

## 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](mailto: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

Stephanie

\* 2.3 Surname

Pautke

\* 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*

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.

\* 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*

Competition Law

**\*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                                  |

- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
  
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
  
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
  
- Cambodia
  
- Cameroon
  
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
  
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
  
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
  
- Colombia
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
  
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
  
- Guam
  
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
  
- Guyana
  
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
  
- Hungary
  
- Iceland
  
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
  
- Iraq
  
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
  
- Italy
  
- Jamaica
- Japan
  
- Jersey
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
  
- Nepal
  
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
  
- Niger
  
- Nigeria
- Niue
  
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
  
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
  
- Palau
  
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
  
- Peru
- Philippines
  
- Pitcairn Islands
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
  
- Syria
  
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
  
- The Gambia
  
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
  
- Tokelau
- Tonga
  
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
  
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
  
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay

- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

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

---

\* 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*

The concept of a BER for certain types of agreements has significant value to companies and fosters competition as it provides (i) increased legal certainty compared to a situation of a direct application of Art. 101 (3) TFEU and (ii) ensures the homogenous application of the exemption requirements of Art. 101 (3) TFEU throughout Europe. This is beneficial to competition as there is a regular review and re-assessment of the effectiveness and the appropriateness of the given framework in a changing market environment. For that the European Commission can take into account many resources, such as enforcement practices, including those on the national level, sector inquiries and studies. All this contributes to ensure that the framework remains fit to address restraints that would otherwise distort effective competition and exempts others that have no adverse effects if within the scope of a BER.

#### ***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 brings about significant advantage for companies entering into such agreements as it enhances legal certainty. A company does not have to demonstrate on an individual basis that each of the exemption criteria of Article 101(3) TFEU is met for the respective agreement. It only needs to show that the application requirements of the relevant R&D BER are satisfied. BERs are directly applicable in EU Member States and prevent that differing enforcement activities of national competition authorities water down essential common principles and create uncertainty. This applies in particular for restrictive agreements that are rarely dealt with by national enforcers, let alone are subject to fining decisions or other publicly available precedents. R&D agreements are almost exclusively drafted, applied and reviewed following a self-assessment and, if the need arises, disputed in arbitration. Still, the enforceability of such contracts inter partes is of utmost relevance for the respective companies. Uncertainties as to the validity of crucial contract provisions, such as in particular limitations on the access of results, might well lead to giving up the idea of entering into such pro-competitive agreements in the first place

\* 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*

The direct application of Art. 101 (3) TFEU can, even with accompanying guidelines such as the HGL, not replace the certainty provided by the R&D BER. Absent the R&D BER, any self assessment by companies as to the legality of an R&D agreement is subject to deviating national enforcement standards that could ultimately only be aligned by the European Court of Justice. Given the lack of case law for this type of agreements over the past decade, it is not likely that reliable precedents evolve in the future. Experience rather suggests that, in light of the non binding nature on other institutions than the Commission, the HGL may not have the desired unifying effect on national enforcement practices for provisions that are not also reflected in the wording of a Regulation (see e.g the debate about online platform bans that are mentioned in the VGL but not in the VBER). Taking into account the supra-national importance of R&D agreements and their key role in fostering innovation, there is a particular risk that the loss of a common Regulation, which is binding on national level, will quite simply lead to a different set of enforcement standards in Europe and a chilling effect on competition.

\* 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

\* 4.9 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*

See general reasons provided under 4.6 above

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

\* 4.13 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

\* 4.15 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

\* 4.17 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

\* 4.19 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

\*

4.21 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

\* 4.24 If No, please explain what aspect of this provision fails to correctly identify R&D agreements that are compliant with Article 101 of the Treaty

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Please see detailed reasons provided under 9.2 below

\* 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

\* 4.26 If No, please explain what aspect of these conditions fails to correctly identify R&D agreements that are compliant with Article 101 of the Treaty

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Please see detailed reasons provided under 9 below

\* 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

\* 4.30 If No, please explain what aspect of these conditions fails to correctly identify R&D agreements that are compliant with Article 101 of the Treaty

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Please see detailed reasons provided under 9.2 below

\* 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

\* 4.32 If No, please explain what aspect of these conditions fails to correctly identify R&D agreements that are compliant with Article 101 of the Treaty

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Please see detailed reasons provided under 9.2 below

\* 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

\*

4.34 If No, please explain what aspect of these conditions fails to correctly identify R&D agreements that are compliant with Article 101 of the Treaty

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Please see detailed reasons provided under 9.2 below

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*

Please see detailed reasons provided under 9.2 below

\* 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*

Please see detailed reasons provided under 9.2 below.

