

Official Journal of the European Union

C 225



English edition

Information and Notices

Volume 65

9 June 2022

Contents

II *Information*

INFORMATION FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

European Commission

2022/C 225/01	Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case M.10579 – PON HOLDING / AUTOHAUS ADELBERT MOLL / FLEXXDRIVE) ⁽¹⁾	1
---------------	--	---

IV *Notices*

NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

Council

2022/C 225/02	Council Decision of 2 June 2022 appointing members and alternate members of the Management Board of the European Food Safety Authority representing civil society and food chain interests	2
---------------	--	---

European Commission

2022/C 225/03	Euro exchange rates — 8 June 2022	5
---------------	---	---

European Data Protection Supervisor

2022/C 225/04	Summary of the Opinion of the European Data Protection Supervisor on the Proposal for a Regulation on automated data exchange for police cooperation ('Prüm II') (<i>The full text of this Opinion can be found in English, French and German on the EDPS website www.edps.europa.eu</i>)	6
---------------	---	---

EN

⁽¹⁾ Text with EEA relevance.

V *Announcements*

OTHER ACTS

European Commission

2022/C 225/05	Publication of the amended single document following the approval of a minor amendment pursuant to the second subparagraph of Article 53(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012	10
2022/C 225/06	INFORMATION NOTICE – PUBLIC CONSULTATION – Geographical Indications from the Republic of Uzbekistan to be protected as Geographical Indications in the European Union	14

II

*(Information)*INFORMATION FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES
AND AGENCIES

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Non-opposition to a notified concentration**(Case M.10579 – PON HOLDING / AUTOHAUS ADELBERT MOLL / FLEXXDRIVE)****(Text with EEA relevance)**

(2022/C 225/01)

On 30 May 2022, 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 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 policy’ 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/homepage.html?locale=en>) under document number 32022M10579. EUR-Lex is the online point of access to European Union law.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1.

IV

(Notices)

NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND
AGENCIES

COUNCIL

COUNCIL DECISION

of 2 June 2022

**appointing members and alternate members of the Management Board of the European Food Safety
Authority representing civil society and food chain interests**

(2022/C 225/02)

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 25(1a), point (c), thereof,

Having regard to the list of candidates submitted to the Council by the European Commission by letter dated 20 January 2022,

Having regard to the views expressed by the European Parliament by letter dated 18 May 2022,

Whereas:

- (1) It is vital to ensure the independence, high scientific quality, transparency and efficiency of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). It is also indispensable to ensure the cooperation of EFSA with Member States.
- (2) Regulation (EU) 2019/1381 of the European Parliament and of the Council ⁽²⁾ amended Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 as regards, *inter alia*, the composition of the EFSA Management Board.
- (3) Pursuant to Article 10(2) of Regulation (EU) 2019/1381, the term of office of the members of the EFSA Management Board in office on 30 June 2022 will expire on that date. The members and alternate members of the EFSA Management Board whose term of office is to start on 1 July 2022 are to be appointed in accordance with the new procedure for nomination and appointment introduced by Regulation (EU) 2019/1381.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Regulation (EU) 2019/1381 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on the transparency and sustainability of the EU risk assessment in the food chain and amending Regulations (EC) No 178/2002, (EC) No 1829/2003, (EC) No 1831/2003, (EC) No 2065/2003, (EC) No 1935/2004, (EC) No 1331/2008, (EC) No 1107/2009, (EU) 2015/2283 and Directive 2001/18/EC (OJ L 231, 6.9.2019, p. 1).

