



## Stockholm Network Experts' Series on Intellectual Property and Competition

### What Is Wrong With Royalties in High-Technology Industries?



By Damien Geradin



STOCKHOLM NETWORK

# What is wrong with royalties in high technology industries?

By Damien Geradin

Damien Geradin is Professor of Competition Law and Economics at Tilburg University and Director of the Global Competition Center, College of Europe, Bruges; Partner, Howrey LLP, Brussels. The author thanks Anne Layne-Farrar for her comments. [geradind@howrey.com](mailto:geradind@howrey.com)

© Stockholm Network 2007. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the corporate view of the Stockholm Network or those of its member think tanks.

## I. Introduction

Over the past few years, there has been an unprecedented degree of interest among competition authorities, scholars, Standard-Setting Organisations (hereafter, SSOs) and trade associations with respect to the level of royalties that are charged by holders of intellectual property rights (IPRs). For instance, in the past two years, the US Department of Justice (DoJ) granted business letter clearance to two SSOs – VITA and IEEE – to implement new IPR policies designed to control the IPR costs.<sup>1</sup> In April 2007, the DoJ and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) jointly released a report on ‘Antitrust Enforcement and Intellectual Property Rights’.<sup>2</sup> But the interest is not limited to the United States. The European Commission is currently investigating the compatibility of certain licensing regimes and conduct within SSOs against EC competition law.<sup>3</sup> Reflecting the debate at the policy level, scholars have produced a large body of legal and economic literature on IPR and standardisation issues, including patent hold-up (where the patent holder exploits ill-gotten market power in ‘excessive’ licensing fees) and royalty stacking (where multiple patents must be licensed and thus the royalty rates stack up to ‘excessive’ amounts).<sup>4</sup>

Against this background, this paper addresses the issue of whether something has gone wrong with royalties in high technology industries. This paper seeks to answer this question first by looking at a number of concrete scenarios where firms holding IPRs seek to obtain a return on their patent portfolios by licensing them. As will be seen, the behaviour of these firms essentially depends on whether they are vertically-integrated or non vertically-integrated. Vertically-integrated firms engage in research and development activities (R&D), patenting at least some of their inventions, and also manufacturing products based on their own innovations and the innovations produced by others. Non vertically-integrated firms, in contrast specialise in either one or the other of the multiple layers of production. Pure upstream firms conduct R&D and patent their innovations, but they do not engage in manufacturing. Downstream firms specialise in manufacturing, but do not engage in R&D.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Thomas O. Barnett, Response to VMEbus International Trade Association (VITA)’s Request for Business Review Letter; Dep’t Just. Antitrust Division; 2006; <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/public/busreview/219380.htm>; Thomas O. Barnett; Response to Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.’s Request for Business Review Letter; Dep’t Just. Antitrust Division; 2007; <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/public/busreview/222978.htm>

<sup>2</sup> See FTC; “Antitrust Enforcement and Intellectual Property Rights: Promoting Innovation and Competition”; <http://www.ftc.gov/reports/innovation/P040101PromotingInnovationandCompetitionrpt0704.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> The European Commission sent a Statement of Objections to Rambus in August 2007 on the ground that it infringed EC Treaty rules on abuse of a dominant position (Article 82) by claiming unreasonable royalties for the use of certain patents for ‘Dynamic Random Access Memory’ chips (DRAMs) subsequent to a so-called ‘patent ambush’, See Memo/07/330; “Commission confirms sending a Statement of Objections to Rambus”; Brussels; 23 August 2007. In October 2007, the European Commission also decided to open formal anti-trust proceedings against Qualcomm following complaints lodged with the Commission by Ericsson, Nokia, Texas Instruments, Broadcom, NEC and Panasonic, alleging that Qualcomm’s licensing terms and conditions are not Fair, Reasonable and Non-Discriminatory (“FRAND”) and, therefore, may breach EC competition rules. See MEMO/07/389; “Commission initiates formal proceedings against Qualcomm”; 1 October 2007. This initiation of proceedings does not imply that the Commission has proof of an infringement. It only signifies that the Commission will conduct an in-depth investigation of the case as a matter of priority.

