

Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6986

C 39

Volume 41

6 February 1998

English edition

Information and Notices

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents	Page
	I Information	
	Commission	
98/C 39/01	Ecu	1
98/C 39/02	Notice from the Commission on the application of the competition rules to the postal sector and on the assessment of certain State measures relating to postal services ⁽¹⁾	2
98/C 39/03	Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case No IV/M.1049 — AKZO/PLV-EPL) ⁽¹⁾	19
98/C 39/04	Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case No IV/M.1075 — Nordic Capital/Mölnlycke Clinical/Kolmi) ⁽¹⁾	19
98/C 39/05	Prior notification of a concentration (Case No IV/M.999 — CLT-UFA/Havas Intermédiation) ⁽¹⁾	20
98/C 39/06	Commission notice pursuant to Article 23(3) of Regulation (EEC) No 4056/86 concerning Case IV/MAR/36.253 — P&O Stena Line ⁽¹⁾	21
98/C 39/07	Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case No IV/M.1059 — Suez Lyonnaise des Eaux/BFI) ⁽¹⁾	22

II Preparatory Acts

.....



<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
	III <i>Notices</i>	
	Council	
98/C 39/08	Notice concerning the organization of open competitions	23
	Commission	
98/C 39/09	Amendment to the notice of invitation to tender for the subsidy for the export of husked long grain rice to Réunion	24

I

(Information)

COMMISSION

Ecu ⁽¹⁾

5 February 1998

(98/C 39/01)

Currency amount for one unit:

Belgian and Luxembourg franc	40,7486	Finnish markka	5,98398
Danish krone	7,52316	Swedish krona	8,82799
German mark	1,97431	Pound sterling	0,666383
Greek drachma	312,764	United States dollar	1,10020
Spanish peseta	167,318	Canadian dollar	1,58682
French franc	6,61494	Japanese yen	135,324
Irish pound	0,784232	Swiss franc	1,58979
Italian lira	1949,18	Norwegian krone	8,21023
Dutch guilder	2,22548	Icelandic krona	79,2363
Austrian schilling	13,8911	Australian dollar	1,60965
Portuguese escudo	202,095	New Zealand dollar	1,86474
		South African rand	5,40032

The Commission has installed a telex with an automatic answering device which gives the conversion rates in a number of currencies. This service is available every day from 3.30 p.m. until 1 p.m. the following day. Users of the service should do as follows:

- call telex number Brussels 23789,
- give their own telex code,
- type the code 'cccc' which puts the automatic system into operation resulting in the transmission of the conversion rates of the ecu,
- the transmission should not be interrupted until the end of the message, which is marked by the code 'ffff'.

Note: The Commission also has an automatic fax answering service (No 296 10 97/296 60 11) providing daily data concerning calculation of the conversion rates applicable for the purposes of the common agricultural policy.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EEC) No 3180/78 of 18 December 1978 (OJ L 379, 30.12.1978, p. 1), as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1971/89 (OJ L 189, 4.7.1989, p. 1).

Council Decision 80/1184/EEC of 18 December 1980 (Convention of Lomé) (OJ L 349, 23.12.1980, p. 34).

Commission Decision No 3334/80/ECSC of 19 December 1980 (OJ L 349, 23.12.1980, p. 27).

Financial Regulation of 16 December 1980 concerning the general budget of the European Communities (OJ L 345, 20.12.1980, p. 23).

Council Regulation (EEC) No 3308/80 of 16 December 1980 (OJ L 345, 20.12.1980, p. 1).

Decision of the Council of Governors of the European Investment Bank of 13 May 1981 (OJ L 311, 30.10.1981, p. 1).

Notice from the Commission on the application of the competition rules to the postal sector and on the assessment of certain State measures relating to postal services

(98/C 39/02)

(Text with EEA relevance)

PREFACE

Subsequent to the submission by the Commission of a Green Paper on the development of the single market for postal services⁽¹⁾ and of a communication to the European Parliament and the Council, setting out the results of the consultations on the Green Paper and the measures advocated by the Commission⁽²⁾, a substantial discussion has taken place on the future regulatory environment for the postal sector in the Community. By Resolution of 7 February 1994 on the development of Community postal services⁽³⁾, the Council invited the Commission to propose measures defining a harmonised universal service and the postal services which could be reserved. In July 1995, the Commission proposed a package of measures concerning postal services which consisted of a proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on common rules for the development of Community postal services and the improvement of quality of service⁽⁴⁾ and a draft of the present Notice on the application of the competition rules⁽⁵⁾.

This notice, which complements the harmonisation measures proposed by the Commission, builds on the results of those discussions in accordance with the principles established in the Resolution of 7 February 1994. It takes account of the comments received during the public consultation on the draft of this notice published in December 1995, of the European Parliament's resolution⁽⁶⁾ on this draft adopted on 12 December 1996, as well as of the discussions on the proposed Directive in the European Parliament and in Council.

The Commission considers that because they are an essential vehicle of communication and trade, postal services are vital for all economic and social activities. New postal services are emerging and market certainty is needed to favour investment and the creation of new employment in the sector. As recognized by the Court of

Justice of the European Communities, Community law, and in particular the competition rules of the EC Treaty, apply to the post sector⁽⁷⁾. The Court stated that 'in the case of public undertakings to which Member States grant special or exclusive rights, they are neither to enact nor to maintain in force any measure contrary to the rules contained in the Treaty with regard to competition' and that those rules 'must be read in conjunction with Article 90(2) which provides that undertakings entrusted with the operation of services of general economic interest are to be subject to the rules on competition in so far as the application of such rules does not obstruct the performance, in law or in fact, of the particular tasks assigned to them.' Questions are therefore frequently put to the Commission on the attitude it intends to take, for purposes of the implementation of the competition rules contained in the Treaty, with regard to the behaviour of postal operators and with regard to State measures relating to public undertakings and undertakings to which the Member States grant special or exclusive rights in the postal sector.

This notice sets out the Commission's interpretation of the relevant Treaty provisions and the guiding principles according to which the Commission intends to apply the competition rules of the Treaty to the postal sector in individual cases, while maintaining the necessary safeguards for the provision of a universal service, and gives to enterprises and Member States clear guidelines so as to avoid infringements of the Treaty. This Notice is without prejudice to any interpretation to be given by the Court of Justice of the European Communities.

Furthermore, this Notice sets out the approach the Commission intends to take when applying the competition rules to the behaviour of postal operators and when assessing the compatibility of State measures restricting the freedom to provide service and/or to compete in the postal markets with the competition rules and other rules of the Treaty. In addition, it addresses the issue of non-discriminatory access to the postal network and the safeguards required to ensure fair competition in the sector.

⁽¹⁾ COM(91) 476 final.

⁽²⁾ 'Guidelines for the development of Community postal services' (COM(93) 247 of 2 June 1993).

⁽³⁾ OJ C 48, 16.2.1994, p. 3.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ C 322, 2.12.1995, p. 22.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ C 322, 2.12.1995, p. 3.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ C 20, 20.1.1997, p. 159.

⁽⁷⁾ In particular in Joined Cases C-48/90 and C-66/90, *Netherlands and Koninklijke PTT Nederland and PTT Post BV v. Commission* [1992] ECR I-565 and Case C-320/91 *Procureur du Roi v. Paul Corbeau* [1993] ECR I-2533.

Especially on account of the development of new postal services by private and public operators, certain Member States have revised, or are revising, their postal legislation in order to restrict the monopoly of their postal organisations to what is considered necessary for the realisation of the public-interest objective. At the same time, the Commission is faced with a growing number of complaints and cases under competition law on which it must take position. At this stage, a notice is therefore the appropriate instrument to provide guidance to Member States and postal operators, including those enjoying special or exclusive rights, to ensure correct implementation of the competition rules. This Notice, although it cannot be exhaustive, aims to provide the necessary guidance for the correct interpretation, in particular, of Articles 59, 85, 86, 90, and 92 of the Treaty in individual cases. By issuing the present notice, the Commission is taking steps to bring transparency and to facilitate investment decisions of all postal operators, in the interest of the users of postal services in the European Union.

As the Commission explained in its communication of 11 September 1996 on 'Services of general interest in Europe' (*), solidarity and equal treatment within a market economy are fundamental Community objectives. Those objectives are furthered by services of general interest. Europeans have come to expect high-quality services at affordable prices, and many of them even view services of general interest as social rights.

