approved in the framework of LAIF. This follow up takes place both at Headquarters and Delegation level. EU Delegations are in dialogue with local civil society. While it is important to avoid duplication of efforts, finance institutions are asked to involve EU Delegations systematically in the consultation process with local civil society. The Commission is also open to input from European civil society on general issues related to EU external cooperation, including blending.

It is not possible to give more details on the next financing period at this stage of preparation and on processes which involve all the facilities.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002079/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(21 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ουκρανική κρίση και καταγγελία της βίας που προέρχεται από ακροδεξιά στοιχεία

Οι εξελίξεις στην Ουκρανία είναι τραγικές. Είναι τραγικές γιατί μετρούμε ήδη δεκάδες νεκρούς, τόσο από την πλευρά των διαδηλωτών όσο και από τις τάξεις της αστυνομίας. Η βία έγινε καθημερινό φαινόμενο, και η εκεχειρία δεν κράτησε ούτε μία μέρα. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση καταδίκασε τη βία και πολύ καλά έκανε. Νομίζω όμως πως θα συμβάλλαμε πιο ουσιαστικά αν η ΕΕ κατήγγελλε ταυτόχρονα και τη βία από ακροδεξιά στοιχεία που παρεισέφρησαν ανάμεσα στους διαδηλωτές με προφανή στόχο την ανατροπή δια της βίας της εκλεγμένης κυβέρνησης. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μπορεί να συμβάλει μόνο με ειλικρινή διάλογο που λαμβάνει υπόψη ολόκληρο τον λαό της Ουκρανίας αλλά και την επίσημη κυβέρνηση της χώρας, όπως και μέσα από τον διμερή ισότιμο διάλογο με τη Ρωσική Ομοσπονδία.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή αν είναι έτοιμη να καταγγείλει με έντονο τρόπο και την βία που προέρχεται από την μεριά αυτών των ακροδεξιών στοιχείων.

Συμφωνεί η Επιτροπή ότι η κρίση στην Ουκρανία θα πρέπει να εκτονωθεί μόνο από τον ουκρανικό λαό και τους εκλεγμένους αντιπροσώπους του, των οποίων οι όποιες αποφάσεις θα πρέπει να λαμβάνονται κατόπιν διαφανών διαβουλεύσεων και διευρυμένης κοινωνικής συναίνεσης, και χωρίς παρεμβάσεις από το εξωτερικό;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου κ. Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Η ΕΕ καταδικάζει κάθε μορφή βίας που διαπράχθηκε από οποιοδήποτε μέρος και εκφράζει τη βαθιά της συμπάθεια για τα θύματα των πρόσφατων βιαιοτήτων στην Ουκρανία. Επίσης, η ΕΕ αποδίδει μεγάλη σημασία στην ουσιαστική διερεύνηση των υποθέσεων που περιλαμβάνουν εκφοβισμό, βασανιστήρια, εξαφανίσεις και απάνθρωπη ή ταπεινωτική μεταχείριση σε βάρος ειρηνικών διαδηλωτών. Η ΕΕ εφαρμόζει περιοριστικά μέτρα κατά προσώπων που έχουν εντοπιστεί ως υπεύθυνοι για παραβιάσεις των ανθρώπινων δικαιωμάτων ή σφετερισμό κρατικών πόρων, καθώς και μέτρα που αποσκοπούν στην αποκλιμάκωση της κρίσης στην Κριμαία. Η ΕΕ πάντοτε υπογραμμίζει την ετοιμότητά της να διευκολύνει την επίτευξη ειρηνικής λύσης στην κρίση μέσω διαπραγματεύσεων, με την πλήρη αυτοτέλεια των Ουκρανών, και να προωθήσει τον πλήρη σεβασμό των αρχών του διεθνούς δικαίου και των υποχρεώσεων που απορρέουν από αυτό. Η ΕΕ είναι στο πλευρό της νέας ουκρανικής κυβέρνησης στις προσπάθειές της να σταθεροποιήσει την κατάσταση και να συνεχίσει την πορεία των μεταρρυθμίσεων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων περαιτέρω συνταγματικών μεταρρυθμίσεων και της διεξαγωγής ελεύθερων, εύνομων και διαφανών προεδρικών εκλογών. Ουσιαστικής σημασίας είναι ο ρόλος μιας αντιπροσωπευτικής κυβέρνησης της Ουκρανίας που να καλύπτει όλες τις περιφέρειες της χώρας και όλες τις πληθυσμιακές ομάδες, ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί η πλήρης προστασία των εθνικών μειονοτήτων. Πρώτες προτεραιότητες είναι η αποκατάσταση της δημόσιας τάξης και η εξασφάλιση ότι τα σώματα επιβολής του νόμου είναι αποτελεσματικά και δρουν υπό συνθήκες διαφάνειας, με παράλληλο σεβασμό των ανθρώπινων δικαιωμάτων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002079/14
to the Commission
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: The crisis in Ukraine: call for a condemnation of the violence perpetrated by right-wing extremists

A tragedy is unfolding in Ukraine: already scores of people have been killed, both among the demonstrators and in the ranks of the police. Violence has become a daily occurrence, and the truce has not lasted even a single day. The European Union has quite rightly condemned the violence. But it would be making a more substantive contribution if it also condemned the violence committed by extreme right-wing elements that have infiltrated the demonstrators with the obvious objective of overthrowing the elected government by force. The European Union can contribute only through engaging in a sincere dialogue that takes into account the entire population of Ukraine and the official government of the country, as well as through a bilateral dialogue on a footing of equality with the Russian Federation.

Will the Commission say whether it is prepared forcefully to denounce the violence perpetrated by these right-wing elements?

Does the Commission agree that the crisis in Ukraine should be defused only by the Ukrainian people and its elected representatives and that any decisions they may take should be made after transparent consultations and with a broad social consensus, without interference from abroad?

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

The EU condemns all forms of violence perpetrated by any party and expresses deep sympathy for victims of recent violence in Ukraine. The EU also attaches the utmost importance to the proper investigation of cases involving intimidation, torture, disappearances, and inhumane or degrading treatment of peaceful demonstrators. The EU is pursuing restrictive measures against persons identified as responsible for human rights violations or misappropriation of State funds, as well as measures aimed at encouraging de-escalation of the crisis in Crimea. The EU has always underlined its readiness to facilitate a peaceful, negotiated solution to the crisis with the full ownership of Ukrainians, and to advance full respect for the principles of and obligations under international law. The EU stands by the new Ukrainian Government in its efforts to stabilise the situation and pursue the course of reform, including further constitutional reforms and the holding of free, fair and transparent Presidential elections. An inclusive Ukrainian Government that reaches out to all Ukrainian regions and population groups to ensure full protection of national minorities is essential. Restoring public order and ensuring that law-enforcement bodies are efficient and transparent, and respect human rights, are top priorities.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002080/14
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Air pollution in Kent

It has come to my attention that Maidstone Borough Council has failed to implement appropriate measures to conform to the EU's recommended maximum pollution level (Ambient Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC)).

In light of this, what measures can the Commission take against councils to ensure that they comply with pollution targets?

What assistance, financial or otherwise, is available to improve air quality in 'pollution black spots' such as this?

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

On 20 February 2014, the Commission launched an infringement procedure against the UK for its failure to ensure compliance with the NO_2 limit values laid down by Directive 2008/50/EC ([1]) in 16 zones, amongst which UK0031 South East, which includes Kent.

As a general rule, the main source of relevant emissions in the UK is road transport. As part of the Horizon2020 Research and Innovation Programme, significant investments are planned in several areas including Mobility for Growth, Green Vehicles and Small Business and Fast Track Innovation for Transport. These should help address the impact of air pollution from traffic.

For the 2014-2020 period, the regulations for the ESI Funds ([2]), particularly the ERDF ([3]), allow to fund actions to help reduce pollution from traffic. Negotiations on the 2014-2020 programmes between the UK authorities and the Commission are ongoing. It is thus not possible to prejudge the outcome and whether the ESI Funds will be allocated to support projects in the air-pollution sector.

The Commission recognised the key importance of clean vehicles in the CARS 2020 Action Plan ([4]) and their uptake should also be actively supported by Member States by means of financial and non-financial instruments. The principles underlying the introduction of financial incentives were laid down in a Commission staff working document of February 2013 ([5]).

([1]) OJ L 152/1, 11.6.2008.
([2]) European Structural and Investment Funds.
([3]) European Regional and Development Fund.
([4]) COM(2012) 636 final.
([5]) SWD(2013) 27 final.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002081/14
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(21 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Retrasos deliberados en la devolución del IVA en la Comunidad Foral de Navarra

El Gobierno regional de Navarra, que disfruta de un régimen financiero con autonomía institucional, normativa y económica (el «Convenio de Navarra»), atraviesa una grave crisis, entre otras razones porque se ha desvelado que en el ejercicio 2012 retrasó las devoluciones del IVA. El objetivo que se perseguía con esta medida era ajustar la liquidación del ejercicio al cumplimiento de las previsiones en materia de déficit recogidas en su Plan de estabilidad. Esta trampa contable se basa en la aplicación de las normas en materia de supervisión presupuestaria de los Estados miembros con graves dificultades financieras de conformidad con el Reglamento (UE) n° 472/2013 del Parlamento y el Consejo. Al parecer, Eurostat ha remitido una comunicación al Gobierno de Navarra en la que le recordaba que estas devoluciones deben contabilizarse en la fecha legal en la que se realiza el abono y no cuando se pagan efectivamente. Sin este artificio contable, el déficit del PIB registrado en 2012 con el que se cerró inicialmente el ejercicio, que ascendía al 1,45 % (y con el que se cumplía el objetivo del 1,5 %), ascendería hasta el 1,72 %. Además de esta perspectiva económica, la jurisprudencia europea ha añadido desde 2008 otro enfoque con su sentencia en el caso Intersplav contra el Gobierno de Ucrania (JUR/2007/6934). En concreto, el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos estimó que retrasar más allá del límite legal la devolución del IVA supone una injerencia no admisible y abusiva de los poderes públicos en el disfrute de bienes privados. Para adoptar esta sentencia, el Tribunal se apoyó en el Convenio para la protección de los derechos humanos y de las libertades fundamentales, y, en concreto, en el artículo 1 del Protocolo n° 1, que concretiza la protección de la propiedad, y en el artículo 14, relativo a la prohibición de la discriminación.

1. ¿Está al tanto la Comisión de la problemática relativa a los retrasos en las devoluciones del IVA registrada en la Comunidad Foral de Navarra?

2. ¿Puede confirmar la Comisión que Eurostat ha remitido al Gobierno de Navarra la comunicación de referencia?

3. A la vista de la jurisprudencia de los tribunales europeos y las previsiones en materia de supervisión financiera de los Estados miembros, ¿considera la Comisión que estas prácticas son compatibles con las normas aplicables a los países en régimen de supervisión reforzada?

4. ¿Qué opinión le merecen estas prácticas teniendo en cuenta el perjuicio que ocasionan al desarrollo de la economía productiva y a la creación de empleo así como desde la óptica de la jurisprudencia del Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos de Estrasburgo?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión no ha recibido información sobre el calendario de devoluciones de impuestos en Navarra. Eurostat ha examinado el registro estadístico de las devoluciones de impuestos a nivel nacional en España en 2013, pero nunca se ha comunicado directamente con la Comunidad Foral de Navarra sobre este asunto.

Antes de 2013, las devoluciones de impuestos se registraban en las cuentas nacionales españolas cuando el Gobierno aprobaba el reembolso de los fondos, aprobación que tenía lugar en fecha cercana a aquella en la que los importes se abonaban. Eurostat declaró que esto no se ajustaba plenamente al principio de registro por devengo y pidió a las autoridades estadísticas que registrarán las devoluciones de impuestos en el momento de la presentación de las declaraciones fiscales por los contribuyentes. En consonancia con la recomendación de Eurostat, las autoridades estadísticas españolas aplicaron este método en 2013 y revisaron los datos correspondientes a 2012 y años anteriores.

El Tribunal de Justicia ha declarado reiteradamente que la libertad de que gozan los Estados miembros en virtud de dicha disposición no significa que no se pueda ejercer un control teniendo en cuenta el Derecho de la UE ([1]). Las condiciones de devolución establecidas por los Estados miembros no pueden vulnerar el principio de neutralidad fiscal haciendo que el sujeto pasivo soporte la carga del IVA en su totalidad o en parte, sino que deben permitir al sujeto pasivo, en las circunstancias apropiadas, recuperar la totalidad del crédito derivado de ese exceso de IVA. Esto implica que el reembolso debe efectuarse en un plazo razonable de tiempo mediante un pago en efectivo o de manera equivalente y que, en cualquier caso, el modo de devolución que se adopte no debe entrañar ningún riesgo financiero para el sujeto pasivo. Este principio es válido con independencia de si el Estado miembro está sujeto o no a uno de los procedimientos de vigilancia previstos en el Reglamento (UE) n° 472/2013.

([1]) No obstante, el artículo 183 de la Directiva del IVA no contiene normas específicas sobre los plazos en los que los Estados miembros deben proceder a la devolución del IVA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002081/14
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Premeditated delay in refunding VAT in the Autonomous Community of Navarre

The regional government of Navarre, which enjoys a financial regime with institutional, regulatory and economic autonomy (the Navarre Agreement), is undergoing a severe crisis, one of the reasons for which turns out to be that it postponed VAT refunds for the 2012 fiscal year. This was done in an attempt to adjust the year's accounts to meet the deficit forecast set out in Navarre's stability plan. This accounting device was linked to the application of budgetary supervision rules for Member States in severe financial difficulties, under Regulation (EU) No 472/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council. Apparently Eurostat has issued the regional government of Navarre with a reminder that VAT refunds need to be accounted for on the date on which they are due, not the date on which they are actually paid. Without this accounting trick, the 1.4% GDP deficit with which Navarre initially closed the 2012 accounting year, and which met the target of 1.5%, would have risen to 1.72%. In addition to the economic perspective, European jurisprudence adds another dimension following the 2008 ruling against the Ukrainian Government in the Intersplav case (JUR/2007/6934). Specifically, the European Court of Human Rights found that postponing VAT refunds beyond the legal time limit constituted unjustifiable and abusive interference by the public authorities in the peaceful enjoyment of private property. The Court based its judgment on the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and, in particular, on Article 1 of Protocol Nº 1 thereto, on the protection of property, and on Article 14, which prohibits discrimination.

1. Is the Commission informed of the problems in relation to late VAT refunds in the Autonomous Community of Navarre?

2. Can the Commission confirm whether Eurostat has communicated as described above with the regional government of Navarre?

3. In light of European case-history and the provisions relating to financial supervision of Member States, does the Commission see such practices as being compatible with the rules applied to countries under enhanced surveillance?

4. How does it view these practices, given their negative impact on the development of a productive economy and job creation, and in light of the case history of the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg?

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

The Commission didn't receive information on the schedule for tax refunds in Navarre. Eurostat discussed the statistical recording of tax refunds at national level in Spain in 2013, but never communicated on this issue directly with the Autonomous Community of Navarre.

Before 2013, tax refunds were recorded in Spanish national accounts when the government approved reimbursement of the funds, which was close to the moment when the amounts were paid out. Eurostat stated that this wasn't fully in line with the accrual principle of recording, and asked the statistical authorities to record the tax refunds at the time of the submission of the tax declarations by the taxpayers. In line with Eurostat's advice, the Spanish statistical authorities applied this method in 2013 and revised data for 2012 and backward.

The ECJ has consistently stated that the freedom which MS enjoy under that provision doesn't mean that no control may be exercised in light of EC law ([1]). The conditions for the refund laid down by the MS can't undermine the principle of fiscal neutrality by making the taxable person bear the burden of the VAT in whole or in part. They must enable the taxable person, in appropriate circumstances, to recover the entirety of the credit arising from that excess VAT. This implies that, the refund must be made within a reasonable period of time by a payment in liquid funds or equivalent means and in any event, the method of refund adopted must not entail any financial risk for the taxable person. This principle is valid regardless of whether the MS is subject to one of the surveillance procedures foreseen in Regulation (EU) No 472/2013, or not.

([1]) Although Art. 183 of the VAT Directive doesn't contain specific rules about the deadlines within which MS must proceed to the refund of VAT.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002082/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Povertà sanitaria e donazioni di farmaci in Italia

In Italia dal 2007 al 2012 la povertà assoluta è cresciuta di circa il 60 %, arrivando a interessare il 6,8 % della popolazione, pari a 4,8 milioni di persone. Nelle famiglie povere si spendono in media 16,34 euro al mese per la sanità, rispetto ai 92,45 euro spesi in media dalle famiglie italiane. È dunque evidente come un maggior numero di persone è costretto a rinunciare alle spese sanitarie per problemi economici.

Allo stesso tempo, si segnala come i farmaci donati nell'ultimo anno sono stati 1.162.859 e si nota come si sia verificata una propensione crescente alla donazione di farmaci (nel corso dell'ultimo anno 24 aziende hanno donato un totale di 812 mila confezioni). Per quanto riguarda le tipologie di farmaci donati, i più diffusi sono gli analgesici, i medicinali contro l'acidità, gli antinfiammatori e i farmaci contro i dolori articolari e muscolari.

Considerato che:

— anche se le donazioni sono aumentate nel corso del tempo, si è verificato un concomitante incremento della domanda di farmaci di automedicazione, che ha generato un aumento del gap tra l'entità del bisogno e la capacità di risposta;

— in caso di distruzione di farmaci prossimi alla scadenza o invenduti, le imprese produttrici devono sostenere un costo di distruzione delle confezioni stimato in circa 1 euro al kg (a cui va aggiunto il costo di deposito mensile pari a circa 7 euro a pallet), per cui donare farmaci risulta utile per tutti i soggetti della filiera;

può la Commissione indicare se:

1. ritiene possibile rimuovere alcuni vincoli normativi e burocratici che ancora rendono complesso il sistema delle donazioni;

2. considera utile incentivare le donazioni attraverso azioni promozionali che incoraggino tale pratica anche nell'ambito di politiche di responsabilità sociale delle aziende;

3. reputa opportuno potenziare l'alleanza tra aziende produttrici, farmacie, enti caritativi e istituzioni politiche al fine di ridurre le domande di farmaci rimaste insoddisfatte?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(16 aprile 2014)

La normativa UE sui prodotti farmaceutici costituisce un quadro solido che garantisce la fornitura di medicinali sicuri ed efficaci ai cittadini dell'UE. A norma dell'articolo 168, paragrafo 7, del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFUE), tuttavia, l'Unione deve rispettare le responsabilità degli Stati membri per la definizione della loro politica sanitaria e per l'organizzazione e la fornitura di servizi sanitari e di assistenza medica.

Di conseguenza, la Commissione non dispone né delle competenze né di politiche in grado di promuovere o di vietare la pratica delle donazioni da parte dell'industria farmaceutica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002082/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Health poverty and drug donation in Italy

Between 2007 and 2012, absolute poverty in Italy increased by around 60% and affected 6.8% of the population, equivalent to 4.8 million people. The poorer families spent on average EUR 16.34 a month on health, compared with an average of EUR 92.45 spent by Italian families as a whole. It is therefore clear that a greater number of people are compelled to abandon health expenditure due to economic problems.

At the same time it is reported that drugs donated in the last year amounted to 1 162 859 and there has been a growing trend to donate drugs (over the last year, 24 companies donated a total of 812 thousand drug packs). In terms of the type of drugs donated, the most popular are analgesics, medicines to combat acidity, anti-inflammatories and drugs to prevent articular and muscular pain.

In view of the fact that:

— although donations have increased over time, there has been a parallel rise in demand for over-the-counter drugs, which has increased the gap between the scale of demand and the capacity for response;

— in terms of the destruction of unsold drugs and drugs close to their expiry date, manufacturers incur an estimated cost in the destruction of drug packs of approximately 1 Euro per kg, plus a monthly storage cost of approximately 7 Euro per pallet, which means drug donation is useful to all sections of the industry chain;

can the Commission indicate whether:

1. it considers it possible to remove the regulative and bureaucratic constraints which continue to complicate the system of donations;

2. it considers it useful to boost donations through promotional measures to encourage this practice, in the context of corporate social responsibility policies and otherwise;

3. it considers it appropriate to strengthen the alliance between manufacturers, pharmacists, charitable bodies and political institutions to reduce the unsatisfied demand for drugs?

