

Public questionnaire for the 2019 Evaluation of the Research & Development and Specialisation Block Exemption Regulations

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

1

Introduction

Background and aim of the public questionnaire

Article 101(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ('the Treaty') prohibits agreements between undertakings that restrict competition unless they generate efficiencies in line with Article 101(3) of the Treaty. Agreements generate efficiencies in line with Article 101(3) of the Treaty if they contribute to improving the production or distribution of goods or services, or to promoting technical or economic progress, while allowing consumers a fair share of the resulting benefits; they only impose restrictions that are indispensable for the attainment of these objectives and do not eliminate competition in respect of a substantial part of the product in question. The prohibition contained in Article 101(1) of the Treaty covers, amongst others, agreements entered into between actual or potential competitors (so-called 'horizontal agreements').

Commission Regulations (EU) No 1217/2010 (Research & Development Block Exemption Regulation - 'R&D BER') and 1218/2010 (Specialisation Block Exemption Regulation - 'Specialisation BER'), together referred to as the 'Horizontal block exemption regulations' (or 'HBERs'), exempt from the prohibition contained in Article 101(1) of the Treaty those R&D and specialisation agreements for which it can be assumed with sufficient certainty that they satisfy the conditions of Article 101(3) of the Treaty. The Commission Guidelines on horizontal cooperation agreements ('HGL') provide binding guidance on the Commission for the interpretation of the HBERs and for the application of Article 101 of the Treaty to other horizontal agreements. The HBERs will expire on 31 December 2022.

This public questionnaire represents one of the methods of information gathering in the evaluation of the HBERs, together with the HGL, which was launched on 5 September 2019. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect views and evidence from the public and stakeholders on how the current rules work for them. The Commission will evaluate the current HBERs, together with the HGL, based on the following criteria:

- Effectiveness (Have the objectives been met?),
- Efficiency (Were the costs involved proportionate to the benefits?),
- Relevance (Do the objectives still match current needs or problems?),
- Coherence (Does the policy complement other actions or are there contradictions?), and
- EU added value (Did EU action provide clear added value?).

The collected information will provide part of the evidence base for determining whether the Commission should let the HBERs lapse, prolong their duration without changing them or prolong them in a revised form, together with the accompanying HGL.

The responses to this public consultation will be analysed and the summary of the main points and conclusions will be made public on the Commission's central public consultations page. **Please note that your replies will also become public as a whole, see below under Section 'Privacy and Confidentiality'.**

Nothing in this questionnaire may be interpreted as stating an official position of the Commission.

Submission of your contribution

You are invited to reply to this public consultation by answering the questionnaire online. To facilitate the analysis of your replies, we would kindly ask you to keep your answers concise and to the point. You may include documents and URLs for relevant online content in your replies.

While the questionnaire contains several questions of a more general nature, notably Section 4 and 5 also contain questions that are aimed at respondents with more specialised knowledge of the HBERs and HGL. We invite all respondents to provide answers to the questionnaire. In case a question does not apply to you or you do not know the answer, please choose the field 'Do not know' or 'Not applicable'.

For your information, you have the option of saving your questionnaire as a 'draft' and finalising your response later. In order to do this you have to click on 'Save as Draft' and save the new link that you will receive from the EUSurvey tool on your computer. Please note that without this new link you will not be able to access the draft again.

The questionnaire is available in English, French and German. You may however respond in any EU language.

In case of questions, you can contact us via the following functional mailbox: COMP-HBERS-REVIEW@ec.europa.eu.

In case of technical problem, please contact the Commission's [CENTRAL HELPDESK](#).

Duration of the consultation

The consultation on this questionnaire will be open for 14 weeks, from 6/11/2019 to 12/2/2020.

Privacy and confidentiality

*** 1.1 Publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

☒ **Anonymous**

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

☒ **Public**

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

Please note that your replies and any attachments you may submit will be published in their entirety even if you chose 'Anonymous'. Therefore, please remove from your contribution any information that you will not want to be published.

