UACES 46th Annual Conference

London, 5-7 September 2016

www.uaces.org

Dr. rer. pol. Sonja Witte

Head of Brussels office oft he

German Association of Local Public Utilities (VKU)

9-31, Avenue des Nerviens

1040 Bruxelles

Belgium

0049-(0)170-8580-125

witte@vku.de

about 7,000 words

LOCAL GOVENRMENT INTEREST REPRESENTATION:

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT IN EU REGULATORY POLICY

by Dr. Sonja Witte

LOCAL GOVENRMENT INTEREST RESPRESENTATION:

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT IN EU REGULATORY POLICY

by Dr. Sonja Witte

ABSTRACT

Local governments in Europe are highly impacted by EU regulatory policy. A lot of scientific work has been done in order to analyse the Europeanization of local governments when it comes to the implementation of EU policy. However, this is not supposed to be the focus of this paper. This paper applies a bottom-up approach while looking at the opportunities local governments have to impact themselves on European (regulatory) policy. In these terms the institutional context as invented by Mayntz/ Scharpf (1995) and Scharpf (2000) and their heuristic approach of the actor-centred institutionalism will be applied in order to give an opinion about the possibilities and restrictions local government associations face in case they want to impact on EU (regulatory) policy. An evaluation of the last 20 years of EU regulatory policy will be outlined while drawing a picture of the institutional context local and regional authorities are confronted with when trying to influence EU policy making.

Key words: Local Government, European Union, interest representation, regulatory policy, institutional context, services of general interest

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND THE EUROPEAN SINGLE MARKET

The Single European Act that entered into force 1 July 1987 put in place the prerequisites for the European Single Market. Since that time it is the overall goal of European policy and especially of European regulatory policy to fully implement the so called four fundamental freedoms (i.e. to guarantee the free movement of goods, capital, services and people). The current EU wide and worldwide financial and economic crisis does not seem to have changed this kind of approach. It is still the implementation of the European Single Market that the EU institutions look at when discussing about how to solve this crises. Just when the crisis hit its zenith in 2011 and again in 2012 the European Commission proposed its Single Market Acts I and II in order to complete the European Single Market while proposing a set of legislative and non-legislative initiatives especially in the field of public procurement policy. And the European Council in its conclusions on 29 June 2012 pronounced that for growth and competitiveness it was necessary to further open up network industries (such as water and energy) (EUCO, 2012: 76/12:8).

Local governments in Europe are highly impacted by EU regulatory policy. A lot of scientific work has been done in order to analyse the Europeanization of local governments when it comes to the implementation of EU policy (see Schäfer (1998), Ambrosius (2000/2001), Steckert (2002), Wollmann (2002 and 2014), Cox (2003), Bogumil (2009) in order to just mention some authors). However, this is not supposed to be the focus of this paper. This paper does not apply a top-down approach, i.e. in analysing what impact the European Union does have on local governments but this paper applies a bottom-up approach while looking at the opportunities local governments have to impact themselves

on European (regulatory) policy. In these terms the institutional context as invented by Mayntz/ Scharpf (1995) and Scharpf (2000) and their heuristic approach of the actor-centred institutionalism will be applied in order to give an opinion about the possibilities and restrictions local government associations face in case they want to impact on EU (regulatory) policy. The actor-centred institutionalism assumes that political decisions are the result of interactions between individual, collective and corporative actors that are influenced by the institutional context they are confronted with. The results of political decisions are understood as the results of the targeted actions of the actors under the conditions of the given institutional framework (Scharpf, 2000: 75 – 85).

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT IN EU REGULATORY POLICY

When applying the heuristic approach of Mayntz and Scharpf with the aim of making a statement about the institutional context in EU regulatory policy there are several variables that have to be looked at. First there are the actors involved in the policy-making process. Those actor's preferences, resources and – most important – their institutional rights and competences have to be analysed. Second there are the constellations meaning an analysis of the political arena and the strategies the actors do apply in order to achieve their aims. And third there are the forms of interactions that are applied by the actors. Actors can act hierarchical, unidirectional, via negotiations or qualified majority (Scharpf, 2000: 85-94). In these terms the following chapters will analyse the local and regional actors as well as the three legislative organizations of the EU, i.e. the EU Commission, the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers.

