

Index

- abuse of dominant position, in EU
 - see also* fading dominance; monopolization
 - as-efficient competitor test 163–4, 191, 208–10
 - avoidable cost approach 165
 - causality, proof of 161–3, 168
 - Chicago critique on 194
 - commercially viable share 195
 - efficiency benefits 196–7
 - efficiency defense 172–5, 193, 196–7
 - form-based *vs.* effects-based approach 79, 161–4, 192–5
 - ineffective competitive structure 191
 - and legal certainty, assessing 231–2
 - leveraging 194–5, 240, 249–63
 - market foreclosure effect 9, 23, 68–9, 161, 163–4, 171–3
 - no economic sense test 190–91, 213–15, 219–20
 - per se* rules 162
 - predation 164–5, 195–6
 - rebates 166, 194–6
 - refusal to deal 74–6, 167, 257–9
 - technology tying 166, 252, 254–7, 259–63
 - and US law, compared 164–8, 263
 - attempt to monopolize 240–43, 248–9
 - leveraging 252, 254–6
- acção popular* (class/popular actions – Portugal) 5, 111–13, 118
- access to justice
 - class actions
 - in EU law 69
 - in Portugal 5, 111–13, 118
 - in US law 54–5
 - by third parties
 - under EU state aid rules 410–20
 - in US antitrust policy 42, 56–8
- air travel sector
 - airline mergers 306, 354
 - transparency in 26–7
- Altmark Trans* [2003] ECR I-7747 386, 397
- Antitrust Division, Department of Justice (US)
 - economists in 151–2
 - enforcement role 41–2
- Antitrust Modernization Commission (AMC) (US)
 - on need for greater legal certainty 199–200
 - reform recommendations 147–8
- antitrust policy and law *see* United States antitrust policy
- aplicação impositiva* (enforcement – Portugal) 91
- Arcelor-Mittal acquisition 309, 313
- Arrow, Kenneth 296
- Artola, M.C. 312–13
- as-efficient competitor test 163–4, 191, 208–10
- Aspen Skiing Co v Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp* 472 US 585 (1985) 52–3, 220, 258
- Astra-Zeneca* decision 2005 (EU) 185, 187
- Atkinson, M. 347
- attempt, at monopolization *see under* monopolization
- Baker, Jon 285
- balance tests 219–20
 - harms/justification test 226–9
 - in *Microsoft* case 226–9
 - proportionality test 223–5, 387
 - in state aid 71, 364–5, 397–402
 - necessity test 402–8
- banking
 - incentive effect in 369–70

- productivity and national ownership 314–15
- retail payment system (SEPA) 29, 31
- risk capital markets and state aid 369–70
- barriers to entry *see* entry barriers
- Beccaria, Cesare 72
- Beffa, Jean-Louis 294
- Belgium v Commission (Tubemeuse case)* [1990] ECR I-959 391
- Bell Atlantic Corp v Twombly* 127 S Ct 1955 (2007) 53, 155–7
- Bellamy, Christopher 78
- Berkey Photo, Inc. v Eastman Kodak Co* 603 F.2d 263 (1979) 219, 251
- Bernin 2010 program* decision (EU) 368–9
- Blundell, Richard 296–7
- Boarnett, Tom 164
- Boehringer Ingelheim v Commission* (2007) 185
- bounded rationality, theory of 10, 311
- British Aggregates Association v Commission* [2006] ECR II–2789 418
- British Airways v Commission* [2007] ECR I-2331 175
- Brooke Group Ltd v Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp* 509 US 209 (1993) 154, 211
- Brown Shoe Co v United States* 370 US 294 (1962) 153
- Brunswick v Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat*, 429 US 477 (1977) 42–3, 48
- Cabral, Luis 140–41, 143, 301
- California v Texaco, Inc.* 762 P.2d 385 (1988) 45
- Canada
 - combines, formation of 333
 - competition policy in
 - Competition Bureau 338–9, 345, 356
 - Competition Tribunal 338–9, 356
 - criminal offenses under 337–8, 357
 - efficiency defense 338, 356
 - enforcement 338–9
 - historical development 332–3
 - horizontal agreements 357
 - industrial policy, as part of 339–40
 - purpose clause 336–7
 - R&D exemptions 357
 - reform in 1980s 340–45, 358
 - economic challenges 350–51
 - industrial policy in 332–4, 357–8
 - competition policy as part of 339–40
 - Crown Corporations 340–41
 - deregulation 341–2
 - foreign investment and ownership 342–4, 351–2
 - free-trade agreements 334, 342–5
 - horizontal policy development 357–8
 - Industrial Regional Development Program (IRDP) 347
 - national champions 351–7
 - suitability of law for 355–6
 - privatization 340–41
 - subsidies 345–9, 358
 - for R&D 347–9
 - Technology Partnerships Canada (TPC) Program 348–9
 - productivity levels 350, 358
- Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development
 - Prospects for Canada (MacDonald Commission) 1985 334–6, 344
 - securities regulation 350–51
- Carbice Corp v American Patents Development Corp* 283 US 27 (1931) 259
- Carlton, Dennis 152
- cartels
 - access to information on 61, 115
 - EU authorities' role in pursuing 64
 - Portuguese ruling on 33–4
 - US antitrust enforcement policy on 48–51
- causality, role in EU competition policy 161–3, 168
- Chicago school
 - on abuse of dominance 194, 259–60
 - on leveraging 259–60, 262
 - on national champions 295
- Chronopost/UFEX* [2003] ECR I–6993 395–7
- civil law, principles of 72

