



ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

MARKET STUDIES INFORMATION STORE

SECTOR

COMPETITION POLICY

UPDATED: JULY 2020

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Brazil											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	cross sectional - focus on digital economy	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	2019											
Duration:		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	Discussions in the scope of the BRICS working group on digital economy.											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	The study aims at better understanding and examining how antitrust toolkit and competition policy are being used to deal with the challenges imposed by the digital economy, in the context of BRICS, thus, enhancing future cooperation.											
Link to report:	http://www.cade.gov.br/acesso-a-informacao/publicacoes-institucionais/brics_report.pdf											
Remarks (if any):												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Brazil												
Sector:	Competition Policy												
Market:	Cross-Sectional	Range of Possible Outcomes											
End Date:	2019												
Duration:		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found	
Source of idea for study:													
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	There is a growing number of investigations and several requests from the Brazilian industry concerning the imposition of antidumping measures in recent years. It was necessary to evaluate the potential of unfair competition and economic harm. The study investigates the relation between competition and antidumping measures adopted in the Brazilian industry.												
Link to report:	http://www.cade.gov.br/aceso-a-informacao/publicacoes-institucionais/publicacoes-dee/Documentodetrabalho022019.pdf												
Remarks (if any):													

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Israel											
Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Personal Import											
End Date:	August 2018											
Duration:												
Source of idea for study:												
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	The study reviews ways in which personal import can enhance competition, and the barriers needed to be lifted for personal import to take place, in delivery services, taxation policy and other regulations.											
Link to report:	Personal Import as a Way to Promote Competition (August 7 th , 2018) https://www.gov.il/he/departments/publications/reports/marketresearch-personalimport (Hebrew)											
Remarks (if any):												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Brazil												
Sector:	Competition Policy												
Market:	Cross-Sectional	Range of Possible Outcomes											
End Date:	2017												
Duration:		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found	
Source of idea for study:													
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	The study presents a discussion on the adoption of competition indicators to compare market power between sectors of the manufacturing industry.												
Link to report:	http://www.cade.gov.br/acesso-a-informacao/publicacoes-institucionais/dee-publicacoes-anexos/documento-de-trabalho-02-2017												
Remarks (if any):													