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

The EU pharmaceutical legislation represents a solid framework guaranteeing that EU citizens are provided with safe and efficacious medicines. However, according to Article 168(7) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the Union must respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care.

Consequently, the Commission has no competence nor policies in place that can either promote or prohibit the practice of donations by the pharmaceutical industry.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002083/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuovi strumenti finanziari per stimolare la crescita nei paesi del Terzo mondo

Il boom dei telefonini, oggi, è nei paesi in via di sviluppo. Dal 2000, il numero di abbonamenti alla telefonia mobile, nei paesi sviluppati, è rimasto più o meno uguale. L'esplosione è avvenuta in Africa, in Asia e in America latina. Dei 6,5 miliardi di abitanti della Terra, oltre 1 miliardo non hanno acqua corrente, 1,6 miliardi non hanno elettricità, 2,6 miliardi non hanno fogne, ma solo 2,5 miliardi non hanno un telefonino. Secondo un recente studio del FMI, il prossimo miliardo di abbonati saranno contadini poveri. La storia recente sembra dimostrarlo: nella Repubblica Centrafricana, uno dei paesi più poveri del mondo, dove meno dell'1 % della popolazione (4 milioni) ha accesso a un telefono fisso, in meno di un anno la rete mobile ha già raccolto 127 mila abbonati. Nella piccola e tormentata Guinea-Bissau (1,5 milioni di abitanti), in un anno e mezzo ci sono stati 60 mila abbonamenti. È una rivoluzione epocale che in meno di una generazione ha trasformato l'agricoltura, i mercati, la pesca, i trasporti, l'irrigazione, le banche e le piccole imprese — nonché, in qualche modo, la stessa teoria dello sviluppo economico. La telefonia mobile, osservano al FMI, consente ai paesi in via di sviluppo di saltare a piè pari una fase dell'evoluzione economica che, prima, impegnava per decenni un paese. Il settore del credito sembra essere quello cruciale: ricorda le «lettere di credito» del Medio Evo ed è più semplice di quanto sembri, basandosi sulle carte telefoniche prepagate. Le compagnie telefoniche africane si stanno attrezzando, creando veri e propri conti correnti telefonici, in cui si possono depositare soldi veri sul proprio conto telefonico e spedirli, con un codice, attraverso un messaggino, come un bonifico bancario.

Considerato il massiccio impegno delle istituzioni europee nei confronti della cooperazione allo sviluppo dei paesi in via di sviluppo, può la Commissione indicare se intende approfondire e riferire in merito alla questione e preparare dei piani specifici di sviluppo per i prossimi aiuti da stanziare?

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

La Commissione è pienamente consapevole dell'importanza delle tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione (TIC), tra cui la telefonia mobile, per lo sviluppo.

Partendo dal presupposto che la diffusione delle TIC in Africa, e ovunque nel mondo, è spinta soprattutto dagli investimenti del settore privato, il sostegno della Commissione in quest'ambito è principalmente rivolto a questioni «accessorie», quali la promozione di riforme delle regolamentazioni, la creazione di un contesto favorevole che faciliti l'accesso universale alle TIC attraverso l'interconnessione di infrastrutture di rete senza scopo di lucro e il consolidamento delle capacità, la promozione di una sana concorrenza sul mercato e l'abbassamento delle tariffe.

Per l'attuazione di progetti di infrastrutture TIC fondamentali, la Commissione promuove altresì l'impiego di meccanismi finanziari innovativi, tra cui strumenti finanziari che combinano sovvenzioni dell'UE con altre risorse diverse dalle sovvenzioni, come prestiti concessi da istituzioni finanziarie pubbliche, prestiti commerciali e investimenti.

La Commissione è impegnata a mantenere il sostegno ad azioni finalizzate all'utilizzo delle TIC nel processo di sviluppo in Africa, in linea con la strategia congiunta Africa-UE. Le attività previste nell'ambito del quadro finanziario pluriennale 2014-2020 sono finalizzate a sostenere le tre seguenti priorità:

— armonizzare e allineare le politiche e i quadri normativi in materia di comunicazioni elettroniche tra l'UE e l'Africa, con un effetto positivo diretto anche sul mercato delle comunicazioni mobili;

— promuovere l'interconnessione di reti di ricerca e istruzione ad elevata capacità;

— rafforzare le capacità nel settore delle TIC per tutti, ossia cittadini, imprese (in particolare PMI), governi e organizzazioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002083/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: New financial tools to stimulate growth in Third World countries

The boom in mobile phone usage is today taking place in the developing countries. Since 2000, the number of mobile telephony subscriptions in the developed nations has remained more or less constant. The explosion has taken place in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Of the 6.5 billion inhabitants throughout the world, over 1 billion have no running water, 1.6 billion no electricity, 2.6 billion no drainage, yet only 2.5 billion have no mobile phone. According to a recent survey by the IMF, the next billion mobile telephony subscribers will be poor farm workers. This is demonstrated by recent history: in the Central African Republic, one of the poorest countries in the world, where less than 1% of the population (4 million) has access to a landline, the mobile network has already signed up 127 thousand subscribers in less than a year. In the small and beleaguered country of Guinea-Bissau (1.5 million inhabitants), 60 thousand subscriptions have been obtained in a year and a half. This is an epoch-making revolution which, in less than a generation, has transformed agriculture, the markets, fishing, transport, irrigation, the banks and small businesses, and to some extent the actual theory of economic development. As the IMF has observed, mobile telephony has enabled the developing countries to skip an entire phase of economic evolution, which would previously have taken a country decades to achieve. The credit sector, reminiscent of the 'letters of credit' of the Middle Ages and simpler than it appears, being based on prepaid telephone cards, is crucial. The African telecommunications providers are preparing themselves by creating current accounts with mobile telephony applications in which actual money can be deposited and, using a code, transferred by text message in the same way as a standard bank transfer.

In view of the substantial commitment of the European institutions to cooperation in the growth of developing countries, can the Commission indicate whether it intends to investigate and report on this question and draw up specific development plans for forthcoming aid to be earmarked?

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

The Commission is fully aware of the importance for development of information and communication technologies (ICT), mobile telephony being an integral part of them.

Acknowledging that the deployment of ICTs in Africa, and everywhere in the world, is largely driven by private-sector investment, the Commission's support in this area is mainly focused on 'soft' issues, such as promoting regulatory reforms, interconnections of non-profit network infrastructures and capacity building, in order to lay down the necessary conditions for an enabling environment that will facilitate access to ICT for all, promote healthy market competition and make tariffs more affordable.

The Commission also favours the use of innovative financial mechanisms for implementation of 'hard' ICT infrastructure projects. These include blending facilities, combining EU grants with additional non-grant resources, such as loans from public finance institutions, as well as commercial loans and investments.

The Commission is committed to continuing supporting actions aiming at the take-up of ICT in the development process in Africa, in coherence with the Joint European — African Strategy (JAES). Activities foreseen under the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework are concentrated on supporting the following 3 priorities:

— The harmonisation and alignment of the e-communications policies and regulatory frameworks between the EU and Africa, expected to have a direct positive impact on the mobile communications market as well.

— The interconnection of high-capacity research and education networks.

— The enhancement of ICT capacity-building for All, i.e. citizens, businesses with a focus on SMEs, governments and organisations.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002084/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Interventi dell'Autorità garante per la concorrenza in Italia e in Europa

Recentemente l'Autorità italiana garante per la concorrenza e il mercato ha comminato, per la mancata trasparenza sulle offerte delle assicurazioni facoltative, una sanzione per oltre un milione di euro alle due maggiori compagnie europee *low cost*. L'Autorità ha multato le due compagnie per le vendite delle polizze abbinate all'acquisto dei biglietti e per gli ostacoli posti all'esercizio del diritto di rimborso.

In particolare le multe sono state decise al termine di due distinti procedimenti per pratiche commerciali scorrette. Sono stati concessi 30 giorni di tempo perché le aziende comunichino le iniziative adottate per rimuovere i comportamenti sanzionati.

Per l'Autorità, le due compagnie hanno violato il Codice del consumo in quanto non hanno fornito, o lo hanno fatto in modo insufficiente e inadeguato, informazioni essenziali sulla polizza facoltativa destinata a coprire i rischi per l'annullamento del viaggio. In particolare: nella fase di acquisto sul *web*, è risultata sommaria l'indicazione dei rischi effettivamente coperti dal contratto di assicurazione, al quale si rinvia solo tramite *link*. Inoltre non è immediatamente reso chiaro l'ammontare della franchigia prevista in caso di indennizzo, elevata in proporzione al costo del biglietto. Ugualmente non è spiegato che il risarcimento non copre le tasse e i diritti aeroportuali.

L'omissione o la non agevole reperibilità delle informazioni necessarie possono in sostanza indurre in errore i consumatori sulla natura del rischio assicurato, molto più limitato in caso di «annullamento viaggio», nonché in merito alle numerose limitazioni e restrizioni previste dalla polizza di assicurazione, spingendoli ad assumere una decisione di natura commerciale che non avrebbero altrimenti preso.

Considerato che le attività commerciali coinvolte operano in tutti gli Stati membri con le stesse metodologie, può la Commissione indicare se intende formulare un parere riguardo a tali pratiche attraverso l'Autorità europea per la concorrenza?

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

I consumatori dell'UE sono protetti contro gli operatori commerciali che utilizzano pratiche sleali. Tali pratiche sono vietate dalla direttiva 2005/29/CE (la direttiva PCS) ([1]), che si applica tra l'altro agli operatori che omettono di fornire ai consumatori le informazioni di cui questi hanno bisogno per poter prendere decisioni con cognizione di causa e alle pratiche che possono ingannare i consumatori. Ciò vale anche nel caso delle offerte di assicurazioni facoltative proposte in concomitanza dell'acquisto di biglietti aerei. L'obbligo per i commercianti di fornire ai consumatori informazioni precontrattuali chiare è ulteriormente rafforzato dalla direttiva 2011/83/UE ([2]), che si applicherà a decorrere dal 13 giugno 2014.

Nell'ambito della protezione dei consumatori, la Commissione non dispone però di poteri esecutivi nei confronti dei singoli commercianti. Responsabili dell'esecuzione delle normative Le autorità nazionali sono infatti le autorità nazionali, che per le questioni transfrontaliere cooperano nell'ambito della rete di cooperazione per la tutela dei consumatori (rete CPC) ([3]). I casi citati dall'onorevole parlamentare sono stati discussi in tale sede.

Quando i problemi riguardano Stati membri diversi sorge la necessità di coordinare meglio l'esecuzione della normativa. Nella sua strategia di protezione dei consumatori ([4]), la Commissione ha sottolineato l' intenzione di garantire l'esecuzione efficace della normativa dell'Unione europea che tutela i consumatori, come sottolinea anche la comunicazione della Commissione relativa all'applicazione della direttiva PCS ([5]) e la relazione che l'accompagna. In tale comunicazione, vengono individuati i settori chiave — tra cui il settore dei viaggi e dei servizi finanziari — nei quali l'applicazione della direttiva PCS dovrebbe essere intensificata. Inoltre, la Commissione prevede di aggiornare, entro la fine del 2014, gli orientamenti in materia di attuazione e applicazione della direttiva PCS.

([1]) Direttiva 2005/29/CE sulle pratiche commerciali sleali, GU L 149 dell'11.6.2005, pag. 22.
([2]) Direttiva 2011/83/CE sui diritti dei consumatori, GU L 304 del 22.11.2011, pag. 64.
([3]) La rete di cooperazione per la tutela dei consumatori, istituita con il regolamento 2006/2004/CE sulla cooperazione tra le autorità nazionali responsabili dell'esecuzione della normativa che tutela i consumatori, GU L 364 del 9.12.2004, pag. 1.
([4]) Un'agenda europea dei consumatori — Stimolare la fiducia e la crescita (COM(2012) 225).
([5]) COM(2013) 138 final, adottata il 14 marzo 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002084/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Action by the Italian Competition Authority in Italy and Europe

The Italian Competition Authority recently imposed a fine of over EUR 1 000 000 on the two leading low-cost European insurance companies due to lack of transparency in offers of optional insurance. The Authority fined the two companies for sales of policies linked to the purchase of tickets and the creation of obstacles to the right to surrender policies.

In specific terms, the fines were decided on completion of two separate proceedings for unfair trade practices. The companies were granted 30 days in which to communicate measures taken to eliminate the conduct sanctioned.

In the view of the Authority, the two companies had breached the Consumer Code due to failure to provide or the provision of insufficient and inadequate key information on optional policies intended to cover the risk of trip cancellation. With specific reference to the purchase of policies on the web, only a brief description of the risks effectively covered by the policy, only accessible through a link, was provided. The amount of the policy excess applicable to the indemnity payable was also not immediately clear and found to be high in proportion to the cost of the ticket. It was also not explained that the indemnity did not include airport duty or tax.

Failure to provide the necessary information or difficulty in locating such information could in essence mislead consumers as to the nature of the insured risk (far smaller in the case of 'trip cancellation') and the multiple limitations and restrictions contained in the policy, thereby inducing the consumer to take a commercial decision they would not otherwise have taken.

Considering that the sales operations in question are operative in all Member States and the same methodologies are used, can the Commission indicate whether it intends to formulate an opinion on these practices through the European Competition Authority?

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

EU consumers are protected from traders engaging in unfair practices. Such practices are prohibited by Directive 2005/29/EC ([1]) (the UCPD), which applies *inter alia* to traders failing to provide consumers with information they need to take informed decisions and to practices that are likely to deceive consumers. This is relevant to offers of optional insurances linked to the purchase of airline tickets. The obligation for traders to provide consumers with clear pre-contractual information is further strengthened by Directive 2011/83/EU ([2]), which becomes applicable on 13 June 2014.

In the field of consumer protection the Commission does not have enforcement powers against individual traders. National authorities are responsible for enforcing the legislation. They cooperate on cross border issues within the CPC network ([3]). The cases mentioned by the Honourable Member have indeed been discussed there.

There is a need for better coordinated enforcement where problems arise in several Member States. In the Consumer Agenda ([4]), the Commission underlined its intention to ensure effective enforcement of EU consumer law. This is also highlighted in the communication on the application of the UCPD ([5]) and its accompanying Report. Key areas are identified where enforcement of the UCPD should be stepped up, including the travel sector and financial services. Also, the Commission plans to update the Guidance on the implementation and application of the UCPD by late 2014.

([1]) Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair commercial practices, OJ L 149 of 11.6.2005, p. 22.
([2]) Directive 2011/83/EU on consumer rights, OJ L 304 of 22.11.2011, p. 64.
([3]) The Consumer Cooperation Protection Network, established by Regulation 2006/2004/EC on cooperation between national authorities responsible for the enforcement of consumer protection laws, OJ L 364, 9.12.2004, p.1.
([4]) A European Consumer Agenda — Boosting confidence and growth (COM(2012) 225).
([5]) COM(2013) 138 final, adopted on 14 March 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002085/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Fotovoltaico e fiscalità: obbligo di catasto compatibile con la strategia Europa 2020

Recentemente, con la circolare 36/E del 19 dicembre 2013, l'Agenzia delle Entrate ha ridefinito il trattamento riservato agli impianti fotovoltaici ai fini catastali e della fiscalità generale: gli impianti fotovoltaici a terra sono considerati beni immobili ed è quindi previsto il loro accatastamento nella categoria D/1 «opifici». Se infatti l'impianto è costruito in forza di diritto di superficie, va accatastato autonomamente. Gli impianti fotovoltaici con potenza superiore ai 3 kilowatt sono equiparati ai beni immobili e assoggettati di conseguenza all'obbligo di accatastamento e all'attribuzione di una rendita catastale che comporta un pagamento addizionale di Irpef e Imposta unica comunale Iuc (Imu, Tasi e Tari) ed eventuali altre imposte, come quella di registro. Al contrario, se invece di impianti a sé stanti, come nel primo caso, si tratta di strutture poste su edifici, lastrici solari o su aree di pertinenza di altri immobili, non si dovrà effettuare un autonomo accatastamento, ma procedere alla rideterminazione della rendita dell'immobile a cui i pannelli sono connessi. I cittadini coinvolti, per capire se sarà necessario aggiornare la propria rendita catastale, dovranno ricostruire la spesa complessiva sostenuta fino al momento dell'allacciamento con la rete elettrica nazionale, calcolare se il valore dell'impianto supera o meno il 15 % del valore catastale dell'immobile e in caso positivo comunicare la variazione al catasto.

Considerato che:

— gli effetti di tale normativa ricadono direttamente sui cittadini che finora sono stati i più sensibili alle questioni delle energie rinnovabili,

si chiede alla Commissione:

ritiene che tale normativa presenti profili di incompatibilità con le istanze della normativa europea in merito alla necessità di risparmiare energia per il 2020?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(28 aprile 2014)

L'installazione di pannelli solari non ha alcun impatto sul risparmio energetico, ma contribuisce alla realizzazione degli obiettivi in materia di energia rinnovabile di cui alla direttiva 2009/28. In questo senso, le misure cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato non sembrano incompatibili con la direttiva sulla promozione dell'uso dell'energia da fonti rinnovabili.

Nell'ambito di questa normativa, l'Italia è tenuta a raggiungere un obiettivo nazionale per le energie rinnovabili del 17 % entro il 2020. Secondo i dati più recenti di Eurostat, nel 2012 la quota di energie rinnovabili in Italia ha raggiunto il 13,5 % del consumo totale di energia, al di sopra dell'obiettivo intermedio per il 2012 del 7,6 %. L'Italia deve pertanto garantire che l'attuale andamento prosegua.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002085/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Photovoltaic installations and taxation: compatibility of the requirement of entry in the Land Registry with the Europe 2020 strategy

Recently, in Circular 36/E dated 19 December 2013, the Italian Revenues Agency redefined the treatment applicable to photovoltaic installations for Land Registry and general taxation purposes. Onshore photovoltaic installations are classified as real estate and hence required to be entered in the Land Registry under Category D/1 'Industrial premises'. If in fact the installation has been constructed under a building lease, it must be entered in the Land Registry autonomously. Photovoltaic installations with a power of over 3 kilowatts are regarded as equivalent to real estate and, as such, required to be entered in the Land Registry and liable for an assessment of cadastral income, generating additional liability for IRPEF [Personal Income Tax] and IUC [Single Municipal Tax] (IMU [Local Property Tax], TASI [Tax on Invisible Services] and TARI [Refuse Tax] and any other taxes, including stamp duty. Conversely, if, the structures do not consist of separate installations, but are instead installed on buildings, flat roofs or sites belonging to other properties, an autonomous entry in the Land Registry will not be required, but the income from the property to which the panels are connected must be reassessed. To ascertain whether it will be necessary for the cadastral income to be updated, the citizens concerned should calculate the overall expense incurred up to the moment of connection to the national electricity grid, establish whether the value of the installation does or does not exceed 15% of the assessed value of the property, and, if so, notify this change to the Land Registry.

In view of the fact that:

— this regulation has a direct impact on citizens who, to date, have been the most sensitive to renewable energy issues,

the Commission is asked whether:

— it considers this regulation in any way incompatible with the requirements of European regulations on the need for energy savings by 2020?

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

Installing solar panels has no impact on energy savings. It contribute to the achievement of renewable energy targets as set out in Directive 2009/28. In this sense, the measures referred to by the Honourable Member do not appear to be incompatible with this directive on the promotion of renewable energy sources.

Under this legislation, Italy is required to achieve a national renewable energy target of 17% by 2020. According to the latest Eurostat data, in 2012 the renewable energy share in Italy reached 13.5% of total energy consumption, above the interim target for 2012 of 7.6%. Italy should therefore ensure that this trajectory is maintained.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002086/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Iprite e residui bellici velenosi

Le armi siriane che arriveranno al porto di Gioia Tauro si troveranno in buona compagnia, dal momento che l'Italia ha migliaia di impianti di stoccaggio di materiale bellico in disuso che ne avvelenano quotidianamente l'ambiente e i cittadini. È il caso dei due cimiteri sottomarini a largo di Molfetta ed Ischia, delle armi inabissate a Pesaro e delle oltre 400 000 munizioni che avvelenano le acque italiane. A questo si aggiungono le decine di impianti che durante il fascismo hanno prodotto 111 000 tonnellate di armi chimiche a base di iprite, fosgene e arsenico e che non sono stai mai bonificati. Come mai bonificate sono state le aule e gli uffici dell'Università La Sapienza che ospitavano i laboratori del Servizio centrale chimico, nei quali si sperimentava l'uso di sostanze velenose, e che oggi, senza mai essere state bonificate adeguatamente, accolgono centinaia di giovani studenti sottoposti quotidianamente all'avvelenamento silenzioso.