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, Daniel Swanson & William Baumol; “Reasonable and Nondiscriminatory (RAND) Royalties, Standards Selection, and Control of Market Power,” 73 Antitrust L.J. 1; Douglas G. Lichtman; “Patent Holdouts and the Standard-Setting Process”; University Chicago Law and Economics; Olin Working Paper No. 292; May 2006. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=902646>; Mark Lemley & Carl Shapiro; Patent Holdup and Royalty Stacking; 2007; 85 *Texas Law Review*, 1989; “Patent Trolls’ and Patent Remedies”; 85; 2007; *Texas Law Review*, 2111; Holdup, Royalty Stacking, and the Presumption of Injunctive Relief for Patent Infringement: A Reply to Lemley and Shapiro, (2008) 92 *Minnesota Law Review* p713.

<sup>5</sup> For a good discussion of the conflicting incentives of these firms, see Teece & Sherry; “Standards Setting and Antitrust”; 2003 87 *Minnesota Law Review*; 1913, at p1929.

In order to narrow the scope of the discussion, this paper focuses on royalties, which are paid by firms seeking to implement an industry standard.<sup>6</sup> Standard-setting activities aim to achieve device interoperability and product compatibility.<sup>7</sup> There is a large number of SSOs, some of which, like ETSI, have a prominent role in the development of standards in high technology industries.<sup>8</sup> Although standardisation processes tend to vary among SSOs, most SSOs encourage IPR owners involved in standardisation to disclose upfront, i.e. prior to the adoption of a standard, the IPR that they consider may be ‘essential’ for its implementation.<sup>9</sup> Once disclosure is made, or contemporaneously with disclosure, IPR owners are typically asked to provide an assurance or commitment that, should their IPR be essential for a standard, they will license them on fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms to members of the SSO and outsiders.<sup>10</sup>

Once a standard has been formally adopted, manufacturers wishing to implement the standards have to obtain licenses from the firms holding the ‘essential’ patents as otherwise they would take the risk of being sued for patent infringement. As will be seen below, not all licenses are royalty-bearing as, for instance, both firms engaging in license negotiations may hold essential patents to a given standard and thus decide to cross-license each other with limited or no royalty payment. Cross-licenses may involve royalty payments when the firms’ patent portfolios have different value, necessitating a ‘balancing’ payment from one to the other. Essential IP holders not engaged in manufacturing are typically not interested in royalty-free cross-licenses as royalties are their only source of revenues.

This paper is divided into three parts. Following this introduction, Part II reviews four different hypothetical scenarios, illustrating common misconceptions and misinformation related to evaluating the royalties that are paid by standard implementers. It also shows that the focus of competition authorities analysing technology licensing agreements should not be so much to control royalty rates, a complex task for which competition authorities are not well suited, but rather to ensure that vertically-integrated firms do not restrict downstream competition through anti-competitive licensing practices.<sup>11</sup> Part III presents some conclusions.

---

<sup>6</sup> Note that royalties are but one element of the consideration agreed upon between the parties. Other elements susceptible of pecuniary valuation, such as a cross-licence to the licensees’ IPR or an upfront fee, are taken into account and their value is often significantly higher than that of the royalty itself.

<sup>7</sup> See D. Geradin, “Standardisation and Technological Innovation: Some Reflections on Ex-ante Licensing, FRAND, and the Proper Means to Reward Innovators”; (2006) 29(4); *World Competition* p511.

<sup>8</sup> For instance, the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), headquartered in Sophia Antipolis, France, was formed in 1988 by the European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations (“CEPT”) and is officially recognised by the European Commission as the organisation responsible for standardisation of information and communication technologies within Europe. Its mission is to “develop globally applicable deliverables meeting the needs of the Information and Communications Technologies (“ICT”) community.” See generally Mark Lemley, “Intellectual Property Rights and Standard-Setting Organisations”; 90 ;2002; *California Law Review* 1889

<sup>9</sup> ETSI defines “Essential IPR” as meaning “that it is not possible on technical (but not commercial) grounds, taking into account normal technical practice and the state of the art generally available at the time of standardisation, ..... [to] comply with a standard without infringing that IPR.” ETSI IPR Policy (version of 23 November 2005) at Art. 15.

