ISSN 1977-1037

Úradný vestník Európskej únie

C 237

Slovenské vydanie

Zväzok 56

15. augusta 2013

Informácie a oznámenia

SK

Cena: 3 EUR

([1]) Text s významom pre EHP

(Pokračovanie na nasledujúcej strane)

SK

II

(Oznámenia)

OZNÁMENIA INŠTITÚCIÍ, ORGÁNOV, ÚRADOV A AGENTÚR EURÓPSKEJ ÚNIE

EURÓPSKA KOMISIA

Nevznesenie námietky voči oznámenej koncentrácii

(Vec COMP/M.6843 – Siemens/Invensys Rail)

(Text s významom pre EHP)

(2013/C 237/01)

Dňa 18. apríla 2013 sa Komisia rozhodla nevzniesť námietku voči uvedenej oznámenej koncentrácii a vyhlásiť ju za zlučiteľnú so spoločným trhom. Toto rozhodnutie je založené na článku 6 ods. 1 písm. b) nariadenia Rady (ES) č. 139/2004. Úplné znenie rozhodnutia je dostupné iba v anglickom jazyku a bude zverejnené po odstránení akýchkoľvek obchodných tajomstiev. Bude dostupné:

— v časti webovej stránky Komisie o hospodárskej súťaži venovanej fúziám (http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/). Táto webová stránka poskytuje rôzne možnosti na vyhľadávanie individuálnych rozhodnutí o fúziách podľa názvu spoločnosti, čísla prípadu, dátumu a sektorových indexov,

— v elektronickej podobe na webovej stránke EUR-Lex (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/index.htm) pod číslom dokumentu 32013M6843. EUR-Lex predstavuje online prístup k európskemu právu.

IV

(Informácie)

INFORMÁCIE INŠTITÚCIÍ, ORGÁNOV, ÚRADOV A AGENTÚR EURÓPSKEJ ÚNIE

EURÓPSKA KOMISIA

Výmenný kurz eura [1]

14. augusta 2013

(2013/C 237/02)

1 euro =

	Mena	Výmenný kurz		Mena	Výmenný kurz
USD	Americký dolár	1,3243	AUD	Austrálsky dolár	1,4524
JPY	Japonský jen	130,17	CAD	Kanadský dolár	1,3689
DKK	Dánska koruna	7,4583	HKD	Hongkongský dolár	10,2705
GBP	Britská libra	0,85440	NZD	Novozélandský dolár	1,6501
SEK	Švédska koruna	8,6393	SGD	Singapurský dolár	1,6835
CHF	Švajčiarsky frank	1,2415	KRW	Juhokórejský won	1 482,39
ISK	Islandská koruna		ZAR	Juhoafrický rand	13,2129
NOK	Nórska koruna	7,8130	CNY	Čínsky juan	8,1041
BGN	Bulharský lev	1,9558	HRK	Chorvátska kuna	7,5415
CZK	Česká koruna	25,822	IDR	Indonézska rupia	13 667,59
HUF	Maďarský forint	298,62	MYR	Malajzijský ringgit	4,3351
LTL	Litovský litas	3,4528	PHP	Filipínske peso	57,975
LVL	Lotyšský lats	0,7025	RUB	Ruský rubeľ	43,8995
PLN	Poľský zlotý	4,2037	THB	Thajský baht	41,504
RON	Rumunský lei	4,4315	BRL	Brazílsky real	3,0586
TRY	Turecká líra	2,5664	MXN	Mexické peso	16,8756
			INR	Indická rupia	81,3700

[1] *Zdroj*: referenčný výmenný kurz publikovaný ECB.

INFORMÁCIE TÝKAJÚCE SA EURÓPSKEHO HOSPODÁRSKEHO PRIESTORU

DOZORNÝ ÚRAD EZVO

Štátna pomoc – rozhodnutie uzavrieť existujúce konanie o štátnej pomoci v dôsledku prijatia vhodných opatrení štátom EZVO

(2013/C 237/03)

Dozorný úrad EZVO navrhol vhodné opatrenia, ktoré Island v súvislosti s týmto opatrením štátnej pomoci prijal:

Dátum prijatia rozhodnutia:	24. apríl 2013
Vec č.:	70958
Rozhodnutie č.:	159/13/COL
Štát EZVO:	Island
Názov:	Štátna pomoc poskytnutá spoločnostiam Landsvirkjun a Orkuveita Reykjavíkur
Právny základ:	zákon č. 42/1983 o spoločnosti Landsvirkjun, právny akt miestnej vlády č. 45/1998, zákon č. 139/2001 o založení Orkuveita Reykjavíkur ako spoločne vlastnenom podniku a zákon č. 121/1997 o štátnych zárukách
Účel:	neuv.
Forma pomoci:	Neobmedzená štátna pomoc a záruky samospráv ako vlastníkov spoločnostiam Landsvirkjun a Orkuveita Reykjavíkur bez zaplatenia primeranej trhovej prirážky
Odvetvia hospodárstva:	odvetvie elektrickej energie
Ďalšie informácie:	Na základe uskutočnených opatrení a ďalších záväzkov zrušiť neobmedzené štátne záruky v prospech spoločností Landsvirkjun a Orkuveita Reykjavíkur, ktoré prijali islandské orgány, Dozorný úrad prestal pochybovať o nezlučiteľnosti schémy pomoci a zastavil konanie vo veci formálneho zisťovania.

Autentické znenie rozhodnutia, ktoré neobsahuje dôverné informácie, možno nájsť na webovej lokalite Dozorného úradu EZVO:

http://www.eftasurv.int/state-aid/state-aid-register/

Výzva na predloženie pripomienok podľa článku 1 ods. 2 časti I protokolu 3 k Dohode medzi štátmi EZVO o zriadení Dozorného úradu a Súdneho dvora k štátnej pomoci týkajúcej sa regionálnej pomoci pre program investičných stimulov na Islande a šiestich investičných dohôd

(2013/C 237/04)

Rozhodnutím č. 177/13/COL z 30. apríla 2013, ktoré je uvedené v autentickom jazyku za týmto zhrnutím, Dozorný úrad EZVO začal konanie podľa článku 1 ods. 2 časti I protokolu 3 k Dohode medzi štátmi EZVO o zriadení Dozorného úradu a Súdneho dvora. Islandské orgány boli informované prostredníctvom kópie tohto rozhodnutia.

Dozorný úrad EZVO týmto oznamuje štátom EZVO, členským štátom EÚ a zainteresovaným stranám, aby predložili svoje pripomienky k predmetnému opatreniu v lehote jedného mesiaca odo dňa uverejnenia tohto oznámenia na adresu:

EFTA Surveillance Authority
Registry
Rue Belliard/Belliardstraat 35
1040 Bruxelles/Brussel
BELGIQUE/BELGIË

Tieto pripomienky sa oznámia islandským orgánom. Zainteresované strany, ktoré predložia pripomienky, môžu písomne s uvedením dôvodov požiadať o dôverné zaobchádzanie s údajmi o ich totožnosti.

ZHRNUTIE

Postup

Dňa 13. októbra 2010 dozorný úrad rozhodnutím č. 390/10/COL schválil program investičných stimulov (ďalej len „program“) notifikovaný islandskými orgánmi podľa článku 1 ods. 3 časti I protokolu 3.

V spojení s počiatočnými investíciami v oblastiach oprávnených na získanie regionálnej pomoci („regióny podľa písmena c“) na Islande program ustanovuje možnosť poskytnúť pomoc vo forme priamych grantov, prostredníctvom rôznych daňových výnimiek až na 10 rokov a predaja a prenájmu pozemkov pod trhovú hodnotu spoločnostiam vo všetkých odvetviach okrem finančného sektora. Program prestane platiť 31. decembra 2013.

Právnym základom programu, ktorý schválil Dozorný úrad, je:

— zákon č. 99/2010 o stimuloch pre počiatočné investície na Islande (ďalej len „zákon“), ktorý prijal islandský parlament 29. júna 2010, a

— nariadenie (EÚ) č. 985/2010 o stimuloch pre počiatočné investície na Islande vydané ministerstvom priemyslu 25. novembra 2010 (ďalej len „nariadenie“), ktoré zodpovedá návrhu nariadenia predloženému dozornému úradu 27. septembra 2010. Nariadenie je súčasťou sekundárnej legislatívy na základe zákona.

Dňa 30. decembra 2010 ministerstvo priemyslu vydalo nové nariadenie, nariadenie (EÚ) č. 1150/2010 (ďalej len „doplňujúce nariadenie“), ktorým sa nariadenie mení, najmä pokiaľ ide o zabezpečenie stimulačného účinku investičnej pomoci. Dozorný úrad nebol notifikovaný o doplnkovom nariadení.

V období od roku 2010 do roku 2013 islandský štát uzatvoril niekoľko dohôd, ktoré podľa jeho názoru spadajú pod program (ďalej len „šesť investičných dohôd“):

1. dňa 30. decembra 2010 so spoločnosťou Becromal Island ehf.;

2. dňa 30. decembra 2010 so spoločnosťou Thorsil ehf.;

3. dňa 17. februára 2011 so spoločnosťou Íslenska Kísilfélagið ehf.;

4. dňa 22. septembra 2011 so spoločnosťou Verne Real Estate II ehf.;

5. dňa 7. mája 2012 so spoločnosťou GMR Endurvinnslan ehf.;

6. dňa 28. januára 2013 so spoločnosťou Marmeti ehf.

Po diskusiách uskutočnených pred notifikáciou islandské orgány 13. decembra 2012 notifikovali Dozorný úrad v súlade s článkom 1 ods. 3 časti I protokolu 3 o súbore navrhovaných zmien (ďalej len „notifikované zmeny“) zákona.

Posúdenie opatrenia

Notifikované zmeny spočívajú v zrušení priamych grantov, novom spôsobe stanovenia maximálnej výšky dane z príjmu právnických osôb v prípade všetkých nových projektov v rámci programu, oslobodení od platenia kolkových poplatkov a zvýšení rozsahu oslobodenia od miestnej dane z majetku a príspevkov na sociálne zabezpečenie. Dozorný úrad dospel k predbežnému záveru, že notifikované zmeny programu nebolo možné oddeliť od programu ako takého. Preto posudzoval celý program v znení jeho zmien. Okrem toho posudzoval uplatňovanie programu a zistil, že niektoré prvky šiestich investičných dohôd, ktoré Island uzavrel na základe programu v znení zmien, vyvolali pochybnosti o zlučiteľnosti s Dohodou o EHP.

Dozorný úrad mal pochybnosti najmä o tom, či poskytnutie pomoci v rámci investičných dohôd so spoločnosťami Becromal, Kísilfélagið a Verne spadá do rozsahu pôsobnosti programu schváleného dozorným úradom a či bola dodržaná požiadavka stimulujúceho účinku investičnej pomoci.

Dozorný úrad mal okrem toho pochybnosti o tom, či investičná dohoda so spoločnosťou Marmeti bola uzatvorená v rozsahu pôsobnosti programu, pokiaľ ide o požiadavku stimulujúceho účinku.

Dozorný úrad mal ďalej pochybnosti o tom, či prvky investičnej dohody so spoločnosťou Thorsil a investičnej dohody so spoločnosťou GMR neustanovujú pomoc poskytovanú mimo schváleného programu.

Dozorný úrad preto mal pochybnosti, či program pomoci v znení zmien a pomoc poskytnutú v rámci šiestich investičných dohôd možno považovať za zlučiteľnú s Dohodou o EHP.

Záver

Vzhľadom na uvedené skutočnosti Dozorný úrad pochybuje o tom, či je program v znení zmien a šesť investičných dohôd uvedených vyššie v súlade s článkom 61 ods. 3 Dohody o EHP v spojení s požiadavkami stanovenými v usmerneniach Dozorného úradu o regionálnej pomoci.

Vzhľadom na uvedené skutočnosti sa Dozorný úrad rozhodol začať konanie vo veci formálneho zisťovania podľa článku 1 ods. 2 časti I protokolu 3 k Dohode medzi štátmi EZVO o zriadení Dozorného úradu a Súdneho dvora týkajúce sa programu investičných stimulov v znení zmien notifikovaných islandskými orgánmi, ktorý bol zmenený nariadením (EÚ) č. 1150/2010 implementovaným islandskými orgánmi, ako aj šiestich investičných dohôd.

Zainteresované strany sa vyzývajú, aby predložili svoje pripomienky v lehote jedného mesiaca odo dňa uverejnenia tohto oznámenia v *Úradnom vestníku Európskej únie*.

EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY DECISION

No 177/13/COL

of 30 April 2013

to initiate the formal investigation procedure with regard to the investment incentives scheme and certain investment agreements

(Iceland)

THE EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY ('THE AUTHORITY'),

HAVING REGARD to the Agreement on the European Economic Area ('the EEA Agreement'), in particular to Articles 61 to 63 and Protocol 26,

HAVING REGARD to the Agreement between the EFTA States on the establishment of a Surveillance Authority and a Court of Justice ('the Surveillance and Court Agreement'), in particular to Article 24,

HAVING REGARD to Protocol 3 to the Surveillance and Court Agreement ('Protocol 3'), in particular to Article 1 in Part I and Article 4(3) in Part II,

HAVING REGARD to the consolidated version of the Authority's Decision No 195/04/COL of 14 July 2004 on the implementing provisions referred to under Article 27 in Part II of Protocol 3,

Whereas:

I. FACTS

1. Chronology of events

(1) On 13 October 2010, the Authority approved a scheme on investment incentives ('the scheme') [1] notified by the Icelandic authorities pursuant to Article 1(3) in Part I of Protocol 3, by Decision No 390/10/COL.

(2) The scheme provides for the possibility of granting aid in the form of direct grants, through various tax exemptions for up to 10 years and through the sale and lease of land below market value to companies in all sectors except the financial sector, in connection with an initial investment in areas eligible for regional aid (known as 'c-regions') in Iceland.

(3) The scheme expires on 31 December 2013.

(4) The legal basis for the scheme as approved by the Authority is:

(a) Act No 99/2010 on incentives for initial investments in Iceland ('the Act') [2], adopted by the Icelandic Parliament on 29 June 2010; and

(b) Regulation (EU) No 985/2010 on incentives for initial investments in Iceland [3], issued by the Ministry of Industry on 25 November 2010 ('the Regulation'), corresponding to a draft regulation which was submitted to the Authority on 27 September 2010. The Regulation is a piece of secondary legislation, based on the Act.

(5) On 30 December 2010, the Ministry of Industry issued a new regulation, Regulation (EU) No 1150/2010 ('the Supplementary Regulation'), amending the Regulation. The Supplementary Regulation was not notified to the Authority.

(6) During the period 2010 to 2013, the Icelandic State entered into a number of agreements which it considered to fall under the scheme. The agreements are collectively referred to herein as 'the six investment agreements'. They are as follows:

(a) on 30 December 2010, the Minister for Industry on behalf of the Icelandic Government entered into an investment agreement with Becromal Iceland ehf., Becromal Properties ehf., Stokkur Energy ehf. and Becromal SpA, with a projected investment cost of EUR 117,25 million;

(b) on 30 December 2010, the Minister for Industry on behalf of the Icelandic Government entered into an investment agreement with Thorsil ehf., Timminco Ltd. and Stokkur Energy ehf.;

(c) on 17 February 2011, the Minister for Industry, Energy and Tourism and the Minister for Finance on behalf of the Icelandic Government entered into an investment agreement with Íslenska Kísilfélagið ehf., Tomahawk Development á Íslandi ehf. and GSM Enterprises LLC;

(d) on 22 September 2011, the Minister for Industry, Energy and Tourism on behalf of the Icelandic Government entered into an investment agreement with Verne Real Estate II ehf. and Verne Holdings Ldt., on a project with the total envisaged investment cost of USD 675 million;

(e) on 7 May 2012, the Minister for Industry, Energy and Tourism on behalf of the Icelandic Government entered into an investment agreement with GMR Endurvinnslan ehf.;

(f) on 28 January 2013, the Minister for Industries on behalf of the Icelandic Government entered into an investment agreement with Marmeti ehf.

2. Procedure

(7) Following pre-notification discussions, the Icelandic authorities notified, pursuant to Article 1(3) in Part I of Protocol 3, a series of proposed amendments ('the notified amendments') to Act No 99/2010 by way of a letter dated and received on 13 December 2012 (Event No 656578).

(8) By letter submitted on 22 January 2013 (Event No 660120), the Authority requested additional information from the Icelandic authorities. By letter received on 30 January 2013 (Event No 661235), the Icelandic authorities replied to the information request.

[1] Available at: http://www.eftasurv.int/media/state-aid/390-10-COL.pdf

[2] *Lög um ívilnanir vegna nýfjárfestinga á Íslandi*, referred to in this Decision as the Act, adopted by the Parliament on 29 June 2010.

[3] *Reglugerð um um ívilnanir vegna nýfjárfestinga á Íslandi*, referred to in this Decision as the Regulation, issued by the Minister for Industry on 25 November 2010.

(9) The Authority submitted a second request for information on 11 February 2013 (Event No 662250) to which it received a reply on 5 March 2013 (Event Nos 664789-92). The Authority responded to this letter on 20 March 2013. The Icelandic authorities submitted further information by way of a letter received on 10 April 2013 (Event No 668635) and a meeting was held between the Icelandic authorities and the Authority on 23 April 2013.

3. **Description of the measures under preliminary examination**

3.1. ***Background***

(10) As described above, the investment incentives scheme is established by Act No 99/2010, and Regulation (EU) No 985/2010, on incentives for initial investments in Iceland. The Act and the Regulation set out a mechanism for the support of initial investment in regions which, under Decision No 378/06/COL of 6 December 2006 on the map of assisted areas and levels of aid in Iceland, are eligible for regional aid.

(11) The scheme was approved by the Authority by Decision No 390/10/COL on 13 October 2010, following a notification from the Icelandic authorities dated 28 June 2010. The Authority assessed the scheme under the Guidelines on national regional aid 2007-2013 ('the Regional aid guidelines') ([4]).

(12) The aim of the scheme is to promote initial investment thereby creating jobs in the disadvantaged regions in Iceland. Projects with projected minimum annual turnover of ISK 300 million or which create at least 20 new direct jobs within the first two years of operation are eligible. The project shall operate in the region for at least 10 years. Projects must be approved by the Minister for Industry, who signs an investment agreement with each successful applicant. Approval of applications is subject to an *ex ante* cost benefit calculation by the Invest in Iceland Agency. For a detailed description of the scheme, reference is made to Section I.2 of Decision No 390/10/COL of 13 October 2010.

(13) The present decision of the Authority concerns three sets of measures taken in Iceland with regard to the scheme: (i) the notified amendments (Section 3.2 below); (ii) the non-notified amendments (Section 3.3); and (iii) the six investment agreements (Section 3.4).

3.2. ***The notified amendments to the scheme***

(14) On 30 November 2012, the Icelandic Government submitted to the Parliament a bill which proposed a series of amendments to the existing scheme. On 13 December 2012, the Icelandic authorities submitted a notification to the Authority of the proposed amendments. The Icelandic Parliament adopted the bill, as Act No 25/2013, on 13 March 2013. Act No 25/2013 will only come into force once the Authority has given a decision approving the amendments. The notified amendments are as follows:

1. Direct grants under Article 8 of Act No 99/2010 will be abolished.

2. The maximum payable corporate income tax rate will be fixed to 18 %, instead of the applicable rate at the time at which an agreement is signed between the Icelandic authorities and a beneficiary. The statutory income tax rate was raised from 18 % to 20 % on 1 January 2011. This means that the maximum 18 % tax rate will apply, instead of the tax rate (currently 20 %) in force at the time at which a new agreement is signed between the Icelandic authorities and a beneficiary for new investment projects under the scheme. The new maximum rate will apply as of the entry into force of the notified amendment until the expiry of the scheme on 31 December 2013.

