



**OECD-Korea Policy Centre
Competition Programme**

Annual Report 2016

OECD

www.oecd.org/competition/seoulrcc

Korea Policy Centre
www.oecdkorea.org

1. Introduction to the OECD/Korea Policy Centre's Competition Programme

The Centre is a joint venture between the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (the OECD) and the Korean Government. The function of the Centre is to provide education and training to government officials in the Asia-Pacific in the fields of tax, competition, public governance and social policy. The Centre also undertakes research in these subject areas.

The Centre's Competition Programme draws on the experience of:

- the OECD's Competition Committee which oversees an extensive programme of work, involving both member and non-member countries, in developing recommendations and best practices, as well as discussing and publishing papers on topical issues in competition law and policy; and
- the Korea Fair Trade Commission (KFTC) which is a cabinet level agency responsible for both competition law enforcement and competition policy advocacy.

Each of these bodies has an extensive capacity building programme to assist younger competition enforcement agencies in skills development. The OECD/Korea Policy Centre's Competition Programme (the Programme) is an important part of each of the two joint venture parties' capacity building efforts in the Asia-Pacific region.

Mission of the Centre's Competition Programme

To assist Asia-Pacific competition authorities in developing and implementing sound competition law and policy.

The primary activities of the Programme are competition law and policy workshops which are held five or six times a year. Details of the 2016 workshops are provided in section 2 of this Report.

The Programme's workshops and seminars provide:

- an opportunity for younger competition authorities to learn the skills necessary to efficiently enforce new competition laws;
- an opportunity for younger competition authorities to share the details of their early decisions and discuss their challenges and successes with their peer agencies from developing and developed countries;
- an opportunity for all competition agencies, old and new, to learn new approaches and techniques from each other; and
- an opportunity for the staff of all competition agencies, old and new, to meet and form enduring professional contacts with officials from other countries to facilitate effective international cooperation in competition law enforcement.

The events also provide a forum for policy makers from countries who are in the process of drafting, enacting or implementing competition law to:

- gain a more detailed understanding of the practicalities, practices and approaches of different enforcement agencies in various countries when designing competition laws; and
- begin the preparations for the formation of their country's competition authority.

2. Detailed Review of the Activities of the Centre in 2016

In 2016, the Programme included the following workshops:

- Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement;
- Abuse of Dominance: fundamentals;
- Sector Event – Financial markets
- Workshop on merger control
- Judge Workshop on the use of competition economics in the Courtroom;
- Seminar For New Agencies - Basic Concepts and Procedures in Competition Law
- Experienced Agencies Seminar – Information Exchange: Efficiency Enhancing or Cartel in Disguise?

In total there were 282 participants in attendance in 2016, from 25 jurisdictions, with 39 speakers presenting at these 7 events.

The Programme seeks to evaluate its workshops by asking participants to complete a detailed evaluation form. The target for the workshops is to achieve, on average, a rating of at least 4.0 out of a possible 5.0.

A description of each workshop, and the evaluation by the attendees, is set out below.

2.1) Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement: March 30 – 1 April 2016

From the 30th March to 1st of April 2016, the Centre held its first workshop of 2016 in a workshop held in Hanoi, Vietnam dedicated to building capacity for cartel enforcement. This was an event co-hosted with the Vietnam Competition Authority (VCA) and co-sponsored by CLIP¹.

Cartels have been considered by the OECD as “a principal focus of competition policy and enforcement” and the OECD Competition Committee has devoted significant efforts to hard-core cartel enforcement (see separate box). The goal of the Workshop was to set out the fundamentals needed to build a strong and effective cartel enforcement practice in agencies across the region.

This workshop had nearly 80 participants from competition officials from a multiplicity of jurisdictions in the Asia Pacific Region (Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand), including many participants from both Vietnamese competition agencies (VCA and Vietnam Competition Council) as well as government officials, judges and academics from Vietnam. On the other hand, panel members included experts from the Korea Fair Trade Commission (KFTC), the Australian Consumer and Competition Commission (ACCC), the Japanese Fair Trade Commission (JFTC).

¹ About CLIP: Through the Competition Law Implementation Program (CLIP), the ACCC is delivering assistance to ASEAN Member States to effectively introduce and implement national competition laws and policies. More information can be found here: <https://www.accc.gov.au/about-us/international-relations>. CLIP sponsored ASEAN participants accommodation during the event as well as the speakers from the ACCC Australia.

The event opened with introductory speeches by Director General Dae-Won Hong of the Korea Policy Centre, Mr. Tran Anh Son (Deputy Director General of the VCA) and Mr Frédéric Jenny (Chairman of the OECD Competition Committee and keynote speaker). Mr. Ruben Maximiano of the OECD then provided a road map of the three day workshop introducing the topic at a general level and putting it into the context of the toolbox at the disposal of competition agencies.

Mr. Jenny was also the first speaker in the substantive part of the workshop, sharing the importance of fighting cartels, with many examples of cartels from Vietnam and other jurisdictions as well as an explanation of how cartels function and how they can be fought effectively. The second session was led by Ms. Clare Nightingale, senior investigator at the ACCC that dug deeper into a more specific looking at the different types of hard-core cartels, offering examples from Australia on cases on price fixing (Queensland pre-mixed concrete cartel), market sharing (the Visy and Amcor packaging cartel), bid rigging (the Demolition Cover Pricing cartel) and output restrictions (the Tasmanian Atlantic Salmon Growers case).

The first case study session of the workshop was provided by Mr. Phung Van Thanh, Deputy Director of the VCA, who explained the Vietnamese legal regime and its particularities. Mr Van Thanh also provided detail on a recent cartel case between 19 insurance companies in the car insurance sector (see box). The tools for detection were the subject of part of the afternoon sessions, with Ms. Songrim Koo, Deputy Director at the KFTC presenting the cartel detection tools used by the KFTC with particular focus on the functioning and operation of the BRIAS system for bid rigging as well as the reward system in place for reporting of cartels. Ms. Makiko Asami of the JFTC then led a session with in depth explanations on the operation of the leniency and complaints systems in Japan.

The first day of the workshop finished with an in-depth session lead by Mr. Jenny on the use of indirect evidence in cartel enforcement, sharing experiences from across the OECD membership and beyond, as well as the importance of fighting bid rigging and the respective guidelines of the OECD.

The second day started with the work done by the ACCC in its efforts to advocate for the prevention and combat of cartels, by building partnerships with other government entities such as anti-corruption and procurement agencies. Ms. Clare Nightingale also expanded on the work done more broadly on cartel education for the business and wider community, culminating with the showing of the infamous Marker Video. The second case study was offered by Ms. Chichi Huang of the CTFTC of Chinese Taipei, firstly explaining how the Leniency programme operates and then providing analysis on a recent case involving aluminium and Tantalum capacitors used in electronic products such as PCs and mobile phones.

