

---

# Contents

---

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> .....  | v        |
| <i>Abbreviations</i> .....   | xi       |
| <i>Table of Cases</i> .....  | xiii     |
| <i>Table of Legislation</i> .....  | xxi      |
| <b>1. Introduction</b> .....   | <b>1</b> |
| 1.1. The Previous Focus On Initial Innovation .....  | 1        |
| 1.2. The Need to Account for Follow-On Innovation .....  | 4        |
| 1.3. The Regulatory Problem and the Policy Levers .....  | 5        |
| 1.4. Methodology and Structure .....   | 6        |
| <b>2. The Relationship between IP and Antitrust Laws</b> .....                                       | <b>8</b> |
| 2.1. A First Look: Two Types of IP .....   | 9        |
| 2.1.1. A Common Dynamic Benefit: Incentives to Create Markets .....                                  | 10       |
| 2.1.2. Similar Static Costs: Preventing Competition by Imitation .....                               | 12       |
| 2.1.3. A Different Dynamic Cost: Blocking Follow-On Innovation<br>and Improvements .....             | 13       |
| 2.2. A Closer Look: The Anti-Competitive Potential of IP Rights .....                                | 14       |
| 2.2.1. IP Laws and the Basic Rights of IP Holders .....  | 14       |
| 2.2.2. The Anti-Competitive Potential of Conduct Involving IP .....                                  | 19       |
| 2.3. Approaches to the Relationship between IP and Antitrust .....                                   | 24       |
| 2.3.1. Approach I: Absolute IP Domination .....  | 25       |
| 2.3.2. Approach II: Inherency and the Specific Subject Matter<br>as Legal(istic) Filters .....       | 26       |
| 2.3.3. Approach III: Balancing Different Means to Enhance<br>Consumer Welfare .....                  | 32       |
| 2.4. A Positive Economic Analysis of the IP/Antitrust Interface .....                                | 46       |
| 2.4.1. Preventing Competition by Imitation (Reward Mechanism) .....                                  | 47       |
| 2.4.2. Other Functions of IP and their Relation to Antitrust .....                                   | 58       |
| 2.5. IP or Antitrust? Some Meta Rules .....  | 60       |
| 2.5.1. Approach I: 'Pure' IP Solution .....  | 60       |
| 2.5.2. Approach II: Antitrust as a Discretionary 'Fine-Tuning' Device .....                          | 61       |
| 2.5.3. Approach III: Comparative Cost-Benefit Analysis According<br>to the Competition Problem ..... | 63       |
| 2.6. Which Antitrust Rules? Some Principles .....  | 65       |
| 2.7. Conclusion .....  | 67       |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>3. The Concepts of Monopolisation and Abuse: What is the Correct Test?</b> .....                 | <b>68</b> |
| 3.1. The Tests Used under § 2 Sherman Act and Article 102 TFEU .....                                | 70        |
| 3.2. Obstacles to Cross-Fertilisation?.....   | 72        |
| 3.2.1. Exploitative Abuses .....  | 73        |
| 3.2.2. The Elements of § 2 Sherman Act and Article 102 TFEU .....                                   | 74        |
| 3.2.3. Leveraging.....  | 75        |
| 3.2.4. What is to be Protected? Market Structure vs Consumers.....                                  | 76        |
| 3.2.5. Enforcement .....  | 79        |
| 3.3. Analysis of Potential Standards .....  | 79        |
| 3.3.1. The Relationship between the Standard and Conduct-Specific Rules .....                       | 80        |
| 3.3.2. The Cost-Error Approach as Heuristic.....  | 81        |
| 3.3.3. The Conduct Element—Suggested Standards .....  | 85        |
| 3.4. Conclusion .....   | 95        |
| <b>4. Refusals to Deal which May Impede Follow-On Innovation .....</b>                              | <b>96</b> |
| 4.1. The Traditional Typology of Refusals to Deal.....  | 98        |
| 4.1.1. Vertical Complementary and Horizontal Refusals to Deal .....                                 | 98        |
| 4.1.2. Concerted Refusals to Deal.....  | 102       |
