

Jos van Doormaal

# Nonlegal Sanctioning in Private Legal Systems

Limits in US Antitrust Law and EU Competition Law



**Nomos**

## Wirtschaftsrecht und Wirtschaftspolitik

edited by

Prof. Dr. Florian Bien

Prof. Dr. Ulrich Schwalbe

Prof. Dr. Heike Schweitzer

founded by

Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. mult. Ernst-Joachim Mestmäcker

Volume 306

Jos van Doormaal

# Nonlegal Sanctioning in Private Legal Systems

Limits in US Antitrust Law and EU Competition Law



**Nomos**

**The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek** lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

a.t.: Bremen, Univ., Diss., 2021

ISBN      978-3-8487-8164-5 (Print)  
             978-3-7489-2624-5 (ePDF)

**British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN      978-3-8487-8164-5 (Print)  
             978-3-7489-2624-5 (ePDF)

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

van Doormaal, Jos

Nonlegal Sanctioning in Private Legal Systems

Limits in US Antitrust Law and EU Competition Law

Jos van Doormaal

518 pp.

Includes bibliographic references.

ISBN      978-3-8487-8164-5 (Print)  
             978-3-7489-2624-5 (ePDF)

1st Edition 2021

© Jos van Doormaal

Published by

Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG

Waldseestraße 3–5 | 76530 Baden-Baden

[www.nomos.de](http://www.nomos.de)

Production of the printed version:

Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG

Waldseestraße 3–5 | 76530 Baden-Baden

ISBN      978-3-8487-8164-5 (Print)  
ISBN      978-3-7489-2624-5 (ePDF)

DOI        <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783748926245>



Onlineversion  
Nomos eLibrary



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

## Preface

This work was accepted as a doctoral dissertation by the law faculty of the University of Bremen. The literature and case law are current to January 2020.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my doctoral supervisor Prof. Dr. Graf-Peter Calliess. He has inspired and supported me throughout my work and has given me the academic freedom to complete my dissertation. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Christoph Schmid for writing a second expert opinion (*Zweitgutachten*).

Special thanks also go to all my family and friends who have so strongly supported me throughout my dissertation. They were especially important at the end of my dissertation and motivated me to finish the process.

Lastly, I would like to thank my parents and my wife who have given me all the support and assistance possible. They were there when I needed them the most.

Bremen, February 2021

*Jos van Doormaal*



# Table of Contents

List of abbreviations and principal concepts	23
Introduction	25
<i>Part I: Framework and Research Question</i>	
Chapter 1: Rise of Specialized Commercial Arbitration in Global Markets	37
A. An historical overview of PLSs	37
I. Ancient Greece: “Self-regulation within the Oikos in classical Athens”	38
II. The Roman Empire: “Flexibility & risk allocation with regard to lease contracts in the agriculture sector”	39
III. Medieval Times: “Lex Mercatoria”	40
IV. The Industrial Revolution	41
B. The theory on present-day PLSs	42
I. Present-day PLSs: General characteristics	43
1. Self-governance in reputation-based networks vs. governance of members by and through associations	43
2. Market of trust	45
3. Naming and shaming through an information exchange	45
4. Market where a loss of social standing is important	46
II. Typology of nonlegal sanctions in present-day PLSs	47
1. Blacklisting	48
2. Withdrawing membership	49
3. Denying membership for expelled members on the basis of an additional entry barrier	51
4. Refusing to deal with an expelled member	51
5. Entering the premises of a recalcitrant industry actor	53
6. Limiting adequate access to public courts prior to arbitral proceedings and after an award	53
C. Present-day PLSs vs. State-enforced contract law	54
I. Inefficiency of the court system	54

## Table of Contents

II. Increased contractual security / Safeguarding the sanctity of contract	56
III. Lower transaction costs	58
IV. Lower distribution costs	59
Chapter 2: Examples of Present-day PLSs in which Private-enforcement / Nonlegal Sanctioning Ensures Compliance	60
A. Introduction	60
B. The International Cotton Association	61
I. Background	61
1. History	61
2. Legal form	62
3. Institutional structure	63
4. Membership	64
5. Specialized commercial arbitration	66
a. A dichotomy of arbitration forms	66
b. Selection of arbitrators	67
i. Quality arbitration	67
ii. Technical arbitration	68
c. Choice of tribunal and jurisdiction of arbitration tribunals	69
i. Quality arbitration	69
ii. Technical arbitration	70
d. Procedure	71
i. Quality arbitration	71
ii. Technical arbitration	72
e. The finality of arbitration or the possibility of (some) legal redress in public courts according to the association	73
i. Quality arbitration	73
ii. Technical arbitration	74
II. Nonlegal sanctioning	75
1. Blacklisting	75
2. Withdrawing membership	76
3. Denying membership for expelled members on the basis of an additional entry condition	77
4. Refusing to deal with expelled members	77
III. Rationale for private enforcement/nonlegal sanctioning	78



