

Merger Control

The international regulation of mergers and joint ventures
in 74 jurisdictions worldwide

Consulting editor
John Davies



2016

GETTING THE
DEAL THROUGH

GETTING THE
DEAL THROUGH 

Merger Control 2016

Consulting editor

John Davies

Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer

Publisher
Gideon Robertson
gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions
Sophie Pallier
subscriptions@gettingthedealthrough.com

Business development managers
Alan Lee
alan.lee@lbresearch.com

Adam Sargent
adam.sargent@lbresearch.com

Dan White
dan.white@lbresearch.com



Published by
Law Business Research Ltd
87 Lancaster Road
London, W11 1QQ, UK
Tel: +44 20 3708 4199
Fax: +44 20 7229 6910

© Law Business Research Ltd 2015
No photocopying without a CLA licence.
First published 1996
Twentieth edition
ISSN 1365-7976

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of August 2015, be advised that this is a developing area.

Printed and distributed by
Encompass Print Solutions
Tel: 0844 2480 112



CONTENTS

At the intersection of the global economy and national interests: foreign investment review and merger control meet	7	China	97
Robert Schlossberg and Christine Laciak Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Nicholas French, Ninette Dodoo, Vivian Cao and Janet (Jingyuan) Wang Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Timelines	11	Colombia	104
Michael Bo Jaspers and Joanna Goyder Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Carlos Esguerra Posse Herrera Ruiz	
Acknowledgements for verifying contents	27	COMESA	110
Albania	29	Janine Simpson and Nkongo Hlatshwayo Webber Wentzel	
Günter Bauer, Denis Selimi and Paul Hesse Wolf Theiss		Croatia	113
Argentina	33	Günter Bauer, Luka Čolić and Paul Hesse Wolf Theiss	
Alfredo M O'Farrell, Miguel del Pino and Santiago del Rio Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal		Cyprus	119
Australia	39	Anastasios A Antoniou and Aquilina Demetriadi Anastasios Antoniou LLC	
Fiona Crosbie and Kon Stellios Allens		Czech Republic	124
Austria	47	Martin Nedelka and Radovan Kubáč Nedelka Kubáč advokáti	
Axel Reidlinger and Maria Dreher Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Denmark	129
Belgium	54	Morten Kofmann, Jens Munk Plum, Erik Bertelsen and Bart Creve Kromann Reumert	
Laurent Garzaniti, Thomas Janssens, Tone Oeyen and Amaryllis Müller Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Egypt	134
Bolivia	59	Firas El Samad Zulficar & Partners	
Jorge Luis Inchauste Comboni Guevara & Gutierrez SC – Servicios Legales		Estonia	138
Bosnia and Herzegovina	63	Raino Paron and Martin Mäesalu Ellex	
Günter Bauer, Paul Hesse and Amela Selmanagić Wolf Theiss		European Union	143
Brazil	68	John Davies, Rafique Bachour and Angeline Woods Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Marcelo Calliari, Daniel Andreoli and Joana Cianfarani TozziniFreire Advogados		Faroe Islands	151
Bulgaria	73	Morten Kofmann, Jens Munk Plum, Erik Bertelsen and Bart Creve Kromann Reumert	
Peter Petrov Boyanov & Co		Finland	154
Canada	78	Christian Wik, Niko Hukkinen and Sari Rasinkangas Roschier, Attorneys Ltd	
Neil Campbell, James Musgrove, Mark Opashinov and Joshua Chad McMillan LLP		France	159
Channel Islands	85	Jérôme Philippe and François Gordon Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Rob van der Laan OmniCLES		Germany	166
Chile	92	Helmut Bergmann, Frank Röhling and Bertrand Guerin Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Claudio Lizana and María José Villalón Carey		Greece	175
		Aida Economou Vainanidis Economou & Associates	

Greenland	180	Malta	266
Morten Kofmann, Jens Munk Plum, Erik Bertelsen and Bart Creve Kromann Reumert		Ian Gauci and Karl Sammut GTG Advocates	
Hong Kong	183	Mexico	272
Nicholas French, Ninette Dodoo and Ruth Chen Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Gabriel Castañeda Castañeda y Asociados	
Hungary	192	Morocco	277
Gábor Fejes and Zoltán Marosi Oppenheim		Corinne Khayat and Maija Brossard UGGC Avocats	
Iceland	198	Namibia	282
Hulda Árnadóttir and Heiðrún Lind Marteinsdóttir LEX		Peter Frank Koep and Hugo Meyer van den Berg Koep & Partners	
India	203	Netherlands	286
Shweta Shroff Chopra, Harman Singh Sandhu and Rohan Arora Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas & Co		Winfred Knibbeler and Paul van den Berg Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Indonesia	209	New Zealand	292
HMBC Rikrik Rizkiyana, Anastasia PR Daniyati and Ingrid Gratsya Zega Assegaf Hamzah & Partners		Sarah Keene and Troy Pilkington Russell McVeagh	
Ireland	215	Nigeria	302
Helen Kelly and Eoin Kealy Matheson		Babatunde Irukera and Ikem Isiekwena SimmonsCooper Partners	
Israel	221	Norway	307
Eytan Epstein, Tamar Dolev-Green and Eti Portook Epstein, Knoller, Chomsky, Osnat, Gilat, Tenenboim & Co		Jonn Ola Sørensen, Simen Klevstrand and Øyvind Andersen Wikborg Rein	
Italy	227	Pakistan	312
Gian Luca Zampa Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Waqas Mir Mohsin Tayebaly & Co	
Japan	236	Poland	317
Akinori Uesugi and Kaori Yamada Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Aleksander Stawicki and Bartosz Turno WKB Wierciński Kwieciński Baehr	
Korea	242	Portugal	322
Seong-Un Yun and Sanghoon Shin Bae, Kim & Lee LLC		Mário Marques Mendes and Pedro Vilarinho Pires Gómez-Acebo & Pombo	
Latvia	247	Russia	329
Julija Jerneva and Janis Sarans VILGERTS		Alexander Viktorov Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Liechtenstein	252	Saudi Arabia	334
Heinz Frommelt Sele Frommelt & Partners Attorneys at Law Ltd		Fares Al-Hejailan, Rafique Bachour, Anna Biganzoli and Hani Nassef Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Luxembourg	257	Serbia	339
Alexandrine Armstrong-Cerfontaine and Bertrand Geradin King & Wood Mallesons		Günter Bauer and Maja Stanković Wolf Theiss	
Macedonia	260	Singapore	345
Vesna Gavriloska, Maja Jakimovska and Margareta Taseva Čakmakova Advocates		Lim Chong Kin and Corinne Chew Drew & Napier LLC	

