WEP Warwick Evans Publishing

International Journal of Global Economics and Management

ISSN: 3005-9690 (Print), ISSN: 3005-8090 (Online) | Volume 4, Number 2, Year 2024
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62051/ijgem.v4n2.23
Journal homepage: https://wepub.org/index.php/IJGEM/index

On the Regulation of Technology Transfer

Feihuan Xu

Tianjin Conservatory of Music, Tianjin, 300171, China
feihuanxu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the legal controversies and regulatory issues of forced technology transfer (FTT) in international trade, analyzing its stipulations under international law, the balance between intellectual property protection and technology transfer obligations, interpretations of relevant provisions in WTO and other international agreements, and the differences and conflicts in China's legal definitions of technology transfer. Through empirical analyses of WTO dispute cases such as DS603, DS611, and DS615, the study reveals the complexity and diversity of technology transfer in international trade, and proposes specific measures and recommendations for building a fair legal framework for technology transfer. These measures aim to strengthen intellectual property protection while promoting the free flow and development of technology, providing a balanced legal solution for technology circulation in international trade.

KEYWORDS

Forced technology transfer; International trade disputes; Intellectual property protection; Technology transfer legal framework; Fair competition

1. INTRODUCTION

Technology transfer, as a crucial driver of international trade growth and innovation, has garnered extensive attention in international trade conflicts. The issue of forced technology transfer, in particular, has sparked intense debate over its legality and fairness within global trade disputes. Although existing research has explored the definitions, legal frameworks, and roles of forced technology transfer in international trade, gaps remain in specific legal provisions, cross-national comparisons, empirical analyses, and the examination of international dynamics. This study examines the forced technology transfer issues under the TRIPs Agreement, TRIMs Agreement, and WTO dispute cases (e.g., DS615, DS611, DS603), and other global trade disputes, analyzing the stipulations under international and domestic laws to identify their legal commonalities and differences. The research aims to explore the boundaries of technology transfer definitions, legal controversies, and practical challenges through comparative studies, case studies, and literature analyses, providing suggestions for constructing a fair and operable international legal framework to regulate forced technology transfer and promote the free flow and innovation of technology. The paper aims to systematically discuss the legal controversies and regulatory issues of forced technology transfer in international trade, offering theoretical support and references for future policy-making and legal practice.

2. CURRENT STATE OF RESEARCH

Chinese scholars have analyzed the role of forced technology transfer in international trade, its necessity in global trade, legal controversies, and its regulation under international legal frameworks. Forced technology transfer has attracted significant attention in international trade disputes. Research indicates that technology transfer helps bridge the technological gap and promote balanced global economic development, as seen in China's enhanced technological capabilities through technology transfer. However, this has also led to legal disputes over intellectual property protection and market access, with strong opposition from the United States and the European Union. Existing international frameworks, such as the TRIMs Agreement, provide some regulations but remain inadequate [1].International scholars have conducted extensive research on the role, necessity, legal controversies, and regulatory aspects of forced technology transfer in international trade. Ferreira explored the limitations of the TRIPS Agreement in technology transfer [2], while Ellen 't Hoen emphasized its importance in global public health[3]. Lewis noted that China's technology acquisition strategies, while improving local technological capabilities, have sparked international controversy and opposition [4]. Research findings suggest that forced technology transfer plays a crucial role in promoting technology diffusion and enhancing local economic competitiveness but faces legal challenges in intellectual property protection and fair competition [5]. Scholars suggest clarifying the legality and reasonableness of technology transfer through international agreements, constructing transparent, fair, and operable mechanisms to facilitate the free flow and innovation of technology. Despite significant progress in research, gaps remain, such as insufficient exploration of international organizations' and multinational enterprises' strategies, lack of attention to the dynamic changes in recent international trade cases and legal environments, and the absence of unified suggestions for a fair forced technology transfer legal framework. This paper aims to fill these gaps through detailed legal provision analysis, cross-national comparative studies, and attention to the latest international dynamics, providing directions and theoretical foundations for constructing a more comprehensive regulatory framework for forced technology transfer and related policy and legal development. This will help promote the free and fair transfer of technology while protecting intellectual property, contributing to sustainable global economic development.

3. LEGAL CONTROVERSIES IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND FORCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

3.1. Concept of Forced Technology Transfer and Its Role in Global Trade

Forced technology transfer (FTT) refers to the act of compelling foreign enterprises to transfer technology to domestic firms through legal or policy measures. In global trade, FTT can help developing countries enhance technological capabilities and accelerate economic modernization but also generates international disputes. China has significantly improved its local technological strength through FTT, narrowing the technological gap with developed countries. However, the United States argues that FTT violates market economy principles, constituting unfair competition. The U.S. 301 investigation against China in 2018 accused China of harming U.S. enterprises' interests through FTT.

