

SAIC's New IPR Regulation to Take Effect on 1 August 2015

The past decade has seen a significant shift in the competitive landscape of China's science and technology sector. From the manufacturing floor to a major contributor to scientific advances and technological innovation, spending on R&D continues to increase and Chinese companies are emerging as genuine contenders to worldwide brands and renowned research facilities.

Against this backdrop, on 13 April 2015, the State Administration for Industry and Commerce (SAIC) released the final version of the *Provisions on Prohibition of Abuse of Intellectual Property Rights to Eliminate or Restrict Competition* (IPR Regulation) which will take effect on 1 August 2015.

The IPR Regulation comes at an opportune time, and reflects the growing recognition of intellectual property rights (IPR) protection in China. In fact the IPR Regulation was first conceived in 2008 pursuant to the government issued *National Intellectual Property Strategy Outline* (Outline)¹. Its enactment this year represents the fruits of a 7-year-long legislative process, including numerous rounds of public consultation during which issues on the interface between IPRs and competition law were debated and explored.

Another Piece in the IPR-related Antitrust Legal Framework

The IPR Regulation supplements Article 55 of the Anti-monopoly Law (AML) which is the principal rule for IPR-related conduct. Article 55 states that the AML does not apply to companies which exercise their IPRs in accordance with applicable laws and administrative regulations on IPRs, unless the companies abuse their IPRs to eliminate or restrict competition.

The IPR Regulation is the first IPR-dedicated piece of antitrust regulation. However, it will only apply to enforcement action taken by the SAIC, not the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) or the Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM). Notably, the exclusion of provisions regulating price-related abuses in the final version of the IPR Regulation means that price-related abuses will remain the NDRC's exclusive jurisdiction.

More recently, towards the end of May 2015, the State Council's Anti-Monopoly Commission announced that the NDRC has been tasked with developing a set of antitrust guidelines, in consultation with the SAIC and MOFCOM. One of the guidelines will address specific issues relating to abuses of IPR which eliminate or restrict competition. It will be interesting to see, in due course, how the new guideline will interact with the IPR Regulation.

¹ The *National Intellectual Property Strategy Outline* was a high level government strategy issued in 2008. It recognised that there were, at the time, IPR-related abusive practices which impeded fair competition and recommended issuance of specific legislation to regulate the market and protect public interest.

Introduction of Safe Harbours

Article 5 of the IPR Regulation introduces the following safe harbours to determine whether an IP-related agreement is likely to restrict competition:

HORIZONTAL MONOPOLY AGREEMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The combined market share of the parties in the relevant market does not exceed 20 percent; or• There are at least four other independently controlled substitute technologies in the relevant market that can be obtained at reasonable cost.
VERTICAL MONOPOLY AGREEMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The market shares of each parties in the relevant markets does not exceed 30 percent; or• There are at least two other independently controlled substitute technologies in the relevant market that can be obtained at reasonable cost.

The safe harbours are a key feature of the IPR Regulation. They stipulate conditions which act as proxies for measuring the impact of an agreement on competition, which, when met, raise a presumption that the IPR agreement is unlikely to be anti-competitive. The presumption is rebuttable, and parties to an agreement may lose the protection of the safe harbour if there is evidence showing an IPR agreement has the effect of eliminating or restricting competition.

The safe harbours are modelled upon the European Commission block exemption for technology transfer agreements (TTBER), but differ in an important respect. Whilst the TTBER safe harbour² exempts certain agreements on the presumption they fulfil Article 101(3) of the *Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union* (the equivalent of Article 15 of the AML), i.e., their benefits outweigh their harm, the IPR Regulation safe harbours fall short of providing justification for negative effects on competition, and accords more limited protection.

IPR-related Abuses of a Dominant Market Position

Articles 7 – 11 of the IPR Regulation prohibit members of patent pools in a dominant market position from abusing their dominance and provide a list of IPR-related abuses, including, but not limited to, forcible bundling, exclusive dealing, imposing unreasonable restrictive conditions and discriminatory treatment.

Additionally and despite objections, the SAIC has adopted the essential facilities doctrine. Article 7 sets out three factors that will be considered in determining what constitutes an “essential” IPR:

- The IPR has no reasonable substitute and is essential for other undertakings to compete in the relevant market;
- Refusal to license the IPR will cause an adverse impact on competition or innovation in the relevant market, leading to the impairment of consumer or public interest; and
- Licensing the IPR will not cause unreasonable damage to the licensor.

These factors define and limit the scope of essentiality to an extent, but Article 7 nonetheless augments legal uncertainty around how the tension between IPR protection and competition will be resolved, and when companies will find themselves at the tipping point where the objectives of competition law overtake an essential IPR.

² See Paragraph 41 of the *Guidelines on the application of Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to technology transfer agreements*.

