

1H//650181(039)



PUBLIC
ACCESS TO
DOCUMENTS
IN THE EU

Leonor Rossi and
Patricia Vinagre e Silva

B L O O M S B U R Y

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| <i>Foreword</i> | v |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | ix |
| <i>Table of Cases</i> | xxi |

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. The Normative Development of Access to Documents..... | 1 |
| I. Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. Wide or Deep? Horizontal or Vertical Profiles in Legal Design..... | 2 |
| A. A Plain Proposition? | 2 |
| B. Confusion and Misrepresentation | 4 |
| C. A Discussion for Applicants, Practitioners, Academics, Institutions and Judges | 5 |
| D. The Normative Width of Access | 5 |
| i. Three Questions Regarding the Width of Access..... | 6 |
| E. The Normative Depth of Access | 6 |
| i. Two Questions Regarding the Depth of Access | 7 |
| F. The Name ‘Access’ | 8 |
| III. Two Codes of Conduct for Europe | 9 |
| A. The Code of 1993..... | 9 |
| B. Code of 1993—Administrative Tasks..... | 13 |
| i. A Challenge to the Code of 1993..... | 15 |
| ii. Beyond the Code: Achievements of the Early Case Law..... | 18 |
| C. Code of 1995—Legislative Tasks | 19 |
| IV. Treaty Articles for Access..... | 21 |
| A. Article 1 TEU..... | 21 |
| B. Article 255 TEC..... | 21 |
| C. Article 207(3) TEC | 24 |
| D. Article 41 and 42 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights | 25 |
| V. A Challenge to Post-Amsterdam Implementing Decisions, pre-Regulation 1049/2001 | 27 |
| VI. Post-Amsterdam Achievements of the Case Law, Pre Regulation 1049/2001 | 30 |
| VII. A General Framework—Regulation 1049/2001 | 30 |
| A. Selected Achievements of the Prior Case Law Drafted into Regulation 1049/2001 | 32 |
| B. Normative Changes Introduced by the Regulation to the Pre-2001 Model..... | 32 |
| C. Treaty of Nice..... | 33 |
| D. Failed Attempt at Reform | 34 |
| E. Treaty of Lisbon | 35 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| E. | Achievements of the Case Law under Regulation 1049/2001 | 36 |
| VIII. | Rules Governing Special Topics | 38 |
| A. | The Exceptions in Article 4 of Regulation 1049/2001..... | 38 |
| B. | The Environmental Law of the EU..... | 39 |
| C. | An Outlier—The Council of Europe’s Convention on Public Access to Official Documents | 40 |
| IX. | Conclusions..... | 41 |
| 2. | Applicants | 42 |
| I. | Introduction—By Right or by Grace?..... | 42 |
| A. | Persons, Beneficiaries and Applicants..... | 44 |
| B. | A Geo-political Contraction of Access?..... | 46 |
| C. | Applicants by Right | 47 |
| D. | Applicants by Grace..... | 48 |
| i. | Silence on the Concession..... | 49 |
| ii. | The Concession, Revoked | 49 |
| E. | The (Ir)relevance of Reasons for Requests | 49 |
| II. | A Smaller(er) Version of Reversed <i>erga omnes</i> | 52 |
| III. | Profiles..... | 53 |
| A. | Names from the Statistics | 53 |
| i. | Who most Calls on the EU Courts?..... | 55 |
| ii. | Divergences in Purpose..... | 56 |
| iii. | Industry..... | 57 |
| iv. | Non-industry..... | 58 |
| v. | Preponderance of Name | 59 |
| B. | Those who Seek Annulment..... | 59 |
| i. | Meeting again at the Baseline Court..... | 59 |
| ii. | A Model without Injunctive Orders | 60 |
| iii. | One Exception at a Time..... | 60 |
| iv. | The Abyss of the ‘Infinite Loop’ | 62 |
| C. | Those who Seek Injunctions..... | 62 |
| D. | Those who Enforce Procedure | 62 |
| i. | For whom the Deadline Tolls | 63 |
| ii. | Late Answers, the Fox in the Henhouse | 64 |
| iii. | Stratagems of Many Kinds | 65 |
| a. | One Document, Many Applicants | 65 |
| b. | Many Documents, One Applicant | 66 |
| c. | Eyes Wide Shut | 67 |
| IV. | Conclusions | 67 |
| 3. | Institutions | 69 |
| I. | Introduction—Component Parts of a Census..... | 69 |
| A. | Implementation: Top-down | 70 |
| i. | First-movers Secure a Foothold | 70 |
| B. | No Enumeration | 71 |
| C. | Distinct Periods of Advancement | 71 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| II. | Institutions that were Signatories to the Codes of Conduct | 72 |
| A. | All Quiet in the Early Case Law..... | 72 |
| B. | Reining in the Committees..... | 73 |
