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The OECD-GVH Regional Centre for Competition in Budapest (Hungary) ("RCC") was established by the Gazdasági Versenyhivatal (GVH, Hungarian Competition Authority) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) on 16 February 2005 when a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the parties.

The main objective of the RCC is to foster the development of competition policy, competition law and competition culture in the South-East, East and Central European regions and to thereby contribute to economic growth and prosperity in the involved regions.

The RCC provides capacity building assistance and policy advice through workshops, seminars and training programmes on competition law and policy for officials in competition enforcement agencies and other parts of government, sector regulators, and judges. The RCC also works to strengthen competition law and policy in Hungary and in the GVH itself.

The RCC’s work focuses on four main target groups. The first group of beneficiaries are the competition authorities of South-East Europe and the majority of the CIS countries, namely Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo*, Kyrgyzstan, North Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, the Russian Federation, Serbia and Ukraine. The work targeting these economies is regarded as the core activity of the RCC. These economies have all progressed with the development of their competition laws and policies, but are at different stages in this process. As a consequence, the needs for capacity building differ among the involved non-OECD member economies and this necessitates a broad approach to competition outreach work. Major capacity building needs in these regions include (a) enhancing analytical skills in competition law enforcement, (b) raising the awareness of the judiciary regarding the specific characteristics of competition law adjudication, (c) pro-competitive reform in infrastructure sectors, (d) competition advocacy, (e) relations between competition authorities and sector regulatory agencies, (f) legal and institutional reform in the area of competition, and (g) building international co-operation and networking.

* All references to Kosovo, whether the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nation’s Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.
Judges represent the second target group of the RCC’s activities. The seminars for judges provide judges with an opportunity to improve their understanding of competition law and economics, to exchange views on the latest developments in EU competition law, and to discuss the key challenges arising in competition law cases.

The third group of beneficiaries of the work of the RCC are the competition authorities which belong to the Central European Competition Initiative (CECI). This Initiative aims to provide a forum for cooperation on competition matters and was established by the Central European competition authorities in 2003. It is a network of agencies and operates via workshops and informal meetings. Involved are the competition authorities of Austria, the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and Hungary. These countries all belong to the same geographic region, share fundamentally similar cultural traditions and historical experiences and are, more or less, at the same stage of development. As a result, their competition authorities face several common challenges and difficulties. Moreover, from time to time these authorities deal with markets which are regional, overlapping or which are connected to each other, and they may also on occasion deal with the same parties (the same companies within the region).

The fourth beneficiary of the RCC’s work is the GVH itself. The agendas of the RCC workshops that are organised for the staff of the GVH are related to ongoing projects or “hot” topics and provide an excellent opportunity for staff to learn about state-of-the-art antitrust theory and enforcement practices.

Concerning the functioning of the RCC, the Memorandum of Understanding of the RCC provides that the GVH and the OECD are to make major decisions on their activities and work jointly. For this purpose, the parties meet on an annual basis to review the operation and performance of the RCC and to prepare the annual work plan.

Regarding the financing of the RCC, the GVH is responsible for providing most of the necessary funding for the functioning of the RCC, including an annual voluntary contribution to the OECD for the costs associated with the staff position in Paris. The OECD helps to co-finance the RCC’s operation and activities. In addition to this, both the GVH and the OECD co-operate in efforts to raise additional financial support for the RCC from third parties.
II. Overview of the activities for the year 2018

The RCC organised seven events in 2018. Seminars focused on some important core competences of competition authorities as well as on best practices in the area of competition law. In addition to its regular seminars, the RCC continued with its special initiatives: a seminar organised in one of the beneficiary economies, and a seminar organised jointly with the FAS Russia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Person-days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country or institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Commission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Altogether, over the course of the year, the RCC invited 262 participants and 47 speakers to its events. Through the RCC’s core events it delivered 788 person-days of capacity building. All in all, participants from 36 economies and institutions attended the RCC’s programmes, coming from Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan and the GVH. Meanwhile, experts from 16 countries and institutions attended as panel members: Albania, Austria, Belgium, EU Commission, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russian Federation, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, the GVH and the OECD.

