



2019

Annual Activity Report

Annexes

DG COMPETITION

Table of Contents

ANNEX 1:	STATEMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR AND HEAD OF UNIT IN CHARGE OF RISK MANAGEMENT AND INTERNAL CONTROL	3
ANNEX 2:	REPORTING – HUMAN RESOURCES, BETTER REGULATION, INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION	4
ANNEX 3:	DRAFT ANNUAL ACCOUNTS AND FINANCIAL REPORTS	11
ANNEX 4:	MATERIALITY CRITERIA	21
ANNEX 5:	RELEVANT CONTROL SYSTEM(S) FOR BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION (RCSs)	22
ANNEX 6:	IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC-SECTOR BODIES AND BODIES GOVERNED BY PRIVATE LAW WITH A PUBLIC SECTOR MISSION (NOT APPLICABLE)	26
ANNEX 7:	EAMR OF THE UNION DELEGATIONS (NOT APPLICABLE)	26
ANNEX 8:	DECENTRALISED AGENCIES AND/OR EU TRUST FUNDS (NOT APPLICABLE)	26
ANNEX 9:	EVALUATIONS AND OTHER STUDIES FINALISED OR CANCELLED DURING THE YEAR	27
ANNEX 10:	SPECIFIC ANNEXES RELATED TO "FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT"	29
ANNEX 11:	SPECIFIC ANNEXES RELATED TO "ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INTERNAL CONTROL SYSTEMS" (NOT APPLICABLE)	33
ANNEX 12:	PERFORMANCE TABLES	34

ANNEX 1: Statements of the Director and Head of Unit in charge of Risk Management and Internal Control

"I declare that in accordance with the Commission's communication on the internal control framework¹, I have reported my advice and recommendations on the overall state of internal control in the DG to the Director-General.

I hereby certify that the information provided in Section 2 of the present Annual Activity Report and in its annexes is, to the best of my knowledge, accurate and complete."

Brussels, 30 March 2020

(e-signed)

Isabelle Bénoliel

"I hereby certify that the information provided in Section 1 of the present Annual Activity Report and in its annexes is, to the best of my knowledge, accurate and complete."

Brussels, 30 March 2020

(e-signed)

Téa Katarina Broms

¹ C(2017)2373 of 19.04.2017.

ANNEX 2: Reporting – Human Resources, Better Regulation, Information Management and External Communication

This annex is the annex of section 2.2 "Other organisational management dimensions".

Objective 1: The DG deploys effectively its resources in support of the delivery of the Commission's priorities and core business, has a competent and engaged workforce, which is driven by an effective and gender-balanced management and which can deploy its full potential within supportive and healthy working conditions

Indicator 1: Percentage of female representation in middle management

Source of data: Sysper

Baseline 01/05/2015	Target (2019)	Latest known results (01/01/2020)
30.2%	45%	44%

Indicator 2: Percentage of staff who feel that the Commission cares about their well-being

Source of data: Commission staff survey

Baseline 2014	Target (2020)	Latest known results (2018)
36.5% (EC=35%)	Maintain above the Commission average (52% in 2018)	59%

Indicator 3: Staff engagement index

Source of data: Commission staff survey

Baseline 2014	Target (2020)	Latest known results (2018)
68.4%	Above 70% and maintain above the Commission average (69% in 2018)	76%

Objective 2: Attract, motivate, train and retain highly qualified staff and promote equal opportunities within DG Competition

Indicator 1: Turnover (% of statutory staff leaving DG Competition before three years in DG Competition)

Source of data: Sysper

Baseline 2015	Target (2020)	Latest known results (2019)
3.4%	Less than 3.4%	3.1% ²

² This figure includes all statutory staff, i.e. Officials, Temporary Agents and Contract Agents, and thus also staff with contracts of limited duration. If only AD and AST officials are considered, the percentage of staff leaving DG Competition before three years in DG Competition reaches 2.5%.

Indicator 2: Staff engagement index**Source of data:** Commission staff survey

Baseline 2014	Target (2020)	Latest known results (2018)
68.4%	Above 70% and maintain above the Commission average (69% in 2018)	76%

Objective 3: Information flows effectively both top-down and bottom-up and that staff understand Commission and DG Competition's objectives and how their individual work relates to these objectives

Indicator 1: Understanding by the staff of DG Competition's priorities**Source of data:** Commission staff survey

Baseline (2014)	Target (2016-2020)	Latest known results (2018)
89%	Improve the level of staff understanding of DG Competition's priorities	73%

Indicator 2: Understanding by the staff of DG Competition of their objectives and tasks**Source of data:** Commission staff survey

Baseline (2014)	Target (2016-2020)	Latest known results (2018)
85%	Maintain or increase	93%

Objective: Information and knowledge in your DG is shared and reusable by other DGs. Important documents are registered, filed and retrievable³

Indicator 1 (data provided by DG DIGIT): Percentage of registered documents that are not filed (ratio)

Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
2.10% (ARES) 0% (EDMA)	N.A. (ARES) 0% (EDMA)	3,23% (ARES) 0% (EDMA)

This number reflects only filing and registration in Ares of documents exchanged with other DGs, because internally DG Competition uses its own registration/document system (EDMA). In EDMA 100% of documents are filed, including also those that are sent from EDMA to other DGs via ARES, since filing is mandatory in DG Competition (technically not possible to save a document into the system EDMA without filing). Also, in Case@EC, all registered documents will have to be filed.

³ As for indicator "Number of documents eligible to an electronic validation circuit", the estimated number (80%) of documents eligible to an electronic validation circuit remains unchanged. Therefore, DG Competition opted not to report on it.

Indicator 2: (data provided by DG DIGIT): Percentage of HAN files readable/accessible by all units in the DG

Source of data: HAN statistic

Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
99.19%	99%	99,19%

For this indicator it is not useful to refer to HAN, because inside DG Competition documents are exchanged and made visible in the DG's own registration/document system (EDMA), in which 99.19% of files are opened to the whole DG. Note however that inside the DG security is implemented in EDMA also at the attachment level, and individual attachments can be and are protected. The target here is not a quality measure, but reflects a policy decision taken in DG Competition on accessibility.

Indicator 3: (data provided by DG DIGIT): Percentage of HAN files shared with other DGs

Source of data: HAN statistics

Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
0,04%	<1%	0%

Files created by DG COMP in HAN are by default not shared with other DGs, since documents are exchanged in the framework of cases. In its own registration/document system (EDMA), no file is shared with another DG. Competition regulations set out a strict professional secrecy obligation and limitations on use of data for any other purposes than competition cases.

In the new Case Management Application currently under development, COMP will assess if some horizontal files could be shared.

Indicator 4: Percentage of units using collaborative tools to manage their activities

Source of data: DG Competition

Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
95%	100%	100%

The percentage represent the proportion of units using either the COMP Collaborative Platform or eDiscovery.

Indicator 5: Number of cases where an important document could not be retrieved and resulted in a report to the DMO (register of "exceptions" to be created)

Source of data: DG Competition

Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
0	0	0

Objective: Timely and effective handling of requests for information under Regulation 1049/2001

Output indicator: Respect of the time-limits for replies

Source of data: GESTDEM – corporate application managing access to document requests

Baseline (2014)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
87% ⁴	100%	94%

Objective: Enhance paperless document exchanges (e-Commission) with 3rd parties

Result indicator: Incrementing paperless exchanges with Member States and external stakeholders

Source of data: DG Competition's document management and electronic communication systems (EDMA)

Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
95%	99%	97%

Objective: IT rationalisation in sub-domain for Case Management Systems (led by DG Competition)

Indicator: Implementation of a common Case Management System for the Commission services participating in CASE@EC project (KPI 4)

Source of data: Reports to the Inter-Service Steering Committee of the project

Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
Conclusion of the inception phase, start of the tender process.	Release of version 1 of CASE@EC covering "Horizontal Projects" and prepare version 2 covering the State Aid instrument and enhanced Horizontal Projects.	First version released into production in March 2019 and updated in June 2019. Implementation work for version 2 ongoing.

⁴ DG Competition is one of the Commission services receiving most requests for access to documents under Regulation 1049/2001. DG Competition aims to handle all requests for access to documents efficiently and within the time limits set in the Regulation. In 2019, the number of requests managed by DG Competition remained high (424 requests), continuing at the same time to ensure clarity in application of the public access principles through explanations provided in any access refusal letters.

Objective: Prepare new policy initiatives and manage the EU's acquis in line with better regulation practices to ensure that EU policy objectives are achieved effectively and efficiently

Indicator 1: Percentage of Impact assessments submitted by DG Competition to the Regulatory Scrutiny Board that received a favourable opinion on first submission

Explanation: The opinion of the RSB (Regulatory Scrutiny Board) will take into account the better regulation practices followed for new policy initiatives. Gradual improvement of the percentage of positive opinions on first submission is an indicator of progress made by the DG in applying better regulation practices

Source of data: EC

Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2019)
For DG Competition: 87.5%, RSB positive opinions on 7 of the 8 IA submissions in 2014 (68% Commission average in 2014)	Positive trend	0 % ⁵

Indicator 2: Percentage of the DG's regulatory acquis covered by ex-post evaluations and Fitness Checks not older than five years

Explanation: Better Regulation principles foresee that regulatory acquis is evaluated at regular intervals. As evaluations help to identify any burdens, implementation problems, and the extent to which objectives have been achieved, the availability of performance feedback is a prerequisite to introduce corrective measures allowing the acquis to stay fit for purpose

Relevance of Indicator 2: The application of better regulation practices would progressively lead to the stock of legislative acquis covered by regular evaluations to increase

Source of data: EC

Baseline (2015)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2019)
25% ⁶ (Percentage of the DG's regulatory acquis covered by ex-post evaluations and Fitness Checks not older than seven years)	Positive trend compared to baseline	25% ⁷

⁵ There were no submissions to the RSB in 2019. Hence, the latest know result for DG COMP is 0%.

