

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Competition Policy Newsletter</i></b></p>	<p><b>Competition Policy Information and Research Center, Fair Trade Commission</b>  <b>Publisher: Hwang Tzong-Leh</b>  <b>Editor-in-Chief: Shin Chih-Chung</b></p>
<p><b>Issue 6, Volume 10</b></p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>December 31, 2006</b></p>
<p><b>Index:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ <b>News Section</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◎ <b>2005 Industrial Study on 10 Major Chain Convenience Stores</b></li> <li>◎ <b>FTC Enacts “Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Cases of Weight Loss &amp; Body Care Activities”</b></li> <li>◎ <b>FTC Enacts “Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Cases of Television Rating”</b></li> <li>◎ <b>FTC Enacts “Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Banking Industry Advertising”</b></li> <li>◎ <b>Selected FTC Decisions</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>◆ <b>FTC Activities</b></li> <li>◆ <b>International Exchanges</b></li> </ul>	

◆ **News Section**

◎ **2005 Industrial Study on 10 Major Chain Convenience Stores**

In order to understand the development status of domestic chain convenience stores, the FTC has over the years studied several major chain convenience stores. Based on the study’s results for 2005, the 10 major chain convenience stores that were the focus of the study owned 8,656 stores at the end of 2005. The store-opening rate had been decreasing for the last 5 years, falling from 25.38% in 1999 to 7.01% in 2005. On an individual basis, until 2005, 7-Eleven had been the No.1 enterprise with the highest store opening growth rate of 9.7%, followed by Hi-Life with 8.93%, Family Mart with 8.88%, Lai Lai Convenience Store (a.k.a. OK Convenience Store) with 7.5% and Niko Mart with 5.57%. On the other hand, Chieh Yang, TSC Million, SJExpress and Everyday had negative store growth rates, respectively, of -4.19%, -18.18%, -18.82% and -48.15%. On the whole, compared with 2004, except for 7-Eleven and Niko Mart that had a slightly higher store opening growth rate, the rest of the stores all had slower growth rates in 2005. Stores with smaller scales, such as Chieh Yang, TSC Million, SJExpress and Everyday, all recorded negative growth. Wong Chai Chi even closed down its business in 2005. In light of the store structure, 1,789 stores were regular chain stores, or 20.67% of total stores, while 6,867 stores were franchise stores, or 79.33% of total stores. Among the franchise stores, 3,259 stores were subject to license chains, or 37.65% of total stores; 3,237 stores were subject to franchise chains, or 37.4%, and the remaining 371 stores were subject to voluntary chains, or 4.29%. Thus, the structure of chain convenience stores still mainly consisted of license chains and franchise chains under franchising. Franchise chain stores had a market share of 26.41% in 2002, which increased to 37.4% in 2005. In fact, the market shares of franchise chain stores and license chain stores were getting so close that the difference between the two in 2005 was less than 1%. Based on the statistics mentioned above, it can be found that the nationals’ willingness for entrepreneurship is elevated. In addition, participating in franchise operations costs less and has less risk; therefore, nationals prefer license chains to the other two franchise types.

As for the numbers of stores in each chain system, 7-Eleven had 4,037 stores, which was No. 1 among all enterprises, or 46.64% of the total store amount. Following 7-Eleven were Family Mart with 1,851 stores, or 21.38%; then Hi-Life with 1,159 stores, or 13.39%; Lai Lai Convenience Store with 860 stores, or 9.94%; and Niko Mart with 360 stores, or 4.16%. From 6th through 9th were Chieh Yang with 206 stores, SJExpress with 151 stores, TSC Million with 18 stores, and Everyday with 14 stores. The net number of stores that opened in 2005 was 619 for all chain systems, in which 7-Eleven was at the top of the list with 357 stores, followed by Family Mart with 151 stores, Hi-Life with 102 stores, Lai Lai Convenience Store with 60 stores, and Niko Mart with 19 stores. Enterprises that saw reductions in the numbers of stores were Chieh Yang with 9 stores closed, SJExpress with 44, TSC Million with 4, and Everyday with 13. The highest net number of stores that opened in a single year in the past 10 years was that in 1999 when a total of 1,002 stores opened. The total amount of stores that opened declined to 550 in 2004 but increased slightly to 619 in 2005.