This was followed by a hypothetical case where the large assembly was divided into smaller groups of between 8 and 10 persons to discuss and try and solve a bid rigging case involving the possible operation of a cartel across regions. This led to a lively participation by all the groups, and each was given the opportunity to share with the plenary an aspect of the case. The last two sessions of the day before the cultural tour of the beautiful Hanoi were the case study brought by Ms. JingJin of the NDRC (China) on a very recent bid rigging case in the shipping sector. Finally, the meeting chair Mr. Ruben Maximiano of the OECD closed the day's session by sharing the work that the OECD has done on the international cooperation in the context of cartel cases and investigations.

The third day was dedicated to more practical aspects of fighting cartel cases, in particular looking at how to investigate case and use of evidence. The first session of the day was led by Ms. Michelle Holmes, Assistant Director at the ACCC, who worked through in detail the main steps when investigating and building a cartel case. This ranged from receiving a complaint or allegation, to the initial investigation and

assessment to the management and planning of the in-depth investigation as well as to the evaluation of the evidence collected and the final recommendation to the decision makers. The next sessions were case studies offered by a number of participants: Ms. Rosanna Sarita an instructor at the KPPU who shared a case on the use of indirect evidence in the fuel surcharge markets, by Ms. Quianting Chen an officer at SAIC on a case of co-insurance, Ms. Serene Seet (Assistant Director at the CCS) with a close look at the Ball Bearing cartel, Ms. Sophia Khan of the Competition Commission of Pakistan and Mr. Jay Kishor Mishra Additional Director General of the Competition Commission of India presenting a number of recent cartel cases.

Before the second hypothetical of the workshop, Ms. Michelle Holmes led a session on executing a search and seizure operation, with many practical tips in all stages of the investigation as well as in the operation of dawn raids themselves. Allowing some of these techniques to be put into practice, in the second hypothetical case participants simulated the preparing of a dawn raid – a very lively exercise indeed!

The day ended with a presentation by Mr. Ruben Maximiano on the principles that should be considered by agencies, in particular those that are starting a cartel enforcement practice, when setting fines or sanctions; whilst the final session was a free discussion led by Mr. Ruben Maximiano on all of the aspects that had been analysed during the three days, with many participants asking questions and commenting on their practice in their respective jurisdictions.

Overall, this was a very successful event with many and enthusiastic participants showing great interest in ramping up their cartel enforcement know-how and practices.

EVALUATION

OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE FOR EVENT ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES	4.54
--	-------------

DETAILED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS (Numerical score for each category)	Average Score	Number of Responses*	% in Highest Category	Number of Response					
				Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	No answer
1. The overall usefulness of the topics addressed.	4.7	48	69%	33	15				
2. The overall quality of the presentations	4.6	48	58%	28	20				
3. The overall usefulness of the hypothetical Exercise	4.4	48	46%	22	22	4			
4. The overall usefulness of the seminar materials	4.5	48	48%	23	25				
5. The overall usefulness of this event	4.6	48	60%	29	18	1			

* 48 participants returned the evaluation form.

2.2) Workshop on Abuse of Dominance Fundamentals, 11-13 May

In May 2016, the OECD/Korea Policy Centre held a workshop co-hosted by the Indonesian Commission for the Supervision of Business Competition (KPPU) and co-sponsored by GIZ dedicated to the fundamentals of abuse of dominance and unilateral conduct.

In the second in-country event of 2016, Bali received nearly 50 participants from several jurisdictions in the Asia Region, as well as several speakers from across the OECD membership (Australia, Korea, Japan and United States). The keynote opening speech was offered by the KPPU Chairman Dr. Muhammad Syarkawi RAUF, and he focused on sharing the work done over the years by the KPPU in bringing cases on abuse of dominance.

Following the keynote speech by Dr. Rauf, Ruben Maximiano (OECD) provided a guided tour of all the sessions of the workshop as well as the main concepts that would be then discussed in greater detail throughout the event.

The first substantive session was led by Mr. Nicholas Franczyk from the Federal Trade Commission (US) that established, defined and developed the concept of dominance, and analysed market definition, market shares and market power as well as ultimately how to establish proof of the existence of dominance. Nick Taylor (Jones Day, Australia) led the following session introducing, in general terms, the notion of abuse of dominance, with the following sessions being dedicated to looking at specific types of abuses: first up was a refusal to deal session dealt with by Mr. Ruben Maximiano, looking at refusal to supply, essential facilities as well as margin squeeze, examining a number of concrete cases from the US and EU. This was then followed by a case study presented by Ms. Min-Hui Pan of the CFTC from Chinese Taipei, about price discrimination in the cargo handling market at the Port of Taichung (see box for more detail). The last two sessions were provided by Mr. Nick Taylor and looked at tying and bundling as well as excessive pricing cases. In the latter case, Mr. Taylor looked at the different policy arguments for and against excessive pricing prohibitions as well as the practice in different jurisdictions on this rather controversial matter.

The second day opened with a session set to solve two hypothetical cases: one on an alleged abuse for excessive pricing in the pharmaceutical markets, the other on an alleged abuse for loyalty rebates in the food sector. For this session, the plenary was broken up into 4 smaller groups of 12 persons, and worked through the preparation for a public hearing and then the public hearing itself, with groups representing the competition agency and the defendant company. The morning of the second day was then completed with the sharing of experiences in abuse of dominance cases by Mr. Byungkun Lee from the KFTC (Korea) and Mr. Osamu Igarashi (JFTC, Japan), and a case study presented by the CCP of Pakistan. After lunch, the group then had a short cultural tour of Bali.

The foundations having been firmly established in the first two days of the workshop, the last day focused on the more practical matters of building cases of abuse of dominance, first of all in a session dedicated to the first steps of an investigation and to case selection, and then to taking the case forward once a case has been selected for review – both sessions having been delivered by Mr. Nicholas Franczyk. The morning then built upon these, with a hypothetical case on exclusivity clauses and their potential effects in the biscuit market, in a case loosely inspired on Van den Bergh/Masterfoods case of the European Commission. The groups represented the competition authority, the defendant and the complainant, and there was a very lively discussion of the potential foreclosure effects and potential benefits of certain exclusivity arrangements between a producer with significant market power and its distributors.

The afternoon saw the discussion of the most appropriate sanctions (fines) as well as possible structural and behavioural remedies in abuse of dominance cases by Mr. Nick Taylor. India's representative Mr. Nilotpal Bal then shared India's experience in a number of different cases recently brought, including in

the real estate markets. This was followed by a presentation by Ms. Yang Jie of SAIC (China) looking at a recent abuse of dominance case in data packages in the telecoms sector. The last two sessions, looked at unfair trading laws and cases in Korea and Japan, in a session jointly held by Mr. Lee and Mr. Igarashi of the KFTC and JFTC, respectively. This session allowed the audience to understand the differences and some similarities that exist with the abuse of dominance prohibition. The last session was conducted by Mr. Ruben Maximiano and looked at the abuse of dominance concept and its relationship with the State, drawing upon work that has been recently undertaken by the OECD on competitive neutrality – some of the aspects discussed related to the increased ability and incentives that state owned enterprises may in some instances have to engage in abusive conduct.

