



ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

MARKET STUDIES INFORMATION STORE

JURISDICTION

United States – Federal Trade Commission

UPDATED: MARCH 2020

Information Store

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Mergers											
Market:	Request for information to examine past acquisitions by large technology companies	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	Ongoing study											
Duration:	Announced February 11, 2020											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>The Federal Trade Commission (Commission or FTC) issued orders to five large technology firms, requiring them to provide information about prior acquisitions not reported to the Department of Justice (DOJ) or FTC under the Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Act, which requires mandatory notification of certain mergers. The orders require Alphabet Inc. (including Google), Amazon.com, Inc., Apple Inc., Facebook, Inc., and Microsoft Corp. to provide information and documents on the terms, scope, structure, and purpose of transactions that each company consummated between Jan. 1, 2010 and Dec. 31, 2019.</p> <p>The Commission issued these orders under Section 6(b) of the FTC Act, which authorizes the Commission to conduct wide-ranging studies that do not have a specific law enforcement purpose. The orders will help the FTC deepen its understanding of large technology firms’ acquisition activity, including how these firms report their transactions to FTC and DOJ, and whether large tech companies are making potentially anticompetitive acquisitions of nascent or potential competitors that fall below HSR merger filing thresholds and therefore do not</p>											

	need to be reported to FTC and DOJ.
Link to report:	No report is available, as work is ongoing. Link to press release and related documents: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2020/02/ftc-examine-past-acquisitions-large-technology-companies
Remarks (if any):	The Commission plans to use the information obtained in this study to examine trends in acquisitions and the structure of deals, including whether acquisitions not subject to HSR pre-merger notification might have raised competitive concerns, and the nature and extent of other agreements that may restrict competition. The Commission also seeks to learn more about how small firms perform after they are acquired by large technology firms. These and related issues were discussed during several sessions of the FTC's 2018-19 Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century , and this study is part of the follow-up from those <i>Hearings</i> . For more information on the related hearing, search for "nascent" within this document.

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Employment											
Market:	Non-compete agreements in the workplace	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	January 9, 2020											
Duration:	1 day workshop											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative; previous DOJ labor market workshop											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This workshop examined whether there is a sufficient legal basis and empirical economic support to create an FTC Rule to restrict the use of non-compete clauses in employer-employee employment contracts. Non-compete clauses are covenants in employment contracts that limit the ability of an employee to join or start a competing firm after a job separation. Panelists at the workshop included legal scholars, economists, and policy experts, who evaluated the effects of non-compete clauses on labor market participants and any efficiencies of such provisions. The panels also considered the potential harms to workers that could and should be addressed by the FTC.</p> <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the workshop.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/non-competes-workplace-examining-antitrust-consumer-protection-issues											
Remarks (if any):	<p>The Department of Justice Antitrust Division hosted a labor market workshop in September 2019, which addressed related issues.</p>											

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Healthcare											
Market:	Health professional services and hospitals/clinics	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	Ongoing study											
Duration:	Announced October 21, 2019											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		Competition Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/>	Consumer Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/>	Consumer Education <input type="checkbox"/>	Business Education <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Voluntary Business Compliance <input type="checkbox"/>	Voluntary Business Action <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure <input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Referral to Third Parties <input type="checkbox"/>	No Problems Found <input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>The FTC issued orders to five health insurance companies and two health systems to provide information that will allow the agency to study the effects of certificates of public advantage (“COPAs”) on prices, quality, access, and innovation of healthcare services. COPAs are regulatory regimes, adopted by state governments that are intended to displace competition among healthcare providers. COPAs purport to immunize mergers and collaborations from antitrust scrutiny. The FTC orders seek aggregated patient billing and discharge data; health system employee wage data; and other information relevant for analyzing the health systems’ prices, quality, access, and innovation. The FTC also intends to study the impact of hospital consolidation on employee wages.</p> <p>In addition, the FTC intends to collect information over the next several years that will help FTC staff to conduct retrospective analyses of the Ballad Health and Cabell COPAs. Once the study is complete, the FTC intends to report publicly the study’s findings in a manner that is consistent with the FTC’s confidentiality rules. This project will enhance the agency’s knowledge of COPAs and inform future advocacy and enforcement. It will also serve as a resource for state governments and stakeholders who may be considering using COPAs.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2019/10/ftc-study-impact-copas											

Remarks (if any):	FTC staff have led an ongoing COPA Assessment Project to assess the effects of COPAs, which includes this study and a related workshop . A description of related work is available within this document. Search for “COPA” to locate additional information.
--------------------------	---

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Healthcare											
Market:	Pharmaceutical pricing	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	June 24, 2019											
Duration:	Approximately four months from request to report being issued	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	Congressional request											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	In response to a Congressional request, the FTC issued a report about the FTC’s authority, under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, to address “unreasonable” price increases for off-patent pharmaceutical drugs and biologics. Part I of this Report provides an overview of the scope of the FTC’s authority under Section 5(a) to address unfair methods of competition and the nexus to existing antitrust principles. Part II explains how the Commission may combat high drug prices when a monopolist employs business practices that harm competition. Part III briefly discusses other considerations that may affect the FTC’s use of its standalone Section 5 authority* to address anticompetitive conduct. Part IV examines how the FTC enforces the antitrust laws to combat anticompetitive conduct and preserve competition in pharmaceutical markets. Part V recounts FTC’s efforts to work with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and other government agencies to promote competition and eliminate barriers to entry in pharmaceutical and emerging biologic markets.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/ftc-report-standalone-section-5-address-high-pharmaceutical-drug-biologic-prices											
Remarks (if any):	Congress directed the Federal Trade Commission to report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on the use of the FTC’s standalone authority under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to address high pharmaceutical prices.											

*Standalone authority refers to the Commission’s application of its statutory authority to take action against “unfair methods of competition” prohibited by Section 5 of the FTC Act but not necessarily by the Sherman or Clayton Act (which are other federal antitrust laws).

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)												
Sector:	Healthcare												
Market:	Health professional services and hospitals/clinics	Range of Possible Outcomes											
End Date:	June 18, 2019 [related work is ongoing]												
Duration:	1 day workshop	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found	
Source of idea for study:	FTC’s past advocacy and enforcement in healthcare markets												
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This workshop assessed the impact of certificates of public advantage (“COPAs”) on prices, quality, access, and innovation for healthcare services. COPAs are regulatory regimes adopted by state governments intended to displace competition among healthcare providers, and immunize mergers and collaborations from antitrust scrutiny. The FTC used this workshop to develop a better understanding of the actual benefits and harms associated with COPAs, to advance the agency’s policy and enforcement strategies.</p> <p>Topics discussed at the workshop included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General conclusions, if any, that may be drawn from existing research on the effects of COPAs, as well as suggestions for additional research that may be useful; • Observations and practical experiences with COPAs, including the resources and expertise required at the state level to implement and monitor these regulatory regimes; and • The ability of competition versus regulation to generate optimal levels of price, quality, access, and innovation in healthcare markets. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the workshop.</p>												

Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/health-check-copas-assessing-impact-certificates-public-advantage
Remarks (if any):	<p>This workshop was part of a broader COPA Assessment Project announced in November 2017. Academics, health policy experts, healthcare industry stakeholders, state regulators and law enforcers, and staff from the FTC’s Bureau of Economics discussed research regarding the effects of COPAs, as well as practical experiences with these regulatory regimes. A study of price and quality effects following Phoebe Putney’s acquisition of Palmyra Memorial Hospital, which involved an otherwise anticompetitive hospital merger that was consummated due to state regulations, was also presented.</p> <p>In October 2019, the FTC announced plans to conduct a market study on the effects of certificates of public advantage on prices, quality, access, and innovation of healthcare services.</p> <p>A description of related work is available within this document. Search for “COPA” to locate additional information.</p>

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition and consumer protection enforcement and policy											
Market:	U.S. State consumer protection and competition enforcement and policy	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	June 12, 2019											
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	Joint FTC-State initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing focused on state consumer protection and competition issues, optimizing consumer protection remedies, and error-cost considerations.</p> <p>Discussions focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumer protection and antitrust enforcement and policy issues encountered in U.S. states; • Legal and economic considerations relevant to optimizing the Commission’s consumer protection remedies; and • Whether and under what conditions error-cost considerations are an appropriate guide for antitrust policy and enforcement, and how and to what degree such considerations should influence the Commission’s case selection and advocacy agenda. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-14-roundtable-state-attorneys-general											
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the fourteenth session of the FTC’s <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based											

changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection>.