<sup>10</sup> See Damien Geradin and Miguel Rato; “Can Standard-Setting Lead to Exploitative Abuse? A Dissonant View on Patent Hold-up, Royalty-Stacking and the Meaning of FRAND”; (2007; 3 *European Competition Law Journal*, p101; “Pricing Patents for Licensing in Standard Setting Organisations: Making Sense of FRAND Commitments” by Anne Layne-Farrar et al., forthcoming in *Antitrust Law Journal*, available online at [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=937930](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=937930).

<sup>11</sup> Of course, specialist firms can have incentives for anticompetitive behaviours (strategic non-disclosure and subsequent hold up, for instance) but this potential does not suggest vertically-integrated firms are exempt from competition scrutiny. To the contrary, we will see that integration is not a solution to opportunistic licensing but instead offers its own dangers.

## II. Are royalties too high? A review of several scenarios


While common wisdom among industry actors is that the level of royalties sought by essential IP holders in high technology industries is generally 'too high', information over the level of royalties that applies to the implementation of a given standard is often confusing. Take the example of the WCDMA standard applied in the mobile industry. While authors of a case study on the royalty rates applicable to this standard indicated that cumulative royalty levels can be as high as 30%,<sup>12</sup> Nokia, the world's leading handset makers, said publicly that it does not pay more than 3% royalties for implementing WCDMA.<sup>13</sup> The apparent inconsistency between such figures can be explained by looking at some hypothetical scenarios, which are discussed below.

### A. Four hypothetical scenarios

*Scenario 1: The essential IP is detained by five vertically-integrated firms*

Let's assume, for the purpose of this scenario, that five vertically-integrated firms (A, B, C, D and E) own all the essential patents for a given standard and have relatively symmetrical holdings. Let's also assume that these firms consider that, should it be licensed, their patent portfolio would be worth a royalty rate of 5% (calculated on the basis of the sales of the products implementing the standard in question).

**Figure 1**



In this scenario, vertically-integrated firms will typically grant each other royalty-free licenses covering their respective essential patents. Pursuant to such cross-licenses, no royalty will be exchanged among these firms. The cumulative royalty rate paid by each of these firms will thus be zero. These vertically-integrated firms will then compete on the downstream market for the relevant product.

<sup>12</sup> See Lemley and Shapiro, *supra* note 4.


<sup>13</sup> See "Nokia WCDMA Handsets" ("Nokia confirmed that until 2007 it has paid less than 3 per cent aggregate license fees on WCDMA handset sales under all its patent license agreements. This number represents Nokia's aggregate gross royalty payments made under all the numerous patent license agreements applicable to its WCDMA handsets"), available at <http://www.letsgomobile.org/en/1218/wcdma-handsets>

Alternatively, vertically-integrated firms may decide to charge each other a royalty rate of 5% and pass the royalty cost on to downstream customers. This operation could be profitable as each of these firms would have to pay 20% royalties (which they would pass on downstream), but collect significant royalties, which would directly contribute to their bottom line. This strategy would, however, violate EC competition rules, as it would be no different than a price-fixing cartel, and would thus run the risk of being investigated by competition authorities. Experience in the mobile telecommunications industry teaches that this scenario is nevertheless plausible.<sup>14</sup>

*Scenario 2: The essential IP is detained by five vertically-integrated firms, and five pure manufacturers need a license to compete downstream*

Scenario 2 differs from scenario 1 in that it not only involves the five vertically-integrated firms referred to above, but also five pure manufacturers (V, W, X, Y and Z), which want to enter the downstream market for the relevant product and compete with the vertically-integrated firms.

**Figure 2**



As in scenario 1, vertically-integrated firms will typically grant each other low or royalty-free licenses covering their respective essential patents. By contrast, these firms will charge a 5% royalty to each of the pure manufacturers that need to obtain a license covering their essential patents. Such pure manufacturers, which by definition do not hold


<sup>14</sup> For some examples, see: See Notice on the application of the competition rules to access agreements in the telecommunications sector - framework, relevant markets and principles, O.J. 22 August 1998, C 265/02: "There is, however, obvious potential for anti competitive effects of certain access agreements or clauses therein. Access agreements may, for example: (a) serve as a means of coordinating prices"; Revised ERG Common Position on the approach to Appropriate remedies in the ECNS regulatory framework Final Version May 2006, p. 37: "Economic theory suggests that – under certain circumstances – the setting of reciprocal high or low termination charges can be used as an instrument of tacit collusion between networks which are in competition on the retail market". Generally, see Jean-Jacques Laffont et Jean Tirole; *Competition in Telecommunications*; MIT Press; 2000; pp. 190-95 and Damien Geradin and Michel Kerf; *Controlling Market Power in Telecommunications - Antitrust vs. Sector Specific Regulation*; Oxford University Press; 2003; p46.

