

Official Journal

of the European Union

L 284

English edition

Legislation

Volume 51

28 October 2008

Contents

II Acts adopted under the EC Treaty/Euratom Treaty whose publication is not obligatory

DECISIONS

Commission

2008/806/EC:

- ★ **Commission Decision of 11 March 2008 on a State aid scheme implemented by Italy for the aeronautical industry (C 61/03 (ex NN 42/01))** (notified under document number C(2008) 845) ⁽¹⁾ 1

2008/807/EC:

- ★ **Commission Decision of 10 September 2008 amending Decisions 2001/881/EC and 2002/459/EC as regards the list of border inspection posts** (notified under document number C(2008) 4861) ⁽¹⁾ 32

Note to the reader (see page 3 of the cover)

II

(Acts adopted under the EC Treaty/Euratom Treaty whose publication is not obligatory)

DECISIONS

COMMISSION

COMMISSION DECISION

of 11 March 2008

on a State aid scheme implemented by Italy for the aeronautical industry (C 61/03 (ex NN 42/01))

(notified under document number C(2008) 845)

(Only the Italian text is authentic)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2008/806/EC)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular the first subparagraph of Article 88(2) thereof,

Having regard to the Agreement on the European Economic Area, and in particular Article 62(1)(a) thereof,

Having called on interested parties to submit their comments pursuant to those provisions ⁽¹⁾,

Whereas:

- (1) The measure under assessment concerns individual aid for research and development projects in the aeronautical industry. The aid was granted by Italy on the basis of the Law of 24 December 1985, No 808, laying down measures to develop and enhance the competitiveness of manufacturers in the aeronautical industry (Law No 808/1985). The Commission approved the scheme in 1986 ⁽²⁾.

1. PROCEDURE

- (2) On 7 October 1999, and again on 12 January 2001, the Commission received a complaint alleging that Italy had unlawfully granted aid to individual research and development (R & D) projects carried out by the Italian aeronautical industry.
- (3) The Commission sent a request for information on 8 May 2000, to which the Italian authorities replied on 1 August.

The complainant provided additional information by letters of 27 April 2001 and 30 May 2002.

- (4) On 1 February 2001 the Italian authorities provided the Commission with information concerning non-notified aid granted by Italy to 13 individual R & D projects.
- (5) By letters of 14 August and 24 August 2001 the Commission wrote to the Italian authorities asking for further information on the projects. Italy replied on 31 October, supplying additional information regarding six cases.
- (6) In 2002 the Commission asked independent experts to evaluate the six projects. The reports were delivered to the Commission on 7 April and 23 April 2003.
- (7) Two meetings were held, at the request of the Italian authorities, on 27 May and on 30 June 2003.
- (8) On 1 October 2003, the Commission initiated the formal investigation procedure (the first initiating decision) with regard to six cases of substantial aid to R & D projects that had not been individually notified by Italy, contrary to the rules governing aid to R & D, that is to say to the 1996 Community framework for State aid for research and development (the 1996 Framework) ⁽³⁾ and the 1986 Community framework for State aids for research and

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 16, 22.1.2004, p. 2, and OJ C 252, 12.10.2005, p. 10.

⁽²⁾ Case N 281/84, letter SG(86) 5685 dated 14.5.1986.

⁽³⁾ OJ C 45, 17.2.1996, p. 5.

- development (the 1986 Framework) ⁽⁴⁾. In all six cases, the Commission raised doubts concerning compatibility with the rules governing aid to R & D ⁽⁵⁾.
- (9) After the first initiating decision, the following parties submitted comments:
- a) Italy, by letter dated 3 February 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 4 February; Italy submitted a revised version of its comments by letter of 18 February, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 23 February;
 - b) France, by letter of 20 February 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on the same day;
 - c) Finmeccanica, by letter of 20 February 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 23 February;
 - d) an interested third party, who wished to remain anonymous, by letter of 23 February 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on the same day.
- (10) By letter of 22 March 2004, the comments received by the Commission were forwarded to Italy.
- (11) By letter of 26 May 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 28 May, Italy replied to the comments.
- (12) By letter of 1 July 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 6 July 2004, the anonymous third party submitted additional information regarding the application of Law No 808/1985, which is the approved aid scheme under which the six measures referred to in the first initiating decision were taken.
- (13) By letter of 3 August 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 4 August 2004, Italy submitted additional information on Law No 808/1985 and its application to the cases that were the subject of the original investigation proceedings.
- (14) By letter of 19 August 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 20 August 2004, the anonymous third party submitted additional information on Law No 808/1985 and its application to individual cases.
- (15) By letter of 13 September 2004, the Commission asked Italy for further information on the cases that were the subject of the original investigation.
- (16) By letter of 20 September 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 22 September 2004, the anonymous third party submitted additional information on Law No 808/1985 and its application to individual cases.
- (17) By letter of 30 September 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 1 October 2004, Italy replied to the Commission letter of 13 September 2004.
- (18) By letter of 12 October 2004, the Commission warned Italy that it considered that Italy had provided incomplete answers to the Commission letter of 13 September 2004. The Commission reiterated its request, and warned Italy that failing a complete reply the Commission would issue an information injunction in accordance with Article 10(3) of Council Regulation (EC) No 659/1999 of 22 March 1999 laying down detailed rules for the application of Article 93 of the EC Treaty (the Procedural Regulation) ⁽⁶⁾.
- (19) By letter of 15 October 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on the same day, and letter of 22 October 2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 25 October 2004, Italy replied to the Commission letter of 12 October 2004.
- (20) On 10 December 2004 the Commission decided to issue an information injunction ⁽⁷⁾ requiring a complete answer to the questions raised in its letter of 13 September 2004.
- (21) By letter of 19 January 2005, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 21 January 2005, Italy replied to the information injunction.
- (22) By letter of 10 March 2005, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 14 March 2005, Italy added information to its reply to the information injunction.
- (23) By decision of 22 June 2005 ⁽⁸⁾, the Commission decided to extend the scope of the proceedings (the second initiating decision). On 12 October 2005, the second initiating decision was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* ⁽⁹⁾.
- (24) By letter of 17 June 2005, the Italian authorities observed that the scope of the two initiating decisions touched on issues that were sensitive for national security.
- (25) By letter of 15 July 2005, the Commission replied that the Commission's investigation would be confined to civilian aspects and that the assessment of projects that were a matter of national security would be carried out precisely in order to exclude them from the scope of the final decision.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ C 83, 11.4.1986, p. 2.

⁽⁵⁾ See footnotes 3 and 4.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ L 83, 27.3.1999, p. 1.

⁽⁷⁾ Commission letter ref. C(2004) 5009, 10.12.2004.

⁽⁸⁾ C(2005) 1813 final.

⁽⁹⁾ OJ C 252, 12.10.2005, p. 10.

- (26) At the request of the Italian authorities, the Commission, by letters of 6 September 2005 and 18 November 2005, transmitted to Italy all the documents mentioned in the second initiating decision, namely those submitted by the anonymous third party.
- (27) On 24 October 2005, the Italian authorities submitted initial observations on the second initiating decision, dealing mainly with the functioning of the overall scheme.
- (28) On 30 November 2005 the Italian authorities submitted further observations, which they supplemented with a number of annexes on 6 December 2005.
- (29) On 11 November 2005, the anonymous third party submitted observations on the second initiating decision. On 19 December 2005 those observations were transmitted to the Italian authorities, who commented on them by letter of 6 March 2006.
- (30) On 3 May 2006 a meeting took place between the Commission and the Italian authorities. Following that meeting, by letter of 23 May 2006, the Commission asked for supplementary information, and reminded the Italian authorities of the requests for information in the second initiating decision.
- (31) On 5 May 2006, the Italian authorities submitted observations on the nature of part of the information, and in particular the question whether the list of projects in the anonymous third party's submission could be attributed to the Italian Court of Auditors.
- (32) On 29 June 2006, the Italian authorities further transmitted the decision of the Interministerial Committee for Economic Programming (CIPE) adopted on 22 March 2006, which they said was intended to ensure that the scheme complied with the rules on state aid to R & D.
- (33) On 11 July 2006, the Italian authorities provided initial observations on the Commission's letter of 23 May 2006.
- (34) On 17 October 2006, the Italian authorities completed their observations on the Commission's letter, and provided a list of projects financed under the scheme. On 24 October 2006 they provided annexes that had been mentioned in the previous letter.
- (35) By letter of 12 December 2006, the Commission requested supplementary information on the reimbursement schedules for the projects in the list provided by the Italian authorities, and suggested discussions at technical level on the granting and reimbursement schedules for each of the projects.
- (36) On 24 April 2007, following a meeting on 30 March, the Italian authorities provided information concerning a full computation for the projects, along with two notes concerning two projects referred to in the second initiating decision (A139 and BA609).
- (37) On 4 May 2007, following a meeting on 26 April 2007, there was a meeting on the premises of the Italian Permanent Representation to the EU, where the Italian authorities allowed a delegation from the Commission to consult documents concerning these two projects, which were classified for national security reasons.
- (38) On 23 May 2007 there was a final meeting on the reimbursement schedules for the individual projects.
- (39) By letter of 21 June 2007 the Commission requested certain information. The letter had attached the schedules for the individual R & D projects, including the conditions for the reimbursement of the loans.
- (40) Italy replied to this letter on 1 August 2007, indicating its agreement to the schedules annexed to the Commission's most recent letter, and providing information on the other issues raised in that letter. Further supplementary information was submitted on 1 October 2007.
- (41) Another meeting with the Italian authorities took place on 5 October 2007, attended by Commissioner Kroes and Minister Bersani.
- (42) The Italian authorities provided further information by letters of 29 October 2007, 27 November 2007 and 12 December 2007.
- (43) The Commission requested supplementary information by letter of 23 November 2007.
- (44) Meetings with France and with the anonymous third party took place on: 21 March 2006, 18 October 2006, 10 November 2006, 22 May 2007, 5 July 2007, 6 September 2007, 14 and 19 November 2007 and 11 February 2008.
- (45) As mentioned in recital 45, the Commission approved the scheme of assistance to R & D in the Italian aeronautical industry in 1986. In its decision, the Commission took note of the fact that the precise mechanisms of the state financing, in particular as regards reimbursement, would be determined for each specific project at a later stage.

2. THE SCHEME APPROVED IN 1986

- (46) In the decision the Commission pointed out that under point 5.5 of the 1986 Framework, individual aid measures had to be notified if they exceeded a threshold of ECU 20 million in eligible costs ⁽¹⁰⁾.
- (47) The Italian authorities never notified any individual case of application of Law No 808/1985 to the Commission under Article 88(3) of the EC Treaty.
- (48) Law No 808/1985, as notified to the Commission, provided for a budget of ITL 690 billion for these measures, to be spent during the period 1985-1989. The scope of the Law originally notified was extended several times after 1989 in new budgetary decisions taken by the Italian Government. None of these extensions were notified to the Commission under Article 88(3) of the EC Treaty.
- (49) When the 1996 Framework entered into force ⁽¹¹⁾ the Italian authorities accepted the appropriate measures ⁽¹²⁾, including new notification thresholds of ECU 25 million in eligible costs and ECU 5 million in aid.
- (50) In 2001 and 2002, the Commission and the Italian authorities exchanged correspondence on the scheme ⁽¹³⁾. This concerned changes to be made to the scheme to bring it into line with the criteria of the 1996 Framework.
- (51) The correspondence resulted in the adoption by Italy of a measure aimed at implementing the criteria of the Framework ⁽¹⁴⁾. This document was sent to the Commission on 22 November 2002, and the Commission accepted the Italian commitments by letter of 18 December 2002.
- (52) Law No 808/1985 provided for three types of State assistance to companies in the aeronautical industry. Of the three there remains only one, which is the subject of the present decision, namely assistance under Article 3(a) of the Law.
- (53) This assistance consists in the financing by the State of part of the costs of aeronautical R & D projects carried out by Italian companies in collaboration with foreign companies.

3. DOUBTS EXPRESSED IN THE FIRST INITIATING DECISION

- (54) The first initiating decision concerned 13 individual R & D projects.
- (55) In the decision the Commission expressed doubts regarding the compatibility of a number of large R & D projects (listed below in recital 60, table 1) that had not been notified in

accordance with the rules governing aid to R & D (the 1986 Framework and the 1996 Framework) ⁽¹⁵⁾.

- (56) In particular, the Commission doubted:
- that part of the work packages of several projects could be classified as precompetitive development: A109 X, A109 D/E/F, MD95 ⁽¹⁶⁾, MD11, DO328 Panels and DO328 Extended Capacity;
 - that the aid to several projects had had an incentive effect: A109 X, A109 D/E/F, MD95, MD11, DO328 Panels and DO328 Extended Capacity.
- (57) The Commission raised no objection to four other projects, on the basis on the information available at that time (DO328, MD11 Winglet, ATR72 and EH101).
- (58) The Commission accepted that one project fell under Article 296(2) of the EC Treaty ([...]) ^(*).
- (59) Finally, the Commission accepted that, on the basis of the information available at that time, two projects were below the thresholds for individual notification (Pressurised Cabins, A119 Koala).
- (60) The table below summarises the information concerning these projects:

Table 1

Projects covered by the first initiating decision

Project	Recipient	Comment
1) Pressurised Cabins	Alenia	At that time considered to be below the threshold for individual notification
2) A109 X	Agusta	Doubts regarding classification of R & D activities and incentive effect
3) A119 Koala	Agusta	At that time considered to be below the threshold for individual notification

⁽¹⁰⁾ See footnote 4.

⁽¹¹⁾ See footnote 3.

⁽¹²⁾ Letter ref. A/322247, 27.3.1996.

⁽¹³⁾ Commission letters refs. D/54984, 30.11.2001; D/50557, 11.2.2002; and D/52819, 4.6.2002; letters from Italy refs. A/30747, 1.2.2002; A/31921, 13.3.2002; and A/57170, 18.12.2002. Case E 48/2001.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Decision (*delibera*) of the Interministerial Committee for Economic Programming (CIPE), 2.8.2002, laying down guidelines for assistance to the aerospace industry.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See footnotes 3 and 4.

⁽¹⁶⁾ For this project a doubt was also raised regarding the possibility of classifying some work packages as industrial research.

^(*) Confidential information related to the protection of essential interest of national security or business secrets.

Project	Recipient	Comment
4) A109 D/E/F	Agusta	Doubts regarding classification of R & D activities and incentive effect
5) MD95	Alenia	Doubts regarding classification of R & D activities and incentive effect
6) [...]	[...]	Falling under Article 296 of the EC Treaty
7) MD11 Lower Panels	Alenia	Doubts regarding classification of R & D activities and incentive effect
8) DO328 Extended Capacity	Aermacchi	Doubts regarding classification of R & D activities and incentive effect
9) DO328 Panels	Aermacchi	Doubts regarding classification of R & D activities and incentive effect
10) DO328	Aermacchi	No objection raised on the basis of the information available at that time
11) MD11 Winglet	Alenia	No objection raised on the basis of the information available at that time
12) ATR72	Alenia	No objection raised on the basis of the information available at that time
13) EH101 Utility	Agusta	No objection raised on the basis of the information available at that time

4. RECIPIENTS

(61) The recipients referred to in the first initiating decision were the following:

- a) Agusta, an enterprise belonging to the Finmeccanica group specialising in helicopters, since renamed AgustaWestland following a merger with Westland;
- b) Alenia, an enterprise belonging to the Finmeccanica group specialising in aero structures;
- c) Aermacchi, an enterprise belonging to the Finmeccanica group since January 2003, which originally specialised in aircraft for military training, and subsequently diversified into aero structures;

(62) On the basis of the information made available after that decision, it emerged that there were two further recipients:

- a) Avio, an enterprise specialising in aero engines; Avio was formerly part of the Fiat Group (as FiatAvio); it was subsequently bought by the private equity group Carlyle, with a minority stake held by Finmeccanica; in 2006 Avio passed under the control of the private equity group Cinven, with Finmeccanica having a stake of 25 %;
- b) Piaggio Aero Industries (Piaggio), an enterprise active in aero structures and engines; it was established in November 1998 when a group of shareholders acquired the assets and took over the projects of the aerospace business of the firm formerly known as Rinaldo Piaggio SpA, as confirmed by the correspondence provided by the Italian authorities between the Ministry of Industry and Piaggio Aero Industries.

5. ITALY'S COMMENTS ON THE DOUBTS EXPRESSED IN THE FIRST INITIATING DECISION

- (63) Italy acknowledged that the information available to the Commission on the projects questioned in the first initiating decision was wholly insufficient. Italy also acknowledged that because of this lack of information the Commission was right to express doubts regarding those projects. To dispel these doubts, Italy provided extensive information on the projects, notably concerning the eligibility of costs at the research stages and the incentive effect of the aid.
- (64) On the A109 D/E/F project, Italy provided a detailed description of the R & D work with regard to the development of the helicopter, in particular concerning the installation of a new type of engine, the skids, the rotor, the avionic systems, and the fuselage. The Italian authorities also provided the schedule for the projects, showing that the innovations in these components came well before their certification, which took place in 1998, and their incorporation into the A109 Power helicopter equipped with the Turbomeca engine, which was certified in June 2001. This succession of events, the Italian authorities argued, also showed that the aid did have an incentive effect, as the technologies were new and had not been installed in any aircraft.
- (65) On the A109 X project, Italy provided detailed information on the R & D work, in particular concerning the tail rotor, the transmission, the main rotor and the fuselage. Italy indicated that the specific features of the A109 X — the main five-blade rotor, the antitorque rotor integrated into the tail boom, and the reducer with face gears — were not present in any other product made by Agusta. The Italian authorities said that the A109 X project was aimed at developing a new generation of helicopters, to be put on the market after 2009.
- (66) On the MD95 and MD11 projects, the Italian authorities acknowledged that the information available to the

Commission at the time of the first initiating decision was not sufficient to distinguish between the two projects, which were separate, even though they both concerned fuselages.

- (67) According to the Italian authorities, the MD95 comprised activities classified as industrial research and precompetitive development, because it allowed Alenia to improve its knowledge of fuselages on large aircraft. The activities were concerned in particular with calculation methodologies for the engineering of fuselages, the development of specific codes for the damage tolerance of the fuselages, and the improvement of general knowledge in the company about some engineering aspects such as fireproof structural solutions and corrosion of materials.
- (68) Concerning the MD11, the Italian authorities indicated that the R & D activities concerned the development of a prototype with preliminary research. It allowed the establishment of databases and of the development processes for the use of new fuselage technologies, which was a new activity for Alenia.
- (69) Secondly, the Italian authorities provided evidence of the incentive effect of the aid concerning these two projects. The aid allowed Alenia to increase its R & D spending significantly over the four years of the projects, from [...] of the total turnover of the company. According to Italy, the projects allowed Alenia to improve its technological knowledge beyond its normal level.
- (70) The Italian authorities said that the two projects regarding the DO328 were DO328 Panels and DO328 Extended Capacity (EC) ⁽¹⁷⁾. A project entitled DO328 Basic concerned the development by Aermacchi of technological know-how for civil aviation. Until the end of the 1980s Aermacchi had been working mostly on aircraft for military training.
- (71) DO328 Panels concerned the development of shells previously produced by the Korean firm Daewoo. The project also included the development of assembly techniques and technologies, some of which were not used in the final product, and the development of two prototypes.
- (72) According to the Italian authorities, DO328 Extended Capacity was aimed at increasing the number of passengers, through the development of a new fuselage, modified wings and modified structures (for instance to take account of different loads), etc. The Italian authorities provided specific information on the work packages singled out in the first initiating decision, detailing the research stages.
- (73) Finally, the Italian authorities provided detailed information on the incentive effect of the aid for the two DO328 projects. They drew attention to the importance of the

projects to Aermacchi: the projects represented almost half of the entire R & D activities of the company in the period 1996-1999. They also said that Aermacchi would not have been able to fund these R & D projects out of its own resources, and would not have been able to participate in the overall project, which was led by Dornier.

6. COMMENTS ON THE FIRST INITIATING DECISION FROM THIRD PARTIES

6.1. Finmeccanica

- (74) Finmeccanica submitted observations after the first initiating decision only ⁽¹⁸⁾, on behalf of all the companies belonging to the group: Agusta, Aermacchi and Alenia. Finmeccanica indicated that it was to all intents and purposes controlled by the Italian State ⁽¹⁹⁾.
- (75) Finmeccanica submitted observations in order to dispel the doubts concerning the six projects expressed by the Commission in the first initiating decision. Finmeccanica wanted to supplement the observations submitted by the Italian Government, with which it agreed and to which it referred, adding the following with reference to the six projects:
- a) A109 D/E/F: According to Finmeccanica the three versions of the project comprised different technological innovations (rotor, landing gear), and were equipped with different engines (Allison, PW and Turbomeca respectively), and this had led to different certification processes for the different versions.
 - b) A109 X: Finmeccanica argued that this helicopter was not simply a different version of the A109, but was a radically new helicopter, which the company intended should be the first of a new generation of twin-engine helicopters to be placed on the market as of 2009.
 - c) MD95: Finmeccanica gave a detailed explanation of why in its view the activities carried out by Alenia in the work packages did indeed qualify as R & D expenditures.
 - d) MD11: Finmeccanica gave a detailed explanation of why in its view the activities carried out by Alenia in the work packages did indeed qualify as R & D expenditures.
 - e) DO328 Panels: On this Aermacchi project, Finmeccanica referred to the observations of the Italian authorities.
 - f) DO328 Extended Capacity: On this Aermacchi project, Finmeccanica referred to the observations of the Italian authorities. It added that the project was

⁽¹⁸⁾ Letter dated 20.2.2004.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Latest information available on the website of the company indicates that the Italian State controls 32,45 % of the shares of the company, which is listed on the Milan Stock Exchange. The rest of the shares are in the hands of private and institutional investors.

⁽¹⁷⁾ To distinguish them from the DO328 Basic. The three projects are included in the final list in recital 281, table 4.

fundamentally different to the preceding one, as it led to the production of two prototypes, which could still be seen on the company's website.

(76) Concerning the incentive effect of the aid received for these projects, Finmeccanica submitted the following:

- a) For the two helicopters (A109 D/E/F and A109 X), Finmeccanica submitted that in its view the company would not have been able to carry out the projects without the aid, because of the risks involved, associated with the prospect of return only over a long period of time. Second, Finmeccanica submitted that the expenditure and personnel devoted to R & D at Agusta had increased by four percentage points in the period from 1995 to 1999.
- b) Finmeccanica said that the avionics projects conducted by Alenia (MD11 and MD95) had enabled Alenia to specialise in the development of fuselage sub-systems. Alenia had had to significantly upgrade its technological know-how for prototyping and testing in both development processes.
- c) The avionics projects conducted by Aermacchi (DO328 Panels and DO328 Extended Capacity), Finmeccanica said, were not part of the core business of the company, which was specialised in the military sector, and especially aircraft for the training of pilots. The aid had enabled Aermacchi to embark upon R & D in the civilian area which was clearly additional to the R & D otherwise carried out by the company.

6.2. France

(77) The French authorities submitted observations after the first initiating decision only⁽²⁰⁾. The French authorities raised three issues: a) they drew attention to the aid instrument, which in their view was a repayable advance; b) they asked that reimbursement be ensured; and c) they indicated a number of projects not mentioned in the decision which might potentially have received aid under the scheme and which they believed Italy had failed to notify individually.

6.3. The anonymous third party

(78) The anonymous third party submitted observations in the proceedings twice, once after the first initiating decision and again after the second initiating decision.

(79) Its observations on the first initiating decision were as follows.

(80) The third party confirmed that in its view the doubts expressed by the Commission regarding the six projects were well founded.

(81) It said that the Commission ought to widen the scope of the investigation to include various other projects (including the AB139, BA609 and A119 helicopters).

(82) The third party asked the Commission to verify that aid granted under Law No 808/1985 had indeed been applied to the projects in question, and that other projects had been excluded because of a lack of prototypes or a lack of participation on the part of Italian industry.

(83) It asked the Commission to verify the amounts of money actually associated with the six projects under assessment.

(84) It asked the Commission to request Italy to suspend payment in respect of the projects under way.

(85) It asked the Commission to verify the aid instrument used under Law No 808/1985, and on that basis to request the repayment of aid paid unlawfully.

(86) It asked the Commission to ensure that Law No 808/1985 was amended so as to ensure repayment on financial terms consistent with the R & D framework.

(87) It asked the Commission to impose a yearly reporting obligation, together with effective auditing measures to be carried out by the Commission if necessary.

(88) With its observations the anonymous third party supplied a number of documents, among others the reports on the state of the aerospace industry made by the Minister of Industry to the Italian Parliament, years 1996 to 2001. From the information in those reports the anonymous third party also argued in particular that the number of non-notified projects was much larger than the six projects under assessment in the proceedings.

7. OBSERVATIONS FROM ITALY REGARDING THE COMMENTS FROM THIRD PARTIES ON THE FIRST INITIATING DECISION

(89) Italy did not put forward any observations regarding the comments from Finmeccanica.

(90) Regarding the comments from France and the anonymous third party, Italy observed, first, that they went far beyond the scope of the proceedings. Italy complained that these attempts to widen the scope of the proceedings were not supported by evidence.

