



The European, Middle Eastern and African Antitrust Review 2019

Published by Global Competition Review in association with

AEQUO Law Firm

Analysis Group

Baker Botts LLP

Bruun & Hjejle

Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP

Dechert LLP

Dryllarakis & Associates

ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law

FBC – Fischer Behar Chen

Well Orion & Co

Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP

Herbert Smith Freehills LLP

Hogan Lovells

Kellerhals Carrard

Morgan Lewis & Bockius UK LLP

Oppenländer Rechtsanwälte

Popovici Nițu Stoica & Asociații

Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

Shearman & Sterling LLP

SZA Schilling, Zutt & Anschütz

Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH

Vieira de Almeida

White & Case

WilmerHale LLP

The European, Middle Eastern and African Antitrust Review 2019

A Global Competition Review Special Report

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd
This article was first published in August 2018
For further information please contact Natalie.Clarke@lbresearch.com

GCR |
GLOBAL COMPETITION REVIEW

The European, Middle Eastern and African Antitrust Review 2019

Senior business development manager Nicholas O'Callaghan
nicholas.ocallaghan@lbresearch.com
+44 20 3780 4188

Senior account manager Mahnaz Arta
mahnaz.arta@lbresearch.com
+44 20 3780 4290

Senior production editor Simon Busby
Production editor Harry Turner
Chief subeditor Jonathan Allen
Subeditor Martin Roach
Head of production Adam Myers
Editorial coordinator Iain Wilson

Editor, Global Competition Review Pallavi Guniganti
Publisher Clare Bolton

Subscription details

To subscribe please contact
Global Competition Review
87 Lancaster Road
London, W11 1QQ
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7908 9205
Fax: +44 20 7229 6910
subscriptions@globalcompetitionreview.com

No photocopying. CLA and other agency licensing systems do not apply.
For an authorised copy contact claire.bagnall@globalcompetitionreview.com

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 May 2018, be advised that this is a developing area.

© 2018 Law Business Research Limited

ISBN: 978-1-78915-104-6

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

The European, Middle Eastern and African Antitrust Review 2019

Published in association with:

AEQUO Law Firm

Hogan Lovells

Analysis Group

Kellerhals Carrard

Baker Botts LLP

Morgan Lewis & Bockius UK LLP

Bruun & Hjejle

Oppenländer Rechtsanwälte

Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP

Popovici Nițu Stoica & Asociații

Dechert LLP

Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

Dryllerakis & Associates

Shearman & Sterling LLP

ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law

SZA Schilling, Zutt & Anschutz

FBC – Fischer Behar Chen Well

Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH

Orion & Co

Vieira de Almeida

Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP

White & Case

Herbert Smith Freehills LLP

WilmerHale LLP

Europe

European Union

Economics: Overview 1
David N Mishol and Joshua White
Analysis Group

Abuse of Dominance 7
Frédéric Louis and Cormac O'Daly
WilmerHale LLP

Cartels and Leniency 13
Geert Goeteyn, Elvira Aliende Rodriguez and Ruba Noorali
Shearman & Sterling LLP

Financial Services 20
Vincent Brophy and Tom Bainbridge
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP

IP & Antitrust 27
Nadine Herrmann and Henning Wienstroth
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

Joint Ventures 33
Catriona Hatton and David Cardwell
Baker Botts LLP

Merger Control 38
Craig Pouncey, Kyriakos Fountoukakos, Peter Rowland, Camille Puech and Dafni Katrana
Herbert Smith Freehills LLP

Pharmaceuticals 52
Jérémie Jourdan, James Killick, Axel Schulz, Strati Sakellariou-Witt and Pierre Pêcheux
White & Case

State Aid 59
Falk Schöning and David Dauchez
Hogan Lovells

Cyprus

Commission for the Protection of Competition 65
Loukia Christodoulou
Chairperson

Denmark

Overview 67
Olaf Koktvedgaard, Søren Zinck and Frederik André Bork
Bruun & Hjejle

Merger Control 73
Olaf Koktvedgaard, Søren Zinck and Frederik André Bork
Bruun & Hjejle

