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 355/01)

Treść | Strona

E-000698/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Drones and European defence
Versione italiana 15
English version 16

E-001455/14 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Ukrainian aid package
Verżjoni Maltija 17
English version 18

E-002056/14 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Council
Subject: New round of talks to resolve the Cyprus problem
Ελληνική έκδοση 19
English version 20

E-003403/14 by Salvador Sedó i Alabart to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Venezuela
Versión española 21
English version 26

P-002167/14 by Crescenzio Rivellini to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Crisis in Venezuela
Versione italiana 22
English version 25

E-002717/14 by Oreste Rossi and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Venezuela — re-examination of EU actions under strategy for 2014-20 following recent events
Versione italiana 22
English version 25

E-003725/14 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Venezuela: right to protest descends into violence and chaos
Versione italiana 23
English version 26

E-003946/14 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Outbreak of violence in Venezuela
English version 27

E-002425/14 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — The situation in Venezuela
Versiunea în limba română 24
English version 25

E-002315/14 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: Syrian Refugee Crisis
Versione italiana 28
English version 29

E-002601/14 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Mass redundancies in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση 30
English version 32

E-002860/14 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Collective redundancies in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση 30
English version 32

E-002602/14 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Maldives elections
Versión española 34
English version 35

E-002603/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Financial impact and effects of obesity
Deutsche Fassung 36
English version 37

E-002604/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: New strategy to support the fight against obesity
Deutsche Fassung 38
English version 39

E-002605/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Depression set to be one of the leading causes of disability
Deutsche Fassung 40
English version 41

E-002606/14 by Sophia in 't Veld and Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy to the Commission
Subject: Health insurance and labour mobility
Nederlandse versie 42
English version 43

E-002607/14 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Travel to islands in Europe
English version 44

E-002608/14 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Scientific exploration of the marine environment
English version 45

E-002609/14 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Outdoor leisure facilities in the EU
English version 46

E-002610/14 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Winter sports infrastructure across the EU
English version ... 47

E-002611/14 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Improving literacy from an early age
English version ... 48

E-002612/14 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Improving access to education
English version ... 49

E-002614/14 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Firefighter training in the EU
English version ... 50

E-002615/14 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Eating disorders across the EU
English version ... 51

E-002616/14 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Business opportunities for women
English version ... 52

E-002617/14 by Davor Ivo Stier to the Commission
Subject: Return of emigrants
Hrvatska verzija ... 53
English version ... 54

E-002620/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Influence of protein intake on the development of cancer
Versione italiana ... 55
English version ... 56

E-002621/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — OSCE visit to Ukraine
Versione italiana ... 57
English version ... 58

E-002622/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: New anaerobic digestion plants for waste management
Versione italiana ... 59
English version ... 60

E-002623/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: New scientific study on the fight against pancreatic cancer
Versione italiana ... 61
English version ... 62

E-002624/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Plans to establish telecommunication systems by using civilian drones
Versione italiana ... 63
English version ... 64

E-002625/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Online school application systems in the European Union
Versione italiana ... 65
English version ... 66

E-002626/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: The rise of environmentally sustainable tourist facilities
Versione italiana ... 67
English version ... 69

E-002627/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Using social networks to analyse and prevent social risks
Versione italiana 71
English version 72

E-002628/14 by Auke Zijlstra and Lucas Hartong to the Commission
Subject: Budgetary equilibrium and compliance with Article 310(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
Nederlandse versie 73
English version 74

E-002629/14 by Horst Schnellhardt to the Commission
Subject: REACH: Inclusion of chromium trioxide in the list of substances subject to authorisation
Deutsche Fassung 75
English version 76

E-002630/14 by Horst Schnellhardt to the Commission
Subject: End-of-waste status of lignite fly ash
Deutsche Fassung 77
English version 78

E-002631/14 by Horst Schnellhardt to the Commission
Subject: Recycling of intestines from BSE-free Member States and non-EU countries
Deutsche Fassung 79
English version 80

E-002633/14 by George Lyon to the Commission
Subject: Dog management in Romania
English version 81

E-002634/14 by Jean-Luc Mélenchon to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Does the European Union support the far right?
Version française 82
English version 83

E-002636/14 by Guido Milana to the Commission
Subject: Labelling of leather products
Versione italiana 84
English version 85

E-002637/14 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission
Subject: Social consequences of the crisis at Pali Italia
Versione italiana 86
English version 87

E-002638/14 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission
Subject: Granting of a subsidy to 'Notre Europe — Jacques Delors Institute'
Nederlandse versie 88
English version 90

P-002639/14 by Marije Cornelissen to the Commission
Subject: Involvement of the European Parliament in the European Semester
Nederlandse versie 92
English version 93

P-002640/14 by Claude Turmes to the Commission
Subject: Draft Guidelines on environmental and energy state aid for 2014-2020
Version française 94
English version 96

P-002641/14 by Iratxe García Pérez to the Commission
Subject: Protecting the EU from Citrus Black Spot
Versión española 97
English version 98

P-002642/14 by Heinz K. Becker to the Commission
Subject: Future of social entrepreneurship in Europe
Deutsche Fassung ... 99
English version ... 101

P-002643/14 by Erminia Mazzoni to the Commission
Subject: Suspicions of dumping on the Italian rabbitmeat market
Versione italiana ... 103
English version ... 104

E-002644/14 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Council
Subject: Start of negotiations on the new EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol
Versión española ... 105
English version ... 106

E-002645/14 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Airport controls
Versión española ... 107
English version ... 108

E-002646/14 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Consumer fraud in information on labels for fish
Versión española ... 109
English version ... 110

E-002647/14 by Heinz K. Becker to the Commission
Subject: Disabled parking permits
Deutsche Fassung ... 111
English version ... 112

E-002649/14 by Phil Bennion, Baroness Sarah Ludford, George Lyon, Bill Newton Dunn, Rebecca Taylor, Sir Graham Watson, Chris Davies, Catherine Bearder, Andrew Duff and Sharon Bowles to the Commission
Subject: Protection of geographical indications
English version ... 113

E-002650/14 by Heinz K. Becker to the Commission
Subject: Hearing loss
Deutsche Fassung ... 114
English version ... 115

E-002651/14 by Heinz K. Becker to the Commission
Subject: International Year of the Family
Deutsche Fassung ... 116
English version ... 117

E-002652/14 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Autism bullying
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 118
English version ... 119

E-002653/14 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 120
English version ... 121

E-002655/14 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Widespread violence against women
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 122
English version ... 123

E-002656/14 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Industrial policy
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 124
English version ... 125

E-002658/14 by Jens Rohde to the Commission
Subject: Approval of aid for photovoltaic cells
Dansk udgave 126
English version 127

E-002659/14 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: EU-US free trade agreement
Version française 128
English version 129

E-002660/14 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Working conditions of seasonal migrant workers
Version française 130
English version 132

E-002661/14 by Tonino Picula to the Commission
Subject: Usability of disused buildings
Hrvatska verzija 134
English version 135

E-002662/14 by Tonino Picula to the Commission
Subject: Combating violence against women
Hrvatska verzija 136
English version 137

E-002663/14 by Tonino Picula to the Commission
Subject: Availability of the EURES portal in Croatian
Hrvatska verzija 138
English version 139

E-002664/14 by Guido Milana to the Commission
Subject: Action plan
Versione italiana 140
English version 141

E-002665/14 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission
Subject: Ukraine to receive EUR 11 billion from the EU
Nederlandse versie 142
English version 143

E-002666/14 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission
Subject: Development aid to Congo
Nederlandse versie 144
English version 145

P-002667/14 by Derek Vaughan to the Commission
Subject: NOx infraction measures
English version 146

P-002668/14 by Salvatore Caronna to the Commission
Subject: Presumed infringement by Italy of EU legislation on mediation
Versione italiana 147
English version 148

E-002669/14 by George Lyon to the Commission
Subject: Geographical indication schemes
English version 149

E-002670/14 by George Lyon to the Commission
Subject: Geographical indication protection for Scottish tartan
English version 150

E-002671/14 by Willy Meyer and Sabine Lösing to the Commission
Subject: Record of the events of 6 February 2014 at Playa El Tarajal beach in Ceuta, Spain
Versión española ... 151
Deutsche Fassung ... 152
English version ... 153

E-002672/14 by Ruža Tomašić to the Commission
Subject: Informing small and medium-sized enterprises about funding opportunities through EU programmes
Hrvatska verzija ... 154
English version ... 155

E-002673/14 by Ruža Tomašić to the Commission
Subject: Impact of the Upper Horizons project on the ecosystem of the river Neretva and the local economy
Hrvatska verzija ... 156
English version ... 157

E-002674/14 by Ruža Tomašić to the Commission
Subject: Poaching of protected animal species in Croatia
Hrvatska verzija ... 158
English version ... 159

E-002675/14 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission
Subject: Problems relating to the functioning of CONAI and the determination of contributions
Versione italiana ... 160
English version ... 162

E-002676/14 by Jarosław Kalinowski to the Commission
Subject: EU milk market
Wersja polska ... 163
English version ... 164

E-002677/14 by Minodora Cliveti to the Commission
Subject: Separate rules on people trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation
Versiunea în limba română ... 165
English version ... 166

E-002678/14 by Hiltrud Breyer to the Commission
Subject: Time to implement the Birds Directive — 2.5 million dead migratory birds is too many
Deutsche Fassung ... 167
English version ... 168

E-002679/14 by Hiltrud Breyer to the Commission
Subject: Pesticides: prolongation of all deadlines for requests for ongoing approval
Deutsche Fassung ... 169
English version ... 170

E-002680/14 by Hiltrud Breyer to the Commission
Subject: Pesticides: is the publication of a list of candidates for substitution being prevented by industry?
Deutsche Fassung ... 171
English version ... 172

E-002681/14 by Hiltrud Breyer to the Commission
Subject: Pesticides: criteria for endocrine disruption
Deutsche Fassung ... 173
English version ... 174

E-002682/14 by Hiltrud Breyer to the Commission
Subject: Pesticides: data and study requirements
Deutsche Fassung ... 175
English version ... 176

E-002683/14 by Hiltrud Breyer to the Commission
Subject: Pesticides: independent literature and scientists to scrutinise European Food Safety Authority opinion
Deutsche Fassung ... 177
English version ... 178

E-002684/14 by Hiltrud Breyer to the Commission
Subject: European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption: Ensuring participation of all stakeholders to make sure all possible risk factors are identified
Deutsche Fassung 179
English version 180

E-002685/14 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Revision of the GDP calculation method
Nederlandse versie 181
English version 182

P-002688/14 by Teresa Riera Madurell to the Commission
Subject: Horizon 2020 — 'Science with and for society' in the 2014 EU budget
Versión española 183
English version 184

E-002690/14 by Teresa Riera Madurell to the Commission
Subject: European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) commitments and payments in the Balearic Islands
Versión española 185
English version 186

E-002691/14 by Teresa Riera Madurell to the Commission
Subject: Structural and Investment funds for 2014-2020 in the Balearic Islands
Versión española 187
English version 188

E-002692/14 by Sabine Lösing to the Commission
Subject: EUBAM Libya
Deutsche Fassung 189
English version 190

E-002693/14 by Alain Cadec and Tokia Saïfi to the Commission
Subject: Herring war — WTO Dispute Settlement Body
Version française 191
English version 192

E-002695/14 by Philippe de Villiers to the Commission
Subject: Soil erosion
Version française 193
English version 194

E-002696/14 by Philippe de Villiers to the Commission
Subject: Increase in sugar stocks
Version française 195
English version 196

E-002697/14 by Philippe de Villiers to the Commission
Subject: Youth Guarantee scheme
Version française 197
English version 198

E-002699/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Funding for the archaeological site of Pompeii
Versione italiana 199
English version 201

E-002782/14 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Preserving Pompeii
English version 201

E-002872/14 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission
Subject: Doing more for Pompeii
Versione italiana 199
English version 201

E-002700/14 by Esther de Lange to the Commission
Subject: Mutual recognition of driving licences in Portugal
Nederlandse versie 203
English version 204

E-002701/14 by Marisa Matias and Alda Sousa to the Commission
Subject: Infringement by Portugal of legislation on identifying the risks to workers of exposure to asbestos
Versão portuguesa 205
English version 206

E-002702/14 by Marisa Matias and Alda Sousa to the Commission
Subject: Unlawful felling of trees in Alqueva and failure to comply with EU legislation
Versão portuguesa 207
English version 208

E-002703/14 by Silvia-Adriana Ţicău to the Commission
Subject: Balancing employment rates in the European tourism sector to cover off-season periods
Versiunea în limba română 209
English version 210

P-002705/14 by Niccolò Rinaldi to the Commission
Subject: Protection of Geographical Indications
Versione italiana 211
English version 212

E-002706/14 by Andrés Perelló Rodríguez to the Commission
Subject: Spanish bill at odds with new European legislation on e-cigarettes
Versión española 213
English version 214

E-002707/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: State aid from the Government of Navarra
Versión española 215
English version 216

E-002709/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Level of compliance with EU legislation on conservation of fauna in zoos and aquariums
Versión española 217
English version 218

E-002710/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: European participation in setting up shelters for abandoned pets in Member States
Versión española 219
English version 220

E-002711/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Use of animals in circuses
Versión española 221
English version 222

E-002712/14 by Catherine Stihler and Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: European Pensioners' Parliament
English version 223

E-002713/14 by Barbara Matera, Lara Comi, Cristiana Muscardini, Marco Scurria, David Casa, Dubravka Šuica, Marietje Schaake, Sophia in 't Veld, Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández, Joanna Senyszyn, Angelika Werthmann, Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid, Nicole Sinclaire, Roberta Metsola, Anne Delvaux, Ana Gomes, Jörg Leichtfried, Hannu Takkula, Rolandas Paksas, Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska, Zuzana Roithová, Reinhard Bütikofer, Antigoni Papadopoulou, Alda Sousa, Jan Březina, Marisa Matias, Salvador Sedó i Alabart, Jean Lambert and Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Rights of women detained in Egypt
Versión española ... 224
České znění ... 225
Deutsche Fassung ... 226
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 227
Version française ... 229
Hrvatska verzija ... 231
Versione italiana ... 232
Tekstas lietuvių kalba ... 233
Verżjoni Maltija ... 234
Nederlandse versie ... 236
Wersja polska ... 237
Versão portuguesa ... 238
Suomenkielinen versio ... 239
English version ... 240

E-002714/14 by Ruža Tomašić to the Commission
Subject: Vulnerable electricity and natural gas customers in Croatia
Hrvatska verzija ... 241
English version ... 242

P-002715/14 by Gilles Pargneaux to the Commission
Subject: Endocrine disruptors and hormonal imbalances
Version française ... 243
English version ... 244

E-002716/14 by Oreste Rossi and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: China's increased military budget: EU monitoring activities and failed European army project
Versione italiana ... 245
English version ... 246

E-002718/14 by Oreste Rossi and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Women and endometriosis: EU involvement in 'Million Woman March for Endometriosis'
Versione italiana ... 247
English version ... 248

E-002719/14 by Oreste Rossi and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Offshore wind farms — a challenge for Europe
Versione italiana ... 249
English version ... 250

E-002720/14 by Oreste Rossi and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Hydrogeological risks and European funding
Versione italiana ... 251
English version ... 252

E-002723/14 by Biljana Borzan to the Commission
Subject: Potentially hazardous chemicals in materials used for the packaging and storage of food
Hrvatska verzija ... 253
English version ... 254

P-002725/14 by Emma McClarkin to the Commission
Subject: Discrimination against lecturers
English version ... 255

E-002726/14 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Report by the Fundamental Rights Agency
Versión española ... 256
English version ... 257

E-002728/14 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Evaluation of the consequences of the 'haircut' in Cyprus one year ago
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 258
English version ... 259

E-002729/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Counterfeiting of 'Made in Italy' products
Versione italiana ... 260
English version ... 261

E-002730/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Parent 1 and 2, or mother and father
Versione italiana ... 262
English version ... 263

E-002731/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Maritime piracy
Versione italiana ... 264
English version ... 265

E-002732/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Swiss referendum and EU reactions
Versione italiana ... 266
English version ... 267

E-002733/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Fight against food waste
Versione italiana ... 268
English version ... 269

E-002734/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Social utility project in healthcare sector aimed at supporting citizens over 60
Versione italiana ... 270
English version ... 272

E-002735/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Development of a socially relevant theatre project by an association in Tuscany: possible financing
Versione italiana ... 274
English version ... 275

E-002736/14 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: IT programs for the learning of foreign languages by people with autism
Versiunea în limba română ... 276
English version ... 277

E-002737/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version ... 278

E-002738/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US Trade Agreements
English version ... 278

E-002739/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version ... 278

E-002740/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US Trade Agreements
English version ... 278

E-002741/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version ... 278

E-002742/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 279

E-002743/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 279

E-002744/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 279

E-002745/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 279

E-002746/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 279

E-002747/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 280

E-002748/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 280

E-002749/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 280

E-002750/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 280

E-002751/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 280

E-002752/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 281

E-002753/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 281

E-002754/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 281

E-002755/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 281

E-002756/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements
English version 281

E-002757/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Commission answer to Written Question E-012063/2013 on lack of filters in flag factory
Deutsche Fassung 283
English version 284

E-002758/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Costs of nuclear waste disposal
Deutsche Fassung ... 285
English version ... 286

E-002759/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: European Union and further candidates for accession
Deutsche Fassung ... 287
English version ... 288

E-002760/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Research into final repositories for radioactive waste
Deutsche Fassung ... 289
English version ... 290

E-002761/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: ITER research reactor — costs under the new Multiannual Financial Framework
Deutsche Fassung ... 291
English version ... 292

E-002762/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Risks of working with fusion reactors
Deutsche Fassung ... 293
English version ... 294

E-002764/14 by Derek Vaughan to the Commission
Subject: Food shortages
English version ... 295

E-002765/14 by Derek Vaughan to the Commission
Subject: Spanish equity release scheme
English version ... 296

E-002766/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Classification of the truffle as an agricultural product: request for information
Versione italiana ... 297
English version ... 298

P-002767/14 by Michèle Rivasi to the Commission
Subject: Collusion between Novartis and Roche in connection with the marketing of the drugs Lucentis and Avastin
Version française ... 299
English version ... 300

E-002768/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Formal application to build a floating dock in Ferrol (Galicia)
Versión española ... 301
English version ... 302

E-002770/14 by Pavel Poc, Baroness Sarah Ludford and Brian Simpson to the Commission
Subject: Possible extension of mandatory method-of-production labelling
České znění ... 303
English version ... 304

E-002771/14 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Cost of rural crime
English version ... 305

E-002880/14 by Fabrizio Bertot to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Developments in Ukraine
Versione italiana ... 306
English version ... 307

E-002896/14 by Marlene Mizzi to the Commission
Subject: Entry to Switzerland for EU citizens
Verżjoni Maltija 308
English version 309

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000698/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(23 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Droni e difesa europea

I recenti studi e le operazioni sul campo condotte dalle forze armate di diversi Stati membri hanno messo in luce una serie di lacune non indifferenti, tra cui emerge l'assenza di droni per operazioni ISR in grado di rivaleggiare con gli omologhi internazionali, in particolare con i modelli statunitensi, oggi leader del mercato.

La debolezza nel settore è stata inoltre riconosciuta sia dalla Commissione sia dal Consiglio europeo.

Eppure in Europa esistono dei progetti di dimostratori che hanno presentato risultati estremamente interessanti, come ad esempio un progetto partito da un'azienda francese e poi rimodulato e esteso a aziende provenienti da cinque Stati membri e dalla Svizzera e che ha portato notevoli risultati.

Alla luce di quanto riportato, può il Vice-presidente/Alto Rappresentante chiarire se:

1. è a conoscenza di programmi di dimostratori nel settore dei droni in Europa e quale sia il loro stato di avanzamento;

2. quali specifiche misure sono allo studio per promuovere gli investimenti privati nel settore;

3. tramite quali investimenti in altri veicoli, strumenti e equipaggiamenti potrebbe essere ulteriormente colmata la lacuna europea nel campo delle capacità ISR?

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

La capacità strategica e operativa di gestire, raccogliere, trattare e divulgare informazioni è uno strumento di difesa di primaria importanza per le operazioni militari, comprese quelle intraprese nel quadro della PSDC. Al fine di colmare le lacune esistenti in tale ambito, occorre operare in alcune aree specifiche investendo in modo consistente nelle stesse.

In particolare, sono necessarie delle soluzioni in materia di sorveglianza durature ed efficaci sotto il profilo dei costi, volte a proteggere per lunghi periodi vaste aree contro una serie di minacce. Tale capacità può essere in parte sviluppata grazie ai Sistemi Aeromobili a Pilotaggio Remoto (SAPR). Esiste un'ampia gamma di SAPR in termini di grandezza, tipologia, velocità, autonomia di durata, altitudine e carico utile. Il prezzo dei SAPR li rende accessibili a livello nazionale. Molti Stati membri hanno già dotato le loro forze armate di tali sistemi, spesso in seguito a investimenti privati da parte delle PMI.

Alcuni Stati membri stanno effettuando delle dimostrazioni tecnologiche a livello nazionale o in collaborazione sui futuri sistemi aerei a pilotaggio remoto. In alcuni casi si tratta di prodotti tecnologici di avanguardia che contribuiscono a rafforzare la base industriale della difesa europea. Nel settore dei SAPR idonei ad operare a media quota e con lunga autonomia (MALE — Medium Altitude Long Endurance) viene riconosciuta la necessità di favorire la collaborazione tra gli Stati membri. A tal fine, l'Agenzia europea per la difesa sta sostenendo un programma di lavoro che mira a risolvere una lunga serie di questioni di carattere tecnologico, normativo e operativo. Il potenziale economico dei sistemi aeromobili a pilotaggio remoto e delle relative tecnologie per applicazioni civili crea delle sinergie naturali tra gli investimenti civili e militari.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000698/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(23 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Drones and European defence

Recent studies and field operations conducted by the armed forces of various Member States have brought to light a series of major deficiencies that need to be addressed, including the lack of any ISR drones that are as technologically advanced as those of other national forces, and especially those of the United States, which is currently leading the way in this field.

The shortcomings of Europe's drones have, moreover, been acknowledged by both the Commission and the European Council.

That said, there are several demonstrator projects currently underway in Europe that are yielding extremely encouraging results: for instance, the project that was launched by a French company and subsequently reshaped to incorporate companies from five other Member States and Switzerland, which has so far produced outstanding results.

1. In light of the above, is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of any drone demonstrator projects that are currently underway in Europe, and how far advanced they are?

2. What specific measures are being looked into in order to promote private investment in drones?

3. What investments need to be made in other vehicles, instruments and equipment in order to further address Europe's deficiencies in its ISR capabilities?

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

The ability at strategic and operational levels to direct, collect, process and disseminate information is a major defence capability required for military operations including those undertaken under CSDP. To overcome existing gaps in this field some areas need specific attention and sustained investments.

In particular, persistent surveillance solutions are required to cover wide areas over long timescales, against a diverse set of threats in a cost effective manner. Part of this capability can be provided by Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS). The spectrum of RPAS types is very broad in size, range, speed, endurance, altitude and payloads. Regarding very light RPAS, the cost of such systems makes them affordable at a national level. Many Member States have already equipped their armed forces with such systems; very often these are the result of private investments involving SMEs.

Some Member States are conducting, either nationally or collaboratively, technological demonstrations on future unmanned aerial systems. Some are at the leading edge of technology, and reinforce the strength of the European defence industrial base. On the segment of Medium Altitude and Long Endurance (MALE) RPAS, there is a recognised need to foster cooperation among the Member States. To that end, the European Defence Agency is supporting the Member States through a programme of work addressing a wide range of technological, regulatory and operational issues. The economic potential of remotely piloted aircraft systems and the related technologies for civil applications creates natural synergies between civil and military investments.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001455/14
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli)
David Casa (PPE)
(11 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: VP/HR — pakkett ta' għajnuna għall-Ukraina

Ġie rrappurtat li l-Unjoni Ewropea u l-Istati Uniti qed jaħdmu flimkien biex jipproduċu pakkett ta' għajnuna għall-Ukraina li se jkun jiswa mill-anqas USD 15 biljun. Min-naħa l-oħra, l-offerta min-naħa tar-Russi, li tirrappreżenta l-istess ammont preċiż, għadha valida u l-pressjoni ekonomika tar-Russja fuq l-Ukraina qed tkompli tiżdied ([1]) ([2]).

L-Unjoni Ewropea, l-Istati Uniti u r-Russja ma jaqblux bejniethom dwar l-involviment tagħhom fl-Ukraina u dwar it-theddida ekonomika tal-Punent kif perċepita mir-Russja.

Pakkett ta' għajnuna ekonomika mill-Unjoni Ewropea u l-Istati Uniti għall-Ukraina se jkollu impatt fuq ir-relazzjonijiet bejn l-Unjoni Ewropea u r-Russja? U, jekk iva, liema se jkun dan l-impatt?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Füle f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(8 ta' Lulju 2014)

L-UE hija impenjata bis-sħiħ lejn assoċjazzjoni politika u integrazzjoni ekonomika eqreb mal-Ukraina u qed tipprovdi appoġġ kruċjali f'koordinazzjoni ma' sħab internazzjonali oħra. L-għajnuna tal-UE se tgħin biex jiġi stabbilizzat il-pajjiż kif ukoll se tgħin lill-programm ta' riforma u biex tkompli tissaħħaħ is-sjieda mill-awtoritajiet Ukraini. Il-Gvern Ukrain qed iniedi sett ambizzjuż ta' riformi strutturali, inkluż fir-rigward tal-ġlieda kontra l-korruzzjoni u t-tisħiħ tat-trasparenza. Prijorità immedjata hija li tiġi stabbilita mill-ġdid l-istabbiltà makroekonomika permezz ta' politiki fiskali, monetarji u tal-kambju sodi. Il-miżuri tal-UE flimkien, jistgħu jammontaw għal għajnuna komplessiva ta' mill-inqas EUR 11-il biljun matul is-snin li ġejjin. Ta' min isemmi EUR 3 biljun mill-baġit tal-UE, EUR 1.6 biljun f'self ta' assistenza makrofinanzjarja u pakkett ta' għajnuna ta' għotjiet li jiswa EUR 1.4 biljun. L-ewwel porzjon ta' EUR 100 miljun f'Għajnuna Makrofinanzjarja ġie żborżat fl-20 ta' Mejju 2014. L-UE dalwaqt se tiffirma d-dispożizzjonijiet li fadal tal-Ftehim ta' Assoċjazzjoni, inkluża Żona ta' Kummerċ Ħieles Approfondita u Komprensiva. Inħeġġu lis-sħab internazzjonali tagħna, inkluża r-Russja, biex jikkontribwixxu għal dawn l-isforzi ta' stabbilizzazzjoni, u joqogħdu lura minn kwalunkwe miżura li potenzjalment ma tkux konformi tad-WTO. Jekk jintlaħaq ftehim dwar il-kundizzjonijiet tal-provvista tal-gass mir-Russja lill-Ukraina, permezz tal-faċilitazzjoni tal-UE, fit-taħditiet trilaterali fis-sehħ, ikun ta' kontribut kbir biex l-ekonomija tal-Ukraina tiġi stabbilizzata.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/europes-east/eu-us-provide-significant-aid-uk-news-533212
([2]) http://www.euractiv.com/global-europe/russia-ups-economic-pressure-ukr-news-533131

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001455/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Casa (PPE)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Ukrainian aid package

It has been reported that the European Union and the United States are working together to produce an aid package for Ukraine that will be worth at least USD 15 billion. On the other hand, the Russian offer representing exactly the same amount still stands, and Russia's economic pressure on Ukraine is being stepped up ([1]), ([2]).

The EU, the US and Russia disagree over their involvement in Ukraine and the economic threat of the West as perceived by Russia.

What impact, if any, will an EU-US economic aid package for Ukraine have on EU-Russian relations?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(8 July 2014)

The EU is firmly committed to closer political association and economic integration with Ukraine and is providing crucial support in coordination with other international partners. EU assistance will help stabilise the country as well as support the reform programme and further enhance ownership by the Ukrainian authorities. The Ukrainian Government is launching an ambitious set of structural reforms, including with respect to fighting corruption and enhancing transparency. An immediate priority is to restore macroeconomic stability through sound fiscal, monetary and exchange rate policies. EU measures combined could bring overall support of at least EUR 11 billion over the coming years. Highlights include EUR 3 billion from the EU budget, EUR 1.6 billion in macro financial assistance loans and an assistance package of grants worth EUR 1.4 billion. A first tranche of EUR 100 million in Macro-Financial Assistance was disbursed on 20 May 2014. The EU will very soon sign remaining provisions of the Association Agreement, including a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area. We encourage our international partners, including Russia, to contribute to these stabilisation efforts, and refrain from any potential WTO non-compliant measures. Reaching agreement on the conditions of the gas supply from Russia to Ukraine with the EU's facilitation in the ongoing trilateral talks will greatly contribute to the stabilisation of Ukraine's economy.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/europes-east/eu-us-provide-significant-aid-uk-news-533212
([2]) http://www.euractiv.com/global-europe/russia-ups-economic-pressure-ukr-news-533131

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002056/14
προς το Συμβούλιο
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(20 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Νέος κύκλος συνομιλιών για επίλυση του Κυπριακού προβλήματος

Στην Κύπρο έχει αρχίσει ένας νέος γύρος συνομιλιών, υπό την αιγίδα του Οργανισμού Ηνωμένων Εθνών, για επίλυση του χρονίζοντος πολιτικού προβλήματος, το οποίο δημιουργήθηκε λόγω της τουρκικής εισβολής, της βίαιης διαίρεσης και της συνεχιζόμενης για 40 χρόνια ημι-κατοχής του νησιού από τα τουρκικά στρατεύματα.

Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο:

1. Προτίθεται να εμπλακεί και να βοηθήσει στη επίτευξη μιας δίκαιης, λειτουργικής, βιώσιμης και σύμφωνης με το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο λύσης του προβλήματος;

2. Ποιους μοχλούς πίεσης διαθέτει και πώς προτίθεται να τους χρησιμοποιήσει ώστε να εξαναγκαστεί η κατοχική Τουρκία να συνεργαστεί, αποσύροντας τα στρατεύματά της και αποδεχόμενη την επανένωση του νησιού που, στο σύνολο του, αποτελεί μέλος της ΕΕ;

3. Θεωρεί το Συμβούλιο ότι οι βασικές αρχές που περιέχονται στο Κοινό Ανακοινωθέν του Προέδρου της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας κ. Ν. Αναστασιάδη και του Τουρκοκύπριου ηγέτη κ. Ν. Έρογλου μπορούν να οδηγήσουν σε μια λύση που να είναι σύμφωνη με το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο ως έχει σήμερα, χωρίς οποιεσδήποτε παρεκκλίσεις;

4. Αν η λύση που πιθανόν να συμφωνηθεί δεν διασφαλίζει όλα τα δικαιώματα που έχει κάθε ελεύθερος Ευρωπαίος πολίτης, όπως π.χ. το δικαίωμα της ελεύθερης διακίνησης, της εγκατάστασης, της περιουσίας και του εκλέγειν και εκλέγεσθαι στον τόπο διαμονής του, τι θα πράξει η ΕΕ; Θα προσυπογράψει μια τέτοια λύση ή θα επιμείνει στην χωρίς όρους και παρεκκλίσεις εφαρμογή όλων των ευρωπαϊκών αρχών καθώς και του κοινοτικού κεκτημένου;

Απάντηση
(8 Ιουλίου 2014)

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο χαιρετίζει την επανέναρξη των συνολικών διαπραγματεύσεων για διευθέτηση του Κυπριακού με βάση την κοινή δήλωση της 11ης Φεβρουαρίου και με σκοπό την επανένωση της Κύπρου. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο υποστηρίζει μια συνολική και βιώσιμη διευθέτηση του Κυπριακού προβλήματος υπό την αιγίδα του ΟΗΕ, σύμφωνα με τις σχετικές αποφάσεις του Συμβουλίου Ασφαλείας του ΟΗΕ και τηρουμένων των αρχών στις οποίες εδράζεται η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο υπογραμμίζει ότι η διχοτόμηση της Κύπρου έχει διαρκέσει πολύ μεγάλο χρονικό διάστημα και τονίζει τη σημασία της διατήρησης της συγκεκριμένης δυναμικής. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο είναι έτοιμο να εκπληρώσει το ρόλο του συμβάλλοντας στη στήριξη των διαπραγματεύσεων. Η επανένωση της Κύπρου θα είναι προς όφελος όλων των Κυπρίων και υπό το πρίσμα αυτό το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο υποστηρίζει τα μέτρα οικοδόμησης εμπιστοσύνης που θα συμφωνηθούν μεταξύ των δύο μερών και τα οποία θα μπορούσαν να συμβάλουν αποφασιστικά στη δημιουργία κλίματος αμοιβαίας εμπιστοσύνης και να δώσουν ώθηση στη διαπραγματευτική διαδικασία.

Υπενθυμίζεται ότι, όπως τονίζεται στο διαπραγματευτικό πλαίσιο, το Συμβούλιο αναμένει επίσης ότι η Τουρκία θα υποστηρίξει ενεργά τις διεξαγόμενες διαπραγματεύσεις με σκοπό τη δίκαιη, συνολική και βιώσιμη λύση του Κυπριακού στο πλαίσιο του ΟΗΕ, σύμφωνα με τις σχετικές αποφάσεις του Συμβουλίου Ασφαλείας του ΟΗΕ και βάσει των αρχών στις οποίες εδράζεται η Ένωση. Η δέσμευση της Τουρκίας και η συμβολή της με συγκεκριμένες ενέργειες σε αυτή τη συνολική διευθέτηση είναι θέμα ζωτικής σημασίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002056/14
to the Council
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: New round of talks to resolve the Cyprus problem

A new round of talks has started in Cyprus, under the aegis of the UN, to resolve the long-standing political problem created by the Turkish invasion and the violent division of the island, which has been semi-occupied by Turkish troops for the past 40 years.

In view of the above, will the Council say:

1. Does it intend to become involved in order to help achieve a fair, workable and sustainable solution to the problem in line with the Community *acquis*?

2. What means of applying pressure does it have at its disposal and how does it intend to use them in order to force Turkey, as the occupying country, to cooperate by withdrawing its troops and agreeing to the reunification of the island, which is an EU Member State in its entirety?

3. Does the Council consider that the basic principles set out in the joint statement released by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr N. Anastasiades, and the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr N. Eroglu, can lead to a solution in line with the Community *acquis* as it stands, without any derogation?

4. If an agreed solution does not safeguard all the rights which every free European citizen enjoys, such as the right to freedom of movement, to freedom of establishment and to property and the right to vote and stand as a candidate in their place of residence, what will the EU do? Will it endorse such a solution or will it insist on the unconditional application of all European principles and the Community *acquis* without derogation?

Reply
(8 July 2014)

The European Council welcomes the resumption of fully fledged settlement negotiations based on the 11 February Joint Declaration with the aim to reunite Cyprus. The European Council supports a comprehensive and viable settlement of the Cyprus problem within the UN framework, in accordance with relevant UN Security Council resolutions and in line with the principles on which the European Union is founded. The European Council underlines that the division of Cyprus has endured for too long and emphasises the importance of maintaining the momentum. The European Council stands ready to play its part in supporting the negotiations. Reunification of Cyprus would be to the benefit of all the Cypriot people and in this respect the European Council supports any confidence building measures agreed by the two parties which could contribute decisively to creating a climate of mutual trust and give impetus to the negotiation process.

It is recalled that, as emphasised by the Negotiating Framework, the Council also expects Turkey to actively support the ongoing negotiations aimed at a fair, comprehensive and viable settlement of the Cyprus problem within the UN framework, in accordance with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions and in line with the principles on which the Union is founded. Turkey's commitment and contribution in concrete terms to such a comprehensive settlement is crucial.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003403/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(20 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Situación en Venezuela

La represión ejercida por las autoridades venezolanas contra las marchas pacíficas que se registran desde el pasado 12 de febrero se ha saldado hasta la fecha con trece muertes y numerosos heridos.

La elevada tasa de inflación, la delincuencia y la escasez de algunos productos de primera necesidad, así como los niveles de corrupción y la intimidación de los medios de comunicación y de la oposición democrática en general, han provocado una creciente y preocupante tensión y polarización política.

A la luz de lo expuesto anteriormente, ¿podría indicar la Comisión qué puede hacer la UE para evitar la violación alarmante de derechos fundamentales por parte del Gobierno venezolano así como para garantizar el respeto del principio de la separación de poderes en Venezuela?

Respuesta conjunta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión ha estado muy atenta a la evolución de la situación desde el 12 de febrero. La Delegación de la Unión Europea en Venezuela y las doce embajadas de los Estados miembros de la UE siguen los acontecimientos e informan de los mismos periódicamente.

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su declaración de 21 de febrero de 2014 sobre los disturbios en Venezuela, así como al comunicado oficial del Comisario responsable de Fiscalidad, Unión Aduanera, Estadística, Auditoría y Lucha contra el Fraude, en nombre de la Comisión, en la sesión plenaria del Parlamento Europeo de 27 de febrero. Además, el portavoz de la Comisión emitió declaraciones los días 14 de febrero, 28 de marzo y 14 de abril.

Con arreglo a los nuevos instrumentos financieros para el período 2014-2020, la ayuda de la UE se va a concentrar en los países y regiones más pobres y vulnerables. Venezuela, que ha sido clasificada por el Banco Mundial como una economía de renta media alta durante tres años consecutivos sobre la base de la renta nacional bruta (RNB) per cápita, es uno de los países que ya no se beneficia de las ayudas en virtud de la cooperación bilateral y, a partir del 1 de enero de 2014, tampoco del sistema de preferencias comerciales (SPG).

Las asignaciones de ayuda humanitaria de la Comisión Europea se hacen siempre con arreglo a las necesidades existentes, aplicando estrictamente los principios humanitarios. Desde el año 1998, la Comisión Europea ha prestado ayuda humanitaria a Venezuela por un total de 14 122 823 EUR, incluidas las ayudas a la preparación ante las catástrofes.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002167/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(25 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Crisi in Venezuela

L'UE intrattiene con la Repubblica bolivariana del Venezuela relazioni politiche ed economiche.

Sulla base del dialogo economico UE-Repubblica bolivariana del Venezuela, quest'ultima beneficia delle riduzioni tariffarie previste dallo schema generalizzato di preferenza e degli accordi commerciali di cui agli accordi di associazione economica e ai programmi di aiuti al commercio.

L'UE rappresenta per il Venezuela il più grande donatore/oblatore al mondo in materia di cooperazione allo sviluppo, giacché la Commissione attua una cooperazione bilaterale attraverso il memorandum d'intesa del 2009 e lo strumento di associazione del 2011, una cooperazione tematica attraverso finanziamenti diretti a progetti nei settori previsti dallo strumento europeo per la democrazia ed i diritti umani e una cooperazione regionale che prevede attualmente il sovvenzionamento di quaranta progetti.

Nel programma di aiuti umanitari all'America latina, la DG ECHO ha già speso in favore del Venezuela, a partire dal 1998, 41 milioni e 550 mila euro nel soccorso e nella prevenzione dalle catastrofi.

Può l'Alto Rappresentante per la PESC riferire:

— se vi siano e quali siano, al di là delle dichiarazioni pubbliche, le azioni concrete intraprese dall'Alto Rappresentante in merito all'uso della forza nei confronti della società civile, agli arresti di studenti e esponenti politici e alle gravi lesioni delle libertà di espressione, associazione e riunione da parte delle autorità pubbliche in Venezuela;

— se stia valutando la sospensione delle agevolazioni commerciali, dei programmi di cooperazione e degli aiuti umanitari succitati?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002717/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Venezuela — riesame delle azioni dell'UE nell'ambito della strategia 2014-2020 a seguito dei recenti avvenimenti

Il 12 febbraio scorso gli studenti dello Stato di Tachira (sud ovest del Venezuela) hanno deciso di protestare esigendo al governo più sicurezza, rifornimento di viveri e migliori misure economiche. A seguito delle proteste cinque studenti sono stati incarcerati e trasferiti nella città di Coro, dove sono stati malmenati e torturati con l'elettricità. Il 12 febbraio 2014 gli studenti di tutto il paese sono scesi in piazza esigendo la liberazione dei loro compagni. Il governo di Nicolas Maduro e Diosdado Cabello ha proibito alle emittenti televisive di parlare delle proteste e ordinato il silenzio alle radio. Nessun mezzo di informazione venezuelano ha menzionato le morti degli studenti. I fatti sono stati trasmessi da CNN e NTN24, ma la seconda emittente è stata oscurata per ordine di Conatel (Comisión Nacional de Telecomunicaciones de Venezuela), organo del ministero delle Telecomunicazioni venezuelano. Il governo sta censurando l'informazione bloccando anche l'accesso al sito web di NTN24.

Il fornitore Internet nazionale, CANTV, ha anche bloccato la condivisione di immagini su Twitter. Il *social network* ha confermato il tentativo di censura da parte del governo e, in seguito, ha offerto una guida passo a passo per aggirare il problema.

Considerando che:

— due studenti e un membro del collettivo armato sono morti; più di 300 studenti sono stati detenuti dalla Guardia nazionale bolivariana, più di 200 hanno riportato ferite da arma da fuoco o contusioni e più di 100 sono stati asfissiati;

— nelle scorse settimane, l'imposizione della legge del 2009 del «prezzo giusto» (che vieta alle aziende di guadagnare più del 30 %, pena l'esproprio) ha costretto una buona parte dei giornali nazionali a chiudere per mancanza di carta;

— la censura e la negazione del diritto di espressione e della libertà di stampa costituiscono violazioni dei diritti fondamentali dell'uomo, in particolare degli articoli 57 e 58 della costituzione venezuelana,

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se nell'ambito della cooperazione strategica tra l'Unione europea e il Venezuela 2014-2020, che mira a contribuire alla riduzione della povertà, al consolidamento della democrazia e al miglioramento dello sviluppo economico equo del paese, intende delineare nuove azioni a tutela dei diritti umani;

2. se intende valutare l'imposizione di sanzioni e procedere al congelamento dei fondi destinati al paese.

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003725/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Venezuela: diritto di manifestare sfociato in violenze e caos

Come ha dichiarato il procuratore generale venezuelano Louisa Ortega Diaz dall'inizio del mese di febbraio 2014 in Venezuela ci son stati ben 28 morti e 365 feriti, per mano di partecipanti a una manifestazione di studenti nata inizialmente come pacifica per protestare contro lo stupro di una studentessa e trasformatasi in violenze e caos con la presenza di armi, mentre paesi come Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Cina e Russia hanno offerto il loro sostegno.

Può la Commissione precisare:

1. se è al corrente dei fatti sopra descritti;

2. quali misure intende intraprendere per tutelare i diritti dei manifestanti e l'incolumità dei civili?

Risposta congiunta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(13 giugno 2014)

La Commissione segue da vicino gli sviluppi dal 12 febbraio. La delegazione dell'UE in Venezuela, così come le dodici ambasciate degli Stati membri, stanno monitorando la situazione e riferiscono regolarmente.

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla dichiarazione del 21 febbraio 2014 sui disordini in Venezuela, nonché alla dichiarazione ufficiale fornita, a nome della Commissione, dal commissario europeo per la Fiscalità, le dogane, le statistiche, l'audit e la lotta antifrode, in occasione del dibattito tenutosi durante la seduta plenaria del Parlamento europeo del 27 febbraio. Inoltre, la Commissione ha rilasciato dichiarazioni tramite il suo portavoce, rispettivamente il 14 febbraio, il 28 marzo e il 14 aprile.

Nell'ambito dei nuovi strumenti finanziari per il periodo 2014-2020, gli aiuti dell'UE saranno concentrati sui paesi e le regioni più poveri e vulnerabili. Il Venezuela, classificato dalla Banca mondiale come paese con reddito medio-alto per tre anni consecutivi sulla base del reddito nazionale lordo (RNL) pro capite, è tra i paesi che non beneficeranno più degli aiuti bilaterali alla cooperazione e, a decorrere dal 1° gennaio 2014, del Sistema delle Preferenze Generalizzate (SPG).

Gli stanziamenti della Commissione europea per gli aiuti umanitari sono forniti seguendo un approccio rigorosamente basato sulle esigenze e applicando i principi umanitari. Dal 1998 la Commissione europea ha fornito al Venezuela aiuti per un totale di 14 122,823 EUR, compresa l'assistenza per la preparazione alle catastrofi.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002425/14
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreşedintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(3 martie 2014)

Subiect: VP/HR — Situația din Venezuela

Situația din Venezuela a devenit tot mai îngrijorătoare pentru comunitatea internațională. Pe lângă situația economică instabilă, o rată a criminalității foarte ridicată și o inflație în creștere, în ultimele săptămâni au avut loc proteste, reprimate în dese rânduri în mod violent de către forțele de ordine. Ceea ce este și mai îngrijorător este că aceste proteste, direcționate împotriva conducerii politice a statului, s-au soldat cu mai multe victime în rândul civililor.

Are în vedere Uniunea Europeană impunerea unor sancțiuni celor responsabili de escaladarea violențelor (interdicția de călătorie în Uniune, înghețarea conturilor etc.)?

Răspuns comun dat de Înaltul Reprezentant/doamna vicepreședinte Ashton în numele Comisiei
(13 iunie 2014)

Începând din 12 februarie, Comisia urmărește îndeaproape evoluțiile care au loc. Delegația UE în Venezuela, precum și ambasadele celor douăsprezece state membre ale UE monitorizează situația și întocmesc rapoarte cu regularitate.

Comisia dorește să aducă în atenția onorabilului deputat declarația din 21 februarie 2014 a doamnei Catherine Ashton, Vicepreședinte al Comisiei/Înalt Reprezentant, cu privire la tulburările din Venezuela, precum și declarația oficială dată în numele Comisiei de comisarul responsabil pentru impozitare, vamă, statistică, audit și lupta antifraudă, în cadrul dezbaterii din plenul Parlamentului European din 27 februarie. În plus, Comisia aduce în atenție declarațiile purtătorului de cuvânt al Comisiei din 14 februarie, 28 martie și 14 aprilie.

În conformitate cu noile instrumente financiare stabilite pentru perioada 2014-2020, resursele UE în domeniul ajutorului vor fi concentrate pe cele mai sărace și mai vulnerabile țări și regiuni. Venezuela, țară care a fost clasificată de Banca Mondială, timp de trei ani consecutiv, ca fiind, pe baza venitului național brut (VNB) pe cap de locuitor, o economie cu venituri medii superioare, se află printre țările care nu vor mai beneficia de ajutor pentru cooperare bilaterală și, începând de la 1 ianuarie 2014, de sistemul general de preferințe comerciale (SGP).

Comisia Europeană alocă fonduri pentru asistență umanitară conform unei abordări bazate strict pe necesități, precum și prin aplicarea principiilor umanitare. Începând din 1998, Comisia Europeană a oferit Venezuelei o asistență umanitară care totalizează 14 122,823 EUR, inclusiv sprijin pentru pregătire în caz de dezastre.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002167/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(25 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Crisis in Venezuela

The EU maintains political and economic relations with the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

On the basis of the economic dialogue between the EU and Venezuela, the latter benefits from the tariff reductions provided for by the scheme of generalised tariff preferences and trade agreements laid down in the economic association agreements and the programmes of aid for trade.

The EU is Venezuela's largest international donor in the field of development cooperation: the Commission conducts bilateral cooperation through the 2009 Memorandum of Understanding and the 2011 instrument of association, thematic cooperation through funding directed at projects in the fields covered by the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights and regional cooperation that currently provides grants for forty projects.

Since 1998, DG ECHO has spent EUR 41 550 000 on aid and disaster prevention in Venezuela, as part of the programme of humanitarian aid to Latin America.

In view of the above, can the VP/HR say:

— Beyond the public rhetoric, has she taken any practical measures on the use of force against civil society, the arrests of students and political opponents and the grave violations of freedom of expression, association and assembly by the public authorities in Venezuela? If so, which measures?

— Is she considering whether to suspend the trade facilitation measures, cooperation programmes and humanitarian aid mentioned above?

Question for written answer E-002425/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(3 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — The situation in Venezuela

The situation in Venezuela has been giving the international community increasing cause for concern, in view of its unstable economy aggravated by very high crime rates and galloping inflation. Of even greater concern is the civilian death toll from protests against the country's political leadership over the last few weeks , which have frequently met with violent clampdowns by the forces of law and order.

Does the EU intend to impose sanctions on those responsible for the escalating violence (ban on travel to the Union, freezing of accounts, etc)?

Question for written answer E-002717/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Venezuela — re-examination of EU actions under strategy for 2014-20 following recent events

On 12 February, students from Tachira State (south-western Venezuela) decided to protest and demand from the government greater security, replenishment of basic essentials and better economic measures. Following the protests five students were imprisoned and transferred to the city of Coro, where they were beaten and tortured with electricity. On 12 February 2014 students from the whole country went to the town square demanding the release of their companions. The government of Nicolas Maduro and Diosdado Cabello has prohibited television stations from talking about the protests and has ordered radio silence. The deaths of the students have not been reported in any Venezuelan media. The facts were broadcast by CNN and NTN24, but the latter station was blacked out by order of Conatel (Venezuelan National Telecommunications Commission), an agency of the Venezuelan Telecommunications Ministry. The government is censoring information and also blocking access to the NTN24 website.

The national Internet service provider, CANTV, has also blocked image sharing on Twitter. The social network has confirmed this attempt at censorship by the government and has subsequently issued a step-by-step guide to circumventing the problem.

Considering that:

— two students and one member of the armed collective have been killed; more than 300 students have been arrested by the Venezuelan National Guard, more than 200 have reported firearms injuries or bruises and more than 100 have been asphyxiated;

— in recent weeks, the imposition of the 2009 'fair price' law (which bans companies from earning more than 30%, on pain of expropriation) has forced a large part of the national newspapers to close down due to a lack of paper;

— censorship and the denial of the right of expression and of the freedom of the press are breaches of fundamental human rights, in particular of Articles 57 and 58 of the Venezuelan constitution,

1. within the scope of the strategic cooperation between the European Union and Venezuela 2014-20, which aims to contribute to the reduction of poverty, the consolidation of democracy and the improvement of the fair economic development of the country, does the Commission intend to set out any new actions in protection of human rights?

2. Does it intend to evaluate the imposition of sanctions and proceed to freeze any funds intended for the country?

Question for written answer E-003403/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(20 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Venezuela

The Venezuelan authorities' repressive action against the peaceful marches taking place there since 12 February 2014 has so far resulted in 13 deaths and many injured.

High rates of inflation, crime, and scarcity of several basic products, as well as extensive corruption and intimidation of the media and the democratic opposition in general, have served to increase tensions and political polarisation to worrying levels.

In light of the above, could the Commission indicate what action the EU can take to prevent the alarming violation of fundamental rights by the Venezuelan Government and to guarantee respect for the principle of the separation of powers in Venezuela?

Question for written answer E-003725/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 March 2014)

Subject: Venezuela: right to protest descends into violence and chaos

Venezuela's state prosecutor, Luisa Ortega Diaz, recently announced that the death toll from the ongoing protests in her country has risen to 28, with a further 365 people sustaining injuries. The protests, which began at the beginning of February as a peaceful student demonstration against the rape of a female student, soon descended into violence and chaos, with armed clashes taking place between the protestors and the security forces of the incumbent Venezuelan Government, which has the backing of countries such as Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua, China and Russia.

1. Is the Commission aware of the facts described above?

2. What measures does it intend to take in order to protect the rights of protestors and guarantee the safety of civilians?

Question for written answer E-003946/14
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31 March 2014)

Subject: Outbreak of violence in Venezuela

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned about the current violent situation in Venezuela which, he tells me, has already led to the deaths of 20 people.

My constituent tells me that after the EP resolution on Venezuela was passed on 27 February 2014, Parliament wished to send an ad hoc delegation to Venezuela. However, the Venezuelan Government has said it will not accept international mediation.

My constituent would like the Venezuelan Government to engage in unconditional dialogue with the opposition. He would also like the EU to take further action to protect citizens in Venezuela and to seek a peaceful resolution to this crisis.

Could the Commission state if it is putting any pressure on the Venezuelan Government to end the current outbreak of violence and to protect the welfare of its citizens?

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

The Commission has been following developments closely since 12 February. The EU Delegation in Venezuela as well as the twelve EU Member States embassies are monitoring the situation and report on a regular basis.

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its 21 February 2014 Statement on unrest in Venezuela as well as to the official statement given by the Commissioner responsible for Taxation, Customs, Statistics, Audit and Anti-Fraud on behalf of the Commission during the European Parliament plenary debate on 27 February. In addition the spokesperson of the Commission issued statements on 14 February, 28 March and 14 April.

Under the new financial instruments for the period 2014-2020, EU aid resources will be concentrated on the poorest and most vulnerable countries and regions. Venezuela, which has been classified by the World Bank as an upper middle income economy during three consecutive years on the basis of the gross national income (GNI) per capita, is among the countries that will no longer benefits from bilateral cooperation aid and, from 1 January 2014, the General Scheme of trade Preferences (GSP).

The European Commission's allocations for humanitarian assistance are provided following a strictly needs-based approach and applying the humanitarian principles. Since, 1998, the European Commission has provided humanitarian assistance to Venezuela, totalling EUR 14 122 823, including support to disaster preparedness.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002315/14
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(27 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Crisi dei rifugiati siriani

Il 26 febbraio 2014, l'Alto commissario dell'ONU per i rifugiati, Antonio Guterres, ha dichiarato che presto i siriani sostituiranno gli afghani come primo popolo di rifugiati nel mondo. Sono circa 9,3 milioni i siriani, quasi la metà della popolazione, che necessitano di aiuto e 2,4 milioni hanno abbandonato il paese. I bambini, in particolare, sono estremamente vulnerabili. Nei campi profughi libanesi quasi 2 000 bambini siriani rischiano di morire di fame e 10 000 bambini siriani di cinque anni di età e i più piccoli soffrono di malnutrizione acuta. Secondo il vice capo aiuti dell'ONU Kyung-Wha Kang «la Siria rischia di perdere una generazione di bambini».

Il Segretario generale dell'ONU ha chiesto al governo siriano di concedere agli operatori umanitari un maggiore accesso al paese. Gli approvvigionamenti umanitari sono disponibili, ma è difficoltoso garantire il loro transito sicuro. L'uso indiscriminato da parte del governo delle bombe barile ha provocato centinaia di vittime civili innocenti e non sembra esserci alcun rallentamento nell'uso di tali tattiche. I colloqui di pace di Ginevra 2 sono terminati il 15 febbraio 2014, con un accordo provvisorio per un terzo ciclo di colloqui in una fase successiva.

1. Quale ruolo sta svolgendo la Commissione, insieme all'ONU, per fare pressioni affinché il governo siriano permetta agli operatori umanitari e ai soccorritori di transitare in modo sicuro nelle parti del paese sotto assedio?

2. Quali sforzi sta compiendo la Commissione in paesi come il Libano, dove i bambini siriani rischiano di morire di fame?

Risposta di Kristalina Georgieva a nome della Commissione
(10 luglio 2014)

1. La Commissione europea sostiene da tempo la necessità di garantire agli operatori umanitari e ai soccorritori un transito libero e sicuro in Siria, affinché possano raggiungere tutte le persone bisognose di aiuto, fra cui i 4,7 milioni di cittadini che secondo le stime risiedono in zone difficilmente raggiungibili in cui ricevono poca o nessuna assistenza.

Sin dall'adozione, nel febbraio 2014, della risoluzione n. 2139 del Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU, la Commissione ne chiede una rapida attuazione e rivolge in particolare un appello a tutte le parti del conflitto affinché garantiscano il transito attraverso le linee di conflitto e le frontiere.

L'UE è un membro attivo del Gruppo ad alto livello sulle sfide umanitarie sin dalla sua creazione. Il Gruppo è stato istituito nel 2013 per promuovere e intensificare la cooperazione fra i Paesi che possono esercitare un'influenza sulle Parti del conflitto siriano in modo da ottenere miglioramenti sul piano dell'accesso umanitario.

2. L'Unione europea, con i suoi Stati membri, è in prima fila nella risposta internazionale e ha mobilitato, collettivamente, 2,8 miliardi di euro per i soccorsi e l'assistenza ai siriani in Siria e ai rifugiati e alle comunità che li accolgono nei paesi confinanti (Libano, Giordania, Iraq e Turchia). Circa la metà dei beneficiari dei 615 milioni di euro che la Commissione ha stanziato a favore dell'aiuto umanitario è costituita da bambini ([1]).

La Commissione sostiene l'iniziativa «No Lost Generation» che mira ad affrontare le conseguenze immediate e a lungo termine della crisi sui bambini e sui giovani, migliorando l'accesso all'istruzione e fornendo un sostegno psicologico in Siria e nella regione. Circa la metà dei 337 milioni di euro stanziati dalla Commissione per l'aiuto allo sviluppo è destinata all'istruzione e beneficia così 2,5 milioni di bambini in tutta la regione.

([1]) L'assistenza prestata comprende la fornitura di alimenti, cure mediche, acqua e servizi igienico-sanitari, generi non alimentari e protezione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002315/14
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(27 February 2014)

Subject: Syrian Refugee Crisis

On February 26 2014, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Antonio Guterres, announced that Syrians would soon replace Afghans as the world's largest refugee population. Approximately 9.3 million Syrians, almost half the population, are in need of help, and 2.4 million have fled the country. Children in particular are extremely vulnerable. In Lebanese refugee camps, nearly 2 000 Syrian children are at risk of starving to death and 10 000 Syrian children aged five years and younger are suffering from acute malnutrition. According to UN deputy aid chief Kyung-Wha Kang, 'Syria is in danger of losing a generation of children'.

The UN Secretary-General has called for the Syrian Government to grant aid workers greater access to the country. Humanitarian supplies are available, but guaranteeing their safe passage has proved difficult. The government's indiscriminate use of barrel bombs has resulted in hundreds of innocent civilians being killed, and there appears to be no let-up in the use of such tactics. The Geneva 2 peace talks ended on February 15 2014, with a tentative agreement for a third round of talks at a later date.

1. What role is the Commission playing, together with the UN, to pressure the Syrian Government to allow safe passage for humanitarian and relief workers into parts of the country that have been under siege?

2. What efforts are being undertaken by the Commission in countries such as Lebanon, where Syrian children are at risk of starvation?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(10 July 2014)

1. The European Commission has constantly been advocating for unfettered and safe access of humanitarian assistance and personnel inside Syria in order to be able to reach all people in need with aid, including the estimated 4.7 million people that reside in hard-to-reach areas that receive limited or no assistance.

Since the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 2139 in February 2014, the Commission has called for its swift implementation and, in particular, on all parties to the conflict to ensure access across conflict lines and borders.

The EU has been an active member of the High Level Group on Humanitarian Challenges since its inauguration. The Group was created in 2013 to foster and maximise cooperation among those countries with influence over parties to the Syrian conflict to bring about progress in terms of humanitarian access.

2. The EU, with its Member States, has led the international response with over EUR 2.8 billion collectively mobilised for relief and recovery assistance to Syrians inside their country as well as to refugees and host-communities in the neighbouring countries (Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Turkey). Approximately half of the recipients of the Commission's humanitarian funding of EUR 615 million are children ([1]).

The Commission supports the No Lost Generation initiative that aims at addressing the immediate and long-term consequences of the crisis on children and youth by expanding access to education and providing psychosocial support in Syria and the region. Approximately half of the Commission's development funding of EUR 337 million has been provided for education, thus reaching 2.5 million children in the region.

([1]) This includes the provision of e.g. food, health, water and sanitation, non-food items and protection.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002601/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(6 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ομαδικές απολύσεις στην Ελλάδα

Πρόσφατα, θεσπίστηκε η αλλαγή των αρμοδιοτήτων του «Ανώτατου Συμβουλίου Εργασίας» στην Ελλάδα (στο οποίο συμμετέχουν εκπρόσωποι του υπουργείου Εργασίας, των εργοδοτικών οργανώσεων των συνδικαλιστικών φορέων των εργαζομένων) ώστε αυτό να εξετάζει τα συγκεκριμένα οικονομικά στοιχεία μιας επιχείρησης προκειμένου να εισηγηθεί την υπέρβαση του ορίου των ομαδικών απολύσεων.

Δεδομένου ότι, για το ζήτημα των ομαδικών απολύσεων, σε παλαιότερη απάντησή της (E-009220/2013) η Επιτροπή μού απάντησε ότι η ελληνική κυβέρνηση συμφώνησε να προβεί στην αναθεώρηση της ισχύουσας εργασιακής νομοθεσίας «ως μέρος των όρων πολιτικής που συνδέονται με το πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα», ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Θεωρεί πως η αλλαγή στις αρμοδιότητες του Ανώτατου Συμβουλίου Εργασίας ικανοποιεί τη δέσμευση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης να προβεί σε αναθεώρηση της ισχύουσας εργασιακής νομοθεσίας; Αν όχι, ποιες άλλες αλλαγές προτείνει να γίνουν επιπλέον ως προς το καθεστώς των ομαδικών απολύσεων;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002860/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ομαδικές απολύσεις στην Ελλάδα

Στη συνεδρίαση της Ολομέλειας του Ανωτάτου Συμβουλίου Εργασίας της 22ας Ιανουαρίου 2014 αποφασίστηκε η αλλαγή των αρμοδιοτήτων του, ώστε αυτό να εξετάζει τα συγκεκριμένα οικονομικά στοιχεία μιας επιχείρησης προκειμένου να εισηγηθεί την υπέρβαση του ορίου των ομαδικών απολύσεων, όπου θεωρεί ότι είναι αναγκαίο.

Δεδομένου ότι, πρώτον, για το ζήτημα των ομαδικών απολύσεων σε παλαιότερη απάντησή της (E-009220/2013) η Επιτροπή μού απάντησε, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι «το εν λόγω εγχείρημα αναμένεται να συμπεριλάβει τη συγκριτική αναθεώρηση ρυθμιστικών θεμάτων που αφορούν την αναδιάρθρωση εταιρειών και τις ομαδικές απολύσεις ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί η ισορροπία μεταξύ της διευκόλυνσης της αναγκαίας προσαρμογής και ενός δίκαιου επιμερισμού του βάρους της προσαρμογής μεταξύ εργαζομένων, εταιρειών και της κυβέρνησης» και, δεύτερον, ότι σύμφωνα με επίμονες δημοσιογραφικές πληροφορίες η Τρόικα επιμένει σε επιπλέον απελευθέρωση των ορίων για τις ομαδικές απολύσεις, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι έχει γίνει στην κατεύθυνση της «συγκριτικής αναθεώρησης ρυθμιστικών θεμάτων που αφορούν την αναδιάρθρωση εταιρειών και τις ομαδικές απολύσεις»;

2. Θεωρεί ότι η αλλαγή στις αρμοδιότητες του Ανώτατου Συμβούλιου Εργασίας δεν ικανοποιεί τη δέσμευση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης για αναθεώρηση της ισχύουσας εργασιακής νομοθεσίας;

3. Ποιες ακριβώς απαιτήσεις έχει η Τρόικα για τις ομαδικές απολύσεις;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Μαΐου 2014)

Στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση, το ΔΝΤ, η ΕΚΤ και η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, εξ ονόματος των κρατών μελών της ζώνης ευρώ, συμμετέχουν σε τακτικό πολιτικό διάλογο για ευρύ φάσμα θεμάτων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων εκείνων της αγοράς εργασίας, που έχει το δυναμικό να βοηθήσει τις προοπτικές της καλύτερης λειτουργίας της ελληνικής οικονομίας. Υπήρξε η κοινή αντίληψη ότι το πλαίσιο για τις ομαδικές απολύσεις είναι σημαντικό θέμα που πρέπει να συζητηθεί δεόντως και να συμπεριληφθεί στους όρους του προγράμματος.

Υπό το πρίσμα αυτό, οι ελληνικές αρχές προέβησαν σε διοικητικές αλλαγές στον τομέα των ομαδικών απολύσεων. Επιπλέον, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση θα προβεί, αρχικά, σε αξιολόγηση του ελληνικού πλαισίου μέχρι τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2014, εξίσου υπό το φως αυτών των τελευταίων αλλαγών, καθώς και σε αξιολόγηση του πόσο το ελληνικό πλαίσιο προσεγγίζει τις βέλτιστες πρακτικές που ισχύουν αλλού· στη συνέχεια, βάσει αυτής της αξιολόγησης, θα εξετάσει τη νομοθετική δράση που θα αποδειχθεί ενδεχομένως απαραίτητη για να επιτευχθεί η καλύτερη λειτουργία του πλαισίου ([1]). Περιττό να πούμε ότι, οποιαδήποτε αλλαγή θα πρέπει να συμμορφώνεται με την οδηγία 98/59/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με τις ομαδικές απολύσεις ([2]).

([1]) Για περισσότερες λεπτομέρειες, βλ. κεφάλαιο 4.3 Περαιτέρω βελτίωση του ρυθμιστικού πλαισίου (σ. 192) της 4ης αναθεώρησης του προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα στην ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2014/pdf/ocp192_en.pdf

([2]) Οδηγία 98/59/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 20ής Ιουλίου 1998, για προσέγγιση των νομοθεσιών των κρατών μελών που αφορούν τις ομαδικές απολύσεις, ΕΕ L 222/16 της 12.8.1998.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002601/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Mass redundancies in Greece

A change was recently made to the remit of the Greek Supreme Labour Council (which comprises representatives of the Ministry of Labour, of employer organisations and of trade union organisations), allowing it to examine the specific financial data of an undertaking for the purpose of recommending that it be allowed to exceed the limit on mass redundancies.

In view of the fact that the Commission replied to an earlier question on mass redundancies (E-009220/2013) that 'As part of the policy conditionality attached to the economic adjustment programme for Greece, the Greek Government agreed in carrying out a review of existing labour relations', will the Commission say:

Does it consider the change to the remit of the Supreme Labour Council to satisfy the commitment by the Greek Government to carry out a review of existing labour legislation and, if not, what other changes does it propose should also be made to mass redundancy schemes?

Question for written answer E-002860/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 March 2014)

Subject: Collective redundancies in Greece

At a plenary session held on 22 January 2014 the Supreme Labour Council decided to change its powers, so as to allow it to examine the financial records of individual enterprises with a view to recommending whether the limit for collective redundancies should be exceeded, wherever it considered such as step necessary.

As regards the issue of collective redundancies, given firstly that, the Commission had answered an earlier question of mine (E-009220/2013) by stating, *inter alia*, that: 'This exercise is expected to include a comparative review of regulatory issues concerning the re-structuring of companies and collective dismissals to ensure a balance between facilitating necessary adjustment and a fair sharing of the burden of adjustment between workers, firms and the Government' and secondly that, according to recurrent press reports, the Troika is insisting on the further deregulation of the limits on collective redundancies, will the Commission say:

1. What has been done by way of 'a comparative review of regulatory issues concerning the re-structuring of companies and collective dismissals'?

2. Does it consider that changing the powers of the Supreme Labour Council will not be sufficient to meet the Greek government's commitment to revise existing labour legislation?

3. What exactly are the Troika's demands concerning collective redundancies?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(20 May 2014)

In the context of the economic adjustment programme for Greece, the Greek Government, the IMF, the ECB and the European Commission on behalf of the euro area Member States are engaged in a regular policy dialogue on a broad range of issues, including labour market ones, that have the potential to help the prospects of a better functioning Greek economy. There has been a shared understanding that the framework for collective dismissals is a relevant issue to be properly discussed and included in the programme conditionality.

In that light, the Greek authorities have taken administrative changes in the area of collective dismissals. In addition, the Greek Government will first carry out an assessment of the Greek framework by September 2014, also in the light of these latest changes, and of how close it comes to best practises elsewhere; and, second, based on the assessment, consider legislative action that may turn out to be necessary in order to achieve a better-functioning framework ([1]). Needless to say, any change will have to comply with Council Directive 98/59/EC on collective redundancies ([2]).

([1]) For more details see Chapter 4.3 Further improving regulatory framework (p 192) of the 4th review of the 2nd Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece available at: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2014/pdf/ocp192_en.pdf

([2]) Council Directive 98/59/EC of 20 July 1998 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies, OJEC, L 222/16 of 12.8.1998.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002602/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Elecciones en Maldivas

El 25 de febrero de 2014, la Delegación de la UE a Sri Lanka y Maldivas emitió una declaración clara en la que criticaba al Tribunal Supremo de Maldivas por su trato a la Comisión Electoral.

En los últimos meses, la Comisión Electoral ha criticado en repetidas ocasiones la interferencia del Tribunal Supremo en los procesos electorales, y en respuesta el Tribunal Supremo ha denunciado a la Comisión Electoral por desacato. Como señaló la Delegación de la UE, estos procedimientos pueden socavar la independencia vital de la Comisión Electoral, violando los principios fundamentales de la separación de poderes y la libertad de expresión en Maldivas. Las elecciones en Maldivas se celebrarán el 22 de marzo de 2014.

1. ¿Enviará la UE una delegación a Maldivas para observar las elecciones y ayudar a la Comisión Electoral en su tarea de salvaguardar la celebración de elecciones libres y democráticas?

2. ¿Qué otras medidas piensa tomar el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior para asegurarse de que los miembros de la Comisión Electoral no sean perseguidos por el cumplimiento de sus obligaciones?

3. ¿Está supervisando la UE la situación en Maldivas en relación con el respeto de los derechos y libertades fundamentales, en particular la libertad de expresión?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de abril de 2014)

Una Misión de Observación Electoral (MOE) de la UE se encuentra en Maldivas desde el 4 de marzo de 2014 a raíz de una invitación de la Comisión Electoral. El jefe de la Misión es Eduard Kukan, diputado del Parlamento Europeo y antiguo ministro de Asuntos Exteriores de Eslovaquia. La MOE de la UE ha desplegado treinta observadores de dieciseis Estados miembros por todo el país. Diez de ellos son observadores a corto plazo, reclutados entre el personal de las embajadas de los Estados miembros en Colombo, Sri Lanka. La MOE de la UE permanecerá en Maldivas hasta el 6 de abril para seguir de cerca los acontecimientos posteriores a la celebración de las elecciones. En los próximos dos meses se publicará un informe final.

La UE sigue atentamente la evolución política en Maldivas. En respuesta a la demanda interpuesta por el Tribunal Supremo contra los miembros de la Comisión Electoral, la UE ha emitido una declaración local de la UE. La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta también expuso su posición a través de una declaración de su portavoz de 12 de marzo de 2014. Le rogamos consulte los enlaces siguientes:
http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/sri_lanka/documents/press_corner/20140225_en.pdf
http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140312_04_en.pdf

La UE seguirá supervisando la situación en Maldivas en lo que atañe al respeto de los derechos y libertades fundamentales. En este contexto, la UE continuará exhortando a las autoridades maldivas a que alineen su marco jurídico con los convenios sobre derechos humanos de los que Maldivas es parte (como el Pacto Internacional de Derechos Civiles y Políticos y la Convención sobre la Eliminación de Todas las Formas de Discriminación contra la Mujer).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002602/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Maldives elections

On 25 February 2014, the EU Delegation to Sri Lanka and the Maldives issued a clear statement which criticised the Maldives Supreme Court for its treatment of the Electoral Commission.

In recent months the Electoral Commission has repeatedly criticised the Supreme Court's interference in electoral processes, and in return the Supreme Court has placed the Electoral Commission in contempt of court. As the EU Delegation noted, these proceedings risk undermining the vital independence of the Elections Commission, violating the fundamental principles of separation of powers and free expression in the Maldives. Elections in the Maldives have been scheduled for 22 March 2014.

1. Will the EU send a delegation to the Maldives to observe the elections and assist the Electoral Commission in its task of safeguarding free and democratic elections?

2. What further steps will the European External Action Service take to ensure that the members of the Electoral Commission are not being persecuted in the process of fulfilling their duties?

3. Is the EU monitoring the situation in the Maldives with regard to respect for fundamental rights and freedoms, especially freedom of speech?

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

An EU Election Observation Mission (EU EOM) has been present in the Maldives since 4 March 2014, following an invitation from the Election Commission. The mission is led by Chief Observer Eduard Kukan, a Member of the European Parliament from Slovakia and former Minister for Foreign Affairs. The EU EOM deployed 30 observers from 16 EU Member States across the country. The observer group included 10 locally recruited Short-Term Observers from EU Member States' embassies in Colombo, Sri Lanka. The EU EOM will remain in the country until the 6th of April to observe post-election developments; a final report will be published within the next two months.

The EU is following political developments in the Maldives closely. In reply to the case taken by the Supreme Court against the Election Commissioners the EU has issued a Local EU statement. Also HR/VP has clearly spelt out her position in a Statement by her spokesperson, issued on 12 March 2014. Please refer to the links:
http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/sri_lanka/documents/press_corner/20140225_en.pdf
http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140312_04_en.pdf

The EU will continue to monitor the situation in the Maldives with regard to respect for fundamental rights and freedoms, including freedom of speech. In this context the EU will continue to urge the Maldives to ensure that its legal framework is aligned with international conventions on human rights to which the Maldives is a party (such as ICCPR, CEDAW).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002603/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Finanzielle Auswirkungen und Folgen der Fettleibigkeit

1. Kann die Kommission konkrete Angaben dazu machen, ob sie sich mit den zukünftigen finanziellen Auswirkungen wirksamer Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung von Fettleibigkeit auf die Haushalte der Mitgliedstaaten und den EU-Haushalt befassen wird, etwa mittels einer Strategie und Empfehlungen für die Entwicklung von Programmen zur Änderung des Lebensstils?

2. Kann die Kommission konkrete und genaue Finanzdaten zum wirtschaftlichen Nutzen der Bekämpfung von Fettleibigkeit bereitstellen?

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

Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-005660/2012 und E-011219/2012 ([1]).

Die Kommission ist sich der schwierigen Finanzlage in den Mitgliedstaaten und insbesondere der Auswirkungen von Fettleibigkeit und damit verbundener Krankheiten auf die nationalen Haushalte bewusst. Schätzungen zufolge entfallen jährlich bis zu 7 % der Gesundheitsausgaben der EU auf mit Adipositas zusammenhängende Krankheiten ([2]). Hierzu addieren sich weitere Kosten infolge der Produktivitätsverluste durch Gesundheitsprobleme und vorzeitige Sterbefälle (so stehen jedes Jahr 2,8 Mio. Todesfälle mit Übergewicht und Adipositas in Zusammenhang) ([3]).

Die Kommission teilt die Auffassung, dass Prävention unerlässlich ist, um die Auswirkungen auf die menschliche Gesundheit und die Gesundheitssysteme sowie die Kosten von Fettleibigkeit gering zu halten.

Die Kommission fördert die Zusammenarbeit, die Abstimmung und den Austausch über bewährte Verfahren zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten gemäß dem Weißbuch „Ernährung, Übergewicht, Adipositas: Eine Strategie für Europa" ([4]). Sie unterstützt darüber hinaus Initiativen wie den Aktionsplan gegen Fettleibigkeit bei Kindern ([5]), der freiwillige Maßnahmen im Hinblick auf einen gesünderen Lebensstil umfasst.

Die Kommission hat die Veröffentlichung „Obesity and the Economics of Prevention: Fit not Fat" ([6]) kofinanziert, in der Daten über die Kostenwirksamkeit von Präventionsstrategien aufgeführt sind.

Die laufende Studie „Analyse von Sterblichkeitstabellen: Kosten-Nutzen-Analyse der Gesundheitssysteme in den Mitgliedstaaten" ([7]) soll außerdem dazu beitragen, ein besseres Verständnis der langfristigen Kosten und Vorteile von Investitionen in Gesundheitsförderung und Prävention zu schaffen. Die Studie wird voraussichtlich im November 2014 fertiggestellt sein. Über das Gesundheitsprogramm ([8]) und das Programm Horizont 2020 ([9]) kann die Kommission darüber hinaus Projekte finanzieren, in deren Rahmen die langfristige Relevanz und Kostenwirksamkeit von Präventionsmaßnahmen untersucht wird.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) „Obesity — preventing and managing the global epidemic", Report of a WHO Consultation, 2000, (Technical Report Series, Nr. 894, S. 79): http://whqlibdoc.who.int/trs/WHO_TRS_894_(part2).pdf
([3]) Weltgesundheitsorganisation. Global Status Report on Non-Communicable Diseases 2010: http://www.who.int/nmh/publications/ncd_report2010/en/
([4]) KOM(2007)279 endg.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([6]) http://www.oecd.org/els/healthpoliciesanddata/obesityandtheeconomicsofpreventionfitnotfat.htm
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/health/tenders_H05_2013.html
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/index_de.htm
([9]) KOM(2011)809 vom 30.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002603/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Financial impact and effects of obesity

1. Will the Commission consider the future financial impact on the Member States' budgets and the European budget of taking effective steps to tackle obesity, possibly through a strategy and recommendations for developing lifestyle-change programmes? (Please be specific in the answer.)

2. Is the Commission able to provide any exact financial data about the economic benefits of tackling obesity? (If so, please be specific in the answer.)

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to written questions 005660/2012 and 011219/2012 ([1]).

The Commission is aware of the current difficult financial situation in the Member States and in particular of the impact of obesity and related diseases on the national budgets. It is estimated that up to 7% of EU health budgets are spent on diseases linked to obesity each year ([2]). Additional costs result from loss of productivity due to health problems and premature death (2.8 million deaths per year from causes associated with overweight and obesity) ([3]).

The Commission agrees that prevention is essential to minimise the human impact and the impact on healthcare systems and the economy of obesity.

The Commission promotes cooperation, coordination and exchange of good practices between Member States as set out in the strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related Health issues ([4]). It also supports initiatives such as the action plan on Childhood Obesity ([5]) which includes voluntary actions to establish healthier lifestyles.

The Commission has co-financed the 'Obesity and the Economics of Prevention: Fit not Fat' ([6]) publication which has provided information on the cost-effectiveness of prevention strategies.

The on-going study 'Life-table analysis: health system cost-effectiveness assessment across Member States' ([7]) also aims at understanding the long-term costs and benefits of investments in health promotion and disease prevention. The study is expected to be finalised by November 2014. Via the Health Programme ([8]) or Horizon 2020 ([9]), the Commission may also fund projects that investigate the long-term relevance and cost-effectiveness of prevention.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) 'Obesity — preventing and managing the global epidemic', Report of a WHO Consultation, 2000, (Technical Report Series, No 894, p79), http://whqlibdoc.who.int/trs/WHO_TRS_894_(part2).pdf
([3]) World Health Organisation. Global Status Report on Non-Communicable Diseases 2010 http://www.who.int/nmh/publications/ncd_report2010/en/
([4]) COM(2007) 279.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([6]) http://www.oecd.org/els/healthpoliciesanddata/obesityandtheeconomicsofpreventionfitnotfat.htm
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/health/tenders_H05_2013.html
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/index_en.htm
([9]) COM(2011) 809, 30.11.2011.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002604/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Neue Strategie zur Unterstützung des Kampfes gegen die Fettleibigkeit

Kann die Kommission angesichts der hohen Prozentzahl von Menschen, die in den Mitgliedstaaten an Fettleibigkeit leiden, ungefähre Angaben dazu machen, wann sie die Strategie der EU zu Ernährung, Übergewicht und Adipositas erneuern wird?

Wenn ja, sieht die Kommission in der Änderung der Lebensweise und einer Gewichtsregulierung ein Instrument zur Bekämpfung der Fettleibigkeit?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(29. April 2014)

Der Kommission sind die beunruhigenden Trends bei Übergewicht und Fettleibigkeit in Europa bekannt.

Die Kommission arbeitet mit den Mitgliedstaaten zusammen, und zwar im Wege der Kooperation, der Koordinierung und des Austauschs guter Beispiele für eine gesunde Lebensweise im Sinne der europäischen Strategie für Ernährung, Übergewicht und Adipositas ([1]). Außerdem hat sich die Hochrangige Gruppe für Ernährung und Bewegung ([2]) am 24. Februar 2014 auf einen Aktionsplan zur Bekämpfung der Fettleibigkeit im Kindesalter ([3]) geeinigt ([4]).

Die Strategie wurde einer unabhängigen Bewertung unterzogen, die im Jahr 2013 veröffentlicht wurde. Die Bewerter stellten den Mehrwert der gemeinsamen Arbeiten auf EU-Ebene, die Wirksamkeit der Strategie und die Argumente für ihre Fortführung heraus, regten jedoch an, den Schwerpunkt auf die Förderung der körperlichen Betätigung und die Bekämpfung der Ungleichheiten im Gesundheitsbereich zu legen.

Derzeit steht eine Überarbeitung der Strategie nicht zur Diskussion. Die Hochrangige Gruppe für Ernährung und Bewegung ist nach wie vor das bevorzugte Forum für die Erörterung aktueller und künftiger Maßnahmen auf diesem Gebiet.

([1]) KOM(2007)279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_de.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([4]) Die Niederlande meldeten einen Vorbehalt an.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002604/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: New strategy to support the fight against obesity

In view of the high percentage of people suffering from obesity across the Member States, can the Commission give an indication as to when it will consider renewing the EU strategy on nutrition, overweight and obesity-related health issues?

If so, would the Commission consider encouraging lifestyle and weight management as one tool for tackling obesity?

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

The Commission is aware of the worrying trends of overweight and obesity in Europe.

The Commission has been working with the Member States through cooperation, coordination and exchange of good practices on healthy lifestyles, as set out in the strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related Health issues ([1]). Further, on 24 February 2014 the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity ([2]) agreed ([3]) an Action Plan on Childhood Obesity ([4]).

The strategy underwent an independent evaluation, published in 2013. The added value of joint work at EU level, the efficacy of the strategy and the case for its continuation were made clear by the evaluators, whilst a strengthened focus on promotion of physical activity and on fighting against health inequalities was suggested.

At present, the revision of the strategy is not under discussion. The High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity remains a prime forum for the discussion of present and future action in this area.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([3]) With the reserve of The Netherlands.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002605/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Depressionen sollen zu einer der wichtigsten Ursachen für Behinderungen werden

Es wurde festgestellt, dass Depressionen in etwa 30 Jahren eine der wichtigsten Ursachen für Behinderungen sein werden.

Wenn sich Depressionen zu einer chronischen Krankheit entwickeln, sind sie sehr schwer heilbar, und die Patienten benötigen Medikamente, therapeutische Behandlung und so viel Unterstützung von Familie und Freunden wie möglich.

Werden frühzeitig Präventivmaßnahmen in Form einer Behandlung der Depressionen eingeleitet, verringert sich das Risiko, dass sie sich zu einer chronischen Krankheit entwickeln.

1. Ist sich die Kommission der Tatsache bewusst, dass immer mehr Menschen an depressiven Belastungen leiden werden, die sich zu chronischen Krankheiten entwickeln werden?

2. Wenn ja, was empfiehlt die Kommission den Mitgliedstaaten, um das bereits bestehende Risiko zu senken, mit dem langfristigen Ziel, auch die durch soziale Kosten und Gesundheitskosten entstehende finanzielle Belastung für die Mitgliedstaaten und den EU-Haushalt zu verringern?

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

Die jüngste Studie zu den durch Krankheiten ausgelösten globalen Belastungen ([1]) belegt, dass Depressionen bereits heute eine der Hauptursachen für Behinderungen sind. Gemäß der regionalen Ausgabe für die EU- und EFTA-Mitgliedstaaten ([2]) zählt die klinische Depression in jedem einzelnen EU- und EFTA-Mitgliedstaat zu den drei Hauptursachen für Behinderungen.

Einer weiteren breit angelegten Studie ([3]) zufolge ist die Zahl der an Depressionen leidenden Personen in den letzten Jahren nicht gestiegen. Dagegen nimmt die Zahl der diagnostizierten Fälle von Depression zu, da das medizinische Fachpersonal stärker für diese Krankheit sensibilisiert ist und sie weniger stark stigmatisiert wird als in der Vergangenheit.

Die Kommission unterstützt die Maßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten in diesem Bereich durch die Bereitstellung von Mitteln für eine Gemeinsame Aktion für psychische Gesundheit und Wohlbefinden ([4]) aus dem EU-Gesundheitsprogramm. Einer der Aktionsschwerpunkte sind Depressionen. Zielsetzung der Aktion sind eine Bestandsaufnahme in den teilnehmenden Mitgliedstaaten, die Ermittlung bewährter Verfahren, die Ausarbeitung von Empfehlungen und schlussendlich die Vereinbarung eines gemeinsamen Aktionsrahmens.

Am 1. April 2014 wurde ferner im Rahmen des Projekts PREDI-NU (2011-2014) ([5]) eine Website mit Informationen zum Thema Depression eingerichtet; dort steht auch das Tool „iFightDepression" zur Selbsttherapie leichterer Formen der Depression ([6]) unter Aufsicht einer medizinischen Fachkraft bereit. Dieses Projekt wird in Zusammenarbeit mit der European Alliance Against Depression ([7]) durchgeführt und wird ebenfalls mit Mitteln aus dem EU-Gesundheitsprogramm gefördert.

([1]) http://www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org/gbd
([2]) http://www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org/gbd/research/project/global-burden-diseases-injuries-and-risk-factors-study-2010#/publications-presentations/reports
([3]) H.U. Wittchen et al: The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010, in: European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.
([4]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/
([5]) http://www.predi-nu.eu/
([6]) https://ifightdepression.com/Home/tabid/113/ctl/Login/language/de-DE/Default.aspx?returnurl=%2f
([7]) http://www.eaad.net/deu/index.php

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002605/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Depression set to be one of the leading causes of disability

It has been established that in some 30 years' time depression will have become one of the leading causes of disability.

When depression evolves into a chronic condition it is very difficult to cure, with patients requiring pharmaceutical remedies, therapeutic care and as much support as can be given by family and friends.

If preventive measures are taken in the form of treatment at a very early stage, the risk of a chronic condition developing is reduced.

1. Is the Commission aware of the increasing number of people who will suffer from strains of depression which evolve into chronic conditions?

2. If so, what will the Commission recommend to the Member States in order to reduce this risk, which already exists, with the long-term goal of also reducing the financial burden of social and health costs to Member States, as well as to the EU budget?

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

The outcomes of the latest Global Burden of Disease study for 2010 ([1]) underline that depression is already today one of the leading causes of disability. The edition for the EU and EFTA-countries ([2]) states that major depression is among the top three cause of disability in every EU- and EFTA-country.

Another major study ([3]) suggested that the number of people with depression did not grow over the past years. Instead, more cases of depression are being diagnosed because health professionals are increasingly aware about depression and it is less stigmatised than it was the case before.

In order to support Member States' action in this area, the Commission co-funds from the EU-Health Programme a Joint Action on Mental Health and Well-being (2013-2016) ([4]). One of its work packages specifically addresses depression. It aims to analyse the situation in the participating Member States, to identify good practices, to develop recommendations and finally to agree upon a common framework of action.

In addition, the PREDI-NU-project (2011-2014) ([5]) launched a website on 1 April 2014 with information about depression, which also includes an eHealth-tool ('iFightDepresison') for the self-management of depression ([6]) under the supervision of a health professional. The project is linked to the European Alliance Against Depression ([7]), and it is also co-funded by the EU-Health Programme.

([1]) http://www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org/gbd
([2]) http://www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org/gbd/research/project/global-burden-diseases-injuries-and-risk-factors-study-2010#/publications-presentations/reports
([3]) HU Wittchen et al: The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010, in: European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.
([4]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/
([5]) http://www.predi-nu.eu/
([6]) https://ifightdepression.com/Home/tabid/113/ctl/Login/language/de-DE/Default.aspx?returnurl=%2f
([7]) http://www.eaad.net/

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002606/14
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) en Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(6 maart 2014)

Betreft: Ziektekostenverzekering en arbeidsmobiliteit

Volgens de Nederlandse Zorgverzekeringswet moet iedereen die in Nederland woont en werkt een basisverzekering ziektekosten hebben. Verzekeraars die een ziektekostenverzekering willen aanbieden aan mensen die in Nederland wonen en werken, moeten dat aan de Nederlandse Zorgautoriteit (NZa) melden. Tot nu toe heeft geen enkele buitenlandse verzekeraar dit gedaan, wat het voor Nederlandse ingezetenen onmogelijk lijkt te maken om zich aan te sluiten bij een buitenlandse ziektekostenverzekering.

Onlangs werden we attent gemaakt op een zaak waarbij een Nederlander vanuit Frankrijk terug naar Nederland verhuisde. Hij beschikte over een Franse ziektekostenverzekering (die ook geldig was in de rest van Europa) die nog vijf maanden geldig was. Desondanks eiste de Nederlandse verzekeraar dat het contract voor de basisverzekering in Nederland zou gelden vanaf de datum van de verhuizing naar Nederland. Daardoor moest de betrokkene zowel aan de Franse als aan de Nederlandse ziektekostenverzekeraar gedurende vijf maanden premies afdragen.

1. Is de Commissie deze bestaande praktijk in Nederland bekend en is ze al eens eerder op de hoogte gebracht van dergelijke gevallen?

2. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van soortgelijke praktijken in andere lidstaten?

3. Vindt de Commissie dat deze praktijk in strijd is met de internemarktregelgeving, in het bijzonder het recht van vrij verkeer van personen?

4. Is de Commissie van mening dat deze praktijk ingaat tegen het vergemakkelijken en stimuleren van de arbeidsmobiliteit in Europa?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(2 mei 2014)

Overeenkomsting artikel 153, lid 4, VWEU zijn de lidstaten exclusief bevoegd voor de fundamentele beginselen van hun socialezekerheidsstelsels.

Aangezien Nederland de dekking van zorgrisico's die behoren tot de wettelijke sociale zekerheid voor andere verzekeraars heeft opengesteld, gelden de regels voor vervangende ziektekostenverzekering (d.w.z. ziekteverzekeringen die geheel of gedeeltelijk ter vervanging dienen van de ziektekostenverzekering van de wettelijke sociale zekerheid) van de derde richtlijn schadeverzekering ([1]). De richtlijn erkent de specifieke aard en de sociale gevolgen van vervangende ziektekostenverzekering. Op grond van de richtlijn mogen lidstaten bijgevolg de systematische mededeling eisen van de voorwaarden van dergelijke verzekeringspolissen, om na te gaan of deze daadwerkelijk een volwaardige vervanging vormen voor de wettelijke sociale zekerheid. Verzekeraars kunnen worden verplicht om standaardovereenkomsten aan te bieden met dezelfde dekking als het socialezekerheidsstelsel.

De EU-wetgeving voorziet wel in een coördinatie, maar niet in een harmonisatie van de nationale socialezekerheidsstelsels. Dit betekent dat het iedere lidstaat vrij staat om de details van zijn socialezekerheidsstelsel te regelen. Via EU-coördinatiewetgeving wordt gewaarborgd dat de toepassing van verschillende nationale stelsels geen negatieve gevolgen heeft voor personen die gebruik maken van hun recht op vrij verkeer.

Daartoe bepaalt artikel 11 van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 welke nationale wetgeving van toepassing is op de verschillende categorieën van personen. Dat Nederland een persoon verplicht om een verzekering af te sluiten in Nederland zelf, is dus verenigbaar met de EU-wetgeving mits dit land overeenkomstig artikel 11 van deze verordening bevoegd is voor de sociale zekerheid van deze persoon.

([1]) PB L 228 van 11.8.1992, blz. 1-23.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002606/14
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) and Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Health insurance and labour mobility

According to the Dutch health insurance law (*Zorgverzekeringswet*), anyone living and working in the territory of the Netherlands is required to conclude a contract for basic health insurance. Insurers wishing to offer health insurance to people living and working in the territory of the Netherlands have to announce this to the Dutch Health Authority (NZa). Until now, no foreign insurer has done so, which would seem to make it impossible for Dutch residents to use a foreign health insurer.

We were recently alerted to the case of a Dutch citizen who had moved back from France to the Netherlands while holding French health insurance (with an extension for the whole of Europe), which was valid for a further five months. Nevertheless, the Dutch insurer required a contract for basic health insurance in the Netherlands to be concluded from the date on which the citizen moved back to the country. As a consequence, premiums had to be paid to both insurers for a period of five months.

1. Is the Commission aware of this practice in the Netherlands, and has it previously been alerted to similar cases?

2. Is the Commission aware of similar practices in other Member States?

3. Does the Commission consider this practice to be contrary to internal market rules, in particular the right of free movement of people?

4. Does the Commission consider this practice to be contrary to the principle of facilitating and encouraging labour mobility in Europe?

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

Under Article 153(4) TFEU Member States hold exclusive competence over the fundamental principles of their social security systems.