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

1. è in grado di tracciare una mappatura dei residui bellici velenosi presenti sui territori degli Stati membri?

2. quali strumenti utilizza per favorire la bonifica dei territori, dei mari e degli edifici che ospitano o hanno ospitato sostanze chimiche pericolose?

3. può certificare che le armi chimiche provenienti dalla Siria che arriveranno sui territori degli Stati membri saranno eliminate in sicurezza e non causeranno alcun danno alla popolazione?

4. può chiarire se esiste o è in progetto una politica comune per lo smaltimento dei rifiuti pericolosi, in particolare delle armi chimiche?

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

1. È responsabilità degli Stati membri garantire la conformità ai pertinenti strumenti internazionali in materia di smaltimento del materiale bellico, in particolare nel quadro della convenzione sulle armi chimiche. La Commissione non ha alcuna competenza in questo settore e non può quindi fornire la mappatura richiesta.

2. La direttiva 96/82/CE (Seveso II) ([1]) sul controllo dei pericoli di incidenti rilevanti connessi con determinate sostanze pericolose impone agli Stati membri di garantire che i gestori abbiano adottato una politica di prevenzione degli incidenti rilevanti. I gestori che trattano sostanze pericolose al di sopra di determinate soglie devono preparare le persone potenzialmente esposte agli incidenti, fornire alle autorità un rapporto sulla sicurezza e disporre di un sistema di gestione della sicurezza e di piani di emergenza interni. Gli Stati membri devono garantire la presenza di piani di emergenza. Di tali aspetti è necessario tenere conto anche in fase di controllo dell'urbanizzazione. La direttiva Seveso non si applica ai depositi militari.

3. La distruzione dell'arsenale siriano di armi chimiche viene monitorata dal consiglio esecutivo dell'Organizzazione per la proibizione delle armi chimiche (OPCW) e dal Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU. Sia il programma delle Nazioni Unite per l'ambiente (UNEP) che l'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità (OMS) hanno partecipato attivamente.

4. La direttiva 2008/98/CE ([2]) relativa ai rifiuti stabilisce il quadro normativo comunitario per la sicurezza della gestione e dello smaltimento dei rifiuti pericolosi. Se la distruzione delle armi chimiche viene effettuata in impianti dell'UE, tali impianti devono rispettare le normative ambientali dell'UE, compresa la direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti.

([1]) GU L 10 del 14.1.1997.
([2]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002086/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Mustard gas and toxic war remnants

The Syrian arms due to arrive at the port of Gioia Tauro will find themselves in good company, given that Italy has thousands of disused war material storage plants which daily poison the environment and the general public. Examples include the two undersea cemeteries off the coasts of Molfetta and Ischia, the sunken weapons at Pesaro and over 400 000 munitions which poison Italian waters. To these must be added the dozens of installations which, during the fascist era, produced 111 000 tonnes of chemical weapons based on mustard gas, phosgene and arsenic, which have never been decontaminated. The lecture halls and offices at the La Sapienza University, which once housed the laboratories of the Central Chemical Service and in which experiments were carried out on the use of poisonous substances, have also never been adequately decontaminated, although they accommodate hundreds of young students who are subjected to silent poisoning on a daily basis.

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

1. Is the Commission able to produce a map of toxic war remnants present in Member States?

2. What tools does the Commission use to encourage the decontamination of land, sea and buildings which host or have hosted hazardous chemical substances?

3. Can the Commission certify that chemical weapons deriving from Syria due to arrive on the territory of Member States will be safely eliminated without causing damage to the population?

4. Can the Commission clarify whether a common policy for the disposal of hazardous waste, in particular chemical weapons, exists or is planned?

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

1. It is the responsibility of Member States to ensure that they comply with relevant international instruments dealing with the disposal of munitions in particular under the Chemical Weapons Convention. The Commission has no competence in this area and can therefore not provide the requested map.

2. The Seveso II Directive 96/82/EC ([1]) on the control of major accident hazards involving dangerous substances obliges Member States to ensure that operators have a policy in place to prevent major accidents. Operators handling dangerous substances above certain thresholds must regularly inform the public likely to be affected by an accident, providing safety reports, a safety management system and an internal emergency plan. Member States must ensure that emergency plans are in place. Account must also be taken of these objectives in land-use planning. The Seveso Directive does not apply to military storage facilities.

3. The destruction of Syrian chemical weapons is being supervised by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) Executive Council and the UN Security Council. Both the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and World Health Organisation (WHO) have been actively involved.

4. Directive 2008/98/EC ([2]) on waste lays down the Community framework rules on the safe management and disposal of hazardous waste. Should the destruction of chemical weapons be undertaken in EU facilities, such facilities should comply with EU's environment legislation, including Directive 2008/98/EC on waste.

([1]) OJ L 10, 14.1.1997.
([2]) OJ L 312/3, 22.11.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002087/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Maltrattamenti sui minori e inconsapevolezza della società

L'indagine di un'ONG attiva nel campo dei diritti dei bambini rivela che in Italia le vittime di maltrattamenti sono oltre 100.000, in particolare bambine. Secondo quanto riportato dall'indagine, condotta su un campione di 1.700 dottori, queste vittime spesso non sono denunciate dai medici che spesso confondono i casi di maltrattamento. Addirittura il 60 % di essi sostiene di aver sospettato di trovarsi di fronte a un caso di abuso, ma di non aver sporto denuncia temendo di non disporre di elementi sufficienti o non sapendo a chi rivolgersi.

Anche l'accesso ai numeri telefonici di emergenza per gli stessi bambini può spesso rivelarsi difficoltoso, dal momento che, nella maggior parte dei casi, i genitori controllano l'utilizzo degli apparecchi in casa.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è in possesso di dati riguardanti i maltrattamenti sui minori a livello di Unione?

2. Intende intraprendere progetti atti a sensibilizzare medici e insegnanti a contatto con i bambini a riconoscere i casi di maltrattamento e a facilitare, in caso di sospetti, la possibilità di sporgere denuncia?

3. Non ritiene di dover invitare gli Stati membri ad aderire quanto prima alla Convenzione di Istanbul contro la violenza, che, oltre a tutelare i diritti delle donne, protegge anche i minori e gli anziani, che sono le vittime più indifese di fronte alla violenza?

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

1. L'abuso sui minori può assumere molteplici forme e verificarsi in contesti diversi. Un vasto studio dal titolo «Violence against women: an EU-wide survey» («Violenza contro le donne: un'indagine su scala europea»), condotto di recente dall'Agenzia dell'Unione europea per i diritti fondamentali, rivela, per esempio, dati concreti sulle violenze subite dai minori ([1]).

2. La direttiva 2012/29/UE che istituisce norme minime in materia di diritti, assistenza e protezione delle vittime di reato, stabilisce misure specifiche per incoraggiare e agevolare le denunce di reato e permettere alle vittime di rompere il ciclo della vittimizzazione ripetuta.

3. In tutte le attività connesse all'eliminazione della violenza contro le donne, la Commissione sollecita gli Stati membri a portare avanti la ratifica nazionale della Convenzione del Consiglio d'Europa sulla prevenzione e la lotta contro la violenza nei confronti delle donne e la violenza domestica.

([1]) http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-vaw-survey-main-results_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002087/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Abuse of children and lack of awareness in society

A survey carried out by an NGO active in the area of the rights of children has revealed that there are over 100 000 victims of abuse in Italy, in particular girls. According to the findings of the survey, carried out on a sample of 1 700 doctors, victims are frequently not reported by doctors, who are often mistaken on cases of abuse. Indeed, 60% of doctors say they have suspected that they are dealing with a case of abuse, but have not reported it because they fear that they have insufficient evidence or do not know who to turn to.

Access to emergency telephone numbers for children can also frequently prove problematic because, in the majority of cases, parents control the use of home telephones.

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

1. Is the Commission in possession of figures on the abuse of children at Union level?

2. Does the Commission intend to instigate projects to promote awareness in doctors and teachers in contact with children to enable them to recognise cases of abuse and to facilitate reporting of the matter where suspicion exists?

3. Is the Commission considering urging Member States to sign up as soon as possible to the Istanbul Convention against violence which, in addition to safeguarding the rights of women, also protects children and the elderly, the most defenceless victims in the face of violence?

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

1. Abuse against children can take many forms and will occur in different settings. A recent major study 'Violence against women: an EU-wide survey' conducted by the EU Fundamental Rights Agency, for example, has revealed concrete figures of experiences of violence in childhood. ([1])

2. The directive 2012/29/EU establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime lays down specific measures to encourage and facilitate reporting of crimes and to allow victims to break the cycle of repeat victimisation.

3. In all its activities related to the elimination of violence against women, the Commission calls on the Member States to advance on the national ratification of the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.

([1]) http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-vaw-survey-main-results_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002088/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Social network e violenza psicologica

I social network sono uno strumento straordinario per rimanere in contatto e mantenere legami con le persone. Tuttavia, la possibilità di anonimato che garantiscono può diventare molto pericolosa, dal momento che di fronte ad una tastiera si innescano meccanismi psicologici per cui scrivere certe cose non sembra un reato e in ogni caso di fronte ad un computer si pensa di non venire mai scoperti. Mentre alcuni social vietano l'anonimato chiudendo i profili non riferibili ad una persona fisica, altri lo favoriscono, come nel caso di un social network diffusissimo tra gli adolescenti (80 milioni di utenti) che permette di scambiarsi domande, anche in forma anonima, senza dover per forza conoscere gli altri utenti. Facile comprendere come in molti ne approfittino per fare del male, insultando e umiliando gratuitamente altre persone, spesso adolescenti fragili, che amplificano quello che accade nel mondo virtuale (del resto un insulto è tale anche se scritto su uno schermo) e soffrono particolarmente per quanto leggono su di loro. Già 9 adolescenti si sono tolti la vita per insulti sui social, che spesso diventano veicolo di odio razziale, omofobo o semplicemente gratuito.

La Commissione:

1. È in possesso di dati precisi sui suicidi che potrebbero essere causati dagli insulti e dagli attacchi personali sui social network?

2. Posto che internet è uno spazio di libertà, quali provvedimenti normativi a favore delle vittime ha adottato o intende adottare?

3. Non ritiene di dovere invitare gli Stati membri a rendere quanto più rapide ed efficaci possibili le indagini di polizia sui reati informatici?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2014)

La Commissione concorda sul fatto che la lotta alla criminalità informatica, in particolare ai reati che causano gravi danni alle vittime, debba costituire una priorità, e ha presentato proposte normative relative agli attacchi diretti contro i sistemi di informazione ([1]) e agli abusi sessuali sui minori ([2]), al fine di agevolare la cooperazione internazionale e accelerare di conseguenza le indagini su quelli che spesso sono casi transfrontalieri. La Commissione si compiace inoltre del fatto che gli Stati membri abbiano incluso i crimini informatici che causano gravi danni alle vittime tra le priorità del ciclo programmatico dell'UE per il 2014-2017 per la criminalità organizzata e le forme gravi di criminalità internazionale ([3]), il cui obiettivo è quello di ottimizzare la cooperazione tra i servizi competenti degli Stati membri, le istituzioni dell'UE e le agenzie dell'UE, nonché con i paesi terzi e le organizzazioni pertinenti ([4]).

La Commissione ha istituito e sostiene una rete paneuropea di centri «Internet più sicuro», che forniscono assistenza tramite call center nei vari paesi e si rivolgono a ragazzi, genitori e insegnanti sensibilizzandoli sulla gestione dei rischi di internet. Le linee di assistenza offrono consulenza sui rischi online, compreso il ciberbullismo, fenomeno che, stando alle statistiche più recenti, è all'origine del 23 % di tutte le chiamate. Al fine di garantire agli utenti una maggiore sicurezza online, la rete paneuropea ha inoltre creato un partenariato con Ask.fm che ha portato alla creazione del centro di sicurezza per l'uso dei social network ([5]).

Il coinvolgimento delle imprese del settore lungo tutta la catena del valore è essenziale per affrontare le nuove sfide poste dalle tecnologie e dai modelli di utente emergenti. Attraverso iniziative di autoregolamentazione come la coalizione CEO ([6]), la Commissione si adopera per fare di internet un luogo migliore per i bambini.

([1]) Direttiva 2013/40/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 12 agosto 2013, relativa agli attacchi contro i sistemi di informazione e che sostituisce la decisione quadro 2005/222/GAI del Consiglio (GU L 218 del 14.8.2013, pagg. 8-14).
([2]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, relativa alla lotta contro l'abuso e lo sfruttamento sessuale dei minori e la pornografia minorile, e che sostituisce la decisione quadro 2004/68/GAI del Consiglio (GU L 335 del 17.12.2011, pagg. 1-14).
([3]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/137401.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/pdf/4_council_conclusions_on_the_policy_cycle_en.pdf
([5]) http://ask.fm/about/safety/about-company
([6]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/node/61973

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002088/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Social networks and psychological violence

Social networks are an extraordinary tool for keeping in touch and maintaining links with other people. However, guaranteed anonymity can be highly dangerous, given that, in front of a keyboard, psychological mechanisms come into play which lead people to believe that writing certain things is not an offence, and in any case the writer believes discovery to be impossible while he/she is sitting at a computer. Although some social networks ban anonymity and close profiles which cannot be ascribed to an individual person, others encourage it, as is the case for a social network with a huge following among adolescents (80 million users), which makes it possible to exchange questions, even anonymously, without having to know the other users. It can be readily understood that, in many of these networks, users take advantage of the situation to do wrong, gratuitously insulting and humiliating other people, often fragile adolescents, who exaggerate what is going on in the virtual world (although an insult remains an insult, even if written on a computer screen) and suffer in particular as a result of what they read about themselves. Already 9 adolescents have taken their own lives as a result of insults on social networks, which frequently become a vehicle for racial hatred, homophobia or simply gratuitous insults.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is the Commission in possession of exact figures on suicides which may have been caused by personal attacks or insults on social networks?

2. Given that the Internet is a free space, what regulative measures has the Commission taken or does it intend to take to protect victims?

3. Does the Commission consider it necessary to urge Member States to ensure that police investigations into computer crime are undertaken as rapidly and effectively as possible?

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

The Commission agrees that the fight against cybercrime, in particular crimes that cause serious harm to victims, should be made a priority. It has proposed legislation on attacks against information systems ([1]) and on child sexual abuse ([2]) which serves to facilitate international cooperation and hence to speed up investigations in what are frequently cross-border cases. The Commission also welcomes the fact that Member States have included cybercrimes causing serious harm to victims among the priorities of the 2014-2017 EU Policy Cycle for organised and serious international crime ([3]), whose ambition is to optimise cooperation between the relevant services of the Member States, EU institutions and EU Agencies as well as relevant third countries and organisations ([4]).

The Commission set up and supports a pan-European network of Safer Internet Centres, providing support through national networks of helplines and promoting awareness to minors, parents and teachers of how to manage risks online. Helplines offer advice on online risks, including cyber-bullying. The latest helpline statistics show that 23% of all calls are related to cyberbullying. The network also partnered with Ask.fm in order to improve online safety for the users. This has also led to the launch of Ask.fm's Safety Centre ([5]).

Engaging industry across the value chain is central to tackle new challenges coming out of new technology and user patterns. The Commission endeavours through self-regulatory initiatives such as the CEO Coalition ([6]) to make the Internet a better place for children.

([1]) 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, 14/08/2013, p. 8-14.
([2]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA; OJ L 335, 17.12.2011, p. 1-14.
([3]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/137401.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/pdf/4_council_conclusions_on_the_policy_cycle_en.pdf
([5]) http://ask.fm/about/safety/about-company
([6]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/node/61973

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002089/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Mancata evidenza pubblica per l'affidamento in gestione del Porto turistico di Lavagna: compatibilità con il diritto comunitario e violazione della concorrenza

In base al diritto dell'Unione europea le concessioni pubbliche, comprese le concessioni demaniali marittime, possono essere affidate a soggetti privati soltanto all'esito di procedure ad evidenza pubblica propriamente dette, nel rispetto dei criteri della proporzionalità, della congruità e della non discriminazione.

Con atto autorizzativo del 7.8.2003 la Porto di Lavagna S.p.A. ha ottenuto dall'ente locale la concessione in subingresso per la gestione del porto turistico in provincia di Genova, nonostante l'opposizione di un'altra società che invocava il proprio diritto alla titolarità e quindi all'esercizio delle prerogative inerenti alla concessione demaniale attribuitale già nel 1974 e nonostante le domande di concessione per la gestione del porto presentate da altre società concorrenti. Nel caso di specie l'autorità amministrativa non ha, di fatto, proceduto ad alcuna comparazione tra le istanze pervenute, né ad alcuna procedura ad evidenza pubblica.

Attualmente la società opponente ha avviato davanti ai tribunali italiani un'azione di risarcimento per i danni causati alla stessa dalla violazione dei principi di diritto dell'UE in materia di evidenza pubblica, contestando la compatibilità della procedura con la normativa comunitaria, in particolare con il principio della libertà di stabilimento e le disposizioni in materia di concorrenza.

Considerando l'orientamento espresso dalla Commissione nella comunicazione interpretativa sulle concessioni (2000/C 121/02) e la base giuridica di cui all'articolo 12 della direttiva 2006/123/CE relativa ai servizi nel mercato interno (cd. direttiva servizi) nonché le disposizioni di cui all'articolo 49 del TFUE, può la Commissione ribadire il proprio orientamento in materia di evidenza pubblica e verificare se sussiste nel caso di specie un'ingiustificata compressione dell'assetto concorrenziale del mercato della gestione del demanio marittimo, in violazione del principio della parità di trattamento (detto anche «di non discriminazione») di cui agli articoli 49 e seguenti del TFUE in tema di libertà di stabilimento, a seguito della quale siano stati favoriti i vecchi concessionari a scapito degli aspiranti nuovi?

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

La Commissione ritiene che sia compito dei tribunali italiani applicare il diritto dell'Unione, valutando tutti i dati del caso.

In merito alla questione più generale, la Commissione desidera rammentare che l'articolo 12 della direttiva 2006/123/CE («la direttiva relativa ai servizi nel mercato interno») impone agli Stati membri che vogliono concedere autorizzazioni nei casi in cui vi è scarsità di risorse naturali, di applicare una procedura di selezione tra i candidati potenziali. Tale procedura dovrebbe offrire garanzie di imparzialità e di trasparenza e prevedere, in particolare, un'adeguata pubblicità dell'avvio della procedura e del suo svolgimento e completamento. Gli Stati membri non possono né porre in essere una procedura di rinnovo automatico delle autorizzazioni né accordare altri vantaggi al prestatore uscente o a persone che con tale prestatore abbiano particolari legami. Ai fini dell'attuazione dell'articolo 12 della direttiva relativa ai servizi nel mercato interno, gli Stati membri possono tener conto di considerazioni di salute pubblica, di obiettivi di politica sociale, della salute e della sicurezza dei lavoratori dipendenti ed autonomi, della protezione dell'ambiente, della salvaguardia del patrimonio culturale e di altri motivi imperativi d'interesse generale conformi al diritto dell'Unione.

Pertanto, la Commissione ritiene che qualora l'autorizzazione per l'affidamento in gestione del Porto turistico di Lavagna sia stata concessa per fornire un servizio e i fatti sollevati nell'interrogazione siano confermati, la procedura per l'attribuzione di tale autorizzazione deve conformarsi all'articolo 12 della succitata direttiva.

La Commissione segnala che le concessioni demaniali marittime sono regimi di autorizzazione che non possono definirsi concessioni ai sensi della normativa UE in materia di appalti pubblici, e di conseguenza, le direttive UE sugli appalti pubblici non si applicano al caso in esame.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002089/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Failure to conduct a public call for tenders for the management of the Lavagna marina — compatibility with EC law and breach of competition law

Under EC law, public concessions, including state maritime concessions, may be entrusted to private parties only following open tendering procedures, in accordance with criteria of proportionality, fairness and non-discrimination.