CONTENTS

Slovakia	354	Ukraine	411
Günter Bauer, Luboš Frolkovič and Paul Hesse Wolf Theiss		Igor Svechkar and Alexey Pustovit Asters	
Slovenia	359	United Arab Emirates	416
Günter Bauer, Klemen Radosavljevič and Paul Hesse Wolf Theiss		Rafique Bachour and Anna Biganzoli Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
South Africa	364	United Kingdom	421
Robert Legh and Tamara Dini Bowman Gilfillan		Martin McElwee, Alison Jones and Olivia Hagger Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Spain	374	United States	428
Francisco Cantos, Álvaro Iza and Enrique Carrera Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Ronan P Harty and Stephen M Pepper Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	
Swaziland	380	Uruguay	437
Kenneth J Motsa and Gabsile A Maseko Robinson Bertram		Alberto Foderé Foderé Abogados	
Sweden	383	Uzbekistan	441
Tommy Pettersson, Johan Carle and Stefan Perván Lindeborg Mannheimer Swartling		Bakhodir Jabborov and Jamol Ryskiyev GRATA Law Firm	
Switzerland	388	Zambia	445
Marcel Meinhardt, Benoît Merkt and Astrid Waser Lenz & Staehelin		Sydney Chisenga Corpus Legal Practitioners	
Taiwan	393	The ICN in 2015	449
Mark Ohlson, Charles Hwang and Fran Wang YangMing Partners		Andreas Mundt Chair of the International Competition Network's Steering Group President of the Bundeskartellamt (Germany)	
Thailand	401	Quick reference tables	450
Pakdee Paknara and Patraporn Poovasathien Weerawong, Chinnavat & Peangpanor Ltd			
Turkey	405		
Gönenç Gürkaynak ELIG, Attorneys-at-Law			

Macedonia

Vesna Gavriloska, Maja Jakimovska and Margareta Taseva

Čakmakova Advocates

Legislation and jurisdiction

1 What is the relevant legislation and who enforces it?

Due to the obligations undertaken with the Stabilisation and Association Agreement between the Republic of Macedonia and the European Communities and their member states and the ongoing process of harmonisation of the Macedonian legislation with the EU acquis, the new Law on Protection of Competition (LPC) entered into force on 13 November 2010 (Official Gazette of the RM No. 145/10). The LPC was amended and supplemented in October 2011 (Official Gazette No. 136/2011) and in February 2014 (Official Gazette No. 41/2014).

The purpose of the LPC as a primary source of competition law in Macedonia is to ensure free competition on the domestic market to stimulate economic efficiency and consumer welfare.

In March 2012, on the basis of the LPC, the government of Macedonia adopted nine by-laws:

- Decree on the detailed conditions for block exemption of certain types of agreements for transfer of technology, licence or know-how;
- Decree on the detailed conditions for block exemption of certain types of research and development agreements;
- Decree on the conditions for block exemption of certain categories of horizontal agreements for specialisation;
- Decree on block exemption of certain categories of insurance agreements;
- Decree on block exemption of certain categories of agreements on distribution and servicing of motor vehicles;
- Decree on block exemption of certain categories of vertical agreements;
- Decree on the detailed conditions on agreements of minor importance (*de minimis*);
- Decree on the form and content of the notification for concentration and the documentation to be submitted with the notification; and
- Decree on the detailed conditions and procedure under which the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters decides on immunity and reduction of fines.

The above-mentioned by-laws regulate some specific institutions that are prescribed within the LPC to enable the proper enforcement in the practice of, as well as total harmonisation with, EU principles, especially the secondary legislation of the EU.

The body responsible for implementing the LPC is the Commission for the Protection of Competition (the Commission). The Commission is an independent state body with the status of a legal entity, and is independent in its working and decision-making within the scope of its competencies as determined by the law.

