

Public questionnaire for the 2019 Evaluation of the Research & Development and Specialisation Block Exemption Regulations

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

1

Introduction

Background and aim of the public questionnaire

Article 101(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ('the Treaty') prohibits agreements between undertakings that restrict competition unless they generate efficiencies in line with Article 101(3) of the Treaty. Agreements generate efficiencies in line with Article 101(3) of the Treaty if they contribute to improving the production or distribution of goods or services, or to promoting technical or economic progress, while allowing consumers a fair share of the resulting benefits; they only impose restrictions that are indispensable for the attainment of these objectives and do not eliminate competition in respect of a substantial part of the product in question. The prohibition contained in Article 101(1) of the Treaty covers, amongst others, agreements entered into between actual or potential competitors (so-called 'horizontal agreements').

Commission Regulations (EU) No 1217/2010 (Research & Development Block Exemption Regulation - 'R&D BER') and 1218/2010 (Specialisation Block Exemption Regulation - 'Specialisation BER'), together referred to as the 'Horizontal block exemption regulations' (or 'HBERs'), exempt from the prohibition contained in Article 101(1) of the Treaty those R&D and specialisation agreements for which it can be assumed with sufficient certainty that they satisfy the conditions of Article 101(3) of the Treaty. The Commission Guidelines on horizontal cooperation agreements ('HGL') provide binding guidance on the Commission for the interpretation of the HBERs and for the application of Article 101 of the Treaty to other horizontal agreements. The HBERs will expire on 31 December 2022.

This public questionnaire represents one of the methods of information gathering in the evaluation of the HBERs, together with the HGL, which was launched on 5 September 2019. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect views and evidence from the public and stakeholders on how the current rules work for them. The Commission will evaluate the current HBERs, together with the HGL, based on the following criteria:

- Effectiveness (Have the objectives been met?),
- Efficiency (Were the costs involved proportionate to the benefits?),
- Relevance (Do the objectives still match current needs or problems?),
- Coherence (Does the policy complement other actions or are there contradictions?), and
- EU added value (Did EU action provide clear added value?).

The collected information will provide part of the evidence base for determining whether the Commission should let the HBERs lapse, prolong their duration without changing them or prolong them in a revised form, together with the accompanying HGL.

The responses to this public consultation will be analysed and the summary of the main points and conclusions will be made public on the Commission's central public consultations page. **Please note that your replies will also become public as a whole, see below under Section 'Privacy and Confidentiality'.**

Nothing in this questionnaire may be interpreted as stating an official position of the Commission.

Submission of your contribution

You are invited to reply to this public consultation by answering the questionnaire online. To facilitate the analysis of your replies, we would kindly ask you to keep your answers concise and to the point. You may include documents and URLs for relevant online content in your replies.

While the questionnaire contains several questions of a more general nature, notably Section 4 and 5 also contain questions that are aimed at respondents with more specialised knowledge of the HBERs and HGL. We invite all respondents to provide answers to the questionnaire. In case a question does not apply to you or you do not know the answer, please choose the field 'Do not know' or 'Not applicable'.

For your information, you have the option of saving your questionnaire as a 'draft' and finalising your response later. In order to do this you have to click on 'Save as Draft' and save the new link that you will receive from the EUSurvey tool on your computer. Please note that without this new link you will not be able to access the draft again.

The questionnaire is available in English, French and German. You may however respond in any EU language.

In case of questions, you can contact us via the following functional mailbox: COMP-HBERS-REVIEW@ec.europa.eu.

In case of technical problem, please contact the Commission's [CENTRAL HELPDESK](#).

Duration of the consultation

The consultation on this questionnaire will be open for 14 weeks, from 6/11/2019 to 12/2/2020.

Privacy and confidentiality

*** 1.1 Publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

☒ **Anonymous**

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

☒ **Public**

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

Please note that your replies and any attachments you may submit will be published in their entirety even if you chose 'Anonymous'. Therefore, please remove from your contribution any information that you will not want to be published.