- (4) The Council, by means of its Decision of 7 April 2022 ⁽³⁾, has already appointed representatives of Member States as members and alternate members of the EFSA Management Board.
- (5) The new procedure for nomination and appointment introduced by Regulation (EU) 2019/1381 requires that the EFSA Management Board also include four members and four alternate members with the right to vote as representatives of civil society and food chain interests, namely one member and one alternate member from consumer organisations, one member and one alternate member from environmental non-governmental organisations, one member and one alternate member from farmers organisations, and one member and one alternate member from industry organisations.
- (6) The members and alternate members representing civil society and food chain interests are to be appointed by the Council in consultation with the European Parliament on the basis of a list drawn up by the Commission. Their term of office is four years and can be renewed only once.
- (7) The candidates included in the list submitted by the Commission have been selected following a call for expression of interest on the basis of their relevant experience and expertise in the field of food-chain law and policy, including risk assessment, as well as relevant expertise in the fields of managerial, administrative, financial and legal matters.
- (8) The list submitted by the Commission has been examined, with a view to appointing the four members and four alternate members of the EFSA Management Board representing civil society and food chain interests, on the basis of the documentation provided by the Commission and in light of the views expressed by the European Parliament. The appointment, by means of this Decision, of those members and alternate members further secures the highest standard of competence and the broadest range of relevant experience and expertise available in the field of food chain law and policy, including risk assessment, whilst ensuring that there is relevant expertise in the fields of managerial, administrative, financial and legal matters within the EFSA Management Board,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

The following persons are hereby appointed as members and alternate members of the Management Board of the European Food Safety Authority for the period from 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2026:

Category	Members	Alternate members
Consumer organisations	Ms Floriana CIMMARUSTI	Ms Eleni IOANNOU-KAKOURI
Environmental non-governmental organisations	Mr Xavier GABARRELL DURANY	Ms Apolline ROGER
Farmers organisations	Ms Annette TOFT	Ms Maira DZELZKALĒJA-BURMISTRE
Industry organisations	Ms Rebeca FERNANDEZ	Mr Dimitrios LADIKOS

Article 2

This Decision shall enter into force on the date of its adoption.

⁽³⁾ Council Decision of 7 April 2022 appointing representatives of Member States as members and alternate members of the Management Board of the European Food Safety Authority (OJ C 159, 12.4.2022, p. 6).

Done at Luxembourg, 2 June 2022.

For the Council
The President
A. DE MONTCHALIN

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Euro exchange rates ⁽¹⁾

8 June 2022

(2022/C 225/03)

1 euro =

Currency	Exchange rate	Currency	Exchange rate		
USD	US dollar	1,0739	CAD	Canadian dollar	1,3467
JPY	Japanese yen	143,92	HKD	Hong Kong dollar	8,4275
DKK	Danish krone	7,4386	NZD	New Zealand dollar	1,6644
GBP	Pound sterling	0,85575	SGD	Singapore dollar	1,4769
SEK	Swedish krona	10,4938	KRW	South Korean won	1 349,34
CHF	Swiss franc	1,0486	ZAR	South African rand	16,4626
ISK	Iceland króna	138,90	CNY	Chinese yuan renminbi	7,1785
NOK	Norwegian krone	10,1395	HRK	Croatian kuna	7,5215
BGN	Bulgarian lev	1,9558	IDR	Indonesian rupiah	15 577,86
CZK	Czech koruna	24,622	MYR	Malaysian ringgit	4,7187
HUF	Hungarian forint	391,25	PHP	Philippine peso	56,799
PLN	Polish zloty	4,5698	RUB	Russian rouble	
RON	Romanian leu	4,9450	THB	Thai baht	37,076
TRY	Turkish lira	18,4530	BRL	Brazilian real	5,2447
AUD	Australian dollar	1,4917	MXN	Mexican peso	21,0458
			INR	Indian rupee	83,4140

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

EUROPEAN DATA PROTECTION SUPERVISOR

Summary of the Opinion of the European Data Protection Supervisor on the Proposal for a Regulation on automated data exchange for police cooperation ('Prüm II')

(The full text of this Opinion can be found in English, French and German on the EDPS website www.edps.europa.eu)

(2022/C 225/04)

The European Commission adopted on 8 December 2021 a Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on automated data exchange for police cooperation ('Prüm II'), amending Council Decisions 2008/615/JHA and 2008/616/JHA and Regulations (EU) 2018/1726, 2019/817 and 2019/818 of the European Parliament and of the Council (the so-called 'Prüm Decisions'). The Proposal is part of a larger legislative package, referred to as 'EU Police Cooperation Code', which also includes a Proposal for Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on information exchange between law enforcement authorities of Member States (subject to a separate EDPS opinion), and Proposal for Council Recommendation on operational police cooperation.

