



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Increasing the requirements to show antitrust harm in modernised effects-based analysis: an assessment of the impact on the efficiency of enforcement of Art 81 EC

Lankhorst, M.

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Lankhorst, M. (2010). *Increasing the requirements to show antitrust harm in modernised effects-based analysis: an assessment of the impact on the efficiency of enforcement of Art 81 EC*. Amsterdam Center for Law & Economics.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1 SETTING THE STAGE

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|----|
| 1.1 | Subject matter | 13 |
| 1.2 | Structure of the argumentation | 15 |
| | Part 2 | 16 |
| | Part 3 | 17 |

CHAPTER 2 BACKGROUND, METHOD, AND SCOPE

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 2.1 | Introduction | 18 |
| 2.2 | A first introduction to Community competition policy | 19 |
| 2.2.1 | Competition policy and general Community objectives | 20 |
| | The European Coal and Steel Community | 21 |
| | The EC Treaty and Community competition policy | 22 |
| 2.2.2 | Art 81 EC, its components, and the scope of this work | 23 |
| | The elements of the assessment under Art 81(1) EC that are not addressed | 25 |
| | The object or effect to restrict competition | 27 |
| | The investigation of restrictions, countervailing benefits and ancillary restraints | 30 |
| 2.2.3 | Art 81 EC and non-competition-related objectives | 31 |
| 2.3 | The dividing line between Art 81(1) and (3) EC | 35 |
| 2.3.1 | Regulation 17/62 and freedom of trade | 35 |
| 2.3.2 | The <i>rule of reason</i> debate in EC antitrust | 39 |
| | The impact of the notification regime | 39 |
| | The call for a <i>rule of reason</i> in Art 81(1) EC | 42 |
| | The <i>rule of reason</i> in practice | 46 |
| 2.4 | Modernisation and the generic objectives of EC antitrust | 51 |
| 2.4.1 | An overview of recent developments | 51 |
| 2.4.2 | Generic antitrust objectives | 55 |
| | Ultimate objectives | 55 |
| | Intermediate objectives | 56 |
| | Market power | 59 |
| | Ways to identify market power: structure or conduct | 61 |
| 2.4.3 | An overview of substantive modernisation | 64 |
| 2.5 | Approach and scope | 68 |
| | Legal certainty: modernisation as applied in practice | 68 |
| | Making the effects of uncertainty visible | 70 |
| | An alternative approach | 73 |
| | A final note on the scope of this work | 74 |

PART 2
EVALUATING THE CURRENT STATE OF EFFECTS-BASED ANALYSIS

CHAPTER 3
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS-BASED STANDARD

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 3.1 | Introduction..... | 76 |
| 3.2 | Efficient enforcement, the legal standard and decision theory..... | 77 |
| | The system as a whole..... | 77 |
| | The legal standard..... | 79 |
| | Decision theory..... | 80 |
| 3.3 | Calibration of the legal standard..... | 82 |
| 3.3.1 | Rulemaking: accuracy and timing..... | 82 |
| | Components of the rule making calculus..... | 82 |
| | Timing: rules and standards..... | 85 |
| | Errors in the application of standards..... | 86 |
| 3.3.2 | Dividing the burden of proof..... | 88 |
| 3.4 | Firm behaviour under uncertainty about the legal standard..... | 97 |
| 3.4.1 | Analysing the effects of uncertainty..... | 99 |
| | Binary settings..... | 99 |
| | Continuous range of options..... | 100 |
| 3.4.2 | Contracting in the effects-based field..... | 105 |
| 3.5 | Conclusions and implications..... | 109 |

