US-China Law Review, Mar.-Apr. 2026, Vol. 23, No. 2, 69-76
doi:10.17265/1548-6605/2026.02.001

Antitrust Safe Harbors in the European Union and the United States: Institutional Paths and Theoretical Foundations

WANG Zichao
University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China

This article examines antitrust safe harbor regimes in the European Union and the United States. It outlines the EU's legislation-led framework, centered on block exemptions and the *de minimis* rule, and the US model of *de facto* safe harbors developed through case law, agency guidance, and procedural practice. It also discusses the theoretical foundations of safe harbors, focusing on the error-cost framework and the chilling effect. The article highlights the common logic underlying different safe harbor models and their role in improving legal certainty and enforcement efficiency.

Keywords: antitrust safe harbor, block exemption, de minimis, self-assessment

Introduction

Antitrust safe harbors constitute a significant institutional arrangement widely adopted across major competition law jurisdictions. They serve as mechanisms through which legal certainty is introduced into a field otherwise characterized by analytical complexity and enforcement discretion. In competition law, the term refers to a set of rules or mechanisms that clarify legal responsibility and, in some cases, provide immunity or presumptive legality where predefined conditions, such as market share thresholds, are satisfied.

Across major antitrust jurisdictions, safe harbor regimes have become an important institutional tool in modern competition governance. Their scope has expanded beyond monopoly agreements to encompass merger control and, in some instances, certain forms of unilateral conduct. Although these regimes differ considerably in legal form and specific rules, reflecting differences in legal traditions, market structures, and competition policies, they share a common objective: to enhance legal predictability, guide enterprise compliance, and reduce unnecessary intervention in conduct unlikely to produce substantial anticompetitive effects.

In institutional design, antitrust safe harbor regimes generally follow two principal modes: legislative authorization and judicial derivation. The European Union exemplifies the former through a relatively comprehensive framework based on Block Exemption Regulations, the *de minimis* rule, notices, and guidelines. The United States illustrates the latter, having developed a series of *de facto* safe harbors through judicial precedent, enforcement guidelines, and procedural mechanisms such as Business Review Letters and FTC (Federal Trade Commission) advisory opinions.

WANG Zichao, Ph.D. in Economic Law, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China. This paper is partially derived from his doctoral dissertation, titled "Research on the System of Antitrust "Safe Harbor"".

Against this background, this article undertakes a comparative study of the European Union and the United States. It examines the EU's legislation-led and progressively systematized safe harbor regime, the US model of *de facto* safe harbors developed through case law, agency guidance, and procedural practice, and the theoretical foundations of antitrust safe harbors, focusing on the error-cost framework and the chilling effect. It shows that antitrust safe harbors should be understood not as marginal exceptions to competition law, but as important institutional tools for making competition enforcement more predictable, rational, and effective.

The EU Approach to Antitrust Safe Harbors

Among major jurisdictions, the European Union offers the most representative example of a legislation-led and gradually evolving safe harbor regime. Over several decades, the EU has developed its safe harbor regime through a continuous process of normative refinement, drawing on treaties, regulations, notices, guidelines, and other soft-law instruments.

At the core of the EU regime lies the legal foundation established by what is now Article 101 TFEU, particularly Paragraph (3)[1], which permits exemptions for agreements that generate efficiencies, benefit consumers, and do not eliminate competition. This provision reflects a fundamental principle of EU competition law: Not all restrictions of competition are harmful, and some may be justified by their economic effects. It is this balance between prohibition and efficiency that provides the normative basis for the development of safe harbor rules.

The early enforcement system, established by Regulation No. 17/62[2], relied on a centralized model of individual exemption, under which undertakings were required to notify agreements to the Commission and obtain formal approval. While this system ensured legal certainty, it soon proved administratively burdensome and inefficient as the number of notified agreements increased. The resulting backlog highlighted the limits of case-by-case authorization and created pressure for more general, rule-based mechanisms.