The Commission supervises the application of the provisions of the law by monitoring and analysing the conditions of the market to the extent necessary for the development of free and efficient competition, as well as conducting procedures and making decisions in accordance with the provisions of the law.

The misdemeanour procedure is conducted and the misdemeanour sanction is imposed by the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters within the Commission for the Protection of Competition.

In 2012 the Commission adopted the following guidelines:

- Guidelines on the term concentration – harmonised with the Commission Consolidated Jurisdictional Notice under Council Regulation (EC) No. 139/2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings;
- Guidelines on the application of article 7, paragraph 3 of the LPC – harmonised with the Commission Notice – Guidelines on the application of article 81(3) of the Treaty (text with EEA relevance); and
- Guidelines on determining the cases in which assessing the concentration the Commission shall pass a decision in simplified form – harmonised with the Commission Notice on a simplified procedure for treatment of certain concentrations under Council Regulation (EC) No. 139/2004 (2005/C 56/04).

In July 2015, the Commission adopted Guidelines for the method of submission and filing of notifications for concentration, which is harmonised with the Commission Regulation (EC) No. 802/2004 dated 21 April 2004 for implementing Council Regulation (EC) No. 139/2004 on control of concentrations between enterprises.

In January 2015 the Commission published a Guide for detecting collusive agreements in the procedures for granting public procurement agreements. These guidelines are harmonised with the recommendations for prevention and avoiding of collusive tendering of international organisations, such as the OECD.

2 What kinds of mergers are caught?

The LPC's merger control rules are based on the concept of control. A concentration shall be deemed to arise where a change of control on a lasting basis results from:

- the merger of two or more previously independent undertakings or parts of undertakings; or
- the acquisition of direct or indirect control of the whole or parts of one or more other undertakings by one or more persons already controlling at least one undertaking, or by one or more undertakings, whether by purchase of securities or assets, by means of an agreement or in other manner stipulated by law.

3 What types of joint ventures are caught?

The creation of a joint venture that permanently performs all the functions of an autonomous economic entity (so-called full-function joint ventures) shall constitute a concentration according to the provisions of the LPC (ie, the acquisition of direct or indirect control).

The Guidelines on the term concentration closely defines the specific requirements under which the joint venture would be considered a concentration.

The full-functionality criterion envisages the application of the LPC for the creation of joint ventures by the parties, irrespective of whether the relevant joint venture is created as a 'greenfield operation' and whether the parties contribute assets to the joint venture that were previously in individual ownership. In these circumstances, the joint venture must fulfil the full-functionality criterion in order to constitute a concentration. Even though a joint venture may be a full-functioning undertaking and

thus economically autonomous from an operational perspective, that does not mean that it enjoys autonomy as regards the adoption of its strategic decisions or on the contrary the jointly controlled undertaking could never be considered as a full-functioning joint venture and therefore the condition, under which the joint venture would constitute a concentration under the provisions of the LPC, would never be met. Hence, for the application of the full-functionality criterion it is sufficient for the joint venture to be autonomous in an operational respect.

The full-functionality in fact means that a joint venture must operate on the market, performing functions that are normally carried out by the undertakings operating on the same market. For that purpose, the joint venture must have a management dedicated to its daily operations and access to sufficient resources including finance, personnel and assets (tangible and intangible) in order to perform its business activities on a permanent basis within the framework determined in the joint venture agreement.

The Guidelines on the term concentration outlines more specific directions with respect to the situations that would be considered when examining the notification of concentration in cases involving joint ventures (for example the sufficient resources to operate independently on a market, the activities outside the specific function of the ruling (parent) undertakings, sale and purchase relations with the ruling (parent) undertakings, sustainable operations (operations on a lasting basis), changes in the activities of the joint venture).

4 Is there a definition of 'control' and are minority and other interests less than control caught?

Pursuant to the LPC, control shall comprise rights, contracts or any other means that either separately or in combination, and having regard to the factual or legal conditions confer the possibility of exercising decisive influence on an undertaking, in particular through:

- ownership or the right to use all or part of the assets of an undertaking; or
- rights or contracts that confer decisive influence on the composition, voting or decisions of the bodies of the undertaking.

Control is acquired by persons or undertakings who are holders of the rights or have acquired the rights under the contracts referred to above, or that still have the power to exercise such rights under the contracts even though such persons or undertakings have not been holders of such rights or have not acquired the rights under the contracts.

Minority interests may fall within the definition of control if they are associated with veto rights over strategic decisions of the undertaking.

With the Guidelines of the Commission regarding the term concentration, the Commission provided more information and instructions as to questions when the concentration arises in accordance with article 12 of the LPC, thus specifying the types of control.

5 What are the jurisdictional thresholds for notification and are there circumstances in which transactions falling below these thresholds may be investigated?

The participants in a concentration are obliged to notify such concentration to the Commission, if:

- the collective aggregate annual income of all the participating undertakings, generated by sale of goods or services on the world market, exceeds the equivalent amount of €10 million expressed in denars counter value, made during the business year preceding the concentration, and where at least one participant is registered in Macedonia;
- the collective aggregate annual income of all the participating undertakings, generated by sales of goods or services in Macedonia, exceeds the equivalent amount of €2.5 million expressed in denars counter value, made during the business year preceding the concentration; or
- the market share of one of the participants exceeds 40 per cent or the total market share of the participants in the concentration exceeds 60 per cent in the year preceding the concentration.

