

EUROPEAN MONOGRAPHS

The Optimal Enforcement of EC Antitrust Law
Essays in Law & Economics

Wouter P.J. Wils

W

KLUWER LAW INTERNATIONAL

THE HAGUE / LONDON / NEW YORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. SUBJECT MATTER	1
1.2. METHOD	3
2. EC COMPETITION FINES: TO DETER OR NOT TO DETER	8
2.1. INTRODUCTION	8
2.1.1. The legislative framework	8
2.1.2. Some elementary statistics (1969-1994)	10
2.1.3. The economic approach to law enforcement	12
2.2. FINES VERSUS OTHER METHODS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT	13
2.2.1. Deterrence versus prevention	16
2.2.2. Fines or damages versus imprisonment	16
2.2.3. Public versus private enforcement	18
2.2.4. Compensation	21
2.3. THE CORRECT BASIS FOR ASSESSING FINES	21
2.3.1. Gain-based or harm-based fines	22
2.3.2. Nominal and expected fines and the probability of punishment	24
2.4. THE PRACTICE OF EC COMPETITION FINES (1969-1994)	26
2.4.1. Cases in which no fine is imposed	26
2.4.1.1. Notified agreements	26
2.4.1.2. Leniency	28
2.4.1.3. Absence of negligence or intent	29

Table of Contents

2.4.2. The Commission's method of calculating fines	31
2.4.2.1. Description	31
2.4.2.2. Critical assessment	32
2.4.3. Other factors taken into account	34
2.5. DO CURRENT FINES DETER?	37
2.6. TO DETER OR NOT TO DETER	41
3. THE COMMISSION NOTICE ON THE NON-IMPOSITION OR REDUCTION OF FINES IN CARTEL CASES	45
3.1. SUMMARY OF THE COMMISSION NOTICE	45
3.2. PRECEDENTS IN THE EC AND IN THE US	47
3.3. LENIENCY AND THE ECONOMICS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT	49
3.3.1. Deterrence and prevention	49
3.3.2. Commission fines and other sanctions with deterrent effect	51
3.3.3. Nominal amount of fines and probability of being detected and fined	52
3.3.4. The effects of leniency	52
3.4. THE CONDITIONS FOR LENIENCY REVISITED	53
3.4.1. The scope of application of the notice	53
3.4.2. The conditions for first and second degree leniency	55
3.4.3. Third degree leniency	57
3.5. LEGAL BASIS, COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND BINDING EFFECT	59
3.5.1. Regulation No 17 and the Commission's discretionary fining power	59
3.5.2. Compatibility with the right not to give evidence against oneself and with the right of access to a court	61
3.5.3. The binding effect of the notice	63
3.6. HAS THE CARTEL ENFORCEMENT PROBLEM NOW BEEN SOLVED?	65

4. THE COMMISSION'S NEW METHOD FOR CALCULATING FINES IN ANTITRUST CASES	67
4.1. SUMMARY OF THE COMMISSION NOTICE	67
4.2. THE NEW METHOD COMPARED TO EXISTING LAW AND PREVIOUS PRACTICE	69
4.3. THE ISSUE OF TRANSPARENCY	73
4.4. SOME FURTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEW METHOD	75
4.4.1. Its effect on the overall level of fines	75
4.4.2. The increased weight attached to duration	75
4.4.3. Benefit derived from the infringement	76
4.4.4. Intent and negligence	77
4.4.5. Cooperation with the Commission and voluntary termination of the infringement	79
4.4.6. Differentiation according to the relative size of the undertakings concerned	80
4.5. CONCLUSION	81
5. NOTIFICATION, CLEARANCE AND EXEMPTION IN EC COMPETITION LAW	82
5.1. INTRODUCTION	82
5.1.1. The enforcement of EC competition law	82
5.1.2. Object of this chapter	86
5.2. THE ECONOMICS OF PRESCREENING	88
5.2.1. In the absence of prescreening: ex post enforcement through deterrence	88
5.2.2. Ex ante enforcement through prescreening as a Substitute to ex post enforcement through deterrence	91
5.2.3. The two alternatives compared	94
5.2.4. Ex ante enforcement through prescreening as a complement to ex post enforcement through deterrence	95
5.3. APPLICATION TO EC COMPETITION LAW ENFORCEMENT	97

