

Competition Law, Innovation and Antitrust

An Analysis of Tying and Technological
Integration

Hedvig Schmidt

University of Southampton, UK

NEW HORIZONS IN COMPETITION LAW AND ECONOMICS

Edward Elgar

Cheltenham, UK • Northampton, MA, USA

Contents

<i>List of figures and tables</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	x
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>Table of legislation, cases and other official documents</i>	xii
1. Introduction	1
1. Background	1
2. Tying	3
3. Outline of the book	5
2. Tying from an Economic Perspective	7
1. Introduction	7
2. Defining Tying	8
3. The Purposes of Tying	11
4. Efficiency Reasons	13
4.1. Cost Reduction	13
4.2. Quality Improvement	15
4.2.1. Quality Assurance	15
4.2.2. Reduction in Search Costs	16
4.2.3. Product Improvement	17
4.3. Reducing Pricing Inefficiencies	18
4.3.1. Price Discrimination	18
4.3.2. The Double Marginalisation Problem	21
4.4. Concluding Remarks on Efficiency Reasons	25
5. Strategic Reasons for Tying	25
5.1. The Leveraging Theory	25
5.1.1. Market Foreclosure	30
5.1.2. Protection of the Tying Product Market – Defensive Leveraging	31
5.1.3. Undercutting Rivals' Price by Tying	33
5.2. Competition Mitigation	34
5.3. Gaining Competitive Advantage	35
5.3.1. Creating Network Externalities	36
5.4. Price Obfuscation	37
5.5. Technological Integration	38

5.6.	Tying as an Incentive to Innovate	41
5.7.	Concluding Remarks on Strategic Reasons	42
6.	Empirical Evidence	42
7.	How Should Tie-ins be Treated? – An Economic Perspective	46
3	Tying Arrangements under Article 82 EC	55
1.	Introduction	55
2.	Assessing Tying under Article 82	59
2.1.	Defining the Relevant Market – the Need for Two Separate Products	60
2.1.1.	Defining the Relevant Market in Tying Cases	61
2.1.2.	The Need for Two Separate Products	65
2.1.3.	Tying in ‘Aftermarkets’ and Consumables	72
2.1.4.	Concluding Remarks on Two Separate Products	73
2.2.	Establishing Dominance in the Tying Product Market	74
2.2.1.	Conclusion on Dominance	76
2.3.	Abuse	77
2.3.1.	Conclusion on Abuse	83
2.4.	Anti-competitive Effects – Foreclosure of the Tied Product Market	83
2.4.1.	Concluding Remarks on Anti-competitive Effects of Tying	93
2.5.	Objective Justifications	94
2.5.1.	Concluding Remarks on Objective Justifications	100
3.	Remedies	102
3.1.	Concluding Remarks on Remedies	105
4.	Article 82, Tying and IP Rights	106
5.	Lessons to be Learned from EC Case Law on Tying	113
4	Tying Arrangements under US Antitrust Law	117
1.	Introduction	117
2.	The Antitrust Analysis of Tying Arrangements	119
2.1.	Tying – Pre- <i>Jefferson Parish</i>	120
2.1.1.	A Tying Arrangement	122
2.1.2.	Market Power	123
2.1.3.	A Substantial Amount of Commerce in the Tied Product Market	126
2.1.4.	Justification and Defences	127

2.1.5.	Concluding Remarks on Pre- <i>Jefferson Parish</i> Case Law	129
2.2.	Tying – Post- <i>Jefferson Parish</i>	130
2.2.1.	A Tying Arrangement between Two Separate Products	135
2.2.1.1.	Concluding Remarks on Two Separate Products	145
2.2.2.	Market Power	146
2.2.3.	Substantial Impact on Competition in the Tied Market	149
2.2.4.	Objective Justification	151
3.	IP Rights	152
4.	<i>Per Se</i> or <i>Rule of Reason</i> – That is the Question!	154
5.	Lessons to be Learned from US Tying Case Law	157
5.1.	Introduction	157
5.2.	Two Separate Products	158
5.3.	Market Power	159
5.4.	Substantial Amount of Commerce Affected in the Tied Product Market	160
5.5.	Objective Justification	160
5.6.	IP Rights	161
5.7.	Conclusion	162
5	Intellectual Property Law and Tying – An Alternative Approach	164
1.	Introduction	164
2.	The US Patent Misuse Doctrine	166
3.	Tying Arrangements Caught under the Patent Misuse Doctrine	172
4.	The US Misuse Doctrine and its Effect on Tying – Lessons to be Learned	177
6	Alternative Solutions, the Development of a New Regulatory Model	179
1.	Introduction	179
2.	Illegal <i>per se</i> – <i>Rule of Reason</i> – Where Are We Now? Where Should We Be?	180
2.1	Good or Bad Conduct	182
2.2.	<i>Rule of Reason</i>	183
2.3.	<i>Per se</i> Legality	185
2.4.	Recommending <i>per se</i> Legality	186
3.	The Format of the Approach	186
3.1.	Recommendation: A Four-step Test	191

4.	Step 1: The Need for Two Separate Products – Alternative Solutions	192
4.1.	Introduction	192
4.2.	Is the Separate Products Test Essential?	196
4.3.	The TTBER and the US IP Licensing Guidelines – Alternative Market Definitions?	197
4.4.	The Indispensability Test – an Alternative to the Consumer Demand Test?	204
4.5.	The Expanded Consumer Demand Test and the Broken Product Test	206
4.6.	Recommending the Expanded Consumer Demand Test	215
5.	Step 2: Dominance – Alternative Solutions	216
5.1.	Introduction	216
5.2.	The Indispensability Test	217
5.3.	Market Share Cap	219
5.4.	Recommending the Market Share Cap	221
6.	Step 3: Anti-competitive Effects – Alternative Solutions	222
6.1.	Introduction	222
6.2.	Indispensability Test	225
6.3.	The Sacrifice Test and the No Economic Sense Test	227
6.4.	As-Efficient-As Competitor Test	231
6.5.	The Consumer Harm Test – Re-balancing the Standard of Proof	233
6.6.	Standard of Proof	237
6.7.	Recommending the As-Efficient-As Competitor Test and the Consumer Harm Test	239
7.	Step 4: Objective Justifications – Alternative Solutions	241
7.1.	Introduction	241
7.2.	Replicate Article 81(3) Exemption	242
7.3.	Article 82(d) Exemption – By Nature or According to Commercial Usage	246
7.4.	Recommending the Article 82(d) Exemption	248
8.	Conclusion: Setting out the New Regulatory Model to Tying	249
7.	Conclusion	252
1.	Concluding Remarks	252
2.	Technological Integration	255
3.	Future Cases	256
	<i>Bibliography</i>	259
	<i>Index</i>	271