



EUROPSKI PARLAMENT

2009 - 2014

Dokument s plenarne sjednice

A7-0299/2013

24.9.2013

IZVJEŠĆE

o radu Odbora za predstavke tijekom 2012. godine
(2013/2013(INI))

Odbor za predstavke

Izvjestitelj: Edward McMillan-Scott

SADRŽAJ

	Stranica
PRIJEDLOG REZOLUCIJE EUROPSKOG PARLAMENTA	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	13
STATISTIČKI PRILOG	27
REZULTAT KONAČNOG GLASOVANJA U ODBORU.....	35

PRIJEDLOG REZOLUCIJE EUROPSKOG PARLAMENTA

o djelovanju Odbora za predstavke tijekom 2012. godine (2013/2013(INI))

Europski parlament,

- uzimajući u obzir svoje prethodne rezolucije o radu Odbora za predstavke,
 - uzimajući u obzir članke 10. i 11. Ugovora o Europskoj uniji,
 - uzimajući u obzir članke 24., 227., 228., 258. i 260. Ugovora u funkcioniranju Europske unije (UFEU),
 - uzimajući u obzir članak 48. i članak 202. stavak 8. Poslovnika,
 - uzimajući u obzir izvješće Odbora za predstavke (A7-0299/2013),
- A. budući da je, u skladu s Protokolom br.30 Ugovora, Povelja Europske unije o temeljnim pravima već dobila obvezujuću pravnu snagu stupanjem na snagu Ugovora iz Lisabona; budući da područje primjene Povelje u skladu s člankom 51. obuhvaća tijela i institucije EU-a i država članica isključivo kada primjenjuju pravo Unije; budući da su istim Ugovorom utvrđeni pravna osnova za pristupanje EU-a Europskoj konvenciji o ljudskim pravima i uvođenje europske građanske inicijative;
- B. budući da Odbor za predstavke ima dužnost stalnog pregledavanja i po mogućnosti poboljšavanja svoje uloge, osobito u vezi s razvojem demokratskih načela poput većeg sudjelovanja građana u postupku odlučivanja u EU-u te veće transparentnosti i odgovornosti; budući da u sklopu svog redovnog djelovanja Odbor usko surađuje s državama članicama, Komisijom, Europskim ombudsmanom i ostalim tijelima kako bi osigurao da se zakoni EU-a u potpunosti poštuju u sadržaju i duhu;
- C. budući da je 2012. godine Odbor za predstavke zaprimio 1 986 predstavki koje su se uglavnom odnosile na temeljna prava, okoliš, unutarnje tržište te gospodarsku i društvenu krizu; budući da je 1 406 predstavki proglašeno prihvatljivima i od njih je 853 proslijedeno Komisiji na daljnju istragu sukladno člancima 258. i 260. Ugovora, a 577 predstavki proglašeno je neprihvatljivima; budući da su za predmete barem pet predstavki podnesenih 2012. pokrenuti postupci pred Sudom Europske unije u skladu s člancima 258. i 260. Ugovora; budući da je presudom Suda Europske unije od 14. rujna 2011. u predmetu T-308/07 jasno utvrđeno da i postupovne odluke Parlamenta u pitanjima predstavki podliježu sudskom preispitivanju; budući da se, uzimajući u obzir statističku analizu sadržanu u ovom izvješću, najviše predstavki odnosi na EU u cijelosti (27,3%), zatim slijede španjolski (15,0%), njemački (12,5%) i talijanski (8,6%) slučajevi;
- D. budući da je, kad je riječ o temeljnim pravima, Odbor u 2012. godini posvetio veliku pozornost pravima osoba s invaliditetom, pravima djece, pravima potrošača, vlasničkim pravima, pravima na slobodno kretanje bez diskriminacije po bilo kojoj osnovi, zaštiti slobode izražavanja i privatnosti, slobodnom pristupu dokumentima i informacijama te

pravima slobodnog političkog i sindikalnog udruživanja; budući da je situacija gospodarske krize dovela do niza predstavki koje se odnose na socijalne probleme poput stanovanja, zapošljavanja i nesavjesnog postupanja banaka sa štedišama;

- E. budući da podnesene predstavke građana pokazuju da postoji stalna diskriminacija gradana na temelju invaliditeta, pripadnosti manjini ili etničkoj skupini, dobi ili seksualnoj orijentaciji;
- F. budući da inicijative EU-a za borbu protiv diskriminacije poput okvira EU-a za nacionalne strategije integracije Roma iz 2011. treba hitno uklopiti u nacionalne strategije i da ih treba stalno preispitivati i pratiti u svjetlu razvoja gospodarske i socijalne situacije;
- G. budući da se, kad je riječ o zaštiti okoliša, ne može pretjerati s upozorenjima na rizike od zagađenja i nesavjesnog ekološkog postupanja imaju li se u vidu rizici za biološku raznolikost i ekosustave te rizici za javno zdravlje, a svi su oni dugotrajni i često opasni po život; budući da u pogledu biološke raznolikosti neke države članice još nisu utvrstile ukupan broj područja pod minimalnom zaštitom Nature 2000 niti su u potpunosti provedle njihovu učinkovitu zaštitu; budući da treba uzeti u obzir ciljeve borbe protiv zagađenja i klimatskih promjena; budući da je Odbor 2012. posvetio veliku pozornost provedbi zakonodavstva u vezi s otpadom i vodom te ocjeni utjecaja projekata i aktivnosti na okoliš i javno zdravlje;
- H. budući da moramo očuvati naše prirodne resurse imajući u vidu zaštitu budućnosti Zemlje; budući da se u pogledu tehnoloških inovacija poput GMO-a i nanotehnologije mora primjenjivati načelo predostrožnosti;
- I. budući da je misija za utvrđivanje činjenica u Italiji istaknula hitnu potrebu da sva uključena talijanska tijela nađu održivo rješenje za potrebe gospodarenja otpadom u pokrajini Rim koje bi osiguralo poštovanje zdravlja i dostojanstva građana; budući da, unatoč tome što je izvanredna situacija u gradu Napulju završila, i dalje postaje mnogi izazovi u pogledu sveobuhvatnog pristupa gospodarenju otpadom u regiji Kampanija u vezi s hijerarhijom otpada utvrđenom u Direktivi 2008/98/EZ (Okvirna direktiva o otpadu) te presudom Suda EU-a od ožujka 2010.;
- J. budući da unatoč tome što Komisija može u potpunosti provjeriti poštovanje zakona EU-a tek nakon što nacionalna tijela vlasti donesu konačnu odluku, važno je, pogotovo što se tiče pitanja okoliša, u ranoj fazi provjeriti primjenjuju li lokalna, regionalna i nacionalna tijela sve relevantne proceduralne zahtjeve koji proizlaze iz prava EU-a, uključujući provođenje načela predostrožnosti;
- K. budući da je Odbor svojim radom doveo do toga da Parlament proglaši vodu javnim dobrom; budući da je europska građanska inicijativa „Pravo na vodu“ prva dostigla prag od milijun potpisa europskih građana;
- L. budući da treba izbjegići daljnje nepopravljive gubitke biološke raznolikosti, pogotovo unutar područja obuhvaćenih Naturom 2000; budući da su se države članice obvezale osigurati zaštitu posebnih područja očuvanja u skladu s Direktivom 92/43/EEZ (Direktiva o staništima) i Direktivom 79/409/EEZ (Direktiva o pticama);

- M. budući da u svojoj rezoluciji od 13. prosinca 2012. o novoj održivoj i konkurentnoj industriji čelika na temelju primljene predstavke¹ Parlament zagovara načelo „onečišćivač plaća”;
- N. budući da, bez obzira na međuinstitucionalni sporazum Parlamenta i Komisije, Komisija nije sklona brzom davanju informacija o prirodi svojih rasprava ni o donesenim odlukama u postupcima zbog kršenja koji se odnose na predstavke, a povezanim s provedbom zakonodavstva o okolišu; budući da je to važan razlog za zabrinutost s obzirom na nepopravljivu štetu i opseg uništenja koje bi mogli pretrpjeti naši ekosustavi i zdravlje; budući da bi europske institucije trebale pružati više informacija te biti transparentnije prema građanima EU-a;
- O. budući da je 2013. proglašena Europskom godinom građana i da su upravo građani Europske unije i osobe koje u njoj borave, pojedinačno ili zajedno s drugima, u dobrom položaju da ocijene učinkovitost primjene europskog zakonodavstva i da ukažu na moguće rupe u zakonu koje ometaju ispravnu provedbu zakonodavstva i potpuno ostvarivanje prava; budući da treba voditi računa o sadržaju Europske strategije za potrošače za poticanje povjerenja i rasta; budući da je pritom temeljni preduvjet da se građane informira o europskom zakonodavstvu na praktičan način;
- P. budući da je Odbor za predstavke iz tog razloga 2012. godine mnogo vremena i napora posvetio raspravi o značenju europskog građanstva, koje je doduše usko povezano s potpunom slobodom kretanja i boravka u Europskoj uniji, kako je utvrđeno u dijelu III. UFEU-a, ali koje također obuhvaća mnoga druga prava te je korisno građanima koji ne napuštaju svoju domovinu; budući da predstavke pokazuju da su građani Unije i osobe koje borave u njoj i dalje suočeni s rasprostranjениm i konkretnim preprekama osobito za ostvarivanje svojih prekograničnih prava, a to ima neposredan i svakodnevni utjecaj na živote i dobrobit tisuća domaćinstava;
- Q. budući da se postupkom predstavki mogu dopuniti drugi europski instrumenti dostupni građanima, poput mogućnosti podnošenja pritužbe Europskom ombudsmanu ili Komisiji; budući da Odbor za predstavke usko surađuje s Europskim ombudsmanom, drugim odborima Europskog parlamenta, europskim tijelima, subjektima i mrežama te državama članicama;
- R. budući da postupak predstavki može i treba ostati dopunski postupak u odnosu na druge mehanizme pravne zaštite koji građanima stoje na raspolaganju, poput ulaganja žalbi Europskoj komisiji ili Europskom ombudsmanu; budući da je upravo SOLVIT važno sredstvo koje građani EU-a mogu koristiti za pronalaženje brzih rješenja za probleme uzrokovane lošom primjenom zakona o unutarnjem tržištu od strane javnih tijela; budući da se stoga mora ostvariti napredak u zajedničkom rješavanju sudskih postupaka koje su pokrenuli potrošači ili njihove udruge; budući da jedinstveni internetski portal „Ostvari svoja prava” sadrži važne informacije za građane koji žele uložiti žalbu zbog neodgovarajuće primjene zakonodavstva EU-a;
- S. budući da se područje djelovanja i način rada prava na predstavke koje je u skladu s uvjetima Ugovora dodijeljeno svim građanima EU-a razlikuje od ostalih pravnih likovaca

¹ Usvojeni tekstovi, P7_TA(2012)0510.