C. The Diamond Dealers Club	79
I. Background	79
1. History	79
2. Legal form	81
3. Institutional structure	81
4. Membership	82
5. Specialized commercial arbitration	83
a. The single arbitration model	83
b. Selection of arbitrators	84
c. Choice of tribunal and jurisdiction of arbitration tribunals	85
d. Procedure	86
e. The finality of arbitration or the possibility of (some) legal redress in public courts according to the association?	88
II. Nonlegal sanctioning	89
1. Blacklisting	89
2. Withdrawing membership	90
III. Rationale for private enforcement/nonlegal sanctioning	91
D. The Grain and Feed Trade Association	92
I. Background	92
1. History	92
2. Legal form	93
3. Institutional structure	94
4. Membership	95
5. Specialized commercial arbitration	96
a. Tripartite arbitration	96
b. Selection of arbitrators	97
c. Choice of tribunal and jurisdiction of arbitration tribunals	99
d. Procedure	99
e. The finality of arbitration or the possibility of (some) legal redress in public courts according to the association?	101
II. Nonlegal sanctioning	101
1. Blacklisting	102
III. Rationale for private enforcement/nonlegal sanctioning	102

## Table of Contents

E. The Federation of Cocoa Commerce	104
I. Background	104
1. History	104
2. Legal form	105
3. Institutional structure	105
4. Membership	106
5. Specialized commercial arbitration	107
a. A dichotomy of arbitration forms	107
b. Selection of arbitrators	107
c. Choice of tribunal and jurisdiction of arbitration tribunals	109
d. Procedure	109
e. The finality of arbitration or the possibility of (some) legal redress in public courts according to the association?	110
II. Nonlegal sanctioning	111
1. Blacklisting	111
2. Withdrawing membership	111
III. Rationale for private enforcement/nonlegal sanctioning	112
F. The London Metal Exchange	113
I. Background	113
1. History	113
2. Legal form	114
3. Institutional structure	114
4. Membership	115
5. Specialized commercial arbitration	116
a. The single arbitration model	116
b. Selection of arbitrators	117
c. Choice of tribunal and jurisdiction of arbitration tribunals	117
d. Procedure	118
e. The finality of arbitration or the possibility of (some) legal redress in public courts according to the association?	118
II. Nonlegal sanctioning	119
1. The power to enter premises	119
2. Blacklisting	120
3. Withdrawing membership	120
III. Rationale for private enforcement/nonlegal sanctioning	121

G. The Federation of Oils, Seeds and Fats Association	122
I. Background	122
1. History	122
2. Legal form	123
3. Institutional structure	123
4. Membership	124
5. Specialized commercial arbitration	125
a. Tripartite arbitration	125
b. Selection of arbitrators	126
c. Choice of tribunal and jurisdiction of arbitration tribunals	126
d. Procedure	127
e. The finality of arbitration or the possibility of (some) legal redress in public courts according to the association?	128
II. Nonlegal sanctioning	128
1. Blacklisting	128
2. Withdrawing membership	129
III. Rationale for private enforcement/nonlegal sanctioning	129
Chapter 3: A comparative view of the Present-Day PLSs and their respective enforcement mechanisms	131
A. Introduction	131
B. Legal form	132
C. Access to membership	132
D. Structure and composition of the arbitration tribunal	133
I. First-tier arbitration	133
II. Second-tier arbitration/internal appeal	134
III. Qualification criteria for candidate arbitrators	134
E. The place of arbitration and applicable law	135
F. The finality of arbitration or the possibility of (some) legal redress in public courts	136
I. The English Arbitration Act 1996	137
1. Judicial review at a public court prior to arbitral proceedings	137
a. Stay of proceedings pursuant to Section 9 of the Arbitration Act 1996	137
i. “Null and void” defence	138

