

Official Journal of the European Union

C 211



English edition

Information and Notices

Volume 66

16 June 2023

Contents

II *Information*

INFORMATION FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

European Commission

2023/C 211/01	Commission Notice on the interpretation and implementation of certain legal provisions of the EU Taxonomy Regulation and links to the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation	1
2023/C 211/02	Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case M.11107 – EDF / SEKG / NEBRAS / QUWATT / SCE-QUVVAT) ⁽¹⁾	6

IV *Notices*

NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

European Commission

2023/C 211/03	Euro exchange rates – 15 June 2023	7
---------------	--	---

NOTICES FROM MEMBER STATES

2023/C 211/04	Summary of European Commission Decisions on authorisations for the placing on the market for the use and/or for use of substances listed in Annex XIV to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) (<i>Published pursuant to Article 64(9) of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006</i>) ⁽¹⁾	8
---------------	---	---

EN

⁽¹⁾ Text with EEA relevance.

OTHER ACTS

European Commission

2023/C 211/05

Publication of a communication of approval of a standard amendment to a product specification for a name in the wine sector, as referred to in Article 17(2) and (3) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/33

II

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

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION NOTICE

**on the interpretation and implementation of certain legal provisions of the EU Taxonomy Regulation
and links to the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation**

(2023/C 211/01)

This Frequently Asked Questions document (FAQ) aims to provide some clarifications on how operators should consider the requirements for compliance with minimum safeguards under the Article 18 of Regulation (EU) 2020/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council ⁽¹⁾ (hereafter 'Taxonomy Regulation'). This document also aims to clarify the status of investments in Taxonomy-aligned economic activities and assets under Regulation (EU) 2019/2088, i.e. the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (hereafter 'SFDR') ⁽²⁾.

The frequently asked questions contained in this document clarify existing provisions in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation, nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The FAQ is merely intended to assist financial and non-financial undertakings in implementing the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret EU law. The views expressed in this Notice cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the EU and national courts.

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Minimum safeguards under the EU Taxonomy Regulation	2
1. What role do the minimum safeguards play in the EU Taxonomy Regulation?	2
2. How are the minimum safeguards defined under the Article 18 of the EU Taxonomy?	2
3. What are the key expectations for undertakings under Article 18 of the Taxonomy Regulation?	3
Interactions with the SFDR	5
4. Do Taxonomy-aligned investments qualify as 'sustainable investment' under the SFDR?	5

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) 2020/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2020 on the establishment of a framework to facilitate sustainable investment, and amending Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 (OJ L 198, 22.6.2020, p. 13).

⁽²⁾ Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 November 2019 on sustainability-related disclosures in the financial services sector (OJ L 317, 9.12.2019, p. 1).

Minimum safeguards under the EU Taxonomy Regulation

1. What role do the minimum safeguards play in the EU Taxonomy Regulation?

The Taxonomy Regulation provides that an economic activity can only qualify as environmentally sustainable if, in addition to meeting the other requirements of Article 3 ⁽³⁾, it is carried out in compliance with the minimum safeguards laid down in Article 18⁷. This is in line with the principles enshrined in the European Pillar of Social Rights in support of a sustainable and inclusive growth, as well as with the relevant international minimum human and labour rights standards.

The minimum safeguards are therefore an integral part of the Taxonomy and are one of the four criteria laid down in Article 3 which must be met for economic activities to be considered environmentally sustainable. The inclusion of minimum safeguards in the Taxonomy framework aims to ensure that entities carrying out economic activities considered as Taxonomy-aligned meet certain minimum social and governance standards.

In other words, the purpose of the minimum safeguards under the Taxonomy Regulation is to prevent activities and investments from being regarded as 'sustainable' if they involve breaches of key social principles and human and labour rights or do not align with minimum standards for responsible business conduct.

2. How are the minimum safeguards defined under the Article 18 of the EU Taxonomy?

Article 18 of the Taxonomy Regulation lays down specific requirements for minimum safeguards referring both to international standards of responsible business conduct under Article 18(1) and to the principle of 'do no significant harm' of the SFDR ⁽⁴⁾ under Article 18(2).

Under **Article 18(1)**, minimum safeguards are to be understood as due diligence and remedy procedures implemented by a company that is carrying out an economic activity in order to ensure alignment with the *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (OECD MNEs)* and the *UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPR)*. The latter includes the principles and rights set out in eight of the ten fundamental conventions identified in the International Labour Organization (ILO) Declaration of the on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work ⁽⁵⁾ and the International Bill of Human Rights ⁽⁶⁾.

