Official Journal of the European Union

C 32

English edition

Information and Notices

Volume 64

29 January 2021

Contents

II *Information*

INFORMATION FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

European Commission

2021/C 32/01 Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case M.9837 — BP/Sinopec Fuel Oil Sales/BP Sinopec Marine Fuels) [1] 1

2021/C 32/02 Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case M.9990 — Vattenfall/ENGIE/GASAG) [1] 2

2021/C 32/03 Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case M.10053 — Zollner Elektronik/Syskron Holding/Samhammer/TIKI) [1] 3

IV *Notices*

NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

European Commission

2021/C 32/04 Euro exchange rates — 28 January 2021 4

2021/C 32/05 Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant positions at its meeting on 23 November 2020 at 15.00–17.30 (CEST) concerning a draft decision concerning Case AT.39686 – Cephalon – Rapporteur: Netherlands [1] 5

2021/C 32/06 Final Report of the Hearing Officer – Case AT.39686 – Cephalon [1] 6

2021/C 32/07 Summary of Commission Decision of 26 November 2020 relating to a proceeding under Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement (Case AT.39686 – Cephalon) *(notified under document C(2020) 8153)* [1] 9

EN

[1] Text with EEA relevance.

NOTICES FROM MEMBER STATES

2021/C 32/08 Information communicated by Member States regarding closure of fisheries 11

V *Announcements*

PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMON COMMERCIAL POLICY

European Commission

2021/C 32/09 Notice concerning the anti-dumping and countervailing measures in force in respect of imports of electric bicycles originating in the People's Republic of China: name change of one company subject to the anti-dumping duty rate for non-sampled cooperating companies and to the definitive countervailing duty rate for non-cooperating companies 12

PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION POLICY

European Commission

2021/C 32/10 Prior notification of a concentration (Case M.10130—APG/Arcus/PSP/Alpha Trains) – Candidate case for simplified procedure ([1]) 13

2021/C 32/11 Prior notification of a concentration (Case M.10109 - CINVEN/BCI/COMPRE) – Candidate case for simplified procedure ([1]) 15

2021/C 32/12 Prior notification of a concentration (Case M.10142 — Pamplona Capital/Signature Foods) – Candidate case for simplified procedure ([1]) 17

2021/C 32/13 Prior notification of a concentration (Case M.10136 —PGGM/Arcus/AMP/Alpha Trains) – Candidate case for simplified procedure ([1]) 18

OTHER ACTS

European Commission

2021/C 32/14 Publication of a communication of approval of a standard amendment to a product specification for a name in the wine sector, as referred to in Article 17(2) and (3) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/33 20

([1]) Text with EEA relevance.

II

(Information)

INFORMATION FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Non-opposition to a notified concentration

(Case M.9837 — BP/Sinopec Fuel Oil Sales/BP Sinopec Marine Fuels)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/01)

On 22 January 2021, the Commission decided not to oppose the above notified concentration and to declare it compatible with the internal market. This decision is based on Article 6(1)(b) of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 [1]. The full text of the decision is available only in English and will be made public after it is cleared of any business secrets it may contain. It will be available:

— in the merger section of the Competition website of the Commission (http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/). This website provides various facilities to help locate individual merger decisions, including company, case number, date and sectoral indexes,

— in electronic form on the EUR-Lex website (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html?locale=en) under document number 32021M9837. EUR-Lex is the online access to European law.

---

[1] OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1.

Non-opposition to a notified concentration

(Case M.9990 — Vattenfall/ENGIE/GASAG)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/02)

On 14 December 2020, the Commission decided not to oppose the above notified concentration and to declare it compatible with the internal market. This decision is based on Article 6(1)(b) of Council Regulation (EC) No. 139/2004 [1]. The full text of the decision is available only in German language and will be made public after it is cleared of any business secrets it may contain. It will be available:

— in the merger section of the Competition website of the Commission (http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/). This website provides various facilities to help locate individual merger decisions, including company, case number, date and sectoral indexes,

— in electronic form on the EUR-Lex website (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html?locale=en) under document number 32020M9990. EUR-Lex is the online access to the European law.

[1] OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1.

Non-opposition to a notified concentration

(Case M.10053 — Zollner Elektronik/Syskron Holding/Samhammer/TIKI)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/03)

On 22 January 2021, the Commission decided not to oppose the above notified concentration and to declare it compatible with the internal market. This decision is based on Article 6(1)(b) of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 [1]. The full text of the decision is available only in English and will be made public after it is cleared of any business secrets it may contain. It will be available:

— in the merger section of the Competition website of the Commission (http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/). This website provides various facilities to help locate individual merger decisions, including company, case number, date and sectoral indexes,

— in electronic form on the EUR-Lex website (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html?locale=en) under document number 32021M10053. EUR-Lex is the online access to European law.

---

[1] OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1.

IV

(Notices)

NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Euro exchange rates [1]

28 January 2021

(2021/C 32/04)

1 euro =

	Currency	Exchange rate		Currency	Exchange rate
USD	US dollar	1,2091	CAD	Canadian dollar	1,5564
JPY	Japanese yen	126,20	HKD	Hong Kong dollar	9,3742
DKK	Danish krone	7,4368	NZD	New Zealand dollar	1,7008
GBP	Pound sterling	0,88603	SGD	Singapore dollar	1,6119
SEK	Swedish krona	10,1353	KRW	South Korean won	1 350,76
CHF	Swiss franc	1,0783	ZAR	South African rand	18,4355
ISK	Iceland króna	156,00	CNY	Chinese yuan renminbi	7,8226
NOK	Norwegian krone	10,5205	HRK	Croatian kuna	7,5652
BGN	Bulgarian lev	1,9558	IDR	Indonesian rupiah	17 069,17
CZK	Czech koruna	26,114	MYR	Malaysian ringgit	4,8914
HUF	Hungarian forint	360,34	PHP	Philippine peso	58,126
PLN	Polish zloty	4,5471	RUB	Russian rouble	92,3842
RON	Romanian leu	4,8761	THB	Thai baht	36,315
TRY	Turkish lira	8,9313	BRL	Brazilian real	6,5857
AUD	Australian dollar	1,5914	MXN	Mexican peso	24,7187
			INR	Indian rupee	88,3210

[1] *Source*: reference exchange rate published by the ECB.

Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant positions at its meeting on 23 November 2020 at 15.00–17.30 (CEST [1]) concerning a draft decision concerning Case AT.39686 – Cephalon

Rapporteur: Netherlands

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/05)

(1) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees that the Parties were potential competitors.

(2) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees that the Parties' conduct amounts to a restriction of competition by object with the geographic scope: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

(3) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees that the conduct amounts to a restriction of competition by effect with the geographic scope: France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

(4) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees with the Commission that the anticompetitive conduct covered by the draft decision does not meet the conditions for exemption under Article 101(3) TFEU and Article 53(3) of the EEA Agreement.

(5) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees with the Commission that the Settlement Agreement between Cephalon and Teva as outlined in the draft decision constitutes an anti-competitive agreement between undertakings that infringes Article 101 TFEU and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement.

(6) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees with the Commission's assessment in the draft decision as regards the duration of the infringement.

(7) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees with the Commission that a fine should be imposed on the addressees of the draft decision.

(8) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees with the Commission on the determination of the fine for Cephalon.

(9) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees with the Commission on the determination of the fine for Teva.

(10) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) agrees with the Commission on the final amount of the fines.

(11) The Advisory Committee (11 Member States) recommends the publication of its Opinion in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

---

[1] Central European Summer Time (i.e., Brussels time).

Final Report of the Hearing Officer [1]

Case AT.39686 – Cephalon

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/06)

1. The draft decision, addressed to Cephalon, Inc. ('Cephalon') and Teva Pharmaceuticals Industries Ltd. ('Teva') (together, the 'Parties' [2]), concerns an infringement of Article 101 TFEU and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement by means of the conclusion, on 8 December 2005, of an agreement for the worldwide settlement of patent litigation, as well as certain related implementing transactions and agreements concluded between companies belonging to the Cephalon and Teva groups (taken together, the 'Settlement Agreement'). The litigation in question related to the active pharmaceutical ingredient known as 'modafinil', used in the treatment of excessive daytime sleepiness associated in particular with narcolepsy.

2. The investigation started at the Commission's own initiative with unannounced inspections under Article 20(4) of Regulation No 1/2003 [3] carried out between 9 and 11 December 2009 at the premises of Cephalon Europe SAS in France and of Cephalon (UK) Limited and Teva UK Limited in the United Kingdom.

3. On 28 April 2011, the Commission initiated proceedings against the Parties pursuant to Article 2(1) of Regulation (EC) No 773/2004. [4]

4. In the course of the investigation, the Commission sent several requests for information pursuant to Article 18(1) of Regulation No 1/2003 to the Parties, as well as to third parties.

5. On 29 July 2015, the Commission adopted a decision pursuant to Article 18(3) of Regulation No 1/2003, addressed to Teva and ordering the provision of specified documents by 28 August 2015. Teva complied with the request in full on 27 August 2015.

6. On 17 July 2017, the Commission addressed a statement of objections (the 'SO') to the Parties. In the SO, the Commission provisionally considered, in essence, that the Settlement Agreement entailed a transfer of value from Cephalon to its (potential) generic competitor Teva for the latter's agreement not to challenge Cephalon's modafinil patents and to delay its efforts to enter and compete in certain national modafinil markets in the EEA, and that the Settlement Agreement had the object and (in certain countries) the effect of restricting competition contrary to Article 101 TFEU and, to the extent applicable, Article 53 of the EEA Agreement.

7. The Directorate-General for Competition ('DG Competition') provided the Parties with access to the main part of the Commission's investigation file by means of DVDs delivered on 14 August 2017 and a data room procedure organised between 12 and 16 October 2017 for certain sensitive information that the Commission had obtained from third parties.

8. The Parties also obtained access to a large number of documents received from a single third-party undertaking (the 'Document Owner') – and on which the Document Owner claimed full confidentiality – by means of a confidentiality ring arrangement organised pursuant to a 'Disclosure and Access Agreement' concluded between the Parties and the

---

[1] Pursuant to Articles 16 and 17 of Decision 2011/695/EU of the President of the European Commission of 13 October 2011 on the function and terms of reference of the hearing officer in certain competition proceedings (OJ L 275, 20.10.2011, p. 29) ('Decision 2011/695/EU').

[2] Teva acquired control of Cephalon in 2011. The Commission, with decision of 13 October 2011 in Case M.6258 – Teva/Cephalon, authorised that concentration subject to conditions and obligations. The infringement relates to a period prior to the concentration, lasting for most countries under consideration from 4 December 2005 until 12 October 2011 (while for Bulgaria and Romania the infringement started on 1 January 2007, and for Hungary it ended on 14 June 2011).

[3] Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 of 16 December 2002 on the implementation of the rules on competition laid down in Articles 81 and 82 of the Treaty (OJ L 1, 4.1.2003, p. 1) ('Regulation No 1/2003').

[4] Commission Regulation (EC) No 773/2004 of 7 April 2004 relating to the conduct of proceedings by the Commission pursuant to Articles 81 and 82 of the EC Treaty (OJ L 123, 27.4.2004, p. 18) ('Regulation No 773/2004').

Document Owner. Pursuant to this agreement, named external law firms advising the Parties in the present case were permitted to examine the documents in question (without revealing their content to the Parties) with a view to identifying information in those documents that 'may reasonably be exculpatory or otherwise be reasonably required for exercising the [Parties'] rights of defence' and which these external counsel intended to use for the purposes of this case.

9. On 3 October 2017, the Parties listed 12 such documents and sought that these be made accessible in full. On 6 October 2017, DG Competition asked the Document Owner to confirm that these 12 documents (the 'Requested Documents') were not confidential or to provide proposed non-confidential versions of them, backed by corresponding confidentiality requests. The Document Owner replied on 2 November 2017 that it did not maintain any confidentiality requests concerning the Requested Documents. On 9 November 2017, DG Competition sent the Parties a CD-Rom with the Requested Documents, which was delivered the following day.

