

TABLE OF CONTENTS



FOREWORD	23
BY BEN SMULDERS	
INTRODUCTION	27
BY THE EDITORS, MASSIMO MEROLA, JACQUES DERENNE AND JOSÉ RIVAS	
COMPOSITION OF THE WORKING GROUPS	41

I

ANTITRUST LAW IN TIMES OF ECONOMIC CRISIS

COORDINATED BY JOSÉ RIVAS

PART I: THE VIEWS OF THE GCLC	45
BY JOSÉ RIVAS	
Section (I): <i>Anticompetitive agreements in times of crisis</i>	47
1. Crisis cartels and restructuring agreements.	48
1.1. Brief Historical Perspective	49
1.2. Crisis Cartels Under EU Competition Law	52
(a) Are Crisis Cartels always 101(1) Restrictions?	52
(b) The Availability of an Article 101(3) Exemption	53
(i) Introduction: Structural Overcapacity	55
(ii) The Four Conditions for Application of Article 101(3) TFEU	57
1.3. National Precedents	65
(a) Ireland: BIDS	65
(b) Greek Fishing Farms	68
(c) Spanish Olive Oil Storage	69
(d) Dutch Shrimp	70
1.4. Procedural Issues: finding of inapplicability and informal guidance	71
2. Alternatives to Restructuring Agreements – Other Forms of Cooperation	74
2.1. Horizontal Cooperation: Specialisation agreements	74
2.2. Mergers	75

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
2.3. State aid	75
(a) French Mills	76
(b) Dutch Beef (Weyl Beef)	77
(c) Dutch Pork	78
(d) Conclusion	79
Section (II): <i>Unilateral behaviour in times of crisis</i>	80
1. Enforcement of competition rules on unilateral conduct in the EU – state of play	80
1.1. EU Commission recent practice in the field of unilateral conduct.	81
1.2. NCAs’ recent practice in the field of unilateral conduct	84
2. Competition enforcement and unilateral conduct - is there room for a different approach?.	86
2.1. Unilateral conduct as opposed to State aid, anticompetitive agreements and anticompetitive mergers	86
2.2. Unilateral conduct in times of crisis - Is there room for reviewing the assessment criteria?	90
3. Shifting of enforcement priorities	92
3.1. Grounds for non-intervention	93
3.2. Competition law versus regulation	96
3.3. Interplay between competition law and consumer protection . .	98
3.4. Grounds for Intervention	99
(a) If there are high and non-transitory entry barriers resulting in a dominant position	100
(b) The dominant position is due to current/past exclusive/ special rights or to previously unprosecuted exclusionary anticompetitive practices.	100
(c) Lack of a sector-specific regulator with jurisdiction to set prices	100
4. Review of the enforcers’ toolkit.	101
4.1. Non mandatory deadlines and transparency obligations.	103
4.2. Commitment decisions	104
4.3. Interim measures.	106
5. Conclusions	109
Section (III): <i>Redefining EU antitrust fining policy in times of crisis</i>	111
1. The current fining practice and the downturn	113
1.1. Recent fining practice.	113
(a) Inability to pay	114
(b) Ability of the Commission to take into account the particularities of a given case	116

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
(c) Statutory fine cap	118
(d) Payment modalities	119
1.2. Conclusion	120
2. Rethinking fining policy in times of crisis	120
2.1. The objectives of a fining policy	120
(a) Deterrence	122
(b) Restitution	124
2.2. Alternative tracks for a fining policy	125
(a) Taking into account profits when calculating fines.	125
(b) Use of alternative sanctions.	127
(c) Reflection of damage compensation.	128
3. Conclusion	129
Section (IV): <i>Is a sector focus needed in a recession?</i>	129
1. How to focus antitrust enforcement in times of crisis?	131
1.1. Collusive behaviour	131
(a) Impact of falling demand on collusion.	132
(b) Recommendations	133
1.2. Exclusionary behaviour	134
(a) Effects increasing the likelihood of exclusionary behaviour.	134
(b) Opposite effects.	135
(c) Recommendations.	135
2. Does the financial crisis affect the current sector focus?	136
2.1. Financial sector	136
(a) LIBOR/EURIBOR	137
(b) Credit Default Swaps	138
(c) S&P / Reuters	138
(d) Online payments (EPC)	139
(e) Multilateral Interchange Fees.	140
(f) Recommendations.	140
2.2. Information and telecommunication technologies.	141
2.3. Pharmaceutical sector	143
2.4. Energy.	144
2.5. Food and other basic industry sectors	145
3. Conclusion	147
 PART II: THE VIEWS OF THE EU ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS	 149
BY KRIS DEKEYSER	
1. Introduction	149
2. Notion of “crisis cartels” and the underlying economic problem	150