The objective of the Proposal is to enhance law enforcement cooperation and in particular the information exchange between the competent authorities responsible for the prevention, detection and investigation of criminal offences, by laying down the conditions and procedures for the automated searching of DNA profiles, dactyloscopic data (fingerprints), facial images, police records and certain vehicle registration data, as well as the exchange of data following a match.

While the EDPS understands the need for the law enforcement authorities to benefit from the best possible legal and technical tools to detect, investigate and prevent crimes, he notes that the proposed new Prüm framework does not clearly lay down essential elements of the exchange of data, such as the types of crimes, which may justify a query, and is not sufficiently clear about the scope of data subjects affected by the automatic exchange of data, e.g. whether the databases, subject to a query, contain data only of suspects and/or convicted persons, or also data of other data subjects, such as victims or witnesses.

The EDPS considers in particular that the automated searching of DNA profiles and facial images should be possible only in the context of individual investigations into serious crimes, instead of any criminal offence, as provided for in the Proposal. Furthermore, the EDPS considers necessary to introduce in the Proposal common requirements and conditions concerning the data in the national databases that are made accessible for automated searches, taking due account of the obligation under Article 6 of the Law Enforcement Directive 680/2016 (LED) to make a distinction between different categories of data subjects (i.e. convicted criminals, suspects, victims, etc.).

The EDPS is also concerned about the implications for the fundamental rights of the concerned individuals by the proposed automated searching and exchange of police records. He considers that the necessity of the proposed automated searching and exchange of police records data is not sufficiently demonstrated. If such a measure is nevertheless adopted, even on voluntary basis, then additional strong safeguards would be required to comply with the principle of proportionality. In particular, given the data quality challenges, the future Regulation should, inter alia, explicitly define the types and/or the seriousness of crimes that may justify an automated query in the national police records.

Regarding the inclusion of Europol within the Prüm framework, the EDPS considers that his comments and recommendations in Opinion 4/2021 on the Proposal for Amendment of the Europol Regulation remain fully valid in the context of Prüm cooperation, in particular those related to the so-called 'big data challenge', i.e. processing by the Agency of large and complex datasets. The EDPS would like to recall two of the key messages in the Opinion on Europol: with stronger powers should always come a stronger oversight, and, equally important, any applicable exceptions in the form of derogations should not be allowed to become the rule.

The Proposal provides for a complex architecture for the automated searching and exchange of data within the Prüm framework with three separate technical solutions, developed and maintained by three different entities. The EDPS considers that the Proposal should be more explicit regarding the responsibility for the processing of personal data, in particular in EUCARIS, which is not based on EU law and has an intergovernmental nature. In addition, the EDPS is of the opinion that, given the scale and the sensitivity of the personal data processing, the proposed horizontal governance model of the Prüm framework is not suitable and should be further strengthened, e.g. by assigning a central coordination role to an EU entity, e.g. the Commission.

In addition, in the interest of legal certainty, the EDPS considers that the relationship of the data protection rules in the Proposal with the existing legal framework on data protection in the EU, in particular the LED and the Regulation (EU) 1725/2018 (EUDPR), should be explicitly clarified.

The Opinion also analyses and provides recommendations on a number of other specific issues, such as the link of the Prüm framework with the interoperability framework, the transfer of data to third countries and international organisations, or the supervision of the processing operations for the purposes of Prüm cooperation.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. On 8 December 2021 the European Commission adopted a Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on automated data exchange for police cooperation ('Prüm II'), amending Council Decisions 2008/615/JHA and 2008/616/JHA and Regulations (EU) 2018/1726, 2019/817 and 2019/818 of the European Parliament and of the Council (the 'Proposal') ⁽¹⁾.
2. The Proposal is part of a larger legislative package, referred to as 'EU Police Cooperation Code', which also includes:
 - a Proposal for Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on information exchange between law enforcement authorities of Member States, repealing Council Framework Decision 2006/960/JHA ⁽²⁾, and
 - a Proposal for Council Recommendation on operational police cooperation ⁽³⁾.
3. The objective of the EU Police Cooperation Code, as stated by the Commission, is to enhance law enforcement cooperation across Member States and in particular the information exchange between the competent authorities ⁽⁴⁾. In this regard, the Proposal lays down the conditions and procedures for the automated searching of DNA profiles, dactyloscopic data (fingerprints), facial images, police records and certain vehicle registration data and the exchange of data following a match between authorities responsible for the prevention, detection and investigation of criminal offences.
4. The Proposal, as well as the EU Police Cooperation Code more generally, is linked to the policy goals of several EU strategic documents in the area of Justice and Home Affairs, in particular the EU Security Union Strategy ⁽⁵⁾, the EU Strategy to tackle Organised Crime 2021-2025 ⁽⁶⁾ and 2021 Strategy on Schengen area ⁽⁷⁾. Moreover, the proposals establishing the Police Cooperation Code should be considered in the light of the ongoing reform of Europol and the growing role of the Agency as a central criminal information hub of the Union, collecting and processing ever-increasing amounts of data ⁽⁸⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2021) 784 final.