| 4.1.3. ‘Naked’ vs ‘Constructive’ and Conditional vs Unconditional Refusals .....                    | 102       |
| 4.1.4. Discriminatory Conditions of Supply .....  | 103       |
| 4.1.5. Termination of Supply.....   | 105       |
| 4.1.6. Refusal to Deal as an Instrument or as a Corollary of<br>Other Anti-Competitive Conduct..... | 106       |
| 4.2. Cumulative Innovation and Bargaining Rules.....  | 109       |
| 4.2.1. Repercussions of Mandatory Rules on the Incentive to Innovate .....                          | 111       |
| 4.2.2. Cases for IP Reform: Patent Thickets, Holdup, and Royalty Stacking.....                      | 112       |
| 4.2.3. Self-Correction of Innovation Regimes? .....   | 114       |
| 4.3. A Typology of Refusals to Deal involving IP.....   | 115       |
| 4.4. Scenario 1: Impeding Research into Follow-On Innovation .....                                  | 116       |
| 4.4.1. IP Solutions .....   | 116       |
| 4.4.2. Antitrust in Innovation Markets? .....   | 117       |
| 4.5. Scenario 2: Impeding the Marketing of Follow-On Innovation.....                                | 119       |
| 4.5.1. The Potential Case for Antitrust: Foreclosure of<br>Competition by Improved Products.....    | 120       |
| 4.5.2. Some Conditions of an Antitrust Rule .....   | 121       |
| 4.5.3. Comparison to Alternative IP Solutions .....   | 122       |
| 4.5.4. Which Antitrust Solution: Leveraging Test or<br>Essential Facilities Rule?.....              | 124       |
| 4.6. Scenario 3: Refusal to Give Interoperability Information .....                                 | 125       |
| 4.6.1. Gatekeepers on Markets with Network Effects .....  | 127       |
| 4.6.2. Protection through Trade Secrecy.....  | 131       |
| 4.7. Scenario 4: Refusal to License IP which Protects a Standard.....                               | 132       |
| 4.8. Scenario 5: Refusal to Supply Products on the Basis of IP.....                                 | 133       |
| 4.9. Conclusion .....   | 135       |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>5. The Licensing Fee: Determining Liability and the Remedy .....</b>                    | <b>136</b> |
| 5.1. The Royalty.....  | 138        |
| 5.1.1. No Royalty.....   | 138        |
| 5.1.2. Cost-Based Pricing.....   | 139        |
| 5.1.3. Same Firm Price Comparison, Market-Based Pricing,<br>and Profit Comparison.....     | 140        |
| 5.1.4. Efficient Component Pricing Rule (ECPR).....  | 141        |
| 5.1.5. Hypothetical Bargaining and Maximum Willingness to Pay .....                        | 142        |
| 5.1.6. At-Least Reasonably Efficient Licensee's Maximum Ability to Pay .....               | 143        |
| 5.2. The Relationship between Liability and the Remedy Price.....                          | 145        |
| 5.3. Non-Discriminatory Pricing?.....  | 146        |
| 5.4. The Procedure: Bargaining, Determining the Price, Monitoring,<br>and Enforcement..... | 147        |
| 5.5. Conclusion .....  | 147        |
| <b>6. An Essential Facilities Test.....</b>  | <b>149</b> |
| 6.1. Condition 1: Harm to Competition .....  | 150        |
| 6.1.1. Dominant Position .....   | 150        |
| 6.1.2. No Circumvention or Substitution within a<br>Reasonable Period of Time .....        | 157        |
| 6.1.3. Elimination or Prevention of Effective Competition<br>on the Adjacent Market .....  | 158        |
| 6.2. Condition 2: No <i>Ex Ante</i> Investment Defence .....                               | 160        |
| 6.2.1. The Difficulties of Balancing in Innovation Cases .....                             | 160        |
| 6.2.2. <i>Ex Ante</i> Investment .....   | 162        |
| 6.3. Condition 3: No <i>Ex Post</i> Efficiency Defence .....                               | 163        |
| 6.4. Conclusion .....  | 163        |
| <b>7. Cumulative Innovation under US IP and Antitrust Laws .....</b>                       | <b>165</b> |
