Baker McKenzie.

Client Alert

2025

Latin America: Algorithms, data and antitrust — Latin America's response to AI in markets

In brief

Explore how artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming competition law in Latin America. This article delves into the rapid adoption of AI and algorithmic pricing tools by businesses and the unique antitrust challenges they create. Discover how authorities in Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Argentina, Peru and Colombia are responding to risks like algorithmic collusion, price-fixing and digital market manipulation. With real-world investigations, policy updates and forward-looking studies, the article highlights both the promise and perils of AI-driven markets by offering essential insights into the Latin American competition authorities' perspective and legal approach toward AI.

In this issue

Algorithms, data and antitrust: Latin America's response to AI in markets

AI is steadily gaining momentum throughout Latin America, as companies and government agencies across the region increase their investment in this transformative technology. Recent research anticipates that, by 2029, half of Latin American businesses will have adopted AI in their activities, marking a substantial 30% rise in implementation over the next five years.[1] This surge is already visible, with the proportion of businesses in the region using AI climbing from 58% to 71% between 2020 and 2023.[2] The accelerating growth of AI signals a period of profound change for the activities of economic agents in Latin America, driven by the promise of enhanced efficiency and innovation.

Some applications of AI are becoming extremely relevant for companies' daily operations and can simultaneously present significant antitrust issues. The increasing adoption of algorithmic pricing and AI tools by companies in diverse sectors has raised novel challenges for competition law enforcement. While these AI solutions or automated pricing tools promise efficiency — integration of cost data, immediate response to market conditions, and capacity to design different pricing strategies according to the respective sensitivities and the behavior of different customer groups — it also introduces antitrust risks, derived primarily from unlawful collusion and information exchange between competitors. In particular, if competitors rely on the same pricing algorithm solution or a common third-party intermediary, these systems may inadvertently facilitate coordinated outcomes that mimic cartel behavior without the need for direct communications or agreements among competing players. Latin America, although in earlier stages of enforcement practice compared to the US and Europe, is beginning to grapple with these concerns, with Brazil and other authorities taking the lead.

Algorithmic collusion: the central concern

The main enforcement risk arises when algorithmic pricing software aligns competitors' behavior in ways that reduce incentives to compete aggressively. By reacting instantaneously to rivals' prices and market signals, these tools can stabilize margins and

[1] As AI Adoption Increases In LatAm, Regional Governments Seek More Investment In Training To Close The Skill Gap.

[2] According to the "Artificial Intelligence in Latin America 2023" report by MIT Technology Review and NTT DATA.

dampen competition. In some instances, software providers act as conduits of competitively sensitive information by aggregating and redistributing pricing strategies across users. This creates antitrust exposure even if rivals never meet, speak or exchange information directly.

For agencies in Latin America, the challenge seems to be twofold: detecting when algorithmic tools cross the line from efficiency to collusion, and developing the technical capacity to analyze pricing solutions and assess their competitive effects in practice.

More broadly, there is a growing concern that as AI systems become more sophisticated, the risks associated with price-fixing and anticompetitive information exchange intensifies. AI-powered pricing tools can analyze vast amounts of market data, identify patterns and adjust prices in real time — potentially enabling firms to coordinate pricing strategies with little transparency or oversight. The opacity of these algorithms makes it difficult for regulators to identify explicit collusive strategies, especially when coordination occurs without direct human interaction. As businesses increasingly rely on third-party software vendors, the potential for these platforms to act as hubs for sharing sensitive information (including current and future pricing strategies) further complicates enforcement efforts. This trend underscores the need for robust regulatory frameworks, technical expertise and ongoing monitoring to ensure that AI and algorithmic pricing tools do not undermine competitive markets.

Brazil: CADE's algorithmic pricing probe and consultations

Brazil has emerged as a front-runner in the region. In late 2024, the Administrative Council for Economic Defense (Conselho Administrativo de Defesa Econômica (CADE)) launched an investigation into the use of algorithmic pricing software in the fuel retail sector. This software promised to optimize pricing for gas stations by integrating costs, sales volumes and competitors' prices. CADE probed whether widespread adoption of this tool reduced incentives for retailers to lower prices and may have facilitated coordinated pricing outcomes.
The company acknowledged that its tool — which generates dynamic pricing based on numerous variables — limits individual gas stations' ability to make independent pricing decisions. As a result, this approach prevents price disputes and reduces the likelihood of significant decreases in fuel prices. Importantly, the probe also examined the role of a fuel retailer's trade association in promoting the software among its members, raising questions about whether collective adoption of a common algorithm can substitute explicit cartel agreements. Although these pricing algorithms are not prohibited by law, their application in supporting coordinated actions among competitors that harm competition could be considered unlawful, according to CADE.[3]