The *OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises* bring together all thematic areas of responsible business conduct and responsible supply chain management. It also recommends that enterprises apply good corporate governance practices, including due diligence ⁽⁷⁾ as set out in the *OECD Principles of Corporate Governance*.

The *UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights* (i) specify a standard of conduct for businesses to prevent human-rights violations; and (ii) address any potential risks resulting from the economic activities that businesses conduct. The responsibility of business entities to respect human rights refers to internationally recognised rights understood, as a minimum, as those expressed in eight of the ten fundamental ILO conventions and in the International Bill of Human Rights

⁽³⁾ The four criteria laid down in the Article 3 of the Taxonomy Regulation specify that an economic activity shall: (a) contributes substantially to one or more of the environmental objectives set out in Article 9 in accordance with Articles 10 to 16; (b) does not significantly harm any of the environmental objectives set out Article 9 in accordance with Article 17; (c) is carried out in compliance with the minimum safeguards laid down in Article 18; (d) complies with technical screening criteria that have been established by the Commission in accordance with Article 10 (3), 11(3), 12(2), 13(2), 14(2) or 15(2).

⁽⁴⁾ Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 November 2019 on sustainability-related disclosures in the financial services sector (OJ L 317, 9.12.2019, p. 1).

⁽⁵⁾ The core conventions of the International Labour Organisation are: *Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention*, 1948 (No 87); *Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention*, 1949 (No 98); *Forced Labour Convention*, 1930 (No 29) (and its 2014 protocol); *Abolition of Forced Labour Convention*, 1957 (No 105); *Minimum Age Convention*, 1973 (No 138); *Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention*, 1999 (No 182); *Equal Remuneration Convention*, 1951 (No 100); *Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention*, 1958 (No 111).

⁽⁶⁾ This includes: *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948); *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (1966); and *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (1966).

⁽⁷⁾ See also specific OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct (2018) and OECD sectoral guidance, available at: <https://mneguidelines.oecd.org/mneguidelines/>, which provides practical support to enterprises on the implementation of the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.

Article 18(2) introduces a direct link with the principle of ‘do no significant harm’ (DNSH) referred to in Article 2(17) of the SFDR. This ensures that minimum social standards are defined at European level, and that there is consistency in European legislation.

The details of the SFDR’s principle of ‘do no significant harm’ are specified in Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1288 adopted by the European Commission in April 2022. According to this regulation, in addition to disclosing whether the sustainable investment is aligned with the OECD MNEs and UN GP, implementing the SFDR principle of do no significant harm requires the consideration of a list of principal adverse indicators. The European Commission considers that, in the context of the Article 18(2) of the Taxonomy Regulation, the link between the minimum safeguards and the principle of DNSH of the SFDR is to be understood, as a minimum, through the SFDR principal adverse impact indicators for social and employee matters, respect for human rights, anti-corruption and anti-bribery matters listed in the table 1 of Annex I of the SDFDR Delegated Regulation ⁽⁸⁾.

Adverse sustainability indicator of Table 1	Metric
Violations of UN Global Compact principles and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises	Share of investments in investee companies that have been involved in violations of the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises
Lack of processes and compliance mechanisms to monitor compliance with UN Global Compact principles and OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises	Share of investments in investee companies without policies to monitor compliance with the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises or grievance/complaints handling mechanisms to address violations of the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises
Unadjusted gender pay gap	Average unadjusted gender pay gap of investee companies
Board gender diversity	Average ratio of female to male board members in investee companies, expressed as a percentage of all board members
Exposure to controversial weapons (anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical weapons and biological weapons)	Share of investments in investee companies involved in the manufacture or selling of controversial weapons

3. What are the key expectations for undertakings under Article 18 of the Taxonomy Regulation?

Undertakings disclosing their alignment with the Taxonomy will need to assess their compliance with the Taxonomy’s minimum safeguards requirements under both Article 18(1) and Article 18(2).

Under Article 18(1), undertakings whose economic activities are to be considered as Taxonomy-aligned must have implemented due diligence and remedy procedures to ensure the alignment with the standards for responsible business conduct mentioned in the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (see question 2). Both these texts extensively outline how the principles and conduct of due diligence can be implemented.

The central requirement under Article 18(1) is that an undertaking must implement appropriate procedures, including procedures to continuously identify, prevent, mitigate or remediate the relevant actual and potential adverse impacts connected with their own operations, value chains and business relationships in order to ensure their activities are carried out in line with these standards.

⁽⁸⁾ The methodology for the calculation of these indicators can be found in Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1288. The term ‘investee companies’ in table 1 of Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1288 corresponds to references to ‘undertakings’ in the Taxonomy Regulation.