The LPC does not specify any conditions under which the Commission would be competent to investigate transactions falling below the above-mentioned thresholds.

6 Is the filing mandatory or voluntary? If mandatory, do any exceptions exist?

The filing is mandatory and there are no exceptions provided in the law. Therefore, any merger qualifying as a concentration that meets the turnover thresholds or market share thresholds must be filed.

7 Do foreign-to-foreign mergers have to be notified and is there a local effects test?

The implementation of the LPC is not limited only to practices undertaken within the territory of Macedonia, but also abroad if they produce certain effects on the territory of Macedonia. The LPC shall be applied to all forms of prevention, restriction or distortion of competition that produce an effect on the territory of Macedonia, even when they result from acts carried out or undertaken outside the territory of Macedonia.

If the thresholds are fulfilled the presumption stands that the merger produces effects in Macedonia.

8 Are there also rules on foreign investment, special sectors or other relevant approvals?

There are no special provisions on foreign investments or on special sectors in the LPC.

Notification and clearance timetable

9 What are the deadlines for filing? Are there sanctions for not filing and are they applied in practice?

There is no deadline for filing the notification. The participants are obliged to notify the Commission before implementation of the concentration and following the conclusion of the merger agreement, or the announcement of a public bid for the purchase or acquisition of a controlling interest in the charter capital of the undertaking.

Failure to notify is a misdemeanour penalised by a fine amounting to up to 10 per cent of the value of the aggregate annual income of the undertaking made in the business year preceding the year when the misdemeanour was committed. In addition to the fine, the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters may impose to the legal person a temporary ban on the performance of specific activity in duration of three to 30 days, and to the natural person – a ban on the performance of an occupation, activity or duty in duration of three to 15 days.

In 2014 the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters adopted two decisions for failure of the undertakings to file a notification on concentration to the Commission.

10 Who is responsible for filing and are filing fees required?

The following participants in a concentration are obliged to notify a concentration to the Commission:

- merging undertakings; and
- persons or undertakings that acquire control of the whole or part of one or more other undertakings, as well as the undertakings or parts thereof over which control is acquired.

The initial filing fee is set at a fixed amount of 6,000 denars. An additional filing fee of 30,000 denars will be charged for a decision declaring the concentration compliant with the provisions of the LPC. These are payable after the concentration has been appraised by the Commission.

11 What are the waiting periods and does implementation of the transaction have to be suspended prior to clearance?

The concentration shall not be performed either before its notification to the Commission or after the submission of the notification until a decision is made declaring the concentration compliant with the law or before the expiry of the legal terms in which the Commission should pass the decision. This shall not prevent the implementation of a public bid for the purchase of securities or a series of securities transactions, including those convertible into other securities for the purpose of trading on the market if the concentration has been notified to the Commission without delay, and the acquirer of securities does not exercise the voting rights attached to the securities in question, or does so only to the extent which is necessary to maintain the full value of its investment and based on a Commission's procedural order (decision) for exemption.

After the complete notification is received, the Commission has up to 57 or at most 145 business days, depending on the case, to pass its decision.

12 What are the possible sanctions involved in closing before clearance and are they applied in practice?

If the undertakings do not comply with the suspension obligation as stipulated in article 18 of the LPC, than such undertakings are committing a serious misdemeanour and can be fined with up to 10 per cent of the value of the total annual income of the undertaking realised in the business year preceding the year in which the concentration was performed. So far, there have been no such cases and no such fines have been imposed by the Commission.

13 Are sanctions applied in cases involving closing before clearance in foreign-to-foreign mergers?

If the undertaking does not file a notification on concentration in cases of foreign-to-foreign mergers that fall under the provisions of the LPC, the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters shall impose a fine amounting to up to 10 per cent of the value of the aggregate annual income of the undertaking made in the business year preceding the year when the misdemeanour was committed. In addition to the fine, the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters may impose on the legal person a temporary ban on the performance of specific activity for three to 30 days, and to the natural person a ban on the performance of an occupation, activity or duty for three to 15 days.

In 2014 the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters imposed fines in two cases involving closing before clearance in foreign-to-foreign mergers, whereas as of 30 April 2015 there have been no such cases.

14 What solutions might be acceptable to permit closing before clearance in a foreign-to-foreign merger?

All mergers (not only foreign-to-foreign) that fulfil the thresholds can apply for an exemption from the suspension obligation by submitting a justified written request, which is subject to approval by the Commission (article 18 of the LPC).

The Commission may, upon a reasoned request by the participants in a concentration, adopt a decision to allow an exemption from the obligations that the concentration shall not be performed before its notification and clearance. In deciding upon the request for exemption, the Commission shall, *inter alia*, take into account the effects of the suspension of the concentration on one or more undertakings concerned by the concentration or on a third party, as well as the threat to the competition posed by the concentration. This exemption may be subject to conditions and obligations in order to ensure conditions for effective competition. The exemption may be applied for and granted at any time, that is, prior to the notification or following the transaction that refers to the public bid for the purchase of securities or a series of securities transactions, including those convertible into other securities for the purpose of trading on the market. The Commission prescribed a special form of request for exemption, regulating in general manner its content; however, details of the documents to be enclosed in the request are not provided. The decision following the request for exemption has to be issued within 15 days of the day of receipt of the complete documentation necessary to assess the request.