⁽²⁰⁾ Letter dated 20.2.2004

- (91) Italy reiterated that in its view the scheme constituted existing aid, because it had been approved in 1986 ⁽²¹⁾, and because the Commission had accepted in 2002 that it had in effect been brought into line with the rules now governing aid to R & D (see recital 50). As it had been declared compatible, the scheme could not then be challenged in proceedings that were concerned only with individual measures adopted under it, unless it was shown that the original decision to approve the scheme was based on faulty information, in which case the decision might be revoked in accordance with Article 9 of the Procedural Regulation.
- (92) Second, Italy said that in its view the aid instrument was compatible with the EC Treaty.
- (93) The anonymous third party, Italy argued, was wrong to base itself on the reports to Parliament on the implementation of Law No 808/1985, because the figures indicated in the reports were not those actually granted for the projects. In the reports the Ministry had included its own targets for projects that could be financed under Law No 808/1985. However, in the budgetary process, the normal practice was that these targets were not covered by the available funding, which had been at levels far below those indicated in the abovementioned reports. The amounts indicated in the reports for the individual projects were also merely targets, because the Ministry decided the amount of aid actually to be granted to the individual project only after it had received the final budget, which, as already said, was usually normally far below the levels called for.
- (94) Italy contested the argument put forward by France and by the anonymous third party according to which aid recipients might not be required to reimburse the aid. According to Italy, reimbursements had to be made in accordance with the schedules laid down in the granting decisions. Under domestic law the State could renounce such a claim only in the specific case of liquidation of a company.
- (95) The payments had been made using what were known as 'commitment limits' (*limiti d'impegno*), under which payments were made to the recipient after the expenses were incurred, beginning the year after the first year of expenditure and continuing for a period of 10 to 15 years. Reimbursement started one year after the end of the period of payment, that is to say 11 or 16 years after the start of the project.
- (96) Concerning the comments made by the anonymous third party on the specific R & D projects, Italy in the first place referred back to the observations it had submitted in response to the initiating decision.
- (97) Second, in reply to the comments of the anonymous third party, Italy provided observations on the specific projects. Concerning the A109 X, Italy indicated that the project concerned the development of technologies that would be applied in helicopters only after a long period of development. The name A109 X was used as a generic name; when the development was finished, the resulting helicopter would be radically new.
- (98) The A109 Power project had been considered at one point, but had never been supported under Law No 808/1985.
- (99) As regards the funding for the A109 X, the figure referred to by the anonymous third party was only a forecast. The aid actually granted towards the project was EUR 33,6 million; the additional ITL 49 billion for the period 2002-2005 which the anonymous third party had referred to had never been paid.
- (100) Concerning the A109 D/E/F, Italy contested the argument put forward by the anonymous third party that this in reality related to the A109 Power, certified in 1996. The main objective of the project was to develop the new A109 F version, with a new engine, rotor and skids, which was subsequently certified in June 2001, 30 months after the end of the R & D project.
- (101) In reply to the allegations by the anonymous third party regarding the development of Agusta, Italy wrote that the information and data provided by the anonymous third party were not correct. Agusta had an average share of around [20-30 %] of the European market for light twin-engine helicopters in the period 1994-2000, compared to over 60 % for its main competitor, Eurocopter ⁽²²⁾. Its turnover derived mainly from the military sector ([> 70 %]). In terms of products, Agusta had only one helicopter in two of the segments, compared to Eurocopters three or four in each of these segments. In the view of the Italian authorities, Agusta was a company that had been able to develop from being a minor player in the sector into a full competitor, thanks to legal and compatible aid towards R & D, to strategic alliances and to technological innovation.
- (102) Finally, the observations from France and the anonymous third party concerning the existence of other non-notified projects were based on a misinterpretation of the reports to Parliament. Italy also commented on some of the projects referred to by the anonymous third party.
- (103) According to Italy, some of these projects had never been funded; some had received aid below the threshold for individual notification; some were military; some others were already within the scope of the proceedings (MD95 and MD11); while another had been excluded by the Commission in the decision to open proceedings.

⁽²¹⁾ Letter ref. SG(86) D/5685, 14.5.1986.

⁽²²⁾ A European competitor of Agusta in the helicopter industry.

(104) Given the doubts raised in the second initiating decision, and the subsequent discussions on the final list of non-notified projects, it is not necessary to detail these projects at this stage in the Decision.

8. FRESH DOUBTS

(105) In the first initiating decision the Commission expressed doubts regarding the R & D content of six projects and regarding their incentive effect.

(106) The Commission there pointed out that its assessment of the R & D projects had to take account of the following factors:

- a) the time that had passed since the date of the granting;
- b) the difficulty of making a reasonable assessment of the incentive effect of the projects at that stage (in 2003), applying the criteria of the 1986 and 1996 Frameworks in the scientific, technical and economic context of the aeronautical industry 10 to 15 years before;
- c) the general terms in which some of the rules in the 1986 Framework were expressed.

(107) The Italian authorities provided detailed information about the activities eligible for aid. They acknowledged that on the basis of the information available to the Commission at the time the Commission's doubts were justified.

(108) With the information provided, the Commission was now in a better position to understand the content of the different projects and in particular of the work packages that were identified in the first initiating decision.

(109) As regards the classification of the activities as eligible R & D activities, the Commission could now say that the information provided by Italy on each project allowed a clear distinction to be made between industrial research and precompetitive development.

(110) The Commission also accepted that the information supplied by Italy concerning the incentive effect of the aid given for these projects was sufficient to show that the recipients would not have carried out the projects without the aid.

(111) However, this assessment was made on the basis of the information available at the time, notably concerning the number of projects to be assessed.

(112) When it reached these conclusions, the Commission took it that the Italian authorities were right to describe the form of the aid as that of a soft loan, with the principal always being fully reimbursable.

(113) This assumption was a decisive factor in the Commission's assessment, in particular because when it has to be determined whether an individual aid measure exceeds the notification threshold it is essential to establish the gross grant equivalent of the aid.

(114) Since the Commission began investigating the original complaint regarding the application of Law No 808/1985, the Italian authorities have maintained that at least in the 13 cases referred to in the first initiating decision aid has been granted in the form of soft loans, which are interest-free but always reimbursable in full.

(115) France and the anonymous third party challenged this understanding of the matter, contending that the principal had to be repaid only to the extent the programmes concerned were commercial successes ⁽²³⁾.

(116) The Commission tried to establish which view was the correct one, at least for the six cases that were the subject of the proceedings in which France and the anonymous third party had intervened.

(117) The Commission accordingly had to turn to the detailed implementing mechanisms which, as provided in the original Law No 808/1985 and in the Commission's 1986 decision on the Law ⁽²⁴⁾, were to be determined in further rules.

(118) In order to ascertain in detail whether and in what way the loans had to be repaid, the Commission asked the Italian authorities to provide it with a copy of each of the decisions (*provvedimenti di concessione*) granting aid in the six cases.

(119) The Italian authorities first provided the Commission with extracts from the granting decisions. Among other things the extracts did not include the recitals to the decisions. The Italian authorities maintained that the recitals could not be provided to the Commission for reasons of national security. The recitals of granting decisions under Law No 808/1985, they said, were common to civilian and military projects. Even though the six cases related to civilian aircraft, therefore, the recitals to the granting decisions also referred to matters of national security.

(120) The extracts from the granting decisions provided by the Italian authorities did not enable the Commission to arrive at a definitive view of the conditions for the reimbursement of the loans.

(121) In particular, the clause concerning reimbursement ⁽²⁵⁾ was worded in an ambiguous manner: it first stated that the aid 'will be reimbursed in progressive instalments computed on the basis of revenues deriving from sales' (*verrà restituito mediante quote progressive calcolate sulla base degli incassi*

⁽²³⁾ No-one denied that the loans were interest-free.

⁽²⁴⁾ Letter ref. SG(86) D/5685, 14.5.1986.

⁽²⁵⁾ Numbered Article 3 in all the granting decisions.

relativi alle vendite), but then added that this would be done in accordance with the mechanisms laid down in the granting decision, which included a chart with a fixed schedule for reimbursement of 100 % of the principal.

- (122) No provision that might reconcile these two apparently inconsistent aspects appeared in any of the extracts provided.

9. INFORMATION INJUNCTION

- (123) Since a provision of this kind might appear in the missing parts of the decisions, the Commission issued an information injunction requiring that the full texts of the decisions be produced ⁽²⁶⁾.

- (124) Italy replied to the information injunction ⁽²⁷⁾ by stating that in its view it had sent the Commission all the relevant information concerning the granting decisions. It added that the recitals to the decisions referred to matters of national security, which could not be disclosed to any third party, and not even to the recipient of the aid. Italy concluded that in its view the recitals could not in any circumstances contain any clause additional to those in the main text.

- (125) It should be pointed out that Italy had not responded positively to the information injunction. In other words, it continued to refuse access to the full text of documents requested by the Commission.

- (126) However, when it subsequently submitted observations in reply to the extension of the proceedings, Italy did in fact transmit all the requested documents. In the last analysis, therefore, it can be said that Italy did comply with the information injunction.

- (127) To conclude on this point, the Commission would observe that Italy's reply did not satisfy the requirements of Article 12 of the Procedural Regulation. In addition, the argument that the recitals concerned matters of national security, and consequently could not be disclosed to the recipient, has been proved wrong, because from the copies that Italy subsequently sent the Commission it is clear that the recipients received — and signed — full copies of the granting decisions.

- (128) However, Italy did eventually provide the information requested.

10. DOUBTS EXPRESSED IN THE DECISION TO EXTEND PROCEEDINGS (THE SECOND INITIATING DECISION)

- (129) As explained in the second initiating decision, several new issues arose in the course of the proceedings ⁽²⁸⁾.

- (130) First, the Commission became aware of the existence of two documents indicating that the loans were not being reimbursed.

- (131) The first document was submitted by the anonymous third party ⁽²⁹⁾. This was a report by a major commercial bank concerning Finmeccanica's financial position. In this report, dated 12 August 2004, [the investment bank] wrote that Finmeccanica had stated that 'the principal has to be repaid only once deliveries exceed a certain ([...]) volume, so that Finmeccanica has very low repayments in the first 15 years and is much less likely to have to repay all of the advance'.

- (132) The second document was a report of the Italian Court of Auditors (*Corte dei Conti*) on the application of Law No 808/1985 ⁽³⁰⁾. In section 6 of this document, the Court of Auditors analysed the position regarding the reimbursement of loans.

- (133) The report referred to a ministerial order ⁽³¹⁾ that laid down the precise mechanism for the reimbursement of loans granted under Law No 808/1985. The order has never been provided to the Commission by the Italian authorities, and does not seem to have been made public even in Italy. The Court of Auditors referred to it only by the number of its registration at the Court.

- (134) According to the Court of Auditors, the mechanism laid down in the ministerial order required in particular that the planned reimbursements be set out in a chart showing the instalments to be paid back to the State. However, this schedule of repayments did not have to be adhered to if the programme was not technically or economically successful in the manner originally expected.

⁽²⁸⁾ See in particular section 2.3 of the second decision.

⁽²⁹⁾ Letter dated 20.9.2004, registered by the Commission as incoming mail on 22.9.2004. The document was subsequently transmitted to Italy.

⁽³⁰⁾ Corte dei Conti, *Indagine sulla promozione dello sviluppo tecnologico dell'industria aeronautica ed aumento dei livelli occupazionali nel settore di cui alla legge 24 dicembre 1985, n. 808*. Available at that time on the website of the Court of Auditors at http://www.corteconti.it/Ricerca-e-1/Gli-Atti-d/Controllo-/Documenti/Sezione-ce1/Anno-2003/Secondo-co/allegati-d7/indagine-industria-aeronautica.doc_cvt.htm.

⁽³¹⁾ Order (*decreto*) of the Minister for Industry, Commerce and Crafts of 14 March 1988, registered at the Court of Auditors the following 20 July, registration number 11 ind. fg. 154. According to annexes to several annual reports to Parliament on the application of the Law, the title of the order was 'General criteria for the mechanisms and schedule for the granting of funding under Article 3 of Law No 808 of 24 December 1985 and conditions and manner of repayment' (Criteri generali per modalità e tempi di erogazione, condizioni e modo di restituzione dei finanziamenti ex art. 3 della legge 808 del 24 dicembre 1985).

⁽²⁶⁾ Commission letter ref. C(2004) 5009, 10.12.2004.

⁽²⁷⁾ Letter by Mr Marzano, Minister for Productive Activities, to Ms Kroes, dated 14.1.2005, forwarded to the Commission by the Italian Permanent Representation by letter dated 19.1.2005.

- (135) The report of the Court of Auditors also stated that the proportion of loans actually reimbursed ranged from 0,86 % to 80,18 %, and that the overall proportion of reimbursement of the total loans paid out was 68,92 %; the Court said that in some cases reimbursements had been delayed or had not taken place ⁽³²⁾.
- (136) Second, France and the anonymous third party submitted lists of other projects which they said had received aid and which Italy had failed to notify. The figures they gave were for the amounts of the loans rather than gross grant equivalents. The relationship between the amounts of loans and their gross grant equivalents depends on the manner of reimbursement of the aid. As has been explained in paragraphs 0 to 0, the third parties and the Italian authorities disagreed on these mechanisms.
- (137) In reply to question on this point the Italian authorities explained that the figures from the third parties were at least in part incorrect. In particular, the reports that the anonymous third party cited as its main sources merely set out hypotheses for possible future aid. Not all the projects considered for aid in this report had actually been launched. Some of the projects that had in fact been initiated had not received aid, or had received less than was initially foreseen in the reports. Lastly, some of the projects were of a military nature.
- (138) Third, the Commission learned of two further projects — the AB139 and BA609 — and raised doubts in particular as to whether they could be classified as military, as the Italian authorities claimed.
- (139) To summarise, since the information available was not conclusive, and since the Commission had become aware of documents and information that raised new issues, the Commission decided to widen the scope of the Article 88(2) proceedings (in the second initiating decision).
- (140) In the second initiating decision, the Commission expressed three main concerns.
- (141) The first was a question as to the nature of the aid instrument, namely whether the loans provided under Law No 808/1985 were always fully reimbursed.
- (142) The Commission also seriously doubted whether the Italian authorities had informed it of all individual cases exceeding the thresholds for individual notification, under the terms of the initial decision of 1986 and of the appropriate measures accepted by Italy in 1996.
- (143) Finally, the Commission seriously doubted whether the AB139 and BA609 projects could be qualified as military, as the Italian authorities claimed.
- (144) The second initiating decision stated clearly that, although the original investigation concerned only six cases, and although the comments provided by third parties were submitted within the scope of those proceedings, it was clear that the new doubts raised in the comments submitted went beyond the six cases.
- (145) The doubts now expressed related to the entire application of Law No 808/1985. Thus they concerned all individual cases in which the Law had been applied, and among them all of the 13 cases ⁽³³⁾, including those that had been considered not to require prior notification and those to which the Commission had raised no objection in its decision of 1 October 2003.
- (146) The second initiating decision did not concern projects below the thresholds for individual notification, with the following exception. The Commission's doubts did apply to the application of Law No 808/1985 including all individual decisions granting aid below the individual notification threshold that had been taken since 22 November 2002.
- (147) Finally, the second initiating decision indicated clearly that its scope was limited to individual aid measures for civilian projects.
- (148) The Commission observed that, at that stage of its analysis, it considered that projects which consisted in modifying a military product to adapt it to civilian use should be considered as civilian.

11. ITALY'S OBSERVATIONS ON THE SECOND INITIATING DECISION

a) *Concerning procedure*

- (149) In the first place, Italy indicated it was presenting its observations together with Finmeccanica.
- (150) Italy pointed out that in the second initiating decision the Commission had acknowledged that the aid scheme introduced by Law No 808/1985 constituted an existing aid measure, as it had been approved by the Commission in 1986 and again in 2002.
- (151) Italy observed that the second initiating decision was based either on Article 16 of the Procedural Regulation or on Article 13.
- (152) Italy did not agree that there had been misuse of aid: that concept would apply only to misuse by the recipient of the aid it had received. All the aid granted under the scheme had been used for the purpose it was granted for. Italy

⁽³²⁾ It is unclear however which individual cases the Court of Auditors was referring to, and what was the basis for the computation of the average.

⁽³³⁾ With the exception of the case which was judged to be of military nature.

objected to the term 'misuse' especially with regard to the individual aid granted after 20 November 2002.

the aid. The recipient had to sign a clause requiring it to repay the principal.

(153) If the Commission had wanted to examine the aid granted in each case under the scheme, it should have done so in the context of the constant review of existing aid schemes provided for in Article 88(1) of the EC Treaty.

(162) Italy said the Commission had expressed doubts regarding reimbursement partly because of the report from [the investment bank] on Finmeccanica referred to in the second initiating decision.

(154) Proceedings under Article 88(2) of the Treaty were not possible under the Procedural Regulation unless the cases were identified in a precise and specific manner.

(163) But that report, according to Italy, made it clear that the sentence quoted in the second initiating decision — 'the principal has to be repaid only once deliveries exceed a certain (high) volume, so that Finmeccanica has very low repayments in the first 15 years and is much less likely to have to repay all of the advance' — was preceded by a sentence that showed that it referred to the company's defence business.

(155) Concluding on the procedural aspects, Italy observed that the second initiating decision generated a situation of legal uncertainty because of the lack of a clear definition of its scope.

(164) Finally, Italy said, the Commission had doubts regarding reimbursement because it believed Italy had refused access to the full texts of the granting decisions.

b) *Development of the scheme*

(156) In its reply to the second initiating decision, Italy clarified the history of the scheme. Military programmes had historically been dealt with partly by the Ministry of Industry.

(165) Italy reiterated that the recitals to all the granting decisions were identical, and this included those for military projects. Furthermore, in Italy's view the recitals omitted could not contain any conditions additional to what was in the main text of the decisions themselves.

(157) Italy summarised the way the scheme had been adapted to the 1996 Framework and to the appropriate measures. It sketched the essential outline of the scheme in the future, which still needed to be transposed into a new internal regulation ⁽³⁴⁾.

(166) The aid instrument used was a soft loan, with fixed reimbursement schedules that were always adhered to, with a few limited exceptions. Furthermore, the loans had been paid out to recipients under 'commitment limits' over 10 to 15 years, or immediately in a single payment, but in this second case there was involvement on the part of a bank, which had to be discounted. Reimbursement started the first year after the last payment.

(158) Italy commented on the question of reimbursement. For an authentic interpretation of the Court of Auditors report referred to in the second initiating decision, the Italian authorities had approached the Court itself. In reply the Court said, first and foremost, that the report was concerned only with the period up to 1998. Given the limited period covered, it would be wrong to draw general conclusions.

(167) To conclude on the aid instrument and the reimbursement, Italy maintained that the instrument used was a soft loan.

(159) In the second place, the Court said that the report confirmed that for all projects sales had started and reimbursements had been made, though with some delays.

(168) Italy also submitted observations on the two helicopters referred to in the second initiating decision (the AB139 and the BA609).

(160) Lastly, as regards the possibility that the State might renounce its claim (which would be the case if the loans were not to be reimbursed), the Court confirmed that it was a general principle of Italian public administration that claims could not be abandoned. A ministerial order, the Court said, could not make provision for any such abandonment. In the report the Court had not mentioned any possibility that the public administration might renounce its claim to reimbursement.

(169) Along with these observations, Italy provided the documents requested concerning the legal basis:

a) decision (*delibera*) of the Interministerial Committee on Economic Programming, dated 15 April 1986, on the initial implementation of Law No 808/1985;

b) order (*decreto*) of the Minister for Industry, dated 8 June 1986, on the mechanisms for the submission of applications for aid;

c) order of the Minister of the Treasury, dated 7 February 1987, on the role of Mediocredito Centrale ⁽³⁵⁾;

(161) Italy acknowledged that there had been delays in reimbursement in a few cases, but added that a schedule for reimbursement was laid down in the decision to grant

⁽³⁴⁾ Italy submitted a new notification for the future scheme on 22.2.2008 (N 101/08).

⁽³⁵⁾ This aspect of the proceedings has been discontinued.

- d) order of the Minister for Industry, dated 14 March 1988, detailing further criteria for the implementation of Law No 808/1985 ⁽³⁶⁾;
- e) press release issued by the Interministerial Committee on Industrial Policy (CIPI), dated 30 May 1991, on collaboration with foreign partners;
- f) Law No 181 of 4 June 1991 refinancing the scheme;
- g) Law No 237 of 19 July 1993 refinancing the scheme;
- h) decision of the Interministerial Committee on Industrial Policy dated 28 December 1993, with new instructions for the implementation of the scheme;
- i) Law No 644 of 22 November 1994, converting the aid instrument into commitment limits;
- j) order of the Minister for Industry, dated 31 May 1995, on non-R & D aspects of the scheme;
- k) decision of the Interministerial Committee on Economic Programming, dated 8 August 1996, modifying the conditions for eligibility and setting priorities;
- l) Law No 266 of 7 August 1997 refinancing the scheme; this Law also funded the European fighter aircraft (EFA) programme;
- m) decision of the Interministerial Committee on Economic Programming, dated 22 December 1998, amending the priorities and criteria for eligibility;
- n) order of the Prime Minister, dated 6 August 1999, keeping the administrative management of the scheme in the hands of the Government;
- o) Law No 388 of 23 December 2000 refinancing the scheme;
- p) decision of the Interministerial Committee on Economic Programming, dated 2 August 2002, amending the selection criteria, the activities eligible and the intensity of the aid.

(170) Italy also provided a full picture of the overall funding of the scheme, which is shown in the table below (the amounts are expressed in ITL billion):

Table 2

Budget for Law No 808/1985

Law	'93	'94	'95	'96	'97	'98	'99	'00	'01	'02	'03	'04	After	Total
808/85														690
181/91														150
237/93	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50				500
237/93		50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50			500
644/94		25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25			250
644/94			50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50		500
266/97						105	105	105	105	105	105	105	315	1 050
488/99									45	45	45	45	495	675
488/99										44	44	44	528	660
388/00										40	40	40	480	600
350/03												19,3	270,2	290
Total														5 865

⁽³⁶⁾ This is the order referred to in the second decision.

(171) Up to 22 June 2005, the date of the second initiating decision, out of the total amount of EUR 3 029 million (corresponding to ITL 5 865 billion), according to Italy, EUR 2 878 million had been used, with EUR 151 million not yet committed.

(172) Italy also specified the breakdown of expenditure:

- a) EUR 1 311 million had been used for projects relating to national security;
- b) EUR 1 327 million had been used for civilian projects approved up to November 2002;
- c) EUR 239 million had been used for civilian projects approved after November 2002.

(173) According to Italy, EUR 510 million went to fund projects of European interest.

(174) Italy also responded to the request for a list of all civilian projects funded under Law No 808/1985 that were above the thresholds for individual notification, and a complete list of all projects funded since 22 November 2002. In its letter of 24 October 2005, Italy submitted observations on the projects referred to in the second initiating decision.

(175) Italy stated that there were no other aid projects above the thresholds for individual notification.

(176) Italy provided a table listing the programmes relating to national security which had been funded by the scheme.

(177) Finally, concerning delays in the reimbursement of specific projects, Italy said that there had been difficulties with only two projects, DO328 Panels and DO328 Extended Capacity. The project, conducted by Aermacchi, had had problems because of the failure of the main partner, Fairchild Dornier GmbH.

12. COMMENTS BY THE ANONYMOUS THIRD PARTY ON THE SECOND INITIATING DECISION

(178) The observations and requests put forward by the anonymous third party after the second initiating decision are set out below.

(179) The third party asked the Commission to declare the aid granted under Law No 808/1985 to be unlawful, and accordingly to order its recovery on the basis of Article 11 of the Procedural Regulation.

(180) It asked the Commission to verify the aid instruments used under the scheme.

(181) It asked the Commission to recover any aid granted in violation of state aid rules, on the basis of Article 14 of the Procedural Regulation.

(182) It asked the Commission to require a suspension of future payments under the scheme, on the grounds that there was no proper evidence to show that the aid would be used for R & D purposes.

(183) It asked the Commission to ensure that Law No 808/1985 was amended so that aid was reimbursed on financial terms consistent with the R & D framework.

(184) It asked the Commission to widen its investigation further in order to verify the compatibility with the State aid rules of other schemes applying in the aerospace industry in Italy, and to ensure that such schemes were not used to circumvent the Commission's decision on Law No 808/1985.

(185) It asked the Commission to require the Italian Government to present a full report every year, which the Commission might if necessary ask to have audited.

(186) The anonymous third party annexed a number of documents to its observations, among them the report from the Italian Court of Auditors on the implementation of Law No 808/1985, dated 12 August 2003, with a table referring to 164 projects; the text of the ministerial order dated 14 March 1988; the text of the laws refinancing Law No 808/1985; and extracts from the annual reports of Avio and Finmeccanica for 2003 and 2004.

13. OBSERVATIONS SUBMITTED BY ITALY REGARDING THE ANONYMOUS THIRD PARTY'S COMMENTS ON THE SECOND INITIATING DECISION

(187) Following the comments of the anonymous third party, the Italian authorities asked for clarification of the scope of the proceedings: did they relate to the whole scheme, or only to aid granted under the scheme in those cases that had to be notified to the Commission individually?

(188) Italy contended that the figures put forward by the anonymous third party, taken from the Ministry's website, covered ground broader than this particular scheme alone. They included not just aid granted under Law No 808/1985 but also other industrial programmes relating to national security ([...]) which were funded under other legislation.

(189) [...]

(190) Italy argued that the fact that the scheme introduced by Law No 808/1985 allowed for funding of both civilian and military programmes had confused the anonymous third party. The Court of Auditors had been similarly misled in its report on Law No 808/1985.

(191) Italy provided the following table comparing the funding referred to in the reports cited by the anonymous third party and the funding provided under Law No 808/1985.

