

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003154/25
to the Commission**

Valentina Palmisano (The Left), Danilo Della Valle (The Left), Mario Furore (The Left), Dario Tamburrano (The Left)
(31 July 2025)

Subject: Verifying whether Ecologic S.p.A's Ginosa project complies with EU environmental, financial and anti-mafia law

Ecologic S.p.A's plan to build a waste-to-energy plant — which will be powered by secondary solid fuel and non-recyclable plastics — in Ginosa (Apulia) appears to be at odds with EU law. One example is Directive 92/43/EEC, inasmuch as the facility will be located near a number of Natura 2000 sites, an arrangement which could also run counter to the regional landscape plan.

The project also appears to fall short of the requirements laid down by Directive 2011/92/EU (as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU), seeing as the plant's environmental impact assessment (EIA) did not include a cumulative impact assessment, even though it will be built in an area where the Massafra incinerator and the industrial facilities located in the Taranto site of national interest have already caused critical environmental damage.

The project — which has received approximately EUR 68 million in cohesion funds through Invitalia — might also be in breach of the Do No Significant Harm (DNSH) principle laid down by Article 5 of Regulation (EU) 2021/241 and could therefore have negative repercussions for the environment, organic farming and rural tourism.

Given also that the waste sector is vulnerable to being infiltrated by mafia organisations (see Legislative Decree No 159/2011):

1. Could the Commission clarify whether the Ginosa plant's EIA was carried out in accordance with Directive 2011/92/EU and whether Ecologic's project complies with Directives 2008/98/EC and 2010/75/EU?
2. Were the aforementioned cohesion funds allocated in compliance with the DNSH principle, and are these financing measures coherent with the EU Green Deal?
3. What measures will be implemented to ensure that the Ginosa project is managed transparently and is free from mafia interference?

Submitted: 31.7.2025

Answer given by Ms Roswall on behalf of the European Commission
(12 September 2025)

Under Annex IV of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive ⁽¹⁾, an environmental impact assessment report required by Article 5(1) shall contain a description of the likely significant effects of the project on the environment resulting from, *inter alia*, the cumulation of effects with other existing and/or approved projects.

Under the Waste Framework Directive ⁽²⁾, Member States must ensure that waste management is carried out without endangering human health and the environment.

The disposal of waste in incinerators is also regulated by the Industrial Emissions Directive ⁽³⁾. Decisions on the type and location of waste treatment plants are the prerogative of the Member States as part of their waste management plans to implement EU waste legislation.

Without prejudice to the Commission's role as guardian of the Treaties, Member States are primarily responsible to ensure compliance with EU law ⁽⁴⁾.

The project has been co-funded by the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) ⁽⁵⁾ during the programming period 2014-2020, whose regulatory framework lays down that the programmes should comply *inter alia* with the rules for environmental protection and fighting climate change.

⁽¹⁾ Consolidated text: Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 026 28.1.2012, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Article 13 of Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008, p. 3-30, as amended by Directive (EU) 2018/851 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May, OJ L 150, 14.6.2018, p. 109-140.

⁽³⁾ Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 on industrial emissions, OJ L 334, 17.12.2010, p. 17-119. Therefore, installations falling under the Annex I of the IED must hold a permit granted in compliance with IED as well as with best available techniques (BAT) conclusions (Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2019/2010 of 12 November 2019 establishing the best available techniques (BAT) conclusions, under Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, for waste incineration, OJ L 312, 3.12.2019).

⁽⁴⁾ Especially for individual cases — in line with its strategic approach on enforcement action as set out in the communication of 19 January 2017: EU law: Better results through better application — C/2016/8600, OJ C 18, 19.1.2017, p. 10-20 and in the communication of 13 October 2022: COM(2022) 518 final — Enforcing EU law for a Europe that delivers, the Commission focuses on systemic non-compliance.

⁽⁵⁾ https://commission.europa.eu/funding-tenders/find-funding/eu-funding-programmes/european-regional-development-fund-erdf_en.

The obligations stemming from the Do Not Significant Harm (DNSH) principle were introduced in the Common Provisions Regulation ⁽⁶⁾ on Cohesion Policy Funds for the programming period 2021-2027, so after the implementation of the 2014-2020 ESIF funds programmes.

The management authorities of the programmes are responsible to ensure their correct management and implementation, in accordance with EU regulations and with the principle of fairness, equal conditions and transparency.

⁽⁶⁾ Regulation (EU) 2021/1060 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 June 2021 laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund Plus, the Cohesion Fund, the Just Transition Fund and the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund and financial rules for those and for the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, the Internal Security Fund and the Instrument for Financial Support for Border Management and Visa Policy, OJ L 231, 30.6.2021, pp. 159-70.