15 Are there any special merger control rules applicable to public takeover bids?

There are no special merger control rules applicable to public takeover bids.

16 What is the level of detail required in the preparation of a filing?

The LPC does not prescribe special form for submission of the notification. The LPC only stipulates that the notification of the concentration must include an original of the legal act which is the basis for the creation of the concentration or a verified transcript thereof; financial report of the participants regarding the business year preceding the concentration in the original or a verified transcript thereof; certificate from the trade register or other register of legal persons containing the basic information on the undertaking, the registered office and the scope of operation of the participants in the original or a verified transcript thereof and data regarding the market shares of the participants, as well as the shares of their competitors.

However, the Regulation on the form and content of the notification of concentration and necessary documentation that shall be submitted along with the notification, sets out detailed rules with regard to the notification's content and format (written and electronic) as well as additional enclosures. *Inter alia*, the notification on concentration should contain the following information: a short resume on the notification (which should not contain confidential information), data on the submitter of the notification and the participants in the concentration, a detailed description and legal basis of the concentration, and information about the financial reports, relevant markets and market shares, etc.

The notification for concentration should mandatorily include a statement signed by or on behalf of all members in the concentration that submit the notification, by which the persons submitting the notification state that pursuant to their opinion and belief, the information in the notification is true, correct and complete, and that correct and complete documents have been delivered in the original, respectively copies of the documents as required in accordance with the LPC and this Regulation, and that all assessments are made and are best assessments of the specified indicators made by the persons submitting the notification, that all stated opinions are honest, and that the persons submitting the notification are completely familiar with the provisions of the article 61 paragraph (2) of the LPC (in accordance with article 3, paragraph 1, point 21 of the Regulation).

In addition to the compulsory data, the Commission may require the submission of all other data considered necessary for the evaluation of the concentration. In particular, this would take place in cases of horizontal relations (where two or more of the participants in the concentration are engaged in business activities related with the same market of goods and geographical market) or vertical relations (when one or more of the participants in the concentration are engaged in business activities on the market of goods which is upstream or downstream in relation to the market of goods in which any other participant in the concentration participates) between the participants in the concentration, provided that in cases of horizontal relations their mutual market share is higher than 15 per cent, and in cases of vertical relations their individual or mutual market shares are equal to or higher than 25 per cent.

The Guidelines for submission and filing of the notification for concentration prescribe the form and content of the introductory (first) page of the notification for concentration, which is of a very general nature. In addition, the Guidelines provide some more technical details about the form, content and technical description of the elements of the notification of concentration (all mandatory data to be provided on separate sheet of paper, to include description of the circumstances related to the concentration, or to indicate and elaborate that such information is not relevant for the assessment of the concentration, to provide a detailed list of all enclosures, etc). The Guidelines also prescribe the form and content of the statement of the participants in the concentration relating to the accuracy of the data, information and documents enclosed to the notification.

17 What is the statutory timetable for clearance? Can it be speeded up?

Once the Commission receives all the data and documents, it shall start to examine the notification of the concentration. Within 25 working days of receipt of the complete notification the Commission shall make the decision on the compatibility of the merger with the LPC, or it shall make a procedural order initiating an in-depth procedure if it finds that the notified concentration falls under the provisions of the LPC, but might not be compliant with the LPC.

This term may be extended up to 35 working days if the participants in the concentration undertake commitments in relation to the Commission with a view to rendering the concentration compliant with the LPC.

If an in-depth procedure has been initiated, the decision appraising the concentration has to be passed within 90 working days from the date of initiating the procedure. At any time following the initiation of the procedure the time limits may be extended by the Commission in agreement with the participants in the concentration and the total duration of each extension may not exceed 20 working days.

If the Commission has not adopted a decision within the prescribed deadlines, the concentration shall be considered to be compliant with the provisions of the LPC.

By exception, the time limits stipulated with the LPC shall not be binding on the Commission when, as a result of circumstances for which one of the participants is responsible, the Commission had to request *ex officio*

from the undertakings to submit necessary data regarding their economic-financial standing, their business relations, data regarding their statutes and decisions, and the number and identity of the persons affected by such decisions, as well as other necessary data, or if the Commission had to perform other relevant actions by inspection.

The procedure cannot be speeded up.

Between July 2014 and May 2015 all of the Commission's decisions were adopted within the prescribed term of 25 days as of the day of receipt of complete notification. There has been only one case in which the Commission decided to initiate an investigation of the concentration. This was because, upon receipt of the notification, the Commission ascertained that the filed notification falls under the provisions of the LPC and that it may have as its effect significant impediment of the effective competition on the market or a substantial part thereof (article 15, article 17 and article 19, paragraph 1, point 3 of the LPC). In June and July 2015 the concerned undertakings filed commitments to the Commission for the purpose of enabling the Commission to determine whether the concentration is in compliance with the LPC. On 8 July 2015, the Commission approved the proposed merger conditionally.

