ISSN 1560-3849

Competition Policy Newsletter

Competition Policy Information and Research Center, Fair Trade Commission, Taiwan (ROC)
Publisher: Tang Jinn-Chuan
Editor-in-Chief: Shin Chih-Chung

Issue 2, Volume 11 April 30, 2007

Index:

◆Special Topics

◎FTC and UCRA Sign MOU

Mr. Tang Jinn-Chuan, Chairman of FTC (right) and Mr. Buyanulzii Jargalsaikhan, Chairman of UCRA (left) sign the Memorandum

The Fair Trade Commission (FTC) and the Unfair Competition Regulatory Authority of Mongolia (UCRA) offi-cially signed the MOU in Taipei on March 15, 2007.

The ceremony was held at the FTC on March 15, 2007 at 2:30 pm. The said

memorandum was signed by the Chairman of the FTC, Mr. Tang Jinn-Chuan, and the Chairman of the UCRA, Mr. Buyanulzii Jargalsaikhan, representative of the Ulaanbaatar Economic Office in Taipei, Mrs. Jargalsaikhan, and five UCRA officials that came to Taipei for competition law training provided by the FTC were all invited to attend this signing ceremony.

The UCRA was formed in November 2004, and is directly subordinated to the Deputy Prime Minister of Mongolia. Its duty is to administer the enforcement of unfair competition prohibition and the enactment of competition policies. As a newcomer in the enforcement of competition laws, Mongolia has been actively gaining experience overseas in order to cultivate a superior and more professional approach to law enforcement in its own country. The interaction between the competition authorities of Taiwan and Mongolia commenced in 2005. In August 2005 and February 2006, the Vice Chairman of the UCRA, Mr. Khurenbaatar, and the Chairman, Mr. Jargalsaikhan, respectively visited Taiwan. In May last year, Mongolia also selected and dispatched five officials to Taiwan to receive the training in competition law provided by the FTC. When the ex-Chairman of the FTC, Mr. Hwang Tzong-Leh, was invited to visit Mongolia last November, the UCRA had already submitted a proposal for signing a memorandum regarding cooperation in competition laws. After the mutual deliberation and with the assistance of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission, the proposal finally became official. The contents of this memorandum of cooperation included provisions regarding the scope of cooperation, the exchange of information, visits by high-level officials, and activities to provide assistance.

The said memorandum is the fifth document to promote cooperation that

has been signed by the FTC with a foreign country following the Bilateral Cooperation Agreements of Competition Laws signed by the FTC with Australia, New Zealand, and France, respectively, in 1996, 1997, and 2004; and the Trilateral Cooperation Agreement signed by the FTC with Australia and New Zealand in 2002. During this period, the FTC has also continued to provide necessary technical support to Southeast Asian countries, such as Thailand, Vietnam, and Indonesia, in regard to the enforcement of competition laws. At the signing ceremony of the said memorandum, Mr. Jargalsaikhan mentioned that although the competition authorities of Taiwan, Japan and Korea had all provided technical support to the UCRA, Taiwan's FTC had given the most assistance. The FTC said that it would continue, pursuant to the mutual understanding in relation to this Memorandum of Cooperation, to promote and strengthen the cooperation between Taiwan and Mongolia and provide any necessary assistance to Mongolia, such as dispatching trainers, providing short-term training arrangements in Taiwan, inviting Mongolia to participate in international conferences held by the FTC, and encouraging regular visits by high-level officials. The FTC will assist Mongolia in establishing a sound capacity for enforcing competition laws by sharing Taiwan's relevant experiences.

Creating a trading environment with fair competition will help enterprises with their investments, make their operations more competitive and efficient, as well as promote the consumer's interests. In this era of the globalization of trade, the competition authorities of each country may make the cross-country investments of enterprises more secure, improve the development of international trade, and then elevate the overall economy and the consumer's welfare through mutual cooperation and assistance. Thus, mutual cooperation and assistance have become crucial issues in the free trade agreements

of each country. The FTC will therefore actively develop cooperative relationships with the competition authorities of each country to jointly create trading order in the presence of fair competition.

◆News Section

◎Selected FTC Decisions

□Champion Building Material Co., Ltd. and Sanyo Pottery & Porcelain Co., Ltd. Violate Article 18 of the Fair Trade Law by Restraining the Resale Prices of Downstream Distributors

During its 789th Commissioners' Meeting on December 21, 2006, the FTC found that Champion Building Material Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called "Champion") and Sanyo Pottery & Porcelain Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called "Sanyo") respectively violated Article 18 of the Fair Trade Law by requesting in the contracts that their downstream distributors shall sell according to the product price lists attached to the contracts. The FTC ordered these two enterprises to immediately cease the unlawful acts and imposed an administrative fine of NT$720,000 respectively on these two enterprises.

