

TABLE OF CONTENTS



FOREWORD	15
SETTING PRIORITIES IN ANTITRUST	23
BY COMMISSIONER MARGRETHE VESTAGER	

PART I MAPPING THE NOTION OF RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION

“RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION” – A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	31
BY SIR CHRISTOPHER BELLAMY	
I. <i>Ancient times</i>	31
II. <i>The early law</i>	33
III. <i>1966 to 2004: The Great Confusion</i>	35
IV. <i>2004 onwards</i>	37
IDENTIFYING “RESTRICTIONS OF COMPETITION” SOME COMMENTS FROM A LAW AND ECONOMICS PERSPECTIVE ...	39
BY DAMIEN J. NEVEN	
I. <i>A framework of sequential decisions</i>	40
II. <i>Object and effect as sequential decisions</i>	44
III. <i>Acquisition of more information</i>	47
IV. <i>Conclusion</i>	48
THE BIFURCATED APPROACH AND ITS PRACTICAL IMPACT ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HARM TO COMPETITION.	51
BY BEN SMULDERS	
I. <i>The implications of the bifurcated approach</i>	52
II. <i>The bifurcated approach in the application of Article 101</i>	55
A. <i>First Step of Analysis under Article 101(1)</i>	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
B. Second Step of the Analysis under Article 101(3)	58
III. <i>The bifurcated approach in the application of Article 102.</i>	59
A. First Step of Analysis under Article 102	59
B. Second Step of Analysis under Article 102	60
IV. <i>Does it make sense to rely on efficiency defences?</i>	61
V. <i>Burden of proof</i>	61
VI. <i>Convergence in the application of the two provisions</i>	62
THE OBJECT-EFFECT DICHOTOMY AND THE REQUIREMENT OF HARM TO COMPETITION: ON THE ROAD TO CLARITY AFTER <i>CARTES BANCAIRES</i> ?	
	65
BY BERNARD AMORY, GEOFFROY VAN DE WALLE AND NATHALIE A. SMUHA	
I. <i>The court before Cartes Bancaires</i>	67
A. Standard of Harm: “Capability” or “Sufficient Degree” of Harm?	68
B. Level of Scrutiny: Factors to Take into Account	71
II. <i>The court after Cartes Bancaires.</i>	74
A. Preliminary Reference Rulings: <i>ING Pensii</i> and <i>Maxima Latvija</i>	75
1. <i>ING Pensii</i>	75
2. <i>Maxima Latvija</i>	76
B. Appeals against the General Court: <i>Dole</i> and <i>Toshiba</i>	77
1. <i>Dole</i>	77
2. <i>Toshiba</i>	80
C. The Way Forward: Still Scope for Clarification	83
THE CHALLENGE OF EUROPEAN COMPETITION NETWORK CONVERGENCE IN THE DEFINITION OF HARM TO COMPETITION.	
	87
BY IMELDA MAHER	
I. <i>Restriction by Object</i>	88
A. NCAs and Restriction by Object	90
B. The Case of Retail MFN	92
C. The Case of Pay-For-Delay Arrangements.	98
II. <i>Institutional Tools</i>	100
A. Preliminary References	100
B. The European Competition Network.	102
C. National Courts	105
D. Mirroring	106

PART II
RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION
UNDER ARTICLE 101 TFEU

WHAT MAKES AN AGREEMENT ANTI-COMPETITIVE: LESSONS FROM THE PAST	111
BY LUC GYSELEN	
I. <i>Top line definition of an anti-competitive agreement</i>	114
II. <i>Shortcomings of dualist Article 101 TFEU</i>	117
III. <i>Time to rewrite Article 101?</i>	121
IV. <i>Support for a monist version “2.0” of Article 101</i>	124
A. The Legislative History of Article 85 EEC / 101 TFEU	125
B. CJEU Judgements	129
V. <i>How to rewrite Article 101?</i>	133
INFORMATION EXCHANGES AND PRICE SIGNALLING: AN ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE	137
BY RAPHAËL DE CONINCK	
I. <i>Information exchanges</i>	138
A. Potential Efficiencies	139
B. Potential Anticompetitive Effects	140
II. <i>Public announcements</i>	142
A. Invitation to Collude	142
B. Price Signalling: Testing the Coordination Hypothesis	143
1. Do the announcements provide a focal point for coordination? ..	144
2. Do the announcements provide a plausible mechanism for coordination?	146
3. Are there other reasons for the announcements (potentially pro-competitive), unrelated to a potential coordination mechanism?	146
4. Are the announcements likely to lead to coordination (or to make coordination more sustainable) in the specific industry?	147
NATIONAL COMPETITION AUTHORITIES' INVESTIGATIONS IN HUB-AND-SPOKE ARRANGEMENTS: A CRITICAL REVIEW	149
BY YVES BOTTEMAN	
I. <i>The great and elusive Hub-and-Spoke exchange</i>	149
A. Concerted Practice	151