As regards, in particular, the postal sector, consumers are becoming increasingly assertive in exercising their rights and wishes. Worldwide competition is forcing companies using such services to seek out better price deals comparable to those enjoyed by their competitors. New technologies, such as fax or electronic mail, are putting enormous pressures on the traditional postal services. Those developments have given rise to worries about the future of those services accompanied by concerns over employment and economic and social cohesion. The economic importance of those services is considerable. Hence the importance of modernising and developing services of general interest, since they contribute so much to European competitiveness, social solidarity and quality of life.

The Community's aim is to support the competitiveness of the European economy in an increasingly competitive world and to give consumers more choice, better quality

and lower prices, while at the same time helping, through its policies, to strengthen economic and social cohesion between the Member States and to reduce certain inequalities. Postal services have a key role to play here. The Community is committed to promoting their functions of general economic interest, as solemnly confirmed in the new Article 7d, introduced by the Amsterdam Treaty, while improving their efficiency. Market forces produce a better allocation of resources and greater effectiveness in the supply of services, the principal beneficiary being the consumer, who gets better quality at a lower price. However, those mechanisms sometimes have their limits; as a result the potential benefits might not extend to the entire population and the objective of promoting social and territorial cohesion in the Union may not be attained. The public authority must then ensure that the general interest is taken into account.

The traditional structures of some services of general economic interest, which are organised on the basis of national monopolies, constitute a challenge for European economic integration. This includes postal monopolies, even where they are justified, which may obstruct the smooth functioning of the market, in particular by sealing off a particular market sector.

The real challenge is to ensure smooth interplay between the requirements of the single market in terms of free movement, economic performance and dynamism, free competition, and the general interest objectives. This interplay must benefit individual citizens and society as a whole. This is a difficult balancing act, since the goalposts are constantly moving: the single market is continuing to expand and public services, far from being fixed, are having to adapt to new requirements.

The basic concept of universal service, which was originated by the Commission (*), is to ensure the provision of high-quality service to all prices everyone can afford. Universal service is defined in terms of principles: equality, universality, continuity and adaptability; and in terms of sound practices: openness in management, price-setting and funding and scrutiny by bodies independent of those operating the services. Those criteria are not always all met at national level, but where they have been introduced using the concept of European universal service, there have been positive effects for the development of general interest services. Universal service is the expression in Europe of the requirements

(*) COM(96) 443 final.

(*) See footnote 8.

and special features of the European model of society in a policy which combines a dynamic market, cohesion and solidarity.

High-quality universal postal services are of great importance for private and business customers alike. In view of the development of electronic commerce their importance will even increase in the very near future. Postal services have a valuable role to play here.

As regards the postal sector, Directive 97/67/EC has been adopted by the European Parliament and the Council (hereinafter referred to as 'the Postal Directive'). It aims to introduce common rules for developing the postal sector and improving the quality of service, as well as gradually opening up the markets in a controlled way.

The aim of the Postal Directive is to safeguard the postal service as a universal service in the long term. It imposes on Member States a minimum harmonised standard of universal services including a high-quality service countrywide with regular guaranteed deliveries at prices everyone can afford. This involves the collection, transport, sorting and delivery of letters as well as catalogues and parcels within certain price and weight limits. It also covers registered and insured (*valeur déclarée*) items and applies to both domestic and cross-border deliveries. Due regard is given to considerations of continuity, confidentiality, impartiality and equal treatment as well as adaptability.

To guarantee the funding of the universal service, a sector may be reserved for the operators of this universal service. The scope of the reserved sector has been harmonised in the Postal Directive. According to the Postal Directive, Member States can only grant exclusive rights for the provision of postal services to the extent that this is necessary to guarantee the maintenance of the universal service. Moreover, the Postal Directive establishes the maximum scope that Member States may reserve in order to achieve this objective. Any additional funding which may be required for the universal service may be found by writing certain obligations into commercial operator's franchises; for example, they may be required to make financial contributions to a compensation fund administered for this purpose by a body independent of the beneficiary or beneficiaries, as foreseen in Article 9 of the Postal Directive.

The Postal Directive lays down a minimum common standard of universal services and establishes common

rules concerning the reserved area. It therefore increases legal certainty as regards the legality of some exclusive and special rights in the postal sector. There are, however, State measures that are not dealt with in it and that can be in conflict with the Treaty rules addressed to Member States. The autonomous behaviour of the postal operators also remains subject to the competition rules in the Treaty.

Article 90(2) of the Treaty provides that suppliers of services of general interest may be exempted from the rules in the Treaty, to the extent that the application of those rules would obstruct the performance of the general interest tasks for which they are responsible. That exemption from the Treaty rules is however subject to the principle of proportionality. That principle is designed to ensure the best match between the duty to provide general interest services and the way in which the services are actually provided, so that the means used are in proportion to the ends pursued. The principle is formulated to allow for a flexible and context-sensitive balance that takes account of the technical and budgetary constraints that may vary from one sector to another. It also makes for the best possible interaction between market efficiency and general interest requirements, by ensuring that the means used to satisfy the requirements do not unduly interfere with the smooth running of the single European market and do not affect trade to an extent that would be contrary to the Community interest⁽¹⁰⁾.

The application of the Treaty rules, including the possible application of the Article 90(2) exemption, as regards both behaviour of undertakings and State measures can only be done on a case-by-case basis. It seems, however, highly desirable, in order to increase legal certainty as regards measures not covered by the Postal Directive, to explain the Commission's interpretation of the Treaty and the approach that it aims to follow in its future application of those rules. In particular, the Commission considers that, subject to the provisions of Article 90(2) in relation to the provision of the universal service, the application of the Treaty rules would promote the competitiveness of the undertakings active in the postal sector, benefit consumers and contribute in a positive way to the objectives of general interest.

The postal sector in the European Union is characterised by areas which Member States have reserved in order to guarantee universal service and which are now being

⁽¹⁰⁾ See judgment of 23 October 1997 in Cases C-157/94 to C-160/94 'Member State Obligations — Electricity' *Commission v. Netherlands* (157/94), *Italy* (158/94), *France* (154/94), *Spain* (160/94).

harmonised by the Postal Directive in order to limit distortive effects between Member States. The Commission must, according to the Treaty, ensure that postal monopolies comply with the rules of the Treaty, and in particular the competition rules, in order to ensure maximum benefit and limit any distortive effects for the consumers. In pursuing this objective by applying the competition rules to the sector on a case-by-case-basis, the Commission will ensure that monopoly power is not used for extending a protected dominant position into liberalised activities or for unjustified discrimination in favour of big accounts at the expense of small users. The Commission will also ensure that postal monopolies granted in the area of cross-border services are not used for creating or maintaining illicit price cartels harming the interest of companies and consumers in the European Union.

This notice explains to the players on the market the practical consequences of the applicability of the competition rules to the postal sector, and the possible derogations from the principles. It sets out the position the Commission would adopt, in the context set by the continuing existence of special and exclusive rights as harmonised by the Postal Directive, in assessing individual cases or before the Court of Justice in cases referred to the Court by national courts under Article 177 of the Treaty.