Table of contents

5.3.1. Merger control	97
5.3.2. Articles 81 and 82 EC	99
6. THE COMMISSION'S PROPOSAL FOR A NEW COUNCIL REGULATION REPLACING REGULATION NO 17	105
6.1. INTRODUCTION	105
6.1.1. The provisions of the EC Treaty	105
6.1.2. Regulation No 17	106
6.1.3. Main difference between the proposed new regulation and Regulation No 17	107
6.1.4. Fundamental dimensions of law enforcement – outline of this chapter	108
6.2. THE TIMING OF LEGAL INTERVENTION: EX ANTE ENFORCEMENT THROUGH PRESCREENING OR EX POST ENFORCEMENT THROUGH DETERRENCE?	109
6.2.1. The two alternatives and the current Situation	109
6.2.1.1. Two methods of enforcement	109
6.2.1.2. The current Situation	110
6.2.1.2.1. Merger control	110
6.2.1.2.2. Article 82	110
6.2.1.2.2. Article 81	111
6.2.2. Which enforcement method is best suited?	113
6.2.2.1. Criteria for choosing between the two enforcement methods	113
6.2.2.2. First factor: credibility of deterrence	114
6.2.2.2.1. Application to merger control	115
6.2.2.2.2. Application to Articles 81 and 82	116
6.2.2.3. Second factor: relative knowledge and predictability of the Substantive rule	116
6.2.2.3.1. Errors	117
6.2.2.3.1.1. Limited access to information	117
6.2.2.3.1.2. Neglect	119
6.2.2.3.2. Uncertainty and risk-bearing cost	119
6.2.2.3.3. Summing up on the second factor	120
6.2.2.3.4. Application to merger control	121
6.2.2.3.5. Application to Articles 81 and 82	121

6.2.2.3.5.1. Article 81 is no longer revolutionary today	121
6.2.2.3.5.2. Article 81(3) does not depend on discretionary political decisions....	123
6.2.2.4. Third factor: enforcement costs	124
6.2.2.4.1. Application to merger control	125
6.2.2.4.2. Application to Articles 81 and 82	125
6.2.2.5. Fourth factor: specific problems with voluntary prescreening: adverse selection and distortion of enforcement priorities	127
6.2.2.5.1. Application to merger control	128
6.2.2.5.2. Application to Articles 81 and 82	128
6.2.2.6. Conclusion as to Articles 81 and 82	129
6.2.3. The proposed new regulation	130
6.2.3.1. A clear choice for ex post enforcement	130
6.2.3.2. Block exemptions	131
6.2.3.3. Guidelines and notices	133
6.2.3.4. Non-infringement decisions	135
6.2.3.5. Reasoned opinions	136
6.2.3.6. Register of restrictive agreements	137
6.3. THE RESPECTIVE ROLES OF THE COMMISSION AND THE COMPETITION AUTHORITIES OF THE MEMBER STATES	139
6.3.1. What the proposed new regulation does not do, and what it does	139
6.3.1.1. No sharing of the exemption monopoly	139
6.3.1.2. Multiple ex post enforcement	140
6.3.2. Why should national authorities prosecute violations of Articles 81 and 82?	142
6.3.3. Criteria for allocating cases	143
6.3.4. Possible problems with multiple ex post enforcement	144
6.3.4.1. Duplication	144
6.3.4.2. Conflicting decisions	145
6.3.4.3. National bias	147
6.3.4.4. Forum Shopping	148
6.4. THE ROLE OF PRIVATE COMPLAINANTS AND NATIONAL COURTS	149
6.4.1. The role of private complainants in public enforcement	149