Table 3

Comparison between sources of information on funding under Law No 808/1985

(EUR million)

Commitments	2000	2001	2002	2003
2004 report on incentives (p. 181)	287	492	710	501
Measures under Law No 808/1985	18	94	280	189
Difference	269	398	430	312

(192) Italy also provided a list of relevant military programmes funded in these years, which it said might explain the discrepancies: [...].

(193) Concerning the annual report of Finmeccanica for the year 2003 referred to by the anonymous third party, Italy argued that a large part of the increase in R & D expenditures was due to the incorporation of Aermacchi into the company (around [...]).

(194) Italy acknowledged that there had been delays in some reimbursements, which it said were due primarily to the long periods of payment (10 to 15 years), so that they should rather be interpreted as late reimbursements.

(195) Italy acknowledged that there were difficulties with one specific project, the DO328 Extended Capacity, but said it was out of the question that the State should abandon any claim.

(196) In reply to the specific points raised by the anonymous third party, the Italian authorities provided the following arguments.

(197) The request by the anonymous third party that the Commission should declare unlawful the aid given to the six projects on which it had raised doubts in the first initiating decision, and require that the aid be recovered, was not acceptable. It was contrary to Article 11 of the Procedural Regulation.

(198) According to Italy, the proceedings were concerned only with individual applications of the scheme, the projects that the Commission had specifically identified, which were the 13 projects referred to in the first initiating decision. Italy had already suspended payments towards those projects pending a final decision by the Commission.

(199) As regards the anonymous third party's request that the Commission impose monitoring conditions and other control measures on a yearly basis, the Italian Government said it was ready to present any report called for under Article 21 of the Procedural Regulation. But the Italian authorities did not agree that additional reporting obligations should be imposed: that would be disproportionate and unfair by comparison with the obligations that other Member States had to comply with in respect of aid schemes in the same industry.

(200) The anonymous third party referred in its observations to the 2004 annual report of Avio, quoting in particular the phrase 'If no revenues are earned, no reimbursement is due'. The Italian authorities said they had asked the company for an explanation. The lawyer consulted by Avio had confirmed that the recipients of aid under the scheme were obliged to reimburse the sums received in full, irrespective of the success of the programme. Avio had stated that the statements in its 2004 annual report were based on an incorrect interpretation of the scheme, and would be modified in the following annual report.

(201) Italy provided information on the other legislation mentioned by the anonymous third party in its observations, indicating that Law No 421/96, Law No 388/00, the 2003 Finance Law and Law No 140/99 (which related specifically to military transport aircraft) were concerned only with the funding of military projects relating to national security.

(202) On the report by the Court of Auditors, Italy first noted that the anonymous third party had annexed to its comments two 'tables or charts extracted from fig. 3 and fig. 5' of the report. These were Excel files that did not appear in the version referred to in the second initiating decision, but only in the Word version of the report. It was not clear by what investigative methods the anonymous third party had secured access to these tables.

(203) Italy stressed that in its view it was completely inappropriate to attribute these figures to the Court of Auditors, given that they did not appear as such in the text of the report.

(204) Nevertheless, Italy did provide some observations on the content of the tables, which referred to 164 granting decisions for a total of around EUR 3 billion.

(205) There were several mistakes in that total, including sums counted twice and figures for aid that had not been granted. The tables also showed projects relating to

national security, including some that were funded under other laws and were thus outside the scope of the scheme. The correct figure for aid granted on the basis of the scheme was the one supplied in the observations submitted by Italy [...].

14. ASSESSMENT

- (206) In order to assess the case the Commission will first consider whether there is State aid and how its compatibility should be assessed.
- (207) Second, the Commission will clarify the scope of these proceedings and the correct procedure to be followed.
- (208) Third, the Commission will assess whether the doubts expressed in the first initiating decision can be dispelled.
- (209) Fourth, the decision will list the projects to which it relates and on the basis of the information available will assess their compatibility, including any conditions to be imposed in order to ensure that they are properly applied.
- (210) Finally, the Commission will draw conclusions on the individual projects, and explain why its conclusions do not concern the two helicopters whose military character was questioned in the second initiating decision.
- 14.1. Existence of aid within the meaning of Article 87(1) of the EC Treaty and applicable compatibility guidelines**
- (211) A measure constitutes aid caught by Article 87(1) of the EC Treaty if state resources are used in a manner that distorts or threatens to distort competition by favouring certain undertakings, and trade between Member States is affected.
- (212) As indicated in the first and second initiating decisions, the measures under assessment constitute aid. This assessment has not been disputed by Italy, or by any of the parties that have intervened in the proceedings.
- (213) The loans provided under Law No 808/1985 are clearly selective, because they benefit only companies operating in the aeronautical sector.
- (214) These loans are provided via funds coming from the State budget, and therefore involve the use of state resources.
- (215) The loans do not bear interest, thus conferring an advantage on companies receiving them over companies that have to finance their projects on market terms. In a soft loan the element of advantage is the difference between the interest that the undertaking would have to pay on an equivalent loan on commercial terms and the special low interest rate, which in the present case is zero. The principal is always reimbursed according to the schedule fixed at the time of granting, and the aid is the sum of the interest payments forgone by the State.
- (216) In most cases, the projects involved here concern products where there is large-scale intra-Community trade (helicopters, small aircraft, or sometimes parts of larger aircraft).
- (217) The support granted by Italy to R & D projects in the aeronautical industry under Law No 808/1985 thus falls within the scope of Article 87(1) of the EC Treaty.
- (218) Italy and the intervening parties also agree that the compatibility of the aid with the Treaty should be assessed on the basis of the rules concerning the application of Article 87(3)(c) to R & D aid.
- (219) The aid under assessment was granted unlawfully, as it was never notified by Italy.
- (220) The Community framework for state aid for research and development and innovation (the 2006 Framework) ⁽³⁷⁾ clearly indicates, in line with the Commission notice on the determination of the applicable rules for the assessment of unlawful State aid ⁽³⁸⁾, that in the case of non-notified aid the Commission will apply:
- the 2006 Framework if the aid was granted after its entry into force,
 - in all other cases, the framework in force when the aid was granted.,
- (221) To assess the compatibility of these projects with Article 87(3)(c) of the EC Treaty, therefore, the Commission will apply the 1986 Framework or the 1996 Framework as the case may be, depending on the date on which the aid was granted.
- 14.2. The subject-matter of the Decision**
- (222) This Decision is concerned only with individual aid granted by Italy to civilian R & D projects in the aeronautical industry under Law No 808/1985.

⁽³⁷⁾ OJ C 323, 30.12.2006, p. 1.

⁽³⁸⁾ OJ C 119, 22.5.2002, p. 22.

- (223) It relates in the first place to the six projects regarding which the Commission expressed specific doubts in the first initiating decision.
- (224) It also relates to the other projects referred to in the first initiating decision, in so far as the information subsequently assembled concerning them allows a different assessment to be made, especially as regards the obligation of individual notification.
- (225) Third, the Decision relates to other individual aid granted by Italy for projects above the notification thresholds set by the R & D frameworks of 1986 and 1996. These projects were not known to the Commission at the time of the first initiating decision. Some of them were mentioned in the second initiating decision as possible cases of non-notified individual aid.
- (226) It cannot be argued, as Italy seeks to do, that investigation proceedings must define from the outset all the projects to which they relate, because when it initiates the proceedings the Commission does not necessarily know how many projects may be concerned.
- (227) The present proceedings are concerned with individual applications of a scheme, individual cases that Italy should have notified but did not notify. The scale of Italy's failure to notify is exceptional: among other things, Italy failed to notify any of the projects over a period of more than ten years. As a consequence of this persistent violation of the obligation to notify laid down in Article 88(3), the Commission clearly indicated in the second initiating decision, in the light of the comments received from third parties and on the basis of the information available, that the proceedings related to all individual projects under the scheme that ought to have been notified individually.
- (228) The second initiating decision did not set any specific date with effect from which individual projects that had not been notified were to begin to be included in the scope of the proceedings and to be considered individual applications of Law No 808/1985. In any event, the Italian authorities frequently allowed the recipient not to reimburse the aid in full, and this must be considered to constitute new aid.
- (229) It is worth drawing attention to the importance of the individual notification of aid above certain thresholds for purposes of state aid control. The 2006 Framework clearly indicates that, in order better to focus the Commission's scrutiny, individual measures above certain thresholds are subject to a detailed assessment by the Commission. The purpose of the individual assessment is to ensure that high amounts of aid for R & D&I work carried out by the same recipient do not distort competition to an extent contrary to the common interest, but rather contribute to the common interest in a proportionate manner.
- (230) In the period under assessment the thresholds for individual notification varied. Under the 1986 Framework individual notification was required for projects with eligible costs above ECU 20 million.
- (231) Under the 1996 Framework projects were to be notified individually to the Commission if the eligible costs were above ECU 25 million and the aid was above ECU 5 million ⁽³⁹⁾.
- (232) With regard to the need for the decision initiating the procedure in Article 88(2) of the EC Treaty to indicate the individual projects concerned precisely and specifically, the Commission would make the following observations.
- (233) When the Commission initiated the Article 88(2) procedure it precisely identified 13 projects. On the basis of the information available at that time, it expressed doubts with regard to six of these, and raised no objection to the other seven.
- (234) It became evident, however, that the aid instrument used by Italy, coupled with the way it was implemented, with delays in reimbursement, were such as to modify the assessment of the 13 projects. Italy has acknowledged that the information available to the Commission at that time was not correct and did not correspond to the real conditions of the aid which had been granted and which had not been correctly reimbursed.
- (235) It also became evident that there were other cases which Italy had failed to notify individually, despite the clear statements in the R & D frameworks and the 1986 decision.
- (236) It became evident, too, that in most of the cases assessed in this Decision the reimbursements did not follow the initial schedule; delays were allowed, making the terms more generous to the recipient. These new and more generous terms constitute new aid.
- (237) To conclude, the present proceedings concern a number of projects to which new unlawful aid has been granted.

⁽³⁹⁾ See for instance point 4.7: 'Individual grants of aid under an R & D scheme that has been authorized by the Commission do not, in principle, need to be notified. However, in order to allow the Commission to assess significant amounts of aid under approved schemes and the compatibility of such aid with the common market, the Commission requires prior notification of any individual research project costing more than ECU 25 million and for which it is proposed to provide aid with a gross grant equivalent of more than ECU 5 million. This new notification rule must be regarded as an appropriate measure within the meaning of Article 93(1) of the EC Treaty. Its substance was examined by the representatives of the Member States at a multilateral meeting.'

14.3. **The doubts expressed in the first initiating decision**

(238) The Commission has assessed the information submitted by Italy on eligible costs and incentive effect for the six programmes referred to in the first initiating decision, which are now included in the list of projects (recital 281, table 4).

(239) The Commission has established that for each project the costs were incurred for industrial research and precompetitive development.

(240) The Commission has established that the aid for each of these six projects had an incentive effect. The assessment was carried out taking into account the time that has elapsed since Italy took the decision to grant the aid.

(241) As described in recitals 105 to 122, however, it appeared that other crucial aspects of these aid measures, notably the aid instrument, were not clearly defined, and did not allow the Commission to take a final view of their compatibility. Before presenting the assessment of the individual projects, therefore, it will be necessary to assess the information available concerning the other doubts expressed in the second initiating decision.

14.4. **The doubts expressed in the second initiating decision**

(242) In order to arrive at a final conclusion concerning individual aid granted under the scheme it will be necessary, first of all, to assess all of the information concerning the development of the scheme, including the legal basis and the budgetary changes.

(243) Second, it will be necessary to assess the nature of the aid instrument and the implementation of the granting decisions.

(244) Third, it will be necessary to draw up a list of individual projects that Italy has failed to notify, to assess the financial terms for each of these projects, and if necessary to verify the terms of reimbursement and the mechanisms for monitoring compliance with those terms.

(245) Finally, a separate section, in paragraphs 0 0, will be devoted to the assessment of the information concerning the two allegedly military helicopters.

14.4.1. *The development of the scheme*

(246) The Commission now has a clear picture of the development of the overall scheme.

(247) Italy has provided sufficient information on the overall funding of the projects to enable the Commission to form a more general view. This is particularly relevant to the problem that the scheme under assessment has been used by Italy to fund both civilian projects and projects relating to national security. The figures for overall funding would thus be misleading if they were to be interpreted as showing only funding used by Italy towards civilian R & D projects in the aeronautical industry.

14.4.2. *Nature of the aid instrument*

(248) As regards the nature of the aid instrument, the Italian authorities have provided full documentation concerning the projects that Italy should have notified individually on the basis of the thresholds set in the successive R & D frameworks.

(249) The Italian authorities have indicated that the nature of the instrument was hybrid, in the sense that it was a soft loan whose reimbursement schedule was constructed according to the sales forecast for the product being developed. According to the Italian authorities these reimbursement schedules were fixed from the outset.

(250) The loans were granted on the basis of the reference rate at the time of the granting plus a premium.

(251) For each project, the Italian authorities determined a theoretical maximum aid intensity at the moment the aid was granted, calculated on the basis of the eligible costs, with the inclusion of any bonuses that might be relevant.

(252) In some cases, however, this intensity was not complied with, and the aid was granted on terms more favourable to the recipient, at an intensity higher than the maximum intensity allowable under the R & D frameworks.

(253) Moreover, in practice, these schedules were often not adhered to, in two different ways. First, payments to the recipients were late compared to the initial schedules, either because the project was late, or because the State was late in making the payments. In some cases, therefore, the actual intensity of the aid was lower than the initial intensity.

(254) But more importantly, reimbursements did not abide by the initial schedules. As a consequence, in many cases the initial intensity increased as the recipients benefited from the further advantage of late reimbursement.

(255) While Italy has provided the Commission with a number of letters it sent to recipients requesting reimbursement, it is clear that such letters had limited effect. In some instances, several letters were sent to a recipient on the same project,

but no steps were taken effectively to reimburse the loan, and there was no action on the part of the State to recover the claim ⁽⁴⁰⁾.

the nature of the aid instrument meant that Italy itself had no clear view of which projects needed to be notified individually ⁽⁴³⁾ and which projects had to be included in the ex post list of cases that ought to have been notified..

(256) In conclusion, there were two potential problems with the aid granted to the projects: a) an initial intensity that in some cases was higher than the maximum intensity allowed; and b) insufficient reimbursement that allowed the intensity to increase even further.

(261) In order to arrive at a final list, a series of requests for information had to be sent.

(257) The Italian authorities, working together with the Commission, have defined a methodology that allows both problems to be solved. As a first step, a maximum intensity is defined for each project, which is the lower of two intensities, the maximum theoretical intensity ⁽⁴¹⁾ and the initial intensity. If the initial intensity is the lower, it can be said that the incentive effect of the specific amount of aid granted was sufficient to convince the company to commit itself to the project. Any increase in the intensity over the one fixed initially must necessarily be considered new aid.

(262) Italy initially denied that it had failed to notify any individual project other than those referred to in the first initiating decision. It subsequently acknowledged that the list of non-notified projects was longer, and submitted all the necessary information and evidence.

(263) The difficulty of drawing up the list of non-notified projects can be explained by a conjunction of several factors.

(258) The cumulative aid intensity is then calculated. In the year in which this cumulative intensity reaches the level of the maximum intensity defined in recital 257, the recipient has to reimburse the full outstanding principal. If the maximum intensity has already been reached, then compound interest is to be charged on the outstanding debt for the years until the date of the final reimbursement of the entire loan. The level of interest is the reference rate for the year in which the maximum intensity was reached, and then for each year of further delay.

(264) First, the scheme has been applied since 1986.

(265) Second, the number of projects involved is necessarily high. Including those not subject to individual notification, the number of projects funded through the scheme in the period under assessment is well above 100.

(259) The methodology thus makes it possible to ensure compliance with the maximum intensities defined in the successive R & D frameworks ⁽⁴²⁾.

(266) Third, the fact that the lists include numerous military projects has increased the confusion. The Commission notes that even in a report by the Italian Court of Auditors there was some confusion as to the nature of the projects.

14.4.3. *The list of non-notified projects*

(260) A shared and accurate understanding of the aid instrument made it possible to establish the list of projects that Italy ought to have notified individually. When aid takes the form of a soft loan, the significant value is the amount of interest forgone by the State. The uncertainty surrounding

(267) The information available on the projects supported was piecemeal and often confused, not least because the reporting from the Government itself to the Italian Parliament was in terms of a list of future projects rather than projects actually supported.

(268) There are lists submitted by the anonymous third party, and others referred to directly by the Commission, such as the 13 projects specified in the first initiating decision and the list of projects cited in the second initiating decision.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ The Italian authorities have indicated that they have no intention of abandoning their claims on the recipients. However, the number of cases in which letters were sent asking for reimbursement, but no further action was taken, while new aid was granted to the same recipients for new projects, suggests that in some cases at least recipients believed that the aid they had received was not to be reimbursed.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Being the 25 % or 50 % intensity plus bonuses for precompetitive development and industrial research provided for in the R & D Frameworks.

⁽⁴²⁾ The Commission has adopted a similar approach in two cases concerning R & D aid to the aeronautical sector, C27/06 and C 28/06.

(269) The report of the Court of Auditors did not contain a list of the projects, but only overall figures, graphs and tables. However, the Word version of the document, available on the Courts website in 2005, allowed the underlying data to be extracted from the overall graphs.

⁽⁴³⁾ It should be noted, though, that there is no trace in the history of the file of any intention on the part of the Italian authorities to notify any project individually, whatever the size of the project or the amount of the aid.

(270) In its submission of 11 November 2005 the anonymous third party included these data. In its request for information of 23 May 2006 the Commission referred to most of the projects entered on the list submitted by the anonymous third party⁽⁴⁴⁾ to point out to Italy that in all likelihood there were still a number of non-notified projects on which Italy had not provided the requested information.

(271) Italy denied that the list could be attributed to the Court of Auditors⁽⁴⁵⁾: it had been derived from the information system of the Court by a person unknown. It would be misleading, therefore, to attribute the list to the Court itself, since it was the result of manipulation of data by a third party. It contained a number of errors and inaccuracies, and it would be wrong to imagine that the Court of Auditors itself was responsible for it.

(272) Ultimately Italy decided that it would itself provide a complete list of individual projects that were subject to individual notification, so that it is not necessary for the Commission to state a view on the accuracy of the information received previously⁽⁴⁶⁾.

(273) The discussion on the list of non-notified projects was difficult, but after about two years, it enabled the Italian authorities and the Commission to identify a number of individual projects that Italy had failed to notify.

(274) As requested in the second initiating decision, Italy also provided a list of the projects below the thresholds for individual notification that had been approved after 20 November 2002. The Commission finds that that list matches the overall budget for Law No 808/1985 in the period concerned, and that it does refer to projects below the thresholds for individual assessment⁽⁴⁷⁾.

14.5. Assessment of the final list of civilian projects

(275) The list of projects that Italy failed to notify individually to the Commission contains 17 projects.

(276) The list comprises the projects on which the Commission is able to reach a final conclusion regarding compatibility with the Treaty, but that leaves open the possibility that the Commission may in future take measures in respect of other projects that have not been notified and of which it is

not currently aware, or projects of which it is aware but for which it does not possess information sufficient for purposes of a decision, either because the information available is not complete or because the information indicates that the project is currently below the threshold for notification, whereas fresh information may modify this assessment.

(277) For each project the Commission has the initial schedule for disbursement and reimbursement laid down at the time the aid was granted and the real figures for payments by the State and reimbursement by the recipients. The schedules incorporate the corrections imposed by the methodology described above⁽⁴⁸⁾.

(278) On the basis of the information available on the projects, and bearing in mind that all the projects are individual applications of the same aid scheme, the Commission has no evidence that would lead it to suspect that the aid was aimed at supporting activities that did not qualify as R & D activities under the R & D frameworks.

(279) As regards the incentive effect, the Commission would note, first of all, that point 8.2 of the 1986 Framework required only that the aid should encourage additional effort in the field of R & D or enable the recipients to respond to exceptional conditions for which their own resources were too limited. In point 6 of the 1996 Framework, the incentive effect was to be verified on the basis of quantifiable factors, or other relevant factors indicated by the Member State, showing that the same R & D project would not have taken place without the aid, or that it would have been less ambitious, or that it would not have been carried out at the same pace.

(280) The Commission has no reason to doubt the incentive effect of the aid under assessment. The aid allowed the recipients to engage in R & D activities additional to their normal research, and to undertake R & D projects they would not have been able to undertake alone. Furthermore, consistently with its assessment of similar projects in the aeronautical industry, the Commission finds that the aid to the projects under assessment allowed the recipients to engage in risky projects which they would not have been able to finance alone. Finally, the Commission notes that most of the projects were international projects that required additional collaborative efforts.

(281) Each project is described below with its overall eligible costs and the amount of aid received. For the six projects regarding which the first initiating decision expressed doubts, the assessment also covers the information available on the eligible activities and the incentive effect. For all the projects the consequences of the application of the methodology are detailed in recital 257.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ It excluded those whose military character was evident, either because they had been assessed in the course of the proceedings or because the public information available left their nature in no doubt.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ See letter dated 5.5.2006.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Irrespective of whether or not it should be attributed to the Court of Auditors.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ The list also shows that Italy has spent a large part of the budget of the scheme on small projects. This allows the overall figures for the budget for the scheme to be reconciled with the number of large projects now known.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ See recitals 248 to 259.

Table 4

List of projects to which this Decision relates

Project	Company	Purpose	Year
A109 D/E/F	Agusta	Helicopter	1997
A109 X	Agusta	Helicopter	1999
A119 Koala	Agusta	Helicopter	1997
DO328	Aermacchi	Aero structure	1991
DO328 Extended Capacity	Aermacchi	Aero structure	1996
DO 328 Panels	Aermacchi	Aero structure	1996
ATR72	Alenia	Aero structure	1988 to 1994 (5 projects)
ATR 42 500	Alenia	Aero structure	1992
MD11 LWRP J/S	Alenia	Aero structure	1996
Falcon 2000	Alenia	Aero structure	1994
MD11 Winglet	Alenia	Aero structure	1989
MD95	Alenia	Aero structure	1996 and 1998
GE90 B	Avio	Engine	1994
GE90 Growth	Avio	Engine	1996
LPT PW308	Avio	Engine	1997
Falcon 2000	Piaggio	Aero structure	1994
Cabins	Alenia	Aero structure	1999

a) *A109 D/E/F project carried out by Agusta*

(282) The project concerned a helicopter, and was carried out by Agusta; it consisted in the development of different versions of the A109, adapting it to different engines in order to satisfy the most stringent criteria in terms of security, flight performance and environmental impact. The D, E and F versions corresponded to engines provided by Allison, Pratt & Whitney and Turbomeca. The D and E versions, according to Italy, were never developed.

(283) The project was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 4. Investments were carried out in the period 1996 to 1998. In the first initiating decision the Commission expressed doubts regarding the classification of R & D activities and the incentive effect.

(284) As regards the R & D activities, the Italian authorities have provided more detailed information on the work packages. The Commission would observe, first, that several prototypes were developed, and that the D and E versions were not completed or marketed.

(285) Second, the Commission notes that the technologies more directly concerned — new engine and skids — were certified only in June 2001. According to Italy, the developments in the rotor still have to be incorporated into the final product, even though the result of the R & D was successful.

(286) The sequence of events would seem to indicate that the aid for the R & D project carried out in the period 1996-1998 enabled Agusta to introduce new technologies, with a time horizon of more than 30 months. The aid consequently had an incentive effect on Agusta.

(287) The eligible investment ⁽⁴⁹⁾ was ITL 69 790 million ⁽⁵⁰⁾. The amount of aid in the form of interest forgone by the State was ITL 24 450 million. Thus, the initial aid intensity was 35,03 %, as compared with a theoretical maximum intensity of 31 % allowed by the 1996 Framework. The year in which the cumulative intensity reached the maximum 31 % allowed was 2004.

(288) In 2007, therefore, Agusta has immediately to repay the outstanding principal (ITL 19 300 million) plus the ITL 7 811 million called for in the reimbursement schedule for the year. Interest has also to be paid from 2005 onwards, amounting on 31 December 2007 to ITL [...] million.

(289) The Commission concludes, therefore, that the aid can be considered compatible under the 1996 Framework, since it concerned R & D activities and had an incentive effect on Agusta, on the condition that Agusta immediately reimburses the outstanding principal and the compound interest.

b) *A109 X project carried out by Agusta*

(290) The project concerned an Agusta helicopter. It was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 2. The Commission expressed doubts regarding the classification of R & D activities and the incentive effect.

(291) According to Italy, the project, carried out in the period 1999-2001, aimed at developing an entirely new helicopter, to enter the market after 2009. The helicopter would be in the range between 3 and 3,5 tonnes, and would also be used for developments in the military market.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ For all the projects, all the figures presented here are discounted figures.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Since all the projects concerned were approved before the introduction of the euro, all granting decisions and all reimbursement schedules are expressed in Italian lire. table 5 in recital 381 shows the impact in euro.

- (292) Italy was able to demonstrate that the A109 X was a project totally different from the A109 D/E/F, A109 Power and A119 Koala. The main technological differences related to the five-blade rotor, the tail rotor, and the transmission using face gears.
- (293) On the incentive effect, Italy was able to show that the A109 X was a new project, which would not be finalised before 2009. The aid thus enabled Agusta to engage in R & D activities which were very distant from the market and were very risky from a technological point of view.
- (294) Eligible investment by the company was worth ITL 67 144 million. Aid received in the form of interest forgone was ITL 13 902 million, giving an intensity of 20,70 %, which is below the maximum initial intensity of 33 % allowable under the 1996 Framework.
- (295) The reimbursement schedule has nevertheless been adjusted to take account of the fact that the aid was disbursed in a manner different from what was foreseen, and the fact that the loan was smaller. Reimbursements for this project will follow the adjusted schedule until 2018.
- (296) The Commission can therefore conclude that the aid is compatible with the 1996 Framework, since it concerned R & D activities and had an incentive effect, on the condition that the reimbursement plan is completed in 2018.
- c) *A119 Koala project carried out by Agusta*
- (297) The project concerned the development of a helicopter by Agusta. The A119 Koala is the utility version of an eight-seat helicopter, powered by a single turboshaft engine, and produced for the civilian market.
- (298) It was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 3. On the basis of the information available at that time, the Commission there took the view that the project was not subject to individual notification to the Commission, so that it fell outside the scope of that decision.
- (299) Subsequently, it appeared that the amount of eligible investment and the amount of aid were in fact such that the project should have been notified individually to the Commission.
- (300) Aid was granted in 1997 for eligible investment of ITL 58 137 million in the period 1997-1999. The aid received had an intensity of 26,92 %, which was below the initial maximum intensity of 32 % allowable under the 1996 Framework.
- (301) The reimbursements for this project will thus follow the schedule until 2009.
- (302) The Commission can therefore conclude that the A119 Koala project carried out by Agusta is compatible with the 1996 Framework provided that the reimbursement schedule is adhered to.
- d) *DO328 project carried out by Aermacchi*
- (303) This project concerned the basic version of the DO328 and was carried out by Aermacchi. The DO328 is a regional jet developed by Dornier. Aermacchi was entrusted with the development of two segments of the fuselage and the assembly of the entire fuselage, made up of 13 panels produced for Dornier by the Korean company Daewoo.
- (304) The R & D project allowed Aermacchi to acquire the knowledge necessary to develop the two segments and to assemble the fuselage. These activities were new to the company, which until then had concentrated on military training aircraft. The eligible activities were carried out in 1990 and 1991.
- (305) The project was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 10. The Commission there decided to raise no objection to the project because, based on the information available, it considered it to be compatible.
- (306) But the information submitted by Italy during the proceedings clearly shows that that initial conclusion has to be modified in the light of the financial situation of the project.
- (307) The information available today indicates that the eligible investment amounted to ITL 60 722 million, and that the initial maximum intensity was 43 %.
- (308) However, there have been numerous delays in the reimbursement, as the Italian authorities themselves have acknowledged. The intensity of 43 % allowable under the 1986 Framework was reached as long ago as 1996. As the maximum intensity has been reached, Aermacchi must immediately repay the outstanding balance, which is ITL 34 019 million. Compound interest has also to be paid on the sums owed by Aermacchi from 1996, amounting to a total of ITL [...] million on 31 December 2007.
- (309) The Commission concludes that the project relating to the basic version of the DO328 can be considered compatible with the EC Treaty on the basis of the 1986 Framework, on the condition that Aermacchi immediately reimburses the outstanding principal and the compound interest.
- e) *DO328 Extended Capacity project carried out by Aermacchi*
- (310) The project was to be carried out by Aermacchi, and concerned the development of an extended version of the DO328 regional jet developed by Dornier. The extended version would have allowed the transport of 40 to 50 passengers. The project does not seem to have been finalised, not least because Dornier, or Dornier-Fairchild as it later became, went into liquidation. The project was carried out in the period from 1995 to 1997.

- (311) The project was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 8. The Commission expressed doubts regarding the classification of R & D activities and the incentive effect.
- (312) On the R & D activities, the Italian authorities were able to demonstrate that extending the jet meant that the firm had to redevelop entire sections of the fuselage, while minimising the impact on the weight of the aircraft and on the costs of the project. During the project Aermacchi developed two prototypes.
- (313) On the incentive effect, the Italian authorities demonstrated that the funding for this project (together with the other project, DO328 Panels) allowed a substantial increase in the level of R & D spending by Aermacchi. In the period from 1993 to 1999 (covered by the two projects) the costs for the two DO328 projects amounted to [...] % of Aermacchi's total R & D expenditures. Italy also argued that owing to its military specialisation, Aermacchi was not used to working on civilian projects, and had to adapt substantially, making additional investments.
- (314) Eligible investment in the project amounted to ITL 66 360 million. The maximum initial intensity defined by the Italian authorities at the time the aid was granted was 43,49 % (below the 44 % maximum intensity allowable under the 1996 Framework). The reimbursement schedule indicates that this intensity will be reached in 2010, when the entire outstanding balance will have to be reimbursed to the State.
- (315) The Commission thus concludes that the aid given to Aermacchi for the DO328 Extended Capacity project is compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1996 Framework, and that the doubts concerning the eligible R & D activities and the incentive effect have been dispelled. Aermacchi must reimburse the entire outstanding principal by 2010.
- f) *DO328 Panels project carried out by Aermacchi*
- (316) This project was carried out by Aermacchi in the period from 1993 to 1999, and related to the development of innovative concepts to obtain modular elements of different longitudinal dimensions to serve in the development of fuselages of different lengths, while reducing the development costs.
- (317) The project was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 9. The Commission expressed doubts regarding the classification of R & D activities and the incentive effect.
- (318) On the R & D activities, the Italian authorities were able to demonstrate that the project was aimed at transferring the development of the fuselage panels from Daewoo to Aermacchi, and rethinking the entire project. The project also concerned the use of composite materials.
- (319) On the incentive effect, the Italian authorities provided sufficient information on Aermacchi's R & D activities to show that the project involved activities that were new for the company in terms of scale and technology. As mentioned above in connection with the DO328 Extended Capacity project, the Italian authorities also provided information on the development of R & D spending by Aermacchi.
- (320) The eligible investment amounted to ITL 51 480 million. Initial intensity at the moment the aid was granted was 42,30 % (below the 44 % maximum intensity allowable under the 1996 Framework).
- (321) This intensity was reached in 2006, when the cumulative discounted intensity reached 42,51 %. This means that the entire outstanding balance of ITL 54 454 million (comprising ITL 37 751 million planned for 2007 and ITL 16 703 million outstanding) has to be reimbursed, with compound interest, which on 31 December 2007 totalled ITL [...] million.
- (322) The Commission thus concludes that the aid given to Aermacchi for the DO328 project can be considered compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1996 Framework, since the doubts regarding the eligible R & D activities and the incentive effect have been dispelled, on the condition that Aermacchi immediately reimburses the entire outstanding balance of the debt with compound interest.
- g) *ATR72 project carried out by Alenia*
- (323) A project for a regional jet to be conducted by Alenia⁽⁵¹⁾ was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 12. On the basis of the information available at the time the Commission did not express doubts regarding the project. It became clear, however, that there were other projects concerning the ATR72⁽⁵²⁾ in respect of the eligible costs incurred by the company in subsequent years. The final conditions of the various measures to assist the ATR72 were laid down in the last granting decision.
- (324) The project concerned the development of aero structures for the regional jet developed by the ATR consortium, which is a 50 % joint venture between Alenia Aeronautica and EADS.
- (325) Overall, the eligible investment for the ATR72 amounted to ITL 165 442 million. The maximum initial intensity was 49 %.
- (326) However, the aid granted was above that level of intensity. Reimbursements have taken place, but not completely and not according to the schedule. Thus, interest must be charged from the point where the cumulative intensity reached the maximum level of 49 % allowed by the 1986 Framework, that is to say beginning in 1998. Alenia must immediately reimburse the outstanding balance of the loan,

⁽⁵¹⁾ Initially Aeritalia, subsequently named Alenia Aerospazio.

⁽⁵²⁾ Granting decisions were adopted on 8.11.1988, 18.12.1990, 18.12.1991 and 21.12.1991.

amounting to ITL 31 573 million. In addition, Alenia must pay compound interest, which on 31 December 2007 totalled ITL [...] million.

- (327) On the basis of the new information available, the Commission concludes that the projects concerning the ATR72 carried out by Alenia can be considered compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1986 Framework on the condition that Alenia immediately reimburses the outstanding principal with compound interest.

h) *ATR42-500 project carried out by Alenia*

- (328) The project was carried out by Alenia, and concerned the development of the latest version of the ATR42 regional jet, an aircraft capable of transporting up to 50 passengers. The project was not mentioned in the first initiating decision. Aid was granted in 1994.

- (329) Overall, the eligible investment was ITL 35 997 million. The initial intensity of the aid was 35,87 % (below the 49 % maximum intensity allowable under the 1986 Framework).

- (330) Since reimbursements have been slightly late, and the actual calculation of the intensity brings it to 47,75 %, the application of the methodology requires that the balance of the debt be reimbursed immediately, comprising the reimbursement already scheduled for 2007, amounting to ITL 20 027 million, plus the remaining balance of ITL 17 961 million. Alenia must pay compound interest, which for the period from 2003 until 31 December 2007 totalled ITL [...] million.

- (331) The Commission concludes that the project concerning the ATR42-500 carried out by Alenia can be considered compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1986 Framework on the condition that Alenia immediately reimburses the outstanding principal with compound interest.

i) *MD11 Lower Panels project carried out by Alenia*

- (332) The project, carried out by Alenia, concerned the development and introduction of new processes and concepts of automated development of aero structures, in particular for the nose and the tail of the MD11. The project was carried out in 1996-1997.

- (333) The project was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 7. The Commission expressed doubts regarding the classification of R & D activities and the incentive effect.

- (334) On the basis of the information supplied by the Italian authorities, the Commission concludes that the work packages in this project do constitute eligible R & D activities, because they relate to developments and processes linked to prototypes.

- (335) Concerning the incentive effect, the Italian authorities have been able to show that the aid enabled Alenia to increase its R & D spending to levels comparable with those typical of

the industry generally ([...]). Furthermore, the aid enabled Alenia to carry out activities additional to its current ones. Finally, according to Italy, the aid allowed a substantial technological improvement in Alenias work, reducing the need for re-working or re-engineering of panels, and shortening assembly times.

- (336) The intended investment amounted to ITL 69 711 million, with an aid intensity of 30,32 %, which was below the 35 % maximum intensity allowable under the 1986 Framework.

- (337) However, the scope of the work actually done was much more limited. The investment amounted to ITL 36 266 million. The aid intensity was 15,65 %. The principal was fully reimbursed in 2002.

- (338) The Commission is therefore able to conclude that the aid concerning the MD11 Lower Panels (MD11 LWR) project is compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1996 Framework.

j) *Falcon 2000 project carried out by Alenia*

- (339) The project was carried out by Alenia, and concerned the aero structure of the Dassault Falcon 2000 business jet. Alenia worked on the rear fuselage, the engine nacelles and engine support pylons, and the wing fairings.

- (340) The project was not mentioned in the first initiating decision; it was carried out in the period 1991-1993.

- (341) The eligible investment was ITL 30 520 million. The aid intensity of the soft loan was 38,16 %, slightly above the 37,5 % maximum initial intensity allowable under the 1986 Framework.

- (342) Since this maximum intensity of 37,5 % was reached in 2006, Alenia must immediately reimburse the entire outstanding principal of ITL 11 605 million (ITL 5 725 million due in 2007 plus the remaining ITL 5 880 million). Furthermore, Alenia has to pay compound interest, which on 31 December 2007 totalled ITL [...] million.

- (343) The Commission concludes that the support granted to Alenia for the Falcon 2000 project can be considered compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1986 Framework on the condition that Alenia immediately reimburses the entire outstanding principal with compound interest.

k) *MD11 Winglet project carried out by Alenia*

- (344) This is a project carried out by Alenia, which concerned the development of calculation methods, the development of new materials characterised by high rigidity, and the development of processes for advanced polymerisation for aeronautical applications. The project also provided for the application of these technologies to the development of a structure that would reduce the turbulence generated by the MD11's wingtips.

- (345) The project was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 11. On the basis of the information available at the time the Commission did not express any doubts regarding the project. It became clear, however, that the terms were not those that had been understood from the information available.
- (346) The project was carried out in the period from 1987 to 1989. The theoretical maximum intensity allowable for this project under the 1986 Framework was 41 %. The eligible investment was ITL 21 826 million.
- (347) But the aid intensity of the loan paid out from 1990 was 48,63 %. The maximum intensity of 41 % was reached in 1995, at which point the debt should have been repaid, and that is the date from which interest has to be charged. As a result, Alenia has to reimburse the outstanding ITL 4 236 million, and to pay compound interest which on 31 December 2007 totalled ITL [...] million.
- (348) The Commission concludes that the MD11 Winglet project can be considered compatible with the R & D framework on the condition that Alenia immediately reimburses the outstanding principal with compound interest.
- l) *MD95 project carried out by Alenia*
- (349) This is a project carried out by Alenia which concerned the development and introduction of new processes and concepts for the automated development of large aero structures. The project also provided for the validation of processes and concepts developed in the factory in Nola (in the Region of Campania).
- (350) Work on the project was carried out in the period from 1996 to 1999. The project was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 5. The Commission expressed doubts regarding the classification of R & D activities and the incentive effect.
- (351) On the R & D activities, the Italian authorities demonstrated that Alenia had invested in new software and calculation methods to be applied to the prototypes. The activities further involved the comparative use of structural solutions for fuselage components and the study of new systems to protect fuselage components from corrosion.
- (352) On the incentive effect, the Italian authorities were able to demonstrate that this project, together with the work carried out on the MD11 (see the MD11LWR project), enabled Alenia to develop new knowledge of the development of fuselages. Furthermore, the aid enabled Alenia to increase its R & D spending.
- (353) The eligible investment costs for this project were ITL 149 629 million, and the maximum aid intensity allowable under the 1996 Framework was 38 %.
- (354) This intensity will be reached in 2009. As a consequence, Alenia has to reimburse the entire outstanding amount of the loan (ITL 96 701 million) at the end of 2008.
- (355) The Commission takes the view that the doubts concerning the R & D activities and the incentive effect of the aid to the MD95 have been dispelled. The Commission concludes that the aid to the MD95 can be considered compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1996 Framework on the condition that Alenia fully reimburses the entire outstanding amount of the loan at the end of 2008.
- m) *Falcon 2000 project carried out by Piaggio*
- (356) This is a project carried out by Piaggio, which related to the Falcon 2000 ⁽⁵³⁾. Piaggio worked in parallel with Alenia on the project, but on distinct work packages. Piaggio worked especially on the structural analysis (linear and non-linear), the analysis of the damage tolerance of the structure, and the structural analysis of specific events (bird impact, crashworthiness and ditching).
- (357) The project, which was not mentioned in the first initiating decision, was carried out in the period from 1991 to 1993.
- (358) The eligible investment was ITL 31 038 million. The aid intensity was initially set under the terms of the soft loan at 37,75 %, lower than the 38 % maximum intensity allowable under the 1986 Framework.
- (359) Taking account of a different reimbursement schedule, the intensity of the aid has been 33,23 %. According to the schedule, Piaggio can reimburse until 2009.
- (360) The Commission concludes that the Falcon 2000 project carried out by Piaggio is compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1986 Framework provided that the reimbursement schedule is adhered to.
- n) *GE90 B project carried out by Avio*
- (361) This is a project carried out by Avio on the GE90, an engine developed by General Electric. Avio was responsible for 7 % of the engine, a share of the work larger than for previous engines. More specifically, Avio was in charge of the development of large parts of the low pressure turbine.
- (362) The project was not mentioned in the first initiating decision; it was carried out in the period from 1991 to 1993.
- (363) The eligible investment was ITL 35 674 million. On the basis of the R & D activities carried out, the maximum intensity allowable under the 1986 Framework was 32,5 %.

⁽⁵³⁾ See the description of the Alenia Falcon 2000 project above.

- (364) However, from the outset the soft loan provided for an intensity higher than this maximum. From the point where the cumulative intensity reached the permissible maximum, therefore, the outstanding principal has to be reimbursed, and interest has to be charged. In this case the initial intensity was reached in 2005. The outstanding balance to be reimbursed immediately by Avio is ITL 40 939 million (ITL 4 688 million due for 2007 plus the outstanding ITL 36 251 million). On 31 December 2007 the interest immediately payable by Avio totalled ITL [...] million.
- (365) The Commission therefore concludes that the aid given to Avio for the GE90 B project can be considered compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1996 Framework on the condition that Avio immediately reimburses the outstanding principal with compound interest.
- o) *GE90 Growth project carried out by Avio*
- (366) This is a project carried out by Avio which concerned an upgraded version of the GE90 engine developed by General Electric. The GE90 Growth project consisted of three different engines intended to equip Boeing and Airbus aircraft for flight over the Pacific. Once again Avio was responsible for 7 % of the programme. Here too Avio was in charge of developing large parts of the low pressure turbine.
- (367) The project was not mentioned in the first initiating decision; it was carried out in the period from 1996 to 1997.
- (368) The eligible investment was ITL 46 434 million. On the basis of the R & D activities carried out, the maximum intensity allowable under the 1996 Framework was 36,25 %.
- (369) That intensity was reached in 2006. From that date Avio has to repay to the State the entire outstanding balance of ITL 47 064 million (comprising ITL 2 123 million originally to be reimbursed in 2007 plus the entire balance of ITL 44 941 million) and to pay compound interest.
- (370) The Commission concludes that the aid given to Avio for the GE90 Growth project can be considered compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1996 Framework on the condition that Avio immediately reimburses the entire outstanding loan with compound interest.
- p) *LPT PW308 project carried out by Avio*
- (371) This project was carried out by Avio, and concerned the low pressure turbine of a Pratt & Whitney engine (PW308) for a large business jet (and small regional jets).
- (372) The project, which was not mentioned in the first initiating decision, was carried out in the period from 1997 to 1998.
- (373) The eligible cost was ITL 30 688 million. The maximum initial aid intensity allowable under the 1996 Framework was 36 %. The aid paid out to Avio and the reimbursement schedule give an intensity of 33,88 %. Avio will reimburse the aid in accordance with the schedule up to the year 2013.
- (374) The Commission concludes that the aid granted to Avio for the project concerning the low pressure turbine of the PW308 is compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1996 Framework provided that the reimbursement schedule is adhered to.
- q) *Pressurised Cabins project carried out by Alenia*
- (375) This is a project carried out by Alenia which concerned pressurised cabins for large civil aircraft.
- (376) The project was listed in the first initiating decision as project No 1. On the basis of the information available at that time, the Commission took the view that it was not subject to individual notification to the Commission, and thus fell outside the scope of the decision.
- (377) Subsequently, it emerged that the amount of eligible investment planned at the moment of granting and the amount of aid actually granted were such that the project should have been notified individually to the Commission.
- (378) The project was carried out in the period from 1999 to 2001. The aid was granted on the basis of expected eligible costs of ITL 67 758 million, with an initial intensity calculated by the Italian authorities at 25,74 % (below the maximum intensity allowable under the 1996 Framework).
- (379) However, the actual disbursements of aid and the eligible costs were lower than initially planned; the costs were ITL 27 122 million. The aid will nevertheless reach the initial intensity of 25,74 % in 2008. In 2008, therefore, Alenia will have to reimburse the outstanding principal, worth ITL 29 244 million.
- (380) The Commission concludes that the aid granted to Alenia for the project concerning pressurised cabins is compatible with the EC Treaty and the 1996 Framework on the condition that Alenia reimburses the entire outstanding loan in 2008.
- Summary of the projects*
- (381) The following table presents the impact on each project of the methodology adopted, with figures rounded in euro at an exchange rate of ITL 1 936 per euro.

Table 5

List of projects and amounts involved

Project	Company	Reimbursement
A109 D/E/F	Agusta	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 14 million) with compound interest
A109 X	Agusta	Schedule to be adhered to until full reimbursement in 2018
A119 Koala	Agusta	Schedule to be adhered to until full reimbursement in 2009
DO328	Aermacchi	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 17 571 million) with compound interest
DO328 Extended Capacity	Aermacchi	Schedule to be adhered to until full reimbursement in 2010
DO328 Panels	Aermacchi	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 28 127 million) with compound interest
ATR72	Alenia	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 16 308 million) with compound interest
ATR42-500	Alenia	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 19 621 million) with compound interest
MD11 Lower Panels	Alenia	Loan fully reimbursed
Falcon 2000	Alenia	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 5 994 million) with compound interest
MD11 Winglet	Alenia	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 2 188 million) with compound interest
MD95	Alenia	Schedule to be adhered to until full reimbursement in 2008
GE90 B	Avio	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 21 146 million) with compound interest
GE90 Growth	Avio	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 24 309 million) with compound interest
LPT PW308	Avio	Schedule to be adhered to until full reimbursement in 2013
Falcon 2000	Piaggio	Schedule to be adhered to until full reimbursement in 2009
Cabins	Alcatel Alenia	Balance to be reimbursed immediately (EUR 15 105 million)

14.6. Terms of reimbursement

(382) As indicated, for most of the projects that Italy failed to notify it has been necessary to adjust the reimbursement schedules. In many cases, the outstanding loan has to be repaid immediately. In some of these cases the recipients have to pay interest, calculated from the year when the maximum allowable intensity was reached. In other cases, the reimbursement of the outstanding debt will be advanced ahead of the schedule originally set out in the granting decisions.

(383) The reimbursement schedule for each of the above-mentioned projects has been arrived at jointly by the Commission and the Italian authorities. In their letter of 31 July 2007 the Italian authorities undertook to ensure that the schedules for the reimbursement of the projects would be adhered to.

(384) Where it is indicated that the recipients must reimburse immediately, this should be understood to mean within a period of two months. That period for repayment is justified by the fact that some components of the aid may have become partially incompatible because the intensity of the aid provided was higher than the maximum intensity allowable (i.e. either the intensity allowed under the R & D frameworks or the intensity set at the time the aid was granted) ⁽⁵⁴⁾. Compound interest is to be charged from the year in which the maximum intensity was reached, in accordance with Commission Regulation (EC) No 794/2004 of 21 April 2004 implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 659/1999 laying down detailed rules for the application of Article 93 of the EC Treaty ⁽⁵⁵⁾.

(385) The Italian authorities have acknowledged that some projects contained elements of unlawful and incompatible aid. They have agreed to the conditions attached to the present decision to eliminate the distortion of competition by means of effective and immediate recovery of the aid.

(386) The Italian authorities have undertaken to comply with the conditions for the monitoring of all reimbursements of compatible aid by sending an annual report on the payments received from the recipients, certified by auditors.

(387) This will enable the Commission to monitor compliance with the conditions for each of the projects. The monitoring does not impose any additional burden, but merely seeks to ensure that the conditions imposed by this Decision and accepted by Italy are complied with.

(388) The Italian authorities have informed the Commission of Decree-law No 159/07 ⁽⁵⁶⁾, which reallocates the sums that Finmeccanica has to pay on the basis of this Decision pending a payment that is to be made by ENEA, a public

⁽⁵⁴⁾ As explained above with regard to the methodology applied in this case: see the section on the 14.4.2. Nature of the aid instrument, paragraphs 0 to 0.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ OJ L 140, 30.4.2004, p. 1.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Decree-law No 159 of 1 October 2007, converted into statute, with amendments, by Law No 222 of 29 November 2007, published *Gazzetta Ufficiale*, No 279, 30.11.2007.

body operating in the energy sector, under a settlement with Finmeccanica, following a decision by the Court of Appeal in Rome.

(389) The Commission does not need to assess here whether the arrangements in Decree-law No 159/07 involve the granting of new state aid in order to reimburse the unlawful aid referred to in this Decision. Those arrangements are outside the scope of the present proceedings. This Decision consequently does not prejudice any further investigation that the Commission may decide to undertake into the arrangements made in Decree-law No 159/07.

(390) The Commission recalls that the case-law of the Court of Justice is clear: it was recently summarised in the opinion of Advocate-General Geelhoed⁽⁵⁷⁾ in the *Lucchini* case⁽⁵⁸⁾. In that case the Court had to give a preliminary ruling on the question whether a judgment of a national court could prevent the exercise by the Commission of its exclusive power to verify the compatibility of state aid with the single market, and if necessary to order its recovery.

(391) It follows that a state has an obligation to respect the primacy of Community law, and the exclusive power of the Commission to determine the compatibility or otherwise of state aid. A national decision concerning aid (be it a Decree-law or a court judgment) cannot replace the procedure laid down for the valid granting of aid, which is concluded only when the Commission grants its authorisation.

14.7. Conclusion of the assessment of the individual projects

(392) As described in paragraphs 0-0, the methodology adopted ensures that the aid granted to a project does not exceed maximum aid intensity allowed by the applicable R & D frameworks. When assessing aid to large R & D projects, the intensity of the aid — its proportionality — is one of the main factors the Commission takes into account.

(393) The Commission has also verified whether the initial maximum intensity was adhered to. If a soft loan, because of the way it is disbursed or reimbursed, reaches an aid intensity above the level set at the moment of granting, the aid beyond that initial intensity has to be considered new aid. Since this new aid is in all likelihood granted after the project has been terminated, and in any event only as a consequence of late payment, it has no incentive effect on the recipient. Thus it is not compatible under any of the R & D frameworks. If the reimbursement schedules are adjusted to ensure that the maximum allowable intensity is adhered to, then the aid for these projects can be considered compatible.

(394) The Commission further notes that it is a regular feature of the aeronautical industry that projects have a long duration, and that reimbursements take place over periods that can even exceed fifteen years, bearing in mind among other things that projects often show a return only in the long term. In the present case, aid payments have often been spread over several years, with reimbursement starting only after the end of the last payment and lasting more than ten years. Overall the average duration of the projects, calculated from the beginning until final reimbursement, is around eighteen years.