⁽²⁾ COM(2021) 782 final.

⁽³⁾ COM(2021) 780 final.

⁽⁴⁾ https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/boosting-police-cooperation-across-borders-enhanced-security-2021-12-08_en

⁽⁵⁾ Communication from the Commission on the EU Security Union Strategy, COM/2020/605 final.

⁽⁶⁾ Communication from the Commission on the EU Strategy to tackle Organised Crime 2021-2025, COM/2021/170 final

⁽⁷⁾ Communication from the Commission 'A strategy towards a fully functioning and resilient Schengen area', COM/2021/277 final.

⁽⁸⁾ For more information see the EDPS Opinion 4/2021, https://edps.europa.eu/system/files/2021-03/21-03-08_opinion_europol_reform_en.pdf

5. The Commission consulted the EDPS on the Proposal for Regulation Prüm II on 5 January 2022, pursuant to Article 42(1) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725. The comments and recommendations in this Opinion are limited to the provisions in the Proposal that are most relevant from data protection perspective.

4. CONCLUSIONS

73. The proposed new Prüm framework does not clearly lay down essential elements of the exchange of data, such as the types of crimes, which may justify a query (search), especially of DNA profiles, i.e. any criminal offence or only more serious crimes. In addition, the Proposal is not clear about the scope of data subjects affected by the automatic exchange of data, i.e. whether the databases, subject to a query, contain data only of suspects and/or convicted persons, or also data of other data subjects, such as victims or witnesses.
74. In order to ensure the necessity and proportionality of the interference with the fundamental right to the protection of personal data, in the light of Article 52(1) of the Charter, it is essential to clarify the personal and the material scope of the measures, i.e. the categories of data subjects who will be directly affected, and the objective conditions which may justify an automated query in the respective database of other Member States or of Europol.
75. The EDPS considers in particular that the automated searching of DNA profiles and facial images should only be possible in the context of individual investigations of serious crimes, and not of any criminal offence, as provided for in the Proposal. Furthermore, in line with the obligation under Article 6 LED to make a distinction between different categories of data subjects, the Proposal should provide for a limitation of the categories of data subjects whose DNA profiles and facial images, stored in the national databases, should be made accessible for automated searches, considering especially the inherent purpose limitation for data from other categories than convicted criminals or suspects.
76. The EDPS considers that the necessity of the proposed automated searching and exchange of police records data is not sufficiently demonstrated. If such measure is nevertheless adopted, even on voluntary basis, then additional strong safeguards would be required to comply with the principle of proportionality. In particular, given the data quality challenges, which cannot be solved by technical measures like pseudonymisation alone, the future Regulation should as a minimum lay down the types and/or seriousness of crimes that may justify an automated search in the national police records.
77. Regarding the inclusion of Europol within the Prüm framework, the EDPS considers that his comments and recommendations in Opinion 4/2021 on the Proposal for Amendment of the Europol Regulation remain fully valid in the context of Prüm cooperation, in particular those related to the processing of large datasets by the Agency. In addition, the EDPS recommends clarifying the personal scope, i.e. specifying the data subject categories subject to queries under Article 49 and Article 50, as well as alignment of the retention periods for logs, in order to ensure consistency with the Europol Regulation.
78. The Proposal provides a complex architecture for the automated searching and exchange of data within the Prüm framework with three separate technical solutions, developed and maintained by three different entities. Moreover, one of them - EUCARIS - is not based on EU legal act but has an intergovernmental nature. Therefore, the EDPS considers that the Proposal should explicitly address the responsibility for the processing of personal data in EUCARIS. In addition, the EDPS considers that, given the scale and the sensitivity of the personal data processing, the current horizontal governance model of the Prüm framework is not suitable and should be further strengthened, e.g. by assigning a central coordination role to a EU entity, such as the Commission.
79. Another important element of the Proposal, which requires careful analysis of its fundamental rights implications, is the alignment of the Prüm framework with the interoperability framework of the EU information systems in the area of justice and home affairs. The EDPS invites co-legislator to consider the need for additional rules in this regard, e.g. in an implementing or delegated act, which should address specific challenges such as the quality and the performance of the matching algorithms for facial images.

