6) Can the above provisions of the directive be interpreted as meaning that if a Member State's legislation does not treat the registered partnership as equivalent in all respects to marriage, such partnerships do not in any circumstances confer the status of family member, even having regard to Article 37?

7) Can the above provisions of the directive be interpreted as meaning that the equivalence to marriage must encompass all legal situations and consequences? If full equivalence is not required, what aspects of the two statuses must be the same in any event?

8) Is it or might it be relevant for the purposes of the application of the above provisions of the directive, whether the legislation of a Member State distinguishes between statutory recording ('*bejegyzés*') and registration ('*regisztráció*') or uses the terms interchangeably?

9) Can Article 37 of the directive be interpreted as meaning that legislation of a Member State which does not provide that partnerships are to be equivalent to marriage must be regarded as more favourable national legislation under Article 37?

([1]) Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States amending Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 and repealing Directives 64/221/EEC, 68/360/EEC, 72/194/EEC, 73/148/EEC, 75/34/EEC, 75/35/EEC, 90/364/EEC, 90/365/EEC and 93/96/EEC; OJ 2004 L 158, p. 77.

Request for a preliminary ruling from Tribunal Supremo — Sala Tercera Contencioso-Administrativo (Spain) lodged on 14 October 2014 — Entidad de Gestión de Derechos de los Productores Audiovisuales (EGEDA) and Others v Administración del Estado and Others

(Case C-470/14)

(2015/C 007/18)

Language of the case: Spanish

Referring court

Tribunal Supremo, Sala Tercera Contencioso-Administrativo

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicants: Entidad de Gestión de Derechos de los Productores Audiovisuales (EGEDA), Derechos de Autor de Medios Audiovisuales (DAMA) and Visual Entidad de Gestión de Artistas Plásticos (VEGAP)

Defendants: Administración del Estado, Asociación Multisectorial de Empresas de la Electrónica, las Tecnologías de la Información y la Comunicación, de las Telecomunicaciones y de los contenidos Digitales (AMETIC), Entidad de Gestión, Artistas, Intérpretes o Ejecutantes y Sociedad de Gestión de España (AIE), Asociación de Gestión de Derechos Intelectuales (AGEDI), Sociedad General de Autores y Editores (SGAE), Centro Español de Derechos Reprográficos (CEDRO) and Artistas Intérpretes, Sociedad de Gestión (AISGE)

Questions referred

1) Is a scheme for fair compensation for private copying compatible with Article 5(2)(b) of Directive 2001/29 ([1]) where the scheme, while taking as a basis an estimate of the harm actually caused, is financed from the General State Budget, it thus not being possible to ensure that the cost of that compensation is borne by the users of private copies?

2) If the first question is answered in the affirmative, is the scheme compatible with Article 5(2)(b) of Directive 2001/29 where the total amount allocated by the General State Budget to fair compensation for private copying, although it is calculated on the basis of the harm actually caused, has to be set within the budgetary limits established for each financial year?

(1) Directive 2001/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society OJ 2001 L 167, p. 10.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Simvoulio tis Epikratias (Greece) lodged on 20 October 2014 — Dimos Kropias Attikis v Ipourgos Perivallontos, Energias kai Klimatikis Allagis

(Case C-473/14)

(2015/C 007/19)

Language of the case: Greek

Referring court

Simvoulio tis Epikratias

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Dimos Kropias Attikis

Defendant: Ipourgos Perivallontos, Energias kai Klimatikis Allagis

Questions referred

1. Is a master plan for a metropolitan urban-planning area which sets out general objectives, guidelines and programmes for organising the spatial and urban planning of the broader metropolitan area, in particular establishing as individual general objectives the protection of the mountainous areas surrounding the metropolitan area and the containment of urban sprawl, a plan which allows the competent administrative authority not to subject a plan — which is subsequently adopted by means of a decree pursuant to the law containing the aforementioned initial master plan and which defines protection zones in one of the aforementioned mountainous areas and the related permitted land uses and activities, in order to give more specific expression to and implement the objectives for the protection of mountainous areas and the containment of urban sprawl — to the strategic environmental assessment procedure laid down in Directive 2001/42/EC (1) (OJ 2001 L 197), within the meaning of Article 3 thereof, as interpreted by the judgment of the Court of Justice in Case C-567/10 *Inter-Environnement Bruxelles and Others* [2012], paragraph 42?

2. If the answer to the previous question is in the affirmative: where, due to the time of the adoption of the plan to which more specific expression has been given within the framework of a hierarchy of spatial planning acts, no strategic environmental assessment under the aforementioned Directive 2001/42/EC was carried out in respect of that plan, must that assessment be carried out in respect of the measure, adopted when the directive is in force, which gives more specific expression to that plan?

3. If the answer to the second question is in the negative: where a decree contains rules relating to protection measures and to permitted activities and land uses in an area included in the national part of the NATURA network as a SCI [Site of Community Importance], SAC [Special Area of Conservation] and SPA [Special Protection Area], and those rules admittedly establish a regime of absolute nature protection, permitting only fire protection installations, forest management and hiking paths, but it is not apparent from the preparatory acts for the introduction of those rules that the conservation objectives of those areas — namely the specific environmental characteristics on account of which they were selected for inclusion in the NATURA network — were taken into account, while moreover uses that are no longer permitted are also still maintained within the area in question on the basis of those rules solely due to the fact that they were compatible with the previous protection regime, is that decree a management plan, within the meaning of Article 6(3) of Directive 92/43/EEC (2) (OJ 1992 L 206), prior to the adoption of which there was no obligation to carry out a strategic environmental assessment, in accordance with that article interpreted in conjunction with Article 3 (2)(b) of the aforementioned Directive 2001/42/EC?