## 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

\* 5.9 Please explain your reply

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

In our view, the costs for the legal assessments of such agreements would increase

5.10 Please provide an estimate of the possible change in costs and explain your estimation

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Not possible

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

- Would increase
- Would decrease
- Do not know

\* 5.12 Please explain your reply

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

In our view, the costs for the legal assessments of such agreements would increase

5.13 Please provide an estimate of the possible change in costs and explain your estimation

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Not possible

***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 concept of a BER for certain types of horizontal agreements as well as accompanying HGL have significant value to companies and should not be abandoned: both provide (i) increased legal certainty compared to a situation of a direct application of Art. 101 (3) TFEU and (ii) foster the homogenous application of the exemption requirements of Art. 101 (3) TFEU throughout Europe. This is beneficial for competition and is an effective way for companies to ensure legal certainty of their agreement at a reasonable cost level.

***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

\* 5.16 Please explain your reply

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Legal costs to ensure compliant contracts absent the availability of a BER would be higher

\* 5.17 Regarding the **Specialisation BER**

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

\* 5.18 Please explain your reply

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Legal costs to ensure compliant contracts absent the availability of a BER would be higher

\* 5.19 Regarding the **HGL**

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

\* 5.20 Please explain your reply

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Legal costs to ensure compliant behaviour absent the availability of HGL would be higher

## 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	Global agreements	Art. 3 R&D BER	The concept of Art. 3 R&D BER is counter-intuitive to paid-for research agreements and typically not required for R&D agreements between non-competitors without market power in order to prevent negative effects on competition. Global R&D agreements drafted under a non-EU jurisdiction almost inevitably fail to meet the exemption requirements under Art. 3 R&D BER as they were not drafted with the R&D BER in mind.
2	Research bodies and university are generally engaged in licensing and thus commercialization of the results	Article 1 (1) g); Art. 3(2) third sentence R&D BER	The possibility to limit access to R&D results solely for purposes of further R&D (Article 3(2), third sentence) is of limited relevance. This is due to the fact that universities or research organizations are (against the assumption of the BER) in fact typically commercially active in the exploitation of IPRs gained by R&D by licensing them out to third parties (and might even be required to do so by national law as it is for example the case due to the German Hochschulgesetz). In other words: Many research bodies are simply not covered by the exemption, as they are active in licensing which is in fact one form of exploitation, as defined in Article 1(1)(g). An important exemption to Article 3 therefore often fails to apply

3	Paid-for R&D Agreements have significant commercial importance, but generally fail to meet the exemption requirements of the R&D BER	Art. 1 (1) a); Art. 3 (2), Art. 5 a) R&D BER	Paid-for research agreements should be excluded from the scope of the R&D BER. These type of agreements can be dealt with easily under the general framework of Art. 101 (1) and (3) as well as 102 TFEU. Most of them are not restrictive of competition in the first place. However, the R&D BER somehow puts them in a straight-jacket not tailored to the commercial and competitive realities of such agreements, as is inter alia reflected in Art. 3 (2) and Art. 5 a R&D BER. As a consequence, the R&D BER makes it more difficult to argue that these agreements to not require an exemption by the R&D BER for their non restrictive nature in the first place.
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*

Please see detailed reasons given under 9.2 below that strongly advocate in favor of (i) maintaining the concept of an R&D BER and the HGL, but do so (ii) in a revised format that fixes the addressed legal issues.

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

- Still relevant
- No longer relevant
- Do not know

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

- Still relevant
- No longer relevant
- Do not know

\* 6.8 Section 5 of the HGL on purchasing agreements is

- Still relevant
- No longer relevant
- Do not know

\* 6.10 Section 6 of the HGL on commercialisation agreements is

- Still relevant
- No longer relevant
- Do not know

\* 6.12 Section 7 of the HGL on standardisation agreements is

- Still relevant
- No longer relevant
- Do not know

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*

See detailed reasons given under 9.2 below on Art. 3 R&D BER.

**\* 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

## 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*

See reasons given under 4.2, 4.4, 4.6 above

\* 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

\* 8.5 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

## 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*

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

**f09e8ae1-4c53-45c9-b76d-ba5c87e1c098**

**/Commeo\_LL\_P\_Remarks\_on\_the\_review\_of\_Regulation\_1217\_2010\_R\_D\_BER.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