80. Taking into account that the legal basis of the Proposal includes, *inter alia*, Article 16 TFEU, in the interest of clarity and certainty, the EDPS recommends specifying in the Proposal that the data protection provisions in Chapter 6 are without prejudice to the application of the LED and the EUDPR, as regards the processing of personal data in the context of law enforcement cooperation under Prüm framework.
81. Furthermore, the EDPS considers that the requirement for regular audits of the personal data processing operations for the purposes of the Regulation Prüm II should be extended and should cover also personal data processing operations at national level. In this context, the EDPS recommends that Article 60 (2) of the Proposal refers generally to the powers of the EDPS, pursuant to Article 58 EUDPR, and not only to some of them.

Brussels, 2 March 2022.

Wojciech Rafał WIEWIÓROWSKI

V

(Announcements)

OTHER ACTS

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Publication of the amended single document following the approval of a minor amendment pursuant to the second subparagraph of Article 53(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012

(2022/C 225/05)

The European Commission has approved this minor amendment in accordance with the third subparagraph of Article 6(2) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 664/2014 ⁽¹⁾.

The application for approval of this minor amendment can be consulted in the Commission's eAmbrosia database.

SINGLE DOCUMENT

'Mortadella Bologna'

EU No: PGI-IT-0325-AM02 - 17.11.2021

PDO () PGI (X)

1. Name(s) [of PDO or PGI]

'Mortadella Bologna'

2. Member State or Third Country

Italy

3. Description of the agricultural product or foodstuff**3.1. Type of product**

Class 1.2: Meat products (cooked, salted, smoked, etc.)

3.2. Description of product to which the name in (1) applies

When released for consumption, 'Mortadella Bologna' has the following organoleptic, chemical and chemico-physical characteristics:

Organoleptic characteristics:

External appearance: oval or cylindrical in shape;

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 179, 19.6.2014, p. 17.

Consistency: firm and not springy;

Appearance when cut: the cut surface must be smooth with a uniform bright pink colour. The slices must have pearly white shapes of adipose tissue (at least 15 % of total mass), possibly attached to muscle tissue. The squares must be well distributed and must stick fast to the rest. There must be no bulges of fat or gelatin and the greasy film must be minimal; Colour: uniform bright pink;

Aroma: characteristic aromatic fragrance;

Taste: characteristic delicate taste with no traces of smoke;

Chemical and chemico-physical characteristics:

- Total proteins: minimum 14,50 %;
- Collagen/protein ratio: maximum 0,18;
- Water/protein ratio: maximum 4,10;
- Fat/protein ratio: maximum 2,00;
- pH: minimum 6;
- Salt: maximum 2,8 %.

3.3. *Feed (for products of animal origin only) and raw materials (for processed products only)*

'Mortadella Bologna' consists of a mixture of pigmeat obtained from striated muscle from carcasses, reduced to fine pieces by a meat mincer, cubes of pig throat fat, salt, and pepper (whole, in pieces or in powder form), stuffed in natural or synthetic casings permeable to water vapour and cooked for an extended period in dry-air ovens. This process must ensure that the finished product loses at least 3 % of the weight of the sausage before cooking. The following may also be used: pig stomachs with mucus removed, hard pork fat, water in accordance with good industrial practice, natural flavourings (not more than 0,3 % of the total weight of the mixture), spices and herbs, pistachios, sugar up to a maximum of 0,5 %, sodium and/or potassium nitrite up to a maximum of 140 ppm, and ascorbic acid and its sodium salt. Smoke flavourings, polyphosphates, processing aids and any substance having an effect, even a secondary one, on the colour of the product are not permitted. Mechanically separated meat may not be used.