- class actions
 - in EU law 69
 - in Portugal 5, 111–13, 118
 - in US law 54–5
- Clayton Act 1914 (US) 42, 166, 252–4, 322
- Code of Procedure in Administrative Courts (Portugal) 97
- Commission Green Paper on damages actions for breach of the EC antitrust rules COM(2005)672 Final 85, 116–17
- Commission v Sytraval* [1998] ECR I–1719 411–12
- common law
 - advantages, US examples of 150–54
 - and competition law, suitability for 72–3
 - development of 71
 - disadvantages, US examples of 154–7
- competition, generally
 - advantages of 18
 - and ambiguity of business behavior 201–2
 - and competitiveness 301–2
 - influence of 18–19
- Competition Authority Statutes (Portugal) 90, 94–5
- competition law, generally
 - burden of proof 6, 77, 161–3, 172, 229, 244–5
 - common law vs. civil law, suitability for 72–3
 - and complex economic/technical analysis 76–7
 - consistency, importance of 305–6
 - and efficiency, balancing 78
 - facts vs law, categorization of 77–9
 - independence, importance of 305–6
 - purpose 25–7, 162
 - consumer welfare 25–7, 162–3, 305
 - and intellectual property protection, balancing with 183–8, 285–6
 - protection of competition vs. protection of competitors 25–7, 153–4, 162–3, 190, 241
- as ‘tax on competitive success’ 270–71, 280, 289
- competition policy *see* EU competition policy; United States antitrust policy
- competitiveness, and competition 301–2
- computer industry
 - fading dominance in 265–6, 272–4
- conduct-specific test 229–31
- consumer choice, role of competition in 22, 25–7
- Consumer Policy Strategy 25
- consumer welfare, as aim of competition policy 25–7, 162–3, 305
- consumer welfare test 219–23
- Continental TV, Inc. v GTEsylvania, Inc.* 433 US 36 (1977) 49, 150
- contra-ordenações* (private procedures – Portugal) 35–6
- Cook v Commission* [1993] ECR I–2487 417
- Council Regulation 1/2003 on the implementation of the rules of competition laid down in Articles 81 and 82 of the EC Treaty 63, 86, 99, 102
- Council Regulation 1049/2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents 413–14
- Courage v Crehan* [2001] All ER (EC) 886 60, 65, 110–11, 116–17
- courts, generally *see also* enforcement; judicial review
 - failure to establish clear tests of anti-competitive behavior 202, 402–8
 - role in civil/common law traditions 72–3
- Covad Communications Co v Bell Atlantic Corp* 398 F.3d 666 (2005) 219
- creative construction competition and fading dominance 264–5, 276
- opportunities for 265–6
- Crown Corporations, in Canada 340–41
- Cyprus, state aid policy in 379

- damages, multipliers for, in US
 antitrust cases 46, 50–51, 54, 69
- Daubert v Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.* 509 US 579 (1993) 80–81, 83
- de minimis* rule, in state aid assessment 393–4, 400
- defects in reasoning 73, 78
- Denmark, state aid policy 377–8
- Department of Justice (US)
 Antitrust Division, enforcement role 41–2
 role in electricity regulation 135–6
- deterrence
 and overdeterrence 202–3, 223
 as purpose of competition 39–40, 46–7, 50–51, 54–7, 202–3
- DG Competition 2007 Annual Management Plan 177–8
 on intellectual property regulatory structure 184
- DG Competition discussion paper on the application of Article 82 to exclusionary abuses (2005) 193–4
- Digital terrestrial TV in Berlin-Brandenburg* (Decision C–25/2004) 403, 405
- discovery
 abuse of 156
 in private and public enforcement, differences between 63–4, 115
- dominant position *see* abuse of dominant position; fading dominance; monopolization
- Dr. Miles Med. Co v John D. Park & Sons Co* 220 US 373 (1911) 150, 155
- Drexler, Josef 179
- Easterbrook, Frank H. 52
- EC Treaty Article 81
 burden of proof 61, 64
 declaration of non-applicability 99–100
 as defense rather than claim 61
 direct applicability of 65
 effectiveness factors 111
 efficiency defense 193
 modernization, approaches to
 and Lisbon Agenda 175–7
 Regulation 1/2003 63, 86, 99
 and private enforcement 61–2, 64, 66–70
- EC Treaty Article 82 *see also* abuse of dominant position
 abuses considered under 191–2
 application, *ex post* vs. *ex ante* 60, 180–83, 185–8
 burden of proof 31–2, 61–2, 172
 compared with US Sherman Act 1890 section 2 204, 248–50, 252, 263
 attempt to monopolize 240–43, 248–9, 263
 Economic Advisory Group for Competition Policy (EAGCP) Report (2005) 192–3
 efficiency defense 172–5
 guidelines for interpreting 31–2
 and imposition of FRAND conditions 180
 innovation policy rationale 174–5, 178–9
 and intellectual property law 180–83, 185–8
 leveraging 252, 254
 limitations on 181–3
 modernization, approaches to 169–73
 DG Competition 2007 Annual Management Plan 177–8
 on exclusionary abuses 193–4
 and Lisbon Agenda 169–73, 175–7
 Regulation 1/2003 63, 86, 99
 principles of 241
 and private enforcement 61–2, 66–70
 rebates, application to 194–5
 recoupment requirement 242
 tests under 190–91
- EC Treaty Article 87(1)
 court simplification of 388
 evolution of state aid under 385–8
 exclusion from scope of 385–6
 state reasons and jurisdictional control, obligations to 388–95
 distortion of trade and effect on trade conditions 389–95, 407
 under State Aid Action Plan 395–7