France

Competition Authority 78
Isabelle de Silva
President

Merger Control 80
Mélanie Thill-Tayara and Laurence Bary
Dechert LLP

Germany

Federal Cartel Office 86
Andreas Mundt
President

Merger Control 89
Silvio Cappellari and Stephanie Birmanns
SZA Schilling, Zutt & Anschutz Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH

Private Antitrust Litigation 94
Albrecht Bach and Christoph Wolf
Oppenländer Rechtsanwälte

Greece

Overview 100
Cleomenis Yannikas
Dryllerakis & Associates

Latvia

Competition Council 106
Skaidrite Ābrama
Chairwoman

Moldova

Competition Council 109
Viorica Carare
President

Netherlands

Authority for Consumers and Markets 111
Chris Fonteijn
Chairman

Private Antitrust Litigation 115
Winfred Knibbeler, Onno Brouwer and Nima Lorjé
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP

Norway

Competition Authority	119
Lars Sjørgard Director general	

Poland

Office of Competition and Consumer Protection	122
Marek Niechciał President	

Portugal

Competition Authority	127
Margarida Matos Rosa President	
Overview	130
Miguel Mendes Pereira and João Francisco Barreiros Vieira de Almeida	

Romania

Overview	135
Silviu Stoica and Mihaela Ion Popovici Nițu Stoica & Asociații	

Russia

Federal Antimonopoly Service	142
Igor Artemiev Head	

Spain

National Authority for Markets and Competition	148
José María Marín-Quemada Chairman	

Sweden

Competition Authority	150
Rikard Jermsten Director general	

Switzerland

Overview	152
Daniel Emch, Anna-Antonina Gottret and Stefanie Schuler Kellerhals Carrard	

Turkey

Cartels	157
Gönenç Gürkaynak and Öznur İnanılır ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law	
Dominance	162
Gönenç Gürkaynak and M Hakan Özgökçen ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law	
Merger Control	167
Gönenç Gürkaynak and K Korhan Yıldırım ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law	

Ukraine

Merger Control	172
Denis Lysenko, Sergey Denisenko and Yevgen Blok AEQUO Law Firm	

United Kingdom

Cartel Enforcement	175
Frances Murphy, Joanna Christoforou, and Michael Zymler Morgan Lewis & Bockius UK LLP	

Middle East and Africa

COMESA

Competition Commission	182
Willard Mwemba Head of M&A	

Egypt

Competition Authority	187
Mahmoud A Momtaz Head of Policy and Advocacy	

Israel

Antitrust Authority	190
Michal Halperin Director general	

Overview.....	197
Tal Eyal-Boger, Ziv Schwartz and Shani Brown FBC – Fischer Behar Chen Well Orion & Co	

Mauritius

Competition Commission	204
Deshmuk Kowlessur Executive director	

Mozambique

Overview.....	209
Miguel Mendes Pereira and João Francisco Barreiros Vieira de Almeida	

Global Competition Review is delighted to publish 2019 edition of *The European, Middle Eastern & African Antitrust Review*, one of a series of three special reports that have been conceived to deliver specialist intelligence and research to our readers – general counsel, government agencies and private practice lawyers – who must navigate the world’s increasingly complex competition regimes.

Like its sister reports, *The Antitrust Review of the Americas* and *The Asia-Pacific Antitrust Review*, *The European, Middle Eastern & African Antitrust Review* provides an unparalleled annual update, from competition enforcers and leading practitioners, on key developments in the field.

In preparing this report, *Global Competition Review* has worked with leading competition lawyers and government officials. Their knowledge and experience – and above all their ability to put law and policy into context – give the report special value. We are grateful to all of the contributors and their firms for their time and commitment to the publication.

Although every effort has been made to ensure that all the matters of concern to readers are covered, competition law is a complex and fast-changing field of practice, and therefore specific legal advice should always be sought. Subscribers to *Global Competition Review* will receive regular updates on any changes to relevant laws over the coming year.

Global Competition Review

London

June 2018

Turkey: Merger Control

Gönenç Gürkaynak and K Korhan Yıldırım
ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law

The national competition agency for enforcing merger control rules is the Turkish Competition Authority (the Competition Authority), a legal entity with administrative and financial autonomy. The Competition Authority consists of the Competition Board, the Presidency and service departments. 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 seated in Ankara.

