

Urbanistica e appalti

Mensile di edilizia, urbanistica, espropriazione,
appalti, lavori pubblici

ANNO XVI - Direzione e redazione - Strada 1 Palazzo F6 - 20090 Milanofiori Assago (MI)

8-9 2012

www.ipsoa.it/urbanisticaeappalti

**Il requisito di regolarità
fiscale e tributaria
dopo il D.L. 16/2012**



Ipsoa,
una tradizione
di innovazione.
Da 40 anni.

**Requisiti generali:
La Plenaria a tutto campo
su DURC e cessione di azienda**

**Il primo Report on Italian
Public Contracts**

DIREZIONE SCIENTIFICA
Luigi Carbone, Francesco Caringella,
Giuseppe De Marzo,
Rosanna De Nictolis,
François Lichère, Mariano Protto,
Marco Sica, Aldo Travi

COMITATO SCIENTIFICO
Matteo Baldi, Giovanni Balocco,
Claudio Contessa, Roberto Conti,
Giulia Ferrari, Marco Lipari,
Saverio Musolino, Luigi Tarantino

00129566



4 000001129566



IPSOA

Gruppo Wolters Kluwer

SPECIALE

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| | LA RIFORMA DEL CODICE APPALTI di <i>Rosanna De Nictolis</i> | 857 |
| | IUS PUBLICUM - REPORT ON ITALIAN PUBLIC CONTRACTS di <i>Gabriella Margherita Racca</i> | 859 |

NORMATIVA

| | | |
|------|--|------------|
| Gara | LA NUOVA DISCIPLINA DELLA CORRETTEZZA FISCALE <i>D.L. 2 marzo 2012, n. 16 convertito, con modificazioni, in L. 26 aprile 2012, n. 44, art. 1, comma 5</i> di <i>Ignazio Pagani</i> | 869 869 |
| | OSSERVATORIO REGIONALE a cura di <i>Saverio Musolino</i> | 875 |

GIURISPRUDENZA

Costituzionale

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | OSSERVATORIO a cura di <i>Maria Teresa Sempreviva</i> | 877 |
|--|--|-----|

Civile

| | | |
|------------------|--|-----|
| Giurisprudizione | LE PATOLOGIE NEGOZIALI DERIVANTI DA ILLEGITTIMITÀ DELLA PROCEDURA DI GARA: QUALI LIMITI ALLA VALUTAZIONE INCIDENTALI POSTUMA DEL G.O.? <i>Cassazione civile, Sez. Un., ord. 5 aprile 2012, n. 5446</i> | 879 |
| | Il commento di <i>Andrea Reggio d'Acì</i> | 880 |
| | OSSERVATORIO a cura di <i>Giuseppe De Marzo</i> | 886 |

Amministrativa

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------|
| Gara | LA PLENARIA SCIoglie I DUBBI SULLE DICHIARAZIONI EX ART. 38 IN CASO DI CESSIONE DI AZIENDA <i>Consiglio di Stato, Ad. Plen., 4 maggio 2012, n. 10</i> | 889 891 |
| | il commento di <i>Ilenia Filippetti</i> | |
| DURC | LA PLENARIA FA LUCE SULL'EFFICACIA DEL DURC AI FINI DELL'ESCLUSIONE DALLE GARE DI APPALTO <i>Consiglio di Stato, Ad. Plen., 4 maggio 2012, n. 8</i> | 905 911 |
| | Il commento di <i>Hebert d'Herin</i> | |
| Appalto di servizi | L'ART. 4, COMMA 33, D.L. 138/2011 E LA REVOCA DELL'AGGIUDICAZIONE PROVISORIA DEL SERVIZIO DI IGIENE URBANA <i>Consiglio di Stato, sez. V, 20 aprile 2012, n. 2338</i> | 917 919 |
| | il commento di <i>Francesca Dello Sbarba</i> | |
| Ricorso | I LIMITI TEMPORALI DELLA TUTELA PROCESSUALE AVVERSO IL SILENZIO-INADEMPIMENTO DELLA P.A. <i>Consiglio di Stato, sez. V, 20 aprile 2012, n. 2337</i> | 929 931 |
| | il commento di <i>Elena Quadri</i> | |
| Gara | LE VICENDE DELLA COMMISSIONE DI GARA: DALLA DISCREZIONALITÀ TECNICA AL RINNOVO DELLA PROCEDURA <i>Consiglio di Stato, sez. III, 13 marzo 2012, n. 1409</i> | 937 940 |
| | il commento di <i>Antonio Nicodemo</i> | |

Ius Publicum - Report on Italian Public Contracts (first part) (*)

a cura di **GABRIELLA MARGHERITA RACCA**

IUS PUBLICUM is a network founded by the Board of Directors of the **Die Verwaltung**, the **Diritto amministrativo**, the **Public Law**, the **Revista de Administración Pública** and the **Revue française de droit administratif**, whose aim is to follow the evolution of public law in each country involved, pointing out the influences of national public law systems on the development of an administrative and public European law and the connections with other legal cultures (www.ius-publicum.com).

The **IUS PUBLICUM REVIEW NETWORK** publishes Reports on the main topics of public and administrative law, such as Administrative Law and Constitutional Law, Administrative Law and Labour Law, Civil service, Comparative Administrative Law, European and International Law, Construction, city planning and zoning, Environment, Human rights, Judicial review and remedies, Liability and accountability, Local Authorities, Police - Administrative fines, Public bodies and public enterprises, Public Contracts, Public Finance and Tax Law, Public Law and Economics (Competition and Regulation) and Public Utilities, Public Law and Private Law divide, Public ownership.

This article is the first part of the Italian Report on Public Contracts, available in Italian and English, in <http://www.ius-publicum.com>, under the topic 'Public contracts' of the 'News and documents' section.

The Italian Implementation of European Directives n. 2004/18/EC and n. 2004/17/EC

The EU Directives of March 31, 2004, n. 2004/17 and n. 2004/18 (1) regulating public contracts, works, services and supplies have been implemented in Italy by means of Legislative Decree n. 163, of April 13, 2006 of the Public Contracts Code (hereafter PCC). In June 2011, the government regulation implementing the code entered into force (2) (D.P.R. 5 October 2010. Cfr. Cons. Stato, 24 February 2010, n. 313, opinion on *Schema di regolamento di attuazione ed esecuzione del codice dei contratti pubblici relativi a lavori, servizi e forniture, di cui all'articolo 5, D.Lgs. 12 aprile 2006, n. 163*) The new regulation abrogates the previous one (D.P.R. 21 December 1999, n. 554) on the public works sector (L. 11 February 1994, n. 109). This regulation governs the award and execution of public contracts and public works (classic sector arts. 9-251; utilities sector arts. 339-359), also with reference to services and supplies (classic sector arts. 271-338; services for architecture and engineering arts. 252-270; utilities sector art. 339-359). The provisions on public works have been extended, where compatible, to these sectors. In order to modernize, improve Italian infrastructures and enhance market competition the regulation aims to simplify administrative procedures by using IT solutions, fight organized crime prevent criminal infiltration of the public contract sector.

The EU Commission's data indicate that in 2010 the Italian market value for public procurements (concerning the total expenditure for the purchase of works, services and supplies) exceeded 252 billion euros (European Commission, Internal Market, *Public procurement indicators 2011*, November 4, 2011) which corresponds to 16,3% of National GDP.

The Italian Authority for the Supervision of Public Contracts calculated that in 2010 the amount of resources involved in public procurements exceeding 150,000 euros was 87 billion euros, equivalent to 6.6% of GDP, while in 2009 it

Note:

(*) In www.ius-publicum.com.