Since the Netherlands opened up coverage of health risks belonging to statutory social security to insurers, the rules for substitutive health insurance (i.e. health insurance which serves as a partial or complete alternative to health cover provided by the statutory social security system) under Third Non-life Insurance Directive ([1]) applies. The directive recognises the specific nature and social consequences of substitutive health insurance. Therefore, under the directive Member States may require systematic notification of policy conditions to verify that they effectively substitute social security cover. Insurers may be required to offer standard policies and guarantee the same cover as the social security system.

EC law provides for coordination but not harmonisation of the national social security schemes. This means that each EU Member State is free to determine the details of its social security system. EU coordination law intervenes to ensure that the application of different national legislations does not adversely affect persons exercising their right to free movement.

To this end, Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 determines which national law applies to different categories of persons. It is therefore compatible with the EC law that the Netherlands require a person to take insurance in the Netherlands, as long as this country is competent for this person's social security according to Article 11 of that regulation.

([1]) OJ L 228, 11.8.1992, p. 1-23.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002607/14
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Travel to islands in Europe

The islands of Lewis and Harris were recently named the top islands in Europe to visit by international travel website TripAdvisor. The Scottish Government has created an initiative to give 8 000 free trips to encourage more people to visit Scotland's islands, as part of the Year of Homecoming celebrations.

How does the EU help encourage travel to islands in Europe?

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

In line with the EU's competence to complement, support, and coordinate the actions of the Member States, it is the objective of the Commission to foster the competitiveness of the tourism sector and to promote and encourage travel to and within Europe.

In the recent years, the Commission has adopted several measures to support the promotion of tourism and to increase tourism demand, both intra-EU and from third countries. It is especially worth mentioning the international communication campaign, 'Europe — Whenever you're ready' ([1]) which was carried out over the period September 2012 — December 2013 to keep Europe in the spotlight for international tourists and highlight Europe's diverse cultural and natural heritage. The campaign included dedicated journalistic travel reports and blog reviews on coastal and maritime tourism in Europe.

Further to this, on 20 February 2014, the Commission adopted a dedicated Communication on a new strategy to enhance coastal and maritime tourism in Europe ([2]). This communication makes particular reference to challenges and opportunities in islands and other remote destinations and proposes a dedicated set of actions to be followed up at EU, national, regional, local, as well as industry level. Amongst others, it is proposed to encourage the diversification and integration of coastal and inland attractors, to explore ways to improve island connectivity and design innovative tourism strategies for (remote) islands. Other proposals refer to measures such as, using national and regional strategies to ensure the coherence of tourism offers and better accessibility of islands and remote locations and developing innovative practices for regenerating and re-using existing maritime infrastructure.

([1]) For further information: http://europa.eu/readyforeurope/
([2]) COM(2014) 86 final of 20.2.2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002608/14
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Scientific exploration of the marine environment

Biologists from the University of Aberdeen and a research institute in New Zealand recently visited a previously unexplored deep ocean trench in the South Pacific.

To what extent does the EU support scientific exploration of the marine environment?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2014)

The scientific exploration of the marine environment is essential for filling the many gaps that remain in the knowledge of seas and oceans. The importance of marine and maritime research is reflected within the EU Research Framework Programmes.

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) has provided more than EUR 1.5 billion of support for more than 700 marine and maritime research projects. Scientific ocean exploration forms an essential part of many of these. For example, Euro Argo ([1]) supports a global ocean observation infrastructure, Eurosites ([2]) integrates deep ocean observatories, and Uncoss ([3]) develops an underwater Coastal Sea Surveyor and Hermione ([4]) studies deep water environments.

Support has been further strengthened in Horizon 2020, the framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), by the inclusion of a new activity specifically dedicated to the better coordination of cross-cutting marine and maritime research ([5]). Support for marine and maritime research and innovation is spread across Horizon 2020. Specifically in 2014 and 2015, EUR 145 million has been allocated to support research for 'Blue Growth'. The results of this research will also contribute to the scientific exploration of the marine environment by, for example, improving underwater imaging technology and supporting observation of the Atlantic Ocean.

([1]) http://www.euro-argo.eu/
([2]) http://www.eurosites.info/
([3]) http://www.uncoss-project.org
([4]) Hemione succeeds the important FP6 research project HERMES which was the first major study of European deep water environments: http://www.eu-hermione.net/
([5]) Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal: http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002609/14
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Outdoor leisure facilities in the EU

The town of Stonehaven in the north-east of Scotland is this year celebrating the 80th anniversary of its open air pool.

What is the EU doing to support the maintenance and availability of outdoor leisure facilities in the EU?

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

The Commission thanks the Honourable Member for drawing the attention to maintenance and availability issues in outdoor leisure facilities and in particular in open air swimming pools. The regulation and control of such services, similarly to other outdoor leisure activities offered to consumers, remain the competence of Member States.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002610/14
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Winter sports infrastructure across the EU

A new multi-million pound National Curling Centre is to be built in Scotland.

What is the European Union doing to improve winter sports infrastructure across the EU?

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

The European Union has no specific instrument in support of winter sports infrastructure.

However, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) can support small-scale infrastructure investments which contribute to national, regional and local development, in view of promoting social inclusion through improved access to social, cultural and recreational services.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002611/14
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Improving literacy from an early age

The Scottish Government has an action plan to raise standards of literacy for all from the early years to adulthood.

Does the EU fund any programmes on a Europe-wide scale to improve literacy from an early age?

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

The European Union provides funding for educational projects through Erasmus+, the EU programme for education, training, youth and sport ([1]). The programme covers all facets of lifelong learning, from early childhood years to adult life. It offers educational institutions (pre-school, primary and secondary schools, training centres, adult education centres, higher education institutions, as well as youth groups and other bodies involved in educational provision) the opportunity to develop and take part in European projects aimed at improving literacy across all ages. Projects are based on cooperation between institutions from at least three European countries. The Erasmus+ programme is managed on behalf of the European Commission by National Agencies ([2]) located in all Member States. More information on concrete funding opportunities can be obtained from them or from the above website.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/national-agencies_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002612/14
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Improving access to education

Attendance at Scottish primary schools has been compulsory for every child since 1872. However, in many countries around the world there is no such opportunity, and according to a recent Unesco report, it will be at least 70 years before all children will have access to primary school.

What is the EU doing to improve access to education globally?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

Significant progress has been made towards the Millennium Development Goal of universal primary education. Between 1999 and 2011 the number of primary-school-age children not attending school fell almost by half, from 103 million to 57 million, 55 million of whom in developing countries. This progress is the result of the strong political commitment and sound policies of partner countries as well as support from the international community. However, progress has been uneven and as mentioned above, there are still 57 million children out-of-primary school. Further efforts are needed.

Education is a priority in the EU's development cooperation. EU policy underlines the importance of equity of access to education, and improving its quality. In the programming period 2007-2013, the EU helped 14 million children to go to primary school. In the new programming period (2014-2020), the EU has made a firm commitment to spend at least 20% of development aid on human development and social inclusion, including education. The bulk of EU support to education will be channelled through bilateral programmes in partner countries which have chosen education as a focal sector. In addition, the EU is supporting education through allocations to the Global Partnership for Education. As programming is still under way, no figures are available concerning the period 2014-2020.

As regards EU Member States, 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 (including access to primary school) lies entirely with the Member States.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002614/14
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Firefighter training in the EU

The Scottish Fire and Rescue Service are encouraging more men and women to sign up to the Retained Duty System, which typically trains part-time firefighters who provide a vital service to the communities in which they live and work.

To what extent does the European Union monitor and encourage the uptake of firefighter training across the Member States?

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

EU Member States (MS) have the primary responsibility for all phases of disaster management cycle (prevention, preparedness and response) and for the choice of specific measures and schemes, in their territory, that reduce the risk and impact of the disasters. Thus, as part of the preparedness, the training of firefighters is a responsibility of the MS.

Nonetheless, at European level, the Union Civil Protection Mechanism (Decision No 1313/2013/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013) includes a general policy framework aimed at continuously improving the level of preparedness of civil protection systems, services and their personnel and of the population within the Union. This includes also a programme of exercises, training programmes and a training network, at Union and Member State level, on prevention of, preparedness for and response to disasters.

The training programme for civil protection and emergency management personnel aims at enhancing the coordination, compatibility and complementarity between modules, experts and other response capacities coming from different MS and to improve the competence of European experts.

The training programme consists of courses on introduction, operational and management level and is complemented by an online learning and preparation tool. Access to the training programme is granted via the national training coordinator of the respective MS.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002615/14
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Eating disorders across the EU

The Scottish Parliament recently hosted an event during Eating Disorders Awareness Week that focused on the role of the media; the role of fashion; the role of technology and social media; eating disorders in men; nutrition and dieticians; and supporting family and careers, all of which aimed to raise awareness of eating disorders and to offer support to people affected by these issues.

What is the European Union doing to tackle eating disorders across the EU?

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

The European Union has no competence in tackling eating disorders.

To support Member States' efforts in this area, the Commission is co-financing the project ProYouth (2011-2014) through the EU-Health Programme ([1]). The project is led by Heidelberg-University from Germany and partners from six further countries are participating. It targets young people and uses the Internet to provide information about mental health, health promotion, and eating disorders in nine languages. The project further offers peer and professional support to counteract the development of eating disorders and related problems, and, where necessary, it facilitates access to the regular healthcare system (e.g. counselling, treatment). As such, it can help reduce the time between the occurrence of symptoms and the seeking of professional help.

([1]) https://www.proyouth.eu/home.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002616/14
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Business opportunities for women

The Scottish Government has recently announced a range of measures to support women in business.

What is the EU doing to increase business opportunities for women?

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

The Commission has been working to facilitate access to networks for women with the creation of the European Network of Female Entrepreneurship Ambassadors in 2009. It has mobilised successful entrepreneurs to campaign on the ground as role models and to inspire women of all ages to set up their own businesses ([1]).

Furthermore, the European Network of Mentors for Women Entrepreneurs provides advice and support to women entrepreneurs on the starting-up, functioning and growth of their enterprises in the early stages of operation (years 2-4 of a new woman-led enterprise) ([2]).

The main initiative of the Entrepreneurship Action Plan targeting women is the creation of an online E-Platform for women entrepreneurs. This platform will be a one-stop shop for women of all ages who want to start, run and grow a business. It will provide educational, mentoring, advisory and business networking opportunities for women across Europe. The platform will bring together local, national and European stakeholders, and peer groups as well as the tools needed to support a new generation of women who make regular use of the Internet and other IT technologies. It will be one of the main tools that women can use across Europe to find information online and it will provide them with support for the start-up and growth of their businesses. The platform is set to be up and running sometime in 2015.

Other measures include the European Network to Promote Women's Entrepreneurship (WES). WES is composed of government representatives responsible for promoting female entrepreneurship; it helps to identify good practices and provides guidance on future policy direction.

([1]) There are 300 ambassadors in 22 European countries taking part in the network. These countries are: Albania, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Ireland, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Serbia, Slovakia, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

([2]) Today 17 CIP countries form the Mentors' Network which has currently around 200 mentors .These countries are: Albania, Belgium, Cyprus, FYROM, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002617/14
upućeno Komisiji
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(6. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Povratak iseljenika

Pretpostavlja se kako će se u Uniji do 2060. godine udio stanovništva starijeg od 65 godina povećati sa 17 na 30 posto. Posljedica toga bit će da ćemo umjesto četiri radno sposobne osobe koje privređuju za jednu iznad 65 godina, što je slučaj danas, imati dvije radno sposobne osobe na jednog umirovljenika.

Jedna od mjera za demografsku obnovu EU-a mogao bi biti program povratka europskih državljana i njihovih potomaka koji su emigrirali izvan granica Unije. Namjerava li Komisija poduzeti konkretne mjere u tom pravcu i koje su to mjere?

Odgovor g. Andora u ime Komisije
(2. svibnja 2014.)

Kao što je primijetio uvaženi zastupnik, u desetljećima koja su pred nama sve države EU-a suočit će se s velikim porastom udjela osoba starije dobi u ukupnoj populaciji i znatnim padom udjela mladih i stanovništva u radnoj dobi.

Iako je produženje očekivane životne dobi veliko postignuće europskih društava, ona se zbog starenja populacija istovremeno suočavaju s velikim problemima u gospodarstvu i sustavima socijalne skrbi. Komisija pažljivo analizira i prati predviđene posljedice ([1]) demografske tranzicije. Komisija ne namjerava razviti program povratne migracije u EU, što je ionako izvan njezine nadležnosti.

([1]) COM(2013) 83 završna verzija i SEC(2013) 38 završna verzija.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002617/14
to the Commission
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Return of emigrants

The proportion of over-65s in the EU population is expected to rise from 17% to 30% by the year 2060. As a result, the number of people of working age to provide for every person over 65 will not be four, as it is at present, but just two per pensioner.

One way for the EU to ensure population replacement might be a programme for the return of European citizens and their offspring who have emigrated out of the EU. Does the Commission intend to take specific steps in that direction? If so, what will it do?

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

As underlines by the Honourable Member, all EU countries will in the coming decades experience steep increases in the share of elderly persons in the total population and a significant decline in the share of young people and those of working age.

While longer lives are a major achievement of European societies, the ageing of the population also poses significant challenges for their economies and welfare systems. The Commission closely analyses and monitors projected impacts ([1]) of the demographic transition. The Commission does not envisage a programme of return migration to the EU, which is in any event outside the remits of its competence.

([1]) COM(2013) 83 final and SWD(2013) 38 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002620/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Incidenza dell'apporto proteico sullo sviluppo del cancro

Da tempo il mondo scientifico è attraversato da una diatriba riguardo ai benefici e ai rischi legati all'apporto eccessivo di proteine. Un nuovo studio di un'università statunitense pare dare ragione ai «detrattori» delle proteine, sostenendo che il danno può essere tanto grave da essere equiparabile a quello provocato dal consumo quotidiano di 20 sigarette. Parlando di dieta «iperproteica», i ricercatori si riferiscono a un apporto di almeno il 20 % derivante da proteine, mentre una dieta «ipocalorica» si attesta con una soglia al di sotto del 10 %.

Poco più di 6 mila soggetti adulti sono stati coinvolti nello studio, che ha rilevato che coloro che seguivano una dieta ricca di proteine (specie se animali, ad esempio provenienti dalla carne rossa o da latte e formaggi) avevano un rischio del 74 % maggiore di morte prematura, rispetto a coloro che seguono una dieta povera di proteine animali. Il rischio di morte era associato in special modo a malattie cardiovascolari, cancro e diabete.

Questi danni derivano dal fatto che le proteine controllano l'ormone della crescita IGF-I, coinvolto nello sviluppo fisico, che ad alti livelli può influire sullo sviluppo di tumori, in particolare perché dopo i 65 anni d'età i livelli di IGF-I calano drasticamente.

In riferimento a questo studio, può la Commissione disporre di ulteriori dati a conferma della tesi supportata dal team di ricercatori? Ritiene che alcune frazioni della popolazione europea possano essere particolarmente soggette a questo rischio, qualora dovesse rivelarsi provato scientificamente?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(23 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio condotto dalla *University of Southern California* cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare. È tuttavia prassi della Commissione non commentare i risultati di studi di ricerca.

Nell'ambito del 5° ([1]) e del 6° PQ ([2]) la Commissione ha finanziato progetti di ricerca quali EARNEST ([3]) e EARLY NUTRITION ([4]), destinati a fornire una solida base scientifica per formulare raccomandazioni sui modelli alimentari ottimali nei primi anni di vita e sugli effetti a lungo termine dell'alimentazione sulla salute. Dai risultati dell'ultimo progetto emerge che gli alimenti per lattanti con un basso tenore di proteine riducono l'indice di massa corporea (BMI) e il rischio di obesità in età scolare. Evitare un eccessivo apporto proteico nell'alimentazione dei lattanti potrebbe quindi contribuire a ridurre il fenomeno dell'obesità infantile ([5]).

Ulteriori possibilità di finanziamento per la ricerca in questo settore sono offerte da Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020), nell'ambito delle sfide sociali «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere» e «Sicurezza alimentare, agricoltura e silvicoltura sostenibili, ricerca marina, marittima e sulle acque interne e bioeconomia». Le informazioni sulle attuali possibilità di finanziamento sono reperibili nel portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione ([6]).

([1]) Quinto programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (1998-2002).
([2]) Sesto programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (2002-2006).
([3]) http://www.metabolic-programming.org/obesity/
([4]) http://www.project-earlynutrition.eu
([5]) http://ajcn.nutrition.org/content /early/2014/03/12/ajcn.113.064071.abstract
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002620/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Influence of protein intake on the development of cancer

For some time, scientists have been deeply divided about the benefits and risks of excessive protein intake. A new study by an American university seems to support protein's 'detractors', claiming that excessive protein intake can be as harmful as smoking 20 cigarettes a day. When the researchers refer to a 'hyperproteic' diet, they mean one in which at least 20% of a person's calorie intake comes from proteins, while a 'hypocaloric' diet is one in which less than 10% of that intake comes from proteins.

The study involved just over 6 000 adults. It found that persons who ate a protein-rich diet (especially animal proteins, e.g. red meat or milk and cheese) had a 74% higher risk of premature death than persons whose diet was low in animal proteins. The main risk factors were cardiovascular disease, cancer and diabetes.

These health problems occur because proteins control release of the growth hormone IGF-1, a factor in physical development. High levels of IGF-1 can influence the development of tumours, in particular because, after the age of 65, the levels occurring naturally in the body fall drastically.

Can the Commission confirm the theory put forward by the team of researchers who published the study referred to above? Does it consider that some sections of the European population may be particularly at risk, should the theory turn out to have a basis in fact?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

The Commission is aware of the study carried out by the University of Southern California referred to by the Honourable Member. It is Commission policy not to comment on individual research results.

In FP5 ([1]) and FP6 ([2]), the Commission has funded research projects such as EARNEST ([3]) and EARLY NUTRITION ([4]) that aimed at providing the scientific foundations for evidence-based recommendations on optimal early nutrition incorporating long-term health outcomes. The recent findings from the last project reveal that infant formula with lower protein content reduces the BMI (Body Mass Index) and obesity risk at school age. Therefore, the avoidance of infant foods that provide an excessive protein intake could contribute to a reduction in childhood obesity ([5]).

Horizon 2020, the framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), may provide further funding opportunities through the societal challenges 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' and 'Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research, and the Bioeconomy' to continue research in this area. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the EC Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([6]).

([1]) Fifth Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (1998-2002).
([2]) Sixth Framework Programme for Research, , Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (2002-2006).
([3]) http://www.metabolic-programming.org/obesity/
([4]) http://www.project-earlynutrition.eu
([5]) http://ajcn.nutrition.org/content /early/2014/03/12/ajcn.113.064071.abstract
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002621/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Missione OSCE in Ucraina

In merito alla crisi ucraina, l'Osce ha deciso di imbastire una missione composta da 35 osservatori militari, su richiesta del governo ucraino di Kiev. SI tratta di una missione disarmata, nonostante si tratti di personale militare, e partirà da Odessa, per poi concludersi il 12 marzo. Alla missione partecipa personale di 18 diversi paesi: Canada, Danimarca, Estonia, Finlandia, Francia, Germania, Gran Bretagna, Irlanda, Lettonia, Lituania, Norvegia, Polonia, Repubblica Ceca, Slovacchia, Svezia, Turchia, Ungheria e Usa. L'obiettivo principale della missione è quello di dissipare le preoccupazioni su attività militari insolite, in seguito all'invasione ad opera della Federazione russa di pochi giorni fa, oggi rientrata.

La minaccia militare non pare del tutto superata, dal momento che diversi cittadini ucraini hanno creato file lunghissime davanti ai centri di arruolamento per volontari, nel timore di una spirale di violenze contro Mosca.

1. A tal proposito, la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante può chiarire se è stata contattata dal governo ucraino per avviare un monitoraggio diretto della situazione in Ucraina o se essa stessa ha offerto il proprio supporto in tal senso?

2. Può tenere informato il Parlamento europeo e i cittadini europei in merito all'andamento della missione e ai suoi risultati?

3. In che modo ha intenzione di impostare la propria azione diplomatica al fine di mediare tra le due posizioni dell'Ucraina e della Russia?

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

L'Unione europea ha assunto l'impegno di difendere la sovranità, l'integrità territoriale e l'indipendenza dell'Ucraina e appoggia qualsiasi meccanismo internazionale volto a trovare una soluzione in conformità del diritto internazionale. L'UE si avvale di e collabora con organizzazioni internazionali come l'OSCE e il Consiglio d'Europa per stabilizzare la situazione e acquisire una migliore conoscenza delle condizioni in loco. Anche se non è potuta entrare in Crimea, la recente missione inviata dall'OSCE in base al documento di Vienna ha svolto un ruolo importante nel fornire informazioni di base in altre parti dell'Ucraina. L'UE sta riflettendo su come appoggiare la missione di monitoraggio speciale (SMM) recentemente approvata dal Consiglio permanente dell'OCSE per contribuire a ridurre le tensioni e a promuovere la pace, la stabilità e la sicurezza in tutta l'Ucraina, nonché a sorvegliare e sostenere l'attuazione di tutti i principi e gli impegni dell'OSCE. L'Unione si aspetta che tutti gli Stati partecipanti, compresa la Russia, collaborino con l'SMM affinché i suoi membri possano accedere in condizioni di sicurezza a tutte le parti dell'Ucraina. L'UE è inoltre pronta ad aiutare l'Ucraina a riformare il settore della sicurezza civile, anche mediante un'eventuale missione PSDC, e ha inviato una missione di esperti incaricata di valutare le diverse opzioni.

L'UE si compiace che il governo ucraino si sia impegnato a garantire la natura rappresentativa e inclusiva delle strutture governative, in modo da riflettere la diversità regionale, a garantire la piena tutela dei diritti delle persone appartenenti a minoranze nazionali, a intraprendere una riforma costituzionale, a indagare su tutte le violazioni dei diritti umani e su tutti gli atti di violenza, a lottare contro l'estremismo e a organizzare elezioni presidenziali libere, eque e trasparenti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002621/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — OSCE visit to Ukraine

In response to the ongoing crisis in Ukraine, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is sending 35 military observers on a visit to the country, at the request of the Ukrainian Government in Kiev. The visit will start at Odessa, and is scheduled to end on 12 March. The delegation is made up of unarmed military personnel from 18 different countries, namely Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The main objective of the visit is to dispel concerns about unusual military activities following the Russian Federation's invasion several days ago, even though it is now withdrawing its troops.

The military threat does not appear to have gone away entirely, with thousands of Ukrainian citizens queuing at volunteer recruitment centres amid fears of violence with Moscow escalating further.

1. In light of the above, can the Vice-President/High Representative indicate whether she has been asked by the Ukrainian Government to begin directly monitoring the situation in Ukraine, or whether she has offered its support in this respect?

2. Can she keep the European Parliament and European citizens informed of the progress made and results achieved by the delegation?

3. What diplomatic actions does she intend to take in order to act as a mediator between Ukraine and Russia?

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

The EU is committed to uphold the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Ukraine, and supports any international mechanism to bring about a solution in line with international law. The EU is working with and through international organisations such as the OSCE and Council of Europe to stabilise the situation and increase awareness of conditions on the ground. It is regrettable that the OSCE's recent Vienna Document Mission did not gain access to Crimea, although it played an important role in providing baseline information in other parts of Ukraine. The EU is exploring ways to support the Special Monitoring Mission (SMM), recently approved by the OSCE Permanent Council, with the goals of contributing throughout Ukraine to reducing tensions and fostering peace, stability and security; and to monitoring and supporting implementation of all OSCE principles and commitments. We expect all participating States, including Russia, to cooperate with the SMM so that its members may have safe and secure access to all parts of Ukraine. The EU is also ready to assist Ukraine in the field of civilian security sector reform, including through a possible CSDP mission, and has deployed an expert mission to assess the options.

The EU welcomes the Ukrainian Government's commitment to ensure the representative nature and inclusiveness of governmental structures, reflecting regional diversity, to ensure the full protection of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities, to undertake constitutional reform, to investigate all human rights violations and acts of violence, to fight extremism, and to hold free, fair and transparent Presidential elections

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002622/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Nuovi digestori anaerobici per la gestione dei rifiuti

In Emilia Romagna, uno dei più importanti operatori nazionali nel campo della gestione dei rifiuti ha realizzato tre «digestori anaerobici», impianti per la produzione di compost, biogas ed elettricità, utilizzando come fonte di energia rifiuti umidi e sfalci di potature. Ogni impianto è in grado di trattare annualmente 60 mila tonnellate di rifiuti per produrre circa 8GWh di elettricità, abbastanza per coprire il fabbisogno di circa 2700 famiglie, e circa 5mila tonnellate di compost per la concimazione dei campi.

Si tratta di digestori basati su una tecnologia estremamente innovativa, che riduce di molto l'impatto ambientale, dato che la «digestione» produce emissioni pari al volume prodotto da appena 40 caldaie domestiche.

Questi impianti potrebbero anche potenziare il circolo virtuoso del riciclo e dell'economia circolare, dal momento che quanto più si ricicla, tanta più energia si può produrre a minor costo e minor impatto ambientale.

Alla luce di quanto detto, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. in che misura questi impianti sono diffusi negli altri Stati membri dell'Unione europea;

2. se, laddove sono già attivi da alcuni anni, si è verificato un effettivo risparmio sui consumi e una riduzione dell'impatto ambientale dei processi di riciclo dei rifiuti;

3. se, laddove sono già attivi da alcuni anni, si è verificato un effettivo aumento della raccolta differenziata e un consolidamento culturale del concetto di economia circolare nella cittadinanza.

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

Di norma la Commissione non raccoglie informazioni sui vari tipi di impianti per il trattamento dei rifiuti presenti in Europa e non può pertanto trarre conclusioni sulle conseguenze dell'attività degli impianti di digestione anaerobica sulle abitudini di consumo dei cittadini di determinati paesi o sulla loro consapevolezza in materia di economia circolare.

Secondo dati esterni ([1]), esistono attualmente 244 impianti di digestione anaerobica costruiti o approvati in 16 Stati membri dell'UE, con una capacità totale di 7 750 000 tonnellate di rifiuti biodegradabili all'anno. Fra le tecniche disponibili per il trattamento dei rifiuti biodegradabili, la digestione anaerobica, sebbene più costosa, vanta i migliori risultati ambientali ([2]). La presenza di impianti di digestione anaerobica è strettamente correlata alla raccolta differenziata, in quanto la raccolta separata dei rifiuti organici biodegradabili costituisce il prerequisito per una digestione anaerobica efficiente.

([1]) http://www.ows.be/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Anaerobic-digestion-of-the-organic-fraction-of-MSW-in-Europe.pdf
([2]) Relazione del CCR «Supporting Environmentally Sound Decisions for Bio-Waste Management», http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/22583/1/d4a%20%20guidance%20on%20lct%26lca%20applied%20to%20bio-waste%20management%20-%20final%20-%20online.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002622/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: New anaerobic digestion plants for waste management

In the Italian region of Emilia Romagna, one of the country's largest operators in the waste management sector has constructed three 'anaerobic digesters' — plants that produce compost, biogas and electricity by using food waste and garden trimmings as an energy source. Each plant can process up to 60 000 tonnes of waste a year, and produce around 8 GWh of electricity — enough to meet the supply needs of around 2 700 homes — and roughly 5 000 tonnes of compost, which is used to fertilise fields.

These digestion plants are based on groundbreaking technology that significantly reduces their environmental impact, since the emissions generated by the 'digestion' are equivalent to those given off by just 40 household boilers.

These plants could also strengthen the virtuous circle of recycling and the circular economy, given that the amount of energy that can be produced at minimal cost (both financial and in terms of environmental impact) is directly proportional to the amount of waste that is recycled.

1. In light of the above, can the Commission indicate how widespread these types of plants are in the other Member States of the European Union?

2. In countries where such plants have been operational for several years, have markedly lower consumption rates and reduced environment impacts of waste recycling processes been observed?

3. In countries where such plants have been operational for several years, have marked increases in waste sorting been observed, and has the concept of the circular economy become more ingrained in the national psyche?

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

The Commission does not ordinarily collect information on the various types of waste treatment plants present in Europe and cannot draw conclusions on the consequences of anaerobic digestion plants on the consumption habits or awareness of circular economy of the citizens of specific countries.

According to external data ([1]), there are currently 244 built or approved anaerobic digestion plants in 16 EU Member States, with a total capacity of 7 750 000 tons of biodegradable waste per year. Among the available techniques to treat biodegradable waste, anaerobic digestion, while more expensive, has the best environmental outcome ([2]). There is a clear link between the presence of anaerobic digestion plants and waste sorting, as separate collection of bio-waste is a pre-requisite for efficient anaerobic digestion.

([1]) http://www.ows.be/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Anaerobic-digestion-of-the-organic-fraction-of-MSW-in-Europe.pdf

([2]) Report of JRC 'Supporting Environmentally Sound Decisions for Bio-Waste Management'
http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/22583/1/d4a%20%20guidance%20on%20lct%26lca%20applied%20to%20bio-waste%20management%20-%20final%20-%20online.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002623/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Nuovo studio scientifico sulla lotta contro il tumore al pancreas

Un'università texana ha studiato le proprietà del Phellodendron Amurense, noto anche come Amur o abete giallo, ovvero un albero della famiglia delle rutacee sfruttato nella medicina tradizionale cinese per curare il pancreas. Il team di ricercatori ha indagato le proprietà dell'arbusto per verificarne l'effettiva efficacia nella cura del cancro al pancreas, particolarmente difficile da curare poiché le cicatrici fibrotiche che si formano intorno all'area tumorale inibiscono la penetrazione e l'azione dei farmaci tradizionalmente utilizzati.

La fase che permette lo sviluppo della fibrosi incoraggia anche l'azione dell'enzima Cox-2, che provoca lo sviluppo di infiammazioni, ma è proprio su tale aspetto che, a quanto pare, l'abete giallo può giocare un ruolo significativo, dal momento che l'estratto della corteccia dell'Amur è parso in grado di contrastare l'azione enzimatica. Un'altra notizia positiva è che si tratta di un prodotto estremamente tollerabile per l'organismo umano, tanto che già è disponibile sul mercato sotto forma di capsule. La reale sfida per gli scienziati sarà ora quella di capire quanto l'azione di inibizione enzimatica possa influire sullo sviluppo della fibrosi e quindi di valutare l'effetto indiretto dell'abete giallo sullo sviluppo del tumore. Per tale motivo lo studio sarà ora esteso a un numero più elevato di soggetti, in modo da ottenere dati statistici più consistenti relativi alla correlazione tra il farmaco in oggetto e il tasso di mortalità delle cellule cancerogene.

In merito a quanto sopra esposto l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito elencati.

1. È la Commissione già a conoscenza dello studio?

2. È il farmaco in questione disponibile sul mercato europeo?

3. In caso affermativo, esistono dati sul suo consumo da parte dei cittadini europei?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2014)

I risultati cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare, riguardanti gli estratti di abete giallo (*Phellodendron Amurense*) nel trattamento del tumore al pancreas, pubblicati nella rivista scientifica *Clinical Cancer Research* dall'Health Science Center dell'Università del Texas con sede a San Antonio (USA), sono noti alla Commissione ([1]) ([2]). Va osservato che gli autori dello studio dichiarano esplicitamente che esso è circoscritto a un campione di 22 pazienti e che solo dopo avere analizzato i risultati valuteranno se estenderlo a un gruppo più vasto di pazienti al fine di verificare i risultati iniziali.

Come linea politica, la Commissione non valuta né commenta progetti di ricerca che non riguardano direttamente le sue attività di finanziamento.

Su proposta della Commissione è stata adottata la direttiva 2004/24/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 31 marzo 2004, che modifica, per quanto riguarda i medicinali vegetali tradizionali, la direttiva 2001/83/CE recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano, con l'obiettivo di agevolare l'immissione sul mercato dell'UE dei medicinali vegetali tradizionali. Questa direttiva prevede un periodo transitorio eccezionalmente lungo, pari a 7 anni, per la registrazione dei medicinali vegetali tradizionali già sul mercato alla data della sua entrata in vigore. Tale periodo transitorio di 7 anni è scaduto il 30 aprile 2011 ([3]).

Secondo i dati di cui dispone la Commissione, non è stata presentata alcuna domanda di registrazione di prodotti basati sul *Phellodendron Amurense*.

([1]) http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24520096
([2]) http://uthscsa.edu/hscnews/singleformat2.asp?newID=4734
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/human-use/herbal-medicines/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002623/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: New scientific study on the fight against pancreatic cancer

A Texas-based university has recently conducted a study on the properties of *Phellodendron amurense*, also known as the Amur cork tree or yellow fir, which is a tree in the family Rutaceae and is used in traditional Chinese medicine for treating pancreatic diseases. The team of researchers investigated the tree's properties to see how effective it was in treating pancreatic cancer, a condition that is particularly difficult to treat since the fibrotic scarring that develops around the tumour area prevents conventionally used drugs from penetrating into the site and taking effect.

The pathway that contributes to fibrotic development also promotes the action of Cox-2, an enzyme that causes inflammation, but it seems that the Amur cork tree could specifically be used to combat this effect, since its extract appears capable of suppressing such enzymatic action. Another plus point is that Amur cork tree extract is extremely safe for human consumption, and is already available on the market in capsule form. The real challenge now facing the researchers is to discover to what extent the enzymatic inhibitory action can influence fibrotic development, and thereby assess the indirect effect that the Amur cork tree has on tumour development. For this reason, the study is now going to be extended to cover a larger number of patients, so that more consistent statistical data can be obtained concerning the relationship between the medicinal product in question and the mortality rate of tumour cells.

1. Is the Commission aware of the study described above?

2. Is the medicinal product in question available on the European market?

3. If so, is there any data available on how widely it is taken by European citizens?

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

The Commission is aware of the results, published in the scientific journal *Clinical Cancer Research*, by the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio (USA) referred to by the Honourable Member about cork tree (*Phellodendron amurense*) extracts in treating pancreatic cancer ([1]), ([2]). It should be noted that authors of the study explicitly say that the study was limited to a sample of 22 patients and only after having analysed results, will they consider expanding the study to a larger group of patients to verify initial results.

As a matter of policy, the Commission does not assess or comment on research projects that do not directly relate to its funding activities.

The Commission adopted Directive 2004/24/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 31 March 2004, amending, as regards traditional herbal medicinal products, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, in order to facilitate the placing on the EU market of traditional herbal medicinal products. This directive provides for an exceptionally long transitional period of 7 years to register traditional herbal medicinal products that were already on the market on the date of entry into force of the directive. This 7 year transitional period ended on 30 April 2011 ([3]).

According to the data in possession of the Commission, no request for registration of products based on *Phellodendron amurense* has been submitted to the Commission.

([1]) http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24520096
([2]) http://uthscsa.edu/hscnews/singleformat2.asp?newID=4734
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/human-use/herbal-medicines/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002624/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Progetto per sistemi di telecomunicazione tramite l'utilizzo di droni civili

Un noto social network ha avviato trattative per acquistare, da un'azienda texana attiva nel settore dei droni, circa 11000 droni alimentati da energia solare, in grado di rimanere in volo ad alta quota per cinque anni senza necessità di tornare a terra per rifornirsi. L'affare, che potrebbe concludersi con un spesa di 60 milioni di dollari, è legato al possibile sfruttamento dei droni per la telecomunicazione. I droni in questione possono infatti supportare sistemi di trasmissione wireless per dati e voce e, posizionati a una certa distanza dal suolo, possono svolgere un'attività generalmente riservata ai satelliti.

L'acquisto rientrerebbe nel progetto «Internet.org», sostenuto da diverse imprese del settore delle telecomunicazioni e mirato ad estendere l'accesso alla rete per gli oltre 5 miliardi di persone nel mondo ancora esclusi dalla possibilità di connessione.

In merito a tale progetto, può la Commissione specificare se:

1. il progetto possa incrementare, tramite il dispiegamento di numerosi droni, i rischi per la sicurezza aerea?

2. È a conoscenza di imprese o altri attori europei coinvolti nel progetto?

3. È a conoscenza di progetti simili sviluppati da operatori europei o extra-europei?

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

1. Affinché sia loro consentito il sorvolo in uno spazio aereo europeo non segregato, i droni cui fa riferimento l'on. parlamentare dovranno rispettare le norme che saranno adottate a livello europeo e degli Stati membri. La Commissione intende garantire che le norme di sicurezza che disciplinano l'aeronavigabilità dei veivoli, le capacità tecniche dell'operatore e la competenza del pilota assicurino lo stesso livello di sicurezza sia per i droni pilotati a distanza che per il resto dei veivoli. Inoltre, la normale altitudine dei droni va dai 18.000 ai 27.000 metri, molto al di sopra di quella dei veicoli commerciali e di uso generale. Di conseguenza, il rischio per la sicurezza sarebbe limitato e sussisterebbe unicamente durante le fasi di ascesa e discesa, nelle quali i droni dovrebbero affrontare altri tipi di traffico. Per questi motivi, la Commissione ritiene che, nel momento in cui saranno rispettate le normative di sicurezza poste in essere, i droni non dovrebbero avere un'incidenza sugli elevati livelli di sicurezza dell'Unione europea.

2. La società dalla quale la ben nota rete sociale intende acquistare droni alimentati ad energia solare è una start-up statunitense fondata nel 2012. Sembra che la rete sociale collabori anche con PMI britanniche che sviluppano veivoli ad energia solare senza equipaggio. La Commissione non è a conoscenza di altre società o entità europee coinvolte in questo progetto.

3. Secondo le informazioni a disposizione della Commissione, non vi sono progetti equivalenti in Europa e la fattibilità tecnologica di tale progetto non è ancora dimostrata. Al di fuori dell'Europa, il progetto Google Loon persegue obiettivi simili, anche se con aerostati (circa la stessa altitudine) piuttosto che con droni. Alcuni produttori europei stanno lavorando allo sviluppo di droni ad energia solare da utilizzare per un'ampia gamma di applicazioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002624/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Plans to establish telecommunication systems by using civilian drones

A well-known social network has recently opened talks with a Texas-based company operating in the drone sector over the possible purchase of around 11 000 solar-powered drones, each capable of remaining in the air for five years without needing to return to Earth for refuelling. The deal, which could be concluded for around USD 60 million, is linked to the belief that drones may one day be used for telecommunications purposes. The drones in question are in fact capable of carrying wireless voice and data transmission systems and, when positioned at a certain altitude above the ground, can perform functions that generally only satellites have been able to carry out to date.

The purchase would fall within the Internet.org project, which is supported by various telecommunications companies and is seeking to provide Internet access to the 5 billion-plus people across the planet who have yet to be connected to the World Wide Web.

1. Does the Commission believe that this project could pose heightened risks to aviation safety, due to the sheer number of drones that could be deployed?

2. Does it know if any companies or other entities from Europe are involved in the project?

3. Is it aware of any similar projects currently being developed by European or non-European organisations?

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

1. To be allowed to fly in a European non-segregated airspace, the drones referred to by the Honourable Member will have to respect the rules to be established at the European and Member States level. It is the intention of the Commission that safety rules on the airworthiness of the aircraft, the technical capabilities of the operator and the competence of the pilot ensure the same level of safety for remotely piloted drones as currently exists for the rest of aviation. In addition, those drones are planned to fly at an altitude of 18 000 to 27 000 meters, which is well-above the altitude where commercial and general aviation aircraft fly. As a consequence, there would only be a limited safety risk, likely to manifest itself during the climbing and descending phases where the drones would be confronted with other types of traffic. For these reasons, the Commission is of the view that, provided that the safety regulation to be developed is respected, those drones should not affect the high safety levels in the European Union.

2. The company that the well-known social network is contemplating to buy solar-powered drones from is a US start-up founded in 2012. It seems that this social network also works with a UK SME that develops unmanned solar aircraft. The Commission is not aware of other European companies and entities involved in this project.

3. As far as the Commission is aware, there is no equivalent project in Europe and the technological feasibility of such a project is not demonstrated yet. Outside of Europe, the Google Loon project pursues similar objectives though with balloons (at a similar altitude) rather than drones. Some European manufacturers are working on the development of solar-powered drones that can be used for a wide variety of applications.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002625/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Sistemi di iscrizione scolastica online nell'Unione europea

Il 28 febbraio in Italia è scaduto il termine per le iscrizioni agli istituti scolastici per il prossimo anno. Le iscrizioni per le prime classi di scuole elementari, medie e superiori erano effettuabili solo online.

La notizia aveva destato non poche preoccupazioni, soprattutto da parte di quelle famiglie che temevano che la procedura di iscrizione virtuale fosse troppo complessa o da coloro che temevano che errori di sistema potessero provocare il ritardo o problemi di altra natura nelle procedure di iscrizione.

In realtà, le iscrizioni telematiche sono state oltre 1 milione e mezzo e oltre l'80 % degli utenti si è ritenuto soddisfatto della procedura, soprattutto in termini di risparmio di tempo. Inoltre, il Ministero per l'istruzione, l'università e la ricerca ha valutato che circa il 43 % delle famiglie ha trovato la procedura on line «molto facile», mentre il 37,41 % «abbastanza facile». Un successo quindi, sia in termini di tempo che di denaro risparmiati.

A tale proposito, può dire la Commissione quali altri Stati adottino il sistema di iscrizioni online per gli anni scolastici e/o accademici e se esistano già dei dati quantitativi in merito al risparmio in termini di denaro, sia per le istituzioni pubbliche che per i cittadini? Può dire, altresì, se esista uno studio comparativo dei diversi sistemi di iscrizione online nell'UE che permetta una valutazione di quali siano i sistemi più efficienti e funzionali?

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

Come l'onorevole parlamentare saprà, a norma dell'articolo 165 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, la responsabilità del contenuto e dell'organizzazione dei sistemi di istruzione e formazione (comprese le procedure di iscrizione) è interamente degli Stati membri.

La Commissione non raccoglie dunque informazioni dagli Stati membri sui sistemi di iscrizione alla scuola primaria e/o secondaria. La Commissione non è a conoscenza di studi comparativi dei diversi sistemi di iscrizione online nell'UE e non è in grado di indicare quali tra questi sistemi siano i più efficienti e funzionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002625/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Online school application systems in the European Union

On 28 February, the deadline for applying for school places for the next academic year expired in Italy. Applications for places in the lowest year groups in elementary, middle and secondary schools could only be made online.

This news had sparked more than a few concerns, not least from families who feared that the virtual application process would be too complicated, or those who were afraid that glitches in the system could result in delays or other types of problems in the application process.

In actual fact, however, over 1.5 million electronic applications were successfully made, and more than 80% of users said that they were satisfied with the process, especially in terms of the time it allowed them to save. In addition, the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities and Research has reported that around 43% of families found the online process to be 'very straightforward', with a further 37.41% finding it 'fairly straightforward'. The initiative has therefore been a resounding success, in terms of both the time and the money that has been saved.

In this respect, can the Commission indicate which other Member States have introduced, or are in the process of introducing, online application systems for academic years, and whether there is any quantitative data currently available to show how much money is being saved, both by public authorities and by citizens? Can it also indicate whether any comparative studies of the different online application systems in the EU have been conducted in order to ascertain which of these systems are the most efficient and practical?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(16 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 (including the application procedures) rests entirely with Member States.

Therefore, the Commission does not collect information from Member States on the various application systems for entrance to primary and/or secondary schools. The Commission is not aware of any comparative studies of the different online application systems in the EU and cannot indicate which of these systems are the most efficient and practical.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002626/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Sviluppo di strutture turistiche ecosostenibili

Da alcuni anni, in Italia, sta prendendo piede un nuovo fenomeno nel settore turistico, che punta allo sviluppo di un turismo innovativo e sostenibile. Si tratta, nello specifico, della diffusione di Bed & Breakfast che investono in fonti energetiche pulite, nuove tecnologie, risparmio energetico e riciclo/recupero dei materiali. Vengono, ad esempio, utilizzati materiali a basso impatto ambientale, come vernici naturali e igienizzanti, parquet ecologico, lampadine led a basso consumo, sistemi di riscaldamento muniti di biocamino a bioetanolo, ecologico e senza dispersione di calore. Inoltre, l'offerta alimentare si basa spesso su prodotti locali a km. 0, biologici, che valorizzano il territorio e le produzioni locali.

Pur consapevole che non si tratti di un fenomeno esclusivamente italiano, il territorio e le produzioni tipiche delle diverse regioni italiane possono garantire una varietà e una qualità di prodotti che ben si adattano a questo modello imprenditoriale sostenibile.

1. Può la Commissione fornire dati sulla diffusione di questo genere di attività negli altri Stati membri?

2. Dispone di una lista di «successi» cui i nuovi imprenditori del settore o coloro i quali vogliano riconvertire le proprie strutture verso una gestione più ecosostenibile possano ispirarsi?

3. Esistono programmi di scambio di esperienze e buone pratiche nel settore?

4. Può comunicare in che misura questo settore possa incidere sulla riduzione delle emissioni nocive e la realizzazione degli obiettivi dell'UE in materia di sostenibilità ambientale e lotta al cambiamento climatico?

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

La Commissione riconosce che è necessario gestire il turismo in modo responsabile e sostenibile per evitare effetti negativi sull'ambiente, cercando di conservare al massimo le risorse naturali e culturali. Essa è anche consapevole della crescente importanza del turismo sostenibile e responsabile non solo per i prestatori di servizi turistici, ma anche per i consumatori.

Sebbene la Commissione non disponga di un elenco di imprese specifiche che praticano il turismo sostenibile nell'UE, essa incoraggia e segue con interesse le iniziative dell'industria del turismo in tal senso, come, tra l'altro, la gestione ambientale e i sistemi di certificazione ([1]).

Esistono inoltre varie iniziative a livello dell'UE volte a incoraggiare una gestione sostenibile del turismo. Queste comprendono, tra l'altro, l'elaborazione di un sistema europeo di indicatori per la gestione sostenibile delle destinazioni turistiche (ETIS) ([2]). Anche il marchio di qualità ecologica dell'UE «Ecolabel UE» ([3]) o il sistema di ecogestione e audit EMAS ([4]), destinato a facilitare una sana gestione ambientale per le imprese, possono essere utilizzati dal settore turistico.

Per sensibilizzare i turisti e minimizzare il loro impatto ambientale, la Commissione ha cofinanziato numerosi progetti transnazionali per il turismo in bicicletta o a piedi ([5]) e le destinazioni non tradizionali del turismo sostenibile ([6]).

([1]) A guide through the label jungle, Naturefriends International, 2014: http://www.nfi.at/dmdocuments/labelguide_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/sustainable-tourism/indicators/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/emas/index_en.htm
Un elenco di hotel e alloggi turistici registrati EMAS di tutta l'UE può essere consultato sul seguente sito:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/emas/pdf/EMAS-Accomodation_new%20layout-FINAL.pdf.
La Commissione ha pubblicato anche una scheda informativa sull'EMAS del settore turistico:
(http://ec.europa.eu/environment/emas/pdf/factsheet/EMASFactsheet_Tourism.pdf) e un documento di riferimento settoriale dell'EMAS sulle migliori pratiche di gestione ambientale nel settore turistico che descrive tutte le attuali migliori pratiche e i parametri di eccellenza per il settore turistico:
(http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/activities/emas/documents/TOURISM_BP_REF_DOC_2012j.pdf).
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/cycling-tourism/index_en.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/eden/index_en.htm

Tali iniziative contribuiscono alla crescita sostenibile del turismo. È sempre più evidente che investire nel turismo sostenibile può ridurre il costo dell'energia, dell'acqua e dei rifiuti e accrescere il valore della biodiversità, degli ecosistemi e del patrimonio culturale, con significativi vantaggi ambientali come la riduzione del consumo dell'acqua (18 %), dell'utilizzo di energia (44 %) e delle emissioni di CO_2 (52 %) ([7]).

([7]) Relazione 2011 dell'UNEP (Programma per l'ambiente delle Nazioni Unite) Towards a Green Economy, Capitolo sul turismo — Investing in Energy and Resource Efficiency.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002626/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: The rise of environmentally sustainable tourist facilities

For several years now, a new phenomenon has gradually been sweeping across the Italian tourism sector, with the ultimate aim being to develop an innovative and sustainable form of tourism. More specifically, this phenomenon relates to the spread of B&B establishments that not only invest in clean energy sources and new technologies, but also do everything possible to save energy and recycle and reuse materials. These establishments go to great lengths to keep their environmental impact to a minimum — for example, they use natural, anti-bacterial paints and are fitted with eco-friendly parquet floors, low-consumption LED lamps and heating systems equipped with eco-friendly bioethanol fireplaces that do not disperse unnecessary amounts of heat. In addition, the food they serve is often based on organic produce sourced from the local area, which helps local producers and provides a further boost to the region.

Even though this phenomenon is by no means exclusive to Italy, the geography and traditional output of Italy's different regions can guarantee a wide variety of high-quality produce that is more than suited to this sustainable business model.

1. Can the Commission give any information as to how widespread this form of activity is in other Member States?

2. Does it have a list of successful businesses to hand, including both those new to the sector and those who have sought to adapt their practices to a more environmentally sustainable form of management, which could inspire other businesses to follow suit?

3. Are there any programmes in the sector for exchanging experience and good practices?

4. Can the Commission indicate what impact the tourism sector could have on reducing harmful emissions and meeting the objectives of the EU in relation to environmental sustainability and combating climate change?

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

The Commission acknowledges that tourism needs to be managed in a responsible and sustainable manner to avoid negative impacts on the environment, striving for the utmost in the preservation of natural and cultural resources. It is also conscious of the fact that sustainable and responsible tourism is gaining more and more importance, not only in the eyes of tourism service providers, but also of consumers.

Although the Commission does not have a list of specific businesses following a sustainable tourism approach across the EU, it encourages and follows with interest the initiatives of the tourism industry in this sense, such as, among others, environmental management and certification schemes ([1]).

Furthermore, several EU level initiatives exist to encourage sustainable tourism management. These include, among others, the development of a European System of Indicators for the Sustainable Management of Tourist Destinations (ETIS) ([2]). Also the EU Eco-label ([3]) or the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) ([4]) aiming at facilitating sound environmental management for businesses, can be used by the tourism sector.

To raise tourists' awareness and minimise their environmental impact, the Commission has co-financed numerous transnational projects related to cycle or hiking tourism ([5]) and to non-traditional sustainable tourism destinations ([6]).

([1]) A guide through the label jungle, Naturefriends' International, 2014: http://www.nfi.at/dmdocuments/labelguide_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/sustainable-tourism/indicators/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/emas/index_en.htm
A list of EMAS Registered Hotels and Tourism Accommodations across the EU can be accessed via the following hyperlink:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/emas/pdf/EMAS-Accomodation_new%20layout-FINAL.pdf
The Commission also published a factsheet on EMAS in the tourism sector (http://ec.europa.eu/environment/emas/pdf/factsheet/EMASFactsheet_Tourism.pdf) and an EMAS Sectoral Reference Document on Best Environmental Management Practice in the Tourism Sector which describes all the current best practices and benchmarks of excellence for the tourism sector (http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/activities/emas/documents/TOURISM_BP_REF_DOC_2012j.pdf).
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/cycling-tourism/index_en.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/eden/index_en.htm

These initiatives contribute to the sustainable growth of tourism. There is increasing evidence that investing in sustainable tourism can reduce the cost of energy, water and waste, and enhance the value of biodiversity, ecosystems and cultural heritage: significant environmental benefits could include reductions in water consumption (18%), energy use (44%) and CO_2 emissions (52%) ([7]).

([7]) United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) 2011 Report 'Towards a Green Economy', Chapter on Tourism — Investing in Energy and Resource Efficiency.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002627/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Uso dei social network per l'analisi e la prevenzione dei rischi sociali

I social network potrebbero rivelarsi un valido strumento per prevedere e potenzialmente prevenire la diffusione del virus HIV, causa dell'AIDS, sindrome da immunodeficienza acquisita. Questo è quello che emerge da uno studio di un'équipe scientifica californiana.

Il team ha raccolto 550 milioni di messaggi apparsi fra il maggio e il dicembre del 2012 su un noto social network e li ha poi filtrati, evidenziando quelli che contenevano espressioni legate ad attività sessuali o all'uso di droghe, fattori di rischio per la contrazione dell'AIDS. Il campione selezionato ammontava infine a 9 880 messaggi. Gli scienziati hanno quindi localizzato geograficamente gli autori e hanno quindi incrociato le informazioni ottenute da questa mappa con quelle della cartina relativa alla diffusione dell'AIDS negli Stati Uniti.

Sorprendentemente, i ricercatori hanno individuato una correlazione collimante tra la mappa dei messaggi online e quella dei casi dichiarati di HIV, suggerendo che il monitoraggio dei social network potrebbe dare un contributo importante nella prevenzione della malattia e l'individuazione di possibili «focolai».

In merito a quanto detto, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. È a conoscenza dello studio?

2. Ritiene che lo studio in questione possa davvero dare un contributo al monitoraggio, dal momento che non copre l'interezza della popolazione e, per su natura, tende a dare una visione selettiva?

3. Ritiene che in generale, l'analisi dei social network possa dare un contributo nell'analisi sociale per la previsione e la prevenzione di determinati problemi?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare.

2. Il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (CEPCM) ha affermato che lo studio, pur giungendo a risultati interessanti, deve essere integrato da altri studi in altre zone.

3. Due progetti ([1]) finanziati nell'ambito del Programma dell'UE in materia di sanità 2009-2013 hanno analizzato le pertinenti reti sociali al fine di entrare in contatto con specifici gruppi di popolazione a rischio elevato di HIV/AIDS. Questa metodologia si è dimostrata particolarmente utile poiché questi gruppi a rischio sono spesso occulti a livello sociale a causa della discriminazione e, spesso, della criminalizzazione di alcuni comportamenti che generano rischi. I membri di questi gruppi possono pertanto sovente essere identificati solo attraverso la collaborazione tra pari. I progetti hanno fornito informazioni utili, ad esempio, in merito alla copertura garantita dell'assicurazione sanitaria, alle barriere di accesso all'assistenza sanitaria, alla copertura fornita dai servizi di prevenzione e di assistenza sanitaria, ai comportamenti a rischio riferiti dai soggetti interessati e ai rapporti tra virus HIV e le coinfezioni.

([1]) http://www.sialon.eu/en/
http://www.tai.ee/en/tubidu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002627/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Using social networks to analyse and prevent social risks

A recent study carried out by a research team in California has revealed that social networks could prove to be a viable means of foreseeing and potentially preventing the spread of HIV, the viral precursor to AIDS (acquired immunodeficiency syndrome).

The team collated 550 million messages that had been posted on a well-known social network between May and December 2012 and then sorted through them, with all those containing expressions associated with sexual activity or drug use (the two most common ways of contracting AIDS) being flagged up. At the end of this sorting process, 9 880 such messages had been identified. Next, the researchers worked out the geographical location of the authors of each of these messages, and then checked the resulting map against that showing the prevalence of AIDS in the United States.

Surprisingly, the researchers found that there was a strong correlation between the map of online messages and the map of declared cases of HIV, which suggests that monitoring social networks could play an important role in preventing the disease and identifying any possible 'hot spots'.

1. Is the Commission aware of the study described above?

2. Does it believe that this study could genuinely supplement monitoring activities in the medical field, given that it does not cover the entire population and, due to its nature, tends to give a rather selective viewpoint?

3. Does it believe that, in general, analysing social networks could help to form a clearer picture of society and thereby foresee and prevent specific problems?

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

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

2. The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) confirmed that while study shows some interesting findings, it needs to be supported by other studies in other locations.

3. Two projects ([1]) funded under the EU Health Programme 2009-2013 have studied relevant social networks to reach out to specific population groups at high risk of acquiring HIV/AIDS. This methodology proved to be useful as such risk groups are often socially hidden due to discrimination and sometimes criminalisation of certain risk behaviour. Therefore members of these groups can often only be identified through peer to peer support. The projects provided useful information about for instance the coverage of health insurance, barriers for access to healthcare, coverage of target prevention and healthcare services, self-reported prevalence of risk behaviour and HIV and co-infections.

([1]) http://www.sialon.eu/en/ and http://www.tai.ee/en/tubidu

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002628/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI) en Lucas Hartong (NI)
(6 maart 2014)

Betreft: Begrotingsevenwicht en naleving artikel 310, lid 1 VWEU

Vandaag bevestigde Commissaris Lewandowski tijdens een debat met de leden van de Begrotingscommissie dat er voor 2014 een groot tekort aan zit te komen op de beleidsterreinen cohesie en ontwikkelingshulp. Dit onder andere als gevolg van een enorme stijging in de aanvragen aan het einde van 2013.

De rekening komt uiteindelijk bij de netto-bijdragende lidstaten terecht.

1. Wie is volgens de Commissie verantwoordelijk voor deze discrepantie tussen de inkomsten en de uitgaven van de Unie in 2014?

2. Kan de Commissie aangeven hoe vaak het al is voorgekomen dat men meer geld uit moet geven dan dat men beschikbaar heeft op de begroting?

3. Bent u met de PVV van mening dat het volgens artikel 310 lid 1 VWEU niet toegestaan is tekorten op de begroting te laten ontstaan (en deze onbalans dus in feite illegaal is)?

4. Volgens welke procedure houdt de Commissie toezicht op het aangaan van verplichtingen en dan met name de voorkoming van het aangaan van verplichtingen die de betalingsniveaus zullen overschrijden?

5. Vindt u de mobilisatie van flexibiliteitsinstrumenten en het gebruik van de contingency margin de juiste oplossing om het begrotingsevenwicht te herstellen? Zo nee, wat zou de voorkeur van de Commissie genieten?

6. Hoe gaat de Commissie voorkomen dat in de toekomst artikel 310 VWEU wederom met voeten wordt getreden?

Antwoord van de heer Lewandowski namens de Commissie
(3 april 2014)

Artikel 310, lid 1 van het VWEU bepaalt: „De ontvangsten en uitgaven van de begroting moeten in evenwicht zijn." Telkens als de Commissie de ontwerpbegroting of een ontwerp van gewijzigde begroting voorstelt, ziet zij erop toe dat dit evenwicht wordt gerespecteerd. Hetzelfde geldt bij de goedkeuring van de eigenlijke begroting en de wijzigingen hieraan. In de praktijk betekent dit dat er net zoveel middelen van de lidstaten worden afgeroepen als er uitgaven zijn begroot.

Het geachte Parlementslid heeft het over een „tekort", maar dit is geen „tekort" op de balans van uitgaven en ontvangsten, die altijd in evenwicht moet blijven. Het gaat eerder over een achterstand aan onbetaalde betalingsaanvragen, die is ontstaan doordat de afgelopen jaren meer aanvragen zijn ingediend dan er overeenkomstige betalingskredieten in de begroting waren opgenomen, met name bij het cohesiebeleid. De betalingsachterstand is grotendeels afkomstig van in december ontvangen betalingsaanvragen die het volgende jaar moesten worden uitbetaald.

De Commissie kan niet meer geld uitgeven dan er in de begroting beschikbaar is en indien er dus meer betalingskredieten nodig zijn, zoals het geval was in 2013, kan zij een ontwerp van gewijzigde begroting voorstellen om meer betalingen te kunnen verrichten.

Tijdens de begrotingsprocedure 2014 zijn de Commissie en het Europees Parlement het eens geworden over een gezamenlijke verklaring dat „de jaarlijkse fluctuaties van het totale niveau van betalingen beheerst zullen worden door gebruik te maken van de overkoepelende marge voor betalingen. Zo nodig kan de Commissie ook gebruikmaken van het flexibiliteitsinstrument en de marge voor onvoorziene uitgaven, overeengekomen in de MFK-verordening."

Wat het aangaan van verplichtingen betreft, zijn er geen sancties aan de lidstaten te betalen in geval van vertraging bij terugbetaling van middelen onder gedeeld beheer.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002628/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI) and Lucas Hartong (NI)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Budgetary equilibrium and compliance with Article 310(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

Today, Commissioner Lewandowski confirmed during a debate with the members of the Committee on Budgets that there is set to be a severe deficit in 2014 in the policy areas of cohesion and development aid. This is due in part to the enormous rise in applications at the end of 2013.

Ultimately, the bill will be footed by the net contributing Member States.

1. In the Commission's view, who is responsible for this discrepancy between the Union's income and expenditure in 2014?

2. Can the Commission indicate how often it has been necessary in the past to pay out more money than is available in the budget?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it is not permitted, pursuant to Article 310(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, for budget deficits to arise (and this imbalance is therefore actually illegal)?

4. How does the Commission monitor the incurrence of liabilities and specifically the prevention of the incurrence of liabilities which will exceed the disbursement levels?

5. Does the Commission think that the mobilisation of flexibility instruments and the use of the contingency margin is the right way to restore the budgetary equilibrium? If not, what would be the Commission's preferred approach?

6. How does the Commission intend to prevent any future violations of Article 310 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

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

Article 310(1) of the TFEU states that 'the revenue and expenditure shown in the budget shall be in balance.' The Commission ensures that this balance is maintained every time it proposes either the draft budget, or draft amending budgets to the annual budget, and each time the budget or amendments to it are adopted. This is done by ensuring that the call for own resources from the Member States corresponds with the level of expenditure budgeted.

The Honourable Member refers to a 'deficit', but this is not a 'deficit' in relation to the balance between expenditure and revenue, which must always be in equilibrium. Rather, it is a backlog of unpaid payment applications which has arisen because, notably in relation to Cohesion Policy, the level of payment claims over the last years has been higher than the corresponding level of payment appropriations in the budget. The backlog mostly derives from payment applications received in December that have to be paid the following year.

The Commission cannot pay out more money than is available in the budget, and so if more payment appropriations are required, as was the case in 2013, it can propose a draft amending budget to increase payments.

The Commission and the European Parliament agreed a joint statement in the course of the 2014 budget procedure, to the effect that 'the annual fluctuations in the global level of payments would be managed through the use of the global margin for payments. If needed, the Commission may also have recourse to the Flexibility Instrument and the Contingency Margin agreed upon in the draft MFF Regulation.'

With respect to the incurrence of liabilities, there are no penalties payable to the Member States in the case of delays in the payment of reimbursements for funds in shared management.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002629/14
an die Kommission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: REACH: Aufnahme von Chromtrioxid in die Liste der zulassungspflichtigen Stoffe

Im Wege der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 348/2013 wird Chromtrioxid in die Liste der zulassungspflichtigen Stoffe der REACH-Verordnung aufgenommen.

1. Welche Daten wurden von der Kommission bzw. von der ECHA verwendet, um die Aufnahme von Chromtrioxid in die Liste zu begründen? Welche anderen Daten wurden ggf. im Rahmen des Verfahrens geprüft? Mit welchen Methoden wurde die Prüfung des Stoffes durchgeführt?

2. Wurde im Zuge dieser Entscheidung geprüft, ob das für die Behandlung von Oberflächen ausschließlich industriell eingesetzte Chromtrioxid aufgrund anderer bestehender Rechtsvorschriften zum Schutz der Arbeitnehmer von dieser Zulassungspflicht gemäß Artikel 58 Absatz 2 der REACH-Verordnung ausgenommen werden kann? Mit welchen Argumenten und Fakten wurde die Entscheidung begründet?

3. In welcher Weise wurde der betroffene Wirtschaftszweig in der Entscheidungsfindung konsultiert?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(25. April 2014)

Chromtrioxid wurde im Rahmen der REACH-Verordnung ([1]) als ein besonders besorgniserregender Stoff (substance of very high concern — SVHC) ermittelt und auf die Liste der für eine Aufnahme in Anhang XIV infrage kommenden Stoffe gesetzt, da es die in Artikel 57 Buchstaben a und b der REACH-Verordnung festgelegten Kriterien erfüllt, weil Nachweise sowohl beim Menschen als auch beim Tier seine Einstufung als karzinogen (Kategorie 1A) und mutagen (Kategorie 1B) nach der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1272/2008 ([2]) begründen.

Die Europäische Chemikalienagentur (ECHA) empfahl Chromtrioxid als prioritären Stoff für die Aufnahme in die Liste der zulassungspflichtigen Stoffe (Anhang XIV der REACH-Verordnung), und zwar aufgrund der Verwendung dieses Stoffes in großen Mengen, wobei einige Verwendungen als weit verbreitet gelten. Die ECHA stützte ihre Empfehlung auf die in den Registrierungsdossiers vorliegenden Informationen. Demzufolge beträgt die Menge des im Geltungsbereich der Zulassung in der EU verwendeten Chromtrioxids 1 000 bis 10 000 t/Jahr; es wird an zahlreichen Standorten mit der Möglichkeit einer signifikanten Exposition der Beschäftigten in verschiedenen Anwendungen eingesetzt.

Während der dreimonatigen öffentlichen Konsultation, die der ECHA-Empfehlung vorausging ([3]), wurden nach Artikel 58 Absatz 2 der REACH-Verordnung zahlreiche Anträge auf Ausnahme von der Zulassungspflicht für bestimmte Verwendungen eingereicht. Gemäß Artikel 58 Absatz 2 können Verwendungen oder Verwendungskategorien von der Zulassungspflicht ausgenommen werden, sofern — auf der Grundlage bestehender spezifischer Rechtsvorschriften der Union mit Mindestanforderungen an den Schutz der menschlichen Gesundheit oder der Umwelt bei der Verwendung des Stoffes — das Risiko ausreichend beherrscht wird. Die ECHA kam zu dem Schluss, dass die in der EU geltenden Vorschriften zum Schutz von Arbeitnehmern die in Artikel 58 Absatz 2 festgelegten Bedingungen hinsichtlich der Verwendung von Chromtrioxid nicht erfüllen. Die Kommission stimmte mit dieser Einschätzung überein.

Während der Konsultation gingen zahlreiche Stellungnahmen der betroffenen Wirtschaftszweige ein, insbesondere aus dem Bereich Oberflächenbehandlung.

([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]) Zur Einstufung von Chromtrioxid wird in der Verordnung Nr. 1272/2008 auf die Richtlinie 67/548/EWG des Rates Bezug genommen.
([3]) Wie in Artikel 58 Absatz 4 der REACH-Verordnung vorgeschrieben.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002629/14
to the Commission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: REACH: Inclusion of chromium trioxide in the list of substances subject to authorisation

Regulation (EU) No 348/2013 includes chromium trioxide in the list of substances subject to authorisation under the REACH Regulation.

1. What data did the Commission or the ECHA use to justify the inclusion of chromium trioxide in the list? What other data were checked during the process? What methods were used to test the substance?

2. When making this decision, did the Commission or the ECHA check whether the chromium trioxide used exclusively for industrial surface treatment can be exempted from this authorisation obligation under Article 58 (2) of the REACH Regulation on the basis of other existing employee protection laws? What arguments and facts were used to support the decision?

3. How was the sector concerned consulted in the decision-making process?

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

Chromium trioxide was identified as a substance of very high concern (SVHC) under REACH ([1]) and included in the candidate list as it meets the criteria set out in Article 57(a) and (b) of REACH due to its classification as carcinogenic (Category cA) and mutagenic (Category cB) in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 ([2]) based on human and animal data.

The European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) recommended chromium trioxide as a priority substance for inclusion in the list of substances subject to authorisation (Annex XIV of REACH) due to its use in high volumes, with some uses considered as wide-dispersive. ECHA based its recommendation on the information available in the registration dossiers. According to it the amount of chromium trioxide used in the scope of authorisation in the EU is in the range of 1 000 — 10 000 t/y, and at a large number of sites, with the potential for significant worker exposure in a number of uses.

During the three months public consultation preceding the ECHA recommendation ([3]) numerous requests were submitted for exemptions for certain uses in accordance with Article 58(2) REACH. Article 58(2) allows exempting a use or category of uses from the authorisation requirement provided that, on the basis of existing specific Union legislation imposing minimum requirements relating to the protection of human health or the environment for the use of the substance, the risk is properly controlled. ECHA concluded that the existing EU worker protection legislation did not meet the conditions set out in Article 58(2) regarding the uses of chromium trioxide. The Commission agreed with that assessment.

During the consultation, numerous comments were submitted by the sectors concerned, in particular the surface treatment sector.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals.
([2]) For classification of chromium trioxide, Regulation 1272/2008 refers to the Council Directive 67/548/EEC.
([3]) As required by Article 58(4) REACH.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002630/14
an die Kommission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Ende der Abfalleigenschaft von Braunkohlenflugasche

Der Artikel 6 (1) der Abfallrahmenrichtlinie ist darauf gerichtet, die Recyclingmärkte zu unterstützen, indem einheitliche Qualitätsststandards für sekundäre Rohstoffe eingeführt werden und Rechtssicherheit geschaffen wird.

1. Sind der Kommission durch die Europäische Union geförderte und/oder betreute Modellvorhaben bekannt, in deren Mittelpunkt die Wandlung von mineralischen Abfällen zu Produkten für die Bauindustrie steht?

2. An welchem Punkt endet nach Auffassung der Kommission konkret die Abfalleigenschaft von Braunkohlenflugasche für den Einsatz in der Bauindustrie?

3. Ist der Kommission bekannt, wie andere Mitgliedstaaten den Artikel 6 (1) der Abfallrahmenrichtlinie in nationales Recht umgesetzt haben?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(13. Mai 2014)

1. Aus dem Umweltprogramm LIFE wurden verschiedene Projekte kofinanziert, die mit der Umwandlung mineralischer Abfälle in Produkte für die Bauindustrie zusammenhängen ([1]). Im Rahmen der europäischen Innovationspartnerschaft für Rohstoffe hat die Kommission ebenfalls eine Reihe diesbezüglicher Zusagen erhalten, die von der hochrangigen Lenkungsgruppe anerkannt wurden.

Das Siebte Rahmenprogramm für Forschung und technologische Entwicklung (RP7) finanziert Vorhaben zur stofflichen Verwertung von Bau- und Abbruchabfällen zur Herstellung von recycelten Baustoffen ([2]). Außerdem enthält das Arbeitsprogramm 2014-2015 des neuen Rahmenprogramms für Forschung und Innovation „Horizont 2020“ eine spezielle Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen zu Abfällen als Ressource für Recycling, Wiederverwendung und stoffliche Verwertung von Rohmaterial („Waste: a Resource to Recycle, Reuse and Recover Raw Materials“), in der ein Themenschwerpunkt das Recycling von Rohstoffen aus Produkten und Gebäuden zum Gegenstand hat.

2. Es gibt keine EU-weit geltenden Kriterien für das Ende der Abfalleigenschaft von Braunkohlenflugasche, und der Kommission sind auch keine diesbezüglichen nationalen Kriterien für solche Abfallströme bekannt. Insofern ist es Sache der Mitgliedstaaten, von Fall zu Fall unter Berücksichtigung der einschlägigen, in Artikel 6 Absatz 4 der Richtlinie 2008/98/EG ([3]) wiedergegebenen Rechtsprechung festzulegen, wann das Ende der Abfalleigenschaft vorliegt.

3. Gemäß Artikel 40 Absatz 2 der Richtlinie 2008/98/EG müssen die Mitgliedstaaten der Kommission den Wortlaut der wichtigsten nationalen Rechtsvorschriften zur Umsetzung der genannten Richtlinie mitteilen. Die Liste dieser Maßnahmen ist auf EUR-Lex unter dem Link „Nationale Durchführungsmaßnahmen“ abrufbar.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm?fuseaction=search.dspPage&n_proj_id=3093&docType=pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm?fuseaction=search.dspPage&n_proj_id=3730
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm?fuseaction=search.dspPage&n_proj_id=3997

([2]) http://www.ircow.eu/
http://www.c2ca.eu/

([3]) ABl. L 312 vom 22.11.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002630/14
to the Commission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: End-of-waste status of lignite fly ash

Article 6 (1) of the directive on waste aims to support the recycling markets by introducing uniform quality standards for secondary raw materials and creating legal certainty.

1. Is the Commission aware of pilot projects promoted and/or overseen by the European Union which focus on the conversion of mineral waste into products for the building industry?

2. In the Commission's opinion, at which precise point does lignite fly ash acquire end-of-waste status for use in the building industry?

3. Does the Commission know how other Member States have transposed Article 6 (1) of the directive on waste into national law?

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

1. The LIFE Environment Programme has been used to co-finance various projects related to the conversion of mineral waste into products for the building industry ([1]). Within the European Innovation Partnership on Raw Materials, the Commission has received, and the High-Level Steering Group has recognised, a number of commitments that are also related to this.

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) is funding projects aiming at the recovery of Construction and Demolition (C&D) Waste for the production of recycled building materials ([2]). Furthermore, the new Framework Programme for Research and Innovation 'Horizon 2020', in its work programme 2014-2015, includes a specific call for proposals on 'Waste: a Resource to Recycle, Reuse and Recover Raw Materials', in which a specific topic addresses the recycling of raw materials from products and buildings.

2. There are no EU-wide end-of-waste (EoW) criteria for lignite fly ash and the Commission is not aware of any EoW criteria set at national level for this waste stream. Thus, the point for this waste to reach the EoW status is determined by Member States on a case-by-case basis taking into account the applicable case law as reflected in Article 6 (4) of Directive 2008/98/EC ([3]).

3. Member States are required under Article 40(2) of Directive 2008/98/EC to notify to the Commission the main provisions transposing the directive. The list of those transposition measures is available through EUR-lex database under 'National execution measures'.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm?fuseaction=search.dspPage&n_proj_id=3093&docType=pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm?fuseaction=search.dspPage&n_proj_id=3730
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm?fuseaction=search.dspPage&n_proj_id=3997
([2]) http://www.ircow.eu/
http://www.c2ca.eu/
([3]) OJ L 312 of 22.11.2008.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002631/14
an die Kommission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Verwertung von Darmpaketen aus BSE-freien Mitgliedstaaten und Drittstaaten

Die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 999/2001 sieht einen differenzierten Umgang mit Tiergeweben vor, je nachdem, welche Statusklasse für den Herkunfts- oder Haltungsmitgliedstaat bzw. den Herkunfts- oder Haltungsdrittstaat des Tieres in Bezug auf das Auftreten von BSE in ihrem Hoheitsgebiet festgestellt wurde.

1. Kann die Kommission bestätigen, dass für Tiergewebe aus Mitgliedstaaten und aus Drittstaaten derselben Statusklasse die gleichen Anforderungen an die Weiterbehandlung und Beseitigung gelten?

2. Sind der Kommission Fälle bekannt, in denen Darmpakete aus BSE-freien Drittstaaten in das geografische Gebiet der EU eingeführt wurden, während Darmpakete in BSE-freien Mitgliedstaaten in Tierkörperbeseitigungsanstalten abgeliefert werden müssen?

3. Sind Möglichkeiten vorgesehen, nach denen Rinderschlachtbetriebe in BSE-freien Mitgliedstaaten Darmpakete selbst verwerten dürfen, ohne sie an die Tierkörperbeseitigungsanstalten abzuführen?

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

Auf die Frage zur Beseitigung von aus Mitgliedstaaten und Drittstaaten stammenden Tiergeweben aus Gründen, die mit der bovinen spongiformen Encephalopathie (BSE) zusammenhängen, verweist die Kommission auf ihre Antwort auf die vorhergehende schriftliche Anfrage E-008891/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002631/14
to the Commission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Recycling of intestines from BSE-free Member States and non-EU countries

Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 provides for differentiated handling of animal tissue, depending on the category classifying the Member State or non-EU country of origin or residence of the animal on the basis of the occurrence of BSE in its territory.

1. Can the Commission confirm that the processing and disposal of animal tissue from Member States and non-EU countries of the same category are subject to the same requirements?

2. Is the Commission aware of any cases in which intestines from BSE-free non-EU countries were imported into the geographical area of the EU while, in BSE-free Members States, intestines have to be delivered to rendering plants?

3. Is there any possibility of permitting cattle slaughterhouses in BSE-free Member States to recycle intestines themselves without sending them to rendering plants?

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

Regarding the question about the disposal of animal tissues for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) related reasons from Member States and non-EU countries, the Commission refers to its answer to previous Written Question E-008891/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002633/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Dog management in Romania

In light of the European Parliament's Agriculture Committee voting in favour of a motion for resolution on stray animals on 18 March, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission have competence to intervene on the issue of stray dogs in Romania, specifying whether this competence lies within the area of Public Health and/or other areas of EU competences?

2. Does the Commission have any information about whether Romania's Rabies Eradication Program mentions dog control?

3. Could the Commission confirm whether, to the best of its knowledge, EU funds might be being used, directly or indirectly, to finance the so-called 'Catch & Kill' dog management business in Romania and whether it is aware of accusations that such funds are being channelled through local administration budgets for this purpose?

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

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2012 and E-005276/2013 [1] which address the issues of stray dogs and of dog population management and the EU competence on this matter.

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-001377/2014, E-01404/2014 and P-001898/2014 which address the issues of the dog control within the framework of the EU co-funded rabies eradication programme for Romania.

EU competences do not allow the Commission to fund stray dogs control programs.

---

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002634/14
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)
(6 mars 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — L'Union européenne soutient-elle l'extrême-droite?

Svoboda, parti national-socialiste (nazi) qui encadre l'insurrection ukrainienne d'Euro-Maidan, a été soutenu par Catherine Ashton, qui s'est affichée aux côtés de son président, Oleh Tyahnybok. En faisant cela, la représentante de la diplomatie de l'UE apporte le soutien de l'Union aux forces d'extrême-droite en Ukraine. Qui lui en a donné le mandat?

Certains membres du nouveau gouvernement tiennent des positions en contradiction totale avec les valeurs de l'UE, comme le Parlement européen l'a d'ailleurs déclaré dans l'une de ses résolutions, en décembre 2012 ([1]). Voilà ce que l'on disait de Svoboda à l'époque: «les opinions racistes, antisémites et xénophobes sont contraires aux valeurs et principes fondamentaux de l'Union européenne et, par conséquent, (…) invite les partis démocratiques siégeant à la Verkhovna Rada (Assemblée ukrainienne) à ne pas s'associer avec ce parti, ni à approuver ou former de coalition avec ce dernier.» Catherine Ashton a-t-elle conscience que sa voix ne peut représenter la diplomatie de l'UE à partir du moment où elle ne respecte pas les votes du Parlement?

Enfin, Catherine Ashton sait-elle que ses nouveaux amis défilent sous le drapeau rouge et noir de l'OUN-B, les collaborateurs nazis qui exterminèrent les juifs et les Polonais dans le cadre de la machine de guerre nazie?

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

Il n'existe aucune preuve concrète du renforcement des activités antisémites en Ukraine depuis la mise en place du nouveau gouvernement. Ces dernières semaines, nombre d'éminents dirigeants juifs, tels Josef Zisels, président de l'association des communautés et organisations juives d'Ukraine, ont rejeté les rapports faisant état de pressions ou de politiques antisémites exercées par le gouvernement ukrainien. Le nouveau gouverneur de l'oblast de Dnipropetrovsk, Ihor Kolomoyskyy, est un membre actif bien connu de la communauté juive d'Ukraine. L'UE estime essentiel que le gouvernement ukrainien comprenne des ministres défendant toutes les régions et groupes de population du pays afin d'assurer la pleine protection des minorités nationales. Selon le Haut commissaire de l'OSCE pour les minorités nationales et sous-secrétaire général des Nations unies aux Droits de l'homme Ivan Šimonović, la situation est très préoccupante en Crimée ukrainienne, où les Ukrainiens et les Tatars sont particulièrement exposés suite aux mesures prises illégalement par la Russie pour annexer la péninsule. L'UE presse toutes les parties à assurer la sécurité et le respect des Droits de l'homme, en particulier les droits des minorités, pour tous ceux qui se trouvent sur le territoire ukrainien, quelle que soit leur ethnie, leur religion ou leur origine nationale. Toutes les formes de racisme et de xénophobie sont inacceptables.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=FR&reference=P7-TA-2012-507.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002634/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Does the European Union support the far right?

Svoboda, the national-socialist (Nazi) party behind the Euro-Maidan Ukrainian insurrection, has been supported by Catherine Ashton, who has appeared beside its leader, Oleh Tyahnybok. In doing so, the EU diplomacy representative gives the Union's support to the far-right forces in Ukraine. Who gave her the mandate to do this?

Certain members of the new government hold views which are in complete contradiction to the values of the EU, as was furthermore declared by the European Parliament in one of its resolutions, in December 2012 ([1]). This is what was said about Svoboda at the time: 'racist, anti-Semitic and xenophobic views go against the EU's fundamental values and principles and therefore (…) appeals to pro-democratic parties in the Verkhovna Rada (Ukrainian Assembly) not to associate with, endorse or form coalitions with this party.' Is Catherine Ashton aware that, as soon as she fails to respect Parliament's votes, she cannot represent EU diplomacy?

Finally, does Catherine Ashton know that her new friends march under the red and black flag of the OUN-B, the Nazi collaborators who exterminated Jews and Poles as part of the Nazi war machine?

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

There is no concrete evidence of increased anti-Semitic activity in Ukraine since the new Government has been in place. In recent weeks, many prominent Jewish leaders, including Josef Zisels, Chairman of the Association of Jewish Communities and Organisations of Ukraine, have dismissed reports of pressure or anti-Semitic policies by the Ukrainian Government. The new Governor of Dnipropetrovsk oblast, Ihor Kolomoyskyy, is a well-known and active member of Ukraine's Jewish community. The EU believes that an inclusive Ukrainian Government that reaches out to all Ukrainian regions and population groups to ensure full protection of national minorities is essential. According to the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities and the UN Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights Ivan Šimonović, a big concern in Ukraine Crimea, where Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar groups are at particular risk following Russia's illegal steps to annex the peninsula exists. The EU urges all sides to ensure security and respect for human rights, including minority rights, for all those present on Ukrainian territory, regardless of ethnicity, religion or national origin. Racism, xenophobia of any kind are unacceptable.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=FR&reference=P7-TA-2012-507

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002636/14
alla Commissione
Guido Milana (S&D)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Etichettatura manufatti in cuoio

Il mercato europeo dei beni di consumo in pelle è privo di una regolamentazione specifica armonizzata, che stabilisca regole precise di etichettatura del manufatto e dei materiali che lo costituiscono a partire dalla loro provenienza. Il vuoto normativo ha permesso il moltiplicarsi di pratiche sleali e ingannevoli a danno dei consumatori e dell'industria conciaria europea.

Da ben tre anni la Commissione valuta l'opportunità di una regolamentazione apposita, conclusasi con una consultazione pubblica a fine gennaio 2014 volta a stabilire se consumatori e imprese sentano la necessità di un intervento comunitario.

Considerando che:

— i risultati preliminari dell'indagine della Commissione europea dimostrano la presenza di un'elevata confusione nell'uso della terminologia;

— circa l'80 % dei rispondenti ha chiesto un'azione a livello di UE sotto forma di un'etichettatura obbligatoria;

— dallo studio preliminare della consultazione era già emersa l'esigenza di trasparenza richiesta dai consumatori;

— il «pacchetto sicurezza» è fermo e rischia nuovamente di fallire nel conseguimento dell'obiettivo di attuare un'etichettatura d'origine per tutti i manufatti e loro materiali costituenti in circolazione nel mercato unico;

1. chiediamo la data di pubblicazione definitiva dei risultati della consultazione;

2. chiediamo se i provvedimenti che la Commissione intende adottare vadano nella direzione di un'etichettatura obbligatoria per dare una risposta concreta a cittadini, imprese e lavoratori in relazione alle loro ripetute richieste di una trasparenza vera e leale.

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(16 aprile 2014)

1. La consultazione pubblica è parte integrante del processo di valutazione d'impatto avviato dalla Commissione riguardo a un possibile regime UE di etichettatura attestante l'autenticità del cuoio. I risultati della consultazione pubblica saranno pubblicati entro la fine di aprile 2014. Inoltre, anche la relazione sulla valutazione d'impatto conterrà informazioni sui risultati della consultazione.

2. Nel quadro dell'attuale processo di valutazione d'impatto, è in corso uno studio realizzato da un consulente esterno per aiutare la Commissione ad effettuare la valutazione. In linea con gli orientamenti per la valutazione d'impatto ([1]), la Commissione esaminerà le diverse opzioni strategiche, tra cui il mantenimento della situazione attuale e l'introduzione di un'etichettatura obbligatoria, considerando il rapporto costo/efficacia di ciascuna opzione. In questa fase non è dunque ancora stata scelta l'opzione favorita.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/commission_guidelines/docs/iag_2009_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002636/14
to the Commission
Guido Milana (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Labelling of leather products

The European market for leather consumer goods is lacking any specific, harmonised regulation which lays down precise rules for labelling of the product and its component materials at origin. This regulatory void has allowed unfair and misleading practices to multiply, to the detriment of consumers and of the European tanning industry.

For over three years, the Commission has been assessing whether appropriate legislation is required, ending with a public consultation at the end of January 2014 intended to establish whether consumers and companies feel the need for Community intervention.

Considering that:

— the preliminary results of the European Commission's survey show the existence of a high degree of confusion as regards the use of terminology;

— around 80% of respondents requested action at EU level in the form of compulsory labelling;

— the preliminary consultation study had already revealed a demand for transparency by consumers;

— the 'safety package' is at a standstill and again risks failing to achieve the objective of implementing labelling of origin for all manufactured goods and their component materials within the single market;

1. What is the date of final publication of the results of the consultation?

2. Do the measures which the Commission intends to adopt tend towards compulsory labelling in order to give a specific response to citizens, companies and employees to their repeated requests for true and fair transparency?

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

1. The public consultation is an integral part of the impact assessment process that the Commission is currently carrying out on a possible authenticity leather labelling scheme at EU level. The results of the public consultation will be published by the end of April 2014. In addition, the impact assessment report will also provide feedback on the outcome of the consultation.

2. In the framework of the current impact assessment process, a study by an external consultant is being carried out in order to support the Commission to carry out the assessment. In line with the impact assessment Guidelines ([1]), the Commission will analyse different policy options, including a 'no action' and a compulsory labelling option, considering the cost-effectiveness of all options. Therefore, no preferred option has been chosen at this stage.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/commission_guidelines/docs/iag_2009_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002637/14
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Conseguenze sociali della crisi dell'azienda Pali Italia

L'azienda Pali Italia, produttrice fin dagli anni '80 di pali metallici destinati a sostenere dispositivi di illuminazione pubblica, nonché antenne radio e cavi dell'alta tensione, è da tempo interessata da una procedura di accordo di ristrutturazione del debito.

I 129 dipendenti della sede di Parma (frazione Pizzolese) della Pali Italia si trovano attualmente in cassa integrazione, con scadenza, eventualmente prorogabile di altri sei mesi, a maggio 2104; nonostante i ripetuti incontri tra sindacati, dirigenza dell'azienda e autorità locali, non è a tutt'oggi emerso un piano industriale condiviso che permetta di riorganizzare l'azienda evitando esuberi, pertanto l'azienda ha comunicato l'avvio di una procedura di mobilità per 114 dei 129 dipendenti della sede di Parma.

Poiché, in questo periodo di crisi, la perdita del lavoro avrebbe conseguenze gravissime e facilmente prevedibili per le famiglie dei numerosi lavoratori interessati, chiediamo alla Commissione se essa sia a conoscenza di tale situazione e quali strategie intenda eventualmente adottare per incoraggiare una maggiore cooperazione tra tutti gli attori coinvolti, istituzionali e non, al fine di evitare la perdita di posti di lavoro.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(28 aprile 2014)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza dei dettagli riguardanti l'attuale ristrutturazione dell'azienda Pali Italia e non ha la facoltà di interferire nelle decisioni dell'impresa o nel dialogo sociale interno all'impresa.

Essa esorta tuttavia le imprese ad attenersi alle buone pratiche in materia di anticipazione e gestione socialmente responsabile delle ristrutturazioni, come indicato nella sua comunicazione del 13 dicembre 2013, che istituisce un quadro di qualità UE per l'anticipazione dei cambiamenti e delle ristrutturazioni ([1]).

Per quanto riguarda il dialogo sociale la Commissione ricorda inoltre che conformemente al diritto dell'Unione ([2]), in caso di chiusura di imprese, il datore di lavoro è tenuto a rispettare i propri obblighi in materia di informazione e consultazione dei lavoratori.

Essa osserva inoltre che i lavoratori interessati possono avere diritto ad un sostegno del Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) e, purché in possesso dei requisiti necessari, del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione.

Per quanto riguarda la politica industriale, nel gennaio 2014 la Commissione ha adottato una comunicazione per un rinascimento industriale europeo ([3]). Un numero crescente di strumenti finanziari saranno messi a disposizione degli Stati membri, delle regioni e dell'industria grazie al programma Orizzonte 2020, al programma COSME e ai Fondi strutturali e di investimento europei. La Commissione suggerirebbe alle autorità competenti e alle parti interessate di esaminare come le imprese locali possano beneficiare di tali opportunità di finanziamento per sviluppare la propria posizione competitiva.

([1]) COM(2013) 882 def.
([2]) In particolare le direttive 2009/38/CE, 2002/14/CE, 98/59/CE.
([3]) COM(2014) 14 del 22.1.2014.

(*English version*)

Question for written answer E-002637/14
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Social consequences of the crisis at Pali Italia

The company Pali Italia, which since the 1980s has produced metal posts for supporting street lighting equipment, as well as radio masts and high-tension cables, has for some time been involved in a debt restructuring agreement process.

The 129 staff at the Pizzolese (Parma) site of Pali Italia are currently being paid under the Wage Guarantee Scheme until May 2014, which may be extended for a further six months; despite repeated meetings between union representatives, management and local authorities, as yet no joint business plan has emerged which allows for restructuring of the company and avoids compulsory redundancies, and therefore the company has announced a redundancy scheme for 114 of the 129 staff at the Parma site.

Since, at this time of crisis, the loss of employment would have very serious and readily foreseeable consequences for the families of the many workers involved, we ask the Commission whether it is aware of this situation and what strategies it intends to adopt in order to encourage greater cooperation between all parties involved, institutional and otherwise, so as to avoid the loss of jobs.

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

The Commission is not aware of the details of the current restructuring within Pali Italia nor does it have powers to interfere in the company's decisions or in the social dialogue procedures internal to the company.

The Commission, however, urges all companies to follow good practices on anticipation and socially responsible management of restructuring as outlined in its communication of 13 December 2013 establishing a EU Quality Framework for Anticipation of Change and Restructuring ([1]).

With regard to social dialogue, the Commission reminds that, in case of closure of undertakings, the employer has to respect his/her obligations relating to information and consultation of workers in accordance with EC law ([2]).

It would also point out that workers affected may qualify for support from the ESF and, provided that the necessary conditions are met, from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.

On industrial policy, the Commission has adopted a communication for a European industrial renaissance ([3]) in January 2014. An increasing share of financial levers will be put at the disposal of Member States, regions, and industry thanks to the Horizon 2020 Programme, COSME, and European Structural and Investment Funds. The Commission would suggest that relevant authorities and stakeholders consider how local companies could benefit of these funding opportunities to develop their competitive position.

([1]) COM(2013) 882 final.
([2]) In particular, Directives 2009/38/EC, 2002/14/EC and 98/59/EC.
([3]) COM(2014) 14, 22.1.2014.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002638/14
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(6 maart 2014)

Betreft: Subsidieverlening aan „Notre Europe — Jacques Delors Institute”

In 2012 heeft het Jacques Delors Institute EUR 1 350 000 aan inkomsten ontvangen. Bijna de helft daarvan is afkomstig uit het „Europe for Citizens Programme” van uw Commissie ([1]). In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Kunt u aangeven hoeveel geld de Commissie exact aan het Jacques Delors Institute heeft gegeven in 2012, 2013 en het huidige verkiezingsjaar 2014?

2. Zijn er buiten het Jacques Delors Institute nog meer stichtingen, instellingen dan wel (semi) NGO's die in 2013 en 2014 een EU-bijdrage hebben ontvangen via het „Europe for Citizens programme”?

Op 25 februari jl. schreef Yves Bertoncini, directeur van het Jacques Delors Institute: „It is hardly surprising, then, that higher-than-normal popular support is going to political parties who slam the EU. Those wishing to destroy the European integration have no positive proposals to address the problems and fears they exploit and absolutely no chance of obtaining a majority at the European Parliament.” en: „The European election campaign must naturally draw positive attention to the opportunities and advantages of European integration, for example in terms of economic growth and employment or human exchanges. But it must not leave the fear being invoked only by „populists”, whose increased popularity is both an ineffective solution and an additional threat to Europeans” ([2]).

3. Kunt u aangeven hoe het „Europe for Citizens Programme” Europa via subsidie aan dit Jacques Delors Institute dichter bij de burger tracht te brengen en dan met name het groeiende eurosceptische deel van het electoraat? Kunt u wellicht uitleggen hoe Europa „for the citizens” is, terwijl tegelijkertijd een significant deel van die „citizens” wordt buitengesloten door dit soort uitspraken?

4. Vindt de Commissie dat een stichting die wordt gesubsidieerd door uw Commissie zich op bovenstaande wijze mag mengen in de Europese verkiezingen? Zo ja, bent u niet van mening dat u zich tijdens de verkiezingen onafhankelijk en neutraal moet opstellen? Zo nee, wat gaat u hieraan doen?