In response, the EU gradually shifted toward a system of block exemptions, which marked the first major step toward a functional safe harbor regime. Instead of relying on individualized decisions, block exemption regulations defined categories of agreements that would automatically qualify for exemption if certain conditions were met. This transition significantly reduced administrative costs and provided undertakings with greater predictability. Over time, block exemptions expanded to cover a wide range of vertical and horizontal agreements, including distribution arrangements, technology licensing, research and development cooperation, and specialization agreements.

Alongside block exemptions, the EU developed the *de minimis* rule[3], which excludes agreements with only insignificant effects on competition from the scope of Article 101(1). Originating in the case law of the Court of Justice, this principle was later formalized through Commission notices and progressively translated into quantifiable thresholds based on market share. The *de minimis* rule reflects the principle of proportionality and

---

[1] Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union Art. 101(3), Oct. 26, 2012, 2012 O.J. (C 326) 47.
[2] Council Regulation No. 17, First Regulation Implementing Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty, 1962 O.J. (013) 204 (EEC), https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A31962R0017.
[3] European Commission, Antitrust: Commission adopts revised safe harbour rules for minor agreements ("*De Minimis* Notice"), https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_14_728.

serves to filter out trivial cases, allowing enforcement efforts to focus on conduct with meaningful competitive impact.

Together, block exemptions and the *de minimis* rule form the two pillars of the EU safe harbor regime. Their functions are complementary: Block exemptions provide *ex ante* legal certainty for specific categories of agreements, while the *de minimis* rule operates as an exclusionary threshold, ensuring that only appreciable restraints are subject to scrutiny. This dual structure enables the EU to balance regulatory effectiveness with economic flexibility.

A key feature of the EU regime is its gradual transition from qualitative to quantitative standards. Early block exemptions relied heavily on lists of permitted and prohibited clauses, but over time, market share thresholds became the central organizing principle. Modern block exemption regulations typically employ a structured approach combining (i) market share threshold, (ii) lists of hardcore restrictions that exclude agreements from the safe harbor, and (iii) additional conditions or excluded restrictions. This framework enhances transparency and allows undertakings to assess compliance with a relatively high degree of confidence.

The modernization of EU competition law in the early 2000s further strengthened the role of safe harbors. With the adoption of Regulation No. 1/2003[4], the EU replaced the notification system with a regime of self-assessment, under which undertakings themselves determine whether their agreements satisfy the conditions of Article 101(3). At the same time, enforcement powers were decentralized to national competition authorities and courts. In this new context, safe harbor rules became even more important, as they provide essential guidance in the absence of prior administrative approval.

Recent developments have continued to refine and update the EU safe harbor framework. The current generation of block exemption regulations, including those governing vertical agreements, technology transfer, and horizontal cooperation, maintains the core structure of market-share-based thresholds combined with strict prohibitions on hardcore restrictions. At the same time, the Commission has adapted these rules to new market realities, particularly in the context of digital platforms and online distribution, demonstrating the regime's capacity for dynamic adjustment.

Beyond agreements, safe harbor logic has also influenced EU merger control, where turnover thresholds, market share benchmarks, and simplified procedures are used to identify transactions unlikely to raise competition concerns.[5] Although not always labeled as safe harbors, these mechanisms reflect the same underlying principle: Regulatory resources should be concentrated on cases with significant competitive risk.

Overall, the evolution of the EU antitrust safe harbor regime reflects a systematic and incremental legislative process rooted in treaty-based principles and developed through successive layers of regulation and guidance. From a comparative perspective, this formally structured framework has achieved a relatively high degree of coherence and stability, while enhancing both legal certainty and enforcement efficiency by clearly delineating low-risk conduct, reducing unnecessary intervention, and preserving the capacity to address genuinely harmful practices. At the same time, its reliance on continuous revision and soft-law instruments enables it to remain

[4] 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.

