
Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xiii
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxi
1. Introduction	1
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
2. The Relationship between IP and Antitrust Laws	8
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 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 as Legal(istic) Filters	26
2.3.3. Approach III: Balancing Different Means to Enhance 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 to the Competition Problem	63
2.6. Which Antitrust Rules? Some Principles	65
2.7. Conclusion	67

3. The Concepts of Monopolisation and Abuse: What is the Correct Test?	68
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
4. Refusals to Deal which May Impede Follow-On Innovation	96
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 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 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 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

5. The Licensing Fee: Determining Liability and the Remedy 136

5.1. The Royalty.....138

5.1.1. No Royalty138

5.1.2. Cost-Based Pricing.....139

5.1.3. Same Firm Price Comparison, Market-Based Pricing,
and Profit Comparison140

5.1.4. Efficient Component Pricing Rule (ECPR).....141

5.1.5. Hypothetical Bargaining and Maximum Willingness to Pay142

5.1.6. At-Least Reasonably Efficient Licensee’s Maximum Ability to Pay143

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,
and Enforcement.....147

5.5. Conclusion147

6. An Essential Facilities Test 149

6.1. Condition 1: Harm to Competition150

6.1.1. Dominant Position150

6.1.2. No Circumvention or Substitution within a
Reasonable Period of Time157

6.1.3. Elimination or Prevention of Effective Competition
on the Adjacent Market158

6.2. Condition 2: No *Ex Ante* Investment Defence160

6.2.1. The Difficulties of Balancing in Innovation Cases160

6.2.2. *Ex Ante* Investment162

6.3. Condition 3: No *Ex Post* Efficiency Defence163

6.4. Conclusion163

7. Cumulative Innovation under US IP and Antitrust Laws..... 165

7.1. The Initial Innovator’s and the Improver’s Positions under US IP Laws.....165

7.1.1. US Patent Law166

7.1.2. US Copyright Law.....172

7.1.3. US Trade Secret Law175

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-*Trinko*176

7.2.2. The Effects of *Trinko*.....180

7.3. Potential Exceptions to the No Duty to Deal Rule181

7.3.1. Essential Facilities Doctrine182

7.3.2. Unjustified Change in the Pattern of Dealing.....187

7.3.3. Monopoly Leveraging Doctrine189

7.3.4. Margin Squeeze193

7.3.5. Discriminatory Refusals to Deal194

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
8. Cumulative Innovation under European IP Laws and EU Competition Law	205
8.1. The Original Innovator's and the Improver's Positions 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
9. Comparison and International Dimension.....	249
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
10. Summary.....	260
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 EU Competition Law	262
10.9. Comparison and International Dimension.....	263
<i>Bibliography</i>	264
<i>Index</i>	293

German Law