An enterprise shall allow its trading counterparts to decide on sales prices freely. Thus, if an enterprise sets limitations on the resale prices of its products and takes measures to request trading counterparts to follow them, such an act of restraining downstream business operators' trading activities has already deprived the downstream business operators of their freedom to decide on prices according to their own cost structure and market competition and has therefore weakened the price competition among different sales operators within the same brand. This type of act is expressly prohibited in the Fair Trade Law.

Champion is a manufacturer of two tile brands, Champion and Marcobelli, with 10 regional distributors who sell

Champion's products exclusively. It was agreed in the contracts entered into by and between Champion and its distributors and building material businesses that Champion's products would be sold at prices based on the suggested price lists appended to the products. In the event that any party failed to comply with Champion's policies and reduced the prices, the distribution right would be cancelled or supply would cease and a penalty be imposed. Sanyo is a manufacturer of two tile brands, STG and San Marino, with 15 regional distributors who can sell other tile brands besides Sanyo's products. It was agreed in the contracts entered by and between Sanyo and its distributors that the distributors would sell Sanyo's products at prices based on the suggested price lists appended to the products and would not reduce the prices without authorization. It was also agreed that the contract would be terminated in the event of default. Champion and Sanyo are currently two of the top three domestic tile businesses in terms of reputation and market share. Since the downstream distributors have to bear the risks of tile products, sales and finance, the aforementioned measures a have sizable impact and also serve to oppress the downstream distributors and building material businesses. The freedom of these trading counterparts to decide on prices has actually been restrained by the disadvantageous measures mentioned above. Moreover, the relevant distributors and downstream retailers have stated that any and all quotations and contracts have been determined in accordance with the price lists provided by Champion and Sanyo. It is obvious that Champion and Sanyo's suggested resale prices and relevant punitive measures set forth in the contracts entered into by and between Sanyo and its distributors have affected the freedom of these distributors and retailers to decide on the resale prices. Champion and Sanyo's acts have damaged the market competition mechanism and violated Article 18 of the Fair Trade Law.

After considering the motivation, purpose, and expected improper benefit of the unlawful acts of Champion and Sanyo; the degree of the acts' harm to market order; the duration of the acts' harm to market order; the benefits derived on account of the unlawful acts; the scale, operating condition, sales and market position of the enterprises; whether or not the type of unlawful acts involved in the violation have been corrected or appropriate warnings have been given by the Central Competent Authority; the types and numbers of and intervals between past violations, and the punishment for such violations; the remorse shown for the acts and attitude of cooperation in the investigation; and other factors, the FTC ordered Champion and Sanyo to immediately cease the unlawful acts and imposed an administrative fine of NT$720,000, respectively, on Champion and Sanyo in accordance with the fore part of Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

☐Far Eastern Department Stores Co., Ltd. Violates Article 11(1)(iii) of the Fair Trade Law by Failing to File a Merger Report

During its 789th Commissioners' Meeting on December 21, 2006, the FTC found that Far Eastern Department Stores Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called "Far Eastern") violated Article 11(1)(iii) of the Fair Trade Law by failing to file a merger report after receiving indirect control of the business operations and personnel appointments of Pacific SOGO Department Stores Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called "Pacific SOGO"). The FTC ordered Far Eastern to make a supplemental report or any necessary corrections and imposed an administrative fine of NT$1.02 million on Far Eastern in accordance with Article 40 of the Fair Trade Law.

The sales of Far Eastern and Pacific SOGO in 2001 were respectively NT$16.92748 billion and NT$26.05559 billion. In September 2002, Far Eastern used the subsidiaries of Far Eastern and

By-Yang Investment Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called "By-Yang Investment") to increase its shares in Pacific Circulation Investment Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called "Pacific Circulation Investment"), the parent company of Pacific SOGO possessing more than half of the shares of Pacific SOGO, through its trust account with Shanghai Commercial Bank Ltd. (hereinafter called "Shanghai Commercial Bank"). A total of 54.45% of Pacific Circulation Investment's shares was thereby acquired.