☒ 1.2 I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

2 About you

* 2.1 Language of my contribution

- ☐ Bulgarian
- ☐ Croatian
- ☐ Czech
- ☐ Danish
- ☐ Dutch
- ☒ English
- ☐ Estonian
- ☐ Finnish
- ☐ French
- ☐ Gaelic
- ☐ German
- ☐ Greek
- ☐ Hungarian
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Latvian
- ☐ Lithuanian
- ☐ Maltese
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Portuguese
- ☐ Romanian
- ☐ Slovak
- ☐ Slovenian
- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Swedish

* 2.2 First name

wassim

* 2.3 Surname

CHOURBAJI

* 2.4 Email (this won't be published)

* 2.5 I am giving my contribution as

- ☐ Academic/research institution
- ☐ Business association
- ☒ Company/business organisation
- ☐ Consumer organisation
- ☐ EU citizen
- ☐ Environmental organisation
- ☐ Non-EU citizen
- ☐ Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ☐ Public authority
- ☐ Trade union
- ☐ Other

2.6 Other - please specify

If you chose "Other", please specify whether you are contributing as lawyer/law firm, economic consultancy or something else:

* 2.7 Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Qualcomm Inc.

If available, please provide your ID number of the [EU Transparency Register](#). If your organisation is not registered, we invite you to register, although it is not compulsory to be registered to reply to this consultation.

2.8 Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

00358442856-45

* 2.10 Organisation size

- ☐ Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ☐ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ☐ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ☒ Large (250 or more)

* 2.11 The main activities of your organisation:

Text of 1 to 250 characters will be accepted

We're the world's leading wireless technology innovator & driving force behind 5G. When we connected the phone to the Internet, the mobile revolution was born. Our inventions are the foundation for life-changing products, experiences, & industries.

*** 2.12 Please describe the sectors where your organisation or your members are conducting business:**

Text of 1 to 250 characters will be accepted

Our technologies enable the mobile ecosystem and are found in every 3G, 4G and 5G smartphone. We bring mobile to new industries and are leading the way to a world in which everything can interact seamlessly.

*** 2.13 The 2 digit NACE Rev.2 code(s) referring to the level of "division" that applies to your business (see part III, pages 61 – 90 of Eurostat's statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community, [available here](#):**

26.11, 61.20, 72, 72.1, 72.19

*** 2.14 The product(s) and/or service(s) provided by your company/business organisation:**

Qualcomm conducts its business primarily through Qualcomm CDMA Technologies ("QCT") and Qualcomm Technology Licensing ("QTL"). QCT is a leading developer and supplier of semiconductor chipsets used primarily in voice and data communications. Qualcomm's chipsets are sold, and its system software is licensed, to companies that use them in mobile phones, tablets, laptops, data modules, and other consumer electronics. QTL operates Qualcomm's broad intellectual property licensing programme, licensing primarily cellular devices. More than 3,000 of Qualcomm's employees are based in Europe, including at research and design centres in Germany, Austria, Finland, France, and the Netherlands. Qualcomm's Radio Frequency Front End ("RFFE") business unit is headquartered in Germany.