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Healthcare											
Market:	Reverse-payment settlements	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	May 2019											
Duration:	Third report in a series	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	Prior FTC enforcement and advocacy work											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>Generic drugs often cost less than brand drugs, helping to make medicines more affordable for millions of American consumers and thereby keep health care costs down. This report is the FTC’s third regarding reverse payment settlement agreements since <i>FTC v. Actavis</i>, a Supreme Court decision holding that a brand drug manufacturer’s reverse payment to a generic competitor to settle patent litigation can violate the antitrust laws. The report found that, despite a considerable increase in the total number of final patent settlements in Fiscal Year 2016, significantly fewer settlements included the types of reverse payments that are likely to be anticompetitive.</p> <p>According to the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a single agreement contained a side deal or no-authorized-generic commitment, the types of reverse payments at issue in the <i>Actavis</i> case and, subsequently, in cases before appellate courts. This was the lowest number of such agreements since 2004. • In 29 of the 30 final settlements that contained compensation to the generic company and a restriction on selling a generic product for a period of time, the only explicit compensation was \$7 million or less in litigation fees. In <i>Actavis</i>, the Supreme Court noted that avoided litigation expenses might constitute a justified payment. 											

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of agreements with “possible compensation” to the generic company – provisions that might act as compensation, but would require inquiry into specific marketplace circumstances – increased to 14. • In 82 percent of final settlements, the generic company received rights not only to the patents at issue in the litigation, but also to licenses or covenants not to sue for all patents that the brand owns at any time after the settlement that might cover the generic product. • Other features tracked by the report include provisions that accelerate the licensed entry date based on marketplace events and how parties settle when the generic company has launched its generic product at risk – before a final court decision on the patent merits – prior to settlement.
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/agreements-filed-federal-trade-commission-under-medicare-prescription-drug-improvement-fy2016
Remarks (if any):	Prior reports in this series can be found at https://www.ftc.gov/taxonomy/term/388/type/report .

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition enforcement (Mergers)											
Market:	Merger retrospectives (all markets)	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	April 12, 2019	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing gathered information from experts to help guide the FTC's future merger retrospective research program.</p> <p>Speakers examined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The findings of existing studies, and the requirements for informative retrospective studies; How the findings from merger retrospectives can be used to improve enforcement agencies' prospective merger enforcement programs, including merger simulation tools and design of merger remedies; How, or if, merger retrospectives can be used to evaluate and guide antitrust policy; and How the FTC should focus its resources on merger retrospectives in the near future. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-14-merger-retrospectives											
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the thirteenth session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law,											

enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection>.

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)												
Sector:	Competition and consumer policy												
Market:	Privacy of consumer data	Range of Possible Outcomes											
End Date:	April 9-10, 2019												
Duration:	2 day hearing	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found	
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative; previous FTC work in data privacy; 2012 comprehensive FTC privacy report												
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing focused on the privacy of consumer data, which is a daily topic of news headlines, public discourse, and policy debates around the world. This hearing considered: questions about consumers’ ability to make informed choices about data collection and use; potential harms to consumers resulting from data collection, sharing, aggregation, and use; the adequacy of existing legal and self-regulatory frameworks to protect consumers from those harms without unduly restraining legitimate business activity; and whether emerging frameworks improve on prior versions.</p> <p>Speakers addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether current approaches sufficiently protect consumer privacy; • Whether certain approaches may have unintentionally hindered innovation, growth, or competition, to the detriment of consumers and the economy; • Whether other approaches might better serve consumers and competition; and • If so, what those approaches should be. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>												
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-competition-consumer-												

	protection-21st-century-february-2019
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the twelfth session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection .

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	International cooperation and coordination regarding competition, consumer protection, privacy enforcement and policy	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	March 25-26, 2019	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	2 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing explored the FTC's international role in light of globalization, technological change, and the increasing number of competition, consumer protection, and privacy laws and enforcement agencies around the world. Speakers addressed the implications of international developments on the FTC's work on behalf of American consumers.</p> <p>Topics discussed at the hearing included:</p>											

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness of FTC’s enforcement cooperation tools and approaches in light of new challenges in competition, consumer protection, and privacy matters; • Approaches to promoting international policy coordination and best practice development; and • Strategies for international enforcement and policy engagement given today’s dynamic global marketplace. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-11-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century
Remarks (if any):	<p>This hearing was the eleventh session of the FTC’s <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p>

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Telecommunications											
Market:	Broadband	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	March 20, 2019											
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	Prior FTC work; Bureau of Competition; Bureau of Consumer Protection											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing examined developments in U.S. broadband markets, technology, and law since the FTC staff's 2007 Broadband Connectivity Competition Policy report and the FTC staff's 1996 Competition Policy in the New High-Tech, Global Marketplace report.</p> <p>Topics discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evolution of broadband networking and broadband markets since the <i>2007 Broadband Report</i>; • The identification and evaluation of advertising claims by internet service providers with respect to the delivery speed of content; and • The identification and evaluation of conduct by broadband market participants that may be exclusionary or anticompetitive. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-10-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century											
Remarks (if any):	<p>This hearing was the tenth session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p>											

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Technology											
Market:	Data security	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	December 12, 2018	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	2 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)												
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing focused on data security, and included panel discussions and additional discussion of research related to data breaches and data security threats. The first day’s panel discussions examined incentives to invest in data security and consumer demand for data security. Discussions on the second day focused on data security assessments, the U.S. framework related to consumer data security, and the FTC’s data security enforcement program.</p> <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century-december-2018											
Remarks (if any):	<p>This hearing was the ninth session of the FTC’s <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p>											

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Common ownership	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	December 6, 2018	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing considered recent econometric studies that have concluded that when investors hold stock in competing firms, competition may be reduced among those commonly held competing firms.</p> <p>Speakers addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Econometric and qualitative evidence for and against the proposition that such common ownership reduces competition; Potential harms in concentrated industries and unconcentrated industries; Potential mechanisms by which such stock holdings would lead to anticompetitive harm, and how likely are they to lead to anticompetitive results; Incentive and opportunity by institutional investors to affect corporate governance, particularly regarding competitive decision-making; and Future needs for data, additional research, and enforcement and policy responses. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-8-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century											
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the eighth session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series											

of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection>.