Sometimes, despite implementing all appropriate procedures, an undertaking cannot address certain risks or eliminate certain negative impacts. This does not necessarily mean that the undertaking does not comply with the minimum safeguards, provided that the undertaking has clearly disclosed these potential impacts and explained what it did to identify, prevent, mitigate or remediate them and why it could not eliminate certain impacts. In fact, it is recognised that there can be instances where, despite reasonable due diligence measures, undertakings may still not be able to prevent, cease or mitigate adverse impacts when it comes to the adverse impacts in the undertaking's value chain.

As part of those due diligence and remedy procedures, companies are required under Article 18(2) to consider the SFDR principal adverse impact indicators related to social and employee matters, respect for human rights, anti-corruption and anti-bribery matters referred to under question 2 ⁽⁹⁾.

The only issue covered by Article 18(2) as of today which is not explicitly covered by Article 18(1) is the principal adverse impact relating to the exposure to controversial weapons as defined under the SFDR Delegated Regulation ⁽¹⁰⁾ (anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical weapons and biological weapons). Therefore, by virtue of Article 18(2), undertakings are to ensure that their due diligence and remedy procedures allow for the identification, prevention, mitigation or remediation of any actual or potential exposure to the manufacture or selling of controversial weapons.

Beyond the provisions of Article 18(2) described above, the Taxonomy Regulation does not contain further considerations relating to weapons or defence-related equipment and technologies in the assessment of minimum safeguards. As stated in the Draft Commission notice on interpretation and implementation of certain legal provisions of the EU Taxonomy Climate Delegated Act ⁽¹¹⁾, the Commission acknowledges the need to ensure access to finance and investment including from the private sector for all strategic sectors, including the defence industry. The defence industry is recognised as a crucial contributor to the resilience and security of the Union, and therefore to peace and social sustainability ⁽¹²⁾.

The list of SFDR indicators related to social and employee matters, respect for human rights, anti-corruption and anti-bribery might change with potential future revisions of the SFDR delegated act. That is why any issue that may be addressed in the future by the adverse indicators of the SFDR will also need to be considered by undertakings according to Article 18(2).

Reporting in line with the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive ⁽¹³⁾ (CSRD) will help companies to assess their compliance with Article 18 requirements and will help investors to get the necessary information from investee companies ⁽¹⁴⁾. Article 18 of the EU Taxonomy Regulation does not require additional disclosures, there is therefore no duplication with the CSRD reporting requirements.

⁽⁹⁾ The methodology for the calculation of these indicators can be found in Tables 1 and 3 of Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1288 (OJ L 196, 25.7.2022, p. 1).

⁽¹⁰⁾ Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1288 of 6 April 2022 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to regulatory technical standards specifying the details of the content and presentation of the information in relation to the principle of 'do no significant harm', specifying the content, methodologies and presentation of information in relation to sustainability indicators and adverse sustainability impacts, and the content and presentation of the information in relation to the promotion of environmental or social characteristics and sustainable investment objectives in pre-contractual documents, on websites and in periodic reports (OJ L 196, 25.7.2022, p. 1).

⁽¹¹⁾ Question 11 'How does the sustainable finance framework apply to access to private funding for the defence industry?', p. 16.

⁽¹²⁾ See Commission's proposal for Proposal for an Act in Support of Ammunition Production (ASAP), COM(2023) 237 final.

⁽¹³⁾ Directive (EU) 2022/2464 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 December 2022 amending Regulation (EU) No 537/2014, Directive 2004/109/EC, Directive 2006/43/EC and Directive 2013/34/EU, as regards corporate sustainability reporting (OJ L 322, 16.12.2022, p. 15).

⁽¹⁴⁾ The CSRD requires that the sustainability reporting standards that undertakings are required to use to meet their disclosure obligations contain the information that financial market participants need in order to comply with their disclosure obligations under the SFDR. In practice this means that undertakings will be required to report the mirroring information for the principal adverse impact indicators required under the delegated regulation of the SFDR. Article 29b(5)(b) of Directive 2013/34/EU '5. When adopting delegated acts pursuant to paragraph 1, the Commission shall, to the greatest extent possible, take account of: [...] b) the information that financial market participants need in order to comply with their disclosure obligations laid down in Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 and the delegated acts adopted pursuant to that Regulation'.

For further informal advice on best practices, users are invited to consult the Final Report on Minimum Safeguards of the Platform on Sustainable Finance published in October 2022.