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
3. Assessment of industrial restructuring agreements under Article 101 TFEU	152
3.1. Article 101(1) TFEU	152
3.2. Article 101(3) TFEU	153
(a) Efficiency gains	154
(b) Indispensability of the restrictions to attainment of the efficiency gains	155
(c) Consumers must receive a fair share of the resulting benefits	156
4. Conclusion	158
 PART III: THE VIEWS FROM THE USA	 159
BY DONALD C. KLAWITER	
1. The Incentive to Collude in an Economic Downturn	160
2. The U.S. Reaction to crisis cartels and suspending enforcement	164
3. Preserving and enhancing competition is – and always will be – the highest enforcement priority	166
 PART IV: CONCLUSION	 169

II MERGER CONTROL IN TIMES OF ECONOMIC CRISIS

COORDINATED BY ROBBERT SNELDERS

1. INTRODUCTION	175
BY ROBBERT SNELDERS	
 2. MERGER ENFORCEMENT CHALLENGES DURING ECONOMIC CRISIS	 177
BY HANS ZENGER	
2.1. The Standard of Review in Merger Control in Times of Economic Crisis	177
(a) Antitrust Laxity as a Response to Economic Crises	177
(b) Case Study: <i>Lloyds TSB v. HBOS</i> (2008)	179
2.2. The Outcome of Review in Merger Control in Times of Economic Crisis	180
(a) The Impact of Economic Crises on Market Realities	180
(b) Case Study: <i>Olympic v. Aegean Airlines</i> (2011)	182
2.3. Dealing With Mergers in Declining Industries in Times of Economic Crisis	183

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
(a) The Interaction of Pre-Crisis Decline and Post-Crisis Mergers	183
(b) Case Study: <i>UPM/Myllykoski</i> and <i>Rhein Papier</i> (2011)	186
2.4. Final Remarks on Merger Control Challenges	187
3. MERGER DEFENCES IN TIMES OF CRISES.	189
BY ENRIQUE GONZÁLEZ DÍAZ	
3.1. The Efficiency Defence	189
(a) Current Regulatory Framework and Commission Practice	189
(b) Efficiency Defences: Time for Taking Them More Seriously?	193
3.2. Failing Firm Defence	197
(a) Status and Regulation of the FFD in EU Merger Control Law	197
(b) A Need for an Alternative Framework?	199
3.3. Final Remarks on Merger Defences	203
4. NATIONAL MERGER ENFORCEMENT DURING THE CRISIS: MORE FLEXIBLE?	205
BY ÉRIC BARBIER DE LA SERRE	
4.1. A Few – Albeit Spectacular – Instances of Legislative and Political Intervention.	205
(a) Legislative Intervention to Protect the Financial System and Certain Sectors	206
(b) Limited Political Interventionism in Merger Cases	208
4.2. No Widespread Relaxing on the Substance.	211
(a) Failing Firm Defence: No Relaxing	211
(b) Beyond the FFD: No Signs of Increased Flexibility on the Substance.	216
4.3. Remedies and Procedure: More Pragmatism	218
(a) In Certain States: More Pragmatism on Remedies	218
(b) In General: More Pragmatism on Procedural Matters	219
4.4. Final Remarks on National Merger Enforcement	221
5. CONCLUSION.	223

