

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i>	xv
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>page</i>	xvii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>page</i>	xix
<i>List of Definitions</i>	<i>page</i>	xxi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	<i>page</i>	xxiii
1 Introduction and Methodology	1	
1.1 Introduction	1	
1.1.1 Research Question	1	
1.1.2 Novel Approach	4	
1.1.3 Structure and Argument	7	
1.2 Definitions	12	
1.2.1 Competition and Non-Competition Interests	12	
1.2.1.1 A Narrow Definition	12	
1.2.1.2 Dialectic Approach	14	
1.2.1.3 Theoretical Justifications: The Example of Consumer Welfare	15	
1.2.1.4 Methodological Justifications	19	
1.2.2 Balancing	21	
1.2.2.1 Process: Legal Balancing, Economic Balancing, and Exclusion	21	
1.2.2.2 Remedy: Corrective and Regulatory Balancing	22	
1.2.2.3 Level of Discretion	23	
1.3 Systematic Content Analysis	23	
1.3.1 Promises and Pitfalls of Systematic Content Analysis	24	
1.3.2 The Database: Case Selection and Definitions	26	
1.3.2.1 Legal Provisions	27	
1.3.2.2 Jurisdiction Selection	28	

1.3.2.3	Sources of Information	30
1.3.2.4	Types of Proceedings	31
1.3.3	Coding Book	31
2	History of Article 101 TFEU Balancing	34
2.1	Introduction	34
2.2	Balancing in EU Primary Law: More Questions than Answers	35
2.2.1	Normative Value of Competition in the EU Treaties	35
2.2.2	Article 101 TFEU Wording and Structure: Member States Agree to Disagree	38
2.2.3	Substantive Aspects: The Four Conditions of Article 101(3) TFEU	40
2.2.3.1	First Condition: Benefit	40
2.2.3.2	Second Condition: Fair Share	42
2.2.3.3	Third Condition: Indispensability	43
2.2.3.4	Fourth Condition: Elimination of Competition	44
2.3	Balancing in EU Secondary Law: Between Notifications and Self-Assessment	45
2.3.1	Notification-Centralised Regime of Regulation 17/62	46
2.3.2	Blessing and Curse: Consequences of Regulation 17/62	47
2.3.3	Modernisation of Competition Law	50
2.3.3.1	Origin and Reactions to the White Paper	50
2.3.3.2	Point of Contention: EU and National Competition Laws	52
2.3.3.3	Commission's and NCAs' Role under Regulation 1/2003	53
2.4	EU Courts' Role in Shaping Balancing	55
2.5	Balancing in Practice I: The Commission's Approach	57
2.5.1	First Enforcement Period (1962–1977): The Foundation Period	57
2.5.1.1	Balancing Guided by Keynesian Theories	57
2.5.1.2	Market Integration as the Primary Aim	58
2.5.2	Second Enforcement Period (1978–1987): Workable Competition	59
2.5.2.1	Workable Competition Standard and Regulatory Balancing	59
2.5.2.2	Balancing in Times of Economic Crisis	62
2.5.3	Third Enforcement Period (1988–April 2004): Economic, Social, and Political EU	63
2.5.3.1	Sectoral Approach	63
2.5.3.2	Policy-Linking Clauses	64
2.5.3.3	First Seeds of the More Economic Approach	64
2.5.4	Fourth Enforcement Period (May 2004–2017): Post-Modernisation Era	67

