

Notice No 10/2017
of the President of the Hungarian Competition Authority and the Chair of the Competition
Council of the Hungarian Competition Authority

on the settlement procedure *

(consolidated version with amendments made by Notice No 2/2018.)

I. Introduction

1. Pursuant to Article 36 (6) of Act LVII of 1996 on the Prohibition of Unfair and Restrictive Market Practices (hereinafter: Competition Act), the President of the Hungarian Competition Authority (in Hungarian: Gazdasági Versenyhivatal; hereinafter: GVH) and the Chair of the Competition Council may jointly issue notices detailing the basic principles of the law enforcement practice of the GVH.
2. Such notices have no binding force; their function is to lay down the principles that the law enforcement authority follows when applying legal provisions, whilst also providing summaries of well-established past practice and outlining the practice that is to be followed in the future.
3. This Notice provides a detailed explanation of the principles set out by the legislation that the GVH follows in the settlement procedure pursuant to Article 73/A of the Competition Act in the course of its competition supervision proceedings.
4. The settlement procedure can be applied in competition supervision proceeding commenced ex officio for an infringement falling under the prohibition of Article 11 or 21 of the Competition Act or Article 101 or 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (hereinafter: TFEU), or Article 7¹ of Act CLXIV of 2005 on Trade (hereinafter: Act on Trade). In such proceedings, if the competition council proceeding in the case, based on the report completing the investigation - having regard to the established facts of the case and the supporting evidence - deems it appropriate for the swift and effective conclusion of the proceeding, it may invite the party to indicate whether it is interested in engaging in the settlement procedure. If, as a result of the settlement procedure initiated on the basis of this invitation, the party makes a settlement submission, in which it admits the infringement and the established facts of the case concerning its participation, accepts the amount of fine to be imposed on it and states that it

* *In case of discrepancies between the Hungarian and English versions of this Notice, the Hungarian version shall prevail.*

¹ Pursuant to Article 9 (3) of the Act on Trade, in the event of an abuse pursuant to Article 7, the GVH shall conduct a competition supervision proceeding in the course of which it applies the provisions applicable in the case of prohibition of Article 21 of the Competition Act.

waives its right to seek a legal remedy against the decision, the competition council proceeding in the case in its final decision shall reduce the amount of the fine to be imposed under other provisions of the Competition Act by at least 10%, but not more than 30%. The settlement procedure, if successful, shall enable the GVH in line with the principle of efficiency pursuant to Article 4² of Act CL of 2016 on the General Rules of Administrative Proceedings (hereinafter: GRAP Act) – as applicable pursuant to Article 46 (2) a) of the Competition Act – to adopt its decision within a shorter period of time and in compliance with the public interest attached to the detection of infringements and the initiation of a greater number of proceedings using the resources at its disposal, and to thereby increase the overall deterrent effect of competition supervision proceedings. The party may also have an interest in the success of the settlement procedure if it becomes aware during the procedure that there is a low likelihood that it would be able to successfully challenge, via a legal remedy, a possible decision establishing the infringement. In this case, it may save the costs stemming from the potential unsuccessful litigation and any other additional costs and burdens that would otherwise be incurred as a result of a subsequent litigation.

5. The application of the settlement procedure can take place after the comprehensive clarification of the facts of the case and the completion of the investigation phase, thus the settlement procedure does not differ from the competition supervision proceedings conducted pursuant to the general provisions. The fundamental difference between the two procedures is that, in order to reduce the administrative burden and to ensure the swift conclusion of the proceedings, the parties participating in settlement proceedings exercise their right of access to the file of the competition supervision proceeding, as a general rule, in a simplified way, only to the extent necessary and the procedure shall be primarily verbal. (See subsections II.3. and IV.2.) Moreover, in accordance with the statement of the party containing its waiver of its right to seek a legal remedy against the decision, the final decision will no longer be subject to judicial review, which will also lead to an earlier termination of the proceeding.
6. The settlement procedure set out in this Notice is not identical to the leniency procedure, the rules of which are laid down in Articles 78/A-78/C of the Competition Act and contained in the Leniency Notice³ of the GVH. While the leniency policy can only be applied in cases pursuant to Article 78/A of the Competition Act, i.e. in relation to an infringement falling under the prohibitions of Article 11 of the Competition Act and Article 101 of TFEU; the settlement procedure can be applied in all competition supervision proceedings commenced for an infringement falling under the prohibition of Article 11 or 21 of the Competition Act, Article 7 of the Act on Trade and Article 101 or 102 of the TFEU. The fundamental difference between

² Pursuant to Article 4 of the GRAP, in the interest of efficiency, the authority shall organise its activity in such a manner as to result in the least possible expense for all participants involved in the procedure and, without prejudice to the requirements of clarifying the facts of the case, for the procedure to be closed as expeditiously as possible with the application of advanced technologies.

³ Notice No 14/2017 of the President of the Hungarian Competition Authority and the Chair of the Competition Council of the Hungarian Competition Authority on the application of the rules on leniency pursuant to Article 78/A of Act LVII of 1996 on the Prohibition of Unfair and Restrictive Market Practices

the two legal institutions is that while the purpose of the leniency policy is to facilitate the detection of cartels and other infringements aimed at fixing prices – including the initiation of proceedings by the GVH and the voluntary submission of evidence – the settlement procedure aims to accelerate decision-making on the basis of the established facts of the case and to reduce the workload and costs incurred by both the party and GVH stemming from the legal remedy sought by the party against the GVH's decision.

7. Moreover, while as a result of the application of the leniency policy, the competition council proceeding in the case may grant immunity from the imposition of a fine or reduce the amount of the fine to be imposed on the undertaking participating in the infringement by up to 50%, in a settlement procedure pursuant to Article 79 of the Competition Act the amount of the fine to be imposed may be reduced by 10-30%. If the cooperation offered by a party satisfies both procedures, the fine reduction shall be granted on both grounds taking the form of a cumulative fine reduction taking into account the cooperation of the undertaking.⁴ The fine reduction of up to 50% granted in the framework of the leniency policy and the fine reduction of 10-30% granted in the framework of the settlement proceeding shall be applied cumulatively by the GVH by adding together the exact percentage of fine reduction granted in the framework of each procedure and then by reducing the basic amount of the fine adjusted by any correctional factors.
8. The settlement procedure is not identical to the commitment procedure, the rules of which are laid down in Article 75 of the Competition Act. While the submission of commitments may be accepted in competition supervision proceedings commenced on any legal basis, the settlement procedure can be applied in competition supervision proceedings commenced on the basis of Article 11 or 21 of the Competition Act, Article 7 of the Act on Trade and Article 101 or 102 of the TFEU. The purpose of adopting a commitment decision is to ensure that the party – by offering the commitments and undertaking to ensure their fulfilment – will bring its conduct in line with the applicable legal provisions. The decision obliging the party to implement its commitments shall neither establish the existence of an infringement nor the absence of one. By contrast, the decision adopted in the framework of a settlement procedure shall establish the infringement. These two legal institutions – due to their different purposes – cannot be used side by side.