☒ 1.2 I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

2 About you

* 2.1 Language of my contribution

- ☐ Bulgarian
- ☐ Croatian
- ☐ Czech
- ☐ Danish
- ☐ Dutch
- ☒ English
- ☐ Estonian
- ☐ Finnish
- ☐ French
- ☐ Gaelic
- ☐ German
- ☐ Greek
- ☐ Hungarian
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Latvian
- ☐ Lithuanian
- ☐ Maltese
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Portuguese
- ☐ Romanian
- ☐ Slovak
- ☐ Slovenian
- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Swedish

* 2.2 First name

Yves

* 2.3 Surname

Botteman

* 2.4 Email (this won't be published)

* 2.5 I am giving my contribution as

- ☐ Academic/research institution
- ☐ Business association
- ☒ Company/business organisation
- ☐ Consumer organisation
- ☐ EU citizen
- ☐ Environmental organisation
- ☐ Non-EU citizen
- ☐ Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ☐ Public authority
- ☐ Trade union
- ☐ Other

2.6 Other - please specify

If you chose "Other", please specify whether you are contributing as lawyer/law firm, economic consultancy or something else:

* 2.7 Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Dentons Europe LLP

If available, please provide your ID number of the [EU Transparency Register](#). If your organisation is not registered, we invite you to register, although it is not compulsory to be registered to reply to this consultation.

2.8 Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

512856833272-88

* 2.10 Organisation size

- ☐ Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ☐ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ☐ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ☒ Large (250 or more)

* 2.11 The main activities of your organisation:

Text of 1 to 250 characters will be accepted

Law firm

* 2.12 Please describe the sectors where your organisation or your members are conducting business:

Text of 1 to 250 characters will be accepted

Legal services

* 2.13 The 2 digit NACE Rev.2 code(s) referring to the level of "division" that applies to your business (see part III, pages 61 – 90 of Eurostat's statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community, [available here](#)):

69.10

* 2.14 The product(s) and/or service(s) provided by your company/business organisation:

Legal services

* 2.15 Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Martinique | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia | <input type="radio"/> Fiji | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia |

<input type="radio"/> Austria	<input type="radio"/> Finland	<input type="radio"/> Mauritius	<input type="radio"/> Slovenia
<input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan	<input type="radio"/> France	<input type="radio"/> Mayotte	<input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands
<input type="radio"/> Bahamas	<input type="radio"/> French Guiana	<input type="radio"/> Mexico	<input type="radio"/> Somalia
<input type="radio"/> Bahrain	<input type="radio"/> French Polynesia	<input type="radio"/> Micronesia	<input type="radio"/> South Africa
<input type="radio"/> Bangladesh	<input type="radio"/> French Southern and Antarctic Lands	<input type="radio"/> Moldova	<input type="radio"/> South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
<input type="radio"/> Barbados	<input type="radio"/> Gabon	<input type="radio"/> Monaco	<input type="radio"/> South Korea
<input type="radio"/> Belarus	<input type="radio"/> Georgia	<input type="radio"/> Mongolia	<input type="radio"/> South Sudan
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Belgium	<input type="radio"/> Germany	<input type="radio"/> Montenegro	<input type="radio"/> Spain
<input type="radio"/> Belize	<input type="radio"/> Ghana	<input type="radio"/> Montserrat	<input type="radio"/> Sri Lanka
<input type="radio"/> Benin	<input type="radio"/> Gibraltar	<input type="radio"/> Morocco	<input type="radio"/> Sudan
<input type="radio"/> Bermuda	<input type="radio"/> Greece	<input type="radio"/> Mozambique	<input type="radio"/> Suriname
<input type="radio"/> Bhutan	<input type="radio"/> Greenland	<input type="radio"/> Myanmar /Burma	<input type="radio"/> Svalbard and Jan Mayen
<input type="radio"/> Bolivia	<input type="radio"/> Grenada	<input type="radio"/> Namibia	<input type="radio"/> Sweden
<input type="radio"/> Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	<input type="radio"/> Guadeloupe	<input type="radio"/> Nauru	<input type="radio"/> Switzerland
<input type="radio"/> Bosnia and Herzegovina	<input type="radio"/> Guam	<input type="radio"/> Nepal	<input type="radio"/> Syria
<input type="radio"/> Botswana	<input type="radio"/> Guatemala	<input type="radio"/> Netherlands	<input type="radio"/> Taiwan
<input type="radio"/> Bouvet Island	<input type="radio"/> Guernsey	<input type="radio"/> New Caledonia	<input type="radio"/> Tajikistan
<input type="radio"/> Brazil	<input type="radio"/> Guinea	<input type="radio"/> New Zealand	<input type="radio"/> Tanzania
<input type="radio"/> British Indian Ocean Territory	<input type="radio"/> Guinea-Bissau	<input type="radio"/> Nicaragua	<input type="radio"/> Thailand
<input type="radio"/> British Virgin Islands	<input type="radio"/> Guyana	<input type="radio"/> Niger	<input type="radio"/> The Gambia
<input type="radio"/> Brunei	<input type="radio"/> Haiti	<input type="radio"/> Nigeria	<input type="radio"/> Timor-Leste
<input type="radio"/> Bulgaria	<input type="radio"/> Heard Island and McDonald Islands	<input type="radio"/> Niue	<input type="radio"/> Togo
<input type="radio"/> Burkina Faso	<input type="radio"/> Honduras	<input type="radio"/> Norfolk Island	<input type="radio"/> Tokelau
<input type="radio"/> Burundi	<input type="radio"/> Hong Kong	<input type="radio"/> Northern Mariana Islands	<input type="radio"/> Tonga
<input type="radio"/> Cambodia	<input type="radio"/> Hungary	<input type="radio"/> North Korea	<input type="radio"/> Trinidad and Tobago
<input type="radio"/> Cameroon	<input type="radio"/> Iceland	<input type="radio"/> North Macedonia	<input type="radio"/> Tunisia
<input type="radio"/> Canada	<input type="radio"/> India	<input type="radio"/> Norway	<input type="radio"/> Turkey
<input type="radio"/> Cape Verde	<input type="radio"/> Indonesia	<input type="radio"/> Oman	<input type="radio"/> Turkmenistan
<input type="radio"/> Cayman Islands	<input type="radio"/> Iran	<input type="radio"/> Pakistan	<input type="radio"/> Turks and Caicos Islands
<input type="radio"/> Central African Republic	<input type="radio"/> Iraq	<input type="radio"/> Palau	<input type="radio"/> Tuvalu

