

Official Journal

of the European Union

C 307



English edition

Information and Notices

Volume 53

12 November 2010

<u>Notice No</u>	<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
IV Notices		
NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES		
European Commission		
2010/C 307/01	Euro exchange rates	1
2010/C 307/02	Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant position given at its meeting of 15 October 2009 regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/38.589 — Heat Stabilisers (1) — Rapporteur: Malta	2
2010/C 307/03	Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant position given at its meeting of 6 November 2009 regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/38.589 — Heat Stabilisers (2) — Rapporteur: Malta	3
2010/C 307/04	Final report of the Hearing Officer — Case COMP/38.589 — Heat Stabilisers	4
2010/C 307/05	Summary of Commission Decision of 11 November 2009 relating to a proceeding under Article 81 of the EC Treaty and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement (Case COMP/38.589 — Heat Stabilisers) (<i>notified under document C(2009) 8682</i>) ⁽¹⁾	9
Court of Auditors		
2010/C 307/06	Special Report No 6/2010 'Has the reform of the sugar market achieved its main objectives?'	13

EN

Price:
EUR 3⁽¹⁾ Text with EEA relevance

(Continued overleaf)

NOTICES FROM MEMBER STATES

2010/C 307/07	Information communicated by Member States regarding State aid granted under Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty to State aid to small and medium-sized enterprises active in the production of agricultural products and amending Regulation (EC) No 70/2001	14
2010/C 307/08	Information communicated by Member States regarding State aid granted under Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty to State aid to small and medium-sized enterprises active in the production of agricultural products and amending Regulation (EC) No 70/2001	17

V *Announcements*

PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION POLICY

European Commission

2010/C 307/09	Prior notification of a concentration (Case COMP/M.5986 — Schindler/Droege/ALSO/Actebis) ⁽¹⁾	20
---------------	--	----

OTHER ACTS

European Commission

2010/C 307/10	Publication of an application pursuant to Article 6(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs	21
2010/C 307/11	Publication of an application pursuant to Article 6(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs	24



⁽¹⁾ Text with EEA relevance

IV

(Notices)

NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Euro exchange rates ⁽¹⁾

11 November 2010

(2010/C 307/01)

1 euro =

Currency	Exchange rate	Currency	Exchange rate		
USD	US dollar	1,3700	AUD	Australian dollar	1,3682
JPY	Japanese yen	112,78	CAD	Canadian dollar	1,3742
DKK	Danish krone	7,4538	HKD	Hong Kong dollar	10,6198
GBP	Pound sterling	0,84910	NZD	New Zealand dollar	1,7495
SEK	Swedish krona	9,3102	SGD	Singapore dollar	1,7646
CHF	Swiss franc	1,3282	KRW	South Korean won	1 520,57
ISK	Iceland króna		ZAR	South African rand	9,4674
NOK	Norwegian krone	8,0910	CNY	Chinese yuan renminbi	9,0772
BGN	Bulgarian lev	1,9558	HRK	Croatian kuna	7,3727
CZK	Czech koruna	24,634	IDR	Indonesian rupiah	12 206,66
EEK	Estonian kroon	15,6466	MYR	Malaysian ringgit	4,2442
HUF	Hungarian forint	276,54	PHP	Philippine peso	60,089
LTL	Lithuanian litas	3,4528	RUB	Russian rouble	41,9220
LVL	Latvian lats	0,7093	THB	Thai baht	40,710
PLN	Polish zloty	3,9329	BRL	Brazilian real	2,3491
RON	Romanian leu	4,2865	MXN	Mexican peso	16,7769
TRY	Turkish lira	1,9540	INR	Indian rupee	60,9310

⁽¹⁾ Source: reference exchange rate published by the ECB.

Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant position given at its meeting of 15 October 2009 regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/38.589 — Heat Stabilisers (1)

Rapporteur: Malta

(2010/C 307/02)

1. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission assessment of the facts as an agreement and/or concerted practice within the meaning of Article 81 of the Treaty and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement.
 2. The Advisory Committee agrees that the complex of agreements and/or concerted practices constitutes two single and continuous infringements for tin stabilisers and ESBO/esters for the time frame in which they existed.
 3. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission that the agreements and/or concerted practices have as object a restriction of competition.
 4. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission assessment on the duration of the infringements for each addressee.
 5. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission draft decision as regards the conclusion that the agreements and concerted practices between the addressees were capable of having an appreciable effect upon trade between EU Member States and between contracting parties of the EEA.
 6. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission draft decision as regards the addressees of the decision, specifically with reference to imputation of liability to parent companies of the groups concerned.
 7. The Advisory Committee recommends the publication of its opinion in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.
-

Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant position given at its meeting of 6 November 2009 regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/38.589 — Heat Stabilisers (2)

Rapporteur: Malta

(2010/C 307/03)

1. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission that a fine should be imposed on the addressees of the draft decision with regard to the infringements.
 2. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission's reasoning on the basic amount of the fines.
 3. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission on the increase of the basic amount due to aggravating circumstances.
 4. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission on the application of the 2002 Leniency Notice for immunity from fines and reduction of fines in cartel cases.
 5. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission on the final amounts of the fines.
 6. The Advisory Committee recommends the publication of its opinion in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.
-

Final report of the Hearing Officer ⁽¹⁾
Case COMP/38.589 — Heat Stabilisers
(2010/C 307/04)

This competition case concerns a cartel agreement between producers of two categories of heat stabilisers used in the production of PVC products: tin stabilisers and ESBO/esters.

The draft decision gives rise to the following observations:

Statement of Objections

The Commission's investigation was initiated on the basis of an immunity application in November 2002. The Commission carried out on-site inspections. In addition to the immunity applicant, there were four leniency applicants in this case.

The Commission notified a Statement of Objections ('SO') on 18 March 2009 to 15 undertakings or groups of undertakings ('the Parties') ⁽²⁾.

In the SO, the Commission came to the preliminary conclusion that the Parties participated in a single and continuous infringement of Article 81(1) EC and Article 53(1) EEA relating to tin stabilisers for 13 years between 1987 and 2000 and ESBO/esters for 9 years between 1991 and 2000.

Time period to respond to the SO

The Parties were originally granted a deadline to reply to the SO until 14 May 2009. 13 Parties submitted reasoned requests for an extension. I prolonged the time limit for all of these. Three parties came back with justified reasons for a further extension which I granted. All Parties replied in due time except for one.

Access to file

The Parties were granted access to the file via a CD-ROM. The Parties also received access to oral and written leniency statements at the Commission's premises.

Baerlocher requested further access to the file. In my reply, I partially granted their request and allowed additional access to certain oral statements. This was to allow Baerlocher to verify potential discrepancies between various versions of documents. Another part of their request was rejected on the ground that the documents in question were subject to legal professional privilege ('LPP') claims then under adjudication by the Court of Justice. Several parties requested access to other parties' replies at various stages of the procedure. I rejected these request by referring to the Notice on Access to File and the applicable case law ⁽³⁾.

Oral Hearing

The Oral Hearing was held in June 2009. All Parties attended except for one.

⁽¹⁾ Pursuant to Articles 15 and 16 of Commission Decision 2001/462/EC, ECSC of 23 May 2001 on the terms of reference of Hearing Officers in certain competition proceedings (OJ L 162, 19.6.2001, p. 21).

⁽²⁾ (i) Akzo Nobel Chemicals GmbH, Akzo Nobel Chemicals BV, Akzo Nobel Chemicals International BV and their parent company, Akzo Nobel N.V. ('Akzo'); (ii) Ackros Chemicals Ltd ('Ackros'); (iii) Elementis plc, Elementis Holdings Ltd, Elementis UK Ltd, Elementis Services Ltd ('Elementis'); (iv) Elf Aquitaine SA ('Elf'); (v) CECA SA and its parent company Arkema France SA ('Arkema'); (vi) Baerlocher GmbH, Baerlocher Italia SpA, Baerlocher UK Ltd and their parent company MRF Michael Rosenthal GmbH ('Baerlocher'); (vii) GEA Group AG ('GEA'); (viii) Chemson GmbH and Chemson Polymer-Additive AG ('Chemson'); (ix) Aachener Chemische Werke Gesellschaft für glastechnische Produkte und Verfahren mbH ('ACW'); (x) Addichem SA ('Addichem'); (xi) Chemtura Vinyl Additives GmbH and its parent company Chemtura Corporation ('Chemtura'); (xii) Ciba Lampertheim GmbH and its parent company Ciba Holding AG ('Ciba'); (xiii) Faci SpA ('Faci'); (xiv) Reagens SpA ('Reagens'); and (xv) AC Treuhand AG ('AC Treuhand').

⁽³⁾ For example, cf. Case C-204/00 Aalborg Portland A/S [2004] ECR-I-123, paragraph 70: 'there is no general, abstract principle that a party must have in all instances the opportunity to receive copies of all the documents taken into account in the case of other persons.'

