

# *Competition Policy*

## *Newsletter*

Competition Policy Information  
and Research Center, Fair Trade  
Commission, Taiwan (ROC)  
Publisher: Tang Jinn-Chuan  
Editor-in-Chief: Hsu Shu-Hsin

Issue 6, Volume 11

December 31, 2007

### **Index:**

#### ◆ News Section

◎ Selected FTC Decisions ..... 1

◆ FTC Activities ..... 15

◆ International Exchanges ..... 17

### ◆ News Section

#### ◎ Selected FTC Decisions

**12 Liquid Petroleum Gas distributors in Huwei township, Yunlin, were fined for violating the Fair Trade Law by their concerted actions.**

The FTC, during its 826th Commissioners' Meeting on September 6, 2007, resolved that 12 liquid petroleum gas distributors in Huwei township, Yunlin, namely, Chuan-Shuai Corporation (hereinafter called "Chuan-Shuai"), Ms. Lin, Yen-Yi (and Ta-Lung Fuel; hereinafter called "Ta-Lung"), Sen-Ming Propane Co. Ltd, Tao-An Gas Corporation, Ms. Huang, Shu-Chun (and Yung-Chi Gas; hereinafter called "Yung-Chi"), Mr. Liao, Yen-Qin (and Sen-Mao Petroleum Gas; hereinafter called "Sen-

Mao”), Ms. Chen Huang, Li-Hua (the first person in charge of Yulin Liquid Petroleum Gas), Chih-Wen Corporation (hereinafter called “Chih-Wen”), Chien-Yeh Liquid Gas Co. Ltd. (hereinafter called “Chien-Yeh”), Mr. Chiu, Sheng-Ping (the first person in charge of Yuan Fu An Gas), Mr. Lin, Sung-Hsieh (the first person in charge of Yuan Hui Lai Gas) and Mr. Wu, Shun-Hsing (the first person in charge of Yuan Yung Sing Gas) agreed to raise the sales price of liquid petroleum gas in June 2004. Raising the sales price through the agreement was an act that mutually restrained the business activities and affected the function of the liquid petroleum gas distribution in Huwei township, Yunlin and the twelve distributors violated Article 14(1) of the Fair Trade Law, which provides that “[n]o enterprise shall have any concerted action.” The FTC ordered them to cease the aforesaid unlawful act and an administrative fine of NT\$360,000 was imposed on Chuan-Shuai, NT\$250,000

on Ta-Lung, NT\$200,000 on Sen-Ming, NT\$150,000 on Tai-An, NT\$100,000 on Yung-Chi, NT\$100,000 on Sen-Mao, NT\$100,000 on Ms. Chen Huang, Li-Hua, NT\$90,000 on Chih-Wen, NT\$70,000 on Chien-Yeh, NT\$70,000 on Mr. Chiu, Sheng-Ping, NT\$50,000 on Mr. Lin, Sung-Hsieh and NT\$50,000 on Mr. Wu, Shun-Hsing. The administrative fines totaled NT\$1,590,000.

The FTC indicated that, by taking advantage of the opportunity presented by COC Corporation, Taiwan and Formosa Petrochemical Corporation who raised the list price of domestic liquid petroleum gas to NT\$1.5 per kg on June 5, 2004, Chuan-Shuai and Ta-Lung in Huwei township, Yunlin asked the enterprises that were in the same line of business in the same township to gather and dine in the Wu Fu Yuan Restaurant together. They agreed to jointly raise the sales price of domestic 20kg liquid petroleum gas from NT\$450 per barrel to NT\$500 per barrel. They also made the majority of liquid petroleum gas

distributors in the same township agree to raise the sales price of their domestic liquid petroleum gas to NT\$500 per barrel, which was higher than the list price which was raised by COC Corporation, Taiwan, and Formosa Petrochemical Corporation (NT\$ 1.5/kg×20kg=NT\$30). Their acts had already severely affected the functions of the liquid petroleum gas distribution in Huwei township, Yunlin.