III

STATE AID ENFORCEMENT IN THE FINANCIAL SECTOR

COORDINATED BY JACQUES DERENNE

1. INTRODUCTION	229
BY JACQUES DERENNE	

	PAGES
2. OVERVIEW - MANAGING THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN EUROPE: THE ROLE OF EU STATE AID LAW ENFORCEMENT	231
BY DAMIEN GERARD	
2.1. Introduction	231
(a) The financial crisis as a market failure	232
(b) State aid as a remedy	233
2.2. State aid enforcement as a coordination tool	235
(a) Salvaging EU State aid rules to the benefit of certainty and stability	237
(b) Conditionality as the preeminent coordination tool	243
2.3. State aid enforcement as a regulatory fix	249
(a) Regulatory objectives underlying the crisis regime of State aid control	250
(b) Regulatory choices: tensions in the crisis regime of State aid control	251
2.4. Beyond the crisis and beyond State aid enforcement	255
(a) Managing the crisis beyond State aid enforcement	256
(b) State aid enforcement beyond the crisis	258
3. SUBSTANTIVE COMPETITION ISSUES	261
3.1. The notion of aid in the financial crisis	261
BY HANS GILLIAMS	
(a) “Advantage” - The “Market Economy Investor Principle” test . .	261
(i) Absence of a “market”	262
(ii) Too big and too hurried to be private	263
(iii) Action in the public interest	264
(iv) Significant private concomitant participation	264
(v) Use of the private investor test for measuring the amount/intensity of aid	265
(b) Advantage resulting from modification of terms of previously granted aid	265
(c) Beneficiary of aid measures	268
(i) Nationalisation of banks and sale of viable activities . . .	268
(ii) No aid to purchaser of viable activities sold by “bad bank”	273
(iii) Aid for orderly liquidation	273
(iv) Squeeze-out payments to minority shareholders of nationalised banks	274
(d) Extension of deposit guarantee schemes	275

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
(i) Extension of a deposit guarantee scheme not a “selective” measure	275
(ii) Extension of a deposit guarantee scheme: (no) indirect advantage for issuers of protected savings products	277
(e) Imputability to the State of liquidity lines granted by national central banks and implication of State resources	278
3.2. Compatibility assessment	281
BY ANDREAS VON BONIN AND ULRICH SOLTÉSZ	
(a) Return to long-term viability as the primary goal of banking restructuring	281
(i) The Banking Restructuring Communication of 23 July 2009	282
(ii) Restoring long-term viability is paramount to burden sharing and compensatory measures	283
(iii) The role assumed by DG COMP in the financial crisis: viability watchdog for banks	284
(b) The assessment of long term viability by DG COMP in practice	286
(i) Relevant factors (appropriate return on capital, compete in the market place for capital, level of risk, access to funding)	287
(ii) Application to individual business activities	288
(iii) Consequences for the business model and the restructuring plan to be submitted	288
(iv) Remuneration of State aid measures and claw-back obligations as a threat to viability	289
(v) The flipside: Winding-up of banks where return to viability is not credible	289
(c) Own contribution – burden sharing	290
(i) The Banking Restructuring Communication of 23 July 2009	290
(ii) The assessment in the case practice	291
(d) Compensatory measures (type, implementation)	293
(i) Background and legal basis	293
(ii) Divestments and reduction of the balance sheet	294
(iii) Behavioural commitments	297
(iv) A new role for DG COMP: reshaping the European banking sector?	299
4. PROCEDURE ISSUES	301
4.1. “Firm on the principles - Flexible on procedure”	301
BY ANDREAS VON BONIN	
(a) Rescue measures	301