THE ACTORS – EU REGULATORY POLICY 1992-2012

The Single European Act aimed at completing an EU internal market in 1992. That is why the European Union celebrated the 20th anniversary of the Single Market in 2012. For the *local and regional authorities* this meant that in principal all their activities have to comply with internal market and competition rules. Especially concerning the provision of so called Services of General Interest (SGI) there is always the question how to provide them both in an efficient way compatible with the EU internal market on one hand side and universally accessible and affordable on the other hand. Furthermore there is the question where to draw the line between the citizen's value and the shareholder value of a competitive market, while at the same time taking into account the different traditions of local and regional self-government. That is why for local and regional authorities in the European Union the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty on 1 December 2009 marked an important step. For the first time ever the Lisbon Treaty laid down in EU primary law the right of regional and local self-government (Article 4 of the Treaty on the European Union/ TEU). In the attachment to the Treaty there is a new protocol no. 26 on Services of General Interest that acknowledges "the shared values of the Union in respect of services of general economic interest […] in particular the essential role and the wide discretion of national, regional and local authorities in providing, commissioning and organizing services of general economic interest as closely as possible to the needs of the users […]".

Local governments are the grantors and often also the providers of Services of General Interest (SGI). A huge variety of SGI are provided in the member states of the European Union. The range goes from water and energy supply, to waste water and waste disposal, public transport, social housing or broadband services. It is especially the provision of

local and regional SGI that often faces tensions when it comes to EU regulatory policy. On one hand Article 26(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) clearly states *"The internal market shall comprise an area without internal frontiers in which the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital is ensured in accordance with the provisions of the Treaties"*. On the other hand Article 4 TEU and protocol no. 26 confirm the freedom of choice of national, regional and local authorities to organize SGI amongst their priorities. The interest of local and regional entities in European policy making is to make their services compatible with the internal market and competition rules or even the other way round that is to make internal market and competition rules compatible with their freedom of choice. The area of conflict between local entities' competences of self-provision of SGI on the one hand and the European interest of the completion of the Single Market on the other hand can only be solved politically.

How this is done can be explained by having a look at the other three actors being involved in this discussion i.e. the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers especially analysing their views on the Services of General Interest with regard to the application of EU public procurement and competition policy. Especially the European Parliament and the European Commission reflect(ed) a lot about the place of Services of General Interest in the European Single Market. The European Parliament did start its discussions in the early 1990s. These discussions forced the EU Commission to come up with several documents on Services of General Interest in Europe that were issued in the years 1996 to 2007 (two communications (1996 and 2000), a report (2001), a communication (2002), a green paper (2003), a white paper (2004) and a communication (2007)) . After the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty on 1 December 2009 and its new articles on local and regional self-government and SGI, the discussion focussed merely on the question of the need for a European regulation on SGI foreseen by Article 14 TFEU.

These discussions came to an end in the EU Commission's communication of 2011 that stated that various public consultations and an on-going dialogue with stakeholders examined the need for legislation based on Article 14 TFEU. The consensus seemed to be that this was not an immediate priority. The Commission was therefore of the view that a sectorial approach is more appropriate (European Commission, 2011a: 5).

In order to judge the preferences and institutional rights of the *European Commission* the provisions in the Treaties do play an important role. The main task of the European Commission is to make sure that the Treaties are applied. In Article 17(1) TEU it says: *The Commission shall promote the general interest of the Union and take appropriate initiatives to that end. It shall ensure the application of the Treaties, and measures adopted by the institutions pursuant to them.* Furthermore, when it comes to the actual provision of Services of General Interest, the Treaties are neutral concerning the legal nature of the providers of SGI. This can be proofed by having a look at new article 14 TFEU that entered into force with the new Lisbon Treaty, and that has an impact on local and regional entities. Article 14 AEUV does foresee the possibility to regulate the provision of SGI with respect to their principles and prerequisites via the political instrument of one or several EU regulation(s). The focus of Article 14 TFEU is on the provision of certain SGI in a universal and affordable way no matter who provides them in the end. This perspective is different from some member states of the EU. Especially in Germany, Services of General Interest are often used synonymous with the term "Public Services". In Germany this implicitly means the provision of SGI by local and regional entities and their local public utilities. Germany, like for example France or the Nordic countries do not limit their municipalities and towns to the function of *granting* the provision of certain SGI but they are active themselves in *providing* these services. The Treaties of the European Union, however, do only look at the service itself and not at the provider(s). This means from a

European perspective it does not matter if the provider is public, private or public-private. The latter is of course important for the application of European regulatory policy especially public procurement and competition policy. The mixture of these two perspectives poses a lot of difficulties in the application of EU regulatory policy.

