

Proposal for a
Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council
on **Standard-Essential Patents**

Leaked March 2023 Draft

Unofficial Table of Contents And Synopsis

by Florian Mueller, FOSS Patents

Follow FOSS Patents on LinkedIn:

<https://www.linkedin.com/company/fosspatents/>

RECITALS

Rec. (1)	reference to 2020 IP Action Plan	1
Rec. (2)	explanation of "essential"	1
Rec. (3)	benefits of standard-setting and FRAND commitment	1
Rec. (4)	"SEP licensing issues arise", examples of technologies; IoT widens group of implementers "including many SMEs"	1
Rec. (5)	references to Horizontal Guidelines, <i>Huawei v. ZTE</i> , national patent laws, IPR Enforcement Directive (2004/48/EC) ("IPRED")	2
Rec. (6)	"Dutch, French and German courts" have adjudicated FRAND disputes with "different approaches (not necessarily different results)"	2
Rec. (7)	issues: "insufficient transparency with regard to SEPs, FRAND terms and conditions and licensing in the value chain", "unavailability of dispute resolution procedures"	2
Rec. (8)	more efficiency, predictability and certainty in SEP licensing would help EU businesses including start-ups and SMEs	2
Rec. (9)	SEP Regulation complementary to, but different from, antitrust rules (particularly Art. 101 and 102 TFEU)	2
Rec. (10)	royalty-free standards outside scope of SEP Regulation	2
Rec. (11)	"competence centre" to be established under purview of EUIPO	3
Rec. (12)	"competence centre" to manage SEP register (SEPs, opinions, reports, global case law, foreign rules, studies) and to "establish training procedures" for (essentiality) evaluators and (FRAND) conciliators; also, free-of-charge assistance to SMEs	3
Rec. (13)	"human and financial resources" for "competence centre"; balance between "basic information publicly available free of charge" and fees	3
Rec. (14)	documents normally in English, SMEs may submit in other EU language	3
Rec. (15)	objective of publishing expected aggregate royalty per standard	3
Rec. (16)	contributors to standard may proactively inform "competence centre" of "the aggregate royalty ... they have agreed upon among themselves"	3

Rec. (17)	if no agreement on aggregate royalty, contributors "may request the competence centre to appoint a conciliator" to facilitate discussions without making recommendation for aggregate royalty	4
Rec. (18)	"implementers and/or contributors" may ask "competence centre for an expert opinion on an aggregate royalty"; opinion to be delivered by conciliators as "non-binding recommendation for an aggregate royalty"	4
Rec. (19)	description of objectives of SEP register	4
Rec. (20)	SEP register only for standards "which were submitted to the competence centre, for which an aggregate royalty has been specified, or otherwise the subject of a request made for an expert opinion"	4
Rec. (21)	registration obligation regardless of whether SEP holders license proactively, cross-license, or use patents only defensively; registration prerequisite to enforcement; no royalties or past damages for period prior to registration; status updates to be made every 6 months; failure to update could lead to suspension (from register) until update is made	4
Rec. (22)	modification of registrations to fix inaccuracies; removal if patent was invalidated or found non-essential by court or EUIPO evaluator	5
Rec. (23)	"competence centre" to check for accuracy and completeness	5
Rec. (24)	random essentiality checks by independent evaluators	5
Rec. (25)	essentiality checks based on "sampling from SEP portfolios"; results should determine essentiality ratio by SEP owner	5
Rec. (26)	SEP owners may "designate up to 100 registered SEPs for essentiality checks" (SEPs used in licensing negotiations or for essentiality assessments by pools); results may be used in court but can be challenged there; ratio only based on sampling, updated annually	5
Rec. (27)	essentiality assessments by independent entity prior to entry into force for SEP Regulation (such as patent pools or essentiality determinations by courts) to be added to register; no reassessment "after the relevant evidence ... is provided to the competence centre"	6
Rec. (28)	essentiality evaluators to be assigned by "competence centre", replace if conflicted; subset of sampled SEPs to be peer-reviewed by another evaluator; Commission to define procedures	6
Rec. (29)	SEP owner may submit claim chart or other relevant information to support essentiality evaluation, get to comment on preliminary results	6
Rec. (30)	results of essentiality checks to be recorded in register; not legally binding (courts may disagree), but can be used in negotiations; reference to "collective licensing group"	6
Rec. (31)	SEP enforcement goal is license agreement, not exclusion, so "a properly functioning out-of-court dispute resolution mechanism ... ('FRAND determination procedure') may offer significant benefits"	6
Rec. (32)	FRAND determination procedure to be administered by EUIPO with conciliators "that satisfy ... competence and independence criteria"; repository of non-confidential reports (only conciliators see confidential ones)	7

