

Official Journal

of the European Union

C 179

Volume 49

English edition

Information and Notices

1 August 2006

<u>Notice No</u>	<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
	I <i>Information</i>	
	Commission	
2006/C 179/01	Euro exchange rates	1
2006/C 179/02	Commission interpretative communication on the Community law applicable to contract awards not or not fully subject to the provisions of the Public Procurement Directives	2
2006/C 179/03	Publication of decisions by Member States to grant or revoke operating licenses pursuant to Article 13(4) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2407/92 on licensing of air carriers ⁽¹⁾	8
2006/C 179/04	Information communicated by Member States regarding State aid granted under Commission Regulation (EC) No 70/2001 of 12 January 2001 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the EC Treaty to State aid to small and medium-sized enterprises ⁽¹⁾	9
2006/C 179/05	Withdrawal of notification of a concentration (Case COMP/M.4009 — CIMC/Burg)	10
2006/C 179/06	Prior notification of a concentration (Case COMP/M.4305 — Nokia/Giesecke & Devrient) — Candidate case for simplified procedure ⁽¹⁾	11
2006/C 179/07	Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case COMP/M.4262 — Carlyle/Vista/Turmed) ⁽¹⁾	12
2006/C 179/08	Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case COMP/M.4278 — PAI Partners SAS/AMEC SPIE SA) ⁽¹⁾	12
2006/C 179/09	Non-opposition to a notified concentration (Case COMP/M.4233 — BP France/Vitogaz/Energaz JV) ⁽¹⁾	13



I

(Information)

COMMISSION

Euro exchange rates ⁽¹⁾

31 July 2006

(2006/C 179/01)

1 euro =

Currency	Exchange rate	Currency	Exchange rate		
USD	US dollar	1,2767	SIT	Slovenian tolar	239,66
JPY	Japanese yen	145,82	SKK	Slovak koruna	38,110
DKK	Danish krone	7,4618	TRY	Turkish lira	1,9010
GBP	Pound sterling	0,68430	AUD	Australian dollar	1,6672
SEK	Swedish krona	9,2330	CAD	Canadian dollar	1,4346
CHF	Swiss franc	1,5713	HKD	Hong Kong dollar	9,9216
ISK	Iceland króna	92,92	NZD	New Zealand dollar	2,0708
NOK	Norwegian krone	7,8615	SGD	Singapore dollar	2,0138
BGN	Bulgarian lev	1,9558	KRW	South Korean won	1 219,89
CYP	Cyprus pound	0,5750	ZAR	South African rand	8,7961
CZK	Czech koruna	28,528	CNY	Chinese yuan renminbi	10,1753
EEK	Estonian kroon	15,6466	HRK	Croatian kuna	7,2520
HUF	Hungarian forint	272,23	IDR	Indonesian rupiah	11 611,59
LTL	Lithuanian litas	3,4528	MYR	Malaysian ringgit	4,669
LVL	Latvian lats	0,6960	PHP	Philippine peso	65,725
MTL	Maltese lira	0,4293	RUB	Russian rouble	34,2240
PLN	Polish zloty	3,9365	THB	Thai baht	48,315
RON	Romanian leu	3,5447			

⁽¹⁾ Source: reference exchange rate published by the ECB.

COMMISSION INTERPRETATIVE COMMUNICATION**on the Community law applicable to contract awards not or not fully subject to the provisions of the Public Procurement Directives**

(2006/C 179/02)

INTRODUCTION

The European Community has recently adopted new directives for the award of public works, supplies and services contracts ⁽¹⁾. They set up detailed rules on EU-wide competitive tendering procedures.

However, the Public Procurement Directives do not apply to all public contracts. There remains a wide range of contracts that are not or only partially covered by them, such as

- Contracts below the thresholds for application of the Public Procurement Directives ⁽²⁾;
- Contracts for services listed in Annex II B to Directive 2004/18/EC and in Annex XVII B to Directive 2004/17/EC that exceed the thresholds for application of these Directives.