The vicious circle already becomes obvious in a communication on Services of General Interest in Europe that was issued by the European Commission in the year 1997 and is true still today. There it says in two successive sentences: "The Community's commitment to the European model of society is based on respect for the diversity of the organization general interest services in Europe, which is underpinned in two basic principles: neutrality as regards the public or private status of companies and their employees, as guaranteed by Article 222 of the Treaty […]; Member State's freedom to define what are general interest services, to grant the special or exclusive rights that are necessary to the companies responsible for providing them, regulate their management and, where appropriate, fund them, […]." (European Commission, 1997: 5).

Since the political aim of completing the EU Single Market is laid down in the Treaties it is first and foremost the goal of the EU Commission to propose actions to this end. That is what its policy proposals in EU regulatory policy are up for. This is first due to the fact that the aim of completing the Single Market is placed at an exponent place already in article 3(3) TEU. The right of local and regional self-government is not only numerically placed behind it (article 4 (2) TEU) but does also play a subordinate role in actual EU policy making as the following chapters will show. And second the EU Commission is rarely liable to anyone or anything else than the Treaties.

Furthermore critically analysed article 4 TEU does not institutionally guarantee the existence of local or regional self-governance but does only constitute the denomination to pay attention to it as far as it is existent in the different types of EU member states at all (Witte 2013: 129). This is totally different than for example in Germany where the German Federal Constitutional Court in its "Rastede" judgement (BVerfGE 79, 127) clearly defined and specified the core of the German local self-government. And last but not least even the principle of subsidiarity which is laid down in article 5(3) TEU does not imply a direct connection between the EU and the local or regional level but rather focusses on the relationship between the EU and the member states at national level.

Another problem that makes it difficult to really put Services of General Interest in relationship to the Internal Market and competition provisions is the very nature of these services. Nowhere neither in EU primary nor in EU secondary law there is a definition of the scope and the tasks of local or regional self-government and SGI. This is not astonishing at all, since there are that many different models amongst the almost 30 EU member states that it seems inappropriate to define this at European level. And even local and regional authorities do not want to have this question solved hierarchically by the EU institutions as the EU Commission's communication on A Quality Framework for Services of General Interest in Europe dating from 2011 shows: "*Various public consultations and an on-going dialogue with stakeholders will continue to examine the need for legislation based on Article 14 TFEU. The consensus at this stage seems to be that this not an immediate priority. The Commission is of the view that a sectoral approach, where tailor-made solutions can be found to concrete and specific problems in different sectors, is more appropriate at this stage."* (European Commission, 2011a: 5).

Having a look at the *European Parliament* also this institution in principal is neutral when it comes to the provision of SGI although it does see a special role of the public sector, when it comes to the provision of certain Services of General Interest. However, exactly in line with the Treaty's principal of neutrality the public sector shall only function as grantor for certain SGI. Especially when it comes to the provision, the European Parliament does not take a decision. This line of reasoning can be followed since the last 20 years of European regulatory policy making.

In a resolution on the role of the public sector in the completion of the internal market from 12 February 1993 the European Parliament states *„whereas it is the responsibility of the public sector to provide high-quality services (energy, water, transport, etc.) responsive to the needs of the population and in the general economic interest.*" (European Parliament, 1993: 160). This means that the European Parliament acknowledges a special role for the public sector when it comes to the provision of SGI. In a working document on public undertakings and public service activities in the European Union from 1996 the Parliament then discusses the border between EU action and freedom of national, regional and local entities. There it says: *„An agreement at European level on the general aim of maintaining a substantial level of public service is one thing. Another thing is to achieve that aim, i.e. choosing the means of attaining it. We are no longer dealing with public service as an abstract principle but public services in the practical sense of the term, such as they operate in the different sectors of the economy where they exist. This operation probably calls for a share of European decision-making but it is difficult to see how a great deal of leeway could not be left to Member States given the very strong attachment of many countries to their traditions and achievements in this field. The share-out of powers between European and national levels must, therefore, take into account as much as possible the principle of subsidiarity, which means that it will vary from sector to sector.*

Those sectors which are mainly organized at local level, for example water distribution and refuse collection, will have to remain within national powers. On the other hand, those reliant on strong centralization to be properly run, such railways or postal services, might be suitable for a sizeable share of European intervention" (European Parliament, 1996a: 187). Practical EU policy making has shown that nowadays also water distribution has become a focus of EU regulatory policy (see EU Commission's proposal on concessions from December 2011).