Article 6(1)(v) of the Fair Trade Law provides that "where an enterprise directly or indirectly controls the business operation or the appointment or discharge of personnel of another enterprise" this shall be considered to be one of the situations of a merger. Article 11(1)(iii) of the same Law provides that "in the event that the sales for the preceding fiscal year of one of the enterprises in the merger exceeds the threshold amount (NT$10 billion or more for non-financial institutes and NT$1 billion for the merged enterprises) publicly announced by the central competent authority, a report shall be filed with the central competent authority prior to the merger." In this case, Far Eastern and its subsidiary acquired 54.45% of Pacific Circulation Investment's shares in 2002, while Pacific Circulation Investment owned more than half of Pacific SOGO's shares. The shares of Pacific Circulation Investment owned by Far Eastern and its By-Yang Investment and the shares of Pacific SOGO owned by Pacific Circulation Investment both exceeded 50% of the shares of the owned companies. Through such "control of possession" or "legal control," Far Eastern and By-Yang Investment could completely control the shareholders' meeting and board of directors of Pacific Circulation Investment and indirectly control the business operations and personnel appointments of Pacific SOGO through the controlling/subordinate relationship between Pacific Circulation Investment

and Pacific SOGO.

In 2001, both Far Eastern and Pacific SOGO had a sales amount that exceeded the threshold announced by the FTC. However, Far Eastern failed to file a merger report with the FTC prior to the merger and therefore violated Article 11(1) of the Fair Trade Law. The FTC ordered Far Eastern to make a supplemental report or any necessary corrections in accordance with Article 13(1) of the Fair Trade Law and imposed an administrative fine of NT$1.02 million on Far Eastern in accordance with Article 40 of the Fair Trade Law.

☐The Board of Directors of the Tourist Bus Association of Taiwan Province Violates Article 14(1) of the Fair Trade Law by Engaging in Concerted Action

During its 789th Commissioners' Meeting on December 21, 2006, the FTC found that the Board of Directors of the Tourist Bus Association of Taiwan Province (hereinafter called the "Tourist Bus Association") violated Article 14(1) of the Fair Trade Law by making a resolution to request the association of each county/city to invite business operators and mobile license lessees to jointly raise transportation charges. The FTC therefore ordered the said Tourist Bus Association to immediately cease the unlawful act and imposed an administrative fine of NT$500,000 in accordance with Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

During the second meeting of the Board of Directors of the 11th Tourist Bus Association, a resolution was passed to "request the association of each county/city to invite business operators and mobile license lessees to jointly raise transportation charges. Licenses will be denied or licensing fees raised for those who refuse to do so." It was found by the FTC that due to constantly rising gas prices, the economic recession, the oversupply of tourist buses and a price war started by license lessees, the Tourist Bus

Association submitted the said proposal at the meeting to reflect the difficulties being encountered by its members. Since no objection was raised against the proposal, the said resolution was made and the meeting minutes sent to each director and association of each county/city.

The act whereby the Tourist Bus Association used a resolution to request business operators and license lessees to jointly raise transportation charges affected the supply and demand of the domestic tourist bus transportation service market and restrained tourist bus business operators from freely deciding on prices. Such an act also restrained enterprises from resorting to favorable prices, quantity, quality, service or other conditions to strive for trading opportunities and weakened the competition mechanism in the market. It accorded with the descriptions of a "concerted action" set forth in Article 7 of the Fair Trade Law and violated Article 14(1) of the Fair Trade Law. After considering the motive of the Tourist Bus Association, the degree of harm, the content of the unlawful act, the scale of operations, the remorse shown after the violation, and other factors, the FTC imposed an administrative fine of NT$500,000.

☐Formosa Petroleum Co., Ltd. Violates Article 21(1) of the Fair Trade Law by Making False, Untrue and Misleading Representations about Its Product Price

During its 792nd Commissioners' Meeting on January 11, 2007, the FTC found that Formosa Petroleum Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called "Formosa") violated Article 21(1) of the Fair Trade Law by publishing in its advertisement the promotion of gas discounts, i.e., "Happy Wednesday Exclusively for Members, $3 Off Per Liter; $1.8 Off Per Liter On Other Days of the Week, $2.3 Off Per Liter for Taxi Members; Apply Now For Immediate

Discounts," a false, untrue and misleading representation about its product price. The FTC ordered Formosa to immediately cease the unlawful act and imposed an administrative fine of NT$1 million.