The various business activities conducted by convenience stores, such as the receipt of payments, meal boxes, international gourmets, New Year's dish reservations, and pick-ups for books purchased online, are gradually reaching a mature stage. A newly-developed business—the competition for cards—started in 2005. At the end of 2005, over 3 million I cash cards had been issued by 7-Eleven for one year, reaching an accumulated stored value of nearly NT\$5 billion. 7-Eleven further cooperated with Chinatrust to issue co-brand cards in 2006. Family Mart and Hi-Life have plans to cooperate with Easy-Card and Electronic Toll Collection, respectively, in the future as well. Clearly, chain convenience stores are characterized as serving as distribution channels to create value in addition to their business. The study also showed that these chain convenience stores were trying to find various ways of competing with those within the same field of business. According to the study, currently there are more than 8,500 chain convenience stores nationwide. The density of convenience stores is as high as one to every 2,700 of the population. Family Mart, Hi-Life, Lai Lai Convenience Store and Niko Mart have jointly invested in and established [www.cvs.com.tw](http://www.cvs.com.tw) (hereinafter called “CVS”) to develop and market products together, in order to compete with 7-Eleven. If the development of CVS becomes mature, the market for convenience stores will exhibit a more obvious form of monopolistic competition. In the event that convenience stores choose market integration to expand their operating scales in the future, whether through vertical integration, horizontal mergers or upstream and downstream strategic alliances, the FTC will pay close attention to these enterprises in regard to restraints on competition or impediments to fair competition that might be caused by such integration.

### ◎ **FTC Enacts “Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Cases of Weight Loss & Body Care Activities”**

The FTC enacted the “Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Handling Cases of Weight Loss & Beauty Treatments” (hereinafter called “the Guidelines”) based on a resolution of the 777th Commissioners’ Meeting passed on September 28, 2006, and revoked the “Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Cases of Weight Loss & Body Care Activities Information Transparency and Improper Marketing.” The related promulgation matters were handled by the FTC in accordance with legal procedure. The said enactment was also published in the Executive Bulletin and posted on the FTC’s web site. Relevant propagation was also planned for the general public.

In the light of the constantly changing marketing techniques and socioeconomic trends, as well as the greater danger and illegal profits caused by improper weight loss & body care activities enterprises to fair competition and the public interest, the enactment of these Guidelines will serve as guidance for the relevant enterprises to comply with the law and

reduce trading disputes. In this way, trading order and the consumer's interests will surely be protected.

The term "weight loss & body care activities" referred to in the Guidelines shall mean any non-medical treatment such as consolidated instructions or measures employed to enhance physical or visual beauty through craftsmanship, machinery, supplies, materials, cosmetics, food, etc. The enactment of the said Guidelines was based upon the deliberation conclusion between the FTC and Department of Health, Executive Yuan, on May 24, 1999 and the results of combining the "Investigation Guidelines on Handling Unlawful Advertisements by Weight Loss & Body Care Activities Enterprises," "Regulations on Advertisements by Weight Loss & Beauty Treatment Enterprises," "Administrative Regulations on Weight Loss & Body Care Activities Enterprises," and the "Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Cases of Weight Loss & Body Care Activities Information Transparency and Improper Marketing." In addition, the Guidelines also incorporate the 120 cases involving weight loss and body care activities enterprise violations handled by the FTC from October 1992 to July 2006 to list the possible violation types regarding weight loss and body care activities; for example, false, untrue or misleading representations or symbols, comparative advertisements and other deceptive or obviously unfair acts sufficient to affect trading order. The nature of the Guidelines is merely to list several common and possible violations involving weight loss and body care activities. Therefore, the procedures for each case shall still be handled according to the actual facts.

#### © **FTC Enacts "Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Cases of Television Rating"**

The FTC enacted the "Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Cases of Television Rating" (hereinafter called "the Guidelines") based on a resolution of the 780th Commissioners' Meeting passed on October 19, 2006. The enactment of these Guidelines will serve as guidance for the relevant enterprises engaged in television rating and announcements and for the FTC in handling related cases.