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Digital technology											
Market:	Algorithms, artificial intelligence, and predictive analytics	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	November 13-14, 2018	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	2 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)												
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing examined competition and consumer protection issues associated with the use of algorithms, artificial intelligence, and predictive analytics in business decisions and conduct.</p> <p>The hearing informed the FTC, other policymakers, and the public of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current and potential uses of these technologies; • The ethical and consumer protection issues that are associated with the use of these technologies; • How the competitive dynamics of firm and industry conduct are affected by the use of these technologies; and, • Policy, innovation, and market considerations associated with the use of these technologies. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-7-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century											
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the seventh session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based											

changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection>.

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Digital technology											
Market:	Privacy, big data, and competition	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	November 6-8, 2018	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	3 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing examined the role that data has played in competition and innovation, and considered the antitrust analysis of mergers and firm conduct where data is a key asset or product.</p> <p>Speakers addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is “big data”? Is there an important technical or policy distinction to be drawn between data and big data? • How have developments involving data – data resources, analytic tools, technology, and business models – changed the understanding and use of personal or commercial information or sensitive data? • Does the importance of data – or large, complex data sets comprising personal or commercial information – in a firm’s ordinary course operations change how the FTC should analyze mergers or firm conduct? If so, how? Does data differ in importance from other assets in assessing firm or industry conduct? • What structural, behavioral or conduct remedies should the FTC consider when remedying antitrust harm in a market or industry where data or personal or commercial information 											

	<p>are a significant product or a key competitive input?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there policy recommendations that would facilitate competition in markets involving data or personal or commercial information that the FTC should consider? • Do the presence of personal information or privacy concerns inform or change competition analysis? • How do state, federal, and international privacy laws and regulations, adopted to protect data and consumers, affect competition, innovation, and product offerings in the United States and abroad? <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>
<p>Link to report:</p>	<p>https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-6-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century</p>
<p>Remarks (if any):</p>	<p>This hearing was the sixth session of the FTC’s <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p>

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Vertical merger analysis and the consumer welfare standard	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	November 1, 2018	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)												
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing examined vertical merger analysis and the role of the consumer welfare standard in U.S. antitrust law.</p> <p>Speakers addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for vertical merger guidelines, including guidance regarding the assessment of the competitive effects of vertical mergers, any presumptions of harm, the substantive theories of competitive harm and the treatment of transaction-related efficiencies, and potential remedies; and Whether the “consumer welfare standard” is the appropriate standard for evaluating compliance with the antitrust laws; alternative frameworks and their strengths and weaknesses; and empirical support for preferring one standard over another. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/ftc-hearing-5-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century											
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the fifth session of the FTC’s <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law,											

enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection>.

Issues discussed during this hearing and related public comments helped to inform the FTC-DOJ draft *2020 Vertical Merger Guidelines*, which were out for public comment when this summary was drafted. For information on these draft guidelines, see <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2020/02/ftc-doj-extend-deadline-public-comments-draft-vertical-merger>. There are also two planned workshops related to these guidelines. See <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/vertical-merger-guidelines-workshop>.

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Innovation and intellectual property policy	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	October 23-24, 2018											
Duration:	2 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing examined the role of intellectual property in promoting innovation from academic, economic, and industry perspectives; emerging trends in patent quality and litigation, and included the FTC’s first wide-scale exploration of copyright issues.</p> <p>Questions discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a role for the government in advancing or supporting innovation? • What is the importance of intellectual property – all forms – in advancing, protecting, and supporting innovation? Does it differ because of industry-specific or other market-based factors, or because of the form of intellectual property? • How does modern economic analysis and empirical literature view the relationship 											

	<p>between intellectual property and innovation, and the role of government in advancing and supporting innovation? Are there differences that depend on the type of intellectual property, and the protections offered for that intellectual property?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the FTC use its enforcement and policy authority to advance innovation? What factors should the FTC consider in attempting to achieve this objective? • What are emerging trends in patent quality and litigation issues? Should these trends influence the FTC’s enforcement and policy agenda? • How should the current status of copyright law and current business practices influence the FTC’s enforcement and policy agenda? <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>
Link to report:	<p>https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/10/ftc-hearing-4-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century</p>
Remarks (if any):	<p>This hearing was the fourth session of the FTC’s <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p>

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Multi-sided platforms; Labor markets; Acquisitions of nascent and potential competitors in digital technology markets	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	October 15-17, 2018	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	3 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing examined the potential for collusive, exclusionary, and predatory conduct in multi-sided, technology-based platform industries; antitrust frameworks for evaluating acquisitions of nascent competitors or occurring in nascent markets; and the approach to addressing antitrust issues regarding labor markets.</p> <p>Questions discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the defining characteristics of multi-sided platforms? Is there a way to distinguish between multi-sided and single-sided businesses? Are any adjustments to antitrust analysis necessary to account for any special characteristics of multi-sided businesses? What is the relevance of network effects (direct and indirect) in multi-sided platform markets? • How should the courts and agencies evaluate exclusionary conduct by firms competing in multi-sided platform markets, including predatory pricing, vertical restraints, most-favored nation clauses, and actions to undermine rivals who depend on platform 											

	<p>infrastructure?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there unique procompetitive justifications for these types of conduct by firms competing in multi-sided platform markets? • Is a lack of competition among employers a significant contributor to observed macroeconomic trends in labor markets, such as the declining labor share and/or real wage stagnation? What are other explanations for these trends? How should the agencies approach defining relevant labor markets for purposes of antitrust analysis? What (if any) reliable evidence is available on the existence and effect of employer concentration in properly defined labor markets? • What is the appropriate antitrust framework to evaluate acquisitions of potential or nascent competitors in high-technology markets? Is current antitrust law sufficient for developing challenges to these types of acquisitions? How should the antitrust agencies evaluate whether a nascent technology is likely to develop into a competitive threat in dynamic, high-technology markets? <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>
<p>Link to report:</p>	<p>https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/10/ftc-hearing-3-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century</p>
<p>Remarks (if any):</p>	<p>This hearing was the third session of the FTC’s <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for “hearings” in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection.</p> <p>Discussions and public comments related to this hearings helped to inform the FTC non-enforcement action to examine past acquisitions by large technology companies. See https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2020/02/ftc-examine-past-acquisitions-large-technology-companies and search for “prior acquisitions” within this document.</p>

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Mergers and monopsony or buyer power	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	September 21, 2018											
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing focused on mergers and monopsony or buyer power.</p> <p>Questions discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the consumer welfare standard is adequate to deal with the competitive challenges of the new economy, and, if not, whether a new standard or standards should be considered? If so, what should the standard(s) be? In assessing consumer welfare, should the antitrust laws consider consumer surplus, total surplus, wealth maximization, utility maximization, or something else? • Should antitrust law routinely, or ever, take into account additional public policy concerns raised by the size, wealth, or influence of corporations or individuals? Income and wealth distribution? The bargaining power of large entities? Labor and employment considerations? Other concerns? If so, how should those considerations be defined and evaluated and how should the antitrust laws make trade-offs between competing or multiple considerations? • What are the highest priority reforms that would improve U.S. antitrust enforcement policy? • What is the state and quality of the evidence of monopsony power in the economy? Are their sectors or markets in which the incidence of monopsony power is more likely and more prevalent? <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											

Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/09/ftc-hearing-2-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the second session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection .

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Competition policy											
Market:	Review of competition and consumer protection landscape; Concentration and competitiveness in the U.S. economy; Privacy regulation	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	September 13, 2018	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 day hearing											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This hearing reviewed the competition and consumer protection landscape, concentration and competitiveness in the U.S. economy, and privacy regulation.</p> <p>Topics discussed at the hearing included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current landscape of competition and consumer protection law and policy; • Whether the U.S. economy has become more concentrated and less competitive; • The regulation of consumer data; • Antitrust law and the consumer welfare standard; and • The analysis of vertical mergers. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the hearing.</p>											

Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/09/ftc-hearing-1-competition-consumer-protection-21st-century
Remarks (if any):	This hearing was the first session of the FTC's <i>Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century</i> series. This series of hearings examined whether broad-based changes in the economy, evolving business practices, new technologies, or international developments might require adjustments to competition and consumer protection law, enforcement priorities, and policy. For information about other topics discussed at this series of hearings, search for "hearings" in this document, and visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection .

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Employment											
Market:	Occupational licensing	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	September 2018											
Duration:	March 2017 (task force launched) until September 2018 (report released)	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative; Bureau of Competition; Office of Policy Planning											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>Nearly 30 percent of American jobs require a license, up from less than five percent in the 1950s. For some professions, occupational licensing is necessary to protect the public against legitimate health and safety concerns. In many situations, the expansion of occupational licensing threatens economic liberty. Unnecessary or overbroad restrictions erect significant barriers and impose costs that harm American workers, employers, consumers, and our economy as a whole, with no measurable benefits to consumers or society.</p> <p>Recognizing the costs to both consumers and licensees of overly burdensome multistate licensing requirements, the FTC formed the Economic Liberty Task Force, which held a Roundtable to examine ways to mitigate the negative effects of state-based occupational licensing requirements. This report builds on the key points that emerged from the Roundtable regarding the development of effective license portability initiatives.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/options-enhance-occupational-license-portability											
Remarks (if any):	For more information about the Economic Liberty Task Force and other occupational-licensing-related work, visit https://www.ftc.gov/policy/advocacy/economic-liberty .											

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and Department of Justice Antitrust Division (DOJ)											
Sector:	Housing											
Market:	Residential Real Estate Brokerage	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	June 5, 2018	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 day workshop											
Source of idea for study:	FTC and DOJ initiative; previous FTC-DOJ work in Real Estate Brokerage Industry											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>Buying or selling a home is one of the biggest financial transactions that most consumers make in their lives, and the residential real estate brokerage industry has experienced significant change in recent years, including the emergence of new technologies and business models. The one-day workshop focused on developments since the publication of the FTC-DOJ Report on Competition in the Real Estate Brokerage Industry in 2007.</p> <p>Topics discussed at the workshop included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing and emerging consumer-facing platforms for accessing listings information; • Availability of listings information to consumers; • Regulatory and competitive hurdles facing listings platforms; • Effect of listings platforms on consumers' use of real estate services; • Changes in traditional real estate broker, brokerage, and Multiple Listing Service (MLS) practices; • Emergence and growth of nontraditional fee and service models; • Obstacles and catalysts to innovation in real estate fee structures and service models; • Competitive impact of nontraditional real estate fee and service models • Effect of antitrust enforcement actions and consent decrees on competition in the 											

	residential real estate industry; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State licensing regimes relating to residential real estate transactions.
	FTC and DOJ sought public comments in advance of and following the workshop.
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/04/whats-new-residential-real-estate-brokerage-competition-ftc-doj
Remarks (if any):	

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Healthcare											
Market:	Contact lenses	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	March 7, 2018											
Duration:	1 day workshop											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Competition; Bureau of Consumer Protection; previously issued FTC rule											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	<p>This workshop explored issues regarding competition in the contact lens marketplace, consumer access to contact lenses, prescription release and portability, and related subjects. The workshop was held in conjunction with the Commission’s regulatory review of the Contact Lens Rule. The Rule, which had been in place since August 2004, helps to promote competition in the retail sale of contact lenses by facilitating consumers’ ability to comparison shop for contact lenses. It imposes obligations on both eye-care prescribers and contact lens sellers.</p> <p>Topics discussed at the workshop included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consumers’ ability to comparison shop for contact lenses; The use of electronic health records, patient portals, and other technology to improve prescription portability; 											

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The interaction between the Contact Lens Rule and emerging telehealth business models; The potential for new technology to improve the prescription verification process; and Potential modifications to the Rule to foster competition and maximize consumer benefits, including benefits to eye health. <p>FTC sought public comments in advance of and following the workshop.</p>
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2018/03/contact-lens-rule-evolving-contact-lens-marketplace
Remarks (if any):	The workshop was held in conjunction with the Commission's regulatory review of the Contact Lens Rule. A Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NRPM) was issued in December 2016 announcing proposed changes to the Commission's Contact Lens Rule.

Jurisdiction:	United States – Federal Trade Commission (FTC)											
Sector:	Fuel											
Market:	Ethanol	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	Annual since 2005											
Duration:	n/a											
Source of idea for study:	Statutory requirement by Congress											
Outcome: (check all relevant boxes)		Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the underlying problems?):	The Energy Policy Act of 2005 requires the FTC to assess concentration in the market for ethanol annually. Each report provides the results of the FTC staff's examination of the state of ethanol production in the United States. It measures market concentration using ethanol production capacity and actual ethanol production.											
Link to report:	Annual Report: 2019 Report on Ethanol Market Concentration, https://www.ftc.gov/reports/2019-report-ethanol-market-concentration Annual Report: Federal Trade Commission Report to Congress on Ethanol Market Concentration (November 2018), https://www.ftc.gov/reports/federal-trade-commission-report-congress-ethanol-market-concentration Annual Report: Report to Congress on Ethanol Market Concentration (November 2017),											

	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/report-congress-ethanol-market-concentration-november-2017
Remarks (if any):	For other years' reports, visit https://www.ftc.gov/tips-advice/competition-guidance/industry-guidance/oil-and-gas and click on "Reports".

Information Store

United States- Federal Trade Commission

Sector:	Information Markets and Intellectual Property Rights											
Market:	Patent Assertion Entities	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	December 2012 (Workshop) Ongoing (Study announced May 2014)	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 day workshop											
Source of idea for study:	FTC and DOJ experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Patent Assertion Entity Activities Workshop. The FTC and Department of Justice held a joint public workshop to explore the impact of patent assertion entity (PAE) activities on innovation and competition and the implications for antitrust enforcement and policy. PAEs are firms with a business model based primarily on buying patents and then attempting to generate revenue by asserting them against businesses that are already practicing the patented technologies. The workshop examined the economic and legal implications of PAE activity, as distinct from prototypical “non-practicing entity” (NPE) activity, such as developing and transferring technology. Panelists included academics, economists, industry representatives, and private attorneys.</p> <p>Patent Assertion Entities study. The FTC is studying PAE organization and activity to develop a better understanding of how PAEs may impact innovation and competition.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>2012 Workshop: http://www.ftc.gov/opa/2012/11/paeworkshop.shtm Study-related information: https://www.ftc.gov/policy/studies/patent-assertion-entities-pae-study</p>											



ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

Information Store

Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Merger remedies (all markets)	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	Ongoing	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	Announced June 2015											
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The FTC is studying the effectiveness of the Commission's orders in merger cases where it required a divestiture or other remedy. The study will update and expand on the <u>divestiture study the FTC issued in 1999</u> . The new study, which was cleared by the Office of Management and Budget on August 12, 2015, will focus on 90 merger orders issued by the Commission between 2006 and 2012.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/policy/studies/remedy-study											

Sector:	Other											
Market:	Peer-to-peer platforms	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	June 2015	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 day workshop											
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The FTC held a workshop to explore issues relating to emerging internet peer-to-peer platforms—often called the “sharing” economy—and the economic activity these platforms facilitate. The workshop examined competition, consumer protection, and economic issues arising in the sharing economy to promote more informed analysis of its competitive dynamics as well as benefits and risks to consumers. The workshop considered if, and the extent to which, existing regulatory frameworks can be responsive to sharing economy business models while maintaining appropriate consumer protections. It also examined how various regulatory choices may affect competition and consumers.											
Link to report:	Workshop transcript, video, an agenda, and additional event-related materials are available at: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2015/06/sharing-economy-issues-facing-platforms-participants-regulators Report is expected.											