(395) For the 17 projects referred to above, the Commission can conclude that the aid intensity corrected in accordance with the methodology adopted satisfies the requirements of the successive R & D frameworks.

(396) This conclusion has been reached on the basis of the information available and in view of the measures very long duration.

(397) For the six projects regarding which it expressed doubts in the first initiating decision, the Commission has established, taking into account the long time that has elapsed since these projects were carried out, that the classification of the R & D activities was correct and was in line with the Commissions practice.

(398) Finally, the Commission has also established that the six projects had an incentive effect.

15. THE TWO HELICOPTERS DESCRIBED AS MILITARY HELICOPTERS

(399) As Italy explained in its reply of October 2005, the scheme has also been used to fund military R & D. In the first initiating decision it was accepted that one project was to be considered military, and thus fell within the scope of Article 296 of the Treaty.

(400) The Italian authorities have provided some information on the two helicopters referred to in the second initiating decision.

(401) The anonymous third party submitted comments on both helicopters.

(402) In summary, Italy explained the development of the A139 helicopter, and of the number assigned to it, saying that the civilian AW139 helicopter had been developed by Agusta with a number of partners without receiving any state support.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Opinion of Advocate-General Geelhoed in Case C-119/05 *Ministero dell'Industria, del Commercio e dell'Artigianato v Lucchini SpA, formerly Lucchini Siderurgica SpA*.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Judgment in Case C-119/05 *Ministero dell'Industria, del Commercio e dell'Artigianato v Lucchini SpA, formerly Lucchini Siderurgica SpA*, not yet reported.

- (403) But Italy stated that Agusta had indeed received assistance to develop a military helicopter, the [...], which was in its final phase of development.
- (404) The anonymous third party indicated that in its view the A139 was an entirely civilian helicopter.
- (405) On the BA609, Italy said that Agustas involvement in the project was targeted at developing a tilt-rotor for military use.
- (406) The anonymous third party said, however, that all the information publicly available on the project indicated that the BA609 was a helicopter intended for civilian use.
- (407) On the basis of the information available, the Commission cannot reach a conclusion on these two projects. It reserves the right to put further questions to Italy in order to clarify certain aspects of the projects before taking a final decision. The two projects are consequently outside the scope of the present decision, and will be the subject of a separate decision.
- (408) In any event, however, the fact that an item of equipment is military in its nature and purpose is not by itself sufficient for an exemption from the Community rules on the basis of Article 296 of the EC Treaty. The measure must also be necessary for the protection of the essential interests of a Member States security. According to the case-law of the Court of Justice, Article 296 must be interpreted strictly, and confined to exceptional, clearly defined cases. Moreover, the burden of proving that the tests for exemption are satisfied rests on the Member State.

16. CONCLUSION

- (409) Taking account of all the factors set out above, the Commission has decided to close the proceedings under Article 88(2) of the EC Treaty with respect to the 17 individual R & D projects which Italy failed to notify and which were consequently granted unlawfully.
- (410) Individual aid within the meaning of Article 1(e) of the Procedural Regulation which was notifiable, but was not notified, constitutes unlawful aid within the meaning of Article 1(f) of the Procedural Regulation. Since this Decision concerns unlawful aid, it will be adopted on the basis of Article 13 of the Procedural Regulation.
- (411) Article 13 states that in the case of decisions to initiate the formal investigation procedure, proceedings are to be closed by means of a decision pursuant to Article 7. The present Decision is adopted under Article 7(4) of the Procedural Regulation with respect to all the individual projects referred to above, subject to the conditions of reimbursement indicated for each of the projects.
- (412) With regard to the doubts expressed in the first initiating decision in respect of six projects, the Commission concludes that the work packages constituted R & D

activities, and that the aid had an incentive effect on the recipients.

- (413) The Commission can conclude that the aid instrument used throughout the application of the scheme has been a soft loan with an interest rate of zero. In the operation of the loan mechanism, however, the initial conditions have in several cases not been complied with, and the recipients have been allowed more generous terms.
- (414) The Commission and the Italian authorities have been able to define a methodology to correct excessive initial intensities and insufficiently rigorous application of the aid mechanism.
- (415) The Commission has received from the Italian authorities a list of non-notified projects, with a reimbursement schedule calculated using this methodology for each project.
- (416) The Italian authorities have undertaken to adhere to the reimbursement schedule for each of the projects referred to.
- (417) The Italian authorities have undertaken to comply with the monitoring conditions indicated, that is say to ensure that the immediate reimbursements are made within two months from this decision, and that the Commission receives detailed yearly reporting on future reimbursements.
- (418) The list of projects is without prejudice to any case in which the Commission may become aware of a project or may receive further information on any project.

- (419) The Commission cannot reach a conclusion, however, on the two projects regarding whose military character it expressed doubts in the second initiating decision. The Commission reserves the right to ask Italy for further information on these projects with a view to a decision in the near future,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

The individual aid to the R & D projects in the aeronautical industry listed in paragraph 2 which was granted by Italy under Article 3(a) of the Italian Law of 24 December 1985, No 808, is compatible with the common market in accordance with Article 87(3) of the EC Treaty, subject to compliance with the conditions set out in Articles 2 and 3.

The projects concerned are the following:

- (a) aid to Augusta: the A109 D/E/F, A109 X, and A119 Koala projects;
- (b) aid to Aermacchi: the DO328, DO328 Extended Capacity and DO328 Panels projects;

- (c) aid to Alenia: the ATR72, ATR42 500, MD11 LWRP J/S, Falcon 2000, MD11 Winglet, MD95 and Pressurised Cabins projects;
- (d) aid to Avio: the GE90 B, GE90 Growth and LPT PW308 projects; and
- (f) aid to Piaggio: the Falcon 2000 project.

Article 2

For the following projects and recipients the Italian Republic shall ensure that the following conditions are met:

- (a) aid to Augusta
 - (i) for the A109 D/E/F project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately, with compound interest;
 - (ii) for the A109 X project, the reimbursement schedule is to be adhered to until full reimbursement of the loan by 31 December 2018;
 - (iii) For the A119 Koala project, the reimbursement schedule is to be adhered to until full reimbursement of the loan by 31 December 2009;
- (b) aid to Aermacchi
 - (i) for the DO328 project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately;
 - (ii) for the DO328 Extended Capacity project, the reimbursement schedule is to be adhered to until full reimbursement of the loan by 31 December 2009;
 - (iii) for the DO328 Panels project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately, with compound interest;
- (c) aid to Alenia
 - i) for the ATR72 project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately, with compound interest;
 - (ii) for the ATR42-500 project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately, with compound interest;
 - (iii) for the Falcon 2000 project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately, with compound interest;
 - (iv) for the MD11 Winglet project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately, with compound interest;

- (v) for the MD95 project, the reimbursement schedule is to be adhered to until full reimbursement of the loan by 31 December 2008;

- (vi) for the Pressurised Cabins project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately, with compound interest;

- (d) aid to Avio

- (i) for the GE90 B project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately, with compound interest;

- (ii) for the GE90 Growth project, the outstanding principal is to be reimbursed immediately, with compound interest;

- (iii) for the LPT PW308 project, the reimbursement schedule is to be adhered to until full reimbursement of the loan by 31 December 2013;

- (e) aid to Piaggio

- (i) for the Falcon 2000 project, the reimbursement schedule is to be adhered to until full reimbursement of the loan by 31 December 2013.

Article 3

1. Immediate reimbursement must take place within two months of this Decision, in accordance with the procedures of national law, provided that they allow the immediate and effective enforcement of the Decision.

2. In the cases of immediate reimbursement the interest applied shall be calculated on a compound basis in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 794/2004.

3. Within two months of notification of this Decision, the Italian Republic shall provide the following information to the Commission:

- (a) the total amount reimbursed by the recipients;
- (b) a detailed description of the measures taken and to be taken to comply with this Decision;
- (c) documents demonstrating that aid has been reimbursed.

4. The Italian Republic shall keep the Commission informed of the progress of the national measures taken to implement this Decision until reimbursement of the aid referred to in Article 2 has been completed.

If so requested by the Commission it shall immediately provide information on the measures already taken and to be taken to comply with this Decision.

It shall also provide detailed information concerning the amount of aid reimbursed and interest paid by the recipients.

5. In those cases where reimbursement schedules continue beyond 2008, Italy shall supply to the Commission an annual report on the payments received by the recipients, certified by auditors.

Article 4

This Decision is addressed to the Italian Republic.

Done at Brussels, 11 March 2008.

For the Commission

Neelie KROES

Member of the Commission

COMMISSION DECISION

of 10 September 2008

amending Decisions 2001/881/EC and 2002/459/EC as regards the list of border inspection posts

(notified under document number C(2008) 4861)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(2008/807/EC)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Directive 90/425/EEC of 26 June 1990 concerning veterinary and zootechnical checks applicable in intra-Community trade in certain live animals and products with a view to the completion of the internal market ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 20(3) thereof,

Having regard to Council Directive 91/496/EEC of 15 July 1991 laying down the principles governing the organisation of veterinary checks on animals entering the Community from third countries and amending Directives 89/662/EEC, 90/425/EEC and 90/675/EEC ⁽²⁾, and in particular the second subparagraph of Article 6(4) thereof,

Having regard to Council Directive 97/78/EC of 18 December 1997 laying down the principles governing the organisation of veterinary checks on products entering the Community from third countries ⁽³⁾, and in particular Article 6(2) thereof,

Whereas:

(1) Commission Decision 2001/881/EC of 7 December 2001 drawing up a list of border inspection posts agreed for veterinary checks on animals and animal products from third countries and updating the detailed rules concerning the checks to be carried out by the experts of the Commission ⁽⁴⁾ sets out a list of border inspection posts for veterinary checks on live animals and animal products introduced into the Community from third countries in the Annex to that Decision (the list of border inspection posts).

(2) The list of border inspection posts includes the Traces unit number for each border inspection post. Traces is a computerised system introduced by Commission Decision 2004/292/EC of 30 March 2004 on the introduction of the Traces system and amending Decision 92/486/EEC ⁽⁵⁾. It replaces the previous Animo system, based on the network

introduced by Commission Decision 91/398/EEC of 19 July 1991 on a computerised network linking veterinary authorities (Animo) ⁽⁶⁾, for tracing movements of animals and certain products in intra-Community trade and imports.

(3) Following a satisfactory inspection in accordance with Decision 2001/881/EC, an additional border inspection posts at Brindisi, Italy should be added to the list of border inspection posts.

(4) Following a communication from Portugal the BIP at Praia da Vitória (Açores) should be deleted from the list of border inspection posts and the port BIP at Funchal (Madeira) replaced by Caniçal (Madeira) BIP set out in the Annex to 2001/881/EC.

(5) In addition, following communications from France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal and the United Kingdom, the list of border inspection posts for those Member States should be updated to take account of recent changes regarding inspection centres and categories of animals or products that can be checked at certain border inspection posts already approved in accordance with Decision 2001/881/EC and the organisation of inspection centres at those posts.

(6) The list of units in Commission Decision 2002/459/EC of 4 June 2002 listing the units in the Animo computer network and repealing Decision 2000/287/EC ⁽⁷⁾ includes the Traces unit number of each border inspection post in the Community. In the interests of consistency of Community legislation, that list should, accordingly, be updated to take account of amendments to be made to the Annex to Decision 2001/881/EC so that the information contained in those two Annexes is identical.

(7) Decisions 2001/881/EC and 2002/459/EC should therefore be amended accordingly.

(8) The measures provided for in this Decision are in accordance with the opinion of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health,

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 224, 18.8.1990, p. 29.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 268, 24.9.1991, p. 56.

⁽³⁾ OJ L 24, 30.1.1998, p. 9.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ L 326, 11.12.2001, p. 44.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ L 94, 31.3.2004, p. 63.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ L 221, 9.8.1991, p. 30.

⁽⁷⁾ OJ L 159, 17.6.2002, p. 27.

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 3

This Decision is addressed to the Member States.

Article 1

The Annex to Decision 2001/881/EC is replaced by the text in Annex I to this Decision.

Done at Brussels, 10 September 2008.

Article 2

The Annex to Decision 2002/459/EC is amended in accordance with Annex II to this Decision.

For the Commission

Androulla VASSILIOU

Member of the Commission

ANNEX I

ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ — PŘÍLOHA — BILAG — ANHANG — LISA — ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ — ANNEX — ANEXO — ANNEXE — ALLEGATO — PIELIKUMS — PRIEDAS — MELLÉKLET — ANNESS — BIJLAGE — ZAŁĄCZNIK — ANEXO — ANEXĂ — PRÍLOHA — PRILOGA — LIITE — BILAGA

СПИСКЪ НА ОДОБРЕНИТЕ ГРАНИЧНИ ИНСПЕКЦИОННИ ПУНКТОВЕ — SEZNAM SCHVÁLENÝCH STANOVIŠŤ HRANIČNÍCH KONTROL — LISTE OVER GODKENDTE GRÆNSEKONTROLSTEDER — VERZEICHNIS DER ZUGELASSENEN GRENZKONTROLLSTELLEN — KOKKULEPITUD PIIRIKONTROLI PUNKTIDE NIMEKIRI — ΚΑΤΑΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΕΓΚΕΚΡΙΜΕΝΩΝ ΜΕΘΟΡΙΑΚΩΝ ΣΤΑΘΜΩΝ ΕΠΙΘΕΩΡΗΣΗΣ — LIST OF AGREED BORDER INSPECTION POSTS — LISTA DE PUESTOS DE INSPECCIÓN FRONTERIZOS AUTORIZADOS — LISTES DES POSTES D'INSPECTION FRONTALIERS AGRÉÉS — ELENCO DEI POSTI DI ISPEZIONE FRONTALIERI RICONOSCIUTI — APSTIPRINĀTO ROBEŽKONTROLES PUNKTU SARAKSTS — SUTARTŲ PASIENIO VETERINARIJOS POSTŲ SĄRAŠAS — A MEGÁLLAPODÁS SZERINTI HATÁRELLENŐRZŐ PONTOK — LISTA TA' POSTIJIET MIFTIEHMA GĦAL SPEZZJONIJIET TA' FRUNTIERA — LIJST VAN DE ERKENDE INSPECTIEPOSTEN AAN DE GRENS — WYKAZ UZGODNIONYCH PUNKTÓW KONTROLI GRANICZNEJ — LISTA DOS POSTOS DE INSPECÇÃO APROVADOS — LISTA POSTURILOR DE INSPECȚIE LA FRONTIERĂ APROBATE — ZOZNAM SCHVÁLENÝCH HRANIČNÝCH INŠPEKČNÝCH STANÍC — SEZNAM DOGOVORJENIH MEJNIH KONTROLNIH TOČK — LUETTELO HYVÄKSYTYISTÄ RAJATARKASTUSASEMISTA — FÖRTECKNING ÖVER GODKÄNDA GRÄNSKONTROLLSTATIONER

- 1 = Име — Název — Navn — Name — Nimi — Ονομασία — Name — Nombre — Nom — Nome — Vārds — Pavadinimas — Név — Isem — Naam — Nazwa — Nome — Denumire — Názov — Ime — Nimi — Namn
- 2 = Код Traces — TRACES kód — Traces-kode — Traces Code — TRACESi kood — Κωδικός Traces — Traces Code — Código Traces — Code Traces — Codice Traces — Traces kods — TRACES kodas — Traces-kód — Kodiči-Traces — Traces-code — Kod Traces — Código Traces — Cod Traces — Kód TRACES — Traces-koda — Traces-koodi — Traces-kod
- 3 = Тип — Typ — Type — Art — Tüüp — Φύση — Type — Tipo — Type — Tipo — Tips — Tipas — Típus — Tip — Type — Rodzaj punktu — Tipo — Tip — Typ — Tip — Tyypki — Typ
- A = Летище — Letiště — Lufthavn — Flughafen — Lennujaam — Αεροδρόμιο — Airport — Aeropuerto — Aéroport — Aeroporto — Lidosta — Oro uostas — Repülőtér — Ajrport — Luchthaven — Na lotnisku — Aeroporto — Aeroport — Letisko — Letališče — Lentokenttä — Flygplats
- F = Железница — Železnice — Jernbane — Schiene — Raudtee — Σιδηρόδρομος — Rail — Ferrocarril — Rail — Ferrovia — Dzelzceļš — Geležinkelis — Vasút — Ferrovija — Spoorweg — Na przejsćiu kolejowym — Caminho-de-ferro — Cale ferată — Železnica — Železnica — Rautatie — Järnväg
- P = Пристанище — Přístav — Havn — Hafen — Sadam — Λιμένας — Port — Puerto — Port — Porto — Osta — Uostas — Kikötő — Port — Zeehaven — Na przejsćiu morskim — Porto — Port — Prístav — Pristanišče — Satama — Hamn
- R = Път — Silnice — Landevej — StraÙe — Maantee — Οδός — Road — Carretera — Route — Strada — Ceļš — Kelias — Közút — Triq — Weg — Na przejsćiu drogowym — Estrada — Cale rutieră — Cesta — Cesta — Maantie — Väg
- 4 = Център за инспекция — Kontrolní středisko — Inspektionscenter — Kontrollzentrum — Kontrollkeskus — Κέντρο ελέγχου — Inspection centre — Centro de inspección — Centre d'inspection — Centro d'ispezione — Pārbaudes centrs — Kontrolės centras — Ellenőrző központ — Centru ta' spezzjoni — Inspectiecentrum — Ošrodek kontroli — Centro de inspecção — Centru de inspecție — Inšpekčné stredisko — Kontrolno središče — Tarkastuskeskus — Kontrollcentrum
- 5 = Продукти — Produkty — Produkter — Erzeugnisse — Tooted — Προϊόντα — Products — Productos — Produits — Prodotti — Produkti — Produktai — Termékek — Prodotti — Producten — Produkty — Produtos — Produe — Produkty — Proizvodi — Tuotteet — Produkter
- HC = Всички продукти за консумация от човека — Všechny výrobky pro lidskou spotřebu — Alle produkter til konsum — Alle zum menschlichen Verzehr bestimmten Erzeugnisse — Köik inimtarbimiseks ette nähtud tooted — Όλα τα προϊόντα για ανθρώπινη κατανάλωση — All products for human consumption — Todos los productos destinados al consumo humano — Tous produits de consommation humaine — Prodotti per il consumo umano — Visi patēriņa produkti — Visi žmonių maistui skirti vartoti produktai — Az emberi fogyasztásra szánt összes termék — Il-prodotti kollha għall-konsum tal-bniedem — Producten voor menselijke consumptie — Produkty przeznaczone do spożycia przez ludzi — Todos os produtos para consumo humano — Toate produsele destinate consumului uman — Všetky produkty na ľudskú spotrebu — Vsi proizvodi za prehrano ljudi — Kaikki ihmisravinnoksi tarkoitettut tuotteet — Produkter avsedda för konsumtion

- NHC = Други продукти — Ostatní výrobky — Andre produkter — Andere Erzeugnisse — Teised tooted — Λοιπά προϊόντα — Other products — Otros productos — Autres produits — Altri prodotti — Citi produkti — Kiti produktai — Egyéb termékek — Prodotti Ohra — Andere producten — Produkty nieprzeznaczone do spożycia przez ludzi — Outros produtos — Alte produse — Ostatné produkty — Drugi proizvodi — Muut tuotteet — Andra produkter
- NT = Няма изисквания за температура — Žádné teplotní požadavky — ingen temperaturkrav — ohne Temperaturanforderungen — ilma temperatuuri nõueteta — δεν απαιτείται χαμηλή θερμοκρασία — no temperature requirements — Sin requisitos de temperatura — Sans conditions de température — che non richiedono temperature specifiche — nav prasību attiecībā uz temperatūru — Nēra temperatūros reikalavimų — nincsenek hőmérsékleti követelmények — ebda htiğijiet ta' temperatura — Geen temperaturen vereist — Produkty niewymagające przechowywania w obniżonej temperaturze — sem exigências quanto à temperatura — fără condiții de temperatură — žiadne požiadavky na teplotu — nobenih temperaturnih zahtev — Ei alhaisen lämpötilan vaatimuksia — Inga krav på temperatur
- T = Замразени/охладени продукти — Zmražené/chlazené výrobky — Frosne produkter — Gefrorene Erzeugnisse — Kūlmutatud jahutatud tooted — Προϊόντα κατεψυγμένα/διατηρημένα με απλή ψύξη — Frozen/chilled products — Productos congelados/refrigerados — Produits congelés/réfrigérés — Prodotti congelati/refrigerati — Sasaldēti/atdzesēti produkti — Užšaldyti/atšaldyti produktai — Fagyasztott/hűtött termékek — Prodotti ffrizati/mkesshin — Bevroren/gekoelde producten — Produkty wymagające przechowywania w obniżonej temperaturze — Produtos congelados/refrigerados — Produse congelate/refrigerate — Mrazené/chladené produkty — Zamrznjeni/ohlajeni proizvodi — Pakastetut/jäähdytetty tuotteet — Frysta/kylda produkter
- T(FR) = Замразени продукти — Zmražené výrobky — Frosne produkter — Gefrorene Erzeugnisse — Kūlmutatud tooted — Προϊόντα κατεψυγμένα — Frozen products — Productos congelados — Produits congelés — Prodotti congelati — Sasaldēti produkti — Užšaldyti produktai — Fagyasztott termékek — Prodotti ffrizati — Bevroren producten — Produkty wymagające przechowywania w temperaturze mrożenia — Produtos congelados — Produse congelate — Mrazené produkty — Zamrznjeni proizvodi — Pakastetut tuotteet — Frysta produkter
- T(CH) = Охладени продукти — Chlazené výrobky — Kølede produkter — Gekühlte Erzeugnisse — Jahutatud tooted — Διατηρημένα με απλή ψύξη — Chilled products — Productos refrigerados — Produits réfrigérés — Prodotti refrigerati — Atdzesēti produkti — Atšaldyti produktai — Hűtött termékek — Prodotti mkesshin — Gekoelde producten — Produkty wymagające przechowywania w temperaturze chłodzenia — Produtos refrigerados — Produse refrigerate — Chladené produkty — Ohlajeni proizvodi — Jäähdytetty tuotteet — Kylda produkter
- 6 = Живи животни — Živá zvířata — Levende dyr — Lebende Tiere — Elusloomad — Ζωντανά ζώα — Live animals — Animales vivos — Animaux vivants — Animali vivi — Dzīvi dzīvnieki — Gyvi gyvūnai — Élő állatok — Animali hajjin — Levende dieren — Zwierzęta — Animais vivos — Animale vii — Živé zvieratá — Žive živali — Elävät eläimet — Levande djur
- U = Копитни: едър рогат добитък, прасета, овце, кози, диви и домашни еднокопитни. — Kopytníci: skot, prasata, ovce, kozy, volně žijící a domácí lichokopytníci. — Hovdyr: kvæg, svin, får, geder, og husdyr eller vildtlevende dyr af hesteracen. — Huftiere: Rinder, Schweine, Schafe, Ziegen, Wildpferde, Hauspferde. — Kabjalised ja sõralised: veised, sead, lambad, kitsed, mets- ja koduhobused. — Οπληφόρα: βοοειδή, χοίροι, πρόβατα, αιγες, άγρια και κατοικίδια μόνοπλα. — Ungulates: cattle, pigs, sheep, goats, wild and domestic solipeds — Ungulados: bovinos, porcinos, ovinos, caprinos, solípedos domésticos y salvajes. — Ongulés: les bovins, porcins, ovins, caprins et solipèdes domestiques ou sauvages. — Ungulati: bovini, suini, ovini, caprini e solipedi domestici o selvatici. — Nagaini: liellopi, cūkas, aitas, kazas, savvaļas un mājas nepārnadži — Kanopiniai: galvijai, kiaulės, avys, ožkos, laukiniai ir naminiai neporakanopiniai. — Patások: marha, sertés, juh, kecske, vad és házi páratlanujjú patások. — Ungulati: baqar, hniezer, naghag, moghoz, solipedi salvaggi u domestiçi. — Hoefdieren: runderen, varkens, schapen, geiten, wilde en gedomesticeerde eenhoevigen — Zwierzęta kopytne: bydło, świnie, owce, kozy, konie i koniowate. — Ungulados: bovinos, suínos, ovinos, caprinos, solípedos domésticos ou selvagens. — Ungulate: bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine, solipede sălbatică și domestică — Kopytníky: dobytok, ošípané, ovce, kozy, vol'ne žijúce a domáce nepárnokopytníky. — Kopitarji: govedo, prašiči, ovce, koze, divji in domači enokopitarji. — Sorkka- ja kavioläimet: naudat, siat, lampaat, vuohet, luonnonvaraiset ja kotieläiminä pidettävät kavioläimet. — Hovdjur: nötkreatur, svin, får, getter, vilda och tama hovdjur.
- E = Регистрирани еднокопитни животни, както е определено в Директива 90/426/ЕИО на Съвета — Registrovaní koňovití podle definice ve směrnici Rady 90/426/EHS. — Registrerede heste som defineret i Rådets direktiv 90/426/EØF. — Registrierte Equiden wie in der Richtlinie 90/426/EWG des Rates bestimmt. — Nōukogu direktiivis 90/426/EMÜ märgitud registreeritud hobuslased. — Καταχωρημένα υποείδη όπως ορίζονται στην οδηγία 90/426/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου. — Registered equidae as defined in Council Directive 90/426/EEC — Équidos registrados definidos en la Directiva 90/426/CEE del Consejo. — Équidés enregistrés au sens de la directive 90/426/CEE. — Equidi registrati ai sensi della direttiva 90/426/CEE del Consiglio. — Registrēts *Equidae* saskaņā ar Padomes Direktīvu 90/426/EEK. — Registruoti arkliniai gyvūnai, kaip numatyta Tarybos direktyvoje 90/426/EEB. — A 90/426/EGK tanácsi irányelv szerint regisztrált lófélék. — Ekwidi rregistriti kif iddefinit fid-Direttiva tal-Kunsill 90/426/KEE. — Geregistreerde paardachtigen als omschreven in Richtlijn 90/426/EEG van de Raad. — Konie i koniowate określone w dyrektywie Rady 90/426/EWG. — Equídeos registados conforme definido na Directiva 90/426/CEE do Conselho. — Ecvidae înregistre conform Directivei 90/426/CEE a Consiliului — Registrované zvieratá koňovité, ako je definované v smernici Rady 90/426/EHS. — Registrirani kopitarji, kakor so opredeljeni v Direktivi Sveta 90/426/EGS. — Rekisteröidyt hevoseläimet kuten määritellään neuvoston direktiivissä 90/426/ETY. — Registrerade hästdjur enligt definitionen i rådets direktiv 90/426/EEG.