10. In accordance with the Disclosure and Access Agreement and the cover letter accompanying the SO, the Parties initially had eight weeks from receipt of the Requested Documents (on 10 November 2017; see paragraph 9 above) to submit a written reply to the SO.

11. On 21 December 2017, Teva asked DG Competition for an extension of that deadline until 26 January 2018. DG Competition granted the extension sought.

12. The Parties submitted a joint written reply to the SO on 26 January 2018. In their written reply, the Parties requested the opportunity to develop their arguments at an oral hearing, in accordance with Article 12 of Regulation No 773/2004.

13. The oral hearing took place on 13 March 2018.

14. On 1 July 2019, the Commission sent a letter of facts to the Parties, to inform them about additional evidence supporting the preliminary conclusions reached in the SO. The initial time limit to submit written comments on the additional evidence was 19 July 2019. Upon the Parties' request, DG Competition granted a deadline extension to 26 July 2019. The Parties submitted their written comments on that date.

15. On 8 April 2020, the Commission sent to the Parties a second letter of facts, again informing them of additional evidence supporting the preliminary conclusions in the SO. The Parties submitted their written comments on 6 May 2020.

16. On 8 June 2020, the Commission adopted a supplementary statement of objections ('SSO') in order to (i) complement and clarify the Commission's reasoning underlying the preliminary conclusion reached in the SO that the Parties' conduct constitutes a restriction of competition by object, also in light of the case-law developments occurred after July 2017, ([5]) and (ii) revise and complement the indications of the SO concerning the calculation of the fine that could be imposed on Teva.

17. In the cover letter of 8 June 2020 accompanying the SSO, DG Competition noted that since the adoption of the SO the file had only been supplemented by accessible documents which had either already been shared with the Parties, or which had been provided by the Parties themselves. Accordingly, DG Competition considered that there were no accessible documents to which access needed to be granted in order to enable the Parties to exercise their rights of defence in the context of the SSO. ([6]) The Parties did not make any request for additional access to documents in the Commission's file.

([5]) In particular the judgments of 12 December 2018, *Krka* v *Commission*, T-684/14, ECLI:T:2018:918, and of 30 January 2020, Generics (UK) Ltd and Others, C-307/18, ECLI:C:2020:52.

([6]) In this regard, the Commission provided an index of documents which became part of the Commission's file in this investigation since the adoption of the SO, allowing the Parties to verify that the file did not contain any accessible documents to which access needed to be granted in order for the Parties to exercise their rights of defence.

18. DG Competition set a time limit of 4 weeks for the Parties to submit their written reply to the SSO, taking into account the fact that the SSO was limited in size and scope and that it did not rely on any new evidence.

19. The Parties submitted their joint written reply to the SSO on 6 July 2020 and requested the opportunity to develop their arguments at an oral hearing.

20. The second oral hearing took place on 22 July 2020. ([7])

21. Pursuant to Article 16(1) of Decision 2011/695/EU, I have reviewed the draft decision in order to consider whether the draft decision deals only with objections in respect of which the Parties have been afforded the opportunity of making known their views. My conclusion is that it does.

22. Overall, I consider that the effective exercise of procedural rights has been respected throughout the procedure.

Brussels, 23 November 2020.

Wouter WILS

([7]) Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, this oral hearing was held remotely by secure encrypted videoconference.

Summary of Commission Decision

of 26 November 2020

relating to a proceeding under Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement

(Case AT.39686 – Cephalon)

(notified under document C(2020) 8153)

(Only the English text is authentic)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/07)

On 26 November 2020, the Commission adopted a decision relating to a proceeding under Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement. In accordance with the provisions of Article 30 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 ([1]), 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.

Introduction

(1) The Decision establishes that in a patent dispute settlement agreement ('Settlement Agreement') the originator company Cephalon, Inc. ('Cephalon', United States) induced its generic challenger Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. ('Teva', Israel), by means of beneficial commercial transactions and some cash payments, not to enter the market with a generic version of the sleeping disorder medicine modafinil. This agreement constitutes a restriction of competition by object and by effect and an infringement of Article 101 TFEU and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement.

(2) The Decision orders Cephalon and Teva to refrain from repeating any act or conduct having the same or similar object or effect as the Settlement Agreement and imposes fines on Cephalon and Teva for the period of 4 December 2005 to 12 October 2011.

(3) On 23 November 2020, the Advisory Committee on Restrictive Practices and Dominant Positions issued a favourable opinion on the Decision and on the fines imposed on Cephalon and Teva.

Settlement Agreement as a restriction by object

(4) Provigil is a modafinil-based medicine used for the treatment of excessive daytime sleepiness associated in particular with narcolepsy. It was Cephalon's best-selling product and its main source of revenue.

(5) At the time of signing the agreement in 2005, Cephalon's primary patent protecting modafinil had expired. Teva was Cephalon's most advanced generic rival and the only real competitive threat in Europe. It had already entered in the United Kingdom and was preparing to enter in other countries where it was about to obtain marketing authorisations. It was thus a potential competitor to Cephalon.

(6) Cephalon held a number of secondary patents on modafinil. While Cephalon itself had doubts as to the strength of these patents, it was still attempting to enforce them against Teva. Teva was convinced that these patents were both invalid and not infringed (invalidity was, years later, confirmed by courts). Nonetheless, the parties concluded the Settlement Agreement in December 2005. Through Teva's commitment not to compete and not to challenge Cephalon's secondary patents, the parties replaced the risks and uncertainty of litigation and competition with the certainty of a market exclusion arrangement. For years, this agreement eliminated Teva as a competitor.