(1) Treaties: A. Carullo, G. Iudica, *Commentario breve alla legislazione sugli appalti pubblici e privati*, Padova 2012; R. Caranta, *I contratti pubblici*, Torino 2012; A. Massera, *Lo Stato che contratta e che si accorda. Vicende della negoziazione con le PP.AA., tra concorrenza per il mercato e collaborazione con il potere*, Pisa, 2011; G. D. Comporti, *Le Gare pubbliche: il futuro di un modello*, Napoli, 2011; R. Garofoli, G. Ferrari, *Codice degli appalti pubblici*, Lecce 2011; V. Cerulli Irelli, *Amministrazione pubblica e diritto privato*, Torino, 2011; L. Fiorentino, *Gli acquisti delle amministrazioni pubbliche nella Repubblica multilivello*, Bologna, 2011; C. Franchini (eds.), *I contratti di appalto pubblico*, Torino, 2010; M. Clarich (eds.), *Commentario al Codice dei contratti pubblici*, Torino, 2010; C. Franchini (eds.), *I contratti con la Pubblica Amministrazione*, Torino, 2007, I e II, in P. Rescigno, E. Gabrielli (eds.), *Trattato dei contratti*, Torino, 2007; A. Grazzini, *Appalti e contratti - Percorsi giurisprudenziali*, Milano, 2009; M. A. Sandulli, R. De Nictolis, R. Garofoli (eds.), *Trattato sui contratti pubblici*, Milano, 2008; M. Baldi, R. Tomei, *La disciplina dei contratti pubblici - Commentario al codice appalti*, Milano, 2009.

(2) Government Regulation on public contracts code: R. De Nictolis, R. Garofoli, M. A. Sandulli (a cura di), *Trattato sui contratti pubblici*, vol. VIII - *Il regolamento di attuazione*, Milano, 2011; R. Giovagnoli (a cura di), *Il nuovo regolamento sui contratti pubblici*, Milano, 2011; R. Garofoli, G. Ferrari, *Il nuovo regolamento appalti pubblici*, Lecce, 2011; R. De Nictolis, *Il nuovo regolamento dei contratti pubblici*, in questa *Rivista*, 2011, 136.

had been 79.4 billion euros (the Italian Authority for the Supervision of Public Contracts, *Relazione annuale 2010*, June 15, 2011). The value of the contracts covered by the EU Directive n. 2004/18 was 64 billion euro (about 35.7% for works, approximately 27.3% for supplies and approximately 37% for services), and 23 billion concerned the special sectors (about 33.9% for works, about 27.3% for supplies and about 38.8% for services). The higher value of public contracts in 2010 compared to 2009 can largely be explained by the entry into force of the law on traceability of financial flows (L. 13 August 2010, n. 136 special plan against the Mafia and the delegation to the Government on anti-mafia legislation, Art. 3) which provides a Procedure ID Code (CIG). The CIG Code is an alphanumeric code generated by the Information System on Monitoring awarding procedure (SIMOG) of the Italian Authority for the Supervision of Public Contracts.

The allocation of Legislative power between State and Regions (3)

The State has exclusive legislative competence on competition and consequently, on public contracts (4). Regions have filed claims before the Constitutional Court so as to assert their competence on: public contracts design and planning (Corte cost. n. 221/2010); contracts below threshold (Corte cost. n. 401/2007); exclusion of abnormally low tenders (Corte cost. n. 160/2009). The Constitutional Court left to Regions only limited discretion in the choice of the composition and functions of the jury.

The Italian Authority for the Supervision of Public Contracts for works, services and supplies

The Italian PCC (art. 6) envisages the institution of the Italian Authority for the Supervision of Public Contracts (*Autorità di vigilanza sui contratti pubblici*), with the task of monitoring both the award and the execution of public contracts. This authority expresses opinions on the correct interpretation and implementation of the PCC and it submits to the Government proposals for legislative amendments to the PCC. It also prepares an annual report on public contracts award and execution for the Parliament (for further reference visit www.avcp.it).

The Authority's Monitoring Board on public contracts was created to collect and process data on public contracts worth over 150 thousand euros awarded and executed in Italy, so as to define standardized costs according to territory and sector. The Monitoring Board has also recently been entrusted with the management of the database of non-compliant tenderers that were excluded from public tender due to violations or false declarations, either in the selection or in the execution phase (see the Public Contract National Database below in § 5). The Authority's activities are funded by the State, by the awarding authorities and, partly, by bidders, since the latter have to pay a set contribution for participating in award procedures.

The implementation of the Directive on: public contracts for works, supplies and services in the areas of defense and security

In 2011 Directive 2009/81/EC regarding public contracts for works, supplies and services in the areas of defense and security was implemented. This provision applies to public contracts for the supply of military or sensitive equipment, as well as for works, supplies and services directly related to them and services specifically for military purposes. In this field contracting authorities during the awarding procedure, may use the restricted procedure, negotiated procedure (with the prior publication of a contract notice, or without) or competitive dialogue (D.Ls. n. 208 of 2011, art. 16, comma 1). The possibility of using framework agreements is also proved. In this case the term of a framework agreement may not exceed seven years, except in exceptional circumstances determined by taking into account the expected service life of any delivered items, installations or systems, and the technical difficulties which a change of supplier may cause (law n. 208 of 2011, art. 16, comma 4).

Subjective and objective coverage, in house providing

The subjective coverage of public procurement legislation is often litigated in Italy. Some interpretative uncertainties still undermine the non-industrial and commercial character of the body governed by public law (5). The qualification of body governed by public law was denied for a consortium company whose shares were partially held by public authorities and whose task was to run a public market area since it bears the economic risk of its activities (Cass., Sez. Un., n. 8225/2010). On the other hand, three companies entrusted respectively with the tasks of building and operating airport facilities (Cass., Sez. Un., ord. n. 23322/2009), highway facilities (T.A.R. Lazio, Roma, sez. III, n. 2369/2009 and T.A.R. Puglia, Bari, sez. I, n. 399/2009) and organizing a Public Fair, the *aziende speciali delle Camere di commercio* (Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 24 November 2011, n. 6211), as well as *RAI* (Cass., Sez. Un., 22 December 2011, n. 28329) were considered bodies governed by public law.

Note:

(3) State-Region Competence: A. Massera, *La disciplina dei contratti pubblici: la relativa continuità in una materia instabile*, in *Gior. Dir. Amm.*, 2009, 1252; D. Casalini, *Il recepimento nazionale del diritto europeo dei contratti pubblici tra autonomia regionale ed esigenze nazionali di «tutela dell'unità giuridica ed economica» dell'ordinamento*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2009, 1215-1237.

(4) Art. 117, comma 2, lett. e, l, m, s, Cost.

(5) Body Governed by Public Law: S. Girella (a cura di), *Organismi di diritto pubblico e imprese pubbliche: l'ambito soggettivo nel sistema degli appalti europeo e nazionale*, Milano, 2010; D. Casalini, *Concessionario, organismo di diritto pubblico o gestore in house: chi sopporta il rischio economico della gestione delle autostrade?*, in questa *Rivista*, 2009, 882-889.

