

Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6978

L 144

Volume 42

9 June 1999

English edition

Legislation

Contents

I *Acts whose publication is obligatory*

- ★ **Regulation (EC) No 1182/1999 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 May 1999 amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 3330/91 on the statistics relating to the trading of goods between Member States with a view to reducing the data to be provided** 1
- Council statement** 3
- Commission statement** 3
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 1183/1999 of 8 June 1999 establishing the standard import values for determining the entry price of certain fruit and vegetables 4
- ★ **Commission Regulation (EC) No 1184/1999 of 8 June 1999 laying down rates of compensatory interest applicable during the second half of 1999 to customs debts incurred in relation to compensating products or goods in the unaltered state (inward processing relief arrangements and temporary importation)** 6
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 1185/1999 of 8 June 1999 opening a standing invitation to tender for the export of barley held by the Spanish intervention agency . 7
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 1186/1999 of 8 June 1999 amending the import duties in the cereals sector 13

Council

1999/372/EC, ECSC, Euratom:

- ★ **Decision No 1/1999 of the Association Council between the European Communities and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of Estonia, of the other part of 28 April 1999 adopting the necessary rules for the implementation of Article 63(1)(i), (1)(ii) and (2) of the Europe Agreement establishing an association between the European Communities and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of Estonia, of the other part** 16

1999/373/EC:

- ★ **Council Decision of 31 May 1999 appointing a member of the Committee of the Regions** 20

Commission

1999/374/EC:

- ★ **Commission Decision of 28 October 1998 on aid granted by Germany to Neptun Industrie Rostock GmbH ⁽¹⁾ (notified under document number C(1998) 3435)** 21

1999/375/EC:

- ★ **Commission Decision of 19 May 1999 recognising the fully operational character of Luxembourg's database for bovine animals (notified under document number C(1999) 1270)** 34

1999/376/EC:

- ★ **Commission Decision of 19 May 1999 recognising the fully operational character of the Danish database for bovine animals (notified under document number C(1999) 1305)** 35

1999/377/EC:

- ★ **Commission Decision of 19 May 1999 recognising the fully operational character of the Belgian database for bovine animals (notified under document number C(1999) 1349)** 36

Corrigenda

- ★ **Corrigendum to Commission Decision 1999/366/EC of 4 June 1999 terminating the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of ferro-silicon originating in Egypt and Poland (OJ L 142 of 5.6.1999)** 37

I

(Acts whose publication is obligatory)

**REGULATION (EC) No 1182/1999 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND
OF THE COUNCIL**

of 10 May 1999

**amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 3330/91 on the statistics relating to the
trading of goods between Member States with a view to reducing the data to be
provided**

THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL
OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European
Community, and in particular Article 95 thereof,

Having regard to the proposal from the Commission ⁽¹⁾,

Having regard to the opinion of the Economic and Social
Committee ⁽²⁾,

Acting in accordance with the procedure laid down in
Article 251 of the Treaty ⁽³⁾, in the light of the joint text
approved by the Conciliation Committee on 13 April
1999,

- (1) Whereas, pursuant to Regulation (EEC) No 3330/91 ⁽⁴⁾, the Community and the Member States have been compiling statistics relating to the trading of goods between Member States (Intrastat) during the transitional period beginning on 1 January 1993 and ending on the date of changeover to a unified system of taxation in the Member State of origin;
- (2) Whereas the simplification of legislation for the internal market, as formulated in the SLIM (simpler legislation for the internal market) initiative, aims to improve enterprises' competitiveness and job-creation potential;
- (3) Whereas the simplification of the Intrastat system was chosen as a SLIM pilot project, and specific proposals formulated by the SLIM-Intrastat

Working Party with a view to reducing the burden on providers of statistical information which were contained in a communication to the European Parliament and to the Council have been endorsed by those institutions;

- (4) Whereas limiting the information on declarations, while maintaining an acceptable level of information for users, is a prime means of reducing the burden on providers of statistical information;
- (5) Whereas deletion of the mode of transport and the delivery terms is one of these simplification measures; whereas, however, reporting of the country of origin, the region of origin and/or the region of destination is of particular benefit to many users and should therefore be retained;
- (6) Whereas it is important to simplify the combined nomenclature to be used on a uniform basis in both intra-Community and external trade, so as to make it easier to apply the system — in particular for small and medium-sized undertakings; whereas in this context the results of the on-going discussions conducted by the Commission with Member States and European trade and industry organisations in the SLIM framework should be taken into account, preserving the principle of one single nomenclature;
- (7) Whereas it is necessary for certain Member States to require reporting of delivery terms, the presumed mode of transport and the statistical procedure; whereas certain Member States may wish to have reports other than those needed for

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 203, 3.7.1997, p. 10, amended by OJ C 171, 5.6.1998, p. 12.

⁽²⁾ OJ C 19, 21.1.1998, p. 49.

⁽³⁾ Opinion of the European Parliament of 1 April 1998 (OJ C 138, 4.5.1998, p. 89). Council common position of 20 July 1998 (OJ C 285, 14.9.1998, p. 1). Decision of the European Parliament of 16 December 1998 (OJ C 98, 9.4.1999, p. 153). Council Decision of 22 April 1999. Decision of the European Parliament of 7 May 1999.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ L 316, 16.11.1991, p. 1. Regulation as amended by Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3046/92 (OJ L 307, 23.10.1992, p. 27).

information forming part of the Community statistical system; whereas, however, it is desirable for thresholds below which Member States may not prescribe such statistical data to be set in accordance with Article 30 of Regulation (EEC) No 3330/91 in order to avoid a disproportionate burden for small and medium-sized undertakings;

- (8) Whereas, in order to meet the expectations of the providers of statistical information and take account of the Member States' differing administrative structures, national administrations should be afforded greater flexibility in laying down the deadlines for the transmission of declarations,

HAVE ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

Regulation (EEC) No 3330/91 is hereby amended as follows:

1. Article 13(1) shall be replaced by the following:

'1. The statistical information required by the Intra-stat system shall be covered in periodic declarations to be sent by the party responsible for providing the information to the competent national departments, under conditions which the Commission shall lay down pursuant to Article 30.'

2. Article 23 shall be amended as follows:

(a) in paragraph (1) the points (f) and (g) shall be deleted;

(b) paragraph 2 shall be replaced by the following:

'2. Member States may prescribe that the following additional data be provided on the statistical data medium:

(a) in the Member States of arrival, the country of origin; however, that information may only be prescribed within the limits of Community law;

(b) in the Member State of dispatch, the region of origin; in the Member State of arrival, the region of destination.'

- (c) paragraph 3 becomes paragraph 4 and the following new paragraph 3 shall be inserted:

'3. In the case of providers of statistical information whose annual value of arrivals or dispatches falls below the thresholds fixed by the Commission in accordance with the procedure established under Article 30, it shall not be prescribed that data other than those listed in paragraphs 1 and 2 be provided for such arrivals or dispatches on the statistical data medium.

Apart from the data provided for in paragraphs 1 and 2, Member States may, solely in respect of providers of statistical information with dispatches or arrivals of an annual value in excess of the above thresholds, prescribe that the following additional data be provided on the statistical data medium:

(a) the delivery terms;

(b) the presumed mode of transport;

(c) the statistical procedure.'

- (d) the following paragraph shall be added:

'5. The Commission shall ensure publication of a list of the data required of providers of statistical information by the Member States, as well as the thresholds referred to in paragraph 3, in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*.'

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on the 20th day following that of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*.

It shall apply from 1 January 2001.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 10 May 1999.

For the European Parliament

The President

J. M. GIL-ROBLES

For the Council

The President

H. EICHEL

Council statement

The Council will examine the proposal for a European Parliament and Council Regulation amending Council Regulation (EC) No 3330/91 on the statistics relating to the trading of goods between Member States, with specific reference to the nomenclature of products, preserving the principle of one single nomenclature and taking into account the amendments of the European Parliament and the results of the ongoing discussions conducted by the Commission in the SLIM framework.

Commission statement

Taking into account the report from the Working Group on Statistics approved by the Ecofin Council on 18 January 1999, the Commission will submit to the European Parliament and the Council a report on the Intrastat system before the end of 1999; the report will consider the results of studies and work under the SLIM/Intrastat initiative, in particular with reference to quality and burdens on businesses, and will include implications for the activities under the Edicom programme. The Commission will propose any amendment to Council Regulation (EEC) No 3330/91 it considers necessary.

COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 1183/1999
of 8 June 1999
establishing the standard import values for determining the entry price of certain
fruit and vegetables

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Commission Regulation (EC) No 3223/94 of 21 December 1994 on detailed rules for the application of the import arrangements for fruit and vegetables ⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1498/98 ⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 4 (1) thereof,

Whereas Regulation (EC) No 3223/94 lays down, pursuant to the outcome of the Uruguay Round multilateral trade negotiations, the criteria whereby the Commission fixes the standard values for imports from third countries, in respect of the products and periods stipulated in the Annex thereto;

Whereas, in compliance with the above criteria, the standard import values must be fixed at the levels set out in the Annex to this Regulation,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The standard import values referred to in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 3223/94 shall be fixed as indicated in the Annex hereto.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 9 June 1999.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 8 June 1999.

For the Commission

Franz FISCHLER

Member of the Commission

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 337, 24.12.1994, p. 66.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 198, 15.7.1998, p. 4.

ANNEX

to the Commission Regulation of 8 June 1999 establishing the standard import values for determining the entry price of certain fruit and vegetables

(EUR/100 kg)

CN code	Third country code ⁽¹⁾	Standard import value
0702 00 00	052	58,9
	999	58,9
0707 00 05	052	76,3
	628	126,6
	999	101,5
0709 90 70	052	60,0
	999	60,0
0805 30 10	382	45,5
	388	56,6
	528	58,7
	999	53,6
0808 10 20, 0808 10 50, 0808 10 90	388	74,3
	400	77,5
	508	75,4
	512	66,5
	524	74,8
	528	61,1
	804	98,4
	999	75,4
0809 20 95	052	243,2
	064	234,8
	400	213,4
	999	230,5

⁽¹⁾ Country nomenclature as fixed by Commission Regulation (EC) No 2317/97 (OJ L 321, 22.11.1997, p. 19). Code '999' stands for 'of other origin'.

COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 1184/1999

of 8 June 1999

laying down rates of compensatory interest applicable during the second half of 1999 to customs debts incurred in relation to compensating products or goods in the unaltered state (inward processing relief arrangements and temporary importation)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 of 12 October 1992 establishing the Community Customs Code ⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EC) 955/1999 of the European Parliament and of the Council ⁽²⁾,

Having regard to Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2454/93 of 2 July 1993 laying down provisions for the implementation of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 establishing the Community Customs Code ⁽³⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 502/1999 ⁽⁴⁾, and in particular Articles 589(4)(a) and 709 thereof,

Whereas Article 589(4)(a) of Regulation (EEC) No 2454/93 provides that the Commission shall publish rates of compensatory interest applicable to customs debts incurred in relation to compensating products or goods in the unaltered state, in order to make up for the unjustified financial advantage arising from the postponement of the date on which the customs debt is incurred in the case of non-exportation out of the customs territory of the Community; whereas the rates of compensatory interest for the second half of 1999 must be established in accordance with the rules laid down in that Regulation,

Article 1

The annual rates of compensatory interest referred to in Articles 589(4)(a) and 709(3)(a) of Regulation (EEC) No 2454/93 applicable for the period 1 July until 31 December 1999 are the following:

Belgium	3,44
Denmark	4,31
Germany	3,49
Greece	12,99
Spain	4,03
France	3,52
Ireland	4,90
Italy	4,37
Luxembourg	3,44
Netherlands	3,36
Austria	3,53
Portugal	4,04
Finland	3,56
Sweden	4,04
United Kingdom	7,19.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 1 July 1999.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 8 June 1999.

For the Commission

Mario MONTI

Member of the Commission

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 302, 19.10.1992, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 119, 7.5.1999, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ L 253, 11.10.1993, p. 1.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ L 65, 12.3.1999, p. 1.

COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 1185/1999

of 8 June 1999

opening a standing invitation to tender for the export of barley held by the Spanish intervention agency

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Article 1

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1766/92 of 30 June 1992 on the common organisation of the market in cereals ⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Commission Regulation (EC) No 923/96 ⁽²⁾, and in particular Article 5 thereof,

Subject to the provisions of this Regulation, the Spanish intervention agency issues a standing invitation to tender for the export of barley held by it in accordance with Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93.

Article 2

(1) Whereas Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93 ⁽³⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 39/1999 ⁽⁴⁾, lays down the procedure and conditions for the disposal of cereals held by intervention agencies;

1. The invitation to tender shall cover a maximum of 375 000 tonnes of barley for export to third countries, with the exception of the United States of America, Canada and Mexico.

(2) Whereas a standing invitation to tender should be opened for the export of 375 000 tonnes of barley held by the Spanish intervention agency;

However, the customs export formalities for tenders submitted on or after 17 June 1999 shall be completed only on or after 1 July 1999.

(3) Whereas the invitation to tender for the export of intervention stocks is unusual in that it will also operate at the end of the marketing year, i.e. in June 1999; whereas, therefore, in the case of tenders made between 17 and 30 June 1999, deliveries will be possible only from 1 July 1999; whereas provision must accordingly be made to derogate from the first paragraph of Article 16 of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93, which stipulates that payments must be made no later than one month after acceptance of the tender;

2. The regions in which the 375 000 tonnes of barley are stored are set out in Annex I.

Article 3

(4) Whereas special procedures must be laid down to ensure that the operations and their monitoring are properly effected; whereas, to that end, provision should be made for a security lodgement scheme which ensures that aims are met while avoiding excessive costs for the operators; whereas derogations should accordingly be made to certain rules, in particular those laid down in Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93;

1. Notwithstanding the third paragraph of Article 16 of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93, the price to be paid for the export shall be that quoted in the tender.

(5) Whereas, where removal of the barley is delayed by more than five days or the release of one of the securities required is delayed for reasons imputable to the intervention agency the Member State concerned must pay compensation;

2. No export refund or tax or monthly increase shall be granted on exports carried out pursuant to this Regulation.

(6) Whereas the measures provided for in this Regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Management Committee for Cereals,

3. Article 8(2) of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93 shall not apply.

Article 4

1. The export licences shall be valid from their date of issue within the meaning of Article 9 of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93 until the end of the fourth month thereafter.

2. Between 17 and 30 June 1999, tenders submitted under this invitation to tender shall not be admissible unless they are accompanied by a written undertaking to export only on or after 1 July 1999. The tenders may not be accompanied by applications for export licences submitted under Article 44 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3719/88 ⁽⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 181, 1.7.1992, p. 21.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 126, 24.5.1996, p. 37.

⁽³⁾ OJ L 191, 31.7.1993, p. 76.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ L 5, 9.1.1999, p. 64.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ L 331, 2.12.1988, p. 1.

Article 5

1. Notwithstanding Article 7(1) of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93, the time limit for submission of tenders in respect of the first partial invitation to tender shall be 9 a.m. (Brussels time) on 10 June 1999.
2. The time limit for submission of tenders in respect of subsequent partial invitations to tender shall be 9 a.m. (Brussels time) each Thursday thereafter.
3. The last partial invitation to tender shall be 9 a.m. (Brussels time) on 30 September 1999.
4. Tenders shall be lodged with the Spanish intervention agency.

Article 6

In the case of tenders submitted between 17 and 30 June 1999, the following conditions shall apply:

- notwithstanding the first paragraph of Article 16 of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93, the cereals must be paid for by 31 July 1999, at the latest.
- notwithstanding the third paragraph of Article 16 of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93, the price to be paid for the export shall be that indicated in the tender.

Article 7

In the case of licences applied for between 17 and 30 June 1999, without prejudice to Article 17(3) of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93, the security referred to in the second indent of Article 17(2) of that Regulation shall be released only when proof is provided that the customs export formalities were completed on or after 1 July 1999.

Article 8

1. The intervention agency, the storer and the successful tenderer shall, at the request of the latter and by common agreement, either before or at the time of removal from storage as the successful tenderer chooses, take reference samples for counter-analysis at the rate of at least one sample for every 500 tonnes and shall analyse the samples. The intervention agency may be represented by a proxy, provided this is not the storer.

The analyses results shall be forwarded to the Commission in the event of a dispute.

Reference samples for counter-analysis shall be taken and analysed within seven working days of the date of the successful tenderer's request or within three working days if the samples are taken on removal from storage. Where the final result of sample analyses indicates a quality:

- (a) higher than that specified in the notice of invitation to tender, the successful tenderer must accept the lot as established;
- (b) higher than the minimum characteristics laid down for intervention but below the quality described in the notice of invitation to tender, providing that the

differences having regard to those criteria do not exceed the following limits:

- two kilograms per hectolitre as regards specific weight, which must not, however, be less than 60 kg/hl,
- one percentage point as regards moisture content,
- half a percentage point as regards impurities as specified in points B.2 and B.4 of the Annex to Commission Regulation (EEC) No 689/92⁽¹⁾, and
- half a percentage point as regards impurities as specified in point B.5 of the Annex to Regulation (EEC) No 689/92, the percentages admissible for noxious grains and ergot, however, remaining unchanged,

the successful tenderer must accept the lot as established;

- (c) higher than the minimum characteristics laid down for intervention but below the quality described in the notice of invitation to tender, and a difference exceeding the limits set out in point (b), the successful tenderer may:
 - accept the lot as established, or
 - refuse to take over the lot in question. The successful tenderer shall be discharged of all his obligations relating to the lot in question and the securities shall be released only once he has informed the Commission and the intervention agency forthwith in accordance with Annex II; however, if he requests the intervention agency to supply him with another lot of intervention barley of the quality laid down at no additional charge, the security shall not be released. The lot must be replaced within three days of the date of the successful tenderer's request. The successful tenderer shall notify the Commission immediately thereof in accordance with Annex II;
- (d) below the minimum characteristics laid down for intervention, the successful tenderer may not remove the lot in question. He shall be discharged of all his obligations relating to the lot in question and the securities shall be released only once he has informed the Commission and the intervention agency forthwith in accordance with Annex II; however, he may request the intervention agency to supply him with another lot of intervention barley of the quality laid down at no additional charge. In that case, the security shall not be released. The lot must be replaced within three days of the date of the successful tenderer's request. The successful tenderer shall immediately inform the Commission thereof in accordance with Annex II.

2. However, if the barley is removed before the results of the analyses are known, all risks shall be borne by the successful tenderer from the time the lot is removed, without prejudice to any means of redress of which he may avail himself against the storer.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 74, 20.3.1992, p. 18.

3. If, as a result of successive replacements, the successful tenderer has not received a replacement lot of the quality laid down within one month of the date of his request for a replacement, he shall be discharged of all his obligations and the securities shall be released once he has informed the Commission and the intervention agency forthwith in accordance with Annex II.

4. Except where the final results of analyses indicate a quality below the minimum characteristics laid down for intervention, the costs of taking the samples and conducting the analyses provided for in paragraph 1 but not of inter-bin transfers shall be borne by the EAGGF in respect of up to one analysis per 500 tonnes. The costs of inter-bin transfers and any additional analyses requested by the successful tenderer shall be borne by him.