II. Fundamental principles of the settlement procedure

II.1. Principle of *ex officio* proceedings

9. One of the fundamental principles of administrative authority proceedings, and thus of competition supervision proceedings, is the ability of administrative authorities to act *ex officio*, and this also applies to the settlement procedure. This means that pursuant to Article 3

⁴ See chapter VI of Notice No 11/2017 of the President of the Hungarian Competition Authority and the Chair of the Competition Council of the Hungarian Competition Authority on the method of setting fines for infringements of the prohibitions of anti-competitive agreements and concerted practices, abuse of a dominant position and abuse of significant market power (hereinafter: Fine Setting Notice) chapter VI.

of the GRAP Act applicable pursuant to Article 46 (2) a) of the Competition Act, the authority shall establish ex officio the facts of the case and determine the means and the scope of evidence. Pursuant to Article 64/A (1) of the Competition Act, any evidence that is suitable for the clarification of the facts of the case may be used in competition supervision proceedings. Evidence obtained by the GVH or any other authority through the violation of any legal regulation shall not be admissible as evidence. Pursuant to paragraph (3), the case handler and the competition council proceeding in the case shall choose the mode of proof at their discretion and assess the available evidence by free deliberation.

10. Consequently, in its proceedings initiated ex officio for which the application of this Notice is relevant, it is the GVH's duty and obligation to clarify the facts of the case, to carry out a procedure to obtain evidence and to adopt a decision on the merits of the case. It follows from this that the existence of the infringement, the evidence and the sanction cannot be negotiated during the settlement procedure; the competition council proceeding in the case only rewards the cooperation according to this Notice.
11. It also follows from the principle of ex officio proceedings that the competition council proceeding in the case decides whether or not to enter into a settlement procedure with a particular party. Therefore, the case and the party suitable for a settlement procedure are – at its own discretion – selected by the competition council proceeding in the case pursuant to Article 73/A (1) of the Competition Act, based on the report completing the investigation, having regard to the discovered facts of the case and the supporting evidence in the case for the swift and effective conclusion of the proceeding. After assessing whether the parties in a given case are willing to participate in a settlement procedure (see paragraph 33), it may be the case that not all of the parties wish to engage in the settlement procedure. However, the lack of involvement of one of the parties does not preclude other parties from entering into the settlement procedure. The competition council proceeding in the case might decide to carry out a so-called hybrid procedure.
12. Given the aforementioned, the parties have no right to a settlement procedure. However, the parties are not precluded during the proceeding from indicating their willingness to participate in a possible settlement procedure – irrespective of such invitation by the Competition Council – nevertheless the competition council proceeding in the case has no obligation to declare the case suitable for a settlement procedure on the basis of the parties' request. The parties' request for participation in a settlement procedure does not constitute a request pursuant to Article 35 of the GRAP Act, applicable pursuant to Article 46 (2) f) of the Competition Act.
13. In the framework of this Notice the competition council proceeding in the case can terminate its participation in a settlement procedure. (See paragraph 85.)
14. In view of the progress made in the settlement procedure, the competition council proceeding in the case determines – in the context of this Notice – the order and timing of the disclosure of information to the party referred to in Article 73/A (2) of the Competition Act, bearing in mind the swift and effective conclusion of the proceeding. In case of parallel settlement proceedings

involving several parties in the same proceeding, the competition council proceeding in the case decides the order in which the hearings of the parties shall take place.

II.2. Voluntariness

15. Parties cannot be obliged to engage in a settlement procedure. Pursuant to Article 73/A (1) of the Competition Act, the party decides upon the invitation of the competition council proceeding in the case if it wishes to participate in a settlement procedure and, pursuant to Article 73/A (2) of the Competition Act, it is also the party that decides, taking into account the evidence obtained in relation to the alleged conduct and the minimum and maximum amount of fine to be imposed, whether or not to introduce its settlement submission. However, it is essential that after the establishment of a common understanding the failure to introduce the settlement submission may have consequences referred to in paragraph 22.
16. The competition council proceeding in the case shall only initiate the settlement procedure pursuant to Article 73/A (2) of the Competition Act if the party states, within the time limit set in the invitation, that it is willing to participate in the settlement procedure. On the basis of the principle of voluntariness, the party – at its own discretion – is free to determine, depending on its right to informed consent (see subsection II.5.2.), the content of the common understanding in which it is willing to participate in establishing. (See Article 73/A (3) d) of the Competition Act.)

II.3. Orality

17. The legal institution of the settlement procedure set out in Article 73/A of the Competition Act is intended to simplify and accelerate proceedings; therefore, the application of this legal institution prioritises speed, simplicity, and the reduction of the administrative burdens placed on both the GVH and the concerned party. Consequently, the orality has an essential role during the settlement procedure as, pursuant to Article 73/A (2) of the Competition Act, the common understanding between the competition council proceeding in the case and the party concerned is primarily reached as a result of oral hearings. (See subsection V.2.)
18. In settlement proceedings, oral hearings are primarily held in order to ensure that the concerned parties' are able to exercise their rights stemming from the principles of immediacy and orality, thus the competition council proceeding in the case sets deadlines for making written comments only in justified and exceptional cases.

II.4. Principle of good faith

19. Pursuant to Article 6 (1)-(2) of the GRAP Act, applicable pursuant to Article 46 (2) a) of the Competition Act, the party to the competition supervision proceeding shall act in good faith and shall not engage in any conduct aimed at deceiving the authorities or unjustifiably delaying the decision-making or enforcement procedure.