3. Stamp duties under Act No 36/1978 on documents relating to new investment projects which will be granted aid under the scheme will be zero (instead of 0,15 %, as provided in the scheme as approved).

4. The municipal property tax rate for new investment projects will be 50 % less than the maximum rate stipulated in Chapter II of Act No 4/1995 (instead of the 30 % reduction as provided in the scheme as approved).

5. The general social security charge for new investment projects will be 50 % less than the charge stipulated in Article 2(3) of Act No 113/1990 on social security charge (instead of the 20 % reduction as provided in the scheme as approved).

([4]) Available at: http://www.eftasurv.int/?1=1&showLinkID=15125&1=1

(15) The Icelandic authorities have asserted ([5]) that the proposed amendments will not apply to projects subject to investment agreements which had already been entered into between the beneficiary and the Icelandic authorities at the time at which the notified amendments enter into effect. The Icelandic authorities have explained that the proposed amendments will expire on 31 December 2013, as will the scheme itself.

3.3. ***The non-notified amendments to the scheme***

(16) During its preliminary examination, the Authority became aware that the Supplementary Regulation, issued by the Ministry of Industry shortly after the Authority's approval of the scheme ([6]), had made a number of changes to the scheme.

(17) The amendments concern:

(i) the application of the incentive effect test under the scheme (Article 3(c) of the Regulation);

(ii) the maximum corporate tax applicable (Article 8(2)(1) of the Regulation); and

(iii) the date for calculating the maximum duration of the tax exemptions allowed under the scheme (Article 20(3)(1) and (3)(2) of the Regulation).

(18) The amended provisions (with the text added by the Supplementary Regulation underlined) read as follows:

Article 3

Conditions for granting aid

When assessing whether to grant aid to new investment projects, according to Act No 99/2010, the following cumulative criteria shall be fulfilled:

[…]

(c) the prospective investment project has not been started before the signing of an agreement according to Article 20, or according to a special investment agreement prior to entry into force of the Act, and it is demonstrated that the granting of the aid is a prerequisite for the project to materialise in Iceland.

[…]

Article 8

Aid relating to taxes and other public fees

Regional aid under Act No 99/2010 may be granted through the reduction of taxes or other public fees relating to the investment project in question.

A company, established for initial investment purposes, which fulfils the cumulative criteria set out in Act No 99/2010, and in this Regulation, shall enjoy the following tax derogations:

1. The income tax rate of the company shall, for the period stipulated in Article 3, not exceed the income tax rate in effect when the investment agreement according to Article 20 is concluded, or according to a special investment agreement prior to entry into force of the Act

[…]

Article 20

Agreement on the granting of aid

If an applicant accepts the Minister's offer to enter into an agreement on aid, such an agreement shall be signed between the applicant and the Minister on behalf of the national authorities, and where applicable the local authorities, on the granting of aid for an investment project.

The duration of an agreement granting aid according to paragraph 1 shall not exceed 13 years from the date of signature, taking into account a special investment agreement, should such an agreement previously have been concluded concerning the project. Aid granted on the basis of Article 9 of Act No 99/2010 shall apply for 10 years calculated from the date when the relevant tax liability occurs or the obligation to pay the relevant charges under Article 9(2) of Act No 99/2010 is triggered, however not exceeding 13 years from the signing of an agreement granting aid, taking into account a special investment agreement should such an agreement previously have been concluded concerning the project. The net present value of the estimated total State aid to be granted over the duration of

([5]) Letter submitted to the Authority on 30 January 2013 (Event No 661235).

([6]) As stated above, the Authority approved the scheme on 13 October 2010 and the Supplementary Regulation was issued on 30 December 2010.

an investment agreement shall be stipulated in the agreement. An investment agreement entered into on the basis of Act No 99/2010 shall be published in the B-Section of the Official Gazette ([7]).

(19) During the Authority's preliminary examination, the Icelandic authorities provided the following explanation regarding the non-notified amendments to the scheme:

'The reference "or according to a special investment agreement prior to entry into force of the Act" was added to certain provisions of Regulation (EU) No 985/2010 with Regulation (EU) No 1150/2010 from 30 December 2010. This means that the prospective investment project must not have been initiated before the signing of an investment agreement referred to in the Regulation or a special investment agreement, specifically related to the project in question. The reference to a special investment agreement relates to preparation of the investment project. Nevertheless, the project as such shall not be undertaken before the activation of the incentives referred to in Regulation (EU) No 985/2010, as amended.' ([8]).

3.4. *The six investment agreements*

(20) The Icelandic authorities have provided the Authority with copies of six investment agreements, which were entered into during the period December 2010 to January 2013.

(21) The six investment agreements are listed below ([9]):

Table 1

	Date	Companies	Project
1	30 December 2010	Becromal Iceland ehf., Becromal Properties ehf., Stokkur Energy ehf. and Becromal SpA	Aluminium foil anodising plant in the town of Akureyri
2	30 December 2010	Thorsil ehf., Stokkur Energy ehf. and Timminco Limited	Silicon metal production in Þorlákshöfn in the municipality of Ölfus
3	17 February 2011	Íslenska Kísilfélagið ehf., Tomahawk Development á Íslandi ehf. and GSM Enterprises LLC	Silicon metal production in Helguvík in the municipality of Reykjanesbær
4	27 September 2011	Verne Real Estate II ehf. and Verne Holdings Ltd.	Data centre in the municipality of Reykjanesbær
5	7 May 2012	GMR Endurvinnslan ehf.	Steel recycling plant at Grundartangi in the municipality of Hvalfjarðarsveit
6	28 January 2013	Marmeti ehf.	Fish factory in the town of Sandgerði

(22) The Authority has not been provided with copies of any agreements which are expressly labelled as 'special investment agreements', as referred to in the Supplementary Regulation or as described in the reply from the Icelandic authorities quoted in paragraph 19 above.

([7]) In the Authority's translation. The text in Icelandic (with the text added by the Supplementary Regulation also underlined) is as follows: 3.gr. *Skilyrði fyrir veitingu ívilnana*. Við mat á því hvort veita eigi ívilnun vegna nýfjárfestingar samkvæmt lögum nr. 99/2010 skal eftirfarandi skilyrðum vera fullnægt: […] c. að fyrirhugað fjárfestingarverkefni sé ekki hafið áður en undirritaður er samningur um ívilnun skv. 20. gr. eða samkvæmt sérstökum fjárfestingarsamningi fyrir gildistöku laganna, og að sýnt sé fram á að veiting ívilnunar sé forsenda þess að fjárfestingarverkefnið verði að veruleika hér á landi […] 8. gr. *Ívilnanir tengdar sköttum og opinberum gjöldum*. Byggðaaðstoð getur samkvæmt lögum nr. 99/2010 verið í formi frávika frá sköttum eða opinberum gjöldum vegna viðkomandi fjárfestingarverkefnis. Félag sem stofnað er um nýfjárfestingu og uppfyllir öll skilyrði laga nr. 99/2010, og reglugerðar þessarar, fyrir veitingu ívilnunar skal njóta eftirfarandi skattalegra ívilnana: 1. Tekjuskattshlutfall viðkomandi félags skal, í þann tíma sem kveðið er á um í 3. mgr., aldrei vera hærra en það tekjuskattshlutfall sem í gildi er þegar samningur skv. 20. gr. eða samkvæmt sérstökum fjárfestingarsamningi fyrir gildistöku laganna, er gerður við félagið. […] 20. gr. *Samningur um veitingu ívilnunar*. Fallist umsækjandi á boð iðnaðarráðherra um ívilnun skal gerður samningur milli umsækjanda og iðnaðarráðherra, fyrir hönd stjórnvalda og, eftir atvikum, sveitarfélaga um veitingu ívilnunar vegna viðkomandi fjárfestingarverkefnis Samningur um veitingu ívilnunar skv. 1. mgr. skal að hámarki gilda í 13 ár frá undirritun hans, að teknu tilliti til sérstaks fjárfestingarsamnings ef slíkur samningur hefur áður verið gerður um verkefnið. Ívilnun sem veitt er á grundvelli 9. gr. laga nr. 99/2010 skal gilda í 10 ár frá því að viðkomandi skattskylda eða gjaldskylda sem kveðið er á um í 2. mgr. 9. gr. laga nr. 99/2010 myndast, þó aldrei lengur en í 13 ár frá undirritun samnings um veitingu ívilnunar að teknu tilliti til sérstaks fjárfestingarsamnings ef slíkur samningur hefur áður verið gerður um verkefnið. Í samningi samkvæmt þessari grein skal koma fram áætlun um samtals fjárhæð ívilnunar, núvirt, á gildistíma samningsins. Samningur um veitingu ívilnunar, sem iðnaðarráðherra undirritar samkvæmt lögum nr. 99/2010, skal birtur í B-deild Stjórnartíðinda.

([8]) Letter submitted to the Authority on 30 January 2013 (Event No 661235).

([9]) The investment agreements are available in the public domain, according to Article 21(4) of Act No 99/2010, and they are as of 4 March 2013 available here, in English and in Icelandic: http://stjornartidindi.is/AdvertList.aspx?ID=7F3926F3-992D-4211-903D-D4F28F1DC87A&view=2&value=ddc9274e-1111-44ac-9d52-5ffa832684fc

(23) However, two of the investment agreements listed in the table above refer to previous agreements which were entered into by the Icelandic authorities with the same beneficiaries. These agreements concerned the same projects. The Authority is therefore making the initial assumption that these earlier investment agreements fall into the category of 'special investment agreements' and that the references to 'special investment agreements' in the Supplementary Regulation in fact relates to these earlier investment agreements. The investment agreements which make reference to earlier agreements are to be found at No 1 and No 3 in the table above.

(24) The first of these was concluded between the State and Becromal Iceland ehf., Becromal Properties ehf., Stokkur Energy efh. and Becromal SpA ('the Becromal Investment Agreement'). This agreement refers to an investment agreement on the same project between the same parties which was entered into on 7 July 2009 ([10]). The project referred to is an investment in an aluminium foil anodising plant to be constructed in the town of Akureyri in two steps; the first phase, EUR 66 million, by end of March 2011 and second phase by the end of year 2014, total investment cost approximately EUR 117,25 million. The Icelandic authorities have provided some further information about the background of the Becromal Investment Agreement, including information on the earlier agreement referred to, dated on 7 July 2009 ([11]).

(25) The third investment agreement set out in the table above, which was concluded between the State and Íslenska Kísilfélagið ehf., Tomahawk Development á Íslandi ehf. and GSM Enterprises LLC ('the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement') likewise refers to a previous agreement, which was entered into between the same parties, and on the same project, on 29 May 2009 ([12]). The project referred to is the construction, in two or more steps, of a silicon production plant in Helguvík in the municipality of Reykjanesbær with the production capacity of up to 50 000 metric tonnes of metallurgical grade silicon or equivalent (> 98 %), up to 20 000 metric tonnes of silica dust (SiO_2) per year.

(26) Lastly, although the fourth investment agreement set out in the table above, which was entered into between the State and Verne Real Estate II ehf. and Verne Holdings Ltd. ('the Verne Investment Agreement') ([13]), does not refer to a previous agreement, it nonetheless appears to concern the same or a similar investment project ([14]) as one that was subject to a previous decision of the Authority. By Decision No 418/10/COL of 3 November 2010 ([15]), the Authority opened a formal investigation procedure on an investment agreement which was entered into on 23 October 2009 between the State and Verne Real Estate ehf. and Verne Holdings Ltd. on a data centre project in Reykjanesbær. According to the Icelandic authorities, this agreement was later cancelled and the notification was withdrawn. The matter was not pursued further by the Authority at that point ([16]).

(27) The preliminary view of the Authority is that the reference to 'special investment agreements' in the Supplementary Regulation may encompass these three earlier investment agreements, which were entered into prior to the entry into force of the scheme.

(28) For the sake of completeness, the Authority notes that the investment agreements set out at points 2, 5 and 6 in the table above do not relate to any earlier investment agreements, according to information available to the Authority at this point in time.

(29) The Authority has not been provided with further details of any 'special investment agreements' referred to in the Supplementary Regulation, apart from some information on the one referred to in the Becromal Investment Agreement. The Authority has not received copies of these earlier investment agreements. Furthermore, the Authority has not been provided with information on or

([10]) See the Becromal Investment Agreement at sections H and I of the preamble.
([11]) Letter received on 10 April 2013 (Event No 668635).
([12]) See the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement at sections N and O of the preamble.
([13]) The Verne Investment Agreement refers to Verne Real Estate II ehf. as the 'Company' and Verne Holdings Ltd. as the 'Investor' and to both companies as the 'Parties'. For the purposes of this Decision, the companies will both be referred to as 'Verne'. According to the Annual Report 2011 for Verne Holdings Ltd., Verne Holdings ehf. put in place a new parent company for the Verne Group on 24 June 2011: Verne Holdings Ltd., being a company incorporated in England and Wales that is tax resident in the United Kingdom. The prior parent company was Verne Holdings ehf., domiciled in Iceland. Verne Holdings ehf. was the beneficiary according to the agreement subject to assessment in Decision No 418/10/COL. Verne Real Estate II ehf., established in September 2011, is a subsidiary of Verne Holdings Ltd., which also owns the following subsidiaries: Verne Real Estate ehf., Verne Global Inc and Verne Global Ltd., according to the Verne Group's consolidated financial statements for the period ended on 31 December 2011. The Authority regards both Verne Real Estate II ehf. and Verne Holdings Ltd. as beneficiaries under the Verne Investment Agreement.
([14]) The project will be further described in Section II.4.3.3 below.
([15]) Available at: http://www.eftasurv.int/media/decisions/418-10-COL.pdf
([16]) See reference to the Icelandic authorities' letter on 28 September 2011 in the Authority's Decision No 261/12/COL at paragraph 8; http://www.eftasurv.int/media/decisions/261-12-COL.pdf

copies of any separate agreements entered into between municipalities and the beneficiaries ([17]), pursuant to the provisions of the scheme allowing for exemptions from municipal property tax and sale or lease of land below market price as provided for under the scheme ([18]).

II. ASSESSMENT

1. The presence of State aid

1.1. *State aid within the meaning of Article 61(1) of the EEA Agreement*

(30) Article 61(1) of the EEA Agreement reads as follows:

'Save as otherwise provided in this Agreement, any aid granted by EC Member States, EFTA States 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 Contracting Parties, be incompatible with the functioning of this Agreement.'

In the following, the Authority will assess whether the criteria for the existence of State aid within the meaning of Article 61(1) of the EEA Agreement are fulfilled.

1.2. *Presence of State resources*

(31) To be qualified as State aid, an advantage must be granted by the State or through State resources. For the purposes of the State aid rules, the term 'State' covers also regional and local bodies ([19]). A loss of tax revenue is equivalent to consumption of State resources in the form of fiscal expenditure and State support may be provided equally by tax provisions of a legislative, regulatory or administrative nature as through the practices of the tax authorities ([20]). A reduction in the tax base or a total or partial reduction on the amount of tax, fees or charges involves a loss of revenue and is therefore equivalent to the consumption of State resources in the form of fiscal expenditure.

(32) The scheme, its amendments and the six investment agreements all contain tax concessions, and thus State resources are involved ([21]).

1.3. *Favouring certain undertakings or the production of certain goods*

(33) The scheme as amended by the notified and non-notified amendments is selective as only undertakings investing in certain regions in Iceland eligible for assistance under Article 61(3)(c) of the EEA Agreement can receive aid under the scheme. As regards the six investment agreements, the beneficiaries are individual companies and therefore the measures are selective.

(34) The definition of aid is more general than that of subsidy, because it includes not only positive benefits, such as subsidies themselves, but also State measures which, in various forms, mitigate the charges which are normally included in the budget of an undertaking and which thus, without being subsidies in the strict sense of the word, are similar in character and have the same effect ([22]). According to settled case law, a measure by which the public authorities grant to certain undertakings a tax exemption which, although not involving a transfer of State resources, places those to whom the tax exemption applies in a more favourable financial situation than other taxpayers constitutes aid granted by the State or through State resources ([23]).

(35) The Authority notes that the scheme and the six investment agreements contain a clause protecting against future increase of the statutory rate of income tax. This guarantee against future legislative changes in itself constitutes State aid in the Authority's view.

(36) The scheme as amended by the notified and non-notified measures, and the six investment agreements, allow or will allow beneficiaries to be relieved of part of the costs which they would normally have to bear themselves in their course of business.

([17]) Such an agreement is referred to in the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement.
([18]) Reference is made to Decision No 390/10/COL, description of the State aid granted by municipalities, see Section I.2.5.2.6 and Section I.2.5.3.
([19]) Case 248/84 *Germany* v *Commission* [1987] ECR 4013, paragraph 17.
([20]) See paragraph 3 of the Authority's Business Taxation Guidelines.
([21]) As regards the notified amendments to the scheme described in Section I.3.2 above, the proposed modifications include an abolition of direct grants under Article 8 of the Act. The removal of a provision to directly grant aid manifestly does not amount to a State aid measure in and of itself. This part of the notified measures clearly does not need to be assessed within the present Decision.
([22]) See, in particular, Case C-143/99 *Adria-Wien Pipeline and Wietersdorfer & Peggauer Zementwerke* [2001] ECR I-8365, paragraph 38; Case C-501/00 *Spain* v *Commission* [2004] ECR I-6717, paragraph 90; and Case C-66/02 *Italy* v *Commission* [2005] ECR I-10901, paragraph 77.
([23]) See to that effect Case C-387/92 *Banco Exterior de España* [1994] ECR I-877, paragraph 14; and Case C-222/04 *Cassa di Risparmio di Firenze and Others* [2006] ECR I-289, paragraph 132.

(37) Thus, the scheme as amended and the six investment agreements favour certain undertakings and the production of certain goods within the meaning of Article 61(1) of the EEA Agreement.

1.4. ***Distortion of competition and effect on trade between Contracting Parties***

(38) The notified and non-notified measures and the six investment agreements will strengthen the competitive situation of the supported undertakings in the eligible regions compared to their actual or potential competitors in the EEA. The scheme applies to all sectors, with the exemption of the financial sector, and therefore has a potential to distort trade within the EEA since it cannot be excluded that in some of these sectors there is competition between the aid beneficiaries and undertakings in the EEA.

1.5. ***Conclusion***

(39) The Authority notes that in its Decision No 390/10/COL it found the measures under the scheme to fall within the definition of State aid within the meaning of Article 61(1) of the EEA Agreement. The Authority has not been presented with new elements calling for a different assessment with respect to the scheme at this point.

(40) Based on the above findings, the Authority comes to the conclusion that the scheme, as amended by the non-notified measures set out in the Supplementary Regulation and by the notified amendments, constitutes State aid within the meaning of Article 61(1) of the EEA Agreement. The same conclusion applies to the six investment agreements.

2. **New aid procedure**

(41) All plans to amend the scheme are subject to a notification obligation pursuant to Article 1(3) in Part I of Protocol 3 and the Authority's Decision No 390/10/COL approving the scheme.

