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MR HOSKINS: Good morning.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Good morning, Mr Hoskins. We are in open court at the moment.
The outstanding matter is we should probably give
a short ruling on the matters that were subject to those applications yesterday evening.
Ruling (sent for approval)

MR JUSTICE BARLING: There we are, that's that. Mr Hoskins, as I said, I'm not sure which is going to be the first
witness you are going to call.
MR HOSKINS: Today you mean?
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Yes.
MR HOSKINS: I just have a couple of bits of housekeeping if you want to do that first.

Housekeeping
MR HOSKINS: This is an updated witness timetable. As you know we have Mr Perez and Mr Tittarelli today. MRJUSTICE BARLING: Yes. MR HOSKINS: Then Wednesday will be Mr Willeart -MRJUSTICE BARLING: Right. MR HOSKINS: -- and Mr Koboldt. MR JUSTICE BARLING: So it will be Mr Willeart and
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Mr Koboldt on Wednesday?
MR HOSKINS: That is right.
MRJUSTICE BARLING: Yes.
MR HOSKINS: Then if you are happy to sit Thursday pm, it would be Mr Sidenius then and that gives Mr Brealey a bit more time to consider the evidence. So Perez and Tittarelli today; Willeart and Koboldt tomorrow; and then Thursday pm, Mr Sidenius.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Yes. What about Mr Willeart? MR HOSKINS: That's tomorrow, Willeart and Koboldt. MR JUSTICE BARLING: Tomorrow, right. Got that. So we retain Thursday morning as a non-sitting --
MR HOSKINS: That is right.
MRJUSTICE BARLING: Right.
MR HOSKINS: There's one other matter, I have just been told there is a document that's come to Jones Day's attention that they believe should have been disclosed and wasn't. MRJUSTICE BARLING: Right.
MR HOSKINS: It is a document that relates -- it is a Europe interchange committee decision and it was dated 28th October 2014. It actually relates to the decision to taper down the MIF with a view to the regulation coming into effect. Mr Brealey asked questions about it yesterday.
Again, our view is, having come across this, it has
to be disclosed. Mr Brealey clearly can't be
disadvantaged. I know Mr Perez's name isn't on the list
of attendees but Mr Tittarelli's is. I have only just seen this. Mr Brealey's team has only just seen it.
I suggest that they have a chance to absorb it and
I will speak to him in the break.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Are you calling Mr Perez first?
MR HOSKINS: I'm calling Mr Perez first. Also, if there is a problem we will need to sort it out, so they have time to deal --
MRJUSTICE BARLING: Yes, that's fine. Now a lot of Mr Perez's evidence is shaded, isn't it?
MR HOSKINS: It is, yes.
MRJUSTICE BARLING: We have to do as much as possible in open court but I think we are really in Mr Brealey's hands as to whether he is going to delve straight into confidential matters, in which case there's not much point starting -- we might as well go into camera if that's the application, or it may be you feel you can deal with it as you have done with some other witnesses.
MR BREALEY: I'm conscious that we should be in open court as much as possible, which is what is my Lord told me. I will do my best to -- if we go into any of the blue bits, I will let Mr Perez read.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: So we will see how we get on? Okay.
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MR HOSKINS: I'm very happy, but obviously the Tribunal will bear in mind as well that Mr Perez has to be free to talk, I know I keep saying that. I'm grateful to Mr Brealey, it is not a criticism, but there is that other aspect to it as well.
MRJUSTICE BARLING: I think what we might do is explain to
Mr Perez, if he doesn't already realise, which he probably does, but if he feels inhibited and can't give a full answer without straying into confidential matters then it wouldn't be in the interests of justice to let him continue trying and we ought to go into camera.
MR HOSKINS: Thank you. I will call Mr Perez then.

