

**International  
Comparative  
Legal Guides**



Practical cross-border insights into FDI screening regimes

# **Foreign Direct Investment Regimes**

# **2023**

**Fourth Edition**

Contributing Editors:

**Bernadine Adkins and Samuel Beighton**  
Gowling WLG

**ICLG.com**

## Expert Analysis Chapters

- 1** **Global Developments in Foreign Direct Investment Screening Regimes**  
Christopher Kimball, Christine Graham, Anna Caro & Penelope Hale, Cooley LLP
- 8** **An Overview of Policy and Regulatory Developments in East and Southern Africa**  
Joyce Karanja, Shianee Calcutteea, Xolani Nyali & Dr. Wilbert Kapinga, Bowmans

## Q&A Chapters

- 16** **Angola**  
Morais Leitão, Galvão Teles, Soares da Silva & Associados: Claudia Santos Cruz & Bruno Xavier de Pina
- 23** **Australia**  
MinterEllison: Alberto Colla, Samuel Robertson, Julia Riley & Thomas Galloway
- 30** **Austria**  
Schoenherr: Volker Weiss & Sascha Schulz
- 36** **Bahrain**  
Hassan Radhi & Associates: Fatima Al Ali & Saifuddin Mahmood
- 42** **Belgium**  
Liedekerke Wolters Waelbroeck Kirkpatrick: Vincent Mussche & Nina Carlier
- 49** **Canada**  
Stikeman Elliott LLP: Mike Laskey, Peter Flynn & Kirsten Cirella
- 57** **China**  
Lehman, Lee & Xu: Jacob Blacklock
- 64** **Czech Republic**  
Wolf Theiss: Jitka Logesová, Robert Pelikán & Tereza Mrázková
- 71** **Denmark**  
Accura Law Firm: Jesper Fabricius
- 78** **Finland**  
Waselius & Wist: Lotta Pohjanpalo & Sami Hartikainen
- 83** **France**  
Bredin Prat: Pierre Honoré, Olivier Billard & Arthur Helfer
- 92** **Germany**  
ADVANT BEITEN: Philipp Cotta, Patrick Alois Huebner & Christian von Wistinghausen
- 99** **Greece**  
Georgaki and Partners Law Firm: Christina Georgaki & Paula Koteli
- 103** **Hungary**  
Wolf Theiss: János Tóth
- 109** **India**  
Luthra and Luthra Law Offices India: Neha Sinha & Radhika Malpani
- 116** **Indonesia**  
Ali Budiardjo Nugroho Reksodiputro: Giffy Pardede, Elsie Hakim & Monic Nisa Devina
- 124** **Ireland**  
Mason Hayes & Curran LLP: Tara Kelly, Liam Heylin & Chris Chan
- 131** **Japan**  
Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune: Hiroaki Takahashi & Koji Kawamura
- 140** **Malaysia**  
Zaid Ibrahim & Co.: Stephanie Choong Siu Wei
- 145** **Mozambique**  
Morais Leitão, Galvão Teles, Soares da Silva & Associados: Claudia Santos Cruz & André de Sousa Vieira
- 151** **Netherlands**  
Houthoff: Gerrit Oosterhuis, Weyer VerLoren van Themaat, Victorine Dijkstra & Jori de Goffau
- 159** **Nigeria**  
Ikeyi Shittu & Co.: Taofeek Shittu, Josephine Tite-Onnoghen & Levi Chiefuna
- 164** **Norway**  
Advokatfirmaet Thommessen AS: Eivind J. Vesterkjær & Magnus Hauge Greaker
- 171** **Poland**  
Wolf Theiss: Jakub Pietrasik & Jacek Michalski
- 178** **Romania**  
Wolf Theiss: Anca Jurcovan & Maria Ionescu
- 184** **Slovenia**  
Schoenherr: Eva Škufca & Manja Hubman
- 190** **South Africa**  
CMS South Africa: Deepa Vallabh & Nonkululeko Dunga
- 196** **Sweden**  
Advokatfirman Vinge KB: Martin Johansson & Victoria Fredén
- 203** **Switzerland**  
Schellenberg Wittmer AG: David Mamane, Dr. Frank Bremer, Josef Caleff & Philippe Borens
- 210** **Taiwan**  
Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law: Yvonne Hsieh & Gary Chen
- 215** **United Kingdom**  
Gowling WLG: Samuel Beighton & Bernardine Adkins

# Netherlands

Houthoff



**Gerrit  
Oosterhuis**



**Weyer VerLoren  
van Themaat**



**Victorine  
Dijkstra**



**Jori de Goffau**

## 1 Foreign Investment Policy

### 1.1 What is the national policy with regard to the review of foreign investments (including transactions) on national security and public order grounds?