O = Други животни (включително животни от зоологически градини) — Ostatní zvířata (včetně zvířat v zoologické zahradě). — Andre dyr (herunder dyr fra zoologiske haver). — Andere Tiere (einschließlich Zootiere). — Teised loomad (kaasa arvatud loomaaia loomad). — Λοιπά ζώα (συμπεριλαμβανομένων των ζώων των ζωολογικών κήπων). — Other animals (including zoo animals) — Otros animales (incluidos los de zoológico). — Autres animaux (y compris les animaux de zoos). — Altri animali (compresi gli animali dei giardini zoologici). — Citi dzīvnieki (ieskaitot zoodārza dzīvniekus). — Kiti gyvūnai (įskaitant zoologijos sodų gyvūnus). — Egyéb állatok (beleértve az állatkerti állatokat). — Annimali ohra (inkluzi annimali taž-žu). — Andere dieren (met inbegrip van dieren tuindieren). — Pozostałe zwierzęta (w tym do ogrodów zoologicznych). — Outros animais (incluindo animais de jardim zoológico). — Alte animale (inclusiv animale din grădini zoologice) — Ostatné zvieratá (vrátane zvierat v ZOO). — Druge živali (vključno z živalmi za živalski vrt). — Muut eläimet (myös eläintarhoissa olevat eläimet). — Andra djur (även djur från djurparker).

5–6 = Особени забележки — Zvláštní poznámky — Særlige bemærkninger — Spezielle Bemerkungen — Erimärkused — Ειδικές παρατηρήσεις — Special remarks — Menciones especiales — Mentions spéciales — Note particolari — Įpašas atžimės — Specialios pastabos — Különleges észrevételek — Rimarki specjali — Bijzondere opmerkingen — Szczególne uwagi — Menções especiais — Observații speciale — Osobitné poznámky — Posebne opombe — Erityismainintoja — Anmärkningar

* = Спрямо въз основа на член 6 от Директива 97/78/ЕО до ново известие, както е посочено в колони 1, 4, 5 и 6. — Pozdrženo na základě článku 6 směrnice 97/78/ES až do dalšího oznámení, jak je uvedeno ve sloupcích 1, 4, 5 a 6. — Ophævet indtil videre iht. artikel 6 i direktiv 97/78/EF som angivet i kolonne 1, 4, 5 og 6. — Bis auf Weiteres nach Artikel 6 der Richtlinie 97/78/EG ausgesetzt, wie in den Spalten 1, 4, 5 und 6 vermerkt. — Peatatud direktiivi 97/78/EÜ artikli 6 alusel edasise teavitamiseni, nagu märgitud 1., 4., 5. ja 6. veerus. — Έχει ανασταλεί σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 6 της οδηγίας 97/78/ΕΚ μέχρι νεωτέρας όπως σημειώνεται στις στήλες 1, 4, 5 και 6. — Suspended on the basis of Article 6 of Directive 97/78/EC until further notice, as noted in columns 1, 4, 5 and 6 — Autorización suspendida hasta nuevo aviso en virtud del artículo 6 de la Directiva 97/78/CE (columnas 1, 4, 5 y 6). — Suspendu jusqu'à nouvel ordre sur la base de l'article 6 de la directive 97/78/CE, comme indiqué dans les colonnes 1, 4, 5 et 6. — Sospeso a norma dell'articolo 6 della direttiva 97/78/CE fino a ulteriore comunicazione, secondo quanto indicato nelle colonne 1, 4, 5 e 6. — Apturēts, pamatojoties uz Direktīvas 97/78/EK 6. pantu līdz tālākiem ziņojumiem, kā minēts 1., 4., 5. un 6. slejā. — Sustabdyta remiantis Direktyvos 97/78/EB 6 straipsniu iki tolimesnio pranešimo, kaip nurodyta 1, 4, 5 ir 6 skiltyse. — További értesítésig a 97/78/EK irányelv 6. cikke alapján felfüggesztve, ami az 1., 4., 5. és 6. oszlopban jelzésre került. — Sospiza abbaži ta' l-Artikolu 6 tad-Direttiva 97/78/KE sakemm jinhareġ avvż iehor, kif imsemmi fil-kolonn 1, 4, 5 u 6. — Erkennung voorlopig opgeschort op grond van artikel 6 van Richtlijn 97/78/EG, zoals aangegeven in de kolommen 1, 4, 5 en 6. — Zawieszona do odwołania na podstawie art. 6 dyrektywy 97/78/WE, zgodnie treścią kolumn 1, 4, 5 i 6. — Suspensas, com base no artigo 6.º da Directiva 97/78/CE, até que haja novas disposições, tal como referido nas colunas 1, 4, 5 e 6. — Suspendat în temeiul articolului 6 din Directiva 97/78/CE până la o comunicare ulterioară, conform indicațiilor din coloanele 1, 4, 5 și 6. — Pozastavené na základe článku 6 smernice 97/78/ES do ďalšieho oznámenia, ako je uvedené v stĺpcoch 1, 4, 5 a 6. — Odloženo na podlagi člana 6 Direktive 97/78/ES, do nadaljnega, kakor je navedeno v stolpcih 1, 4, 5 in 6. — Ei sovelleta direktiivin 97/78/EY 6 artiklan perusteella kunnes toisin ilmoitetaan, siten kuin 1, 4, 5 ja 6 sarakeissa esitetään. — Upphåvd tills vidare på grundval av artikel 6 i direktiv 97/78/EG vilket anges i kolumnerna 1, 4, 5 och 6.

(1) = Проверка според изискванията на Решение 93/352/ЕИО на Комисията, взето в изпълнение на член 19, параграф 3 от Директива 97/78/ЕО на Съвета. — Kontrola v souladu s požadavky rozhodnutí Komise 93/352/EHS s výkonem čl. 19 odst. 3 směrnice Rady 97/78/ES. — Kontrol efter Kommissionens beslutning 93/352/EØF vedtaget i henhold til artikel 19, stk. 3, i Rådets direktiv 97/78/EF. — Kontrolle erfolgt in Übereinstimmung mit den Anforderungen der Entscheidung 93/352/EG der Kommission, die in Ausführung des Artikels 19 Absatz 3 der Richtlinie 97/78/EG des Rates angenommen wurde. — Kontrollida kooskõlas komisjoni otsusega 93/352/EMÜ nõukogu direktiivi 97/78/EÜ artikli 19 lõike 3 täideviimisel. — Ελέγχεται σύμφωνα με τις απαιτήσεις της απόφασης 93/352/ΕΟΚ της Επιτροπής που έχει εκδοθεί κατ' εφαρμογή του άρθρου 19 παράγραφος 3 της οδηγίας 97/78/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου. — Checking in line with the requirements of Commission Decision 93/352/EEC taken in execution of Article 19(3) of Council Directive 97/78/EC — De acuerdo con los requisitos de la Decisión 93/352/CEE de la Comisión, adoptada en aplicación del apartado del artículo 19, apartado 3, de la Directiva 97/78/CE del Consejo. — Contrôles dans les conditions de la décision 93/352/CEE de la Commission prise en application de l'article 19, paragraphe 3, de la directive 97/78/CE du Conseil. — Controllo secondo le disposizioni della decisione 93/352/CEE della Commissione in applicazione dell'articolo 19, paragrafo 3, della direttiva 97/78/CE del Consiglio. — Pārbaude saskaņā ar Komisijas Lēmuma 93/352/EEK prasībām, ieviešot Padomes Direktīvas 97/78/EK 19. panta 3. punktu. — Patikrinimas pagal Komisijos sprendimo 93/352/EEB reikalavimus, vykdanč Tarybos direktyvos 97/78/EB 19 straipsnio 3 punktą. — A 93/352/EGK bizottsági határozat követelményeivel összhangban ellenőrizve, a 97/78/EK tanácsi irányelv 19. cikkének (3) bekezdése szerint végrehajtva. — Iščekkar skond il-htigijiet tad-Deciżjoni tal-Kummissjoni 93/352/KEE meħuda biex jitwettaq l-Artikolu 19(3) tad-Direttiva tal-Kunsill 97/78/KE. — Controle overeenkomstig Beschikking 93/352/EEG van de Commissie, vastgesteld ter uitvoering van artikel 19, lid 3, van Richtlijn 97/78/EG van de Raad. — Kontrola zgodna z wymogami decyzji Komisji 93/352/EWG podjętej w ramach wykonania art. 19 ust. 3 dyrektywy Rady 97/78/WE. — Controlos nas condições da Decisão 93/352/CEE da Comissão, em aplicação do n.º 3 do artigo 19.º da Directiva 97/78/CE do Conselho. — Controale desfășurate conform dispozițiilor Deciziei 93/352/CEE a Comisiei, adoptată în vederea punerii în aplicare a articolului 19 alineatul (3) din Directiva 97/78/CE a Consiliului. — Kontrola v súlade s požiadavkami rozhodnutia Komisie 93/352/EHS prijatými pri vykonávaní článku 19 ods. 3 smernice Rady 97/78/ES. — Preverjanje v skladu z zahtevami Odločbe Komisije 93/352/EGS, z namenom izvrševanja člena 19(3) Direktive Sveta 97/78/ES. — Tarkastus suorittamaan komission päätöksen 93/352/ETY, jolla pannaan täytäntöön neuvoston direktiivin 97/78/EY 19 artiklan 3 kohta, vaatimusten mukaisesti. — Kontroll i enlighet med kraven i kommissionens beslut 93/352/EEG, som antagits för tillämpning av artikel 19.3 i rådets direktiv 97/78/EG.

(2) = Само опаковани продукти — Pouze balené výrobky — Kun emballerede produkter — Nur umhüllte Erzeugnisse — Ainult pakitud tooted — Συσκευασμένα προϊόντα μόνο — Packed products only — Únicamente productos embalados — Produits emballés uniquement — Prodotti imballati unicamente — Tikai fasėti produktai — Tiktai supakuoti produktai — Csak csomagolt áruk — Prodotti ppakkjati biss — Uitsluitend verpakte producten — Tylko produkty pakowane — Apenas produtos embalados — Numai produse ambalate — Len balené produkty — Samo pakirani proizvodi — Ainoastaan pakatut tuotteet — Endast förpackade produkter

- (3) = Само рибни продукти — Pouze rybářské výrobky — Kun fiskeprodukter — Ausschließlich Fischereierzeugnisse — Ainult pakitud kalatooted — Αλιεύματα μόνο — Fishery products only — Únicamente productos pesqueros — Produits de la pêche uniquement — Prodotti della pesca unicamente — Tikai zivju produkti — Tiktai žuvininkystės produktai — Csak halászati termékek — Prodotti tassajd biss — Uitsluitend visserijproducten — Tylko produkty rybne — Apenas produtos da pesca — Numai produse din domeniul pescuitului — Len produkty rybolovu — Samo ribiški proizvodi — Ainoostaan kalastustuotteet — Endast fiskeriprodukter
- (4) = Само животински протеини — Pouze živočišné bílkoviny — Kun animalske proteiner — Nur tierisches Eiweiß — Ainult loomseed valgud — Ζωικές πρωτεΐνες μόνο — Animal proteins only — Únicamente proteínas animales — Uniquement protéines animales — Únicamente proteine animali — Tikai dzīvnieku proteīns — Tiktai gyvūniniai baltymai — Csak állati fehérjék — Proteini ta' l-animali biss — Uitsluitend dierlijke eiwitten — Tylko białko zwierzęce — Apenas proteínas animais — Numai proteine animale — Len živočišne bielkoviny — Samo živalske beljakovine — Ainoostaan eläinproteiinit — Endast djurprotein
- (5) = Само кожи с вълна и кожи — Pouze surové kůže s vlnou — Kun uld, skind og huder — Nur Wolle, Häute und Felle — Ainult villad, karusnahad ja loomanahad — Έριο και δέρματα μόνο — Wool hides and skins only — Únicamente lana, cueros y pieles — Laine et peaux uniquement — Lana e pelli unicamente — Tikai dzīvnieku vilna un zvērādas — Tiktai vilna, kailiai ir odos — Csak irhák és bőrok — Glud tas-suf biss — Uitsluitend wol, huden en vellen — Tylko skóry futerkowe i inne — Apenas lâ e peles — Numai lână și piei — Len vlnené prikrývky a kože — Samo kožuh in koža — Ainostaan villa, vuodat ja nahat — Endast ull, hudar och skinn
- (6) = Само течни мазнини, масла и рибни масла — Pouze tekuté tuky, oleje a rybí tuky — Kun flydende fedtstoffer, oljer og fiskeolier — Nur flüssige Fette, Öle und Fischöle — Ainult vedelad rasvad, ölid ja kalaõlid — Μόνον υγρά λίπη, έλαια και ψευέλαια — Liquid fats, oils, and fish oils only — Solo grasas líquidas, aceites y aceites de pescado — Graisses, huiles et huiles de poisson liquides uniquement — Exclusivamente grassi liquidi, oli e oli di pesce — Tikai šķidrie tauki, eļļa un zivju eļļa — Tiktai skysti riebalai, aliejus ir žuvų taukai — Csak folyékony zsírok, olajok és halolajok — Xahmijiet likvidi, žjūt, u žjūt tal-hut biss — Uitsluitend vloeibare vetten, oliën en visolie — Tylko płynne tłuszcze, oleje i oleje rybne — Apenas gorduras líquidas, óleos e óleos de peixe — Numai grăsimi, uleiuri și uleiuri de pește lichide — Len tekuté tuky, oleje a rybíe oleje — Samo tekoče maščobe, olja in ribja olja — Ainoostaan nestemäiset rasvat, öljyt ja kalaöljyt — Endast flytande fetter, oljor och fiskoljor
- (7) = Исландски понита (само от април до октомври) — Islandští poníci (pouze od dubna do října) — Islandske ponyer (kun fra april til oktober) — Islandponys (nur von April bis Oktober) — Islandi ponid (ainult aprillist oktoobrini) — Μικρόσωμα άλογα (πόνους) (από τον Απρίλιο έως τον Οκτώβριο μόνο) — Icelandic ponies (from April to October only) — Poneys de Islandia (únicamente desde abril hasta octubre) — Poneys d'Islande (d'avril à octobre uniquement) — Poneys islandesi (solo da aprile ad ottobre) — Islandes poniji (tikai no aprīļa līdz oktobrim) — Islandijos poniai (tikai nuo balandžio iki spalio mėn.) — Izlandi pónik (csak áprilistól októberig) — Ponijiet Ízlandízi (minn April sa Ottubru biss) — Íslandse pony's (enkel van april tot oktober) — Kucyki islandzkie (tylko od kwietnia do października) — Póneis da Islândia (apenas de Abril a Outubro) — Ponei islandezi (numai între lunile aprilie și octombrie) — Islandské poníky (len od apríla do októbra) — Islandski poniji (samo od aprila do oktobra) — Islanninponit (ainoostaan huhtikuusta lokakuuhun) — Islandshästar (endast från april till oktober)
- (8) = Само еднокопитни — Pouze koňovití — Kun enhovede dyr — Nur Einhufer — Ainult hobuslased — Μόνο ιπποειδή — Equidae only — Equinos únicamente — Équidés uniquement — Únicamente equidi — Tikai Equidae — Tiktai arkliniai gyvūnai — Csak lófélék — Ekwidi biss — Uitsluitend paardachtigen — Tylko koniowate — Apenas equídeos — Numai ecvidee — Len zvieratá koňovité — Samo equidae — Ainoostaan hevoseet — Endast hästdjur
- (9) = Само тропически риби — Pouze tropické ryby — Kun tropiske fisk — Nur tropische Fische — Ainult troopilised kalad — Τροπικά ψάρια μόνο — Tropical fish only — Únicamente peces tropicales — Poissons tropicaux uniquement — Únicamente pesci tropicali — Tikai tropu zivis — Tiktai tropinės žuvis — Csak trópusi halak — Hut tropikali biss — Uitsluitend tropische vissen — Tylko ryby tropikalne — Apenas peixes tropicais — Numai pești tropicali — Len tropické ryby — Samo tropske ribe — Ainoostaan trooppiset kalat — Endast tropiska fiskar
- (10) = Само котки, кучета, гризачи, зайцеподобни, живи риби и влечуги — Pouze kočky, psi, hlodavci, zajícovci, živé ryby a plazi — Kun katte, hunde, gnavere, harer, levende fisk og krybdyr — Nur Katzen, Hunde, Nagetiere, Hasentiere, lebende Fische und Reptilien — Ainult kassid, koerad, nārlised, jāneselised, elus kalad, roomajad ja muud linnud, vālja arvatud jaanalinnulased — Μόνο γάτες, σκύλοι, τρωκτικά, λαγόμορφα, ζωντανά ψάρια, ερπετά και πτηνά, εκτός από τα στρουθιοειδή — Cats, dogs, rodents, lagomorphs, live fish, and reptiles only — Únicamente gatos, perros, roedores, lagomorfos, peces vivos, y reptiles — Uniquement chats, chiens, rongeurs, lagomorphes, poissons vivants et reptiles — Únicamente cani, gatti, roditori, lagomorfi, pesci vivi, e rettili — Tikai kači, suņi, graužēji, lagomorphs, dzīvas zivis, un reptiļi — Tiktai katės, šunys, graužikai, kiškiniai, gyvos žuvis, ropliai — Csak macskák, kutya, rágcsálók, nyúlélék, élő halak, hüllők — Qtates, klieb, rodenti, lagomorfi, hut haj, u rettili — Uitsluitend katten, honden, knaagdieren, haasachtigen, levende vis, en reptielen — Tylko psy, koty, gryzonie, zającokształtne, żywe ryby i gady — Apenas gatos, cães, roedores, lagomorfos, peixes vivos e répteis — Numai pisici, câini, rozătoare, lagomorfe, pești vii și reptile — Len mačky, psy, hlodavce, zajacovitité zvieratá, živé ryby a plazy — Samo mačke, psi, glodalci, lagomorfi, žive ribe, plazilci in ptiči — Ainoostaan kissat, koirat, jysijät, jäniseläimet, elävät kalat, matelijat ja muut kuin sileälästäisiin kuuluvat linnut — Endast katter, hundar, gnagare, hardjur, levande fiskar, reptiler och fåglar, andra än strutsar
- (11) = Само насипна храна за животни — Pouze krmiva ve velkém — Kun foderstoffer i løs afladning — Nur Futtermittel als Schüttgut — Ainult pakendamata loomatoit — Ζωοτροφές χύμα μόνο — Foodstuffs in bulk only — Únicamente alimentos a granel para animales — Aliments pour animaux en vrac uniquement — Alimenti per animali in massa unicamente — Tikai beramā lopbarība — Tiktai neįpakuoti pašarai — Csak ömlesztett takarmányok — Oggetti ta' l-għalf fi kwantitajiet kbar biss — Uitsluitend onverpakte diervoeders — Tylko żywność luzem — Apenas alimentos para animais a granel — Numai furaje la vrac — Len volne ložené krmivá — Samo krma v razsutem stanju — Ainoostaan pakkaamaton rehu — Endast foder i lösikt

(12) = За (U) в случай на еднокопитни, само тези, предназначени за зоологически градини; и за (O), само пилета на един ден, риба, кучета, котки, насекоми или други животни, предназначени за зоологически градини. — Pro (U), v případě lichokopytníků, pouze ti odeslaní do zoologické zahrady; a pro (O) pouze jednodenní kuřata, ryby, psi, kočky, hmyz nebo jiná zvířata odeslaná do zoologické zahrady. — Ved (U), for så vidt angår dyr af hestefamilien, kun dyr sendt til en zoologisk have; og ved (O), kun daggamle kyllinger, fisk, hunde, katte, insekter eller andre dyr sendt til en zoologisk have. — Für (U) im Fall von Einhufnern, nur an einen Zoo versandte Tiere; und für (O) nur Eintagsküken, Fische, Hunde, Katzen, Insekten oder andere für einen Zoo bestimmte Tiere. — Ainult (U) loomaaeda mõeldud hobuslaste puhul; ja ainult (O) ühepäevaste tibude, kalade, koerte, kasside, putukate ja teiste loomaaeda mõeldud loomade puhul. — Για την κατηγορία (U) στην περίπτωση των μονοπίλων, μόνο αυτά προς μεταφορά σε ζωολογικό κήπο· και για την κατηγορία (O), μόνο νεοσσοί μιας ημέρας, ψάρια, σκύλοι, γάτες, έντομα ή άλλα ζώα προς μεταφορά σε ζωολογικό κήπο. — For (U) in the case of solipeds, those consigned to a zoo only; and for (O), day old chicks, fish, dogs, cats, insects, or other animals consigned to a zoo only. — En lo que se refiere a (U) en el caso de solípedos, solo los destinados a un zoológico; en cuanto a (O), solo polluelos de un día, peces, perros, gatos, insectos u otros animales destinados a un zoológico. — Pour (U), dans le cas des solipèdes, uniquement ceux expédiés dans un zoo; et pour (O), uniquement les poussins d'un jour, poissons, chiens, chats, insectes ou autres animaux expédiés dans un zoo. — Per (U) nel caso di solipedi, soltanto quelli destinati ad uno zoo, e per (O), soltanto pulcini di un giorno, pesci, cani, gatti, insetti o altri animali destinati ad uno zoo. — (U) tikai tie nepārnādži, kas ir nodoti zoodārzam; (O) tikai vienu dienu veci cāļi, zivis, suņi, kaķi, kukaiņi un citi dzīvnieki, kas ir nodoti zoodārzam — (U) neporakanopinių atveju, tiktai jei vežami į zoologijos sodą, ir (O) — tiktai vienadieniai viščiukai, žuvis, šunys, katės, vabzdžiai arba kiti į zoologijos sodą vežami gyvūnai. — Az (U) esetében páratlanújjú patások esetében csak az állatkertbe szállított egyedek; az (O) esetében csak naposcsibék, halak, kutyák, macskák, rovarok vagy egyéb, állatkertbe szállított állatok. — Ghal (U) fil-kaž ta' solipedi, dawb biss ikkonsenjati lil żu; u ghal (O), flieles ta' ġurnata żmien, hut, klieb, qtaes, insetti, jew annimali ohra kkonsenjati lil żu, biss. — Voor (U) in het geval van eenhoevigen uitsluitend naar een zoo verzonden dieren; en voor (O) uitsluitend eendagskuijken, vissen, honden, katten, insecten of andere naar een zoo verzonden dieren. — Przy (U) w przypadku koniowatych, tylko przeznaczone do zoo; a przy (O), tylko jednodzienne kurczęta, ryby, psy, koty, owady i inne zwierzęta przeznaczone do zoo. — Relativamente a (U), no caso dos solípedos, só os de jardim zoológico; relativamente a (O), só pintos do dia, peixes, cães, gatos, insectos ou outros animais de jardim zoológico. — Pentru (U) în cazul solipedelor, numai cele încredințate unei grădini zoologice; și pentru (O), doar pui de o zi, pești, câini, pisici, insecte sau alte animale încredințate unei grădini zoologice. — Pre (U) v prípade nepárnokopytníkov len tie, ktoré sú posielané do ZOO; a pre (O) len jednodňové kurčatá, ryby, psy, mačky, hmyz alebo iné zvieratá posielané do ZOO. — Za (U) v primeru enokopitarjev, samo tisti, namenjeni v živalski vrt; in za (O), samo dan stari piščanci, ribe, psi, mačke, žuželke, ali druge živali, namenjene v živalski vrt. — Sorkka- ja kavioläimistä (U) ainoastaan eläintarhaan tarkoitettut untuvikot, kalat, koirat, kissat, hyönteiset tai muut eläimet. — För (U) när det gäller vilda och tama hovdjur, endast sådana som finns i djurparker; och för (O), endast dagsgamla kycklingar, fiskar, hundar, katter, insekter eller andra djur i djurparker.