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Chad | <input type="radio"/> Ireland | <input type="radio"/> Palestine | <input type="radio"/> Uganda |
| <input type="radio"/> Chile | <input type="radio"/> Isle of Man | <input type="radio"/> Panama | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine |
| <input type="radio"/> China | <input type="radio"/> Israel | <input type="radio"/> Papua New Guinea | <input type="radio"/> United Arab Emirates |
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island | <input type="radio"/> Italy | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica | <input type="radio"/> Peru | <input type="radio"/> United States |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands | <input type="radio"/> Japan | <input type="radio"/> Philippines | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia | <input type="radio"/> Jersey | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros | <input type="radio"/> Jordan | <input type="radio"/> Poland | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan | <input type="radio"/> Portugal | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands | <input type="radio"/> Kenya | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati | <input type="radio"/> Qatar | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo | <input type="radio"/> Réunion | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait | <input type="radio"/> Romania | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Russia | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao | <input type="radio"/> Laos | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Latvia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy | <input type="radio"/> Yemen |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zambia |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark | <input type="radio"/> Liberia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia | |

* 2.16 Mark the countries/geographic areas where your main activities are located:

at least 1 choice(s)

Multiple choice is possible

- ☐ Austria
- ☒ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia
- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czech Republic
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☐ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece

- ☐ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☐ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Slovak Republic
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐ Sweden
- ☐ United Kingdom
- ☐ Others in Europe
- ☐ The Americas
- ☐ Asia
- ☐ Africa
- ☐ Australia

* 2.17 Please specify whether your company/business organisation has been the addressee of a Commission decision under Article 7 or Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Do not know

3 General Questions on the Horizontal Block Exemption Regulations and the Guidelines on horizontal cooperation agreements

* 3.1 Has your company/business organisation been involved in horizontal cooperation agreements since the current HBERs and the HGL were introduced in 2010?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know
- ☐ Not applicable

* 3.2 Please specify the type of your horizontal cooperation agreements

at least 1 choice(s)

Multiple answers possible

- ☒ R&D agreements in the sense of art.1(1)(a) of the R&D BER and Section 3 of the HGL
- ☒ Specialisation agreements in the sense of art. 1(1)(a) of the Specialisation BER and Section 4 of the HGL

