

This Transcript has not been proof read or corrected. It is a working tool for the Tribunal for use in preparing its judgment. It will be placed on the Tribunal Website for readers to see how matters were conducted at the public hearing of these proceedings and is not to be relied on or cited in the context of any other proceedings. The Tribunal's judgment in this matter will be the final and definitive record.

**IN THE COMPETITION**  
**APPEAL TRIBUNAL**

Case No. 1046/2/4/04

Victoria House,  
Bloomsbury Place,  
London WC1A 2EB

6 October 2006

Before:  
SIR CHRISTOPHER BELLAMY  
(The President)

THE HONOURABLE ANTONY LEWIS  
PROFESSOR JOHN PICKERING

Sitting as a Tribunal in England and Wales

**BETWEEN:**

**ALBION WATER LIMITED**

Appellant

Supported by

**AQUAVITAE (UK) LIMITED**

Intervener

-v-

**WATER SERVICES REGULATION AUTHORITY**  
(Formerly Director General of Water Services)

Respondent

Supported by

**DŴR CYMRU CYFYNGEDIG**  
and  
**UNITED UTILITIES WATER PLC**

Interveners

Transcribed from the Shorthand notes of  
Beverley F. Nunnery & Co.  
Official Shorthand Writers and Tape Transcribers  
Quality House, Quality Court, Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1HP  
Tel: 020 7831 5627 Fax: 020 7831 7737

**PROCEEDINGS**  
**AFTER JUDGMENT HANDED DOWN**

## **APPEARANCES**

Mr. Rhodri Thompson QC appeared on behalf of the Appellant.

Mr. Rupert Anderson QC and Miss Valentina Sloane (instructed by the Head of Legal Services, Water Services Regulation Authority) appeared on behalf of the Respondent.

Miss Su-Yong Kim (of Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP) appeared on behalf of Dŵr Cymru Cyfyngedig.

Mr. Fergus Randolph (instructed by the Group Legal Manager, United Utilities) appeared on behalf of United Utilities.

---

1 THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal is handing down its Judgment today in case no. 1046, Albion  
2 Water Limited, supported by Aquavitae (UK) Limited v Water Services Regulation Authority  
3 (formerly Director General of Water Services) supported by Dŵr Cymru Cyfyngedig and  
4 United Utilities Water PLC.

5 A copy of the Judgment has been handed to the parties. The parties have until 4 p.m. on  
6 Tuesday, 10<sup>th</sup> October 2006 to ask whether anything should be excised from the Judgment on  
7 grounds of commercial confidentiality. Subject to that, the full text of the Judgment (which  
8 runs to some 300 pages) will be published on the Tribunal's website. For convenience we  
9 propose also to publish an abridged version of the Judgment.

10 As far as today's proceedings are concerned, the Tribunal has also made available to the parties  
11 a summary of the Judgment which is, in effect, sections I and XVI of the main Judgment; that  
12 summary will also be made publicly available as soon as the Tribunal rises.

13 Paragraphs 1 and 2 and 62 to 66 of the summary are in the following terms:

14  
15 “1. Albion Water Limited (“Albion”) appeals to the Tribunal against the Decision  
16 dated 26 May 2004 (“the Decision”) of the Director General of Water Services  
17 (“the Director”), now the Water Services Regulatory Authority (“the Authority”)   
18 adopted under the Competition Act 1998 (“The 1998 Act”). The Decision is to  
19 the effect that the price of 23.2p/m<sup>3</sup> (“the First Access Price”) offered by Dŵr  
20 Cymru to Albion on 2 March 2001 for the “common carriage” of non-potable  
21 water across what is known as the Ashgrove system, did not constitute an abuse  
22 of a dominant position contrary to the Chapter II prohibition imposed by section  
23 18 of the 1998 Act.

24  
25 2. This case raises some important issues regarding the application of the Chapter II  
26 prohibition in the water industry in England and Wales, which is characterised by  
27 vertically integrated companies with *de facto* monopolies within their designated  
28 areas. A further aspect is the interaction between the 1998 Act and the regulatory  
29 system established by the Water Industry Act 1991 (“the WIA91”), as notably  
30 amended by the Water Act 2003 (“the WA03”). The 1998 Act applies  
31 notwithstanding the provisions of the WIA91: see sections 2(6A), (6B) and (7),  
32 section 31 and section 66D(9) and (10).

1 62. For the reasons given in the Judgment the Tribunal has reached the following  
2 conclusions:

