



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 Drexl, 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 Schrickler, 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