Finally, the wrap up discussion allowed participants to ask further questions and make comments on some of the sessions as well as the overall workshop.

Overall, a very important event, that allowed for a detailed look at many aspects of abuse of dominance cases. These are cases that are very important within the arsenal of a competition authority, that need to be considered carefully as not only are they resource intensive but also must be targeted carefully to avoid over use and the chilling effect that may have on pro-competitive conduct and incentives to innovate.

EVALUATION

OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE FOR EVENT ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES					4.53				
DETAILED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS (Numerical score for each category)	Average Score	Number of Responses*	% in Highest Category	Number of Response					
				Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	No answer
1. The overall usefulness of the topics addressed.	4.6	28	61%	17	11				
2. The overall quality of the presentations	4.5	28	50%	14	13	1			
3. The overall usefulness of the hypothetical Exercise	4.6	28	57%	16	12				
4. The overall usefulness of the seminar materials	4.4	28	43%	12	16				
5. The overall usefulness of this event	4.6	28	57%	16	12				

* 28 participants returned the evaluation form.

2.3) Sector Workshop on Competition Rules in the Financial Sector, 22-24 June

In June 2016, the OECD/KPC annual sector workshop took place in Seoul, Korea with this year's event devoted to the application of competition policy and rules to a very important sector in most economies: the financial sector.

With participants from both sector regulators (bank regulators and securities regulators) as well as competition authorities, the sector focused not only on enforcement actions but also undertook a wider viewpoint examining the intersection between competition policy and prudential and consumer protection regulations. This was the first part of the event, drawing on valuable work undertaken by the Korea Development Institute as well as by the OECD. For this workshop a wide array of top notch speakers with extensive experience in the sector were made available by the authorities of Korea (Korea Development Institute as well as KFTC), EU Commission and Department of Justice (US).

The event started with an examination by Dr. Sunjoo Hwang of the KDI of the relationship between competition and financial stability, with an analysis of this sometimes uneasy relationship and a review of the more recent economic literature on the matter, with more recently the increased recognition of the positive role competition may play within the framework of adequate prudential regulations and oversight. This was followed by a session on consumer protection, switching and competition in retail banking, drawing upon the work done by the OECD in the last few years. This session was led by Mr. Ruben Maximiano (OECD) and focused on the importance of switching in increasing the incentives for banks to offer better deals to new and existing customers as well as some of the actions that can be taken to increase switching via increased transparency as well as the use of adequate remedies (considering also behavioural economics).

The afternoon sessions were devoted to competition enforcement tools of merger control and cartels. The first two presentations were provided by Mr. Sean Greenaway (EU Commission) and looked in-depth at merger control in banking, insurance as well as on trading and clearing platforms. In both instances the issues of market definition were analysed as was the competition assessment in a number of individual cases as well as some of the remedies applied in those cases. The proposed merger between Deutsche Borse and New York Stock Exchange was analysed in detail. The final part of the day introduced cartels to the discussion: first with the case study by Competition Commission of Singapore's Cindy Chang on a cartel case in the Life insurance sector; secondly, in the first presentation by Mr. Benjamin Sirota of the DOJ who led the session on the Libor, FX and other cartels in the financial sector.

The second day followed on cartels, with Mr. Sirota leading a session on investigating a financial markets antitrust case, sharing his experience in running such investigations and how such cases differ from cases in other sectors. Vietnam then talked on a car insurance cartel it had sanctioned, involving 19 insurance companies. Other types of anticompetitive agreements in the insurance sector and in payment systems were then discussed by Mr. Sean Greenaway.

In the afternoon the groups were broken up into several smaller groups of 5 or 6 participants and discussed the next steps of a merger case involving two smaller national banks who were particularly strong on certain segments of the banking sector. This involved discussing relevant markets as well as factors to determine the competitive constraints imposed both upon each other as well as the marketplace, by the merging parties. This was followed by a session co-chaired by Mr. Ruben Maximiano and Mr. Sirota on the relationship between Financial Regulators and Competition Authorities. Whilst, on the one hand, Mr. Maximiano focused on a number of examples from across the OECD membership and on the role that competition authorities can play in seeking to increase competition, mainly via advocacy work and helping the relevant financial regulators. Mr. Sirota, on the other hand, shared the rich experience of the working relationships between the DOJ and other financial regulators. The last presentation was offered by the Competition Commission of India's Ms. Praachi Misra, Deputy Director and Mr. Mukul Sharma, Deputy

Director and focused on a case of abuse of dominance in the stock exchange services for exchange traded currency derivatives in India, in particular the waiver of fees relating to transaction and admission.

The third and last day had two sessions: one by Mr. Greenaway on the recent practice of the EU on abuse of dominance in the financial sector, looking at the Clearstream, Reuters Instrument Codes and Standard and Poors, cases in the EU. Finally, Ms. Heeun Jeong of the KFTC (Korea) reviewed the relationship between the KFTC and the Financial Services Commission and then discussed a number of cartels in the insurance sector that have recently been investigated and decided in Korea.

This was an event that allowed participants to explore in depth a sector that has not always, in many jurisdictions, been subject to competition policy and which given its specificities can be a rather daunting one for newer agencies in particular. Drawing upon some very experienced speakers it was possible to show that, where relevant, this is a sector where competition authorities may intervene effectively.

EVALUATION

OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE FOR EVENT ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES					4.51				
DETAILED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS (Numerical score for each category)	Average Score	Number of Responses*	% in Highest Category	Number of Response					
				Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	
1. The overall usefulness of the topics addressed.	4.5	20	50%	10	9	1			
2. The overall quality of the presentations	4.6	20	55%	11	9				
3. The overall usefulness of the hypothetical Exercise	4.4	20	55%	11	6	3			
4. The overall usefulness of the seminar materials	4.6	20	65%	13	6	1			
5. The overall usefulness of this event	4.6	20	55%	11	9				

2.4) Workshop on Merger Control, Seoul, Korea: 5-7 September

In September 2016, the OECD/Korea Policy Centre held a workshop in Seoul, Korea on merger control. The objective of the workshop was to help participant agencies identify and then investigate mergers which may be harmful to competition, and where appropriate apply remedies to mergers that are anti-competitive, as well as to understand the role and benefits of international cooperation in such cases. We were honoured to have a session chaired by Mr. John Pecman, head of the Competition Bureau of Canada (CBC) on international cooperation cases that involved the CBC.

Mr. Ruben Maximiano (OECD) started by providing the main aspects and structure of merger control, drawing upon international experience, and then to introduce the main economic and legal concepts that would be then discussed in greater detail throughout the event.