After taking into account the motive of the unlawful acts of the said Respondents, the degree of the unlawful act's harm to trading order, the duration of the actions, the benefits derived on account of the unlawful acts, the scale of business and remorse shown for the acts and attitudes of cooperation in the investigation, the FTC ordered them to cease the aforesaid unlawful acts and administrative fines from NT\$50,000 to NT\$360,000, respectively, were imposed on them in accordance with the fore part of Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

**☐ National Petroleum Corporation violated the Fair Trade Law by failing to file a merger report.**

The FTC conducted an ex officio investigation on the alliance which was formed by two large oil station management organizations, namely, the National Petroleum Corporation (hereinafter called “National Corporation”) and Formosa Petroleum Corporation ((hereinafter called “Formosa”). The FTC, during its 827th Commissioners’ Meeting on September 13, 2007, resolved that National Corporation which directly and indirectly controlled the business operations and employment or discharge of personnel of Formosa by holding a concurrent post of managing director in Formosa should file a merger, but it did not; it then violated Article 11(1) of the Fair Trade Law. Therefore, the FTC ordered National Corporation to file a merger report or adopt necessary corrections within three months of the receipt of the Disposition

and imposed on it an administrative fine of NT\$1,000,000.

The FTC indicated that a total of more than 160 Formosa petrol stations and a total of more than 100 petrol stations of National Corporation were at first in the same line of business in the domestic oil market, and the total market shares of each of these two enterprises was approximately 10%. Formosa employed the director of National Corporation, Tsai, Chia-Chang, who concurrently served as the managing director of the same company, to be its managing director and the board of directors of each of the two companies successively passed the resolutions on such employment and the dissolution of the non-compete clause. The managing director of National Corporation managed the office of the managing director, the management office and the business office. The same managing director who however supervised the related affairs of both the management office and the

facilities office, the operations office (the business office in each area) and the accounting office of Formosa held a concurrent post as the managing director of Formosa. These affairs in fact covered the business and personnel affairs of the two companies and the managing director of both companies controlled them, including purchase and acquisition, the targets of sale and decisions over the conditions of business transactions, as well as the employment of administrative staff in the status equivalent to or higher than the status of a main manager. Thus, the operations which made the managing director have key operational strategies sufficient to affect the enterprises or manage the companies successfully or unsuccessfully were very apparent and it was obvious that the operations fell under the merger type set forth in Article 6(1)(v) of the Fair Trade Law, which means that the managing director “directly or indirectly controls the business operation or the appointment or discharge of

personnel of another enterprise.”

The FTC further pointed out that the sales amount of each of National Corporation and Formosa had exceeded the threshold promulgated by the FTC, and that it should file a merger report to the FTC prior to the merger. In addition, in accordance with Article 7 of the Enforcement Rules of the Fair Trade Law, an enterprise which directly or indirectly controls the business operation or the appointment or discharge of personnel of another enterprise shall file a report to declare its status as a controlling enterprise. National Corporation was a controlling enterprise and was obliged to file a merger report, but it did not do so prior to the merger in terms of the law – it hence violated Article 11(1) of the Fair Trade Law. After referring to the past modes of handling the enterprises which did not file merger reports and by taking into account the degree of the impact of the merger, the FTC therefore ordered National Corporation to file a merger

report or adopt necessary corrections in accordance with Article 13(1) of the Fair Trade Law and imposed on it an administrative fine of NT\$1,000,000 according to Article 40(1) of the Fair Trade Law.

**☐ SunChin Marketing Network violated the Supervisory Regulations Governing Multi-Level Sales by placing false and untrue content regarding successfully earning revenues**

The FTC, during its 830th Commissioners’ Meeting on October 4, 2007, resolved that SunChin Marketing Network (hereinafter called “SunChin Network”) which undertook multi-level sales copied the report and published on its website that the participant, Mr. Chiang, earned millions of New Taiwan dollars per month within four months of the time that he joined the network. After the investigation, it was found that Mr.

Chiang indeed did not have the successful experience in casu and it was proved that the content regarding successfully earning profits was false and untrue. The FTC held that SunChin Network violated Article 20 of the Supervisory Regulations Governing Multi-Level Sales and therefore imposed an administrative fine of NT\$1,000,000 on it.

The FTC indicated that SunChin Network published the content under the title, "Record of Success Stories," on its website, indicating that the participant, Mr. Chiang, mentioned at the time of the interview with the media that he joined SunChin Network two years ago and by applying "speaking techniques of invitation and recommendation," earned millions of New Taiwan dollars per month within four months of the time he joined the network. He also indicated that earning millions of New Taiwan dollars per month would not be a dream if one did what the network said, and it was very easy. After the FTC conducted

an investigation, SunChin Network admitted that it had posted this report on its website; however, it was found that no participants in this network had earned millions of New Taiwan dollars per month since the establishment of the network, and even until now, Mr. Chiang in the report had accumulated commissions that amounted to less than millions of New Taiwan dollars. Hence, the related news in the report as copied was apparently false. As SunChin Network did not investigate the genuineness of the content of the related news before copying it and did not confirm whether the report was suitable for publication, the claimed representation on the content regarding successfully earning revenues was false and untrue. It therefore violated Article 20 of the Supervisory Regulations Governing Multi-Level Sales.