- ☒ Agreements involving information exchange in the sense of Section 2 of the HGL
- ☒ Purchasing agreements in the sense of Section 5 of the HGL
- ☒ Commercialisation agreements in the sense of Section 6 of the HGL
- ☒ Standardisation agreements in the sense of Section 7 of the HGL
- ☐ Other horizontal cooperation agreements

* 3.4 Has your company/business organisation relied upon (an) exemption /exemptions under the R&D BER or Specialisation BER, or both?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 3.5 If Yes, please specify

at most 3 choice(s)

Optional question, multiple answers possible

- ☐ Exemption(s) under R&D BER
- ☐ Exemption(s) under Specialisation BER
- ☒ Exemption(s) under both

* 3.6 How often do you consult the **R&D BER** for guidance on a horizontal cooperation agreement?

- ☒ Frequently (several times per year)
- ☐ Occasionally (once or twice per year)
- ☐ Never

* 3.7 How often do you consult the **Specialisation BER** for guidance on a horizontal cooperation agreement?

- ☐ Frequently (several times per year)
- ☒ Occasionally (once or twice per year)
- ☐ Never

* 3.8 How often do you consult the **HGL** for guidance on a horizontal cooperation agreement?

- ☒ Frequently (several times per year)
- ☐ Occasionally (once or twice per year)
- ☐ Never

4 Effectiveness (Have the objectives of the current HBERs and HGL been met?)

In this section, we would like to have your opinion on the extent to which the HBERs and the HGL have met their objectives.

The **purpose of the EU competition rules** is to ensure that competition is not distorted to the detriment of the public interest, individual undertakings and consumers. In line with this objective, the Commission's policy is to leave companies maximum flexibility when concluding horizontal co-operation agreements in

order to increase the competitiveness of the European economy while at the same time promoting competition for the benefit of European businesses and consumers.

The **purpose of the HBERs and the HGL** is to make it easier for undertakings to cooperate in ways which are economically desirable and without adverse effect from the point of view of competition policy. The specific objectives of the HBERs and HGL are to ensure effective protection of competition and providing adequate legal certainty for undertakings.

* 4.1 In your view, do you perceive that the HBERs and the HGL have contributed to promoting competition in the EU?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ Yes, but they have contributed only to a certain extent or only in specific sectors
- ☐ They were neutral
- ☐ No, they have negatively affected competition in the EU
- ☐ Don't know

* 4.2 Please explain your reply, distinguishing between sectors where relevant: (1500 characters max.)

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

These instruments provide useful frameworks for assessing (a) collaboration agreements between competitors as well as (b) various trade association activities and initiatives. In that sense, appropriately used and understood, they have proven to enable rather than inhibiting legitimate cooperation between competing undertakings. This said, as discussed below, the digitisation of the economy and the environmental challenges that we face, including in relation to climate change and sustainable production, will require more cooperation and coordination amongst competitors, either within or outside trade associations. In that context, self-assessment alone may not be sufficient to enable innovation and new production models. The EC and NCAs should consider providing guidance in the form of comfort letters when parties so require (NB: the French Competition Authority's Stihl vertical case seemingly provides a telling example of a gap in that respect).

Legal certainty provided by the HBERs and the HGL

* 4.3 In your view, have the R&D BER and Section 3 of the HGL on research and development agreements provided sufficient legal certainty on R&D agreements companies can conclude without the risk of infringing competition law?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.4 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

The R&D BER and guidelines provide a certain degree of legal certainty to undertakings when they engage in cooperation/collaboration.

* 4.5 In your view, does the R&D BER increase legal certainty compared with a situation where the R&D BER would not exist but only the HGL applied?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.6 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

On balance, having a BER in place is probably better for legal certainty than without. While the guidelines cover much of the same ground, the BER is nonetheless a solid framework for self-assessment.

* 4.7 In your view, have the Specialisation BER and Section 4 of the HGL on production agreements provided sufficient legal certainty on production /specialisation agreements companies can conclude without the risk of infringing competition law?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.8 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

The Specialisation BER and guidelines provide a certain degree of legal certainty to undertakings when they engage in cooperation/collaboration.