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
B. Proving an Illicit Hub-and-Spoke Exchange	154
C. A Hub-and-Spoke State of Mind	155
II. <i>Do Hub-and-Spoke exchanges affect competition? And does it really matter?</i>	159
III. <i>Resale price maintenance (“RPM”): the non-Hub-and-Spoke exchange.</i>	162

**PART III
RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION
UNDER ARTICLE 102 TFEU**

WHAT MAKES A UNILATERAL CONDUCT ABUSIVE: THE LEGAL PERSPECTIVE	169
BY ROBERT O’DONOGHUE	
I. <i>Fundamental concepts.</i>	170
A. The Basic Definition of Abuse	172
B. Uncertainty Surrounding the Definition of Exclusionary Conduct . .	173
II. <i>The categories of abuse under Article 102 TFEU</i>	177
A. Exploitative Abuses (Article 102(a))	178
1. Excessive prices	178
2. Unfair contractual terms and conditions	179
B. Exclusionary Abuses (Article 102(b))	180
1. The need for a unified basis for exclusionary abuses	180
2. Article 102(b): the legal basis for defining exclusionary conduct .	181
3. Explanation of the “limiting production” test	184
4. The Commission’s policy rethink in the Guidance Paper	186
C. Discriminatory Abuses (Article 102(c)).	188
1. The need to distinguish different categories of discrimination. . .	188
2. Clarifying the treatment of discrimination under Article 102 TFEU	190
(a) <i>The analysis of exclusionary abuses that involve elements of discrimination</i>	191
(b) <i>The analysis of discrimination by a dominant firm between non- associated customers</i>	192
D. Tying Abuses (Article 102(d))	193
E. Leveraging Abuses	194
1. Definition of leveraging	194

	PAGES
2. The need to distinguish procompetitive and anticompetitive leveraging.	195
3. Circumstances in which leveraging conduct amounts to an abuse . . .	197
(a) <i>No independent abuse of leveraging</i>	197
(b) <i>The need for a causal connection between the dominance and the abusive conduct</i>	198
(c) <i>The relevance of “associative links”</i>	199
III. <i>Anticompetitive effects under Article 102 TFEU</i>	202
A. The Need for Causation between Dominance and the Abuse	203
1. Causation and Article 102 TFEU: conflicting statements	203
2. Further recent exceptions: AstraZeneca and Rambus	204
3. Resolving the conflict	205
4. Causation in fact.	206
5. The use of counterfactuals	208
B. The Standard for Anticompetitive Effects under Article 102 TFEU . .	209
1. Criticism of the formalistic approach in earlier cases	209
2. The gradual shift in the Commission’s approach	210
3. The current position	211
4. The continued gulf between theory and practice	213
5. An exception for a naked restraint?	214
C. The Role of Consumer Harm	216
1. Uncertainty as to the role of consumer harm under Article 102 TFEU	216
2. Consequences of adopting a consumer harm criterion	218
3. Consumer harm under the four clauses of Article 102 TFEU.	219
4. Proving consumer harm in practice	221
D. The Role of Intent Evidence.	224
1. Intent evidence in pricing abuse cases.	224
2. Intent evidence in other types of abuse cases.	225
IV. <i>Objective justification</i>	228
A. Defences of objective necessity.	230
B. Reasonable steps by a dominant firm to protect its commercial interest	230
C. Efficiency defences.	232
1. The basic conditions for efficiencies	233
2. Evaluating the approach to efficiency defences under Article 102 TFEU	234

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION AND EXCLUSIONARY ABUSE UNDER ARTICLE 102 – THE SOLUTION	239
BY JOHN TEMPLE LANG	
I. <i>An unsatisfactory discussion</i>	240
A. The Simple Case – Retroactive Rebates	241
B. Exclusivity and Rebates	241
C. Imprecise Language of the EU Courts	242
1. The failure to consider some of the case law.	245
2. The concept of exclusionary abuse cannot be open-ended	245
3. How much does this matter?	246
II. <i>So where do we stand now? A solution is available</i>	247
A. The Advantages of Article 102(B) as a Definition of Restriction of Competition and Exclusionary Conduct	248
B. The Possible Disadvantages of Article 102(B)	250
C. Is Article 102(B) Exhaustive, or Could There Be Another Category of Abuse?	252
WHAT MAKES A UNILATERAL CONDUCT ABUSIVE? AN ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE	255
BY ADAM CELLAN-JONES AND ANDREA LOFARO	
I. <i>No form of unilateral conduct is inherently anti-competitive</i>	255
II. <i>Harm to competitors does not imply harm to competition</i>	257
A. Effects-based Approach	258
B. Application to High-technology Industries.	260
1. Assessing abuse of dominance allegations in practice – <i>Google</i>	262
2. Assessing abuse of dominance allegations in practice – <i>Intel</i>	264
3. Assessing abuse of dominance allegations in practice – <i>Internet Explorer</i>	266
THE <i>PERINDOPRIL</i> CASE: PATENT SETTLEMENTS AND ACQUISITION OF TECHNOLOGY.	269
BY JAMES KILLICK	
I. <i>Market definition and generic entry</i>	270
A. The <i>Perindopril</i> Molecule	270
B. The Econometric Assessment	270
C. A Contextual Approach to Market Definition.	271
II. <i>The blurred boundaries of “competition on the merits” and generic entry</i>	273
A. The Scope of the Alleged Abuse(s)	273