## MR JAVIER PEREZ (affirmed)

MR JUSTICE BARLING: Thank you, Mr Perez. Mr Perez just before Mr Hoskins addresses you, you heard what we were just talking about. A lot of your witness statement is actually said to be confidential.
A. Your Honour, if we then go into something confidential, do I need to stop?
MR JUSTICE BARLING: The point is this, we need to get your full answers, we don't want you to give half answers, when you feel there is something else you want to say but you are afraid to say it because we are in open court. So I think if you feel you can't give a full answer to Mr Brealey's questions in particular, without
straying into material that is confidential, then
I think you should tell us and then we will have to
consider going into camera.
A. Understood. Thank you very much.
Examination-in-chief by MR HOSKINS
MR HOSKINS: Good morning, Mr Perez. You should have
bundle C2 in front of you. If you go to tab 5, there
should be a witness statement of Javier Perez.
A. Yes.
Q. If you just flick through the pages -- no need to read
them -- to the end, just confirm that is your witness
statement.
A. That is indeed.
Q. On the final page, page 91 , you will see a signature.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that your signature?
A. It is.
Q. Can you confirm that the contents of this witness
statement are true?
A. Yes, they are.
MR HOSKINS: Thank you very much. Mr Brealey has some
questions.
Cross-examination by MR BREALEY
MR BREALEY: Good morning, Mr Perez. You have got your
statement in front of you, I take it?
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A. Yes, I do.
Q. Just to recap on the background, from 1996 to 2004 you were general manager of customer division for MasterCard Europe?
A. Correct.
Q. Could you just assist the Tribunal, what did actually that entail? What is the general manager of the customer division?
A. It is -- probably the easiest way to put it is the commercial role. Fundamentally, anything that has to do with clients, advertising, promotions, those things that are mostly business related. That would exclude, for example, IT, technology, HR, accounting, finance. Broadly, I think that would be a fair explanation.
Q. When you say "clients", you mean the licensees, the banks?
A. Yes, some were banks but not all of them.
Q. Some were financial institutions?
A. Correct.
Q. Since 2006 you have been responsible for MasterCard's European operations, so you are President of MasterCard Europe SPRL, could you just tell the Tribunal what does that entail.
A. Basically I oversee the operations of MasterCard in Europe -- yes, I guess that's a good way to put it.
Q. So you oversee -- forgive me -- the operations in Europe?
A. Mmm .
Q. So does that involve the litigation in this case?
A. The one that we are in right now?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Did that involve the proceedings before the OFT?
A. There were many proceedings before the OFT.
Q. What about in 2006 when you came back from the

Caribbean -- if you were in the Caribbean.
A. I wish I was in the Caribbean. Actually, you are probably technically correct. Yes, so I did come back and, yes, I did get involved with our legal activities right away, yes.
Q. When you were the general manager of the customer division, so dealing with clients, and the original OFT proceedings started in the early 2000s, were you involved then?
A. Not directly no.
Q. But you were aware of them?
A. I was aware of them, yes.
Q. You mention in paragraph 16 other countries, other anti-trust investigations in other countries. Could you just summarise what other countries, this is
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paragraph 16 of your witness statement.
A. "There has been a longstanding anti-trust ...(Reading to the words)... and domestic interest in some EEA countries."
So, for example, there are plenty of countries actually, if one thinks about that period of time. So it could be Italy, it could be France, it could be the UK, it could be Spain, it could be Hungary, it could be Poland, quite a few countries indeed.
Q. Right, all challenging the level of the interchange fee, or the majority of them challenging the interchange fee?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm just going to read something that MasterCard said in opening and I want you to tell me if you agree with it, and it relates to Maestro and I'm going to ask some questions about Maestro. So, again, I don't know whether that's confidential but that's where I'm going. I will read it out, you don't need to go to it, but what is said is:
"Of course what we have in the UK is the Maestro experience. It is a particular characteristic of the UK market. It has not previously been considered by any court or regulator."
In your recollection, is that correct or not?
A. Not really, no. I think that the Maestro experience in
the UK -- of course, the UK is a different market than other markets, obviously, but I don't think the fundamentals of what happen in the UK are different than others, ie I suppose you are referring to why we lost the Maestro business in the UK, and I don't think that it is different in other countries, fundamentally different. There are differences, yes, but not in the essence of what happened.
Q. But did you -- not you, I will come onto your involvement a bit later on -- but did MasterCard ever inform the OFT, what then became the CMA, of the Maestro experience that you briefly referred to in your witness statement, paragraphs 45 and 47 ?
A. I wouldn't know. I don't know, I'm not sure.
Q. I'm going to take you to some documents and see if we can refresh your memory. The first bundle I want to go to is bundle E1. It is tab 3, it is page 224 and it is paragraph 637. There are two pages. This is the OFT decision, you have probably seen. It is the decision of the Office of Fair Trading, 6th September 2005. On the bottom right-hand -- I don't know whether you should mark it or not -- should the witness mark the document? MRJUSTICE BARLING: If it helps. MR BREALEY: Okay. The bottom right-hand, page 224. A. I think I'm there.
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Q. This is what was being submitted by MasterCard to the OFT prior to its decision. It is under the heading:
"The MMF MIF must be set by reference to competitive constraints. Summary of the arguments made ..."
This is MasterCard submitting at 367:
"The OFT fails to recognise the freedom to set the MFF MIF is indispensable to the scheme, as any outcome that fettered this freedom would place the scheme at a competitive disadvantage."
Pausing there, at 537 there is a footnote,
paragraph 566. There has been no disclosure of that, so we can't actually work out what was actually submitted but we get the sense at 637:
"The MMF MIF must be set by reference to competition provided by other payment card schemes, in particular the Visa scheme. The MasterCard scheme must be able to set and if necessary vary the amount of the MMF MIF to be able to respond to competition. Freedom to do this is indispensable to the MasterCard scheme, as any limit to its ability to recover overall costs would put the scheme at a severe disadvantage."
Then, 638 , some of it is redacted, argues:
"Without this freedom, competition would be distorted in favour of the Visa scheme and issuers/ acquirers would move to three-party schemes.