20. From the principle of good faith in the settlement procedure it follows the requirements of the legitimate exercise of the parties' rights and the cooperation with the authority. The competition council proceeding in the case considers it to be an infringement of the principle of good faith if the party abuses the legal instrument of the settlement procedure. It may constitute such an abuse if the party introduces a false submission which has the object or result of protracting the competition supervision proceeding or preventing the establishment of the facts of the case, or if the party does not enter into the settlement proceeding with the willingness to establish a common understanding but to have access to the decision likely to be adopted by the competition council proceeding in the case (this may become obvious, for example, if the party fails to introduce its settlement submission despite the common understanding recorded at the hearing or if the party introduces its settlement submission with a content clearly differing from the common understanding), or furthermore, if the party demonstrates any other conduct implying or leading to the inappropriate use of the legal instrument of the settlement procedure.
21. The settlement submission is clearly unfounded, i.e. its withdrawal contrary to Article 73/A (4)-(5) of the Competition Act, may be regarded as a breach of the obligation to cooperate with regard to the fact that the time limit of the competition supervision proceeding includes the duration of the settlement procedure and further procedural measures may be necessary due to the unfounded withdrawal of the settlement submission.
22. Where it may be established from the relevant facts and circumstances of the case that the party concerned has violated the duty of good faith, the competition council proceeding in the case may decide to impose a procedural fine pursuant to Article 61 of the Competition Act in addition to terminating the settlement procedure pursuant to paragraph 85. Moreover, when imposing a sanction in the decision, the competition council proceeding in the case may consider it an aggravating factor if the party has violated its duty of cooperation.⁵

II.5. Parties' rights and their exercise

II.5.1. The right of defence

23. The competition council proceeding in the case also respects the right of defence of the party during the settlement procedure; therefore, the party is also entitled during the settlement procedure – within the framework described in this Notice – to exercise the right of access to the file, to give an oral presentation of its comments during the interview, and to submit comments pursuant to paragraph 79. Contrary to competition supervision proceedings conducted pursuant to the general rules, the party introducing a settlement submission is not entitled to give an oral presentation of its comments during the hearing; however, in the oral phase of the settlement procedure (prior to the introduction of the settlement submission) the

⁵ See Notice No 13/2017 of the President of the Hungarian Competition Authority and the Chair of the Competition Council of the Hungarian Competition Authority on procedural fines imposed in relation to the obligation to disclose information.

party is entitled to submit its arguments – as a general rule orally – relating to the obtained information in order to reach a common understanding referred to in Article 73/A (2) of the Competition Act. (See subsection V.2.)

24. The presumption of innocence also applies with regard to the settlement procedure. The submission of the party expressing its willingness to participate in the settlement procedure in response to the invitation of the competition council proceeding in the case does not imply an admission by the parties concerned of having participated in an infringement or of being liable for it.
25. In light of the parties' oral presentation the competition council proceeding in the case may, in the course of the settlement procedure, disregard certain objections, supplement, and reconsider – both in terms of the facts and the legal assessment – its position.
26. In case the competition council proceeding in the case wishes to depart in its decision from the settlement submission introduced by the party, it will issue another preliminary position to ensure the party's right of defence, including its right to full access to the file and to submit a request for a hearing.

II.5.2. The right to informed consent

27. In order to make an informed decision about the introduction of the settlement submission, the party, pursuant to subsection IV.2., shall have the right to access the case file within the scope and to the extent determined by the competition council proceeding in the case, in any phase of the proceeding, taking into consideration the swift and effective conclusion of the proceeding and the progress that has been made in the settlement procedure.
28. In addition to the right of access to the file, the party engaging in a settlement procedure shall be granted with the right to informed consent and shall be entitled to be informed about the infringement which the competition council proceeding in the case would be likely to establish, the conduct giving rise to such finding and the underlying evidence, as well as the fine likely to be imposed, including its minimum and maximum amount, and the considerations to be taken into account in the determination of such amount.
29. There may be exceptional cases (in particular in competition supervision proceedings conducted pursuant to Article 21 of the Competition Act and Article 102 of the TFEU) where, on the basis of the available evidence, the case may be considered appropriate for the settlement procedure but the competition council proceeding in the case considers that, in order to promote the exercise of the parties' rights and in particular the right to informed consent, it is necessary to provide the parties to the proceeding with the possibility of wide-scale and thorough access to the evidence (e.g. complex economic analysis) even before they respond to the invitation to participate in the settlement procedure. In such instances - also taking into account that in these cases the advantages of the settlement procedure do not necessarily and primarily arise from the shortening and simplifying of the phase of the proceeding of the competition council – it may occur that the competition council proceeding in the case sends its

invitation for participation in the settlement procedure only with the delivery of its preliminary position. Therefore, the party is able to decide – in view of the preliminary position – on a more informed basis whether or not it should engage in the settlement procedure. (See subsection II.5.2.) Although, in such a case the advantages related to the provision of limited access to the file no longer apply with regard to Article 55 (5) of the Competition Act; however, despite these circumstances the settlement procedure may still lead to the swifter and more effective conclusion of the proceeding and may also bring benefits for the party, e.g. because of the possibility of fine reduction. In such a case the competition council proceeding in the case shall simultaneously provide the party with the first preliminary position and the invitation to participate in the settlement procedure, then – if a common understanding has been reached – it shall, following the settlement procedure, prepare a new preliminary position and schedule the hearing together with the sending of the new preliminary position. The provisions of this Notice related to the ‘preliminary position’ shall only apply in these cases to this new preliminary position established following the settlement procedure. On the basis of the principle of ex officio proceedings (see subsection II.1. of this Notice) it is solely at the discretion of the competition council proceeding in the case to determine whether, following the delivery of the preliminary position, the settlement procedure should exceptionally be applied in the given case with regard to the specificities of the underlying evidence.

II.5.3. The party’s right to information

30. The competition council proceeding in the case shall ensure that the party concerned is also aware of its rights and duties during the settlement procedure; furthermore, the competition council proceeding in the case shall promote the exercise of the party’s rights. (See Article 5 (2) a) of the GRAP Act applicable pursuant to Article 46 (2) a) of the Competition Act.) To this end, the competition council proceeding in the case shall inform the party about its rights and duties in relation to the settlement procedure and it shall provide information relating to the course of the settlement procedure or in the event of its termination (see paragraph 84) of that fact.

II.5.4. The right to the withdrawal of the settlement submission

31. The party to the settlement procedure – with regard to Article 73/A (4)-(5) of the Competition Act – may unilaterally withdraw the settlement submission in a lawful manner only if the content of the preliminary position, or subsequently the decision of the competition council proceeding in the case, departs on the merits from what is provided in the settlement submission.