ii. “Inoperative” defence	139
iii. “Incapable of being performed” defence	139
b. Application to the court for preliminary ruling on jurisdiction	140
2. Judicial review at a public court after an arbitral award has been rendered	141
a. Insufficient reference made to a broader arbitration agreement within an arbitration clause included in a standardized agreement	141
i. “Sufficient reference” to arbitration agreements within the standardized agreements provided by the UK-based trade associations	142
ii. Examples of arbitration clauses within standardized contracts provided by the UK-based trade associations that refer to a broader arbitration agreement	144
iii. The trade association and its members joint reprisal against members who/that seek redress at a public court to invalidate an arbitration agreement for the reason that the arbitration clause within a standardized agreement has “insufficient reference” to the former agreement	148
b. Lack of substantive jurisdiction of an arbitrator or arbitrators	148
c. Unfair proceedings	149
d. Review on the merits	150
II. Article 75 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules and the US Federal Arbitration Act	152
1. Judicial review at a public court prior to arbitral proceedings	152
a. Stay of proceedings pursuant to Article 75, Section 7503 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules	152
b. Application to the court for preliminary ruling on jurisdiction	153
2. Judicial review at a public court after an arbitral award has been rendered	154
a. Lack of substantive jurisdiction of an arbitrator or arbitrators	155
b. Unfair proceedings	156

III. Statement about the conformity of the trade associations and their members' joint limitation to seek legal redress at a public court with the English Arbitration Act 1996, Article 75 of the CPLR and the FAA	157
G. A typology of nonlegal sanctions	159
I. Blacklisting	160
II. Withdrawing membership	161
III. Denying membership for expelled members on the basis of an additional entry barrier	162
IV. Refusing to deal with an expelled member	163
V. Entering the premises of a recalcitrant industry actor	163
VI. Limiting adequate access to public courts prior to arbitral proceedings and after an award.	163
H. Reasons for nonlegal sanctioning	164
I. Markets in which futures play a crucial role	164
II. A market in which trust plays a crucial role	165
Chapter 4: The Limits of Nonlegal Sanctioning	167
A. The boundaries of nonlegal sanctioning	167
I. US Antitrust Law: Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act	167
II. EU Competition Law: Articles 101 and 102 TFEU	168
B. Prisoner's dilemma type of function analogy	168
C. The actors involved in nonlegal sanctioning	170
I. Actors that take part in nonlegal sanctioning	171
1. Trade associations	171
2. Members of a trade association	171
3. Non-members of a trade association	172
II. Recipients of nonlegal sanctioning	172
D. Research Question	173
Chapter 5: Research Design and Research Methods	174
A. Case studies	174
I. Unnecessary redundancy exploratory research methodology	175
II. Methodological adequacy	175
B. Delimitation	176
I. US Antitrust Law	176

## Table of Contents

II. EU Competition Law	178
III. Type of reasoning	178
C. Reflection on the research question	179
D. Objectives of this research	182
I. Guidance for compliance with competition law	183
II. Promoting transparency for trade associations, their members and non-members	184
III. Promulgating best practice guidelines for actors that infringe US Antitrust Law and EU Competition Law	184
 <i>Part II: Study of US Antitrust Law</i>	
Chapter 6: Restraint of Trade or Commerce under Section 1 of the Sherman Act	189
A. Introduction	189
B. The actors involved in nonlegal sanctioning	190
I. Individual members, member undertakings and non-members	190
II. Trade associations	191
C. Collusion: “a concurrence of wills”	192
I. Contract	192
II. Combination in the form of trust or otherwise	194
III. Conspiracy	195
D. An unreasonable restraint on competition: The existence of an illegal horizontal agreement and collective boycott	196
I. Collection and dissemination of market information	197
1. Blacklists by trade associations	198
2. Execution of blacklists by members of trade associations	202
3. Execution of blacklists by non-members	204
II. Membership rules and barriers for market access	205
1. Withdrawal of membership of a trade association	206
a. Withdrawal by a trade association	206
b. Execution of the withdrawal of membership by members of a trade association	210
c. Execution of the withdrawal of membership by non-members	211

