

<u>Číslo oznamu</u>	Obsah	Strana
II <i>Oznámenia</i>		
OZNÁMENIA INŠTITÚCIÍ A ORGÁNOV EURÓPSKEJ ÚNIE		
Komisia		
2008/C 137/01	Povolenie štátnej pomoci v rámci ustanovení článkov 87 a 88 Zmluvy o ES — Prípady, ku ktorým nemá Komisia námietky ⁽¹⁾	1
2008/C 137/02	Nevznesenie námietky voči oznámenej koncentrácii (Prípady COMP/M.5143 – Barclays/CID) ⁽¹⁾	5
2008/C 137/03	Nevznesenie námietky voči oznámenej koncentrácii (Prípady COMP/M.5131 – Rewe/Fegro-Selgros) ⁽¹⁾	5
2008/C 137/04	Nevznesenie námietky voči oznámenej koncentrácii (Prípady COMP/M.4786 – Deutsche Bahn/Transfesa) ⁽¹⁾	6
2008/C 137/05	Nevznesenie námietky voči oznámenej koncentrácii (Prípady COMP/M.5008 – Vivendi/Activision) ⁽¹⁾	6
IV <i>Informácie</i>		
INFORMÁCIE INŠTITÚCIÍ A ORGÁNOV EURÓPSKEJ ÚNIE		
Komisia		
2008/C 137/06	Úroková miera použitá Európskou centrálnou bankou pri hlavných refinančných operáciách: 4,19 % dňa 1. júna 2008 — Výmenný kurz eura	7

2008/C 137/07	Oznámenie Komisie – Oznámenie o dokladoch o formálnych kvalifikáciách špecializovaných lekárov, sestier zodpovedných za všeobecnú starostlivosť, špecializovaných zubných lekárov, pôrodných asistentiek a architektov ⁽¹⁾	8
---------------	---	---

V *Oznamy*

ADMINISTRATÍVNE POSTUPY

Európsky úrad pre výber pracovníkov (EPSO)

2008/C 137/08	Oznámenie o verejných výberových konaniach EPSO/AST/58–63/08	11
---------------	--	----

KONANIA TÝKAJÚCE SA VYKONÁVANIA POLITIKY HOSPODÁRSKEJ SÚŤAŽE

Komisia

2008/C 137/09	Štátna pomoc – Taliansko — Štátna pomoc C 19/08 (ex NN 13/08) – Zneužitie pomoci na záchranu v prospech spoločnosti Sandretto — Výzva na predloženie pripomienok v súlade s článkom 88 ods. 2 Zmluvy o ES ⁽¹⁾	12
2008/C 137/10	Štátna pomoc – Spojené kráľovstvo — Štátna pomoc C 13/08 (ex N 589/07) – Pomoc spoločnosti Channel 4 spojená s digitalizáciou — Výzva na predloženie pripomienok v súlade s článkom 88 ods. 2 Zmluvy o ES ⁽¹⁾	16



⁽¹⁾ Text s významom pre EHP

II

(Oznámenia)

OZNÁMENIA INŠTITÚCIÍ A ORGÁNOV EURÓPSKEJ ÚNIE

KOMISIA

Povolenie štátnej pomoci v rámci ustanovení článkov 87 a 88 Zmluvy o ES**Prípady, ku ktorým nemá Komisia námietky**

(Text s významom pre EHP)

(2008/C 137/01)

Dátum prijatia rozhodnutia	30. 1. 2008
Číslo pomoci	N 435/07
Členský štát	Francúzsko
Región	—
Názov (a/alebo názov príjemcu)	Soutien de l'Agence de l'innovation industrielle en faveur du programme MINimage
Právny základ	Régime N 121/06
Druh opatrenia	Individuálna pomoc
Účel	Výskum a vývoj
Forma pomoci	Priama dotácia, Návrtná pomoc
Rozpočet	Celková výška plánovanej pomoci: 69 932 308 EUR
Intenzita	50 %
Trvanie	Do 31. 12. 2010
Sektory hospodárstva	Elektrické a optické zariadenia
Názov a adresa orgánu poskytujúceho pomoc	Agence de l'innovation industrielle 195, Bd Saint Germain F-75007 Paris
Ďalšie informácie	—

Rozhodnutie v autentickom jazykovom znení, z ktorého boli odstránené všetky informácie, ktoré sú predmetom obchodného tajomstva, je uverejnené na stránke:

http://ec.europa.eu/community_law/state_aids/

Dátum prijatia rozhodnutia	16. 4. 2008
Číslo pomoci	N 457/07
Členský štát	Taliansko
Región	Marche
Názov (a/alebo názov príjemcu)	Promozione della ricerca industriale e dello sviluppo sperimentale in filiere tecnologico-produttive — Marche
Právny základ	Bando per la promozione della ricerca industriale e dello sviluppo sperimentale in filiere tecnologico-produttive
Druh opatrenia	Schéma pomoci
Účel	Výskum a vývoj
Forma pomoci	Priama dotácia
Rozpočet	Celková výška plánovanej pomoci: 30 mil. EUR
Intenzita	80 %
Trvanie	Do 31. 12. 2013
Sektory hospodárstva	Všetky odvetvia
Názov a adresa orgánu poskytujúceho pomoc	Regione Marche Via Tiziano, 44 I-60100 Ancona
Ďalšie informácie	Týmto rozhodnutím sa zrušuje a nahrádza rozhodnutie z 21. januára 2008

Rozhodnutie v autentickom jazykovom znení, z ktorého boli odstránené všetky informácie, ktoré sú predmetom obchodného tajomstva, je uverejnené na stránke:

http://ec.europa.eu/community_law/state_aids/

Dátum prijatia rozhodnutia	2. 4. 2008
Číslo pomoci	N 575/07
Členský štát	Poľsko
Región	—
Názov (a/alebo meno príjemcu)	Pomoc państwa dla polskiego górnictwa w latach 2008–2010
Právny základ	Ustawa z 7 września 2007 r. o funkcjonowaniu górnictwa węgla kamiennego w latach 2008–2015
Druh opatrenia	Schéma štátnej pomoci
Účel	Pomoc na pokrytie výnimočných nákladov

Forma pomoci	Grant, Zrieknutie sa príspevkov PFRON, Odpustenie poplatkov a pokút splatných NGOSiGW, Odklad záväzkov voči ZUS
Rozpočet	1 305 598 500 PLN
Intenzita	—
Trvanie	2008-2010
Odvetvia hospodárstva	Uhoľný priemysel
Názov a adresa orgánu poskytujúceho pomoc	Minister Gospodarki (MG) Plac Trzech Krzyży 3/5 PL-00-507 Warszawa Zakład Ubezpieczeń Społecznych (ZUS) ul. Czerniakowska 16 PL-00-701 Warszawa Narodowy Fundusz Ochrony Środowiska i Gospodarki Wodnej (NFOŚiGW) ul. Konstruktorska 3a PL-02-673 Warszawa Państwowy Fundusz Rehabilitacji Osób Niepełnosprawnych (PFRON) Al. Jana Pawła II 13 PL-00-828 Warszawa
Ďalšie informácie	—

Rozhodnutie v autentickom jazykovom znení, z ktorého boli odstránené všetky informácie, ktoré sú predmetom obchodného tajomstva, je uverejnené na stránke:

http://ec.europa.eu/community_law/state_aids/

Dátum prijatia rozhodnutia	16. 4. 2008
Číslo pomoci	NN 17/08 (ex N 301/07)
Členský štát	Taliansko
Región	Campania
Názov (a/alebo názov príjemcu)	Aiuto a favore di Digital Display Devices (MSF 2002)
Právny základ	Legge n. 488 del 19 dicembre 1992 «Disciplina intervento aree depresse territorio nazionale» Legge n. 662 del 23 dicembre 1996, art. 2, commi 203 e segg. «Disciplina della programmazione negoziata/contratti di programma» DPR n. 175 del 26 marzo 2001 Art. 60 legge finanziaria 2003 «Creazione fondo aree sottosviluppate» DM Attività produttive del 12 novembre 2003 modalità di accesso dei contratti di localizzazione/programma DM Sviluppo economico del 27 dicembre 2006
Druh opatrenia	Individuálna pomoc
Účel	Regionálny rozvoj
Forma pomoci	Priama dotácia

Rozpočet	Celková výška plánovanej pomoci: 179,8 mil. EUR
Intenzita	12,08 %
Trvanie	27. 12. 2006-31. 12. 2009
Sektory hospodárstva	Elektrické a optické zariadenia
Názov a adresa orgánu poskytujúceho pomoc	Ministero dello Sviluppo economico Via Molise, 2 I-00187 Roma
Ďalšie informácie	—

Rozhodnutie v autentickom jazykovom znení, z ktorého boli odstránené všetky informácie, ktoré sú predmetom obchodného tajomstva, je uverejnené na stránke:

http://ec.europa.eu/community_law/state_aids/

Dátum prijatia rozhodnutia	26. 3. 2008
Číslo pomoci	N 106/08
Členský štát	Spolková republika Nemecko
Región	—
Názov (a/alebo meno príjemcu)	Richtlinie zur Förderung der Anschaffung emissionsarmer schwerer Nutzfahrzeuge
Právny základ	Haushaltsgesetz
Druh opatrenia	Schéma štátnej pomoci
Účel	Podpora ťažkých úžitkových vozidiel šetrnejších k životnému prostrediu
Forma pomoci	Investičné granty a úrokové prémie
Rozpočet	Maximálne do výšky 120 mil. EUR ročne
Intenzita	Maximálna intenzita 50 % oprávnených nákladov (dodatočné investičné náklady)
Trvanie	1. 1. 2007-31. 12. 2013
Odvetvia hospodárstva	Odvetvie dopravy
Názov a adresa orgánu poskytujúceho pomoc	Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Wohnungswesen Invalidenstraße 4 D-10115 Berlin
Ďalšie informácie	—

Rozhodnutie v autentickom jazykovom znení, z ktorého boli odstránené všetky informácie, ktoré sú predmetom obchodného tajomstva, je uverejnené na stránke:

http://ec.europa.eu/community_law/state_aids/

Nevnesenie námietky voči oznámenej koncentrácii**(Prípád COMP/M.5143 – Barclays/CID)**

(Text s významom pre EHP)

(2008/C 137/02)

Dňa 15. mája 2008 sa Komisia rozhodla neoponovať voči vyššie spomínanej oznámenej koncentrácii a vyhlásiť ju za kompatibilnú so spoločným trhom. Toto rozhodnutie je založené na článku 6 odsek 1 písmeno b) nariadenia Rady (ES) č. 139/2004. Úplný text rozhodnutia je dostupný iba v angličtine a bude dostupný verejnosti po tom, ako budú odstránené akékoľvek obchodné tajomstvá, ktoré by mohol obsahovať. Prístupný bude na:

- webovej stránke Europa competition (<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/mergers/cases/>). Táto webová stránka poskytuje rôzne možnosti pomoci na lokalizáciu individuálnych rozhodnutí o fúziách, vrátane názvu spoločnosti, čísla prípadu, dátumu a sektorových indexov,
- v elektronickej forme na webovej stránke EUR-Lex pod číslom dokumentu 32008M5143. EUR-Lex je počítačový dokumentačný systém práva Európskeho spoločenstva (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu>).