- dostupnih građanima poput primjerice podnošenja pritužbi Komisiji ili Ombudsmanu;
- T. budući da je nužno povećati sudjelovanje građana u postupku donošenja odluka EU-a, imajući na umu jačanje njegove legitimnosti i odgovornosti;
 - U. budući da je 1. travnja 2012. stupio na snagu novi instrument participativne demokracije, „Europska građanska inicijativa”, i da je tijekom godine ukupno registrirano šesnaest inicijativa; budući da su razni inicijatori Europske građanske inicijative izrazili zabrinutost zbog tehničkih prepreka pri stvarnom prikupljanju potpisa; budući da će Odbor za predstavke imati ključnu ulogu u organizaciji javnih rasprava o uspješnim inicijativama;
 - V. budući da je očito da postoji nedostatak jasno strukturiranih i široj javnosti objavljenih informacija te da građani EU-a nisu dovoljno upoznati sa svojim pravima; budući da su to ključne prepreke za aktivno ostvarivanje građanstva EU-a; budući da bi u tom pogledu države članice trebale bolje ispunjavati svoje obveze informiranja i stvaranja svijesti;
 - W. budući da građani Europske unije i osobe koje u njoj borave imaju legitimno pravo očekivati da će pitanja koja postave Odboru za predstavke biti riješena bez nepotrebnog odgađanja u okviru zakonskog okvira Europske unije, a osobito da će članovi Odbora braniti prirodni okoliš, zdravlje, slobodu kretanja, dostojanstvo i temeljna prava i slobode podnositelja predstavki; budući da je učinkovitost rada Odbora uglavnom rezultat brzine i temeljnosti njegova tajništva, što bi se moglo još više poboljšati, osobito optimizacijom vremena obrade predstavki te sistematizacijom postupka njihove procjene; budući da bi u tu svrhu, s obzirom na sve veći broj zaprimljenih predstavki svake godine, trebalo izdvojiti više sredstava te odvojiti više vremena za sastanke Odbora; budući da pri obrađivanju predstavki mora postojati kontinuitet i u razdobljima izmjene mandata te time i osoblja; budući da su žrtve Francova režima podnijele nekoliko predstavki u vezi s otetom djecom u Španjolskoj;
 - X. budući da su neke predstavke još uvijek u postupku rješavanja između Komisije, Parlamenta, Suda EU-a i nacionalnih vlasti i da nije pronađeno nikakvo rješenje, što stvara nesigurnost kod podnositelja predstavki bez ikakvih naznaka zaključenja postupka;
 - Y. budući da se znatno povećao broj predstavki koje se odnose na kršenje načela temeljnih demokratskih prava i vladavine prava zaštićenih Ugovorom o Europskoj uniji u državama članicama, što pokazuje da europski građani imaju sve veće povjerenje u institucije Zajednice da zagovaraju njihova temeljna prava;
 - Z. budući da su pojedinci i lokalne zajednice te volonterske organizacije i poduzeća u stanju procijeniti učinkovitost europskog zakonodavstva koje se odnosi na njih, te da mogu upozoriti na moguće rupe u zakonu koje je potrebno provjeriti kako bi se osiguralo bolje, usklađenije i usporedivije provođenje prava EU-a u svim državama članicama;

* * *

- 1. prima na znanje da se predstavke građana Europske unije i osoba koje u njoj borave iz 2012. godine uglavnom tiču navoda o povredama zakonodavstva EU-a u području temeljnih prava, okoliša, unutarnjeg tržišta i vlasničkih prava; smatra da predstavke pokazuju da su još uvijek česti i rašireni slučajevi nepotpunog prenošenja zakonodavstva

EU-a ili njegove pogrešne primjene;

2. napominje da temeljna prava ostaju ključna tema podnesenih predstavki, posebno u pogledu pitanja o pravima osoba s invaliditetom, pravima djece, imovinskim pravima, pravu na slobodno kretanje, uključujući prenosivost prava na socijalnu skrb bez suočavanja s ikakvim oblikom diskriminacije, zaštiti slobode izražavanja i privatnosti, slobodi udruživanja i pravu na pristup dokumentima i informacijama; poziva države članice da ispravno provedu i poštuju ta prava kako je navedeno u Ugovoru i poziva Komisiju da poduzme potrebne mjere da države članice koje ta prava ne poštuju primora da uklone nesrazmjer između nacionalnih zakona i temeljnih prava građana EU-a;
3. smatra da bi interaktivni priručnik dostupan preko internetske stranice Europskog parlamenta sličan onom Europskog ombudsmana mogao smanjiti broj podnesenih predstavki o pitanjima koje se ne odnose na područja djelatnosti EU-a;
4. potvrđuje važnu ulogu Odbora za predstavke u traženju izvansudskih rješenja za građane od kojih se u praksi spoznaje kako građani Europe gledaju na Europsku uniju, što zauzvrat omogućava zaključke o tome daje li europsko zakonodavstvo željene rezultate te odgovara li očekivanjima građana Unije;
5. poziva Odbor za predstavke da razmotri posljedice sudske prakse Suda Europske unije u vezi s organizacijom „Equal Rights Trust“ na prihvatljivost predstavki, koja građanima Unije daje čak i u slučaju isključivo nacionalnog prava veću razinu zaštite kod nacionalnih presuda koje utječu na ostvarivanje njihovih prava kao građana EU-a; poziva da se istraže stvarne prepreke s kojima se suočavaju građani Unije koji zatraže odluku o prethodnim pitanjima od Suda Europske unije kako bi dobili pouzdano tumačenje europskog zakonodavstva u predmetima pred nacionalnim sudovima;
6. poziva na misiju za utvrđivanje činjenica, u kontekstu poboljšanja rada Odbora, kojom bi se s jedne strane osiguralo da svaki član misije za utvrđivanje činjenica ima pravo iznijeti činjenice sa svog gledišta, a s druge strane jamčilo da svaki član Odbora ima mogućnost sudjelovanja u postupku donošenja odluka u pogledu zaključaka Odbora za predstavke;
7. odlučan je u namjeri da postupak predstavki učini učinkovitijim, transparentnijim i nepristranim, a pritom sačuva pravo sudjelovanja članova Odbora za predstavke tako da postupanje s predstavkama bude u skladu s kriterijima za preispitivanje zakonitosti čak i u proceduralnom smislu;
8. ukazuje na postojanu diskriminaciju građana zbog njihove vjere ili uvjerenja, invaliditeta, pripadnosti manjinskoj skupini, dobi ili seksualnoj orijentaciji; posebno upozorava na to da romsko stanovništvo širom EU-a i dalje nailazi na prepreke za uključivanje u društvo; poziva stoga Komisiju da olakša suradnju među vladama u tom području, da osigura odgovarajuća financijska sredstva za provedbu nacionalnih strategija za uključivanje Roma i da aktivno prati provode li države članice učinkovito navedene strategije;
9. poziva Komisiju da iznese zakonodavni prijedlog za konačno rješenje problema uzajamnog priznavanja dokumenata o građanskom stanju i njihovih učinaka od strane država članica te da pritom istodobno poštuje društvenopolitičke tradicije pojedinih država članica u skladu s načelom supsidijarnosti;

10. ponavlja prethodne pozive državama članicama da osiguraju slobodu kretanja za sve građane EU-a i njihove obitelji bez diskriminacije na osnovi seksualne orientacije ili državljanstva; ponavlja svoj poziv državama članicama da prava utvrđena člancima 2. i 3. Direktive 2004/38/EZ u potpunosti provedu, ne samo za supružnike različitog spola nego i za registriranog partnera, člana domaćinstva ili partnera s kojim građanin EU-a ima propisno potvrđenu stabilnu vezu, uključujući pripadnike istospolnih parova, na temelju načela uzajamnog priznavanja, jednakosti, nediskriminacije, dostojanstva i poštovanja privatnog i obiteljskog života; poziva Komisiju da u tom smislu osigura dosljedno provođenje i u konačnici odgovarajuću reviziju te Direktive te da se po potrebi pokrene postupak zbog povrede Ugovora za države članice koje se ne drže navedene Direktive;
11. primjećuje da je okoliš i dalje ključna tema predstavki, što pokazuje da javne vlasti u državama članicama konstantno propuštaju osigurati očuvanje biološke raznolikosti, biološke raznolikosti i ekosustava i zajamčiti najviše norme javnog zdravlja; posebno upućuje na brojne podnesene peticije o upravljanju otpadom, o vodama, mogućim rizicima nuklearne energije i genetičkog inženjerstva, o zaštićenim vrstama te o ocjenjivanju utjecaja projekata i aktivnosti poput ekstrakcije plina iz škriljca metodom hidrauličnog frakturiranja na okoliš i javno zdravlje; poziva Komisiju da ojača zakonodavni okvir o okolišu i borbi protiv klimatskih promjena, a posebno njegovu ispravnu provedbu; žali zbog toga što neke države članice unatoč svojim naporima nisu uspjеле pronaći održiva rješenja za probleme upravljanja otpadom;
12. potiče Komisiju da poduzme mјere kako bi osigurala da države članice shvate da je voda javno dobro; zauzima stajalište da se načelo predostrožnosti mora strogo primjenjivati u pogledu korištenja biotehnologije i nanotehnologije u proizvodima koji bi mogli imati ozbiljni utjecaj na zdravlje potrošača;
13. očekuje da će pregledana Direktiva o procjeni utjecaja na okoliš, kojom se revidira Direktiva 2011/92/EU, ne samo ojačati pružanjem jasnijih parametara, nego da će je države članice i propisno primjenjivati;
14. smatra da se moraju hitno razviti postupci za predstavke koji bi omogućili rad misija za utvrđivanje činjenica također u razdobljima bez sjednica tijekom europskih izbora i inače – kada to dozvoljava priroda predstavke – tijekom ljetne stanke u zasjedanju (primjer je Damüls u kojem je misija za utvrđivanje činjenica bila ograničena na ljetne mјesece);
15. pozdravlja završetak izvanredne situacije u gradu Napulju i nove inicijative u vezi s gospodarenjem otpadom te očekuje primjerен odgovor na i dalje postojeće izazove u regiji Kampanija, osobito pomoću sveobuhvatnog regionalnog pogona za gospodarenje otpadom u skladu s hijerarhijom Okvirne direktive o otpadu te presudom Suda Europske unije iz 2010.; još je zabrinut zbog pristupa gospodarenju otpadom u regiji Laciј, posebno nakon zatvaranja odlagališta otpada Malagrotta;
16. osim toga, napominje da građani Europske unije i dalje nailaze na prepreke na unutarnjem tržištu, posebno pri ostvarivanju prava na slobodu kretanja kao pojedinci, korisnici i pružatelji robe i usluga te radnici poput primjerice slučaja rumunjskih i bugarskih radnika koji su i dalje suočeni s ograničenjima u pristupu tržištu rada u nekim državama članicama; posebno ukazuje na to da je prekogranična pravosudna suradnja i njezina učinkovitost još uvijek područje u kojem ima vrlo velikih problema; zaključuje da, sve u

svemu, pojačana prekogranična suradnja i harmonizacija osiguravaju velik doprinos zaštiti prava građana i poticanju ekonomije;