II.5.5. The application of the prohibition of undue discrimination

32. Pursuant to Article 2 (2) b) of the GRAP Act applicable pursuant to Article 46 (2) a) of the Competition Act, parties shall be entitled to equality before the law in administrative authority procedures; consequently, in the course of the administration of legal proceedings the administrative authority shall act without undue discrimination and bias.

33. Consequently, if the competition council proceeding in the case considers that the given case is in principle appropriate for a settlement procedure, it may assess in relation to all parties to the proceeding – taking into account reasonableness and expediency (e.g. the settlement procedure shall not be carried out if the party to the proceeding is granted immunity to fines) – if the parties wish to participate in a settlement procedure.*
34. Furthermore, the competition council proceeding in the case ensures that all parties to the settlement procedure are able to exercise their right to informed consent based on the same level of knowledge.
35. The settlement procedure may also be carried out if all parties to the competition supervision proceeding do not wish to participate in it. In such a case, the competition council proceeding in the case may continue with the settlement procedure in relation to those parties that wish to participate in the procedure, irrespective of the fact that a particular has stated, in response to the invitation by the competition council proceeding in the case, that it does not wish to participate in the procedure (so-called hybrid proceeding).
36. However, it shall be at the discretion of the competition council proceeding in the case to decide whether, in view of the relevant facts and circumstances of the given case, there is a possibility for a hybrid proceeding and thus whether the settlement procedure should be continued in respect to the parties concerned. (See paragraph 11.)

II.5.6. Confidentiality

37. Confidentiality is an important principle of the settlement procedure for both the authority and the party.
38. With regard to the statement of admission of the infringement, the settlement submission and the fact that the submission has been introduced shall be treated as restricted access data pursuant to Article 73/A (7) of the Competition Act.
39. Pursuant to Article 73/A (6) the party involved in the settlement procedure shall keep this fact confidential as well as any information obtained during the settlement procedure until the conclusion of the competition supervision proceeding, consequently, the party involved in the settlement procedure shall not be entitled to disclose to third parties including other parties in the proceeding the fact and the content of the negotiation with the competition council proceeding in the case or the content of the documents which it obtained during the settlement procedure or to which it had the right to access to for this purpose pursuant to Article 55 (6) of the Competition Act. (For further information see subsection VII.1.)

III. Selection criteria

* Amended by the paragraph 3 of the GVH Notice 2/2018. Regarding its application see paragraph 104.

40. The Competition Act grants a broad margin of discretion to the GVH to determine which cases may be suitable for the initiation of a settlement procedure or the termination with a settlement procedure.
41. In this context, the competition council proceeding in the case shall consider whether a possible settlement procedure is likely to result in a settlement with the parties in a reasonable period of time which, on the basis of practical experience, is facilitated by the parties to the proceeding having a legal representative. With regard to the adoption of such decisions, in connection with the establishment of liability, the likelihood of contradictory positions or the extent to which the facts are disputed, may play a role. In this regard, the competition council proceeding in the case favours, in its selection, those cases in which – due to the extent of the proof of the infringement – there is a low likelihood that the facts of the case will be contested and, therefore, it is likely that the proceeding will be concluded within a reasonable period of time (e.g. in case of leniency statements by the parties involved in the proceeding). Further factors that may also play a role in assessing suitability include the number of parties, the extent of restricted access data, the identity of the representative of the parties (see paragraph 97), and if all parties wish to participate in the settlement procedure. As a general rule, the competition council proceeding in the case does not initiate a settlement procedure in cases giving rise to novel legal questions.*

IV. The settlement submission and access to the file

IV.1. The settlement submission

42. The settlement submission made as a result of the settlement procedure is the party's express statement in which it states its commitment to cooperate with the authority in the context of the settlement procedure in order to speed up the conclusion of the proceeding, in the event that the competition council proceeding in the case accepts the settlement submission.
43. The settlement submission shall, in accordance with the common understanding reached by the competition council proceeding in the case and the party concerned, contain:
 - a. a statement of the party explicitly admitting its participation in the infringement;
 - b. a factual and brief description of the conduct and its legal assessment, the objective of the conduct and the way in which it was carried out, its duration and the manner and extent in which the party was involved;
 - c. the maximum amount of the fine the party deems acceptable, which is equal to the amount set out in paragraph 74;
 - d. a statement of the party to the effect that it was appropriately informed by the competition council proceeding in the case and that it was given sufficient opportunity to make its arguments on the infringement the competition council proceeding in the

* Amended by paragraphs 4 and 5 of the GVH Notice No 2/2018. Regarding its application see paragraph 104.

case would be likely to find, the conduct giving rise to such finding and the underlying evidence as well as the fine likely to be imposed, including its minimum and maximum amount, and the considerations to be taken into account in the determination of such amount;

- e. a statement of the party to the effect that if the content of the preliminary position and of the decision corresponds to the content of the settlement submission, it will not apply for further procedural actions, especially access to the file or the holding of a hearing; and
 - f. a statement of the party containing its waiver of its right to seek a legal remedy against the decision.
44. Pursuant to Article 53/A, the GVH shall determine the mode of communication with the proviso that it shall regulate, in a notice published on its website, the mode of communication to be used in various competition supervision proceedings. The competition council proceeding in the case views the settlement submission introduced according to the abovementioned notice as capable of producing the intended legal effects, consequently, in case of a settlement submission introduced in a different way (e.g. via fax or in a copy), it requires the party to re-introduce the submission as specified by the GVH.*
45. If the settlement submission contains deficiencies that can be remedied, the competition council proceeding in the case shall call upon the party concerned to remedy the deficiencies.
46. The settlement submission and the fact that the submission has been introduced, until the time specified in Article 55 (5) of the Competition Act, shall be treated as restricted access data. After the time specified in Article 55 (5) of the Competition Act, the other parties may exclusively have access to the settlement submission, with the proviso that no copies shall be made of the settlement submission; only notes may be taken thereof.
47. Third persons within the meaning of Article 55 (5) of the Competition Act shall not have access to the settlement submission; they shall not make copies or take notes.
48. Paragraphs 90 and 92-94 of this Notice, pursuant to Article 73/A (5) and (7) of the Competition Act, apply to the use of the settlement submission after the termination of the proceeding.

IV.2. Access to the file

49. In this Notice access to the file is used exclusively in the sense that this right is granted only to the party against whom the GVH carries out a competition supervision proceeding. Access to the file of other participants to the proceeding and of third parties are not covered by this Notice.