The Netherlands remains one of the world's most attractive destinations for Foreign Direct Investments (“**FDI**”). It offers foreign investors a stable political climate, a developed economy, a highly qualified labour force, transparent tax guidance and an excellent communications infrastructure. Foreign investments are welcomed across industries, including in the extensively privatised utilities sector. Investors are actively supported by the Netherlands Foreign Investment Agency (“**NFIA**”).

At the same time, the Netherlands is intensifying its review of FDI inflows. This is mainly caused by the strong rise of Chinese outbound investment in the Netherlands, Europe and in general over the past decade. The COVID-19 pandemic has added urgency: in April 2020, the government announced the introduction of general FDI screening for all acquisitions and investments in sectors that are considered vital for national security and public policy. On 8 September 2020, the bill setting up this FDI screening mechanism, the Economy and National Security Bill (“**ENSB**”), was published for consultation. After extensive criticism from the Dutch Council of State, the revised Investment Screening Bill (“**ISB**”) was sent to Parliament on 30 June 2021. The ISB provides more legal certainty than the ENSB. It is clear as to which companies are in scope of the FDI screening mechanism. It also limits retroactive reviews to transactions from 8 September 2020 onwards rather than from 2 June 2020.

The ISB was passed by the Dutch Senate on 17 May 2022. The Dutch government expects the ISB to enter into force in the first quarter of 2023.

### 1.2 Are there any particular strategic considerations that the State will apply during foreign investment reviews? Is there any law or guidance in place that explains the concept of national security and public order?

There is no practice regarding general FDI review yet. Acquisitions and attempts at acquisitions in the recent past have shown that, even though the Netherlands is in general very welcoming to FDI, acquisitions of companies that are considered crown jewels of the Dutch economy may meet political resistance.

There is no specific guidance in place that explains the concept of national security and public order. National security

is defined in the ISB with reference to the concept of national security under the Treaty on the European Union and the concept of public security and essential interest of its security under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. In particular, it is concerned with the continuity of critical processes, maintaining the integrity and information of critical or strategic importance for the Netherlands, and preventing unwanted strategic dependence on other countries.

### 1.3 Are there any current proposals to change the foreign investment review policy or the current laws?

#### ISB

The ISB was passed by Parliament on 19 April 2022 and by the Senate on 17 May 2022. This bill sets up an *ex ante* screening mechanism for investments in companies active with vital processes and sensitive technologies, and managers of business campuses. The ISB will have retroactive effect to the extent that investments which took place after 8 September 2020 and fall within the definitions of vital processes or sensitive technologies and pose a risk to Dutch national security may be reviewed. The Dutch government expects the ISB to enter into force from 1 January 2023.

On 18 July 2022, the draft orders in council (*Algemene Maatregelen van Bestuur*) were published for consultation. They contain (i) rules on the scope of application of sensitive technologies, and (ii) further technical rules. The draft order in council containing rules on the scope of application of sensitive technologies delineates the scope of the sensitive technologies category and provides that a filing obligation for minority shareholdings will only apply to the newly created category of “highly sensitive” technologies. The order in council containing the further technical rules elaborates on several technical aspects that are necessary to implement the ISB and what information must be included in the filing under the ISB. Since the orders in council are drafts for consultation, their content may be subject to change. The details of these proposals are set out under the relevant questions below.

#### Defence sector

The Dutch Minister of Defence is preparing a bill regarding the protection of the Dutch defence technological and industrial sector. The bill will introduce a sector-specific test, which will also entail *ex ante* screening, to complement the ISB and is expected to be published for public consultation at the end of 2022 or beginning of 2023.



## 2 Law and Scope of Application

**2.1 What laws apply to the control of foreign investments (including transactions) on grounds of national security and public order? Does the law also extend to domestic-to-domestic transactions? Are there any notable developments in the last year?**

At present, incoming FDI is controlled exclusively in the electricity, gas and telecommunications sectors, through the Mining Act (*Mijnbouwwet*), the Electricity Act (*Elektriciteitswet*), the Gas Act (*Gaswet*), the implementing Regulation for notification of changes of control of the Electricity Act 1998 and the Gas Act (*Regeling melding wijziging zeggenschap Elektriciteitswet 1998 en Gaswet*), and finally the Telecommunications Act (*Telecommunicatiewet*).

The ISB was passed by Parliament on 19 April 2022 and by the Senate on 17 May 2022. On 18 July 2022, draft orders in council (*Algemene Maatregelen van Bestuur*) containing (i) rules on the scope of application of sensitive technologies (*Besluit toepassingsbereik sensitieve technologie*), and (ii) further technical rules (*Besluit veiligheidstoets investeringen, fusies en overnames*) were published for consultation.

Notification obligations apply irrespective of the nationality of the investor, so both to foreign-to-domestic and to domestic-to-domestic transactions. The nationality of the buyer will only play a role in the material assessment of an investment.