(42) The Authority recalls that the notified amendments to the approved scheme consist of the following four proposals for increasing the level of exemptions from statutory taxes for new investment projects:

1. The maximum payable corporate income tax rate will be fixed to 18 %, instead of the applicable tax rate (currently 20 %) at the time at which an agreement is signed between the State and a beneficiary, as is the case under the scheme as approved.

2. Stamp duties under Act No 36/1978 on documents relating to the new investment project will be zero, instead of 0,15 % as provided in the scheme as approved (the statutory stamp duty is 1,5 %).

3. The municipal property tax rate for such projects will be 50 % less (instead of 30 % less, as set out in the scheme as approved) than the maximum rate stipulated in Chapter II of Act No 4/1995.

4. The general social security charge for such projects will be 50 % less (instead of 20 % less, as set out in the scheme as approved) than is stipulated in Article 2(3) of Act No 113/1990 on social security charge.

(43) Under Article 1(c) in Part II of Protocol 3, 'alterations to existing aid' are to be regarded as new aid. An increase in the original budget of an existing aid scheme by up to 20 %, without amending the provisions of an aid scheme, is not considered an alteration to existing aid, according to the Authority's Decision No 195/04/COL on the implementing provisions under Article 27 in Part II of Protocol 3 ('the Implementing Decision'). The notified amendments do not merely increase the budget of the scheme. Rather, the Icelandic authorities propose amending certain provisions for granting aid in the form of tax exemptions while abolishing direct grants from the scheme. The Icelandic authorities have not considered the notified alterations to fall within the criteria for the simplified notification procedure set out in Article 4(2) of the Implementing Decision. Moreover, it is the Authority's view that the notified amendments cannot be classified as 'of purely formal or administrative nature', as referred to in Article 4 of the Implementing Decision. Accordingly, the notified amendments must be regarded as alterations to existing aid. Hence, the notified amendments are classified as new aid as defined in Article 1(c) in Part II of Protocol 3.

(44) The question then arises whether the entire scheme, or only the amendments, are to be classified as new aid. According to established case-law, when alterations are made which are severable from the existing aid only the alterations need to be notified, and only when the alteration affects the actual substance of the original scheme is the latter transformed into new aid scheme ([24]). In the Authority's preliminary view, the proposals to: (i) introduce a new method for granting maximum corporate tax, which would, in the current situation reduce the tax rate for all new projects instead of guaranteeing

([24]) See joined Cases T-195/01 and T-207/01 *Government of Gibraltar* v *Commission* [2002] ECR II-2309, paragraphs 109 and 111.

a current maximum tax rate; (ii) eliminate stamp duties for all new projects instead of only reducing them; (iii) increase the level of municipal tax discount from 30 % to 50 %; and (iv) increase the level of general social security charge from 20 % to 50 % are alterations that change basic features of the scheme and they are not severable from the scheme itself. They will apply to all aid granted to new projects under the scheme. Moreover, these are not merely additions to the scheme, which add (e.g.) categories of companies or operations, but rather, alterations that affect the whole scheme.

(45) The amendment under point (i) in itself changes the nature and the intrinsic functioning of the provision on corporate tax rate from being a pure guarantee against future increases in corporate tax rate into fixing a maximum rate below the rate at any given point, when a beneficiary enters into an agreement. This new arrangement would apply to all new projects which would be granted aid under the scheme in the future.

(46) Furthermore, the elimination of stamp duties in their entirety under point (ii) and the increase in discounts under points (iii) and (iv) are large in volume and they increase the discounts considerably. Under these circumstances, it is the Authority's preliminary view that the alterations to the scheme cannot be classified as being severable from the initial scheme. In other words, the alterations affect the entire scheme, such that the whole scheme must be regarded as new aid, which may not be implemented prior to a new approval. According to established case-law, the entire scheme thus becomes new aid ([25]).

(47) The Authority moreover recalls that the non-notified amendments set out in the Supplementary Regulation concern: (i) the application of the incentive effect test under the scheme; (ii) the maximum corporate tax rate applicable; and (iii) the date for calculating the maximum duration of the tax exemptions allowed under the scheme.

(48) These amendments to the scheme are in the Authority's preliminary view subject to a notification obligation pursuant to Article 1(3) in Part I of Protocol 3.

(49) In its ruling in the *Heineken Brouwerijen* Case ([26]), the Court stated:

'Where a plan has been notified and the Commission has not raised any objections to it, but the Member State concerned has made alterations of which the Commission has not been informed, the provision precludes the putting into effect of the aid programme in its entirety. The position may be different only where the alteration in question is in actual fact a separate aid measure which should be assessed separately and which is therefore not such as to influence the assessment which the Commission has already made of the initial plan.'

(50) The Authority takes the preliminary view that the non-notified amendments to the scheme, made only shortly after its approval, influence the assessment which the Authority has already made of the scheme, in particular as regards the application of the incentive effect test, which is a central element in assessing the compatibility of national regional aid with Article 61(1) EEA. Therefore, the Authority takes the preliminary view that the whole scheme, as amended, constitutes new aid according to Article 1 in Part II of Protocol 3.

(51) Insofar as one or more of the six investment agreements are concluded outside the scope of the initial scheme as approved by the Authority, they likewise constitute new aid, according to established case-law ([27]).

3. **Procedural requirements**

(52) Pursuant to Article 1(3) in Part I of Protocol 3, 'the EFTA Surveillance Authority shall be informed, in sufficient time to enable it to submit its comments, of any plans to grant or alter aid (…). The State concerned shall not put its proposed measures into effect until the procedure has resulted in a final decision'.

(53) The Icelandic authorities submitted a notification of the amendments to the scheme contained in the bill of law amending the Act with a letter dated and received on 13 December 2012 (Event No 656578). The bill was put forward to the Parliament prior to the notification. According to the information currently available to the Authority, the bill was adopted by the Parliament on 13 March 2013 as Act No 25/2013. However, the under Article 3 therein, the Act will only become effective once the Authority has approved the amendments. The Authority therefore concludes that the Icelandic authorities have respected their obligations under Article 1(3) in Part I of Protocol 3 as regards the notified amendments proposed.

([25]) Joined Cases T-195/01 and T-207/01 *Government of Gibraltar* v *Commission* [2002] ECR II-2309, paragraphs 109 and 111. See also Joined Cases 91 and 127/83 *Heineken Brouwerijen* [1984] ECR 3435, paragraph 21.
([26]) Joined Cases 91 and 127/83 *Heineken Brouwerijen* [1984] ECR 3435, paragraph 21.
([27]) See Case E-14/10 *Konkurrenten.no* v *EFTA Surveillance Authority*, paragraph 87, Report of the EFTA Court [2011], p. 268.

(54) The Icelandic authorities did not notify the Supplementary Regulation to the Authority. The Authority therefore concludes that the Icelandic authorities have not respected their obligations pursuant to Article 1(3) in Part I of Protocol 3 as regards the amendments put into effect by Regulation (EU) No 1150/2010.

(55) The Icelandic authorities did not notify the six investment agreements entered into after the approval of the scheme. Insofar as the investment agreements, or elements thereof, entail State aid granted outside the scope of the approved scheme and/or were subject to individual notification requirements under Section 4.3 of the Regional aid guidelines, the Authority therefore concludes that the Icelandic authorities have not respected their obligations pursuant to Article 1(3) in Part I of Protocol 3.

4. **Compatibility of the aid**

4.1. ***Introduction***

(56) Article 61(3)(c) EEA concerns, inter alia, aid to facilitate the development of certain disadvantaged areas, known as national regional aid.

(57) National regional aid is designed to assist the development of the most disadvantaged regions by supporting investment and job creation. The Authority has issued guidelines on the application of the derogation (the Regional aid guidelines), which are in force for the period 2007 to 2013. For Iceland, the Authority has approved a map for regions eligible for such aid, in Decision No 378/06/COL of 6 December 2006 on the map of assisted areas and levels of aid in Iceland.

(58) The Authority notes that the areas which are eligible for aid under the scheme and the individual projects which were subject to the six Investment Agreements are in areas that are eligible for regional investment aid based on the Authority's Decision No 378/06/COL.

4.2. ***The scheme as amended***

(59) The Authority recalls that the notified amendments to the scheme as approved by the Authority in its Decision No 390/10/COL are contained in the following four proposals for increasing the level of exemptions from statutory taxes for new investment projects which will be granted under the scheme following the entry into effect of the proposed amendments:

1. The maximum payable corporate income tax rate will be fixed to 18 %, instead of the applicable tax rate (currently 20 %) at the time at which an agreement is signed between the State and a beneficiary, as is the case under the scheme as approved.

2. Stamp duties under Act No 36/1978 on documents relating to the new investment project will be zero, instead of 0,15 % as provided in the scheme as approved.

3. The municipal property tax rate for such projects will be 50 % less (instead of 30 % less, as set out in the scheme as approved) than the maximum rate stipulated in Chapter II of Act No 4/1995.

4. The general social security charge for such projects will be 50 % less (instead of 20 % less, as set out in the scheme as approved) than is stipulated in Article 2(3) of Act No 113/1990 on social security charge.

(60) During the preliminary examination, the Authority became aware of further amendments and of the application of the scheme, which give rise to doubts as to whether the scheme has sufficiently clear criteria, inter alia, for the incentive effect to be verified, as applied by the Icelandic authorities. In order to review this, the Authority has examined the application of the scheme during the period from when it came into force in 2010 to date. In this respect the Authority has been provided with the six investment agreements entered into — in the Icelandic authorities' view — on the basis of the scheme ([28]).

4.2.1. *The application of the scheme*

(61) First, the Authority notes that the Becromal Investment Agreement and the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement both contain a reference to previous agreements on the same projects, referred to as 'a preliminary step'. The Becromal Investment Agreement and the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement are considered by their parties to be 'a follow up and completion of previous investment agreement'. This appears to be facilitated by the amendments to the scheme made by the Supplementary Agreement.

(62) It is the Authority's preliminary view that this application of the amended scheme indicates that the conditions under the scheme as regards the application of the incentive effect test are not sufficiently limited or strict, as regards the condition that the prospective investment project is not to have started prior to the signing of an agreement under the scheme. The Authority recalls that the

([28]) The six investment agreements will be examined in more detail in Section 4.3 below.

Icelandic authorities are under the obligation to ensure that construction work had not started prior to entering into agreements under the scheme and this obligation was a clear precondition for the its approval of the scheme by Decision No 390/10/COL. The Authority recalls its reference to the significance of the incentive effect requirements under paragraph 30 of the Regional aid guidelines, set out at Section II.3.6 of Decision No 390/10/COL.

(63) Second, the scheme contains an obligation to include in the Investment Agreements an estimate of the net present value of the total State aid to be granted to a project over the duration of the scheme, and to establish the eligible costs and the overall ceiling of the aid.

(64) The obligation to make a reference to the net present value of the aid granted in the agreements entered into on the basis of the scheme is codified in Article 20(4) of the Regulation. However, the estimated net present value of the aid is not referred to in any of the six Investment Agreements. In this respect, the application of the scheme appears not to be entirely consistent with the scheme as set out in the Regulation and approved by the Authority.

(65) Further, only two of the six investment agreements refer to the total investment costs of the respective projects (the Becromal Investment Agreement and the Verne Investment Agreement). The Authority recalls that the scheme provides for aid in the form of tax concessions, which only qualifies as investment aid on the basis set out in detail in Decision No 390/10/COL at Section II.3.3. An essential element for aid in the form of tax concessions to be regarded as investment aid is an overall ceiling expressed as a percentage of the eligible investment costs in a specific project.

(66) The Authority's preliminary view is that the lack of a clear statement of the eligible investment costs, the lack of a reference to the estimate of the discounted value of the aid, and the lack of a statement as to the overall ceiling in the investment agreements, indicate that the scheme being applied in a way that is insufficiently transparent. The Authority therefore has doubts as to whether the scheme contains sufficiently clear provisions to ensure the necessary transparency and documentation with regard to the maximum aid amounts.

(67) Third, the examples mentioned above give rise to doubt as to whether the cost-benefit analysis calculation which forms part of the scheme — a mechanism designed to ensuring the necessity and proportionality of the aid to be established *ex ante* — is sufficiently described, regulated and applied under the scheme. The cost-benefit analysis was a precondition for the approval of the scheme, see Section II.3.6 of Decision No 390/10/COL.

(68) Fourth, in their submission to the Authority during the preliminary examination of the notified amendments to the scheme, the Icelandic authorities asserted that the amendments will not have any retroactive effects on investment agreements already concluded before the entering into force of the amendments. They have asserted that all the proposed amendments will apply only to new agreements entered into after the proposed amendments enter into force. Moreover, they have stated that beneficiaries under existing agreements under the scheme will not benefit from the amended scheme. Further, the Icelandic authorities have stated that investment projects that have already been approved under the scheme will not be eligible under the amended scheme.

(69) In the Authority's preliminary view, the assertions above appear to be in contradiction with the explicit provisions of some of the investment agreements set out above. It is expressly stated in the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement, the Verne Investment Agreement, the GMR Investment Agreement and the Marmeti Investment Agreement that the beneficiaries have an unconditional right to claim that they will benefit from any amendments to the scheme which would be more favourable for them than the current arrangements. The scheme, as approved, classifies the aid granted as investment aid, on the basis set out above in paragraph 65. An unconditional contractual obligation to grant further aid in the future, in case of an amended scheme, appears not to be compatible with these conditions. It is the Authority's preliminary view that this application of the scheme is not consistent with the scheme as approved. The Authority has doubts as to whether the provisions and mechanisms under the scheme are sufficiently clear to ensure that the aid is sufficiently limited and proportionate to ensure the regional aid objectives, and is not instead pure operating aid.

(70) Fifth, the Becromal Investment Agreement and the Thorsil Investment Agreement contain a clause on the possibility of an extension of the aid period beyond the maximum duration provided for in the scheme. The duration of the aid measures is fixed in the scheme. Grants of aid in the form of tax measures qualify as investment aid on the condition that these measures are limited in time. The Authority's preliminary view is that the application of the scheme appears to be contrary to the nature of the investment aid which was approved by the Authority. The Authority has doubts as to whether the provisions and mechanisms under the scheme are sufficiently clear to ensure that the aid is necessary and sufficiently proportionate to ensure the regional aid objectives and is not pure operating aid.

4.2.2. *The non-notified amendments to the scheme*

(71) As described in Section I.3.3 above, the Supplementary Regulation, issued on 30 December 2010, alters Article 3(c), Article 8(2)(1) and Article 20(3)(1) and (3)(2) of the Regulation. These provisions concern:

(i) the application of the incentive effect test under the scheme as approved by the Authority (Article 3(c));

(ii) the rules on maximum corporate tax applicable (Article 8(2)(1)); and

(iii) the date for calculating the maximum duration of the tax exemptions allowed under the scheme (Article 20(3)(1) and (3)(2)).

(72) The Supplementary Agreement was not notified to the Authority. In light of the conclusions above as regards the notified amendments and the six investment agreements, the Authority takes the view that the alterations of the scheme made under the Supplementary Agreement shortly after the approval of the scheme in 2010 must be examined by the Authority.

(73) The Authority recalls that it stated in Decision No 390/10/COL that:

'The scheme excludes the award of aid to projects which have started before an agreement with the Icelandic authorities is entered into, according to Article 21 of the Incentives Act.' ([29]).

(74) Furthermore, the Authority referred in that Decision to the assertions made by the Icelandic authorities regarding the incentive effect of the scheme, as follows:

'Moreover, no aid will be granted under the scheme to projects on which work has started before the signing of an agreement on the granting of aid between the State and the beneficiary. The Icelandic authorities have confirmed that the scheme excludes the award of aid to projects which have started before publication of the final text of the scheme in line with paragraph 93 in fine of the Regional aid guidelines' ([30]).

(75) The Authority's preliminary view is that the Supplementary Regulation has adversely affected the incentive effect requirement set out in the original scheme. The amended wording of Article 3(c) of the Regulation states that aid may be granted also to a project which has started after a special investment agreement prior to entry into force of the Regulation. The Authority takes the preliminary view that this amendment considerably widens the scope of the scheme beyond that which was approved by the Authority's decision.

(76) Moreover, the Authority takes the preliminary view that the amendment to Article 3(c) of the Regulation means that the conditions under which aid is to be granted may in this respect no longer be consistent with the Regional aid guidelines. Indeed, paragraph 30 of the Regional aid guidelines states:

'It is important to ensure that regional aid produces a real incentive effect to undertake investments which would not otherwise be made in the assisted areas. Therefore aid may only be granted under aid schemes if the beneficiary has submitted an application for aid and the authority responsible for administering the scheme has subsequently confirmed in writing that, subject to detailed verification, the project in principle meets the conditions of eligibility laid down by the scheme before the start of work on the project.'

(77) The requirements and method for verifying the existence of an incentive effect of aid, as prescribed by the Regional aid guidelines, were a precondition for the Authority's approval of the scheme by Decision No 390/10/COL. Contrary to the assertion made by the Icelandic authorities, referred to in Decision No 390/10/COL, the scheme as subsequently amended by the Supplementary Regulation appears to allow for aid to be granted to projects which were started before the scheme entered into force. Consequently, the Authority has doubts as to whether the requirement of an incentive effect of aid granted under the scheme as amended by the Supplementary Regulation is fulfilled.

(78) It is the Authority's preliminary view that, under the Regulation as amended by the Supplementary Regulation, aid might have been granted not only to projects upon which work had started prior to the conclusion of an agreement under the scheme, but indeed also prior to the entry into force of the scheme as such. The Authority's preliminary view is reinforced by the fact that two of the six investment agreements (the Becromal investment agreement and the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement) indeed have an explicit reference to earlier individual agreements signed in 2009 on what appear to be the same projects. These projects appear to have been started prior to the starting of the scheme in 2010. In addition, the Verne Investment Agreement likewise appears to be related to a prior agreement, entered into in 2009, on the same or a similar project to one which that had already been started in 2008.

([29]) Decision No 390/10/COL, p. 6.
([30]) *Idem*, p. 16.

(79) The Authority cannot exclude that the conditions for granting aid, as specified in the scheme following the insertion of new text ('or according to a special investment agreement prior to entry into force of the Act') into Article 3 of the Regulation, allow for a grant of aid which would be considered incompatible with the EEA Agreement, as aid may be granted for a project upon which work has started prior to the conclusion of an agreement.

(80) The alteration which the Supplementary Regulation made to Article 8 of the Regulation alters the reference rate for corporate income tax which can be guaranteed to a beneficiary as a maximum tax rate. Under the amended version of the article, the reference rate in case of a 'special investment agreement' is (alternatively) the corporate tax rate in effect at a point in time prior to the entry into force of the scheme. Under the original version of the article, the reference rate would exclusively have been the tax rate at the time at which an investment agreement was signed under the scheme.

(81) The Authority considers that the Supplementary Regulation appears to allow for a retroactive application of the scheme, insofar as the amended provisions of Article 8 allow for an application of the corporate tax rate applicable before the start of the scheme. In view of the amendments to Article 3 of the Regulation, which allow for a grant of aid to be made on the basis of agreements which were entered into prior to the entry into force of the scheme, the Authority has doubts as to whether the amended version of Article 8, in conjunction with the amended version of Article 3, can properly be considered to be compatible with the EEA Agreement.

(82) The amendments made to Article 20 of the Regulation appear to provide for a maximum duration of the tax exemptions which dates from the signature of an agreement prior to the entry into force of the scheme in 2010.