The constant specification of in house providing (6) requirements through ECJ case-law (ECJ, C-324/07, *Coditel Brabant SA*; ECJ, C-573/07, *Sea s.r.l. v Comune di Ponte Nossa*) sheds light on the interpretative issues at stake at the national level, mainly underlining the distinction between property of and control over the in house provider as for the assessment of the similar control requirement (ECJ, C-371/05, *EU Commission v Italy*; ECJ, C-295/05, *Asociación Nacional de Empresas Forestales (Asemfo) c. Transformación Agraria SA (Tragsa), Administración del Estado*). The requirement is met whenever several public authorities, holding even a minimal share in the in house provider's capital, exercise the actual power of defining the industrial strategies and the core decisions of the in house provider (Cons. Stato, sez. V, 3 February 2009, n. 591, Cons. Stato, sez. V, 9 March 2009, n. 1365 e Cons. Stato, sez. V, 26 August 2009, n. 5082; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 11 August 2010, n. 5620; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 24 September 2010, n. 7092; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 8 March 2011, n. 1447; Cons. Stato, sez. I, opinion, 23 March 2011, n. 5653). The essential destination requirement shall be assessed both from a qualitative and quantitative point of view (ECJ, C-220/06, *Asociación Profesional de Empresas de Reparto y Manipulado de Correspondencia c. Administración del Estado*; Corte cost. n. 439/2008). However the Italian legislation limited the in house provider's activities outside its relevant territories, forbidding even the power of tendering procedures issued by public authorities other than the controlling ones (D.L. n. 223/2006 converted by law n. 248/2006). The exception to public procurement rules set out by the ECJ in C-480/06 (*Commission v Germany*), concerning cooperation arrangements among public authorities aiming at carrying out public tasks jointly and without a financial consideration, has not yet found application in our national case-law. Nonetheless, several forms of cooperation and joint exercise of public tasks among local public authorities have long been known in the Italian legal system (art. 15, law n. 241/1990 and art. 31-33, D.L. n. 267/2000) and have recently been promoted or even imposed by the budgetary law (L. n. 244/2007, art. 2, § 28; D.L. n. 78/2010, art. 14, § 25-31). As for the definition of economic operator, any individual or legal person offering works, supply or service provision on the market, regardless of its legal qualification as non-profit organisation (7), NGO, public or private body in the relevant national system, is considered an «economic operator» according to EU directives on public procurement (Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 8 June 2010, n. 3638; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 25 February 2009, n. 1128; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 26 August 2010, n. 5956 *Autorità per la Vigilanza sui Contratti Pubblici, determinazione 21 October 2010, n. 7, questioni interpretative concernenti la disciplina dell'articolo 34 del D.Lgs. 163/2006 relativa ai soggetti a cui possono essere affidati i contratti pubblici*; C.G.C.E., 23 December 2009, C-305/08).

The special legislation on organized crimes (L. 13 August 2010, n. 136, art. 13) defines modalities for creating at regional level one or more central purchasing bodies (specifically named stazioni uniche appaltanti - SUA, (8) for the implementation of the provision see: D.P.C.M. 30 June 2011, regarding the *Stazione Unica Appaltante, in attuazione dell'articolo 13 della legge 13 agosto 2010, n. 136 - Piano straordinario contro le mafie*). This provision also establishes the awarding of public contracts and the checking of the execution phase at the territorial level (regional, provincial, interprovincial, municipal and inter municipal level) with the other administrative bodies involved. Some limitations of this provision seem to concern the territory in which these authorities can operate. The risk is the duplication of the contractual activity with other central purchasing bodies on the same territory and difficulty in aggregating the needs of local authorities. The provision may give rise to the opposite effect by maintaining many individual award procedures in the hands of the SUA rather than a real aggregation of needs and joint procurement through framework agreements.

P.C.C., art. 33, comma 3-bis, (introduced by D.L. 6 December 2011, n. 201, art. 23, comma 4, converted into L. 22 December 2011, n. 214) limits capacity to stipulate contracts of municipalities with less than 5000 inhabitants. These municipalities, organized in aggregations of municipalities (according to art. 32, D.Lgs. 18 August 2000, n. 267) or consortium, from 31 of March 2013 (on the introduction of this term see D.L. 29 December 2011, n. 216, art. 29, comma 11-ter, converted with amendments into L. 24 February 2012, n. 14) will have to entrust their procurements of works, services and supplies to a central purchasing bodies (P.C.C., art. 33, comma 3-bis, introduced by D.L. 6 December 2011, n. 201, art. 23, comma 4, converted into L. 22 December 2011, n. 214).

Strategic use of public procurement policies

The new Government regulation enforcing the code introduced the planning of the awarding procedures (9) (art.

Note:

(6) In-House providing: for the similar control requirement see C. Volpe, *In house providing, Corte di giustizia, Consiglio di Stato e legislatore nazionale. Un caso di convergenze parallele?*, in www.giustizia-amministrativa.it; R. Cavallo Perin, D. Casalini, *The control over in-house providing organizations*, in *Public Procurement Law Review*, 2009, 5, 227-240; for a wider perspective see R. Caranta, *The In-House Providing: The Law as It Stands in the EU*, in *The In House Providing in European Law*, M. Comba and S. Treumer (eds.), Copenhagen, 2010; M. Comba, *In-House Providing in Italy: the circulation of a model*, in *The In House Providing in European Law*, M. Comba and S. Treumer (eds.), Copenhagen, 2010; F. Cassella, *In-House providing - European regulations vs. national systems*, in *The In House Providing in European Law*, M. Comba and S. Treumer (eds.), Copenhagen, 2010; M. G. Pulvirenti, *Recenti orientamenti in tema di affidamenti in house*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2009, 108; G. Corso, G. Fares, *Crepuscolo dell'in house?*, in *Foro It.*, 2009, I, 1319; H. Simonetti, *Il modello delle società in house al vaglio della corte costituzionale*, in *Foro It.*, 2009, I, 1314; G. Piperata, *La corte costituzionale, il legislatore regionale ed il modello «a mosaico» della società in house*, in *Regioni*, 2009, 651.

(7) No profit Organization: S. Mento, *La partecipazione delle fondazioni alle procedure per l'affidamento di contratti pubblici*, in *Giorn. Dir. Amm.*, 2010, 151.

(8) Stazione unica appaltante: M. Pignatti, *La Stazione Unica Appaltante: le modalità di finanziamento e la trasparenza dell'attività*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2011; R. De Nicolis, *La nuova disciplina antimafia in materia di pubblici appalti*, in questa *Rivista*, 2010, 1129.

(9) Planning of the awarding procedures: C. Contessa, P. De Bernardis, *Organi del procedimento e programmazione nel nuovo regolamento unico*, in questa *Rivista*, 2011, 757 ss.

271). The new regulation provides that the contracting authorities can annually approve the planning of purchases for the following financial years by extending to the contracts of services and supplies the same provisions that are mandatory for public works (art. 128, comma 2 last commas, 9, 10 e 11), apart from the possibility to purchase goods and services not provided for in such planning in cases of necessity and urgency. Concerning public works, the government regulation enforcing the code specifies also provisions about work planning (it establishes a term for the adoption of the three-year program, cf. artt. 13 and ff.) and it expressly provides the content of the feasibility study (art. 14).

In 2011, a new provision was introduced whereby contracting authorities are obliged to split contracts into functional lots (P.C.C., art. 2, comma 1-bis, introduced by D.L. 6 December 2011, n. 201, art. 44, comma 7, converted in law 22 December 2011, n. 214). Such a provision can be interpreted as a social clause to facilitate the participation of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the public procurement market, thus promoting open competition.. With specific reference to public works sector in the field of large infrastructure the law provide the involvement of SMEs (P.C.C., art. 2 comma 1-bis, introduced by D.L. 6 December 2011, n. 201, art. 44, comma 7, converted in law 22 December 2011, n. 214). These provisions, in line with policies set by the EU Commission (see *Green Paper on the modernization of EU public procurement. For a more efficient European market for procurement*, COM (2011) 15 final; *Evaluation Report Impact and Effectiveness of EU Public Procurement Legislation*, SEC (2011) 853 final) allow the inclusion in tender documents of social clauses, in favor of SMEs, that take into account, the EU rules and principles. However Italian law does not specify how to achieve those results.