| III. | Institutions Included under Regulation 1049/2001 | 74 |
| A. | By the Regulation itself..... | 74 |
| i. | Institutions..... | 74 |
| ii. | Agencies, Bodies and Committees | 75 |
| B. | By the Institutions Voluntarily | 77 |
| C. | By Article 15 TFEU..... | 78 |
| IV. | Practical Consequences of the Policy's Advancement | 78 |
| A. | The EACEA..... | 79 |
| B. | The EP and the ECB | 80 |
| C. | The EFSA..... | 82 |
| D. | The ECDC..... | 83 |
| E. | The EMA..... | 84 |
| F. | The Cedefop | 85 |
| G. | The EASO..... | 86 |
| V. | ECJ Documents—Same Person, Different Hats | 86 |
| VI. | Different Guardians, Same Documents | 87 |
| VII. | Conclusions | 88 |
| 4. | Documents | 89 |
| I. | Introduction—A Policy of Bites and Pieces? | 89 |
| II. | Qualitative Boundaries—The Object of the Access Policy, Legislator's Approach | 90 |
| A. | Definition that Expands over Time | 91 |
| B. | The Textual Preference for Document Over Information | 92 |
| C. | The Functional Implications of the Legislative Definition | 93 |
| i. | One, Two, Three | 94 |
| a. | One..... | 94 |
| b. | Two | 94 |
| c. | Three | 94 |
| D. | <i>Blind Man's Buff?</i> The (Im)possible Specificity of Applications | 96 |
| i. | A Document (Implicitly) Identified by the Applicant?..... | 97 |
| ii. | A Document Identifiable by the Institution? | 97 |
| iii. | Cross-referencing and Compiling—Beyond the (Outer) Limit of Institutional Duty? | 98 |
| iv. | Documents that Contain Names v Names (Contained) in Documents | 99 |
| v. | Coupling 'No Duty to Draw up' with 'Excessive Burden'—A Tactic for the Future? | 100 |
| E. | Provenance Matters: The Origin of Documents as a Qualitative Boundary..... | 101 |
| i. | Some Documents (those Drawn up by the Institutions) | 101 |
| ii. | All Documents (in Possession of the Institution)..... | 102 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| III. | Qualitative Boundaries—The Object of the Access Policy, the Judicial Approach..... | 103 |
| A. | Jurisdiction..... | 103 |
| i. | <i>Carvel I</i> , Jurisdiction is not an Issue | 103 |
| ii. | <i>Svenska</i> , Jurisdiction is Discussed | 104 |
| iii. | Jurisdiction (on Access) Asserted Over All Three Pillars | 104 |
| IV. | Qualitative <i>cum</i> Quantitative Boundaries: Topics not Covered by the Law, the Judicial Approach..... | 105 |
| A. | Partial Access | 105 |
| i. | Censure as an Opportunity..... | 106 |
| ii. | Censure without Thresholds | 106 |
| a. | At the Least, (Disclose) the Title!..... | 106 |
| b. | Still, is the Title Enough?..... | 106 |
| iii. | However Lessened, it Remains a Tale of Access to Documents | 107 |
| iv. | The Judicial Approach: <i>Mecklenburg</i> and <i>Hautala</i> | 107 |
| v. | Epilogue: The Law Changes | 109 |
| B. | Institutional Allegations that Documents Do Not Exist..... | 110 |
| i. | Documents No Longer Held..... | 111 |
| ii. | Veritable Non-existence and/or Lack of Cognisance | 111 |
| C. | Cumbersome Applications and Categories of Documents | 113 |
| i. | Cumbersome Applications: ‘It’s the Quantity, Stupid!’ | 113 |
| ii. | Leading Case | 115 |
| iii. | Categories, Documents of a Kind | 117 |
| a. | ‘In their Entirety’ as a Double Shroud | 119 |
| b. | The Burden of Specificity..... | 120 |
| D. | Presuming Harm: Shelters that Keep out Public Scrutiny..... | 121 |
| E. | Ruling on Empty, Documents Seen by No One | 122 |
| i. | Just a Little Sunshine in the Rain | 124 |
| V. | Conclusions..... | 125 |
| 5. | Exceptions | 126 |
| I. | Introduction—The Undertones of ‘No’ | 126 |
| II. | A Historical Perspective..... | 126 |
| A. | From 1993 to 2001 and Beyond..... | 127 |
| i. | 1993: The Background | 128 |
| ii. | Cornerstone 1: A Policy for Internal Documents | 128 |
| iii. | Cornerstone 2: a Policy for Documents Authored by the EU..... | 128 |
| iv. | The Structure: Mandatory v Discretionary Secrecy | 128 |
| III. | 1993: What was Mandatory..... | 129 |
| A. | 1993–2001: WWF and <i>Hautala</i> : The Reasons behind the Requirement Categorisation and the Advent of a Necessary Analysis of the Feasibility of Partial Access..... | 131 |
| i. | WWF..... | 132 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| ii. | <i>Hautala</i> | 133 |
| a. | Two Levels of Categorisation | 134 |
