Richard Whish Emeritus Professor of Law, QC (Hon)

> Slovenian Competition Day 26 September 2019

- REMEDIES MAY BE AN IMPORTANT PART OF BOTH ANTITRUST CASES (ARTICLES 101 AND 102 TFEU) AND MERGER CASES
- IN PRACTICE MUCH MORE IS KNOWN ABOUT MERGER REMEDIES THAN ANTITRUST REMEDIES
- BUT IN PRINCIPLE THE SAME CONSIDERATIONS APPLY IN BOTH SITUATIONS
- MY COMMENTS RELATE BOTH TO ANTITRUST AND TO MERGER CONTROL

- IN SOME CASES THE REMEDY IS SIMPLE
 - STOP THE CARTEL
 - DON'T ENTER INTO ANYTHING LIKE THIS ARRANGEMENT AGAIN
 - AND A RECIVIDIST UPLIFT OF THE FINE WILL BE APPLIED TO YOU IF YOU DO INFRINGE COMPETITION LAW AGAIN
 - THERE HAVE BEEN TWO RECIDIVIST UPLIFTS IN THE EU RECENTLY: SLOVAK TELEKOM (GENERAL COURT, DECEMBER 2018, UPHOLDING AN EARLIER COMMISSION DECISION) AND MASTERCARD (JANUARY 2019)

- IN OTHER CASES THE REMEDY MAY BE EXTREMELY COMPLEX. FOR EXAMPLE:
 - MULTI-MEDIA MERGERS: FOR EXAMPLE SUPPLY OF CONTENT ON FRAND TERMS; ACCESS TO PLATFORMS FOR THIRD PARTY CONTENT
 - MICROSOFT (1): WINDOWS WITHOUT A MEDIA PLAYER (AT THE SAME PRICE AS WITH A MEDIA PLAYER)
 - BUT NOTE THE IMPORTANT PRECEDENT IN LAW THAT THE MICROSOFT CASE ESTABLISHED: INCLUSION OF THE MEDIA PLAYER WAS AN ABUSE
 - MICROSOFT (II): DISPLAY OF COMPETING BROWSERS
 - GOOGLE SHOPPING: DISPLAY OF COMPETING SHOPPING TOOLS

- AND IN SOME CASES THE REMEDY MAY BE EXTREME
 - IN THE US, THINK OF STANDARD OIL AND AT&T
 - IN THE UK A COMPETITION INVESTIGATION OF BRITISH GAS LED TO IT VOLUNTARILY ENDING ITS VERTICAL INTEGRATION
 - ALSO IN THE UK A COMPETITION INVESTIGATION OF BRITISH AIRPORTS AUTHORITY LED TO IT HAVING TO DIVEST ITSELF OF GATWICK AND STANSTEAD AIRPORTS IN LONDON, RETAINING HEATHROW
 - QUERY: COULD COMPETITION LAW INTERVENTION LEAD TO ANY OF THE MAJOR DIGITAL PLATFORMS BEING BROKEN UP?

- A COMPETITION AUTHORITY NEEDS TO ASK AT AN EARLY STAGE OF AN INVESTIGATION 'IS THERE A SENSIBLE EXIT STRATEGY FOR THIS CASE?'
- BUSINESSES UNDER INVESTIGATION NEED TO ASK AT AN EARLY STAGE 'IS THERE A REMEDY THAT CAN GET US OUT OF THIS SITUATION?'
- IT MAY BE NECESSARY TO HAVE DIFFERENT TEAMS TO RUN THE INVESTIGATION AND TO CONSIDER REMEDIES

LEGAL INSTRUMENTS IN THE EU

- REGULATION 1/2004 FOR ANTITRUST INFRINGEMENTS:
 - INTERIM MEASURES ARTICLE 8
 - INFRINGEMENT DECISIONS ARTICLE 7, INCLUDING CARTEL SETTLEMENTS AND COOPERATION CASES
 - COMMITMENT DECISIONS ARTICLE 9
 - FINES ARTICLE 23
 - PERIODIC PENALTY PAYMENTS ARTICLE 24
- EUMR 139/2004 FOR MERGERS
 - ARTICLE 6(2): PHASE 1 COMMITMENTS
 - ARTICLE 8(2): PHASE II COMMITMENTS

STATISTICS

	MIIIRUSI - 2016	
	INTERIM MEASURES	0
	INFRINGEMENT DECISIONS	7
0	CARTEL SETTLEMENTS 6	
0	COOPERATION 1	
	COMMITMENT DECISIONS	3
A	NTITRUST - 2017	
• 4	NTITRUST - 2017 INTERIM MEASURES	0
A		0 10
• •	INTERIM MEASURES	0 10
	INTERIM MEASURES INFRINGEMENT DECISIONS	0 10