In a resolution on the communication from the Commission on services of general interest in Europe [COM(96)0443] issued in 1997 it says in recital I: *"whereas the notion and reality of public services is thus not linked with the organisation, control and ownership of its operators and cannot in particular be confused with public undertaking"*.

This means that the European Parliament does see the necessity of providing some essential SGI in a universal and affordable manner. Concerning the legal nature, however (public, private, public-private) it applies the principal of neutrality out of the EU primary law.

In order to underline these detections it should be referred to the report of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy on the XXV report by the Commission on competition policy issued 15 October 1996. In this report it says in point 16: The Parliament *„recommends the incorporation into Art 3 of the Treaty of a clause on the universal availability of basic services, regardless of whether the provider or producer of such services belongs to the public or private sector"*. In the explanatory statement to the report it is furthermore stated *„In examining this subject we must avoid ideological dogma. The public sector is not a bad thing in itself nor is private enterprise a panacea.*

Not all private companies are efficient nor can public enterprises always be identified with the general interest. There are inefficient public-sector firms but also many inefficient private companies. It should be borne in mind that some public-sector undertakings are at the forefront of the European economy, have experienced significant growth in recent years, adhere scrupulously to the criteria of Community competition policy and generate profits for the State and hence for the public and the taxpayer. Thus, when viable public sector companies are privatized, the decision to privatize must be based on economic objectives of industrial policy and competitiveness and not on the mere desire to reduce deficits.“ In part IV of the explanatory statement on the place of public services in Europe it finally says *„Finally, your rapporteur would like to point out that the private sector is not necessarily a universal panacea and that, for example, the body responsible for regulating the British privatized water market employs more staff than the previous government department: it is in fact the operations of both public and private bureaucracies that need to be called in question and not just the public sector as such.“* (European Parliament, 1996 b)

These discussions then returned to the agenda since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. In this context it has been heavily discussed if there was a need for an EU wide regulation on SGI as the new Article 14 TFEU allows for now. Nonetheless as already indicated earlier, the majority of the stakeholders, including local and regional authorities, as well as the EU institutions do not think that this would bring an added value to the diverse forms of SGI in the member states and thus concentrate on sectorial legislation in this field. One of these initiatives is the directive on concessions this article will focus on later.

Coming to the *Council of Ministers* it is of course hard to define one single common interest in respect to the recognition of local and regional self-government as there are nearly 30 EU member states with very different forms of local and regional self-government and very different views on the provision of SGI. In each and every member state there is of course a local and regional level being more or less responsible for certain SGI. In all national legal systems – except for Great Britain, Latvia and Hungary – one can find a constitutional anchor of local and regional self-government. And in Latvia and Hungary it is at least laid down in secondary national law. However, there are huge differences between the member states when it comes to the practical implementation of this self-government. This is especially true when looking at the political and financial competences of local and regional authorities. The right for example to govern all affairs of the local community in its own responsibility (called Allzuständigkeit in Germany) is only found in Sweden, Finland, Germany and partly in Belgium and Austria. In most of the other member states local and regional entities do only execute the tasks that have been transferred to them by the national government (Witte, 2013: 130). The financial autonomy of local and regional authorities also differs very much amongst the EU member states. Again the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Finland, Sweden) as well as Germany and Austria do have the greatest financial competences which means that they have their own taxes and do not only depend on the money which is transferred to them by the national government. In some other member states there are just rare financial competences meaning that local and regional authorities do have some own financial resources but more than half of the money comes from the national government, like in Estonia, Croatia, Poland, Rumania, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Ireland and Luxemburg. And in the rest of the member states local and regional authorities do not have any financial competences that would allow for an actual implementation of self-government (Witte, 2013: 79-102). Furthermore the data for Greece, Italy, Portugal and

Ireland have been conducted before the Troika of the European Union implemented heavy budget constraints on all public authorities in these states. Regardless of the different traditions of SGI in the member states, the Council of the EU over and over again emphasises the Single Market as THE tool for fostering growth and jobs in the EU. This is all the more true since the world-wide financial and economic crises hit the EU. In its conclusions of the European Council in March 2011 it says for example “The Single Market has a key role to play to deliver growth and employment and promote competitiveness […] Particular emphasis should be laid on measures which create growth and jobs and bring tangible results to citizens and businesses." (EUCO, 2011: 10/1/11, paragraph 7). And in its conclusions on 29 June 2012 the European Council pronounced that for growth and competitiveness it was necessary to further open up network industries (EUCO, 2012: 76/12:8).

