

**Request for a preliminary ruling from the Landgericht Köln (Germany) lodged on 11 May 2022 —
Gesamtverband Autoteile-Handel eV v Scania CV AB**

(Case C-319/22)

(2022/C 340/19)

Language of the case: German

Referring court

Landgericht Köln

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Gesamtverband Autoteile-Handel eV

Defendant: Scania CV AB

Questions referred

I. Does the requirement in the second sentence of Article 61(1) of Regulation (EU) 2018/858, ⁽¹⁾ according to which

‘Information shall be presented in an easily accessible manner in the form of machine-readable and electronically processable datasets’,

cover all repair and maintenance information within the meaning of point 48 of Article 3 of that regulation, **or** is that requirement limited to ‘spare parts information’ (*‘parts of the vehicle [...] that can be replaced by spare parts’*) pursuant to point 6.1 of Annex X to that regulation?

II. Must the second sentence of Article 61(1) of Regulation (EU) 2018/858, according to which information is to be presented

‘in an easily accessible manner in the form of machine-readable and electronically processable datasets’,

and the second subparagraph of Article 61(2), according to which, for independent operators other than repairers,

‘the information shall also be given in a machine-readable format that is capable of being electronically processed with commonly available information technology tools and software and which allows independent operators to carry out the task associated with their business in the aftermarket supply chain’,

be interpreted as meaning that the vehicle manufacturer fulfils its obligations in that regard only by

1. making the information accessible via the internet by means of a machine-controlled query via a database interface, which provides the possibility to download the results, or is it sufficient that the vehicle manufacturer enables only a manual search by a human user on-screen on a website and limits the result of the query to the visible content of the pages displayed on-screen?

and

2. making it possible for all information in the database linked to the vehicle manufacturer’s vehicle identification numbers (VINs) to be searched for on the basis of those VINs, which are to be provided by it in a separate list, and, independently of that possibility,

— also on the basis of other vehicle identification characteristics in accordance with the third subparagraph of point 6.1 of Annex X to the regulation

— and on the basis of the terms that the vehicle manufacturer otherwise uses for categories (such as categories of components, spare parts, repair and maintenance instructions and technical illustrations) and other database entries in any combination

or is it sufficient that the manufacturer offers the search exclusively as an individual query based on the VIN of a single, specific vehicle without at the same time providing an up-to-date list of all its vehicles' VINs?

and

3. providing those datasets in files in a format which is intended to make the datasets contained therein directly amenable to (further) electronic processing, the description of the dataset concerned being specified (in the case of texts and tables), **or** is the possibility to export mere screenshots in any conventional file format, such as a PDF file, sufficient for that purpose?

III. Does Article 61(1) of Regulation (EU) 2018/858 constitute, for vehicle manufacturers, a legal obligation within the meaning of Article 6(1)(c) of the GDPR which justifies the disclosure of VINs or information linked to VINs to independent operators as other controllers within the meaning of point 7 of Article 4 of the GDPR?

(¹) Regulation (EU) 2018/858 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2018 on the approval and market surveillance of motor vehicles and their trailers, and of systems, components and separate technical units intended for such vehicles, amending Regulations (EC) No 715/2007 and (EC) No 595/2009 and repealing Directive 2007/46/EC (OJ 2018 L 151, p. 1).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Varhoven administrativen sad (Bulgaria) lodged on 17 May 2022 — Zamestnik izpalnitelen direktor na Darzhaven fond 'Zemedelie' v IW

(Case C-329/22)

(2022/C 340/20)

Language of the case: Bulgarian

Referring court

Varhoven administrativen sad

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: Zamestnik izpalnitelen direktor na Darzhaven fond 'Zemedelie'

Defendant: IW

Questions referred

1. Must the second sentence of Article 29(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (¹) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 ('Regulation [EU] No 1305/2013') be interpreted as precluding a national provision such as Article 11(5) (formerly Article 11(4)) of Naredba No 4 of 24.02.2015 za prilagane na myarka 11 'Biologichno zemedelie' ot Programata za razvitie na selskite rayoni za perioda 2014-2020 (Ordinance No 4 of 24 February 2015 on the application of measure 11 'Organic farming' of the Rural Development Programme for the period 2014-2020), under which the possibility of receiving financial support for organic production during conversion is limited to a period not exceeding the minimum conversion periods under Article 36(1), Article 37(1) and Article 38 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 (²) of 5 September 2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products with regard to organic production, labelling and control?
2. If the first question is answered in the affirmative, must the second sentence of Article 29(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 be interpreted as meaning that the Member States are authorised to lay down by statute a maximum period for the granting of support for conversion to organic farming on the sole basis of the type of production and not on the basis of the particularities of each individual case?