

Official Journal of the European Union

C 137



English edition

Information and Notices

Volume 57

7 May 2014

Contents

II *Information*

INFORMATION FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

European Commission

2014/C 137/01	Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case M.7200 — Lenovo/IBM x86 Server Business) ⁽¹⁾	1
---------------	--	---

IV *Notices*

NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

European Commission

2014/C 137/02	Euro exchange rates	2
2014/C 137/03	Opinion of the Advisory Committee on mergers given at its meeting of 18 January 2013 regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/M. 6570 — UPS/TNT Express — Rapporteur: Austria	3
2014/C 137/04	Final Report of the Hearing Officer — UPS/TNT Express (COMP/M.6570)	4
2014/C 137/05	Summary of Commission Decision of 30 January 2013 declaring a concentration incompatible with the internal market and the functioning of the EEA Agreement (Case COMP/M.6570 — UPS/TNT Express) (<i>notified under document C(2013) 431 final</i>) ⁽¹⁾	8

EN

⁽¹⁾ Text with EEA relevance

2014/C 137/06	Communication from the Commission concerning the quantity not applied for to be added to the quantity fixed for the subperiod 1 July to 30 September 2014 under certain quotas opened by the Union for products in the poultrymeat, egg and egg albumin sectors	18
---------------	---	----

NOTICES FROM MEMBER STATES

2014/C 137/07	Publication of decisions by Member States to grant, suspend or revoke operating licenses pursuant to Article 10(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008 on common rules for the operation of air services in the Community (recast) ⁽¹⁾	19
---------------	---	----

V *Announcements*

PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION POLICY

European Commission

2014/C 137/08	Prior notification of a concentration (Case M.7233 — Allianz/Going concern of UnipolSai Assicurazioni) ⁽¹⁾	42
---------------	---	----

⁽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.7200 — Lenovo/IBM x86 Server Business)****(Text with EEA relevance)**

(2014/C 137/01)

On 29 April 2014, 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 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/en/index.htm>) under document number 32014M7200. EUR-Lex is the online access to the 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⁾

6 May 2014

(2014/C 137/02)

1 euro =

Currency	Exchange rate	Currency	Exchange rate		
USD	US dollar	1,3945	CAD	Canadian dollar	1,5232
JPY	Japanese yen	141,89	HKD	Hong Kong dollar	10,8103
DKK	Danish krone	7,4641	NZD	New Zealand dollar	1,5909
GBP	Pound sterling	0,82115	SGD	Singapore dollar	1,7387
SEK	Swedish krona	9,0666	KRW	South Korean won	1 431,82
CHF	Swiss franc	1,2169	ZAR	South African rand	14,6440
ISK	Iceland króna		CNY	Chinese yuan renminbi	8,6829
NOK	Norwegian krone	8,2420	HRK	Croatian kuna	7,5863
BGN	Bulgarian lev	1,9558	IDR	Indonesian rupiah	16 059,02
CZK	Czech koruna	27,438	MYR	Malaysian ringgit	4,5377
HUF	Hungarian forint	307,03	PHP	Philippine peso	61,729
LTL	Lithuanian litas	3,4528	RUB	Russian rouble	49,4230
PLN	Polish zloty	4,2019	THB	Thai baht	45,094
RON	Romanian leu	4,4420	BRL	Brazilian real	3,1202
TRY	Turkish lira	2,9183	MXN	Mexican peso	18,1675
AUD	Australian dollar	1,4932	INR	Indian rupee	83,8060

⁽¹⁾ Source: reference exchange rate published by the ECB.

**Opinion of the Advisory Committee on mergers given at its meeting of 18 January 2013
regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/M.6570 — UPS/TNT Express**

Rapporteur: Austria

(2014/C 137/03)

1. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission that the notified operation constitutes a concentration within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Merger Regulation.
 2. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission that the notified transaction has a Union dimension pursuant to Article 1 of the Merger Regulation.
 3. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission's definitions of the relevant product and geographic markets as stated in the draft decision.
 4. In particular, the Advisory Committee agrees that there is a separate market for (international) intra-EEA express services which is national in scope.
 5. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission's assessment that the notified concentration would not lead to a significant impediment of effective competition in the markets concerned in the areas of: (1) air cargo, (2) freight forwarding, and (3) contract logistics.
 6. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission's assessment that the notified concentration, as originally proposed by the notifying parties, is likely to give rise to non-coordinated horizontal effects that would significantly impede effective competition on the market for intra-EEA express services in the following countries:

— Bulgaria,	— Malta,
— The Czech Republic,	— The Netherlands,
— Denmark,	— Poland,
— Estonia,	— Romania,
— Finland,	— Slovakia,
— Hungary,	— Slovenia,
— Latvia,	— Sweden.
— Lithuania,	
 7. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission's analysis of efficiencies, in particular the netting off against the estimated price increase, and the conclusion that they are not of a nature to counteract the significant impediment to effective competition resulting from the notified transaction on the markets identified in the previous point.
 8. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission that in view of the extremely limited number of potentially suitable purchasers for any divested business an upfront buyer or a fix-it-first solution was needed.
 9. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission that the commitments offered by the notifying party on 29 November 2012, as modified on 16 December 2012 and 3 January 2013, do not address the competition concerns identified by the Commission and will not eliminate the significant impediment to effective competition resulting from the notified transaction.
 10. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission that the notified transaction must therefore be declared incompatible with the internal market and the functioning of the EEA Agreement in accordance with Articles 2(3) and 8(3) of the Merger Regulation and Article 57 of the EEA Agreement.
-

Final Report of the Hearing Officer ⁽¹⁾**UPS/TNT Express****(COMP/M.6570)**

(2014/C 137/04)

I. BACKGROUND

1. On 15 June 2012, the Commission received a notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of the Merger Regulation ⁽²⁾ by which UPS acquires sole control, within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Merger Regulation, of TNT by way of a public takeover under Dutch law. (UPS and TNT are referred to as 'the Parties'). On 20 July 2012, the Commission initiated proceedings pursuant to Article 6(1)(c) of the Merger Regulation.

II. WRITTEN PROCEDURE**The Statement of Objections**

2. A Statement of Objections ('SO') was addressed to UPS on 19 October 2012. UPS was granted 10 working days to submit a written reply. In the SO, the Commission's preliminary findings indicated that the notified concentration would raise competition concerns in the markets for international intra-EEA express small package delivery services in 29 EEA Member States.

Access to file

3. UPS was granted access to the file via CD-ROMs on 22, 26 and 29 October, 28 November, 13 and 21 December 2012 and 17 January 2013. In addition, two data rooms were organised in this case. One, concerning a selection of extracts from internal presentations and replies to requests for information of FedEx, took place, upon FedEx' consent, on 26 and 29 October 2012 and was attended by three UPS outside counsels. The second, concerning bidding data, took place on 26 October 2012 and was attended by UPS' economic advisers.

4. On 25 October 2012, UPS requested additional access to the file. In response DG Competition partially provided less-redacted versions of documents and granted UPS access via its outside counsels in a data room; partially DG Competition rejected the request. Shortly thereafter UPS referred the matter to me. It asked for additional access to the internal presentations of FedEx detailing the company's expansion plans in Europe, extracts of which UPS' external counsels had seen in the data room. UPS argued that since FedEx had played a key role in the investigation acting almost as a 'plaintiff' and as the 'main evidence' held against the proposed transaction, UPS had an 'unequivocal right' to review all documents submitted by FedEx without redactions. According to UPS, access to these documents would allow it to understand FedEx' objections against the proposed transaction and to assess the plausibility of FedEx' submissions on the basis of other evidence in the file and publicly available data.

5. I rejected UPS' request for the following reasons. First, UPS has no 'unequivocal right' to see all FedEx documents in the Commission file un-redacted because of any special position it may have in this proceeding. The rules and standards for access to the file do not vary in function of the position an information provider adopts in a proceeding. Secondly, UPS had been given full access, either via CD-ROMs or through data room exercises, to the adverse evidence relied upon by the Commission in the SO. Thirdly, the redacted information appeared to consist of very sensitive business secrets and UPS had not shown that access to the information was 'indispensable' for the exercise of its rights of defence, as required by Article 8(4) of Decision 2011/695/EU. Finally, I could not find — as UPS alleged — that the content of the redacted documents submitted by FedEx was inconsistent with the findings reached by the Commission in the SO with regard to FedEx' expansion plans.

⁽¹⁾ Pursuant to Articles 16 and 17 of Decision 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⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings (OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1).

6. However, since the Commission file did not contain descriptions of the non-accessible internal presentations, I requested FedEx to provide justifications for its confidentiality claims and summaries of the information redacted, so as to better enable UPS to fully exercise its rights of defence.

7. UPS also sought full disclosure of other FedEx documents. However, since the notifying party received for some of them less redacted versions from DG Competition while its request was pending with me, I considered that the request had been satisfied. For other documents, I referred the matter, in accordance with Article 3(7) of Decision 2011/695/EU, to DG Competition, as UPS had not first raised the matter with it.

Third persons

8. Three competitors of the merging entities, i.e., DHL, FedEx, and GeoPost, and one airport, i.e., Liege Airport, demonstrated 'sufficient interest' within the meaning of Article 18(4) of the Merger Regulation and were, thus, given the opportunity to be heard as third persons in writing and orally.

Better information

9. DHL and FedEx complained that the edited version of the SO they had received was so heavily redacted that they could not fully understand the nature and subject matter of the merger procedure. DHL, in particular, sought the disclosure of the sections of the SO analysing efficiency claims, price concentration and bidding data.

10. DG Competition rejected these complaints on the ground that the information of third persons is left to its discretion as long as the legal minimum requirement is fulfilled.

Access to the reply to the SO

11. In preparation for the oral hearing, FedEx requested access to a non-confidential version of UPS' reply to the SO as it anticipated that a part of UPS' observations would focus on FedEx' particular position in this proceeding.

12. I rejected this request pointing out that neither the applicable law nor the Best Practices of the Commission entitle third persons to obtain the reply of the notifying party to the SO. The Commission is, furthermore, equipped with all necessary investigatory and other means to ascertain the evidentiary value of the information it receives. The oral hearing is thus neither the only nor necessarily the most appropriate forum to assess the credibility of third persons. Moreover, since UPS addressed the issue of its credibility in its presentation at the Oral Hearing, FedEx was informed about UPS' most salient arguments and had the opportunity to react to them.

III. ORAL PROCEDURE

13. The notifying party requested an Oral Hearing, which was held on 12 November 2012. Three closed sessions took place at the Hearing. Two concerned UPS' presentation on efficiencies and the price concentration analysis. The third related to FedEx' presentation on the scale and service coverage of its operations in Europe. For the notifying party the same outside counsels attended who participated in the data room of 26 and 29 October.