[5] See Council Regulation 139/2004, Art. 1, 2004 O.J. (L 24) 1; Commission Notice on a simplified treatment for certain concentrations under Council Regulation (EC) No. 139/2004, 2023 O.J. (C 160) 1; Guidelines on the assessment of horizontal mergers under the Council Regulation on the control of concentrations between undertakings, 2004 O.J. (C 31) 5, Paras. 14-21.

responsive to changing market conditions, making the EU experience a particularly valuable reference point for jurisdictions seeking to develop a balanced and effective antitrust safe harbor framework.

The US Approach to Antitrust Safe Harbors

Unlike the European Union, the United States has never established a formal antitrust safe harbor regime through statutory exemption clauses or a unified legislative framework. The Sherman Act contains no equivalent to Article 101(3) TFEU, and Congress has not created a codified system of exemptions. Instead, US antitrust law has developed a series of *de facto* safe harbors through judicial precedents, agency guidance, and procedural practices. These safe harbors do not operate as formal legality thresholds or exemptions, but rather function as evidentiary and analytical screens within the rule-of-reason framework, identifying conduct unlikely to produce substantial anticompetitive effects.

The emergence of these *de facto* safe harbors is closely tied to the evolution of American antitrust analysis. In the early enforcement of the Sherman Act, courts relied heavily on the *per se* rule, under which certain restraints were deemed unlawful without inquiry into their actual market effects. While this approach provided clarity and reduced enforcement costs, it risked condemning conduct that could enhance efficiency or benefit consumers. In response, the Supreme Court gradually moved toward the rule of reason, under which only unreasonable restraints of trade are prohibited.

This transformation began with *Standard Oil Co. v. United States*[6] in 1911 and was further elaborated in *Chicago Board of Trade v. United States v. United States*[7] in 1918. However, for much of the twentieth century, courts continued to apply the *per se* rule to many horizontal and vertical restraints. It was not until the 1970s that the Supreme Court began to systematically narrow *per se* illegality and expand rule-of-reason analysis. In *Continental T.V. v. GTE Sylvania*[8], the court held that non-price vertical restraints should be assessed under the rule of reason, recognizing that such arrangements may promote inter-brand competition. Subsequent decisions, including *BMI*[9], *NCAA*[10], *State Oil v. Khan*[11], and *Leegin*[12], further reinforced this shift, establishing the modern framework in which the rule of reason is the default approach and *per se* illegality is limited to clearly harmful conduct.

However, the rule of reason introduced significant uncertainty, high litigation costs, and broad judicial discretion. To mitigate these concerns, courts gradually developed a set of *de facto* safe harbors, which serve to screen out low-risk conduct and simplify antitrust analysis. These safe harbors typically rely on measurable indicators—such as market share, foreclosure levels, or price-cost relationships—to determine whether a full rule-of-reason inquiry is necessary.

In the context of horizontal cooperation, courts have sometimes required plaintiffs to demonstrate that defendants possess a minimum level of market power before proceeding with a full analysis. This reflects the

---

6 *Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. United States*, 221 U.S. 1 (1911).
7 *Chicago Board of Trade v. United States*, 246 U.S. 231 (1918).
8 *Continental T.V., Inc. v. GTE Sylvania, Inc.*, 433 U.S. 36 (1977).
9 *Broadcast Music, Inc. v. CBS, Inc.*, 441 U.S. 1 (1979).
10 *NCAA v. Board of Regents of University of Oklahoma*, 468 U.S. 85 (1984).
11 *State Oil Co. v. Khan*, 522 U.S. 3 (1997).
12 *Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. v. PSKS, Inc.*, 551 U.S. 877 (2007).

understanding that firms with low market shares are unlikely to cause substantial competitive harm. In practice, courts have occasionally cited the Competitor Collaboration Guidelines, while the Guidelines themselves provided a safety zone under which collaborations with combined market shares below 20 percent were generally viewed as unlikely to raise antitrust concerns. Although not formally binding, such thresholds have functioned as *de facto* safe harbors, limiting the scope of judicial intervention.