- EC Treaty Article 87(3)
 evolution of state aid under, *vs.*
 Article 87(1) 387–8
 margin of discretion under 399–400
 potential importance of 407–8
- EC Treaty Article 88(2)
 third party rights 412, 415
- EC Treaty Article 93(3)
 third party rights 412
- Economic Advisory Group for
 Competition Policy (EAGCP),
 Report on Article 82 (2005)
 192–3
- economic analysis
 as-efficient competitor test 163–4
 in competition law, generally 71
 balancing facts and law 76–9
 and case selection 151
 increasing role of 150–53
 consumer welfare test 219–23
Daubert principles 80–81, 83
 efficiency test 29–30, 386–7, 397
 Elhauge test 216–18
 in enforcement
 bias, opportunities for 79
 and experts in court 79–81, 83–4
 and judiciary, limitations on 65,
 79–81
 in EU abuse of dominant position
 no economic sense test 190–91,
 213–15, 219–20
 and facts *vs.* law 77–9
 and legal certainty 155–6
 in merger control 127–8
 no economic sense test 190–91,
 213–15, 219–20
 profit sacrifice test 211–14, 219–20
 proportionality test 223–5, 387
 in state aid control 20–21, 363–4,
 389–97
 balance test, 71, 364–5, 397–402
 incentive effect test 365–75
 necessity test 402–8
 refined economic approach
 397–408
 in US antitrust law, increasing role
 of 150–53
 in US electricity sector 128–34,
 136–7
- Economic Analysis Group (US) 152
- Economic Policy Office (US) 152
- economists, role in US Antitrust
 Division 151–2
- effectiveness factors 107–10, 113
- effects-based approach
 and *per se* rules of illegality, under
 US law 205–6
vs. form-based approach 79, 161–4,
 192–5
- efficiency
 as-efficient competitor test 163–4,
 191, 208–10
 and competition, balancing effects
 of 78–9, 193–4
 efficiency defense 172–5, 193, 196–7
 in Canada 338, 356
 efficiency test, in state aid 29–30,
 386–7, 397
 and foreign ownership 311–18
 of national champions 295–7,
 311–18
- efficiency defense 172–5
- electricity sector
 in EU
 reform proposals 23, 29–31,
 310–11
 forward contracts 135–7
 liberalization, in UK 26
 marginal cost curves 128–30
 regulation, multiple layers of 125–6,
 134–6
- in US
 background to 126–8
 competition opportunities and
 incentives 127–34
 and economic analysis, of market
 shares 128–34, 136–7
 Exelon/PSEG merger 128–34
 merger control in 125–6, 134–6
 wholesale demand, influences on
 126–7
- Elhauge test 216–18
- Empagran S.A. v F. Hoffman Laroche*
 315 F.3d 338 (2003) 42
- energy sector *see* electricity sector
- enforcement, of competition/antitrust
 law
 cross-border enforcement networks
 26–7
 delays in 64–5

- in EU competition policy
 - limitations on court role 65
 - and national laws, conflicts with 61–2
 - private actions, in national courts 60, 63–4
 - barriers to 60–61
 - differing outcomes from public actions 65–9
- incentives for 39–40, 50–51, 54
- leniency programs 55–6
- private actions, generally 27
 - importance of 23–4, 69–70
 - and legal certainty 63–4
- purpose of 57–8, 63, 69–70
- deterrence 39–40, 46–7, 50–51, 54–7, 202–3
- tests, for anti-competitive behavior
 - as-efficient competitor test 163–4, 191, 208–10
 - balance tests 219–20
 - harms/justification test 226–9
 - in *Microsoft* case 226–9
 - proportionality test 223–5, 387
 - in state aid 71, 364–5, 397–402
 - conduct-specific test 229–31
 - consumer welfare test 219–23
 - court failure to establish 202, 402–8
 - efficiency test 29–30, 386–7, 397
 - Elhauge test 216–18
 - incentive effect test
 - court applications 367–9
 - under EU General Block Exemption Regulation 366–7, 372–5, 405–6
 - under EU R&D&I Framework 366–9, 371–2, 406
 - and legal certainty 372–5
 - ineffective competitive structure 191
 - no economic sense test 190–91, 213–15, 219
 - profit sacrifice test 211–14, 219–20
- in US antitrust policy
 - bias/distortion, risk of 79
 - of cartels 48–51
 - class actions 54–5
 - common law process, advantages of 150–54
 - court role 147–9
 - damages multipliers 46, 50–51, 54, 69
 - detection and proof, problems with 46, 55–7
 - economic analysis, increasing role of 150–53
 - enforcement agencies role 41–2
 - finances 46, 50–51
 - and indirect purchasers 42, 56–8
 - ‘inhospitality’ tradition of 52
 - legal basis 41
 - leniency programs 55–6
 - of monopolization 51–3
 - private enforcement actions 42–3
 - financing for 53–5
 - incentives for 39–40, 43, 50–51, 54
 - remedies 46–7
 - State actions 43–5
- entry barriers 22–3, 143
 - EU policy developments on 171
 - predation/intent to exclude 164–5
- E.ON – Endesa merger 309
- Ericson, Richard 141
- error of law standard 73
- essential faculty approach 167
- EU competition policy and law, generally *see also* abuse of dominant position; EC Treaty Article 81; EC Treaty Article 82; enforcement; merger control; state aid
 - and capital markets policy 32
 - and consumer welfare 25–7, 162–3, 305
 - and impact assessments 32
 - and industrial policy, place in 300–302
 - and innovation, conflicts between 171–2, 270–71, 288–9, 296–7
 - and intellectual property, balancing protections 183–8
 - as ‘tax on competitive success’ 270–71, 280, 289
- Euro, The 29, 31
- European Commission
 - role and powers, in competition enforcement 61–2, 86–7
- European Competition Day 28