17. potiče Komisiju da poduzme mјere koje bi potrošačima omogućile pristup informacijskim i komunikacijskim tehnologijama osiguravajući potrebna jamstva sigurnosti i transparentnosti, a posebno se mora uvjeriti da su internetske stranice tijela javnog sektora dostupne;
18. ističe napore ovog Odbora u prenošenju zahtjeva mnogih građana za uspostavu pravnog okvira EU-a koji bi osigurao bolju zaštitu i poboljšanje dobrobiti životinja, što uključuje i kućne ljubimce i životinje latalice;
19. naglašava važnost osnivanja radne skupine o španjolskom Zakonu o obali koja bi mogla utrti put drugim takvim inicijativama, a koja podrobno izučava predstavke o toj temi i izmjene zakona; u tom smislu ponavlja važnost izravnog kontakta sa španjolskim nacionalnim vlastima i naglašava hitnu potrebu za dalnjom jačom suradnjom u svrhu pronalaženja bolje ravnoteže između imovinskih prava i njihove socijalne funkcije te boljih rješenja imovinskih prava kada krajnji cilj zaštite okoliša zahtijeva izvlaštenje; izražava svoje strahove da novi Zakon o obali koji je odobrio španjolski parlament ne rješava zabrinutost podnositelja predstavki niti postoje planovi za daljnju zaštitu okoliša obalnih područja u Španjolskoj;
20. naglašava potrebu za učinkovitom regulacijom zaštite obalnih područja, ali napominje da Zakon o obali nije usklađen s ciljevima kojima se teži, s obzirom na to da utječe na povijesnu baštinu i tradicionalne zajednice pogađajući stanovnike obalnih sela koji su oduvijek imali održiv suživot s morem i njegovim ekosustavima;
21. pozdravlja zaključke Odbora donesene nakon misije za utvrđivanje činjenica u Berlinu o dobrobiti mladeži i obitelji, posebno u vezi s prekograničnim slučajevima skrbništva; međutim, na temelju stalnog dotoka predstavki ove vrste konstatira da pitanje prekograničnih slučajeva skrbništva očito još uvijek nije riješeno i da je Odbor upoznat sa sličnim slučajevima iz drugih država članica, posebno Danske; nadalje prima na znanje da se u danskem slučaju radi i o slučajevima stranaca koji žive u samoj zemlji te da je osim toga bilo potvrđenih slučajeva otmice djece (između ostalog iz inozemstva);
22. smatra da su bolje upravljanje i učinkovitiji mehanizmi pravne zaštite izravno povezani s transparentnošću i pristupom informacijama u skladu s Uredbom (EZ) br. 1049/2001;
23. smatra da je važno ojačati suradnju s parlamentima i vladama država članica koja će počivati na uzajamnosti i kada to bude potrebno poticati nadležna tijela država članica da potpuno transparentno prenesu i provedu zakonodavstvo EU-a; naglašava važnost suradnje Komisije s državama članicama te izražava žaljenje zbog nemara nekih država članica u vezi s prijenosom i provedbom europskog zakonodavstva o okolišu;
24. u vezi s tim upućuje na istraživanje javnog mnijenja Eurobarometar iz kojeg proizlazi da se samo 36 % građana EU-a smatra dobro informiranim o svojim pravima, a da samo 24 % smatra da su dobro informirani o tome što mogu učiniti u slučaju da se njihova prava ne poštuju; stoga naglašava hitnu potrebu da se poboljša pristup informacijama i da se jasnije odijele funkcije različitih nacionalnih i europskih institucija kako bi predstavke i žalbe

mogle biti upućene odgovarajućim tijelima;

25. posebno poziva Komisiju da internetski portal „Ostvari svoja prava“ učini lakšim za korištenje i da građane EU-a upozna s postojanjem tog portala;
26. odlučan je da uspostavi praktičniji i vidljivi internetski portal za predstavke do kraja 2013. godine kako bi se olakšao pristup predstavkama i pružile vrijedne informacije o predstavkama, omogućilo njihovo širenje u javnosti i interaktivni pristup postupku predstavki, te drugim mehanizmima pravne zaštite; poziva da se pravo na predstavke učini uočljivijim na početnoj internetskoj stranici Europskog parlamenta;
27. naglašava da Odbor za predstavke zajedno s drugim institucijama, tijelima i instrumentima poput europske građanske inicijative, Europskog ombudsmana, Komisije i istražnih odbora ima neovisnu i jasno definiranu ulogu kao mjesto za kontakt sa svakim pojedinim građaninom; naglašava da Odbor za predstavke mora i dalje biti referentna točka za građane čija su prava navodno prekršena;
28. pozdravlja konstruktivnu suradnju Odbora i Europskog ombudsmana, kao npr. u slučaju tematskog izvješća ombudsmana o bečkoj zračnoj luci u vezi s odgovarajućom primjenom Direktive o procjeni utjecaja na okoliš; podržava aktivnosti Ombudsmana u vezi sa slučajevima nepravilnosti u djelovanju institucija, tijela, ureda i agencija EU-a; očekuje da će se ova zadaća nastaviti na temelju potpune neovisnosti, kao što je to bio slučaj i do sada;
29. potvrđuje da nemaju svi građani Unije jednog ombudsmana na nacionalnoj razini koji ima proširene ovlasti, a što svim građanima Unije ne pruža iste mogućnosti pravnih sredstava; procjenjuje da bi s jednim ombudsmanom u svakoj državi članici europske mreža ombudsmana pružila značajnu potporu Europskom ombudsmanu;
30. pozdravlja stalnu suradnju s Komisijom u pogledu pregledavanja predstavki na području primjene zakona EU-a u državama članicama; unatoč tome naglašava da Odbor očekuje da bude odmah i dobro obaviješten o razvoju situacije u vezi s postupcima za utvrđivanje povrede; traži od Komisije da jednaku pažnju posveti i predstavkama i žalbama o funkcioniranju postupaka za utvrđivanje povrede; osim toga, poziva Komisiju da Odboru dostavi detalje i statističku analizu svih žalbi koje istražuje; naglašava da je za potpuno poštovanje prava na predstavke nužna temeljita analiza i odgovor Komisije s procjenom ne samo formalnih ili proceduralnih pitanja, već i ključnog sadržaja predmetnog slučaja, ukoliko ista bude zatražena;
31. naglašava da je pristup informacijama koje imaju institucije EU-a, kao što je navedeno u Uredbi (EZ) br. 1049/2001, primarni interes građana koji žele bolje shvatiti postupak donošenja odluka, osobito u vezi s projektima koji utječu na okoliš; smatra da bi Komisija mogla omogućiti veći pristup informacijama o istragama i predmetima u vezi s utvrđivanjem povreda ne ugrožavajući svrhu istraga te da bi opravdani javni interes mogao biti razlogom za pristup tim dokumentima, posebno u slučajevima kad se radi o temeljnim pravima, zdravju ljudi ili životinja i zaštiti okoliša od nepopravljive štete, ili o postupcima koji se vode zbog diskriminacije manjine ili kršenja dostojanstva čovjeka, a dokle god je osigurana zaštita poslovne tajne i povjerljivih informacija u vezi s predmetima na sudu, tržišnim natjecanjem i osobnim podacima;

32. traži od Komisije preventivni pristup temeljen na predostrožnosti prilikom procjene projekata s potencijalnim negativnim utjecajem na okoliš ili javno zdravlje u obliku rane suradnje s državama članicama u pitanju; napominje mogućnost uspostavljanja mjera zabrane tijekom rasprava u slučajevima u kojima se prognozira nepopravljiva šteta;
33. posebno prima na znanje važan doprinos mreže SOLVIT otkrivanju i rješavanju pitanja povezanih s provedbom zakonodavstva o unutarnjem tržištu; potiče poboljšanje tog alata EU-a tako što će države članice osigurati adekvatno osoblje za nacionalne centre SOLVIT; dodaje da je potrebno zajedničko djelovanje kako bi se riješili sporovi koje su pokrenuli potrošači i njihove udruge;
34. ističe da su, kako je potvrdila pravna služba u svom mišljenju od 29. veljače 2012., područja djelovanja institucija Europske unije, kako je navedeno u Ugovoru, šira od pukog zbroja nadležnosti Unije; uzima u obzir viđenje pravne službe Parlamenta da Parlament ima pravo donijeti interne administrativne odluke s ciljem uspostavljanja postupka za obrađivanje podnesaka građana; izražava žaljenje zbog propusta odgovarajuće službe Parlamenta da do kraja provede rezoluciju Parlamenta od 21. studenog 2012. o radu Odbora za predstavke tijekom 2011.¹ u pogledu podnesaka građana na teme koje nisu dio područja nadležnosti EU-a; na kraju, prima na znanje pravnu odluku Suda Europske unije (slučaj T-280/09) kojom se utvrđuje da predstavka mora biti sastavljena dovoljno jasno i precizno kako bi se mogla ispravno shvatiti u svjetlu uvjeta utvrđenih u članku 227. UFEU-a;
35. poziva države članice da transparentno prenesu i provedu zakonodavstvo EU-a te, imajući to na umu, smatra neophodnim poboljšati ranu suradnju Komisije s parlamentima i vladama država članica na uzajamnoj osnovi;
36. žali zbog birokratskih prepreka na koje nailaze europske građanske inicijative zbog manjka informatičke podrške; posebice žali što se takav instrument za građane neujednačeno koristi u različitim administracijama zbog različitih radnih procesa u državama članicama;
37. pozdravlja Europsku godinu građana 2013.; poziva sve institucije i tijela Europske unije kao i država članica da tijekom ove godine poboljšaju svoje usluge i bolje o njima informiraju europske građane i osobe koje borave u Uniji imajući u vidu načela iz Ugovora i činjenice navedene u ovom izvješću;
38. napominje da mehanizam predstavki nije samo usluga, nego i pravo svih građana Europske unije i osoba koje u njoj borave; obvezuje se da će postupak predstavki učiniti učinkovitim, transparentnim i nepristranim, a pritom sačuvati pravo sudjelovanja članova Odbora za predstavke tako da postupanje s predstavkama bude u skladu s kriterijima za preispitivanje zakonitosti čak i u proceduralnom smislu;
39. naglašava ključnu ulogu misija za utvrđivanje činjenica u postupcima predstavki, ne samo kao pravo parlamenta na sudjelovanje, nego i kao obvezu u odnosu na podnositelje predstavki; ponovno potvrđuje, što je već naveo u prethodnom izvješću Odbora, potrebu za preciznijim pisanim proceduralnim pravilima u pogledu pripreme, provedbe i ocjene

