

Annual report for the Centre for Competition Policy 1 January – 31 December 2017

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Activities 1 January to 31 December 2017	3
2.1 Staff	3
2.2 Funding.....	3
2.3 Engagement and Dissemination.....	5
2.4 Focus on: Knowledge Exchange	6
3. Summary of Activities.....	6
3.1 Ongoing and Completed Directly Funded Projects	7
3.2 Research on Anticompetitive Strategies	8
3.3 Research on Markets and Systemic Challenges	9
3.4 Institutions.....	10
4. Appendices	11
4.1 KPI Tracker.....	11
4.2 CCP year on year	12

CCP, Elizabeth Fry Building, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ

This report is an abridged version of the Annual Report 2017 submitted to the University of East Anglia in February 2018

The objective of CCP, as stated in its constitution, is to undertake high quality independent academic research into competition and regulation policy and its impact on companies and others. Its output is in the public domain and contributes both to the development of policy and to understanding business responses.

1. Introduction

The Centre for Competition Policy (CCP) is a joint venture between the University of East Anglia's (UEA) School of Economics (ECO), the School of Law (LAW), Norwich Business School (NBS) and the School of Politics, Philosophy, Language and Communication Studies (PPL). CCP has established itself as a leading internationally recognised research centre focused on competition policy and regulation.¹ Thorough enquiry in this field is necessarily multidisciplinary. In its research, CCP draws on models, theories and techniques from economics, law and political science. Economic analysis provides an understanding of how consumers, firms and markets operate, of when markets fail for lack of competition, of techniques which might be adopted to regulate behaviour and of the consequences of such policy interventions. Legal analysis is necessary to ensure the legislature and the courts establish and develop sound rules with which firms should comply, and which regulatory agencies can enforce and operate within. Political science provides an understanding of the design and development of policies, and the bodies and institutions that implement them. Our research applies each of these disciplines individually and together to achieve real-world policy relevance without compromising academic rigour.

By the end of 2017, CCP had **32** faculty members, compared with 35 the year before, four Research Associates (six the previous year) and **21** research student members, compared with 19. Together with two administrators, CCP consists of **62** members, all of whom either work or study at UEA. During the year, CCP members published **32** journal articles and book chapters and **5** working papers. CCP continues to disseminate its research to both academics and practitioners. We organise both a weekly research seminar which had **35** meetings during the year and an annual open summer conference which for the fourth year running attracted more than one hundred delegates. Our research findings were presented externally to academics (**83** occasions) and practitioners (**33** occasions). Our research was highlighted in **6** responses to public consultations, and formed the basis for **10** blog posts. Members were active in both new digital media, where our Twitter account has **3,107** followers and in more traditional media where researchers were quoted **35** times.

Research at CCP has been funded through a number of grants from the UK Research Councils, including the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), and the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), as well as contract research carried out for UK and international organisations. The latter include the European Union's Directorate General (DG) Competition and DG Justice, the Centre on Regulation in Europe (CERRE), the UK energy regulator Ofgem, the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), and Anglian Water Plc. Core funding

¹ Competition policy provides a broad framework for the manner in which firms can interact, while regulation sets industry-specific rules. Markets with many alternative suppliers typically provide consumers with products and services they want at the best possible prices. In such markets, competition policy provides little restraint on business behaviour, the exception being on cartel practices, which are nearly always harmful. When fewer firms participate in a market, however, it is appropriate to constrain a range of anticompetitive business practices. Competition law provides the general framework for this. In cases where entry and competition cannot erode market power, at least in the medium term, policy options include direct (sectoral) regulation of the firms' behaviour.

is also obtained through our subscription membership scheme which currently has **seven** public sector members. As in past years, CCP has undertaken bespoke training, described further below.

While we have exceeded the majority of our key performance indicators, in several cases significantly (for a full list see section 4.1 below), we have come up short in a few areas, notably: working papers, consultation responses and blog posts. Of those three, only the first is also below a three year rolling average. One of the tasks for 2018 is to respond to this shortcoming.