*** 2.15 Country of origin**

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |

- ⦿ Antarctica
- ⦿ Antigua and Barbuda
- ⦿ Argentina
- ⦿ Armenia
- ⦿ Aruba
- ⦿ Australia
- ⦿ Austria
- ⦿ Azerbaijan
- ⦿ Bahamas
- ⦿ Bahrain
- ⦿ Bangladesh
- ⦿ Barbados
- ⦿ Belarus
- ⦿ Belgium
- ⦿ Belize
- ⦿ Benin
- ⦿ Bermuda
- ⦿ Bhutan
- ⦿ Bolivia
- ⦿ Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- ⦿ Bosnia and Herzegovina
- ⦿ Botswana
- ⦿ Bouvet Island
- ⦿ Brazil
- ⦿ British Indian Ocean Territory
- ⦿ British Virgin Islands
- ⦿ Brunei
- ⦿ Bulgaria
- ⦿ Burkina Faso
- ⦿ Burundi
- ⦿ Cambodia
- ⦿ Estonia
- ⦿ Eswatini
- ⦿ Ethiopia
- ⦿ Falkland Islands
- ⦿ Faroe Islands
- ⦿ Fiji
- ⦿ Finland
- ⦿ France
- ⦿ French Guiana
- ⦿ French Polynesia
- ⦿ French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- ⦿ Gabon
- ⦿ Georgia
- ⦿ Germany
- ⦿ Ghana
- ⦿ Gibraltar
- ⦿ Greece
- ⦿ Greenland
- ⦿ Grenada
- ⦿ Guadeloupe
- ⦿ Guam
- ⦿ Guatemala
- ⦿ Guernsey
- ⦿ Guinea
- ⦿ Guinea-Bissau
- ⦿ Guyana
- ⦿ Haiti
- ⦿ Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- ⦿ Honduras
- ⦿ Hong Kong
- ⦿ Hungary
- ⦿ Maldives
- ⦿ Mali
- ⦿ Malta
- ⦿ Marshall Islands
- ⦿ Martinique
- ⦿ Mauritania
- ⦿ Mauritius
- ⦿ Mayotte
- ⦿ Mexico
- ⦿ Micronesia
- ⦿ Moldova
- ⦿ Monaco
- ⦿ Mongolia
- ⦿ Montenegro
- ⦿ Montserrat
- ⦿ Morocco
- ⦿ Mozambique
- ⦿ Myanmar /Burma
- ⦿ Namibia
- ⦿ Nauru
- ⦿ Nepal
- ⦿ Netherlands
- ⦿ New Caledonia
- ⦿ New Zealand
- ⦿ Nicaragua
- ⦿ Niger
- ⦿ Nigeria
- ⦿ Niue
- ⦿ Norfolk Island
- ⦿ Northern Mariana Islands
- ⦿ North Korea
- ⦿ Serbia
- ⦿ Seychelles
- ⦿ Sierra Leone
- ⦿ Singapore
- ⦿ Sint Maarten
- ⦿ Slovakia
- ⦿ Slovenia
- ⦿ Solomon Islands
- ⦿ Somalia
- ⦿ South Africa
- ⦿ South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- ⦿ South Korea
- ⦿ South Sudan
- ⦿ Spain
- ⦿ Sri Lanka
- ⦿ Sudan
- ⦿ Suriname
- ⦿ Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- ⦿ Sweden
- ⦿ Switzerland
- ⦿ Syria
- ⦿ Taiwan
- ⦿ Tajikistan
- ⦿ Tanzania
- ⦿ Thailand
- ⦿ The Gambia
- ⦿ Timor-Leste
- ⦿ Togo
- ⦿ Tokelau
- ⦿ Tonga
- ⦿ Trinidad and Tobago

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Cameroon | <input type="radio"/> Iceland | <input type="radio"/> North Macedonia | <input type="radio"/> Tunisia |
| <input type="radio"/> Canada | <input type="radio"/> India | <input type="radio"/> Norway | <input type="radio"/> Turkey |
| <input type="radio"/> Cape Verde | <input type="radio"/> Indonesia | <input type="radio"/> Oman | <input type="radio"/> Turkmenistan |
| <input type="radio"/> Cayman Islands | <input type="radio"/> Iran | <input type="radio"/> Pakistan | <input type="radio"/> Turks and Caicos Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Central African Republic | <input type="radio"/> Iraq | <input type="radio"/> Palau | <input type="radio"/> Tuvalu |
| <input type="radio"/> Chad | <input type="radio"/> Ireland | <input type="radio"/> Palestine | <input type="radio"/> Uganda |
| <input type="radio"/> Chile | <input type="radio"/> Isle of Man | <input type="radio"/> Panama | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine |
| <input type="radio"/> China | <input type="radio"/> Israel | <input type="radio"/> Papua New Guinea | <input type="radio"/> United Arab Emirates |
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island | <input type="radio"/> Italy | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica | <input type="radio"/> Peru | <input checked="" type="radio"/> United States |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands | <input type="radio"/> Japan | <input type="radio"/> Philippines | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia | <input type="radio"/> Jersey | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros | <input type="radio"/> Jordan | <input type="radio"/> Poland | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan | <input type="radio"/> Portugal | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands | <input type="radio"/> Kenya | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati | <input type="radio"/> Qatar | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo | <input type="radio"/> Réunion | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait | <input type="radio"/> Romania | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Russia | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao | <input type="radio"/> Laos | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Latvia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy | <input type="radio"/> Yemen |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zambia |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark | <input type="radio"/> Liberia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia | |

* 2.16 Mark the countries/geographic areas where your main activities are located:

at least 1 choice(s)

Multiple choice is possible

- ☒ Austria
- ☐ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia

- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czech Republic
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☒ France
- ☒ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☐ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☒ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☒ Netherlands
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Slovak Republic
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐ Sweden
- ☒ United Kingdom
- ☐ Others in Europe
- ☒ The Americas
- ☒ Asia
- ☐ Africa
- ☐ Australia