2. Denial of membership for an expelled member on the basis of an additional entry requirement	212
a. Access restrictions by a trade association	212
b. Access restrictions by members of a trade association	217
c. Access restrictions by non-members	218
III. Refusal to deal with an expelled member	218
1. Refusal to deal with an expelled member by a trade association	219
2. Execution of the refusal to deal with an expelled member by members of a trade association	221
3. Execution of the refusal to deal with an expelled member by non-members	223
IV. Entering the premises of a recalcitrant industry actor without a warrant	223
V. Limiting adequate access to public courts prior to arbitral proceedings and after an award	224
E. A rule-of-reason analysis under Section 1 of the Sherman Act	225
I. First step of the rule-of-reason defence: The existence of visibly plausible procompetitive benefits	226
II. Second step of the rule-of-reason defence: Illustration that the visibly plausible efficiency or benefit cannot exist without the anticompetitive risk	227
1. Efficiency defence: Consumer or total welfare justification	228
2. Total welfare and consumer welfare vs. collective boycotts of targeted industry actors	230
a. Blacklisting	230
b. Membership rules and barriers for market access	233
i. Withdrawal of membership	234
ii. Denial of membership for expelled members on the basis of an additional entry condition	238
c. Refusal to deal with an expelled member	241
F. Key findings	244
I. Qualification as member or undertaking	245
II. Collusion: “a concurrence of wills”	245
III. The anti-competitiveness of nonlegal sanctions	246
IV. Rule-of-reason defence	247

Chapter 7: Monopolization of any Part of the Trade or Commerce under Section 2 of the Sherman Act	249
A. Introduction	249
B. Unlawful monopolization by the trade associations researched	250
I. The possession of monopoly power in the relevant market	250
1. Market definition: Monopoly leveraging	251
2. Market shares in the market for regulation and private ordering	252
a. The International Cotton Association	252
b. The Diamond Dealers Club	253
c. The Grain and Feed Trade Association	254
d. Federation of Cocoa Commerce	254
e. London Metal Exchange	255
f. Federation of Oils, Seeds and Fats Association	255
3. Monopolization in the market for regulation and private ordering	256
II. Anticompetitive conduct	257
1. Monopoly leveraging doctrine: Attributing liability for a violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act to the trade associations researched for utilizing a monopoly position in one market to punish wrongdoers operating on a different market	259
2. The anti-competitiveness of nonlegal sanctioning attributable to the trade associations researched and the existence of a rule-of-reason defence	260
a. Blacklisting	261
b. Membership rules and barriers for market access	262
i. Withdrawal of membership	263
ii. Denial of membership for expelled members on the basis of an additional entry condition	266
c. Refusal to deal with an expelled member	268
d. Entering the premises of a recalcitrant industry actor without a warrant	268
III. Interim conclusion	269
C. The functioning of the concept of illegal attempted monopolization as a safety net when one or more of the trade associations researched does not hold sufficient market power to establish monopolization	269
I. Specific intent to monopolize	269



II. Dangerous probability of achieving monopoly power	271
III. Anticompetitive conduct (and rule-of-reason)	273
IV. Interim conclusion	273
D. Unlawful conspiracy to monopolize by members of the trade associations researched	274
I. The existence of an agreement between two or more parties	275
II. Specific intent to monopolize	276
III. Overt act in furtherance of the agreement	277
IV. Interim conclusion	278
E. Key findings	278

*Part III: Study of EU Competition Law*

Chapter 8: The Scope of Application of European Competition Law	285
A. The nucleus of European Competition Law: a brief overview	285
B. Introduction	287
C. Legal boundary	288
I. Members of the trade associations researched and non-members	288
II. Trade associations	290
D. Economic boundaries: the effect on trade between Member States	291
I. Interpretation by the Court of Justice of the European Union	292
II. Interpretation by the Commission	294
1. Commission Recommendation on SMEs and the positive and negative rebuttable presumption of non-appreciability	295
2. The De Minimis Notice	296
III. Do the extrajudicial measures imposed by the trade associations researched and executed by their members and non-members have an effect on Community trade?	296
1. The concept of trade	297
2. The presence of “may affect”	297
3. The concept of appreciability	298
a. Nonlegal sanctions as effect restrictions	299
E. Key findings	301