These contracts present significant opportunities for businesses in the Internal Market, particularly for SMEs and start-up companies. At the same time, open and competitive award methods help the public administrations to attract a broader range of potential bidders for such contracts and to gain from better-value offers. Ensuring the most efficient use of public money is of particular importance in view of the budgetary problems encountered in many Member States. One should also not forget that transparent contract awarding practices are a proved safeguard against corruption and favouritism.

Yet, such contracts are still in many instances directly awarded to local providers without any competition. The European Court of Justice (ECJ) has confirmed in its case-law that the Internal Market rules of the EC Treaty apply also to contracts outside the scope of the Public Procurement Directives. On various occasions, Member States and stakeholders have asked the Commission for guidance on how they should apply the basic principles deriving from this case-law.

This interpretative communication addresses the two above mentioned groups of contracts not or only partially covered by the Public Procurement Directives ⁽³⁾. The Commission sheds light on its understanding of the ECJ case-law and suggests best practices in order to help the Member States to reap the full benefit of the Internal Market. This communication does not create any new legislative rules. It should be noted that, in any event, interpretation of Community law is ultimately the role of the ECJ.

1. LEGAL BACKGROUND**1.1. Rules and principles of the EC Treaty**

Contracting entities ⁽⁴⁾ from Member States have to comply with the **rules and principles of the EC Treaty** whenever they conclude public contracts falling into the scope of that Treaty. These principles include the **free movement of goods** (Article 28 of the EC Treaty), the **right of establishment** (Article 43), the **freedom to provide services** (Article 49), **non-discrimination and equal treatment, transparency, proportionality and mutual recognition**.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2004/18/EC, OJ L 134, 30.4.2004, p. 114 and Directive 2004/17/EC, OJ L 134, 30.4.2004, p. 1 ('the Public Procurement Directives').

⁽²⁾ Threshold values are set in Article 7 of Directive 2004/18/EC and Article 16 of Directive 2004/17/EC.

⁽³⁾ A third group of contracts not or only partially covered by the Directives are concessions. See Article 17 of Directive 2004/18/EC and Article 18 of Directive 2004/17/EC for service concessions and Articles 56 to 65 of Directive 2004/18/EC and Article 18 of Directive 2004/17/EC for works concessions. However, these are not discussed in this communication since they will be included in the follow-up to the Green Paper on Public Private Partnerships.

⁽⁴⁾ In this Communication the term 'contracting entity' covers both contracting authorities within the meaning of Article 1(9) of Directive 2004/18/EC and contracting entities within the meaning of Article 2 of Directive 2004/17/EC.

1.2. Basic standards for the award of contracts

The ECJ has developed a set of **basic standards for the award of public contracts** which are **derived directly from the rules and principles of the EC Treaty**. The principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination on grounds of nationality imply an **obligation of transparency** which, according to the ECJ case-law ⁽¹⁾, 'consists in ensuring, for the benefit of any potential tenderer, **a degree of advertising sufficient to enable the services market to be opened up to competition and the impartiality of the procedures to be reviewed**' ⁽²⁾.

These standards apply to the award of services concessions, to contracts below the thresholds ⁽³⁾ and to contracts for services listed in Annex II B to Directive 2004/18/EC and in Annex XVII B to Directive 2004/17/EC in respect of issues not dealt with by these Directives ⁽⁴⁾. The ECJ stated explicitly that **'although certain contracts are excluded from the scope of the Community directives in the field of public procurement, the contracting authorities which conclude them are nevertheless bound to comply with the fundamental rules of the Treaty'** ⁽⁵⁾.

1.3. Relevance to the Internal Market

The standards derived from the EC Treaty apply only to contract awards having a sufficient connection with the functioning of the Internal Market. In this regard, the ECJ considered that in individual cases, *'because of special circumstances, such as a very modest economic interest at stake'*, a contract award would be of **no interest to economic operators located in other Member States**. In such a case, *'the effects on the fundamental freedoms are ... to be regarded as too uncertain and indirect'* to warrant the application of standards derived from primary Community law ⁽⁶⁾.

