

32.

**From:** [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE)  
**Sent:** 16 June 2015 11:16  
**To:** [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE)  
**Subject:** FW: Meeting with CEEP on public services

For registration

---

**From:** [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 16, 2015 11:15 AM  
**To:** SCHLEGELMILCH Rupert (TRADE); [Art. 4.1(b)]  
[Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE)  
**Cc:** [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE)  
**Subject:** Meeting with CEEP on public services

On Thursday, 11 June 2015 we had a meeting with the Task Force on Services of General Interest of CEEP (European Centre of Employers and Enterprises providing Public Services).

Overall, a constructive and positive meeting. Members of the Task Force believe in the political will of the Commission to provide public services, however see some technical / legal issues to be discussed. Yet, they were not able to identify concrete problems regarding the sectors flagged as sensitive (public lighting, school canteens etc.). COM outline of EU approach on subsidies, procurement and public services in general, highlighting that internal market legislation will be respected, were welcomed by participants.

Questions evolved mainly around the following issues:

- On subsidies, a representative of a social housing association flagged that they do not feel protected by EU internal market legislation, neither trade agreements. [reply: subsidies not affected, what other concrete problems can association identify?]
- On procurement, CEEP flagged that inhouse procurement was the main concern. In the US, the administrative structure differs from the EU and cooperatives may play a larger role than local enterprises, COM invited CEEP to provide more insights in particular issues/problems.
- Generally on public services, the usual questions around negative listing and worries that new services would be committed – how do trade agreements take into account future digitilisation of energy, telecommunication services etc. How to prevent e.g. Google to invest? [reply: this is not an issue of positive vs. negative listing; could Google invest nowadays without TTIP? If so, TTIP might neither be the problem nor the solution]
- Regarding the public statement of Malmstroem and Froman it was asked how this statement will be translated into a legal text. [reply: as statement says, current practice will not change]
- The Social Housing association questioned whether COM is allowed to negotiate services that are Member state competence. [reply: this I not a question of competence - MS have given mandate to COM to negotiate - but a question of substance, i.e. respecting red lines with respect to public services]

[Art. 4.1(b)]  
Policy Officer



**European Commission**  
DG TRADE

[Art. 4.1(b)]

[Art. 4.1(b)]