3.4. *Specific steps in production that must take place in the identified geographical area*

All stages in the production of Mortadella Bologna, from preparation of the mixture to the end of the cooling phase, must take place in the production area referred to in point 4 of this document.

3.5. *Specific rules concerning slicing, grating, packaging, etc. of the product the registered name refers to*

'Mortadella Bologna' may be released for consumption unpackaged for slicing, vacuum packed or packed in a modified atmosphere, whole, in portions, or sliced. Packaging, slicing and portioning must be carried out, under the supervision of the control body, only in the production area referred to in point 4 of this document.

'Mortadella Bologna' is a very delicate product that is sensitive to external agents, particularly light and air. Preparing 'Mortadella Bologna' for slicing means the casing has to be removed; consequently, the whole product is directly exposed to air and light. Exposing the product to external agents, in uncontrolled conditions, causes oxidation, which irreversibly changes the organoleptic characteristics of the product, causing, in particular, the slices to darken and the smell and taste to deteriorate. For these reasons, it is essential for slicing to take place in the geographical production area, after the cooling phase has ended.

3.6. *Specific rules concerning labelling of the product the registered name refers to*

The name of the protected geographical indication 'Mortadella Bologna' may not be translated and must appear on the label in clear and indelible lettering, clearly distinguishable from any other wording, and followed immediately by the wording 'Indicazione Geografica Protetta' [Protected Geographical Indication] and/or the abbreviation 'IGP' [PGI],

which must be translated into the language in which the product is marketed. It is forbidden to add any description that is not expressly provided for. However, the use of names, trade names and brand names is permitted, provided that they have no laudatory purport and are not such as to mislead the purchaser.

4. Concise definition of the geographical area

The area in which 'Mortadella Bologna' is prepared comprises the territory of the following regions or provinces: Emilia-Romagna, Piedmont, Lombardy, Veneto, Province of Trento, Tuscany, Marche and Lazio.

5. Link with the geographical area

The link between 'Mortadella Bologna' and its geographical area is based on the product's excellent reputation and quality, which are factors resulting from the know-how and specific skills employed by the producers.

The link with the area of production is created by the technical skills of the sausage makers, who over time have shown themselves to be skilled craftspeople who have enabled the continuation of processing techniques that are perfectly attuned to the well-established tradition. Indeed, unlike ordinary mortadella, 'Mortadella Bologna' must be made following a much stricter procedure that corresponds to the method used for centuries in the defined geographical area. This procedure makes it possible to develop the product's specific characteristics, notably its texture, colour and organoleptic properties.

The proper execution of certain stages of production, such as mincing, gives the product its typical firmness, which can be noted both from the compressed state of the product and during chewing. The technological constraints imposed at this stage also make it possible to develop, at the end of the production process, a particularly bright and homogeneous shade of pink.

Specialist publications also attest to and recognise the above. For example, the following passage: '*Lean raw meat is cut into pieces of less than a millimetre in the meat mincer; if this stage is done incorrectly, it has a negative effect on the colour, lustre and consistency of the mortadella*' is taken from the book *Mortadella che passione* [A Passion for Mortadella] by C. Marconi and G. Roversi (CAIRO, Milan 2015), specifically the section on the Mortadella Bologna PGI production process in Chapter 2 'Come si fa la mortadella IGP' [How Mortadella PGI is made], p. 65 et seq.

Moreover, the cooking process is another crucial factor in obtaining the top-quality finished product. It is a slow process, the duration varying according to the diameter of the sausage, which allows it to develop the colour and bouquet of aromas that set 'Mortadella Bologna' apart. The following extract attests to this: '*Traditionally, the way mortadella is cooked is defined as "stufatura", because it is cooked slowly and for a prolonged period at a low temperature. It is carried out in large dry-air (fan) ovens with forced convection. The organoleptic characteristics of the mortadella are therefore due to the fact that it is cooked slowly. Cooking takes many hours, both because of the large size of the mortadella sausages (up to 40 kg) and because of the type of heat transmission and the low temperature*'. This extract is from the book *Mortadella che passione* by C. Marconi and G. Roversi (CAIRO, Milan 2015), specifically the section on the Mortadella Bologna PGI production process in Chapter 2 'Come si fa la mortadella IGP', p. 68 et seq.