3.2. Stances and Policies of International Organizations on Technology Transfer

International organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have different stances and policies on technology transfer. The WTO, through the TRIPS and TRIMs Agreements, regulates technology transfer, aiming to promote the free flow of technology and protect intellectual property. However, developing countries argue that these agreements fail to effectively promote technology transfer and instead exacerbate technological monopolies and inequalities [6]. The WTO has repeatedly questioned

China's technology transfer policies but lacks effective enforcement and supervision mechanisms, making dispute resolution challenging [7].

3.3. Interests and Strategies of Multinational Enterprises in Technology Transfer

Multinational enterprises play a crucial role in technology transfer, with complex strategies and interests. On one hand, they can enter new markets and gain investment opportunities and policy support through technology transfer. On the other hand, they face risks of intellectual property protection and technology leakage. To balance the benefits and risks of technology transfer, multinational enterprises typically adopt strategies such as joint ventures, technology licensing, and patent protection. For instance, many multinational enterprises achieve technology transfer in China through joint ventures while retaining core technologies to protect their interests.

3.4. Disputes and Impacts of Technology Transfer in International Conflicts

International disputes over technology transfer mainly focus on intellectual property protection and market access. The United States and the European Union argue that China's forced technology transfer policies violate international trade rules and constitute unfair competition [8]. These disputes not only affect bilateral trade relations but also pose challenges to the stability of the global trade system. For example, the U.S. 301 investigation accused China of using administrative measures and policies to force U.S. enterprises to transfer technology, claiming it undermines the U.S.'s technological advantage and economic interests [9].

4. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER IN TRADE DISPUTES

4.1. DS549 and DS542

In the China-U.S. trade disputes, typical cases such as DS549 and DS542 saw the United States and the European Union respectively file complaints against China, accusing China of forcing foreign enterprises to form joint ventures with local firms and transfer technology through joint venture regulations and technology licensing requirements. These measures compel foreign enterprises to compromise on technology transfer to gain market access [10, 11]. This practice not only leads to intellectual property loss but also negatively impacts the global innovation environment. Through the WTO dispute resolution mechanism and bilateral agreements, parties attempt to resolve these disputes, but significant deficiencies remain in the enforcement and supervision of the current international legal framework [12]. The disputes not only affect China-U.S. and China-EU trade relations but also have profound impacts on the global trade environment. These cases highlight the complexity and sensitivity of technology transfer in international trade. As technology's importance in the global economy continues to rise, countries will impose stricter and more complex regulations and policies on technology transfer [13]. Common issues in these cases involve foreign enterprises facing pressure for forced technology transfer when entering the Chinese market. These policies compel foreign enterprises to compromise on technology transfer for market access, leading to intellectual property loss and negatively impacting the global innovation environment. Parties attempt to resolve these disputes through the WTO dispute resolution mechanism and bilateral agreements, but significant deficiencies remain in the enforcement and supervision of the current international legal framework.

4.2. DS603 Case

4.2.1. Technology Transfer Requirements in Trade Disputes

The DS603 case was initiated by China against Australia, primarily concerning anti-dumping and countervailing measures imposed by Australia on certain products imported from China. China argued that these measures unfairly increased the burden on Chinese enterprises, compelling them to transfer technology when entering the Australian market. Specifically, these measures included anti-dumping and countervailing duties on wind towers, stainless steel sinks, and railway wheels, which restricted market access for Chinese companies, forcing them to share technology to reduce costs and avoid high taxes.

4.2.2. Analysis of Technology Transfer Issues in DS603

In the DS603 case, China specifically alleged that Australia's anti-dumping and countervailing measures did not comply with WTO rules and led to forced technology transfer by Chinese companies. For example, the anti-dumping and countervailing duties imposed on wind towers, stainless steel sinks, and railway wheels from China pressured producers to make technological concessions to meet Australian market requirements. China pointed out that in determining normal value and dumping margins, Australia failed to use the actual production costs of Chinese companies and instead relied on cost data from other countries. This approach resulted in unfair treatment of Chinese enterprises, compelling them to make technological adjustments and transfers to enter the Australian market.

4.2.3. The Role of Bilateral Agreements and Multilateral Frameworks in Dispute Resolution

In this case, bilateral agreements and multilateral frameworks played a significant role in resolving the dispute. China and Australia utilized the WTO dispute resolution mechanism to address the conflict and reached several interim agreements to ease tensions before the final WTO ruling. Both parties agreed to resolve certain specific technology transfer and anti-dumping tax disputes through arbitration, thus avoiding more severe trade frictions.