14. UPS also asked for a closed session for a presentation on the theory of harm, where a representative of TNT would discuss customer behaviour on the basis of country-specific case studies. I rejected this request as I considered that it was not necessary for UPS' right to be heard orally that the TNT representative refers to confidential information. Moreover, I considered that the presence of competitors during TNT's presentation would be beneficial to clarify relevant facts, as they also have customers and may express views on their behaviour. This was indeed the case, as during the hearing DHL took position on certain demand-related issues.

IV. PROCEDURE AFTER THE ORAL HEARING

Remedies

15. In November 2012, the notifying party submitted a first remedies package, which the Commission considered insufficient to solve the competition concerns arising from the merger. Subsequently, UPS submitted two revised remedies packages in December 2012 and January 2013, consisting of the divestment of assets in a number of EU countries where competition concerns had been identified. The Commission continued to consider these remedies insufficient, in particular in view of the inadequacy of the proposed buyer to qualify as a suitable purchaser and a future viable competitor in the EEA.

Letter of Facts

16. On 21 December 2012, the Commission sent to UPS a Letter of Facts informing it about additional evidence in support of its findings regarding FedEx' competitive position in fourteen Member States. UPS was granted two working days to submit written observations. In its written comments, UPS complained that the Letter of Facts was sent at a time when it had no possibility any longer to modify the proposed remedies. It also reiterated its request for access to internal FedEx documents, which DG Competition again rejected. Finally, it requested minutes of meetings between the Commission and FedEx, which it received.

17. UPS did not refer these claims to me in accordance with Article 3(7) of Decision 2011/695/EU, thus I did not have to intervene on these matters. However, as regards the point concerning the timing of the Letter of Facts, I do not find that UPS' rights of defence have been violated. In my view, UPS had sufficient time to modify the remedies, which is confirmed by the fact that it submitted revised remedies one day before its written comments. More importantly, the Letter of Facts did not change the scope or content of the Commission's competition assessment, which UPS was made aware of in meetings after the Oral Hearing. Therefore, the Letter of Facts did not introduce any new element which UPS could have not taken into account before to prepare a revised remedies package. As regards access to FedEx internal documents, I refer to my observations above (para. 5).

18. On 21 January 2013, UPS sent me a request to reassess DG Competition's refusals to grant it access to FedEx' internal documents, in particular with regard to FedEx' expansion plans, and to incorporate the alleged shortcomings as regards the extent and timing of the access to file in this Final Report. Having carried out the requested review, I cannot find that UPS' rights to access the file were violated. Firstly as regards the extent of the access to file, UPS was granted the opportunity to see all the adverse evidence, including confidential information, concerning FedEx' expansion plans, on which the SO and the Letter of Facts were based upon. Access was not limited to the 15 SIEC countries but was granted to summaries for all those EEA countries for which such plans exist. UPS also had access to all other FedEx' submissions, except for the confidential information contained therein. Furthermore, as regards FedEx' confidential information, UPS received justifications for the redactions and descriptions or summaries of the inaccessible parts. On this basis, I consider that the rules for access to file have been complied with. Secondly as regards the timing of the access to file, since UPS did not sufficiently substantiate its claim, I could not review it.

19. In its request, UPS appears to suggest that the Commission withdrew the objections raised in the SO with regard to certain Member States solely after reassessing FedEx' expansion plans on the basis of internal documents submitted before the SO and new information provided thereafter. This suggestion is not correct according to the information I have received from DG Competition. The Commission amended its objections in view of the new information obtained from FedEx and, equally important reconducted price concentration analysis and the evaluation of the efficiencies, which became to a large part only possible after UPS had provided DG Competition with more information.

V. THE DRAFT COMMISSION DECISION

20. In my opinion the draft Decision relates only to objections in respect of which the parties have been afforded the opportunity to make known their views.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

21. Overall, I conclude that all participants in the proceedings have been able to effectively exercise their procedural rights in this case.

Michael ALBERS

Summary of Commission Decision
of 30 January 2013
declaring a concentration incompatible with the internal market and the functioning of the
EEA Agreement

(Case COMP/M.6570 — UPS/TNT Express)

(notified under document C(2013) 431 final)

(Only the English version is authentic)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2014/C 137/05)

On 30 January 2013 the Commission adopted a Decision in a merger case under Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 of 20 January 2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 8(3) of that Regulation. A non-confidential version of the full Decision can be found in the authentic language of the case on the website of the Directorate-General for Competition, at the following address: http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/index_en.html

I. THE PARTIES

1. United Parcel Service Inc. ('UPS' – United States of America) is one of the world's largest logistics providers operating mainly in the small package delivery, freight transport and contract logistics sectors. UPS' EU hub is located in Köln, Germany.

2. TNT Express N.V. ('TNT' – The Netherlands) is active in the small package delivery and freight transport sectors. TNT's European network has its central hub in Liège, Belgium.

II. THE OPERATION AND EU DIMENSION

3. On 15 June 2012, the Commission received a notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 (the 'Merger Regulation') by which the undertaking UPS intended to acquire within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Merger Regulation sole control of the whole of the undertaking TNT by way of a public takeover under Dutch law⁽²⁾ (the 'Merger'). UPS and TNT are hereafter referred to as 'the Parties'.

4. The operation had an EU dimension in accordance with Article 1(2) of the Merger Regulation.

III. THE PROCEDURE

5. After the first phase market investigation, the Commission concluded that the Merger raised serious doubts as to its compatibility with the internal market and with the EEA Agreement. Therefore, on 20 July 2012, the Commission opened second phase proceedings pursuant to Article 6(1)(c) of the Merger Regulation.

6. A Statement of Objections was sent to the Parties on 19 October 2012. The Parties had the opportunity to present their views through a written response and at an Oral Hearing that took place on 12 November 2012.

7. On 29 November 2012 the Notifying party presented Commitments pursuant to Article 8(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004. New commitments were submitted subsequently on 16 December 2012 and on 3 January 2013.

8. A Letter of Facts was sent to UPS on 21 December 2012. UPS submitted its written observations on the Letter of Facts on 4 January 2013.

9. On 30 January 2013, the Commission adopted pursuant to article 8(3) of the Merger Regulation a decision declaring the Merger to be incompatible with the internal market and the EEA agreement (the '**Decision**').

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union* C 186, 26.6.2012, p. 9.

IV. COMPETITIVE ASSESSMENT

1. Description of the small package sector

10. The small package delivery industry shows at least two major characteristics:

- (a) significant economies of density/scale as it is a **network industry**. Pick-up and delivery costs are a major contributor to a parcel service provider's direct cost. Moreover, coverage at *both* the origin and destination is important;
- (b) highly differentiated products as providers are able to differentiate the service supplied across a vast number of dimensions:
 - (i) speed of delivery (ranging from early-morning next-day express delivery services to two or more days standard delivery services), (ii) geography (ranging from domestic to international extra-EEA services), and (iii) quality of service (such as reliability, security, late pick-up time, comprehensive track-and-trace ability, etc.).

11. There are a number of different operators active in the industry: integrators, national and local postal operators, partner networks and freight forwarders, each with a different operating model based on the structure and type of its network. The main characteristic of an integrator is that it has full operational control over the logistics of the parcel delivery from origin to destination, including air transport. Within the EEA, there are four integrators: UPS, TNT, DHL and FedEx.

12. National postal operators own extensive domestic ground networks and in some cases are present in international operations. In particular, Royal Mail (United Kingdom), through its subsidiary GLS, and La Poste (France), through its subsidiary DPD, as well as PostNL (Netherlands) and Austrian Post (Austria), qualify as international network operators. La Poste, in particular in France and Spain, offers international intra-EEA express deliveries for many EEA countries, as does Royal Mail in the UK. These operators nevertheless do not have their own air fleet network and offer international intra-EEA express delivery services based on road transportation for neighbouring countries as well as on air transportation that relies on commercial flights (belly space) or on integrators.

13. National small package operators have a predominantly domestic small package business. Companies such as Bartolini in Italy, Yodl in the UK, Siodemka in Poland or Speedex in Greece have rather a national footprint and compete with the Parties only at that level. Partner networks (such as Eurodis, NetExpress, and EuroExpress) hardly have any own operations on the international intra-EEA express markets. Freight forwarders (e.g. Kuehne + Nagel, DB Schenker, DSV, Geodis) focus on heavy consignments but sometimes also deliver small packages, mostly for customers who send cargo through their networks. For the international intra-EEA express market they essentially resell the integrators' services.

2. Market definition

14. In line with its decisional practice,⁽¹⁾ the Commission identifies the relevant product markets for small package delivery services⁽²⁾ on the basis of the speed of delivery (i.e. express delivery services — commonly understood as services with a next day delivery commitment, and standard/deferred delivery services) and whether the packages are picked-up and delivered in the same country, in two different EEA countries, or in one EEA country and one non-EEA country (i.e. domestic, international intra-EEA and international extra-EEA services).

15. With respect to the geographic dimension, the Commission identified national markets for both domestic and international services

16. The Commission concluded for the purpose of the Decision that there is a separate product market for international intra-EEA express small package delivery services. This market is national in scope.

⁽¹⁾ Case COMP/M.3971 *Deutsche Post/Exel* paragraphs 8-24.

⁽²⁾ The Commission identifies a separate product market for small package delivery services for which 31,5 kg appears as an appropriate threshold to distinguish small packages from freight.

3. International intra-EEA express small package delivery services

(i) *Competitive constraints on the Parties: non-integrators*

17. International intra-EEA express delivery is a network industry requiring operators to ensure a presence in all countries. The required presence in turn entails investments in infrastructure all along the value chain (from pick-up, sorting, line-hauls, hubs, air network, delivery). Even if outsourcing of parts of the value chain to third parties is possible, outsourcing reduces the control over the value chain, the operational efficiency and ultimately the quality of the services rendered.

18. Outsourcing of air transport is a case in point. According to UPS' estimates, the cost of air transport accounts for a substantial share of direct costs for international deliveries. In order to minimize them, a key determinant is the aircraft load factor, hence the necessity to adapt capacity, schedules and routes to volumes in order to minimize these costs. Non-integrators that outsource air transport services have no control over the routings, frequencies, schedules and capacity of the aircraft operated. They have therefore less opportunities to optimise their cost structure and they face a higher risk of failing to comply with the committed delivery time-frame, a very serious disadvantage vis-à-vis the integrators.

19. On the basis of the market investigation, it turned out that non-integrators are weaker competitors with respect to several key parameters of competition:

(i) coverage (numbers of countries, postal codes, business addresses served), as their coverage is less than the one offered by the Parties, (ii) air network, so that non-integrators do not serve customers with significant needs for international intra-EEA express services requiring air transport (long-haul segment), (iii) premium services, i.e. timed next-day morning express services.