Since television rating have become a rather important index for domestic advertisers or advertising agencies to make decisions regarding investments in advertising, the survey results in terms of television rating dominate the profits of television enterprises and affect the competition order within the television industry. Television rating shall be consistent with the principles of statistics. Additionally, enterprises engaged in television rating shall disclose the survey methods, the results and statistical analyses as reference material for trading counterparts to read the survey results. Moreover, full disclosure can prevent unnecessary disputes over the results of television rating. The overall television rating market and television industry will thereby be able to develop soundly. The FTC plans on providing specific guidelines governing the television rating and announcement of results within the scope of the Fair Trade Law and other relevant regulations. The key points are as follows:

1. Purpose: The purpose of the Guidelines is to maintain trading order in the television rating market, promote fair competition among television enterprises, and ensure the sound development of the television rating market and television industry by preventing enterprises from deceiving or concealing important trading information concerning the television rating reports or engaging in unfair competition.
2. Information Disclosure:
  - (1) Specifically providing that enterprises engaged in television rating services shall disclose the survey targets, areas, units, terms, methods, results and inaccuracy analyses; and
  - (2) Specifically providing that enterprises shall publicly announce survey results, disclose any and all important trading information regarding the survey reports and shall not make any false, untrue or misleading representation.

3. **Improper Deceptive Acts:** The Guidelines prohibit enterprises engaged in television rating services from exploiting their advantageous position to deceive or conceal important survey information for the purpose of striving for trading opportunities.
4. **Information Preservation:** Enterprises shall preserve their survey reports and relevant information for at least 1 year to avoid any inconvenience to the disputes arising in the future as well as in relation to law enforcement.
5. **Legal Effects:** Should any enterprise violate the Guidelines by making false, untrue and misleading representations or engaging in other acts sufficient to affect trading order, the said enterprise will also be in violation of Article 21 or 24 of the Fair Trade Law.
6. **Transitional Period:** Enterprises engaged in television rating services shall refer to relevant rules set forth in the Guidelines to make necessary adjustments within 3 months after the promulgation of the said Guidelines. The FTC shall conduct investigations into enterprises that fail to make adjustments by the respective deadlines in individual cases.

### ◎ **FTC Enacts “Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Banking Industry Advertising”**

The FTC enacted the “Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Banking Industry Advertising” (hereinafter called “the Guidelines”) based on a resolution of the 783rd Commissioners’ Meeting passed on November 9, 2006. The related promulgation matters were handled by the FTC in accordance with legal procedure. The said enactment was also published in the Executive Bulletin and posted on the FTC’s web site. Relevant propagation was also planned for the general public.

The purpose of the Guidelines is to cope with the liberalization and privatization of the banking industry, the innovation of financial products and the ever-changing consumption tools. From time to time, the banking industry employs advertisements or other methods to make the general public aware of its financial services to strive for trading opportunities. In order to effectively regulate the advertising acts by the banking industry, improve enterprises’ self-regulatory operation, and prevent any false, untrue or misleading advertisements from affecting competition order and the public interest, the FTC decided to enact the Guidelines to serve as guidance for the relevant enterprises to comply with the law and reduce trading disputes. In this way, trading order and the consumer’s interests will surely be protected.

The term “banking industry” referred to in the Guidelines shall mean banks, trust cooperatives, the credit departments of farmers’ associations and fishermen’s associations, securities finance companies, credit card business institutions and postal banking services. The Guidelines incorporate the cases concerning advertisements made by the banking industry that have been handled by the FTC since its formation up until March 2006. A total of 13 violations or possible violation types are listed in the Guidelines, including acts where a bank makes any false, untrue or misleading representations or symbols regarding its zero interest rate, zero account opening fee, zero service fee, zero cost, limitations of preferential interest rates, no risk for lost cards, maximum loan amount, no pre-set spending amount, gift value, limited time for traveler’s check replacements, or claims, or has different calculation standards for comparative targets. The nature of the Guidelines is merely to list several common and possible violations involving advertisements in relation to banking services. Therefore, the procedures for each case shall still be handled according to the actual facts.