4.2.4. Impact of the Dispute on the International Trade Environment and Legal Adaptation

The dispute not only affected trade relations between China and Australia but also had profound implications for the global trade environment. As the importance of technology in the global economy continues to rise, countries will impose stricter and more complex regulations and policies on technology transfer. The issue of forced technology transfer involves market access, competition, intellectual property protection, and technological innovation.

4.3. DS611 Case

4.3.1. Technology Transfer Requirements in Trade Disputes

This case was initiated by the European Union against China, focusing on China's "anti-suit injunctions" policy in intellectual property enforcement. The EU accused China of using court orders to prohibit patent holders from exercising their rights outside China, thus forcibly limiting their ability to protect their rights globally. This practice was deemed a violation of the TRIPS Agreement and the GATT 1994 provisions, as it indirectly compelled foreign companies to share technology within the Chinese market to avoid legal risks [14].

4.3.2. Analysis of Technology Transfer Issues in DS611

In this case, the EU specifically accused China of several measures, including injunctions issued by the Supreme People's Court and various intermediate courts. These injunctions not only affected patent holders in China but also compelled them to comply through daily fines. These measures forced patent holders to transfer technology in China to avoid barriers and hefty fines associated with exercising their patent rights internationally. For instance, in the Huawei v. Conversant case, China's Supreme People's Court issued an anti-suit injunction preventing Conversant from enforcing its

judgment in German courts. Similar cases include Xiaomi v. InterDigital, OPPO v. Sharp, and Samsung v. Ericsson, where Chinese courts issued similar injunctions prohibiting related parties from seeking or enforcing injunctions outside China.

4.3.3. The Role of Bilateral Agreements and Multilateral Frameworks in Dispute Resolution

In this case, the WTO framework provided a multilateral platform for resolving such international trade disputes, allowing the EU and China to mediate and adjudicate based on international law. Additionally, both parties sought to find solutions through bilateral negotiations and agreements. For example, the EU and China agreed on an arbitration procedure within the WTO dispute settlement mechanism to address the issue. This combination of bilateral agreements and multilateral frameworks offered diverse paths and options for resolving complex international trade disputes.

4.3.4. Impact of the Dispute on the International Trade Environment and Legal Adaptation

The case significantly impacted the international trade environment and legal adaptation. Firstly, it highlighted the complexity and uncertainty of the international legal framework concerning intellectual property protection and technology transfer. The use of anti-suit injunctions increased the difficulty for multinational companies to protect their intellectual property globally and intensified the unfairness in the technology transfer process. This policy forced multinational companies to transfer technology within the Chinese market to avoid international legal risks, increasing the coercion and complexity of technology transfer. Secondly, the case reflected deep-rooted contradictions between China and its major trading partners in intellectual property enforcement and technology transfer policies. China's anti-suit injunction policy sparked widespread controversy internationally, leading to decreased trust in China's intellectual property protection policies. This distrust further complicated international technology transfer, affecting the free flow of technology and innovative cooperation globally.

4.4. DS615 Case

4.4.1. Technology Transfer Requirements in Trade Disputes

This case was initiated by China against the United States, involving U.S. measures on semiconductors and other related products, services, and technologies. China accused the U.S. of imposing a series of export control measures that restricted China's access to key semiconductor technologies and products, putting Chinese companies at a disadvantage in market access and technology acquisition. These measures included the Export Control Reform Act and its implementing regulations, the Export Administration Regulations, particularly concerning advanced computing semiconductor chips, supercomputer projects, and related services and technologies.

4.4.2. Analysis of Technology Transfer Issues in DS615

In this case, China alleged that U.S. export control measures not only restricted Chinese companies' access to key technologies but also indirectly forced them to transfer technology. For example, the U.S. Export Administration Regulations stipulated that foreign-produced products involving U.S. technology or software, if ultimately destined for China, require a license. This provision significantly expanded the scope of U.S. export controls, affecting the stability of the global semiconductor supply chain. U.S. measures included export restrictions on certain high-performance semiconductor chips and their manufacturing equipment, which are crucial for China's technological development and industrial upgrading. To circumvent these restrictions, Chinese companies had to engage in joint ventures and technological collaborations, indirectly acquiring the necessary technology. This approach effectively increased the coercion of technology transfer, limiting Chinese companies' technological independence and competitiveness in the global market.