In the area of vertical restraints, courts have developed similar screening mechanisms based on substantial foreclosure. In *Tampa Electric*[13], the Supreme Court held that exclusive dealing arrangements are unlawful only when they foreclose a substantial share of the market. Later, in *Jefferson Parish*, the Court indicated that foreclosure levels around 30 percent are generally insufficient to establish anticompetitive harm. Lower courts have since treated foreclosure below roughly 30 to 40 percent as unlikely to meet the threshold for liability.[14] In tying cases, courts have likewise required proof of sufficient market power before imposing liability. These doctrines collectively function as *de facto* safe harbors based on market power and foreclosure thresholds.

Courts have also developed safe-harbor-like rules based on contract duration and terminability. Short-term exclusive agreements that can be terminated on short notice are typically viewed as unlikely to produce significant exclusionary effects. As such, they are often treated as falling within a *temporal de facto* safe harbor, signaling that such arrangements do not ordinarily warrant antitrust condemnation.

In the field of unilateral conduct, the most prominent *de facto* safe harbor is the price-cost test established in *Brooke Group*[15]. The Supreme Court held that a predatory pricing claim requires proof of both below-cost pricing and a likelihood of recoupment. Crucially, the Court made clear that pricing above cost does not constitute predatory conduct, regardless of intent. This rule creates a clear and powerful cost-based *de facto* safe harbor, which was reaffirmed in *LinkLine*[16] and extended to bundled discount cases such as *PeaceHealth*[17]. Similarly, in *Copperweld*[18], the Court held that a parent and its wholly owned subsidiary constitute a single entity and therefore cannot conspire under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, effectively creating a structural boundary that shields intra-enterprise coordination.

Beyond judicial doctrine, US antitrust safe harbors are also shaped by agency guidelines and policy statements issued by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission. Although these instruments lack binding legal force, they play a critical role in structuring enforcement expectations. The 1982 Horizontal Merger Guidelines[19] introduced the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index and used concentration thresholds to identify transactions unlikely to raise concerns. Later documents, such as the 1995 Intellectual Property Guidelines[20] and the 2000 Competitor Collaboration Guidelines[21], articulated similar safety zones based on

---

[13] *Tampa Elec. Co. v. Nashville Coal Co.*, 365 U.S. 320 (1961).
[14] *Jefferson Parish Hospital District No. 2 v. Hyde*, 466 U.S. 2 (1984).
[15] *Brooke Group Ltd. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 509 U.S. 209 (1993).
[16] *Pacific Bell Telephone Co. v. LinkLine Communications, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 438 (2009).
[17] *Cascade Health Sols. v. PeaceHealth*, 515 F.3d 883 (9th Cir. 2008).
[18] *Copperweld v. Independence Tube*, 467 U.S. 752 (1984).
[19] U.S. Dep't of Justice, 1982 Merger Guidelines, https://www.justice.gov/archives/atr/1982-merger-guidelines.
[20] U.S. Dep't of Justice & Fed. Trade Comm'n, Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property (Apr. 6, 1995), https://www.justice.gov/atr/archived-1995-antitrust-guidelines-licensing-intellectual-property.
[21] U.S. Dep't of Justice & Fed. Trade Comm'n, Antitrust Guidelines for Collaborations Among Competitors (Apr. 2000), https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public_events/joint-venture-hearings-antitrust-guidelines-collaboration-among-competitors/ftcdojguidelines-2.pdf.

market-share thresholds, often around 20 percent. These guidelines have contributed to the institutionalization of policy-based *de facto* safe harbors, even in the absence of formal legislation.

