Swedish Competition Authority
Professor Richard Whish
6 December 2013

STRUCTURE OF PRESENTATION

- WHEN IS IT NECESSARY TO USE A COUNTERFACTUAL?
- WHEN IS IT NOT NECESSARY TO USE A COUNTERFACTUAL?
- WHEN IS IT USEFUL TO USE A COUNTERFACTUAL?
- CONCLUSION

- IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES IT IS CLEAR THAT THERE IS A LEGAL REQUIREMENT TO USE A COUNTERFACTUAL
- ARTICLE 101(1) TFEU: RESTRICTIONS BY EFFECT
 - SOCIÉTÉ TECHNIQUE MINIÈRE V LTM (1966): 'THE COMPETITION IN QUESTION MUCH BE UNDERSTOOD WITHIN THE ACTUAL CONTEXT IN WHICH IT WOULD OCCUR IN THE ABSENCE OF THE AGREEMENT IN DISPUTE'

- ARTICLE 101(1) TFEU: RESTRICTIONS BY EFFECT
 - A FAIRLY RECENT EXAMPLE OF A COMMISSION DECISION BEING ANNULLED FOR FAILURE TO ESTABLISH THE COUNTERFACTUAL IS THE GENERAL COURT IN O2 (GERMANY) V COMMISSION (2006)
- •ARTICLE 101(3) TFEU: ARE THE RESTRICTIONS INDISPENSABLE?
 - ALL FOUR HEADS OF ARTICLE 101(3) REQUIRE COUNTERFACTUAL ANALYSIS

- •MERGER CONTROL SYSTEMS THAT ASK
 'WOULD THE MERGER SUBSTANTIALLY LESSEN COMPETITION?' NECESSARILY REQUIRE COUNTERFACTUAL ANALYSIS
 - SEE PAGES 21-27 OF THE COMPETITION COMMISSION/OFT MERGER GUIDELINES 2010: EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION OF THE COUNTERFACTUAL

- MERGER CONTROL SYSTEMS THAT ASK 'WOULD THE MERGER SIGNIFICANTLY IMPEDE EFFECTIVE COMPETITION?'
 - PARAGRAPH 9 OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S HORIZONTAL MERGER GUIDELINES SAYS THAT THE COMMISSION WILL COMPARE THE POSITION AFTER THE MERGER 'WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT WOULD HAVE PREVAILED WITHOUT THE MERGER'
 - SEE SIMILARLY PARAGRAPH 20 OF THE NON-HORIZONTAL MERGER GUIDELINES

- THE FAILING FIRM DEFENCE IS A PARTICLARLY CLEAR CASE WHERE THE COUNTERFACTUAL MUST BE ANALYSED
 - SEE FRANCE V COMMISSION (1998): DID THE MERGER CAUSE A LOSS OF COMPETITION?
 - SEE THE PRESENTATION OF DAMIEN GERADIN ON THIS

- THE ASSESSMENT OF DAMAGES
 - WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED 'BUT FOR' THE CARTEL
 - WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED 'BUT FOR' THE ABUSE OF DOMINANCE?
 - SEE THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S PRACTICAL GUIDE ON THE ASSESSMENT OF DAMAGES OF JUNE 2013 - BASED ON THE COUNTERFACTUAL OR 'BUT FOR' TEST
 - SEE THE PRESENTATION OF DAME VIVIEN ROSE

- INABILITY TO PAY A FINE
 - AGAIN THIS NECESSARILY REQUIRES COUNTERFACTUAL ANALYSIS

WHEN IS IT NOT NECESSARY TO USE A COUNTERFACTUAL?