Nevnesenie námietky voči oznámenej koncentrácii**(Prípád COMP/M.5131 – Rewe/Fegro-Selgros)**

(Text s významom pre EHP)

(2008/C 137/03)

Dňa 16. mája 2008 sa Komisia rozhodla neoponovať voči vyššie spomínanej oznámenej koncentrácii a vyhlásiť ju za kompatibilnú so spoločným trhom. Toto rozhodnutie je založené na článku 6 odsek 1 písmeno b) nariadenia Rady (ES) č. 139/2004. Úplný text rozhodnutia je dostupný iba v nemčine a bude dostupný verejnosti po tom, ako budú odstránené akékoľvek obchodné tajomstvá, ktoré by mohol obsahovať. Prístupný bude na:

- webovej stránke Europa competition (<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/mergers/cases/>). Táto webová stránka poskytuje rôzne možnosti pomoci na lokalizáciu individuálnych rozhodnutí o fúziách, vrátane názvu spoločnosti, čísla prípadu, dátumu a sektorových indexov,
- v elektronickej forme na webovej stránke EUR-Lex pod číslom dokumentu 32008M5131. EUR-Lex je počítačový dokumentačný systém práva Európskeho spoločenstva (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu>).

Nevznesenie námietky voči oznámenej koncentrácii
(Prípád COMP/M.4786 – Deutsche Bahn/Transfesa)

(Text s významom pre EHP)

(2008/C 137/04)

Dňa 18. marca 2008 sa Komisia rozhodla neoponovať voči vyššie spomínanej oznámenej koncentrácii a vyhlásiť ju za kompatibilnú so spoločným trhom. Toto rozhodnutie je založené na článku 6 odsek 1 písmeno b) nariadenia Rady (ES) č. 139/2004. Úplný text rozhodnutia je dostupný iba v angličtine a bude dostupný verejnosti po tom, ako budú odstránené akékoľvek obchodné tajomstvá, ktoré by mohol obsahovať. Prístupný bude na:

- webovej stránke Europa competition (<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/mergers/cases/>). Táto webová stránka poskytuje rôzne možnosti pomoci na lokalizáciu individuálnych rozhodnutí o fúziách, vrátane názvu spoločnosti, čísla prípadu, dátumu a sektorových indexov,
- v elektronickej forme na webovej stránke EUR-Lex pod číslom dokumentu 32008M4786. EUR-Lex je počítačový dokumentačný systém práva Európskeho spoločenstva (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu>).

Nevznesenie námietky voči oznámenej koncentrácii
(Prípád COMP/M.5008 – Vivendi/Activision)

(Text s významom pre EHP)

(2008/C 137/05)

Dňa 16. apríla 2008 sa Komisia rozhodla neoponovať voči vyššie spomínanej oznámenej koncentrácii a vyhlásiť ju za kompatibilnú so spoločným trhom. Toto rozhodnutie je založené na článku 6 odsek 1 písmeno b) nariadenia Rady (ES) č. 139/2004. Úplný text rozhodnutia je dostupný iba v angličtine a bude dostupný verejnosti po tom, ako budú odstránené akékoľvek obchodné tajomstvá, ktoré by mohol obsahovať. Prístupný bude na:

- webovej stránke Europa competition (<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/mergers/cases/>). Táto webová stránka poskytuje rôzne možnosti pomoci na lokalizáciu individuálnych rozhodnutí o fúziách, vrátane názvu spoločnosti, čísla prípadu, dátumu a sektorových indexov,
 - v elektronickej forme na webovej stránke EUR-Lex pod číslom dokumentu 32008M5008. EUR-Lex je počítačový dokumentačný systém práva Európskeho spoločenstva (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu>).
-

IV

(Informácie)

INFORMÁCIE INŠTITÚCIÍ A ORGÁNOV EURÓPSKEJ ÚNIE

KOMISIA

Úroková miera použitá Európskou centrálnou bankou pri hlavných refinančných operáciách ⁽¹⁾:

4,19 % dňa 1. júna 2008

Výmenný kurz eura ⁽²⁾

3. júna 2008

(2008/C 137/06)

1 euro =

Mena		Výmenný kurz	Mena		Výmenný kurz
USD	Americký dolár	1,5593	TRY	Turecká líra	1,9132
JPY	Japonský jen	163	AUD	Austrálsky dolár	1,6272
DKK	Dánska koruna	7,4583	CAD	Kanadský dolár	1,562
GBP	Britská libra	0,79105	HKD	Hongkongský dolár	12,1702
SEK	Švédská koruna	9,3408	NZD	Novozélandský dolár	1,9822
CHF	Švajčiarsky frank	1,611	SGD	Singapurský dolár	2,1202
ISK	Islandská koruna	118,79	KRW	Juhokórejský won	1 587,29
NOK	Nórska koruna	7,9615	ZAR	Juhoafrický rand	12,0315
BGN	Bulharský lev	1,9558	CNY	Čínsky juan	10,7982
CZK	Česká koruna	24,84	HRK	Chorvátska kuna	7,252
EEK	Estónska koruna	15,6466	IDR	Indonézska rupia	14 517,08
HUF	Maďarský forint	241,48	MYR	Malajzijský ringgit	5,0256
LTL	Litovský litas	3,4528	PHP	Filipínske peso	68,212
LVL	Lotyšský lats	0,7031	RUB	Ruský rubel	36,902
PLN	Poľský zlotý	3,365	THB	Thajský baht	50,841
RON	Rumunský lei	3,62	BRL	Brazílsky real	2,5267
SKK	Slovenská koruna	30,36	MXN	Mexické peso	16,0686

⁽¹⁾ Použitý kurz sa vzťahuje k poslednej operácii vykonanej pred určeným dňom. V prípade, že tender obsahuje variabilný kurz, použije sa kurz medzný.

⁽²⁾ Zdroj: referenčný výmenný kurz publikovaný ECB.

Oznámenie Komisie – Oznámenie o dokladoch o formálnych kvalifikáciách špecializovaných lekárov, sestier zodpovedných za všeobecnú starostlivosť, špecializovaných zubných lekárov, pôrodných asistentiek a architektov

(Text s významom pre EHP)

(2008/C 137/07)

Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2005/36/ES zo 7. septembra 2005 o uznávaní odborných kvalifikácií, zmenená a doplnená smernicou Rady 2006/100/ES z 20. novembra 2006, ktorou sa z dôvodu pristúpenia Bulharska a Rumunska upravujú určité smernice v oblasti voľného pohybu osôb, a najmä jej článok 21 ods. 7, určuje, že členské štáty oznamujú Komisii právne, regulačné a správne ustanovenia, ktoré prijímajú v súvislosti s udeľovaním dokladov o formálnych kvalifikáciách v oblastiach, na ktoré sa vzťahuje kapitola III tejto smernice. Komisia uverejňuje všetky príslušné správy v *Úradnom vestníku Európskej únie*, s uvedením titulov, ktoré prijali členské štáty ako doklad o formálnej kvalifikácii, v prípade potreby s uvedením organizácie, ktorá vydáva doklady o príslušnej formálnej kvalifikácii, osvedčenia, ktoré k nim patria a v prípade potreby zodpovedajúci profesijný titul uvedený v prílohe V článku 5 ods. 1 bodoch 1, 2, 3, 4; ods. 2 bode 2; ods. 3 bodoch 2, 3; ods. 4 bode 2; ods. 5 bode 2; ods. 6 bode 2 a ods. 7 bode 1 v tomto poradí.

Keďže niekoľko členských štátov oznámilo nové tituly alebo zmeny v zozname názvov, Komisia vydáva toto oznámenie v súlade s článkom 21 ods. 7 smernice 2005/36/ES⁽¹⁾.

1. Špecializovaní lekári

Holandsko oznámilo nasledujúce zmeny v už uvedených tituloch špecializačnej medicíny (príloha V, článok 5 ods. 1 bod 3 smernice 2005/36/ES):

- a) v záhlaví „pôrodníctvo a gynekológia“:

Obstetrie en Gynaecologie

- b) v záhlaví „gastro-enterológia“:

Maag-darm-leverziekten

- c) v záhlaví „biochémia“:

Klinische Chemie (do 4. apríla 2000)

- d) v záhlaví „alergológia“:

Allergologie (do 12. augusta 1996).

2. Zdravotné sestry a ošetrovatelia zodpovední za všeobecnú starostlivosť

Poľsko oznámilo nasledujúci dodatočný titul zdravotnej sestry a ošetrovateľa zodpovedných za všeobecnú starostlivosť (príloha V, článok 5 ods. 2 bod 2 smernice 2005/36/ES):

Krajina	Doklad o formálnych kvalifikáciách	Orgán udeľujúci doklad o dosiahnutej kvalifikácii	Názov profesie	Referenčný dátum
Polska	Dyplom ukończenia studiów wyższych zawodowych na kierunku/specjalności pielęgniarstwo z tytułem „licencjat pielęgniarstwa”	Instytucja prowadząca kształcenie na poziomie wyższym uznana przez właściwe władze	Pielęgniarka	1. 5. 2004

3. Špecializovaní zubní lekári

1. Portugalsko oznámilo nasledujúce tituly zubných lekárov špecializujúcich sa na čeľusťnú ortopédiu a maxilofaciálnu chirurgiu (príloha V, článok 5 ods. 3 bod 3 smernice 2005/36/ES):

- a) pre „čeľusťnú ortopédiu“:

Krajina	Doklad o formálnych kvalifikáciách	Orgán udeľujúci doklad o dosiahnutej kvalifikácii	Referenčný dátum
Portugal	Título de Especialista em Ortodontia	Ordem dos Médicos Dentistas (OMD)	4. 6. 2008

⁽¹⁾ Konsolidovaná verzia prílohy V k smernici 2005/36/ES sa nachádza na webovej stránke: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/qualifications/index_en.htm

b) pre „maxilofaciálnu chirurgiu“:

Krajina	Doklad o formálnych kvalifikáciách	Orgán udeľujúci doklad o dosiahnutej kvalifikácii	Referenčný dátum
Portugal	Título de Especialista em Cirurgia Oral	Ordem dos Médicos Dentistas (OMD)	4. 6. 2008

2. Švédsko oznámilo nasledujúce zmeny v už uvedených tituloch špecializovaných zubných lekárov (príloha V, článok 5 ods. 3 bod 3 smernice 2005/36/ES):

a) pre „čelústnu ortopédiu“:

Krajina	Doklad o formálnych kvalifikáciách	Orgán udeľujúci doklad o dosiahnutej kvalifikácii	Referenčný dátum
Sverige	Bevis om specialistkompetens i ortodonti	Socialstyrelsen	1. 1. 1994

b) pre „maxilofaciálnu chirurgiu“:

Krajina	Doklad o formálnych kvalifikáciách	Orgán udeľujúci doklad o dosiahnutej kvalifikácii	Referenčný dátum
Sverige	Bevis om specialistkompetens i oral kirurgi	Socialstyrelsen	1. 1. 1994

4. Pôrodné asistentky

Poľsko oznámilo nasledujúci dodatočný titul pôrodnej asistentky (príloha V, článok 5 ods. 5 bod 2 smernice 2005/36/ES):

Krajina	Doklad o formálnych kvalifikáciách	Orgán udeľujúci doklad o dosiahnutej kvalifikácii	Názov profesie	Referenčný dátum
Polska	Dyplom ukończenia studiów wyższych zawodowych na kierunku/specjalności położnictwo z tytułem „licencjat położnictwa”	Instytucja prowadząca kształcenie na poziomie wyższym uznana przez właściwe władze	Położna	1. 5. 2004