5. Vindt u de uitspraken van de directeur van dit door uw Commissie gesubsidieerde Jacques Delors Institute getuigen van respect voor de parlementaire democratie in het algemeen en het werk van de democratisch door het volk gekozen eurosceptische europarlementsleden in het bijzonder?

6. Bent u voornemens de directeur van het Jacques Delors Institute tot de politieke orde te roepen? Zo nee, waarom niet? Zo ja, op welke termijn?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(7 april 2014)

Het programma „Europa voor de burger” ([3]) biedt structurele steun aan Europese organisaties die onderzoek naar overheidsbeleid doen, en aan Europese maatschappelijke organisaties.

In het kader van het programma „Europa voor de burger” (2007-2013) kreeg de organisatie „Notre Europe-Jacques Delorsinstituut” in 2012 een exploitatiesubsidie van 500 000 EUR, en in 2013 een exploitatiesubsidie van 500 000 EUR en een projectsubsidie van 195 000 EUR. Aangezien het nieuwe „Europa voor de burger”-programma nog niet in werking is getreden op 1 januari 2014, zoals eerst gepland, werd voor het jaar 2014 nog geen subsidie toegekend.

Het nieuwe „Europa voor de burger”-programma beoogt onder andere de democratische en burgerparticipatie aan te moedigen op het niveau van de Unie, door het inzicht van burgers in de beleidsvorming van de Unie te ontwikkelen en door de mogelijkheden tot maatschappelijke en interculturele betrokkenheid en vrijwilligersactiviteiten op het niveau van de Unie te bevorderen. Met het programma zal worden getracht om Europa dichter bij alle burgers, inclusief de eurosceptische burgers, te brengen, door hun de mogelijkheid te bieden hun ideeën, angst en hoop uit te drukken via projecten die door hen werden ontwikkeld, met het volste respect voor de beginselen van diversiteit, pluralisme en vrije meningsuiting.

([1]) http://www.notre-europe.eu/media/annualreport2012-notreeurope-jacquesdelorsinstitute.pdf?pdf=ok (p. 31).
([2]) http://www.notre-europe.eu/media/anodetofear-bertoncini-ne-jdi-feb14.pdf?pdf=ok.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/index_en.htm

Organisaties die in het kader van de „Europa voor de burger"-programma's exploitatiesubsidies krijgen, zoals het „Notre Europe-Jacques Delorsinstituut", moeten werkprogramma's opzetten die in overeenstemming zijn met de doelstellingen van het programma, die door het Europees Parlement zijn bevestigd, toen het heeft ingestemd met de ontwerpverordening van de Raad tot oprichting van het „Europa voor de burger"-programma op 18 november 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002638/14
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Granting of a subsidy to 'Notre Europe — Jacques Delors Institute'

In 2012, the Jacques Delors Institute received income of EUR 1 350 000, with almost half of this revenue coming from the Commission's 'Europe for Citizens Programme' ([1]). In the light of the above:

1. Can the Commission indicate precisely how much money the Commission gave to the Jacques Delors Institute in 2012, 2013 and the current election year of 2014?

2. Can the Commission confirm whether, in addition to the Jacques Delors Institute, any other organisations, institutions or (semi-)NGOs received an EU contribution through the 'Europe for Citizens programme' in 2013 and 2014?

On 25 February 2013, Yves Bertoncini, director of the Jacques Delors Institute, wrote: 'It is hardly surprising, then, that higher-than-normal popular support is going to political parties who slam the EU. Those wishing to destroy the European integration have no positive proposals to address the problems and fears they exploit and absolutely no chance of obtaining a majority at the European Parliament.' and: 'The European election campaign must naturally draw positive attention to the opportunities and advantages of European integration, for example in terms of economic growth and employment or human exchanges. But it must not leave the fear being invoked only by "populists", whose increased popularity is both an ineffective solution and an additional threat to Europeans' ([2]).

3. Can the Commission indicate how the 'Europe for Citizens Programme' is seeking to bring Europe closer to its citizens, and in particular the growing Eurosceptic constituent of the electorate, by way of the subsidy to this Jacques Delors Institute? Can it perhaps explain how Europe is 'for the citizens', while a significant proportion of these 'citizens' are being excluded by such statements?

4. Does the Commission believe that an organisation which it subsidises should interfere in the European elections in the abovementioned sense? If so, does it not think that it should adopt an independent and neutral approach during the elections? If not, what does it intend to do about it?

5. Does it think that the statements made by the director of this Jacques Delors Institute, which is subsidised by the Commission, are respectful of parliamentary democracy in general and in particular of the work of the Eurosceptic MEPs who have been democratically elected by the people?

6. Does it intend to take action to bring the director of the Jacques Delors Institute into line politically? If not, why not? If so, when will this be done?

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

The Europe for Citizens Programme ([3]) provides structural support for European public policy research organisations and for European civil society organisations.

Within the Europe for Citizens Programme (2007-2013), the organisation 'Notre Europe — Jacques Delors Institute' was awarded an operating grant of EUR 500 000 in 2012 as well as an operating grant of EUR 500 000 and a project grant of EUR 195 000 in 2013. As the new Europe for Citizens Programme (2014-2020) has not entered into force on 1 January 2014 as foreseen, so far no grant was awarded for the year 2014.

One of the objectives of the new Europe for Citizens Programme will be to encourage the democratic and civic participation of citizens at Union level, by developing citizens understanding of the Union policy-making process and promoting opportunities for societal and intercultural engagement and volunteering at Union level. The programme will seek to bring Europe closer to all citizens including Eurosceptic citizens by giving them the opportunity to express their ideas, fears and hopes in projects developed by them in full respect of the principles of diversity, pluralism and freedom of speech.

([1]) http://www.notre-europe.eu/media/annualreport2012-notreeurope-jacquesdelorsinstitute.pdf?pdf=ok (p. 31).
([2]) http://www.notre-europe.eu/media/anodetofear-bertoncini-ne-jdi-feb14.pdf?pdf=ok
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/index_en.htm

Organisations receiving operating grants within the Europe for Citizens Programme such as 'Notre Europe — Jacques Delors Institute' have to develop work programmes in line with the objectives of the programme that have been confirmed by the European Parliament as it gave its consent to the draft Council Regulation setting up the Europe for Citizens Programme on 18 November 2013.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-002639/14
aan de Commissie
Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE)
(6 maart 2014)

Betreft: Betrokkenheid van het Europees Parlement bij het Europees semester

De cyclus van het Europees semester vangt aan met de publicatie van de jaarlijkse groeianalyse, waarin de Commissie een overzicht geeft van de economische prioriteiten van de EU. Op basis van dit Commissiedocument stelt de Europese Raad jaarlijks richtsnoeren vast voor het economisch beleid. In de periode 2011-2013 zijn de door de Commissie aangegeven economische prioriteiten door de Europese Raad ongewijzigd overgenomen, ondanks talloze aanmerkingen hierop van het Parlement.

In zijn resolutie van 25 februari 2014 over „het Europees semester voor economische beleidscoördinatie: sociale en werkgelegenheidsaspecten in de jaarlijkse groeianalyse 2014" dringt het Parlement aan op een interinstitutioneel akkoord om het Parlement te betrekken bij de opstelling en goedkeuring van de jaarlijkse groeianalyse.

1. Wanneer en op welke wijze zal de Commissie een vervolg geven aan het verzoek van het Parlement om een interinstitutioneel akkoord ter waarborging van de democratische legitimiteit van beleidsmaatregelen die genomen worden in het kader van het Europees semester?

2. Hoe kan er volgens de Commissie het best voor gezorgd worden dat het Parlement daadwerkelijk de bevoegdheid heeft om de door de Commissie in haar jaarlijkse groeianalyse voorgestelde economische prioriteiten te wijzigen voordat deze door de Raad en de Europese Raad worden besproken?

Antwoord van de heer Barroso namens de Commissie
(15 april 2014)

De jaarlijkse groeianalyse vormt de bijdrage van de Commissie tot de discussie over de prioriteiten van het economisch beleid door de Europese Raad. Zij schetst het standpunt van de Commissie over de economische prioriteiten voor het komende jaar. Het doel van de jaarlijkse groeianalyse is om een debat op gang te brengen op Europees niveau, namelijk met het Parlement en de Raad.

In haar „Blauwdruk voor een hechte Economische en Monetaire Unie" heeft de Commissie opgemerkt dat een grotere betrokkenheid van het Parlement bij de besprekingen over de jaarlijkse groeianalyse van de Commissie mogelijk is. Op cruciale momenten tijdens het Europees semester zouden er immers twee debatten kunnen worden gehouden in het Parlement, namelijk vóór de Europese Raad de jaarlijkse groeianalyse van de Commissie bespreekt en vóór de vaststelling door de Raad van de landenspecifieke aanbevelingen (CSR's).

Met dit doel voor ogen heeft de Commissie het idee gelanceerd van een interinstitutioneel akkoord tussen het Europees Parlement, de Raad en de Commissie. Het zou echter de taak van de volgende Commissie zijn om deze mogelijkheid te onderzoeken.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002639/14
to the Commission
Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Involvement of the European Parliament in the European Semester

The European Semester cycle starts with the publication of the Annual Growth Survey (AGS), in which the EU's economic priorities are outlined. The European Council issues its yearly economic policy guidance on the basis of this document, which is drafted by the Commission. In the period 2011-2013 the economic priorities set by the Commission have been endorsed by the European Council without changes, despite Parliament's numerous comments.

In its resolution of 25 February 2014 on 'The European Semester for economic policy coordination: Employment and Social Aspects in the Annual Growth Survey 2014', Parliament calls for an interinstitutional agreement in order to involve Parliament in the drafting and approval of the AGS.

1. How and when is the Commission going to follow up on Parliament's request to enter into an interinstitutional agreement in order to ensure sufficient democratic legitimacy of the policies pursued in the European Semester?

2. In the Commission's view, what is the best way to ensure that Parliament has the de facto power to amend the economic priorities proposed by the Commission in the Annual Growth Survey before they are discussed by the Council and the European Council?

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

The Annual Growth Survey is the Commission's contribution to the discussion of economic policy priorities by the European Council. It outlines the Commission's view on the economic priorities for the coming year. The purpose of the Annual Growth Survey is to open a debate at EU level, namely with the Parliament and the Council.

In its 'Blueprint for a deep and genuine Economic and Monetary Union', the Commission suggested that a stronger involvement of the Parliament in the discussions on the Commission's Annual Growth Survey could be envisaged. In particular, two debates in Parliament could be held at key moments of the European Semester, namely before the European Council discusses the Commission's Annual Growth Survey and before the adoption by the Council of the country-specific recommendations (CSRs).

In this context, the Commission put forward the idea that this could be achieved through an interinstitutional agreement between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission. However, it would be for the next Commission to examine this option.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-002640/14
à la Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(6 mars 2014)

Objet: projet de lignes directrices concernant les aides d'État dans le domaine de l'environnement et de l'énergie pour la période 2014-2020

Le 18 décembre 2013, la Commission a entamé des consultations avec les parties intéressées sur la révision des lignes directrices concernant les aides d'État destinées aux projets en matière d'environnement et d'énergie. Nous considérons que ces lignes directrices constituent une violation du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne et de la directive 2009/28/CE sur les énergies renouvelables, étant donné que les dispositions juridiques non contraignantes qu'elles contiennent livrent une définition trop étroite des outils de politique énergétique des États membres. Elles vont donc à l'encontre de l'article 290, paragraphe 1, du traité FUE, qui dispose que «les éléments essentiels d'un domaine sont réservés à l'acte législatif et ne peuvent donc pas faire l'objet d'une délégation de pouvoir».

Les lignes directrices instaurent un système d'adjudication comme principal instrument de soutien pour développer l'utilisation des énergies renouvelables. Toutefois, l'expérience acquise avec ce système jusqu'à présent est rare et essentiellement négative. Ces lignes directrices compromettent fortement la liberté des États membres de choisir le mécanisme de soutien le plus adéquat et constituent donc une tentative de passer outre aux dispositions spécifiques de la directive sur les énergies renouvelables (droit dérivé) par le biais du droit tertiaire.

Nous demandons une transparence totale sur cette question. Nous savons que de nombreuses parties intéressées, y compris les États membres, pensent que les modifications proposées auront un effet négatif sur les projets d'intérêt collectif et les coopératives de citoyens.

1. Combien de parties intéressées ont participé à la consultation?

2. Dans quelles proportions les différentes parties intéressées ont-elles participé (secteur privé, États membres, régions ou Länder, coopératives, municipalités, ONG)?

3. Quelles sont les principales inquiétudes exprimées par les gouvernements, les coopératives et les responsables de projets d'intérêt collectif?

4. Comment la Commission entend-elle prendre en compte les critiques formulées sur les appels d'offres technologiquement neutres en tant qu'instrument principal de demande d'aide ainsi que sur les seuils arbitraires et peu élevés servant à différencier les technologies matures et immatures? Comment la Commission entend-elle définir le droit à bénéficier du système de tarif de rachat?

5. Il a récemment été révélé que la Commission a l'intention de faire adopter le projet final d'ici le début du mois d'avril 2014. Le délai étant très serré, nous pensons que les citoyens risquent de rejeter cette procédure de consultation, qu'ils pourraient considérer comme une mascarade. Comment la Commission entend-elle garantir que les principes de bonne gouvernance inscrits dans le traité de Lisbonne seront respectés et que les commentaires de toutes les parties intéressées seront correctement analysés et pris en compte?

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

La Commission a reçu 4 494 réponses dont beaucoup ne sont pas directement liées aux lignes directrices et expriment des préoccupations générales au sujet de l'énergie éolienne.

77 % de citoyens, 14 % d'entreprises, 5 % de représentants de l'industrie, 2 % d'ONG actives dans le domaine de l'environnement, 0,2 % d'autorités publiques (locales ou régionales, régulateurs de l'énergie) et 1 % de répondants divers (associations locales, par exemple). 22 États membres, la Norvège et l'AELE ont répondu à la consultation.

De manière générale, les pouvoirs publics accueillent favorablement le réexamen des lignes directrices tout en demandant à disposer d'une marge de manœuvre pour décider de leur bouquet énergétique. Les coopératives énergétiques demandent que les tarifs de rachat soient maintenus pour les installations qui produisent de l'énergie renouvelable. Un grand nombre de citoyens et d'associations locales sont critiques à l'égard de la promotion des éoliennes, du fait des incidences négatives que celles-ci ont sur la santé, l'économie locale et l'environnement.

En réponse à la consultation, la Commission envisage de prévoir des conditions accordant aux États membres beaucoup plus de latitude pour décider du lancement d'appel d'offres en vue de soutenir les énergies renouvelables et des technologies à prendre en compte dans ce cadre, ainsi que pour décider du maintien ou non de la distinction entre technologies déployées et moins déployées. Ces conditions limiteraient les distorsions de concurrence au sein du marché intérieur et garantirait la réalisation des objectifs en matière d'énergies renouvelables à l'horizon 2020. La Commission envisage également de prolonger la période de transition et de maintenir les tarifs de rachat pour les petites installations.

L'analyse des réponses n'est pas terminée. La Commission revoit actuellement son projet en tenant le plus grand compte de ces réponses et des discussions avec les États membres et les parties prenantes.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002640/14
to the Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Draft Guidelines on environmental and energy state aid for 2014-2020

On 18 December 2013, the Commission opened a stakeholder consultation on the revision of state aid guidelines for environmental and energy projects. We are of the opinion that the guidelines represent a breach of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Renewables Directive 2009/28/EC, since their soft-law approach excessively defines energy policy tools for Member States. They thus contradict Article 290(1) of the TFEU, which stipulates that 'essential elements of an area shall be reserved for the legislative act and accordingly shall not be the subject of a delegation of power'.

The guidelines impose a tendering scheme as a main support tool to expand renewable energy deployment. However, so far there has been very little, and mainly negative, experience of this scheme. These guidelines impact strongly on Member States' freedom to choose the most appropriate support mechanism and therefore constitute an attempt to overrule specific provisions of the Renewables Directive (secondary law) with tertiary law.

We demand full transparency on this issue, as we know that many stakeholders, including Member States, believe the proposed changes will have a negative impact on communal projects and citizens' cooperatives.

1. How many stakeholders participated in the consultation?

2. What was the participation ratio among the different stakeholders (industry, Member States, regions or *Länder*, cooperatives, municipalities, NGOs)?

3. What are the main concerns expressed by governments, cooperatives and communal projects?

4. How does the Commission intend to integrate criticisms regarding technology-neutral bidding as the main mechanism to apply for support and the arbitrary and low thresholds for distinguishing between mature and immature technologies? How will the Commission define eligibility for feed-in tariff support?

5. It was recently disclosed that the Commission intends to have the final draft approved by early April 2014. The timing seems to be very tight and we think there is a risk that the whole consultation process could be dismissed by European citizens as farcical. How will the Commission ensure that the principles of good governance enshrined in the Lisbon Treaty are safeguarded and that all stakeholders' comments are adequately evaluated and respected?

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

The Commission has received 4 494 replies. Many are not directly linked to the Guidelines but express general concerns about wind power.

77% citizens, 14% companies, 5% industry representatives, 2% environmental NGOs, 0.2% other public authorities (local, regional, energy regulators), and 1% other (like local associations). 22 Member States, Norway and EFTA replied to the consultation.

Governments generally welcome the review while pleading for flexibility to decide on their energy mix. Energy cooperatives ask to maintain feed-in-tariffs for renewable energy installations. Many local associations and individual citizens are critical about the promotion of wind turbines for their negative impacts on health, the local economy and the environment.

In response to the consultation the Commission is considering including conditions which give Member States much more flexibility to decide when they tender RES support and which technologies to include in such a process, and whether to maintain the distinction between deployed and less deployed technologies. Such conditions would limit distortions to the internal market and ensure that the 2020 renewables targets are met. A longer transition period and continuation of feed-in tariffs for small installations are also being considered.

The analysis of replies is still on-going. The Commission is revising the draft taking the utmost account of those replies and the input from discussions with Member States and stakeholders.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-002641/14
a la Comisión
Iratxe García Pérez (S&D)
(6 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Protección de la UE contra la plaga Black Spot

El elevado riesgo de contagio, para las plantaciones de cítricos europeas, de *Guirlardia Citricarpa* (Black Spot) por la llegada de fruta contaminada, ha sido confirmado por la EFSA en su informe de 21 de febrero de 2014.

La fruta contaminada ha estado entrando en la EU, a lo largo de estos últimos años y especialmente en 2013, en importaciones procedentes de Sudáfrica: 38 interceptaciones de cítricos contaminados, varias de ellas posteriores al anuncio de medidas paliativas y cautelares por el Gobierno de este país. Pese a ello, la Comisión solo propuso cerrar parcialmente la frontera, cuando la campaña de importación desde Sudáfrica ya había finalizado.

Teniendo en cuenta que el sector de los cítricos en la EU juega un papel social, medioambiental y económico fundamental, siendo fuente de empleo (especialmente joven y femenino) en regiones especialmente afectadas por la crisis económica y el desempleo; teniendo en cuenta que, si llegara a producirse el contagio, podría ser necesario arrancar hasta 500 000 hectáreas de plantaciones citrícolas en la EU, lo que supondría un gasto colosal de dinero público,

¿no cree la Comisión que habría razones más que suficientes para cerrar de inmediato la frontera a los cítricos procedentes de Sudáfrica antes de que comience su campaña de exportación a la UE y evitar una situación similar a la vivida en 2013?

¿no cree la Comisión que la protección fitosanitaria de las plantaciones comunitarias en cualquier sector, así como el principio de «mercado único europeo», deberían estar por encima de cualquier interés comercial de algunos operadores que, según parece, prefieren seguir arriesgando al sector citrícola en aras de otros intereses?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de marzo de 2014)

A fin de cubrir la próxima campaña comercial de cítricos procedentes de Sudáfrica y antes de la revisión de los requisitos generales de importación relativos a la mancha negra de los cítricos, la Comisión considerará la adopción de medidas específicas más estrictas para Sudáfrica.

El régimen fitosanitario de la UE tiene como objetivo proteger todos los sectores agrícolas y hortícolas de la Unión contra las plagas y las enfermedades nocivas. Para cumplir este objetivo, la Unión regula la introducción y los traslados internos de determinados vegetales y productos vegetales estableciendo requisitos fitosanitarios específicos. Estos requisitos deben cumplirse antes de comercializar dichos productos.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002641/14
to the Commission
Iratxe García Pérez (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Protecting the EU from Citrus Black Spot

The high risk to European citrus plantations of contagion with *Guignardia Citricarpa* (Citrus Black Spot), due to the importation of contaminated fruit, has been confirmed by the European Food Safety Authority's scientific opinion of 21 February 2014.

In recent years, infected fruit has reached the EU in consignments imported from South Africa, particularly in 2013: 38 consignments of contaminated citrus fruit were intercepted, some of them after the Spanish Government had announced palliative and precautionary measures. Despite this situation, the Commission only proposed to partially close the border, once the import season from South Africa was already over.

In view of the fact that the EU's citrus fruit sector plays a fundamental social, environmental and economic role and is a source of employment, particularly for young people and women, in regions which have been hard hit by the economic crisis and unemployment, and bearing in mind that any introduction of this disease would lead to up to 500 000 hectares of citrus orchards being uprooted in the EU, at huge public expense, does the Commission not think there are more than enough reasons to immediately close our borders to citrus fruit from South Africa before the start of that country's next export season to the EU, thereby avoiding a repeat of what happened in 2013?

Does the Commission not think that the protection of plant health in Community crops in any sector, and the start of the European single market, should outweigh the commercial interests of those operators who seem happy to continue endangering the citrus sector in order to pursue other goals?

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

In order to cover the upcoming trade season of citrus fruit from South Africa and in advance of the revision of the general import requirements for citrus black spot, the Commission will consider the adoption of specific more strict measures for South Africa.

The EU plant health regime aims to protect all agricultural and horticultural sectors in the Union from harmful pests and diseases. In order to meet this aim, the Union regulates the introduction and internal movements of certain plants and plant products establishing specific phytosanitary requirements. Before trade takes place these phytosanitary requirements should be met.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-002642/14
an die Kommission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Zukunft des sozialen Unternehmertums in Europa

Im Rahmen der von der Kommission am 16. und 17. Januar 2014 in Straßburg organisierten Konferenz „Soziales Unternehmertum — Deine Meinung zählt!" mit rund 2 000 Teilnehmer/innen aus Politik, Sozialwirtschaft, Wissenschaft usw. wurde erörtert, wie sich die „Initiative für soziales Unternehmertum" der EU auf die Sozialwirtschaft in Europa bisher ausgewirkt und entwickelt hat. Auf Basis der gesammelten Expertisen, der Workshop-Ergebnisse und verschiedener offener Foren wurde die „Straßburger Erklärung" verfasst.

Aus aktueller Sicht ergeben sich daher folgende Fragen:

1. Welche konkreten Schritte plant die Kommission, um die Förderung des sozialen Unternehmertums verstärkt voranzutreiben?
2. Wie sollen soziale Innovationen und das Management sozialer Innovationen mit den zukünftigen Maßnahmen für das soziale Unternehmertum verknüpft werden?
3. Wie wird 2014 sichergestellt, dass das soziale Unternehmertum in die Umsetzung der neuen EU-Förderprogramme — vor allem in den Bereichen Beschäftigung, KMU, Umwelt, Energie, Jugend, Forschung und Dienstleistungen — integriert wird?
4. Welche Unterstützung beabsichtigt die Kommission den Mitgliedstaaten und Regionen bei der Programmierung des Investitionsschwerpunktes „Soziales Unternehmertum" in den Programmen der europäischen Struktur- und Investitionsfonds anzubieten, und mit wie vielen Mitgliedstaaten wird konkret darüber verhandelt?
5. Wann ist zu erwarten, dass der Sozialinvestitionsfonds, begleitet von einem Zertifizierungs-/Kennzeichnungssystem, mit dem bei Investoren Vertrauen geschaffen wird, europaweit zur Verfügung steht?
6. Welche nächsten Schritte beabsichtigt die Kommission — nach der Einführung eines europäischen Statuts für Gegenseitigkeitsgesellschaften und Genossenschaften — bei der Umsetzung auch für Vereine und Stiftungen?
7. Welche Unterstützung wird den Mitgliedstaaten bei der Umsetzung und Anwendung der neuen Richtlinie über die Vergabe öffentlicher Aufträge im Hinblick auf die Einbeziehung sozialer und ökologischer Kriterien angeboten, um Sozialunternehmen einen effektiveren Zugang zu öffentlichen Aufträgen zu ermöglichen?
8. Was wird unternommen, um soziales Unternehmertum in die nationalen Programme zur Bekämpfung der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit zu integrieren?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(5. Mai 2014)

1. In der Straßburger Erklärung werden alle Beteiligten aufgerufen, soziales Unternehmertum in Europa zu unterstützen und zu fördern. Die Erklärung empfiehlt eine rasche Umsetzung der Initiative für soziales Unternehmertum und enthält Vorschläge für eine mögliche Fortsetzung des Projekts. Die Kommission prüft derzeit alle Vorschläge.

2. Soziale Innovationen können dazu dienen, soziale Bedürfnisse zu decken und soziale Herausforderungen zu überwinden. Sie werden durch die Programme EaSI und Horizont 2020 unterstützt. Dem Sozialinvestitionspaket ([1]) zufolge könnte der private Sektor spezielle innovative Finanzinstrumente schaffen.

3. Im EaSI-Programm sind 86 Mill. EUR für die Finanzierung sozialer Unternehmen vorgesehen. Damit soll die Entwicklung eines Markts für Sozialinvestitionen unterstützt und den Unternehmen der Zugang zu Finanzierungen erleichtert werden.

4. Unter den Strukturfonds können die Mitgliedstaaten soziales Unternehmertum als Investitionsschwerpunkt wählen. Dies ist auch den Programmplanungsdokumenten zu entnehmen. Wenn die Mitgliedstaaten dies nicht ausdrücklich als Ziel wählen, können Projekte im Rahmen anderer thematischer Schwerpunkte finanziert werden.

5. Fonds der Kategorie EuSEF ([2]) ermöglichen es unterschiedlichsten Investoren, Kapital in der Sozialwirtschaft anzulegen. Diese Fonds müssen in nicht börsennotierte Firmen investieren, die sich in erster Linie Zielen mit positiver sozialer Wirkung verschrieben haben. Fonds, die den EuSEF-Bestimmungen entsprechen, sind Investoren, die mindestens 100 000 EUR bereitstellen, vorbehalten.

([1]) https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/eipaha/news/index/show/id/346
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/social_investment_funds/index_de.htm

6. Weitere Gespräche über Europäische Statute für andere Formen sozialer Unternehmen können nach der Verabschiedung des Statuts der Europäischen Stiftung beginnen.

7. Die Mitgliedstaaten werden von der Government Expert Group on Public Procurement (Arbeitsgruppe der Regierungssachverständigen zum öffentlichen Auftragswesen) in bilateralen Treffen und mit Leitlinien unterstützt.

8. Die Empfehlung des Rates zur Einführung einer Jugendgarantie ([3]) enthält einen Verweis auf die Unterstützung sozialen Unternehmertums und fordert ESF-Verwaltungsbehörden auf, in ihren ESF-Programmen entsprechende Investitionsprioritäten zu setzen.

([3]) ABl. C 120 vom 1. April 2013, S. 26.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002642/14
to the Commission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Future of social entrepreneurship in Europe

At the conference entitled 'Social entrepreneurs — have your say!' organised by the Commission in Strasbourg on 16 and 17 January 2014 some 2 000 participants from realms including politics, the social economy and academia discussed the impact the EU's 'Social Business Initiative' has had thus far on the social economy in Europe. They drew up the 'Strasbourg declaration' on the basis of the expert contributions to the conference, the outcome of the workshops held and the views expressed in various open discussion forums.

1. What practical steps does the Commission plan to take in order to step up support for social entrepreneurship?

2. How will future measures to foster social entrepreneurship tie in with social innovations and the management of social innovations?

3. In 2014, what steps will be taken to ensure that the issue of social entrepreneurship is reflected in the measures drawn up to implement the new EU support programmes, in particular in the areas of employment, SMUs, the environment, energy, youth, research and services?

4. What support does the Commission plan to offer Member States and regions to help them implement the investment priority 'social entrepreneurship' in programmes carried out under the EU Structural Funds and Investment Fund, and with how many Member States are specific negotiations being conducted?

5. When will the social entrepreneurship funds, combined with a certification/labelling system designed to foster investor confidence, likely to be available Europe-wide?

6. What steps does the Commission now plan to take — following the introduction of a European statute for mutual societies and cooperatives — to establish a similar framework for associations and foundations?

7. What support will the Member States be offered to help them take account of social and environmental criteria when transposing and applying the new directive on public procurement, with a view to guaranteeing social enterprises better access to public contracts?

8. What steps are being taken to incorporate ideas linked to social entrepreneurship into national programmes to combat youth unemployment?

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

1. The Strasbourg Declaration calls on all actors to foster and promote social entrepreneurship in Europe. It advocates a swift implementation of the Social Business Initiative and makes suggestions for a possible follow-up. The Commission is currently examining these suggestions.

2. Social innovation addresses social needs or challenges. It is supported under the EaSI Programme and Horizon 2020. The SIP ([1]) mentions the private sector which could create specific innovative financial instruments.

3. EUR 86 million is earmarked for financing social enterprises under EaSI with the aim of supporting the development of the social investment market and facilitate their access to finance.

4. Structural Funds allow MSs to choose social entrepreneurship as an investment priority. This is reflected in the programming documents. If MSs choose not to have it as an explicit objective, projects may still be financed under other thematic objectives.

5. EuSEFs ([2]) enable a wide range of investors to invest in the social economy. Such funds must invest in unlisted firms which have the primary aim of achieving a positive social impact. Funds complying with the EuSEF regulations will be eligible for investors who commit at least EUR 100 000.

([1]) https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/eipaha/news/index/show/id/346
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/social_investment_funds/index_en.htm

6. Future discussions on European statutes for other forms of social enterprise could start after the adoption of the Statute for a European Foundation.

7. Assistance will be provided to MSs by the Commission Government Expert Group on Public Procurement, through bilateral meetings and guidance notes.

8. The Council Recommendation on Establishing a Youth Guarantee [3] makes a reference to the support of social entrepreneurship, inviting ESF managing authorities to make use of the relevant investment priorities in their ESF programmes.

---

[3] OJ C 120/1, 26.4.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002643/14
alla Commissione
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Presunto dumping nel mercato italiano delle carni cunicole

Secondo recenti dati statistici, le importazioni di carni cunicole dell'Italia provengono per il 55 % dalla Francia, il 26 % dall'Ungheria e il 16 % dalla Spagna. Durante il 2013 dalla Francia sono arrivati in Italia quasi 15 000 quintali di conigli macellati, con un incremento del 22 % rispetto al 2012, quando invece i consumi in Italia sono rimasti pressoché invariati o leggermente calati (meno 2 % nel 2013). Inoltre, occorre considerare che in Italia i prezzi del coniglio «vivo» sono più bassi che nel resto d'Europa. Il surplus di conigli macellati francesi viene immesso in commercio in Italia ad un prezzo inferiore al valore normale del prodotto praticato all'interno della stessa Francia e tale fenomeno, che si ripete ciclicamente da aprile ad agosto di ogni anno, quest'anno è iniziato a febbraio, in concomitanza dei ribassi eccessivi sulla piazza di Verona.

Inoltre, l'elevato livello di autoapprovvigionamento del mercato italiano non sembra giustificare l'aumento delle importazioni.

Può la Commissione indicare se non ritiene che l'immissione in commercio in Italia di carni cunicole provenienti dalla Francia ad un prezzo inferiore al valore normale del prodotto praticato all'interno della stessa Francia non denoti comportamenti scorretti, tesi ad alterare la concorrenza tra paesi europei, praticando un vero e proprio dumping? Può inoltre verificare se la Francia non stia finanziando, attraverso aiuti di Stato, prezzi di dumping a favore delle imprese francesi?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(31 marzo 2014)

Le pratiche delle imprese che potrebbero falsare la concorrenza nel mercato interno sono disciplinate dagli articoli da 101 a 106 del TFUE (Regole di concorrenza applicabili alle imprese). Alla Commissione non risulta che i produttori francesi di carni cunicole abbiano ricorso a pratiche di tale tipo né che beneficino di aiuti di Stato specifici che, falsando la concorrenza nel mercato interno ai sensi dell'articolo 107 del TFUE, recano pregiudizio agli omologhi di altri Stati membri.

Per quanto attiene ai regimi di aiuto approvati dalla Commissione per il settore agricolo francese, non si può escludere che fra i beneficiari si annoverino anche produttori di carni cunicole. Non può tuttavia essere preclusa a tali produttori, sempre che soddisfino le condizioni di ammissibilità, la possibilità di beneficiare dei regimi di aiuto per il solo motivo che, applicando il principio di libera circolazione delle merci, offrono i loro prodotti sul mercato di un altro Stato membro dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002643/14
to the Commission
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Suspicions of dumping on the Italian rabbitmeat market

According to recent statistics, 55% of rabbitmeat imported into Italy comes from France, 26% from Hungary and 16% from Spain. In 2013, Italy imported almost 15 000 quintals of butchered rabbits, a 22% increase over 2012, even though consumption in Italy dropped very slightly (2% less than in 2012). It must also be borne in mind that in Italy prices for 'live' rabbits are lower than in the rest of Europe. French surplus butchered rabbits are flooding the Italian market at a price lower than that normally charged in France itself. This phenomenon, which is normally repeated each year between April and August, this year began in February, in parallel with very significant drops in prices on the Verona market.

Apart from anything else, the fact that Italy is essentially self-sufficient in rabbitmeat would not seem to justify the increase in imports.

Does the Commission not agree that flooding the Italian market with rabbitmeat from France, and what is more at prices lower than those normally charged in France itself, is an inappropriate practice which serves to distort competition between Member States and amounts to dumping? Can it check whether France is not financing this dumping by granting French undertakings state aid?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(31 March 2014)

Practices of undertakings that could distort competition within the internal market are governed by Articles 101 to 106 of the TFEU (Rules on Competition applying to undertakings). The Commission has no indication that French rabbit meat producers have made use of any such practices. Neither is known to the Commission any state aid specifically benefitting French rabbit meat producers that would distort the internal market within the meaning of Article 107 TFEU and thus harm rabbit meat producers in other Member States.

As regards the aid schemes approved by the Commission for the French sector of agriculture, it cannot be excluded that among the beneficiaries of aid there are also rabbit meat producers. However, provided that such producers meet the eligibility conditions, they cannot be excluded from the possibility of benefitting from aid schemes only on the basis that, in application of the principle of free movement of goods, they offer their products on the market of an another EU Member State.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002644/14
al Consejo
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(6 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Inicio de las negociaciones de un nuevo Protocolo de Pesca entre Mauritania y la UE

En su respuesta del 26 de febrero de 2014 a mi pregunta E-014339/2013, la Comisaria Damanaki señala en nombre de la Comisión Europea que, en cuanto reciba la autorización del Consejo, tiene intención de iniciar las negociaciones tendentes a la renovación del Protocolo de Pesca existente entre Mauritania y la UE, que expira en diciembre del presente año.

La Comisión ha informado de que, a tal fin, ha presentado al Consejo una recomendación para que la autorice a entablar negociaciones.

¿Tiene previsto el Consejo conceder su autorización a la Comisión para el inicio de las correspondientes negociaciones o acaso la ha concedido ya? ¿Tiene previsto incluir en el mandato de negociación la obtención de oportunidades para la pesca de cefalópodos por la flota europea? Si ya ha sido otorgado el mandato, ¿contempla esta cuestión?

Respuesta
(13 de mayo de 2014)

El 18 de febrero de 2014, el Consejo adoptó la Decisión por la que se autoriza a la Comisión a entablar negociaciones en nombre de la Unión Europea para la renovación del Protocolo adjunto al Acuerdo de Asociación en el sector pesquero con Mauritania. El 21 de febrero de 2014 se transmitió al Parlamento Europeo una copia en papel de la Decisión ([1]).

Los mandatos de negociación no especifican ninguna especie en particular. Por ello cualquier posible inclusión de oportunidades de pesca para una especie específica en un Protocolo depende de:

— las solicitudes de los Estados miembros de la UE al respecto,

— la determinación de la existencia de un remanente de capturas del total admisible sobre la base de los mejores dictámenes científicos disponibles y de un cambio de información pertinente entre la Unión y el tercer país de que se trate, y

— el deseo del tercer país de poner a disposición de la Unión ese remanente.

Cabe señalar que en el actual Protocolo, la República Islámica de Mauritania ejerció su derecho de Estado soberano y, en respuesta a una solicitud de la UE, declaró que no quedaba disponible ningún excedente de cefalópodos, subrayando así que su flota nacional quería explotar estos recursos.

([1]) 6051/14 PECHE 48.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002644/14
to the Council
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Start of negotiations on the new EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol

In her answer of 26 February 2014 to my Question E-014339/2013, Commissioner Damanaki stated on behalf of the European Commission that, as soon as it receives authorisation from the Council, it intends to start the negotiations for renewal of the existing Fisheries Protocol between Mauritania and the EU, which expires in December this year.

The Commission has stated that, to that end, it has submitted to the Council a recommendation for it to be authorised to open negotiations.

Does the Council plan to authorise the Commission to open the corresponding negotiations or has it done so already? Does it intend to include in the mandate for negotiations a proposal to obtain opportunities for the European fishing fleet to catch cephalopods? If authorisation has already been granted, does the mandate include this question?

Reply
(13 May 2014)

On 18 February 2014, the Council adopted a decision authorising the Commission to open negotiations on behalf of the European Union for the renewal of the Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement with Mauritania. A paper copy of the decision was transmitted to the European Parliament on 21 February 2014 ([1]).

Negotiation mandates do not single out any one particular species. Therefore, any possible inclusion of fishing opportunities for a specific species in a Protocol depends on:

— requests from the EU Member States in this respect,

— the establishment of a catch surplus of the allowable catch on the basis of the best available scientific advice and the exchange of relevant information between the Union and the third country in question, and

— the third country's wish to make available any surplus to the Union.

It should be noted that under the current Protocol, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania exercised its rights as a sovereign state and stated, in response to an EU request, that there was no available surplus of cephalopods, thus underlining that it wished its national fleet to exploit these resources.

([1]) 6051/14 PECHE 48.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002645/14
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(6 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Controles aeroportuarios

Usuarios del transporte aéreo se quejan de diferentes prácticas en los controles aeroportuarios a las que se han visto sometidos en sus desplazamientos por la UE. Las quejas aluden, entre otros, a procedimientos en los aeropuertos de A Coruña y Vigo en España, Helsinki en Finlandia, Copenhague en Dinamarca, Heathrow en el Reino Unido y Bruselas en Bélgica.

Se plantean si existe alguna justificación para que se establezcan diferencias en las prendas de ropa y calzado de las que tienen que despojarse, en el modo en que se procede a la revisión del equipaje, en las condiciones en que se realizan cacheos e inspecciones personales por los encargados y si estas últimas funciones deben ser desempeñadas por agentes de la autoridad y con garantías adecuadas.

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que los aeropuertos de la UE cumplen la normativa europea de control aeroportuario de forma armonizada?

2. ¿Podría indicar la Comisión cuántas denuncias por trato vejatorio o abuso de autoridad se han producido a causa de la realización de procedimientos de control aeroportuarios en la EU en los últimos siete años y qué consecuencias han tenido?

3. ¿Considera la Comisión que debería mejorarse la protección del viajero en el actual sistema de control aeroportuario?

4. ¿Va a adoptar la Comisión alguna medida para evitar que los usuarios del transporte aéreo tengan que someterse a controles de seguridad redundantes con motivo de sus conexiones dentro del espacio Schengen?

5. ¿Podría indicar la Comisión qué puede hacer un pasajero que se enfrenta a una situación de este tipo?

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

1. Las medidas de seguridad aérea de la UE tienen por objeto reducir el riesgo de interferencias ilícitas en la aviación y están adaptadas a las necesidades de seguridad exigidas (pasajeros, equipaje, carga, correo) con el fin de garantizar el máximo nivel de seguridad desde el punto de vista de los resultados.

Las autoridades competentes, los aeropuertos, las líneas aéreas y los demás agentes aplican las medidas de seguridad que son más compatibles con sus operaciones. Su correcta aplicación está supeditada a inspecciones sobre la calidad de la seguridad aérea realizadas a escala nacional o por la Comisión. Esta última publica anualmente un informe destinado al Parlamento en el que le presenta la información correspondiente.

2. La Comisión no suele recibir denuncias sobre la aplicación de las medidas de seguridad aérea, ya que generalmente suelen dirigirse a la autoridad competente o al propio aeropuerto.

3. Los niveles de observancia de los que se tiene conocimiento gracias al Programa universal de auditoría de la seguridad de la aviación (USAP) de la OACI muestran que el grado de protección que ofrece el sistema de aeropuertos de la Unión es uno de los mejores del mundo. Junto con los Estados miembros y las partes interesadas, la Comisión garantiza la concepción y el seguimiento continuo de controles efectivos y eficientes de seguridad que simplifican las operaciones y facilitan los viajes de los pasajeros.

4. La Comisión recuerda que, en los aeropuertos del espacio Schengen, los controles de seguridad de los pasajeros no se duplican desde que la UE aplica el control de seguridad único. A los pasajeros solo se los controla una vez al inicio de su viaje, salvo que se apliquen medidas más estrictas conforme a la normativa de la UE.

5. Se insta a los pasajeros que se vean sometidos a situaciones injustificadas o abusivas a presentar una denuncia ante la autoridad competente en asuntos de seguridad aérea del Estado correspondiente ([1]).

([1]) La lista de autoridades europeas competentes puede consultarse en https://www.ecac-ceac.org//about_ecac/ecac_member_states

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002645/14
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Airport controls

Users of air transport complain of different practices they have to put up with at airport controls in the course of their journeys across the EU. These complaints refer, among others, to procedures at A Coruña and Vigo airports in Spain and the airports of Helsinki in Finland, Copenhagen in Denmark, Heathrow in the UK and Brussels in Belgium.

Passengers have asked whether any justification exists for differences in the clothing and footwear they have to remove, how baggage is checked, how they are frisked or body searches are carried out by security staff, and whether these latter functions ought to be carried out by law enforcement officers with proper guarantees.

1. Does the Commission consider that European airports comply in a harmonised manner with EU regulations on airport controls?

2. Could the Commission say how many complaints of degrading treatment or abuse of authority have been made in relation to airport control procedures in the EU over the past seven years and what the consequences have been?

3. Does the Commission consider that passengers should receive greater protection in the present airport control system?

4. Does the Commission intend to adopt any measures to stop airline passengers from having to submit to pointless security controls at their connections for flights within the Schengen area?

5. Could the Commission say what a passenger can do when he or she is faced with such a situation?

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

1. EU aviation security measures are designed to mitigate the risk of unlawful interference in aviation and are adapted to the required security needs (passengers, baggage, cargo, mail) to ensure the highest level of security from the outcome point of view.

Responsible authorities, airports, airlines, and other agents implement the security measures that are most compatible with their operations. Their correct application is subject to aviation security quality inspections done at national level or by the Commission. Every year the Commission issues a report providing the Parliament with details thereof.

2. The Commission rarely receives complaints on the application of aviation security measures since they are normally directed to the relevant Authority or to the airport itself.

3. The compliance levels evidenced under the Universal Security Audit Programme (USAP) of ICAO show that the level of protection granted by the airport system of the Union is one of the best in the world. With Member States and stakeholders, the Commission ensures the design and constant monitoring of effective and efficient security controls that simplify operations and facilitate passenger travel.

4. The Commission recalls that no duplicate security screening of passengers takes place in airports within the Schengen area since the EU implements One-stop-security. Passengers are screened only once at the start of their trip (unless more stringent measures are applicable in compliance with EC law).

5. A passenger faced with unjustified or abusive situations is invited to address a complaint to the appropriate authority for aviation security established in every state ([1]).

([1]) The list of European appropriate authorities can be accessed through https://www.ecac-ceac.org//about_ecac/ecac_member_states

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002646/14
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(6 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Fraude al consumidor en la información contenida en el etiquetado de pescado

Nuevos estudios científicos ponen de manifiesto la gravedad del fraude al consumidor en el etiquetado de pescado que planteé en mi pregunta E-001836/2013.

A los estudios realizados por la Universidad de Oviedo entre 2006 y 2010, a que me refería entonces, se unen los del Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas de España, que alertan del fraude en el etiquetado en porcentajes que oscilan entre el 25 % para atún congelado o fresco, el 12,2 % para semiconservas de anchoa, el 11,3 % para conservas de atún y el 6,5 % para bacalao seco salado.

Las señales de alarma se multiplican. En 2011 la Universidad de Oviedo junto con la Universidad Aristóteles de Grecia mostraban que prácticamente el 40 % de la merluza vendida en ambos países contenían información errónea sobre su procedencia. Un estudio de la Universidad de Dublín del mismo año señalaba que el 28 % de los productos de bacalao comercializados en Irlanda y Reino Unido correspondían a especies más baratas que las indicadas en sus etiquetas.

Al otro lado del Atlántico, un estudio encargado el pasado año por la organización ambientalista Oceana puso de manifiesto que, en los EE.UU., el 33 % de la información sobre el origen del pescado resultaba engañosa. En esta parte del Atlántico, estudios preliminares, pendientes de publicación, en el Reino Unido e Irlanda calculan asimismo tasas de error de entre el 2 % y el 18 %.

A raíz del escándalo de la carne de caballo, hemos sabido que el pescado ocupa el segundo lugar en la lista de los alimentos con mayor riesgo de fraude, solo por detrás del aceite de oliva.

¿Se han producido en este último año nuevos avances en el ámbito del control del etiquetado del pescado y sus productos derivados? ¿Ha adoptado la Comisión alguna nueva medida o tiene previsto adoptarla para asegurar un control sistemático y coordinado en el ámbito de la UE?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión sigue atentamente los resultados de los estudios que se llevan a cabo dentro o fuera de la UE destinados a evaluar la magnitud de la sustitución de las especies de peces. Dichos estudios llegan a la conclusión de que las discrepancias entre las auténticas especies y la información transmitida al consumidor pueden alcanzar, en ocasiones, proporciones significativas.

En su Resolución sobre la crisis alimentaria, los fraudes en la cadena alimentaria y el control al respecto, aprobada el 14 de enero de 2014, el Parlamento Europeo ha incluido el pescado entre los productos alimenticios que con mayor frecuencia son objeto de fraude. El etiquetado incorrecto del pescado (especies de menor valor de mercado etiquetadas como especies más caras y/o peces de acuicultura etiquetados como silvestres) se sitúa en segundo lugar, después del de aceite de oliva, según una base de datos de los EE.UU. y la «información de organizaciones sectoriales y de distribución minorista», que no ha sido comunicada a la Comisión.

Tras el escándalo de la carne de caballo, la Comisión ha decidido emprender acciones para reforzar la capacidad de todo el sistema de control de la UE con el fin de detectar y combatir el fraude alimentario. Un objetivo clave es mejorar las capacidades de los Estados miembros encargados de efectuar los controles para verificar que los productos alimenticios comercializados cumplen las normas pertinentes nacionales y de la UE. Ello también se considera esencial para facilitar la asistencia y la cooperación administrativas entre las autoridades nacionales cuando se registren infracciones transfronterizas.

La Comisión está investigando actualmente las técnicas de diagnóstico disponibles para detectar el etiquetado incorrecto de las especies de peces en el contexto de los controles oficiales, antes de decidir adoptar otras medidas como, por ejemplo, planes coordinados de control de conformidad con el artículo 53 del Reglamento (CE) n° 882/2004 ([1]).

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 882/2004 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 29 de abril de 2004, sobre los controles oficiales efectuados para garantizar la verificación del cumplimiento de la legislación en materia de piensos y alimentos y la normativa sobre salud animal y bienestar de los animales (DO L 165 de 30.4.2004, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002646/14
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Consumer fraud in information on labels for fish

New scientific research shows the depth of the fraud committed against consumers in fish labelling, to which I referred in my Question E-001836/2013.

In addition to the research carried out by the University of Oviedo between 2006 and 2010, which I referred to then, studies undertaken by the Spanish National Research Council warn of labelling fraud in proportions that range between 25% for fresh or frozen tuna, 12.2% for anchovy semi-preserves, 11.3% for tuna conserves and 6.5% for salted dry cod.

The alarm signals are multiplying. In 2011 the University of Oviedo together with the Aristoteles University of Greece showed that practically 40% of the hake sold in both countries contained wrong information about its origin. Research by the University of Dublin that same year showed that 28% of the cod products marketed in Ireland and the United Kingdom corresponded to cheaper species than what was indicated on the label.

On the other side of the Atlantic, a study commissioned last year by the environmental organisation Oceana revealed that in the United States 33% of the information on the origin of fish was misleading, while on this side preliminary research results, which have not yet been published, in Ireland and the United Kingdom calculate error rates of between 2% and 18%.

As a result of the horsemeat scandal we have learnt that fish comes in second place on the list of foods at risk of fraud, only surpassed by olive oil.

Has any progress been made in the past year in the ambit of checks on labels for fish and fish products? Has the Commission taken any new steps or does it intend to do so in order to ensure systematic and coordinated monitoring within the EU?

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

The Commission closely monitors the results of studies aiming to assess the magnitude of fish species substitution, whether they are conducted within or outside the EU. They lead to conclude that discrepancies between the real species and the information conveyed to the consumer may sometimes occur in significant proportion.

The European Parliament has listed fish among food products that are the most often subject to fraud in its resolution entitled 'The food crisis, fraud in the food chain and the control thereof' adopted on 14 January 2014. The mislabelling of fish species (lower-market-value species labelled as higher-market-value species and/or aquaculture fish labelled as fish caught in the wild) is ranked in second position, after olive oil, on the basis of a US database and of 'information from retail and branch organisations' that have not been communicated to the Commission.

Following the horse meat scandal the Commission has decided to undertake actions to strengthen the ability of the EU control system as a whole to detect and counter food fraud. A key objective is to improve the capabilities of the Member States which are responsible for carrying controls to verify that food products placed on the market comply with the relevant national and EU rules. It is also considered critical to facilitate administrative assistance and cooperation among national enforcers in the case of cross border violations.

The Commission is currently investigating the diagnostic techniques available to detect the mislabelling of fish species in the context of official controls before deciding for any further action, for instance in the form of coordinated control plans in accordance with Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 ([1]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002647/14
an die Kommission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Behinderten-Parkausweise

In der EU leben etwa 80 Millionen Menschen mit Behinderungen, ihr Behindertenausweis gibt ihnen häufig Zugang zu besonderen Vergünstigungen, vor allem im Bereich öffentlicher Verkehrsmittel oder kultureller Einrichtungen.

Diese Unterstützung soll maximal ausgebaut werden. In der „Empfehlung des Rates (98/376/EG) vom 4. Juni 1998 betreffend einen Parkausweis für Behinderte" wurde erstmals ein einheitliches — aber unverbindliches — EU-Modell entwickelt. Es werden gleiche Standards vorgegeben, welche es Behinderten erlauben, Parkerleichterungen zu bekommen. Außerdem ist der Behinderten-Parkausweis geeignet, Parkraum-Kontrolleuren, Polizisten, etc. die Feststellung zu erleichtern, dass Ausweisinhaber berechtigt sind, die Parkerleichterungen zu nutzen. Auf diese Weise lässt sich auch die unberechtigte Ausstellung von Strafzetteln vermeiden und zugleich den Alltag der Betroffenendeutlich erleichtern.

Leider kommt es zum Beispiel in Österreich vermehrt zu einem Missbrauch von nicht legitimierter Inanspruchnahme von Behinderten-Parkausweisen. Dies könnte einfach unterbunden werden, wenn österreichische Behörden die Empfehlungen des Rates zu einer genauen Angabe des Ablaufdatums vom Gültigkeitsdatum auf den Parkausweisen einhalten würden.

Zu obigem Sachverhalt ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Was gedenkt die Europäische Kommission zu unternehmen, um Missbrauch von bestehenden Ausweisen durch nicht legitimierte Personen vorzubeugen?

2. Wie bewertet die Europäische Kommission aus heutiger Sicht die Notwendigkeit einer Europäischen Strategie für Behinderte Personen?

3. Wird die Europäische Kommission wie angekündigt (Bericht über die Unionsbürgerschaft aus dem Frühjahr 2013, S. 15-16) die Entwicklung eines allgemein anerkannten EU-Behindertenausweises vorantreiben, um Behinderten EU-weit gleichberechtigten Zugang zu bestimmten Sonderleistungen — vornehmlich in den Bereichen Verkehr, Tourismus, Kultur und Freizeit — zu gewährleisten?

4. Ist dazu ein verpflichtender Rahmen mit Mindestvorgaben innerhalb der Europäischen Union zweckmäßig?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(23. April 2014)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-003132/2013 und möchte hinzufügen, dass das im letzten Absatz genannte Pilotprojekt ausgewählt wurde und im Januar 2014 für einen Zeitraum von drei Jahren gestartet ist.

Eine Überprüfung der Umsetzung der verschiedenen Maßnahmen der Europäischen Strategie zugunsten von Menschen mit Behinderungen 2010-2020 ([1]) ist im Gange. 2014 soll ein Bericht über die erzielten Fortschritte vorgelegt werden. Ferner wird eine aktualisierte Liste der Maßnahmen ab 2016 vorbereitet.

Zu dem im Bericht über die Unionsbürgerschaft 2013 ([2]) angekündigten EU-Behindertenausweis hat die Kommission eine Projekt-Arbeitsgruppe eingesetzt, in der sich Vertreter interessierter Mitgliedstaaten (bisher 15) und der Zivilgesellschaft mit den praktischen Modalitäten der Ausstellung und Verwaltung eines europäischen Muster-Behindertenausweises befassen. Diese Gruppe befindet sich noch in der Frühphase ihrer Arbeit. Es ist davon auszugehen, dass die zu entwickelnde Karte Vorteile in den Bereichen Verkehr, Kultur, Freizeit, Sport und Tourismus bieten wird.

([1]) KOM(2010)636 endg.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013eucitizenshipreport_de.pdf (s. Seite 23).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002647/14
to the Commission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Disabled parking permits

There are approximately 80 million people with disabilities living in the EU. They often have access to certain entitlements, particularly in connection with public transport or cultural institutions, linked to their disability card.

This support is to be expanded as far as possible. A standard — but not compulsory — EU model was first established in 'Council Recommendation of 4 June 1998 on a parking card for people with disabilities (98/376/EC)', which specifies identical standards providing disabled people with parking facilities. The disabled parking card also makes it easier for car park attendants, police officers etc., to ascertain that card holders are entitled to use the parking facilities. This prevents parking tickets from being issued unjustifiably and makes daily life considerably easier for those concerned.

Unfortunately, abuse of the system by people not authorised to hold a disabled parking card is increasingly common, for example in Austria. This could easily be prevented if the Austrian authorities adhered to the Council Recommendation to state the expiry date clearly on the parking cards.

I have the following questions on the above:

1. What does the European Commission intend to do to prevent the abuse of existing cards by people not authorised to hold them?

2. What is the European Commission's current assessment of the need for a European strategy for disabled people?

3. Will the European Commission press ahead with the development of a generally-recognised EU disabled parking card, as announced (EU Citizenship Report, spring 2013, p. 15-16), to allow disabled people throughout the EU to have equal access to certain special facilities — primarily in the fields of traffic, tourism culture and leisure?

4. Would it be advisable to establish a compulsory framework of minimum requirements for this within the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-003132/2013, adding that the pilot project referred to in the last paragraph was selected and started in January 2014, for a period of three years.

A review of the implementation of the various actions of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]) is ongoing with a view to report in 2014 on progress made and to prepare an updated list of actions from 2016.

Regarding the EU disability card, announced in the EU Citizenship report 2013 ([2]), the Commission has initiated a Project Working Group where representatives of interested Member States (15 so far) and civil society are dealing with practical details of issuing and managing a European model disability card. This group is still in the early stages of its work but the expectation is that the card to be developed is likely to grant benefits in the areas of transport, culture, leisure, sport and tourism.

([1]) COM(2010) 636 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013eucitizenshipreport_en.pdf (see page 23).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002649/14
to the Commission
Phil Bennion (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), George Lyon (ALDE), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Rebecca Taylor (ALDE), Sir Graham Watson (ALDE), Chris Davies (ALDE), Catherine Bearder (ALDE), Andrew Duff (ALDE) and Sharon Bowles (ALDE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Protection of geographical indications

Can the Commission give an estimate of the increased added value to local economies from the recognition of European geographical indications (GIs) in the EU's external trade agreements?

How many of the EU's trade agreements protect GIs originating in the UK, and how many British products are explicitly protected by GIs?

Would British GIs continue to enjoy protection in third countries and within the EU if the UK were to leave the EU?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The Commission does not have data available on the added value to local economies from Geographical Indications (GI's) protected through EU's external trade agreements. However, a recent study (2010) on the value of all EU GI's combined, estimated the worldwide wholesales value at EUR 54.3 billion. It furthermore highlighted the importance of exports, with extra-EU trade increasing more rapidly (29%) than production (12%). This export is realised mainly by France (40%), the UK (25%) and Italy (21%) and results from a small number of GI's, among which Scotch Whisky. Moreover, the UK remains the leading producer Member State in whisky, lamb and beef products under GIs.

Nineteen concluded EU trade agreements and three close to conclusion protect GI's originating in the UK (all including Scotch Whisky). Furthermore, the EU is currently negotiating GI protection with at least 13 other partners. All major export markets are covered. At this date the names of 57 agricultural products and foodstuffs, four wines and six spirits originating in the UK are protected by GI's in the EU.

With regard to the third sub-question, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E-003836/2013 ([1]).

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002650/14
an die Kommission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Hörverlust

Eine Reihe fachspezifischer Studien ([1]) belegen alarmierende Informationen, wonach es notwendig ist, für eine große Anzahl von europäischen Bürgern mit Hörproblemen die Gesundheitsfürsorge zu verbessern und generell effizientere Präventivmaßnahmen einzuführen.

Dieser Studie zufolge leiden 16 % der EU-Bevölkerung, d. h. 80 Millionen Menschen, an Hörverlust: 30 Millionen davon sind unentdeckte Fälle. Hörverlust an sich stellt bereits ein Problem dar, aber es ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass Hörverlust häufig mit einer Reihe anderer Krankheiten einhergeht, einschließlich Fettleibigkeit, wobei fettleibige Frauen mit einem BMI von mehr als 40 zu 25 % anfälliger für Hörprobleme sind. Nach Bainbridge et al. (2008) leiden Diabetiker doppelt so häufig an Hörverlust, und die Wahrscheinlichkeit, an Demenz zu erkranken, steigt mit dem Grad der Schwerhörigkeit. In Bezug auf Depressionen ist anzumerken, dass das Risiko bei Menschen mit Hörminderung, depressive Symptome zu entwickeln, um 50 % reduziert werden kann, wenn diese Menschen Hörhilfen verwenden.

Angesichts dessen wird die Kommission ersucht, folgende Fragen zu beantworten:

1. Kann die Kommission angesichts der Tatsache, dass Menschen mit Hörproblemen möglicherweise auch an anderen Krankheiten leiden, erläutern, mit welchen Maßnahmen und Initiativen auf EU-Ebene gefördert wird, dass bei Vorsorgeuntersuchungen für Erwachsene in den Mitgliedstaaten auch systematisch Hör-Tests durchgeführt werden?

2. Aufgrund des erhöhten Risikos von Mehrfacherkrankungen in Zusammenhang mit Hörverlust benötigen hörgeschädigte Menschen spezifische und integrierte medizinische Versorgung. Kann die Kommission angesichts dessen erläutern, welche Fortschritte auf EU-Ebene zur Förderung einer integrierten Gesundheitsfürsorge erzielt wurden, insbesondere im Rahmen der Europäischen Innovationspartnerschaft im Bereich Aktivität und Gesundheit im Alter?

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

Die Kommission verfolgt keine politischen Strategien oder Initiativen zur Unterstützung systematischer Untersuchungen auf Hörverlust im Rahmen der medizinischen Vorsorgeuntersuchungen für Erwachsene in den Mitgliedstaaten. Dies ist eine Angelegenheit der medizinischen Versorgung und fällt laut Vertrag in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten.

Die Kommission engagiert sich für die Förderung von Aktivität und Gesundheit im Alter. Ihre Pilotinitiative ist die Europäische Innovationspartnerschaft im Bereich „Aktivität und Gesundheit im Alter", mit der die Zahl der gesunden Lebensjahre der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger um zwei erhöht werden soll.

Die Partnerschaft zielt auf Lösungen zur Verbesserung der Lebensqualität älterer Menschen, die Nachhaltigkeit der Gesundheitssysteme und die Umsetzung innovativer Ideen in konkrete Produkte und Dienstleistungen, die der demografischen Entwicklung in Europa Rechnung tragen. In diesem Zusammenhang arbeiten die Partner zusammen, um Gesundheits- und Pflegedienstleistungen zu entwickeln und zu koordinieren, damit ältere Menschen aktiv und rüstig bleiben, auch wenn sie einen Hörverlust erleiden, der eine bedeutende funktionelle Einschränkung für die Betroffenen darstellt und die Teilhabe an der Gesellschaft beeinträchtigt. Auch werden IKT-Lösungen entwickelt, um Problemen im Zusammenhang mit dem Hörverlust entgegenzuwirken.

Zur Prävention der Gebrechlichkeit wird derzeit ein Projekt vom Institut Carlos III in Madrid erarbeitet, das auf Ernährungsinterventionen beruht und erforscht, inwieweit Nahrungsergänzungsmittel die Entwicklung von Altersschwerhörigkeit verhindern oder verzögern könnten. Dazu gehört die Entwicklung neuer Nahrungsmittel anhand wissenschaftlich gesicherter Erkenntnisse durch die Industrie.

([1]) Shields (2006), Curhan et al. (2013), Lin et al. (2011), Share study (2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002650/14
to the Commission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Hearing loss

Professional studies [1] have produced relevant and alarming information that highlights the need to improve the health situation and introduce more effective preventive measures for a significant number of European citizens with hearing problems.

According to one study, some 16% of the EU population, i.e. 80 million people, suffer from hearing loss: of this figure, 30 million correspond to undetected cases. Aside from being a problematic condition in itself, hearing loss is often associated with a number of other diseases, including obesity, with extremely obese women with a BMI in excess of 40 being 25% more likely to suffer from hearing problems. According to Bainbridge et al. (2008), diabetics are twice as likely to suffer from hearing loss, while the likelihood of developing dementia increases with the severity of hearing loss. With regard to depression, the risk for people who are hard of hearing of developing depressive symptoms is reduced by 50% if they use hearing aids.

In light of this, could the Commission answer the following:

1. Given the increased risk for people who are hard of hearing of suffering from other diseases, can it indicate the policies and initiatives which are in place at EU level to support systematic screening for hearing loss as part of medical check-ups for adults in the Member States?

2. Owing to the increased risk of multimorbidity associated with their condition, people who are hard of hearing have specific needs in terms of integrated care. In view of this, can the Commission outline any progress that has been made at EU level to promote integrated care, in particular within the framework of the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing?

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

The Commission does not have policies or initiatives in place which support systematic screening for hearing loss as part of medical check-ups for adults in the Member States. This is a healthcare management issue and falls under the responsibility of Member States, as laid down in the Treaty.

The Commission is taking action to encourage active and healthy ageing. Its pilot initiative is the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing which seeks to increase by two the healthy life years (HLY) of the European citizens.

The Partnership is aimed at finding solutions to improve the quality of life of older people, the sustainability of health systems and to translate innovative ideas into tangible products and services that respond to European demographic challenges. In this context, partners are working to design and coordinate health and care services to enable older people to remain active and functional while living with hearing loss, which is an important functional limitation for patients to participate in the society. ICT solutions are emerging too to help counteract problems related to hearing loss.

In the area of frailty prevention, a project is currently developed by the Institute Carlos III in Madrid, based in dietary interventions with nutritional supplements that could prevent or delay the development of age-related hearing loss. It involves the creation by industry of new nutritional products according to scientific based results.

---

[1] Shields (2006), Curhan et al. (2013), Lin et al. (2011), Share study (2011).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002651/14
an die Kommission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Internationales Jahr der Familie

Das Recht, eine Familie zu gründen, ist durch Artikel 16 der Allgemeinen Erklärung der Menschenrechte sowie durch Artikel 7, 9 und 33 der Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union geschützt.

Das 20. Jubiläum des Internationalen Jahres der Familie bietet 2014 laut der Erklärung der Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen die Gelegenheit, verstärkt Aufmerksamkeit auf die Ziele dieses Internationalen Jahres zu schenken, nämlich die verstärkte Zusammenarbeit auf allen Ebenen bei Familienfragen und konzertierte Aktionen zur wirksamen Stärkung und Förderung auf die Familie ausgerichteter politischer Maßnahmen und Programme.

Die ökonomische und demographische Krise wirkt sich auf keine andere Weltregion so stark aus wie auf Europa. Da nur eine familienfreundliche Gesellschaft stabil sein und prosperieren kann, sollte die Europäische Union die politische Führung auf diesem Gebiet übernehmen.

Darüber hinaus haben die Vereinten Nationen der Europäischen Union vorgeschlagen, eine Familienperspektive in ihre politischen Entscheidungsprozesse zu integrieren. Dies würde die Schaffung eines familienfreundlichen europäischen Rechtsrahmens befördern, wobei alle Stellen zur Gestaltung der Familienpolitik jedoch auf nationaler Ebene verbleiben würden.

1. Wird die Kommission eine Familienperspektive in ihre politischen Entscheidungsprozesse integrieren, um zu gewährleisten, dass Familienwerte durch EU-Rechtsvorschriften stärker unterstützt werden?

2. In der Resolution der Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen wird die Bedeutung regionaler und zwischenstaatlicher Organisationen für die Vorbereitungen und Feierlichkeiten zum 20. Jubiläum des Internationalen Jahrs der Familie hervorgehoben. Welche Vorbereitungen hat die Kommission diesbezüglich getroffen?

3. Plant die Kommission Leitlinien für ihre Generaldirektionen angesichts der Tatsache, dass die EU-Organe Rechtsvorschriften erlassen, von denen die Familie und ihr gesellschaftliches Umfeld in einer ganzen Reihe von Gebieten betroffen sind?

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

In der vorherigen Antwort der Kommission auf die Frage P-000568/2014 sind die politische Ausrichtung und die Koordination der verschiedenen Initiativen, die die Kommission zur Förderung des Wohlergehens von Familien und Kindern ergriffen hat, dargelegt; dazu gehören die Mitteilung „Die demografische Zukunft Europas“ ([1]), das Paket zu Sozialinvestitionen ([2]) und die im Rahmen des Europäischen Semesters abgegebenen länderspezifischen Empfehlungen. Der Herr Abgeordnete sei bezüglich der Fragen 1 und 3 auf diese Antwort verwiesen.

Zu Ihrer Frage 2 zum 20. Jahrestag des Internationalen Jahres der Familie: Die Kommission hat über eine neue Partnerschaftsrahmenvereinbarung mit der COFACE ([3]) finanzielle Unterstützung bereitgestellt. Die COFACE ist ein Bund von Familienorganisationen in der Europäischen Union, der für das Jahr 2014 eine EU-weite Informationskampagne zur Vereinbarkeit von Berufs- und Familienleben gestartet hat und einschlägige Seminare zu Familien in Krisensituationen organisiert.

([1]) KOM(2006)571 endg.
([2]) KOM(2013)83 endg.
([3]) http://www.coface-eu.org/en/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002651/14
to the Commission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: International Year of the Family

The right to found a family is protected by Article 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Articles 7, 9 and 33 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

As declared by the United Nations General Assembly, the 20th anniversary of the International Year of the Family in 2014 provides a useful opportunity to draw further attention to the objectives of the International Year, which are to increase cooperation at all levels on family issues and undertake concerted action to effectively strengthen and promote family-focused policies and programmes.

The economic and demographic crisis has had a much greater impact in Europe than in any other region of the world. Since only a family-friendly society can be stable and prosperous, the European Union should take political leadership in this regard.

Furthermore, the United Nations has suggested that the European Union should integrate a family perspective into the policy-making process. This would facilitate the creation of a family-friendly European legal framework even though all family policy-making bodies remain at a national level.

In light of the above, we ask the Commission to answer the following:

1. Will the Commission integrate a family perspective into the policy-making process, to ensure that European legislation further supports family values?

2. The United Nations General Assembly Resolution has highlighted the importance of regional and intergovernmental organisations preparing for and observing the twentieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family. What preparations have been made by the Commission in this regard?

3. Since the European institutions are adopting legislation which affects families and its societal environment in a number of areas, does the Commission plan to establish overall guidelines for the DGs in the EC General Directorate?

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

The Commission's previous reply to Question P-000568/2014 outlines the policy orientation and coordination of its various initiatives undertaken to promote the wellbeing of families and children, which includes the communication on The Demographic Future of Europe ([1]), the Social Investment Package ([2]) and country-specific recommendations issued in the framework of the European Semester. The Honourable Member is referred to this reply in response to Questions 1 and 3.

Concerning Question 2 on the 20th Anniversary of the International Year of the Family, the Commission has provided financial support through a new framework partnership agreement with COFACE ([3]), a confederation of family organisations across Europe, which has launched an EU-wide information campaign on Reconciling Work and Family life for 2014 and organised relevant seminars on families in the crisis.

([1]) COM(2006) 571.
([2]) COM(2013) 083.
([3]) http://www.coface-eu.org/en/

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002652/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Εκφοβισμός ατόμων με αυτισμό

Ο εκφοβισμός είναι ιδιαίτερα βλαπτικός όταν στο στόχαστρο είναι άτομα με διαταραχές αυτιστικού φάσματος, οι οποίες πλήττουν έναν στους 150 ανθρώπους. Ο διαδικτυακός εκφοβισμός συνιστά ένα όλο και μεγαλύτερο πρόβλημα στο διαδίκτυο.

1. Ποια μέτρα προφύλαξης λαμβάνει η Επιτροπή για την προστασία των ατόμων με διαταραχές αυτιστικού φάσματος από τον εκφοβισμό και το διαδικτυακό εκφοβισμό;

2. Πώς προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να καταπολεμήσει το διαδικτυακό εκφοβισμό, ο οποίος καλπάζει στην ΕΕ;

Απάντηση της κ. Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(29 Απριλίου 2014)

Τα παιδιά αποτελούν ευάλωτη ομάδα στον επιγραμμικό τομέα που χρήζει ιδιαίτερης παρακολούθησης και προστασίας, δεδομένου ότι το Διαδίκτυο δεν δημιουργήθηκε για να χρησιμοποιείται από την ομάδα αυτή. Η στρατηγική της Επιτροπής για ένα καλύτερα προσαρμοσμένο στα παιδιά Διαδίκτυο άπτεται του φάσματος των επιγραμμικών προβλημάτων, από τη διαχείριση του κινδύνου μέχρι την παροχή ευκαιριών στο Διαδίκτυο για όλα τα παιδιά, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της ψηφιακής εκπαίδευσης και της απόκτησης στα σχολεία γνώσεων περί των επιγραμμικών εργαλείων και της ανάπτυξης της ατομικής υπευθυνότητας των παιδιών στο Διαδίκτυο. Στον «μη επιγραμμικό» κόσμο, διαπιστώθηκε ότι τα παιδιά με διαταραχές του αυτιστικού φάσματος (ΔΑΦ) διατρέχουν υψηλότερο κίνδυνο προσβολής ([1]), ιδιαίτερα όταν ερμηνεύουν λανθασμένα τις κοινωνικές περιστάσεις. Ταυτόχρονα, ενδέχεται τα παιδιά να μην συνειδητοποιούν τις συνέπειες της ίδιας τους της συμπεριφοράς και ως εκ τούτου να εκφοβίζουν ασυνείδητα. Συνολικά, τα συσσωρευόμενα αποδεικτικά στοιχεία ([2]) υποδηλώνουν ότι τα παιδιά που είναι ευάλωτα ή που ανήκουν σε ομάδες κινδύνου συγκεντρώνουν περισσότερες πιθανότητες να εκτεθούν σε κίνδυνο μέσω του Διαδικτύου.

Η Επιτροπή συγχρηματοδοτεί ένα πανευρωπαϊκό δίκτυο κέντρων για την ασφαλή χρήση του διαδικτύου (Safer Internet Centres), ώστε να εξασφαλίσει την παροχή στήριξης μέσω εθνικών δικτύων ανοιχτών γραμμών επικοινωνίας-αρωγής και την αύξηση της συνειδητοποίησης των ανηλίκων, γονέων και εκπαιδευτικών για τους τρόπους διαχείρισης των κινδύνων που ελλοχεύουν στο Διαδίκτυο. Γραμμές επικοινωνίας-αρωγής προσφέρουν συμβουλές σε παιδιά, γονείς και εκπαιδευτικούς σχετικά με τους διαδικτυακούς κινδύνους, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του εκφοβισμού στον κυβερνοχώρο. Επιπλέον, από τις έρευνες έχει συναχθεί το συμπέρασμα ότι τα εργαλεία των ΤΠΕ μπορούν κάλλιστα να αναβαθμίσουν τις κοινωνικές ικανότητες των παιδιών που πάσχουν από ΔΑΦ ([3]) ([4]).

Η συμμετοχή της βιομηχανίας σε ολόκληρη την αξιακή αλυσίδα είναι καίριας σημασίας παράγοντας για την αντιμετώπιση των νέων προβλημάτων που συνοδεύουν τις νέες τεχνολογίες και τις πρακτικές των χρηστών. Η Επιτροπή προσπαθεί, μέσω αυτορρυθμιστικών πρωτοβουλιών, όπως είναι ο συνασπισμός CEO ([5]), να καταστήσει το Διαδίκτυο ασφαλέστερο για τα παιδιά.

([1]) http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2809311/
([2]) http://www.ehu.es/zer/hemeroteca/pdfs/zer35-01-livingstone.pdf
([3]) http://cospatial.fbk.eu/
([4]) http://asc-inclusion.eu/
([5]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/node/61973

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002652/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Autism bullying

Bullying is especially harmful when targeted at people with autistic spectrum disorders, which affect one in 150 people. Cyberbullying is a growing problem online.

1. What precautions is the Commission taking to protect people with autistic spectrum disorders from bullying and cyberbullying?

2. How does the Commission intend to combat cyberbullying, which is rampant in the EU?

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

Children are a vulnerable group online that needs special empowerment and protection as the Internet was not created for its use. The Commission's Strategy for a Better Internet for Children deals with the range of online challenges from managing risks to providing opportunities online for all children, including through teaching digital and media literacy in schools and developing children's self-responsibility online. In the 'offline' world, children with Autistic Spectrum Disorders (ASD) have been found to be at higher victimisation risk ([1]), especially when they misinterpret social situations. At the same time those children may not be aware of the consequences of their own behaviour, and may thus bully, without being aware of it. Overall, the growing evidence base ([2]) suggests that those children who are vulnerable or at risk offline are more likely also to be at risk online.

The Commission co-funds a pan-European network of Safer Internet Centres, to provide support through national networks of helplines and promote awareness to minors, parents and teachers of how to manage risks online. Helplines offer advice to children, parents and teachers on online risks, including cyber-bullying. In addition, research has shown how ICT tools can successfully promote the learning of social competence by children with ASD ([3]) ([4]).

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 ([5]) to make the Internet a better place for children.

([1]) http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2809311/
([2]) http://www.ehu.es/zer/hemeroteca/pdfs/zer35-01-livingstone.pdf
([3]) http://cospatial.fbk.eu/
([4]) http://asc-inclusion.eu/
([5]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/node/61973

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002653/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Διαπραγματεύσεις σχετικά με τη διατλαντική εταιρική σχέση συναλλαγών και επενδύσεων

Η κυβέρνηση των ΗΠΑ διαπραγματεύεται επί του παρόντος με την Επιτροπή τη διατλαντική εταιρική σχέση συναλλαγών και επενδύσεων (TTIP), η οποία αποσκοπεί στη δημιουργία της μεγαλύτερης ζώνης ελεύθερων συναλλαγών παγκοσμίως και η οποία θα απέφερε αυξημένα κέρδη για τις επιχειρήσεις. Στο πλαίσιο των διαπραγματεύσεων η εντολή της Επιτροπής εστιάζεται στην προώθηση του διατλαντικών συναλλαγών.

1. Λαμβάνει υπόψη της η Επιτροπή, στο πλαίσιο της εντολής της, την απαραίτητη προστασία των καταναλωτών, των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων, των ατομικών δικαιωμάτων και του περιβάλλοντος;

2. Είναι ρεαλιστικό να πιστεύει κανείς ότι ο στόχος της δίκαιης κατανομής του πλούτου μπορεί να επιτευχθεί μόνο μέσω της οικονομικής ανάπτυξης;

3. Συνιστά η TTIP απειλή όσον αφορά την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος και των καταναλωτών;

4. Έχοντας υπόψη ότι έχουν συγκεντρωθεί 70 000 υπογραφές πολιτών κατά της TTIP, με ποια επιχειρήματα υποστηρίζει η Επιτροπή την TTIP;

Απάντηση του κ. De Gucht εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Απριλίου 2014)

1 και 3. Σύμφωνα με τις οδηγίες που εξέδωσε το Συμβούλιο, οι διαπραγματεύσεις για τη διατλαντική εταιρική σχέση εμπορίου και επενδύσεων (TTIP) προσπαθούν να εξασφαλίσουν ότι η πρόοδος όσον αφορά την ενίσχυση του εμπορίου και των επενδύσεων δεν θα γίνει εις βάρος των θεμελιωδών αξιών της ΕΕ και δεν θα θίγει το δικαίωμα της ΕΕ να θεσπίζει ρυθμίσεις και να λαμβάνει μέτρα για την επίτευξη νόμιμων στόχων δημόσιας πολιτικής με τον τρόπο που αυτή κρίνει ενδεδειγμένο. Η Επιτροπή θα εξασφαλίσει ότι τα αποτελέσματα των διαπραγματεύσεων θα εξακολουθήσουν να προωθούν υψηλά επίπεδα προστασίας για το περιβάλλον, την υγεία, τους εργαζομένους και τους καταναλωτές.

2. Η κατανομή του πλούτου που θα προκύψει ως αποτέλεσμα της έναρξης ισχύος της συμφωνίας εξαρτάται από αποφάσεις εθνικού επιπέδου αλλά και επιπέδου ΕΕ που υπερβαίνουν την απλή εμπορική πολιτική.

4. Η Επιτροπή διεξάγει τις διαπραγματεύσεις για την TTIP έχοντας την εδραία πεποίθηση ότι η συμφωνία μπορεί να αποφέρει οφέλη στις κοινωνίες, τους πολίτες και τις επιχειρήσεις της ΕΕ με βιώσιμο τρόπο. Η συμφωνία αναμένεται να δημιουργήσει θέσεις εργασίας και ανάπτυξη με την παροχή καλύτερης πρόσβασης στην αγορά των ΗΠΑ, την επίτευξη μεγαλύτερης κανονιστικής συμβατότητας μεταξύ της ΕΕ και των ΗΠΑ και τη δημιουργία των προϋποθέσεων για τη θέσπιση παγκόσμιων προτύπων. Αν συναφθεί αυτή η φιλόδοξη συμφωνία, αναμένεται ότι η οικονομία της ΕΕ θα ενισχυθεί κατά 0,5% έως και 1% του ΑΕγχΠ, ή κατά 119 δισ. ευρώ ετησίως, όταν εφαρμοστεί πλήρως. Περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα αναμενόμενα οφέλη της TTIP υπάρχουν στον ιστότοπο της Επιτροπής ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/in-focus/ttip/about-ttip/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002653/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations

The US administration and the Commission are currently negotiating the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), which aims to create the world's largest free trade area and would result in increased profits for businesses. The focus of the Commission's mandate in these negotiations is the promotion of transatlantic trade.

1. Does the Commission's mandate take into consideration the necessary protection of consumers, workers' rights, civil rights and the environment?

2. Is it realistic to believe that the goal of fairly distributed wealth can be achieved through economic growth alone?

3. Does the TTIP pose any threats to the protection of the environment and consumers?

4. Bearing in mind that more than 70 000 signatures have been collected by citizens against the TTIP, what are the Commission's arguments for supporting the TTIP?

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

1 and 3. In line with the directives adopted by the Council, the negotiations on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) strive to ensure that progress in terms of enhanced trade and investment will not come at the expense of EU's fundamental values and will be without prejudice to its right to regulate and to take measures to meet legitimate public policy objectives in the way it considers appropriate. The Commission will ensure that the outcomes of the negotiations will continue to promote high levels of protection for the environment, health, workers and consumers.

2. The repartition of the wealth obtained as a result of the entry into force of the Agreement depends on both national and EU-wide decisions that go beyond mere trade policy.

4. The Commission conducts TTIP negotiations having the firm belief that the Agreement can bring benefits to EU societies, citizens and companies in a sustainable way. The Agreement is expected to create jobs and growth by delivering better access to the US market, achieving greater regulatory compatibility between the EU and the US, and paving the way for setting global standards. If such an ambitious agreement were achieved, it is expected that EU economy would be boosted by 0.5% to up to 1% of GDP, or EUR 119 billion annually, once fully implemented. More detailed information on the expected benefits of TTIP can be found on the Commission's website ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/in-focus/ttip/about-ttip/

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002655/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ευρέως διαδεδομένη η κακοποίηση των γυναικών στα κράτη μέλη

Μια μελέτη του Οργανισμού Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ (FRA), διαπίστωσε ότι μία στις τρεις γυναίκες στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει υποστεί σωματική ή σεξουαλική βία από την ηλικία των 15, αποκαλύπτοντας ότι σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη είναι ευρέως διαδεδομένη η κακοποίηση των γυναικών. Πέντε τοις εκατό όλων των γυναικών ισχυρίζονται ότι έχουν πέσει θύματα βιασμού.

Επιπλέον, η μελέτη διαπίστωσε ότι το 75% των γυναικών που έχουν υποστεί σεξουαλική παρενόχληση είναι εργαζόμενες σε εξειδικευμένα επαγγέλματα ή σε ανώτατες διοικητικές θέσεις, και ότι στις περιπτώσεις (μια στις 10 γυναίκες) που υπάρχει σεξουαλική βία εκτός σχέσης, στο σοβαρό περιστατικό υπάρχει ανάμιξη περισσότερων από ένα δραστών.

Η απροθυμία των γυναικών να καταγγείλουν τις περιπτώσεις κακοποίησης συνεχίζεται, και πρέπει να εξεταστεί το ενδεχόμενο ανανέωσης της πολιτικής.

1. Ποια μέτρα προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να λάβει φέτος για την υλοποίηση μέτρων πρόληψης και εκστρατειών ευαισθητοποίησης που θα στοχεύουν τόσο τους άνδρες όσο και τις γυναίκες;

2. Πώς εξασφαλίζει η Επιτροπή ότι η νομοθεσία σε κάθε κράτος μέλος είναι σύμφωνη με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ και τις συμβάσεις του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης για τη βία κατά των γυναικών;

3. Πώς μπορεί η Επιτροπή να διασφαλίσει ότι οι νόμοι που αφορούν την ισότητα των φύλων θα εφαρμόζονται δεόντως;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Μαΐου 2014)

1. Τον Νοέμβριο του 2013, 13 εθνικά προγράμματα για την προώθηση δραστηριοτήτων ευαισθητοποίησης σχετικά με τη βία κατά των γυναικών επιχορηγήθηκαν με συνολικό ποσό ύψους 3,7 εκατ. ευρώ στο πλαίσιο του προηγούμενου προγράμματος χρηματοδότησης Progress (2007-2013). Τα προγράμματα θα υλοποιηθούν το 2014-2016. Εφέτος, η Επιτροπή θα χρηματοδοτήσει επίσης προγράμματα σχετικά με τη βία κατά των γυναικών στο πλαίσιο του γενικού προγράμματος «Δικαιώματα, Ισότητα και Ιθαγένεια».

2. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι αρμόδια να εξασφαλίσει ότι τα κράτη μέλη συμμορφώνονται με τις συμβάσεις του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης σχετικά με τη βία κατά των γυναικών. Ωστόσο, η οδηγία 2012/29/ΕΕ, που θα ισχύσει από τις 16 Νοεμβρίου 2015, θα εξασφαλίσει ότι για όλα τα θύματα, περιλαμβανομένων των γυναικών και των κοριτσιών που είναι θύματα βίας, θα ισχύουν ελάχιστα πρότυπα για τα δικονομικά δικαιώματα, τη στήριξη και την προστασία. Στόχος της είναι επίσης να εξασφαλίσει ότι οι ανάγκες των θυμάτων αξιολογούνται κατά περίπτωση και ότι τα πλέον ευάλωτα θύματα, μεταξύ των οποίων τα θύματα βίας λόγω φύλου, υποβάλλονται σε θεραπεία κατάλληλη για τις ανάγκες τους.

3. Η Επιτροπή, ως θεματοφύλακας των Συνθηκών, οφείλει να εξασφαλίζει τον σεβασμό του δικαίου της ΕΕ, ελέγχοντας την τήρηση από τα κράτη μέλη των κανόνων της Συνθήκης και της ενωσιακής νομοθεσίας. Σε περίπτωση κενών ή μη ορθής μεταφοράς του δικαίου της ΕΕ, η Επιτροπή μπορεί να κινήσει διαδικασία επί παραβάσει και να προσφύγει στο Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, προκειμένου να τεκμηριωθεί παράβαση ενωσιακής νομοθεσίας από κράτος μέλος. Όταν η νομοθεσία της ΕΕ έχει εφαρμοστεί ορθά, αρμόδια για την παρακολούθηση της εφαρμογής της σε μια συγκεκριμένη υπόθεση είναι, κατ' αρχήν, τα εθνικά δικαστήρια. Εναπόκειται, συνεπώς, στους ιδιώτες να κινήσουν δικαστική διαδικασία και να καταγγείλουν οποιαδήποτε παράβαση του δικαίου της ΕΕ ενώπιον των εθνικών δικαστηρίων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002655/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Widespread violence against women

A study by the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) found that one in three women in the European Union has experienced physical or sexual violence since the age of 15, revealing widespread abuse of women throughout all Member States. Five percent of all women claim to have been raped.

Furthermore, the study found that 75% of women who have been sexually harassed are in qualified professions or top management positions, and that in the case of one in 10 women who have experienced sexual violence by a non-partner there was more than one perpetrator involved in the most serious incident.

The unwillingness of women to report abuse continues, and attention must be given to a renewal of policy.

1. What action does the Commission intend to take this year to implement prevention and awareness-raising campaigns targeting both men and women?

2. How does the Commission ensure that legislation in each Member State is in line with EC law and with Council of Europe conventions on violence against women?

3. How can the Commission ensure that gender equality laws are implemented?

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

1. In November 2013, 13 national projects developing awareness-raising activities on violence against women were awarded a grant for a total amount of EUR 3.7 million under the previous funding programme Progress (2007-2013). The projects will be implemented in 2014-2016. This year, the Commission will also fund projects on violence against women through the Rights, Equality and Citizenship programme.

2. It is not for the Commission to ensure that EU Member States comply with the Council of Europe Conventions on violence against women. However, Directive 2012/29/EU, applicable as of 16 November 2015, will ensure that all victims, including women and girls victims of violence, benefit from common minimum standards on procedural rights, support and protection. It also aims to ensure that needs of victims are individually assessed and that the most vulnerable victims, among them victims of gender-based violence, receive treatment appropriate to their requirements.

3. As guardian of the Treaties, the Commission has the responsibility to ensure respect for EC laws, verifying that Member States abide by Treaty rules and EU legislation. In case of lack of or incorrect transposition of EC law, the Commission can institute infringement proceedings and can bring the matter before the Court of Justice of the European Union, seeking a declaration of infringement of EC law by the Member State. When the EU legislation has been correctly implemented, the monitoring of its application in a particular case is in principle the competence of national courts. It is therefore up to individuals to initiate judicial proceedings and claim any breach of EC law before the national courts.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002656/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Βιομηχανική πολιτική

Με τη στρατηγική «Ευρώπη 2020» και τη νέα βιομηχανική πολιτική της, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει θέσει ένα φιλόδοξο στόχο: 20% του ΑΕγχΠ της ΕΕ πρέπει να προέρχεται από τον τομέα της μεταποίησης έως το 2020.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι δυνατό να επιτευχθεί αυτός ο στόχος έως το 2020;

2. Ποια συγκεκριμένα μέτρα έχουν ληφθεί για να στηριχθεί η πραγματική οικονομία και να επανέλθει στο επίκεντρο των πολιτικών της ΕΕ;

3. Γιατί δεν είναι ορατή η «βιομηχανική αναγέννηση» και στα 28 κράτη μέλη;

4. Ποιες χώρες έχουν επωφεληθεί περισσότερο από τα βιομηχανικά σχέδια που έχουν εγκριθεί μέχρι σήμερα (για την αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία, τον χαλυβουργικό τομέα, τον τομέα των κατασκευών και τον ναυπηγοεπισκευαστικό τομέα);

5. Σε τι βαθμό ωφέλησαν οι «αποστολές για την ανάπτυξη» του επιχειρηματίες — μεγάλους ή μικρούς, νέους ή πεπειραμένους — στην Ελλάδα, την Πορτογαλία και την Κύπρο;

6. Καθώς ο δρόμος που πρέπει να διανύσουμε είναι ακόμη μακρύς, με ποιους τρόπους μπορεί η Επιτροπή να διασφαλίσει ότι μια στέρεη και ισχυρή νέα βιομηχανική πολιτική θα είναι επωφελής για όλα τα κράτη μέλη στη βόρεια, κεντρική και νότια Ευρώπη, χωρίς τις τεράστιες ανισότητες που σημειώνονται σήμερα;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Μαΐου 2014)

1. Θα είναι δύσκολο αλλά όχι αδύνατο να επιτευχθεί ο στόχος του 20% του ΑΕγχΠ στον τομέα της μεταποίησης. Η αιώνια φθίνουσα τάση του τομέα της μεταποίησης στην οικονομία είναι αναστρέψιμη, όπως αποδείχθηκε από πρόσφατες εξελίξεις στην οικονομία των ΗΠΑ.

2. Η πρόσφατη ανακοίνωση για τη βιομηχανική πολιτική με τίτλο «Για μια ευρωπαϊκή βιομηχανική αναγέννηση» ([1]) προβαίνει σε απολογισμό των διαφόρων μέτρων που έχουν ληφθεί και που απαιτούνται για να διασφαλιστεί η ανάκαμψη της βιομηχανικής ανάπτυξης στην ΕΕ.

3. Δεν υπάρχει ένας μεμονωμένος παράγοντας που να εξηγεί γιατί η ανάκαμψη στη βιομηχανία της ΕΕ είναι τόσο δύσκολη. Αντίθετα, υπάρχει ένα σύνολο παραγόντων όπως οι συνθήκες συνολικής ζήτησης, η πρόσβαση στη χρηματοδότηση, τα εμπόδια όσον αφορά την αποτελεσματική αναδιάρθρωση και η παρατεταμένη αβεβαιότητα σχετικά με το περιβάλλον της πολιτικής.

4. Τα βιομηχανικά σχέδια που έχουν εγκριθεί μέχρι σήμερα δεν χρηματοδοτούν προγράμματα της ΕΕ, πράγμα το οποίο θα ωφελούσε κάποιο από τα κράτη μέλη. Είναι μάλλον κοινές στρατηγικές που έχουν εκπονηθεί από όλα τα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη, ούτως ώστε να αντιμετωπιστεί η πρόσφατη κρίση. Λόγω της φύσης τους, η Επιτροπή δεν αναμένει ότι τα σχέδια θα έχουν διαφοροποιημένο αντίκτυπο στα κράτη μέλη πέραν της ειδικής βαρύτητας των αντίστοιχων βιομηχανικών τομέων σε κάθε κράτος μέλος.

5. Οκτώ αποστολές οργανώθηκαν σε πέντε κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ: Ελλάδα (2), Πορτογαλία (1), Βέλγιο (1), Ιταλία (2) και Ισπανία (2). Κατά μέσο όρο, κάθε αποστολή περιελάμβανε 500 εταιρείες που συμμετείχαν σε 800 συνεδριάσεις. Συνολικά 850 ελληνικές, 695 πορτογαλικές και 22 κυπριακές εταιρείες συμμετείχαν σε αυτές τις εκδηλώσεις. Επιπλέον, οι αποστολές για την ανάπτυξη οργανώθηκαν σε 17 χώρες εκτός της ΕΕ. 17 ελληνικές, 9 πορτογαλικές και 9 κυπριακές εταιρείες συμμετείχαν σε αυτές.

6. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί τις βιομηχανικές επιδόσεις της ΕΕ και των επιμέρους κρατών μελών στις ετήσιες και μηνιαίες δημοσιεύσεις της, οι οποίες είναι διαθέσιμες στην ιστοσελίδα βιομηχανικής ανταγωνιστικότητας Europa ([2]).

([1]) COM(2014)014 τελικό.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/industrial-competitiveness/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002656/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Industrial policy

With the Europe 2020 strategy and its new industrial policy, the European Union has set itself an ambitious target: 20% of EU GDP is to come from the manufacturing sector by 2020.

We ask the Commission:

1. Is this target achievable by 2020?

2. What concrete action has been taken to support the real economy and to put it back at the centre of EU policies?

3. Why is the 'industrial Renaissance' not visible in all 28 Member States?

4. What countries have benefited most from the industrial plans adopted so far (for cars, steel, construction and shipbuilding)?

5. To what extent have the 'missions for growth' benefited entrepreneurs — large or small, beginners or experienced — in Greece, Portugal and Cyprus?

6. As the road ahead is still long, how can the Commission ensure that a solid and strong new industrial policy will benefit all the Member States in northern, central and southern Europe, without the huge inequalities experienced at present?

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

1. It will be difficult but not impossible to achieve the target of 20% GDP for manufacturing. The secular diminishing trend of manufacturing in the economy is not irreversible as it has been shown by recent developments in the US economy.

2. The recent Industrial Policy Communication 'For a European Industrial Renaissance' ([1]) takes stock of the different measures taken and needed to assure that industrial growth takes off in the EU.

3. There is no single factor explaining why recovery in EU industry is so difficult. There is rather a set of factors including aggregate demand conditions, access to finance, barriers to effective restructuring and a prolonged uncertainty on the policy environment.

4. The industrial plans adopted so far are not funding programmes of the EU which would benefit one MS or another. These are rather joint strategies elaborated by all stakeholders in order to address the recent crisis. Due to their nature, the Commission does not expect that the plans will have a differentiated impact across MS beyond the specific weight of the respective industrial sectors in each MS.

5. Eight Missions have been organised in five EU countries: Greece (2), Portugal (1) Belgium (1), Italy (2) and Spain (2). On average each mission involved 500 companies participating in 800 meetings. In total 850 Greek, 695 Portuguese and 22 Cypriot companies have participated in these events. In addition, mission for growth have been organised to countries outside the EU to 17 countries. 17 Greek, 9 Portuguese and 9 Cypriot companies have participated in them.

6. The Commission keeps track of industrial performance of the EU and individual MS in its annual and monthly publications that can be found in our Industrial Competitiveness Europa webpage ([2]).

([1]) COM(2014) 014 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/industrial-competitiveness/index_en.htm

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002658/14
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(6. marts 2014)

Om: Godkendelse af støtteordning til solceller

Kan Kommissionen som supplement til sit svar på skriftlig forespørgsel E-012370/13 oplyse, hvornår den forventer at have færdigbehandlet ansøgningen fra de danske myndigheder om godkendelse af de nye danske regler for statsstøtte til solceller?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Joaquín Almunia
(28. april 2014)

Danmark anmeldte i februar 2013 en støtteordning for solcelleanlæg, men den måtte efterfølgende ændres. Kommissionen er kommet langt med vurderingen heraf, men der er stadig visse spørgsmål, der mangler at blive besvaret, før den kan godkende ordningen. I den forbindelse er Kommissionen i tæt kontakt med de danske myndigheder. På nuværende tidspunkt kan Kommissionen ikke nøjagtig oplyse, hvornår den vil træffe afgørelse.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002658/14
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Approval of aid for photovoltaic cells

Further to its answer to Written Question E-012370/13, can the Commission say when it expects to finish processing the application from the Danish authorities regarding the new rules on state aid for photovoltaic cells?

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

Denmark notified a support scheme for photovoltaic installations in February 2013, but the scheme subsequently had to be modified. The Commission made significant progress in the assessment, but some issues still need to be resolved before the Commission can give its approval. The Commission is in close contact with the Danish authoritites in this regard. At this stage, the Commission cannot give a definite date for when a decision will be taken.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002659/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(6 mars 2014)

Objet: Traité transatlantique UE-USA

Le grand marché transatlantique en cours de négociation est un projet de libre-échange entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis. Ce projet de traité pose problème et suscite l'inquiétude car il vise non seulement à abaisser les barrières douanières entre l'Europe et les États-Unis, mais aussi à harmoniser les normes en matière sociale, technique, alimentaire et environnementale, et à appliquer les principes édictés par l'OMC. Or les États-Unis sont nettement moins-disants sur ces normes.

En matière alimentaire, les normes concernant les OGM, les hormones, les additifs toxiques, les pesticides, etc., sont nettement différentes et moins protectrices de nos santés aux États-Unis. Nos normes deviendraient des «barrières commerciales illégales».

Par ailleurs, il peut y avoir un risque que les nations interdisant l'exploitation du gaz de schiste soient poursuivies par des sociétés privées réclamant des dommages et intérêts, sachant que dans ces accords de libre-échange, il y a ce qu'on appelle des «arbitrages», dont les États-Unis et leurs firmes sortent toujours vainqueurs.

1. Quelles procédures ou mécanismes la Commission prévoit-elle afin de maintenir les normes en matière de protection sociale, technique, environnementale et alimentaire de l'Union européenne face aux États-Unis?

2. Sachant que les États-Unis n'ont signé presqu'aucune des conventions de l'OIT, comment les aspects sociaux et le respect des conventions de l'OIT d'un tel accord se règleront-ils?

3. Sachant que les États-Unis n'ont pas signé le protocole de Kyoto, comment la Commission compte-t-elle maintenir ses standards en matière environnementale face un tel accord?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(30 avril 2014)

1. La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire aux réponses qu'elle a données aux questions E-002653/2014 et E-013569/2013.

2. Comme elle l'a souligné dans le document public exposant sa position sur le commerce et le développement durable ([1]), la Commission considère que les négociations sur le partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement (TTIP) devraient refléter les engagements des parties sur un ensemble de principes et de règles reconnus au niveau international concernant le travail et l'environnement, y compris le changement climatique. Pour ce qui est du travail, les discussions devraient prendre comme point de départ les engagements existants des parties dans les domaines pertinents, y compris la déclaration relative aux principes et droits fondamentaux au travail de l'Organisation internationale du travail (OIT) de 1998 et son suivi, ainsi que la déclaration de l'OIT de 2008 sur la justice sociale pour une mondialisation équitable, qui s'applique à l'ensemble des membres de l'OIT. L'UE estime également que les normes fondamentales du travail de l'OIT, inscrites dans les principales conventions de l'OIT et reconnues au niveau international en tant que droits fondamentaux du travail, sont un élément clé à intégrer dans le cadre d'un accord commercial.

3. La Commission est fermement déterminée à préserver le droit de réglementer et d'adopter des mesures pour répondre à des objectifs publics légitimes dans le domaine de l'environnement et assurer un niveau élevé de protection environnementale. Pour la Commission, il est de la plus haute importance de veiller à ce que ce niveau élevé de protection dans l'UE ne soit pas fragilisé ou affaibli. Dans le cadre du TTIP, la Commission cherche à établir des engagements sur des principes et règles internationalement approuvés en matière d'environnement, à parvenir à une mise en œuvre efficace du droit environnemental sur le plan national et à maintenir un niveau élevé de protection de l'environnement par l'application efficace des législations nationales.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/july/tradoc_151626

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002659/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: EU-US free trade agreement

The Transatlantic Free Trade Area currently under negotiation is an EU-US free trade project. The draft agreement would not only lower customs barriers between Europe and the USA, but would also bring the two sides' social, technical, food and environmental standards more closely into line and apply World Trade Organisation principles. This is problematic and a cause for concern, because US standards in these areas are much less strict.

US standards governing the use of genetically modified organisms or levels of hormones, toxic additives, pesticides, etc. in food are very different from the EU's and are not so clearly designed to protect public health. Our standards would become 'illegal trade barriers'.

What is more, there is a risk that private companies may take legal action to claim damages from states which ban fracking, since free trade agreements of this kind make provision for arbitration procedures which the USA and US companies always seem to win.

1. What procedures or mechanisms is the Commission planning to employ in an effort to safeguard the EU's social protection, technical, environmental and food standards in the face of US pressure to water them down?

2. Given that the US has signed hardly any of the International Labour Organisation's (ILO) conventions, what provisions will the free-trade agreement contain governing labour issues and compliance with ILO conventions?

3. Given that the US has not signed the Kyoto Protocol, how does the Commission intend to maintain EU environmental standards in the context of such an agreement?

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

1. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the answers provided to questions E-002653/2014 and E-013569/2013.

2. As highlighted in its public position paper on Trade and Sustainable Development ([1]), the Commission considers that the TTIP negotiations should reflect the Parties' commitments regarding a set of internationally agreed principles and rules on labour and the environment, including climate change. In the labour domain, the starting point for discussions should be the Parties' existing commitments in relevant areas, including the International Labour Organisation (ILO) 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Rights and Principles at Work, as well as and its follow-up, and the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalisation, which applies to all ILO members. The EU also considers that ILO core labour standards, enshrined in the core ILO Conventions and internationally recognised as the fundamental labour rights, are a key element to be integrated in the context of a trade agreement.

3. The Commission is fully committed to protect the right to regulate and to take measures to meet legitimate public objectives in the area of environment, and to ensure high levels of environmental protection. For the Commission it is of utmost importance to ensure that these high levels of environmental protection in the EU are not weakened or lowered. In TTIP, the Commission is looking for commitments regarding internationally agreed principles and rules on the environment, effective domestic implementation of the environmental laws and upholding of high levels of environmental protection through the effective enforcement of domestic laws.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/july/tradoc_151626

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002660/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(6 mars 2014)

Objet: Conditions de travail des travailleurs migrants saisonniers

La directive européenne établissant les conditions d'entrée et de séjour des ressortissants de pays tiers aux fins d'un emploi en tant que travailleur saisonnier (PE-CONS 113/13), qui a pour objectif de faciliter l'accès des travailleurs saisonniers de pays non européens aux permis de travail, de définir une série de droits sociaux et économiques de base pour ceux-ci et de mettre sur un pied d'égalité les droits du travail de ces travailleurs de pays tiers et les droits des travailleurs européens, semble ne pas avoir les effets désirés.

En France et en Espagne, la précarité des saisonniers dans l'agriculture intensive est renforcée par le fait que la plupart d'entre eux, Africains et Européens de l'Est, sont dans la semi-légalité. Tous ces travailleurs ne bénéficient plus des garanties qu'offraient les contrats à l'origine et sont donc plus exposés aux abus (salaires, horaires, conditions de travail, logement) et au travail sans contrat.

Le secteur des fraises espagnoles est l'un des exemples de cette agriculture intensive dans laquelle les conditions de vie et d'emploi des travailleurs — majoritairement immigrés — sont bien éloignées des normes de l'Union européenne.

Dans la province de Huelva (Espagne), où l'on cultive la fraise, plus de 2 500 immigrés vivraient actuellement dans des *chabolas*, habitations faites de bois, de plastiques ou de cartons et dépourvues d'eau courante et d'électricité. Ces conditions dramatiques renforcent la vulnérabilité des travailleurs immigrés. Les quelques jours de travail ne se déroulent que très rarement dans le respect des conventions collectives et les conditions de travail sont difficiles (pauses très rares, exposition à des produits chimiques) et aléatoires (dépendantes des conditions climatiques).

Le PE vient d'adopter une résolution sur des inspections du travail efficaces à titre de stratégie pour l'amélioration des conditions de travail.

1. Quelles mesures la Commission compte-t-elle prendre afin de veiller à ce que les droits des travailleurs saisonniers soient respectés et en accord avec la directive? Quelles sont les étapes à venir?

2. Comment mettre en œuvre les inspections du travail dans le domaine du travail saisonnier? Comment protéger les droits sociaux et économiques des travailleurs saisonniers?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(2 mai 2014)

La directive sur les travailleurs saisonniers ([1]) a été adoptée par le Parlement européen et le Conseil le 26 février 2014. Les États membres doivent mettre en vigueur les dispositions législatives, réglementaires et administratives nécessaires pour s'y conformer au plus tard le 30 septembre 2016.

Cette directive garantira l'égalité de traitement des travailleurs migrants saisonniers et des ressortissants de l'État membre d'accueil en ce qui concerne, notamment, les conditions d'emploi et de travail ou le droit de grève. Elle impose en outre aux États membres d'exiger la preuve que le travailleur saisonnier dispose d'un logement qui lui assure des conditions de vie décentes pendant la durée de son séjour et de veiller à ce que des mécanismes appropriés de contrôle des employeurs soient mis en place et des inspections efficaces réalisées.

La Commission veillera à la bonne mise en œuvre de cette directive, en engageant notamment des procédures d'infraction s'il le faut, et présentera un rapport sur son application au plus tard le 30 septembre 2019.

La directive relative aux sanctions à l'encontre des employeurs ([2]) devrait également permettre de remédier au problème soulevé par l'Honorable Parlementaire. Elle interdit l'emploi de ressortissants de pays tiers en séjour irrégulier dans l'ensemble de l'Union et prévoit des sanctions pour ceux qui contreviennent à ses dispositions.

([1]) Directive 2014/36/UEdu Parlement européen et du Conseil du 26 février 2014 établissant les conditions d'entrée et de séjour des ressortissants de pays tiers aux fins d'un emploi en tant que travailleur saisonnier; JO L 94 du 28.3.2014, p. 375.
([2]) Directive 2009/52/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 18 juin 2009 prévoyant des normes minimales concernant les sanctions et les mesures à l'encontre des employeurs de ressortissants de pays tiers en séjour irrégulier; JO L 168 du 30.6.2009, pp. 24-32.

La Commission a adopté ([3]), le 9 avril 2014, une initiative visant à améliorer la coopération entre les États membres au niveau de l'UE pour lutter plus efficacement contre le travail non déclaré. Cette initiative réunira des organes nationaux chargés de faire appliquer la législation, tels que les inspections du travail et les organismes de sécurité sociale, les administrations fiscales et les services d'immigration.

([3]) COM(2014)221 final — Proposition de décision du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant une plateforme européenne dans l'objectif de renforcer la coopération visant à prévenir et à décourager le travail non déclaré.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002660/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Working conditions of seasonal migrant workers

The European directive establishing the conditions of entry and stay of third-country nationals for the purpose of seasonal work (PE-CONS 113/13), which aims to facilitate the access of seasonal workers from non-European countries to work permits, define a series of basic social and economic rights for these workers and put the labour rights of these workers from third countries on an equal footing with the rights of European workers, does not seem to be having the desired effects.

In France and Spain, the precarious situation of seasonal workers in intensive agriculture is reinforced by the fact that the majority of them, Africans and Eastern Europeans, are in a position of semi-legality. These workers no longer benefit from the guarantees originally offered by contracts and are therefore more exposed to abuse (wages, hours, working conditions, accommodation) and to working without a contract.

The Spanish strawberry sector is one example of this intensive agriculture in which the living and working conditions of the workers — the majority of which are immigrants — are far removed from the standards of the European Union.

In the province of Huelva (Spain), where strawberries are cultivated, more than 2 500 immigrants seem to currently be living in *chabolas*, dwellings made of wood, plastic or cardboard and with no running water or electricity. These appalling conditions make immigrant workers even more vulnerable. On the few working days, the collective agreements are only very rarely respected and the working conditions are difficult (very infrequent breaks, exposure to chemical products) and uncertain (dependent on climatic conditions).

The EP has just adopted a resolution on effective labour inspections as a strategy to improve working conditions.

1. What measures is the Commission intending to take in order to ensure that the rights of seasonal workers are respected in accordance with the directive? What steps will be taken next?

2. How will the labour inspections in the field of seasonal work be implemented? How will the social and economic rights of seasonal workers be protected?

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

The Seasonal Workers Directive [1] was adopted by the European Parliament and the Council on 26 February 2014. Member States should bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this directive by 30 September 2016.

According to this directive, migrant seasonal workers will be entitled to equal treatment with nationals of the host Member State with regard to terms of employment, working conditions or the right to strike, among others. Moreover, Member States must require evidence that the seasonal worker will benefit from accommodation that ensures an adequate standard of living for the duration of his or her stay. Member States will have to ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place for the monitoring of employer and that effective inspections are carried out.

The Commission will ensure the proper implementation of the directive, including by launching infringement procedures where necessary, and will produce a report on the application of the directive no later than 30 September 2019.

The Employer Sanctions Directive [2] should also help tackle the phenomenon raised by the Honourable Member. It prohibits the employment of illegally staying third-country nationals across the EU and provides for sanctions for those who do employ illegally staying workers.

[1] Directive 2014/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on the conditions of entry and stay of third-country nationals for the purpose of employment as seasonal workers; OJ L 94, 28.3.2014, p. 375-390.
[2] Directive 2009/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 providing for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals; OJ L 168, 30.6.2009, p. 24-32.

The Commission adopted [3] on 9 April 2014 an initiative to improve Member States' cooperation at EU level to tackle undeclared work more efficiently. It will bring together Member States enforcement bodies, such as the labour inspectorates and the social security, tax and migration authorities.

---

[3] COM(2014) 221 final — Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing a European Platform to enhance cooperation in the prevention and deterrence of undeclared work.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002661/14
upućeno Komisiji
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(6. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Iskoristivost napuštenih zgrada

Prema posljednjim podacima u Europi se nalazi najmanje 11 milijuna praznih nekretnina. U Španjolskoj je prazno više od 3,4 milijuna nekretnina, zatim slijede Francuska i Italija s više od 2 milijuna praznih nekretnina te Njemačka s 1,8 milijuna praznih nekretnina. Značajan broj praznih domova imaju i Velika Britanija, Grčka, Portugal, Irska i ostale europske zemlje. Mnoge od tih nekretnina nalaze se u turistički atraktivnim područjima i sagrađene su tijekom građevinskog *booma* koji je završio financijskim krahom 2008. godine.

Postojeće inicijative politike EU-a u području zaštite okoliša zgrada uglavnom su usmjerene na energetsku učinkovitost te, do sada, samo ograničen broj država članica inicijative koristi resurse izvan domene energetske učinkovitosti u građevinskom sektoru.

Opći cilj inicijative Komisije o održivoj izgradnji je, između ostalog, smanjenje utjecaja zgrada na okoliš poboljšanjem ukupne učinkovitosti resursa i, kao rezultat veće učinkovitosti, poboljšanje konkurentnosti građevinskih poduzeća. No unatoč tome broj napuštenih zgrada u pojedinim se zemljama članicama povećava.

Slijedom najava o pripremama priopćenja o održivoj gradnji i procjeni popratnih učinaka, pritom uvažavajući podatke o iznimno velikom broju praznih nekretnina, kao i već poduzete inicijative i strategije, koje mjere Komisija planira provesti kako bi se postojeće zgrade intenzivnije koristile i time smanjila potreba za dodatnom izgradnjom okoliša?

Odgovor g. Potočnika u ime Komisije
(28. travnja 2014.)

Intenzitet uporabe zgrada, koji je u određenoj mjeri povezan s uporabom praznih zgrada umjesto novih, pitanje je koje Komisija razmatra u okviru pripremne inicijative o mogućnostima učinkovitog korištenja resursa u građevinskom sektoru. Točnije, Komisija u suradnji s dionicima razmatra okvir za sveobuhvatne procjene utjecaja zgrada na okoliš, koje će obuhvaćati i pokazatelje povezane s intenzitetom uporabe zgrada.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002661/14
to the Commission
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Usability of disused buildings

According to the most recent data there are at least 11 million empty properties in Europe. In Spain there are more than 3.4 million, the next highest figures being recorded by France and Italy (over 2 million) and Germany (1.8 million). There are also considerable numbers of empty homes in the United Kingdom, Greece, Portugal, Ireland, and other European countries. Many of these properties are situated in popular tourist centres and were erected during the building boom that ended with the financial crash in 2008.

Current EU policy initiatives in the area of building-related environmental protection are intended primarily to promote energy efficiency, and, to date, only a limited number of Member States have taken initiatives aimed at utilising resources in the building sector for purposes other than energy efficiency.

One of the general aims of the Commission's 'sustainable buildings' initiative is to reduce the environmental impact of buildings by improving resource efficiency overall and, through this greater efficiency, boost the competitiveness of building firms. That notwithstanding, the number of disused buildings in individual Member States is rising.

Following the announcement that it is drawing up a communication on sustainable buildings and an accompanying impact assessment, and taking into account the data on the exceptionally high number of empty properties as well as the initiatives and strategies already under way, what measures will the Commission implement to enable more intensive use to be made of existing buildings, thereby reducing the need to add to the built environment?

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

The intensity of use of buildings, which to some extent is linked to the use of empty buildings instead of new ones, is an issue that the Commission is considering in its preparatory initiative on Resource Efficiency Opportunities in the Building Sector. More specifically the Commission is examining, in collaboration with stakeholders, a framework for comprehensive environmental assessments of buildings that will also include indicators related to the use intensity of buildings.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002662/14
upućeno Komisiji
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(6. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Borba protiv nasilja nad ženama

Na današnji dan objavljeno je istraživanje Europske agencije za temeljna prava provedeno u svih 28 država članica Unije vezano uz nasilje nad ženama. Podaci o nasilju prikupljeni razgovorima s 42 000 žena više su nego alarmantni te ukazuju na činjenicu da je svaka treća žena starija od 15 godina bila žrtva fizičkog ili seksualnog zlostavljanja. Ovakve brojke sasvim sigurno nisu u skladu s poveljom o temeljnim pravima Europske unije. Od petnaeste godine svaka je deseta žena proživjela neku vrstu seksualnog zlostavljanja, a svaka dvadeseta bila je silovana. Zabrinjava i podatak da je nasilje nad ženama jedan od najmanje prijavljenih zločina, što dodatno ukazuje na potrebu za poduzimanjem adekvatnih mjera kako bi se žene zaštitile na učinkovit način.

Unatoč činjenici da postoje sličnosti između nacionalnih politika za borbu protiv nasilja nad ženama, države članice pristupaju ovom problemu na različite načine. Iako se na nivou Europske unije raspravlja o nasilju nad ženama, trenutačno još ne postoji zajednička strategija na razini Unije osmišljena posebno za zaštitu žena od nasilja. Europski parlament u svojim je raspravama više puta pozivao na strategiju kako bi se suprotstavilo nasilju, uključujući i pravno obvezujući instrument. „Istanbulskom konvencijom” (Konvencija Vijeća Europe o sprečavanju i borbi protiv nasilja nad ženama i obiteljskog nasilja) i Direktivom EU-a o žrtvama kaznenih djela iz 2012. godine postavljeni su minimalni standardi pravne zaštite koji u mnogim slučajevima nisu adekvatni ni dovoljni.

Nastavljajući se na mišljenje Europske komisije iz 2010. godine o strategiji EU-a o nasilju nad ženama i djevojčicama, napore Parlamenta vezano za jačanje politike Unije u tom području te poražavajuće velik broj zlostavljanih žena, koje konkretne mjere Komisija planira kako bi dodatno ojačala pravni okvir za zaštitu žena žrtava nasilja? Jesu li planirani europski programi podizanja svijesti o štetnosti zlostavljanja kroz obrazovanje od najranije dobi? Je li u planu donošenje zajedničke europske strategije posvećene isključivo borbi protiv nasilja nad ženama i njihovoj zaštiti?

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

Komisija aktivno pomaže državama članicama smjernicama o provedbi nedavno donesenog sveobuhvatnog pravnog okvira za žrtve kaznenih djela.

Direktivom 2012/29/EU kojom se uspostavljaju minimalni standardi u području prava, potpore i zaštite žrtava kaznenih djela osigurat će se da sve žrtve nasilja, uključujući žene i djevojčice, imaju koristi od zajedničkih minimalnih standarda u području postupovnih prava, potpore i zaštite. Cilj joj je i osigurati da se potrebe žrtava pojedinačno procijene i da se prema najranjivijim žrtvama, među kojima su žrtve nasilja u obitelji, postupa na način koji odgovara njihovim potrebama.

Uredba 606/2013/EU (za uzajamno priznavanje zaštitnih mjera u građanskim stvarima) i Direktiva 2011/99/EU (za uzajamno priznavanje zaštitnih mjera u kaznenim stvarima) primjenjivat će se od siječnja 2015. te će se njima omogućiti da se mjera zaštite koja je izdana protiv počinitelja u jednoj državi članici prizna i izvrši u drugoj državi članici EU-a.

Jedan od posebnih ciljeva Programa o pravima, ravnopravnosti i građanstvu jest „sprječavati i suzbijati sve oblike nasilja nad djecom, mladima i ženama, kao i nasilja nad drugim rizičnim skupinama, posebno skupinama koje su u opasnosti od nasilja u bliskim odnosima, te zaštititi žrtve od takvog nasilja” ([1]). Time će se omogućiti financiranje aktivnosti podizanja svijesti namijenjenih djeci, mladima i ženama u narednim godinama.

Mjere koje je Komisija poduzela radi potpore državama članicama u sprječavanju i uklanjanju svih oblika nasilja nad ženama međusobno se dopunjuju i predstavljaju čvrst i sveobuhvatan okvir za konkretno djelovanje kojime se postižu vidljivi rezultati. Komisija smatra da nije potrebno donositi daljnje posebne strateške dokumente u tom području.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:354:0062:0072:en:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002662/14
to the Commission
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Combating violence against women

On 5 March 2014 the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights published the findings of a survey conducted in all 28 Member States into violence against women. The data on violence, obtained from interviews with 42 000 women, are more than alarming, showing as they do that one woman in three has suffered physical or sexual abuse since the age of 15. Figures of this kind are utterly at odds with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. One woman in 10 has, since the age of 15, experienced some form of sexual abuse, and one woman in 20 has been raped. Violence against women is, worryingly, one of the crimes least likely to be reported, a fact which further underlines the need to take such measures as might be necessary to ensure that women are properly protected.

Although national policies to combat violence against women are in some respects similar, Member States approach the problem in different ways. Despite the fact that violence against women is an issue debated at EU level, there is as yet no common EU-wide strategy aimed specifically at protecting women from violence. In its debates Parliament has repeatedly called for a strategy to counter violence, including a legally binding instrument. The Istanbul Convention (Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence) and the 2012 EU directive on victims of crime have laid down minimum standards of legal protection, but in many cases these are neither suitable nor sufficient.

Following on from its 2010 opinion on an EU strategy on violence against women and girls and from Parliament's efforts to strengthen EU policy in this area, and given the shockingly high number of abused women, what practical steps will the Commission take to further consolidate the legal framework to protect women subjected to violence? Are there any plans for European programmes to raise awareness of the harm that abuse does and to educate people on that point from the earliest age? Will a common European strategy be adopted for the express purpose of combating violence against women and protecting them?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

The Commission is actively assisting Member States with guidance on implementing the recently adopted comprehensive legal framework for victims of crime.

The directive 2012/29/EU establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime will ensure that all victims of violence, including women and girls, benefit from common minimum standards on procedural rights, support and protection. It also aims to ensure that needs of victims are individually assessed and that the most vulnerable victims, among them victims of domestic violence, receive treatment appropriate to their requirements.

The regulation 606/2013/EU (for mutual recognition of civil protection measures) and Directive 2011/99/EU (for mutual recognition of criminal protection measures) will be applicable as of January 2015 and will enable a protection measure issued against a perpetrator in one EU country to be recognised and enforced in another EU country.

One of the specific objectives of the Rights, Equality and Citizenship programme is to 'prevent and combat all forms of violence against children, young people and women, as well as violence against other groups at risk, in particular groups at risk of violence in close relationships, and to protect victims of such violence' ([1]). This will allow the funding of awareness-raising activities targeted at children, young people and women in the coming years.

The measures undertaken by the Commission to support the Member States in preventing and eliminating all forms of violence against women complement each other and constitute a solid and comprehensive framework for concrete action, bringing tangible results. The Commission sees no need to adopt any further specific policy document in this field.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:354:0062:0072:en:PDF

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002663/14
upućeno Komisiji
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(6. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Dostupnost portala EURES na hrvatskom jeziku

Od trenutka ulaska u Europsku uniju Hrvatska je postala i dio EURES-a, mreže javnih službi za zapošljavanje u članicama Europske unije, Europskog gospodarskog prostora i Švicarske, koju koordinira Europska komisija. Portal EURES pokrenut je 1994. godine kao rezultat suradnje između Europske komisije i javnih službi za zapošljavanje država članica EGP-a (zemlje članice EU-a i Norveška, Island i Lihtenštajn) i drugih partnerskih organizacija.

Svrha portala EURES je pružanje informacija, savjeta i oglasa za zapošljavanje za opću dobrobit radnika i poslodavaca te svakog građanina Unije koji želi imati koristi od slobodnog kretanja ljudi.

Radna mjesta pokrivaju širok spektar zanimanja i obuhvaćaju mogućnosti stalnog i sezonskog zapošljavanja. Svako radno mjesto sadrži informacije o tome kako se prijaviti i kome se obratiti. Baza podataka EURES-a ažurira se svakodnevno u skladu s europskim službama za zapošljavanje, a natječaj ostaje u sustavu dok god je aktivan. Ipak na portalu EURES oglasi su dostupni na 25 stranih jezika, uključujući sve službene jezike EU-a, osim na hrvatskom jeziku.

Budući da su europske potrebe za radnom snagom velike te da se svakodnevno na portalu EURES nudi preko milijun poslova koje bi hrvatski građani mogli kvalitetno obavljati, kada je predviđeno prevođenje portala EURES na hrvatski jezik kako bi njegov sadržaj postao dostupniji zainteresiranim građanima?

Odgovor g. Andora u ime Komisije
(24. travnja 2014.)

Trenutačno su u tijeku radovi na znatnom poboljšanju i nadogradnji portala EURES u sklopu kojih će se uvesti potpuno nova elektronička aplikacija za podnošenje životopisa te drugi sadržaji, kao i poboljšano korisničko sučelje. Kako bi se izbjegli visoki troškovi prijevoda na hrvatski tekstova i drugih elemenata koje neće biti moguće koristiti nakon nadogradnje, odlučeno je da se s uvođenjem hrvatske jezične verzije pričeka do pokretanja novog portala. U planu je stoga da hrvatska verzija postane dostupna tijekom mjeseca travnja 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002663/14
to the Commission
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Availability of the EURES portal in Croatian

From the moment of its accession to the European Union, Croatia became part of EURES, a network comprising public employment agencies in the EU Member States, the European Economic Area and Switzerland, which is coordinated by the Commission. The EURES portal was launched in 1994 and is the fruit of cooperation between the Commission and public employment agencies in the Member States of the EEA (EU Member States alongside Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein) and other partner organisations.

The objective of the EURES portal is to provide information, advice and job adverts for the benefit of workers, employers and all citizens of the EU who wish to take advantage of the free movement of people.

The jobs advertised cover a wide range of vocations and professions, and they also include opportunities for permanent and seasonal employment. All of the job adverts featured include information on how to apply and to whom. The EURES database is updated every day to include vacancies from European employment agencies, and a vacancy will remain on the system until it is filled. Job adverts on EURES are available in 25 languages, including all of the EU's official languages, but with the exception of Croatian.

Given that Europe has a great need for workers and that the EURES portal features over one million jobs that could be carried out to a very high standard by Croatian citizens, when does the Commission plan to have the EURES portal translated into Croatian in order to make its contents more accessible to Croatians who may wish to apply for vacancies?

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

The EURES Portal is currently undergoing a major enhancement and upgrade that will add a completely new CV online application and other features as well as a revamped user interface. In order to avoid costly translations into Croatian of texts and other elements that would not be possible to use after this upgrade, it was decided to wait until the launch of the new portal to introduce the Croatian language version. The Croatian version is therefore planned to be available during the month of April 2014.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002664/14
alla Commissione
Guido Milana (S&D)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Action Plan

Vista la decisione C(2013) 8635 della Commissione, del 6 dicembre 2013, che istituisce un piano d'azione per ovviare alle carenze del sistema italiano di controllo della pesca;

visto che la suddetta decisione prevede che ogni sei mesi l'Italia trasmetta alla Commissione un rapporto di valutazione sull'attuazione delle misure, a norma dell'articolo 2, paragrafo 3, e che entro un mese dal ricevimento i servizi della Commissione trasmettano osservazioni sul rapporto italiano;

visto che il medesimo articolo 2, paragrafo 3, prevede che il primo rapporto dell'Italia sia trasmesso entro il 1º febbraio 2014.

Si chiede:

di conoscere le osservazioni della Commissione relative al primo rapporto dell'Italia sull'efficacia delle azioni intraprese al fine di garantire un efficace controllo delle attività di pesca.

Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(12 maggio 2014)

La Commissione sta monitorando attentamente il processo di attuazione, da parte dell'Italia, del piano di azione approvato a norma dell'articolo 102 del regolamento (CE) n. 1224/2009 del Consiglio e adottato dalla decisione della Commissione del 6 dicembre 2013 (C(2013) 8635 final).

La prima relazione di attuazione, pervenuta il 17 febbraio 2014, indica che le azioni più importanti sono in fase di attuazione, in particolare quelle relative al miglioramento dei meccanismi di controllo e alla gestione della flotta, e individua inoltre dei ritardi nell'attuazione di determinate misure. La Commissione segue attentamente la situazione ed è in contatto con le autorità italiane per garantire che i possibili effetti di tali ritardi sull'attuazione generale del piano di azione siano ridotti al minimo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002664/14
to the Commission
Guido Milana (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Action plan

In view of the Commission's decision of 6 December 2013, notified under document C(2013) 8635, which sets out an action plan for solving the deficiencies in the Italian fisheries control system;

In view of the fact that Article 2(3) of the above-cited decision stipulates that Italy shall submit to the Commission, every six months, an assessment report on how well the measures have been implemented, and that the services of the Commission shall submit their observations on this report within one month of receiving it;

In view of the fact that Article 2(3) also stipulates that Italy shall submit its first report by 1 February 2014,

Can the Commission please give its observations on the first report submitted by Italy on the effectiveness of the actions that have been taken in order to ensure that fishing activities are properly controlled?

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

The Commission is closely monitoring the implementation by Italy of the action plan agreed in accordance with Article 102 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 and adopted by Commission decision on 6 December 2013 (C(2013)8635 final).

The first implementation report was received on 17 February 2014. The report indicates that the most critical actions are being implemented, in particular those related to the improvement of the control mechanisms and the management of the fleet. The report also identifies some delays in the implementation of certain measures. The Commission is closely monitoring the situation and is in contact with the Italian authorities to ensure that the possible impacts of these delays on the overall implementation of the Action plan are minimised.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002665/14
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(6 maart 2014)

Betreft: Oekraïne ontvangt 11 miljard van de EU

1. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat zij voornemens is om de komende jaren 11 miljard euro aan Oekraïne uit te keren?

2. Kan de Commissie uiteenzetten waar zij deze 11 miljard aan toezeggingen aan Oekraïne vandaan gaat halen?

3. Hoe kan de Commissie garanderen dat deze 11 miljard niet in de zakken belandt van de corrupte elite in Oekraïne?

4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het absurd is dat in deze tijden van keiharde bezuinigingen, waarin de lidstaten de eigen broek niet eens op kunnen houden, de EU wel 11 miljard euro toezegt aan Oekraïne? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(19 mei 2014)

Op 5 maart gaf de Commissie haar goedkeuring aan een steunpakket van 11 miljard euro voor Oekraïne voor de periode 2014-2020, waarin de belangrijkste concrete maatregelen worden beschreven die moeten bijdragen tot de economische en financiële stabiliteit van het land. Het doel van het pakket is om Oekraïne bij te staan tijdens de overgangsperiode, politieke en economische hervormingen aan te moedigen, en inclusieve ontwikkeling voor alle inwoners van Oekraïne te ondersteunen.

Deze steunmaatregelen combineren leningen en subsidies uit de EU-begroting met bijdragen van in de EU gevestigde internationale financiële instellingen (IFI). Ongeveer 3 miljard euro van dit bedrag komt van de EU-begroting, waarvan 1,6 miljard aan macrofinanciële bijstandsleningen (MFB) en 1,5 miljard euro ontwikkelingshulp. De Europese Investeringsbank en de Europese Bank voor Wederopbouw en Ontwikkeling zouden dan weer tot 8 miljard euro kunnen vrijmaken voor leningen ([1]).

EU-steun is onderworpen aan een reeks subsidiabiliteitscriteria en onderling afgesproken voorwaarden, waaronder het beheer van overheidsfinanciën en doorzichtigheid van de begroting. Tijdens een bezoek aan Oekraïne op 25 en 26 maart door de commissarissen Füle en Lewandowski werd daarnaast afgesproken dat OLAF zijn expertise ter beschikking te stellen voor de oprichting van een autoriteit ter bestrijding van fraude en corruptie, die toezicht zal uitoefenen op de effectieve uitbetaling van de EU-steun.

Tijdens hun buitengewone bijeenkomst op 6 maart verwelkomden de staatshoofden en regeringsleiders van de EU het steunpakket van 11 miljard euro dat de Commissie op 5 maart had goedgekeurd. Het engagement van de EU om Oekraïne te steunen bij het herstellen van de interne stabiliteit en het doorvoeren van cruciale hervormingen werd bevestigd in de conclusies van de Europese Raad van 20 maart 2014. De voorziene EU-begrotingsmiddelen zijn afkomstig uit rubriek 4 van het akkoord over het meerjarig financieel kader voor 2014-2020, waardoor er geen nieuwe financiële middelen voor nodig zijn.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-159_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002665/14
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Ukraine to receive EUR 11 billion from the EU

1. Can the Commission confirm that it intends to pay out EUR 11 billion to Ukraine over the coming years?

2. Can the Commission explain where it plans to get this EUR 11 billion that it is pledging to Ukraine?

3. How can the Commission guarantee that this 11 billion will not end up in the pockets of Ukraine's corrupt elite?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it is absurd in these times of extreme cutbacks, in which the Member States cannot even look after their own interests, that the EU is pledging EUR 11 billion to Ukraine? If not, why not?

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

On 5 March the Commission agreed a EUR 11 billion support package, for the 2014-2020 period, identifying the main concrete measures to help stabilise the economic and financial situation in Ukraine, assist with the transition, encourage political and economic reforms and support inclusive development for the benefit of all Ukrainians.

These support measures combine loans and grants from the EU budget with the contributions of EU based international financial institutions (IFIs). In particular, some EUR 3 billion would come from the EU budget, including EUR 1.6 billion in macro financial assistance loans (MFA) and EUR 1.5 billion in development assistance, while up to EUR 8 billion in loans could be mobilised by the European Investment Bank and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development ([1]).

EU assistance is conditioned to a set of eligibility criteria and mutually agreed conditions, including on Public Finance Management and budget transparency. In addition to these conditions, during a visit to Ukraine by Commissioners Füle and Lewandowski on 25-26 March, OLAF agreed to provide expertise for the establishment of an anti-fraud/anti-corruption authority, which will focus on the effective disbursement of the EU aid.

The EUR 11 billion package adopted by the Commission on 5 March was welcomed by the EU Heads of State and Government during their extraordinary meeting on 6 March. The EU commitment to support Ukraine in its efforts to stabilise the country and undertake key reforms was confirmed in the European Council conclusions of 20 March 2014. Funds from the EU budget come from heading 4 agreed in the framework for the 2014-2020 Multi-annual Financial Framework and do not require the mobilisation of new financial resources.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-159_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002666/14
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(6 maart 2014)

Betreft: Ontwikkelingshulp aan Congo

Dinsdag 4 maart waarschuwde Commissaris Lewandowski de Begrotingscommissie voor het tekort van EUR 23,4 miljard waar de begroting van de Unie mee te kampen heeft als gevolg van de vele aanvragen op de beleidsterreinen van cohesie en ontwikkeling.

Terwijl Commissaris Lewandowski de noodklok luidt over het gapende gat tussen inkomsten en uitgaven voor dit jaar kondigt Commissaris Piebalgs vandaag, 5 maart, doodleuk aan onder andere EUR 620 miljoen in de bodemloze put Congo te gaan storten.

1. Heeft de Commissie niets geleerd van de fiasco's in de voorgaande programmaperiode ([1])?

2. Waarom neemt de Commissie de zorgen van de Europese Rekenkamer niet serieus en blijft men ongebreideld geld steken in één van de meest corrupte landen ter wereld ([2])?

3. Heeft de Commissie al een excuus achter de hand voor het geval over een aantal jaren blijkt dat het zuurverdiende geld van de belastingbetaler wederom niet goed is besteed? Zo ja, welk excuus?

Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie
(27 mei 2014)

In december vorig jaar keurde het Europees Parlement het meerjarig financieel kader en de rechtsgrondslag goed voor het ontwikkelingssamenwerkingsbeleid voor de periode 2014-2020. Het Europees Ontwikkelingsfonds, dat instaat voor de voorgestelde 620 miljoen euro voor de Democratische Republiek Congo, houdt dezelfde beleidslijnen aan als de ontwikkelingssamenwerkingsprojecten die door het Europees Parlement worden goedgekeurd. De Commissie wijst erop dat het Europees Ontwikkelingsfonds (EOF) niet met middelen uit de algemene begroting van de EU wordt gefinancierd, maar met directe bijdragen van de lidstaten.

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoord op de schriftelijke vragen E-11284/2013 en E-11700/2013 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/development-policy/auditors-slams-effectiveness-eu-news-530807.
([2]) Transparency International: Plaats 154/177 in 2013.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002666/14
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Development aid to Congo

On Tuesday 4 March, Commissioner Lewandowski warned the Committee on Budgets of the deficit of EUR 23.4 billion which is being faced by the budget of the Union as a result of the high numbers of applications in the areas of cohesion and development policy.

While Commissioner Lewandowski is sounding the alarm bells on the gaping hole between income and expenditure for this year, Commissioner Piebalgs coolly announced today, 5 March, among other things that EUR 620 million is to be paid into the bottomless pit that is Congo.

1. Has the Commission not learnt from the fiascos in the previous programming period ([1])?

2. Why is the Commission failing to take seriously the concerns of the European Court of Auditors and why are we continuing to pump money with wanton abandon into one of the most highly corrupt countries in the world ([2])?

3. Does the Commission already have an excuse in reserve if it emerges a few years down the line that the taxpayer's hard-earned money has once again not been spent wisely? If so, what is this excuse?

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

The European Parliament approved last December the Multiannual Financial Framework and the legal basis for the Development Cooperation policy for the period 2014-2020. The European Development Fund, providing the proposed EUR 620 million for the Democratic Republic of Congo, follows the same policy line as the Development Cooperation initiatives approved by the European Parliament. The Commission would like to highlight that the European Development Fund (EDF) is not funded from the EU's general budget, but rather from direct contributions from EU Member States.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-11284/2013 and E-11700/2013 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/development-policy/auditors-slams-effectiveness-eu-news-530807
([2]) Transparency International: Ranked 154/177 in 2013.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002667/14
to the Commission
Derek Vaughan (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: NOx infraction measures

Aberthaw power station in Wales safely and efficiently uses Welsh coal and has successfully reduced NOx and CO_2 emissions since the early 2000s. Aberthaw wants to invest more money to bring about environmental improvements, but it would like the Commission's NOx infraction measures removed in order for it to be able to do so. Aberthaw would also like to be included in the Transitional National Plan (TNP).

Could the Commission provide information as soon as possible on whether it will be possible to remove the NOx infraction measures and whether or not Aberthaw can be included in the TNP?

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

The Aberthaw power plant was included in the draft Transitional National Plan (TNP) submitted by the UK. However, the Commission could not agree to this draft TNP ([1]) *inter alia* because an excessive emission value had been used to calculate the contribution of the Aberthaw power plant to the yearly NOx emission ceilings under the TNP.

The Commission expects the UK to submit a revised TNP addressing this issue and provide a detailed planning for investments at the Alberthaw plant in order to reduce its NOx emissions. If Aberthaw is included in TNP and approved by the Commission, this would resolve the infringement procedure.

([1]) Commission Decision 2013/761/EU of 12 December 2013, OJ L 335, 14.12.2013, p. 52.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002668/14
alla Commissione
Salvatore Caronna (S&D)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Presunta violazione della normativa europea sulla mediazione da parte dell'Italia

Considerando la direttiva 2013/11/UE sulla risoluzione alternativa delle controversie dei consumatori (ADR), che stabilisce norme comuni sulla mediazione come risoluzione extragiudiziale delle controversie in materia civile e commerciale, e la direttiva 2008/52/CE relativa a determinati aspetti della mediazione in materia civile e commerciale, nonché la legge della Repubblica italiana del 9 agosto 2013 n. 98, conversione del decreto-legge del 21 giugno 2013 n. 69, che ripristina il procedimento di mediazione quale condizione di procedibilità della domanda giudiziale in materie stabilite dalla legge, considerando inoltre la direttiva 2005/29/CE, considerandi 5 e 7, nonché l'articolo 47 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea,

può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. l'obbligo della legge italiana di prevedere sempre la presenza di un avvocato (articolo 8, comma 1) non pregiudica il senso stesso della mediazione poiché rischia semplicemente di farne un nuovo processo giudiziale, svolto in altra sede, e quindi di lasciare la volontà delle parti in secondo piano?

2. La disposizione della legge italiana circa l'esenzione dal pagamento all'organo di mediazione in caso di fallimento della stessa (articolo 17, comma 5 ter), non rischia di indurre l'organo a trovare una risoluzione positiva, non nell'interesse delle parti bensì nel proprio interesse pecuniario?

3. La disposizione della legge italiana secondo cui gli avvocati iscritti all'albo diventano mediatori di diritto (articolo 16, comma 4 bis) non va contro la previsione europea del requisito di «conoscenze giuridiche generali sufficienti» per le persone fisiche incaricate dell'ADR, che non può presumersi dalla semplice iscrizione ad un albo, considerando, oltretutto, la diversa funzione che il mediatore ha rispetto ad un difensore di parte? Questa disposizione non rappresenta inoltre una pericolosa barriera al commercio transfrontaliero, poiché le imprese europee (e i consumatori) sarebbero scoraggiate ad avanzare una richiesta di mediazione transfrontaliera in Italia non avendo garantita la professionalità del mediatore ed essendo obbligate a farsi assistere da un legale (vedasi anche il primo punto)?

4. Ciò premesso, intende la Commissione procedere ad una verifica della presunta violazione del diritto europeo da parte della norma italiana, ed eventualmente prendere i necessari provvedimenti affinché tale presunta violazione venga a cessare?

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

La direttiva 2008/52/CE non contiene alcuna disposizione relativa al ruolo degli avvocati nella mediazione, al compenso dei mediatori, né nessun'altra norma che impedirebbe agli avvocati di lavorare come mediatori.

La direttiva 2013/11/UE è entrata in vigore l'8 luglio 2013 e dovrà essere recepita negli ordinamenti giuridici nazionali degli Stati membri entro il 9 luglio 2015. Tale direttiva non impone che tutti i procedimenti di risoluzione extragiudiziale delle controversie rispettino i requisiti di qualità di cui al suo Capo II. La direttiva 2013/11/UE stabilisce che gli Stati membri debbano garantire l'accesso almeno ad un «organismo di risoluzione alternativa delle controversie» che rispetti questi principi per le «controversie dei consumatori» che coinvolgano un professionista stabilito sui loro territori. Ai sensi della direttiva, gli «organismi ADR» possono anche essere organismi che propongono procedimenti extragiudiziali non considerati come «mediazione» ai sensi della legge italiana. Pertanto, la questione se la legge italiana sulla mediazione rispetti tutti i principi di cui al Capo II della direttiva 2013/11/UE non incide, in sé, sulla questione del corretto recepimento della direttiva da parte dell'Italia.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002668/14
to the Commission
Salvatore Caronna (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Presumed infringement by Italy of EU legislation on mediation

With reference to the following: Directive 2013/11/EU on alternative dispute resolution for consumer disputes (ADR), which lays down common rules on mediation as an alternative, out-of-court way of settling disputes in civil and commercial matters; Directive 2008/52/EC on certain aspects of mediation in civil and commercial matters; Italian Law No 98 of 9 August 2013, converted from Italian decree-law No 69 of 21 June 2013, which restores the mediation process as a prerequisite for the admissibility of claims in matters established by law; with reference also to recitals 5 and 7 of Directive 2005/29/EC and Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Italian legal requirement that a lawyer must always be present (Article 8(1)) not run counter to the very purpose of mediation, since it is likely to simply establish a new judicial process, carried out elsewhere, thus attaching minor importance to the will of the parties concerned?

2. Is the Italian legal provision regarding exemption from paying the mediation body should it fail (Article 17(5)(b)), not likely to induce that body to reach a positive resolution that is not in the interests of the parties concerned but rather in its own financial interest?

3. Does the Italian legal provision under which registered lawyers automatically become mediators (Article 16(4)(a)) not run counter to the EU requirement that natural persons in charge of ADR must have ‘sufficient general knowledge of legal matters’, which cannot be assumed from the mere inclusion in a professional register, given the different role a mediator has to play compared to that of counsel for the defence? Is this provision not also a dangerous barrier to cross-border trade, given that EU companies (and consumers) would be discouraged from submitting a request for cross-border mediation in Italy if the professionalism of the mediator were not guaranteed and if they were forced to seek the assistance of a lawyer (see also paragraph 1)?

4. Accordingly, will the Commission ascertain whether the Italian law is actually compliant with EC law and, if not, take the necessary measures to ensure that such infringement ceases?

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

Directive 2008/52/EC does not contain any provisions concerning the role of lawyers in mediation, the compensation of mediators or any rule that would exclude lawyers from working as mediators.

Directive 2013/11/EU entered into force on 8 July 2013 and will have to be transposed by Member States into their national legal systems by 9 July 2015. Directive 2013/11/EU does not impose that all national out-of-court dispute resolution procedures respect the quality requirements set out in its Chapter II. According to Directive 2013/11/EU, Member States will have to ensure access to at least one ‘Alternative Dispute Resolution entity’ respecting these principles for the ‘consumer disputes’ involving a trader established on their territories. Under the directive, ‘ADR entities’ can also be entities that offer out-of-court procedures that do not qualify as ‘mediation’ under Italian law. Therefore, the question of whether the Italian law on mediation respects all the principles set out in Chapter II of Directive 2013/11/EU does not in itself prejudge the question of the correct transposition of the directive by Italy.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002669/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Geographical indication schemes

A number of Scottish agricultural products, for example Stornaway black pudding, currently benefit from EU geographical indication (GI) schemes. Against this background, could the Commission clarify the following:

Should Scotland vote to leave the UK, would Scottish GIs, which are currently protected within the EU, continue to enjoy this protection?

Would those Scottish GIs which also enjoy protection in non-EU countries through the EU's bilateral trade agreements continue to enjoy protection under such trade agreements if Scotland were to vote for independence?

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

With regard to GI names registered and protected directly through the registration procedure under Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 ([1]), the regulation does not make a distinction in terms of protection between GI names from EU member states or third countries. Registered GI names continue to be protected as long as the applicable legislative provisions under the above Regulation (such as respect of the specification, labelling and control provisions) are fulfilled.

A possible vote for the independence of Scotland from the UK would not in itself trigger consequences for the protection currently enjoyed by Scottish GIs in non-EU countries through EU's bilateral agreements. Should a vote lead to Scottish independence the status of Scottish GIs in non-EU countries would depend on the subsequent legal arrangements made and it would not be appropriate for the Commission to speculate about these at this stage.

([1]) OJ L 343, 14.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002670/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Geographical indication protection for Scottish tartan

The Commission has carried out a number of studies, as well as a public consultation on 22 April 2013, on the question of geographical indication protection for non-agricultural products.

What conclusions have been drawn by the Commission and what further action is proposed to protect distinct regional products, such as Scottish tartan, from copyright infringement or misrepresentations?

Can the Commission also provide any statistics on the estimated global trade in tartan produced outside Scotland?

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

The Study on Geographical Indication protection for non-agricultural products in the internal market and the feedback received from stakeholders at the public hearing organised in April 2013 provided instructive evidence on the potential benefits of a system protecting geographical indications (GI) for non-agricultural products at European Union level for European producers, consumers, the internal market as well as for European cultural heritage and diversity. Complementary evidence-gathering and consultations are still under way. As soon as they are finalised, the Commission will decide on appropriate follow-up action.

The Commission has no data concerning trade of the specific product Scottish tartan. The product is classified under the line, 'woven fabrics of carded wool or fine animal hair' and any existing EU data covers a larger variety of products complying with this definition.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002671/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL) y Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL)
(6 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Grabación de los acontecimientos ocurridos el 6 de febrero de 2014 en la playa de El Tarajal en Ceuta (España)

El 6 de febrero de 2014, fuerzas de seguridad españolas se enfrentaron a un grupo de inmigrantes que intentaba cruzar la frontera entre la ciudad española de Ceuta y Marruecos, lo que dio lugar a la muerte de 15 inmigrantes. Los hechos fueron grabados por las cámaras de seguridad situadas en la valla de la frontera. Las organizaciones de la sociedad civil española temen que los guardas de fronteras españoles puedan intentar destruir el material grabado. Consideran que se debería adoptar una decisión judicial sobre la cuestión, dado que el material grabado podría utilizarse como prueba decisiva para las investigaciones.

De conformidad con el artículo 2 del Reglamento (CE) n° 2007/2004 del Consejo, de 26 de octubre de 2004, por el que se crea Frontex, la Agencia debe «coordinar la cooperación operativa entre los Estados miembros en materia de gestión de las fronteras exteriores; realizar análisis de riesgos»; y «seguir de cerca la evolución de la investigación en materia de control y vigilancia de las fronteras exteriores». Conforme al artículo 7, apartado 3, del Reglamento (UE) n° 1052/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 22 de octubre de 2013, por el que se crea un Sistema Europeo de Vigilancia de Fronteras (Eurosur), «la Agencia intercambiará, tratará y almacenará información sensible no clasificada e información clasificada en la red de comunicación de conformidad con lo dispuesto en el artículo 11 quinquies del Reglamento (CE) n° 2007/2004». Se afirma asimismo que «la Agencia podrá adoptar todas las medidas necesarias para facilitar el intercambio con la Comisión y los Estados miembros de información pertinente para la ejecución de sus funciones». Además, la Resolución 1932(2013) de la Asamblea Parlamentaria del Consejo de Europa disponía que Frontex debe abordar una serie de problemas estructurales que tienen repercusiones en los derechos humanos mejorando la transparencia y la comunicación pública por lo que respecta a la naturaleza de las operaciones realizadas in situ y su impacto en los derechos humanos. La Asamblea Parlamentaria instaba asimismo a Frontex a respetar los derechos humanos reforzando la cooperación con organizaciones como el Consejo de Europa, el Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas, la Oficina del Alto Comisionado de las Naciones Unidas para los Derechos Humanos y la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea.

¿Considera la Comisión que las agencias europeas anteriormente mencionadas son responsables del material grabado? ¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión de la existencia de planes para destruir el material grabado o de la posibilidad de que haya sido destruido? ¿Tiene la Comisión la intención de instar a las autoridades españolas a que conserven el material grabado, dado que puede ser utilizado como prueba? En caso negativo, ¿por qué no? ¿Considera necesario la Comisión modificar el actual marco jurídico que sustenta Frontex y Eurosur con objeto de que asegurar que el material grabado en que se muestran las acciones de los guardias fronterizos en cuestión se conserve para fines de investigación penal?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de mayo de 2014)

El centro nacional español de coordinación para la vigilancia de las fronteras, creado de conformidad con el artículo 5 del Reglamento Eurosur ([1]), tiene acceso directo a las cámaras de seguridad colocadas a lo largo de la valla que rodea la frontera con Ceuta. No obstante, ni el Reglamento Eurosur ni el Reglamento Frontex ([2]) otorgan a Frontex o a la Comisión acceso a esa clase de datos: la Comisión no tiene derecho a consultar ningún tipo de información operativa que sea objeto de intercambios nacionales y europeos a través de Eurosur. La agencia Frontex no está autorizada para procesar ningún dato personal procedente de Eurosur, salvo los números de identificación de buques (artículo 13, apartado 2, del Reglamento Eurosur).

Por esos motivos, ni la Comisión ni Frontex están en condiciones de determinar si el material grabado ha sido borrado, y si lo ha sido, en qué medida. Si bien lamenta profundamente la muerte de esos migrantes, la Comisión no puede interferir en las investigaciones en curso por parte de las autoridades responsables españolas.

La Comisión está considerando proponer a los Estados miembros una recomendación, que se incluiría en la Guía de Eurosur actualmente en fase de debate, para conservar el material de vídeo y otra información de vigilancia durante cierto tiempo.

([1]) Reglamento (UE) nº 1052/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 22 de octubre de 2013, por el que se crea un Sistema Europeo de Vigilancia de Fronteras (Eurosur); DO L 295 de 6.11.2013, pp. 11-26.

([2]) Reglamento (CE) nº 2007/2004 del Consejo, de 26 de octubre de 2004, por el que se crea una Agencia Europea para la gestión de la cooperación operativa en las fronteras exteriores de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea; DO L 349 de 25.11.2004, pp. 1-11.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002671/14
an die Kommission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL) und Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Aufzeichnungen der Ereignisse am Strand von El Tarajal in Ceuta, Spanien, vom 6. Februar 2014

Am 6. Februar 2014 wurden Migranten von spanischen Sicherheitskräften an der Überschreitung der Grenze zwischen Marokko und der spanischen Stadt Ceuta gehindert. Dabei kamen 15 Migranten ums Leben. Das Geschehen wurde durch am Grenzzaun installierte Sicherheitskameras aufgezeichnet. Spanische zivilgesellschaftliche Organisationen befürchten nun, dass der spanische Grenzschutz versuchen könnte, die Aufzeichnungen zu löschen. Sie sind der Ansicht, dass über diese Angelegenheit ein Gericht entscheiden sollte und dass die Aufzeichnungen bei den betreffenden Ermittlungen als entscheidendes Beweismaterial dienen könnten.

Nach Artikel 2 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2007/2004 des Rates vom 26. Oktober 2004 zur Errichtung von Frontex obliegt der Agentur die „Koordinierung der operativen Zusammenarbeit der Mitgliedstaaten im Bereich des Schutzes der Außengrenzen", die „Durchführung von Risikoanalysen" und die „Verfolgung der Entwicklungen der für die Kontrolle und Überwachung der Außengrenzen relevanten Forschung". Nach Artikel 7 Absatz 3 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1052/2013 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 22. Oktober 2013 zur Errichtung eines Europäischen Grenzüberwachungssystems (Eurosur) „[erfolgen d]er Austausch, die Verarbeitung und die Speicherung von nicht als Verschlusssache eingestuften sensiblen Informationen und von Verschlusssachen im Kommunikationsnetz durch die Agentur […] im Einklang mit Artikel 11d der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2007/2004". Außerdem heißt es in der Frontex-Verordnung: „Die Agentur kann alle erforderlichen Maßnahmen ergreifen, um den Austausch von Informationen, die für ihre Tätigkeit von Bedeutung sind, mit der Kommission und den Mitgliedstaaten zu erleichtern." Gemäß der Entschließung 1932(2013) der Parlamentarischen Versammlung des Europarats muss Frontex auf die Lösung einer Reihe struktureller Probleme mit Auswirkungen auf die Menschenrechte hinwirken, indem für mehr Transparenz gesorgt und die Öffentlichkeit besser über die Art der vor Ort durchgeführten Maßnahmen und ihre Folgen für die Menschenrechte informiert wird. Die Parlamentarische Versammlung fordert auch, dass Frontex die Menschenrechte achtet und in diesem Zusammenhang stärker mit Organisationen wie dem Europarat, dem Menschenrechtsrat der Vereinten Nationen, dem Amt des Hohen Kommissars für Menschenrechte und der Agentur der EU für Grundrechte zusammenarbeitet.

Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass die genannten EU-Agenturen eine Verantwortung für die Aufzeichnungen tragen? Weiß die Kommission eventuell von Absichten, die Aufzeichnungen zu löschen, oder hat sie Informationen darüber, dass die Aufzeichnungen möglicherweise bereits gelöscht worden sind? Die Aufzeichnungen könnten als Beweismaterial dienen. Beabsichtigt die Kommission vor diesem Hintergrund, die spanischen Behörden zur Erhaltung dieser Aufzeichnungen aufzufordern, oder welche Gründe sprechen ihrerseits dagegen? Muss der geltende Rechtsrahmen, der die Grundlage für Frontex und Eurosur bildet, aus Sicht der Kommission dahin gehend geändert werden, dass sichergestellt ist, dass die Aufzeichnungen vom Einschreiten des Grenzschutzes im konkreten Fall zu Strafverfolgungszwecken aufbewahrt werden?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(13. Mai 2014)

Das spanische nationale Koordinierungszentrum für die Grenzüberwachung, das auf der Grundlage von Artikel 5 der Eurosur-Verordnung ([1]) eingerichtet worden ist, hat unmittelbaren Zugang zu den entlang des Grenzzauns von Ceuta angebrachten Sicherheitskameras. Weder die Eurosur- noch die Frontex-Verordnung ([2]) geben Frontex oder der Kommission eine Handhabe, um auf entsprechende Daten zugreifen zu können: Die Kommission hat keinerlei Recht auf Auskunft über operative Daten, die auf nationaler oder europäischer Ebene über Eurosur ausgetauscht werden. Frontex darf keine personenbezogenen Daten von Eurosur verarbeiten mit Ausnahme von Schiffsidentifizierungsnummern (Artikel 13 Absatz 2 der Eurosur-Verordnung).

Aus diesen Gründen ist weder die Kommission noch Frontex in der Lage, festzustellen, ob und in welchem Umfang die Aufzeichnungen möglicherweise gelöscht wurden. Die Kommission bedauert den Tod dieser Migranten zutiefst, hat aber keine Handhabe, um in die laufenden Untersuchungen der zuständigen spanischen Behörden eingreifen zu können.

Die Kommission erwägt einen Vorschlag für eine Empfehlung an die Mitgliedstaaten, die in das Eurosur-Handbuch, das zurzeit im Gespräch ist, aufgenommen werden sollte, um Videoaufnahmen und andere Überwachungsinformationen eine gewisse Zeitlang aufzeichnen zu können.

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1052/2013 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 22. Oktober 2013 zur Errichtung eines Europäischen Grenzüberwachungssystems (Eurosur); ABl. L 295 vom 6.11.2013, S. 11-26.

([2]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2007/2004 des Rates vom 26. Oktober 2004 zur Errichtung einer Europäischen Agentur für die operative Zusammenarbeit an den Außengrenzen der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union; ABl. L 349 vom 25.11.2004, S. 1-11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002671/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL) and Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Record of the events of 6 February 2014 at Playa El Tarajal beach in Ceuta, Spain

On 6 February 2014, migrants who attempted to cross the border between the Spanish city of Ceuta and Morocco were confronted by Spanish security forces, resulting in the death of 15 migrants. The events were recorded by security cameras in place at the border fence. Spanish civil society organisations fear that Spanish border guards may attempt to delete the recorded material. They believe that a court decision should be taken on the matter, given that the recorded material could serve as crucial evidence for investigations.

Under Article 2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 2007/2004 of 26 October 2004 establishing Frontex, the agency must 'coordinate operational cooperation between Member States in the field of management of external borders, carry out risk analyses [and] follow up on the development of research relevant for the control and surveillance of external borders'. According to Article 7.3 of Regulation (EU) No 1052/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur), 'the Agency shall exchange, process and store non-classified sensitive and classified information in the communication network in accordance with Article 11(d) of Regulation (EC) No 2007/2004'. It is also stated that 'the Agency may take all necessary measures to facilitate the exchange of information relevant for its tasks with the Commission and the Member States'. In addition, Resolution 1932 (2013) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe stated that Frontex must 'tackle a number of structural problems that have human rights implications by improving transparency and public communication regarding the nature of the operations carried out in the field and their impact on human rights'. The Parliamentary Assembly also called on Frontex to comply with human rights by strengthening cooperation with organisations such as the Council of Europe, the United Nations Human Rights Council, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Fundamental Rights Agency.

Does the Commission believe that the European agencies mentioned above hold a responsibility towards the recorded material? Is the Commission aware of any plans to delete the recorded material or of any possibility that it may have already been deleted? Will the Commission call on the Spanish authorities to preserve the recorded material, owing to its potential for use as evidence? If not, why not? Does the Commission deem it necessary to change the existing legal framework underpinning Frontex and Eurosur in order to ensure that the recorded material showing the actions of the border guards in question is preserved for purposes of criminal investigation?

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

The Spanish national coordination centre for border surveillance, established in line with Article 5 of the Eurosur Regulation ([1]), has direct access to the security cameras placed along the border fence around Ceuta. However, neither the Eurosur Regulation nor the Frontex Regulation ([2]) give Frontex or the Commission access to this kind of data: the Commission does not have any right to access any kind of operational information exchanged at national and European level via Eurosur. Frontex is not allowed to process any personal data from Eurosur except for ship identification numbers (Article 13(2) of the Eurosur Regulation).

For these reasons neither the Commission nor Frontex are in the position to determine whether and to which extent the recorded material may have been deleted. While deeply regretting the deaths of these migrants, the Commission has no possibility to interfere in the on-going investigations of the responsible Spanish authorities.

The Commission is considering proposing a recommendation to Member States, to be included into the Eurosur Handbook which is currently under discussion, to record video and other surveillance information for a certain period of time.

([1]) 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.

([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 2007/2004 of 26 October 2004 establishing a European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union; OJ L 349, 25.11.2004, p. 1-11.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002672/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(6. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Informiranje malih i srednjih poduzeća o mogućnostima financiranja preko programa EU-a

U sklopu zakonodavne rezolucije Europskog parlamenta od 21. studenog 2013. o prijedlogu Uredbe Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća o uspostavi Programa za konkurentnost poduzeća te malih i srednjih poduzeća navedeno je da Europska poduzetnička mreža, uz potporu Europske komisije, pruža usluge informiranja i savjetovanja o inicijativama i pravu Unije te potporu jačanju upravljačkih kapaciteta i financijskog znanja, uključujući savjetovanje o pristupu financiranju, kako bi se ojačala konkurentnost malih i srednjih poduzeća.

Smatram da je takva inicijativa posebno važna za članice poput Hrvatske jer je u našoj zemlji informiranost malih i srednjih poduzeća o mogućnostima financiranja koju nude razni programi EU-a na prilično niskoj razini. Europska poduzetnička mreža u Hrvatskoj je organizirana u sklopu Hrvatske gospodarske komore, ali unatoč naporima te institucije i ureda državne uprave, informiranost malih i srednjih poduzetnika o mogućnostima financiranja koje pruža EU još uvijek je slaba.

Stoga bih ovim putem željela pitati postoji li dodatna potpora koju Komisija može pružiti Europskoj poduzetničkoj mreži u novim članicama poput Hrvatske kako bismo podigli informiranost malih i srednjih poduzetnika na višu razinu. Također, zanima me koje su se mjere poduzete na nacionalnoj razini u ostalim članicama pokazale najučinkovitijima po tom pitanju.

Odgovor g. Barniera u ime Komisije
(15. svibnja 2014.)

Komisija nastavlja podržavati Europsku poduzetničku mrežu i nastavit će s djelatnošću pomaganja MSP-ovima u razvoju njihovih poslovnih djelatnosti u okviru Programa za konkurentnost poduzeća te malih i srednjih poduzeća (COSME) te je dalje razvijati. Tijekom priprema za taj program naznačeno je da su usluge podrške u pristupu MSP-ova financijskim sredstvima prioritet za buduću mrežu. Poziv na podnošenje prijedloga koji je trenutačno u tijeku stoga kao jednu od ključnih djelatnosti za buduću mrežu sadržava savjetodavne usluge o pristupu financijskim sredstvima. To obuhvaća informacije o pristupu programu Obzor 2020. i europskim strukturnim i investicijskim fondovima.

Radna skupina prikupila je najbolje prakse partnera mreže iz drugih država članica o savjetodavnim uslugama za pristup financijskim sredstvima i europskim programima financiranja. Osim što daju savjete o financijskim instrumentima EU-a u okviru programa COSME ili Obzor 2020., svi bi konzorciji trebali informirati lokalne MSP-ove o regionalnim programima financiranja i drugim izvorima javnih financijskih sredstava. To obuhvaća i detaljno kartiranje financijskih sredstava dostupnih u toj regiji, upućivanje na odgovarajućeg pružatelja financijskih sredstava i davanje savjeta o programima poticanja ulaganja za MSP-ove. Za partnere mreže planirano je posebno usavršavanje 19. — 20. lipnja.

U pogledu pristupa financijskim sredstvima, za mobiliziranje zajmova i vlasničkog kapitala namijenjeno je 1,4 milijarde eura u okviru programa COSME i 2,7 milijardi eura u okviru programa OBZOR 2020. Dodatno će se promovirati portal Vaša Europa kojim se pruža sveobuhvatan pregled mogućnosti financiranja u svakoj državi članici ([1]).

Uz to se od organizacija koje su članice mreže zahtijeva pružanje usluga korisnicima instrumenta za MSP-ove programa Obzor 2020., što na kraju može rezultirati dodatnim mogućnostima financiranja u trećoj fazi (komercijalizacija) tog instrumenta.

([1]) http://europa.eu/youreurope/business/funding-grants/access-to-finance/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002672/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Informing small and medium-sized enterprises about funding opportunities through EU programmes

As part of the European Parliament legislative resolution of 21 November 2013 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and small and medium-sized enterprises, it was stated that the Enterprise Europe Network, with support from the European Commission, provides information and advice on Union initiatives and law as well as support for the strengthening of administrative capacity and financial knowledge, including advice on access to finance, in order to strengthen the competitiveness of small and medium-sized enterprises.

I think that such an initiative is of particular importance for Member States like Croatia because awareness of small and medium-sized enterprises in our country about the funding opportunities offered by various EU programmes is at a fairly low level. The Enterprise Europe Network operates in Croatia as part of the Croatian Chamber of Commerce, but despite the efforts of these institutions and state administration offices the awareness of small and medium-sized entrepreneurs about funding opportunities provided by the EU is still limited.

Therefore, I would hereby like to ask whether there is some additional support that the Commission can provide for the Enterprise Europe Network in new Member States such as Croatia in order to raise the awareness of small and medium-sized entrepreneurs to a higher level. Also, I would be interested to know which of the measures taken at national level in other Member States have proven most effective in this respect.

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

The Commission continues to support the Enterprise Europe Network and will maintain and further develop its activities to help SMEs grow their business under the Competitiveness and SME Programme (COSME). During the preparations for this programme, support services on access to finance for SMEs were indicated as priority for the future Network. The on-going call for proposals therefore includes advisory services on access to finance as a core activity for the future Network. This includes information on access to the Horizon 2020 Programme and the European Structural and Investment Funds.

A working group gathered best practices of Network partners from other Member States on advisory services for access to finance and European funding programmes. In addition to providing advice on EU financial instruments of COSME or Horizon 2020, all consortia should ensure that local SMEs are advised on regional financial schemes and other sources of public funding. This includes a detailed mapping of the funding available in the region, signposting to the adequate financial provider and advice on SME investment readiness programmes. A special training session for Network partners is planned on 19-20 June.

On access to finance, EUR 1.4 billion of the COSME and EUR 2.7 billion of the Horizon 2020 programme budgets is earmarked for mobilising loans and equity financing. The Your Europe Portal, which provides a comprehensive overview of the financing possibilities in each Member State, will be further promoted ([1]).

Additionally, Network organisations are requested to provide services to the beneficiaries of the SME Instrument of Horizon 2020 which may eventually lead to additional funding opportunities in phase 3 (commercialisation) of this instrument.

([1]) http://europa.eu/youreurope/business/funding-grants/access-to-finance/index_en.htm

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002673/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(6. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Utjecaj projekta „Gornji horizonti" na ekosustav rijeke Neretve i lokalno gospodarstvo

Gradnja triju hidroelektrana u BiH (HE Dabar, Nevesinje i Bileća) u sklopu projekta „Gornji horizonti" podrazumijeva drastično reguliranje međunarodnog vodotoka, što bi prema mišljenju stručnjaka moglo presušiti donji dio toka Neretve koji prolazi kroz Hrvatsku.

Naime, vode koje teku podzemnim kraškim kanalima manjih rijeka i prirodno se ulijevaju u Neretvu i dalje u more preusmjeravale bi se u slijevno područje Trebišnjice i dalje prema novosagrađenim akumulacijama. Neretva bi time izgubila znatan dio svog hidropotencijala, a povećani salinitet onemogućio bi uzgoj povrća i voća u dolini Neretve južno od Čapljine, što predstavlja velik udarac za lokalno gospodarstvo.

Članci 10. i 11. u poglavlju 3. Berlinskih pravila o vodnim resursima jasno govore o pravu Hrvatske da sudjeluje u upravljanju bazenom Neretve te obvezuju države da upravljaju međunarodnim riječnim bazenima u dobroj vjeri, što ovdje nije slučaj.

Zanima me je li Komisija upoznata s tim slučajem i hoće li stati u zaštitu prava država članica da sudjeluju u upravljanju riječnim bazenima koje dijele s trećim zemljama. Također, želim znati hoće li Komisija ustrajati na rješavanju takvih otvorenih pitanja s državama iz susjedstva, konkretno u ovom slučaju BiH, tijekom njihovih pregovora za članstvo u EU-u.

Odgovor g. Potočnika u ime Komisije
(28. travnja 2014.)

Komisija je svjesna tog slučaja i mogućih utjecaja na sliv rijeke Neretve u kontekstu odnosa između EU-a i Bosne i Hercegovine. Kao potencijalna država kandidatkinja Bosna i Hercegovina nije obvezana zakonodavstvom EU-a, no dužna je postići napredak u usklađivanju s propisima EU-a o okolišu te njihovoj provedbi. Komisija taj proces podržava i nadzire na redovnim sastancima o suradnji. Na sljedećem će se sastanku s predstavnicima tijela vlasti Bosne i Hercegovine pružiti prilika za iznošenje tog pitanja i na temelju toga Komisija će razmotriti odgovarajuće daljnje postupke.

Nadalje, Komisija je spremna podržati Hrvatsku ako joj se to pitanje podastre u skladu s člankom 12. Okvirne direktive o vodama [1].

---

[1] Direktiva 2000/60/EZ Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 23. listopada 2000. o uspostavi okvira za djelovanje Zajednice u području vodne politike, SL L 327, 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002673/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Impact of the Upper Horizons project on the ecosystem of the river Neretva and the local economy

The construction of three hydroelectric power plants in Bosnia and Herzegovina (the Dabar, Nevesinje and Bileća power plants) as part of the Upper Horizons project implies drastic regulation of international waterways which, according to experts, could dry up the lower course of the river Neretva, which runs through Croatia.

Water flowing through underground karst channels of smaller rivers that naturally flows into the Neretva and then on into the sea would be rerouted to the Trebišnjica drainage area and further to the newly built reservoirs. The Neretva would thereby lose much of its hydropower potential, and increasing salinity would prevent the growing of fruit and vegetables in the Neretva valley south of Čapljina, which would represent a major blow to the local economy.

Under the Berlin Rules on Water Resources (Chapter III), Articles 10 and 11 clearly demonstrate that Croatia has a right to participate in the management of the Neretva basin, and they also oblige states to manage international river basins in good faith, which is not the case here.

Is the Commission is aware of this case and will it defend the right of Member States to participate in the management of river basins shared with third countries? Will it continue its efforts to resolve outstanding issues of this kind with neighbouring countries, specifically, in this case, with Bosnia and Herzegovina, as they negotiate for EU membership?

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

The Commission is aware of this case and the potential impacts on the River Neretva Basin in the context of EU — Bosnia and Herzegovina relations. While as a potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina is not bound by the EU legislation it is committed to make progress towards alignment with and implementation of EU environment law. This process is supported by the Commission and monitored at regular cooperation meetings. The next meeting with the Bosnia and Herzegovina authorities will provide an opportunity to raise this issue and on this basis the Commission will consider an appropriate course of action.

In addition, the Commission stands ready to support Croatia, if the issue is brought to its attention in accordance with Art. 12 of the Water Framework Directive ([1]).

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002674/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(6. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Krivolov zaštićenih vrsta životinja na hrvatskom teritoriju

Rezolucijom od 15. siječnja 2014. o kriminalu povezanim s divljom florom i faunom Parlament je naglasio kako takva vrsta kriminala može biti ozbiljna prijetnja vladavini prava i održivom razvoju te pozvao države članice da potpuno provedu Preporuku Komisije br. 2007/425/EZ kojom se određuje paket mjera za provedbu Uredbe (EZ) br. 338/97 o zaštiti vrsta divljih biljaka i životinja uređenjem trgovine njima. Među ostalim, navedena Preporuka određuje da države članice moraju osigurati odgovarajuće informiranje javnosti i zainteresiranih strana kako bi se podigla svijest o negativnim posljedicama ilegalne trgovine divljom faunom.

U Hrvatskoj postoji značajan problem krivolova, kojim se na njezinom teritoriju bave krivolovci iz drugih članica, naročito Italije, radi trgovanja u njihovoj matičnoj državi. Ti su krivolovci aktivni i u državama iz hrvatskog susjedstva, tako da se Hrvatska nalazi i na krijumčarskoj ruti.

Unatoč uspostavi odgovarajućeg zakonskog okvira i edukaciji kadrova, Hrvatska nema utjecaj na stanje svijesti u drugim članicama, prije svega Italiji iz koje dolazi većina krijumčara, pa tako ni na mjere protiv sprječavanja krivolova u susjednim državama.

Stoga bih željela znati koje bi dodatne mjere Komisija mogla preporučiti nadležnim tijelima RH kako bismo u suradnji s tijelima država članica i trećih zemalja iz susjedstva stali na kraj ovom gorućem problemu.

Odgovor g. Potočnika u ime Komisije
(28. travnja 2014.)

Države članice nadležne su za provedbu zakonodavstva EU-a u vezi s lovom na divlje životinje (npr. članak 7. Direktive o pticama ([1]) ili članci 12., 14., 15. i 16. Direktive o staništima ([2])) te za suzbijanje krivolova na svojem državnom području.

Komisija blisko surađuje s državama članicama u cilju jačanja provedbe mjerodavnog zakonodavstva. Suradnja na suzbijanju nezakonite trgovine divljom faunom i florom odvija se i putem skupine za provedbu zakona EU-a, u okviru koje se službenici odgovorni za provedbu zakona iz svih država članica EU-a i mjerodavnih organizacija sastaju dva puta godišnje pod predsjedanjem Europske komisije.

Nedostatak svijesti i dalje predstavlja veliku prepreku učinkovitoj provedbi zakona u tom području. To je istaknuto i u nedavnoj Komunikaciji o pristupu EU-a suzbijanju krijumčarenja divlje faune i flore ([3]) na temelju koje se Komisija savjetuje s dionicima i razmatra potrebu za revizijom pristupa EU-a.

Hrvatske bi vlasti mogle iskoristiti te postojeće mehanizme i tijela za suradnju na razini EU-a, primjerice Provedbenu skupinu CITES, Eurojust i Europol u cilju podizanja svijesti o problemu i jačanja suradnje sa susjednim državama članicama.

([1]) Direktiva 2009/147/EZ Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 30. studenoga 2009. o očuvanju divljih ptica.
([2]) Direktiva Vijeća 92/43/EEZ od 21. svibnja 1992. o očuvanju prirodnih staništa i divlje faune i flore.
([3]) Komunikacija Komisije Vijeću i Europskom parlamentu o pristupu EU-a suzbijanju krijumčarenja divlje faune i flore, COM(2014) 64 završna verzija.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002674/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Poaching of protected animal species in Croatia

In its resolution of 15 January 2014 on wildlife crime, Parliament drew attention to the fact that this kind of crime can be a serious threat to the rule of law and to sustainable development and urged Member States to fully implement Commission Recommendation No 2007/425/EC identifying a set of actions for the enforcement of Regulation (EC) No 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein. The above recommendation calls for Member States to provide the necessary information to the public and stakeholders in order to raise awareness about the harmful consequences of the trade in wild fauna.

Poaching, a significant problem in Croatia, is engaged in by poachers from other Member States, especially Italy, for trading in their home countries. The fact that these poachers are also active in countries neighbouring Croatia means that Croatia is also on a trafficking route.

Despite the establishment of an appropriate legal framework and the training of personnel, Croatia has no influence on the state of awareness in other Member States, especially Italy, where most of the traffickers come from, or on anti-poaching measures in neighbouring countries.

What additional measures could the Commission could recommend to the proper authorities in Croatia to enable them, in cooperation with bodies in Member States and other neighbouring countries to put an end to this pressing problem.

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

Member States are responsible for enforcing EU legislation related to wildlife hunting (e.g. Article 7 of the Birds Directive ([1]) or Articles 12, 14-16 of the Habitats Directive ([2])) and to address poaching on their territory.

The Commission works closely with Member States to strengthen the enforcement of relevant legislation. Cooperation on illegal wildlife trade issues also takes place through the EU enforcement group, where law enforcement officials from all EU Member States and relevant organisations meet twice a year under the chairmanship of the European Commission.

Lack of awareness remains a major obstacle to effective enforcement in the area. This is also highlighted in the recent Communication on the EU approach against wildlife trafficking ([3]) on the basis of which the Commission is consulting stakeholders and considering the need for a review of the EU approach.

The Croatian authorities could take advantage of these existing cooperation mechanisms and bodies at EU level, such as the CITES Enforcement Group, Eurojust and Europol to raise awareness about the problem and to strengthen cooperation with neighbouring Member States.

([1]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds.
([2]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.
([3]) Communication COM(2014) 64 final from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the EU approach against wildlife trafficking.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002675/14
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(6 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Problemi relativi al funzionamento del CONAI e alla determinazione dei contributi

Il Consorzio Nazionale Imballaggi (CONAI) è il consorzio privato senza fini di lucro istituito in Italia dal decreto legislativo 22 del 1997 e ora disciplinato dal decreto legislativo 152 del 2006.

Il CONAI è costituito dai produttori e utilizzatori italiani di imballaggi, che sono obbligati ad aderirvi allo scopo di perseguire gli obiettivi di recupero e riciclo dei materiali d'imballaggio previsti dalla direttiva 94/62/CE e dalle successive direttive 2004/12/CE e 2013/2/UE.

L'Istituto superiore per la protezione e la ricerca ambientale del governo italiano afferma che nel 2013 la percentuale di raccolta differenziata per aree geografiche in Italia è la seguente: 52,6 % al Nord, 32,9 % al Centro e 26,7 % al Sud.

Le somme percepite dal CONAI risultano però inversamente proporzionali al tasso di riciclaggio: le aziende delle regioni del Nord sono indubbiamente quelle che più di tutte versano contributi al consorzio.

Per questa ragione, il contributo CONAI è percepito, specialmente nel settore dell'abbigliamento, non certo come un contributo utile per l'ambiente, ma come una tassa che si trasforma di fatto in un ostacolo alla competitività. Le aziende in regola subiscono infatti la concorrenza di laboratori tessili che in alcune aree italiane operano frodando il fisco, usufruendo di manodopera in nero o clandestina, violando le norme ambientali e risultando quindi sconosciuti al CONAI e alle autorità italiane che dovrebbero vigilare.

Questo organismo opera poi con metodi che non convincono gli imprenditori: le aziende devono anticipare al CONAI il contributo ancor prima di incassare le fatture; se cessano l'attività, le quote versate sono perse e non vengono restituite; gli adempimenti per il calcolo degli importi risultano assai complicati.

È la Commissione al corrente di questa situazione?

Può la Commissione chiarire se il governo italiano provvede a inviare periodicamente i dati sugli imballaggi e i rifiuti di imballaggio così come previsto dall'articolo 220, comma 8, del decreto legislativo 152 del 2006?

Ritiene la Commissione che il contributo pagato al CONAI in maniera inversamente proporzionale alla percentuale di raccolta differenziata per area geografica sia coerente con gli obiettivi delle normative europee in materia?

Quali misure intende quindi adottare la Commissione per obbligare il governo italiano a migliorare i controlli, specialmente nelle aree dove sono numerose le aziende che operano in totale clandestinità?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(19 maggio 2014)

La Commissione desume che il citato consorzio funge in Italia da piattaforma per l'applicazione del principio della responsabilità estesa del produttore (EPR), a sostegno della direttiva sugli imballaggi e i rifiuti di imballaggio. La Commissione riconosce la validità dell'EPR quale strumento fondamentale per l'attuazione della politica in materia di rifiuti e per il conseguimento degli obiettivi giuridicamente vincolanti dell'UE.

Le autorità italiane comunicano regolarmente alla Commissione le informazioni che sono tenute a trasmetterle in ossequio agli obblighi della direttiva sugli imballaggi e i rifiuti di imballaggio ([1]), ivi comprese le relazioni triennali sull'attuazione e i dati statistici annuali per ulteriori informazioni si veda:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/waste/key_waste_streams/packaging_waste

La normativa UE in materia di rifiuti non precisa le condizioni cui devono attenersi i sistemi nazionali che traducono nella pratica il principio dell'EPR. Spetta agli Stati membri stabilire come attuare il principio dell'EPR, ossia decidere la struttura del sistema, nonché come controllarlo e monitorarlo.

([1]) Direttiva 94/62/CE sugli imballaggi e i rifiuti di imballaggio (GU L 365 del 31.12.1994).

Pur tuttavia, viste le grandi differenze in termini di prestazioni, trasparenza e rapporto costi-efficacia che si sono constatate tra i sistemi nazionali EPR, la Commissione, in base alle conclusioni dello studio *Development of guidance on Extended Producer Responsibility* ([2]), sta vagliando alcuni requisiti minimi che tutti i sistemi dovrebbero rispettare.

La Commissione può anche fornire agli Stati membri orientamenti tecnici che illustrino esempi di buone pratiche e linee guida per l'applicazione dell'EPR.

([2]) http://epr.eu-smr.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002675/14
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Problems relating to the functioning of CONAI and the determination of contributions

CONAI, the Italian national packaging consortium, is a private non-profit consortium established in Italy by Legislative Decree No 22 of 1997 and now governed by Legislative Decree 152 of 2006.

CONAI consists of Italian producers and users of packaging, who are obliged to join the consortium in order to achieve the targets for the recovery and recycling of packaging materials laid down in Directive 94/62/EC and subsequent directives 2004/12/EC and 2013/2/EU.

According to the Italian Government's Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, in 2013 the percentage of recycling in Italy by geographical area was as follows: 52.6% in the North, 32.9% in the Centre and 26.7% in the South.

The amounts received by CONAI are, however, inversely proportional to the rate of recycling: companies in the northern regions of Italy are undoubtedly those which pay the most contributions to the consortium.

For this reason, the CONAI contribution is seen, especially in the clothing industry, not as a useful contribution to the environment, but rather as a tax which, in actual fact, hampers competitiveness. Companies that operate lawfully have to endure competition from textile laboratories that, in some parts of Italy, operate by defrauding the Italian revenue authorities, taking advantage of illegal or undeclared labour and infringing environmental rules, and are therefore unknown to CONAI and to the Italian authorities which are supposed to supervise them.

CONAI, moreover, operates using methods which entrepreneurs find somewhat dubious: companies have to make advance contributions to CONAI even before their bills have been paid; if their business closes down, the fees paid are lost and not returned. The procedures relating to the calculation of the amounts to be paid are also very complicated.

Is the Commission aware of this situation?

Can the Commission clarify whether the Italian Government periodically sends its data on packaging and packaging waste as provided for in Article 220(8) of Legislative Decree 152 of 2006?

Does the Commission believe that the contribution paid to CONAI, which is inversely proportional to the rate of recycling by geographical area, is consistent with the objectives of the relevant EU rules?

What measures will it therefore take to force the Italian Government to improve its monitoring, especially in areas where there are many companies operating in total secrecy?

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

The Commission understands that this packaging consortium is being used in Italy as the platform to implement the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) principle in support of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive. The Commission acknowledges that EPR is a key instrument to support the implementation of waste policy and the achievement of EU legal targets.

The Italian authorities report periodically to the Commission in respect of the requirements of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive ([1]), including the triennial implementation reports and the annual statistical data (see:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/waste/key_waste_streams/packaging_waste for more information).

EU waste legislation does not establish conditions which have to be met by national EPR systems. Member States are responsible for the implementation of the EPR principle, including the design of the system, its control, and its monitoring.

However, due to important difference between national EPR systems in terms of their performance, transparency, and cost-effectiveness, the Commission is examining some minimum requirements which all such systems should be required to meet, based on the conclusions of a study on the 'Development of guidance on Extended Producer Responsibility' ([2]).

Some technical guidance may also be provided by the Commission, to present good practices and guidelines for the implementation of EPR by the Member States.

([1]) Directive 94/62/EC on packaging and packaging waste, OJ L 365, 31.12.1994.
([2]) http://epr.eu-smr.eu/

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002676/14
do Komisji
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(6 marca 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Rynek mleka w UE

W ostatnim czasie obserwujemy rosnącą dynamikę dostaw mleka w większości państw członkowskich UE. Widać wyraźnie, że rolnicy przygotowują się do liberalizacji rynku mleka, zwiększając stada i inwestując w budynki i urządzenia. Sprzyja temu sytuacja na rynku światowym, ponieważ wzrasta popyt na produkty mleczarskie. Wszystko wskazuje na to, że wiele krajów przekroczy swoje krajowe limity dostaw w ostatnich dwóch latach funkcjonowania kwot.

W związku z powyższym apeluję o przyjęcie skutecznych rozwiązań, które spowodują ograniczenie sankcji za przekroczenie kwot i pozwolą przygotować producentów mleka do prowadzenia działalności po zniesieniu systemu kwotowego. Nie ma sensu karać rolników za to, że rozpoczęli przygotowania do nowej rzeczywistości po 2015 r., gdy nie będzie już kwot.

Jedną z decyzji, jaką Komisja Europejska możne podjąć w dość krótkim czasie, a która może uchronić rolników przed płaceniem wysokich kar finansowych za przekroczenie kwot, jest korekta współczynnika tłuszczowego. Wystarczy dokonać zmiany rozporządzenia Komisji (WE) nr 595/2004.

Czy Komisja podejmie jakieś działania, które uchronią rolników przed płaceniem wysokich kar za przekroczenie kwot?

Czy Komisja dokona korekty współczynnika tłuszczowego dla dwóch ostatnich lat kwotowych, tj. dla bieżącego roku kwotowego (2013/2014) oraz roku kwotowego 2014/2015?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(29 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Komisja uprzejmie prosi szanownego Pana Posła o zapoznanie się z odpowiedzią na pytanie pisemne nr E-014095/2013 ([1]).

W ciągu ostatnich kilku tygodni miały miejsce dalsze dyskusje na temat korekty zawartości tłuszczu; zwłaszcza w Radzie, gdzie brakuje większości kwalifikowanej do zmiany elementów porozumienia w sprawie oceny funkcjonowania reformy WPR z 2008 r. w zakresie „miękkiego lądowania" w kontekście zniesienia kwot mlecznych. W związku z powyższym Komisja nie zamierza zmienić obecnych przepisów w odniesieniu do korekty zawartości tłuszczu.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002676/14
to the Commission
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: EU milk market

Milk production is currently on the rise in most EU Member States. Farmers are clearly preparing themselves for the liberalisation of the milk market, expanding their herds and investing in buildings and equipment. The situation on the world market also reflects this trend, with demand for dairy products on the increase. All this suggests that many countries will exceed their national limits in the final two years of quotas.

With the above in mind I should like to call for effective action to be taken to reduce the penalties for exceeding quotas and allow milk producers to make preparations with a view to taking their businesses forward after the quota system has ceased to apply. It makes no sense to punish farmers for starting to prepare for the new situation after 2015, when quotas will no longer exist.

One decision that the Commission could take fairly swiftly and which might prevent farmers from having to pay stiff financial penalties for exceeding quotas would be to change the fat correction factor. All it would take would be to amend Commission Regulation (EC) No 595/2004.

Will the Commission be taking any steps to prevent farmers from having to pay stiff fines for exceeding quotas?

Will the Commission be adjusting the fat correction factor for the final two years of quotas, i.e. for the current quota year (2013-14) and for the quota year 2014-15?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-014095/2013 ([1]).

Further discussions on the issue of fat correction have taken place in the last few weeks, in particular at Council level where there is no qualified majority to change elements of the 2008 Health Check agreement on a soft landing in the context of the abolition of dairy quota. In that light, the Commission does not intend to alter current provisions as regards fat correction.