The first substantive session was led by Ms. Lucrezia Busa from the European Commission (EU). This session established, defined and developed the concept of market definition in the context of the European Competition law, in its geographic and product dimensions. In doing so Ms. Busa provided a comprehensive overview of the principles and methodology used for market definition, as well as looked at some of the main challenges when defining markets and how to use analytical tools such as UPP and Demand Simulations help with such issues where sufficient data is available. Ms. Busa used recent decisional practice of the European Commission in telecoms, office supplies and gas turbines markets to illustrate her presentation.

Mr. Sean Ennis, Acting Head of the Competition Division of the OECD, then presented the main theories of harm that may be applied to mergers, mainly focusing on horizontal unilateral effects as one of the most common theories applied in the context of merger analysis, although also touching upon coordinated effects. Mr. Ennis then looked at the role of economic evidence with a focus on economic tools to assess economic effects. In the discussion, he examined elasticities, the use of critical loss analysis, price correlation [and stationarity], price-concentration analysis as well as for unilateral effects cases – diversion ratios, UPP and merger simulation. Mr. Ennis provided a basic understanding of how each of these tools can be used, whilst concluding that these should not be seen as ‘modelling’ reality, that they are merely indicative and that a final decision should not be based on these methods alone. In particular he suggested that in many instances all the required data is not available and that even when such data does exist, an attempt should be made to confirm them by using several different ways, measures, techniques and assumptions to try and test the results obtained and make the findings more robust. Leading from this the Chinese Taipei delegation provided a case example where it used some economic data to analyse the effects in the Hon Hai vs Sharp merger.

The first day ended with the first of the 3 breakout sessions for a hypothetical case involving a merger between two beverage producers. The plenary broken up into 4 smaller teams of 9 persons, and in the first session the teams made a first analysis of the case to identify critical points of the merger and offer first indications of whether the case should merit a more in-depth review and then to draft a very preliminary investigation strategy.

The morning of the second day started with investigation techniques, in a session lead by Ms. Lucrezia Busa, looking at how to scope a market investigation and then prepare for it, offering detailed example of the European Commission’s “investigation toolbox” and experience in concrete cases. Still on the topic of investigation of mergers, Mr. Savitri Kore and Ms. Sunaina Dutta of the Competition Commission of India shared with the participants how the CCI undertakes investigations, using the example of the recent Holcim and Lafarge and PVR Cinemas-DT Cinemas mergers.

The second breakout session followed with two groups being given the role of proposing to prohibit the merger and the other two to take over the part of the “devil’s advocate”, pointing out all the weaknesses of first groups’ arguments.

The last two sessions of the day were devoted to mergers, first with Mr. Ruben Maximiano providing the framework drawing upon the OECD work as well as his experience with mergers at the Portuguese Competition Authority and European Commission, and then with Mr. Joong-kyu Sun of the KFTC, providing the experience of the KFTC with remedies in the AMAT-TEL case and the Microsoft Nokia case. The final session of the day was the last breakout session where a state of play meeting was simulated between the competition authority and the merging company’s representatives to discuss the suitability and eventual acceptance or not of the remedies offered. A very lively discussion, very close to real life state of play’s the author of these lines has attended!

The last day opened with Mr. John Pecman, Commissioner of Competition of the Competition Bureau in Canada, showing the importance of cooperation and of investing in building relationships with other

agencies for the better outcome of cases and calling for improved information exchange and the move towards joint instead of parallel reviews in the future.

Pakistan's representative Ms. Syeda Amina Gilani then shared the CCP's experience in the GSK Novartis case, involving many different competition authorities from across the globe and how international cooperation was invaluable to obtain appropriate remedies and the best results in that case. The final presentation was offered by the Competition Commission of Singapore's Mr. Lim Wei Lu who provided a great example of an ex-post assessment of a case. Such examples are very important as evaluating past decisions allow agencies to understand the impact of past interventions and find out whether the analytical framework can be improved. This in turn helps to enhance the agency's credibility to its stakeholders, while less positive results will also provide valuable lessons for the agency.

Finally, the wrap up discussion allowed participants to ask further questions and make comments on some of the sessions as well as the overall workshop.

EVALUATION

OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE FOR EVENT ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES				4.52					
DETAILED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS (Numerical score for each category)	Average Score	Number of Responses*	% in Highest Category	Number of Response					
				Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	No answer
1. The overall usefulness of the topics addressed.	4.5	21	57%	12	8	1			
2. The overall quality of the presentations	4.4	21	48%	10	10	1			
3. The overall usefulness of the hypothetical Exercise	4.7	21	71%	15	5	1			
4. The overall usefulness of the seminar materials	4.5	21	52%	11	9	1			
5. The overall usefulness of this event	4.5	21	52%	11	10				

2.5) Competition Workshop for Judges: The Use of Competition Economics in the Courtroom, Seoul, Korea 5-7 October

Workshop for Judges: Use of Competition Economics in the Courtroom

In October 2016, the OECD/Korea Policy Centre held in Seoul (Korea) the second in the series of workshops for judges dedicated to using competition economics in the courtroom. This event was attended exclusively by judges, with judges from Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand.

In the first workshop in this series, which took place in 2015, there were sessions discussing the use of economic evidence in the context of merger control and abuse of dominance cases. The 2016 event

complemented this by looking at how courts may integrate economic evidence within cartel cases and vertical agreements, as well as how fines and damages may be calculated.

The first session was by Mr. Ruben Maximiano (OECD) who provided the back-drop for cartel enforcement across the world as well the main challenges that some of the more experienced jurisdictions have faced, which was then followed by a guided tour of all the sessions of the workshop.

The next session was by Mr. Frédéric Jenny, Chairman of the Competition Committee and former member of the Cour de Cassation in France, that developed in detail the main challenges for judges in competition cases, drawing upon a number of sessions undertaken in the OECD Competition Committee over the years. In particular, Mr. Jenny distinguished between antitrust and unfair competition laws, relevant in many Asian countries, focused on understanding the goal of competition law, as well as then establishing the elements of economic analysis useful to assess competition cases, in particular the use of economic evidence for tacit cartels or cartels without direct proofs, as well as ways in which courts may bring and use economic expertise to their courtroom.

Once the main challenges had been clearly discussed and defined, Ms. Rhonda Smith, a reputed economist and Senior Lecturer of the University of Melbourne and former Lay Member, High Court of New Zealand, analysed the central issues in any competition case: market definition, market shares and market power, followed by a session dedicated to the underlying economics of cartel formation and maintenance over time as well as their nefarious effects on society, looking at some cartels along the way such as the car parts and marine hose cases.