| iii. | <i>Petrie</i> , The Redundancy (or not) of the Author's Rule..... | 135 |
| B. | 1993: Synopsis of Tasks Incumbent on the Institutions within the Mandatory Context..... | 135 |
| i. | Relevance of Temporal Sequence: <i>Petrie</i> and <i>Hautala</i> | 136 |
| IV. | 1993: What was Discretionary | 137 |
| A. | The Relevance of Personal Interests, if Notorious | 138 |
| B. | Governance Similar to that Inherent to the Mandatory Exception | 139 |
| C. | 1993: Synopsis of Tasks Incumbent on the Institutions within the Discretionary Context..... | 139 |
| D. | 1993: Mandatory v Discretionary, Summation..... | 140 |
| V. | What Changes in 2001? | 140 |
| A. | 2001: Less Insulation?..... | 141 |
| B. | Cornerstone 2 (the Author's Rule) Falls | 141 |
| i. | The Discretionary Framework Falls..... | 141 |
| ii. | The New (Mandatory) Trilogy..... | 141 |
| a. | Article 4(1): Mandatory with no Balancing Test..... | 141 |
| b. | Article 4(2): Mandatory with a (New) Balancing Test | 142 |
| c. | Article 4(3)..... | 143 |
| VI. | A Functional Analysis of Article 4 of Regulation 1049/2001..... | 144 |
| A. | Still a Tale of Presumptions | 145 |
| B. | A Layered Structure, the New Interplay of the Presumptions of Correlation, Preponderance and Harm | 145 |
| i. | The First Presumption: Correlation between the Contested Documents and the Exception Relied on..... | 145 |
| ii. | The Second Presumption: Preponderance of the Protected Interests over 'Public Interest in Disclosure' | 145 |
| iii. | The Third Presumption: Undermining an Asserted Counter-interest (ie Harm in Disclosure) and the Feasibility of Partial Access | 147 |
| a. | First Task, Testing the Faithfulness of Preliminary Triage..... | 147 |
| b. | Second Task: Blanking out Sensitive Passages..... | 149 |
| c. | Excessive Burden, Tempering Proportionality with Proportionality | 151 |
| C. | The Loopholes of Article 4(2) | 151 |
| D. | The Case Law on Article 4(2)..... | 152 |
| i. | Circumscribing Regulation 1049/2001 by way of an unlimited dominion of the Presumption of Preponderance..... | 152 |
| ii. | No Consideration of Partial Access | 159 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| iii. | No Example of OPI and Burden of Identification Imposed on the Applicant | 159 |
| iv. | Something Old: Private Reasons of Private Parties | 159 |
| v. | Striking the Balance between what?..... | 160 |
| vi. | Something New? The Emergence of a Nuanced Approach in <i>LPN and Finland v Commission</i> : Own Reasons of Private Parties that Act in the Public Interest..... | 162 |
| vii. | Sliding Doors..... | 163 |
| viii. | The Tone of the Affair..... | 164 |
| ix. | More Exceptions, Elsewhere..... | 165 |
| VII. | 2006: New Exception—The Environment..... | 165 |
| A. | For the EU Institutions—Regulation 1367/2006 | 165 |
| B. | For the Member States—Directives 2003/4/EC and 90/313/EEC | 166 |
| C. | Regulation 1367/2006, Less Access: Article 6(2)..... | 167 |
| D. | Regulation 1367/2006, More Access: Article 6(1)..... | 168 |
| i. | Article 6(1), First Sentence..... | 168 |
| a. | Article 4(2) First Indent | 170 |
| b. | Part of Article 4(2) Third Indent | 170 |
| ii. | Article 6(1), Second Sentence..... | 170 |
| iii. | Play it Again? | 171 |
| VIII. | A Procedure for ‘No’ | 173 |
| A. | Administrative Proceedings..... | 173 |
| i. | Phase 1 | 173 |
| ii. | Phase 2 | 174 |
| B. | The Choice to Go to Court | 175 |
| i. | The Effects of Annulment..... | 175 |
| C. | Successive Reasons for ‘No’ | 176 |
| i. | Pick your Poison..... | 176 |
| ii. | The First Problem..... | 177 |
| iii. | The Second Problem..... | 177 |
| IX. | Conclusions | 178 |
| 6. | Silence | 180 |
| I. | Introduction—Much Ado about Nothing? | 180 |
| A. | Giving the Emptiness in the Letter Box a Meaning | 180 |
| B. | Positive and Negative Silence | 181 |
| C. | Negative Silence since the Implementing Decisions of the 1993 Code of Conduct | 182 |
| D. | Different Reactions to the Substitute Decision | 183 |
| II. | The Advantages of ‘No’, <i>ex lege</i> | 184 |
| A. | The End to a Deadlock | 184 |
| B. | Clearly, the Meaning ‘No’..... | 185 |
| C. | The Opportunity to Challenge a Definitive Refusal..... | 185 |