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002677/14
adresată Comisiei
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(6 martie 2014)

Subiect: Reglementare separată privind traficul de persoane în scopul exploatării sexuale

Având în vedere raportul privind traficul de ființe umane, ediția 2013 al Eurostat, care constată în partea sa introductivă că 62% dintre victime sunt traficate în scopul exploatării sexuale, procent care este în creștere în perioada analizată în acest raport, în timp ce numărul victimelor traficate pentru munca forțată este în scădere;

Având în vedere faptul că 96% din aceste victime sunt femei și că 61 % dintre aceste victime identificate provin din state membre ale UE, cele mai multe din România și Bulgaria;

Având în vedere faptul că 75% dintre traficanții de persoane sunt bărbați și că 84% dintre aceștia sunt implicați în traficul în vederea exploatării sexuale;

Având în vedere faptul că adunarea datelor privind traficul de persoane are în vedere, pe lângă exploatarea sexuală (care reprezintă 62% din trafic), munca forțată, servitutea domestică, cerșetoria forțată, exploatarea în procesul traficului de droguri sau terorismului, traficul de organe și alte activități, precum căsătorii forțate, adopții forțate etc., toate acestea împreună reprezentând 38% din traficul de persoane,

Nu consideră Comisia că se impune reglementarea separată a traficului în scopul exploatării sexuale, care este în mod evident cea mai importantă parte a traficului de ființe umane, care folosește în imensă majoritate femei, este practicat în imensă majoritate de bărbați și are caracteristici specifice care nu pot fi analizate, monitorizate și controlate decât prin legislație, metode, mijloace și soluții specifice?

Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei
(23 aprilie 2014)

Comisia împărtășește preocupările stimatei doamne deputat cu privire la tendința ascendentă înregistrată de traficul de persoane în scopul exploatării sexuale în perioada 2008-2010, care a fost identificată în documentul de lucru din 2013 al Eurostat ([1]).

Forma de trafic de persoane cea mai frecvent raportată este traficul în scopul exploatării sexuale (66 % din cazurile raportate în 2010), majoritatea covârșitoare a victimelor acestui tip de trafic fiind femei și fete (96 % în 2010). Traficul de persoane în scopul exploatării prin muncă reprezintă 23 % din cazurile raportate în 2010, majoritatea victimelor acestui tip de trafic fiind bărbați și băieți (77 % în 2010).

Directiva 2011/36/UE ([2]) prevede o definiție armonizată a infracțiunii de trafic de persoane și a sancțiunilor aplicabile, precum și dispoziții în materie de protecție, asistență și sprijin pentru victime și în materie de prevenire. Directiva prevede, de asemenea, că traficul de persoane este un fenomen care afectează în mod diferit femeile și bărbații, pentru combaterea acestuia solicitându-se adoptarea de măsuri diferențiate în funcție de sex.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Policy/Report_DGHome_Eurostat
([2]) Directiva 2011/36/UE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 5 aprilie 2011 privind prevenirea și combaterea traficului de persoane și protejarea victimelor acestuia, precum și de înlocuire a Deciziei-cadru 2002/629/JAI a Consiliului (JO L 101, 15.4.2011, p. 101).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002677/14
to the Commission
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Separate rules on people trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation

The executive summary of Eurostat's 2013 report on trafficking in human beings notes that 62% of victims are trafficked for the purpose of sexual exploitation and that this percentage has increased each year over the period analysed in the report, whereas the number of victims of trafficking for labour exploitation is falling.

96% of these victims are female and 61% of the identified victims come from EU Member States, the majority of them from Romania and Bulgaria. 75% of traffickers are men, and 84% of them are involved in trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation.

The collection of data on people trafficking concerns other aspects as well as the sexual exploitation which accounts for 62% of victims. The remaining 38% are victims of forced labour, domestic servitude, forced begging, exploitation for the purpose of drug trafficking or terrorism, organ trafficking, and other activities such as forced marriage, forced adoption, etc.

Does the Commission not believe that separate rules need to be introduced on trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation, which is clearly the most significant aspect of trafficking in human beings, where the vast majority of victims are women and the vast majority of traffickers are men, and which has specific features that can be analysed, monitored and controlled only through specific legislation, methods, tools and solutions?

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

The Commission shares the concerns of the Honourable Member over the increasing trend in trafficking of human beings for the purpose of sexual exploitation between 2008 and 2010 identified in the 2013 Eurostat Working Paper ([1]).

The most reported form of trafficking in human beings is trafficking for sexual exploitation (66% of reported victims in 2010) and the overwhelming majority of victims of this form of trafficking are women and girls (96% in 2010). Trafficking for the purpose of labour exploitation accounts for 23% of reported victims in 2010 and the majority of victims of trafficking for labour exploitation are men and boys (77% in 2010).

Directive 2011/36/EU ([2]) provides for a harmonised definition of the criminal offence of trafficking in human beings and the applicable penalties, as well as provisions for the protection, assistance and support of victims and prevention. The directive further stipulates that human trafficking is a gendered phenomenon, and calls for gender specific measures to address it.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Policy/Report_DGHome_Eurostat
([2]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA,, OJ L 15.4.2011, p. 101.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002678/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: EU-Vogelschutzrichtlinie umsetzen — 2,5 Millionen tote Zugvögel sind zu viel

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission die stetige Zunahme getöteter Zugvögel in der Republik Zypern auch nach 10 Jahren EU-Mitgliedschaft?

2. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Umsetzung der EU-Vogelschutzrichtlinie in der Republik Zypern, insbesondere seit 2013?

3. Welche konkreten Maßnahmen wird die Kommission gegenüber der zyprischen Regierung ergreifen, um eine effiziente Umsetzung der EU-Vogelschutzrichtlinie sicherzustellen und die weitere Verschleierung von Tatsachen und Verstößen gegen EU-Recht zu verhindern?

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

Die Kommission hat vor kurzem einen Monitoring-Bericht mit Daten über die illegale Fangjagd auf Wildvögel erhalten, die im Herbst 2013 in Zypern stattfand. Die Kommission hat diese Daten geprüft. Außerdem hat sie auf einer Paketsitzung ([1]) am 25. Februar 2014 die Fangjagd in der Republik Zypern bei den zuständigen zyprischen Behörden zur Sprache gebracht. Darüber hinaus wird die Kommission die Fangjagd im souveränen britischen Stützpunkt Dhekelia mit den zuständigen britischen Behörden erörtern.

Die Verantwortung für die Durchsetzung der Bestimmungen der Vogelschutzrichtlinie ([2]), einschließlich Maßnahmen gegen die Vogelwilderei und der Mobilisierung von Freiwilligen für solche Maßnahmen, liegt bei den zuständigen Behörden der Mitgliedstaaten. In Fällen, in denen das illegale Töten oder Fangen von Wildvögeln anhält, prüft die Kommission zusammen mit den nationalen Behörden die Wirksamkeit der zur Bekämpfung derartiger Praktiken getroffenen Maßnahmen. In diesem Zusammenhang hat die Kommission auch einen Fahrplan ([3]) erstellt, in dem konkrete Maßnahmen zur Beseitigung der illegalen Tötung von Wildvögeln, der Fangjagd auf Wildvögel und des Handels mit Wildvögeln in der EU aufgezeigt werden. Sie überwacht die Durchführung dieses Fahrplans in Zusammenarbeit mit den Mitgliedstaaten und den Interessenträgern.

([1]) Sitzung über die Umsetzung der EU-Rechtsvorschriften in den Mitgliedstaaten.
([2]) Richtlinie 2009/147/EG, ABl. L 20 vom 26.1.2010.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/illegal_killing.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002678/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Time to implement the Birds Directive — 2.5 million dead migratory birds is too many

1. How does the Commission view the steady increase in the killing of migratory birds in Cyprus, even though that country has been an EU Member State for 10 years now?

2. How does the Commission view the implementation of the Birds Directive in Cyprus, particularly since 2013?

3. What practical measures will the Commission take vis-à-vis the Government of Cyprus to ensure that the Birds Directive is properly implemented, to prevent further obfuscation and to stop EC law being broken?

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

The Commission received recently the monitoring report with data of illegal bird trapping during autumn 2013 in Cyprus. The Commission has analysed these and further raised the matter, as regards trapping activities taking place in the Republic of Cyprus, with the competent Cypriot authorities during a package meeting ([1]) on 25 February 2014. The Commission will also raise this issue with the competent British authorities as regards trapping activities within the Dhekelia Sovereign British Base area.

The enforcement of the provisions of the Birds Directive ([2]), including action against bird poaching and the mobilisation of volunteers for such action, is a responsibility of the competent authorities of Member States. Where illegal killing or trapping of birds persists, the Commission investigates with the national authorities the effectiveness of the measures taken to combat these practices. In that regard the Commission has also produced a Roadmap ([3]) identifying specific measures aimed at eliminating illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds in the EU, and is monitoring its implementation in cooperation with Member States and stakeholders.

([1]) Meeting on implementation of EU legislation in Member States.
([2]) 2009/147/EC, OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/illegal_killing.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002679/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Pestizide: Verlängerung der Fristen für laufende Genehmigungsanträge

Aufgrund der Tatsache, dass mit der Industrie vereinbart wurde, nicht zugelassene Pestizide einer nochmaligen Bewertung zu unterziehen, und des als „Verlängerung" bekannten einschlägigen Verfahrens verzögern sich die Fristen für Anträge auf Genehmigung auf EU-Ebene. Eine Reihe sehr wichtiger Pestizide, wie Glyphosat, Amitrol und Diquat, sollen zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt nochmals geprüft werden.

1. Für wie viele in Pestiziden enthaltene Wirkstoffe ist die Neubewertung verschoben worden?

2. Wie werden die neu bewerteten Wirkstoffe (d. h. die in der Neufassung von Anhang I) auf etwaige endokrinschädigende Eigenschaften überprüft?

3. Warum wurden keine unabhängigen Studien in das Dossier aufgenommen?

4. Teilt die Kommission die Auffassung, dass von der Industrie geförderte Studien und Sicherheitstests — vor allem jene chronischen Studien, auf deren Grundlage die zulässige Tagesdosis festgelegt wird — generell überprüft werden sollten?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(22. April 2014)

Wir nehmen Bezug auf die in der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1141/2010 ([1]) aufgeführten Wirkstoffe.

1. Mit der Richtlinie 2010/77/EU der Kommission ([2]) wurden die Fristen für 31 Stoffe bis zum 31. Dezember 2015 verlängert. Für zwei Wirkstoffe wurde kein Antrag gestellt, so dass der Ablauf der Frist wieder auf das ursprüngliche Datum zurückverlegt wurde.

2. Bis zur Festlegung von Kriterien für endokrinschädigende Eigenschaften werden Stoffe anhand der vorläufig geltenden Kriterien bewertet, die in Anhang II Nummer 3.6.5 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 ([3]) aufgeführt sind.

3. Gemäß Artikel 13 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1141/2010 können unabhängige Studien von Dritten innerhalb einer bestimmten Zeit übermittelt werden. Für mehrere Stoffe haben die Antragsteller von Fachleuten überprüfte frei verfügbare Literatur vorgelegt, bei der die Leitlinien der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit für die Einreichung wissenschaftlicher und von Fachleuten überprüfter frei verfügbarer Literatur im Hinblick auf die Zulassung von Pestizidwirkstoffen nach der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 (EFSA Journal 2011;9(2):2092) beachtet wurden. Für die betroffenen Wirkstoffe war das nicht vorgeschrieben.

4. Auf Anfrage können als Antragsunterlagen vorgelegte Studien und Sicherheitstests zur Verfügung gestellt werden, sofern nicht um vertrauliche Behandlung der betreffenden Informationen gebeten wurde und diese gerechtfertigt ist.

([1]) ABl. L 322 vom 8.12.2010.
([2]) ABl. L 293 vom 11.11.2010.
([3]) ABl. L 309 vom 24.11.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002679/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Pesticides: prolongation of all deadlines for requests for ongoing approval

Owing to an existing agreement with industry to reassess non-authorised pesticides, all deadlines for requests for approval at EU level are delayed in a process known as 'prolongation'. Several very important pesticides such as glyphosate, amitrole and diquat are to be reassessed at a later stage.

1. For how many active substances contained in pesticides has reassessment been delayed?

2. How are the reassessed active substances (i.e. those in the AIR groups) assessed for endocrine-disrupting properties?

3. Why have all independent studies been omitted from the dossier?

4. Does the Commission agree that industry-sponsored studies and safety tests should be made available for general scrutiny, in particular those chronic studies establishing the basis for acceptable daily intake?

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

Reference is made to active substances listed in Regulation (EU) No 1141/2010 ([1]).

1. The expiry dates of 31 substances have been extended till 31 December 2015 by Commission Directive 2010/77/EU ([2]). For two active substances no application was received and the expiry date has been set back to the original expiry date.

2. Pending the adoption of criteria for endocrine-disrupting properties substances are assessed in accordance with the interim criteria as listed in Annex II point 3.6.5 to Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([3]).

3. According to the provisions of Article 13 of Regulation (EU) No 1141/2010 independent studies can be submitted by third parties within a set timeframe.

For a number of substances peer-reviewed open literature has been submitted for which the applicant has followed the recommendations included in the European Food Safety Authority guidance on the submission of scientific peer-reviewed open literature for the approval of pesticide active substances under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 (EFSA Journal 2011;9(2):2092). This was not mandatory for the active substances referred to.

4. Upon request studies and safety tests which are submitted as part of the application will be made available, excluding any information for which confidentiality treatment has been requested and is justified.

([1]) OJ L 322, 8.12.2010.
([2]) OJ L 293, 11.11.2010.
([3]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002680/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Pestizide: Verhindert die Industrie die Veröffentlichung der Liste der zu ersetzenden Stoffe?

Nach Artikel 80 Absatz 7 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 gilt: „Die Kommission erstellt bis zum 14. Dezember 2013 eine Liste der in Anhang I der Richtlinie 91/414/EWG aufgeführten Wirkstoffe, die die Kriterien von Anhang II Nummer 4 der vorliegenden Verordnung erfüllen und für die Artikel 50 der vorliegenden Verordnung gilt."

Die GD Gesundheit und Verbraucherschutz hat eine Liste der zu ersetzenden Wirkstoffe zusammengestellt, dafür aber von der Industrie viel Kritik geerntet, weil die Liste als „Schwarze Liste der zu ersetzenden Stoffe" verwendet werden könnte.

1. Warum wurde die Liste der zu ersetzenden Wirkstoffe nicht fristgemäß zum 14. Dezember 2013 veröffentlicht?

2. Warum findet sich unter den zur Festlegung der zu ersetzenden Stoffe herangezogenen Quellen keine unabhängige wissenschaftliche Fachliteratur?

3. Warum zählt Entwicklungsneurotoxizität nicht zu den Kriterien für die Ermittlung zu ersetzender Stoffe?

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

1. Die Vorarbeiten zur Erstellung der Liste von Stoffen, die die in Artikel 80 Absatz 7 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 ([1]) festgelegten Kriterien erfüllen, wurden im Ständigen Ausschuss für die Lebensmittelkette und Tiergesundheit mit den Mitgliedstaaten und in der entsprechenden Arbeitsgruppe seiner Beratungsgruppe mit den Interessenträgern erörtert. Im Verlauf dieser Erörterungen erhielt die Kommission mehrere Anregungen für Verbesserungen und Korrekturen. Da die Bewertung und gegebenenfalls Umsetzung dieser Anregungen Zeit in Anspruch nahmen, verzögerte sich die Veröffentlichung der Liste.

2. Die Bewertung von Stoffen unter dem Gesichtspunkt ihrer etwaigen Aufnahme in die Liste der Stoffe, die die in Artikel 80 Absatz 7 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 festgelegten Kriterien erfüllen (sogenannte „zu ersetzende Stoffe") basiert auf einvernehmlich festgelegten Endpunkten, die als Grundlage ihrer Zulassung als Wirkstoffe in Pflanzenschutzmitteln dienen. Unabhängige wissenschaftliche Fachliteratur wurde insoweit berücksichtigt, als sie im Rahmen des Zulassungsverfahrens vorgelegt wurde und deshalb den Status eines Stoffs berührt haben könnte.

3. Die Entwicklungsneurotoxizität wird bei der Zulassung berücksichtigt und berührt den Status eines Stoffes auf der Liste der zu ersetzenden Stoffe. Das dritte unter Nummer 4 des Anhangs II der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 aufgeführte Kriterium schreibt die Berücksichtigung der Entwicklungsneurotoxizität bei der Ermittlung der Stoffe vor, die in die Liste aufgenommen werden sollen, allerdings in Kombination mit anderen Faktoren.

([1]) ABl. L 309 vom 24.11.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002680/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Pesticides: is the publication of a list of candidates for substitution being prevented by industry?

Article 80(7) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 provides that: 'By 14 December 2013, the Commission shall establish a list of substances included in Annex I to Directive 91/414/EEC which satisfy the criteria set out in point 4 of Annex II to this regulation and to which the provisions of Article 50 of this regulation shall apply.'

DG SANCO drew up a list of active substance candidates for substitution, but received much criticism from industry on the grounds that it could be used as a substitute black list.

1. Why was the list of candidates for substitution not published on 14 December 2013, as required?

2. Why is independent scientific literature not being used as a source for candidates?

3. Why is developmental neurotoxicity not being used as a criterion for the identification of candidates?

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

1. The preparatory work to establish a list of substances that fulfil the provisions set out in Article 80(7) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([1]) was discussed with the Member States in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health and with stakeholders in the Working Group of its Advisory Group. In the course of these discussions, the Commission received several suggestions for improvement and correction. The time required to assess the suggestions and implement them, where appropriate, led to a delay in the publication of the list.

2. The assessment of substances as regards the possible inclusion in the list of substances that fulfil the provisions set out in Article 80(7) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 (the so-called 'candidates for substitution') is based on agreed endpoints that form the basis of their approval as active substances in plant protection products. Independent scientific literature was taken into account insofar it has been submitted as part of the approval process and therefore can have affected the status of a substance.

3. Developmental neurotoxicity is taken into account for the approval and affects the status of a substance on the list of candidates for substitution. The third criterion listed under point 4 of Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 requires the consideration of developmental neurotoxicity for the identification of substances to be included in the list, however in combination with other factors.

([1]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002681/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Kriterien für die endokrindisruptive Wirkung von Pestiziden

2009 entschieden die Dienststellen der Kommission, dass Kriterien für die endokrindisruptive Wirkung von Pestiziden unter der Führung der GD Umwelt erarbeitet werden sollten. Die GD Umwelt arbeitete daraufhin über mehrere Jahre mit Sachverständigenteams unter der Führung der Gemeinsamen Forschungsstelle (JRC) und mit Interessengruppen zusammen und legte schließlich Anfang 2013 einen Entwurf der Kriterien vor. Dann veranlasste der Generalsekretär auf massives Betreiben der Lobby der Pestizidindustrie die Einstellung des Verfahrens, wobei er die GD Umwelt völlig überging. Jetzt muss eine Folgenabschätzung durchgeführt werden. Die dafür festgelegte Frist wurde missachtet. 2012 gab die GD Gesundheit und Verbraucherschutz bei der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) einen Entwurf der Kriterien in Auftrag, ohne die GD Umwelt einzubeziehen. In Bezug auf die durchzuführende Folgenabschätzung arbeitete die GD Gesundheit und Verbraucherschutz anschließend mit anderen Generaldirektionen zusammen.

1. Warum hat die Kommission die auf Dezember 2013 festgelegte Frist missachtet?

2. Warum hat der Generalsekretär erst so spät eingegriffen? (Er wusste schließlich, woran die GD Umwelt arbeitete.)

3. Welche Agentur oder Stelle der EU (die EFSA, die JRC, der Wissenschaftliche Ausschuss „Gesundheits- und Umweltrisiken“ (SCHER) o. a.) sollte mit der wissenschaftlichen Bewertung der Kriterien betraut werden?

4. An welcher Stelle werden in der Verordnung über Pflanzenschutzmittel wirtschaftliche Folgen als ein Aspekt genannt, den es bei der Festlegung von Kriterien für eine endokrindisruptive Wirkung zu beachten gilt?

5. Wie oft haben Treffen zwischen den Dienststellen der Kommission und Vertretern der Branche stattgefunden, in denen es um endokrin aktive Substanzen ging? Liegen Protokolle dieser Treffen vor, in die Einsicht genommen werden kann?

6. Warum hat die Kommission zur Erarbeitung der Kriterien keine unabhängigen Wissenschaftler herangezogen? (Die Endocrine Society zählt 40 000 Endokrinologen zu ihren Mitgliedern.)

7. Wie viele Pestizide werden aufgrund der vorläufig geltenden Kriterien für eine endokrindisruptive Wirkung verboten werden?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(24. April 2014)

In den Rechtsvorschriften über Pflanzenschutzmittel und Biozidprodukte wird die Kommission ermächtigt, Kriterien zur Identifizierung endokrin wirksamer Stoffe zu erarbeiten. Die vorläufigen Kriterien sind in diesen Instrumenten festgelegt und gelten so lange, bis die neuen Kriterien vorliegen.

Für die Festlegung der Kriterien stehen verschiedene Optionen zur Verfügung. Schwierig wird es dadurch, dass in der Wissenschaft nicht unbedingt Einigkeit besteht, wie endokrine Disruptoren zu definieren sind, und dass in den einschlägigen Rechtsvorschriften unterschiedliche Entscheidungsverfahren festgelegt sind. Aus diesen Gründen hat die Kommission 2013 entschieden, eine Folgenabschätzung durchzuführen, um ihre Entscheidung bezüglich der Kriterien zu untermauern. Es ist Kommissionspolitik, eine Folgenabschätzung vorzunehmen, wenn die geplanten Maßnahmen erhebliche Auswirkungen haben; dies gilt auch für Durchführungsrechtsakte und delegierte Rechtsakte. Um eine solide Entscheidungsgrundlage zu schaffen, werden die potenziellen wirtschaftlichen, sozialen und ökologischen Auswirkungen der möglichen Kriterien bewertet.

Die Folgenabschätzung umfasst außerdem eine öffentliche Anhörung, an der sich alle Interessengruppen beteiligen können. Mit relevanten Interessengruppen einschließlich privaten Unternehmen zu sprechen, ist gängige Praxis und ein integraler Bestandteil der Agenda der Kommission für intelligente Regulierung.

Die Kommission hat bereits — hauptsächlich in der „Endocrine Disrupters Expert Advisory Group“ („beratende Expertengruppe zu endokrinen Disruptoren“) [1] und über ein Mandat für die EFSA [2] — unabhängige Wissenschaftler miteinbezogen. Während der Folgenabschätzung werden weitere Anhörungen stattfinden.

Sobald die Kriterien festgelegt sind, sind sie gemäß den übergeordneten Rechtsvorschriften anzuwenden. Wie viele Pflanzenschutzmittel und Biozidprodukte aufgrund vorläufiger oder neuer Kriterien verboten werden, ist noch nicht bekannt. Dies wird in der Folgenabschätzung bewertet.

---

[1] Bericht der Endocrine Disrupters Expert Advisory Group: „Key scientific issues relevant to the identification and characterisation of endocrine disrupting substances“: http://ihcp.jrc.ec.europa.eu/our_activities/food-cons-prod/endocrine_disrupters/jrc-report-scientific-issues-identification-endocrine-disrupting-substances

[2] EFSA Scientific Opinion on the hazard assessment of endocrine disruptors: Scientific criteria for identification of endocrine disruptors and appropriateness of existing test methods for assessing effects mediated by these substances on human health and the environment: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3132.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002681/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Pesticides: criteria for endocrine disruption

In 2009, Commission departments agreed that DG ENV had the lead on criteria. DG ENV worked for several years with expert groups led by the Joint Research Centre (JRC) and stakeholder groups, and finally drafted criteria in early 2013. Then the Secretary-General stopped the process and sidelined DG ENV, after a massive lobby by the pesticide industry. Now an impact analysis needs to be performed. The deadline has been disregarded. In 2012, SANCO mandated the European Food and Safety Authority (EFSA) to draft criteria without involving DG ENV. Next, DG SANCO collaborated with other DGs on the need to perform an impact assessment.

1. Why did the Commission disregard the deadline of December 2013?

2. Why did the Secretary-General intervene at such a late stage (when he knew very well what DG ENV was doing)?

3. Which EU agency or body (the EFSA, the JRC, the Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks (SCHER), etc.) should be carrying out a scientific assessment of the criteria?

4. Where does the text of the pesticide regulation on endocrines mention economic impact as an element for establishing criteria?

5. How many times did the Commission departments meet industry representatives regarding endocrines? Do transparent minutes of these meetings exist?

6. Why did the Commission not involve independent scientists in drawing up the criteria (the Endocrine Society has 40 000 endocrinologists amongst its members)?

7. How many pesticides will be banned because of the interim criteria on endocrines?

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

In the legislation on plant protection products and biocidal products, the Commission is empowered to develop criteria to identify endocrine disrupting substances. Interim criteria are defined in these instruments and will apply until the new criteria are established.

Different options are available for the choice of criteria. This is further complicated by the divergent scientific opinions on how to define endocrine disruptors and by the different regulatory decision making processes in the sectoral legislation. For these reasons, the Commission decided in 2013 to carry out an Impact Assessment (IA) to inform its decision on the criteria. Existing Commission policy on Impact Assessments requires assessments to be made where the envisaged measures entail significant impacts and applies also to the development of implementing and delegated acts. The potential economic, social and environmental impacts of the various possible criteria will be evaluated in order to provide a solid basis for decision making.

The IA will also be supported by a public consultation where all stakeholders will be able to contribute. Meeting relevant stakeholders including private companies is normal practice and an integral part of the Commission's smart regulation agenda.

The Commission has already involved independent scientists mainly via the 'Endocrine Disruptors Expert Advisory Group' ([1]) and via a mandate to EFSA ([2]). Further consultations will be made during the IA process.

Once established, the criteria will be applied pursuant to the parent legislation. It is not known yet how many plant protection products and biocides will be banned because of the interim criteria or by application of any new criteria. This will be assessed in the impact assessment.

([1]) Report of the Endocrine Disrupters Expert Advisory Group: 'Key scientific issues relevant to the identification and characterisation of endocrine disrupting substances' http://ihcp.jrc.ec.europa.eu/our_activities/food-cons-prod/endocrine_disrupters/jrc-report-scientific-issues-identification- endocrine-disrupting-substances.

([2]) EFSA Scientific Opinion on the hazard assessment of endocrine disruptors: Scientific criteria for identification of endocrine disruptors and appropriateness of existing test methods for assessing effects mediated by these substances on human health and the environment http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3132.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002682/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Pestizide: Daten- und Studienanforderungen

Artikel 84 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 verpflichtet die Kommission zum Erlass folgender Verordnungen bis zum 14. Juni 2011:

„… b) eine Verordnung gemäß Artikel 8 Absatz 1 Buchstabe b über die Datenanforderungen für Wirkstoffe;

…

d) eine Verordnung gemäß Artikel 36 über einheitliche Grundsätze für die Risikobewertung von Pflanzenschutzmitteln“.

Die Datenanforderungen, die vor 2009 schon alt und veraltet waren, sind immer noch gültig, und einige Sicherheitsprüfungen wurden infolge einer massiven Lobbykampagne der Industrie, die Kostensenkungen zum Ziel hatte, gestrichen.

1. Warum wird die pränatale Exposition in den erforderlichen Sicherheitsprüfungen für chronische Krebserkrankungen nicht berücksichtigt?

2. Warum erfolgt die Prüfung für chronische Krebserkrankungen nicht lebenslang?

3. Warum ist die Prüfung auf Entwicklungsneurotoxizität keine Standardanforderung für alle Pestizide?

4. Warum enthalten die Datenanforderungen keine Prüfungen für Chemikalien mit endokriner Wirkung?

5. Warum werden die Prüfungen nicht in unabhängigen Labors in Blindversuchen durchgeführt?

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

Die Datenanforderungen für die Genehmigung von Wirkstoffen und die Zulassung von Pflanzenschutzmitteln wurden 2013 durch zwei Verordnungen im Wege des Regelungsverfahrens mit Kontrolle erlassen ([1]). Zuvor hatte eine breit angelegte Konsultation aller betroffenen Stakeholder stattgefunden, und mehrere Gutachten der EFSA waren berücksichtigt worden. In den Fällen, in denen keine neuen Methoden zur Verfügung standen, die eine bessere Datenbasis gebildet hätten, wurden geltende Datenanforderungen nicht ersetzt.

1) Die pränatale Exposition fällt unter die Studien, die im Rahmen der Reproduktionstoxizität vorgeschrieben sind. Dazu zählen auch Entwicklungstoxizitätsstudien, die immer verlangt werden ([1])([2]).

2) Die Langzeit-Toxizitäts- und Carcinogenitätsprüfung erfolgt nach Leitlinien, die auf europäischer und internationaler Ebene (z. B. OECD) vereinbart wurden ([2]).

3) Neurotoxizitätsstudien *in vivo* werden nur vorgeschrieben, wenn sie durch Toxizitätsstudien oder für bestimmte Wirkstoffgruppen gerechtfertigt sind. Damit wird dem Erwägungsgrund 40 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 ([3]) Rechnung getragen, nach dem Tierversuche auf ein Minimum zu beschränken sind.

4) Prüfungen für Chemikalien mit endokriner Wirkung sind in den neuen Datenanforderungen unter den Punkten 5.8.3, 8.1.5 und 8.2.3 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 283/2013 ([1]) vorgeschrieben.

5) Die Prüfungen müssen nach der Guten Laborpraxis gemäß den Grundsätzen der Richtlinie 2004/10/EG ([4]) durchgeführt werden. Damit wird eine unabhängige Qualitätssicherung des Prozesses und der Bedingungen garantiert, unter denen Sicherheitsstudien geplant, durchgeführt und wiedergegeben werden.

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 283/2013 der Kommission vom 1. März 2013 zur Festlegung der Datenanforderungen für Wirkstoffe gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über das Inverkehrbringen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln. ABl. L 93/1.
Verordnung (EU) Nr. 284/2013 der Kommission vom 1. März 2013 zur Festlegung der Datenanforderungen für Wirkstoffe gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über das Inverkehrbringen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln. ABl. L 93/85.

([2]) Mitteilung der Kommission im Rahmen der Durchführung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 283/2013 der Kommission vom 1. März 2013 zur Festlegung der Datenanforderungen für Wirkstoffe gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über das Inverkehrbringen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln. ABl. 2013/C 95/01.

([3]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 21. Oktober 2009 über das Inverkehrbringen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinien 79/117/EWG und 91/414/EWG des Rates. ABl. L 309/1.

([4]) Richtlinie 2004/10/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 11. Februar 2004 zur Angleichung der Rechts- und Verwaltungsvorschriften für die Anwendung der Grundsätze der Guten Laborpraxis und zur Kontrolle ihrer Anwendung bei Versuchen mit chemischen Stoffen. ABl. L 50.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002682/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Pesticides: data and study requirements

Article 84 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 required the Commission to adopt the following by 14 June 2011:

'… (b) a regulation on data requirements for active substances, as referred to in Article 8(1)(b);

…

(d) a regulation on uniform principles for risk assessment for plant protection products, as referred to in Article 36;'.

Data requirements that were already old and outdated before 2009 are still maintained, and some safety tests have even been removed as a result of a major industry lobbying campaign aimed at cutting costs.

1. Why is *in utero* exposure not taken into account in the required chronic cancer safety test?

2. Why is the chronic cancer test not lifelong?

3. Why is the developmental neurotoxicity test not a standard requirement for all pesticides?

4. Why are tests for endocrine-disrupting chemicals not included in the data requirements?

5. Why are the tests not performed in independent laboratories, using blind testing?

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

The data requirements for the approval of active substances and the authorisation of plant protection products were updated in 2013 by two regulations adopted under the regulatory procedure with scrutiny ([1]). This was preceded by a wide consultation of all concerned stakeholders and the consideration of several EFSA's opinions. In cases where no new methods which would provide a better data basis were available, the existing data requirements were not replaced.

1. In utero exposure is covered by studies requested under reproductive toxicity. This includes developmental toxicity studies, which are always requested ([2]).

2. The long term toxicity and carcinogenicity testing follow guidelines agreed at European and international level (e.g. OECD).

3. Neurotoxicity studies *in vivo* are only requested if justified by toxicity studies or for certain groups of active substances. This is in line with Recital 40 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([3]) which requests that animal testing should be minimised.

4. Tests for endocrine disruption chemicals are requested in the new data requirements under points 5.8.3, 8.1.5 and 8.2.3 of Regulation (EU) No 283/2013.

5. Tests have to be performed under Good Laboratory Practice in accordance with the principles laid down in Directive 2004/10/EC ([4]). This guarantees an independent quality assurance of the process and the conditions under which safety studies are planned, performed and reported.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EU) No 283/2013 of 1 March 2013 setting out the data requirements for active substances, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market. OJ L 93/1.
Commission Regulation (EU) No 284/2013 of 1 March 2013 setting out the data requirements for plant protection products, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market. OJ L 93/85.

([2]) Commission Communication in the framework of the implementation of Commission Regulation (EU) No 283/2013 of 1 March 2013 setting out the data requirements for active substances, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market. OJ 2013/C 95/01.

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and the Council of 21 October 2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC. OJ L 309/1.

([4]) Directive 2004/10/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 11 February 2004 on the harmonisation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the application of the principles of good laboratory practice and the verification of their applications for tests on chemical substances. OJ L 50.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002683/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Pestizide: unabhängige Literatur und Begutachtung der EFSA-Stellungnahme durch unabhängige Wissenschaftler

Laut der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 wurde die Europäische Behörde für die Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) mit der Aufgabe befasst, festzulegen, was als unabhängige, von Fachleuten überprüfte Literatur gilt. Sie kam dieser Pflicht in einer Art und Weise nach, dass ausschließlich von der Industrie gesponserte Studien für geeignet befunden worden, wissenschaftliche Studien hingegen nicht. Das ist genau das Gegenteil dessen, was mit der Verordnung erreicht werden sollte.

Bei den ersten Bewertungen, die nach dieser Anforderung durchgeführt wurden (Glyphosat, Diquat, 2,4-D usw.) hat die Industrie die EFSA-Stellungnahme für ihre Zwecke genutzt und eine „Überprüfung" durchgeführt, mit dem Ergebnis, dass aufgrund der Lücke bei den Zuverlässigkeitskriterien nach Klimisch keine einzige wissenschaftliche Studie für die Entscheidungsfindung relevant ist. Dadurch wird die in der Verordnung festgelegte Anforderung komplett ausgehöhlt.

1. Sind nach Auffassung der Kommission wissenschaftliche Studien für die Entscheidungsfindung in Brüssel absolut irrelevant?

2. Stimmt die Kommission mit der Auffassung der EFSA überein, dass von der Industrie gesponserte Studien stets zuverlässig und relevant sind?

3. Wäre es nicht an der Zeit, die EFSA-Stellungnahme zu revidieren und neu zu konzipieren, zumal jetzt klar ist, dass unabhängige Studien überhaupt nicht berücksichtigt werden?

4. Was hält die Kommission davon, unabhängige Wissenschaftler hinzuzuziehen, damit sie die Ergebnisse der EFSA-Stellungnahme einer kritischen Prüfung unterziehen?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(24. April 2014)

Die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 [1] sieht die weltweit strengste Risikobewertung für Wirkstoffe zur Verwendung in Pflanzenschutzmitteln vor. Antragsteller müssen umfangreiche Angaben machen.

Das System basiert auf wissenschaftlicher Strenge und unterscheidet nicht a priori zwischen Studien, die vom Antragsteller selbst finanziert wurden, und Studien, die aus anderen Quellen stammen, z. B. aus der öffentlichen Literatur.

Die OECD/EU-Prüfungsrichtlinien enthalten sehr strenge Standards für die Festlegung der Art und Weise der Gewinnung von Erkenntnissen durch die Industrie; entsprechen akademische Studien nicht diesem Standard, so sollte dies eindeutig angegeben werden, damit eine transparente Beurteilung frei verfügbarer Literatur seitens der Öffentlichkeit, der EFSA und aller Stakeholder möglich ist.

Leider enthalten frei verfügbare Studien oft nicht die Rohdaten, sondern lediglich Sekundärinformationen. Dadurch wird die Reproduzierbarkeit der Ergebnisse beeinträchtigt, was eine unabhängige und transparente wissenschaftliche Bewertung solcher Daten unmöglich macht.

Im EFSA-Leitfaden [2] sind die Anforderungen an eine Qualitätsbewertung, bei der sichergestellt ist, dass alle vorgelegten Informationen mit derselben wissenschaftlichen Strenge geprüft werden, eindeutig festgelegt.

Die Kommission würde es begrüßen, wenn mehr von Dritten finanzierte Studien bei der Risikobewertung berücksichtigt werden könnten.

Es ist Aufgabe der EFSA, die Kommission mit unabhängiger wissenschaftlicher Beratung zu unterstützen.

---

[1] Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 21. Oktober 2009 über das Inverkehrbringen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinien 79/117/EWG und 91/414/EWG des Rates, ABl. L 209 vom 24.11.2009, S. 50.

[2] Submission of scientific peer-reviewed open literature for the approval of pesticide active substances under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009. EFSA Journal 2011; 9(2):2092 [49 pp.]. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2011.2092.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002683/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Pesticides: independent literature and scientists to scrutinise European Food Safety Authority opinion

Under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) was given the task of defining independent peer-reviewed literature. It did this in such a way that, generally, only industry-sponsored studies qualified and academic studies did not. This is exactly the opposite of what the regulation was intended to achieve.

In the first cases of assessment with this requirement (Glyphosate, Diquat, 2,4-D, etc.), industry took advantage of this EFSA opinion and did a 'review', with the result that no academic study is relevant for decision-making, owing to the Klimisch loophole. This means the requirement of the regulation is completely undermined.

1. Does the Commission think academic studies are completely useless for Brussels decision-making?

2. Does the Commission agree with the EFSA opinion that industry-sponsored studies are always reliable and relevant?

3. Now that it is clear that no independent studies are taken into account, is it not time to revise and redesign the EFSA opinion?

4. What does the Commission think about involving independent scientists to scrutinise the results of the EFSA opinion?

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

Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([1]) provides for the most restrictive risk assessment for active substances to be used in plant protection products worldwide. Applicants have to provide a substantial amount of information.

The system is based on scientific rigorousness and does not distinguish a priori between studies financed by the applicant itself, or studies coming from other sources, e.g. from public literature.

There is a high standard set by the OECD/EU test guidelines in determining the way information is generated by industry and when academic studies do not adhere to this standard this should be transparent in the information provided in order to allow a transparent judgment of the open literature by the public, EFSA, and all stakeholders.

Studies published in open literature unfortunately do often not contain the raw data, but only secondary information. This jeopardises the reproducibility of the results and an independent and transparent scientific evaluation of such data is not possible.

The EFSA guidance document ([2]) clearly sets out the requirements for a quality assessment which makes sure that all information submitted is subject to the same scientific rigor.

The Commission would welcome if more studies financed by third parties could be taken into account in the risk assessment.

It is the role of EFSA to provide independent scientific advice to the Commission.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC. OJ L 209, 24.11.2009, p. 50.

([2]) Submission of scientific peer-reviewed open literature for the approval of pesticide active substances under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009. EFSA Journal 2011;9(2):2092 [49 pp.]. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2011.2092.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002684/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6. März 2014)

Betrifft: Überwachung des Verbrauchs antimikrobieller Mittel in der Veterinärmedizin: Sicherstellung der Beteiligung aller Interessengruppen, damit alle etwaigen Risikofaktoren identifiziert werden

Im Rahmen des Europäischen Projekts zur Überwachung des Verbrauchs antimikrobieller Mittel in der Veterinärmedizin (ESVAC) werden Information darüber gesammelt, wie in der EU antimikrobielle Wirkstoffe bei Tieren angewendet werden.

1. Wann werden die Berichte über den Absatz von antimikrobiellen Mitteln in der Veterinärmedizin mit Angaben für 2012 veröffentlicht?

2. Wann findet das nächste Treffen der Interessengruppen statt?

3. Welche Interessengruppen werden dazu eingeladen?

4. Wie wird dafür gesorgt, dass alle Interessenten daran teilnehmen und ihre Kenntnisse teilen können, damit alle etwaigen Risikofaktoren identifiziert werden, die zur Entwicklung und Ausbreitung von Resistenzen gegen antimikrobielle Mittel bei Tieren führen könnten?

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

Im Jahr 2009 hat die Kommission die Europäische Arzneimittel-Agentur (EMA) gebeten, bei der Erhebung von Daten über den Absatz antimikrobieller Mittel in den Mitgliedstaaten die Leitung zu übernehmen. Im selben Jahr hat die EMA das Europäische Projekt zur Überwachung des Verbrauchs antimikrobieller Mittel in der Veterinärmedizin (ESVAC) gestartet. Die Jahresberichte und Protokolle der Sitzungen der Interessengruppen können von der Website der EMA ([1]) abgerufen werden. Der Bericht mit Daten aus dem Jahr 2012 wird 2014 veröffentlicht. Die nächste Sitzung der Interessengruppen findet 2015 statt.

Die Kommission gewährleistet die Beteiligung aller Interessengruppen, indem sie regelmäßige Sitzungen der Beratungsgruppen ([2]), öffentliche Konsultationen ([3]), Konferenzen ([4]) und andere Möglichkeiten zur Weitergabe von relevanten Kenntnissen organisiert.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000302.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac0580153a00
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/sdg/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/veterinary-use/rev_frame_index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/antimicrobial_resistance/events/ev_11122013_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002684/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption: Ensuring participation of all stakeholders to make sure all possible risk factors are identified

The European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption (ESVAC) project collects information on how antimicrobial medicines are used in animals across the EU.

1. When will the reports on sales of veterinary antimicrobial agents with data for 2012 be published?

2. When will the next stakeholder meeting take place?

3. Which stakeholders will be invited?

4. How is it ensured that all interested parties are able to participate and share their knowledge, to make sure all possible risk factors that could lead to the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance in animals are identified?

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

In 2009 the Commission asked the European Medicines Agency (EMA) to take the lead in the collection of data on sales of veterinary antimicrobial agents in the Member States. The European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption (ESVAC) project was launched by EMA in 2009. Annual reports and minutes of the ESVAC stakeholders meeting are published at the EMA website ([1]). The report with data for 2012 will be published in 2014. The next stakeholder meeting will be held in 2015.

The Commission ensures the involvement of all concerned stakeholders through the organisation of regular meetings of the consultative groups ([2]), public consultations ([3]), conferences ([4]), and other relevant knowledge-sharing activities.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000302.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac0580153a00
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/sdg/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/veterinary-use/rev_frame_index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/antimicrobial_resistance/events/ev_11122013_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002685/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(6 maart 2014)

Betreft: Herziening van de berekeningsmethode voor het bbp

Eurostat heeft zijn methode voor de berekening van het bbp (bruto binnenlands product) gewijzigd. Volgens de nieuwe methode valt het bbp van Nederland bijna 45 miljard hoger uit (plus 7,6 %) ([1]). Er wordt voortaan ook rekening gehouden met illegale activiteiten zoals drugshandel, piraterij en smokkel. 2,4 van de 45 miljard zijn afkomstig van dit soort activiteiten.

Gezien het bovenstaande wilde ik de Commissie het volgende vragen:

1. Wat zijn de financiële gevolgen van de nieuwe berekeningsmethode van Eurostat voor Nederland en de overige 27 lidstaten? Moet de financiële bijdrage van Nederland aan de EU-begroting worden opgetrokken?

2. Op welke rechtsgrond kan het aandeel van illegale activiteiten in het bbp worden geïntegreerd in de berekeningsmethode van Eurostat?

3. Waarom maakt Eurostat een onderscheid tussen illegale activiteiten — die in de berekening van het bbp in overweging worden genomen — en de zogenaamde „zwarte" en „grijze" economie? Hoe kan de Commissie de omvang van de „zwarte" en de „grijze" economie in de lidstaten ramen?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(22 mei 2014)

1. Pas nadat de lidstaten gegevens hebben verstrekt ingevolge de nieuwe ESR 2010 ([2])-normen kan de Commissie de volledige impact van de methodologische en statistische wijzigingen bekendmaken. Volgens ramingen bedraagt de waarschijnlijke impact van de methodologische veranderingen op het bruto binnenlands product (bbp) van de EU 2,4 %. Voor Nederland was de aanpassing van het bbp van 2010 naar boven toe grotendeels te wijten aan de herevaluatie van nieuwe bronnen.

De bijdragen van de lidstaten aan de EU-begroting bestaan uit verschillende elementen ([3]). Hoe de Nederlandse financiële bijdrage zich in de toekomst zal ontwikkelen, zal dus afhangen van verschillende factoren, waaronder de mate waarin het bruto nationaal inkomen (bni) kan veranderen.

2. De vereiste om de waarde van de illegale of verborgen productieactiviteiten mee te tellen, is reeds door alle lidstaten overeengekomen in de ESR 95 ([4])-normen om een strikte vergelijkbaarheid van de dekking van de nationale rekeningen te waarborgen. De Commissie heeft voorbehoud gemaakt bij de lidstaten betreffende het bni om deze wetten toe te passen tegen 22 september 2014.

3. Eurostat moet ervoor zorgen dat de bni-ramingen van alle lidstaten alle economische activiteiten omvatten. Daarom moeten correcties worden aangebracht voor de niet-gecontroleerde delen van de economie, door bijvoorbeeld ramingen te maken van „grijze" en „zwarte" (illegale) activiteiten. De lidstaten zijn momenteel niet verplicht om afzonderlijk te rapporteren over de ramingen die zijn gemaakt voor de correctie van activiteiten die illegaal zijn, verborgen zijn, of die niet in de statistische gegevens zijn opgenomen.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3608526/2014/03/06/Nieuwe-rekenmethode-doet-BBP-met-45-miljard-euro-stijgen.dhtml.
([2]) Europees systeem van nationale en regionale rekeningen (ESR): Verordening (EU) nr. 549/2013 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 21 mei 2013 betreffende het Europees systeem van nationale en regionale rekeningen in de Europese Unie.
([3]) http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/money/revenue-income/index_nl.htm
([4]) Europees systeem van nationale en regionale rekeningen, 1995: Verordening (EG) nr. 2223/96 van de Raad van 25 juni 1996 inzake het Europees Systeem van nationale en regionale rekeningen in de Gemeenschap.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002685/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Revision of the GDP calculation method

Eurostat has revised the gross domestic product (GDP) calculation method. According to the new method, the Dutch GDP is almost EUR 45 billion (7.6%) higher ([1]). The new methodology takes into account illegal activities such as drug trafficking, piracy and smuggling. Out of the EUR 45 billion increase, EUR 2.4 billion come from illegal activities.

In the light of this:

1. Can the Commission state what the financial consequences of the new calculation method adopted by Eurostat will be for the Netherlands and for the other 27 Member States? Will the Dutch financial contribution to the EU budget have to be increased as well?

2. Can the Commission explain on what legal grounds the percentage of GDP generated by illegal activities can be included in the calculation carried out by Eurostat?

3. Can the Commission clarify why Eurostat differentiates between illegal activities — which are taken into account for the sake of GDP calculations — and the so-called black economy and grey economy? How can the Commission estimate the different sizes of the black and grey economies in the Member States?

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

1. Only after the transmission of data by Member States according to the new ESA 2010 ([2]) standards will the Commission be able to present the full impact of methodological and statistical changes. According to estimations, the likely impact *of the methodological changes* on EU gross domestic product (GDP) is an increase of 2.4%. For the Netherlands, the upward adjustment of GDP for 2010 was mainly due to the re-evaluation of new sources.

The contributions of Member States to the EU budget consist of different elements ([3]). The future development of the Dutch financial contribution to the EU budget will thus depend on various factors, including the extent to which the gross national income (GNI) may change.

2. The requirement to include the value of production activities that are illegal or hidden has already been agreed by all Member States for the ESA 95 ([4]) standards to ensure strict comparability of coverage of the national accounts. The Commission has issued GNI reservations for Member States to apply these rules by 22 September 2014.

3. It is Eurostat's task to ensure that Member States' GNI estimates include all economic activities. This is done by correcting for the non-observed parts of the economy, for example by making estimates for 'grey' as well as for 'black' (illegal) activities. There is currently no obligation for Member States to report separately estimates made for the correction for activities that are illegal, hidden or not covered by statistical collections.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3608526/2014/03/06/Nieuwe-rekenmethode-doet-BBP-met-45-miljard-euro-stijgen.dhtml
([2]) European System of national and regional accounts (ESA), 2010: Regulation (EU) No 549/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2013on the European system of national and regional accounts in the European Union.
([3]) http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/money/revenue-income/index_en.htm
([4]) European System of national and regional Accounts, 1995: Council Regulation (EC) No 2223/96 of 25 June 1996 on the European system of national and regional accounts in the Community.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-002688/14
a la Comisión
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Horizonte 2020: Ciencia con y para la sociedad en el presupuesto UE 2014

Estamos ante la revisión del presupuesto de la UE para el año 2014 con el fin de incluir, entre otras, las modificaciones que requiere la versión aprobada del programa Horizonte 2020. Efectivamente, la propuesta sobre la mesa refleja los acuerdos entre Parlamento y Consejo, incluida la nueva sección de Horizonte 2020 «Ciencia con y para la sociedad».

El Programa de Trabajo de «Ciencia con y para la sociedad» ya ha sido aprobado formalmente, y se han publicado las convocatorias para implementarlo.

Sin embargo, en la citada propuesta de revisión del presupuesto para el año 2014, la Comisión no compromete ningún montante para esta sección de Horizonte 2020. ¿Podría informarnos la Comisión de las razones que subyacen a este hecho? ¿No impedirá esta falta de presupuesto la implementación adecuada del programa de trabajo de la sección «Ciencia con y para la sociedad»?

Respuesta del Sr. Lewandowski en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de abril de 2014)

La nueva base jurídica del Programa Horizonte 2020, adoptada después del Presupuesto 2014, contempla una serie de cambios en las líneas presupuestarias, nomenclatura e importes correspondientes al Programa. La Comisión no puede integrar las modificaciones requeridas (tales como la creación de una línea presupuestaria o la modificación de su nomenclatura) mediante transferencia, lo que ha motivado la presentación del Proyecto de Presupuesto Rectificativo nº 1 (PPR 1). Solo algunos de los ajustes de compromisos entre líneas presupuestarias necesarios pueden hacerse, con mayor facilidad y rapidez, mediante transferencias, ya sean internas o de la autoridad presupuestaria [DEC 3/2013]. Sin embargo, no es posible transferir importes a una línea todavía inexistente.

La base jurídica del Programa Horizonte 2020 ha introducido dos nuevas actividades de investigación: *Ciencia con y para la sociedad* y *Ampliación de la participación*. En sus enmiendas al Proyecto de Presupuesto 2014, el Parlamento Europeo solo creó la línea presupuestaria *Ciencia con y para la sociedad*, pero con el rango de artículo presupuestario (08 02 04) y sin consignar importe alguno en la misma. Por lo tanto, fue preciso recurrir al PPR 1 para crear la línea *Ampliación de la participación* y ascender *Ciencia con y para la sociedad* al nivel de partida presupuestaria (08 02 04 01).

Están previstas otras transferencias para asignar los importes correspondientes a la partida presupuestaria 08 02 04 01 *Ciencia con y para la sociedad* en cuanto se haya aprobado el PPR 1.

Se adoptarán cuantas medidas sean necesarias para evitar retrasos en la ejecución del programa de trabajo *Ciencia con y para la sociedad*, lo que incluye la posibilidad de efectuar transferencias conforme al artículo 26.1 del Reglamento Financiero.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002688/14
to the Commission
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Horizon 2020 — 'Science with and for society' in the 2014 EU budget

The EU budget for 2014 is currently under review. The changes that are to be made to the budget include those made necessary as a result of the adoption of the Horizon 2020 programme. The proposal under discussion reflects the agreements concluded between Parliament and the Council, including the new 'Science with and for society' section of Horizon 2020.

The 'Science with and for society' work programme has now been formally approved, and calls for proposals have been published with a view to implementing it.

However, in the proposal for the review of the 2014 budget, the Commission does not put forward any figure for this section of Horizon 2020. Could the Commission state why this is? Will the fact that no budget is put forward not hinder the proper implementation of the work programme relating to the 'Science with and for society' section?

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

The new legal basis of H2020, adopted only after the Budget 2014, foresees a number of changes for H2020 both in terms of budget lines, nomenclature and amounts. The Commission cannot integrate the required changes, such as create a budget line or change its nomenclature by transfer, and so Draft Amending Budget 1 (DAB 1) was presented. Only some of the necessary adjustments of appropriations between budget lines can more easily and quickly be done by transfers — either internal transfer or Budgetary Authority Transfer [i.e. DEC 3/2013]. However, no amounts can be transferred to a line which does not yet exist.

The adopted legal basis of H2020 created two new research activities, i.e. 'Science with and for society and Widening participation'. In its amendments to Draft Budget 2014, the European Parliament only created the budget line for 'Science with and for society', but at the level of budget article (08 02 04) and no amounts were placed on the line. Therefore, DAB 1 was needed to create the line for Widening Participation, and to move 'Science with and for society' to the level of a budget item (08 02 04 01).

Further transfers are planned to place the amounts on the budget item 08 02 04 01 'Science with and for society', as soon as the DAB 1 has been adopted.

All necessary action will be taken to avoid any delay in the implementation of the 'Science with and for society' work programme, including the possibility for transfers in accordance with Article 26.1 of the Financial Regulation.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002690/14
a la Comisión
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Compromisos contraídos y pagos efectuados del FEDER en Baleares

Llegados al inicio de la nueva política regional europea para el período 2014-2020, estamos en un buen momento para analizar el grado de ejecución del gasto de los fondos comprometidos para el período 2007-2013, siendo conscientes de que parte de ese gasto aún puede realizarse en los próximos años.

La inversión del FEDER en las Islas Baleares durante el período 2007-2013 estaba orientada a aumentar la competitividad económica, impulsar la economía del conocimiento, mejorar la accesibilidad territorial, promover una mayor integración social y el desarrollo local y rural, así como consolidar un modelo de desarrollo sostenible.

¿Podría informarnos la Comisión acerca de las cifras de los compromisos contraídos en las Islas baleares por el FEDER durante el período 2017-2013? Asimismo, ¿nos podría informar acerca de los pagos efectuados hasta el presente?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de abril de 2014)

Para el período 2007-2013, la situación del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER) en las Islas Baleares es la siguiente:

Total FEDER decidido: 102 676 038 EUR

Total FEDER comprometido para proyectos: 76 849 827 EUR

Total FEDER pagado: 59 154 042 EUR

Pagado/comprometido: 76,97 %

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002690/14
to the Commission
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) commitments and payments in the Balearic Islands

The start of the new programming period for European regional policy (2014-2020) seems a good time to analyse the extent to which commitment appropriations for the period 2007-2013 were actually disbursed, bearing in mind that some of these monies may in fact be spent over the next few years.

The purpose of ERDF investment in the Balearic Islands during the period 2007-2013 was to increase economic competitiveness, boost the knowledge economy, improve transport links , promote greater social cohesion and local and rural development, and consolidate a sustainable development model.

Could the Commission provide figures for ERDF appropriations committed in the Balearic Islands during the period 2007-2013 and for the payments made to date?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2014)

For the 2007-2013 period, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) state of play in the Balearic Islands is the following:

Total ERDF decided : EUR 102 676 038

Total ERDF committed to projects : EUR 76 849 827

Total ERDF paid : EUR 59 154 042

Paid/committed : 76,97%

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002691/14
a la Comisión
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión 2014-2020 en Baleares

Entrados en el primer año de la nueva política regional europea 2014-2020 sería ya un buen momento para conocer el montante de Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión que recibirán las regiones europeas.

1. ¿Puede facilitar la Comisión la cifra exacta de fondos europeos que recibirá la Comunidad Autónoma de Baleares en el período 2014-2020?

2. ¿Para cuándo cree la Comisión que estarán aprobados los programas operativos para cada Fondo necesarios para empezar a invertir?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de abril de 2014)

Las autoridades nacionales españolas aún no han comunicado oficialmente a la Comisión las cifras de los fondos de la UE asignados a los distintos programas para el período 2014-2020.

Los programas correspondientes a cada Fondo deberán presentarse a la Comisión dentro de un plazo de tres meses a partir de la fecha de la presentación del Acuerdo de Asociación, es decir, a más tardar el 22 de julio de 2014, a excepción del programa en el marco del Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca (FEMP), cuyo plazo de presentación depende de la fecha de adopción del FEMP. La Comisión tiene seis meses para adoptar una decisión sobre los programas, siempre y cuando se haya tenido debidamente en cuenta cualquier observación formulada por la Comisión.

Si la Comisión formula observaciones durante el proceso de negociación, el Estado miembro deberá facilitar toda la información necesaria y, cuando proceda, revisar el programa correspondiente y presentar una nueva versión. En tal caso, el plazo de seis meses no incluye el período en que el programa está en el Estado miembro para su revisión.

A partir del 1 de enero de 2014, los Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión Europeos pueden aportar una contribución al gasto. Las cifras exactas relativas a los importes de cada programa deben indicarse en las propuestas de programas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002691/14
to the Commission
Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Structural and Investment funds for 2014-2020 in the Balearic Islands

As we are now in the first year of the new European regional policy for 2014-2020, it would seem a good time to know the amount of the Structural and Investment funds that the European regions are to receive.

1. Can the Commission provide the exact figure for the EU funds that the Autonomous Community of the Balearic Islands will receive in the period 2014-2020?

2. When does the Commission think the operative programmes for each Fund, which are required for investment to begin, will be approved?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2014)

The Spanish national authorities have not yet communicated officially to the Commission the figures for the EU funds allocated to the different programmes for the period 2014-2020.

The programmes for each Fund should be submitted to the Commission within three months of the presentation of the Partnership Agreement, i.e. by 22 July 2014 at the latest, with the exception of the programme under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), as, for this case, the deadline for submission of the programme depends on the date of adoption of the EMFF. The Commission has 6 months to adopt a decision on the programmes, provided that any Commission observations made have been satisfactorily taken into account.

If the Commission formulates observations during the negotiation process, the Member State will need to provide all necessary information and where appropriate revise the corresponding programme and submit a new version. In such a case, the time limit of 6 months does not include the period when the programme is with the Member State for revision.

Expenditure is eligible for a contribution from the ESI Funds as from 1 January 2014. Exact figures as regards the amounts under each programme need to be indicated in the programme proposals.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002692/14
an die Kommission
Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL)
(7. März 2014)

Betrifft: Eubam Libyen

Eubam bildet paramilitärische Grenztruppen „Border Guards" aus, die auch „kritische Infrastrukturen" bewachen sollen und den Fall von Geiselnahmen trainieren. Die „Border Guards" bestehen zu großen Teilen aus Angehörigen von Milizen. Gleichzeitig befinden sich ca. 8 000 Inhaftierte (größtenteils ohne Gerichtsverfahren) in von Milizen geführten Haftanstalten. Es wird von Folter und Misshandlungen „teilweise mit Todesfolge" berichtet. Während der libysche Polizei- und Militäraufbau von der EU unterstützt wird, gibt es keine Projekte zum Schutz von Grundrechten. Zudem weigert sich die libysche Regierung im EU-Projekt Saharamed mitzuarbeiten, da dort auch der italienische Flüchtlingsrat beteiligt ist.

1. Welche Vertreter welcher libyschen zivilen und militärischen Behörden nahmen am Besuch von Frontex im Juni 2013 in Warschau teil?

2. Welchen Beitrag im Bereich Risikoanalyse und grenzpolizeiliches Training könnte Frontex leisten, und was ist der Bedarfsanalyse von Eubam Libyen hierzu bereits zu entnehmen?

3. Inwieweit ist die direkte Zusammenarbeit/Unterstützung der Agentur Frontex mit dem Grenzschutz Libyens anvisiert, und welchen Stand hat ein entsprechendes Arbeitsabkommen hierzu?

4. Inwieweit war Frontex auch an der Ausarbeitung der Conops Plus ([1]) beteiligt und zu welchen Aspekten wurden die Verfasser durch Frontex beraten?

5. Welche Abgangsstellen für Flüchtlinge aus Libyen nach Europa sind der Kommission bekannt?

6. Welche Erkenntnisse hat die Kommission über die rund 8 000 Internierten, die größtenteils ohne Gerichtsverfahren in Haftanstalten sitzen, welche von Milizen geführt werden, und die dort von Folter und Misshandlungen betroffen sind ([2])?

7. Wie fließen diese Erkenntnisse in die Politik der Kommission, aber auch in die finanzielle Unterstützung bestimmter Vorhaben gegenüber Libyen ein?

8. Wer sind die Organisatoren und anvisierten Teilnehmenden einer beim JI-Rat im März vorgestellten „Konferenz zur Bekämpfung des Menschenhandels in Ostafrika", die für den Herbst vorgesehen ist, und wo soll diese stattfinden?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(12. Juni 2014)

1.-4. Die Kommission hat Frontex um Informationen ersucht, die es ermöglichen, sobald wie möglich die Fragen der Frau Abgeordneten zu beantworten.

Die Zusammenarbeit von Frontex und Drittstaaten sollte der Förderung der europäischen Grenzschutznormen dienen, einschließlich der Achtung der Grundrechte.

5. Angaben von Migranten zufolge, die allerdings nicht überprüfbar sind, waren die wichtigsten Abgangsstellen Zuwara, Gasr Garabulli, Tripoli und Sabratah.

6. Die EU hat die libyschen Behörden wiederholt aufgefordert, alle Hafteinrichtungen unter ihre Kontrolle zu bringen und mutmaßliche Verletzungen der Rechte von Gefangenen zu untersuchen. Die libysche Regierung hat erklärt, dass sie Maßnahmen eingeleitet hat, um den Milizen die Kontrolle der Hafteinrichtungen zu entziehen. Da eine politische Lösung fehlt, kommt es allerdings zu Verzögerungen.

7. Es gibt mehrere von der EU geförderte Schutzprogramme, die z. B. bessere Lebensbedingungen für die Inhaftierten, Rehabilitation und die Integration benachteiligter Menschen zum Gegenstand haben. 2014 läuft ein neues EU-finanziertes Schutzprogramm (2,4 Millionen EUR) für schutzbedürftige, marginalisierte und gefährdete Gruppen, darunter Migranten an.

8. Die Konferenz, die derzeit noch in Vorbereitung ist, wird von der Afrikanischen Union unter Beteiligung weiterer Akteure organisiert. Der Veranstaltungsort ist noch nicht bekannt. Als Teilnehmer werden verschiedene Interessengruppen, die sich aktiv gegen den Menschenhandel einsetzen, aus den Ziel-, Transit- und Herkunftsländern erwartet.

([1]) Ratsdokument 8182/4/13.
([2]) Bundestagsdrucksache 18/280.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002692/14
to the Commission
Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: EUBAM Libya

EUBAM trains paramilitary 'Border Guards' that are also intended to guard 'critical infrastructures' and train for hostage-taking scenarios. The 'Border Guards' largely consist of members of militia groups. At the same time, approximately 8 000 detainees are incarcerated (without legal process, for the most part) in prisons run by militia groups. There are reports of torture and mistreatment 'resulting, in some cases, in death'. While the reconstruction of the Libyan police and military is supported by the EU, there are no projects on the protection of fundamental rights. In addition, the Libyan Government refuses to cooperate in the EU project SAHARA-MED, as the Italian Council for Refugees also participates in it.

1. Which representatives of which civil and military Libyan authorities participated in the visit to Frontex in Warsaw in June 2013?

2. What contribution could Frontex make in the area of risk analysis and border police training, and what can already be gathered from the requirement analysis of EUBAM Libya in this respect?

3. To what extent is the Frontex agency intended to directly cooperate in/support the protection of the Libyan border, and what is the status of a corresponding working agreement in this respect?

4. To what extent did Frontex also participate in drafting Conops Plus ([1]), and on which aspects did Frontex advise those drafting it?

5. Which offices of departure for refugees travelling from Libya to Europe is the Commission aware of?

6. What knowledge does the Commission have of the approximately 8 000 internees who are incarcerated — without legal process, for the most part — in prisons run by militia groups and are subjected to torture and mistreatment in them ([2])?

7. How does this knowledge affect not only Commission policy, but also the financial support of specific projects concerning Libya?

8. Who are the organisers and prospective attendees of the 'Anti-Human Trafficking Conference in Eastern Africa', which was proposed in the JHA Council in March and is scheduled for the autumn, and where is this intended to take place?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

1-4. The Commission has requested Frontex to provide the information to allow for the Commission to respond to the questions raised by the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

Frontex's cooperation with any third country should promote European border management standards, including respect for fundamental rights.

5. According to non-verifiable information obtained from the migrants, the main departure points have been Zuwara, Gasr Garabulli, Tripoli and Sabratah.

6. The EU has repeatedly urged the Libyan authorities to bring all places of detention under their control and to investigate allegations of violations of detainees' rights. The Libyan government has declared that it is implementing measures aiming at transferring the control of detention facilities away from the militias. However, the lack of a political settlement is delaying the implementation.

7. Several EU supported programmes are addressing protection issues, e.g. improving living conditions of detainees, rehabilitation and integration of vulnerable people. A new EU-funded programme on protection amounting to EUR 2.4 million will start in 2014. It will address the protection needs of vulnerable, marginalised and at-risk groups, including migrants.

8. The Conference will be organised by the African Union, with involvement of other actors. It is currently under preparation but the venue is not yet known. As for the attendees, different stakeholders, active in the field of anti-trafficking, from the countries of destination, transit and origin, are expected.

([1]) Council Document 8182/4/13.
([2]) Parliamentary Publication 18/280.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002693/14
à la Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE) et Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(7 mars 2014)

Objet: Guerre du hareng — Organe de règlement des différends de l'OMC

Le 12 septembre 2012, le Parlement européen a adopté par 659 voix pour, 11 voix contre et 7 abstentions, une résolution législative concernant les mesures relatives aux pays autorisant une pêche non durable, aux fins de la conservation des stocks halieutiques. L'adoption de ce texte permet à la Commission européenne de sanctionner les pays autorisant une pêche non durable s'ils ne coopèrent pas à la gestion d'un stock d'intérêt commun en conformité avec les dispositions du 10 décembre 1982 de l'Unclos et s'ils ne coopèrent pas à tout accord international visant à la préservation d'un stock halieutique commun à un niveau de biomasse au-dessus de celui capable de produire le rendement maximal durable.

Les îles Féroé se sont retirées de l'accord côtier permettant l'établissement de quotas de pêche de hareng atlantico-scandinave qui réunissait habituellement les cinq États côtiers. Le 26 mars 2013, les autorités féringiennes ont annoncé une augmentation unilatérale de leurs quotas de 145 % pour l'année 2013. En application du règlement (CE) n° 1026/2012, la Commission a donc proposé à l'encontre des îles Féroé dès août 2013 les sanctions commerciales suivantes: d'une part, l'interdiction d'importer dans l'Union du hareng et du maquereau du stock atlantico-scandinave capturés sous contrôle féringien et, d'autre part, l'accès restreint aux ports de l'Union européenne pour les navires féringiens.

Le Danemark a indiqué qu'il était inquiet des mesures économiques coercitives imposées par l'Union européenne à l'encontre des îles Féroé, en application du règlement d'exécution n° 793/2013 sur un territoire autonome faisant partie intégrante du Danemark. Il considère que ces mesures sont incompatibles avec le droit de l'OMC et a demandé à l'Organe de règlement des différends de l'OMC d'établir un groupe spécial d'experts pour régler le conflit qui oppose les îles Féroé et l'Union européenne.

En qualité de membres du Parlement européen, nous souhaitons déclarer que la résolution de ce conflit est nécessaire à la préservation du stock de hareng de l'Atlantique nord-est à des niveaux au-delà de ceux capables de produire le rendement maximum durable. À ce titre, nous n'accepterons pas que la Commission faiblisse face aux autorités féringiennes qui déclarent que les sanctions commerciales sont contraires au droit de l'OMC.

Les sanctions prises en vertu du règlement d'exécution n° 793/2013 sont-elles en conformité avec le droit de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce?

La Commission européenne prévoit-elle d'annuler les sanctions prises à l'encontre des îles Féroé?

Quelle est la position que l'Union européenne défendra devant le panel d'experts de l'OMC afin de résoudre ce conflit?

Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(10 avril 2014)

La Commission est d'avis que le règlement (UE) n° 1026/2012 tout autant que les mesures prises en application de ce règlement et au moyen du règlement (UE) n° 793/2013 en ce qui concerne les îles Féroé afin d'assurer la préservation du stock de hareng atlantico-scandinave sont parfaitement conformes aux règles pertinentes de l'OMC. La Commission prévoit de défendre cette position devant le groupe d'experts mis en place par l'Organe de règlement des différends de l'OMC à la demande du Danemark afin d'examiner la compatibilité des mesures susmentionnées avec les règles pertinentes de l'OMC en ce qui concerne les îles Féroé ([1]).

La Commission est également prête à résoudre le conflit par des moyens autres qu'une procédure judiciaire, pour autant que les îles Féroé acceptent une solution satisfaisante pour les deux parties.

En vertu de l'article 7 du règlement (UE) n° 1026/2012, les mesures prises au moyen du règlement (UE) n° 793/2013 cesseront de s'appliquer à la suite d'un changement dans les circonstances ayant conduit à identifier les îles Féroé comme un pays autorisant une pêche non durable, et, plus particulièrement, lorsque les îles Féroé auront adopté les mesures correctives appropriées nécessaires pour la conservation et la gestion du stock de hareng atlantico-scandinave et que ces mesures correctives:

a) auront été soit adoptées de manière autonome, soit convenues dans le cadre de consultations avec l'Union et, le cas échéant, d'autres États côtiers; et

b) ne compromettront pas l'impact des mesures prises par l'Union et d'autres États côtiers aux fins de la conservation du stock de hareng atlantico-scandinave.

L'article 7 du règlement (UE) n° 1026/2012 prévoit également qu'il reviendra à la Commission d'adopter des actes d'exécution établissant si les conditions susmentionnées ont été remplies et, s'il y a lieu, que les mesures en cause cessent de s'appliquer.

([1]) Différend WT/DS469.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002693/14
to the Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE) and Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Herring war — WTO Dispute Settlement Body

On 12 September 2012, Parliament adopted by 659 votes to 11, with seven abstentions, a legislative resolution on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on certain measures in relation to countries allowing non-sustainable fishing for the purpose of the conservation of fish stocks. Following the adoption of the regulation, the Commission may impose sanctions on countries allowing non-sustainable fishing if they fail to cooperate in the management of a stock of common interest in compliance with the provisions of the Unclos of 10 December 1982 and if they fail to cooperate in any international agreement that has the aim of maintaining a common fish stock at a biomass level above that which can produce the maximum sustainable yield.

The Faroe Islands withdrew from the coastal agreement under which fishing quotas for Atlanto-Scandian herring are set by the five 'coastal states'. On 26 March 2013, the Faroese authorities announced that they had unilaterally increased their quotas by 145% for the year 2013. Under Regulation (EU) No 1026/2012, the Commission therefore proposed that the following trade sanctions be imposed on the Faroe Islands from August 2013: firstly, a ban on imports into the Union of herring and mackerel from the Atlanto-Scandian stocks that have been caught under the control of the Faroe Islands, and, secondly, restricted access to European Union ports for Faroese vessels.

Denmark has expressed concern over the coercive economic measures imposed on the Faroe Islands — an autonomous territory forming an integral part of Denmark -by the European Union under Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 793/2013. It considers those measures to be incompatible with WTO law and has asked the WTO Dispute Settlement Body to set up a special panel of experts to settle the dispute between the Faroe Islands and the European Union.

In our capacity as Members of the European Parliament, we wish to assert that the resolution of this dispute is essential to maintaining the herring stock in the North-East Atlantic at levels above those that can produce the maximum sustainable yield. In light of this, we consider that it would be inadmissible for the Commission to show any signs of weakening in the face of the Faroese authorities' assertion that the trade sanctions are contrary to WTO law.

Are the sanctions imposed under Implementing Regulation (EU) No 793/2013 compatible with WTO law?

Does the Commission intend to repeal the sanctions imposed on the Faroe Islands?

What position will the European Union be defending before the WTO panel of experts with a view to resolving this dispute?

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

The Commission is of the opinion that both Regulation (EU) No 1026/2012 and the measures taken in application of that regulation and by means of Regulation (EU) No 793/2013 in respect of the Faroe Islands to ensure the conservation of the Atlanto-Scandian herring stock, are fully consistent with relevant WTO rules. The Commission intends to defend this position before the panel established by the WTO Dispute Settlement Body at the request of Denmark in respect of the Faroe Islands to examine the compatibility of the abovementioned measures with relevant WTO rules ([1]).

The Commission is also ready to resolve the dispute by means other than litigation, provided the Faroe Islands agree to a mutually satisfactory solution.

Pursuant to Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1026/2012, the measures taken by means of Regulation (EU) No 793/2013 shall cease to apply following a change in the circumstances that led to the identification of the Faroe Islands as a country allowing unsustainable fishing and more particularly when the Faroe Islands adopt appropriate corrective measures necessary for the conservation and management of the stock of Atlanto-Scandian herring and those corrective measures:

(a) have either been adopted autonomously or have been agreed in the context of consultations with the Union and other coastal States, and

(b) do not undermine the effect of measures taken by the Union and other coastal States for the purpose of the conservation of the stock of Atlanto-Scandian herring.

Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1026/2012 also provides that it will be for the Commission to adopt implementing acts determining whether the said conditions have been complied with and, where necessary, providing that the measures in issue cease to apply.

([1]) dispute WT/DS469.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002695/14
à la Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(7 mars 2014)

Objet: Érosion des sols

La lutte contre l'érosion est un enjeu majeur. Pour la protection des milieux naturels, des biens et des personnes et celle du potentiel agricole.

La Commission européenne estime que l'érosion des sols est la principale menace pesant sur les sols. 26 millions d'hectares, soit 17 % des sols européens sont concernés en Europe.

Les dernières tempêtes et catastrophes naturelles ayant eu lieu dans le nord et l'ouest de la France montrent l'ampleur des dégâts dont elle est responsable, notamment à cause du remembrement.

La Commission dispose-t-elle de chiffres montrant l'importance du remembrement dans l'érosion des sols?

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

La Commission n'a pas connaissance d'études ou de rapports qui abordent explicitement les incidences du remembrement sur l'érosion des sols à l'échelle de l'UE.

Le processus de modification du parcellaire (remembrement) pour augmenter l'efficacité de l'agriculture et permettre l'utilisation de machines plus grandes et plus spécialisées va normalement de pair avec une atténuation des particularités topographiques (haies, rangées d'arbres, fossés, murs en pierres, etc.) qui constituent des obstacles naturels au ruissellement des eaux et à l'érosion éolienne. En France, selon des données récentes d'Eurostat (2012) ([1]), les exploitations de plus de 50 hectares (soit moins de 40 % de l'ensemble des exploitations), ayant donc des parcelles de plus grande taille, gèrent environ 85 % de la superficie agricole utilisée totale. Deux projets de recherche menés en Allemagne ([2]) ont abordé les conséquences négatives sur l'environnement des parcelles de grande taille et ont proposé un certain nombre de mesures pour y faire face, y compris des recommandations quant à la longueur maximale des parcelles, puisqu'il existe un lien entre la taille et la forme d'une parcelle et l'ampleur de l'érosion.

Pour ce qui est de l'érosion des sols, il n'existe pas de chiffres précis au niveau européen, du fait de l'absence de programmes de suivi et de séries de données harmonisées. D'après un modèle récent d'érosion des sols par l'eau élaboré par le Centre commun de recherche de la Commission européenne, la superficie concernée dans l'UE-27 est estimée à 1,3 million de km^2, dont près de 20 % soumis à une érosion annuelle des sols de plus de 10 tonnes par hectare ([3]). Selon les évaluations de l'Institut national de la recherche agronomique, près de 18 % des sols présentent un aléa d'érosion moyen à très fort en France métropolitaine ([4]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/statistics/agricultural/2012/index_en.htm
([2]) http://www.umwelt.sachsen.de/umwelt/download/natur/endbericht_acker.pdf et
http://www.lfl.bayern.de/mam/cms07/publikationen/daten/schriftenreihe/051476_erosionsschutzmassnahmen.pdf
([3]) COM(2012) 46.
([4]) http://www.gissol.fr/RESF/Rapport_BD.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002695/14
to the Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Soil erosion

The fight against erosion is a major issue, affecting the preservation of natural environments, assets and people as well as the preservation of farming potential.

The European Commission regards soil erosion as the single greatest threat to farmland. The problem affects 26 million hectares, that is, 17% of the agricultural land in Europe.

The recent storms and natural disasters that have occurred in northern and western France illustrate the extent of the damage that soil erosion causes, in particular as a result of land consolidation.

Does the Commission have any figures that show the significance of land consolidation as a factor in soil erosion?

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

The Commission is not aware of any studies or reports that explicitly address the effects of land consolidation on soil erosion at EU level.

The process of re-organisation of land (land consolidation) to allow more efficient farming and use of larger and more specialised machinery normally goes along with a reduction of landscape features (e.g. hedges, tree lines, ditches, stone walls) which are natural barriers to water runoff and wind erosion. In the case of France, according to recent Eurostat data (2012) ([1]), holdings with more than 50 hectares (less than 40% of all holdings), and thus larger field sizes, are responsible for the management of some 85% of the total Utilized Agricultural Area. Two research projects ([2]) conducted in Germany have addressed negative environmental consequences of large field sizes and proposed a number of measures to deal with it, including recommendations as to the maximum length of parcels, as there is a relation between the size and shape of a parcel and the extent of erosion.

Concerning soil erosion, due to a lack of monitoring schemes and harmonised data sets, there are no exact figures at European level. A recent model of soil erosion by water produced by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission has estimated the surface area affected by water erosion in EU-27 at 1.3 million km² with almost 20% of these subjected to an annual soil loss in excess of 10 tonnes per hectare ([3]). For France, the National Institute for Agricultural Research has assessed the annual soil erosion hazard as medium to very high on 18% of the countryside (mainland) ([4]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/statistics/agricultural/2012/index_en.htm
([2]) http://www.umwelt.sachsen.de/umwelt/download/natur/endbericht_acker.pdf and
http://www.lfl.bayern.de/mam/cms07/publikationen/daten/schriftenreihe/051476_erosionsschutzmassnahmen.pdf
([3]) COM(2012) 46
([4]) http://www.gissol.fr/RESF/Rapport_BD.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002696/14
à la Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(7 mars 2014)

Objet: Augmentation des stocks de sucre

Le 13 février 2014, la Commission européenne a repoussé d'un mois sa prise de décision en faveur des importations supplémentaires de sucre et de requalification de sucres hors quota en sucres du quota. Elle veut augmenter les stocks du sucre européen qu'elle juge insuffisants et estime que les prix européens du sucre sont trop élevés par rapport au prix mondial.

Pourtant, la Confédération internationale des betteraviers européens (CIBE), affirme: «le marché de l'UE est sur-approvisionné et la baisse des prix est drastique». Pour la campagne 2013-2014, le stock final de sucre du quota de l'Union devrait être de 2,3 Mt au 1er octobre 2014 et 230 000 t de sucre hors quota européen devrait être reportées sur la période 2014-2015, annonce la Confédération générale des planteurs de betteraves (CGB). Quant au prix du sucre, une baisse de 24 euros/t en décembre s'est ajoutée aux 100 euros/t perdus depuis janvier 2013.

Alors même que la baisse des cours est sensible, dans un contexte difficile pour la production agricole et le raffinage du sucre européen, la Commission européenne souhaite pousser plus loin la libéralisation et l'ouverture des marchés sucriers.

Dans quelle mesure, dans un contexte de sur-approvisionnement, cette décision peut-elle avoir un impact positif alors qu'elle est dénoncée par l'ensemble de la filière sucrière européenne?

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

La Commission européenne gère le marché du sucre au cours de la campagne de commercialisation. Après trois années de tension au niveau de l'offre de sucre, la Commission constate que les stocks et l'offre semblent avoir atteint un niveau suffisant à la fin de la campagne de commercialisation 2012/13.

Pour l'heure, compte tenu de la dernière situation connue sur le marché et du niveau actuel des stocks, une augmentation de l'offre n'est pas jugée nécessaire. Par conséquent, lors de la réunion du comité de gestion de l'organisation commune des marchés agricoles qui s'est tenue le 27 mars, en accord avec la majorité des États membres, la Commission a décidé de ne pas demander l'avis de ces derniers sur des mesures visant à autoriser un renforcement de l'offre.

La Commission continuera à surveiller étroitement le marché et proposer des mesures si nécessaire.

Lorsqu'elle élabore des mesures, la Commission tient dûment compte des intérêts de tous les acteurs de la chaîne d'approvisionnement: producteurs, transformateurs, raffineurs, utilisateurs et consommateurs.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002696/14
to the Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Increase in sugar stocks

On 13 February 2014, the European Commission postponed by one month its decision to permit additional sugar imports and reclassify non-quota sugar as quota sugar. The Commission wants to increase Europe's sugar stocks, which it regards as insufficient, and takes the view that European sugar prices are too high in comparison to prices globally.

The International Confederation of European Beet Growers (CIBE), however, has stated that 'the EU market is oversupplied and prices have fallen drastically.' The French General Confederation of Sugar-Beet Planters (CGB) has announced that the Union's final stock of quota sugar for the 2013-14 growing season is expected to reach 2.3 million tonnes by 1 October 2014 and 230 000 tonnes of sugar outside the European quota will have to be carried over into the 2014-15 period. Sugar prices dropped by a further 24 EUR/tonne in December, having already fallen by 100 EUR/tonne since January 2013.

Notwithstanding this considerable drop in prices and a difficult economic climate for European farming and sugar refining, the European Commission wants to extend its liberalisation of the sugar markets.

Against a background of oversupply, and bearing in mind that it has been decried by the whole of the European sugar industry, in what way can this decision have a positive effect?

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

The European Commission manages the sugar market during the marketing year. After three years of tight sugar supply, the Commission notes that stocks and supply seem to have reached a sufficient level at the end of marketing year 2012/13.

For the moment and with a view to the most recent market situation and current stock levels, additional supplies are not considered necessary. Therefore, in the Committee for the Common Organisation of the Agricultural Markets held on 27 March, in agreement with a majority of the Member States, the Commission decided not to ask the opinion of the Member States on measures to allow additional supplies.

The Commission will continue to monitor the market closely and propose measures in case necessary.

When designing measures the Commission takes due account of the interests of all different stakeholders in the supply chain: growers, processors, refiners, users and consumers.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002697/14
à la Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(7 mars 2014)

Objet: Initiative «Garantie pour la jeunesse»

La «garantie pour la jeunesse» est une nouvelle initiative qui vise à lutter contre le chômage des jeunes en proposant à tous les jeunes de moins de 25 ans, qu'ils soient inscrits au chômage ou non, une offre de qualité, dans les 4 mois suivant la fin de leur scolarité ou la perte de leur emploi.

Avec plus de 5,5 millions de jeunes chômeurs en Europe en janvier 2014, dont 3,5 millions dans la zone euro, le coût total de ce dispositif est estimé à 21 milliards d'euros par an, soit 0,22 % du PIB par an. Le financement se fera via les budgets nationaux, le Fonds social européen et une enveloppe de 6 milliards d'euros alloués au titre de l'initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes.

Lors d'une conférence organisée le 4 mars 2014, le commissaire européen chargé de l'emploi, des affaires sociales et de l'inclusion, László Andor, a estimé que les régions d'Europe ont, et conserveront à l'avenir, un rôle crucial dans l'application de l'initiative «Garantie pour la jeunesse».

1. Passé l'effet d'annonce, de quelles garanties d'efficacité la Commission dispose-t-elle pour ce programme européen?

2. Dans son application, cette initiative respecte-t-elle vraiment la subsidiarité?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(2 mai 2014)

1. Il dépendra en premier lieu de chaque État membre concerné que la «garantie pour la jeunesse» soit un succès. Il faut reconnaître que les États membres se trouvent dans des situations très diverses, en fonction de l'ampleur des défis, de l'existence et de la sophistication des dispositifs et mesures concernés et de leur situation budgétaire. C'est pourquoi la «garantie pour la jeunesse» sera instaurée progressivement dans certains États membres, comme cela est envisagé dans la recommandation du Conseil ([1]). Pour sa part, la Commission se limite à mobiliser tout le savoir-faire et les instruments de financement disponibles pour réussir sa mise en œuvre. Elle évalue actuellement les plans de mise en œuvre qui ont été soumis jusqu'à présent (à ce jour par presque tous les États membres). Des contacts bilatéraux sont en cours afin de fournir une assistance technique visant à renforcer encore l'ensemble de réformes envisagé. La conférence «Youth Guarantee: Making It Happen» qui s'est tenue le 8 avril a aussi donné une impulsion supplémentaire à la mise en œuvre des engagements. Les progrès seront suivis régulièrement, dans le cadre tant des semestres européens que de forums spécialisés, tels que le comité de l'emploi.

2. Avec la recommandation du Conseil sur l'établissement d'une «garantie pour la jeunesse», les États membres ont approuvé les principales caractéristiques des dispositifs envisagés. La recommandation précise que cette garantie doit «être adaptée aux circonstances nationales, régionales et locales». L'instauration d'approches de partenariat est mise en avant comme un critère horizontal déterminant pour une mise en œuvre réussie. Les niveaux national, régional et local de gouvernement ont tous un rôle essentiel à jouer pour faire de la «garantie pour la jeunesse» une réalité, et ces efforts seront soutenus par l'UE.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:FR:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002697/14
to the Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Youth Guarantee scheme

The Youth Guarantee scheme is a new approach to tackling youth unemployment which ensures that all young people under the age of 25, whether they are registered with employment agencies or not, receive a good-quality job, apprenticeship, traineeship or continued education offer within four months of leaving formal education or becoming unemployed.

With more than 5.5 million young people unemployed in Europe (as at January 2014) — 3.5 million of them in eurozone countries — the annual cost of the scheme has been put at EUR 21 billion (0.22% of GDP). The funding will come from national budgets and the European Social Fund, and EUR 6 billion will also be provided under the Youth Employment initiative.

During a conference held on 4 March 2014, the Commissioner with responsibility for employment, social affairs and inclusion, László Andor, said that Europe's regions played a key role in the implementation of the Youth Guarantee scheme and would continue to do so in future.

1. Although this all sounds very positive, can the Commission guarantee that the scheme will be effective?

2. Is the scheme really being implemented in accordance with the subsidiarity principle?

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

1. Making the Youth Guarantee a success will first and foremost depend on each Member State concerned. It has to be recognised that Member States face highly diverse situations. This relates to the scope of the challenge, the existence and sophistication of relevant schemes and measures, and the budgetary situation. For this reason, the Youth Guarantee will be phased in gradually in some Member States, which is recognised in the Council Recommendation ([1]). For its part the Commission is only mobilising all available know-how and funding tools to support successful implementation. It is at present assessing the Implementation Plans which have so far been submitted (to date by nearly all Member States). Bilateral contracts are on-going to provide technical assistance to further enhance the envisaged set of reforms. A conference "Youth Guarantee — Making it Happen" on 8 April also helped to further galvanise commitment. Progress will be monitored continuously, both as part of the European Semesters and in specialised fora such as the Employment Committee.

2. With the Council Recommendation on Establishing a Youth Guarantee, Member States agreed on the key features of the envisaged schemes. The recommendation stipulates that the Youth Guarantee needs to be 'geared to national, regional and local circumstances'. Building up partnership approaches is highlighted as a major horizontal criterion for successful implementation. Local, regional and national levels of government all have their crucial role to play in making the Youth Guarantee a reality, with the EU level supporting these efforts.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:EN:PDF

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002699/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Finanziamenti per il sito archeologico di Pompei

L'Italia ha ricevuto finanziamenti europei per un totale di 105 milioni di euro per salvaguardare il sito archeologico di Pompei, finanziamenti che dovranno essere impiegati entro un anno nella percentuale più alta possibile. Secondo diversi tecnici, il problema della tutela del sito è però legato anche a problemi di natura amministrativa, in quanto non solo le autorità competenti dovranno indire gare d'appalto in brevissimo tempo, ma inoltre le stesse gare vengono poi bloccate in seguito a denunce mosse da ditte che vi partecipano con esito negativo, ostacolando l'assegnazione e l'avvio dei lavori. I lavori inoltre, una volta iniziati, vengono costantemente rallentati da ispezioni volte a monitorare l'eventuale infiltrazione del crimine organizzato nelle ditte appaltanti.

Alla luce di questa peculiare situazione, la Commissione non ritiene che la scadenza per l'impiego dei fondi, fissata al 2015, rischi di andare contro gli obiettivi stessi per cui i finanziamenti sono stati accordati allo Stato italiano? Non ritiene che l'utilizzo possa essere effettuato in maniera più proficua dando maggiore libertà d'azione nel tempo alle autorità appaltatrici e alle ditte appaltanti?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002872/14
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(11 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Maggiori interventi per la salvaguardia di Pompei

Considerando che:

— la Commissione europea riconosce che, trattandosi di uno dei siti archeologici più importanti al mondo, la conservazione di Pompei non è soltanto una responsabilità dell'Italia, ed è per questo motivo che dal 2007 sono stati erogati per Pompei 74 milioni di euro di finanziamenti a valere sul Fondo regionale dell'UE;

— anche la commissaria europea Androulla Vassiliou sollecita un maggiore coordinamento tra le autorità locali, regionali e nazionali in Italia per assicurare che «Pompei sia conservata per le generazioni future»;

— il finanziamento di 74 milioni di euro per Pompei fa parte di un investimento complessivo di 105 milioni di euro, gestito dalle autorità italiane, destinato a lavori strutturali di alta tecnologia da condurre nel lungo periodo nelle zone a maggiore rischio e ai sistemi di drenaggio delle acque pianificati per la parte del sito non scavata che sovrasta gli antichi edifici;

— il cedimento delle mura di Pompei e le condizioni delle rovine archeologiche della Campania, aggravate dalle piogge che hanno colpito il sito negli ultimi giorni, hanno suscitato nella collettività il malcontento generale e la speranza di interventi straordinari più mirati e immediati in aiuto di Pompei, tra l'altro dichiarata dall'UNESCO patrimonio mondiale dell'umanità;

— la situazione di degrado ha fatto sì che l'UNESCO, preoccupata per lo stato di conservazione del sito vesuviano, rischi di inserirlo nella lista dei «beni in pericolo» (si vedano gli ulteriori tre crolli negli ultimi giorni, che portano a 29 il numero di cedimenti strutturali verificatesi negli ultimi cinque anni);

può la Commissione indicare:

— quali misure intende adottare per monitorare in maniera approfondita e coordinare i nuovi fondi, in modo da evitare le inefficienze passate e migliorare la gestione dell'importante sito archeologico?

— se intende inoltre adottare un piano speciale che incentivi i gestori del sito e l'utilizzo dei nuovi fondi per l'assunzione di manodopera qualificata ed interventi strutturali che impediscano eventuali crolli futuri?

Risposta congiunta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione

(25 aprile 2014)

Per quanto concerne le misure finalizzate alla conservazione del sito di Pompei, la Commissione ha approvato nel 2012 l'omonimo grande progetto del Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) con una dotazione finanziaria complessiva di 105 milioni di euro e un contributo del FESR di 78 milioni. Il progetto concerne le misure urgenti di conservazione del sito. La scadenza per la spesa a valere sul progetto è il 31 dicembre 2015, in linea con la scadenza generale di spesa dei finanziamenti per il periodo 2007-2013 quale stabilita all'articolo 56, paragrafo 1, del regolamento (CE) n. 1083/2006 ([1]). Se il progetto in corso dimostrerà di aver raggiunto risultati tangibili, non è escluso tuttavia che vi faccia seguito un progetto di follow-up finanziato a valere sul periodo 2014-2020.

In linea con il principio della gestione concorrente, la responsabilità dell'esecuzione del progetto, compresa l'assunzione del necessario personale qualificato e l'esecuzione dei lavori, oltre al monitoraggio e alla valutazione delle attività, rientra nelle attribuzioni dell'autorità nazionale competente che, nel presente caso, sono il Ministero italiano della Cultura e la Sovrintendenza di Napoli e Pompei. La Commissione riceve regolarmente aggiornamenti sui progressi del progetto che sono discussi con le autorità italiane.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1083/2006 del Consiglio, dell'11 luglio 2006, recante disposizioni generali sul Fondo europeo di Sviluppo regionale, sul Fondo sociale europeo e sul Fondo di coesione e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1260/1999, GU L 210 del 31.07.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002699/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Funding for the archaeological site of Pompeii

Italy has received European funding totalling EUR 105 million for the preservation of the archaeological site of Pompeii, with as much of this funding as possible having to be used within a year. According to various experts, administrative problems also come into play when it comes to the preservation of the site. Not only do the competent authorities have to issue invitations to tenders within an extremely short space of time, but these tenders then come to a standstill due to complaints from companies that are unsuccessful in these tender proceedings. This impedes the assignment of work and means that the start date is delayed. In addition, once work has begun it is subject to constant delays as a result of inspections to monitor any infiltration of organised crime into the contractor companies.

