EUROPEAN COMMISSION

SECRETARIAT-GENERAL

PV(2013) 2046 final

Brussels, 29 May 2013

MINUTES

of the 2046th meeting of the Commission

held in Brussels

(Berlaymont)

on Wednesday 15 May 2013

(morning)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Single sitting</u>: Wednesday 15 May 2013 (morning)

The sitting opened at 8.38 with Mr BARROSO, President, in the chair.

<u>Present</u>:

Mr BARROSO	President	
Baroness ASHTON	High Representative/ Vice-President	
Ms REDING	Vice-President	
Mr ALMUNIA	Vice-President	
Mr KALLAS	Vice-President	
Ms KROES	Vice-President	Items 8/9 (in part) to 11
Mr ŠEFČOVIČ	Vice-President	
Mr REHN	Vice-President	Items 1 to 11 (in part)
Mr BARNIER	Member	Items 10 (in part) and 11
Ms VASSILIOU	Member	Item 11
Mr ŠEMETA	Member	
Mr DE GUCHT	Member	Items 10 (in part) and 11
Ms GEOGHEGAN-QUINN	Member	Items 1 to 11 (in part)
Mr LEWANDOWSKI	Member	
Ms DAMANAKI	Member	Items 1 to 10 (in part)
Mr OETTINGER	Member	Items 10 (in part) and 11
Ms HEDEGAARD	Member	
Mr FÜLE	Member	
Mr ANDOR	Member	
Ms MALMSTRÖM	Member	
Mr CIOLOŞ	Member	Items 8/9 (in part) to 11
Mr BORG	Member	

Absent:

Mr TAJANI	Vice-President
Mr POTOČNIK	Member
Mr PIEBALGS	Member
Ms GEORGIEVA	Member
Mr HAHN	Member

The following sat in to represent absent Members of the Commission:

Mr CANGA FANO	Chef de cabinet to Mr TAJANI	
Mr VANDENBERGHE	Chef de cabinet to Mr POTOČNIK	
Mr KARHUNEN	Deputy Chef de cabinet to Mr PIEBALGS	Items 10 (in part) and 11
Mr DELPHIN	Chef de cabinet to Ms GEORGIEVA	
Mr GAMBS	Chef de cabinet to Mr HAHN	

The following also sat in:

Mr LAITENBERGER	Chef de cabinet to the PRESIDENT	
Mr ROMERO REQUENA	Director-General, Legal Service	
Mr VANDERSTEEN	Deputy Director-General (acting), DG Communication	
Mr DOENS	Head of the Commission Spokesperson Service	
Ms AHRENKILDE HANSEN	Commission Spokeswoman	Items 8/9 (in part) to 11
Mr THEBAULT	Head of the Bureau of European Policy Advisers	Items 10 (in part) and 11 (in part)
Mr SOBRAL	Deputy Chef de cabinet to the PRESIDENT	Items 10 (in part) and 11
Mr CABRAL	Adviser hors classe in the PRESIDENT's office	Items 10 and 11
Ms SKURATOWICZ	A member of the PRESIDENT's staff	Item 10 (in part)
Mr LAHTI	Adviser in Mr REHN's office	Item 10 (in part)
Mr RITTER	A member of Mr REHN's staff	Item 10 (in part)
Mr HILL	Deputy Chef de cabinet to Ms VASSILIOU	Items 1 to 10
Mr VANHEUKELEN	Chef de cabinet to Mr DE GUCHT	

Ms CHRISTOPHIDOU	Chef de cabinet to Ms DAMANAKI	Items 10 (in part) and 11
Mr SERVOZ	Deputy Secretary-General	Item 10 (in part)

Secretary: Ms DAY, Secretary-General, assisted by Mr AYET PUIGARNAU, Director in the Secretariat-General.

1. AGENDAS
(OJ(2013) 2046/FINAL; SEC(2013) 264/2)

The Commission took note of that day’s agenda and of the tentative agendas for forthcoming meetings.

