

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004865/25
to the Commission
Ana Miranda Paz (Verts/ALE)
(9 December 2025)**

Subject: Potential non-compliance of the Altri project with the principles and objectives of EU environmental policy and possible concealment of harmful emissions

The judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 June 2024 relating to Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions and Article 191 TFEU states that environmental permits can only be issued following an assessment of all harmful emissions known to science, including any which were not initially identified. Administrations must ensure that permits reflect the best available techniques (BAT) and are consistent with EU environmental policy, which demands a high level of environmental protection, and with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which protects health (Article 35) and the environment (Article 37).

In the case of the Altri project for a cellulose plant in Palas de Rei, a report by Ramón Varela published by the Association for the Defence of the Environment in Galicia (ADEGA) warns of the potential concealment of as many as 15 pollutants, incorrect declarations of CO₂ emissions, and the use of old technologies out of step with the best available techniques. These shortcomings could conflict with the CJEU ruling and EU legislation on environmental and health protection. ⁽¹⁾

Does the Commission consider that the Altri project respects the TFEU and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union with regard to the environment and public health?

Submitted: 9.12.2025

**Answer given by Ms Roswall on behalf of the European Commission
(7 May 2026)**

The Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) ⁽¹⁾ covers production of pulp as well as production of cellulose-based fibres. Article 14(1)(a) requires that an installation permit includes emission limit values for polluting substances listed in Annex II, and for other polluting substances, which are likely to be emitted from the installation concerned in significant quantities, having regard to their nature and their potential to transfer pollution from one medium to another.

The IED also requires that the public concerned are given opportunities to participate in the permitting procedures and have access to a review procedure to challenge the legality of decisions.

From the information provided, the Commission cannot identify any breach of the IED. Moreover, the Commission understands from publicly available information that the competent authority decided to not grant a permit to the project ⁽²⁾.

Without prejudice to the role of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties, when implementing EU law, national authorities, including the judiciary, are better placed to assess individual situations and ensure the respect of fundamental rights, in accordance with the Treaties.

This would be consistent with the strategic approach adopted by the Commission on its enforcement policy ⁽³⁾, which focuses on systemic non-compliance.

¹ <https://www.adega.gal/novas.php?id=1582&sec=7>.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 on industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control), OJ L 334, 17.12.2010, p. 17-119.

⁽²⁾ <https://www.lavozdeg Galicia.es/noticia/economia/2026/02/20/xunta-anuncia-archivo-proyecto-altri/00031771583685915138669.htm>.

⁽³⁾ 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.