Chapter 9: Anticompetitive Agreements under Article 101(1) TFEU	305
A. Introduction	305
B. Collusion: “a concurrence of wills”	305
I. Agreement between undertakings	306
II. Decisions by associations of undertakings	308
III. Concerted practices	309
C. Prevention, restriction or distortion of competition: The existence of an illegal horizontal agreement and collective boycott	311
I. Restrictions by object or effect	311
II. Collection and dissemination of market information	314
1. Blacklists by trade associations	316
a. Asnef-Equifax/Ausbanc	318
b. Compagnie Maritime Belge	319
c. Statement	321
2. Execution of blacklists by members of trade associations	322
3. Execution of blacklists by non-members	322
III. Membership rules and barriers for market access	323
1. Withdrawal from a trade association	323
a. Withdrawal by a trade association	323
b. Execution of the withdrawal of membership by members of a trade association	326
c. Execution of the withdrawal of membership by non-members	327
2. Denial of membership for an expelled member on the basis of an additional entry requirement	327
a. Access restrictions by a trade association	327
b. Access restrictions by members of a trade association	331
c. Access restrictions by non-members	332
IV. Refusal to deal with an expelled member	332
1. Refusal to deal by a trade association	332
2. Execution of the refusal to deal by members of a trade association	335
3. Execution of the refusal to deal by non-members	335
V. Entering the premises of a recalcitrant industry actor without a warrant	336
VI. Limiting adequate access to public courts prior to arbitral proceedings and after an award	336
1. Voluntary nature of specialized commercial arbitration	337

2. Recourse to national courts	338
D. Rule-of-reason analysis under Article 101(1) TFEU	339
I. Court of Justice of the European Union	341
II. Commission	343
III. Summary evaluation	344
E. Key findings	345
Chapter 10: Exemption under Article 101(3) TFEU	352
A. Introduction	352
B. BER: Research and Development and Specialization Agreements	352
C. Assessment of pro- and anti-competitive effects under Article 101(3) TFEU	354
I. First condition: efficiency gains	357
1. The nature of the efficiencies claimed	359
2. Sufficient link and likelihood and magnitude of the efficiency	361
II. Second condition: consumer pass-on	362
1. The scope of the term “consumers”	364
2. Pass-on benefits (the concept of “fair share”)	367
3. An efficient allocation of resources to countervail the negative effects of nonlegal sanctions imposed by the trade associations researched and executed by their members	369
III. Third condition: Indispensability - without restriction, elimination or significant reduction of efficiencies	370
1. Blacklisting	373
a. The juxtaposition with online evaluation forums	376
2. Membership rules and barriers for market access	378
a. Withdrawal of membership	378
b. Denial of readmission to membership	380
3. Limiting adequate access to public courts prior to arbitral proceedings and after an award	383
IV. Fourth condition: no elimination of competition	384
V. Conclusion	387
D. Key findings	387

Chapter 11: Abuse of a Dominant Position under Article 102 TFEU	392
A. Introduction	392
B. The existence of a dominant position in the relevant market which impacts the EU territory	395
I. Guidance by the CJEU and the decisional practice of the Commission	396
II. The Discussion Paper	398
III. The unequivocal dominance of the trade associations researched in the EU markets for regulation and private ordering	399
C. The existence of an abuse of a dominant position in the market	400
I. The current understanding of the “abuse” concept through an Ordoliberal lens	401
1. The proof required for finding an exclusionary abuse	403
II. The exclusionary abuse of refusal to grant access to an essential facility when the trade associations researched impose nonlegal sanctions	406
1. Nature and characteristics of the facility	407
2. The essentiality, indispensability or objective necessity of the facility	409
3. Elimination of (effective) competition	411
a. Blacklisting	413
b. Membership rules and barriers for market access	414
i. Withdrawal of membership	414
ii. Denial of readmission to membership of expelled members on the basis of an additional entry condition	414
c. Refusal to deal with an expelled member	414
III. Existence of a causal connection between market power of the trade associations researched and an exclusionary abuse on adjacent second-tier commodities markets	415
IV. “Objective justification” of the refusal to grant access to the facilities offered by the trade associations researched	416
1. Efficiency defence: lower transaction and distribution costs?	417
2. The protection of a legitimate commercial interest	419
3. The objective necessity of an abuse	421
D. Key findings	422