(7) Teva accepted the non-compete and non-challenge commitments in return for a transfer of significant value from Cephalon. This value transfer was made predominantly through a package of commercial transactions and only in a small part through cash payments. These transactions included, for instance, an agreement for Teva to supply the

([1]) OJ L 1, 4.1.2003, p. 1. Regulation as amended by Regulation (EC) No 411/2004 (OJ L 68, 6.3.2004, p. 1).

input material (API) for modafinil to Cephalon at guaranteed prices and volumes whilst Cephalon had already several API suppliers supplying it at lower prices. Another example is a licence to modafinil-related IP rights held by Teva, even if Cephalon had always considered that it did not need such licence.

(8) The Decision concludes that these transactions would not have occurred under normal circumstances, either not at all or at least not at the same terms. They have no plausible explanation other than the commercial interest of the parties to agree on not competing in the modafinil markets. The Decision demonstrates that the total value transfer was significant, that the transactions were very attractive to Teva and that it was this package of transactions and payments that induced Teva to stay out of the market.

(9) As a part of the Settlement Agreement, Cephalon granted to Teva a non-exclusive licence to market generic modafinil during the last three years before the expiry of the litigated secondary patents (i.e. from 2012 onwards). In return, Teva would have had to pay Cephalon royalties ranging from 10 % to 20 % of its net profits from the sale of generic modafinil. This licensing agreement was never implemented due to the merger of Teva and Cephalon. The Decision shows that this arrangement actually further delayed Teva's independent entry and softened price competition between Cephalon and Teva, whilst at the same time it raised barriers to entry for other potential generic competitors.

(10) The Decision concludes that the Settlement Agreement amounts to an infringement of Article 101 TFEU and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement as a restriction by object that concerns all but a two Member States (Estonia and Malta) and signatory countries of the EEA. The infringement lasted from 2005 to 2011, when Teva acquired Cephalon.

Settlement Agreement as a restriction by effect

(11) For six EU Member States where the vast majority (over 80 %) of modafinil sales in the EEA occurred, the Decision establishes that the Settlement Agreement also constituted a restriction of competition by effect under Article 101 TFEU. These are France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The Decision establishes that Cephalon had market power on all of the markets concerned, that Teva was its most advanced competitive threat and that no other generic manufacturer exerted competitive pressure on Cephalon at the time of the Settlement Agreement.

(12) The impact of the restrictions imposed on Teva under the Settlement Agreement is compared to the counterfactual scenario of no Settlement Agreement. Absent the Settlement Agreement, Teva would have been likely to continue trying to enter and compete with Cephalon on the modafinil markets. The Decision therefore concludes that the Settlement Agreement eliminated Teva as a potential competitor and preserved Cephalon's market power. It allowed Cephalon to maintain its significant rents (and the resulting prices) to the detriment of patients and health systems and deterred all other generic challengers from entering the market.

Fines

(13) The Commission imposed a fine of EUR 30 480 000 on Cephalon. The fine was calculated in accordance with the general methodology of the Commission's 2006 Guidelines on the method of setting fines imposed pursuant to Article 23(2)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003.

(14) The Commission imposed a fine of EUR 30 000 000 on Teva. This fine was established as a fixed amount in application of point 37 of the Guidelines on fines, because Teva had agreed not to sell generic modafinil and therefore did not have any relevant sales. In establishing the fine, in particular, the Commission took into account that for both Teva and Cephalon the gravity and duration of the infringement are the same as well as the fact that the revenues and profits of an originator company (such as Cephalon) protected by an anticompetitive pay-for-delay agreement are typically higher than the revenues and the profits foregone by a potential generic entrant (such as Teva). The Commission also took into account Teva's size and negotiating strength.

(15) The Commission also ordered the undertakings concerned to refrain from repeating any act or conduct have the same or similar object or effect.

NOTICES FROM MEMBER STATES

Information communicated by Member States regarding closure of fisheries

(2021/C 32/08)

In accordance with Article 35(3) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 of 20 November 2009 establishing a Union control system for ensuring compliance with the rules of the common fisheries policy [1], a decision has been taken to close the fishery as set down in the following table:

Date and time of closure	17.12.2020
Duration	17.12.2020 – 31.12.2020
Member State	Poland
Stock or Group of stocks	HER/1/2-
Species	Herring (*Clupea harengus*)
Zone	Union, Faroese, Norwegian and international waters of 1 and 2
Type(s) of fishing vessels	—
Reference number	33/TQ123

[1] OJ L 343, 22.12.2009, p. 1.

V

(Announcements)

PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMON COMMERCIAL POLICY

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Notice concerning the anti-dumping and countervailing measures in force in respect of imports of electric bicycles originating in the People's Republic of China: name change of one company subject to the anti-dumping duty rate for non-sampled cooperating companies and to the definitive countervailing duty rate for non-cooperating companies

(2021/C 32/09)

Imports of cycles, with pedal assistance, with an auxiliary electric motor ('electric bicycles') originating in the People's Republic of China are subject to a definitive anti-dumping duty, imposed by Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/73 ([1]) ('Regulation (EU) 2019/73') and a definitive countervailing duty, imposed by Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/72 ([2]) ('Regulation (EU) 2019/72').

Wuxi Merry Ebike Co., Ltd. (TARIC ([3]) additional code C456) is a company located in the People's Republic of China whose exports to the Union of electric bicycles are subject to the anti-dumping duty rate for non-sampled cooperating companies of 16,2 % and to the anti-subsidy rate for non-cooperating companies of 17,2 %. On 29 October 2020, Wuxi Merry Ebike Co., Ltd. informed the Commission that as of 18 September 2020 it had changed its name as set out below.

The company asked the Commission to confirm that the change of name does not affect the right of the company to benefit from the individual anti-dumping duty applied to the company under its previous name.

The Commission examined the information supplied and concluded that the change of name in no way affects the findings of Regulation (EU) 2019/73 and of Regulation (EU) 2019/72.

Therefore, the references in Annex II of Regulation (EU) 2019/73 and in Annex II of Regulation (EU) 2019/72 to:

Wuxi Merry Ebike Co., Ltd.	Jiangsu	C456

should be read as:

Changzhou Merry Ebike Co., Ltd.	Jiangsu	C456

The TARIC additional code C456 previously attributed to Wuxi Merry Ebike Co., Ltd. shall apply to Changzhou Merry Ebike Co., Ltd.