- 3
- 4 (1) There is evidence before the Tribunal that the treatment cost of non-  
5 potable water on an average accounting cost basis was over-estimated in  
6 the Decision. However the Tribunal is prepared to assume, without  
7 deciding, that treatment costs are in the range 1.6p/m<sup>3</sup> to 3.2p/m<sup>3</sup>.  
8
- 9 (2) The matter of the “distribution” cost of non-potable water on an average  
10 accounting cost basis was not sufficiently investigated. In this respect the  
11 Decision is incorrect, or at least insufficient, from the point of view of the  
12 reasons given, the facts and analysis relied on, and the investigation  
13 undertaken, as regards in particular to the Director’s conclusion in  
14 paragraph 302 of the Decision to the effect that it was not unreasonable to  
15 assume that the “distribution” costs of potable and non-potable water are  
16 the same.  
17
- 18 (3) The evidence strongly suggests that the First Access Price was excessive  
19 in relation to the economic value of the services to be supplied, by reason  
20 of the absence of any convincing justification for the “distribution” costs  
21 included in the average accounting cost calculation.  
22
- 23 (4) The cross-check as to the validity of the First Access Price by reference  
24 to ECPR in paragraphs 317 to 331 of the Decision cannot be safely relied  
25 on because (i) the ‘retail’ price used in the calculation is not shown to be  
26 cost-related, as regards the distribution element; (ii) the evidence strongly  
27 suggests that that price was itself excessive; (iii) the particular method of  
28 ECPR used in this case would eliminate existing competition and, in  
29 effect, preclude virtually any competitive entry, because the margins are  
30 insufficient; and (iv) the approach of the Authority in its evidence and  
31 submissions was not the same as that in the Decision. None of the  
32 justifications for an ECPR approach advanced by the Authority persuaded  
33 us that we could safely rely on the approach set out in the Decision in the  
34 circumstances of the present case.

1  
2 (5) As regards the allegation of margin squeeze, the existence of a margin  
3 squeeze was not seriously disputed. The Director's finding at paragraph  
4 352 of the Decision that nonetheless there was no breach of the Chapter II  
5 prohibition was erroneous in law and incorrect, or at least insufficient,  
6 from the point of view of the reasons given, the facts and analysis relied  
7 on and the investigation undertaken.

8  
9 (6) It is unsafe to assume, as the Director does in paragraphs 331 and 338 of  
10 the Decision, that the Costs Principle set out in section 66E of the  
11 WIA91 supports the conclusion which the Director reached in the  
12 Decision, since (i) the retail price used in the calculation in the Decision  
13 is not shown to have been reasonably cost-based, and the evidence  
14 strongly suggests that that price was itself excessive; and (ii) the  
15 Director's interpretation of ARROW costs under section 66E(4) is open  
16 to serious question, since that interpretation would on the evidence  
17 preclude virtually any effective competition or market entry, and give  
18 rise to a potential conflict with the consumer objective under the WIA91  
19 and with the Chapter II prohibition.

20  
21 63. It is now for the Tribunal to consider what consequential action, as regards orders  
22 and remedies, to take to conclude this case, having regard to the Tribunal's  
23 powers under paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 8 of the 1998 Act, together with any  
24 appropriate ancillary relief.

25  
26 64. There is also the remaining issue of dominance and the associated question of  
27 essential facilities. In the Decision the Director was prepared to assume  
28 dominance, while expressing reservations as to whether Dŵr Cymru had a  
29 dominant position (paragraph 215). The Director did not believe that the  
30 Ashgrove system is an essential facility (paragraph 225). In recent submissions,  
31 the Authority has taken the stance that it is not yet in a position to take a final  
32 view on the issue of dominance which it considers to be outside the scope of the  
33 appeal. Dŵr Cymru adopts a similar position, and argues that how issues of  
34 dominance should be addressed, if at all, should be considered at a further case

1 management conference. Both the Authority and Dŵr Cymru submit that it is not  
2 open to the Tribunal to make a finding of dominance under Schedule 8, paragraph  
3 3(2)(e) of the Act. Albion submits that the issues of dominance and essential  
4 facilities are before the Tribunal and raised in the notice of appeal, and that the  
5 Tribunal can and should deal with them, if necessary by making the appropriate  
6 findings.

7  
8 65. The Tribunal's present view is that it is highly unsatisfactory for the issue of  
9 dominance to be left as it is, and for the issue of dominance to have become  
10 "detached" from the issues relating to abuse. A good deal of evidence bearing on  
11 the issue of dominance that was not before the Director is now before the  
12 Tribunal. In those circumstances the Tribunal proposes to consider with the  
13 parties how the matter of dominance should now be handled. To facilitate that  
14 consideration, Annex A to this judgment summarises non-exhaustively matters  
15 potentially relevant to the issue of dominance and to the most appropriate course  
16 to adopt in that regard.

17  
18 66. Those and any other relevant applications or matters will be considered by the  
19 Tribunal at a further hearing on a date to be notified."  
20

21 In that latter regard, the parties have already been notified of a further directions hearing to be  
22 held at 10.30 a.m. on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2006. Albion and Aquavitae should file their skeleton  
23 arguments for that hearing by 4 o'clock on Wednesday, 18<sup>th</sup> October and the Authority and the  
24 Intervenors should do so by 4 o'clock on Friday, 20<sup>th</sup> October.

25 Unless anything else arises at this stage the Tribunal will be adjourned until 24<sup>th</sup> October.

26 MR. THOMPSON: I think the only issue is whether or not that date is writ in stone, but it sounds  
27 from the tone of your announcement that it probably is?

28 THE PRESIDENT: It is fairly well chiselled, I think, Mr. Thompson. (Laughter)

29 MR. THOMPSON: I am grateful. I will make arrangements.

30 THE PRESIDENT: Very well, thank you very much.

31 (Adjourned until Tuesday, 24<sup>th</sup> October 2006 at 10.30 a.m.)