*Part IV: Summary, Conclusions and Best Practice Guidelines*

Chapter 12: A Succinct Summary of the Research	431
A. A case study based review of present-day PLSs	431
B. Similarities and differences between the trade associations researched	432
C. The antitrust limits of nonlegal sanctioning	436
D. Restraint of trade or commerce under Section 1 of the Sherman Act	438
E. Monopolization of any part of trade or commerce under Section 2 of the Sherman Act	442
F. The applicability of Articles 101 and 102 TFEU	445
G. Anticompetitive agreement under Article 101(1) TFEU	448
H. Exemption under Article 101(3) TFEU	452
I. Abuse of a dominant position under Article 102 TFEU	456
Chapter 13: Conclusions and Best Practice Guidelines	462
A. An answer to the central research question	462
B. Introductory comments to draft best practice guidelines for compliance with US Antitrust Law and EU Competition Law	463
I. Differences between US Antitrust Law and EU Competition Law	463
II. Outline of the best practice guidelines	464
C. Best practice guidance for trade associations	464
I. The dissemination of the names of wrongdoers in a blacklist	464
II. Withdrawal of membership	465
III. Denial of readmission of expelled members to membership on the basis of an additional entry requirement	466
IV. Refusal to deal with an expelled member	467
V. Entering the premises of a recalcitrant industry actor without a warrant	467
VI. Limiting adequate access to public courts prior to arbitral proceedings and after an award	468
D. Best practice guidance for the members of a trade association	468
I. The dissemination of the names of wrongdoers in a blacklist	468

## *Table of Contents*

II. Withdrawals of membership	469
III. Additional entry barriers to being readmitted to membership after an expulsion	470
IV. Refusal to deal with an expelled member	471
V. Entering the premises of a recalcitrant industry actor without a warrant	472
VI. Limiting adequate access to public courts prior to arbitral proceedings and after an award	472
Bibliography	475

## List of abbreviations and principal concepts

Commission	Directorate General for Competition of the European Commission
GC	General Court (constituent court of the EU which allows parties to the proceedings to lodge a complaint against a Commission decision; formerly known as the CFI before the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty on 1 December 2009)
ECJ	European Court of Justice (constituent court of the EU which handles second level appeals by reviewing a GC judgment; before 2009 it was the appellate body to uphold, modify or reverse the findings of a CFI judgment; for reasons of clarity, court judgments before 1989 are also mentioned as coming from the ECJ in this research)
CJEU	The Court of Justice of the European Union (the collective term for the judicial arm of the EU, consisting of the GC and the ECJ despite this definition dating from 2009, for the purpose of elucidation the CFI and the ECJ combined are mentioned as the CJEU in this research)
CFI	Court of First Instance of the European Communities (precursor of the GC before the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty on 1 December 2009)
PLSs	Private Legal Systems
NCA	National Competition Authorities
Members	Member undertakings of the trade associations researched
ICA	International Cotton Association
ADB	Antwerp Diamond Bourse
DDC	Diamond Dealers Club
GAFTA	Grain and Feed Trade Association
FCC	Federation of Cocoa Commerce
LME	London Metal Exchange
FOSFA	Federation of Oils, Seeds and Fats Associations
BIMCO	Baltic and International Maritime Council

*List of abbreviations and principal concepts*

Guidelines on Horizontal Co-operation Agreements	Guidelines on the applicability of Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to horizontal co-operation agreements
Guidelines on Inter-State Trade	Guidelines on the effect on trade concept contained in Articles [101 and 102 TFEU]
The Commission Recommendation on SMEs	The Commission Recommendation concerning the definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises or any future recommendation replacing it
The De Minimis Notice	Commission Notice on Agreements of Minor Importance which do not Appreciably Restrict Competition under Article 101 (1) TFEU
1999 White Paper	White Paper on Modernisation of the Rules implementing Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty (now Articles 101 and 102 TFEU)
RDBER	Research & Development Block Exemption Regulation
SABER	Specialization Agreements Block Exemption Regulation
Commission's Guidance	Commission's Guidance on the Commission's enforcement priorities in applying Article 82 of the EC Treaty [now Article 102 TFEU] to abusive exclusionary conduct by a dominant undertaking
Discussion Paper	Commission's Discussion Paper on the application of Article 82 [now Article 102 TFEU] to exclusionary abuses
Rome Treaty/ EEC	Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community