Turkish merger control regulation

The applicable legislation on merger control is Law No. 4054 on Protection of Competition (Law No. 4054) and Communiqué No. 2010/4 on Mergers and Acquisitions Requiring the Approval of the Competition Board (Communiqué No. 2010/4).

Article 7 of Law No. 4054 authorises the Competition Board to regulate, through communiqués, which mergers and acquisitions should be notified in order to gain validity. Communiqué No. 2010/4 is the primary instrument in assessing merger cases in Turkey. Communiqué No. 2010/4 sets forth the types of mergers and acquisitions that are subject to the Competition Board's review and approval.

With a continued interest in harmonising Turkish competition law with EU competition law, the Competition Authority published the following guidelines on merger control that are in line with the EU antitrust and merger control rules: the Guidelines on Market Definition; the Guideline on Undertakings Concerned, Turnover and Ancillary Restrictions in Mergers and Acquisitions (Guideline on Undertakings Concerned); the Guideline on Cases Considered as Mergers and Acquisitions and the Concept of Control (Guideline on Control), the Guideline on the Assessment of Horizontal Mergers and Acquisitions (Guideline on Horizontal Mergers), the Guideline on the Assessment of Non-Horizontal Mergers and Acquisitions (Guideline on Non-Horizontal Mergers) and the Guideline on Remedies Acceptable in Mergers and Acquisitions (Guidelines on Remedies). The Guidelines on Market Definition is closely modelled after the Commission Notice on the Definition of Relevant Market for the Purposes of Community Competition Law (97/C 372/03). The Guideline on Undertakings Concerned, Turnover and Ancillary Restrictions in Mergers and Acquisitions contains certain topics and explanations about the concepts of undertakings concerned, turnover calculations and ancillary restraints, and is closely modelled after Council Regulation (EC) No. 139/2004 on the Control of Concentrations between Undertakings. The Guideline on Control, Guideline on Horizontal Mergers and the Guideline on Non-Horizontal Mergers were published in 2013. Finally, the Guideline on Remedies has also been issued by the Competition Authority, which provides explanations on the possible remedies.

Types of transactions

Communiqué No. 2010/4 defines the scope of the notifiable transactions in article 5 as follows:

- a merger of two or more undertakings; or
- the acquisition of direct or indirect control over all or part of one or more undertakings by one or more undertakings or persons, who currently control at least one undertaking, through:
 - the purchase of assets or a part or all of its shares;
 - an agreement; or
 - other instruments.

Turkey is a jurisdiction with a pre-merger notification and approval requirement, much like the EU regime. Concentrations that result in a change of control on a lasting basis are subject to the Competition Board's approval, provided they exceed the applicable 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 can be exercised de jure or de facto.

Acquisition of a minority shareholding can constitute a notifiable merger if it leads to a change in the control structure of the target entity on a lasting basis. Joint ventures that emerge as independent economic entities possessing assets and labour to achieve their objectives and that do not aim at or effectively result in the restriction of competition among the parties, or between the parties and the joint venture itself, are subject to notification to, and 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.

Market dominance

The Turkish merger control provisions rely on the market dominance test to ascertain whether a merger may be cleared. According to article 7 of Law No. 4054 and article 13 of Communiqué No. 2010/4, mergers and acquisitions that do not create or strengthen a dominant position and that do not significantly impede effective competition in a relevant product market within the whole or part of Turkey shall be cleared by the Competition Board.

Article 3 of Law No. 4054 defines 'dominant position' as 'any position enjoyed in a certain market by one or more undertakings by virtue of which those undertakings have the power to act independently from their competitors and purchasers in determining economic parameters such as the amount of production, distribution, price and supply'. However, the substantive test is a two-prong test, and a merger or acquisition can only be blocked when the concentration not only creates or strengthens a dominant position but also significantly impedes competition in the whole territory of Turkey or in a substantial part of it.

The Competition Board's approval decision will be deemed to also cover the directly related and necessary extent of restraints in competition brought by the concentration (eg, non-compete, non-solicitation, confidentiality, etc). This will allow parties to engage in self-assessment, and the Competition Board will no longer have to devote a separate part of its decision to the ancillary status of all

restraints brought with the transaction. Non-competition issues are, in principle, not taken into account.