(83) The Authority has not yet been provided with sufficient information to allow it to verify whether the alterations, seen in relation to the alterations to Articles 3 and 8 of the Regulation discussed above, could be considered to be compatible with the EEA Agreement.

(84) On this basis, the Authority has doubts as to whether the scheme, as amended by the Supplementary Regulation, can be regarded compatible with the State aid provisions of the EEA Agreement.

(85) The Authority likewise has doubts as to whether the scheme as amended by Act No 25/2013 will be capable of being found to be compatible with the EEA Agreement.

(86) The Authority is under a duty to carry out all requisite consultations and, therefore, to initiate the procedure under Article 4(4) in Part II of Protocol 3, if its initial investigation does not enable the Authority to overcome all the difficulties involved in determining whether the aid is compatible with the functioning of the EEA Agreement.

(87) In the light of this duty, and the doubts expressed above as regards the necessary clarity and limitation provided for under the scheme and its application to date, the Authority cannot approve the notified amendments without further investigation.

4.3. ***The six investment agreements***

(88) As a preliminary point the Authority observes that aid granted under an approved scheme would in principle constitute existing aid. However, as set out above, any aid granted outside the scope of the approved scheme would be new aid. The Authority takes the preliminary view that aid granted on the basis of the non-notified amendments to the scheme is granted outside the scope of the approved scheme. Such aid could have been granted on the basis of investment agreements entered into prior to the entry into force of the scheme, with such earlier investment agreements later being brought within the scheme on the basis of the provisions of the Supplementary Regulation.

(89) The Authority accordingly sets out below a preliminary examination of the Becromal, the Kísilfélagið and the Verne investment agreements, which appear to be related to earlier investment agreements, entered into prior to the entry into force of the scheme.

(90) Moreover, the Authority cannot at this point exclude the possibility that aid granted under the Thorsil, GMR and Marmeti investment agreements, which are not related to any earlier investment agreements, went beyond the limitations set out in the scheme as approved.

(91) Therefore, the Authority will examine all six investment agreements which the Icelandic authorities have made available under the preliminary examination in the present case. They all refer to the scheme as the basis for the tax exemptions they contain.

(92) The Authority will first address the three investment agreements, discussed in Section I.3.4 above, which appear to be related to a previous investment agreement: the Becromal, the Kísilfélagið and the Verne investment agreements.

4.3.1. *The Becromal Investment Agreement*

4.3.1.1. Link to an earlier investment agreement and the incentive effect

(93) The Becromal Investment Agreement was signed on 30 December 2010. Sections D, H and I of the preamble to the Becromal Investment Agreement read as follows:

'The Investors have, from the year 2007, been taking the necessary preliminary and preparatory steps towards the establishment of the Plant in the township of Akureyri, which production will be marketed towards non-Icelandic international clients using electric power for its operations, supplied in first instance by Landsvirkjun on a long-term basis, propelling, by the end of March 2011, 60 specially designed machines with the estimated investment in the 1st phase being EUR 66 million, and with the expected expansion of the Plant's capacity (the 2nd phase), by the year end 2014, with the total investment expected to be approximately EUR 117,25 million (hereinafter referred to as the "Project").

On 7 July 2009, the Parties signed and Investment relating to the Project, covering an exemption of Becromal and the Investors from restrictions set forth in Rules No 1130/2008 on Foreign Exchange. The Investment Agreement, dated 7 July 2009, also contains a commitment to enter into a complete Investment Agreement, "similar to the Investment agreements the Government has previously concluded in relation to other large-scale power intensive investment projects in Iceland". In this respect the Investment Agreement signed on 7 July 2009 was regarded as "a preliminary step towards the conclusion of a more comprehensive investment agreement between the Parties."

This Investment Agreement is therefore a follow up and completion of the previous Investment Agreement dated 7 July 2009. This Investment Agreement has legal validity on the basis of Act No 99/2010, on incentives for initial incentive on Iceland, which came into force in 2010, and subsequent secondary legislation.'

(94) The text cited appears to be linked to the alterations of the scheme by the Supplementary Regulation, which was issued on the same day as the signing of the Becromal Investment Agreement (on 30 December 2010). The Authority takes the preliminary view that Supplementary Regulation may have enabled a retroactive application of the scheme. From the information submitted by the Icelandic authorities the Authority understands that the Supplementary Regulation was designed so as to enable the previous investment agreement, entered into with Becromal on 7 July 2009, to be covered by the scheme ([31]).

(95) The scheme, as approved, allows for no granting of aid to projects under agreements entered into prior to the entry into force of the scheme. On the basis of the information available, the Authority has doubts as to whether the Becromal Investment Agreement is entered into on the basis of the approved scheme.

(96) Furthermore, the Authority has doubts as to whether the link drawn in the Becromal Investment Agreement to a previous (special) investment agreement on the same project is compatible with the conditions set out in the Regional aid guidelines on the so-called incentive effect of investment aid.

(97) The facts of the present case appear to indicate that at the date on which the Becromal Investment Agreement was signed, work on the project to which aid was granted may have been already started. Indeed, it appears that this work started even before the signing of the earlier agreement on 7 July 2009 ([32]).

(98) The rules on incentive effect are stated in paragraph 30 of the Regional aid guidelines:

'It is important to ensure that regional aid produces real incentive effect to undertake investments which would not otherwise be made in the assisted areas. Therefore, aid may only be granted under aid scheme if the beneficiary has submitted an application for aid and the authority responsible for has submitted an application for aid and the authority responsible for administering the scheme has subsequently confirmed in writing that, subject to detailed verification, the project in principle meets the conditions of eligibility laid down by the scheme before the start of work on the project. An express reference to both conditions must also be included in all aid schemes. In the case of ad hoc aid, the competent authority must have issued a letter of intent, conditional on the Authority's approval of the measure, to award aid before work starts on the project. If work begins before the conditions laid down in this paragraph are fulfilled, the whole project will not be eligible for aid.'

([31]) Letter from the Iceland authorities, received on 10 April 2013 (Event No 668635).

([32]) According to information on the company's website, production started in the Becromal plant in Iceland in 2009, see: http://www.becromal.eu/history.php and http://www.becromal-.eu/iceland_projects.php
According to a news article in *Morgunblaðið* on 24 July 2008, the construction works had already started on the plant in 2008, see: http://www.mbl.is/-greinasafn/grein/1231137/

(99) The Regional aid guidelines defines the term 'start of work' as 'start of construction work or first firm commitment to order equipment, excluding preliminary feasibility studies' ([33]).

(100) In line with the decision-making practices of the European Commission and the Authority, a letter of intent within the meaning of the Regional aid guidelines can be described as a 'document that may be considered as explicitly granting aid to [the company] for the investment' ([34]).

(101) The aim of paragraph 30 of the Regional aid guidelines is to make it possible for the Authority to ascertain the existence of incentive effect of investment aid without unduly delaying the investment by carrying out a full analysis of the economic circumstances of the recipient's investment decision ([35]). Thus, as confirmed by the General Court in the *Kronoply* judgement, the Authority may base its assessment of the incentive effect by reference to a circumstance of a chronological nature ([36]).

(102) As referred to above, work appears to have started on the Becromal project already in 2008. The Authority has not been provided with information which enables it to verify whether the Icelandic authorities had committed to grant aid to the project before start of work.

(103) The Authority accordingly has doubts as to whether the incentive effect condition is satisfied as regards the Becromal Investment Agreement.

4.3.1.2. Retroactive effect of maximum income tax

(104) Article 15.1 of the Becromal Investment Agreement reads:

'This Agreement shall become effective on the date of signature by the Parties. However, Article 7.1 of the Agreement shall become effective as of 7 July 2009.'

(105) Further, Article 7.1 reads:

'Notwithstanding eventual changes in Act No 90/2003 on income tax, as amended, the Companies shall pay an income tax rate of 15 % with the following special provisions […].'

(106) At the time of signature of the Becromal Investment Agreement the general corporate tax rate in Iceland was 18 % ([37]). According to the scheme as approved by the Authority, the applicable tax rate at the time of signing an investment agreement was the tax rate that could be guaranteed to the beneficiary. By fixing the maximum tax rate (15 %) as that which was applicable at a point in time prior to the entry into force of the scheme, the aid granted under the Becromal Investment Agreement was granted on terms which were more favourable than those set out in the approved scheme. The Authority takes the preliminary view that the Becromal Investment Agreement fell in this respect outside the scope of the approved scheme.

4.3.1.3. The investment costs and aid ceiling

(107) The Authority has consistently considered that fiscal aid granted to provide an incentive for firms to embark on certain specific projects (investment in particular) and which is limited in its intensity with respect to the costs of carrying out the project is no different from a subsidy and may be treated in the same manner. Nevertheless, such aid schemes must lay down rules which are sufficiently transparent to enable the benefit conferred to be quantified ([38]).

(108) The Authority consequently considers that for aid such as the tax measures granted under the scheme and in the Becromal Investment Agreement to be characterised as investment aid: (i) it

([33]) See the Regional aid guidelines, footnote 32.

([34]) Case N 357/2008 *Fri-El Acerra S.r.l.* (Italy), paragraph 40. See also Commission Decision of 15 September 2010, C 8/2009 *Fri-El Acerra*, and the Authority's Decision No 418/10/COL at Section II.3.1.

([35]) See Case T-162/06 *Kronoply* v. *Commission* [2009] ECR II-1, paragraph 81: 'As stated in recital 30 of the Decision, the aim of applying the criterion set out in point 4.2 of the Guidelines is to ascertain the existence of incentive effect without unduly delaying the investment by carrying out a full analysis of the economic circumstances of the recipient's investment decision, which might prove very difficult or time-consuming. The latter concern explains why the finding that the aid application was made before the start of the investment project is enough in itself, according to the Commission, to raise the presumption that an incentive effect exists.'

([36]) See Case T-162/06 *Kronoply* v. *Commission* [2009] ECR II-1, paragraph 80: 'It should be observed that that provision refers to a circumstance of a chronological nature and therefore points to an examination *ratione temporis*, which is perfectly suitable for determining whether an incentive effect exists. That examination must be made by reference to the decision to invest taken by the undertaking concerned, which marks the beginning of the dynamic process that an operating investment such as that undertaken by Kronoply necessarily constitutes.'

([37]) The Authority notes that the rate of corporate income tax have been increasing in Iceland from 2008 and 2009, when it was 15 %, while it had been 18 % in 2002-2007. The tax rate was raised again to 18 % on 1 January 2010 and to 20 % on 1 January 2011.

([38]) See the Authority's Direct business taxation guidelines at 4(3), also referred to in the Authority's Decision No 390/10/COL.

must be linked to the carrying-out of specific project(s); (ii) it must be based on an amount invested in the region; (iii) it must be possible to quantify the aid (assess the precise volume); and (iv) there must be a ceiling expressed as a percentage of the amount invested in the region ([39]).

(109) The Becromal Investment Agreement refers to EUR 117,25 million as the total investment cost. However, it is not clear whether this is regarded as the eligible investment costs under the scheme. Moreover, the agreement does not refer to aid intensities or a fixed aid ceiling. Neither does the agreement appear to provide for a mechanism for quantifying the aid.

(110) Furthermore, the Authority observes that the Becromal Investment Agreement's preamble refers to the investment project as to be constructed in two phases, where the second phase would expand the production capacity of the plant. The first phase, approximately EUR 66 million in investment, appears to have been expected to be operational by the end of March 2011 while the total investment costs are envisaged at EUR 117,25 million by end of year 2014. Thus, it appears that the second phase (the expansion) would almost double the initial investment by end of 2014. However, the agreement does not contain any explicit commitment on behalf of the company to complete the construction of the second phase (or the whole project). Moreover, the agreement does not contain any explicit obligation as to the time limits for the construction. Since the first phase, according to information presently available to the Authority, appears to (have) become operational irrespective of whether the subsequent phase (the expansion) is eventually constructed, the Authority's understanding is that the situation could arise in which Becromal could decide not to carry out the construction work required under the second phase of the envisaged project. This would entail considerably lower investment costs (EUR 66 million instead of EUR 117,5 million). The Authority accordingly takes the preliminary view that a question mark remains over whether the agreement ensures that a mechanism will be put in place to guarantee whether and how the applicable aid intensities under the Regional aid guidelines would be ensured in this case.

(111) In the light of the above, the Authority has doubts as to whether the Becromal Investment Agreement complies with the conditions set out in Decision No 390/10/COL, since the agreement does not demonstrate that the rules on eligible expenses under the Regional aid guidelines are ensured when fixing the eligible investment costs; there is no explicit obligation to carry out the second phase of the project, the aid appears not to have been quantified and there is no aid ceiling expressed in the agreement.

4.3.1.4. The possibility for an extended period of tax exemptions — Operating aid

(112) Article 15.3 of the Becromal Investment Agreement reads:

'During the 13 years following the date of this Agreement, the Parties shall have concluded discussions regarding a possible extension of this Agreement for a period of a further 13 years following the date of expiration set forth in Article 15.2, on mutually agreeable terms.'

(113) This provision opens up the possibility of negotiations regarding an extension of the tax derogations which are provided for in the agreement beyond the time limit set out in the scheme — that is, 13 years as of the signature of the agreements and 10 years from the date at which the obligation to pay tax is triggered. Such a provision is outside the scope of the scheme as approved. Moreover, it is the Authority's preliminary view that such a provision would be incompatible with the EEA Agreement, as it is not linked to an initial investment, but instead reduces the costs which Becromal would normally have to bear in the course of pursuing its day-to-day business activities and is consequently to be classified as operating aid.

(114) The Authority notes that the tax derogations do not appear to comply with the conditions for granting operating aid set out in Chapter 5 of the Regional aid guidelines. In particular, the measures are not granted in respect of a predefined set of eligible expenditures or costs, as is stipulated in paragraph 66 of the Regional aid guidelines. The Authority's preliminary view is that operating aid to Becromal would not be compatible under Article 61(3)(c) of the EEA Agreement and the Regional aid guidelines.

4.3.1.5. Credit balance against future tax

(115) The Becromal Investment Agreement contains the following clause at Article 7.6:

'The aggregate amount of income tax levied on and paid by the Companies from 7 July 2009 to the date of signature of this Agreement shall constitute a credit balance which shall be set off against income tax which the Companies become liable to pay from the date of signature of this Agreement and during the remainder of the Contract Period.'

([39]) See Decision No 390/10/COL, Section II.3.3.

(116) In the Authority's preliminary view, the clause provides for a retroactive grant of aid. Such a grant would fall outside the scope of the scheme, and would be incompatible with the EEA Agreement, for the same reasons set out above in Section 4.3.1.1.

4.3.1.6. Large investment project and individual notification obligation

(117) In instances where the level of aid from all sources is above certain thresholds provided for under paragraph 53 of the Regional aid guidelines, an individual notification obligation applies. The total investment costs of the Becromal project appear to equate to EUR 117,25 million. The project therefore appears to qualify as a large investment project under Section 4.3 of the Regional aid guidelines ([40]). The Authority has not been provided with information with regard to the aid intensities, and therefore is not in a position to exclude the possibility that an individual notification obligation should apply to the Becromal Investment Agreement under paragraph 53 of those Guidelines. As regards the conditions for the detailed verification obligation set out in the Authority's Guidelines on criteria for an in-depth assessment of regional aid to large investment projects ([41]) ('the LIP Guidelines'), the Authority notes that the Icelandic authorities bear the burden of proof on the point that the market situations to which paragraph 57(a) and (b) of the Regional aid guidelines refer do not apply.

4.3.2. *The Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement*

4.3.2.1. The project

(118) On 17 February 2011, the State signed an investment agreement with Íslenska Kísilfélagið on tax concessions for the construction of a silicon metal production plant in Helguvík in the municipality of Reykjanesbær. The plant's production capacity is 50 000 metric tonnes of metallurgical grade silicon, and up to 20 000 metric tonnes of Silica dust per year.

4.3.2.2. Contract between Íslenska Kísilfélagið and the municipality of Reykjanesbær and the Harbour Fund

(119) The Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement makes the following reference to a contract which was signed between Íslenska Kísilfélagið on the one hand and the municpality of Reykjanesbær and the Harbour Fund on the other hand in:

'The Municipality of Reyjanesbær and the Harbour Fund have executed an Agreement with the Company on Licensing and Charges relating to the Project, including principles on property tax and land lease.' ([42]).

(120) It is not clear whether this contract is — as a whole or in part — regarded by the Icelandic authorities as having been entered into on the basis of the scheme. The Authority has not been provided with a copy or any further details of the contract to which the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement refers. Therefore, the Authority is not in a position to assess whether the contract referred to was entered into within the scope of the scheme.

4.3.2.3. Link to an earlier investment agreement and the incentive effect

(121) The Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement refers to a previous agreement between the State and the company. This agreement concerns the same project, and was entered into on 29 May 2009, before the entry into force of the scheme. Section N of the preamble to the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement contains the following:

'The Investment Agreement, dated 29 May 2009, also contains a commitment to enter into a complete Investment Agreement, "similar to the Investment agreements the Government has previously concluded in relation to other large-scale power intensive investment projects in Iceland". In this respect the Investment Agreement signed on 29 May 2009 was regarded as "a preliminary step towards the conclusion of a more comprehensive investment agreement between the Parties."'

(122) The Authority's preliminary view is that the agreement entered into on 29 May 2009 constitutes a special investment agreement, as referred to in the Supplementary Regulation, as described above in Section I.3.3 of this Decision.

([40]) Large investment project is an initial investment as defined by the Guidelines with an eligible expenditure above EUR 50 million, see paragraph 49 of those Guidelines.

([41]) Available at http://www.eftasurv.int/media/state-aid-guidelines/Part-III----Criteria-for-an-In-depth-Assessment-of-Regional-Aid-to-Large-Investment-Projects.pdf

([42]) Referred to in Section G of the preamble to the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement.

(123) Based on the reasoning set out in Section 4.3.1.1 above regarding an identical provision in the Becromal Investment Agreement, the Authority has doubts as to whether the necessary incentive effect criteria have been fulfilled in the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement. The Authority, however, notes that it does not at present have information about the status of this project.

4.3.2.4. The investment costs and aid ceiling

(124) Under the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement, construction of the silicon metal production plant is envisaged to take place in two or more steps during a three-year period. The agreement does not provide for any start or end dates for the construction of this plant, nor for any of the steps required for such a construction to take place. Moreover, the agreement neither refers to eligible or total investment costs, nor does it stipulate the aid intensities or fix an aid ceiling.

(125) Based on the reasoning set out in Section 4.3.1.3 above regarding the Becromal Investment Agreement, the Authority has doubts as to whether the aid can be characterised as investment aid. Similarily, the Authority has not been provided with any arguments as to whether operating aid to Íslenska Kísilfélagið would be compatible with the EEA Agreement.

4.3.2.5. Addtional aid in case of amendments of the scheme

(126) The Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement contains the following clause at Article 22.8:

'In the event amendments are made to Act No 99/2010 which are regarded by the Company, as providing further incentives than already stipulated in the Act, the Government shall upon request by the Company amend this Agreement and provide the Company with the new incentives, which shall enter into force from date of signature of the amended Agreement.'