5. Architekti

1. Taliansko oznámilo nasledujúci dodatočný titul v oblasti architektúry (príloha V, článok 5 ods. 7 bod 1 smernice 2005/36/ES):

Krajina	Doklad o formálnych kvalifikáciách	Orgán udeľujúci doklad o dosiahnutej kvalifikácii	Doplňujúce osvedčenie ku kvalifikácii	Referenčný školský rok
Italia	Laurea specialistica in ingegneria edile — architettura	Università degli Studi di Salerno Università degli Studi della Calabria Università degli Studi di Brescia	Diploma di abilitazione all'esercizio indipendente della professione che viene rilasciato dal ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'università e della ricerca dopo che il candidato ha sostenuto con esito positivo l'esame di Stato davanti ad una commissione competente	2005/2006 2003/2004 2001/2002
	Laurea specialistica in architettura	Facoltà di architettura dell'Università degli Studi «G. D'Annunzio» di Chieti-Pescara Facoltà di architettura, pianificazione e ambiente del Politecnico di Milano Università IUAV di Venezia		2001/2002 2001/2002 2002/2003
	Laurea specialistica in architettura (Restauro)	Facoltà di architettura di «Valle Giulia» dell'Università degli Studi «La Sapienza» di Roma Università degli Studi di Roma Tre — Facoltà di Architettura		2004/2005 2001/2002
	Laurea specialistica in architettura — progettazione architettonica e urbana	Facoltà «Ludovico Quaroni» dell'Università degli Studi «La Sapienza» di Roma		2000/2001
	Laurea magistrale/specialistica in architettura	Facoltà di architettura dell'Università degli Studi di Trieste		2001/2002

2. Slovinsko oznámilo nasledujúci dodatočný titul v oblasti architektúry (príloha V, článok 5 ods. 7 bod 1 smernice 2005/36/ES):

Krajina	Doklad o formálnych kvalifikáciách	Orgán udeľujúci doklad o dosiahnutej kvalifikácii	Doplňujúce osvedčenie ku kvalifikácii	Referenčný školský rok
Slovenija	Magister inženir architekture/Magistrica inženirka architekture	Univerza v Ljubljani, Fakulteta za Arhitekturo		2007/2008

3. Česká republika oznámila nasledujúci dodatočný titul v oblasti architektúry (príloha V, článok 5 ods. 7 bod 1 smernice 2005/36/ES):

Krajina	Doklad o formálnych kvalifikáciách	Orgán udeľujúci doklad o dosiahnutej kvalifikácii	Doplňujúce osvedčenie ku kvalifikácii	Referenčný školský rok
Česká republika	Architektura a urbanismus	Fakulta architektury, České vysoké učení technické (ČVUT) v Praze		2007/2008

V

(Oznamy)

ADMINISTRATÍVNE POSTUPY

EURÓPSKY ÚRAD PRE VÝBER PRACOVNÍKOV (EPSO)

OZNÁMENIE O VEREJNÝCH VÝBEROVÝCH KONANIACH EPSO/AST/58–63/08

(2008/C 137/08)

Európsky úrad pre výber pracovníkov (EPSO) organizuje verejné výberové konania:

- EPSO/AST/58/08 – mechanika,
- EPSO/AST/59/08 – laboratórna technika,
- EPSO/AST/60/08 – stavebné inžinierstvo a elektrotechnika

na nábor laboratórnych asistentov (AST1) v oblasti výskumu a jadrových technológií, najmä pre technickú podporu a laboratórne práce,

a

- EPSO/AST/61/08 – laboratórni technici a technici pre infraštruktúru,
- EPSO/AST/62/08 – technici v oblasti jadrových technológií,
- EPSO/AST/63/08 – jadroví inšpektori

na nábor asistentov (AST3) v oblasti jadrových technológií.

Oznámenia o výberových konaniach sú uverejnené výlučne v anglickom, francúzskom a nemeckom jazyku v Úradnom vestníku Európskej únie C 137 A zo 4. júna 2008.

Úplné informácie sú k dispozícii na internetovej stránke úradu EPSO: <http://europa.eu/epso>

KONANIA TÝKAJÚCE SA VYKONÁVANIA POLITIKY HOSPODÁRSKEJ SÚŤAŽE

KOMISIA

ŠTÁTNA POMOC – TALIANSKO

Štátna pomoc C 19/08 (ex NN 13/08) – Zneužitie pomoci na záchranu v prospech spoločnosti Sandretto

Výzva na predloženie pripomienok v súlade s článkom 88 ods. 2 Zmluvy o ES

(Text s významom pre EHP)

(2008/C 137/09)

Listom z dňa 16. apríla 2008, ktorý je uvedený v autentickom jazyku za týmto zhrnutím, Komisia oznámila Taliansku svoje rozhodnutie začať konanie podľa článku 88 ods. 2 Zmluvy o ES, pokiaľ ide o časť uvedeného opatrenia pomoci.

Zainteresované strany môžu predložiť svoje pripomienky k opatreniu pomoci, vo veci ktorého Komisia začína konanie, v lehote jedného mesiaca odo dňa uverejnenia tohto zhrnutia a nasledujúceho listu. Kontaktné údaje:

European Commission
Directorate-General Competition
State aid Greffe
B-1049 Brussels
Fax: (32-2) 296 12 42

Tieto pripomienky sa oznámia Taliansku. Zainteresované strany môžu písomne s uvedením dôvodov požiadať o dôverné zaobchádzanie s údajmi o ich totožnosti.

TEXT ZHRNUTIA

KONANIE

Dňa 29. januára 2007 Komisia schválila pomoc na záchranu pre spoločnosť Sandretto Industrie Srl („Sandretto“) vo výške 5 miliónov EUR. Keďže Komisia nedostala žiadnu informáciu o ďalšom vývoji, zaslala Taliansku dňa 14. decembra 2007 list so žiadosťou o zaslanie najnovších informácií v tomto prípade. Taliansko odpovedalo dňa 21. januára 2008 listom, v ktorom informovalo Komisiu o tom, že pomoc bola poskytnutá v dvoch splátkach: dňa 24. júla 2007 a dňa 13. augusta 2007. Dňa 23. januára 2008 Komisia požiadala Taliansko, aby potvrdilo, že záruka vyprší dňa 24. januára 2008 alebo aby predložilo plán na reštrukturalizáciu. Taliansko informovalo Komisiu dňa 8. februára 2008, že prvá časť záruky vypršala 24. januára 2008 a že spoločnosť zbankrotovala.

OPIS

Sandretto je výrobcom lisovacích zariadení na vstrekovanie plastických materiálov. Nachádza sa v provincii Turín a zamestnáva 350 osôb. Od roku 2005 sa nachádza vo vážnych ťažkostiach. Pomoc na záchranu, ktorú schválila Komisia, bola

poskytnutá vo forme záruky na dva pohotovostné úvery, každý vo výške 2,5 milióna EUR. Pomoc bola vyplatená približne 6 mesiacov po jej schválení. Taliansko informovalo Komisiu, že pokus predať spoločnosť Sandretto súkromnému investorovi zlyhal začiatkom roka 2008.

POSÚDENIE

Komisia nemá žiadnu správu o tom, že Sandretto prestalo čerpať výhody z pomoci na záchranu po vypršaní šesťmesačnej lehoty. Komisia sa navyše domnieva, že dlhá časová odstup medzi schválením a poskytnutím pomoci je potrebné odôvodniť osobitnými okolnosťami tohto prípadu a v tomto konkrétnom prípade má Komisia pochybnosti, či takéto osobitné okolnosti vôbec existujú. Okrem toho Taliansko neposkytlo žiadne informácie o konkurznom konaní spoločnosti Sandretto, Komisia má preto pochybnosti o tom, či je v konaní zabezpečené účinné vrátenie zneužitej výšky pomoci. Keďže Taliansko nepredložilo plán na reštrukturalizáciu, Komisia nepovažuje v tomto štádiu za pravdepodobné, že predĺženie pomoci na záchranu by mohlo byť zlučiteľné so spoločným trhom ako pomoc na reštrukturalizáciu.

TEXT LISTU

„La Commissione informa l'Italia che, dopo aver esaminato le informazioni trasmesse dalle autorità italiane sull'aiuto in oggetto, ha deciso di avviare il procedimento di cui all'articolo 88, paragrafo 2, del trattato CE.

I. PROCEDIMENTO

- (1) Il 29 gennaio 2007 la Commissione ha approvato un aiuto per il salvataggio dell'importo di 5 Mio EUR a favore di Sandretto Industrie Srl (in seguito denominata "Sandretto")⁽¹⁾. L'aiuto consisteva in una garanzia su due linee di credito fornite da banche private, le cui condizioni erano da definire dopo l'approvazione della Commissione. L'Italia si era impegnata a revocare la garanzia al più tardi sei mesi dopo la sua concessione e a fornire alla Commissione un piano di ristrutturazione per Sandretto entro sei mesi dalla data di autorizzazione dell'aiuto.
- (2) In mancanza di informazioni circa gli sviluppi della situazione, la Commissione ha inviato una lettera all'Italia il 14 dicembre 2007 (D/54995) per chiedere un aggiornamento sul caso.
- (3) L'Italia ha risposto con lettera del 21 gennaio 2008 (A/1233), informando la Commissione che l'aiuto era stato versato in due tranches: la prima erogata il 24 luglio 2007 e la seconda il 13 agosto 2007.
- (4) Con lettera del 23 gennaio 2008 (D/50314) la Commissione ha chiesto all'Italia di confermare la cessazione della garanzia al 24 gennaio 2008 o in alternativa di trasmetterle un piano di ristrutturazione, aggiungendo che in mancanza di una sollecita risposta i servizi della Commissione avrebbero proposto l'avvio del procedimento di indagine formale.
- (5) L'8 febbraio 2008 l'Italia ha risposto (A/2526) alla Commissione che la prima tranche della garanzia cessava il 24 gennaio 2008 e che la società era fallita.

II. DESCRIZIONE

2.1. L'impresa interessata

- (6) Sandretto è un produttore di presse per iniezione per materie plastiche. L'impresa è stata fondata nel 1947 come "Fratelli Sandretto" e da allora ha cambiato più volte denominazione e forma societaria: l'ultimo di questi cambiamenti risale al 18 maggio 2005 quando l'impresa ha assunto la denominazione di Sandretto Industrie Srl. Sandretto ha due stabilimenti di produzione situati nella provincia di Torino nei comuni di Grugliasco e Pont Canavese, entrambi ammessi a beneficiare di aiuti ai sensi dell'articolo 87, paragrafo 3, lettera c), del trattato CE. Attualmente l'impresa appartiene ad un unico azionista, la società statunitense Taylor's International LLC.

⁽¹⁾ Caso N 802/06 (GU C 43 del 27.2.2007, pag. 2).

