

THE MERGER
CONTROL
REVIEW

NINTH EDITION

Editor
Ilene Knable Gotts

THE LAWREVIEWS

THE
MERGER
CONTROL
REVIEW

NINTH EDITION

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd
This article was first published in August 2018
For further information please contact Nick.Barette@thelawreviews.co.uk

Editor
Ilene Knable Gotts

THE LAWREVIEWS

PUBLISHER

Tom Barnes

SENIOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Nick Barette

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGERS

Thomas Lee, Joel Woods

SENIOR ACCOUNT MANAGER

Pere Aspinall

ACCOUNT MANAGERS

Sophie Emberson, Jack Bagnall

PRODUCT MARKETING EXECUTIVE

Rebecca Mogridge

EDITORIAL COORDINATOR

Gavin Jordan

HEAD OF PRODUCTION

Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR

Anna Andreoli

SUBEDITOR

Janina Godowska

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Paul Howarth

Published in the United Kingdom

by Law Business Research Ltd, London

87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK

© 2018 Law Business Research Ltd

www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of July 2018, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above.

Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed
to the Publisher – tom.barnes@lbresearch.com

ISBN 978-1-912228-46-1

Printed in Great Britain by

Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire

Tel: 0844 2480 112

THE LAWREVIEWS

THE ACQUISITION AND LEVERAGED FINANCE REVIEW
THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW
THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW
THE ASSET TRACING AND RECOVERY REVIEW
THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW
THE BANKING LITIGATION LAW REVIEW
THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW
THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW
THE CLASS ACTIONS LAW REVIEW
THE CONSUMER FINANCE LAW REVIEW
THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW
THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW
THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW
THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW
THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW
THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW
THE ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE LAW REVIEW
THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW
THE FINANCIAL TECHNOLOGY LAW REVIEW
THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REGULATION REVIEW
THE FRANCHISE LAW REVIEW
THE GAMBLING LAW REVIEW
THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW
THE HEALTHCARE LAW REVIEW
THE INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERINGS LAW REVIEW
THE INSOLVENCY REVIEW
THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW
THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND ANTITRUST REVIEW
THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW
THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW
THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW
THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW REVIEW
THE INVESTMENT TREATY ARBITRATION REVIEW
THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW
THE ISLAMIC FINANCE AND MARKETS LAW REVIEW
THE LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DISPUTES REVIEW
THE LENDING AND SECURED FINANCE REVIEW
THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW
THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW
THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW
THE MINING LAW REVIEW
THE OIL AND GAS LAW REVIEW
THE PATENT LITIGATION LAW REVIEW
THE PRIVACY, DATA PROTECTION AND CYBERSECURITY LAW REVIEW
THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW
THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW
THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW
THE PRODUCT REGULATION AND LIABILITY REVIEW
THE PROFESSIONAL NEGLIGENCE LAW REVIEW
THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW
THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW
THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP LAW REVIEW
THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW
THE REAL ESTATE M&A AND PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW
THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW
THE SECURITIES LITIGATION REVIEW
THE SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS AND ACTIVISM REVIEW
THE SHIPPING LAW REVIEW
THE SPORTS LAW REVIEW
THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW
THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW
THE THIRD PARTY LITIGATION FUNDING LAW REVIEW
THE TRADEMARKS LAW REVIEW
THE TRANSFER PRICING LAW REVIEW
THE TRANSPORT FINANCE LAW REVIEW

www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

ALLEN & GLEDHILL LLP

ALTIUS

ANDERSON MÖRI & TOMOTSUNE

ANTONIOU MCCOLLUM & CO

ASHURST

AZB & PARTNERS

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP

BREDIN PRAT

CAIAZZO DONNINI PAPPALARDO & ASSOCIATI – CDP STUDIO LEGALE

CALLOL, COCA & ASOCIADOS

CLEARY GOTTLLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

CMS REICH-ROHRWIG HAINZ RECHTSANWÄLTE GMBH

CMS RUSSIA

CMS VON ERLACH PONCET LTD

CUATRECASAS

DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP

ELIG GÜRKAYNAK ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

HOUTHOFF

KARANOVIĆ & NIKOLIĆ

KING & WOOD MALLESONS

LAW FIRM BEKINA, ŠKURLA, DURMIŠ AND SPAJIĆ LTD

LCS & PARTNERS

LINKLATERS
MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP
MINTERELLISONRUDDWATTS
MOTTA FERNANDES ADVOGADOS
NIHAD SIJERČIĆ INDEPENDENT ATTORNEY-AT-LAW IN COOPERATION WITH
KARANović & NIKOLIĆ
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
PÉREZ BUSTAMANTE & PONCE
POLENAK LAW FIRM
PRAGMA LEGAL
SK CHAMBERS
SLAUGHTER AND MAY
UGGC LAW FIRM
VALDÉS ABASCAL ABOGADOS SC
WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
YULCHON LLC

CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	vii
<i>Ilene Knable Gotts</i>	

Part I: General Papers

Chapter 1	CHINA'S MERGER CONTROL IN THE PHARMACEUTICAL SECTOR.....	1
	<i>Susan Ning and Ting Gong</i>	
Chapter 2	EU MERGER CONTROL.....	8
	<i>Nicholas Levy and Patrick Bock</i>	
Chapter 3	EU MERGER CONTROL IN THE MEDIA SECTOR.....	26
	<i>J�r�mie Marthan</i>	
Chapter 4	INTERNATIONAL MERGER REMEDIES.....	32
	<i>John Ratliff, Fr�d�ric Louis and Cormac O'Daly</i>	
Chapter 5	US MERGER CONTROL IN THE HIGH-TECHNOLOGY SECTOR.....	46
	<i>C Scott Hataway, Michael S Wise, Noah B Pinegar and Sabin Chung</i>	
Chapter 6	US MERGER CONTROL IN THE MEDIA SECTOR.....	53
	<i>Gary W Kubek and Michael Schaper</i>	

Part II: Jurisdictions

Chapter 7	AUSTRALIA.....	69
	<i>Peter Armitage, Ross Zaurrini and Amanda Tesvic</i>	
Chapter 8	AUSTRIA.....	85
	<i>Dieter Zandler and Linda Marterer</i>	
Chapter 9	BELGIUM.....	98
	<i>Carmen Verdonck and Daniel Muheme</i>	