essential IP, cannot buy their access to the vertically-integrated firms' essential patents through a cross-license. This means that each of these firms will face a cumulative royalty burden of 25%. The average cumulative royalty rate will in turn amount to  $((0\% \times 5) + (25\% \times 5)) / 10 = 12.5\%$ .

*Scenario 3: The essential IP is detained by four vertically-integrated firms and a pure upstream firm, and five pure manufacturers need a license to compete downstream*

This scenario is similar to scenario 2, but for one aspect: assume now that the essential patents for a given standard are shared among four vertically-integrated firms (A, B, C and D) and one upstream-only firm (U\*). Let's assume that, like the vertically-integrated firms referred to in the first two scenarios, U\* considers that its patent portfolio is worth a royalty rate of 5%.

**Figure 3**




U\* is, however, unwilling to agree on a royalty-free cross license with the vertically-integrated firms as, unlike these firms which make the bulk of their revenues by selling downstream products (i.e. mobile handsets, laptops, etc.), royalties are U\*'s main or only source of revenues. In this scenario, each of the vertically-integrated firms will thus pay a cumulative royalty rate of 5%, while the non vertically-integrated firms will continue to pay cumulative rate of 25%. The average cumulative royalty rate paid by the firms willing to implement the standard amount to  $((5\% \times 4) + (25\% \times 5)) / 9 = 16.11\%$ .

*Scenario 4: The essential IP is detained by a pure upstream firm, and four vertically-integrated firms and five pure manufacturers need a license to compete downstream*

In this scenario, all the essential IP is owned by an upstream firm, which requests a royalty rate of 5% to license this IP. The vertically-integrated firms are in the same situation as the pure manufacturers, despite the fact they engage in

R&D, as they do not own any essential IP to the standard in question (either because they focused on technologies relevant to other standards or because their research on the standard in question has been unsuccessful and they do not have any patentable technology). In this case, the average cumulative royalty rate will amount to  $(9 \times 5\%) / 9 = 5\%$ .

**Figure 4**



**B. Discussion**

A number of valuable insights can be gained from considering the above scenarios.

First, these scenarios explain the presence of inconsistent reports as to the cumulative royalty rates applicable to firms wishing to implement a given standard. In fact, vertically-integrated firms with significant portfolios of essential patents will, thanks to their ability to cross-license, face a much lower royalty burden than pure manufacturers holding no IP. A distinction has thus to be made between the *minimum* cumulative royalty rate, the *maximum* cumulative royalty rate and the *average* cumulative royalty rate. For instance, in scenario 2, the minimum cumulative royalty rate (which applies to the vertically-integrated operators) is zero, the maximum cumulative royalty rate (which applies to pure manufacturers) is 25%, and the average cumulative royalty (which represents the cumulative royalty rates of all firms active downstream) is 12.5%. Some complaining about high cumulative royalty rates may thus refer to the maximum cumulative royalty rate paid by firms with no essential IP while conveniently ignoring that most standard implementers can lower their royalty costs through cross-licensing. This omission gives a distorted view of the royalty situation for the implementation of a given standard and thus may give rise to reforms aimed at solving largely non-existing problems.

Second, scenario 1 shows that vertically-integrated firms, which do not pay any royalties, are at a significant cost advantage compared to pure manufacturers, which face a cumulative royalty rate of 25%. Although this royalty cost difference may make entry on the downstream market for the relevant product more difficult, it does not in itself suggest competitive abuse. Since the patent portfolio held by the vertically-integrated manufacturers (or as in

scenarios 3 and 4, pure upstream firms) generally results from costly research and development (R&D) efforts which need to be adequately compensated, pure downstream firms should pay more to join in a market in whose creation they did not contribute.