20. These weaknesses are also shared by the two ground-based operators, La Poste and Royal Mail, which operate an extensive network across the EEA, but are not fully-fledged competitors of the Parties in the international intra-EEA express market. This was largely confirmed by the Commission's analysis of the bidding data provided by UPS, TNT, DHL and FedEx.

21. For the above reasons, the Commission concluded that non-integrated players are unable to exert a sufficient competitive constraint on integrators.

(ii) *Competitive constraints on the Parties: FedEx and DHL*

22. The Parties argued that other than DHL as the current market leader among integrators also FedEx were a fully-fledged competitor. However, the in-depth investigation confirmed that FedEx is currently a weaker competitor for the following reasons:

- a) in terms of market shares, FedEx is the weakest of the four integrators in most of the EEA-countries. FedEx' market share does not exceed [5-10 %] in 14 out of the 15 EEA-countries where the Commission found a significant impediment to effective competition and *post* transaction, FedEx would have held the smallest market share in all 29 EEA-countries among the integrators;
- b) its coverage is inferior compared to other integrators. If measured in terms of business addresses served, this holds true for all express services (end-of day, before noon and before 10 am);
- c) its network is less developed in Europe in comparison to the other integrators (in terms of number of pick up points, flight points, type of aircrafts, etc.);
- d) its European pick-up and delivery (PUD) costs are currently significantly higher than those of UPS and TNT.

23. The Commission concluded that FedEx represents a weak competitive constraint to the Parties on the market of international intra-EEA express services. This view was shared by customers as well as other competitors. FedEx' business core activities are related to the extra-EEA deliveries. This was confirmed also by the analysis of the Commission of the UPS and FedEx internal databases.

24. The Commission took also into account in the competitive assessment FedEx' on-going organic expansion plan which aims at strengthening its network infrastructure and increasing its density and coverage, as well as its global domestic expansion. It turned out that, depending on the EEA-country considered, its organic expansion plan was indeed deemed likely to help FedEx to attract additional volumes to fill in the network increasing capacity and, thus, indirectly benefit its competitiveness in the international intra-EEA market. However, the Commission concluded that FedEx would still lag behind the Parties and DHL in terms of market position in the near future.

25. As concerns DHL, the outcome of the market investigation confirmed that DHL is a strong and credible player and that it is a close competitor to both UPS and TNT. Post merger, the customers would thus face two very strong integrators: DHL and the merged entity.

(iii) *Theory of harm, closeness of competition and barriers to entry*

26. The Commission assessed the effects of the merger in the different national markets as the Merger would have led to a significant increase in the level of concentration of the market and a strong combined market position of the Parties in a large number of EEA countries and reduced the number of competitors from four to three (UPS/TNT, DHL and FedEx) or even from three to two (UPS/TNT and DHL) in a significant portion thereof.

27. In fact, the Parties, together with DHL, can be considered to be close competitors on the international intra-EEA express market while all other companies are seen as offering products which are much more distant substitutes, FedEx included, than the ones offered by UPS, TNT and DHL. Absent any countervailing factors, the Commission concluded that the Parties, which are close competitors, would have had an incentive to increase prices after the merger. The price concentration analysis undertaken by the Commission concluded that there would be a price increase in all 29 EEA countries. UPS disagreed with the Commission on the magnitude of the price increase.

28. UPS claimed that certain customers could exercise buyer power either by down-trading to less demanding services or by switching to other existing suppliers, either by selecting other suppliers for express, or by shifting non-express volumes to other suppliers (multisourcing). However, this was not confirmed during the course of the market investigation.

29. With respect to the barriers to entry, it turned out that a new entrant would have had to set up (i) a sophisticated IT infrastructure, (ii) a sorting infrastructure all across the EEA and (iii) an air network ensuring an efficient air and road corresponding connection. As it is evidenced by the absence of major entry over the last 20 years, these barriers are quite high and cannot be overcome, not even by outsourcing. As regards outsourcing of airlift, in fact, the Commission's findings were that it was not an effective alternative due to double marginalisation and generally lower service quality.

30. Given the absence of new entrants and the absence of countervailing buyer power, as even the largest UPS' customer accounts for less than [0-5] % of its total sales, the Commission concluded that should the merged entity unilaterally increase the prices on the express international intra-EEA market by [5-10] to [10-20] %, such rise would have not created an incentive to induce further entry or expansion in the timeframe relevant for the assessment of this concentration, as confirmed by a large majority of competitors.

(iv) *Efficiencies*

31. The Horizontal Merger Guidelines establish a cumulative set of requirements to take efficiencies into consideration. Efficiencies have to benefit consumers, be merger-specific and be verifiable. UPS claimed that the Merger was expected to give rise to significant efficiencies through the combination of the UPS and TNT's businesses. It pointed out the expected significant economies of density and of scope, improved service quality, and transactional efficiencies by combining their complementary networks: UPS customers gained access to TNT's extensive European road and freight network and TNT's customers benefited from access to UPS's worldwide network.

32. Following UPS' analysis, efficiencies would have benefited consumers, as the majority of the cost synergies were variable and merger-specific since they could not be achieved without full integration. To show that efficiencies were deemed verifiable, the Parties provided internal documents with estimates of the efficiencies following a certain number of years after closing the Merger, divided into three main areas: - operational (covering ground transportation costs), air network and management and administrative overheads, amounting to a total of EUR 400-550 million. Based on the Parties estimates, the total savings for the international intra-EEA express services would vary in the different countries.

33. The Commission agreed that the efficiencies were merger-specific, but it confirmed as verifiable only the cost savings related to the European air network and the ground handling, arising during the first three years after the completion of the Merger, that amount to respectively EUR [...] million, for intra Europe air network synergies and to EUR [...] million for ground handling. These savings were allocated on a country by country level based on UPS volume and cost data at the lane level. In order to estimate the pass-through rate of changes in variable costs to consumers, the Commission considered appropriate the estimate of the impact of total average cost changes on the price of international intra-EEA express services provided by the Parties following their price concentration analysis. This is likely to be an underestimation of the actual pass-through of marginal costs.

34. Based on the computation of the Commission, the total savings for the international intra-EEA express services in the different countries ranged from [0-5] to [5-10] % of the price.

35. UPS put forward that the operation would also induce out-of-market efficiencies. However, the Commission concluded that those were not verifiable to the required standard.

(v) *Country-by-country analysis*

36. The Commission evaluated the likely effects of the Merger, country by country, on the basis of four main factors: the market structure, the competitors' expansion plans in the next years, in particular FedEx' expansion plans, the results from the market investigation and the price effect taking into account efficiencies.

37. The Decision concludes that the proposed merger would likely lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the markets for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small package in 15 countries:

(i) Bulgaria, (ii) Czech Republic, (iii) Denmark, (iv) Estonia, (v) Finland, (vi) Hungary, (vii) Latvia, (viii) Lithuania, (ix) Malta, (x) the Netherlands, (xi) Poland, (xii) Romania, (xiii) Slovakia, (xiv) Slovenia and (xv) Sweden, as it is summarized in the following paragraphs.

38. Post transaction the integrators' market shares⁽¹⁾ in Bulgaria were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [30-40] %; DHL [50-60] %; FedEx [5-10] %. Because of FedEx's limited market presence, its very weak geographic coverage (on the destination side) and in view of internal documents relating to expansion plans in Bulgaria, it appeared to exert, at the time of the Decision and for the near future, a limited competitive constraint on the Parties.

39. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Bulgaria would have ranged between [5-10] % and [5-10] %, while the estimated net price effects in Bulgaria, by taking into account the efficiency gains would have been positive, ranging between [0-5] % and [5-10] %.

40. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Bulgarian market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

41. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in the Czech Republic were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [50-60] %; DHL [40-50] %; FedEx [5-10] %. FedEx is characterised by a limited market presence, a weaker geographic coverage (on the destination side) and longer time-in-transit data. In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a weak competitive constraint on the Parties even in the near future.

⁽¹⁾ For all the EEA countries, the Commission reconstructed the integrator's market positions basing itself on their revenues and on an integrator-only basis.

42. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from the Czech Republic would have ranged between [0-5] % and [0-5] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in the Czech Republic would have been positive, ranging between [0-5] % and [0-5] %.

43. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Czech market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

44. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Denmark were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [50-60] %; DHL [40-50] %; FedEx [5-10] %. FedEx is characterised by a limited market presence, a slightly weaker geographic coverage (on the destination side) and longer time in transit data. On the basis of FedEx's organic expansion in Denmark, it was deemed likely that in the near future FedEx would experience only a limited increase of its international intra-EEA express market share, with a resulting market share of less than [5-10] %.

45. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Denmark would have ranged between [0-5] % and [0-5] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Denmark would have been negative, ranging between -[0-5] % and -[0-5] %. Although the efficiencies appear to outweigh the price increases, there was a serious risk that the efficiencies alone would have been insufficient to outweigh the overall negative effect of the Merger. In fact, the merger would have eliminated an important competitive force from the Danish international intra-EEA express market and limited the possibilities of switching supplier while there was no sufficient countervailing buyer power and no entry or expansion was likely, timely and sufficient to defeat possible anticompetitive effects.

46. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Danish market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

47. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Estonia were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [40-50] %; DHL [50-60] %; FedEx [0-5] %. FedEx is characterised by a very limited market presence, with no geographic coverage (on the destination side). In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a weak competitive constraint on the Parties even in the near future.

48. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increases on lanes originating from Estonia would have ranged between [5-10] % and [5-10] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Estonia would have been positive, ranging between [0-5] % and [0-5] %.

49. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Estonian market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

50. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Finland were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [30-40] %; DHL [60-70] %; FedEx [0-5] %. FedEx is characterized by a very limited market presence, with weaker geographic coverage (on the destination side). Even more striking, FedEx does not offer premium services, i.e. morning deliveries to Sweden, Norway and Denmark, which are neighbouring countries. In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that it was unlikely that FedEx position would have changed in the foreseeable future to such an extent as to counter-act the negative effects of the Merger on competition.

51. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Finland would have ranged between [5-10] % and [5-10] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Finland would have remained positive, ranging between [0-5] % and [0-5] %, despite the expected cost savings.

52. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Finish market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

53. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Hungary were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [40-50]%; DHL [30-40]%; FedEx [10-20]%. FedEx has a significantly lower market share than each of the other three integrators, with weaker geographic coverage (on the destination side). In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a limited competitive constraint to the Parties even in the near future.

54. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Hungary would have ranged between [0-5] % and [0-5] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Hungary would have therefore ranged between -[0-5] % and [0-5] %. The quantitative analysis produces an ambiguous result in Hungary given that the net effect is predicted as a slight price decrease or a slight price increase.

55. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Hungarian market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

56. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Latvia were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [40-50]%; DHL [40-50]%; FedEx [5-10]%. FedEx can be considered as a weaker player in international intra-EEA express deliveries from Latvia with respect to the other integrators, because its limited market presence and its much weaker geographic coverage (on the destination side). In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a limited competitive constraint to the Parties even in the near future.

57. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Latvia would have ranged between [5-10] % and [5-10] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the estimated net price effects in Latvia would have been positive and significant, ranging between [0-5] % and [5-10] %.

58. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Latvian market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

59. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Lithuania were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [50-60]%; DHL [40-50]%; FedEx [0-5]%. FedEx is characterized by a very limited market presence, with no geographic coverage (on the destination side). In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a limited competitive constraint to the Parties even in the near future.

60. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Lithuania would have ranged between [5-10] % and [5-10] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Lithuania would have been positive and significant, ranging between [0-5] % and [5-10] %.

61. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Lithuanian market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

62. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Malta were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [40-50]%; DHL [50-60]%; FedEx [0-5]%. The outcome of the market investigation confirmed that FedEx is the weakest integrator as regards the international intra-EEA express deliveries. In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a weak competitive constraint on the Parties even in the near future.

63. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Malta would have ranged between [5-10] % and [10-20] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the estimated net price effects in Malta would have been positive, ranging between [5-10] % and [5-10] %.

64. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Maltese market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

65. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in the Netherlands were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [50-60] %; DHL [40-50] %; FedEx [5-10] %. All the integrators have 100 % geographic coverage (on the destination side). In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a limited competitive constraint to the Parties even in the near future.

66. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from the Netherlands would have ranged between [0-5] % and [0-5] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the estimated net price effect in the Netherlands would have been negative and range between -[0-5] to -[0-5] %. However, the quantification of net merger effects was given less weight because the model did not allow to capture the specificities of the Dutch market, as the estimated price effect reflects the fact that FedEx's coverage in the Netherlands is complete (in fact, all four integrators have 100 % coverage). The Commission noted that in the Netherlands, coverage data and market shares are particularly inconsistent. FedEx has a 100 % coverage but achieves very limited revenues.

67. The Commission considered that the Merger was likely to eliminate an important competitive force from the Dutch international intra-EEA express market where FedEx does not represent an effective competitive constraint to the Parties and to limit the possibilities of switching supplier while there is no sufficient countervailing buyer power and no entry or expansion is likely, timely and sufficient to defeat possible anticompetitive effects.

68. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Dutch market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

69. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Poland were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [40-50] %; DHL [40-50] %; FedEx [5-10] %. FedEx is characterised by a limited market presence, with a slightly weaker geographic coverage (on the destination side) so that it will represent a limited competitive constraint against the Parties. The recent acquisition by FedEx of Opek would allow FedEx to increase its domestic presence in Poland, but it will not add volume in terms of international intra-EEA express and in domestic express. On balance the Commission concluded that FedEx then is unlikely to become a significantly stronger competitive force on this market in the near future.

70. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Poland would have ranged between [0-5] % and [5-10] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Poland would have been positive, ranging between [0-5] % and [0-5] %.

71. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Polish market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

72. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Romania were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [40-50] %; DHL [50-60] %; FedEx [0-5] %. FedEx is characterised by a very limited market presence, with a much weaker geographic coverage (on the destination side). In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a weak competitive constraint on the Parties even in the near future.

73. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Romania would have ranged between [5-10] % and [5-10] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Romania would have been positive, ranging between [0-5] % and [5-10] %.

74. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Romanian market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

75. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Slovakia were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [40-50] %; DHL [40-50] %; FedEx [5-10] %. FedEx is characterised by a limited market presence, with a much weaker geographic coverage (on the destination side). In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a weak competitive constraint on the Parties even in the near future.

76. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Slovakia would have ranged between [0-5] % and [5-10] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Slovakia would have been positive, ranging between [0-5] % and [0-5] %.

77. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Slovakian market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

78. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Slovenia were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [30-40] %; DHL [60-70] %; FedEx [0-5] %. FedEx is characterised by a very limited market presence, with no geographic coverage (on the destination side). In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain in the near future a limited competitive constraint on the Parties.

79. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Slovenia would have ranged between [5-10] % and [5-10] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Slovenia would have been positive, ranging from [0-5] % to [0-5] %.

80. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Slovenian market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

81. Post transaction the integrators' market shares in Sweden were estimated as follows: UPS/TNT [40-50] %; DHL [50-60] %; FedEx [0-5] %. FedEx is characterised by a very limited market presence, with a geographic coverage (on the destination side) weaker than UPS and DHL. In view also of FedEx' internal documents relating to its expansion plans, on balance, the Commission concluded that FedEx would remain a weaker competitive constraint on the Parties even in the near future.

82. Following the Commission's price concentration analysis, price increase on lanes originating from Sweden would have ranged between [5-10] % and [5-10] % and taking into account the efficiency gains, the net price effects in Sweden would have been positive, ranging between [0-5] % and [0-5] %.

83. For these reasons, the Commission concluded that the merger would have been likely to lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on the Swedish market for international intra-EEA express deliveries of small packages.

V. COMMITMENTS

1. Description of the Commitments

84. UPS submitted three sets of commitments: (i) on 29 November 2012, (ii) on 16 December 2012 and (iii) on 3 January 2013.

85. The three remedy packages had, to different degrees, a structural and a behavioural pillar:

— a divestment remedy: sale of TNT's subsidiaries, in 17 countries to a single buyer.⁽¹⁾

— an access remedy: engagement of UPS to provide access to its intra-European air network from/to the remedies countries.

⁽¹⁾ (i) Bulgaria, (ii) the Czech Republic, (iii) Denmark, (iv) Estonia, (v) Finland, (vi) Hungary, (vii) Latvia, (viii) Lithuania, (ix) Malta, (x) the Netherlands, (xi) Poland, (xii) Romania, (xiii) Slovakia, (xiv) Slovenia and (xv) Sweden. As of the second package, the remedy also included Spain and Portugal.

86. Through the divestment, any overlap in the remedy Countries would have been eliminated.
87. None of the market players interrogated on the Commitments of 29 November 2012 and on the Commitments of 16 December 2012 declared being interested by the divested business as a whole, with the exception of La Poste/DPD.
88. As a result of the second market test, UPS presented another set of Commitments, on 3 January 2013, trying to accommodate particular needs of La Poste/DPD.

2. Assessment of the Commitments

89. The overall conclusion reached by the Commission was that the proposed commitments were not likely to eliminate the competition concerns raised in the Statement of Objections. On the one hand, UPS was unable to offer a fix-it-first or upfront-buyer solution, and on the other hand the Commitments in combination with the business plan of the only interested purchaser, La Poste/DPD, were insufficient to remove the Commission's concerns. In this respect, the following concerns were still present after the third package:

(i) *Timing of the conclusion of the divestment procedure*

90. La Poste/DPD would have had to negotiate with UPS, inter alia, a Share Purchase Agreement, but La Poste/DPD itself indicated that the due diligence could take considerably longer than estimated by UPS.

(ii) *Suitability of La Poste/DPD as a buyer of the divested activities*

91. La Poste/DPD provided no evidence that it had made an assessment of the profitability of the acquired international intra-EEA express services, in light of the comparatively small volumes and the required investments to be made in the non-remedy destination countries. Instead, La Poste/DPD assessed the overall profitability of the divested TNT subsidiaries as a whole, per group of countries. From its business plan, it turned out that La Poste/DPD had no precise economic data whatsoever relating to the profitability of the international intra-EEA express businesses.

92. La Poste/DPD furthermore stated that it did not intend to acquire, lease or charter aircraft once the agreement with UPS would have expired, despite its earlier negative opinion about the possibility to operate effectively in the international intra-EEA air-based express segment on the basis of outsourcing. This increased the above-mentioned doubts considerably with respect to the period that would have followed the expiry of the agreement on access to UPS air network.

93. As a consequence, there was insufficient evidence to allow the Commission to conclude that, were La Poste/DPD to take up the Commitments of 3 January 2013, it was likely that it would have developed a network able to handle international intra-EEA express deliveries across the EEA as efficiently as an integrator.

VI. CONCLUSION

94. For the reasons mentioned above, the Decision concludes that the proposed operation whereby United Parcel Service Inc. acquires sole control of TNT Express N.V. within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 is declared incompatible with the internal market and the EEA Agreement.

Communication from the Commission concerning the quantity not applied for to be added to the quantity fixed for the subperiod 1 July to 30 September 2014 under certain quotas opened by the Union for products in the poultrymeat, egg and egg albumin sectors

(2014/C 137/06)

Commission Regulations (EC) No 1384/2007⁽¹⁾ and (EC) No 1385/2007⁽²⁾ opened tariff quotas for imports of products in the poultrymeat sector. The import licence applications lodged during the first seven days of March 2014 for the subperiod 1 April to 30 June 2014 do not, for quotas 09.4091, 09.4092 and 09.4421, cover the quantities available. Pursuant to the second sentence of Article 7(4) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1301/2006⁽³⁾, the quantities that were not applied for are to be added to the quantity fixed for the following quota subperiod, from 1 July to 30 September 2014; they are set out in the Annex to this notice.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 309, 27.11.2007, p. 40.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 309, 27.11.2007, p. 47.

⁽³⁾ OJ L 238, 1.9.2006, p. 13.

ANNEX

Quota order number	Quantities not applied for, to be added to the quantity fixed for the subperiod 1 July to 30 September 2014 (kg)
09.4091	280 000
09.4092	1 627 000
09.4421	350 000

NOTICES FROM MEMBER STATES

Publication of decisions by Member States to grant, suspend or revoke operating licenses pursuant to Article 10(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008 on common rules for the operation of air services in the Community⁽¹⁾

(recast)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2014/C 137/07)

In accordance with Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008 on common rules for the operation of air services in the Community (recast), the European Commission publishes the decisions to grant, suspend or revoke operating licences taken by Member States during the period 1 January to 31 December 2013.

Operating licences granted

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category ⁽¹⁾	Decision effective since
Austria	Agiles Aviation GmbH	Glanegg 2, 5082 Gröding	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	3.6.2013
Austria	X-Jet GmbH	Walfischgasse 8/13, 1010 Wien	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	6.3.2013
Bulgaria	AIR BRIGHT Ltd	116A, vh.B, app. 27, Geo Milev str., Sofia 1574	Cargo, mail	A	22.5.2013
Bulgaria	'A L K' Jsc	2A, N. Obreshkov str., Sofia 1113	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	25.1.2013
Bulgaria	JET OPS EUROPE Ltd	App.2, 14 Karnigradska str., Sofia 1000	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	12.8.2013
Czech Republic	Eclair Aviation s.r.o.	Italská 1580/26, Vinohrady, Praha 2, PSČ 120 00	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	7.7.2013
Denmark	Jutland Jets Air Taxa A/S	Karup Airport, N O Hansens vej 4, 7470 Karup	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	4.3.2013

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 293, 31.10.2008, p. 3.