- European Competition Network (ECN) 170
- European Consumers Consultative Group 26
- evidence
 - discovery
 - abuse of 156
 - private vs. public enforcement 63–4, 115
 - problems with obtaining 115
 - experts' testimony
 - Daubert* principles 80–81
 - of intent, and legal certainty 232–5
- exclusionary conduct, definition 223–4
- Exelon/PSEG merger 128–34
- experts in court, principles for use of 79–81, 83–4
- facts
 - categorization of 77–9
 - and defects in reasoning 73, 78
 - distinguished from law 77–9
- fading dominance
 - and creative destruction competition 264–6, 276
 - of Microsoft 271–4
 - and monopolization 269–71
 - and positional advantages 265–6
 - profit motives of 265–7
 - reasons for 264–5
 - strategies for
 - competitive strategies 267
 - continuation 203, 267–8
 - expropriation 266–9
 - and lack of capability advantage 268
 - and tax on competitive success 270–71, 280, 289
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) (US) 134–6
- Federal Trade Commission (US), competition enforcement role 41–2
- Foreign Investment Review Agency (FIRA) (Canada) 342
- foreign ownership
 - in Canada 342–4, 351–2
 - and efficiency 311–18
- form-based approach
 - vs. effects-based approach 79, 161–4, 192–5
- France, national champions in and mergers 293–4, 309–10 and state aid 294–5
- France Télécom v Commission (Wanadoo case)* [2007] ECR II-107 195–7
- FRAND conditions (fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory), EU imposition of 180–83
- free movement of capital, restriction on regulation 308–9
- Fries, S.D. 314–15
- General Block Exemption Regulations 21, 30, 379–80
 - and incentive effect 366–7, 372–5, 405–6
 - for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) 373–4
- General Electric Co v Joiner*, 522 US 136 (1997) 80
- Geroski, Paul 352–3
- globalization, influence of 21–2
- Griffith, R. 315–18
- harms/justifications test 226–9
- Hay, George 152
- Herfindhal-Hirschman Index (HHI) 125
- Hovenkamp, Herbert 149, 209, 217, 232–3
 - proportionality test 223–5, 387
- 'ice cream wars' (*Masterfoods/Van den Berg* cases) 66–9
- Illinois Brick Co v State of Illinois* 431 US 720, 746 (1977) 42, 57
- Illinois Tool Works Inc. v Independent Ink, Inc.* 547 US 28 (2006) 261
- impact assessments, in competition policy 2, 32
- IMS Health* [2004] ECR I-5039 181, 243
- incentive effect test
 - court applications 367–9
 - under General Block Exemption Regulation 366–7, 372–5, 405–6

- and legal certainty 372–5
- under R&D&I Framework 366–9, 371–2, 406
- substantive conditions for 369–71
- industrial policy
 - in Canada 332–4
 - competition place in 300–302
 - in EU Lisbon Agenda 294–5
 - and globalization 21–2
 - and national champions 294–5, 296–8, 303–5
- in US
 - and antitrust policy, overlap with 320–28
 - defining 323–4
- Industrial Regional Development Program (IRDP) (Canada) 347
- ineffective competitive structure 191
- innovation
 - competition policy, conflicts with 178–9, 270–71, 288–9, 296–7
 - harmful practices affecting
 - collective standard setting 180–81
 - de facto* standard setting 181–3
 - leveraging 181–3
 - patent ambush 179–83
 - importance of 171–2, 174–5
 - and intellectual property, conflicts between 285–6
 - and national champions 294, 296–7
 - replacement effect 296
- innovation policy rationale 171–2, 178–9
- intellectual property
 - abuse of dominant position
 - Article 82 application, *ex post vs. ex ante* 180–83, 185–8
 - collective standard setting 180–81
 - de facto* standard setting 181–3
 - and innovation policy 171–2, 174–5, 178–9
 - leveraging 181–3
 - patent ambush 179–83
 - patent chains 187–8
 - regulatory structure
 - abuse of 185–8
 - balancing with competition policy 183–8, 285–6
- intention
 - evidence of, and legal certainty 232–5
 - to exclude 22–3, 143, 164–5, 171
 - investment, incentives for 178–9
- Investment Canada Act 2009 343–4
- Ireland
 - competition policy developments 301–2
 - national champions, policy on 303–5
- Italy and Wam SpA v Commission* [2006] ECR II–64 390–92
- Jackson, T. 312–13
- Jefferson Parish Hosp. Dist. No.2 v Hyde* 466 US 2 (1984) 260–61
- judicial review
 - in complex cases 73–4
 - defective reasoning standard 73, 78
 - error of law standard 73
 - in EU
 - court role of 71, 73–6
 - under State Aid Action Plan 401–3
- Kauper, Tom 152
- Kroes, Neelie 171, 177, 375
- Kumho Tire Co v Carmichael* 118 S. Ct, 2339 (1998) 80–81
- Kuwait Petroleum v Commission* [2006] II–1475 416
- labour, mobility of 302
- Laffont, Jean-Jacques 138–40, 143–4, 297
- Lao, Marina 229–31
- Law on Popular Participation in proceedings and Popular Action, Law No. 83/95 (Portugal) 111–13
- Le Levant 001 v Commission* [2006] ECR II–267 390, 415
- Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. v PSKS, Inc.* 127 S Ct 2705 (2007) 49, 150, 155
- legal certainty
 - adverse influence on business decisions 200–201
 - as-efficient competitor test 163–4, 191, 208–10
 - and common law development 155–6
 - conduct-specific test 229–31
 - consumer welfare test 219–23
 - Elhauge test 216–18