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Colombia Superintendence of Industry and Trade											
Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Creative and Cultural Economy	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	2019	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 year											
Source of idea for study:	Own initiative in cooperation with International Competition Network office											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	The study, presented in the 2019 International Competition Network – ICN – Annual Conference, stands as an opportunity to emphasize in some aspects, challenges and perspectives that not only reflect the effective and efficient application of competition policy rules in the Creative and Cultural Economy, but, in turn, that Competition Authorities submit to evaluation and reflection new methodologies and tools to encourage innovation, taking into account the implications of innovation for competition law, consumer rights and industrial property.											
Link to report:	https://bit.ly/39Kblwv											
Remarks (if any):	The Special Project, considering the complementarity between the creativity, innovation and digitization of the economy, reflect the importance of understanding the productive value chain, the markets and their corresponding interrelationship. Hence the relevance of economic analysis and, consequently, interdisciplinary between jurists and economists. In addition, given the increased complementarity and lower transaction costs, the overview preferences and estimates of demand play an important role.											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Japan Fair Trade Commission											
Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Bridal	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	March 22nd, 2017											
Duration:	9months	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	Internal competition concern											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>The JFTC observes that the bridal market in Japan is highly competitive to satisfy consumers' demands and to compete new entries. At the same time, however, bridal companies allegedly compel their own trade partners to buy some goods irrelevant to the business directly, which could constitute a violation of the AMA: abuse of superior bargaining position and/or infringement of the Subcontract Act.</p> <p>Given such situation, the JFTC surveyed the trade practices in the bridal market to figure out what violates the Acts happens in practice.</p>											
Link to report:	(Press release and full report in Japanese only) https://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h29/mar/170322_1.html											
Remarks (if any):												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Japan Fair Trade Commission											
Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Funeral	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	March 22nd, 2017	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	9months											
Source of idea for study:	Internal competition concern											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>The JFTC observes that the funeral market in Japan is highly competitive to satisfy consumers' demands and to compete new entries. At the same time, however, funeral companies allegedly compel their own trade partners to buy some goods irrelevant to the business directly, which could constitute a violation of the AMA: abuse of superior bargaining position and/or infringement of the Subcontract Act.</p> <p>Given such situation, the JFTC surveyed the trade practices in the funeral market to figure out what violates the Acts happens in practice.</p>											
Link to report:	(Press release and full report in Japanese only) https://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h29/mar/170322_2.html											
Remarks (if any):												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Japan Fair Trade Commission											
Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Others	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	December 2016											
Duration:	8 months	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	Occurring many violations of the AMA and other problems that involve trade associations.											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>There have occurred many violations of the AMA and other problems that involve trade associations. In some cases of price cartel by a group of enterprises, those enterprises took advantage of the meetings of trade associations.</p> <p>The JFTC conducted a survey regarding compliance efforts of trade associations with an aim to contribute to better achievement by trade associations of AMA compliance by getting the picture of the current status of their efforts to promote AMA compliance and then by clarifying issues to be tackled by them.</p>											