Thresholds

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

- the aggregate Turkish turnover of the transaction parties exceeds 100 million lira and the Turkish turnover of at least two of the transaction parties each exceeds 30 million lira;
- the Turkish turnover of the transferred assets or businesses in acquisitions exceeds 30 million lira and the worldwide turnover of at least one of the other parties to the transaction exceeds 500 million lira; or
- the Turkish turnover of any of the parties in mergers exceeds 30 million lira and the worldwide turnover of at least one of the other parties to the transaction exceeds 500 million lira.

The new regulation, after the amendments, no longer seeks the existence of an 'affected market' in assessing whether a transaction triggers a notification requirement, and if a concentration exceeds one of the alternate jurisdictional thresholds, the concentration will automatically be subject to the approval of the Turkish Competition Board.

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

- 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;
- mandatory acquisitions by public institutions as a result of financial distress, concordat, liquidation, etc, do not require a pre-merger notification;
- intra-corporate transactions are not notifiable;
- acquisitions by inheritance are not subject to merger control;
- 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; and
- 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 Amending Communiqué No. 2010/4 on Mergers and Acquisitions Requiring Approval of the Board (Communiqué No. 2017/2). In case such transactions exceed the notification thresholds individually or cumulatively, all of the transactions must be notified, regardless of whether the transactions concerned are related to the same market or sector or whether they were previously notified. The main goal of this regulation is to prevent the conclusion of important mergers or acquisitions without authorisation through the compartmentalisation of those mergers and acquisitions originally subject to authorisation.

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 and insurance companies. The Turkish merger control regime does not, however, recognise any *de minimis* exceptions.

Procedure

There is no specific deadline for making a notification in Turkey. There is, however, a suspension requirement (ie, 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 the Competition Authority approves it. It is therefore advisable to file the transaction at least 45 calendar days before the projected closing.

The notification is deemed filed when the 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 sworn Turkish translations of the final executed or current version of the transaction agreement.

Notification

In principle, under the merger control regime, a filing can be made by either of the parties to the transaction, or jointly. In case of filing by one of the parties, the filing party should notify the other party of the filing. It is advisable to file the transaction at least 45 calendar days before closing, as noted above.

As for the filing process for privatisation tenders or transactions, Communiqué No. 2013/2 provides that it is mandatory to file a pre-notification with the Competition Authority before the public announcement of tender specifications to receive the opinion of the Competition Board which will include a competitive assessment. 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. Filing can also be performed when the documentation at hand adequately proves the irreversible intent to finalise the contemplated transaction.

The notification form is similar to the Form CO of the European Commission. One hard copy and an electronic copy of the merger notification form shall be submitted to the Competition Board. In parallel with the notion that only transactions with a relevant nexus to the Turkish jurisdiction will be notified, there is an increase in information requested, including data with respect to supply and demand structure, imports, potential competition, expected efficiencies, and so on. Some additional documents, such as the executed or current copies and sworn Turkish translations of the documents that bring about the transaction, annual reports including balance sheets of the parties and, if available, market research reports for the relevant market, are also required.

There is also a short-form notification (without a fast-track procedure) if a transition from joint control to sole control is at stake or the parties' aggregate market share is less than 20 per cent in horizontally affected markets and the parties' individual market shares are less than 25 per cent in vertically affected markets.

In the event that the parties to a notifiable transaction violate the suspension requirement (ie, close a notifiable transaction without having obtained the approval of the Competition Board or do not notify the notifiable transaction at all), the acquirer party (for formation of a full-function joint venture, all of the parent companies are deemed as the acquirer party separately) would receive a turnover-based monetary fine at a rate of 0.1 per cent over its annual Turkish turnover generated in the financial year preceding the date of the fining decision. In mergers, both merging parties would be fined. In any event, the minimum amount of this administrative monetary fine is set at 21,036 lira for 2018 and is revised annually.

This fine does not depend on whether the Competition Authority will ultimately clear the transaction. This is a fixed ratio (0.1 per cent). The Competition Board does not have the power to increase or decrease such fine. Therefore, the acquirer would automatically incur the administrative monetary fine once the violation of the suspension requirement is detected.