The most important development is that the ISB, as complemented by orders in council, would also apply to four new areas of technology: semi-conductors; quantum mechanics; high assurance identification; and photonics.

**2.2 What kinds of foreign investments, foreign investors and transactions are caught? Is the acquisition of minority interests caught? Is internal re-organisation within a corporate group covered? Does the law extend to asset purchases?**

### ISB

The ISB applies to investments in companies established in the Netherlands when the company is (i) involved in vital processes, (ii) active with sensitive technologies, or (iii) a manager of a business campus.

The ISB catches all mergers and demergers, acquisitions and other investments that result in (a) a change of control over a relevant company, (b) the acquisition of a relevant company, or (c) in case of highly sensitive technologies, an acquisition or increase of significant influence over a relevant company. Asset purchases are also captured if those assets are essential for the company to function as a vital provider or as a sensitive technology enterprise. An internal re-organisation within a corporate group is captured when the above conditions are met.

The bill intends to complement sectoral screening mechanisms (see below) as it applies to any investment that is not caught by specific sectoral review mechanisms.

### Telecommunications sector

Sector-specific screening applies to telecommunications companies, which are defined as branch offices, legal entities, or any other type of company established in the Netherlands active as a provider or holder of a controlling interest in a provider of an electronic communications network or a hosting service, internet node, trust service or data centre that exceeds certain thresholds. An investor is deemed to have a controlling interest in the telecommunications company if it:

- (i) either directly or indirectly, individually or jointly with other persons, holds at least 30% of the votes in its general meeting;

- (ii) has the right to appoint or dismiss more than half of the members of its management or supervisory boards even if all persons entitled to vote cast their votes;
- (iii) holds one or more shares granting special rights of statutory control;
- (iv) holds a branch office that is a telecommunications operator;
- (v) is liable as a partner (*vennoot*) for debts of the company acting under its own name; or
- (vi) is the owner of a sole proprietorship.

The law does not capture asset purchases.

### Gas and electricity sector

The privatisation of Dutch companies responsible for the national high-voltage grid and the national transmission network is prohibited. Under the Electricity Act, notice must be given to the Minister of all transactions resulting in a change of control of an electricity production plant with a capacity of at least 250 megawatts. The same type of notification obligation is provided for in the Gas Act in relation to a change of control over Liquefied Natural Gas plants. For the definition of change of control, reference is made to the Competition Act, from which follows that (a) control can be acquired by the acquisition of shares or assets, and (b) that minority shares can give rise to a duty to notify but only if they give control as defined in the Competition Act.

### Mining sector

The Mining Act (*Mijnbouwwet*) provides that the Dutch state will be entitled to 40% of the proceeds of any mining concession, possibly through a 40% stake in the relevant entity. Greenfield investments and transfer of permits under the Mining Act will be assessed under a separate procedure relating to obtaining (or keeping) a permit under the Mining Act.

**2.3 What are the sectors and activities that are particularly under scrutiny? Are there any sector-specific review mechanisms in place?**

For the sector-specific provisions, please refer to question 2.2.

The ISB will cover investments in companies (i) involved in vital processes, or (ii) active with sensitive technologies, and (iii) managers of business campuses.

### Vital functions and processes

The ISB and its explanatory memorandum specifically mention what functions and processes are considered vital and give examples of companies that are relevant, namely heating network operators, activities in relation to storage, production and processing of nuclear materials, KLM, Schiphol Airport (including all activities related to air traffic management, passenger and luggage handling), the Rotterdam Port Authority, banks, financial market infrastructure and companies active with natural gas exploration, transport and storage. In addition, whilst not explicitly mentioned in the ISB, but rather in its explanatory memorandum, water management (drinking water and the management of water (resources)) is also considered a vital process. Additional vital processes can be added, but any addition must be confirmed by an order in council followed by a formal law. The Minister informed Parliament that the possibility of including businesses in the agricultural sector as vital suppliers will be considered. Other current candidates are companies that are active with road and rail transport infrastructure.

### Business campus

Before the Dutch Parliament passed the ISB, a last-minute amendment was incorporated that adds “managers of business campuses” as a category of vital suppliers under the ISB. A business campus is defined as an area with public-private partnerships for working on technologies and applications that are of economic and strategic importance to the Netherlands. The amendment was made as a result of the public debate surrounding the acquisition of High-Tech Campus Eindhoven by GIC, a Singaporean investment fund.

### Sensitive technologies

Regarding sensitive technologies, the ISB confirms that military and dual-use technologies as defined in the EU Dual-Use Regulation (EU 2021/821) and the EU Military Goods List (2020/C 85/01) are caught. The draft order in council (please refer to question 2.1) specifies and expands the scope of the sensitive technologies category. It adds the following technologies: quantum mechanics; semi-conductor technologies (including know-how regarding production, industrial production machines and design software); high-assurance identification technologies; and photonics. In addition, the draft order in council excludes from the scope of the ISB a small number of technologies and dual-use items, nevertheless included in the EU Dual-Use Regulation, such as certain graphite and ceramic materials and certain composite structures and laminates.