2. WEEKLY MEETING OF CHEFS DE CABINET
(RCC(2013) 2046)

The Commission considered the Secretary-General's report on the weekly meeting of Chefs de cabinet held on Monday 13 May.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES AND SPECIAL MINUTES OF THE 2044th AND 2045th MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION (2 AND 8 MAY)
(PV(2013) 2044; (PV(2013) 2044; PART II; PV(2013) 2045; PV(2013) 2045; PART II)

The Commission approved the minutes of its 2044th and 2045th meetings.

4. INTERINSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS

4.1. LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

i) Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 – Programme for the competitiveness of enterprises and small and medium-sized enterprises (2014-2020) (Regulation) – CREUTZMANN report – 2011/0394 (COD)

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2013) 253.

ii) Establishment of the European Border Surveillance System (EUROSUR) (Regulation) – MULDER report – 2011/0427 (COD)

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2013) 247/2.

iii) Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 – Action programme for taxation in the European Union for the period 2014-2020 (Fiscalis 2020) and repeal of Decision 1482/2007/EC (Regulation) – STOLOJAN report – 2011/0341B (COD)

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2013) 250.

iv) Amendment of Council Regulation (EC) 659/1999 laying down detailed rules for the application of Article 93 of the EC Treaty (Council Regulation) – PIETIKÄINEN report – 2012/0342 (NLE)

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2013) 248.

v) Amendment of Council Regulation (EC) 994/98 on the application of Articles 92 and 93 of the Treaty establishing the European Community to certain categories of horizontal State aid and Regulation (EC) 1370/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council on public passenger transport services by rail and by road (Council Regulation) – DORFMANN report – 2012/0344 (NLE)

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2013) 249.

vi) Rules for the Financial Management of the Common Foreign and Security Policy Missions (Commission communication) – C(2012) 4052

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2013) 243.

vii) Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 – Union support for the nuclear decommissioning assistance programmes in Bulgaria, Lithuania and Slovakia (Council Regulation) – CHICHESTER report – 2011/0363 (NLE)

The Commission approved the line set out in SP(2013) 322.

4.2. RELATIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL AND THE COUNCIL

viii) Programming of Council business
(SI(2013) 252)

The Commission took note of the information in SI(2013) 252 on the Council meetings between 16 and 29 May.

5. MONITORING THE APPLICATION OF EUROPEAN UNION LAW

STATE AID – INDIVIDUAL CASES
(SEC(2013) 271/2)

The Commission adopted the decisions in SEC(2013) 271/2.

6. WRITTEN PROCEDURES, EMPOWERMENT AND DELEGATION OF POWERS

6.1. WRITTEN PROCEDURES APPROVED
(SEC(2013) 265 ET SEQ.)

The Commission took note of the Secretariat-General’s memoranda recording decisions adopted between 6 and 10 May.

6.2. EMPOWERMENT
(SEC(2013) 266 ET SEQ.)

The Commission took note of the Secretariat-General’s memoranda recording decisions adopted between 6 and 10 May.

6.3. DELEGATION AND SUBDELEGATION OF POWERS (SEC(2013) 267 ET SEQ.)

The Commission took note of the Secretariat-General's memoranda recording decisions adopted under the delegation and subdelegation procedure between 6 and 10 May, as archived in e-Greffe.

6.4. SENSITIVE WRITTEN PROCEDURES (SEC(2013) 268)

The Commission took note of the sensitive written procedures for which the time limit expired between 13 and 17 May.

7. ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY MATTERS (SEC(2013) 269)

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER
(PERS(2013) 82)

DG HUMAN RESOURCES AND SECURITY – SPECIAL ADVISER TO THE COMMISSION
(PERS(2013) 83)

The Commission took note of the information in point 1 of PERS(2013) 82 and, on a proposal from Mr ŠEFČOVIČ, in agreement with the PRESIDENT, decided:

- to appoint Mr Juan RAMALLO MASSANET as special adviser to the Commission with responsibility for chairing the Financial Irregularities Panel for the period from 16 May 2013 to 31 March 2014;
- to authorise the Director-General for Human Resources and Security to implement that decision by specifying the contractual conditions in accordance with the provisions submitted to the budgetary authority and signing a contract

of employment on behalf of the authority empowered to conclude contracts of employment.

These decisions would take effect immediately.