¹ Usvojeni tekstovi, P7_TA(2012)0455.

misija, osiguravajući pritom da svi članovi misije za utvrđivanje činjenica imaju pravo na iznošenje činjenica sa svog gledišta, a s druge strane, jamčeći svim članovima Odbora mogućnost na sudjelovanje u postupku donošenja odluka u pogledu zaključaka i preporuka koje sastavlja Odbor za predstavke;

40. poziva Konferenciju predsjednika Europskog parlamenta da ojača istražnu ulogu ovog Odbora;
41. smatra organizaciju javnih saslušanja korisnim načinom za podrobno razmatranje pitanja koja postavljaju podnositelji predstavki; želi usmjeriti pozornost na, primjerice, javno saslušanje o istraživanju i korištenju nekonvencionalnih izvora energije tijekom kojeg je primljena na znanje zabrinutost građana EU-a koju su oni u tom pogledu izrazili u svojim predstavkama; priznaje pravo država članica da same odaberu koju će kombinaciju energetskih resursa koristiti te potrebu za boljom koordinacijom diljem EU-a imajući na umu trostruki cilj cjelokupne energetske politike EU-a, naime konkurentnost, održivost i sigurnost opskrbe;
42. raduje se organizaciji javnih saslušanja o uspješnim europskim građanskim inicijativama s nadležnim zakonodavnim odborom u skladu s člankom 197.a Poslovnika Europskog parlamenta; ponovno potvrđuje svoje uvjerenje da će navedeno novo sredstvo ojačati demokratske institucije Unije i dati značenje pojmu europskog građanstva;
43. ipak izražava zabrinutost zbog birokratskih i tehničkih prepreka koje su se pojavile tijekom prvih mjeseci praktične primjene europske građanske inicijative; stoga poziva Komisiju da ozbiljno razmotri raniji početak provjere propisane u članku 22. Uredbe (EU) br. 211/2011;
44. naglašava potrebu za redovitim pregledavanjem stanja stvari zajedno s europskim građanskim inicijativama s ciljem poboljšavanja postupka i kako bi se omogućilo pronalaženje djelotvornih rješenja za bilo kakve prepreke u svakoj fazi postupka što je brže moguće;
45. vjeruje da bi se uloga i odgovornosti Odbora za predstavke najbolje izvršavale, a njegova vidljivost, učinkovitost, odgovornost i transparentnost u najvećoj mjeri poboljšale boljim načinom da se pitanja važna za europske građane predstave na plenarnoj sjednici, te njegovom većom sposobnošću da poziva svjedočke, provodi istrage i organizira saslušanja;
46. odlučan je ispitati u kojem bi opsegu izmjene Poslovnika bile primjerene za provedbu gore navedenih formalnih uvjeta u vezi s misijama za utvrđivanje činjenica i plenarnim rezolucijama u skladu s člankom 202. Poslovnika;
47. nalaže svom predsjedniku da ovu Rezoluciju i izyešće Odbora za predstavke proslijedi Vijeću, Komisiji, Europskom ombudsmanu te vladama i parlamentima država članica, njihovim odborima za predstavke i njihovom ombudsmanu ili sličnim nadležnim tijelima.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The right to petition

The right of European Union citizens and residents to petition the European Parliament, as individuals or on behalf of associations, is a long-standing right conferred by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Art. 227) and by the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (Art. 44). The right to petition is an essential democratic tool, as it provides a reality check for Members of the European Parliament on the issues that concern citizens, and also demonstrates that the European Parliament is prepared to directly intervene in order to promote and protect the rights of citizens.

The Members of the Committee on Petitions check admissibility, analyse content, and take action on each petition submitted. Action often includes direct dialogue with other Committees of the European Parliament and with other EU institutions, particularly the European Commission, who are asked to investigate or to give their opinion. The Committee may also consult national administrations or permanent representations, organise fact-finding visits, and elaborate own-initiative reports. The objective of Members is to reply to petitioners with conclusions, recommendations, or referrals to other institutions or bodies.

In 2012, the Committee on Petitions registered a total of 1986 petitions. This represents a marked increase from the 1414 petitions registered in 2011. Detailed figures on registration, adoption, countries concerned, nationality of the petitioners, language and format of submission, as well as main themes of the petitions, are provided in the Statistical Annex of this report.

The meaning of *Citizenship*

All through the year 2012, the Members of the Committee on Petitions (PETI) have devoted a great amount of time and effort to discussing the meaning of citizenship and the obstacles that European Union citizens still face to exercising their rights.

Most notably, the Committee on Petitions welcomed the implementation of the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI) on 1 April 2012. The ECI constitutes the first instrument of transnational participatory democracy and will give citizens the possibility to become actively involved in the framing of European policies and legislation. PETI will play a primordial role in the process as the independent organiser of public hearings on the subjects of successful ECIs, alongside the legislative Committee responsible. In May, Members held an exchange of views with Vice-President of the European Commission Maroš Šefčovič, during which he announced the symbolic registration of the first ECI, dedicated to policies for Europe's Youth - Fraternity 2020.

The Committee on Petitions tabled a key debate in the March plenary session in Brussels, during which the European Parliament adopted its own-initiative report 'EU Citizenship Report 2010' (Rapporteur: Adina-Ioana Vălean). The report, which received opinions from the committees on Culture, Internal Market and Consumer Protection, and Constitutional Affairs, emphasised issues related to the freedom of movement of EU citizens and to the protection of fundamental rights, highlighting the barriers encountered by same-sex partners

and by the Roma population in the exercise of their rights. The report hopes to contribute to raising awareness and promoting discussion on the meaning of citizenship in the European Union.

Early in the year, PETI also contributed to the work of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs with Opinions for two key reports. On the designation of 2013 as the European Year of the Citizen, PETI called for measures to be taken to provide Union citizens with information about its work and the work of the European Ombudsman in order to enable them to make better use of, and defend their rights under Union law (Rapporteur: Nikolaos Salavrakos). On the Rights and Citizenship Programme proposed for 2014-2020, PETI urged for the explicit inclusion of references to the rights of persons with disabilities and to the need for judicious, accessible and transparent allocation of funds within the framework of the Programme, two issues which have been the subject of numerous petitions (Rapporteur: Adina-Ioana Vălean).

In order to continue deliberating on the meaning of citizenship in the European Union, PETI decided to hold a joint hearing with the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs and with the European Commission on February 19th, 2013.

o The impact of the economic crisis on the meaning of citizenship

Along 2012, the economic crisis continued to profoundly impact most regions across the European Union, rapidly deteriorating the welfare of hundreds of thousands of households. This reality has raised scepticism amongst European Union citizens on the health of democratic institutions both at the Member State and European levels, including on the way decisions are made within the European Parliament.

In September, the Committee on Petitions held a long discussion on a petition which addresses precisely this issue. The petition, signed by over 10,000 citizens, argues in favour of the formation of a federal economic government in the European Union; a fiscal union which would be democratically accountable to the European Parliament and which would entail structural reforms aimed at raising competitiveness and employment. Petitioners also argued in favour of a Constitutional Convention following the 2014 European Parliament Elections

During the debate, members of PETI shared the view that the current economic crisis violates the rights of citizens, not only their economic rights but also social and political rights conferred by the Treaty and by the Charter of Fundamental Rights. Undoubtedly, the erosion of democracy is widely felt across the Union and a broader public debate is urgently needed.

As a result, PETI decided to propose the organisation of a public hearing on citizens' rights and the economic crisis in 2013. The hearing, held jointly with the Committee on Constitutional Affairs, will involve citizens from all Member States and discuss ways and tools for greater democratic accountability and engagement.

o The imperative of good administration and proper implementation of EU law

The right to good administration is a fundamental right which ensures that citizens' questions, problems and other affairs be handled impartially, fairly and within a reasonable time. In recent years, numerous petitions provide evidence that citizens are increasingly directly

confronted with the Union's administration and that instances of arbitrariness, legal uncertainty, and lack of transparency risk diminishing the confidence that European Union citizens give European institutions. As a result, in April PETI adopted an Opinion for the Committee on Legal Affairs in which it expressed concern that the right to good administration is not sufficiently protected. The Opinion welcomed the proposal for a new Law of Administrative Procedure while emphasising the need for specific provisions on infringement procedures and on conflicts of interest (Rapporteur: Margrete Auken).

Proper implementation of European Union law is also an essential condition for the legitimacy of democratic governance and to ensure that citizens will fully enjoy their rights. In a separate Opinion for the Committee on Legal Affairs, members of PETI pointed out that civil society organisations continue to use the petitions mechanism to report on, and complain about, non-compliance with EU law by Member State authorities on different levels. In particular, PETI members alerted that citizens remain largely uninformed about infringement proceedings, and that they often feel misled about the applicability of EU law in instances of late transposition and about the actual scope of application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. PETI thus urged substantive and tangible progress towards increased transparency through greater access to information on complaints, infringement files and other enforcement mechanisms (Rapporteur: Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg).

Upholding Fundamental Rights

As in previous years, Fundamental Rights remains a main subject of petitions submitted to the Committee on Petitions. A total of 500 petitions submitted in 2012 denounced, to some extent, violations of fundamental rights and thus called for a more effective protection of the European values enshrined in the Charter and in the Treaties. This represents 25,1% of petitions in 2012, compared with 21% in 2011, 20,4% in 2010, and 22,3% in 2009.

EU and its institutions have a duty to respect, guarantee, protect and promote the fundamental rights of European citizens. The Committee on Petitions has a core role in this duty, as it is specifically entrusted with seeking non-judicial remedies on behalf of petitioners, in order to assist citizens in the exercise of their fundamental rights and in the proper application of the values and principles contained in the Charter and the Treaties.

In this area, the Committee on Petitions contributed with an Opinion for the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union (2010-2011) (Rapporteur: Adina-Ioana Vălean). The opinion drew attention to persisting discrimination against citizens as a result of their religion or belief, disability, belonging to a minority group, age or sexual orientation. It also deplored restrictions on the freedom of the media which frequently obstruct media pluralism; recalled that citizens have the right to move and reside freely within the European Union ;and underlined that the portability of social security benefits, pensions, health care and recognition of professional qualifications and civil status documents and of their effects are important rights.

o The rights of persons with disabilities

On 5 December 2012, the Committee on Petitions actively participated in the 3rd European Parliament of Persons with Disabilities. Numerous petitions bear witness to the difficulties encountered by persons with disabilities and to the fact that they do not enjoy the fundamental

freedoms and rights laid out in the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Members of PETI thus take very seriously their responsibility to establish a framework for the implementation of the Convention and systematically refer to it in the course of the Committee's work.