(127) This provision sets out an unconditional obligation for the State to grant additional aid to the beneficiary for a project which has already been granted aid under the scheme, should future amendments to the scheme prove more beneficial for Íslenska Kísilfélagið. This obligation is not linked to new investment. The Authority takes the preliminary view that this provision guarantees the beneficiary a right to a grant of aid going beyond the initial grant of aid made under the scheme, and therefore entails an element of aid which falls outside the scope of the scheme.

(128) Moreover, it is the Authority's preliminary view any aid granted under the clause would be properly classified as operating aid since it is not linked to an initial investment. The Authority takes the preliminary view that such a clause is incompatible with the EEA Agreement. In particular, the measures are not granted in respect of a predefined set of eligible expenditures or costs, as is stipulated in paragraph 66 of the Regional aid guidelines.

4.3.2.6. Effectiveness guarantee

(129) Article 7 of the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement is entitled 'Government Taxes'. It contains the following clause at Article 7.9:

'The concessions, exemptions, derogations and other stipulations of Article 7.1 to 7.6 shall remain in full force and effect for 10 years from the day the relevant taxable obligation or charge obligation is activated by the Company, however never more than 13 years from date of signature of this Agreement, notwithstanding eventual changes of Act No 90/2003, on Income Tax, Act No 4/1995 on Revenues of Municipalities and Act No 38/2010, on Íslandsstofa or any other law or secondary legislation which might otherwise limit or reduce the effect intended by the provisions of Article 7.1 to 7.6. The concessions, exemptions, derogations and other stipulations of Article 7.7 to 7.8 shall remain in full force and effect for the Contract Period stipulated in Article 16 of this Agreement or any other law or secondary legislation which might otherwise limit or reduce the effect intended by the provisions of Article 7.7 to 7.8.' ([43]).

(130) It is the Authority's preliminary view that this clause has a broader application than the scope of the scheme as approved by Decision No 390/10/COL. As set out above in paragraph 35, guarantee against future legislation in itself constitutes State aid. While the tax exemptions set out in the approved scheme are limited to certain, predefined allowable derogations from statutory legislation, the text cited above appears to refer to a broader application insofar as amendments of provisions of the legislation referred to, other than those explicitly covered by the scheme, would have the effect as to 'otherwise limit or reduce the effect intended'. As set out above, one of the conditions for tax measures to be classified as investment aid is that it must be possible to quantify the aid (by assessing the precise volume of the aid granted). Under Article 7.9 of the Kísilfélagið Agreement, it would, in the Authority's preliminary view, be impossible to quantify the aid. The clause refers to possible

([43]) Article 7.9 of the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement.

alteration of not only the Act on income tax and of the Act on municipal revenues, but also 'any other law or secondary legislation'. This wording appears to give the clause a very broad potential scope. It is the Authority's preliminary view that such an open guarantee clause would not give sufficient transparency to enable the benefit to be quantified. In that case it would entail operating aid, which in the Authority's preliminary view would be incompatible with the EEA Agreement, for the same reasons as set out above in paragraphs 114 and 128 above.

4.3.3. *The Verne Investment Agreement*

4.3.3.1. The project and the incentive effect of the aid

(131) The Verne Investment Agreement was signed on 27 September 2011. The project concerns a data centre complex in the municipality of Reykjanesbær ([44]) comprising four individual buildings housing electrical, mechanical, and IT equipment and additional administrative and electrical support buildings, serving mostly non-Icelandic international clients with the aim to commence operations in 2011.

(132) It appears that this agreement relates to the same, or a similar, investment project to a project which was the subject of the Authority's Decision No 418/10/COL on 3 November 2010 to open a formal investigation procedure into an investment agreement between the Icelandic State and Verne (see Section I.2.3 of that Decision). Following the Authority's Decision, the Icelandic authorities withdrew their notification and the Authority did not further pursue the matter as regards the previous investment agreement as such further ([45]).

(133) The Authority observes that no explicit reference is made to any previous investment agreement in the Verne Investment Agreement. Indeed, in the preamble to the Verne Investment Agreement it is stated that: 'In line with Act No 99/2010 the Investment Agreement only relates to new buildout of data centre space and infrastructure, which has not yet been undertaken.' Nonetheless, the Authority also notes that the estimated potential level of investment is USD 675 million 'over and above prior preparatory investment', whereas the estimated investment was USD 726 million in the project under assessment in the Authority's Decision No 418/10/COL. The Authority accordingly has doubts over whether these are in fact two different projects. The Verne Investment Agreement refers to Verne Holdings Ltd. together with its subsidiaries and its investors, amongst other the Wellcome Trust, Novator, and General Catalyst partners, having been taking the necessary preliminary steps towards the establishment of the project described above in paragraph 131. The beneficiary in both cases is the parent company in the Verne Group ([46]). Both agreements refer to power consumption that 'could exceed 140 MW' ([47]). The investors are at least partially the same in both cases, the location of the data centre appears to be the same in both cases (Reykjanesbær) and from the limited information provided on the project itself in the Verne Investment Agreement it appears to be the same or at least a similar project as the one that was subject to the Authority's Decision No 418/10/COL. Reference is made to the description of that project under Section I.2.3 of that Decision. If the project is the same, the construction of the project, according to the facts as established in Decision No 418/10/COL, started in early 2008. In light of this information the Authority's preliminary view is that it appears that the Verne Investment Agreement concerns a project on which work had already started at the time of the signature.

(134) On this basis, the Authority has doubts as to whether the Verne Investment Agreement can be considered to have been entered into within the scope of the scheme. Furthermore, the Authority refers to the reasoning for its Decision No 418/10/COL on opening the formal investigation procedure into the previous investment agreement with Verne, see that Decision at Section II.3.1. Moreover, on the same reasoning set out above in paragraphs 98 to 102 (regarding the Becromal Investment Agreement), the Authority has doubts as to whether the aid could be considered compatible with the EEA Agreement.

4.3.3.2. The investment costs and aid ceiling

(135) Reference is made to the discussion under paragraph 107 above, as regards the Direct business taxation guidelines. In the case of Verne Investment Agreement, the total investment costs, which appear to be regarded as eligible under the Regional aid guidelines, are fixed to USD 675 million. However, there is no clear link between the investment and the envisaged aid. Moreover, the envisaged aid has not been quantified in the Verne Investment Agreement, and no ceiling has been expressed therein either. These elements run counter to the provisions of the scheme as approved.

([44]) The Verne Investment Agreement refers to the date centre complex as 'initially' in Reykjanesbær.
([45]) See the Authority's Decision No 261/12/COL at Section I.1.
([46]) See footnote 16 in this Decision.
([47]) See footnote 8 in Decision No 418/10/COL and paragraph 5 in the Verne Investment Agreement's preamble.

(136) Accordingly, applying the reasoning set out in Section 4.3.1.3 above with regard to the Becromal Investment Agreement, it is the Authority's preliminary view that the Verne Investment Agreement does not comply with the conditions set out in Decision No 390/10/COL, since the agreement does not demonstrate that the rules on eligible expenses under the Regional aid guidelines are met when fixing the eligible investment costs. In this respect, there is no explicit obligation to carry out the second phase of the project, the aid appears not to have been quantified and there is no aid ceiling expressed in the agreement (which means that the Direct business taxation guidelines have not been complied with). Similarly, the Authority cannot at this point conclude that operating aid can be found compatible under the Regional aid guidelines.

4.3.3.3. Additional aid in case of amendments of the scheme

(137) Article 23.7 of the Verne Investment Agreement contains an identical clause as regards the unconditional right to request increased aid, should the scheme be expanded, as the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement, referred to at paragraphs 126 to 128 above. The Authority has the same doubts as expressed in the cited paragraphs.

4.3.3.4. Effectiveness guarantee

(138) Article 7.9 contains an identical clause as the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement, cited above at paragraph 129. Based on the reasoning set out in paragraph 130, the Authority has doubts as to whether the effectiveness guarantee can be regarded as compatible with the EEA Agreement.

4.3.3.5. Large investment project

(139) In the light of the total investment costs referred to in the Verne Investment Agreement, it cannot be excluded that the project qualifies as a large investment project under Section 4.3 of the Regional aid guidelines. The Authority has not been provided with information which would exclude the possibility that the individual notification procedure provided for under that section should apply to the project.

4.3.4. *Conclusion regarding aid to Becromal, Kísilfélagið and Verne*

(140) On the basis of the above, the Authority has doubts as to whether aid to Becromal, Kísilfélagið and Verne has been granted within the scope of the scheme. The Authority takes the preliminary view that the agreements were concluded outside the scope of the approved scheme, and should therefore be classified as individual aid that should have been notified to the Authority.

(141) Furthermore, the Authority has doubts as to whether the aid to Becromal, Kísilfélagið and Verne was granted before the work started on the projects, and as to whether that aid was limited to a defined investment project.

(142) Moreover, the Authority has doubts as to whether a provision entailing an unconditional obligation for the State to grant additional aid in the case of amendments made to the scheme can be classified as investment aid, and the Authority has not been provided with reasoning as to the compatibility of such operating aid. Finally, the Authority has doubts as to the compatibility of the effectiveness guarantee.

(143) Lastly, it is the preliminary view of the Authority that it cannot be excluded that the aid granted may be properly subject to the procedure provided for under Section 4.3 of the Regional aid guidelines for large investment projects, in particular as regards the Becromal and Verne investment agreements.

4.3.5. *The Thorsil Investment Agreement*

(144) The Thorsil Investment Agreement was signed on 30 December 2010. It concerns a silicon metal production plant to be built in the municipality of Ölfus, with an annual production capacity of approximately 50 000 metric tonnes. The plant's start-up is scheduled to take place in October 2014. The Authority has the following doubts as to whether certain elements of the agreement fulfil the criteria set out in the scheme:

(145) First, the Thorsil Investment Agreement contains an identical clause to the one set out in the Becromal Investment Agreement (see Section 4.3.1.4 above), on the possibility of an extension of the aid period beyond the maximum duration provided for in the scheme. Following the same reasoning as set out at paragraphs 113 to 114 above, the Authority has doubts as to whether the agreement falls within the scope of the scheme and whether such a clause is compatible with the EEA Agreement, as it would be operational aid.

(146) Second, reference is made to the discussion under paragraph 107 above, as regards the Direct business taxation guidelines. In the case of the Thorsil Investment Agreement, the total investment

costs are not presented and there is no link between the investment and the envisaged aid, which has not been quantified in the agreement, as stipulated in the scheme as approved. Moreover, no aid ceiling has been expressed.

(147) Accordingly, the Authority has doubts as to whether the Thorsil Investment Agreement complies with the conditions set out in Decision No 390/10/COL, insofar as the agreement does not demonstrate that the rules on eligible expenses under the Regional aid guidelines have been met when fixing the eligible investment costs; there is no explicit obligation to carry out the second phase of the project, the aid appears not to have been quantified and no aid ceiling has been expressed in the agreement and thus the requirements of the Direct business taxation guidelines have also not been met. Similarly, the Authority cannot conclude that any operating aid that might be involved can be found compatible with EEA law under the Regional aid guidelines.

4.3.6. *The GMR Investment Agreement*

(148) On 7 May 2012, the State entered into an agreement with GMR Endurvinnslan on the granting of tax exemptions for the construction of a recycling plant at Grundartangi in the municipality of Hvalfjarðarsveit. The agreement states that GMR intends to commence production at the end of 2012 and to have the plant fully operational in 2014. The agreement does not contain any further description of the project, its scale or the volume of the investment and the Authority is not in possession of any further details to verify whether the agreement was entered into within the scope of the scheme in this respect.

(149) The Authority notes that the GMR Investment Agreement contains an identical clause to that found in the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement (see paragraphs 126 to 128 above) as regards the establishment of an unconditional right to request increased aid, should the scheme be expanded. The Authority has the same doubts regarding the inclusion of this clause in the GMR Investment Agreement as those which it has expressed in the cited paragraphs.

(150) Furthermore, the total investment costs are not presented in the GMR Investment Agreement. Nor is there a link between the investment and the envisaged aid, which was not quantified in the agreement, as is stipulated in the scheme as approved. Nor has an aid ceiling been expressed in the agreement.

(151) Article 7.9 contains an identical clause as the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement, cited above at paragraph 129. Based on the reasoning set out in paragraph 130, the Authority has doubts as to whether the effectiveness clause can be regarded as compatible with the EEA Agreement.

(152) Based on its reasoning regarding the Becromal Investment Agreements, discussed in Section 4.3.1.3 above, the Authority has doubts as to whether the aid can properly be characterised as investment aid. Similarily, the Authority has not been provided with any arguments as to whether operating aid to GMR would be compatible with the EEA Agreement.

(153) Article 22.7 of the GMR Investment Agreement contains an identical clause to that which is set out in the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement (see paragraphs 126 to 128 above) as regards the unconditional right to request increased aid, should the scheme be expanded. The Authority has the same doubts as expressed in the cited paragraphs.

4.3.7. *The Marmeti Investment Agreement*

(154) The last agreement entered into on the basis of the scheme is an agreement signed after the initiation of the present case, dated on 28 January 2013. This agreement was concluded between the State and Marmeti, a company established in 2012 for the construction and operation of a fish processing factory in Sandgerði.

(155) The envisaged start-up of the factory is at the beginning of 2013. Since the Investment Agreement was only signed in late January 2013, this raises questions as to whether work may in fact have already started on the project before the signing of the agreement, contrary to the requirements of the scheme as approved ([48]). The Authority therefore has doubts as to whether the agreement was concluded within the scope of the scheme.

(156) The agreement does not contain any further description of the project, its scale or the volume of the investment, quantification of the aid, aid ceiling or aid intensities and the Authority is not at this point in possession of any further details to verify whether the agreement is in compliance with these conditions of the scheme.

([48]) Article 21 of the Act, see Decision No 390/10/COL at Section I.2.13.

(157) The Authority notes that the agreement contains, at Article 20.7, an identical clause as that which is set out in the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement (paragraphs 126 to 128 above) as regards the unconditional right to request increased aid, should the scheme be expanded. The Authority has the same doubts as expressed in the cited paragraphs.

(158) Based on its line of reasoning regarding the Becromal Investment Agreements, discussed in Section 4.3.1.3. above, the Authority has doubts as to whether the aid can be characterised as investment aid. Similarily, the Authority has not been provided with any arguments as to whether possible operating aid to Marmeti would be compatible with the EEA Agreement.

(159) Article 7.9 of the Marmeti Investment Agreement contains an identical clause as the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement, cited above at paragraph 129. Based on the reasoning set out in paragraph 130, the Authority has doubts as to whether the effectiveness guarantee can be regarded as compatible with the EEA Agreement.

4.3.8. *Conclusion*

(160) As set out above, the Authority has doubts as to whether aid granted under the Becromal Investment Agreement, the Kísilfélagið Investment Agreement and the Verne Investment Agreement is granted within the scope of the scheme.

(161) Moreover, the Authority has doubts as to whether the Marmeti Investment Agreement is concluded within the scope of the scheme, as regards the incentive effect requirement. Further, the Authority has doubts as to whether certain clauses of the Marmeti Investment Agreement grant aid outside the approved scheme.

(162) Further, the Authority has doubts as to whether elements of the Thorsil Investment Agreement and the GMR Investment Agreement provide for aid granted outside the approved scheme.

(163) The Authority thus has doubts as to whether aid granted under all six Investment Agreements can be considered compatible with the EEA Agreement.

5. **Conclusion**

(164) Based on the information submitted by the Icelandic authorities, the Authority cannot exclude the possibility that the aid measures described above constitute State aid within the meaning of Article 61(1) of the EEA Agreement. The Authority also has doubts as to whether these measures comply with Article 61(3) of the EEA Agreement, in conjunction with the requirements laid down in the Authority's Regional aid guidelines. The Authority, therefore, doubts that the above measures are compatible with the functioning of the EEA Agreement.

(165) Consequently, and in accordance with Article 4(4) in Part II of Protocol 3, the Authority is obliged to open the formal investigation procedure provided for in Article 1(2) in Part I of Protocol 3. The decision to open a formal investigation procedure is without prejudice to the final decision of the Authority, which may conclude that the measures in question are compatible with the functioning of the EEA Agreement.

(166) In light of the foregoing considerations, the Authority, acting under the procedure laid down in Article 1(2) in Part I of Protocol 3, invites the Icelandic authorities to submit their comments within one month of the date of receipt of this Decision.

(167) In light of the foregoing considerations, within one month of receipt of this Decision, the Authority requests the Icelandic authorities to provide all documents, information and data needed for assessment of the compatibility of the scheme, as amended by Regulation (EU) No 1150/2010, the notified proposed amendments and the six investment agreements referred to in this Decision.

(168) The Authority requests the Icelandic authorities to forward a copy of this Decision to the potential recipients of the aid immediately.

(169) The Authority must remind the Icelandic authorities that, according to Article 14 in Part II of Protocol 3, any incompatible aid unlawfully granted to the beneficiaries will have to be recovered, unless (exceptionally) this recovery would be contrary to a general principal of EEA law,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

The formal investigation procedure provided for in Article 1(2) in Part I of Protocol 3 is opened into the investment incentives scheme, with amendments notified by the Icelandic authorities, and as amended by Regulation (EU) No 1150/2010, implemented by the Icelandic authorities.

Article 2

The formal investigation procedure provided for in Article 1(2) in Part I of Protocol 3 is opened into the following investment agreements entered into by the Icelandic authorities:

1. agreement entered into on 30 December 2010 between the State and Becromal Iceland ehf., Becromal Properties ehf., Stokkur Energy efh. and Becromal SpA;

2. agreement entered into on 30 December 2010 between the State and Thorsil ehf., Stokkur Energy ehf. and Timminco Limited;

3. agreement entered into on 17 February 2011 between the State and Íslenska Kísilfélagið ehf., Tomahawk Development á Íslandi ehf. and GSM Enterprises LLC;

4. agreement entered into on 27 September 2011 between the State and Verne Real Estate II ehf. and Verne Holdings Ltd;

5. agreement entered into on 7 May 2012 between the State and GMR Endurvinnslan ehf.; and

6. agreement entered into on 28 January 2013 between the State and Marmeti ehf.

Article 3

The Icelandic authorities are invited, pursuant to Article 6(1) in Part II of Protocol 3, to submit their comments on the opening of the formal investigation procedure within one month from the notification of this Decision.

Article 4

The Icelandic authorities are requested to provide within one month from notification of this Decision all documents, information and data needed for assessment of the compatibility of the aid measures.

Article 5

This Decision is addressed to Iceland.

Article 6

Only the English language version of this Decision is authentic.

Done at Brussels, 30 April 2013.

For the EFTA Surveillance Authority

Oda Helen SLETNES
President

Sabine MONAUNI-TÖMÖRDY
College Member

V

(Oznamy)

KONANIA TÝKAJÚCE SA VYKONÁVANIA POLITIKY HOSPODÁRSKEJ SÚŤAŽE

EURÓPSKA KOMISIA

Oznámenie Komisie uverejnené podľa článku 27 ods. 4 nariadenia Rady (ES) č. 1/2003 vo veciach AT.39398 Deutsche Bahn I, AT.39731 Deutsche Bahn II a AT.39915 Deutsche Bahn III

(2013/C 237/05)

1. ÚVOD

1. Podľa článku 9 nariadenia Rady (ES) č. 1/2003 zo 16. decembra 2002 o vykonávaní pravidiel hospodárskej súťaže stanovených v článkoch 101 a 102 zmluvy ([1]) v prípadoch, keď Komisia má v úmysle prijať rozhodnutie vyžadujúce ukončiť porušovanie a zainteresované strany sa zaviažu, že splnia požiadavky vyjadrené Komisiou v jej predbežnom posúdení, Komisia môže rozhodnúť, že uvedené záväzky budú pre tieto podniky záväzné. Takéto rozhodnutie možno prijať na vymedzené obdobie, pričom je potrebné v ňom uviesť, že dôvody na zásah Komisie už neexistujú. Pred prijatím rozhodnutia podľa článku 9 nariadenia (ES) č. 1/2003 Komisia v súlade s článkom 27 ods. 4 toho istého nariadenia uverejní stručné zhrnutie veci a hlavný obsah záväzkov. Zainteresované strany môžu predložiť svoje pripomienky v rámci lehoty stanovenej Komisiou.