* Person-days are defined as the number of days a person attended a RCC seminar. Thus, if 10 people attended a course for 5 days and 4 people attended a course for 3 days the number of person days delivered is 62 (10*5 + 4*3 = 62).
Table No2 provides a brief overview of the topics of the seminars held in 2018 as well as the participating economies and institutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total Number of Participants and Speakers</th>
<th>Attending Economies/Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Seminar on European Competition Law for National Judges on “National Judges and Antitrust Damages Litigation” | 23-24 February | 21 + 5                                   | Participants: Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Portugal, Romania, United Kingdom  
Speakers: Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg, United Kingdom, OECD |
| Seminar on Cartel Detection Tools”                                            | 06-08 March | 41 + 6                                   | Participants: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo*, Kyrgyzstan, North Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Ukraine, GVH  
Speakers: Germany, Lithuania, United Kingdom, GVH, OECD |
| GVH Staff Training                                                           | 17-18 April | 74 + 6                                   | Participants: GVH  
Speakers: Belgium, Germany, United Kingdom, United States, OECD |
| Introductory Level Seminar - Basic Concepts and Procedures in Competition Law for Young Authority Staff | 15-18 May | 41 + 6                                   | Participants: Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo*, Kyrgyzstan, North Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Ukraine, GVH  
Speakers: EU Commission, Germany, GVH, United States, OECD |
| Outside Seminar in Albania – Merger Control Investigations                    | 19-21 June | 35 + 7                                   | Participants: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo*, Kyrgyzstan, North Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Ukraine  
Speakers: Albania, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Turkey, OECD |
| RCC – FAS Seminar in Russia on Effective Cartel Enforcement                   | 02-04 October | 24 + 10                                | Participants: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan  
Speakers: Austria, Italy, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, OECD, GVH |
| Seminar on European Competition Law for National Judges on “Competition Issues in the Digital Age” | 16-17 November | 25 + 7                                   | Participants: Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Spain, Sweden  
Speakers: Belgium, Luxembourg, Portugal, GVH, OECD |
Advanced Seminar on European Competition Law For National Judges
“National Judges and Antitrust Damages Litigation”

The Topic:

The seminar aimed at consolidating knowledge of the participant judges about the new rules derived from the EU Damage Directive, which they now have to take into consideration in the accomplishment of their duties. It also allowed them to share their thoughts and experience with their counterparts and the interveners. The seminar was co-financed by the European Union.
The Speakers:

Mr. Iestyn Williams
RBB Economics, UK
on quantification of harm

Dr. Martin Seegers
CDC Cartel Damage Claims, Belgium
on quantification of damages, passing on of overcharges, joint and several liability and consensual settlements

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Georg Kodek
Supreme Court of Justice of Austria
on disclosure of evidence, joint and several liability, consensual settlements, limitation periods & effect of national decisions

Mr. Pedro Caro De Sousa
OECD, France
on disclosure of evidence, limitation periods and the impact of national decisions, passing on, quantification of harm

Mr. Vivien Terrien
General Court of the European Union, Luxembourg
on jurisdictional issues and the applicable law, disclosure of evidence

Main results:

- Reflections on consistent application of EU law by national courts
- Improved knowledge regarding the main issues that derive from the directive
- Experience sharing about practical difficulties that may occur

The hypothetical exercises

Participants brainstormed on
- economic considerations relating to quantification of harm and passing on of overcharges
- disclosure of evidence
- joint and several liabilities, consensual settlements, limitation periods and effect of national decisions
The seminar dealt with sources of cartel detection and investigated what it needs to have an effective leniency system. Which alternatives exist if leniency is not working in a country? These include whistle-blower or anonymous informant systems, informant reward schemes, systematic screening and also market studies. Another source to be tapped systematically are attentive public procurement officials and systematic monitoring of e-procurement data. The OECD Guidelines for Fighting Bid Rigging in Public Procurement are a good starting point.
Armenia, Georgia, Serbia, Russia and Ukraine presented cartel cases – most of them had affected public procurement!