- (7) Sandretto ha 350 dipendenti e rappresenta la principale fonte di impiego per l'economia locale. Le sue attività commerciali sono principalmente orientate al mercato europeo, con varie imprese controllate in Francia, Spagna, Regno Unito e Paesi Bassi. Sandretto è specializzata in macchinari per usi speciali in mercati di nicchia: nel 2003, quando ancora non si erano manifestate difficoltà finanziarie, era al decimo posto fra gli operatori di questo mercato in Europa.
- (8) Nel 2005 Sandretto ha realizzato un fatturato di 21,58 Mio EUR e subito perdite per 43,74 Mio EUR. Il tribunale di Torino, con decisione del 16 marzo 2006, ha ammesso la società alla procedura di amministrazione straordinaria⁽²⁾. Di conseguenza, l'azionista unico ha automaticamente perso il controllo sulla gestione dell'impresa, passata ai tre commissari straordinari nominati dal ministero competente.
- (9) Secondo le autorità italiane, la principale causa delle difficoltà della società è da imputarsi al suo rilievo da parte dell'investitore americano Taylor's International LLC che non è riuscito ad effettuare gli investimenti necessari provocando l'inattività degli stabilimenti produttivi.
- (10) Nel giugno 2007 è stato pubblicato un invito a manifestare l'interesse all'acquisto, per vendere Sandretto ad un nuovo investitore privato. Secondo quanto riferito dalle autorità italiane, questo tentativo non ha avuto buon esito e la società è andata in fallimento⁽³⁾. La Commissione non è al corrente se Sandretto abbia cessato la sua attività.

2.2. La misura di aiuto

- (11) Sebbene sia stato approvato il 29 gennaio 2007, l'aiuto per il salvataggio è stato erogato solo sei mesi dopo: la prima tranche il 24 luglio 2007 e la seconda il 13 agosto 2007. Secondo l'Italia questo periodo di tempo era necessario agli amministratori straordinari per scegliere le banche private che avrebbero concesso le linee di credito e per accordarsi sulle condizioni del finanziamento.
- (12) L'aiuto al salvataggio è stato concesso nella forma di una garanzia su due linee di credito di 2,5 Mio EUR ciascuna, fornite dalla Banca Popolare di Novara e Banca Intesa Sanpaolo.
- (13) Secondo l'Italia, la prima tranche dell'aiuto è terminata il 24 gennaio 2008. Tuttavia, nonostante due richieste da parte della Commissione, le autorità italiane non hanno presentato alcuna prova che la prima tranche della garanzia è terminata, né hanno fornito alcuna informazione sulla seconda tranche, o un piano di ristrutturazione (o di liquidazione) per la società.

⁽²⁾ La Commissione comprende dalla legislazione italiana che "l'amministrazione straordinaria" è una procedura concorsuale applicata alle imprese in stato di insolvenza con l'obiettivo di mantenerne l'attività produttiva.

⁽³⁾ La Commissione comprende dalla legislazione italiana che la "procedura fallimentare" è una procedura concorsuale che ha l'obiettivo di soddisfare le richieste dei creditori attraverso la vendita dei beni dell'impresa, che conduce di solito alla liquidazione della società.

III. VALUTAZIONE

3.1. Esistenza di aiuto

(14) La Commissione ritiene che la misura di aiuto per il salvataggio costituisca aiuto di Stato, ai sensi dell'articolo 87, paragrafo 1, del trattato CE. La misura ha assunto la forma di una garanzia, che costituisce un beneficio finanziato da risorse pubbliche. L'aiuto è selettivo in quanto riguarda solo Sandretto ed è probabile che falsi la concorrenza poiché garantisce all'impresa un vantaggio rispetto ad altri concorrenti che non ne fruiscono. Infine, il mercato in cui Sandretto opera è caratterizzato da notevoli scambi tra Stati membri.

3.2. Applicazione abusiva di aiuto per il salvataggio

(15) La Commissione ha approvato l'aiuto per il salvataggio a favore di Sandretto⁽⁴⁾. In seguito a questa decisione, l'aiuto per il salvataggio, se limitato a sei mesi, è compatibile col mercato comune. Per la proroga dell'aiuto per il salvataggio oltre il periodo di sei mesi è necessaria una valutazione sulla base degli Orientamenti comunitari sugli aiuti di Stato per il salvataggio e la ristrutturazione di imprese in difficoltà [in seguito, "gli orientamenti"⁽⁵⁾], per verificare se costituisca un'applicazione abusiva dell'aiuto per il salvataggio o se possa essere considerata compatibile a titolo di aiuto per la ristrutturazione.

(16) In base al punto 25, lettera a) degli orientamenti, l'aiuto per il salvataggio deve cessare entro un termine non superiore a sei mesi dall'erogazione della prima tranche all'impresa. Il punto 25, lettera c), degli orientamenti sembra fissare un'altra data di inizio per il calcolo del termine dei sei mesi, stabilendo che lo Stato membro deve presentare alla Commissione, entro sei mesi dall'autorizzazione dell'aiuto per il salvataggio, un piano di ristrutturazione (o di liquidazione) o la prova che la garanzia è stata revocata. Questo ultimo punto sembra basarsi sull'ipotesi che l'aiuto per il salvataggio, per la sua natura temporanea e di urgenza, viene di solito concesso immediatamente dopo la sua autorizzazione da parte della Commissione.

(17) Tuttavia, nel presente caso, l'Italia ha concesso l'aiuto per il salvataggio quasi sei mesi dopo la sua approvazione da parte della Commissione e pertanto, in base alla semplice enunciazione degli orientamenti, la data di inizio del termine di sei mesi può risultare non evidente. Poiché la Commissione ritiene che eventuali distorsioni della concorrenza possono verificarsi a partire dal momento in cui l'aiuto è effettivamente erogato, la data che dà avvio al termine di sei mesi coincide con la concessione all'impresa della prima rata che è assistita dalla garanzia.

(18) Di conseguenza, il termine per la cessazione della garanzia o per la presentazione di un piano di ristrutturazione scade, conformemente al punto 25, lettera a), degli orientamenti, sei mesi dopo la concessione della prima tranche, ossia il 24 gennaio 2008.

(19) Al momento della notifica dell'aiuto per il salvataggio, l'Italia si era impegnata a revocare la garanzia al più tardi sei mesi dopo la sua concessione e a fornire alla Commis-

sione un piano di ristrutturazione per Sandretto entro sei mesi dall'autorizzazione dell'aiuto.

(20) Tuttavia, nonostante le richieste della Commissione, le autorità italiane non hanno presentato alcun piano di ristrutturazione (o di liquidazione), né fornito la prova della cessazione della garanzia a seguito del rimborso della prima rata del prestito. Ad eccezione di una breve lettera in cui affermavano che la data di cessazione per la prima tranche dell'aiuto era il 24 gennaio 2008 (data presunta del rimborso della prima rata del prestito), le autorità italiane non hanno presentato sinora alcuna prova dell'effettiva cessazione della garanzia né dell'effettivo rimborso della prima rata del prestito. Riguardo alla seconda tranche, l'Italia non ha fornito alcun tipo di informazione relativa alla cessazione della garanzia e/o al rimborso del prestito.

(21) Pertanto la Commissione non dispone di elementi attestanti che la società abbia cessato di beneficiare dell'aiuto per il salvataggio dopo il termine dei sei mesi.

(22) Inoltre, fra l'autorizzazione e la concessione dell'aiuto per il salvataggio è intercorso un lasso di tempo considerevole: questo ritardo di quasi sei mesi suscita dubbi riguardo alla necessità dell'aiuto. Conformemente al punto 15 degli orientamenti, l'aiuto per il salvataggio è uno strumento previsto per sostenere un'impresa che affronta un'acuta crisi di liquidità allo scopo di consentire di mantenerla in attività per il tempo necessario a elaborare un piano di ristrutturazione. L'aiuto per il salvataggio è quindi caratterizzato dalla rapidità e dalla temporaneità e la decisione di approvazione della Commissione non ne autorizza la sua corresponsione ad una data di gran lunga posteriore, quando le circostanze originarie che ne avevano giustificato l'approvazione potrebbero non sussistere più.

(23) Le autorità italiane sostengono che il periodo di tempo intercorso era necessario per concordare con le banche le condizioni del finanziamento e affermano che la società era ancora in serie difficoltà sei mesi dopo l'autorizzazione. La Commissione ritiene che un lasso di tempo di tale durata fra l'autorizzazione e la concessione dell'aiuto debba essere giustificato da speciali circostanze e nutre dubbi circa la loro presenza nel caso di specie.

(24) Inoltre, l'Italia non ha trasmesso informazioni circa la procedura fallimentare applicata a Sandretto: in particolare se l'iscrizione degli importi dovuti allo Stato ne assicuri il totale ed immediato recupero e se e quando l'attività della società dovesse cessare. Pertanto la Commissione non è certa che la procedura fallimentare assicuri l'effettivo recupero degli importi di aiuto erogati abusivamente.

3.3. Compatibilità con il mercato comune a titolo di aiuto per la ristrutturazione

(25) La Commissione deve valutare se esistano altri motivi per dichiarare la compatibilità con il mercato comune dell'aiuto per il salvataggio illegalmente prorogato. Conformemente al punto 20 degli orientamenti, gli aiuti a favore delle imprese in difficoltà possono essere unicamente considerati compatibili in base agli

⁽⁴⁾ Caso N 802/06 (GU C 43 del 27.2.2007, pag. 2).

⁽⁵⁾ GU C 244 dell'1.10.2004, pag. 2.

orientamenti stessi. La proroga dell'aiuto per il salvataggio può costituire un aiuto per la ristrutturazione compatibile qualora soddisfisi le condizioni per l'autorizzazione stabilite ai punti 32-51 degli orientamenti. In particolare, l'autorizzazione di un aiuto per la ristrutturazione è subordinata all'attuazione di un piano di ristrutturazione realizzabile, credibile e solido da presentare alla Commissione per approvazione.

- (26) Poiché l'Italia non ha presentato tale piano di ristrutturazione, la Commissione in questa fase ritiene improbabile che la proroga dell'aiuto per il salvataggio possa essere considerata compatibile a titolo di aiuto per la ristrutturazione.

IV. CONCLUSIONE

- (27) La Commissione non dispone di elementi attestanti che la società abbia cessato di beneficiare dell'aiuto per il salvataggio dopo il termine dei sei mesi.
- (28) La Commissione ritiene peraltro che il considerevole lasso di tempo intercorso fra l'autorizzazione e la concessione dell'aiuto susciti dubbi riguardanti la necessità dell'aiuto e debba perciò essere giustificato da circostanze speciali del caso. In questa fase la Commissione dubita che sussistano siffatte circostanze speciali.
- (29) Inoltre, poiché le autorità italiane non hanno comunicato alcuna informazione sulla procedura fallimentare applicata a Sandretto, la Commissione dubita che la procedura fallimentare assicuri l'effettivo recupero degli importi di aiuto erogati abusivamente.
- (30) Infine, poiché l'Italia non ha presentato alcun piano di ristrutturazione, la Commissione in questa fase ritiene improbabile che la proroga dell'aiuto per il salvataggio possa essere considerata compatibile a titolo di aiuto per la ristrutturazione.

V. DECISIONE

- (31) La Commissione in questa fase ritiene probabile che la proroga oltre il termine di sei mesi dell'aiuto per il salvataggio approvato a favore di Sandretto Industrie Srl sia illegale e nutre dubbi circa la compatibilità della misura con il mercato comune. La Commissione decide pertanto di avviare il procedimento di indagine formale ai sensi dell'articolo 88, paragrafo 2, del trattato CE e del

regolamento (CE) n. 659/1999 del Consiglio ⁽⁶⁾. Ciò premesso, la Commissione, nell'ambito del procedimento di cui all'articolo 88, paragrafo 2, del trattato della CE, invita l'Italia a inviarle eventuali osservazioni e a fornirle qualsiasi informazione che possa essere utile ai fini della valutazione dell'aiuto entro il termine di un mese dalla data di ricezione della presente, in particolare le informazioni richieste dall'ingiunzione di fornire informazioni di cui al punto seguente.