⁶ The DG's regulatory acquis comprises the following four key instruments: Access to file/complaints study/evaluation finalised in 2015 concerning Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 of 16 December 2002 on the implementation of the rules on competition laid down in Articles 81 and 82 of the Treaty, OJ L 1, 4.1.2003, p. 1-25; Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 of 20 January 2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings (the EC Merger Regulation), OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1-22; (iii) Council Regulation (EU) No 733/2013 of 22 July 2013 amending Regulation (EC) No 994/98 on the application of Articles 92 and 93 of the Treaty establishing the European Community to certain categories of horizontal State aid, OJ L 204, 31.7.2013, p. 11-14; Damages Directive, Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on certain rules governing actions for damages under national law for infringements of the competition law provisions of the Member States and of the European Union, 2013/0185 (COD) of 26 November 2014, http://ec.europa.eu/competition/antitrust/actionsdamages/damages_directive_final_en.pdf and (v) Modernisation of State aid rules see also http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/modernisation/index_en.html. Out of these four key regulatory instruments, one has been evaluated in the last five years (Access to file/complaints study/evaluation finalised in 2015) already. The share of the DG's regulatory acquis covered by evaluations in the last five years was therefore 25% in 2015.

⁷ In 2019, the Commission published the evaluation of Commission Regulation 906/2009 ("the Consortia Block Exemption Regulation"). The finalisation of these evaluations will contribute to a positive trend of

Annual communication spending (based on estimated commitments):

Baseline 2018	Target 2019:	Total amount spent	Total of FTEs working on external communication
No communications budget other than participation in Open Day	No communications budget other than participation in Open Day	25,000 for participation in EU Open Day	4

Objective: Citizens perceive that the EU is working to improve their lives and engage with the EU. They feel that their concerns are taken into consideration in European decision making and they know about their rights in the EU

Indicator 1: (provided by DG COMM): Percentage of EU citizens having a positive image of the EU

Definition: Eurobarometer measures the state of public opinion in the EU Member States. This global indicator is influenced by many factors, including the work of other EU institutions and national governments, as well as political and economic factors, not just the communication actions of the Commission. It is relevant as a proxy for the overall perception of the EU citizens. Positive visibility for the EU is the desirable corporate outcome of Commission communication, even if individual DGs' actions may only make a small contribution

Source of data: Standard Eurobarometer⁸ monitored by DG Communication

Baseline (November 2014)	Target (2020)	Latest known results (November 2019)
Total "Positive": 39% Neutral: 37% Total "Negative": 22%	Positive image of the EU ≥ 50%	Total "Positive": 42% Neutral: 37% Total "Negative": 20%

Objective: Help understanding of EU competition rules by stakeholders

Indicator 2: Number of people reached with communication actions directly supporting EU competition policy as a result of the DG's actions

Source of data: Collated monitoring data by DG COMP

Baseline (2018):	Target (2020):	Latest known results (2019)
22,000 subscribers to external weekly electronic newsletters; 4500 EU-bookshop downloads of publications Press releases: 127 press releases, 391 midday express chapeaux	Increasing trend	22,000 subscribers; 6200 downloads of publications 120 press releases, 405 midday express chapeaux

regulatory acquis evaluations in the coming years. The Commission continued the following evaluations with the aim to finalise them in 2020: (1) the Fitness Check of State aid rules, which were adopted as part of the State Aid Modernisation, the railways guidelines and the short term export credit insurance ("Fitness check"); (2) the review of the Emissions trading scheme State aid guidelines (ETS Guidelines) to ensure that they are adapted to the new Emissions Trading Scheme for the period 2021-2030; (3) the evaluation of the Vertical Block Exemption Regulation (VBER); (4) the evaluation of the Motor Vehicle Block Exemption Regulation and the evaluation of the certain aspects of the Merger Regulation. In addition, the Commission launched the following two evaluations: (1) the evaluation of the Horizontal Block Exemption Regulation (HBER); (2) the evaluation of Services of General Economic Interest rules for health and social services.

⁸ <https://ec.europa.eu/COMFrontOffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/General/index>

Twitter activity: 1067 tweets,
3.1 million impressions,
13,000 followers

Speaking to new stakeholder
audiences (15 events) and
COM Visitors' centre (50
speakers)

590 tweets, 3.5m
impressions, 15,800 followers

New audience events: 12,
COM Visitors' centre: 36
speakers

ANNEX 3: Draft annual accounts and financial reports

Annex 3 Financial Reports - DG COMP - Financial Year 2019

Table 1 : Commitments

Table 2 : Payments

Table 3 : Commitments to be settled

Table 4 : Balance Sheet

Table 5 : Statement of Financial Performance

Table 5 Bis: Off Balance Sheet

Table 6 : Average Payment Times

Table 7 : Income

Table 8 : Recovery of undue Payments

Table 9 : Ageing Balance of Recovery Orders

Table 10 : Waivers of Recovery Orders

Table 11 : Negotiated Procedures

Table 12 : Summary of Procedures

Table 13 : Building Contracts

Table 14 : Contracts declared Secret

Table 15 : FPA duration exceeds 4 years

TABLE 1: OUTTURN ON COMMITMENT APPROPRIATIONS IN 2019 (in Mio €) for DG COMP					
			Commitment appropriations authorised *	Commitments made **	% **
			1	2	3=2/1
Title 03 Competition					
03	03 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Competition' policy area	13,71	12,97	94,60 %
Total Title 03			13,71	12,97	94,60 %
Title 05 Agriculture and rural development					
05	05 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Agriculture and rural development' policy area	0,05	0,05	98,55 %
Total Title 05			0,05	0,05	98,55 %
Title 11 Maritime affairs and fisheries					
11	11 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Maritime affairs and fisheries' policy area	0,05	0,05	100,00 %
	11 06	European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)	0,05	0,05	100,00 %
Total Title 11			0,1	0,1	100,00 %
Title 16 Communication					
16	16 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Communication' policy area	0,12	0,12	100,00 %
	16 03	Communication actions	0,01	0,01	100,00 %
Total Title 16			0,13	0,13	100,00 %
Title 26 Commission's administration					
26	26 03	Services to public administrations, businesses and citizens	3,25	3,25	100,00 %
Total Title 26			3,25	3,25	100,00 %
Title 27 Budget					
27	27 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Budget' policy area		0	
Total Title 27				0	
Title 33 Justice and consumers					
33	33 03	Justice	1,01	1	98,85 %
Total Title 33			1,01	1	98,85 %
Total DG COMP			18,25	17,50	95,90 %

* Commitment appropriations authorised include, in addition to the budget voted by the legislative authority, appropriations carried over from the previous exercise, budget amendments as well as miscellaneous commitment appropriations for the period (e.g. internal and external assigned revenue).

TABLE 2: OUTTURN ON PAYMENT APPROPRIATIONS in 2019 (in Mio €) for DG COMP					
			Payment appropriations authorised *	Payments made	%
			1	2	3=2/1
Title 03 Competition					
03	03 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Competition' policy area	21,62	9,98	46,17 %
Total Title 03			21,62	9,98	46,17%
Title 05 Agriculture and rural development					
05	05 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Agriculture and rural development' policy area	0,05	0,1	207,00 %
Total Title 05			0,05	0,1	207,00%
Title 11 Maritime affairs and fisheries					
11	11 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Maritime affairs and fisheries' policy area	0,05	0,09	188,31 %
	11 06	European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)	0,09	0,09	100,00 %
Total Title 11			0,14	0,18	132,52%
Title 16 Communication					
16	16 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Communication' policy area	0,18	0,1	52,95 %
	16 03	Communication actions	0,01	0,01	57,64 %
Total Title 16			0,19	0,11	53,29%
Title 26 Commission's administration					
26	26 03	Services to public administrations, businesses and citizens	0	2,26	0,00 %
Total Title 26			0	2,26	0,00%
Title 27 Budget					
27	27 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Budget' policy area		0,1	
Total Title 27				0,1	
Title 33 Justice and consumers					
33	33 03	Justice	1,07	1,01	94,33 %
Total Title 33			1,07	1,01	94,33%
Total DG COMP			23,07	13,74	59,53 %

* Payment appropriations authorised include, in addition to the budget voted by the legislative authority, appropriations carried over from the previous exercise, budget amendments as well as miscellaneous payment appropriations for the period (e.g. internal and external assigned revenue).

TABLE 3 : BREAKDOWN OF COMMITMENTS TO BE SETTLED AT 31/12/2019 (in Mio €) for DG COMP									
Chapter	Commitments to be settled				Commitments to be settled from financial years previous to 2018	Total of commitments to be settled at end of financial year 2019	Total of commitments to be settled at end of financial year 2018		
	Commitments	Payments	RAL	% to be settled					
	1	2	3=1-2	4=1-2/1	5	6=3+5	7		
Title 03 Competition									
03	03 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Competition' policy area	12,97	2,59	10,38	80,07%	0,09	10,48	7,49
Total Title 03			12,97	2,59	10,38	80,07%	0,09	10,48	7,49
Title 05 Agriculture and rural development									
05	05 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Agriculture and rural development' policy area	0,05	0,00	0,05	92,90%	0,00	0,05	0,10
Total Title 05			0,05	0,00	0,05	92,90%	0,00	0,05	0,10
Title 11 Maritime affairs and fisheries									
11	11 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Maritime affairs and fisheries' policy area	0,05	0,04	0,01	11,69%	0,00	0,01	0,05
	11 06	European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)	0,05	0,00	0,05	100,00%	0,00	0,05	0,09
Total Title 11			0,10	0,04	0,06	55,85%	0,00	0,06	0,14
Title 16 Communication									
16	16 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Communication' policy area	0,12	0,04	0,08	64,86%	0,00	0,08	0,07
	16 03	Communication actions	0,01	0,00	0,01	64,72%	0,00	0,01	0,01
Total Title 16			0,13	0,05	0,08	64,85%	0,00	0,09	0,08
Title 26 Commission's administration									
26	26 03	Services to public administrations, businesses and citizens	3,25	0,25	3,00	92,28%	0,32	3,32	2,34
Total Title 26			3,25	0,25	3,00	92,28%	0,32	3,32	2,34
Title 27 Budget									
27	27 01	Administrative expenditure of the 'Budget' policy area	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00%	0,00	0,00	0,10
Total Title 27			0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00%	0,00	0,00	0,10
Title 33 Justice and consumers									
33	33 03	Justice	1,00	0,00	1,00	99,75%	2,86	3,86	3,87
Total Title 33			1,00	0,00	1,00	99,75%	2,86	3,86	3,87
Total for DG COMP			17,50	2,93	14,57	83,25 %	3,27	17,84	14,11

The accounting situation presented in the Balance Sheet and Statement of Financial Performance does not include the accruals and deferrals calculated centrally by the services of the Accounting Officer.

