

**LATVIAN COMMENTS ON THE REVISION OF THE GUIDELINES ON STATE AID FOR BROADBAND NETWORKS  
(HEREAFTER – THE DRAFT GUIDELINES) (HT.5766)**

No.	Place in the document text	Comments/Proposals
1.	<p><b>5.2.4.5 Claw-back</b> (154) Member States must implement a claw-back mechanism for at least the duration of the project if the aid amount of the project is above <b>EUR 5 million</b>, and must set out its rules transparently and clearly ex-ante (including in the documentation for the competitive selection procedure).</p>	<p>Considering that the provisions of the draft guidelines are complemented by the General Block Exemption Regulation ('GBER') it is not clear why the proposed draft guidelines foresee different claw back mechanism threshold (EUR 10 million in GBER vs EUR 5 million in draft guidelines). Therefore, we would appreciate if claw back threshold in draft guidelines would be the same as in GBER.</p>
2.	<p><b>7.1 Transparency</b> (200) Member States must publish the following information in the Commission's transparency award module<sup>124</sup> or on a comprehensive State aid website, at national or regional level: a) the full text of the decision approving the aid scheme or the individual aid, and its implementing provisions, or a link to it; b) information on each individual aid award exceeding <b>EUR 100 000</b>, in accordance with Annex IV.</p>	<p>The initial concept of the transparency requirement covered individual grants above the threshold of EUR 500 000. In the case of broadband aid, there is a disproportionate administrative burden on the provision of transparency requirements for each aid award granted, regardless of its threshold. Therefore, Latvian authorities suggest keeping the initial concept that the transparency requirement is applicable to individual grants above the threshold of EUR 500 000. This threshold, <b>which is below the de minimis threshold</b>, is likely to lead to considerable additional costs being borne by the Member States.</p>
3.	<p><i>All document</i></p>	<p><i>Technical comment.</i> Please review the translation of the document into Latvian. For example, "6.2 Connectivity vouchers" in Latvian version is translated as "6.2 Savienotības taloni", but in the General Block Exemption Regulation ('GBER') it is translated as "52.c Savienotības vaučeri". Please keep translation for "6.2 Connectivity vouchers" the same as for GBER - "Savienotības vaučeri".</p>