8. PROPOSAL FOR A COUNCIL DECISION ON THE SIGNING, ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, AND PROVISIONAL APPLICATION OF THE ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS MEMBER STATES, OF THE ONE PART, AND UKRAINE, OF THE OTHER PART
(COM(2013) 289 (AND ANNEXES); SEC(2013) 294; RCC(2013) 65)

9. PROPOSAL FOR A COUNCIL DECISION ON THE CONCLUSION OF THE ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS MEMBER STATES, OF THE ONE PART, AND UKRAINE, OF THE OTHER PART
(COM(2013) 290 (AND ANNEXES); SEC(2013) 294; RCC(2013) 65)

Mr FÜLE outlined the two proposals for a Council Decision which were legal instruments that would make it possible to authorise, first, the signing and provisional application, and, second, the conclusion of an association agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and Ukraine, of the other part.

He referred to the negotiation process for this agreement and the developments in Ukraine in recent years. He pointed in particular to the balanced approach adopted in the conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council of 10 December 2012 which provided for both the Union’s continued commitment to Ukraine and conditions regarding the progress to be made by the Ukrainian authorities on the basis of clearly-defined assessment criteria. He specified the three key areas to which these criteria would apply: appropriate follow-up to the 2012 general election, the issue of selective justice and implementation of the reforms set out in the jointly-agreed association programme. He also referred to the specific measures which the Ukrainian authorities had taken to coordinate the various reforms in progress, which the Commission was actively monitoring.

The adoption of these proposals this day was simply one stage in the technical preparations which the European Union had to carry out to ensure that the agreement could potentially be signed at the Eastern Partnership summit in Vilnius on 28 and 29 November 2013. In line with the statement accompanying these two proposals, which the Commission also approved this day, this technical stage did not affect the Council's decision on this matter as the signing of the agreement was dependent on the action decided and the tangible progress made by the Ukrainian authorities.

Mr FÜLE ended by saying that if the agreement was signed in the end, it would mark an historic turning-point in relations between the Union and Ukraine.

Following this presentation, the Commission:

- approved the statement set out in SEC(2013) 294;
- adopted the proposal for a Decision set out in COM(2013) 289 and its annexes for transmission to the Council, together with the statement set out in SEC(2013) 294;
- adopted the proposal for a Decision set out in COM(2013) 290 and its annexes for transmission to the European Parliament and the Council and, for information, to the national parliaments,, together with the statement set out in SEC(2013) 294.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

LATEST ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Mr REHN reported to the Commission Members on the latest economic developments, starting with the spring economic forecasts published by the Commission on 3 May. Using graphs handed out at the meeting, he indicated the main trends in trade figures and growth and unemployment rates in the Union, against a background of stabilisation of bond markets and persistent fragmentation of credit markets. There were two conclusions to be drawn, namely that European gross domestic product should start to rise again in 2014 after moving out of recession in the second half of 2013, and that, while short-term growth prospects were still very modest, progress was being made in terms of the rebalancing of the European economy.

The European Central Bank's monetary policy was bolstering the sustainable growth and job-creation measures deployed in the Union. Fiscal consolidation was going ahead at the same time, albeit at a slower pace given the current economic situation, and was contributing to the medium-term viability of public finances. Mr REHN welcomed these positive signs which he attributed to the fiscal adjustment efforts already made and the credibility of the new European economic governance.

He then turned to the 2013 European Semester and the country-specific recommendations the Commission was to adopt on 29 May. As regards those recommendations which were likely be presented together with excessive deficit and macroeconomic imbalance procedures, he underlined the quid pro quo logic behind them, explaining that any Member States that obtained extra time for their fiscal adjustment efforts would be asked by the Commission to come up with significant, credible and concrete reforms.

Mr REHN also referred to the main results of the meeting of G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors held in London on 10 and 11 May. In particular there had been fruitful discussions on fiscal policy and bank resolution. The G7 members had agreed to maintain the current pace of fiscal consolidation and to focus on structural deficits, as the Union had been doing for some time, unlike some of its G7 partners. In relation to bank resolution, the Ministers had considered it necessary to define the rules of play clearly, for instance the organisation of private financing and the priority ranking of the creditors to be called upon in the event of a bank failure or liquidation. An agreement had emerged on the need for ex-ante private financing rules to be applied quite flexibly, which was in fact the approach taken by the Union in its Directive on bank resolution.

