

Statement regarding the CMA's decision to close an investigation into suspected anti-competitive conduct in relation to the supply of chemicals for use in the construction industry on the grounds of administrative priority

Parties: The CMA has not named the parties to the investigation

Case reference: 51343

Case closed: 23 January 2025

Issue: Suspected breaches of competition law relating to the supply of chemical admixtures and additives for use in concrete, cement, mortars and related construction products

Relevant provision: Chapter I of the Competition Act 1998 (CA98)

Summary of closure decision

The CMA has closed its investigation into suspected anti-competitive conduct relating to the supply of chemical admixtures and additives for use in concrete, cement, mortars and related construction products in the UK on the grounds that the investigation no longer constitutes an administrative priority. This decision does not amount to a statement or finding as to whether the parties to the investigation have infringed competition law, nor should any inference be made to that effect.

The CMA launched an investigation under Chapter I of the CA98 on 17 October 2023 because it had reasonable grounds for suspecting that certain suppliers of these chemicals and certain industry bodies had breached Chapter I of the CA98.

Following a period of evidence gathering and assessment, the CMA considered whether to continue with the investigation in light of its Prioritisation Principles. The Prioritisation Principles set out the factors that the CMA considers before deciding whether to take action. To make efficient and effective use of public resources, the CMA needs to ensure it takes appropriate decisions about which projects and programmes of work it prioritises (and continues to prioritise), to have the greatest impact across the breadth of its work.

Having given the parties the opportunity to comment on the CMA's proposed action, the CMA has decided to discontinue its investigation into all parties involved on the grounds of administrative priorities. In taking this decision, the CMA carefully assessed the evidence obtained and had regard to its Prioritisation Principles and to the CMA's other current priorities in its overall portfolio of work. In accordance with its Prioritisation Principles, the CMA considered several factors, including whether the CMA is best placed to act (that is, whether there is an appropriate alternative to CMA action), the strategic significance of the investigation, its likely impact in terms of delivering benefits to consumers and deterring anti-competitive conduct, the likelihood of it achieving the desired impact, and the required resources.¹

A decision to close the case on administrative priority grounds does not prevent the CMA from opening an investigation in the future if its priorities change or if it receives new evidence which changes its prioritisation assessment.

¹ See [Prioritisation Principles \(CMA188\)](#) and [Guidance on the CMA's investigation procedures in Competition Act 1998 cases \(CMA8\)](#), paragraphs 10.2–10.12.