* 2.17 Please specify whether your company/business organisation has been the addressee of a Commission decision under Article 7 or Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 2.18 Please specify the type of decision

- ☒ Article 7 decision
- ☐ Article 9 decision

3 General Questions on the Horizontal Block Exemption Regulations and the Guidelines on horizontal cooperation agreements

*

3.1 Has your company/business organisation been involved in horizontal cooperation agreements since the current HBERs and the HGL were introduced in 2010?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know
- ☐ Not applicable

* 3.2 Please specify the type of your horizontal cooperation agreements

at least 1 choice(s)

Multiple answers possible

- ☐ R&D agreements in the sense of art.1(1)(a) of the R&D BER and Section 3 of the HGL
- ☐ Specialisation agreements in the sense of art. 1(1)(a) of the Specialisation BER and Section 4 of the HGL
- ☐ Agreements involving information exchange in the sense of Section 2 of the HGL
- ☐ Purchasing agreements in the sense of Section 5 of the HGL
- ☐ Commercialisation agreements in the sense of Section 6 of the HGL
- ☒ Standardisation agreements in the sense of Section 7 of the HGL
- ☐ Other horizontal cooperation agreements

* 3.4 Has your company/business organisation relied upon (an) exemption /exemptions under the R&D BER or Specialisation BER, or both?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 3.6 How often do you consult the **R&D BER** for guidance on a horizontal cooperation agreement?

- ☐ Frequently (several times per year)
- ☐ Occasionally (once or twice per year)
- ☒ Never

* 3.7 How often do you consult the **Specialisation BER** for guidance on a horizontal cooperation agreement?

- ☐ Frequently (several times per year)
- ☐ Occasionally (once or twice per year)
- ☒ Never

* 3.8 How often do you consult the **HGL** for guidance on a horizontal cooperation agreement?

- ☐ Frequently (several times per year)
- ☒ Occasionally (once or twice per year)
- ☐ Never

4 Effectiveness (Have the objectives of the current HBERs and HGL been met?)

In this section, we would like to have your opinion on the extent to which the HBERs and the HGL have met their objectives.

The **purpose of the EU competition rules** is to ensure that competition is not distorted to the detriment of the public interest, individual undertakings and consumers. In line with this objective, the Commission's policy is to leave companies maximum flexibility when concluding horizontal co-operation agreements in order to increase the competitiveness of the European economy while at the same time promoting competition for the benefit of European businesses and consumers.

The **purpose of the HBERs and the HGL** is to make it easier for undertakings to cooperate in ways which are economically desirable and without adverse effect from the point of view of competition policy. The specific objectives of the HBERs and HGL are to ensure effective protection of competition and providing adequate legal certainty for undertakings.

* 4.1 In your view, do you perceive that the HBERs and the HGL have contributed to promoting competition in the EU?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ Yes, but they have contributed only to a certain extent or only in specific sectors
- ☐ They were neutral
- ☐ No, they have negatively affected competition in the EU
- ☐ Don't know

* 4.2 Please explain your reply, distinguishing between sectors where relevant: (1500 characters max.)

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Not Applicable

Legal certainty provided by the HBERs and the HGL

* 4.3 In your view, have the R&D BER and Section 3 of the HGL on research and development agreements provided sufficient legal certainty on R&D agreements companies can conclude without the risk of infringing competition law?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 4.5 In your view, does the R&D BER increase legal certainty compared with a situation where the R&D BER would not exist but only the HGL applied?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 4.7 In your view, have the Specialisation BER and Section 4 of the HGL on production agreements provided sufficient legal certainty on production /specialisation agreements companies can conclude without the risk of infringing competition law?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 4.9 In your view, does the Specialisation BER increase legal certainty compared with a situation where the Specialisation BER would not exist but only the HGL applied?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

In this section we would like to have your opinion on the extent to which the HGL have provided sufficient legal certainty on horizontal cooperation agreements companies can undertake without the risk of infringing competition law. Please specify your answer according to the different types of horizontal agreements.