During the event, PETI members alerted that gaps in the implementation of the existing principle of equal treatment of people with disabilities are regularly brought to the attention of the Committee by the citizens concerned. This reality creates barriers that prevents them from enjoying the rights of EU citizens, such as normal use of the education system, access to employment, insurance, financing or public transport facilities.

Members of PETI reminded participants that already in 2009 the Committee received a petition bearing more than 1 million signatures which called for extensive protection in all European Union policies for people with disabilities. Another more recent petition denounced the misuse of EU Structural Funds by some Member States, a practice which hinders the objectives of the Disabilities Strategy. PETI urged the European Commission to make disability an ex ante conditionality for every project funded by the EU.

o Protecting freedom of expression and privacy

One of the most controversial topics in the European Parliament during the first half of 2012 was the debate over the multinational Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA). In February, PETI Chair Erminia Mazzoni and Rapporteur for the ACTA treaty in the European Parliament David Martin, who is a member of the lead Committee on International Trade, formally received a petition with over two-and-a-half million signatures. Petitioners expressed opposition to ACTA on the grounds that it would violate the fundamental rights of citizens with regards to freedom of expression and privacy. On the day of the petition's handover, statements to the press were widely broadcast and distributed.

In June, a debate ensued during the monthly meeting of PETI. Petitioners were present and warned members of parliament that the year 2012 marked a breaking point in institutional responsiveness and accountability of the European Union. Members of the Committee on International Trade, including Rapporteur David Martin, were lamented that the European Commission had not tried to reconsider the substance of ACTA based on the widespread criticism and concerns voiced by citizens. PETI members concluded that there was a clear majority in favour of rejecting ACTA and agreed to relay such position to the relevant legislative committees in the European Parliament.

All five legislative committees involved (Development, Civil Liberties, Justice and Home affairs, Legal Affairs, and International Trade) rejected the agreement in their own meetings. During the plenary session of July, the European Parliament in full voted overwhelmingly to reject ACTA, with 478 votes against and only 39 in favour (146 abstentions).

o Accessing documents and information

In November, the Committee on Petitions dealt with a petition concerning the fundamental right of access to documents, which is protected by the Charter of Fundamental Rights. The specific case concerns an octogenarian Spanish citizen whose father was arrested and executed during the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), and who explained to PETI members

that the national courts and administration are denying her access to documents she alleges exist.

Although the European Commission lamented that the case is outside the competence of the European Union, PETI pointed to the Charter as well as to the European Parliament resolution of 14 September 2011 on public access to documents, which already stressed that citizens' right to information is generally not complied with by the Member States' authorities, and urged more transparency at the Member State level. At the end of the debate, PETI decided to contact national authorities at the local, regional and national level, urging them to facilitate the petitioner's inquiries and to ensure that Spain sign and ratify the Council of Europe Convention on Access to Official Documents (CETS no.:205).

o Respecting choice in the right to Freedom of association

The Charter of Fundamental Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights both cover a citizen's right to freedom of association. Occasionally, however, the Committee on Petitions is confronted with petitions which ask for respect for negative freedoms. In 2012, PETI continued work on a long-standing petition which serves as an example of this.

In 2008, a Swedish Christian union of business owners indicated that its members were being threatened and intimidated because they declined for religious reasons to subscribe to collective agreements concluded by Swedish trade unions. They have argued that freedom of non-association is an individual right equal in weight to the freedom of association, and consequently have demanded for respect of their right to negative freedom of association. Whereas the European Commission maintains that the issue raised is an internal situation in Sweden with no connection to EU law, PETI members remain concerned about a potential violation of fundamental rights of citizens, and thus in 2012 continued to give course to the petition, submitting a question for oral answer to the Commission and pledging to discuss the substance in early 2013.

This petition serves as a reminder that the work of the Committee on Petitions is very much unlike the work of the Commission and the judiciary. Particularly with regards to protecting fundamental rights, and in order to give tangible meaning to the notion of citizenship, PETI members have first and foremost the duty to investigate petitioners' claims, and to ensure that deliberations and interpretations of EU law at the institutional level do not become obdurate, stagnant, or detached from the everyday lives of citizens.

o Property rights

In early 2012, the Committee on Petitions established an Informal Working Group, comprised of members from all political groups, to discuss the long-standing issue of the respect of property rights in Spain and, specifically, this country's Coastal Law.

Between March and November, six meetings took place during which members considered the contents of the 79 petitions received on this matter and which raise a wide range of issues, most notably the situation of legal uncertainty faced by property owners in the face of a law they allege has been implemented retroactively and, in many cases raised by petitioners, arbitrarily.

In April, the Working Group held an exchange of views with two representatives of Spain's Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente. As the General Director of Coastal Affairs had announced to the Working Group, the Government introduced amendments to the Coastal Law in October. By the end of 2012, the Draft Law was undergoing the amendments stage in the national legislative process.

Dialogue with the Spanish authorities has overall proved positive. In order to continue the exchange of views and to ensure that the fundamental rights of petitioners are respected, by the end of the year the Working Group decided to follow-up their work by conducting a fact-finding visit to Madrid in early 2013 [21-22 March], during which a PETI delegation will meet petitioners, authorities, and other representatives of civil society.

The imperative of protecting the Environment and Public Health

The Committee on Petitions firmly believes that it is the responsibility of public authorities, from the local to the European level, to ensure that biodiversity and our eco-systems are preserved and enhanced, not only in the areas designated for special protection but also everywhere else.

Undoubtedly, the protection of the environment cannot be disassociated from the protection of public health. Pollution and environmental malpractice expose citizens to dangerous health risks, long-lasting and often life-threatening. The Committee on Petitions takes the right of citizens to enjoy a healthy environment very seriously, and therefore it necessarily considers the risks to health to be inherent in the proper assessment of the environmental impact of projects and activities.

It is therefore a reality that daily lives and livelihoods of European citizens are deeply dependent on the health of our environment, and it is undeniable that the responsibility to ensure high standards of protection falls onto public authorities at the Member State level. These realities are reflected in the fact that a vast majority of petitions submitted to the Committee on Petitions concern the environment. In 2012, a total of 279 petitions were submitted on this broad topic, representing 14,1% of all petitions. This compares with 18,4% in 2011, 14,9% in 2010, and 11,9% in 2009. Many petitions referred specifically to Pollution (57), Waste (37), Protection and preservation (31), Impact Assessments (23) and Water (24).

On 5 December, Chair of PETI Erminia Mazzoni spoke at a Conference of the Committee of Regions which discussed the 7th Environment Action Programme and ways for better implementation of EU Environmental law. On behalf of PETI, the Chairwoman primordially emphasised the right of citizens, under the Directive on Environmental Impact Assessment, to be consulted on a wide range of projects which would potentially impact the environment. All too often, PETI receives petitions of citizens who denounce that no public consultation has taken place for major public and private works. Secondly, Chair Mazzoni urged the European Commission to conduct more and more thorough monitoring of waste management plans across Europe, as many petitions refer to the systematic violation of waste-related directives. Lastly, the Chairwoman reminded the Commission of the Interinstitutional Agreement whereby details of the reasons and status of infringement procedures must be communicated to the Parliament in good time and in an exhaustive manner.

Through 2012, PETI Members have unequivocally taken the view that better environmental

governance and more efficient redress mechanisms are directly linked with transparency and access to information. PETI's Opinion on improving the delivery of benefits from EU environment measures, which contributed to the work of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, emphasised that high standards of information and transparency are essential to ensuring that EU environmental policy meets with citizens' consent (Rapporteur: Giles Chichester).

o Waste management practices in Italy - PETI's Fact-Finding Visit in 2012

Waste management has been a recurrent and rising subject of petitions in recent years, increasing from 18 petitions in 2009 to 37 in 2012. PETI had already devoted much time and resources to the issue in 2011, work which culminated with the adoption by the full European Parliament, in February 2012, of its own-initiative report 'Issues raised by petitioners in relation to the application of the Waste Management Directive, and related directives, in the Member States of the European Union' (Rapporteur: Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo).

Pervasively deficient waste management practices in Italy, nevertheless, prompted the Committee on Petitions to continue investigating petitions in this area through 2012. Early in the year, Members debated new petitions on waste management and illegal landfills in the regions of Campania and Lazio. Petitioners and representatives of the Italian authorities were present to the debates, during which the European Commission expressed dissatisfaction with progress made in Italy since a ruling of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) in 2007 ordered Italy to act in conformity with the Waste Management Directive. In October 2012, the European Commission decided to refer Italy back to the CJEU, seeking fines, because of the failure of the Italian authorities to implement this previous judgement.

As a result, PETI decided to conduct a Fact-Finding Visit to the regions of Campania and Lazio. The delegation travelled on 29-31 October 2012 and was composed of three Members (Judith Merkies as the leader of the delegation, Margrete Auken, and Erminia Mazzoni, Chairwoman of PETI), as well as seven accompanying members of the Member State concerned (Roberta Angelilli, Alfredo Antoniozzi, Clemente Mastella, Roberto Gualtieri, Guido Milana, David-Maria Sassoli, and Niccolò Rinaldi). The delegation visited the sites of Malagrotta, Monti dell'Ortaccio, Riano Pian dell'Olmo, and A.M.A. Via Salaria, nearby Rome, and met with petitioners and public authorities both in Rome and in Naples.

At their return, the delegation expressed disapproval of the policies pursued in the Lazio region regarding waste management, in particular the excessive reliance placed upon landfills. The delegation also expressed deep concern at the apparent inability of the regional and provincial authorities to work in a more transparent and coherent manner with municipalities and civil society, towards establishing a workable waste strategy, based upon waste reduction, waste sorting and recycling, and including composting and bio-mechanical waste treatment. Nevertheless, members recognised that the approach of the current Minister of the Environment is positive and constructive and deserves support from the European Commission, and the European Parliament.

The delegation also concluded that the role and authority of the special Commissioner in Lazio is ill-adapted to the real problems faced by the population, given the astonishing levels of long-term mismanagement, and given that emergency powers are counter-productive and in flagrant violation of many aspects of EU waste legislation. Furthermore, members observed

that privatisation has contributed to the downward spiral of waste management with disastrous consequences for the local population and that this has benefitted none more than organised criminal gangs under the general terminology of the mafia.

Amongst other recommendations, the delegation urged Italian authorities to engage in a constructive dialogue with petitioners and civil society, recalling the right of citizens to be publicly consulted. The delegation called on the European Commission to release the necessary funding which is required to support the efforts of the Naples Municipal authorities, while undertaking regular auditing of the expenditure incurred and publishing such annual audits in a transparent register open for inspection to the public. The delegation also recommended that the military withdraw from every aspect of waste policy and that powers given to the Special Commissioner, by using the instrument of Emergency Legislation, be revoked immediately.

- o *Assessing the impact of projects and activities on the environment and on public health*

In 2012, the Committee on Petitions once again treated numerous petitions presented by citizens affected or concerned by the impact of certain projects or activities on the environment and on their health. At least 23 petitions submitted in 2012 fall specifically into this category.