This would have significant detrimental effects on issuers and acquirers."
It is a very similar point that you are making in paragraphs 45 to 47 of your statement. So I would like to take you to the OFT's response and ask you how MasterCard reacted to this, if you can assist the Tribunal. At 639 it says:
"In essence, this argument suggests that the costs of additional features [I take that to be the free funding for example] can legitimately be recovered with the MMF MIF irrespective of how peripheral these features may be to the completion of a transaction, simply because competing payment card schemes also consider that the recovery of these costs is necessary. On this basis, otherwise unlawful conduct would become lawful if others also engaged in it. The OFT cannot accept this as a justification for the recovery of extraneous costs through the MMF MIF."
You have just heard from the Tribunal that the Tribunal will make up its own mind and will not be bound by what the OFT or the European Commission has said, because I have accepted that. But can I ask you whether you were aware of this principle or of this reaction by the regulatory body?
A. If your question is did I know that that was going to be
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the answer of the OFT? No, I didn't.
Q. No. Were you aware of this answer?
A. After the fact?
Q. After the fact.
A. Yes.
Q. So you were aware, at least from 2005, that -- and we will go back again -- it would not be a justification to say, well, Visa also operates a similar scheme and I will lose business to Visa.
A. Of course, the fact that I'm aware doesn't mean that I agree with it, right? So I think the statement is quite clear. I think what we were saying, and we keep on saying and we keep on repeating, is that unless we are able to compete on the economics, if we are disadvantaged versus another scheme because we are artificially constrained from providing all the benefits that our clients need and request, it is very difficult to compete, if not impossible.
Q. Can you go back in this document, this decision, to paragraph 55 , the procedure, which is page 66 of the bundle. I don't suppose you have --
A. Got it.
Q. Have you read this? I don't suppose you have. You may have read it.
A. I don't recollect. You haven't given me a chance to
read it so I don't even know whether I have read it or
not.
Q. No. So it is page 66 of the bundle. I want to just
highlight the procedure here in front of the OFT. If
I can just highlight certain passages. You will see
paragraph 57 . There was a complaint made in
September 2000 against both MasterCard, Visa and Switch
card services.
You were aware that the retailers were complaining
about all the schemes in the UK?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Then, at 59, again this is a MasterCard proceeding, you
will see the last sentence of 59 , the OFT provided
non-confidential versions of the rule 14 to Visa
International. Then, over the page at 61 you will see
there written representations received by various banks
and submissions were also received with Visa
International. Were you aware that the banks and Visa
were actively participating in the OFT proceedings
against MasterCard?
A. Yes.
Q. You will see there at 64 the OFT also provided the
non-confidential version of the SR14 to Visa
International and the same goes on.
If one goes on to page 70 of this decision, you will
see here -- this is under the legal and economic assessment, and then "Background", and the OFT refers to the Commission's Visa International proceedings. I take it that you were aware of the Visa exemption in 2002?
A. I must have been, yes.
Q. If you go to paragraph 81, which is the last paragraph on page 71:
"On many key points there is considerable similarity between the reasoning relied on and conclusions reached by the OFT in this decision."
Were you aware that the reasoning and conclusions in the Visa decision would apply equally to MasterCard?
A. No, because I think they were separate proceedings. There was no reason why -- it would have been expected but I can't say that they wouldn't have been the same place with us as with Visa, unfortunately meaning, as you will see we have repeatedly insisted, that an equal level playing field where we can compete is important.
Q. As far as Visa is concerned, I think you have achieved that, haven't you?
A. You mean with the legislation that the Commission has put through, the late legislation?
Q. Let's take the legislation: you have achieved that, the level playing field?
A. In the legislation that is going into place, I would
say, in the legislation, yes.
Q. Visa offered commitments, you gave undertakings to reduce your EEA MIF to $0.3 \%$ on credit cards?
A. At some point in time in the past, yes, we did.
Q. A few years' gap but at the end you achieved a level playing field?
A. It depends what you call -- if you talk about the legislation we have in place today, the answer is yes. Over time what I would say is that -- over time what has happened is that I think the Commission has tried to really achieve that level playing field, over time, and at some times they have, at some times they haven't. Sometimes we have been disadvantaged, sometimes we have been advantaged. So ...
Q. Have you achieved a level playing field?
A. With the legislation, yes.
Q. If you go over the page in the context of what