TABLE 4 : BALANCE SHEET for DG COMP		
BALANCE SHEET	2019	2018
A.I. NON CURRENT ASSETS	9.655.412,16	4.937.603,94
A.I.1. Intangible Assets	9.655.412,16	4.937.603,94
A.II. CURRENT ASSETS	13.255.065.799,89	11.891.752.037,42
A.II.2. Current Pre-Financing	860.681,50	818.797,44
A.II.3. Curr Exch Receiv & Non-Ex Recoverables	13.254.205.118,39	11.890.933.239,98
ASSETS	13.264.721.212,05	11.896.689.641,36
P.I. NON CURRENT LIABILITIES		0
P.I.2. Non-Current Provisions		0,00
P.II. CURRENT LIABILITIES	-359.852,47	-468.192,11
P.II.4. Current Payables	-359.852,47	-468.192,11
P.II.5. Current Accrued Charges & Defrd Income	0,00	0,00
LIABILITIES	-359.852,47	-468.192,11
NET ASSETS (ASSETS less LIABILITIES)	13.264.361.359,58	11.896.221.449,25
P.III.2. Accumulated Surplus/Deficit	-18.207.291.397,08	-11.647.658.103,01
Non-allocated central (surplus)/deficit*	4.942.930.037,50	-248.563.346,24
TOTAL DG COMP	0,00	0,00

It should be noted that the balance sheet and statement of financial performance presented in Annex 3 to this Annual Activity Report, represent only the assets, liabilities, expenses and revenues that are under the control of this Directorate General. Significant amounts such as own resource revenues and cash held in Commission bank accounts are not included in this Directorate General's accounts since they are managed centrally by DG Budget, on whose balance sheet and statement of financial performance they appear. Furthermore, since the accumulated result of the Commission is not split amongst the various Directorates General, it can be seen that the balance sheet presented here is not in equilibrium.

Additionally, the figures included in tables 4 and 5 are provisional since they are, at this date, still subject to audit by the Court of Auditors. It is thus possible that amounts included in these tables may have to be adjusted following this audit.

The accounting situation presented in the Balance Sheet and Statement of Financial Performance does not include the accruals and deferrals calculated centrally by the services of the Accounting Officer.

TABLE 5 : STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE for DG COMP		
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE	2019	2018
II.1 REVENUES	-4.105.446.993,77	-6.568.250.847,40
II.1.1. NON-EXCHANGE REVENUES	-4.104.759.000,00	-6.561.211.000,00
II.1.1.4. FINES	-4.104.759.000,00	-6.533.935.000,00
II.1.1.6. OTHER NON-EXCHANGE REVENUES		-27.276.000,00
II.1.2. EXCHANGE REVENUES	-687.993,77	-7.039.847,40
II.1.2.2. OTHER EXCHANGE REVENUE	-687.993,77	-7.039.847,40
II.2. EXPENSES	116.270.581,91	8.617.553,33
II.2. EXPENSES	116.270.581,91	8.617.553,33
II.2.10. OTHER EXPENSES	100.837.086,59	8.664.482,64
II.2.2. EXP IMPLM BY COMMISS&EX.AGENC. (DM)	1.073.441,77	374.910,37
II.2.6. STAFF AND PENSION COSTS	-712.000,00	-422.040,00
II.2.8. FINANCE COSTS	15.072.053,55	200,32
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE	-3.989.176.411,86	-6.559.633.294,07

TABLE 5bis : OFF BALANCE SHEET for DG COMP		
OFF BALANCE	2019	2018
OB.2. Contingent Liabilities	-1.742.400.000,00	-1.742.400.000,00
OB.2.7. CL Legal cases OTHER	-1.742.400.000,00	-1.742.400.000,00
OB.4. Balancing Accounts	1.742.400.000,00	1.742.400.000,00
OB.4. Balancing Accounts	1.742.400.000,00	1.742.400.000,00
OFF BALANCE	0,00	0,00

It should be noted that the balance sheet and statement of financial performance presented in Annex 3 to this Annual Activity Report, represent only the assets, liabilities, expenses and revenues that are under the control of this Directorate General. Significant amounts such as own resource revenues and cash held in Commission bank accounts are not included in this Directorate General's accounts since they are managed centrally by DG Budget, on whose balance sheet and statement of financial performance they appear. Furthermore, since the accumulated result of the Commission is not split amongst the various Directorates General, it can be seen that the balance sheet presented here is not in equilibrium.

Additionally, the figures included in tables 4 and 5 are provisional since they are, at this date, still subject to audit by the Court of Auditors. It is thus possible that amounts included in these tables may have to be adjusted following this audit.

TABLE 6: AVERAGE PAYMENT TIMES in 2019 for COMP

Legal Times							
Maximum Payment Time (Days)	Total Number of Payments	Nbr of Payments within Time Limit	Percentage	Average Payment Times (Days)	Nbr of Late Payments	Percentage	Average Payment Times (Days)
1	2				2	100,00 %	65
30	422	413	97,87 %	12,51	9	2,13 %	34,22
60	30	29	96,67 %	28,14	1	3,33 %	61

Total Number of Payments	454	442	97,36 %		12	2,64 %	
Average Net Payment Time	14,27			13,53			41,58
Average Gross Payment Time	16,19			15,16			54

Suspensions							
Average Report Approval Suspension Days	Average Payment Suspension Days	Number of Suspended Payments	% of Total Number	Total Number of Payments	Amount of Suspended Payments	% of Total Amount	Total Paid Amount
0	58	15	3,30 %	454	1.197.264,99	8,78 %	13.634.241,41

Late Interest paid in 2019			
DG	GL Account	Description	Amount (Eur)
COMP	65010100	Interest on late payment of charges New FR	2.141,78
			2.141,78

TABLE 7 : SITUATION ON REVENUE AND INCOME in 2019 for DG COMP

Chapter		Revenue and income recognized			Revenue and income cashed from			Outstanding balance
		Current year RO	Carried over RO	Total	Current Year RO	Carried over RO	Total	
		1	2	3=1+2	4	5	6=4+5	7=3-6
57	OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS AND REFUNDS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATION OF THE INSTITUTION	1.020.136,61	0,00	1.020.136,61	985.268,47	0,00	985.268,47	34.868,14
66	OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS AND REFUNDS	11.622,28	2.710.366,69	2.721.988,97	11.622,28	4.076,22	15.698,50	2.706.290,47
71	FINES AND PENALTIES	4.035.931.717,00	13.032.230.804,72	17.068.162.521,72	2.242.730.750,00	219.888.808,75	2.462.619.558,75	14.605.542.962,97
Total DG COMP		4.036.963.475,89	13.034.941.171,41	17.071.904.647,30	2.243.727.640,75	219.892.884,97	2.463.620.525,72	14.608.284.121,58

**TABLE 8 : RECOVERY OF PAYMENTS in 2019 for DG COMP
(Number of Recovery Contexts and corresponding Transaction Amount)**

Year of Origin (commitment)	Total undue payments recovered		Total transactions in recovery context (incl. non-qualified)		% Qualified/Total RC	
	Nbr	RO Amount	Nbr	RO Amount	Nbr	RO Amount
2016			1	11.622,28		
2017			2	379.723,10		
Sub-Total			3	391.345,38		

EXPENSES BUDGET	Irregularity		OLAF Notified		Total undue payments recovered		Total transactions in recovery context (incl. non-qualified)		% Qualified/Total RC	
	Nbr	Amount	Nbr	Amount	Nbr	Amount	Nbr	Amount	Nbr	Amount
INCOME LINES IN INVOICES										
NON ELIGIBLE IN COST CLAIMS							9	308.142,91		
CREDIT NOTES							18	387.870,03		
Sub-Total							27	696.012,94		
GRAND TOTAL							30	1.087.358,32		

TABLE 9: AGEING BALANCE OF RECOVERY ORDERS AT 31/12/2019 for DG COMP

	Number at 01/01/2019	Number at 31/12/2019	Evolution	Open Amount (Eur) at 01/01/2019	Open Amount (Eur) at 31/12/2019	Evolution
2003	1	1	0,00 %	1.060.000,00	1.060.000,00	0,00 %
2005	1		-100,00 %	670.000,00		-100,00 %
2006	1	1	0,00 %	11.500.000,00	11.500.000,00	0,00 %
2009	4	4	0,00 %	1.068.981.290,47	1.068.981.290,47	0,00 %
2010	13	10	-23,08 %	78.895.783,13	51.220.244,46	-35,08 %
2011	2	2	0,00 %	14.855.731,15	13.568.737,98	-8,66 %
2013	12	12	0,00 %	252.271.000,00	252.271.000,00	0,00 %
2014	33	28	-15,15 %	869.549.126,21	849.114.545,85	-2,35 %
2015	26	10	-61,54 %	237.691.000,00	173.475.000,00	-27,02 %
2016	5	5	0,00 %	495.721.467,68	495.721.467,68	0,00 %
2017	24	21	-12,50 %	4.181.698.076,22	4.144.253.000,00	-0,90 %
2018	16	11	-31,25 %	5.830.456.696,55	5.757.563.000,00	-1,25 %
2019		11			1.812.256.868,14	
	138	116	-15,94 %	13.043.350.171,41	14.630.985.154,58	12,17 %

TABLE 10 :Recovery Order Waivers >= 60 000 € in 2019 for DG COMP

	Waiver Central Key	Linked RO Central Key	RO Accepted Amount (Eur)	LE Account Group	Commission Decision	Comments
0	3233190088	3241009796	-482.250,00	Private Companies	C(2019)3222	1)
1	3233190089	3240711425	-670.000,00	Private Companies	C(2019)3215	2)

Total DG COMP	-1.152.250,00
----------------------	----------------------

Number of RO waivers	2
-----------------------------	----------

Justification:

- 1) Commission Decision C(2019)3222 of 6 May 2019 - due to insolvency of the debtor.
- 2) Commission Decision C(2019)3215 of 3 May 2019 - due to insolvency of the debtor.