Formosa produced large billboards and posters with the above-mentioned content, posted the same at its 13 gas stations located in Taipei County, and disseminated flyers to non-specific consumers at these 13 gas stations. The advertisement did not specifically state that the preferential prices were only applicable at these 13 gas stations. Undoubtedly, when the general or relevant public received such flyers, they would think that they were entitled to these discounts at any Formosa gas station as long as they applied for membership cards. Formosa admitted that such discounts were only available at these 13 gas stations, or 8.7% of its 150 gas stations. In addition, taxi members were required to register their license plate number separately with these 13 gas stations prior to receiving the discounts. The advertisement in question, however, did not disclose such information. As a result, the complainant was not entitled to the preferential prices set forth in the advertisement in question after obtaining such a membership from Formosa. This advertisement was therefore a false, untrue and misleading representation.

The current gas market has been opened to liberal competition. Each Formosa gas station may set its own preferential prices according to its actual competition status and need not to follow the same prices. However, the gas price is an important factor for the consumer when choosing among gas stations and therefore greatly affects the consumer's trading decision. Formosa failed to expressly state the limitations in regard to the availability of these preferential prices and only stated that "participating methods were subject to announcements on its Website" in a very small font size, which was out of proportion compared with the font

size of the discounts. Such a difference was difficult for a certain amount of the general or relevant public to accept, was sufficient to cause a wrongful recognition or decision, and was deemed to be a false, untrue and misleading representation in violation of Article 21(1) of the Fair Trade Law.

After considering the motivation, purpose, and expected improper benefit of the unlawful acts of Formosa; the degree of the act's harm to market order; the duration of the act's harm to market order; the benefits derived on account of the unlawful act; the scale, operating condition, sales and market position of the enterprise; whether or not the type of unlawful act involved in the violation had been corrected or warnings of its consequences given by the Central Competent Authority; the types and number of and intervals between past violations, and the punishment for such violations; the remorse shown for the act and attitude of cooperation in the investigation; and other factors, the FTC ordered Formosa to immediately cease the unlawful act and imposed an administrative fine of NT$1 million in accordance with the fore part of Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

□Taiwan Salt Industrial Co., Ltd. Violates Article 18 of the Fair Trade Law by Restraining Resale Prices

During its 793rd Commissioners' Meeting on January 18, 2007, the FTC found that Taiwan Salt Industrial Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called "TAIYEN") violated Article 18 of the Fair Trade Law by agreeing on resale prices in its franchising contracts and distribution contracts and issuing letters to request franchisers and distributors to follow such resale price restraints during the existence of their contractual relationships. The FTC ordered TAIYEN to immediately cease such unlawful acts from the next day after the disposition was served and imposed an

administrative fine of NT$1 million.

An enterprise shall allow its trading counterparts to decide on sales prices freely. Thus, if an enterprise sets limitations on the resale prices of its products and takes measures to request trading counterparts to follow, such an act of restraining downstream business operators' trading activities has already deprived the downstream business operators of their freedom to decide on prices according to their own cost structure and market competition and has therefore weakened the price competition among different sales operators within the same brand. This type of act is expressly prohibited in Article 18 of the Fair Trade Law.

After investigation, the FTC found that after a product was sold to a franchiser and distributor by TAIYEN, the ownership of such a product was transferred to such franchiser and distributor. Such a franchiser and distributor would then have to resell this product to obtain profits, and would also have to bear the risks of not being able to sell this product. In the contracts signed by TAIYEN with its franchisers and distributors, TAIYEN provided a provision to restrain sales prices. It is obvious that TAIYEN intended to restrain the resale prices. In addition, when the franchising contract or distribution contract was still in effect, TAIYEN continuously issued letters or facsimiles to inform and warn its franchisers and distributors not to sell at a price lower than a certain amount. TAIYEN even punished distributors that violated such an order. It is obvious that TAIYEN did enforce the aforesaid provision and had certain power to restrain its franchisers or distributors. By doing so, TAIYEN had violated Article 18 of the Fair Trade Law.

