



MAX-PLANCK-GESELLSCHAFT



TECHNISCHE
UNIVERSITÄT
MÜNCHEN

THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY
LAW SCHOOL
WASHINGTON DC

MIPLC Studies

Edited by

Prof. Dr. Christoph Ann, LL.M. (Duke Univ.)

Technische Universität München

Prof. Robert Brauneis

The George Washington University Law School

Prof. Dr. Josef Drexler, LL.M. (Berkeley)

Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property,
Competition, and Tax Law

Prof. Dr. Thomas M.J. Möllers

University of Augsburg

Prof. Dr. Dres. h.c. Joseph Straus,

Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property,
Competition, and Tax Law

Volume 10

Monica Armillotta

Technology Pooling Licensing Agreements: Promoting Patent Access Through Collaborative IP Mechanisms



Nomos

MIPLC

Munich
Intellectual
Property
Law Center

Augsburg
München
Washington DC

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Zugl.: München, Univ., Diss., 2010

ISBN 978-3-8329-5976-0

D 19

1. Auflage 2010

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2010. Printed in Germany. Alle Rechte, auch die des Nachdrucks von Auszügen, der fotomechanischen Wiedergabe und der Übersetzung, vorbehalten. Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically those of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, broadcasting, reproduction by photocopying machine or similar means, and storage in data banks. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to »Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort«, Munich.

Dedication

To My Love

&

To My Angel

Acknowledgements

My fondest thanks are for my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Dres. h.c. Joseph Straus, for having believed in me by offering me the chance of attaining a doctoral degree, in the first place, and for dedicating his time and experience into reviewing my work, which has greatly benefited from his comprehensive and constructive suggestions.

I would also like to convey my sincerest thanks both to Prof. Dr. Michael Lehmann, for his appreciative second report, and Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. mult. Gerhard Schricker, for having attended to my oral exam.

I also owe my deepest thanks to the Munich Intellectual Property Law Center (MIPLC) for providing me with a scholarship award to sustain my doctoral research endeavours. In fact prior to pursuing my Ph.D, I had the good fortune of attending the MIPLC's LL.M. program, which moved me into exploring more in depth the challenging domains of IP and competition law.

In the context of the MIPLC, I would like to dedicate a very special note of thanks to Prof. Martin J. Adelman and Honourable Chief Judge Randall R. Rader, for their inspiring feedback on the US patent law's system and their lasting friendly support all along my academic and professional endeavours.

I would also like to express my true gratitude to the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property, Competition and Tax Law for offering exceptional research facilities and for the friendly support I have always received during my stay, and to the Law Faculty of the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (LMU), for welcoming me in their doctoral program. I felt truly privileged to be part of such a great and stimulating academic environment.

Furthermore I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to the editors of the MIPLC Book Series for the honour of having retained my work for publication, as well as to the Nomos's staff, for the extremely cooperative technical and substantial support.

A particular thanks goes also to my friend and colleague Dr. Kristina Janušauskaitė for all her good and practical advices on the journey we shared towards our doctoral degree.

Finally my most deeply felt gratitude goes to my best friend and companion, for his endless patience, encouragement and selfless support all along the way. It is with his love and dedication that this work has been accomplished.