TABLE 11 :Negociated Procedures in 2019 for DG COMP**Internal Procedures > € 60,000**

Negotiated Procedure Legal base	Number of Procedures	Amount (€)
Annex 1 - 11.1 (a) - Follow-up of an open/restricted procedure where no (or no suitable) tenders/requests to participate have been submitted	1	402.450,00
Annex 1 - 11.1 (b) - Artistic/technical reasons or exclusive rights or technical monopoly/captive market	1	189.166,00
Annex 1 - 11.1 (c) - Extreme urgency caused by unforeseeable events not attributable to the contracting authority	1	250.000,00
Total	3	841.616,00

TABLE 12 : Summary of Procedures in 2019 for DG COMP**Internal Procedures > € 60,000**

Procedure Legal base	Number of Procedures	Amount (€)
Negotiated procedure middle value contract (Annex 1 - 14.2)	2	275.850,00
Negotiated procedure without prior publication (Annex 1 - 11.1)	3	841.616,00
Open procedure (FR 164 (1)(a))	2	2.187.000,00
Total	7	3.304.466,00

TABLE 13 : BUILDING CONTRACTS in 2019 for DG COMP

N/A

TABLE 14 : CONTRACTS DECLARED SECRET in 2019 for DG COMP

N/A

TABLE 15 : FPA duration exceeds 4 years - DG COMP

N/A

ANNEX 4: Materiality criteria

As from 2019⁹, a 'de minimis' threshold for financial reservations is introduced. Quantified AAR reservations related to residual error rates above the 2% materiality threshold, are deemed not substantial for segments representing less than 5% of a DG's total payments and with a financial impact below EUR 5 million. In such cases, quantified reservations are no longer needed.

In conformity with the current guidelines, DG Competition applies the following quantitative and qualitative materiality criteria, in order to assess the overall impact of a weakness and judge whether it is material enough to have an impact on the assurance.

Qualitative assessment

Competition policy is implemented through enforcement and involves predominantly procedural (case-handling) and advocacy activities, involving a very modest level of financial management.

Qualitative criteria cover significant reputational risks for the DG or the Commission and significant weaknesses in the internal control systems. For assessing the significance of the weakness, the nature and scope, duration, existence of mitigating controls and/or remedial actions are taken into account.

For weaknesses, which are considered significant in qualitative terms but not in quantitative terms, DG Competition takes into account the possible reputational impact they may entail to the image of DG Competition and the Commission. They will be assessed according to the context and nature of the impact, awareness and duration.

Quantitative assessment

As regards legality and regularity, the proposed standard quantitative materiality threshold of 2% of the residual error rate of the executed payments is applied. DG Competition considers it an appropriate threshold above which weaknesses detected should be considered "material".

In DG Competition, this applies to all non-compliance events detected throughout the year and with a quantifiable impact on legality and regularity.

⁹ Agreement of the Corporate Management Board of 30/4/2019.

ANNEX 5: Relevant Control System(s) for budget implementation (RCSs)

Enforcement

Security of IT-systems

Main control objectives: Ensuring that the Commission protects and maintains its IT security

Main risks	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
Sensitive information is disclosed or its integrity breached (data altered) due to security of IT systems and/or information processes not being fully effective.	<p>Security of IT systems and information safeguarding 'culture': appropriate design of IT systems and/or information processes;</p> <p>Update of the IT Risk Register</p> <p>Formal procedures to add, manage and remove user access rights to IT applications.</p>	<p>Security rules and culture to be adjusted in view of latest technical developments and 'possibilities'.</p> <p>DG's IT governance body to evaluate the probability and impact of IT risks at least once per year and to discuss mitigation actions.</p> <p>Continuous risk management of each project according to the PM² methodology;</p> <p>Daily access rights management of the case management applications and related applications</p>	Reputational events during the reporting year linked to issues of data security and the protection of confidential and/or sensitive information.

EU competition policy and enforcement

Main internal control objectives: Ensuring that EU competition policy and enforcement actions are of high quality

Main risks	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
Challenges before courts potentially leading to significant reputational risks, excessive legal costs, annulments of decisions and (monetary) compensation claims of high value.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A dedicated team in DG Competition continuously updates instrument specific Manuals of Procedures (ManProc) for antitrust/cartels, mergers and State aid. Instrument-based ManProcs and the Working Arrangements with the Commissioner provide guidance to the staff of DG Competition about the different roles, procedures, required consultations and procedural steps to be followed in the daily operations. The case support Units contribute to ensuring policy consistency and high quality of draft decisions in terms of substance and clarity. They participate in the weekly meetings with the Commissioner and instrument management meetings contributing to the uniform application of the rules and regulations by the case teams. Chief Economist Team (CET) offers an expert economic view for policy development and provides independent guidance in individual cases in all 3 instruments (anti-trust, mergers and State aid) throughout the investigation process and a final written advice on a formal proposal which is to be submitted for decision to the Commissioner. Peer review panel assures internal scrutiny organised for major antitrust, merger and State aid cases, covering all or certain aspects of the case (factual basis, legal reasoning and economic analysis). Legal Service (an independent Commission service operating under the control and authority of the 	Coverage: 100%	<p>Number of control failures,</p> <p>Number and value of annulments of Competition decisions decided by courts</p> <p>Number and value of claims for damages</p> <p>Number and value of claims for damages upheld by courts</p> <p>Reputational damage out of the annulments and claims for damages upheld by courts.</p>

Main risks	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
	<p>President of the Commission) ensures high quality output in terms of theory of harm and legal reasoning in enforcement cases and policy documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent Hearing Officers chair oral hearings and oversee the procedural fairness of competition proceedings in the field of antitrust, cartels and mergers and provide a final opinion published in the Official Journal when the Commission decision is taken. • The Principal Adviser strengthens the capacity of DG Competition to carry out economic evaluations of the EU's competition policy. • Senior Management Meeting (SMM) chaired by the Director General discusses inter alia major developments in on-going cases and jurisprudence of the General Court and the Court of Justice. • Operations Committee Meeting – Policy (OCM/P), chaired by the Director General discusses major on-going cases and decides on the granting of priority and ensuring adequate staffing in a case in close cooperation with the Commissioner. • Weekly instruments management meetings review and decide on the planning of ongoing cases and horizontal policy initiatives and ensure adequate staffing of cases. • Knowledge Management and information sharing tools like 'COMPWiki' allow staff to share knowledge and best practices within the DG. • Document Management and Case Management Applications support key business processes. • Weekly meetings between the Commissioner, the Cabinet and DG Competition monitor important developments in competition cases and horizontal policy initiatives. • Quarterly, or ad-hoc multiannual meetings, strategic meetings of the Commissioner with the Senior Management and Directorates of DG Competition are regularly updated on the progress in the most important enforcement cases in all instruments. 		

Fines imposed in the area of Competition

Main control objectives: Ensuring that the Commission establishes its revenue entitlements and correctly registers its revenue entitlements, reliable reporting (true and fair)

Main risks	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
<p>The Commission decision embeds weaknesses that would undermine the Commission's legal rights in terms of revenue entitlements such as decision not addressed to the correct legal entity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main parameters of the fines are discussed before the SO is finalised in a meeting chaired by the DDG Antitrust in which A1, CET, LS and CAB participate • Experienced case handlers verify calculations (fresh pair of eyes) 	<p>Coverage: 100% in-depth panel review for draft COMP-decisions on fines</p>	<p>Effectiveness: Value of the rights concerned (e.g. decision on fine overruled by CoJ) Benefits: The (average annual) total value of the significant errors detected/avoided - and thus prevented in terms of the Commission's rights</p>

Main risks	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
EU accounting rules are not respected and that the accounts do not reflect the reality.	Commission Decisions being followed-up by concerned services	Coverage: 100% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> monthly for new decisions quarterly for follow-up of fines before Court of Justice	Effectiveness: Value of the rights concerned Benefits: The accounts at year-end give a true and fair view. Economy (costs): estimation of cost of staff involved in the controls.

Security of information

Main control objectives: Ensuring that the Commission protects and maintains its information security

Main risks It may happen (again) that...	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
Sensitive information is disclosed in the course of proceedings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Security Officer (LSO) Detailed manuals of procedures Daily enforcement of DG COMP's security measures: own marking system, reporting and risk assessment of incidents, security of buildings and staff (access controls) Regular follow-up and monitoring of information security incidents in order to identify systematic issues and help to avoid similar situations in the future LISO's prior approval of, and timely follow up reporting by, DG DIGIT's investigation of suspicious activities on COMP workstations Staff awareness actions 	Coverage: 100% Systematic (access controls, training sessions for newcomers, reporting and follow-up of disclosures), and <i>ad-hoc</i> (update of internal guidance documents, communication of events and policies, information sessions)	Cost: estimate of cost of staff involved. Effectiveness: staff awareness of security rules and best practices. Number of disclosures reported (accidental or leaks).

Fraud, Insider trading, Conflict of interests

Main control objectives: Ensuring that staff behaves according to the highest professional standards.

Main risks It may happen (again) that...	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
The reputation of the Commission is damaged due to the misconduct of staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training and awareness sessions on ethics for staff. Systematic training of newcomers, including trainees and visiting staff Conflict of Interest checks in Case Management applications 	Systematic (conflict of interests declarations for all cases, training sessions for all newcomers), and <i>ad-hoc</i> information sessions)	Cost: estimate of cost of staff involved. Benefits: staff awareness about the ethical rules, no reports of unethical behaviour, number of IDOC/OLAF investigations.

Management of administrative expenditures

Main control objectives: Ensuring that the implementation of the contract is in compliance with the signed contract before payment

Main risks It may happen (again) that...	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
The goods/services/works foreseen are not, totally or partially, provided in accordance with	Operational and financial checks in accordance with the financial circuits. Operation authorisation by the AO.	100% of the contracts are controlled Depth: All underlying documents	Error rate < 2% Payment times Deterrents & systematic weaknesses corrected.