Contents

Chapter 10	BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	115
	<i>Nihad Sijerčić</i>	
Chapter 11	BRAZIL.....	124
	<i>Cecilia Vidigal M de Barros, Paula Beeby M de Barros Bellotti and Antônio José D R da Rocha Frota</i>	
Chapter 12	CANADA.....	138
	<i>Julie A Soloway, Cassandra Brown and Julia Potter</i>	
Chapter 13	CHINA.....	150
	<i>Susan Ning</i>	
Chapter 14	COSTA RICA.....	158
	<i>Edgar Odio</i>	
Chapter 15	CROATIA	167
	<i>Goran Durmiš, Ivana Ostojić and Tea Radmilo</i>	
Chapter 16	CYPRUS.....	178
	<i>Anastasios A Antoniou and Christina McCollum</i>	
Chapter 17	ECUADOR.....	186
	<i>Diego Pérez-Ordóñez, Luis Marín-Tobar and Mario Navarette-Serrano</i>	
Chapter 18	FRANCE.....	196
	<i>Hugues Calvet, Olivier Billard and Guillaume Fabre</i>	
Chapter 19	GERMANY.....	211
	<i>Alexander Rinne</i>	
Chapter 20	HONG KONG	220
	<i>Marc Waba, Pearl Yeung and Sophie Chen</i>	
Chapter 21	INDIA	230
	<i>Rahul Rai, Shashank Sharma and Shivam Jha</i>	
Chapter 22	ITALY	244
	<i>Rino Caiazza and Francesca Costantini</i>	

Chapter 23	JAPAN <i>Yusuke Nakano, Takeshi Suzuki and Kiyoko Yagami</i>	253
Chapter 24	KOREA <i>Sai Ree Yun, Seuk Joon Lee, Cecil Saehoon Chung, Kyoung Yeon Kim and Kyu Hyun Kim</i>	264
Chapter 25	MACEDONIA <i>Tatjana Popovski-Buloski</i>	272
Chapter 26	MALAYSIA <i>Shanthy Kandiah</i>	278
Chapter 27	MEXICO <i>Rafael Valdés Abascal and Enrique de la Peña Fajardo</i>	290
Chapter 28	MOROCCO <i>Corinne Khayat and Maija Brossard</i>	297
Chapter 29	NETHERLANDS <i>Gerrit Oosterhuis and Weyer VerLoren van Themaat</i>	305
Chapter 30	NEW ZEALAND <i>Ross Patterson, Oliver Meech and Kristel McMeekin</i>	316
Chapter 31	POLAND <i>Małgorzata Sz waj and Wojciech Podlasin</i>	327
Chapter 32	PORTUGAL <i>Rita Leandro Vasconcelos and Inês Ferrari Careto</i>	337
Chapter 33	RUSSIA <i>Maxim Boulba and Maria Ermolaeva</i>	350
Chapter 34	SERBIA <i>Rastko Petaković and Bojana Miljanović</i>	359
Chapter 35	SINGAPORE <i>Daren Shiau, Elsa Chen and Scott Clements</i>	369

Contents

Chapter 36	SOUTH AFRICA	384
	<i>Candice Upfold</i>	
Chapter 37	SPAIN.....	409
	<i>Pedro Callol</i>	
Chapter 38	SWITZERLAND	418
	<i>Pascal G Favre and Marquard Christen</i>	
Chapter 39	TAIWAN.....	428
	<i>Victor I Chang, Margaret Huang and Rose Lin</i>	
Chapter 40	TURKEY.....	437
	<i>Gönenç Gürkaynak and K Korhan Yıldırım</i>	
Chapter 41	UNITED KINGDOM	446
	<i>Jordan Ellison and Paul Walter</i>	
Chapter 42	UNITED STATES	459
	<i>Ilene Knable Gotts</i>	
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....	467
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS.....	501

PREFACE

Pre-merger competition review has advanced significantly since its creation in 1976 in the United States. As this book evidences, today almost all competition authorities have a notification process in place – with most requiring pre-merger notification for transactions that meet certain prescribed minimum thresholds. Additional jurisdictions, most recently in South America, have added pre-merger notification regimes. In our endeavour to keep our readers well informed, we have expanded the jurisdictions covered by this book to include the newer regimes as well. Also, the book now includes chapters devoted to such ‘hot’ M&A sectors as pharmaceuticals, and high technology and media in key jurisdictions to provide a more in-depth discussion of recent developments. Finally, the book includes a chapter on the economic analysis applied to merger review.

Given the ability of most competition agencies with pre-merger notification laws to delay, and even block, a transaction, it is imperative to take each jurisdiction – small or large, new or mature – seriously. For instance, in 2009, China blocked the Coca-Cola Company’s proposed acquisition of China Huiyuan Juice Group Limited and imposed conditions on four mergers involving non-China-domiciled firms. In *Phonak/ReSound* (a merger between a Swiss undertaking and a Danish undertaking, each with a German subsidiary), the German Federal Cartel Office blocked the entire merger, even though less than 10 per cent of each of the undertakings was attributable to Germany. It is, therefore, imperative that counsel for such a transaction develops a comprehensive plan prior to, or immediately upon, execution of an agreement concerning where and when to file notification with competition authorities regarding such a transaction. To this end, this book provides an overview of the process in 36 jurisdictions, as well as a discussion of recent decisions, strategic considerations and likely upcoming developments. Given the number of recent significant M&A transactions involving media, pharma and high-technology companies, we have included chapters that focus on the enforcement trends in these important sectors. In addition, as merger review increasingly includes economic analysis in most, if not all, jurisdictions, we have added a chapter that discusses the various economic tools used to analyse transactions. The intended readership of this book comprises both in-house and outside counsel who may be involved in the competition review of cross-border transactions.