2.5.4.1	Institutional Pillar of Modernisation (Decentralisation)	68
2.5.4.2	Substantive Pillar of Modernisation (1): White Paper	69
2.5.4.3	Substantive Pillar of Modernisation (2): Commission's Guidelines	70
2.5.4.4	Substantive Pillar of Modernisation (3): Consumer Welfare	72
2.5.4.5	Procedural Pillar of Modernisation: Self-Assessment and Enforcement Discretion	74
2.6	Balancing in Practice II: Five Member States	75
2.6.1	France	76
2.6.1.1	Origins of National Competition Law	76
2.6.1.2	National Equivalent of Article 101 TFEU and Consumer Welfare Standard	77
2.6.1.3	National Enforcement System	77
2.6.2	Germany	78
2.6.2.1	Origins of National Competition Law	78
2.6.2.2	National Equivalent of Article 101 TFEU and Consumer Welfare Standard	79
2.6.2.3	National Enforcement System	81
2.6.3	The Netherlands	81
2.6.3.1	Origins of National Competition Law	81
2.6.3.2	National Equivalent of Article 101 TFEU and Consumer Welfare Standard	82
2.6.3.3	National Enforcement System	84
2.6.4	UK	84
2.6.4.1	Origins of National Competition Law	85
2.6.4.2	National Equivalent of Article 101 TFEU and Consumer Welfare Standard	87
2.6.4.3	National Enforcement System	88
2.6.5	Hungary	89
2.6.5.1	Origins of the National Competition Law	89
2.6.5.2	National Equivalent of Article 101 TFEU and the Consumer Welfare Standard	90
2.6.5.3	National Enforcement System	90
2.7	Non-Competition Interests under Article 101 TFEU: An Open Question	91
3	Article 101(3) TFEU: Individual Exemptions	93
3.1	Introduction	93
3.2	Legal and Empirical Background	96

3.3	Types of Benefits	99
3.3.1	Overview	99
3.3.1.1	Improving the Production or Distribution of Goods or Promoting Technical or Economic Progress	99
3.3.1.2	Economic and Non-Economic Benefits	101
3.3.2	First Enforcement Period: Industrial Policy	102
3.3.3	Second and Third Enforcement Periods: Broadening the Types of Benefits	105
3.3.3.1	Metro I and the Workable Competition Standard	105
3.3.3.2	The Irrelevance of the Policy-Linking Clauses	107
3.3.3.3	Relevant Types of Beneficiaries	110
3.3.3.4	The Case of Environmental Agreements	111
3.3.3.5	Non-Economic Benefits as an Additional Justification	113
3.3.4	Fourth Enforcement Period: Limiting the Types of Benefits and Beneficiaries	115
3.3.4.1	The Commission's Policy Papers	115
3.3.4.2	The Commission's Practice	118
3.3.5	Interim Conclusion	119
3.4	The Balancing Method	120
3.4.1	Overview	120
3.4.2	First Enforcement Period: Market Integration and the First Benefit Condition	121
3.4.3	Second and Third Enforcement Periods: Sectoral Approach and the Third Indispensability Condition	123
3.4.3.1	The Workable Competition Standard as a Balancing Method	123
3.4.3.2	Market Integration	125
3.4.3.3	Liberalised and Regulated Markets	126
3.4.3.4	Sectors Affected by Economic Crisis	129
3.4.3.5	Industrial Policy	130
3.4.4	Fourth Enforcement Period: Consumer Welfare and Economic Evidence	132
3.4.4.1	Short-Term Narrow Consumer Welfare Standard	132
3.4.4.2	Robust Economic Evidence	133
3.4.4.3	Focus on the First Benefit Condition	135
3.4.4.4	Hard-Core and By-Object Restrictions	136
3.4.5	Interim Conclusion	138
3.5	EU Courts	139
3.5.1	Overview	139
3.5.2	From an Active Role Prior to Modernisation to a Passive Role	142

