

**Question for written answer E-012591/2013
to the Commission**
Rule 117
Giles Chichester (ECR)

Subject: Telecoms

Why has the Commission chosen to ignore the third critical (although not formally 'negative') opinion of its own impact assessment board; a critical opinion which therefore remains entirely valid?

Why is it deemed more effective to aggregate so many measures in one new proposal, when it would surely be better and more manageable to have a series of smaller, sector-specific proposals and to build upon the existing framework where possible?

How exactly does the Commission arrive at the figure of EUR 110 billion per year for the potential GDP increase resulting from implementation of the proposals, even though the proposals do not contain all the measures recommended in the Ecorys report which produced the EUR 110 billion figure?

When, if at all, does the Commission envisage a comprehensive review of the framework for electronic communications? Why is the current piecemeal approach deemed to be better than a comprehensive review?

What is your answer to the suggestion that the EU market is actually less fragmented than the US one, with the big four possessing a 60 % market share?

Given the progress towards regulatory harmonisation made by the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC), why does the Commission wish to override the proven strength of these mechanisms?

Why was there no specific assessment of the expected impact of this proposal on small and medium-sized enterprises (the SME test)?

With regard to radio spectrum, why is the Commission attempting to seize more power from Member States when it has so far failed to use powers already at its disposal to speed up spectrum auctioning/allocation? Why does the Commission not cancel the derogations which it has granted to certain Member States?