Allowing firms to freely benefit from the investments of others would have several negative consequences. First, it would encourage inefficient entry. Second, the results of such R&D efforts would be expropriated to the benefit of those firms (in this case the pure manufacturers), which would not have undertaken similar efforts. This would negatively impact R&D investments.

Interestingly, the fact that pure manufacturers have to pay significant royalty rates to essential IP holders, which thus place them at a cost disadvantage, could give them an incentive to engage in R&D and develop their own portfolio of essential patents – if only to be in a position to cross-license and lower their royalty payments. Having these firms engaging in R&D, would have two main benefits. First, it would increase innovation in the relevant sector. Second, by reducing their royalty cost disadvantage vis-à-vis vertically-integrated firms, these firms would be able to compete more strongly on the downstream market for the relevant product, thereby putting pressure on end prices and potentially increasing consumer choice as well.

The fact that royalty payment differences between vertically-integrated firms and pure manufacturers may be legitimate does not mean, however, that the licensing strategy of the vertically-integrated firms should be left unchecked. These firms often have both the means and the incentives to engage in anticompetitive conduct. First, like all vertically-integrated operators facing downstream competition, these firms may be tempted to discriminate against pure manufacturers.<sup>15</sup> One way to eliminate downstream competition would be for them to refuse granting licenses to pure manufacturers, a strategy which is unlikely to occur in standard setting contexts since a blunt refusal to license would obviously violate FRAND commitments. They might, however, foreclose their downstream competitors by imposing un-FRAND royalties, which would amount to a constructive refusal to supply. Foreclosure strategies based on the selling of necessary inputs at prohibitive prices have, for instance, been observed in network industries.<sup>16</sup> Alternatively, the vertically-integrated firms might charge rates that allow pure downstream firms to operate, but which soften price competition dramatically, allowing the vertically-integrated firms to earn considerable margins. Moreover, vertically-integrated firms could engage in margin squeeze by combining high royalty rates with aggressively low prices of the relevant downstream product.<sup>17</sup> Finally, as has been seen in the context of the first scenario, cross-payments of royalties among vertically-integrated firms may be a strategy to engage in price-fixing cartels.

Third, the above scenarios lead to the counter-intuitive observation that there may be a negative correlation between the cumulative level of royalties and the degree of competition in the downstream market. In scenario 1, the average cumulative royalty rate amounts to zero since none of the vertically-integrated firms pay any royalty. In this scenario,

---

<sup>15</sup> See Swanson and Baumol, *supra* note 4

<sup>16</sup> See generally, Geradin and Kerf, *supra* note 14.

<sup>17</sup> See Damien Geradin and Robert O'Donoghue; "The Concurrent Application of Competition Law and Regulation: The Case of Margin Squeeze Abuses in the Telecommunications Sector"; 2005; 2 *Journal of Competition Law and Economics*; p355.

the downstream market for the relevant product is limited to five players, and is thus an oligopoly.<sup>18</sup> For reasons developed in the economic literature, oligopolistic markets may not be considered competitive.<sup>19</sup> In scenario 2, the average cumulative royalty rate is higher than in scenario 1 since it amounts to 12.5%. Yet if the pure manufacturers manage to overcome their 25 % royalty cost disadvantage by being particularly cost efficient, the downstream market will count ten players and thus will likely be much more competitive, with positive consequences in terms of prices and innovation. As the economics literature also points out, whether input cost increases, such as higher royalty rates, are passed on to end consumers in the form of higher prices depends on the level of downstream competition and consumers' elasticity of demand.<sup>20</sup> Higher average cumulative royalty rates do not necessarily translate in higher end consumer prices. These rates are due to the presence of firms without essential IP, the presence of which can stimulate downstream competition, thereby putting pressure on end consumer prices.

This observation is confirmed by extending the second scenario. If, for instance, three of the five pure manufacturers were not able to address their royalty cost disadvantage and thus were forced to exit the downstream market, this would translate in a significant decrease in the average cumulative royalty rate from 12.5% to  $((0\% \times 4) + (25\% \times 2)) / 10 = 5\%$ . Yet the downstream market would be less competitive, limited now to seven players. This would in turn likely have a negative affect on consumer prices.