CONCLUSIONS ON THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT OF EU REGULATROY POLICY

The discussions in the EU Parliament and the EU Commission about SGI as well as the European policy making processes show a clear picture of the institutional context in EU regulatory policy. It becomes clear that there is one dominating variable that determines the decision making process: the completion of the European Single Market. This can be proofed by several facts. First, by the provisions in the EU primary law, second, by the very (different) nature of SGI themselves and third, by the role and the self-understanding of the EU institutions.

The political aim of the completion of the Single Market is located at an exponent place in the TEU. The right of local and regional self-government is not only numerically placed behind it but does also play a subordinate role in actual EU policy making. Since there are that many different concepts of local and regional self-government and SGI it is almost impossible to find common denominators that can be identified in a first step by local and regional authorities and that can then have an impact on qualified majority voting in the Council of Ministers or the European Parliament. Thus, for local and regional authorities the possibilities to impact on EU regulatory policy are quite rare. They will only be successful if they manage to make their interests part of the common interest of a majority of member states or members of the European Parliament. For some sectors of services of general interest the internal market has already led to huge transformations. This is for example true for telecommunications, public transport or energy. There are not many sectors that still lack sector specific legislation. This is for example the case in waste management as well as in water and waste water management. Those sectors are quite sensitive when it comes to the assessment by the public. That is why it seems quite risky for the EU Commission to propose a directive on the offensive opening up of the water sector for example like it did in the energy sector with its first liberalisation directives for electricity in 1996 and for gas in 1998 which were followed by a second liberalisation package in 2003 and a third in 2007. In the energy sector the directives did proactively aim at opening the market and were hence labelled alike. This is however, not possible in the water sector, like a current example just showed. For the sake of completeness of the analysis the article will shortly focus on this issue as it serves as an example where the EU Commission could not push through its original policy proposal even if the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament have been on its side until almost the end of the political debate.

EXCURSION ON THE LIBERALISATION OF THE EU WATER SECTOR

Since the EU Commission knew it would be faced with heavy opposition when offensively liberalising the water sector, it chose a way through the 'back door' while trying to apply stronger rules in terms of public procurement. This was the proposal for a directive on the award of concession contracts (COM(2011)897 final). However, nevertheless, this attempt still evoked heavy opposition amongst the EU citizens and also amongst some local and regional authorities in Europe that had a long-standing tradition of local self-government and a model of the water sector that is characterized by the self-provision of water supply managed by multi-utility public enterprises.

Concessions are usually understood to be cooperations between a public authority and a private partner, where the latter bears risks that are traditionally borne by the public sector and often contributes to financing the project. (European Commission, 2008: 1). Those kinds of cooperation are often found in the water sector. So far EU regulatory policy did not regulate the EU water sector via sector specific policies. Furthermore concessions have so far not been subject to EU regulatory policy. Although there has been EU primary law in force asking for a certain amount of non-discrimination, transparency and equal treatment when awarding concessions such a directive would implement a new dimension of procurement rules on local and regional authorities. Therefore especially the German local and regional authorities as well as those from Austria and the Netherlands heavily opposed against this kind of legislation. In their opinion this kind of approach was not necessary at all and would impose a liberalization of the water sector through the back-door (Verband kommunaler Unternehmen, 2011). Furthermore the water sector in these

member states is organized quite fragmented (Germany does have for example around 6.000 water suppliers (Association of Drinking Water from Reservoirs et. al., 2001: 34)) and is mostly provided by local public entities in the frame of the local and regional self-government. When putting these local utilities into the market with big national and international actors municipalities feared to lose their contracts and with it the control of their water management. As a consequence local and regional entities in Germany and Austria asked for an exemption of the whole water sector out of the directive (Verband kommunaler Unternehmen, 2012/ Österreichischer Städtebund, 2012).