- (32) La Commissione, dato che le autorità italiane, nonostante un sollecito, hanno fornito risposte incomplete alla sua precedente richiesta di informazioni, ingiunge all'Italia ai sensi dell'articolo 10, paragrafo 3, del regolamento (CE) n. 659/1999 di:

- presentare la prova della cessazione della prima tranche della garanzia a seguito del rimborso del prestito,
- fornire informazioni dettagliate sulla seconda tranche della garanzia, in particolare se sia stata utilizzata,
- fornire informazioni dettagliate circa lo stato di avanzamento della procedura fallimentare applicata a Sandretto, in particolare se l'iscrizione degli importi dovuti allo Stato nell'ambito della procedura ne assicuri il pieno e immediato recupero,
- comunicare se l'impresa Sandretto continui a svolgere la sua attività,
- presentare un piano di liquidazione, ammesso che esista.

La Commissione invita inoltre le autorità italiane a trasmettere senza indugio copia della presente lettera a Sandretto.

La Commissione richiama all'attenzione del governo italiano che l'articolo 88, paragrafo 3, del trattato CE ha effetto sospensivo e che in forza dell'articolo 14 del regolamento (CE) n. 659/1999, essa può imporre allo Stato membro di recuperare presso il beneficiario un aiuto illegalmente concesso.

La Commissione comunica all'Italia che informerà gli interessati attraverso la pubblicazione della presente lettera e di una sintesi della stessa nella *Gazzetta ufficiale dell'Unione europea*. L'autorità di sorveglianza EFTA sarà del pari informata tramite invio di copia della presente lettera. Le parti interessate saranno invitate a presentare osservazioni entro un mese dalla data di tale pubblicazione.

⁽⁶⁾ GUL 83 del 27.3.1999, pag. 5.

ŠTÁTNA POMOC – SPOJENÉ KRÁLOVSTVO**Štátna pomoc C 13/08 (ex N 589/07) – Pomoc spoločnosti Channel 4 spojená s digitalizáciou****Výzva na predloženie pripomienok v súlade s článkom 88 ods. 2 Zmluvy o ES**

(Text s významom pre EHP)

(2008/C 137/10)

Listom zo dňa 2. apríla 2008, ktorého text je uvedený v autentickom jazyku za týmto zhrnutím, Komisia oznámila Spojenému kráľovstvu svoje rozhodnutie začať konanie podľa článku 88 ods. 2 Zmluvy o ES, pokiaľ ide o navrhovanú finančnú pomoc spoločnosti Channel 4 určenú na náklady spojené s digitalizáciou.

Zainteresované strany môžu predložiť svoje pripomienky k opatreniam, vo veci ktorých Komisia začína konanie, v lehote jedného mesiaca odo dňa uverejnenia tohto zhrnutia a nasledujúceho listu. Kontaktné údaje:

European Commission
Directorate-General for Competition
State Aid Greffe
SPA 3 6/5
B-1049 Brussels
Fax: (32-2) 296 12 42

Tieto pripomienky sa oznámia Spojenému kráľovstvu. Zainteresované strany môžu písomne s uvedením dôvodov požiadať o dôverné zaobchádzanie s údajmi o ich totožnosti.

TEXT ZHRNUTIA**POSTUP**

Na opatrenie, v súvislosti s ktorými sa Komisia rozhodla začať konanie podľa článku 88 ods. 2, bola Komisia upozornená navrhovateľom a neskôr aj prostredníctvom oficiálnej notifikácie orgánmi Spojeného kráľovstva.

OPIS OPATRENIA

Notifikované opatrenie sa týka pomoci, ktorú notifikovali orgány Spojeného kráľovstva a ktorá sa poskytuje vo výške 14 miliónov GBP spoločnosti Channel 4 s cieľom pomôcť jej poskytnúť kapitálové náklady spojené s digitalizáciou.

Spoločnosť Channel 4 je vysielateľ poverený verejnoprávnou objednávkou, ktorý pôsobí ako verejnoprávna spoločnosť bez akcionárov. Tvorí jadro spoločnosti Channel 4 Corporation (C4C) a funguje na komerčnom princípe (jediným zdrojom príjmov sú zisky z reklamy). V roku 2006 bola Komisii doručená sťažnosť od britského komerčného vysielateľa, ktorý protestoval proti finančnej pomoci poskytnutej spoločnosti Channel 4, nakoľko spoločnosť C4C disponuje dostatočnými hotovostnými rezervami, ktoré stačia na pokrytie nákladov spojených s digitalizáciou, a verejná pomoc preto nie je potrebná.

Rozhodnutie orgánov Spojeného kráľovstva o poskytnutí pomoci spoločnosti Channel 4 vychádza z detailného finančného prehľadu spoločnosti Channel 4 uskutočneného spoločnosťou Ofcom v roku 2007 a odbornej správy zhotovenej konzultantmi (LEK) pre spoločnosť Ofcom.

Orgány Spojeného kráľovstva uznali, že notifikované opatrenie predstavuje pomoc v zmysle článku 87 ods. 1 Zmluvy o ES. Namietajú však, že opatrenie je zlučiteľné so Zmluvou o ES podľa článku 86 ods. 2, so zreteľom na oznámenie Komisie ⁽¹⁾ o uplatňovaní pravidiel štátnej pomoci s ohľadom na verejnoprávne vysielanie (ďalej len „oznámenie“) a tri konkrétne kritériá vymedzenia, poverenia a *proporcionality*, podľa ktorých by sa pomoc tohto druhu mala posudzovať.

Navrhovateľ napadol potrebu finančnej podpory spoločnosti Channel 4. Namietá, že spoločnosť Channel 4 má značné finančné rezervy a dostatočnú hotovosť, aby mohla zaplatiť náklady spojené s digitalizáciou. Navrhovateľ ďalej tvrdí, že aj napriek možnému zníženiu ziskov nebude schopnosť spoločnosti Channel 4 plniť verejnoprávnú objednávku ohrozená, a preto pomoc nie je nutná.

Posúdenie opatrenia

V zmysle oznámenia o vysielaní musí Komisia v prípade štátnej podpory poskytnutej verejnoprávnym vysielateľom zistiť, či nedošlo k nadmernej kompenzácii. Na tento účel musí Komisia najskôr získať informácie o hrubých nákladoch spojených s verejnoprávnou objednávkou, odčítať zisk z komerčného využívania verejnoprávnych služieb (napr. reklama), čím získa čisté náklady verejnoprávnej služby. Komisia musí okrem toho

⁽¹⁾ Ú. v. EÚ C 320, 15.11.2001, s. 5.

zistiť, či vysielateľ nespôsobuje v súvislosti s komerčnými aktivitami spojenými s verejnoprávnou službou zbytočné narušenie hospodárskej súťaže. Ak existujú čisté náklady, mal by spomínaný prevádzkovateľ vysielania mať právo na štátnu pomoc.

Z informácií poskytnutých Spojeným kráľovstvom Komisia zatiaľ nebola schopná zistiť, či spoločnosti C4 vzniknú alebo nevzniknú v súvislosti s povinnosťou digitalizácie v krátkodobom horizonte čisté náklady spojené s verejnoprávnou službou, ktoré by jej umožňovali získať štátnu pomoc.

TEXT LISTU

„(1) The Commission wishes to inform the United Kingdom that, having examined the information supplied by your authorities on the aid referred to above, it has decided to initiate the procedure laid down in Article 88(2) of the EC Treaty.

I. PROCEDURE

- (2) On 2 August 2006, the Commission received a complaint (CP 186/06) by a UK-based television broadcaster against a possible funding support that the UK authorities were about to grant to Channel 4 to help it meet the costs of the digital switchover.
- (3) On 10 October 2007, the UK authorities notified to the Commission their decision to grant an aid of GBP 14 million to Channel 4 to assist it to meet the capital costs of digital switchover. In the notification the UK authorities acknowledged that the notified measure constitutes an aid within the meaning of Article 87(1), and invited the Commission “to find that this aid is compatible with the EC Treaty by virtue of Article 86(2) EC, having regard (in particular) to the Commission’s Communication ⁽²⁾ on the application of the State aid rules in relation to public service broadcasting (“the Communication)”.
- (4) On 23 November 2007, the Commission asked the UK authorities to provide further information and to clarify a number of aspects of the notification. On 22 January 2008, the UK authorities submitted their reply.

II. DESCRIPTION

Background: Digital Switchover and Public Service Broadcasting in the UK: A Brief Overview

- (5) The system of Public Service Broadcasting (“PSB”) in UK television has evolved over the course of more than 70 years and competition was introduced gradually into the system: Independent television (ITV) was launched in 1955, BBC Two went on air in 1964, Channel 4 came into being in 1982, and Channel 5 (later Five) was launched in 1997.
- (6) Three appear to be the major sources of PSB in the UK:
 - the BBC has historically been at the heart of the PSB system, with wide-ranging public service obligations. The corporation is exempt from commercial pressures, due to its licence fee funding, and as such has been able to maintain a broad portfolio of public service activities across television, radio and, more recently, new media,

- Channel 4, although financed by advertising, has an embedded specific public service remit to be distinctive and to experiment, innovate, educate and reach culturally diverse audiences freed from some of the restrictions on other commercial broadcasters, notably shareholder returns and some programming quotas,

- commercial PSB broadcasters — ITV, Five and Teletext — also have specific programming obligations. The public service provision from the commercial players is delivered in return for privileged access to scarce analogue spectrum and the right to broadcast ⁽³⁾.

- (7) In February 2005, Ofcom published the final report and conclusions of its statutory Review of Public Service Broadcasting (PSB) ⁽⁴⁾. Previous phases of the Review underlined why the framework for delivering PSB would need to change. In those phases, Ofcom highlighted amongst other that the existing terrestrial analogue model of commercially-funded PSB will not survive the transition to digital and may erode rapidly prior to 2012.
- (8) Phase 3 of the PSB Review committed Ofcom to conduct a more detailed review of Channel 4’s financial position in 2006/07. The PSB Review identified that changes in the market are threatening the established PSB system, in the sense that the move from analogue to digital, and consequently multichannel, television may mean it is no longer realistic to expect commercial broadcasters to deliver significant PSB obligations due to their fragmenting audience base. In particular, a key issue of the review concerned the future viability of and operating model for Channel 4.

Channel 4

- (9) C4 Television Corporation (C4C) is an operator providing public service broadcasting whose principal function is to provide the public service television channel called “Channel 4”. It is incorporated as a not for profit public corporation but run on a commercial basis. C4C receives no direct financial support from the State and all of its income is derived from its channels, such as by the sale of advertising and the commercial sponsorship of programmes, and from other commercial activities connected with its channels, such as the sale of books and DVDs.
- (10) Channels 4’s public service programming remit is defined in Section 265(3) of the Communications Act 2003:

“The public service remit for Channel 4 is the provision of a broad range of high quality and diverse programming which, in particular:

- (a) demonstrates innovation, experiment and creativity in the form and content of programmes;
- (b) appeals to the tastes and interests of a culturally diverse society;

⁽³⁾ Ofcom makes reference to a fourth source of PSB, the broadcasting market at large which includes all other commercial broadcasters which while not explicitly entrusted with a PSB remit and have received no funding or privileged access to spectrum, nonetheless produce content that meets the PSB purposes although the supply is not guaranteed, see “Digital PSB, Public Service Broadcasting post Digital Switchover”, Ofcom Issue Paper, 27 July 2007, p. 6.