Information Store

Sector:	Pharmaceuticals											
Market:	Pet medications	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	October 2012 (workshop) May 2015 (report)	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	Appx. 2.5 years											
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Pet Medications Workshop and Report. The FTC hosted a workshop to examine the ways pet medications are distributed to consumers, and how these practices affect consumer choice and price competition. The workshop brought together consumers, veterinarians, business representatives, economists, lawyers, academics, and other interested parties to consider how current industry distribution and other business practices affect consumer choice and price competition for pet medications; the ability of consumers to obtain written, portable prescriptions that they can fill wherever they choose; and the ability of consumers to verify the safety and efficacy of pet medications that they purchase. The FTC's report on the pet medications industry noted fast growth and a changing landscape of suppliers – with veterinarians seeing increased competition from non-traditional sellers, and consumers finding more ways to buy medications for their pets. The report, "Competition in the Pet Medications Industry," made recommendations to promote greater competition in the pet medications market.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>2012 Workshop: http://www.ftc.gov/opp/workshops/petmeds/index.shtml 2015 Report: https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/competition-pet-medications-industry-prescription-portability-distribution-practices/150526-pet-meds-report.pdf</p>											

Information Store

Sector:	Health										
Market:	Healthcare services	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	March 2014 February 2015	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	Two 2-day workshops										
Source of idea for study:	FTC and DOJ experience										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Workshop: Examining Health Care Competition. The FTC and DOJ jointly held two public workshops entitled “Examining Health Care Competition.” The workshops focused on certain activities and trends that may affect competition in the evolving health care industry, including those related to: professional regulation of health care providers; innovations in health care delivery; advancements in health care technology; measuring and assessing health care quality; price transparency of health care services; alternatives to the traditional fee-for service payment model; and early observations regarding health insurance exchanges.</p>										
Link to report:	<p>2014 Workshop transcript, video, an agenda, and additional event-related materials are available at: http://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2014/03/examining-health-care-competition</p> <p>2015 Workshop transcript, video, an agenda, and additional event-related materials are available at: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2015/02/examining-health-care-competition</p>										

Information Store

Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Pricing practices (all markets)	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	June 2014	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 day workshop											
Source of idea for study:	FTC and DOJ experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Workshop: Conditional Pricing Practices. This joint FTC-DOJ workshop focused on conditional pricing arrangements – practices in which prices are explicitly or effectively contingent on commitments to purchase or sell a specified share or volume of a single product or a mix of multiple products – such as loyalty or bundled pricing. A principal goal of the workshop was to advance the economic understanding of the potential harms and benefits of conditional pricing practices and to re-examine their treatment under the antitrust laws. Participants focused primarily on economics, law, and policy issues related to conditional pricing practices.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>Workshop transcript, video, an agenda, and additional event-related materials are available at: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2014/06/conditional-pricing-practices-economic-analysis-legal-policy</p>											

Information Store

Sector:	Health	Range of Possible Outcomes											
Market:	Nurses												
End Date:	March 2014	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:													
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience												
Outcome (tick relevant columns):													
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Policy Perspectives: Competition and the Regulation of Advanced Practice Nurses. FTC staff issued a policy paper* suggesting that state legislators should be cautious when evaluating proposals to limit the scope of practice of Advanced Practice Registered Nurses (APRNs). By limiting the range of services APRNs may provide and the extent to which they can practice independently, such proposals may reduce competition that benefits consumers, the paper states. The policy paper notes the potential benefits of improved competition in the provision of primary health care services. The policy paper sets forth recommended principles for evaluating APRN scope of practice proposals. As the policy paper states, “Numerous expert health care policy organizations have concluded that expanded APRN scope of practice should be a key component of our nation’s strategy to deliver effective health care efficiently and, in particular, to fill gaps in primary care access. Based on our extensive knowledge of health care markets, economic principles, and competition theory, the FTC staff reach the same conclusion: expanded APRN scope of practice is good for competition and American consumers.”</p> <p>*A policy paper is longer, more deeply researched, and more detailed in its analysis than a typical staff advocacy comment, but shorter and more focused than most FTC reports. It provides another mechanism for FTC staff to share our expertise and learning, outside the context of a specific legislative or regulatory proposal. A concise policy paper enables us to synthesize previous agency study, related advocacy comments, pertinent outside research, and ongoing analytical work by FTC staff</p>												
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/policy-perspectives-competition-regulation-advanced-practice-nurses												



ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

Information Store

Sector:	Pharmaceuticals											
Market:	Biologic medicines and follow-on biologics	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	February 2014	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 day workshop											
Source of idea for study:	Previous FTC work regarding follow-on biologics											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Follow-On Biologics Workshop: Impact of Recent Legislative and Regulatory Naming Proposals on Competition. The FTC held a workshop to explore competition issues involving biologic medicines and follow-on biologics. The workshop focused on selected issues including: the potential impact of state regulations affecting competition; how regulations, if necessary, might be structured to facilitate competition while still protecting patient health and safety; how naming may affect competition; and the experience of other countries with follow-on biologic competition. The FTC previously held a roundtable on follow-on biologics (November 2008) and issued a report (June 2009).</p>											
Link to report:	<p>Workshop transcript, video, an agenda, and additional event-related materials are available at: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2014/02/follow-biologics-workshop-impact-recent-legislative-regulatory</p>											

Information Store

Sector:	Advertising and Marketing	Range of Possible Outcomes									
Market:	Cigarettes and Smokeless Tobacco										
End Date:	May 2013	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found									
Duration:	N/A										
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer Protection (pre-1990s reports were Congressionally mandated)										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Report on cigarette and smokeless tobacco sales and advertising / promotional expenditure for 2011. The FTC has issued reports on advertising and promotion of cigarettes periodically since 1967, and the Smokeless Tobacco Report periodically since 1987.</p> <p>These reports are used by public health advocates, and others, who have made recommendations for changes in government policy, though the FTC has not.</p>										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2013/05/ftc-releases-reports-2011-cigarette-and-smokeless-tobacco										

Sector:	Fuel	Range of Possible Outcomes									
Market:	Ethanol										
End Date:	Annual since 2005	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found									
Duration:											
Source of idea for study:	Statutory requirement by Congress										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>The Energy Policy Act of 2005 required the FTC to assess concentration in the market for ethanol annually. Each report provides the results of staff's examination the state of ethanol production in the United States and measures market concentration using capacity and production data</p>										
Link to report:	<p>Annual Report: Federal Trade Commission Report on Ethanol Market Concentration (2014): https://www.ftc.gov/reports/report-congress-ethanol-market-concentration-december-2014</p> <p>Annual Report: Federal Trade Commission Report on Ethanol Market Concentration (2013): https://www.ftc.gov/reports/report-congress-ethanol-market-concentration-november-2013</p> <p>For other years, search https://www.ftc.gov.</p>										