However, this would have been without political effect if there would not have been a 'window of opportunity' made possible by two political circumstances. First, the fact that Germany was only some months before its Bundestag elections (in September 2013) and second, the first successful European Citizen's Initiative. 1,5 million citizens signed the initiative "Right2Water" that promoted water as a public good and stated that water supply and management of water resources should not be subject to 'internal market rules' and water services should be excluded from liberalization. (see www.right2water.eu). The connection to the German Bundestag elections becomes clear when noticing that almost one million out of 1,5 million signatures have been collected in Germany. That is why the German federal government got nervous when half a year before the elections the Citizen's Initiative announced that it successfully gathered the requested amount of signatures in the requested amount of EU member states (Ver.di 2013). Chancellor Angela Merkel feared that this topic could negatively impact her election campaign and only then asked its Minister of Economic Affairs to find a solution for the German water sector in the Brussels negotiations. In parallel to this fact she declared at the general assembly of the German Association of Cities that out of her point of view she would prefer to exclude the water sector out of the directive. (Deutscher Städtetag 2013). This has already been the position

of her party since a party congress in December 2012, however the responsible Minister of Economic Affairs, coming from the liberal part of the coalition, did not turn this decision into praxis in Brussels. This only changed after the heavy opposition coming from the German citizens. Also the EU Commission was faced with the first ever successful EU Citizen's initiative, a new instrument that entered into force with the Lisbon Treaty (Article 11(4) TEU) in order to activate the EU citizenship and motivate EU citizens to get involved into EU policy making. In the end the EU Commissioner for Internal Market, Michel Barnier, felt forced to make an official press statement in June 2013 that "the best solution now appears to be to remove water from the scope of the concessions directive" (Barnier 2013). Although technically spoken at this stage of political debate the EU Commission could not take such a position, the European Parliament and the Council did have rare chances to oppose this proposal after the official press statement made by Barnier.

What consequences can be drawn from the findings above? What do these findings mean for the future provision of SGI and the role of local and regional authorities in EU regulatory policy?

CONSEQUENCES – TREND TO REGIONAL STRUCTURES

Local and regional authorities will have to accept that their activities – especially those of the majority of their local public utilities – are subject to the EU internal market and

competition rules. For local and regional authorities and their local public enterprises this means that in order to face EU wide competition they will have to organise themselves more regionally. Small entities will have to merge to regional structures in order to be able to compete with other actors. Such developments can already be observed in the energy sector in Germany, for example, which has been subject to EU liberalisation policy since the beginning of the 1990s. Cooperations will also play a more important role. Local and regional structures do have a future in EU policy making, they will however look different than 20 years ago. They will be organised more regionally and they will have to align their activities to the rules of the Single Market.

The concessions directive might be an example that the EU does not always succeed to push internal market and competition rules forward. However, the example does also show the variables that have to be given in case of opposition, namely a very sensitive political topic (i.e. water), a huge amount of EU citizens opposing an initiative (i.e. public awareness), at least one big member state of the EU heavily opposing to a legislation (i.e. activation of the Council of Ministers) and also a second institution (either EU Commission of European Parliament) taking the initiative to change contents. The water example therefore has to be seen as a non-representative example for the institutional context of EU regulatory policy and local governments in the European Single Market.

The norm is mentioned in the chapters before. However, if this development is always in line with the aim of the EU to get closer to the European citizens and to solve the democratic deficit may be questioned. Especially in times of the financial and economic crises people tend to trust most their organizations being active at regional or even local level. This has for example been a result of a Eurobarometer survey from February 2009. According to this survey, local and regional entities are judged as the most credible

administrative units in Europe. Whereas just one third (34 percent) of the people of the European Union trust their national government, half of them (50 percent) declared that they trust their local and regional entities most. Equal findings were made by the former Commissioner Mario Monti who has been entrusted by Commission president José Manuel Barroso to make a report on "A new strategy for the single market". In his report Monti declared that amongst the European Citizens "the Single Market today is less popular than ever […]" (Monti, 2010: 6).

REFRENCES

Ambrosius, G.(2000/2001) *Kommunale Selbstverwaltung im Zeichen des Subsidiaritätsprinzips in Europa*, in: Brede, Hellmut (Hrsg.): Wettbewerb in Europa und die Erfüllung öffentlicher Aufgaben, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2000/2001

Association of Drinking Water from Reservoirs et. al. (2011) ,*Profile of the German Water Sector'*, Wirtschafts- und Verlagsgesellschaft Gas und Wasser mbH, Bonn, available at http://www.dvgw.de/fileadmin/dvgw/wasser/organisation/branchenbild2011_en.pdf (accessed January 2014).

Barnier, M. (2013) '*Statement by Commissioner Michel Barnier on the exclusion of water from the Concessions Directive'*, 21 May available at http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/barnier/docs/speeches/20130621_water-out-of-concessions-directive_en.pdf (accessed July 2013).