⁽⁴⁾ Section 264 of the Communications Act 2003 required Ofcom to report on the effectiveness of the existing television public service broadcasters — BBC, ITV, Channel 4, S4C, Five and Teletext — in the delivery of their PSB obligations; and to make recommendations for maintaining and strengthening the quality of PSB for the future.

⁽²⁾ OJ C 320, 15.11.2001, p. 5.

- (c) makes a significant contribution to meeting the need for the licensed public service channels to include programmes of an educational nature and other programmes of educative value; and
- (d) exhibits a distinctive character”.
- (11) C4C's statutory powers permit it to engage in activities apart from the provision of Channel 4 itself. On this basis, C4C has launched a series of other channels: two general entertainment channels called “E4” and “More4”, a film channel called “Film4”, and “C4 + 1”, which runs Channel 4's schedules an hour later than the channel itself ⁽⁵⁾. These channels are not public service channels under current legislation, and do not have public service remits.
- (12) C4C is not permitted to engage in any commercial activity only for financial reasons: Section 199(1) of the 2003 Act provides that “the activities that C4C are able to carry on include any activities which appear to them”:
- (a) to be activities that it is appropriate for them to carry on in association with the carrying out of their primary functions; and
- (b) to be connected, otherwise than merely in financial terms, with activities undertaken by them for the carrying out of those functions.
- (13) Section 199(2) of the 2003 Act defines the “primary functions” of C4C as securing the continued provision of Channel 4, and the fulfilment of that channel's public service remit. Schedule 9 to the Act makes detailed provision as to the regulation of C4C's commercial activities by Ofcom who must approve arrangements prepared by C4C concerning the management of those activities, and those arrangements must (in particular) address any risks those activities could pose to the fulfilment of the primary functions, and financial transparency as between the primary functions and other activities.

The funding of C4C

- (14) As stated above, C4C is run on a commercial basis only and does not receive any State funding. C4C financial results for 2006 showed post-tax profits of GBP 14,5 million on a turnover of GBP 937 million, compared with GBP 48,5 million post-tax profits on a turnover of GBP 894 million in 2005 ⁽⁶⁾.
- (15) In the past, in order to ensure that Channel 4 can continue to provide public service broadcasting, the UK Government introduced a “safety net” in the form of a financial support that would be funded by a levy on the

Channel 3 licence holders (that is, ITV) if Channel 4's advertising revenue proved insufficient. The commercial success of Channel 4 was such that the system never needed to be activated, and was repealed in 2003.

C4C and digital switchover

- (16) Channel 4 operates under a licence granted to C4C by Ofcom. New licences were granted to ITV, Channel 4 and Five by Ofcom in December 2004, and in common with the other new licences, the Channel 4 licence requires C4C to provide the service in digital form, and to deliver that service by digital terrestrial television so as to secure coverage that is equivalent to, or substantially the same as, that currently achieved by the analogue service. According to those licences, switchover must be completed by 31 December 2012. C4C was obliged to accept the new licence whereas the legislation gave ITV and Five the opportunity to refuse the new licences.
- (17) As part of the UK Government's switchover policy, all the operators of the PSB multiplexes will need to extend their transmission network from the current 80 digital transmitters to the 1 154 transmitters currently used for analogue transmissions.
- (18) Channel 4, in digital form, is currently delivered on the *Digital 3 & 4 multiplex* (as well as on cable, satellite and DSL). That multiplex carries the national and regional ITV channels, Channel 4 and the free to view, commercial channels E4, More4 and C4 + 1 (all 100 % owned by and provided by the C4C). The licence for this multiplex is held by Digital 3 & 4 a company which is owned in equal shares by the ITV companies and C4C. 48,5 % of the capacity is reserved for ITV, 48,5 % for C4C, and 3 % for the digital version of the public Teletext service.
- (19) C4C pays carriage charges to Digital 3 & 4 — the multiplex licence holder and operator. They are charged at cost, and charges are apportioned between the two main users of the multiplex in proportion to the capacity reserved for them. Thus, C4C and ITV each pays 48,5 % of the multiplex's costs ⁽⁷⁾.
- (20) In turn, the multiplex operator must negotiate with the owners of transmitting masts and sites and the providers of “managed transmission services” to secure the physical transmission of the services carried on the multiplex. Negotiations for new digital terrestrial transmission contracts were concluded in August 2007. The masts and sites owners actually will incur the capital expenditure needed to build the transmission network in order to meet the coverage obligation in the new licences. They will recover those costs from the multiplex operator over the life of the transmission contract, and the multiplex operator will in turn pass those costs on to the broadcasters seeking carriage.

⁽⁵⁾ E4, More4, Film Four and C4 + 1 are owned and operated by 4 Ventures Ltd, which is 100 % owned by C4C.

⁽⁶⁾ These results are for the C4C group which includes Channel 4, all other non PSB channels, its new media activities (Channel 4.com), and Channel 4 International Limited which is responsible for the exploitation of secondary rights. C4C also has partial stakes in a number of other subsidiaries including One Word Radio Limited in which C4C holds 51 % of the equity, and the 4 Digital Group Limited (which holds the licence to a national DAB multiplex) in which it has a 55 % stake. It also holds 50 % of a joint-venture digital channel business with Emap, a very successful UK media corporation. 4 Ventures also holds equity stakes in a number of other businesses including Popworld (29 %), SwitchCo (11 %), Espresso Broadband (10 %), Taste of London (50 %).

⁽⁷⁾ C4C, by internal accounting, imposes a notional charge on Channel 4 and the other C4C channels for the capacity they occupy.

(21) In its notification the UK authorities have estimated that C4C's share (48,5 % of the total) of the costs of building out and running the *Digital 3 & 4* multiplex to the extent required to meet the coverage obligation in the new licence will be in the region of GBP [...] (*) million through to the end of 2034. The elements of the capital costs of the project relevant to C4C are likely to be in the range GBP [...] million to GBP [...] million over the build-out period. Digital 3&4 has structured this into a 26 year management contract to manage the impact on their annual cash flows. The front-end of the management contract overlaps with the BBC's current licence fee period from 2008-2013. The amount payable by C4C over the latter period is GBP 14 million, of which GBP 7 million relates to the repayment of principal and the remainder to the cost of financing the capital over that period.

(22) To date, take-up of digital platforms is growing very rapidly in the UK. This has been driven both by rapid growth in digital terrestrial television (the Freeview platform), and continued growth by Sky (Satellite). Partly due to this rapid penetration of multichannel television, existing analogue channels as a whole have also lost share on every platform, due to increased competition from digital-only channels (although many of the more successful channel launches have been by the existing analogue channels themselves). Although analogue channels including the BBC and ITV have experienced over the last year a declining audience share, digital only channels have benefited from (and helped to cause) the main terrestrial broadcasters' declining audience share. In its "Issue Paper" of July 2006, Ofcom noted that the digital channels launched by the existing terrestrial broadcasters have actually performed better and have compensated in part for the decline in the flagship PSB (8).

Main features of the aid

(23) The UK government has announced that it will grant C4C GBP 14 million to enable it to meet the costs of digital switchover. The main features of the notified aid can be described as follows.

(24) The aid will be calculated according to the actual costs to C4C of the capital expenditure (not running costs) incurred in converting the DTT transmission network to a fully digital operation. Negotiations between Digital 3 & 4 and its preferred transmission provider (Arquiva) were jointly conducted by ITV and C4C in order to reach the most advantageous deal with its broadcast transmission service provider. The actual costs of converting the network will be known by the time the aid becomes payable.

(25) The aid will be funded out of the proceeds of the TV licence fee (levied on every household that uses a television to receive broadcast services) and administered and disbursed by the BBC. The level of the licence fee, and hence the level of income to the BBC, has been set in

a manner that takes account of the BBC's possible liability to pay aid to C4C.

(26) There will be a mechanism to ensure that the BBC is not over-compensated. The BBC will receive no more from licence fee proceeds than it is liable to disburse in aid to C4C or in meeting the reasonable administrative costs of the scheme proposed measure. In that sense, BBC is not in any way whatsoever the recipient or beneficiary of the aid, simply the administrator of the aid mechanism granted by the UK authorities to C4C.

III. CHANNEL 4 FINANCIAL REVIEW BY OFCOM (JUNE 2007): THE LEK STUDY

(27) During the PSB Review in 2006, Ofcom found no strong evidence of a short term funding gap at the time of the review for Channel 4 which could threaten the delivery of its remit but stated that there would be a need to revisit the issue. In 2007, Ofcom carried out the *Financial Review of Channel 4* to assess the Channel 4 Group's financial viability in delivering its PSB remit by looking into the historic and current financial position of Channel 4 and the likely resilience of its funding model in the face of changing competitive pressures. To that end, Ofcom asked LEK, a financial consultancy, to undertake, on its behalf, a detailed review of Channel 4 Group's financial statements, business plans and management accounts for the past five years, and of its future performance projections. In parallel to the LEK's report, Ofcom examined the delivery of Channel 4's public service remit, mainly how Channel 4 defines and implements its remit.

(28) In short, LEK found that "there is likely to be a slow deterioration in the Group's surplus" to 2008 (9), but noted that since Channel 4 has "substantial" cash reserves, there would be "no immediate, pressing risk to Channel 4" (9). Even taking into account significant variations between their "low", "high" and "central" scenarios, LEK identified "no significant risk of intractable financial challenges emerging before 2010" (10), and "little evidence to suggest that Channel 4's remit delivery would need to be fundamentally compromised before 2010" (11).

(29) LEK, however, concluded that "it is likely that the Group will cease to be profitable around 2010, and will become increasingly unprofitable thereafter ... LEK's assessment is that Channel 4's funding model is likely, in the medium term, to become unsustainable". The Group's other channels are expected to move into profit in 2007 but LEK did not expect returns from this source to be sufficient to offset losses on the core channel (12).

(30) LEK identified the following as the key trends driving the C4C future performance (i) flat or declining advertising revenues; (ii) higher prices for acquired programming and competition for its original productions; (iii) cost inflation; and (iv) a more pessimistic view of the likely profitability of the Group's ancillary businesses than the group itself takes.

(*) Confidential data.

(8) Ofcom: "Digital PSB, Public Service broadcasting post Digital Switchover", Issue Paper 27 July 2006, "For Channel 4 — where the main channel has performed well — strong digital share and revenues have meant its overall performance has improved substantially", p. 16.

(9) Section 3, paragraphe 3.2.

(10) Section 3, paragraphe 3.5.

(11) *Ibid.*

(12) Section 3, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.7.

- (31) In the light of this analysis, Ofcom took the view that the current and future market pressures on Channel 4 “could have a gradual, but cumulatively serious, impact on Channel 4’s delivery of its remit”⁽¹³⁾. For Ofcom, there is a wider issue of how to measure and enhance the monitoring of Channel 4’s PSB output⁽¹⁴⁾.
- (32) Ofcom considered that there is a need to be open to looking at fundamental reform of Channel 4’s financial model in the long term⁽¹⁵⁾. Contrary to LEK’s figures which suggested that there is time to monitor performance further before intervening, Ofcom considered that it might take time to identify and implement a long-term intervention and that accordingly there is a case for the UK government to look at short-term, transitional measures which:
- they would provide support during the transitional period between now and 2011-2012,
 - they would be quantifiable and hence provide the Group with greater certainty,
 - the Group would be able to demonstrate how these measures would help delivery of Channel 4’s remit,
 - they would not have long-term effects or implications for longer-term policy⁽¹⁶⁾.
- (33) Although Ofcom expressed no opinion on the notified aid, the UK authorities consider that the notified aid meets Ofcom’s above listed criteria.

IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PARTIES INVOLVED

The UK position: the justification for the aid

- (34) The UK authorities argue that the aid to C4C is justified for two main reasons. First, as a public corporation with no shareholders, C4C has no access to the capital markets; and second, any calls on its resources would mean that there is less money available for other aspects of the business, including public service programming, since the reserves accumulated from previous years are finite and partly required to fund the working capital requirements of the business⁽¹⁷⁾.
- (35) In cash terms, in 2007 C4C will have spent GBP 636 million on programming for Channel 4 and its other non-PSB digital channels. At the same time, the UK expects that income from Channel 4 over the same period is likely to fall, as a result (in particular) of the fact that, in a fully digital environment, Channel 4’s audience share will drop, with a corresponding effect on advertising revenue. In particular the UK has produced data showing that

Channel 4’s share of viewing is highest in an analogue terrestrial home (14,5 %) with access to only five channels, and lowest in a cable or satellite home having hundreds of channels available (6,7 %). Digital switchover would mean that the number of analogue terrestrial homes — where Channel 4 performs best — will eventually fall to zero as the remaining homes in the UK without digital television are required to opt for one or the other of the multi-channel platforms.

- (36) The UK authorities add that while its audience is bound to decline with the advent of the DTT and the multichannel home environment, C4C must still assume the costs of simulcasting in analogue and digital mode until switchover is complete.
- (37) Accordingly, the UK authorities argue that the negative effect of switchover on C4C’s financial position is significant. Although the proposed GBP 14 million aid is relatively small when compared to Channel 4’s total programming expenditure, the aid will have a significant impact on the ability of C4C to continue to deliver its public service remit. As a commercial broadcaster, C4C’s funding model involves an implicit cross-subsidy whereby its most profitable programming generates commercial surpluses to finance loss-making programming, particularly in traditional PSB genres such as News and Current Affairs, characterised by high costs and limited revenue potential. Without the aid, C4C may be forced to divert expenditure away from certain genres which deliver significant public value in order to focus on more commercial programming. In other words, without the aid, the costs of digital switchover will have a direct impact on the resources available to C4C to meet its public service remit. Moreover, since the obligations of digital switchover and the associated costs are essentially attributable to the Government’s switchover policy, the UK authorities consider it appropriate for there to be a contribution to those costs from public resources.
- (38) Thus, the UK authorities believe that it is appropriate to remove one of the pressures being faced by C4C, by granting State aid to give C4C assistance with meeting the capital costs involved in converting to a digital transmission the network that carries Channel 4.

Aid compatible with the Treaty

- (39) The UK authorities accept that the notified measure constitutes aid within the meaning of Article 87(1). It argues however that the measure is compatible with the Treaty by virtue of Article 86(2) EC, having regard to the Commission’s Communication⁽¹⁸⁾ on the application of the State aid rules in relation to public service broadcasting (“the Communication”) and the three particular criteria according to which the compatibility of aid of this nature falls to be judged, namely, definition, entrustment and proportionality.

⁽¹³⁾ Section 3, paragraph 3.16.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Section 3, paragraphs 3.16 and 3.17 and Section 5, paragraph 5.10.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See Section 5, paragraphs 5.35 to 5.40.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Section 5, paragraphs 5.24 to 5.27.

⁽¹⁷⁾ The UK acknowledges that C4C’s currently healthy cash balances are being used to acquire increased commercial footprint and further cross-media access, e.g. moving into radio to address long term structural issues, including through investment in a company which secured the newly-awarded national DAB multiplex as a joint venture with a consortium of radio broadcasters.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Communication from the Commission on the application of State aid rules to public service broadcasting (2001/C 320/04) (OJ C 320, 15.11.2001, p. 5).

- (40) In particular, Sections 231, 264 and 265(3) of the Communications Act 2003, taken with the new licence, satisfy the “definition” criterion. Sections 23 and 24(3) of the Broadcasting Act 1990 and Section 265(3) of the 2003 Act, along with the licence, will further satisfy the “entrustment” requirement ⁽¹⁹⁾.
- (41) With regard to the criterion of “proportionality” the UK authorities consider that the sums paid in support of Channel 4 will not exceed the capital costs of providing near-universal coverage as a public service, and that any market distortions implicit in the funding could not be avoided or reduced by adopting another means of delivering or funding the remit. They argue that the aid will correspond to the capital costs of converting the transmission network to digital broadcasting by analysing the charges paid by C4C to the multiplex operator for the transmission of its services. The UK authorities clarify that the costs to expand the multiplex are fixed regardless of any other channels that may be carried alongside Channel 4. Likewise any income or other economic advantage (higher advertising revenues from a larger audience) will need to be deducted from the amount of the aid. Although in the long term C4C will no longer have to incur any simulcast costs, which will help to reduce the overall cost of C4C, the UK authorities consider that if C4C is entitled to an aid for the capital costs of digital conversion, it is also entitled to any consequential benefits that may result thereof.
- (42) The UK authorities acknowledge that C4C has built substantial cash reserves through time (up to GBP 170 million). They argue however that a significant portion of those reserves is required to manage C4C’s working capital requirements (an average of GBP 75 million per month). Its average capital balance for 2007 stood at GBP 137 million. The UK argues that contrary to allegations by others, C4C need to keep these reserves to protect against revenue variations and to make further investments in new business activities that could offset the expected decline of the core PSB channel.
- (43) Finally, the aid will not allow C4C to distort competition in the advertisement market, given that the advertisement market does not operate on the basis of discounted rates, but on the basis of annual purchases of airtime that deliver a number of “impacts” to the advertiser.
- (44) In their reply to a request for further information, the UK authorities further clarified that the aid to C4C is intended to address not only the capital costs of switchover but also the broader impact that switchover will have on C4C medium-to-long term financial performance.

The complainant’s position

- (45) Although supportive of the PSB system and the State’s intervention to maintain and sustain a high level of PSB, the complainant considers that the proposed aid to

⁽¹⁹⁾ The “definition”, “entrustment” and “proportionality test” are the three cumulative conditions that need to be met in order or a measure to benefit from the derogation of Article 86(2), see paragraph 29 of the “Broadcasting” Communication, *op. cit.*

Channel 4 is not justified. Channel 4 has accumulated reserves of around GBP 150 million through its commercial operations and is thus in a position to face up to the expected short term challenges identified by the LEK report and the Ofcom review.

- (46) The complainant considers that the question whether in the longer term the funding mechanism of Channel 4 should be reviewed in detail to take into account the changes in the broadcasting market post digital switchover is a wholly separate issue, one which is currently under review by Ofcom. The aid should not therefore be used to address the longer term issues facing Channel 4 under the disguise of a support mechanism for the capital costs of digital switchover.
- (47) More importantly, the complainant argues that the current decision-making process has been opaque given that there has not yet been any kind of assessment of the costs for Channel 4 to deliver its PSB remit. As a result, there is no correlation between the GBP 14 million aid pledged for Channel 4 and the alleged threat that digital switchover will have on the delivery of its PSB remit.
- (48) The complainant stresses that during the period 1999-2005, all the non-PSB commercial activities of Channel 4 made cumulative losses of GBP 200 million which were offset by the profits made by the core Channel 4. The complainant argues that the aid will allow C4C to continue subsidising its non PSB commercial channels distorting competition in the market. For the complainant, C4C would be better off in the coming years sub-leasing the free DTT spectrum in has received for its other non-PSB channels and reinvest the money to support the core PSB channel. The complainant estimates that subleasing the “free” spectrum used by the 3 commercial channels between 2007-2012, C4C would have between GBP 52 and GBP 116 million more than if it continued to provide its digital channels.

V. ANALYSIS

1.1. The existence of aid

- (49) Article 87(1) of the EC Treaty states:

“Save as otherwise provided in this Treaty, any aid granted by a Member State or through State resources in any form whatsoever which distorts or threatens to distort competition by favouring certain undertakings or the production of certain goods shall, in so far as it affects trade between Member States, be incompatible with the common market”.

- (50) In order for aid in the sense of Article 87(1) to be present, there needs to be an aid measure imputable to the State which is granted by State resources, affects trade between Member States and distort competition in the common markets, and confers a selective advantage to undertakings.

(51) In the present case, the Commission notes that the notified measure: (i) constitutes a transfer of State resources to C4C ⁽²⁰⁾; (ii) it would favour a particular undertaking in the market, C4C — BBC is not a recipient or a beneficiary of the aid insofar as BBC will receive no more from the licence fee proceeds than it is liable to disburse in aid to C4C or in meeting the reasonable administrative costs of the proposed measure (see paragraphs 25 and 26 above; (iii) by helping C4C to meet switchover costs that other broadcasters might need to meet themselves it would distort, or threaten to distort, competition; and (iv) it could affect trade between Member States in that C4C operates in a European market, even though it is providing public service broadcasting in the UK — for example, it competes with other broadcasters for sports and other programme rights, and the market for the sale of broadcast advertising is to an extent international. The UK authorities have stated in the notification that the notified measure constitutes aid within the meaning of Article 87(1) of the Treaty.

Conclusions

(52) In the light of the foregoing the Commission can therefore conclude that the notified State measure, in as much as it confers an advantage to C4C which is likely to distort competition and affect trade between Member States constitutes an aid within the meaning of Article 87(1).

1.2. The compatibility assessment

Preliminary remarks

(53) It should be recalled that the Commission is in principle in favour of public support for the digital switchover provided that a number of conditions are respected. In particular, the Commission has stated in the past that it would take a favourable view for “financial compensation to public service broadcasters for the cost of broadcasting via all transmission platforms in order to reach the entire population, provided this forms part of the public service mandate” ⁽²¹⁾.

(54) However, the situation of Channel 4 is different in some respects from that of other public service broadcasters. Although entrusted with a PSB remit, Channel 4 is supposed to conduct all of its business and operations on the strength of its commercial activities only. Thus, C4C

⁽²⁰⁾ That conclusion is not affected by the fact that the aid will be funded from the proceeds of the licence fee of BBC. As the Commission found in the past, “the compulsory legal nature of the licence fee [of BBC] and the express approval by the State for the financing of the service from licence fee funds unequivocally establish the use of state resources”; see Commission Decision of 1 October 2003, State aid 37/03 — United Kingdom, “BBC Digital Curriculum”, at paragraph 21.