CHAPTER 4
COMPARING EU AND US *RULE OF REASON* ANALYSIS

| | | |
|---------|---|-----|
| 4.1 | Introduction..... | 111 |
| 4.2 | A brief note on the of comparison..... | 111 |
| | Comparing EC law with US law..... | 111 |
| | Comparative methodology..... | 112 |
| | Materials studied..... | 114 |
| | Structure of the comparison..... | 115 |
| 4.3 | EU and US law on restrictive agreements compared..... | 116 |
| 4.3.1 | The enforcing party's burden of proof..... | 117 |
| 4.3.1.1 | US antitrust..... | 117 |
| | The use of direct evidence..... | 118 |
| | <i>Eastman Kodak</i> and <i>California Dental Association</i> | 121 |
| | The required level of substantiation: a sliding scale..... | 122 |
| 4.3.1.2 | EC antitrust..... | 124 |
| | The <i>de minimis</i> doctrine..... | 125 |
| | The case law..... | 126 |
| | The Commission..... | 132 |
| 4.3.2 | The affirmative defence and the weighing of effects on competition..... | 135 |
| | Basic framework..... | 136 |
| | Crucial differences..... | 138 |
| | <i>Bass</i> | 140 |
| | <i>Van den Bergh Foods</i> | 142 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| | <i>Master Card</i> (and the Commission’s interpretation of <i>Métropole</i>)..... | 143 |
| | Comparison and implications for indispensability..... | 144 |
| 4.4 | Characterisation in terms of uncertainty..... | 146 |

CHAPTER 5

THE IMPACT OF MODERNISATION ON LEGAL CERTAINTY

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 5.1 | Introduction..... | 153 |
| 5.2 | The impact of substantive modernisation..... | 154 |
| 5.2.1 | The shift from a rule-based to a standard-based system..... | 154 |
| 5.2.2 | The guidelines and developments in Industrial Organization..... | 156 |
| | Early thought, Ordo-liberalism, and the Harvard School..... | 157 |
| | Chicago and game theory..... | 162 |
| | Implications for the usefulness of the Guidelines..... | 164 |
| 5.2.3 | Substantive modernisation in practice..... | 165 |
| 5.3 | The impact of procedural modernisation..... | 168 |
| 5.4 | The case for increased requirements to show harm..... | 172 |
| | Modernisation as practiced..... | 172 |
| | Some anecdotic evidence..... | 174 |
| | Raising the level of certainty..... | 179 |

PART 3

IMPROVING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE EFFECTS-BASED STANDARD

CHAPTER 6

COSTS AND BENEFITS OF IMPROVING ACCURACY

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 6.1 | Introduction..... | 184 |
| 6.2 | Improving accuracy: incentives under current conditions..... | 185 |
| | Incentives in the field of negligence..... | 186 |
| | Craswell and Calfee’s theory applied to antitrust..... | 188 |
| | Kahan’s theory applied to antitrust..... | 191 |
| 6.3 | Impact on different actors and complementary measures..... | 193 |
| | Countering a drop in deterrence..... | 195 |
| 6.4 | Conclusion..... | 198 |

CHAPTER 7

A NEW AGENDA FOR EUROPEAN *RULE OF REASON* ANALYSIS

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 7.1 | Introduction..... | 200 |
| 7.2 | Empiricism in the analysis of restraints..... | 201 |
| | Implications for the way restraints are analysed..... | 203 |
| | Implications for the guidance available to firms..... | 208 |
| 7.3 | Effects on enforcement costs..... | 209 |
| 7.3.1 | Transforming the Commission’s burden of proof..... | 209 |
| 7.3.2 | Effects on private enforcers’ costs..... | 213 |
| 7.4 | Compatibility with European antitrust..... | 216 |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| | <i>Métropole</i> seen in its context..... | 217 |
| | The implications of the proposal and changed circumstances..... | 219 |
| | Developments in the field of concentration control..... | 221 |
| | Developments in the field of abuse of dominance..... | 224 |
| 7.5 | Conclusion..... | 226 |

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 8.1 | Summary..... | 227 |
| | The objective..... | 227 |
| | On the method..... | 228 |
| | Findings on legal certainty..... | 228 |
| | Findings on improving accuracy..... | 229 |
| | Compatibility with European antitrust..... | 230 |
| 8.2 | Broader implications and directions for future research..... | 230 |
| | Art 82 EC review..... | 231 |
| | Policy innovation, Remia, and the French model..... | 232 |
| 8.3 | Concluding remarks..... | 233 |

APPENDIX A

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----|
| | EU COMMISSION DECISIONS..... | 235 |
|--|------------------------------|-----|

APPENDIX B

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----|
| | US DISTRICT COURT CASES..... | 239 |
|--|------------------------------|-----|

| | | |
|--|-------------------|-----|
| | BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 244 |
|--|-------------------|-----|

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| | NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING (<i>Summary in Dutch</i>)..... | 261 |
|--|---|-----|