Main rights of defence issues raised by the Parties

A number of claims with regard to the rights of defence were raised by the Parties in their written and oral comments. Their claims mainly concerned the violation of the information obligation, the excessive duration of the proceeding and the failure to conduct a comprehensive investigation.

Addressees' rights to be informed of the investigation

AC Treuhand, Elementis, Chemson, GEA and Faci claimed that their rights of defence had been violated because they had not been informed of the investigation against them in good time. Following from this AC Treuhand and Elementis asked the Commission to close the proceedings against them, while Chemson and Gea demanded an investigation of ChemTrade Roth. Faci did not make any specific request.

(i) AC Treuhand

The first time that AC Treuhand was informed of its status as a potential addressee of a SO in the Heat Stabilisers case was in February 2009, i.e. a year and a half after the first request for information and six months after the judgment of the Court of First Instance ("CFI") setting the precedent for the information obligation of the Commission towards AC Treuhand in the Organic Peroxides case ⁽¹⁾. This was despite the several requests to Competition DG by AC Treuhand, both before and after the CFI's judgment, for clarification of its role in the proceedings.

Measured against the standards set by the CFI, the Commission should have informed AC Treuhand of its status at the time of the first request for information of October 2007. The fact that such duty was spelt out by the court only in July 2008 is of no relevance since the obligation objectively already existed before the judgment. Further, as the SO had been sent to AC Treuhand in the Organic Peroxides case in March 2003, Competition DG should have been aware of AC Treuhand's status in the case at hand when it issued the first request for information to the consultancy. Accordingly, an irregularity has occurred.

It can be left open whether the information obligation could have occurred at an even earlier date ⁽²⁾ as AC Treuhand did not demonstrate that the belated information was capable of actually compromising its rights of defence in the proceeding in question.

According to the court, the mere fact that a legal entity is not provided with such information in time cannot lead to the annulment of the contested decision. Rather, it is also necessary to establish whether the irregularity committed by the Commission was capable of actually compromising the undertaking's rights of defence in the procedure in question ⁽³⁾.

AC Treuhand advanced three arguments in this regard: first, it pointed to the retirement of one employee-witness on 31 August 2002. Second, it referred to the fact that this individual's recollection of the facts had faded. Third, it underlined the expiry of the 10-year duty under Swiss law to store company documents (Aufbewahrungspflicht). The first argument can be rebutted since the employee's retirement had taken place even before the Commission received Chemtura's immunity application. The retirement would thus also have taken place, even if AC Treuhand had been duly informed about the investigation by the Commission. The second and third argument appear to be rather abstract and imprecise because AC Treuhand did not specify the nature and scope of the information or details necessary for its defence which the employee could have remembered or could have been retrieved in the AC Treuhand archives. It might also be relevant in this context to bear in mind that, after having been notified of the SO in the Organic Peroxides case in 2003, AC Treuhand was, or could reasonably have been aware of being subject to Commission scrutiny. I conclude therefore that AC Treuhand's rights of defence have not been breached.

⁽¹⁾ Case T-99/04, *AC Treuhand v Commission*, paragraph 56. Cf. also Article 6(3)(a) ECHR and ECtHR, Application No 13972/88, *Imbrioscia v Switzerland*, judgment of 24 November 1993, paragraph 36.

⁽²⁾ AC Treuhand claimed that it should have been informed after the Commission concluded its evaluation of the leniency applications, i.e. approximately in mid-2003.

⁽³⁾ Case T-99/04, *AC Treuhand v Commission*, paragraph 58. See also Joined Cases C-204/00 P, C-205/00 P, C-211/00 P, C-213/00 P, C-217/00 P and C-219/00 P, *Aalborg Portland and Others v Commission* [2004] ECR I-123 and Case C-105/04 P, *Nederlandse Federatieve Vereniging voor de Groothandel op Elektrotechnisch Gebied v Commission* [2006] ECR I-8725.

(ii) Elementis

The Commission duly informed Elementis about putative charges in its first request for information sent in May 2008. It can be left open whether it should already have been informed earlier, since Elementis' arguments to support a finding that its rights of defence have been compromised do not meet the requisite standard. Elementis noted that one witness died on 24 January 2008. It further argued that it had been impossible to locate and get in touch with several witnesses referred to in the SO or otherwise considered relevant. Lastly, it maintained that it had been difficult to locate documentary records and that the memory of available witnesses had faded.

Elementis' allegation that it could not have interviewed a number of witnesses is peculiar because at least two of the witnesses it lists had given testimony to another party to this case. Furthermore, Elementis described only in general terms the issues which the witnesses were to have provided additional insight on. It remained completely open, however, how their testimony would have helped Elementis' in its defence against the alleged infringement, as required by the jurisprudence.

(iii) Faci

The Commission also correctly informed Faci about its status when sending its first request for information in October 2007. Faci claimed that, if it had been informed in 2003 or at least before 2007, it would have been in a position to assess whether or not to submit a leniency application. After the relevant staff had left the company, it was no longer able to make such an assessment.

Faci's submission substantiated neither the violation of an information obligation nor its rights of defence and thus, has to be rejected.

Obligation to investigate

Both GEA and Chemson maintained that the Commission had been — and still is — under an obligation to investigate ChemTrade Roth. Both connected in their reply to the SO the right to be informed of their status with the duty of the Commission to conduct a comprehensive investigation.

GEA and Chemson withdrew from the relevant activities during the period of the alleged infringement. GEA had sold its ESBO business in May 2000. In addition, it had disposed of the former parent companies of the business directly involved in the alleged activities (Dynamit Nobel AG and Chemetall GmbH). Chemson had sold (via a management buy-out) all relevant assets and documents in relation to its ESBO business in 2002 to ChemTrade Roth. Chemson claimed that it had no access to documentary evidence and witnesses regarding the ESBO business ever since. As regards the information obligation of the Commission, it must be noted that it had made Chemson and GEA duly aware of putative charges in the request for information sent in October 2007 and July 2008 respectively. Chemson nevertheless pointed at a particularity of this case. It argued that it cannot be excluded and that it is perhaps even likely, that if Chemson's ESBO business had been sold by way of a share deal rather than a management buy-out, then ChemTrade Roth would have been subject to investigative measures by the Commission.

According to established case law, it is for the Commission to decide whether a particular item of information is necessary to enable it to bring to light an infringement of the competition rules⁽¹⁾. In the case at hand, it does not seem to have been strictly necessary to investigate ChemTrade Roth in order to have enough incriminating evidence to prove the cartel.

With regard to exculpatory evidence, however, the situation is less clear. On the one hand, it could be argued that addressees of the SO are primarily obliged to adduce exculpatory pieces of evidence and GEA as well as Chemson have not provided any indication what useful piece of information an investigation of ChemTrade Roth could produce. Further, addressees can include clauses in their transfer agreements to secure continuing access to information and/or to shift internally liability for the payment of fines for cartel infringements. On the other hand, it is also true that the Commission is obliged to conduct an objective investigation which would normally have included ChemTrade Roth. Finally, Chemson and GEA might have been in a better situation, had the investigation not been suspended in 2003, or had the Commission informed these addressees about the investigation earlier.

⁽¹⁾ Case C-94/00, *Roquette Frères v Commission* [2002] ECR I-9011, paragraph 78.

In any event, the sending of a request for information to, or a dawn-raid of, ChemTrade Roth, i.e. after the oral hearing did not seem promising. These measures could not have realistically be expected to produce any results which would remedy the previous omission, since it is very likely that relevant documents (if any had existed) are no longer kept. Moreover, interviews of former representatives of the sold business would have only been possible with their consent.

Further, access to the documents had already been lost in 2002, i.e. before the case was opened. Any investigatory measure directed to ChemTrade Roth would therefore only be a substitute for the lost access to the former representative's memory (which could have been secured on a contractual basis).

Under these circumstances, I see no obligation of the Commission to investigate ChemTrade Roth as demanded by Chemson and GEA and certainly no violation of their rights of defence.

Duration of proceedings

A total of 9 out of 15 Parties claimed a violation of their rights of defence due to the duration of the proceedings ⁽¹⁾. Indeed, the preliminary investigation lasted for more than six years. Taken in isolation, this might appear to be too long.

The courts have held that action must be taken within a reasonable period in administrative proceedings ⁽²⁾. This principle fully applies to the investigation ⁽³⁾.

However, during that period, the case was put on hold for more than four years due to the Akzo/Ackros proceedings. During the inspection at Ackros, the company's representatives claimed that certain documents were covered by LPP. In April 2003, Akzo and Ackros initiated court proceedings to have their LPP claims confirmed. For the time period of the court proceedings, the Commission's investigation was suspended. Four years later in September 2007, the CFI dismissed the applicants' actions as being partly inadmissible, partly unfounded ⁽⁴⁾.