By official authorisation of 7 August 2003, the Porto di Lavagna S.p.a. company obtained, from the local authority, a back-door concession for the management of Lavagna marina in the province of Genoa, despite opposition from another company, which claimed that it was entitled to the state concession by virtue of the fact that it had already been granted it in 1974, and despite marina management concession applications submitted by other rival companies. In the case at issue, the administrative authority concerned did not actually compare any of the applications received, neither did it carry out any public tendering procedure.

The rival company has recently taken legal action before the Italian courts, to request compensation for damages caused to it due to the breach of the principles of EC law on public tendering, and it has questioned whether the procedure is compatible with EC law, in particular with the principle of freedom of establishment and the competition rules.

In view of the approach taken by the Commission in its Interpretative Communication on Concessions (2000/C 121/02) and the legal basis referred to in Article 12 of Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market (the so-called Services Directive), not to mention the provisions of Article 49 TFEU, can the Commission reiterate its guidance on public tendering procedures?

Can it also determine whether, in this case, competition in the market for managing the public maritime domain has been unfairly thwarted, in violation of the principle of equal treatment (known also as 'non-discrimination') referred to in Articles 49 et seq. TFEU on freedom of establishment, as a result of which old concessionaires are being favoured at the expense of new would-be concessionaires?

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

The Commission considers that it is for the Italian courts to apply Union law, assessing all the underlying facts.

On the more general question, the Commission would like to recall that Article 12 of Directive 2006/123/EC ('the Services Directive') requires Member States wanting to grant authorisations in case of scarce natural resources to organise a selection procedure for potential candidates. This procedure should provide full guarantees of impartiality, objectivity and transparency, including, in particular, adequate publicity about the launch, conduct and completion of the procedure. Member States can neither put in place a system of automatic renewal of authorisations for incumbent holders nor confer any other advantage upon the person or company whose authorisation has just expired or on anybody else having any close links with that person or company. In order to implement Article 12 of the Services Directive, Member States may take into account considerations of public health, social policy objectives, the health and safety of employees or self-employed persons, the protection of the environment, the preservation of cultural heritage and other overriding reasons relating to the public interest.

The Commission therefore considers that if the authorisation on the Lavagna marina has been granted to perform a service and the facts raised in the question are confirmed, the procedure for the attribution of such an authorisation must comply with Article 12 of the Services Directive.

The Commission points out that state maritime concessions are authorisation schemes which should not qualify as concessions within the meaning of EU public procurement law, therefore EU public procurement directives do not apply to the case at stake.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002090/14
to the Commission
Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: EU Solidarity Fund

Please could the Commission tell me what negotiations and/or conversations it has had with UK Government representatives this year on the possibility of the UK applying to the EU Solidarity Fund for assistance in recovering from the flooding and storm damage that has occurred this year?

Could the Commission also tell me if UK Government representatives have spoken to it about the possibility of receiving such funding?

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

A number of MEPs from the UK have put forward parliamentary questions to the Commission relating to the floods and the Welsh Government has enquired about the conditions and procedures for activating the EU Solidarity Fund. Commissioner Hahn met with Mr Watson, MEP, at the end of January to discuss the options. The UK authorities have not so far signalled to the Commission whether they intend to apply for Solidarity Fund assistance.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002091/14
alla Commissione
Mario Pirillo (S&D)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Terra dei Fuochi (territorio tra Napoli e Caserta)

L'8 febbraio 2014 il Parlamento italiano ha approvato il decreto sulle emergenze ambientali (in vigore dal 9 febbraio 2014) che dispone misure urgenti non solo per la Terra dei Fuochi (territorio tra Napoli e Caserta), ma anche per l'Ilva di Taranto. Il decreto introduce il reato di combustione illecita dei rifiuti, e stanzia 50 milioni di euro per il 2014 ed il 2015 per le azioni di screening medico-sanitari sulla popolazione residente nelle due aree interessate. L'Istituto Superiore di Sanità insieme all'Arpa Campania (Agenzia Regionale per la Protezione dell'Ambiente della Campania) hanno constatato il forte tasso di contaminazione dell'area (acqua, suolo e aria). Nella cava Resit (dove fra l'altro sono stati smaltiti illegalmente i rifiuti dell'Acna di Cengio), non lontano dal territorio di Giugliano in Campania (in provincia di Napoli), sono stati riscontrati, nelle acque prelevate dai pozzi spia, superamenti dei valori limite di mercurio, fluoruri, idrocarburi totali, 1,2-dicloropropano, tricloroetilene, tetracloroetilene, mentre molti dei suoli dell'area hanno mostrato superamenti per arsenico, metalli pesanti e inquinanti organici. Si è registrato un incremento di tumori proprio nei Comuni che presentano il maggior numero di rifiuti (Acerra, Aversa, Bacoli, Caivano, Castel Volturno, Giugliano in Campania, Marcianise e Villaricca). Nell'altro sito analizzato, la cava di Caselle Pisani in località Pianura di Napoli, si sono accertate presenze di berillio, cobalto, rame, stagno, zinco, PCB, PCDD e PCDF, oltre alla registrazione di superamenti nelle acque di falda di alluminio, ferro, manganese e idrocarburi. Il tasso di mortalità per malattie oncologiche è arrivato al 47 %.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ritiene di dover intervenire, viste le palesi violazioni della normativa europea;

2. se è a conoscenza delle gravi problematiche che interessano la Terra dei Fuochi;

3. se intende mettere in campo strumenti idonei per la salvaguardia della salute dei cittadini delle zone interessate?

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

La Commissione invita l'onorevole parlamentare a consultare le sue risposte alle interrogazioni scritte P-000745/2014 e P-001094/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002091/14
to the Commission
Mario Pirillo (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Terra dei Fuochi (between Naples and Caserta)

On 8 February 2014 the Italian Parliament adopted the decree on environmental emergencies (which entered into force on 9 February 2014) laying down urgent measures not just for the area between Naples and Caserta known as the Terra dei Fuochi (land of fire), but also regarding the Ilva steelworks in Taranto. The decree has established the offence of unlawful burning of waste and earmarked EUR 50 million to be spent in 2014 and 2015 on medical screening of the people living in the two areas concerned. The Italian National Institute of Health, together with Arpa Campania (the Campania regional environmental protection agency), has ascertained that the area (water, soil, and air) is severely contaminated. At the Resit landfill (where waste from the ACNA factory in Cengio has been disposed of illegally), not far from Giugliano in Campania (province of Naples), water samples taken from the monitoring wells have been found to exceed the limit values for mercury, fluorides, total hydrocarbons, 1,2-dichloropropane, trichloroethylene, and tetrachloroethylene, and soil over much of the area has been found to exceed the limit values for arsenic, heavy metals, and organic pollutants. The incidence of tumours has increased in the municipalities with the largest quantities of waste (Acerra, Aversa, Bacoli, Caivano, Castel Volturno, Giugliano in Campania, Marcianise, and Villaricca). Another test site, the Caselle Pisani landfill in Pianura, a suburb of Naples, has been found to contain beryllium, cobalt, copper, tin, zinc, PCBs, PCDDs, and PCDFs, and the groundwater concentrations of aluminium, iron, manganese, and hydrocarbons have risen above the limits. The cancer mortality rate has reached 47%.

1. Does the Commission consider that it has to intervene, given the blatant infringements of European legislation?

2. Is it aware of the serious problems affecting the Terra dei Fuochi?

3. Will it employ the means necessary to protect public health in the areas concerned?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions P-000745/2014 and P-001094/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002092/14
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Safety devices and child protection

The UK's Electrical Safety Council has carried out an investigation revealing that retailers and manufacturers are selling hair straighteners without additional safety devices or information about preventing burns. The investigation was conducted following concerns that the number of hair straightener burns among children has doubled in recent years and now account for nearly one in ten burns. The majority of these incidents are caused when toddlers touch, grab or tread on the hot plates. Hair straighteners can reach temperatures of 235°C and stay hot up to 15 minutes after they have been switched off, and so heat-proof pouches are the best way to ensure that heated appliances are properly stored away from children. However, the Electrical Safety Council's 'mystery shopper' investigation of leading high street and online retailers found that none of the outlets sampled encouraged shoppers to buy heat-proof pouches with their straighteners and most did not even sell the safety devices.

Can the Commission inform us as to what it is doing to encourage retailers and manufacturers to do more to protect children and to increase safety measures and greater consumer awareness?

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

At the European Union level, hair straighteners must comply with the safety objectives of Directive 2006/95/EC (the Low Voltage Directive) ([1]) as far as the products concerned are mains powered.

The directive covers all safety risks arising from the use of electrical equipment, including the risk of burns. It requires in particular that manufacturers provide information with the equipment to ensure the safe use of the equipment in the applications for which it was made.

This means that consumers shall be provided with sufficient information to enable them to take appropriate precautions when using hair straighteners (such as using heat-proof pouches), thereby avoiding the risk of children being accidentally burned.

Market surveillance authorities in Member States are responsible for the enforcement of the directive.

The Commission organises at least once per year a meeting in the framework of the Low Voltage Directive Working Group, composed of stakeholders and Member States, where safety issues on electrical equipment are discussed.

([1]) OJ L No 374/10, 27.12.2006.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002093/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Trattament xieraq tal-annimali

It-trattament xieraq tal-annimali għandu jkollu rwol integrali fl-iżvilupp tas-soċjetà tagħna. Kull soċjetà moderna għandu jkollha sistema adegwata fis-seħħ għat-trattament xieraq tal-annimali.

Il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tipprevedi finanzjament dirett għall-programmi dwar it-trattament xieraq tal-annimali?

Jekk dan mhuwiex il-każ, il-Kummissjoni tikkunsidra l-introduzzjoni ta' tali finanzjament?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(10 ta' April 2014)

Il-finanzjament tal-UE dwar it-trattament xieraq tal-annimali kien parti mill-evalwazzjoni mwettqa minn konsulent estern fl-2009 ([1]). Minn din l-evalwazzjoni, jidher li hemm diversi sorsi ta' fondi tal-UE li ntużaw għall-appoġġ ta' programmi li jikkontribwixxu għat-trattament xieraq tal-annimali, b'dawk ewlenin joħorġu mill-politika tal-UE dwar l-agrikoltura (il-Fond għall-Iżvilupp Rurali) u r-riċerka (il-Programm Qafas għar-Riċerka Nru 7). Din l-azzjoni se tkompli, b'mod partikolari taħt il-Programm Qafas il-ġdid għar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni 2014-2020: Orizzont 2020 ([2]).

Madankollu, għandu jiġi mfakkar li t-trattament xieraq tal-annimali mhuwiex għan tat-Trattati tal-UE bħala tali u, għaldaqstant, ma jibbenefikax minn allokazzjoni speċifika tal-baġit li tippermetti finanzjament ta' programmi apposta.

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni adottat proposta għal Regolament dwar in-nefqa fuq l-ikel u l-għalf ([3]) li tinkludi infiq għal numru limitat ta' azzjonijiet relatati ma' politiki dwar it-trattament xieraq tal-annimali. Madankollu, dan il-qafas baġitarju ma jipprevedix finanzjament ta' programmi dwar it-trattament xieraq tal-annimali.

([1]) Evaluation of the EU Policy on Animal Welfare and Possible Policy Options for the Future: http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/3%20Final%20Report%20-%20EUPAW%20Evaluation.pdf

([2]) Ir-Regolament (UE) Nru 1291/2013 tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tal-11 ta' Diċembru 2013 li jistabbilixxi Orizzont 2020 — il-Programm Qafas għar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni (2014-2020) u li jħassar id-Deċiżjoni Nru 1982/2006/KE.

([3]) COM(2013)327 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002093/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Animal welfare

Animal welfare should play an integral role in the development of our society. Any modern society should have an adequate animal welfare system in place.

Does the Commission envisage direct funding for animal welfare programmes?

If not, would the Commission consider introducing such funding?

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

EU funding on animal welfare was part of the evaluation performed by an external consultant in 2009 ([1]). From this evaluation, it appears that there are different sources of EU funding that have been used to support programmes contributing to the welfare of animals, the main ones deriving from the EU policy on agriculture (rural development fund) and research (research framework programme No 7). This action will continue, in particular under the new framework programme for research and innovation 2014-2020: Horizon 2020 ([2]).

However, it should be reminded that animal welfare is not an objective of the EU Treaties as such and, therefore, does not benefit from a specific budget allocation which would allow funding of dedicated programmes.

In addition, the Commission adopted a proposal for a regulation on the food and feed expenditure ([3]) which includes expenditures for a limited number of actions related to animal welfare policies. However, this budgetary framework does not foresee funding for animal welfare programmes.

([1]) Evaluation of the EU Policy on Animal Welfare and Possible Policy Options for the Future: http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/3%20Final%20Report%20-%20EUPAW%20Evaluation.pdf

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1291/2013 of the European parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing Horizon 2020 — the framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) and repealing Decision No 1982/2006/EC.

([3]) COM(2013)327 final.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002094/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: L-Immigrazzjoni

Is-sajf huwa normalment il-perjodu li fih l-għadd ta' persuni li jfittxu asil li jaqsmu l-Mediterran, jiżdied b'mod esponenzjali.

Wara żviluppi riċenti bħall-istabbilment tat-Task Force għall-Mediterran u l-adozzjoni tal-pakkett Eurosur, il-Kummissjoni tħoss li l-Istati Membri huma ppreparati b'mod xieraq biex jilqgħu għall-influss mistenni?

Il-Kummissjoni temmen li pajjiżi konfinali bħal Malta għandhom il-faċilitajiet meħtieġa biex jiffaċjaw dawn il-problemi u jiżguraw li traġedji bħal dik li seħħet f'Lampedusa ma jerġgħux jiġru?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' April 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni tqis li l-azzjonijiet identifikati mit-Task Force fil-Mediterran u l-Eurosur huma strumenti li jippermettu lill-Istati Membri biex jiġġestixxu aħjar il-migrazzjoni irregolari fil-fruntieri tagħhom. L-oqsma ta' azzjoni identifikati mit-Task Force fil-Mediterran fil-Komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni tal-4 ta' Diċembru 2013 ([1]) jsegwu approċċ komprensiv u jiffukaw ukoll fuq soluzzjonijiet immedjati u prattiċi.

Is-sorveljanza tal-fruntieri hija waħda minn dawn l-oqsma ta' azzjoni. L-Eurosur tippermetti l-kooperazzjoni u l-iskambju tal-informazzjoni bejn l-Istati Membri u mal-Frontex. L-Istati Membri huma f'qagħda aħjar li jkunu konxji ta' dak li jkun qed jiġru fil-fruntieri esterni tagħhom u jistgħu jirreaġixxu aktar malajr għal xi inċidenti li jikkonċernaw il-migrazzjoni irregolari, il-kriminalità transfruntiera jew inċidenti marbuta ma' riskju għall-ħajja tal-migranti.

Ir-rwol tal-Frontex fil-koordinazzjoni tal-kooperazzjoni operattiva bejn l-Istati Membri fil-Mediterran, inkluża Malta, hija element kruċjali għal garanzija ta' kontroll effettiv tal-fruntieri, u fl-istess ħin biex tingħata assistenza lill-persuni li jkunu f'diffikultajiet. Il-Frontex għandha l-kompitu li tassisti lill-Istati Membri f'ċirkostanzi li jirrekjedu assistenza teknika u operattiva ulterjuri fil-fruntieri esterni u ssostni lill-Istati Membri permezz ta' operazzjonijiet konġunti. Il-Parlament Ewropew u l-Kunsill sejrin dalwaqt jadottaw regoli ġodda għall-operazzjonijiet ta' sorveljanza tal-fruntieri fil-baħar, bil-koordinazzjoni tal-Frontex.

F'dak li jolqot l-appoġġ finanzjarju addizzjonali fil-każ tal-influss fis-sajf f'Malta ta' dawk li jkunu qed ifittxu l-ażil, tingħata assistenza ta' emerġenza mill-Fond tal-Ażil, il-Migrazzjoni u l-Integrazzjoni. L-iffinanzjar ta' emerġenza għal kwistjonijiet relatati mal-fruntieri jista' wkoll jinġabar mill-Fondi għall-Fruntieri Esterni u mill-Fond għas-Sigurtà Interna l-ġdid. Il-Kummissjoni tmexxi 'l quddiem ir-rilokazzjoni minn Malta, u jeżistu l-fondi ukoll għal dan l-iskop.

([1]) COM(2013) 869 finali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002094/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Immigration

Summer is usually a period in which the number of asylum-seekers crossing the Mediterranean increases exponentially.

Following recent developments such as the establishment of the Task Force Mediterranean and the adoption of the Eurosur package, does the Commission feel that Member States are adequately prepared for dealing with the expected influx?

Does the Commission believe that border countries such as Malta have the necessary facilities to cope with these problems and to ensure that tragedies such as the one in Lampedusa do not occur again?

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

The Commission considers that the actions identified by the Task Force Mediterranean and Eurosur are instruments which allow Member States to better manage irregular migration at their borders. The areas of actions identified by the Task Force Mediterranean in the Commission Communication of 4 December 2013 ([1]) follow a comprehensive approach and also focus on immediate and practical solutions.

Border surveillance is one of these areas of action. Eurosur enables cooperation and information exchange among Member States and with Frontex. Member States are better aware of what is happening at their external borders and react faster to any incidents concerning irregular migration, cross-border crime or incidents relating to a risk to the lives of migrants.

The role of Frontex in coordinating operational cooperation between Member States in the Mediterranean, including Malta, is a key element to ensure effective border control, and at the same time to provide assistance to persons in distress. Frontex has the task of assisting Member States in circumstances requiring increased technical and operational assistance at the external borders and supports Member States through joint operations. New rules governing border surveillance operations at sea coordinated by Frontex are expected to be adopted shortly by the European Parliament and the Council.

In terms of additional financial support in case of a summer influx of asylum-seekers to Malta, emergency assistance is available through the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund. Emergency funding for border-related issues might also be mobilised from the External Borders Fund and the new Internal Security Fund. The Commission promotes relocation from Malta, for which funding is also available.

([1]) COM(2013) 869 final.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002095/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Immigrazzjoni

Waqt il-laqgħa tal-Kunsill Diċembru 2013, il-Kummissjoni ppreżentat is-sejbiet tat-Task Force Mediterran dwar il-fenomenu tal-immigrazzjoni illegali fil-Mediterran.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tispjega l-qagħda attwali rigward ir-rakkomandazzjonijiet magħmula?

Ittieħdet xi deċiżjoni dwar il-kondiviżjoni obbligatorja tal-piżijiet?

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002099/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: L-Immigrazzjoni

Rapporti reċenti mit-territorji Spanjoli ta' Ceuta u Melilla għal darb'oħra enfasizzaw id-diffikultajiet u l-pressjonijiet li jiffaċċjaw l-Istati Membri biex jikkontrollaw mewġiet kbar tal-migranti irregolari li jaqsmu l-fruntieri.

Fid-dawl tal-impenji reċenti mill-Kunsill u l-Kummissjoni biex ifasslu pjan konkret għall-ġlieda kontra l-migrazzjoni irregolari, u t-twaqqif tat-Task Force tal-Mediterran fl-2013:

1. liema żviluppi wieħed għandu jistenna minn din it-task force?

2. x'segwitu se jingħata lir-rakkomandazzjonijiet tat-task force?

Tweġiba konġunta mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(22 ta' April 2014)

L-istat tal-implimentazzjoni tal-attivitajiet stipulati fil-Komunikazzjoni dwar il-ħidma tat-Task Force tal-Mediterran ([1])ġie ppreżentat lill-Kunsill tal-Ġustizzja u l-Intern fit-3 ta' Marzu u preżentazzjoni simili saret lill-Kumitat għal-Libertajiet Ċivili tal-PE fl-1 ta' April, inkluż inizjattivi li bdew mill-Istati Membri u l-Aġenziji tal-UE.

Diversi passi diġà bdew jittieħdu fid-dimensjonijiet varji stipulati fil-komunikazzjoni, inkluż, b'mod partikolari, l-inizjattivi għall-kooperazzjoni mal-pajjiżi terzi, aċċess legali msaħħaħ għall-Unjoni Ewropea, il-ġlieda kontra l-kuntrabandu, sorveljanza msaħħa tal-fruntieri u assistenza u solidarjetà mal-Istati Membri fuq il-linja ta' quddiem.