Rec. (33)	parties may agree on conciliators; otherwise selection by "competence centre"; FRAND determination procedure can be initiated by either side and "should be ... concluded within 9 months"; mandatory step prior to infringement actions; FRAND determination will examine parties' offers/counteroffers in light of <i>Huawei v. ZTE</i> ; one party's interest in FRAND determination procedure is sufficient; panel will recommend FRAND terms and conditions; either party can reject recommendation; report to be written only if parties do not accept or otherwise settle; non-confidential version to be published by "competence centre"	7
Rec. (34)	attempted justification of restriction of intellectual property rights despite Art. 17(2) of EU Charter of Fundamental Rights	7
Rec. (35)	attempted justification of restriction of intellectual property rights despite TRIPS	8
Rec. (36)	attempted justification of restriction of intellectual property rights despite access to justice as per art. 47 of EU Charter of Fundamental Rights	8
Rec. (37)	conciliators "should respect" Horizontal guidelines, <i>Huawei v. ZTE</i> , and Commission's 2017 Communication on EU approach to SEPs, as well as other EU statutory and case law	8
Rec. (38)	"frictions in the value chains" not previously exposed to SEPs; "competence centre" to "raise[] awareness concerning SEP licensing in the value chain through any of the tools at its disposal"; aggregate royalty determinations to "contain a non-confidential analysis of the expected impact of the aggregate royalty on ... the value chain"; consideration of factors such as "efficiency of SEP licensing, including insights from any customary rules or practices for licensing of intellectual property in the value chain and cross-licensing"; also, "ability of upstream manufacturers to pass the cost of a SEP licence downstream and any potential impact of ... indemnification clauses"	8
Rec. (39)	SMEs may be SEP owners or implementers; currently few SME SEP owners; goal of reducing fees for SMEs (such as essentiality checks of SME-owned SEPs); SME portfolios not to be subjected to sampling	9
Rec. (40)	"implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission"	9
Rec. (41)	registration and aggregate royalty submission to be "added to the requirements set out in Annex II of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 ... of 15 October 2012 on European standardisation" (public procurement)	9
Rec. (42)	SEP owners could circumvent obligations under SEP Regulation by seeking "customs detention" under Regulation (EU) No 608/2013	9
Rec. (43)	to a request for customs action, "the SEP owner should attach ... a notice of termination of the FRAND determination"	10
Rec. (44)	Implementing Regulation 1352/2013 ("customs detention") to be amended	10
Rec. (45)	European Data Protection Supervisor was consulted	10
Rec. (46)	entry into force deferred by 24 months for EUIPO to set up register, Commission to adopt implementing acts, stakeholders to adapt	10
Rec. (47)	justification for action at EU rather than Member States level	10

TITLE I: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Art. 1	Subject matter and scope	10
Art. 2	Definitions	11
Art. 3	Change in ownership	14