18 What are the typical steps and different phases of the investigation?

The Commission shall examine the notification once it is received, and if:

- it determines that the notified concentration does not fall under the provisions of the LPC, it shall adopt a decision thereof;
- it finds that the concentration notified, although falling under the provisions of the LPC, shall not have as its effect significant impediment of effective competition on the market or in a substantial part of it, in particular as a result of the creation or strengthening of a dominant position, it shall adopt a decision declaring that the concentration is compliant with the provisions of the LPC; or
- it finds that the concentration notified falls under the provisions of the LPC and may have as its effect significant impediment of effective competition on the market or in a substantial part of it, in particular as a result of the creation or strengthening of a dominant position, the Commission shall issue a procedural order for the initiation of in-depth procedure. No appeal or legal action on instituting an administrative dispute is allowed against this procedural order.

If the participants, after the notification is filed, modify the concentration and the Commission finds that due to those changes the concentration shall no longer have as its effect significant impediment to effective competition on the market or in a substantial part of it, in particular as a result of the creation or strengthening of a dominant position, it shall adopt a decision stating that the concentration is compliant with the provisions of the LPC.

During the in-depth procedure the following steps may occur:

- the Commission may decide to adopt a decision declaring that the concentration is compliant with the provisions of the LPC, if after the notification is filed or after the performed concentration modifications by its participants, the Commission finds that the concentration shall not have as its effect significant impediment of effective competition on the market or in a substantial part of it, in particular as a result of the creation or strengthening of a dominant position;
- the participants in the concentration may enter into commitments with the Commission with a view to rendering the concentration compliant with the provisions of the LPC. In this case the Commission may adopt a decision declaring that the concentration is compliant with the provisions of the LPC and in the same decision shall determine the conditions and impose obligations intended to insure that the participants act in line with the commitments undertaken with the Commission; or
- the Commission may adopt a decision declaring that the concentration is not compliant with the provisions of the LPC if it finds that the concentration shall have as its effect a significant impediment of effective competition on the market or in a substantial part of it, in particular as a result of the creation or strengthening of a dominant position.

Substantive assessment

19 What is the substantive test for clearance?

A concentration that significantly impedes the effective competition on the market or in a substantial part of it, in particular as a result of the creation

or strengthening of a dominant position of its participants, is not in compliance with the provisions of the LPC.

20 Is there a special substantive test for joint ventures?

To the extent that the creation of a joint venture constituting a concentration has as its object or effect the coordination of the competitive behaviour of undertakings – part of the joint venture that remain legally independent, such coordination shall be appraised according to the criteria applicable to the prohibited agreements, decisions and concerted practices as well as the exemptions thereof.

In making such appraisal, the Commission in particular shall take into account whether the parties to the joint venture continue to retain, to a significant extent, the activities on the same market as the joint venture or on the market that is downstream or upstream from that of the joint venture or on a neighbouring market closely related to the market of the joint venture; and the coordination that arises as a direct effect from the creation of the joint venture affords the parties in the joint venture the possibility of eliminating competition in respect of a substantial part of the goods or services in question.

21 What are the 'theories of harm' that the authorities will investigate?

The Commission shall investigate whether the concentration shall significantly impede the effective competition on the market or in a substantial part of it, in particular as a result of the creation or strengthening of a dominant position of its participants.

In making the appraisal of the concentration, the Commission especially takes into account:

- the need to maintain and develop effective competition on the market or in a substantial part of it, especially in terms of the structure of all markets concerned and the actual or potential competition from undertakings located in Macedonia and outside Macedonia; and
- the market position of the undertakings concerned and their economic and financial power, the supply and alternatives available to suppliers and users, as well as their access to the supplies or markets, any legal or other barriers to entry on and exit from the market, the supply and demand trends for the relevant goods or services, the interest of the consumers and the technological and economic development, provided this is benefit for the consumers and the concentration does not form an obstacle to competition development.

22 To what extent are non-competition issues relevant in the review process?

Non-competition issues are not reviewed by the Commission; they are reviewed by other competent state bodies.

23 To what extent does the authority take into account economic efficiencies in the review process?

The Commission will take into account economic efficiencies to the extent that the parties are able to offer a defence that the efficiency gains will benefit consumers.

Remedies and ancillary restraints

24 What powers do the authorities have to prohibit or otherwise interfere with a transaction?

Interim measures for restoring or maintaining effective competition may be imposed when the concentration has:

- been implemented before filing the notification and its clearance (as compliant with LPC);
- been implemented contrary to the conditions and obligations attached to the decision for its clearance; and
- already been implemented and declared not compliant with the provisions of the LPC.

The Commission has the power to annul its decision for clearance of the concentration and to declare that the concentration is not compliant with the LPC, and, if necessary, impose measures and obligations to restore effective competition on the relevant market. In this procedure, the Commission is not bound by the time limits outlined in question 17.

25 Is it possible to remedy competition issues, for example by giving divestment undertakings or behavioural remedies?

Yes, it is possible to remedy competition issues.

After the notification is filed, the participants may enter into commitments (divestiture or behavioural remedies) with the Commission with a view to rendering the concentration compliant with the provisions of the Law. In its decision the Commission shall attach conditions and impose obligations intended to insure that the participants act in line with the commitments entered into with the Commission, with a view to rendering the concentration compliant with the provisions of the Law.