This is not CADE's first investigation into algorithmic pricing; the agency has examined similar cases, demonstrating its ongoing attention to potential antitrust risks posed by these tools. In 2019, the agency started examining whether three major Brazilian airlines may have coordinated ticket prices using algorithmic pricing software.[4] The three companies under investigation denied using machine learning or pricing algorithms, but acknowledged consistent monitoring of their competitors' prices in Brazil.

Although the parallel pricing conduct suggested alignment among the companies, CADE found this to be independent implementation of comparable pricing strategies rather than collusion. The agency stated that, even if the parties used pricing algorithms for their commercial policies, there would be no basis for enforcement without substantive evidence of an explicit agreement or coordinated actions aimed at collusion. This means that, in the absence of proof of coordinated action or an explicit agreement intended to produce collusion, CADE regarded the situation as tacit collusion, which was not a violation of the law and, therefore, not subject to enforcement by the competition authority. As no such evidence was found — despite the airlines' use of pricing algorithms — the investigation was concluded. However, in its decision, the office of the superintendent general addressed algorithmic collusion, noting growing competitive concerns due to the use of algorithms.[5]

CADE has also reviewed consultations regarding the approval of pricing algorithms and business conduct, demonstrating the agency's commitment to responding to consultations from interested companies on how these tools might impact competition in the marketplace. Two years after the probe on airlines, a large Brazilian fuel distribution company requested clarification from the agency about a pricing algorithm to be employed for recommending prices to gas stations. The agency noted that the company's pricing algorithms could enable coordination between its gas stations and competitors, but the company's system offered personalized prices for each station, reducing the risk of collusion. After the consultation, CADE's decision-making body determined that the company's revised price recommendation policy (which was voluntary, personalized, non-retaliatory and unilateral) complied with legal requirements and did not present competition issues.[6]

---

[3] CADE investigates algorithmic pricing in fuel market — Conselho Administrativo de Defesa Econômica.

[4] Administrative Inquiry No. 08700.007894/2023-88 (Federal Prosecutor's Office and CADE ex officio). See also, OECD Algorithmic competition – Note by Brazil, June 2023.

[5] *Id.*

[6] CADE assesses fuel company Ipiranga's new pricing policy — Conselho Administrativo de Defesa Econômica.

These investigations and consultations are significant for Latin America because they highlight the evidentiary hurdles in proving algorithmic collusion. Authorities need to differentiate between efficiency-enhancing software and tools that may stabilize prices or potentially facilitate horizontal price-fixing. CADE's willingness to pursue these cases show that it is prepared to adapt novel cartel theories of harm to new technological realities.

CADE is also proactively advocating for strengthened antitrust enforcement in the era of AI. In May 2024, CADE submitted a commentary regarding Bill No. 2338/2023, which seeks to regulate AI. CADE noted that voluntary regulatory sandboxes could facilitate businesses' implementation of pricing algorithms and other AI systems while mitigating antitrust liability risks. Among its recommendations, CADE proposed introducing an experimental regulatory environment to enable companies developing or deploying innovative AI systems to test their solutions within a safe harbor provision. Additionally, CADE's supplementary comments on the bill underscored the need to establish principles and mechanisms for information-sharing and highlighted the importance of conducting joint investigations. These suggestions were presented to the Federal Senate, which already approved the bill in December 2024, with explicit provisions concerning CADE's powers to investigate possible anticompetitive conducts involving AI developers. Now, the chamber of deputies is assessing the bill.[7]

Brazil stands out in Latin America for its early and active examination of the risks associated with algorithmic collusion, particularly through its cases on pricing tools in the fuel and airline sectors. CADE's investigations illustrate a proactive approach to identifying potential antitrust issues related to AI and pricing algorithms. By addressing these novel challenges and engaging in regulatory initiatives, such as its proposed legislative reform, Brazil has taken steps that may inform how other countries in the region respond to emerging issues in competition law.