Il-qsim tar-responsabbiltà ma kienx parti mir-rakkomandazzjonijiet ħirġin mill-ħidma tat-Task Force tal-Mediterran. Kull inizjattiva f'dan il-qasam, b'mod partikolari r-rilokazzjoni tal-benefiċjarji tal-protezzjoni internazzjonali, tibqa' volontarja għall-Istati Membri. B'rikonoxximent tal-isfidi partikolari ffaċċjati minn Malta, il-Kummissjoni appoġġjat sforzi ta' rilokazzjoni permezz tal-proġett EUREMA, fil-qafas tal-Fond Ewropew għar-Refuġjati. Ir-rilokazzjoni se tkompli tiġi appoġġjata fil-qafas tal-Fond tal-Ażil, il-Migrazzjoni u l-Integrazzjoni (2014-2020).

([1]) COM(2013) 869 finali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002095/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Immigration

During the December 2013 Council meeting, the Commission presented the findings of the Task Force Mediterranean regarding the phenomenon of irregular immigration in the Mediterranean.

Could the Commission explain the state of play as regards the recommendations made?

Has any decision been taken about mandatory burden-sharing?

Question for written answer E-002099/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Immigration

Recent reports from the Spanish exclaves of Ceuta and Melilla have once again highlighted the difficulties and pressures faced by Member States in controlling the large waves of irregular migrants crossing their borders.

In light of the recent commitments by the Council and the Commission to draw up a concrete plan for tackling irregular migration, and of the establishment of the Mediterranean Task Force in 2013:

1. What developments can be expected from this task force?

2. How will the task force's recommendations be followed up?

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

The state of implementation of the activities set out in the communication on the work of the Task Force Mediterranean ([1]) was presented to the Justice and Home Affairs Council on 3 March and a similar presentation was made to the EP Civil Liberties Committee on 1 April, including initiatives started by Member States and EU Agencies.

Several steps are already underway in the various dimensions set out in the communication including, in particular, the initiatives for cooperation with third countries, reinforced legal avenues to the EU, the fight against smuggling, reinforced border surveillance and assistance and solidarity with Member States on the frontline.

Mandatory responsibility sharing was not part of the recommendations emerging from the work of the Task Force Mediterranean. Any initiative in this field, in particular relocation of beneficiaries of international protection, remains voluntary for Member States. In recognition of the particular challenges faced by Malta, the Commission has supported relocation efforts through the EUREMA project, under the European Refugee Fund. Relocation will continue to be supported under the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (2014-2020).

([1]) COM(2013) 869 final.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002096/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Skema taċ-ċittadinanza

Nhar il-15 ta' Jannar 2014, il-Kummissarju Reding kienet ikkwotata li qalet li ċ-"ċittadinanza mogħtija f'pajjiż wieħed trid tkun rikonoxxuta fl-Istati Membri kollha; lil min jingħata ċ-ċittadinanza fi Stat Membru wieħed dan jagħtih jeddijiet fis-27 stat l-ieħor u mhux biss f'dak l-istat fejn tkun ingħatatlu".

Fid-dawl ta' din id-dikjarazzjoni, tista' l-Kummissjoni tgħid meta qed tistenna li l-iskemi kurrenti u futuri taċ-ċittadinanza ta' pajjiżi oħrajn se jkunu ppreżentati lill-Parlament għall-iskrutinju, id-dibattitu u l-votazzjoni, kif sar fil-każ tal-iskema ta' Malta?

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002101/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Skemi taċ-ċittadinanza

F'dikjarazzjoni konġuntat maħruġa flimkien mal-Gvern Malti, il-Kummissjoni qalet li se twettaq eżami tal-iskemi kollha tal-UE dwar ċittadinanza li jixbhu lill-iskema Maltija.

Liema qafas se tuża l-Kummissjoni?

Il-Kummissjoni se tippubblikahom ir-rakkomandazzjonijiet finali tagħha?

Tweġiba konġunta mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(3 ta' April 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni tirreferi lill-Onorevoli Membru għat-tweġiba tagħha għall-mistoqsija bil-miktub E-013318/2013 ([1]). Kif intqal, il-Kummissjoni qed tanalizza skemi simili fl-Istat Membri kkonċernati kollha biex tara jekk hemmx il-ħtieġa għal azzjoni ulterjuri, biex tiżgura li jiġi ssodisfat ir-rekwiżit minimu ta' "rabta ġenwina" mal-pajjiż.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002096/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Citizenship scheme

On 15 January 2014, Commissioner Reding was quoted as having said that the 'citizenship granted in one country has to be recognised in all Member States; this gives a person granted citizenship in one Member State rights in 27 other states and not just the one in which it has been granted'.

In view of this statement, can the Commission say whether it expects current and future citizenship schemes in other countries to be submitted to Parliament for scrutiny, debate and voting, as in the case of Malta's scheme?

Question for written answer E-002101/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Citizenship schemes

In a joint statement issued with the Maltese Government, the Commission has said that it will be carrying out a review of all EU citizenship schemes similar to the Maltese scheme.

What framework will the Commission use?

Will the Commission publish its final recommendations?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-013318/2013 ([1]). As said, the Commission is analysing similar schemes in all Member States concerned in order to see if any further action is required, to make sure that the minimum requirement of a 'genuine link' to the country is met.

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

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002097/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Sistema elettorali Taljana

L-Italja bħalissa tinsab fil-proċess li tbiddel il-liġijiet elettorali tagħha, ftit xhur biss qabel l-elezzjonijiet tal-Parlament Ewropew.

Il-Kummissjoni hija mħassba dwar il-mod kif tali bidla sejra tolqot il-perċentwal ta' persuni li joħorġu jivvotaw għall-elezzjonijiet tal-PE fl-Italja?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(7 ta' April 2014)

Skont l-informazzjoni disponibbli lill-Kummissjoni, il-Parlament Taljan attwalment qiegħed jiddiskuti r-riforma tal-liġi elettorali għall-elezzjonijiet nazzjonali. L-abbozz ta' riforma ma jkoprix il-liġi elettorali għall-elezzjonijiet għall-Parlament Ewropew.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002097/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Italian electoral system

Italy is currently in the process of changing its electoral laws, just a few months before the European Parliament elections.

Is the Commission concerned about how such a change will affect voter turnout in the Italian EP elections?

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

According to the information available to the Commission, the Italian Parliament is currently discussing the reform of the electoral law for the national elections. The draft reform would not cover the electoral law for the elections to the European Parliament.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002098/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-ġlieda kontra l-korruzzjoni fl-UE

Dan l-aħħar, l-UE ppubblikat l-ewwel rapport tagħha kontra l-korruzzjoni li jsostni li aktar minn 76 % taċ-ċittadini tal-UE jemmnu li l-korruzzjoni hija mifruxa sew.

Il-Kummissjoni tinsab imħassba dwar dan?

Liema miżuri tista' tipproponi l-Kummissjoni biex tiġġieled dawn il-perċezzjonijiet?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(30 ta' April 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni hija mħassba daqs kemm hu l-Onorevoli Membru rigward il-korruzzjoni fl-Ewropa.

L-ewwel Rapport Kontra l-Korruzzjoni tal-Unjoni Ewropea ġie adottat mill-Kummissjoni fit-3 ta' Frar 2014 ([1]). Ir-rapport jagħti valutazzjoni sempliċi ta' kif kull Stat Membru jindirizza l-korruzzjoni, kif il-liġijiet u l-politiki eżistenti jaħdmu fil-prattika, u jissuġġerixxi kif kull Stat Membru jista' jaħdem aktar kontra l-korruzzjoni.

Kull wieħed mis-suġġetti msemmija fil-kapitoli tal-Istati Membri ġew magħżula skont il-kuntest nazzjonali biex ikun żgurat li huma rilevanti u immirati lejn dawk l-oqsma fejn aktar sforzi jagħmlu tassew differenza fil-prattika fil-fehma tal-Kummissjoni.

Il-Kummissjoni qed tippjana li tinvolvi lill-Istati Membri fi djalogu dwar il-passi futuri issuġġeriti fir-Rapport tal-UE Kontra l-Korruzzjoni. Il-Kummissjoni din is-sena se ddaħħal fis-seħħ ukoll programm ta' qsim ta' esperjenzi biex tgħin lill-Istati Membri, l-NGOs lokali u l-partijiet interessati oħra jaqsmu prattika tajba u jegħlbu nuqqasijiet fil-politika kontra l-korruzzjoni, jiffaċilitaw ix-xogħol ta' segwitu, iqajmu l-għarfien, u jipprovdu t-taħriġ.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002098/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: EU anti-corruption

The EU has recently published its first anti-corruption report which states that the more than 76% of EU citizens believe that corruption is widespread.

Is the Commission concerned about this?

What measures would the Commission propose to counter such perceptions?

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

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern regarding corruption in Europe.

The first Anti-Corruption Report of the European Union was adopted by the Commission on 3 February 2014 ([1]). The report gives a straightforward assessment of how each Member State tackles corruption, how existing laws and policies work in practice, and it suggests how each Member State can step up the work against corruption.

Each of the topics mentioned in the Member State chapters have been selected according to the national context to make sure they are relevant and targeted at those areas where more effort would really make a difference in practice in the view of the Commission.

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

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

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002100/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Persuni mingħajr dar fl-Ewropa

L-għadd ta' persuni mingħajr dar fl-Ewropa donnu qiegħed jiżdied.

Il-Kummissjoni tiġbor statistika dwar l-għadd ta' persuni mingħajr dar fl-Ewropa?

Il-Kummissjoni għandha strateġija biex tgħin lill-Istati Membri jindirizzaw il-problema tal-persuni mingħajr dar?

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

Bħalissa ma hemm l-ebda dejta komparabbli fil-livell tal-UE dwar il-kundizzjoni ta' persuni mingħajr dar. Madanakollu mir-riżultati taċ-Ċensimenti tal-UE dwar il-Popolazzjoni u l-Akkomodazzjoni għall-2011 huma mistennija xi statistiki dwar id-daqs u l-karatteristiċi demografiċi tal-popolazzjoni ta' persuni mingħajr dar ([1]). B'mod ġenerali huwa diffiċli biex wieħed ikollu idea ċara tal-għadd ta' persuni mingħajr dar. Minħabba li dawn in-nies ma għandhomx indirizz regolari, ma jistgħux jinqabdu permezz ta' stħarriġ statistiku. Bl-istess mod, huwa diffiċli biex jiġi żgurat li l-persuni mingħajr dar ikunu koperti fir-reġistri tal-popolazzjoni u f'enumerazzjonijiet bieb bieb li ġeneralment jintużaw biex tiġi prodotta l-istatistika taċ-ċensimenti. Għal ħarsa ġenerali tad-dejta disponibbli miġbura minn diversi organizzazzjonijiet nazzjonali, lokali jew muniċipali ara s-Social Europe Quarterly Review ta' Ġunju 2012. ([2])

Ir-responsabbiltà primarja biex tiġi indirizzata l-kundizzjoni ta' persuni mingħajr dar u l-faqar tinsab f'idejn l-Istati Membri, imma l-UE għandha rwol x'taqdi biex tgħin biex jinstabu soluzzjonijiet. Fil-Pakkett ta' Investiment Soċjali (SIP) ([3]), adottat fi Frar 2013, il-Kummissjoni pprovdiet approċċ ta' politika strateġika lill-Istati Membri biex dawn jaffrontaw il-kundizzjoni ta' persuni mingħajr dar b'mod sostenibbli, billi jittrattaw l-għeruq tal-problema u jiffokaw l-isforzi tagħhom fuq il-prevenzjoni u l-intervent bikri: pereżempju billi jqiegħdu fis-seħħ miżuri mmexxija mill-akkomodazzjoni. L-Istati Membri huma mħeġġa jfasslu u jimplimentaw strateġiji nazzjonali għal persuni mingħajr dar, li huma parti minn politiki ta' inklużjoni soċjali wiesgħa li jinkludu l-faqar tat-tfal, l-anzjani u l-kura fit-tul, l-inklużjoni attiva kif ukoll politiki għall-inklużjoni tar-Roma. Dawk l-istrateġiji iktar riċenti mħejjija fl-Irlanda, fid-Danimarka, Spanja jew ir-Repubblika Ċeka jirriflettu dan l-approċċ ta' investiment soċjali.

([1]) L-istatistika mill-Programm taċ-Ċensiment tal-UE tal-2011 se tiġi ppubblikata mill-Eurostat aktar tard fl-2014. Minħabba d-diffikultajiet biex tinġabar dejta taċ-ċensimenti kompleta dwar persuni mingħajr dar, f'xi Stati Membri, in-numru tagħhom se jiġi stmat separatament mit-totali u t-tqassim tal-popolazzjoni ewlenin. Se tkun meħtieġa attenzjoni kbira fl-użu ta' dawn l-istatistiki, minħabba li din hija l-ewwel darba li tali dejta għaċ-ċensimenti ġiet prodotta u mxerrda fuq livell Ewropew. Skont il-leġiżlazzjoni taċ-ċensimenti tal-UE, it-tqassim demografiku u soċjali dwar persuni mingħajr dar huwa pprovdut mill-Istati Membri fuq bażi volontarja.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?pager.offset=10&langId=mt&mode=advancedSubmit&year=0&country=0&type=0&advSearchKey=quarterlyreview%20homelessness.

([3]) Ara l-Komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni "Lejn Investiment Soċjali għat-Tkabbir u l-Koeżjoni — inkluża l-implimentazzjoni tal-Fond Soċjali Ewropew 2014-2020" (COM(2013) 83 final) u d-dokumenti li jakkumpanjawha, speċjalment id-dokument ta' ħidma tal-persunal "L-indirizzar tal-problema tal-persuni mingħajr dar fl-Unjoni Ewropea" (SWD(2013) 42 final).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002100/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Homelessness in Europe

The number of homeless people in Europe seems to be on the rise.

Does the Commission collect statistics on the number of homeless people in Europe?

Does the Commission have any strategy for assisting Member States to deal with the problem of homelessness?

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

There are currently no comparable EU-level data on homelessness. Some statistics on the size and demographic characteristics of the homeless population are however expected from the results of the 2011 EU Population and Housing Censuses ([1]). In general the scale of homelessness is difficult to assess, the lack of a regular address means that homeless people cannot be captured through regular statistical surveys. Similarly, it is difficult to ensure that homeless people are covered in the population registers and in door-to-door enumerations that are generally used to produce census statistics. For an overview of the available data collected by various municipal, local or national organisations see the Social Europe Quarterly Review of June 2012 ([2]).

The primary responsibility for tackling homelessness and poverty lies with Member States, but the EU has a role to play to help finding solutions. In the Social Investment Package (SIP) ([3]), adopted in February 2013, the Commission provided a strategic policy approach to the Member States to confront homelessness in a sustainable way, targeting its root causes and focusing on prevention and early intervention: for example, by putting in place housing-led measures. Member States are encouraged to design and implement national homelessness strategies which are part of broad social inclusion policies encompassing child poverty, elderly and long-term care, active inclusion as well as Roma inclusion policies. Most recent ones prepared in Ireland, Denmark, Spain or the Czech Republic reflect this social investment approach.

([1]) Statistics from the 2011 EU Census Programme will be published by Eurostat later in 2014. Due to the difficulties of collecting complete census data on the homeless, in some Member States, the numbers of homeless people will be estimated separately from the main population totals and disaggregations. Caution will be needed in using these statistics as this is the first time such census data have been produced and disseminated at European level. Under the EU census legislation, the demographic and social disaggregations on homeless persons are provided by Member States on a voluntary basis.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?pager.offset=10&langId=en&mode=advancedSubmit&year=0&country=0&type=0&advSearchKey=quarterlyreview homelessness

([3]) See Commission Communication 'Towards Social Investment for Growth and Cohesion — including implementing the European Social Fund 2014 — 2020' (COM(2013) 83 final and its accompanying documents, especially the Staff Working Document 'Confronting Homelessness in the European Union' (SWD(2013) 42 final).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002102/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Dipendenza enerġetika

Rapport reċenti dwar il-konsum tal-enerġija ppubblikat mill-Eurostat wera li Malta kellha dipendenza ta' 100.4 % fuq l-importazzjonijiet ta' enerġija. B'mod ġenerali, l-Unjoni Ewropea kollha kellha rata' ta' dipendenza medja ta' 53.3 %.

Fid-dawl ta' dan, il-Kummissjoni se tagħti aktar importanza lill-ikkompletar tas-suq uniku tal-enerġija?

Il-Kummissjoni għandha mira speċifika fir-rigward tad-dipendenza enerġetika?

Hemm xi miżuri partikolari li jgħinu lill-pajjiżi li qed jaffaċċjaw livelli għoljin ħafna ta' dipendenza enerġetika?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Oettinger f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(31 ta' Marzu 2014)

1. Il-Kummissjoni diġà tagħti prijorità għolja lit-tlestija tas-suq intern tal-enerġija (IEM), b'mod partikolari sabiex tnaqqas l-impatt tad-dipendenza fuq l-enerġija esterna billi tkattar il-fluss liberu tal-enerġija fi ħdan l-UE kollha.

2. Fil-Komunikazzjoni tagħha dwar il-Qafas 2030 tat-22 ta' Jannar 2014, il-Kummissjoni tipproponi sett ta' indikaturi ewlenin biex tkejjel il-progress lejn sistema tal-enerġija aktar kompetittiva f'perspettiva għall-2030. Dawn l-indikaturi jinkludu d-diversifikazzjoni tal-importazzjonijiet tal-enerġija u s-sehem tas-sorsi tal-enerġija indiġeni użati fil-konsum tal-enerġija.

3. Il-Kummissjoni qiegħda timplimenta r-Regolament TEN-E li jippromwovi "Proġetti ta' Interess Komuni" (PCIs — Projects of Common Interest). Waħda mill-miri strateġiċi tal-PCIs hija li ttemm l-iżolament enerġetiku ta' ċerti Stati Membri, billi tqarribhom lejn Stati Membri oħra u b'hekk tnaqqas id-dipendenza tagħhom fuq l-enerġija esterna. Fil-każ speċifiku ta' Malta, proġett li għandu l-għan li Jikkonnettja lil Malta man-Netwerk tal-Gass Ewropew (Pipeline tal-Gass ma' Gela fl-Italja u Unità li Żżomm f'Wiċċ l-Ilma għall-Ħażna u l-Gassifikazzjoni mill-ġdid tal-LNG (FSRU — Floating LNG Storage and Regasification Unit) jinsab fi stad bikri ta' żvilupp.

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni Ewropea tat appoġġ finanzjarju lil Malta fil-qafas tal-Programm Ewropew tal-Enerġija għall-Irkupru (EEPR) għall-manifattura u l-provvista ta' kejbil sottomarin ta' vultaġġ għoli (interkonnettur) li għandu jitpoġġa bejn Malta u Sqallija. Dan l-interkonnettur tal-elettriku mal-Italja, li bħalissa qed jinbena u se jkun kummissjonat sa tmiem l-2014, se jkollu impatti pożittivi qawwija fuq is-sigurtà tal-provvista ta' Malta.

B'mod parallel, il-Kummissjoni qed theġġeġ bis-sħiħ lil Malta biex tkompli tiżviluppa s-sorsi ta' enerġija rinnovabbli u biex tibbenefika mill-mekkaniżmi ta' kooperazzjoni fil-qafas tad-Direttiva 2009/28/KE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002102/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Energy dependency

A recent report on energy consumption published by Eurostat showed that Malta had a 100.4% dependency on energy imports. Overall, the European Union as a whole had an average dependency rate of 53.3%

In light of this, will the Commission be giving added importance to the completion of the single market in energy?

Does the Commission have a specific target in mind with regard to energy dependency?

Are there any particular measures to assist countries facing very high energy-dependency levels?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(31 March 2014)

1. The Commission already gives high priority to the completion of the internal energy market (IEM), in particular in order to reduce the impact of external energy dependency by fostering the free flow of energy within the whole EU.

2. In its communication on the 2030 Framework of 22 January 2014 the Commission proposes a set of key indicators for measuring progress towards a more competitive and secure energy system in a 2030 perspective. These indicators include the diversification of energy imports and the share of indigenous energy sources used in energy consumption.

3. The Commission is implementing the TEN-E regulation that promotes 'Projects of Common Interest' (PCIs). One of the strategic aims of PCIs is to end the energy isolation of certain Member States, by better linking them to other Member States thus reducing their external energy dependency. In the specific case of Malta, a project aiming at the Connection of Malta to the European Gas Network (Gas Pipeline with Italy at Gela and Floating LNG Storage and Regasification Unit, FSRU) is at an early stage of development. .