In the light of this unique situation, does the Commission not think that the deadline for using the funds, which is fixed for 2015, risks opposing the very objectives for which Italy was granted the funding? Does it not think that the funds could be used more cost-effectively by giving the contracting authorities and contractor companies more freedom to carry out their work?

Question for written answer E-002782/14
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(10 March 2014)

Subject: Preserving Pompeii

Italy has announced it will unblock EUR 2 million in emergency funding to save the ancient city of Pompeii, after flooding caused walls to collapse.

A number of structures, including the Temple of Venus and Roma, were damaged by heavy rainfall. The site, where volcanic ash smothered a Roman city in AD 79, has suffered slow degradation for many years. It is one of the world's greatest archaeological treasures.

What actions are currently being taken by the EU to ensure that this archaeological treasure will be preserved for generations to come?

Question for written answer E-002872/14
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(11 March 2014)

Subject: Doing more for Pompeii

The Commission acknowledges that, as Pompeii is one of the world's greatest archaeological treasures, the site's conservation is not a matter for Italy alone, which is why the EU has provided EUR 74 million from its regional funds since 2007.

The Commissioner responsible, Androulla Vassiliou, has called for closer coordination between local, regional and national authorities in Italy, in order to ensure that 'Pompeii is saved for future generations'.

The EUR 74 million in EU funding for Pompeii forms part of an overall budget of EUR 105 million administered by the Italian authorities. The funds are to be spent on long-term, high-tech structural works in the highest risk areas and on water drainage systems for the non-excavated area overlooking the ancient buildings.

The collapse of an ancient wall in Pompeii and the generally poor state of repair of the ruins, which has been exacerbated by heavy rainfall at the site, has led to public anger and calls for more effective action to be taken without delay to preserve the site.

The degradation of this World Heritage site (three more structures have collapsed over recent days, bringing the total number of such incidents over the last five years up to 29) is such that Unesco is considering placing it on its at-risk list.

How does the Commission intend to ensure that the fresh funding is properly monitored and coordinated, in order to put the inefficiencies of the past behind us and make sure that this valuable archaeological site is looked after better than has been the case hitherto?

Does it intend to introduce a special plan that will encourage the people in charge of the site to use the new funds to take on properly qualified workers and carry out the structural works required in order to prevent any further collapses?

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(25 April 2014)

As regards conservation measures for Pompeii, the Commission approved the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) major project 'Pompeii' in 2012 with an overall financial envelope of EUR 105 million and an ERDF contribution of EUR 78 million. This project focuses on urgent conservation measures for the site. The deadline for expenditure under the project is 31 December 2015, in line with the general deadline for spending the funds of the 2007-2013 period set in Article 56, paragraph 1, of Council Regulation (EC) No1083/2006 ([1]). Provided the current project demonstrates tangible results, it is not excluded, however, that there could be a follow-up project with funding from the 2014-2020 period.

In line with the principle of shared management, the responsibility for project implementation, including the hiring of the necessary qualified personnel and carrying out the works, as well as monitoring and evaluation activities lie with the competent national authorities, which is the Italian Ministry for Culture and the Superintendence for Naples and Pompeii. The Commission receives regular updates on the progress of the implementation of the project, which are discussed with the Italian authorities.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) N° 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) N° 1260/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002700/14
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(7 maart 2014)

Betreft: Wederzijdse erkenning van rijbewijzen in Portugal

Een man met de Nederlandse nationaliteit woont in Portugal. Hij is in het bezit van een geldig Portugees rijbewijs. Hij is in 2013 beboet voor het rijden met een Portugees rijbewijs in een auto met een Nederlands kenteken die van een vriend was. De hoogte van de boete was 288 euro. Op 19 januari 2009 heb ik eenzelfde situatie aangekaart bij de Europese Commissie (E-0096/09). Het antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie was destijds dat de zaak op basis van Richtlijn 91/439/EEG een mogelijke inbreuk betrof op de regel van wederzijdse erkenning van rijbewijzen door de Portugese autoriteiten. Op basis van dit advies heeft de man besloten om een klacht in te dienen bij de bevoegde Portugese autoriteit om de zaak recht te zetten. Helaas, tot nu toe zonder resultaat. Omdat de kwestie van wederzijdse erkenning van rijbewijzen in Portugal na 5 jaar nog altijd voorkomt, stel ik de volgende vragen:

1. Is de Commissie van mening dat er hier wederom sprake is van een inbreuk op de regel van wederzijdse erkenning van rijbewijzen door de Portugese autoriteiten?

2. Erkent de Commissie dat er in Portugal ten opzichte van 5 jaar geleden nog geen verbeteringen hebben plaatsgevonden op het gebied van wederzijdse erkenning van rijbewijzen door de Portugese autoriteiten?

3. Is de Commissie voornemens alsnog stappen tegen Portugal te ondernemen om het recht op vrij verkeer te waarborgen?

4. Is de Commissie zich ervan bewust dat dit probleem zeer schadelijk is voor het beeld dat Europese burgers zich van Europa vormen?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(12 mei 2014)

Op basis van de informatie van het geachte Parlementslid gaat de Commissie ervan uit dat de boete werd opgelegd door de Portugese autoriteiten. Aangezien de betrokkene over een Portugees rijbewijs beschikte, zijn de vragen over de wederzijdse erkenning van rijbewijzen zonder voorwerp.

De Commissie voert momenteel evenwel een grondig onderzoek uit naar de nationale wetgeving tot omzetting van Richtlijn 2006/126/EG betreffende het rijbewijs ([1]). Als er sprake zou zijn van inconsistenties, zal de Commissie — als hoedster van het Verdrag — de nodige stappen zetten om de juiste omzetting en toepassing van bovengenoemde richtlijn te waarborgen.

Wat betreft het rijden in eigen land met voertuigen die in een andere lidstaat zijn ingeschreven, zou de betrokkene informatie moeten inwinnen bij de Portugese autoriteiten. Zo kan hij nagaan of en onder welke voorwaarden de nationale wetgeving hem ertoe verplicht het voertuig in Portugal te registreren en of hij eventueel registratie- en motorrijtuigenbelasting moet betalen.

([1]) PB L 403 van 30.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002700/14
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Mutual recognition of driving licences in Portugal

A man who is a Netherlands national lives in Portugal. He is in possession of a valid Portuguese driving licence. In 2013, he was fined EUR 288 for driving a Dutch-registered car belonging to a friend while holding a Portuguese driving licence. On 19 January 2009, I had raised a similar situation with the Commission (E-0096/09). The answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission at the time was that, in the light of Directive 91/439/EEC, the case in question suggested a possible infringement of the rule on mutual recognition of driving licences by the Portuguese authorities. On the basis of that opinion, the man decided to complain to the competent authority in Portugal in order to set matters right. Regrettably, this has not so far yielded any result. As mutual recognition of driving licences in Portugal remains an issue five years on, I wish to put the following questions:

1. Does the Commission consider that, here again, the Portuguese authorities have infringed the rule on mutual recognition of driving licences?

2. Does the Commission acknowledge that, in the past five years, there has been no improvement in Portugal with regard to mutual recognition of driving licences by the Portuguese authorities?

3. Will the Commission take steps against Portugal in order to safeguard freedom of movement?

4. Is the Commission aware that this problem is very damaging to European citizens' image of Europe?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(12 May 2014)

The Commission assumes from the information provided by the Honourable Member that the fine was imposed by Portuguese authorities. Since the person concerned held a Portuguese driving licence any questions on mutual recognition of driving licences should therefore be excluded.

Nevertheless, the Commission is currently undertaking an in-depth assessment of the national legislations transposing Directive 2006/126/EC on driving licences ([1]). Should there be any inconsistencies, the Commission will — in its quality of a guardian of the treaty- undertake the necessary steps to ensure the correct transposition and application of the abovementioned Directive.

As regards the driving in a Member State by residents of this Member State with vehicles registered in another Member State, the person concerned should verify with the Portuguese authorities whether it is required, and under what conditions, according to national legislation, to register the vehicle in Portugal and pay any possible registration and circulation tax.

([1]) OJ L 403, 30.12.2006.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002701/14
à Comissão
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(7 de março de 2014)

Assunto: Incumprimento pelo Estado Português da legislação relativa à identificação dos riscos da exposição ao amianto para os trabalhadores

Na sequência da pergunta E-012695-13, e respetiva resposta, vimos colocar as seguintes questões à Comissão:

1. Já agiu junto das autoridades portuguesas de modo a apurar se estas cumprem as disposições relativas à proteção dos trabalhadores do sector público contra os riscos ligados à exposição ao amianto durante o trabalho? Se não o fez, quando tenciona dar início a essa análise?

Mais esclarecemos que é/foi precisamente o Estado Português, enquanto empregador, que não promoveu o cumprimento do artigo 3.°, n.° 2, da Diretiva 2009/148/CE, que exige a avaliação de riscos «relativamente às atividades suscetíveis de apresentar um risco às poeiras provenientes do amianto ou materiais contendo amianto», de forma a determinar a natureza e o grau de exposição.

Existem situações em que os funcionários públicos desconhecem estes riscos, exercendo atividades em que estão expostos às fibras de amianto, sem que o seu empregador — neste caso o Estado Português — os proteja das mesmas.

2. Corrobora a Comissão a opinião de que esta situação, a confirmar-se, constitui uma violação da legislação europeia por parte do Estado Português? Se sim, tem ou não entre as suas competências a obrigação de assegurar que o enunciado nas diretivas europeias é cumprido, constitua ou não um requisito formal?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(28 de abril de 2014)

1. Na sequência da análise de uma denúncia apresentada relativa à aplicação, em Portugal, de várias disposições da Diretiva 2009/148/CE ([1]) no que diz respeito aos funcionários públicos, a Comissão elaborou um pedido de informação que será transmitido às autoridades portuguesas em breve.

2. A informação recolhida na sequência desse pedido permitirá à Comissão determinar se Portugal aplica essa diretiva corretamente aos trabalhadores do setor público.

Se houver elementos de prova que mostrem que Portugal não cumpriu as obrigações que lhe incumbem por força da diretiva, a Comissão tomará todas as medidas necessárias para corrigir a situação, incluindo, se necessário, recorrendo à instauração de um processo por infração, em conformidade com o artigo 258.° do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia.

([1]) Diretiva 2009/148/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 30 de novembro de 2009, relativa à proteção dos trabalhadores contra os riscos de exposição ao amianto durante o trabalho, JO L 330 de 16.12.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002701/14
to the Commission
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Infringement by Portugal of legislation on identifying the risks to workers of exposure to asbestos

Following up on Written Question E-012695/13 and the answer thereto, could the Commission answer the following:

1. Has the Commission already taken action vis-à-vis the Portuguese authorities to determine their compliance with the rules on protecting public sector workers from the risks associated with exposure to asbestos in the workplace? If not, when does it intend to start this process?

We wish to highlight the fact that the Portuguese Government has itself failed, as an employer, to comply with the terms of Directive 2009/148/EC, Article 3(2) of which requires an assessment of the 'risk of exposure to dust arising from asbestos or materials containing asbestos' in order to determine the nature and degree of workers' exposure.

In some cases, civil servants are unaware of the dangers and continue to be exposed to asbestos fibres during the course of their work, without receiving any protection from their employer — in this case the Portuguese Government.

2. Does the Commission share the view that this situation, if confirmed, is an infringement of European legislation by the Portuguese State? If so, does it have the power to ensure that the terms of European directives are complied with, regardless of whether or not they constitute a formal requirement?

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

1. Further to its analysis of a complaint lodged with it and relating to the application in Portugal of several provisions of Directive 2009/148/EC ([1]) as regards public-sector employees, the Commission has drafted a request for information, to be forwarded to the Portuguese authorities soon.

2. The information gathered in connection with that request will allow the Commission to determine whether Portugal applies that directive correctly to public-sector employees.

Should evidence show that Portugal has failed to fulfil its obligations under the directive, the Commission will take all measures necessary to redress the situation, including, if necessary, through an infringement procedure in accordance with Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

([1]) Directive 2009/148/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to asbestos at work, OJ L 330, 16.12.2009.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002702/14
à Comissão
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(7 de março de 2014)

Assunto: Abate ilegal de árvores no Alqueva e incumprimento de legislação comunitária

No último ano foram abatidas «ilegalmente» 11 500 árvores protegidas no Alqueva, entre azinheiras, oliveiras e sobreiros, situação que levou a Liga para a Protecção da Natureza (LPN) a pedir esclarecimentos a várias entidades portuguesas, exigindo que fossem tomadas medidas contra os envolvidos.

De acordo com a legislação existente, para se cortar árvores (protegidas), deve-se pedir uma autorização e as mesmas têm de ser marcadas, o que não se verificou. Além disso, o contrato de execução foi adjudicado sem concurso, nem autorização.

Aparentemente, este abate deve-se ao facto de as árvores estarem mortas, o que poderá ser parcialmente verdade, tendo em conta que se permitiu subir o nível da água para o limite máximo. No entanto, o procedimento (ilegal) levado a cabo, atendendo à inexistência de um pedido de autorização e de marcação das árvores, impediu que se verificasse quantas árvores estavam realmente mortas.

Segundo a LPN, desde o início, desmontaram-se fábricas de papel sem cuidados ambientais, várias áreas foram desbravadas e desflorestadas, ameaçando espécies protegidas, já que era um espaço que servia de apoio a projectos de introdução de águias-pesqueiras, num claro desprezo pela legislação ambiental e por várias directivas comunitárias.

Face a estas considerações, solicita-se à Comissão que se pronuncie sobre esta situação, e se, de acordo com a legislação comunitária existente, considera legal este abate de árvores protegidas no Alqueva.

Solicita-se ainda que nos esclareça:

1. O anexo 3 da Directiva-quadro da Água foi cumprido (preços estabelecidos pelo Governo para a água para rega)?

2. O alargamento da zona de rega previsto no novo plano de Avaliação de Impacte Ambiental (AIA) respeita a Rede Natura e as espécies protegidas?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(28 de abril de 2014)

Nem todas as zonas circundantes da albufeira de Alqueva são zonas protegidas da rede Natura 2000. A menos que façam parte da rede, as azinheiras e os sobreiros não beneficiam das salvaguardas de proteção estabelecidas no artigo 6.° da Diretiva que cria a rede Natura 2000, embora possam beneficiar de um regime de proteção estabelecido por legislação nacional. Por conseguinte, a Comissão não parece ter base para intervir no abate das árvores em questão.

1. Da avaliação efetuada pela Comissão do cumprimento, por Portugal, dos requisitos prévios em matéria de recursos hídricos aos quais a legislação da União Europeia subordina os financiamentos da UE, verifica-se que, para efeitos da análise económica prevista no anexo III da Diretiva-Quadro Água ([1]), Portugal apenas teve em conta o abastecimento de água e a recolha e tratamento das águas residuais. A expectativa da Comissão é que a análise económica contemple todos os serviços hídricos e todos os setores pertinentes.

2. Como todos os planos ou projetos que afetem espécies ou sítios protegidos pela legislação da União Europeia, qualquer extensão da zona de rega relacionada com a barragem de Alqueva terá de respeitar as disposições específicas das diretivas relativas à proteção da natureza ([2]). A Comissão não foi informada de nenhum projeto de rega com impacto potencial em espécies ou habitats protegidos, pelo que irá pedir às autoridades portuguesas informações adicionais acerca da avaliação do impacto ambiental das novas zonas de rega e sobre as condições em que estas foram autorizadas.

([1]) JO L 327 de 22.12.2000.
([2]) Diretiva 92/43/CEE, JO L 206 de 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002702/14
to the Commission
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unlawful felling of trees in Alqueva and failure to comply with EU legislation

Last year 11 500 protected holm oak, olive, and cork oak trees were felled 'unlawfully' in Alqueva. The Portuguese Nature Conservation League (LPN) responded by asking for explanations from a number of authorities and calling for action to be taken against the persons involved.

The current legislation allows (protected) trees to be felled only when authorisation been requested and the trees themselves have been marked, neither of which happened in this case. Furthermore, the contract for the felling work was awarded without a call for tenders, again without authorisation.

Apparently, the reason for the felling was that the trees were dead. This might have been true in part, given that the water level had been allowed to rise up to the maximum limit. However, because of the way of proceeding, which was unlawful to the extent that no authorisation was sought and the trees were not marked, it was impossible to ascertain how many trees were actually dead.

According to the LPN, it has been the case from the outset that paper mills have been dismantled with no environmental precautions and several areas have been cleared and deforested, posing a threat to protected species, bearing in mind that the site concerned was being used to support osprey introduction projects; all this has been done in blatant disregard of environmental legislation and EU directives.

In the light of the foregoing, can the Commission comment on this situation and can it say, having regard to the EU legislation in force, whether it considers the felling of protected trees in Alqueva to have been carried out legally?

In addition:

1. Has Annex III of the Water Framework Directive been complied with (as regards the prices set by the Government for irrigation water)?

2. What is the position regarding the extension of the irrigation zone under the new environmental impact assessment (EIA) plan, taking into account the Natura network and protected species?

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

Not all areas around the Alqueva 'reservoir' are protected in Natura 2000 network. Unless they are included in the network, oak trees do not benefit from the protective safeguards set out in its Article 6. However, they may benefit from a protection regime under national legislation. Therefore the Commission would not appear to have a basis to intervene in this matter in relation to the felling of the trees.

1. From the Commission's assessment of Portugal's fulfilment of the 'water ex-ante conditionality' provided for in EU legislation for the entitlement to EU funding, it appears that Portugal has only taken into account water supply and wastewater collection and treatment for the purpose of the economic analysis under Annex III of the Water Framework Directive ([1]). The Commission expects Member States to include all water services and all relevant sectors in that analysis.

2. Any extension of the irrigation zone linked to the Alqueva dam, like any other plan or project affecting species or sites protected under the EU legislation, has to abide by specific provisions of the Nature Directives ([2]). The Commission has not been informed of irrigation projects with potential impacts on protected species and habitats and it will seek further information from the Portuguese authorities on the EIA for new irrigation areas and conditions under which they were authorised.

([1]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([2]) Directive 1992/43/EEC, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002703/14
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(7 martie 2014)

Subiect: Echilibrarea ratelor de angajare pe perioada extrasezonului în turismul european

Analizele Eurostat pentru determinarea ratelor de ocupare a unităților de cazare pentru 2012-2013 în Europa au înregistrat o creștere de 0,6% în timpul sezonului de vară 2013, cele două luni de vârf fiind iulie și august. În aceste două luni, toate statele membre, în afară de Danemarca, Letonia, Estonia și Finlanda au avut cele mai mari rate de ocupare anuale. Croația, Cipru, Malta și Grecia sunt țările cu cea mai mare rată de ocupare a unităților de cazare, cu 96,7%, 89,7%, 84% și 81,9%.

Comisia are ca strategie reducerea sezonalității, dar și promovarea turismului în extra-sezon prin programe precum Calypso, Low-Season Tourism și Tourism for Seniors. Având în vedere faptul că provocările în acest sector sunt legate de îmbunătățirea calității locurilor de muncă și de echilibrarea ratelor de angajare din timpul sezonului și din extra-sezon, doresc să întreb Comisia cum își propune să abordeze aceste provocări, împreună cu statele membre, și care sunt măsurile prevăzute?

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

Comisia recunoaște că intensificarea fluxurilor de turiști în extrasezon poate consolida creșterea economică, poate stimula productivitatea și poate contribui la menținerea și eventual la crearea de noi locuri de muncă.

Începând din 2009, în cadrul inițiativei „Calypso — turismul pentru toți” ([1]), Comisia a cofinanțat zece proiecte transnaționale care au implicat 17 state membre (plus Serbia și Muntenegru), un studiu referitor la turismul social și a sprijinit crearea unei platforme web ([2]). Platforma facilitează echilibrarea cererii și a ofertei, având ca scop sprijinirea organizațiilor și grupurilor de operatori care intenționează să organizeze și să asigure experiențe de călătorie pentru anumite grupuri țintă, oferindu-le un acces ușor și rapid la pachete turistice în întreaga Europă.

Începând cu 2012, Comisia a pus accentul într-o mai mare măsură pe grupul persoanelor mai în vârstă (Calypso+), recunoscând marele potențial turistic al acestui segment de populație. Până în prezent în 2014, Comisia a oferit cofinanțare pentru patru proiecte care ar trebui să instituie și/sau să consolideze parteneriatele publice și private la nivel european, național și/sau regional și să faciliteze schimburile turistice transnaționale în extrasezon pentru persoanele în vârstă pe teritoriul Europei. De asemenea, Comisia intenționează să exploreze mai în profunzime piața tineretului, cu același scop de a facilita mobilitatea transnațională și de a promova parteneriatele public-privat.

În cele din urmă, dar nu mai puțin important, recent, Comisia a inițiat un amplu proces de consultare cu actorii din sectorul public și privat privind inițiativa „Europa, destinația cea mai bună pentru persoanele în vârstă”, care, în continuitate cu inițiativa Calypso, vizează crearea unor mecanisme de coordonare pentru intensificarea fluxurilor de turiști persoane în vârstă în extrasezon pe teritoriul Europei, turiști provenind și din țări terțe.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/index_ro.htm
([2]) www.eCalypso.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002703/14
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Balancing employment rates in the European tourism sector to cover off-season periods

Eurostat data regarding accommodation occupancy rates for the period 2012-2013 in Europe revealed a 0.6% rise in the summer of 2013, peaking in July and August, the two months in which all Member States (aside from Denmark, Latvia, Estonia and Finland) registered the highest percentages for the year, headed by Croatia, Cyprus, Malta and Greece with 96.7%, 89.7%, 84% and 81.9% respectively.

The Commission is currently seeking to reduce seasonal variations, for example through the Calypso initiative designed to promote off-season tourism and tourism for seniors and provide more stable employment by levelling out the disparities between peak and off-season periods. In view of this, can the Commission indicate how it intends to achieve these objectives in cooperation with the Member States and what specific measures are being envisaged?

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

The Commission acknowledges that enhancing low and medium season tourism flows can reinforce economic growth, boost productivity, help maintain and possibly generate new jobs.

Since 2009, in the framework of the initiative 'Calypso — tourism for all' ([1]), the Commission has co-financed ten transnational projects, involving 17 Member States (plus Serbia and Montenegro), a study on social tourism, and has supported the creation of a web platform ([2]). The platform facilitates the match of demand and supply, aiming at supporting organisations and groups of operators who plan to organise and provide travel experiences to the specific target groups, by offering them quick and easy access to tourism packages across Europe.

Since 2012, the Commission has focused more extensively on the senior group (Calypso+), recognising the great tourist potential of this population segment. So far in 2014, the Commission provided co-funding to four projects which should set up and/or strengthen public and private partnerships at European, national and/or regional levels, and facilitate transnational tourism exchanges for seniors in the low season within Europe. The Commission also intends to explore more in depth the youth market, with the same aim of facilitating transnational mobility and fostering public-private partnerships.

Last but not least, the Commission has recently engaged in a broad consultation process with various public and private actors on the initiative 'Europe, the best destination for seniors', which, in continuity with the Calypso initiative, aims at setting up coordination mechanisms to increase low/medium seasons flows for senior tourists within Europe and from third countries.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/index_en.htm
([2]) www.eCalypso.eu

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002705/14
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Protezione delle indicazioni geografiche

Può la Commissione fornire una stima del valore aggiunto per le economie locali rappresentato dal riconoscimento delle indicazioni geografiche europee (IG) negli accordi commerciali esterni dell'Unione?

Quanti accordi commerciali dell'Unione proteggono le IG italiane e quanti prodotti italiani sono esplicitamente protetti dalle IG?

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

In base a uno studio del 2012 ([1]), nel 2010 le vendite nei paesi terzi di prodotti protetti da indicazioni geografiche dell'UE (IG) sono state stimate a 11,5 miliardi di EUR, pari al 15 % della totalità degli scambi extra-UE di alimenti e bevande. Le suddette esportazioni di prodotti IG dell'UE erano costituite per circa la metà da vini (51 %), da bevande spiritose IG (40 %) e da prodotti agricoli e alimentari (9 %).

Con un valore complessivo pari a circa 5 miliardi di EUR nel 2010, i vini protetti da indicazione geografica hanno rappresentato il 74 % del valore complessivo delle esportazioni extra-UE di vino (6,7 miliardi di EUR). Nel 2010 il valore dei vini italiani IG venduti nei paesi terzi ha totalizzato 1,6 miliardi di EUR. Sempre nel 2010 le vendite di prodotti agricoli e alimentari sono state pari a circa 1 miliardo di EUR, circa il 2 % del valore complessivo delle esportazioni alimentari extra-UE (57 miliardi di EUR). Nell'ambito di queste esportazioni extra-UE la quota di gran lunga più significativa era costituita da prodotti italiani (62 %). Le prime cinque denominazioni hanno rappresentato il 55 % della totalità delle esportazioni extra-UE (Grana Padano, Parmigiano Reggiano, Aceto Balsamico di Modena, Prosciutto di Parma, *Scottish Farmed Salmon*). Con un valore complessivo pari a 4,6 miliardi di EUR nel 2010, le bevande spiritose IG hanno rappresentato circa il 64 % del valore complessivo delle esportazioni extra-UE (7 miliardi di EUR).

Una maggiore protezione delle IG rappresenta un forte interesse offensivo dell'UE in tutti i suoi negoziati commerciali. Negli ultimi anni l'UE ha garantito un elevato livello di protezione di molte delle sue IG nei mercati di alcuni dei principali partner commerciali. Tutti gli accordi commerciali conclusi dall'UE che prevedono la protezione delle sue indicazioni geografiche contemplano IG originarie dell'Italia. In ciascun accordo è definito l'elenco delle indicazioni geografiche protette nel territorio di ciascuna parte contraente. Le IG italiane specifiche protette nell'ambito di ciascun accordo sono disponibili al seguente indirizzo internet: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/gi-international/index_en.htm.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external-studies/value-gi_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002705/14
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Protection of Geographical Indications

Can the Commission provide an estimate of the value added to local economies through the recognition of European Geographical Indications (GIs) in the Union's external trade agreements?

How many of the Union's trade agreements protect GIs originating in Italy, and how many Italian products are explicitly protected by GIs?

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

According to a 2012 study [1], in 2010 the sales of EU Geographical Indications (GI) products to third countries were estimated EUR 11.5 billion, representing 15% of all extra-EU trade for food and beverages. Nearly half of those exports of GI products were wines (51%), the value of GI spirits exports amounted to 40% and agricultural products and foodstuffs represented 9% of the EU GI exports.

With a total value around EUR 5 billion in 2010, GI wines represented 74% of the total value of extra-EU exports of wine (EUR 6.7 billion). Italian GI wines sold in third countries accounted for EUR 1.6 billion in 2010. GI agricultural products and foodstuffs represented around EUR 1 billion in 2010, about 2% of the total value of extra-EU food exports (EUR 57 billion). Italian products represented by far the largest share of those extra-EU exports (62%). The first five designations represented 55% of all extra-EU exports (Grana Padano, Parmigiano Reggiano, Aceto Balsamico di Modena, Prosciutto di Parma, Scottish Farmed Salmon). With a total value of EUR 4.6 billion in 2010, GI spirits represented about 64% of the total value of extra-EU spirit exports (EUR 7 billion).

Enhanced GI protection is an important offensive interest of the EU in all its trade negotiations. Over the last few years the EU has ensured a high level of protection of many EU GIs in the markets of some key trade partners. All EU trade agreements providing protection for EU GIs do include GIs originating in Italy. The list of the geographical indications protected in each contracting party is defined in each agreement. The specific Italian GIs protected under each agreement can be found at the following address: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/gi-international/index_en.htm

---

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external-studies/value-gi_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002706/14
a la Comisión
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Incompatibilidad de una Ley española con la nueva legislación europea sobre cigarrillos electrónicos

Actualmente se encuentra en trámite de aprobación en el Senado español la nueva Ley para la Defensa de los Consumidores y Usuarios que debe regular, entre otros aspectos, el consumo y la publicidad de los cigarrillos electrónicos.

Por lo que respecta a la publicidad en medios audiovisuales, el texto del proyecto de Ley permitiría la publicidad de estos dispositivos en medios audiovisuales, siempre que se realice fuera de la franja considerada como «horario infantil» (de las 16.00 a las 20.00 horas).

El acuerdo interinstitucional alcanzado para la revisión de la Directiva de productos del tabaco (2001/37/CE), a falta de un marco legal específico para estos dispositivos novedosos, establece un nuevo capítulo para cigarrillos electrónicos. Concretamente, en el Título III, el artículo 18 bis, punto 5, establece que los Estados miembros garantizarán que «queden prohibidas las comunicaciones comerciales audiovisuales reguladas por la Directiva 2010/13/UE para los cigarrillos electrónicos y sus envases de recarga».

A su vez, esta última Directiva sobre prestación de servicios de comunicación audiovisual, prohíbe en su capítulo III, artículo 9, letra d, «cualquier forma de comunicación audiovisual aplicada a los cigarrillos y demás productos del tabaco», incluidos los cigarrillos electrónicos, según la disposición aprobada en la revisión de la Directiva 2001/37/CE a partir de su entrada en vigor.

En caso de aprobarse la citada Ley española en los términos descritos en referencia a la publicidad audiovisual de los cigarrillos electrónicos, ¿considera la Comisión que existiría incompatibilidad entre la legislación española y las directivas UE en el momento de su entrada en vigor?

En caso afirmativo, ¿piensa la Comisión solicitar a las autoridades españolas una rectificación del proyecto de ley en curso para una correcta adaptación a la legislación UE?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de abril de 2014)

La nueva Directiva sobre productos del tabaco, que ha sido oficialmente aprobada por el Parlamento Europeo y el Consejo, prohíbe la promoción y el patrocinio de los cigarrillos electrónicos con carácter transfronterizo. Sin embargo, se necesitaría información adicional para determinar si la ley española infringe la nueva Directiva permitiendo la publicidad transfronteriza.

La Comisión estudiará las legislaciones nacionales, en el marco del control de su transposición, a fin de asegurarse de que son conformes con la nueva Directiva sobre productos del tabaco. Si se comprobase que no es el caso, se pedirá al Estado miembro en cuestión que tome las medidas correctoras apropiadas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002706/14
to the Commission
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Spanish bill at odds with new European legislation on e-cigarettes

The Spanish Senate is currently considering a new consumer protection bill containing provisions regulating the use and advertising of electronic cigarettes.

Under the bill, media advertising of those products will be authorised outside 'children's viewing time' (between 16.00 and 20.00).

In the absence of specific legal framework provisions governing these new devices, the interinstitutional agreement on revision of the Tobacco Products Directive (2001/37/EC) includes a new chapter for e-cigarettes. Specifically, Title III, Article 18 (2), point 5 requires Member States to ensure that 'audiovisual communications falling under Directive 2010/13/EU are prohibited for electronic cigarettes and their refill container'.

Furthermore, Chapter III, Article 9 (d) of this latest Directive on audiovisual communications service provision prohibits 'all forms of audiovisual commercial communications for cigarettes and other tobacco products', including e-cigarettes, in accordance with Directive 2001/37/EC as amended.

If the abovementioned provisions of the bill in question referring to the audiovisual advertising of e-cigarettes are adopted, does the Commission consider that they will be at odds with the relevant EU Directives?

If so, will the Commission ask the Spanish authorities to amend the bill accordingly in line with EU legislation?

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

The new Tobacco Products Directive, which has been officially approved by both the European Parliament and Council, prohibits promotion and sponsorship of electronic cigarettes with a cross-border character. Further information would be needed, however, to establish if the Spanish bill contravenes the new Directive by allowing cross-border advertising.

The Commission will study national legislations, as part of its transposition checks, to ensure they are correctly aligned with the new Tobacco Products Directive. If this is found not to be the case, the Member State in question will be required to take the appropriate corrective measure.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002707/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Ayudas estatales del Gobierno de Navarra

El Parlamento de Navarra aprobó el día 12 de marzo de 2013 la Ley Foral 10/2013, por medio de la cual se modificó la Ley Foral 2/1995. En el apartado 7 del artículo único de dicha norma se da una nueva redacción al art. 136, letra d), de la precitada Ley Foral 2/1995 en los siguientes términos:

«d) Los de la Iglesia Católica y las asociaciones no católicas, legalmente reconocidas, con las que se establezcan los acuerdos de colaboración a que se refiere el artículo 16 de la Constitución Española y siempre que estén destinados al culto.» La interpretación de dicha norma es muy clara teniendo en cuenta que el encabezamiento del artículo 136 de dicha ley dice literalmente: «Disfrutarán de la exención del impuesto los siguientes bienes». Es decir, se estableció la obligación de pagar el IBI con respecto a los bienes no destinados al culto. El Tribunal Constitucional, mediante su sentencia n° 207/2013, de 5 de diciembre, dictada con desacostumbrada celeridad y por unanimidad, ha declarado inconstitucional dicha ley. La argumentación es la siguiente: Navarra —por convenio— tiene que acatar los acuerdos internacionales, como el Concordato de 1979.

Hay que recordar que las iglesias son entes de Derecho privado y, por lo tanto, sometidos a las reglas del mercado interior. Este privilegio del cual goza la Iglesia Católica parece constituir una ayuda estatal, prohibida por el Derecho de la Unión Europea. Efectivamente, el artículo 107 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea prohíbe expresamente las ayudas estatales, en la medida en que «afecten a los intercambios comerciales entre Estados miembros» y falseen la competencia. En el presente caso, dicho privilegio fiscal conduce a falsar la competencia, ya que favorece más a una iglesia que a otra.

¿Qué opina la Comisión sobre dicho asunto?

¿Considera la Comisión que dichos privilegios constituyen ayudas estatales? ¿Por qué?

¿Piensa la Comisión dar algún paso para que el Gobierno de Navarra respete las reglas del mercado interior?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de mayo de 2014)

La Comisión desea señalar a Su Señoría que las normas de competencia son aplicables a las empresas. Por empresa se entiende toda entidad que ejerza una actividad económica, con independencia de su forma jurídica o del carácter lucrativo o benéfico de sus fines. Cualquier iglesia de cualquier religión puede ajustarse a esa definición; no obstante, si esa entidad no lleva a cabo ninguna actividad económica, no se le aplican las normas de ayudas estatales. La naturaleza económica de la actividad específica de la entidad debe determinarse caso por caso. Si, efectivamente, existe actividad económica, una exención fiscal puede constituir una ventaja que requiere a España la notificación de la ayuda a la Comisión conforme a lo dispuesto en el artículo 108, apartado 3, del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea.

La Comisión no ha recibido de España ninguna notificación relacionada con la ley indicada por Su Señoría. Además, la Comisión observa que Su Señoría menciona al Tribunal Constitucional, que ha declarado dicha ley inconstitucional. Por ese motivo, la situación parece ser hipotética en la fase actual y es posible que la Comisión no tenga que pronunciarse al respecto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002707/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: State aid from the Government of Navarra

On 12 March 2013 the Parliament of the Navarra region of Spain passed Regional Law (*Ley Foral*) 10/2013, amending Regional Law 2/1995. Paragraph 7 of the sole article of that new law altered the wording of Article 136(d) of Regional Law 2/1995 so that it now reads as follows:

'(d) [buildings] belonging to the Catholic Church and non-Catholic associations, which are recognised by law, with which cooperation agreements provided for in Article 16 of the Spanish Constitution may be entered into, , provided that they are places of worship'. This provision is quite clear, bearing in mind that the heading of Article 136 of Regional Law 2/1995 reads 'the following assets shall be exempt from the tax:'. In other words, an obligation was laid down that real estate tax (IBI) be paid on property not used as places of worship. In its unanimous judgment No 207/2013 of 5 December, which was handed down with an unusual degree of swiftness, the Constitutional Court declared the new law to be unconstitutional, on the grounds that Navarra is bound by law to comply with international treaties, such as the 1979 Concordat.

It must be remembered that churches are institutions governed by private law and are therefore subject to the rules of the internal market. This privilege enjoyed by the Catholic Church appears to constitute state aid, which is prohibited under EC law. Indeed, Article 107 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union expressly prohibits state aid, insofar as it 'affects trade between Member States' and distorts competition. In this case, the aforementioned tax concession leads to a distortion of competition, since it benefits one church more than another.

What are the Commission's views on this matter?

Does the Commission consider that these privileges constitute state aid? Why?

Does the Commission intend to take any steps to ensure that the government of Navarra complies with the rules of the internal market?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2014)

The Commission would like to point out to the Honourable Member that competition rules apply to undertakings. An undertaking is defined as an entity engaged in an economic activity, regardless of its legal status or whether it seeks to make a profit or not. A church of any faith may fall under that definition. However, if the entity concerned does not carry out any economic activity, State aid rules do not apply. Whether the specific activity of the entity is of an economic nature or not needs to be analysed on a case by case basis. Under the condition that an economic activity is exercised, a fiscal exemption might constitute an advantage which would require Spain to notify the aid to the Commission pursuant to Article 108(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

The Commission has not received a notification from Spain in relation to the law the Honourable Member mentions. The Commission further notes that the Honourable Member refers to the Spanish Constitutional Court which declared the law unconstitutional. Therefore, at this stage, the situation seems to be hypothetical and may not require the Commission to take a position.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002709/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Nivel de cumplimiento de la legislación europea sobre conservación de fauna en zoológicos y acuarios

Desde 1999 podemos decir que ha pasado un tiempo prudencial para realizar una valoración acerca de la normativa de aplicación en parques zoológicos y acuarios al respecto de la conservación de fauna en los mismos.

Durante estos años las denuncias de colectivos animalistas han sido constantes y contundentes, llegando algunas de ellas a la propia Comisión de Peticiones, sobre las malas condiciones de parques de Galicia. En este sentido cabe subrayar la falta de interés generalizada de los diferentes gobiernos autonómicos a la hora de aplicar de forma adecuada la normativa, posibilitando la apertura de parques sin licencia o permitiendo el desarrollo de programas de conservación sin ningún impacto real sobre especies amenazadas o en peligro de extinción, una tónica habitual, desgraciadamente.

¿Qué valoración realiza la Comisión de la normativa sobre parques zoológicos y acuarios? ¿Existe algún informe al respecto?

¿Qué valoración se realiza de forma específica sobre los parques ubicados en Galicia? ¿De cuántos y qué parques tiene constancia la Comisión que están abiertos en la comunidad?

¿Cuántas denuncias ha recibido la Comisión por infracciones en este sentido en los Estados miembros? ¿Y de forma específica en instalaciones ubicadas en España?

¿Piensa la Comisión desarrollar o actualizar normativa al respecto?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de abril de 2014)

Está prevista una evaluación de la Directiva relativa a los parques zoológicos en el marco del programa de adecuación y eficacia de la reglamentación (REFIT) de la Comisión ([1]). La Comisión esperará a que haya concluido dicha evaluación para examinar posibles medidas y elaborar nuevos actos legislativos o actualizar la normativa existente.

La Comisión está al corriente de las denuncias presentadas en el pasado, que llevaron al Tribunal de Justicia a declarar, en diciembre de 2010, que España había incumplido sus obligaciones en materia de concesión de licencias y de control en virtud de la Directiva relativa a los parques zoológicos ([2]) en varias regiones, entre ellas Galicia. Desde entonces, las autoridades españolas han adoptado todas las medidas necesarias en relación con todos los parques zoológicos en cuestión, incluidos los de Galicia. La Comisión no dispone de más información actualizada sobre el número y tipo de instalaciones en la región, ya que la Directiva relativa a los parques zoológicos no exige a los Estados miembros que notifiquen a la Comisión este tipo de información.

([1]) COM(2013) 685 final.
([2]) Directiva 1999/22/CE del Consejo, relativa al mantenimiento de animales salvajes en parques zoológicos (DO L 94 de 9.4.1999).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002709/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Level of compliance with EU legislation on conservation of fauna in zoos and aquariums

Enough time has now passed since 1999 to justify an assessment being carried out of the laws in force governing the conservation of fauna in zoos and aquariums.

In that time animal welfare groups have repeatedly and emphatically condemned denounced the poor conditions at zoos and aquariums in Galicia, and indeed some of these complaints have even reached the Committee on Petitions. Attention should be drawn to the general lack of interest shown by Spain's various regional governments in applying the provisions properly , as this has made it possible for parks to be opened without a licence, and conservation programmes to be developed that do nothing to help endangered species or those at risk of extinction. Unfortunately, this has been standard practice.

What is the Commission's view on the legislation governing zoos and aquariums? Have any reports been drawn up on this matter?

What view does it take of facilities in Galicia in particular? Does the Commission know how many and what kinds of facilities there are in the region?

How many complaints has the Commission received regarding infringements of this kind in the Member States, and, in particular, as regards facilities in Spain?

Does the Commission intend to draw up new or update existing legislation in this area?

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

An evaluation of the Zoos Directive is foreseen under the Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT) of the Commission ([1]). Until this is completed the Commission is not considering any measures to draw up new or update the existing legislation.

The Commission is aware of past complaints which led the European Court of Justice to declare, in December 2010, that Spain had failed to fulfil its obligations on licencing and inspections under the Zoos Directive ([2]) in several regions, including Galicia. The Spanish authorities have since adopted all the necessary measures in relation to all the concerned zoological establishments, including those in Galicia. The Commission does not possess further updated information on the number and kind of facilities in the region, as the Zoos Directive does not require Member States to report the Commission on this type of information.

([1]) COM(2013) 685 final.
([2]) Council Directive 1999/22/EC relating to the keeping of wild animals in zoos, OJ L 94, 9.4.1999.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002710/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Participación europea en el desarrollo de centros de acogida de animales abandonados en los Estados miembros

En 2012 la Diputación de Pontevedra anunciaba la construcción de una perrera que contaría con financiación a través de fondos comunitarios, sin especificar qué posibles planes contribuirían económicamente al desarrollo de estas instalaciones. Cuestionando la necesidad de que empresas privadas —centradas en la obtención de beneficios— puedan asumir labores que tradicionalmente vienen prestando organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro e independientes de cualquier institución o gobierno, resulta pernicioso el uso de fondos europeos para construir instalaciones donde se pueden sacrificar animales sanos.

En este sentido, es necesario desarrollar medidas que aborden la posibilidad de establecer cooperaciones con Estados miembros para la promoción y refuerzo del trabajo de las sociedades protectoras que cada año recogen en la Unión Europea cientos de miles de animales abandonados —en su mayoría domésticos— pero cada vez de más especies exóticas, con el riesgo añadido que esto conlleva para los ecosistemas y los animales autóctonos.

La Unión Europea debe seguir implicándose en la lucha contra lacras como el maltrato y abandono de animales, que en países como España alcanzan cada año récords lamentables.

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión desarrollar alguna iniciativa de cooperación con Estados miembros en relación al maltrato y abandono de animales?

¿Tiene la Comisión constancia del uso de fondos europeos para construir perreras o centros de acogida de animales abandonados?

¿Piensa la Comisión posibilitar el uso de fondos comunitarios para el establecimiento de medidas urgentes contra el abandono y maltrato animal?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de abril de 2014)

Remitimos a Su Señoría a las respuestas a las preguntas escritas E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2012 y E-005276/2013 ([1]), en las que se abordan las cuestiones de los perros vagabundos y la gestión de la población de perros.

Las competencias de la UE no permiten a la Comisión financiar la creación de perreras o de refugios para animales de compañía abandonados.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002710/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: European participation in setting up shelters for abandoned pets in Member States

In 2012 the Provincial Council of Pontevedra announced the construction of a dog pound that would be financed with Community funds, but without specifying what possible plans would contribute financially to the setting-up of this pound. While it is questionable whether private firms, whose aim is to make a profit, should take on tasks that are traditionally undertaken by non-profit organisations which are independent of any public institution or government, it is offensive that EU funds should be employed to construct facilities where healthy animals may be killed.

In this regard, steps should be taken to address the possibility of establishing measures in cooperation with Member States in order to promote and reinforce the work of animal protection associations, which collect hundreds of thousands of abandoned pets each year in the European Union. Most of these are normal domestic animals, but there are now more and more exotic species which pose an additional danger to native fauna and ecosystems.

The European Union should continue to involve itself in the struggle against inhumane actions such as the mistreatment and abandonment of animals, which in countries like Spain reach shameful proportions every year.

Does the Commission plan to pursue any initiative in cooperation with Member States in relation to the mistreatment and abandonment of animals?

Is the Commission aware of EU funds being used to build dog pounds or shelters for abandoned pets?

Does the Commission intend to facilitate the use of EU funds to adopt urgent measures against the mistreatment and abandonment of animals?

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

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2012 and E-005276/2013 ([1]) which address the issues of stray dogs and of dog population management.

EU competences do not allow the Commission to fund the creation of dog pounds or shelters for abandoned pets.

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002711/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Uso de animales en espectáculos de carácter circense

Un total de 16 Estados europeos restringen en diferente medida el uso de animales en los circos basándose en normativas estatales y, también, comunitarias para impulsar modificaciones legislativas en este sentido. La Organización Mundial de Sanidad Animal, (OIE) adoptó en 2004 las denominadas «Cinco libertades», que han facilitado el debate en torno al bienestar animal en el continente europeo y por las que se reconocen unos derechos básicos inherentes a los animales en cuanto a su vida.

Teniendo en cuenta lo señalado anteriormente, se impone que la Comisión tome en consideración estos avances legislativos, sociales y morales que reclaman el fin de unos espectáculos que someten a seres vivos a unas condiciones de cautividad extrema, que basan sus entrenamientos en el miedo y el golpe, y que recurren a dudosas técnicas publicitarias, como el regalo de entradas a personas menores de edad.

En este sentido, se están registrando avances interesantes en territorios como Galicia y Cataluña, donde decenas de municipios ya prohíben esta actividad de maltrato animal.

Teniendo en cuenta que la UE dispone de una normativa en materia de parques zoológicos y acuarios, es significativo el vacío legal existente en este sentido en relación con los circos, lo que permite su instalación y desarrollo.

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión desarrollar alguna iniciativa relacionada con el uso de animales en los circos?

¿Qué valoración merecen a la Comisión las restricciones legislativas introducidas en relación con estos espectáculos con animales en diferentes Estados miembros?

¿Podría indicar la Comisión si está al tanto de que se han realizado estudios en la materia y que distintos expertos han expresado su opinión cuestionando el uso de animales en los circos?

¿Podría indicar la Comisión si ha sido objeto de algún tipo de presión para impedir la prohibición del uso de animales en este tipo de espectáculos?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de abril de 2014)

El elemento clave en la legislación de la UE relativa al mantenimiento de animales salvajes en cautividad es la Directiva sobre parques zoológicos (Directiva 1999/22/CE ([1]) del Consejo), que se adoptó para reforzar el papel de los parques zoológicos en la conservación de la biodiversidad. Como se explica en las respuestas a las preguntas E-4427/2011, P-5287/2011 y E-6436/2011 ([2]), los circos quedan excluidos del ámbito de aplicación de dicha Directiva.

Asimismo, el Reglamento 338/97/CE ([3]), relativo a la protección de especies de la fauna y flora silvestres mediante el control de su comercio, tiene por objeto garantizar que el comercio internacional de especímenes de animales salvajes y plantas silvestres no ponga en peligro su supervivencia. Los circos no se mencionan en dicho texto legislativo.

El bienestar de los animales no es un objetivo de los Tratados de la UE como tal, y solo es pertinente cuando se ven afectadas políticas específicas de la UE, como la agricultura o el mercado interior ([4]).

Sin embargo, hasta la fecha, no hay pruebas de que las diferencias en las políticas de los Estados miembros relativas al uso o la prohibición de animales salvajes en circos puedan afectar a alguno de los otros objetivos de la UE, de manera que justifiquen la acción de la Unión en materia de bienestar animal. Por lo tanto, la Comisión sigue considerando que, por ahora, las cuestiones de bienestar animal de los animales salvajes en este contexto no figuran entre las competencias de la Unión Europea, sino que son competencia exclusiva de los Estados miembros.

([1]) DO L 94 de 9.4.1999, p. 24.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) DO L 61 de 3.3.1997, p. 1.
([4]) El artículo 13 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la UE (DO C 326 de 26.10.2012, p. 54), establece lo siguiente: «Al formular y aplicar las políticas de la Unión en materia de agricultura, pesca, transporte, mercado interior, investigación y desarrollo tecnológico y espacio, la Unión y los Estados miembros tendrán plenamente en cuenta las exigencias en materia de bienestar de los animales como seres sensibles, respetando al mismo tiempo las disposiciones legales o administrativas y las costumbres de los Estados miembros relativas, en particular, a ritos religiosos, tradiciones culturales y patrimonio regional.».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002711/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Use of animals in circuses

A total of 16 European countries restrict to varying degrees the use of animals in circuses, in application of both national and Community regulations to foment legislative reform in this area. The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) adopted in 2004 the so-called 'Five freedoms', which have facilitated debate on animal welfare in Europe. These five freedoms recognise certain basic rights inherent to animals vis-à-vis their lives.

In view of the foregoing, there is a need for the Commission to take into consideration such moral, social and legislative advances, which have given rise to calls for an end to spectacles that submit living beings to conditions of extreme captivity, that base their training programmes on fear and beating, and that have recourse to questionable advertising techniques, such as giving tickets away to minors.

In this regard, interesting steps forward have been taken in regions such as Galicia and Catalonia, where dozens of towns and villages have banned these activities involving the mistreatment of animals.

Bearing in mind that there are EU regulations governing zoos and aquaria, it is significant that there is a legal vacuum in this respect so far as circuses are concerned, which therefore allows them to be set up and run.

Does the Commission intend to adopt any measures in relation to the use of animals in circuses?

What are the Commission's views on the legislative restrictions introduced in various Member States with respect to these shows involving animals?

Can the Commission say whether it is aware that research has been carried out in this area and that various experts have questioned the use of animals in circuses?

Can the Commission say whether it has been subjected to any pressure to prevent the use of animals in this sort of spectacle being banned?

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

The key piece of EU legislation relating to the keeping of wild animals in captivity is the Zoos Directive 1999/22/EC ([1]), which was adopted with a view to strengthening the role of zoos in the conservation of biodiversity. As explained in reply to Questions E-4427/2011, P-5287/2011 and E- 6436/2011 ([2]), circuses are excluded from the scope of this directive.

Likewise, Regulation 338/97/EC ([3]) on the protection of endangered species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein, aims to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival. Circuses are not mentioned in this legislation.

Animal welfare is not an objective of the EU Treaties as such and it is only relevant when specific EU policies like agriculture or internal market are affected ([4]).

However, till now, there is no evidence indicating that differences in Member States policies regarding the use or the ban of wild animals in circuses would affect one of the other EU objectives thereby justifying Union action for animal welfare. Therefore, the Commission remains of the opinion that, at this stage, matters of animal welfare of wild animals in this context do not fall under EU competences but remain under the sole competence of the Member States.

([1]) OJ L 94, 9.4.1999 , p.24.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) OJ L 61, 3.3.1997, p. 1.
([4]) Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (OJ C 326, 26.10.2012, p. 54) states that: 'In formulating and implementing the Union's agriculture, fisheries, transport, internal market, research and technological development and space policies, the Union and the Member States shall, since animals are sentient beings, pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals, while respecting the legislative or administrative provisions and customs of the Member States relating in particular to religious rites, cultural traditions and regional heritage'.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002712/14
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D) and Claude Moraes (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: European Pensioners' Parliament

Can the Commission update Parliament on its actions to help European pensioners, and in particular whether it supports the concept of a European Pensioners' Parliament to bring European pensioners and their representatives together?

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

The European Commission set out its actions to promote adequate, safe and sustainable pensions in the 2012 White Paper 'An agenda for adequate, safe and sustainable pensions' ([1]) which presented a number of measures to support Member States' reforms of their pension systems, aiming to help women and men to work longer and save more for their retirement. An overview of the implementation of these measures can be found online ([2]).

Measures to make adequate pension systems more sustainable have also been high on the agenda during all the European Semesters that have taken place so far. In 2012, 17 and in 2013, 15 Member States received country-specific recommendations on pensions, which primarily focused on ensuring longer working lives.

Recent pension reforms across the EU have improved the sustainability of pension systems, while future adequacy depends on whether people will be enabled to remain longer on the labour market. Both the sustainability and the adequacy of pension systems will be reviewed in spring 2015 in reports prepared with the Economic Policy Committee (Ageing Report) and the Social Protection Committee (Pension Adequacy Report).

The Commission works closely with AGE Platform Europe which has also benefited from EU funding. AGE is a valuable partner in many policy initiatives that are relevant to the well-being of older people.

In relation to the concept of a European Pensioners' Parliament, the Commission considers that the interests of such group would be best represented by the European Parliament taking into account also the interests of younger generations in a spirit of solidarity between generations.

([1]) COM(2012) 55 final.
([2]) See under 'related documents': http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=752

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002713/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) y Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Derechos de las mujeres detenidas en Egipto

Recientes informes de prensa han revelado que Egipto otra vez está realizando «pruebas de virginidad» a las mujeres que se encuentran detenidas. Las pruebas de virginidad son invasivas y Amnistía Internacional las considera una forma de tortura. Consisten en un examen que verifica si hay sangre en el himen. Cabe señalar que los informes no han sido ampliamente verificados o confirmados. Cuando el ejército egipcio llegó al poder declaró que prohibiría las pruebas de virginidad, pero esto aún no ha sucedido. De hecho, en 2012 el general Abdel Fattah el-Sissi defendió las pruebas, afirmando que estaban destinadas a «proteger a las niñas de la violación, y a los soldados y oficiales de las acusaciones de violación». Es preocupante que un candidato presidencial egipcio apruebe este tipo de pruebas, que violan los derechos de las mujeres e infringen claramente la Convención sobre la Eliminación de todas las Formas de Discriminación contra la Mujer (CEDAW). Además, se suman al renovado esfuerzo por sofocar las protestas políticas, arrestando a los manifestantes y sometiéndolos a condiciones carcelarias espantosas.

El Grupo de Trabajo UE-Egipto ha aprobado un paquete de ayuda para promover la educación, combatir los abusos contra las mujeres y aumentar la participación de las mujeres en el proceso electoral. No obstante, es importante que la Comisión siga denunciando cuando se violan los derechos de los ciudadanos egipcios, como en este caso.

1. ¿Qué presión piensa ejercer la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante con el fin de garantizar que el futuro líder de Egipto prohíba estas supuestas pruebas de virginidad y mejore los derechos de las personas más vulnerables del país, a la luz de las nuevas severas medidas represivas contra los disidentes políticos?

2. ¿Prevé la Comisión ofrecer asistencia financiera o mediación a fin de que estas denuncias de opresión militar puedan ser investigadas por tribunales civiles, y que los autores comparezcan ante la justicia?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de junio de 2014)

La UE es consciente de la situación de las mujeres en Egipto y la Delegación de la UE en El Cairo mantiene contactos permanentes con las organizaciones de la sociedad civil local y supervisa de cerca los casos referidos de violencia contra las mujeres.

La UE condena todas las formas de violencia contra las mujeres y otros grupos vulnerables, y la alta representante y vicepresidenta plantea regularmente este tema en declaraciones públicas y ante sus homólogos egipcios. Más aún a la luz de la reciente evolución de la situación en el país, la Unión Europea espera que el nuevo Gobierno provisional egipcio respete los compromisos adquiridos en materia de derechos humanos, incluidos los derechos de las mujeres, en el marco del Acuerdo de Asociación celebrado con Egipto.

El Representante Especial de la Unión Europea (REUE) para los Derechos Humanos, Sr. Lambrinidis, realizó su quinta visita a Egipto en febrero de 2014 y obtuvo de los Ministros del Interior y de Justicia, así como del Fiscal, el compromiso «de que investigarían todas las acusaciones de abusos policiales incluidas en el futuro informe de la Comisión de Investigación».

En el informe de 2013 sobre los progresos realizados para la aplicación de la política de vecindad de la UE en Egipto, la Unión pide a Egipto, entre otras cosas, que «garantice la protección de los derechos de la mujer y la igualdad de género», «pare completamente el recurso a los tribunales militares para juzgar a civiles» y «garantice que las investigaciones sobre los numerosos casos de violencia, incluido el abuso sexual, se lleven a cabo y que los responsables sean rápidamente entregados a la justicia».

La delegación de la UE en Egipto está financiando nueve proyectos de organizaciones de la sociedad civil sobre género, por un importe total de 3,3 millones de euros.

En el marco del Instrumento Europeo de Vecindad y Asociación, la UE financia asimismo el programa de las Naciones Unidas para el período 2012-2016 «Primavera para el adelanto de la mujer» (con 7 millones de euros de un total de 8,2).

Por último, los derechos de la mujer son una prioridad clave de la estrategia nacional de derechos humanos en Egipto.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-002713/14
Komisi (Místopředsedkyně Komise/Vysoká představitelka)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) a Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7. března 2014)

Předmět: VP/HR – Práva žen zadržovaných v Egyptě

Podle nejnovějších zpráv v Egyptě opět dochází k provádění „zkoušek panenství" u zadržovaných žen. Zkoušky panenství jsou invazivní a organizace Amnesty International je považuje za formu mučení. Sestávají z vyšetření, kterým se ověřuje přítomnost krve v panenské bláně. Je třeba poznamenat, že tyto zprávy nebyly v širším smyslu ověřeny či potvrzeny. Když se poprvé v Egyptě chopila moci armáda, prohlásila, že zkoušky panenství zakáže, ale dosud k tomu nedošlo. Ve skutečnosti v roce 2012 generál Abd al-Fattáh as-Sísí tyto zkoušky obhajoval a tvrdil, že jsou určeny k tomu, aby „chránily dívky před znásilněním a vojáky a důstojníky před obviněním ze znásilnění". Je znepokojující, že kandidát na egyptského prezidenta takové zkoušky, které porušují práva žen, toleruje. Přitom představují jasné porušení Úmluvy o odstranění všech forem diskriminace žen. Tato informace navíc přichází v době, kdy opět dochází k potlačování politických protestů a kdy jsou protestující zatýkáni a čelí děsivým podmínkám ve vězení.

Pracovní skupina EU-Egypt schválila balíček podpory, který má pomoci se vzděláváním, bojem proti násilí páchaném na ženách a zvýšením účasti žen ve volebním procesu. Je však důležité, aby Komise i nadále veřejně upozorňovala na situace, kdy jsou porušována práva egyptských občanů, jako je tomu v tomto případě.

1. Jakou formu nátlaku hodlá místopředsedkyně Komise, vysoká představitelka Unie použít, aby zajistila, že budoucí vůdce Egypta tyto tzv. zkoušky panenství zakáže a zlepší práva nejzranitelnějších obyvatel země, a to ve světle nových tvrdých zásahů proti politickým odpůrcům?

2. Hodlá Komise nabídnout finanční nebo zprostředkovatelskou pomoc, aby mohla být tato tvrzení o vojenském útlaku prošetřena civilními soudy a pachatelé postaveni před soud?

Odpověď vysoké představitelky a místopředsedkyně Komise C. Ashtonové jménem Komise
(2. června 2014)

EU si je situace žen v Egyptě vědoma. Delegace EU v Káhiře je pravidelně v kontaktu s místními organizacemi občanské společnosti a bedlivě sleduje nahlášené případy násilí páchaného na ženách.

EU odsuzuje veškeré formy násilí páchaného na ženách a jiných zranitelných skupinách. Vysoká představitelka a místopředsedkyně Komise na problém pravidelně poukazuje jak ve veřejných prohlášeních, tak i při setkáních s egyptskými představiteli. EU očekává – ve světle nedávných událostí v zemi ještě intenzivněji – že nová prozatímní egyptská vláda bude dodržovat závazky v oblasti lidských práv, včetně práv žen, jež byly stanoveny v dohodě o přidružení uzavřené s Egyptem.

S. Lambrinidis, zvláštní zástupce EU pro lidská práva, v únoru 2014 popáté navštívil Egypt a získal od ministra vnitra a ministra spravedlnosti, jakož i od veřejného žalobce příslib, že „prošetří veškerá obvinění policejní zvůle uvedená v budoucí zprávě vyšetřovací komise".

EU ve zprávě o pokroku v roce 2013 při provádění evropské politiky sousedství v Egyptě vyzývá Egypt, aby mimo jiné „zajistil ochranu práv žen a rovnost pohlaví", „úplně přestal používat vojenské soudy v případech civilistů" a „zajistil, že početné případy násilí, včetně sexuálního zneužívání, budou vyšetřeny a že pachatelé budou bezodkladně postaveni před soud".

Delegace EU v Egyptě financuje 9 projektů organizací občanské společnosti, které se týkají genderu. Celková výše příspěvku činí 3,3 milionu eur.

V rámci evropského nástroje sousedství a partnerství EU také spolufinancuje program OSN „Více prostoru ženám" („Spring forward for women") na období 2012-2016, přičemž poskytuje 7 milionů z celkových 8,2 milionu eur.

Práva žen jsou navíc klíčovou prioritou strategie v oblasti lidských práv pro Egypt.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002713/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) und Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7. März 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — die Rechte inhaftierter Frauen in Ägypten

Jüngsten Presseberichten zufolge führt Ägypten erneut „Jungfräulichkeitstests" bei inhaftierten Frauen durch. Jungfräulichkeitstests sind ein Eingriff in die Intimsphäre und werden von Amnesty International als eine Form der Folter betrachtet. Bei dem Test wird das Jungfernhäutchen auf Blut hin untersucht. Es sollte darauf hingewiesen werden, dass diese Berichte bislang weder umfassend überprüft noch bestätigt wurden. Als die ägyptische Armee anfangs die Macht übernommen hatte, kündigte sie ein Verbot der Jungfräulichkeitstests an, was bislang jedoch nicht geschehen ist. In Wahrheit hat General Abdel Fattah el-Sissi im Jahr 2012 die Tests verteidigt, als er sagte, sie würden dazu dienen, „Mädchen vor Vergewaltigung und die Soldaten und Offiziere vor Vergewaltigungsvorwürfen zu schützen". Es ist besorgniserregend, dass ein Anwärter auf das Amt des ägyptischen Staatspräsidenten solche Tests, mit denen man die Rechte der Frau verletzt, duldet. Sie stellen einen eindeutigen Verstoß gegen das Übereinkommen der Vereinten Nationen zur Beseitigung jeder Form von Diskriminierung der Frau (CEDAW) dar. Hinzu kommt, dass sie mit den erneuten Bemühungen einhergehen, politische Proteste zu unterdrücken, indem Demonstranten in Gewahrsam genommen und schrecklichen Haftbedingungen ausgesetzt werden.

Die EU-Taskforce zu Ägypten hat ein Hilfspaket gebilligt, mit der Bildung, die Bekämpfung von Übergriffen gegen Frauen und eine größere Beteiligung von Frauen an den Wahlen gefördert werden sollen. Es ist jedoch wichtig, dass die Kommission sich weiterhin zu Wort meldet, wenn, wie in diesem Fall, die Rechte ägyptischer Bürger verletzt werden.

1. Welche Hebel gedenkt die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin anzusetzen, um sicherzustellen, dass der künftige Staatspräsident Ägyptens die sogenannten Jungfräulichkeitstests verbietet und angesichts des neuesten massiven Vorgehens gegen politisch Andersdenkende die Rechte der am meisten gefährdeten Bevölkerungsgruppen des Landes stärkt?

2. Plant die Kommission, in finanzieller Form oder als Vermittler unterstützend einzugreifen, damit diese Anschuldigungen der Unterdrückung durch das Militär vor Zivilgerichten untersucht und die Täter zur Rechenschaft gezogen werden?

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

Die EU ist sich der Lage der Frauen in Ägypten bewusst und die EU-Delegation in Kairo, die in regelmäßigem Kontakt mit lokalen Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft steht, verfolgt aufmerksam alle gemeldeten Fälle von Gewalt gegen Frauen.

Die EU verurteilt alle Formen von Gewalt gegen Frauen und andere gefährdete Gruppen, und die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin greift dieses Thema regelmäßig in öffentlichen Erklärungen sowie in Gesprächen mit der ägyptischen Seite auf. Angesichts der jüngsten Entwicklungen im Land erwartet die EU umso mehr, dass die neue ägyptische Übergangsregierung den Menschenrechtsverpflichtungen — auch hinsichtlich der Rechte der Frauen — nachkommt, die Ägypten im Rahmen des Assoziierungsabkommens eingegangen ist.

Der EU-Sonderbeauftragte für Menschenrechte, Stavros Lambrinidis, besuchte Ägypten im Februar 2014 zum fünften Mal und erhielt vom Minister für Inneres und Justiz und von der Staatsanwaltschaft die Zusicherung, „dass sie alle Fälle mutmaßlichen Missbrauchs durch die Polizei, die in dem vorzulegenden Bericht der Untersuchungskommission genannt werden, untersuchen werden".

Im Bericht 2013 über die Fortschritte bei der Umsetzung der Nachbarschaftspolitik der Europäischen Union in Ägypten fordert die EU Ägypten unter anderem auf, „den Schutz der Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter zu gewährleisten", „völlig auf die Verurteilung von Zivilisten durch Militärgerichte zu verzichten" und „sicherzustellen, dass die zahlreichen Fälle von Gewalt, einschließlich des sexuellen Missbrauchs, untersucht und die Täter umgehend der Justiz überstellt werden".

Die EU-Delegation in Ägypten finanziert mit insgesamt 3,3 Mio. EUR neun Gender-Projekte zivilgesellschaftlicher Organisationen.

Im Rahmen des Europäischen Nachbarschafts- und Partnerschaftsinstruments finanziert die EU auch das UN-Programm 2012-2016 „Spring Forward for Women" (mit 7 Mio. EUR von insgesamt 8,2 Mio. EUR).

Zudem gehören die Rechte der Frau auch zu den Schlüsselprioritäten des Länderstrategiepapiers für Ägypten zu Menschenrechsfragen.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002713/14
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) και Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Δικαιώματα των γυναικών που κρατούνται στην Αίγυπτο

Πρόσφατες αναφορές στον Τύπο έχουν αποκαλύψει ότι η Αίγυπτος διεξάγει για άλλη μια φορά «τεστ παρθενίας» στις γυναίκες που έχουν συλληφθεί. Τα «τεστ παρθενίας» είναι επεμβατική πρακτική και η Διεθνής Αμνηστία την θεωρεί μια μορφή βασανιστηρίου. Είναι μια εξέταση που ελέγχει για αίμα στον παρθενικό υμένα. Θα πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι οι αναφορές αυτές δεν έχουν ευρέως επαληθευτεί ή επιβεβαιωθεί. Όταν ο αιγυπτιακός στρατός ανέλαβε αρχικά την εξουσία, δήλωσε ότι θα απαγορεύσει τα τεστ παρθενίας, αλλά αυτό δεν έχει ακόμη συμβεί. Πράγματι, το 2012 ο Στρατηγός Abdel Fattah el-Sissi υπερασπίστηκε την πρακτική αυτή, δηλώνοντας ότι είχε σκοπό να προστατεύσει τα κορίτσια από βιασμό, και τους στρατιώτες και τους αστυνομικούς από κατηγορίες για βιασμό. Είναι ανησυχητικό το γεγονός ότι ένας Αιγύπτιος υποψήφιος Πρόεδρος υπερασπίζεται παρόμοια τεστ, που παραβιάζουν τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών και αποτελούν σαφώς παραβίαση της Σύμβασης για την Εξάλειψη όλων των Μορφών Διακρίσεων κατά των Γυναικών (CEDAW). Επιπλέον, έρχονται να προστεθούν σε μια νέα προσπάθεια καταστολής των πολιτικών διαμαρτυριών, με τους διαδηλωτές να συλλαμβάνονται και να κρατούνται κάτω από φρικτές συνθήκες στις φυλακές.

Η Taskforce ΕΕ-Αιγύπτου ενέκρινε ένα πακέτο βοήθειας για να βοηθήσει την προώθηση της εκπαίδευσης, την καταπολέμηση των καταχρήσεων σε βάρος των γυναικών και την αύξηση της συμμετοχής των γυναικών στην εκλογική διαδικασία. Ωστόσο, είναι σημαντικό για την Επιτροπή να συνεχίσει να μιλάει ανοιχτά όταν παραβιάζονται τα δικαιώματα των αιγυπτίων πολιτών, όπως στην προκειμένη περίπτωση.

1. Ποιες πιέσεις προτίθεται να ασκήσει η Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος, με σκοπό να διασφαλιστεί ότι η μελλοντική ηγεσία της Αιγύπτου θα απαγορεύσει αυτά τα λεγόμενα «τεστ παρθενίας» και θα βελτιώσει τα δικαιώματα του πλέον ευάλωτου τμήματος του πληθυσμού της χώρας, υπό το φως των νέων σκληρών μέτρων καταστολής των πολιτικά αντιφρονούντων;

2. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να προσφέρει οικονομική βοήθεια ή διαμεσολάβηση, έτσι ώστε οι ισχυρισμοί περί στρατιωτικής καταπίεσης να διερευνηθούν σε πολιτικά δικαστήρια, και οι δράστες να οδηγηθούν στη δικαιοσύνη;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου κ. Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η ΕΕ είναι ενήμερη για την κατάσταση των γυναικών στην Αίγυπτο και η αντιπροσωπεία της ΕΕ στο Κάιρο βρίσκεται σε τακτική επαφή με τις τοπικές οργανώσεις της κοινωνίας των πολιτών και παρακολουθεί στενά τις καταγγελλόμενες υποθέσεις άσκησης βίας σε βάρος των γυναικών.

Η ΕΕ καταδικάζει όλες τις μορφές βίας κατά των γυναικών και άλλων ευάλωτων ομάδων και η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής εγείρει τακτικά το ζήτημα σε δημόσιες δηλώσεις, καθώς και ενώπιον των Αιγυπτίων ομολόγων της. Ακόμη περισσότερο, ιδίως μετά τις πρόσφατες εξελίξεις στη χώρα, η ΕΕ αναμένει ότι η νέα αιγυπτιακή προσωρινή διοίκηση θα τηρήσει τις δεσμεύσεις της στον τομέα των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών, που έχουν αναληφθεί στο πλαίσιο της συμφωνίας σύνδεσης με την Αίγυπτο.

Ο ειδικός εντεταλμένος της ΕΕ (ΕΕΕΕ) για τα Ανθρώπινα Δικαιώματα, κ. Λαμπρινίδης, πραγματοποίησε την πέμπτη επίσκεψη του στην Αίγυπτο τον Φεβρουάριο του 2014, και έλαβε από τους υπουργούς εσωτερικών και δικαιοσύνης και την εισαγγελική αρχή τη διαβεβαίωση ότι «θα διερευνήσουν όλες τις καταγγελίες για κατάχρηση εξουσίας από την αστυνομία, οι οποίες θα συμπεριληφθούν στη μελλοντική έκθεση της διερευνητικής των πραγμάτων επιτροπής».

Με την έκθεση προόδου του 2013 σχετικά με την εφαρμογή της πολιτικής γειτονίας της ΕΕ στην Αίγυπτο, η ΕΕ καλεί την Αίγυπτο, μεταξύ άλλων, «να εξασφαλίσει την προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών και της ισότητας των φύλων», «να σταματήσει εντελώς τη χρήση στρατιωτικών δικαστηρίων για την εκδίκαση υποθέσεων πολιτών» και «να διασφαλίσει τη διερεύνηση των πολυάριθμων υποθέσεων βίας, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της σεξουαλικής κακοποίησης, και την άμεση προσαγωγή των δραστών ενώπιον της δικαιοσύνης».

Η αντιπροσωπεία της ΕΕ στην Αίγυπτο χρηματοδοτεί 9 σχέδια οργανώσεων της κοινωνίας των πολιτών για την ισότητα των φύλων, συνολικού ποσού ύψους 3,3 εκατ. ευρώ.

Στο πλαίσιο του ευρωπαϊκού μηχανισμού γειτονίας και εταιρικής σχέσης, η ΕΕ χρηματοδοτεί επίσης το πρόγραμμα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για το 2012-2016 «Spring forward for Women» («Ένα βήμα προς τα εμπρός για τις γυναίκες») (7 εκατομμύρια ευρώ εκ συνόλου 8,2 εκατομμυρίων).

Τέλος, τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών συνιστούν βασική προτεραιότητα της εθνικής στρατηγικής για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα στην Αίγυπτο.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002713/14
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) et Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7 mars 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Droits des femmes détenues en Égypte

De récentes informations ont révélé que l'Égypte procède une fois de plus à des «tests de virginité» sur les femmes détenues. Ces tests sont une atteinte à la vie privée et Amnesty International estime qu'ils sont une forme de torture. Il s'agit d'un examen de contrôle du sang au niveau de l'hymen. Il convient de noter que l'information n'a pas été totalement vérifiée ou confirmée. Lorsque l'armée égyptienne a pris le pouvoir, elle a affirmé qu'elle interdirait les tests de virginité, ce qu'elle n'a toujours pas fait. En 2012, le Général Abdel Fattah Al-Sissi a défendu les tests de virginité en déclarant qu'ils ont pour but de «protéger les femmes contre le viol ainsi que les soldats et les officiers de toute accusation de viol». Il est inquiétant qu'un candidat à l'élection présidentielle égyptienne approuve de tels tests, qui portent atteinte aux droits des femmes. Les tests constituent une violation manifeste de la Convention des Nations unies sur l'élimination de toutes les formes de discrimination à l'égard des femmes. En outre, ils s'ajoutent aux nouvelles mesures déployées pour mettre fin aux protestations politiques, à savoir l'arrestation des manifestants et la détention dans d'épouvantables conditions carcérales.

Le groupe de travail pour l'Égypte a approuvé un ensemble de mesures de soutien pour promouvoir l'éducation, lutter contre les violences envers les femmes et accroître la participation des femmes dans le processus électoral. Toutefois, il est important que la Commission continue de dénoncer les violations faites à l'égard des droits des citoyens égyptiens, comme dans ce cas-ci.

1. Quels moyens de pression la vice-présidente et haute représentante entend-elle utiliser pour garantir que le prochain dirigeant de l'Égypte interdira les tests de virginité et améliore les droits des personnes les plus vulnérables dans le pays au vu des violentes répressions exercées à l'encontre des dissidents politiques?

2. La Commission prévoit-elle de fournir une aide financière ou une aide à la médiation afin que ces accusations d'oppression militaire fassent l'objet d'une enquête judiciaire et les responsables soient poursuivis?

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

L'Union européenne est consciente de la situation des femmes en Égypte. La délégation de l'UE au Caire est en contact régulier avec les organisations locales de la société civile et surveille attentivement les cas signalés de violence à l'égard des femmes.

L'Union européenne condamne toutes les formes de violence envers les femmes et d'autres groupes vulnérables et la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante soulève régulièrement cette question dans ses déclarations publiques ainsi qu'auprès de ses homologues égyptiens. En particulier à la lumière des événements récents survenus dans le pays, l'Union européenne espère que la nouvelle administration intérimaire égyptienne respectera les engagements en matière de droits humains, y compris des droits des femmes, pris dans le cadre de l'accord d'association conclu avec l'Égypte.

Le représentant spécial de l'Union européenne pour les Droits de l'homme, M. Lambrinidis, a effectué sa cinquième visite en Égypte en février 2014 et obtenu des ministres de l'intérieur et de la justice ainsi que du procureur général l'engagement «qu'ils allaient examiner toutes les allégations concernant l'abus de pouvoir par la police, contenues dans le futur rapport de la commission d'enquête».

Dans le rapport de suivi de 2013 sur la mise en œuvre de la politique européenne de voisinage en Égypte, l'UE invite l'Égypte, notamment, à «assurer la protection des droits des femmes et l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes», «à renoncer complètement à traduire les civils devant des tribunaux militaires» et à «veiller à ce que les enquêtes sur les nombreux cas de violence, y compris les abus sexuels, soient menées à bien et à ce que les auteurs de ces actes soient traduits en justice sans tarder».

La délégation de l'UE en Égypte finance neuf projets d'organisations de la société civile sur l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes, pour un montant total de 3,3 millions d'euros.

Dans le cadre de l'instrument européen de voisinage et de partenariat, l'UE finance également le programme 2012-2016 des Nations unies, intitulé «Le printemps des femmes» (7 millions d'euros sur 8,2).

Enfin, les droits des femmes sont une priorité essentielle de la stratégie en matière de Droits de l'homme pour l'Égypte.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002713/14
upućeno Komisiji (potpredsjednici/Visokoj predstavnici)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) i Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: VP/HR — prava žena u pritvorima u Egiptu

Najnoviji novinski navodi otkrivaju da se u Egiptu opet provode „testovi djevičanstva" kod žena koje se nalaze u pritvoru. Testovi djevičanstva invazivna su metoda, a Amnesty International ih smatra oblikom mučenja. Sastoje se od pregleda pri kojem se provjerava prisutnost krvi u himenu. Treba imati na umu da spomenuti navodi nisu u širem okviru provjereni niti potvrđeni. Neposredno nakon što je egipatska vojska preuzela vlast, najavila je da će zabraniti testove djevičanstva, no to se još nije dogodilo. Zapravo je 2012. general Abdel Fattah el-Sissi opravdavao navedene testove izjavama da su oni namijenjeni da bi „zaštitili djevojke od silovanja, a vojnike i časnike od optužbi za silovanje". Zabrinjavajuće je što pretendent na položaj egipatskog predsjednika tolerira takve testove kojima se krše prava žena. Oni jasno predstavljaju povredu Konvencije UN-a o uklanjanju svih oblika diskriminacije žena. Osim toga, oni su nastavak ponovnih pokušaja gušenja političkih prosvjeda u kojima se prosvjednici uhićuju i podvrgavaju užasnim zatvorskim uvjetima.

Radna skupina EU-a za Egipat odobrila je paket pomoći za obrazovanje, borbu protiv zlostavljanja žena i jače uključivanje žena u izborni proces. Međutim, važno je da se Komisija i dalje nastavi otvoreno izjašnjavati u slučajevima kada se krše prava egipatskih građana, kao što se događa u ovom slučaju.

1. Na koji način potpredsjednica Komisije/visoka predstavnica namjerava izvršiti utjecaj kako bi se osiguralo da budući čelnik Egipta zabrani te tzv. testove djevičanstva i unaprijedi prava onih najugroženijih u toj zemlji s obzirom na najnoviji ozbiljan pritisak na političke neistomišljenike?

2. Namjerava li Komisija ponuditi financijsku pomoć ili pomoć u posredovanju kako bi se navedene tvrdnje o vojnom pritisku mogle istražiti na civilnim sudovima, a počinitelji izvesti pred sud?

Odgovor visoke predstavnice/potpredsjednice Ashton u ime Komisije
(2. lipnja 2014.)

EU je obaviješten o položaju žena u Egiptu i Delegacija EU-a u Kairu u redovitim je kontaktima s lokalnim organizacijama civilnog društva te pomno prati prijavljene slučajeve nasilja nad ženama.

EU osuđuje svaki oblik nasilja nad ženama i drugim ranjivim skupinama, a visoka predstavnica/potpredsjednica redovito postavlja to pitanje u svojim javnim izjavama i u kontaktima s egipatskim kolegama. Štoviše, u svjetlu nedavnih događaja u toj zemlji EU očekuje da će nova egipatska prijelazna vlada poštovati obveze koje se odnose na zaštitu ljudskih prava, uključujući prava žena, iz Sporazuma o pridruživanju s Egiptom.

Ministri unutarnjih poslova i pravosuđa te državni odvjetnik obećali su posebnom predstavniku Europske unije za ljudska prava Lambrinidisu za vrijeme njegovog petog posjeta Egiptu u veljači „da će istražiti sve navode o policijskom zlostavljanju iz budućeg izvješća Komisije za utvrđivanje činjenica".

U svom izvješću o napretku u provedbi europske politike susjedstva u Egiptu za 2013. EU je pozvao Egipat da, među ostalim, „osigura zaštitu ženskih prava i ravnopravnost spolova", „u potpunosti obustavi suđenja civilima na vojnim sudovima" i „osigura provođenje istraga u mnogim slučajevima nasilja, uključujući seksualno zlostavljanje, i brzo dovođenje počinitelja pred lice pravde".

Delegacija EU-a u Egiptu financira 9 projekata organizacija civilnog društva o rodnim pitanjima u ukupnom iznosu od 3,3 milijuna EUR.

U okviru Europskog instrumenta za susjedske odnose i partnerstvo EU također financira program UN-a pod nazivom „Skok naprijed za žene" za razdoblje od 2012. do 2016. (7 milijuna EUR od ukupno 8,2 milijuna).

Naposljetku, prava žena ključni su prioritet u strategiji zaštite ljudskih prava za Egipat.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002713/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) e Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Diritti delle donne detenute in Egitto

Secondo notizie recentemente diramate dagli organi di informazione, l'Egitto starebbe nuovamente realizzando «test di verginità» sulle donne in stato di detenzione. I test in questione sono invasivi e Amnesty International li considera una forma di tortura. Essi consistono in un esame che verifica la presenza di sangue nell'imene. Va rilevato che le notizie non sono state completamente verificate o confermate. Inizialmente quando l'esercito egiziano è salito al potere ha dichiarato che avrebbe messo al bando i test di verginità, ma finora ciò non è avvenuto. In realtà nel 2012 il generale Abdel Fattah el-Sissi ha difeso i test dichiarando che il loro scopo era quello di tutelare le ragazze dagli stupri, da un lato, e i soldati e ufficiali dalle accuse di violenza sessuale, dall'altro. Il fatto che uno dei candidati alle elezioni presidenziali egiziane giustifichi test come quelli in oggetto suscita preoccupazione, dal momento che questi ultimi, oltre a ledere i diritti delle donne, costituiscono una chiara violazione della Convenzione sull'eliminazione di ogni forma di discriminazione nei confronti della donna (CEDAW). Essi vanno inoltre ad aggiungersi ai rinnovati sforzi, tesi al soffocamento delle proteste politiche, nell'ambito dei quali i manifestanti sono arrestati e detenuti in condizioni terribili.

La task force UE-Egitto ha approvato un pacchetto di aiuti per contribuire a promuovere l'istruzione, combattere gli abusi nei confronti delle donne e incrementare la partecipazione di queste ultime al processo elettorale. È comunque importante che la Commissione continui a far sentire la sua voce quando si verificano violazioni dei diritti dei cittadini egiziani come quelle in oggetto.

1. Che tipo di pressioni intende esercitare il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante al fine di garantire che il futuro leader egiziano metta al bando i cosiddetti «test di verginità» e migliori i diritti delle fasce più vulnerabili della popolazione del paese, alla luce della ripresa di una dura repressione nei confronti dei dissidenti politici?

2. Intende la Commissione offrire assistenza a livello finanziario o di mediazione per permettere la conduzione, da parte di tribunali civili, di indagini sulla presunta oppressione militare e quindi la consegna alla giustizia dei responsabili?

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

L'UE è a conoscenza della situazione della donna in Egitto e la delegazione dell'Unione europea al Cairo è in costante contatto con le organizzazioni locali della società civile e monitora da vicino i casi segnalati di violenza contro le donne.

L'UE condanna ogni forma di violenza contro le donne e altre categorie vulnerabili e l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente solleva regolarmente il problema nelle sue dichiarazioni pubbliche e con le sue controparti egiziane. E tanto più oggi, alla luce dei recenti sviluppi nel paese, l'UE si attende che la nuova amministrazione provvisoria egiziana rispetti gli impegni in materia di diritti umani, come i diritti delle donne, assunti nel quadro dell'Accordo di associazione concluso con l'Egitto.

Il rappresentante speciale dell'UE per i diritti umani, Stavros Lambrinidis, ha compiuto la sua quinta visita in Egitto nel febbraio 2014 ed ha ottenuto l'impegno dei ministri dell'Interno e della Giustizia e della Procura generale egiziana di indagare su tutte le accuse di abusi da parte della polizia figuranti nella relazione della commissione d'inchiesta.

Nella relazione 2013 sui progressi compiuti nell'attuazione della politica europea di vicinato in Egitto, l'UE ha invitato l'Egitto, tra le altre cose, a garantire la tutela dei diritti delle donne e la parità di genere, ad arrestare completamente il ricorso a tribunali militari per giudicare i civili e a garantire che siano eseguite indagini sui numerosi casi di violenza segnalati, compresi gli abusi sessuali e che i responsabili siano immediatamente consegnati alla giustizia.

La delegazione dell'Unione europea in Egitto sta finanziando 9 progetti di organizzazioni della società civile sulle problematiche di genere, per un totale di 3,3 milioni di euro.

Nel quadro dello strumento europeo di vicinato e partenariato l'UE finanzia altresì il programma «Spring forward for women» 2012-2016 delle Nazioni Unite (7 milioni di EUR su complessivi 8,2 milioni).

Infine, i diritti delle donne sono una priorità fondamentale della strategia per l'Egitto in materia di diritti umani.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-002713/14
Komisijai (Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotojai ir vyriausiajai įgaliotinei)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) ir Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(2014 m. kovo 7 d.)

Tema: VP/HR – Egipte sulaikomų moterų teisės

Anot naujausių pranešimų, Egipte vėl atliekami sulaikytų moterų nekaltybės patikrinimai. Nekaltybės patikrinimai yra invaziniai tyrimai ir organizacija „Amnesty International“ juos laiko kankinimo rūšimi. Šie tyrimai pagrįsti kraujo buvimo mergystės plėvėje tikrinimu. Pažymėtina, kad minėti pranešimai nėra visuotinai patikrinti ar patvirtinti. Kai Egipto armija pirmą kartą gavo valdžią, ji paskelbė, kad uždraus nekaltybės patikrinimus, tačiau ligi šiol to nepadarė. Iš tiesų 2012 m. generolas Abdelis Fatachas al-Sisis (Abdel Fattah el-Sissi) gynė šiuos patikrinimus, teigdamas, kad jais siekiama „apsaugoti merginas nuo išžaginimo ir kareivius bei karininkus nuo apkaltinimo išžaginimu“. Nerimą kelia tai, kad kandidatas į Egipto prezidentus toleruoja šiuos patikrinimus, kurie yra moterų žmogaus teisių pažeidimas. Minėti patikrinimai akivaizdžiai yra Konvencijos dėl visų formų diskriminacijos panaikinimo moterims (angl. CEDAW) nuostatų nesilaikymas. Be to, jais prisidedama prie atnaujintų pastangų nuslopinti politinius protestus sulaikant protestuotojus ir kalinant juos siaubingomis sąlygomis.

ES ir Egipto darbo grupė patvirtino pagalbos paketą, kuriuo siekiama padėti skatinti švietimą, kovoti su nusikaltimais prieš moteris ir didinti moterų dalyvavimą rinkimų procese. Vis dėlto svarbu, kad Komisija ir toliau atvirai pasisakytų, kai pažeidžiamos Egipto piliečių teisės, kaip šiuo atveju.

1. Kokį poveikį ketina daryti Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotoja ir vyriausioji įgaliotinė, siekdama užtikrinti, kad būsimas Egipto vadovas uždraustų vadinamuosius nekaltybės patikrinimus ir geriau užtikrintų labiausiai pažeidžiamų šalies gyventojų teises atsižvelgiant į naujas griežtas priemones, taikomas politinių disidentų atžvilgiu?

2. Ar Komisija ketina teikti finansinę arba tarpininkavimo pagalbą, kad šie skundai dėl karinės priespaudos galėtų būti ištirti civiliniuose teismuose ir kaltininkai būtų patraukti atsakomybėn?

Europos Sąjungos vyriausiosios įgaliotinės ir Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotojos Catherine Ashton atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2014 m. birželio 2 d.)

ES žino apie moterų padėtį Egipte. ES delegacija Kaire palaiko nuolatinius ryšius su vietos pilietinės visuomenės organizacijomis ir atidžiai stebi smurto prieš moteris atvejus, apie kuriuos pranešama.

ES smerkia visų formų smurtą prieš moteris ir kitas pažeidžiamas grupes ir Sąjungos vyriausioji įgaliotinė ir Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotoja reguliariai kelia šį klausimą savo viešuose pareiškimuose ir per susitikimus su Egipto atstovais. Atsižvelgdama į naujausius įvykius šioje šalyje, ES tikisi, kad nauja Egipto laikinoji administracija vykdys įsipareigojimus žmogaus teisių, įskaitant moterų teises, srityje, nustatytus asociacijos susitarime su Egiptu.

ES specialusis įgaliotinis žmogaus teisių klausimais S. Lambrinidis 2014 m. vasario mėn. apsilankė Egipte penktą kartą ir pasiekė, kad vidaus reikalų ir teisingumo ministrai bei prokuroras įsipareigotų „ištirti visus įtarimus dėl policijos piktnaudžiavimo, kurie bus nurodyti būsimoje faktų nustatymo komisijos ataskaitoje“.

2013 m. dokumente, kuriame apžvelgiama pažanga įgyvendinant ES kaimynystės politiką Egipte, ES ragina Egiptą, be kita ko, „užtikrinti moterų teisių apsaugą ir lyčių lygybę“, „visiškai atsisakyti to, kad civilius gyventojus teistų karo teismai“ ir „užtikrinti, kad dažni smurto atvejai, įskaitant seksualinės prievartos atvejus, būtų tiriami ir kad kaltininkai būtų nedelsiant traukiami baudžiamojon atsakomybėn.“

ES delegacija Egipte finansuoja 9 pilietinės visuomenės organizacijų projektus, susijusius su lyčių lygybe. Iš viso tam skiriama 3,3 mln. eurų.

Be to, pasitelkusi Europos kaimynystės ir partnerystės priemonę ES teikia finansavimą 2012-2016 m. JT programai „Šuolis į priekį moterų labui“ (7 mln. eurų iš 8,2 mln. eurų).

Galiausiai moterų teisės yra pagrindinis Egipto žmogaus teisių strategijos prioritetas.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002713/14
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) u Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: VP/HR — Id-drittijiet tan-nisa miżmuma f'detenzjoni fl-Eġittu

Rapporti riċenti tal-aħbarijiet żvelaw li l-Eġittu qed jerġa' jwettaq "testijiet tal-virġinità" fuq in-nisa miżmuma f'detenzjoni. It-testijiet tal-virġinità huma invażivi u l-Amnesty International tqis li huma forma ta' tortura. Dawn jikkonsistu f'eżami li jiċċekkja jekk hemmx demm fl-imene (fil-ħajta). Ta' min jinnota li r-rapporti ma ġewx verifikati estensivament jew ikkonfermati. Meta l-armata Eġizzjana ħadet il-poter għall-ewwel darba, din iddikjarat li se tipprojbixxi t-testijiet tal-virġinità, imma dan għadu ma seħħx. Fil-fatt, fl-2012 il-Ġeneral Abdel Fattah el-Sissi ddefenda t-testijiet billi qal li dawn kienu maħsuba "biex jipproteġu lit-tfajliet mill-istupru, u lis-suldati u l-uffiċjali minn akkużi ta' stupru". Hu fatt inkwetanti li kandidat għall-elezzjonijiet presidenzjali Eġizzjani jiddefendi testijiet bħal dawn, li jiksru d-drittijiet tan-nisa. Dawn it-testijiet jikkostitwixxu b'mod ċar ksur tal-Konvenzjoni tan-Nazzjonijiet Uniti dwar l-Eliminazzjoni ta' Kull Forma ta' Diskriminazzjoni kontra n-Nisa (CEDAW). Barra minn hekk, dawn qed iseħħu flimkien ma' sforzi mġedda biex jintemmu l-protesti politiċi, billi min jipprotesta qed jiġi arrestat u suġġett għal kundizzjonijit orrendi fil-ħabs.

It-Taskforce UE-l-Eġittu approvat pakkett ta' għajnuna li jgħin il-promozzjoni tal-edukazzjoni, il-ġlieda kontra l-abbużi min-nisa u ż-żieda tal-parteċipazzjoni tan-nisa fil-proċess elettorali. Madankollu, hu importanti li l-Kummissjoni tkompli ssemma' leħinha meta jinkisru d-drittijiet taċ-ċittadini Eġizzjani, kif qed jiġri f'dan il-każ.

1. X'livell ta' piż bi ħsiebha teżerċita l-Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli bil-għan li tiżgura li l-mexxej futur tal-Eġittu jipprojbixxi dawn it-testijiet hekk imsejħa tal-virġinità u jtejjeb id-drittijiet tal-persuni l-iktar vulnerabbli fil-pajjiż fid-dawl tal-operazzjonijiet severi ġodda kontra l-opponenti politiċi?

2. Il-Kummissjoni qed tippjana li toffri għajnuna finanzjarja jew ta' medjazzjoni sabiex dawn l-ilmenti ta' oppressjoni militari jkunu jistgħu jiġu investigati fil-qrati ċivili, u l-awturi tar-reati jinġabu quddiem il-ġustizzja?