(13) = Предназначено за транзитното преминаване през Европейската общност на пратки с някои продукти от животински произход за консумация от човека, идващи за или от Русия, по реда на процедурите на съответното общностно законодателство. — Určeno k přepravě přes Evropské společenství pro záslilky s určitými výrobky živočišného původu pro lidskou spotřebu, které směřují do nebo pocházejí z Ruska podle zvláštních postupů stanovených v příslušném právu Společenství. — Udpeget EF-transitstied for sendering af visse animalske produkter til konsum, som transporteres til eller fra Rusland i henhold til de særlige procedurer, der er fastsat i de relevante EF-bestemmelser. — Für den Versand von zum menschlichen Verzehr bestimmten Erzeugnissen tierischen Ursprungs aus oder nach Russland durch das Zollgebiet der Europäischen Gemeinschaft gemäß den in den einschlägigen Rechtsvorschriften der Gemeinschaft vorgesehenen Verfahren. — Määratud transiidiks läbi Euroopa Ühenduse teatud inimtarbimiseks mõeldud loomset päritolu toodete partiidele, mis lähevad Venemaale või tulevad Venemaalt ning kuuluvad vastavate ühenduse õigusaktidega ette nähtud protseduuride alla — Проц διαμετακόμιση ορισμένων προϊόντων ζωικής προέλευσης που προορίζονται για κατανάλωση από τον άνθρωπο μέσω της Ευρωπαϊκής Κοινότητας, προερχόμενων από και κατευθυνόμενων προς τη Ρωσία, σύμφωνα με ειδικές διαδικασίες που προβλέπονται στη σχετική κοινοτική νομοθεσία. — Designated for transit across the European Community for consignments of certain products of animal origin for human consumption, coming to or from Russia under the specific procedures foreseen in relevant Community legislation — Designado para el tránsito a través de la Comunidad Europea de partidas de determinados productos de origen animal destinados al consumo humano, que tienen Rusia como origen o destino, con arreglo a los procedimientos específicos previstos en la legislación comunitaria pertinente. — Désigné pour le transit, dans la Communauté européenne, d'envois de certains produits d'origine animale destinés à la consommation humaine, en provenance ou à destination de la Russie, selon les procédures particulières prévues par la législation communautaire applicable. — Designato per il transito nella Comunità europea di partite di taluni prodotti di origine animale destinati al consumo umano, provenienti dalla o diretti in Russia, secondo le procedure specifiche previste nella pertinente legislazione comunitaria. — Norikojums sūtījumu tranzītam caur Eiropas Kopienu noteiktu dzīvnieku izcelsmes produktu, kas tiek sūtīti uz Krieviju vai no tās, patēriņam saskaņā ar noteiktu, attiecīgā Kopienas likumdošanā paredzētu kārtību. — Skirta tam tikrų gyvulinės kilmės produktų, skirtų žmonių maistui, siuntų tranzitui per Europos bendriją, vežamų į arba iš Rusijos vadovaujantis specialia atitinkamuose Bendrijos teisės aktuose numatyta tvarka. — Az Európai Közösségen keresztül történő tranzitszállításra kijelölve bizonyos emberi fogyasztásra szánt állati eredetű termékek szállítmányai számára, amelyek Oroszországból érkeznek a vonatkozó közösségi jogszabályokban előre elrendelt különleges eljárások szerint. — Allokati ghat-trağitt tul il-Komunità Ewropea għal kunsinji ta' ċerti prodotti għall-konsum tal-bniedem li joriginaw mill-annimali, provenjenti minn jew diretti lejn ir-Russja taht il-proċeduri speċifiċi previsti fil-leġiżlazzjoni Komunitarja rilevanti. — Aangewezen voor doorvoer door de Europese Gemeenschap van partijen van bepaalde producten van dierlijke oorsprong die bestemd zijn voor menselijke consumptie, bestemd voor of afkomstig van Rusland, overeenkomstig de specifieke procedures van de relevante communautaire wetgeving. — Przeznaczone do przewozu przez Wspólnotę Europejską przesyłek pewnych produktów pochodzenia zwierzęcego przeznaczonych do spożycia przez ludzi, przywożonych lub pochodzących z Rosji, na podstawie szczególnych procedur przewidzianych w odpowiednich przepisach Wspólnoty. — Designado para o trânsito, na Comunidade Europeia, de remessas de certos produtos de origem animal destinados ao consumo humano, com destino à Rússia ou dela provenientes, ao abrigo dos procedimentos específicos previstos pela legislação comunitária pertinente. — Desemnat pentru tranzitul în cadrul Comunității Europene privind transportul anumitor produse de origine animală destinate consumului uman, înspre sau dinspre Rusia, conform unor proceduri specifice prevăzute de legislația comunitară relevantă. — Určené na tranzit cez Európske spoločenstvo pre záslilky určitých produktov živočišného pôvodu na ľudskú spotrebu pochádzajúce z Ruska podľa osobitných postupov plánovaných v príslušnej legislatíve Spoločenstva. — Določeno za tranzit preko Evropske skupnosti za pošiljke nekaterih proizvodov živalskega izvora za prehrano ljudi, ki prihajajo iz Rusije po posebnih postopkih, predvidenih v ustreznih zakonodaji Skupnosti. — Asettettu passituksean Euroopan yhteisön kautta, kun on kyse tiettyjen ihmismavinnoksi tarkoitettujen eläinperäisten tuotteiden lähetyksistä, jotka tulevat Venäjälle tai lähtevät sieltä yhteisön lainsäädännön mukaisia erityismenettelyjä noudattaen. — För transit genom Europeiska gemenskapen av sändningar av vissa produkter av animaliskt ursprung avsedda att användas som livsmedel, som transporteras till eller från Ryssland enligt de särskilda förfaranden som fastställts i relevant gemenskapslagstiftning.

- (14) = Разрешени са ограничен брой видове, така както е определено от компетентния национален орган. — Povoluje se omezený počet druhů podle definice příslušných vnitrostátních orgánů. — Et begrænset antal arter som fastsat af den kompetente nationale myndighed. — Es ist nur eine begrenzte, von der zuständigen nationalen Behörde festgelegte Anzahl Arten zugelassen. — Lubatud on ainult piiratud arv liike, mille on kindlaks määranud pädev siseriiklik asutus. — Επιτρέπεται περιορισμένος μόνο αριθμός ειδών, τα οποία καθορίζονται από την αρμόδια εθνική αρχή. — A limited number of species are permitted, as defined by the competent national authority. — Se permite un número limitado de especies, tal como lo establezca la autoridad nacional competente. — Suivant la définition de l'autorité nationale compétente, un nombre limité d'espèces sont autorisées. — Sono ammesse solo alcune specie quali definite dall'autorità nazionale competente. — Atļauts ierobežots sugu skaits, kā noteikusi attiecīgās valsts kompetentā iestāde. — Leidžiamas ribotas skaičius rūšių, kaip nustatyta kompetentingos nacionalinės institucijos. — Korlátozott számú faj engedélyezett az illetékes nemzeti hatóság meghatározása szerint. — Numru limitat ta' speci huwa permess, kif definit mill-awtorità nazzjonali kompetenti. — Een beperkt aantal soorten is toegelaten, als omschreven door de bevoegde nationale autoriteit. — Dopuszcza się ograniczoną liczbę gatunków, jak określiły właściwe władze krajowe. — É permitido um número limitado de espécies, a definir pela autoridade nacional competente. — Este permis un număr limitat de specii, stabilit de autoritatea națională competentă. — Je povolený obmedzený počet druhov, ako určil príslušný národný orgán. — Dovoljeno je omejeno število vrst, kakor je določil pristojni nacionalni organ. — Toimivaltaisen kansallisen viranomaisen määrittämä rajoitettu määrä lajeja sallitaan. — Ett begränsat antal arter tillåts, enligt vad som fastställts av den behöriga nationella myndigheten.
- (15) = Това одобрение важи единствено до 31.07.2011 г. — Toto schválení platí pouze do 31. července 2011. — Denne godkendelse gælder kun indtil den 31. juli 2011. — Diese Genehmigung gilt nur bis zum 31. Juli 2011. — See heakskiit kehtib ainult 31. juulini 2011. — Η έγκριση αυτή ισχύει μόνο μέχρι τις 31 Ιουλίου 2011. — This approval is valid until 31 July 2011 only. — Esta autorización únicamente es válida hasta el 31 de julio de 2011. — Cette autorisation n'est valable que jusqu'au 31 juillet 2011. — La presente autorizzazione è valida soltanto fino al 31 luglio 2011. — Šis apstiprinājums ir spēkā tikai līdz 31.7.2011. — Šis patvirtinimas galioja tik iki 2011 m. liepos 31 d. — A jóváhagyás 2011. július 31-ig érvényes. — Din l-approvazzjoni hija valida biss sal-31/07/2011. — Deze goedkeuring is slechts geldig tot en met 31 juli 2011. — Niniejsze zatwierdzenie jest ważne do 31.7.2011. — Esta aprovação só é válida até 31 de Julho de 2011. — Această aprobare este valabilă numai până la 31.7.2011. — Ta odobritev velja samo do 31. 7. 2011. — Toto schválenie je platné len do 31. júla 2011. — Tämä hyväksyntä on voimassa ainoastaan 31.7.2011 saakka. — Detta godkännande är bara giltigt till den 31 juli 2011.

Страна: Белгия — **Země:** Belgie — **Land:** Belgien — **Land:** Belgien — **Riik:** Belgia — **Χώρα:** Βέλγιο — **Country:** Belgium — **Pais:** Bélgica — **Pays:** Belgique — **Paese:** Belgio — **Valsts:** Bēlgija — **Šalis:** Belgija — **Ország:** Belgium — **Pajjiž:** il-Belġju — **Land:** België — **Kraj:** Belgia — **País:** Bélgica — **Țara:** Belgia — **Krajina:** Belgicko — **Država:** Belgija — **Maa:** Belgia — **Land:** Belgien

1	2	3	4	5	6
Antwerpen/Anvers	BE 02699	P	Kaai 650	HC, NHC	
			Kallo	HC, NHC	
Brussel-Zaventem/Bruelles-Zaven-tem	BE 02899	A	Flight Care	HC-T(2)	
			Flight Care 2	NHC(2)	U, E, O
			Avia Partner	HC-T(2)	
			WFS	HC-T(2)	
			Swiss Port	HC-T(2)	
Gent/Gand	BE 02999	P		HC-NT(6) NHC-NT(6)	
Luik/Liège	BE 03099	A		HC, NHC-NT(2), NHC-T(FR)	U, E, O
Oostende/Ostende	BE 02599	P		HC-T(2)	
Oostende	BE 03199	A	IC-1	HC(2)	
			IC-2		E
Zeebrugge/Zeebruges	BE 02799	P	OCHZ	HC(2), NHC(2)	

Страна: България — **Země:** Bulharsko — **Land:** Bulgarien — **Land:** Bulgarien — **Riik:** Bulgaaria — **Χώρα:** Βουλγαρία — **Country:** Bulgaria — **País:** Bulgaria — **Pays:** Bulgarie — **Paese:** Bulgaria — **Valsts:** Bulgārija — **Šalis:** Bulgarija — **Ország:** Bulgária — **Pajjiž:** il-Bulgarija — **Land:** Bulgarije — **Kraj:** Bułgaria — **País:** Bulgária — **Ṭara:** Bulgaria — **Krajina:** Bulharsko — **Država:** Bolgarija — **Maa:** Bulgaria — **Land:** Bulgarien

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bregovo	BG 00199	R		HC(2), NHC	
Burgas	BG 00299	P		HC(2), NHC	
Gjueshevo	BG 00399	R		HC(2), NHC	
Kalotina	BG 00499	R		HC(2), NHC	U, E, O
Kapitan Andreevo	BG 00599	R		HC, NHC	U, E, O
Sofia	BG 00699	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	E, O
Varna	BG 00799	P		HC(2), NHC	
Zlatarevo	BG 00899	R		HC(2), NHC	

Страна: Чешка Република — **Země:** Česká republika — **Land:** Tjekkiēt — **Land:** Tschechische Republik — **Riik:** Tšehhi Vabariik — **Χώρα:** Τσεχική Δημοκρατία — **Country:** Czech Republic — **País:** República Checa — **Pays:** République tchèque — **Paese:** Repubblica ceca — **Valsts:** Čehija — **Šalis:** Čekijos Respublika — **Ország:** Cseh Köztársaság — **Pajjiž:** ir-Repubblika Ċeka — **Land:** Tsjechië — **Kraj:** Republika Czeska — **País:** República Checa — **Ṭara:** Republica Cehă — **Krajina:** Česká republika — **Država:** Česka — **Maa:** Tšekki — **Land:** Tjeckien

1	2	3	4	5	6
Praha-Ruzyně	CZ 00099	A		HC(2), NHC-T(CH)(2), NHC(NT)(2)	E, O

Страна: Дания — **Země:** Dánsko — **Land:** Danmark — **Land:** Dänemark — **Riik:** Taani — **Χώρα:** Δανία — **Country:** Denmark — **País:** Dinamarca — **Pays:** Danemark — **Paese:** Danimarca — **Valsts:** Dānija — **Šalis:** Danija — **Ország:** Dánia — **Pajjiž:** id-Danimarka — **Land:** Denemarken — **Kraj:** Dania — **País:** Dinamarca — **Ṭara:** Danemarca — **Krajina:** Dánsko — **Država:** Danska — **Maa:** Tanska — **Land:** Danmark

1	2	3	4	5	6
Ålborg 1 (Greenland Port) 1	DK 02299	P		HC-T(FR)(1)(2)	
Ålborg 2 (Greenland Port) 2	DK 51699	P		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Århus	DK 02199	P		HC(1)(2), NHC-T(FR) NHC-NT(2)(11)	
Esbjerg	DK 02399	P		HC-T(FR)(1)(2), NHC-T(FR)(2), NHC-NT(11)	
Fredericia	DK 11099	P		HC(1)(2), NHC(2), NHC-(NT)11	
Hanstholm	DK 11399	P		HC-T(FR)(1)(3)	
Hirtshals	DK 11599	P	Centre 1	HC-T(FR)(1)(2)	
			Centre 2	HC-T(FR)(1)(2)	
Billund	DK 01799	A		HC-T(1)(2), NHC(2)	U, E, O

1	2	3	4	5	6
København	DK 11699	A	Centre 1, SAS 1 (North)	HC(1)(2), NHC*	
			Centre 2, SAS 2 (East)	HC*, NHC(2)	
			Centre 3		U, E, O
København	DK 21699	P		HC(1), NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	
Kolding	DK 01899	P		NHC(11)	
Skagen	DK 01999	P		HC-T(FR)(1)(2)(3)	

Страна: Германия — Země: Německo — Land: Tyskland — Land: Deutschland — Riik: Saksamaa — Χώρα: Γερμανία —
Country: Germany — País: Alemania — Pays: Allemagne — Paese: Germania — Valsts: Vācija — Šalis: Vokietija —
Ország: Németország — Pajjiž: il-Germanja — Land: Duitsland — Kraj: Niemcy — País: Alemanha — Țara: Germania —
Krajina: Nemecko — Država: Nemčija — Maa: Saksa — Land: Tyskland

1	2	3	4	5	6
Berlin-Tegel	DE 50299	A		HC, NHC	O
Brake	DE 51599	P		NHC-NT(4)	
Bremen	DE 50699	P		HC, NHC	
Bremerhaven	DE 50799	P		HC, NHC	
Cuxhaven	DE 51699	P	IC 1	HC-T(FR)(3)	
			IC 2	HC-T(FR)(3)	
Düsseldorf	DE 51999	A		HC(2), NHC-T(CH)(2) NHC-NT(2)	O
Frankfurt/Main	DE 51099	A		HC, NHC	U, E, O
Hahn Airport	DE 55999	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Hamburg Flughafen	DE 50999	A		HC, NHC	O
Hamburg Hafen	DE 50899	P	Burchardkai	HC, NHC-NT, NHC-T(FR)	
			Frigo Altenwerder	HC	
			Reiherdamm	HC, NHC-T(FR) NHC-NT	
Hannover-Langenhagen	DE 51799	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Kiel	DE 52699	P		HC, NHC	
Köln	DE 52099	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Konstanz Straße	DE 53199	R		HC, NHC	U, E, O
Leipzig-Halle Flughafen	DE 56099	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	U, E, O
Lübeck	DE 52799	P		HC, NHC	E(14)
München	DE 49699	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O

1	2	3	4	5	6
Rostock	DE 51399	P		HC, NHC	U, E, O
Rügen	DE 51199	P		HC(3)	
Schönefeld	DE 50599	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	U, E, O
Stuttgart	DE 49099	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Weil/Rhein	DE 49199	R		HC, NHC	U, E, O

Страна: Естония — **Země:** Estonsko — **Land:** Estland — **Land:** Estland — **Riik:** Eesti — **Χώρα:** Εσθονία —
Country: Estonia — **País:** Estonia — **Pays:** Estonie — **Paese:** Estonia — **Valsts:** Igaunija — **Šalis:** Estija —
Ország: Észtország — **Pajjiž:** I-Estonja — **Land:** Estland — **Kraj:** Estonia — **País:** Estónia — **Ṭara:** Estonia —
Krajina: Estónsko — **Država:** Estonija — **Maa:** Viro — **Land:** Estland

1	2	3	4	5	6
Luhamaa	EE 00199	R		HC, NHC	U, E
Muuga	EE 00399	P	IC 1	HC, NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	
			AS Refetra	HC-T(FR)(2)	
Narva	EE 00299	R		HC, NHC-NT	
Paldiski	EE 00599	P		HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	

Страна: Гърция — **Země:** Řecko — **Land:** Grækenland — **Land:** Griechenland — **Riik:** Kreeka — **Χώρα:** Ελλάς —
Country: Greece — **País:** Grecia — **Pays:** Grèce — **Paese:** Grecia — **Valsts:** Grieķija — **Šalis:** Graikija —
Ország: Görögország — **Pajjiž:** il-Greċja — **Land:** Griekenland — **Kraj:** Grecja — **País:** Grécia — **Ṭara:** Grecia —
Krajina: Grécko — **Država:** Grčija — **Maa:** Kreikka — **Land:** Grekland

1	2	3	4	5	6
Evezoni	GR 06099	R		HC, NHC-NT	U, E, O
Athens International Airport	GR 05599	A		HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	U, E, O
Idomeni	GR 06299	F			U, E
Kakavia	GR 07099	R		HC(2), NHC-NT	
Neos Kafassos	GR 06399	F		HC(2), NHC-NT	U, E
Neos Kafassos	GR 06399	R		HC, NHC-NT	U, E
Peplos	GR 07299	R		HC(2), NHC-NT	E
Pireas	GR 05499	P		HC(2), NHC-NT	
Thessaloniki	GR 05799	A		HC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT	O
Thessaloniki	GR 05699	P		HC(2), NHC-NT	

Страна: Испания — Země: Španělsko — Land: Spanien — Land: Spanien — Riik: Hispaania — Χώρα: Ισπανία —
 Country: Spain — País: España — Pays: Espagne — Paese: Spagna — Valsts: Spānija — Šalis: Ispanija —
 Ország: Spanyolország — Pajjiž: Spanja — Land: Spanje — Kraj: Hiszpania — País: Espanha — Tāra: Špania —
 Krajina: Španielsko — Država: Španija — Maa: Espanja — Land: Spanien

1	2	3	4	5	6
A Coruña-Laxe	ES 48899	P	A Coruña	HC, NHC	
			Laxe	HC	
Algeciras	ES 47599	P	Productos	HC, NHC	
			Animales		U, E, O
Alicante	ES 49999	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Alicante	ES 48299	P		HC, NHC-NT	
Almería	ES 50099	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Almería	ES 48399	P		HC, NHC-NT	
Asturias	ES 50199	A		HC(2)	
Barcelona	ES 50299	A	Iberia	HC(2), NHC-T(CH)(2) NHC-NT(2)	O
			Flightcare	HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Barcelona	ES 47199	P		HC, NHC	
Bilbao	ES 50399	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Bilbao	ES 48499	P		HC, NHC	
Cádiz	ES 47499	P		HC, NHC	
Cartagena	ES 48599	P		HC, NHC	
Castellón	ES 49799	P		HC, NHC	
Gijón	ES 48699	P		HC, NHC	
Gran Canaria	ES 50499	A		HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	O
Huelva	ES 48799	P	Puerto interior	HC	
			Puerto exterior	NHC-NT	
Las Palmas de Gran Canaria	ES 48199	P	Productos	HC, NHC	
			Animales		U, E, O
Madrid	ES 47899	A	Iberia	HC(2), NHC(2)	U, E, O
			Flightcare	HC(2), NHC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT(2)	U, E, O
			PER4	HC-T(CH)(2)	
			WFS: World Wide Flight Services	HC(2), NHC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT(2)	O
Málaga	ES 50599	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Málaga	ES 47399	P		HC, NHC	U, E, O

1	2	3	4	5	6
Marín	ES 49599	P		HC, NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	
Palma de Mallorca	ES 47999	A		HC(2)-NT, HC(2)-TCH, HC(2)-T(FR)*, NHC(2)-NT, NHC(2)-T(CH), NHC(2)-T(FR)*	O
Santa Cruz de Tenerife	ES 48099	P	Dársena	HC	
			Dique	NHC	U, E, O
Santander	ES 50799	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Santander	ES 48999	P		HC, NHC	
Santiago de Compostela	ES 49899	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	
San Sebastián*	ES 50699	A		HC(2)*, NHC(2)*	
Sevilla	ES 50899	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Sevilla	ES 49099	P		HC, NHC	
Tarragona	ES 49199	P		HC, NHC	
Tenerife Norte	ES 50999	A		HC(2)	
Tenerife Sur	ES 49699	A	Productos	HC(2), NHC(2)	
			Animales		U, E, O
Valencia	ES 51099	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Valencia	ES 47299	P		HC, NHC	
Vigo	ES 51199	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Vigo	ES 47699	P	T.C. Guixar	HC, NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	
			Pantalan 3	HC-T(FR)(2)(3)	
			Frioya	HC-T(FR)(2)(3)	
			Frigalsa	HC-T(FR)(2)(3)	
			Pescanova	HC-T(FR)(2)(3)	
			Vieirasa	HC-T(FR)(3)	
			Fandicosta	HC-T(FR)(2)(3)	
			Frig. Morrazo	HC-T(FR)(3)	
Vilagarcía-Ribeira-Caramiñal	ES 49499	P	Vilagarcía	HC(2), NHC(2)(11)	
			Ribeira	HC	
			Caramiñal	HC	
Vitoria	ES 49299	A	Productos	HC(2), NHC-NT(2), NHC-T(CH)(2)	
			Animales		U, E, O
Zaragoza	ES 49399	A		HC(2)	

Страна: Франция — Země: Francie — Land: Frankrig — Land: Frankreich — Riik: Prantsusmaa — Χώρα: Γαλλία —
Country: France — País: Francia — Pays: France — Paese: Francia — Valsts: Francija — Šalis: Prancūzija —
Ország: Franciaország — Pajjiž: Franza — Land: Frankrijk — Kraj: Francja — País: França — Țara: Franța —
Krajina: Francúzsko — Država: Francija — Maa: Ranska — Land: Frankrike

1	2	3	4	5	6
Beauvais	FR 16099	A			E
Bordeaux	FR 13399	A		HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC	
Bordeaux	FR 23399	P		HC-NT	
Boulogne	FR 16299	P		HC-T(1)(3), HC-NT(1)(3)	
Brest	FR 32999	A		HC-T(CH)(1)(2)	
Brest	FR 12999	P		HC-T(FR) (1), NHC-T(FR)	
Châteauroux — Déols	FR 13699	A		HC-T(2)	
Concarneau — Douarnenez	FR 22999	P	Concarneau	HC-T(1)(3)	
			Douarnenez	HC-T(FR)(1)(3)	
Deauville	FR 11499	A			E
Dunkerque	FR 15999	P	Caraibes	HC-T(1), HC-NT	
			Maison Blanche	NHC-NT	
Ferney-Voltaire (Genève)	FR 20199	A		HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT, NHC	O
Le Havre	FR 17699	P	Route des marais	HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC	
			Dugrand	HC-T(FR)(1)(2)	
			EFBS	HC-T(FR)(1)(2)	
			Fécamp	HC-NT(6), NHC-NT(6)	
Lorient	FR 15699	P	CCIM	NHC-NT(4)	
Lyon — Saint-Exupéry	FR 16999	A		HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC	O
Marseille Port (15)	FR 11399	P	Hangar 14		E
			STEF	HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT(2)	
Marseille Fos-sur-Mer	FR 31399	P		HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC	
Marseille aéroport	FR 21399	A		HC-T(1), HC-NT,	O
Nantes — Saint-Nazaire	FR 14499	P		HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC-NT	
Nice	FR 10699	A		HC-T(CH)(1)(2)	O
Orly	FR 29499	A	SFS	HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT(2), NHC	
			Air France	HC-T(1), HC-NT	
Réunion Port Réunion	FR 29999	P		HC(1), NHC	
Réunion Roland-Garros	FR 19999	A		HC(1), NHC	O

1	2	3	4	5	6
Roissy Charles-de-Gaulle	FR 19399	A	Air France	HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC-NT	
			France Handling	HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC	
			Station animale		U, E, O
Rouen	FR 27699	P		HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC	
Saint-Louis Bâle	FR 26899	A		HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC	O
Saint-Louis Bâle	FR 16899	R		HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC	
Saint-Malo	FR 13599	P		NHC-NT	
Saint-Julien Bardonnex	FR 17499	R		HC-T(1), HC-NT, NHC	U, O
Sète	FR 13499	P	Frontignan	HC-T(1), HC-NT	
Toulouse — Blagnac	FR 13199	A		HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT(2), NHC(2)	O
Vatry	FR 15199	A		HC-T(CH)(1)(2)	

Страна: Ирландия — **Země:** Irsko — **Land:** Irland — **Land:** Irland — **Riik:** Iirimaa — **Χώρα:** Ιρλανδία — **Country:** Ireland — **País:** Irlanda — **Pays:** Irlande — **Paese:** Irlanda — **Valsts:** Īrija — **Šalis:** Airija — **Ország:** Írország — **Pajiz:** l-Irlanda — **Land:** Ierland — **Kraj:** Irlandia — **País:** Irlanda — **Ṭara:** Irlanda — **Krajina:** Irsko — **Država:** Irska — **Maa:** Irlanti — **Land:** Irland