Main risks It may happen (again) that...	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
<p>the technical description and requirements foreseen in the contract and/or the amounts paid exceed that due in accordance with the applicable contractual and regulatory provisions.</p> <p>DG unable to meet some objectives and priorities because contractor unable to deliver.</p>	<p>Network in place for co-ordination, monitoring and follow-up of contracts.</p>		<p>Benefits: Controls performed comply with the base line requirements of the Financial Regulation.</p>

Main control objectives: Ensuring that any weakness in the procedures (tender and financial transactions) is corrected

Main risks It may happen (again) that...	Mitigating controls	Coverage, frequency and depth of controls	Cost-Effectiveness indicators
<p>An error or non-compliance with regulatory and contractual provisions, including technical specifications, or a fraud, is not detected by ex-ante control, prior to payment.</p>	<p>Review of procurements and financial transactions through ex-post audits performed by the ICC.</p> <p>Review of reported exceptions.</p>	<p>Representative coverage.</p> <p>Depth: all underlying documents.</p>	<p>Amounts detected associated with fraud & error.</p> <p>Potential irregularities, errors and overpayments prevented.</p> <p>Benefits: Controls performed comply with the base line requirements of the Financial Regulation.</p> <p>Potential irregularities, errors and overpayments prevented.</p> <p>Number of cases referred to OLAF.</p> <p>Number of instances of overriding controls or deviations from established procedure</p>

ANNEX 6: Implementation through national or international public-sector bodies and bodies governed by private law with a public sector mission (not applicable)

ANNEX 7: EAMR of the Union Delegations (not applicable)

ANNEX 8: Decentralised agencies and/or EU Trust Funds (not applicable)

ANNEX 9: Evaluations and other studies finalised or cancelled during the year

Study project ID	Title of the study	Study reason	Study overview	Study internal ID	Associated services	Study cost	Note	Title of the deliverable
7572	Study on the practical impact of RDI State aid rules	General study	<p>Study on the practical impact of RDI State aid rules.</p> <p>The objective of the contract is to collect and assess factual evidence on the extent to which, if any, the current State aid rules have an impact on RDI activities in a manner or to a degree which is disproportionate to the objective of these rules, i.e. the prevention of undue distortions of competition.</p>	O		133.800 €		Study on the practical impact of RDI State aid rules
7236	Study on the enforcement of State aid rules and decisions by national courts.	General study	Study on the enforcement of state aid rules by national courts and on their use of the cooperation tools.	O		416.931 €		Study on the enforcement of State aid rules and decisions by national courts.
7136	EU loan syndication and its impact on competition in credit markets.	General study	<p>EU loan syndication and its impact on competition in credit markets. Loan syndication is an important source of capital in Europe, funding corporate and public financing needs. The study aims to formulate a methodology for analysing competition dynamics during the lifecycle of the loan.</p>	O		250.000 €		EU loan syndication and its impact on competition in credit markets.

8426	Evaluation of Consortia Block Exemption Regulation	Evaluation	The Consortia Block Exemption Regulation, Commission Regulation 906/2009 will expire on 25 April 2020. It declares Article 101(1) TFEU not applicable to certain types of agreements between maritime shipping companies to cooperate in "consortia", i.e. in the provision of regular and scheduled international maritime shipping services. The Commission is now evaluating its impact and relevance in order to determine whether it should be prolonged and, if so, under which conditions.	O				SWD(2019)411 final, SWD(2019) 411final
------	--	------------	---	---	--	--	--	--

ANNEX 10: Specific annexes related to "Financial Management"

This annex is for reporting and assessing the elements identified by management which support the assurance on the achievement of the internal control objectives¹⁰. The DG's assurance building and materiality criteria are outlined in AAR Annex 4. Annex 5 outlines the main risks together with the control processes to mitigate them and the indicators used to measure the performance of the relevant control systems.

Focus of internal controls on EU competition policy enforcement and policy

DG Competition is committed to ensuring EU competition policy enforcement of the highest standards. Enforcement actions are taken in the public interest assessing evidence and other elements of information objectively pursuant to the principle of rule of law. The process is characterised by impartiality vis-à-vis the parties at all stages of the process and respecting their rights of defence governed by the respective regulations, guidelines and best practices issued for competition proceedings, which are maintained aligned with market realities and contemporary economic and legal thinking and advocacy activities.

The Internal Control Framework of DG Competition takes into account the revised Internal Control Framework of the Commission that came into force on 1 January 2018 (Communication on the Revision of Internal Control Framework (C(2017) 2373)). It governs the internal controls related to the main inherent risks in DG Competition, which concern procedures leading to Commission enforcement actions (Commission decisions) and policy initiatives in the field of EU competition policy, handling of confidential information as well as attracting and maintaining highly qualified staff and the necessary IT support and tools.

Considering the impact that competition enforcement decisions can have on EU citizens, companies and the Member States, DG Competition cannot focus any less on its non-financial than its financial controls. The internal guidance, management supervision and effective controls in this area help DG Competition to achieve its objectives and provide the additional benefit of internal knowledge building and sharing. The controls demonstrate themselves, *inter alia*, as follows:

- A cascade of steering meetings (weekly meeting with the Commissioner and the Cabinet, Senior Management Meeting, Operational Committee Meeting, competition instruments management meetings);
- Competition instrument specific Manuals of Procedures (ManProc) providing guidance to the staff of DG Competition about the different roles, procedures, templates, required consultations and procedural steps to be followed in competition policy enforcement;
- Document Management and Case Management Applications support and guide the key business processes and exchanges with stakeholders;
- The coordination units of each competition instrument strongly contribute to ensuring policy consistency and high quality of draft decisions in terms of substance and clarity;
- Chief Economist Team (CET), the Principal Advisor for ex-post economic evaluation, and the Hearing Officer oversee their dedicated specialist areas and thereby mitigate

¹⁰ 1) Effectiveness, efficiency and economy of operations; 2) reliability of reporting; 3) safeguarding of assets and information; 4) prevention, detection, correction and follow-up of fraud and irregularities; and 5) adequate management of the risks relating to the legality and regularity of the underlying transactions, taking into account the multiannual character of programmes as well as the nature of the payments (FR Art 36.2). The 2nd and/or 3rd Internal Control Objective(s) (ICO) only when applicable, given the DG's activities.

risks;

- Peer review panels can be organised in major cases;
- The Legal Service and DG Competition collaborate intensively on competition enforcement cases.

In 2019 the financial management played a minor part in DG Competition's overall activity. This is reflected in the Internal Control Framework and the controls in place. The implementation of EU competition policy involves a modest administrative budget (13.7 million in 2019¹¹) supporting organisational management and functioning of DG. The budget covers the administrative costs in support of DG Competition's operations such as missions, expert groups, advisory committees, conferences, studies, consultations, expert advice, IT and training. In addition, DG Competition manages another EUR 4.5 million received by co-delegation (Training of judges programme, contributions to the IT-project CASE@EC and purchase of online information).

Governance structures

The internal control processes in DG Competition are based on the Commission Internal Control Framework, guidance, best practices and materials distributed via the Internal Control Correspondents Network and the adopted Internal Control Framework of DG Competition. These consist, among others, of internal control effectiveness review, internal control criteria and indicators, review templates, and ad-hoc advice of the coordinating unit.

The Communication C(2017) 2373 on the Revision of the Internal Control Framework prompted the Directors General and the Directors of the Executive Agencies to formally appoint a Director in charge of Risk Management and Internal Control. For DG Competition the responsibility is split in two: The Director of the Horizontal Management Directorate is nominated the Director in charge of risk management and internal control, while the Head of Unit COMP.04 (Strategy, Delivery and Evaluation) is nominated the Head of Unit taking responsibility for the completeness and reliability of management reporting on the results and on the achievement of objectives in Part 1. They together take the responsibility for the continuous monitoring of the internal control system (see Annex 1).

The internal control governance consists of the DG Competition Network of Internal Control Correspondents, Internal control and risk review meetings and specific responsibilities of the units and individuals related to internal controls.

- Internal Control Management Group Meeting (ICMM) assembling mainly coordinating units¹² assesses and reports on the functioning of the specific internal controls, which serves as the basis for the overall assessment of the functioning of the internal controls in DG Competition. This contributes to the declaration of assurance in the Annual Activity Report.
- Internal control framework at the DG level is implemented through effective use of control procedures and internal control structures relating to enforcement activities, horizontal activities - including human resources planning, ethics, business continuity, advocacy and communication activities - and the financial management.
- The monitoring and assessment of the presence and functioning of the control system is conducted with the help of monitoring indicators, which fall into two categories:
 1. Impact and output indicators measuring the achievement of objectives defined in the Strategic and Management Plan of the DG. These indicators are reported in the Annual Activity Report; and

¹¹ This amount reflects DG COMP's administrative expenditures (see annex 3).

¹² Units A1, A2, A3, 03, Dir. G, CPI, CET, 04, R1, R2, R3 and the HR Business Correspondent Team.

2. Internal Control Monitoring Criteria measuring the functioning of internal control principles and components in the context of the Internal Control Framework. The results of the assessment are reported in the Annual Activity Report.

As regards the management of administrative expenditures, DG Competition operates a centralised circuit for its administrative expenditures, partially decentralised for the Training of judges' programme and a decentralised circuit with counterweight for issuing recovery orders in relation to fines. The role of the operational units/directorates is important, in particular with respect to operational initiation and verification. A close and constant liaison with members of the DG's Finance Team is essential throughout the implementation of the budget. These arrangements allow for a more responsive organisation without endangering the effectiveness of internal controls.

In financial management, DG Competition relies both on ex-ante and ex-post controls; for efficiency purposes, the latter takes the form of a year-end review performed by Unit 04. It is designed to review procurements, financial transactions and the effectiveness of the internal control system for financial management.

Overview of the estimated cost of controls at Commission (EC) level:

Title of the Relevant Control System (RCS)	Ex ante controls			Ex post controls			Total	
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
	EC total costs (in EUR)	funds managed (in EUR)	Ratio (%)* (a)/(b)	EC total costs (in EUR)	total value verified and/or audited (in EUR)	Ratio (%) (d)/(e)	EC total estimated cost of controls (in EUR) (a)+(d)	Ratio (%)* (g)/(b)
1. – IT security	136 720	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	136 720	N/A
2. – EU competition policy and enforcement actions	8 203 200	102 214 283	8,03%	N/A	N/A	N/A	8 203 200	8,03%
3. - Fines imposed in the area of competition	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4. - Security of information	72 786	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	72 786	N/A
5. – Fraud, Insider trading, Conflict of interests	44 416	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	44 416	N/A
6. – Financial management – administrative expenditure	218 800	9 205 652	2,38%	92 427	7 116 011	1,3%	311 227	3,38**
OVERALL total estimated cost of control at EC level	8 675 922	111 419 935	7,78%	92 427	7 116 011	1,3%	8 768 349	7,87***

* Ratio possibly "Not Applicable (N/A)" if a RCS specifically covers an Internal Control Objective such as safeguarding sensitive information, reliable accounting/reporting, etc.