If, however, there truly is a risk that the transaction is problematic under the dominance test applicable in Turkey, the 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 carve-out or hold-separate arrangements proposed by merging undertakings. Communiqué No. 2010/4 provides that a transaction is deemed to be 'realised' (ie, closed) 'on the date when the change in control occurs.' While the wording allows some room to speculate that carve out or hold-separate arrangements are now allowed, it remains to be seen whether the Competition Authority will interpret this provision in such a way. As noted above, this has consistently been rejected by the Competition Board so far, arguing 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.

The Competition Authority publishes the notified transactions on its official website (www.rekabet.gov.tr) with only the names of the parties and their areas of commercial activity. To that end, once notified to the Turkish Competition Authority, the 'existence' of a transaction will no longer be a confidential matter.

Costs

There are no filing fees required under Turkish merger control proceedings.

Investigation

The Competition Board, upon its preliminary review of the notification (ie, Phase I), will decide either to approve or to investigate the transaction further (ie, 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 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 40-45 calendar days before the projected closing.

If a notification leads to a Phase II review, it turns into a full-fledged investigation. Under Turkish competition law, Phase II investigations take about six months. If necessary, the Competition Board may extend this period once by up to six months.

In practice, only exceptional cases require a Phase II review, and most notifications obtain a decision within 55-60 days from the original date of notification. Neither Law No. 4054 nor Communiqué No. 2010/4 foresee a 'fast-track' procedure to speed up the clearance process. Aside from close follow-up with the case handlers reviewing the transaction, the parties have no available means to speed up the review process.

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 there is a genuine inability to provide information owing to the one-sided nature of the transaction, the Competition Authority tends to use most of its powers of investigation or information request under articles 14 and 15 of Law No. 4054.

The Competition Board may request information from third parties, including customers, competitors and suppliers of the parties, and other persons related to the merger or acquisition. The Competition Board uses this power 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.

Clearance

The Competition Board may either render a clearance or a prohibition decision. It may also give a conditional approval. The reasoned decisions of the Competition Board are served on the representatives to the notifying parties and are also published on the website of the Competition Authority (www.rekabet.gov.tr).

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, right of access, and so on. The number of conditional clearances has increased significantly in recent years.

Judicial review

Final decisions of the Competition Board, including its decisions on interim measures and fines, can be submitted for judicial review before the administrative courts. The plaintiff may initiate a lawsuit 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 a lawsuit 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 the execution of the decision is likely to cause irreparable damages, and the decision is highly likely to violate the law. The appeal process may take up to two-and-a-half years.

Recent developments

The Draft Competition Law, which was issued by the Turkish Competition Authority in 2013 and officially submitted to the

Presidency of the Turkish 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 reinitiate 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. Therefore, in this hypothetical scenario, the discussions are expected to mainly focus on:

- compliance with EU competition law legislation;
- introduction of the EU's SIEC (significant impediment of effective competition) test instead of the current dominance test;
- adoption of the term of 'concentration' as an umbrella term for mergers and acquisitions;
- elimination of the exemption of acquisition by inheritance;
- abandonment of the Phase II procedure;
- extension of the appraisal period for concentrations from the current 30-calendar-day period to 30 working days; and
- removal of the fixed turnover rates for certain procedural violations, including the failure to notify a concentration and hindering on-site inspections, and set upper limits for the monetary fines for these violations.

The TCA recently published the Merger and Acquisition Insight Report (the Report) for 2017. Along with its mission, vision, objectives, priorities and description of its duties and power, the TCA made an assessment in the Report on its activities between 1 January and 31 December 2017 concerning merger control along with the statistical data. To summarise, in 2017, the Board assessed 184 transactions and among these, there have been five privatisations. This shows a drop of approximately 12 per cent compared to the previous year.

Among these transactions, four concentrations regarding the Ro-Ro transportation services, agriculture, port services and optics sectors were taken into Phase II review in 2017. Furthermore, the Board refused to grant approval to one concentration notified and taken into Phase II review in 2017 (UN Ro-Ro İşletmeleri A.Ş., 17-36/595-259, 9 November 2017). The other three of these transactions are still under review. Considering that the number of Phase II reviews has dramatically increased compared to the past year, in which the Board conducted Phase II reviews only for two notified transactions, the Board will not hesitate to go into Phase II review and seek for commitments if it deems it necessary based on the potential competition law concerns. This strongly indicates that remedies and conditional clearances are also becoming increasingly

important under Turkish merger control enforcement. In line with this trend, 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 few years.