Table of Contents

6.4.2. Private enforcement and the role of national courts: what the proposed new regulation will not change, and what it will change	150
6.4.2.1. Impact on private enforcement and on contractual litigation	150
6.4.2.2. Agreements which fulfill the conditions of Article 81(3) will no longer be void	151
6.4.2.3. National courts will be able to apply the four conditions of Article 81(3) themselves	151
6.4.2.4. No declaratory judgments	153
6.4.3. Possible problems with the application of Article 81(3) by national courts	153
6.4.3.1. Complex economic assessments	153
6.4.3.2. Forum Shopping	154
6.4.2.3. Inconsistent judgments	154
6.5. SANCTIONS	156
6.5.1. Fines	157
6.5.1.1. Only pecuniary sanctions imposed on undertakings	157
6.5.1.2. The <u>criminal-law</u> nature of fines	157
6.5.1.3. The maximum amount of fines	159
6.5.1.4. Publication of fining decisions	159
6.5.2. Remedies	159
6.5.2.1. Termination orders	159
6.5.2.2. Consent decisions	160
6.6. CONCLUSION	161
7. THE UNDERTAKING AS SUBJECT OF EC COMPETITION LAW AND THE IMPUTATION OF INFRINGEMENTS TO NATURAL OR LEGAL PERSONS	163
7.1. THE UNDERTAKING AS SUBJECT OF EC COMPETITION LAW	163
7.1.1. Main provisions	163
7.1.2. The two faces of the definition of undertaking	164
7.1.3. Preliminary conclusions and further questions	166
7.1.4. The economic notion of the firm	167

7.1.5. Conclusions flowing from the economic notion of the firm	169
7.1.6. The overall structure and internal consistency of competition law	170
7.1.7. Conclusions flowing from the overall structure and internal consistency of competition law	173
7.1.8. Final conclusions	176
7.2. THE IMPUTATION OF INFRINGEMENTS TO NATURAL OR LEGAL PERSONS	176
7.2.1. Introduction	176
7.2.2. Undertakings coinciding with a Single natural person without employees ..	177
7.2.3. Undertakings consisting of a Single natural person and his employees	178
7.2.4. Undertakings coinciding with a single Company or other legal person	180
7.2.5. Undertakings consisting of a group of companies	182
7.2.6. Succession	184
7.2.7. Conclusions	186
8. DOES THE EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF ARTICLES 81 AND 82 EC REQUIRE NOT ONLY FINES ON UNDERTAKINGS BUT ALSO INDIVIDUAL PENALTIES, IN PARTICULAR IMPRISONMENT?	188
8.1. INTRODUCTION	188
8.1.1. The current Situation under EC law	188
8.1.2. The Situation in the United States	190
8.1.3. Outline of this chapter	192
8.2. WHO COMMITS ANTITRUST VIOLATIONS, WHY DO THEY DO IT, AND HOW CAN THEIR BEHAVIOUR BE INFLUENCED?	192
8.2.1. Who really commits antitrust violations?	192
8.2.2. Why do they do it?	193
8.2.3. How can their behaviour be influenced?	195
8.3. THE CASE FOR CORPORATE SANCTIONS	196
8.3.1. Exploiting the firm's ability to influence the behaviour of its agents	197
8.3.2. Avoiding perverse incentives	198

Table of contents

8.4. THE CASE AGAINST EXCLUSIVE RELIANCE ON CORPORATE SANCTIONS	198
8.4.1. The fines needed for effective deterrence are impossibly high	199
8.4.1.1. What level of fines is required to achieve effective deterrence?	199
8.4.1.1.1. An estimate of the minimum fine required for effective deterrence	199
8.4.1.1.2. Comparison with the current level of fines	201
8.4.1.2. Why can actual fines not be raised to the level required for effective deterrence?	202
8.4.1.2.1. The fines required for effective deterrence would regularly breach the ceiling laid down in Regulation No. 17	202
8.4.1.2.2. The fines required for effective deterrence would often exceed the undertakings' ability to pay	203
8.4.1.2.3. The consequences of inability to pay	204
8.4.1.2.4. Even below the level of inability to pay, the imposition of high fines is costly	205
8.4.1.2.5. The fines required for effective deterrence are likely to raise fundamental objections of proportional justice	206
8.4.2. Corporate sanctions do not always guarantee adequate incentives for responsible individuals within the firm	207
8.4.2.1. Firms have often only a limited ability to discipline their agents	208
8.4.2.2. Firms may be management controlled	209
8.4.2.3. Managers may have left the firm by the time their violation is detected	210
8.4.3. Consequences and possible Solutions	210
8.4.3.1. Consequences	210
8.4.3.2. Possible Solutions	211
8.4.3.2.1. Keeping a notification system is of no use	211
8.4.3.2.2. Encouraging private enforcement does not help much	212
8.4.3.2.3. Increasing the probability of detection cannot solve the problem on its own	213
8.5. THE CASE FOR COMBINING CORPORATE SANCTIONS WITH INDIVIDUAL PENALTIES	213
8.5.1. Adding individual penalties could provide the Solution to the problem of corporate sanctions being unable to bring about effective deterrence	214
8.5.1.1. Adding individual penalties could solve the problems of impossibly high fines	214