Competition DG had to await the judgment of the CFI in order to be able to assess the added value of the leniency applications ⁽⁵⁾. This assessment hinged on whether or not a particular piece of evidence could be used as an inspection document. The document at issue is indeed an important piece of evidence on which the SO and the decision are based.

Therefore, the duration of the proceeding was not unreasonably long. The rights of defence of the 9 Parties have not been violated.

The draft decision

In the draft decision, the Commission essentially retains its objections; however, there are some changes in comparison to the SO:

- The Commission drops the objections against Akzo Nobel Chemicals International BV and Addichem SA.
- The Commission, although recognising that Arkema withdrew from the tin stabilisers cartel in the period from 1 April 1996 until 8 September 1997, holds Arkema liable for the first period of its participation (from 16 March 1994 until 31 March 1996) on the basis that later it rejoined the same cartel (from 9 September 1997 until 21 March 2000). However, exercising its discretion, the Commission does not impose a fine on Arkema for the first period of infringement. The Commission holds that the agreements with regard to tin stabilisers and ESBO/esters constitute two separate infringements.

⁽¹⁾ AC Treuhand, ACW, Akzo subsidiaries, Arkema, Baerlocher, Chemson, Elementis, GEA, Reagens.

⁽²⁾ Joined Cases C-238/99 P, C-244/99 P, C-245/99 P, C-250/99 P to C-252/99 P and C-254/99 P, *Limburgse Vinyl Maatschappij et al. v Commission* [2000] ECR I-8375, paragraph 179; see also Case C-167/04 P, *JCB Service v Commission* [2006] ECR I-8935, paragraph 60.

⁽³⁾ Case C-113/04 P, *Technische Unie BV v Commission*, [2006] ECR I-8831, paragraph 54 et seq.

⁽⁴⁾ Case T 112/05, *Akzo Nobel and Others v Commission*, [2007] ECR II-05049.

⁽⁵⁾ Point 26 of the 2002 Leniency Notice.

- The Commission concludes that it cannot be held responsible for any procedural irregularities, in particular for not informing the potential addressees of the SO that there was an investigation and that it had been suspended. With regard to AC Treuhand, the Commission finds that under the specific circumstances of the case, AC Treuhand could have concluded that it was a possible target of the investigation. The Commission concluded that it acted diligently and reasonably throughout the procedure.
- When setting the fine for Arkema, the Commission takes three previous decisions relevant for recidivism into account (instead of two previous decisions mentioned in the SO). The Commission sent a Letter of Facts to Arkema on 20 October 2009 informing it about this omission in the SO and gave Arkema the opportunity to submit comments thereon.
- The Commission concludes that the proceedings have lasted for a considerable length of time, and this justifies a reduction of the fine. The reduction, however, does not apply to Akcros and the Akzo group of companies since their action for annulment to the CFI in connection with LPP claims was central to the delay in the present case.

In my view the draft decision deals only with objections in respect of which the Parties have been afforded the opportunity of making known their views.

Conclusion

In view of the above observations I consider that the right to be heard has been respected with regard to all Parties to the proceedings in this case.

Brussels, 5 November 2009.

Michael ALBERS

Summary of Commission Decision
of 11 November 2009
relating to a proceeding under Article 81 of the EC Treaty and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement
(Case COMP/38.589 — Heat Stabilisers)

(notified under document C(2009) 8682)

(Only the English, German and French texts are authentic)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2010/C 307/05)

On 11 November 2009, the Commission adopted a decision relating to a proceeding under Article 81 of the EC Treaty. In accordance with the provisions of Article 30 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2003, the Commission herewith publishes the names of the parties and the main content of the decision, including any penalties imposed, having regard to the legitimate interest of undertakings in the protection of their business secrets. A non-confidential version of the decision is available on the Directorate-General for Competition's website at the following address:

<http://ec.europa.eu/competition/antitrust/cases/>

1. INTRODUCTION

- (1) The Decision is addressed to 27 legal entities belonging to 11 undertakings at the time of the infringements, for infringing Article 81 of the EC Treaty and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement. The addressees participated in one or two infringements relating to tin stabilisers and ESBO/esters respectively. The infringements lasted from February 1987 until March 2000 (tin stabilisers) and from September 1991 until September 2000 (ESBO/esters) and covered the EEA territory (as constituted during the time of the infringements).

2. CASE DESCRIPTION

2.1. Procedure

- (2) The case was opened on the basis of an immunity application of Chemtura. The Commission obtained further evidence from inspections that took place in February 2003. Additionally, the Commission received four applications under the Leniency Notice (Arkema France, Baerlocher, Akzo Nobel and BASF). During the inspections at Akcros Chemicals (UK), its representatives claimed that certain documents were covered by legal professional privilege. Following an application for annulment of several Commission decisions by Akzo Nobel and Akcros Chemicals in April 2003, the issue regarding the documents was settled by the Court of First Instance (now General Court) in its judgement on 17 September 2007. The CFI dismissed Akzo Nobel's and Akcros Chemicals' actions. The Commission sent out several requests for information.
- (3) On 17 March 2009, the Statement of Objections was issued and all undertakings were given the possibility to have access to the file and defend themselves against the preliminary view of the Commission in writing and, on 17

and 18 June 2009, during an Oral Hearing. The Advisory Committee on Restrictive Practices and Dominant Positions issued a favourable opinion on 15 October 2009 and 6 November 2009 and the Commission adopted the Decision on 11 November 2009.

2.2. Summary of the infringements

- (4) The Decision concerns two separate single and continuous infringements of Article 81 of the EC Treaty and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement regarding two categories of heat stabilisers: tin stabilisers and ESBO/esters. Tin stabilisers are used to avoid decomposition caused by heat during the processing of PVC into final products. Their two main applications are in rigid and plasticised PVC products. ESBO/esters are used as plasticisers as well as heat stabilisers for plasticised PVC products.
- (5) The objective of both of the anti-competitive arrangements was to increase and maintain prices in the EEA for tin stabilisers and ESBO/esters above normal competitive levels and to sustain this objective through customer and sales volume allocation in these products. The principal decisions for both cartels were taken at meetings organised by AC Treuhand. For the majority of the duration of the cartels, AC Treuhand monitored the implementation of the agreements on sales quotas and on fixed prices.
- (6) The general lines of both cartels in the EEA were developed at the Swiss meetings which were organised monthly for tin stabilisers and quarterly for ESBO/esters. The infringements on price fixing, market sharing and

customer allocation were negotiated and translated into specific action at the country meetings held throughout Europe. Thus the participants ensured that their coordinated behaviour was implemented in all EEA countries.

- (7) Until 1996, the heat stabiliser suppliers verified if all the cartel members followed the anti-competitive agreements directly at AC Treuhand. AC Treuhand distributed also 'red' and 'pink' papers with the details on fixed prices and allocation of sales volumes during the secret meetings held at its premises. These papers were not allowed to be taken outside the meeting room.
- (8) Each addressee is held liable according to its own involvement in the cartel arrangements, that is either as a direct participant, or, as a parent company, because the behaviour of the subsidiary is imputed to the parent given that the parent exercised decisive influence over the conduct of subsidiaries during the period of the infringement.

2.3. Addressees and duration in the infringements

- (9) Tin stabilisers: Akzo Nobel N.V. (24.2.1987-21.3.2000), Akzo Nobel Chemicals GmbH (24.2.1987-28.6.1993), Akros Chemicals Ltd (28.6.1993-21.3.2000), Elementis Holdings Limited (28.9.1988-2.10.1998), Elementis plc (23.2.1998-2.10.1998), Elementis UK Limited (28.9.1988-2.7.1993), Elementis Services Limited (2.7.1993-2.10.1998), Elf Aquitaine SA (16.3.1994-31.3.1996 and 9.9.1997-21.3.2000), Arkema France (16.3.1994-31.3.1996 and 9.9.1997-21.3.2000), CECA SA (16.3.1994-31.3.1996 and 9.9.1997-21.3.2000), MRF Michael Rosenthal GmbH (12.10.1990-21.3.2000), Baerlocher GmbH (24.2.1987-21.3.2000), Baerlocher Italia SpA (22.6.1994-21.3.2000), Baerlocher UK Limited (28.3.1995-17.9.1997), Chemtura Corporation (29.5.1998-21.3.2000), Chemtura Vinyl Additives GmbH (12.12.1997-21.3.2000), BASF Specialty Chemicals Holding GmbH (24.2.1987-29.5.1998), BASF Lampertheim GmbH, (24.2.1987-29.5.1998), Reagens SpA (20.11.1992-21.3.2000), AC-Treuhand AG (1.12.1993-21.3.2000).
- (10) ESBO/esters: Akzo Nobel N.V. (11.9.1991-22.3.2000), Akzo Nobel Chemicals B.V. (11.9.1991-28.6.1993), Akros Chemicals Ltd (28.6.1993-22.3.2000), Elementis Holdings Limited (11.9.1991-2.10.1998), Elementis plc (23.2.1998-2.10.1998), Elementis UK Limited (11.9.1991-2.7.1993), Elementis Services Limited (2.7.1993-2.10.1998), Elf Aquitaine SA (11.9.1991-26.9.2000), Arkema France (11.9.1991-26.9.2000), CECA SA (11.9.1991-26.9.2000), GEA Group AG (11.9.1991-17.5.2000), Chemson Polymer-Additive AG (30.9.1995-26.9.2000), Aachener Chemische Werke Gesellschaft für glastechnische Produkte und Verfahren mbH (11.9.1991-17.5.2000), Chemson GmbH (17.5.2000-26.9.2000), Chemtura Corporation

(29.5.1998-26.9.2000), Chemtura Vinyl Additives GmbH (12.12.1997-26.9.2000), BASF Specialty Chemicals Holding GmbH (11.9.1991-29.5.1998), BASF Lampertheim GmbH (11.9.1991-29.5.1998), Faci SpA (6.11.1996-26.9.2000), AC-Treuhand AG (1.12.1993-26.9.2000).