2. Activities 1 January to 31 December 2017

2.1 Staff

As in past years, CCP membership numbers fluctuate. This year we have been joined by faculty members Wynne Lam (NBS) and Pierre Bocquillon (PPL). During the same period, Subhasish Modak Chowdhury, Sven Gallasch, Chris Hanretty, Joo Young Jeon and Hao Lan have left to take up posts elsewhere. This reduces the current number of faculty members from UEA Schools to 32. Breaking these down by the main UEA Schools, CCP has 11 members from ECO, 6 from LAW, 9 from NBS and 5 from PPL, ensuring that all the disciplines are well represented.

CCP faculty members are heavily involved in activities external to but relevant for CCP. Several are members of peer-review panels of the UK funding bodies and others serve on various advisory boards of research centres, public sector bodies and NGOs. Notably, Fletcher is a non-executive director of the CMA and FCA, Waddams a non-executive director of Ofwat, Lyons and Ormosi are members of CMA's Academic Panel, Hviid and Waddams are members of Ofgem's Academic Panel and Lyons is a member of the European Commission's economic advisory group on competition policy.

During the year, we were joined by Liang Lu, a new Research Associate, while the contracts of two Research Associates, Elizabeth Errington and Noel Longhurst, came to an end. This takes the number of Research Associates on longer term contracts to four. In addition, a number of research students undertook various ad hoc research work. Finally, we were joined by five new PhD students, while **five** of the PhD students associated with CCP successfully submitted their doctoral thesis for examination.

In addition to academics and policy makers visiting the centre for one to two days in connection with our seminar series, we were joined by Professor Andy Gavil from Howard University, Washington DC, as a long-term visiting researchers in 2017.

2.2 Funding

Funding is essential for CCP to carry out its planned research and engagement. CCP brought a total of £533k into the University through its various activities: grants (43%), contract research (37%), knowledge exchange (10%), membership scheme (6%), sponsorship (2%), conference fee income (1%) and other (1%).

Grants

Success in research grant applications is crucial to CCP's sustainability; such funding allows its academics to pursue their research passions while also raising the Centre's reputation and delivering overheads into its budgets to cover some of its running costs.

CCP was a junior partner in a successful bid to the ESRC, NIBS2, led at UEA by the Centre for Behavioural and Experimental Social Science (CBESS). The UK Energy Research Centre (UKERC)-funded project on Equity and Justice in Energy Markets continues until October 2018.

Contract Research

Contract research keeps CCP in touch with the urgent research questions of the practitioner world; these are only undertaken if they fall squarely within CCP's research areas, and usually only if the funder will allow findings to be published. Surpluses from these contracts are indispensable to the running of the Centre.

Ormosi (PI) Bennato, Davies and Mariuzzo completed work on a contract from DG Competition to assess the microeconomic impact of enforcement of competition policies on innovation. Deller (PI), Bernal, Hviid and Waddams completed work on a contract from Ofgem to assess collective switching and possible uses of a disengaged consumer database. Hviid (PI), Deller and Lu completed work on a contract from Anglian Water on price and behavioural signals to encourage water conservation. Hviid with colleagues from the ESRC Business and Local Government Data Research Centre worked on issues related to Care Homes for the Competition and Markets Authority.

Knowledge Exchange

The delivery of training courses to practitioners forms and maintains links, dialogue and understanding between CCP and practitioners, leading to more policy relevant research and more academically informed policy development.

In addition to teaching on relevant modules on undergraduate and postgraduate degrees, CCP members deliver bespoke training courses during the year.

Fletcher organised and delivered a two day course on “Economics of Competition Policy for Economists” together with Hviid and a number of practitioners, aimed at participants from the public and private sector. This course, which ran for the fourth year in a row, attracted 29 delegates and was, according to the formal feedback, very well received.

A second two-day course on the “Introduction to the economics of competition policy”, designed by Hviid and delivered together with Fletcher, Lyons and Waddams, is now part of the Civil Service Learning catalogue of courses available to the Government Economic Service (GES) and was as planned run twice this year with positive delegate feedback.

Fletcher designed and delivered a four day course on consumer policy for Which?. This course was delivered by Fletcher together with colleagues, including CCP members Hviid, Lyons and Waddams.