1	2	3	4	5	6
Dublin Airport	IE 02999	A			E, O
Dublin Port	IE 02899	P		HC(2), NHC	
Shannon	IE 03199	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	U, E, O

Страна: Италия — **Země:** Itálie — **Land:** Italien — **Land:** Italien — **Riik:** Itaalia — **Χώρα:** Ιταλία — **Country:** Italy — **País:** Italia — **Pays:** Italie — **Paese:** Italia — **Valsts:** Itālija — **Šalis:** Italija — **Ország:** Olaszország — **Pajiz:** Italja — **Land:** Italië — **Kraj:** Włochy — **País:** Itália — **Ṭara:** Italia — **Krajina:** Taliansko — **Država:** Italija — **Maa:** Italia — **Land:** Italien

1	2	3	4	5	6
Ancona	IT 10199	A		HC, NHC	
Ancona	IT 00199	P	VIS	HC	
			Garbage	NHC	
Bari	IT 00299	P		HC, NHC-NT	
Bergamo	IT 03999	A		HC, NHC	
Bologna Borgo Panigale	IT 00499	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Brescia Montichiari Aeroporto	IT 04599	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Brindisi	IT 04699	P		HC	

1	2	3	4	5	6
Campocologno	IT 03199	F			U
Chiasso	IT 10599	F		HC, NHC	U, O
Chiasso	IT 00599	R		HC, NHC	U, O
Civitavecchia	IT 04399	P		HC-T(2)	
Genova	IT 01099	P	Calata Sanità (terminal Sech)	HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	
			Nino Ronco (terminal Messina)	NHC-NT(2)	
			Porto di Voltri (Voltri)	HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	
			Ponte Paleocapa	NHC-NT(6)	
Genova	IT 11099	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Gioia Tauro	IT 04099	P		HC, NHC	
Gran San Bernardo — Pollein	IT 02099	R		HC, NHC	
La Spezia	IT 03399	P		HC, NHC	U, E
Livorno — Pisa	IT 01399	P	Porto Commerciale	HC, NHC-NT	
			Sintermar	HC, NHC	
			Lorenzini	HC, NHC-NT	
			Terminal Darsena Toscana	HC, NHC	
Livorno — Pisa	IT 04299	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Milano Linate	IT 01299	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Milano Malpensa	IT 01599	A	Magazzini aeroportuali ALHA	HC(2), NHC(2)	
			SEA		U, E
			Cargo City MLE	HC, NHC	O
Napoli	IT 01899	P	Molo Bausan	HC, NHC	
Napoli	IT 11899	A		HC, NHC-NT	
Olbia	IT 02299	P		HC-T(FR)(3)	
Palermo	IT 01999	A		HC-T	
Palermo	IT 11999	P		HC	
Ravenna	IT 03499	P	Sapir 1	NHC-NT(6)	
			TCR	HC-T(FR)(2), HC-NT(2), NHC-NT(2)	
			Setramar	NHC-NT(4)	
			Docks Cereali	NHC-NT	
Reggio Calabria*	IT 01799	P		HC*, NHC*	

1	2	3	4	5	6
Reggio Calabria	IT 11799	A		HC, NHC	
Roma Fiumicino	IT 00899	A	Alitalia	HC(2) NHC-NT(2)	O(14)
			Cargo City ADR	HC, NHC	
			Isola Veterinaria		U, E, O
Rimini	IT 04199	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Salerno	IT 03599	P		HC, NHC	
Taranto	IT 03699	P		HC, NHC	
Torino Caselle*	IT 02599	A		HC-T(2),* NHC-NT(2)*	O*
Trapani	IT 03799	P		HC	
Trieste	IT 02699	P	Hangar 69	HC, NHC	
Venezia	IT 12799	A		HC(2), NHC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT(2)	
Venezia	IT 02799	P		HC-T, NHC-NT	
Verona	IT 02999	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Vado Ligure Savona porto	IT 04499	P		HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	

Страна: Кипър — **Země:** Kypr — **Land:** Cypern — **Land:** Zypern — **Riik:** Küpros — **Χώρα:** Κύπρος — **Country:** Cyprus — **País:** Chipre — **Pays:** Chypre — **Paese:** Cipro — **Valsts:** Kipra — **Šalis:** Kipras — **Ország:** Ciprus — **Pajjiž:** Ċipru — **Land:** Cyprus — **Kraj:** Cypr — **País:** Chipre — **Ṭara:** Ċipru — **Krajina:** Cyprus — **Država:** Ċiper — **Maa:** Kypros — **Land:** Cypern

1	2	3	4	5	6
Larnaka	CY 40099	A		HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	O
Lemesos	CY 50099	P		HC(2), NHC-NT	

Страна: Латвия — **Zemē:** Lotyšsko — **Land:** Letland — **Land:** Lettland — **Riik:** Läti — **Χώρα:** Λεττονία — **Country:** Latvia — **País:** Letonia — **Pays:** Lettonie — **Paese:** Lettonia — **Valsts:** Latvija — **Šalis:** Latvija — **Ország:** Lettország — **Pajjiž:** il-Latvja — **Land:** Letland — **Kraj:** Łotwa — **País:** Letónia — **Ṭara:** Letonia — **Krajina:** Lotyšsko — **Država:** Latvija — **Maa:** Latvia — **Land:** Lettland

1	2	3	4	5	6
Daugavpils	LV 81699	F		HC(2), NHC(NT)(2)	
Grebņeva(13)	LV 72199	R		HC, NHC-T(CH), NHC-NT	
Patarnieki	LV 73199	R	IC 1	HC, NHC-T(CH), NHC-NT	
			IC 2		U, E, O
Rēzekne(13)	LV 74299	F		HC(2), NHC(NT)(2)	

1	2	3	4	5	6
Rīga (Rīga port)	LV 21099	P		HC(2), NHC(2)	
			Kravu terminālis	HC-T(FR)(2) HC-NT(2)	
Rīga (Baltmarine Terminal)	LV 05099	P		HC-T(FR)(2)	
Terehova(13)	LV 72299	R		HC, NHC-NT	E, O
Ventspils	LV 31199	P		HC(2), NHC(2)	

Страна: Литва — **Zemē:** Litva — **Land:** Litauen — **Land:** Litauen — **Riik:** Leedu — **Χώρα:** Λιθουανία —
Country: Lithuania — **País:** Lituania — **Pays:** Lituanie — **Paese:** Lituania — **Valsts:** Lietuva — **Šalis:** Lietuva —
Ország: Litvánia — **Pajjiž:** il-Litwanja — **Land:** Litouwen — **Kraj:** Litwa — **País:** Lituânia — **Ṭara:** Lituania —
Krajina: Litva — **Država:** Litva — **Maa:** Liettua — **Land:** Litauen

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kena(13)	LT 01399	F		HC-T(FR), HC-NT, NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	
Kybartai(13)	LT 01899	R		HC, NHC	
Kybartai(13)	LT 02199	F		HC, NHC	
Lavoriškės(13)	LT 01199	R		HC, NHC	
Medininkai(13)	LT 01299	R		HC, NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	U, E, O
Molo	LT 01699	P		HC-T(FR)(2), HC-NT(2), NHC-T (FR)(2), NHC-NT(2)	
Malkų įlankos	LT 01599	P		HC, NHC	
			Laistų	HC	
Pilies	LT 02299	P		HC-T(FR)(2), HC-NT(2), NHC-T (FR)(2), NHC-NT(2)	
Panemunė(13)	LT 01799	R		HC, NHC	
Pagėgiai(13)	LT 02099	F		HC, NHC	
Šalčininkai(13)	LT 01499	R		HC, NHC	
Vilnius	LT 01999	A		HC, NHC	O

Страна: Люксембург — **Zemē:** Lucembursko — **Land:** Luxembourg — **Land:** Luxemburg — **Riik:** Luksemburg —
Χώρα: Λουξεμβούργο — **Country:** Luxembourg — **País:** Luxemburgo — **Pays:** Luxembourg — **Paese:** Lussemburgo —
Valsts: Luksemburga — **Šalis:** Liuksemburgas — **Ország:** Luxemburg — **Pajjiž:** il-Lussemburgu — **Land:** Luxemburg —
Kraj: Luksemburg — **País:** Luxemburgo — **Ṭara:** Luxemburg — **Krajina:** Lucembursko — **Država:** Luksemburg —
Maa: Luxemburg — **Land:** Luxemburg

1	2	3	4	5	6
Luxembourg	LU 00199	A	Centre 1	HC	U, E, O
			Centre 2	NHC-NT	

Страна: Унгарија — **Země:** Maďarsko — **Land:** Ungarn — **Land:** Ungarn — **Riik:** Ungari — **Χώρα:** Ουγγαρία — **Country:** Hungary — **País:** Hungría — **Pays:** Hongrie — **Paese:** Ungheria — **Valsts:** Ungārija — **Šalis:** Vengrija — **Ország:** Magyarország — **Pajjiž:** l-Ungerija — **Land:** Hongarije — **Kraj:** Węgry — **País:** Hungria — **Ṭara:** Ungaria — **Krajina:** Maďarsko — **Država:** Maďarska — **Maa:** Unkari — **Land:** Ungern

1	2	3	4	5	6
Budapest-Ferihegy	HU 00399	A		HC(2), NHC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT(2)	O
Eperjeske	HU 02899	F		HC-T(CH)(2), HC(NT(2), NHC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT(2)	
Gyékényes	HU 00499	F		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Kelebia	HU 02499	F		HC-T(CH)(2), HC(NT(2), NHC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT(2)	
Letenye	HU 01199	R		HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	
Röske	HU 02299	R		HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	E
Záhony	HU 02799	R		HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	U, E

Страна: Малта — **Země:** Malta — **Land:** Malta — **Land:** Malta — **Riik:** Malta — **Χώρα:** Μάλτα — **Country:** Malta — **País:** Malta — **Pays:** Malte — **Paese:** Malta — **Valsts:** Malta — **Šalis:** Malta — **Ország:** Málta — **Pajjiž:** Malta — **Land:** Malta — **Kraj:** Malta — **País:** Malta — **Ṭara:** Malta — **Krajina:** Malta — **Država:** Malta — **Maa:** Malta — **Land:** Malta

1	2	3	4	5	6
Luqa	MT 01099	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O, U, E
Marsaxxlok	MT 03099	P		HC, NHC	
Valletta	MT 02099	P			U, E

Страна: Нидерландия — **Země:** Nizozemsko — **Land:** Nederlandene — **Land:** Niederlande — **Riik:** Madalmaad — **Χώρα:** Κάτω Χώρες — **Country:** Netherlands — **País:** Países Bajos — **Pays:** Pays-Bas — **Paese:** Paesi Bassi — **Valsts:** Nīderlandē — **Šalis:** Nyderlandai — **Ország:** Hollandia — **Pajjiž:** l-Olanda — **Land:** Nederland — **Kraj:** Niderlandy — **País:** Países Baixos — **Ṭara:** Ṭarile de Jos — **Krajina:** Holandsko — **Država:** Nizozemska — **Maa:** Alankomaat — **Land:** Nederländerna

1	2	3	4	5	6
Amsterdam	NL 01399	A	Aero Ground Services	HC(2), NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT(2)	O(14)
			KLM-2		U, E, O(14)
			Freshport	HC(2), NHC(2)	O(14)
Amsterdam	NL 01799	P	Cornelis Vrolijk	HC-T(FR)(2)(3)	
			Daalimpex Velzen	HC-T	
			PCA	HC(2), NHC(2)	
			Kloosterboer IJmuiden	HC-T(FR)	
Eemshaven	NL 01899	P		HC-T(2), NHC-T(FR)(2)	
Harlingen	NL 02099	P	Daalimpex	HC-T	

1	2	3	4	5	6
Maastricht	NL 01599	A		HC, NHC	U, E, O
Rotterdam	NL 01699	P	Eurofrigo Karimatastraat	HC, NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	
			Eurofrigo, Abel Tasmanstraat	HC	
			Kloosterboer	HC-T(FR)(2)	
			Wibaco	HC-T(FR)(2), HC-NT(2)	
			Van Heezik	HC-T(2)	
Vlissingen	NL 02199	P	Daalimpex	HC-T(2), NHC-T(FR)(2)	
			Kloosterboer	HC-T(2), HC-NT(2)	

Страна: Австрия — **Země:** Rakousko — **Land:** Østrig — **Land:** Österreich — **Riik:** Austria — **Χώρα:** Αυστρία — **Country:** Austria — **País:** Austria — **Pays:** Autriche — **Paese:** Austria — **Valsts:** Austrija — **Šalis:** Austrija — **Ország:** Ausztria — **Pajjiž:** Awstrija — **Land:** Oostenrijk — **Kraj:** Austria — **País:** Austria — **Ṭara:** Austria — **Krajina:** Rakúsko — **Država:** Avstrija — **Maa:** Itävalta — **Land:** Österrike

1	2	3	4	5	6
Feldkirch-Buchs	AT 01399	F		HC-NT(2), NHC-NT	
Feldkirch-Tisis	AT 01399	R		HC(2), NHC-NT	E
Höchst	AT 00699	R		HC, NHC-NT	U, E, O
Linz	AT 00999	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O, E, U(8)
Wien-Schwechat	AT 01599	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O

Страна: Полша — **Země:** Polsko — **Land:** Polen — **Land:** Polen — **Riik:** Poola — **Χώρα:** Πολωνία — **Country:** Poland — **País:** Polonia — **Pays:** Pologne — **Paese:** Polonia — **Valsts:** Polija — **Šalis:** Lenkija — **Ország:** Lengyelország — **Pajjiž:** il-Polonja — **Land:** Polen — **Kraj:** Polska — **País:** Polónia — **Ṭara:** Polonia — **Krajina:** Polsko — **Država:** Poljska — **Maa:** Puola — **Land:** Polen

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bezledy (13)	PL 28199	R		HC, NHC	U, E, O
Dorohusk	PL 06399	R		HC, NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	O
Gdańsk	PL 22299	P		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Gdynia	PL 22199	P	IC 1	HC, NHC	U, E, O
			IC 2	HC-T(FR)(2)	
Hrebenne	PL 06499	R		HC, NHC	
Korczowa	PL 18199	R		HC, NHC	U, E, O
Kukuryki-Koroszczyn	PL 06199	R		HC, NHC	U, E, O
Kuźnica Białostocka (13)	PL 20199	R		HC, NHC	U, E, O

1	2	3	4	5	6
Świnoujście	PL 32299	P		HC, NHC	
Szczecin	PL 32199	P		HC, NHC	
Terespol-Kobyłany	PL 06299	F		HC, NHC	
Warszawa Okęcie	PL 14199	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	U, E, O

Страна: Португалия — **Země:** Portugalsko — **Land:** Portugal — **Land:** Portugal — **Riik:** Portugal — **Χώρα:** Πορτογαλία —
Country: Portugal — **País:** Portugal — **Pays:** Portugal — **Paese:** Portogallo — **Valsts:** Portugāle — **Šalis:** Portugalija —
Ország: Portugália — **Pajjiž:** il-Portugall — **Land:** Portugal — **Kraj:** Portugalia — **País:** Portugal — **Țara:** Portugalia —
Krajina: Portugalsko — **Država:** Portugalska — **Maa:** Portugali — **Land:** Portugal

1	2	3	4	5	6
Aveiro	PT 04499	P		HC-T(3)	
Faro	PT 03599	A		HC-NT(2) HC-T(CH)(2)	O
Funchal (Madeira)	PT 05699	A		HC(2)	
Caniçal (Madeira)	PT 03699	P		HC-T(2)	
Horta (Açores)	PT 04299	P		HC-T(FR)(3)	
Lisboa	PT 03399	A	Centre 1	HC(2),	O
Lisboa	PT 03999	P	Liscont	HC(2), NHC	
			Xabregas	HC, NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	
Peniche	PT 04699	P		HC-T(FR)(3)	
Ponta Delgada (Açores)	PT 03799	A		NHC-NT	
Ponta Delgada (Açores)	PT 05799	P		HC-T(FR)(3), NHC-T(FR)(3)	
Porto	PT 03499	A		HC-T(2), NHC-NT(2)	O
Porto	PT 04099	P		HC(2), NHC-NT	
Setúbal	PT 04899	P		HC(2), NHC	
Sines	PT 05899	P		HC(2), NHC	
Viana do Castelo	PT 04399	P		HC-T(FR)(3)	

Страна: Румъния — **Země:** Rumunsko — **Land:** Rumænien — **Land:** Rumänien — **Riik:** Rumeenia — **Χώρα:** Ρουμανία —
Country: Romania — **País:** Rumanía — **Pays:** Roumanie — **Paese:** Romania — **Valsts:** Rumānija — **Šalis:** Rumunija —
Ország: Románia — **Pajjiž:** ir-Rumanija — **Land:** Roemenië — **Kraj:** Rumunia — **País:** Roménia — **Ṭara:** România —
Krajina: Rumunsko — **Država:** Romunija — **Maa:** Romania — **Land:** Rumänien

1	2	3	4	5	6
Albita	RO 40199	R	IC 1	HC(2)	
			IC 2	NHC-T(CH), NHC-NT	
			IC 3		U, E, O
Bucharest Henri Coandă	RO 10199	A	IC 1	HC-NT(2), HC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT(2)	
			IC 2		E, O
Constanta North	RO 15199	P		HC(2), NHC-NT(2)	
Constanta South — Agigea	RO 15299	P		HC(2), NHC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT(2)	
Halmeu	RO 33199	R	IC 1	HC(2), NHC(2)	
			IC 2		U, E, O
Sculeni Iasi	RO 25199	R		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Siret	RO 36199	R		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Stamora Moravita	RO 38199	R	IC 1	HC(2), NHC(2)	
			IC 2		U, E, O

Страна: Словения — **Země:** Slovinsko — **Land:** Slovenien — **Land:** Slowenien — **Riik:** Sloveenia — **Χώρα:** Σλοβενία —
Country: Slovenia — **País:** Eslovenia — **Pays:** Slovénie — **Paese:** Slovenia — **Valsts:** Slovēnija — **Šalis:** Slovėnija —
Ország: Szlovénia — **Pajjiž:** is-Slovenja — **Land:** Slovenië — **Kraj:** Slowenia — **País:** Eslovénia — **Ṭara:** Slovenia —
Krajina: Slovinsko — **Država:** Slovenija — **Maa:** Slovenia — **Land:** Slovenien

1	2	3	4	5	6
Dobova	SI 00699	F		HC(2), NHC(2)	U, E
Gruškovje	SI 00199	R		HC, NHC-T (FR), NHC-NT	O
Jelšane	SI 00299	R		HC, NHC-NT, NHC-T(CH)	O
Koper	SI 00399	P		HC, NHC-T(CH), NHC-NT	
Ljubljana Brnik	SI 00499	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Obrežje	SI 00599	R		HC, NHC-T(CH)(2), NHC-NT(2)	U, E, O

Страна: Словакия — **Země:** Slovensko — **Land:** Slovakiet — **Land:** Slowakei — **Riik:** Slovakkia — **Χώρα:** Σλοβακία —
Country: Slovakia — **País:** Eslovaquia — **Pays:** Slovaquie — **Paese:** Slovacchia — **Valsts:** Slovākija — **Šalis:** Slovakija —
Ország: Szlovákia — **Pajjiž:** is-Slovakja — **Land:** Slowakije — **Kraj:** Słowacja — **País:** Eslováquia — **Ṭara:** Slovakia —
Krajina: Slovensko — **Država:** Slovaška — **Maa:** Slovakia — **Land:** Slovakien

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bratislava	SK 00399	A	IC 1	HC(2), NHC(2)	
			IC 2		E, O
Vyšné Nemecké	SK 00199	R	IC 1	HC, NHC	
			IC 2		U, E
Čierna nad Tisou	SK 00299	F		HC, NHC	

Страна: Финландия — **Země:** Finsko — **Land:** Finland — **Land:** Finnland — **Riik:** Soome — **Χώρα:** Φινλανδία —
Country: Finland — **País:** Finlandia — **Pays:** Finlande — **Paese:** Finlandia — **Valsts:** Somija — **Šalis:** Suomija —
Ország: Finnország — **Pajjiž:** il-Finlandja — **Land:** Finland — **Kraj:** Finlandia — **País:** Finlândia — **Ṭara:** Finlanda —
Krajina: Fínsko — **Država:** Finska — **Maa:** Suomi — **Land:** Finland

1	2	3	4	5	6
Hamina	FI 20599	P		HC(2), NHC(2)	
Helsinki	FI 10199	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O
Helsinki	FI 00199	P		HC(2), NHC-NT	
Vaalimaa	FI 10599	R		HC(2), NHC	U, E, O

Страна: Швеция — **Země:** Švédsko — **Land:** Sverige — **Land:** Schweden — **Riik:** Rootsi — **Χώρα:** Σουηδία —
Country: Sweden — **País:** Suecia — **Pays:** Suède — **Paese:** Svezia — **Valsts:** Zviedrija — **Šalis:** Švedija —
Ország: Svédország — **Pajjiž:** L-Iżvezja — **Land:** Zweden — **Kraj:** Szwecja — **País:** Suécia — **Ṭara:** Suedia —
Krajina: Švédsko — **Država:** Švedska — **Maa:** Ruotsi — **Land:** Sverige

1	2	3	4	5	6
Göteborg	SE 14299	P		HC(2), NHC(2)-NT	E*, O*
Göteborg-Landvetter	SE 14199	A	IC 1	HC(2), NHC(2)	O
			IC 2		E
Helsingborg	SE 12399	P		HC(2), NHC-T(FR)(2), NHC-NT(2)	
Norrköping	SE 05199	A			E
Stockholm	SE 01199	P		HC(2)	
Stockholm-Arlanda	SE 01299	A		HC(2), NHC(2)	O

Страна: Обединеното кралство — **Země:** Spojené království — **Land:** Det Forenede Kongerige — **Land:** Vereinigtes Königreich — **Riik:** Suurbritannia — **Χώρα:** Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο — **Country:** United Kingdom — **País:** Reino Unido — **Pays:** Royaume-Uni — **Paese:** Regno Unito — **Valsts:** Apvienotā Karaliste — **Šalis:** Jungtinė Karalystė — **Ország:** Egyesült Királyság — **Pajjiž:** ir-Renju Unit — **Land:** Verenigd Koninkrijk — **Kraj:** Zjednoczone Królestwo — **País:** Reino Unido — **Ṭara:** Regatul Unit — **Krajina:** Spojené kráľovstvo — **Država:** Združeno kraljestvo — **Maa:** Yhdistynyt kuningaskunta — **Land:** Förenade kungariket

1	2	3	4	5	6
Belfast	GB 41099	A		HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT(2), NHC(2)	
Belfast	GB 40099	P		HC-T(FR)(1)(2), NHC-T(FR)(2)	
Bristol	GB 11099	P		HC-T(FR)(1), HC-NT(1), NHC-NT	
Falmouth	GB 14299	P		HC-T(1), HC-NT(1)	
Felixstowe	GB 13099	P	TCEF	HC-T(1), NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	
			ATEF	HC-NT(1)	
Gatwick	GB 13299	A	IC 1		O
			IC 2	HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT(1)(2), NHC(2)	
Glasgow*	GB 31099	A		HC-T(1)(2)*, HC-NT(1)(2)*, NHC-NT(2)*	
Grimsby–Immingham	GB 12299	P	Centre 1	HC-T(FR)(1)	
Grove Wharf Wharton	GB 11599	P		NHC-NT(4)	
Heathrow	GB 12499	A	Centre 1	HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT(1)(2), NHC(2)	
			Centre 2	HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT(1)(2)	
			Animal Reception Centre		U, E, O
Hull	GB 14199	P		HC-T(1), HC-NT(1), NHC-NT	
Invergordon	GB 30299	P		NHC-NT(4)	
Liverpool	GB 12099	P		HC(1)(2), NHC(2)	
Luton	GB 10099	A			U, E
Manchester	GB 13799	A	IC 1		O(14)
			IC 2	HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT(1)(2)	
			IC 3	NHC(2),	
Manston	GB 14499	A		HC(1)(2), NHC(2)	
Nottingham East Midlands	GB 12199	A		HC-T(1), HC-NT(1), NHC-T(FR), NHC-NT	
Peterhead	GB 30699	P		HC-T(FR)(1,2,3)	
Prestwick	GB 31199	A			U, E
Southampton	GB 11399	P		HC-T(1), HC-NT(1), NHC	
Stansted	GB 14399	A		HC-NT(1)(2), NHC-NT(2)	U, E
Thamesport	GB 11899	P		HC-T(1)(2), HC-NT(1)(2), NHC(2)	
Tilbury	GB 10899	P		HC-T(1), HC-NT(1), NHC-T (FR), NHC-NT	

ANNEX II

The Annex to Decision 2002/459/EC is amended as follows:

1. In the Section on border inspection posts in Portugal,

the following entry is deleted:

'PT03899 P Praia da Vitória (Açores)';

the following entry is deleted:

'PT03699 P Funchal (Madeira)';

and the following entry added:

'PT03699 P Caniçal (Madeira)'.

2. In the section of border inspection posts in Italy,

the following entry is added:

'IT04699 P Brindisi'.

NOTE TO THE READER

The institutions have decided no longer to quote in their texts the last amendment to cited acts.

Unless otherwise indicated, references to acts in the texts published here are to the version of those acts currently in force.