Information Store

Sector:	Health	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Market:	Pharmaceutical products											
End Date:	Annual	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	Various											
Source of idea for study:	FTC initiative and statutory requirement by Congress											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 requires that brand-name drug manufacturers and generic drug applicants file certain agreements with the FTC and the Department of Justice. Based on the information filed, the FTC has developed a series of annual reports that summarize the number and types of agreements filed. The annual reports identify the number of agreements that constitute final resolutions of patent disputes between brand and generic pharmaceutical manufacturers that have been filed by pharmaceutical companies. A preliminary assessment summarizes the types of final settlements received in each fiscal year and describes how the results compare to filings in other recent years.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/tips-advice/competition-guidance/industry-guidance/health-care/pharmaceutical-agreement-filings											

Sector:	Energy	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Market:	Oil and Natural Gas											
End Date:	Periodically updated	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	Various											
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	As part of the FTC's work to maintain competition in the petroleum industry, the FTC has produced series of reports on "Activities in the Oil and Natural Gas Industries." These reports summarize the agency's activities relating to ongoing reviews of mergers, acquisitions and other transactions in the oil and natural gas industries, the investigation of pricing behaviour or any potential anticompetitive actions in these industries, and the resources that the FTC has devoted to such reviews and investigations.											
Link to report:	Go to https://www.ftc.gov/tips-advice/competition-guidance/industry-guidance/oil-and-gas and click on "Reports".											

Information Store

Sector:	Advertising and Marketing											
Market:	Food Marketing to Children and Adolescents	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	Study 2012, Interagency Working Group 2011, December 2009 Forum, July 2008 Report, July 2007 Forum, May 2006 Report	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	Various											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer Protection (except for 2008 Report, which Congress requested)											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>The FTC has been actively working with government agencies, consumer advocates, academics, and industry to foster creative and effective self-regulatory initiatives to help combat childhood obesity. Among other things, the agency has conducted workshops, issued a series of reports on food marketing, self-regulation and childhood obesity, and published a study on television food advertising.</p> <p>The 2009 Forum discussed current research on the impact of food advertising on children; the statutory and constitutional issues surrounding governmental regulation of food marketing; and the food and entertainment industries' implementation of the recommendations in the FTC's 2008 report. The Forum also announced recommended nutritional standards for foods marketed to children.</p> <p>The 2008 Report tracked expenditures and promotional activities used to market foods and beverages to children and adolescents in 2006, and recommended changes to food marketing practices by both food and beverage industry members and entertainment and media companies.</p> <p>The 2007 Forum offered members of the food and media industries and self-regulatory groups an opportunity to report on their progress implementing initiatives in response to the recommendations set forth in the 2006 report, and for other stakeholders to comment on that progress.</p> <p>The 2006 Report was a joint report with the Department of Health and Human Services, recommending concrete steps that industry can take to change their marketing and other practices to make progress against childhood obesity.</p>											
Link to report:	Information about these and other related activities are available at https://www.ftc.gov/food-marketing-to-children-and-adolescents											

Information Store

Sector:	Competition Policy											
Market:	Contractual terms (Most-Favored Nation Clauses)	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	September 2012	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 day conference											
Source of idea for study:	FTC and DOJ experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Conference: Most-Favored-Nation Clauses and Antitrust Enforcement and Policy. In September 2012, the FTC hosted a joint conference with the Department of Justice’s Antitrust Division on most-favored-nation clauses (MFNs), which explored the use of MFN clauses and the implications for antitrust enforcement and policy. The most commonly used MFN provisions guarantee a customer that it will receive prices that are at least as favorable as those provided to other buyers of the same seller, for the same products or services. Although most often employed for benign purposes, MFNs can under certain circumstances present competitive concerns. This is because they may raise other buyers’ costs or foreclose would-be competitors from accessing the market, , especially when used by a dominant buyer of intermediate goods. Additionally, MFNs can facilitate collusion and stabilize coordinated pricing among sellers.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>An agenda, public comments, and additional event-related materials are available at: http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/workshops/mfn/index.html</p>											

ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

Information Store

Sector:	Information Markets and Intellectual Property Rights											
Market:	IP in standard setting	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	June 2011	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 day workshop											
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):												
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Workshop: Tools to Prevent Patent "Hold-up": IP Rights in Standard Setting. The FTC hosted a workshop addressing legal and policy issues surrounding the inclusion of patented technology in collaboratively set industry standards. The workshop was part of FTC's policy project to examine the legal and policy issues surrounding the problem of potential patent "hold-up" when patented technologies are included in collaborative standards. As part of the project, the FTC held a workshop and sought views of consumers and the legal, academic, and business communities</p>											
Link to report:	<p>Workshop transcript, an agenda, and additional event-related materials are available at: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2011/06/tools-prevent-patent-hold-ip-rights-standard-setting</p>											



ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

Information Store

Sector:	Health	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Market:	Accountable Care Organizations											
End Date:	October 2010 May 2011	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	Two 1-day workshops											
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Workshop Regarding Accountable Care Organizations and Implications Regarding Antitrust, Physician Self-Referral, Anti-Kickback and Civil Monetary Penalty Laws. In 2010, the FTC, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and DHHS co-hosted a workshop on several issues associated with Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs), organizations authorized by the Affordable Care Act of 2010 that seek to deliver high-quality and efficient health care services to consumers. The workshop addressed and sought public comments on the legal issues raised by various ACO models being considered by health care providers.</p> <p>In 2011, FTC hosted a workshop, "Another Dose of Competition: Accountable Care Organizations and Antitrust," to seek input on the FTC's Proposed Statement of Antitrust Enforcement Policy, which discusses how the federal antitrust agencies will enforce U.S. antitrust laws when competing health care providers create new ACOs under the Affordable Care Act of 2010.</p>											
Link to report:	2010 workshop: http://www.ftc.gov/opp/workshops/aco/index.shtml 2011 workshop: http://www.ftc.gov/opp/workshops/aco2/index.shtml											

Sector:	Pharmaceuticals	Range of Possible Outcomes										
Market:	Authorized Generics											
End Date:	August 2011	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	Started in 2006											
Source of idea for study:	Congress											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>The study was conducted to examine the short-term and long-term effects of "authorized generics" on competition in the prescription drug marketplace.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/policy/public-comments/initiative-223											

Sector: Information Markets

United States – Federal Trade Commission

Information Store

	and Intellectual Property Rights											
Market:	Patents and technology in various industries	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	May 2009 (hearings) May 2010 (workshop) March 2011 (report)	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	Appx. 3 years											
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):												
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>To explore the interplay of legal standards, patent examination practices and procedures, remedies in legal actions challenging patents, innovation, and competition, the FTC held eight days of hearings between December 2008 and May 2009. The hearings explored how markets for patents and technology operate in different industries, whether those markets operate efficiently, and how patent policy might be adjusted to respond to problems in those markets in order to better promote innovation and competition. In addition, the FTC cosponsored a workshop with the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) and the Department of Justice in May 2010, on the intersection of patent policy and competition policy.</p> <p>Following the hearings and workshop, and taking into account testimony, written submissions, and independent research, FTC staff drafted the report, "The Evolving IP Marketplace: Aligning Patent Notice and Remedies With Competition." The report examines the role of technology markets and patent markets in innovation. It recognizes that collaboration and technology transfer have become increasingly important pathways to innovation with significant benefits for consumers, and that patents play an important role in supporting technology markets, and undermining that role would harm innovation. At the same time, there are increasing complex business models in markets for patents that do not involve technology transfer. The report includes recommendations for adjustments to the legal rules and practices related to obtaining patents and remedies that are better aligned with competition policy without undermining patent law's support for innovation.</p>											
Link to report:	Hearings series: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2009/05/evolving-ip-marketplace Workshop: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2010/05/intersection-competition-policy-patent-policy-implications Report: https://www.ftc.gov/reports/evolving-ip-marketplace-aligning-patent-notice-remedies-competition											

Information Store

Sector:	Financial Services										
Market:	Debt Collection	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	December 2009 (workshops); July 2010 (report)	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	August-December 2009; July 2010										
Source of idea for study:	Previous work on debt collection (recommendation from FTC's February 2009 report)										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):											
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The FTC held three roundtable meetings in Fall 2009 to examine issues related to debt collection arbitration and litigation, as recommended in the FTC's February 2009 report, "Collecting Consumer Debts: The Challenges of Change – A Workshop Report," on general issues related to debt collection. After the workshops, the FTC issued another report, "Repairing A Broken System: Protecting Consumers in Debt Collection Litigation and Arbitration."										
Link to report:	Information from workshops is contained in the report "Repairing A Broken System: Protecting Consumers in Debt Collection Litigation and Arbitration," available at https://www.ftc.gov/reports/repairing-broken-system-protecting-consumers-debt-collection-litigation .										