Additionally, the European Commission granted financial support to Malta in the framework of the European Energy Programme for Recovery (EEPR) for the manufacture and supply of a high voltage submarine cable (interconnector) to be laid between Malta and Sicily. This electricity interconnector with Italy, which is currently being constructed and will be commissioned by end of 2014, will have strong positive impacts on Malta's security of supply.

In parallel, the Commission is strongly encouraging Malta to further develop renewable energy sources and benefit from the cooperation mechanisms under the directive 2009/28/EC.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002103/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Ir-rati ta' inflazzjoni fl-Ewropa

Skont pubblikazzjoni reċenti tal-Eurostat, l-inflazzjoni fiż-żona tal-euro naqset minn 2 % f'Jannar 2013 għal 0.7 % f'Jannar 2014.

Il-Kummissjoni hija mħassba dwar din id-diżinflazzjoni?

Il-Kummissjoni taħseb li ż-żona tal-euro se tidħol f'perjodu ta' diżinflazzjoni?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Kallas f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' April 2014)

L-inflazzjoni kumplessiva naqset ferm fl-aħħar żewġ kwarti minħabba fatturi esterni u interni, bħal tnaqqis fil-prezzijiet tal-enerġija u tal-prodotti bażiċi, domanda dgħajfa u l-impatt dejjem inqas ta' xi fatturi temporanji. Huwa naturali li l-inflazzjoni tkun baxxa fil-pajjiżi li qed jirriformaw biex ifittxu li jerġgħu jiksbu l-kompetittività tal-kost.

Min-naħa waħda, inflazzjoni baxxa mistennija li ssostni l-konsum privat għax iżżid l-introjtu disponibbli reali. Min-naħa l-oħra, perjodu twil ta' inflazzjoni baxxa fiż-żona tal-Euro kollha jagħmilha iktar diffiċli għal pajjiżi vulnerabbli li jiksbu l-kompetittività tal-kost fil-preżenza tar-riġiditajiet nominali u jżid il-valur reali tad-dejn pubbliku u privat. Naturalment, livelli għolja ta' dejn fi kwalunkwe każ għandhom ikunu indirizzati permezz ta' politiki fiskali responsabbli u riformi strutturali li jsaħħu t-tkabbir.

Il-Previżjoni tax-Xitwa tal-Kummissjoni tipprevedi perjodu mtawwal ta' inflazzjoni baxxa, li tilħaq medja ta' 1,0 % fl-2014 b'żieda gradwali ħafna fl-inflazzjoni matul l-2015, f'konformità mal-irkupru li għaddej bħalissa. Fid-dawl li l-irkupru qed jissaħħaħ, iż-żieda fil-kunfidenza u l-isforzi kontinwi biex titjieb is-saħħa tas-sistema bankarja, ir-riskju ta' deflazzjoni diretta fiż-żona tal-Euro, fis-sens ta' sistema ġeneralizzata u t-tnaqqis fil-prezzijiet awtoinfurzanti bejn il-pajjiżi fiż-żona u s-setturi tal-Euro, tista' tidher baxxa. Kif stabbilit fl-istħarriġ annwali dwar it-tkabbir tal-2014, il-Kummissjoni tikkunsidra li huwa kruċjali li jinżamm ir-ritmu tar-riforma biex tittejjeb il-kompetittività u jiġi żgurat irkupru dewwiemi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002103/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Inflation rates in Europe

According to a recent Eurostat publication, inflation in the eurozone dropped from 2% in January 2013 to 0.7% in January 2014.

Is the Commission concerned by this disinflation?

Does the Commission believe that the eurozone will enter a deflationary period?

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

Headline inflation decreased markedly in the last two quarters due to external and internal factors, such as falling energy and commodity prices, weak demand and the fading impact of some temporary factors. It is natural that inflation is low in the reforming countries seeking to regain cost competitiveness.

On the one hand, low inflation is expected to support private consumption because it raises real disposable incomes. On the other hand, a prolonged period of low inflation in the whole euro area makes it harder for vulnerable countries to gain cost competitiveness in the presence of nominal rigidities and increases the real value of public and private debt. Of course, high debt levels must in any case be addressed through responsible fiscal policies and growth-enhancing structural reforms.

The Commission Winter Forecast expects a protracted period of low inflation, averaging 1.0% in 2014 with a very gradual increase in inflation throughout 2015, in line with the on-going recovery. Given the strengthening recovery, the increase in confidence and the on-going efforts to improve the health of the banking system, the risk of outright deflation in the euro area, in the sense of a generalised and self-enforcing fall in prices across euro-area countries and sectors, seems low. As set out in the 2014 Annual Growth Survey, the Commission considers it crucial to keep up the pace of reform to improve competitiveness and secure a lasting recovery.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002104/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Riżervi tal-ilma

Studji reċenti li saru f'Malta wrew li Malta għandha riżerva tal-ilma li sservi għal jumejn biss. Dan huwa partikolarment inkwetanti f'kuntest fejn it-tisħin globali żdied.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha xi rakkomandazzjonijiet dwar il-livell ta' riżervi tal-ilma li għandu jkollhom l-Istati Membri?

Il-Kummissjoni x'azzjoni tissuġġerixxi biex dawn il-livelli jiżdiedu?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Potočnik f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni ma għandhiex rakkomandazzjonijiet speċifiċi dwar il-livell meħtieġ ta' riżorsi tal-ilma, peress li din hija kwistjoni ta' kompetenza tal-Istati Membri soġġetta għal analiżi xierqa tar-riżorsi disponibbli tal-ilma u d-domanda tal-ilma.

Madankollu, bħala segwitu dettaljat għall-Pjan ta' Azzjoni dwar l-Ilmijiet tal-Ewropa ([1]) bħalissa l-Kummissjoni qiegħda tiżviluppa gwida dwar il-bilanċi tal-ilma u dwar il-flussi ambjentali (flimkien mal-Istati Membri u l-partijiet interessati). Dawn l-għodod se jkunu ta' benefiċċju għall-Istati Membri, bħal Malta, fejn hemm il-problema tal-iskarsezza tal-ilma u għandhom bżonn itejbu l-ġestjoni tal-kwantità tal-ilma.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/blueprint/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002104/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Water reserves

Recent studies conducted in Malta have shown that Malta has a water reserve which lasts for only two days. This is especially worrying in the context of increased global warming.

Does the Commission have any recommendations on the level of water reserves to be held by Member States?

What action would the Commission suggest to increase such levels?

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

The Commission does not have specific recommendations on the required level of water reserves, as this is a matter of Member States' competence subject to a proper analysis of available water resources and water demand.

However, as a follow-up to the Blueprint for Europe's Waters ([1]) the Commission is currently developing guidance on water balances and on environmental flows (together with Member States and stakeholders). These tools will be beneficial for Member States, such as Malta, that face water scarcity and need to improve water quantity management.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/blueprint/index_en.htm

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002105/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Ir-rikonoxximent tal-kondotti

Iċ-ċittadini Ewropej li jaħdmu barra minn pajjiżhom, spiss jiffaċċjaw diffikultajiet meta jiġu biex jippreżentaw il-kondotta tagħhom mill-pajjiż tal-oriġini tagħhom. Dawn il-kondotti spiss mhumiex rikonoxxuti u dan joħloq diffikultajiet fil-ksib ta' impjieg.

Il-Kummissjoni temmen li dan in-nuqqas ta' rikonoxximent ixekkel il-moviment ħieles tal-ħaddiema fl-UE b'mod reali?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' April 2014)

Sakemm dan japplika wkoll għall-ħaddiema nazzjonali, rekwiżit minn impjegatur għall-ħaddiema migranti tal-UE biex jippreżentaw il-kondotta tagħhom sabiex jiksbu aċċess għal impjieg ma jmurx kontra r-regoli tal-UE dwar il-moviment liberu tal-ħaddiema. Madankollu, rifjut li tiġi aċċettata kondotta mhejjija fi Stat Membru ieħor għall-finijiet ta' kisba ta' aċċess għal impjieg jista' jikkostitwixxi ksur tal-Artikolu 45 tat-TFUE, li japplika direttament.

Għalkemm is-sistemi nazzjonali tal-kondotti mhumiex armonizzati, il-Kummissjoni tixtieq tiġbed l-attenzjoni tal-Onorevoli Membru għad-Deċiżjoni Qafas tal-Kunsill 2009/315/ĠAI tas-26 ta' Frar 2009 dwar l-organizzazzjoni u l-kontenut tal-iskambju ta' informazzjoni bejn l-Istati Membri ta' informazzjoni estratta mir-rekords kriminali ([1]), li tistabbilixxi sistema kompjuterizzata għall-iskambju ta' informazzjoni dwar il-kundanni bejn l-Istati Membri.

([1]) ĠU L 93, 7.4.2009, p. 23 u d-Deċiżjoni tal-Kunsill 2009/316/ĠAI tas-6 ta' April 2009 dwar l-istabbiliment ta' Sistema Ewropea ta' Informazzjoni ta' Rekords Kriminali (ECRIS) fl-applikazzjoni tal-Artikolu 11 tad-Deċiżjoni Qafas 2009/315/ĠAI, ĠU L, 93,7.4.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002105/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Recognition of criminal records

European citizens working abroad are often faced with difficulties when presenting their criminal record from their home country. Such criminal records are sometimes not recognised and lead to difficulty in obtaining employment.

Does the Commission believe that this lack of recognition hinders the effective free movement of workers in the EU?

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

Provided it also applies to national workers, a requirement by an employer for EU migrant workers to present an extract from their criminal records in order to gain access to employment is not contrary to the EU rules on the free movement of workers. However, a refusal to accept an extract from the criminal record drawn up in another Member State for the purposes of gaining access to employment may constitute an infringement of Article 45 TFEU, which is directly applicable.

Although the national systems of criminal record are not harmonised, the Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to Council Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA of 26 February 2009 on the organisation and content of the exchange of information extracted from the criminal record between Member States ([1]), which establishes a computerised system for the exchange of information on convictions between Member States.

([1]) OJ L 93, 7.4.2009, p. 23 and Council Decision 2009/316 JHA of 6 April 2009 on the establishment of the European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS) in application of Article 11 of Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA, OJ L 93, 7.4.2009.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002106/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Livelli tar-riċerka u l-iżvilupp fl-Ewropa

In-nefqa għar-riċerka u l-iżvilupp (R&Ż) fl-UE kienet inugwali ħafna, minn 0.5 % tal-PDG f'Ċipru għal 3.87 % tal-PDG fil-Finlandja. Barra minn hekk, ir-rata medja tan-nefqa tal-UE fuq ir-R&Ż (2 % tal-PDG) hija iktar baxxa minn dik ta' kompetituri bħall-Ġappun (3.45 %) u l-Istati Uniti tal-Amerika (2.79 %).

L-UE attwalment għandha l-objettiv li tilħaq il-mira ta' 3 % tal-PDG għar-R&Ż sal-2020.

1. Il-Kummissjoni temmen li tali mira hija realistika?

2. Il-Kummissjoni kif biħsiebha tgħin lil dawk l-Istati Membri li qed isibuha diffiċli jilħqu din il-mira?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Geoghegan-Quinn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(3 ta' April 2014)

1. Wara li baqgħet stabbli għal madwar 1.85% bejn is-sena 2000 u 2007, l-intensità kumplessiva tar-R&Ż tal-UE żdiedet għal 2.01% fl-2009 u wara żdiedet biss b'mod moderat, u laħqet il-livell ta' 2.06% fl-2012. Il-kontinwazzjoni ta' din ix-xejra mhux se tippermetti l-ilħuq tal-mira tal-intensità tar-R&Ż tal-Ewropa 2020 ta' 3% fl-2020. Jekk l-Istati Membri jilħqu l-miri nazzjonali tagħhom, l-intensità kumplessiva tar-R&Ż tal-UE tista' tilħaq 2.6% fl-2020.

2. Fl-Istħarriġ Annwali tat-Tkabbir tagħha tal-2014 ([1]), il-Kummissjoni enfasizzat li l-Istati Membri jeħtieġ li jsibu mezzi biex jipproteġu u jippromwovu l-infiq pubbliku (bħall-infiq fuq ir-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni) li jirrinforza l-potenzjal tat-tkabbir tagħhom. L-Istħarriġ talab ukoll lill-Istati Membri jaċċelleraw l-modernizzazzjoni tas-sistemi nazzjonali tar-riċerka f'konformità mal-għanijiet taż-Żona Ewropea tar-Riċerka. Billi jidentifikaw speċjlizzazzjonijiet xjentifiċi u teknoloġiċi li huma konsistenti mal-potenzjal ta' kull reġjun biex jiżviluppa attivitajiet ekonomiċi kompetittivi, l-istrateġiji tal-ispeċjalizzazzjoni intelliġenti jikkontribwixxu għal effett miżjud ta' ingranaġġ tal-investiment pubbliku tar-R&Ż fl-investiment privat.

Barra minn hekk, il-progress fir-rigward tal-impenji tal-inizjattiva ewlenija "Unjoni tal-Innovazzjoni" irriżulta fi privattiva unitarja, f'iffissar iktar bikri tal-istandards, f'modernizzazzjoni tar-regoli tal-UE tal-akkwist u f'passaport Ewropew għal fondi tal-kapital ta' riskju, li lkoll jagħmlu l-ambjent kummerċjali fl-Ewropa iżjed faċli għall-innovazzjoni u b'hekk iktar attraenti għall-investiment privat fir-R&Ż.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_mt.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002106/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Research and development levels in Europe

Research and development (R&D) expenditure in the EU has been very uneven, ranging from 0.5% of GDP in Cyprus to 3.87% of GDP in Finland. Moreover, the EU average rate of expenditure on R&D (2% of GDP) is lower than that of competitors such as Japan (3.45%) and the USA (2.79%).

The EU is currently aiming to reach a target of 3% of GDP for R&D by 2020.

1. Does the Commission believe that such a target is realistic?

2. How does the Commission intend to help those Member States that are finding it difficult to achieve this target?

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

1. After remaining stable at around 1.85% between 2000 and 2007, the EU's overall R&D intensity increased to 2.01% in 2009 and increased only moderately thereafter, reaching a level of 2,06% in 2012. The continuation of this trend would not allow reaching the Europe 2020 R&D intensity target of 3% in 2020. If Member States meet their national targets, the EU's overall R&D intensity could reach 2,6% in 2020.

2. In its Annual Growth Survey 2014 ([1]), the Commission stressed that Member States need to find ways to protect or promote public spending (like spending on research and innovation) that reinforces their growth potential. The Survey also called on Member States to accelerate the modernisation of national research systems in line with the objectives of the European Research Area. By identifying scientific and technological specialisations consistent with each region's potential for the development of competitive economic activities, smart specialisation strategies also contribute to an increased leverage effect of public R&D investment on private investment.

Moreover, progress with respect to the commitments of the 'Innovation Union' flagship initiative has resulted in a unitary patent, faster standard-setting, modernised EU procurement rules and a European passport for venture capital funds, all of which make the business environment in Europe more innovation-friendly and thereby more attractive for private R&D investment.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_en.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002107/14
lill-Kunsill
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-Korea ta' Fuq

L-UE stabbiliet relazzjonijiet diplomatiċi mar-Repubblika Demokratika Popolari tal-Korea (RDPK) fl-2001. Dawn ir-relazzjonijiet huma bbażati fuq il-ħtieġa li jitħarsu l-paċi u l-istabbiltà reġjonali, in-nonproliferazzjoni u d-drittijiet tal-bniedem.

Sa mill-2013, l-UE implimentat għadd ta' miżuri addizzjonali kontra l-Korea ta' Fuq.

Fid-dawl tar-rapport riċenti maħruġ min-NU dwar il-ksur tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem u l-possibbiltà tal-prosekuzzjoni tal-kap tar-RDPK, Kim Jong Un, fil-Qorti Internazzjonali tal-Ġustizzja, l-UE qiegħda tikkunsidra li żżid il-miżuri restrittivi fis-seħħ kontra l-Korea ta' Fuq?

Tweġiba
(13 ta' Mejju 2014)

L-UE koinizjat ir-riżoluzzjoni tal-Kunsill tad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem tan-NU li f'Marzu 2013, stabbilixxiet il-Kummissjoni ta' Inkjesta tan-NU dwar id-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem fir-Repubblika Demokratika Popolari tal-Korea (RDPK), ir-rapport li għalih jirreferi l-Onorevoli Membru. L-UE ser taħdem mas-sħab kollha tagħha, u speċjalment man-NU, sabiex jiġi żgurat is-segwitu adatt għas-sejbiet u r-rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni tal-Inkjesta.

Ir-reġim tas-sanzjonijiet tal-UE kontra r-RDPK jimplimenta l-miżuri restrittivi adottati mill-Kunsill tas-Sigurtà tan-Nazzjonijiet Uniti b'reazzjoni għall-armi ta' qerda massiva tar-RDPK u l-programmi tal-missili ballistiċi u jinkludi miżuri awtonomi addizzjonali li jirrinfurzaw is-sanzjonijiet tan-NU. L-UE ser tkompli tissorvelja mill-qrib l-iżviluppi fin-NU u ser tikkonsulta mas-sħab ewlenin.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002107/14
to the Council
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: North Korea

The EU established diplomatic relations with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) in 2001. These relations are based on the need to safeguard regional peace and stability, non-proliferation and human rights.

As of 2013, the EU has also put a number of additional measures in place against North Korea.

In light of the recent report issued by the UN on human rights violations and the possibility of DPRK leader Kim Jong-Un's prosecution in the International Court of Justice, is the EU considering increasing the restrictive measures in place against North Korea?

Reply
(13 May 2014)

The EU co-initiated the UN Human Rights Council resolution which, in March 2013, established the UN Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), the report to which the Honourable Member refers. The EU will work with all its partners, and especially the UN, to ensure appropriate follow-up to the Commission of Inquiry's findings and recommendations.

The EU's sanctions regime against the DPRK implements the restrictive measures adopted by the United Nations Security Council in response to the DPRK's weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile programmes and includes additional autonomous measures that reinforce the UN sanctions. The EU will continue to monitor closely developments at the UN and consult with key partners.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002109/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Chiusura temporanea della sede succursale dell'Istituto magistrale Giordano Bruno a Roma per danni causati dal maltempo: interventi per garantire il diritto allo studio

L'Unione europea ha tra i suoi obiettivi lo sviluppo di politiche volte alla promozione e al miglioramento dell'istruzione e della formazione, priorità che si basano sulla qualità delle infrastrutture scolastiche, l'eco-sostenibilità e la sicurezza degli edifici stessi.

L'eccezionale ondata di maltempo che ha colpito la città di Roma nel corso dei mesi di gennaio e febbraio ha determinato ingenti danni a edifici, anche scolastici. In particolare, si segnala la chiusura temporanea della sede succursale dell'Istituto magistrale Giordano Bruno di Roma a causa di forti infiltrazioni e della lesione strutturale di un pilastro. I disagi conseguenti alla chiusura dell'Istituto sono notevoli, giacché una soluzione alternativa non sembra essere stata trovata, e quindi gli studenti sono costretti a seguire le lezioni spostandosi ogni ora in aule diverse, con i relativi problemi legati alla continuità didattica e al diritto di godere di un'istruzione di livello adeguato.

Tutto ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se è al corrente della situazione;

2. di fornire un quadro a livello europeo della normativa relativa alla sicurezza degli edifici scolastici;

3. quali interventi possono essere messi in campo al fine di garantire la continuità didattica ed assicurare il diritto allo studio;

4. se esistono finanziamenti o bandi europei diretti alla riqualificazione, ristrutturazione e messa in sicurezza degli edifici scolastici pubblici?

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

A norma dell'articolo 165 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea all'UE compete di contribuire allo sviluppo di un'istruzione di qualità incentivando la cooperazione tra Stati membri e, se necessario, sostenendo e integrando la loro azione nel pieno rispetto delle loro responsabilità per quanto riguarda il contenuto dell'insegnamento e l'organizzazione di sistemi educativi. La Commissione pertanto non ha competenze specifiche in merito alle infrastrutture scolastiche.