1. DEFINITIONS

In the context of this notice, the following definitions shall apply ⁽¹⁾:

'postal services': services involving the clearance, sorting, transport and delivery of postal items;

'public postal network': the system of organisation and resources of all kinds used by the universal service provider(s) for the purposes in particular of:

- the clearance of postal items covered by a universal service obligation from access points throughout the territory,
- the routing and handling of those items from the postal network access point to the distribution centre,
- distribution to the addresses shown on items;

'access points': physical facilities, including letter boxes provided for the public either on the public highway or at the premises of the universal service provider, where postal items may be deposited with the public postal network by customers;

'clearance': the operation of collecting postal items deposited at access points;

'distribution': the process from sorting at the distribution centre to delivery of postal items to their addresses;

'postal item': an item addressed in the final form in which it is to be carried by the universal service provider. In addition to items of correspondence, such items also include for instance books, catalogues, newspapers, periodicals and postal packages containing merchandise with or without commercial value;

'item of correspondence': a communication in written form on any kind of physical medium to be conveyed and delivered at the address indicated by the sender on the item itself or on its wrapping. Books, catalogues, newspapers and periodicals shall not be regarded as items of correspondence;

'direct mail': a communication consisting solely of advertising, marketing or publicity material and comprising an identical message, except for the addressee's name, address and identifying number as well as other modifications which do not alter the nature of the message, which is sent to a significant number of addressees, to be conveyed and delivered at the address indicated by the sender on the item itself or on its wrapping. The National Regulatory Authority should interpret the term 'significant number of addressees' within each Member State and publish an appropriate definition. Bills, invoices, financial statements and other non-identical messages should not be regarded as direct mail. A communication combining direct mail with other items within the same wrapping should not be regarded as direct mail. Direct mail includes cross-border as well as domestic direct mail;

'document exchange': provision of means, including the supply of *ad hoc* premises as well as transportation by a third party, allowing self-delivery by

⁽¹⁾ The definitions will be interpreted in the light of the Postal Directive and any changes resulting from review of that Directive.

mutual exchange of postal items between users subscribing to this service;

'express mail service': a service featuring, in addition to greater speed and reliability in the collection, distribution, and delivery of items, all or some of the following supplementary facilities: guarantee of delivery by a fixed date; collection from point of origin; personal delivery to addressee; possibility of changing the destination and addressee in transit; confirmation to sender of receipt of the item dispatched; monitoring and tracking of items dispatched; personalised service for customers and provision of an *à la carte* service, as and when required. Customers are in principle prepared to pay a higher price for this service;

'universal service provider': the public or private entity providing a universal postal service or parts thereof within a Member State, the identity of which has been notified to the Commission;

'exclusive rights': rights granted by a Member State which reserve the provision of postal services to one undertaking through any legislative, regulatory or administrative instrument and reserve to it the right to provide a postal service, or to undertake an activity, within a given geographical area;

'special rights': rights granted by a Member State to a limited number of undertakings through any legislative, regulatory or administrative instrument which, within a given geographical area:

- limits, on a discretionary basis, to two or more the number of such undertakings authorised to provide a service or undertake an activity, otherwise than according to objective, proportional and non-discriminatory criteria, or
- designates, otherwise than according to such criteria, several competing undertakings as undertakings authorised to provide a service or undertake an activity, or
- confers on any undertaking or undertakings, otherwise than according to such criteria, legal or regulatory advantages which substantially affect the ability of any other undertaking to provide the same service or undertake the same activity in the same geographical area under substantially comparable conditions;

'terminal dues': the remuneration of universal service providers for the distribution of incoming cross-border mail comprising postal items from another Member State or from a third country;

'intermediary': any economical operator who acts between the sender and the universal service provider, by clearing, routing and/or pre-sorting postal items, before channelling them into the public postal network of the same or of another country;

'national regulatory authority': the body or bodies, in each Member State, to which the Member State entrusts, *inter alia*, the regulatory functions falling within the scope of the Postal Directive;

'essential requirements': general non-economic reasons which can induce a Member State to impose conditions on the supply of postal services ⁽¹²⁾. These reasons are: the confidentiality of correspondence, security of the network as regards the transport of dangerous goods and, where justified, data protection, environmental protection and regional planning.

Data protection may include personal data protection, the confidentiality of information transmitted or stored and protection of privacy.

2. MARKED DEFINITION AND POSITION ON THE POSTAL MARKET

a) Geographical and product market definition

- 2.1. Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty prohibit as incompatible with the common market any conduct by one or more undertakings that may negatively affect trade between Member States which involves the prevention, restriction, or distortion of competition and/or an abuse of a dominant position within the common market or a substantial part of it. The territories of the Member States constitute separate geographical markets with regard to the delivery of domestic mail and also with regard to the domestic delivery of inward cross-border mail, owing primarily to the exclusive rights of the operators

⁽¹²⁾ The meaning of this important phrase in the context of Community competition law is explained in paragraph 5.3.

referred to in point 4.2 and to the restrictions imposed on the provision of postal services. Each of the geographical markets constitutes a substantial part of the common market. For the determination of 'relevant market', the country of origin of inward cross-border mail is immaterial.

2.2. As regards the product markets, the differences in practice between Member States demonstrate that recognition of several distinct markets is necessary in some cases. Separation of different product-markets is relevant, among other things, to special or exclusive rights granted. In its assessment of individual cases on the basis of the different market and regulatory situations in the Member States and on the basis of a harmonised framework provided by the Postal Directive, the Commission will in principle consider that a number of distinct product markets exist, like the clearance, sorting, transport and delivery of mail, and for example direct mail, and cross-border mail. The Commission will take into account the fact that these markets are wholly or partly liberalised in a number of Member States. The Commission will consider the following markets when assessing individual cases.

2.3. The general letter service concerns the delivery of items of correspondence to the addresses shown on the items.

It does not include self-provision, that is the provision of postal services by the natural or legal person (including a sister or subsidiary organisation) who is the originator of the mail.

Also excluded, in accordance with practice in many Member States, are such postal items as are not considered items of correspondence, since they consist of identical copies of the same written communication and have not been altered by additions, deletions or indications other than the name of the addressee and his address. Such items are magazines, newspapers, printed periodicals catalogues, as well as goods or documents accompanying and relating to such items.

Direct mail is covered by the definition of items of correspondence. However, direct mail items do not contain personalised messages. Direct mail addresses the needs of specific operators for commercial

communications services, as a complement to advertising in the media. Moreover, the senders of direct mail do not necessarily require the same short delivery times, priced at first-class letter tariffs, asked for by customers requesting services on the market as referred to above. The fact that both services are not always directly interchangeable indicates the possibility of distinct markets.

2.4. Other distinct markets include, for example, the express mail market, the document exchange market, as well as the market for new services (services quite distinct from conventional services). Activities combining the new telecommunications technologies and some elements of the postal services may be, but are not necessarily, new services within the meaning of the Postal Directive. Indeed, they may reflect the adaptability of traditional services.

A document exchange differs from the market referred to in point 2.3 since it does not include the collection and the delivery to the addressee of the postal items transported. It involves only means, including the supply of *ad hoc* premises as well as transportation by a third party, allowing self-delivery by mutual exchange of postal items between users subscribing to this service. The users of a document exchange are members of a closed user group.

The express mail service also differs from the market referred to in point 2.3 owing to the value added by comparison with the basic postal service⁽¹³⁾. In addition to faster and more reliable collection, transportation and delivery of the postal items, an express mail service is characterised by the provision of some or all of the following supplementary services: guarantee of delivery by a given date; collection from the sender's address; delivery to the addressee in person; possibility of a change of destination and addressee in transit; conformation to the sender of delivery; tracking and tracing; personalised treatment for customers and the offer of a range of services according to requirements. Customers are in principle prepared to pay a higher price for this service. The reservable services as defined in the Postal Directive may include accelerated delivery of items of domestic correspondence falling within the prescribed price and weight limits.

⁽¹³⁾ Commission Decisions 90/16/EEC (OJ L 10, 12.1.1990, p. 47) and 90/456/EEC (OJ L 233, 28.8.1990, p. 19).

2.5. Without prejudice to the definition of reservable services given in the Postal Directive, different activities can be recognised, within the general letter service, which meet distinct needs and should in principle be considered as different markets; the markets for the clearance and for the sorting of mail, the market for the transport of mail and, finally, the delivery of mail (domestic or inward cross-border). Different categories of customers must be distinguished in this respect. Private customers demand the distinct products or services as one integrated service. However, business customers, which represent most of the revenues of the operators referred to in point 4.2, actively pursue the possibilities of substituting for distinct components of the final service alternative solutions (with regard to quality of service levels and/or costs incurred) which are in some cases provided by, or sub-contracted to, different operators. Business customers want to balance the advantages and disadvantages of self-provision versus provision by the postal operator. The existing monopolies limit the external supply of those individual services, but they would otherwise limit the external supply of those individual according to market conditions. That market reality supports the opinion that clearance, sorting, transport and delivery of postal items constitute different markets⁽¹⁴⁾. From a competition-law point of view, the distinction between the four markets may be relevant.

That is the case for cross-border mail where the clearance and transport will be done by a postal operator other than the one providing the distribution. This is also the case as regards domestic mail, since most postal operators permit major customers to undertake sorting of bulk traffic in return for discounts, based on their public tariffs. The deposit and collection of mail and method of payment also vary in these circumstances. Mail rooms of larger companies are now often operated by intermediaries, which prepare and pre-sort mail before handing it over to the postal operator for final distribution. Moreover, all postal operators allow some kind of downstream access to distribution. Moreover, all postal operators allow some kind of downstream access to their postal network, for instance by allowing or even demanding (sorted) mail to be deposited at an expediting or sorting centre. This permits in many cases a higher reliability (quality of service) by bypassing any sources of failure in the postal network upstream.

