I. INTRODUCTION

Good afternoon. Thank you for your kind introduction, and for inviting me to participate in this conference. It is my pleasure to join you today.

I have served as an FTC Commissioner for almost four years now. Throughout my term, I have devoted a great deal of attention to issues at the intersection of intellectual property and competition law. The Commission's unanimous *Rambus* liability decision,[1] issued last August under my authorship, is one particularly noteworthy example.

But I am not going to talk about standard-setting today. I will leave that discussion to tomorrow morning's panelists – other than to put in a shameless plug, before a captive audience, for my dissenting statement on remedy in *Rambus*. The statement is available on the Commission's website.[2]

When I accepted this invitation, I was determined to talk about something a little off the beaten path – something that would be thought-provoking for this highly skilled audience. I decided I would share what I have learned thus far about so-called "generic biologics" – also known as "follow-on" biologics, or FOBs. (As I will explain in a moment, the two terms are not necessarily interchangeable, but for now I will use them that way.) I believe you will be hearing even more about generic biologics in the future. And what you hear may have a lot of rhetoric

---

[1] In the matter of Rambus Inc., FTC Dkt. No. 9302, Opinion of the Comm'n (Aug. 2, 2006), *available at* http://www.ftc.gov/os/adjpro/d9302/060802commissionopinion.pdf.

[2] In the matter of Rambus Inc., FTC Dkt. No. 9302, Remedy Statement of Comm'r Pamela Jones Harbour, Concurring in Part and Dissenting in Part (Feb. 5, 2006), *available at* http://www.ftc.gov/os/adjpro/d9302/070205harbourstmnt.pdf.