Il fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) può cofinanziare interventi per la gestione e la prevenzione di rischi causati da vari fattori tra cui condizioni meteorologiche avverse. Il programma operativo regionale 2007-2013 per il Lazio cofinanziato dal FESR non prevede tuttavia interventi specifici destinati a strutture scolastiche. In base al principio della gestione condivisa applicato alla gestione amministrativa dei fondi strutturali la selezione e l'attuazione dei progetti competono alle autorità nazionali. Per ulteriori informazioni la Commissione suggerisce pertanto all'onorevole deputato di contattare direttamente l'autorità di gestione italiana:

Autorità di gestione
POR FESR Lazio 2007/2013
Via R. R. Garibaldi, 7
00145 Roma
adgcomplazio@regione.lazio.it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002109/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Temporary closure of the Rome branch of the Giordano Bruno Teacher Training College due to damage caused by adverse weather: measures to guarantee the right to education

Among the objectives of the European Union is the development of policies designed to promote and enhance education and training, priorities based on the quality of educational infrastructures, eco-sustainability and the safety of the buildings themselves.

The period of exceptionally adverse weather which struck the city of Rome in January and February has caused substantial damage to buildings, including educational facilities. Particular attention must be drawn to the temporary closure of the Rome branch of the Giordano Bruno Teacher Training College as a result of major infiltration and structural damage to a pillar. The inconvenience resulting from closure of the College is considerable, given that an alternative solution does not appear to have been found and the students are therefore obliged to attend lessons by moving to different lecture halls on an hourly basis, causing problems associated with educational continuity and the right to an adequate level of teaching.

In full consideration of the above, the Commission is asked:

1. whether it is aware of this situation;

2. to provide an overview of European regulations on the safety of educational buildings;

3. to identify potential measures to guarantee educational continuity and the right to education;

4. whether European calls for tender or funding for the upgrading, refurbishment and making safe of public educational buildings exist?

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

According to Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union the Union shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organisation of education systems. Therefore, the Commission has no specific education-related competence as far as educational infrastructure is concerned.

The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) can co-fund interventions for the management and prevention of risks caused, among others, by adverse weather. However, the 2007-2013 regional operational programme for Lazio co-financed by ERDF does not foresee specific interventions for educational buildings. In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of the Structural Funds, project selection and implementation is the responsibility of the national authorities. For more information the Commission therefore suggests the Honourable Member contact directly the managing authority in Italy:

Managing authority
Regional operational programme for Lazio for 2007-2013
Via R. R. Garibaldi, 7
00145 Roma
adgcomplazio@regione.lazio.it

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002110/14
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(21 februari 2014)

Betreft: Criteria voor niet-EU-voetballers om een arbeidsvergunning te krijgen in de EU-lidstaten

Om als niet-EU-speler toegelaten te worden tot de nationale competities, gelden erg uiteenlopende criteria in de verschillende lidstaten.

In Nederland moet een niet-Europese speler anderhalf keer het gemiddelde loon uit de eredivisie verdienen om een arbeidskaart te krijgen, waarmee hij in een Nederlandse club aan de slag kan.

In België volstaat een loon dat slechts een derde daarvan bedraagt.

In Engeland krijgt een speler enkel een arbeidsvergunning als hij in de twee laatste jaren minstens de helft van de wedstrijden met zijn nationale ploeg heeft gespeeld.

Heeft de Commissie dit aspect al in kaart gebracht middels een vergelijkend onderzoek?

Hoe evalueert de Commissie deze situatie in het licht van een gelijk speelveld voor de clubs in de EU? Vindt de Commissie het zinvol om zo nodig een initiatief te nemen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Vassiliou namens de Commissie
(16 april 2014)

De Commissie heeft nog geen vergelijkend onderzoek uitgevoerd met betrekking tot de kwesties die door het geachte Parlementslid aan de orde werden gesteld. De nationale regels inzake de toegang tot EU-landen voor niet-EU-voetballers worden gedeeltelijk aangekaart in de EU-studie over de economische en juridische aspecten van spelerstransfers ([1]).

De Commissie werkt aan een gemeenschappelijk immigratiebeleid overeenkomstig artikel 79 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie. In de regel behouden de lidstaten het recht zelf te bepalen hoeveel onderdanen van derde landen (ODD's) tot hun grondgebied worden toegelaten teneinde daar arbeid te verrichten.

Enkel voor specifieke gebieden heeft de EU voorwaarden inzake toegang en verblijf vastgesteld, alsook voor de definiëring van de rechten van ODD's ([2]). Voorbeelden hiervan zijn de blauwekaartrichtlijn van de EU voor hooggekwalificeerde ODD-werknemers, en de richtlijn betreffende seizoenarbeiders die kort geleden werd aangenomen. Voetballers vallen niet specifiek onder de immigratiewetten van de EU.

De Commissie wijst erop dat de verschillende regels in dit gebied het nationaal beleid vooral weerspiegelen op het vlak van immigratie. De Commissie is van mening dat in dit opzicht een EU-initiatief niet nodig is.

([1]) Zie deel 2.1.1.2 van de studie, beschikbaar op http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/documents/cons-study-transfers-final-rpt.pdf

([2]) Sommige lidstaten (Ierland, Denemarken en het Verenigd Koninkrijk) passen een volledige opt-out toe in vrijheid, veiligheid en rechtvaardigheid, waardoor ook maatregelen worden uitgesloten die een gemeenschappelijk migratiebeleid ten uitvoer willen leggen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002110/14
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Criteria for non-EU footballers to obtain work permits in the EU Member States

The criteria for allowing non-EU footballers to play in national competitions differ widely between Member States.

In the Netherlands, a non-European player is required to earn one and a half times as much as the average wage in the highest division in order to obtain a work permit enabling him to play for a Dutch club.

In Belgium it is sufficient to have a wage which is only one third as much.

In England a player can obtain a work permit only if in the past two years he has played at least half the matches with his national team.

Has the Commission made a comparative survey of this aspect?

What is the Commission's assessment of this situation in the interests of a level playing field for clubs in the EU? Does the Commission consider it desirable, if necessary, to launch an initiative?

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

The Commission has not carried out a comparative survey concerning the issues raised by the Honourable Member. The topic of national rules governing the access of non-EU football players to EU countries is partially addressed by the EU study on the economic and legal aspects of transfers of players. ([1])

The EU develops a common immigration policy in line with Article 79 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU. As a general rule, Member States retain the right to determine the number of third-country nationals (TCNs) to admit to their territory for reasons of work.

Only in specific areas has the EU established the conditions of entry and residence, as well as the definition of rights of TCNs ([2]). Examples are the EU Blue Card Directive for highly qualified TCN workers and the recently adopted Seasonal Workers Directive. Football players are not specifically covered by EU immigration laws.

The Commission notes that the different rules in this field reflect national policies notably in the field of immigration; the Commission does not consider that an EU initiative is needed in this respect.

([1]) See Section 2.1.1.2 of the study, available at http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/documents/cons-study-transfers-final-rpt.pdf

([2]) Some Member States (Ireland, Denmark and the UK) exercise a full opt-out from the area of freedom, security and justice, which also excludes it from measures aimed at implementing a common migration policy.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002111/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(21 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Referendum per l'indipendenza del Veneto

Dopo la Scozia e la Catalogna, anche la Regione Veneto sta decidendo di indire un referendum consultivo per permettere al popolo veneto di esprimersi sulla questione dell'indipendenza dallo Stato centrale e di esercitare così il proprio diritto all'autodeterminazione. Il 28 novembre 2012 il Consiglio regionale del Veneto ha approvato la risoluzione n. 44 che ha impegnato il presidente della Regione e il presidente del Consiglio regionale del Veneto ad attivarsi «per avviare urgentemente con tutte le istituzioni dell'Unione europea e delle Nazioni Unite le relazioni istituzionali che garantiscono l'indizione della consultazione referendaria […] al fine di accertare la volontà del popolo veneto in ordine alla propria autodeterminazione sino anche alla dichiarazione di indipendenza». Il 2 aprile 2013 è stato presentato in Regione il progetto di legge n.342/13 per l'indizione del referendum per l'indipendenza del Veneto. Dal 5 aprile 2013 ad oggi 168 comuni (in rappresentanza di oltre 1 670 000 cittadini) e 4 province (Venezia, Verona, Padova e Treviso, in rappresentanza di oltre 3,5 milioni di cittadini) hanno ufficialmente approvato, nei rispettivi Consigli, un ordine del giorno che chiede l'indizione e la celebrazione del referendum.

Il Presidente della Commissione José Manuel Barroso, nella sua risposta all'interrogazione E-007453/2012 in tema di «Eventuali secessioni in uno Stato membro e conseguenze per i cittadini», ha espressamente affermato che «nel caso ipotetico di una secessione in uno Stato membro, si dovrà trovare e negoziare la soluzione ricorrendo all'ordinamento giuridico internazionale». Occorre inoltre tener presente che l'autodeterminazione è un diritto naturale, tutelato e sancito dalla Carta dell'ONU che dal 1945 ad oggi ha permesso la nascita di oltre 120 nuovi Stati, così come un diritto garantito anche dal Patto internazionale relativo ai diritti civili e politici sottoscritto a New York il 19 dicembre 1966 e ratificato dall'Italia con la legge del 25 ottobre 1977 n. 881. Infine, l'articolo 10 della Costituzione italiana stabilisce che «l'ordinamento giuridico italiano si conforma alle norme del diritto internazionale generalmente riconosciute».

Ritiene la Commissione che nei trattati che hanno dato vita all'ordinamento giuridico dell'Unione europea e nei trattati che costituiscono il tessuto dell'ordinamento giuridico internazionale, da cui l'UE non ha mai ritenuto di prescindere, sussistano limiti, divieti, restrizioni o altre condizioni ostative che impediscano al Veneto di indire un referendum, libero e democratico, che consenta al popolo veneto di esercitare il proprio diritto naturale all'autodeterminazione?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(3 aprile 2014)

La Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alle risposte fornite alle interrogazioni scritte E-008133/2012, P-009756/2012 e P-009862/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002111/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Referendum on independence for the Veneto region

Following Scotland and Catalonia, the Veneto region is now in the process of organising a referendum on independence from central government, enabling its inhabitants to exercise their right to self-determination if they so wish. On 28 November 2012, the Veneto Regional Council adopted Resolution No 44 calling on its President and the President of the Veneto Regional Government to take measures without delay to establish formal relations with all EU and UN institutions, thereby paving the way for a referendum to establish the wishes of the inhabitants of Veneto regarding self-determination or a declaration of independence. On 2 April 2013, Draft Law No 342/13 was tabled at regional level with a view to organising the referendum in question. From 5 April 2013 until now, 168 municipal councils (representing over 1 670 000 citizens) and four provincial councils (Venice, Verona, Padua and Treviso, representing over 3.5 million citizens) have officially adopted an agenda calling for the organisation and holding of the referendum.

In reply to Question for Written Answer E-007453/2012 on the possibility of secession in a Member State and impact on citizens, the Commission President José Manuel Barroso stated that 'in the hypothetical event of a secession of a part of an EU Member State, the solution would have to be found and negotiated within the international legal order'. It must also be remembered that self-determination is a natural right protected by and enshrined in the UN Charter, which from 1945 until today has led to the emergence of over 120 new countries, and guaranteed under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights signed in New York on 19 December 1966, ratified by Italy under Law No 881 of 25 October 1977. Finally, Article 10 of the Italian Constitution states that Italian laws conform to the generally recognised tenets of international law.

Does the Commission consider that the treaties and agreements establishing the European Union as a legal entity and forming the substance of the international legal system, from which the EU has never chosen to depart, contain limits, prohibitions, restrictions or other impediments preventing the Veneto region from organising a free and democratic referendum, allowing its inhabitants to exercise their natural right to self-determination?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 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

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002112/14
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(21 februari 2014)

Betreft: Huisideoloog Erdoğan: „Turkse integratie in EU is onaanvaardbaar"

Hayrettin Karaman is de huisideoloog van de Turkse premier Erdoğan en diens AK-partij. In het AKP-orgaan „Yeni safak" („Nieuwe morgenstond") schrijft Karaman in zijn column van 13 februari 2014: „Vrome moslims kunnen een integratie van Turkije in de EU niet aanvaarden. Het verzet tegen alles wat christelijk-westers is, is voor ons een geloofspunt." Over godsdienstvrijheid voor niet-moslims schrijft hij: „In zoverre zij (de niet-moslims) zich van het islamitische geloof en zijn moraal onderscheiden, zullen wij hun noch in de naam van de democratie, noch in de naam van de mensenrechten toegevingen doen ([1])."

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de uitlatingen van Hayrettin Karaman, de huisideoloog van premier Erdoğan en de regerende AK-partij [(1)]? Hoe reageert de Commisie hierop?

2. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat uit de woorden van Karaman, de „islamitisch-ideologische spreekbuis" van premier Erdoğan, de Turkse onwil blijkt om deel van de EU te worden resp. om zich aan de zogenaamde EU-maatstaven aan te passen? Zo neen, hoe interpreteert de Commissie Karamans woorden dan wél?

3. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat uit Karamans woorden de Turkse intolerante houding jegens niet-moslims blijkt? Zo neen, hoe interpreteert de Commissie Karamans woorden dan wél?

4. Wat is de Commissie voornemens naar aanleiding van Karamans uitlatingen te doen? Is zij bereid premier Erdoğan hiermee te confronteren en hem vervolgens luid en duidelijk te verkondigen dat er voor Turkije nooit plaats zal zijn in de EU?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(4 april 2014)

De Commissie wenst niet te reageren op elke verklaring die in de pers wordt gepubliceerd. De Commissie heeft er nota van genomen dat premier Erdogan nogmaals zijn engagement voor het toetredingsproces heeft bevestigd tijdens zijn bezoek aan Brussel op 21 januari en dit zowel aan de voorzitter van de Europese Raad, de heer Van Rompuy, de voorzitter van de Europese Commissie, de heer Barroso, als aan de voorzitter van het Europees Parlement, de heer Schulz.

([1]) http://yenisafak.com.tr/yazarlar/HayrettinKaraman/dostlugun-ve-desteklemenin-sarti/50283.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002112/14
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Erdoğan's in-house ideologue states that: 'the integration of Turkey with the EU is unacceptable'

Writing in a column in the pro-AKP daily 'Yeni Safak' (New Dawn) on 13 February 2014, Hayrettin Karaman, in-house ideologue to Prime Minister Erdoğan and his ruling party, stated that pious Muslims would never want integration with the EU and that opposition to all Christian and western values was a matter of belief. Regarding freedom of religious belief for non-Muslims, he wrote that, if those concerned (non-Muslims) were contrary to the religion and morality of Islam, no concessions would be made to them in the name of democracy or human rights.

1. Is the Commission aware of these remarks by Hayrettin Karaman, the in-house ideologue of Prime Minister Erdoğan and the governing AK party ([1])? What view does it take of them?

2. Does the Commission agree that the utterances of Karaman, 'the Islamic ideological mouthpiece' of Prime Minister Erdoğan, reflect reluctance on the part of Turkey to join the EU or conform to EU criteria? If not, how does the Commission interpret his remarks?

3. Does the Commission agree that his remarks reflect Turkish intolerance towards non-Muslims? If not, how does it interpret them?

4. What action is being envisaged by the Commission in response to this? Is it willing to take the matter up with Prime Minister Erdoğan and inform him in no uncertain terms that there will never be room for Turkey in the EU?

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

The Commission does not wish to react to each and every statement published in the press. The Commission noted the commitment to the accession process which Prime Minister Erdoğan confirmed once more during his visit to Brussels on 21 January to the President of the European Council, Mr Van Rompuy, the President of the European Commission, Mr Barroso and the President of the European Parliament, Mr Schulz.

([1]) http://yenisafak.com.tr/yazarlar/HayrettinKaraman/dostlugun-ve-desteklemenin-sarti/50283

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002113/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Acuerdo entre Facebook y Whatspp: cuestiones relacionadas con la privacidad de los ciudadanos de la UE

Esta semana se ha anunciado que Facebook va a comprar WhatsApp por un importe de 16 000 millones de euros. Este acuerdo plantea una serie de cuestiones a los ciudadanos de la UE con respecto a la privacidad de los datos personales.

En 2013 se afirmó que 74 países habían solicitado a Facebook datos sobre sus usuarios y que Facebook los había proporcionado en numerosas ocasiones, lo que, en sí, es motivo de gran preocupación en cuanto a la protección de la privacidad en dicha plataforma, ya que algunos de los países en cuestión eran Estados miembros de la UE y que 250 millones de europeos tienen una cuenta en Facebook.

La adquisición de WhatsApp plantea nuevas preocupaciones ya que millones de ciudadanos de la UE utilizan esta aplicación de chat.

Teniendo en cuenta la legislación europea en materia de protección de datos, ¿podrá indicar la Comisión de qué informaciones dispone en relación con el acceso de los gobiernos a los datos privados de los ciudadanos de la UE a través de Facebook?

¿Tiene intención la Comisión de adoptar alguna medida para asegurarse de que los datos privados de los ciudadanos que utilizan Facebook o WhatsApp no podrán cederse a terceros sin su consentimiento?

¿Considera la Comisión que debería existir una cláusula de exclusión voluntaria para los usuarios de esta plataforma de redes sociales que no deseen que sus datos sean utilizados por terceros concretos?

¿Está la Comisión de acuerdo en que los gobiernos que soliciten información privada sobre los usuarios de una red social deberían tener una orden judicial?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de mayo de 2014)

La Comisión está al corriente de las cifras publicadas en el informe mundial de Facebook sobre las peticiones de Gobiernos correspondiente al primer semestre de 2013.

La Directiva 95/46/CE ([1]), que es el principal instrumento de la UE para la protección de la intimidad y la protección de datos, se aplica al tratamiento de datos personales por parte de los servicios de medios de comunicación sociales como Facebook ([2]).

La Directiva 95/46/CE no es aplicable cuando las operaciones de tratamiento de datos personales están relacionadas con las actividades del Estado en el ámbito del Derecho penal. No obstante, en virtud del artículo 8 del Convenio Europeo de Derechos Humanos, toda persona tiene derecho a la protección de sus datos personales. No podrá haber injerencia de las autoridades públicas en el ejercicio de ese derecho salvo cuando esa injerencia esté prevista por la ley y constituya una medida que, en una sociedad democrática, sea necesaria, entre otras cosas, para la seguridad nacional o la seguridad pública, la prevención de desórdenes o delitos, o la protección de los derechos y las libertades de terceros.

La Directiva propuesta por la Comisión en enero de 2012, como parte del paquete de la reforma de la protección de datos de la UE ([3]), establece principios y normas en materia de protección de datos para su cumplimiento por las autoridades judiciales y policiales al tratar datos personales. Estas normas se aplicarán tanto al tratamiento nacional como a las transferencias transfronterizas de datos.

([1]) Directiva 95/46/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 24 de octubre de 1995, relativa a la protección de las personas físicas en lo que respecta al tratamiento de datos personales y a la libre circulación de estos datos (DO L 281 de 23.11.1995, pp. 31-50).

([2]) La Directiva es aplicable al tratamiento de datos personales por parte de los responsables del tratamiento de datos que sean personas físicas o jurídicas, autoridades públicas, agencias o cualquier otro organismo que, solos o conjuntamente con otros, determinen los fines y los medios del tratamiento de datos personales.

([3]) Propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo relativa a la protección de las personas físicas en lo que respecta al tratamiento de datos personales por parte de las autoridades competentes para fines de prevención, investigación, detección o enjuiciamiento de infracciones penales o de ejecución de sanciones penales, y la libre circulación de dichos datos [COM(2012) 10].

Además, la Comisión ha tomado medidas para abordar las preocupaciones específicas de los ciudadanos en relación con el acceso por terceros países de sus datos de carácter personal, en particular mediante su Comunicación publicada el 27 de noviembre de 2013. La Comisión considera que los datos personales en poder de las empresas privadas que necesiten las autoridades policiales de los Estados Unidos deben obtenerse a través de los canales oficiales de cooperación, tales como el Acuerdo de asistencia judicial. Debe quedar descartado el acceso por otros medios, a menos que se haga en situaciones excepcionales claramente definidas y sujetas a control judicial.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002113/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: Privacy issues for EU citizens in relation to the Facebook-WhatsApp deal

This week, it was announced that Facebook is going to buy WhatsApp for EUR 16 billion. This deal raises a number of issues for EU citizens regarding the privacy of personal data.