** Ratio for total estimated cost based on part of title 3, "Other administrative expenditure", which are managed directly by DG Competition.

*** Ratio for total estimated cost is based on the total budget for title 3, "Administrative expenditure of the Competition policy area", which includes the budget for staff. This allows for correct ratio of cost of controls as competition policy is implemented through human resources rather than through financial resources.

ANNEX 11: Specific annexes related to "Assessment of the effectiveness of the internal control systems" (not applicable)

ANNEX 12: Performance tables

General objective: A New Boost for Jobs, Growth and Investment		
Impact indicator 1: GDP growth		
Source of data: Eurostat		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2020)	Latest known results (2018)
1.8%	Increasing Trend Bookmark ¹³	2.0%

Antitrust and cartels

Specific objective 1: Effective enforcement of antitrust rules with a view to protecting consumer welfare (Antitrust and cartels)		
Result indicator 1: Estimate of customer benefits resulting from Commission decisions prohibiting cartels (KPI 1)		
Rationale: Quantitative indicator to ensure positive impact of competition enforcement on consumer welfare		
Source of data: DG Competition calculation ¹⁴		
Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
EUR 1.0-1.5 bn ¹⁴	No target ¹⁴	EUR 1.5-2.3 bn
Result indicator 2: Deterrent effect of the Commission's fines		
Rationale: The Commission can impose fines on companies to punish infringements of antitrust rules and to deter future infringements.		
Source of data: DG Competition Stakeholder Survey 2014		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results 2014 ¹⁵
> 50% ¹⁶	Maintain	> 50%
Output indicator 1: Intervention rate ¹⁷		
Source of data: DG Competition case management system (Natacha)		
Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
14	No target ¹⁸	15

¹³ Please note that Eurostat periodically revises its published data to reflect new or improved information, also for previous years. The latest published data is available by clicking on "bookmark". The "latest known value" column reflects the data that was available at the time of the preparation of the AARs 2016 and it is the reference point for the AARs of Commission services.

¹⁴ Please refer to footnote 38 of the main document for a comprehensive explanation on the calculation methodology and target setting of this indicator.

¹⁵ This survey is carried out once per Commission mandate.

¹⁶ Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014), Aggregate Report, published in 2015, p. 35, "Overall, most participants believed that fines, especially larger fines, are an effective deterrent for companies, which try to avoid being in a position where they could be penalised. A national competition authority and some companies mentioned that fines have increased considerably in recent years and have become even more effective". Senior Management decision to repeat the survey once in a mandate.

¹⁷ Intervention rate consists of antitrust interventions (decisions) by the Commission. In 2019, 15 interventions by the Commission included 10 antitrust decisions (3 commitment decisions, 4 cooperation decisions, 3 prohibition decisions and 1 procedural decision), 5 cartel prohibition decisions (4 settlement decisions and 1 prohibition decision).

¹⁸ Please refer to footnote 20 of the main document.

Specific objective 2: Effective and coherent application of EU competition law by the national competition authorities (Antitrust and cartels)		
Result indicator 1: Number of cases signalled to the European Competition Network (ECN)¹⁹		
Rationale: Benchmark for the level of the ECN activity to ensure coherent application of EU competition law		
Source of data: ECN case system		
Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
179	No target ¹⁸	138
Result indicator 2: Number of envisaged enforcement decisions and similar case consultations in the European Competition Network (ECN)²⁰		
Rationale: Benchmark for the level of the ECN activity to ensure coherent application of EU competition law		
Source of data: ECN case system		
Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
100	No target	98
Output indicator 1: Half-yearly meetings of the heads of the NCAs with the Director General of DG Competition, regular meetings of ECN Plenary, ECN working groups and sectorial subgroups.		
Source of data: DG Competition statistics		
Baseline (2017)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
Regular meetings, half-yearly for heads of NCAs with the Director General of DG Competition, regular meetings of ECN Plenary, ECN working groups and sectorial subgroups.	No target	Regular meetings, half-yearly for heads of NCAs with the Director General of DG Competition, regular meetings of ECN Plenary, ECN working groups and sectorial subgroups all held.

Main outputs in 2019:			
All new initiatives and REFIT initiatives from the Commission Work Programme			
Description	Indicator	Target	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
Proposal for a Directive on empowering the National Competition Authorities to be more effective enforcers (ECN+)	Adoption by the European Parliament and the Council	2018/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adoption of Directive 2019/1 by the European Parliament and the Council on 11 December 2018. - Publication in the OJ on 14 January 2019 - Entry into force on 4 February 2019 - Transposition deadline

¹⁹ Please note that number of cases signalled to the ECN is dependent on a number of factors such as priorities set by the national competition authorities, complexities and number of already on-going cases as well as changes in the competition structure of each market.

²⁰ Please note that the number of envisaged decisions varies depending on the level of output by the NCAs.

			expires on 4 February 2021 - As a matter of priority DG COMP has been providing technical assistance to Member States in the transposition process
Effective support to NCAs on individual cases with a view to ensure coherent and effective application of Articles 101 and 102 TFEU	Implementation of comments on envisaged decisions received from the NCAs ²¹	2019 (no target)	In 100% of cases the comments on envisaged decisions have been completely or partially implemented ²² .
Efficient support to NCAs on individual cases with a view to ensure coherent and effective application of Articles 101 and 102	Time to reply to NCAs	Within 30 days or as otherwise agreed with the NCAs	In 100% of cases the reply has been provided within 30 days or as otherwise agreed with the NCAs.

Specific objective 2: Effective and coherent application of EU competition law by national competition authorities and national courts (Antitrust and cartels)

Result indicator 1: Compliance rate of national judgments with Commission replies to requests for opinions (Article 15(1) of Regulation 1/2003)

Rationale: Benchmark for coherence of the activities by the courts and the Commission to ensure coherent private enforcement of EU competition law

Source of data: DG Competition statistics on the basis of national judgments transmitted

Baseline (2004-2015)	Target	Latest known results (2004-2019)
18/21: 100% compliance rate possible ²³	Maintain 100% compliance rate in the long term to ensure coherent application of EU competition rules	27/27 ²⁴

Result indicator 2: Compliance rate of national judgments with Commission 'amicus curiae' briefs (Article 15 (3) of Regulation 1/2003)

Rationale: Benchmark for coherence of the activities by the courts and the Commission to ensure coherent private enforcement of EU competition law

Source of data: DG Competition statistics on the basis of national judgments transmitted

Baseline (2006-2015)	Target	Latest known results (2006-2019)
12/12	Maintain 100% compliance rate in the long term to ensure coherent application of EU competition rules	15/15

²¹ The accuracy of the indicator depends on how accurately the NCAs report to the Commission.

²² Cases with terminated proceedings are not counted since the implementation of comments is not applicable.

²³ In three cases the respective national courts have not yet issued their judgment.

²⁴ Three cases were not counted among the 27: one because the proceedings are suspended and two more because the proceedings terminated with no judgement (e.g., the parties settled).

Result indicator 3: Number of Member States having fully implemented the Directive ensuring the right for victims of EU competition law infringements to obtain compensation through national courts

Rationale: Benchmark for ensuring equal opportunities to obtain compensation for competition law infringements in all Member States

Source of data: DG Competition statistics based on evaluation

Baseline (2014)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
-	100% of Member States implemented by 27 December 2016	All Member States transposed the Directive by 2018. The application of the new rules has stemmed a number of preliminary ruling cases at the Court of Justice of the EU. In 2019, the Commission has sent observations for 5 cases helping to clarify the rules on private enforcement of EU competition law. ²⁵

Main outputs in 2019:

Policy-related outputs

Description	Indicator	Target date	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
Support to national courts in individual cases pending before them	Information and opinions provided to national courts concerning the application of the EU antitrust rules	2019 (no target)	Information and opinions provided.
Efficient support to national courts in individual cases pending before them	Time to reply to requests for information and requests for opinion from national courts	Within one month for requests for information and within four months for requests for opinion or as otherwise agreed with the courts ²⁶	Requests for information: in all the cases, the reply was provided within one month. Requests for opinions: In two out of three cases, the reply was provided within four months. In one case, the reply was slightly delayed.
Guidelines for national courts on quantifying passing-on effects in	Adoption	No target	The 'Guidelines for national courts on how to estimate the share

²⁵ Cases C-637/17 *Cogeco*, C-724/17 *Skanska*, C-435/18 *Otis*, C-451/18 *Tibor-Trans*, C-716/19 *Repsol*.

²⁶ See Commission Notice on cooperation between the Commission and the courts of the EU Member States in the application of Articles 81 and 82 EC, OJ C101/43, 27.04.2004.

antitrust damages actions			of overcharge which was passed on to the indirect purchaser' were published on 9 August 2019 ²⁷ .
---------------------------	--	--	--

Specific objective 3: EU competition law instruments maintained aligned with market realities and contemporary economic and legal thinking (Antitrust and cartels)

Result indicator 1: Stakeholder consultation on new rules (Eurobarometer 2019)

Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work

Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)

Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014) ²⁸
5.5/7.0 ²⁹	Stable Trend ³⁰	5.5/7.0

Main outputs in 2019:

Policy-related outputs

Description	Indicator	Target date	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
Evaluation of Maritime Consortia Block Exemption Regulation (BER) – (PLAN/2018/2757)	Publication of Evaluation Staff Working Document (SWD)	2019	The SWD was published on 20 November 2019. At the same time, a public consultation on a draft Regulation prolonging the Consortia BER was opened, with a deadline to reply ending on 3 January 2020 (PLAN/2019/5734 - Prolongation of the Consortia Block Exemption Regulation).
Evaluation of the Motor Vehicle Block Exemption Regulation	Continued	2019	The feedback period for the roadmap remained open

²⁷ The Guidelines are available at [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52019XC0809\(01\)&from=EN](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52019XC0809(01)&from=EN).

²⁸ The Commission did not carry out any Eurobarometer qualitative surveys during 2019. The future approach is currently under revision.

²⁹ See Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014), Aggregate Report p. 27, "There was a high overall level of satisfaction with DG Competition's consultation on new rules, although some participants felt that their views are not always taken into account." http://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/reports/surveys_en.html.

³⁰ Senior Management decision of 1 February 2016: Increasing trend for <5/7 and stable trend ≥ 5/7.