2.4. Remedies

- (11) The Decision applies the 2006 Guidelines on fines. With the exception of Chemtura Corporation and Chemtura Vinyl Additives GmbH, the Decision imposes the fine on all companies listed above under points 9 and 10.

2.4.1. Basic amount of the fine

- (12) The basic amount is set at 20 % of the undertakings' sales in the tin stabilisers sector. Only the percentage to be applied for Chemtura and Arkema France is set 19 % because the companies did not participate to the rigorous implementation of the cartel carried out until 1996. The basic amount is set at 19 % of the undertakings' sales in ESBO/esters sector. Only the percentage to be applied for Chemtura and Faci is set 18 % because the companies did not participate to the rigorous implementation of the cartel carried out until 1996.

- (13) The basic amount is multiplied by the number of years of participation in the infringement taking fully into account the duration of the participation for each undertaking in the infringement individually.

2.4.2. Adjustments to the basic amount

2.4.2.1. Aggravating circumstances

- (14) Recidivism is an aggravating circumstance for Arkema France (three previous cartel decisions taken into account).

2.4.2.2. Specific increase for deterrence

- (15) The multiplier of 1,7 to the fine is imposed on Elf Aquitaine SA in order to deter this company from even entering into horizontal price-fixing and market-sharing agreements.

2.4.3. Application of the 2002 Leniency Notice: reduction of fines

- (16) As regards the application of the 2002 Leniency Notice, Chemtura is granted a reduction of 100 % for tin stabilisers and of 100 % for ESBO/esters, CECA/Arkema France/Elf Aquitaine is granted a reduction of 30 % for tin stabilisers and of 50 % for ESBO/esters, Baerlocher is granted a reduction of 20 % for tin stabilisers, Akzo is granted a reduction of 0 % for tin stabilisers and of 0 % for ESBO/esters and BASF is granted a reduction of 15 % for tin stabilisers and of 25 % for ESBO/esters.

2.4.4. *Inability to pay*

- (17) Three undertakings invoked their inability to pay under point 35 of the 2006 Guidelines on fines. The Commission considered those claims and carefully analysed the financial situation of those undertakings and the specific social and economic context.
- (18) As a result of the Commission's analysis, the fine of one company was reduced significantly given its difficult financial situation.

3. FINES IMPOSED BY THE DECISION

(19) For the infringement in the tin stabiliser sector the following fines are imposed:

1. Elementis plc, Elementis Holdings Limited, Elementis Services Limited, Akzo Nobel N.V. and Akcros Chemicals Ltd are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 875 200
2. Elementis Holdings Limited, Elementis Services Limited, Akzo Nobel N.V. and Akcros Chemicals Ltd are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 2 601 500
3. Elementis Holdings Limited, Elementis Services Limited and Akzo Nobel N.V. are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 4 546 300
4. Akzo Nobel N.V., Akzo Nobel Chemicals GmbH and Akcros Chemicals Ltd are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 1 580 000
5. Akzo Nobel N.V. and Akcros Chemicals Ltd are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 944 300
6. Akzo Nobel N.V. and Akzo Nobel Chemicals GmbH are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 9 820 000
7. Akzo Nobel N.V. is liable for: EUR 1 432 700
8. Elementis plc, Elementis Holdings Limited, Elementis UK Limited and Elementis Services Limited are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 1 580 000
9. Elementis Holdings Limited and Elementis UK Limited are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 7 231 000
10. MRF Michael Rosenthal GmbH, Baerlocher GmbH, Baerlocher Italia SpA and Baerlocher UK Limited are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 1 000 000
11. Elf Aquitaine SA, Arkema France and CECA SA are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 3 864 000
12. Arkema France is liable for: EUR 3 477 600
13. Elf Aquitaine SA is liable for: EUR 2 704 800
14. Chemtura Corporation and Chemtura Vinyl Additives GmbH are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 0
15. BASF Specialty Chemicals Holding GmbH and BASF Lampertheim GmbH are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 61 320 000
16. Reagens SpA is liable for: EUR 10 791 000

17. AC-Treuhand AG is liable for: EUR 174 000
- (20) For the infringement in the ESBO/esters sector the following fines are imposed:
18. Elementis plc, Elementis Holdings Limited, Elementis Services Limited, Akzo Nobel N.V. and Akcros Chemicals Ltd are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 1 115 200
19. Elementis Holdings Limited, Elementis Services Limited, Akzo Nobel N.V. and Akcros Chemicals Ltd are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 2 011 103
20. Elementis Holdings Limited, Elementis Services Limited and Akzo Nobel N.V. are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 7 116 697
21. Akzo Nobel N.V., Akzo Nobel Chemicals B.V. and Akcros Chemicals Ltd are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 2 033 000
22. Akzo Nobel N.V. and Akcros Chemicals Ltd are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 841 697
23. Akzo Nobel N.V. and Akzo Nobel Chemicals B.V. are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 3 467 000
24. Akzo Nobel N.V. is liable for: EUR 2 215 303
25. Elementis plc, Elementis Holdings Limited, Elementis UK Limited, and Elementis Services Limited are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 2 033 000
26. Elementis Holdings Limited and Elementis UK Limited are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 3 412 000
27. Elementis Holdings Limited is liable for: EUR 53 000
28. Elf Aquitaine SA, Arkema France and CECA SA, are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 7 154 000
29. Arkema France is liable for: EUR 6 438 600
30. Elf Aquitaine SA is liable for: EUR 5 007 800
- 31.(a) GEA Group AG, Aachener Chemische Werke Gesellschaft für glastechnische Produkte und Verfahren mbH and Chemson Polymer-Additive AG are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 1 086 129
- 31.(b) GEA Group AG and Chemson Polymer-Additive AG are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 827 842
32. GEA Group AG is liable for: EUR 1 432 229
33. Chemson Polymer-Additive AG and Chemson GmbH are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 137 606
34. Chemson GmbH is liable for: EUR 317 794
35. Chemtura Corporation and Chemtura Vinyl Additives GmbH are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 0
36. BASF Specialty Chemicals Holding GmbH and BASF Lampertheim GmbH are jointly and severally liable for: EUR 7 104 000
37. Faci SpA is liable for: EUR 5 940 000
38. AC-Treuhand AG is liable for: EUR 174 000
-

COURT OF AUDITORS

Special Report No 6/2010 'Has the reform of the sugar market achieved its main objectives?'

(2010/C 307/06)

The European Court of Auditors hereby informs you that Special Report No 6/2010 'Has the reform of the sugar market achieved its main objectives?' has just been published.

The report can be accessed for consultation or downloading on the European Court of Auditors' website:
<http://www.eca.europa.eu>

A hard copy version of the report may be obtained free of charge on request to the Court of Auditors:

European Court of Auditors
Communication and Reports Unit
12, rue Alcide De Gasperi
1615 Luxembourg
LUXEMBOURG

Tel. +352 4398-1

E-mail: euraud@eca.europa.eu

or by filling in an electronic order form on EU-Bookshop.

NOTICES FROM MEMBER STATES

Information communicated by Member States regarding State aid granted under Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty to State aid to small and medium-sized enterprises active in the production of agricultural products and amending Regulation (EC) No 70/2001

(2010/C 307/07)

Aid No: XA 166/10

should improve the overall income of the holding, reduce production costs and help improve working, environmental and hygiene conditions through more efficient equipment.

Member State: France**Region:** Département des Hautes-Pyrénées

All new equipment intended for cultivation and animal husbandry is eligible for aid. Such equipment includes: equipment for harvesting, hay conditioning, soil preparation, traction, cereal harvesting, maintenance of farm access and roads, restraining animals, etc.

Title of aid scheme or name of company receiving an individual aid: Aides du département des Hautes-Pyrénées aux investissements en matériels des coopératives d'utilisation de matériel en commun (CUMA).