Finally, the order in council defines a category of “highly sensitive” technologies, comprising the newly added areas of semiconductors, quantum mechanics, high-assurance identification and photonics as well as some of the technologies already covered by the Dual-Use Regulation and the Military Goods List. See question 3.1 for the lower notification threshold that applies to this category.

#### 2.4 How are terms such as ‘foreign investor’ and ‘foreign investment’ defined in the law?

The ISB catches all mergers and demergers, acquisitions, and other investments, whether by foreign or domestic investors, that result in (a) a change of control over a relevant company, (b) the acquisition of a relevant company, or (c) only in case of very sensitive technologies, the acquisition or increase of significant influence over a relevant company. Therefore, the terms foreign investor and foreign investment are not defined in the ISB.

#### 2.5 Are there specific rules for certain foreign investors (e.g. non-EU/non-WTO), including state-owned enterprises (SOEs)?

At the moment, there are no special rules for SOEs or other foreign investors. The ISB explicitly captures both foreign and domestic investors. Under the Telecommunications Act and the ISB, the fact that a company is an SOE is one of the factors that may imply a threat to national security and is considered in the FDI review.

#### 2.6 Is there a local nexus requirement for an acquisition or investment? If so, what is the nature of such requirement (existence of subsidiaries, assets, etc.)?

All sector-specific regulations, by their very nature, require a local nexus. Under the ISB, relevant companies are target companies that are established in the Netherlands. The

explanatory memorandum to the ISB clarifies and expands the scope of the targets that the ISB captures. It stipulates that the place of establishment should not be interpreted formally as a statutory requirement, but rather this criterion aims to capture entities that conduct actual economic activities in the Netherlands. The place of establishment should be based on geographical location of the activities and management, irrespective of its legal form.

#### 2.7 In cases where local presence is required to trigger the review, are indirect acquisitions of local subsidiaries and/or other assets also caught?

Direct and indirect acquisitions are caught if the requisite degree of control or significant influence is acquired.

## 3 Jurisdiction and Procedure

#### 3.1 What conditions must be met for the law to apply? Are there any monetary or market share-based thresholds?

The ISB applies to all mergers and demergers, acquisitions, and other investments, whether by foreign or domestic investors, that result in a change of control of any company established in the Netherlands which is (i) deemed essential for the continuity and resilience of vital processes, (ii) active in the field of sensitive technology, or (iii) the manager of a business campus.

Change of control mirrors the definition of control used in EU and Dutch competition law.

In addition, any investment leading to the acquisition or increase of significant influence over companies based in the Netherlands active in the field of “highly” sensitive technology is captured by the ISB. Earlier drafts of the ISB extended this lower threshold to all sensitive technologies, but the draft order in council limits the scope of the lower threshold.

Acquiring or increasing significant influence occurs where one person or entity may cast at least 10%, 20% or 25% of the votes in the target’s shareholders meeting.

There are no monetary or market share-based thresholds.

#### 3.2 Do the relevant authorities have discretion to review transactions that do not meet the prescribed thresholds?

No, but the relevant authorities have the possibility under the ISB to alter the significant influence thresholds, the designation of categories of vital companies, and sensitive technologies by Ministerial Decree. Alterations to the designation of categories of vital companies must subsequently be enacted by a formal law.

#### 3.3 Is there a mandatory notification requirement and is there a specific notification form? Are there any filing fees?

A notification under the Telecommunications Act and the ISB shall be submitted using a prescribed notification form and must be accompanied by the information and documents specified therein (see question 3.7). There is no specific notification form for notifications under the Electricity Act and the Gas Act. However, the information that a notification shall contain is specified and should be submitted insofar as available at the time of notification.

Filings under sector-specific regimes are mandatory and no filing fees are due. Similarly, filings under the ISB, once it enters into force, will be mandatory and it is expected that also these filings not be subject to a filing fee.

**3.4 Is there a 'standstill' provision, prohibiting implementation pending clearance by the authorities? What are the sanctions for breach of the standstill provision? Has this provision been enforced to date?**

Under the ISB, there is a standstill provision that prohibits the execution of a notifiable transaction before the Minister (a) has indicated that no review decision is required, or (b) approves the transaction. The Minister may grant an exemption from the standstill obligation after the party obliged to notify has notified the transaction or the intention to carry out the acquisition activity. Failure to comply with the standstill provision may result in a fine of up to EUR 900,000 or up to 10% of the parties' turnover.

There is no standstill provision in place in the sector-specific regulations (i.e. the Gas Act, Electricity Act and Telecommunications Act), but under the Telecommunications Act a notification must be made at least eight weeks prior to closing. However, there remains the risk that the transaction must be reversed when the Minister prohibits the notifiable transaction.

