

**Question for written answer E-006088/2018  
to the Commission**

Rule 130

**Laura Agea (EFDD) and Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD)**

Subject: Delocalisation of Ball Beverage Packaging to Spain

The US multinational company Ball Beverage Packaging, which produces aluminium cans, has decided to close its historic facility in San Martino della Marrucina (Chieti), moving its production to Spain, where labour costs are lower. It is only offering the 70 workers affected the option to relocate within the company, but this would involve relocation to other EU countries.

This decision has been made by an entrepreneurial company that, not only is not in crisis and has not recorded any accidents at work for over 10 years, but it also has an absenteeism rate of 0.2%, well below all national averages.

In light of the above, can the Commission say:

- 1) how it intends to verify that the decision taken does not breach Directive 2014/95/EC amending Directive 2013/34/EU and Directive 98/59/EC on collective redundancies, also taking into account that, in the notice issued by the company, it cites 'efficiency, quality and safety reasons' to justify the closure?
- 2) whether it intends to verify that Ball Beverage Packaging did not benefit from public funding in the form of aid provided by the countries concerned for regional investment, thereby constituting unfair competition in accordance with Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market?