Interactions with the SFDR

4. Do Taxonomy-aligned investments qualify as 'sustainable investment' under the SFDR?

Recital 19 of the Taxonomy Regulation clarifies that 'sustainable investments' under the SFDR include investments into 'environmentally sustainable economic activities' within the meaning of the Taxonomy Regulation.

In setting out what is required for an activity to be considered as 'environmentally sustainable', Article 18(2) makes a link between the Taxonomy Regulation and the SFDR via one of the required steps of the Taxonomy Regulation: the compliance with minimum safeguards. According to the guidance given under question 1 and 2 above, the social elements of the 'do no significant harm' principle are considered to be adhered to at entity level for an undertaking that discloses activities as 'environmentally sustainable' under the EU Taxonomy.

Furthermore, according to the guidance provided in questions 1 and 2 above, the SFDR do no significant harm principle and the requirement to ensure that an investee company follows good governance practices are deemed to be fulfilled for investments in Taxonomy-aligned economic activities as these comply with the Taxonomy's minimum safeguards. The four aspects of good governance referred to in point 17 of Article 2 of the SFDR (namely sound management structures, employee relations, remuneration of staff and tax compliance⁽¹⁵⁾) can be considered to be satisfied by the provisions referred to in Article 18 of Regulation (EU) 2020/852.

Therefore, such investments in Taxonomy-aligned 'environmentally sustainable' economic activities can be automatically qualified as 'sustainable investments' in the context of the product level disclosure requirements under the SFDR. This means that investments in specific economic activities can be considered to be sustainable investments.

However, if a financial market participant (FMP) invests in an undertaking with some degree of taxonomy-alignment through a funding instrument that does not specify the use of proceeds, such as a general equity or debt, the FMP would still need to check additional elements under the SFDR in order to consider the whole investment in that undertaking as sustainable investment. This means that the FMP would still need to: (i) check whether the rest of the economic activities of the undertaking comply with the environmental elements of the SFDR DNSH principle; and (ii) assess whether she/he considers the contribution to the environmental objective sufficient.

⁽¹⁵⁾ The EU list of non-cooperative jurisdictions for tax purposes was updated in February 2023. It provides useful guidance to identify countries which have failed to fulfil their commitments to comply with tax good governance criteria within a specific timeframe, and countries which have refused to do so.

Non-opposition to a notified concentration**(Case M.11107 – EDF / SEKG / NEBRAS / QUWATT / SCE-QUVVAT)****(Text with EEA relevance)**

(2023/C 211/02)

On 12 June 2023, 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 32023M11107. 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

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Euro exchange rates ⁽¹⁾

15 June 2023

(2023/C 211/03)

1 euro =

Currency	Exchange rate	Currency	Exchange rate		
USD	US dollar	1,0819	CAD	Canadian dollar	1,4415
JPY	Japanese yen	152,86	HKD	Hong Kong dollar	8,4661
DKK	Danish krone	7,4523	NZD	New Zealand dollar	1,7559
GBP	Pound sterling	0,85555	SGD	Singapore dollar	1,4543
SEK	Swedish krona	11,6206	KRW	South Korean won	1 387,60
CHF	Swiss franc	0,9761	ZAR	South African rand	19,9252
ISK	Iceland króna	149,30	CNY	Chinese yuan renminbi	7,7491
NOK	Norwegian krone	11,5025	IDR	Indonesian rupiah	16 208,51
BGN	Bulgarian lev	1,9558	MYR	Malaysian ringgit	5,0049
CZK	Czech koruna	23,751	PHP	Philippine peso	60,638
HUF	Hungarian forint	376,03	RUB	Russian rouble	
PLN	Polish zloty	4,4693	THB	Thai baht	37,693
RON	Romanian leu	4,9578	BRL	Brazilian real	5,2244
TRY	Turkish lira	25,6112	MXN	Mexican peso	18,5832
AUD	Australian dollar	1,5924	INR	Indian rupee	88,9825

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

NOTICES FROM MEMBER STATES

Summary of European Commission Decisions on authorisations for the placing on the market for the use and/or for use of substances listed in Annex XIV to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH)

(Published pursuant to Article 64(9) of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 ⁽¹⁾)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2023/C 211/04)

Decision granting an authorisation

Reference of the decision ⁽¹⁾	Date of decision	Substance name	Holder of the authorisation	Authorisation number	Authorised use	Date of expiry of review period	Reasons for the decision
C(2023) 3646	9 June 2023	4-(1,1,3,3-tetramethylbutyl)phenol, ethoxylated ('4-tert-OPnEO') EC No.-; CAS No.-	Alexion Pharma International Operations Unlimited Company, College Business & Technology Park, Blanchardstown, D15 R925, Dublin 15, Ireland	REACH/23/18/0	Industrial use for virus inactivation in the manufacture of Andexanet alfa for treatment of adult patients treated with a direct factor Xa (FXa) inhibitor when reversal of anticoagulation is needed due to life-threatening or uncontrolled bleeding	31 December 2030	In accordance with Article 60(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006, the socio-economic benefits outweigh the risk to human health and the environment from the use of the substance and there are no suitable alternative substances or technologies.

