Question for written answer E-013497/2013
to the Council
Rule 117
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)

Subject: European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)

The International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) have been granting investment funding to agricultural businesses in non-EU countries such as Russia, China, Turkey and Ukraine which are not complying with EU standards on animal welfare. The result is a distortion of competition arising from the fact that EU farmers are required to meet higher animal welfare standards which involve higher production costs. At present, the two bodies are not requiring binding performance standards, and especially with regard to the EBRD it does not seem appropriate for an EU-controlled bank to support agricultural businesses of this kind that fall short of EU animal welfare standards. The same issues apply to export credit agencies.

1. On behalf of whom are these bodies acting?

2. Given that the EU Member States hold over 50 % of the EBRD's shares, what can they do to influence the EBRD?

3. What can the Member States of the EU do to make the EBRD's animal welfare guidelines binding? If this is not in the power of the EU or the Member States, then who can do so?

4. Where do the Member States providing the funding consider their interest lies, and are they taking into consideration the disadvantaging of European producers?

5. Is there an interest on the part of the Member States in ceasing to provide funds to these bodies (and in particular the EBRD) if they continue to fund agricultural businesses that do not comply with European animal welfare standards?