(b) Dominant position

2.6. Since in most Member States the operator referred to in point 4.2 is, by virtue of the exclusive rights granted to him, the only operator controlling a public postal network covering the whole territory of the Member State, such an operator has a dominant position within the meaning of Article 86 of the Treaty on the national market for the distribution of items of correspondence. Distribution is the service to the user which allows for important economies of scale, and the operator providing this service is in most cases also dominant on the markets for the clearance, sorting and transport of mail. In addition, the enterprise which provides distribution, particularly if it also operates post office premises, has the important advantage of being regarded by the users as the principal postal enterprise, because it is the most conspicuous one, and is therefore the natural first choice. Moreover, this dominant position also includes, in most Member States, services such as registered mail or special delivery services, and/or some sectors of the parcels market.

(c) Duties of dominant postal operators

2.7. According to point (b) of the second paragraph of Article 86 of the Treaty, an abuse may consist in limiting the performance of the relevant service to the prejudice of its consumers. Where a Member State grants exclusive rights to an operator referred to in point 4.2 for services which it does not offer, or offers in conditions not satisfying the needs of customers in the same way as the services which competitive economic operators would have offered, the Member State induces those operators, by the simple exercise of the exclusive right which has been conferred on them, to limit the supply of the relevant service, as the effective exercise of those activities by private companies is, in this case, impossible. This is particularly the case where measures adopted to protect the postal service restrict the provision of other distinct services on distinct or neighbouring markets such as the express mail market. The Commission has requested several Member States to abolish restrictions resulting from exclusive rights regarding the provision of express mail services by international couriers⁽¹⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁴⁾ See Commission Notice on the definition of the relevant market for the purpose of the application of Community competition law (OJ C 372, 9.12.1997, p. 5).

⁽¹⁵⁾ See footnote 13.

Another type of possible abuse involves providing a seriously inefficient service and failing to take advantage of technical developments. This harms customers who are prevented from choosing between alternative suppliers. For instance, a report prepared for the Commission ⁽¹⁶⁾ in 1994 showed that, where they have not been subject to competition, the public postal operators in the Member States have not made any significant progress since 1990 in the standardisation of dimensions and weights. The report also showed that some postal operators practised hidden cross-subsidies between reserved and non-reserved services (see points 3.1 and 3.4), which explained, according to that study, most of the price disparities between Member States in 1994, especially penalising residential users who do not qualify for any discounts schemes, since they make use of reserved services that are priced at a higher level than necessary.

The examples given illustrate the possibility that, where they are granted special or exclusive rights, postal operators may let the quality of the service decline ⁽¹⁷⁾ and omit to take necessary steps to improve service quality. In such cases, the Commission may be induced to act taking account of the conditions explained in point 8.3.

As regards cross-border postal services, the study referred to above showed that the quality of those services needed to be improved significantly in order to meet the needs of customers, and in particular of residential customers who cannot afford to use the services of courier companies or facsimile transmission instead. Independent measurements carried out in 1995 and 1996 show an improvement of quality of service since 1994. However, those

measurements only concerne first class mail, and the most recent measurements show that the quality has gone down slightly again.

The majority of Community public postal operators have notified an agreement on terminal dues to the Commission for assessment under the competition rules of the Treaty. The parties to the agreement have explained that their aim is to establish fair compensation for the delivery of cross-border mail reflecting more closely the real costs incurred and to improve the quality of cross-border mail services.

2.8. Unjustified refusal to supply is also an abuse prohibited by Article 86 of the Treaty. Such behaviour would lead to a limitation of services within the meaning of Article 86, second paragraph, (b) and, if applied only to some users, result in discrimination contrary to Article 86, second paragraph, (c), which requires that no dissimilar conditions be applied to equivalent transactions. In most of the Member States, the operators referred to in point 4.2 provide access at various access points of their postal networks to intermediaries. Conditions of access, and in particular the tariffs applied, are however, often confidential and may facilitate the application of discriminatory conditions, Member States should ensure that their postal legislation does not encourage postal operators to differentiate unjustifiably as regards the conditions applied or to exclude certain companies.

2.9. While a dominant firm is entitled to defend its position by competing with rivals, it has a special responsibility not to further diminish the degree of competition remaining on the market. Exclusionary practices may be directed against existing competitors on the market or intended to impede market access by new entrants. Examples of such illegal behaviour include: refusal to deal as a means of eliminating a competitor by a firm which is the sole or dominant source of supply of a product or controls access to an essential technology or infrastructure; predatory pricing and selective price cutting (see section 3); exclusionary dealing agreements; discrimination as part of a wider pattern of monopolizing conduct designed to exclude competitors; and exclusionary rebate schemes.

⁽¹⁶⁾ UFC — Que Choisir, Postal services in the European Union, April 1994.

⁽¹⁷⁾ In many Member States users could, some decades ago, still rely on this service to receive in the afternoon, standard letters posted in the morning. Since then, a continuous decline in the quality of the service has been observed, and in particular of the number of daily rounds of the postmen, which were reduced from five to one (or two in some cities of the European Union). The exclusive rights of the postal organisations favoured a fall in quality, since they prevented other companies from entering the market. As a consequence the postal organisations failed to compensate for wage increases and reduction of the working hours by introducing modern technology, as was done by enterprises in industries open to competition.

3. CROSS-SUBSIDISATION

(a) Basic principles

- 3.1. Cross-subsidisation means that an undertaking bears or allocates all or part of the costs of its activity in one geographical or product market to its activity in another geographical or product market. Under certain circumstances, cross-subsidisation in the postal sector, where nearly all operators provide reserved and non-reserved services, can distort competition and lead to competitors being beaten by offers which are made possible not by efficiency (including economies of scope) and performance but by cross-subsidies. Avoiding cross-subsidisation leading to unfair competition is crucial for the development of the postal sector.
- 3.2. Cross-subsidisation does not distort competition when the costs of reserved activities are subsidised by the revenue generated by other reserved services since there is no competition possible as to these services. This form of subsidisation may sometimes be necessary, to enable the operators referred to in point 4.2 to perform their obligation to provide a service universally, and on the same conditions to everybody⁽¹⁸⁾. For instance, unprofitable mail delivery in rural areas is subsidised through revenues from profitable mail delivery in urban areas. The same could be said of subsidising the provision of reserved services through revenues generated by activities open to competition. Moreover, cross-subsidisation between non-reserved activities is not in itself abusive.
- 3.3. By contrast, subsidising activities open to competition by allocating their costs to reserved services is likely to distort competition in breach of Article 86. It could amount to an abuse by an undertaking holding a dominant position within the Community. Moreover, users of activities covered by a monopoly would have to bear costs which are unrelated to the provision of those activities. Nonetheless, dominant companies too many compete on price, or improve their cash flow and obtain only partial contribution to their fixed (overhead) costs, unless the prices are predatory or go against relevant national or Community regulations.

(b) Consequences

- 3.4. A reference to cross-subsidisation was made in point 2.7; duties of dominant postal operators. The operators referred to in point 4.2 should not use the income from the reserved area to cross-subsidise activities in areas open to competition. Such a practice could prevent, restrict or distort competition in the non-reserved area. However, in some justified cases, subject to the provisions of Article 90(2), cross-subsidisation can be regarded as lawful, for example for cultural mail⁽¹⁹⁾, as long as it is applied in a non discriminatory manner, or for particular services to the socially, medically and economically disadvantaged. When necessary, the Commission will indicate what other exemptions the Treaty would allow to be made. In all other cases, taking into account the indications given in point 3.3, the price of competitive services offered by the operator referred to in point 4.2 should, because of the difficulty of allocating common costs, in principle be at least equal to the average total costs of provision. This means covering the direct costs plus an appropriate proportion of the common and overhead costs of the operator. Objective criteria, such as volumes, time (labour) usage, or intensity of usage, should be used to determine the appropriate proportion. When using the turnover generated by the services involved as a criterion in a case of cross-subsidisation, allowance should be made for the fact that in such a scenario the turnover of the relevant activity is being kept artificially low. Demand-influenced factors, such as revenues or profits, are themselves influenced by predation. If services were offered systematically and selectively at a price below average total cost, the Commission would, on a case-by-case basis, investigate the matter under Article 86, or under Article 86 and Article 90(1) or under Article 92.

4. PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS AND SPECIAL OR EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS

- 4.1. The treaty obliges the Member States, in respect of public undertakings and undertakings to which they grant special or exclusive rights, neither to enact nor maintain in force any measures contrary to the

⁽¹⁸⁾ See these Postal Directive, recitals 16 and 28, and Chapter 5.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Referred to by UPU as 'work of the mind', comprising books, newspapers, periodicals and journals.

Treaty rules (Article 90(1)). The expression 'undertaking' includes every person or legal entity exercising an economic activity, irrespective of the legal status of the entity and the way in which it is financed. The clearance, sorting, transportation and distribution of postal items constitute economic activities, and these services are normally supplied for reward.

The term 'public undertaking' includes every undertaking over which the public authorities may exercise directly or indirectly a dominant influence by virtue of ownership of it, their financial participation in it or the rules which govern it⁽²⁰⁾. A dominant influence on the part of the public authorities may in particular be presumed when the public authorities hold, directly or indirectly, the majority of the subscribed capital of the undertaking, control the majority of the voting rights attached to shares issued by the undertaking or can appoint more than half of the members of the administrative, managerial or supervisory body. Bodies which are part of the Member State's administration and which provide in an organised manner postal services for third parties against remuneration are to be regarded as such undertakings. Undertakings to which special or exclusive rights are granted can, according to Article 90(1), be public as well as private.

- 4.2. National regulations concerning postal operators to which the Member States have granted special or exclusive rights to provide certain postal services are 'measures' within the meaning of Article 90(1) of the Treaty and must be assessed under the Treaty provisions to which that Article refers.

In addition to Member States' obligations under Article 90(1), public undertakings and undertakings that have been granted special or exclusive rights are subject to Articles 85 and 86.

- 4.3. In most Member States, special and exclusive rights apply to services such as the clearance, transportation and distribution of certain postal items, as well as the way in which those services are provided, such as the exclusive right to place letter boxes along the public highway or to issue stamps bearing the name of the country in question.

5. FREEDOM TO PROVIDE SERVICES

(a) Basic principles

- 5.1. The granting of special or exclusive rights to one or more operators referred to in point 4.2 to carry out the clearance, including public collection, transport and distribution of certain categories of postal items inevitably restricts the provision of such services, both by companies established in other Member States and by undertakings established in the Member State concerned. This restriction has a transborder character when the addresses or the senders of the postal items handled by those undertakings are established in other Member States. In practice, restrictions on the provision of postal services, within the meaning of Article 59 of the Treaty⁽²¹⁾, comprise prohibiting the conveyance of certain categories of postal items to other Member States including by intermediaries, as well as the prohibition on distributing cross-border mail. The Postal Directive lays down the justified restrictions on the provision of postal services.

- 5.2. Article 66, read in conjunction with Article 55 and 56 of the Treaty, sets out exceptions from Article 59. Since they are exceptions to a fundamental principle, they must be interpreted restrictively. As regards postal services, the exception under Article 55 only applies to the conveyance and distribution of a special kind of mail, that is mail generated in the course of judicial or administrative procedures, connected, even occasionally, with the exercise of official authority, in particular notifications in pursuance of any judicial or administrative procedures. The conveyance and distribution of such items on a Member State's territory may therefore be subjected to a licensing requirement (see point 5.5) in order to protect the public interest. The conditions of the other derogations from the Treaty listed in those provisions will not normally be fulfilled in relation to postal services. Such services cannot, in themselves, threaten public policy and cannot affect public health.

- 5.3. The case-law of the Court of Justice allows, in principle, further derogations on the basis of mandatory requirements, provided that they fulfil non-economic essential requirements in the general interest, are applied without discrimination, and are appropriate and proportionate to the objective to

⁽²⁰⁾ Commission Directive 80/723/EEC on the transparency of financial relations between Member States and public undertakings, OJ L 195, 29.7.1980, p. 35.

⁽²¹⁾ For a general explanation of the principles deriving from Article 59, see Commission interpretative communication concerning the free movement of services across frontiers (OJ C 334, 9.12.1993, p. 3).

be achieved. As regards postal services, the essential requirements which the Commission would consider as justifying restrictions on the freedom to provide postal services are data protection subject to approximation measures taken in this field, the confidentiality of correspondence, security of the network as regards the transport of dangerous goods, as well as, where justified under the provisions of the Treaty, environmental protection and regional planning. Conversely, the Commission would not consider it justified to impose restrictions on the freedom to provide postal services for reasons of consumer protection since this general interest requirement can be met by the general legislation on fair trade practices and consumer protection. Benefits to consumers are enhanced by the freedom to provide postal services, provided that universal service obligations are well defined on the basis of the Postal Directive and can be fulfilled.

- 5.4. The Commission therefore considers that the maintenance of any special or exclusive right which limits cross-border provision of postal services needs to be justified in the light of Articles 90 and 59 of the Treaty. At present, the special or exclusive rights whose scope does not go beyond the reserved services as defined in the Postal Directive are *prima facie* justified under Article 90(2). Outward cross-border mail is *de jure* or *de facto* liberalised in some Member States, such as Denmark, the Netherlands, Finland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

(b) Consequences

- 5.5. The adoption of the measures contained in the Postal Directive requires Member States to regulate postal services. Where Member States restrict postal services to ensure the achievement of universal service and essential requirements, the content of such regulation must correspond to the objective pursued. Obligations should, as a general rule, be enforced within the framework of class licences and declaration procedures by which operators of postal services supply their name, legal form, title and address as well as a short description of the services they offer to the public. Individual licensing should only be applied for specific postal services, where it is demonstrated that less restrictive procedures cannot ensure those objectives. Member States may be invited, on a case-by-case basis, to notify the

measures they adopt to the Commission to enable it to assess their proportionality.

6. MEASURES ADOPTED BY MEMBER STATES

(a) Basic principles

- 6.1. Member States have the freedom to define what are general interest services, to grant the special or exclusive rights that are necessary for providing them, to regulate their management and, where appropriate, to fund them. However, under Article 90(1) of the Treaty, Member States must, in the case of public undertakings and undertakings to which they have granted special or exclusive rights, neither enact nor maintain in force any measure contrary to the Treaty rules, and in particular its competition rules.

(b) Consequences

- 6.2. The operation of a universal clearance and distribution network confers significant advantages on the operator referred to in point 4.2 in offering not only reserved or liberalised services falling within the definition of universal service, but also other (non-universal postal) services. The prohibition under Articles 90(1), read in conjunction with Article 86(b), applies to the use, without objective justification, of a dominant position on one market to obtain market power on related or neighbouring markets which are distinct from the former, at the risk of eliminating competition on those markets. In countries where local delivery of items of correspondence is liberalised, such as Spain, and the monopoly is limited to inter-city transport and delivery, the use of a dominant position to extend the monopoly from the latter market to the former would therefore be incompatible with the Treaty provisions, in the absence of specific justification, if the functioning of services in the general economic interest was not previously endangered. The Commission considers that it would be appropriate for Member States to inform the Commission of any extension of special or exclusive rights and of the justification therefor.
- 6.3. There is a potential effect on the trade between Member States from restrictions on the provision of postal services, since the postal services offered by operators other than the operators referred to in

point 4.2 can cover mailings to or from other Member States, and restrictions may impede cross-border activities of operators in other Member States.

- 6.4. As explained in point 8(b)(vii), Member States must monitor access conditions and the exercise of special and exclusive rights. They need not necessarily set up new bodies to do this but they should not give to their operator⁽²²⁾ as referred to in point 4.2, or to a body which is related (legally, administratively and structurally) to that operator, the power of supervision of the exclusive rights granted and of the activities of postal operators generally. An enterprise in a dominant position must not be allowed to have such a power over its competitors. The independence, both in theory and in practice, of the supervisory authority from all the enterprise supervised is essential. The system of undistorted competition required by the Treaty can only be ensured if equal opportunities for the different economic operators, including confidentiality of sensitive business information, are guaranteed. To allow an operator to check the declarations of its competitors or to assign to an undertaking the power to supervise the activities of its competitors or to be associated in the granting of licences means that such undertaking is given commercial information about its competitors and thus has the opportunity to influence the activity of those competitors.