([1]) OJ L 16, 18.1.2019, p. 108.
([2]) OJ L 16, 18.1.2019, p. 5.
([3]) The Integrated Tariff of the European Union.

PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION POLICY

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Prior notification of a concentration

(Case M.10130—APG/Arcus/PSP/Alpha Trains)

Candidate case for simplified procedure

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/10)

1. On 21 January 2021, the Commission received notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ([1]).

This notification concerns the following undertakings:

— APG Asset Management N.V. ('APG', Netherlands);

— Arcus European Investment Manager LLP ('Arcus', United Kingdom);

— Public Sector Pension Investment Board ('PSP', Canada); and

— Alpha Trains (Luxembourg) Holdings S.à.r.l. ('Alpha Trains', Luxembourg).

APG, Arcus and PSP acquire within the meaning of Articles 3(1)(b) and 3(4) of the Merger Regulation joint control of Alpha Trains.

The concentration is accomplished by way of purchase of shares.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

— for APG: asset manager with global investments on behalf of Dutch pension funds;

— for Arcus: independent fund manager specialising in European infrastructure;

— for PSP: pension investment manager with a diversified global portfolio;

— for Alpha Trains: specialist train leasing company providing rolling stock to both public and priate operators in a number of countries across continental Europe.

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

Pursuant to the Commission Notice on a simplified procedure for treatment of certain concentrations under the Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ([2]) it should be noted that this case is a candidate for treatment under the procedure set out in the Notice.

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. The following reference should always be specified:

M.10130—APG/Arcus/PSP/Alpha Trains

([1]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1 (the 'Merger Regulation').
([2]) OJ C 366, 14.12.2013, p. 5.

Observations can be sent to the Commission by email, by fax, or by post. Please use the contact details below:

Email: COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu

Fax +32 22964301

Postal address:

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

Prior notification of a concentration

(Case M.10109 - CINVEN/BCI/COMPRE)

Candidate case for simplified procedure

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/11)

1. On 22 January 2021, the Commission received notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ([1]).

This notification concerns the following undertakings:

— Cinven Capital Management (SFF) General Partner Limited ('Cinven SFF', Guernsey),

— The British Columbia Investment Management Corporation ('BCI', Canada),

— Cambridge Topco Limited and Cambridge Holdco Limited (together 'Compre', Malta).

Cinven SFF and BCI acquire within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) and 3(4) of the Merger Regulation joint control of Compre.

The concentration is accomplished by way of purchase of shares.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

— for Cinven SFF: a private equity business engaged in the provision of investment management and investment advisory services to a number of investment funds. Cinven controls a number of portfolio companies which are active in a variety of sectors across a range of jurisdictions.

— for BCI: an investment manager for British Columbia public sector clients in fixed income, public equities, private equity, infrastructure, renewable resources, real estate and commercial mortgages.

— for Compre: an insurance and reinsurance company specialising in the consolidation of discontinued, 'closed' non-life insurance portfolios from other non-life insurance companies.

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

Pursuant to the Commission Notice on a simplified procedure for treatment of certain concentrations under the Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ([2]) it should be noted that this case is a candidate for treatment under the procedure set out in the Notice.

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. The following reference should always be specified:

M.10109 – Cinven/BCI/Compre

Observations can be sent to the Commission by email, by fax, or by post. Please use the contact details below:

Email: COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu

([1]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1 (the 'Merger Regulation').
([2]) OJ C 366, 14.12.2013, p. 5.

Fax +32 22964301

Postal address:

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

Prior notification of a concentration

(Case M.10142 — Pamplona Capital/Signature Foods)

Candidate case for simplified procedure

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/12)

1. On 21 January 2021, the Commission received notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ([1]).

This notification concerns the following undertakings:

— Pamplona Capital Management LLP ('Pamplona Capital', United Kingdom),

— Signature Foods Holding B.V. ('Signature Foods', the Netherlands), indirectly controlled by IK Investment Partners.

Pamplona Capital acquires within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Merger Regulation sole control of the whole of Signature Foods.

The concentration is accomplished by way of purchase of shares.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

— for Pamplona Capital: global private equity investment firm,

— for Signature Foods: manufacturing, producing and distributing a variety of branded and private label consumer and professional chilled and frozen food products across Northern Europe.

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

Pursuant to the Commission Notice on a simplified procedure for treatment of certain concentrations under the Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ([2]) it should be noted that this case is a candidate for treatment under the procedure set out in the Notice.

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. The following reference should always be specified:

M.10142 — Pamplona Capital/Signature Foods

Observations can be sent to the Commission by email, by fax, or by post. Please use the contact details below:

Email: COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu

Fax +32 22964301

Postal address:

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

([1]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1 (the 'Merger Regulation').
([2]) OJ C 366, 14.12.2013, p. 5.

Prior notification of a concentration

(Case M.10136 —PGGM/Arcus/AMP/Alpha Trains)

Candidate case for simplified procedure

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2021/C 32/13)

1. On 25 January 2021, the Commission received notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ([1]).

This notification concerns the following undertakings:

— Stichting Depositary PGGM Infrastructure Funds, part of the PGGM Group ('PGGM', Netherlands);

— Arcus European Investment Manager LLP ('Arcus', United Kingdom);

— AMP Capital Investors ('UK') Limited ('AMP', United Kingdom); and

— Alpha Trains (Luxembourg) Holdings S.à.r.l. ('Alpha Trains', Luxembourg).

PGGM, Arcus and AMP acquire within the meaning of Articles 3(1)(b) and 3(4) of the Merger Regulation joint control of Alpha Trains.

The concentration is accomplished by way of purchase of shares.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

— for PGGM: pensions management for different pension funds, the affiliated employers and their employees;

— for Arcus: independent fund manager specialising in European infrastructure;

— for AMP: investment manager operating across a broad range of asset classes worldwide;

— for Alpha Train: specialist train leasing company providing rolling stock to both public and private operators in a number of countries across continental Europe.