**3.5 In the case of transactions, who is responsible for obtaining the necessary approval?**

Under the Gas Act and the Electricity Act, both the investor and the seller are responsible for notifying the transaction. Under the Telecommunications Act, only the party acquiring relevant influence in the telecommunications sector is responsible for the notification.

Under the ISB, both the investor and the target company are responsible for the notification of the transaction. The investor, however, cannot be held responsible for a failure to notify the transaction where it could not have known that a notification was required (for example, as a result of confidentiality constraints on the target company). In such cases, only the target company is responsible for the notification of the transaction.

**3.6 Can the parties to the transaction engage in advance consultations with the authorities and ask for formal or informal guidance as to whether the authorities would object to the transaction?**

Informal guidance is not explicitly provided for under the Gas Act, Electricity Act and Telecommunications Act, but Dutch authorities are usually willing to speak with companies informally. It is possible to discuss a case, regardless of the general or sector-specific regime, in advance with the Dutch Investment Review Agency (*Bureau Toetsing Investerings*, the "BTI") on an informal basis. It is not expected that the authorities will provide their objections to any transaction upfront.

Under the ISB, the BTI will provide further guidance on the scope of the ISB as soon as possible. Where appropriate, information on the scope of the ISB will be provided in a manual.

**3.7 What type of information do parties to a transaction have to provide as part of their filing?**

According to the Regulation for notification of changes of

control of the Electricity Act 1998 and the Gas Act, a notification must contain information covering:

- (i) the installations and relevant parties involved;
- (ii) the intended change in control;
- (iii) the financial position; and
- (iv) the strategy intentions and past performance.

Under the Telecommunications Act, the party acquiring relevant influence in the telecommunications sector only needs to notify the BTI of the intention to acquire a controlling interest in a telecommunications company. A notification must contain information covering:

- (i) information on the parties (i.e. investor and target) and their representatives;
- (ii) description of the business activities of the parties including information regarding its telecommunications services and networks and the jurisdiction of the activities;
- (iii) information on the proposed acquisition of control, including the participating interests of the shareholders, the control structure after the acquisition, the transaction value, the financial institutions involved in the transaction and the economic motives of the transactions; and
- (iv) all relevant facts and circumstances that may have a role in the assessment of the transactions, such as ties with foreign governments, financial, fiscal and criminal information as well as information of other authorities (including foreign) on the investor and target.

The draft order in council (please refer to question 2.1) specifies, that the following information must be included in the notification:

- (a) information on the notifying parties and their representatives;
- (b) information regarding the proposed acquisition, increase or acquisition of significant influence or change of control;
- (c) information on the ownership structure and ownership relations of the notifying parties;
- (d) information on the products and services that the notifying parties offer;
- (e) the country in which the head office of the acquirer is situated;
- (f) an overview of the legal entities, legal forms and statutory seat of the legal entities of the acquirer; and
- (g) other information necessary for the assessment referred to in section 3.5 of the ISB (i.e. the assessment of the risks, please refer to question 4.3).

**3.8 Are there any sanctions for not filing (fines, criminal liability, invalidity or unwinding of the transaction, etc.) and what is the current practice of the authorities?**

An unnotified transaction under the Gas Act or the Electricity Act will be null and void.

Under the Telecommunications Act, the BTI may impose a fine of up to EUR 900,000 where there was a late notification or a failure to notify the transaction. If the acquisition of a controlling interest poses a threat to public interest, the BTI may either completely prohibit the transaction or prohibit it under suspensive conditions.

Under the ISB, if a transaction is implemented before the assessment by the BTI has taken place, a fine of up to EUR 900,000 or 10% of the turnover in the calendar year preceding the infringement of the companies involved may be imposed.

Alternatively, if a transaction is within the scope of the ISB, but has not been notified, the BTI may undertake an assessment *ex officio*. The BTI shall have the right to order the parties to submit

a (new) filing within three months after it has become aware that a transaction should have been notified, or that incomplete or incorrect information has been provided in the notification.

A transaction executed despite the BTI's decision to prohibit the transaction is void. In the event that the prohibited acquisition took place through a stock exchange, it is subject to annulment. Under these circumstances, the BTI may also impose a fine of up to EUR 900,000 or 10% of the turnover of the companies involved in the year preceding the infringement.

### 3.9 Is there a filing deadline and what is the timeframe of review in order to obtain approval? Is there a two-stage investigation process for clearance? On what basis will the authorities open a second-stage investigation?

Under the Telecommunications Act, the BTI must decide within eight weeks after receiving the notification whether to approve, prohibit or refer the transaction for an in-depth investigation. If no decision is made before the deadline, approval is deemed granted. If further investigation is required, the BTI may extend the deadline by up to six months. If the BTI requests additional information, the total timeframe is suspended until this information is received.