The afternoon was dedicated to types of evidence and its collection in the context of cartels: the first session on direct evidence and the use of economics in cartel cases. The first session was offered by Mr. Ruben Maximiano, who started by framing the evidentiary standards used for hard core cartels (price fixing, reducing output, bid rigging, market allocation or sharing) in most jurisdictions where the probatory focus lies in demonstrating the existence of an agreement or concerted practice and not on the anti-competitive effects of the practice. This involves showing that there has been a “meeting of the minds” toward a common goal or result, or, in other words, some “conscious commitment to a common scheme. “ Direct evidence of cartels is therefore one which identifies a meeting or communication between the subjects and describes the substance of that agreement. Mr. Maximiano then looked at general issues with evidence in this context, the types of evidence that can be used.

However, proving the existence of a cartel agreement, whether formal or informal, poses special problems for the competition law enforcer as Cartels are usually formed and conducted in secret; their participants understand that their conduct is unlawful, and that their customers would object to the conduct if they knew about it, and so they take pains to conceal it and thus Mr. Jenny’s session on indirect or economic evidence. Drawing upon the OECD Competition Committee Roundtable Prosecuting Cartels without Direct Evidence (2006), Mr. Jenny discussed that given that special investigative tools and techniques may not be available for competition enforcers in newer jurisdictions, the competition law enforcer may be faced with the task of proving the existence of a cartel agreement without the benefit of direct evidence. This has the implication that it will have to rely more heavily on circumstantial evidence. Drawing upon a number of real case examples where indirect evidence played a central role, Mr. Jenny identified two types of circumstantial evidence: communication evidence and economic evidence.

The last session of the first day was offered by Judge Jaeoh Cheong from the Busan High Court of Korea, analysing a number of different cases where communication and economic evidence was evaluated and considered by the courts in Korea.

The second day opened with a session set to discuss a hypothetical case of possible cartel involving communications between doctors and their association. For this session, the plenary was broken up into 2 smaller groups where judges discussed amongst themselves the evidence brought before them.

This was followed by two sessions lead by Justice Denis Gascon of the Competition Tribunal of Canada who shared his experiences as a judge in Canada in integrating and analysing economic evidence and hearing economic witnesses. This session allowed for discussion of practical thoughts and tips based on experience at Competition Tribunal, the different types of economic evidence judges faced with in competition cases, notably in horizontal and vertical agreements, as well as what convinces a judge and what doesn't, what is helpful to reach a decision as well as the tools and approaches developed by the Competition Tribunal to deal with economic evidence and then drawing upon lessons from recent cases. A very practical session that lead to a very lively discussion between judges keen to engage in the debate.

Finally, the day closed with two sessions lead by Mr. R. Ian McEwin, managing director of competition consulting Asia with wide experience of acting as expert witness in several courtrooms, on vertical agreements looking at economic concepts in such cases, and more particularly digging into Retail Price Maintenance, Most Favoured Nation clauses and internet sales.

The third day started with a session set to solve a hypothetical case of possible cartel between retail fuel companies. For this session, the plenary was broken up into 2 smaller groups where judges evaluated a stack of evidence presented to them for analysis. This was then complemented by a courtroom scenario where counsel for the alleged cartelists and the competition authority representatives put their case before the plenary of judges.

The last substantive session of the workshop was offered by Mr. R. Ian McEwin on quantifying antitrust harm and imposing optimal sanctions, looking at several methods to achieve this goal.

Overall, a very highly rated event where judges were very engaged in interesting discussions amongst themselves and with the panel members.

EVALUATION

OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE FOR EVENT ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES								4.8
DETAILED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS <i>(Numerical score for each category)</i>	Average Score	% of Highest Category	Number of Response					No answer
			Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	
1. The overall usefulness of the topics addressed	4.9	90%	9	1				
2. The overall quality of the presentations	4.8	80%	8	2				
3. The overall usefulness of the hypothetical exercise	4.8	80%	8	2				
4. The overall usefulness of the seminar materials	4.7	70%	7	3				
5. The overall usefulness of this event	4.8	80%	8	2				

2.6) Workshop for New Competition Agencies in ASEAN, P, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 3-4 November

In November 2016, the OECD/Korea Policy Centre held a workshop co-hosted by the Ministry of Commerce (MoC) and co-sponsored by GIZ dedicated to institution building of new competition agencies

in ASEAN. In attendance were many officials from Cambodian government, including two Secretaries of State of the Ministry of Commerce of Cambodia - H.E. KEM Sithan and H.E Mao Thora, as well as officials from Laos, Myanmar, the Philippines. In total there were more than 60 participants.

This was the third in-country event of 2016, this workshop having the objective of helping countries in ASEAN who have either yet to set up a competition agency or have only recently set one up, to better design their agencies as well as to facing the initial challenges of a new institution as effectively as possible, by learning the lessons of other examples from ASEAN and across the world. On the speaker roster were Mr. Daewon Hong, Mr. William Kovacic, Mr. Hassan Qaqaya, Mr. Ruben Maximiano, Ms. Shila Raj and Ms. Catherine Setiawan of the ASEAN Secretariat.

The keynote opening speech was offered by the H.E. KEM Sithan (Secretary of State, Ministry of Commerce, Cambodia). Following this keynote speech Director General Daewon Hong (OECD/KPC) welcomed all participants and offered the context for the workshop whilst Mr. Ruben Maximiano (OECD) provided a guided tour of all the sessions of the workshop and went into detail on the benefits of competition, in particular for developing economies as well as the main concepts that would be then discussed in greater detail throughout the event. The scene was further set by the presentation by the ASEAN Secretariat's Ms. Catherine Setiawan of the current status of competition laws and practice in across ASEAN countries.

Mr. Hassan Qaqaya, former head of the UNCTAD Competition and Consumer Policies, then highlighted a number of key challenges for young competition agencies, particularly in the ASEAN region and addressed the institutional design and related questions of internal and external effectiveness in applying competition law, notably concerning the institutional set-up and agency effectiveness. The following session was led by Mr. William Kovacic, former head of the US FTC and now non-executive member of the CMA, UK. His session was devoted to looking at the major options of design of an agency, drawing and comparing experience of a number of different agencies from around the globe.

With the main institutional design options discussed, the workshop benefited from the experience of Ms. Shila Raj as the first CEO of MyCC in Malaysia, with a candid and comprehensive sharing of the main issues that MyCC encountered in the first few months of existence. The last session of the day was used to break up the plenary into smaller groups to discuss the main challenges and issues facing each of the countries represented in the workshop, with short presentations from each country within each group, as had been organized before the workshop. This allowed for a lively discussion in each of the smaller groups, which lead to the discussion in the plenary that followed on some of the main issues raised, such as the importance of having an internal uniform understanding of the law, the importance of defining its role and managing expectations, the role of training of staff, amongst other issues.