* Amended by paragraph 6 of the GVH Notice 2/2018. Regarding its application see paragraph 104.

50. The competition council proceeding in the case shall fully respect the right of defence of the undertakings subject to the proceeding in settlement procedures as well, an important part of which is ensuring the right of access to the file.
51. Pursuant to Articles 55 (5) and 73 (3) of the Competition Act, the party entitled to exercise the right of access to the file may only exercise this right after the completion of the investigation, once the preliminary position of the competition council proceeding in the case is delivered or, if it has already been delivered, after the report completing the investigation is delivered to the parties. Prior to this the party may exercise the right of access to the file upon its request pursuant to Article 55 (6) of the Competition Act, and the party may exercise its right of access to documents containing restricted access data only upon its own request. This Notice explains how the parties, within the framework of these provisions, shall exercise their right of access to the file in the context of a settlement procedure without jeopardising the swift and effective conclusion of the proceeding.
52. In the settlement procedure the competition council proceeding in the case shall not send the report completing the investigation to the parties; consequently, access to the file is not possible after the completion of the investigation.
53. Prior to sending the preliminary position, the party shall be entitled to the right of access to the file during the settlement procedure – depending on the decision of the competition council proceeding in the case – to the extent that is necessary to reach a common understanding or to form the party's position in relation to its settlement submission without jeopardising the swift and effective conclusion of the proceeding.
54. The competition council proceeding in the case shall present to the party at the interview organised for the purpose of the settlement procedure or upon the party's request pursuant to Article 55 (6) of the Competition Act the register of the case file and the accessible documents thereof, which it considers reasonable for reaching a common understanding or for forming the party's position concerning the settlement submission. (See paragraph 68.)
55. The party to the settlement procedure shall declare in the settlement submission that it will not apply for further procedural actions, including access to the file. Consequently, after the delivery of the preliminary position, despite the possibility of access to the file, the party - on the basis of its voluntary statement - will not exercise its right to access all of the documents of the competition supervision proceeding.
56. The party has the right to request access to the file with regard to restricted access data, however, this request and the right of full access to the file may impede the timely conclusion of the settlement procedure; thus, such initiatives may result in the termination of the settlement procedure in relation to the party concerned. (See paragraph 84 c.)
57. In the case described in paragraph 29 – taking into account Article 55 (5) of the Competition Act – the exercise of the party's right to access the file in relation to documents that do not contain restricted access data shall not impede the continuation of the settlement procedure.

Also in the case set out in paragraph 29, the competition council proceeding in the case shall not consider access to the file with regard to restricted access data as an obstacle to the continuation of the settlement procedure if it is justified by the circumstances of the case and it is authorised pursuant to Article 55/B (3) of the Competition Act.

V. The process of the settlement procedure

58. The process of the settlement procedure set out below is illustrated in the flow chart⁶ annexed to this Notice.

V.1. Invitation to make a statement

59. After the completion of the investigation, if the competition council proceeding in the case considers the given case appropriate on the basis of the facts and circumstances – pursuant to chapter III of this Notice – it may invite specific parties to the competition supervision proceeding with the aim of swiftly and effectively concluding the proceeding, to indicate in writing within a maximum of fifteen days whether it is willing to engage in a settlement procedure. The competition council proceeding in the case shall send to the party concerned or to its representative(s) this invitation together with the statement of confidentiality which, in the event of engaging in a settlement procedure, shall be signed and returned together with a written statement. Pursuant to Article 73/A (2) of the Competition Act, no application for justification may be submitted in case of failure to observe the time limit for making a statement. The competition council proceeding in the case shall not consider the statement received after the expiry of the time limit.*
60. The competition council proceeding in the case shall commence the settlement procedure and fix the date of the hearing of the parties provided that the parties concerned, which have already been invited to make such statement, request it in a written and duly completed statement of confidentiality, signed by the parties concerned or their representative(s). The request of the parties shall explicitly state that they are going to introduce the settlement submission at a later date in accordance with the common understanding of the competition council proceeding in the case and the parties concerned.
61. The written statement containing the willingness of the parties to participate in the settlement procedure does not imply an admission by the parties concerned of having participated in an infringement or of being liable for it.
62. In order to increase the acceptability of the leniency statement, namely to ensure that the evidence submitted by the leniency applicant has significant added value, the submission of the leniency statement shall precede participation in the settlement procedure. (See Article 78/A (2) b) and (3) of the Competition Act.)

⁶ Except for the case described in paragraph 29.

* Amended by paragraph 7 of the GVH Notice No 2/2018. Regarding its application see paragraph 104.

V.2. The interview of the party concerned

63. The settlement procedure shall start with the interview of the party concerned. The interview is considered as a non-public interview which the other parties shall not attend. Furthermore, the competition council proceeding in the case is not subject to a notification obligation in relation to the date, purpose and content of the interview. The competition council proceeding in the case only accepts the presence of representatives who have submitted the confidentiality declaration pursuant to paragraph 95 or who undertake to sign the confidentiality declaration at the beginning of the interview.
64. At the first interview of the party held to commence the settlement procedure, the competition council proceeding in the case shall inform the party of the infringement it would be likely to find, the conduct giving rise to such finding and the underlying evidence. If the competition council proceeding in the case considers that there is likely to be a direct chance that a common understanding will be reached at the first interview, it shall communicate the fine likely to be imposed, including its minimum and maximum amount, the considerations to be taken into account in the determination of such amount and the extent of the fine reduction that it is likely to offer on the basis of the existing facts and circumstances pursuant to Article 79 of the Competition Act.⁷ If several interviews of the parties are to be held, the competition council proceeding in the case informs the parties to the settlement procedure of the fine to be imposed, including its minimum and maximum amount, and the fine reduction factors to be applied when there is a direct chance for reaching a common understanding.
65. The chance of reaching a common understanding shall be considered as direct if the party explicitly states during the course of the interview that it has understood the position of the competition council proceeding in the case in relation to the facts, legal basis and the infringement, and it is willing to continue the settlement procedure in good faith. This statement of the party shall not be considered as an admission of the infringement; its purpose is only to confirm that the party is still willing to participate in the settlement procedure in good faith (see paragraph 20). The competition council proceeding in the case shall provide the party with a short time limit - maximum three working days - for submitting this statement.
66. Minutes shall be made on the interview, of which the party is allowed to request a copy.
67. At the interview the party is entitled to exercise its right to defence and may, accordingly, give an oral presentation of its arguments to the competition council proceeding in the case. (See paragraph 23.)
68. During the course of the interview, the competition council proceeding in the case shall disclose to the party concerned those documents that it considers necessary for the formulation of the party's arguments on the settlement submission and, to this end, for the introduction of the party's statement. At the first interview, or at a later time, the competition council proceeding in the case shall provide the party with an opportunity to submit a request for

⁷ See chapter VI.2. of the Fine Setting Notice

access to the file, which shall be assessed on the basis of the principles set out in this Notice pursuant to Article 55 (6) of the Competition Act. (See paragraph 54.) Interviews may also be held several times during the procedure and the competition council proceeding in the case is allowed to hold continued interviews.