For example, Members welcomed back to the March Committee Meeting an Irish farmer who submitted a petition back in 2006. PETI visited the farm in 2007 and, ever since, Members have supported the petitioner in his attempt to get recognition and obtain an apology for the devastating impact that toxic emissions from a nearby factory had on the health of the farmer and his family. The Irish authorities and the former President of the Irish Farmer's Union were also present at the debate, which concluded with the decision by PETI Members to seek an independent assessment on the data and information available so far.

Petitioners from Tarranto, Italy, are similarly concerned about the impact of excessive industrial pollution on the health and welfare of the local population. Their petition concerns extremely elevated levels of dioxin emissions from a steel plant, which place over 20,000 families at risk of chronic illness. The European Commissioner of Industry and Entrepreneurship, Antonio Tajani, and the Chair of the EP Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, Amalia Sartori, were present at the discussion of the petition in the month of October. The petition prompted PETI Members to table a Motion for a European Parliament resolution on a new sustainable and competitive steel industry to Plenary.

Authorisations for quarrying activities have generally proved to be unwelcome by nearby inhabitants, who tend to be concerned from the onset about the impact of this sector on the environment. Furthermore, PETI notes that petitions concerning this issue often complain of Environmental Impact Assessments which they consider inaccurate and biased, if existing at all, and also often point to a systematic failure to consult the local population and to ensure access to information. In 2012, PETI treated several petitions related to quarrying activities, amongst others, in Angoulême, France, and in Oencia, Spain.

Another petition that brought substantive debate in November touched upon a permit awarded to a French energy company for the storing of 120,000 tonnes of CO₂ in Jurançon, France.

Petitioners alerted that the designated site is located in a seismic area and at the heart of a wine-growing region. According to the petitioners, similar projects in Germany, the Netherlands and the United States have been suspended as a result of the significant risks to the environment and to human health. Members of PETI insisted that the European Commission investigate this case further.

Within the energy sector, the exploration and exploitation of shale oil and gas through the technique of hydraulic fracturing generates severe concern and rejection across the European Union. Petitions have been submitted in recent years by citizens in France, Romania, Poland, Bulgaria, United Kingdom, Germany and Spain. Petitioners believe that the current EU legal framework applying to hydraulic fracturing is inadequate and contains worrying gaps and loopholes. Most notably, petitioners point to the reality that major pieces of EU environmental legislation, such as the Water Framework Directive and the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, have not been amended to appropriately cover and account for the impacts and risks posed by this new technique. In addition, petitioners maintain that the exploration and exploitation of shale oil and gas goes against the energy transition toward a decarbonised society, which they perceive as the only viable option to mitigate climate change. Petitioners asked the Committee on Petitions to urge an imminent moratorium on the exploration and exploitation of shale oil and gas, and later on to urge legislation prohibiting it.

In view of the urgent nature of this topic and of the many citizens and Member States involved, PETI organised a Workshop on Shale Gas on 9 October 2012, in conjunction with the EP Policy Department for Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs. Rapporteurs from the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, and from the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy were present, alongside petitioners, experts in the field, representatives of the sector, and Member State officials. PETI provided a platform for all participants to compare, contrast and confront their views, and welcomed the ensuing report prepared by the Policy Department.

It should be finally noted that the Committee on Petitions considered, in the second half of the year, two petitions submitted by Irish citizens which will be followed-up by a Fact-Finding Visit in 2013. One is a long-standing petition, submitted in 2006, which refers to the toxic sludge accumulated in the Shannon Estuary as a result of the operation of a nearby aluminium plant. Petitioners alert that the sludge is gravely and irreparably polluting groundwater and the river Shannon. The other petition refers to a high-density building project which is due to be built in an acknowledged flood risk area. As a result, local residents fear that their homes will be threatened by the floods. Ahead of deciding dates for the Fact-Finding Visit in 2013, PETI members decided to ask the Permanent representation of Ireland and the Oireachtas Committee on Investigations, Oversight and Petitions for opinion on these issues.

o *Implementing water legislation*

Early in the year, the Committee on Petitions contributed to the work of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety with an Opinion on the implementation of EU water legislation (Rapporteur: Nikolaos Chountis). The Opinion considers that water is a shared resource of humankind and a public good which therefore should not be a source of profit. Furthermore, PETI members share the view that water should constitute a fundamental and universal right, and that the sustainable use of water is an environmental and health

necessity that plays a fundamental role in the climate regulation cycle.

The prompt and correct implementation of the Water Framework Directive is thus a major concern of PETI Members, particularly as citizens recurrently provide evidence of widespread ineffective implementation and enforcement. Already in January, as a result of a petition from the United Kingdom, PETI decided to contact the Scottish Executive and the District Council concerned to ask for clarification on the lack of implementation of the Drinking Water Directive and the Water Framework Directive. In May, PETI heard petitioners from Spain denounce allegedly unauthorised water extraction from illegal wells near Jaén, which may severely impact a Natura2000 site.

The Opinion of PETI called, specifically, for the European Commission to end subsidies which undermine incentives for efficient water management, and to instead free up funds for targeted subsidies – in particular for poor and rural populations – aimed at affordable access for all. Simultaneously, PETI urged the Commission and the Member States to improve monitoring and reporting of chemical pollutants in water, and asked the Commission to develop a road map for higher efficiency of water resource management and a ‘Blueprint to safeguard EU water’. Strategies should be based on a thorough review of the WFD implementation, the EU Water Scarcity and Drought Policy, and the EU adaptation policy as related to water management.

Finally, the Committee on Petitions decided to conduct a Fact-Finding Visit to the Spanish region of Galicia in 2013, in order to investigate a number of petitions which denounce high levels of water pollution in various coastal areas, notably in several estuaries of high biodiversity and including a Natura2000 site.

Citizens in the Internal Market

o *Moving across borders*

Petitions give evidence that citizens in the European Union continue to face barriers to exercising their freedom of movement as individuals, workers, and also as providers and consumers of goods and services. Petitions submitted in 2012 in relation to the Internal Market amounted to 143, representing around 7,2% of all petitions. This compares with 8,2% in both 2011 and 2010, and 7,4% in 2009.

A number of petitions related to the Internal Market refer specifically to the free movement of persons (37% of all Internal Market petitions), the free movement of goods and services (12 %), or the recognition of qualifications (22%). As an example, PETI members head a petition from Spain who complained that the various different tolling systems in the EU create obstacles to the free movement of persons, goods and services. The European Commission informed the petitioners and PETI that it continuously monitors this issue with a view to promoting the harmonisation of road charging policies.

In March, a PETI opinion for the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection, on 20 main concerns of European citizens and businesses with the functioning of the Single Market, underscored that Member States repeatedly fail to correctly transpose or implement EU law in this area, and urged the Commission to take timely and appropriate action when this happens (Rapporteur: Simon Busuttil).

The Committee on Petitions also receives complaints of ineffective cross-border judicial cooperation. In a case heard in November, a Portuguese national indicated that he worked for 16 years for a Dutch company on a North Sea platform and that his employers failed to register him with the social security authorities, thereby depriving him of his own entitlements. The European Commission observed that this case was at the base of an infringement procedure and that a ruling of the European Court of Justice has led to sanctions in favour of the petitioner

o *Protecting the rights of consumers*

Improving and protecting consumer rights is of paramount importance to the daily lives of citizens. Petitions submitted in 2012 in relation to this issue amounted to 101, representing around 5,1% of all petitions. This compares with 3,9% in 2011, 5,1% in 2010, and 5% in 2009.

Citizens expect certainty in the quality and safety of the products and services they purchase in the European Union, but all too often there are instances of misleading labelling, discriminatory selling practices, sub-standard safety, delays and misinformation in customer servicing, and outright business malpractice. In July, for example, PETI members discussed a group of five petitions submitted by Italian citizens who denounce the fact that vehicle liability insurance premiums are considerably higher in some regions of Italy than in others. PETI members worry that this practice is discriminatory and constitutes a breach of consumer protection, and therefore remain in dialogue with the national authorities and the European Commission, to further investigate the substance of the petitions.

Moreover, petitions submitted give evidence that strengthened cross-border cooperation and harmonisation markedly benefits the protection of consumer rights. In November, PETI welcomed suggestions made by a petitioner who complained about the way airlines deal with lost luggage and the fact that, apparently, more and more luggage is being lost in EU airports. Baggage-related issues have prompted a Public Consultation on a possible revision of EU Regulation on the issue. PETI members therefore urged the Commission to keep promoting passenger' awareness of the applicable rules, and to monitor the actions of Member States in order to ensure that such rules are being applied.

The welfare of animals in the European Union

In 2012, the Committee on Petitions devoted significant attention to the welfare of animals. Early in the year, PETI contributed to the work of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural development with an Opinion for the Report on the European Union Strategy for the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2012-2015 (Rapporteur: Victor Boştinaru).

The Opinion drew attention to the ever-increasing number of petitions from European citizens of all Member States who asked for the regulations on animal protection and welfare to be tightened up in order to fill the existing loopholes. PETI not only referred to the on-going spectacles that cause stress or injury, and/or kill animals, such as bullfights, but also to the large number of stray dogs and cats, which are evidently not covered under the European Animal Welfare Framework Law.

In June, having regard to the large number of petitions from EU citizens requesting the

establishment of an EU legal framework for the protection of pets and stray animals, PETI tabled a motion for a resolution to plenary on the establishment of an EU legal framework for the protection of pets and stray animals, which was adopted by Parliament in July. The resolution calls on the European Union and the Member States to ratify the European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals, and on the Commission to put forward an EU legal framework for the protection of pets and stray animals.

Reaching Out

The Committee on Petitions could not stress more emphatically that there is a need to increase the visibility of the petitions process amongst the citizens of the European Union. Through its work, PETI Members not only consider the subject matter of petitions but also contribute to raising awareness about the rights that European Union citizens and residents enjoy. In this regard, it is noteworthy that, according to the Flash Eurobarometer 365 on "European Union Citizenship," in 2012 just over a third of citizens (36%) considered themselves well-informed about their rights. The Eurobarometer additionally revealed that almost nine out of ten (89%) citizens was aware of the right to make a complaint to the European Commission, European Parliament or European Ombudsman.

For the purpose of increasing visibility, in 2012, PETI has continued to actively correspond with citizens and petitioners through various participative means, focusing efforts on several key aspects:

- o *Welcoming petitioners to the meetings of the Committee*

In 2012, as in the previous three years, petitioners were present in every monthly meeting of the Committee. Attendance of petitioners to the meetings of the Committee is not required, but it surely adds dynamism to the discussion. The presence of public authorities of the member state concerned, as well as of other interested parties, is equally welcome. It is noteworthy that PETI is the only Committee which systematically provides a platform for citizens to voice their concerns directly to Members of the European Parliament and which enables a multiparty dialogue between the EU institutions, the national authorities and petitioners, in a space of total transparency.