⁽¹⁾ The decision is available on the European Commission website at: [Authorisation \(europa.eu\)](https://europa.eu).

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 396, 30.12.2006, p. 1.

V

(Announcements)

OTHER ACTS

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Publication of a communication of approval of a standard amendment to a product specification for a name in the wine sector, as referred to in Article 17(2) and (3) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/33

(2023/C 211/05)

This communication is published in accordance with Article 17(5) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/33 ⁽¹⁾.

COMMUNICATING THE APPROVAL OF A STANDARD AMENDMENT

‘Gigondas’**PDO-FR-A0143-AM03****Date of communication: 20.4.2023****DESCRIPTION OF AND REASONS FOR THE APPROVED AMENDMENT****1. Editorial amendment to the geographical area and the area in immediate proximity**

In Chapter I of the specification, Section IV ‘Geographical area’ and ‘Area in immediate proximity’ has, without further change, been supplemented with a reference to the Official Geographical Code, which recognises and lists the communes by department at national level. This editorial amendment allows the geographical area to be identified with reference to the 2022 version of the Official Geographical Code, which is updated by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE), and gives the definition of the geographical area legal certainty.

The same reference has been added to the single document, under the headings ‘Geographical area’ and ‘Additional conditions – area in immediate proximity’.

2. Production conditions for white wines

The PDO has been extended to cover the production of white wines from grape varieties already listed in the specification as white grape varieties for use in the production of red and rosé wines. As the archives and various texts on the history of Gigondas show, the winegrowers have always produced white wines.

The production conditions and a description of the wine produced have been added to both the specification and the single document.

The following sections of the specification have been amended:

- Section V ‘Grape varieties’: a list has been added of the grape varieties that may be used for the production of white wines.

The varieties Clairette Blanc B, Bourboulenc B, Clairette Rose Rs, Grenache Blanc B, Grenache Gris, Marsanne B, Piquepoul Blanc B and Roussanne B have been added under ‘Wine grape varieties’ in the single document.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 9, 11.1.2019, p. 2.

The varieties Viognier B and Ugni Blanc B have been added under 'Secondary wine grape varieties' in the single document.

- Section IX, point 1 'Blends of grape varieties': the proportion of Clairette Blanc in the blend has been set at a minimum of 70 %. That provision has also been added under 'Description of the wine(s)' in the single document.
- Section X 'Link with the geographical area': an organoleptic description of the white wines has been added under point 2 'Information on product quality'. That description has also been added to the single document, under 'Description of the wine(s)'.
- Section VII 'Grape harvest, transport and ripeness' sets the minimum sugar content of white grape varieties used for white wine production at 196 g/l. This provision does not affect the single document.
- Section VII of the specification also sets the minimum natural alcoholic strength by volume of the white wines at 12 % vol., and the same provision has been added under 'Description of the wine(s)' in the single document.
- In Chapter I of the specification, Section IX 'Processing, production' sets the volatile acidity of the white wines at no more than 17,30 milliequivalents per litre. That parameter has also been added to the single document, under 'Description of the wine(s)'.
- Section VIII 'Yield': the yield for the white wines has been set at a maximum of 44 hl/ha. That provision has also been added under 'Maximum yields' in the single document.

3. Amendment to the production conditions for red wines

- Pruning rules:

In Chapter I of the specification, point 1 of Section VI 'Vineyard management' has been amended to supplement the pruning rules so as to allow the use of single or double Guyot pruning for the Syrah and Viognier varieties.

Those provisions have also been added to the single document, under 'Winemaking practices'.

- List of main grape varieties:

In Section V 'Grape varieties' of Chapter I of the specification, Cinsaut has been moved from the list of secondary grape varieties to the list of main grape varieties. This variety is of interest to producers because it gives the wines an appealing finesse and lightness without altering their organoleptic profile. The same amendment has also been made to the single document, under 'Main wine grape varieties'.

- Change to the rules on blending:

In Chapter I of the specification, point 1 of Section IX has been amended under 'Blending of grape varieties', because the applicant group wishes to increase the proportion of other varieties in the red and rosé wines by reducing the minimum proportion of the Grenache variety to 50 %.

