ANAL YSIS OF AGREEMENT CONTAINING CONSENT ORDER TO AID PUBLIC COMMENT In the Matter of Nufarm Limited., File No. 081-0130

I. Introduction

The Federal Trade Commission ("Commission") has accepted, subject to final approval, an Agreement Containing Consent Ord("Consent Agreement") from Nufarm Limited ("Nufarm" or "Respondent") to remedy the anticompetitive effects stemming from Nufarm's acquisition of A.H. Maks HoldingLimited ("A. H. Marks"). Underthe terms of the Consent Agreement, Nufam is required to divest to Commission-approved bueys certain A. H. Marks assets, including egulatory permits and intellect up roperty, and takecertain additional measurs to restore competition in the markets for three phenoxyherbicide products: MCPA, MCPP-p, and 2,4DB.

On March 5, 2008, Nufam acquired A. H Marks. Both parties held, driad access to, regulatory approvals from the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") to sell MCPA, MCPP-p, and 2,4DB in ther lited States. The Commissis complaint allegs that the acquisition and acquisition agreement violated Section 7 of the Ctan Act, as an ended, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and Section 5 of the leal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act"), as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45, by lessening competition in the United States markets for the sale of the phenoxy herbicides: MCPA, MCPP-P, and 2,4DB

The Consent Argement has bereplaced on the public record for thirty (30) days for receipt of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After thirty (30) days, the Commission will review the Consent Agreement and comments one ived and deicle whether to withdraw from the proposed Consent Agreement, modifyit, or make final the Consent Agreement's proposed Ecision and Oder.

II.

III. Entry

Entry into the markets for MCPA, MCPPp and 2,4DB would not be timely, likely, or sufficient to deter or counteract he articompetitive effects of the acquisition. In order to obtain approval to sell herbicides for use oncrops, turf, or lawns in the United States, the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") requires manufacturers to submit extensive environmental and toxicology testing data. Herbicide manufacturers often generate such data by forming industry task forces to share the costs of testing. Later entrants are often required to compensate members of the task force to obtain intellectual property rights to existing testing data by either purchasing the rights to the data or obtaining a seat on the task force. The costs associated with obtaining either the testing data or atask force seat to enter the makets for MCPA, MCPP-p, and 2,4DB are high compared to the limited potential sales revenues available to an entrant in each of these markets. Additionally, obtaining EPA approval for the manufacture and sale of each of the relevant products can take several years due to the presence of regulatory barriers. As a result, entry into each elevant market would require substantial sunk costs that would marketeye

ued todenstobbeg

For both MCPA and MCPP-p, the purchase of a taskforce set and EiPA registration will permit each divestiture purchaser to enter and compete in these markets. By acquiring A.H. Mark's task force seatand EPA registration, the dvestiture purchases will obtain EPA approval to distribute the herbicide in the United States and certify additional manufacturing sources of the herbicides. In addition to the task force seatand EPA registration, Nufam is r

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MCPPp}}$ assets to a trustee in the event Nufarm fails to c