These measures are subject to Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 of 15 December 2006, and the cooperative will ensure that the relevant requirements of the Community instrument are complied with.

Legal basis:

— Articles L 1511-1 et suivants du code général des collectivités territoriales

— Délibération du Conseil général des Hautes-Pyrénées

Aid will therefore be paid exclusively to:

Annual expenditure planned under the scheme or overall amount of individual aid granted to the company:
EUR 130 000

— farms whose size does not exceed that of an SME as defined in Community law (cf. Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 800/2008 of 6 August 2008 OJ L 214, 9.8.2008),

Maximum aid intensity: Twenty per cent of the investments will be used to purchase heavy traction equipment, soil preparation equipment or equipment enabling environmentally sound practices and 10 % to purchase other tools.

— farms that are enterprises active in the primary production of agricultural products,

— farms that are not enterprises in difficulty within the meaning of the Community guidelines on State aid for the rescue and restructuring of companies in difficulty (OJ C 244, 1.10.2004).

Date of implementation: From the date of publication of the registration number of the exemption request on the website of the Commission's Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development.

The maximum amount of aid must not exceed the ceiling referred to in Article 4, point 9, of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006.

Duration of scheme or individual aid award: Up to 31 December 2013

Sector(s) concerned:

Agriculture, all sectors

Objective of aid:

The objective of this aid is to promote the joint procurement of equipment for agricultural holdings. The holdings in the Hautes-Pyrénées are small in size (averaging 23 hectares) and are unable to obtain all the necessary equipment on their own. This aid

The aid is open to all CUMAs, irrespective of their sector of activity, provided that they comply with the definition of SMEs within the meaning of the Community legislation.

Name and address of the granting authority:

Conseil général des Hautes-Pyrénées
6 rue Gaston Manent
65000 Tarbes
FRANCE

Website:

<http://www.cg65.fr/front.aspx?publiId=321>

Other information: —

Aid No: XA 167/10

Member State: France

Region: Département des Hautes-Pyrénées

Title of aid scheme or name of company receiving an individual aid: Aides à l'assistance technique et aides destinées à encourager la production de produits agricoles de qualité du département des Hautes-Pyrénées.

Legal basis:

Articles L 1511-1 et suivants du code général des collectivités territoriales;

Délibération du Conseil général des Hautes-Pyrénées;

Annual expenditure planned under the scheme or overall amount of individual aid granted to the company:
EUR 300 000

Maximum aid intensity: 80 %

Date of implementation: From the date of publication of the registration number of the exemption request on the website of the Commission's Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development

Duration of scheme or individual aid award: Until 31 December 2013

Objective of aid:

The objective of this aid is to encourage technical support operations, including sales promotional activities that might be useful for the agricultural sector of the department, regardless of the type of production. However, priority will be given to actions aimed at quality products and actions carried out in the chain of distribution. The aid will be granted to agricultural development bodies responsible for these activities (chambers of agriculture, interbranch associations, etc.).

Some of the activities will target the financing of market surveys, the preparation of documents related to applications for recognition and the organisation of promotional activities (fairs, exhibitions) in order to encourage high-quality agriculture by supporting products that bear an official quality mark or are in the process of being recognised.

Other activities will be to promote the distribution of knowledge and the sharing of experiences and data among farmers and to provide advice on new or highly specialised products (e.g. products bearing an official quality mark, organically produced products).

In the department of Hautes-Pyrénées, the main products bearing an official quality mark are: Haricot Tarbais (PGI and red label), mouton Barèges-Gavarnie (registered designation of origin and PDO), Agneau des Pyrénées (red label), Bœuf Blond d'Aquitaine (red label), Jambon de Bayonne (PGI), Produit Jambon Noir de Bigorre (COC), Vin de Madiran and Pacherenc du Vic-Bilh (registered designation of origin), Canard à foie gras du Sud Ouest (PGI). The necessary procedures have been launched to obtain an official quality mark for certain other products, such as Oignon Doux de Trébons and Poule Gascogne.

The levels of aid granted by the departmental council (Conseil général) will vary from 10 to 80 %.

The purpose of the aid from the departmental council is to support the activities during a limited period of time.

Aid will be paid exclusively to:

- farms whose size does not exceed that of an SME as defined in Community law (cf. Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 800/2008 of 6 August 2008 OJ L 214, 9.8.2008),
- farms that are enterprises active in the primary production of agricultural products,
- farms that are not enterprises in difficulty within the meaning of the Community guidelines on State aid for the rescue and restructuring of companies in difficulty (OJ C 244, 1.10.2004).

Pursuant to Article 14, point 6, and Article 15, point 4, of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 of 15 December 2006, the departmental council ensures that the aid is accessible to every eligible farmer from the department of Hautes-Pyrénées without any obligation to join a group or other organisation and that any contribution is limited to the costs of providing the service.

Sector(s) concerned: agricultural holdings (SMEs)

Name and address of the granting authority:

Conseil général des Hautes-Pyrénées
6 rue Gaston Manent
65000 Tarbes
FRANCE

Website:

<http://www.cg65.fr/front.aspx?publiId=321>

Other information: —

Aid No: XA 171/10

Member State: France

Region: Départements d'Outre-mer (DOM)

Title of aid scheme or name of company receiving an individual aid: Aides aux groupements de producteurs dans les départements d'Outre-mer (DOM)

Legal basis:

- Articles L621-1 à L621-11, articles R621-1 à R621-43 et articles R684-1 à R684-12 du code rural
- Article 9 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006
- Projet de décision du directeur de l'ODEADOM

Annual expenditure planned under the scheme or overall amount of individual aid granted to the company: EUR 2 300 000 (between several groups of beneficiaries)

Maximum aid intensity: Up to 95 % (but not more than EUR 400 000 per beneficiary for the entire period). Furthermore, aid will be degressive each year, decreasing by 5 percentage points per year.

Date of implementation: On receipt of an acknowledgement of receipt from the Commission.

Duration of scheme or individual aid award: Until 31 December 2013

Objective of aid:

This aid is intended for producer groups in the French overseas departments and is financed from the budget of the Office de développement de l'économie agricole d'Outre-mer (ODEADOM) (the overseas departments agricultural economy development office). The aid cannot be combined with any similar aid financed by the POSEI France programme.

The purpose of the aid will be to facilitate the establishment of producer groups and to launch their activities. Eventually, the establishment and successful launch of these groups should facilitate producers' technological and economic modernisation, help them adapt to market demands, strengthen producers' negotiating power when dealing with organised distribution centres and make farmers more professional.

This aid concerns the actions listed in Article 9 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006, in particular rental of suitable premises, purchase of office equipment, including computer hardware and software, administrative costs (including staff), overheads and other expenses. If premises are purchased, the eligible expenses for premises must be limited to rental costs at market rates.

Sector(s) concerned:

Fruit and vegetables (subsistence and market-garden crops, roots and tubers, fresh fruit, citrus fruit, dry fruit), semi-permanent fruit crops, viticulture, horticulture, herbs, medicinal plants, plants used for perfume extraction, stimulant plants and rice.

Ruminants and intensive production sector.

Name and address of the granting authority:

ODEADOM
12 rue Henri Rol-Tanguy
TSA 60006
93555 Montreuil Cedex
FRANCE

Website:

<http://www.odeadom.fr/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/100817-groupements-de-producteurs.pdf>

Other information: The proposed scheme will enable the continuation of scheme XA 110/08 with an annual budget that is better adapted to the needs of producer groups in overseas departments.

Information communicated by Member States regarding State aid granted under Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty to State aid to small and medium-sized enterprises active in the production of agricultural products and amending Regulation (EC) No 70/2001

(2010/C 307/08)

Aid No: XA 212/09

Member State: The Netherlands

Region: Provincie Fryslân (Friesland)

Title of aid scheme or name of company receiving an individual aid: Subsidie agrarische bedrijfsverplaatsing en daaraan gerelateerde investeringskosten

Legal basis:

Kadersubsidieverordening pMJP Fryslân 2009

Subsidieverordening pMJP Fryslân 2009, Hoofdstuk 1.1.3.

Subsidie agrarische bedrijfsverplaatsing en daaraan gerelateerde investeringskosten te vinden op:

<http://www.fryslan.nl/regelgevingeuropa>

gebruikersnaam: europa

wachtwoord: regelgeving

Annual expenditure planned under the scheme or overall amount of individual aid granted to the company:

Planned annual expenditure:

Estimated annual expenditure: EUR 1 600 000

Estimated expenditure 2009-2013: EUR 8 million

Maximum aid intensity:

In accordance with Articles 4 and 6 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006, aid is to be granted as follows:

1. 100 % of the actual costs incurred where relocation consists of the dismantling, removal and re-erection of existing facilities and the cost of advice, planning and searches for the purposes of relocation. The cost of advice, planning and searches includes: notary fees, land registry fees and consultancy fees in connection with relocation, such as estate agents', accountants' and architects' fees, etc.;
2. 40 % of the increase in the value of the facilities concerned after relocation, where relocation results in the farmer benefiting from more modern facilities, on condition that the farmer contributes at least 60 % of the related expenditure;
3. 40 % of the expenditure incurred to increase production capacity, where relocation leads to such an increase, on condition that the farmer contributes at least 60 % of the related expenditure;

4. 40 % of the investment connected with the relocation, subject to an application being submitted within two years following the execution of the relevant instrument.