In 2010 the Commission adopted the Guidelines on possible remedies acceptable to the Commission under chapter III, 'Control of concentrations', of the LPC.

26 What are the basic conditions and timing issues applicable to a divestment or other remedy?

There are no strict provisions in the LPC related to the basic conditions and timing issues applicable to a divestment or other remedies; the situation is appraised by the Commission on a case-by-case basis.

27 What is the track record of the authority in requiring remedies in foreign-to-foreign mergers?

To date, there has been only one foreign-to-foreign merger with remedies imposed, which have been duly fulfilled by the merging parties. On 8 July 2015, the Commission approved the proposed merger conditionally.

28 In what circumstances will the clearance decision cover related arrangements (ancillary restrictions)?

If the concentration is approved, it is considered that the ancillary restrictions are included. In November 2011 the Commission adopted the Guidelines on restrictions directly related and necessary to concentrations.

Involvement of other parties or authorities

29 Are customers and competitors involved in the review process and what rights do complainants have?

After the short resume of the notification of the concentration (which includes the name, headquarters and subject of activity of the participants in the concentration, the type of concentration – whether it is a merger, or acquiring a joint control, etc) is published on the website of the Commission, all interested parties (including the customers and competitors) can provide their comments, opinions and remarks regarding the concentration concerned within the deadline stipulated by the Commission.

30 What publicity is given to the process and how do you protect commercial information, including business secrets, from disclosure?

The participants in the concentration should clearly mark all the confidential data in the notification. However, the Commission shall accept the classification of data as a business secret if it concerns data that have economic or market value and whose discovery or use may lead to economic advantage of other undertakings. When submitting data classified as a business secret, the undertaking is obliged to justify such determination by indicating objective reasons.

The participants in the concentration should take particular care of the fact that the short resume of the notification of concentration should not contain any confidential data and business secrets, as it is published on the Commission's website, and is a forum for interested parties to provide their comments, opinions and remarks.

After adopting a decision on concentration, the Commission delivers the decision to the party that submitted the notification, asking it to clearly mark all confidential data, then the non-confidential version of the decision is published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia and on the Commission's website.

The non-confidential versions of the decisions of the Commission and the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters are published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia and on the website of the Commission. The judgments, that is, the decisions of the court are published only on the Commission's website.

The president, and the members of the Commission and its employees, as well as the president and the members of the Commission for

Misdemeanour Matters are obliged to keep business or professional secrets regardless of how they have been learnt. The obligation to keep business or professional secrets lasts for five years as of the termination of the employment with the Commission or after the expiry of the term of office of the president or the Commission member. The above persons may not give public statements that could harm the reputation of the undertaking or statements on the measures they have undertaken or the procedures they have initiated while performing the activities under their competence until they are final, unless it regards the announcement of general information.

The parties in the procedure shall not be entitled to inspect, transcribe or copy any documents that are a business or professional secret within the definition under the LPC.

31 Do the authorities cooperate with antitrust authorities in other jurisdictions?

The Commission participates in the implementation of projects of international authorities and the authorities of the European Union, and cooperates with the authorities of other countries and institutions in the area of competition. The Commission has a good cooperation record, especially with the competition authorities of countries in the region, and has signed memorandums of cooperation with these countries. In practice the cooperation between the Commission and the other competition authorities consists mainly of sharing their respective experience. The Commission is not allowed to share any confidential information related to any ongoing or finished cases.

In November 2012, in Vienna, an Energy Community Competition Network within the frameworks of the Energy Community was established with the execution of the Joint Declaration on Cooperation between the Competition Authorities of the Contracting Parties and the Energy Community Secretariat. The competition authorities of Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Kosovo, Serbia and Ukraine, signatories of the Agreement for the establishment of the Energy Community, the competition authorities of Armenia and Georgia, as member observers, the Energy Community Secretariat and the competition authorities of Austria – all signers to the Declaration jointly agreed for the establishment of the Energy Community Competition Network for the purpose of protection of competition.

In February 2005, the OECD Regional Centre for Competition (RCC) in Budapest was formed. The RCC organises seminars and training for the employees of the competition authorities of south-east European countries. The employees from the Macedonian Commission participate every year in these events. They are very useful tools for exchange of information and for gaining experience with other competition authorities. Additionally, from 3 to 5 June 2014, a 'Seminar for cartels in public procurements' was held in Skopje, organised by the RCC and the Macedonian Commission.

Judicial review

32 What are the opportunities for appeal or judicial review?

Participants in the procedure are entitled to lodge lawsuits with the Administrative Court of Macedonia against decisions of the Commission adopted during the administrative procedure as well as against decisions of the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters.

The Law on Administrative Disputes applies to disputes initiated in accordance with the above. As of 1 July 2011, decisions of the Administrative Court can be appealed to the Higher Administrative Court. The Supreme Court shall decide on extraordinary legal remedies against decisions of the Higher Administrative Court.

Between July 2014 and May 2015 all of the Commission's decisions related to the concentrations were positive: all concentrations were determined to be in compliance with the LPC and there are no pending appeals before the administrative courts. Only one case is pending before the Commission as it is conducting a procedure for evaluation of the concentration in accordance with the provision of the LPC.