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

Pursuant to the Commission Notice on a simplified procedure for treatment of certain concentrations under the Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ([2]) it should be noted that this case is a candidate for treatment under the procedure set out in the Notice.

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. The following reference should always be specified:

M.10136 —PGGM/Arcus/AMP/Alpha Trains

([1]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1 (the 'Merger Regulation').
([2]) OJ C 366, 14.12.2013, p. 5.

Observations can be sent to the Commission by email, by fax, or by post. Please use the contact details below:

Email: COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu

Fax +32 22964301

Postal address:

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

OTHER ACTS

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Publication of a communication of approval of a standard amendment to a product specification for a name in the wine sector, as referred to in Article 17(2) and (3) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/33

(2021/C 32/14)

This communication is published in accordance with Article 17(5) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/33 ([1]).

COMMUNICATION OF A STANDARD AMENDMENT TO THE SINGLE DOCUMENT

'CORBIÈRES-BOUTENAC'

PDO-FR-A0670-AM01

Date of communication: 3.11.2020

DESCRIPTION OF AND REASONS FOR THE APPROVED AMENDMENT

1. **Geographical area and area in immediate proximity**

A reference to the Official Geographical Code, which recognises and lists the municipalities by department at national level, has been inserted in Section IV 'Geographical area and area in immediate proximity' of Chapter I of the specification. This editorial amendment allows the geographical area to be identified with reference to the 2019 version of the Official Geographical Code, which is updated by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE), and gives the definition of the geographical area legal certainty.

The same reference has been inserted in the single document under the headings 'Geographical area' and 'Area in immediate proximity'.

2. **Demarcated parcel area**

Section IV of Chapter I of the specification has been amended to replace the wording 'the wines are produced exclusively from vines' with the more precise wording 'the wines are produced from grapes grown on parcels' (located within the parcel area of production).

This rewording does not affect the single document.

3. **Vine varieties**

Section V of Chapter I of the specification, on vine varieties, has been amended to eliminate the concepts of primary and secondary varieties. The four vine varieties for the PDO, Carignan N, Grenache N, Mourvèdre N and Syrah N, are unchanged but now all have equal importance as primary varieties.

The list of vine varieties has been supplemented by rules on the proportion of those varieties grown in the vineyards of each holding. Those rules have been amended to increase the proportion of Carignan grown to over 30 %, in order to reflect its predominance over the other varieties.

In the single document, the section headed 'Main wine-grape varieties' has been amended to include the four varieties. The list headed 'Secondary varieties' has been deleted.

([1]) OJ L 9, 11.1.2019, p. 2.

4. **Yield**

In Section VIII of Chapter I of the specification, on the yield of the PDO wines, the basic yield has been reduced from 45 hl/ha to 42 hl/ha and the maximum yield has been reduced from 54 hl/ha to 50 hl/ha, to bring them into line with the yields for wines with a designation of origin produced in the Corbières region.

The maximum yield has also been amended in the single document, under the heading 'Maximum yields'.

5. **Growing methods**

In Section VI of Chapter I of the specification, on vine training:

— the average maximum crop load per parcel has been reduced from 7 500 kg to 7 000 kg per hectare in line with the decrease in wine yield,

— irrigation of the vines is permitted, in which case the average maximum crop load per parcel is reduced to 5 500 kg/ha.

In Section VII of Chapter I of the specification, on grape harvest, transport and ripeness, the requirement for grapes of the Carignan variety to be transported whole to the winemaking location has been deleted. That requirement has been deleted from the specification because it is a question of best practice rather than a production condition. It has also been deleted because of the progress that has been made with regard to transporting the harvest.

These amendments to the specification bring the production conditions more into line with the reality on the ground.

These amendments have also been made to the single document, under the heading 'Winemaking practices'.

6. **First production of young vines**

In Section VIII of Chapter I of the specification, on yield and first production of vines, the date of first production of vines of the Carignan variety that qualify for the PDO has been brought forward from the 9th to the 7th year after the year of planting, in order to reflect the importance of Carignan in the wines covered by this PDO.

This amendment to the specification does not affect the single document.

7. **Analytical characteristics of the product**

In Section VII of Chapter I of the specification, on harvesting, the minimum natural alcoholic strength by volume has been increased from 12 % to 13 %, and the sugar content for determining the ripeness of the grapes has been changed from less than 207 g/l of must to less than 224 g/l. These amendments to the specification bring the production conditions more into line with the reality on the ground.

These amendments have also been made in the single document, under the heading 'Analytical characteristics' in the section 'Description of the wine(s)'.

8. **Blending of varieties**

In Section IX of Chapter I of the specification, the blending rules for the grape variety Carignan now state that the proportion of Carignan in the blend must be at least 30 %. This minimum proportion reflects the place and importance of Carignan in the wines covered by this PDO.

This amendment has also been made in the single document, under the heading 'Winemaking practices'.

In this same section, the provisions on packaging are unchanged but have been clarified to specify that all the wines are packaged in bottles.

This amendment has also been made in the single document, under the heading 'Winemaking practices'.

9. **Packaging**

In Section IX of Chapter I of the specification, it is specified under point 3 'Provisions on packaging' that all the wines are packaged in bottles. The words 'For every batch packaged' have been replaced by the words 'All batches are packaged in bottles'.

This clarification has also been made in the single document, under 'Winemaking practices'.

10. **Date from which wines can circulate**

In Section IX of the specification, on the processing and packaging of the wines, the date from which the wines may circulate among traders and brokers has been deleted under point 5 to allow wines to circulate among all operators and eliminate any risk of unfair competition.

It has also been deleted from the 'Specific oenological practices' section of the single document.

11. **Link with the geographical area**

In Section X of Chapter I of the specification, on the link with the geographical area, the human factors relevant to the link have been expanded to include the winegrowers' role in developing the land and building particular expertise.

This addition has also been made in the single document, under the heading 'Description of the wine(s)'.