Link to report:	(Press release and summary report in English) https://www.jftc.go.jp/en/pressreleases/yearly-2016/December/161221.html (Press release and full report in Japanese) https://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h28/dec/161221.html											
Remarks (if any):												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Japan Fair Trade Commission											
Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Nursing Care	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	September 2016											
Duration:	7 months	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	Internal competition concern											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>As the birth rate declines and the population ages in Japan, social security reform has been at the top of the agenda. In particular, the issue of how people can manage nursing care and their work at the same time needs to be addressed urgently when the society is aging further. In light of these facts, the JFTC conducted a survey and review on the current state in the field of nursing care in terms of competition policies which aim to promote fair and free competition by enterprises and to protect consumers' interests including quality improvement of services, etc., and released "Survey Report concerning the Field of Nursing Care", which compiles basic principles and proposals based on the competition policies.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>(Press release and full report in Japanese only) https://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h28/sep/160905_1.html</p>											
Remarks (if any):												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Japan Fair Trade Commission	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	International Ocean Shipping											
End Date:	February 2016											
Duration:	10 months	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	Internal competition concern											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	To conclude an agreement concerning freight rates, fees, other transportation conditions, maritime routes or allocation of vessels is regarded as exempt from the AMA, conditioned upon advanced notification being submitted to the Minister of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism based on the Marine Transportation Act (Act No. 187 of 1949). As a result of the review conducted in FY2010 based on the “Management policy concerning regulatory/system reform” (Cabinet Decision on June 18th, 2010), the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism was supposed to re-examine this system for revision during FY2015 while discussing with the JFTC. Based on this, the JFTC conducted a fact-finding survey, reviewed on whether the reasons for maintaining this system still existed, and publicized the report, “Review of the System for Exemption from the AMA in the International Ocean Shipping Business” on February 4th in 2016. The report compiled the JFTC’s review results.											
Link to report:	(Press release and full report in English) http://www.jftc.go.jp/en/pressreleases/yearly-2016/February/160204.html (Press release and full report in Japanese) http://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h28/feb/160204.html											
Remarks (if any):												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Sweden											
Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Competition enforcement in light of digitalisation	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	Feb, 2017											
Duration:	Approx. 1 year											
Source of idea for study:	Government commissioned inquiry											
		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	Need for modernisation of competition policy/law?											
Link to report:	http://www.konkurrensverket.se/globalassets/publikationer/rapporter/rapport_2017-2.pdf											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition and consumer protection enforcement and policy											
Market:	U.S. State consumer protection and competition enforcement and policy	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	June 12, 2019											
Duration:	1 day hearing	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	Joint FTC-State initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing focused on state consumer protection and competition issues, optimizing consumer protection remedies, and error-cost considerations.</p> <p>Discussions focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumer protection and antitrust enforcement and policy issues encountered in U.S. states; • Legal and economic considerations relevant to optimizing the Commission’s consumer protection remedies; and • Whether and under what conditions error-cost considerations are an appropriate guide for antitrust policy and enforcement, and how and to what degree such considerations should influence the Commission’s case selection and advocacy agenda. 											

	FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-14-roundtable-state-attorneys-general
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the fourteenth session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection .

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition and consumer policy											
Market:	Privacy of consumer data	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	April 9-10, 2019											
Duration:	2 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative; previous FTC work in data privacy; 2012 comprehensive FTC privacy report	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing focused on the privacy of consumer data, which is a daily topic of news headlines, public discourse, and policy debates around the world. This hearing considered: questions about consumers’ ability to make informed choices about data collection and use; potential harms to consumers resulting from data collection, sharing, aggregation, and use; the adequacy of existing legal and self-regulatory frameworks to protect consumers from those harms without unduly restraining legitimate business activity; and whether emerging frameworks improve on prior versions.</p> <p>Speakers addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether current approaches sufficiently protect consumer privacy; • Whether certain approaches may have unintentionally hindered innovation, growth, or competition, to the detriment of consumers and the economy; • Whether other approaches might better serve consumers and competition; and • If so, what those approaches should be. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											

Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century-february-2019
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the twelfth session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection .

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	International cooperation and coordination regarding competition, consumer protection, privacy enforcement and policy											
End Date:	March 25-26, 2019	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	2 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing explored the FTC’s international role in light of globalization, technological change, and the increasing number of competition, consumer protection, and privacy laws and enforcement agencies around the world. Speakers addressed the implications of international developments on the FTC’s work on behalf of American consumers.</p> <p>Topics discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness of FTC’s enforcement cooperation tools and approaches in light of new challenges in competition, consumer protection, and privacy matters; • Approaches to promoting international policy coordination and best practice development; and 											

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strategies for international enforcement and policy engagement given today's dynamic global marketplace.
	FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-11-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the eleventh session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection .

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Common ownership	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	December 6, 2018											
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing considered recent econometric studies that have concluded that when investors hold stock in competing firms, competition may be reduced among those commonly held competing firms.</p> <p>Speakers addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Econometric and qualitative evidence for and against the proposition that such common ownership reduces competition; • Potential harms in concentrated industries and unconcentrated industries; • Potential mechanisms by which such stock holdings would lead to anticompetitive harm, and how likely are they to lead to anticompetitive results; • Incentive and opportunity by institutional investors to affect corporate governance, particularly regarding competitive decision-making; and • Future needs for data, additional research, and enforcement and policy responses. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-8-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century											

Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the eighth session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection .
------------------------------	---

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Vertical merger analysis and the consumer welfare standard	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	November 1, 2018											
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing examined vertical merger analysis and the role of the consumer welfare standard in U.S. antitrust law.</p> <p>Speakers addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for vertical merger guidelines, including guidance regarding the assessment of the competitive effects of vertical mergers, any presumptions of harm, the substantive theories of competitive harm and the treatment of transaction-related efficiencies, and potential remedies; and • Whether the “consumer welfare standard” is the appropriate standard for evaluating compliance with the antitrust laws; alternative frameworks and their strengths and weaknesses; and empirical support for preferring one standard over another. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											

Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-5-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century
Remarks (if any):	<p>This hearing was the fifth session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p> <p>Issues discussed during this hearing and related public comments helped to inform the FTC-DOJ draft <i>2020 Vertical Merger Guidelines</i>, which were out for public comment when this summary was drafted. For information on these draft guidelines, see https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2020/02/ftc-doj-extend-deadline-public-comments-draft-vertical-merger. There are also two planned workshops related to these guidelines. See https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/vertical-merger-guidelines-workshop.</p>



ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)												
Sector:	Competition policy												
Market:	Innovation and intellectual property policy	Range of Possible Outcomes											
End Date:	October 23-24, 2018												
Duration:	2 day hearing												
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative												
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing examined the role of intellectual property in promoting innovation from academic, economic, and industry perspectives; emerging trends in patent quality and litigation, and included the FTC’s first wide-scale exploration of copyright issues.</p> <p>Questions discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a role for the government in advancing or supporting innovation? • What is the importance of intellectual property – all forms – in advancing, protecting, and supporting innovation? Does it differ because of industry-specific or other market-based factors, or because of the form of intellectual property? • How does modern economic analysis and empirical literature view the relationship between intellectual property and innovation, and the role of government in advancing and supporting innovation? Are there differences that depend on the type of intellectual property, and the protections offered for that intellectual property? • How can the FTC use its enforcement and policy authority to advance innovation? What factors should the FTC consider in attempting to achieve this objective? 												

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are emerging trends in patent quality and litigation issues? Should these trends influence the FTC's enforcement and policy agenda?• How should the current status of copyright law and current business practices influence the FTC's enforcement and policy agenda?
	FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/10/ftc-hearing-4-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the fourth session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection .

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Multi-sided platforms; Labor markets; Acquisitions of nascent and potential competitors in digital technology markets	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	October 15-17, 2018											
Duration:	3 day hearing	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)												
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing examined the potential for collusive, exclusionary, and predatory conduct in multi-sided, technology-based platform industries; antitrust frameworks for evaluating acquisitions of nascent competitors or occurring in nascent markets; and the approach to addressing antitrust issues regarding labor markets.</p> <p>Questions discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the defining characteristics of multi-sided platforms? Is there a way to distinguish between multi-sided and single-sided businesses? Are any adjustments to antitrust analysis 											

	<p>necessary to account for any special characteristics of multi-sided businesses? What is the relevance of network effects (direct and indirect) in multi-sided platform markets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How should the courts and agencies evaluate exclusionary conduct by firms competing in multi-sided platform markets, including predatory pricing, vertical restraints, most-favored nation clauses, and actions to undermine rivals who depend on platform infrastructure? • Are there unique procompetitive justifications for these types of conduct by firms competing in multi-sided platform markets? • Is a lack of competition among employers a significant contributor to observed macroeconomic trends in labor markets, such as the declining labor share and/or real wage stagnation? What are other explanations for these trends? How should the agencies approach defining relevant labor markets for purposes of antitrust analysis? What (if any) reliable evidence is available on the existence and effect of employer concentration in properly defined labor markets? • What is the appropriate antitrust framework to evaluate acquisitions of potential or nascent competitors in high-technology markets? Is current antitrust law sufficient for developing challenges to these types of acquisitions? How should the antitrust agencies evaluate whether a nascent technology is likely to develop into a competitive threat in dynamic, high-technology markets? <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>
<p>Link to report:</p>	<p>https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/10/ftc-hearing-3-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century</p>
<p>Remarks (if any):</p>	<p>This hearing was the third session of the FTC’s <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p> <p>Discussions and public comments related to this hearings helped to inform the FTC non-enforcement action to examine past acquisitions by large technology companies. See https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2020/02/ftc-examine-past-acquisitions-large-technology-companies and search for “prior acquisitions” within this document.</p>

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Mergers and monopsony or buyer power	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	September 21, 2018											
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing focused on mergers and monopsony or buyer power.</p> <p>Questions discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the consumer welfare standard is adequate to deal with the competitive challenges of the new economy, and, if not, whether a new standard or standards should be considered? If so, what should the standard(s) be? In assessing consumer welfare, should the antitrust laws consider consumer surplus, total surplus, wealth maximization, utility maximization, or something else? • Should antitrust law routinely, or ever, take into account additional public policy concerns raised by the size, wealth, or influence of corporations or individuals? Income and wealth distribution? The bargaining power of large entities? Labor and employment considerations? Other concerns? If so, how should those considerations be defined and evaluated and how should the antitrust laws make trade-offs between competing or multiple considerations? • What are the highest priority reforms that would improve U.S. antitrust enforcement policy? 											