Article 9

By derogation from Article 12 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3002/92 ⁽¹⁾, the documents relating to the sale of barley in accordance with this Regulation, and in particular the export licence, the removal order referred to in Article 3(1)(b) of Regulation (EEC) No 3002/92, the export declaration and, where necessary, the T5 copy shall carry the entry:

- Cebada de intervención sin aplicación de restitución ni gravamen, Reglamento (CE) n° 1185/1999
- Byg fra intervention uden restitutionsydelse eller -afgift, forordning (EF) nr. 1185/1999
- Interventionsgerste ohne Anwendung von Ausfuhrerstattungen oder Ausfuhrabgaben, Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1185/1999
- Κριθή παρέμβασης χωρίς εφαρμογή επιστροφής ή φόρου, κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1185/1999
- Intervention barley without application of refund or tax, Regulation (EC) No 1185/1999
- Orge d'intervention ne donnant pas lieu à restitution ni taxe, règlement (CE) n° 1185/1999
- Orzo d'intervento senza applicazione di restituzione né di tassa, regolamento (CE) n. 1185/1999
- Gerst uit interventie, zonder toepassing van restitutief of belasting, Verordening (EG) nr. 1185/1999
- Cevada de intervenção sem aplicação de uma restituição ou imposição, Regulamento (CE) n.º 1185/1999
- Interventio-ohraa, johon ei sovelleta vientitukea eikä vientimaksua, asetus (EY) N:o 1185/1999
- Interventionskorn, utan tillämpning av bidrag eller avgift, förordning (EG) nr 1185/1999.

Article 10

1. The security lodgement pursuant to Article 13(4) of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93 must be released once the export licences have been issued to the successful tenderers.

2. Notwithstanding Article 17 of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93, the obligation to export shall be covered by a security equal to the difference between the intervention price applying on the day of the award and the price awarded but not less than EUR 10 per tonne. Half of the security shall be lodged when the licence is issued and the balance shall be lodged before the cereals are removed.

Notwithstanding Article 15(2) of Regulation (EEC) No 3002/92:

- the part of the security lodged when the licence is issued must be released within 20 working days of the date on which the successful tenderer provides proof that the cereals removed have left the customs territory of the Community.

Notwithstanding Article 17(3) of Regulation (EEC) No 2131/93:

- the remainder must be released within 15 working days of the date on which the successful tenderer provides the proof referred to in Article 18 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3665/87 ⁽²⁾.

3. Except in duly substantiated exceptional cases, in particular the opening of an administrative enquiry, any release of the securities provided for in this Article after the time limits specified in this same Article shall confer an entitlement to compensation from the Member State amounting to EUR 0,015 per 10 tonnes for each day's delay.

This compensation shall not be charged to the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF).

Article 11

Within two hours of the expiry of the time limit for the submission of tenders, the Spanish intervention agency shall notify the Commission of tenders received. Such notification shall be made using the model set out in Annex III and the telex or fax numbers set out in Annex IV.

Article 12

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 304, 17.10.1992, p. 17.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 351, 14.12.1987, p. 1.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 8 June 1999.

For the Commission

Franz FISCHLER

Member of the Commission

ANNEX I

<i>(tonnes)</i>	
Place of storage	Quantity
Álava	2 000
Aragón	60 900
Castilla-La Mancha	32 710
Castilla y León	236 330
La Rioja	3 000
Navarra	40 060

ANNEX II

**Communication of refusal of lots under the standing invitation to tender for the export of
barley held by the Spanish intervention agency**

(Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1185/1999)

— Name of successful tenderer:

— Date of award of contract:

— Date of refusal of lot by successful tenderer:

Lot No	Quantity in tonnes	Address of silo	Reason for refusal to take over
			— Specific weight (kg/hl) — % sprouted grains — % miscellaneous impurities (Schwarzbesatz) — % of matter which is not basic cereal of unimpaired quality — Other

*ANNEX III***Standing invitation to tender for the export of barley held by the Spanish intervention agency**

(Regulation (EC) No 1185/1999)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tender No	Consignment No	Quantity (tonnes)	Offer price (EUR/tonne) ⁽¹⁾	Price increases (+) or reductions (–) (EUR/tonne) p.m.	Commercial costs (EUR/tonne)	Destination
1						
2						
3						
etc.						

⁽¹⁾ This price includes the increases or reductions relating to the lot to which the tender refers.*ANNEX IV*

The only numbers to use to call Brussels are (DG VI-C-1)

— fax: 296 49 56,
295 25 15,— telex: 22037 AGREC B,
22070 AGREC B (Greek characters).

COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 1186/1999
of 8 June 1999
amending the import duties in the cereals sector

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1766/92 of 30 June 1992 on the common organization of the market in cereals⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Commission Regulation (EC) No 923/96⁽²⁾,

Having regard to Commission Regulation (EC) No 1249/96 of 28 June 1996 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1766/92 as regards import duties in the cereals sector⁽³⁾, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 2519/98⁽⁴⁾, and in particular Article 2 (1) thereof,

Whereas the import duties in the cereals sector are fixed by Commission Regulation (EC) No 1137/1999⁽⁵⁾;

Whereas Article 2, (1) of Regulation (EC) No 1249/96 provides that if during the period of application, the average import duty calculated differs by EUR 5 per tonne from the duty fixed, a corresponding adjustment is to be made; whereas such a difference has arisen; whereas it is therefore necessary to adjust the import duties fixed in Regulation (EC) No 1137/1999,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

Annexes I and II to Regulation (EC) No 1137/1999 are hereby replaced by Annexes I and II to this Regulation.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on 9 June 1999.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 8 June 1999.

For the Commission

Franz FISCHLER

Member of the Commission

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 181, 1.7.1992, p. 21.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 126, 24.5.1996, p. 37.

⁽³⁾ OJ L 161, 29.6.1996, p. 125.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ L 315, 25.11.1998, p. 7.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ L 137, 1.6.1999, p. 3.

ANNEX I

Import duties for the products covered by Article 10(2) of Regulation (EEC) No 1766/92

CN code	Description	Import duty by land inland waterway or sea from Mediterranean, the Black Sea or Baltic Sea ports (EUR/tonne)	Import duty by air or by sea from other ports ⁽²⁾ (EUR/tonne)
1001 10 00	Durum wheat high quality	46,65	36,65
	medium quality ⁽¹⁾	56,65	46,65
1001 90 91	Common wheat seed	51,53	41,53
1001 90 99	Common high quality wheat other than for sowing ⁽³⁾	51,53	41,53
	medium quality	81,08	71,08
	low quality	102,71	92,71
1002 00 00	Rye	104,25	94,25
1003 00 10	Barley, seed	104,25	94,25
1003 00 90	Barley, other ⁽³⁾	104,25	94,25
1005 10 90	Maize seed other than hybrid	97,39	87,39
1005 90 00	Maize other than seed ⁽³⁾	97,39	87,39
1007 00 90	Grain sorghum other than hybrids for sowing	104,25	94,25

⁽¹⁾ In the case of durum wheat not meeting the minimum quality requirements for durum wheat of medium quality, referred to in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1249/96, the duty applicable is that fixed for low-quality common wheat.

⁽²⁾ For goods arriving in the Community via the Atlantic Ocean or via the Suez Canal (Article 2(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1249/96), the importer may benefit from a reduction in the duty of:

— EUR 3 per tonne, where the port of unloading is on the Mediterranean Sea, or

— EUR 2 per tonne, where the port of unloading is in Ireland, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Sweden, Finland or the Atlantic Coasts of the Iberian Peninsula.

⁽³⁾ The importer may benefit from a flat-rate reduction of EUR 14 or 8 per tonne, where the conditions laid down in Article 2(5) of Regulation (EC) No 1249/96 are met.

ANNEX II

Factors for calculating duties

(period from 01 June to 07 June 1999)

1. Averages over the two-week period preceding the day of fixing:

Exchange quotations	Minneapolis	Kansas-City	Chicago	Chicago	Minneapolis	Minneapolis	Minneapolis
Product (% proteins at 12 % humidity)	HRS2. 14 %	HRW2. 11,5 %	SRW2	YC3	HAD2	Medium quality (*)	US barley 2
Quotation (EUR/t)	118,21	100,73	88,26	83,52	133,71 (**)	123,71 (**)	76,11 (**)
Gulf premium (EUR/t)	—	9,55	1,65	10,45	—	—	—
Great Lakes premium (EUR/t)	10,05	—	—	—	—	—	—

(*) A discount of EUR 10/t (Article 4(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1249/96).

(**) Fob Duluth.

2. Freight/cost: Gulf of Mexico — Rotterdam: EUR 14,23/t; Great Lakes — Rotterdam: EUR 25,81/t.

3. Subsidy within the meaning of the third paragraph of Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1249/96 : EUR 0,00/t (HRW2)
: EUR 0,00/t (SRW2).

II

(Acts whose publication is not obligatory)

COUNCIL

DECISION No 1/1999 OF THE ASSOCIATION COUNCIL

between the European Communities and their Member States, of the one part,
and the Republic of Estonia, of the other part

of 28 April 1999

adopting the necessary rules for the implementation of Article 63(1)(i), (1)(ii) and
(2) of the Europe Agreement establishing an association between the European
Communities and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of
Estonia, of the other part

(1999/372/EC, ECSC, Euratom)

THE ASSOCIATION COUNCIL,

Having regard to the Europe Agreement establishing an association between the European Communities and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of Estonia, of the other part, signed on 12 June 1995 and in particular Article 63(3) thereof,

Whereas pursuant to Article 63(3) of the Europe Agreement the necessary rules for the implementation of Article 63(1) and (2) thereof should be adopted by the Association Council,

HAS DECIDED AS FOLLOWS:

Article 1

The necessary rules implementing Article 63(1)(i), (1)(ii) and (2) of the Europe Agreement establishing an Association between the European Communities and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of

Estonia, of the other part, as set out in the Annex to this Decision, are hereby adopted.

Article 2

This Decision shall be published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* and *Riigi Teataja* (Estonian State Gazette).

Article 3

This Decision shall enter into force on the day of its adoption.

Done at Brussels, 28 April 1999.

For the Association Council

The President

T. H. ILVES

ANNEX

IMPLEMENTING RULES FOR COMPETITION PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO UNDERTAKINGS

Implementing rules for the application of the competition provisions applicable to undertakings provided for in Article 63(1)(i), (1)(ii) and (2) of the Europe Agreement establishing an Association between the European Communities and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of Estonia, of the other part

*Article 1***General principle**

Cases relating to agreements between undertakings, decisions by associations of undertakings and concerted practices between undertakings which have as their object or effect the prevention, restriction or distortion of competition as well as to abuses of a dominant position in the territories of the Community or of Estonia as a whole or in a substantial part thereof, which may affect trade between the Community and Estonia shall be settled according to the principles contained in Article 63(1) and (2) of the Europe Agreement.