Some common threads in institutional design underlie most of the merger review mandates, although there are some outliers as well as nuances that necessitate careful consideration when advising a client on a particular transaction. Almost all jurisdictions vest exclusive authority to review transactions in one agency. The United States is now the major exception in this regard since China consolidated its three antitrust agencies into one agency

this year. Most jurisdictions provide for objective monetary size thresholds (e.g., the turnover of the parties, the size of the transaction) to determine whether a filing is required. Germany has recently amended its law to ensure that it has the opportunity to review transactions in which the parties' turnover do not reach the threshold, but the value of the transaction is significant (e.g., social media, new economy, internet transactions). Please note that the actual monetary threshold levels can vary in specific jurisdictions over time. There are some jurisdictions that still use 'market share' indicia (e.g., Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain, Ukraine and the United Kingdom). Most jurisdictions require that both parties have some turnover or nexus to their jurisdiction. However, there are some jurisdictions that take a more expansive view. For instance, in Poland, a notification may be required even though only one of the parties is present and, therefore, there may not be an impact on competition in Poland. Turkey recently issued a decision finding that a joint venture (JV) that produced no effect on Turkish markets was reportable because the JV's products 'could be' imported into Turkey. In Serbia, there similarly is no 'local' effects required. Germany also takes an expansive view by adopting as one of its thresholds a transaction of 'competitively significant influence'. Although a few merger notification jurisdictions remain 'voluntary' (e.g., Australia, Singapore, the United Kingdom and Venezuela), the vast majority impose mandatory notification requirements. Moreover, in Singapore, the transaction parties are to undertake a 'self-assessment' of whether the transaction will meet certain levels, and, if so, should notify the agency to avoid potential challenge by the agency.

Although in most jurisdictions the focus of the competition agency is on competition issues, some jurisdictions have a broader mandate. For instance, the 'public interest' approach in South Africa expressly provides for consideration of employment matters, local enterprises and procurement, and for economic empowerment of the black population and its participation in the company. Many of the remedies imposed in South Africa this year have been in connection with these considerations. Although a number of jurisdictions have separate regulations and processes for addressing foreign entity acquisitions when national security or specific industrial sectors are involved, in Romania, for example, the competition law provides that the government can prohibit a merger if it determines that such merger could have a potential impact on national security.

The potential consequences for failing to file in jurisdictions with mandatory requirements vary. Almost all jurisdictions require that the notification process be concluded prior to completion (e.g., pre-merger, suspensory regimes), rather than permitting the transaction to close as long as notification is made prior to closing. Many of these jurisdictions can impose a significant fine for failure to notify before closing, even where the transaction raises no competition concerns (e.g., Austria, Cyprus, India, the Netherlands, Romania, Spain and Turkey). In France, for instance, the competition authority imposed a €4 million fine on Castel Frères for failure to notify its acquisition of part of the Patriache group. In Ukraine and Romania, the competition authorities have focused their efforts on discovering consummated transactions that had not been notified, and imposing fines on the parties. Chile's antitrust enforcer recommended a fine of US\$3.8 million against two meat-packing companies, even though the parties had carved the Chilean business out of the closing.

Some jurisdictions impose strict time frames within which the parties must file their notification. For instance, Cyprus requires filing within one week of signing of the relevant documents and agreements; Serbia provides for 15 days after signing of the agreement; and Hungary, Ireland and Romania have a 30-calendar-day time limit for filing the notification that commences with entering into the agreement. Some jurisdictions that mandate filings

within specified periods after execution of the agreement also have the authority to impose fines for 'late' notifications (e.g., Bosnia and Herzegovina, Indonesia, and Serbia). Most jurisdictions also have the ability to impose significant fines for failure to notify or for closing before the end of the waiting period, or both (e.g., Austria, Canada, China, Greece, Portugal, Ukraine and the United States). In Macedonia, the failure to file can result in a misdemeanour and a monetary fine of up to 10 per cent of the worldwide turnover. In Belgium, the competition authority fined a party for late submission of information.

In addition, other jurisdictions have joined the European Commission (EC) and the United States in focusing on interim conduct of the transaction parties, commonly referred to as 'gun jumping'. Brazil, for instance, issued its first gun-jumping fine in 2014 and recently issued guidelines on gun-jumping violations. Since then, Brazil has continued to be very active in investigating and imposing fines for gun-jumping activities. In addition, the sharing of competitively sensitive information prior to approval appears to be considered an element of gun jumping. And the fines that are being imposed has increased. For example, the EC imposed the largest gun-jumping fine ever of €124.5 million against Altice.

In most jurisdictions, a transaction that does not meet the pre-merger notification thresholds is not subject to review or challenge by the competition authority. In Canada – like the United States – however, the Canadian Competition Bureau can challenge mergers that were not required to be notified under the pre-merger statute. In Korea, Microsoft initially filed a notification with the Korea Fair Trade Commission (KFTC), but when it faced difficulties and delays in Korea the parties restructured the acquisition to render the transaction non-reportable in Korea and consummated the transaction. The KFTC, however, continued its investigation as a post-consummation merger investigation and eventually obtained a consent order.

In almost all jurisdictions, very few transactions undergo a full investigation, although some require that the notification provide detailed information regarding the markets, competitors, competition, suppliers, customers and entry conditions. Most jurisdictions that have filing fees specify a flat fee or state in advance a schedule of fees based upon the size of the transaction; some jurisdictions, however, determine the fee after filing or provide different fees based on the complexity of the transaction. For instance, Cyprus is now considering charging a higher fee for acquisitions that are subjected to a full Phase II investigation.

Most jurisdictions more closely resemble the EC model than the United States model. In these jurisdictions, pre-filing consultations are more common (and even encouraged); parties can offer undertakings during the initial stage to resolve competitive concerns; and there is a set period during the second phase for providing additional information and for the agency to reach a decision. In Japan, however, the Japan Federal Trade Commission (JFTC) announced in June 2011 that it would abolish the prior consultation procedure option. When combined with the inability to 'stop the clock' on the review periods, counsel may find it more challenging in transactions involving multiple filings to avoid the potential for the entry of conflicting remedies or even a prohibition decision at the end of a JFTC review. Some jurisdictions, such as Croatia, are still aligning their threshold criteria and processes with the EC model. Some jurisdictions even within the EC remain that differ procedurally from the EC model. For instance, in Austria, the obligation to file can be triggered if only one of the involved undertakings has sales in Austria, as long as both parties satisfy a minimum global turnover and have a sizeable combined turnover in Austria.

The role of third parties also varies across jurisdictions. In some jurisdictions (e.g., Japan), there is no explicit right of intervention by third parties, but the authorities can choose

to allow it on a case-by-case basis. In contrast, in South Africa, registered trade unions or representatives of employees must be provided with a redacted copy of the merger notification from the outset and have the right to participate in merger hearings before the Competition Tribunal: the Tribunal will typically also permit other third parties to participate. Bulgaria has announced a process by which transaction parties even consent to disclosure of their confidential information to third parties. In some jurisdictions (e.g., Australia, the EC and Germany), third parties may file an objection to a clearance decision. In some jurisdictions (including Canada, the EC and the United States), third parties (e.g., competitors) are required to provide information and data if requested by the antitrust authority. In Israel, a third party that did not comply with such a request was recently fined by the authority.