(PLAN/2018/4817)			between 19 February 2019 and 19 March 2019.
Evaluation of the Vertical Vehicle Block Exemption Regulation (PLAN/2018/4003)	Public consultation to be launched	2019	The public consultation was launched on 4 February 2019 and remained open until 27 May 2019.
Report "Competition policy for the digital era" by the Special Advisers to Commissioner Vestager	Publication	March 2019	Report published on 4 April 2019.
Study on technology developments and rights management in the music sector	Call for tender to be launched	2019	Project called off due to budgetary restraints.
Study in the automotive sector on the relevant market developments linked to the evaluation of the Motor Vehicle Block Exemption Regulation (Commission Regulation No 461/201)	Call for tender to be launched	2019	The contract was signed on 26 November 2019; study to be delivered by 26 August 2020.

Merger control

Specific objective 4: Facilitating smooth market restructuring by assessing non-harmful mergers in a streamlined manner (Merger control)

Result indicator 1: Ratio of merger decisions adopted in a simplified procedure

Rationale: Quantitative indicator demonstrating reduced regulatory burden facilitating smooth market restructuring

Source of data: DG Competition calculation

Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
70%	Stable Trend	ca. 78%

Output indicator 1: Number of Commission decisions adopted in a simplified procedure		
Source of data: DG Competition calculation		
Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
302	No target	283

Specific objective 5: Prevention of anticompetitive effects of mergers with a view to protecting consumer welfare (Merger control)		
Result indicator 1: Estimate of customer benefits resulting from merger interventions (KPI 2)		
Rationale: Quantitative indicator to ensure positive impact of competition enforcement on consumer welfare		
Source of data: DG Competition calculation ³¹		
Baseline (2015)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
EUR 1.7-2.9 bn ³¹	No target ³¹	EUR 5.7-9.4 bn
Output indicator 1: Number of merger decisions per year		
Source of data: DG Competition calculation		
Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
393	No target ¹⁸	362
Output indicator 2: Intervention rate³²		
Source of data: DG Competition calculation		
Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
25	No target	19
Output indicator 3: Number of merger decisions adopted by the Commission ("non-simplified") per year		
Source of data: DG Competition calculation		
Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
91	No target ¹⁸	79

Specific objective 6: EU competition law instruments maintained aligned with market realities and contemporary economic and legal thinking (Merger control)		
Result indicator 1: Stakeholder consultation on new rules (Eurobarometer 2014)		
Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work		
Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014) ³³
5.5/7.0 ³⁴	Stable Trend	5.5/7.0

Main outputs in 2019:			
Policy-related outputs			
Description	Indicator	Target date	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
Evaluation of selected procedural and	Finalisation and publication of	2019	Preparation of Staff Working Document

³¹ Please refer to footnote 39 of the main document for a comprehensive explanation on the calculation methodology and target setting of this indicator.

³² Intervention rate indicator includes prohibition decisions and mergers approved subject to commitments, as well as withdrawals during second phase investigation (in-depth investigation by the Commission).

³³ This survey is carried out once per Commission mandate.

³⁴ See Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014), Aggregate Report p. 27, "There was a high overall level of satisfaction with DG Competition's consultation on new rules, although some participants felt that their views are not always taken into account." https://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/reports/surveys_en.html.

jurisdictional aspects of EU merger control (2017/COMP/003)	Evaluation Staff Working Document		
---	-----------------------------------	--	--

State aid control

Specific objective 7: Overall effectiveness of State aid modernisation, increasing share of better targeted growth-enhancing aid (State aid control)

Result indicator 1: The share of GBER expenditure over total expenditure on State aid (KPI 3)

Source of data: State Aid Scoreboard

Link: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/scoreboard/index_en.html

Baseline (2014)	Target (2016-2020)	Latest known results (2018)
38%	Maintain or increase	38%

Result indicator 2: Percentage of State aid granted by Member States for horizontal objectives of common interest.

Rationale: Indicator to ensure that state aid is targeted at horizontal objectives of Community interest, such as regional development, employment, environmental protection, promotion of research and development and innovation, risk capital and development of SMEs.

Source of data: State Aid Scoreboard – The information is based on the annual reports provided by Member States pursuant to Article 6(1) of Commission Regulation (EC) 794/2004 and comprises expenditure granted by Member States through existing aid measures which fall into scope of Article 107(1) TFEU.

Link: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/scoreboard/index_en.html

Baseline (2014)	Target (2017)	Latest known results (2018)
85%	Maintain or increase	94%

Output indicator 1: Number of opening decisions per year

Source of data: DG Competition calculation

Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
9	No target ¹⁸	65 ³⁵

Main outputs in 2019:

Description	Indicator	Target date	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
Targeted modification of the General Block Exemption Regulation in relation to the EU funding programmes (PLAN/2018/2884)	Adoption	2019	1st Advisory Committee meeting with Member States held in September 2019; public consultation until end September; Processing of reactions and revision of draft proposal.

³⁵ In 2019 the number of opening decisions has increased significantly mainly due to aligning processes with the Tempus-judgement and one case, which accounted for 39 openings.

<p>Prolongation of the Commission Regulation (EU) N°651/2014 of 17 June 2014 declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the internal market in application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty</p>	<p>Adoption</p>	<p>2019</p>	<p>2 advisory committee meetings with Member States (last one in September 2019); in light of comments received and Green Deal announcement, review of proposal ongoing</p>
<p>Prolongation of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1407/2013 of 18 December 2013 on the application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to de minimis aid</p>	<p>Adoption</p>	<p>2019</p>	<p>2 advisory committee meetings with Member States (last one in September 2019); in light of comments received and Green Deal announcement, review of proposal ongoing</p>
<p>Fitness check of 2012 State aid modernisation (SAM) package, including railways guidelines and short term export credit insurance (PLAN/2018/4881)</p>	<p>Launch/continue</p>	<p>2019</p>	<p>The fitness check involves internal analyses by the Commission, studies prepared by external consultants as well as consultations of the relevant stakeholders and of the general public. Stakeholders had the opportunity to give feedback on the roadmaps for the fitness check and for the prolongation of the rules by 7 March 2019. The web-based public consultation in the form of a comprehensive questionnaire ran from 17 April until 19 July 2019. Several targeted questionnaires to relevant stakeholders for individual rules concerned (e.g.</p>

			<p>Member States, regional or local authorities, other granting authorities or beneficiaries) were also launched. All these consultations have been finalised and the Commission is now analysing the contributions received. The final results of the fitness check will be published. Considering the delays in externalising some studies, most likely the fitness check can be finalised in the second half of 2020.</p>
<p>Prolongation of the State aid rules reformed under the State aid modernisation (SAM) package and expiring by the end of 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Guidelines on regional State aid for 2014-2020</i> • <i>Guidelines on risk finance aid for 2014-2020</i> • <i>Communication from the Commission – Criteria for the analysis of the compatibility with the internal market of State aid to promote the execution of important projects of common European interest</i> • <i>Guidelines on State aid for environmental protection and energy 2014-2020</i> • <i>Guidelines on State aid for rescuing</i> 	Adoption	2019	Multilateral meeting with Member States; in light of comments received and Green Deal announcement, review of proposal ongoing

<i>and restructuring non-financial undertakings in difficulty</i>			
Revision of the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) State aid Guidelines (PLAN/2018/4137)	Public consultation to be launched	2019	Launched in January 2020 (aligned with announcement of the Just Transition Mechanism)
Other important outputs			
Output	Indicator	Target	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
Study on the enforcement of State aid law by national courts	Publication	2019	Published on 31/07/2019 ³⁶

Specific objective 8: Compliance of renewable support schemes and capacity remuneration mechanisms with State aid rules (State aid control)

Result indicator 1: Number of EEAG-based decisions³⁷ on operating support schemes for renewable electricity

Rationale: The compliance of the renewable energy support schemes with EEAG ensures a level playing field in the internal electricity market.

Source of data: DG Competition calculation³⁸

Link: <http://ec.europa.eu/competition/elojade/isef/index.cfm>

Baseline (2014-2015)	Target (2016-2020)	Latest known results (2019)
11 decisions	Increase	91 decisions

Result indicator 2: Number of EEAG--compatible capacity mechanisms as share of all existing capacity mechanisms

Rationale: The compliance of the capacity mechanisms with EEAG ensures a level playing field in the internal electricity market.

Source of data: DG Competition calculation

Link: <http://ec.europa.eu/competition/elojade/isef/index.cfm>

Baseline (2014-2015)	Target (2018)	Latest known results (2017)
5% of capacity mechanisms	50%	60%

³⁶ <https://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/reports/kd0219428enn.pdf>.

³⁷ EEAG, Communication from the Commission — *Guidelines on State aid for environmental protection and energy 2014-2020*, OJ C 200, 28.6.2014, p. 1-55, [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52014XC0628\(01\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52014XC0628(01)).

³⁸ Number of Commission decisions under EEAG on operating schemes for RES-electricity; individual/ad hoc aid is not considered; trend should be increasing in view of cumulative decisions.

Output indicator 1: Adoption of Commission decisions in the field of State aid in accordance with EU State aid rules Source of data: DG Competition calculation		
Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
18	No target ¹⁸	11

Specific objective 9: Stability and promotion of competition in the banking sector						
Result indicator 1: Ratio of (a) State aid to all banks in the EU in the form of capital-relevant instruments to (b) primary equity issuance within the EU for banks³⁹						
Rationale: A lower ratio indicates that the share of State aid is falling compared against the total volume of equity issuance in a given year which is better for financial stability.						
Source of data: For the numerator DG COMP calculation. For the denominator Bloomberg ⁴⁰ data.						

Baseline (2014)	(2015)	(2016)	(2017)	(2018)	Target (2016-2020)	Latest known results (2019)
16.81%	29.12%	14.99%	21.84% ⁴¹	4.92%	Decrease	0.00%

Result indicator 2: Ratio of (a) State aid to all banks in the EU in the form of capital-relevant instruments to (b) the stock of total capital and reserves for all banks in the EU						
Rationale: The more banks are capable of filling in the capital shortfalls identified in the stress tests themselves, the better it is for the financial stability.						
Source of data: For the numerator DG COMP calculation. For the denominator ECB data under: http://sdw.ecb.europa.eu/home.do						

Baseline (2014)	(2015)	(2016)	(2017)	(2018)	Target (2016-2020)	Latest known results (2019)
0.228%	0.349%	0.005%	0.323% ⁴¹	0.009%	Decrease	0.00%

Output indicator 1: Adoption of Commission decisions Source of data: DG Competition calculation		
Baseline (2017)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
37	No target ¹⁸	22

³⁹ The denominator "primary equity issuance within the EU for banks" has a wider scope compared to the indicator used in the AAR 2016 report. The denominator now also includes capital increases through right offerings. The ratios for previous years have been adjusted accordingly.

