

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Corte dei Conti (Italy) lodged on 24 October 2017 —
Federazione Italiana Golf (FIG) v Istituto Nazionale di Statistica — ISTAT, Ministero dell’Economia e
delle Finanze**

(Case C-612/17)

(2018/C 022/34)

Language of the case: Italian

Referring court

Corte dei Conti

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Federazione Italiana Golf (FIG)

Defendants: Istituto Nazionale di Statistica — ISTAT, Ministero dell’Economia e delle Finanze

Questions referred

1. Must the concept of ‘public intervention in the form of general regulations applicable to all units working in the same activity’ referred to in Paragraph 20.15 of [Annex A to] Regulation (EU) No 549/2013 ⁽¹⁾ (‘the ESA 2010’) be understood broadly as covering also the powers of guidance of a sporting nature (so-called soft law) and the powers of recognition, laid down by law, for the purposes of acquiring legal personality and enablement powers in the sports sector, both powers relating generally to all Italian national sports federations?
2. Must the general indicator of control referred to in Paragraph 20.15 of [Annex A to] Regulation (EU) No 549/2013 (‘the ESA 2010’) (‘the ability to determine the general policy or programme of [a non-profit institution]’) be interpreted in a substantive sense as the ability to manage, constrain and influence the management activity of the non-profit institution or can it be understood in a non-technical sense as also covering powers of external supervision other than those defined by the specific indicators of control referred to in subparagraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of Paragraph 20.15 (such as, for example, powers to approve budgets, appoint auditors, and approve statutes and certain types of regulations, sports guidelines or recognition for the purposes of sport)?
3. On the basis of the combined provisions of Paragraphs 20.15, 4.125 and 4.126 of [Annex A to] Regulation (EU) No 549/2013 (‘the ESA 2010’), can account be taken of membership fees for the purposes of establishing the existence or otherwise of public control, specifying whether a high level of such fees, together with other own revenues, can demonstrate, in the light of the particular features of the case at issue, that the non-profit institution has significant ability to exercise self-determination?

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) No 549/2013 of the European Parliament and the Council of 21 May 2013 on the European system of national and regional accounts in the European Union (Text with EEA relevance) (OJ 2013 L 174, p. 1).

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Corte dei Conti (Italy) lodged on 24 October 2017 —
Federazione Italiana Sport Equestri (FISE) v Istituto Nazionale di Statistica — ISTAT**

(Case C-613/17)

(2018/C 022/35)

Language of the case: Italian

Referring court

Corte dei Conti

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Federazione Italiana Sport Equestri (FISE)

Defendant: Istituto Nazionale di Statistica — ISTAT

Questions referred

1. Must the concept of 'public intervention in the form of general regulations applicable to all units working in the same activity' referred to in Paragraph 20.15 of [Annex A to] Regulation (EU) No 549/2013 ⁽¹⁾ ('the ESA 2010') be understood broadly as covering also the powers of guidance of a sporting nature (so-called soft law) and the powers of recognition, laid down by law, for the purposes of acquiring legal personality and enablement powers in the sports sector, both powers relating generally to all Italian national sports federations?
2. Must the general indicator of control referred to in Paragraph 20.15 of [Annex A to] Regulation (EU) No 549/2013 ('the ESA 2010') (the ability to determine the general policy or programme of [a non-profit institution]) be interpreted in a substantive sense as the ability to manage, constrain and influence the management activity of the non-profit institution or can it be understood in a non-technical sense as also covering powers of external supervision other than those defined by the specific indicators of control referred to in subparagraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of Paragraph 20.15 (such as, for example, powers to approve budgets, appoint auditors, and approve statutes and certain types of regulations, sports guidelines or recognition for the purposes of sport)?
3. On the basis of the combined provisions of Paragraphs 20.15, 4.125 and 4.126 of [Annex A to] Regulation (EU) No 549/2013 ('the ESA 2010'), can account be taken of membership fees for the purposes of establishing the existence or otherwise of public control, specifying whether a high level of such fees, together with other own revenues, can demonstrate, in the light of the particular features of the case at issue, that the non-profit institution has significant ability to exercise self-determination?

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) No 549/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2013 on the European system of national and regional accounts in the European Union (Text with EEA relevance) (OJ 2013 L 174, p. 1).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Tribunal correctionnel de Foix (France) lodged on 26 October 2017 — Procureur de la République v Mathieu Blaise and Others

(Case C-616/17)

(2018/C 022/36)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Tribunal correctionnel de Foix

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Procureur de la République

Defendants: Mathieu Blaise, Sabrina Dauzet, Alain Feliu, Marie Foray, Sylvestre Ganter, Dominique Masset, Ambroise Monsarrat, Sandrine Muscat, Jean-Charles Sutra, Blanche Yon, Kevin Leo-Pol Fred Perrin, Germain Yves Dedieu, Olivier Godard, Kevin Pao Donovan Schachner, Laura Dominique Chantal Escande, Nicolas Benoit Rey, Eric Malek Benromdan, Olivier Eric Labrunie, Simon Joseph Jeremie Boucard, Alexis Ganter, Pierre André Garcia

Other party: Espace Émeraude

Questions referred

1. Is Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC ⁽¹⁾ compatible with the precautionary principle when it provides no specific definition of an active substance, leaving it to the applicant to determine what it designates as the active substance in its product and granting it scope to focus its whole application dossier on a single substance, while its end product placed on the market is made up of several substances?