The FTC finally indicated that, after taking into consideration the motive, purpose and anticipated improper profits of the unlawful acts of SunChin Network;

the degree and duration of the unlawful acts' harm to trading order; the benefits derived on account of the unlawful acts; the scale, operating condition and market position of the enterprise; whether or not the types of unlawful acts involved in the violation had been corrected or warnings had 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, an administrative fine of NT\$1,000,000 was imposed on SunChin Network.

**☐ Leisure Group Marketing Ltd. (Taiwan) violated the Fair Trade Law by improperly claiming refunds in cash and resale services.**

The FTC, during its 831st Commissioners' Meeting on October 11, 2007, resolved that Leisure Group

Marketing Ltd. (Taiwan) (hereinafter called "LGM") sold membership cards for overseas holiday villages by applying the promotion means which were to improperly claim refunds in cash and resale services, to induce consumers to make decisions on business transactions. LGM then conducted deceptive and obviously unfair acts sufficient to affect market order. It violated Article 24 of the Fair Trade Law and an administrative fine of NT\$10,000,000 was imposed on it.

The FTC indicated that many members of the general public filed complaints against it, stating that LGM planned to put CVC membership cards under promotion with "refunds in cash" amounting to more than, being equivalent to or amounting to approximately the total purchase price which was charged to a member for a membership card for the overseas holiday villages, so as to induce consumers to make decisions on business transactions. After the investigation, the amount of the refund under the cash-

refund scheme proposed by LGM was calculated on the basis of the following factors, namely, 13% of the purchase price charged to a member, the change in the Financial Times Ordinary Shares 100 Index over a period of five years, and the number of people who remembered handling the application for refunds after five years; in fact, LGM did not ensure that a member could receive a refund amounting to a high amount in terms of the cash-refund scheme after five years commencing from the time that the member purchased the membership card, and it even could not estimate the exact amount of the refund which a member could receive. As LGM put CVC membership cards under promotion in terms of its cash-refund scheme with the claim that it would refund the high amount so as to induce consumers to make decisions on business transactions, it did not disclose the said material trade information to the knowledge of the members, and the English version of the

registration form for refunds stipulated under the terms of the agreement also only described the method used to calculate the amount of the refund. Thus the members were in quite a disadvantageous position at the time that they requested the refunds. Therefore, LGM violated Article 24 of the Fair Trade Law. Previously, LGM had been under disciplinary action in terms of Disposition Kung Ch'u Tzu No. 094046 and the case was pending; however, it still did not cease the unlawful act on the basis of the intention of the said Disposition. Therefore, it was placed under disciplinary action in accordance with the post-part of Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

The FTC further indicated that LGM also promoted the sales of the rights of VIP ASIA members through the resale services and claimed that within a short period of time, a member could take back the total purchase price which was charged for a membership card for overseas holiday villages, with the intention of inducing consumers to make decisions on



business transactions. However, LGM did not guarantee that the rights would be sold out and the term, “[t]his agreement does not guarantee that the rights of a member will be sold out; it however guarantees that MAC will earnestly and ceaselessly strive to sell the said rights prior to the termination of the resale agreement,” was only presented in their registration form for resale to show the provision of the resale services and the speed of resale. This term which was placed together with numerous terms in the agreement, was in ordinary typeface, so it would have still been difficult to allow consumers to pay attention to the term. In the same way, the content of the said term would put the members in quite a disadvantageous position when they requested that LGM perform its resale agreement within a short period of time. LGM was found to be in violation of Article 24 of the Fair Trade Law and therefore became subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the fore part of Article 41 of the Fair

Trade Law.

The FTC finally indicated that, after taking into consideration the motive, purpose and anticipated improper profits of the unlawful acts of LGM; the degree and duration of the unlawful acts’ harm to trading order; the benefits derived on account of the unlawful acts; the scale, operating condition, turnover and market position of the enterprise; whether or not the types of unlawful acts involved in the violation had been corrected or warnings had 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, LGM was ordered to cease the above-mentioned two unlawful acts and an administrative fine of NT\$10,000,000 was imposed on it.