* 4.9 In your view, does the Specialisation BER increase legal certainty compared with a situation where the Specialisation BER would not exist but only the HGL applied?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.10 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

On balance, having a BER in place is probably better for legal certainty than without. While the guidelines cover much of the same ground, the BER is nonetheless a solid framework for self-assessment.

In this section we would like to have your opinion on the extent to which the HGL have provided sufficient legal certainty on horizontal cooperation agreements companies can undertake without the risk of infringing competition law. Please specify your answer according to the different types of horizontal agreements.

* 4.11 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on agreements involving **information exchange** in the sense of Section 2 of the HGL?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.12 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Overall, the section on information exchange has proven to be a very useful guiding instrument. This said, experience has shown that certain trade associations/industries ultimately opted for a strict(er) application when engaging in surveys and industry statistics, which, in certain cases, limited the relevance and usefulness of their market studies. This is because members often sought the level of aggregation that provided them with zero-risk antitrust scrutiny. For example, without necessarily conducting a case-by-case assessment, certain associations mandated that at least 5 reporting members participate in a survey in order to secure full anonymity and the impossibility to reverse engineer the aggregated data-set. The absence of a safe harbor has also often been seen as discouraging what would otherwise be legitimate information exchange.

The rise of the digitisation and the IoT will require more cooperation and exchange of data, e.g. big data, among competing and non-competing firms. In fact, the EC recognizes that data pooling and data sharing may well prove to be useful instruments to remedy market foreclosure and market power entrenchment. In this vein, the EC should reflect -- taking perhaps stock of its past approach in relation to the insurance markets -- on setting out guidance on data pooling and exchange between competing firms.

* 4.13 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on **purchasing agreements** in the sense of Section 5 of the HGL?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.14 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

The only comment would relate to the market share threshold of 15%, which may be deemed too low.

* 4.15 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on **commercialisation agreements** in the sense of Section 6 of the HGL

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.16 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

While the HGL provide useful guidance for self-assessment, the current framework could benefit from more clarity and flexibility, specifically in the context of joint bidding in consortia. In particular, the objective necessity required by the HGL as a pre-condition for entering into a consortia with competing undertakings might find application in a narrow set of circumstances. As a result, parties are often left without the ability to articulate and advance plausible justifications (including capacity constraints) to validate consortia involving competing undertakings, which are otherwise pro-competitive and efficiency enhancing.

* 4.17 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on **standardisation agreements** in the sense of Section 7 of the HGL

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.18 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

The guidance has initially been welcome to facilitate and frame discussions around standards and standard terms. However, in a number of instances, industry associations were more active and interested in devising best business practices and recommendations. Those initiatives were customarily bench-marked against the principles laid down in the standardisation section. In this regard, associations were invariably reminded on the necessity to make such recommendations non binding and to ensure that they engage discussions on such recommendations in a very inclusive way (which may be counterproductive and time-consuming).

Today, we see a growing number of industries faced with the prospect of aggressive legislative and regulatory interventions in Europe and beyond, e.g. in the areas of environment protection and human health. In this context, industries are increasingly incentivised or put under pressure to act quickly, decisively and proactively to address concerns from civil society (e.g. setting and achieving carbon neutrality or sustainability goals) and be accountable and transparent (e.g. in showing in concrete terms what they have done to achieve such goals). However, such initiatives would be far more effective and efficient if they went well beyond mere exhortations/recommendations or best practices. Non-binding instruments reduce the level of industry engagement and commitment, open the door to free-riding and make the industry messages less audible and credible.

* 4.19 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on **other types of horizontal cooperation agreements** that are currently not specifically addressed in the HGL (for example sustainability agreements)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.20 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

By way of a continuation of the discussion under 4.18 above, the EC should encourage, rather than roadblock, trade associations or industry-wide initiatives that impose mandatory measures that provide a tangible and credible response to clearly identified environment or human health challenges, even in the absence of regulatory/legislative intervention (e.g. REACH); or when there are legal instruments in place,

such

initiatives could well encourage industry to go further and beyond the legal requirements in virtuous cycle. Of course, such cooperation should be consumer-welfare enhancing and, in particular, the focus should be on ensuring that the innovation process is not unduly restricted.