3.5.3	Not Fully Endorsing the Commission's New Approach	144
3.5.3.1	Types of Benefits	144
3.5.3.2	Balancing Method	147
3.5.4	Interim Conclusion	149
3.6	NCAs and National Courts	149
3.6.1	Overview	149
3.6.2	Types of Benefits and Balancing Method	153
3.6.2.1	Economic Benefits and Short-Term Narrow Consumer Welfare (UK and Hungary)	155
3.6.2.2	Non-Economic Benefits and Long-Term Broad Consumer Welfare (the Netherlands and France)	156
3.6.2.3	Rejecting the Consumer Welfare Standard (Germany)	166
3.6.3	Intensity of Control	170
3.6.3.1	Strict Control (UK, Germany, and Hungary)	170
3.6.3.2	Varying Control (the Netherlands and France)	175
3.6.4	National Equivalent Provisions	177
3.6.5	National Courts	179
3.6.6	Interim Conclusion	181
3.7	Closing Remarks: Transitions in Article 101(3) TFEU Balancing	182
4	Block Exemption Regulations	186
4.1	Introduction	186
4.2	Legal and Empirical Background	189
4.3	BERs as a Balancing Tool	192
4.3.1	Type of Benefit: General and Sectoral	193
4.3.1.1	General BERs	193
4.3.1.2	Sectoral BERs	194
4.3.2	The Balancing Method	196
4.3.2.1	Adopting BERs	196
4.3.2.2	Applying BERs	198
4.3.3	Modernising BERs	201
4.3.3.1	From Form-Based to Effects-Based Balancing	201
4.3.3.2	Questioning the Theoretical Justification of Sectoral BERs	204
4.3.4	Interim Conclusion	205
4.4	NCAs and National Courts	206
4.4.1	NCAs	206
4.4.1.1	EU and Mixed Cases	206
4.4.1.2	Purely National Cases	209
4.4.1.3	National BERs	210
4.4.2	National Courts	211
4.4.3	Interim Conclusion	212

4.5	Relationship between BERs and Individual Exemption Balancing	213
4.5.1	Individual Exemption Granted after BER Refused	213
4.5.2	Withdrawal of BERs	216
4.6	Closing Remarks: Transitions in BERs Balancing	217
5	Article 101(1) TFEU	220
5.1	Introduction	220
5.1.1	Between a Jurisdictional Provision and a Balancing Tool	221
5.1.2	Between the Theory of Harm and a Balancing Tool	223
5.1.3	Two Categories of Article 101(1) TFEU Balancing Tools	224
5.2	Balancing Competition and State or Public Interests	226
5.2.1	Legal and Empirical Background	226
5.2.2	State Action Defence	230
5.2.2.1	Balancing Tool	230
5.2.2.2	Balancing Method (1): State Requiring or Favouring Anti-competitive Agreements	232
5.2.2.3	Balancing Method (2): State Reinforcing an Anti-competitive Agreement	236
5.2.2.4	Balancing Method (3): Delegation of State Powers	237
5.2.2.5	Modernising the State Action Defence	241
5.2.3	Article 106(2) TFEU	246
5.2.3.1	Types of Benefits	246
5.2.3.2	Balancing Method	247
5.2.4	Notion of Undertakings	250
5.2.4.1	Types of Benefits	250
5.2.4.2	Balancing Method	251
5.2.5	‘Nature and Purpose’: Collective Bargaining Agreements	254
5.2.5.1	Types of Benefits	255
5.2.5.2	Balancing Method	255
5.2.6	Inherent Restriction	257
5.2.6.1	Types of Benefits	257
5.2.6.2	Balancing Method	258
5.2.7	Interim Conclusion	261
5.3	Balancing Competition and Commercial Interests	263
5.3.1	Legal and Empirical Background	263
5.3.2	EU Rule of Reason	267
5.3.3	Objectively Necessary Agreement	269
5.3.4	Ancillary Restraints	270
5.3.5	IPRs	275
5.3.6	De Minimis	278
5.3.7	Interim Conclusion	279