The proportion of Clairette Blanc in the white wines has been set at a minimum of 70 %. The same provisions have also been added under 'Description of the wine(s)' in the single document.

- Reduction of the maximum malic acid content of the red wines from 0,4 g/l to 0,3 g/l.

This value will make it easier to determine when malolactic fermentation has finished. It has been specified in Section IX 'Processing, production' of Chapter I of the specification and has been amended under 'Description of the red wines' in the single document.

- Removal of the maturation requirement for red and rosé wines:

In Chapter I of the specification, point 2 'Provisions concerning each product' of Section IX has been amended to remove the dates for maturation of the wines, namely 1 January following the year of harvest for rosé wines and 15 January following the year of harvest for red wines. The applicant group wishes to abolish the maturation requirement, which is not justified for the production of wines bearing this designation, and to prevent traders from being discriminated against. This amendment does not affect the single document.

— Change to the date of release for sale to the consumer:

In Chapter I of the specification, point 5 'Provisions concerning product circulation and release for sale to the consumer' of Section IX sets the date of release for sale to the consumer as 15 January following the year of harvest for the rosé wines and 31 January for the red wines. As the maturation requirement has been abolished, the applicant group wishes to bring the date of release for sale to the consumer forward to 15 December for the rosé wines, while the date of release for sale remains unchanged for the red wines. This amendment does not affect the single document.

4. Declaration requirements

In Chapter II of the specification, Section I 'Declaration requirements' has been amended as follows:

- The packaging declaration has been brought into line with the inspection plan and may be sent directly to the inspection body up to 3 working days after packaging.
- The withdrawal declaration is not needed. It has been abolished because the wines cannot be declared under the broader designation of origin 'Côtes du Rhône', as the production conditions are different.

These amendments do not affect the single document.

SINGLE DOCUMENT

1. Name(s)

Gigondas

2. Type of geographical indication

PDO – protected designation of origin

3. Category of grapevine product

1. Wine

4. Description of the wine(s)

1. *Still rosé wines*

BRIEF WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

The wines have a minimum natural alcoholic strength by volume of 12,5 %.

At the time of packaging: the fermentable sugar (glucose + fructose) content is not more than 3 g per litre.

The other analytical criteria are in line with EU rules.

The red and rosé wines are mostly produced from the Grenache N, Syrah N and Mourvèdre N varieties. The proportion of Grenache N in the wines is at least 50 %.

Grenache N brings tannins and roundness to the blends. A moderate quantity of Syrah N strengthens the colour and aromatic intensity and gives the wine greater ageing potential, without altering its character. Mourvèdre N, with its high antioxidant capacity, perfectly complements Grenache N. It enhances the wine's aromatic complexity, adds spicy notes and is perfectly suited to maturing in wood. The rosé wine, despite making up only a small percentage of the overall production, deserves considerable attention, notably due to its fullness on the palate. It is a rich pink colour with tints of purple. The nose is characterised by a bouquet of almonds and cooked berries, while on the palate, it is heady yet well balanced.

General analytical characteristics

Maximum total alcoholic strength (in % volume)	14,5
Minimum actual alcoholic strength (in % volume)	

Minimum total acidity	in milliequivalents per litre
Maximum volatile acidity (in milliequivalents per litre)	14,28
Maximum total sulphur dioxide (in milligrams per litre)	

2. *Still red wines*

BRIEF WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

The wines have a minimum natural alcoholic strength by volume of 12,5 %.

At the time of packaging:

- the malic acid content is no more than 0,3 g per litre at the time of packaging;
- the total polyphenol index is at least 45;
- the fermentable sugar (glucose + fructose) content is not more than 3 g per litre.

The other analytical criteria are in line with EU rules.

The red and rosé wines are mostly produced from the Grenache N, Syrah N and Mourvèdre N varieties. The proportion of Grenache N in the wines is at least 50 %.

Grenache N brings tannins and roundness to the blends. A moderate quantity of Syrah N strengthens the colour and aromatic intensity and gives the wine greater ageing potential, without altering its character. Mourvèdre N, with its high antioxidant capacity, perfectly complements Grenache N. It enhances the wine's aromatic complexity, adds spicy notes and is perfectly suited to maturing in wood. The red wine is well suited to ageing. Its shimmering red colour ranges from ruby to a dark garnet. Robust and generous, it possesses aromas of very ripe red and black fruits in its youth, later developing wild notes of undergrowth and truffles.

General analytical characteristics	
Maximum total alcoholic strength (in % volume)	14,5
Minimum actual alcoholic strength (in % volume)	
Minimum total acidity	in milliequivalents per litre
Maximum volatile acidity (in milliequivalents per litre)	17,30
Maximum total sulphur dioxide (in milligrams per litre)	

3. *Still white wines*

BRIEF WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

The white wines have a minimum natural alcoholic strength by volume of 12 %.