In Section X of Chapter I of the specification, on the link with the geographical area, the production figures for the wines covered by this PDO have been updated.

These figures have been updated in the single document, under 'Link with the geographical area'.

In Section X of Chapter I of the specification, on the link with the geographical area, the causal link has been expanded to include the contribution and importance of the Carignan N grape variety in these wines.

These figures have been updated in the single document, under 'Link with the geographical area'.

12. **Presentation and labelling rules**

In Section XII of Chapter I of the specification, on the presentation and labelling rules, the broadest geographical name that can appear on the label of these wines is now 'Corbières' rather than 'Languedoc', which corresponds to a broader geographical area. The winegrowing area covered by this PDO forms an integral part of the 'Corbières' PDO winegrowing area, which identifies the geographical origin of these wines more precisely.

This clarification has also been made in the single document, in the labelling section.

13. **Declaration requirements for inspection purposes**

In Chapter II of the specification, on the declaration requirements for producers of the PDO, the following clarifications have been made:

— A document identifying the parcels suitable for irrigation must be attached to the advance declaration of parcels assigned to production of the PDO.

— The deadline for each operator to submit a claim statement to the protection and management body has changed. It should be sent to the protection and management body no later than 1 February of the year following the year of harvest and at least 10 working days before the first transaction or packaging declaration.

— The requirements regarding the declaration of transactions between authorised warehousekeepers have been supplemented. It must be sent not only to the protection and management body but also to the inspection body on the day on which the transaction between the operators is contracted, or at least within 5 working days thereof, and at least 10 working days before the collection of the wine. The quality and volume of wine covered by the declaration, its vintage and the identity and full address of the buyer must be given in addition to the identity and full address of the seller.

— Operators that carry out more than 12 packaging operations per year must send the protection and management body and the inspection body a summary packaging declaration each month.

— Any operator wishing to market a wine under a broader designation of origin must declare this to the protection and management body and inspection body responsible for the broader designation of origin at least 8 working days prior to the wine's withdrawal in order to ensure follow-up. That declaration must specify the designation of origin, colour, vintage, volume and storage location of the wine.

It must be accompanied by:

— on the part of operators that are winemakers, a copy of the claim statement for the original designation of origin,

— on the part of operators that are not winemakers, an extract of the stock records or a copy of the bulk transaction under the designation of origin.

— Any operator declassifying wines covered by the registered designation of origin must declare this to the protection and management body and the authorised inspection body 'no later than 7 working days' rather than 'at least 15 working days' after that declassification.

— .Every operator must declare the pruning method used on each parcel to the protection and management body on the advance declaration of the assignment of parcels.

— .Operators must keep an up-to-date record of the ripeness of the grapes, stating their sugar content per crop unit or the alcoholic strength by volume per container.

These amendments do not affect the single document.

14. **Main points to be checked**

The table in Chapter III of the specification has been updated under 'Inspection of products'. All batches of packaged wine are checked.

SINGLE DOCUMENT

1. **Name of the product**

Corbières-Boutenac

2. **Geographical indication type**

PDO – Protected Designation of Origin

3. **Categories of grapevine product**

1. Wine

4. **Description of the wine(s)**

Organoleptic characteristics

These wines are still, dry red wines.

'Corbières-Boutenac' is an aged, dry red wine in which the combined proportion of the Carignan N, Grenache N, Mourvèdre N and Syrah N varieties in the blend must be greater than or equal to 70 %. Carignan N must account for at least 30 % of each blend. It is a *vin de garde* (wine for ageing) and must be aged until 31 December of the year following the year of harvest, with at least 2 months in the bottle to refine its tannin structure.

The wines generally have a deep robe, shot through with violet glints when young. They develop notes of spices and mature fruit. They are powerful and generous on the palate and are structured around smooth and harmonious tannins which are overlaid with flattering notes of mocha, spices and caramel. They are full-bodied and warm with a long finish.

Analytical characteristics

These red wines have a minimum natural alcoholic strength by volume of 13 %.

Batches of wine that are ready for marketing have a fermentable sugar content (glucose and fructose):

— less than or equal to 3 g/l for wines with a natural alcoholic strength by volume less than or equal to 14 %,

— less than or equal to 4 g/l for wines with a natural alcoholic strength by volume greater than 14 %.

Wines ready to be marketed in bulk or packaged have a malic acid content less than or equal to 0,4 g/l. The total acidity, volatile acidity and total sulphur dioxide content are as laid down in EU legislation.

General analytical characteristics	
Maximum total alcoholic strength (in % volume)	
Minimum actual alcoholic strength (in % volume)	
Minimum total acidity	
Maximum volatile acidity (in milliequivalents per litre)	
Maximum total sulphur dioxide (in milligrams per litre)	

5. **Winemaking practices**

a. *Specific oenological practices*

Specific oenological practice

— The use of wood chips is prohibited.

— Any heat treatment of the wine harvest at a temperature above 40 °C is prohibited.

— In addition to the above provisions, all winemaking practices followed must also comply with the requirements laid down at EU level and in the Rural Code.

— The use of continuous fermentation tanks, continuous presses, centrifugal destemmers (vertical destemmers) and screw-type juice separators is prohibited.

In the wine blends:

— The proportion accounted for by the Carignan N, Grenache N and Mourvèdre N varieties combined must be greater than or equal to 70 %.

— The Carignan N variety must account for at least 30 % of the blend.

— No single variety may account for more than 80 % of the blend.

— The wines are aged at least until 31 December of the year following the year of harvest, with at least 2 months in the bottle.

— After ageing, the wines are placed on the market for sale to the consumer from 1 January of the second year following the year of harvest.

— All batches are packaged in bottles.

Cultivation method

The minimum planting density of the vines is 4 400 plants per hectare. The distance between the rows must not exceed 2,50 m.

The area available for each plant must not exceed 2,25 m^2. This area is calculated by multiplying the distance between rows by the distance between vines in the same row. For vines planted in squares or triangles and trained using the goblet system, the area available for each plant must not exceed 3 m^2.