TITLE II: COMPETENCE CENTRE

Art. 4	Establishment and status of the competence centre	14
Art. 5	Tasks of the competence centre: (a) register; (b) manage evaluators and conciliators; (c) system for essentiality checks; (d) administer FRAND determination process; (e) train evaluators and conciliators; administer process for aggregate royalty determination; (g)(i) publish non-confidential results of essentiality checks and FRAND determinations; (g)(ii) enable access to case law summaries (including ADR), also from non-EU jurisdictions; (g)(iii) compile non-confidential information on FRAND determination methodologies and royalties; (g) (iv) enable access to SEP-related rules of non-EU countries; (h) training, support, advice for SMEs; (i) studies "and any other necessary activities to support the objectives of this Regulation"; (j) raise awareness about SEP licensing, including in the value chain	14
Art. 6	Languages: 1. procedures in any EUIPO working language; 2. register in English; 3. SME may make submission in any EU language; 4. machine translation of material submitted in language other than English; 5. SEP owner may provide English translation	15

TITLE III: INFORMATION ON SEPs AVAILABLE THROUGH COMPETENCE CENTRE

Art. 7	SEP Register to be maintained by the "competence centre" shall contain (a) information on standards, products, processes; (b) identification of declared-essential patents; (c) patent bibliographic data; (d) technical specification, standard version, sections of relevant standardisation document(s); (e) terms of FRAND pledge; (f) current and past owners; (g) EU legal representative; (h) essentiality-related information; (i) "public standard terms and conditions, including SEP owner's royalty and discount policies"; (j) licensing through collective licensing programs such as pools; (k) contact details	16
Art. 8	Electronic database: (a) expert opinions; (b) SEP rules of third countries; (c) case law summaries; (d) reports/studies published by "competence centre"; (e) "awareness raising and training materials"; (f) information on FRAND terms and conditions (notification of standard); (g) public versions of reports by conciliators	17
Art. 9	Identification if implementations of a standard and related SEP licensing terms and conditions: SEP owner shall provide (to the extent known) information on how SEP may be implemented and its standard terms	18

Art. 10	Essentiality information: any decision maybe UPC or national court of EU Member State within 6 months of publication	18
Art. 11	Patent pools or "any entity representing a collaborative licensing group" shall publish on websites at least (a) standards subject to collective licensing, (b) administrative entity's ownership, (c) SEP evaluation process, (d) list of EU-based evaluators; (e) list of evaluated SEPs and list of SEPs being licensed, (f) "illustrative cross-references to standard", (g) list of products that may be licensed, (h) royalties and discount policies, (i) standard license agreements, (j) list of licensors, (k) list of licensees	18
Art. 12	Information on decision on SEPs: 1. UPC and national courts of Member States to notify the "competence centre" (within 6 months of judgment) of (a) injunction requests, (b) infringement proceedings, (c) essentiality/validity challenges, (d) abuse-of-dominance cases, (e) FRAND determination requests; 2. anyone can notify the "competence centre" of judicial proceedings or ADR involving SEPs	19
Art. 13	Information on FRAND determinations: those involved in ADR concerning SEPs "shall disclose to the competence centre" FRAND determination methodology, parties, patents, and determined rates	20
Art. 14	Information on SEP rules in third countries to be collected by "competence centre" or submitted by anyone	20
Art. 15	Enhancing transparency and information sharing: 1. all data provided by stakeholders; reports and notes of evaluators and conciliators; 2. stated purposes; 3. electronic database for case law summaries (UPC, Member States' national courts, non-EU jurisdictions, ADR); 4. "competence centre" to verify references/results reported; 5. "competence centre" to "collect all information on FRAND terms and conditions, including any discounts", make available to antitrust authorities, courts, stakeholders; 6. annual report on methodologies, statistical information on licenses and licensed products; 7. case files to be kept for 10 years; 8. redactions at reasoned stakeholder request	20
Art. 16	Notification of standard: 1. notification to "competence centre" through SDO unless standard is royalty-free; 2. within 30 days of publication of latest technical specification; 3. contributors or implementers may also notify within 12 months; 4. "competence centre" to publish and receive comments from stakeholders within 30 days of publication; 5. after deadlines, comments will be considered and info published	21
Art. 17	Notification of aggregate royalty to "competence centre"	22
Art. 18	Revision of aggregate royalty: revision possible before period of validity (of aggregate royalty) has expired "if ... change in circumstances"	23
Art. 19	Process for facilitating agreements on aggregate royalty determinations: 1. upon request of at least 10% of contributors 2. elements of request 3. "competence centre" to appoint conciliator, who will mediate discussions; 4. if contributors can't agree within 6 months, conciliator shall submit report to "competence centre" summarizing reasons for failure to reach agreement; report to be published; 5. if contributors reach agreement, report will also be published; 6. fees to be paid by contributors based on number of technical contributions to standard	23