In almost all jurisdictions, once the authority approves the transaction, it cannot later challenge the transaction's legality. The United States is one significant outlier with no bar for subsequent challenge, even decades following the closing, if the transaction is later believed to have substantially lessened competition. Canada, in contrast, provides a more limited time period of one year for challenging a notified transaction (see the recent *CSC/Complete* transaction). Norway is a bit unusual, where the authority has the ability to mandate notification of a transaction for a period of up to three months following the transaction's consummation. In 'voluntary' jurisdictions, such as Australia and Singapore, the competition agency can investigate and challenge unnotified transactions.

It is becoming the norm in large cross-border transactions raising competition concerns for the United States, Canadian, Mexican and EC authorities to work closely together during the investigative stages, and even in determining remedies, minimising the potential of arriving at diverging outcomes. The KFTC has stated that it will engage in even greater cooperation with foreign competition authorities, particularly those of China and Japan, which are similar to Korea in their industrial structure. Regional cooperation among some of the newer agencies has also become more common; for example, the Argentinian authority has worked with Brazil's CADE, which in turn has worked with the Chilean authority. Competition authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Slovenia, and Turkey similarly maintain close ties and cooperate on transactions. Taiwan is part of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum, which shares a database. In transactions not requiring filings in multiple European jurisdictions, Member States often keep each other informed during the course of an investigation. In addition, transactions not meeting the EC threshold can nevertheless be referred to the European Commission in appropriate circumstances. The United States has signed cooperation agreements with a number of jurisdictions, including most recently Peru and India. China has 'consulted' with the United States and the EC on some mergers and entered into a cooperation agreement with the United States authorities in 2011.

The impact of such multi-jurisdictional cooperation was very evident this year. For instance, the transaction parties in *Applied Materials/Tokyo Electron* ultimately abandoned the transaction due to the combined objections of several jurisdictions, including the United States, Europe and Korea. In *Office Depot/Staples*, the FTC and the Canadian Competition Bureau cooperated and both jurisdictions brought suits to block the transaction (although the EC had also cooperated on this transaction, it ultimately accepted the undertakings offered by the parties). In the *GE/Alstom* transaction, the United States and the EC coordinated throughout, including at the remedies stage. Additionally, in the *Halliburton/Baker Hughes* transaction, the United States and the EC coordinated their investigations, with the United

States suing to block the transaction while the EC's investigation continued. Also, in *Holcim/Lafarge*, the cooperation between the United States and Canada continued at the remedies stage, where both consents included assets in the other jurisdiction's territory. The United States, Canada and Mexico coordinated closely in the review of the *Continental/Veyance* transaction. In fact, coordination among the jurisdictions in multinational transactions that raise competition issues is becoming the norm.

Although some jurisdictions have recently raised the size threshold at which filings are mandated, others have broadened the scope of their legislation to include, for instance, partial ownership interests. Some jurisdictions continue to have as their threshold test for pre-merger notification whether there is an 'acquisition of control'. Many of these jurisdictions, however, will include, as a reportable situation, the creation of 'joint control', 'negative (e.g., veto control) rights to the extent that they may give rise to *de jure* or *de facto* control (e.g., Turkey), or a change from 'joint control' to 'sole control' (e.g., the EC and Lithuania). Minority holdings and concerns over 'creeping acquisitions', in which an industry may consolidate before the agencies become fully aware, have become the focus of many jurisdictions. Some jurisdictions will consider as reviewable acquisitions in which only a 10 per cent or less interest is being acquired (e.g., Serbia for certain financial and insurance mergers), although most jurisdictions have somewhat higher thresholds (e.g., Korea sets the threshold at 15 per cent of a public company and otherwise at 20 per cent of a target; and Japan and Russia at any amount exceeding 20 per cent of the target). Others use, as the benchmark, the impact that the partial shareholding has on competition; Norway, for instance, can challenge a minority shareholding that creates or strengthens a significant restriction on competition. The United Kingdom also focuses on whether the minority shareholder has 'material influence' (i.e., the ability to make or influence commercial policy) over the entity. Several agencies during the past few years have analysed partial ownership acquisitions on a stand-alone basis as well as in connection with JVs (e.g., Canada, China, Cyprus, Finland and Switzerland). Vertical mergers were also a subject of review (and even resulted in some enforcement actions) in a number of jurisdictions (e.g., Belgium, Canada, China, Sweden and Taiwan). Portugal even viewed as an 'acquisition' subject to notification the non-binding transfer of a customer base.

For transactions that raise competition issues, the need to plan and to coordinate among counsel has become particularly acute. Multi-jurisdictional cooperation facilitates the development of cross-border remedies packages that effectively address competitive concerns while permitting the transaction to proceed. The consents adopted by the United States and Canada in the *Holcim/Lafarge* merger exemplify such a cross-border package. As discussed in the 'International Merger Remedies' chapter, it is no longer prudent to focus merely on the larger mature authorities, with the expectation that other jurisdictions will follow their lead or defer to their review. In the current enforcement environment, obtaining the approval of jurisdictions such as Brazil and China can be as important as the approval of the EC or the United States. Moreover, the need to coordinate is particularly acute to the extent that multiple agencies decide to impose conditions on the transaction. Although most jurisdictions indicate that 'structural' remedies are preferable to 'behavioural' conditions, a number of jurisdictions in the past few years have imposed a variety of such behavioural remedies (e.g., China, the EC, France, the Netherlands, Norway, South Africa, Ukraine and the United States). For instance, some recent decisions have included as behavioural remedies pricing, sales tariffs and terms of sale conditions (e.g., Korea, Ukraine and Serbia), employee retrenchment (South Africa) and restrictions on bringing anti-dumping suits (e.g., Mexico).

Many recent decisions have imposed behavioural remedies to strengthen the effectiveness of divestitures (e.g., Canada's decision in the *Loblaw/Shoppers* transaction, China's MOFCOM remedy in *Glencore/Xstrata*, and France's decision in the *Numericable/SFR* transaction). This book should provide a useful starting point in navigating cross-border transactions in the current enforcement environment.