After considering the motivation, purpose, and expected improper benefit of the unlawful acts of TAIYEN; the degree of the act's harm to market

order; the duration of the act's harm to market order; the benefits derived on account of the unlawful act; the scale, operating condition, sales and market position of the enterprise; whether or not the type of unlawful act involved in the violation has been corrected or warnings of its consequences given by the Central Competent Authority; the types and number of and intervals between past violations, and the punishment for such violations; the remorse shown for the act and attitude of cooperation in the investigation; and other factors, the FTC ordered TAIYEN to immediately cease the unlawful act and imposed an administrative fine of NT$1 million in accordance with the fore part of Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

☐The Non-Life Insurance Association of the ROC violates Article 14(1) of the Fair Trade Law by Engaging in a Concerted Action Sufficient to Affect the Supply and Demand in the Property Insurance Market

During its 794th Commissioners' Meeting on January 25, 2007, the FTC found that the Non-Life Insurance Association of the ROC (hereinafter called the "NLIA") violated Article 14(1) of the Fair Trade Law by preventing its members from complying with the second stage of the "Premium Liberalization of the Property Insurance Market" in which companies may decide on the application for hazard insurance premiums. Such an act restrained free competition and was sufficient to affect the supply and demand in the property insurance market. The FTC therefore ordered the NLIA to immediately cease such an unlawful act and imposed an administrative fine of NT$1 million.

In order to promote the liberalization of premiums in the property insurance market and to safeguard the insurer's rights and interests, the Financial Supervisory Commission, Executive Yuan

(hereinafter called the "FSC"), enacted the "Premium Liberalization of the Property Insurance Market Plan" (hereinafter called the "Plan"). The content of the second stage of the said Plan was to promote the modification of commercial fire insurance and type A car damage insurance, type B car damage insurance, collision insurance without deductibles, car theft insurance, and third-party liability insurance in terms of "physical injury" and "monetary loss" and to adjust the hazard premium for any car insurance within 5%. However, the NLIA claimed that "maintaining current premium rates is the common acknowledgement of the industry for pursuing order and stability" and employed memorandums, meeting minutes of the Board of Directors, and emails to request its members not to apply for the premium liberalization with the FSC regarding the premium rates for automobile insurance, thus affecting the consumer's rights and interests.

After investigation, it was found that the FSC sent a letter on March 30, 2005 to request that the NLIA inform its members to apply for premium liberalization regarding any automobile insurance. The FSC additionally sent a letter on July 8, 2005 to request that the NLIA inform its members to truthfully comply with the letter issued by the Taiwan Insurance Institute on June 30, 2005. The said letter of the Taiwan Insurance Institute stated that the deadline for the modification of the hazard insurance premium of any automobile insurance and the application for review was the 15th day of August each year, and that, with the approval of the Insurance Bureau of the FSC, the hazard insurance premium may be adjusted in the following year. However, during the 10th meeting of the 3rd Board of Directors of the NLIA on July 28, 2005, the Automobile Insurance Commission reported that "upon the discussion of the Automobile Insurance Commission…for the implementation of the second stage of the premium liberalization, the premium

modification will be applied after the completion of the adjustment calculation." The Board of Directors passed a resolution stating "to be consulted" and mailed the meeting minutes as Letter (94) Chan-Tzong-Tzu No. 099 of August 2, 2005 to its members. It was also found that according to the "memorandum" and "attachment" attached to the email transmitted by the "Compulsory Automobile Liability Insurance Pool" respectively on July 25, 2005 and August 4, 2005, the common acknowledgement of the industry for pursuing order and stability and maintaining current premium rates was formed during 2005 through the meetings of the Automobile Insurance Commission of the NLIA.

The NLIA employed the agreement of the Automobile Insurance Commission and the decision of the Board of Directors to restrain hazard insurance premiums from being lowered and requested its members to comply accordingly. It can be proved that a "mutual consent" of concerted action existed then. Externally, none of the members applied for automobile insurance premium liberalization during 2005. As a result, it can be determined that the consent of the NLIA to maintain premium rates restrained the freedom of its members to decide on the prices and affected the supply and demand of product trade or services in violation of Article 14(1) of the Fair Trade Law.

After considering the motivation and purpose of the unlawful acts of the NLIA; the degree of the act's harm to market order; the duration of the act's harm to market order; and the scale, operating condition and market position of the enterprise, the aforementioned disposition was made.

□Crown Ltd.'s Intention to Merge with 10 Cable Television Companies Limited by Shares is Approved

During its 794th Commissioners'

Meeting on January 25, 2007, the FTC approved the merger of Crown Ltd. with Keelung Cable TV, Changde Cable TV, Liguan Cable TV, Wonderful Cable TV, Jahe Cable TV, Xinshibo Cable TV, Beijian Cable TV, Sun Crown Cable TV, Chienglian Cable TV and Gangdu Cable TV and the merger of Commander Ltd. with Twinstars Cable TV Co., Ltd. in accordance with Article 12(1) of the Fair Trade Law.