When trained using the goblet system, the vines are pruned short, with a maximum of six spurs per vine. Each spur has a maximum of two count buds.

When trained using the Royat cordon system, the vines are pruned short:

— with a maximum of six spurs per vine and a maximum of two count buds per spur, or

— with a maximum of 10 spurs per vine and a maximum of one count bud per spur.

Irrigation may be authorised.

The average maximum crop load per parcel is set at 7 000 kg per hectare. Where irrigation is authorised, the average maximum crop load per irrigated parcel is set at 5 500 kg per hectare.

Grapes containing less than 224 g of sugar per litre of must cannot be considered fully ripe.

Grapes of the Carignan N variety are harvested by hand and transported whole to the winemaking location.

b. *Maximum yields*

50 hectolitres per hectare

6. **Demarcated geographical area**

The grapes are harvested and the wines are made, processed, aged and bottled in the following municipalities in the department of Aude, listed on the basis of the 2019 Official Geographical Code: Boutenac, Fabrezan, Ferrals-les-Corbières, Lézignan-Corbières, Luc-sur-Orbieu, Montséret, Ornaisons, Saint-André-de-Roquelongue, Saint-Laurent-de-la-Cabrerisse, Thézan-des-Corbières.

7. **Main wine grape variety(-ies)**

Carignan N

Grenache N

Mourvèdre N - Monastrell

Syrah N - Shiraz

8. **Description of the link(s)**

The geographical area is located at the centre of the department of Aude, between Carcassonne and Narbonne, around the Pinada de Boutenac massif, which ascends to an altitude of 273 m. It is bounded:

— by three rivers, the Orbieu to the north, the Aussou to the east and the Nielle to the west,

— and by the limestone plateaux of Thézan-des-Corbières and Saint-Laurent-de-la-Cabrerisse to the south.

This geographical area, which is south / south-west facing, is characterised by a gently rolling landscape made up of a succession of small hills, elongated ridges and hilltops crowned with pine forests.

Vines occupy most of the slopes up to an altitude of around 180 m. Grown in a Mediterranean climate, the vineyards covered by the 'Corbières-Boutenac' registered designation of origin are well protected from maritime influences by a network of interlacing hills and exposed to the influence of the north-west wind. The soils are thin and very stony but deep enough to allow good root development.

The natural conditions are ideal for achieving excellent ripeness, as they prevent summer water stress. However, the plant achieves balance gradually, which is why the more robust vine varieties, such as Mourvèdre N and Carignan N, have a late entry into production.

These natural conditions are particularly favourable for the historical Mediterranean grape varieties Grenache N, Mourvèdre N and Carignan N, and have proved to be well suited to Syrah N, which was introduced throughout Languedoc-Roussillon in the early 1980s. Syrah N contributes coveted and original aromatic notes in the coolest situations.

Carignan N is a hardy variety that tolerates windy and dry situations well. It is the winegrowers' preferred variety in the poorest soils of the Boutenac area, which is its natural habitat of choice. The young wines have hard, powerful tannins which become more refined over the appropriate ageing period.

Grenache N is happy in stony soils. It is adapted to wind and to the hottest situations, contributing fruitiness, alcoholic richness and fullness to the blend.

Mourvèdre N performs well in soils that are very warm with good water status. It is slow to adapt and its yield is used in blends only from the 6th year after planting, after which it contributes subtle notes and a sought-after hint of tannin.

The soils, climate, human expertise in planting the grape varieties, vine training method (short pruning for Mediterranean grape varieties), cultivation practices (manual harvesting) and ageing (mandatory ageing for 1 year, with 2 months in the bottle to refine the wines) are all factors that contribute to the production of an original product, which was recognised as a registered designation of origin within the 'Corbières' PDO in 2005.

By including a period of bottle ageing within the demarcated geographical area and area in immediate proximity in the production conditions, the producers are aiming to better safeguard the product's quality and specificity and thus the reputation of the registered designation of origin.

It is a young registered designation of origin which, nevertheless, has a long history of winegrowing. Vineyards already existed in Roman times, as shown by the earliest reference to wine being grown in the Corbières region at 'Villa major', now 'Villemajou', which lies in the municipality of Boutenac, right at the heart of the geographical area.

9. **Essential further conditions (packaging, labelling, other requirements)**

Legal framework:

National legislation

Type of further condition:

Derogation concerning production in the demarcated geographical area

Description of the condition:

The area in immediate proximity, defined by derogation for the production, processing, ageing and bottling of the wines, comprises the territory of the following municipalities in the department of Aude, listed on the basis of the 2019 Official Geographical Code: Bizanet and Narbonne.

Legal framework:

National legislation

Type of further condition:

Additional provisions relating to labelling

Description of the condition:

(a) Wines with the registered designation of origin may display the name of a smaller geographical unit on their labels, provided that:

— it is a registered location,

— it appears on the harvest declaration.

The name of the registered location must be printed in letters no larger, in terms of both height and width, than half the size of the letters forming the name of the registered designation of origin.

(b) Wines with the registered designation of origin may display the broader geographical unit 'Corbières' on their labels.

The size of the letters for this broader geographical unit must be no larger, in terms of both height and width, than half the size of the letters forming the name of the registered designation of origin.

Legal framework:

National legislation

Type of further condition:

Packaging within the demarcated geographical area

Description of the condition:

The wines are aged at least until 31 December of the year following the year of harvest, with at least 2 months in the bottle.

By including a period of bottle ageing within the demarcated geographical area and area in immediate proximity in the production conditions, the producers are aiming to better safeguard the product's quality and specificity and thus the reputation of the registered designation of origin.

Link to the product specification

https://info.agriculture.gouv.fr/gedei/site/bo-agri/document_administratif-eb40cd8d-b50b-496a-9338-b05361e352b3

ISSN 1977-091X (electronic edition)
ISSN 1725-2423 (paper edition)

Publications Office
of the European Union
L-2985 Luxembourg
LUXEMBOURG

EN