MasterCard was arguing here at 82 and 83, if you just read that. 82 and 83.
A. Sorry, you want me to --
Q. Not read it out. We always make that mistake. If you
can just read it to yourself, paragraphs 82 and 83.
A. Paragraph 82, sorry. I thought you meant page.
Q. Over the page. So it is paragraph.
A. 82 and 83 , yes. (Pause)

## 15

Q. In particular 83, where the OFT says:
"It is certainly not the case" --
A. I'm sorry, I'm a little bit slow, I apologise.
Q. No, go on, you finish. (Pause)
A. Go ahead.
Q. So at 83:
"It is certainly not the case, has been argued ..." You will see the Visa submission:
"... that the OFT has rejected the Commission's analysis in the Visa MIF decision out of hand."

Do you see that? So, were you aware that Visa was arguing that its Visa decision should be applied to MasterCard?
A. When was this? At which year is this?
Q. This is after -- this is -- you see the Visa submission is 2005, 25th February.
A. Because --
Q. It was three years after its exemption decision.
A. Because at some point, yes, of course, I know that Visa was suggesting that MasterCard -- MasterCard should be brought down to the same level as MasterCard.(sic)
Q. But MasterCard was arguing that the Visa exemption should apply to it, correct?
A. On which case? I'm sorry, it is just that -- that is a very general statement.

1 Q. In this case, are you aware that MasterCard was arguing that the Visa exemption should apply to its methodology?
A. Yes.
Q. Why should the Visa methodology apply to MasterCard?
A. Because to the best of my knowledge, if I recall this correctly, the Visa methodology and the MasterCard methodology were based on cost and therefore similar.
Q. Because, essentially, they are identical four-party payment schemes, correct?
A. I don't think they are identical, no.
Q. Very similar?
A. Similar, yes.
Q. Right. So they are very similar?
A. I wouldn't say very similar, no.
Q. Why wouldn't you say they are very similar?
A. Why do you say --
Q. I'm not here to answer the questions Mr Perez, you are here to give evidence.
A. Yes, so what's your question?
Q. Are their schemes very similar?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Because I think what we offer and what Visa offers is similar but not very similar to our clients, in terms of products, in terms of branding, in terms of positioning,
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in terms of interaction with our clients, in terms of client management and things like that.
Q. What about just the mechanics of it? Four-party schemes; do you at least accept that they operate in a similar way --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the two four-party schemes?
A. That I would agree with.
Q. Thank you. I think you can put that -- actually, if you could just go to tab 5 of this bundle, we finished with the OFT decision. Tab 5, this is a press release from the Office of Fair Trading. It hasn't been copied that well, but you see there:
"The OFT is to refocus credit card interchange fees, work."

OFT sets aside its decision but it is starting an investigation afresh into both Visa and MasterCard. Were you aware that in 2006 the OFT launched an investigation into both Visa and MasterCard?
A. Yes.
Q. You can put that bundle away. If you can go to bundle E3.12 please. The tab that I want to go to is tab 210A. This hasn't been blued so I take it ... (Pause) It is blue?

MR SMITH: It is blue.
MR BREALEY: Oh. (Pause)
Then I'm going to have to ask questions on this, I'm afraid.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Right. This is MasterCard's material, isn't it?
MR BREALEY: It is and I want to ask questions about the Maestro --
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Yes, all right. I'm afraid we are going to have to ask those people who are not in the confidentiality ring and who are not -- if they are in the confidentiality ring if there's anyone in this category who is not able to hear MasterCard's confidential information then I'm going to have to ask those people to be kind enough to leave the court.
MR HOSKINS: Sir, I don't want to add to the degree of difficulty but we had yesterday some people from MasterCard and there are some of the witnesses from MasterCard today. They have not all signed the undertaking. I'm not being facetious but Mr Perez hasn't signed the undertaking. Do you want them to leave, do you want them to sign the undertaking? MR JUSTICE BARLING: I think everyone who is listening to this information should sign the undertaking.
MR HOSKINS: We will get the witnesses to sign undertakings.
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It is done. They've all signed.
MRJUSTICE BARLING: You have a highly efficient team behind you.

Sorry about this, those of you who have to go.
(11.13 am)
(End of open session)
(The court adjourned until 10.30 am on
Wednesday, 10th February 2016)
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