Mr REHN wound up his presentation of the situation with the creation of banking union, which in his opinion would be one of the most important undertakings at European level during the months and years ahead, allowing the foundations to be laid for a return to growth and a resumption of job creation. The future banking union was part of the broader context of ‘repairing’ the financial system, which had also been addressed at the G7 Summit. Although the United States had done most of this consolidation work in 2008 and 2009, it had only been partially completed in Europe, which explained the time-lag between the American recovery that was already under way and the European recovery that had yet to begin. It was therefore urgent to establish banking union, which would also loosen the credit squeeze, in particular in the south of Europe, for both households and businesses. He concluded by stressing that the Commission would continue to work closely with the European Central Bank and the European Investment Bank to examine which other measures would help remove this continuing obstacle to economic recovery in the Union.

The Commission held a discussion covering the following questions:

– the general support by the Members of the Commission for the analysis of the current situation as presented and the need to continue the efforts undertaken in the Union in relation to both public finances and structural reforms; the figures proved that this two-pronged parallel approach was starting to bear fruit;

– the support by some for a differentiated, gradual approach to budget consolidation in order to allow the potential for growth to be unleashed; the question, raised by others, of whether any slow-down in the pace of budget consolidation could be applied across the board; the recognition of the advisability, in certain cases, of extending the deadline for attaining certain budget consolidation objectives in the light of the efforts already made; the need, in return, for firm commitments on the structural reforms to be implemented during the extended period; the concern to avoid a snowball effect on the other Member States from extending the deadlines for budget consolidation granted to one country; in any event, the need to ensure ownership by all the Commission Members of all the decisions relating to this process;

– the urgent and immediate priority to pursue and step up the fight against unemployment, more specifically among young people, in the light of the resulting social problems and political tensions; the acknowledgement that this pressing priority should go hand in hand with the necessary structural reforms, whose impact would be felt rather in the long term; the need to pay particular attention to ensure that the current period of budgetary consolidation be accompanied by a dynamic social investment policy;

– the urgent need, in order to encourage the activity of businesses and small and medium-sized enterprises in particular, to release additional funds and increased financing for the regions of the Union most affected by the crisis, which were, moreover, often characterised by low credit availability;

– the usefulness for this purpose of more pro-active measures and a greater commitment by the different players concerned, whether at the level of the European Central Bank, the European Investment Bank, national governments or banks in the Member States; the advisability of diversifying the sources of financing in Europe, including through an increase in the share of financing by the market in order to supplement financing by the public sector and banks; the support by some for the possibility envisaged by the European Central Bank of examining the idea of creating asset-backed securities; the essential role of the European Investment Bank; the request for clarifications concerning the activities financed by the European Investment Bank following the recent increase in its capital;

– the case for continuing to examine the question of rebalancing the trade surpluses in certain Member States of the euro area and, in that context, the suggestion to explore the avenue of adjusting unit labour costs;

– the importance, moreover, of ensuring better follow-up of the implementation of the measures agreed under the Annual Growth Survey, in particular in the shape of administrative reforms;

– the need to fine-tune the communications approach in order to better explain all the areas in which the Commission proposed to act; the advisability of demonstrating, in particular, that the Commission's analysis was not limited merely to the Member States complying 'to the letter' with the rules of the Stability and Growth Pact, for example the limit of 3% of the gross domestic product for public deficits, but that it instead emphasised the completion of structural reforms to boost the economy.

Mr REHN responded to these comments by pointing out that all these subjects would be discussed again on 29 May when the country-specific recommendations under the European Semester 2013 were submitted to the College; they would be clear, complete and adapted to the particular situation of each Member State. He acknowledged the importance of a strong political response in favour of sustainable growth and job creation, given the current political and social tensions.

The question of unequal access to credit, especially in the south of Europe, would be a central concern in the months ahead. On this point, he noted that there was an ongoing dialogue with the European stakeholders concerned, and pointed out that the Commission could take political initiatives to restore the credit flows that were essential for the real economy, while respecting the powers of all involved. He confirmed the usefulness of examining the feasibility of asset-backed securities.