It was reported in 2013 that 74 countries had asked Facebook for data on users, and that Facebook had provided such data on many occasions. That in itself is cause for great concern in terms of the protection of privacy on this platform, since some of the countries in question were Member States and 250 million Europeans have a Facebook account.

The acquisition of WhatsApp raises new concerns, as this chat application is used by millions of EU citizens.

In the light of European legislation on data protection, what information does the Commission have on government access to EU citizens' private data through Facebook?

Is the Commission planning to take any action to ensure that the private data of citizens using Facebook or WhatsApp cannot be given to third parties without their consent?

Does the Commission believe that there should be an opt-out clause for users of the social network platform who do not want their data to be used by certain third parties?

Is the Commission of the opinion that governments demanding private user information from a social network company should need a judicial warrant?

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

The Commission is aware of the figures published in Facebook's Global Government Requests Report for the first half of 2013.

Directive 95/46/EC ([1]), the main EU instrument for privacy and data protection, applies to the processing of personal data by social media services such as Facebook ([2]).

Directive 95/46/EC does not apply when personal data processing operations relate to activities of the State in the field of criminal law. However, under Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights, everyone has the right to protection of his or her personal data. Public authorities may interfere with the exercise of this fundamental right only in accordance with the law and where necessary in a democratic society, *inter alia*, in the interests of national security or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

The directive proposed by the Commission in January 2012 as part of the EU data protection reform package ([3]) provides for data protection principles and rules for police and criminal justice authorities when processing personal data. These rules will apply both to domestic processing and cross-border transfers of data.

In addition, the Commission has taken steps to address the specific concerns of citizens regarding access by third countries to their personal data, notably through its communication published on 27 November 2013. The Commission considers that personal data held by private companies and needed by US law enforcement authorities should be obtained through formal channels of cooperation, such as the Mutual Legal Assistance agreement. Access by other means should be excluded unless it takes place in clearly defined, exceptional and judicially reviewable situations.

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31-50 .

([2]) The directive is applicable to the processing of personal data by data controllers who are natural or legal persons, public authority, agencies or any other bodies which alone or jointly with others determine the purposes and means of the processing of personal data.

([3]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data (COM(2012) 10).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002114/14
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(21 februari 2014)

Betreft: Uitbreiding bevoegdheden Turkse inlichtingendienst MIT

De Turkse regeringspartij AKP diende een uiterst controversieel wetsvoorstel in om de bevoegdheden van de nationale inlichtingendienst MIT gevoelig uit te breiden. Deze dienst zou voortaan onder de rechtstreekse verantwoordelijkheid van de eerste minister vallen. Het is de bedoeling dat over het wetsvoorstel nog voor het parlementaire reces wordt gestemd, zodat het in snel tempo behandeld moet worden.

De Turkse oppositie is verontrust over het wetsvoorstel, gezien de recente maatregelen die de vrije meningsuiting in Turkije verder aan banden leggen (bijvoorbeeld de wet inzake het internet). De voorzitter van de Republikeinse Volkspartij (CHP), Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu, beschuldigt premier Erdoğan ervan een dictatoriale „intelligence state" te willen vormen.

Welke stappen overweegt de Commissie te nemen in verband met het wetsvoorstel over de MIT (behalve het gebruikelijke uiten van bezorgdheid)?

Werd hierover al contact opgenomen met de Turkse regering? Zo ja, wat waren de conclusies?

Is de beoogde hervorming van de Turkse inlichtingendienst in overeenstemming met de criteria van Kopenhagen en het acquis communautaire? Welke gevolgen heeft het aannemen van de wet voor het verdere verloop van de toetredingsonderhandelingen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(13 mei 2014)

De wet inzake de nationale inlichtingendienst (MIT) werd op 17 april goedgekeurd door het Turkse parlement. De Commissie heeft reeds een voorlopige beoordeling gemaakt van het wetsvoorstel in kwestie. Hierbij werden met name de volgende aspecten onderzocht: de controlemaatregelen op het toezicht op de activiteiten van de nationale inlichtingendienst, de toegang van de MIT tot documenten, procedures voor het afluisteren van telefoonverkeer, de duur van de straffen voor journalisten en uitgevers, en bepaalde verplichtingen tot het doorgeven van informatie van andere instellingen aan de MIT, die tot bezorgdheid strekken in het licht van het EVRM en de rechtspraak van het EHRM.

De Commissie bespreekt haar opmerkingen over de wetgeving op het gebied van de rechtsstaat in alle relevante vergaderingen met de Turkse autoriteiten. De volgende gelegenheid om de wet ter sprake te brengen is de werkgroep rond hoofdstuk 23 — Rechterlijke macht en fundamentele rechten, het Associatiecomité en de Associatieraad.

De Commissie zal de aangenomen wet in het kader van de toetredingscriteria beoordelen. Zij zal deze beoordeling opnemen in haar jaarlijkse voortgangsverslag.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002114/14
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: New powers for the Turkish National Intelligence Organisation (MIT)

Turkey's ruling AK Party has proposed a highly controversial new law to give the country's National Intelligence Organisation sweeping new powers and bring its future operations under the direct responsibility of the prime minister. It is planned to rush the bill through parliament by putting it to the vote before the recess.

The Turkish opposition parties have expressed concern at the proposed legislation, coming as it does in the wake of recent measures to further restrict freedom of expression in Turkey (for example on Internet). The Head of the Republican People's Party (CHP), Kemal Kiliçdaroğlu, has accused Prime Minister Erdogan of seeking to create a dictatorial 'intelligence state'.

What measures (apart from the standard expressions of concern) are being envisaged by the Commission in response to the proposed legislation to expand the powers of the MIT?

Has the matter been broached with the Turkish Government? If so, what was the outcome?

Is the planned restructuring of the MIT in accordance with the Copenhagen criteria and the EU acquis? If the law is adopted, what implications will this have for subsequent accession negotiations?

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

The law on National Intelligence Service (MIT) was adopted by the Turkish parliament on 17 April. The Commission had made a preliminary assessment of the draft and looked in particular into safeguards which apply to the supervision of the Service's activities, the scope of MIT's access to documents, procedures for wiretapping, length of sentences for journalists and publishers, and certain information obligations of other institutions towards MIT that raise concerns in light of the ECHR and the case law of the ECtHR.

The Commission discusses its comments on legislation in the rule of law area in all relevant meetings with the Turkish authorities. The next opportunity to discuss the law will be the working group on Chapter 23 — judiciary and fundamental rights, the Association Committee and the Association Council.

The Commission will assess the adopted law in light of the accession criteria. This assessment will be presented in its annual Progress Report.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002115/14
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(24 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Rezolucja Parlamentu Europejskiego z dnia 21 listopada 2013 r. w sprawie uczciwego wymiaru sprawiedliwości w Boliwii, w szczególności przypadków Elõda Tóásó i Maria Tadića

W dniu 21 listopada 2013 r. Parlament Europejski przyjął rezolucję w sprawie uczciwego wymiaru sprawiedliwości w Boliwii, w szczególności przypadków Elõda Tóásó i Maria Tadića (P7_TA(2013)0518).

W paragrafie 4 rezolucji zawarto następujące stwierdzenie:

„[Parlament Europejski] wzywa Europejską Służbę Działań Zewnętrznych do utrzymania wysokiego priorytetu tej sprawy w kontaktach z rządem boliwijskim oraz do podjęcia konkretnych działań w tym zakresie;".

Jakie działania zostały podjęte lub wkrótce zostaną podjęte przez Wiceprzewodniczącą/Wysoką Przedstawiciel i Europejską Służbę Działań Zewnętrznych w następstwie tej rezolucji?

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

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest w pełni świadoma obaw wyrażonych przez Parlament Europejski dotyczących konieczności zapewnienia sprawiedliwego i przejrzystego procesu obywateli UE – Elõda Tóásó (HU) i Maria Tadića (HR).

Jak Panu wiadomo, sprawa tych obywateli jest bezpośrednio powiązana z toczącym się obecnie procesem innych osób aresztowanych podczas akcji policji rzekomo mającej na celu unieszkodliwienie komórki terrorystycznej, podczas której śmierć poniosło trzech innych obywateli UE (Árpád Magyarósi, Michael Martin Dwyer i Eduardo Rózsa-Flores).

Proces był bezpośrednio monitorowany przez delegaturę UE w Boliwii, w koordynacji z innymi ambasadami UE obecnymi w La Paz i przy wsparciu Biura Wysokiego Komisarza NZ ds. Praw Człowieka (OHCHR). Obecny proces uznano w zasadzie za otwarty i przejrzysty, chociaż strona rządowa (skarżący) przyjęła bardzo surowe stanowisko w stosunku do oskarżonych. OHCHR NZ oraz mediom przyznano nieograniczony dostęp do postępowania. UE zapewnia również OHCHR NZ wsparcie finansowe przeznaczone na udział w rozprawach sądowych wymagających licznych wyjazdów do Tariji i Santa Cruz.

UE będzie w dalszym ciągu poruszać tę kwestię na odpowiednim szczeblu oraz wywierać naciski w dążeniu do szybkiego, sprawiedliwego i przejrzystego procesu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002115/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(24 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — European Parliament resolution of 21 November 2013 on fair justice in Bolivia, in particular the cases of Előd Tóásó and Mario Tadić

On 21 November 2013 the European Parliament adopted a resolution on fair justice in Bolivia, in particular the cases of Előd Tóásó and Mario Tadić (P7_TA(2013)0518).

Paragraph 4 of the resolution states:

'[The European Parliament] calls on the European External Action Service to keep the case high on the agenda in its contacts with the Bolivian Government, and to take concrete measures and steps on the matter'.

What action has been taken, or will shortly be taken, by the Vice-President/High Representative and the European External Action Service to follow up this resolution?

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

The HR/VP is fully aware of the concerns expressed by the EP regarding the need for a fair and transparent trial in the case of EU citizens Mr Toaso (HU) and Mr Tadjic (HR).

As you are aware, the case of Mr Toaso and Mr Tadic is closely linked to the (on-going) trial of other people arrested during a police operation allegedly aimed at dismantling a terrorist cell in which three other EU citizens (Árpád Magyarósi, Michael Martin Dwyer and Eduardo Rózsa-Flores) were killed.

The trial has been closely followed throughout by the EU Delegation in Bolivia, in coordination with the other EU Embassies present in La Paz and with the support of the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). The current trial is considered overall open and transparent, though the government (the plaintiff) party has taken a very tough position against the defendants. Unrestricted access to the proceedings was granted to UN OHCHR and the media. The EU is also providing financial support to UN OHCHR to attend court hearings involving numerous missions to Tarija and Santa Cruz.

The EU will continue to raise the matter at the appropriate level and to press for a speedy, fair and transparent trial.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002116/14
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(24 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Modernizacja linii kolejowej Katowice-Kraków

Kraków i Katowice, jedne z największych i najważniejszych miast w Polsce, leżą w odległości zaledwie 80 km, jednakże podróż pociągiem na tym odcinku zajmuje 2 godziny, z powodu złego stanu infrastruktury kolejowej.

Modernizacja ww. trasy miała pierwotnie rozpocząć się w 2010 r., a termin ukończenia zaplanowano na rok 2015. Ponad połowa środków niezbędnych do realizacji inwestycji miała pochodzić z funduszy europejskich.

Wskutek między innymi upadłości firmy odpowiedzialnej za przeprowadzenie remontu, prace przeciągnęły się, a na części odcinków zostały przerwane. W obecnej chwili ich zaawansowanie nadal pozostaje niewielkie. W odniesieniu do niektórych odcinków nie sporządzono jeszcze nawet dokumentacji projektowej. Z informacji udzielonej przez Ministerstwo Infrastruktury i Rozwoju (MIR) wynika, że przewidywane zakończenie remontu linii nastąpi dopiero w 2017 r.

Infrastruktura kolejowa w całej Polsce wymaga dużych inwestycji, jednak jak dowodzi przykład linii Katowice-Kraków, środki unijne nie są właściwie wykorzystywane. Zwracam się z prośbą do Komisji o udzielenie informacji czy i w jakim zakresie strona polska konsultowała zamiany projektów współfinansowanych przez UE, dotyczących modernizacji linii kolejowych? Proszę o określenie czy przedmiotowa inwestycja, w ocenie Komisji, zostanie zrealizowana w terminie do 2017 r. oraz czy przekierowanie przyznanych środków na inne, niż wyżej wymieniony, cele nie spowoduje zagrożenia ich utraty?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(24 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Projekt dotyczący modernizacji linii kolejowej E30, etap II, odcinek Zabrze – Katowice – Kraków, jak również projekt związanych z nim prac przygotowawczych są ujęte w orientacyjnym wykazie indywidualnych projektów programu „Infrastruktura i środowisko" na lata 2007-2013. Oznacza to, że koszty projektu powinny być poniesione do 2015 r., aby wkład UE został wypłacony w całości. Jeśli tak się nie stanie, państwo członkowskie przyjmuje na siebie odpowiedzialność za ukończenie i realizację projektu do 2017 r. na własny koszt w odniesieniu do kosztów poniesionych po 2015 r. Jeśli projekt nie zostanie zrealizowany do 2017 r., całkowity wkład UE będzie musiał zostać zwrócony do budżetu UE.

Ze względu na zasadę zarządzania dzielonego realizacja współfinansowanych projektów należy do obowiązków państw członkowskich. Oznacza to, że państwo członkowskie może przenieść środki z jednego projektu do drugiego, o ile jest to projekt w tym samym sektorze, a projekty wchodzą w zakres działań opisanych w odpowiednim programie. W ostatnich latach Komisja ściśle współpracowała z Polską w celu zapewnienia szybkich postępów w realizacji tak potrzebnych inwestycji w infrastrukturę kolejową.

Komisja nie posiada informacji o jakichkolwiek planach przeniesienia środków z tego konkretnego projektu do innych projektów.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002116/14
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(24 February 2014)

Subject: Modernisation of the Katowice-Kraków rail line

Kraków and Katowice — two of Poland's largest and most important cities — lie only 80 km apart, yet travelling between them by train takes two hours owing to the poor state of rail infrastructure.

Modernisation of the aforementioned route was originally scheduled to begin in 2010 and to end in 2015. More than half of the money needed to carry out this investment project was to come from EU funds.

However, work has been delayed and even halted on some stretches of the track after the company responsible for carrying out the modernisation went bankrupt. At present, progress on modernising the route remains insignificant. For some stretches of the route, design documentation has not even been produced. Information provided by the Polish Ministry of Infrastructure and Development reveals that the refurbishment of the line is not expected to be completed until 2017.

Rail infrastructure throughout Poland is in need of major investment; however, as the example of the Katowice-Kraków line proves, EU funds are not being used appropriately. Could the Commission provide information on whether and to what extent the Polish authorities engaged in consultations on the substitution of rail line modernisation projects co-financed by the EU? Could it say whether it believes the investment project in question will be completed by 2017? Could it also say whether the redirection of earmarked funds to other objectives could result in those funds being lost?

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

The project concerning the modernisation of the E30 railway line, stage II, section Zabrze — Katowice — Kraków, as well as the related preparatory works' project is included in the indicative list of individual projects of the 2007-2013 'Infrastructure and Environment' programme. This implies that project costs should be incurred by 2015, in order for the EU contribution to be paid out in full. If that is not the case, the Member State assumes the responsibility to complete and render the project operational by 2017, at its own expense for costs incurred after 2015. If the project is not operational by 2017, the totality of the EU contribution will have to be paid back to the EU budget.

Due to the shared management principle, the implementation of co-financed projects is the responsibility of the Member States. This means that the Member State may transfer funds from one project to the other, as long as this is in the same sector and the projects fall within the scope of interventions as described in the relevant programme. In the recent years, the Commission has worked closely with Poland to ensure that the much needed investments in railways are advanced swiftly.

The Commission is not aware of any plans to transfer funds from this specific project to others.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002117/14
do Rady
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(24 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Prawo do edukacji w regionie Naddniestrza

W dniu 6 lutego 2014 r. Parlament Europejski przyjął rezolucję w sprawie Naddniestrza (P7_TA(2014)0108).

W paragrafie 16 rezolucji zawarto następujące stwierdzenie:

„[Parlament Europejski] wzywa Radę i państwa członkowskie do opracowania szybkiej procedury zmierzającej do przyjęcia w lecie bieżącego roku przepisów o liberalizacji reżimu wizowego z Mołdawią, gdyż przyniesie to pozytywne skutki wszystkim obywatelom, w tym w dziedzinie edukacji".

Jakie działania zostały podjęte lub wkrótce zostaną podjęte przez Radę w następstwie tej rezolucji?

Odpowiedź
(23 czerwca 2014 r.)

W dniu 28 listopada 2013 r. Komisja przedstawiła Parlamentowi Europejskiemu i Radzie wniosek ([1]) oparty na art. 77 ust. 2 lit. a) TFUE, mający na celu przesunięcie Republiki Mołdawii z załącznika I (wykaz negatywny) do załącznika II (wykaz pozytywny) do rozporządzenia 539/2001 ([2]), co oznaczać będzie zniesienie wymogu wizowego dla obywateli Republiki Mołdawii podróżujących do państw członkowskich, które należą do strefy Schengen.

Parlament Europejski przyjął 27 lutego 2014 r. stanowisko w pierwszym czytaniu, zatwierdzając wniosek Komisji i nie proponując żadnych poprawek. Wynik głosowania w Parlamencie Europejskim odzwierciedla porozumienie kompromisowe osiągnięte przez instytucje ([3]).

Na posiedzeniu w dniu 14 marca 2014 r. ([4]) Rada zatwierdziła stanowisko Parlamentu Europejskiego przedstawione w dok. PE-CONS 36/14.

Rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (UE) nr 259/2014 wymieniające państwa trzecie, których obywatele muszą posiadać wizy podczas przekraczania granic zewnętrznych, oraz te, których obywatele są zwolnieni z tego wymogu, zostało podpisane 3 kwietnia 2014 r. przez przewodniczącego Parlamentu Europejskiego i przewodniczącego Rady oraz opublikowane 8 kwietnia w *Dzienniku Urzędowym Unii Europejskiej*. Zgodnie z jego art. 2 rozporządzenie to ma wejść w życie dwadzieścia dni po jego opublikowaniu, tj. 28 kwietnia 2014 r. Od tego momentu obywatele Republiki Mołdawii posiadający paszporty biometryczne mogą podróżować bez wiz do państw członkowskich strefy Schengen.

([1]) 17268/13.
([2]) Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 539/2001 wymieniające państwa trzecie, których obywatele muszą posiadać wizy podczas przekraczania granic zewnętrznych, oraz te, których obywatele są zwolnieni z tego wymogu (Dz.U. L 81 z 21.3.2001, s. 1).
([3]) Dok. 6810/14.
([4]) Dok. 7645/14.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002117/14
to the Council
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(24 February 2014)

Subject: Right to education in the Transnistria region

On 6 February 2014, Parliament adopted a resolution on Transnistria (P7_TA(2014)0108).

Paragraph 16 of the document set out the following assertion:

'[Parliament] calls on the Council and the Member States to adopt a speedy procedure leading to the adoption of the visa liberalisation with Moldova in the course of this summer, since this will have a positive impact on all citizens, including in the education field'.

What measures have been taken, or will be taken soon, by the Council in response to this resolution?

Reply
(23 June 2014)

On 28 November 2013, the Commission submitted a proposal ([1]), based on Article 77(2)(a) TFEU, to the European Parliament and to the Council, with a view to moving the Republic of Moldova from Annex I (negative list) to Annex II (positive list) of Regulation 539/2001 ([2]), which amounts to lifting the visa requirement for the nationals of the Republic of Moldova travelling to the Member States of the Schengen area.

The European Parliament adopted on 27 February 2014 its position at first reading, approving the Commission proposal without proposing any amendments. The outcome of voting in the European Parliament reflects the compromise agreement reached between the institutions ([3]).

At its meeting of 14 March 2014 ([4]), the Council approved the European Parliament's position, as set out in PE-CONS 36/14.

Regulation (EU) No 259/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council 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 was signed on 3 April 2014 by the President of the European Parliament and the President of the Council, and published on 8 April in the *Official Journal of the European Union*. In accordance with its Article 2, the regulation is to enter into force twenty days after its publication, i.e. on 28 April 2014. Since then, nationals of the Republic of Moldova who are holders of biometric passports are able to travel visa-free to the Member States of the Schengen area.

([1]) 17268/13.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 539/2001 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, p. 1).
([3]) 6810/14.
([4]) 7645/14.