4.4.3. The Role of Bilateral Agreements and Multilateral Frameworks in Dispute Resolution

In this case, bilateral agreements and multilateral frameworks played a crucial role in dispute resolution. China filed a complaint against the U.S. through the WTO dispute settlement mechanism, seeking to address the issue through a multilateral framework. Concurrently, multiple rounds of bilateral negotiations were conducted to find a solution through dialogue and negotiation, preventing further trade frictions. Other countries and regions, such as the EU, Japan, and South Korea, also expressed concern over the dispute and called for WTO reform and new international rules to further regulate and constrain coercive technology transfer practices.

4.4.4. Impact of the Dispute on the International Trade Environment and Legal Adaptation

The case had a profound impact on the international trade environment and legal adaptation. Firstly, it underscored the complexity and sensitivity of technology transfer in international trade. As technology becomes increasingly important in the global economy, countries will impose stricter and more complex regulations and policies on technology transfer. The issue of forced technology transfer involves market access, competition, intellectual property protection, and technological innovation.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of the legal controversies and regulatory issues of forced technology transfer in international trade, revealing the complexity and diversity of technology transfer in global trade. The study finds that while forced technology transfer can promote technology diffusion and economic development, it also poses challenges to intellectual property protection and market access. International legal frameworks such as the TRIPS and TRIMs agreements, despite regulating technology transfer, have significant deficiencies in enforcement and supervision, particularly in developing countries where regulatory mechanisms are inadequate, and enforcement is weak. Through empirical analysis of WTO dispute cases such as DS603, DS611, and DS615, this paper emphasizes the importance of constructing a fair legal framework for technology transfer. To strengthen intellectual property protection while promoting the free flow and development of technology, especially in developing countries, it is necessary to establish clear legal definitions and standards, incorporate fair clauses, and ensure the voluntariness and transparency of technology transfer. Additionally, international cooperation and multilateral agreements can establish global technology-sharing platforms and improve dispute resolution mechanisms, effectively reducing unfair practices in technology transfer and fostering global technological innovation and sustainable economic development. Ultimately, constructing a fair, transparent, and operable legal framework for technology transfer not only protects the technological and intellectual property interests of all countries but also promotes the healthy development of international trade, providing a solid legal foundation for balanced and sustainable global economic growth. This study offers theoretical foundations and practical guidance for policymakers and legal practitioners, contributing to the realization of free and fair technology transfer and competition globally.

REFERENCES

[1] Wang, T. (2023). Research on the Prohibition Clauses of Technology Transfer Performance Requirements in the China-EU Comprehensive Investment Agreement. Thesis of Shandong University, 53.

[2] Ferreira, J. J., Fernandes, C. I., & Ferreira, F. A. (2020). Technology transfer, climate change mitigation, and environmental patent impact on sustainability and economic growth: A comparison of European countries. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 150:119770.

[3] Hoen, E. T. (2022). Protecting public health through technology transfer: the unfulfilled promise of the TRIPS agreement. Health and Human Rights, 24(2): 211.

[4] Lewis, J. A. (2019). Emerging technologies and managing the risk of tech transfer to China. Center for Strategic & International Studies.

[5] Zheng, G. (2024). Research on the Issues of Forced Technology Transfer from the Perspective of International Investment Law. Thesis of Guangxi University, 71.

[6] Xu, Y. (2019). China's National People's Congress Standing Committee Promulgates the Foreign Investment Law Prohibiting Forced Technology Transfer. Technology Law Review, 31(4): 2-4.

[7] Mengdi, Z. (2019). China-US Phase One Agreement: The End of Technology Transfer Debate? Tsinghua China Law Review, 12: 365.

[8] Chen, A. W., Chen, J., & Dondeti, V. R. (2020). The US-China trade war: dominance of trade or technology? Applied Economics Letters, 27(11): 904-909.

[9] Prud'homme, D., & von Zedtwitz, M. (2019). Managing "forced" technology transfer in emerging markets: The case of China. Journal of International Management, 25(3): 100670.

[10] Yin, Q. (2022). Forced technology transfer performance requirement in international investment agreements—a Chinese perspective. Journal of Intellectual Property Law and Practice, 17(2): 114-131.

[11] Qin, J. Y. (2019). Forced technology transfer and the US–China trade war: Implications for international economic law. Journal of International Economic Law, 22(4): 743-762.

[12] García-Revillo, M. (2020). International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS). Yearbook of International Environmental Law, 31(1), 276-279.

[13] Liu, Y. (2024). Research on the Problems and Improvements of China's International Technology Transfer Legal System. Thesis of Jilin University, 62

[14] Svetlicinii, A., & Xie, F. (2024). The anti-suit injunctions in patent litigation in China: what role for judicial self-restraint? Journal of Intellectual Property Law and Practice, jpae049.