2. In the event that the criterion referred to in Question 1 is to be interpreted as meaning that it does not, in principle, include web-based email services which are supplied over the open internet and do not themselves provide internet access, is that criterion nonetheless capable, exceptionally, of being fulfilled where the provider of such an email service simultaneously operates a number of its own internet-connected electronic communications networks which can in any event be used, inter alia, for the purposes of the email service? If so, under which conditions is this possible?

3. How is the criterion 'normally provided for remuneration', laid down in Article 2(c) of Framework Directive 2002/21/EC, to be interpreted?

   (a) In particular, does that criterion require the payment of a fee by users or can the remuneration also consist in the provision by users of another form of consideration in the financial interests of the service provider, as, for example, in the case where users actively make available personal or other data or where such data is otherwise captured by the service provider while the service is being used?

   (b) In particular, does that criterion necessarily require the remuneration to be paid by the person to whom the service is also provided or may it also be sufficient for the service to be financed in part or in full by third parties, such as, for example, through advertising on the service provider's website?

   (c) In particular, does the word 'normally' refer in this context to the circumstances in which the provider of a specific service supplies that service or to the circumstances in which identical or comparable services are generally supplied?

([1]) Directive 2002/21/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 March 2002 on a common regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services (OJ 2002 L 108, p. 33).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Curtea de Apel Pitești (Romania) lodged on 20 March 2018 — Maria-Cristina Dospinescu, Filofteia-Camelia Ganea, Petre Sinca, Luminița-Maria Ioniță, Maria Burduv and Raluca-Marinela Trașcă v Spitalul Județean de Urgență Vâlcea

(Case C-205/18)

(2018/C 211/18)

Language of the case: Romanian

Referring court

Curtea de Apel Pitești

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellants: Maria-Cristina Dospinescu, Filofteia-Camelia Ganea, Petre Sinca, Luminița-Maria Ioniță, Maria Burduv and Raluca-Marinela Trașcă

Respondent: Spitalul Județean de Urgență Vâlcea

Question referred

Must Articles 114(3), 151 and 153 TFEU, read in conjunction with Framework Directive 89/391/EEC ([1]) and the subsequent specific directives, be interpreted as precluding a Member State from introducing time limits and procedures which deny people access to justice for the purposes of having their workplaces classified as characterised by special conditions, with the result that newly-hired workers' rights to safety and health at work, deriving from the assessment of those conditions in accordance with national legislation, are not recognised?

([1]) Council Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work (OJ 1989 L 183, p. 1).