Bogumil, J, (2009) *Kommunale Selbstverwaltung unter Reformdruck - Aktuelle Partizipations- und Ökonomisierungstrends in Deutschland*, in: Foljanty-Jost, Gesine: Kommunalreform in Deutschland und Japan. Ökonomisierung und Demokratisierung in vergleichender Perspektive, Wiesbaden. p. 17-31 available at http://www.sowi.rub.de/mam/images/regionalpolitik/bogumil_-_kommunale_selbstverwaltung_unter_reformdruck.pdf (accessed January 2014).

Consolidated version of the Treaty on the European Union (TEU), OJ C 83 Volume 53, 30 March 2010.

Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), OJ C 83 Volume 53, 30 March 2012.

Cox, H. (2003) *Öffentliche Dienstleistungen künftig im obligatorischen Ausschreibungswettbewerb?* Zur Initiative der Europäischen Kommission zur Ausschreibungspflicht bei öffentlichen Dienstleistungskonzessionen, in: Cox, Helmut (Hrsg.): Ausschreibungswettbewerb bei öffentlichen Dienstleistungen, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft Baden-Baden, Volume 52, p. 43-68

Deutscher Städtetag (2013): Hauptversammlung 2013 in Frankfurt am Main: *"Europa stärken – für seine Bürgerinnen und Bürger, für seine Städte",* Dank von Christian Ude an die Bundeskanzlerin mit Nachfrage und Antwort von Dr. Angela Merkel, 23 April Live webstream available at http://www.staedtetag.de/fachinformationen/staedtetag/065164/index.html (accessed January 2014).

Eurobarometer (2009) '*The role and impact of local and regional authorities within the European Union'*, Special Eurobarometer 307, February 2009 available at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_307_en.pdf (accessed January 2014).

European Council (2011) '*Conclusion Brussels'*, Council Document No. EUCO 10/1/11, 25 March 2011, Brussels: European Council, available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/120296.pdf (accessed January 2014).

European Council (2012) '*Conclusions Brussels',* Council Document No. EUCO 76/12, 29 June 2012, Brussels: European Council, available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/131388.pdf (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2011a) *'A Quality Framework for Services of General Interest in Europe'*, COM(2011)900 final, 20 December, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, available at http://ec.europa.eu/services_general_interest/docs/comm_quality_framework_en.pdf (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (1996) *'Communication form the Commission. Services of General Interest in Europe, COM(96)443,* 11 September, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities available at http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/cons_int/serv_gen/serv_int_gen06_en.pdf (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2000) *'Communication from the Commission. Services of General Interest in Europe', COM(2000) 580 final,* 20 September, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2000:0580:FIN:EN:PDF (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2008) '*Commission interpretative communication on the application of Community law on Public Procurement and Concessions to institutionalised PPP (IPPP)', 12* April, Brussels: Official Journal of the European Union OJ C9/4

available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:091:0004:0009:EN:PDF (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2002) '*Communication on the Status of Work on the Examination of a Proposal for a Framework Directive on Services of General Interest',* COM(2002) 689 final, 04 December, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2002:0689:FIN:EN:PDF (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2007) 'Communication *Services of general interest, including social services general interest: a new European commitment'*, COM(2007) 725 final, 20 November, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0725:FIN:en:PDF (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2010) 'Communication *towards a Single Market Act For a Highly Competitive Social Market Economy – 50 proposals for improving our work, business and exchanges with one another'*, COM(2010)608 final, Brussels, 27 October, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0608:FIN:EN:PDF (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2004)*'Communication White Paper on services of general interest'*, COM(2004) 324 final, 12 May, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities available at http://eur-

lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2004/com2004_0374en01.pdf (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2003) '*Green Paper on services of general interest'*, COM(2003) 270 final, 21 May, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2003/com2003_0270en01.pdf (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2011 b) '*Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the award of Concession Contracts'*, COM(2011)897 final, 20 December, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, available at http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/docs/modernising_rules/COM2011_897_en.pdf (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2011) '*Single Market Act – Twelve levers to boost growth and strengthen confidence "Working together to create new growth",* COM(2011)206 final, 13 April, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0206:FIN:en:PDF (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2012) '*Single Market Act II'*, COM(2012)573/3, 03 October, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities available at http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/smact/docs/single-market-act2_en.pdf (accessed January 2014).

European Commission (2001) *'Report to the Laeken European Council. Services of General Interest', COM(2001) 598 final,* 17 October, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2001:0598:FIN:EN:PDF (accessed January 2014).

European Parliament (1996 b) '*Report on the XXV report by the Commission on competition policy – 1995*', EP-Document PE 218.621/déf., Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy (Rapporteur: Ludivina García Arias), 15 October available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A4-1996-0324+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN (accessed January 2014).