* 4.21 In your view, are there other types of horizontal cooperation agreements outside those identified in the current HGL that should have been specifically addressed in order to increase legal certainty?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

Identification of pro-competitive horizontal agreements

The R&D BER and the Specialisation BER set out a number of conditions that R&D and specialisation agreements need to meet in order to benefit from the block exemption. The HGL provide additional guidance on how to interpret these conditions. These conditions have been defined with the purpose to give exemption only to those agreements for which it can be assumed with sufficient certainty that they generate efficiencies that outweigh, in line with Article 101(3) of the Treaty, the harm caused by the restriction of competition.

Based on your experience, have the following provisions in the **R&D BER** allowed to correctly identify the horizontal cooperation agreements that are compliant with Article 101 of the Treaty?

* 4.23 The list of definitions that apply for R&D agreements that can benefit from exemption in Article 1 of the R&D BER

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.25 The conditions for exemption listed in Article 3 of the R&D BER, regarding, for instance, access to the final results of the R&D, access to pre-existing know-how and joint exploitation.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.27 The absence of a market share threshold for non-competing undertakings, the market share threshold of 25% for competing undertakings and the application thereof provided for in Articles 4 and 7 of the R&D BER

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.29 The limits regarding the duration of the exemption provided for in Article 4

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.31 The list identified in Article 5 of the R&D BER which make the exemption not available for agreements that have as their object certain restrictions or limitations ('hardcore restrictions')

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.33 The list of obligations included in agreements to which the exemption does not apply ('excluded restrictions'), identified in Article 6 of the R&D BER

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

Based on your experience, have the following provisions in the **Specialisation BER** allowed to correctly identify the horizontal cooperation agreements that are compliant with Article 101 of the Treaty?

* 4.35 The definitions that apply for the purposes of the Specialisation BER, in Article 1

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.37 The explanations on the type of specialisation agreements to which the exemption applies, provided by Article 2 of the Specialisation BER

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.39 The market share threshold of 20% and its application, provided for in Articles 3 and 5 of the Specialisation BER

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.41 The list identified in Article 4 of the Specialisation BER which make the exemption not available for agreements that have as their object price fixing, certain limitations of output or sales or market or customer allocation ('hardcore restrictions')

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

4.43 Based on your experience, are there other elements, besides those listed in the previous questions that should have been clarified, added, or removed to improve the guidance given by the BERs?

Text of 1 to 3000 characters will be accepted

As a general matter, in connection to all the questions 4.23 to 4.42, the framework set forth by the BERs and guidelines provides useful and valuable guidance. However, the safe harbors set forth in the BERs are too narrowly defined -- most notably in terms of market share thresholds, and, hence, self-assessment will in many situations not so much be about whether the contemplated collaboration is safe-harbored but rather whether it is likely that it meets the conditions of Article 101(3) TFEU in view of the goals pursued and the anticipated efficiencies and benefits for consumers. In sum, the approach is probably overly strict and conservative.

* 4.44 Based on your experience, are there other types of horizontal cooperation agreements outside those identified in the R&D and Specialisation BERs which would satisfy the conditions of Article 101(3) of the Treaty?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 4.46 Based on your experience, have the BERs and the HGL had any impacts that were not expected or not intended?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.47 If Yes, please explain your answer

Text of 1 to 3000 characters will be accepted

The guidelines may have had the effect of curbing cooperation that was otherwise non-problematic. For example, in relation to industry statistics and market studies, the rules on information exchange caused certain industries to take a more conservative approach beyond what would have been necessary under the circumstances.

Similarly, in relation to industry initiatives intended to mandate virtuous orientations (e.g. greener, cleaner production processes, or phasing out environmentally harmful products or processes), antitrust has often been a cause or a trigger for delay or inhibition in achieving ambitious goals.

Finally, another example may be consortia where the guidelines may have had the impact of inhibiting or delaying collaboration.

5 Efficiency (were the costs involved proportionate to the benefits?)

In this section, we would like to have your view concerning the efficiency of the HBERs and the HGL. In your view, do you consider that the costs (for example, legal fees, delays in implementation) of analysing the conditions and applying these instruments is proportionate to the benefits (for example, faster self assessment) of having the rules in place?