Chile: growing emphasis on digital markets

Chile's competition institutions are likewise intensifying their digital focus. In recent years, the Fiscalía Nacional Económica (FNE) and the Tribunal de Defensa de la Libre Competencia (TDLC) have imposed record fines in cartel cases, while also opening inquiries into markets characterized by digital intermediation. Chilean authorities are paying heightened attention to algorithmic conduct in sectors such as e-commerce and digital accommodation platforms.

Chile is actively working to establish a legal framework for AI. The country released its first National Artificial Intelligence Policy in 2021 and updated it in 2023 to reflect evolving technological and regulatory needs.[8] In May 2024, the Chilean government took a major step forward by introducing draft legislation aimed at regulating AI systems.[9]

While there is no specific regulation yet for the use of AI in competition law, the FNE is exploring the need for updates to the existing framework and looking into the use of algorithms and AI that could facilitate collusion or inefficient price discrimination. In April 2024, the FNE released the final report of its market study on the accommodation sector, highlighting the increasing presence of digital intermediation platforms.[10] During this study, algorithmic pricing was examined; however, no definitive anticompetitive effects were identified within the study. In November 2024, the FNE initiated an additional market study focused on e-commerce.[11] The report notes that the adoption of algorithms and AI-based technologies can produce significant efficiencies but may also present certain risks, such as potentially enabling collusion or coordination among competitors and leading to forms of price discrimination that could impact competitive market dynamics.

On 11 December 2024, the FNE held its 21st Competition Day, which addressed the challenges related to algorithmic pricing and its connection to collusive practices. The prosecutor noted that the FNE acknowledges the efficiencies that companies gain through using algorithms, as referenced in the hospitality market study.[12] He also highlighted potential anticompetitive risks associated with these computational tools, stating that the FNE "is prepared to detect algorithmic collusion and address it with the same rigor applied to traditional forms of collusion."[13] Additionally, he clarified that claiming that proprietary or third-party software facilitated an

---

[7] https://www.camara.leg.br/noticias/1159193-projeto-que-regulamenta-uso-da-inteligencia-artificial-no-brasil.

[8] https://www.minciencia.gob.cl/areas/inteligencia-artificial/politica-nacional-de-inteligencia-artificial/.

[9] "Artificial Intelligence Systems" (Bill 16821-19).

[10] Estudio sobre el Mercado del Hospedaje, Informe Final, abril de 2024, Fiscalia Nacional Economia.

[11] FNE inicia estudio de mercado sobre comercio electrónico.

[12] Estudio sobre el Mercado del Hospedaje, Informe Final, abril de 2024, Fiscalia Nacional Economia.

[13] CeCo | Día de la competencia FNE 2024: Precios algorítmicos.

agreement or practice, instead of a company executive, would not be accepted as a legitimate defense. In this context, the prosecutor also noted that the FNE, through its intelligence unit, is already applying modern techniques, such as machine learning and screening, to accurately and effectively identify anomalies in competitive variables.[14]

This reflects a broader recognition that algorithmic coordination can emerge even in traditionally fragmented markets when mediated by tech tools. In particular, Chile's ongoing market studies and legislative efforts underscore its commitment to proactively addressing the risks and opportunities associated with AI and algorithms in competition policy.

Mexico: market studies on algorithms in digital markets

Mexico's Federal Economic Competition Commission (Comisión Federal de Competencia Económica (COFECE))[15] has begun identifying risks related to algorithms. In November 2024, COFECE released a policy statement on algorithmic competition, indicating that AI and AI-driven algorithms may be used to facilitate anticompetitive practices, such as price-fixing and collusion.[16] The regulatory body is examining how algorithms might contribute to illegal activity in the digital economy and has launched investigations into markets like digital advertising and e-commerce to assess algorithmic behaviors that could limit competition.

In 2023, Mexico submitted a note on algorithmic competition to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), reflecting growing concern over the role of algorithms in shaping markets. The document highlights their dual impact: While algorithms can enhance innovation, efficiency and personalized services, they also pose risks of exclusionary practices and even tacit collusion. Drawing on its enforcement record under the Federal Economic Competition Law (Ley Federal de Competencia Económica (LFCE)), COFECE pointed to the rising use of algorithms in digital markets such as e-commerce, online advertising and app distribution, and confirmed that it has launched investigations in these areas.

One of the most pressing challenges identified is algorithmic collusion — where pricing software or monitoring tools enable coordination without human involvement. The LFCE prohibits not only explicit agreements but also concerted practices and information exchanges that restrict competition, giving the commission a legal basis to address algorithm-driven conduct. At the same time, the authority is investing in its own technological capacity, deploying algorithms and AI tools for monitoring markets and detecting anticompetitive behavior.

