

**Question for written answer E-003084/2023
to the Commission**

Rule 138

Kostas Papadakis (NI), Lefteris Nikolaou-Alavanos (NI)

Subject: New floods in Thessaly and Evia

Evia and Thessaly were hit by devastating floods twice in less than a month, with the second round of flooding destroying whatever had been left standing after the first round.

In Karditsa, entire villages were literally wiped out by tonnes of mud, hundreds of houses flooded, thousands of people living in cities in Thessaly and Evia were confronted with tonnes of mud, on top of which major problems were caused by road networks being cut off, by the destruction of bridges and by Volos' water distribution network. Agriculture across all areas also suffered incalculable damage.

The government, the municipalities and the regions did nothing to prevent the fatal consequences of the second wave of bad weather. Thus, by the time the heavy rain came, infrastructure had been destroyed, drains had not been cleaned and there were torrents and rivers everywhere. Basically, cities and villages were exposed just as they had been in the first wave of bad weather.

In view of this:

1. How does the Commission respond to the call for the immediate deployment of the 'Solidarity Fund' to offer full compensation to the flood victims of Evia and Thessaly – waving the condition of no compensation for private losses – as well as for the deployment of other EU funds that subsidise business groups but could instead be made available to cover the needs of the flood victims?
2. What does it have to say about the fact that, based on Directive 2007/60/EC, flood prevention works are not planned with the needs of residents in mind but based on the financial returns they can bring and how inexpensive they are, leading to loss of life, properties and crops?

Submitted: 18.10.2023