⁴⁰ For more information on Bloomberg, please refer to <https://www.bloomberg.com/europe>.

⁴¹ The ratio has significantly increased from 2016 to 2017. This is due to the low level of State aid in the form of capital-relevant instruments in 2016 and the increase of State aid in the form of capital-relevant instruments in 2017. After the results of the EU-wide 2016 Stress Test were announced some institutions were required to increase their capital levels. For the institutions that did not manage to raise the necessary capital on the markets, the State was allowed to step in in accordance with State aid rules and the Banking Recovery and Resolution Directive. This increased the amount of recapitalisation aid used for 2017.

Specific objective 10: Prevention and recovery of incompatible aid (State aid control)		
Result indicator 1: Implementation of recovery (at least provisional) or Court action for non-implementation within two years from the date of the recovery decision (expressed as percentage of total recovery decisions)		
Rationale: Qualitative indicator on the effectiveness and enforcement of recovery decisions		
Source of data: DG Competition case management system (ISIS)		
Baseline (2015)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2019) ⁴²
33% ⁴³	Increase	27% ⁴⁴
Output indicator 1: Adoption of recovery decisions in the field of State aid in accordance with EU State aid rules		
Source of data: DG Competition case management system (ISIS)		
Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
7	No target ¹⁸	4

Main outputs in 2019:			
Other important outputs			
Output	Indicator	Target	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
Adoption of recovery decisions in the field of State aid in accordance with EU State aid rules	Adoption of Commission decisions	2019 (no target)	4 ⁴⁵
Revision of State aid Enforcement Notice – (PLAN/2018/2922)	Adoption	2019	No adoption yet – postponed
Revision of the State aid Recovery Notice – (PLAN/2018/2406)	Adoption	2019	Adopted; published in the OJ on 23 July 2019 ⁴⁶

⁴² This indicator shows a decrease compared to 2015 due to the many new recovery decisions that have been adopted (especially in 2016) and for which the foreseen implementation period of 2 years has not yet elapsed. In the previous period (2014-2015) many court actions were taken.

⁴³ Total of recovery decisions adopted which fall into this result indicator is 39; in 9 instances, recovery was implemented and in 4 cases it was decided to launch Court action.

⁴⁴ Total of recovery decisions adopted which fall into this result indicator is 17; in 4 instances, recovery was implemented; one Court action was launched.

⁴⁵ Recovery decisions that concerned State aid measures examined by DG Competition.

⁴⁶ OJ C 247, 23.7.2019, p. 1-23.

Specific objective 11: Monitoring of aid measures (State aid control)

Result indicator 1: Number of aid measures subject to ex-post monitoring

Rationale: Stable indicator ensuring a reasonable number of aid measures (mainly schemes) subject to ex-post monitoring in every annual monitoring cycle.

Source of data: DG Competition calculation

Baseline (2015)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2019)
At least 75 aid measures (mainly schemes) subject to ex-post monitoring	Stable	47 aid schemes ⁴⁷

Specific objective 12: EU competition law instruments maintained aligned with market realities and contemporary economic and legal thinking (State aid control)

Result indicator 1: Stakeholder consultation on new rules (Eurobarometer 2014)

Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work

Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)

Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014) ⁴⁸
5.5/7.0 ⁴⁹	Stable Trend	5.5/7.0

Main outputs in 2019:

All new initiatives and REFIT initiatives from the Commission Work Programme

Description	Indicator	Target date	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
See output under objective 7 and 10	-	-	See output under objective 7

⁴⁷ Slightly fewer schemes were monitored given the larger number of individual aids verified in the sample of 70 schemes where the focus was on schemes with high expenditure and therefore the possible distortion of competition could be expected to be higher than having few more schemes but with smaller expenditure.

⁴⁸ The Commission did not carry out any Eurobarometer qualitative surveys during 2019. The future approach is currently under revision.

⁴⁹ See Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014), Aggregate Report, p. 27, "There was a high overall level of satisfaction with DG Competition's consultation on new rules, although some participants felt that their views are not always taken into account." https://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/reports/surveys_en.html.

Promoting competition culture and international cooperation in the area of competition policy: maintaining and strengthening the Commission's reputation world-wide

Specific objective 13: Competition advocacy contributing to a pro-competitive regulatory framework at EU and national level		
Result indicator 1: Readiness to engage and contribute with high quality input to other DG's policy projects (Ensuring collegiality)		
Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work		
Source of data: Other DGs' Survey by DG Competition (2014)		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014) ⁵⁰
5.0/7.0	Stable Trend	5.0/7.0
Result indicator 2: Relevance of input to other DGs' policy projects (Ensuring collegiality)		
Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work		
Source of data: Other DGs' Survey by DG Competition (2014)		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014)
5.2/7.0	Stable Trend	5.2/7.0
Output indicator 1: Number of substantial replies to Commission inter-service consultations		
Source of data: DG Competition calculation		
Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
192	Stable Level	187
Output indicator 2: Number of country specific recommendations promoted or followed by DG Competition		
Source of data: DG Competition calculation		
Baseline (2018)	Target	Latest known results (2019)
25	Stable Level	29

Main outputs in 2019:			
Policy-related outputs			
Description	Indicator	Target date	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
ECN Communication and Advocacy Working Group	Annual meeting	2019	Annual meeting organized on 09 April 2019

⁵⁰ This survey is linked to the DG Competition Stakeholder Survey, which could not be executed as it is a Eurobarometer Qualitative Survey. The Commission did not carry out any Eurobarometer qualitative surveys during 2019. The future approach is currently under revision.

Specific objective 14: Explaining competition policy and its benefits

Result indicator 1: Percentage of positive replies in surveys conducted among citizens agreeing that effective competition has a positive impact on them as consumers

Rationale: Indicator to measure citizens' view of competition and competition policy

Source of data: Eurobarometer Flash Citizens' Survey

Baseline (2015)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2019) ⁵¹
74%	Increasing Trend	78%

Main outputs in 2019:

Other important outputs

Description	Indicator	Target date	Latest known results (situation on 31/12/2019)
Actions to explain EU competition rules to stakeholders	Number of people reached with communication actions directly supporting EU competition policy ⁵²	Throughout 2019	15,000 visitors to Open Doors event 15,800 Twitter followers 12 speaking events to new audiences 36 speeches to visitor groups in the Visitors' Centre
DG Competition's publications	Number of subscribers/readers of DG Competition's publications ⁵³	Increasing trend	22,000 subscribers; 6200 downloads of publications

Specific objective 15: Promoting international cooperation and convergence in the area of competition policy and greater transparency and basic disciplines on subsidies control

Result indicator 1: Promotion of competition culture and policy convergence at international level

Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work

Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)⁵¹

Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014) ⁵⁴
4.9/7.0	Increasing Trend	4.9/7.0

⁵¹ This survey is carried out once per Commission mandate.

⁵² Collated monitoring data collected by DGs from their actions, from monitoring and evaluation contractors, from Opinion polls etc. (DG Competition calculation).

⁵³ Baseline 2015 – DG Competition's publications sent to 6 452 subscribers/readers and the digital publications to 34 880.

⁵⁴ The Commission did not carry out any Eurobarometer qualitative surveys during 2019. The future approach is currently under revision.

Output indicator 1: Number of competition cooperation agreements and free trade agreements containing competition and State aid clauses		
Rationale: Provides a benchmark for the increased level of convergence with third countries' competition authorities		
Source of data: DG Competition's statistics		
Baseline (2018)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2019)
24 agreements	37 agreements	27 agreements
Output indicator 2: Number of contributions to OECD, ICN and UNCTAD		
Rationale: Provides a benchmark for the activity of the Commission in contributing to increased international convergence of competition policy on multilateral fora		
Source of data: DG Competition's statistics		
Baseline (2018)	Target (2019-2021)	Latest known results (2019)
13 (OECD), 7 (ICN), 1 (UNCTAD)	15-20	12 (OECD), 18 (ICN)
Output indicator 3: Number of technical assistance workshops organised with third countries		
Rationale: Provides a benchmark for the activity of the Commission in contributing to increased international convergence of competition policy bilaterally		
Source of data: DG Competition's statistics		
Baseline (2018)	Target (2019-2022)	Latest known results (2019)
China (2) India (1)	China (12) Brazil (2), Japan, Korea, India, ASEAN (min. 2),	China (2), India (1), Japan (1), Korea (1)

Specific objective 16: Ensuring the highest standards in the enforcement of competition policy⁵⁵		
Result indicator 1: Legal soundness of Commission decisions in competition cases		
Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work		
Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014) ⁵⁶
5.3/7.0 ⁵⁷	Stable Trend	5.3/7.0
Result indicator 2: Quality of economic analysis		
Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work		
Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014)
4.9/7.0 ⁵⁸	Increasing Trend	4.9/7.0

⁵⁵ For the result indicators of this specific objective, data collection takes place once per Commission mandate.

⁵⁶ The Commission did not carry out any Eurobarometer qualitative surveys during 2019. The future approach is currently under revision.

⁵⁷ See Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014), Aggregate Report, p. 12.

⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 19.

Result indicator 3: Market knowledge		
Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work		
Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014)
5.0/7.0 ⁵⁹	Stable Trend	5.0/7.0
Result indicator 4: Impact on the markets		
Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work		
Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014)
4.8/7.0 ⁶⁰	Increasing Trend	4.8/7.0
Result indicator 5: Timeliness of decisions		
Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work		
Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014)
4.0/7.0 ⁶¹	Increasing Trend	4.0/7.0
Result indicator 6: Informing in a timely manner		
Rationale: Benchmark for a key quality parameter related to DG Competition's work		
Source of data: Eurobarometer Standard Qualitative Study – DG Competition Stakeholder Survey (2014)		
Baseline (2014)	Target (2019)	Latest known results (2014)
4.9/7.0 ⁶²	Increasing Trend	4.9/7.0

⁵⁹ Ibid. p. 17.

⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 42.

⁶¹ Ibid. p. 37.

⁶² Ibid. p. 24.