The second day opened with a session lead by Mr. Kovacic, that built upon the previous two sessions of the previous day, and discussed the importance of the first steps of an agency. Topics detailed were the importance of selecting human resources and of setting out a conscious plan, to prioritise and to have a strategy to achieve them and to manage expectations. Mr. Kovacic has spent a significant amount of time thinking and writing about these issues over the last few years and this allowed him to draw upon the experience of different agencies from across the globe to stress the importance of the different tools that an agency should be using at an early stage, from enforcement to advocacy and research. Advocacy was the subject of the following session, where Mr. Qaqaya presented the importance of advocacy in creating a competition culture. This allows the competition authority to explain the benefits of competition and of its actions, as well as helps to promote compliance with competition rules. In essence, Mr. Qaqaya explained the importance of communicating to: public authorities, to help them clearly to delineate the boundaries of economic regulation and to legislate in a way that does not unnecessarily prevent competition; to business actors to not undertake anti-competitive actions; to judges and the public at large via the media, all of which are needed for an effective competition policy and to an economy with well-functioning markets.

Building upon Mr. Qaqaya's session on advocacy the next two sessions discussed in particular the role for competition authorities and for public authorities more generally to ensure that markets are competitive so

that the benefits of competition can be harnessed: namely via undertaking a competition assessment of rules and regulations to ensure they are not unduly hindering competition in markets. The first session drew upon the significant work of the OECD in this field, with Mr. Ruben Maximiano discussing the Competition Assessment Toolkit and in particular the use of the check list to determine which regulations would require a closer analysis. The following session was led by Mr. Hong of the KPC and KFTC who explained comprehensively the vast experience of Korea with competition assessment of rules and regulations, offering a wide range of differing examples.

The final session discussed the importance of measuring the effectiveness of competition agencies, not only to ensure that the wider public and public authorities are aware of the real benefits of competition and of the actions of the agency, but also to ensure that the competition authority is permanently vying to improve its internal processes and consequently its outputs (enforcement and advocacy).

Finally, the wrap up discussion allowed participants to ask further questions and make comments on all of the sessions as well as the overall workshop. Drawing upon the valuable work done during the workshop H.E Mao Thora, Secretary of State of the Ministry of Commerce showed his interest in Cambodia passing the competition law counting on the help of the OECD and GIZ, and other organisations to do so.

Overall, a very important event, that allowed for a detailed look at how best to design an agency but also the first organizational steps of a competition authority, which are crucial to achieving a competition culture and competitive markets. The passing of a competition law by itself is only a first step in ensuring the benefits of competition, the remaining steps are then to a significant extent in the hands of the competition authority and the courts.

EVALUATION

OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE FOR EVENT ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES								4.2
DETAILED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS (Numerical score for each category)	Average Score	% of Highest Category	Number of Score (51 respondents)					No answer
			Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	
1. The overall usefulness of the topics addressed	4.3	55%	19	28	3	1	0	
2. The overall quality of the presentations	4.1	51%	15	26	9	1	0	
3. The overall usefulness of the hypothetical exercise	4.1	53%	15	27	9	0	0	
4. The overall usefulness of the seminar materials	4.2	60%	16	30	4	1	0	
5. The overall usefulness of this event	4.2	50%	19	24	8	0	0	

Information Exchange: Efficiency Enhancing or Cartel in Disguise? Seoul, Korea, 6 - 8 December

The OECD/KPC held a workshop on information exchanges. The workshop highlighted different forms of information exchange: Formal and informal exchanges, direct and indirect exchanges and the unilateral disclosure of information. Information exchanges can be observed in horizontal and vertical relationships

and in different organisational settings. We investigated which forms of information exchange warrant closer scrutiny by competition authorities.

The OECD-Korea Policy Centre workshop in Seoul, Korea on December 6 - 8 on “Information Exchange: Efficiency Enhancing or Cartel in Disguise” brought these issues into focus. Participants included competition enforcers from countries across Asia, including Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam. Panellists included experts from the Korea Fair Trade Commission, the Hanyang University School of Law, Korea, the United States Department of Justice, the UK CMA and the Japanese Fair Trade Commission.

The workshop opened with welcoming remarks from Director General Daewon Hong of the OECD-Korea Policy Centre. The substantive presentations of the first day started with an introductory presentation by Sabine Zigelski for the OECD. Ms Kristen C. Limarzi for US Department of Justice continued the introductory part of the day by presenting on the general experience the DOJ had made over the years of enforcement and the most important learnings.

The second part of the day started with a hypothetical case exercise, discussed in small groups. The case presented an information exchange and participants were asked to identify problematic parts of the exchange and to discuss possible steps in an investigation. Ms Hui Chan Yeo for the Singapore Competition Commission presented the first country case study of the seminar. It introduced the legal framework in Singapore and discussed an information exchange between ferry operators. The day ended with a comprehensive overview of the Korean experience. Mr Choong-sik Yang of the KFTC and Prof. Ho Young Lee of the Hanyang University School of Law provided the legal background and the most prominent decisions and case law. They showed the difficulties a jurisdiction may face if the concept of a concerted practice is not included in the law and where information exchanges can only serve as indirect evidence for proving an agreement.

The second day opened with a presentation by Mr Junichi Yanagita of the Japanese Fair Trade Commission. He presented the legal situation in Japan and leading cases. Following this presentation Mr Arshad Javed for the Competition Commission of Pakistan gave insights into Pakistan’s legal background and illustrated the enforcement practice with recent case examples. The UK experience was outlined with a case study by Ms Francisca Mendia-Lara for the UK Competition and Market Authority. This case also illustrated the CMA’s wide use of advocacy tools.

The afternoon started again with a hypothetical case exercise. The participants worked on a case scenario and were again asked to identify potential competition problems and investigative steps. As the case was based on a real European Case, the bananas case, Ms Sabine Zigelski presented a summary of the relevant EU jurisprudence on information exchanges. The day concluded with another presentation by Ms Kristen C. Limarzi on information exchange cases involving the buyer side, between intersellers and a TV case.

On the last day of the seminar Ms Francisca Mendia-Lara presented the UK case law on indirect information exchanges between competitors, ABC or hub & spoke type infringements. She outlined the standard of proof that UK courts have established and referenced enforcement cases.

The seminar finished with a third hypothetical case. The participants were asked to discuss a piece of evidence that clearly indicated some form of hub & spoke exchange intention. Ms Sabine Zigelski finished this session with a short case presentation of a German case and illustrated why and how resale price maintenance cases can often be found in enforcement action against hub & spoke practices.

Throughout the seminar differences but mostly parallel characteristics of dealing with information exchange cases were pointed out by the experts. Participants were strongly reminded that information exchanges can have efficiency enhancing aspects and that any enforcement action needed to balance pro- and anticompetitive effects of the observed information exchanges.

EVALUATION

OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE FOR EVENT ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES								4.47
DETAILED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS (Numerical score for each category)	Average Score	% of Highest Category	Number of Score (26 respondents)					No answer
			Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	
1. The overall usefulness of the topics addressed	4.54	54%	14	12	0	0	0	0
2. The overall quality of the presentations	4.3	62%	9	16	1	0	0	0
3. The overall usefulness of the hypothetical exercise	4.5	50%	13	12	1	0	0	0
4. The overall usefulness of the seminar materials	4.53	54%	14	12	0	0	0	0
5. The overall usefulness of this event	4.53	54%	14	12	0	0	0	0

3. Programme Newsletter

The Programme continued to publish regular newsletter, known as the “Asia-Pacific Competition Update” in 2016. All the editions of the newsletter are available online at the following address <http://www.oecd.org/daf/competition/koreacentrenewsletter.htm>.

