## UNICE CONFERENCE 2004 Oslo - October 1, 2004

## WHEN IN GETS OUT

**Evelyne Clerc** 

## 2 Principles

- Suppliers may be either public or private entities
  - Directives' definition of tenderers
  - Art. 295 EC agnostic as to property ownership regime
    - → procuring authorities enjoy "freedom of organisation"
- But award of procurement contract must comply with basic EC Treaty provisions
  - functioning of internal market (freedom to provide services, freedom of establishment, non-discrimination)
  - undistorted competition
    - →public tenderer vis-à-vis private tenderers (Recital)

## **Principles**

- ◆ ECJ, case Lottomatica, C-272/91
  - call for tender which restricts participation in a contract to bodies the majority of whose capital is held by the public sector
    - → infringement of freedom of establishment & freedom to provide services
- A fortiori where direct award to public operator
- Means to ensure compliance with Treaty
  - procuring procedures (Directives) apply even where potential supplier is a public operator
  - exceptions to be interpreted restrictively

### Outer boundaries of in-house

#### Specific exceptions

- ◆ Service contract to a public operator with ex ante exclusive right
  - exclusive right compatible with EC Treaty
  - operator is contracting authority
  - Central purchasing body
  - mere reseller/agent
  - purchasers? only contracting authorities
  - operator is contracting authority

#### 2 In-house exception

- ◆ Utilities Directive
  - affiliated undertaking, joint venture formed exclusively by contracting authorities
  - max. turnover from market (20%)
  - stability of links (3 years)
- ◆ Teckal case
  - close control over public operator
  - essential part of operator's activity ...
  - ... carried out with controlling authorities

- **3** General principle: procuring procedure
- All other instances where public operator as bidder

## When to launch procuring procedure?

- Public operator (potential tenderer)
  - no ex ante exclusive right to provide service (e.g. case-by-case choice)
  - no central purchasing body
  - no in-house entity (close control + principal activity)
- Contracting authority (purchaser)
  - not located in exclusive territory covered by exclusive right (if exclusive right granted ex ante)
  - no controlling authority/authorities (if in-house situation)

# Ensuring undistorted competition where public operator as bidder

- Case ARGE Gewässerschutz, C-94/99
  - participation of public bodies in procuring procedure is not in itself contrary to principle of equal treatment of tenderers
  - ... except where distortion of competition
- All costs accounted for
  - no illegal state aids
    - hidden subsidies (similar social security & tax requirements)
    - cross-subsidies, over compensation for public service
  - transparent & separate accounts (Transparency Directive)
  - sanctions of illegal aid: exclusion
    - repayment threatens financial well-being
    - abnormally low tenders [Art. 55 Classical Directive]

# Ensuring undistorted competition where public operator as bidder

- No illegal economic activity of public operator, according to national law (speciality principle)
  - sanction: exclusion
- No testing of the market
  - no discontinuance of procuring procedure, on grounds of in-house award
    - in-house ground favours national (public) tenderer
    - bad faith acting by contracting authority
  - award to in-house operator only if most economically advantageous tender

### **Genuine in-house situation**

- Close control over public operator
  - intervention in day-to-day business (principal/agent)
  - absence of autonomous behaviour
    - see intra-group agreements in competition law (Art. 81)
  - degree of control assessed on case-by-case basis
  - →no mixed public-private entities
  - →formally/legally distinct (contract)
    - should publicly-controlled operators without legal personality automatically qualify for in-house status?