* 4.11 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on agreements involving **information exchange** in the sense of Section 2 of the HGL?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 4.13 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on **purchasing agreements** in the sense of Section 5 of the HGL?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 4.15 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on **commercialisation agreements** in the sense of Section 6 of the HGL

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 4.17 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on **standardisation agreements** in the sense of Section 7 of the HGL

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 4.18 Please explain your reply

When adopted, we believed the HGLs contributed to legal certainty by balancing the needs of standards development organizations (SDOs) with the enforcement responsibility of antitrust authorities. The HGLs gave SDOs the freedom to put in place rules and procedures that suit their purpose while ensuring compliance with Article 101 TFEU. It is important that the HGLs recognize that “there exist different models for standard-setting and that competition within and between those models is a positive aspect of a market economy. Therefore, standard-setting organisations remain entirely free to put in place rules and procedures that do not violate competition rules.”

Unfortunately, lately, we’ve seen some in the industry misinterpret a single paragraph in the HGLs to be a prescriptive endorsement for a “license to all” model which undermines SDOs rulemaking freedom. Specifically, the confusion has arisen from paragraph 285 which states that an SDO’s IPR policy should require its’ participants to issue: “an irrevocable commitment in writing to offer to license their essential IPR to all third parties”. The words “to all third parties” is cited as evidence that anyone in a value chain that requests a license must be offered one.

Even more worrying is that there’s no evidence that a “license to all” model would benefit the industry by increasing access to the standard and in fact it’s likely it’d be counterproductive and lead to less innovation, less efficiency and more litigation.

* 4.19 In your view, have the HGL provided sufficient legal certainty on **other types of horizontal cooperation agreements** that are currently not specifically addressed in the HGL (for example sustainability agreements)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 4.21 In your view, are there other types of horizontal cooperation agreements outside those identified in the current HGL that should have been specifically addressed in order to increase legal certainty?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

Identification of pro-competitive horizontal agreements

The R&D BER and the Specialisation BER set out a number of conditions that R&D and specialisation agreements need to meet in order to benefit from the block exemption. The HGL provide additional guidance on how to interpret these conditions. These conditions have been defined with the purpose to give exemption only to those agreements for which it can be assumed with sufficient certainty that they generate efficiencies that outweigh, in line with Article 101(3) of the Treaty, the harm caused by the restriction of competition.

Based on your experience, have the following provisions in the **R&D BER** allowed to correctly identify the horizontal cooperation agreements that are compliant with Article 101 of the Treaty?

* 4.23 The list of definitions that apply for R&D agreements that can benefit from exemption in Article 1 of the R&D BER

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

☒ Do not know

* 4.25 The conditions for exemption listed in Article 3 of the R&D BER, regarding, for instance, access to the final results of the R&D, access to pre-existing know-how and joint exploitation.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Do not know

* 4.27 The absence of a market share threshold for non-competing undertakings, the market share threshold of 25% for competing undertakings and the application thereof provided for in Articles 4 and 7 of the R&D BER

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Do not know

* 4.29 The limits regarding the duration of the exemption provided for in Article 4

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Do not know

* 4.31 The list identified in Article 5 of the R&D BER which make the exemption not available for agreements that have as their object certain restrictions or limitations ('hardcore restrictions')

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Do not know

* 4.33 The list of obligations included in agreements to which the exemption does not apply ('excluded restrictions'), identified in Article 6 of the R&D BER

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Do not know

Based on your experience, have the following provisions in the **Specialisation BER** allowed to correctly identify the horizontal cooperation agreements that are compliant with Article 101 of the Treaty?

* 4.35 The definitions that apply for the purposes of the Specialisation BER, in Article 1

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Do not know

* 4.37 The explanations on the type of specialisation agreements to which the exemption applies, provided by Article 2 of the Specialisation BER

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Do not know

* 4.39 The market share threshold of 20% and its application, provided for in Articles 3 and 5 of the Specialisation BER

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☒ Do not know

* 4.41 The list identified in Article 4 of the Specialisation BER which make the exemption not available for agreements that have as their object price fixing, certain limitations of output or sales or market or customer allocation ('hardcore restrictions')

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☒ Do not know

4.43 Based on your experience, are there other elements, besides those listed in the previous questions that should have been clarified, added, or removed to improve the guidance given by the BERs?