This observation is important since it is often argued that high cumulative royalty rates negatively affect end consumers and that, as a consequence, measures should be taken to reduce such rates. This claim, however, would be true only if such high royalty rates were paid by the majority of firms (not the minority of pure downstream entities), if royalty rates were indeed passed on to end consumers, and if the royalty rates were extremely high so that they had a measurable affect on downstream prices. The other scenario in which high royalties could raise consumer prices is if the vertically-integrated firms were to charge exclusionary royalty rates to their downstream competitors, softening price competition. This scenario would be anticompetitive and likely to violate EC competition law (as a form of market foreclosure and/or tacit collusion). In most scenarios, however, higher average cumulative royalty rates will typically indicate the presence of pure manufacturers, representing increased downstream competition.

Fourth, the above scenarios show that the so-called 'royalty stacking' problem, whereby essential patents are spread across a large number of firms so that the royalties may stack on top of each other and make the standard very costly to implement, is attenuated through cross-licensing.<sup>21</sup> Thus, in scenarios 1 and 2 the cumulative royalty rate paid by the vertically-integrated firms is equal to zero. Scenario 3, however, shows that these firms will have to pay royalties to a pure upstream firm, which because royalties represent its only source of revenues, will not be satisfied with a royalty-free cross-licensing agreement. But will these royalty payments necessarily lead to higher consumer prices as vertically integrated firms are likely to claim? The answer is no for the following reasons. The prices of the relevant product will not solely depend on the costs faced by vertically-integrated firms, but on the degree of competition in

---

<sup>18</sup> "An oligopoly is a market characterised by a small number of firms who realise they are interdependent in their pricing and output policies. The number of firms is small enough to give each firm some market power". See *Glossary of Industrial Organisation Economics and Competition Law*, compiled by Shyam Khemani and Daniel Shapiro; Directorate for Financial, Fiscal and Enterprise Affairs, OECD; 1993.

<sup>19</sup> See Kip Viscusi, John Vernon, and Joseph Harrington, Jr.; *Economics of Regulation and Antitrust* (Third Edition); Cambridge; 2000; p. 135.

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g., the discussion of royalty rate pass through in Anne Layne-Farrar, Gerard Llobet, and A. Jorge Padilla, *Ex-Ante Negotiations in Standard Setting Organisations*, working paper February 2008.

<sup>21</sup> See Lemley and Shapiro, *supra* note 4; Damien Geradin et al.; "The Complements Problem within Standard Setting: Assessing the Evidence on Royalty Stacking"; *Boston University Journal of Science & Technology Law*; 2008 (forthcoming).

the downstream market. Except in perfectly competitive markets, sellers may not necessarily be able to reflect input price increases in their selling prices. This may induce them to engage in price fixing cartels.<sup>22</sup> When manufacturers earn substantial profit margins, increased input prices can often represent a transfer across firms with no impact on consumer prices at all. That is, the upstream firm captures more of the overall market rents, so that the manufacturer's margin is reduced. Moreover, the 25% royalty cost advantage enjoyed by vertically-integrated firms over pure manufacturers in scenario 2 is reduced to 20% in scenario 3 when the upstream specialist enters, thereby making it easier for pure manufacturers to compete on the downstream market. This could translate into lower prices as more downstream firms are able to enter and compete.

Finally, scenario 4 significantly differs from scenarios 2 and 3 since the essential IP is entirely owned by upstream firm U\*. This scenario allows stronger competition in the downstream market for the relevant product since the pure manufacturers do not suffer any royalty cost disadvantage compared to vertically-integrated firms, which for the sake of implementing this standard loses the benefit of their vertical integration. Moreover, the risk of distorted competition is also limited in this case since the upstream innovator has no incentives to discriminate among its various licensees, regardless of whether they are vertically integrated or not.<sup>23</sup> This scenario is also likely to stimulate innovation since the vertically-integrated firms will have incentives to engage in R&D and develop a patent portfolio essential to the standard in question or to develop technologies which will lead to the development and adoption of a new, more advanced standard.

### III. Conclusions

The licensing of standardised technologies is a complex subject on which a lot has been written over the last few years. The bulk of the literature suggests that the FRAND regime no longer works and that something needs to be done to control royalties, as excessively high royalties threaten the implementation of standards. Royalty stacking is one of the concerns behind the view that something has gone wrong with royalties in high technology industries.