Mexico's OECD note ultimately underscores the difficulty of regulating fast-evolving technologies: Enforcement requires deep technical expertise, strong evidentiary tools, and cooperation with consumer and data regulators, while also safeguarding innovation. For the commission, the task ahead is to strike the right balance between intervention and allowing algorithmic markets to deliver benefits to consumers.

COFECE has issued several relevant studies in 2025. In January 2025, it published a document entitled "Competition in the Digital Economy: Basic Concepts," a primer designed to clarify key issues for policymakers and market participants.[17] In March 2025, COFECE released "Data and Competition in the Digital Environment," which analyzed how access to and use of data can shape competitive dynamics.[18]

In April 2025, the Mexican authority published another report around AI and competition in the digital environment, a forward-looking study on how AI tools affect market power, exclusionary conduct and enforcement strategies.[19] In this report, COFECE observes that Mexico continues to address the challenge of balancing regulation with innovation. The report indicates that overregulation may discourage innovation and limit the potential benefits provided by new technologies. Furthermore, it notes that excessive regulatory measures could restrict access to additional services, impede economic growth and diminish opportunities for new business development. Finally, COFECE highlights that increased regulation may reduce competition, thereby making it more difficult for smaller enterprises to enter or sustain their presence in the market.

---

[14] Data Screening Tools for Competition Investigations (EN).

[15] The National Antitrust Commission (Comisión Nacional Antimonopolio (CNA)) has been established as a decentralized public agency under the Ministry of Economy. The CNA has assumed all powers and responsibilities previously held by COFECE, becoming the new authority for antitrust matters moving forward. For the purposes of this article, the developments discussed occurred while COFECE was still the relevant Mexican authority in effect.

[16] https://www.cofece.mx/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/AlgorCompEcoEntDigital-eng.pdf.

[17] BasConComDigEco-eng.pdf.

[18] Data and Competition in the Digital Environment.

[19] Artificial Intelligence and Competition in the Digital Environment.

Taken together, these reports reflect a comprehensive agenda: the Mexican competition authority is not only addressing present risks in the digital economy, but also anticipating how technologies like algorithms and AI will transform competition policy.

COFECE recently closed its first digital market investigation in the e-commerce sector, examining how algorithm-driven tools such as "featured offers" and platform incentives linked to logistics services shape competition. The authority found that these mechanisms could restrict seller mobility and tilt visibility in ways that reduce rivalry, even if no sanctions were ultimately imposed.[20]

The case is significant because it shows how algorithms at the core of digital platforms can influence market dynamics, raising concerns about transparency and competitive neutrality. Together with COFECE's recent studies on data, algorithms and AI, the investigation underscores Mexico's forward-looking approach to ensuring that technological innovation in digital markets evolves within a framework that safeguards competition.

COFECE's decision on its first digital market investigation occurred as the agency prepared to transition from an autonomous body to a government ministry, following Congress' approval of constitutional reforms in November 2024. The newly formed CNA in Mexico is anticipated to uphold COFECE's enforcement priorities. Particularly, with the appointments of the new commissioners, the CNA's continuity is anticipated, and it is expected that the authority will continue to address emerging issues, such as AI, digital markets and data-driven competition.

While there have been no specific enforcement actions concerning AI, collusion or algorithmic pricing software related to anticompetitive practices, these various studies and current investigations indicate that the authority intends to incorporate algorithmic risks into its policy framework and investigative priorities. This suggests that future enforcement efforts and regulatory strategies will increasingly focus on addressing the challenges posed by algorithms and AI in digital markets.

Argentina, Peru and Colombia: emerging frameworks

Other Latin American agencies are laying their respective groundwork for future action. In recent years, Argentina's National Commission for the Defense of Competition (Comisión Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia (CNDC)) has shown growing interest in the challenges posed by digital markets, algorithms and AI for competition policy. In 2023, the CNDC established the Research and Working Group on Digital Markets,[21] with the objective of systematically analyzing large-scale data collection and processing, as well as algorithmic pricing and automated decision-making systems, and analyzing how it can affect competitive dynamics. The working group holds bimonthly meetings to exchange technical and academic insights, and has developed a virtual digital markets library, which compiles case law, research papers and articles.[22]

In 2024, the CNDC also reinforced its national contribution by participating in the 10th edition of the International Forum on Competition Challenges in the Digital Environment,[23] where discussions explicitly addressed the "use of algorithms" and analyses of new "digital markets," as well as the potential risks of algorithmic collusion and the implications of AI for detecting anticompetitive conduct. In parallel, the CNDC gave a presentation at the panel on "Strengthening international collaboration as a means to achieve greater benefits from economic competition in the digital age."[24] Although the authority has not yet issued enforcement decisions related to algorithms or AI, these initiatives reflect a proactive and capacity-building approach, aimed at strengthening its ability to address emerging forms of coordination and market concentration in digital environments.