Text of 1 to 3000 characters will be accepted

Not Applicable

* 4.44 Based on your experience, are there other types of horizontal cooperation agreements outside those identified in the R&D and Specialisation BERs which would satisfy the conditions of Article 101(3) of the Treaty?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☒ Do not know

* 4.46 Based on your experience, have the BERs and the HGL had any impacts that were not expected or not intended?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No
☐ Do not know

* 4.47 If Yes, please explain your answer

Text of 1 to 3000 characters will be accepted

Yes, we note that a single article in HGLs that uses slightly different language has been interpreted by some to endorse a license to all model where a license must be granted to any third party that requests one. As an example, p 23 of appendix 2 of The App Association's roadmap submission interprets paragraph 285 as a clarification from the Commission that "in order to avoid competition-law concerns, FRAND licenses need to be offered to all third parties who seek a license so that they may implement the standard."

Given that 284 recognizes the need for SDOs to have a clear and balanced IPR policies that are adapted to an industry interpreting paragraph 285 as a specific endorsement of the license to all model runs counter to the intent of the HLGs. Access to the standard is already assured in article 287 which states that "FRAND

commitments can prevent IPR holders from making the implementation of a standard difficult by refusing to license.” Removing the words “to all third parties” in article 285 would be a simple fix to this issue.

The continued misinterpretation by some industry players of 285 as an endorsement of license to all runs contrary to the European interests in fostering innovation and enabling the widest access to standardized technologies. Licensing to all has a major negative impact on industry by leading to multi-level licensing for several reasons, First, multi-level licensing would materially increase transaction costs in at least three ways: (1) the complexity of negotiating each license agreement, (2) the number and frequency of license negotiations and agreements that will be needed, and (3) the difficulty of monitoring compliance with license agreements. These elements would negatively impact the entire industry, adding costs to both licensors and licensees at both the device and component level. These increased costs strongly militate against requiring multi-level licensing, as an alternative that is decidedly less efficient than the current and longstanding industry practice.

Second, multi-level licensing would lead to material disruption and transition. The equilibrium developed in the industry decades ago, and the pricing of various inputs, including baseband chipsets, is based on this stable structure. Mandating a change would cause massive disruption and would reduce the fair investment in standards. No baseband chipset supplier would want to be the first to take a license because the license would cause an increase in its costs relative to its competitors. On the other hand, existing device maker licensees would likely seek to renegotiate their agreements to reduce their royalties in light of the expectation that baseband chipset suppliers would begin bearing some portion of the royalty expense. There would be immense opportunities for cheating and gamesmanship during the transition from the current structure to multi-level licensing which could end in a gridlock.

5 Efficiency (were the costs involved proportionate to the benefits?)

In this section, we would like to have your view concerning the efficiency of the HBERs and the HGL. In your view, do you consider that the costs (for example, legal fees, delays in implementation) of analysing the conditions and applying these instruments is proportionate to the benefits (for example, faster self assessment) of having the rules in place?

Costs

* 5.1 Please describe the different types of costs of applying the current R&D and Specialisation BERs; and the HGL

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Not Applicable

5.2 Please explain whether you can express the above costs in money terms

Text of 1 to 1000 characters will be accepted

Not Applicable

5.3 Please provide an estimate of your quantifiable costs both in terms of value (in EUR) and as a percentage of your annual turnover (or, in the case of a business association, of the annual turnover of the members you are representing)

Text of 1 to 500 characters will be accepted

Not Applicable

5.4 Please explain how you calculate these costs

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Not Applicable

* 5.5 In your view, how have the costs generated by the application of the R&D or the Specialisation BER or the HGL evolved **compared with the previous legislative framework** (Reg. 2659/2000 on R&D, Reg. 2658/2000 on Specialisation agreements and the accompanying horizontal guidelines)?

- ☐ Costs increased
- ☐ Costs decreased
- ☒ Do not know

In your view, would the costs of ensuring compliance of your horizontal cooperation agreements (or the agreements of your members) with Article 101 of the Treaty would be different **if the current HBERs were not in place but only the HGL applied?**

* 5.8 Were the **R&D BER** not in place, the cost of ensuring compliance

- ☐ Would increase
- ☐ Would decrease
- ☒ Do not know

5.11 Were the **Specialisation BER** not in place, the cost of ensuring compliance

- ☐ Would increase
- ☐ Would decrease
- ☒ Do not know

Benefits

* 5.14 Please describe the benefits, if any, of having the R&D and Specialisation BERs; and the HGL

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Not Applicable

Benefits vs. costs

In your view, does the application of the R&D and Specialisation BERs and the HGL generate costs that are proportionate to the benefits they bring (or, in the case of a business association, the benefits for the members you are representing)?