For this purpose, these cases are dealt with by the Commission of the European Communities (DG IV) on the Community side and the Competition Board on the Estonian side.

The competences of the European Commission and the Estonian Competition Board to deal with these cases shall flow from the existing rules of the respective legislation of the Community and Estonia, including where these rules are applied to undertakings located outside the respective territory.

Both authorities shall settle the cases in accordance with their own substantive rules, and having regard to the provisions set out below. The relevant substantive rules of the authorities are the competition rules of the Treaty establishing the European Community as well as the European Coal and Steel Treaty including the competition-related secondary legislation, for the European Commission, and the Estonian Competition law and the relevant by-laws, for the Estonian Competition Board.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES UNDER THE EC TREATY

*Article 2***Competence of both competition authorities**

Cases under Article 63 of the Europe Agreement which may affect both the Community and the Estonian market and which may fall under the competence of both competition authorities shall be dealt with by the Euro-

pean Commission and the Estonian Competition Board, according to the rules under this Article.

2.1. Notification

2.1.1. The competition authorities shall notify to each other those cases they are dealing with, which, according to the general principle laid out in Article 1, appear to fall also under the competence of the other authority.

2.1.2. This situation may arise in particular in cases concerning activities that:

- involve anti-competitive activities carried out in the other authority's territory,
- are relevant to enforcement activities of the other competition authority,
- involve remedies that would require or prohibit conduct in the other authority's territory.

2.1.3. Notification under this Article shall include sufficient information to permit an initial evaluation by the recipient party of any effects on its interests. Copies of the notifications shall be submitted on a regular basis to the Association Council.

2.1.4. Notification shall be made in advance, as soon as possible and at the latest at the stage of an investigation still far enough in advance of the adoption of a settlement or decision, so as to facilitate comments or consultations and to enable the proceeding authority to take into account the other authority's views, as well as to take such remedial actions it may find feasible under its own laws, in order to deal with the case in question.

2.2. Consultation and comity

Whenever the European Commission or the Estonian Competition Board considers that anti-competitive activities carried out on the territory of the other authority are substantially affecting important interests of the respective Party, it may request consultation with the other authority, or it may request that the other Party's competition

authority initiate any appropriate procedures with a view to taking remedial action under its legislation on anti-competitive activities. This is without prejudice to any action under the requesting Party's competition law and does not hamper the full freedom of ultimate decision of the authority so addressed.

2.3. Finding of an understanding

The competition authority so addressed shall give full and sympathetic consideration to such views and factual materials as may be provided by the requesting authority and, in particular, to the nature of the anti-competitive activities in question, the enterprises involved and the alleged harmful effects on the important interests of the requesting Party.

Without prejudice to any of their rights or obligations, the competition authorities involved in consultations under this Article shall endeavour to find a mutually acceptable solution in the light of the respective important interests involved.

Article 3

Competence of one consumption authority only

- 3.1. Cases falling under the exclusive competence of one competition authority, in accordance with the principle laid down in Article 1, and which may affect important interests of the other Party, shall be handled having regard to the provisions set out in Article 2, and taking account of the principles set out below.
- 3.2. In particular, whenever one of the competition authorities undertakes an investigation or proceeding in a case which is found to affect important interests of the other Party, the proceeding authority shall notify this case to the other authority, without formal request by the latter.

Article 4

Request for information

Whenever the competition authority of a Party becomes aware of the fact that a case, falling also or only under the competence of the other authority, appears to affect important interests of the first Party, it may request information about this case from the proceeding authority.

The proceeding authority shall give sufficient information to the extent possible and at a stage of its proceedings far enough in advance of the adoption of a decision or settle-

ment to enable the requesting authority's views to be taken into account.

Article 5

Secrecy and confidentiality of information

- 5.1. Having regard to Article 63(7) of the Europe Agreement, neither competition authority is required to provide information to the other authority if disclosure of that information to the requesting authority is prohibited by the law of the authority possessing the information, or would be incompatible with important interests of the Party whose authority is in possession of the information.
- 5.2. Each authority agrees to maintain, to the fullest extent possible, the confidentiality of any information provided to it in confidence by the other authority.

Article 6

Block exemptions

In the application of Article 63 of the Europe Agreement as provided for in Articles 2 and 3 above, the competition authorities shall ensure that the principles contained in the block exemption regulations in force in the Community shall be applied in full. The Estonian Competition Board shall be informed of any procedure related to the adoption, abolition or modification of block exemptions by the Community.

Where such block exemption Regulations encounter serious objections on the Estonian side, and having regard to the approximation of legislation as foreseen in the Europe Agreement, consultations shall take place in the Association Council, in accordance with the provisions contained in Article 9.

The same principles shall apply regarding other significant changes in the Community or Estonian competition policies.

Article 7

Merger control

With regard to mergers which fall within Council Regulation (EEC) No 4064/89 of 21 December 1989 on the control of concentrations between undertakings⁽¹⁾ and which have a significant impact on the Estonian economy, the Estonian Competition Board shall be entitled to express its view in the course of the procedure, taking into account the time limits as provided for in the aforementioned Regulation. The European Commission shall give due consideration to that view, without prejudice to any action under the Parties' respective competition laws.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 395, 30.12.1989, p. 1. Regulation as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1310/97 (OJ L 180, 9.7.1997, p. 7).

*Article 8***Activities of minor importance**

- 8.1. Anti-competitive activities whose effects on trade between the Parties or on competition are negligible, do not fall under Article 63(1) of the Europe Agreement, and therefore, are not to be treated under Articles 2 to 6 of the present implementing rules.
- 8.2. Negligible effects within the meaning of paragraph 8.1 are generally presumed to exist when:
 - the aggregate annual turnover of the participating undertakings does not exceed ECU 200 million, and
 - the goods or services which are the subject of the agreement together with the participating undertakings' other goods or services which are considered by users to be equivalent in view of their characteristics, price and intended use, do not represent more than 5 % of the total market for such goods or services in the area of the common market affected by the agreement, and the Estonian market affected by the agreement.

*Article 9***Association Council**

- 9.1. Whenever the procedures provided for in Articles 2 and 3 do not lead to a mutually acceptable solution, as well as in other cases explicitly mentioned in the present implementing rules, an exchange of views shall take place in the Association Council at the request of one Party within three months following the request.
- 9.2. Following this exchange of views, or after expiry of the period referred to in paragraph 9.1, the Association Council may make appropriate recommendations for the settlement of these cases, without prejudice to Article 63(6) of the Europe Agreement. In these recommendations, the Association Council

may take into account any failure of the requested authority to give its point of view to the requesting authority within the period referred to in paragraph 9.1.

- 9.3. These procedures in the Association Council are without prejudice to any action under the respective competition laws in force in the territory of the Parties.

*Article 10***Negative conflict of competence**

When both the European Commission and the Estonian Competition Board consider that neither of them is competent to handle a case on the basis of their respective legislation an exchange of views shall take place on request in the Association Council. The Community and Estonia shall endeavour to find a mutually acceptable solution in the light of the respective important interests involved with the support of the Association Council, which may make appropriate recommendations, without prejudice to Article 63(6) of the Europe Agreement, and the rights of individual Member States of the European Communities on the basis of their competition rules.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ECSC TREATY*Article 11***Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC)**

The provisions contained in Articles 1 to 6 and 8 to 10 shall also apply with respect to the coal and steel sector.

*Article 12***Administrative assistance (languages)**

The European Commission and the Estonian Competition Board will provide for practical agreements for mutual assistance or any other appropriate solution concerning in particular the question of translations.

COUNCIL DECISION
of 31 May 1999
appointing a member of the Committee of the Regions

(1999/373/EC)

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 263 thereof,

Having regard to Council Decision 98/110/EC of 26 January 1998 ⁽¹⁾ appointing members and alternate members of the Committee of the Regions,

Whereas a seat as a member of the committee has become vacant following the resignation of Mr Christof Zernatto, of which the Council was notified on 19 April 1999;

Having regard to the proposal from the Austrian Government,

HAS DECIDED AS FOLLOWS:

Sole Article

Mr Jörg Haider is hereby appointed a member of the Committee of the Regions in place of Mr Christof Zernatto for the remainder of his term of office, which expires on 25 January 2002.

Done at Brussels, 31 May 1999.

For the Council

The President

J. FISCHER

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 28, 4.2.1998, p. 19.

COMMISSION

COMMISSION DECISION

of 28 October 1998

on aid granted by Germany to Neptun Industrie Rostock GmbH

(notified under document number C(1998) 3435)

(Only the German text is authentic)

(Text with EEA relevance)

(1999/374/EC)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular the first subparagraph of Article 93(2) thereof,

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

Having given the interested parties notice, in accordance with the abovementioned Articles, to submit their observations,

Whereas:

I

By letter No 1015 dated 11 February 1997, the Commission informed Germany that it had decided to initiate proceedings pursuant to Article 93(2) of the EC Treaty in respect of aid granted for the rescue of Neptun Industrie Rostock GmbH (hereinafter 'NIR').

The Commission's decision to initiate proceedings was published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* ⁽¹⁾; the other Member States and interested parties were asked to submit their comments.

Germany replied to the notice of 11 February 1997 by letters dated 10 March and 29 April 1997. In reply to further questions by the Commission, it sent further information by letters dated 28 May, 16 June, 1 July, 4 July, 22 July, 10 September, 29 September, 5 December and 8 December 1997, and 29 January, 15 May, 19 June, 17 September and 19 October 1998.

The Commission's letters asking Germany for further information on the restructuring were dated 2 May, 19 June, 5 August and 23 December 1997, and 30 March, 2 September and 30 September 1998.

One Member State submitted comments to the Commission.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 119, 17.4.1997, p. 4.