The combined aid for parts 1-4 does not exceed EUR 400 000 over three fiscal years.

Date of implementation: Implementation will begin following publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*, as specified in Article 18(1) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006.

Duration of scheme or individual aid award: Until 31 December 2013

Objective of aid:

Main objective: Support for small and medium-sized undertakings that produce agricultural products.

Secondary objective: Relocation of farms in the public interest, namely improvement of spatial or agricultural structures, improvement of the countryside, the landscape, water or the environment, and associated investment.

This relates to Articles 4 and 6 of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006.

Sector(s) concerned: All small and medium-sized primary agricultural holdings that produce products listed in Annex I to the EC Treaty.

Name and address of the granting authority:

Provincie Fryslân (Friesland)
Sneekertrekweg 1
Leeuwarden
Postbus 20120
8900 HM Leeuwarden
NEDERLAND

Website:

<http://www.fryslan.nl/regelgevingeuropa>

gebruikersnaam: europa

wachtwoord: regelgeving

Other information: —

Aid No: XA 152/10

Member State: Spain

Region: Cataluña

Title of aid scheme or name of company receiving an individual aid: Ayudas para proyectos de inversión en materia de ahorro y eficiencia energética y auditorías en explotaciones agrarias, en el marco del Plan de Acción de la Estrategia de Ahorro y Eficiencia Energética.

Legal basis: Orden ECF/XXX/2010, de xx de xxx, por la que se aprueban las bases reguladoras para la concesión de las subvenciones de ahorro y eficiencia energética en régimen de concurrencia competitiva y en régimen reglado en el marco del Plan de Acción de la Estrategia de Ahorro y Eficiencia Energética, y se abre la convocatoria para el año 2010.

Annual expenditure planned under the scheme or overall amount of individual aid granted to the company: The annual expenditure planned under the scheme is EUR 1,4 million.

Maximum aid intensity:

The aid amounts and ceilings are different for each type of aid specified in the Order (see Article 3(3)) but in no event do they exceed the aid intensities and maximum amounts of aid specified below:

1. investment in technologies to improve energy efficiency on agricultural holdings: 40 % of the eligible costs as a general rule, subject to the possible application of other intensities specified in Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 where the necessary conditions apply;
2. cogeneration in the non-industrial sector: 40 % of the eligible costs as a general rule, subject to the possible application of other intensities specified in Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 where the necessary conditions apply;
3. micro-cogeneration systems up to 150 kW_e: 40 % of the eligible costs as a general rule, subject to the possible application of other intensities specified in Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 where the necessary conditions apply;
4. improvement of the energy efficiency of existing potable water processing, water supply, waste water treatment and desalination plants: 40 % of the eligible costs as a general rule, subject to the possible application of other intensities specified in Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 where the necessary conditions apply;
5. modernisation of passenger cars: 40 % of the eligible costs as a general rule, subject to the possible application of other intensities specified in Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 where the necessary conditions apply;

6. modernisation of the commercial vehicle and mobile equipment fleet: 40 % of the eligible costs as a general rule, subject to the possible application of other intensities specified in Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 where the necessary conditions apply.

The maximum amount of aid granted to a given undertaking will not exceed EUR 400 000 over a period of three fiscal years. This sum may be increased to EUR 500 000 if the undertaking is located in a less-favoured area or in an area referred to in Article 36(a)(i), (ii) or (iii) of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005;

7. energy audits on agricultural holdings: 75 % of the eligible costs.

Aid in kind equating to 75 % of the fees for performing an energy audit will be granted and paid direct to the auditor or firm which carries out the audit. The maximum amount of aid will depend on the consumption of the plant or section to be audited, subject to a ceiling of EUR 8 000 per audit, except in the case of irrigator communities covering an area of more than 700 ha, where the ceiling will be EUR 10 000.

Date of implementation: From the date on which the registration number of the request for exemption provided for in Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 is published on the website of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development.

Duration of scheme or individual aid award:

Until 30 June 2011, from which date no further aid will be granted under the current aid scheme.

It is anticipated that actual payments of aid will take place between 1 January 2012 and 30 December 2013.

Objective of aid:

Preservation and improvement of the natural environment by encouraging energy savings and efficiency on agricultural holdings.

Article 4 — Investment in agricultural holdings. The eligible costs are:

- (a) the construction, acquisition or improvement of immovable property;
- (b) the purchase or lease-purchase of machinery and equipment, including computer software up to the market value of the asset;
- (c) general costs linked to expenditure under points (a) and (b), such as architects', engineers' and consultants' fees, feasibility studies, the acquisition of patents and licences.

Costs connected with a leasing contract other than those listed in points (a) and (b), such as tax, lessor's margin, interest refinancing costs, overheads, insurance, etc. will not be eligible.

Article 15 — Provision of technical support in the agricultural sector. The eligible costs are costs concerning consultancy services provided by third parties.

Aid will be granted in respect of the auditor's fees or the costs of the service provided by a firm where they are related to the performance of an energy audit. The aid will be granted in kind and will not involve direct payments of money to producers.

Sector(s) concerned: Any subsector of the plant and animal production sectors

Name and address of the granting authority:

Institut Català d'Energia
Calle Pamplona, 113, tercera planta
08018 Barcelona
ESPAÑA

Website:

http://www.gencat.cat/icaen/ajuts/Ordre_EE_enviadaDOGCastella.pdf

Other information: —

Aid No: XA 153/10

Member State: Romania

Region: România

Title of aid scheme or name of company receiving an individual aid: Schemă de ajutor de stat

Legal basis:

Ordonanța nr. 14 din 29 ianuarie 2010 privind măsuri financiare pentru reglementarea ajutoarelor de stat acordate producătorilor agricoli, începând cu anul 2010;

Legea nr. 74 din 26 aprilie 2010 pentru aprobarea Ordonanței Guvernului nr. 14/2010 privind măsuri financiare pentru reglementarea ajutoarelor de stat acordate producătorilor agricoli, începând cu anul 2010;

Hotărârea nr. 756/2010 pentru aprobarea normelor metodologice referitoare la modul de acordare a ajutorului de stat în agricultură pentru plata primelor de asigurare.

Annual expenditure planned under the scheme or overall amount of individual aid granted to the company: (Amounts are to be given in euro or, if applicable, national currency): RON 600 000 000

Maximum aid intensity:

- (a) 70 % of the cost of insurance policies covering losses from adverse weather conditions that are comparable to a natural disaster: frost, hail, ice, rain or drought;
- (b) 50 % of the cost of insurance policies covering the losses listed in point (a) and other losses from adverse weather conditions and/or from animal or plant diseases or pest infestations.

Date of implementation: From the date of publication of the registration number of the exemption request on the website of the Commission's Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development.

Duration of scheme or individual aid award: Four years, i.e. until 31 December 2013

Objective of aid: Insurance premiums pursuant to Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006

Sector(s) concerned: Agriculture

Name and address of the granting authority:

Ministerul Agriculturii și Dezvoltării Rurale
Bd. Carol I nr. 24, sector 3
București
ROMÂNIA

Website:

http://www.madr.ro/pages/arhiva_legislativa.php?offset=0&limit=20

Other information: Payments covering insurance premiums for 2013 may also be made in 2014.

V

*(Announcements)*PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION
POLICY

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Prior notification of a concentration**(Case COMP/M.5986 — Schindler/Droege/ALSO/Actebis)****(Text with EEA relevance)**

(2010/C 307/09)

1. On 5 November 2010 the Commission received notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ⁽¹⁾ by which the undertaking ALSO Holding AG ('ALSO', Switzerland), controlled by Schindler Holding AG ('Schindler', Switzerland), acquires within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Merger Regulation control over the whole of the undertaking Actebis GmbH ('Actebis', Germany), controlled by Droege International Group AG ('Droege', Germany) by way of purchase of shares. At the same time Droege and Schindler acquire within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Merger Regulation joint control of the undertaking ALSO by way of purchase of shares.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

- ALSO: wholesale and logistics services for information technology products and consumer electronics in Europe,
- Schindler: lifts and escalators, as well as IT wholesale,
- Actebis: wholesale of products, solutions and services for information technology, telecommunications and consumer electronics in Europe,
- Droege: consulting and investment. Droege provides management consultancy services and has majority holdings in undertakings in the pharmaceuticals, safety systems and ICT distribution sectors.

3. On preliminary examination, the Commission finds that the notified transaction could fall within the scope the EC Merger Regulation. However, the final decision on this point is reserved.