5.4 NCAs and National Courts	281
5.4.1 NCAs	281
5.4.1.1 Overview	281
5.4.1.2 Types of Benefits	283
5.4.1.3 Balancing Method	284
5.4.1.4 Intensity of Control	286
5.4.2 National Courts	288
5.5 Closing Remarks: Transitions in Article 101(3) TFEU Balancing	290
6 National Balancing Tools	293
6.1 Introduction	293
6.2 Legal and Empirical Background	295
6.3 Balancing Tools	296
6.3.1 Low Discretion, Economic Benefits	296
6.3.2 High Discretion, Economic Benefits	300
6.3.3 Low Discretion, Economic and Non-Economic Benefits	302
6.3.4 High Discretion, Economic and Non-Economic Benefits	303
6.4 Closing Remarks: Transition to National Balancing Tools	308
7 Enforcement Discretion	310
7.1 Introduction	310
7.1.1 Balancing by the Exercise of Enforcement Discretion	310
7.1.2 Explicit-Substantive <i>v.</i> Implicit-Procedural Balancing Tools	313
7.1.3 Structure and Approach: Studying the Dark Matter of Enforcement	314
7.2 Hypothesis: Incentives Guiding Enforcement Discretion	316
7.3 Detection Discretion	319
7.3.1 Balancing Tool	319
7.3.2 Scope of Detection Discretion	322
7.3.3 Empirical Indications	323
7.3.4 Interim Conclusion	327
7.4 Target Discretion	328
7.4.1 Balancing Tool	328
7.4.2 Scope of Target Discretion	330
7.4.2.1 Wide Target Discretion: Commission, German, and UK NCAs	330
7.4.2.2 Public Interest Criterion: Dutch and Hungarian NCAs	333
7.4.2.3 Legality Principle: French NCA and Complaints	335
7.4.3 Empirical Indications	335
7.4.3.1 Discontinued Investigations	336
7.4.3.2 Steep Decrease in Article 101(3) TFEU Defence Claims	337

7.4.3.3	Influence of National Approaches to the Relevant Types of Benefits under the Explicit-Substantive Balancing Tools	339
7.4.3.4	Influence of Unique National Balancing Tools	340
7.4.3.5	Addressing Coronavirus Challenges	341
7.4.4	Interim Conclusion	345
7.5	Instrument Discretion	346
7.5.1	Sector Regulation	346
7.5.2	Markets-Work (Sector Inquiries and Market Studies)	349
7.5.3	Informal Opinions	351
7.5.4	Effect on Trade Test	356
7.5.5	Interim Conclusion	359
7.6	Outcome Discretion	359
7.6.1	Fines	360
7.6.1.1	A Balancing Tool	360
7.6.1.2	Public Policy Aims	362
7.6.1.3	Economic Crisis and Weak Financial Situation	364
7.6.1.4	SMEs	372
7.6.1.5	Damage to the Economy (France)	373
7.6.1.6	Scope of Discretion	373
7.6.2	Commitments	375
7.6.2.1	A Balancing Tool	375
7.6.2.2	Unclear Boundaries	379
7.6.2.3	Empirical Indications	382
7.6.2.4	Scope of Discretion	388
7.6.3	Findings of Inapplicability	391
7.6.3.1	A Balancing Tool	391
7.6.3.2	Empirical Indications	393
7.6.3.3	Scope of Discretion	395
7.6.3.4	Interim Conclusion	395
7.7	ECN+ Directive: Towards Harmonisation of Priority Setting?	396
7.8	Closing Remarks: Transition to Balancing by Enforcement Discretion	398
8	Conclusion	402
8.1	Introduction	402
8.2	Transitions in Balancing	403
8.2.1	A Shift in the Balancing Tools: From Explicit-Substantive to Implicit-Procedural	403
8.2.2	Shifting the Locus of Balancing: From the EU to the Member States	408
8.2.3	A Shift in the Role of the EU Courts: From Active to Passive	410

8.3 Hinder the Objectives of Article 101 TFEU Enforcement	411
8.3.1 Effectiveness	412
8.3.2 Uniformity	415
8.3.3 Legal Certainty	419
8.3.4 Modernisation as a Double-Edged Sword	420
8.4 Policy Recommendations	421
8.4.1 Re-shifting Balancing to the Explicit-Substantive Tools	423
8.4.2 Enforcing Cases Involving Balancing Questions	424
8.4.3 Codifying and Formalising the Balancing Principles	425
8.5 Final Remarks	426
<i>Annex A References</i>	427
<i>Annex B BERs Development</i>	465
<i>List of Laws, Regulations, Reports, and Policy Papers</i>	469
<i>List of Case Laws</i>	491
<i>Bibliography</i>	517
<i>Index</i>	541