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category ⁽¹⁾	Decision effective since
Estonia	AS Fort Aero	Viru väljak 2, 10111 Tallinn	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	18.10.2013
Estonia	Nordic Jet OÜ	Paljassaare tee 14, 10313 Tallinn	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	10.10.2013
Finland	Airline Management Technologies ALMT Oy	Siipitie 11, 01530 Vantaa	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	17.5.2013
France	ALPHI	31 boulevard de la Tour Maubourg 75007 Paris	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	28.2.2013
France	EWA AIR	Place de France, Immeuble Issoufali BP 52, 97610 Dzaoudzi	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	23.10.2013
France	HOP!	Parc tertiaire SILIC, 40 rue d'Arcueil 94150 Rungis	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	15.3.2013
France	VOLDIRECT SAS	22 bis rue des Landes 35135 Chantepie	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.3.2013
France	Héli Sphère 45	Aérodrome des Quatre Vents 45500 st Denis de l'Hôtel	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	31.5.2013
France	HELISAIR	Aérodrome de Grenoble Le Versoud 38420 Le Versoud	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	6.6.2013
Germany	aeroways GmbH	Clemensstraße 49, 80803 München	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	27.6.2013
Germany	B-Air Charter GmbH & Co. KG	Bernhäuser Hauptstraße 14, 70794 Filderstadt	Passengers	B	14.1.2013
Germany	DL Helicopter Technik GmbH	Walter-Carsten-Straße 1, 27637 Nordholz	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	29.7.2013
Germany	Helicopter Business Travel GmbH & Co. KG	Am Plärrer 35, 90443 Nürnberg	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	23.9.2013
Germany	HeliSense GmbH	Thalmühlstraße 32, 86739 Ederheim	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	3.5.2013

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category ⁽¹⁾	Decision effective since
Germany	Pro Jet GmbH	Berliner Allee 11-22 66482 Zweibrücken	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	20.11.2013
Greece	AEROSPACE ONE	Koumpi 24 - 19003 Markopoulo Mesogaias Attikis	Cargo, mail	A	17.9.2013
Ireland	National Flight Centre Limited	Weston Airport, Leixlip, Co. Kildare.	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	31.5.2013
Italy	Ariane s.r.l. Unipersonale	Via Colonnello Alessi n.15 – 23100 Sondrio (SO)	Passengers, cargo	B	23.9.2013
Italy	E+S Air s.r.l.	Contrada Ficocelle s.n.c. 84081 — Ogliastro Cilento (SA)	Passengers, cargo	B	10.12.2013
Italy	Hoverfly s.r.l.	Via Benedetto Croce n. 249 – 66100 Chieti (CH)	Passengers, cargo	B	22.2.2013
Lithuania	Air Lituania, UAB	J. Galvydžio str. 5, 08236 Vilnius	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	6.8.2013
Lithuania	Grand Cru Airlines, UAB	Dariaus ir Gireno str. 81-1, 02189 Vilnius	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	19.7.2013
Poland	Husair sp. z o.o.	ul. Księżycowa 3, Hangar 11, 01-934 Warszawa	Passengers, cargo	B	4.10.2013
Poland	Royal-Star sp. z o.o.	ul. Drogowców 7, 39-200 Dębica	Passengers, cargo	B	15.11.2013
Romania	S.C. BLUE AIR – AIRLINE MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS S.R.L.	17 Teheran Street, sector 1, Bucharest	Passengers, cargo	A	20.8.2013
Romania	S.C. INTERAVIATION CHARTER SRL	Bucuresti, Bd. Regiei nr. 2, sector 6	Passengers, cargo	A	28.1.2013
Romania	S.C. UNITED EUROPEAN AIRLINES S.R.L.	5 Georges Bizet Street, sector 2, Bucharest	Passengers	B	22.8.2013
Slovakia	Air Carpatia, s.r.o.	Slowackého 4673/24, 821 04 Bratislava	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	18.3.2013
Slovakia	Go2Sky, spol. s.r.o.	Ivánska cesta 65/3421, 821 04 Bratislava	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	3.7.2013
Slovakia	EHC service, s.r.o.	Sibírska 2, 080 01 Prešov	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	19.6.2013

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category ⁽¹⁾	Decision effective since
Spain	BIGAS GRUP, S.L.	Carretera del Masnou, Km. 14,300 – 08400 Granollers (Barcelona)	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	23.5.2013
Spain	BIGAS GRUP HELICOPTERS, S.L.	Carretera del Masnou, Km. 14,300 – 08400 Granollers (Barcelona)	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	13.11.2013
Spain	EVELOP AIRLINES, S.L.	José Rover Motta, 27 – 07006 Palma De Mallorca	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	22.11.2013
Sweden	Saab AB	581 88 Linköping	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	12.8.2013
Sweden	Sundt Air Sweden AB	Hässlögatan 6, 721 31 Västerås	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	22.3.2013
Switzerland	Heli Sitterdorf AG	Flugplatz, 8589 Sitterdorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.5.2013
UK	Apem Aviation Ltd	Unit 3 And 4A, Business Park, Flint Road, Saltney Ferry, Chester. CH4 0GZ	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	8.5.2013
UK	Blu Halkin Ltd	Marshall Business Aviation Centre, Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge. CB5 8RX	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	12.7.2013
UK	London Helicopter Centres Ltd	The Servotec Building, Redhill Aerodrome, Redhill, Surrey. RH1 5JY	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	15.8.2013
UK	Newcastle Aviation Ltd	Number 1, Apex Building Village, Annitsford, Cramlington, Northumberland. NE23 7BF	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	19.12.2013
UK	BAE Systems (Corporate Air Travel) Ltd	Warwick House, PO Box 87 Farnborough, Aerospace Centre, Farnborough, Hampshire. GU14 6YU	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	19.12.2013

⁽¹⁾ Category A: Operating licences without the restriction of Article 5(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008.
Category B: Operating licences including the restriction of Article 5(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008.

Temporary operating licences granted

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Temporary licence until
Italy	Blue Panorama Airlines S.p.A.	Viale Liegi n. 32 – 00198 Roma	Passengers, cargo	A	23.4.2013	23.10.2013
Italy	Blue Panorama Airlines S.p.A.	Viale Liegi n. 32 – 00198 Roma	Passengers, cargo	A	23.10.2013	23.4.2014

Operating licences revived

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
Germany	Advanced Aviation Logistic GmbH	Glockeneichweg 135 88341 Bad Saulgau	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	13.12.2013
Italy	Air Italy S.p.A.	Corso Sempione n. 111 – 21013 Gallarate (MI)	Passengers, cargo	A	Revocation of Temporary Operating Licence and Reinstatement of the Operating Licence since 14.10.2013
Italy	Meridiana Fly S.p.A.	Centro Direzionale Aeroporto Costa Smeralda – 07026 Olbia	Passengers, cargo	A	Revocation of Temporary Operating Licence and Reinstatement of the Operating Licence since 3.6.2013
Netherlands	AIS Airlines B.V.	Flamingoweg 20, 8218NW Lelystad	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	24.9.2013 CAMO/AOC was temporary suspended 10.9.2013 – 24.9.2013
Romania	S.C. VALAHIA AIR SRL	Bucuresti, sector 1, Bd. Ficusului nr. 1, et. 1, ap 4	Passengers, cargo	B	Suspension cancelled. Operating Licence (1st Edition) valid from 16.12.2013

Operating licences suspended

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Czech Republic	HOLIDAYS Czech Airlines, a.s.	Praha 6, Jana Kašpara 1069/1, PSČ 160 08	Passengers, mail, cargo	A	8.11.2013	
France	Taxi Caraïbes Air	Les Hauts de Californie 97232 Le Lamentin	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	12.7.2013	revoked on 1.8.2013
Germany	ACG Air Cargo Germany GmbH	Gebäude 13 35 55483 Hahn – Airport	Cargo	A	17.4.2013	
Germany	Arrow Airservice Inhaber: Winfried Gebhardt	Flugplatz F1/19 15344 Strausberg	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	28.10.2013	
Germany	Augsburg Airways GmbH	Wartungsallee 13 85356 München	Passengers, mail, cargo	A	1.11.2013	
Germany	Condor Berlin GmbH	Willy-Brandt-Platz 2 12529 Schönefeld	Passengers, mail, cargo	A	2.5.2013	
Germany	DL Helicopter GmbH	Werkstr. 11 21218 Seevetal	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	30.7.2013	
Germany	Dresdner Luftfahrtgesellschaft mbH	Heinrich-Mann-Str. 2 01156 Dresden	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	1.2.2013	
Germany	Eifelair Geschäfts- u. Charterflug GmbH	Vollmert 32 53902 Bad Münstereifel	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	31.7.2013	
Germany	Fly Point Flugservice Haufe KG	Am Küngelhof 4 99820 Hörselberg-Hainich	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	9.12.2013	
Germany	GAS Air Service GmbH	Am Bahnhof 5, 49201 Dissen – (false: 49201 Greven)	Passengers, mail, cargo	A	12.3.2013	
Germany	Germania Express Fluggesellschaft mbH	Lilienthalstraße 6 12529 Schönefeld OT Waltersdorf	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	1.11.2013	
Germany	Greenbird GmbH	Dürrheimer Str. 90 78166 Donaueschingen	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	11.1.2013	

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Germany	Hanseflug GmbH	Nordstraße 18, 30855 Langenhagen	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	2.9.2013	
Germany	Heli AG & Co. KG	Carl-Benz-Straße 3 79211 Denzlingen	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	1.11.2013	
Germany	OLT Express Germany GmbH	Henrich-Focke-Str. 6 28199 Bremen	Passengers, mail, cargo	A	28.1.2013	
Germany	Rhein-Ruhr-Helicopter Rainer Zemke GmbH & Co.KG	Flughafen 34, 41066 Mönchengladbach	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	6.11.2013	
Germany	Vibro-Air Flugservice GmbH & Co. KG	Mozartstr. 19 41065 Mönchengladbach	Passengers, mail, cargo	A	2.9.2013	
Germany	VIP-FLIGHTS GmbH	Einsteinstr. 37 82152 Martinsried, Gemeinde Planegg	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	12.2.2013	
Germany	Wiesbadener Flugdienst Kunkel KG	Unter den Eichen 7, 65195 Wiesbaden	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	15.4.2013	
Greece	AVIATOR AIRWAYS S.A.	Vouliagmenis Ave. 85 Glyfada 16674	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	3.4.2013	
Greece	HELLENIC IMPERIAL AIRWAYS S.A.	102, VOULIAGMENIS AVE. & ERMOU 167 77 ELLINIKO	Passengers, mail, cargo	A	16.1.2013	
Greece	INTERJET S.A.	40,2 Km Attikis Road 19002 Paiania Attikis	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	23.4.2013	
Ireland	Premier Helicopters Limited	Bond Road, East Wall, Dublin 3.	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	10.1.2013	
Italy	Aermarche S.p.A.	Via della Vittorina n. 60 – 06024 Gubbio (PG)	Passengers	B	10.1.2013	
Italy	Air Vallée S.p.A	Via Flaminia n. 409 – 47924 Rimini (RN)	Passengers	A	24.4.2013	
Italy	Belle Air Europe s.r.l.	Piazzale Sandro Sordoni – 60015 Falconara Marittima (AN)	Passengers, cargo	A	27.11.2013	