* 5.15 Regarding the **R&D BER**

- ☐ Costs are proportionate to benefits
- ☐ Costs are not proportionate to benefits
- ☒ Do not know

* 5.17 Regarding the **Specialisation BER**

- ☐ Costs are proportionate to benefits
- ☐ Costs are not proportionate to benefits
- ☒ Do not know

* 5.19 Regarding the **HGL**

- ☒ Costs are proportionate to benefits
- ☐ Costs are not proportionate to benefits
- ☐ Do not know

* 5.20 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

Not Applicable

6 Relevance (do the objectives still match the needs or problems?)

In this section, we would like to understand if the objectives of the HBERs and the HGL are still up-to-date considering the developments that have taken place since their publication.

6.1 Please identify major trends and developments (for example legal, economic, political) that, based on your experience, have affected the application of the BERs and HGL. Please provide a short explanation with concrete examples in case you consider that (parts of) the HBERs or HGL do not sufficiently allow to address them

1000 characters max. for each row

	Major trends/changes	Articles of the HBERs and/or recitals of the HGL	Short explanation/concrete examples
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			

Do you think that it is still relevant to have the current HBERs and HGL in light of major trends or developments listed above?

* 6.2 The R&D BER and Section 3 of the HGL are

- ☐ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☒ Do not know

* 6.4 The Specialisation BER and Section 4 of the HGL are

- ☐ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☒ Do not know

* 6.6 Section 2 of the HGL on agreements involving information exchange is

- ☐ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☒ Do not know

* 6.8 Section 5 of the HGL on purchasing agreements is

- ☐ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☒ Do not know

* 6.10 Section 6 of the HGL on commercialisation agreements is

- ☐ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☒ Do not know

* 6.12 Section 7 of the HGL on standardisation agreements is

- ☒ Still relevant
- ☐ No longer relevant
- ☐ Do not know

* 6.13 Please explain your reply

Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted

For the reasons set forth in Q.4.18, above, Qualcomm submits that Section 7 of the HGL on standardization agreements is still relevant and should be maintained as is with the need to change the language in paragraph 285. Where the words "to all third parties" should be removed from the sentence. Access of all implementer to the standards is a sufficient policy that provides an anti-trust safe harbour to SDOs.

7 Coherence (Does the policy complement other actions or are there contradictions?)

*

7.1 In your view, are the HBERs and the HGL coherent with other instruments and /or case law that provide(s) guidance on the interpretation of Article 101 of the Treaty (e.g., other Block Exemption Regulations, the Vertical Guidelines and the Article 101(3) Guidelines)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 7.3 In your view, are the HBERs and the HGL coherent with other existing or upcoming legislation or policies at EU or national level?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Do not know

* 7.4 Please explain

Text of 1 to 3000 characters will be accepted

Not Applicable

8 EU added value (Did EU action provide clear added value?)

In this section, we would like to understand if the HBERs and the HGL have had added value. In the absence of the HBERs and the HGL, undertakings would have had to self-assess their horizontal cooperation agreement with the help of the remaining legal framework. This would include for instance the case law of the EU and national courts, the Article 101(3) Guidelines, the enforcement practice of the Commission and national competition authorities, as well as other guidance at EU and national level.

Please indicate whether, in your view, the HBERs and the HGL have had added value in the assessment of the compatibility of horizontal cooperation agreements with Article 101 of the Treaty

* 8.1 Has the R&D BER had added value in the assessment of the compatibility of horizontal cooperation agreements with Article 101 of the Treaty?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 8.3 Has the Specialisation BER had added value in the assessment of the compatibility of horizontal cooperation agreements with Article 101 of the Treaty?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

* 8.5 Have the HGL had added value in the assessment of the compatibility of horizontal cooperation agreements with Article 101 of the Treaty?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Do not know

9 Specific questions

Final comments and document upload

9.1 Is there anything else with regard to the R&D and Specialisation BERs and the HGL that you would like to add?

Text of 1 to 3000 characters will be accepted

9.2 You may upload a file that further explains your position in more detail or further details the answers you have given

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

5ea6b9a9-5cb1-44bb-9403-47b24157b2f6/Qualcomm_Supplemental_11022020.pdf

* 9.3 Please indicate whether the Commission services may contact you for further details on the information submitted, if required

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Contact

COMP-HBERS-REVIEW@ec.europa.eu