Sector:	Information Markets and Intellectual Property Rights										
Market:	Exploring privacy	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	March 2010	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	6 months										
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer protection										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):											
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	Three roundtables aimed to explore the privacy challenges posted by the vast array of 21 st century technology and business practises that collect and use consumer data. The goal was to determine how best to protect consumer privacy while supporting beneficial uses of the information and technological innovation.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2010/03/exploring-privacy-roundtable-series										

Information Store

Sector:	Pharmaceuticals											
Market:	Authorized Generics	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	January 2010	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	3 months											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Competition, previous enforcement actions											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	Branded and generic drug companies are required to file patent settlement agreements with the FTC. FTC staff identified agreements in which restrictions on generic entry were combined with compensation from the brand to the generic to see if generic entry was delayed longer than agreements without payments. The report found pay-for-delay patent litigation settlements costs consumers approximately \$3.5 billion per year.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/pay-delay-how-drug-company-pay-offs-cost-consumers-billions-federal-trade-commission-staff											

Sector:	Advertising and Marketing											
Market:	Children's Entertainment	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	December 2009 April 2007	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	2 years											
Source of idea for study:	Congress											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The 2009 report was the seventh in a series of reports on industry practices relating to the marketing of violent movies, music, and video games to children.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2009/12/ftc-renews-call-entertainment-industry-curb-marketing-violent https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2007/04/ftc-issues-report-marketing-violent-entertainment-children											

Information Store

Sector:	Media											
Market:	Journalism	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	June 2010	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	6 months											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer Protection and Bureau of Competition											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	This workshop series explored how the internet has changed journalism and the impact on consumers.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2010/06/how-will-journalism-survive-internet-age											

Sector:	Pharmaceuticals											
Market:	Biologics	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	June 2009 Report	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	9 months											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Competition: Previous work on branded and generic pharmaceuticals.											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>The report examined whether the price of biologic drugs – products manufactured using living tissues and microorganisms – could be reduced by competition from so-called “follow-on biologics” (FOBs).</p> <p>A related roundtables focus on two distinct areas in which competition and consumer protection policies are implicated: (1) competition among health care providers based on quality information; and (2) competition provided by developing an abbreviated regulatory approval pathway for follow-on biologic drugs.</p>											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/emerging-health-care-issues-follow-biologic-drug-competition-federal-trade-commission-report Information about the roundtables is available at: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2008/11/emerging-health-care-competition-consumer-issues-competition											

Information Store

Sector:	Communications											
Market:	Mobile commerce	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	April 2009	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	15 months											
Source of idea for study:	Consumer Protection											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>The study explored consumer protection issues in the rapidly expanding world of M-commerce, which connects consumers with advertisers, marketers, and a variety of providers of services and products, through mobile phone and other devices.</p> <p>A related workshop explored consumer protection issues in the rapidly expanding world of M-commerce, which connects consumers with advertisers, marketers, and a variety of providers of services and products, through mobile phone and other devices.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>https://www.ftc.gov/reports/beyond-voice-mapping-mobile-marketplace-federal-trade-commission-staff-report</p> <p>Workshop information: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2008/05/beyond-voice-mapping-mobile-marketplace</p>											

Sector:	Information Markets and Intellectual Property Rights											
Market:	Securing Personal Data in the Global Economy	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	March 17, 2009	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	2 days											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer protection											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>The FTC, in conjunction with APEC and the OECD, hosted the conference addressing how companies can manage personal data-security issues in a global information environment where data can be stored and accessed from multiple jurisdictions.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2009/03/securing-personal-data-global-economy</p>											

Information Store

Sector:	E-Commerce	Range of Possible Outcomes									
Market:	On-Line Behavioural Advertising										
End Date:	February 2009 Report	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found									
Duration:	1 year										
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer Protection										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>The report was part of a process to examine online behavioral advertising. It reflects input from the FTC, industry, consumer and privacy organizations, and individual consumers. The report notes that significant work in this area remains, and that FTC staff will continue the public dialogue regarding the privacy issues raised by behavioral advertising.</p> <p>Related workshops explored how the online advertising market, and specifically behavioural advertising, has changed in recent years, and what changes are anticipated over the next five years. Also, the workshops examined what type of consumer data is collected, how such data is used, how the data is protected, and more generally the costs and benefits to consumers of behavioural advertising.</p>										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/federal-trade-commission-staff-report-self-regulatory-principles-online-behavioral										

Sector:	Financial Services	Range of Possible Outcomes									
Market:	Debt Collection										
End Date:	February 2009 Report	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found									
Duration:	14 months										
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer Protection										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>The FTC held a workshop and prepared a report examining consumer protection issues in debt collection proceedings against consumers.</p>										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/collecting-consumer-debts-challenges-change-federal-trade-commission-workshop-report										

Information Store

Sector:	Advertising and Marketing										
Market:	Negative Option Marketing	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	January 2009 Report	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	Two years										
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer Protection										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The report summarizes the workshop presentations and public comments received by the FTC. The report identifies five principles for marketing online negative option offers based upon recent FTC cases and the workshop panelists' comments. The workshop focused particularly on Internet-based negative option offers, because they are relatively new and present distinct issues regarding the form, content, and timing of disclosures.										
Link to report:	Report: https://www.ftc.gov/reports/negative-options-federal-trade-commission-workshop-analyzing-negative-option-marketing Information about the related workshop: https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2007/01/negative-options-workshop-analyzing-negative-option-marketing										

Sector:	Retail Sector (excluding food and drink only market studies)										
Market:	Contactless Payment Systems	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	July 2008	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	2 years										
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer Protection										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	A series of workshops were held to explore the growth of contactless and mobile payment systems and their implications for consumer protection policy.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2008/07/pay-go-consumers-contactless-payment										

Information Store

Sector:	Advertising and Marketing										
Market:	Alcohol Industry	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	June 2008	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer Protection										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The FTC studied alcohol marketing and youth, examining industry efforts to reduce the likelihood that alcohol advertising will target those under the legal drinking age of 21. The study resulted in a proposal for a new system for monitoring alcohol industry compliance with self-regulatory programs. It was the third Federal Trade Commission report on efforts by the alcohol industry to reduce the likelihood that alcohol advertising will target youth, by its placement or content.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/self-regulation-alcohol-industry-report-federal-trade-commission										