2. ZHRNUTIE VECI

2. Komisia 6. júna 2013 prijala predbežné posúdenie v zmysle článku 9 ods. 1 nariadenia (ES) č. 1/2003 určené podniku Deutsche Bahn AG a jeho dcérskym spoločnostiam DB Energie GmbH (ďalej len „DB Energie“), DB Mobility Logistics AG, DB Fernverkehr AG a DB Schenker Rail Deutschland AG ([2]).

3. Komisia v predbežnom posúdení vyjadrila obavy, že skupina DB pravdepodobne zneužila svoje dominantné postavenie na trhu s dodávkami trakčného prúdu v Nemecku tým, že konkurentom účtovala také ceny za trakčný prúd, ktoré viedli k stláčaniu marží na trhoch s diaľkovou osobnou železničnou dopravou a nákladnou železničnou dopravou, čím porušila článok 102 ZFEÚ.

4. Komisia sa predbežne domnieva, že podnik DB Energie má dominantné postavenie na trhu s dodávkami trakčného prúdu železničným podnikom pôsobiacim v Nemecku. Trakčný prúd je nevyhnutným predpokladom toho, aby železničné podniky mohli súťažiť na nemeckom trhu železničnej dopravy. Podnik DB Energie ponúka od roku 2003 trakčný prúd železničným podnikom v rámci viazanej (all-inclusive) ponuky, v ktorej je zahrnutá cena spotrebovanej elektriny (cena elektriny) a cena za využívanie siete trakčného prúdu (poplatok za prístup k rozvodnej sieti).

5. Komisia v predbežnom posúdení usúdila, že tento systém spoplatňovania a najmä s ním súvisiace zľavy, ktoré zvýhodňovali železničných prevádzkovateľov skupiny DB viac ako ich konkurentov, mohol byť prekážkou rozvoja hospodárskej súťaže na trhoch so železničnou nákladnou dopravou a diaľkovou osobnou železničnou dopravou. Komisia má obavy, že systém spoplatňovania trakčného prúdu uplatňovaný podnikom DB Energie môže na týchto trhoch vytvárať rozdiel medzi cenou za trakčný prúd

([1]) Ú. v. ES L 1, 4.1.2003, s. 1. S účinnosťou od 1. decembra 2009 sa článok 81 Zmluvy o ES stal článkom 101 Zmluvy o fungovaní Európskej únie (ZFEÚ) a článok 82 Zmluvy o ES sa stal článkom 102 ZFEÚ. Uvedené dva súbory ustanovení sú vo svojej podstate totožné. Na účely tohto oznámenia by sa odkazy na články 101 a 102 ZFEÚ mali v prípade potreby chápať ako odkazy na články 81 a 82 Zmluvy o ES.

([2]) Podnik Deutsche Bahn AG a všetky jeho dcérske spoločnosti sa ďalej súhrnne uvádzajú ako „skupina DB“.

účtovanou konkurentom a cenou za služby železničnej dopravy účtované zákazníkom dopravných podnikov DB, ktorý znemožňuje ich rovnako efektívnym konkurentom obchodovať so ziskom alebo umelo znižuje ich ziskové rozpätie. Komisia dospela pri vyšetrovaní k predbežnému záveru, že táto situácia vyvoláva obavy týkajúce sa hospodárskej súťaže na trhoch s diaľkovou osobnou železničnou dopravou a nákladnou železničnou dopravou.

6. V novembri 2010 nemecký spolkový súd rozhodol, že sieť trakčného prúdu sa považuje za energetickú sieť a že podmienky prístupu k nej a poplatky za jej používanie sa riadia nemeckými právnymi predpismi uplatňovanými na sektor energetiky (*Energiewirtschaftsgesetz* — EnWG) ([1]). V dôsledku toho by podnik DB Energie mal účtovať poplatky za prístup k sieti osobitne, aby aj tretí dodávatelia elektriny (t. j. tí, ktorí nepatria do skupiny DG) mohli konkurovať podniku DB Energie, pokiaľ ide o dodávky elektriny železničným podnikom ([2]).

3. HLAVNÝ OBSAH PONÚKNUTÝCH ZÁVÄZKOV

7. Skupina DB nesúhlasí s predbežným posúdením Komisie, že pravdepodobne zneužila svoje dominantné postavenie na trhu s dodávkami trakčného prúdu nemeckým železničným podnikom. Napriek tomu podľa článku 9 nariadenia (ES) č. 1/2003 ponúkla záväzky, ktorými reagovala na obavy Komisie v súvislosti s hospodárskou súťažou. Kľúčové prvky záväzkov sa uvádzajú ďalej v texte.

8. Najneskôr tri mesiace po oznámení rozhodnutia Komisie, ktorým sa tieto záväzky stávajú pre skupinu DB záväzné, a najskôr 1. januára 2014 podnik DB Energie zavedie nový systém spoplatňovania trakčného prúdu, v ktorom oddelí cenu za dodávky elektriny od poplatkov za prístup k rozvodnej sieti, ako to schválil príslušný nemecký regulačný orgán (*Bundesnetzagentur*). Tento nový systém spoplatňovania je navrhnutý tak, aby zabezpečil vstup tretích dodávateľov elektriny na trh s dodávkou elektriny železničným podnikom ([3]).

9. V tomto novom systéme bude podnik DB Energie účtovať rovnakú cenu za elektrinu všetkým železničným podnikom bez zliav založených na objeme alebo dĺžke trvania zmluvy.

10. Podnik DB Energie vráti železničným podnikom v Nemecku, ktoré nepatria do skupiny DB, jednorazovú sumu vo výške 4 % z ich faktúry za trakčný prúd za obdobie jedného roku pred nadobudnutím platnosti nového systému spoplatňovania.

11. Podniky DB Energie, DB Mobility a Logistics AG poskytnú každý rok Komisii údaje, aby posúdila, či úroveň cien za trakčný prúd a dopravné služby účtovaných skupinou DB nemôže viesť k stláčaniu marže. Podnik DB Energie takisto Komisii vopred oznámi akékoľvek zmeny ním účtovaných cien elektriny.

12. Záväzky nadobudnú platnosť najneskôr tri mesiace po oznámení rozhodnutia Komisie. Budú platné päť rokov ([4]) od oznámenia rozhodnutia Komisie alebo dovtedy, kým 20 % objemu trakčného prúdu nakupovaného konkurentmi skupiny DB nebude pochádzať od tretích dodávateľov elektriny. Skupina DB takisto vymenuje správcu, ktorý bude monitorovať dodržiavanie týchto záväzkov.

13. Tieto záväzky sú uverejnené na webovej stránke Generálneho riaditeľstva pre hospodársku súťaž: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/index_en.html

([1]) *Bundesgerichtshof*, rozsudok z 9. novembra 2010 vo veci *EnVR 1/10*.

([2]) Viac informácií o tejto zmene systému spoplatňovania a podmienkach nového systému možno nájsť na webovej stránke podniku DB Energie (iba v nemeckom jazyku): http://www.dbenergie.de/dbenergie-de/netzbetreiber/netzbetreiber_bahnstromnetz/2500898/bahnstromnetz_konsultation.html

([3]) Zavedenie nového systému bude okrem toho doplnené povinnosťou oddeliť účtovníctvo a informácie pri činnostiach podniku DB Energie ako správcu siete trakčného prúdu a ako dodávateľa elektriny.

([4]) Záväzok podniku DB Energie, že v rámci svojej ponuky dodávky elektriny nebude poskytovať zľavy založené na dĺžke trvania zmluvy, bude platný iba tri roky.

4. VÝZVA NA PREDLOŽENIE PRIPOMIENOK

14. S výhradou výsledkov testu trhu má Komisia v úmysle prijať rozhodnutie podľa článku 9 ods. 1 nariadenia (ES) č. 1/2003, ktorým vyššie uvedené záväzky uverejnené v plnom znení aj na webovej lokalite Generálneho riaditeľstva pre hospodársku súťaž vyhlási za záväzné.

15. V súlade s článkom 27 ods. 4 nariadenia (ES) č. 1/2003 Komisia vyzýva zainteresované tretie strany, aby predložili svoje pripomienky k navrhovaným záväzkom. Tieto pripomienky musia byť Komisii doručené najneskôr do jedného mesiaca od dátumu uverejnenia tohto oznámenia. Komisia zainteresované tretie strany zároveň vyzýva, aby predložili takú verziu svojich pripomienok, z ktorej budú informácie považované týmito stranami za obchodné tajomstvá a ďalšie dôverné časti vypustené a nahradené zhrnutím, ktoré nemá dôverný charakter, alebo slovami „obchodné tajomstvo“ alebo „dôverné“. Podľa článku 16 nariadenia (ES) č. 773/2004 musí byť každý takýto nárok na dôvernosť náležite zdôvodnený, najmä uvedením dôvodov, prečo by zverejnenie príslušných informácií mohlo spôsobiť vážnu ujmu.

16. Odpovede a pripomienky by mali byť pokiaľ možno odôvodnené a podložené relevantnými faktmi. V prípade, že v ktorejkoľvek časti navrhovaných záväzkov zistíte problém, Komisia by uvítala návrh jeho možného riešenia.

17. Pripomienky s uvedením referenčného čísla AT.39678/AT.39731/AT.39915 Deutsche Bahn I/II/III možno Komisii zasielať e-mailom (COMP-GREFFE-ANTITRUST@ec.europa.eu), faxom (+32 22950128) alebo poštou na túto adresu:

European Commission
Directorate-General for Competition
Antitrust Registry
1049 Bruxelles/Brussel
BELGIQUE/BELGIË

INÉ AKTY

EURÓPSKA KOMISIA

Uverejnenie žiadosti podľa článku 50 ods. 2 písm. a) nariadenia Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (EÚ) č. 1151/2012 o systémoch kvality pre poľnohospodárske výrobky a potraviny

(2013/C 237/06)

Týmto uverejnením sa poskytuje právo vzniesť námietku proti žiadosti podľa článku 51 nariadenia Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (EÚ) č. 1151/2012 ([1]).

JEDNOTNÝ DOKUMENT

NARIADENIE RADY (ES) č. 510/2006

o ochrane zemepisných označení a označení pôvodu poľnohospodárskych výrobkov a potravín ([2])

„SZENTESI PAPRIKA“

ES č.: HU-PGI-0005-0912-30.11.2011

CHZO (X) CHOP ( )

1. **Názov**

„Szentesi paprika“

2. **Členský štát alebo tretia krajina**

Maďarsko

3. **Opis poľnohospodárskeho výrobku alebo potraviny**

3.1. *Druh produktu*

Trieda 1.6 – Ovocie, zelenina a obilniny v pôvodnom stave alebo spracované.

3.2. *Opis produktu, na ktorý sa vzťahuje názov uvedený v bode 1*

Chránené zemepisné označenie „Szentesi paprika“ označuje plody uvedených druhov odrôd a odrôd *Capsicum annuum* pestované rýchlením.

Produkty „Szentesi paprika“ uvádzané na trh musia byť zdravé a neporušené, pričom jednotlivé druhy odrôd musia mať tieto vlastnosti:

a) Biela paprika na plnenie (*Capsicum annuum* L. *var. grossum*)

([1]) Ú. v. EÚ L 343, 14.12.2012, s. 1.
([2]) Nahradené nariadením (EÚ) č. 1151/2012.

Zrelá biela „Szentesi paprika“ je mastná na dotyk, šupku má hladkú a klzkú, pri prasknutí sa poruší, paprika má tupý a zvrásnený koniec a hrubú dužinu. Povrch papriky je hladký a lesklý, farba žltkasto-biela (slonovinová). Paprika má kužeľovitý tvar, dĺžku 60 – 120 mm a šírku 40 – 70 mm, väčšinou má tri alebo štyri laloky, dužinu hrubú 4 – 7 mm, pevnú konzistenciu a tenkú šupku, intenzívnu paprikovú vôňu, je chutná a neštípe.

Pestované odrody: Hó, Cibere, Century, Hurricane, Bronson, Emese, Kurca, Creta, Joker, Karma, Bravia (RZ35862), Kalota, Brendon, Antal, Zalkod, Censor, Celtic, Cinema, Glorietta, Dimentio, E-49.39615, Galga, Claudius, Skytia.

b) Špicatá štipľavá paprika (*Capsicum annuum* L. *var. longum*)

Špicatá štipľavá „Szentesi paprika“ má lesklý, hladký alebo mierne zvlnený povrch a dlhý, zašpicatený tvar. Paprika má svetlozelenú, stredne zelenú alebo tmavozelenú farbu, dĺžku 150 – 250 mm a šírku 20 – 50 mm, väčšinou má dva alebo tri laloky, dužinu hrubú 3 – 4 mm, pevnú konzistenciu a tenkú šupku. Plody majú intenzívnu paprikovú vôňu, príjemnú arómu a chuť a sú štipľavé.

Pestované odrody: Daras, Rush, Sarah, Fighter, Kard, Thunder, Kais.

Na Scovillovej stupnici dosahujú pestované odrody hodnoty štipľavosti 2 500 – 5 000.

c) Kapia (*Capsicum annuum* L. *var. grossum*)

„Szentesi paprika“ z kapiovej skupiny má kužeľovitý a mierne sploštený tvar, hladký, lesklý povrch a v čase zberu zamatovú, tmavočervenú farbu. Paprika má dĺžku 60 – 120 mm, šírku 40 – 70 mm a zvyčajne má dva alebo tri laloky. Kapia má dužinu hrubú 4 – 7 mm, pevnú konzistenciu a stredne hrubú šupku. Plod má intenzívnu, sladkastú príchuť, vôňu mletej papriky a neštípe.

Pestované odrody: Kárpia (T 112), Kapirex, Karpex, Mágus.

d) Rajčinové papriky (*Capsicum annuum* L. *var. grossum*)

Rajčinová „Szentesi paprika“ má veľmi charakteristický tvar sploštenej gule s hladkým, lesklým povrchom a v čase zberu je tmavočervená. Rajčinová paprika má priemer 60 – 120 mm, dĺžku 40 – 60 mm, tri alebo štyri laloky a dužinu hrubú 5 – 7 mm. Paprika má pevnú konzistenciu, tenkú šupku, intenzívnu paprikovú vôňu a neštípe.

Pestované odrody: Pritavit, Kabala, Bihar.

Uvedené druhy pestovaných odrôd sa môžu z roka na rok meniť.

3.3. *Suroviny (len pri spracovaných výrobkoch)*

—

3.4. *Krmivo (len pri výrobkoch živočíšneho pôvodu)*

—

3.5. *Špecifické kroky výroby, ktoré sa musia uskutočniť v označenej zemepisnej oblasti*

Všetky fázy výrobného postupu produktu „Szentesi paprika“ sa musia uskutočniť v zemepisnej oblasti uvedenej v bode 4:

— produkcia a pestovanie sadeníc papriky,

— integrovaná organická produkcia rôznych druhov a odrôd, do ktorej je zahrnutý:

— výber obdobia pestovania,

— odborná príprava oblasti pestovania,

— kultivácia pôdy a hĺbkové hnojenie,

— výsadba,

— príprava nosnej konštrukcie,

— činnosti súvisiace so starostlivosťou o rastliny (fytotechnológia),

— zavlažovanie a dopĺňanie živín,

— regulácia klímy,

— použitie ekologických postupov integrovanej ochrany rastlín,

— zber, príprava produktu, predbežné skladovanie a skladovanie,

— zničenie zásob papriky, príprava a dezinfekcia výrobných zariadení.

3.6. *Špecifické pravidlá krájania, strúhania, balenia, atď.*

Triedenie, balenie a označovanie produktu „Szentesi paprika“ prebieha v prevádzkových priestoroch výrobcu alebo v akomkoľvek inom vhodnom podniku vo vymedzenej zemepisnej oblasti.

Balenie podľa kusov: tácka, kôš, polyetylénové vrecko (3, 5, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 80 paprík na jednotku); podľa hmotnosti: kôš, sieťové vrecko (0,35; 0,5; 0,7; 1, 2 kg papriky na jednotku) alebo debnička: do obalov M10, M20 alebo M30 (2,5; 10; 12; 14 kg papriky na jednotku). Druh balenia rôznych druhov odrôd sa môže kedykoľvek zmeniť podľa obchodných požiadaviek.

Balenie sa musí uskutočniť vo vymedzenej zemepisnej oblasti, aby sa zachovala charakteristická kvalita a homogenita rôznych druhov a ich odrôd, ako aj osobitná chuť, vôňa, aróma, konzistencia a neporušenosť produktu s CHZO „Szentesi paprika“, a bola zabezpečená vysledovateľnosť výrobkov.

3.7. *Špecifické pravidlá označovania*

— Na obale musí byť uvedená slovná kombinácia „Szentesi paprika“.

— Na obale musí byť tiež etiketa s čiarovým kódom, ktorý zabezpečuje vysledovateľnosť produktu „Szentesi paprika“.

4. Stručné vymedzenie zemepisnej oblasti

Produkt s chráneným zemepisným označením (CHZO) „Szentesi paprika“ sa pestuje v priľahlej oblasti v Čongrádskej župe.

Produkcia produktu „Szentesi paprika“ prebieha v správnych hraniciach týchto lokalít Čongrádskej župy: Derekegyháza, Fábiánsebestyén, Felgyő, Mindszent, Nagymágocs, Nagytőke, Szegvár a Szentes.

5. Súvislosť so zemepisnou oblasťou

5.1. *Špecifickosť zemepisnej oblasti*

Vďaka priaznivým podmienkam na rozvoj produkcie zavlažovanej papriky v regióne Szentes, ktorej priekopníkmi boli takzvaní bulharskí záhradníci (pestovatelia zeleniny využívajúci špecializované malovýrobné metódy, rýchlenú produkciu v pareniskách a zavlažovanie), ktorí sa v tomto regióne usídlili v priebehu druhej polovice 19. storočia, sa vytvorili faktory ovplyvňujúce produkciu kvalitnej papriky, najmä teplota a svetlo, ako aj pôda a hydrogeologické vlastnosti.

Pestovateľský región Szentes sa nachádza v juhovýchodnej časti Maďarska, v jednom z najnižšie ležiacich kotlín Veľkej dunajskej kotliny. Región zaujíma osobitné miesto z topografického hľadiska, pretože má najnižšie ležiacu poľnohospodársku pôdu v krajine, ktorá sa zvažuje z troch strán zo susedných žúp do údolia rieky Tisy. Najdôležitejším vodným tokom hydrografického systému regiónu je rieka Tisa, ktoré tiež vymedzuje jeho celkovú geografickú fyziognómiu. Pre veľké množstvo

povrchovej vody v regióne je prevládajúcim druhom pôdy na tomto mieste karbonátová a slancová lúčna černozem. Pôda pestovateľskej oblasti je v dobrom fyzickom stave. Pôda má hrudkovitú štruktúru, rýchlo sa vyhrieva, má mierne zásadité pH, dobre uchováva vodu aj živiny, má vysoký obsah humusu a hrubú vrstvu ornice.

Počas pestovania produktu „Szentesi paprika“ sú rozhodujúcimi klimatickými faktormi, vďaka ktorým plod dosahuje svoju obsahovú hodnotu, svetlo, počet hodín slnečného svitu, teplota a množstvo vyžarovaného tepla. V pestovateľskom regióne Szentes prevažujú vnútrozemské klimatické podmienky. Počet hodín slnečného svitu je v regióne rovnomerne rozložený a predstavuje priemerne 2 050 hodín slnečného svitu ročne. Podľa priemernej ročnej teploty je táto pestovateľská oblasť jednou z najteplejších oblastí v krajine. Priemerná ročná teplota je + 10 – 11 °C, kým suma teplôt počas pestovateľského obdobia dosahuje hodnoty 3 200 – 3 300 °C. To sú ideálne podmienky na pestovanie papriky, ktorá potrebuje veľa tepla.

Na druhej strane má tento región najnižšiu mieru zrážok v krajine, pričom priemerné ročné zrážky predstavujú 500 – 550 mm. Úhrn zrážok v zimnom období prestavuje zvyčajne 40 % a v letnom období 60 %. Pestovanie papriky, ktorá je náročná na vodu, bolo možné len vďaka zavlažovaniu, ktoré sa rozvinulo v dôsledku priaznivých hydrogeologických podmienok regiónu a ktoré zaviedli „bulharskí záhradníci“.

5.2. *Špecifickosť produktu*

Hlavnými organoleptickými hodnotami a vlastnosťami produktu „Szentesi paprika“ vyplývajúcimi zo zemepisnej oblasti sú: výnimočne aromatická, korenistá, štipľavá, alebo sladká chuť, intenzívna paprikový vôňa, príp. vôňa pripomínajúca mletú papriku a tenká šupka. Dužina plodu má hrúbku 3 – 7 mm a dovoľuje vyniknúť chuti a arómam plodu, ktorý sa obvykle konzumuje čerstvý.

Biela „Szentesi paprika“: v zrelom stave je na dotyk mastná, povrch má hladký a klzký, pri prasknutí sa poruší, má tupý a zvrásnený koniec a hrubú dužinu. Čerstvé papriky majú veľmi osobitnú vôňu a šťavnatosť, preto spotrebitelia zvyknú ľudovo hovoriť: „Szentesi paprika má svoju chuť“.

Špicatá štipľavá „Szentesi paprika“ má lesklý, hladký, mierne zvlnený povrch, dlhý, zašpicatený tvar; dužina má pevnú konzistenciu. Plody majú intenzívnu paprikovú vôňu a štipľavú, lahodnú arómu a chuť. Kapia „Szentesi paprika“ má kužeľovitý a mierne sploštený tvar; dužina má pevnú konzistenciu; šupka je stredne hrubá. Paprika má hladký, lesklý povrch a veľmi atraktívnu zamatovú, tmavočervenú farbu, ktorá je dôsledkom zemepisného prostredia (svetlo a teplo).

Rajčinová „Szentesi paprika“ má veľmi charakteristický tvar sploštenej gule; napriek hrubej dužine má tiež veľmi tenkú šupku a povrch plodu je hladký; v čase zberu má tmavočervenú farbu.

5.3. *Príčinná súvislosť medzi zemepisnou oblasťou a akosťou alebo typickou vlastnosťou produktu (CHOP), alebo špecifickou akosťou, povesťou alebo inou typickou vlastnosťou produktu (CHZO)*

Súvislosť so zemepisnou oblasťou sa zakladá na tradične dobrej povesti produktu a miestnych odborných znalostiach pestovateľov produktu „Szentesi paprika“, ktoré sa odovzdávajú z generácie na generáciu.

Povesť produktu „Szentesi paprika“

Priekopníkmi rozvoja produkcie zavlažovanej papriky v regióne Szentes boli takzvaní bulharskí záhradníci, ktorí sa v tomto regióne usídlili v priebehu druhej polovice 19. storočia. Povestná „Szentesi paprika“ sa odvtedy nepretržite pestuje. Tento produkt sa dodnes teší veľmi dobrej povesti a v roku 2006 mu na výstave Farmer Expo, ktorej súčasťou bol záhradnícky veľtrh v Debrecíne, na ktorom bolo zastúpených okolo 300 maďarských a zahraničných firiem, bola udelená hlavná cena. Sladká paprika určená na konzumáciu v čerstvom stave získala v roku 2007 ocenenie Magyar Termék Nagydíj (maďarské ocenenie za kvalitu výrobkov).

Početné historické údaje potvrdzujú stáročnú súvislosť medzi povesťou produktu „Szentesi paprika“ a zemepisnou oblasťou. Objavenie sladkej papriky v Maďarsku možno prisúdiť usadeniu sa „bulharských záhradníkov“ na veľkostatku Úsztató v regióne Szegvár v zime 1875 – 76. Podľa veľkého poľnohospodárskeho sčítania v roku 1895, bolo 92,74 % celkovej produkcie papriky v Maďarsku sústredených na juhovýchode krajiny v oblasti Szentes. Záhradníci, ktorí si prenajali poľnohospodársku pôdu, využívali výhody aluviálnej pôdy v Čongrádskej župe, lúčnej černozeme, bohatej na humus, ktorá sa rýchlo vyhrieva. Všade tam, kde to bolo možné, sa usadili na mierne sa zvažujúcej pôde. Na

pestovanie skorej papriky používali predklíčené semená a pareniská. Plodinu pestovali taktiež medzi riadkami inej plodiny v záhonoch v záhradníckej škôlke, napríklad sadenice uhorky pestovali spoločne s paprikou, pričom uhorky po presadení paprík zostali na mieste. Oddelené sadenice sa presádzali s malou hrudkou zeminy. Zaviedli pravidelné zavlažovanie vo veľkom rozsahu: na zavlažovanie používali teplú stojatú vodu alebo plytkú, pomaly tečúcu vodu. Mali jedinečnú metódu čerpania a odvádzania vody. Počas tohto obdobia sa v oblasti Szentes používali takzvané reťazové čerpacie (korčekové) kolesá, ktoré boli prispôsobené premenlivej hladine vody.

Miestne odborné znalosti

Pôda v pestovateľskej oblasti Szentes veľmi dobre uchováva teplo. Pretože pôda, v ktorej sa pestuje „Szentesi paprika“, absorbuje viac tepla, než ho uvoľní prostredníctvom vyžarovania na svitaní, teplo z pôdy a zo vzduchu nad pôdou narastá a zvyšuje teplotu. Výnimočná chuť a vôňa produktu „Szentesi paprika“, ktorá je náročná na teplo a vodu, vzniká kombináciou vyváženej mikroklímy vytváranej rovnomernou dodávkou tepla a zavlažovania zavedeného „bulharskými záhradníkmi“.

K prirodzeným faktorom patria aj činnosti miestnych poľnohospodárov a praktické skúsenosti uplatňované pri rýchlenom pestovaní (regulácia tepla, vetranie, tienenie, starostlivosť o rastliny), ktoré sa odovzdávajú z generácie na generáciu. Tieto poznatky pomohli v posledných desaťročiach vykompenzovať nepriaznivé účinky extrémnych poveternostných podmienok, a vďaka nim sa zaručila a tam, kde to bolo možné, aj zachovala chuť, farba a aróma produktu „Szentesi paprika“, ako aj atraktívny tvar, ktorý je pre jednotlivé druhy odrôd charakteristický.

Techniky, ktoré zaviedli „bulharskí záhradníci“, sa počas posledných asi 150 rokov prispôsobovali, aby vyhovovali súčasným podmienkam. Počas produkcie sa prehodnotili základné faktory pestovania papriky a boli objavené nové pestovateľské metódy. Za najdôležitejšie faktory produkcie papriky sa do 60. rokov 20. storočia považovali dobré pôdne podmienky, zavlažovací potenciál (rieky Tisa a Körös a systémy zavlažovacích kanálov), počet hodín slnečného svitu (možnosť pestovania skorej papriky), ako aj skoré jarné otepľovanie. Ďalšie obdobie trvalo od konca 60. rokov do konca 80. rokov 20. storočia. Producenti papriky začali používať fólie a v plnej miere využívať skoré jarné otepľovanie a veľký počet hodín slnečného svitu v zimných a jarných mesiacoch. V období od 60. do 80. rokov 20. storočia sa po objavení geotermálnej energie v regióne pestovanie produktu „Szentesi paprika“ presunulo z vonkajšieho prostredia do fólií, kde sa začínajú presadzovať spôsoby pestovania bez pôdy.

Odkaz na uverejnenie špecifikácie

[Článok 5 ods. 7 nariadenia (ES) č. 510/2006 ([3])]

Vidékfejlesztési Értesítő (Bulletin pre rozvoj vidiek), 16. november 2011, Zväzok LXI, č. 6, s. 317

http://elelmiszerlanc.kormany.hu/minosegpolitika

([3]) Porovnaj poznámku pod čiarou 2.

Uverejnenie žiadosti o zmenu podľa článku 50 ods. 2 písm. a) nariadenia Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (EÚ) č. 1151/2012 o systémoch kvality pre poľnohospodárske výrobky a potraviny

(2013/C 237/07)

Týmto uverejnením sa poskytuje právo vzniesť námietku proti žiadosti o zmenu podľa článku 51 nariadenia Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (EÚ) č. 1151/2012 [1].

ŽIADOSŤ O ZMENU

NARIADENIE RADY (ES) č. 510/2006

o ochrane zemepisných označení a označení pôvodu poľnohospodárskych výrobkov a potravín [2]

ŽIADOSŤ O ZMENU V SÚLADE S ČLÁNKOM 9

„TERRA D'OTRANTO"

ES č.: IT-PDO-0117-1519-01.03.2011

CHZO ( ) CHOP (X)

1. **Položka v špecifikácii výrobku, ktorej sa zmena týka**

— ☐ Názov výrobku

— ☒ Opis výrobku

— ☐ Zemepisná oblasť

— ☒ Dôkaz o pôvode

— ☐ Spôsob výroby

— ☐ Súvislosť

— ☐ Označovanie

— ☒ Vnútroštátne požiadavky

— ☒ Iné (uveďte)

2. **Druh zmeny (zmien)**

— ☐ Zmena jednotného dokumentu alebo zhrnutia

— ☒ Zmena špecifikácie zapísaného CHOP alebo CHZO, ku ktorému nebol uverejnený jednotný dokument, ani zhrnutie

— ☐ Zmena špecifikácie, ktorá nevyžaduje zmenu uverejneného jednotného dokumentu [článok 9 ods. 3 nariadenia Rady (ES) č. 510/2006]

— ☐ Dočasná zmena špecifikácie, vyplývajúca z uloženia povinných sanitárnych alebo rastlinolekárskych opatrení orgánmi verejnej moci [článok 9 ods. 4 nariadenia (ES) č. 510/2006]

[1] Ú. v. EÚ L 343, 14.12.2012, s. 1.
[2] Nahradené nariadením (EÚ) č. 1151/2012.

3. **Zmena (zmeny)**

3.1. *Opis výrobku*

Špecifikácia bola zmenená doplnením mediánov pre typické znaky, ktoré rušia hodnotenie 6,5 (už nie je relevantné), a prijatím ustanovení metódy COI/T20 č. dok. 22. Okrem toho sa do senzorickej analýzy doplnili niektoré špecifické vlastnosti vyplývajúce z prevahy jedného z dvoch pôvodných kultivarov.

Výsledkom použitia novej metódy je tento opis:

— farba: zelená alebo žltá so slabými zelenými odleskami,

— aróma: stredne intenzívna ovocná aróma (medián znaku medzi 3 a 6) s tónom olív s primeraným stupňom zrelosti a s miernym tónom listu,

— chuť: stredne intenzívna ovocná (medián znaku medzi 3 a 6) s tónom olív s primeraným stupňom zrelosti. Jemná až stredná pikantnosť a horkosť podľa obdobia zberu (medián znakov s hodnotami medzi 0 a 6). V závislosti od obdobia zberu a prevahy odrôd sa ovocná chuť obohacuje o tóny olivových listov, čerstvo pokosenej trávy, artičoky kardovej/artičoky/čakanky v prípade kultivaru Ogliarola alebo ovocia/paradajok/lesného ovocia v prípade kultivaru Cellina.

Chemické parametre boli mierne upravené znížením maximálnej celkovej kyslosti vyjadrenej ako kyselina olejová (v súčasnosti od < 0,8 do < 0,65) a miernym zvýšením obsahu kyseliny linoleovej (od ≤ 0,70 do ≤ 0,80) a hodnoty K232 (od ≤ 2,10 do ≤ 2,20). Tieto zmeny vyplývajú z tendencie zvyšovať zastúpenie dvoch kultivarov, v minulosti málo rozšírených a v súčasnosti najrozšírenejších, t. j. Cellina di Nardò a Ogliarola Salentina, ktoré stoja za miernou zmenou obsahu kyseliny linoleovej a K232 v olejoch z jednej odrody.

3.2. *Dôkaz o pôvode*

Špecifikácia bola zmenená v súlade s ustanoveniami podľa nariadenia Komisie (ES) č. 1898/2006 doplnením postupov, ktoré musia prevádzkovatelia použiť, aby vznikol/vznikli dôkaz/dôkazy o pôvode.

3.3. *Vnútroštátne požiadavky*

Povinnosti vyplývajúce zo zákona č. 169 z 15. februára 1992 „Disciplina per il riconoscimento della denominazione di origine controllata degli oli di oliva vergini ed extravergini“ a z Decreto Ministeriale č. 573/93 boli vypustené.

3.4. *Iné*

Združenie požadujúce zmenu je Consorzio di tutela dell'olio extravergine di oliva D.O.P. „Terra d'Otranto“. Ide o orgán oprávnený podávať žiadosť o zmenu podľa článku 14 zákona č. 526/1999, ktorý nemožno zamieňať so združením APROL, ktoré žiadalo o zápis CHOP. Consorzio di tutela vzniklo po pôvodnom podaní žiadosti o zápis CHOP „Terra d'Otranto“, ktorú podalo združenie APROL zastupujúce najmenej sedem združení výrobcov olivového oleja.

JEDNOTNÝ DOKUMENT

NARIADENIE RADY (ES) č. 510/2006

o ochrane zemepisných označení a označení pôvodu poľnohospodárskych výrobkov a potravín [3]

„TERRA D'OTRANTO“

ES č.: IT-PDO-0117-1519-01.03.2011

CHZO ( ) CHOP (X)

1. **Názov**

„Terra d'Otranto“

2. **Členský štát alebo tretia krajina**

Taliansko

[3] Porovnaj poznámku pod čiarou 2.

3. **Opis poľnohospodárskeho výrobku alebo potraviny**

3.1. *Druh výrobku*

Trieda 1.5. Oleje a tuky (maslo, margarín, olej atď.)

3.2. *Opis výrobku, na ktorý sa vzťahuje názov uvedený v bode 1*

„Terra d'Otranto" je extra panenský olivový olej s týmito chemickými a organoleptickými vlastnosťami:

— maximálna kyslosť 0,65 %,

— peroxidy ≤ 14 meq O2/kg,

— K232 ≤ 2,20,

— K270 ≤ 0,170,

— kyselina linoleová ≤ 0,8,

— farba: zelená alebo žltá so zelenými odleskami,

— aróma: stredne intenzívna ovocná aróma (medián znaku medzi 3 a 6) s tónom olív s primeraným stupňom zrelosti a s miernym tónom listu,

— chuť: stredne intenzívna ovocná (medián znaku medzi 3 a 6) s tónom olív s primeraným stupňom zrelosti.

Jemná až stredná pikantnosť a horkosť podľa obdobia zberu. Okrem toho sa v závislosti od obdobia zberu a prevahy odrôd ovocná chuť obohacuje o tóny olivových listov, čerstvo pokosenej trávy, artičoky kardovej/artičoky/čakanky v prípade kultivaru *Ogliarola* alebo ovocia/paradajok/lesného ovocia v prípade kultivaru *Cellina*.

3.3. *Suroviny (len pri spracovaných výrobkoch)*

—

3.4. *Krmivo (len pri výrobkoch živočíšneho pôvodu)*

—

3.5. *Špecifické kroky výroby, ktoré sa musia uskutočniť v označenej zemepisnej oblasti*

Pestovanie, výroba a lisovanie extra panenského olivového oleja „Terra d'Otranto" sa musí uskutočňovať výhradne v zemepisnej oblasti výroby vymedzenej v bode 4.

3.6. *Špecifické pravidlá krájania, strúhania, balenia atď.*

Extra panenský olivový olej „Terra d'Otranto" sa musí uvádzať na trh v nádobách zo skla alebo pocínovaného plechu s objemom do 5 litrov. Balenie extra panenského olivového oleja „Terra d'Otranto" sa musí uskutočňovať v zemepisnej oblasti výroby v záujme lepšej kontroly pôvodu výrobku a aby sa zabránilo preprave voľne loženého výrobku mimo tejto oblasti, ktorá by mohla mať za následok zhoršenie a stratu špecifických vlastností defnovaných v bode 3.2., najmä typických tónov artičoky kardovej/artičoky/čakanky oleja „Terra d'Otranto". Zloženie oleja vyznačujúce sa vyšším podielom polynenasýtených mastných kyselín spôsobuje, že olej vplyvom vzdušného kyslíka, ktorému je vystavený počas prelievania, čerpania, prepravy a vykladania, t. j. častých úkonov pri plnení do fliaš mimo výrobnej oblasti, ľahko stráca svoje organoleptické kvality a typické znaky.

3.7. *Špecifické pravidlá označovania*

Názov „Terra d'Otranto" musí byť na etikete uvedený jasným a nezmazateľným písmom, ktoré je zreteľne odlíšiteľné od akéhokoľvek iného nápisu, ktorý sa uvádza na etikete, a bezprostredne za ním musí nasledovať nápis „Denominazione di origine protetta" alebo skratka „DOP" (CHOP) spolu s príslušným symbolom EÚ.

Každé balenie uvedené na trh musí byť označené vzostupným poradovým číslom, ktoré mu pridelí baliareň na základe ustanovení príslušného plánu kontroly.

Zakazuje sa pridávať akékoľvek ďalšie označenia, ktoré nie sú výslovne stanovené, vrátane prívlastkov „jemný", „vyberaný", „výberový", „vysokokvalitný".

Názvy, obchodné názvy a názvy značiek sa môžu použiť za predpokladu, že nemajú pochvalný význam a nezavádzajú kupujúceho.

Na etikete sa musí uvádzať rok produkcie olív, z ktorých bol olej vyrobený.

4. **Stručné vymedzenie zemepisnej oblasti**

Oblasť produkcie CHOP „Terra d'Otranto" zahŕňa celú provinciu Lecce a časť provincií Taranto a Brindisi. Uvedená oblasť sa rozprestiera v tvare oblúka medzi Iónskym a Jadranským morom, pahorkami Murge Taratine a koncami úbočí Murge na juhovýchode Brindisi, prechádza cez nížinu (*tavoliere*) v provincii Lecce a končí sa pahorkami Serre na prieniku oboch morí.