| | | |
|---------|---|-----|
| III. | Deadlines | 188 |
| A. | Two Relevant Sets of Deadlines Emerge from the Rules that Govern Explicit Replies..... | 189 |
| B. | The Current Framework of Real Silence and an Imperative Deadline..... | 189 |
| i. | The Utility of the Enabling Act in the First Stage of the Administrative Procedure..... | 189 |
| ii. | The Utility of Silences that Mean ‘No’ in the Second Stage of the Administrative Procedure..... | 190 |
| IV. | Beyond the Deadline | 191 |
| A. | A Duty that Outlives the Time Frame of the Deadline | 191 |
| B. | A Late Reply is just an Option..... | 192 |
| C. | Effects on Procedure | 193 |
| i. | Challenges of Silence | 194 |
| V. | The Purpose of Striking Down Nothing..... | 197 |
| A. | What Head of Claim?..... | 198 |
| B. | The Place (in Time) after Annulment | 199 |
| C. | In Addition: the Reputational Constraint..... | 200 |
| D. | Different Points of View: Applicants’ v EU Courts’..... | 200 |
| VI. | Of Cats and Foxes: Holding Replies and Late Answers..... | 200 |
| A. | Cat among the Pigeons: Holding Replies | 201 |
| i. | Better Safe than Sorry..... | 202 |
| B. | Foxes in the Henhouse: Late Answers..... | 203 |
| i. | After ‘No’ <i>ex lege</i> : a Subsequent, Late, Reasoned Refusal..... | 204 |
| ii. | When the Court Takes over..... | 204 |
| VII. | Conclusions | 205 |
| 7. | The Eccentric Actors of the Access Policy | 207 |
| Part I: | Third Actor: The Member State—Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Spy..... | 207 |
| I. | Members Only | 208 |
| II. | The Member State under the Code of Conduct of 1993..... | 209 |
| A. | The Author’s Rule and the Guardianship of EU Documents..... | 209 |
| i. | Author’s Rule | 209 |
| ii. | Guardianship | 210 |
| B. | Interventions..... | 211 |
| III. | The Member State under Regulation 1049/2001..... | 216 |
| A. | The Author’s Rule and the Guardianship of EU Documents | 216 |
| i. | The Author’s Rule is Abolished | 216 |
| ii. | Consultation of Authors..... | 217 |
| iii. | The Prior Consent of the Member State | 217 |
| iv. | ‘No’ and a Reason that fits Article 4(1) to (3) | 218 |
| v. | Sensitive Documents..... | 220 |
| vi. | Duties <i>ex</i> Guardianship Remain Constant..... | 222 |
| vii. | A Remnant of Authority: Interim Relief..... | 223 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| B. | Interventions—National Interpretation of the EU Rules on Access..... | 224 |
| i. | Those in Favour (of Access) | 224 |
| ii. | <i>Those against (an Extensive Interpretation of the Access Rules)</i> | 226 |
| iii. | What Matters More? Number of Interventions or Points of Law..... | 229 |
| C. | When the EU Shapes National Law | 230 |
| i. | When the EU Shapes National Law: <i>Pfleiderer, Donau Chemie</i> and Directive 2014/104/EU | 231 |
| Part II: | Fourth and Fifth Actors: EU Institutions—Two more | |
| | Men in the Boat..... | 233 |
| IV. | Fourth Actor: The EU Institution under the Code of Conduct | 233 |
| A. | Author’s Rule and Guardianship..... | 233 |
| B. | Interventions..... | 234 |
| i. | Those in Favour | 234 |
| ii. | No Interventions against Access | 234 |
| V. | The EU Institution under Regulation 1049/2001 | 235 |
| A. | Author’s Rule and Guardianship..... | 235 |
| B. | Interventions..... | 235 |
| i. | Those in Favour | 235 |
| ii. | Those against | 236 |
| iii. | Those who Fluctuate | 236 |
| VI. | The Private Party under the Code of Conduct..... | 240 |
| A. | Author’s Rule and Guardianship..... | 240 |
| B. | Interventions..... | 240 |
| VII. | The Private Party under Regulation 1049/2001 | 241 |
| A. | Author’s Rule and Guardianship..... | 241 |
| i. | Consultation of Authors..... | 241 |
| ii. | Prior Consent | 241 |
| iii. | Interim Relief | 242 |
| B. | Interventions..... | 242 |
| i. | Interventions Seeking to Impede Access..... | 243 |
| ii. | Competition Law | 243 |
| a. | State Aid | 244 |
| b. | Cartels | 244 |
| c. | Concentrations | 244 |
| d. | Tenders | 245 |
| iii. | Emissions into the Environment and the Aarhus Regulation | 245 |
| iv. | Interventions in Support of an Applicant Requesting Access | 246 |
| C. | Intervention as an (Im)perfect Alternative to Own Proceedings under Regulation 1049/2001..... | 246 |