40 Enforcers from 18 beneficiary Countries and from the Eurasian Economic Commission participated in the Seminar.

The Speakers:

**Mr Markus Wagemann**
Bundeskartellamt, Germany

---
on leniency

**Mr. Kwadjo Adjepong and Ms Heena Mistry**
CMA, UK

---
on the CMA Cartel Screening Tool

**Ms Jolanta Ivanauskienè**
Lithuanian Competition Council

---
on active cooperation with other enforcers and screening

**Mr Botond Horváth**
GVH, Hungary

---
on informant reward schemes and advocacy

**Ms Sabine Zigelski**
OECD, France

---
on the OECD Guidelines and parallel pricing

Main results:

- Leniency is not the only source for cartel detection
- Cooperation with other enforcement bodies is important
- Address public procurement to detect and prevent bid rigging
- Cartel screens can identify red flags

The hypothetical exercises

We practised
- handling a leniency application
- detection of suspicious bidding patterns in a Tender
- a parallel pricing case
Table №3 provides an overview of the number of participants at the seminars. This summary focuses on the participants of the seminars organised as part of the core activity of the RCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Person-days</th>
<th>Events attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td><strong>707</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart No1 provides an overview of the number of participants per economy.

**Chart No1**

Total number of participants per economy attending seminars organised as part of the core activity of the RCC.
The seminar provided an overview of recent developments on European competition law on the first day. On the second day, different groups of staff received tailor-made trainings.
The Speakers:

**Mr Richard Whish**
Emeritus Professor of Law at King’s College London, QC (hon)

1. Day – Presentation on developments in European competition law in 2017
2. Day – Discussions with the GVH Council on hub & spoke cartels and the role and treatment of trade associations as cartel facilitators

**Mr Szabolcs Lorincz**
European Commission, Belgium

2. Day – Training for the merger and chief economist team on economic analysis in merger cases

**Mr Dotan Weinman**
Federal Trade Commission, United States

1. Day – Presentation new trends in US consumer protection
2. Day – Training with the consumer protection section on FTC experiences in consumer protection cases

**Mr Ulrich Schwalbe**
University of Hohenheim, Germany

1. Day – Presentation on algorithms, machine learning and collusion

**Mr Johannes Holzwarth**
European Commission, Belgium

1. Day – Presentation on the EU Damages Directive
2. Day – Presentation for the antitrust section on ECN experiences with vertical agreements and platform cases

**Ms Sabine Zigelski**
OECD, France

1. Day – Presentation vertical restraints and e-commerce
2. Day – Training with the antitrust section on vertical restraints and e-commerce

Main results:

- Active enforcement work at ec level in all areas
- E-commerce will stay on the enforcement agenda
- Algorithmic collusion = competition sci-fi (?)
- Social media, fin-tech and health advertising high on the consumer protection agenda
- NCAs can support private enforcement
Introductory Level Seminar – Basic Concepts and Procedures in Competition Law for Young Authority Staff

The Topic:

This beginner level seminar gave young authority staff the chance to become more familiar with basic competition law concepts. We highlighted cartels, mergers and abuse of dominance and addressed basic legal and economic theories as well as procedural requirements and interesting cases. The international component of competition law enforcement was also presented.
The Speakers:

Ms Patricia Brink  
Department of Justice, United States  

on market definition and market power; on abuse of dominance and on hard core cartels

Ms Eva-Maria Schulze  
Bundeskartellamt, Germany  

on merger investigation practice and on booking platforms and sports shoes

Mr José-Maria Carpi-Badia  
European Commission, Belgium  

on EU cases and case law on mergers, on abuse of dominance and on horizontal restraints.

Ms Zsófia Nagy  
GVH, Hungary  

on merger control

Ms Sabine Zigelski  
OECD, France  

on the vertical restraints and on international co-operation

Main results:
- Procedural rights and rules need to be respected in all competition proceedings
- Merger investigations require legal, economic and process know-how
- In abuse and vertical cases the main concern is about foreclosure
- The EU practice and jurisprudence provide good guidance for all enforcers

The hypothetical exercises

We practised:  
- the application of procedural rights and rules  
- market definition  
- a merger investigation  
- an abuse case

41 Enforcers from 17 beneficiary Countries and from the Eurasian Economic Commission participated in the Seminar.
Seminar on Merger Control Investigations

The Topic:

Merger investigations require a complex skill set. In this seminar, we looked at theories of harm for merger cases, basic economic methods to be applied and at effective merger remedies. At the same time we discussed effective procedures for merger investigations and investigation methods. Merger control specialists from experienced jurisdictions presented case studies and the participants practised their merger skills in hypothetical exercises.
The Speakers:

