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ENFORCING/DEFENSE OF + DECIDING FOLLOW-ON ACTIONS IS NO WALK IN THE PARK

WHY?

(a) Practical obstacles
(b) Process obstacles
(c) Substantive challenges

DEFERRING FACTORS DAMPERING PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT
FOLLOW-ON ACTIONS – SOME BASICS

DEFINITION:
Civil law claims (follow-on damages) subsequent to a finding of an antitrust violation by:
(a) Competition authority (European Commission / national)
(b) Court

OCCURRENCE:
(a) Infringement proceedings
(b) Private enforcement proceedings (Euro Defense / offense)
PRACTICE OBSTACLES:

• Lack of awareness (of existence, of specific violations, process)
• Lack of competence & skill (in-house, external counsel, courts)
• Lack of (specialised) process
• Remote (difficult to get your hands on) players
• $$$ (experts, lawyers, internal resources)
• Lack of expertise / tools to manage the process
• Legal / market culture
• Lack of co-ordinated efforts (EU / member states / business community / legal community)
PROCESS OBSTACLES:

• Lack of adequate procedural framework
  – Lack of collective proceedings in many EU member states
  – Lack of special (taylor-made) rules
  – Lack of resources (human / financial / systems)

• Lack of (international) co-ordination (one-stop-shop venue)
• Lack of (international) co-operation (authorities – courts / courts – courts)
• Time
SUBSTANTIVE CHALLENGES:

• Complexity (factual / legal / procedural)

• Procedural challenges (burden of proof – antitrust violation / damage suffered / qualification of damage; where / who / how?)
WHY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EU-DIRECTIVE ON DAMAGE ACTIONS FOR COMPETITION LAW INFRINGEMENT MAY NOT CHANGE A LOT IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE

• Purely technical measures

• No focus on practical challenges of real life implementation

• Lack of necessary incentives to stakeholders (i.e. “no nudge”)
COLLECTIVE ARBITRATION CAN CHANGE THE GAME

• Yes, collective arbitration is possible

• Yes, requires consent (agreement) of (potential) parties

• But, provides obvious advantages so that consent is likely

• Once recongnized, system provides framework incintivising stakeholder to overcome existing and remaining/foreseable obastacles
SOME OF THE OBVIOUS ADVANTAGES

• International one-stop-shop possible (one venue/globally enforceable)

• Procedural flexibility (possibility to taylor-make proceedings)

• Availability of special procedural tools (e.g. document production)

• Flexible cost allocation (relevant e.g. for pooling of expert costs)

• Specialized fact finder and decision maker (specialized tribunals)

• Case management capability and flexibility

• Timing

• Confidentiality

• AVAILABLE NOW!
OUTLOOK

• Initiative of the ICC

• Upcoming ICC Seminar in Vienna early 2015
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