It is the responsibility of the individual contracting entities to decide whether an intended contract award **might potentially be of interest to economic operators located in other Member States**. In the view of the Commission, this decision has to be based on an **evaluation of the individual circumstances of the case**, such as the subject-matter of the contract, its estimated value, the specifics of the sector concerned (size and structure of the market, commercial practices, etc.) and the geographic location of the place of performance.

If the contracting entity comes to the conclusion that the contract in question is relevant to the Internal Market, it has to award it in conformity with the basic standards derived from Community law.

When the Commission becomes aware of a potential violation of the basic standards for the award of public contracts not covered by the Public Procurement Directives, it will **assess the Internal Market relevance of the contract in question in the light of the individual circumstances of each case**. Infringement proceedings under Article 226 EC Treaty will be opened only in cases where **this appears appropriate in view of the gravity of the infringement and its impact on the Internal Market**.

2. BASIC STANDARDS FOR THE AWARD OF CONTRACTS RELEVANT TO THE INTERNAL MARKET

2.1. Advertising

2.1.1. Obligation to ensure adequate advertising

According to the ECJ ⁽⁷⁾, the principles of equal treatment and of non-discrimination imply an **obligation of transparency** which consists in ensuring, for the benefit of any potential tenderer, **a degree of advertising sufficient to enable the market to be opened up to competition**.

The obligation of transparency requires that an **undertaking located in another Member State has access to appropriate information regarding the contract before it is awarded**, so that, if it so wishes, it would be **in a position to express its interest** in obtaining that contract ⁽⁸⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Cases C-324/98, Telaustria, [2000] ECR I-10745, paragraph 62, C-231/03, Coname, judgment of 21.7.2005, paragraphs 16 to 19 and C-458/03, Parking Brixen, judgment of 13.10.2005, paragraph 49.

⁽²⁾ Telaustria case, paragraph 62 and Parking Brixen case, paragraph 49 (emphasis added).

⁽³⁾ See Cases C-59/00, Bent Moustén Vestergaard [2001] ECR I-9505, paragraph 20 and C-264/03, Commission v France, judgment of 20.10.2005, paragraphs 32 and 33.

⁽⁴⁾ Case C-234/03, Contse, judgment of 27.10.2005, paragraphs 47 to 49. The Public Procurement Directives provide only a limited set of rules for these contracts, see Article 21 of Directive 2004/18/EC and Article 32 of Directive 2004/17/EC.

⁽⁵⁾ Bent Moustén Vestergaard case, paragraph 20 (emphasis added).

⁽⁶⁾ Coname case, paragraph 20 (emphasis added).

⁽⁷⁾ Telaustria case, paragraph 62 and Parking Brixen case, paragraph 49.

⁽⁸⁾ Coname case, paragraph 21.

The Commission is of the view that the practice of contacting a number of potential tenderers would not be sufficient in this respect, even if the contracting entity includes undertakings from other Member States or attempts to reach all potential suppliers. Such a selective approach cannot exclude discrimination against potential tenderers from other Member States, in particular new entrants to the market. The same applies to all forms of 'passive' publicity where a contracting entity abstains from active advertising but replies to requests for information from applicants who found out by their own means about the intended contract award. A simple reference to media reports, parliamentary or political debates or events such as congresses for information would likewise not constitute adequate advertising.

Therefore, the only way that the requirements laid down by the ECJ can be met is by **publication of a sufficiently accessible advertisement prior to the award of the contract**. This advertisement should be **published by the contracting entity in order to open the contract award to competition**.

2.1.2. Means of advertising

The contracting entities are responsible for deciding the most appropriate medium for advertising their contracts. Their choice should be guided by an assessment of the **relevance of the contract to the Internal Market**, in particular in view of its subject-matter and value and of the customary practices in the relevant sector.