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the state and quality of the evidence of monopsony power in the economy? Are their sectors or markets in which the incidence of monopsony power is more likely and more prevalent? <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/09/ftc-hearing-2-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century
Remarks (if any):	<p>This hearing was the second session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p>

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Review of competition and consumer protection landscape; Concentration and competitiveness in the U.S. economy; Privacy regulation											
End Date:	September 13, 2018	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing reviewed the competition and consumer protection landscape, concentration and competitiveness in the U.S. economy, and privacy regulation.</p> <p>Topics discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current landscape of competition and consumer protection law and policy; • Whether the U.S. economy has become more concentrated and less competitive; • The regulation of consumer data; 											

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Antitrust law and the consumer welfare standard; and• The analysis of vertical mergers. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/09/ftc-hearing-1-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century
Remarks (if any):	<p>This hearing was the first session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p>



ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

Information Store

Competition Policy

Jurisdiction:	US - FTC											
Market:	Merger remedies (all markets)	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	Ongoing	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	Announced June 2015											
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The FTC is studying the effectiveness of the Commission's orders in merger cases where it required a divestiture or other remedy. The study will update and expand on the <u>divestiture study the FTC issued in 1999</u> . The new study, which was cleared by the Office of Management and Budget on August 12, 2015, will focus on 90 merger orders issued by the Commission between 2006 and 2012.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/policy/studies/remedy-study											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Japan											
Market:	Competition Policy	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	March 2015	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	7 months											
Source of idea for study:	Emerging vulnerabilities of compliance regimes with foreign competition laws at Japanese companies, etc.											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recently, there are many cases where Japanese companies have been charged with violations of foreign competition laws. As a result, huge amounts of criminal fines and/or surcharges have been imposed on them and their executives and employees have been sentenced to imprisonment. Given these circumstances, the vulnerabilities of compliance regimes with foreign competition laws (hereinafter, "FCL compliance") have been pointed out at Japanese companies. - The competition laws of many major countries and the Antimonopoly Act of Japan have commonality in the conducts that constitute violations especially in cartel prohibition. Therefore, Japanese companies should basically comply with the Antimonopoly Act of Japan in order not to be charged with violation of any foreign competition laws. On the other hand, there are currently differences between the competition laws of major countries and the Antimonopoly Act in terms of the requirements for constituting violations, law enforcement procedures, and other tools for immunity and/or reduction from sanctions over violations. Considering these situations, Japanese companies doing business globally would need to develop their frameworks to comply with foreign competition laws simultaneously with promoting compliance with the Antimonopoly Act. - For this reason, the Japan Fair Trade Commission has recently conducted the questionnaire survey and interviews, with the aim of contributing to reinforcement of FCL compliance regime at Japanese companies. 											
Link to report:	(Press release and full report in Japanese) http://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h27/mar/150327_1.html (Press release and summary report in English) http://www.jftc.go.jp/en/pressreleases/yearly-2015/March/150327.html											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Colombia	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Market:	Functioning of the legal metrology system in Colombia											
End Date:	August 2014	Competition Enforcement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consumer Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/>	Consumer Education <input type="checkbox"/>	Business Education <input type="checkbox"/>	Voluntary Business Compliance <input type="checkbox"/>	Voluntary Business Action <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Referral to Third Parties <input type="checkbox"/>	No Problems Found <input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	4 months											
Source of idea for study:	Own initiative											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Due to recent advances in the National Metrology System, it is necessary to present a proposal for metrological control in Colombia. Additionally, a ranking using information of economic activity, distribution of commercial establishments and service stations, and population was needed to recommend a possible definition of areas that would be designated by the Superintendent of Industry and Commerce in the new approach to legal metrology.</p>											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Japan												
Market:	Childcare service	Range of Possible Outcomes											
End Date:	June 2014	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 year												
Source of idea for study:	Internal competition concern												
Outcome (tick relevant columns):													
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Japan, short supply of childcare facilities leads to a huge issue that a large number of children are on a waiting list. Therefore, childcare service is a sector in need of filling demands. - In addition, childcare service is also a sector that is expected to become a growth area of Japan. - The JFTC considers that competition policy enhances supply and quality of childcare service, as well as helps the sector become a driver for the Japanese economy. - Against this backdrop, the JFTC conducted a survey and analysis on the state of childcare sector, and identified key issues from the viewpoint of competition policy. 												
Link to report:	(Press release and full report in Japanese) http://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h26/jun/140625.html (Press release and full report in English) http://www.jftc.go.jp/en/pressreleases/yearly-2014/June/140625.html												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	US - FTC	Range of Possible Outcomes									
Market:	Pricing practices (all markets)										
End Date:	June 2014	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 day workshop										
Source of idea for study:	FTC and DOJ experience										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):											
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	Workshop: Conditional Pricing Practices. This joint FTC-DOJ workshop focused on conditional pricing arrangements – practices in which prices are explicitly or effectively contingent on commitments to purchase or sell a specified share or volume of a single product or a mix of multiple products – such as loyalty or bundled pricing. A principal goal of the workshop was to advance the economic understanding of the potential harms and benefits of conditional pricing practices and to re-examine their treatment under the antitrust laws. Participants focused primarily on economics, law, and policy issues related to conditional pricing practices.										
Link to report:	Workshop transcript, video, an agenda, and additional event-related materials are available at: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2014/06/conditional-pricing-practices-economic-analysis-legal-policy										

