

**Question for written answer E-012145/2015
to the Commission**
Rule 130
Paul Tang (S&D)

Subject: Regulation of the KNP network by the Authority for Consumers and the Market (ACM) to promote competition on the Dutch telecommunications market

In April 2015, the Commission questioned the ACM's market analysis decision for unbundled access to the Dutch telecommunications market. Its letter expressing 'serious doubts' about this could result in a veto, denying the ACM the power to regulate the market.

This would lead to a duopoly for UPC/Ziggo on the cable and KPN on the copper network, as a result of which a number of active market participants would no longer be viable.

Such a decision might have the opposite of the intended effect on competition, thus harming consumers.

1. Could the Commission elucidate the substance of the objections? Or are fundamental questions being asked about the regulation of monopolistic telecoms infrastructure? If so, does the Commission consider that the regulation of monopolistic telecoms infrastructure is no longer necessary if a second infrastructure exists in a country?
2. Is the Commission aware that a number of telecoms operators are dependent for their existence on regulation of the KPN network and that, without such regulation, competition will be eliminated?
3. What scope is there, in the Commission's view, to differentiate the regulation of telecoms networks more from country to country, so that in countries where no second network yet exists, rules can apply which are different from those applicable in a country where such a second network does already exist?