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
(i) Approval by individual decisions.	301
(ii) Approval under a scheme.	301
(iii) Approval as emergency decisions	302
(b) Restructuring measures.	302
(i) The development of DG COMP's policy on the need to submit a restructuring plan.	302
(ii) Continued validity of rescue aid decisions during the assessment of the restructuring plan vs. provisional approval (under Annex 5 of the Impaired Asset Communication).	306
(c) Opening of in-depth investigations <i>v.</i> fast track: procedural differences	306
(i) Commitments <i>v.</i> conditions and obligations	306
(ii) Involvement of third parties	307
(d) Structuring and duration of procedures: portfolio evaluation, viability assessment.	307
(e) The ECB as the central European banking supervisor	308
4.2. Judicial review (States, beneficiary & third parties).	309
BY FRANÇOIS-CHARLES LAPRÉVOTE	
(a) Overview of Judicial review so far	309
(b) Admissibility	311
(c) Challengeable measures	315
(i) Commission individual decisions	315
(ii) Failure to act?	316
(iii) Monitoring and other decisions?	316
(d) Scope of judicial review	318
(i) Existence of aid	318
(ii) Compatibility/Commitments	319
(iii) Procedural rights.	320
(e) Consequences of judicial review	321
(i) Full or partial annulment	321
(ii) Interim measures.	321
(f) Possible damages actions.	322
(i) Disclosure of sensitive information/ non-confidential versions of decisions	323
(ii) Substance of decisions	323
(g) Judicial review at the national level	324
(i) Role of national courts in case of alleged violation of Article 108 standstill obligation	324
(ii) Possibility to request opinion/ preliminary ruling to Commission/ECJ (not used so far)	326

	PAGES
4.3. Future procedural challenges (and additional commitments policy)	327
BY ULRICH SOLTÉSZ AND ANDREAS VON BONIN	
(a) Monitoring and reopening of proceedings (<i>e.g.</i> in case of new aid)	327
(b) Modification and abuse decisions	329
(c) Conclusion	331
4.4. Procedural specificities in the financial sector	331
BY ANDREAS VON BONIN	
(a) Structural <i>v.</i> non-structural measures at rescue stage	331
(b) In-depth assessment of business models and portfolios	331
(c) Long-term monitoring	332
5. ECONOMIC ISSUES	333
5.1. Economic characteristics of the State aid enforcement in the financial sector and lessons from the financial crisis	333
BY JAMES KAVANAGH AND LORENZO COPPI	
(a) General remarks	333
(i) The three peculiarities, from an economics perspective, of Article 107(3)(b) aid to the financial sector	334
(ii) The bigger picture: the relationship between State aid control and financial stability	338
(iii) Other important considerations: Interaction between state aid policy, competition policy and regulation.	341
(b) Economic lessons for State aid policy	341
(i) Good aid versus bad aid.	341
(ii) Counterfactual analysis.	344
(iii) The measurement of aid to the financial sector	345
5.2. Social cost	350
BY EDURNE NAVARRO VARONA AND LUIS MOSCOSO	
(a) Social cost of restructuring: limits and adequate control by the Commission.	350
(b) Participation of workforce representatives in State aid proceedings before the European Commission	352
(c) Other issues	353
6. INTERNAL MARKET AND COMPETITION ISSUES: INTERACTION BETWEEN NEW FINANCIAL REGULATORY MEASURES AND STATE AID IN THE FINANCIAL CRISIS	355
BY LEONARDO ARMATI AND FRANÇOIS-CHARLES LAPRÉVOTE	
6.1. The pre-crisis and crisis situation: fragmented regulatory landscape versus exclusive competence of the Commission on State aid clearance.	355

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
6.2. Towards a more harmonized regulatory and supervision landscape: EU initiatives and potential impact on State aid control.	357
(a) The Commission proposal for a “banking union”.	358
(b) Interaction with State aid policy	360
(i) Recapitalisation / funding recommendations	361
(ii) Framework for the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms	362
6.3. Addressing the sovereign issue - European Stabilisation Actions since May 2010 and interactions with State aid	366
(a) The “feedback loop” between the banking and the sovereign crisis and its impact on state aid control.	366
(b) EU and euro-area actions in the sovereign crisis	368
(c) Possible interaction with State aid process and questions:	371
7. CONCLUSION.	375

**IV
STATE AID POLICY IN THE REAL ECONOMY
IN TIMES OF ECONOMIC CRISIS**

COORDINATED BY MASSIMO MEROLA

1. INTRODUCTION	381
By MASSIMO MEROLA	
2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATE AID RULES AND COMPETITIVENESS.	385
By BERNARD VAN DE WALLE DE GHELCKE AND SIMON PILSBURY	
2.1. Introduction	385
2.2. The Europe 2020 Strategy and the European Union industrial policy initiatives to enhance competitiveness: the interface with competition policy	387
2.3. The role of the State aid rules in view of strengthening growth and competitiveness	388
(a) The basic objectives of the State aid rules and limitations deriving thereof	388
(b) Relevant areas of the State aid rules	390
(i) Assessment criteria	390
(ii) New or revised instruments.	392
(iii) State aid rules supporting other Europe 2020 initiatives	393