Slovenian Competition Day

Richard Whish

STATISTICS

ANTITRUST - 2018	
INTERIM MEASURES	0
INFRINGEMENT DECISIONS	12
 CARTEL SETTLEMENTS 3 	
COOPERATION 5	
COMMITMENT DECISIONS	3
ANTITRUST - 2019	
INTERIM MEASURES	? (BROADCOM)
INFRINGEMENT DECISIONS	8
 CARTEL SETTLEMENTS 2 	
COOPERATION 3	
COMMITMENTS DECISIONS	6

STATISTICS

- THOSE STATISTICS SHOW THAT SINCE 2016
 THERE HAVE BEEN 50 ANTITRUST DECISIONS OF WHICH:
 - 10 WERE FULLY CONTENTIOUS (AND ALL OF THEM WERE APPEALED)
 - 15 WERE CARTEL SETTLEMENTS
 - 12 WERE COOPERATION CASES
 - 13 WERE COMMITMENT DECISIONS
- NOTE THAT COOPERATION CASES SOMETIMES INVOLVE SIGNIFICANT AGREED REMEDIES (ARA FORECLOSURE: DIVESTITURE; ABINBEV: LABELLING)

STATISTICS

MERGERS - 2017

	NOTIFICATIONS	380
•	PHASE I UNCONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	353
•	PHASE I CONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	18
•	PHASE II UNCONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	0
•	PHASE II CONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	2
	PROHIBITION	2

STATISTICS

MERGERS - 2018

	NOTIFICATIONS	414
•	PHASE I UNCONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	366
•	PHASE I CONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	17
•	PHASE II UNCONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	4
•	PHASE II CONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	6
	PROHIBITION	0

STATISTICS

MERGERS - ALL TIME

	NOTIFICATIONS	7443
•	PHASE I UNCONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	6587
•	PHASE I CONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	316
	PHASE II UNCONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	62
•	PHASE II CONDITIONAL CLEARANCE	131
	PROHIBITION	30

STRUCTURAL V BEHAVIOURAL

- IN MERGER CASES STRUCTURAL REMEDIES ARE INVARIABLY PREFERABLE TO BEHAVIOURAL ONES
- NOTE THE IMPORTANCE OF FINDING A 'SUITABLE PURCHASER' IN DIVESTITURE CASES
- A STRUCTURAL REMEDY FOR AN ANTITRUST INFRINGEMENT IS MUCH MORE CONTROVERSIAL
- THE POWER DOES EXPLICITLY EXIST IN ARTICLE 7
 OF REGULATION 1/2004, BUT HAS NEVER BEEN
 USED (THERE WAS NO EXPLICIT POWER IN
 REGULATION 17/62)

STRUCTURAL V BEHAVIOURAL

- BEHAVIOURAL REMEDIES ARE OBVIOUSLY MORE PROBLEMATIC THAN STRUCTURAL ONES, IN PARTICULAR BECAUSE OF THE PROBLEM OF MONITORING THEM
- HOWEVER 'NEVER SAY NEVER': SOMETIMES A BEHAVIOURAL REMEDY MAY BE APPROPRIATE
- THE LEGITIMACY OF BEHAVIOURAL REMEDIES WAS RECOGNISED BY THE GENERAL COURT IN COMMISSION V TETRA LAVAL, 2005

STRUCTURAL V BEHAVIOURAL

- CAN A PRICE CAP BE A REMEDY?
 - SEE THE CURRENT COMMISSION INVESTIGATION OF THE 'EXCESSIVE' PRICES OF ASPEN PHARMACEUTICALS: IF THE CURRENT PRICE IS EXCESSIVE
 - WHAT PRICE IS NOT EXCESSIVE?
 - WHO DECIDES THIS: ASPEN OR THE COMMISSION?
 - HOW WILL THAT PRICE BE MONITORED?
 - DOES THE COMMISSION BECOME A PRICE REGULATOR?
 - NOTE A RECENT MERGER CASE IN THE UK: RAIL SERVICES FROM NORWICH TO ELY, 15 AUGUST 2019 - PRICE CAP FOR RAIL FARES

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF REMEDIES

- REMEMBER THAT REMEDIES OFTEN ARE FOLLOWED BY LITIGATION INVOLVING DISAPPOINTED THIRD PARTIES, FOR EXAMPLE:
 - ALROSA V COMMISSION, AFTER THE DE BEERS COMMITMENTS
 - MORNINGSTAR V COMMISSION, AFTER THOMSON REUTERS
 - GROUPE CANAL V COMMISSION, AFTER HOLLYWOOD STUDIOS
- MANY MERGER CASES

EX POST ANALYSIS OF REMEDIES

- REMEDY-SETTING IS A NEVER-ENDING LEARNING PROCESS
- IT IS IMPORTANT IN PRINCIPLE FOR COMPETITION AUTHORITIES TO LEARN FROM EXPERIENCE, AND TO CONDUCT EX POST ANALYSIS
- SEE THE UK CMA'S 'MERGER REMEDY EVALUATIONS', 18 JUNE 2019, CMA 109
- AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION REPORT OF 2005
- ALSO FTC, 2017; CANADIAN CB 2011

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!