- guidelines on solutions for 231–2
 - and incentive effect 372–5
 - and intent evidence 232–5
 - no economic sense test 190–91, 213–15, 219–20
 - and private enforcement 63–4
 - profit sacrifice test 211–14, 219–20
 - proportionality test 223–5
 - and rule of reason 169–70, 172–5, 204
- in Sherman Act 1890 section 2
 - debate over 199–204
 - intent evidence 234
 - solutions for 204–32
- Legal Framework for Competition (Portugal) 89, 92–102
 - appeals under 96–102
 - national competition authority's role and powers under 94–6
 - private actions under 93–4
- leniency programs, in US antitrust policy 55–6
- Lepage's case* 324 F.3d 141 166
- Lessig v Tidewater Oil Co* 327 F.2d 459 (1964) 244–6
- leveraging 181–3
 - abuse of dominant position 194–5, 240, 249–63
 - and secondary market 9, 166, 181, 240, 250–63
 - as unilateral refusal to deal 257–9
- limitation periods 64
- Lisbon Agenda 2000 (EU) 22
 - balancing intellectual property and competition interests 184–5
 - DG 2007 Annual Management Plan 174, 177–8
 - and reform of Article 82 169–73, 175–7
 - state aid, industrial policy on 294–5
- Lisbon Commercial Court
 - competition policy role 96–102
 - judicial review 102–6
 - reform suggestions 117
- MacDonald Commission (Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada 1985) 334–6, 344
- McKenzie, K. 348–9
- Malta, state aid policy in 379
- manifest error test 4, 73–6, 78, 399
- market distortion 18, 26
 - by national champions 303–5
 - obligations to state reasons and effect on trade conditions 389–95, 407
- market foreclosure effect
 - in EU law 9, 23, 68–9, 161, 163–4, 171–3, 193–4
 - in intellectual property protection 183–4, 186–7
 - in US law 9, 11, 166–8, 250–51, 253–6, 260
- market share dynamics
 - and economic analysis 128–34, 136–7
 - per se* rules 260–61
 - and pricing strategies 139–43
 - in telecommunications sector 139–43
 - in US electricity sector 128–34, 136–7
- Massachusetts v Microsoft Corp.* 373 F.3d 1199 (2004) 45
- Masterfoods v HB Ice Cream Ltd* [2000] ECR I-11369 66–9
- Matra v Commission* [1993] ECR I-3203 417
- Melamed, Douglas 225
- merger control
 - in air travel sector 306, 354
 - in Canada's telecommunications sector 355
 - economic analysis in 127–8
 - influence on economy/market 18–19
 - and national champions in France 293–4, 309–10
 - and overlapping regulatory authorities 134–6
 - 'two-thirds' rule 32
 - in US electricity sector 125–36
 - US enforcement policy 48
- MetroNet Services Corp v Qwest Corp* 383 F.3d 1124 (2004) 219
- Microsoft
 - difficulties facing 273–4
 - fading dominance of 271–4
 - monopolization by 271–6
 - positional advantage of 273