Ilene Knable Gotts

Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz

New York

July 2018

TURKEY

Gönenç Gürkaynak and K Korhan Yıldırım¹

I INTRODUCTION

The national competition agency for enforcing merger control rules in Turkey is the Turkish Competition Authority, a legal entity with administrative and financial autonomy. The Turkish Competition Authority consists of the Competition Board, the Presidency, Service Departments and the Advisory Department. As the competent decision-making body of the Turkish Competition Authority, the Competition Board is responsible for, *inter alia*, reviewing and resolving merger and acquisition notifications. The Competition Board consists of seven members and is based in Ankara. The Service Departments consist of five technical units, one research unit, one decisions unit, one information management unit, one external relations unit, one management services unit, and one strategy development unit. There is a 'sectoral' job definition for each technical unit.

The relevant legislation on merger control is Law No. 4,054 on Protection of Competition and Communiqué No. 2010/4 on Mergers and Acquisitions Requiring the Approval of the Competition Board. The Competition Authority has also issued many guidelines to supplement and provide guidance on the enforcement of Turkish merger control rules. The Guideline on Market Definition was issued in 2008, and is closely modelled on the Commission Notice on the Definition of Relevant Market for the Purposes of Community Competition Law (97/C372/03). The Competition Board released five comprehensive guidelines on merger control matters. The first is the Guideline on Undertakings Concerned, Turnover and Ancillary Restrictions in Mergers and Acquisitions, covering certain topics and questions about the concepts of undertakings concerned, turnover calculations and ancillary restraints. It is closely modelled on Council Regulation (EC) No. 139/2004 on the Control of Concentrations between Undertakings. The second is the Guideline on Remedies Acceptable to the Turkish Competition Authority in Mergers and Acquisitions (Guidelines on Remedies). The Guidelines on Remedies is an almost exact Turkish translation of the Commission Notice on Remedies Acceptable Under Council Regulation (EC) No. 139/2004 and Under Commission Regulation (EC) No. 802/2004. The third and fourth are the Guidelines on Horizontal Mergers and Acquisitions (Horizontal Guidelines) and the Guidelines on Non-horizontal Mergers and Acquisitions (Non-horizontal Guidelines). These Guidelines are in line with EU competition law regulations and seek to retain harmony

¹ Gönenç Gürkaynak is a founding partner and K Korhan Yıldırım is a partner at ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law.

between EU and Turkish competition law instruments. Finally, the Competition Board released the Guidelines on Merger and Acquisition Transactions and the Concept of Control, also closely modelled on the respective EC guidelines.

Turkey is a jurisdiction with a suspensory pre-merger notification and approval requirement. Much like the EC regime, concentrations that result in a change of control on a lasting basis are subject to the Competition Board's approval, provided that they reach the applicable turnover thresholds. 'Control' is defined as the right to exercise decisive influence over day-to-day management or on long-term strategic business decisions of a company, and it can be exercised *de jure* or *de facto*.

The Authority has recently introduced Communiqué No. 2017/2 Amending Communiqué 2010/4 on Mergers and Acquisitions Requiring the Approval of the Board. One of the amendments introduced in Communiqué No. 2010/4 is that Article 1 of Communiqué No. 2017/2 abolished Article 7(2) of Communiqué No. 2010/4 which had required that 'The thresholds ... are re-determined by the Board biannually'. Through this amendment, the Board no longer has the duty to re-establish turnover thresholds for concentrations every two years. As a result, there is no specific timeline for the review of the relevant turnover thresholds set forth by Article 7(1) of Communiqué No. 2010/4. Secondly, Article 2 of Communiqué No. 2017/2 modified Article 8(5) of Communiqué No. 2010/4. Together with this amendment, the Board will now be in a position to evaluate the transactions realised by the same undertaking concerned in the same relevant product market within three years as a single transaction, as well as two transactions carried out between the same persons or parties within a three-year period. Lastly, Communiqué No. 2017/2 introduced a new regulation concerning public bids and series of transactions in securities. This newly introduced provision is similar to Article 7(2) of the European Merger Regulation. It provides that the applicable suspension requirement will not prevent the implementation of a public bid or of a series of transactions in securities on the conditions that (1) the transaction is notified to the Turkish Competition Authority without delay, and (2) the acquirer does not exercise the voting rights or does so only to maintain the full value of the investment based on a derogation granted by the Board. The Board may condition the derogation upon certain remedies to maintain effective competition.

Prior to this amendment, there was no specific regulation on the implementation of public bids and series of transactions. There were, however, certain precedents that laid down the same principles as the new regulation.

i Thresholds

Article 7 of Communiqué No. 2010/4 provides for the following thresholds:

- a* the total turnover of the parties to a concentration in Turkey exceeds 100 million liras and the respective Turkish turnover of at least two of the parties individually exceed 30 million liras; or
- b* the Turkish turnover of the transferred assets or businesses in acquisitions exceeds 30 million liras, or the Turkish turnover of any of the parties in mergers exceeds 30 million liras; and the worldwide turnover of at least one of the other parties to the transaction exceeds 500 million liras.

Communique No. 2010/4 no longer seeks the existence of an 'affected market' in assessing whether a transaction triggers a notification requirement. Under the old regime, transactions that did not affect a market did not trigger a pre-merger notification or approval requirement,

even if they exceeded the turnover thresholds. Joint venture transactions were the exception to this rule, and they required pre-merger notification and approval if they exceeded the thresholds, regardless of whether they resulted in an affected market. Now, the existence of an affected market is not a condition to triggering a merger control filing requirement.

The Guideline on Undertakings Concerned, Turnover and Ancillary Restrictions in Mergers and Acquisitions has also been amended in line with the changes in the jurisdictional thresholds. Before the amendments, a horizontal or vertical overlap between the worldwide activities of the transaction parties was sufficient to infer the existence of an affected market, provided that one of the transaction parties was active in such an overlapping segment in Turkey. Following the amendments, existence of an affected market is no longer a requirement for a merger filing to the Competition Authority, and all discussions and explanations on the concept of affected market have been removed from the Guideline altogether.

Foreign-to-foreign transactions are caught if they exceed the applicable thresholds.

Acquisition of a minority shareholding can constitute a notifiable merger if and to the extent that it leads to a change in the control structure of the target entity. Joint ventures that emerge as independent economic entities possessing assets and labour to achieve their objectives are subject to notification to, and the approval of, the Competition Board. As per Article 13 of Communiqué No. 2010/4, cooperative joint ventures will also be subject to a merger control notification and analysis on top of an individual exemption analysis, if warranted.