Under the Electricity Act and the Gas Act, the notification has to be made ultimately four months prior to the date of expected change in control. There is no statutory deadline within which the BTI has to decide on the notification.

The ISB notification procedure to the BTI is a two-phase system:

- (i) Phase I runs from the day the investor submits the notification. A (first) decision should be taken within eight weeks, but this period can be extended by six months. Phase I ends with an announcement by the BTI, either that no review is necessary or – in case that the investment may pose risk to national security – that an evaluation decision is required; and
- (ii) Phase II runs when the investor submits a request for an evaluation decision. The decision period in Phase II is another eight weeks and can also be extended up to six months, but the time used by the BTI in Phase I will be deducted from Phase II, with the total extension not exceeding six months.

As is the case with notifications under the Telecommunications Act, the total timeframe is suspended if the BTI requests additional information.

Finally, an additional three-month extension period may be added if the notification must be shared with the European Commission and other Member States under the EU FDI Regulation.

### 3.10 Can expedition of review be requested and on what basis? How often has expedition been granted?

There is no legal provision that allows parties to request an expedited review, nor is it likely that an (informal) request will be honoured.

### 3.11 Can third parties be involved in the review process? If so, what are the requirements, and do they have any particular rights during the procedure?

Third parties are not involved in the review process and do not have any formal participation rights.

### 3.12 What publicity is given to the process and how is commercial information, including business secrets, protected from disclosure?

According to the Telecommunications Act (Article 14a.4 sub 7), a prohibition shall be communicated to the party to which the prohibition is addressed and to the party concerned. In addition, all prohibitions will be published on the internet by the BTI. There is no similar provision in the Gas Act and Electricity Act.

Decisions under the ISB may potentially be published following the granting of a request made in terms of the Government Information (Public Access) Act.

If decisions contain confidential information, that should not be made public, parties have the opportunity to indicate this to the BTI and the reason why it should not be made public (i.e. confidential business or manufacturing data) in case a request is made under the Government Information (Public Access) Act. Based on the limited information available at this point in time, approval decisions do not contain any (or very little) insight into the BTI's analysis.

### 3.13 Are there any other administrative approvals required (cross-sector or sector-specific) for foreign investments?

There are no other administrative reviews in the Netherlands specifically aimed at foreign investments. Transactions may, however, fall under the competition law merger control review. Overlap nevertheless may exist with the upcoming Regulation on Foreign Subsidies (COM(2021)0223, 201/0114 (COD)).

## 4 Substantive Assessment

### 4.1 Which authorities are responsible for conducting the review?

The Minister of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy issues the decisions under the Electricity Act, the Gas Act, the Telecommunications Act and the ISB. The department that is set up to actually perform these reviews is the BTI.

### 4.2 What is the applicable test and what is the burden of proof and who bears it?

Under the Gas Act and Electricity Act, the BTI may prohibit an envisaged transaction or impose conditions on grounds of public safety or security of supply and therefore bears the burden of proof. Under the Telecommunications Act, the BTI can prohibit an envisaged transaction if it poses a threat to the public interest. This would be the case notably if wilful termination of the relevant services by the acquirer would cause a breach of the confidentiality of communications, an unacceptable interruption of online services to the public in general, or to defence and security services in particular.

Under the ISB, the BTI will assess whether an investment poses a risk to national security and the BTI therefore bears the burden of proof. National security is defined with reference to the concept of national security under the Treaty on the European Union and the concept of public security and essential interest of its security under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. In particular, it is concerned with the continuity of critical processes, maintaining the integrity and information of critical or strategic importance for the Netherlands, preventing unwanted strategic dependence on other countries.



Companies are expected to cooperate with the authorities and provide sufficient information to enable the BTI to carry out its assessment. The degree to which the investor cooperates with the authorities will be a factor in the assessment.

#### 4.3 What are the main evaluation criteria and are there any guidelines available? Do the authorities publish decisions of approval or prohibition?

The BTI will consider the following main criteria when evaluating whether an investment poses a risk to national security:

- the investor's ownership structure;
- the degree of transparency regarding the investor's identity;
- whether the investor has committed crimes;
- ties to governments that have other geopolitical agenda's than the Netherlands and its allies;
- restrictions under national and international law; and
- the security situation in the acquirer's country or region of residence.

Other assessment criteria are specific to the investment, such as the exploitation track record in the case of the acquisition of vital infrastructure, and the track record of the acquirer on information security in case of an investment in sensitive technology.

Under the Telecommunications Act, all prohibitions will be published. There is no similar provision in the Gas Act and Electricity Act. Decisions under the ISB may potentially be published following the granting of a request made in terms of the Government Information (Public Access) Act. All prohibition decisions will be published. Based on the limited information available at the time of writing, approval decisions do not contain any (or very little) insight into the BTI's analysis.