4. The Commission invites interested third parties to submit their possible observations on the proposed operation to the Commission.

Observations must reach the Commission not later than 10 days following the date of this publication. Observations can be sent to the Commission by fax (+32 22964301), by e-mail to COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu or by post, under reference number COMP/M.5986 — Schindler/Droege/ALSO/Actebis, to the following address:

European Commission
Directorate-General for Competition
Merger Registry
J-70
1049 Bruxelles/Brussel
BELGIQUE/BELGIË

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1 (the 'EC Merger Regulation').

OTHER ACTS

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Publication of an application pursuant to Article 6(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs

(2010/C 307/10)

This publication confers the right to object to the application pursuant to Article 7 of Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 ⁽¹⁾. Statements of objection must reach the Commission within six months of the date of this publication.

SINGLE DOCUMENT

COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 510/2006**'PROSCIUTTO AMATRICIANO'****EC No: IT-PGI-0005-0780-29.06.2009****PGI (X) PDO ()****1. Name:**

'Prosciutto Amatriciano'

2. Member State or third country:

Italy

3. Description of the agricultural product or foodstuff:**3.1. Type of product:**

Class 1.2 — Meat products

3.2. Description of product to which the name in (1) applies:

On release for consumption, 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI has the following physico-chemical, organoleptic and quality characteristics: a maximum moisture content of 60 %; a minimum protein content of 25 % of the dry matter; it is pear-shaped, with the exception of the trotter; a large part of the front face extending vertically for more than half the height of the leg is uncovered, in accordance with a traditional long trimming method; a minimum weight of 8 kg at the end of the minimum maturing period; a minimum maturing period of 12 months from the date of salting.

3.3. Raw materials (for processed products only):

The raw material used for producing 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI is exclusively the fresh leg of the Italian Large White and Landrace traditional breeds of pig, as improved by the Italian herd

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 93, 31.3.2006, p. 12.

book, offspring of boars of these breeds, pigs bred from Italian Duroc boars, as improved by the Italian herd book, and pigs bred from boars of other breeds, or mixed-breed boars, provided that they are bred under selection or cross-breeding schemes whose aims are in keeping with those of the Italian herd book for the production of heavy pigs. The pigs are sent for slaughter when they are between 9 and 15 months old and must be in excellent health, as attested by the competent animal health authority. The fresh legs must be from half-carcases falling within classes E, U, R, O and P on the SEUROP commercial classification grid. In addition, the fresh leg has a white rind and must contain a part of the hip bone (the 'anchetta'), the femur, the tibia, the patella and the first row of tarsal bones and must weigh between 12,50 kg and 16,00 kg. The fat on the outside of the fresh, trimmed leg must be between 15 mm and 30 mm thick, including the rind, depending on the size of the leg.

3.4. *Feed (for products of animal origin only):*

The feed authorised, the quantities given and the way it is used are designed to produce a traditional heavy pig by moderate daily increases in the ration.

3.5. *Specific steps in production that must take place in the identified geographical area:*

Specific steps in the production of 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI that must take place in the identified geographical area are receipt of the raw material and trimming; selection and cooling; salting; desalting; dressing and resting; washing; drying; pre-maturing and covering with pork fat; maturing and marking.

3.6. *Specific rules concerning slicing, grating, packaging, etc.:*

—

3.7. *Specific rules concerning labelling:*

The collar, the labels or the bags used for 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI must bear the Community graphic symbol for PGI products, the name followed by the letters 'IGP' (PGI) and the product logo in clear and legible print. The name 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' may not be translated.

4. Concise definition of the geographical area:

The production area for 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI comprises the following municipalities in the Province of Rieti lying at a maximum of 1 200 m above sea-level: Amatrice, Accumoli, Antrodoco, Borgo Velino, Cantalice, Castel Sant'Angelo, Cittaducale, Cittareale, Configni, Contigliano, Colli sul Velino, Cottanello, Greccio, Labro, Leonessa, Micigliano, Morro Reatino, Petrella Salto, Poggio Bustone, Posta, Rieti and Rivodutri.

5. Link with the geographical area:

5.1. *Specificity of the geographical area:*

The production area for 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI has a number of particular geological and morphological characteristics. The area is mainly mountainous with very few plains and its soil and climate are well suited to the successful production of this foodstuff. In addition to the production method and the type and length of maturing, the altitudes of up to 1 200 m above sea-level, the climate, harsh in the high-mountain zones, slightly less so at lower altitudes and in the valleys of the mountain zone, the fresh, clean air found in the whole of the production area and, in particular, a relative humidity that is generally less than 70 % have a positive influence at all stages of the production process and especially during the long and careful maturing, conferring on the finished product its distinctive pleasant, sweet but intense aroma.

5.2. *Specificity of the product:*

'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI has a firm, elastic consistency and the sliced ham maintains its integrity. It is red/pink in colour, interspersed with the pure white of the marbling fat, and has a pleasant, sweet but intense fragrance, even in needle tests. It is savoury but not salty and has a pleasant, sweet but intense fragrance. 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI differs in appearance from other food preparations of the same type in that the front face has a particularly long cut, reaching vertically for more than half the height of the leg. This gives a ham with a lower moisture content (a maximum of 60 %) and a higher protein content (a minimum of 25 % of the dry matter).

5.3. *Causal link between the geographical area and the quality or characteristics of the product (for PDO) or a specific quality, the reputation or other characteristic of the product (for PGI):*

'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI has a specific quality that derives from the traditional long trimming method used on the fresh legs throughout the production area when the raw material is received. This method, the fruit of the centuries of experience of the area's producers, involves removing fat and rind by making a clean, semi-circular cut reaching to more than half the height of the leg. This gives the ham its traditional rounded, pear shape, leaving a large part of the front face extending vertically for more than half the height of the leg uncovered.

As well as altering the external appearance of the ham, this operation increases the exposed area not protected by rind and fat, allowing uniform absorption of salt during the salting stage and better air-drying during the maturing stage. This gives a finished product that differs from other products with a smaller exposed area in its lower moisture content and its higher protein content, both indicators of the quality of this ham. These characteristics are accompanied by the product's good olfactory characteristics and consistency, i.e. the ham is noticeably firm to the touch and has an intense, mature aroma.

The esteem in which this product is held is confirmed by the reputation that 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' PGI has built for itself since the beginning of the 20th century, when the product began to be identified with Amatrice. Amatrice can be considered as being the centre of this territory running along the high valleys of the Velino and the Tronto in which hams have been produced for years. Evidence for this is a text on 'Amatrician society' of 1932, in which Cesare De Berardinis describes the preparation of delicious hams by the indefatigable women of Amatrice.

Reference to publication of the specification:

(Article 5(7) of Regulation (EC) No 510/2006)

The Ministry has initiated the procedure provided for in Article 5(5) of Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 with the publication of the proposal for recognising 'Prosciutto Amatriciano' as a Protected Geographical Indication in *Official Gazette of the Italian Republic* No 56 of 9 March 2009.

The full text of the product specification is available:

— on the following website: http://www.politicheagricole.it/DocumentiPubblicazioni/Search_Documenti_Elenco.htm?txtTipoDocumento=Disciplinare%20in%20esame%20UE&txtDocArgomento=Prodotti%20di%20Qualit%C3%A0%20Dop,%20Igp%20e%20Stg

or

— by going directly to the home page of the Ministry (<http://www.politicheagricole.it>) and clicking on 'Prodotti di Qualità' (on the left of the screen) and then on 'Disciplinari di Produzione all'esame dell'UE [regolamento (CE) n. 510/2006]'.

Publication of an application pursuant to Article 6(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs

(2010/C 307/11)

This publication confers the right to object to the application pursuant to Article 7 of Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 ⁽¹⁾. Statements of objection must reach the Commission within six months of the date of this publication.

SINGLE DOCUMENT

COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 510/2006
‘ΑΡΝΑΚΙ ΕΛΑΣΣΟΝΑΣ’ (ARNAKI ELASSONAS)
EC No: EL-PDO-0005-0735-14.01.2009
PGI () PDO (X)

1. Name:

‘Αρνάκι Ελασσόνας’ (Arnaki Elassonas)

2. Member State or third country:

Greece

3. Description of the agricultural product or foodstuff:

3.1. Type of product:

Class 1.1 — Meat (and offal)

3.2. Description of the product to which the name in (1) applies:

Fresh meat from sucking lambs of 30-45 days old, weighing 6,5-10,5 kg and born of ewes bearing the phenotypic characters of indigenous Greek breeds living throughout mainland Greece (small in size, short but strong legs, strong temperament, resistant to extreme weather conditions, resistant to disease and able to walk far). These sheep populations either belong to indigenous mainland Greek breeds (e.g. Karangouniki, Vlahiki, Sarakatsaniki, Boutsiko) or are the result of cross-breeding between such breeds or with the Greek breeds Hiotiko, Seron, Mitilinis or Frizartas. The sheep live under extensive or semi-extensive conditions in the Province of Elassona, as the region is defined and delineated below, and graze on mountain pastures at high altitudes (above 250 m).