7. POSTAL OPERATORS AND STATE AID

(a) Principles

While a few operators referred to in point 4.2 are highly profitable, the majority appear to be operating either in financial deficit or at close to break-even in postal operations, although information on underlying financial performance is limited, as relatively few operators publish relevant information of an auditable standard on a regular basis. However, direct financial support in the form of subsidies or indirect support such as tax exemptions is being given to fund some postal services, even if the actual amounts are often not transparent.

The Treaty makes the Commission responsible for enforcing Article 92, which declares State aid that affects trade between Member States of the Community to be incompatible with the common market except in certain circumstances where an

exemption is, or may be, granted. Without prejudice to Article 90(2), Articles 92 and 93 are applicable to postal services⁽²³⁾.

Pursuant to Article 93(3), Member States are required to notify to the Commission for approval all plans to grant aid or to alter existing aid arrangements. Moreover, the Commission is required to monitor aid which it has previously authorised or which dates from before the entry into force of the Treaty or before the accession of the Member State concerned.

All universal service providers currently fall within the scope of Commission Directive 80/723/EEC of 25 June 1980 on the transparency of financial relations between Member States and public undertakings⁽²⁴⁾, as last amended by Directive 93/84/EEC⁽²⁵⁾. In addition to the general transparency requirement for the accounts of operators referred to in point 4.2 as discussed in point 8(b)(vi), Member States must therefore ensure that financial relations between them and those operators are transparent as required by the Directive, so that the following are clearly shown:

- (a) public funds made available directly, including tax exemptions or reductions;
- (b) public funds made available through other public undertakings or financial institutions;
- (c) the use to which those public funds are actually put.

The Commission regards, in particular, the following as making available public funds:

- (a) the setting-off of operating losses;
- (b) the provision of capital;

⁽²²⁾ See in particular, Case C-18/88 *RTT v GB-Inno-BM* [1991] ECR I-5981, paragraphs 25 to 28.

⁽²³⁾ Case C-387/92 *Banco de Credito Industrial v. Ayuntamiento Valencia* [1994] ECR I-877.

⁽²⁴⁾ OJ L 195, 29.7.1980, p. 35.

⁽²⁵⁾ OJ L 254, 12.10.1993, p. 16.

- (c) non-refundable grants or loans on privileged terms;
- (d) the granting of financial advantages by forgoing profits or the recovery of sums due;
- (e) the forgoing of a normal return on public funds used;
- (f) compensation for financial burdens imposed by the public authorities.

(b) Application of Articles 90 and 92

The Commission has been called upon to examine a number of tax advantages granted to a postal operator on the basis of Article 92 in connection with Article 90 of the Treaty. The Commission sought to check whether that privileged tax treatment could be used to cross-subsidize that operator's operations in sectors open to competition. At that time, the postal operator did not have an analytical cost-accounting system serving to enable the Commission to distinguish between the reserved activities and the competitive ones. Accordingly, the Commission, on the basis of the findings of studies carried out in that area, assessed the additional costs due to universal-service obligations borne by that postal operator and compared those costs with the tax advantages. The Commission concluded that the costs exceeded those advantages and therefore decided that the tax system under examination could not lead to cross-subsidization of that operator's operations in the competitive areas ⁽²⁶⁾.

It is worth noting that in its decision the Commission invited the Member State concerned to make sure that the postal operator adopted an analytical cost-accounting system and requested an annual report which would allow the monitoring of compliance with Community law.

The Court of First Instance has endorsed the Commission's decision and has stated that the tax advantages to that postal operator are State aid

which benefit from an exemption from the prohibition set out in Article 92(1) on the basis of Article 90(2) ⁽²⁷⁾.

8. SERVICE OF GENERAL ECONOMIC INTEREST

(a) Basic principles

8.1. Article 90(2) of the Treaty allows an exception from the application of the Treaty rules where the application of those rules obstructs, in law or in fact, the performance of the particular task assigned to the operators referred to in point 4.2 for the provision of a service of general economic interest. Without prejudice to the rights of the Member States to define particular requirements of services of general interest, that task consists primarily in the provision and the maintenance of a universal public postal service, guaranteeing at affordable, cost-effective and transparent tariffs nationwide access to the public postal network within a reasonable distance and during adequate opening hours, including the clearance of postal items from accessible postal boxes or collection points throughout the territory and the timely delivery of such items to the address indicated, as well as associated services entrusted by measures of a regulatory nature to those operators for universal delivery at a specified quality. The universal service is to evolve in response to the social, economical and technical environment and to the demands of users.

The general interest involved requires the availability in the Community of a genuinely integrated public postal network, allowing efficient circulation of information and thereby fostering, on the one hand, the competitiveness of European industry and the development of trade and greater cohesion between the regions and Member States, and on the other, the improvement of social contacts between the citizens of the Union. The definition of the reserved area has to take into account the financial resources necessary for the provision of the service of general economic interest.

8.2. The financial resources for the maintenance and improvement of that public network still derive mainly from the activities referred to in point 2.3.

⁽²⁶⁾ Case NN 135/92, OJ C 262, 7.10.1995, p. 11.

⁽²⁷⁾ Case T-106/95 *FFSA v. Commission* [1997] ECR II-229.

Currently, and in the absence of harmonisation at Community level, most Member States have fixed the limits of the monopoly by reference to the weight of the item. Some Member States apply a combined weight and price limit whereas one Member State applies a price limit only. Information collected by the Commission on the revenues obtained from mail flows in the Member States seems to indicate that the maintenance of special or exclusive rights with regard to this market could, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, be sufficient to guarantee the improvement and maintenance of the public postal network.

The service for which Member States can reserve exclusive or special rights, to the extent necessary to ensure the maintenance of the universal service, is harmonised in the Postal Directive. To the extent to which Member States grant special or exclusive rights for this service, the service is to be considered a separate product-market in the assessment of individual cases in particular with regard to direct mail, the distribution of inward cross-border mail, outward cross-border mail, as well as with regard to the collection, sorting and transport of mail. The Commission will take account of the fact that those markets are wholly or partly liberalised in a number of Member States.

8.3. When applying the competition rules and other relevant Treaty rules to the postal sector, the Commission, acting upon a complaint or upon its own initiative, will take account of the harmonized definition set out in the Postal Directive in assessing whether the scope of the reserved area can be justified under Article 90(2). The point of departure will be a presumption that, to the extent that they fall within the limits of the reserved area as defined in the Postal Directive, the special or exclusive rights will be *prima facie* justified under Article 90(2). That presumption can, however, be rebutted if the facts in a case show that a restriction does not fulfil the conditions of Article 90(2) ⁽²⁸⁾.

8.4. The direct mail market is still developing at a different pace from one Member State to the other,

which makes it difficult for the Commission, at this stage, to specify in a general way the obligations of the Member States regarding that service. The two principal issues in relation to direct mail are potential abuse by customers of its tariffication and of its liberalisation (reserved items being delivered by an alternative operators as if they were non-reserved direct mail items) so as to circumvent the reserved services referred to in point 8.2. Evidence from the Member States which do not restrict direct mail services, such as Spain, Italy, the Netherlands, Austria, Sweden and Finland, is still inconclusive and does not yet allow a definitive general assessment. In view of that uncertainty, it is considered appropriate to proceed temporarily on a case-by-case basis. If particular circumstances make it necessary, and without prejudice to point 8.3, Member States may maintain certain existing restrictions on direct mail services or introduce licensing in order to avoid artificial traffic distortions and substantial destabilization of revenues.

8.5. As regards the distribution of inward cross-border mail, the system of terminal dues received by the postal operator of the Member State of delivery of cross-border mail from the operator of the Member State of origin is currently under revision to adapt terminal dues, which are in many cases too low, to actual costs of delivery.

Without prejudice to point 8.3, Member States may maintain certain existing restrictions on the distribution of inward cross-border mail ⁽²⁹⁾, so as to avoid artificial diversion of traffic, which would inflate the share of cross-border mail in Community traffic. Such restrictions may only concern items falling under the reservable area of services. In assessing the situation in the framework of individual cases, the Commission will take into account the relevant, specific circumstances in the Member States.