European Parliament (1997) *'Resolution on the Communication from the Commission on Services of general interest in Europe'*, EP-Document A4-0357/97, European Parliament , 19 January 1998 available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:51997IP0357:EN:HTML (accessed January 2014).

European Parliament (1993) *'Resolution on the role of the public sector in the completion of the internal market'*, EP Document B3-0216/93, European Parliament OJ No C 72/159, 15 March available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:1993:072:0147:0192:EN:PDF (accessed January 2014).

European Parliament (1996 a) '*Public undertakings and public service activities in the European Union', Directorate General for Research* Working document, Economic Affaire Series W-21. May 1996, available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/workingpapers/econ/pdf/w21_en.pdf (accessed January 2014).

German Federal Constitutional Court (1979) '*Rastede judgement'*, BVerfGE 79, 127, Germany 23. November 1988 available at http://www.servat.unibe.ch/dfr/bv079127.html (accessed January 2014).

Mayntz, R./ Scharpf, F. W. (1995) *Gesellschaftliche Selbstregulierung und politische Steuerung*, Frankfurt/ Main, Campus.

Monti, M. (2010) '*A new strategy for the single market – At the service of Europe's economy and society'*, Report to the President of the European Commission José Manuel Barroso 9 May available at http://ec.europa.eu/bepa/pdf/monti_report_final_10_05_2010_en.pdf (accessed January 2014).

Österreichischer Städtebund (2012) ,*Städtebund und VÖWG: Gemeinsam gegen EU-Konzessionsrichtlinie auftreten!'*, Presseaussendung 19.12.2012 available at http://www.staedtebund.gv.at/presse/presseaussendungen/presseaussendungen-details/artikel/staedtebund-und-voewg-gemeinsam-gegen-eu-konzessionsrichtlinie-auftreten.html (accessed January 2014).

Schäfer, T. (1998) Die deutsche kommunale Selbstverwaltung in der Europäischen Union, Neue Schriften des Deutschen Städtetages, Heft 74, Kohlhammer Verlag.

Scharpf, F. W. (2000) *Interaktionsformen – Akteurzentrierter Institutionalismus in der Politikforschung*, 1st edn. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Steckert, U. (2002) *Kommunalwirtschaft im Wettbewerb – Durch Liberalisierung zur Sinnkrise?,* Baden-Baden

Verband kommunaler Unternehmen (2011) '*Kommunale Gestaltungsfreiheit aufrecht erhalten',* Presseinformation Nr. 121/2011, 20 December available at http://www.vku.de/service-navigation/presse/pressemitteilungen/liste-pressemitteilung/pressemitteilung-12111.html (accessed January 2014).

Verband kommunaler Unternehmen (2012) '*VKU: Wasserver- und Abwasserentsorgung gehören nicht in die Richtlinie'*, Presseinformation Nr. 22/2012, 2 March available at http://www.vku.de/service-navigation/presse/pressemitteilungen/liste-pressemitteilung/pressemitteilung-2212.html (accessed January 2014).

Ver.di (2013) '*Wasser muss in öffentlicher Hand bleiben: Erste Europäische Bürgerinitiative erfolgreich'.* Gemeinsame Presseerklärung des Unterstützungskreises Europäische Bürgerinitiative „Wasser ist Menschenrecht", 03 May available at http://www.verdi.de/presse/pressemitteilungen/++co++049c5b42-b3e3-11e2-83fa-52540059119e (accessed January 2014).

Water and sanitation are a human right (2012) Online Water campaign available at www.right2water.eu (accessed January 2014).

Witte, S. (2013) *Einflussgrad der deutschen kommunalen Ebene auf die Politikgestaltung der EU*, Peter Lang Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, Frankfurt am Main.

Wollmann, H. (2002) *Is Germany`s Traditional Type of Local Self-Government Being Phased out?,* Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik available at http://www.difu.de/publikationen/municipal-task-evolution.html-1 (accessed January 2014).

Wollmann, H. (2014 forthcoming) *Public Services in European Countries Between Public/Municipal and Private Sector Provision – and reverse?,* In: Carlos Nunes Silva & Jan Bucek (Eds.) 2014, Fiscal Austerity and Innovation in Local Governance in Europe. Farnham: Ashgate available at http://amor.cms.hu-berlin.de/~h0598bce/docs/Wollmann_public_services_in_Europe.pdf (accessed January 2014).