The urgency of a spending review required the establishment of an interministerial committee (D.L. 7 May 2012, n. 52, art. 1) and the appointment of a "commissario straordinario" (special commissioner) to which is attributed the definition of the spending level on public purchases of goods and services and the tasks of supervision, monitoring and coordination of the public procurement of goods and services. For the same purposes was encouraged the use of electronic means, through the availment of a IT system (ASP - Application Service Provider) of the Ministry of Economy and Finance (D.L. May 7, 2012, n. 52, art. 9). To simplify the public procurement of goods and services related to IT systems was excluded both the obligatory nature of the technical opinion (previously mandatory and non-binding) that would be required to the National Centre for Computing in Public Administration (D.L. May 7, 2012, n. 52, art. 10) and the administrative fees applied by local governments for the purchases of goods and services made by using IT tools (D.L. 7 May 2012, n. 52, art. 13).

Aggregated procurement (10) has been one of the main focus of the recent Italian legislation who established central purchasing bodies at the local level (11) able to network with the national central purchasing body (Consip) (12) which, since 2000 (13), is entrusted with the task of awarding framework agreements which the government administrations are compelled to take part in (14). However, it is worth noticing that the framework agreements awarded by Consip concern a very few category of products and services, set out annually by a Ministerial decree. Local authorities shall refer to Consip's framework contracts as price and quality benchmarks (15) for their own purchasing (Cons. Stato, sez. V, 2 February 2009, n. 557) and local civil servants who fail in enforcing these benchmarks are liable (Corte conti, Reg. Valle d'Aosta, 23 November 2005, n. 14).

In drafting the competitive tender documents and in the awarding procedures the contracting authority has to use improved value for money parameters compared to those contained in similar tenders and goods and services contracts made by the central purchasing body - congruence assessment - (D.L. 7 May 2012, n. 52, art. 7) (16). This is not required when the contracting authority verifies fulfilment of the value for money benchmarks contained in the framework agreements made by the central purchasing body (D.L. 7 May 2012, n. 52, art. 7). For the in-progress

Note:

(10) Aggregated procurement: G. M. Racca, *Collaborative procurement and contract performance in the Italian healthcare sector: illustration of a common problem in European procurement*, in *Public Procurement Law Review*, 2010, 119; G. M. Racca, La professionalità nei contratti pubblici della sanità: centrali di committenza e accordi quadro, in *Foro Amm. - C.d.S.*, 2010, 1475; G. M. Racca, R. Cavallo Perin, G. L. Albano, *The safeguard of competition in the execution phase of public procurement: framework agreements as flexible competitive tools*, in *Quaderni Consip*, VI (2010); G. L. Albano, F. Antellini Russo, *Problemi e prospettive del Public procurement in Italia tra esigenze della pubblica amministrazione obiettivi di politica economica*, 2009, in *Economia Italiana*, 809; D. Broggi, *Consip: il significato di un'esperienza, Teoria e pratica tra e-Procurement ed e-Government*, Roma, 2008, 9.

(11) L. 27 December 2006, n. 296, *Disposizioni per la formazione del bilancio annuale e pluriennale dello Stato (legge finanziaria 2007)*, art. 1, comma 455. See also: Autorità per la Vigilanza sui Contratti Pubblici di Lavori, Servizi e Forniture, *Censimento ed analisi dell'attività contrattuale svolta nel biennio 2007-2008 dalle Centrali di Committenza Regionali e verifica dello stato di attuazione del sistema a rete*, 27 e 28 January 2010, in <http://www.avc-p.it/portal/public/classic/>.

(12) See agreement of 21 December 2009 between SCR-Piemonte S.p.A. and Consip S.p.A., in <http://www.consip.it>.

(13) L. 23 December 1999, n. 488, *legge finanziaria per l'anno 2000*, art. 26.

(14) L. 23 December 1999, n. 488, *Budgetary law for 2000*, e art. 26, providing the mandatory participation in Consip agreement for any public authority, apart from the municipalities with less than 1000 or 5000 (if mountain) citizens. See also the *Budgetary law for 2001*, art. 58; L. 24 December 2003, n. 350, *Budgetary law for 2004*, art. 3, § 166; D.L. 12 July 2004, n. 168, art. 1, conv. in L. 30 July 2004, n. 191; L. 24 December 2007, n. 244, art. 2, § 574, *Budgetary law for 2008*.

(15) Benchmarks: art. 1, comma 4, lett. c, D.L. 12 July 2004, n. 168; S. Ponzio, *La verifica di congruità delle offerte rispetto alle convenzioni Consip s.p.a. negli appalti pubblici di forniture e servizi*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2009, 2352; I. Pagani, *Appalti di fornitura ed "anomalia esterna" rispetto alle previsioni del codice dei contratti pubblici*, in questa *Rivista*, 2009, 592.

(16) L. 23 December 1999, n. 488, art. 26, comma 3, providing Consip framework contracts' price and quality as mandatory benchmarks for any contracting authority. G. M. Racca, *Aggregate Models of Public Procurement and Secondary Considerations: An Italian Perspective*, in *The Law of Green and Social Procurement in Europe*, R. Caranta, M. Trybus (Eds.), Djøf Publishing: Copenhagen, 165;

awarding procedures, where the tender has already been published, Consip S.p.A. can publish the applicable parameters on its website.

The regulation has specified the tasks of the person in charge of the procedure also in relation to the services and supplies sector (artt. 272-274). It provides that if purchasing is carried out through central purchasing bodies, the individual contracting authority (the contractor) shall appoint another person to be in charge of the procedure besides the first one who was appointed by the central purchasing body. In this case the director of the procedure (in coordination with the director of the execution phase if one has been appointed) are entrusted with the tasks of overseeing, controlling and surveillance in the execution phase of the contract in order to assure that the contract performance will be correct.

Rules on public contracts

Award procedures and new contractual tools

The negotiated procedure is frequently used in Italy: as for the public contracts (including those below threshold) awarded in 2010, more than 30% (with peaks of more than 60% in the sectors covered by EU Directive n. 17/2004) of the overall tendering procedures are negotiated procedure, accounting for a 28% of the total public contracting expenditure (Autorità per la Vigilanza sui contratti pubblici, *Relazione annuale 2010*, 15 June 2011). Therefore our PPC did not implement two of the cases justifying use of the negotiated procedure with prior publication of a contract notice, according to EU Directive n. 18/2004, art. 30, § 1, lett. b) and c): the exceptional cases, when the nature of the works, supplies, or services or the risks attaching thereto do not permit prior overall pricing as well as the case of services, *inter alia* services within category 6 of Annex II A, and intellectual services insofar as the nature of the services to be provided is such that contract specifications cannot be established with sufficient precision.

The negotiated procedure without prior publication of a contract notice entails the simultaneous dispatch of invitations to submit a tender to, at least, three economic operators meeting the qualitative selection criteria for the provision of the subject-matter of the contract, thus reducing considerably the competition for the award of the contract.

The implementation of competitive dialogue (17) in Italy has been postponed until the entry into force of the Government regulation enforcing the code (art. 253, § 1-quarter PCC). Since the implementation of PCC, a kind of competitive dialogue in Italy has been used solely as a possible instrument to award the few public contracts that do not fall within the scope of the Directives, such as concession of works or services and other forms of PFI and PPP. Nonetheless, Italian PCC limits the use of competitive dialogue which is not available for the most complex work procurements such as strategic infrastructure works and production plants (Art. 161-205 PCC), far beyond the purpose of EC law (whereas 31 of EU Directive n. 18/2004). The government regulation enforcing the code define the elements that must be contained in the contract notice, the procedure for submitting tender (including the presentation of innovative solutions) and final offers by economic operators and the possibility of introducing a provision for the purchase of the project submitted.