II

By letter dated 13 June 1996, Germany sent notification of a loan of DEM 15 million granted by the Bundesanstalt für vereinigungsbedingte Sonderaufgaben (Federal Institute for Special Tasks associated with Unification; hereinafter the 'BvS') to NIR as rescue aid.

In a letter dated 12 September 1996, Germany confirmed that the amount of the loan had already been paid to NIR on 4 April 1996. It was initially to be repaid by the end of that year⁽¹⁾.

The loan had not been notified to the Commission prior to its grant and/or payment.

Furthermore, the Commission found that the *Land* of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania had decided to provide a 100 % guarantee in respect of a DEM 63 million loan on 15 May 1996. By decision of 2 September 1996, the *Land* extended the guarantee until the end of 1996⁽²⁾.

The guarantee was not notified to the Commission prior to its grant.

In its decision to initiate proceedings pursuant to Article 93(2) of the EC Treaty, the Commission took the view that, in line with the 'market economy investor principle', the two financial measures had to be regarded as State aid.

The Commission also considered the aid to be illegal, since Germany had failed to fulfil its obligations pursuant to Article 93(3) of the EC Treaty by granting the aid before notification. The Commission considered that the belatedly notified loan constituted rescue aid and assumed that the non-notified guarantee constituted rescue aid as well.

It expressed doubts as to the compatibility of the aid with the criteria laid down in the Community guidelines on State aid for rescuing and restructuring firms in difficulty ('the guidelines')⁽³⁾, especially as Germany had failed to provide any restructuring plan by the time the Commission decided to initiate the proceedings. The initiation of proceedings therefore comprised a formal injunction requiring Germany to provide full information on the financial situation of NIR, the total amount of aid granted and the restructuring programme.

III

Following the initiation of proceedings, the government of one Member State sent comments to the Commission. It called for rapid clarification of the actual amount of aid paid and shared the Commission's doubts as to the compatibility of the aid.

IV

- (1) In the former GDR, there were two big shipyards in the Rostock area, VEB Schiffswerft Neptun in Rostock and VEB Warnow Werft in Rostock-Warnemünde. These two yards were merged in 1991 to form a new company, Neptun-Warnow Werft GmbH. At the same time, the Neptun yard in Rostock stopped building new ships and continued only with ship repair. The Warnemünde yard was privatised in late 1992/early 1993 in the form of an 'asset deal' and sold to Kvaerner AS.

The residual parts, with a workforce of some 1 500, not having been sold to Kvaerner AS, were combined under a new holding company, NIR. NIR was set up on 1 March 1993 and privatised later that year. Neptun Betriebsgesellschaft took 20 % of the shares as part of a management buy-out (MBO), while the Bremer Vulkan company Hanse Holding purchased the other 80 %.

⁽¹⁾ For final terms, see point IV.6.

⁽²⁾ This guarantee was later extended several times, see point IV.6.

⁽³⁾ OJ C 368, 23.12.1994, p. 12.

The closure of the Neptun yard's capacity for building and converting merchant ships was part of the capacity reductions in the East German shipbuilding industry. These capacity reductions were a condition in the special rules for the restructuring of the shipbuilding industry in East Germany, which were adopted in 1992 (Council Directive 92/68/EEC of 20 July 1992 amending Directive 90/648/EEC on aid to shipbuilding ⁽¹⁾). NIR therefore had to diversify into areas outside shipbuilding. According to the first provisional business plan of December 1992, NIR was to become an industrial conglomerate with a loosely annexed repair yard.

- (2) Germany notified the aid to be granted for this first privatisation and restructuring by letters dated 27 and 29 July 1993. According to the notification and the privatisation contract, the new owners were to make investments of DEM 357,1 million by the end of 1996. They had to guarantee a minimum workforce of 1 200, including no more than 200 in the repair yard. The ship repair capacity was limited to 300 000 hours/year. It was further clearly stipulated that no aid must spill over to the repair yard (as required by the relevant provision in Council Directive 90/648/EEC of 21 December 1990 on aid to shipbuilding ⁽²⁾).

The restructuring aid consisted of a lump-sum payment of DEM 159 million from the Treuhandanstalt and investment aid from the *Land* of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania of up to DEM 92,8 million under regional aid schemes. The Commission approved the restructuring aid by letter No 18963 of 23 November 1993.

- (3) From the end of 1993 until early 1996, NIR belonged to Bremer Vulkan Verbund AG as part of the intermediate holding company 'Vulkan Industrie Holding GmbH' (hereinafter 'VIH'), which held 80 % of NIR's equity. During that period, a number of enterprises in this group, mostly located in the Bremen region, were transferred to NIR. Towards the end of 1995, Bremer Vulkan ran into severe financial difficulties, had to apply for debt composition proceedings on 21 February 1996 and went bankrupt on 1 May 1996.
- (4) In preparation for an intended sale of Bremer Vulkan's holding in NIR (which was held by its intermediate holding company, VIH) to an investment company, VIH, Neptun Vermögensverwaltungsgesellschaft, the BvS, NIR and Neptun Betriebsgesellschaft agreed by means of a contract dated 25 March 1996 that the 80 % holding of Bremer Vulkan should be placed with a company held by the administrator ⁽³⁾. In this arrangement, the BvS released Bremer Vulkan from its investment obligations under the privatisation agreement of 1993, which in practice were no longer enforceable anyway because of the imminent full bankruptcy of Bremer Vulkan Verbund AG and VIH. The contract of 25 March 1996 stipulated that the holding was to be sold as soon as possible, and by the end of 1997 at the latest. However, the plans for rapid sale of the holding came to nothing as the results of a 'due diligence' examination were not satisfactory to the investment company. Subsequently, the investment bank 'C. S. First Boston AG' was entrusted by the BvS with the task of looking for potential investors. In addition, NIR supervisory board members also tried to find a suitable investor for the company. However, although C. S. First Boston contacted a large number of potential buyers of NIR by the summer of 1997 and although NIR's interest in finding a new owner was made public in the specialised press, these activities had no tangible results. It was only in the autumn of 1997 that the owners of Meyer shipyard in Papenburg (hereinafter 'Meyer') made an offer to buy NIR. The only alternative to Meyer's offer was a continuation of the restructuring under the existing MBO. However, the plan worked out by Neptun Betriebsgesellschaft turned out to be financially hardly viable and would have needed very high State guarantees over an extended period. Consequently, the MBO plan was given up. Meyer, as the only bidder, then acquired all the shares of NIR.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 219, 4.8.1992, p. 54 and the preceding 'Proposal for a Council Directive providing for changes to the seventh Council Directive on aid to shipbuilding of 21 December 1990' (OJ C 155, 20.6.1992, p. 20).

⁽²⁾ OJ L 380, 31.12.1990, p. 27.

⁽³⁾ The financing institution in question was the venture capital wing of Vereins- und Westbank, a private German bank. The BvS acted in this agreement as a private investor would have done in a similar situation, as it gave up certain rights under the previous privatisation agreement with Bremer Vulkan in return for a share in the proceeds from the sale of the holding of Vulkan Industrie Holding in NIR.

- (5) Germany further explained in its letter of 22 July 1997 that the separation of NIR from Bremer Vulkan in early 1996 was necessary in order not to jeopardise the restructuring and to avoid the imminent bankruptcy of NIR. A bankruptcy would have risked losing the entire investment in the hatch covers production facility and the boat service yard, both in the Rostock region. NIR had at the time large payment obligations stemming from this investment, which was nearing completion. NIR had participated in the cash concentration system of the Bremer Vulkan group until end of 1995, though it did not benefit from the misuse of aid meant for MTW and Volkswerft⁽¹⁾. It left this system in the end with balanced accounts, but due to its previous linkage with Bremer Vulkan it was not able to get any loans from banks without a State guarantee.
- (6) In its reply of 10 March 1997 regarding the initiation of proceedings and the injunction to provide the relevant information, Germany informed the Commission of the various aid measures. The aid given consists of:
1. a loan from the BvS of DEM 15 million for operating expenditure, disbursed on 10 April 1996, originally to be repaid on 31 December 1997, later prolonged until 31 December 1998;
 2. a loan from the BvS of DEM 5,4 million for ongoing investments, disbursed in March 1997, with due dates as under 1;
 3. a loan from the BvS of DEM 14,1 million for ongoing investments, social plan expenditure and operating purposes, disbursed in three trenches between February and June 1997, with due dates as under 1;
 4. a 100 % State guarantee under the Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania guarantee scheme to secure loans of up to DEM 63 million (DEM 40 million for investments, DEM 11 million overdraft facility, DEM 12 million procurement financing), granted on 15 May 1996, prolonged several times up to the envisaged approval of the restructuring aid plan by the Commission;
 5. a 100 % counter-guarantee up to DEM 8 million provided by the BvS for order financing, granted on 11 March 1997, provisionally prolonged as under 4.

All these loans and guarantees were provided against securities from NIR. The BvS set up a detailed monitoring system to ensure correct use of the funds. Of the loans totalling DEM 34,5 million, an amount of DEM 25,6 million was spent on the completion of investments in two factories in Rostock (Neptun Stahlobjektbau and A&R Neptun BoatSERVICE), DEM 3,5 million on staff costs and DEM 5,4 million on other operating expenditure. Germany considers the measures introduced up to 31 March 1997 to be rescue aid, and their prolongations after that date to be restructuring aid.

The proceedings cover only the loan mentioned under point 1 and the guarantee mentioned under point 4 up to 31 December 1997. The Commission registered their prolongations and the additional measures as new aid under State aid case NN 102/97.

- (7) By letter dated 10 March 1997, Germany sent the Commission a provisional restructuring programme drawn up by the enterprise. It was evident from the documents and the subsequent discussion that an initial restructuring report had already been established by external advisors in September 1996 and a second in December 1996. These had not been sent to the Commission as there was a disagreement between the advisors, the management of NIR, Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania and the BvS on how to proceed. The reports of the auditors on the business years 1993 to 1995 and the analyses of the advisors showed that the situation of NIR was much worse than had been expected up to the autumn of 1996. Reported losses

⁽¹⁾ See the Commission Decision of 23 July 1998 on State aid C 7/96 (not yet published). NIR terminated its participation in the cash concentration system by a separate agreement between Bremer Vulkan, NIR and the relevant commercial bank. In the agreement, NIR claims on Vulkan Industrie Holding were set off against Neptun Techno Products liabilities to Vulkan Industrie Holding, so that both companies left the cash concentration system with balanced accounts.

shot up from DEM 5,2 million (1994) to DEM 122,9 million (1995), and even then the auditors indicated that the pending risks would need further corrections. In its letter of 2 May 1997 to Germany, the Commission therefore expressed serious doubts about the viability of the restructuring plan notified in the spring of 1997.