Jurisdiction:	Finland	Range of Possible Outcomes									
Market:	General Competition Review										
End Date:	April 2014	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 year										
Source of idea for study:	Own initiative										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):											
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	To investigate the uniformity in licensing and supervision practices on certain key sectors and how these practices affect to the ability of companies to enter and expand their operations in the market. Sectors under scrutiny include construction and zoning, social and health care services, restaurant, taxi, groceries and energy.										
Link to report:	<u>Uniformity in licensing and supervision and promoting competition (in Finnish)</u>										

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Sweden											
Market:	Enforcement powers	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	December 2013											
Duration:	12 months											
Source of idea for study:	Part of government commissioned report into competition conditions in Sweden in key focus areas. Topics for study were selected by the SCA.											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Effective competition requires an effective legislative framework. Law enforcement must be carried out efficiently, securely and promptly. It is therefore important that the Competition Authority's ability to enforce the competition law corresponds to the needs for supervision. In an international comparison of investigative and decision-making powers, it is apparent that Sweden in certain respects has less effective enforcement tools in comparison to other Nordic countries, EU and OECD Member States. Against this background, the harmonisation work in process within these institutions, and the Competition Authority's own experiences from competition law enforcement, the Competition Authority has identified certain areas where expanded investigative and decision making powers would favour better enforcement.</p>											
Link to report:	http://www.konkurrensverket.se/globalassets/publikationer/rapporter/rapport_2013-10_summary.pdf (English summary of report and recommendations).											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Finland	Range of Possible Outcomes											
Market:	General Competition Review												
End Date:	March 2013	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 year and a half												
Source of idea for study:	Own initiative (study conducted in co-operation with the competition authorities from the Nordic Countries)												
Outcome (tick relevant columns):													
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	To study how effective competition policy and effective competition authorities can contribute to address future challenges to economic growth and welfare. Particular attention is paid to innovation and the significance of competition in promoting the efficiency, availability and quality of public services. The report focuses especially on public health services.												
Link to report:	A Vision for Competition – Competition Policy Towards 2020 (in English)												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Japan	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Market:	Competition Policy											
End Date:	November 2012	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	10 months											
Source of idea for study:	A follow-up of the previous survey (conducted in 2010)											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):												
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The JFTC conducted the survey in order to contribute to enhance the effectiveness of enterprises' compliance of Antimonopoly Act through promoting strong commitment and initiatives by the top management of enterprises toward effective their compliance.											
Link to report:	(Press release and full report in Japanese) http://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h24/nov/121128.html (Summary report in English) http://www.jftc.go.jp/en/pressreleases/yearly-2012/nov/121128AMA_Compliance.files/121128AMA_Compliance.pdf											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	US - FTC											
Market:	Contractual terms (Most-Favored Nation Clauses)	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	September 2012	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 day conference											
Source of idea for study:	FTC and DOJ experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Conference: Most-Favored-Nation Clauses and Antitrust Enforcement and Policy. In September 2012, the FTC hosted a joint conference with the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division on most-favored-nation clauses (MFNs), which explored the use of MFN clauses and the implications for antitrust enforcement and policy. The most commonly used MFN provisions guarantee a customer that it will receive prices that are at least as favorable as those provided to other buyers of the same seller, for the same products or services. Although most often employed for benign purposes, MFNs can under certain circumstances present competitive concerns. This is because they may raise other buyers' costs or foreclose would-be competitors from accessing the market, especially when used by a dominant buyer of intermediate goods. Additionally, MFNs can facilitate collusion and stabilize coordinated pricing among sellers.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>An agenda, public comments, and additional event-related materials are available at: http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/workshops/mfn/index.html</p>											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Spain											
Market:	Guide on public procurement and competition	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	February, 2012											
Duration:	1 year											
Source of idea for study:	Importance of public procurement across all markets. Identifying the potential restrictions of the public procurement process and anticipating possible collusive conducts of bidders in those processes.	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fostering competition in public procurement procedures on two fronts: (i) guidance on how to avoid having unjustified constraints on competition in the design, development and execution of public procurement procedures, and (ii) guidelines for preventing or avoiding bid rigging. Recommendations on how to identify the most pro-competitive option included in the current public procurement laws and regulations. 											
Link to report:	http://www.cnmec.es/Portals/0/Ficheros/Promocion/Guias_y_recomendaciones/GUIA_CONTRATACION_v4.pdf											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Japan	Range of Possible Outcomes									
Market:	Competition policy										
End Date:	June 2010	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 20%;"> <p>Competition Enforcement</p> <p>Consumer Enforcement</p> <p>Consumer Education</p> <p>Business Education</p> <p>Voluntary Business Compliance</p> <p>Voluntary Business Action</p> <p>Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law</p> <p>Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure</p> <p>Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy</p> <p>Referral to Third Parties</p> <p>No Problems Found</p> </div> <div style="width: 80%; text-align: center;"> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> </div> </div>									
Duration:	7 months										
Source of idea for study:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To verify business situation where there is a strong demand to enhance corporate compliance systems - A follow-up of the previous survey (conducted in 2009) 										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):											
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The JFTC conducted the survey in order to contribute to enhance the effectiveness of enterprises' compliance of Antimonopoly Act through promoting strong commitment and initiatives by the top management of enterprises toward effective their compliance.										
Link to report:	(Press release and full report in Japanese only) http://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h22/jun/10063002gaiyou.html										

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Brazil										
Market:	Conduct: are “abusive prices” an autonomous conduct?	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	2010	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	Not specified										
Source of idea for study:	Own initiative										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The study analyzed whether “abusive pricing” could be investigated and condemned as an autonomous conduct. (DEE, Nota Técnica 002/2010/DEE, referente a estudo sobre questões teóricas de preço abusivo, 2010)										
Link to report:	Not available										
Link to report:	http://www.sic.gov.co/recursos_user/documentos/estudio_metrologia_2014.pdf										