The *Ministero dell'economia e delle finanze* (through Consip S.p.A.) now has to create the instruments for the management of a dynamic purchasing system for public procurement (art. 287) also included IT tools and an advisory system for contracting authority.

In case of framework agreements concluded with several economic operators has been clarified that where all the terms are laid down in the framework agreement (*framework contract*) and is required the use of the "rotation" criterion, the order of priority should be done taking into account not only of results of the tender, but also the content of individual bids in relation to the needs of individual contracting authorities wishing to use the framework agreement to meet their needs (art. 287). This provision could allow a derogations from a strict application of the rotation criteria, especially when the framework agreement has been awarded with the most economically advantageous tender. In this case, goods and services offered by successful tenderers May have different characteristics. Now the regulation enforcing the code provides rules on the selection procedures of the contractor which are done digitally and it has also abrogated the previous regulation (D.P.R. 4 April 2002, n. 101).

The rule provide the means for the use of electronic auction, the IT system, the participation, the design of tender documents and improvements to an electronic auction conclusion, identifying the tasks of the manager IT system.

As for project financing initiative (18), following a EU Commission infringement procedure against Italy, (Cons. Sta-

Note:

(17) Competitive dialogue: G. M. Racca, D. Casalini, *Competitive dialogue in Italy*, in S. Arrowsmith, S. Treumer, *Competitive dialogue*, forthcoming, Cambridge, 2012; G. M. Racca, D. Casalini, *Implementation and application of competitive dialogue: experience in Italy*, *Public Procurement: Global Revolution V*, University of Copenhagen, 9-10 September 2010; on the comparison between competitive dialogue and French *Marchés de définition*: S. Ponzio, *Gli "appalti di definizione" nell'ordinamento francese. La violazione dei principi di trasparenza e concorrenza nell'aggiudicazione degli appalti pubblici*, in *Foro Amm. Cds*, 2010, 22.

(18) PFI: M. Mariani, *Il Project financing. Analisi giuridica, economico-finanziaria, tecnica, tributaria, bancaria, assicurativa*, Torino 2012; M. Baldi, *Il nuovo modello di project financing introdotto dal D.L. 70/2011*, in questa *Rivista*, 2011, 1040 ss.; G. F. Cartei, M. Ricchi (a cura di), *Finanza di Progetto. Temi e Prospettive*, Napoli 2010; G. Manfredi, *La finanza di progetto dopo il D.Lgs. n. 152/2008*, in *Dir. Amm.*, 2009, 429; V. Cesaroni, *La finanza di progetto*, in *Riv. Amm.*, 2009, 119; M. Mattalia, *Il Project financing come strumento di partenariato pubblico privato*, in *Foro Amm. Cds*, 2010, 23; Id, *Project financing, un istituto in continua evoluzione*, in *Giur. It.*, 2011, 5 ss. M. Baldi, *Le novità del D.L. 70/2011*, in questa *Rivista*, 2011, 1012; M. Mattalia, *Project financing, un istituto in continua evoluzione*, in *Giur. It.*, 2011; S. Luce, *La progettazione dei contratti pubblici di lavori, servizi e forniture. I profili problematici*, Lecce, 2011.

to, sez. IV, 13 January 2010, n. 75), Italian legislation was amended, restoring equality of treatment between the promoter and any other participant (art. 153, § 1-14 modified by l.d. n. 152/2008). PFI in Italy is designed as a two-fold procedure where the first phase (to choose the promoter) is not an awarding procedure subject to the relevant EU rules, whilst the second phase is subject to EU directives on public procurement as far as it aims to choose the final concessionaire (Cons. Stato, Ad. Plen., 15 April 2010, n. 1; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 28 May 2010, n. 3399). The possibility of issuing *project bond* by the project company is provided (P.C.C., artt. 157 and 158, as amended January 24, 2012 by D.L., n. 1, art. 41, converted into law March 24, 2012, n. 27).

Regarding the possibility of activating interventions not covered in the three-year program provided in the Code of public contracts, was amended in 2011 (P.C.C., art. 153, comma 19, amended by D.L. 13 May 2011, n. 70, art. 4, comma 2, lett. q) and completely rewritten in 2012 (D.L. 24 January 2012, n. 1, art. 59-bis, converted in L. 24 March 2012, n. 27). Recent Italian case law stated that the position of advantage of the "promoter" immediately affect the legal position of other tenderers which can not take part in the subsequent procedure for the award of the concession on the basis of their project and allows the proposition of a claim (Cons. Stato, Ad. Plen., 28 January 2012, n. 1) (19).

Concerning public-private partnership (20) has been introduced the availability of the "contratto di disponibilità". In this kind of contract the economic operator shall assume the costs and risks related to the construction and provision of the work. Contracting authority shall use this work for a period of time established in the contract during which pay a fee (P.C.C., art. 3, comma 15-bis.1 and 160-ter, introduced by D.L. 24 January 2012, n. 1 art. 44, comma 1, lett. a), converted into law 24 March 2012, n. 27).

The EU Treaty principles and provisions on the qualification requirements for planners and executors are applied to sponsorship contracts (21) of over forty thousand euro (P.C.C., art. 26, as amended by 20, comma 1, lett. b), D.L. 9 February 2012, n. 5, converted in L. 4 April 2012, n. 35). A specific discipline on the procedures for choosing sponsors has also been introduced in the cultural heritage sector (P.C.C., art. 199-bis, introduced by art. 20, comma 1, lett. h), D.L. 9 February 2012, n. 5, converted in L. 4 April 2012, n. 35).

The P.C.C. provides that in a restricted procedure, negotiated through the publication of a call for tenders or competitive dialogue, the contract awarding bodies - if the work is complex - May limit the number of suitable candidates on the basis of objective and not discriminatory criteria on the basis of the principle of proportionality identified in the call for tenders together with the minimum number of candidates and if required also the maximum number (P.C.C., art. 199-bis, introduced by art. 20, comma 1, lett. h), D.L. 9 February 2012, n. 5, converted into L. 4 April 2012, n. 35). This possibility is also known as "forcella". Resort to this provision, which had originally been conceived for public works, was extended in 2011 also to cover supplies and services of any price (P.C.C. art. 199-bis, introduced by art. 20, comma 1, lett. h), D.L. 9 February 2012, n. 5, converted in L. 4 April 2012, n. 35).

