

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	xiii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xv
I Introduction to the EU enforcement system and the goals of the Damages Directive	1
A The enforcement of EU competition law	1
I The enforcement powers of the European Commission	1
II The enforcement powers of NCAs	8
III Private enforcement of EU Commission law	11
B The interplay of public and private enforcement	13
C Research objectives	17
D Methodology	20
I Deterrence	21
II Compensation	23
III The problem of over-enforcement	26
E Structure of the book	28
PART I THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DAMAGES DIRECTIVE: A NEW LEVEL PLAYING FIELD IN EUROPE?	
2 The implementation of the Damages Directive: harmonised rules on competition damages litigation in Europe?	31
A Background: the path towards harmonised rules in Europe for actions for damages for competition law infringements	32
I The right of any individual to claim damages for a breach of competition rules after <i>Courage and Manfredi</i>	33
II The Commission's initiatives to harmonise private enforcement in Europe	41
III The Commission's initiatives for a collective regime for competition damages	44

B	The rules of the Damages Directive and the implementation into national laws	49
I	The legal basis	50
II	The scope of the Directive	52
III	Disclosure of evidence	57
IV	Disclosure of evidence contained in the authority's file	65
V	Effect of national competition authorities' decisions	69
VI	Limitation periods	75
VII	Joint and several liability	79
VIII	Passing-on	88
IX	Quantification and presumption of harm	92
X	Consensual dispute resolution/settlements	96
XI	Temporal scope	99
C	A new level playing field for competition damages actions in Europe?	105
D	Conclusion	106
PART II CONTRIBUTION AMONG JOINT INFRINGERS OF COMPETITION LAW IN LIGHT OF THE DAMAGES DIRECTIVE		
3	Lessons from the US: the no-contribution rule and its inapplicability in Europe	109
A	Introduction	109
B	The no-contribution rule in the US	109
I	The current legal regime in the US	109
II	Historical development of the no-contribution rule in the US	113
III	Criticism of the no-contribution rule in the US	115
IV	Potential justifications for the no-contribution rule	127
C	No contribution is not an option in Europe?	135
D	Conclusion	137
4	Getting contribution right: the allocation of liability among joint infringers of EU competition law based on relative responsibility	139
A	Introduction	139
B	The allocation of liability according to the Damages Directive	140

C	Relative responsibility and the criteria for determining contribution	144
I	Turnover/sales value	145
II	Market shares	146
III	The role in the infringement	148
IV	Allocation per capita	149
V	Allocation based on gains from the infringement	150
VI	The economic approach: Shapley value	152
D	Methods for the quantification of the infringer's responsibility for the infringement	161
I	Criticism of relative responsibility	161
II	Responsibility in terms of justice	165
III	Theories of causation in fact	167
IV	The underlying dogma of the causation theories	175
V	The conditions for allocation based on <i>responsibility</i> in competition cases	176
VI	Digression: similar dogma based on the economic theories on uncertainty over causation	180
VII	Proposal for relative responsibility based on the overcharge, role in the cartel, and market shares	183
E	Assessment of the deterrent effect of the different methods for the allocation of liability	183
I	The model scenario	184
II	Allocation per capita	187
III	Allocation by sales value	187
IV	Allocation based on gains from the infringement	188
V	Allocation rules based on market data (market shares/Shapley value)	189
VI	Relative responsibility based on a combination of illicit gain, market shares, and the role in the cartel	189
VII	The need for harmonisation of the allocation of liability among joint competition infringers	190
F	Conclusion	192
5	The quantification of the role in the cartel for the relative responsibility of joint infringers of EU competition law	194
A	Introduction	194
B	The role in the (cartel) infringement	195
C	The adjustment of fines based on the role in the infringement	197

	I	Mitigating circumstances	198
	II	Aggravating circumstances	211
	III	Summary of the analysis	215
D		Adjusting the allocation of civil liability for the role in the infringement	215
E		The attractiveness of settlements	218
F		Application of adjustment for the role in the cartel	220
G		Conclusion	221
PART III THE IMPACT OF THE DAMAGES DIRECTIVE ON THE EU LENIENCY PROGRAMME			
6	A	A missed opportunity to reconcile compensation of victims and leniency incentives	224
	A	Introduction	224
	B	Previous EU law and Member States' laws on access to leniency documents	227
	I	The case law of the European Courts	228
	II	Member States' case law on access to leniency documents	229
	III	Further complications following from the Transparency Regulation	230
	C	The Directive's new rules on compensation of victims, access to evidence and immunity recipients' limited liability	232
	I	Compensation of victims versus effectiveness of the leniency programme	232
	II	Binding effect of national competition authorities' decisions	233
	III	Presumption of harm	234
	IV	Disclosure of evidence	234
	V	Joint and several liability and liability cap for immunity recipients	236
	VI	The trade-off between compensation of victims and leniency incentives	238
	D	A game theoretical analysis of the Directive	239
	I	The legal situation prior to the Directive	241
	II	The impact of the Directive	243
	E	A suggested alternative solution: immunity from damages or proportionate damages	246

I	The superiority of proportionate damages from the perspectives of deterrence and compensatory justice	247
II	A game theoretical argument supporting proportionate damages	249
F	Potential objections against proportionate damages	255
I	The rise of damages actions since the implementation of the Directive and the impact on the EU leniency programme	260
II	Proportionate damages if all firms have received fine reductions or a non-cooperating firm has disappeared from the market	262
III	Efficiency and a potential corrective justice objection	266
IV	Moral, fairness, and retribution objections	268
V	A potential over-deterrence objection	270
G	Conclusion	271

PART IV THE NEED TO RECONCILE FINES AND DAMAGES FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DAMAGES DIRECTIVE

7	A new approach to the calculation of competition fines to reconcile fines and damages	274
A	Introduction	274
B	Current method of calculating fines	276
I	Background of the Fines Guidelines	276
II	The methodology of the 2006 Fines Guidelines	278
III	Deterrence under the current fining regime	280
C	A new approach for the calculation of fines	283
I	The need for a new approach to the calculation of fines	283
II	Integrating damages into the calculation of fines	285
D	Practical implications of the new approach	287
I	The damages of entitled claimants to be included in the calculation of fines	288
II	The relevant time period for the estimation of civil liability	290
III	Burden and standard of proof for the harm caused by the infringement	292
IV	Blocking an amount for the estimated damages	293

	V	Including a presumption of harm in the methodology	294
	VI	Causation	303
	VII	Methods to quantify the harm	310
	VIII	Determining the amount of fines (<i>F</i>)	311
	IX	Summary of the changes to the current method of calculating fines	314
	E	Optimal level of fines – determining the ‘entry fee’	315
	I	Compensation theory and the new approach	315
	II	Deterrence theory and the new approach	318
	III	Probability of detection	319
	IV	Adjusting the ‘entry fee’	320
	F	Advantages of the new approach	321
	G	The principle of proportionality and equal treatment	323
	H	Examples: <i>Synthetic Rubber</i> and <i>Bananas</i>	327
	I	Conclusion	330
8		Concluding remarks	332
	A	Contribution claims	332
	B	Leniency incentives	334
	C	Fines and damages	335
	D	Further research	336
		<i>Annex 1</i>	338
		<i>Annex 2</i>	353
		<i>Annex 3</i>	362
		<i>Annex 4</i>	364
		<i>Index</i>	366