Mortadella Bologna is the most famous sausage in Bologna's gastronomic tradition; it dates at least as far back as the 16th century. Evidence of this product can be found in numerous literary and historical testimonies of the various eras since the late Renaissance.

The local mortadella tradition has been preserved until recent times and has spread from the original production area to neighbouring areas as the trade of food products has spread.

In addition to the historical testimonies referred to above, there is no doubt that this product is part of the traditional gastronomic heritage of the Emilia region, and it features widely in local customs, which have since expanded to neighbouring areas.

In several areas, the term 'Bologna' on its own is commonly used to refer to 'Mortadella Bologna'.

Finally, within the defined geographical area, the production of 'Mortadella Bologna' is evenly distributed between the regions of central/northern Italy, Emilia-Romagna, and the regions of central Italy.

Reference to publication of the product specification

The full text of the product specification is available on the following Internet: <http://www.politicheagricole.it/flex/cm/pages/ServeBLOB.php/L/IT/IDPagina/3335>

or alternatively:

by going directly to the home page of the Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Policy (www.politicheagricole.it) and clicking on 'Qualità' (at the top right of the screen), then on 'Prodotti DOP IGP STG' (on the left-hand side of the screen) and finally on 'Disciplinari di Produzione all'esame dell'UE'.

INFORMATION NOTICE – PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Geographical Indications from the Republic of Uzbekistan to be protected as Geographical Indications in the European Union

(2022/C 225/06)

The negotiations for an Enhanced Partnership and Cooperation Agreement between the EU and the Republic of Uzbekistan that will include protection of geographical indications of agricultural products and foodstuffs are underway. In this context, the protection in the European Union, as geographical indications, of the name set out below is under consideration.

The Commission invites any Member State or third country or any natural or legal person having a legitimate interest, resident or established in a Member State or in a third country, to submit oppositions to such protection by lodging a duly substantiated statement.

Statements of opposition must reach the Commission within one month of the date of this publication. Statements of opposition should be sent to the following e-mail address: AGRI-NEIGHBOURS@ec.europa.eu

Statements of opposition shall be admissible only if they are received within the time-limit set out above and if they show that:

- (a) the protection of the name proposed would conflict with the name of a plant variety or an animal breed and as a result is likely to mislead the consumer as to the true origin of the product;
- (b) the name proposed would be wholly or partially homonymous with that of a name already protected in the Union under Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs ⁽¹⁾, or with one of the geographical indications from non-EU countries protected in the EU under bilateral/multilateral agreements publicly available at the following address:
<https://www.tmdn.org/giview/>
- (c) in the light of a trade mark's reputation and renown and the length of time it has been used, the protection of the name proposed would be liable to mislead the consumer as to the true identity of the product;
- (d) the protection of the name would jeopardise the existence of an entirely or partly identical name, the existence of a trade mark or the existence of products which have been legally on the market for at least five years preceding the date of the publication of this notice;
- (e) or if the opponents can give details from which it can be concluded that the name for which protection is considered is generic.

The criteria referred to above shall be evaluated in relation to the territory of the Union, which in the case of intellectual property rights refers only to the territory or territories where the said rights are protected. The protection of these names in the European Union is subject to the successful conclusion of this procedure and subsequent legal act adding these names to the above mentioned Agreement.

List of Geographical Indications from the Republic of Uzbekistan to be protected as Geographical Indications in the European Union for agricultural products and foodstuffs ⁽²⁾

Name	Short description
‘БОГИЗАГОН/БОГ‘ИЗОГ‘ОН’/‘БАГИЗАГАН /BAGIZAGAN’	Wine

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 343, 14.12.2012, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ List provided by the authorities of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

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



Publications Office
of the European Union
L-2985 Luxembourg
LUXEMBOURG

EN