### ◎ **Selected FTC Decisions**

#### □ **Four textbook publishers violate Article 14, Paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade Law**

Kang Hsuan Educational Publishing Corp. (hereinafter called “Kang Hsuan”), Nani Books Corp. (hereinafter called “Nani”), Han Lin Publishing Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called “Han Lin”), and Newton Education & Publishing Corp. (hereinafter called “Newton”) allegedly used their business association meetings to discuss promotional items to be given to

students and announced that the free distribution of notebooks and test papers to students would be discontinued starting the first semester in 2006. During its 774th Commissioners' Meeting on September 7, the FTC determined that the four textbook publishers had violated Article 14, paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade Law. In addition to ordering the companies to immediately cease the aforementioned unlawful action, the FTC also imposed a fine of NT\$6.53 million on Kang Hsuan, NT\$4.23 million on Nani, NT\$2.28 million on Han Lin, and NT\$1.42 million on Newton. The total fine was NT\$14.46 million.

The complainants had reported that a few textbook publishers had taken advantage of business association meetings to reach an agreement to discontinue the free distribution of notebooks and test papers to students, which allegedly violated the Fair Trade Law.

FTC investigation found that Kang Hsuan, Nani, Han Lin, and Newton had, since the end of 2005, used their business association meetings to discuss and reach a consensus to discontinue the free distribution of notebooks and test papers to students starting the first semester in 2006. Furthermore, to ensure that the aforementioned action would be carried out, the four companies hired a lawyer to formulate details of self-regulation and guarantee bonds. The publishers likewise announced to school's teachers that, starting from the first semester of 2006, they would stop distributing free notebooks and test papers to students. Investigation also found that the four publishers account for over 80 percent of the high school and elementary school textbook market. Their conduct, which limited competition in the high school and elementary textbook market, was sufficient to affect market function, and violated relevant provisions against concerted action as stipulated in Article 14 of the Fair Trade Law. The FTC subsequently imposed the aforementioned fine in accordance with Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

**□ Winsom Tech Co. in using false or misleading representations of its products, violates Article 21, Paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade Law**

Winsom Tech Co. (hereinafter called "Winsom") allegedly posted advertisements for a "photo-catalyst air purifier" on the Internet claiming that the device "decomposes dead bacteria, dust mites, and disease-carrying fleas" and that it "effectively eliminates disease-carrying bacteria, bacteria in the large intestines, methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus, enterovirus, and common colds." During its 775th Commissioners' Meeting on September 14, the FTC determined that the ads were false and misleading representations of the product, and that the company had violated Article 21, paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade Law. In addition to ordering the company to immediately cease the aforementioned unlawful act, FTC also imposed a fine of NT\$180,000.

In its Internet advertisement for the "photo-catalyst air purifier," Winsom claimed the device "has 99.9 percent effectiveness in killing bacteria; has a three-layered photo catalyst; decomposes dead bacteria, dust mites, and disease-carrying fleas; destroys the protein and DNA of viruses and kills viruses" and "effectively eliminates disease-carrying bacteria, bacteria in the large intestines, methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus, enterovirus, and common colds." Based on statements by product suppliers Heng Long Hang and Daikin, the aforementioned claim regarding the "99.9 percent effectiveness in killing bacteria, and has a three-layered photo catalyst" was not erroneous when referring to the product. They also presented relevant Japanese test information explaining that the air purifier had three layers of photo catalyst to absorb viruses and bacteria, and that it could eliminate 99.99 percent of bacteria and mildew, and cause the viruses to become static. Furthermore, because of the large air volume processing and photo catalyst, the device could eliminate 99 percent of mildew in 30 minutes and 99 percent of odor in six minutes. The Industrial Technology Research Institute said that the antibacterial effect of the photo catalyst was accepted. Therefore, the advertisement's claim regarding "99.9 percent effectiveness in killing bacteria,

and has a three-layered photo catalysis” has basis. As for the claims that the device “decomposes dead bacteria, dust mites, and disease-carrying fleas; destroys the protein and DNA of viruses and kills viruses” and “effectively eliminates disease-carrying bacteria, bacteria in the large intestines, methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus, enterovirus, and common colds,” the FTC wrote to invite Winsom to present a relevant explanation, medical theories and clinical tests as proof. Winsom, however, only said that the claims regarding the aforementioned advertisement were based on information provided by Heng Long Hang, and that the company was unsure about the professional knowledge behind the claims. It relegated the advertiser’s responsibility to provide medical theories and clinical tests as proof. In addition, the Department of Health under the Executive Yuan believed that the aforementioned claims were exaggerated and not true. Therefore, Winsom’s advertisement was a false or misleading representation, and it violated Article 21, paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade Law.