The fermentable sugar (glucose + fructose) content is not more than 3 g per litre.

The other analytical criteria are in line with EU rules.

The white wines are made from grapes or wines which comprise at least 70 % Clairette Blanc.

The white wines are produced in three zones. They show minerality and balance and have a brilliant, pale colour with green tints, which can become slightly more intense and golden with ageing.

On the high ground, the white grape varieties, mainly Clairette, ripen slowly, which gives them freshness. The minerality, in turn, is derived from the limestone substratum. The combination of those two elements gives the wines an airy quality.

On the colluvial cone, the white grape varieties take on a slightly more dense structure, while still reflecting the presence of the limestone that can be found everywhere in Gigondas.

On the Miocene sands, the white grape varieties, in particular Clairette, display salinity and aromatic complexity.

General analytical characteristics	
Maximum total alcoholic strength (in % volume)	14,5
Minimum actual alcoholic strength (in % volume)	
Minimum total acidity	
Maximum volatile acidity (in milliequivalents per litre)	17,30
Maximum total sulphur dioxide (in milligrams per litre)	

5. Winemaking practices

5.1. Specific oenological practices

1. Training of the vines

Cultivation method

- The distance between rows must not exceed 2,50 m.
- The area available for each vine must not exceed 2,50 m². This area is calculated by multiplying the distance between rows by the distance between vines in the same row.
- The distance between vines in the same row must be between 0,80 m and 1,25 m.
- The vines are pruned short (goblet or cordon de Royat) with a maximum of six spurs. There are a maximum of two count buds on each spur.
- The formation or regeneration period for the cordon de Royat is limited to 2 years. During this period, single Guyot pruning, with a maximum of eight count buds on the cane and one spur with a maximum of two count buds, or double Guyot pruning, with two rods with five buds each and two replacement spurs with two buds each, is permitted.
- Single Guyot pruning, with a maximum of eight count buds on the cane, and one or two spurs with a maximum of two count buds, may be used for the Syrah N and Viognier B varieties.

Irrigation may be authorised.

2. Winemaking practices

Specific oenological practice

- Any heat treatment of the wine harvest at a temperature above 40 °C is forbidden.
- The use of woodchips is forbidden.
- When making rosé wines, the use of oenological charcoal is forbidden, whether alone or mixed in preparations.

In addition to the above provisions, all winemaking practices followed must also comply with the requirements laid down at EU level and in the Rural and Maritime Fishing Code.

5.2. *Maximum yields*

1. Red and rosé wines

40 hectolitres per hectare

2. White wines

44 hectolitres per hectare

6. **Demarcated geographical area**

The grapes are harvested and the wines made, developed and matured in the commune of Gigondas in the department of Vaucluse, on the basis of the 2022 Official Geographical Code.

7. **Wine grape variety(-ies)**

Bourboulenc B – Doucillon Blanc

Cinsaut N – Cinsault

Clairette B

Clairette Rose Rs

Grenache N

Grenache Blanc B

Grenache Gris G

Marsanne B

Mourvèdre N – Monastrell

Piquepoul Blanc B

Roussanne B

Syrah N – Shiraz

8. **Description of the link(s)**

8.1. *Description of the natural and human factors relevant to the link*

Located at the heart of the southern vineyards of the Rhône Valley and recognised as a *Cru des Côtes du Rhône*, the area defined for the production of wines bearing the registered designation of origin 'Gigondas' forms an integral part of the remarkable Dentelles de Montmirail limestone massif, which erosion has sculpted into an imposing and spectacular shape. The demarcated geographical area comprises the commune of Gigondas in the department of Vaucluse. The vineyards are planted at an altitude of between 160 and 400 metres, and the orientation of the land is such that they are protected from excessive summer sun. Their hillside location protects them from fog and spring frosts, ensuring a regular harvest each year. The climate is typically Provençal, a climate of contrasts, marked by Mediterranean summer heat and the fierce Mistral wind. As in all parts of the Mediterranean region, rainfall can be very heavy around the spring and autumn equinoxes.

For 2 000 years, the people of Gigondas, a village at the foot of the Dentelles de Montmirail, have made their living mainly from viticulture. The first winemaking estates are thought to have been established by the soldiers of the second Roman legion. In the 19th century, the production of 'Gigondas' wines steadily increased, as did their renown. On the basis of this reputation 'Gigondas' became a protected designation of origin in 1924, in accordance with the law of 6 May 1919.