	PAGES
2.4. The EU State Aid Modernisation	393
2.5. Link with common commercial policy, trade rules and reciprocity	396
3. TEMPORARY FRAMEWORK: STATE AID TO THE REAL ECONOMY	399
BY MARC PITTIE AND GUILLAUME FABRE	
3.1. Introduction: Context of the Temporary Framework	399
3.2. Description of the Real Economy Temporary Framework: a (temporary) step towards greater flexibility in State aid law?	401
(a) The 500 K Measure	402
(b) State guarantees	404
(c) Other measures: loans and simplification measures	405
3.3. Assessing the impact and phasing out of the Real Economy Temporary Framework	406
(a) The relative success of the Real Economy Temporary Framework	406
(b) Phasing out of the Real Economy Temporary Framework in 2011	408
(c) Over too soon?	410
(i) The impact of the banking sector regulatory framework	410
(ii) The absence of an appropriate instrument to assess the compatibility of State aid to the real economy	412
4. PUBLIC INTERVENTION IN THE ECONOMY IN TIMES OF CRISIS	415
BY JOSÉ LUIS BUENDÍA SIERRA, MARÍA MUÑOZ DE JUAN AND MATTHIJS VISSER	
4.1. Introduction	415
4.2. The MEIP and private creditor principle in traditional EU practice and case law	416
4.3. Has something changed because of the economic crisis?	418
4.4. Some final remarks	426
5. STATE GUARANTEES IN TIMES OF CRISIS	429
BY ISABEL TAYLOR AND LUISA AFFUSO	
5.1. Introduction	429
5.2. Comparison of “normal rules” <i>versus</i> “exceptional policy response”	429
(a) Background and basic principles	429

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
(i) Notice on Guarantees	429
(ii) R&R Guidelines	430
(iii) Temporary Framework	431
(b) Scope (type of guarantees and beneficiaries)	432
(c) Economic rationale.	432
(d) Conditions under which guarantees can be granted	434
5.3. Overview and analysis of Commission practice	436
(a) Commission practice under the Temporary Framework	436
(b) Commission practice regarding guarantees outside the Temporary Framework	437
5.4. Conclusions / Lessons for the future	440
(a) Temporary Framework as a long-term tool	440
(b) Temporary Framework as a short-term tool	441
6. RECOVERY OF UNLAWFUL STATE AIDS, ESPECIALLY IN CASES OF INSOLVENCY: <i>STATUS QUO</i> AMIDST FINANCIAL CRISIS?	443
BY GIANNI LO SCHIAVO	
6.1. Introduction	443
6.2. Overview of the rules for recovering unlawful aid	444
(a) Legislation	444
(b) Case law	445
(i) Identification of the “beneficiary”	445
(ii) The objective of recovery	446
(iii) Recovery in cases of insolvency	446
(iv) Recovery in cases of transfer of assets or transfer of shares.	448
(v) The “Absolute Impossibility” defence	449
6.3. The effects of the financial crisis on the recovery of unlawful aids	450
(a) Commission practice	450
(b) Case law	453
6.4. The recovery of unlawful state aid and the financial crisis: a substantial <i>status quo</i>	456
(a) Alternatives to recovery	457
(b) Recovery in cases of insolvency	458
(c) From the “absolute impossibility” to a “financial difficulty” defence?	461
(d) “Economic continuity” in insolvency cases	462
6.5. Conclusion	463

	PAGES
7. RESCUE AND RESTRUCTURING GUIDELINES – PRELIMINARY THOUGHTS	465
By ERIC MORGAN DE RIVERY AND BARBARA VERONESE	
7.1. Is there a need to refine the definition of a firm in difficulty ?	466
(a) Factual current definition and insights from guidelines	466
(b) Is this definition too broad or too narrow in times of economic crisis - based on the experience gained during the crisis?	467
(i) Option 1: keeping the definition as it is.	467
(ii) Option 2: broadening the definition.	467
(iii) Option 3: narrowing the definition	468
(c) Assessment	468
7.2. Should the distinction between rescue and restructuring aid be maintained?	469
(a) The distinction got blurred over time.	469
(b) Businesses are increasingly threatened due to external causes, in spite of sound fundamentals	470
(c) A renewed criterion: long-term viability of the undertaking	472
(d) Long-term viability and the private investor principle	473
8. COMPENSATORY MEASURES IN RESTRUCTURING AID CASES DURING THE FINANCIAL CRISIS	477
By ALIX MÜLLER-RAPPARD AND MATTHIJS VISSER	
8.1. Introduction	477
8.2. The Commission’s use of its power to impose compensatory measures under the Guidelines - before the crisis.	477
8.3. Analysis of the Commission’s practice under the financial crisis - Lessons learnt.	480
(a) No change in the Commission’s policy in the real economy.	480
(b) Lessons learnt in particular with regard to compensatory measures imposed in the financial sector	481
9. OWN CONTRIBUTION UNDER THE NEW R&R GUIDELINES	485
By ISABEL TAYLOR AND LUISA AFFUSO	
9.1. Introduction and background	485
9.2. Overview of the requirements	486
(a) Own contribution requirement under the R&R Guidelines	486
(b) Own contribution / “burden sharing” requirements under the financial crisis rules	487
9.3. Analysis of Commission practice.	490

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
(a) Commission practice regarding own contribution under R&R Guidelines	490
(b) Commission practice regarding own contribution/ burden sharing in banking cases	491
9.4. Conclusion: should the own contribution threshold requirements in the R&R Guidelines be abandoned?	494
10. THE PROBLEM OF DISTORTION OF COMPETITION	497
BY PHILIPP WERNER AND MATTHIJS VISSER	
10.1. Introduction	497
10.2. The assessment of distortions of competition prior to the crisis.	497
10.3. Commission practice during the crisis	500
(a) Definition of the size of the firm in difficulty	501
(b) Firm in difficulty located in assisted areas.	502
(c) Commitment not to grant further aid following the restructuring process.	503
(d) Comparison to aid granted to financial institutions	503
10.4. Comparison and recommendations	505
11. THE BALANCING TEST IN THE CONTEXT OF THE R&R GUIDELINES	507
BY THOMAS JESTAEDT	
11.1. Treaty provisions and Current R&R Guidelines	507
11.2. Standard Economic Balancing Test of the Commission	508
11.3. Non-applicability of Standard Economic balancing Test under the Current guidelines	509
11.4. Balancing of effects in the European Commission Practice . . .	510
(a) Decisions applying R&R Guidelines	510
(b) Examples of balancing test in non R & R cases.	512
11.5. Desirability of introducing a general “balancing test” in R&R Guidelines.	513
(a) Application of a full balancing test	513
(b) Improving the economic underpinnings of the requirement of compensatory measures.	515
12. THE “ONE TIME, LAST TIME” PRINCIPLE IN TIMES OF CRISIS	517
BY MASSIMO MEROLA, LUIGI CAPPELLETTI AND BARBARA VERONESE	
12.1. Introduction	517

	PAGES
12.2. The “one time, last time” requirement prior to the crisis	518
(a) The normative background.	518
(i) The R&R Guidelines of 1994 and 1999	518
(ii) The current rules: the R&R Guidelines of 2004.	520
(iii) The Deggendorf doctrine	521
(b) The Commission’s practice prior to the crisis.	522
12.3. The “one time, last time” principle during the crisis	524
(a) The temporary rules in response to the crisis.	524
(b) The Commission’s practice in the context of the crisis.	526
12.4. What is the future for the “one time, last time” principle in the revised R&R Guidelines for non-financial institutions? . .	529
13. CONCLUSION.	533