**□ Merger of Uni-President Enterprises Corporation and The Tait Group of Companies**

The FTC, during its 832nd Commissioners' Meeting on October 18, 2007, resolved that in accordance with Article 12(2) of the Fair Trade Law, it did not prohibit the merger between The Tait Group of Companies (hereinafter called "Tait Group") and Uni-President Enterprises Corporation (hereinafter called "Uni-President") which filed a merger report regarding its intention to merge with the former. Nevertheless, in order to ensure that the overall economic benefits brought by the merger would outweigh the disadvantage resulting from the competition restraints, the applicant could not, in accordance with Article 12(2) of the Fair Trade Law, restrain sellers or channel businesses to trade with it. In addition, the business transactions between itself and specific drink suppliers were prohibited on the basis of its market status which was acquired due to the merger,

and it could not conduct differential treatment without proper reasons. It also had to be responsible for decisions, for the maintenance or modification of improper prices, its obstruction of fair competition, or the abuse of its market status.

The FTC indicated that Uni-President had held 19.5% of the total shares issued by Tait Group and it planned to purchase another 5% to 40% of such shares. Such a merger fell under the type set forth in Articles 6(1) (ii) and (v) of the Fair Trade Law. However, as the business of the merging enterprises included the manufacture and sale of drinks and the market shares of Uni-President in the domestic drink market had amounted to 25%, these circumstances had reached the threshold for filing a merger report, as set forth in Article 11(1) (ii) of the Fair Trade Law, and they did not fall within the circumstances set forth in Article 11(1) of the same law. Therefore, Uni-President should have filed a merger report prior to the merger.

The FTC pointed out that there are many types of products in the drink market and the degree of mutual substitution is high – a lot of new products are placed in the market each year and the competition is intense. In addition, there are more than 200 domestic drink manufacturers at present; after this merger was approved, the number of competitors in the market did not decrease significantly. Furthermore, since Tait Group started manufacturing drinks in 2004, the market share in each year has not reached 2%. Therefore, this merger has still not given rise to obvious impacts on the overall market structure. In the same way, Tait Group has successively registered deficits for the last three years, and so this merger will be helpful to the ongoing operations of the said company and the company will have an economic effect in that the costs will be reduced or expenses saved – it will increase the competitiveness of Tait Group. As a result, Tait Group can provide better products or

services and further positive competition in the domestic drink market.

The FTC further pointed out that the main drink channels of the enterprises to the merger were different from each other – the channels of Uni-President were mainly based on hypermarkets, supermarkets and convenience stores; the channel of Tait Group was conventional, however, and included grocery stores, restaurants and betel nut stands. After the merger, there is a high possibility that the two companies will utilize the original sales and cooperative relationships between each other to sell products through different channels. On the basis of Uni-President's current scale of operations, market power, investment and control of channels and channels which are controlled indirectly through this merger, if the said company abuses its market power, such as requesting distributors not to sell products of other competitors, or by utilizing its control over channels, conducting differential

treatment against the products of other competitors or refusing to trade with other competitors without proper reasons, it will cause competition restraints or unfair competition against the channels of the drink market. Therefore, in order to prevent the enterprises to the merger from utilizing this merger to result in competition restraints or unfair competition and to ensure that the overall economic benefits brought about by the merger outweigh the disadvantages resulting from the competition restraints, the merger must be consistent with Article 12(2) of the Fair Trade Law and additional obligations.

**□ Hungtu Construction Co., Ltd. violated the Fair Trade Law by placing untrue advertisements on selling “Neoclassicism Architecture: baroque and rococo”**

The FTC, during its 834th Commissioners’ Meeting on November 1,

2007, resolved that Hungtu Construction Co., Ltd. (hereinafter called “Hungtu”) violated Article 21(1) of the Fair Trade Law by representing in its advertisements on selling “Neoclassicism Architecture: baroque and rococo” that the construction work in the hotel zone could be provided for ordinary residential use, as the representation was false, untrue and misleading. Therefore, Hungtu was ordered to immediately cease the aforementioned unlawful act, commencing from the second day of the receipt of this Disposition, and an administrative fine of NT\$10,000,000 was imposed on it.