Initially registered under the 'Côtes du Rhône' registered designation of origin (recognised by decree on 19 November 1937), 'Gigondas' wines were soon recognised for their quality and their distinctive character. As a result, from 1951 the name of the commune was naturally allowed to appear on the label alongside the registered designation of origin 'Côtes du Rhône'. On 6 January 1971, 'Gigondas' itself was recognised by decree as a registered designation of origin, thereby joining the *Crus des Côtes du Rhône* family of wines.

In 2009, the vineyards covered an area of 1 230 hectares, with an average production of 32 500 hectolitres.

Three types of wine are produced: red wines, which account for 99 % of production, and a much smaller quantity of rosé and white wines. Some 80 % of the wines are produced by private wineries.

8.2. Causal interactions

Gigondas, once known as *jucunditas* (Latin for 'great joy'), may justly be considered a prime location for the production of wines with a strongly distinctive identity whose quality has long been recognised.

The area is perfectly suited to winegrowing, and over the centuries the local people have been able to turn this to best advantage and work carefully with the unique raw material, which is the fruit of their labours on the land.

In magnificent surroundings, among holm oak and olive trees, with a good mesoclimate, the vineyards are planted on permeable soils that lessen the erosion caused by run-off water and enable the carefully selected plots of land to dry out quickly. Generally, these soils combine a clayey matrix, suitable for controlled water management, with a high gravel content that helps them to dry out and has a beneficial effect on temperatures when the grapes are ripening. The slopes are located at an altitude of 160 m to 400 m, above the Rhône mists, and this, together with their orientation (north-north-west), protects the vines from excessive sun and from spring frosts.

The commune of Gigondas thus offers all the advantages of the Provençal climate, i.e. plentiful sunshine and the Mistral, a cold, dry wind that helps to reduce fungal diseases and increase natural concentrations in the fruit, without the disadvantages, thanks to the protection provided by the Dentelles de Montmirail mountain range.

Over 2 000 years, all these factors, combined with the winegrowers' hard work and expertise, notably evident in their choice of grape varieties and mandatory sorting of the fruit, have led to the recognition and renown of the wines produced under the 'Gigondas' registered designation of origin and have above all allowed them to retain their distinctive character.

9. Essential further conditions (packaging, labelling, other requirements)

Area in immediate proximity

Legal framework:

National legislation

Type of further condition:

Derogation concerning production in the demarcated geographical area

Description of the condition:

The area in immediate proximity, defined by derogation for the making, development and maturing of the wines, comprises the territory of the following communes in the department of Vaucluse, on the basis of the 2022 Official Geographical Code:

Aubignan, Le Barroux, Beaumes-de-Venise, Beaumont-du-Ventoux, Bédarrides, Bollène, Buisson, Caderousse, Cairanne, Camaret-sur-Aigues, Caromb, Carpentras, Châteauneuf-du-Pape, Courthézon, Le Crestet, Entrechaux, Faucon, Jonquières, Lafare, Lagarde-Paréol, Lamotte-du-Rhône, Lapalud, Loriol-du-Comtat, Malaucène, Mazan, Mondragon, Mornas, Orange, Piolenc, Puymeras, Rasteau, Roaix, La Roque-Alric, Sablet, Sainte-Cécile-les-Vignes, Saint-Hippolyte-le-Graveyron, Saint-Léger-du-Ventoux, Saint-Marcellin-lès-Vaison, Saint-Romain-en-Viennois, Saint-Roman-de-Malegarde, Sarrians, Séguret, Sérignan-du-Comtat, Sorgues, Suzette, Travaillan, Uchaux, Vacqueyras, Vaison-la-Romaine, Vedène, Villedieu, Violès and Visan.

Additional labelling information

Legal framework:

National legislation

Type of further condition:

Additional provisions relating to labelling

Description of the condition:

- (a) Wines bearing the registered designation of origin may display the name of a smaller geographical unit on their labels, provided that:
- it is a registered location;
 - it appears on the harvest declaration.
- (b) Wines bearing the registered designation of origin may indicate the broader geographical unit ‘Cru des Côtes du Rhône’ or ‘Vignobles de la Vallée du Rhône’ on their labels. The rules governing the use of the broader geographical unit ‘Vignobles de la Vallée du Rhône’ are set out in the agreement signed between the protection and management bodies concerned.

Link to the product specification

https://info.agriculture.gouv.fr/gedei/site/bo-agri/document_administratif-ba4e714e-f1f5-476d-9097-07279359da1a

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



Publications Office
of the European Union
L-2985 Luxembourg
LUXEMBOURG

EN