| 7.1. The Initial Innovator's and the Improver's Positions under US IP Laws.....            | 165        |
| 7.1.1. US Patent Law .....   | 166        |
| 7.1.2. US Copyright Law.....   | 172        |
| 7.1.3. US Trade Secret Law .....   | 175        |
| 7.2. The General 'No Duty to Deal' Rule under US Antitrust Law.....                        | 176        |
| 7.2.1. No General Duties to Use and License IP Even Pre- <i>Trinko</i> .....               | 176        |
| 7.2.2. The Effects of <i>Trinko</i> .....  | 180        |
| 7.3. Potential Exceptions to the No Duty to Deal Rule .....                                | 181        |
| 7.3.1. Essential Facilities Doctrine .....   | 182        |
| 7.3.2. Unjustified Change in the Pattern of Dealing.....                                   | 187        |
| 7.3.3. Monopoly Leveraging Doctrine .....  | 189        |
| 7.3.4. Margin Squeeze .....  | 193        |
| 7.3.5. Discriminatory Refusals to Deal .....   | 194        |
| 7.3.6. Concerted Refusals to Deal.....   | 195        |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| 7.4. The Remedy.....  | 196        |
| 7.4.1. Example 1: <i>Kodak II</i> .....   | 196        |
| 7.4.2. Example 2: <i>Microsoft</i> .....  | 197        |
| 7.4.3. Example 3: <i>Rambus</i> .....   | 199        |
| 7.5. Future Tendencies.....   | 201        |
| 7.6. Conclusion.....  | 203        |
| <b>8. Cumulative Innovation under European IP Laws and EU Competition Law.....</b>                  | <b>205</b> |
| 8.1. The Original Innovator's and the Improver's Positions<br>under National IP Laws in the EU..... | 206        |
| 8.1.1. German Patent Law.....   | 206        |
| 8.1.2. German Copyright and Unfair Competition Law.....   | 212        |
| 8.1.3. German Trade Secret Protection and Conclusion.....   | 217        |
| 8.2. Limits to Refusals to Supply Based on IP under Article 102 TFEU.....                           | 217        |
| 8.2.1. Essential Facilities Test.....   | 219        |
| 8.2.2. Margin Squeeze.....  | 235        |
| 8.2.3. Refusal to Deal as a Complementary Strategy.....   | 238        |
| 8.2.4. Discriminatory Refusal to Deal Based on IP.....  | 240        |
| 8.3. The Remedy.....  | 242        |
| 8.3.1. Substantive Criteria.....  | 244        |
| 8.3.2. Procedure.....   | 247        |
| 8.4. Future Tendencies and Conclusion.....  | 247        |
| <b>9. Comparison and International Dimension.....</b>   | <b>249</b> |
| 9.1. Differences between the US and EU Approaches.....  | 249        |
| 9.2. Potential Explanations for the Differences.....  | 251        |
| 9.2.1. Constitutional Frameworks.....   | 251        |
| 9.2.2. Beliefs.....   | 252        |
| 9.2.3. Interests.....   | 253        |
| 9.3. The International Antitrust Law of IP.....   | 254        |
| 9.3.1. The Current TRIPS Approach.....  | 255        |
| 9.3.2. Is Stronger Harmonisation of the Antitrust Law of IP Needed?.....                            | 258        |
| <b>10. Summary.....</b>   | <b>260</b> |
| 10.1. IP and Antitrust as the Framework for Cumulative Innovation.....                              | 260        |
| 10.2. The Relationship between IP and Antitrust Laws.....   | 260        |
| 10.3. Monopolisation and Abuse: What is the Correct Test?.....                                      | 261        |
| 10.4. Refusals to Deal which May Impede Follow-On Innovation.....                                   | 261        |
| 10.5. The Licensing Fee: Determining Liability and the Remedy.....                                  | 261        |
| 10.6. An Essential Facilities Test.....   | 262        |
| 10.7. Cumulative Innovation under US IP and Antitrust Laws.....                                     | 262        |
| 10.8. Cumulative Innovation under European IP Laws and<br>EU Competition Law.....                   | 262        |
| 10.9. Comparison and International Dimension.....   | 263        |
| <i>Bibliography</i> .....   | 264        |
| <i>Index</i> .....  | 293        |