ARTICLE 101 TFEU: RESTRICTIONS BY OBJECT

- SOCIÉTÉ TECHNIQUE MINIÈRE V LTM (1966): WHERE AN AGREEMENT CONTAINS A RESTRICTION BY OBJECT THERE IS NO NEED FOR EFFECTS ANALYSIS
- THIS HAS BEEN REPEATED MANY TIMES IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS
- SEE MOST RECENTLY CASES SUCH AS EXPEDIA, ALLIANZ HUNGARIA, DOLE V COMMISSION

- ARTICLE 101 TFEU: RESTRICTIONS BY OBJECT
 - NOTE ALSO THAT THE SIZE OF THE 'OBJECT BOX' SEEMS TO GET BIGGER RATHER THAN SMALLER: SEE EG DOLE V COMMISSION, ALLIANZ HUNGARIA
 - NOTE ALSO RECENT COMMISSION DECISIONS, SUCH AS TELEFÓNICA, LUNDBECK
- ARTICLE 101 TFEU: THE APPRECIABILITY OF OBJECT RESTRICTIONS
 - SEE PARA 37 OF EXPEDIA: NO NEED FOR EFFECTS ANALYSIS IF AN EFFECT ON TRADE BETWEEN MS

- ARTICLE 102 TFEU: CERTAIN ABUSES DO NOT REQUIRE COUNTERFACTUAL ANALYSIS
 - PREDATORY PRICING: SALES BELOW AAC (AVC) OR LRIC (ATC)
 - ABUSE OF REGULATORY PROCEDURES (ASTRAZENECA V COMMISSION)
- FINING POLICY
 - EFFECTS ARE RELEVANT TO THE SIZE OF A FINE, BUT THE 'BUT-FOR' TEST IS NOT APPLIED AS IT IS IN THE CASE OF CALCULATION OF DAMAGES

WHEN IS IT USEFUL TO USE A COUNTERFACTUAL?

- ARTICLE 102 TFEU AND EFFECTS ANALYSIS
 - A MOVE TOWARDS A MORE 'EFFECTS-BASED APPROACH' WOULD SEEM TO INVITE MORE USE OF THE COUNTERFACTUAL: SEE PARA 21 OF THE COMMISSION'S GUIDANCE ON ARTICLE 102 ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES
 - HOWEVER OTHER TOOLS ARE ALREADY IN PLACE THAT HAVE GREATER PROMINENCE IN ARTICLE 102 CASES (FOR EXAMPLE PRICE-COST ANALYSIS): WILL A FULLY COUNTERFACTUAL APPROACH BE ADOPTED?

WHEN IS IT USEFUL TO USE A COUNTERFACTUAL?

- EFFECTS ANALYSIS UNDER ARTICLE 102 TFEU IS LIKELY TO BE WHERE THE DEBATE ABOUT COUNTERFACTUALISM WILL BE MOST VIGOROUS IN THE YEARS AHEAD
- RECENT JUDGMENTS OF THE COURT OF JUSTICE HAVE STRESSED THE NEED FOR DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTS IN ARTICLE 102 CASES (DEUSTCHE TELEKOM V COMMISSION, TELIASONERA, POST DANMARK)

CONCLUSION

- FOR MANY ISSUES IN COMPETITION LAW IT IS CLEARLY NECESSARY TO USE THE COUNTERFACTUAL
- HOWEVER THERE ARE SOME MATTERS THAT CAN BE RESOLVED IN OTHER WAYS, PARTICULARLY WHERE THERE ARE 'BRIGHT-LINE' RULES
- EFFECTS ANALYSIS IMPLIES GREATER USE OF COUNTERFACTUALISM

CONCLUSION

- A SEPARATE QUESTION IS 'WHAT IS THE APPROPRIATE COUNTERFACTUAL?'
- THERE CAN BE DIFFERING VIEWS AS TO THE CORRECT COUNTERFACTUAL
- THE COUNTERFACTUAL CAN VARY OVER TIME
 - THE COUNTERFACTUAL CANNOT BE 'PINNED TO A BOARD LIKE A BUTTERFLY AT AN EARLY PART OF THE COMMISSION'S ASSESSMENT, IT ACTUALLY REMAINS ALIVE, VIBRANT AND IMPORTANT THROUGHOUT' (BSKYB V COMPETITION COMMISSION, 2008)

CONCLUSION

- SO WHAT IF WE DID NOT USE COUNTERFACTUALS?
 - SOME QUESTIONS COULD NOT BE ANSWERED AT ALL
 - OTHERS WOULD BE ANSWERED IN THE SAME WAY
 - WE WOULD LIVE IN A MORE 'FORM-BASED' WORLD
 - HOW MUCH MORE EFFECTS-BASED WILL WE GET IN THE FUTURE?
- THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION