2. If the operating air carrier is required to take reasonable measures to avoid long delays themselves, is Article 5(3) of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91, to be interpreted as meaning that, in the case of the carriage of passengers on a route consisting of two (or more) flights, the air carrier must, in order to avoid an obligation to pay compensation in accordance with Article 7 of that regulation, merely take reasonable measures aimed at avoiding a delay to the flight which it is due to operate and which is subject to possible delay, or that it must also take reasonable measures to avoid a long delay for the individual passenger at the final destination (for example, by examining the possibility of rebooking the passenger onto another flight)?

3. Are Articles 5, 6, 7 and 8 of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91, to be interpreted as meaning that, in the event of a long delay at the final destination, the operating air carrier — if it wishes to avoid an obligation to pay compensation in accordance with Article 7 of that regulation — must state and prove that it has taken reasonable measures to rebook the passenger onto a flight expected to enable him to reach his final destination without a long delay?

([1]) OJ 2004 L 46, p. 1.

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Korkein hallinto-oikeus (Finland) lodged on 1 December 2017 — Luonnonsuojeluyhdistys Tapiola Pohjois-Savo — Kainuu ry

(Case C-674/17)

(2018/C 063/10)

Language of the case: Finnish

Referring court

Korkein hallinto-oikeus

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: Luonnonsuojeluyhdistys Tapiola Pohjois-Savo — Kainuu ry

Other parties: Suomen riistakeskus, Risto Mustonen, Kai Ruhanen

Questions referred

1. Can regionally restricted derogation permits based on applications from individual hunters be granted for hunting for 'population management purposes' under Article 16(1)(e) of the Habitats Directive, ([1]) having regard to the wording of that provision?

   — In considering that question, is it relevant that the discretion exercised when deciding on derogation permits is governed by a national population management plan and by the maximum number of individual animals killed laid down in a regulation, under which derogation permits may be granted annually for the territory of the Member State?

   — As part of that consideration, may account be taken of other factors, such as the objective of preventing harm to dogs and increasing the general feeling of security?

2. Can derogation permits be granted for hunting for population management purposes, as described in the first question, on the basis that there is no satisfactory alternative within the meaning of Article 16(1) of the Habitats Directive to prevent poaching?

— In such circumstances, may account be taken of the practical difficulties associated with the monitoring of illegal poaching?

— In considering whether a satisfactory alternative exists, is the objective of preventing harm to dogs and increasing the general feeling of security also potentially a relevant factor?

3. How is the requirement laid down in Article 16(1) of the Habitats Directive concerning the conservation status of species' populations to be assessed when regionally restricted derogation permits are granted?

— Is the conservation status of a species to be assessed by reference both to a particular area and to the territory of the Member State as a whole or by reference to an even wider range of the species in question?

— Is it possible to satisfy the requirements for granting a derogation permit laid down in Article 16(1) of the Habitats Directive even though the conservation status of a species cannot be regarded as favourable within the meaning of the directive on the basis of a proper assessment?

— If the previous question is answered in the affirmative, in which circumstances could that be possible?

(1) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (OJ 1992 L 206, p. 7).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Curtea de Apel Ploiești (Romania) lodged on 1 December 2017 — Oana Mădălina Călin v Direcția Regională a Finanțelor Publice Ploieşti — Administrația Județeană a Finanțelor Publice Dâmbovița, Statul Român — Ministerul Finanțelor Public, and Administrația Fondului pentru Mediu

(Case C-676/17)

(2018/C 063/11)

Language of the case: Romanian

Referring court

Curtea de Apel Ploieşti

Parties to the main proceedings

Appellant: Oana Mădălina Călin

Respondents: Direcția Regională a Finanțelor Publice Ploieşti — Administrația Județeană a Finanțelor Publice Dâmbovița, Statul Român — Ministerul Finanțelor Public, and Administrația Fondului pentru Mediu

Question referred

Can Article 4(3) TEU, which refers to the principle of sincere cooperation, Articles 17, 20, 21 and 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 110 TFEU, the principle of legal certainty and the principles of equivalence and effectiveness stemming from the principle of procedural autonomy be interpreted as precluding national legislation, namely Article 21(2) of Law No 554/2004 on administrative proceedings as interpreted by Ruling No 45/2016 of the Înalta Curte de Casație și Justiție (ICCJ) — Completul pentru dezlegarea unor chestiuni de drept (High Court of Cassation and Justice — Panel for the Resolution of Points of Law), under which the period within which a request for revision based on Article 21(2) of Law No 554/2004 may be submitted is one month from the date of notification of the final judgment subject to revision?