The FTC indicated that this construction work was located in the hotel zone in the urban plan of Chiayi City. The Chiayi City Government issued a construction license, A87 Chia-Shih-Kung-Chi-Chien-Chih-Tzu No. 541, to Hungtu, and the zoning and the uses of the building all fell under the category of the “Hotel Zone.” Article 2 of the

Regulation for the Management of Tourist Hotel Enterprises provides that hotel enterprises are for-profit enterprises which provide accommodation and rest for travelers; they do not include tourist hotel enterprises for residential use. In addition, the type of use from floors 1 to 11 described in the “Outline of Alteration of Architectural Design” of the construction work in casu fell under the category of “B4: Accommodation,” and in accordance with the “Guidelines on Types of Use and Modification of the Use of Buildings,” the places from floors 1 to 11 were provided to unspecified people for rest and were not for residential use. However, it was found that Hungtu’s DM, “Neoclassicism Architecture: baroque and rococo,” included the following words, “Houses on first-class land – there are not only high-rise buildings in Lan Tan”; “The precious land is for residential use”; and “Enjoy hotel services at home”; and the advertisements in the newspapers, posters and inserts stated “Create a

super-high safe structure for residential use, to compare favorably with the 101 Building”; “Create a safe residence with the structure meeting very high standards to suit the people living in Chiayi”; “Exercise at home at all times for a healthy life forever”; “Digitalized security system allows the family to control the status of the home at all times”; and “Three rooms control the simple lifestyle of a miniature family; four rooms are suitable for the people within a small and modern family; a duplex house will be enough for three generations to live together; and a double-floor house with a villa-like garden and elevator creates a marble living quality.” In addition, the furnishing plan indicated that the house had three rooms and two living rooms, and the fact that there was a living room, as well as bedrooms (a master bedroom) and a study room, these pictures had the potential to mislead people into believing that the house was for residential use. All of the above-mentioned publications

were designed to indicate that the said building was for “residential” purposes and the contents of the publications did not refer to the “hotel zone” published in the construction license. The construction advertisements in casu were sufficient to mislead consumers into believing that the said building to be constructed by Hungtu was provided for residential use. In addition, the advertisements did not indicate that the nature and approved purpose of the zoning and the construction work in casu was to be for hotel use in accordance with what was stated in the construction license; however, Hungtu’s publication of the advertisement on the residential plan for the construction work in casu was sufficient to mislead consumers into believing that the said building was for residential use and hence induced them to contract with Hungtu. In the event that a consumer were to use the building for residential use later and such a use did not conform to the zoning and the approved type of use, the consumer

would have violated the Urban Planning Law and its provisions which are related to the Architecture Law and would have been subject to the risks of receiving administrative fines. It is obvious that this could not have been foreseen by the buyers at the time of purchasing a house. Therefore, the advertisements in this instance were false, untrue and misleading and Hungtu violated Article 21(1) of the Fair Trade Law.

After taking into consideration the motive, purpose and anticipated improper profits of the unlawful acts of Hungtu; the degree and duration of the unlawful acts’ harm to trading order; the benefits derived on account of the unlawful acts; the scale, operating condition, turnover and market position of the enterprise; whether or not the types of unlawful acts involved in the violation had been corrected or warnings had 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, Hungtu was ordered to immediately cease the above-mentioned unlawful act and an administrative fine of NT\$10,000,000 was imposed on it in accordance with the fore part of Article 41 of the Fair Trade Law.

#### ◆FTC Activities

- ◎ On September 7, the FTC held a seminar to advocate the regulation on beauty salons in National Chengchi University, Taipei City.
- ◎ On September 8, the FTC advocated the Fair Trade Law in Cota Commercial Bank, Taichung City.
- ◎ On September 11, 14, 18 and 21, the FTC held workshops to explain the “Regulation on the Conduct of Sales of Textbooks to Junior High Schools

and Primary Schools” in Taipei City, Taichung City, Kaohsiung City and Hualien County, respectively.