With regard to the necessary rebalancing of the European economy, he felt that the Commission's recommendations should apply not just to the situations of Member States with budget deficits but also to those with budget surpluses. However, he stressed the complexity of the factors involved and of the different circumstances to be taken into account.

Concerning the possible staggering in time of fiscal consolidation targets, he emphasised that this did not mean either suspending or ending the efforts in question, which, on the contrary, must be pursued with renewed vigour. The aim of the measure was rather to ease the pressure on short-term growth prospects in order to restore the confidence of European citizens and economic operators.

Returning to the comments on communication, Mr REHN suggested including more examples of specific measures taken in the Union to support certain activities, and of projects financed on the ground by European funds, which provided real added value for citizens and businesses throughout Europe.

Winding up the discussion, the PRESIDENT commented first on the view that growth and austerity were mutually exclusive, which he regarded as an over-simplification. He also took issue with the idea that the Commission, having realised the limitations of its austerity policies, had changed its policy by focusing now on measures to stimulate growth. He made the point strongly that ever since the crisis began the Commission had continuously encouraged the implementation of the structural reforms necessary for sustainable growth and job creation in parallel with the implementation of sound fiscal policy. Relaxing fiscal consolidation efforts now would be a major political error, and on 29 May, when the Commission adopted the country-specific recommendations as part of the European Semester, it would unambiguously confirm that it was pursuing the Europe 2020 strategy, which combined the two elements, against the backdrop of reform of European economic governance.

The recommendations of 29 May would reflect this twofold approach, taking advantage of the synergy between the measures to encourage competitiveness, growth and employment, on the one hand, and those addressing the challenges identified in the in-depth reviews of the macroeconomic imbalances found in 13 Member States, on the other. This package would also contain decisions on the excessive deficit procedures, including those on the deadline extension that the Commission would propose granting to some Member States for correcting the excessive deficit.

Specifically as regards fiscal consolidation, while the overall situation was improving, it also varied greatly from one Member State to another. The Commission would therefore recommend an adjustment strategy to each Member

State, adapted to the specific difficulties to be overcome in each case. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Commission's analysis would focus on the structural rather than nominal deficit, since it took account of the economic cycle and of the specific budgetary measures. He also explained that if growth dropped suddenly in a Member State, the Union could grant it an additional time period to correct its deficit tendency provided it had made the structural fiscal effort agreed upon.

He noted, too, that limited access to credit put a break on economic recovery, particularly in the most vulnerable Member States. This was compounded by the spread, in the internal market, of interest rates on loans for European companies, in particular small and medium-sized enterprises; this spread seemed to be related to the location rather than the capacities of borrowers. He explained that the Commission had decided to work with the European Investment Bank, whose president, Werner Hoyer, he had met some days previously, on measures to be taken in the short term to boost the financing of the economy. A report on this work would be given at the June European Council.

In conclusion, the PRESIDENT said that these discussions would continue at the Commission's meeting on 29 May, when the country-specific recommendations would be adopted. He pointed out that for 2013, the Commission had maintained close contacts with the Member States throughout the process, which, in addition to a very well-substantiated analysis, contained a political dimension, the ultimate objective being to encourage the European Council to take ownership. He felt that the same applied to the real commitment to implement the necessary reforms and therefore to ensure the success of the process.

The Commission took note of this information.

11. RELATIONS WITH THIRD COUNTRIES

COMMUNICATION TO THE COMMISSION ON THE* EX OFFICIO *INITIATION OF AN ANTI-DUMPING AND AN ANTI-SUBSIDY PROCEEDING CONCERNING IMPORTS OF MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORKS AND THEIR ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS ORIGINATING IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA (SEC(2013) 276)

The PRESIDENT introduced the debate on the *ex officio* initiation of anti-dumping and anti-subsidy proceedings concerning imports of mobile telecommunications networks and their essential elements originating in the People's Republic of China. He reminded the meeting that China, which was a very important partner for the European Union (the second most important after the USA) represented the fastest-growing market for European exports. It was therefore essential to maintain and even step up trade with China. However, it was also essential to comply with international trade rules, particularly in order to ensure fair competition between European and Chinese producers. This was precisely the aim of the trade defence instruments, in particular the rules on anti-dumping and anti-subsidy measures.