- Microsoft* cases 31, 287–9
- EU litigation
- cloning argument 282–4
 - compared with US case 253–7, 278–82, 286
 - competition restriction
 - mechanisms 281–2
 - and complex economic analysis 74–6
 - de facto* standard setting 181–3
 - defenses 197, 282–4
 - delays in 286–7
 - ineffective competitive structure 191
 - and intellectual property protection 285–6
 - interoperability problem 64, 74–5, 279–84, 286–7
 - leveraging 254–7
 - manifest error test 75–6
 - outcome of 64
 - policy issues raised by 287–9
 - principles of 254–5, 277–8
 - refusal to deal 74–6, 167
 - remedies under 286–7
 - technology tying/bundling 197, 254–6, 278
- rule of reason in 227–9, 261, 279–81
- US litigation 51
- compared with EU case 253–7, 278–82, 286
 - defenses 276
 - harms/justifications tests 226–9
 - leveraging 255, 257–9
 - outcome of 64
 - policy issues raised by 288–9
 - principles of 255, 274–6
 - refusal to deal 257–9
 - remedies under 276–7
 - technology tying/bundling 166, 253–4
- Miller–Tydings Act 1937 (US) 322
- modernization proposals 171–2
- monopolies *see also* national champions
- vs.* monopolization 269–70
- monopolization
- ambiguity of anti-competitive behavior 202
 - attempt to monopolize
 - assessment, difficulties with 201, 239–40
 - defining 238–40
 - and intellectual property 170–71
 - recognition as separate offense 240, 242–7
 - bundling, of technology 10, 166, 196–7, 227–8, 253–6
 - criteria for assessing 190–92, 269–71
 - differences between EU and US approaches 240–43, 248–50, 252, 263, 278–9
 - vs.* dominant position 238–42, 248–9
 - leveraging 249–50, 254–9
 - and fading dominance 269–71
 - and legal certainty 199–232
 - guidelines on assessing 231–2
 - and intent evidence 232–5
 - vs.* monopolies 269–70
 - multiple monopoly rents 269–70
 - refusal to deal 243
 - tests for
 - as-efficient competitor test 163–4, 191, 208–10
 - balance test 71, 219–20, 364–5
 - harms/justification tests 226–9
 - proportionality test 223–5, 387
 - conduct-specific test 229–31
 - consumer welfare test 219–23
 - court failure to establish 201–2
 - criticism of 218–21
 - Elhauge test 216–18
 - no economic sense test 190–91, 213–15, 219–20
 - profit sacrifice test 211–14, 219–20
 - proportionality test 223–5
- multinational companies, study of
 - policy influence on 313–18
- Muris, Timothy J. 210
- national champions
- in banking, in EU transition
 - countries 314–15
 - in Canada 351–7
 - conditions for success of 352–3
 - examples of 354–5
 - Chicago school views on 295
 - and cultural differences 312–13
 - definition 308
 - and domestic protectionism 303–6

- and economies of scale 295, 353–6
- efficiency
 - and foreign ownership 311–18
 - vs. smaller enterprises 295–7
- and EU competition policy 30–32, 294–5, 306, 308
- foreign ownership
 - and efficiency 311–13
 - and productivity 313–18
 - restrictions on 309–13
- in France 293–5, 309–10
- and industrial policy 294–8, 303–5
- and innovation 294, 296–7
- in Ireland 303–5
- and market distortion 303–5
- and positive spillovers 353–4
- and productivity 313–18
- and protecting legitimate interests 309–10
- and regulation, conflicts between 308–9
- national competition authorities
 - conflicts of EU policy with 170
 - importance of 17–18
 - independence of 30
 - margin of discretion 86, 98–100, 399
 - in Portugal, role and powers 19, 32–3, 91–5, 106, 108–9, 117–18
 - margin of discretion 86, 98–100
 - role of 18–19, 64, 375–81
 - powers and responsibilities 86–7, 108–9
 - in state aid 375–81
- national ownership *see* national champions
- necessity test, for state aid 402–8
- negative clearances 65
- Neo Val* (Case N 674/2006) 368–9, 398, 404–5
- no economic sense test 190–91, 213–15, 219
- Nungesser v Commission* [1982] ECR 2015 174–5
- OECD Working Party No.3 on law enforcement and cooperation 200
- Office of Fair Trading (UK)
 - on competition policy and productivity 301
- private enforcement, discussion
 - paper on 55, 60–61
 - on state aid policy 378
- Oscar Bronner GmbH & Co KG v Mediaprint Zeitungs-und-Zeitschriftenverlag GmbH & Co KG* [1998] ECR I-7791 243
- Oscar Bronner v Mediaprint Zeitungs-und Zeitschriftenverlag* [1998] ECR I-7817 167
- Pakes, Ariel 141
- Pate, Hew 149
- patents *see* intellectual property
- Paulis, Emil 192–3, 224
- Payment Services Directive 2007 (2007/64/EC) 31
- PeaceHealth* 502 F. 3d. 895 166
- per se* rules 50, 52, 172
 - in abuse of dominance cases 162
 - common law developments 155–6
 - and economic analysis 150–51
 - on horizontal price-fixing 49
 - of illegality, under Sherman Act 1890 204–6
 - of legality/safe harbors, under Sherman Act 1890 206–8
 - on market share and tying 260–61
 - on non-price vertical restraints 49
- Philip Morris v Commission* [1980] ECR 2671 401
- Philips CD-R Disk Patent Licensing investigation 183
- Plaumann & Co v Commission* [1963] ECR 95 417–18
- Porter, Michael 303–4
- Portugal, competition policy in
 - acção popular* (class/popular actions) 5, 111–13, 118
 - aplicação impositiva* (enforcement) 91
 - applicability of EU law 89–90, 92–3
 - Competition Authority Statutes 90, 95–6
 - contra-ordenações* (private procedures) 35–6
 - court role in 34–5, 89–90, 96–106, 108
 - inadequacies of 113–16
 - judicial review 100–102, 109