Through indirect investment, Crown Ltd. and Commander Ltd. respectively acquired the control rights of Keelung Cable TV along with the remaining nine companies and Twinstars Cable TV. These two merger cases only involved share transfers in the parent companies of the system operators in different operating regions. Therefore, neither market share nor service fee decisions would be affected after the merger. Additionally, no impact would be made upon the competition mechanism of the domestic cable TV system market. Furthermore, the applicants, Crown Ltd. and Commander Ltd., did not interfere with the domestic channel supply market or control another cable TV system business market; therefore, the merger would not allow them to obtain a stronger market influencing power in relevant cable TV markets. No major impact was found for up/downstream markets or markets with horizontal competition. No other possibilities of the market being blocked were found either. As a result, there were no concerns over these two merger cases.

Since no disadvantages of competition restraints would occur from the merger, the benefits enjoyed by the economy as a whole should have outweighed the disadvantages of the competition restraints. The FTC therefore allowed the merger to take place in accordance with Article 12(1) of the Fair Trade Law. However, matters concerned with other regulations and laws shall be subject to such regulations and laws.

◆FTC Activities

◎ On February 9, the Research, Development, and Evaluation Commission, Executive Yuan Service Quality Consultant, Chiang Chih-Chun, was invited to deliver a speech on "How to Improve Service Quality."

◎ On February 13, the FTC convened the coordination meeting for the discussion on the "Application of Regulations and Laws Governing Untrue Advertisements by the Real Estate Agency Industry".

◎ On February 15, the Chairman, Mr. Tang, the Vice Chairman, Dr. Yu, and Commissioner Mrs. Chou, respectively, led colleagues of the FTC on visits to southern and northern goods merchants in the New Year Supply Streets in Taipei City and Taichung City to understand the variations in the prices and quantities of the goods supplied.

Commissioner Chou, Ya-shu(1 from left) and Chairman Tang, Jinn-Chuan(2 from left) visit the New Year Supply Streets.

◎ On February 27, the FTC personnel promoted the Fair Trade Law at the Health Bureau of Kaohsiung City.

◆International Exchanges

◎ On January 17 and 18, Senior Specialist, Hu, Tzu-Shun attended the "Independent Action Plan (IAP) Peer Review" of Taiwan and the "Senior Officials Meeting (SOM)" convened by APEC in Canberra, Australia.

◎ On January 23 and 24, Section Chief Chen, Chun-Ting and officer Chang, Shin-Yi attended the "Competition

Policy & Deregulation Group (CPDG)" meeting convened by APEC in Canberra, Australia.

◎ From February 19 to 22, Senior Specialist Hu, Tzu-Shun led a delegation to attend the February meeting convened by the OECD Competition Commission.

The Fair Trade Law was enacted in 1991 with the establishment of the Fair Trade Commission (FTC) a year later on February 4, 1992 as the implementing agency of this law. The mandate of the Commission is to maintain a fair trading order in the market and therefore to ensure the protection of consumer interests in a fair trade environment, the establishment of the Commission complements the government's economic policy of "competition policy in prime, industrial policy in aiding" and reflects the global trend of liberalization and internationalization of trade.

The FTC, to bring the gap closer between international counterparts and practitioners of competition law and policy under this trend of open markets and free competition, has established a Competition Policy Information and Research Center (the CPIRC) , on January 27, 1997.

The CPIRC is dedicated to collecting information of local and foreign competition law and policy. Locally, the CPIRC aims to offer professional information services and to provide relevant reference to the government agencies in the making of industrial policy. Internationally, the CPIRC serves as a focal point for available information on international competition law and policy issues and aims to facilitate research of competition law and policy all over the world.

Publisher : Tang Jinn-Chuan
Editor-in-Chief : Shin Chih-Chung
Tel : (886-2)2397-0339, 2327-8129
Fax : (886-2)2327-8155
Email : cpirc@ftc.gov.tw
Web Site : www.ftc.gov.tw
For more information, please contact the CPIRC.

Competition Policy Information and Research Center, FTC, Taiwan(ROC)

ISSN 1560-3849
9 771560 384008
GPN:2008600056

行政院公平交易委員會
競爭政策資料及研究中心
台北市北平東路30號2樓
Competition Policy Information and Research Center, FTC, Taiwan(ROC)
2F, 30 Peiping East Road, Taipei, Taiwan(ROC)

國內郵資已付
台北中聯郵局
許可證
北台字第12865號
台灣郵政北台字
第5976號執照
登記為雜誌交寄

（限向郵局窗口交寄）

雜誌