Costs

* 5.1 Please describe the different types of costs of applying the current R&D and Specialisation BERs; and the HGL

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

N/A

5.2 Please explain whether you can express the above costs in money terms

Text of 1 to 1000 characters will be accepted

N/A

5.3 Please provide an estimate of your quantifiable costs both in terms of value (in EUR) and as a percentage of your annual turnover (or, in the case of a business association, of the annual turnover of the members you are representing)

Text of 1 to 500 characters will be accepted

N/A

5.4 Please explain how you calculate these costs

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

N/A

- * 5.5 In your view, how have the costs generated by the application of the R&D or the Specialisation BER or the HGL evolved **compared with the previous legislative framework** (Reg. 2659/2000 on R&D, Reg. 2658/2000 on Specialisation agreements and the accompanying horizontal guidelines)?

- ☐ Costs increased
- ☐ Costs decreased
- ☒ Do not know

In your view, would the costs of ensuring compliance of your horizontal cooperation agreements (or the agreements of your members) with Article 101 of the Treaty would be different **if the current HBERs were not in place but only the HGL applied?**

- * 5.8 Were the **R&D BER** not in place, the cost of ensuring compliance

- ☐ Would increase
- ☐

- Would decrease
- ☒ Do not know

5.11 Were the **Specialisation BER** not in place, the cost of ensuring compliance

- ☐ Would increase
- ☐ Would decrease
- ☒ Do not know

Benefits

* 5.14 Please describe the benefits, if any, of having the R&D and Specialisation BERs; and the HGL

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

The main benefits are legal certainty and predictability. However, as outlined above, the current regime is too narrow and often cause undertakings to have to conduct full-fledged self-assessment prior to pursuing their purported collaboration.

Benefits vs. costs

In your view, does the application of the R&D and Specialisation BERs and the HGL generate costs that are proportionate to the benefits they bring (or, in the case of a business association, the benefits for the members you are representing)?

* 5.15 Regarding the **R&D BER**

- ☐ Costs are proportionate to benefits
- ☐ Costs are not proportionate to benefits
- ☒ Do not know

* 5.17 Regarding the **Specialisation BER**

- ☐ Costs are proportionate to benefits
- ☐ Costs are not proportionate to benefits
- ☒ Do not know

* 5.19 Regarding the **HGL**

- ☐ Costs are proportionate to benefits
- ☐ Costs are not proportionate to benefits
- ☒ Do not know

6 Relevance (do the objectives still match the needs or problems?)

In this section, we would like to understand if the objectives of the HBERs and the HGL are still up-to-date considering the developments that have taken place since their publication.

6.1 Please identify major trends and developments (for example legal, economic, political) that, based on your experience, have affected the application of the BERs and HGL. Please provide a short explanation with concrete examples in case you consider that (parts of) the HBERs or HGL do not sufficiently allow to address them

1000 characters max. for each row

	Major trends/changes	Articles of the HBERs and/or recitals of the HGL	Short explanation/concrete examples
1	Climate change and sustainable economy	Information exchange	Information exchange should be facilitated to enable industries to be responsive, transparent and accountable vis-à-vis civil society and governments in meeting their climate changes and sustainability goals. Industry associations should benefit from more safe harbors to showcase concrete industry actions towards achieving those goals.
2	Climate change and sustainable economy	Standardisation / R&D	Industry should be encouraged to adopt standards /binding recommendations to innovate and proactively develop, produce and supply sustainable and healthy goods and phase-out less energy efficient or less sustainable products or processes. Such initiatives should be framed in such a way that they spur innovative solutions through accelerated R&D partnerships, which may include major players in the industry.
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			

Do you think that it is still relevant to have the current HBERs and HGL in light of major trends or developments listed above?

* 6.2 The R&D BER and Section 3 of the HGL are

- ☒ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☐ Do not know

* 6.3 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

In the context of R&D, it would still be highly relevant to have a framework that encourage innovation to meet the climate change and environmental challenges that Europe is facing. Europe needs competition rules that spur rather than discourage innovation and needs to ensure that R&D is conducted in the EU. R&D is very costly, risky, difficult and subject to failures. In order to bring new solutions to curb carbon emissions and protect the environment and meet the goals set forth in the Green Deal, the EC should ensure that competition rules promote industry-wide collaboration, particularly if the EU is keen on being the pioneer and hit new grounds globally.