- on effectiveness of policy 103–5
- on inadequacy of policy 105–6
- Legal Framework for Competition 89, 92–102
- Lisbon Commercial Court, role of 96–102, 117
- national competition authority
 - powers 19, 32–3, 91–6, 106, 108–9, 117–18
 - margin of discretion 86, 98–100
- private enforcement actions 35–6, 111–13
- appeals procedures 96–102
- brought by private individuals 5, 92–6, 111–13
- burden of proof 115–16, 118
- common declaratory actions 107–10
- definition difficulties 88–92
- difficulties with 113–16
- effectiveness factors 107–10, 113
- follow-on actions 93
- interim preventative proceedings 104–5, 108
- reform suggestions 116–19
- remedies 100–102, 104–5, 107–10
- res judicata*, restrictions on 116, 118
- and third-party interests 94
- public enforcement actions 90–92
- rulings under 33–4
- Portugal v Commission* [2006] ECR I-7115 385–6
- Posner, Richard A. 151–3
- Powers, R. 347
- predation, in abuse of dominant position 164–5, 195–6
- predatory bidding/purchasing 150, 165
- predatory pricing 154, 196–7, 230
- and as-efficient competitor test 209–10
- conduct-specific test 229–31
- and legal certainty 207–12, 218
- and *per se* rules of legality/safe harbors 207–8
- and profit sacrifice test 211–12
- recoupment requirement 242
- productivity
 - and competition, links between 300–301
 - and corporate size, links between 295
 - of national champions 313–18
- profit sacrifice test 211–14, 219–20
- proof
 - burden of
 - in competition law, generally 6, 77, 163, 172, 229, 244–5
 - under EU law 61–2, 64, 77, 161–3, 172, 193
 - under Portuguese law 115–16, 118
 - under US law 46, 55–7, 205–6
 - causality 161–3, 168
 - difficulties in obtaining 46, 55–7, 115
- proportionality test 223–5, 387
- protectionism 286
 - avoidance of 271
 - and national champions 303–6
- In re Rambus, Inc.* [2006] 2 Trade Cas. (CCH) 75,364 180
- R&D
 - exemptions, in Canada 347–9, 357
 - incentives for, balancing with competition 178–9
 - and innovation by national champions 296–7
 - and national ownership 317–18
- R&D&I Framework (EU)
 - and incentive effect 366–9, 371–2, 406
 - and necessity test 406–7
 - and state aid 387, 397–9, 404, 406–8
- rebates, in abuse of dominant position 166, 194–6
- Reform Treaty of Lisbon 2000 *see* Lisbon Agenda
- refusal to deal
 - conduct-specific test 229–31
 - in EU *Microsoft* case 74–6, 167
 - leveraging as 257–9
 - need for legal certainty 199
- remedies
 - behavioral remedies 47
 - damages multipliers, in US antitrust cases 46, 50–51, 54, 69
 - under *Microsoft* litigation 276–7, 286–7

- under Portuguese competition policy
 - 100–102, 104–5, 107–10
 - structural remedies 46–7
- replacement effect 296
- resale prices 8, 44, 50, 154–6, 245–6, 322–3
- retail payment system (SEPA) 29, 31
- Rey, Patrick 138–40, 143–4
- Robinson–Patman Act 1936 (US) 252, 322
- Röller, L-H 401–2
- roman law, differences from common law 71
- Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada (MacDonald Commission) 1985 334–6, 344
- RTE v Commission (Magill)* [1995] ECR I-743 64–5, 186–7
- rule of reason 71
 - and consumer welfare test 219–23
 - and efficiency defense 172–5
 - and legal certainty 169–70, 172–5, 204
 - in *Microsoft* cases 227–9, 261, 279–81
 - US developments in 3, 49, 52–3
- safe harbors
 - and as-efficient competitor test 209
 - per se* rules under Sherman Act section 2 207–8
- Sakakibara, Mariko 303–4
- Salop, Steven 200, 210, 213, 215
 - consumer welfare test 221–3
- Schmitz-Gotha Fahrzeugwerke GmbH v Commission* [2006] ECR II-1139 416–17
- Schumpeter, Joseph
 - on creative destruction 264
 - on innovation and competition 296–7
- Scott v Commission* [2005] ECR I-8437 412–13
- separation of powers 72
- Shapiro, Carl 220–21
- Sherman Act 1890 (US) 322
 - legal certainty debate 199–232
 - intent evidence 234
 - solutions for 204–32
- section 1 (unreasonable restraint of trade) 41, 253–4
- section 2 (monopolization) 53, 148
 - ambiguity of anti-competitive behavior 202
 - attempt to monopolize 51–3, 240–41
 - compared with EU Article 82 204, 240–43, 248–50, 252, 263
 - court failure to establish clear tests of anti-competitive behavior 201–2
 - leveraging 250–54
 - per se* rules of illegality 204–6
 - per se* rules of legality/safe harbors 206–8
 - policy development, transparency of 203–4
 - principles of 41, 148, 241, 244, 262–3
- Single Euro Payments Area (SEPA) 29, 31
- Spain 12, 105
 - state aid policy 377–8
- Spectrum Sports, Inc. v McQuillan* 506 US 447 (1993) 201, 246–7, 251
- Standard Oil Co v United States* 221 US 1 (1911) 202
- state aid, in EU
 - Article 87 exclusions 385–6
 - bad decisions, impact of 29–30
 - balance test 71, 364–5, 397–402
 - necessity test 402–8
 - cost, shadow/opportunity 407
 - court margin of discretion 399–400
 - and *de minimis* rule 393–4, 400
 - Deggendorf* doctrine 394–5
 - development of policy 285–388
 - and distortion of trade/effect on trade decisions 389–95, 407
 - and economic analysis 20–21, 389–97
 - efficiency test 29–30, 386–7, 397
 - impact on competition 20–21, 29–30
 - and improved regulation principles 21
 - incentive effect test 365–75
 - court applications 367–9