(8) By letters dated 1 July and 22 July 1997, Germany informed the Commission of revisions to the restructuring plan and a modification of the financing programme. The programme was again modified in the autumn of 1997 after the sale of all the shares in NIR for a total price of DEM [...] ⁽¹⁾ by the administrator of Bremer Vulkan and Neptun Betriebsgesellschaft to Meyer. The main elements of this revised restructuring programme are:

(a) the concentration of NIR's activities on the maritime core business with five companies:

- MACOR-Neptun Rostock (primarily production of hatch covers for container vessels; expected long-term workforce in 1999: 255)
- Neptun Reparaturwerft (ship repair; expected workforce: 59)
- A&R Neptun Boatservice (construction of yachts, repair of small naval and coastguard vessels; expected workforce: 29)
- Möhring Klimatechnik (air conditioning equipment, mainly for ships, expected workforce: 83)
- Personalservice Rostock (a personnel leasing company for craftsmen in the maritime trades; expected workforce: 55);

(b) the sale of the holdings in or closure of companies no longer belonging to the core business:

- Neptun Isolierglas
- Neptun-Scanhus Fertigungsgesellschaft
- Neptun Systemtechnik
- NIR Hotelbetriebsgesellschaft
- Oberflächentechnik Rostock;

(c) the sale of all properties and assets no longer needed for business operations (Neptun owns large areas close to the city centre of Rostock);

(d) a reduction in the number of directly employed staff to around 800 initially and from 1999 onwards to about 530 (the workforce at the beginning of 1996 was 1 200).

(9) According to the business plan sent with Germany's letter dated 8 December 1997 and the provisional annual report for 1997, the maritime core business of NIR will continue to make losses until the end of 1999. The first modest profits are expected as from the year 2000. A major part of the losses are expected in the repair yard, which has not received and will not receive any aid. These losses are to be covered by the sale of property belonging to the yard and by Meyer.

The total expected annual results of the other operative companies are: DEM [...] ⁽¹⁾ in 1997 (provisional outturn), DEM [...] ⁽¹⁾ in 1998 (including staff reduction costs of DEM 3,5 million), DEM [...] ⁽¹⁾ in 1999, DEM [...] ⁽¹⁾ in 2000 and DEM [...] ⁽¹⁾ in 2001. A major part of the losses will occur in Neptun MACOR. This enterprise was formed through a merger of MACOR in Bremerhaven and Neptun Stahlobjektbau in Rostock. The restructuring plan makes it clear that major improvements in the organisation and in sales

⁽¹⁾ Parts of this text have been edited to ensure that confidential information is not disclosed; those parts are enclosed in square brackets and marked with an asterisk.

management will be necessary to achieve positive results from the year 2000 onwards. Minor and rapidly decreasing losses are expected in Neptun BoatSERVICE up to the year 2000. Möhring has been profitable until now and is expected to remain profitable. *De facto*, this company is hardly affected by the restructuring. Personalservice made losses of DEM 0,8 million in 1997, but expects small profits from 1998 onwards.

(10) As regards the financing of the other restructuring measures, the following was agreed between Meyer, the BvS and the *Land*:

- (a) Meyer will provide a subordinated loan of DEM 20 million to strengthen the capital base of NIR. This loan will be used primarily to finance necessary investments in the repair yard, which must not benefit from State aid.
- (b) Neptun Development GmbH, a newly founded subsidiary of NIR, will repay the bank loans taken up by NIR in 1996/97 from the proceeds of property sales by the end of 2002. The present State guarantee provided by Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania to secure these loans (DEM 63 million in total) in favour of the lending bank will be replaced by a guarantee amounting to some DEM 28 million after approval of the aid programme by the Commission.
- (c) After approval from the Commission, the BvS will waive repayment of the loans of a total amount of DEM 34,5 million given to NIR in 1996/97⁽¹⁾.
- (d) At Meyer's request, the BvS will prolong the refund guarantee for a credit line of up to DEM 8 million until 31 December 1998 against securities on the property of NIR and payment of fees of 0,5 % p.a.
- (e) Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania will provide aid of up to DEM 1,7 million under the regional aid programme 'Gemeinschaftsaufgabe zur Förderung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur' for residual investments of DEM 9,8 million for the production of hatch covers by MACOR Neptun. This aid is a residual amount of the regional aid committed in 1994, which was suspended after the collapse of Bremer Vulkan.

Germany gave an assurance that NIR and its enterprises undergoing restructuring would not receive any additional aid during the restructuring period, which runs until the end of 2001. Germany will provide the Commission with annual reports on the progress of the restructuring and the disinvestment measures. These reports will be certified by the company's auditors. For Neptun Reparaturwerft, separate accounts will be maintained, and annual reports will be submitted to the Commission in order to make sure that no aid spills over to the repair yard.

Germany and the company confirmed that Neptun Reparaturwerft will continue to comply with its capacity limitation of 300 000 hours per year. By letter dated 10 September 1997, Germany agreed to provide six-monthly production control reports to the Commission. These will also deal with the status of investments in the yard. Neptun Reparaturwerft will not resume conversion activities for merchant ships before 2001, when the 10-year closure period of the former Neptun Werft comes to an end⁽²⁾. Germany and the company confirmed further that the facilities of A&R Neptun BoatSERVICE will not be used for the building, conversion or repair of vessels falling under the scope of Community legislation on aid to shipbuilding. The auditor will check compliance with this commitment.

⁽¹⁾ See point 6 items 1 to 3.

⁽²⁾ See Article 7 of Directive 90/684/EEC, which stipulates a 10-year closure period.

- (11) In view of the developments in the enterprise, this Decision deals with the rescue aid on which the Article 93(2) proceedings were initiated ⁽¹⁾ as well as with all other aid granted or planned for the rescue and restructuring of NIR.

V

- (1) The loans and the guarantee given by the BvS in 1996/97, like the State guarantee of DEM 63 million provided by Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania in 1996 ⁽²⁾, are State aid. In its letter of 10 March 1997, Germany stated that these measures were indispensable as banks had refused to give loans to NIR, even after the separation from Bremer Vulkan, without a full refund guarantee from the State. It is therefore uncontested that all the financial measures of the BvS and Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, including those notified in 1997, are State aid within the meaning of Article 92(1) of the EC Treaty.

Germany proved with certified detailed reports from the auditors that Neptun Reparaturwerft has not so far received any aid. An assurance has also been given that Neptun Reparaturwerft will not benefit from the rescue and restructuring aid in future either. The expected losses of Neptun Reparaturwerft will be covered by sales of company assets and by Meyer. In the case of A&R Neptun Boatservice, it is clearly set out that this small yard will limit its activities to yachts and small naval boats — in other words, to vessels not falling under the scope of the specific Community legislation governing the building of merchant ships. The rescue and restructuring aid for NIR is therefore not to be regarded as aid to shipbuilding. The aid is to be assessed pursuant to Article 92 of the Treaty in the light of the criteria set out in the Community Guidelines on State aid for rescuing and restructuring firms in difficulty ⁽³⁾.

- (2) The loans and the guarantee from the BvS and the guarantee on an amount of DEM 63 million from Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania have to be regarded as non-notified aid as all the aid was granted before the Commission could state its position on it. Germany failed to fulfil its notification obligations pursuant to Article 93(3) of the EC Treaty. The Commission cannot fully accept the argument put forward by Germany that the guarantee from Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania was granted under an aid scheme approved by the Commission in November 1991. It should be borne in mind that the Commission requested Germany by letter No 15716 of 9 November 1994 to take appropriate measures within the meaning of Article 93(1) of the EC Treaty for the operation of the guarantee scheme. One important measure was the individual notification of guarantees granted for large enterprises in difficulty as required by the guidelines. As Germany did not implement this measure, the Commission found in Decision 96/475/EC ⁽⁴⁾ that the guarantee scheme of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania was incompatible with the common market. Since 1 July 1996, the individual notification of guarantees for large enterprises has been obligatory. The decision of the guarantee board to grant the first guarantee until 31 August 1996 dates from 15 May 1996. While the Commission therefore concedes that the first granting of the guarantee by Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania did not require an individual notification, Germany was bound to notify its extension from 1 September 1996 onwards. This was not done.
- (3) The guidelines distinguish between rescue and restructuring aid. In the present case this distinction is difficult to apply. NIR was already undergoing restructuring at the time of its separation from Bremer Vulkan. While it was clear from the beginning that the previous restructuring plan needed some modification, the full scope of the problems became visible only towards the end of 1996, when the auditors had finalised their work on the annual report for 1995 and the external advisors from UBB had presented their analysis. Matters

⁽¹⁾ See Section II.

⁽²⁾ See the detailed description in point IV.6.

⁽³⁾ OJ C 368, 23.12.1994, p. 12.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ L 194, 6.8.1996, p. 25.

were further complicated by the fact that the NIR holding company consisted of some 15 rather small enterprises, at different locations and working in very different fields. In many cases these enterprises had strong commercial links with other parts of the former Bremer Vulkan group, whose future was uncertain as well. The continuing viability of these firms had to be examined in each individual case. The first restructuring plan, 'Neptun 2000' of December 1996 prepared by NIR itself, was based on over-optimistic assumptions. It was accepted neither by the NIR's bankers nor by the BvS. To arrive at a feasible solution, the restructuring plan had to be modified several times. This process was painful and difficult, as each step involved further closures and further reductions of staff. At the same time, the restructuring of the residual parts had to be continued. It therefore took 15 months to arrive at a new restructuring plan agreed between the relevant parties in Germany⁽¹⁾. When the shares of the company were sold to Meyer, the new owners made further modifications up to November 1997⁽²⁾. This is far more than the period of six months laid down in the guidelines. The Commission acknowledges the particular difficulties involved in the rescue and restructuring of NIR and can therefore as an exception accept the delays which occurred in this case. The Commission regrets, however, that Germany failed until March 1997 to fulfil its obligations of providing information on the progress achieved in drawing up a restructuring plan.