69. In the case set out in paragraph 29 – taking into account that the party may exercise its right of access to the file already been opened pursuant to Article 55 (5) of the Competition Act – the competition council proceeding in the case shall presume at the first interview that the information described in paragraph 64 is already known by the party and it shall try, if possible and reasonable, to reach a common understanding already at the first interview.

V.3. Common understanding

70. The settlement submission may be introduced after the interview(s) of the party if, in the course of the interview(s) of the party, the competition council proceeding in the case and the party concerned reach a common understanding on both the legal basis and the legal consequences with regard to the infringement it is likely to find, the conduct giving rise to such finding and the underlying evidence, as well as the fine likely to be imposed, including its minimum and maximum amount, and the considerations and fine reduction factors to be taken into account in the determination of such amount against the party. The competition council proceeding in the case shall record the common understanding in the minutes of the interview(s) of the party. (See paragraphs 66 and 69.) The competition council proceeding in the case, for the purpose of expressing the party's will in relation to the common position, shall ensure a short time limit – not exceeding five working days – upon a reasoned request of the party.
71. If the competition council proceeding in the case and the party concerned reach a common understanding in the course of the interview(s) within a time period that does not impede the swift and effective conclusion of the proceeding, the competition council proceeding in the case shall invite the party to introduce its settlement submission within a time limit not exceeding fifteen days.
72. In light of the foregoing, if a common understanding is not reached in the course of the interview of the party concerned, the interview shall conclude the settlement procedure; whereas, if a common understanding is reached within a period that does not impede the swift and effective conclusion of the proceeding, the party shall be invited to introduce its settlement submission.

V.4. The introduction of a settlement submission

73. After the adoption of the common understanding by the competition council proceeding in the case no application for justification may be submitted in case of failure to observe the time limit for making such statement, which is set to a maximum of fifteen days pursuant to Article 73/A (2) of the Competition Act. The competition council proceeding in the case shall not consider the statement received after the expiry of the time limit.

74. The competition council proceeding in the case shall only accept the settlement submission if it fully incorporates the elements set out in Article 73/A (3) of the Competition Act and it is in accordance with the common understanding of the competition council proceeding in the case and the party concerned, and if it has been submitted by the person entitled to do so. The competition council proceeding in the case shall deem the settlement submission to be in accordance with the common understanding if it – with respect to the maximum amount of fine specified by the competition council proceeding in the case – contains the following;
- a) the amount of the fine calculated by taking into account the reduction of the fine set by the competition council proceeding in the case pursuant to paragraph 64, or failing that,
 - b) 90% of the maximum of the fine set by the competition council proceeding in the case, deemed acceptable by the party.
75. If the settlement submission contains deficiencies which can be remedied, the competition council proceeding in the case shall ask the party concerned to remedy the deficiencies.
76. The settlement submission shall be introduced in a form that fully complies with the legislation in force. If the party intends to introduce its submission orally, the GVH shall make an audio recording of the statement given in person by the undertaking's legal or authorised representative at the interview.

V.5. The preliminary position

77. The competition council proceeding in the case also delivers its preliminary position on the case even if it carries out a settlement procedure in relation to all or certain parties.
78. In case of the receipt of the complete settlement submission on time, the competition council proceeding in the case shall prepare its preliminary position⁸ pursuant to Article 73 (1) of the Competition Act, taking into account this fact and the settlement submission introduced by the party concerned.
79. Pursuant to Article 73/A (4) of the Competition Act, the party introducing the settlement submission shall declare within a maximum of fifteen days from the preliminary position if the content of the preliminary position on the merits corresponds to what is contained in the settlement submission; the declaration to this effect shall not be justified. If the party declares that the preliminary position departs on the merits from what is provided in the settlement submission (see Article 73/A (5) of the Competition Act), the party is entitled to withdraw its submission with a reasoned statement.⁹ In this case the party can submit its detailed comments to the preliminary position and to this end the party can exercise its right of access to the file arising from the proceeding conducted on the basis of the general rules and is also entitled to request that a hearing is held. If the party does not withdraw its settlement submission but instead makes comments on the preliminary position which contradict the content of the

⁸ In the case pursuant to paragraph 29, this refers to the new preliminary position issued after the common understanding.

⁹ The reasoning is needed to verify if the statutory conditions of the withdrawal set out in Article 73/A (5) of the Competition Act are satisfied.

settlement submission, then the settlement procedure shall be terminated and the competition council proceeding in the case may adopt a new or supplementary/additional preliminary position.

80. The competition council proceeding in the case reserves the right to supplement or amend its preliminary position on the basis of the relevant facts and circumstances of the given case and, in the light of these changes, to terminate the settlement procedure initiated earlier. (See paragraph 85 a.)

V.6. The statement following the preliminary position

81. If the party concerned states after the delivery of the preliminary position that its content corresponds to what is provided in the settlement submission, the party is obliged to deliver its statement to this effect to the competition council proceeding in the case within a maximum of fifteen days from the issuing of the preliminary position. With this statement the party concerned simultaneously expresses its commitment to continue the settlement procedure.
82. If the party concerned has expressed its commitment to continue the settlement procedure by clearly stating that the content of the preliminary position corresponds on the merits to what is provided in the settlement submission, the competition council proceeding in the case shall adopt the decision on the merits of the case without taking further procedural measures (i.e. hearing, access to the file, further evidentiary procedure). If, in a hybrid proceeding, the party that has not introduced a settlement submission requests that a hearing is held, the hearing cannot be omitted pursuant to Article 74 of the Competition Act; however, the statement of the party introducing a settlement submission at the hearing, which is contrary to the party's settlement submission, shall be considered as the withdrawal of the settlement submission by the competition council proceeding in the case.
83. If the settlement procedure is successful, pursuant to Article 79 of the Competition Act, the competition council proceeding in the case shall reduce the amount of the fine to be imposed under other provisions of the Competition Act by at least ten but no more than thirty per cent, with respect to an undertaking that made a settlement submission pursuant to Article 73/A. (See paragraph 7.)

