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It is the policy of the IEEE and many other standard-setting organizations to request that any patented technology incorporated into a technical standard be made available to all users of the standard on reasonable and nondiscriminatory (RAND) terms (see IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws, clause 6, available at http://standards.ieee.org/guides/bylaws/sect6-7.html#6). By the same token, such organizations typically require that participants engaged in formulating a standard disclose whether the proposed standard’s use would infringe patents that their companies own. They must also disclose whether such patents will be subject to RAND licensing.

Ordinarily, if it appears that a necessary patent exists and will not be available on a RAND basis, the organization requires that the technical committee change or abandon the standard to prevent a patent from blocking its use. Consequently, the technology needed to practice all or most standards is, in principle, subject to RAND licensing.

The fly in the ointment becomes visible once an industry adopts a standard and uses it. The owner who promised to make the patent available on a RAND basis might have a different concept of what that means than prospective licensees. Recently, disgruntled standards users have complained that patent owners have unilaterally demanded excessive royalty notes on a “take it or leave it” basis. They have also complained of abusive and unreasonable negotiating tactics. One antitrust suit, for example, charged that the owner of a patent necessary for practicing an IEEE standard (802.11, in this case) offered to license the patent at an allegedly already very high rate. Further, the offer would remain open for only 30 days, after which the royalty rate would double.

To prevent such conduct, some have suggested that standard-setting organizations should require not only an assurance of RAND terms, but also an advance disclosure of those supposedly RAND terms. Then, if the terms are excessive—for example, because of a royalty that is a large multiple of normal and customary notes in the industry—the organization can simply not adopt that technology as a standard, or at least consider other options.

The IEEE and other standard-setting organizations have firmly rejected all such proposals. Thus, the IEEE has stated: “You must not discuss subjects like the pricing for use of a patent, how a patent should be licensed, validity or interpretation of a patent claim, or any terms or conditions of use” (http://standards.ieee.org/board/patguide.html). ANSI has a similar policy (http://www.ftc.gov/opp/intellect/020418marasco.pdf). The main stated reason for the policy is fear that the organization will be liable as a tool for a price-fixing cartel or liable for some similar antitrust violation. The effect, however, is as if a prospective car buyer goes to the dealer,
and the salesman says, “Have I got a deal for you!” The buyer asks about the price, and the salesman says, “Sign here and then I’ll tell you.”

The origin for such antitrust concerns is a problem that the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) ran into around 1980. Hydrolevel Corp. wanted to introduce a new technology for monitoring boilers to prevent them from running too low on water. (If a boiler runs out of water and its heating system does not shut down, it could blow up.) The old technology was a float-shut-off mechanism. Hydrolevel’s technology was a thermal sensor fixed to the boiler wall. Companies using the old technology controlled the ASME’s committee on boilers. One committee member drafted an opinion on behalf of the boiler committee, asserting that the new technology did not comply with the ASME boiler standard, which meant that it was a safety hazard. The committee member then induced an ASME official (the Secretary of the Boiler and Pressure Vessel Committee and a full-time ASME employee) to incorporate the boiler committee’s opinion into an ASME letter that the official then signed on ASME’s behalf. Hydrolevel could no longer sell its devices and filed an antitrust suit against the ASME and the float device manufacturers whose employees were on the ASME boiler committee. Every defendant except the ASME settled. The ASME’s position was that it was not responsible for the actions forming the basis of the suit. It argued, also, that holding a standard-setting organization responsible for such conduct would throttle the standard-setting process and thus deprive the public of its benefits. The case went all the way to the Supreme Court.
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Therefore, any court applying the rule of reason to standard-setting activities that require the advance disclosure of RAND terms would have to conclude that the conduct was reasonable and therefore not an antitrust violation.

Indeed, requiring advance disclosure of RAND terms is comparable to asking for competitive bids. In effect, an IEEE-sponsored standards committee asking for advance RAND disclosure would be using a competitive-bidding process to select which technology to incorporate into a standard. Competitive bidding requirements have never been considered an antitrust violation. Not only is bidding not anticompetitive, but the Supreme Court has held that a professional association’s ban on competitive bidding on projects was an antitrust violation [National Soc’y of Professional Engineers v. United States, 435 U.S. 679 (1978)].

The antitrust ghost in the standard-setting machine is just that: a ghost without substance. Standard-setting groups should no longer let fear of the ghost stop them from protecting their process against RAND promises that turn out to be illusory. Such groups should feel free to institute safeguards against such abuse, requiring, for example, advance disclosure of the details of promised RAND terms.

Finally, it has been argued that unless organizations such as the IEEE take steps to prevent patent owners from abusing the standards process in this way, the organizations can become liable. Thus, Washington antitrust maven and former US Federal Trade Commission official Robert Skitol has argued that antitrust liability for not preventing such abuses is a greater risk to standard setters than asking for advance disclosure of RAND terms. In the Allied Tube case, Skitol points out, the Supreme Court said that a standard-setting organization must impose “safeguards sufficient to prevent the standard-setting process from being biased by members with economic interest in restraining competition” [Allied Tube & Conduit Corp. v. Indian Head, Inc., 486 US 492 (1988)]. According to Skitol, the “central teaching” of Allied Tube and Hydrolevel is that standard-setting organizations must adopt safeguards against patent owners who promise RAND terms and then hold standards users up for exorbitant royalties. Organizations like IEEE, he argues, must implement policies that try to prevent RAND abuse, or they will be liable just as the ASME was for not having a proper policy in place. That is, in ASME’s case, a policy that would have kept the boiler float manufacturers from manipulating ASME to make it a tool in excluding Hydrolevel. Here, arguably, it would be manipulating IEEE to make it a tool for imposing abusive licensing.

The conclusion that comes from Skitol’s analysis is that standards organizations should exorcise the antitrust ghost in the standard-setting machine, but not just because it is a sham. Its invocation—and the antitrust fears that it causes—prevent the adoption of measures that deter the abuse of RAND promises. This situation, in fact, creates real antitrust risks for IEEE and other standard-setting organizations. In that sense, the antitrust ghost in the machine causes risks for IEEE and the standard-setting process that at present go unrecognized or unappreciated. The ghost in the machine is a menace.
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