

Finland is the only Member State which requires investors to explain their position in this way.

Is the Commission aware of the problems which Finnish competition legislation is causing for growth enterprises, investors, and the competition authorities? Is the national law in question contrary to the competition provisions of the Treaty and EU competition legislation?

**Answer given by Mr Monti on behalf of the Commission**

(10 January 2002)

The Commission has no knowledge of Finnish competition legislation causing problems for companies, investors and competition authorities. On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member the Commission can see no grounds which would require investigation under the Community competition rules. As a general rule, Articles 81 and 82 (ex Article 85 and 86) of the EC Treaty apply to agreements and behaviour of economic undertakings and only in very limited circumstances can a Member State be held to have infringed these provisions. The information provided in the question does not reveal such circumstances. Furthermore, the question does not give any indication that there is an issue of privileged undertakings which might fall under Article 86 (ex Article 90) of the EC Treaty.

(2002/C 147 E/111)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-3128/01**

**by Jean-Claude Fruteau (PSE) to the Commission**

(14 November 2001)

*Subject:* Impact of the ACP-EU partnership agreement and the 'Everything but Arms' initiative on the outermost regions

The challenge of integrating the outermost regions into their regional areas has been proclaimed in various international fora. However, the fact is that the similarities between their agricultural products and those of their ACP neighbours, with the wide differences in wage levels can put the outermost regions at a serious competitive disadvantage.

In its report of 14 March 2000 the Commission undertook to 'have an independent analysis carried out of the impact of the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement on the outermost regions', a commitment which was confirmed on 12 June 2001 in the Commission's work programme in respect of a sustainable development strategy for the outermost regions.

1. Could the Commission keep Parliament informed of the state of progress of this expert analysis, and at the very least provide it with details of the subject of this impact study?
2. If this impact study showed that these agreements were having a destabilising effect on the agricultural markets in the outermost regions, to what extent would the European Parliament be involved in the effort to devise ways of compensating producers in those regions?

**Answer given by Mr Lamy on behalf of the Commission**

(17 January 2002)

The Commission will keep Parliament informed of the progress of the impact study. The terms of reference of the study are being finalised by the Commission. All the departments that come under the Inter-Departmental Group on the Outermost Regions are involved, which means that all aspects of the dossier can be taken into account. The study is scheduled to start at the beginning of 2002.

The study will cover the possibilities and questions posed by the Cotonou Agreement and the 'Everything but Arms' initiative for the outermost regions. It will include a socioeconomic analysis of the impact of these instruments, taking account of the specificity of the outermost regions in the Community and in their broader geographical areas. In view of the nature of the outermost regions, the consequences in terms of economic and commercial activity will be examined.

It will, of course, be an independent study and its outcome should not be prejudged. However, the Commission undertakes to keep Parliament fully informed, not only of the state of progress of the study but also the follow-up that it is given.

---

(2002/C 147 E/112)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-3129/01**

**by Monica Frassoni (Verts/ALE) to the Commission**

(14 November 2001)

*Subject:* Use of the golf courses in Is Arenas (Sardinia, Italy)

The 'Primo torneo Golf Cup Guidicato di Arborea' was held on 5-7 October 2001 in Is Arenas, close to the Is Arenas Site of Community Interest (SCI code ITB 002228, Narbolia-San Vero Milis, Sardinia).

The event took place on the golf course itself, for which reason the Commission is considering opening an infringement procedure for contravention of Directive 92/43<sup>(1)</sup>.

On page 20 of the 4 October 2001 edition of the La Nuova Sardegna newspaper, it was reported that the event was attended by the Regional Councillor, Pasquale Onida, the chairman of the provincial tourist board, the Archbishop of Oristano, Mgr Piergiuliano Tiddia, and 10 000 spectators. The sponsors for the event included the Sardinian regional government, the Oristano provincial tourist board, the Oristano local authorities and the Italian National Olympic Committee.

The vulnerable habitats to be found on the site are therefore once again suffering environmental damage.

Is the Commission aware of the above facts?

Can it confirm that no Community funds were spent on financing the golf tournament in question?

Will it take the above facts into account when considering the action to be taken on the reasoned opinion of 9 February 2001, in view of the fact that nothing has been done to repair the damage done to the site through the construction of the golf courses, the use of which is, on the contrary, being promoted?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 206, 22.7.1992, p. 7.

**Answer given by Mrs Wallström on behalf of the Commission**

(11 January 2002)

The Commission was not aware of the facts described by the Honourable Member.

Where relevant, they will be taken into consideration in the assessment of the infringement case concerning the damage done by a golf course development to priority habitats proposed by Italy for protection under the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora) at Is Arenas in Sardinia.

---