After taking into account the motive, objective, expected improper benefits, degree of damage to trading order, duration of the actions, benefits obtained, scale of business, business operations, revenue, and market position, whether the competent authority had previously corrected or warned against such acts, the type and number of previous violations, conduct after the violation, cooperation during the investigation, and other factors, the FTC imposed the aforementioned fine in accordance with Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

**Taiwan Tobacco & Liquor Corporation improperly limits the business activities of its trading counterparts and violates Article 19, Paragraph 6 of the Fair Trade Law**

Taiwan Tobacco & Liquor Corp. (hereinafter referred to as “TTLC”) allegedly took advantage of the supply and demand imbalance resulting from market forecasts of the increase in health tax in 2005 and improperly limited the business activities of its trading counterparts. During its 776th Commissioners’ Meeting on September 21, the FTC determined that TTLC had violated Article 19, paragraph 6 of the Fair Trade Law. In addition to ordering the company to immediately cease the aforementioned unlawful action, the FTC also imposed a fine of NT\$3.01 million.

The FTC initiated an investigation because the media had reported that TTLC in March 2005 implemented a measure requiring customers to buy five new brands of cigarettes before they could avail themselves of preferential endorsements to buy the best-selling Long Life cigarettes. FTC investigation found that, in response to the panic buying and supply and demand imbalance resulting from market forecasts of the increase in the health tax, TTLC limited the total distribution volume between February 21 and June 30, 2005. In addition, on March 18, TTLC began implementing the measure of rewarding customers where the customers had to buy specific new cigarette brands to obtain preferential endorsements to buy a specific quantity of the old, best-selling Long Life Gentle line of cigarettes.

It was difficult to determine if it was improper for TLC to implement a temporary measure to limit the total distribution volume in response to the supply and demand imbalance. TTLC, however, took advantage of the dominance in sales of its long-time product to require its trading counterparts to buy new cigarette brands as a condition for preferential endorsement to buy the long-time cigarette. By using bundles to promote the new cigarette market, the company’s conduct was improper, and it obstructed fair competition in the cigarette market.

Furthermore, the Long Life cigarette series of TTLC has long enjoyed significant popularity and dominance in competition, and it has had a certain impact on the cigarette market. For this reason, when the company imposed limitations on the total distribution volume of its Long Life Gentle series cigarettes and then introduced the bundle, its trading counterparts would have been forced to buy the new cigarette brands so as to avail

themselves of preferential endorsements for buying the old cigarette brand, and not because conditions such as the quality and price of the new cigarette brands were used as factors for making the trade decision. TTLC's conduct obstructed market competition.

After taking into account the motive, objective, expected improper benefits, degree of damage to trading order, duration of the actions, benefits obtained, scale of business, business operations, revenue, and market position, whether the competent authority had previously corrected or warned against such acts, the type and number of previous violations, conduct after the violation, cooperation during the investigation, and other factors, the FTC subsequently imposed the aforementioned fine in accordance with Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

**The Ferry and Pleasure Boat Business Association in Nantou County is sufficient to affect supply and demand in the ferry service market in Sun Moon Lake and violates Article 14, Paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade Law**

The Ferry and Pleasure Boat Business Association in Nantou County (hereinafter referred to as "the Association") allegedly entered into agreements with its members to decide on the number of ferry trips, divide revenues, and restrict the members' business activities through mutual negotiations. During its 776th Commissioners' Meeting on September 21, the FTC determined that the Association's conduct was sufficient to affect supply and demand in the ferry service market in Sun Moon Lake, and violated Article 14, paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade Law. In addition to ordering the company to immediately cease the aforementioned unlawful action, the FTC also imposed a fine of NT\$510,000.