VI. The termination of the settlement procedure

84. The settlement procedure shall be terminated in the cases described below:
 - a. the statement of the party concerned upon the invitation of the competition council proceeding in the case is late or contains deficiencies which cannot be remedied,
 - b. the party concerned is not willing to sign the confidentiality statement pursuant to paragraph 59, 63,
 - c. the party concerned – with the exception of the procedure described under paragraph 29 – submits a request for access to the file for documents containing restricted access

data or, after the introduction of the settlement submission, it initiates a request for access to the file without withdrawing the settlement submission,

- d. a common understanding pursuant to subsection V.3. cannot be reached,
- e. the party concerned fails to introduce the settlement submission in spite of the fact that the common understanding has been reached or it is late or it does not reflect the common understanding (including the case if the maximum amount of the fine indicated by the party is not in accordance with the fine calculated pursuant to paragraph 74), or it contains deficiencies which cannot be remedied,
- f. the party concerned fails to submit its statement on the preliminary position pursuant to Article 73/A (4) of the Competition Act, or the content of such statement – excluding the cases described under paragraphs 87-88 – is not in agreement, furthermore, if the party delivers its written comments which depart on the merits from what is provided in the settlement submission without the reasoned withdrawal of the settlement submission, or the statement is late, or it contains deficiencies which cannot be remedied,
- g. the competition council proceeding in the case terminates the settlement procedure,
- h. the party withdraws the settlement submission.

85. The competition council proceeding in the case may terminate the settlement procedure against the party concerned in the following cases:

- a. the competition council proceeding in the case deems it impossible, on the basis of the relevant facts and circumstances of the case, to continue the settlement procedure; namely, if it cannot accomplish its purpose (i.e. simplification of the proceeding, reduction of the administrative burden and costs), the criteria (e.g. novelty) taken into account at the time of the selection fail (see paragraph 41), or the public interest (e.g. a higher amount of fine is justified because of deterrence) does not justify the continuation of the settlement procedure,
- b. the party concerned violates its obligation of good faith, or it demonstrates any other conduct justifying the imposition of a procedural fine,
- c. if the undertakings concerned collude in order to change or destroy evidence relevant to the establishment of the infringement or to the imposition of the sanction; the conduct to this effect may otherwise be considered as an aggravating factor when imposing a sanction,
- d. the party concerned breaches its obligation to confidentiality (see paragraph 95).

86. The competition council proceeding in the case shall inform the party of the termination of the settlement procedure pursuant to paragraph 84 or 85 in writing.

87. The party can unilaterally withdraw the settlement submission in a lawful manner for the reasons set out in Article 73/A (4)-(5) of the Competition Act only if the competition council

proceeding in the case delivers a preliminary position or adopts a decision which departs on the merits from the content of the settlement submission. Pursuant to Article 73/A (5) of the Competition Act, the settlement submission may be withdrawn in a lawful manner until the expiry of the time limit set for seeking a legal remedy and only if the content of the preliminary position and the decision of the competition council proceeding in the case departs on the merits from what is provided in the settlement submission. With regard to the fine imposed, differences on the merits shall be deemed to arise only if the amount of the fine to be imposed exceeds the maximum amount of the fine provided in the settlement submission which the party considered acceptable.*

88. The preliminary position or the decision shall be considered as departing from the settlement submission, and consequently the withdrawal of the settlement submission may be considered as reasoned and lawful, if
- a. the content of the preliminary position departs on the merits from the settlement submission to the party's detriment (with regard to the facts of the case, the legal assessment of the conduct);
 - b. the content of the resolution departs on the merits from the settlement submission to the party's detriment (with regard to the facts of the case, the assessment of the conduct or the amount of fine considered by the party as acceptable);
 - c. the party to the settlement procedure demonstrates that after the introduction of the settlement submission it became aware of a fact or circumstance, the prior knowledge of which would have had a negative impact on the expression of its will to reach a common understanding;
 - d. the preliminary position or the decision may contain restricted access data with regard to which the party to the settlement procedure could not exercise its right of access to the file.
89. The competition council proceeding in the case shall consider the withdrawal of the settlement submission unlawful if
- a. the party does not explain its reasons (see paragraph 79),
 - b. its referral to the cases set out in paragraph 88 is clearly unsubstantiated,
 - c. the content of the preliminary position or the decision is in accordance with what is provided in the settlement submission, including the case if the amount of the fine imposed pursuant to Article 79 of the Competition Act corresponds to paragraph 74,
 - d. pursuant to Article 73/A (4)-(5) of the Competition Act the withdrawal is effected on a ground which, having regard to the preliminary position, has already existed,

*Amended by paragraph 8 of the GVH Notice No 2/2018. Regarding its application see paragraph 104.

- e. the party withdraws the settlement submission after the delivery of the preliminary position despite the fact that it has explicitly stated that the preliminary position is in accordance with what is provided in the settlement submission.
90. In case of withdrawals pursuant to paragraphs 87-88 and for the provision of benefits set out in paragraph 94, the underlying reasons and circumstances of the withdrawal must be consulted with the competition council proceeding in the case prior to the withdrawal. If there is no agreement on the lawfulness of the withdrawal between the competition council proceeding in the case and the party to the procedure, the competition council proceeding in the case – if it ascertains the party’s good faith – shall not apply the detrimental consequences pursuant to paragraph 93, if the withdrawal was made on the basis of the consultations set out in this paragraph. At the same time, the benefits set out in paragraph 94 shall not apply in this case, but the competition council proceeding in the case pursuant to Article 73/A (7) of the Competition Act disregards the statement of the party admitting the infringement set out in Article 73/A (3) a) in case of the continuation of the procedure pursuant to paragraph 91.
91. The withdrawal of the settlement submission by a given party shall not result in the termination of the settlement procedure for the other parties; however, the competition council proceeding in the case may decide in such case, pursuant to paragraph 85 a), to terminate the settlement procedure against all the parties. In case of the termination of the settlement procedure for any reason, the competition council proceeding in the case, in accordance with the regular course of competition supervision proceedings, shall adopt its decision on the merits after conducting a hearing and providing access to the file. In such case the competition council proceeding in the case is not bound by the maximum and minimum amount of the fine communicated to the party during the settlement procedure.¹⁰ The termination of the settlement procedure does not affect the use of documents created during the settlement procedure other than the statement made pursuant to Article 73/A (3) of the Competition Act (e.g. minutes of the interview of the party or other documents submitted by the party during the settlement procedure). Paragraphs 90, 93-94 set out the rules for the use of the statement made pursuant to Article 73/A (3) of the Competition Act in case of the termination of the settlement procedure.
92. If the party unlawfully withdraws the settlement submission after the adoption of the decision (see paragraph 89), despite the fact that the content of the decision is in accordance with the settlement submission and the fine imposed does not exceed the amount pursuant to Article 73/A (3) c), the competition council proceeding in the case, before forwarding the application for a legal remedy to the court carrying out the review pursuant to Article 120 of the GRAP Act applicable pursuant to Article 46 (1) i) of the Competition Act, may amend/withdraw its decision, at its own discretion, in a way that it considers this conduct of the party as an

