

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

F.	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 <i>Schenker v Commission</i>	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

xx *Table of Contents*

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