Turning from Argentina, we now consider Peru's approach to AI and competition. In 2024, Peru's competition authority, Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual (INDECOPI), published guidelines for the ethical and responsible use of AI.[25] They include references to competition policy concerns and the importance of avoiding algorithmic discrimination or coordination risks. While not an enforcement action, the guidance demonstrates an awareness that competitive safeguards must be considered when adopting AI.

---

[20] https://www.cofece.mx/cofece-concluye-investigacion-en-comercio-electronico-minorista/.

[21] La CNDC creó el Grupo de investigación y Trabajo sobre Mercados Digitales | Argentina.gob.ar.

[22] *Id.*

[23] La CNDC expuso en el Foro Internacional sobre Retos de la Competencia en el Entorno Digital del IFT de México | Argentina.gob.ar.

[24] *Id.*

[25] Guidelines for the ethical use of artificial intelligence at the National Institute for the Defense of Competition and the Protection of Intellectual Property - INDECOPI.

Moreover, in Peru's recent note for the OECD on AI, data and competition,[26] the competition authority acknowledged the benefits of AI. However, it also highlighted that AI creates several concerns about the competition dynamics along the value chain of AI services, as well as concerns about how firms could align the use of AI tools with compliance with competition law. INDECOPI notes that, while AI adoption in Peru remains cautious, it is growing, with optimistic prospects for wider use. The agency highlights the need for continuous monitoring of the competition dynamics of the AI industry and recognizes the importance of enhancing its own expertise and attracting specialized talent. INDECOPI also acknowledges the necessity to improve its ability to detect and address anticompetitive behavior linked to AI in business models. Recent initiatives in Peru have begun tracking company use of AI for consumer protection. For effective competition policy in the AI industry, additional resources for skilled personnel and stronger capabilities are needed.

Colombia has not yet reported any cases of algorithmic pricing collusion. The Superintendencia de Industria y Comercio (SIC) recognizes that similar pricing conduct (parallel pricing) among competitors can be evidence of collusion. Legal precedents may help clarify how Colombian competition authorities might assess future cases involving algorithmic pricing. However, this approach is not universally shared across competition authorities. For instance, in Brazil's recent airline case (where three airlines were investigated for coordinating their prices using algorithmic pricing software), cited above, the Brazilian authority did not interpret parallel conduct as sufficient evidence of collusive behavior in the absence of a formal agreement. Although there have been no reported instances of AI-enabled collusion to date, it remains possible that the SIC may consider parallel pricing as evidence of collaboration in its assessments.

In line with other regional practices in the digital economy, Colombia began to look into regulating AI with the creation of the Digital Transformation and AI National Policy.[27] A year later, a publication was released titled "Ethical framework for artificial intelligence in Colombia,"[28] and a task force was established for the "development and implementation of AI."[29] Additionally, Colombia's SIC has issued guidance on the use of AI and the treatment of personal data in algorithmic systems,[30] and launched a regulatory sandbox on "Privacy by Design and by Default in AI Projects."[31] This underscores its proactive approach to emerging risks associated with data-driven and algorithmic business models. The main purpose of the sandbox is to safeguard personal data; nevertheless, there are connections between this aim and those advanced by competition policy.[32] Although these initiatives do not directly address competition or antitrust issues, they show that the SIC is looking into how algorithms and data-driven practices may influence market dynamics.

Organizations located in Colombia are now able to adopt international standards for AI systems. These standards establish requirements for creating, maintaining and continually improving an AI management system, and are applicable to any organization developing or using AI-based solutions, regardless of its size or sector.[33] With this adoption, organizations in Colombia can be among the first in Latin America to have a certifiable standard for responsible AI management. Certified organizations will be able to show responsibility, transparency and regulatory compliance to clients and authorities.

As enforcement trends and market studies evolve in Colombia, this will likely shape the regulatory framework and understanding of AI's role in competition law, and the SIC's approach to these types of cases.