The greater the interest of the contract to potential bidders from other Member States, the wider the coverage should be. In particular, adequate transparency for contracts for services listed in Annex II B to Directive 2004/18/EC and in Annex XVII B to Directive 2004/17/EC that exceed the thresholds for application of these Directives will typically require publication in a medium with wide coverage.

Adequate and commonly used means of publication include:

— Internet

The wide availability and ease of use of the World Wide Web makes contract advertisements on websites far more accessible, especially for undertakings from other Member States and for SMEs looking for smaller contracts. The Internet offers a large choice of possibilities for advertising of public contracts:

Advertisements on **the contracting entity's own website** are flexible and cost-effective. They should be presented in a way that potential bidders can easily become aware of the information. Contracting entities might also consider publishing information on forthcoming contract awards not covered by the Public Procurement Directives as part of their **buyer profile** on the Internet ⁽¹⁾.

Portal websites specifically created for contract advertisements have a higher visibility and can offer increased search options. In this respect, the setting-up of a specific platform for low value contracts with a directory for contract notices with subscription for e-mail constitutes a best practice, making full use of the Internet's possibilities in order to increase transparency and efficiency ⁽²⁾.

— National Official Journals, national journals specialising in public procurement announcements, newspapers with national or regional coverage or specialist publications

— Local means of publication

Contracting entities may still use local means of publication such as local newspapers, municipal announcement journals or even notice boards. However, such means ensure only strictly local publication, which might be adequate in special cases, such as very small contracts for which there is only a local market.

— Official Journal of the European Union/TED (Tenders Electronic Daily)

Publication in the Official Journal is not mandatory but could be an interesting option, particularly for larger contracts.

⁽¹⁾ See Annex VIII to Directive 2004/18/EC and Annex XX to Directive 2004/17/EC.

⁽²⁾ See for instance the newly created opportunities portal for lower value contracts in the United Kingdom, www.supply2.gov.uk.

2.1.3. Content of advertising

The ECJ has explicitly stated that the requirement of transparency does not necessarily imply an obligation to hold a formal invitation to tender ⁽¹⁾. The advertisement may therefore be limited to a short description of the **essential details of the contract to be awarded and of the award method** together with an invitation to contact the contracting entity. If necessary, it might be completed by additional information available on the Internet or to be obtained upon request from the contracting authority.

The advertisement and any additional documentation should provide as much information as an undertaking from another Member State will **reasonably need to make a decision** on whether to express its interest in obtaining the contract.

As mentioned in point 2.2.2 below, the contracting entity may take measures to limit the number of applicants invited to submit an offer. In this case, the contracting entity should provide adequate information on the mechanisms applied to select the applicants shortlisted.

2.1.4. Procedures without prior publication of an advertisement

The Public Procurement Directives contain specific derogations allowing, under certain conditions, procedures without prior publication of an advertisement ⁽²⁾. The most important cases concern situations of **extreme urgency** due to unforeseeable events and contracts which may, for technical or artistic reasons or for reasons connected with the protection of exclusive rights, be **executed only by one particular economic operator**.

In the view of the Commission, the relevant derogations may be applied to the award of contracts not covered by the Directives. Therefore, contracting entities may award such contracts without publishing a prior advertising, provided they meet the conditions laid down in the Directives for one of the derogations ⁽³⁾.

2.2. Contract award

2.2.1. Principles

The ECJ stated in the *Telaustria* judgment that the obligation of transparency consists in ensuring, for the benefit of any potential tenderer, a degree of advertising sufficient to enable the market to be opened up to competition and the **impartiality of the procedures** to be reviewed. The guarantee of a fair and impartial procedure is the necessary corollary of the obligation to ensure a transparent advertising.

It follows that the award has to be in line with the **rules and principles of the EC Treaty** so as to afford fair conditions of competition to all economic operators interested in the contract ⁽⁴⁾. This can be best achieved in practice through:

— Non-discriminatory description of the subject-matter of the contract

The description of the characteristics required of a product or service should not refer to a specific make or source, or a particular process, or to trade marks, patents, types or a specific origin or production unless such a reference is justified by the subject-matter of the contract and accompanied by the words 'or equivalent' ⁽⁵⁾. In any case, it would be preferable to use more general descriptions of performance or functions.