Subscription Membership Scheme

Public sector organisations concerned with competition in and the regulation of markets and consumer policy confirm the value in which they hold CCP by paying for access to its academics. Through its Subscription Membership Scheme, which contributes to the Centre's diverse income portfolio, CCP cements its relationship with policy makers and deepens the channels for the two-way flow of knowledge across the boundary between academic research and practice.

CCP has a subscription membership scheme to which currently subscribe: the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), CMA, Ofgem, the UK communications industries regulator Ofcom, the UK water regulator Ofwat, the Intellectual Property Office (IPO) and, new this year, the Financial Conduct authority (FCA). While available as a one year membership, most members have now availed themselves of the discounted three year membership. This scheme provides CCP with a small element of core funding and strengthens CCP's engagement with core stakeholders.

2.3 Engagement and Dissemination

CCP members engage through publishing, presentations, discussions, consultation responses and blogging.

Academic and policy engagement

Maintaining strong networks with external academics and policy makers gives the Centre vitality and visibility. This can lead to collaborative working, funding opportunities and a wider dissemination of members' research findings.

During 2017 CCP members published **32** articles and book chapters and **5** working papers, gave **88** presentations to academic audiences and a further **33** to predominantly practitioner audiences. CCP responded to **6** public consultations, wrote **10** blog posts, reached **3,107** followers on Twitter and has been quoted in the media **35** times. CCP organised the annual conference, **three** further events and **35** seminars. In addition, under its membership scheme CCP held **four** events with subscription members this year.

Organised by Catherine Waddams, CCP hosted its 13th Annual Summer Conference, which took place on June 15th-16th. The topic was "Just Markets: Distributional Effects of Competition Policy and Economic Regulation" and the programme boasted a variety of perspectives with a strong policy focus from a truly multi-disciplinary line-up, with speakers from Law, Economics, Politics and Philosophy. After a year "exiled" to the centre of Norwich, the venue was back at UEA at The Enterprise Centre. The conference attracted 114 delegates including speakers.

During 2017 CCP organised three events jointly with other organisations. Farasat Bokhari, School of Economics, and CCP organised a conference on "Competition Issues in Pharmaceuticals: The Challenges Ahead". The conference was held in London with 40 delegates coming from academia, the private and the public sector. Sebastian Peyer, School of Law, and CCP organised a workshop on "Private Enforcement of Competition Law: Current Issues", held in Norwich with 20 delegates. Finally CCP together with CREATE hosted "Doing it for Yourself", a research and dissemination event which showcased results from the CREATE funded project 'Intermediaries and Human Rights'. Taking place in Norwich, the event was attended by over 50 representatives from the creative industries.

One of the benefits under our Membership Scheme is a half-day event per year, and in 2017 we had three such meetings at UEA and one London. The agenda of a meeting is determined by the member. These meetings enable a two-way dialogue in which CCP can offer its expertise in answer to questions posed by the members, and CCP can get insights into the issues of core concern to policy makers. In addition to these meetings, we held specific meetings in relation to work undertaken on the Care Home market (with CMA), Collective Switching (with Ofgem), Mergers and Innovation (DgComp) and Increasing Block Tariffs (Anglian Water)

CCP continues its engagement through blogging and tweeting. Our number of followers at the end of 2016 exceeds other Competition centres as well as Competition Policy International.

Academic and Policy Impact

CCP members aim for their research to have impact on both the academic community and, through informing the debates, on policy making.

Peyer has been shortlisted for one of *Concurrences* 2018 Antitrust Writing Awards. He has been shortlisted in the Private Enforcement category for his forthcoming book chapter: 'Private Antitrust Enforcement in England and Wales after the EU Damages Directive: Where are we Heading?'

CCP research contributes to a number of the impact case studies which the University has identified as potential submissions for the next Research Excellence Framework (REF 2021).

2.4 Focus on: Knowledge Exchange

As in previous years, we pick on one of our activities to highlight its importance and impact. This year we focus on the bespoke training [aka knowledge exchange] delivered by CCP. This activity has become increasingly important for CCP, generating both income for the centre and valuable future contacts through the delegates on the courses we offer. During the year we delivered four bespoke courses with a view to ongoing delivery, all of which were aimed at practitioners and policy makers, and all of which were very well received.

