

Contents

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <i>List of Figures</i> | <i>page</i> xv |
| <i>List of Tables</i> | xvii |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | xix |
| <i>List of Definitions</i> | xxi |
| <i>List of Abbreviations</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 | NCA's 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 | NCA's and National Courts | 206 |
| 4.4.1 | NCA's | 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 | NCAAs and National Courts | 281 |
| 5.4.1 | NCAAs | 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 v. 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 | Hindering 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 |