There are two primary reasons for publishing the newsletters. The first is to ensure that the benefit of the Programme’s workshops can extend beyond only those officials who are able to attend the workshop in person. The newsletter enables a wider audience to have access to information exchanged during the events.

The second reason for publishing the newsletter is to enable Asia-Pacific competition authorities to establish and maintain links between each other. The newsletter provides a means by which countries can report the details of their key cases to each other and, hopefully, assist agencies to contact each other in the event that there is a joint investigation or an investigation that would benefit from the insights gained by a similar investigation in another Asia-Pacific country.

4. Centre Staffing

During 2016, the Programme’s staff comprised:

Title	Name	Location
Director General	<i>Mr. Jin Wook Chung and Mr. Daewon Hong</i>	Seoul, Korea
OECD Senior Competition Expert	<i>Mr. Ruben Maximiano</i>	Paris, France
Director	<i>Ms. Ju Eun Shim</i>	Seoul, Korea
Research officer	<i>Mr. Daniel Oh</i>	Seoul, Korea
Communications officer	<i>Ms. Michelle Ahn and Ms. Hailey Hyegyung Park</i>	Seoul, Korea
Programme coordinator	<i>Ms. Hyekyoung Jun</i>	Seoul, Korea

5. Contributions

The following OECD Member States and organisations generously provided expert speakers for the Programme's workshops in 2016:

Country	Authority/Organisation
Australia	Australian Competition and Consumer Commission Melbourne University
Canada	Canadian Competition Bureau Competition Tribunal of Canada
European Commission	DG Competition
Japan	Japan Fair Trade Commission
Korea	Korea Fair Trade Commission Busan High Court Korea Development Institute
United States	Department of Justice Federal Trade Commission George Washington University

In addition, officials from the following participating authorities made presentations during the 2016 workshops:

Country	Authority
ASEAN	ASEAN Secretariat
China	State Administration for Industry and Commerce, NDRC
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
Hong Kong	Hong Kong Competition Commission
India	Competition Commission of India
Indonesia	Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU)
Pakistan	Competition Commission of Pakistan
Singapore	Competition Commission of Singapore
Chinese Taipei	Fair Trade Commission
Vietnam	Vietnam Competition Authority

A special thank you goes to all the speakers listed for their presentations.

Appendix A. Speakers at Competition Programme Events in 2016

Speaker	Presentation	Workshop
Mr. Frédéric Jenny (Chairman, OECD Competition Committee OECD)	Why Fight Cartels? Indirect evidence in cartels and the importance of fighting bid rigging	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Mr. Ruben Maximiano	International Co-operation in Cartel Investigations Setting Fines or Sanctions in Cartel Cases	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Ms. Clare Nightingale (Senior Investigator, ACCC, Australia)	Different types of cartels : Australian perspective The ACCC's approach to Cartel Education	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Ms. Michelle Holmes (Assistant Director, ACCC, Australia)	Investigation and building a cartel case Executing a Search and Seizure Operation	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Ms. Jiung Jin (Officer, NDRC)	Case Study China (NDRC) – A Bid Rigging Case in International Ro-RO Shipping Sector	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Ms. Quianting Chen (Officer, SAIC)	Case Study China (SAIC) on Cartel Legal Enforcement	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Ms. Songrim Koo (Deputy Director, KFTC, Korea)	Regulation of Cartel and Detection Tools in Korea	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Mr. Jay Kishor Mishra (Additional Director General, CCI), Jyotsna Yadav (Deputy Director, CCI)	Case Study: India – Investigating of cartels in India – an overview	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Ms. Rosanna Sarita (Investigator, KPPU)	Case Study: Indonesia – The use of Indirect Evidence in Cartel Investigation of Fuel Surcharge	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Ms. Makiko Asami (Investigator, JFTC, Japan)	Method of Detecting Cartels in Japan: Complaint system and Leniency	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Ms. Serene Seet (Assistant Director, CCS)	Case Study: Singapore	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Ms. Chichi Huang (Specialist, CTFTC)	Case Study: Chinese Taipei, Leniency Programme as a Tool for Detecting Anticompetitive agreements – Case of Capacitors	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Mr. Tran Anh Son (Deputy Director General, VCA)	Opening remarks	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Mr. Phung Van Thanh (Deputy Director, VCA, Vietnam)	Cartels Enforcement in Viet Nam	Workshop on Building Cartel Enforcement
Mr. Ruben Maximiano	Refusal to Deal, Abuse of Dominance and the State	Workshop on Abuse of Dominance and Unilateral Conduct : Fundamentals
Dr. Muhammad Syarkawi RAUF, (Chairman, KPPU)	Keynote speech on Abuse of Dominance and the Indonesian Approach	Workshop on Abuse of Dominance and Unilateral Conduct : Fundamentals

Speaker	Presentation	Workshop
Nick Taylor (Partner Jones Day, Australia)	Establishing Abuse of Dominance, Tying and Bundling, Excessive Pricing, Remedies and Sanctions in Abuse of Dominance cases	Workshop on Abuse of Dominance and Unilateral Conduct : Fundamentals
Mr. Byungkun Lee (Director, KFTC)	Abuse of Dominance in Korea, Unfair trading in Korea	Workshop on Abuse of Dominance and Unilateral Conduct : Fundamentals
Mr. Nilotpal Bal (Deputy Director, CCI)	Case Study: India – Abuse of Dominance in the Real Estate Sector in India	Workshop on Abuse of Dominance and Unilateral Conduct : Fundamentals
Mr. Osamu Igarashi (Chief investigator from Investigation Bureau, JFTC)	Abuse of Dominance in Japan, Unfair trading in Japan	Workshop on Abuse of Dominance and Unilateral Conduct : Fundamentals
Mr. Syed Umair Javed (Director, CCP, Pakistan)	Case Study: Pakistan	Workshop on Abuse of Dominance and Unilateral Conduct : Fundamentals
Ms. Pan, Min Hui (Officer, CTFTC)	Case Study: Chinese Taipei	Workshop on Abuse of Dominance and Unilateral Conduct : Fundamentals
Nicholas Franczyk (FTC, US)	Establishing Dominance, Building an Abuse of Dominance case – taking the case forward	Workshop on Abuse of Dominance and Unilateral Conduct : Fundamentals
Mr. Ruben Maximiano (OECD)	Consumer Protection, Switching and Competition in Retail Banking	Sector Workshop on Competition Rules in the Financial Sector
Mr. Sean Greenaway (DG COMP, EU)	EU Merger Control in Banking and Insurance, EU Merger Control in Trading and Clearing Platforms, The EC's Practice Regarding Anticompetitive Agreements in the Financial Sector (Insurance and payment systems), The EC Recent Case Practice on Abuse of Dominance in the Financial Sector	Sector Workshop on Competition Rules in the Financial Sector
Dr. Sunjoo Hwang (Korea Development Institute)	Competition and Stability in Financial Markets	Sector Workshop on Competition Rules in the Financial Sector
Mr. Heeun Jeong (KFTC)	Competition Law and the Financial Sector in Korea	Sector Workshop on Competition Rules in the Financial Sector
Mr. Mukul Sharma (Deputy Director, CCI) Ms. Praachi Misra (Deputy Director, CCI)	Case Study: Indian experience in Competition Issues in Financial Sector	Sector Workshop on Competition Rules in the Financial Sector
Ms. Cindy Chang (CCS, Singapore)	The Experience of Singapore	Sector Workshop on Competition Rules in the Financial Sector
Mr. Benjamin Sirota (DOJ, US)	Cartels in Financial Markets – Cases studies (Libor, FX and others), How to Investigate a financial Markets Antitrust Case, Regulators and Competition Authorities	Sector Workshop on Competition Rules in the Financial Sector
Mr. Ngo Viet Manh (VCA)	Case study on Cartel of 19 Insurers in Viet Nam	Sector Workshop on Competition Rules in the Financial Sector