The awarding of public services concessions (22) (CGCE 10 March 2011, in C-274/09, *Privater Rettungsdienst und Krankentransport Stadler v Zweckverband für Rettungsdienst und Feuerwehralarmierung Passau*; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 9 September 2011, n. 5068; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 6 June 2011, n. 3377) falls outside the scope of EU Directive on public procurement and is subject to the European principles of competition in the internal market (C.G.C.E., 9 September 2010, C64/08, *Ernst Engelmann*; C.G.C.E., 3 June 2010, in C203/08, *Sporting Exchange Ltd v Minister van Justitie*). Recently the Italian Consiglio di Stato stated that public services concessions shall be awarded by means of an open or restricted procedure, whereas the use of a negotiated procedure comply with the EU principles only in case of extreme urgency or disproportionate costs in choosing alternative solutions due to their different technical characteristics (Cons. Stato, sez. V, 21 September 2010, n. 7024). With regard to public services concessions, the Law of August 6, 2008, n. 133 was recently abrogated by art 1(1), D.P.R. 18 July 2011, n. 113, as from 21 July 2011. The D.L. of June 25, 2008, n. 112 (*Disposizioni urgenti per lo sviluppo economico, la semplificazione, la competitività, la stabilizzazione della finanza pubblica e la perequazione tributaria*) had been converted by the law 6 August 2008. Art. 23 of the latter D.L. regulates procedures for management of local public services of economic importance, in compliance with EU regulations (Cons. Stato, sez. V, April 11, 2011, n. 2222). The D.L. 13 August 2011, n. 138 *Ulteriori misure urgenti per la stabilizzazione finanziaria e per lo sviluppo* was converted with amendments by art. 1, L. 14 September 2011, n. 148, art. 4, *Adeguamento della disciplina dei servizi pubblici locali al referendum popolare e alla normativa dall'Unione europea*, substituting the previous regulations. This law does not apply to the water service and does not provide the competitive award procedure to "in house" companies which

Note:

(19) M. Mattalia, *La nomofilachia dell'Adunanza plenaria in materia di project financing*, 2012, in corso di pubblicazione.

(20) Public-private partnership: M. A. Sandulli, *Il partenariato pubblico privato istituzionalizzato nell'evoluzione normativa*, in *www.federalismi.it*, 2012; F. Mastragostino (a cura di), *La collaborazione pubblico-privato e l'ordinamento amministrativo*, Torino, 2011; G. F. Cartei, *Le varie forme di partenariato pubblico-privato. Il quadro generale*, in questa Rivista, 2011, 893 ss.

(21) Sponsorship contracts: M. Mattalia, *Le sponsorizzazioni delle amministrazioni pubbliche: dalla libertà alla concorrenza*, Lecce, 2012.

(22) Public services concessions: G. Rizzo, *La concessione di servizi*, Torino, 2012; G. F. Cartei, *Il principio di equilibrio economico-finanziario e la disciplina del contratto di concessione*, in questa Rivista, 2012; F. Goisis, *Concessioni di costruzione e gestione di lavori e concessioni di servizi*, in *Ius Publicum Network Review*, http://www.ius-publicum.com/repository/uploads/14_06_2011_17_33_Goisis_IT.pdf 2011; C. Volpe, *Appalti pubblici e servizi pubblici. Dall'Art. 23-bis al decreto legge manovra di August 2011 attraverso il referendum: l'attuale quadro normativo*, 17 October 2011, in *www.giustizia-amministrativa.it*; L. Perfetti, *La disciplina dei servizi pubblici locali ad esito del referendum ed il piacere dell'autonomia locale*, in questa Rivista, 2011, 906 ss; R. Villata (a cura di), *La riforma dei servizi pubblici locali*, Torino, 2011; C. Viviani, *La disciplina dei servizi pubblici locali di rilevanza economica: si definisce il quadro della Riforma del Governo Monti*, in questa Rivista, 2012, 511; A. Arena, *La nozione di servizio pubblico nel diritto dell'integrazione economica. La specificità del modello sovranazionale europeo*, Napoli, 2011.

are entirely public owned when the economic value of the service is equal to or less than the total sum of 900,000 Euros per year (§ 13).

The new Government regulation enforcing the code specified some aspects of the public procurement procedure for alternative catering services (art. 285 which defines the activity covered by the service, identifies as preferential criterion for the awarding of the contract that of the economically most advantageous bid providing for the obligation of motivation in the case of the application of the criterion of the lowest price, a list of examples of the assessment criteria of the bids) and of cleaning of buildings (art. 286 identifies evaluation criteria which have to be considered for the awarding, their relative weighting, the content of the technical report, the modalities for awarding points).

Qualitative selection of tenderers and technical specifications

In Italy, there's a specific system for work suppliers' suitability requirements' verification (23), according to which licensed private companies (SOAs see: Autorità per la Vigilanza sui contratti pubblici, Determinazione, 15 March 2011, n. 1, concerning *chiarimenti in ordine all'applicazione delle sanzioni alle SOA previste dall'articolo 73 del D.P.R. 5 October 2010, n. 20*) have the task of certifying and assessing the qualification requirements of undertakings which provide works (artt. 34 and 40, PCC). The suitability requirements of suppliers and service providers can be self-declared by the latter and their assessment is done by each single contracting authority within each single awarding procedure, thus entailing a considerable amount of time and resources. The verification concerns the winning tenderer and at least 10% of the other participants chosen by lot (art. 48 PCC see: Autorità per la Vigilanza sui contratti pubblici, Determinazione 21 May 2009, n. 5, *Linee guida per l'applicazione dell'art. 48 del D.Lgs. n. 163/2006*).

The extreme detailed Italian discipline on suitability requirements (including personal situation, economic and financial standing and technical and professional ability) often leads to interpretative issues which courts try to settle through the application of principles such as *favor participationis*, equality of treatment and non-discrimination (24), in order to allow for the widest possible participation (Cons. Stato, sez. V, 2 February 2012, n. 546).

The Italian PCC was amended in order to comply with an ECJ decision (ECJ, sez. IV, 19 May 2009, C-538/2007) stating that any national provision defining cases of exclusion from an awarding procedure has to be proportional and reasonable and the exclusion shall follow a specific procedure which the participants are allowed to take part in. The Italian PCC presently (art. 38) provides for the exclusion of participants who are substantially and mutually linked only insofar as it is proved that the relevant offers of the linked participants come from the same decisional structure (Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 25 January 2010, n. 247; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 26 February 2010, n. 1120; C.G.A., 21 April 2010, n. 546; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 7 April 2010, n. 1967; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 6 April 2009, n. 2139; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 8 September 2008, n. 4267). This is the case of firms using the same venues, having the same telephone number, whose chief executives are relatives (Cons. Stato V, 10 February 2010, No. 690). Italian case-law requires a specific procedure to assess the substantial links (25) among tenderers in order to allow their exclusion (Cons. Stato, sez. IV, 12 March 2009, n. 1459; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 20 August 2008, n. 3982; Cons. Stato, sez. IV, 28 January 2011, n. 673; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 30 November 2011, n. 6329) and rules for the recording of the exclusion by the Authority for the Supervision of Public Contracts (Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 15 June 2010, n. 3754; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 5 February 2010, n. 530).

A widespread ground of exclusion is the false or defective self-declaration of the personal situation requirements (26) by the tenderers (T.A.R. Piemonte, sez. II, 16 March 2009, n. 772; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 2 February 2010, n. 428; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 6 April 2010, n. 1909; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 11 May 2010, n. 2822; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 22 February 2010, n. 1017; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 13 July 2010, n. 4520; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 26 May 2010, n. 3364; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 23 February 2010, n. 1040 Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 12 April 2011, n. 2257; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 21

Note:

(23) Work Suppliers Qualification Scheme: C. Contessa, *Giunge alla consulta la questione dell'obbligo per le SOA di svolgere attività in via esclusiva*, in questa Rivista, 2012; L. Perfetti, *Sulla necessità di distinguere fra pincipes sans texte e sans fondament. Considerazioni in merito a requisiti di qualificazione, quote di partecipazione in associazioni o raggruppamenti e di esecuzione di lavori pubblici*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2011, 2142-2149; L. Giampaolino, *Il codice degli appalti e il sistema di qualificazione*, in *Riv. Trim. App.*, 2009, 301.

(24) Favor participationis and Equality of Treatment: S. Usai, *L'interpretazione delle clausole ambigue inserite nella lex specialis della gara*, in questa Rivista, 2010, 1319; S. Monzani, *L'integrazione documentale nell'ambito di un appalto pubblico tra esigenze di buon andamento e di tutela della par condicio dei concorrenti*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2009, 2346; I. Filippetti, *Par condicio e favor participationis nell'interpretazione degli atti di gara*, in questa Rivista, 2009, 821.