The meat is sold only fresh, (a) as whole carcasses, (b) as half-carcasses or (c) in pieces.

Organoleptic characteristics of ‘Arnaki Elassonas’ meat

‘Arnaki Elassonas’ meat has a characteristic aroma and a pleasant smell and taste; it is tender, juicy, has a pH of 7,1-7,3, a very thin layer of fat, high levels of linolenic acid and a colouring varying from white to faint pink, in accordance with Community regulations. It falls under the category of light lambs pursuant to Community legislation.

Chemical characteristics of ‘Arnaki Elassonas’ meat

Chemical characteristics of ‘Arnaki Elassonas’ meat (average values):

Sucking lamb PDO	Moisture % (av. value)	Protein % (av. value)	Fat % (av. value)	Ash % (av. value)
	76,7	20,13	1,36	1,2

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 93, 31.3.2006, p. 12.

Meat colour

L = 38,32 + 0,32

a = 13,40 + 0,319

b = 10,39 + 0,28

Luminary

Red

Yellow

3.3. *Raw materials (for processed products only):*

—

3.4. *Feed (for products of animal origin only):*

Up to the point of slaughter the lambs are fed exclusively on their mother's milk. The ewes graze freely on mountain pastures (above 250 m) and on artificial grassland. Complimentary feedingstuffs (mostly cereals, legumes, vegetables, straw, clover and oilseed products) produced mainly in the defined geographical area, as well as vitamins and minerals, are given for 3-5 months. The artificial grasslands are fertilised using natural manure from animals of the geographical area as the use of insecticides, pesticides and artificial fertilisers is not permitted.

3.5. *Specific steps in production that must take place in the identified geographical area:*

Slaughtered lambs may only bear the name 'Arnaki Elassonas' if:

- (a) both their parents had been living within the defined area for at least eight months before mating;
- (b) the Elassona lambs must also have been born and reared up to the point of slaughter within the defined area.

3.6. *Specific rules concerning slicing, grating, packaging, etc.:*

—

3.7. *Specific rules concerning labelling:*

As well as national and Community legislation, the following label must be affixed on the whole carcasses, the half-carcasses or the pieces:



4. **Concise definition of the geographical area:**

The geographical area where 'ARNAKI ELASSONAS' is produced comprises

- (a) the Province of Elassona in the Prefecture of Larissa;
- (b) the district of Damasios in the Municipality of Tirnavos of the same prefecture.

5. Link with the geographical area:

5.1. Specificity of the geographical area:

The defined geographical area is mountainous and semi-mountainous with altitudes ranging from 250 m to 2 550 m. 60 % of the area is covered by pastures with a large variety of grasses, herbs and aromatic plants. The land suitable for grazing in the Province of Ellassona includes natural pastures, agricultural land used to grow animal feed, fallow land and seasonal pastures. The natural pastures are covered with grass pasture, scrub pasture and partly wooded pasture. The most characteristic feature of the region is the high degree of flora biodiversity, with many types of aromatic plant.

The herbaceous vegetation is made up mainly of grasses and, to a lesser degree, legumes and composites. The most commonly encountered sub-families are *Festuceae*, *Hordeae*, *Pemineae*, *Aerostideae*, *Phalatiidae* and *Aneneae*. The most common herbaceous plants include *Festuca rubra*, *Dactylis glomerata*, *Bromus* sp., *Trifolium* sp., *Stipa* sp. and *Lolium* sp. The scrub pasture contributes significantly to meeting the needs of the animals by providing both young shoots and the herbaceous vegetation which grows in the shade of the plant crown; pasture capacity is 1,39 livestock units.

Local sheep populations are small, abstemious and adapted to the mountainous and semi-mountainous terrain of the defined geographical area. Extensive sheep-rearing is an integral part of the culture and conservation of the natural environment and an essential part of daily life in the Province of Ellassona.

5.2. Specificity of the product:

The carcass of slaughtered 'Arnaki Ellassonas' lamb displays uniform muscle coverage. It is covered by a thin, uniformly distributed layer of fat. The carcass is light (6,5-10,5 kg), with a very low fat content (1,5 %) in comparison with lambs from other regions (reaching 3 %). Its white to faint pink colour is conditioned by the pH levels, the age of the animal, how it has been fed and its breed. Ellassona lambs give tender, juicy meat with a characteristic aroma and a pleasant smell and taste, even when they are older.

5.3. Causal link between the geographical area and the quality or characteristics of the product (for PDO) or a specific quality, the reputation or other characteristic of the product (for PGI):

The quality features of Ellassona lamb meat are due to the particular soil and weather conditions of the area (mountainous and semi-mountainous land), which contains a wealth of vegetation, a large variety of plants (1 700 species are to be found on Mount Olympus alone) and many aromatic plants. The animals grazing on these pastures often cover long distances and this gives them a different physical form to animals living at lower altitudes and, particularly, confined animals. The antioxidant agents in many aromatic plants give the ewe's milk and, particularly, the lamb's meat a particular and characteristic aroma and taste which make them highly popular among consumers.

There is a positive link between the intensity of the aroma and the linolenic acid (C18:3) found in large quantities in free-pasture animals and between these sought-after qualities in sucking-lamb meat and the soil, vegetation and microclimate of the Ellassona area. Fatty acid tests were conducted on Ellassona lambs and higher levels of linolenic acid (C18:3) were found than those found in lambs from lowland areas. The aroma is also affected by how the animal is fed and reared, its breed, age and reproductive situation.

The organoleptic characteristics of 'Arnaki Ellassonas' meat derive from:

- (a) the small local breeds of sheep, which thanks to regular grazing on natural mountain pastures are abstemious, strong and fully adapted to the particular geographical environment;
- (b) the fact that the lambs' mothers regularly graze on pastures;

- (c) the wide variety of vegetation, grasses, herbs and aromatic plants found on the pastures;
- (d) the range of altitudes (250-2 550 m);
- (e) the soil and microclimate of the region;
- (f) the fact that the lambs are exclusively fed on their mother's milk;
- (g) the high levels of linolenic fatty acid (C18:3);
- (h) the short period of time in which complimentary feedingstuffs, mostly produced in the Province of Ellassona, are given to the mothers (ewes).

Sheep-rearing and the production of 'Arnaki Ellassonas' meat are historical activities and attested over the centuries; it is marketed in Larissa, Katerini, Athens, Thessaloniki and abroad (Italy, Spain and Cyprus).

Reference to publication of the specification:

(Article 5(7) of Regulation (EC) No 510/2006)

<http://www.minagric.gr/greek/data/APNAKI%20ΤΕΛΙΚΕΣ%20ΠΡΟΔΙΑΓΡΑΦΕΣ-%20τελικό.doc>

2010 SUBSCRIPTION PRICES (excluding VAT, including normal transport charges)

EU Official Journal, L + C series, paper edition only	22 official EU languages	EUR 1 100 per year
EU Official Journal, L + C series, paper + annual CD-ROM	22 official EU languages	EUR 1 200 per year
EU Official Journal, L series, paper edition only	22 official EU languages	EUR 770 per year
EU Official Journal, L + C series, monthly CD-ROM (cumulative)	22 official EU languages	EUR 400 per year
Supplement to the Official Journal (S series), tendering procedures for public contracts, CD-ROM, two editions per week	multilingual: 23 official EU languages	EUR 300 per year
EU Official Journal, C series — recruitment competitions	Language(s) according to competition(s)	EUR 50 per year

Subscriptions to the *Official Journal of the European Union*, which is published in the official languages of the European Union, are available for 22 language versions. The Official Journal comprises two series, L (Legislation) and C (Information and Notices).

A separate subscription must be taken out for each language version.

In accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 920/2005, published in Official Journal L 156 of 18 June 2005, the institutions of the European Union are temporarily not bound by the obligation to draft all acts in Irish and publish them in that language. Irish editions of the Official Journal are therefore sold separately.

Subscriptions to the Supplement to the Official Journal (S Series — tendering procedures for public contracts) cover all 23 official language versions on a single multilingual CD-ROM.

On request, subscribers to the *Official Journal of the European Union* can receive the various Annexes to the Official Journal. Subscribers are informed of the publication of Annexes by notices inserted in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

CD-Rom formats will be replaced by DVD formats during 2010.

Sales and subscriptions

Subscriptions to various priced periodicals, such as the subscription to the *Official Journal of the European Union*, are available from our commercial distributors. The list of commercial distributors is available at:

http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index_en.htm

EUR-Lex (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu>) offers direct access to European Union legislation free of charge. The *Official Journal of the European Union* can be consulted on this website, as can the Treaties, legislation, case-law and preparatory acts.

For further information on the European Union, see: <http://europa.eu>