The implementing regulations provide for important exemptions and special rules. In particular:

- a* Article 19 of Banking Law No. 5411 provides an exception from the application of merger control rules for mergers and acquisitions of banks. The exemption is subject to the condition that the market share of the total assets of the relevant banks does not exceed 20 per cent;
- b* mandatory acquisitions by public institutions as a result of financial distress, concordat, liquidation, etc., do not require a pre-merger notification;
- c* intra-corporate transactions that do not lead to a change in control are not notifiable;
- d* acquisitions by inheritance are not subject to merger control;
- e* acquisitions made by financial securities companies solely for investment purposes do not require a notification, subject to the condition that the securities company does not exercise control over the target entity in a manner that influences its competitive behaviour;
- f* two or more transactions carried out between the same persons or parties or within the same relevant product market by the same undertaking concerned within a period of three years are deemed a single transaction for turnover calculation purposes following the amendments brought by Communiqué No. 2017/2. They warrant separate notifications if their cumulative effect exceeds the thresholds, regardless of whether the transactions are in the same market or sector, or whether they were notified before.

There are also specific methods of turnover calculation for certain sectors. These special methods apply to banks, special financial institutions, leasing companies, factoring companies, securities agents, insurance companies and pension companies. The Turkish merger control regime does not, however, recognise any *de minimis* exceptions.

Failing to file or closing the transaction before the Competition Board's approval can result in a turnover-based monetary fine. The fine is calculated according to the annual

local Turkish turnover of the acquirer generated in the financial year preceding the fining decision at a rate of 0.1 per cent. It will be imposed on the acquiring party. In the case of mergers, it will apply to both merging parties. The monetary fine will, in any event, not be less than 21,036 lira for 2018. This monetary fine does not depend on whether the Turkish Competition Authority will ultimately clear the transaction.

If, however, there truly is a risk that the transaction is problematic under the dominance test applicable in Turkey, the Turkish Competition Authority may *ex officio* launch an investigation into the transaction; order structural and behavioural remedies to restore the situation as before the closing (*restitutio in integrum*); and impose a turnover-based fine of up to 10 per cent of the parties' annual turnover. Executive members and employees of the undertakings concerned who are determined to have played a significant role in the violation (failing to file or closing before the approval) may also receive monetary fines of up to 5 per cent of the fine imposed on the undertakings. The transaction will also be invalid and unenforceable in Turkey.

The Competition Board has so far consistently rejected all carveout or hold-separate arrangements proposed by merging undertakings. Communiqué No. 2010/4 provides that a transaction is deemed to be 'realised' (i.e., closed) 'on the date when the change in control occurs'. While the wording allows some room to speculate that carveout or hold-separate arrangements are now allowed, it remains to be seen if the Turkish Competition Authority will interpret this provision in such a way. As noted above, this has so far been consistently rejected by the Competition Board, which argues that a closing is sufficient for the suspension violation fine to be imposed, and that a further analysis of whether change in control actually took effect in Turkey is unwarranted.

II YEAR IN REVIEW

Pursuant to the Merger and Acquisition Insight Report of the Authority (the Report) for 2017, the Board reviewed a total of 184 transactions in 2017; these transactions included five privatisations. Among these transactions four concentrations regarding the roll-on, roll-off (ro-ro) transportation services, agriculture, port services and optics sectors were subjected to Phase II review in 2017. Moreover, the Board refused to grant approval to one concentration notified and subjected to Phase II review in 2017.² The other three of these transactions are still under review. In 2017, 94 transactions notified to the Board were foreign-to-foreign transactions, which constitute over half of the concentrations notified in 2017.

The Board's most important merger control decisions in 2017 were as follows.

In May 2017, the Competition Board granted an unconditional approval to the transaction concerning the acquisition by Maersk Line A/S (Maersk) of all shares and sole control of Hamburg Südamerikanische Dampfschiffahrts – Gesellschaft KG (HSDG). Maersk (the buyer) is the largest container shipping company, while HSDG is among the top 10 worldwide. Maersk and HSDG offer their services on trade routes through cooperation agreements with other shipping companies based on vessel-sharing agreements where members decide jointly on capacity setting, scheduling and ports of call, which are all important parameters of competition. In its decision, the Competition Board clearly indicated that in its assessment of the proposed transaction it took into consideration the commitments that the parties submitted to the European Commission, specifically with respect to the trade routes

2 UN Ro-Ro İşletmeleri A.Ş., 17-36/595-259, 9 November 2017.

to and from the Mediterranean Sea. The European Commission had cleared the proposed acquisition (Case M.8330 – *Maersk/Hamburg* (2017)) conditionally upon the withdrawal of HSDG from five consortia on trade routes. Among these routes, the ones connecting (1) the Mediterranean and West Coast South America and (2) the Mediterranean and East Coast South America are related to the Turkish markets. The Commission stated in its press release dated 10 April 2017 that this will entirely remove the problematic links between Maersk and HSDG's consortia that would have been created by the transaction. In view of the proposed remedies, the Commission concluded that the proposed transaction, as modified, would no longer raise competition concerns. The Commission's decision is conditional upon full compliance with the commitments.

In November 2017, the Competition Board granted unconditional approval to the transaction concerning the reinstatement of certain minority protection rights granted to Anheuser-Busch InBev (ABI) over Anadolu Efes and the formation of a joint venture between those two undertakings (23 November 2017, 17-38/611-267) through concluding that the relevant transaction will not create of a dominant position or strengthen an existing dominant position, and will not significantly impede competition. The transaction is important as it was a cross-border deal between ABI, one of the biggest players in the production of beer worldwide, and Anadolu Efes, the largest beer producer in Turkey and a significant player in eastern Europe where ABI acquired joint control over Anadolu Efes due to reinstatement of certain strategic veto rights.

In November 2017, the Competition Board concluded its Phase II review of the acquisition of Ulusoy Deniz Taşımacılığı AŞ, Ulusoy Gemi İşletmeleri AŞ, Ulusoy Ro-Ro İşletmeleri AŞ, Ulusoy Ro-Ro Yatırımları AŞ, Ulusoy Gemi Acenteliği AŞ, Ulusoy Lojistik Taşımacılık ve Konteyner Hizmetleri AŞ and Ulusoy Çeşme Liman İşletmesi AŞ (Ulusoy Ro-Ro) by UN Ro-Ro İşletmeleri AŞ (UN Ro-Ro). The Competition Board concluded that the transaction would strengthen UN Ro-Ro's dominant position in the market for ro-ro transport between Turkey and Europe, UN Ro-Ro would be in a dominant position in the market for port management concerning Ro-Ro ships upon the consummation of the transaction, the transaction would significantly impede competition in these markets and the behavioural remedies submitted by the parties would not be sufficient to eliminate the competition law concerns arising from the transaction. In light of this, the Competition Board did not approve the transaction.