The European Union had launched several anti-dumping procedures against China and a major anti-dumping case, concerning solar panels, was in the final stage of the decision on the application of provisional duties, to be taken by 6 June. The PRESIDENT pointed out that this case had begun with an official complaint from European producers to the Commission, which automatically triggered the launch of an anti-dumping procedure.

Returning to the day’s discussion, the PRESIDENT explained that Mr DE GUCHT wished to submit a decision of principle to the Commission on the initiation of anti-dumping and anti-subsidy proceedings. As the rules made provision for this method and it had already been followed in the past, he called on the Member of the Commission with special responsibility to explain why it was appropriate in this particular instance. He endorsed the two-stage procedure proposed to the Commission, i.e. (i) first, reaching agreement this day on the principle of initiating anti-dumping and anti-subsidy investigations into telecommunications networks originating in China and then, if appropriate, (ii) formally adopting a decision to initiate those investigations. This would send a strong signal to the Chinese authorities without immediately deploying the trade defence instrument.

Mr DE GUCHT stressed that this was a very complex case. This was one of the few occasions where *ex officio* intervention was envisaged and the evidence collated by the Commission was solid enough to justify initiating proceedings. The mobile telecommunications networks sector was strategically important, not just for telecommunications services in the strict sense of the term, but also for other areas like traffic management, energy and water distribution or banking activities. He noted that the US mobile telecommunications networks and manufacturers market was closed to Chinese companies. The sector was of great strategic importance for security reasons. Chinese telecommunications manufacturers were gaining increasing market shares in the European Union. It was important that European companies should retain their expertise in the technology associated with these networks. The obstacles to market re-entry were significant; the intensity and volume of the research required in this sector made it virtually impossible for operators to re-enter the market once they had left it.

He went on to explain the Member States’ position on whether to initiate investigations and European companies’ concerns that they would face reprisals. An *ex officio* investigation provided EU companies with a degree of protection against this risk.

For all those reasons, he proposed that the Commission, as guardian of the broader European interest, take measures to protect this strategic sector. He suggested a two-stage procedure, adding that the unfinished negotiations with the Chinese authorities would be continued in parallel.

In the course of the ensuing debate the Commission raised the following main points:

– the very broad support for *ex officio* intervention proposed and envisaged in accordance with the European notion of international trade;

– the need for the Commission to promote the general interest of the European Union, to use its exclusive competence in matters of trade and to mark its firm opposition to unfair trade practices in a strategic economic sector; the issue of obstacles to market re-entry, a major argument in favour of this procedure, which would ensure that European production capacity in the telecommunications networks sector was retained and would avoid dependence on technology from a third country;

– similarly, the general backing for a two-stage procedure and, within that context, requests for clarifications on procedural matters;

– questions about possible retaliatory trade measures by China and the sectors which could be concerned;

– the usefulness of the envisaged measure in the light of the weak instruments existing at multilateral level in the state aid field;

– the need for it to be made clear that the envisaged measure was not motivated by protectionism, but was justified on objective grounds; the need to raise awareness among European telecommunications companies operating on the Chinese market and European consumers of the cumulative impact of unfair practices by China; but also the need to make it clear that Europe was willing to negotiate to find a solution which took the economic climate in China into account.

In response, Mr DE GUCHT turned to the potential next stages of these anti-dumping and anti-subsidy proceedings. Returning to the two-stage procedure, he suggested that the Commission take a decision of principle this day to launch an investigation in order to send a strong signal to China, while enabling negotiations to be pursued with the Chinese authorities with a view to reaching an amicable solution. The Commission was preparing to consult the Anti-Dumping Advisory Committee, after which it would, if appropriate, take a formal decision to launch an investigation in due course.

Following this discussion the Commission decided:

- to adopt a decision of principle on notices of initiation of an anti-dumping proceeding and an anti-subsidy proceeding concerning imports of mobile telecommunications networks and their essential elements originating in the People's Republic of China. These notices had been incorporated into SEC(2013) 276;

- to return to this matter after consulting the Anti-Dumping Committee with a view to formally adopting the decision to initiate the investigation and to publish the two Notices of Initiation.

*

*   *

The meeting closed at 11.28.