* 6.4 The Specialisation BER and Section 4 of the HGL are

- ☒ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☐ Do not know

* 6.5 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

In view of today's challenges, combining production assets to generate efficiencies, including reducing our carbon footprint should be encouraged and the BER and guidelines can make a positive contribution towards achieving a sustainable economy for future generations if they are better calibrated and more flexible.

* 6.6 Section 2 of the HGL on agreements involving information exchange is

- ☒ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☐ Do not know

* 6.7 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Those rules have proven to be very useful to date and those rules, subject to relevant adaptations, will be necessary tomorrow to foster more dialogue (within the industry) but also allowing the industry to showcase and demonstrate to civil society and governments how it tackles and solves the environmental and climate crises.

* 6.8 Section 5 of the HGL on purchasing agreements is

- ☒ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☐ Do not know

* 6.9 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Joint purchasing can be efficiency enhancing in a number of ways and should continue to be encouraged through the maintenance of relevant guiding principles in the HGL.

* 6.10 Section 6 of the HGL on commercialisation agreements is

- ☒ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☐ Do not know

* 6.11 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Same as 6.9 above

* 6.12 Section 7 of the HGL on standardisation agreements is

- ☒ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☐ Do not know

* 6.13 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

For the reasons explained above.

7 Coherence (Does the policy complement other actions or are there contradictions?)

- * 7.1 In your view, are the HBERs and the HGL coherent with other instruments and /or case law that provide(s) guidance on the interpretation of Article 101 of the Treaty (e.g., other Block Exemption Regulations, the Vertical Guidelines and the Article 101(3) Guidelines)?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 7.2 Please explain

Text of 1 to 3000 characters will be accepted

Broadly speaking, the two BERs and HGL instruments are complementary and do not contradict each other nor do they seem to conflict with other antitrust policy instruments.

* 7.3 In your view, are the HBERs and the HGL coherent with other existing or upcoming legislation or policies at EU or national level?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 7.4 Please explain

Text of 1 to 3000 characters will be accepted

But it will be important to rethink them in view of the Green Deal challenges outlined above.

8 EU added value (Did EU action provide clear added value?)

In this section, we would like to understand if the HBERs and the HGL have had added value. In the absence of the HBERs and the HGL, undertakings would have had to self-assess their horizontal cooperation agreement with the help of the remaining legal framework. This would include for instance the case law of the EU and national courts, the Article 101(3) Guidelines, the enforcement practice of the Commission and national competition authorities, as well as other guidance at EU and national level.

Please indicate whether, in your view, the HBERs and the HGL have had added value in the assessment of the compatibility of horizontal cooperation agreements with Article 101 of the Treaty

* 8.1 Has the R&D BER had added value in the assessment of the compatibility of horizontal cooperation agreements with Article 101 of the Treaty?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 8.2 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

There has been clear added value although the EC and NCAs should focus their attention on developing a consistent case-law and approach in using those instruments. Industry would be benefited by a consistent and coherent application of those instruments to ensure legal certainty and consistent application of EU law across the EU.

* 8.3 Has the Specialisation BER had added value in the assessment of the compatibility of horizontal cooperation agreements with Article 101 of the Treaty?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No
☐ Do not know

* 8.4 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

See 8.2

* 8.5 Have the HGL had added value in the assessment of the compatibility of horizontal cooperation agreements with Article 101 of the Treaty?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No
☐ Do not know

* 8.6 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Although ad hoc guidance through comfort letters should be considered.

9 Specific questions

Final comments and document upload

9.1 Is there anything else with regard to the R&D and Specialisation BERs and the HGL that you would like to add?

Text of 1 to 3000 characters will be accepted

Please refer to the attached letter under Section 9.2 below.

9.2 You may upload a file that further explains your position in more detail or further details the answers you have given

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

3f9c00df-604c-4eb7-a530-099b05545018

/Reply_of_Dentons_to_Horizontal_Consultation_by_DG_COMP_12_Feb_2020.pdf

* 9.3 Please indicate whether the Commission services may contact you for further details on the information submitted, if required

☒ Yes

☐ No

Contact

COMP-HBERS-REVIEW@ec.europa.eu