- ◎ On September 15, the FTC attended the activity of “Moon Festival Carnival for Consumer Protection: 2007 Advocacy on Consumption: Safe Consumption” hosted by the Consumer Protection Commission, Executive Yuan at the Tamshui Fishermen’s Wharf, Taipei County.
- ◎ On September 19, the FTC held an “Advocacy Meeting on Getting Acquainted with Multi-Level Sales Laws and Orders” in Taipei County.
- ◎ On September 19, the FTC held the “2007 Seminar on the Fair Trade Law – the Relationship between the Fair Trade Law and Intellectual Property Rights” in the Central Taiwan Science Park, Taichung County.
- ◎ On September 28, the FTC held a seminar to advocate the modification

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>of the regulation on cable TV-related enterprises at the Competition Policy Information &amp; Research Center of the Fair Trade Commission.</p> <p>◎ On September 28, the FTC held speeches on urban plans and legal order in architectural management.</p> <p>◎ On September 29, the FTC invited the vice president of Far Eastone Telecommunications Co., Ltd., Chen, Li-jen, to present a speech on the “Development of Telecommunications under the Trend of Digital Convergence”.</p> <p>◎ On October 2, the FTC invited the managing director of Chunghwa Telecom Co., Ltd. to present a speech entitled “The Development of Digital Convergence and Integrated Service.”</p> <p>◎ On October 2, the FTC held a meeting to review the mid-term report under FTC study grants, “The Development and Performance/Execution of Self-</p> | <p>Assessment of Multi-level Marketing Enterprises”.</p> <p>◎ On October 16, teachers and students in the Department of Financial Economic Law, Chung Yuan Christian University, took part in the training camp on the Fair Trade Law.</p> <p>◎ On October 22, the FTC convened a public meeting on the draft of the “FTC’s Decision Guidelines on Mergers and Concerted Actions in the Domestic Civil Aviation Transportation Industry.”</p> <p>◎ On October 29 and 30, the FTC held a “Seminar on Multi-level Marketing Businesses” at the Shandori Chinatrust Hotel, Erlung Village, Yilan County.</p> <p>◎ The speeches handled by the Competition Policy Information and Research Center in September and October were as follows:</p> |
|--|---|



| Date                                    | Speaker   | Subject  |
|---|---|--|
| September 28, 2007<br>(Batch: 9608-190) | Commissioner Hsieh Yi-hung<br>Fair Trade Commission,<br>Executive Yuan  | Analysis of the Maladministration<br>of Enterprises – Who Steals<br>Shareholders’ Money?   |
| October 23, 2007<br>(Batch: 9609-191)   | Assistant Professor Chu Te-Fang<br>Soochow University School of<br>Law  | Corporate Governance and CIS<br>Governance – Exercise of<br>Shareholders’ Rights of the<br>Domestic Securities Investment<br>Trust Funds |
| October 30, 2007<br>(Batch: 9610-192)   | Associate Professor Lin Yen-Chi<br>Graduate Institute of Finance and<br>Economic Law, Feng Chia<br>University | Meaning of Chinese<br>Anti-Monopoly Legislation  |

### ◆ International Exchanges

- ◎ On September 5, Section Chief CHEN, Chun-Ting and Inspector CHEN, Ying-Ju met with Director DOSTAL of the International Affairs Department, Czech Republic Office for the Protection of Competition, who participated in the research and study course on international trade hosted by of the Ministry of Economic Affairs.
- ◎ On September 7, Senior Specialist HU Tzu-Shun attended the “The Workshop on Competition Advocacy: Competition and Consumption Awareness” held by the Department of Internal Trade, Thailand.
- ◎ On September 11 and 12, Commissioner CHEN Chih-Min led a team to attend the

conference on competition policy in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; the conference was co-hosted by the FTC and the OECD.

- ◎ From October 7 to 19, Chairperson TANG Jinn-Chuan of the FTC led a team to conduct bilateral meetings in Europe and attended a meeting of the “Competition Committee”, OECD, in October.
- ◎ On October 25, Senior Specialist HU Tzu-Shun, Section Chief CHEN Chun-Ting, Inspector TU Hsing-Feng and Inspector LIU Shaw-Chen of the FTC took part in the ICN OFWG Conference Call.
- ◎ From October 29 to November 1, Officer CHEN Haw-Kae of the FTC attended the ICN conference of the “Cartel Workshop” in El Salvador.

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 :** Hsu Shu-Hsin

Tel : (886-2)2397-0339, 2327-8129

Fax : (886-2)2327-8155

Email : [cpirc@ftc.gov.tw](mailto:cpirc@ftc.gov.tw)

Web Site : [www.ftc.gov.tw](http://www.ftc.gov.tw)

**For more information, please contact the CPIRC.**



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



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

ISSN 1560-3849



GPN:2008600056

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

(限向郵局窗口交寄)

雜誌