Our “Introduction to the economics of competition policy” has this year been delivered twice through the Government Economic Service (GES). Both courses were over-subscribed with delegates from a variety of Government departments, including Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, HM Revenue and Customs, HM Treasury, Ministry of Justice, the Department of Health, Department for Education and the Medicines & Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency. Feedback continues to be very positive and, in light of comments on the first course, adjustments were made to the programme to move away from legalistic frameworks and focus more on markets, and to incorporate more group work into the sessions. Two further runs of the course are scheduled for 2018.

Now in its fourth run, our annual “Economics of Competition Policy for Economists” again attracted delegates from both the public and private sectors including the Financial Conduct Authority, Citizens Advice, Linklaters LLP, Danish Competition and Consumer Authority and Norwegian Competition Authority. Delivered by both CCP members and practitioners the course focuses on the core elements of standard antitrust including the assessment of anti-competitive agreements, mergers and abuse of dominance. Feedback suggests that delegates found the course a good introduction to the key concepts of competition economics with good practical examples.

Finally, Amelia Fletcher designed a new, four-day, Consumer Policy course for the Consumer Association (Which?). The course was delivered to Which? staff in London on four separate days spread over a four month period. The first day consisted of an introduction to consumer policy, covering the legal and institutional framework, the objectives of consumer policy and the economics underlying this. The second day focused on the law and economics of general consumer policy, covering consumer behaviour, basic consumer rights (WYSIWYG, cooling off, cancellation rights), misleading sales practices and unfair contract terms. The third day was dedicated to sector-specific consumer policy, including market investigations and demand-side remedies but with a particular emphasis on consumer policy in financial services, energy and telecoms. The final day focused on more specialist topics, including consumer policy in national, international and online perspectives, and a discussion of distributional issues. The course enabled CCP to branch out from its competition and regulation core to embrace consumer policy more directly.

Through the delivery of our courses we have interacted with a wide range of representatives from both the private and public sector which has enabled the Centre to continue to raise its profile. This has the potential to lead to new subscription members, further collaboration with policymakers, and the creation of valuable contacts and links with external bodies. This then results in attendance at our annual conference and other CCP-led events, and creates a demand for further courses within other government bodies – this can be seen in new training courses being organised by CCP for the Department for Work and Pensions in 2018.

3. Summary of Activities

In this annual report, we report on the directly funded projects (section 3.1) separately from our general research themes (3.2 – 3.4). This section draws out a few headlines.

3.1 Ongoing and Completed Directly Funded Projects

Equity and justice in retail energy markets

Ongoing Project funded by UKERC involving Catherine Waddams (PI), David Deller, Elizabeth Errington, Tom Hargreaves, Michael Harker, Noel Longhurst, David Reader, and Glen Turner.

Taking a multidisciplinary approach, characteristic of CCP's research, the project explores the interaction between retail energy markets and their distributional impacts on groups which may be particularly vulnerable and previously under researched, including SMEs and households in social housing. During 2017, the group has produced several papers on smart homes as well as a report on UK Energy Expenditure Shares. The latter report maps the percentage of household expenditure devoted to energy by UK households over the past 25 years. By looking over the long-run, recent high expenditure shares are placed in context, with low energy expenditure shares in the late 1990s and early 2000s appearing more exceptional. The large variations in energy expenditure shares across households, and through time, highlight the varying political saliency of energy and the dramatically more pressing budget choices facing low income households after energy price rises. The report finds that, while increased affordability pressures over the past 10 years may support the political expediency of recent commitments to re-regulate energy prices, many affordability support policies were first introduced when energy was at its most affordable.

Research from the project has been presented at numerous academic and practitioner events, including the 2017 CCP Summer Conference. The research has been the basis for considerable policy engagement with various stakeholder groups, including the BEIS parliamentary committee and media appearances.

Microeconomic impact of enforcement of competition policies on innovation

Completed report by Peter Ormosi, Anna Rita Bennato, Steve Davies and Franco Mariuzzo for Directorate-General for Competition, European Commission. 2017.