- o *Organising Fact-Finding Visits*

Delegations of PETI Members to the areas concerned by petitions occur roughly one to four times per year and are a critical component of the work of the Committee. The decision to send a delegation typically responds to the need to gather facts about petitions which have been discussed in committee meetings. Visits then require many weeks of preparation, in order to ensure that PETI members and staff are able to visit the affected sites and to meet with petitioners, national authorities, and also other representatives of civil society. Visits are short and intense, and are followed-up by further discussions in committee meetings and by a working document presenting conclusions and recommendations.

In 2012, the Committee on Petitions sent a two-day delegation to the regions of Campania and Lazio, in Italy, to look into waste management issues (see specific section on Environment - Waste petitions).

Looking forward to 2013, PETI decided on delegations to Galicia, Spain, where it will visit a number of Rías and consider issues related to water pollution; Madrid, Spain, in order to further dialogue with Spanish authorities on the Coastal Law; Greece, where it will study petitions on waste management; Poland, a visit postponed from 2012 to consider a number of projects for open-cast mines in Lower Silesia; and finally Ireland, where PETI will also look into water pollution issues around Cork and Kilkenny, on invitation of the Oireachtas Petitions Committee.

o *Improving electronic access to information*

The website of the Committee on Petitions contains a great deal of information about the right to petition and the process of admissibility and consideration. It also allows citizens to submit petitions via the website, by filling in a brief and straightforward form. In 2012, 70% of petitions were submitted online whereas the rest were received by post. This represents an increase from 58% in 2011 and from 63% in both 2010 and 2009.

In order to improve citizens' access to the petitions process, PETI continues to work on the design and launch of a new web portal. This new website will provide new information and, most importantly, will enable new features such as information on existing petitions and the possibility to add signatures to them. The value to citizens will not only be participative, but also educational, as the web portal will provide a transparent picture of the issues that concern citizens and the work that PETI does to address them.

o *Publishing the PETI Journal and the Annual Report*

Six editions of the PETI-Journal newsletter have been published and distributed to over 1,500 stakeholders. The PETI Journal is circulated during committee meetings and other events, remains available on the website of the Committee, and is also released through social media such as Facebook. Roughly half of the recipients are Members or staff of the European Parliament, whereas the rest are staff of other EU institutions, petitioners and other interested parties of the general public.

The Committee on Petition's Annual Report of 2011 was the first one to be published in a user-friendly format for its distribution amongst the general public. It reached over 18,000 citizens, a significant figure. The Committee hopes that this Annual Report of 2012 reaches and engages an ever-increasing number of citizens.

o *Introducing interactivity*

Web-streaming of committee meetings is extremely important for the Committee on Petitions. A great number of petitions are signed by multiple petitioners who can often not travel to Brussels to be present at the meetings. Therefore, web-streaming allows a large number of citizens to follow the discussion 'live' on the internet. PETI will continue to promote awareness of, and attendance to, the web-streaming of its meetings and events, as a way to reach as many interested parties as possible.

In order to increase visibility and interactivity, PETI also disseminates and reacts to information through social media such as Facebook and Twitter. Posts are followed, liked, syndicated, and commented by an audience of around 2500 users, mainly members of the

general public, and have a global reach of over 1,5 million.

Finally, PETI does its utmost to have a presence at the annual Open Day. On Saturday, 12 May 2012, members and staff of the Secretariat welcomed hundreds of visitors who came to the information desk of DG IPOL to learn about the work of the European Parliament and about the right to petition.

o *Working with the EP Information Offices in the Member States*

The role of the European Parliament Information Offices in the Member States is crucial as decentralised sources of access to all of Parliament's services for civil society and official bodies. Particularly during Fact-Finding Visits, PETI coordinates with the relevant Information Offices in order to disseminate information to citizens and to set up conferences with the press. Conversely, citizens occasionally submit petitions through their national EP Information Office, which forwards the submissions to PETI.

STATISTIČKI PRILOG

Popis tablica

Tablica 1. Registracija i usvajanje predstavki

Tablica 2. Predstavke po formatu podnošenja

Tablica 3. Predstavke po temi

 Tablica 3.a Glavne teme u 2012. godini

 Table 3.b Ostale teme u 2012. godini

Tablica 4. Predstavke po zemlji

Tablica 5. Predstavke po državljanstvu podnositelja predstavke

Tablica 6. Predstavke po jeziku podnošenja

Tablica 7. Predstavke po godini registracije i aktualnom statusu

Tablica 8. Sudjelovanje na sjednicama Odbora i naknade troškova

Tablica 1. Registracija i usvajanje predstavki (2009. – 2012.), s udjelom u ukupnom broju

	2009.	-	2010.	-	2011.	-	2012.
UKUPNO PODNESENO							
<i>od toga registrirano*</i>	1924	-	1746	-	2091	-	2322
<i>od toga registrirano kao predstavke</i>	0	0,0%	91	5,2%	677	32,4%	337
	1924	100,0%	1655	94,8%	1414	67,6%	1986
UKUPNO REGISTRIRANE PREDSTAVKE							
PROGLAŠENO NEPRIHVATLJIVIMA	1924	-	1655	-	1414	-	1986
PROGLAŠENO PRIHVATLJIVIMA	816	42,4%	667	40,3%	416	29,4%	580
	1108	57,6%	988	59,7%	998	70,6%	1406
UKUPNO PROGLAŠENO PRIHVATLJIVIMA							
<i>od toga zaključeno izravnim odgovorom</i>	1108	-	988	-	998	-	1406
<i>prosljedeno Komisiji radi mišljenja</i>	424	38,3%	405	41,0%	315	31,6%	510
<i>prosljedeno drugim tijelima radi mišljenja</i>	710	64,1%	607	61,4%	649	65,0%	853
<i>prosljedeno drugim tijelima radi obavijesti</i>	29	2,6%	26	2,6%	26	2,6%	59
	211	19,0%	184	18,6%	162	16,2%	297
*Podnesci koji nisu u skladu s člankom 227. Ugovora o funkcioniranju Europske unije (bivši članak 194. Ugovora o EZ-u) ne registriraju se kao predstavke.							

Tablica 2. Predstavke po formatu podnošenja (2009. – 2012.), s udjelom u ukupno registriranim predstavkama

Format podnošenja	2009.	-	2010.	-	2011.	-	2012.
Elektronički	1204	63%	1046	63%	815	58%	1387
Papir	720	37%	609	37%	599	42%	599
UKUPNO REGISTRIRANO	1924	-	1655	-	1414	-	1986

Tablica 3. Predstavke po temi (2009. – 2012.), s udjelom u ukupno registriranim predstavkama

Tablica 3.a Glavne teme u 2012. godini

Tema <i>(redoslijed prema udjelu 2012. godine)</i>	2009.		2010.		2011.		2012.	
Temeljna prava	430	22,3%	338	20,4%	297	21,0%	500	25,1%
Invaliditet	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	1	0,1%	10	0,5%
Pravosuđe	159	8,3%	125	7,6%	131	9,3%	242	12,2%
Imovina	106	5,5%	61	3,7%	51	3,6%	47	2,4%
Okoliš	229	11,9%	246	14,9%	260	18,4%	279	14,1%
Procjena utjecaja	40	2,1%	43	2,6%	26	1,8%	23	1,2%
Onečišćenje	53	2,8%	48	2,9%	49	3,5%	57	2,9%
Zaštita i očuvanje	48	2,5%	62	3,7%	38	2,7%	31	1,6%
Otpad	18	0,9%	25	1,5%	25	1,8%	37	1,9%
Voda	11	0,6%	14	0,8%	19	1,3%	24	1,2%
Unutarnje tržište	142	7,4%	135	8,2%	116	8,2%	143	7,2%
Slobodno kretanje robe i usluga	17	0,9%	22	1,3%	19	1,3%	17	0,9%
Slobodno kretanje osoba	71	3,7%	52	3,1%	33	2,3%	53	2,7%
Priznavanje kvalifikacija	20	1,0%	23	1,4%	24	1,7%	31	1,6%
Zdravlje	104	5,4%	83	5,0%	74	5,2%	110	5,5%
Prava potrošača	96	5,0%	84	5,1%	55	3,9%	101	5,1%
Dobrobit životinja	37	1,9%	34	2,1%	36	2,5%	60	3,0%
UKUPNO REGISTRIRANO	1924	-	1655	-	1414	-	1986	-

Tablica 3. Predstavke po temi (2009. – 2012.), s udjelom u ukupno registriranim predstavkama (nastavak)

Tablica 3.b Ostale teme u 2012. godini

Tema <i>(po abecednom redu)</i>	2009.		2010.		2011.		2012.	
Azil	22	1,1%	21	1,3%	21	1,5%	31	1,6%
Ekonomski i monetarna pitanja	6	0,3%	12	0,7%	6	0,4%	12	0,6%
Energija	25	1,3%	20	1,2%	14	1,0%	27	1,4%
Financijske usluge	26	1,4%	27	1,6%	26	1,8%	63	3,2%
Glasačko pravo i izbori	35	1,8%	26	1,6%	21	1,5%	25	1,3%
Imigracija	27	1,4%	26	1,6%	53	3,7%	75	3,8%
Industrija i poduzetništvo	47	2,4%	46	2,8%	53	3,7%	48	2,4%
Informacijsko društvo i mediji	105	5,5%	62	3,7%	45	3,2%	74	3,7%
Institucije	30	1,6%	24	1,5%	43	3,0%	48	2,4%
Istraživanje i inovacije	5	0,3%	1	0,1%	1	0,1%	0	0,0%
Jednake mogućnosti i rodna pitanja	14	0,7%	12	0,7%	6	0,4%	6	0,3%
Kultura i baština	38	2,0%	18	1,1%	16	1,1%	26	1,3%
Mirovine	26	1,4%	19	1,1%	24	1,7%	45	2,3%
Obrazovanje	11	0,6%	5	0,3%	9	0,6%	6	0,3%
Oporezivanje	3	0,2%	9	0,5%	7	0,5%	12	0,6%
Osobna pitanja	22	1,1%	32	1,9%	25	1,8%	66	3,3%
Poljoprivreda	38	2,0%	37	2,2%	45	3,2%	33	1,7%
Prijevare i korupcija	45	2,3%	33	2,0%	21	1,5%	48	2,4%
Prijevoz	33	1,7%	26	1,6%	27	1,9%	27	1,4%
Proširenje	36	1,9%	30	1,8%	17	1,2%	64	3,2%
Regionalna politika	51	2,7%	68	4,1%	30	2,1%	51	2,6%
Restitucija	216	11,2%	191	11,5%	97	6,9%	150	7,6%
Ribarstvo i pomorstvo	13	0,7%	10	0,6%	8	0,6%	7	0,4%
Sigurnost	9	0,5%	3	0,2%	1	0,1%	6	0,3%
Sigurnost hrane	27	1,4%	9	0,5%	1	0,1%	3	0,2%
Socijalna pitanja	10	0,5%	8	0,5%	10	0,7%	21	1,1%
Trgovina	93	4,8%	77	4,7%	78	5,5%	89	4,5%
Tržišno natjecanje	61	3,2%	63	3,8%	48	3,4%	67	3,4%
Urbani razvoj	9	0,5%	8	0,5%	6	0,4%	18	0,9%
Ustavna pitanja	101	5,2%	101	6,1%	69	4,9%	91	4,6%
Vanjski odnosi	77	4,0%	35	2,1%	28	2,0%	11	0,6%
Zaposlenost	23	1,2%	4	0,2%	7	0,5%	8	0,4%
UKUPNO REGISTRIRANO	1924	-	1655	-	1414	-	1986	-