Sector:	Health										
Market:	Physician Services	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	May 2008	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	2 months										
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Competition										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The workshop examined current activities aimed at fostering high quality, cost-effective care through collaborations among otherwise independent providers, including an examination of programs already operating as well as those in development.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2008/05/clinical-integration-health-care-check										

Information Store

Sector:	Postal Services											
Market:	Postal Service	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	January 2008	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	1 year											
Source of idea for study:	Congress											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	This was a Congressionally mandated study that examines the economic effects of relevant laws governing the U.S postal service and its private competitors, and it offers recommendations to enhance competition.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/accounting-laws-apply-differently-united-states-postal-service-its-private-competitors											

Sector:	Health											
Market:	Health Care Delivery	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	2008	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	3 months											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Competition											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The workshop examined the competition and consumer protection issues regarding particular health care delivery innovations. The workshop focused on the following areas: limited services clinics, price and quality transparency, and health information technology.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2008/04/innovations-health-care-delivery											



ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

Information Store

Sector:	Financial Services											
Market:	Consumer Mortgages	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	2007	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:												
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Economics											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	FTC staff generated research on mortgage disclosures examined how consumers shop for mortgages, how well they understand current mortgage cost disclosures and terms. The results of the study show that current mortgage cost disclosures failed to convey key mortgage costs to many consumers, and that prototype disclosures developed for the study significantly improved consumer recognition of mortgage costs, demonstrating that better disclosures are feasible.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/improving-consumer-mortgage-disclosures-empirical-assessment-current-prototype-disclosure											

Sector:	Fuel											
Market:	Gasoline	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	August 2007	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	15 months											
Source of idea for study:	Congress											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	This study was a congressionally-mandated study of factors underlying the spring and summer 2006 gasoline price increases.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/federal-trade-commission-report-springsummer-2006-nationwide-gasoline-price-increases											

Information Store

Sector:	Insurance										
Market:	Automobile Insurance	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	July 2007	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	3 years										
Source of idea for study:	Congress										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):											
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The Congressionally-mandated study examines the effect of credit-based insurance scores on the price and availability of automobile insurance										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/credit-based-insurance-scores-impacts-consumers-automobile-insurance-report-congress-federal										

Sector:	Advertising and Marketing										
Market:	Children and Television Advertising	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	June 2007	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Consumer Protection										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):											
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	This staff-generated study provides a comprehensive assessment of the amount and type of television advertising seen by children in 2004 and compares this with that in 1977.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/childrens-exposure-television-advertising-1977-2004-information-obesity-debate-bureau										

Information Store

Sector:	Communications										
Market:	Broadband	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	June 2007	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 year										
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The policy staff report was the result of an FTC initiative to investigate the competitive implications of the of "net neutrality" issue. The report identifies guiding principles that policy makers should consider in evaluating proposed regulations or legislation relating to broadband Internet access and network neutrality.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/broadband-connectivity-competition-policy-staff-report										

Sector:	Groceries (food and drink)										
Market:	Antitrust analysis of grocery industry	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	May 2007	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Competition and Bureau of Economics										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The conference looked at antitrust analysis of the grocery industry including both historical analysis and analysis of current methods. Topics included historical review of the FTC's actions in this industry, current economic analysis of grocery and retail competition, and recent work on new methods for analysing grocery and retail competition.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2007/05/grocery-store-antitrust-historical-retrospective-current										

Information Store

Sector:	Information Markets and Intellectual Property Rights											
Market:	Intellectual Property	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	April 2007	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	5 years											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Competition											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	<p>Starting in 2002, the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice (DOJ) held hearings on competition and intellectual property issues. In 2007, the agencies issued a joint report to inform consumers, businesses, and intellectual property rights holders about the agencies' competition views with respect to a wide range of activities involving intellectual property.</p> <p>The report discusses issues including: refusals to license patents, collaborative standard setting, patent pooling, intellectual property licensing, the tying and bundling of intellectual property rights, and methods of extending market power conferred by a patent beyond the patent's expiration.</p>											
Link to report:	<p>https://www.ftc.gov/reports/antitrust-enforcement-intellectual-property-rights-promoting-innovation-competition-report</p> <p>For more information, see https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2007/04/federal-trade-commission-and-department-justice-issue-report</p>											

Information Store

Sector:	Energy	Range of Possible Outcomes									
Market:	Electric Energy										
End Date:	April 2007	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found									
Duration:	21 months										
Source of idea for study:	Congress										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The Energy Policy Act of 2005 established an Electric Energy Market Competition Task Force that included both the FTC and DOJ, along with other government agencies. The Act required the Task Force to conduct a study and analysis of competition within the wholesale and retail markets for electric energy in the United States and to submit a final report to Congress on the findings of such study and analysis.										
Link to report:	http://www.ferc.gov/legal/fed-sta/ene-pol-act/epact-final-rpt.pdf										

Sector:	Energy	Range of Possible Outcomes									
Market:	Energy markets										
End Date:	April 2007	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found									
Duration:	N/A										
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Competition										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The three-day conference explored a range of energy issues of importance to American consumers. The topics included the relationship between market forces and government policy in energy markets; the dependence of the U.S. transportation sector on petroleum; the effects of electric power industry restructuring on competition and consumers; what energy producers and consumers may expect in the way of technological developments in the industry; the security of U.S. energy supplies; and the Government's role in maintaining competition and protecting energy consumers.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2007/04/energy-markets-21st-century-competition-policy-perspective										



ADVOCACY WORKING GROUP
MARKET STUDIES PROJECT

Information Store

Sector:	Housing											
Market:	Real Estate Brokerage	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	April 2007	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	18 months											
Source of idea for study:	Bureau of Competition											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	This report was the result of an FTC initiative to study competition in real estate brokerage, after observing various government and private restrictions on competition in this sector. FTC and DOJ jointly drafted the report.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/competition-real-estate-brokerage-industry-report-federal-trade-commission-us-department											

Sector:	Communications											
Market:	Government Provision of Wireless Broadband	Range of Possible Outcomes										
End Date:	October 2006	Competition Enforcement	Consumer Enforcement	Consumer Education	Business Education	Voluntary Business Compliance	Voluntary Business Action	Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law	Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure	Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy	Referral to Third Parties	No Problems Found
Duration:	6 months											
Source of idea for study:	FTC experience											
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	The investigation was an FTC initiative to study the competitive implications of laws that would supplant private competition with government provision of wireless internet access to consumers.											
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/policy/policy-actions/advocacy-filings/2006/09/ftc-staff-report-concerning-municipal-provision											

Information Store

Sector:	Fuel										
Market:	Gasoline	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	May 2006	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	9 months										
Source of idea for study:	Congress										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	This study was a congressionally-mandated investigation into gasoline price manipulation and post-Katrina gasoline price increases.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/federal-trade-commission-investigation-gasoline-price-manipulation-post-katrina-gasoline										

Sector:	Health										
Market:	Contact Lenses	Range of Possible Outcomes									
End Date:	February 2005	Competition Enforcement Consumer Enforcement Consumer Education Business Education Voluntary Business Compliance Voluntary Business Action Recommendations to Government for Changes in the Law Recommendations to Government to Change Market Structure Recommendations for Changes to Government Policy Referral to Third Parties No Problems Found	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duration:	1 year										
Source of idea for study:	Congress										
Outcome (tick relevant columns):		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for study (what were the problems)?	At the request of Congress, the FTC studied the online and offline markets for contact lenses. The study investigated the degree to which certain marketing practices may retard online sellers, and resulted in recommendations for change to government policy.										
Link to report:	https://www.ftc.gov/reports/strength-competition-sale-rx-contact-lenses-ftc-study										