The objective of this study was to offer a detailed literature review, develop a methodological framework, collect data on three different areas (R&D spending, patents, and product characteristics), and analyse them. The task was to identify what is feasible, what we can learn in terms of the applied methodology, and also to provide preliminary results on how innovation was affected by the 2012 consolidation of the HDD market.

The relationship between competition and innovation has long been debated, but the general consensus is that competition is an important stimulus to innovation. This provides an important additional justification for competition policy, beyond the static purely price-based perspective. Remarkably however, we know relatively little about how specific competition policy interventions have impacted on firms' innovation activities. The main objective of this study is to explore whether, and how far, such impact evaluation exercises are feasible for competition and innovation. For this reason DG COMP commissioned a team of academics led by Peter Ormosi to review the existing literature, and to propose a rigorous analytical and methodological framework which can be used to evaluate cases. As an illustration of this framework in action, the study provides a pilot evaluation of the Seagate/Samsung and Western Digital/Hitachi mergers. The findings of this case study prove to be interesting in their own right – shedding some new light on these important mergers. But far more important for present purposes, it establishes that the methodology is viable, albeit with important lessons to be learnt.

Price and Behavioural Signals to Encourage Water Conservation

Completed report by Liang Lu, David Deller and Morten Hviid commissioned by Anglian Water Plc., July 2017

This report reviews international experience of price and non-price approaches to manage residential water demand, with a focus on drawing insights regarding the effectiveness of Increasing Block Tariffs

and information-based behavioural interventions. It then offers some insights on the extent to which lessons from elsewhere may be transferable to the UK context.

The global problem of water resource constraints is pertinent to the UK and particularly acute in the south and east of England. A greater emphasis is being placed on water demand management in the UK, with a need to find a balance among social, environmental, economic and political goals. Putting a price on water is conceptually straightforward but often challenging in implementation. As water bills are typically small relative to household income in the UK, expenditure-led incentives may be insufficient, and so it is important that attitude-led behavioural interventions are also considered for conservation purposes. There is increased penetration of water meters in the UK and there is evidence that metering in itself leads to greater awareness of water use. Development and introduction of conservation-oriented tariffs and behavioural interventions to manage demand have been modest compared to in some other locations. Also, there is a lack of evidence of how tariff signals and behavioural signals interact in the UK.

Collective Switching and Possible Uses of a Disengaged Consumer Database

Completed report by David Deller, Paul Bernal, Morten Hviid and Catherine Waddams Price commissioned by Ofgem, August 2017

This report analyses collective switching in principle and practice, and examines potential uses of a database of disengaged consumers whose construction was recommended by the 2016 Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) investigation report into the energy market. The overall conclusion is that the options for the use of a disengaged consumer database that effectively address the problems identified by the CMA are likely to be challenging to implement both technically, and often legally, while in all cases the eventual outcome is uncertain. The task of either activating or protecting the large number of households likely to find themselves on a database is considerable and requires extensive planning and testing. However, if these challenges can be overcome, collective auctions could provide a way of delivering the benefits of the competition to consumers who are currently disengaged from the market.

3.2 Research on Anticompetitive Strategies

Research on anticompetitive behaviours by firms which may harm consumers. This theme covers the core of traditional competition policy.

During the year, a number of papers have been published in journals or as working papers and presented both to academic and practitioner audiences. Below is a summary of some of the 2017 contributions.

Through a market experiment, **Chowdhury** and Wandschneider investigate the proposition, that the magnitude of fines and the detection rates are substitutable in their deterrence effect. They show that in the absence of a leniency program the proposition holds. However, with a leniency program, due to behavioural bias, low detection rates and high fines lower the overall incidence of cartelization.

Davies and **Mariuzzo** with Armoogum searches for evidence that, as a Competition Agency (CA) builds up experience in cartel enforcement, this feeds back into the business community to deter future cartel formation. The ideal outcome is that, over the long-run, the number of cartels detected by a successful CA will follow an inverted U-shaped time path: its propensity to detect increase, but the number of cartels out there to be detected decrease. They find evidence of the predicted inverse U shape, and interpret this as consistent with an increasingly strong feedback from enforcement to deterrence as the CA evolves over the years.