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Italy	Palio Air Service s.r.l.	Via dei Fossi n. 14/C – 59100 Prato (PO)	Passengers, cargo	B	7.10.2013	
Italy	S.T.C. Aviation S.p.A.	Via Francesco Rolla n. 29 – 16152 Genova (GE)	Passengers	B	19.11.2013	
Netherlands	AIS Airlines B.V.	Flamingoweg 20, 8218NW Lelystad	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	3.9.2013	Decree ILT-2013/29 211 CAMO/AOC suspended
Romania	BLUE AIR TRANSPORT AERIAN S.A.	Bucuresti, str. Buzesti nr. 71, sector 1	Passengers, mail	A	20.8.2013	
Romania	S.C. VALAHIA AIR SRL	Bucuresti, sector 1, Bd. Ficusului nr. 1, et. 1, ap 4	Passengers, cargo	B	20.6.2013	Suspension of the Air Operator Certificate
Romania	SC JETLAN AIR SRL	Bucuresti, str. Coralilor nr 20C, corp C2, sector 1	Passengers, cargo	A	28.1.2013	
Romania	S.C. MEDALLION AIR SRL	Bucuresti, str. Nicolae Caramfil nr. 77, parter, sector 1	Passengers, cargo	A	20.6.2013	Suspension of the Air Operator Certificate
Spain	AIR LINK SOLUTIONS, S.L.	Narcisos, 20 – 28016 Madrid	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	27.9.2013	
Spain	CANARIAS AERONAUTICA, S.L.	Luis Saavedra Miranda, 26 – 35014 LAS PALMAS (GRAN CANARIA)	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	31.10.2013	
Spain	DOMINGUEZ TOLEDO, S.A.	La Orotava, 118 – 29006 MÁLAGA	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	23.4.2013	
Spain	HELISWISS IBERICA, S.A.	Aeropuerto de Sabadell – Hangar nº 4 – Lado Norte – 08205 Sabadell (Barcelona)	Passengers, mail, cargo	B	22.1.2013	
Spain	IBERWORLD AIRLINES, S.A.	Carretera de Valldemosa Km. 7,4 – Edificio Orizonia Parcbit – 07121 Palma de Mallorca	Passengers, mail, cargo	A	17.5.2013	

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Spain	TURISVOL, S.L.	Santiago Rusiñol, s/n – Apartado de Correos 181 – 17250 Playa de Aro (Girona)	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	27.2.2013	Operating licence suspended until 8.10.2013
Spain	IMD AIRWAYS, S.L.	Morse, 14 – 28906 GETAFE (MADRID)	Passengers, mail, cargo	A	27.9.2013	
Spain	LET'S FLY, S.L.	Port ginesta, local 814 – 08860 LES BOTIGUES DE SITGES (BARCELONA)	Passenger, mail, cargo	A	14.10.2013	
UK	RotorMotion UK Limited	14-16 Station Road, Oxted, Surrey. RH8 9EP	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	22.3.2013	7.6.2013 (Revoked)
UK	Suckling Airways (Cambridge) Ltd	Suite 335, The Quorum, Barnwell Drive, Cambridge. CB5 8RE	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	25.4.2013	14.5.2013 (Revoked)
UK	Excel Charter Ltd	Hangar 17, Stapleford Aerodrome, Stapleford Tawney, Essex	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	4.6.2013	
UK	PremiAir Aviation Services Ltd	Business Aviation Centre, Blackbushe Airport, Camberley, Surrey	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	12.11.2013	
UK	Redhill Aviation Ltd	Standen Farm, Standen, East Grinstead, West Sussex	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	17.12.2013	

Voluntary surrender of operating licences

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
Denmark	CHC Denmark ApS	John Tranums Vej 20, 6705 Esbjerg Ø	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	31.1.2013
Spain	BIGAS GRUP, S.L.	Carretera del Masnou, Km. 14,300 – 08400 GRANOLLERS (BARCELONA)	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	14.11.2013

Operating licences revoked

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Austria	Air-Styria Luftfahrtunternehmen Ges.m.b.H.	Flughafen Graz, 8073 Feldkirchen bei Graz	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	2.9.2013	
Austria	Early-birds GmbH	Schachenwald 37, 8073 Feldkirchen bei Graz	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	19.7.2013	
Austria	Flugtaxi Gesellschaft m.b.H.	Schillerstraße 19, 4910 Ried im Innkreis	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	19.7.2013	
Austria	JETALLIANCE Flugbetriebs GmbH	Flugplatz 1, 2542 Kottlingbrunn	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	8.10.2013	
Austria	JETALLIANCE South GmbH	Flugplatz 1, 2542 Kottlingbrunn	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	16.10.2013	
Austria	'VIF' Luftfahrtgesellschaft mbH	Schwefel 91, BT 4, 6850 Dornbirn	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	29.4.2013	
Bulgaria	Air Scorpio Ltd	Ul. Persenk 73, Sofia – 1164	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	10.9.2013	Licence: No. BG 1008 – 04/4.7.2011 – revoked
Bulgaria	'AVB-2010' Jsc.	2A, Nikola Obreshkov Str., 1113 Sofia	Passengers, cargo	A	30.1.2013	Operating Licence № BG 1008-11 of 7.12.2011
Finland	Airecon Oy	Liikelentotie 8, 01530 Vantaa	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	17.5.2013	
Finland	Oulun Helikopteripalvelu Oy	Lentokatu 2, 90460 Oulunsalo	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	3.10.2013	
France	AERO ENTREPRISE	Aéroport de Toussus le Noble, Bat 311 78117 Toussus le Noble	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	23.10.2013	

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
France	Aérozais	1 rue du Coin 49000 Cholet	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.10.2013	
France	Atlantique Air Lines	27 rue de la Clef des Champs 44118 La Chevrolière	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	30.10.2013	Radiation du RCS (annonce officielle BODACC B du 26.6.2013) Fusion avec Atlantique Air Assistance
France	Avialim	Aéroport de Limoges 87100 Limoges	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	14.3.2013	liquidation judiciaire à/c du 7.3.2013 par décision du Tribunal de Commerce de Limoges du 6.3.2013
France	Aviaxess	Héliport de Paris, 61 rue Henri Farman 75015 Paris	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	15.12.2013	liquidation judiciaire jugement à effet du 12.12.2013 CTA non renouvelé licence temporaire valable jusqu'au 15.12.2013 non reconduite
France	SN THS	51 avenue Jean Jaurès 69007 Lyon	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	30.9.2013	
France	Taxi Caraïbes AIR	Aéroport de Fort de France Le Lamentin Zone Aviation générale, Les Hauts de Californie, 97232 Le Lamentin	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.8.2013	after suspension on 12.7.2013
France	Transports Aériens Intercaraïbes (TAI)	SFA La Côte sauvage 97098 Saint Barthélemy	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	10.9.2013	
Germany	ACG Air Cargo Germany GmbH	Gebäude 13 35 55483 Hahn — Airport	Cargo	A	31.10.2013	suspended since 17.4.2013

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Germany	Advance Air Luftfahrtgesellschaft mbH	Buchenweg 17 35789 Weilmünster	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	24.7.2013	suspended since 3.12.2012
Germany	Condor Berlin GmbH	Willy-Brandt-Platz 2 12529 Schönefeld	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	13.12.2013	suspended since 2.5.2013
Germany	Contact Air Flugdienst GmbH & Co. KG	Gottlieb-Manz-Strasse 2 70794 Filderstadt	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	31.5.2013	suspended since 31.8.2012
Germany	Dresdner Luftfahrtgesellschaft mbH	Heinrich-Mann-Str. 2 01156 Dresden	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	22.10.2013	suspended since 1.2.2013
Germany	Elbe Helicopter GmbH & Co. KG	Flugplatz Bautzen 02627 Kubschütz	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	27.2.2013	suspended since 2.4.2012
Germany	FSH Luftfahrtunternehmen GmbH	Schloßplatz 1 04827 Machern	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	31.5.2013	suspended since 1.7.2012
Germany	GAS Air Service GmbH	Am Bahnhof 5, 49201 Dissen	Passengers,cargo,mail	A	24.9.2013	suspended since 12.3.2013
Germany	German Sky Airlines GmbH	Lierenfelder Str. 45 40231 Düsseldorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	14.3.2013	suspended since 1.12.2012
Germany	Greenbird GmbH	Dürrheimer Str. 90 78166 Donaueschingen	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	21.8.2013	suspended since 11.1.2013
Germany	HOMAC Aviation AG	Am Flughafen 46 88046 Friedrichshafen	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	30.10.2013	suspended since 20.6.2013
Germany	OLT Express Germany GmbH	Henrich-Focke-Str. 6 28199 Bremen	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	29.8.2013	suspended since 28.1.2013
Germany	PrivateJet International GmbH	Flughafenallee 24-28 28199 Bremen	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	13.6.2013	suspended since 29.8.2012
Germany	VIP-FLIGHTS GmbH	Einsteinstr. 37 82152 Martinsried, Gemeinde Planegg	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	8.10.2013	suspended since 12.2.2013