(4) Due to the fact that no viable restructuring plan was available until 28 May 1997, the aid given up to that date, as described under point IV.6, is to be regarded as rescue aid. According to the guidelines, rescue aid must meet the following conditions:

- (i) It must consist of liquidity help in the form of loan guarantees or loans bearing normal commercial interest rates. The rescue aid was given in this form. The loans from the BvS carried an interest rate of 3 % above the discount rate, which can be regarded as a market rate in view of the collateral provided by NIR. The loan secured by the State guarantee carries a market interest rate as well. The Commission estimated the aid intensity of the guarantees at 15 % per annum, due to the fact that the securities provided by NIR would not have allowed a full recovery in the event of a default (the corresponding aid amount over an approximate period of two years is therefore DEM 21,3 million⁽³⁾).
- (ii) It must be restricted to the amount needed to keep a firm in business. Germany provided evidence that the funds were limited to the minimum and only disbursed when the payment obligations became due. This also applies to the large payments for investments, which had to be made under existing contracts. The investments were about 80 % complete at the beginning of 1996. Any termination of the contracts with the suppliers would have caused excessive costs and most likely the bankruptcy of NIR. In addition, it would have left major production facilities incomplete and therefore without any economic use.

⁽¹⁾ Fortschreibung der Unternehmenskonzeption 'Neptun 2000': this restructuring plan handed over to the Commission at a meeting on 30 June 1997 in Brussels contains the essential elements of the final restructuring plan. It is the first restructuring plan which can be considered feasible within the meaning of the guidelines.

⁽²⁾ The final business plan dates from 12 November 1997 and was sent to the Commission by Germany by letter dated 8 December 1997.

⁽³⁾ The guarantees in question are shortfall guarantees. The guarantor has to meet the shortfall after liquidation of all collateral securities. The collateral securities provided are mortgages on all real properties belonging to NIR. In its analysis, the Commission estimated the default risk on the basis of the value of the collateral securities, based on assessment of the value of the property. It came to the conclusion that the collateral securities, which had a book value of some DEM 144 million at the end of 1995, would not have been sufficient to repay all loans (some DEM 115 million) from the proceeds of a forced sale of the property. A shortfall in the range of 30 % could have been expected in the two-year guarantee period. This 30 % shortfall on the amount of the guarantees corresponds to an amount of DEM 21,3 million.

- (iii) It must be paid only for the time needed to devise the necessary and feasible recovery plan ⁽¹⁾. As set out above, the Commission can accept in this particular case the reasons given for the delays in drawing up a feasible restructuring plan. The Commission can also agree to the prolongation of this aid until it has taken a decision on the restructuring programme and the restructuring aid linked to it.
- (iv) It must be warranted on the grounds of serious social difficulties and have no unduly disruptive effects on the industrial situation in other Member States.

Most parts of NIR are located in the region of Rostock, with a small proportion in Bremerhaven. Both regions are classified as assisted areas and suffer from very high unemployment. In addition, both areas were particularly affected by the collapse of Bremer Vulkan, as this group was one of their main industrial employers. The rescue aid is therefore justified on social grounds.

The analysis of the impact of the aid on the industry in other Member States can concentrate on the maritime core business of NIR. As mentioned above, the Neptun Reparaturwerft repair yard is not covered by the restructuring aid programme and has not received any aid, nor will it do so. Mohring is a profitable enterprise which never needed any aid. All rescue aid for operative and investment purposes was used for MACOR Neptun and the A&R Neptun Boatservice with the exception of a minor part used in the holding company to meet its social costs for the termination of a number of activities. Boatservice is a small enterprise with less than 50 staff operating on the regional German market for smaller yachts. Its limited activities in the repair of small vessels belonging to the German navy are outside of the scope of Article 92 of the Treaty, owing to the provisions of Article 223 thereof. MACOR Neptun's main activity is the design, engineering and construction of cargo access equipment for freight vessels, particularly of hatch covers for container ships. The engineering and design activities are carried out in MACOR. Three engineering companies, MacGregor (Finland), Kvaerner (Norway) and MACOR control the world market for the design and engineering of hatch covers, with the Finnish company MacGregor in a dominant position. The closure of MACOR would have strengthened this dominant position. The production of hatch covers is concentrated in countries with low labour costs outside the Community, mostly in Asia (especially China) and Eastern Europe (Croatia, Romania, Poland) for price reasons. The main competitor within the Community is Arend & Cie (France). The entrance barriers to this market are extremely low, as in principle any enterprise active in heavy steel construction would be able to manufacture hatch covers according to the design of the engineering firms. This makes this market difficult for Community suppliers. Their main advantage is their proximity to European shipyards and the higher quality of their products. However, given the structure of the shipbuilding market, none of these suppliers, including MACOR Neptun, will be able to influence the relatively low price level. The relevant market for hatch covers is the world market, and the present difficult situation on this market is caused by developments in East Asia, where by far the most cargo vessels are built and equipped.

It can therefore be assumed that the rescue aid has had and is having no unreasonable effect on the industrial situation in other Member States.

⁽¹⁾ As mentioned in the guidelines, the Commission will consider favourably an extension of the rescue aid until its investigation is completed.

Though the rescue aid granted is non-notified aid and therefore illegal, the Commission can declare the aid compatible with the common market, taking into consideration the exceptional circumstances as described above. The loans and the guarantees were provided to ensure the short-term survival of NIR. Subject to the above qualifications, they fulfil the criteria laid down in the guidelines.

- (5) As is explained in the description under point IV.10, the support given by the State for the completion of the restructuring by the new owners consists predominantly in a waiver of the loans from the BvS totalling DEM 34,5 million and a prolongation of the State guarantees on a reduced amount until the bank loans have been repaid. The aid element of the guarantee given by Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania is limited by the fact that the bank loan in question is primarily secured by mortgages on property and other assets valued at DEM 66,5 million. The detailed valuation was submitted to the Commission and can be accepted. The risk relating to this guarantee is therefore limited to a shortfall or delay in the proceeds from the sales of property in the event of a severe crisis on the local property market in the next few years. The fees of about 1 % per annum are, however, somewhat below the expected market price in view of the right of prior claim to 50 % of the proceeds granted to the lending bank. The Commission estimated therefore that the aid equivalent is in the DEM 2 million range. The terms of the refund guarantee by the BvS in respect of a credit line of DEM 8 million can be regarded as market terms in view of the collateral securities required. This assessment by the Commission is supported by the fact that Meyer has not yet requested issue of the guarantee bond in view of the costs.

Apart from the regional aid of DEM 1,7 million, no aid will be paid in cash. As in this case the investment by MACOR Neptun was clearly specified in the notification, any spillover of aid from NIR to its repair yard or to Meyer Werft in Papenburg can be virtually excluded. Notwithstanding that, the Commission will monitor the correct use of the aid and the repayment of the bank loans in the framework of the agreed monitoring system by means of audited reports.

- (6) The guidelines lay down the following criteria for restructuring aid:
- (a) the aid must be linked to a viable restructuring/recovery programme submitted in all relevant detail to the Commission and capable of restoring the long-term viability of the firm within a reasonable time-scale;
 - (b) the aid must be in proportion to the restructuring costs and benefits;
 - (c) undue distortions of competition through the aid must be avoided;
 - (d) the firm must fully implement the restructuring plan and observe any conditions imposed;
 - (e) the implementation of the plan and compliance with the conditions will be monitored by requiring the submission of detailed annual reports to the Commission.
- (7) Germany sent the Commission a detailed restructuring programme⁽¹⁾. It comprises a complete rearrangement of NIR's activities, with a concentration on the core business in the maritime sector and the termination of all other activities. The workforce will be reduced further in this process from 1 200 to about 530 from 1999 onwards (these figures include the repair yard). According to the business plan of Meyer, NIR as a group will be profitable as from the year 2000. The provisional results for 1997 are basically in line with this plan. The planning is based on cautious assumptions as to future demand and prices,

⁽¹⁾ See point IV.8.

which seems realistic given developments in the shipbuilding industries in Western Europe. It is further assumed that productivity will strongly increase in the new facilities at MACOR Neptun and A&R Neptun Boatservice in the first three years after full commissioning in 1997. Together with the reduction in the workforce and lowering of overheads on the part of the holding company, this will reduce production costs and eliminate the high start-up losses in these two companies. As Möhring is already profitable and Personalservice expects a balanced result, the assumption of relatively modest but stable profitability from 2000 onwards seems realistic. The Commission can therefore accept the viability of the restructuring plan.

- (8) As was shown above, the restructuring aid will basically consist of the waiver of the loans from the BvS totalling DEM 34,5 million, the prolongation of the State guarantees on an amount which will gradually decrease until 2002, when the sale of property no longer needed by NIR will be completed, and DEM 1,7 million in regional investment aid. As the main financial contribution, Meyer will provide a capital-replacing loan of DEM 20 million to re-establish the capital base of NIR. Germany considers this package as necessary and justified, in view of the losses made during the rescue period, the losses still expected during the remaining restructuring period and the modest profits expected thereafter. Although the total aid provided for the restructuring of NIR is very high in relation to the workforce retained, the Commission can accept this argument in this specific case. The original restructuring plan of the Bremer Vulkan period must be considered to have failed. Virtually the total equity of NIR was used up due to this failure. Some of the investments recently completed need to be partly written-off because of their low returns. The waiver of the rescue loans of DEM 34,5 million covers a part of the losses run up in the past few years. It is essential in order to restore the financial equilibrium of NIR.