8.6. The clearance, sorting and transport of postal items has been or is currently increasingly being opened up to third parties by postal operators in a number

⁽²⁸⁾ In relation to the limits on the application of the exception set out in Article 90(2), see the position taken by the Court of Justice in the following cases: Case C-179/90 *Merci convenzionali porto di Genova v. Siderurgica Gabrielli* [1991] ECR I-1979; Case C-41/90 *Klaus Höfner and Fritz Elser v. Macroton* [1991] ECR I-5889.

⁽²⁹⁾ This may in particular concern mail from one State which has been conveyed by commercial companies to another State to be introduced in the public postal network via a postal operator of that other State.

of Member States. Given that the revenue effects of such opening up may vary according to the situation in the different Member States, certain Member States may, if particular circumstances make it necessary, and without prejudice to point 8.3, maintain certain existing restrictions on the clearance, sorting and transport of postal items by intermediaries⁽³⁰⁾, so as to allow for the necessary restructuring of the operator referred to in point 4.2. However, such restrictions should in principle be applied only to postal items covered by the existing monopolies, should not limit what is already accepted in the Member State concerned, and should be compatible with the principle of non-discriminatory access to the postal network as set out in point 8(b)(vii).

(b) Conditions for the application of Article 90(2) to the postal sector

The following conditions should apply with regard to the exception under Article 90(2):

(i) Liberalisation of other postal services

Except for those services for which reservation is necessary, and which the Postal Directive allows to be reserved, Member States should withdraw all special or exclusive rights for the supply of postal services to the extent that the performance of the particular task assigned to the operators referred to in point 4.2 for the provision of a service of a general economic interest is not obstructed in law or in fact, with the exception of mail connected to the exercise of official authority, and they should take all necessary measures to guarantee the right of all economic operators to supply postal services.

This does not prevent Member States from making, where necessary, the supply of such services subject to declaration procedures or class licences and, when necessary, to individual licensing procedures aimed at the enforcement of essential requirements and at safeguarding the universal service. Member States

should, in that event, ensure that the conditions set out in those procedures are transparent, objective, and without discriminatory effect, and that there is an efficient procedure of appealing to the courts against any refusal.

(ii) Absence of less restrictive means to ensure the services in the general economic interest

Exclusive rights may be granted or maintained only where they are indispensable for ensuring the functioning of the tasks of general economic interest. In many areas the entry of new companies into the market could, on the basis of their specific skills and expertise, contribute to the realisation of the services of general economic interest.

If the operator referred to in point 4.2 fails to provide satisfactorily all of the elements of the universal service required by the Postal Directive (such as the possibility of every citizen in the Member State concerned, and in particular those living in remote areas, to have access to newspapers, magazines and books), even with the benefit of a universal postal network and of special or exclusive rights, the Member State concerned must take action⁽³¹⁾. Instead of extending the rights already granted, Member States should create the possibility that services are provided by competitors and for this purpose may impose obligations on those competitors in addition to essential requirements. All of those obligations should be objective, non-discriminatory and transparent.

(iii) Proportionality

Member States should moreover ensure that the scope of any special and exclusive rights granted is in proportion to the general economic interest which is pursued through those rights. Prohibiting self-delivery, that is the provision of postal services by the natural or legal person (including a sister or subsidiary organisation) who is the originator of the mail, or collection and transport of such items by a third party acting solely on its behalf, would for

⁽³⁰⁾ Even in a monopoly situation, senders will have the freedom to make use of particular services provided by an intermediary, such as (pre-)sorting before deposit with the postal operator.

⁽³¹⁾ According to Article 3 of the Postal Directive, Member States are to ensure that users enjoy the right to a universal service.

example not be proportionate to the objective of guaranteeing adequate resources for the public postal network. Member States must also adjust the scope of those special or exclusive rights, according to changes in the needs and the conditions under which postal services are provided and taking account of any State aid granted to the operator referred to in point 4.2.

(iv) *Monitoring by an independent regulatory body*

The monitoring of the performance of the public-service tasks of the operators referred to in point 4.2 and of open access to the public postal network and, where applicable, the grant of licences or the control of declarations as well as the observance by economic operators of the special or exclusive rights of operators referred to in point 4.2 should be ensured by a body or bodies independent of the latter ⁽³²⁾.

That body should in particular ensure: that contracts for the provision of reserved services are made fully transparent, are separately invoiced and distinguished from non-reserved services, such as printing, labelling and enveloping; that terms and conditions for services which are in part reserved and in part liberalised are separate; and that the reserved element is open to all postal users, irrespective of whether or not the non-reserved component is purchased.

(v) *Effective monitoring of reserved services*

The tasks excluded from the scope of competition should be effectively monitored by the Member State according to published service targets and performance levels and there should be regular and public reporting on their fulfilment.

(vi) *Transparency of accounting*

Each operator referred to in point 4.2 uses a single postal network to compete in a variety of markets.

Price and service discrimination between or within classes of customers can easily be practised by operators running a universal postal network, given the significant overheads which cannot be fully and precisely assigned to any one service in particular. It is therefore extremely difficult to determine cross-subsidies within them, both between the different stages of the handling of postal items in the public postal network and between the reserved services and the services provided under conditions of competition. Moreover, a number of operators offer preferential tariffs for cultural items which clearly do not cover the average total costs. Member States are obliged by Article 5 and 90 to ensure that Community law is fully complied with. The Commission considers that the most appropriate way of fulfilling that obligation would be for Member States to require operators referred to in point 4.2 to keep separate financial records, identifying separately, *inter alia*, costs and revenues associated with the provision of the services supplied under their exclusive rights and those provided under competitive conditions, and making it possible to assess fully the conditions applied at the various access points of the public postal network. Services made up of elements falling within the reserved and competitive services should also distinguish between the costs of each element. Internal accounting systems should operate on the basis of consistently applied and objectively justified cost-accounting principles. The financial accounts should be drawn up, audited by an independent auditor, which may be appointed by the National Regulatory Authority, and be published in accordance with the relevant Community and national legislation applying to commercial organisations.

(vii) *Non-discriminatory access to the postal network*

Operators should provide the universal postal service by affording non-discriminatory access to customers or intermediaries at appropriate public points of access, in accordance with the needs of those users. Access conditions including contracts (when offered) should be transparent, published in an appropriate manner and offered on a non-discriminatory basis.

Preferential tariffs appear to be offered by some operators to particular groups of customers in a non-transparent fashion. Member States should monitor the access conditions to the network with a view to ensuring that there is no discrimination

⁽³²⁾ See in particular Articles 9 and 22 of the Postal Directive.

either in the conditions of use or in the charges payable. It should in particular be ensured that intermediaries, including operators from other Member States, can choose from amongst available access points to the public postal network and obtain access within a reasonable period at price conditions based on costs, that take into account the actual services required.

The obligation to provide non-discriminatory access to the public postal network does not mean that Member States are required to ensure access for items of correspondence from its territory, which were conveyed by commercial companies to another State, in breach of a postal monopoly, to be introduced in the public postal network via a postal operator of that other State, for the sole purpose of taking advantage of lower postal tariffs. Other economic reasons, such as production costs and facilities, added values or the level of service offered in other Member States are not regarded as improper. Fraud can be made subject to penalties by the independent regulatory body.

At present cross-border access to postal networks is occasionally rejected, or only allowed subject to conditions, for postal items whose production process includes cross-border data transmission before those postal items were given physical form. Those cases are usually called non-physical remail. In the present circumstances there may indeed be an economic problem for the postal operator that

delivers the mail, due to the level of terminal dues applied between postal operators. The operators seek to resolve this problem by the introduction of an appropriate terminal dues system.

The Commission may request Member States, in accordance with the first paragraph of Article 5 of the Treaty, to inform the Commission of the conditions of access applied and of the reasons for them. The Commission is not to disclose information acquired as a result of such requests to the extent that it is covered by the obligation of professional secrecy.

9. REVIEW

This notice is adopted at Community level to facilitate the assessment of certain behaviour of undertakings and certain State measures relating to postal services. It is appropriate that after a certain period of development, possibly by the year 2000, the Commission should carry out an evaluation of the postal sector with regard to the Treaty rules, to establish whether modifications of the views set out in this notice are required on the basis of social, economic or technological considerations and on the basis of experience with cases in the postal sector. In due time the Commission will carry out a global evaluation of the situation in the postal sector in the light of the aims of this notice.