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

L-UE tinsab konxja tas-sitwazzjoni tan-nisa fl-Eġittu u d-Delegazzjoni tal-UE fil-Kajr hija f'kuntatt regolari mal-Organizzazzjonijiet tas-Soċjetà Ċivili lokali u tissorvelja mill-qrib każijiet irrappurtati ta' vjolenza kontra n-nisa.

L-UE tikkundanna kull forma ta' vjolenza kontra n-nisa u gruppi oħra vulnerabbli u r-RGħ/VP tqajjem il-kwistjoni regolarment f'dikjarazzjonijiet pubbliċi kif ukoll mal-kontropartijiet Eġizzjani tagħha. Saħansitra iktar fid-dawl tal-iżviluppi riċenti fil-pajjiż, l-UE tistenna li l-amministrazzjoni interim Eġizzjana l-ġdida se tirrispetta l-impenji tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem, inklużi d-drittijiet tan-nisa, meħuda skont il-Ftehim ta' Assoċjazzjoni konkluż mal-Eġittu.

Ir-RSUE għad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem Lambrinidis wettaq il-ħames żjara tiegħu fl-Eġittu fi Frar 2014, u kiseb mill-Ministri tal-Intern u l-Ġustizzja u mill-Prosekutur Pubbliku l-impenn "li huma se jinvestigaw kull allegazzjoni ta' abbuż mill-pulizija inkluż fir-Rapport tal-Kummissjoni għat-Tiftix tal-Fatti futur".

Fil-Progress għall-implimentazzjoni tal-Politika tal-Viċinat tal-UE fl-Eġittu tal-2013, l-UE tistieden l-Eġittu biex, *inter alia*, "jiżgura l-protezzjoni tad-drittijiet tan-nisa u l-ugwaljanza tas-sessi", "iwaqqaf kompletament l-użu tal-qrati militari biex jiġġudikaw persuni ċivili" u "jiżgura li investigazzjonijiet dwar il-ħafna każijiet ta' vjolenza, inkluż abbuż sesswali, jiġu mwettqa u li l-awturi tar-reati jinġiebu minnufih quddiem il-ġustizzja".

Id-Delegazzjoni tal-UE fl-Eġittu qed tiffinanzja disa' proġetti dwar il-kwistjoni tal-ugwaljanza tas-sessi, għal ammont totali ta' EUR 3,3 miljun.

Fil-qafas tal-Istrument Ewropew ta' Viċinat u Sħubija, l-UE qed tiffinanzja wkoll il-programm tan-NU 2012-2016 "Rebbiegħa għall-Avvanz tan-Nisa", (EUR 7 miljun minn 8,2).

Fl-aħħar nett, id-drittijiet tan-nisa huma prijorità prinċipali fl-Istrateġija għad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem għall-Pajjiżi għall-Eġittu.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002713/14
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) en Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7 maart 2014)

Betreft: VP/HR — Rechten van gedetineerde vrouwen in Egypte

Recente nieuwsberichten hebben aan het licht gebracht dat in Egypte alweer „maagdelijkheidstests" worden uitgevoerd op gedetineerde vrouwen. Maagdelijkheidstests zijn invasief en worden door Amnesty International beschouwd als een vorm van marteling. De tests bestaan uit een onderzoek waarbij wordt gecontroleerd of zich bloed in het maagdenvlies bevindt. De berichten zijn echter niet in brede kring geverifieerd of bevestigd. Toen het Egyptische leger voor het eerst aan de macht kwam, verklaarde het de maagdelijkheidstests te willen verbieden, maar dat is nog steeds niet gebeurd. In feite heeft generaal Abdel Fattah el-Sissi in 2012 de tests verdedigd en verklaard dat ze bedoeld waren om „meisjes te beschermen tegen verkrachting, en de soldaten en officieren tegen beschuldigingen van verkrachting". Het is zorgwekkend dat een Egyptische presidentskandidaat deze tests, die de rechten van vrouwen schenden, vergoelijkt. Zij vormen duidelijk een inbreuk op het VN-Verdrag inzake de uitbanning van alle vormen van discriminatie van de vrouw (IVDV). Bovendien gaan de tests hand in hand met hernieuwde pogingen om politieke protesten te onderdrukken, waarbij de demonstranten worden gearresteerd en blootgesteld aan afschuwelijke omstandigheden in gevangenissen.

De Taskforce EU-Egypte heeft een hulppakket goedgekeurd ter bevordering van onderwijs, bestrijding van vrouwenmishandeling en vergroting van de participatie van vrouwen in het verkiezingsproces. Toch is het belangrijk dat de Commissie haar stem blijft verheffen wanneer de rechten van Egyptische burgers worden geschonden, zoals in dit geval.

1. Op welke manier wil de VV/HV politieke druk uitoefenen om er zorg voor te dragen dat de toekomstige leider van Egypte de zogeheten maagdelijkheidstests verbiedt en de rechten van het kwetsbaarste deel van de bevolking van het land verbetert, in het licht van deze nieuwe, ernstige onderdrukking van politieke dissidenten?

2. Is de Commissie van plan om financiële bijstand te leveren of bemiddeling aan te bieden, zodat deze beweringen over militaire onderdrukking kunnen worden onderzocht door civiele rechtbanken en de daders berecht kunnen worden?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(2 juni 2014)

De EU is zich bewust van de situatie van vrouwen in Egypte. De EU-delegatie in Caïro heeft regelmatig contact met lokale maatschappelijke organisaties en houdt de gerapporteerde gevallen van geweld tegen vrouwen nauwlettend in de gaten.

De EU veroordeelt alle vormen van geweld tegenover vrouwen en andere kwetsbare groepen, en de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter komt hier vaak op terug, zowel in openbare verklaringen als in gesprekken met haar Egyptische tegenhangers. Gezien de recente ontwikkelingen in het land verwacht de EU meer dan ooit dat het nieuwe Egyptische interim-bestuur de mensenrechtenverplichtingen, waaronder ook vrouwenrechten, zal eerbiedigen zoals overeengekomen in de associatieovereenkomst.

In februari 2014 bracht de speciale vertegenwoordiger van de EU voor de mensenrechten Lambrinidis voor de vijfde keer een bezoek aan Egypte en kreeg hij de toezegging van de ministers van Binnenlandse Zaken en Justitie en van de openbaar aanklager, dat zij „alle beschuldigingen inzake misbruik door de politie zouden onderzoeken die worden beschreven in het te verschijnen verslag van de commissie voor feitenonderzoek".

In haar voortgangsverslag 2013 over de tenuitvoerlegging van het EU-nabuurschapsbeleid in Egypte nodigt de EU het land onder andere uit om „de bescherming van vrouwenrechten en gendergelijkheid te waarborgen", „volledig op te houden met het gebruiken van militaire rechtbanken om burgers te berechten en ervoor te zorgen dat er bij de vele gevallen van geweldpleging, waaronder seksueel geweld, steeds een onderzoek wordt gevoerd en dat de daders snel worden berecht".

De EU-delegatie in Egypte financiert momenteel 9 projecten van maatschappelijke organisaties voor in totaal 3,3 miljoen euro.

In het kader van het Europees nabuurschaps- en partnerschapsinstrument verleent de EU ook financiële steun, 7 miljoen euro op een totaal van 8,2, aan het VN-programma „Spring forward for women", dat van 2012 tot 2016 loopt.

Ten slotte vormen vrouwenrechten een topprioriteit in de landenstrategie voor Egypte inzake mensenrechten.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002713/14
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) oraz Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7 marca 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Prawa zatrzymywanych kobiet w Egipcie

Według niedawnych doniesień w Egipcie zatrzymywane kobiety są ponownie poddawane „testom dziewictwa". „Testy dziewictwa" są badaniami inwazyjnymi, a Amnesty International uważa je za rodzaj tortury. Polegają one na badaniu obecności krwi w błonie dziewiczej. Należy zauważyć, że doniesienia te nie zostały jeszcze powszechnie sprawdzone ani potwierdzone. Kiedy wojsko egipskie zdobyło władzę, oświadczyło, że zakaże „testów dziewictwa", lecz do tej pory tak się nie stało. W 2012 r. generał Abdel Fattah el-Sissi bronił testów twierdząc, że ich celem jest „chronienie dziewczynek przed gwałtem, a żołnierzy i oficerów przed oskarżeniami o gwałt". Jest niepokojące, że kandydat na prezydenta Egiptu godzi się na przeprowadzanie testów, które łamią prawa kobiet i stanowią oczywiste naruszenie Konwencji ONZ w sprawie likwidacji wszelkich form dyskryminacji kobiet z 1979 r. (CEDAW). Ponadto sumują się one do ponawianych wysiłków mających na celu wygaszenie protestów politycznych poprzez zatrzymywanie protestujących i przetrzymywanie ich w strasznych warunkach więziennych.

Grupa zadaniowa UE-Egipt zatwierdziła pakiet wsparcia mający na celu promowanie edukacji, zwalczanie seksualnego wykorzystywania kobiet i zwiększenie ich udziału w procesie wyborczym. Ważne jest jednak, aby Komisja nadal przemawiała jednym głosem, kiedy dochodzi do łamania praw obywateli Egiptu, jak ma to miejsce w tym przypadku.

1. Jakie naciski zamierza wywrzeć Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel, aby zagwarantować, że przyszły przywódca Egiptu zakaże takich testów i zwiększy prawa najsłabszych mieszkańców kraju w świetle nowych surowych środków zastosowanych wobec dysydentów politycznych?

2. Czy Komisja zamierza udzielić wsparcia finansowego lub czy zamierza pośredniczyć w przeprowadzeniu dochodzenia w sądach cywilnych, aby postawić sprawców w obliczu wymiaru sprawiedliwości?

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

Unia Europejska jest świadoma sytuacji kobiet w Egipcie, a delegatura UE w Kairze pozostaje w stałym kontakcie z lokalnymi organizacjami społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i uważnie śledzi zgłoszone przypadki przemocy wobec kobiet.

UE potępia wszelkie formy przemocy wobec kobiet i innych słabszych społecznie grup, a Wysoka Przedstawiciel / Wiceprzewodnicząca regularnie podnosi tę kwestię w wystąpieniach publicznych i rozmowach z jej egipskimi partnerami. Tym bardziej w świetle ostatnich wydarzeń w tym kraju UE oczekuje, że nowa egipska tymczasowa administracja będzie przestrzegać zobowiązań w zakresie praw człowieka, w tym praw kobiet, podjętych w ramach układu o stowarzyszeniu zawartego z Egiptem.

SPUE ds. praw człowieka, Stavros Lambrinidis, w lutym 2014 r. zakończył swoją piątą wizytę w Egipcie, i uzyskał od ministrów spraw wewnętrznych i sprawiedliwości oraz od prokuratora generalnego zobowiązanie, że „zbadają oni wszystkie domniemane nadużycia, jakich dopuściła się policja, uwzględnione w przyszłym sprawozdaniu Komisji wyjaśniającej".

W sprawozdaniu z 2013 r. z postępów w realizacji europejskiej polityki sąsiedztwa w Egipcie UE zachęca Egipt między innymi do „zapewnienia ochrony praw kobiet i równości płci", „całkowitego zaprzestania stosowania sądów wojskowych do sądzenia osób cywilnych" i „zagwarantowania przeprowadzenia dochodzeń dotyczących wielu przypadków przemocy, w tym wykorzystywania seksualnego, i bezzwłocznego oddania sprawców w ręce wymiaru sprawiedliwości".

Delegatura UE w Egipcie finansuje dziewięć projektów organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego dotyczących kwestii płci, na łączną kwotę 3,3 mln EUR.

W ramach Europejskiego Instrumentu Sąsiedztwa i Partnerstwa UE finansuje również program ONZ na lata 2012-2016 „Krok naprzód dla kobiet" (7 mln EUR z 8,2 mln EUR).

Ponadto prawa kobiet są głównym priorytetem unijnej strategii w dziedzinie praw człowieka dla Egiptu.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002713/14
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) e Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7 de março de 2014)

Assunto: VP/HR — Os direitos das mulheres detidas no Egito

Notícias recentes revelam que o Egito está a praticar novamente «testes de virgindade» em mulheres detidas. Os testes de virgindade são invasivos e a Amnistia Internacional considera-os uma forma de tortura. Os mesmos consistem num exame que verifica a existência de sangue no hímen. Importa referir que estes relatos ainda não foram plenamente verificados ou confirmados. O Exército egípcio, quando inicialmente assumiu o poder, afirmou que iria proibir os testes de virgindade, mas essa promessa ainda se encontra por cumprir. Na realidade, o General Abdel Fattah el-Sissi defendeu a prática destes testes em 2012, afirmando que a sua intenção é «proteger as mulheres contra violações e os soldados e os oficiais contra acusações de violação». É preocupante que um candidato presidencial egípcio aceite este tipo de testes, os quais violam os direitos das mulheres. Os mesmos constituem uma violação da Convenção sobre a Eliminação de Todas as Formas de Discriminação contra as Mulheres (CEDAW). Além disso, a prática destes testes surge conjuntamente com esforços redobrados para acabar com protestos políticos, sendo os protestantes presos e sujeitos a condições prisionais horrendas.

O Grupo de Trabalho UE-Egito aprovou um pacote de auxílio, de modo a promover a educação, a combater abusos contra as mulheres e a aumentar a participação feminina nos processos eleitorais. Todavia, é importante que a Comissão se continue a pronunciar sempre que os direitos dos cidadãos egípcios sejam violados, como acontece neste caso.

1. Qual é a influência que a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante pretende exercer para assegurar que o futuro líder do Egito proíba estes testes de virgindade e melhore os direitos das pessoas mais vulneráveis do país, tendo em conta as recentes medidas repressivas contra os dissidentes políticos?

2. Tenciona a Comissão oferecer assistência financeira ou de mediação, de modo a que estes relatos de opressão militar possam ser investigados em tribunais civis e a que os responsáveis possam, consequentemente, responder perante a justiça?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(2 de junho de 2014)

A UE tem conhecimento da situação das mulheres no Egito e a Delegação da UE no Cairo mantém contactos regulares com as organizações da sociedade civil locais e acompanha de perto os casos notificados de violência contra as mulheres.

A UE condena todas as formas de violência contra as mulheres e outros grupos vulneráveis e a AR/VP aborda regularmente esta questão, tanto nas suas declarações públicas como junto dos seus homólogos egípcios. Tanto mais que, tendo em conta os recentes acontecimentos no país, a União Europeia espera que a nova administração provisória egípcia respeite os compromissos em matéria de direitos humanos, como os direitos das mulheres, assumidos no âmbito do acordo de associação celebrado com o Egito.

O Representante Especial para os direitos humanos, Stavros Lambrinidis, realizou a sua quinta visita ao Egito em fevereiro de 2014 e obteve o compromisso dos Ministros da Administração Interna e da Justiça, bem como do Procurador-Geral egípcios «de que serão investigadas todas as alegações de abuso policial contidas no futuro relatório da comissão de inquérito».

No relatório de 2013 sobre a execução da Política Europeia de Vizinhança no Egito, a UE convidou o Egito a garantir a proteção dos direitos das mulheres e da igualdade de género, a renunciar por completo ao recurso a tribunais militares para julgar civis e a assegurar que os inquéritos sobre os numerosos de casos de violência, incluindo os abusos sexuais, sejam realizados e que os autores dos crimes sejam rapidamente julgados.

A delegação da UE no Egito financia 9 projetos de organizações não governamentais no domínio das questões de género, num montante total de 3,3 milhões de euros.

No âmbito do Instrumento Europeu de Vizinhança e Parceria, a UE financia ainda o programa «Spring Forward for Women» 2012-2016 das Nações Unidas (7 milhões de euros de um total de 8,2 milhões).

Por último, os direitos das mulheres são uma prioridade fulcral da estratégia para o Egito em matéria de direitos humanos.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-002713/14
komissiolle (Varapuheenjohtajalle/Korkealle edustajalle)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) ja Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7. maaliskuuta 2014)

Aihe: VP/HR – pidätettyjen naisten oikeudet Egyptissä

Tuoreimmat uutisraportit ovat paljastaneet, että Egyptissä tehdään jälleen "neitsyystestejä" vankilassa oleville naisille. Neitsyystestit ovat invasiivisia, ja Amnesty International pitää niitä kidutuksena. Niissä testataan, löytyykö immenkalvolta verta. On huomioitava, että raportteja ei ole laajalti tarkistettu tai vahvistettu. Kun Egyptin armeija otti vallan, se ilmoitti lopettavansa neitsyystestit. Mitään ei ole kuitenkaan tapahtunut. Itse asiassa vuonna 2012 kenraali Abdel Fattah el-Sisi puolusti testejä sanomalla, että niiden tarkoitus oli "suojella tyttöjä raiskauksilta sekä sotilaita ja poliiseja raiskaussyytteiltä". On huolestuttavaa, että Egyptin presidenttiehdokas sallii sellaiset testit, jotka rikkovat naisten oikeuksia. Ne rikkovat selkeästi kaikkinaisen naisten syrjinnän poistamista koskevaa YK:n yleissopimusta. Testit ovat lisänä uusiin yrityksiin nujertaa poliittisia protesteja, joihin osallistuvia mielenosoittajia pidätetään ja pidetään hirvittävissä vankilaolosuhteissa.

EU:n ja Egyptin työryhmä on hyväksynyt tukipaketin, jonka tarkoituksena on edistää koulutusta, torjua naisiin kohdistuvaa väkivaltaa ja lisätä naisten osallistumista vaaliprosessiin. On kuitenkin tärkeää, että komissio ottaa edelleen kantaa, kun Egyptin kansalaisten oikeuksia loukataan, kuten tässä tapauksessa tehdään.

1. Millaista vaikutusvaltaa varapuheenjohtaja/korkea edustaja aikoo käyttää varmistaakseen, että Egyptin tuleva johto lopettaa nämä nk. neitsyystestit ja parantaa maan kaikkein haavoittuvimmassa asemassa olevien kansalaisten oikeuksia ottaen huomioon poliittisiin toisinajattelijoihin kohdistuvat uudet sortotoimet?

2. Aikooko komissio tarjota rahoitus- tai sovittelutukea niin, että kyseiset sotilaallisia sortotoimia koskevat syytteet voidaan selvittää siviilituomioistuimissa ja että rikosten tekijät voidaan saattaa oikeuden eteen?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(2. kesäkuuta 2014)

EU on tietoinen naisten tilanteesta Egyptissä, ja EU:n Kairossa toimiva edustusto on säännöllisesti yhteydessä paikallisiin kansalaisjärjestöihin ja seuraa tarkasti ilmoituksia naisiin kohdistuvasta väkivallasta.

EU tuomitsee kaikenlaisen naisiin ja muihin heikossa asemassa oleviin ryhmiin kohdistuvan väkivallan. Korkea edustaja ottaa säännöllisesti asian esille julkisissa lausunnoissaan ja egyptiläisten vastapuoltensa kanssa. Ottaen huomioon maan viimeaikaisen tilanteen EU olettaa, että Egyptin uusi väliaikaishallinto kunnioittaa assosiaatiosopimuksen yhteydessä annettuja ihmisoikeuksia koskevia sitoumuksia, mukaan lukien naisten oikeudet.

Ihmisoikeuksista vastaava EU:n erityisedustaja Lambrinidis teki viidettä kertaa vierailun Egyptiin helmikuussa 2014 ja sai sisäministeriltä ja yleiseltä syyttäjältä sitoumuksen, jonka mukaan nämä "tutkisivat kaikki poliisin väärinkäytöksiin liittyvät syytökset, jotka mainitaan tiedonkeruukomission tulevassa raportissa".

Euroopan naapuruuspolitiikan täytäntöönpanon edistymistä Egyptissä vuonna 2013 koskevassa yhteisessä valmisteluasiakirjassa EU kehottaa Egyptiä muun muassa "huolehtimaan naisten oikeuksien ja sukupuolten tasa-arvon suojelemisesta", "täysin lopettamaan siviilien tuomitsemisen sotilastuomioistuimissa" sekä "huolehtimaan siitä, että väkivaltatapaukset, mukaan lukien seksuaalinen hyväksikäyttö, tutkitaan ja että syylliset saatetaan viipymättä vastuuseen teoistaan".

EU:n edustusto Egyptissä rahoittaa yhdeksää sukupuolten asemaan liittyvää kansalaisjärjestöprojektia yhteensä 3,3 miljoonalla eurolla.

EU rahoittaa eurooppalaisen naapuruuden ja kumppanuuden välineen puitteissa myös vuosina 2012–2016 toteutettavaa YK:n "Spring Forward for Women" -hanketta (7 miljoonaa euroa 8,2 miljoonasta).

Lisäksi naisten oikeudet ovat Egyptiä koskevan ihmisoikeusstrategian keskeinen prioriteetti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002713/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Marco Scurria (PPE), David Casa (PPE), Dubravka Šuica (PPE), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Nicole Sinclaire (NI), Roberta Metsola (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Ana Gomes (S&D), Jörg Leichtfried (S&D), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Jan Březina (PPE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) and Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Rights of women detained in Egypt

Recent news reports have revealed that Egypt is once again conducting 'virginity tests' on women who are detained. Virginity tests are invasive and Amnesty International considers them to be a form of torture. They consist of an examination that checks for blood in the hymen. It should be noted that the reports have not been widely verified or confirmed. When the Egyptian army first gained power, it stated that it would ban virginity tests, but that has still not happened. In fact, in 2012 General Abdel Fattah el-Sissi defended the tests, stating that they were intended 'to protect the girls from rape, and the soldiers and officers from accusations of rape'. It is troubling that an Egyptian presidential contender condones such tests, which violate the rights of women. They clearly constitute a breach of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). Furthermore, they come in addition to the renewed effort to snuff out political protests, with protesters being arrested and subjected to horrendous prison conditions.

The EU-Egypt Taskforce has approved an aid package to help promote education, combat abuses against women and increase women's participation in the electoral process. However, it is important for the Commission to continue to speak out when the rights of Egyptian citizens are violated, as in this case.

1. What leverage does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to exert with a view to ensuring that the future leader of Egypt bans these so-called virginity tests and improves the rights of the country's most vulnerable people in light of the new severe crackdowns on political dissenters?

2. Does the Commission plan to offer financial or mediation assistance so that these claims of military oppression can be investigated in civilian courts, and the perpetrators brought to justice?

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

The EU is aware of the situation of women in Egypt and the EU Delegation in Cairo is in regular contact with local Civil Society Organisations and closely monitors reported cases of violence against women.

The EU condemns all forms of violence against women and other vulnerable groups and the HR/VP raises the issue regularly in public statements as with her Egyptian counterparts. Even more so in light of the recent developments in the country, the EU expects that the new Egyptian interim administration will respect the Human rights commitments, including the rights for women, undertaken under the Association Agreement concluded with Egypt.

EUSR for Human Rights Lambrinidis conducted his fifth visit to Egypt in February 2014, and obtained by the Ministers of Interior and Justice and by the Public Prosecutor the commitment 'that they would investigate all allegations of police abuse included in the future Report of the Fact-finding Commission'.

In the 2013 Progress to the implementation of the EU Neighbourhood Policy in Egypt, the EU invites Egypt to, *inter alia*, 'ensure the protection of women's rights and gender equality', ' completely halt the use of military courts to judge civilians" and " ensure that investigations on the many cases of violence, including sexual abuse, are carried out and that the perpetrators are promptly brought to justice'.

The EU Delegation in Egypt is financing 9 CSOs projects on gender, for a total amount of EUR 3.3 million.

In the framework of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, the EU is also funding the 2012-2016 UN program 'Spring forward for women', (EUR 7 million out of 8.2).

Lastly, women's rights are a key priority in the Human Rights Country Strategy for Egypt.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002714/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(7. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Ugroženi kupci električne energije i prirodnog plina u RH

Direktivama Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća o zajedničkim pravilima za unutarnje tržište električne energije i prirodnog plina od država članica traži se poduzimanje odgovarajućih mjera radi zaštite krajnjih kupaca te posebno osiguravanje prikladnih mjera zaštite ugroženih kupaca. Navedene direktive nadležnost u definiranju koncepta ugroženih kupaca stavljaju decidirano u ruke država članica, navodeći pritom da se takvim kupcima zabranjuje isključivanje električne energije i plina u kritičnim vremenima.

Vlada Republike Hrvatske još je 19. listopada 2012. donijela Zakon o energiji kojim uvodi institut krajnjeg kupca pod posebnom zaštitom, ali do danas nije donijela provedbene propise kojima bi se, između ostalog, konkretno definirao ugroženi kupac i tako omogućila praktična primjena tog zakona. Stoga Republika Hrvatska, iako ima zakon usklađen s direktivama EU-a, navedene direktive ne provodi u praksi kao i još nekoliko država članica.

Stoga bih ovim putem željela pitati Komisiju hoće li ustrajati na provedbi direktiva 2009/72/EZ i 2009/73/EZ Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća te može li preporučiti rješenja u skladu s najboljim europskim praksama kako bi sve države članice provele navedene direktive, a ugroženi kupci uživali zaštitu na koju imaju pravo.

Odgovor g. Oettingera u ime Komisije
(29. travnja 2014.)

Komisija upućuje uvaženu zastupnicu na svoj odgovor na pisani upit E-000046/14 stavak 3 ([1]). Izvješće stručne skupine o ugroženim potrošačima energije koje se spominje u tom odgovoru sadržava primjere iz prakse o načinima na koje države članice pružaju podršku ugroženim kupcima.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002714/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Vulnerable electricity and natural gas customers in Croatia

Under the European Parliament and Council directives concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity and natural gas, Member States are required to take appropriate measures to protect final customers and, in particular, ensure that there are adequate safeguards to protect vulnerable customers. The directives explicitly call on the Member States to define the concept of vulnerable customers, and their definitions may also stipulate that such customers must not have their electricity and gas supply cut off in critical times.

The Croatian Government, as early as 19 October 2012, adopted an energy act placing final customers under special protection, but to this day has not issued any implementing provisions specifically defining a 'vulnerable customer' and hence making the act enforceable at the practical level. This means that Croatia, even though its law might be in line with the EU directives, is not translating those directives into practice in the same way as any other Member State.

Can the Commission therefore say whether it will endeavour to enforce Directives 2009/72/EC and 2009/73/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and can it recommend solutions based on best European practice whereby all Member States would implement the directives and vulnerable customers would enjoy the protection to which they are entitled?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000046/14 paragraph 3 in this respect ([1]). The expert group report on vulnerable consumers in energy, referred to in that answer, includes examples of Member State practices to support vulnerable customers.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-002715/14
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(7 mars 2014)

Objet: Perturbateurs endocriniens et dérèglement hormonaux

De nombreuses études, de plus en plus concordantes, confirment les inquiétudes que beaucoup ont aujourd'hui sur les conséquences de l'exposition prolongée aux pesticides. En effet, leur utilisation massive dans les régions agricoles apporte des quantités inquiétantes de perturbateurs endocriniens aux effets dangereux sur l'homme.

1. La Commission n'a toujours pas publié sa stratégie sur les perturbateurs endocriniens alors qu'elle s'était engagée à le faire avant la fin de l'année 2013: quand va-t-elle la publier? Étant donné l'urgence de la situation, une réponse européenne à ce phénomène qui dépasse les frontières de chaque État membre est nécessaire avant les prochaines élections européennes.

2. La mise en lumière des liens entre pratique agricole et exposition forte aux perturbateurs endocriniens doit obliger l'Union européenne à repenser son approche de l'agriculture et de l'utilisation des pesticides. La Commission compte-t-elle proposer des actes législatifs pour encadrer et diminuer l'exposition des Européens à ces pesticides et ainsi endiguer les perturbateurs endocriniens dans les régions agricoles?

3. Sachant que, selon la méthodologie utilisée, les dangers des perturbateurs endocriniens varient entre études scientifiques, la Commission compte-t-elle élaborer une définition des perturbateurs endocriniens en se fondant sur leur nocivité propre ou bien sur des critères d'exposition, qui sont moins contraignants?

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

1) les travaux sont en cours en vue de l'élaboration d'une nouvelle stratégie relative aux perturbateurs endocriniens (PE);

2) la législation de l'Union relative aux produits phytopharmaceutiques [règlement (CE) n° 1107/2009 ([1])] interdit la mise sur le marché de produits ayant un effet nocif sur la santé des êtres humains, ce qui inclut les produits contenant des substances qui sont des perturbateurs endocriniens;

3) en vertu de la législation, la Commission est habilitée à définir des critères permettant d'identifier les perturbateurs endocriniens. Des critères provisoires de protection s'appliqueront jusqu'à ce que la Commission fixe les nouveaux critères. En raison des préoccupations suscitées par les fortes incidences que pourraient avoir les critères dans certains secteurs et du débat animé sur les perturbateurs endocriniens qui s'est encore avivé l'été dernier au sein de la communauté scientifique, la Commission a décidé de réaliser une analyse d'impact qui est en cours d'élaboration.

([1]) JO L 309 du 24.11.2009, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002715/14
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Endocrine disruptors and hormonal imbalances

An increasing number of studies are producing the same findings and confirming the fears shared by many today about the consequences of prolonged exposure to pesticides. The widespread use of pesticides in farming regions has given rise to worrying levels of endocrine disruptors, which are hazardous to humans, in the environment.

1. The Commission has still not published its strategy on endocrine disruptors, which it promised to do before the end of 2013. When will the strategy be made public? Given the urgency of the situation, a Europe-wide response to this problem, which transcends Member State borders, is needed before the forthcoming European elections.

2. The revelation that farming practices are exposing people to high levels of endocrine disruptors should make the European Union rethink its stance on agriculture and the use of pesticides. Is the Commission planning to propose legislation with a view to curbing levels of public exposure to these pesticides and, hence, to endocrine disruptors in farming regions?

3. Given that, depending on the methodology employed, studies assess the dangers posed by endocrine disruptors differently, is the Commission planning to define endocrine disruptors on the basis of how harmful they are *per se*, or in accordance with less restrictive exposure criteria?

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

1. The work to develop a new strategy on endocrine disruptors (EDs) is on-going.

2. Union legislation on Plant Protection Products (Reg. (EC) No.1107/2009 ([1])) prohibits the placing on the market of products which have harmful effects on human health. This includes products containing substances which are endocrine disruptors.

3. Under the legislation, the Commission is empowered to develop criteria to identify endocrine disrupting substances. Protective interim criteria will apply until the new criteria are established by the Commission. The Commission decided to do an impact assessment given the concerns about the potential significant impacts of the criteria on some sectors and the vigorous debate in the scientific community on EDs that escalated over last summer. The preparation of the impact assessment is on-going.

([1]) OJ L 309/1, 24.11.2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002716/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Aumento del budget militare in Cina: attività di monitoraggio dell'UE e fallimento del progetto di esercito europeo

Stando al progetto di relazione sul bilancio, presentato mercoledì 5 marzo 2014 al vaglio degli organi legislativi nazionali, la Cina prevede di incrementare il bilancio della difesa del 12,2 % raggiungendo 808,2 miliardi di CNY (circa 132 miliardi di dollari USA) nel 2014. Il bilancio militare della Cina è aumentato del 10,7 % nel 2013, dell'11,2 % nel 2012 e del 12,7 % nel 2011, superando la crescita del PIL del paese. Sebbene le spese militari della Cina siano inferiori alla media globale del 3 %, si tratta di un aumento significativo che ha sollevato preoccupazioni, soprattutto nei paesi limitrofi, dato che la Cina è coinvolta in dispute territoriali con gran parte dei suoi paesi vicini. Nel contempo le persone che vivono nelle province più povere e le minoranze continuano a essere prive di infrastrutture di base e non hanno accesso a generi alimentari e servizi idrici sicuri, e la crisi ambientale in Cina è un fattore importante del deterioramento delle prospettive ambientali globali.

1. Il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna sta monitorando l'aumento delle spese militari della Cina e i piani del governo cinese concernenti la pace e la sicurezza nei mari cinesi del sud e dell'est?

2. Quali misure ha adottato l'UE per far avvicinare la Cina e i paesi limitrofi al fine di risolvere le dispute territoriali nell'area secondo il diritto internazionale? L'UE appoggia la posizione espressa dai paesi dell'area secondo cui le dispute dovrebbero essere risolte dalla Corte di giustizia internazionale?

3. L'UE sta valutando la possibilità di creare un'unità di difesa comune europea per sostituire le forze armate degli Stati membri, consolidare la presenza internazionale dell'UE e ridurre le spese militari di ogni Stato membro?

4. L'UE ha chiesto al governo cinese di garantire che le persone che vivono nelle province più povere e le minoranze non siano escluse dallo sviluppo economico in espansione della Cina e che siano loro offerte condizioni di vita sicure? L'UE ha chiesto al governo cinese di prendere misure volte a proteggere l'ambiente?

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

L'AR/VP segue con la massima attenzione le questioni a cui si riferiscono gli onorevoli deputati e sta estendendo la cooperazione con la Cina in materia di sicurezza e di difesa per garantire un quadro adeguato per affrontarle.

Pur non prendendo posizione riguardo alle rivendicazioni nel Mar Cinese meridionale e orientale, l'UE è preoccupata per i rischi in termini di sicurezza e prosperità regionale e mondiale. L'UE coglie tutte le occasioni per favorire la soluzione a lungo termine delle vertenze attraverso il dialogo e in conformità del diritto internazionale, in particolare l'UNCLOS. L'UE ha ribadito più volte la sua posizione in proposito ai paesi interessati, ad esempio in occasione del dialogo strategico con la Cina del 27 gennaio e durante la visita del presidente Xi del 31 marzo, nelle dichiarazioni del novembre 2013 sulla creazione da parte della Cina di una «Zona di identificazione di difesa aerea del Mar cinese orientale», a dicembre durante la visita del primo ministro Abe al santuario di Yasukuni e l'8 maggio esprimendosi sulle tensioni nel Mar Cinese meridionale. L'UE è pronta a condividere la propria esperienza relativa alla risoluzione delle controversie e alla gestione congiunta delle risorse marittime, come ha fatto in occasione del seminario UE-ASEAN sulla sicurezza marittima tenutosi a Giacarta nel novembre 2013.

Gli Stati membri mettono a disposizione dell'Unione capacità civili e militari per l'attuazione della politica comune di sicurezza e di difesa. Il Consiglio europeo del dicembre 2013 ha promosso un'ulteriore cooperazione sulle stesse basi.

L'attuale cooperazione allo sviluppo dell'UE con la Cina fa sistematicamente riferimento alle necessità delle regioni più povere e rivolge particolare attenzione al modo in cui le attività di cooperazione UE-Cina e le politiche cinesi collegate contribuiscono allo sviluppo sostenibile dell'intera nazione. La tutela dell'ambiente è sempre un tema centrale della nostra agenda, che viene trattato anche nell'ambito del partenariato UE-Cina sull'urbanizzazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002716/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: China's increased military budget: EU monitoring activities and failed European army project

According to a draft budget report submitted to the national legislature for review on Wednesday, 5 March 2014, China plans to raise its defence budget by 12.2% to CNY 808.2 billion (about USD 132 billion) in 2014. China's military budget increased by 10.7% in 2013, 11.2% in 2012 and 12.7% in 2011, surpassing the country's GDP growth. Although China's military expenditure is below the global average of 3%, this significant increase has raised concerns, especially in neighbouring countries given that China has been engaging in territorial disputes with most of its neighbours. At the same time, people in the poorer provinces and minorities are being left without basic infrastructure and access to safe food and water, while the environmental crisis in China has been a major factor in the deteriorating global environmental outlook.

1. Is the European External Action Service monitoring China's increasing military expenditure and the Chinese Government's plans regarding peace and security in the South and East China Seas?

2. What steps has the EU taken to bring China and its neighbouring countries together to resolve the territorial disputes in the area in accordance with international law? Does the EU support the position expressed by countries in the area that such disputes should be resolved by the International Court of Justice?

3. Is the EU considering the possibility of creating a common EU defence unit to replace the Member States' armed forces in order to consolidate the EU's international presence and decrease the military expenses of each Member State?

4. Has the EU asked the Chinese Government to ensure that people in the poorer provinces and minorities are not left out of China's booming economic development, and that they are provided with safe living conditions? Has the EU asked the Chinese Government to take steps to protect the environment?

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

The HR/VP is following these issues closely and is extending cooperation with China on security and defence to secure an appropriate framework for addressing them.

EU takes no position regarding the respective claims in the South and East China Seas. However, it is concerned about risks to the regional and global security and prosperity. The EU uses all opportunities to encourage a long-term resolution of differences through dialogue and based on international law, in particular Unclos. The EU has made this point several times to the countries concerned, including at the EU-China Strategic Dialogue on 27 January and the visit of President Xi to the EU on 31 March, and through statements in November 2013 on the establishment by China of the 'East China Sea Air Defence Identification Zone', in December on PM Abe's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, and on 8 May on tensions in the South China Sea. The EU shares its experience regarding dispute settlement and joint management of maritime resources as in the EU-ASEAN Seminar on maritime security in Jakarta in November 2013.

Member States are making civilian and military capabilities available to the Union for the implementation of the common security and defence policy. The European Council in December 2013 promoted further cooperation on the same basis.

The on-going development cooperation of the EU with China makes systematic reference to the development needs of poorer regions and provides for specific attention being paid to how EU-China cooperation activities and related Chinese policies contribute to nation-wide sustainable development. Environmental protection is a constant topic on our agenda, also addressed in our Urbanisation Partnership with China.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002718/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Donne ed endometriosi: interventi UE per la «Million Woman March for Endometriosis»

Giovedì 13 marzo si terrà la «Million Woman March for Endometriosis», una campagna di sensibilizzazione a livello mondiale operativa contemporaneamente in decine di capitali tra cui Amsterdam, Belfast, Berlino, Brasilia, Buenos Aires, Copenaghen, Dublino, Helsinki, Lisbona, Londra, Madrid, Oslo, Stoccolma, Washington DC e Roma.

L'endometriosi è una malattia cronica, spesso progressiva, dove alcune cellule della mucosa uterina si impiantano al di fuori dell'utero in altri organi quali ovaie, tube, vagina, intestino e peritoneo, vengono stimolate dagli ormoni che provocano il ciclo mestruale e ciclicamente crescono provocando sanguinamenti interni, infiammazioni croniche, tessuto cicatriziale e aderenze.

Questa malattia generalmente compare quando si è ancora adolescenti ed è per questo motivo che in presenza di mestruazioni particolarmente dolorose il medico di base dovrebbe essere in grado di presumere che possa trattarsi di endometriosi e indirizzare le pazienti verso centri idonei a diagnosticare con precisione questa patologia e a identificarne la cura necessaria. In moltissimi casi invece l'endometriosi viene scoperta con un ritardo di 10 anni rispetto alla prima comparsa dei sintomi che, oltre ai dolori pelvici spesso invalidanti, si possono identificare anche con dolori durante la minzione, la defecazione e i rapporti sessuali, affaticamento cronico, colite, periodi di stipsi alternati a diarrea, aborti spontanei. L'endometriosi, se diagnosticata in ritardo, può danneggiare seriamente gli organi nei quali attecchisce, può compromettere la funzione dell'apparato riproduttivo e può causare difficoltà nel concepimento. Il 30-40 % dei casi di infertilità femminile è dovuto proprio a questa malattia.

Considerato che:

— nei casi più gravi l'endometriosi non diagnosticata può portare a pericolose emorragie e persino alla morte;

— l'endometriosi è una delle cause principali di infertilità;

— i costi personali dell'endometriosi sono alti: il dolore, specie quando diventa cronico, può associarsi ad ansia, senso di spossatezza, sintomi depressivi;

Intende la Commissione:

1. esprimere la sua posizione riguardo alla ricerca scientifica e medica per la cura di tale sindrome;

2. promuovere una campagna di sensibilizzazione e di carattere informativo a livello europeo, destinata alla prevenzione e al riconoscimento dei sintomi?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2014)

Nell'ambito del settimo programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7 º PQ, 2007-2013) ([1]), la Commissione ha destinato 5,36 milioni di euro a sostegno della ricerca sull'endometriosi. I progetti MELENDO 2 ([2]), PAEON ([3]) e SARM ([4]) si occupano del ruolo dell'endometriosi quale fattore di rischio per lo sviluppo di altre malattie e sono volti a sviluppare modelli computerizzati specifici secondo il paziente per le malattie endocrinologiche connesse all'infertilità e a chiarire la natura molecolare dello sviluppo dell'embrione umano prima dell'impianto e della maturazione dell'endometrio.

Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020) ([5]), offrirà ulteriori opportunità di sostenere la ricerca sull'endometriosi nel quadro della sfida sociale «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere» ([6]). Maggiori informazioni sono reperibili sul portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione ([7]).

La Commissione non intende promuovere alcuna campagna di informazione e sensibilizzazione sull'endometriosi a livello europeo, poiché si tratta di una questione di gestione dell'assistenza sanitaria che rientra nelle responsabilità degli Stati membri.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home_en.html
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/104851_en.html, ricerca genetica epidemiologica sull'associazione tra endometriosi e melanoma cutaneo.
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/106957_en.html, calcolo basato su modelli delle cure delle malattie endocrinologiche connesse all'infertilità.
([4]) http://www.ccrmb.ee/index.php, genomica endometriale e embrionale, ricerca di biomarcatori nella fecondazione assistita.
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:IT:PDF.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002718/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Women and endometriosis: EU involvement in 'Million Woman March for Endometriosis'

On Thursday 13 March the 'Million Woman March for Endometriosis' will be held. This is a worldwide awareness campaign taking place simultaneously in dozens of capitals including Amsterdam, Belfast, Berlin, Brasilia, Buenos Aires, Copenhagen, Dublin, Helsinki, Lisbon, London, Madrid, Oslo, Stockholm, Washington DC and Rome.

Endometriosis is a chronic, often progressive illness, in which various cells from the lining of the uterus become implanted outside the uterus in other organs, such as the ovaries, fallopian tubes, vagina, intestine and peritoneum; they become stimulated by the hormones which cause the menstrual cycle and grow cyclically, causing internal blood loss, chronic inflammation, scar tissue and growths.

This illness generally makes its appearance in teenage girls and for this reason, when particularly painful menstruation is present, the GP should be able to presume that this may be a case of endometriosis and refer patients to centres able to diagnose this pathology precisely and identify the necessary treatment. However, in very many cases, endometriosis is diagnosed 10 years after the first appearance of symptoms which, apart from pelvic pain which is often debilitating, may consist of pain on urinating, defecating and during sex, chronic fatigue, colitis, periods of constipation alternating with diarrhoea, spontaneous miscarriage. If diagnosed late, endometriosis may seriously damage the organs in which it becomes rooted, may compromise the functioning of the reproductive system and may cause difficulties in conception. Between 30 and 40% of cases of female infertility are due to this illness.

Considering that:

— in the most serious cases, undiagnosed endometriosis may lead to dangerous haemorrhaging and even to death;

— endometriosis is one of the main causes of infertility;

— the personal costs of endometriosis are high: the pain, particularly when it becomes chronic, may be associated with anxiety, a feeling of exhaustion, and symptoms of depression;

1. Does the Commission intend to state its position as regards the scientific and medical research into a cure for this condition?

2. Does it intend to promote an information and awareness campaign at European level, aimed at prevention and recognition of the symptoms?

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

Within the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) ([1]), the Commission has devoted EUR 5, 36 million to support of endometriosis research. The projects MELENDO 2 ([2]), PAEON ([3]) and SARM ([4]) intend to address the role of endometriosis as a risk factor for the development of other diseases, shapepatient-specific computer-based models for infertility related endocrinological diseases, and unravel the molecular nature of human pre-implantation embryo development and endometrial maturation.

Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([5]), will offer further opportunities to support research on endometriosis through the 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge ([6]). More information can be found at the Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([7]).

The Commission does not intend to promote an information and awareness campaign at European level to address Endometriosis. This is a healthcare management issue which falls within the responsibility of Member States.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home_en.html
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/104851_en.html Genetic epidemiological investigation into the association between endometriosis and cutaneous melanoma.
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/106957_en.html Model Driven Computation of Treatments for Infertility Related Endocrinological Diseases.
([4]) http://www.ccrmb.ee/index.php Endometrial and embryonic genomics, searching for biomarkers in assisted reproduction.
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:EN:PDF
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002719/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Parchi eolici offshore: una sfida per l'Europa

Recentemente è stata pubblicata una ricerca che, per la prima volta, dimostra come le turbine eoliche possono arginare i danni causati dagli uragani alle città costiere. I parchi eolici offshore oltre quindi a produrre energia pulita, potrebbero essere la giusta soluzione anche per difendere le nostre città dai forti uragani che spesso provocano gravi disastri. Consentono, infatti, di diminuire l'altezza delle onde, con una conseguente riduzione del movimento di aria verso il centro del ciclone e aumento di pressione centrale, che a sua volta rallenta i venti dell'intero uragano e lo fa dissipare più velocemente.

I mari e gli oceani costituiscono una fondamentale fonte di energia rinnovabile generata dalle onde, dalle maree e dalle correnti marine. Sviluppare questo settore, oltre ad aiutare l'Europa a raggiungere i suoi obiettivi in materia di energia rinnovabile e riduzione dei gas serra, potrebbe risultare importante anche per la crescita economica e la creazione di nuovi posti di lavoro. Sono però di ostacolo allo sviluppo dell'energia eolica offshore: la concorrenza del settore dell'energia eolica terrestre e dell'industria di prospezione del petrolio e del gas con cui si trova a competere per l'ottenimento di finanziamenti, attrezzature o competenze; l'assenza di reti di trasmissione elettrica in mare; la mancanza di esperienza degli Stati membri in materia di pianificazione integrata dell'ambiente marino che potrebbe condurre all'abbandono di taluni progetti.

Considerato che:

— la Commissione ha presentato un piano di azione a sostegno dell'energia blu per una maggiore industrializzazione del settore;

— i costi tecnologici sono elevati e vi sono ancora troppi problemi di tipo infrastrutturale, ambientale, amministrativo e relativi all'accesso ai finanziamenti.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali azioni sono state intraprese fino ad oggi a sostegno dei parchi offshore?

2. In che modo possono essere superati gli ostacoli allo sviluppo sopraindicati?

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

1. Dal 2007, l'UE ha sostenuto l'energia eolica offshore mediante il 7° programma quadro dell'UE per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico. Tale sostegno si è concentrato sul miglioramento dell'affidabilità delle turbine eoliche, sulla previsione dei venti e sull'integrazione delle piattaforme eoliche offshore nella rete di distribuzione. A partire dal 2014, la sfida energetica di Orizzonte 2020, che costituisce l'attuale programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione, offre un sostegno finanziario a progetti eolici offshore e ad altre fonti energetiche rinnovabili come l'energia degli oceani.

La modernizzazione delle infrastrutture energetiche è importante per raggiungere gli obiettivi climatici ed energetici noti come «20-20-20» entro il 2020 e garantire la transizione verso un'economia a basse emissioni di carbonio entro il 2050. Il nuovo regolamento in materia di reti transeuropee dell'energia e il meccanismo per collegare l'Europa (CEF) sono strumenti importanti per preparare il cammino verso i suddetti obiettivi. In tale contesto la rete offshore del Mare del Nord è considerata un corridoio prioritario. Il CEF può fornire un sostegno finanziario per i progetti di interesse comune (PIC) individuati nell'ambito di questo corridoio.

Inoltre, la Commissione ha proposto una direttiva che istituisce un quadro per la pianificazione dello spazio marittimo, a norma della quale i piani di gestione di tale spazio tengano conto di una serie di attività, tra cui lo sviluppo di parchi eolici offshore.

2. La Commissione intende continuare a sostenere lo sviluppo di progetti eolici offshore mediante i diversi strumenti sopra elencati. Allo stesso tempo essa ritiene che saranno necessarie ulteriori e sostanziali riduzioni dei costi per conseguire un maggiore ampliamento di scala del settore a costi ragionevoli. Il settore industriale avrà un ruolo di primo piano da svolgere nel contesto descritto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002719/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Offshore wind farms — a challenge for Europe

A study has recently been published that shows, for the first time, that wind turbines are capable of stemming the damage that hurricanes cause to coastal towns and cities. Consequently, as well as producing a clean form of energy, offshore wind farms could also serve as a viable solution for protecting our towns and cities from strong hurricanes, which often have devastating effects. The study found that the presence of wind turbines decreases wave height, which reduces movement of air towards the centre of the hurricane and increases central pressure, which in turn slows down the winds of the entire hurricane and dissipates it more quickly.

The seas and oceans form a key source of renewable energy, generated by waves, tides and sea currents. Developing this sector, besides helping Europe meet its targets in respect of renewable energy and reduced greenhouse gas emissions, could also prove vital for economic growth and creating new jobs. There are, however, several obstacles currently preventing the development of the offshore wind sector, such as the competition provided by onshore wind farms and the oil and gas exploration sector, with which it vies for funding, equipment and skilled workers, the absence of any electrical grids at sea, and the fact that some Member States have no experience in integrated marine spatial planning, that could result in several offshore wind projects being abandoned.

Given that:

— the Commission has set out an action plan to support the development of 'blue' energy and make the sector increasingly industrialised;

— the technical costs involved are high and there are still too many problems relating to infrastructure, the environment, administrative issues and access to funding,

Can the Commission please answer the following questions:

1. What actions have been implemented to date in support of offshore wind farms?

2. How can the obstacles to development listed above be overcome?

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

1. Since 2007, the EU has supported offshore wind energy through the EU 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technologies Development. This support has focused on improving the reliability of wind turbines, wind forecast and the integration of off-shore wind platforms with the grid. As of 2014, the energy challenge of Horizon 2020, which is the current framework programme for research and innovation, offers financial support to offshore wind projects and other renewable energy sources such as ocean energy.

In order to achieve the 20-20-20 energy and climate goals by 2020, and ensure the transition to a low-carbon economy by 2050, modernisation of the energy infrastructure is important. In this regard, the new Regulation on Trans-European Energy Networks and the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) are important instruments for paving the way. The North Sea Offshore Grid has been established as a priority corridor in this context. The CEF can provide financial support for Projects of Common Interest (PCI's) that have been identified within this corridor.

Furthermore, the Commission has proposed a directive establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning, which envisages that maritime spatial plans should take into consideration a number of activities including the development of offshore wind farms.

2. The Commission intends to continue its support for the development of offshore wind projects through the different instruments listed above. At the same time, the Commission believes that further substantive cost-reductions will be needed to achieve further up-scaling of the sector at reasonable costs. Industry will have a key role to play in this regard.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002720/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE) e Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Rischio idrogeologico e fondi europei

Frane, smottamenti, alluvioni (cui si aggiungono di tanto in tanto eventi sismici) generano una scia ininterrotta di disastri e vittime, con costi altissimi per i cittadini e le imprese. L'Italia è un territorio martoriato in stato di perenne calamità, da Nord a Sud, dove stanno aumentando il rischio di dissesto idrogeologico e la popolazione espostavi. Lo dimostra un recente studio commissionato dalle istituzioni della Regione Lombardia. Ben 580 000 cittadini lombardi, ovvero quasi il 6 % dell'intera popolazione regionale, sono esposti a rischio per il solo fatto di risiedere in aree a forte criticità idrogeologica: in tali aree risultano localizzati ben 99 000 edifici residenziali, di cui un sesto nella sola provincia di Pavia. A essere a rischio, tuttavia, non sono soltanto abitazioni e famiglie ma anche il cuore industriale ed economico del paese. Sono circa 50 000 le unità locali tra imprese, uffici e negozi potenzialmente in pericolo, solo le attività manifatturiere ammontano a 5 600. Il cuore dell'industria italiana quindi non può ritenersi al riparo dal pericolo di dissesto, con evidenti conseguenze disastrose per tutto il tessuto produttivo. A questi si aggiungono 623 edifici scolastici e ben 50 ospedali. Al rischio idrogeologico si aggiunge poi quello sismico, non più trascurabile nelle province orientali lombarde.

Le misure di prevenzione affidate alla pianificazione comunale sono insufficienti: edifici e abitazioni esposti a rischio continuano ad aumentare, mentre le risorse sono bloccate dal patto di stabilità, che impedisce di attuare interventi anche quando gli enti locali hanno le risorse in cassa.

Occorre considerare che il dissesto idrogeologico continua a determinare costi elevatissimi per il bilancio di ogni Stato e per la collettività. In Italia, la Legge 27 dicembre 2013 n. 147 prevede che il fabbisogno per la messa in sicurezza complessiva del territorio italiano dal rischio idrogeologico ammonti a circa 40 miliardi di euro.

Intende la Commissione verificare la compatibilità della normativa menzionata con la direttiva 2007/60/CE relativa alla valutazione e alla gestione dei rischi di alluvioni e con la comunicazione della Commissione «Un approccio comunitario alla prevenzione delle catastrofi naturali e di origine umana» (COM(2009) 0082)?

Quali sono gli strumenti di finanziamento dell'UE disponibili per interventi di messa in sicurezza del territorio e di prevenzione dal rischio idrogeologico?

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

In base alla direttiva Alluvioni [1], è compito degli Stati membri determinare gli obiettivi e le misure necessarie per la gestione del rischio di alluvioni (ivi comprese prevenzione, protezione e preparazione). La suddetta direttiva non precisa alcun obbligo in materia di livelli di finanziamento o risorse di bilancio da destinare alla realizzazione degli obiettivi e delle misure, né indica un metodo per stabilire le priorità. Spetta ai singoli Stati membri decidere gli investimenti necessari e la loro urgenza, in base alla legislazione nazionale e ai quadri di riferimento dell'UE, come il patto di stabilità e crescita.

Nell'ambito dell'azione UE sul fronte della prevenzione delle catastrofi, la Commissione sta integrando e sostenendo gli interventi degli Stati membri con iniziative quali la valutazione del rischio e conseguente pianificazione, lo scambio di buone pratiche e l'elaborazione di norme armonizzate per la raccolta dei dati. La nuova legislazione sul meccanismo unionale di protezione civile [2] impone agli Stati membri l'ulteriore obbligo di stilare valutazioni dei rischi e valutazioni delle capacità di gestione dei rischi, e considera la prevenzione il primo passo da compiersi in una politica di gestione integrata delle catastrofi che informa le attività di preparazione e risposta.

Per il periodo 2014-2020, il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale prevede la possibilità di sostenere gli interventi di prevenzione dei rischi, come pure investimenti per l'adattamento ai cambiamenti climatici, tra cui investimenti appositamente concepiti per determinati rischi, per la resilienza a fronte di catastrofi e per lo sviluppo di sistemi di gestione delle stesse.

---

[1] Direttiva 2007/60/CE (GU L 288 del 6.11.2007).
[2] Decisione n. 1313/2013/UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002720/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE) and Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Hydrogeological risks and European funding

Landslides, floods, and (occasionally) earthquakes are calamitous events that leave a never-ending trail of devastation and victims in their wake, with massive costs to citizens and business alike. The whole of Italy, from its northernmost point to its southernmost tip, is constantly ravaged by such disasters, and the population is being exposed to an ever greater risk of hydrogeological instability. This was highlighted in a recent study commissioned by the Lombardy region, which showed that as many as 580 000 citizens, equivalent to 6% of the entire regional population, are exposed to risks simply because they live in areas in which hydrogeological activity is critically high. There are 99 000 residential buildings in these areas, a sixth being accounted for by the province of Pavia alone. However, it is not just homes and families that are at risk, but also the industrial and economic heart of the country. Around 50 000 local companies, businesses, and shops are potentially in danger, including 5 600 factories. Italy's industrial heartland therefore cannot be considered to be immune from the dangers of subsidence, and any disaster would obviously have devastating consequences for the country's entire production system. Furthermore, 623 schools and some 50 hospitals are likewise in danger. Added to these hydrogeological risks there is the matter of earthquakes, no longer a negligible threat in parts of eastern Lombardy.

Preventive measures at municipal level are not enough: the number of homes and buildings in danger is continuing to rise, and the Italian Stability Law means that local authorities cannot act even when they have money to spend.

It must be assumed that hydrogeological problems will continue to entail very high costs for state budgets and local communities. In Italy, the financing required to make the territory completely safe from hydrogeological risks amounts — to quote the figure given in Law No 147 of 27 December 2013 — to approximately EUR 40 billion.

Will the Commission ascertain whether the abovementioned legislation is compatible with Directive 2007/60/EC on the assessment and management of flood risks and with the Commission communication entitled 'A Community approach on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters' (COM(2009)0082)?

What sources of EU funding could be used for hydrogeological protection and risk prevention operations?

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

According to the Floods Directive ([1]) (FD) it is for Member States to determine the objectives and measures needed for the management of flood risks (including prevention, protection and preparedness). The FD does not specify financing levels or budgeting requirements to support the national objectives set and measures, nor does the FD provide for a prioritisation method. Necessary investments and their prioritisation are the responsibility of individual MSs according to their national laws and EU frameworks such as the Stability and Growth Pact.

As part of the EU disaster prevention framework, the Commission is complementing and supporting Member States actions with initiatives such as risk assessment and planning, exchange of good practices, development of data collection standards. The new Union Civil Protection Mechanism legislation ([2]) further obliges MS to develop risk assessments and assessments of risk management capabilities and puts preventions as a first step in an integrated disaster management policy informing preparedness and response actions.

In the 2014-2020 period, the European Regional Development Fund provides for the possibility to support risk prevention interventions, as well investment for adaptation to climate change including investments designed to address specific risks, ensure disaster resilience and develop disaster management systems.

([1]) Directive 2007/60/EC, OJ L 288, 6.11.2007.
([2]) Decision No 1313/2013/EU.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-002723/14
upućeno Komisiji
Biljana Borzan (S&D)
(7. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Potencijalno opasne kemikalije u materijalima za pakiranje i pohranu hrane

Stručni medicinski časopis „Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health" nedavno je objavio podatke prema kojima uobičajena ambalaža za pakiranje i pohranjivanje hrane sadrži kemikalije koje mogu biti opasne za ljudsko zdravlje. U terminologiji Europske unije takva ambalaža se naziva „Food Contact Materials" i najčešće se sastoji od plastičnih masa.

Prema podacima objavljenima u istraživanju, u materijalima za pakiranje i pohranjivanje hrane koristi se preko 4 000 različitih kemikalija. Formaldehid, koji je dokazano kancerogen, prisutan je u malim količinama u plastičnim bocama i plastičnom posuđu. Koriste se i hormonski disruptori poput bisfenola A, tributilina, triklosana i ftalata. Dakle tvari koje narušavaju normalno lučenje hormona u organizmu.

Najveći problem leži u nedostatku sveobuhvatnih znanstvenih istraživanja koja bi dovela u vezu ili odbacila povezanost dugoročne izloženosti takvim materijalima i raznih bolesti. Iako znamo da su neke od tih tvari općenito štetne za ljudsko zdravlje, nije poznato u kolikoj mjeri i kojim koncentracijama. Dok nam na raspolaganju ne budu takvi podaci, štetne kemikalije bit će potencijalna prijetnja zdravlju građana Europske unije.

1. Je li Komisija upoznata s tvrdnjama o mogućoj štetnosti kemikalija u materijalima za pakiranje i pohranjivanje hrane?

2. Slaže li se Komisija da postoji potreba za istraživanjem potencijalne veze između kemikalija iz ambalaže te kroničnih bolesti kao što su rak, dijabetes i pretilost?

3. Planira li Komisija poduzeti kakve korake u zaštiti zdravlja i potrošačkih prava građana EU-a vezano uz prije navedene kemikalije u materijalima za pakiranje i pohranjivanje hrane?

Odgovor g. Borga u ime Komisije
(16. travnja 2014.)

Komisija je svjesna tekuće rasprave u pogledu potencijalnih zdravstvenih učinaka kemikalija u materijalima u dodiru s hranom.

Uredbom (EZ) br. 1935/2004 ([1]) predviđaju se mjere zaštite kako bi se osiguralo da materijali i predmeti u dodiru s hranom koji se stavljaju na tržište EU-a ne ugrožavaju zdravlje ljudi. Osim toga, za određene materijale u dodiru s hranom postoji posebno usklađeno zakonodavstvo, primjerice za plastične materijale u dodiru s hranom. Samo tvari koje je Europska agencija za sigurnost hrane ocijenila kao sigurne mogu se upotrebljavati u materijalima u dodiru s hranom u Uniji.

Komisija je svjesna da se tvrdi da možda postoji veza između pojave određenih kroničnih bolesti i upotrebe određenih materijala koji dolaze u dodir s hranom. Međutim nije utvrđena uzročna veza, a jedan od razloga je i nedostatak znanstvenih metoda koje omogućuju utvrđivanje takve veze u epidemiološkim studijama.

Komisija je financirala određeni broj istraživačkih projekata u tom području. Na primjer, u okviru programa FP 6 i mreža izvrsnosti CASCADE ([2]) i MoniQA ([3]) proveden je opsežan pregled hrane i kontaminanata prehrambenog lanca. U okviru programa FP 7 ([4]) i teme 2 „Hrana, poljoprivreda i ribarstvo te biotehnologija" ([5]) pružena je znatna potpora istraživanjima u tom području ([6]), ([7]), ([8]), ([9]), a buduće mogućnosti financiranja u okviru programa Obzor 2020. ([10]), uključujući u okviru teme „Procjena zdravstvenog rizika od kombinirane izloženosti ljudi većem broju toksičnih tvari povezanih s hranom" koja je nedavno objavljena u okviru poziva na podnošenje projektnih prijedloga pod nazivom Održiva sigurnost hrane ([11]), omogućit će nastavak istraživanja i inovacija u području sigurnosti hrane.

([1]) SL L 338, 13.11.2004., str. 4.
([2]) CASCADE „Kemikalije kao kontaminanti u prehrambenom lancu: istraživanje zdravstvenih rizika u hrani" http://cascade.projectcoordinator.net/.
([3]) MoniQA „Praćenje i jamstvo kvalitete u cjelokupnom lancu opskrbe hranom" https://www.moniqa.org/about/association.
([4]) Sedmi okvirni program za istraživanje, tehnološki razvoj i demonstracijske aktivnosti (FP 7, 2007. — 2013.); http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([5]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/kbbe/about-kbbe_en.html
([6]) FACET „Radna skupina za arome, dodatke i materijale u dodiru s hranom" http://www.ucd.ie/facet/.
([7]) OBELIX „Kemikalije koje djeluju kao endokrini disruptori i izazivaju pretilost: povezivanje prenatalne izloženosti s razvojem pretilosti kasnije u životu" http://www.theobelixproject.org/.
([8]) PERFOOD „Perfluorirani organski spojevi u našoj prehrani" http://www.perfood.eu/.
([9]) CONTAMED „Mješavine kontaminanata i reproduktivno zdravlje ljudi — nove strategije za učinak na zdravlje i procjenu rizika endokrinih disruptora" http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/88451_en.html
([10]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/home.html
([11]) Tema „Održiva sigurnost hrane H2020-SFS-12-2014" objavljena 11. prosinca 2013. u okviru programa Obzor 2020. http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/2328-sfs-12-2014.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002723/14
to the Commission
Biljana Borzan (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Potentially hazardous chemicals in materials used for the packaging and storage of food

The peer-reviewed medical journal 'Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health' recently published data showing that ordinary food packaging contains chemicals that could be harmful to human health. In EU terminology, such packaging is referred to as 'Food Contact Materials' and is most often produced from plastics.

According to the published research data, over 4 000 different chemicals are present in materials used for the packaging and storage of food. Formaldehyde, which has been proven to be carcinogenic, is present in small quantities in plastic bottles and plastic tableware. Endocrine disruptors, such as bisphenol A, tributyltin, triclosan and phthalates, are also present. These substances disrupt the normal process of hormone production in the human body.

The greatest problem is the lack of comprehensive scientific research that would confirm or refute a link between long-term exposure to such substances and various diseases. Although it is known that some of these substances are generally harmful to human health, it is not know to what extent they are harmful and in what concentrations. For as long as we do not have such information available to us, harmful chemicals will continue to be a potential hazard to the health of EU citizens.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the claims regarding the potential hazard posed by chemicals used in materials for the packaging and storage of food?

2. Does the Commission agree that there is a need to carry out research into the potential links between packaging materials and chronic diseases, such as cancer, diabetes and obesity?

3. Does the Commission plan to take steps to protect the health and consumer rights of EU citizens in respect of the aforementioned chemicals used in materials for the packaging and storage of food?

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

The Commission is aware of the on-going discussions regarding potential health effects of chemicals in food contact materials.

Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 ([1]) provides safeguards to ensure that food contact materials and articles placed on the EU market do not endanger human health. In addition, for certain food contact materials specific harmonised legislation exists, such as for plastic food contact materials. Only substances evaluated as safe by European Food Safety Authority can be used as food contact materials in the Union.

The Commission is aware that it is argued that there may be link between the occurrence of certain chronic diseases and the use of certain food contact materials. Yet no causal link has been established also due to the lack of scientific methods able to establish such link in epidemiological studies.

The Commission has funded a number of research projects in this area. For example, under FP6, the CASCADE ([2]) and MoniQA ([3]) Networks of Excellence carried out a comprehensive review of food and food chain contaminants. Under FP7 ([4]), the 'Food, agriculture and fisheries, and biotechnology' ([5]) theme 2, continued to provide significant support to research in this field ([6]) ([7]) ([8]) ([9]) and future funding opportunities under Horizon 2020 ([10]), including under the recently published call Topic 'Assessing the health risk of combined human exposure to multiple food-related toxic substances' published under the Sustainable Food Security Call ([11]) will allow the continuation of research and innovation in the area of food safety.

([1]) OJ L 338, 13.11.2004, p. 4.
([2]) CASCADE 'Chemical AS Contaminants in the food chain: targeting health risks in food' http://cascade.projectcoordinator.net/
([3]) MoniQA 'Monitoring and quality assurance in the total food supply chain' https://www.moniqa.org/about/association
([4]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013); http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([5]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/kbbe/about-kbbe_en.html
([6]) FACET 'Flavours, additives and food contact material exposure task' http://www.ucd.ie/facet/
([7]) OBELIX 'Obesogenic endocrine disrupting chemicals: Linking prenatal exposure to the development of obesity later in life' http://www.theobelixproject.org/.
([8]) PERFOOD 'Perfluorinated Organics in Our Diet' http://www.perfood.eu/.
([9]) CONTAMED 'Contaminant mixtures and human reproductive health — novel strategies for health impact and risk assessment of endocrine disrupters' http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/88451_en.html
([10]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/home.html
([11]) Sustainable Food Security Topic H2020-SFS-12-2014 published on 11/12/2013 under Horizon 2020 http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/2328-sfs-12-2014.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002725/14
to the Commission
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Discrimination against lecturers

The discrimination against UK lecturers in Italy has been an ongoing case for 30 years. Despite six ECJ judgments in their favour, UK lecturers are still denied equal treatment.

Commissioner Andor recently called for sanctions against Switzerland, including excluding it from the Erasmus+ programme and Horizon 2020 projects, after it had reneged on commitments to respect the free movement of workers.

What actions should the Commission take against Italy for its non-adherence to ECJ rulings, and what actions will be taken to rectify this, and when?

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

The Honourable Member may be aware that two enquiries are under way on this issue, one of which focuses on possible discrimination on grounds of the nationality of the staff concerned, while the other is looking at alleged breaches of the EU rules regarding fixed-term employment contracts (see the Commission's answer to Question E-936/2013).

Since the Commission found no evidence of any infringement of EC law, it informed the complainants at the end of September and December 2013 respectively that it intended to close the cases. It would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-11051/2013 and 905/2014.

The Commission is now finalising its analysis of the observations and information submitted by the complainants in those two cases.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002726/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(7 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Informe de la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales de la UE (FRA)

La Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea acaba de publicar un informe realizado a partir de 42 000 entrevistas a mujeres. Las conclusiones de dicho informe son alarmantes: un 22 % de las mujeres españolas denuncia haber sufrido violencia física o sexual y calla ante ello.

Un 30 % asegura haber sido objeto de violencia física, sexual o psicológica en la infancia a manos de un adulto; 28 % sólo física o sexual. El 41 % de las españolas encuestadas evitan los espacios públicos considerados «peligrosos».

Por otra parte, el Gobierno de España, año tras año, ha ido reduciendo el presupuesto destinado a la lucha contra la violencia machista y al impulso de las políticas de igualdad. En los Presupuestos Generales del Estado para 2014, este recorte fue de un 20 %.

¿Qué medidas concretas tiene intención de adoptar la Comisión ante los resultados de este informe?

Atendiendo a las políticas de austeridad aplicadas en el Estado español, derivadas de la Unión Europea, con fuerte impacto en las condiciones de vida de las mujeres incrementando la feminización de la pobreza y la vuelta de las mujeres a los cuidados del hogar, ¿piensa estudiar la Comisión la incidencia de estas políticas de austeridad en la lucha contra violencia machista?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de abril de 2014)

El informe recientemente publicado por la Agencia de Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea (FRA) sobre la violencia contra las mujeres es la primera encuesta realizada a nivel de la UE sobre este tema. Responde a la necesidad de tener datos globales y comparables sobre la violencia contra las mujeres. Por lo tanto, la Comisión participará en los trabajos de la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales (FRA) y del Instituto Europeo de la Igualdad de Género (IEIG) para buscar el medio de realizar el seguimiento de esta encuesta, a fin de garantizar la disponibilidad de datos comparables a lo largo del tiempo.

En este momento, la Comisión está analizando los resultados de la encuesta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002726/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Report by the Fundamental Rights Agency

The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights has just published a report based on interviews with 42 000 women. The report's conclusions are alarming: 22% of Spanish women said they had suffered physical or sexual violence and not reported it.

As many as 30% had experienced physical, sexual or psychological violence in childhood at the hands of an adult, while for physical or sexual violence alone the figure was 28%. Some 41% of the Spanish women questioned said they avoided public places they considered to be dangerous.

Year after year, however, the Spanish Government has been cutting the budget for tackling gender-based violence and promoting equality policies: by 20% in the 2014 national budget, for example.

What specific measures does the Commission intend to take in response to this report?

Given that EU-imposed austerity policies in Spain are having a major impact on the living conditions of women, increasing the feminisation of poverty and promoting the return of women to housework, does the Commission intend to examine the impact of these austerity policies on the fight against gender-based violence?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

The report very recently published by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) on violence against women is the first ever EU-wide survey on this topic. It responds to the need for comprehensive and comparable data on violence against women. The Commission will therefore participate in the work of the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) and the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) to see how this survey could be followed-up in order to ensure the availability of comparable data over time.

The Commission is currently analysing the findings of the survey.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002728/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(7 Μαρτίου 2014)

Θέμα: Αξιολόγηση των επιπτώσεων του περσινού κουρέματος στην Κύπρο, ένα χρόνο μετά

Οι αποφάσεις του Eurogroup για την Κύπρο τον περσινό Μάρτιο (2013) βύθισαν μια ευημερούσα χώρα στην ύφεση, την ανεργία και τον αποπληθωρισμό, αφού σε χρόνο ρεκόρ μειώθηκε το τραπεζικό σύστημα της χώρας σε λιγότερο από το μισό του μέγεθος. Αυτό έχει εξαφανίσει τη ρευστότητα της οικονομίας με αποτέλεσμα οι επιχειρήσεις και τα νοικοκυριά να υποφέρουν άνευ προηγουμένου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σήμερα, ένα χρόνο μετά, πώς αξιολογεί τα αποτελέσματα των αποφάσεων του Eurogroup για την Κύπρο;

2. Πώς σκοπεύει να ανατρέψει την αρνητική κατάσταση που, μεταξύ άλλων, ήταν και το αποτέλεσμα των αποφάσεων της ΕΚΤ και της Επιτροπής ως μέλος της τρόικας;

3. Γνωρίζει καμιά οικονομική θεωρία ή κανένα textbook των οικονομικών που να δικαιολογεί τέτοιες πολιτικές λιτότητας, χωρίς επενδύσεις και χωρίς ανάπτυξη, καθώς επίσης και εάν έχει επιβληθεί σε άλλη χώρα ένα τέτοιο πρωτοφανές κούρεμα;

4. Από πού έχει αντλήσει η Επιτροπή τέτοιες θεωρίες και πώς τις τεκμηριώνει;

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

Η τελευταία ανασκόπηση των οικονομικών εξελίξεων στην Κύπρο και της εφαρμογής του προγράμματος μακροοικονομικής προσαρμογής υπάρχει στην έκθεση: «βοηθώντας την Κύπρο να συνεχίσει τις μεταρρυθμίσεις και να επανέλθει σε αναπτυξιακή τροχιά» ([1]).

Ταυτόχρονα, η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να επιστήσει την προσοχή του αξιότιμου μέλους του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου στην πρώτη έκθεση πεπραγμένων της ομάδας στήριξης για την Κύπρο, η οποία παρέχει τεχνική βοήθεια στις κυπριακές αρχές και χρησιμοποιεί τους πόρους των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων προκειμένου να στηρίξει τις προσπάθειες της Κύπρου για την επαναφορά της οικονομίας της σε τροχιά βιώσιμης ανάπτυξης και τη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας ([2]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-14-362_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/documents/2014-04-02_sgcy_first_activity_report_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002728/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Evaluation of the consequences of the 'haircut' in Cyprus one year ago

The decisions taken by the Eurogroup about Cyprus in March 2013 plunged a prosperous country into recession, unemployment and deflation, since in record time the country's banking system was reduced to less than half its size. This eliminated liquidity from the economy and, as a result, businesses and households are now suffering unprecedented difficulties.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Now, one year later, how does it evaluate the consequences of the Eurogroup's decisions regarding Cyprus?

2. How does it intend to reverse this negative situation which is the result, *inter alia*, of decisions taken by the ECB and by the Commission as part of the Troika?

3. Is it aware of any economic theory or economics textbook that justifies such austerity policies, unaccompanied by investment or growth, and has any other country ever been subjected to such a 'haircut'?

4. Where did the Commission come across such theories and what evidence does it have of their validity?

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

The latest assessment of the economic developments in Cyprus and of the implementation of the macroeconomic adjustment programme is available in the report: 'helping Cyprus pursue reforms and restore growth' ([1]).

At the same time the Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member of the European Parliament to the first activity report of the Support Group for Cyprus that provides technical assistance to the Cypriot authorities and mobilises the structural Funds to support Cypriot efforts to bring their economy on the path of sustainable growth and job creation ([2]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-14-362_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/documents/2014-04-02_sgcy_first_activity_report_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002729/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Contraffazione e Made in Italy

È recente la denuncia della Coldiretti italiana di un danno economico e di immagine incalcolabile. Secondo quanto riportato il 25 febbraio dall'agenzia giornalistica «Il Velino»/AGV News-Roma, si tratta di una contraffazione che costa all'Italia 300 mila posti di lavoro. «Le confezioni scoperte in Gran Bretagna — sottolinea la Coldiretti —, che promettono di ottenere una mozzarella in appena 30 minuti e gli altri formaggi italiani in appena due mesi, contengono recipienti, colini, garze, termometri, piccole presse, oltre a lipasi (l'enzima in grado di effettuare l'idrolisi dei lipidi) ed altre polveri. La garanzia di ottenere prodotti caseari ben identificati, che sono una chiara contraffazione dei celebri formaggi italiani, rappresenta una truffa ed un reato rispetto alle normative esistenti in proposito.»

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. non ha niente da dire contro queste manipolazioni truffaldine?

2. Non ritiene che queste confezioni mettano a rischio la credibilità di prodotti divenuti simbolo del *Made in Italy* di qualità grazie al lavoro di intere generazioni di allevatori e casari impegnati a rispettare rigorosi disciplinari?

3. Chi garantisce la sicurezza alimentare offerta da queste confezioni?

4. Come si concilia la denominazione d'origine con il prodotto finale di queste confezioni?

5. Cosa intende fare la Commissione contro questa contraffazione?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(28 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione è consapevole dell'esistenza di kit per la produzione di determinati formaggi.

2. Il regolamento (UE) n. 1151/2012 ([1]) disciplina l'identificazione e la protezione delle denominazioni e dei termini utilizzati per descrivere i prodotti agricoli. Di conseguenza la denominazione di origine protetta (DOP) o l'indicazione geografica protetta (IGP) sono protette contro qualsiasi usurpazione e qualsiasi altra prassi che possa indurre in errore il consumatore quanto alla vera origine del prodotto.

3. A norma del regolamento (CE) n. 178/2002 ([2]), gli operatori del settore in tutte le fasi della filiera alimentare devono garantire che gli alimenti o i mangimi soddisfino le prescrizioni della legislazione alimentare. Le norme relative alla filiera alimentare si applicano anche ai mangimi e alimenti ordinati a distanza, ad esempio tramite Internet, e consegnati al consumatore.

Gli Stati membri sono tenuti ad istituire un sistema di controlli ufficiali per verificare che le norme in materia siano rispettate.

4. I prodotti finali ottenuti con tali kit non possono essere considerati prodotti cui si applica una «denominazione d'origine». La DOP e l'IGP possono essere usate solo in riferimento a prodotti ottenuti rispettando le pertinenti specifiche.

5. La Commissione ha intrapreso iniziative volte a rafforzare la capacità dell'intero sistema di controllo dell'UE per combattere le frodi alimentari. In particolare, la Commissione ha istituito una rete di punti di contatto nazionali per lo scambio di informazioni e per agevolare la cooperazione amministrativa in caso di violazioni transfrontaliere.

([1]) Regolamento (UE) n. 1151/2012 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 21 novembre 2012, sui regimi di qualità dei prodotti agricoli e alimentari (GU L 343 del 14.12.2012, pag. 1).

([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 178/2002 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 28 gennaio 2002, che stabilisce i principi e i requisiti generali della legislazione alimentare, istituisce l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare e fissa procedure nel campo della sicurezza alimentare (GU L 31 dell'1.2.2002, pag. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002729/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Counterfeiting of 'Made in Italy' products

Coldiretti (the Italian national farmers' confederation) has recently lifted the lid on a counterfeiting operation, with countless images being provided. According to the report published on 25 February by the news agency Il Velino/AGV News-Roma, these illegal activities have taken away 300 000 jobs from the Italian market. 'The kits discovered in the United Kingdom, which promise you a mozzarella in just 30 minutes and other Italian cheeses in only two months, contain receptacles, strainers, cloths, thermometers and small presses, together with lipase (an enzyme that catalyses the hydrolysis of fats) and other powders,' reports Coldiretti. 'The guarantee that you will obtain specific dairy products — which are clearly counterfeit versions of famous Italian cheeses — is a scam, and violates the anti-counterfeiting regulations currently in force.'

1. Does the Commission have nothing to say against these fraudulent operations?

2. Does it not believe that these kits endanger the credibility of high-quality products that have grown to symbolise the 'Made in Italy' brand, thanks to the hard work of entire generations of farmers and cheese-makers who have resolutely stuck to extremely specific production methods?

3. Who guarantees the safety of the food products obtained with these kits?

4. Can the final products obtained with these kits be regarded as coming under a 'designation of origin'?

5. What actions does the Commission intend to take to combat this form of counterfeiting?

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

1. The Commission is aware of the existence of kits for the production of certain cheeses.

2. Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 ([1]) provides for the identification and protection of names and terms used to describe agricultural products. As a result a registered protected designation of origin (PDO) or a protected geographical indication (PGI) is protected against any misuse and any other practice liable to mislead the consumer as to the true origin of the product.

3. According to Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 ([2]), business operators at all stages of the food chain shall ensure that foods or feeds satisfy the requirements of food law. Food chain rules equally apply to feed and food ordered remotely, for example via the Internet, and delivered to the consumer.

Member States are responsible for establishing a system of official controls to verify that the relevant requirements are complied with.

4. The final products obtained with these kits cannot be regarded as coming under a 'designation of origin'. PDO and PGI can only be used with reference to products that have been obtained complying with the relevant product specification.

5. The Commission has undertaken activities to strengthen the capability of the EU control system as a whole to counter food fraud. In particular, it has established a network of national contact points intended to exchange information and facilitate administrative cooperation in cases of cross border violations.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs (OJ L 343, 14.12.2012, p. 1).
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety (OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002730/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Genitore 1 e 2 o papà e mamma

In Italia alcune amministrazioni comunali ed enti locali, tra cui il comune di Milano, favoriscono la moda «politicamente corretta» di eliminare dai moduli, in particolare quelli scolastici, termini quali «papà» e «mamma», per sostituirli con le asettiche espressioni «genitore 1» e «genitore 2», ritenendo di eliminare in tal modo le discriminazioni nei confronti di genitori omosessuali. A parte il fatto che non vi è nulla di politicamente corretto in tutto ciò, bensì si crea una scorretta forma di discriminazione nei confronti delle famiglie cosiddette «tradizionali», fa riflettere che si tenti di parificare i diritti utilizzando subdolamente la terminologia burocratica. Questo caso apre inoltre la porta a una discriminazione ben più ampia, visto che i numeri 1 e 2 sono in ordine progressivo e, pertanto, il «genitore 1» sarebbe teoricamente più importante del «genitore 2», mentre le accezioni di «papà» e «mamma» hanno uguale peso. Tanto varrebbe, a questo punto, inserire a fianco dei tradizionali genitori la figura dell'«altro», con la quale si potrebbero definire, oltre alle coppie omosessuali, anche nonni, zii, tutori e quant'altro.

La Commissione:

1. Può specificare in quali Stati membri si sta diffondendo una tale usanza, se ne è a conoscenza?

2. In quali modi riconosce il ruolo fondamentale della famiglia sul piano educativo, sociale ed economico nel contesto dell'Unione europea?

3. La tutela dei minori, patrocinata dall'Unione in vari settori, non dovrebbe applicarsi anche al loro diritto a riconoscere i genitori non con una cifra, ma con il nome di padri e madri?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(7 maggio 2014)

La Commissione non controlla sistematicamente la terminologia utilizzata nei moduli scolastici degli Stati membri, in quanto non dispone di competenze generali che le permettano di intervenire nei sistemi di istruzione a livello nazionale o locale, in conformità dell'articolo 165 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea. L'UE, inoltre, non ha competenza a pronunciarsi sulla forma o sul contenuto dei documenti pubblici rilasciati negli Stati membri (che siano emessi da un'autorità pubblica o da un ente privato cui sono affidate funzioni pubbliche). Nel 2013 la Commissione ha peraltro adottato una proposta che prevede che i documenti pubblici rilasciati in un altro Stato membro, compresi gli atti di stato civile, debbano essere accettati come autentici senza bisogno di timbro di autenticazione (postilla).

I diritti della famiglia sono riconosciuti e sanciti dalla Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea (articoli 7, 9 e 33). Inoltre, l'articolo 24 della Carta stabilisce che ogni minore ha diritto di intrattenere regolarmente relazioni personali e contratti diretti con i due genitori, salvo qualora ciò sia contrario al suo interesse. Tuttavia, in virtù dell'articolo 51, paragrafo 1, della Carta, le disposizioni della stessa si applicano agli Stati membri esclusivamente nell'applicazione del diritto dell'Unione.

La Commissione rammenta che il diritto di famiglia è di competenza degli Stati membri e che attualmente l'Unione europea non ha competenze generali relative ai diritti del minore. La Commissione è competente solo per la cooperazione giudiziaria in materia di diritto di famiglia che abbia implicazioni transfrontaliere. In generale, i trattati internazionali sui diritti umani si occupano della relazione tra il minore e i genitori e familiari, senza peraltro disciplinare la materia presentata dall'onorevole parlamentare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002730/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Parent 1 and 2, or mother and father

Some local authorities in Italy, including those in Milan, have stopped using the terms 'mother' and 'father' on documents, in particular school forms, in favour of the more 'politically correct' 'parent 1' and 'parent 2', so as not to discriminate against same-sex parents. Aside from the fact that there is nothing politically correct about these terms themselves and that their use is actually politically incorrect as it constitutes a form of discrimination against traditional families, this is a sly attempt to push the equal rights agenda using bureaucratic terminology. What is more, it could result in further discrimination, in that numbering parents '1' and '2' implies that one parent is more important than the other, whereas the terms 'mother' and 'father' carry equal weight. If we are to go down this road, why not just keep the traditional titles and simply add a third field designated 'other' to allow not only same-sex parents, but also grandparents, aunts and uncles, guardians, or others to be specified on the form?

1. Can the Commission say which Member States use such terminology?

2. What recognition does the Commission give to the educational, social and economic role the family plays in the EU?

3. Should children's rights, which the EU already guarantees, not include the fundamental right to have parents who are recognised as mother and father, and not simply as numbers?

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

The Commission does not systematically monitor the terminology used in school forms in Member States, as it has no general powers to intervene in education systems at national or local level, in accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The EU has also no competence to rule on the form or contents of public documents issued in Member States (whether issued by a public authority or a private entity entrusted with public duties). The Commission adopted in 2013 a proposal providing that public documents issued in another Member State, including civil status documents, must be accepted as authentic without the need for an authentication stamp (the apostille).

The rights of the family are recognised and enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Article 7, Article 9, Article 33). Moreover, Article 24 of the Charter stipulates that every child shall have the right to maintain on a regular basis a personal relationship and direct contact with both his or her parents, unless that is contrary to his or her interests. However, according to its Article 51 (1), the provisions of the Charter are addressed to Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

The Commission recalls that family law is a Member State competence and that the European Union currently does not have general powers in respect of the rights of the child. The Commission has only competence as regards judicial cooperation in family law having cross-border implications. More generally, international human rights treaties focus on the relationship between the child and his or her parents and family members but they omit to regulate the matter put forward by the Honourable Member.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002731/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Pirateria marittima

La pirateria marittima sta diffondendosi sempre di più anche in Africa occidentale e segnatamente nel Golfo di Guinea. L'assenza di una cornice giuridica certa sulla tutela degli Stati alle proprie navi, dovuta anche al recente rifiuto del Segretario generale delle Nazioni Unite di prendere posizione sul caso dei marò italiani, costringe armatori, spedizionieri, assicuratori a provvedere da soli con contractors privati, rispetto ai quali i vari Stati africani del Golfo di Guinea hanno posizioni divergenti.

Può dire la Commissione:

1. se è consapevole dell'escalation dell'attività piratesca in corso nelle acque del Golfo di Guinea?

2. Se è a conoscenza del contratto Guardcon, messo a punto nel 2012 dall'associazione Bimco che raggruppa i soggetti coinvolti nel commercio via mare, in base al quale il riconoscimento di una copertura assicurativa delle navi viene spesso subordinato al ricorso a «private military security companies», che reclutano personale per la sorveglianza sulle navi?

3. Se è a conoscenza del fatto che numerosi Stati del Golfo di Guinea esigono che il personale di guardia sulle navi abbia un passaporto emesso da quegli Stati, pena l'invalidità del contratto Guardcon e di ogni copertura assicurativa, come riconosciuto dalla stessa Bimco?

4. Se non ritiene che rientri tra i propri doveri e competenze la promozione, presso gli organismi internazionali competenti, della codificazione di una disciplina uniforme, che non abbia natura meramente privatistica come quella promossa in sede Bimco, circa i requisiti di reclutamento di contractors privati e le regole di ingaggio che questi devono seguire sulle navi?

5. Se non ritiene che la ricerca di una soluzione alla vicenda dei marò debba essere promossa dall'UE nelle opportune sedi internazionali, anche come soluzione al problema della tutela dei commerci marittimi internazionali?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente dell'escalation degli incidenti nel Golfo di Guinea (oltre 50 casi segnalati nel 2013). Gli attacchi contro le navi nel Golfo di Guinea si verificano prevalentemente nelle acque territoriali degli Stati limitrofi, nel qual caso vengono definiti «rapine a mano armata in mare» (armed robbery at sea — ARAS). In questi casi, gli Stati possono esercitare pienamente la propria sovranità e sono legalmente autorizzati a vietare il ricorso a società private di sicurezza marittima a bordo delle navi commerciali. Il 17 marzo 2014 l'UE ha adottato una strategia relativa al Golfo di Guinea volta a sostenere gli sforzi prodigati nella regione e nei suoi Stati costieri per affrontare le numerose cause dell'insicurezza marittima, tra cui la pirateria e le ARAS.

Per quanto riguarda la pirateria, la Commissione è a conoscenza di GUARDCON, un'iniziativa che vede coinvolti determinati interessi nel settore marittimo.

La Commissione è favorevole all'elaborazione della norma ISO 28 007, che dovrebbe porre le basi per qualsiasi prestazione continuata di servizi da parte di società private di sicurezza marittima a vantaggio del settore dei trasporti marittimi. La Commissione ritiene che questo debba essere il primo passo verso l'elaborazione di uno strumento giuridico internazionale che copra tutte le situazioni di questo tipo in mare, vale a dire la pirateria e le ARAS.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002731/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Maritime piracy

Maritime piracy is becoming ever more widespread, including in West Africa and in particular in the Gulf of Guinea. The lack of a certain legal framework covering protection by states of their own vessels, due in part to the recent refusal of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to take a position on the case of the Italian marines, forces shipowners, shippers and insurers to take their own measures with private contractors, in respect of which the various African states of the Gulf of Guinea take different viewpoints.

Can the Commission say

1. whether it is aware of the escalation of pirate activity taking place in the waters of the Gulf of Guinea;

2. whether it is aware of the Guardcon contract, implemented in 2012 by the Bimco association of those involved in the shipping industry, under which recognition of insurance cover for the vessels is often linked to the use of 'private military security companies', which recruit staff to watch over vessels;

3. whether it is aware of the fact that numerous Gulf of Guinea states require that security guards on the vessels have a passport issued by those states, failing which the Guardcon contract and any insurance cover are invalid, as recognised by Bimco;

4. whether it considers that its duties and competences cover the promotion, with the competent international bodies, of the codification of a uniform regulation, not of a merely private enterprise nature such as that promoted by Bimco, in relation to the requirements for recruiting private contractors and the rules of engagement which they must follow on the vessels;

5. whether it considers that the search for a solution to the situation of the marines should be promoted by the EU with the appropriate international bodies, together with a solution to the problem of protecting international maritime trade?

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

The Commission is aware of the escalation of incidents in the Gulf of Guinea, with more than 50 cases reported in 2013. Attacks against ships in the Gulf of Guinea mainly take place in territorial waters of bordering States and are then named 'armed robbery at sea (ARAS)'. In such cases States can fully exercise their sovereignty and are legally empowered to forbid the use of private maritime security companies on board commercial ships. The EU adopted on the 17 March 2014 a Strategy on the Gulf of Guinea to support the efforts of the region and its coastal states to address the many challenges of maritime insecurity, including Piracy and ARAS .

As far as piracy is concerned the Commission is aware of GUARDCON which is an initiative by some maritime interests.

The Commission supports the elaboration of the ISO 28 007 standard that should form the basis for any sustained provision of service by private maritime security companies to the benefit of the shipping industry. In the view of the Commission this should form the first step through the elaboration of an international legal instrument encompassing all situations of the kind at sea, namely both piracy and ARAS.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002732/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Referendum svizzero e reazioni UE

È indubbio che il risultato del recente referendum svizzero contro la libera circolazione abbia creato preoccupazione e timori nelle zone frontaliere particolarmente interessate: Ticino, Lombardia e Piemonte. Il mercato del lavoro è sotto tensione e le prime reazioni dell'UE fanno temere una rottura politica che vedrebbe tutti perdenti. Il rifiuto di far partecipare gli studenti svizzeri al programma Erasmus mi sembra sproporzionato ed ingiusto rispetto al caso in questione. Colpire la fascia giovanile per ritorsione contro l'espressione della volontà popolare mi sembra un'azione arbitraria, irragionevole e asimmetrica. Far pagare ai giovani le pretese «colpe» di un intero corpo elettorale è un'azione tendenziosa e impropria. Perché deve pagare la fascia più debole della popolazione? Non bisogna dimenticare d'altronde che nel Canton Ticino il rapporto tra stranieri e autoctoni è molto alto a favore dei primo e i problemi che ne conseguono sono reali e non immaginari o soltanto frutto di una cultura xenofoba. Si tratta allora di analizzare insieme (Svizzera, Italia, UE) il fenomeno per cercare soluzioni che possano causare i minori danni possibili agli uni e agli altri, poiché temo che iniziative di rappresaglia non sufficientemente valutate non possano che recare danno. E, di certo, nelle zone frontaliere con l'Italia non c'è bisogno di altri danni istituzionali, oltre ai problemi esistenti da sempre ma sempre contenuti in alti e bassi sopportabili.

La Commissione:

1. Perché non propone un gruppo di lavoro composto da rappresentanti della Lombardia, del Piemonte e del Ticino, assistiti da rappresentanti del governo confederale e dall'UE, per analizzare a fondo i problemi che si pongono, senza giungere a ukaze arroganti e insopportabili che fanno sempre più male che bene?

2. Non ritiene che una valutazione concreta degli interessi degli uni e degli altri giovi a trovare soluzioni equilibrate e non asimmetriche?