	PAGES
B. Acquisition of Technology as an Abuse.....	275
C. Patent Settlements as an Abuse.....	277
UNEQUAL TREATMENT BY ONLINE PLATFORMS: A STRUCTURED APPROACH TO THE ABUSE TEST IN <i>GOOGLE</i> ...	281
BY RENATO NAZZINI	
I. <i>Article 102 and the need for legal certainty</i>	283
II. <i>The ‘concept’ of abuse and ‘competition on the merits’</i>	285
III. <i>The ‘special responsibility’ of the dominant undertaking</i>	289
IV. <i>The search for clear legal principles: ruling out the application of the test for (exploitative or) discriminatory abuses</i>	293
V. <i>Looking for the right exclusionary test in the Google case: extension of the input foreclosure framework</i>	299

PART IV
THE INFLUENCE OF MERGER CONTROL ON THE
ANTITRUST NOTION OF RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION

THE CONTRIBUTION OF MERGER CONTROL TO THE DEFINITION OF HARM TO COMPETITION	311
BY CARLES ESTEVA MOSSO	
I. <i>The convergence of merger control towards antitrust</i>	311
II. <i>Influences of merger control on antitrust enforcement</i>	314
A. Market Power Analysis.....	314
B. Market Definition	314
C. Collective Dominance.....	315
D. The Counterfactual.....	316
E. Remedies	317
III. <i>Is there (or should there be) a single analytical framework for Article 101 TFEU and merger control?</i>	318
ARTICLE 101 AND THE MERGER REGULATION: A SINGLE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK?	323
BY NICHOLAS LEVY	
I. <i>Contribution of merger control to antitrust</i>	324
II. <i>Are levels of intervention similar under Article 101 and the merger regulation?</i>	326

PART V
THE NOTION OF RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION:
LESSONS AND PROSPECTS

ON THE NOTION OF RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION:	
WHAT WE KNOW AND WHAT WE DON'T KNOW WE KNOW	333
BY PABLO IBÁÑEZ COLOMO AND ALFONSO LAMADRID DE PABLO	
I. <i>What we know about restrictions of competition</i>	336
A. It is Necessary to Consider the Nature of the Practice and the Context of which it is Part	336
1. It is necessary to look beyond the formal aspects of the practice	336
2. It is necessary to consider the counterfactual	339
3. A restriction of a firm's freedom of action is not necessarily a restriction of competition.	342
B. A Practice May Restrict Competition by Object or Effect.	346
C. Institutions Matter	347
II. <i>What we don't know we know about restrictions of competition</i> . . .	350
A. The Divide between Restrictions by Object and by Effect	350
1. An apparent puzzle in the case law: the role of effects in 'by object' infringements	351
2. Sorting out the puzzle: is the practice plausibly pro-competitive?	353
3. Explaining the outliers	358
B. The Analysis of Restrictive Effects on Competition	360
1. Temporal dimension: actual or potential effects.	360
2. Threshold of effects: capability or likelihood	361
3. Appreciability and de minimis	364
4. What is a restrictive effect?.	366
THE NOTION OF RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION:	
ECONOMIC PROSPECTS.	375
BY AVANTIKA CHOWDHURY	
I. <i>Where are we now?</i>	376
II. <i>Lessons and practical implications</i>	377
A. The Counterfactual and the Theory of Harm.	378
B. Long-run Consumer Welfare.	379
C. An overall Economic Approach	380

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
THE NOTION OF RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION IN THE POST-MODERNISATION CONTEXT	383
BY CECILIO MADERO	
I. <i>The notion of restriction of competition</i>	384
II. <i>Alignment of Articles 101 and 102</i>	386
A. 'By Object' / 'by Nature' vs 'by Effect' Restrictions	386
B. Efficiencies as a Defence that the Parties Can Prove	387
THE NOTION OF RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION IN THE POST-MODERNISATION CONTEXT: SOME PRACTICAL THOUGHTS REGARDING VERTICAL RESTRAINTS	389
BY ANDREW RENSHAW	