Jurisdiction:	Japan										
Market:	Emissions trading	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	March 2010	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	6 months										
Source of idea for study:	The argument at Study Group on Government Regulations and Competition Policy										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	Considering that the introduction of domestic (regional) emissions trading scheme would influence competition between the business entities, the JFTC has recognized the importance of grasping and summarizing the points of the competition policies on the scheme before its introduction.										
Link to report:	(Press release and full report in Japanese) http://www.jftc.go.jp/houdou/pressrelease/h22/mar/10033102.html (Press release and full report in English [tentative translation]) http://www.jftc.go.jp/en/pressreleases/yearly-2010/mar/individual-000026.html										

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	India											
Market:	Competition Law by Enterprises	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	8 months											
Source of idea for study:	CCI Advisory Committee on Market Studies											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The main objective of the study was to examine and analyze the importance of Compliance of Competition Act, 2002 and based on the study of compliance programme prevalent in other jurisdictions particularly UK, USA and EU, to formulate Guidelines for Compliance under the Competition Act, 2002 and Checklist on Compliance.											
Link to report:												

Jurisdiction:	Denmark											
Market:	All sectors	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	April 2009	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	3 months											
Source of idea for study:	To raise awareness of and explain the positive effect of competition for growth and prosperity.											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	To elucidate which parts of the food supply chain that have contributed to the higher consumer prices in the period August 2007 - March 2009.											
Link to report:	The study was carried out as part of the DCA's advocacy work. The DCA found, that there was a need to be explicit about the positive effects of competition and to communicate the message to policy makers, the greater public, etc. Furthermore there was a need to explain the mechanism behind the positive effects of competition - that is an efficient use of the resources in society, gains from entry and exit and more innovation and R&D. The arguments in the report were based on both empirical and theoretical evidence.											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	Spain	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Market:	Competition Policy and Consumer Protection											
End Date:	February 2009	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	10 days											
Source of idea for study:	Ministry of Health and Consumers (Technical Secretariat)											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Ensure the compliance of Spanish laws and regulations with Directive 2005/CE, which establishes legal provisions for the Member States regarding acts of unfair competition.</p> <p><u>Study:</u> Report on the Draft Bill amending the Unfair Competition Legal Regime in order to improve Consumer Protection.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>http://cnmc.es/es-es/promoci%C3%B3n/informessobrenormativa.aspx?num=IPN%20002/08&ambito=Informes%20de%20Propuestas%20Normativas&b=&p=148&ambitos=Informes%20de%20Propuestas%20Normativas&estado=0&sector=0&av=0</p>											

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	India	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Market:	Cartel Case Laws in Select Jurisdictions											
End Date:	April 2008	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	18 months											
Source of idea for study:	CCI Advisory Committee on Market Studies											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The overall objective of the study was to analyse cartel case laws in select jurisdictions – learning for the Competition Commission of India.											
Link to report:	http://www.cci.gov.in/images/media/completed/cartel_report1_2008_0812115152.pdf											

Jurisdiction:	India	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Market:	Interface between Competition Authority and Sectoral Regulators											
End Date:	April 2008	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	15 months											
Source of idea for study:	CCI Advisory Committee on Market Studies											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The overall objective of the study was to analyze the relationship between sector specific regulators and competition authority in India. The other objectives were to analyse need for regulators in certain sectors, need for co-existence of sector specific regulator and the competition authority, etc.											
Link to report:												

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	India											
Market:	Bilateral Treaties	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	January 2008											
Duration:	15 months											
Source of idea for study:	The Government of India needs a detailed position paper analyzing the issues in detail including country-wise and industry-wise analysis on the impact of inclusion of competition provisions in trade agreements											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	To assess the benefits of incorporating competition clauses in bilateral/regional/multilateral trade agreements with focus on the impact of having competition law cooperation on the trade of major sectors of the Indian economy and the experience of countries party to such trade agreements with competition provisions.											
Link to report:												