⁽¹⁾ Coname case, paragraph 21.

⁽²⁾ Article 31 of Directive 2004/18/EC and Article 40(3) of Directive 2004/17/EC.

⁽³⁾ See Opinion of Advocate General Jacobs in Case C-525/03, *Commission v Italy*, paragraphs 46 to 48.

⁽⁴⁾ See Case C-470/99, *Universale-Bau AG*, [2002] ECR I-11617, paragraph 93.

⁽⁵⁾ See *Bent Moustén Vestergaard* case, paragraphs 21 to 24 and Commission interpretative communication on facilitating the access of products to the markets of other Member States, OJ C 265, 4.11.2003, p. 2. Contracts for services listed in Annex II B to Directive 2004/18/EC and in Annex XVII B to Directive 2004/17/EC have to comply with the rules on technical specifications in Article 23 of Directive 2004/18/EC and in Article 34 of Directive 2004/17/EC if they exceed the threshold for application of these Directives. Technical specifications for such contracts have to be established prior to selection of a contractor and must be made known or available to potential bidders by means that ensure transparency and place all potential bidders on equal footing, see Opinion of Advocate General Jacobs in Case C-174/03, *Impresa Portuale di Cagliari*, paragraphs 76 to 78.

- Equal access for economic operators from all Member States

Contracting entities should not impose **conditions causing direct or indirect discrimination** against potential tenderers in other Member States, such as the requirement that undertakings interested in the contract must be established in the same Member State or region as the contracting entity ⁽¹⁾.

- Mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications

If applicants or tenderers are required to submit certificates, diplomas or other forms of written evidence, documents from other Member States offering an equivalent level of guarantee have to be accepted in accordance with the principle of mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications.

- Appropriate time-limits

Time-limits for expression of interest and for submission of offers should be long enough to allow undertakings from other Member States to make a meaningful assessment and prepare their offer.

- Transparent and objective approach

All participants must be able to know the applicable rules in advance and must have the certainty that these rules apply to everybody in the same way.

2.2.2. *Limit on the number of applicants invited to submit an offer*

Contracting entities may take measures to limit the number of applicants to an appropriate level, provided this is done in a **transparent and non-discriminatory manner**. They can, for instance, apply **objective factors** such as the experience of the applicants in the sector concerned, the size and infrastructure of their business, their technical and professional abilities or other factors. They may even opt for **drawing lots**, either exclusively or in combination with other selection criteria. In any event, the **number of applicants shortlisted** shall take account of the need to ensure adequate competition.

Alternatively, contracting entities might consider **qualification systems** where a **list of qualified operators** is compiled by means of a sufficiently advertised, transparent and open procedure. Later, for the award of individual contracts falling within the scope of the system, the contracting entity may select the operators to be invited to submit an offer from the list of qualified operators on a non-discriminatory basis (e.g. by drawing in rotation from the list).

2.2.3. *Contract award decision*

It is important that the final decision awarding the contract complies with the procedural rules laid down at the outset and that **the principles of non-discrimination and equal treatment are fully respected**. This is particularly relevant to procedures providing for negotiation with shortlisted tenderers. Such negotiations should be organised in a way that gives all tenderers access to the same amount of information and excludes any unjustified advantages for a specific tenderer.

2.3. **Judicial protection**

2.3.1. *Principles*

In the *Telaustria* judgment the ECJ stressed the importance of the possibility to **review the impartiality of the procedure**. Without an adequate review mechanism, compliance with the basic standards of fairness and transparency cannot be effectively guaranteed.

⁽¹⁾ However, the successful tenderer may be required to establish certain business infrastructure at the place of performance if this is justified by the specific circumstances of the contract.