The approach of the Competition Board to market shares and concentration levels is similar to that of the European Commission, and in line with the approach spelled out in the Guidelines on the Assessment of Horizontal Mergers under the Council Regulation on the Control of Concentrations between Undertakings (2004/C 31/03). The first factor discussed under the Horizontal Guidelines is that market shares above 50 per cent can be considered an indication of a dominant position, while the market share of the combined entity remaining below 20 per cent would not require further inquiry into the likelihood of harmful effects emanating from the combined entity. Although a brief mention of the Competition Board's approach to market shares and the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) levels is provided, the Horizontal Guidelines' emphasis on an effects-based analysis (coordinated and uncoordinated effects) without further discussion of the criteria to be used in evaluating the presence of a dominant position indicates that the dominant position analysis still remains subject to Article 7 of Law No. 4054 on the Protection of Competition. Other than market share and concentration level considerations, the Horizontal Guidelines cover the following main topics:

- a the anticompetitive effects that a merger would have in the relevant markets;
- b the buyer power as a countervailing factor to anticompetitive effects resulting from the merger;
- c the role of entry in maintaining effective competition in the relevant markets;
- d efficiencies as a factor counteracting the harmful effects on competition that might otherwise result from the merger; and
- e the conditions of a failing company defence.

The Horizontal Guidelines also discuss coordinated effects that might arise from a merger of competitors. They confirm that coordinated effects may increase the concentration levels and may even lead to collective dominance. As regards efficiencies, the Horizontal Guidelines indicate that efficiencies should be verifiable and that the passing-on effect should be evident.

The Non-horizontal Guidelines confirm that non-horizontal mergers where the post-merger market share of the new entity in each of the markets concerned is below 25 per cent and the post-merger HHI is below 2,500 (except where special circumstances are present) are unlikely to raise competition law concerns, similarly to the Guidelines on the Assessment of Non-horizontal Mergers under the Council Regulation on the Control of Concentrations between Undertakings (2008/C 265/07). Other than the Competition Board's approach to market shares and concentration levels, the other two factors covered in the Non-horizontal Guidelines include the effects arising from vertical mergers and the effects of conglomerate mergers. The Non-horizontal Guidelines also outline certain other topics, such as customer restraints, general restrictive effects on competition in the market and restriction of access to the downstream market.

The Turkish Competition Authority is expected to retain its well-established practice of paying close attention to developments in EU competition law and seeking to retain harmony between EU and Turkish competition law instruments.

Another significant development in competition law enforcement was the change in the competent body for appeals against the Competition Board's decisions. The new legislation has created a three-level appellate court system consisting of administrative courts, regional courts (appellate courts) and the High State Court. The regional courts will (1) go through the case file both on procedural and substantive grounds and (2) investigate the case file and make their decision considering the merits of the case. The decision of the regional court will be subject to the High State Court's review in exceptional circumstances, which are set forth in Article 46 of the Administrative Procedure Law.

Recent indications in practice show that remedies and conditional clearances are becoming increasingly important in Turkish merger control enforcement. The number of cases in which the Competition Board decided on divestment or licensing commitments or other structural or behavioural remedies has increased dramatically over the past five years. Examples include some of the most important decisions in the history of Turkish merger control enforcement.³

In line with this trend, the Turkish Competition Authority issued the Guidelines on Remedies. The Guidelines on Remedies aims to provide guidance on remedies that can be offered to dismiss competition law concerns regarding a particular concentration that may

3 *AFM/Mars*, 17 November 2011, 11-57/1473-539; *Vatan/Doğan*, 10 March 2008, 08-23/237-75; *ÇimSA/ Bilecik*, 2 June 2008, 08-36/481-169; *OYAK/Lafarge*, 18 November 2009, 09-56/1338-341; *THY/HAVAS*, 27 August 2009, 09-40/986-248; *Burgaz/Meyİcki*, 8 July 2010, 10-49/900-314.

otherwise be deemed as problematic under the dominance test. The Guidelines on Remedies sets out the general principles applicable to the remedies acceptable to the Competition Board, the main types of commitments that may be accepted by the Competition Board, the specific requirements that commitment proposals need to fulfil and the main mechanisms for the implementation of such commitments.

III THE MERGER CONTROL REGIME

There is no specific deadline for making a notification in Turkey. There is, however, a suspension requirement (i.e., a mandatory waiting period): a notifiable transaction (whether or not it is problematic under the applicable dominance test) is invalid, with all the ensuing legal consequences, unless and until the Turkish Competition Authority approves it.

The notification is deemed filed when the Turkish Competition Authority receives it in its complete form. If the information provided to the Competition Board is incorrect or incomplete, the notification is deemed filed only on the date when such information is completed upon the Competition Board's subsequent request for further data. The notification is submitted in Turkish. Transaction parties are required to provide a sworn Turkish translation of the final, executed or current version of the transaction agreement.

The Competition Board, upon its preliminary review of the notification (i.e., Phase I), will decide either to approve or to investigate the transaction further (i.e., Phase II). It notifies the parties of the outcome within 30 calendar days following a complete filing. In the absence of any such notification, the decision is deemed to be an 'approval' through an implied approval mechanism introduced with the relevant legislation. While the wording of the law implies that the Competition Board should decide within 15 calendar days whether to proceed with Phase II, the Competition Board generally takes more than 15 calendar days to form its opinion concerning the substance of a notification. It is more sensitive to the 30-calendar-day deadline on announcement. Moreover, any written request by the Competition Board for missing information will stop the review process and restart the 30-calendar-day period at the date of provision of such information. In practice, the Turkish Competition Authority is quite keen on asking formal questions and adding more time to the review process. Therefore, it is recommendable that the filing be done at least 40 to 45 calendar days before the projected closing.

If a notification leads to a Phase II review, it turns into a fully fledged investigation. Under Turkish law, the Phase II investigation takes about six months. If necessary, the Competition Board may extend this period only once, for an additional period of up to six months. In practice, only extremely exceptional cases require a Phase II review, and most notifications obtain a decision within 40 to 45 days after the original date of notification.

The filing process differs for privatisation tenders. Communiqué No. 2013/2 provides that a pre-notification is conducted before the public announcement of tender specifications. In the case of a public bid, the merger control filing can be performed when the documentation adequately proves the irreversible intention to finalise the contemplated transaction.