Art. 20	Non-binding expert opinion on aggregate royalty: 1. can be requested by 5% of all contributors and/or 5 actual or potential implementers; 2. deadline of 120 days; 3. elements of request; 4. "competence centre" to appoint panel of three conciliators; 5. panel to notify "SDO and all known stakeholders"; 6. any stakeholder may request to participate; 7. if participation is granted by panel, participation fee is to be paid; 8. panel to determine time limit for submission of relevant documents and to make specific requests for documents; 9. process "in person or via electronic means"; 10. other participants receive non-confidential versions of documents submitted to panel; 11. panel to render opinion (by majority decision) within 6 months; 12. opinion shall state reasons and underlying methodology, divergent views to be stated in annex; 13. opinion to include analysis of impact on value chain, 14. publication	24
Art. 21	Administration of the register of SEPs	26
Art. 22	Registration of SEPs: 1. SEP owner shall request registration; 2. at least one patent claim shall read on "requirement or recommendation of the standard "; 3. deadline of 6 months from publication of notification of standard or grant of patent, "whichever is earlier; 4. SEP owner shall update information within 6 months of any change; 5. non-notified SEPs within time limit "may not be enforced in the [UPC] or a national court ... until registration in the register"; 6. SEP owner not entitled to royalties or damages prior to registration; 7. UPC or national court to check whether SEP is registered (admissibility requirement); 8. failure to update may lead to suspension of registration until cured; 9. registration published following payment of registration fee	26
Art. 23	Date of registration shall be that of publication in the register	27
Art. 24	Examination of the conditions of registration: 1. annual completeness and correctness checks of registrations selected by "competence centre"; 2. methodology for selection of sample to be adopted by "competence centre"; 3. "competence centre" to inform registrant of deficiencies, which are then to be remedied within 2 months; 4. suspension until issues remedied; if not remedied within a year, registration to be removed	27
Art. 25	Modifying a registration in the register: 1. SEP owner may request modification; 2. no modification during essentiality check; 3. any stakeholder may request modification stating reasons and providing "evidence from an independent source supporting the request"; 4. modification request deemed filed after payment of fee; 5. "competence centre" to forward request to SEP owner and to give time to respond; 6. modification to be carried out if request is justified	28
Art. 26	Removing a claimed SEP from the register: 1. (a) expiry of patent; (b) invalidation of patent; (c) non-essentiality judgment; (d) negative result of EUIPO essentiality check; 2. process for third-party requests as for request for modification	29
Art. 27	Requirements for evaluator or conciliator; Commission to adopt implementing act to determine requirements and code of conduct	30
Art. 28	Selection procedure: "competence centre" to select/invite	30

TITLE V: ESSENTIALITY CHECKS OF SEPs

Art. 29	General requirement[s] for essentiality checks: 1. conducted by evaluators based on standard specifications; 2. no more than one SEP per patent family; 3. lack of essentiality check "shall not preclude licensing negotiations or any court or administrative procedure"; 4. result not legally binding; 5. can be used as evidence for any purpose	31
Art. 30	Administration of essentiality checks: 1. "competence centre" to administer; 2. each SEP owner may propose up to 100 patents (during first year of registration); 3. annual selection by "competence centre" of sample of claimed SEPs from each SEP owner based on methodology to be laid out in implementing act by Commission; 4. "competence centre" to notify SEP owners of selections; SEP owners to submit English translation of patent, claim chart, other technical information; maximum of 5 submissions for each SEP-standard combination; 5. publication of list of selected SEPs; 6. if selected SEP already checked, no additional check performed, prior result applies; 7. assignment of SEPs to be checked to evaluators; 8. identity of evaluators not disclosed to SEP owners	31
Art. 31	Designation of an evaluator: 1. designation of evaluator for particular product category or technology by "competence centre"; 2. evaluator to inform of conflict of interest; 3. if conflict of interest arises later, evaluator to inform "competence centre" within 7 days; 4. in case of conflict of interest, death, incapacity or resignation, "competence centre" to reassign SEP to another evaluator "without undue delay"	32
Art. 32	Observations by stakeholders: 1. stakeholders may submit within 90 days of publication of sample their "written observations" concerning essentiality of selected SEPs, but do not become parties to proceeding; 2. SEP owner may comment on such observations within time limit; 3. "competence centre" to provide observations/responses to evaluator	33
Art. 33	Examination of the essentiality of a claimed SEP: 1. Commission to determine process by implementing act; 2. Evaluator may invite SEP owner to file observations; 3. if evaluator deems patent non-essential, SEP owner may be able to submit observations or amended claim chart; 4. evaluator to consider all information provided by SEP owner; 5. evaluator to render "reasoned opinion"; 6. which remains confidential	33
Art. 34	Publication of the results of the essentiality checks: 1. results to be published in register and to "be valid for all SEPs from the same patent family"; 2. percentage of actually-essential SEPs per owner to be published in register; 3. publication only of binary essentiality result; 4. if "competence centre" publishes erroneously, it shall correct	34
Art. 35	Peer evaluation: 1. "[a] part of the essentiality checks" to be "subject of a peer evaluation"; 2. "any interested person may request" peer evaluation "by providing detailed technical reasons", decision to be made by "competence centre"; 3. ten evaluators to be appointed as peer evaluators for period of three years; 4. requirements of original evaluation apply; 5. no change if essentiality confirmed; 6. if negative peer review, SEP owner may comment; 7. final opinion 8. publication	34

TITLE VI: PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO FRAND DETERMINATION

Art. 36	Initiation of FRAND determination: 1.(a) by SEP owner prior to enforcement; (b) by prospective implementer prior to court action; 2. any party can seek FRAND determination even if no litigation plans	35
Art. 37	Content of the request to initiate a FRAND determination: 1. general data; 2. if SEP owner requests, must provide (a) claim charts (b) proof of essentiality checks (c) summary of licensing negotiations (d) references to any other FRAND determination; 3. request may include proposed FRAND determination	35
Art. 38	Duration of the FRAND determination: general rule of 9 months	36
Art. 39	notification to and reaction of the responding party to FRAND determination requests: "competence centre" to set response deadlines	36
Art. 40	Appointment of conciliators and establishment of the FRAND determination panel: 1. "competence centre" to propose at least five candidates; parties shall choose two candidates; one conciliator will preside, the other will assist; 2. party may oppose proposed candidates only for compelling reasons; if no agreement, "competence centre" to appoint two conciliators; 3. "competence centre" to set conciliators' hourly or daily fees; conciliators to keep record	37
Art. 41	Replacement of conciliators: in case of disqualification, death, incapacity or resignation, procedure to be suspended until vacancy filled; "competence centre" to propose three replacement candidates	38
Art. 42	Acceptance of appointment by the conciliators and composition of the FRAND determination panel	38
Art. 43	Preparation of the proceedings	38
Art. 44	Written procedure	39
Art. 45	Objection to the FRAND determination: if panel agrees, shall terminate procedure (para. 3)	39
Art. 46	Conduct of the FRAND determination	40
Art. 47	Failure of a party to engage: complying party may request decision based on evidence submitted or termination of procedure	41
Art. 48	Parallel proceedings: in case of parallel proceeding in court or "before a tribunal or administrative or state authority of a jurisdiction outside of the Union called upon by law to make legally binding and enforceable decisions" concerning a licensing dispute and "the same matter which serve[s] as a basis for the FRAND determination", the "competence centre" shall terminate the procedure upon request of the other party" (the one that did not bring such action)	41
Art. 49	Evidence: FRAND determination panel may request evidence at request of party or <i>sua sponte</i> , may also "examine publicly available information and access free of charge the competence centre's register and reports of other panels"	42
Art. 50	Witnesses and experts	42

Art. 51	Suggestions for a FRAND determination by the parties and the FRAND determination panel	43
Art. 52	Recommendation of a FRAND determination: panel shall (at least five months prior to time limit) notify parties of written recommendation of RAND determination	43
Art. 53	Submission of written and reasoned FRAND determination proposals by the parties or the party requesting the continuation of the FRAND determination	43
Art. 54	Oral procedure: oral hearing to be held if deemed necessary by panel or requested by a party; at premises of "competence centre", in another place, or remotely as decided by panel	44
Art. 55	Disclosure of information	44
Art. 56	Representation and assistance: "Each party may be represented by agents, counsel or attorneys."	44
Art. 57	Proposal for a FRAND determination by the panel	45
Art. 58	Termination of the FRAND determination and notice of termination: (a) by settlement, (b) by written declaration of parties accepting panel's determination; (c) by written declaratio of party requesting continuation that it accepts the panel's determination; (d) by a written declaration of a party not to accept the panel's proposal; (e) failure to reply in time	45
Art. 59	Report	46
Art. 60	Confidentiality	46

TITLE VII: MICRO, SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZE[D] ENTERPRISES

Art. 61	Training, advice and support: to be provided free of charge to SMEs; costs to be borne by EUIPO	47
Art. 62	FRAND terms of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises: 1. SEP owners shall consider offering SMEs sweetheart terms; 2. such SME sweetheart terms shall not impact FRAND determinations involving larger licensees; 3. "SEP owners shall also consider discounts or royalty-free licensing for low sales volumes" irrespective of company size; must be FRAND and published	47

TITLE VIII: FEES AND CHARGES

Art. 63	Administrative fees: fees for (a) registration of SEPs and access to databse, (b) aggregate royalty determination, (c) essentiality checks (including peer evaluation) and (d) FRAND determination. 2. Fees based on costs but also favoring SMEs. 3. Commission to adopt implementing act 4. which will ensure lower fees for SMEs.	48
Art. 64	Fees for expert opinion on aggregate royalty: to be determined by Commission through implementing act	48
Art. 65	Fees for evaluators and peer evaluators: implementing act to come	49

Art. 66	Fees for conciliators of the FRAND determination panel and costs fees to 1. remunerate conciliators for their time and 2. reimburse them for travel and other expenses, also travel and other expenses of witnesses requested by panel with consent of parties, and cost of any expert advice request by panel with consent of parties; 4. fees and costs of conciliators to be borne equally by the parties; 6. implementing act	49
Art. 67	Payment of fees: payments in euros to EUIPO, which determines payment methods; consequences of default	50
Art. 68	Financial provisions (EUIPO to cover expenses not covered by fees)	50

TITLE IX: FINAL PROVISIONS

Art. 69	Opening registration for an existing standard: 1. existing standard to be submitted to "competence centre" within 28 months of entry into force of SEP Regulation; 2. expert opinion on aggregate royalty rate can be requested within 30 months of entry into force of SEP Regulation	51
Art. 70	Existing essentiality checks: 1. patent pools' or other collaborative licensing entities' essentiality checks conducted by independent evaluator prior to 24 months from entry into force of SEP Regulation shall be included in the register; 3. essentiality check will then not be performed for such already-evaluated SEP	51
Art. 71	Committee procedure: Commission to be assisted by a committee	51
Art. 72	Commission guidance: also related to Art. 101/102 TFUE interpretation	52
Art. 73	Evaluation and review: Commission to evaluate after eight years and then every five years, evaluation submitted to various EU institutions	52
Art. 74	Amendment to Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 (standardization)	52
Art. 75	Amendments to Regulation (EU) 2017/1011	52
Art. 76	Entry into force and application: enters into force on 20 th day following publication on EU OJ, shall apply from 24 months after entry into force	53