2.3.2. Directives on review procedures

The Directives on review procedures ⁽¹⁾ cover only contracts falling within the scope of the Public Procurement Directives ⁽²⁾. This means that in the present context they apply only to contracts for services listed in Annex II B to Directive 2004/18/EC and in Annex XVII B to Directive 2004/17/EC which exceed the thresholds for application of these Directives. Review procedures for such contracts have to comply with the Directives on review procedures and the relevant case-law. These principles remain unchanged in the recently adopted proposal for a new Directive on review procedures ⁽³⁾.

2.3.3. Basic standards derived from primary Community law

With regard to contracts below the thresholds for application of the Public Procurement Directives it has to be taken into account that under ECJ case-law ⁽⁴⁾ individuals are entitled to **effective judicial protection of the rights they derive from the Community legal order**. The right to such protection is one of the general principles of law stemming from the constitutional traditions common to the Member States. In the absence of relevant Community law provisions, it is up to the Member States to provide the necessary rules and procedures guaranteeing effective judicial protection.

In order to comply with this requirement of effective judicial protection, at least **decisions adversely affecting a person having or having had an interest in obtaining the contract**, such as any decision to eliminate an applicant or tenderer, should be subject to review for possible violations of the basic standards derived from primary Community law. To allow for an effective exercise of the right to such a review, contracting entities should state the grounds for decisions which are open to review either in the decision itself or upon request after communication of the decision ⁽⁵⁾.

In accordance with the case-law on judicial protection, the available **remedies** must not be less efficient than those applying to similar claims based on domestic law (principle of equivalence) and must not be such as in practice to make it impossible or excessively difficult to obtain judicial protection (principle of effectiveness) ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 89/665/EEC, OJ L 395, 30.12.1989, p. 33 and Directive 92/13/EEC, OJ L 76, 23.3.1992, p. 14.

⁽²⁾ See Article 72 of Directive 2004/17 and Article 81 of Directive 2004/18.

⁽³⁾ Commission Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Directives 89/665/EEC and 92/13/EEC with regard to improving the effectiveness of review procedures concerning the award of public contracts, COM(2006) 195 final.

⁽⁴⁾ See Case C-50/00, Unión de Pequeños Agricultores, [2002] ECR I-6677, paragraph 39 and Case 222/86, Heylens, [1987] ECR 4097, paragraph 14.

⁽⁵⁾ See Heylens case, paragraph 15.

⁽⁶⁾ See for this principle Cases C-46/93 and C-48/93, Brasserie du Pêcheur, [1996] ECR I-1029, paragraph 83 and Case C-327/00, Santex, [2003] ECR I-1877, paragraph 55.

Publication of decisions by Member States to grant or revoke operating licenses pursuant to Article 13(4) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2407/92 on licensing of air carriers ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾

(2006/C 179/03)

(Text with EEA relevance)

AUSTRIA

Operating licences granted

Category A: *Operating licences without the restriction of Article 5(7)(a) of Regulation (EEC) No 2407/92*

Name of air carrier	Address of air carrier	Permitted to carry	Decision effective since
VistaJet Luftfahrtunternehmen mbH	Sterneckstraße 31 A-5020 Salzburg	passengers, mail, cargo	9.6.2006

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 240, 24.8.1992, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Communicated to the European Commission before 31.8.2005.

Information communicated by Member States regarding State aid granted under Commission Regulation (EC) No 70/2001 of 12 January 2001 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the EC Treaty to State aid to small and medium-sized enterprises

(2006/C 179/04)

(Text with EEA relevance)

Aid No	XS 149/05		
Member State	United Kingdom		
Region	UK wide		
Title of aid scheme or name of company receiving individual aid	The Micro and Nanotechnology Capital Project Fund		
Legal basis	Section 5 of the Science and Technology Act 1965		
Annual expenditure planned under the scheme or overall amount of individual aid granted to the company	Aid scheme	Annual overall amount	GBP 8 million
		Loans guaranteed	
	Individual aid	Overall aid amount	
		Loans guaranteed	
Maximum aid intensity	In conformity with Articles 4(2)-(6) and 5 of the Regulation	Yes	
Date of implementation	From 15.8.2005		
Duration of scheme or individual aid award	Until 31.12.2006		
Objective of aid	Aid to SMEs	Yes	
Economic sectors concerned	All sectors eligible for aid to SMEs	Yes	
Name and address of the granting authority	Name: The Department of Trade and Industry		
	Address: 151 Buckingham Palace Road London SW1W 9SS United Kingdom		
Large individual aid grants	In conformity with Article 6 of the Regulation	Yes	