8.5.1.2. Adding individual penalties solves the problems of firms being unable to control their agents	215
8.5.2. Individual penalties ensure necessary resistance to corporate pressure to break the law	215
8.5.3. Individual penalties can strengthen people's moral commitment to the law	216
8.5.4. Individual penalties should only be used in combination with corporate sanctions	217
8.6. THE CASE FOR IMPRISONMENT	218
8.6.1. The fines needed for effective deterrence may again be impossibly high...	219
8.6.2. The problem of indemnification	220
8.6.3. Imprisonment is a very effective deterrent for antitrust violations	220
8.6.4. Prison sanctions carry a uniquely strong moral message	221
8.6.5. Further arguments in favour of imprisonment	221
8.6.6. No alternative sanctions can replace imprisonment	222
8.6.7. Conclusion	223
8.7. SOME FURTHER ISSUES	225
8.7.1. For which types of violations of Articles 81 and 82 EC should prison sanctions lie?	225
8.7.2. The criminal-law nature of antitrust penalties	226
8.7.2.1. The distinguishing characteristics of criminal law	227
8.7.2.2. Should antitrust penalties be criminal?	228
8.7.2.3. The separate issue of the applicability of the European Convention on Human Rights	229
8.7.3. Some legal and contextual elements supporting the introduction of individual penalties in EC antitrust law	230
8.7.3.1. The OECD Recommendation concerning effective action against hard-core cartels	230
8.7.3.2. The competition laws of the Member States and Norway	231
8.7.3.3. Europe's free ride on American enforcement efforts	232
8.7.4. Some legal and institutional implications of introducing individual penalties in EC antitrust law	232

Table of Contents

8.7.4.1. Would criminal sanctions have to be introduced under the Third Pillar?	232
8.7.4.2. Does the EC Treaty contain an inherent limitation excluding criminal law and criminal sanctions from its scope of application?	233
8.7.4.3. Does the wording of Articles 81 and 82 preclude individual penalties?	233
8.7.4.4. Does the explicit reference to fines in Article 83(2)(a) preclude prison sanctions?	234
8.7.4.5. Could the Commission continue to be both prosecutor and judge?	234
8.7.4.6. Would a Community prison have to be built?	237
9. CONCLUSION	238
9.1. THE TIMING OF LEGAL INTERVENTION: EX ANTE ENFORCEMENT THROUGH PRESCREENING OR EX POST ENFORCEMENT THROUGH DETERRENCE?	239
9.2. THE ROLE OF DIFFERENT ENFORCEMENT AGENTS: THE COMMISSION, THE COMPETITION AUTHORITIES OF THE MEMBER STATES, PRIVATE COMPLAINANTS AND NATIONAL COURTS	242
9.3. THE FORM OF SANCTIONS: FINES ON UNDERTAKINGS, FINES ON INDIVIDUALS OR IMPRISONMENT?	248
9.4. THE PROBLEM OF UNDERDETERRENCE WITH REGARD TO THE MOST SERIOUS ANTITRUST VIOLATIONS	254
9.5. THE HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL DIMENSION	258
REFERENCES	263
TABLE OF CASES	303
SUBJECT INDEX	315