(25) Substantial relationship among tenderers: S. Monzani, *L'estensione del divieto di partecipazione ad una medesima gara di imprese controllate o collegate in nome della tutela effettiva della concorrenza*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2009, 666; M. Briccarello, *Collegamento sostanziale: il superamento del divieto assoluto di partecipazione alla gara*, in questa Rivista, 2010, 731; S. Ponzio, *Il procedimento per l'accertamento del "collegamento sostanziale" tra imprese negli appalti pubblici*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2010, 1795.

(26) Personal Situation: G. Ferrari, *Dichiarazione personale del possesso del requisito di moralità da parte dei singoli rappresentanti dell'impresa*, in *Giorn. Dir. Amm.*, 2010, 537; G. Manfredi, *Moralità professionale nelle procedure di affidamento e certezza del diritto*, in questa Rivista, 2010, 508; A. Azzariti, *Requisiti di capacità tecnico-professionale e cause di esclusione negli appalti di forniture delle asl*, in *Sanità pubbl. e privata*, 2009, 5, 77; G. Ferrari, L. Tarantino, *Revoca di aggiudicazione provvisoria per condanna penale dell'amministratore e direttore tecnico*, in questa Rivista, 2009, 1518; P. Patrito, *L'art. 38 del codice dei contratti pubblici nuovamente al vaglio della giurisprudenza*, in questa Rivista, 2009, 858; D. De Carolis, *Vicende soggettive delle imprese, obblighi del partecipante e poteri della stazione appaltante*, in questa Rivista, 2009, 327; F. Bertini, *Durc e gare di appalto, tra dubbi e certezze*, in questa Rivista, 2009, 10, 1214; G. Ferrari, *Verifica dei requisiti di ammissione in caso di scissione societaria*, in *Giorn. Dir. Amm.*, 2009, 539; M. Napoli, *Imprese vittime della criminalità organizzata ed esclusione dalle pubbliche gare*, in questa Rivista, 2009, 1413; F. A. Giordanengo, *Sulle caratteristiche essenziali dei consorzi stabili*, in *Foro Amm. TAR*, 2010, 1567.

October 2011, n. 5674; Cons. Stato, sez. IV, 22 November 2011, n. 6153; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 18 January 2012, n. 178; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 2 February 2012, n. 527) that are required even with regard to the economic operator whose qualitative requirements the tenderer relies upon (Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 6 April 2010, n. 1930; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 23 February 2010, n. 1054; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 15 June 2010, n. 3759; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 23 May 2011, n. 3077; Cons. Stato, sez. III, 15 November 2011, n. 6040). Italian PCC provides also for the exclusion of tenderers who has incurred in previous breaches of public contract even if agreed upon with other contracting authorities (art. 38, § 1, lett. f, PCC; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 15 March 2010, n. 1550; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 28 July 2010, n. 5029; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 5 July 2011, n. 4025; Cons. Stato, sez. III, 4 November 2011, n. 5866; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 28 December 2011, n. 6951).

From 2013 the contracting authorities will acquire the data demonstrating possession of the technical, organizational, economic, financial and general requirements needed to participate in the procedures regulated by the P.C.C. through the Public Contract National Database at the Italian Authority for the Supervision of Public Contracts (P.C.C., art. 6-bis, introduced by art. 20, comma 1, lett. a), D.L. 9 February 2012, n. 5, converted into L. 4 April 2012, n. 35). This Authority will define the data which should be included in Database and the updating procedures. In 2011 the regulation of the general requirements of tenderers (P.C.C., art. 38) was amended. For example, the requirement for professionals working in enterprises to have a clean criminal record has been further tightened (Art. 38, lett. b) and c) of the P.C.C.). However, their exclusion would no longer be valid in the case of depenalisation, rehabilitation, extinguishment of the offence or reversal of judgment. Tax evasion (D.L. 2 March 2012, n. 16, converted with amendments into L. 26 April 2012, n. 44) is considered serious criminal conduct entailing exclusion from the tender if the amount exceeds ten thousand Euros (D.L. 13 May 2011, n. 70, art. 4, converted into L. 12 July 2011, n. 106) (27).

A mandatory exclusion of tenderers clause (28) has been introduced in the awarding procedure (D.L. 13 May 2011, n. 70, art. 4, converted into L. 12 July 2011, n. 106). The contracting entities will thus exclude the tenderers only on grounds of non fulfillment provided by P.C.C. by its regulation of implementation and execution and of the other law provisions, and "in cases of absolute uncertainty of the contents and origins of the tender; lack of signature or any other essential elements or if the package containing the tender or applications has been tampered with or any other irregularities regarding the packaging leading to the suspicions that the confidentiality principle of the tender has been violated in the specific case". Any other exclusion clauses are considered unenforceable.

Award criteria

The distinction between qualitative requirements and selection criteria (29) (ECJ, sez. I, 24 January 2008, in C-532/06, *Emm. G. Lianakis AE v Dimos Alexandroupolis*; Circolare del Dipartimento per le Politiche Europee della Presidenza del Consiglio, March 1 2007; Cons. Stato, sez. V, n. 2716/2009) is still debated in Italy since Italian administrative courts allow or the evaluation of subjective elements whenever they seems decisive in granting the fair performance of the contract, mainly in case of services contract (Cons. Stato, sez. V, 21 May 2010, n. 3208; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 12 June 2009, n. 3716; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 2 October 2009, n. 6002; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 22 June 2010, n. 3887).

In case of awarding on the ground of the most economically advantageous tender criterion (30) (Autorità per la Vigilanza sui contratti pubblici, *Il criterio di aggiudicazione dell'offerta economicamente più vantaggiosa*, December 2011; Id, Determinazione 24 November 2011, n. 7, Linee guida per l'applicazione dell'offerta economicamente più vantaggiosa nell'ambito dei contratti di servizi e forniture), the contracting authority must appoint a jury (31) whose composition is defined by Italian PCC in details (art. 84 PCC). The members of the jury must have adequate professional skills with regard to the subject-matter of the contract (Cons. Stato, sez. IV, 10 January 2012, n. 27; Cons. Stato, sez. III, 12 April 2011, n. 2265; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 4 March 2011, n. 1386; Cons. Stato, sez. IV, 31 March 2010, n. 1830; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 14 June 2010, n. 3732; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 30 April 2009, n. 2761) and they must be appointed before the opening of the envelopes that contain the offers (Cons. Stato, sez. V, 6 July 10, n. 4311; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 27 October 2011, n. 5740).

Note:

(27) I. Pagani, *La valutazione della stazione appaltante sulla gravità degli inadempimenti contributivi*, in questa Rivista, 2012; F. A. Giordanengo, *Sulla dichiarazione sostitutiva ex art. 38 D.Lgs. 163/2006 resa con riferimento ai soggetti cessati*, in questa Rivista, 2011, 1440.

(28) Mandatory exclusion of tenderers clause: C. E. Gallo, *Le prescrizioni a pena di esclusione alla luce dell'art. 46, comma 1-bis, del codice dei contratti pubblici*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2011, 3733; R. Giani, *Le cause di esclusione dalle gare tra tipizzazione legislativa, bandi standard e dequotazione del ruolo della singola stazione appaltante*, in questa Rivista, 2012, 95 ss.; A. Massera, *Il "decreto sviluppo"*, in *Giorn. Dir. Amm.*, 2011, 1049; R. De Nictolis, *Le novità del D.L. 70/2011*, in questa Rivista, 2011, 1012; S. Ponzio, *I limiti all'esclusione dalle gare pubbliche e la regolarizzazione documentale*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2011, 2464 ss.

(29) Distinction between qualitative requirements and selection criteria: M. Pignatti, *Selezione dell'offerta e selezione dell'offerente: la distinzione fra la valutazione dei requisiti dell'offerente e la qualità dell'offerta*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2010, 2414 ss.; A. Annibali, *Requisiti di idoneità e criteri di aggiudicazione dell'offerta*, in questa Rivista, 2010, 201; M. E. Comba, *Selection and Award Criteria in Italian Public Procurement Law*, in *Public Procurement Law Review*, 2009, 122; A. Annibali, *Requisiti di idoneità e criteri di aggiudicazione dell'offerta*, in questa Rivista, 2010, 201.

(30) Most Economically Advantageous Tender: I. Franco, *Trasparenza e pubblicità nelle gare di appalto con il criterio dell'offerta economicamente più vantaggiosa*, in questa Rivista, 2009, 137; C. Contessa, *L'offerta economicamente più vantaggiosa: brevi note su un istituto ancora in cerca di equilibri*, in *www.giustamm.it*; A. Mascaro, *Appalti: il prezzo non prevale automaticamente sulla qualità se la lex specialis rispetta i parametri di proporzionalità e ragionevolezza*, in *www.dirittoegiustizia.it*.

(31) Jury: M. Sichetti, *La commissione giudicatrice nella procedura di valutazione dell'offerta economicamente più vantaggiosa*, in *Corriere Merito*, 2010, 3; C. Silvestro, *Funzionari interni componenti delle commissioni giudicatrici e requisiti di professionalità*, in questa Rivista, 2009, 1373.

According to the principle of transparency (32), every sessions of the awarding body must be open to the public, the only exception being the evaluation of the single element of the most economically advantageous tender criterion by the jury (Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 8 June 2010, n. 3634).

As the *Adunanza Plenaria of the Consiglio di Stato* declared (Cons. Stato, Ad. Plen., 28 July 2011, n. 13), when the most economically advantageous tender (33) is applied the envelopes that contain the technical offer have to be opened in public in order to check that all the required documents have been produced by the tenderers (D.P.R. 5 October 2010, n. 207, art. 120 as amended by D.L. 7 May 2012, n. 52, art. 12).

As for the most economically advantageous tender (Art. 83, § 4, PCC), Italian rules compel contracting authorities to define in advance, within the contract documents, the elements of tender subject to evaluation and their relative weighting (Cons. Stato, sez. III, 29 November 2011, n. 6306; T.A.R. Piemonte, sez. II, 19 March 2009, n. 785). The jury is allowed to specify the criteria used to mark each element used to determine the most economically advantageous tender, providing that this specification do not entail a modification of the relevant criteria (Authority, opinion n. 119 of 22 January 2007; n. 90 of 20 March 2008; n. 125 del 23 April 2008; n. 183 del 12 June 2008; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 8 September 2008, n. 4271; Corte di Giustizia, decision of 24 November 2005, case C-331/04).

The most economically advantageous tender criterion is sometimes applied in Italy by means of mathematical formulae (34) which should provide an easier marking of the single element of the tender, and can seem to be an aid to the objective evaluation of the tender. Nonetheless, they can be thwarted by tenderers and May lead to further criticalities instead of smoothing the process. The proportionality and reasonableness of these formulae are often subject to judicial review in order to avoid that a single element of the tender alone could turn to be decisive for the final awarding (Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 15 November 2011, n. 6023; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 16 July 2010, n. 4624; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 9 April 2010, n. 2004; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 22 June 2010, n. 3890; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 17 December 2008, n. 6278). Some problems May arise when the price element of the tender is zero (35), since the mathematical formula becomes inapplicable or has an unexpected outcome (leading to a zero mark), thus leading to the exclusion of the tender (Cons. Stato, sez. V, 16 July 2010, n. 4624).

In case of abnormally low tenders (36), the contracting authority shall verify their constituent elements by consulting the tenderer, taking account of the evidence supplied (Cons. Stato, sez. III, 22 November 2011, n. 6144; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 24 August 2011, n. 4801; Cons. Stato, sez. IV, 2 August 2011, n. 4593; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 15 July 2010, n. 4584; Cons. Stato, sez. IV, 30 October 2009, n. 6708; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 13 February 2009, n. 826; T.A.R. Puglia, Lecce, sez. III, 24 September 2009, n. 2186) even when the contract documents require the tenderer to provide in advance (37) the justifications of some elements of the tender when the latter is submitted (Cons. Stato, sez. V, 17 February 2010, n. 922; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 2 April 2010, n. 1893; Cons. Stato, sez. VI, 2 April 2010, n. 1893; Cons. Stato, sez. V, 19 September 2011, n. 5279). To that aim, among the details of the constituent elements of the tender which can be considered relevant are: the possible economic exploitation of the service provided in other markets or other contractual relationships (Cons. Stato, sez. V, 2 February 2010, n. 443), the timetable of the contract performance (T.A.R. Calabria, Reggio Calabria, 4 June 2010, n. 532) and the reutilization of materials and ancillary services produced during the contract performance (T.A.R. Lazio, Roma, sez. III-ter, 20 May 2010 n. 12518).

Note:

(32) Publicity of Sessions: R. Ricci, *Concentrazione, continuità e pubblicità delle sedute di gara: presupposti imprescindibili dei lavori delle commissioni giudicatrici*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2011, 1241 ss.; A. Valletti, *La pubblicità delle sedute di gara si estende all'offerta tecnica*, in questa *Rivista*, 2011, 11, 1314; A. Gandino, *Sulla pubblicità delle sedute di gara: riflessioni a margine della trasparenza amministrativa nel codice dei contratti pubblici (e non solo)*, in *Foro Amm. TAR*, 2009, 1276.

(33) Most economically advantageous tender: A. Valletti, *La pubblicità delle sedute di gara si estende all'offerta tecnica*, in questa *Rivista*, 2011, 1299.

(34) Mathematical formula: M. Mattalia, *L'offerta economicamente più vantaggiosa e l'applicazione della formula matematica prevista dal disciplinare di gara*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2010.

(35) G. Ferrari, L. Tarantino, *Sugli esiti dell'offerta economica pari a zero*, in questa *Rivista*, 2010, 1115 ss.

(36) Abnormally low offer: M. Pignatti, *Il giudizio sulle offerte anomale tra effettività del contraddittorio ed oggettività nelle valutazioni*, in *Foro Amm. CdS*, 2009, 1302; T. Del Giudice, *La rilevanza della concorrenza «effettiva» nel giudizio di anomalia dell'offerta: riflessioni in ordine alla compressione dell'utile d'impresa*, in *Foro Amm. TAR*, 2009; A. Manzi, *Le novità in materia di offerte anomale*, in questa *Rivista*, 2010, 270; E. Santoro, *Offerte anomale e calcolo del costo del lavoro: favor per le imprese che assumono lavoratori dalle liste di mobilità*, in questa *Rivista*, 2010, 208; L. Masi, *Offerte con ribassi identici nel procedimento di determinazione della soglia di anomalia*, in questa *Rivista*, 2010, 186; L. Miconi, *Il problema dei ribassi elevati nell'affidamento dei servizi di architettura e ingegneria: breve commento al nuovo regolamento di attuazione del D.Lgs. 163/2006 e parere del consiglio di stato n. 313/2010*, in www.giustamm.it.

(37) G. Fares, *Sulle conseguenze dell'omessa presentazione delle giustificazioni preventive*, in *Foro Amm. TAR*, 2009, 813.