⁽²¹⁾ See in particular, IP/05/1394 issued at the time of the adoption of the Commission Decision in case C 25/2004 “DVB-T Berlin-Brandenburg” where the Commission also explained how digital TV could be supported. The Commission is in favour of public support for the digital switchover also for broadcaster’s activities beyond what is covered by their public service remit. As the Commission has stated in the past, grants can “aim at covering part of the additional cost of broadcasters caused by the additional burden to broadcast both in analogue and digital mode” and “it is also possible to award grants to broadcasters for investments enabling digital signal transmission”. Beneficiaries of such grants can be both private broadcasters and public service broadcasters. Such grants have to be technologically neutral, beneficiaries have to be selected in open calls for proposals, the funding has to be necessary for the realisation of the project and be limited to the directly attributable, actually incurred eligible costs for the projects; see Commission decision of 16 March 2005, N 622/03 — Austria, “Digitalisierungsfonds”.

does not receive any public financial support (like the BBC does through a licence fee or any other mechanism to that effect) but relies on the strength and the flexibility of a commercial operator to deliver its PSB remit. For that reason, there is a need to ensure that the market conditions within which C4C competes against other commercial broadcasters is not distorted by the notified measure. In this respect, the Commission notes that C4C, relying on the strength of its recent commercial successes, has over the last years launched other broadcasting commercial channels, has ventured into video on demand services and has made a foray into new media internet activities, increasing its market share and advertising revenues. Therefore, one would have expected that Channel 4, as the complainant has argued, might be in a sound financial position and able to pay for the costs of its digital expansion, drawing on its current cash reserves and commercial revenues.

(55) It is equally true that as Ofcom has noted in its Review of Channel 4’s financial situation, in the future, Channel 4, like any other traditional analogue broadcasters, will most likely have to compete within a fiercely competitive digital multichannel environment, vying for advertising revenues and audience capable for sustaining the delivery of its PSB remit. In that sense, digital switchover presents new challenges for existing analogue broadcasters (but also more opportunities). In the present case, for the reasons explained in more detail below, the information provided by the UK does not enable the Commission to assess whether or not, taking into account the market development, C4C will have in the short term a net public service cost which could justify the granting of State aid. If such net public service cost cannot be demonstrated, any grant of State aid by the UK authorities would imply overcompensation of C4C.

Assessment of compatibility under Article 87(2) and 87(3)

(56) As stated in the Broadcasting Communication, State aid provided for public service broadcasting must be examined by the Commission in order to determine whether or not it can be found compatible with the common market. The derogations listed in Article 87(2) and Article 87(3) can be applied. However, the UK authorities have not relied on any of the above mentioned provisions nor have they argued that the notified aid falls under the cultural exemption of Article 87(3)(d). Instead, the UK authorities have argued that aid should be declared compatible under Article 86(2) concerning services of general economic interest.

Assessment of compatibility under Article 86(2): Risk of overcompensation

(57) As the Court has consistently held, Article 86 provides for a derogation and must therefore be interpreted restrictively. The Court has clarified that in order for a measure to benefit from such a derogation, it is necessary that all the following conditions be fulfilled: (i) the service in question must be a service of general economic interest and clearly defined as such by the Member State (definition); (ii) the undertaking in question must be

- explicitly entrusted by the Member State with the provision of that service (entrustment); and (iii) the application of the competition rules of the Treaty (in this case, the ban on State aid) must obstruct the performance of the particular tasks assigned to the undertaking and the exemption from such rules must not affect the development of trade to an extent that would be contrary to the interests of the Community (proportionality test). In the present case, it is not contested that the two first above mentioned conditions that is "definition" and "entrustment" are fulfilled. Indeed, Channel 4 has been entrusted by law with the delivery of a public service remit and is also subject to the supervision of Ofcom. Channel 4's public service programming remit has also been defined in Section 265(3) of the Communications Act 2003.
- (58) The Commission has doubts as to whether the financial support pledged for Channel 4 is necessary and proportional within the meaning of the Broadcasting Communication. As mentioned above, the Commission's practice has been to accept that public service broadcasters can receive aid for the extra capital costs that result from their obligation to switch to digital transmission and their obligation to continue covering as large a territory as in the analogue era. In fact, BBC is funding its own digital switchover from a corresponding increase in the licence fee.
- (59) As stated above, Channel 4 position is however different to the extent that its PSB remit is funded and supported exclusively by the commercial activities (advertising revenues) of its core channel and all its other broadcasting, non-PSB channels. Thus, to the extent that C4C may have the financial resources to meet its PSB obligations on the digital terrestrial platform (cash reserves), the mere fact that the switchover may affect its profitability (but not viability) does not constitute a valid reason for claiming State funding.
- (60) In particular on the basis of the LEK report, the Commission has doubts as to whether there can be a proper or adequate justification for the aid given to Channel 4 given the basic conclusion of the report according to which, although there may be a long term funding issue for Channel 4, in the short to medium term Channel 4 faces the prospect of declining profits, not the loss of its ability to deliver its PSB remit or indeed to maintain its current scheduling.
- (61) In fact, in a recent Statement by Channel 4 concerning its Programme Policy for 2007, it is said that ,continuing the corporate strategy initially set out in 2004, Channel 4 will extend the values of its remit across the digital channels More4, E4 and Film4 and in its new media services without diminishing its core channel offer. For the first time, Channel 4's entire digital TV channel portfolio will be available free-to-air on all digital platforms for the whole year in 2007. New media activities will increase considerably, with a 2007 budget of 22 million-key developments will include the re-launch of E4.com, improvements in the 4oD video on demand service, new automated online programme support and the redesign of channel4.com with new web2.0 tools for use across Channel 4 sites".
- (62) Far from indicating any kind of financial difficulties or challenges, the above 2007 Statement shows that C4C will not only maintain its core channel offer (thus no perceived threat to its PSB remit delivery) but will also invest in new media, relaunch some of its non-PSB channels and invest in new video on demand services.
- (63) In its reply to the Commission request for information, the UK authorities stated that the aid is not only intended to cover the capital cost of digital switchover, but also the overall impact of switchover on Channel 4's medium to long-term financial performance. However, Channel 4's long-term financial performance is a separate issue, linked to the question of what kind of funding support Channel 4 will need in the future to deliver its PSB remit.
- (64) This exercise would require assessing the costs for delivering Channel 4's PSB remit. This has not been done by the UK authorities for the purposes of the notified aid mechanism. Accordingly, the Commission does not have at this stage the required information to assess whether the aid in question is indeed necessary and proportional to help Channel 4 meet its PSB remit post digital switchover. In fact, given that C4C is not currently facing any financial difficulty, the necessity of the notified aid is not clear.
- (65) The Commission's doubts are further compounded by the fact that all the other non-PSB Channels of C4C are also benefiting from the digital expansion of the 3 & 4 Multiplex given to C4C without bearing the relative costs ⁽²²⁾. At this stage, it is not clear to the Commission why the non-PSB commercial activities of Channel 4 should benefit from the aid to Channel 4 if they are not entrusted by law with the delivery of a PSB remit.
- (66) In its reply to the request for information, the UK authorities stated that the current reserves of C4C (around GBP 145 million) are earmarked to meet the monthly capital expenditure of the Corporation and cannot be treated as proper reserves. At this stage, however, it is not clear to the Commission why the current reserves of C4C could not also be used for the costs of digital switchover and should only be used for the on-going financing of C4C's current and new media and broadcasting activities that are non related to C4's PSB remit.
- (67) It may be recalled that in the most likely scenarios, LEK's analysis of Channel 4's business model points to declining profits from 2008 onwards. However, as Ofcom has also confirmed, in these scenarios Channel 4's cash reserves are more than sufficient to ensure the survival of the core channel until at least 2010, "*fluctuations in working capital notwithstanding*" ⁽²³⁾. This conclusion by Ofcom is at odds with the UK authorities' position that the cash reserves should remain intact to protect C4C against possible fluctuations in the working capital requirements. In more positive scenarios, LEK's analysis indicates that Channel 4's business model may be able to deliver stable profits and growing cash balances throughout the period to 2012. According to Ofcom, the above suggests that in LEK's projections there are unlikely to be "*immediate, intractable financial pressures that would require Channel 4 to make significant reductions in its remit delivery before around 2010*".

⁽²²⁾ Non-PSB channels would not meet any of the investment costs related to the digital expansion. As mentioned in footnote 7, C4C currently charges non-PSB channels for the spectrum capacity they occupy by internal accounting.

⁽²³⁾ Ofcom, *Channel 4 Financial review*, Statement, 14 June 2007, page 1.

- (68) From 2010 onwards, LEK suggests that financial pressures on the core channel are likely to grow. However, the timing and extent of the pressures cannot be predicted with certainty. If the programme mix remains unchanged, LEK's analysis suggests that Channel 4's commercial performance is likely to deteriorate, as a result of increasing competition for its most profitable programmes, and some ongoing inflation in other programme costs at a time of flat or declining advertising revenues.
- (69) These scenarios are however separate issues not linked as such to the capital costs of digital switchover, but to the consequences of the digital switchover itself. The analysis of these scenarios may result in an assessment of the ability of Channel 4 to deliver its PSB remit in a multichannel digital environment. Such an analysis however has not been undertaken by the UK authorities in the notification. The Commission notes that this issue is currently being analysed by Ofcom and no conclusions are available at this stage.
- (70) One would have expected Channel 4 to have made an analysis of the expected costs of the public service and expected revenues from the commercial exploitation of that service (which according to the broadcasting communication must be discounted from the public service costs) in order to assess whether the capital costs of switchover can be met, or whether State aid is necessary.
- (71) It is important to stress here that Ofcom in its latest financial review of Channel 4 (see above paragraph (32)) did not rule out the adoption of short term measures "*if they helped Channel 4 avoid making reductions in its public service delivery in response to uncertainty about its financial position*". For Ofcom such measures would need to have the following characteristics: (i) provide support between now and 2011-2012; (ii) their impact could be quantified and known to Channel 4 with a reasonable degree of certainty; (iii) Channel 4 would be able to demonstrate how such measures would help the core channel continue to deliver its remit; and (iv) such measures should not have any lasting consequences that might prejudice the Government's longer term policy for Channel 4 ⁽²⁴⁾. Even if we were to accept that the notified aid is in fact a short term measure aimed not so much at enabling Channel 4 meeting the capital costs of digital switchover, but the declining profitability in a multichannel competitive environment, the notified aid does not appear to have any of the above characteristics. In fact, although the notified measure does not appear to have any long lasting effect on

how Channel 4 may operate in the future, there has not been any quantification so far of the net costs of C4Cs PSB remit in a digital environment, neither Channel 4 has demonstrated that the aid will be necessary to deliver its PSB remit.

Conclusions

- (72) According to the broadcasting communication, in the case of State support for public service broadcasting, in order to determine whether there is overcompensation, the Commission would need first to determine the gross costs of the PSB, deduct the benefit of the commercial exploitation of the public service (e.g. advertising) so as to obtain the net public service cost. Moreover, the Commission has to ascertain that the broadcaster in question does not engage in distortions of competition which are not necessary for the fulfilment of the public service mission. Only if there is a net cost, then the said broadcaster should be entitled to obtain State aid.
- (73) The information provided so far by the UK does not enable the Commission to assess whether or not given its digital switchover obligations, C4 will have in the short term net public service costs which would allow it to receive State aid.
- (74) To conclude, the Commission doubts whether the notified measure is compatible with the common market.

VI. DECISION

- (75) In the light of the foregoing considerations the Commission requests the UK authorities to provide all necessary information to demonstrate (on the basis of the appropriate financial data) that the aid they intend to grant to C4 is necessary in order to enable C4 to deliver its public service remit, and is not going to result in overcompensation, taking into account also the revenues of C4C from its commercial activities.
- (76) The Commission request your authorities to forward a copy of this letter to the recipient of this aid immediately.
- (77) The Commission wishes to remind the United Kingdom that Article 88(3) of the EC Treaty has suspensory effect, and would draw your attention to Article 14 of Council Regulation (EC) No 659/1999, which provides that all unlawful aid may be recovered from the recipient."

⁽²⁴⁾ Ibid at p. 5.