Mr Martijn Wolthoff
ACM, Netherlands

—
on phase 1 and phase 2 investigations

Ms Hatice Yavuz
Turkish Competition Agency, Turkey

—
on the privatisation in the merger control context

Ms Jurgita Breskyte
Lithuanian Competition Council

—
on merger remedies

Mr Attila Dudra
GVH, Hungary

—
on questionnaires and phase 2 merger cases

Ms Sabine Zigelski
OECD, France

—
on merger control, market definition and remedies

Main results:

• Mergers need quick and efficient review procedures
• Market definition is not a goal in itself – when possible it should be left open
• Information collection should strike the right balance between information that could and that should be obtained
• Structural remedies are most in line with the goal of merger control – to preserve competitive market structures

The hypothetical exercises

We practised:
• organising a phase I investigation
• market definition and SNNIP Test
• a remedy negotiation

Ms Juliana Latifi, Ms Diana Dervishi and Ms Leida Matja presented the general framework and enforcement practice of the Albanian Competition Agency and a banking merger case investigation.

35 Enforcers from 17 beneficiary Countries and from the Eurasian Economic Commission participated in the Seminar.
The Topic:

How can cartels be detected effectively and what are the first steps when a suspicion arises? We looked at leniency but also pro-active detection tools like the analysis of public procurement data and co-operation with other enforcement bodies. The next enforcement steps - covert market investigations and dawn raids and what kind of evidence to look for – were discussed, and we provided insights into new challenges to cartel enforcement through e-commerce and digitalisation.
Main results:

- Requisites for an effective leniency
- Programme proactive tools for cartel detection
- Screening for bid rigging in public procurement
- Detection in the digital era
- Dawn raids preparation and execution
- Using indirect evidence

The Speakers:

Mr Kwadjo Adjepong  
CMA, UK  
on the CMA Cartel Screening Tool, direct and indirect evidence, and the CMA’s use of forensic IT

Ms Natalie Harsdorf  
Enderndorf  
BWB, Austria  
on leniency and dawn raid preparation

Mr Dávid Kuritár  
GVH, Hungary  
on informant reward schemes and advocacy

Mr Renato Ferrandi  
Italian Competition Authority  
on merger control

Mr Mukhamed Khamukov  
FAS Russia  
on direct and indirect evidence and the FAS dawn raid experience

Ms Fatima Konieva  
FAS Russia  
on best practices in cartel detection

Mr Dmitry Artyushenko  
FAS Russia  
on agreements and algorithms

Ms Sabine Zigelski  
OECD, France  
on the parallel pricing and algorithms
Seminar on European Competition Law for National Judges

“National Judges and Antitrust Challenges in the Digital Age”

The Topic:

The seminar raised awareness of national judges dealing with competition law cases as to the consequences of new technologies in their traditional reasoning, with the aim of promoting a common understanding of the problems and ensuring a consistent approach within the EU by national courts. The seminar was co-financed by the European Union.
Main results:

- Overview of the challenges raised by dynamic markets for the national competition authorities
- Analysis of the main issues for competition raised by innovative markets, including the assessment of market power and market definition, rebates and predatory practices, intellectual property issues, merger issues and vertical restraints

The hypothetical exercises

Group discussions on
- how dynamic markets could shake the ground of competition law’s fundamental notions, such as market power and market definition
- rebates in the new technology sector
- the relationship between intellectual property and competition
- merger issues
- vertical restraints in dynamic markets

The Speakers:

**Mr Thomas Vinje**
Clifford Chance, Belgium

- on challenges raised by dynamic markets for the lawyers, rebates and predatory practices, intellectual property issues, dynamic markets and merger issues

**Mr Miguel De La Mano**
Compass Lexecon, Belgium

- on SEP and FRAND issues, efficiencies resulting from vertical agreements

**Ms Cristina Camacho**
Autoridade da Concorrência, Portugal

- on price discriminations, RPM and the DG COMP’S consumer electronics manufacturers decisions