Two Special IPR-related Activities

The IPR Regulation also provides guidance on patent pools and standard setting. Specifically, Articles 12 and 13 provide that:

<p>1) PATENT POOL³</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of a patent pool should not exchange competitively sensitive information in terms of output, market division etc. • If a patent pool is in a dominant market position, without justifiable reasons, it shall not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Restrict its members from licensing independently outside the patent pool; » Restrict its members or licensees from developing competing technologies independently or with third parties; » Force its licensees to exclusively grant back their improvements or technologies to the patent pool or its members; » Forbid its licensees to challenge the validity of the patents in the pool; and » Discriminate against its members or licensees.
<p>2) STANDARD SETTING</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a patent holder is in a dominant market position, it shall not, without justifiable reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Deliberately conceal information on its patents or expressly abandon its patent rights during participation in standard setting, but claiming its patent rights against the parties implementing the standard after the patents become part of the standard; and » After its patents become standard essential patents, breach the fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory principle (FRAND) and engage in behaviour such as refusing to license, tying products or attaching unreasonable trading conditions to the license.

There are issues that remain unclear and it is necessary to cross-reference other IPR-related rules for clarification. For example, with regards to regulation of national standards, the *Administrative Regulation on the National Standards involving Patents (Tentative)* provides the procedures for disclosure and publication of standard essential patents.

Final Remarks

Local and international observers have, in recent years, witnessed a clear and inevitable trend towards a more pro-active approach to IPR-related antitrust enforcement in China. China's developing regime has come under scrutiny as a result of high-profile IPR-related antitrust investigations, civil suits and merger control cases involving foreign companies.

Despite concerns expressed by international IP practitioners, the IPR Regulation is just one of many indications that China will no longer be tolerant of IPR infringements. As China is a key market for multi-national corporations, foreign companies operating in China that hold key assets in IPRs should be wary of the impact of the IPR Regulation and ensure early compliance before the IPR Regulation takes effect on 1 August 2015.

³ "Patent Pool" refers to an agreement by which two or more patentees jointly license their patents to a third party.

Contact Us

For inquiries related to this Legal Update, please contact the following persons or your usual contacts at our firm.

Hannah Ha

Partner

T: +852 2843 4378

E: hannah.ha@mayerbrownjism.com

John Hickin

Partner

T: +852 2843 2576

E: john.hickin@mayerbrownjism.com

Mayer Brown JSM is part of Mayer Brown, a global legal services organisation, advising many of the world's largest companies, including a significant portion of the Fortune 100, FTSE 100, DAX and Hang Seng Index companies and more than half of the world's largest banks. Our legal services include banking and finance; corporate and securities; litigation and dispute resolution; antitrust and competition; employment and benefits; environmental; financial services regulatory and enforcement; government and global trade; intellectual property; real estate; tax; restructuring, bankruptcy and insolvency; and wealth management.

OFFICE LOCATIONS AMERICAS: Charlotte, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, New York, Palo Alto, Washington DC
ASIA: Bangkok, Beijing, Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, Hong Kong, Shanghai, Singapore
EUROPE: Brussels, Düsseldorf, Frankfurt, London, Paris
TAUIL&CHEQUER ADVOGADOS in association with Mayer Brown LLP: São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro

Please visit www.mayerbrownjism.com for comprehensive contact information for all our offices.

This publication provides information and comments on legal issues and developments of interest to our clients and friends. The foregoing is intended to provide a general guide to the subject matter and is not intended to provide legal advice or be a substitute for specific advice concerning individual situations. Readers should seek legal advice before taking any action with respect to the matters discussed herein. Please also read the Mayer Brown JSM legal publications [Disclaimer](#). A list of the partners of Mayer Brown JSM may be inspected on our website www.mayerbrownjism.com or provided to you on request.

Mayer Brown is a global legal services provider comprising legal practices that are separate entities (the "Mayer Brown Practices"). The Mayer Brown Practices are: Mayer Brown LLP and Mayer Brown Europe-Brussels LLP, both limited liability partnerships established in Illinois USA; Mayer Brown International LLP, a limited liability partnership incorporated in England and Wales (authorized and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority and registered in England and Wales number OC 303359); Mayer Brown, a SELAS established in France; Mayer Brown JSM, a Hong Kong partnership and its associated legal practices in Asia; and Tauil & Chequer Advogados, a Brazilian law partnership with which Mayer Brown is associated. Mayer Brown Consulting (Singapore) Pte. Ltd and its subsidiary, which are affiliated with Mayer Brown, provide customs and trade advisory and consultancy services, not legal services. "Mayer Brown" and the Mayer Brown logo are the trademarks of the Mayer Brown Practices in their respective jurisdictions.