Non-opposition to a notified concentration
(Case No IV/M.1049 — AKZO/PLV-EPL)

(98/C 39/03)

(Text with EEA relevance)

On 4 December 1997, the Commission decided not to oppose the above notified concentration and to declare it compatible with the common market. This decision is based on Article 6(1)(b) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 4064/89. The full text of the decision is available only in English and will be made public after it is cleared of any business secrets it may contain. It will be available:

- as a paper version through the sales offices of the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities (see list on the last page),
- in electronic form in the 'CEN' version of the Celex database, under document No 397M1049. Celex is the computerised documentation system of European Community law; for more information concerning subscriptions please contact:

EUR-OP,
Information, Marketing and Public Relations (OP/4B),
2, rue Mercier,
L-2985 Luxembourg.
Tel. (352) 29 29 424 55, fax (352) 29 29 427 63.

Non-opposition to a notified concentration
(Case No IV/M.1075 — Nordic Capital/Mölnlycke Clinical/Kolmi)

(98/C 39/04)

(Text with EEA relevance)

On 20 January 1998, the Commission decided not to oppose the above notified concentration and to declare it compatible with the common market. This decision is based on Article 6(1)(b) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 4064/89. The full text of the decision is available only in English and will be made public after it is cleared of any business secrets it may contain. It will be available:

- as a paper version through the sales offices of the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities (see list on the last page),
- in electronic form in the 'CEN' version of the Celex database, under document No 398M1075. Celex is the computerised documentation system of European Community law; for more information concerning subscriptions please contact:

EUR-OP,
Information, Marketing and Public Relations (OP/4B),
2, rue Mercier,
L-2985 Luxembourg
Tel. (352) 29 29 424 55, fax (352) 29 29 427 63.

Prior notification of a concentration
(Case No IV/M.999 — CLT-UFA/Havas Intermédiation)

(98/C 39/05)

(Text with EEA relevance)

1. On 28 January 1998, the Commission received notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 4064/89 ⁽¹⁾ by which the undertaking CLT-UFA controlled by Bertelsmann and Audiofina acquires within the meaning of Article 3 (1)(b) of the Regulation control of the whole of Havas Intermédiation by way of purchase of assets.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

— CLT-UFA: television and radio,

— Havas Intermédiation: selling of advertising time.

3. On preliminary examination, the Commission finds that the notified concentration could fall within the scope of Regulation (EEC) No 4064/89. However, the final decision on this point is reserved.

4. The Commission invites interested third parties to submit their possible observations on the proposed operation.

Observations must reach the Commission not later than 10 days following the date of this publication. Observations can be sent by fax ((32-2) 296 43 01 or 296 72 44) or by post, under reference IV/M.999 — CLT-UFA/Havas Intermédiation, to:

European Commission,
Directorate-General for Competition (DG IV),
Directorate B — Merger Task Force,
Avenue de Cortenberg/Kortenberglaan 150,
B-1040 Brussels.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 395, 30.12.1989; corrigendum: OJ L 257, 21.9.1990, p. 13.

**Commission notice pursuant to Article 23(3) of Regulation (EEC) No 4056/86 concerning Case
IV/MAR/36.253 — P&O Stena Line**

(98/C 39/06)

(Text with EEA relevance)

1. On 31 October 1996, The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company ('P&O') and Stena Line Limited ('Stena') submitted to the Commission pursuant to Article 12(1) of Regulation (EEC) 4056/86 an application in accordance with the MAR form for negative clearance pursuant to Article 85(1) or, in the alternative, exemption pursuant Article 85(3) in respect of a proposed joint venture merging their respective ferry operations on the Short French Sea and Belgian Straits.
2. On 13 March 1997, pursuant to Article 12(2) of Regulation (EEC) 4056/86 the Commission published a summary of the application in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* and invited interested parties to submit their comments within 30 days ⁽¹⁾.
3. On 10 June 1997, before the expiry of the 90-day deadline provided for in Article 12(3) of Regulation (EEC) 4056/86, the Commission informed the parties that there existed serious doubts within the meaning of that Article as to the applicability of Article 85(3) to the agreement in question ⁽²⁾.
4. The Commission intends to take decision finding that the parties' proposed joint venture infringes Article 85(1) but is capable of exemption within the meaning of Article 85(3).
5. In its letter of serious doubts the Commission stated its concern that the creation of the joint venture could lead to a duopolistic market structure conducive to parallel behaviour of the joint venture and Eurotunnel on the Short Sea tourist market. Following detailed examination of the agreement and its likely effects in a market into which new entry cannot be expected, the Commission considers that despite a high degree of concentration in the market after the operation, and despite the significance and the similarity of market shares for both the joint venture and Eurotunnel, the absence of capacity constraints, at least in the short to medium term, and the differences in cost structure of the joint venture and Eurotunnel mean that they can reasonably be expected to compete with each other. The Commission therefore considers that a duopoly would not be brought about by the creation of the joint venture. The agreement can thus not be regarded as affording the parties the possibility of eliminating competition. However, after the abolition of duty-free sales within the EU in 1999, there is uncertainty about the evolution of the market.
6. With regard to the Anglo/Continental freight market, the Commission considers that there is sufficient competition from other operators in the market for the agreement not to risk affording the parties the possibility of eliminating competition and that the other conditions for the exemption within the meaning of Article 85(3) are fulfilled.
7. In its letter of serious doubts the Commission stated its concern about potential spillover effects on other markets where the parent companies are competitors, which could occur through cooperation in various forms, including joint marketing. After detailed examination, the evidence suggests that prices on the Short Sea constrain prices on the Western Channel and North Sea tourist markets, but not vice versa. Thus, any attempt by the parties to co-ordinate behaviour on either market will be destabilised by competition from the Short Sea. The parties' co-operation is therefore unlikely to spill over onto their activities on the North Sea and Western Channel. On the Irish Sea, it is only on the northern corridor that the parties compete directly. In view of the low proportion and low amount of inter-State traffic on the northern corridor, it can be concluded that there is no appreciable effect on trade between Member States.
8. The Commission considers that in view of the effects of the abolition of duty-free sales being uncertain the duration of the exemption should be limited to three years from the date of implementation of the agreement.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 80, 13.3.1997, p. 3.

⁽²⁾ See press release IP/97/511 of 11 June 1997.

9. The Commission does not intend to attach conditions or obligations to the exemption.
10. In accordance with Article 23(3) of Regulation (EEC) 4056/86, before the Commission adopts a decision it invites interested parties to send their comments within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice, quoting reference IV/MAR/36.253, to:

European Commission,
Directorate-General for Competition,
Unit IV/D2,
Rue de la Loi/Wetstraat 200,
B-1049 Brussels

Fax (32-2) 296 98 12.

Internet: CharlesWilliams@dg4.cec.be

Non-opposition to a notified concentration
(Case No IV/M.1059 — Suez Lyonnaise des Eaux/BFI)

(98/C 39/07)

(Text with EEA relevance)

On 19 December 1997, the Commission decided not to oppose the above notified concentration and to declare it compatible with the common market. This decision is based on Article 6(1)(b) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 4064/89. The full text of the decision is available only in French and will be made public after it is cleared of any business secrets it may contain. It will be available:

- as a paper version through the sales offices of the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities (see list on the last page),
- in electronic form in the 'CFR' version of the Celex database, under document No 397M1059. Celex is the computerised documentation system of European Community law; for more information concerning subscriptions please contact:

EUR-OP,
Information, Marketing and Public Relations (OP/4B),
2, rue Mercier,
L-2985 Luxembourg.
Tel. (352) 29 29 424 55, fax (352) 29 29 427 63.

III

(Notices)

COUNCIL

Notice concerning the organization of open competitions

(98/C 39/08)

The General Secretariat of the Council is organizing the following open competition:

Council/LA/380: Translators of Danish mother tongue ⁽¹⁾.

The deadline for submitting applications is **26 March 1998**.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 39 A of 6.2.1998 (Danish edition).

COMMISSION

Amendment to the notice of invitation to tender for the subsidy for the export of husked long grain rice to Réunion

(98/C 39/09)

(Official Journal of the European Communities C 324 of 25 October 1997)

On page 9 the text of paragraph 2 under heading I 'Subject', is amended as follows:

2. The total quantity in respect of which a maximum export subsidy may be fixed, in accordance with Article 6(3) of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2692/89 ⁽¹⁾, is approximately 40 000 tonnes.
-