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Germany	Wiesbadener Flugdienst Kunkel KG	Unter den Eichen 7, 65195 Wiesbaden	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	16.10.2013	suspended since 15.4.2013
Germany	XL Airways Germany GmbH	Hessenring 13 64546 Mörfelden-Walldorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	10.7.2013	suspended since 15.12.2012
Greece	INTERJET ΕΛΙΚΟΠΤΕΡΑ Α.Ε.	40,2 klm Attikis Road. 19002 Paiania Attikis	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	21.3.2013	
Greece	SKY WINGS AIRLINES S.A.	58, Vouliagmenis Ave. 16675 Voula Attikis	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	10.5.2013	
Ireland	Premier Helicopters Limited	Bond Road, East Wall, Dublin 3.	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	2.4.2013	Suspended since 10.1.2013
Italy	Air Mach s.r.l.	Via Mazzini n. 225 – 15067 NOVI LIGURE (AL)	Passengers	B	17.9.2013	
Italy	Delta Aerotaxi s.r.l.	Via del Termine n. 11 - 50127 Firenze (FI)	Passengers	B	29.8.2013	
Italy	Eagles S.p.A.	Via delle Arti n. 101/A - 00054 Fiumicino (RM)	Passengers, cargo	A	2.9.2013	
Italy	Executive Aircraft Management s.r.l.	Viale dell'Aviazione n. 65 – 20138 Milano (MI)	Passengers	B	2.10.2013	
Italy	Halkin Jet s.r.l.	Via Piera Cillario Ferrero n. 8 – 12051 Alba (CN)	Passengers	B	1.2.2013	
Italy	Helica s.r.l.	Via Fratelli Solari n. 10 – Zona Industriale – 33020 AMARO (UD)	Passengers, cargo	B	25.9.2013	
Italy	Interfly s.r.l.	Via Aldo Moro n. 10 – 25100 BRESCIA	Passengers, cargo	B	29.8.2013	
Italy	Rotkopf Aviation Italia s.r.l.	Via Bartolomeo Cavaceppi n. 113 – 00127 Roma (RM)	Passengers, cargo	B	19.11.2013	
Latvia	SIA 'Simplejet LV'	International airport 'Riga', Marupes civil parish, Riga district 1054	Passengers	A	22.11.2013	
Lithuania	Aurela, UAB	Rodunios kelias 32, 02187 Vilnius	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	11.6.2013	

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Netherlands	Air Charters Europe B.V.	Machlaan 26 A- 9761TK Eelde	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	3.7.2013	Air Charters Europe decision nr. ILT-2013/22725 Audit Report nr ILT-2013/22725 Audit basis Category B Chamber of Commerce nr. 4082190
Netherlands	Anti Gravity B.V.	Arendweg 33 - 8218PE Lelystad	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	26.4.2013	Temporary licence expired. AOC limited to A-to-A.
Netherlands	Special Air Services B.V.	Postbus 198 7390 AD TWELLO	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	26.4.2013	AOC NL-AOC-13/23 limited to A-to-A (EU-OPS appendix 1 EU OPS 1.005(a)).
Poland	OLT Express Poland sp. z o.o.	ul. Puławska 465, 02-844 Warszawa	Passengers	A	10.5.2013	
Poland	OLT Express Regional sp. z o.o.	ul. Długie Ogrody 8 -14, 80-755 Gdańsk	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	8.4.2013	
Poland	Silvair sp. z o.o.	Al. Komisji Edukacji Narodowej 93/B3, 02-777 Warszawa	Passengers, cargo	B	29.7.2013	
Romania	Compania Romana de Aviatie ROMAVIA	Bd. Dimitrie Cantemir nr. 1, sector 4 Bucuresti	Passengers, cargo	A	24.5.2013	

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Romania	S.C. InterAviation SRL	Str. Verii nr. 1 – 3, Sector 2, Bucuresti	Passengers, cargo	B	4.6.2013	
Romania	SC JETTRAN AIR SRL	Bucuresti, str. Coralilor nr 20C, corp C2, sector 1	Passengers, cargo	A	5.8.2013	Operating Licence was suspended starting with 28.1.2013
Romania	SC ROMSTRADE LOGISTIC EXPRESS SRL	judetul Giurgiu, sat Adunatii-Copaceni, comuna Adunatii-Copaceni (SOLA 50, nr. topografic 783, camera 4)	Passengers, cargo	B	22.5.2013	
Romania	SC ALFA AIR SERVICES SRL	Bd. Basarabia nr. 250, etaj 2, Corp administrativ (birouri), etajul 2 al Grupului Industrial TITAN, biroul nr. 215, sector 3, București	Passengers	B	18.3.2013	
Spain	AEROTEC ESCUELA DE PILOTOS, S.L.	Chalet del RACE s/n — Aeropuerto de Cuatro Vientos - 28044 Madrid	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	18.7.2013	
Spain	ISLAS AIRWAYS, S.A.	Avda. Punta de Anaga, 36 – 1ª Planta – 38111 Santa Cruz de Tenerife.	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	10.7.2013	Islas Airways, S.A. held a temporary licence until 10.7.2013. This licence was suspended on 30.10.2012 and became extincted on 10.7.2013.
Spain	MINT LÍNEAS AÉREAS, S.A.	Los Arfe, 66 – 28027 MADRID	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	10.4.2013	
Spain	SOKO AVIATION, S.L.	Base Aérea Civil – Complejo Base Aérea – 28850 TORREJÓN DE ARDOZ (MADRID)	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	3.10.2013	
Spain	SPANAIR, S.A.	Plaza de Europa, 54-56 – 08902 L'HOSPITALET DE LLOBREGAT (BARCELONA).	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	29.4.2013	
Sweden	JE Time Sweden AB	Kanalvägen10C, 194 61 Upplands Väsby	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	9.9.2013	

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
Sweden	Sweden Airways AB	Ellipsvägen 5, 141 75 Kungens Kurva	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	15.1.2013	
UK	Oasis Flight Ltd	One Ash, The Green, East End, Witney, Oxfordshire. OX29 6PY	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	29.1.2013	
UK	Veritair Aviation Limited	Cardiff Heliport, Foreshore Road, East Moors, Cardiff. CF10 4LZ	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.5.2013	
UK	Suckling Airways (Cambridge) Ltd	Suite 335, The Quorum, Barnwell Drive, Cambridge. CB5 8RE	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	14.5.2013	
UK	Blue City Aviation Ltd	Anson House, Coventry Airport West, Coventry. CV8 3AZ	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	7.6.2013	
UK	MB Air Ltd	Newcastle City Heliport, Railway Street, Newcastle Upon Tyne. NE4 7AN	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	7.6.2013	
UK	Ocean Sky (UK) Ltd	Portland House, Bressenden Place, London. SW1E 5BH	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	7.6.2013	
UK	RotorMotion UK Limited	14-16 Station Road, Oxted, Surrey. RH8 9EP	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	7.6.2013	
UK	Alan Mann Helicopters Ltd	Fairoaks Airport, Chobham nr Woking, Surrey. GU24 8HX	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	11.6.2013	
UK	Bmibaby Ltd	PO Box 737, Donington Hall, Castle Donington, Derby, Derbyshire, DE74 2SB	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	11.6.2013	
UK	Manhattan Jet Management Ltd	Suite 217 Business Aviation Centre, Farnborough International Airport, Farnborough, Hampshire. GU14 6XA	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	27.6.2013	
UK	Cranfield Helicopters Ltd	Hangar 1, Cranfield Airport, Cranfield, Bedford. MK43 0JR	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	11.7.2013	
UK	Lakeland Seaplane Tours Ltd	Unit 7 St Angelo Airport, Trory, Enniskellen, Co Fermanagh, Northern Ireland. BT94 2FP	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	14.8.2013	

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since	Comments
UK	HD Air Ltd	Elmdon Building, Birmingham International Airport, Birmingham. B26 3QN	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	18.12.2013	
UK	Cambridge Aero Club Ltd	Airport House, The Airport, Cambridge. CB5 8RY	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	27.12.2013	

Change of name of license holder

Member State	Old name of air carrier	New name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
France	Airlinair	HOP!-AIRLINAIR	Parc d'affaires SILIC 24-26 rue de Villeneuve BP 40193 94 563 Rungis Cedex	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	BODACC B du 26.7.2013
France	Brit Air	HOP!-BRIT AIR	Aérodrome de Morlaix CS 27925 29679 Morlaix Cedex	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	BODACC B du 17.7.2013
France	DARTA	AERO JET	Bât H5 Aéroport du Bourget 175 Avenue de l'Europe 93350 Le Bourget	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	chgt du nom acté par l'AGE actionnaires de DARTA Transport Aérien du 30.11.2012 arrêté du 13.2.2013
France	Regional CAE	HOP!-REGIONAL	Aéroport de Nantes atlantique 44340 Bouguenais	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	BODACC B du 11.7.2013
Italy	Air One Executive S.p.A.	Livingston Executive S.p.A.	Corso Sempione n. 111 - 21013 Gallarate (MI)	Passengers and goods	B	10.4.2013
Germany	COMMANDER Flugdienst GmbH	AAA Aviation & Aircraft Assets GmbH	Van-der-Smissen-Str. 9, 22767 Hamburg	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	27.5.2013
Germany	HELI Flight Flugschule- Flugbetrieb GmbH & Co.KG	HELI-FLIGHT GmbH & Co KG	Flugplatz, 61203 Reichelsheim	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	21.6.2013

Member State	Old name of air carrier	New name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
Germany	WDL Aviation GmbH & Co. KG	WDL Aviation GmbH & Co. Kommanditgesellschaft	Flughafen Köln/Bonn Flugzeughalle 6, 51130 Köln	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	1.1.2013
Netherlands	Lelykopters BV	HeliCentre Helicopter Services BV	Arendweg 33 8218 PE Lelystad	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	3.12.2013
Portugal	Airlinair Portugal — Serviços Aéreo, S.A.	LFAS — Lease Fly Aviation Services, S.A.	Rua Bartolomeu de Gusmão, nº 18, 2745-269 São Domingos de Rana	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	28.3.2013
Portugal	Perfect Aviation, S.A.	United Jet Services, S.A.	Rua Bartolomeu de Gusmão, nº 118, 2785-269 São Domingos de Rana	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	16.12.2013
Sweden	Andersson Business Jet AB	Bromma Business Jet AB	c/o SCA, Box 200, 101 23 Stockholm	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	5.8.2013
Sweden	Golden Air Flyg AB	Braathens Regional AB	Trollhättan Vänersborg Flygplats 461 83 Västra Tunhem	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	11.1.2013
Switzerland	Bonsai Helicopter AG	Helialpin AG	Airport St.Gallen- Altenrhein Rütiweg 1340, 9423 Altenrhein	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	19.11.2013

Change of address of the license holder

Member State	Name of air carrier	Old address of air carrier	New address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
Austria	Altenrhein Luftfahrt GmbH	Schwefel 91, 6850 Dornbirn	Office Park 3, Top 312, 1300 Wien-Flughafen	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	15.7.2013
Austria	Globe Air AG	Linzerstraße 30 4063 Hörsching	Polytec-Straße 1 4063 Hörsching	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	11.11.2013
Austria	International Jet Management GmbH	Oppolzergasse 6, 1010 Wien	Concorde Business Park 2/F 14, 2320 Schwechat	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	14.2.2013