There is no special rule for hostile takeovers; the Competition Board treats notifications for hostile transactions in the same manner as other notifications. If the target does not cooperate and if there is a genuine inability to provide information due to the one-sided nature of the transaction, the Turkish Competition Authority tends to use most of its powers of investigation or information request under Articles 14 and 15 of Law No. 4054.

Aside from close follow-up with the case handlers reviewing the transaction, the parties have no available means to speed up the review process.

The Competition Board may request information from third parties, including the customers, competitors and suppliers of the parties, and other persons related to the merger or acquisition. The Competition Board uses this power especially to define the market and determine the market shares of the parties. Third parties, including the customers and competitors of the parties, and other persons related to the merger or acquisition, may request a hearing from the Competition Board during the investigation, subject to the condition that they prove their legitimate interest. They may also challenge the Competition Board's decision on the transaction before the competent judicial tribunal, again subject to the condition that they prove their legitimate interest.

The Competition Board may grant conditional clearance and make the clearance subject to the parties observing certain structural or behavioural remedies, such as divestiture, ownership unbundling, account separation and right of access. As noted above, the number of conditional clearances has increased significantly in recent years.

Final decisions of the Competition Board, including its decisions on interim measures and fines, can be submitted for judicial review before administrative courts. The appellants may make a submission by filing an appeal within 60 days of the parties' receipt of the Competition Board's reasoned decision. Decisions of the Competition Board are considered as administrative acts. Filing an appeal does not automatically stay the execution of the Competition Board's decision. However, upon request of the plaintiff, the Court may decide to stay the execution. The Court will stay the execution of the challenged act only if execution of the decision is likely to cause irreparable damages, and there is a *prima facie* reason to believe that the decision is highly likely to violate the law.

The appeal process may take two-and-a-half years or more.

IV OTHER STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

With the recent changes in Law No. 4054, the Competition Board has geared up for a merger control regime focusing much more on deterrents. As part of that trend, monetary fines have increased significantly for not filing or for closing a transaction without the Competition Board's approval. It is now even more advisable for the transaction parties to observe the notification and suspension requirements and avoid potential violations. This is particularly important when transaction parties intend to put in place carve-out or hold-separate measures to override the operation of the notification and suspension requirements in foreign-to-foreign mergers. As noted above, the Competition Board is currently rather dismissive of carveout and hold-separate arrangements, even though the wording of the new regulation allows some room to speculate that carveout or hold-separate arrangements are now allowed. Because the position the Turkish Competition Authority will take in interpreting this provision is not yet clear, such arrangements cannot be considered as safe early-closing mechanisms recognised by the Competition Board.

Many cross-border transactions meeting the jurisdictional thresholds of Communiqué No. 2010/4 also will require merger control approval in a number of other jurisdictions. Current indications in practice suggest that the Competition Board is willing to cooperate more

with other jurisdictions in reviewing cross-border transactions.⁴ Article 43 of Decision No. 1/95 of the EC–Turkey Association Council authorises the Turkish Competition Authority to notify and request the European Commission (Competition Directorate-General) to apply relevant measures.

V OUTLOOK & CONCLUSIONS

The Draft Competition Law, which was issued by the Turkish Competition Authority in 2013 and officially submitted to the Presidency of the Turkish parliament, which is a separate body within the parliament, on 23 January 2014, is now null and void following the beginning of the new legislative year of the Turkish parliament. In order to re-initiate the parliamentary process, the draft law must again be proposed and submitted to the presidency of the Turkish parliament. At this stage, it remains unknown whether the new Turkish parliament or the government will renew the draft law. However, it could be anticipated that the main topics to be held in the discussions on the potential new draft competition law will not significantly differ from the changes that were introduced by the previous draft.

⁴ The trend for more zealous inter-agency cooperation is even more apparent in leniency procedures for international cartels.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

GÖNENÇ GÜRKAYNAK

ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law

Mr Gönenç Gürkaynak is a founding partner of ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law, a leading law firm of 87 lawyers based in Istanbul, Turkey. Mr Gürkaynak graduated from Ankara University, Faculty of Law in 1997, and was called to the Istanbul Bar in 1998. Mr Gürkaynak received his LLM degree from Harvard Law School, and is qualified to practise in Istanbul, New York, Brussels and England and Wales (currently a non-practising solicitor). Before founding ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law in 2005, Mr Gürkaynak worked as an attorney at the Istanbul, New York and Brussels offices of a global law firm for more than eight years.

Mr Gürkaynak heads the competition law and regulatory department of ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law, which currently consists of 45 lawyers. He has unparalleled experience in Turkish competition law counseling issues with more than 20 years of competition law experience, starting with the establishment of the Turkish Competition Authority. Every year Mr Gürkaynak represents multinational companies and large domestic clients in more than 20 written and oral defences in investigations of the Turkish Competition Authority, about 15 antitrust appeal cases in the High Administrative Court, and over 60 merger clearances of the Turkish Competition Authority, in addition to coordinating various worldwide merger notifications, drafting non-compete agreements and clauses, and preparing hundreds of legal memoranda concerning a wide array of Turkish and EC competition law topics.

Mr Gürkaynak frequently speaks at conferences and symposia on competition law matters. He has published more than 150 articles in English and Turkish by various international and local publishers. Mr Gürkaynak also holds teaching positions at undergraduate and graduate levels at two universities, and gives lectures in other universities in Turkey.

K KORHAN YILDIRIM

ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law

Mr K Korhan Yıldırım is a partner at ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law. He graduated from Galatasaray University Faculty of Law in 2005 and was admitted to the Istanbul Bar in 2006.

He has been working with ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law for more than 13 years and has been a partner in the competition law and regulatory department since January 2014.

Mr Yıldırım has extensive experience in all areas of competition law including cartel agreements, abuse of dominance, concentrations and joint ventures. He has represented various multinational and national companies before the Turkish Competition Authority, Administrative Courts and the High State Court. Mr Yıldırım has given numerous legal opinions and trainings in relation to compliance to competition law rules. Mr Yıldırım has also authored and co-authored many articles on competition law and merger control matters, and is a frequent speaker at various conference and symposia. He is fluent in English and French.

ELIG GÜRKAYNAK ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

Çitlenbik Sokak No. 12

Yıldız Mahallesi

Beşiktaş

34349 Istanbul

Turkey

Tel: +90 212 327 17 24

Fax: +90 212 327 17 25

gonenc.gurkaynak@elig.com

korhan.yildirim@elig.com

www.elig.com



ISBN 978-1-912228-46-1