The DEM 1,7 million regional investment aid for the completion of some minor investments of a total cost of DEM 9,8 million has an intensity of 18 %. This is far lower than the maximum of 35 % permitted in the region and can therefore be accepted. Germany gave an assurance that no other aid will be paid to the enterprises presently under the NIR holding company during their restructuring period, which will end in 2001. No aid will be received by Neptun Reparaturwerft.

The planned aid measures are in line with the restructuring programme submitted and are necessary from a commercial point of view. In view of the comprehensive restructuring of NIR, the substantial closure costs involved and the time needed for the completion of the restructuring, the Commission can consider the total amount of DEM 38,2 million in restructuring aid acceptable.

- (9) As the restructuring aid consists mainly in a prolongation of a State guarantee for an existing loan, which is to be repaid by Meyer, and in a waiver of debts by the BvS, the impact on competition will be very limited for the same reasons as discussed in relation to the rescue aid. Therefore, no undue distortions of competition in the common market are expected.

Implementation of parts of the restructuring programme began provisionally in 1997. On 12 February 1998 Meyer took over the management of NIR. Since then, the restructuring plan has been undergoing full implementation. Germany will provide annual reports on the progress of the restructuring. In addition, Germany will send the Commission the abovementioned reports on the activities of Neptun Reparaturwerft and A&R Neptun Boatservice.

- (10) In conclusion, the restructuring aid for NIR can be regarded as in line with the criteria set out in the guidelines. The aid can therefore be regarded as compatible with the common market pursuant to Article 92(3)(a) and (c) of the EC Treaty and Article 61(3)(c) of the EEA

Agreement, subject to compliance by Germany with the conditions set out in this Decision. Germany and Meyer on behalf of NIR have given an undertaking to implement the restructuring programme as notified and to comply with the conditions.

Past experience, however, both after the takeover by BVV and after the latter's bankruptcy, has shown considerable difficulties in the drawing-up and implementation of a sustainable restructuring plan. The Commission would therefore point out that the full implementation of the restructuring plan is a condition for the aid. The Commission will take steps to require the recovery of the aid if the restructuring plan is not fully implemented (unless any modifications which may have become necessary have been accepted by the Commission) or the conditions concerning the use of the aid are not complied with,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

The loans of a total amount of DEM 34,5 million granted to Neptun Industrie Rostock GmbH (NIR) by the Bundesanstalt für vereinigungsbedingte Sonderaufgaben (BvS), which are to be waived as from the date of adoption of this Decision, are compatible with the common market, subject to compliance with the conditions set out in Article 5.

Article 2

The guarantee in respect of an amount of DEM 63 million, which was granted on 15 May 1996 by the *Land* of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania for NIR and which is to be replaced by a subsequent guarantee of up to DEM 28,1 million as from the date of adoption of this Decision until 31 December 2002 at the latest, comprises an aid equivalent of DEM 20,9 million and is compatible with the common market, subject to compliance with the conditions set out in Article 5.

Article 3

The counter-guarantee in respect of an amount of DEM 8 million granted on 11 March 1997 until the date of this Decision by the BvS for NIR comprises an aid equivalent of DEM 2,4 million and is compatible with the common market.

The possible renewal of this counter-guarantee until 31 December 1998 does not contain aid in view of the fees paid by NIR and the securities to be provided by NIR to the BvS.

Article 4

The regional investment aid of an amount of DEM 1,7 million to be granted for the completion of investments in the NIR company MACOR Neptun is compatible with the common market, subject to compliance with the conditions set out in Article 5.

Article 5

1. The State aid referred to in Articles 1 to 4 may be used exclusively for the rescue and restructuring of NIR, in line with the restructuring plan notified to the Commission. The aid must not be used for, and its benefits must not spill over to, the shipyards Neptun Reparaturwerft in Rostock or Meyer Werft in Papenburg. Until the end of 2001, no other aid shall be paid to the companies of the NIR group undergoing restructuring.

2. Germany shall ensure that:
 - (a) Neptun Reparaturwerft does not exceed the capacity limit of 300 000 hours for the repair of merchant ships
 - (b) no conversion work is carried out on ships falling under the scope of the Community legislation on shipbuilding
 - (c) the facilities of A&R Neptun Boatservice are not used for the building, conversion or repair of ships falling under the scope of the Community legislation on shipbuilding.
3. Germany shall report on the progress of the restructuring by means of annual reports during the period from 1998 to 2001. The reports will also provide sufficiently detailed information on compliance with the conditions set out in this Article. In addition, Germany shall submit six-monthly production control reports providing information on the activities of Neptun Reparaturwerft.

Article 6

This Decision is addressed to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Done at Brussels, 28 October 1998.

For the Commission

Karel VAN MIERT

Member of the Commission

COMMISSION DECISION
of 19 May 1999
recognising the fully operational character of Luxembourg's database for bovine
animals

(notified under document number C(1999) 1270)

(Only the French text is authentic)

(1999/375/EC)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97 of 21 April 1997 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 6(3), first indent,

Having regard to the request submitted by Luxembourg,

- (1) Whereas on 14 August 1998, Luxembourg's authorities submitted to the Commission a request asking for recognition of the fully operational character of their database that forms part of Luxembourg's system for the identification and registration of bovine animals; whereas this request was accompanied by appropriate information that was updated on 12 March 1999;
- (2) Whereas Luxembourg's authorities have undertaken the commitment to improve the reliability of this database ensuring in particular that (i) the competent authority will be able to promptly correct any errors or deficiencies which could be detected automatically or following the appropriate on-the-spot inspections; (ii) the delays for notification of movements, births and deaths shall be shortened to seven days and (iii) measures shall be taken to implement the provisions of Commission Regulation (EC) No 2630/97 ⁽²⁾ as necessary; whereas, in addition, Luxembourg's authorities

have undertaken the commitment to modify their current provisions regarding re-identification of bovine animals in case of lost ear tags so as to comply with the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 820/97; whereas Luxembourg's authorities have undertaken the commitment to implement those improvement measures at the latest by 30 July 1999;

- (3) Whereas in view of the situation in Luxembourg, it is appropriate to recognise the fully operational character of the database for the bovine animals,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

The Luxembourg database for bovine animals is recognised as fully operational from 1 August 1999.

Article 2

This Decision is addressed to the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

Done at Brussels, 19 May 1999.

For the Commission

Franz FISCHLER

Member of the Commission

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 117, 7.5.1997, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 354, 30.12.1997, p. 23.

COMMISSION DECISION

of 19 May 1999

recognising the fully operational character of the Danish database for bovine animals

*(notified under document number C(1999) 1305)***(Only the Danish text is authentic)**

(1999/376/EC)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97 of 21 April 1997 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 6(3), first indent,

Having regard to the request submitted by Denmark,

- (1) Whereas on 19 September 1998, the Danish authorities submitted to the Commission a request asking for recognition of the fully operational character of their database that forms part of the Danish system for the identification and registration of bovine animals; whereas this request was accompanied by appropriate information that was updated on 17 March 1999;
- (2) Whereas the Danish authorities have undertaken the commitment to improve the reliability of this database ensuring in particular that (i) the competent authority will be able to promptly correct any errors or deficiencies which could be detected automatically or following the appropriate on-the-spot inspections; (ii) the delays for notification of movements, births and deaths shall be shortened to seven days as quickly as possible; (iii) measures shall be taken to implement the provisions of Commission Regulation (EC) No 2630/97⁽²⁾ as necessary; (iv) measures will be taken to improve the authentication of passports for bovine animals and (v) measures will be taken to introduce

notification of the premium status of individual bovine animals; whereas, in addition, the Danish authorities have undertaken the commitment to modify their current provisions regarding re-identification of bovine animals in case of lost ear tags so as to comply with the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 820/97; whereas the Danish authorities have undertaken the commitment to implement those improvement measures at the latest by 30 September 1999;

- (3) Whereas in view of the situation in Denmark, it is appropriate to recognise the fully operational character of the database for the bovine animals,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

The Danish database for bovine animals is recognised as fully operational from 1 October 1999.

Article 2

This Decision is addressed to the Kingdom of Denmark.

Done at Brussels, 19 May 1999.

For the Commission

Franz FISCHLER

Member of the Commission

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 117, 7.5.1997, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 354, 30.12.1997, p. 23.

COMMISSION DECISION

of 19 May 1999

recognising the fully operational character of the Belgian database for bovine animals*(notified under document number C(1999) 1349)***(Only the French and Dutch texts are authentic)**

(1999/377/EC)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97 of 21 April 1997 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 6(3), first indent,

Having regard to the request submitted by Belgium,

- (1) Whereas on 12 October 1998, the Belgian authorities submitted to the Commission a request asking for recognition of the fully operational character of their database that forms part of the Belgian system for the identification and registration of bovine animals; whereas this request was accompanied by appropriate information that was updated on 25 February 1999;
- (2) Whereas the Belgian authorities have undertaken the commitment to improve the reliability of this database ensuring in particular that (i) all kinds of movements shall be recorded in the database and (ii) the competent authority will be able to promptly correct any errors or deficiencies which could be detected automatically or following the appropriate on-the-spot inspections; whereas, in addition, the Belgian authorities have undertaken the commitment to modify their current provisions

regarding re-identification of bovine animals in case of lost ear tags so as to comply with the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 820/97; whereas the Belgian authorities have undertaken the commitment to implement those improvement measures at the latest by 30 June 1999;

- (3) Whereas in view of the situation in Belgium, it is appropriate to recognise the fully operational character of the database for the bovine animals,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

The Belgian database for bovine animals is recognised as fully operational from 1 July 1999.

Article 2

This Decision is addressed to the Kingdom of Belgium.

Done at Brussels, 19 May 1999.

For the Commission

Franz FISCHLER

Member of the Commission

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 117, 7.5.1997, p. 1.

CORRIGENDA

Corrigendum to Commission Decision 1999/366/EC of 4 June 1999 terminating the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of ferro-silicon originating in Egypt and Poland

(Official Journal of the European Communities L 142 of 5 June 1999)

The publication of Decision 1999/366/EC is to be considered void.