The FTC received public complaints that the Association had advertised its united ferry reservation Web site and had engaged in concerted action in relation to ferry reservations, which violated relevant regulations of the Fair Trade Law.

Investigation found that, to discourage competition among ferry and pleasure boat operators in Sun Moon Lake and prevent disorder and disputes, the Association, as early as the Association's foundation in 1959, had begun implementing a queuing system. The queuing method at present classifies ferryboats into classes A, B, C, and D. All class-A ferryboats are put in one group, lined up, and assigned their number of trips. On the other hand, the class-B, class-C, and class-D ferryboats are scattered into four groups. The ferryboats in each group are queued in the assigned docks to take passengers. Every 10 days, the revenues are calculated and distributed evenly among the members or according to specific proportions, after deducting the membership fee, insurance fee, and entertainment tax. Through mutual negotiations regarding the queuing system, the Association restricted the ferry trips of its members and distributed their revenues. Consequently, it discouraged competition among members and restricted the consumers' freedom to choose their ride. The Association's conduct was sufficient to affect the supply and demand in the ferry service market in Sun Moon Lake. By distributing the revenues according to boat class or trips made and reducing the difference in benefits received by the operators to prevent mutual competition, the Association restricted its members' business activities of freely providing their products or services. The Association's conduct constituted a "concerted action" as defined by Article 7 of the Fair Trade Law, and violated Article 14, paragraph 1 of the same Law.

After taking into account the motive, objective, expected improper benefits, degree of damage to trading order, duration of the actions, benefits obtained, scale of business, business operations, revenue, and market position, whether the competent authority had previously corrected or warned against such acts, the type and number of previous violations, conduct after the violation, cooperation during the investigation, and other factors, the FTC subsequently imposed the aforementioned fine in accordance with Article 41 of the Fair

Trade Law.

**Chunghwa Telecom Co.,Ltd., in providing false and misleading representations of the quality and content of its services, violates Article 21, Paragraph 1 applied *mutatis mutandis* to Paragraph 3 of the Fair Trade Law**

In its printed advertisements enclosed in mobile phone application forms and billing statements, Chunghwa Telecom Co.,Ltd. (hereinafter called “Chunghwa Telecom”) claimed that its 3G service “has a super-low radiation rate, cares for health better than the PHS does” and generates “extremely low radiation: lower than the PHS and GSM, and is the best choice for maintaining good health.” During its 777th Commissioners’ Meeting on September 28, the FTC determined that the ad was a false and misleading representation of the quality and content of Chunghwa Telecom’s services. It violated Article 21, paragraph 1 applied *mutatis mutandis* to paragraph 3 of the Fair Trade Law. In addition to ordering the company to immediately cease the aforementioned unlawful action, the FTC also imposed a fine of NT\$2.72 million.

Better pricing and quality of communication are used to attract trading counterparts in the competition among mobile phone operators. Because the strength of radiation from the terminal equipment of the mobile phone system is thought to affect health, it is also a critical factor of concern to consumers and a point of competition among mobile phone operators. The radiation rate of the terminal equipment of 3G and PHS systems depends on the distance between the terminal equipment and the base station of the mobile phone operator, the scope of coverage of the base station, and the difference in the quality of communication. These are closely related to the system installation of the operator, and there are no absolute standards as yet. The advertisements enclosed in its mobile phone application forms and billing statements, which Chunghwa Telecom’s business offices in the east and south districts distributed to customers, claimed that Chunghwa Telecom’s 3G service “has a super-low radiation rate, cares for health better than the PHS does” and “has extremely low radiation: lower than the PHS and GSM, and is the best choice for maintaining good health.” Upon review, the content was sufficient to mislead consumers into thinking that the radiation rate of Chunghwa Telecom’s 3G terminal equipment was lower than that of the PHS system at any time and location, and it was the consumer’s best choice for health considerations. Therefore, the advertisement content was a false or misleading representation of the quality and content of the service.

