

(2001/C 350 E/103)

WRITTEN QUESTION E-1226/01**by Patricia McKenna (Verts/ALE) to the Commission**

(26 April 2001)

Subject: Construction of the Ferrol waste-water treatment plant in a Natura 2000 Network area

In order to comply with EU requirements regarding the treatment of waste water, the Ferrol municipal authorities, together with the Regional Planning Ministry and the Northern Hydrographic Confederation, are intending to build a waste-water treatment plant covering six hectares in an area located within the Natura 2000 Network (Costa Artabra-Ensenada, located between Cape Poriño Grande and Cape Poriño Chico, Ferrol district).

Does the Commission consider that locating a waste-water treatment plant within an area included in the Natura 2000 Network is a suitable way of solving a serious environmental problem (the city of Ferrol discharges 60 000 m³ per day of waste water into the estuary on which it stands)? Does it not think that an alternative solution should be found which will not affect the Natura 2000 Network site?

Answer given by Mrs Wallström on behalf of the Commission

(29 June 2001)

Article 4 of Council Directive 91/271/EEC of 21 May 1991 concerning urban waste-water treatment⁽¹⁾ requires agglomerations of more than 15 000 population equivalent (population equivalent is a unit of measurement of organic pollution representing the average pollution produced per person per day) to be equipped with collecting systems and secondary (i.e. biological) treatment systems by no later than 31 December 2000. Ferrol falls into this category.

The fact that the project described by the Honourable Member is indeed located in an area designated a site of Community importance (SCI ES1110002 'Costa Artaba') by the Spanish authorities in accordance with Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora⁽²⁾ does not a priori prevent the project from being carried out, provided it does not have a significant effect on the site.

The question does not provide sufficient information for the Commission to establish whether Directive 92/43/EEC has been infringed.

However, the Commission does not rule out the possibility of investigating the problem raised by the Honourable Member should she be able to provide it with information proving that the project would have a significant effect on the site.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 135, 30.5.1991.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(2001/C 350 E/104)

WRITTEN QUESTION E-1236/01**by Reimer Böge (PPE-DE) to the Commission**

(26 April 2001)

Subject: Protection of animals during transport: follow-up measures to Commission report

In its report to the Council and the European Parliament of 6 December 2000⁽¹⁾ on the experience acquired by Member States since the implementation of Council Directive 95/29/EC⁽²⁾ amending Directive 91/628/EEC⁽³⁾ concerning the protection of animals during transport, the Commission notes serious problems of animal protection, particularly as regards the transport of animals for slaughter.

The Commission report clearly shows that there has been inadequate implementation of the Directive in several Member States.

What stage has been reached in the consideration of these Treaty violations?

When does the Commission propose to initiate proceedings against the Member States which have failed to meet their Treaty obligations?

(¹) COM(2000) 809.

(²) OJ L 148, 30.6.1995, p. 52.

(³) OJ L 340, 11.12.1991, p. 17.

Answer given by Mr Byrne on behalf of the Commission

(27 June 2001)

Although several Member States failed to achieve transposition of Council Directive 91/628/EEC of 19 November 1991 on the protection of animals during transport and amending Directives 90/425/EEC and 91/496/EEC, as amended by Directive 95/29/EC of 29 June 1995 by the required dates, all Member States subsequently communicated details of their legislation transposing these texts into their national legal systems.

At the present time therefore the principal problems in relation to this Directive concern:

- inadequate enforcement by Member States within their territories;
- difficulties arising from ambiguities and imprecisions in the present text;
- obsolescence of certain provisions in the light of current developments.

The Commission is aware of the current areas of difficulty, notably as a result of the examination of mission reports of its Food and Veterinary Office (FVO), complaints from animal welfare organisations and information communicated by Member States.

Infringement procedures have already been opened in a number of cases where Member States have failed to comply with Commission requests to take action to rectify deficiencies in implementation and enforcement. The Commission is prepared to open further infringement procedures in cases where adequate proof of those infringements exists.

Following its presentation of the report referred to by the Honourable Member, the Commission is also working on proposals for updating and improving the text of the Directive with the aim not only of laying down improved standards of animal welfare for transported animals but also clearer requirements in relation to enforcement.

(2001/C 350 E/105)

WRITTEN QUESTION E-1238/01

by Graham Watson (ELDR) to the Commission

(26 April 2001)

Subject: An effective treatment for tuberculosis

Could the Commission explain why the European Union in its communication for action (¹) 'Accelerated action on HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis in the context of world poverty reduction', has failed to mention the DOTS- Directly Observed Treatment Short Course strategy, an effective and low-cost treatment for tuberculosis.

(¹) COM(2001) 96 final.