Standard implementers, who claim that in some sectors cumulative royalty rates can be so high that standards might become too costly to implement, have proposed a variety of reforms, including allowing joint negotiations of licensing terms,<sup>24</sup> encouraging *ex ante* disclosure of such terms,<sup>25</sup> and imposing royalty caps on essential IPR.<sup>26</sup> Against this background this paper has sought to demonstrate that these concerns often reflect a number of misconceptions and a

---

<sup>22</sup> See BBC News, "BA accused over air cargo cartel", (reporting that British Airways had been accused of colluding in setting prices of fuel surcharges and other levies in the provision of air freight services). <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/7158981.stm>

<sup>23</sup> See Damien Geradin and Nicolas Petit, "Price Discrimination under EC Competition Law – Another Doctrine in Search of Limiting Principles?", 2(3) *Journal of Competition Law and Economics*; 2006; p479.

<sup>24</sup> See ., Gil Ohana, Marc Hansen & Omar Shah; "Disclosure and Negotiation of Licensing Terms Prior to Adoption of Industry Standards: Preventing Another Patent Ambush"; 24 *European Competition Law Review*; 2003; p644; and Robert Skitol; "Concerted Buying Power: Its Potential for Addressing the Patent Holdup Problem in Standard-Setting"; *Antitrust Law Journal*; 2005; p727.

<sup>25</sup> See, for instance, the DOJ Business Review Letters discussed at note 1.

<sup>26</sup> See for instance "Groups push for action on intellectual property"; *Financial Times*; 21 November 2005 (reporting that a number of mobile carriers made proposals at ETSI to suggest that IPR terms should be agreed before a standard is even set, and argue in favour of putting a cap on the "maximum royalty payment from individual IPR users to the combined IPR holders"); also *The Register*; "Mobile patents war shifts to email"; [http://www.theregister.co.uk/2005/11/29/mobile\\_email\\_patents\\_war](http://www.theregister.co.uk/2005/11/29/mobile_email_patents_war); and Andrew Updegrave; "Ex Ante Disclosure: Risks, Rewards, Process and Alternatives"; *Consortium Standards Bulletin*; June 2006; Vol. V, No. 6 , at 13.

fair amount of misinformation when it comes to evaluating the royalties that are paid by standard implementers. In particular, this paper makes the following observations:

- There is a great deal of confusion between the *minimum* cumulative royalty rate, the *maximum* cumulative royalty rate and the *average* cumulative royalty rate that apply to the implementation of a standard. While scholars, policy-makers or industry officials have referred to royalty rates as high as 25%, they usually fail to mention that those cumulative rates are not common, but instead apply to standard implementers that do not have any essential IP to offer in exchange. Those with essential IP will pay much lower rates and in some cases will not pay any royalty at all. Moreover, as we have seen above, it is not illegitimate in itself that firms, which did not engage in R&D, pay two-digit royalty figures to be entitled to implement the technologies developed by others. Risk should, after all, have its rewards.
- There is no automatic connection between the level of cumulative royalty rates and the prices paid by end consumers. This is because the prices paid by such consumers in great part depend on the degree of downstream competition. High average cumulative royalty rates may simply translate to the fact there are many players on both upstream and downstream markets, and thus a great deal of competition in the market for the relevant product. As end consumer prices must be the focus of competition authorities, one goal should be to ensure that (efficient) pure manufacturers are not excluded from the downstream market.
- Pure upstream firms and vertically-integrated firms do not have similar incentives. While vertically-integrated firms compete downstream and can thus have incentives to restrict competition at that level, pure upstream firms have no incentives to reduce downstream competition. Quite the contrary, since royalty rates are their main or only source of revenues, their focus is on increasing downstream output and thereby maximising royalty payments. Upstream firms not only have no incentives to discriminate, but may in fact adopt strategies designed to encourage or facilitate entry on the relevant downstream market (for instance, by providing technical assistance to downstream players).
- While reforms have been proposed to modify the FRAND regime, such reforms should be based on accurate information and should be evaluated to determine that they will not cause worse problems than the alleged diseases they offer to treat. Similarly, competition authorities should refrain from regulating royalties, a complex task these authorities are not well placed to undertake. Instead, their focus should be to protect downstream competition.