The Authority has recently introduced the Communiqué No. 2017/2. One of the amendments introduced to Communiqué No. 2010/4 is that article 1 of Communiqué No. 2017/2 abolished article 7(2) of Communiqué No. 2010/4, propounding that 'The thresholds . . . are redetermined by the Board biannually'. Through the mentioned amendment, the Board is no longer rested with the duty to re-establish turnover thresholds for concentrations every two years. To that end, 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 would 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, article 3 of Communiqué No. 2017/2 introduced a new paragraph to be included to article 10 of Communiqué No. 2010/4. This newly introduced provision by article 3 of Communiqué No. 2017/2 is similar to article 7(2) of European Commission Merger Regulation. At any rate, although there was no similar specific statutory rule in Turkey on this matter, the case law of the Turkish Competition Board shed light on this matter. In *Camargo-Cimpor* (12-24/665-187, 3 May 2012), the Board reviewed the acquisition of Cimpor-Cimentos de Portugal SGPS SA by Camargo Corrêa SA by way of a public tender offer. Camargo had filed this transaction following its public tender offer but before acquiring the shares, and indicated that the exact date for the transfer of shares, which would enable the acquisition of control over Cimpor, could not be determined at the time of filing. The Board resolved that, even if Camargo were to acquire the majority of the shares (providing control) before the Board's approval decision, this would not constitute a violation of Law No. 4054, provided Camargo did not exercise these voting rights. To that end, the board recognised that parties can close a public bid on a listed company before the Board's approval, subject to the conditions that:

- the transaction is notified to the Board without delay; and
- the acquirer does not exercise control over the target pending the Board's approval decision.

That said, since this approach had not been solidified through subsequent decisions and the decision appears to be unique, legislation based security on these types of concentration is most welcome.



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 counselling 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 Yıldırım
ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law

Mr K Korhan Yıldırım is a partner at ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law. Mr Yıldırım 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.

ELİG
GÜRKAYNAK
Attorneys at Law

Çitlenbik Sokak No:12
Yıldız Mahallesi
Beşiktaş, 34349
Istanbul
Tel: +90 212 327 1724
Fax: +90 212 327 1725

Gönenç Gürkaynak
gonenc.gurkaynak@elig.com

K Korhan Yıldırım
korhan.yildirim@elig.com

www.elig.com

ELIG Gürkaynak Attorneys-at-Law is committed to providing its clients with high-quality legal services. We combine a solid knowledge of Turkish law with a business-minded approach to develop legal solutions that meet the ever-changing needs of our clients in their international and domestic operations. Our competition law and regulatory department is led by our partner, Mr. Gönenç Gürkaynak, along with three partners, three counsel and 40 associates.

In addition to unparalleled experience in merger control issues, ELIG Gürkaynak has vast experience in defending companies before the Turkish Competition Board in all phases of antitrust investigations, abuse of dominant position cases, leniency handlings, and before courts on issues of private enforcement of competition law, along with appeals of the administrative decisions of the Turkish Competition Authority.

ELIG Gürkaynak represents multinational corporations, business associations, investment banks, partnerships and individuals in the widest variety of competition law matters, while also collaborating with many international law firms.

During the past year, ELIG Gürkaynak has been involved in over 60 merger clearances by the Turkish Competition Authority, more than 20 defence projects in investigations, and over 15 antitrust appeals before the administrative courts. ELIG Gürkaynak also provided more than 50 antitrust education seminars to employees of its clients.

ELIG Gürkaynak has an in-depth knowledge of representing defendants and complainants in complex antitrust investigations concerning all forms of abuse of dominant position allegations, and all forms of restrictive horizontal and/or vertical arrangements, including price-fixing, retail price maintenance, refusal to supply, territorial restrictions and concerted practice allegations.

In addition to significant antitrust litigation expertise, the firm has considerable expertise in administrative law, and is well equipped to represent clients before the High State Court, both on the merits of a case and for injunctive relief. ELIG Gürkaynak also advises clients on a day-to-day basis in a wide range of business transactions that almost always contain antitrust law issues, including distributorship, licensing, franchising and toll manufacturing issues.

Law
Business
Research