The decisions adopted in 2014 by the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters in which it had determined that the respective undertakings had not complied with the mandatory notification of a concentration obligation under the provisions of the LPC were not appealed before the Administrative Court.

Update and trends

There have been no changes made to the legislation in the past year.

On 3 February 2015 the Commission decided to initiate an investigation into a concentration in the telecommunications market. The Commission decided to investigate because, upon receipt of the notification, it ascertained that the filed notification falls under the provisions of the LPC and may have as its effect a significant impediment to competition on the market or a substantial part thereof (article 15, article 17 and article 19, paragraph 1, point 3 of the LPC). In June and July 2015 the concerned undertakings filed commitments to the Commission for the purpose of enabling the Commission to determine whether the concentration is in compliance with the LPC. The Commission's decision is pending.

In 2014 the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters imposed total fines of €3.79 million. The Commission adopted 10 decisions in misdemeanour procedures, of which two decisions relate to failure to file a notification of a concentration.

In 2014 the Commission adopted a total of 41 administrative decisions, of which 30 decisions refer to control of the concentration. In 29 cases it was determined that the concentrations were in compliance with the LPC, whereas in one case the Commission determined that the concentration did not fall under the provisions of the LPC.

33 What is the usual time frame for appeal or judicial review?

A lawsuit can be lodged with the Administrative Court against decisions of the Commission adopted in administrative procedures within 30 days of receiving the decision, not deferring the enforcement.

A lawsuit can be lodged with the Administrative Court against decisions of the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters within eight days of receiving the decision and the same shall defer the enforcement of the decision.

Decisions of the Administrative Court can be appealed to the Higher Administrative Court within 15 days of receiving the decision of the Administrative Court.

Enforcement practice and future developments**34 What is the recent enforcement record and what are the current enforcement concerns of the authorities?**

So far, all of the Commission's merger decisions have been complied with.

The newly enacted LPC introduced misdemeanour procedures in which the Commission for Misdemeanour Matters shall simultaneously determine the existence of violation of the LPC, the existence of

a misdemeanour, and it shall also impose certain fines as sanctions for such behaviour. It is expected that the structure of the LPC shall expedite the enforcement and the system of sanctioning LPC violations, as it will no longer be necessary for the violation to be initially determined in an administrative procedure, which would then be followed by a separate misdemeanour procedure.

Between July 2014 and May 2015 the Commission adopted 20 decisions of which 17 decisions were adopted in short form and three in regular form. All of the decisions were adopted within the prescribed term of 25 days as of the day of receipt of complete notification. There have been no conditional clearances or prohibitions imposed by the Commission in the past year.

35 Are there current proposals to change the legislation?

At present there are no proposals for adoption of regulations or for any changes (amendment and supplement of the current regulation) pending. The new by-laws on the basis of the LPC were adopted in March 2012 and are in force. With this set of by-laws, competition legislation under the LPC is up to date with the most important parts of EU legislation.



ČAKMAKOVA
ADVOCATES

Vesna Gavriloska
Maja Jakimovska
Margareta Taseva

v.gavriloska@mlca.com.mk
maja.jakimovska@mlca.com.mk
margareta.taseva@mlca.com.mk

ul. 8 ma Udarne Brigada No. 43/3
Skopje
Macedonia

Tel: +389 2 3233 599
Fax: +389 2 3111 521
www.cakmakova.com

Getting the Deal Through

Acquisition Finance	Domains & Domain Names	Licensing	Real Estate
Advertising & Marketing	Dominance	Life Sciences	Restructuring & Insolvency
Air Transport	e-Commerce	Loans & Secured Financing	Right of Publicity
Anti-Corruption Regulation	Electricity Regulation	Mediation	Securities Finance
Anti-Money Laundering	Enforcement of Foreign Judgments	Merger Control	Securities Litigation
Arbitration	Environment	Mergers & Acquisitions	Ship Finance
Asset Recovery	Executive Compensation & Employee Benefits	Mining	Shipbuilding
Aviation Finance & Leasing	Foreign Investment Review	Oil Regulation	Shipping
Banking Regulation	Franchise	Outsourcing	State Aid
Cartel Regulation	Fund Management	Patents	Structured Finance & Securitisation
Climate Regulation	Gas Regulation	Pensions & Retirement Plans	Tax Controversy
Construction	Government Investigations	Pharmaceutical Antitrust	Tax on Inbound Investment
Copyright	Initial Public Offerings	Private Antitrust Litigation	Telecoms & Media
Corporate Governance	Insurance & Reinsurance	Private Client	Trade & Customs
Corporate Immigration	Insurance Litigation	Private Equity	Trademarks
Cybersecurity	Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Product Liability	Transfer Pricing
Data Protection & Privacy	Investment Treaty Arbitration	Product Recall	Vertical Agreements
Debt Capital Markets	Islamic Finance & Markets	Project Finance	
Dispute Resolution	Labour & Employment	Public-Private Partnerships	
Distribution & Agency		Public Procurement	

Also available digitally



Online

www.gettingthedealthrough.com



iPad app

Available on iTunes



Merger Control
ISSN 1365-7976



THE QUEEN'S AWARDS
FOR ENTERPRISE:
2012



Official Partner of the Latin American
Corporate Counsel Association



Strategic Research Sponsor of the
ABA Section of International Law