5. **Súvislosť so zemepisnou oblasťou**

5.1. *Špecifickosť zemepisnej oblasti*

Výrobok vďačí za svoje vlastnosti konkrétnym pôdnym a klimatickým podmienkam v oblasti: prírodné faktory a špecifické kultivary tohto územia dávajú oleju „Terra d'Otranto" jeho osobitosť. Pôdy majú z veľkej časti pozoruhodnú jednotnosť vychádzajúcu z kriedových vápencov, na ktorých spočinuli vrstvy treťohorných vápencov a vápenatých, či piesočnato-hlinitých usadenín z pliocénu a pleistocénu. Tvoria ich hnedozeme alebo červenozeme často v striedajúcich sa vrstvách na vápencových horninách. Z pohľadu reliéfu sa oblasť vyznačuje rozsiahlymi rovinami ohraničenými a prerušenými nízkymi pahorkami. Oblasť produkcie nemá povrchové toky, ale má obrovské zásoby podzemných vôd, ktoré dodávajú celej oblasti trvalo krasovú povahu. Keďže oblasť sa nachádza na pobreží v malej nadmorskej výške, teší sa miernemu až tepléhomu podnebiu.

5.2. *Špecifickosť výrobku*

Tradícia pestovania olív v zemepisnej oblasti sa vyznačuje prevahou pôvodných odrôd Cellina di Nardò a Ogliarola leccese, ktoré dávajú vyrobenému oleju jeho kvalitu. Údaj o minimálnom podiele 60 % týchto dvoch kultivarov pomáha stanoviť organoleptické vlastnosti olejov, ktoré sa v závislosti od prevahy jedného alebo druhého kultivaru vyznačujú tónmi artičoky kardovej/artičoky/čakanky alebo tónmi ovocia/paradajok/lesného ovocia.

5.3. *Príčinná súvislosť medzi zemepisnou oblasťou a akosťou alebo typickou vlastnosťou výrobku (CHOP), alebo špecifickou akosťou, povesťou alebo inou typickou vlastnosťou výrobku (CHZO)*

Pestovanie olív je hlavným výrobným sektorom oblasti, ktorý má kľúčovú úlohu v miestnom hospodárstve. Zemepisné označenie „Terra d'Otranto" zahŕňalo súčasné provincie Lecce, Brindisi a Taranto aj v devätnástom storočí. Táto oblasť bola vždy typická bohatým výskytom olivovníka, ktorého plody sa používajú na získavanie „vzácneho moku". Pôvod názvu „Terra d'Otranto" sa spája so samotnou históriou pestovania olív v tejto oblasti, ktoré v dávnych časoch zaviedli fenickí a grécki kolonisti a ktoré vďaka práci brazílskych mníchov, ktorí sa v oblasti usadili v desiatom storočí, dalo vznik prvému rozkvitajúcemu trhu s kvalitnými olejmi pochádzajúcimi z Terra d'Otranto. Termín „Terra d'Otranto" sa v stredoveku používal na označenie Salentského polostrova (*il Salento*), keďže Otranto bolo vtedy hlavným mestom regiónu.

Odkaz na uverejnenie špecifikácie

[Článok 5 ods. 7 nariadenia Rady (ES) č. 510/2006 ([4])]

Súčasné správne orgány začali vnútroštátne námietkové konanie prostredníctvom uverejnenia žiadosti zmenu chráneného označenia pôvodu „Terra d'Otranto" v *Úradnom vestníku Talianskej republiky* č. 297 z 21. decembra 2010. Úplné znenie špecifikácie výrobku sa nachádza na webovej stránke:

http://www.politicheagricole.it/flex/cm/pages/ServeBLOB.php/L/IT/IDPagina/3335

alebo priamo na webovej stránke ministerstva pre poľnohospodárske, potravinárske a lesnícke politiky (http://www.politicheagricole.it) kliknutím na „Qualità e sicurezza" (v ľavom hornom rohu obrazovky) a ďalej na „Disciplinari di produzione all'esame dell'UE".

([4]) Porovnaj poznámku pod čiarou 2.

Uverejnenie žiadosti podľa článku 50 ods. 2 písm. b) nariadenia Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (EÚ) č. 1151/2012 o systémoch kvality pre poľnohospodárske výrobky a potraviny

(2013/C 237/08)

Týmto uverejnením sa poskytuje právo vzniesť námietku proti žiadosti podľa článku 51 nariadenia Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (EÚ) č. 1151/2012 ([1]).

ŽIADOSŤ O ZÁPIS ZARUČENEJ TRADIČNEJ ŠPECIALITY DO REGISTRA

NARIADENIE RADY (ES) č. 509/2006

o zaručených tradičných špecialitách z poľnohospodárskych výrobkov a potravín ([2])

„ŽEMAITIŠKAS KASTINYS“

ES č.: LT-TSG-0007-0910-11.11.2011

1. **Názov a adresa skupiny žiadateľov**

Názov skupiny alebo organizácie (ak je to relevantné): „Žemaitiško kastinio gamintojai“

Adresa:	Sedos g. 35 LT-87101 Telšiai LIETUVA/LITHUANIA
Tel.	+370 44422201
Fax	+370 44474897
e-mail:	info@zpienas.lt

2. **Členský štát alebo tretia krajina**

Litva

3. **Špecifikácia výrobku**

3.1. *Názov (názvy) na zápis do registra (článok 2 nariadenia (ES) č. 1216/2007)*

„Žemaitiškas kastinys“

3.2. *Názov*

☒ je špecifický sám o sebe

☐ vyjadruje špecifický charakter poľnohospodárskeho výrobku alebo potraviny

Názov „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ neodkazuje na osobitné vlastnosti výrobku, ale je zaužívaný a veľmi známy v oblasti Žemaitija (Žmuď, oblasť na západe Litvy) a aj v zostávajúcej časti Litvy, kde tradične označuje tento výrobok, čoho dôkazom sú mnohé pramene uvedené v bode 3.8.

Názov „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ (*kastinys* zo Žmude) sa objavuje v knihe receptúr z dvadsiateho storočia „Gaspadinystės knyga arba Pamokinimai kaip prigulinčiai yra sutaisomi valgiai“ (Tilžė, 1927), v knihe „Čo jeme ?“ od Dr Tumėnienė et al. („Ką valgome“, Kaunas, 1935), a v knihe „Litovská kuchyňa“ od J. Pauliukonienė („Lietuvių valgiai“, Vilnius, 1983).

3.3. *Žiadosť o výhradu názvu podľa článku 13 ods. 2 nariadenia (ES) č. 509/2006*

☒ Zápis do registra s výhradou názvu

☐ Zápis do registra bez výhrady názvu

3.4. *Druh výrobku (pozri prílohu II)*

Trieda 1.4. Iné výrobky živočíšneho pôvodu (vajcia, med, rôzne mliečne výrobky okrem masla atď.)

([1]) Ú. v. EÚ L 343, 14.12.2012, s. 1.
([2]) Nahradené nariadením (EÚ) č. 1151/2012.

3.5. *Opis poľnohospodárskeho výrobku alebo potraviny, na ktoré sa vzťahuje názov podľa bodu 3.1 [článok 3 ods. 1 nariadenia (ES) č. 1216/2007]*

„Žemaitiškas kastinys“ je tradičná, za tepla vyšľahaná a následne vychladená smotana.

Výrobok „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa vyznačuje homogénnou a hustou konzistenciou. Pri teplote + 6 °C je drobivý, má konzistenciu porovnateľnú s tuhou smotanou s rozptýlenými kvapkami a v ústach sa ľahko rozplýva. Farba je úplne jednoliata (žltkavá). „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ môže mať rôzne odtiene v závislosti od použitých korenín, ktorých malé kúsky môže obsahovať. Chuť je mierne kyslá po kyseline mliečnej, tiež mierne slaná a so stopami po koreninách.

Fyzikálno-chemické vlastnosti výrobku „Žemaitiškas kastinys“:

— tuky v závislosti od receptúry: 25 – 30 %,

— obsah kuchynskej soli: 1 – 1,5 %.

3.6. *Opis výrobného postupu poľnohospodárskeho výrobku alebo potraviny, na ktoré sa vzťahuje názov podľa bodu 3.1 [článok 3 ods. 2 nariadenia (ES) č. 1216/2007]*

Zloženie:

— kyslá smotana s obsahom tuku 25 až 30 %: 80 kg až 83 kg na 100 kg výrobku,

— maslo s obsahom tuku 82 % a viac: 6 kg až 7 kg na 100 kg výrobku,

— kyslá smotana s obsahom tuku 2,5 až 4 %: 5 kg až 5,5 kg na 100 kg výrobku,

— obsah kuchynskej soli: 1 kg až 1,5 kg na 100 kg výrobku.

Môžu sa použiť koreniny (čierne korenie, nové korenie, rasca, kôpor, mäta alebo zmes týchto korenín: 0,1 až 0,15 kg na 100 kg výrobku) a aromatická zelenina (cesnak alebo cibuľa: 1 kg až 2 kg na 100 kg výrobku).

Spôsob výroby:

„Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa vyrába tradičným spôsobom.

Jednotlivé prísady sa vážia v súlade s receptúrou. Kyslá smotana sa mieša s kyslým mliekom v oddelenej nádobe a zohrieva sa na teplotu 25 až 30 °C. Studené maslo sa zmäkčí zvýšením teploty na 25 až 30 °C. Aromatická zelenina sa umyje a jemne naseká.

Zohriate maslo sa zmäkčí a v závislosti od receptúry sa preloží do misy určenej na výrobu výrobku. Zmes kyslej smotany a kyslého mlieka sa postupne vlieva po osminách množstva určeného receptúrou a mieša sa ručne alebo rovnocennou mechanickou technikou. „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa vždy mieša v rovnakom smere. Po dosiahnutí konzistencie kyslej smotany (bez toho, aby vznikol cmar) sa pridá ďalšia osmina zmesi kyslej smotany a kyslého mlieka a pokračuje sa v miešaní. Tento postup sa opakuje, až kým nie je preliata celá zmes kyslej smotany a kyslého mlieka (podľa receptúry). Keď „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ začne tuhnúť, pridá sa soľ, koreniny a posekaná aromatická zelenina a pokračuje sa v miešaní. „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa musí baliť ihneď, skôr ako stuhne.

„Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa balí do malých hlinených nádob alebo do jednorazových nádob s obsahom 250 g, 200 g a 100 g. Nádoby sú uzavreté malým hlineným vekom, ktoré sa zakryje papierovým vrchnákom a previaže sa špagátom. Jednorazové nádoby sú uzavreté vekom z alumíniovej fólie. Po zabalení sa „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ ochladí na 6 °C. Po ochladení výrobok získava svoju homogénnu a tuhú konzistenciu.

3.7. *Špecifický charakter poľnohospodárskeho výrobku alebo potraviny [článok 3 ods. 3 nariadenia (ES) č. 1216/2007]*

„Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa od ostatných výrobkov v rovnakej kategórii odlišuje týmito vlastnosťami:

— Tradičné zložky a spôsob výroby. Na rozdiel od iných druhov *kastinys* sa receptúra na prípravu výrobku „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ od prvých zmienok o ňom v písomných prameňoch spomenutých v bode 3.8 takmer nezmenila. Tie isté prísady sa používajú v takmer totožných množstvách. Neskôr sa objavili ďalšie druhy *kastinys* – na získanie väčšieho výberu príchutí kyslá smotana úplne nahrádza kyslým mliekom alebo sa mieša s kefírom. Pridávať sa môže červená repa, mrkvová

šťava alebo vaječný žĺtok, vďaka čomu má *kastinys* červené alebo žlté zafarbenie. Výroba „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa vyznačuje pomalým, konštantným a kruhovým miešaním zmesi masla a kyslej smotany, počas ktorého sa po osminách pridáva zmes kyslej smotany a kyslého mlieka, pričom sa veľmi starostlivo kontroluje teplota (25 – 30 °C), aby nevznikol cmar. Výroba ostatných druhov *kastinys* je modernejšia, pretože namiesto miešania sa využíva šľahanie. Navyše sa všetky prísady prilievajú na tri- až štyrikrát, prípadne naraz. Aj teplota môže viac kolísať.

— Chuť. Výrobok „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ je mierne kyslý po kyseline mliečnej, tiež mierne slaný a so stopami po koreninách alebo aromatickej zelenine. Iné druhy *kastinys* sú typické pomerne trpkou kyslou chuťou kyseliny mliečnej (ak je kyslá smotana nahradená kyslým mliekom) alebo chuťou kyseliny mliečnej s príchuťou kvasiniek (ak je kyslá smotana nahradená kefírom). Taktiež cítiť typickú chuť šťavy (z červenej repy alebo mrkvy), prípadne vaječného žĺtka.

— Konzistencia. Výrobok „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa vyznačuje homogénnou a hustou konzistenciou. Pri teplote + 6 °C je drobivý, má konzistenciu porovnateľnú s tuhou smotanou s rozptýlenými kvapkami a v ústach sa ľahko rozplýva. Ostatné typy *kastinys* sú jemné a roztierateľné.

3.8. *Tradičný charakter poľnohospodárskeho výrobku alebo potraviny [článok 3 ods. 4 nariadenia (ES) č. 1216/2007]*

Okrem primitívneho spôsobu výroby masla, ktorý je rozšírený v celej Litve a spočíva v mútení kyslej smotany lyžicou v miske, bol výlučne v oblasti Žemaitija (Žmuď) vyvinutý originálny postup prípravy kyslej smotany, ktorý sa následne rozšíril na celé územie krajiny. Spočíva v kruhovom miešaní kyslej smotany za tepla, pričom sa dbá, aby nevznikol cmar. Výsledkom je výrobok špecifickej chuti a konzistencie – „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ („Atlas litovského jazyka“, „Lietuvių kalbos atlasas“ T. 1. Leksika, Vilnius, 1977). Tento výrobok je opísaný vo vedeckej literatúre z 19. storočia (Liudwik Adam Jucewicz (Liudwik z Pokiewia). Litwa pod wzgledem starozytnych zabytkow, obyczajow i zwyczajow skreslona, Wilno, 1846; Leon Potocki. Pamiętniki Pana Kamertona, Poznan, 1869) s dôrazom na spôsob výroby (zo zahrievanej kyslej smotany) a veľmi lahodnú chuť.

Príbehy ľudí narodených na konci devätnásteho a na začiatku dvadsiateho storočia, ktoré sa uchovali v Litovskom národnom múzeu, (fondy národopisného oddelenia Litovského národného múzea F 15-4; F 15-13; F 32-7; F 32-48) opisujú spôsob výroby a receptúru: do zohriatej hlinenej misky dajte najskôr tri lyžice kyslej smotany a pol lyžice masla. Zmiešajte všetko dohromady drevenou lyžicou. Vždy miešajte v rovnakom smere. Keď zmiešaná hmota začne chladnúť, bez toho, aby sa podobala na cmar, zohrejte misku v teplej vode a takto skvapalnený obsah prelejte do misky so studenou vodou. Za stáleho miešania prilievajte do hmoty kyslú smotanu v malých dávkach. Časť kyslej smotany sa často mení na kyslé mlieko, vďaka čomu je výrobok *kastinys* menej tučný. Na konci mútenia smotany pridajte soľ a ostatné koreniny (rasca, mleté čierne korenie, posekaný cesnak a cibuľu, sezónne cibuľovú vňať a výhonky feniklu alebo mäty.

Vo vedeckej knihe z roku 1983 s názvom „Litovská kuchyňa“ („Lietuvių valgiai“, zostavil J. Pauliukonienė, „Mokslas“, Vilnius, 1983), ktorá opisuje starobylé tradičné postupy prípravy surovín, pomocou ktorých sa ručne oddeľovala smotana od mlieka (lyžicou) a od prirodzene sa vyskytujúceho zvyšného kyslého mlieka, sa uvádza receptúra „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ aj so spôsobom výroby: „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ – ½ l kyslej smotany, 1 lyžica masla, ½ lyžice rasce alebo iných korenín, soľ. Hlinená miska s maslom a lyžicou smotany sa vloží do teplej vody. Obsah misky sa mieša dookola drevenou lyžicou. Krátko potom (pred vznikom cmaru) sa opäť pridá lyžica kyslej smotany a pokračuje sa v miešaní, až kým sa nevleje celý obsah kyslej smotany. Keď začne hmota hustnúť, pridá sa soľ s umytou a usušenou rascou a všetko sa riadne premieša. Chuť *kastinys* je mierne slaná a trochu kyslá.

Spôsob prípravy a receptúra „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ zostali nezmenené dodnes, o čom svedčí certifikát, ktorý tento výrobok získal v Litve v roku 2010 od „VŠĮ „Kulinarinio paveldo fonda“ “ a ktorý potvrdzuje, že „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa vyrába tradičnými postupmi a s tradičnými surovinami, prísadami a vybavením.

3.9. *Minimálne požiadavky a postupy kontroly špecifického charakteru [článok 4 nariadenia (ES) č. 1216/2007]*

So zreteľom na špecifické vlastnosti „Žemaitiškas kastinys“ sa overuje:

1. kvalita surovín každej šarže:

— obsah tuku kyslej smotany a kyslého mlieka musí zodpovedať obsahu tuku kyslej smotany a kyslého mlieka podľa bodu 3.6. Overuje sa v laboratóriu,

— obsah tuku masla musí zodpovedať obsahu tuku masla podľa bodu 3.6. Overuje sa v laboratóriu,

— organoleptické vlastnosti korenín a aromatickej zeleniny (chuť, vôňa, farba) sa na základe dokumentácie podrobujú senzorickej kontrole;

2. dodržiavanie výrobnej technológie podľa bodu 3.6: poradie jednotlivých krokov technologického postupu a dodržiavanie stanovených parametrov (teplota prísad a množstvá) sa overujú vizuálne a opatreniami počas výrobného procesu každej šarže;

3. kvalita konečného produktu každej šarže:

— organoleptické vlastnosti musia zodpovedať organoleptickým vlastnostiam uvedeným v bode 3.5. Overujú sa organoleptickou analýzou,

— obsah tukov musí zodpovedať obsahu tukov podľa bodu 3.5. Overuje sa v laboratóriu,

— obsah kuchynskej soli musí zodpovedať obsahu podľa bodu 3.5. Overuje sa podľa receptúry. V prípade pochybností sa overuje v laboratóriu.

Orgán uvedený v bode 4.1 najmenej raz za rok kontroluje súlad výrobku a postupu jeho výroby s požiadavkami tejto špecifikácie.

4. **Úrady alebo orgány overujúce dodržiavanie špecifikácie**

4.1. *Názov a adresa*

Názov: Valstybinė maisto ir veterinarijos tarnyba

Adresa: Siesikų g. 19
LT-07170 Vilnius
LIETUVA/LITHUANIA

Tel. +370 44474897
e-mail: vvt@vet.lt

☒ Verejný ☐ Súkromný

4.2. *Osobitné úlohy úradu alebo orgánu*

Kontrolný orgán uvedený v bode 4.1 je zodpovedný za kontrolu všetkých kritérií ustanovených v špecifikácii.

EUR-Lex (http://new.eur-lex.europa.eu) poskytuje priamy a bezplatný prístup k právu Európskej únie. Na stránke možno prehliadať *Úradný vestník Európskej únie*, ako aj zmluvy, právne predpisy, judikatúru a návrhy právnych aktov.

Viac informácii o Európskej únii získate na stránke: http://europa.eu.

Úrad pre vydávanie publikácií Európskej únie
2985 Luxemburg
LUXEMBURSKO

SK