Kühn with coauthors consider when a monopolist will have incentives to leverage market power in a primary market to foreclose competition in a complementary market by degrading compatibility/interoperability. Their application is to Microsoft's alleged strategic incentives to leverage market power from personal computer to server operating systems. Their estimates suggest

that there were incentives to reduce interoperability that were particularly strong at the turn of the 21st century.

Stephan uses public surveys from the UK, Germany, Italy and the US to critically analyse the extent to which normative justifications for cartel conduct have empirical backing. The findings and arguments contained in this paper strengthen the normative basis for criminal sanctions against cartels.

Lu compares the wholesale model and the agency model that characterise a vertical relation in a bilateral duopoly framework. Results suggest that the agency model may be regarded as an example of retailer power resale price maintenance and provides an economic view of why restraints of this kind should be evaluated under the rule of reason.

Reader reflects on the recent developments that have left EU merger control at a crossroads in terms of how it proceeds to react to anti-globalisation sentiment. The paper also examines a radical proposal to task the Commission with the role of analysing foreign takeovers that arise in the EU's strategic sectors. He finds compelling evidence to suggest that the existing regime provides a legal basis for the Commission to afford greater consideration to public interest factors in merger cases, which would allow it to undertake this task in lieu of legislative reform.

3.3 Research on Markets and Systemic Challenges

Research on the effects of other policy objectives sitting alongside traditional competition policy concerns. This theme covers sectors with significant Intellectual Property (IP) rights issues and behaviours by market participants which raise particular issues for policy design and enforcement.

During the year, a number of papers have been published in journals or as working papers and presented both to academic and practitioner audiences. Some of the research related to this topic was summarised in section 3.1 above. Below is a summary of some of the 2017 contributions.

Bokhari and Lyons notes that steep price hikes following the debranding of off-patent medicines are becoming increasingly common in the UK, adding hundreds of millions to the NHS drugs bill. They discuss whether anything can be done to prevent this.

Dobson and co-authors show why policy interventions, including portion cap rules and soda taxes, seeking to reduce portion sizes and curb the consumption of large-size sugary drinks might fail when they do not fully take into account or appreciate the strategic responses that vendors might adopt to retain value size pricing.

Fletcher considers evidence from the more extensive regulatory experience relating to demand-side interventions, and distils a number of lessons for how they might be better designed and implemented.

Jacques, Hviid and Street with Garstka investigated the effect of algorithms designed to identify on-line copyright infringements. The particular focus was diversity, both in terms of how much was supplied (videos posted) and how much was consumed (videos viewed). Apart from demonstrating that supplied diversity is much greater than consumed diversity, because users focus on a small subset of supplied videos, preliminary results suggest that diversity could be increased by algorithms where these take down the more popular videos.

Li, Mariuzzo and Korfiatis with Xiong provide conditions under which online reviews do not impact firms' profits positively. In a vertical market, they identify strategies that a manufacturer can utilize to affect a retailer's attitude towards publicizing consumer reviews. Their main findings are that in a separated distribution channel, the manufacturer always benefits from the availability of online reviews, whereas the retailer only benefits if consumer valuation for a new product is sufficiently low.

Guidelines on healthier lifestyles are widely known and are frequent topics of media attention. Nevertheless, many people do not follow them. Behavioural economists often argue that governments should respond by nudging people towards these healthy lifestyles. **Sugden** asks whether people really want to be the subject of nudges regarding healthier lifestyles.

3.4 Institutions

Research on the institutions tasked with the design and implementation of competition laws and economic regulation and their assessment.

During the year, a number of papers have been published in journals or as working papers and presented both to academic and practitioner audiences. Some of the research related to this topic was summarised in section 3.1 above. Below is a summary of some of the 2017 contributions.

Peyer considered the recent developments in the framework for private antitrust actions in the England and Wales. The Consumer Rights Act 2015 and the implementation of the EU Damages Directive in March 2017 affected access to justice for victims of anticompetitive conduct. The paper documents key developments and issues regarding access to documents (disclosure), joint and several liability of co-infringers, and claim aggregation (opt-out representative actions).