August 2010

Monica Armillotta

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Acronyms and Abbreviations | 15 |
| Chapter 1 Introduction: Putting Patent Pools into Perspective | 21 |
| A. Promoting Patent Access through Collaborative IP Mechanisms: Encountered Problems and Desired Outcomes | 22 |
| I. Finding a Way Through the “Patent Thicket” | 22 |
| II. The Solution Offered by Collaborative IP Mechanisms: A Brief Overview | 25 |
| 1. Patent Pools | 25 |
| 2. Clearinghouses | 26 |
| B. Patent Pools as Business Models and Comparison with Alternative Sharing Solutions | 27 |
| I. Process Leading to the Establishment of a Patent Pool | 28 |
| II. A Step Forward from: | 29 |
| 1. Bilateral Negotiations | 29 |
| 2. Cross-Licensing Agreements | 30 |
| C. Patent Pools and Standards: Endeavors to Promote Access to Standard-Related Patents for Interoperability Purposes | 32 |
| I. Overlaps and Demarcation between Patent Pools and Standard-Setting Organizations | 32 |
| 1. Interface / Interoperability Standards | 32 |
| 2. Pivotal Role of Patent Rights and Advantages of Collaborative Settings: Patent Pools Strategies to Overcome “Hold-Up” Problems | 34 |
| II. Boosting Access to Standard-Related Patents for a Competitive Market Integration | 36 |
| 1. European Commission: General Policy Concerns and Recently Announced Actions | 37 |
| 2. Overcoming the Perceived Shortcomings in the Patent Regime | 39 |
| a. Debated Opportunity of Legislative Interventions | 39 |
| aa. From an Antitrust Law Standpoint | 40 |
| ab. From a Patent Law Standpoint | 41 |
| b. Internal IPR Policies as Self-Regulatory Solutions | 43 |
| ba. Standard-Setting Bodies’ Recommendations | 43 |
| bb. Patent Pools’ Enforced Licensing Terms | 46 |
| D. Patent Pools and the Interface between Intellectual Property Rights and Antitrust Law | 47 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| I. | Confuting the Traditionally Perceived Antagonism between Patent and Antitrust Law: Introducing the Concept of “Competition of First Level” and Refuting the Idea of “Patent Monopolies” | 48 |
| II. | Matured View of Complementarity between IP Protection and Competition | 49 |
| 1. | Stance of the US Antitrust Authorities | 51 |
| 2. | European Commission’s Corresponding Position | 53 |
| 3. | WTO’s TRIPS Acknowledgement of IP as a “Good of Trade” | 54 |
| Chapter 2 | Historical Outlook | 57 |
| A. | Case Survey: The First Distinguished Patent Pools | 57 |
| I. | Sewing Machine | 57 |
| II. | Motion Picture | 57 |
| III. | Folding Bed | 59 |
| IV. | Airplane | 59 |
| V. | Radio | 60 |
| VI. | Hartford-Empire | 60 |
| VII. | Video | 61 |
| B. | Discussed Patent Pools’ Examples | 62 |
| I. | The Debated Case of Software: The “Open Innovation Network” Initiative | 62 |
| 1. | Targeting Collective Free “Open Source” Access to Software Patents | 62 |
| a. | From Linux-Based Cooperative Research Paradigms | 63 |
| b. | To Institutionalised Consortia, as Advocated by IBM at the Madrid OECD Conference on the Research Use of Patented Inventions in May 2006 | 64 |
| 2. | Drawing up a Balance of “Open Innovation” as Alternative Business Models | 66 |
| II. | The Celebrated “MPEG LA” Case | 69 |
| 1. | From the First Steps to a Rising Star | 69 |
| 2. | Still a Necessary Evil? | 71 |
| Chapter 3 | Comparative Analysis: US Legal Treatment of Patent Pools - Delineating the Modern Archetype | 73 |
| A. | Outlook on the American Model: The Early Years | 73 |
| I. | From the Initial Patent Holders’ Immunity to the Fierce Supreme Court’s Antitrust Scrutiny | 73 |
| II. | The Patent Act of 1952 and the “Nine No-Nos”: Defining the Spheres of Interference between Antitrust and Patent Law | 76 |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-----|
| B. | US Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property: The Current View | 79 |
| I. | The Institution of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in 1982 and the 1988 Department of Justice's Antitrust Guidelines: Advocating the "Rule of Reason" | 79 |
| II. | The Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission's 1995 IP Guidelines and their Funding Principles | 81 |
| III. | Driving Criteria for Patent Pools in the IP Guidelines and Business Review Letters: Sanctioning an Overall More Favourable Approach | 83 |
| IV. | Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission's Joint Hearings on Competition and IP Law Policy and the Ensuing Innovation Reports: Paving the Way for a Sustainable Balance | 86 |
| Chapter 4 The EU Legal Framework | | 89 |
| A. | Art. 81 of the EC Treaty | 89 |
| I. | The Proscription of Art. 81 (1) and Its Legal Consequences, in Particular as Set by the 2006 Guidelines on Methods of Setting Fines | 89 |
| II. | The Scope of the Individual Exemption under Art. 81 (3) | 93 |
| B. | The Way to the TTBER | 96 |
| I. | TTBER 1996 and Commission Evaluation Report | 96 |
| II. | TTBER's Review Process | 98 |
| C. | Current TTBER and Accompanying Guidelines | 103 |
| I. | New TTBER's Operative Principles | 103 |
| 1. | Systematisation and Definition of Technology Pools | 104 |
| 2. | Questionable Demarcation of the Pool's Agreements between TTBER and Guidelines | 106 |
| II. | Antitrust Scrutiny of Technology Pools under the Guidelines | 109 |
| 1. | Nature of the Pooled Technologies: Substitutes v. Complements and the Concept of Essentiality | 109 |
| 2. | Beyond Categorizations: Competitive Efficiencies from a Consumer Perspective | 112 |
| 3. | Different Categories of Technologies and Possible Combined Scenarios | 112 |
| 4. | Antitrust Concerns Beyond Merely Technological Systematizations | 115 |
| 5. | Particular Obligations upon Standard-Related Technology Owners Involved in a Pool: Early Disclosure and Licensing Terms | 116 |
| a. | A Delicate Balance of Interests as Base for the Commission's Recommendations | 116 |
| b. | The Precedence Set by Standard-Setting Bodies | 118 |

