

Claudia Schmidt

**Refusal to License
Intellectual Property Rights
as Abuse of Dominance**



PETER LANG

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Contents

Table of Abbreviations.....	XIII
1 Introduction.....	1
2 The Situation to Date.....	5
2.1 Abuse of Dominance and Article 102 TFEU.....	6
2.1.1 Brief Introduction to Article 102 TFEU.....	6
2.1.2 Reform of Article 102 TFEU.....	8
2.1.2.1 The More Economic Approach.....	8
2.1.2.2 Framework for Assessing Abusive Conduct.....	9
2.2 An Overview of Article 102 TFEU Intellectual Property Cases.....	11
2.3 Comparison with American Caselaw.....	20
2.3.1 An Overview of Abuse of Intellectual Property Rights Cases.....	20
2.3.2 Are There Systematic Differences Between U.S. and EU Decisions?.....	24
2.4 The European <i>Microsoft</i> Case: Introduction of the Incentives Balance Test?.....	27
2.4.1 The Decision of the Commission.....	28
2.4.2 The Judgment of the CFI.....	32
2.4.3 Discussion of the Microsoft Decision.....	35
2.4.3.1 The Requirement of Indispensability.....	35
2.4.3.2 Elimination of Competition.....	36
2.4.3.3 The New Product Requirement.....	37
2.4.3.4 Objective Justification and the Incentive Balance Test.....	38
2.5 Criteria for Refusal to License in the Article 102 TFEU Guidance Paper.....	42

2.6 The Incentives Balance Test as a New Instrument in Competition Policy?.....	45
3 Do Competition Policy and Intellectual Property Rights Stand in Conflict With Each Other?.....	47
3.1 Interface between Competition Law and Intellectual Property Law	47
3.1.1 Conflict Theory.....	48
3.1.2 Theory of Complementarity	51
3.2 Innovation as a Common Objective.....	53
3.2.1 Justification of Intellectual Property Rights	53
3.2.2 Economic Goals of Competition Policy	56
3.2.3 Interface of Competition Policy and Intellectual Property Law from an Economic Perspective	59
3.2.4 Tension between European Competition Rules and Intellectual Property Rights	60
3.3 Interplay of Competition Law and Intellectual Property Rights as a Means of Fostering Innovation	63
3.3.1 Under Which Circumstances Should Competition Law Interfere with Intellectual Property Rights?	63
3.3.2 The Incentives Balance Test as a Means to Redefine Intellectual Property Rights	66
3.4 Conclusion: What We Have Learned So Far.....	68
4 The Appropriation of Innovation: How Can We Assess the Necessity of Intellectual Property Rights?.....	71
4.1 The Optimal Design of Intellectual Property Rights in Law and Economics	72
4.1.1 Patents.....	72

4.1.1.1 Optimal Length.....	73
4.1.1.2 Optimal Breadth	76
4.1.1.3 Optimal Combination of Length and Breadth for Single Innovations.....	79
4.1.1.4 Optimal Combination of Length and Breadth for Cumulative Innovation	81
4.1.1.4.1 Limits of Patents with Cumulative Innovation... 81	
4.1.1.4.2 Licensing Agreements as Solution	83
4.1.2 Copyrights.....	86
4.1.2.1 Theoretical Approach to Optimal Design	87
4.1.2.2 Empirical Assessment of Optimal Copyright Scope.....	88
4.1.3 Intermediate Result: Necessity of Case-by-Case Design of Intellectual Property Rights	90
4.2 Innovation Research: What Do We Know about the Appropriability Conditions for New Knowledge?	92
4.2.1 Preconditions for Successful Innovation and Imitation	93
4.2.1.1 Influence of Different Knowledge (Sources) and Routines	93
4.2.1.2 Spillovers, Absorptive Capacity, and Path Dependence ...	96
4.2.2. Empirical Results.....	99
4.2.2.1 Effectiveness of Intellectual Property Rights in Protecting R&D	99
4.2.2.2 Why Firms Do or Do Not Patent	103
4.2.3 Alternative Strategies to Appropriate R&D Returns.....	106
4.2.3.1 Secrecy.....	106
4.2.3.2 Lead Time	109
4.2.3.3 Complementary Assets and Technologies.....	111
4.2.3.4 Other Appropriation Strategies.....	114

4.2.4 Intermediate Result: Limited Relevance of Intellectual Property Rights for Appropriation of R&D Returns	115
4.3 Innovation in Markets with Network Effects	118
4.3.1 Theoretical Digression on Innovation and Market Structure	118
4.3.2 Markets with Network Effects.....	122
4.3.2.1 Characteristics of Network Industries	122
4.3.2.2 Competition, Innovation, and Intellectual Property Rights in Networks and Standards.....	125
4.3.3 Intermediate Result: Considering Differences between Market Structure, Industry Features, and Innovation	128
4.4 Conclusion: Redefining Misallocated Intellectual Property Rights with Competition Policy	129
4.4.1 Summary of the Previous Results.....	129
4.4.2 Limited Practicability of the Incentives Balance Test.....	132
5 Towards a New Test to Assess Refusal to License Intellectual Property Rights Cases.....	135
5.1 Experiences from Previous Caselaw: Discussion of the Criteria for Abusive Conduct.....	136
5.1.2 Indispensability Criterion and Elimination of Competition	136
5.1.3 Defining Harm to Consumers: Prevention of a New Product or Impediment to Innovation	141
5.1.4 Objective Justification	144
5.2 General Standards to Assess Exclusionary Conduct	145
5.2.1 No Economic Sense Test and Profit Sacrifice Test.....	145
5.2.2 Equally Efficient Competitor Test.....	148
5.2.3 Consumer Welfare Test and Disproportionality Test.....	150
5.3 Introduction of the Innovation Effects and Appropriability Test.....	153

- 5.3.1 Basic Idea..... 153
- 5.3.2 Design and Structure of the Test in Detail 155
 - 5.3.2.1 Detecting the Anti-Competitive Effects 155
 - 5.3.2.1.1 Indispensability for Competition in a
Secondary Market 155
 - 5.3.2.1.2 Harm to Consumers..... 158
 - 5.3.2.2 Are Intellectual Property Rights Necessary to Protect
the Innovation? 160
 - 5.3.2.2.1 Methodological Approach..... 160
 - 5.3.2.2.2 The Criteria in Detail 163
 - 5.3.2.3 Imposing the Remedy 166
 - 5.3.2.3.1 Choosing the Right Remedy 167
 - 5.3.2.3.2 Enforcement and Supervision 171
- 5.4 Critical Acclaim 173
 - 5.4.1 Analysis of the Anti-Competitive Effects 173
 - 5.4.1.1 Indispensability Criterion and Elimination of
Competition 173
 - 5.4.1.2 Consumer Harm..... 174
 - 5.4.2 Objective Justification 176
 - 5.4.2.1 Incentives Balancing v. Appropriability Test..... 176
 - 5.4.2.2 Efficiency Defense v. Appropriability Test..... 179
 - 5.4.3 Problems related to the Innovation Effects and
Appropriability Test 181
- 5.5 Intermediate Result 183
- 6 Lessons Learned and Open Questions 187**
 - 6.1 Summary of the Results 187
 - 6.2 Fields of Further Research 190

6.2.1 Implementing a Dynamic Perspective..... 190

6.2.2 Differentiation between the Various Types of Intellectual
Property Rights (One Size Cannot Fit All)..... 192

6.3 Conclusion 193

Bibliography..... 195