The United States has also developed procedural safe harbors through advisory mechanisms. The FTC may issue advisory opinions, and the DOJ may issue business review letters indicating whether it currently intends to challenge proposed conduct. While not legally binding, these mechanisms provide firms with advance guidance and reduce uncertainty, thereby functioning as procedural extensions of the broader *de facto* safe harbor system.

In recent years, however, US antitrust policy has shifted toward a more cautious approach to safe harbors. The withdrawal of earlier guidelines and the adoption of the 2023 Merger Guidelines[22] reflect a move away from clear safety zones toward more flexible, case-specific analysis. This shift has generated debate: Critics argue that it increases uncertainty and may deter efficient conduct, while proponents contend that rigid thresholds may fail to capture modern competitive risks.

Overall, the United States has developed its antitrust safe harbor regime through a multidimensional process centered on *de facto* safe harbors, shaped by case law, agency guidance, and procedural tools. Compared with the EU's legislation-based model, the US approach is more flexible but also less stable. Its safe harbors function primarily as analytical devices rather than formal legal protections, offering guidance while remaining subject to ongoing doctrinal and policy change.

Theoretical Foundations of Antitrust Safe Harbors

The preceding discussion shows that the European Union and the United States have developed antitrust safe harbors through different institutional paths. In the European Union, safe harbors are embedded in a relatively formal and legislation-led framework centered on block exemptions, the *de minimis* rule, and related guidance instruments. In the United States, by contrast, safe harbors have largely emerged as *de facto* safe harbors through judicial doctrine, agency guidance, and procedural practice. Despite these differences in legal form, both systems respond to the same underlying problem. In each jurisdiction, safe harbors help manage uncertainty in antitrust enforcement and distinguish between conduct that warrants intensive scrutiny and conduct that may justifiably remain outside it.

From the perspective of decision theory, antitrust safe harbors are not merely technical devices for simplifying legal analysis. They are instruments for managing uncertainty, reducing decision costs, and improving enforcement outcomes under conditions of incomplete information. Their central rationale lies in the error-cost framework, which evaluates antitrust rules by reference to the social costs of different enforcement errors and the administrative costs of preventing them. This framework helps explain why both the EU model, with its more formal legality thresholds, and the US model, with its more flexible evidentiary screens, have persisted despite their doctrinal differences.

The underlying difficulty is that antitrust decision-making is inherently uncertain. Markets are dynamic, business practices are context-dependent, and the competitive effects of a restraint often cannot be determined with precision *ex ante*. Conduct that appears restrictive in one setting may generate efficiencies in another. Exclusive dealing, resale price maintenance, information exchange, or certain forms of cooperation may,

[22] U.S. Dep't of Justice & Fed. Trade Comm'n, 2023 Merger Guidelines, https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/2023_merger_guidelines_final_12.18.2023.pdf (last visited on March 25, 2025).

depending on market structure and economic context, either impede competition or enhance it. Antitrust enforcement therefore cannot rely solely on abstract legal categories, because the economic significance of conduct is often uncertain at the moment legal judgment must be made.

The error-cost framework addresses this problem by focusing on three categories of cost. First, there are Type I errors, or false positives, in which the law condemns conduct that is actually benign or procompetitive. Second, there are Type II errors, or false negatives, in which anticompetitive conduct is mistakenly allowed to escape liability. Third, there are the administrative costs of enforcement itself, including information gathering, litigation, adjudication, and business compliance costs. The optimal legal rule is not the one that minimizes one type of error in isolation, but the one that minimizes the overall sum of these costs.

Viewed in this light, the different safe harbor structures described above can be understood as alternative methods of allocating enforcement risk. The EU approach seeks to reduce uncertainty by translating accumulated experience into relatively stable *ex ante* rules, often expressed through market-share thresholds and the exclusion of hardcore restrictions. The US approach, by contrast, seeks to reduce decision costs through *ex post* analytical screens that limit the need for full rule-of-reason inquiry where market power, foreclosure, or predatory risk appears weak. Although the institutional techniques differ, both models perform the same basic filtering function. They identify categories of conduct that are unlikely to generate substantial anticompetitive harm and thereby help enforcement authorities focus resources on higher-risk practices.