#### 4.4 In their assessment, do the authorities also take into account activities of foreign (non-local) subsidiaries in their jurisdiction?

Activities of foreign subsidiaries might be considered in the review process, for instance, when assessing whether an envisaged transaction poses a threat to the public interest.

Under the Electricity Act and the Gas Act, the parties must provide information about the past performance of the acquirer in the electricity or gas industries. Other subsidiaries, including non-local subsidiaries, could be relevant in this information.

#### 4.5 How much discretion and what powers do the authorities have to approve or reject transactions on national security and public order grounds? Can the authorities impose conditions on approval?

The BTI has considerable leeway to assess national security risks based on one or more criteria as provided in the ISB (see question 4.3).

Under the Telecommunications Act, the BTI has broad powers to prohibit the acquisition of a controlling interest in a telecommunications company when it finds facts or circumstances indicating a public interest threat (see question 4.2).

If the BTI considers a prohibition, the parties may offer remedies to remove the objections of the BTI. These remedies can be included as conditions in the clearance decision of the BTI.

Under the Gas Act and Electricity Act, the BTI may impose conditions on grounds of public safety or security of supply (see question 4.2).

#### 4.6 Is it possible to address the authorities' objections to a transaction by the parties providing remedies, such as by way of a mitigation agreement, other undertakings or arrangements? Are such settlement arrangements made public?

The BTI's objections may be addressed by offering remedies. In fact, a transaction will only be prohibited if the risks identified cannot sufficiently be resolved by remedies.

Possible remedies include:

- regulating access to sensitive information;
- appointing employees in key positions according to security or integrity policies;
- appointing a security officer or committee with the authority to block access and report back to the BTI;
- bundling the sensitive activities in a Dutch entity;
- offering certain services and goods with limitations;
- appointing a separate supervisory board for the Dutch entity; and/or
- maximising the amount of shares that may be acquired or the obligation to certify the shares.

The ISB also provides specific remedies for the acquisition of sensitive technology. Those include the obligation to transfer to or share certain technology, source code, genetic code, or knowledge with a third party or the Dutch state as well as the duty to notify the BTI before activities are transferred to third countries – after which the Dutch state may decide to acquire the technology or require licensing on fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory conditions.

The BTI may appoint a third party to monitor compliance with any remedies. Based on the limited information available at the time of writing, approval decisions do not contain any (or very little) insight into the BTI's analysis.

#### 4.7 Can a decision be challenged or appealed, including by third parties? On what basis can it be challenged? Is the relevant procedure administrative or judicial in character?

A decision prohibiting the acquisition of a controlling interest under the Telecommunications Act, the Gas Act or the Electricity Act is open to administrative objection and appeal that can then be challenged in court under the Dutch General Administrative Law Act. Under the Telecommunications Act, if the BTI intends to impose a prohibition, he must ask the telecommunications party for its views on the intended decision. Also, in the Gas and Electricity domain, the BTI will usually give companies the opportunity to give their views on the proposed prohibition.

A decision under the ISB is a decision under the Dutch General Administrative Law Act and is open to reconsideration by the BTI (administrative objection), followed by appeal proceedings at the Rotterdam District Court and the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal ("CBb"). This process is also open to third parties, individually and directly concerned by a decision under the ISB.

During appeal proceedings, the administrative court will review the lawfulness of decisions (*ex tunc*) without performing its own investigation. The court will attach significance to the observance of the principles of due care and adequate reasoning in the decision-making process.



**4.8 Are there any other relevant considerations? What is the recent enforcement practice of the authorities and have there been any significant cases? Are there any notable trends emerging in the enforcement of the FDI screening regime?**

Due to the novelty of the FDI screening procedures, the BTI has not yet developed solid enforcement practices. Based on the public debate and EU and international developments, we expect enforcement practice to launch in the (very) near future. We do expect that future enforcement will be pragmatic and reasonable, as the Explanatory Memorandum to the ISB states that the Netherlands wants to continue to attract FDI.



**Gerrit Oosterhuis** advises on Dutch and EU competition law as well as FDI regimes. He heads the Brussels office of Houthoff. His practice focuses on merger notifications but also encompasses cartel investigations, distribution practices and cases concerning abuse of dominance. Gerrit represents clients from a wide range of sectors, including many from the food and energy industries. Gerrit has considerable experience with notifications of complex transactions to the competition authorities and the authorities in charge of the screening of foreign investments, as well as with the coordination of such notifications in multiple jurisdictions. He enjoys being hands-on and providing practical, pragmatic solutions.

