



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR ENERGY

Directorate A – Energy policy: Strategy and Coordination
A.1 – Strategy, Policy Coordination and Planning, Inter-institutional Relations

Brussels

Ms Lala Hakuma Dadci
Mundo B - Rue d'Edimbourg 26,
1050 Brussels

Subject: Your application for access to documents EASE 2023/3839 – fair solution proposal

Dear Ms Dadci,

We are writing concerning your request for access to Commission documents registered on 04/07/2023 under case number 2023/3839

Your application concerns a very large number of meetings, and consequently of documents, which need to be assessed individually. Such a detailed analysis cannot be carried out within the normal time limits set out in Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

Moreover, the handling of your request involves the assessment of very voluminous documents originating from third parties. The analysis of these documents, together with the need to consult the third parties concerned in accordance with Article 4(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, cannot be expected to be completed within the normal time limits set out in Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

However, Article 6(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 also provides for a possibility to confer with an applicant informally with a view to finding a fair solution when an application relates to a very long document or concerns a very large number of documents.

In accordance with the case law of the EU Courts, such a solution can only concern the content, or the number of documents requested, not the deadline for replying¹. This means that the scope of the request must be reduced in a way that would enable its processing within the extended deadline of 15 + 15 working days.

¹ Judgment of the Court of Justice of 2 October 2014, *Strack v European Commission*, C-127/13, (hereinafter referred to as the '*Strack v Commission* judgment'), EU:C:2014:2250, paragraphs 26-28.

Based on the above-mentioned provision, we would kindly ask you to specify the objective of your application and your specific interest in the documents requested², identifying the meetings you are interested in. For this reason, in order to narrow down the scope of your application and to reduce it to a more manageable amount of documents, we kindly ask you to select [here](#) for the Commissioner and [here](#) for the Cabinet the relevant meetings with Cheniere, EQT, MiQ and/or Project Canary.

In order to enable us to respect the time-limits of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, please reply to this proposal for a fair solution **within five working days at the latest**.

In the absence of a reply within five working days, we will restrict the scope of your application to those parts that can be dealt with within the extended deadline of 30 working days.

Yours sincerely,

DG ENER Access to Documents Team

² *Strack v Commission* judgment, paragraph 28; Judgment of the General Court (then 'Court of First Instance') of 22 May 2012, *EnBW Energie Baden-Württemberg v European Commission*, T-344/08, EU:T:2012:242, paragraph 105.