¹⁰ See paragraph 105 of the Judgment (case number T-456/10) of the General Court of 20 May 2015 *Timab Industries and Cie financière et de participations Roullier (CFPR) versus European Commission*, ECLI:EU:T:2015:296

aggravating factor¹¹ when setting the amount of the fine. The rules set out in paragraph 93 shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the use of evidence.

93. In the cases set out in paragraph 84 e¹²-f and paragraph 85 b-d, the competition council proceeding in the case may use the settlement submission to prove the infringement pursuant to Article 73/A (4)-(5) and it can consider the conduct of the party resulting in the termination of the settlement procedure as an aggravating factor when determining the amount of the fine or it may impose a procedural fine. If the settlement procedure shall be terminated pursuant to paragraph 84 c, the competition council proceeding in the case shall not consider the statement admitting the infringement pursuant to Article 73/A (3) a) of the Competition Act – if it is available – in case of the continuation of the proceeding pursuant to Article 73/A (7) of the Competition Act, as set out in paragraph 91.
94. In case of the legitimate withdrawal of the settlement submission (see paragraphs 87-88) or if the competition council proceeding in the case terminates the settlement procedure for the reasons set out in paragraph 85 a, the competition council proceeding in the case shall consider the participation of the party in the settlement procedure as a fine reduction factor¹³ in the framework of the cooperation pursuant to Article 78 (3) of the Competition Act, and it shall return – pursuant to Article 73/A (7) of the Competition Act – the settlement submission and any copies thereof to the undertaking which introduced such submission.

VII. Other procedural questions

VII.1. Obligation to confidentiality

95. The party involved in the settlement procedure and its representative(s) shall keep this fact confidential as well as any information obtained during the settlement procedure until the conclusion of the competition supervision proceeding. To this end, the competition council proceeding in the case shall provide the party and its representative(s) with the confidentiality statement together with the invitation to the settlement procedure, which shall be signed and returned to the competition council proceeding in the case together with the statement of the party expressing its willingness to engage in the settlement procedure. The confidentiality statement shall be duly signed by the legal representative of the party and all the representatives who may proceed on behalf of the party during the settlement procedure (including the case of attending the interview). The party is also subject to the obligation to confidentiality.
96. The undertaking is exempted from the obligation to confidentiality only if the GVH gives its express consent to it. This consent shall not be refused in relation to the granting of access to information that is considered essential pursuant to a statutory provision or an obligation imposed by an authority.

¹¹ See paragraph 37 of the Fine Setting Notice.

¹² Except for the deficiencies which cannot be remedied.

¹³ See paragraph 76 of the Fine Setting Notice.

97. The fact that a given representative represents several parties, independent from each other, may be considered by the competition council proceeding in the case as a circumstance against the initiation of the settlement procedure, since in such case the obligation to confidentiality cannot be ensured pursuant to Article 73/A (6) of the Competition Act.
98. *
99. In case of a breach of the obligation to confidentiality, the GVH is entitled to initiate ethical and disciplinary proceedings against the representative concerned before the respective bar association or disciplinary authorities.

VII.2. Joint representation

100. If several undertakings within a group of undertakings are subject to the competition supervision proceeding, the competition council proceeding in the case shall invite the undertakings of the group of undertakings, which are parties to the proceeding, to make their statements with the proviso that they also name their joint representative – within a maximum of fifteen days – with whom the competition council proceeding in the case shall initiate consultation(s) in the interest of reaching a common understanding during the settlement procedure. To this end, the authorisation of the joint representative and his duly signed statement to confidentiality, which the competition council proceeding in the case sends together with the invitation for the statement, shall be attached to the written statement submitted for the purpose of initiating the settlement procedure.
101. The only purpose of the designation of a joint representative is to facilitate the settlement procedure; it does not affect in any way the establishment of liability for the infringement. The competition council proceeding in the case may, in light of the particular circumstances of the case (e.g. in the event of a conflict of interest), refrain from obliging the undertakings belonging to the same group of undertakings subject to the procedure to appoint or authorise a joint representative.

VIII. Final provisions

102. The GVH shall apply this Notice – considering as referred to in paragraph 103 – in procedures initiated after 1 January 2018 (including also repeated proceedings) and in ongoing proceedings, at the same time Notice No 3/2015 of the President of the Hungarian Competition Authority and the Chair of the Competition Council of the Hungarian Competition Authority shall expire.
103. The GVH shall apply the GRAP Act and the provisions of Act LVII of 1996 on the Prohibition of Unfair and Restrictive Market Practices and the related statutory provisions modified by Act CXXIX of 2017 referred to in this Notice in proceedings initiated after 1 January 2018.

* Overruled by paragraph 10 of the GVH Notice 2/2018. Regarding its application see paragraph 104.

104. The provisions of this Notice amended by Notice No 2/2018 of the President of the Hungarian Competition Authority and the Chair of the Competition Council of the Hungarian Competition Authority on the amendments of previous notices shall be applied by the GVH in settlement procedures laid down in Article 73/A of the Competition Act, which are initiated after 1 January 2019.*

Budapest, 19 January 2019

Dr. Miklós JUHÁSZ
President of the GVH

Dr. András TÓTH
President of the GVH Competition Council

* Introduced by the paragraph 11 of the GVH Notice 2/2018.

Annex I. – Flow chart of the process of the settlement procedure

(with the exception of the case described in paragraph 29)