**Houthoff**  
Bischoffsheimlaan 15 box 8.1  
1000 Brussel  
Belgium

Tel: +32 02 507 98 00  
Email: [g.oosterhuis@houthoff.com](mailto:g.oosterhuis@houthoff.com)  
URL: [www.houthoff.com](http://www.houthoff.com)



**Weyer VerLoren van Themaat** specialises in competition law and leads Houthoff's EU & Competition practice group. He is also head of Houthoff's Healthcare sector group. Weyer focuses, in particular, on merger notifications and cartel defence litigation. His work involves issues relating to regulation and competition in healthcare, and advising and assisting healthcare institutions in the context of partnerships. Weyer was a resident partner of the Brussels office from 1997 to 2005. He is a member of the International Bar Association, the ABA, the Dutch Competition Law Association and the Dutch Association for European Law. He is also Chair-Emeritus of Lex Mundi's Antitrust, Competition and Trade group, and chair of the advisory committee of the Netherlands Bar Association. Weyer is the founder and a board member of the competition law foundation *Stichting Ontwikkelingen Mededingingsrecht* and has authored and co-authored various books on competition law.

**Houthoff**  
Gustav Mahlerplein 50  
1082 MA Amsterdam  
Netherlands

Tel: +31 20 605 61 83  
Email: [w.verloren@houthoff.com](mailto:w.verloren@houthoff.com)  
URL: [www.houthoff.com](http://www.houthoff.com)



**Victorine Dijkstra** is a senior associate with Houthoff. She specialises in Dutch and EU competition law, in particular in relation to Dutch and EU merger control proceedings, FDI, cartel prohibition and abuse of dominance, the EU State aid rules, and the Dutch Public Enterprises Market Activities Act. She also has extensive litigation experience, notably in administrative proceedings and follow-on cartel damages claims. She is a member of the Dutch Competition Law Association.

**Houthoff**  
Gustav Mahlerplein 50  
1082 MA Amsterdam  
Netherlands

Tel: +31 20 605 69 15  
Email: [v.dijkstra@houthoff.com](mailto:v.dijkstra@houthoff.com)  
URL: [www.houthoff.com](http://www.houthoff.com)



**Jori de Goffau** is an associate with Houthoff. He focuses on Dutch and EU competition law. He specialises in merger control proceedings, FDI, regulated markets, and cases concerning cartels and abuse of dominance. Jori is a member of the Dutch Association of Competition Law and publishes on Dutch and EU competition law.

**Houthoff**  
Gustav Mahlerplein 50  
1082 MA Amsterdam  
Netherlands

Tel: +31 20 605 69 74  
Email: [j.de.goffau@houthoff.com](mailto:j.de.goffau@houthoff.com)  
URL: [www.houthoff.com](http://www.houthoff.com)

Houthoff is a leading independent Dutch law firm, with offices in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Brussels, London and New York, as well as representatives in Houston, Singapore, Shanghai and Tokyo. We have over 300 lawyers, civil law notaries and tax lawyers, who work collaboratively to ensure we are there for our clients when they need us most.

We focus on highly complex transactions and dispute resolution. We always look beyond today and find the long-term solution.

We are consistently listed as a top-tier firm by international legal directories, including *Chambers and Partners*, *The Legal 500* and *IFLR1000*.

Houthoff's EU & Competition Team assists companies, institutions and governments in procedures before the Dutch government, the Netherlands Authority for Consumers and Markets, the European Commission, foreign

authorities and the relevant courts. Our expertise includes merger control and foreign direct investment screening procedures, State aid, and investigations into cartels or abuse of dominance.

[www.houthoff.com](http://www.houthoff.com)

# HOUTHOFF

# ICLG.com



## Current titles in the ICLG series

Alternative Investment Funds  
Anti-Money Laundering  
Aviation Finance & Leasing  
Aviation Law  
Business Crime  
Cartels & Leniency  
Class & Group Actions  
Competition Litigation  
Construction & Engineering Law  
Consumer Protection  
Copyright  
Corporate Governance  
Corporate Immigration  
Corporate Investigations  
Corporate Tax  
Cybersecurity  
Data Protection  
Derivatives  
Designs  
Digital Business  
Digital Health  
Drug & Medical Device Litigation  
Employment & Labour Law  
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments  
Environment & Climate Change Law  
Environmental, Social & Governance Law  
Family Law  
Fintech  
Foreign Direct Investment Regimes  
Franchise  
Gambling  
Insurance & Reinsurance  
International Arbitration  
Investor-State Arbitration  
Lending & Secured Finance  
Litigation & Dispute Resolution  
Merger Control  
Mergers & Acquisitions  
Mining Law  
Oil & Gas Regulation  
Patents  
Pharmaceutical Advertising  
Private Client  
Private Equity  
Product Liability  
Project Finance  
Public Investment Funds  
Public Procurement  
Real Estate  
Renewable Energy  
Restructuring & Insolvency  
Sanctions  
Securitisation  
Shipping Law  
Technology Sourcing  
Telecoms, Media & Internet  
Trade Marks  
Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms