

notice, or Notice to potential customers upon request: 3 minutes; Notice posted where customers make deposits: 15 minutes; Notice of changes in policy: 20 hours; and Annual notice of new ATMs: 5 hours.

*Number of respondents:* 989 state member banks  
Small businesses are affected.

*General description of report:* This information collection is mandatory (12 U.S.C. 4008). Because the Federal Reserve System does not collect any information, no issue of confidentiality exists. If during a compliance examination a violation of the Expedited Funds Availability Act is noted, then the information regarding such violation may be kept confidential (5 U.S.C. 552(b)(8)).

*Abstract:* The third party disclosure requirements are intended to alert consumers about their financial institutions' check-hold policies and to help prevent unintentional (and costly) overdrafts. Most disclosures resulting from a policy change must be made thirty days before actions is taken, or within thirty days if the action makes funds available more quickly. Model forms, clauses, and notices are appended to the regulations to provide guidance.

The Board's Regulation CC applies to all depository institutions, not just state member banks. However, under Paperwork Reduction Act regulations, the Federal Reserve accounts for the burden of the paperwork associated with the regulation only for state member banks. Other agencies account for the Regulation CC paperwork burden on their respective constituencies.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 18, 1999.

**Jennifer J. Johnson,**

*Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc. 99-7144 Filed 3-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

---

## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Docket No. 9288]

### Intel Corporation; Analysis to Aid Public Comment

**AGENCY:** Federal Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed consent agreement.

**SUMMARY:** The consent agreement in this matter settles alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the complaint that the Commission issued

in June 1998 and the terms of the consent order—embodied in the consent agreement—that would settle these allegations.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before May 24, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Horsley or Richard Parker, FTC/H-3105, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580, (202) 326-2648 or (202) 326-2574.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and § 3.25(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 3.25f), notice is hereby given that the above-captioned consent agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days. The following Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreement, and the allegations in the complaint. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreement package can be obtained from the FTC Home Page (for March 17, 1999), on the World Wide Web, at "http://www.ftc.gov/os/actions97.htm." A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, Room H-130, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326-3627.

Public comment is invited. Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580. Two paper copies of each comment should be filed, and should be accompanied, if possible, by a 3½-inch diskette containing an electronic copy of the comment. Such comments or views will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with section 4.9(b)(b)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

### Analysis of Proposed Consent Order To Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted for public comment an Agreement Containing Consent Order with Intel Corporation ("Intel") to resolve the matters charged in an administrative Complaint issued by the Commission on June 8, 1998. The Agreement has been placed on the public record for sixty (60) days for

receipt of comments from interested members of the public. The Agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by Intel that the law has been violated as alleged in the Complaint or that the facts alleged in the Complaint, other than jurisdictional facts, are true.

#### I. The Complaint

The Complaint alleges that Intel has monopoly power in the worldwide market for general purpose microprocessors. According to the Complaint, Intel's market dominance is reflected in a market share approximating 80 percent of dollar sales, together with high entry barriers including large sunk costs of design and manufacture, substantial economies of scale, customers' investments in existing software, the need to attract support from software developers, and reputational barriers.

The Complaint alleges that Intel sought to maintain its dominance by, among other things, denying advance technical information and product samples of microprocessors to Intel customers ("original equipment manufacturers" or "OEMs") and threatening to withhold product from those OEMs as a means of coercing those customers into licensing their patented innovations to Intel.

A microprocessor is an integrated circuit that serves as the central processing unit (or CPU) of computer systems. Microprocessors are sometimes described as the "brains" of computers because they perform the major data processing functions essential to computer systems. Advance technical information about new microprocessor products is essential to Intel's OEM customers, who design, develop, manufacture, and sell computer system products such as servers, workstations, and desktop and mobile personal computers. Computer design and development require the effective integration of multiple complex microelectronics components (including microprocessors, memory components, core logic chips, graphics controllers, and various input and output devices) into a coherent system. To achieve such system integration, a computer OEM requires product specifications and other technical information about each component, such as the electrical, mechanical, and thermal characteristics of the microprocessor. OEMs also need advance product samples, errata, and related technical assistance in order to perform system testing and debugging, thereby assuring the high performance and reliability of new computer products.

Intel promotes and markets its microprocessors by providing customers with technical information about new Intel products in advance of their commercial release, subject to formal nondisclosure agreements. Such information sharing has substantial commercial benefits for Intel and its OEM customers. Customers benefit because the information enables them to develop and introduce new computer system products incorporating the latest microprocessors as early and efficiently as possible. Intel benefits because a larger group of OEMs can sell new computer systems incorporating Intel's newest microprocessors as soon as the new microprocessors are introduced to the market.

The Complaint charges that Intel suspended its traditional commercial relationships with three established customers—Digital Equipment Corporation, Intergraph Corporation, and Compaq Computer Corporation—by refusing to provide advance technical information about, and product samples of, Intel microprocessors. Intel did so, according to the Complaint, to force those customers to end disputes with Intel concerning the customers' asserted intellectual property rights and to grant Intel licenses to patented technology developed and owned by those customers. In at least one of the cases, the Complaint alleges that Intel also acted to create uncertainty in the marketplace about the customer's future source of supply of Intel microprocessors.

The computer industry is characterized by short, dynamic product cycles, which are generally measured in months. Time to market is crucial. Indeed, the denial of advance product information is virtually tantamount to a denial of actual parts, because an OEM customer lacking such information simply cannot design new computer systems on a competitive schedule with other OEMs. An OEM who suffers denial of such information over a period of months will lose much of the profits it might otherwise have earned even from a successful new computer model. Continued denial of advance technical information to an OEM by a dominant supplier can make a customer's very existence as an OEM untenable.

As a result of the commercial pressure exerted by Intel's conduct, Compaq and Digital quickly entered in to cross-license arrangements with Intel. Intergraph was able to resist that pressure because it succeeded in obtaining a preliminary injunction from a federal district court requiring Intel to resume and continue supplying Intergraph with advance product

information, part samples, and other technical support pending a judicial resolution on the merits of the claims in the lawsuit.

The alleged conduct tends to reinforce Intel's domination of the general purpose microprocessor market in at least three ways. First, the alleged conduct tends to give Intel preferential access to a wide range of technologies being developed by many other firms in the industry. To the extent that firms desiring to compete with Intel are unable to obtain comparable access to such a wide range of technology, they can be seriously disadvantaged, thus making it more difficult for them to challenge Intel's dominance. Second, because patent rights are an important means of promoting innovation, coercion that forces customers to license away rights to microprocessor-related technologies on unfavorable terms to diminish the customers' incentives to develop such technologies, and thus harms competition by reducing innovation. Finally, Intel's conduct tends to make it more difficult for an OEM to serve as a platform for microprocessors that compete with Intel's. Intel's actions ensure that Intel can act as a conduit for technology flows from one OEM to another. That is, an OEM that seeks to enforce its intellectual property rights against other Intel customers may face retaliation from Intel, as the Complaint alleges Compaq did when it sued Packard-Bell for patent infringement. The result is that OEMs find it more difficult to differentiate their computer systems from their competitors through patented technology. As a result, an OEM seeking to use non-Intel microprocessors is less able to offset the lack of an Intel microprocessor by the strength of its own reputation for offering superior technology in other areas. For all of these reasons, continuation of this pattern of conduct would likely have injured competition by entrenching Intel's dominant position.

The Complaint also alleges that Intel's exclusionary conduct was not reasonably necessary to serve any legitimate, procompetitive purpose.

Exclusionary conduct by a monopolist that is reasonably capable of significantly contributing to the maintenance of a firm's dominance through unjustified means has long been understood to give rise to serious competitive concerns. *See, e.g., Lorain Journal Co. v. United States*, 342 U.S. 143, 154 n.7 (1951); *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Technical Services*, 504 U.S. 451, 483 & n.32 (1992); *Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Co.*, 472 U.S. 585, 596 .19 (1985); *United States*

*v. Grinnell Corp.*, 384 U.S. 563, 570–71 (1966); *Barry Wright Corp. v. ITT Grinnell Corp.*, 724 F.2d 227, 230 (1st Cir. 1983) (Breyer, J.) (citing 3 P. Areeda & D. Turner, *Antitrust Law*, ¶ 626 at 83 (1978)).

Such conduct harms consumers, not only because competition brings lower prices, but also because competition is a powerful spur to the development of new, better, and more diverse products and processes. Unjustified conduct by a monopolist that removes the incentive to such competition by depriving innovators of their reward or otherwise tilting the playing field against new entrants or fringe competitors thus has a direct and substantial impact upon future consumers.

In the absence of a legitimate business justification that outweighs these concerns, such conduct constitutes a violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 2, and therefore Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 45. In issuing Complaint, the Commission found reason to believe that such a violation had occurred.

## II. Terms of the Proposed Consent Order

The Proposed Order would remedy all of the concerns embodied in the Complaint. The substantive prohibition, Section II.A., prohibits Intel from withholding or threatening to withhold certain advance technical information from a customer or taking other specified actions with respect to such information for reasons relating to an intellectual property dispute with that customer. It also prohibits Intel from refusing or threatening to refuse to sell microprocessors to a customer for reasons related to an intellectual property dispute with that customer. This provision is designed to prevent Intel from restricting access to microprocessor products, or advance technical information relating to such products, as leverage in an intellectual property dispute against a customer that is receiving advance technical information from Intel at the time the dispute arises. The Proposed Order does not impose any kind of broad "compulsory licensing" regime upon Intel. So long as it is otherwise lawful, Intel is free to decide in the first instance whether it chooses to provide or not provide information to customers, and whether to provide more information or earlier information to specific customers in furtherance of a joint venture or other legitimate activity. Moreover, the Order is limited to the types of information that Intel routinely gives to customers to enable them to use Intel microprocessors, not information that would be used to design or

manufacture microprocessors in competition with Intel.

In short, Paragraph II.A. secures to Intel customers the right to seek full and fair value for their intellectual property, free from the risk of curtailment of needed advance technical information or product. With one exception, Intel will be required to continue providing information and product while the customer seeks any of a range of legal and equitable remedies available to it, such as damages (trebled or otherwise increased in appropriate cases), reasonable royalties, and attorneys fees and costs. These remedies will generally be sufficient to protect the customer in its exercise of its intellectual property rights.

The exception involves situations where a customer maintains the right to seek an injunction against Intel's manufacture, use, sale, offer to sell or importation of its microprocessors. The Order contemplates that Intel may request a customer to waive that remedy and give the customer a reasonable opportunity to make a simple written statement to that effect. If the customer refuses, Intel will not be required by this Order to continue providing information or product with respect to the microprocessors that the customer is seeking to enjoin.

This part of the Order strikes an appropriate balance, on a prospective basis, between the interests of Intel and its customers. If a customer chooses to seek an injunction against Intel's microprocessors, it cannot, under the provisions of this Order, be assured of continuing to receive advance technical information about the very same microprocessors that it is attempting to enjoin. If an Intel customer nevertheless wishes to seek injunctive relief against Intel's manufacture, use, sale, offer to sell or importation, it remains free to do so, but without the protections in this Order. In all other circumstances, Intel is required to continue supplying technical information and product under the Proposed Order.

The Proposed Order contains a number of other definitions and provisos to ensure that it will achieve its purposes while not sweeping more broadly than needed to remedy the competitive concerns alleged in the Complaint:

- "Advance Technical Information" (or "AT Information") is defined in Paragraph I.C. to encompass all information necessary to enable a customer to design and develop, in a timely way, computer systems incorporating Intel microprocessors. The Proposed Order establishes a rebuttable presumption that the

provision of AT information six months before the commercial release date of a microprocessor is sufficient to enable the customer to design and develop new systems based on that microprocessor in a competitive and timely way. AT Information does not include detailed microprocessor design information or other information not generally provided to Intel's customers.

- "Intellectual Property Dispute" is defined in Paragraph I.D. to include not only situations in which a customer directly or indirectly asserts or threatens to assert patent, copyright or trade secret rights against Intel, but also to situations in which a customer asserts such rights against another Intel customer, or where a customer has refused a request by Intel to license or otherwise convey its intellectual property rights.

- Paragraph II.B.1. states that the Proposed Order does not prohibit Intel from seeking legal or equitable remedies based upon its own intellectual property, provided that it continues to supply AT Information to the customer.

- Paragraph B.2. and B.3. make clear that the Proposed Order does not prohibit Intel from withholding AT Information or making decisions about product supply based on otherwise lawful business considerations unrelated to the existence of the intellectual property dispute. For example, Intel retains the right to withhold information from a customer that has breached an agreement regarding the disclosure or use of the information.

- Paragraph B.4. provides that the Proposed Order does not require Intel to provide AT Information or microprocessors to facilitate the design or development of a type of system that the customer has not designed or developed or demonstrated plans to design or develop within the preceding year.

- Paragraph B.5. makes clear that the Proposed Order does not prohibit Intel from restricting the use of AT Information to the customer's design and development of computer systems that incorporate the microprocessor to which the AT Information pertains. For example, if a recipient of AT Information is in the business of designing competing microprocessors, the Proposed Order would not prevent Intel from using reasonable firewall provisions to prevent that recipient from using the information in that competing business.

- Paragraph B.6. provides that the Proposed Order does not require Intel to disclose information or supply microprocessors that are not otherwise available for disclosure or supply to

Intel's customers. If the information or product is not being provided to other customers, then the refusal to provide it to a customer with which Intel has an intellectual property dispute does not provide the kind of leverage that the challenged conduct provides.

- Paragraph B.7. makes clear that, apart from the specific requirements and prohibitions, the Proposed Order does not otherwise limit Intel's intellectual property rights.

In light of the rapidly changing nature of the industry, Intel's obligations under the Proposed Order would terminate in ten years. The Commission appreciates that this same industry dynamic makes it important for it to address disputes over Intel's compliance with the Order expeditiously, should any such disputes arise.

Parts III, IV, and V of the Proposed Order set out various procedural requirement, such as notice to affected persons and annual compliance reporting. Paragraph III.A. permits Intel to provide notice of the Order to recipients of AT Information through a conspicuous notice placed, for thirty days after final entry of the Order, as the first item on the "In the News" portion of the "developers" page of Intel's World-Wide Web site. Because recipients of AT Information must frequently visit that area of Intel's Website in order to receive information needed in their business, a notice displayed at that location will ensure notice to all affected persons. After the initial thirty-day period, Intel will maintain a link from the "developers" page to the Order, so that new customers will also have access to the Order. The other provisions of these paragraphs are standard provisions of the type typically included in Commission orders of this kind.

### *III. Opportunity for Public Comment*

The Proposed Order has been placed on the public record for 60 days in order to receive comments from interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After 60 days, the Commission will again review the Agreement and comments received, and will decide whether it should withdraw from the Agreement or make final the Order contained in the Agreement.

By accepting the Proposed Order subject to final approval, the Commission anticipates that the competitive issues described in the complaint will be resolved. The purpose of this analysis is to invite and facilitate public comment concerning the Proposed Order. It is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of

the Agreement and Proposed Order or in any way to modify their terms.

By direction of the Commission.

**Donald S. Clark,**  
Secretary.

**Statement of Commission Mozelle W. Thompson in the Matter of Intel Corporation**

The Commission has accepted for public comment an Agreement Containing Consent Order (the "Agreement") that settles the charges made by the Commission against Intel in an administrative complaint (the "Complaint"). The Complaint alleged that Intel unlawfully used its monopoly power in the market for general microprocessors, to coerce computer and other peripheral manufacturers to license intellectual property rights to Intel. The Complaint further alleged that Intel engaged in this conduct in order to maintain its monopoly position.

On June 8, 1998, I voted to issue a Complaint in the above-captioned action because I was concerned that these allegations, if true, threatened to harm competition and opportunity for innovation in the general microprocessor market. This threatened harm would thereby deprive consumers of the price and innovation benefits of a truly competitive marketplace. Today, I vote to accept the Agreement for public comment because I believe the Agreement can address these concerns by preserving competition and providing opportunities for innovation by preventing Intel from using intellectual property disputes to limit access to advance technical information or microprocessor products that it routinely provides customers.

I particularly wish to commend the Commission staff and Intel for working together to craft an agreement that effectively serves the public interest in the context of the important characteristics of the high technology computer industry. By eliminating the possibility of anti-competitive withholding of product and information, the Agreement preserves the benefits of competition while creating a climate for new ideas. This creative solution will benefit consumers and industry alike.

**Statement of Commissioner Orson Swindle in the Matter of Intel Corporation**

As is already widely known, one of the Federal Trade Commission's most significant antitrust adjudications in years was resolved on the eve of trial with the signing of a consent agreement by complaint counsel and respondent

Intel Corporation. A hospitalization for major surgery since March 5 has precluded me for the present from considering the settlement of this important case on its merits. I would have strongly preferred to have been able to evaluate it and to participate in the Commission's vote.

Nevertheless, I fully expect to have an opportunity to formulate and communicate my views on the consent agreement, and I anticipate issuing those views—as an aid to public comment on the settlement—as soon as possible during the 60-day comment period. When my statement is ready for issuance, I will ask the Commission's Office of Public Affairs to release it and will also post it on the Commission's website ([www.ftc.gov](http://www.ftc.gov)).

[FR Doc. 99-7211 Filed 3-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

**FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

[File No. 9810329]

**Medtronic Inc.; Analysis to Aid Public Comment**

**AGENCY:** Federal Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed consent agreement.

**SUMMARY:** The consent agreement in this matter settles alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the draft complaint that accompanies the consent agreement and the terms of the consent order—embodied in the consent agreement—that would settle these allegations.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before May 24, 1999.

**ADDRESS:** Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pa. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen Riddell or Mark Menna, FTC/H-2105, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580, (202) 326-2721 or (202) 326-2722.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and Section 2.34 of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 2.34), notice is hereby given that the above-captioned consent agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days. The following

Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreement, and the allegations in the complaint. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreement package can be obtained from the FTC Home Page (for March 8, 1999), on the World Wide Web, at "<http://www.ftc.gov/os/actions97.htm>." A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, Room H-130, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326-3627. Public comment is invited. Such comments or views will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with Section 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

**Analysis of the Proposed Consent Order and Draft Complaint to Aid Public Comment**

The Federal Trade Commission ("Commission") has accepted for public comment from Medtronic, Inc. ("Medtronic" or "proposed Respondent") an Agreement Containing Consent Order ("the proposed consent order"). The proposed Respondent has also reviewed a draft complaint contemplated by the Commission. The proposed consent order is designed to remedy likely anticompetitive effects arising from the acquisition of Avecor Cardiovascular, Inc. ("Avecor"). Both Medtronic and Avecor are medical technology companies that compete in the manufacture and sale of non-occlusive arterial pumps, perfusion devices used in heart/lung machines. The proposed consent order remedies the acquisition's anticompetitive effects by requiring Medtronic to divest Avecor's non-occlusive arterial pump assets ("Avecor Pump Assets") as a viable, on-going product line. Medtronic has entered into an agreement to divest the Avecor Pump Assets to Baxter Healthcare Corporation ("Baxter").

Medtronic, which is headquartered in Minneapolis, Minnesota, is engaged in the research, development, manufacture and sale of medical devices, including implantable devices, such as pacemakers and defibrillators, which regulate heart rhythm; tissue and mechanical heart valves; coronary stents; and perfusion devices for heart/lung machines. Medtronic's perfusion devices include non-occlusive arterial pumps. Medtronic's Bio-Pump is the market leader in non-occlusive arterial pumps. Avecor, also headquartered in Minneapolis, Minnesota, is engaged in the research, development, manufacture and sale of perfusion devices, including,