Speaker	Presentation	Workshop
Mr. Ruben Maximiano (OECD)	Introduction to Merger Control, Choosing and Applying Merger Remedies	Workshop on Merger Control
Mr. Sean Ennis (OECD)	Theories of Harm in Mergers – focusing on unilateral effects, Economic Evidence in Merger Analysis	Workshop on Merger Control
Mr. John Pecman (Commissioner, Canadian Competition Bureau)	International Cooperation in Merger Review	Workshop on Merger Control
Ms. Lucrezia Busa (Policy Officer, DG Comp, EU)	Market Definition in EU Merger Control, Investigations of Merger Cases	Workshop on Merger Control
Mr. Joong-kyu Sun (Director, KFTC, Korea)	Korea's experience of Remedies	Workshop on Merger Control
Mr. Savitri Barbura Kore (Deputy Director, CCI)	Case Study: India	Workshop on Merger Control
Ms. Syede Amina Gilani (Deputy Director, CCP, Pakistan)	Case Study: Pakistan – In-depth review of GSK-Novartis Global Merger	Workshop on Merger Control
Mr. Lim Wei Lu (Assistant Director, CCS, Singapore)	Case Study: Singapore – ex-post evaluation of CCS Merger Clearance in the Dialysis Market	Workshop on Merger Control
Ms. Su-Yen YEH and Ms. Chia-Chen WU (Officers, CTFTC)	Case Study: Chinese Taipei – How to Use Economic Analysis Tools on Merger Cases – Hon Hai vs. Sharp Deal	Workshop on Merger Control
Mr. Frédéric Jenny (Chairman of Competition Committee, OECD)	Keynote: Challenges for Judges in Competition Cases, Using Economic Evidence in Cartel Cases	Competition Workshop for Judges: Cartels
Mr. Ruben Maximiano (OECD)	Direct Evidence in Cartels	Competition Workshop for Judges: Cartels
Ms. Rhonda Smith (University of Melbourne, Australia)	Competition and Market Power, The Economics and Impact of Cartels	Competition Workshop for Judges: Cartels
Mr. Ian McEwin (Australian National University)	RPM, MFN and Internet Sales, Quantifying Antitrust Harm and Optimal Sanctions	Competition Workshop for Judges: Cartels
Mr. Justice Denis Gascon (Chairperson, Competition Tribunal)	Economic Evidence in Competition Cases: A judicial perspective from Canada	Competition Workshop for Judges: Cartels
Judge Jaeh Cheong (Busan High Court of Korea)	Korean Cases using Economic Evidence in Cartel Cases	Competition Workshop for Judges: Cartels
Mr. Ruben Maximiano (OECD)	Benefits of Competition, Looking at Regulation through a Competition Lens, Measuring Agency Effectiveness	Workshop for Young Competition Agencies in ASEAN
Ms. Catherine Setiawan (ASEAN Secretariat)	The Competition Landscape in ASEAN: Where do we Stand	Workshop for Young Competition Agencies in ASEAN
Dr. Hassan Qaqaya (Senior Fellow, Melbourne Law School)	Introducing and Implementing Competition Laws: Main Challenges, Fostering a Competition Culture – the role of Advocacy	Workshop for Young Competition Agencies in ASEAN

Speaker	Presentation	Workshop
H.E. KEM Sithan (Secretary of State, Ministry of Commerce, Cambodia)	Opening Remarks	Workshop for Young Competition Agencies in ASEAN
H.E. Mao Thora (Secretary of State, Ministry of Commerce, Cambodia)		
Mr. Daewon Hong (DG, OECD/KPC)	Experience from Korea on Competition Policy and Regulations	Workshop for Young Competition Agencies in ASEAN
Ms. Shila Dorai Raj (Cansure Consulting, Malaysia)	Institutional Arrangements: Pathways and Pitfalls, Learning from the Malaysian Experience: Recommendation for New Agencies	Workshop for Young Competition Agencies in ASEAN
Ms. Sita Zimpel (GIZ)	Opening Remarks, The Competition Landscape in ASEAN: Where do we Stand	Workshop for Young Competition Agencies in ASEAN
Mr. William Kovacic (George Washington University, US)	Competition System Design: A Menu of Options, New Competition Agencies: First Steps are the Hardest	Workshop for Young Competition Agencies in ASEAN
Ms. Sabine Zigelski (OECD)	Information Exchange: Introduction	Workshop on Information Exchange
Mr. Choong Sik Yang (KFTC, Korea)	Information Exchange and Ramen Case	Workshop on Information Exchange
Prof. Ho Young Lee (Hanyang Univ. School of Law, Korea)	Information Exchange in Korean Cartel Enforcement	Workshop on Information Exchange
Mr. Junichi Yanagita (JFTC, Japan)	Information Exchange Among Competitors	Workshop on Information Exchange
Mr. Muhammad Arshad Javed (CCP, Pakistan)	Case Study: Pakistan	Workshop on Information Exchange
Ms. Hui Chuan Yeo (CCS, Singapore)	Case Study: Singapore	Workshop on Information Exchange
Mr. Hao-Yu Chien (CTFTC, Chinese Taipei)	Case Study: Chinese Taipei	Workshop on Information Exchange
Ms. Francisca Mendia-Lara (CMA, UK)	Information Exchange – Private Ophthalmology and Other Cases; Information Exchange: ABC infringements	Workshop on Information Exchange
Ms. Kristen C. Limarzi (DOJ, US)	Information Exchange in the US, Information Exchange – beyond the basics	Workshop on Information Exchange