Tablica 4. Predstavke po zemlji (2009. – 2012.), s udjelom u ukupno registriranim predstavkama

<i>Država članica (po abecednom redu)</i>	2009.		2010.		2011.		2012.	
Austrija	34	1,8%	36	2,2%	18	1,3%	19	1,0%
Belgija	30	1,6%	28	1,7%	12	0,8%	21	1,1%
Bugarska	56	2,9%	36	2,2%	52	3,7%	55	2,8%
Češka	13	0,7%	18	1,1%	10	0,7%	14	0,7%
Cipar	13	0,7%	15	0,9%	15	1,1%	18	0,9%
Danska	14	0,7%	25	1,5%	14	1,0%	21	1,1%
Estonija	4	0,2%	7	0,4%	3	0,2%	4	0,2%
Europska unija	404	21,0%	285	17,2 %	311	22,0%	542	27,3%
Finska	20	1,0%	26	1,6%	11	0,8%	18	0,9%
Francuska	73	3,8%	62	3,7%	64	4,5%	77	3,9%
Grčka	299	15,5%	273	16,5 %	183	12,9%	249	12,5%
Irska	74	3,8%	71	4,3%	48	3,4%	79	4,0%
Italija	25	1,3%	36	2,2%	23	1,6%	62	3,1%
Latvija	37	1,9%	27	1,6%	22	1,6%	28	1,4%
Litva	177	9,2%	183	11,1 %	138	9,8%	170	8,6%
Luksemburg	11	0,6%	7	0,4%	3	0,2%	8	0,4%
Mađarska	14	0,7%	7	0,4%	8	0,6%	19	1,0%
Malta	4	0,2%	3	0,2%	4	0,3%	7	0,4%
Nizozemska	9	0,5%	13	0,8%	9	0,6%	21	1,1%
Njemačka	35	1,8%	12	0,7%	20	1,4%	25	1,3%
Poljska	100	5,2%	66	4,0%	104	7,4%	80	4,0%
Portugal	37	1,9%	26	1,6%	30	2,1%	31	1,6%
Rumunjska	143	7,4%	102	6,2%	106	7,5%	146	7,4%
Slovačka	19	1,0%	7	0,4%	8	0,6%	18	0,9%
Slovenija	12	0,6%	6	0,4%	7	0,5%	6	0,3%
Španjolska	279	14,5%	288	17,4 %	216	15,3%	298	15,0%
Švedska	17	0,9%	16	1,0%	13	0,9%	17	0,9%
Ujedinjena Kraljevina	83	4,3%	66	4,0%	60	4,2%	73	3,7%
Ukupno države koje nisu članice EU-a	95	4,9%	84	5,1%	74	5,2%	70	3,5%
UKUPNO REGISTRIRANO*	1924	-	1655	-	1414		1986	-

*Napomena: rubrika „ukupno registrirano“ ne predstavlja zbroj predstavki za dotičnu zemlju.

Tablica 5. Predstavke po državljanstvu podnositelja predstavke (2009. – 2012.), s udjelom u ukupno registriranim predstavkama

Država članica (po abecednom redu)	2009.		2010.		2011.		2012.	
Austrija	38	2,0%	25	1,5%	24	1,7%	29	1,5%
Belgija	27	1,4%	29	1,8%	22	1,6%	33	1,7%
Bugarska	54	2,8%	40	2,4%	49	3,5%	57	2,9%
Cipar	8	0,4%	8	0,5%	4	0,3%	7	0,4%
Češka	6	0,3%	9	0,5%	10	0,7%	14	0,7%
Danska	13	0,7%	17	1,0%	11	0,8%	11	0,6%
Estonija	3	0,2%	2	0,1%	3	0,2%	2	0,1%
Finska	26	1,4%	25	1,5%	12	0,8%	15	0,8%
Francuska	79	4,1%	78	4,7%	78	5,5%	92	4,6%
Grčka	496	25,8%	409	24,7%	315	22,3%	475	23,9%
Irska	78	4,1%	69	4,2%	49	3,5%	74	3,7%
Italija	17	0,9%	31	1,9%	26	1,8%	62	3,1%
Latvija	31	1,6%	27	1,6%	16	1,1%	34	1,7%
Litva	219	11,4%	215	13,0%	166	11,7%	241	12,1%
Luksemburg	11	0,6%	8	0,5%	3	0,2%	8	0,4%
Mađarska	8	0,4%	12	0,7%	6	0,4%	21	1,1%
Malta	2	0,1%	0	0,0%	4	0,3%	7	0,4%
Nizozemska	11	0,6%	11	0,7%	6	0,4%	7	0,4%
Njemačka	44	2,3%	18	1,1%	23	1,6%	31	1,6%
Poljska	129	6,7%	94	5,7%	125	8,8%	99	5,0%
Portugal	32	1,7%	25	1,5%	24	1,7%	33	1,7%
Rumunjska	152	7,9%	101	6,1%	102	7,2%	140	7,1%
Slovačka	14	0,7%	4	0,2%	7	0,5%	11	0,6%
Slovenija	10	0,5%	4	0,2%	7	0,5%	7	0,4%
Španjolska	237	12,3%	261	15,8%	204	14,4%	311	15,7%
Švedska	13	0,7%	11	0,7%	12	0,8%	17	0,9%
Ujedinjena Kraljevina	122	6,3%	91	5,5%	80	5,7%	105	5,3%
Ukupno države koje nisu članice EU-a	44	2,3%	31	1,9%	26	1,8%	43	2,2%
UKUPNO REGISTRIRANO	1924	-	1655	-	1414	-	1986	-

*Napomena: radi se o državljanstvu glavnog podnositelja.

Tablica 6. Predstavke po jeziku podnošenja (2009. – 2012.), s udjelom u ukupno registriranim predstavkama

Država članica (prema udjelu 2012. godine)	2009.		2010.		2011.		2012.	
njemački	548	28,5%	430	26,0%	348	24,6%	498	25,1%
engleski	343	17,8%	295	17,8%	263	18,6%	360	18,1%
španjolski	237	12,3%	260	15,7%	200	14,1%	303	15,3%
talijanski	203	10,6%	199	12,0%	145	10,3%	224	11,2%
francuski	107	5,6%	100	6,0%	91	6,4%	123	6,2%
rumunjski	110	5,7%	72	4,4%	74	5,2%	105	5,3%
poljski	116	6,0%	86	5,2%	112	7,9%	86	4,3%
grčki	61	3,2%	58	3,5%	41	2,9%	68	3,4%
mađarski	16	0,8%	23	1,4%	16	1,1%	53	2,7%
bugarski	37	1,9%	25	1,5%	38	2,7%	37	1,9%
nizozemski	46	2,4%	23	1,4%	22	1,6%	28	1,4%
portugalski	27	1,4%	19	1,1%	17	1,2%	28	1,4%
litavski	7	0,4%	5	0,3%	2	0,1%	15	0,8%
finski	19	1,0%	21	1,3%	6	0,4%	11	0,6%
slovački	11	0,6%	4	0,2%	6	0,4%	10	0,5%
švedski	8	0,4%	5	0,3%	10	0,7%	10	0,5%
češki	4	0,2%	5	0,3%	1	0,1%	7	0,4%
latvijski	7	0,4%	6	0,4%	1	0,1%	5	0,3%
danski	9	0,5%	13	0,8%	8	0,6%	4	0,2%
slovenski	4	0,2%	3	0,2%	7	0,5%	4	0,2%
katalonski	0	0,0%	1	0,1%	0	0,0%	4	0,2%
estonski	1	0,1%	1	0,1%	2	0,1%	2	0,1%
Tekst na više jezika	1	0,1%	1	0,1%	3	0,2%	1	0,1%
malteški	2	0,1%	1	0,1%	1	0,1%	0	0,0%
UKUPNO REGISTRIRANO	1924	-	1655	-	1414	-	1986	-

Tablica 7. Predstavke po godini registracije (1997. – 2012.) i aktualni status*, s udjelom u ukupno registriranim predstavkama

Godina registracije	Ukupno registrirano	U postupku rješavanja	Zaključeno
2012.	1986	894	45,0%
2011.	1414	299	21,1%
2010.	1655	176	13,5%
2009.	1924	141	9,3%
2008.	1886	109	7,5%
2007.	1506	102	8,0%
2006.	1021	44	4,4%
2005.	1016	28	2,8%
2004.	2002	15	1,6%
2003.	1315	6	0,5%
2002.	1601	4	0,3%
2001.	1132	0	0,0%
2000.	908	1	0,1%
1999.	934	1	0,1%
1998.	1127	2	0,2%
1997.	1306	1	0,1%
<i>*od 1.7.2013.</i>			

Tablica 8. Sudjelovanje na sjednicama Odbora i naknade troškova (2009. – 2012.)

	2009.	2010.	2011.	2012.
Ukupan broj prisutnih	245	243	242	234
od toga glavni podnositelji	86	89	148	62
Podnositelji predstavki kojima je isplaćena naknada troškova	24	12	10	22
Iznos naknade troškova	€10.665	€5.710	€6.513	€13.447

REZULTAT KONAČNOG GLASOVANJA U ODBORU

Datum usvajanja	17.9.2013
Rezultat konačnog glasovanja	+: -: 0:
Zastupnici nazočni na konačnom glasovanju	Marta Andreasen, Margrete Auken, Heinz K. Becker, Victor Boştinaru, Philippe Boulland, Michael Cashman, Giles Chichester, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández, Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo, Peter Jahr, Lena Kolarska-Bobińska, Miguel Angel Martínez Martínez, Erminia Mazzoni, Edward McMillan-Scott, Roberta Metsola, Jaroslav Paška, Nicole Sinclair, Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa, Angelika Werthmann, Rainer Wieland, Tatjana Ždanoka
Zamjenici nazočni na konačnom glasovanju	Pablo Arias Echeverría, Birgit Collin-Langen, Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón, Norica Nicolai, Ioannis A. Tsoukalas