3. Non considera che il dialogo costruttivo, di fronte a posizioni divergenti, sia sempre un mezzo più opportuno e rispettoso della democrazia, rispetto ad una condanna unilaterale del suffragio universale?

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

La Commissione europea nutre il massimo rispetto per la tradizione svizzera di democrazia diretta. Tuttavia, la decisione di non procedere, per il momento, con l'associazione della Svizzera al programma Orizzonte 2020 non è né una «punizione» né una «sanzione» che fa seguito all'espressione dell'elettorato svizzero, ma la logica conseguenza della scelta che la Svizzera stessa ha operato, conseguenza che era ben nota già prima del referendum.

Il governo svizzero ha indicato di non potere firmare e concludere il protocollo che estende l'accordo UE-Svizzera sulla libera circolazione delle persone alla Croazia né garantire ai cittadini croati il beneficio della libera circolazione in Svizzera. Gli Stati membri dell'UE hanno subordinato l'esito dei negoziati sull'associazione e la partecipazione della Svizzera ad Orizzonte 2020 e a Erasmus + alla conclusione di tale protocollo. La Commissione europea ha pertanto sospeso i negoziati relativi a tali accordi sino a quando la Svizzera non si impegnerà ufficialmente a perseguire l'obiettivo del protocollo.

Essendo un paese sovrano, la Svizzera è libera di decidere in merito agli obblighi internazionali che intende assumere. Tali decisioni possono tuttavia avere conseguenze sulle relazioni UE-Svizzera, come è successo nel caso del protocollo.

Un dialogo costruttivo tra l'UE e la Svizzera è attualmente in corso e proseguirà nei prossimi mesi. Tuttavia, non spetta all'UE trovare una soluzione a un problema creato dal risultato del voto popolare del 9 febbraio. La Commissione europea è pronta ad ascoltare le proposte svizzere relative all'attuazione dell'iniziativa. Essa esaminerà inoltre anche le preoccupazioni delle amministrazioni locali e regionali e dei loro cittadini, nel momento in cui queste saranno segnalate dai rappresentanti delle amministrazioni nazionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002732/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Swiss referendum and EU reactions

There is no doubt that the outcome of the recent Swiss referendum against free movement has created concern and fear in the border areas particularly affected: Ticino, Lombardy and Piedmont. The employment market is under stress and initial reactions from the EU give rise to fears of a political split under which everyone would be a loser. The refusal to allow Swiss students to take part in the Erasmus programme seems to me disproportionate and unfair in relation to the case in question. Punishing the younger generation in retaliation for the expression of popular will seems to me an arbitrary, unreasonable and asymmetric action. To make young people pay for the alleged 'fault' of an entire electoral body is a tendentious and inappropriate action. Why should the weakest segment of the population pay? Also, it must not be forgotten that in Ticino Canton there is a very high ratio of foreigners to nationals and the problems which arise from that are real and not imaginary or merely the fruit of a xenophobic culture. What is required now is a joint analysis (Switzerland, Italy, the EU) of the problem in order to identify solutions which will cause the least possible harm to either side, because I am afraid that reprisal initiatives which have not been sufficiently well evaluated can only cause harm. And indeed, in the areas bordering Italy there is no need for any further institutional harm, in addition to the problems which have always existed but have always been contained within tolerable limits.

1. Why does the Commission not propose a working group composed of representatives from Lombardy, Piedmont and Ticino, assisted by representatives of the Swiss Government and the EU, to conduct an in-depth analysis of the problems which have arisen, without resorting to arrogant and untenable *ukase* which always do more harm than good?

2. Does it consider that a concrete evaluation of the interests of the parties will assist in finding balanced and not asymmetrical solutions?

3. Does it consider that constructive dialogue, faced with divergent positions, is always a more appropriate means and more respectful of democracy than unilateral condemnation of universal suffrage?

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

The European Commission fully respects the Swiss tradition of direct democracy. However, the decision not to go ahead with the association of Switzerland to Horizon 2020 for the time being is not a 'punishment' or 'sanction' for the expression of the Swiss electorate, but a logical consequence of the choice Switzerland itself has made, a consequence which was well-known before.

The 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. EU Member States made the conclusion of negotiations on Swiss association and participation in Horizon 2020 and Erasmus+ Council's dependent on the conclusion of this protocol. The European Commission has consequently put negotiations of these agreements on hold until Switzerland formally commits to the objective of the protocol.

Switzerland is a sovereign country, and as such is free to decide on the international obligations it wishes to enter into. These decisions however may have consequences for EU-Swiss relations, as was the case for the protocol.

Constructive dialogue between the EU and Switzerland is taking place and will continue over the coming months. It is, however, not up to the EU to find a solution to a problem created by the outcome of the popular vote on 9 February. The European Commission stands ready to listen to the Swiss proposals concerning the implementation of the initiative. It will also consider concerns of local and regional administrations and their citizens when relayed via the representatives of national administrations.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002733/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Lotta agli sprechi alimentari

Secondo le statistiche in Italia ogni cittadino spreca in media 110 kg di cibo all'anno, per un totale di 6,6 milioni di tonnellate (circa 12 miliardi di euro). Questa quantità basterebbe a sfamare 17,6 milioni di persone, vale a dire poco meno di un terzo della popolazione italiana. Quattro giovani ingegneri del Politecnico di Torino hanno ideato un progetto per combattere questo enorme spreco. Si tratta di una piattaforma web gratuita (NDH-www.nextdoorhelp.it) già online e funzionante, che permette di regalare quanto non può essere consumato prima della data di scadenza. Il funzionamento è molto semplice: dopo la registrazione sul sito si può gratuitamente condividere un alimento con la community o richiederne uno messo a disposizione degli altri utenti. Gli autori hanno avviato una collaborazione con «Slow Food» e hanno presentato ufficialmente il progetto a Torino il 19 dicembre scorso, insieme all'Assessore alle politiche per l'ambiente del comune di Torino.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza del progetto?

2. Se potrebbe eventualmente verificare sul sito l'utilità del progetto stesso, ai fini della lotta agli sprechi e nel quadro delle politiche per la tutela dell'ambiente e la sicurezza alimentare?

3. Se, dato che la lotta allo spreco è anche collegata alla conoscenza degli strumenti necessari a combatterla, non potrebbe diffondere la conoscenza di questo progetto per contribuire ad aumentare l'impegno dei cittadini contro lo spreco stesso?

4. Se è disponibile a prendere iniziative in proposito nell'ambito delle azioni contro lo spreco?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(6 maggio 2014)

La Commissione europea sta controllando attivamente le iniziative di innovazione sociale volte a ridurre i rifiuti alimentari lungo l'intera catena alimentare sia attraverso il suo dialogo attivo con le parti interessate ([1]) sia nell'ambito di vari progetti di ricerca UE, come FUSIONS (Food Use for Social Innovation by Optimizing Waste Prevention Strategies — Utilizzazione di alimenti per l'innovazione sociale ottimizzando le strategie di prevenzione della produzione di rifiuti ([2])) e RESPONDER (Linking Sustainable Consumption and Production and growth debate — Collegare il dibattito sulla produzione e il consumo sostenibili e la crescita) ([3]). La Commissione non è ancora a conoscenza del progetto citato dall'onorevole parlamentare (NDH-www.nextdoorhelp.it), ma iniziative locali come questa possono svolgere un ruolo importante nella prevenzione dei rifiuti alimentari.

Il progetto FUSIONS ha lanciato sette studi di fattibilità nel settore dell'innovazione sociale che verificheranno e valuteranno i modi in cui l'innovazione sociale può contribuire a ridurre i rifiuti alimentari. I risultati di questi studi svilupperanno l'informazione e le migliori prassi in questo ambito.

La Commissione europea sta aiutando a promuovere queste iniziative di innovazione sociale attraverso i siti rispettivi della Direzione generale Salute e consumatori ([4]) e di FUSIONS.

Per ulteriori informazioni sulle sue attività nella lotta contro i rifiuti alimentari, la Commissione europea rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta all'interrogazione scritta QE 13588/2013 ([5]). La Commissione intende inoltre inserire nella prossima comunicazione sull'economia circolare una serie di misure adottate per rispondere all'impegno preso nel quadro del settimo programma comunitario di azione in materia di ambiente.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/stakeholders_en.htm
([2]) http://www.eu-fusions.org/
([3]) Tema Cambiamenti climatici http://www.scp-responder.eu/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/good_practices_en.htm
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002733/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Fight against food waste

According to statistics, every Italian citizen wastes on average 110 kg of food a year, a total of 6.6 million tonnes (around EUR 12 billion). This amount would be sufficient to feed 17.6 million people, in other words, slightly less than one third of the population of Italy. Four young engineers from Turin Polytechnic have created a project to fight this enormous waste. It is a free web platform (NDH-www.nextdoorhelp.it), already up and running, which allows users to donate anything which cannot be consumed by the use by date. Its operation is very simple: after registering on the site, users are able to share a food item with the community free of charge, or ask for one to be made available by other users. The designers set up a collaboration with 'Slow Food' and officially launched the project in Turin on 19 December last year, together with the Environmental Policy Advisor of the Municipality of Turin.

1. Is the Commission aware of the project?

2. Would it be able to verify the utility of the project from the website, for the purposes of the fight against waste and within the framework of policies to protect the environment and food safety?

3. Since the fight against waste is also linked to awareness of the tools necessary to combat it, could it spread awareness of this project in order to contribute to increasing the commitment of citizens against waste?

4. Is it prepared to take any initiatives in this respect within the scope of action against waste?

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

The European Commission is monitoring actively social innovation initiatives to reduce food waste along the whole food chain both through its active dialogue with stakeholders ([1]) and with several EU research projects, such as Fusions (Food Use for Social Innovation by Optimizing Waste Prevention Strategies ([2])) and Responder (Linking Sustainable Consumption and Production and growth debate) ([3]). Whilst the Commission is not yet aware of the project cited by the Honourable Member (NDH-www.nextdoorhelp.it), on-the-ground initiatives such as these can play an important role in prevention of food waste.

The Fusions project has launched seven social innovation feasibility studies which will test and evaluate how social innovation can help to reduce food waste. Findings from these studies will help inform and develop best practice in this area.

The European Commission is helping to promote such social innovation initiatives through the respective websites of the Health and Consumers Directorate General ([4]) and Fusions.

For further information on its work in tackling food waste, the European Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to written question QE 13588/2013 ([5]). The Commission also intends to include measures to address the commitment in the 7th Environment Action Programme to reduce food waste in the forthcoming Communication on the circular economy.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/stakeholders_en.htm
([2]) http://www.eu-fusions.org/
([3]) Climate Change theme http://www.scp-responder.eu/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/good_practices_en.htm
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002734/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Progetto di utilità sociale nell'ambito del settore socio-sanitario diretto al sostegno di cittadini over 60

Le sezioni regionali di Emilia Romagna, Lazio e Marche dell'Associazione di volontariato «Andromeda», dedita alla promozione, attraverso progetti ed iniziative con le istituzioni, dello sviluppo sociale e culturale sul territorio, hanno sviluppato un progetto di utilità sociale nell'ambito del settore socio-sanitario. Il progetto è finalizzato all'inclusione sociale dei cittadini over 60 autosufficienti o con limitate capacità motorie fornendo loro percorsi di socializzazione, partecipazione attiva e di recupero e mantenimento del benessere psichico e fisico.

La condivisione delle strutture, aperte di giorno anche ad ospiti esterni in modalità diurna, servirà a coinvolgere la popolazione over 60 cercando di facilitare la loro vita togliendo gran parte delle barriere architettoniche che sono un ostacolo persino nelle proprie abitazioni. Questo progetto disporrà inoltre di dotazioni sportive adeguate al recupero e al mantenimento del benessere psico-fisico, e per fare ciò verranno recuperate e valorizzate strutture già esistenti.

Inoltre, è prevista la realizzazione di «condomini sociali» finalizzati all'ospitalità e alla gestione dei familiari dei ricoverati nel reparto di oncologia di un Policlinicoemiliano. Il progetto prevede che tali attività si realizzino attraverso l'acquisizione, il recupero e l'adeguamento di strutture selezionate tra immobili già individuati a tal fine, ove poter svolgere le attività programmate. Oltre alla realizzazione di una rete interregionale tra le sedi sociali coinvolte, tale progetto porterà un notevole vantaggio sia sotto l'aspetto occupazionale, offrendo posti di lavoro a personale specializzato nell'assistenza degli anziani, sia nell'offrire un servizio assistenziale, sempre più importante in una Europa dove il tasso di anzianità (o durata della vita) è destinato a crescere nei prossimi anni, in un contesto in cui il nuovo assetto sociale della famiglia tende ad escludere l'anziano dal nucleo familiare.

Alla luce di quanto premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se sono previsti finanziamenti comunitari per la realizzazione di tale progetto, compreso l'acquisto ed il recupero di immobili da destinare in tal senso;

2. quali sono i finanziamenti volti a sostenere progetti di utilità sociale, in particolare nell'ambito del settore dell'assistenza socio-sanitaria, nella passata programmazione 2007-2013 per fondi non ancora utilizzati o, in alternativa, nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2014)

La Commissione europea può soltanto sostenere e integrare le politiche degli Stati membri in materia di inclusione sociale e protezione sociale poiché tale ambito rientra nella loro competenza precipua.

I programmi dei Fondi strutturali sono gestiti, in base al principio della gestione concorrente, a livello nazionale o regionale sotto la responsabilità di un'autorità di gestione. Per informazioni dettagliate sulle possibilità di finanziamento si invia l'Onorevole deputata a mettersi in contatto con l'autorità di gestione del Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) nelle tre regioni interessate ([1]).

In relazione al progetto menzionato dall'Onorevole deputata va ribadito che, sia nel periodo di programmazione 2007-2013 sia in quello 2014-2020, l'FSE non può finanziare componenti infrastrutturali ([2]) e che il progetto in quanto tale non sembra rientrare nel suo campo di applicazione. L'FSE può tuttavia intervenire a sostegno di certe attività come la (ri)qualificazione del personale interessato o attività di assistenza atte ad accrescere la partecipazione al mercato del lavoro.

([1]) Regione Lazio: http://www.portalavoro.regione.lazio.it/portalavoro/fondo-sociale-europeo/POR-2007-2013.php
Regione Marche http://www.portalavoro.regione.lazio.it/portalavoro/fondo-sociale-europeo/POR-2007-2013.php
Regione Emilia Romagna fesr.regione.emilia-romagna.it; www.porfesr.lazio.it; www.europa.marche.it
Regione Emilia Romagna: http://formazionelavoro.regione.emilia-romagna.it/sito-fse

([2]) Periodo 2007-2013: l'acquisto di mobili, attrezzature, veicoli, infrastrutture, beni immobili e terreni non configura una spesa ammissibile a valere sul FSE (articolo 11, paragrafo 2, lettera c), del regolamento (CE) n. 1081/2006).
2014-2020: l'acquisto di infrastrutture, terreni e beni immobili non è altresì ammissibile al finanziamento dell'FSE (articolo 13, paragrafo 4, del regolamento (CE) n. 1304/2013).

I programmi regionali cofinanziati dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale nel periodo di programmazione 2007-2013 in queste regioni non riguardano interventi o progetti in materia di inclusione sociale. Per quanto concerne il prossimo periodo di programmazione, il FESR prevede in generale la possibilità di cofinanziare gli investimenti volti a migliorare i servizi sociali e sanitari, tenendo conto dei bisogni specifici degli anziani. Per l'Italia, l'ambito potenziale di intervento del FESR per tali investimenti dipenderà dalle condizioni stipulate nell'accordo di partnership nei programmi operativi regionali che saranno ufficialmente presentati alla Commissione nei prossimi mesi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002734/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Social utility project in healthcare sector aimed at supporting citizens over 60

The Emilia Romagna, Lazio and Marche regional sections of the voluntary association 'Andromeda', which is involved in the promotion of social and cultural development throughout the area by means of projects and initiatives in collaboration with institutions, have developed a social utility project in the healthcare sector. The aim of the project is the social inclusion of those citizens over 60 who are independent or with limited motor capacity by providing them with the means of socialisation, active participation and the recovery and maintenance of their psychological and physical well-being.

The sharing of premises, also open to day visitors, will involve the over 60 population, seeking to facilitate their lives by removing a large part of the architectural barriers which are an obstacle even in their own homes. This project will also make use of sporting facilities suitable for the recovery and maintenance of their psychological and physical well-being, and in order to do so, existing premises will be refurbished and upgraded.

It is also intended to create 'social condominiums' for receiving and accommodating the relatives of the patients of the oncology department of a hospital in Emilia. Under the project these activities will be carried out by means of the purchase, restoration and adaptation of premises selected from buildings already identified for this purpose, where the programmed activities can be carried out. In addition to creating an interregional network of participating social institutions, this project will bring a significant advantage both from an employment point of view, providing jobs for staff specialising in geriatric care, and in providing a care service, ever more important in a Europe in which the proportion of elderly people (or life expectancy) is expected to increase in the coming years, in a context in which the new social structure of the family tends to exclude the elderly from the nuclear family.

In view of the above, can the Commission advise:

1. whether any Community financing is to be made available for the implementation of this project, including the purchase and restoration of premises to be used for this purpose;

2. what financing has been made available to support social utility projects, in particular in the healthcare sector, in the previous period 2007 — 13 as regards funds not yet used, or alternatively in the new period 2014 — 20?

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

The European Commission can only support and complement the Member States' policies in the fields of social inclusion and social protection as this is within mainly their competence.

Structural fund programmes are managed — according to the principle of shared management — at national or regional level, under the responsibility of a managing authority. For detailed information about funding possibilities, the Honourable Member is invited to contact the European Social Fund (ESF) Managing Authority in the three concerned regions ([1]).

In relation to the project referred to by the Honourable Member, it is to be underlined that, both in the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programming periods, ESF cannot finance infrastructural components ([2]) and that the project as such does not seem to fall within its scope. However, ESF could intervene to support some activities such as the (re)training of the staff involved or care activities which allow increased participation in employment.

([1]) Regione Lazio: http://www.portalavoro.regione.lazio.it/portalavoro/fondo-sociale-europeo/POR-2007-2013.php
Regione Marche: http://www.portalavoro.regione.lazio.it/portalavoro/fondo-sociale-europeo/POR-2007-2013.php
Regione Emilia Romagna: fesr.regione.emilia-romagna.it — www.porfesr.lazio.it — www.europa.marche.it
Regione Emilia Romagna: http://formazionelavoro.regione.emilia-romagna.it/sito-fse

([2]) 2007-2013: The purchase of furniture, equipment, vehicles, infrastructure, real estate and land does not constitute eligible expenditure from the ESF (art.11,2.c) of Regulation (EC) No 1081/2006.
2014-2020: the purchase of infrastructure, land and real estate remains shall also not be eligible for a contribution from the ESF Art.13,4. of Regulation (EC) No 1304/2013.

The regional programmes co financed by the European Regional Development Fund in the 2007-2013 programming period in these regions do not cover intervention or projects on social inclusion. As concerns the next programming period, the ERDF generally provides for the possibility to co-finance investments to improve social and health services taking into account the specific needs of elderly people. For Italy, the potential scope of intervention of ERDF for such investments will depend on the conditions stipulated in Italy's Partnership Agreement and in the Regional Operational Programmes that will be officially submitted to the Commission in the next months.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002735/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Realizzazione di un progetto teatrale ad alta valenza sociale da parte di un'associazione toscana: possibili finanziamenti

L'Unione europea si è sempre rivolta con favore al sostegno delle iniziative tese a realizzare idee e progetti nell'ambito culturale e artistico. Un'associazione toscana ha ideato un progetto per la realizzazione di uno spettacolo musicale incentrato su vari temi e problematiche sociali quali la depressione, l'anoressia, l'uso di droghe, il bullismo e i diritti dei bambini e della famiglia. Lo spettacolo, che avrà una durata di circa 100 minuti, sarà introdotto con la proiezione di un cortometraggio realizzato con immagini di varie donne riprese nel periodo gestazionale in varie situazioni: la guerra, la violenza casalinga, l'emarginazione. Vari artisti contribuiranno alla messa in scena dello spettacolo con le loro esibizioni canore e scenografiche. Altre scene vedranno rappresentate storie tratte dalla realtà dirette a sensibilizzare il pubblico sui diritti dei bambini.

Considerata l'attenzione che l'Unione europea rivolge all'adozione di politiche dirette a sostenere il patrimonio culturale, attraverso la creazione di programmi di finanziamento quali «Europa creativa 2014-2020», e considerata l'importanza dei programmi diretti alla prevenzione di ogni violenza fisica, sessuale e psicologica nei confronti dei bambini, dei giovani e delle donne, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. quali finanziamenti o bandi europei sono previsti per la realizzazione di tale progetto?

2. Quali sono i finanziamenti previsti per la realizzazione di progetti teatrali ad alta valenza sociale nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020?

3. Qual è il quadro generale della situazione?

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

I progetti in ambito culturale beneficiano principalmente del sostegno del sottoprogramma Cultura del programma Europa creativa (2014-2020). I principali obiettivi del programma Europa creativa consistono nel promuovere la diversità culturale e la competitività dei settori culturali e creativi. Più precisamente il sottoprogramma Cultura mira a rafforzare la capacità di questi settori di operare a livello transnazionale, attraverso la cooperazione e la mobilità. Poiché la dimensione europea è un elemento chiave nel quadro di Europa creativa, per essere ammissibile al finanziamento un progetto deve coinvolgere operatori culturali di diversi paesi europei. Di conseguenza, la Commissione non può sostenere progetti attuati da un'unico ente. Per ulteriori informazioni e consulenza, si prega di contattare il desk Europa creativa italiano incaricato di promuovere il programma in Italia. ([1])

Le opportunità di finanziamento nel quadro del programma Europa creativa sono disponibili attraverso inviti a presentare proposte. I prossimi bandi riguardanti progetti di cooperazione saranno pubblicati entro l'estate 2014. Ulteriori informazioni sono reperibili sul sito: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/calls/index_en.htm.

Gli operatori culturali possono ricevere finanziamenti anche da altri programmi o piani di sovvenzioni dell'UE, quali il programma COSME, Erasmus+, Europa per i cittadini e i fondi strutturali.

([1]) http://cultura.cedesk.beniculturali.it/creative-europe-desk-italia.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002735/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Development of a socially relevant theatre project by an association in Tuscany: possible financing

The European Union has always supported initiatives designed to put cultural and artistic ideas and projects into practice . An association in Tuscany has come up with a project for a musical show focusing on a range of social issues and problems, such as depression, anorexia, drug use, bullying and the rights of children and of the family. The show, which will last around 100 minutes, will open with the projection of a short film consisting of images of pregnant women against the background of war, domestic violence and marginalisation. Various singers and actors will also take part in the show . Other scenes will recount stories taken from real life in an effort to increase public awareness of children's rights.

Given the importance which the European Union attaches to adopting policies intended to safeguard cultural heritage, by setting up financing programmes such as 'Creative Europe 2014-2020', and the importance of programmes designed to prevent all forms of physical, sexual and psychological violence towards children, young people and women:

1. What forms of European funding are available for projects of this kind?

2. What forms of funding are available for socially relevant theatre projects in the new programming period (2014-2020)?

3. Can the Commission provide an overview of the situation?

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

Projects in the cultural field are mainly supported by the Culture sub-programme of the Creative Europe programme (2014-2020). The main objectives of Creative Europe are to promote cultural diversity and the competitiveness of the cultural and creative sectors. More precisely, the Culture sub-programme aims to reinforce the capacity of these sectors to operate transnationally through cooperation and mobility. The European dimension being a key element under Creative Europe, several cultural operators from different European countries must be involved in a project if it is to be eligible for funding. Consequently, the Commission cannot support projects implemented by a single organisation. For further information and advice, please contact the Italian Creative Europe Desk which is responsible for promoting the programme in Italy. ([1])

Funding opportunities in the framework of Creative Europe are available through calls for proposals. The next calls for cooperation projects will be published by summer 2014. Further information is available under: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/calls/index_en.htm.

Cultural operators may also receive funding through other EU programmes or grant schemes, like the COSME programme, Erasmus+, Europe for Citizens and the Structural Funds.

([1]) http://cultura.cedesk.beniculturali.it/creative-europe-desk-italia.aspx

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002736/14
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(7 martie 2014)

Subiect: Program informatic de învățare a limbilor străine pentru persoane diagnosticate cu autism

Statisticile arată că, la 100 de nașteri, cel puțin o persoană suferă de autism, ceea ce reprezintă cel puțin 5 milioane de persoane la nivel european. Această afecțiune are o frecvență de patru ori mai mare la băieți decât la fete, indiferent de mediul social.

Ce este mai grav este faptul că circa 80 % dintre copiii afectați de această boală nu merg la școală, fapt care are consecințe semnificative asupra vieții personale și, mai ales, profesionale ulterioare a copiilor.

Pe de altă parte, efectele pe termen lung ale autismului asupra sistemelor sociale din țările în cauză este important, această boală reprezentând o adevărată provocare pentru sănătatea publică.

Pentru evitarea marginalizării acestor persoane și integrarea lor în societate este nevoie de soluții adecvate pentru pregătirea lor profesională, un capitol important fiind și cel al învățării limbilor străine.

Ce strategie are Comisia pentru a sprijini proiectele autorităților locale și parteneriatele cu societatea civilă și sectorul privat pentru dezvoltarea și aplicarea unor programe informatice specializate pentru învățarea limbii materne și a limbilor străine destinate copiilor și persoanelor diagnosticate cu autism, în vederea integrării acestora pe piața forței de muncă?

Răspuns dat de dna Vassiliou în numele Comisiei
(28 aprilie 2014)

În conformitate cu articolul 165 din Tratatul privind funcționarea UE, statele membre sunt responsabile pentru organizarea și conținutul sistemelor lor educaționale, inclusiv dispozițiile referitoare la educația și formarea profesională a persoanelor cu nevoi speciale și dificultăți specifice de învățare, cum ar fi autismul.

În perioada 2014-2020, *Erasmus+* va oferi noi oportunități de finanțare pentru o gamă largă de actori care lucrează în parteneriat pentru îmbunătățirea situației educaționale a elevilor cu nevoi educaționale speciale. Va oferi, în special, oportunități de finanțare pentru școli, autorități școlare și organizații pentru educație, în scopul de a dezvolta și de a pune în aplicare practici inovatoare, inclusiv utilizarea TIC în învățarea limbilor străine și dezvoltarea de noi metode de predare pentru persoanele cu nevoi educaționale speciale.

În perioada 2014-2020, statele membre ale UE pot, de asemenea, să mobilizeze resurse din noile fonduri structurale și de investiții europene pentru a sprijini educația, formarea și dezvoltarea competențelor persoanelor cu nevoi educaționale speciale și pentru a promova tranziția lor către piața forței de muncă. Fondul social european va aloca cel puțin 20 % din bugetul său incluziunii sociale. Unul dintre obiectivele sale este de a sprijini incluziunea persoanelor cu handicap/nevoi speciale în cadrul societății și al mediului de lucru.

Comisia colaborează cu Agenția europeană pentru nevoi speciale și educație favorabilă incluziunii și o sprijină financiar ([1]). Această agenție realizează analize, oferă dovezi și informații cu privire la realitatea educației favorabile incluziunii în Europa. Agenția oferă, de asemenea, recomandări privind politici și practici și oferă instrumente pentru evaluarea și monitorizarea progreselor.

([1]) http://www.european-agency.org/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002736/14
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: IT programs for the learning of foreign languages by people with autism

Statistics show that for every 100 people born, at least one suffers from autism. That means at least 5 million people across the European Union. The condition is four times more common in boys than in girls, irrespective of their social background.

What is even more serious is that around 80% of children with this condition do not attend school, which has significant consequences at a later stage for their personal lives and, above all, for their working lives.

Moreover, autism has major long-term effects on the social welfare systems of the countries concerned, with the condition posing a genuine public health challenge.

It is necessary to find appropriate ways of preparing people with autism for work in order to avoid their being marginalised and to ensure they can integrate into society. One important aspect of that process is learning foreign languages.

What strategy does the Commission have to support local authority projects and partnerships with civil society and the private sector aimed at developing and implementing specialised IT programs for the learning, by children and adults with autism, of their own and foreign languages, with a view to their integration into the workforce?

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

According to Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU, Member States are responsible for the organisation and content of their education systems, including provisions for the education and training of people with special needs and specific learning difficulties such as autism.

In 2014-2020, *Erasmus+* will provide new funding opportunities to a broad range of actors working in partnership to improve the educational situation of learners with special educational needs. In particular, it offers funding opportunities for schools, school authorities and education organisations to develop and implement innovative practices, including the use of ICT in language learning and the development of new teaching methods for people with special educational needs.

In 2014-2020, EU Member States can also mobilise resources from the new European Structural and Investment Funds to support the education, training and skills development of people with special educational needs and to promote their transition to the labour market. The European Social Fund will allocate at least 20% of its budget to social inclusion. One of its goals is to support the inclusion of people with disabilities/special needs into society and the work environment.

The Commission works with and supports financially the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education ([1]) which provides analysis, evidence and information about the reality of inclusive education across Europe. The Agency also gives recommendations for policy and practice and provides tools to evaluate and monitor progress.

([1]) http://www.european-agency.org/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002737/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Australia makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Australia does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002738/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US Trade Agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Bahrain makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Bahrain does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002739/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Canada makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Canada does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002740/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US Trade Agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Chile makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Chile does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002741/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Colombia makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Colombia does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002742/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Costa Rica makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Costa Rica does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002743/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Dominican Republic makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Dominican Republic does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002744/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with El Salvador makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with El Salvador does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002745/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Guatemala makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Guatemala does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002746/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Honduras makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Honduras does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002747/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has Free Trade Agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Israel makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTAs with Israel does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002748/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Jordan makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Jordan does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002749/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Korea makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Korea does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002750/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Mexico makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Mexico does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002751/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Morocco makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Morocco does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002752/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Nicaragua makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Nicaragua does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002753/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Oman makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Oman does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002754/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Panama makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Panama does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002755/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Peru makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Peru does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Question for written answer E-002756/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Unacceptable clauses in US trade agreements

The United States has free trade agreements with 20 countries. In the view of the Commission, which clause (or clauses) in the US trade agreement with Singapore makes a similar agreement unacceptable for the European Union?

Which clause or clauses in the USA FTA with Singapore does the Commission consider should be improved or otherwise modified?

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(9 April 2014)

As a matter of principle the European Commission does not comment on (trade) agreements, between third countries.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002757/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7. März 2014)

Betrifft: Nachfrage zur Antwort E-012063/2013 über fehlende Filter in Flaggenfabrik

Augenzeugenberichte lassen den Schluss zu, dass die von der Kommission genannten „ausführlichen Projektunterlagen" offenbar nicht den gesamten Sachverhalt abdecken. Die Einschätzung dieser Augenzeugenberichte geht von sehr wohl bestehenden gesundheitlichen Risiken aus, die offenbar in den Unterlagen nicht verzeichnet zu sein scheinen.

1. Welche Möglichkeiten stehen der Kommission wie auch den Betroffenen auf europäischer Ebene zur Verfügung, um den Kenntnisstand der nationalen Behörden in diesem Fall zu überprüfen?

2. Wie kann die Kommission die nationalen Behörden verpflichten oder veranlassen, die Einhaltung der entsprechenden Richtlinien zum Wohl der betroffenen Bürgerinnen und Bürger durchzusetzen, bzw die vorliegenden Unterlagen auf Richtigkeit zu überprüfen?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(12. Mai 2014)

Die Kommission kann nicht beurteilen, ob den Behörden zum Zeitpunkt der Genehmigung der Projektfinanzierung die potenziellen Gesundheitsrisiken bekannt waren. Die Kommission kann ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren einleiten, wenn sie einen Verstoß gegen EU-Recht vermutet. Im Zuge des Vertragsverletzungsverfahrens kann die Kommission den betreffenden Mitgliedstaat auffordern, ihr alle sachdienlichen Unterlagen vorzulegen. Aus den derzeit vorliegenden Unterlagen kann jedoch nicht auf einen Verstoß gegen EU-Recht geschlossen werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002757/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Commission answer to Written Question E-012063/2013 on lack of filters in flag factory

It is clear from eye-witness reports that what the Commission, in its answer to the abovementioned question, calls 'the extensive project documentation' does not address all aspects of the issue. In the opinion of the eye witnesses, there are indeed health risks present, which are apparently not mentioned in the documentation.

1. What means are available at European level to enable the Commission and the people affected to check how much the national authorities knew in this case?

2. How can the Commission require the national authorities to ensure, for the good of the citizens affected, that the provisions of the relevant directives are observed and how can the veracity of the documentation be checked?

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

The Commission cannot assess whether potential health problems were known to the authorities when the decision on the funding of the project was taken. The Commission may intervene in cases where there is an alleged breach of EC law by opening an infringement case. In the procedure, the Commission may require the Member State in question to provide it with all the necessary information. However, from the materials at hand at the moment, no obvious breach can be deduced.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002758/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7. März 2014)

Betrifft: Für die Endlagerung von Atommüll anfallende Kosten

Angesichts der bereits bestehenden atomaren Abfälle sind die Europäische Union sowie auch die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten mit den Kosten für die Lagerung konfrontiert.

1. Welche Gesamtkosten hat die Endlagerung von Atommüll in Europa bisher verursacht?

1.1 Welche Institutionen, Staaten oder andere Akteure tragen diese Kosten und in welchem Umfang?

1.2 Werden europäische Steuergelder für die Finanzierung der Endlagerung herangezogen?

2. Mit welchen geschätzten Kosten müssen die EU und deren Mitgliedstaaten in den kommenden 50 Jahren für die Endlagerung zusätzlich rechnen, wenn der Betrieb der aktiven Kernkraftwerke in Europa so fortgesetzt wird, wie er gegenwärtig läuft?

3. Welches Einsparungspotenzial sieht die Kommission in diesem Bereich durch den Aufbau ökologischer erneuerbarer Energieträger?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(29. April 2014)

1. Der Kommission liegen keine Zahlen über die Kosten vor, die insgesamt für die Endlagerung radioaktiver Abfälle in Europa anfallen. Eine Studie der Kernenergieagentur der OECD ([1]) (NEA ([2])) liefert Erkenntnisse in diesem Zusammenhang. Nach dieser Studie variieren die Kosten des „Back-end" des Brennstoffkreislaufs zwischen weniger als 1 EUR und 4 EUR pro MWh, je nach Art der Behandlung (direkte Endlagerung abgebrannter Brennstoffe oder Wiederaufarbeitung, wobei Letzere kostspieliger ist, das Kernmaterial jedoch wiederverwendet werden kann) und Umfang des Reaktorbestands (kostengünstiger bei größeren Beständen).

1.1 Es wird davon ausgegangen, dass die Kosten für das „Back-End" des Brennstoffkreislaufs in den von den Verbrauchern gezahlten Strompreis eingehen.

1.2 Nein. Entsprechend dem Verursacherprinzip tragen diejenigen, die die Abfälle erzeugen, die Kosten ihrer Entsorgung ([3]).

2. Es gibt keine offiziellen Zahlen zu den Kosten in den kommenden 50 Jahren. Gemäß der Richtlinie über nukleare Abfälle müssen die Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Kommission bis zum 23. August 2015 ihre nationale Politik für eine verantwortungsvolle und sichere Entsorgung abgebrannter Brennelemente und radioaktiver Abfälle mitteilen, auch in Bezug auf die langfristige Lagerung radioaktiver Abfälle. Die Europäische Kommission kann die Kosten erst beurteilen, wenn ihr die entsprechenden Maßnahmen übermittelt wurden.

3. Diese Frage kann nicht einfach mit einer Zahl beantwortet werden. Voraussetzung ist ein Vergleich zwischen den Investitionen in nukleare Kapazitäten und den Kosten für deren Ersetzung durch Investitionen in andere Quellen der Stromerzeugung. Die Kommission hat eine vergleichende Studie über die Gesamtkosten verschiedener Energiequellen in Auftrag gegeben, die detailliertere Informationen liefern wird.

([1]) Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (Organisation für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung).
([2]) The Economics of the Back-End of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle (2013):
http://www.oecd-nea.org/ndd/pubs/2013/7061-ebenfc.pdf
([3]) Dies wurde bereits in der Empfehlung der Kommission 2006/851/Euratom vom 24. Oktober 2006 für die Verwaltung der Finanzmittel für die Stilllegung kerntechnischer Anlagen und die Entsorgung abgebrannter Brennelemente und radioaktiver Abfälle niedergelegt. Der Grundsatz wurde durch Artikel 4 Absatz 3 Buchstabe e der Richtlinie 2011/70/Euratom des Rates vom 19. Juli 2011 über einen Gemeinschaftsrahmen für die verantwortungsvolle und sichere Entsorgung abgebrannter Brennelemente und radioaktiver Abfälle (ABl. L 199 vom 2.8.2011) rechtsverbindlich.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002758/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Costs of nuclear waste disposal

In view of the nuclear waste which already exists, both the European Union and the individual Member States are confronted by the costs of its disposal.

1. What is the total cost which has so far been incurred in disposing of nuclear waste in Europe?

1.1. What institutions, states or other parties are bearing these costs and what are the amounts involved?

1.2. Is European tax revenue used to help pay for the disposal of this waste?

2. What are the estimated additional costs which will have to be borne by the EU and its Member States over the next 50 years to cover nuclear waste disposal if the nuclear power stations active in Europe continue to operate at the current rate?

3. How much could be saved on this by building up environmentally sound renewable energy sources?

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

1. The Commission does not have figures for the total costs incurred for the disposal of radioactive waste in Europe. However, a study by the OECD ([1]) Nuclear Energy Agency ([2]) provides insights on this. According to this study, the cost of the back-end of the nuclear fuel cycle varies between less than 1EUR to around 4EUR per MWh produced, depending on the specificities of the treatment (direct disposal of spent fuel or reprocessing, the last being more expensive but allowing for nuclear material to be reused) and on the size of the nuclear fleet (cheaper for larger fleets).

1.1. The costs of the back-end of the fuel cycle are expected to be reflected in the price of electricity paid by the consumers.

1.2. No. In accordance with the polluter pays principle, it is those who generate the waste who should bear the costs of its management ([3]).

2. No official figures exist regarding the costs over the next 50 years. Following the Nuclear Waste Directive, Member States need to communicate to the European Commission, by 23 August 2015, their national policies for responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste, including the long term disposal of radioactive waste. Therefore it will only be possible to assess the costs after these policies have been presented to the European Commission.

3. It is not possible to answer this with one simple figure, as it would require a comparison between the investments in nuclear capacity and the costs for replacing these by investments in other sources of electricity. The Commission has launched a comparative study on the full costs of different energy sources that will give more detailed information.

([1]) Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

([2]) The Economics of the Back-End of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle (2013), http://www.oecd-nea.org/ndd/pubs/2013/7061-ebenfc.pdf

([3]) This was already enshrined in Commission Recommendation 2006/851/Euratom of 24 October 2006 on the management of financial resources for the decommissioning of nuclear installations, spent fuel and radioactive waste. The principle was made legally binding in Article 4(3)(e) of 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.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002759/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7. März 2014)

Betrifft: Die Europäische Union und weitere Beitrittskandidaten

Trotz der schweren weltweiten Wirtschafts- und Finanzkrise gibt es nach wie vor Gespräche mit Beitrittskandidaten und „potenziellen" Beitrittskandidaten.

1. In welcher Höhe sollen Heranführungshilfen und weitere finanzielle Unterstützungen, aufgeschlüsselt nach den folgenden Ländern, von der EU im neuen Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen ausbezahlt werden: Island, Türkei, Montenegro, ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien? Um detaillierte Angabe der jeweils betroffenen Haushaltszeilen wird gebeten.

2. Besteht theoretisch die Möglichkeit, diese Zahlungen — zumindest vorübergehend — zu vermindern oder einzustellen, um zunächst die finanzielle Situation der Europäischen Union insgesamt zu konsolidieren und diese Gelder zudem zur europainternen Wirtschaftsförderung einzusetzen?

3. Mit welchen finanziellen Mitteln aus der Europäischen Union werden die „potenziellen" Beitrittskandidaten im neuen Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen voraussichtlich unterstützt werden, und in welcher Höhe bewegen sich diese Beträge? Um eine Beschreibung der jeweiligen Projekte sowie deren Bezifferung hinsichtlich der anfallenden Kosten wird gebeten.

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(25. April 2014)

1. Die vereinbarte Mittelausstattung für die Heranführungshilfe (IPA II) im Zeitraum 2014-2020 beläuft sich auf 11 698,7 Mio. EUR in jeweiligen Preisen. Ausgehend von diesem Betrag werden die Mittel auf die Länderprogramme und das Mehrländerprogramm verteilt. Nach Artikel 6 Absatz 3 der IPA-II-Verordnung (Verordnung (EU) Nr. 231/2014 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates) werden die Richtbeträge für die einzelnen Begünstigten in Strategiepapieren festgelegt; diese sind in Vorbereitung und werden voraussichtlich spätestens im September 2014 angenommen.

2. In der Verordnung zur Festlegung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens für die Jahre 2014-2020 (Verordnung (EU, Euratom) Nr. 1311/2013) sind die jährlichen Höchstbeträge („Obergrenzen") festgelegt, die von der EU in den einzelnen Politikfeldern („Rubriken") im Zeitraum 2014-2020 ausgegeben werden dürfen. Sie enthält eine gesonderte Rubrik „Globales Europa", die alle Ausgaben für Maßnahmen im Außenbereich einschließlich der Heranführungshilfe umfasst. In der MFR-Verordnung sind auch die Möglichkeiten für Flexibilität sowie die Umschichtung von Verpflichtungen und Zahlungen zwischen Rubriken sowie die Vorschriften für die Revision des MFR festgelegt.

3. IPA II wird dafür eingesetzt, die in Anhang I der IPA-II-Verordnung genannten Begünstigten im Hinblick auf den EU-Beitritt zu unterstützen. Die Richtbeträge für die einzelnen Länder stehen jedoch noch nicht fest, da sie erst in den unter Punkt 1 genannten Strategiepapieren aufgeführt werden. Die Kommission kann erst nach Annahme der Strategiepapiere die Aktionsprogramme und Maßnahmen genehmigen, die die Projektbeschreibungen und eine Aufschlüsselung der Kosten pro Maßnahme umfassen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002759/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: European Union and further candidates for accession

In spite of the serious global economic and financial crisis, talks with actual and 'potential' candidates for accession are continuing.

1. How much pre-accession assistance and other financial support is to be paid out by the EU in the new multiannual financial framework, broken down by the following countries: Iceland, Turkey, Montenegro, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia? The Commission is asked to provide details of the budget lines concerned in each case.

2. Would it in theory be possible to reduce or stop these payments — at least temporarily — in order first to consolidate the financial situation of the European Union as a whole, using these funds to support Europe's domestic economy?

3. According to the estimates, what European Union funding will be used to support 'potential' candidates for accession in the new multiannual financial framework, and how much funding is involved? The Commission is asked to provide a description of the corresponding projects and a breakdown of the costs.

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

1. The agreed budget for pre-accession assistance (IPA II) 2014-2020 is EUR 11 698.7 million in current prices, which is the starting point for the allocations between countries and the multi-country programme. In accordance with Article 6(3) of the IPA II regulation (Regulation (EU) No 231/2014 of the European Parliament and the Council), the indicative allocations for each beneficiary will be set out in strategy papers, which are currently under preparation and expected to be adopted at the latest in September 2014.

2. The regulation on the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 (Council Regulation /EU, Euratom) No 1311/2013) lays down the maximum annual amounts ('ceilings') which the EU may spend in different political fields ('headings') over the period 2014 to 2020. It includes a separate heading for 'Global Europe' which covers all external action including pre-accession assistance. This MFF Regulation also sets out the possibilities for flexibility and reallocation of commitments and payments between headings, as well as rules on revision of the MFF.

3. IPA II will be used to support the beneficiaries listed in Annex I of the IPA II Regulation with a view to EU membership. The indicative country allocations will be included in the strategy papers mentioned under point 1, and country-speficic amounts are therefore not yet established. Only after adoption of the strategy papers can the Commission adopt action programmes and measures, which includes the description of the projects and a breakdown of costs per action.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002760/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7. März 2014)

Betrifft: Forschung zur Endlagerung von atomarem Abfall

In Zeiten der Energiewende stellt sich die schwerwiegende Frage, wie die auch folgende Generationen belastende Endlagerung von bereits angefallenem Atommüll gestaltet werden soll.

1. Wie gestaltet sich der derzeitige Forschungsstand bezügliche der (relativen!) Sicherheit von Endlagerungsmöglichkeiten auf der Ebene der EU?

1.1. Welche Bereiche zur Sicherung der lagernden Bestände werden derzeit erforscht?

2. Mit welchem Betrag wurden Forschungsvorhaben zur Sicherheit von Endlagerung in den letzten 10 Jahren aus europäischen Geldern finanziert?

3. Welche Mittel stehen im neuen Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen für Forschungsvorhaben zur Sicherheit der Endlagerung von Atommüll zur Verfügung?

3.1. Welche Zielsetzungen werden in der Forschung mit diesen Geldern aus dem neuen MFF verfolgt?

Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission
(25. April 2014)

1. Seit mehreren Jahrzehnten werden in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten und im Rahmen des Euratom-Rahmenprogramms (RP) für Forschungs- und Ausbildungsmaßnahmen (seit 1975) Forschungs-, Entwicklungs- und Demonstrationsmaßnahmen zum Thema der Entsorgung und Endlagerung hoch radioaktiver und anderer langlebiger radioaktiver Abfälle und abgebrannter Brennelemente in tiefen geologischen Formationen (nachstehend „Entsorgung radioaktiver Abfälle") durchgeführt, wobei der Schwerpunkt auf Sicherheitsaspekten liegt. Gemäß dem Stand der Forschung ist die Endlagerung in tiefen geologischen Formationen die sicherste und ökologisch tragfähigste Option für die Endphase der Entsorgung hoch radioaktiver Abfälle und abgebrannter Brennelemente, die als Abfall angesehen werden; hierüber existiert in Wissenschaft und Technik weltweit Einigkeit.

1.1. Im Rahmen der fortschrittlichsten nationalen Programme (vor allem in Finnland, Frankreich und Schweden), die auch von Euratom unterstützt werden, werden Forschungs-, Entwicklungs- und Demonstrationsmaßnahmen zu Bauverfahren für unterirdische Endlager, zu Technologien für die Endlagerung radioaktiver Abfallgebinde und zur Leistungsüberprüfung von Endlagern vor Ort durchgeführt.

2./3. Für den Bereich der Entsorgung radioaktiver Abfälle wurden insgesamt Euratom-Mittel in Höhe von 47 Mio. EUR (RP6) ([1]) und 56,7 Mio. EUR (RP7) zur Verfügung gestellt. Im Rahmenprogramm der EU für Forschung und Innovation Horizont 2020 (2014-2020) wird diesem Bereich ein Budget von 17,2 Mio. EUR für den Zeitraum 2014-2015 zugewiesen. Die finanzielle Unterstützung nach 2014/2015 unterliegt den existierenden Beschlussverfahren.

3.1. Im Rahmen von Horizont 2020 sind die noch verbleibenden wichtigen Forschungs- und Ausbildungsaspekte zentraler Gegenstand; unter anderem kann es hier auch um die Demonstration der Technologien und der Sicherheit von Endlagern gehen. Ziel der Maßnahmen ist außerdem die Förderung einer gemeinsamen europäischen Position und Expertise im Bereich der Entsorgung radioaktiver Abfälle, für den gesamten Prozess von der Entladung der Brennelemente bis zur Endlagerung.

([1]) Sechstes und Siebtes Rahmenprogramm der Europäischen Atomgemeinschaft (Euratom) für Forschungs- und Ausbildungsmaßnahmen im Nuklearbereich (RP6, 2002-2006, und RP7, 2007-2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002760/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Research into final repositories for radioactive waste

At a time of energy transition, we face the serious question of how to deal with the final storage of the nuclear waste that has already accumulated, which will also place a burden on future generations.

1. What is the current state of research into the (relative!) security of possible final repositories at EU level?

1.1. In what areas is research currently being conducted into securing the waste now being stored?

2. How much European funding has been granted in the past 10 years to research projects looking into the security of final repositories?

3. What resources are available for research projects looking into the security of final repositories for nuclear waste in the new multiannual financial framework?

3.1. What objectives are being pursued in research funded with these appropriations from the new MFF?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2014)

1. Research, development and demonstration (RD&D) on the management and disposal of high-level and other long-lived radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel in deep geological repositories (hereafter referred to as 'management of radioactive waste') has been carried out for several decades in the EU Member States and as part of the Euratom Framework Programme (FP) for Research and Training since 1975, with emphasis on safety aspects. The state of Research has shown that deep geological disposal represents the safest and most sustainable solution as the end point of the management of high-level waste and spent fuel considered as waste, and that there is worldwide scientific and technical consensus on this.

1.1. The most advanced national programmes (notably Finland, France and Sweden), also involving support from Euratom, are conducting RD&D in construction methods for underground repositories, technologies for the disposal of radioactive waste packages and in-situ testing of the performance of the repository.

2-3. The management of radioactive waste has benefited from a total Euratom support of EUR 47 and 56.7 million in FP6 ([1]) and FP7. In Horizon 2020, the EU research and innovation programme (2014-2020), this area has been allocated a budget of EUR 17.2 million for 2014-2015. Future financial support after 2014-2015 will be subject to established decision procedures.

3.1. Under Horizon 2020, the main objective will be to address the remaining key research and training aspects with, as appropriate, the demonstration of technologies and safety of repositories. The activities will also aim to promote the development of a common European view and expertise on the management of radioactive waste, from discharge of fuel to disposal.

([1]) Sixth and Seventh Euratom Framework Programme for nuclear research and training activities (FP6, 2002-2006) and (FP7, 2007-2013).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002761/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7. März 2014)

Betrifft: Forschungsreaktor ITER — Kosten im neuen Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen

Am 19. November 2013 wurde in Straßburg im Plenum im Rahmen eines Entschließungsantrages über ein zusätzliches Forschungsprogramm für das ITER-Projekt im Zeitraum 2014-2018 abgestimmt.

In der Entschließung ist von Maßnahmen zur Kosteneindämmung, aber auch von weiteren möglichen Kostenüberschreitungen die Rede.

1. Welche Maßnahmen zur Kosteneindämmung wurden bisher im Rahmen des ITER-Projekts durchgeführt und wie erfolgreich waren diese?

2. Welche Maßnahmen zur Kosteneindämmung sind für das ITER-Projekt im Rahmen seines Forschungsprogramms im Zeitraum 2014-2018 eingeplant, und auf welche Größenordnung lassen sie sich beziffern?

3. Wenn die Kommission gedenkt, das Projekt außerhalb des neuen Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens zu finanzieren und dennoch von weiteren möglichen Kostenüberschreitungen die Rede ist:

3.1 Kann die Kommission gewährleisten, dass im Fall umfangreicherer Kostenüberschreitungen keine Mittel des MFF herangezogen werden müssen?

3.2 Wie werden die genannten Kostenüberschreitungen gegebenenfalls finanziert?

Antwort von Herrn Günther Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(13. Mai 2014)

1. 2010 hat der Rat der Europäischen Union das Budget für den Bau des ITER auf 6,6 Mrd. EUR (zu Preisen von 2008) begrenzt. Daher hat die Kommission stets betont, dass Kostensteigerungen durch Einsparungen ausgeglichen werden müssen und die Eindämmung der Kosten im Einklang mit dem Arbeitspapier der Kommissionsdienststellen über die solide Verwaltung des ITER ([1]) eine Priorität für das Projekt darstellen müsse. Die ITER-Organisation (IO) und das Gemeinsame Unternehmen „Fusion for Energy" (F4E) ([2]) haben in mehreren Bereichen Maßnahmen zur Kosteneinsparung ermittelt; deren Umsetzung (z. B. über Beschaffungsstrategien) ist bereits angelaufen.

2. Die IO arbeitet daran, im Einklang mit den technischen Spezifikationen alternative Fertigungslösungen zu ermitteln, mit denen sich Kosten einsparen lassen, aber auch die Arbeitsaufteilung neu zu gestalten. 2013 definierte F4E seine Kosteneindämmungspläne und Sparmaßnahmen neu, indem es sie an die bei großmaßstäblichen Industrieprojekten angewandten Grundsätze anpasste.

3.1 und 3.2 2011 schlug die Kommission vor, den ITER und Projekte, bei denen Kostenüberschreitungen möglich scheinen, außerhalb des Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens (MFR) durch direkte Beiträge der Mitgliedstaaten zu finanzieren. 2013 beschloss der Europäische Rat nach Zustimmung des Europäischen Parlaments, das ITER-Projekt wieder in den MFF aufzunehmen.

Um diesem Ersuchen nachzukommen, erließ der Rat der Europäischen Union den Beschluss 2013/791/EU ([3]), um zu gewährleisten, dass die Finanzierung des ITER getrennt von anderen Haushaltslinien des EU-Haushalts, nämlich Horizont 2020 und dem Euratom-Programm, erfolgt. Für diese Finanzierung wird mit Artikel 16 der Verordnung (EU/Euratom) Nr. 1311/2013 zur Festlegung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens eine Obergrenze von 2,707 Mrd. EUR (zu Preisen von 2011) festgesetzt.

Sollte es zu Kostenüberschreitungen kommen, die nicht durch Umschichtungen innerhalb des ITER-Projekts aufgefangen oder außerhalb des EU-Haushalts finanziert werden können, müsste der MFR geändert werden. Diesbezügliche Entscheidungen würde die Haushaltsbehörde im Rahmen des normalen Haushaltsverfahrens treffen.

([1]) SEC(2010)1386 vom 9.11.2010.
([2]) http://fusionforenergy.europa.eu/
([3]) ABl. L 349 vom 21.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002761/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: ITER research reactor — costs under the new Multiannual Financial Framework

On 19 November 2013 in Strasbourg Parliament adopted a resolution on a supplementary research programme for the ITER project (2014-2018). The resolution refers to cost containment measures, but also to possible further cost overruns.

1. What cost containment measures have been taken thus far in the context of the ITER project and how successful have they been?

2. What cost containment measures are planned for the ITER project in the context of the supplementary research programme for the period 2014-2018 and what figure can be put on the proposed savings?

3. If the Commission is planning to finance the project outside the new Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), but further cost overruns are still possible:

3.1. Can the Commission guarantee that MFF appropriations will not be used to cover substantial cost overruns?

3.2. How will any such cost overruns be financed?

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

1. In 2010, the EU Council capped the ITER construction budget at EUR 6.6 billion (2008 values). The Commission therefore has always insisted that any cost increase must be offset by savings and that cost containment must be a priority for the project, in line with the Commission document towards a robust management of ITER ([1]). The ITER Organisation (IO) and Fusion for Energy (F4E) ([2]) have identified cost saving measures in several areas and their implementation is in progress (e.g. on procurement strategies).

2. The IO works to balance the technical specifications with cost saving fabrication alternatives but also to re-organise work allocation. In 2013, F4E re-defined its cost containment and savings plans, aligning them to the principles applied in large-scale industrial projects.

3.1 and 3.2. In 2011, the Commission proposed to fund ITER and projects which may suffer from cost overruns outside the Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF) through direct contributions from Member States. In 2013, the European Council decided, with the approval of the European Parliament, to reintegrate ITER within the MFF.

To respond to this request, the EU Council adopted Decision 2013/791/Euratom ([3]), ensuring that ITER's financing is separated from other EU budget lines, namely Horizon 2020 and the Euratom programme. This financing is capped at EUR 2.707 billion (2011 values) by Article 16 of Council Regulation EU /Euratom No 1311/2013 laying down the MFF.

Should cost overruns occur which could not be covered by redeployments within ITER or financed outside the EU budget, the MFF would need to be amended. The Budgetary Authority would decide on this issue under the normal budgetary procedure.

([1]) SEC(2010)1386, 09.11.2010.
([2]) http://fusionforenergy.europa.eu/
([3]) OJ L 349, 21.12.2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002762/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7. März 2014)

Betrifft: Risiken der Arbeit mit Fusionsreaktoren

Fusionsreaktoren arbeiten bekanntermaßen auch mit einer Technik, die Radioaktivität erzeugt.

1. Wo liegen nach Ansicht der Kommission die wesentlichen Unterschiede zu einem Kernkraftwerk hinsichtlich der Sicherheit?

2. Wie viel Radioaktivität erzeugt ein Fusionsreaktor vergleichbarer Größenordnung im Vergleich zu einem Atomkraftwerk?

3. In einem Fusionsreaktor werden offenbar medizinisch relevante, dementsprechend krebserregende Neutronenstrahlungen produziert. Mit welchen Auswirkungen auf Mensch und Umwelt ist im Fall einer Freisetzung dieser Neutronenstrahlung oder der daraus resultierenden Radioaktivität zu rechnen — verglichen mit der Größenordnung des havarierten Atomkraftwerks in Fukushima?

3.1 Ist bei der Freisetzung entsprechender Stoffe nach Ansicht der Kommission mit ähnlichen Verbreitungsradien zu rechnen wie bei einem entsprechenden Unfall in einem „herkömmlichen" Atomkraftwerk?

Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission
(5. Mai 2014)

1. Die Kommission misst der nuklearen Sicherheit höchste Bedeutung bei und hebt hervor, dass alle kerntechnischen Anlagen über ein sehr hohes Sicherheitsniveau verfügen müssen, wie es im EU-Recht und in den nationalen Rechtsvorschriften ([1]) vorgeschrieben ist und im Rahmen internationaler Übereinkommen abgestimmt wurde. In Anbetracht der fundamentalen wissenschaftlichen und technologischen Unterschiede zwischen Kraftwerken auf der Grundlage der Kernspaltung und Fusionskraftwerken können die Sicherheitsvorschriften bei Fusionskraftwerken sehr viel leichter eingehalten werden, denn es gibt keine Kettenreaktion und es entstehen nur wenige radioaktive Produkte.

2. Die Sicherheitsfragen bei der Kernfusion betreffen den Einsatz von Tritium, einer radioaktiven Form des Wasserstoffs, sowie die allmähliche Aktivierung des Baustahls durch den Einfluss energiegeladener Neutronen. Mithilfe dieser Neutronen wird Tritium erbrütet, und zwar genauso schnell, wie es bei der Fusionsreaktion verbraucht wird. Daher würde ein Fusionskraftwerk nur einen winzigen Teil der gesamten Radioaktivität eines herkömmlichen Kernkraftwerks gleicher Leistung beinhalten.

3. Es gäbe keine Auswirkungen auf die örtliche Bevölkerung oder die Umwelt, die mit Fukushima zu vergleichen wäre. Die zusätzlichen Dosen, denen das Kraftwerkspersonal ausgesetzt sein könnte, wären der natürlichen Hintergrundstahlung vergleichbar. Nach der Abschaltung würde keine Wärme erzeugt, die Reaktorschäden verursachen und zur Freisetzung von Strahlung führen könnte (wie in Fukushima, wo im Anschluss an den Tsunami die gesamte Stromversorgung der Anlage zusammenbrach und die Kühlung nicht mehr aufrechterhalten werden konnte). Moderne Kernspaltungsreaktoren verfügen jedoch über Sicherheitsmerkmale, die einen viel besseren Schutz vor solchen Ausfällen bieten.

4. Es gibt keine Störfallszenarien, in denen Schutzmaßnahmen für die Anwohner erforderlich wären. Die jüngsten Kernspaltungsreaktoren sind ebenfalls so ausgelegt, dass Auswirkungen über die Standortgrenze hinweg auch im ungünstigsten Fall vermieden werden.

([1]) KOM(2013)715 vom 17.10.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002762/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Risks of working with fusion reactors

As is well known, fusion reactor technology also produces radioactivity.

1. In the Commission's opinion, what are the main differences with regard to safety between fusion reactors and nuclear fission power plants?

2. By comparison with a fission plant, how much radioactivity is produced by a fusion reactor of comparable size?

3. It would appear that neutron radiation, which is medically relevant and, accordingly, carcinogenic, is produced in a fusion reactor. What is the likely impact on individuals and the environment, compared with the scale of the Fukushima nuclear power plant accident, of a release of neutron radiation or of the radioactivity induced by it?

4. In the Commission's opinion, is the contamination radius following release of radiation or radioactivity from a fusion reactor likely to be similar to that following a comparable accident in a 'conventional' nuclear power plant?

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

1. The Commission attaches the utmost importance to nuclear safety and stresses the need for all nuclear facilities to respect very high levels of safety, as prescribed in EU and national law ([1]), and harmonised through international agreements. In view of fundamental differences between the scientific and technological aspects of fission and fusion power plants, compliance is much easier in the case of fusion; there is no chain reaction and only a small inventory of radioactive products.

2. Fusion safety issues concern the use of tritium, a radioactive form of hydrogen, and the gradual activation over time of structural steels from bombardment by energetic neutrons. These same neutrons are used to breed tritium at the same rate at which it is consumed in the fusion reaction. Therefore a fusion power plant would contain only a minute fraction of the total radioactive inventory of a fission plant of comparable power.

3. There would be no impact on the local population or environment comparable with Fukushima. Plant workers could receive additional doses that would be comparable with those from natural background radiation. After shutdown, no residual heat is generated that could cause reactor damage and release of radiation, such as what happened in Fukushima, where all site power was lost following the tsunami and cooling could not be maintained. However, more modern fission reactors include safety features that afford much better protection against such loss of site power events.

4. No accident scenario can be identified for which countermeasures are needed to protect the surrounding population. The latest fission reactors are also designed to prevent impacts beyond the site boundary even in the worst case scenario.

([1]) COM(2013)0715, 17.10.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002764/14
to the Commission
Derek Vaughan (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Food shortages

Extreme weather has been affecting many areas of the globe over recent months and there is a real concern that this could have a devastating impact on food production.

Can the Commission provide information on any contingency plans that are in place for international weather-related food shortages affecting European food suppliers this year, and also, looking ahead to the next few years, in anticipation of similar problems?

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

The Commission follows regularly the updates of the supply and demand balance sheets at world level and compiles the ones for the EU. This includes the monitoring of the weather and its impact on current and future productions. The balance sheets at world and regional levels provided by the International Grain Council (IGC), FAO and the G20-Agriculture Market Information System (AMIS) initiative are not depicting any food shortage in the near future. Current data on grain ending stocks in 2014 (IGC data), show a recovery from previous lows by almost 10% in wheat, 20% in maize and 4% in soybean. Stock recovery is foreseen as well for EU grain productions. (http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets-and-prices/short-term-outlook/pdf/2014-03_en.pdf)

The EU is actively participating to the G20-AMIS initiative on market transparency (http://www.amis-outlook.org/). As part of AMIS the Rapid Response Forum met on 6th March in Canberra and did not highlight any food shortage crisis in course at world level, though the world markets remain relatively tights and attentive surveillance is needed.

Within the CAP, the common organisation of the markets (Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 [1]) empowers the Commission to adopt exceptional market measures against threats of market disturbances caused by significant price rises or falls on internal or external markets (Article 219) and the rural development policy (Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 [2]) foresees measures to restore agricultural production damaged by natural disasters (Article 18).

---

(1) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, pp. 671-854.
(2) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, pp. 487-548.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002765/14
to the Commission
Derek Vaughan (S&D)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Spanish equity release scheme

The Commission might be aware that the Spanish equity release scheme (SERS) has been sold by various banks to many retired British citizens buying property in Spain. These citizens have since found themselves in serious financial difficulty, with their investment failing. There is concern that this equity release scheme was illegal, and many of the pensioners have since been faced with the threat of repossession.

Can the Commission comment on whether or not it is aware of the SERS and what action it is taking in this regard?

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

An equity release scheme is a financial arrangement by which an illiquid asset (the property owned by the customer) becomes a source of liquidity, while the property owner has the right to continue living there. The Commission has got little information on the specific cases mentioned by the Honourable Member, however it appears that part of the money released to the customer concerned was used for what was presented as a low-risk investment. Depending whether this 'investment' qualifies as a financial instrument under Directive 2004/39/EC (MiFID), and whether an investment service was provided, certain MiFID rules would apply, including the obligation to act honestly, fairly and professionally in accordance with the clients' best interest and to provide clear, fair and non-misleading information.

Equity release credit agreements are excluded from the scope of Directive 2014/17/EU ([1]). However Directive 2005/29/EC ([2]) is applicable to all business-to-consumer transactions including financial services. Its provisions require traders to act in accordance with the requirements of professional diligence and not to distort the economic behaviour of consumers. In particular, traders should not provide false or deceiving information on the main characteristics of the product or service such as the risks and results to be expected from its use. In the event that the products were sold to the complainants by an insurance intermediary, the provisions of Directive 2002/92/EC ([3]) regulating the sales of insurance products by insurance intermediaries are applicable.

It is in the first place upon the national competent authorities to ensure the enforcement of applicable EU Directives and their national transposition in individual cases.

([1]) Directive 2014/17/EU on credit agreements for consumers relating to residential immovable property and amending Directives 2008/48/EC and 2013/36/EU and Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010. OJ L 60/34, 28.2.2014.
([2]) OJ L 149/22, 11.6.2005.
([3]) OJ L 9, 15.1.2003.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002766/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: Classificazione del tartufo come prodotto agricolo: richiesta di informazioni

Il tartufo, contemplato dall'Allegato I nel capitolo 10 dell'OCM unica, è considerato dalla Commissione europea un prodotto agricolo. La considerazione del tartufo come prodotto agricolo risolve il problema della tracciabilità e rende possibile l'utilizzo degli incentivi e dei fondi europei riservati al settore. Tuttavia, mentre negli altri paesi dell'UE produttori di tartufo il riconoscimento è avvenuto, in Italia sembra che la legislazione non sia ancora al passo con la normativa europea di settore. In particolare, la legge non risolve in maniera netta la distinzione tra produzioni spontanee e coltivazioni specifiche e non consente di ottenere dati circa la tracciabilità del prodotto.

Tale situazione contribuisce alla perdita di competitività dell'Italia con i mercati esteri di produzione del tartufo, alla crisi di aziende e commercianti e al disincentivo ad investire nella tartuficoltura per l'impossibilità di accedere a forme di finanziamento europeo riservate all'agricoltura ed ai prodotti agricoli.

Alla luce di quanto premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se intende chiedere informazioni al Ministero delle Politiche Agricole e Forestali affinché, anche in Italia, si superino le difficoltà legate al riconoscimento del tartufo come prodotto agricolo;

2. quali programmi di sostegno e di aiuto finanziario sono diretti a supporto della tartuficoltura nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(23 aprile 2014)

I tartufi sono un prodotto agricolo. Essi sono inclusi nell'allegato I, parte IX, del regolamento (UE) n. 1308/2013 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio recante organizzazione comune dei mercati dei prodotti agricoli ([1]). Il loro codice nomenclatura combinata è 0709 59 50 (pag. 89):
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:290:0001:0901:it:PDF

Il regolamento (UE) n. 1308/2013 consente agli Stati membri di riconoscere le organizzazioni di produttori nei settori elencati, tra l'altro, nella parte IX e X dell'allegato I. Nel quadro del regime ortofrutticolo può essere concesso un sostegno specifico dell'Unione europea alle organizzazioni di produttori riconosciute di tartufi coltivati.

Il regolamento (UE) n. 1305/2013 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 17 dicembre 2013, sul sostegno allo sviluppo rurale da parte del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR) ([2]) determina il quadro per i programmi di sviluppo rurale (PSR) per il periodo 2014-2020. Gli Stati membri stanno attualmente definendo i loro PSR che dovranno essere poi approvati dalla Commissione europea e avranno la possibilità di valutare quale tipo di sostegno, se del caso, potrebbe essere concesso al settore.

Entrambi i regolamenti sono direttamente applicabili in Italia.

([1]) GU L 347 del 20.12.2013, pag. 671.
([2]) GU L 347 del 20.12.2013, pag. 487.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002766/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 March 2014)

Subject: Classification of the truffle as an agricultural product: request for information

The truffle, which is included in Part X of Annex I of the Single CMO Regulation, is regarded as an agricultural product by the European Commission. The classification of the truffle as an agricultural product removes the problem of traceability, and allows use to be made of incentives and European funds set aside for the sector. However, while truffle producers are recognised as such in other Member States of the EU, it appears that Italian legislation has still not fallen in line with the European regulations governing the sector. In particular, Italian law makes no clear distinction between natural production and cultivated production, and does not allow information on the traceability of the product to be obtained.

This situation is making Italy fall further behind competing truffle production markets from abroad, is contributing to the hard times currently being faced by truffle producers and merchants, and is further discouraging any investments from being made in the truffle-growing sector, since no European funds set aside for farming and agricultural products are currently accessible.

1. In light of the above, does the Commission intend to seek information from the Italian Ministry of Agricultural and Forestry Policies so that the difficulties associated with the classification of the truffle as an agricultural product can also be overcome in Italy?

2. What support and financial aid programmes are in place in the new 2014-20 programming period to assist the truffle-growing sector?

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

Truffles are an agricultural product. They are included in Part IX of Annex I of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products ([1]). Their Combined Nomenclature code is 0709 59 50 (page 89):
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:290:0001:0901:EN:PDF

Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 allows Member States to recognise Producer organisations in the sectors listed, amongst others, in Part IX and X of Annex I. Specific European Union support in the framework of the Fruit and Vegetable regime can be granted to Producer organisations recognised for cultivated truffles.

Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) ([2]) establishes the framework for Rural Development Programmes (RDP) for 2014-2020. Member States are currently defining their RDP which will then have to be approved by the European Commission and have to possibility to evaluate what kind of support, if applicable, could be granted to the sector.

Both abovementioned Regulations are directly applicable in Italy.

([1]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 671.
([2]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 487.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-002767/14
à la Commission
Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(10 mars 2014)

Objet: Entente illégale entre Novartis et Roche (médicaments Lucentis et Avastin)

Le 5 mars 2014, l'autorité italienne de la concurrence a infligé une amende de 182 500 000 euros aux laboratoires pharmaceutiques Novartis et Roche, accusés d'entente illicite dans la vente de médicaments. Ces groupes sont soupçonnés d'avoir fait obstacle à la diffusion de l'Avastin, un anticancéreux de Roche, qui peut aussi être utilisé dans le traitement de la dégénérescence maculaire liée à l'âge (DMLA) et d'autres maladies de l'œil, au profit du Lucentis de Novartis.

Or, en Italie et dans le reste de l'Europe, l'Avastin coûte entre 15 et 80 euros, alors que Lucentis coûte plus de 900 euros la dose. En France, une circulaire du 7 juillet 2012 interdit l'utilisation de l'Avastin pour le traitement de la DMLA, ce qui est scandaleux car ces deux médicaments sont issus de molécules très similaires. Selon l'étude Gefal, menée par le Centre hospitalier universitaire de Lyon et dirigée par le professeur Laurent Kodjikian, les deux traitements sont équivalents (ce que démontraient déjà deux autres essais: CATT aux États-Unis et IVAN en Grande-Bretagne).

Selon le gendarme italien de la concurrence, Roche et Novartis ont introduit une différence «artificielle» entre les deux produits. Ils ont présenté l'Avastin, meilleur marché, comme plus dangereux, influençant ainsi les choix des médecins et des services sanitaires.

Au vu de ces preuves scientifiques irréfutables, la Commission va-t-elle se saisir de la question et ordonner une enquête pour confirmer l'entente illicite entre les deux laboratoires Novartis et Roche?

La Commission peut-elle expliquer pourquoi une autorisation de mise sur le marché (AMM) n'existe pas au niveau européen pour permettre de traiter la dégénérescence maculaire liée à l'âge par l'Avastin, médicament tout aussi efficace que le Lucentis tout en étant moins cher?

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

La Commission prend acte de la décision italienne concernant l'Avastin et le Lucentis.

Les résultats de cette décision et les pratiques en cause sont, en fait et en droit, étroitement liés au cadre réglementaire italien, qui autorise sous certaines conditions l'utilisation hors AMM de certains produits pharmaceutiques. De ce fait, les conclusions concernant les pratiques constatées en Italie ne constituent pas, en soi, une indication de l'existence, ou non, d'un comportement similaire dans d'autres États membres.

La Commission n'est pas sans ignorer que cette situation a suscité des inquiétudes dans plusieurs États membres. Elle reste en contact étroit avec les autorités nationales de la concurrence, en particulier avec l'autorité française de la concurrence, qui a réalisé des inspections dans les locaux de certaines entreprises ([1]).

La Commission collecte actuellement de nouvelles informations tout en continuant à surveiller les marchés pharmaceutiques européens. Cela lui permettra de déterminer si de nouvelles mesures s'imposent. Elle ne peut toutefois pas s'étendre davantage sur le contenu précis de ses démarches d'enquête actuelles.

La question concernant l'absence, au niveau de l'UE, d'une autorisation de mise sur le marché de l'Avastin pour le traitement de la DMLA ([2]) ne relève pas du droit de la concurrence.

La mise sur le marché d'un médicament dans l'UE requiert une autorisation préalable des autorités, qui est accordée uniquement si, après examen des données fournies par l'entreprise, il y a lieu de conclure que le rapport risque/bénéfice est positif pour la ou les indications considérées. Une autorisation de mise sur le marché à l'échelle de l'UE peut être obtenue en soumettant une demande à l'EMEA ([3]).

L'Avastin est actuellement autorisé dans le traitement de plusieurs cancers, mais pas pour le traitement de la DMLA.

L'ajout d'une nouvelle indication requiert la communication de données pertinentes ainsi que l'agrément des autorités. Une demande de nouvelle indication pour un médicament autorisé peut uniquement être déposée par le titulaire de l'autorisation de mise sur le marché.

([1]) Le 8 avril 2014.
([2]) Dégénérescence maculaire liée à l'âge.
([3]) Agence européenne des médicaments.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002767/14
to the Commission
Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(10 March 2014)

Subject: Collusion between Novartis and Roche in connection with the marketing of the drugs Lucentis and Avastin

On 5 March 2014, the Italian competition authority imposed a fine of EUR 182 500 000 on the pharmaceuticals companies Novartis and Roche for operating a cartel in connection with the marketing of drugs. The two companies are suspected of having deliberately kept Avastin, an anti-cancer drug developed by Roche which can also be used to treat age-related macular degeneration (AMD) and other eye diseases, off the market in an effort to boost sales of Lucentis, a drug manufactured by Novartis.

In Italy and the rest of Europe, Avastin costs between EUR 15 and 80, whereas Lucentis costs more than EUR 900 per dose. In France, a ministerial circular of 7 July 2012 banned the use of Avastin to treat AMD, a scandalous decision, given that the two drugs are based on very similar active ingredients. The Gefal study conducted by Lyon University Hospital and led by Professor Laurent Kodjikian has shown that the two treatments are equivalent, a finding which is corroborated by the results of two other tests, CATT in the United States and IVAN in the United Kingdom.

According to the Italian competition watchdog, Roche and Novartis created an 'artificial' difference between the two products: they presented Avastin, the cheaper drug, as more dangerous, thereby influencing doctors and health services in their choices.

In the light of the irrefutable scientific proof referred to above, does the Commission intend to take up the issue and order an inquiry with a view to confirming the existence of a cartel involving Novartis and Roche?

Can the Commission explain why no EU-level marketing authorisation has been issued so that Avastin, a drug which is as effective as Lucentis and cheaper, can be used to treat AMD?

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

The Commission takes note of the Italian decision regarding Avastin and Lucentis.

The findings of that decision, and the practices in question, are, factually and legally, closely related to the Italian regulatory framework, which, under specific conditions, authorises the off-label use of certain pharmaceuticals. Hence, the conclusions on the practices in Italy are not in themselves an indication of the existence, or not, of similar behaviour in other MS.

The Commission is aware that this situation has raised concerns in several MS. It remains in close contact with National Competition Authorities, notably with the French one, which has conducted inspections in the premises of some companies ([1]).

The Commission is gathering more information and will keep monitoring the European pharmaceutical markets. It will assess whether further action is needed, but cannot comment further on the precise content of its current investigate activities.

The question on the absence, at EU level, of a marketing authorisation for the treatment of AMD ([2]) with Avastin does not relate to competition law.

Marketing a medicine in the EU requires prior authorisation by the authorities, which can only be granted if, following examination of the data submitted by the company, it is concluded that the risk-benefit is positive for the relevant indication(s). A EU level marketing authorisation can be obtained by submitting an application to the EMA ([3]).

At present, Avastin is authorised for the treatment of several cancers but not for treating AMD.

The addition of a new indication requires submission of relevant data and regulatory approval. An application for a new indication for an authorised medicine can only be submitted by the marketing authorisation holder.

([1]) On 8.4.2014.
([2]) Age-related macular degeneration.
([3]) European Medicines Agency.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002768/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(10 de marzo de 2014)

Asunto: Solicitud formal de construcción de dique flotante en Ferrol (Galicia)

La zona de Ferrol está estrechamente vinculada a la actividad naval, que adolece de falta de inversión y proyectos, con consecuencias en términos de pérdida de puestos de trabajo y en los distintos sectores económicos de este ámbito. En la actualidad existe la posibilidad de construir un dique flotante para reparar buques de gran tamaño, infraestructura que crearía puestos de trabajo y riqueza y sería muy necesaria en estos tiempos de crisis para reactivar el sector y la economía local. Según los medios de comunicación, el Gobierno de Galicia admitió durante varios meses que no hizo ninguna consulta formal a la Comisión para saber si el ejecutivo de la UE pondría alguna objeción o impedimento a la construcción de un dique flotante en Ferrol, y la propia Comisión reconoció que, en julio de 2013, las autoridades españolas remitieron una consulta informal en relación con el proyecto de construcción por Navantia de un dique flotante en Ferrol, contradiciendo a los Gobiernos gallego y español y a la Sociedad Estatal de Participaciones Industriales (SEPI), que aseguraron que se trataba de una consulta formal. Navantia confirma ahora que ha presentado la documentación formal el 4 de marzo y asegura que la Comisión ha notificado acuse de recibo de la documentación enviada.

La necesidad urgente de este proyecto, reclamado por las estructuras sociales, sindicales y económicas de la ciudad, ralentizado por la ineficacia de ambos Gobiernos, exige un compromiso hacia el futuro industrial de Ferrol por parte de la Comisión Europea, que se espera desde hace mucho tiempo. Por tanto:

1. ¿Puede confirmar la Comisión si Navantia ha presentado formalmente la documentación requerida por la Comisión en julio de 2013? ¿Puede confirmar las gestiones oficiales que han realizado los Gobiernos gallego y español?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión que no existe ningún impedimento en la legislación para que el Gobierno español o el Gobierno gallego, ya sea directamente o a través de una empresa pública como la SEPI, lleven a cabo la construcción de un dique flotante en Ferrol destinado a la reparación de buques?

3. ¿Va a levantar la Comisión el veto a la construcción naval civil para facilitar la viabilidad de la construcción del dique flotante?

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

Mediante carta de 10 de julio de 2013, las autoridades españolas enviaron una consulta informal en relación con la construcción prevista de un muelle flotante por Navantia en Ferrol. El 4 de marzo de 2014, las autoridades españolas facilitaron datos adicionales en respuesta a una solicitud de información de la Comisión. La Comisión tiene previsto contestar a las autoridades españolas lo antes posible sobre la base de la información proporcionada. Según lo indicado en su respuesta a la pregunta E-012588/2013 ([1]), la Comisión recuerda que la carta de las autoridades españolas es una consulta informal y no una notificación oficial de un plan de concesión de una ayuda estatal con arreglo al artículo 108, apartado 3, del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea.

En lo que respecta a las preguntas 2 y 3, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta E-003354/20131 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002768/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(10 March 2014)

Subject: Formal application to build a floating dock in Ferrol (Galicia)

The area of Ferrol is closely linked to shipbuilding, which is suffering from a lack of investment and projects. This is having an impact in terms of job losses and in various business sectors in this field. There is now an opportunity to build a floating dock to repair large ships. This infrastructure would create jobs and wealth and would be much needed in these times of crisis, to revive the sector and the local economy. According to the media, the Government of Galicia admitted, for several months, that it had made no formal enquiry to the Commission as to whether or not the EU executive would find any objection or impediment to the construction of a floating dock in Ferrol. The Commission itself has acknowledged that in July 2013 the Spanish authorities made an informal enquiry regarding the proposed construction by Navantia of a floating dock in Ferrol, thus contradicting the Galician and Spanish Governments and SEPI, the state industrial holding company, which assured that it had actually been a formal enquiry. Navantia has now confirmed that it submitted formal documentation on 4 March and maintains that the Commission has sent an acknowledgement of receipt of the documents sent.

The urgent need for this project, which is demanded by the city's social, trade union and economic stakeholders and is being slowed down by the inefficiency of both governments, calls for a commitment from the Commission to the industrial future of Ferrol, for which it has long been waiting.

1. Can the Commission therefore confirm whether Navantia has actually formally submitted the documentation requested by the Commission in July 2013? Can it confirm the official steps taken by the Galician and Spanish Governments?

2. Does the Commission agree that there is no legal impediment for the Spanish Government or Galician Government, be it directly or through a public company such as SEPI, to construct a floating dock in Ferrol for the repair of ships?

3. Will the Commission lift its ban on civil shipbuilding to make the construction of the floating dock more viable?

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

By letter of 10 July 2013, the Spanish authorities sent an informal consultation in relation to the planned construction by Navantia of a floating dock in Ferrol. On 4 March 2014, the Spanish authorities provided additional information in reply to a request for information by the Commission. On the basis of the information provided, the Commission intends to reply to the Spanish authorities as soon as possible. The Commission emphasises, as indicated in its reply to Question E-012588/2013 ([1]), that the letter of the Spanish authorities is an informal consultation and not a formal notification of a plan to grant state aid pursuant to Article 108(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

As regards questions 2 and 3, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Question E-003354/2013 ([1]).

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

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-002770/14
Komisi
Pavel Poc (S&D), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE) a Brian Simpson (S&D)
(10. března 2014)

Předmět: Možné rozšíření povinného označování metod produkce

Strategie EU v oblasti ochrany a dobrých životních podmínek zvířat pro období 2012-2015 klade velký důraz na posílení práv spotřebitele a nutnost poskytovat spotřebitelům odpovídající informace, na základě kterých se mohou rozhodovat při nákupu. Povinné označování metod produkce u všech masných a mléčných výrobků, které se opírá o důkladné posuzování založené na výsledcích, je podle našeho mínění nejlepší cestou, jak posílit úlohu spotřebitelů tak, aby mohli z pozice tržních kupujících vyvíjet tlak na zlepšení životních podmínek hospodářských užitkových zvířat.

Podle číselných údajů Komise se podíl nosnic chovaných mimo klece v Evropě zvýšil z 19,7 % v roce 2003 na 42,2 % v roce 2012.

Souhlasí Komise s tvrzením, že inovativní režim EU pro označování metod produkce vajec ve skořápce vedl k tomu, že spotřebitelé dostávají lepší a jasnější informace a že díky němu došlo k velkému posunu směrem k produkci vajec na základě chovu mimo klece?

Souhlasí Komise s tím, že povinné označování metod produkce vajec umožnilo těm producentům, kteří investovali do lepších podmínek chovu a systémů chovu mimo klece, tuto informaci snadněji sdělovat spotřebitelům?

Je si Komise vědoma toho, že Britská rada pro vaječný průmysl v nedávné době vyzvala k tomu, aby se označování vajec ve skořápce rozšířilo i na potraviny, jež obsahují vejce, jako jsou quiche či sendviče? Jaký postoj zaujímá Komise k tomuto návrhu?

Odpověď Tonia Borga jménem Komise
(25. dubna 2014)

Díky povinnému označování vajec podle systému výroby ([1]) si může spotřebitel vybrat mezi vejci z klecových systémů nebo z alternativních systémů. Kromě toho je pravda, že nedávné průzkumy ([2]) ukazují, že většina spotřebitelů upřednostňuje nákup vajec z neklecových systémů. Toto označování dále umožňuje rozlišování cen.

Komise musí do 13. prosince 2014 předložit Evropskému parlamentu a Radě zprávu týkající se povinného uvádění země původu nebo místa provenience některých potravin. Jednou kategorií, jež se posuzuje, jsou složky, které tvoří více než 50 % potraviny. Některé vaječné výrobky zřejmě spadají do této kategorie. Toto označování by se však netýkalo aspektu systému výroby, tedy zda jde o vejce nosnic chovaných v kleci, vejce nosnic v halách nebo vejce nosnic ve volném výběhu. V této záležitosti by Komise vážené poslance ráda odkázala na svou odpověď na písemnou otázku E-009338/2012 ([3]).

([1]) Ustanovení čl. 12 odst. 2 nařízení Komise (ES) č. 589/2008 ze dne 23. června 2008, kterým se stanoví prováděcí pravidla k nařízení Rady (ES) č. 1234/2007, pokud jde o obchodní normy pro vejce; Úř. věst. L 163, 24.6.2008, s. 6.
([2]) http://www.labellingmatters.org/ a http://www.animalwelfareplatform.eu/documents/ProjOutput-consumerconcerns.pdf
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/cs/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002770/14
to the Commission
Pavel Poc (S&D), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE) and Brian Simpson (S&D)
(10 March 2014)

Subject: Possible extension of mandatory method-of-production labelling

The EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 places a strong emphasis on enhanced consumer empowerment and the need for consumers to be given adequate information on which to base their purchasing choices. Mandatory method-of-production labelling for all meat and dairy products, underpinned with robust outcome-based assessments, is, we believe, the best way to empower consumers to drive further improvements in farm animal welfare from the marketplace.

Commission figures show that the proportion of cage-free egg-laying hens in Europe rose from 19.7% in 2003 to 42.2% in 2012.

Does the Commission accept that the EU's innovative method-of-production labelling scheme for shell eggs has led to better, clearer information for consumers and to this highly significant shift towards cage-free egg production?

Does the Commission agree that mandatory method-of-production labelling of eggs has allowed producers investing in higher-welfare, cage-free systems to communicate this information to consumers more easily?

Is the Commission aware that the British Egg Industry Council recently called for shell egg labelling to be extended to food containing eggs, such as quiche and sandwiches? What is the Commission's position on this?

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

The mandatory marking of eggs according to production system ([1]) does allow the consumer to choose between eggs from caged systems or alternative systems. It is furthermore true that recent consumer surveys ([2]) show that the majority prefer to buy eggs from non-cage systems. Such labelling furthermore allows for a differentiation in price.

The Commission must submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council by 13 December 2014 regarding the mandatory indication of the country of origin or place of provenance of certain foods. One category being assessed is ingredients that constitute over 50% of a food. Possibly some egg products are in this category. However, this labelling would not cover the aspect of production system, i.e. cage, barn or free range eggs. On that issue the Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Question E-009338/2012 ([3]).

([1]) Article 12(2) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 589/2008 of 23 June 2008 laying down detailed rules for implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards marketing standards for eggs; OJ L 163, 24.6.2008, p. 6.
([2]) http://www.labellingmatters.org/ and http://www.animalwelfareplatform.eu/documents/ProjOutput-consumerconcerns.pdf
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002771/14
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(10 March 2014)

Subject: Cost of rural crime

According to insurance firm NFU Mutual, the cost of rural crime in my constituency, Northern Ireland, fell by 20% in 2012. This cost therefore represented a loss of GBP 3.4 million to the local economy. The results of the survey indicated that livestock and tractors and machinery were the items most taken.

In this context, can the Commission detail any corresponding figures in its possession for the cost of rural crime in each Member State, and outline what steps have been — and will be — taken to robustly combat this type of crime?

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

For lack of competence, the Commission does not receive information or keep records on criminal offences like theft of livestock and machinery in the rural areas of Member States. Such data may be available at the competent authorities in the Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002880/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(11 marzo 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Sviluppi della situazione in Ucraina

La situazione in Ucraina continua ad essere critica. Fra minacce di secessione e richiami alle armi decisi dal governo di Kiev, il pericolo del deflagrare di un conflitto armato alle porte dell'UE resta una minaccia concreta.

Premesso che le proteste di piazza, iniziate nel novembre scorso non solo a Kiev, ma anche in altre città dell'Ucraina occidentale, sono scoppiate dopo la decisione del Presidente di non siglare l'accordo di associazione all'Unione europea, preferendo egli un'intesa, a suo giudizio più vantaggiosa, con la Russia;

considerato che, alla luce delle più recenti notizie riportate da vari media, a dare il via agli scontri sanguinosi pare sia stato l'intervento di un numero imprecisato di cecchini che sparavano indistintamente sulle forze di polizia e sui manifestanti;

considerato che è stato riportato su molti media il testo di una telefonata tra l'Alto Rappresentante per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza dell'UE, lady Catherine Ashton, e il ministro degli Esteri estone, Urmas Paet, che confermerebbe proprio quest'ultima tesi;

si interroga l'Alto Rappresentante per sapere se la telefonata in questione sia vera, se vi siano altri dettagli sulla situazione ucraina, emersi durante quella telefonata o di sua conoscenza, che non sono stati riportati dai media, e se, infine, le notizie riportate dal ministro estone abbiano influenzato (e se sì, come) la sua posizione in merito ai fatti svoltisi a Kiev.

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

In quanto coordinatrice della politica estera e di sicurezza comune dell'UE, l'Alta Rappresentante per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza dell'Unione intrattiene contatti costanti e ravvicinati con tutti gli Stati membri. Non intendiamo presentare osservazioni in merito al contenuto delle presunte comunicazioni intercettate. Accogliamo con favore la creazione, il 9 aprile 2014, del panel consultivo internazionale del Consiglio d'Europa, che esaminerà i tragici eventi verificatisi a Kiev.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002880/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(11 March 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Developments in Ukraine

The situation in Ukraine remains critical. In addition to threats of secession and the Ukrainian Government's decision to call up its military reservists, there is now a very real danger that armed conflict could flare up at the EU's doorstep.

The protests, which began last November, not only in Kiev but also in other cities in western Ukraine, broke out following the president's decision not to sign an association agreement with the EU, and instead to opt for closer ties with Russia.

Recent news reports suggest that the bloody clashes were triggered by snipers who fired indiscriminately at police and protesters alike.

Many media outlets have published the transcript of a telephone call between the VP/HR and the Estonian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Urmas Paet, who has confirmed the authenticity of the call.

Can the VP/HR say whether this telephone call did in fact take place, whether she has received any new details about the situation in Ukraine, either from the telephone call or from other sources, and whether the information given by the Estonian Minister has influenced her stance on the events in Ukraine (and if so, how)?

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

As coordinator of the EU's Common foreign and security policy, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs & Security Policy is in constant close contact with all Member States. We will not comment on the content of allegedly intercepted communications. We welcome the establishement of the International Advisory Panel of the Council of Europe on 9 April which will look into the tragic events that occurred in Kyiv.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-002896/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(12 ta' Marzu 2014)

Suġġett: Id-dħul taċ-ċittadini tal-UE fl-Isvizzera

Insegwitu tar-referendum dwar l-immigrazzjoni li sar dan l-aħħar fl-Isvizzera, u tad-deċiżjoni tal-poplu Svizzeru fir-rigward tad-dħul taċ-ċittadini fil-pajjiż, il-Kummissjoni beħsiebha tirreaġixxi għal din id-deċiżjoni? Fil-każ, kif beħsiebha tirreaġixxi?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/mill-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(30 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Ir-referendum introduċa artikolu ġdid fil-Kostituzzjoni Svizzera li jidħol fis-seħħ biss ladarba l-leġiżlazzjoni ta' implimentazzjoni meħtieġa tiġi adottata. L-inizjattiva tipprevedi wkoll għan-"negozjar mill-ġdid u l-adattament ta' ftehimiet internazzjonali li huma kuntrarju għall-artikolu l-ġdid" fi żmien tliet snin wara l-aċċettazzjoni tal-inizjattiva. Il-konformità tal-leġiżlazzjoni ta' implimentazzjoni mal-Ftehim UE-Svezja dwar il-moviment liberu tal-persuni se tiġi analizzata ladarba d-dettalji tal-abbozz tal-leġiżlazzjoni jkunu magħrufa. Abbażi tar-riżultat ta' din l-analiżi, il-Kummissjoni se tqis ir-rispons tagħha. Il-Gvern Svizzeru aċċerta lill-Unjoni Ewropea wara r-referendum li se jibqa' jonora l-obbligi internazzjonali eżistenti tiegħu, inklużi dawk fis-suq intern.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002896/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(12 March 2014)

Subject: Entry to Switzerland for EU citizens

Following the recent immigration referendum in Switzerland, and the decision of the Swiss people vis-à-vis entry to the country for EU citizens, does the Commission have any plans to react to this decision? If so, how will it react?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(30 June 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 will be analysed once the details of the draft legislation are known. Based on the result of this analysis, the Commission will consider its response. 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.