V

**THE NEXUS BETWEEN COMPETITION, INDUSTRIAL
AND TRADE POLICIES**

COORDINATED BY JACQUES BOURGEOIS AND NICOLETA TUOMINEN

PART I: INTRODUCTION	539
By JACQUES BOURGEOIS AND NICOLETA TUOMINEN	
1. The policy side	539
2. The legal side	549
2.1. The EU treaties	550
2.2. The EU courts	553
 PART II: INDUSTRIAL POLICY AND COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT: IS THERE, COULD THERE AND SHOULD THERE BE A NEXUS?	 555
By NICOLAS PETIT AND NORMAN NEYRINCK	
Introduction	555
1. Definitional Issues.	557
1.1. Targeted Industrial Policies	557
1.2. Competitiveness Policies	559
1.3. Synthesis	561
2. Positivist (or Legalistic) Analysis	562
2.1. Competition and Industrial Policy in the EU Treaties.	562
2.2. Article 101 and 102 TFEU	564

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
(a) Industrial Policy as a Theory of Harm	564
(b) Industrial Policy as a Justification	565
(i) Article 101 TFEU	566
(ii) Article 102 TFEU	569
2.3. Merger Control.	571
(a) Industrial Policy as a Theory of Harm	571
(b) Industrial Policy as a Justification	572
(c) Member States?	574
2.4. State Aid Law	574
(a) State Aid Law and the Quasi <i>Per Se</i> Legality of “ <i>Competitiveness</i> ” Subsidies	574
(b) State Aid Law and the Rule of Reason Approach to “ <i>Targeted Industrial</i> ” Aid	575
3. Empirical perspective	577
3.1. Article 101 and 102 TFEU	577
(a) Article 101 TFEU	577
3.2. Article 102 TFEU	578
(a) “ <i>Targeted industrial policy</i> ” under Article 102 TFEU?	578
(b) “ <i>Competitiveness Policy</i> ” under Article 102 TFEU?	579
3.3. Merger Control.	581
(a) Targeted Industrial Policy under the EUMR?	581
(b) Furthering the EU’s Competitiveness Policy under the EUMR?	584
3.4. State Aid	586
4. Policy Perspective	587
4.1. Overview of the Economic Literature	587
(a) Pros and Cons of Targeted Industrial Policies	587
(i) Pros	587
(ii) Cons	590
(b) Pros and cons of “ <i>competitiveness</i> ” policies	591
(i) Pros	591
(ii) Cons	593
(c) Conclusion	594
4.2. The Policy Perspective	594
4.3. Prospective Perspective	596
(a) Purpose of this Section	596
(i) Possible Adjustments to Enforcement Activities.	597
(ii) Adjustments to the Law?	605
5. Conclusions	605

	PAGES
PART III: COMPETITION POLICY AND TRADE DEFENCE POLICY: TWO WORLDS APART? ALSO IN TIMES OF ECONOMIC CRISIS?	607
BY YVES MELIN	
Introduction	607
1. What are EU trade defence investigations really about?	609
1.1. Trade defence is not about restoring competition	609
1.2. A small sacrifice of welfare in order to protect manufacturing industries and employment in the EU	611
1.3. Trade defence was a small evil necessary to make trade liberalisation possible in the first place	612
1.4. The core of the matter: the impact of trade defence on competition.	614
2. How trade defence investigations work.	615
2.1. Anti-dumping investigations.	615
(a) Dumping	615
(b) Injury	618
(c) Causal link	619
(d) EU interest	619
2.2. Anti-subsidy investigations	620
(a) A subsidy.	620
(b) That is specific.	621
2.3. The trade defence measures imposed	622
2.4. Initiation of trade defence investigations	622
2.5. The gathering of data in trade defence investigations and decision making process	623
2.6. Safeguard investigations.	625
3. Instances where competition arguments have been made in trade defence investigations.	626
3.1. Price fixing arrangement in the upstream industry: distortion of costs having an impact on the injury and causality assessments.	626
3.2. Refusal to supply as self-inflicted injury	628
3.3. Abusive use of trade defence by dominant undertakings	630
3.4. Limited number of players having an impact on the duty level, and the rejection of an undertaking	632
3.5. Existence of a cartel between some of the complaining EU producers.	634
3.6. Tentative conclusion	634
4. Issues identified and recommendations	635

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
PART IV: EUR O-PREFERENCE IN EU TRADE AND COMPETITION LAW	639
By MARCO BRONCKERS	
PART IV: CONCLUSION	643
INDEX	647