| | |
|---|---------|
| III. Assessment of Individual Restraints: Non-Compete, Grant-Back and Non-Challenge Clauses | 120 |
| 1. General Principles | 120 |
| 2. Contextual Implementation | 122 |
| IV. Institutional Framework Governing the Pool | 125 |
| 1. Independent Experts | 126 |
| 2. Open and Indiscriminate Participation | 126 |
| 3. Overseen Exchange of Sensitive Information | 127 |
| 4. Neutral Dispute Resolution Mechanism | 127 |
| D. Selected EC Case Law on Patent Pools | 127 |
| I. Videocassette Recorders (VCR) | 128 |
| II. Advanced Photographic System (APS) | 128 |
| III. Digital Versatile Disc (DVD) | 129 |
| IV. Moving Picture Experts Group (MPEG) | 130 |
| V. Third Generation Patent Platform Partnership (3G3P) | 130 |
| VI. Philips and Sony's CD Disc Licensing Program | 133 |
| Chapter 5 Collaborative IP Mechanisms' Applications: Exploring New Frontiers of Life Sciences | 139 |
| A. Patent Pools and Biotechnology: Legal and Business Considerations | 139 |
| B. Pilot Experiences | 140 |
| I. Cases at Hand | 140 |
| 1. Golden Rice | 140 |
| 2. SNPs | 147 |
| 3. SARS | 153 |
| 4. HNPCC | 157 |
| II. Some Common Remarks | 159 |
| 1. General Considerations | 159 |
| 2. The Issue of Funding | 162 |
| Chapter 6 The Alternative Approach of Clearinghouses: Distinctive Features and Applications in Biotechnology | 167 |
| A. Defining Characteristics | 167 |
| B. Models and Applications | 169 |
| I. Information Clearinghouse | 170 |
| 1. Biosafety Clearing-House | 170 |
| 2. CAMBIA's Patent Lens | 172 |
| II. Technology Exchange Clearinghouse | 174 |
| 1. BirchBob | 174 |
| 2. Pharmalicensing | 175 |

| | |
|--|---------|
| 3. TechEx | 177 |
| 4. PIPRA | 177 |
| III. Royalty Collection Clearinghouse | 184 |
| IV. Open Source Clearinghouse | 188 |
| 1. Science Commons - A Creative Commons' project | 189 |
| 2. BioBricks Foundation | 192 |
| 3. CAMBIA's Biological Open Source (BiOS) | 193 |
| Chapter 7 Conclusions: the Way Forward | 198 |
| List of Works Cited | 205 |