This filtering function is closely connected to concerns about the chilling effect of antitrust enforcement. A chilling effect arises when firms, fearing investigation, litigation, or sanctions, refrain not only from harmful conduct but also from legitimate and socially beneficial competitive behavior. Under vague legal standards, firms may avoid aggressive price competition, efficient vertical arrangements, innovative collaborations, or market expansion simply because the legal boundary is unclear. From an error-cost perspective, this concern is especially serious because false positives may generate harms that are difficult to reverse. Beneficial conduct that is wrongly condemned may disappear altogether, and the legal precedent may deter similar conduct by other firms in the future.

Safe harbors respond by providing clearer legal boundaries. They reduce uncertainty, lower compliance costs, and help prevent the chilling of conduct that is likely to be harmless or efficiency-enhancing. At the same time, they do not eliminate enforcement. Rather, they reserve more intensive scrutiny for conduct outside the safe zone or involving especially serious risks. Properly understood, therefore, safe harbors reveal the common logic behind the European and American approaches. The former gives that logic a more formal and rule-based expression, while the latter embeds it within judicially developed screens and enforcement policy. Yet both ultimately seek to reconcile legal certainty with economic complexity and to make antitrust enforcement more rational, more predictable, and more effective.

Conclusion

In conclusion, antitrust safe harbor regimes should be understood not merely as a set of technical rules, but as an important institutional response to a persistent problem in competition law: how to maintain effective enforcement under conditions of economic complexity, imperfect information, and high decision costs. The comparison between the European Union and the United States shows that, although safe harbors may take

different legal forms, they serve a broadly common purpose, namely to enhance legal predictability, guide business compliance, and reduce unnecessary intervention in conduct unlikely to produce substantial competitive harm.

The analysis in this article demonstrates that the EU and U.S. approaches represent two distinct but functionally comparable models. The European Union has developed a predominantly legislation-led and progressively systematized framework, grounded in Article 101(3) TFEU and refined through block exemption regulations, the *de minimis* rule, and related guidance instruments. This model places greater emphasis on formalization, *ex ante* clarity, and rule-based coordination, thereby providing undertakings with a relatively high degree of advance certainty. By contrast, the United States has developed safe harbors largely through judicial doctrine, agency guidance, and procedural practice. In the absence of formal statutory exemptions, U.S. safe harbors operate mainly as evidentiary and analytical screens within the rule-of-reason framework. Although less formalized, this model remains more adaptable to changing economic theories, market conditions, and enforcement priorities.

The deeper significance of antitrust safe harbors lies in their relationship to the error-cost framework. Because competition authorities and courts must make decisions under uncertainty, antitrust law inevitably faces the dual risks of false positives and false negatives. Safe harbor regimes help to structure this choice by reducing the likelihood of costly over-enforcement, lowering decision and compliance costs, and reserving more intensive scrutiny for conduct that presents greater competitive risk. Their value is therefore not limited to simplifying adjudication; it also lies in mitigating the chilling effect that legal uncertainty may impose on legitimate and efficiency-enhancing conduct.

The comparison undertaken here suggests that the contrast between the EU and the United States should not be framed as a simple opposition between certainty and flexibility. Rather, it reflects different institutional emphases in balancing rules and standards, *ex ante* guidance and *ex post* assessment, and the risks of over-enforcement and under-enforcement. Each model has its own internal logic, and each provides useful insights into how safe harbors can improve the quality of competition law enforcement.

Ultimately, antitrust safe harbor regimes should be evaluated not by whether they are strict or permissive in the abstract, but by whether they contribute to more predictable, rational, and effective enforcement. Properly designed, they are not marginal exceptions to competition law, but central instruments through which competition law reconciles legal certainty with the realities of economic analysis and enforcement.