D. Reversing the Instrumentality: Interest in the Documents as a Facilitator of Interest in the Outcome of the Case..... 249

 i. The Interests of Principal Actors and Interveners in *Schenker v Commission* 250

 ii. The Interests of Principal Actors and (Potential) Interveners in the Cases opposing the Commission and the Members of the Airfreight Cartel..... 251

 iii. No Equating Different Interests..... 251

VIII. Conclusions 252

8. Appeals..... 254

 I. Introduction—A Second Chance to Rule (Them) All..... 254

 II. Appeals of the Member States..... 256

 A. State Intervention Followed by State Appeal..... 257

 i. Side-by-Side Appeals of Intervening Member States under the Code of Conduct 257

 ii. Side-by-Side Appeals of Intervening Member States under Regulation 1049/2001..... 258

 iii. Isolated Appeals: Appeals (of Intervening Member States) with Regard to Rulings that the Principal Actors of First Instance Will Pursue no Further 258

 B. State Appeal without Prior Intervention, a New Practice under Regulation 1049/2001: Side-by-Side and Isolated Appeals..... 259

 i. No Prior Intervention, Side-by-Side State Appeals..... 259

 ii. No Prior Intervention, Isolated State Appeals..... 260

 C. The Netherlands, Sweden and Finland, again 261

 III. Appeals of the Institutions 262

 A. Institutional Appeals under the Code of Conduct 262

 B. Institutional Appeals under Regulation 1049/2001..... 263

 i. Seeking to Restrict Access 263

 ii. Presumptions of Harm 263

 iii. Names of Persons Acting in a Professional Capacity 263

 iv. Environmental Information..... 264

 v. Seeking More Access (and Institutional Independence)..... 264

 C. The Council, the Commission and the EMA, only 264

 IV. Appeals of Private Parties..... 264


 A. Slippery Fish 265

 B. Because you Lost and you have the Money to Keep on Going..... 266

 V. Conclusions 267

Epilogue to Public Access to Documents in the EU..... 269

Annexes 271



1111650781

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| Annex 1 | Code of Conduct – Concerning Public Access to Council And Commission Documents (93/730/EC) | 272 |
| Annex 2 | Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents | 274 |
| Annex 3 | Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the institutions and bodies of the Community and on the free movement of such data | 284 |
| Annex 4 | Regulation (EC) No 1367/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 September 2006 on the application of the provisions of the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters to Community institutions and bodies | 312 |
| | <i>Glossary</i> | 325 |
| | <i>Bibliography</i> | 327 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 331 |