Member State	Name of air carrier	Old address of air carrier	New address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
Bulgaria	SUNLIGHT AIR Jsc	17, Debar str., 1618 Sofia	fl.12, 159, Tsar Boris III Blvd., 1618, Sofia	Passengers	A	12.11.2013
Czech Republic	HELI CZECH s.r.o.	Světlá pod Hoříčkami 39, PSČ 552 05	Pardubice, Luďka Maturovy 811, Studánka, PSČ 530 12	Passengers, mail	B	13.8.2013
Germany	AirGo Flugservice GmbH & Co. KG	Am Finther Wald 5833 55126 Mainz-Finthen	Am Finther Wald 5833 55126 Mainz	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.1.2013
Germany	Augusta Air Luftfahrtunternehmen, Yachtcharter und Videogeräteverleih Hans Schneider e.K.	Flughafenstr. 5 86169 Augsburg	Flughafenstr. 3 86169 Augsburg	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.1.2013
Germany	B-Air Charter GmbH & Co. KG	Bernhäuser Hauptstraße 14 70794 Filderstadt	Plieninger Straße 70 70794 Filderstadt	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	16.10.2013
Germany	BSF Swissphoto GmbH	Am Flughafen Schönefeld Mittelstraße 7 12529 Schönefeld	Mittelstraße 7 12529 Schönefeld	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.1.2013
Germany	City-Flight Germany GmbH	Ruhrstraße 54-56 41469 Neuss	Flughafenstraße 69 41066 Mönchengladbach	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	11.2.2013
Germany	Classic Wings GmbH	Ellewick 24 48691 Vreden	Flughafenstraße 48 40474 Düsseldorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	29.11.2013
Germany	FAIR AIR GmbH	Moritzhöfen 7 95447 Bayreuth	Flugplatzstr. 1, 95463 Bindlach	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	4.7.2013
Germany	FLN FRISIA-Luftverkehr GmbH Norddeich	Flugplatz 26506 Norddeich	Westerlooger Strohweg 5 26506 Norden	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	20.9.2013
Germany	Flugschule- und Luftfahrtunternehmen ARDEX GmbH Berlin Land Brandenburg	Flugplatz Heinrichsfelde 16866 Kyritz	Flugplatz 2b 16866 Kyritz	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.1.2013
Germany	Heli Aviation GmbH	Flughafenstr. 7 86169 Augsburg	Flughafenstr. 19, 86169 Augsburg	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	27.2.2013

Member State	Name of air carrier	Old address of air carrier	New address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
Germany	HHS Hanseatic Helicopter Service GmbH	Flughafen Hamburg, Geschäftsfliegerzentrum, Gebäude 347 A 22335 Hamburg	Flughafen Hamburg, Geschäftsfliegerzentrum (Geb. 347 A) Flughafenstr. 1 – 3 22335 Hamburg	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.1.2013
Germany	JK JETKONTOR AG	Pinneberger Str. 243 25488 Holm	Pinneberger Str. 243 d 25488 Holm	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.1.2013
Germany	NIGHTEXPRESS Luftverkehrsgesellschaft m.b.H.	Gebäude 511, Raum 3056 60549 Frankfurt/Main	Flughafen Tor 109 Gebäude 511, Raum 3056, Cargo City Süd 60549 Frankfurt am Main	Cargo, mail	A	1.1.2013
Germany	Nordcopters GmbH	Lachmannweg 3b 22589 Hamburg	Bültenkoppel/Flugplatz, 25492 Heist	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	29.5.2013
Germany	Rotorflug GmbH	Heliport Burgholzhausen 61381 Friedrichsdorf	Peter-Geibel-Straße 24 61381 Friedrichsdorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.1.2013
Germany	Silver Cloud Air GmbH	Waldspitzweg 3 67105 Schifferstadt	Joachim-Becher-Str. 2 67346 Speyer	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	15.10.2013
Germany	Sylt Air GmbH	Flughafen, Gebäude 101a 25980 Sylt-Ost	Zum Fliegerhorst 101 25980 Sylt/OT Tinum	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	1.1.2013
Germany	WDL Aviation GmbH & Co. Kommanditgesellschaft	Flughafen Köln/Bonn Flugzeughalle 6 51147 Köln	Flughafen Köln/Bonn Flugzeughalle 6 51130 Köln	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	1.1.2013
Germany	WIKING Helikopter Service GmbH	Blumenthalstr. 15 28209 Bremen	JadeWeserAirport 26452 Sande	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	25.9.2013
Hungary	A.B.C. Air Hungary Légiközlekedési és Kereskedelmi Kft	1185 Budapest, Ferihegy 1.	1185 Budapest, BUD Nemzetközi Repülőtér 1.	Cargo	B	27.2.2013
Irelande	Airlink Airways Ltd T/A Private Sky	Western Business Park, Ballymurtagh, Shannon, Co. Clare.	First Floor, Block 2, Shannon Business Park, Shannon, Co. Clare.	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	4.2.2013
Italy	Livingston Executive S.p.A.	Viale Abruzzo n. 410 – 66013 Chieti (CH)	Corso Sempione n. 111 - 21013 Gallarate (MI)	Passengers and goods	B	10.4.2013

Member State	Name of air carrier	Old address of air carrier	New address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
Poland	Ad Astra Executive Charter S. A.	ul. Czereśniowa 40A, 02-456 Warszawa	ul. Kondratowicza 50, 03-642 Warszawa	Passengers, cargo	B	29.10.2013
Poland	Flyjet sp. z o.o.	Al. Krakowska 110/114, 02-256 Warszawa	ul. Sabały 60, 02-174 Warszawa	Passengers, cargo	A	17.10.2013
Poland	Lotnicze Przedsiębiorstwo Usługowe 'Heliseco'z o.o.	ul. Al. Lotników Polskich 1, 21-045 Świdnik	ul. Gen. Bryg. S. Kaliskiego 57, 01-476 Warszawa	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	23.4.2013
Poland	Travel Service Polska sp. z o.o.	ul. Żwirki i Wigury 1, 00-906 Warszawa	ul. Gordona Bennetta 2B, 02-159 Warszawa	Passengers	A	8.7.2013
Portugal	HI FLY — Transportes Aéreos, S.A.	Rua do Borja, nº 6 1350-047 Lisboa	Rua Latino Coelho nº1, Edifício Hifly Building 7º Andar 1050-132 Lisboa	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	2013
Portugal	ORBEST, S.A.	Av. D. João II, Edifício Central Office, Lote 1.17.03, 6º, Parque das Nações, 1990-084 Lisboa	Edifício Rodrigo Uria, Rua Duque de Palmela nº 23, 1250-097 Lisboa	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	2013
Romania	S.C. BLUE AIR – AIRLINE MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS S.R.L.	17 Teheran Street, sector 1, Bucharest	42 – 44 Bucuresti – Ploiesti Street, Baneasa Business&Technology Park, sector 1, Bucharest	Passengers, cargo	A	9.12.2013
Slovakia	Travel Service, a.s. org. zložka Slovensko	Letisko M. R. Štefánika, 823 11 Bratislava	Ivánska cesta 30/B, 821 04 Bratislava	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	8.11.2013
Sweden	Amapola Flyg AB	Box 912 195 05 Arlandastad	Box 57, 230 32 Malmö-Sturup	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	17.5.2013
Sweden	Braathens Regional AB	Trollhättan Vänersborg Flygplats 461 83 Trollhättan	Trollhättan Vänersborg Flygplats 461 83 Västra Tunhem	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	11.1.2013
Sweden	Bromma Business Jet AB	Vetevägen 16 187 69 Täby	c/o SCA, Box 200, 101 23 Stockholm	Passengers, cargo, mail	A	5.8.2013
Sweden	Copterflyg AB	Lövstigen 2 823 30 Kilafors	Ringvägen 12 831 37 Östersund	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	5.11.2013

Member State	Name of air carrier	Old address of air carrier	New address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
Sweden	Sundt Air Sweden AB	Hässlögatan 6, 721 31 Västerås	Hässlögatan 16, 721 31 Västerås	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	11.4.2013 Valid until 1.4.2014

Change of category

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
France	Corail Hélicoptères	Aéroport de Pierrefonds 97410 Saint-Pierre	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category B to Category A	12.11.2013
Germany	AIR HAMBURG Luftverkehrsgesellschaft mbH	Kleine Bahnstr. 8 - 22525 Hamburg	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category B to Category A	5.7.2013
Germany	AIR TRAFFIC Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung EXECUTIVE JET SERVICE	Flughafen, Halle 3, 40474 Düsseldorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category B to Category A	1.3.2013
Germany	Flair Jet Luftverkehrsgesellschaft mbH	Hirschenau 5a, 90607 Rückersdorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category B to Category A	5.3.2013
Germany	Flair Jet Luftverkehrsgesellschaft mbH	Hirschenau 5a, 90607 Rückersdorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category A to Category B	19.4.2013
Germany	Germania Express Fluggesellschaft mbH	Lilienthalstraße 6 12529 Schönefeld OT Waltersdorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category A to Category B	22.4.2013
Germany	Helijet Charter GmbH	Liebigstraße 3-9, 40764 Langenfeld	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category B to Category A	21.11.2013
Germany	Jet Executive International Charter GmbH & Co. KG	Mündelheimer Weg 50 40472 Düsseldorf	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category A to Category B	12.2.2013
Spain	Aeronova, S.L.	Polígono Industrial El Oliveral, Bloque A, Nave 2, Fase 3 - 46394 Ribarroja (Valencia)	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category B to Category A	11.9.2013
UK	British International Helicopter Services Ltd	Anson House, Coventry Airport, Coventry. CV8 3AZ	Passengers, cargo, mail	From category A to Category B	8.10.2013

Change of category transported

Member State	Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Previously permitted to carry	Permitted to carry	Category	Decision effective since
Germany	B-Air Charter GmbH & Co. KG	Bernhäuser Hauptstraße 14 70794 Filderstadt	Passengers	Passengers, cargo, mail	B	19.2.2013
Poland	Flyjet sp. z o.o.	Al. Krakowska 110/114, 02-256 Warszawa	Passengers	Passengers, cargo	A	11.6.2013
Poland	Small Planet Airlines sp. z o.o.	ul. 17 Stycznia 45B, 02-146 Warszawa	Passengers	Passengers, cargo	A	24.9.2013

V

(Announcements)

PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION
POLICY

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Prior notification of a concentration

(Case M.7233 — Allianz/Going concern of UnipolSai Assicurazioni)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2014/C 137/08)

1. On 29 April 2014, the Commission received a notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004⁽¹⁾ by which Allianz SpA (Italy), controlled ultimately by Allianz Group (Germany) acquires within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Merger Regulation control of a non-life insurance going concern ('the Target', Italy) currently owned by UnipolSai Assicurazioni SpA ('UnipolSai', Italy), by way of purchase of assets.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

— Allianz: life and non-life insurance and asset management,

— Target: non-life insurance.

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.

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. Observations can be sent to the Commission by fax (+32 22964301), by e-mail to COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu or by post, under reference number M.7233 — Allianz/Going concern of UnipolSai Assicurazioni to the following 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').

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



Publications Office of the European Union
2985 Luxembourg
LUXEMBOURG

EN