**Mr András Tóth**
GVH, Hungary

- on the challenges raised by dynamic markets for the NCAs

**Mr Vivien Terrien**
General Court of the European Union, Luxembourg

- on dynamic markets and competition law

**Ms Sabine Zigelski**
OECD, France

- on non-price effects of mergers, online sales and vertical restraints

**Mr Pedro Caro De Sousa**
OECD, France

- on digital economy, innovation and competition, disruptive innovation, IP and competition law, anticompetitive pricing practices
IV. Evaluation of RCC Seminars

Participants are always asked to provide feedback on RCC seminars so that the standard of the events can be maintained and even possibly improved. According to the feedback, participants found that the seminars provided theoretical and practical information that was highly relevant to their day-to-day work and that the seminars also provided a good opportunity for the exchange of opinions between participants and experts. The average value of all of the answers for the entire year was 4.6 out of a maximum of 5.

Participants considered the overall usefulness of the programmes to be either very high or high – 96 percent of respondents rated the seminars on this basis. Based on the feedback, the current distribution of the topics is well received. As usual, participants would like more presentations on practical issues and in depth case analyses, rather than theoretical discussions.
### Table №4

Participants’ evaluation of events organised by the RCC in the year 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of answers</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall usefulness of the event</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall usefulness of the topics</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness and quality of materials</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of conference facilities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop preparations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of hypothetical cases / country contributions / case studies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table №5

Detailed evaluations by events and by categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judges' Seminar in February</th>
<th>Seminar in Budapest in March</th>
<th>GVH training in April</th>
<th>Seminar for young authority staff in May</th>
<th>Seminar in in Albania in June</th>
<th>RCC-FAS Russia joint seminar in October</th>
<th>Judges’ Seminar in November</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall usefulness of the event</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall usefulness of the topics</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentations</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness and quality of materials</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of conference facilities</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop preparations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of hypothetical cases / country contributions / breakout sessions</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the Memorandum of Understanding which was signed by the parties in 2005, ensuring that the RCC operates at the highest level is the task of the founding parties, the GVH and the OECD. Both institutions provide financial and intellectual contributions towards the operation of the RCC. The accumulated experience and expertise of the OECD members also contribute to the training programmes offered by the RCC.

The RCC had a budget of 441,637 EUR for 2018. This includes funds provided by the GVH and the OECD as well as grants received from the European Commission, the latter of which were used to fund the seminars on European Competition Law for National Judges.

The following tables provide details on the total costs of the operation of the RCC in 2018 by sources of funds, by events and by major categories of costs.
### The sources of funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of funds (EUR)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gazdasági Versenyhivatal (Hungarian Competition Authority)</td>
<td>367553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission (grants for the judges seminars)</td>
<td>44084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>30000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>441637</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A) Direct organisational costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar on European Competition Law for National Judges on “National Judges and Antitrust Damages Litigation”</td>
<td>25800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar on Cartel Detection Tools</td>
<td>42700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVH Staff Training</td>
<td>11890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Level Seminar - Basic Concepts and Procedures in Competition Law for Young Authority Staff</td>
<td>49770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar on Merger Control Investigations, Tirana, Albania</td>
<td>31500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Seminar with the FAS Seminar in Russia on Effective Cartel Enforcement</td>
<td>14760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar on European Competition Law for National Judges on Competition Issues in the Digital Age</td>
<td>29300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct organisational costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>205720</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B) Overhead and operational costs of the RCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C) Staff costs transferred by the GVH to the OECD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL EXPENSES in 2018 | 441637 |

* On the basis of the Memorandum of Understanding, the GVH made a voluntary contribution to the OECD for staff-related purposes.
The RCC is a “virtual” centre, thus it does not have a central office but is accommodated in the headquarters of the GVH. The virtual existence of the RCC allows it to concentrate funds on the real purpose of its establishment, that is, organising seminars and inviting and training participants. The virtual structure also facilitates adaptation to changing situations. The RCC is run by a senior competition expert at the OECD headquarters in Paris and by a senior consultant and an assistant who are at the same time employees of the GVH in Budapest.

The work of the RCC is based on the expertise of both the GVH and the OECD. The GVH is responsible for inviting participants and organising all of the practical arrangements for the RCC’s programmes. The expert at the OECD sets up the content of the programmes and invites speakers to the seminars. The GVH provides speakers or panellists for each seminar. Other speakers are invited from different OECD member states.
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