Withdrawal of notification of a concentration**(Case COMP/M.4009 — CIMC/Burg)**

(2006/C 179/05)

COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 139/2004

On 6 February 2006, the Commission of the European Communities received notification of a proposed concentration between China International Marine Containers CO., Ltd. and Burg Industries B.V. On 20 July 2006, the notifying parties informed the Commission that they withdrew their notification.

Prior notification of a concentration
(Case COMP/M.4305 — Nokia/Giesecke & Devrient)

Candidate case for simplified procedure

(2006/C 179/06)

(Text with EEA relevance)

1. On 24 July 2006, the Commission received a notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ⁽¹⁾ by which the undertakings Nokia Corporation ('Nokia', Finland) and Giesecke & Devrient ('G&D', Germany) acquire within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Council Regulation joint control of a newly created company constituting a joint venture ('Trustonic', Finland) by way of purchase of shares.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

- for Nokia: supply of mobile devices and telecommunications networks;
- for G&D: supply of banknotes and smart cards;
- for Trustonic: provision of services enabling the management of consumer applications to mobile devices.

3. On preliminary examination, the Commission finds that the notified transaction could fall within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 139/2004. However, the final decision on this point is reserved. Pursuant to the Commission Notice on a simplified procedure for treatment of certain concentrations under Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ⁽²⁾ it should be noted that this case is a candidate for treatment under the procedure set out in the Notice.

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

Observations must reach the Commission not later than 10 days following the date of this publication. Observations can be sent to the Commission by fax (No (32-2) 296 43 01 or 296 72 44) or by post, under reference number COMP/M.4305 — Nokia/Giesecke & Devrient, to the following address:

European Commission
Directorate-General for Competition
Merger Registry
J-70
B-1049 Brussels

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ C 56, 5.3.2005, p. 32.

Non-opposition to a notified concentration
(Case COMP/M.4262 — Carlyle/Vista/Turmed)

(2006/C 179/07)

(Text with EEA relevance)

On 20 July 2006, 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 (EC) No 139/2004. 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:

- from the Europa competition website (<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/mergers/cases/>). This website provides various facilities to help locate individual merger decisions, including company, case number, date and sectoral indexes.
- in electronic form on the EUR-Lex website under document number 32006M4262. EUR-Lex is the on-line access to European law. (<http://ec.europa.eu/eur-lex/lex>)

Non-opposition to a notified concentration
(Case COMP/M.4278 — PAI Partners SAS/AMEC SPIE SA)

(2006/C 179/08)

(Text with EEA relevance)

On 20 July 2006, 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 (EC) No 139/2004. 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:

- from the Europa competition website (<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/mergers/cases/>). This website provides various facilities to help locate individual merger decisions, including company, case number, date and sectoral indexes.
 - in electronic form on the EUR-Lex website under document number 32006M4278. EUR-Lex is the on-line access to European law. (<http://ec.europa.eu/eur-lex/lex>)
-

Non-opposition to a notified concentration
(Case COMP/M.4233 — BP France/Vitogaz/Energaz JV)

(2006/C 179/09)

(Text with EEA relevance)

On 10 July 2006, 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 (EC) No 139/2004. 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:

- from the Europa competition website (<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/mergers/cases/>). This website provides various facilities to help locate individual merger decisions, including company, case number, date and sectoral indexes.
 - in electronic form on the EUR-Lex website under document number 32006M4233. EUR-Lex is the on-line access to European law. (<http://ec.europa.eu/eur-lex/lex>)
-