Recent decades have seen a considerable increase in delegation to independent regulatory agencies, which has been justified by reference to the superior performance of these bodies relative to government departments. **Hanretty** with Koop test the hypothesis that more independent regulators do better work. They find that formal independence has a positive and significant effect on quality. Contrary to expectations, though, formal political accountability does not boost regulatory quality, and there is no evidence that it increases the effect of independence by reducing the risk of slacking. The quality of work is also enhanced by increased staffing, more extensive regulatory powers, and spillover effects of a more capable bureaucratic system.

Brexit has created a significant debate to which CCP members have contributed through publications. **Fletcher** with co-authors, all members of the Brexit Competition Law Working Group, published their report on the implications of Brexit for UK competition law and policy. **Lyons, Reader** and **Stephan** discuss how the UK can take back control while resisting siren calls. A notable effect of 'Brexit' is that it will create new freedoms for the UK to shape its competition policy outside the EU, but these freedoms come at a cost and could prove damaging to competitive markets.

4. Appendices

4.1 KPI Tracker

Measure	Annual KPI	Output 2017
PEER REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLES	20	30
CCP WORKING PAPERS	15	5
PROPORTION OF WP SUBMITTED TO JOURNALS	75%	N/A ²
ACADEMIC PRESENTATIONS	1 per member	88
ACADEMIC EVENTS ORGANISED	3	4
CCP SEMINAR SPEAKERS	30	35
RESEARCH BULLETIN	2	2
POLICY BRIEFINGS/SUMMARIES – WP	100%	4 (80%)
POLICY BRIEFINGS/SUMMARIES – JOURNALS	50%	*see below
CCP POLICY BLOGS + blog on other sites	12	10 + 6
PRACTITIONER PRESENTATIONS	24	33
RESPONSES TO CONSULTATIONS	6	7
MONITORED IMPACT CASE STUDY (target = 4)	1 per school	12
TWEETS	100	548
MENTION IN MEDIA	12	35
RESEARCH STUDENTS ATTACHED TO CENTRE	15	21
RESEARCH ASSOCIATES [PT OR FT]	5	4
SUBSCRIPTION MEMBERS	7	7
RCUK OR SIMILAR GRANTS - APPLICATIONS	3	1
TRAINING EVENTS	3	4

* In 2017 we retrospectively wrote and published policy briefs for peer reviewed journal articles published by CCP members, where relevant (i.e. not all articles had policy relevance). Progress on this is itemised below

2017 Journal articles

No. of Journal Articles = 29

No. of papers that did not require a Policy Brief = 2

No. of Policy Briefs = 7

2016 Journal articles

No. of Journal Articles = 27

No. of papers that did not require a Policy Brief = 4

No. of Policy Briefs = 12

² We do not currently have data on submissions. Focusing on working papers up to and including 2014, roughly 50% have been published.

4.2 CCP year on year

Year	3-year average (2015-17)	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004
Journals	28.7	30	36	20	19	36	23	23	32	36	24	15	13	16	14
Books	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	3	1	0	1	0	0
Book chapters	2.3	2	1	4	3	5	5	3	7	4	0	2	1	0	2
CCP working papers [+ others]	10 (+6.7)	5 (+2)	12 (+2)	13 (+16)	9	13	14	17	19	11	35	21	20	10	4
Reports [commissioned]	5.3	5	3	8	3	3	1	2	2	0	5	2	1	2	1
Policy Blog posts	15	10	22	13	10	18	30	29	35	9	-	-	-	-	-
CCP events	3	4	2	3	4	4	3	3	5	3	4	4	5	3	1
CCP seminars	37	35	35	41	36	35	36	31	39	32	29	27	39	33	12
Consultation responses	9	7	9	11	10	10	10	11	6	2	1	-	-	-	-
Faculty members	32.7	32	35	31	27	28	26	24	21	19	16			13	12
*RAs	4.7	4	6	4	4	11	8	5	7	5	3			4	1
*PhD students	20.3	21	20	20	22	22	19	20	19	17	15			15	12

* Research Associates: Some double counting occurs where a CCP RA is also a CCP PhD student. RA count is the number of different RAs employed by CCP/on CCP projects throughout the year, and excludes RA's on short contracts.