- under General Block Exemption Regulation 366–7, 372–5, 405–6
 - under R&D&I Framework 366–9, 371–2, 406
 - substantive conditions for 369–71
 - and judicial review 401–3
 - and national champions 308
 - Lisbon Agenda on 294–5
 - national competition authorities, role in 375–81
 - necessity test 402–8
 - obligations to state reasons and jurisdictional control 395–7
 - proportionality test 387
 - in R&D&I Framework 387, 397–9, 404, 406–8
 - reform of 408–13 *see also* State Aid Action Plan
 - key problems 410–13
 - suggested solutions 413–20
 - third party rights 410–20
 - selective nature of 385–6
 - subsidy races 22, 366
- State Aid Action Plan 21, 29–30, 363, 375
 - and *de minimis* rule, for assessment 394, 400
 - and economic assessment, role of 387–8, 400–408
- EU courts guidance role on policy development 384–5, 408–9
- judicial review under 401–3
- national competition authorities, role of 375–80
- potential impact on EU courts 383–5
- principles of 382–3
- third party rights 410–20
- State Oil Co v Khan* 522 US 3 (1997) 150
- subsidy races 22, 366
- Swift & Co v United States* 196 US 375 (1905) 244
- Technische Glaswerke Ilmenau GmbH* [2006] ECR II–5131 413
- Technology Partnerships Canada (TPC) Program 348–9
- technology tying, in abuse of
 - dominance cases 166, 252, 254–7
 - leverage 259–63
- telecommunications sector 26
 - long-run/short-run competition models 139–41
 - mergers, in Canada 355
 - network analysis, model for 139–42
 - network economies, importance of 138
 - pricing strategies and market share dynamics 139–43
 - reform proposals 23
 - regulatory conflict with competition law 138–9
- tests, for anti-competitive behavior *see under* enforcement
- Tetra Pak II* [1990] ECR II–309 173–4, 187, 256
- Textilwerke Deggendorf* [1994] ECR I–833 394–5
- third parties
 - indirect purchaser actions, in US antitrust policy 42, 56–8
 - rights, under EU state aid rules 410–20
- Tirole, Jean 138–40, 143–4, 297
- transparency of 203–4
- Turner, Donald 52, 151
- TVMSL* case 368–9
- ‘two-thirds’ rule 32
- UFEX v Commission* [2000] ECR II–4055 395–7
- Unfair Commercial Practices Directive 2005 (2005/29/EC) 26
- United Kingdom
 - national ownership policy 304
 - and productivity, links between 301, 315–18
 - private enforcement of competition 55, 60–61
 - state aid policy review 378
- United States antitrust policy and law 322
 - in electricity sector
 - competition opportunities and incentives 127–34
 - mergers in, lessons learned from 125–6
 - sector background 126–8
 - enforcement
 - bias/distortion, risk of 79

- of cartels 48–51
- class actions 54–5
- common law process, advantages of 150–54
- court role 147–9
- damages multipliers 46, 50–51, 54, 69
- detection and proof, problems with 46, 55–7
- economic analysis, increasing role of 150–53
- enforcement agencies role 41–2
- finances 46, 50–51
- indirect purchaser actions 42, 56–8
- ‘inhospitality’ tradition of 52
- legal basis 41
- leniency programs 55–6
- of monopolization 51–3
- private enforcement actions 42–3
 - financing for 53–5
 - incentives for 39–40, 43, 50–51, 54
- remedies 46–7
- State actions 43–5
- free-trade agreement with Canada 334, 344
- general principles 147–9, 153–4, 321–3
- and industrial policy 320–28
 - conflicts between 324–9
 - criticisms of 322
 - definitions 321–4
 - development of 320–21, 327–9
 - exemptions from 325–6
 - State interference with 326–7
- legal certainty debate
 - intent evidence 234
 - solutions for 204–32
- market foreclosure effect 9, 11, 166–8, 250–51, 253–6, 260
- merger control 42, 166, 252–4, 322
 - in electricity sector 126–34
- modernization program 147–8, 199–200
- monopolization 53, 148
 - ambiguity of anti-competitive behavior 202
 - attempt to monopolize 51–3, 239–47
 - court failure to establish clear tests for 201–2
 - vs. dominant position 238–42, 248–50, 254–9
 - and EU law, compared 164–8, 204, 240–43, 248–50, 252, 263, 278–9
 - and fading dominance 269–71
 - lack of guidance 201–2
 - and legal certainty debate 199–232
 - leveraging 249–50, 254–9
 - vs. monopolies 269–70
 - per se* rules of illegality 204–6
 - per se* rules of legality/safe harbors 206–8
 - policy development, transparency of 203–4
 - principles of 41, 148–9, 241, 244, 262–3
 - unreasonable restraint of trade 41, 253–4
- United States v Falstaff Brewing* 410 US 526 (1973) 304
- United States v Griffith* 334 US 100 (1948) 250–51, 253
- United States v Grinnell Corp.* 384 US 563 (1966) 202
- United States v Schwinn* 388 US 365 (1967) 49
- unreasonable restraint of trade, in US 41, 253–4
- Van den Berg v Commission* [2003] ECR II-4653 66–9
- Verizon Communications Inc. v Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP* 540 US 398 167, 203, 213–14, 219–20, 251–2, 257–8
- Volvo v Veng* [1988] ECR I-6211 187
- Wanadoo case (France Télécom v Commission)* [2007] ECR II-107) 195–7
- Werden, Greg 215, 219, 222
- Weyerhaeuser Co v Ross-Simmons Hardwood Lumber Co* 127 S Ct 1069 (2007) 150, 165
- Williamson, Oliver 151
- Wood, Diane 72, 76

