

**Question for written answer E-004187/2025/rev.1
to the Commission**
Rule 144
Fabio De Masi (NI)

Subject: Dutch government takeover of Nexperia and economic coercion

The current Nexperia case has highlighted the fragility of the trade compromises that were recently agreed with the United States. Presumably to avoid jeopardising Nexperia's position in the US market, management of the company was recently seized by the Dutch Government.

1. Does the Commission support the Dutch Government's decision to intervene in the governance of Nexperia in the framework of EU trade defence policies?
2. Did the Commission itself act as a negotiator or as a mediator with the competent US authorities in this matter?
3. According to press sources and court proceedings, the Dutch Government's intervention came after rising US pressure¹. With the introduction of Regulation (EU) 2023/2675² (the Anti-Coercion Instrument), the EU recognised the danger of actions by foreign governments aimed at influencing EU policymaking and economic stability. Does the Commission consider the US Government's exertion of pressure in this instance to constitute 'economic coercion', defined as 'a situation whereby a third country seeks to pressure the EU or an EU Member State into making a particular choice by applying, or threatening to apply, measures affecting trade or investment'³?

Submitted: 23.10.2025

¹ <https://www.politico.eu/article/us-pressured-the-netherlands-over-ceo-of-seized-chip-maker/>.

² Regulation (EU) 2023/2675 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 November 2023 on the protection of the Union and its Member States from economic coercion by third countries (OJ L, 2023/2675, 7.12.2023, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2023/2675/oj>).

³ https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/enforcement-and-protection/protecting-against-coercion_en.