A comparative glimpse: US enforcement

The US Department of Justice (DOJ) already has quite a significant track record of antitrust enforcement involving AI and algorithmic pricing, with robust actions and investigations. In recent years, the DOJ has pursued major cases against providers of pricing software used in housing and hospitality markets. In one, the DOJ alleged that a software vendor enabled landlords to

---

[26] OECD Note by Peru, Artificial Intelligence, Data and Competition, June 2024.

[27] See AI Regulation and its Impact on Competition Policy and Practice in Latin America: Friends or Foes?

[28] Consulta Marco Ético IA Colombia 200813.

[29] TASK-FORCE-para-desarrollo-implementacion-Colombia-propuesta-201120.pdf.

[30] Colombia's Superintendencia de Industria y Comercio (SIC) issued External Circular No. 002 of 2024.

[31] Sandbox on Privacy and Design and by default in Artificial Intelligence Projects.

[32] See also Colombia Data Protection Authority launches innovative regulatory Sandbox on privacy by design and by default in artificial intelligence projects.

[33] Colombia adopts the first certifiable international standard for AI systems, and see also Colombia: Bill of Law regulating Artificial Intelligence ("AI") - Baker McKenzie InsightPlus.

coordinate rental pricing by sharing sensitive data and generating uniform pricing recommendations. In another, the DOJ filed a statement of interest in litigation involving hotels, emphasizing that using a common pricing algorithm can amount to concerted action under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, even without direct communication. These cases show that US authorities are prepared to treat software-facilitated coordination as equivalent to traditional price-fixing conspiracies.

While Latin American jurisdictions have not yet reached the same level of enforcement development, the region is actively building the necessary frameworks and policies to address similar challenges. As regulatory awareness grows and market studies continue to be published across countries such as Chile, Peru and Colombia, there is a clear trajectory toward more assertive action in the near future. This convergence suggests that, although Latin America currently trails the US in direct enforcement, the gap is narrowing, and some countries in the region are poised to adopt and adapt foreign experience in their respective digital competition policies — not only from the US, but also from their closer neighbors, such as Brazil. Continued developments are expected to bring Latin American countries in line with global trends and to foster an environment where the region can contribute its own perspectives and solutions to the evolving landscape of algorithmic coordination and AI governance.

Conclusion

Latin America is entering a critical phase in addressing the risks of AI and algorithmic pricing. In particular, Brazil stands out as the regional leader in this area. The country's antitrust authority, CADE, has not only opened concrete investigations to identify and address potential collusion facilitated by algorithms, but also analyzed consultations regarding AI-assisted pricing policies. Brazil's early and visible enforcement actions serve as a benchmark for neighboring countries and may have set the pace for Latin America's approach to digital competition issues. In parallel, Mexico is conducting forward-looking market studies, Chile is elevating digital enforcement priorities, and Argentina, Peru, and Colombia are shaping AI policy frameworks. While US authorities have already advanced bold theories treating algorithms as vehicles of collusion, Latin American agencies are beginning to test similar approaches and are not far behind.

While regulatory maturity and enforcement approaches vary across Latin America, AI, algorithmic tools and pricing software are already reshaping the region's competitive landscape. Antitrust authorities across Latin America have noted concerns regarding AI-driven coordination and its potential to raise prices and reduce competition, even without conventional cartel activity such as explicit "meeting of minds." In the coming years, it remains to be seen whether the authorities in the region will develop their own frameworks for algorithmic coordination and application of competition principles to AI, or whether they will adopt international precedents.

As digitalization accelerates, competition authorities face the challenge of addressing complex algorithmic conduct within diverse legal and institutional frameworks. At the same time, AI, AI tools and pricing software will continue to play a significant role in antitrust enforcement across the Americas, and become an integral part of the regulatory tool kit shaping competition authorities and policy across the region. In the end, regardless of how current debates and cases unfold, AI and pricing technologies will remain central to competition discourse — an enduring catalyst influencing both how competition unfolds and how policy adapts in response.

Contact us

Paulo Casagrande*
Partner — Trench Rossi Watanabe
paulo.casagrande
@trenchrossi.com

Natalie Flores
Antitrust & Competition Knowledge Lawyer, Americas
natalie.flores
@bakermckenzie.com

*Trench Rossi Watanabe (Brazil) and Baker McKenzie have executed a strategic cooperation agreement to consult on foreign law.

Baker McKenzie.