After taking into account the motive, objective, expected improper benefits, degree of damage to trading order, and duration of the actions, the FTC subsequently imposed the aforementioned fine in accordance with Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

**Mega Company Ltd., in using false and misleading representation on the supply quantity of its goods, violates Article 21, Paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade law**

During its 779th Commissioners’ Meeting on October 12, the FTC determined that Mega Company’s advertisements from April 13 to 17 constituted false or misleading representation of the supply quantity of its goods, and violated Article 21, paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade Law. In addition to ordering the company to immediately cease the aforementioned unlawful action, the FTC also imposed a fine of NT\$570,000.

In its April 13 to 17 advertisements, Mega Company claimed to have “920ml Yoplait yogurt at NT\$29 per bottle” and a “limited supply of 2000 bottles all over the island.” The company, however, could not provide the goods within the period of the advertisement. The content of the advertisement was therefore a false and misleading representation, and violated Article 21, paragraph 1 of the Fair Trade Law.

After taking into account the company’s violation due to the inability of the supplier to

provide the goods, the marginal severity of motive, degree of damage, the details of violation, scale of business, and conduct after the violation, the FTC subsequently imposed the aforementioned fine in accordance with Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

### ◆ **FTC Activities**

- ◎ On September 5, the FTC organized an orientation seminar at the Taiwan Academy of Banking and Finance to explain the FTC's guidelines on real estate advertisements.
- ◎ On September 5 and 8, the FTC organized orientation seminars in Taichung City and Taipei City to explain the FTC's guidelines on the construction and development industry.
- ◎ On September 11 and 12, the FTC hosted a workshop on the transportation industry and issues of competition.
- ◎ On September 12, the FTC organized an orientation seminar in Taitung County to explain the relevant application of the Fair Trade Law to LPG businesses.
- ◎ On September 14, the FTC co-organized the 40th Fair Trade Law training class with Tunghai University.
- ◎ On September 15, the FTC held a seminar to discuss the evaluation index of multilevel marketing.
- ◎ On September 15, the FTC organized an orientation seminar in Kaohsiung City to explain the guidelines on the sale of resort membership cards.
- ◎ On September 18 and 19, the FTC organized an orientation seminar in Miaoli County for the relevant family appliance associations to explain the Fair Trade Law.
- ◎ On September 25 and 26, the FTC held a specialization seminar on multilevel marketing.
- ◎ On September 28, the FTC organized a public hearing to explain the FTC's guidelines on cases of television rating.
- ◎ On October 2, the FTC organized a conference at the FTC conference room on the application of relevant laws from the Department of Health and the FTC on advertisements claiming therapeutic effects and endorsement ads.
- ◎ On October 16 and 17, the FTC hosted a workshop on the medical service industry and issues of competition.
- ◎ On October 18, the FTC organized an orientation seminar at the Chung Yuan Christian University to explain multilevel marketing.
- ◎ On October 21 and 22 in Taichung City, the FTC organized the 27th coordination meeting between the FTC and local competent authorities.
- ◎ On October 26, the FTC hosted commencement exercises for the 40th Fair Trade Law training class.
- ◎ On October 30, the FTC organized an orientation seminar to explain the FTC's guidelines on cases of weight loss and body care.

### ◆ **International Exchanges**

- ◎ On September 11 and 12 in Bali, Indonesia, the FTC and the OECD organized the Seminar of International Cooperation Program on the Competition Policy.
- ◎ On September 11 and 12, Officer Ms. Chang Hsin-Yi attended the first APEC/OECD Integrated Checklist on Regulatory Reform self-evaluation conference, which was hosted by the APEC Economic Committee, in Danang, Vietnam.
- ◎ From October 16 to 20, Counselor Ms. Chiang Li-Ming, Section Chief Ms. Lee Wen-Hsiu, and Inspector Ms. Liu Shaw-Chen attended the OECD Competition Committee's October conference in Paris, France.
- ◎ On October 16, the FTC co-organized a conference with the Consumer Protection Commission, Bureau of Foreign Trade, Committee of Trade Investigation, and

Department of Customs to discuss the training course for the delegation from the Vietnam Competition Administration Department as part of the technical assistance program.